

ON QUASINORMALITY OF COMPACT PERTURBATIONS OF THE ISOMETRIES

SUSMITA DAS

ABSTRACT. We study the compact perturbations of an isometry on a separable Hilbert space and provide a complete characterization of when they are quasinormal. Based on that, we present a complete classification for a rank-one perturbation of a unilateral shift of finite multiplicity to be quasinormal in the setting of the Hardy space. The result can also be generalized for a separable Hilbert space. As an application, we provide a complete characterization for quasinormality of a rank-one perturbation of the Hardy shift.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be the algebra of bounded linear operators on \mathcal{H} . An operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is quasinormal if it commutes with T^*T . This is equivalent to saying $(T^*T - TT^*)T = 0$. Throughout, we assume that all the Hilbert spaces are separable, infinite dimensional and over the complex field \mathbb{C} . Note that, normal operators are trivially quasinormal and the most natural non-normal examples are isometries. Recall that, an operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is called an isometry if $T^*T = I$, where I is the identity operator on \mathcal{H} . The class of quasinormal operators were first introduced and studied by A. Brown in [1]. As we have seen, the class contains the normal operators and isometries, the two most significant objects in the theory of operators. A canonical representation of quasinormal operators is also given in [1], which serves as the foundation for all the subsequent developments in the corresponding theory.

On the other hand, the operators, that are compact perturbations of an isometry or a normal operator, attracted a lot of attention in recent years. There have been several attempts in studying their properties like hyponormality, contractivity, or to find a characterization of their invariant or hyperinvariant subspaces. [3], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10] are a few of such references. The idea is to perturb an isometry or a normal operator only slightly, observe the deviation in the behaviour of these newly formed operators and then find the suitable criteria to obtain (or restore) the desired (or original) property. For example, in [9], a complete characterization is given when a rank-one perturbation of an isometry can be a contraction or an isometry. In [7], it is shown that for a rank-one perturbation of a normal operator, hyponormality is equivalent to normality. Recall that, an operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a contraction if $\|Tx\| \leq \|x\|$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$, and hyponormal if $T^*T \geq TT^*$. A characterization for the hyponormal contractions that are finite rank perturbations of unilateral shifts of finite multiplicity, is given in [2].

In this paper, we consider compact perturbation of an isometry and investigate its quasinormality. Recall that, a quasinormal operator is hyponormal ([5]) but the converse is not true. Also, the unilateral weighted shift with nonzero weights on the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D})$

Date: December 9, 2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 47A55, 47B20, 47B32, 47B38, 47B91.

Key words and phrases. Quasinormal Operators, Perturbations, Unilateral shifts, Inner functions.

is quasinormal if and only if all the weights are equal ([5]). With the help of this, one can show that a rank-one perturbation of an isometry may not even be hyponormal. Infact, if for nonzero $u, v \in \mathcal{H}$, $u \otimes v$ defines the rank-one operator $(u \otimes v)(f) = \langle f, v \rangle u$, for all $f \in \mathcal{H}$, then an easy computation shows that $T = S + z \otimes 1$ on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ is not hyponormal, where S is the standard Hardy shift. However, one can show that the rank-one perturbation $S - z \otimes 1$ on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ is quasinormal. Throughout, S will denote the standard unilateral shift of multiplicity one on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$, and corresponding to an orthonormal basis $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ on \mathcal{H} the operator S_k with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ will denote the unilateral shift of multiplicity k , defined by $S_k(e_n) = e_{n+k}$. The plan of our paper is as follows: In section 2 we study the arbitrary compact perturbations of an isometry and provide a complete characterization of their quasinormality. let T be a non-isometric operator which is the sum of an isometry and a compact operator. It turns out that $(T^*T)^{1/2}$ is diagonalizable with eigenvalues converging to 1 and each non-unital eigenvalue has finite multiplicity (see Lemma 2.1). Based on this we prove that (also see Theorem 2.2):

THEOREM 1.1. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be non-isometric and of the form $T = \text{Isometry} + \text{Compact}$. Then T is quasinormal if and only if T can be written as the direct sum $D \oplus cU$, for some scalar $c \in \{0, 1\}$, where U is an isometry and D is a diagonal operator such that if \mathcal{P} denotes the set of all non-unital eigenvalues of $(T^*T)^{1/2}$ and n_k is the multiplicity of $\beta_n \in \mathcal{P}$ then*

$$D = \text{diag}_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P}} (\beta_n e^{it_j})_{j=1}^{k_n}.$$

Next, in the same section we consider completely non-unitary contractions (c.n.u for short). Recall that ([11]), a contraction T is called completely non-unitary (c.n.u. for short) if it has no nontrivial reducing subspace on which T is unitary. By canonical decomposition ([11]), every contraction on a Hilbert space can be written as a direct sum of a unitary and a completely non-unitary contractions. Since a unitary is normal (and hence quasinormal), it is sufficient to consider only c.n.u. contractions while discussing quasinormality. The defect spaces $\mathcal{D}_T, \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$ of a contraction T are defined as $\mathcal{D}_T = \overline{\text{ran}}(I - T^*T)$, and $\mathcal{D}_{T^*} = \overline{\text{ran}}(I - TT^*)$, and their dimensions are called the defect indices of T . We provide a complete characterization of quasinormality of c.n.u contractions with finite defect indices (see Theorem 2.6) in terms of certain finite rank operators which appears in our previous work (see [2]). Next we consider the case of the rank-one perturbation of the unilateral shift of arbitrary finite multiplicity on the Hardy space. If $u, v \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ are nonzero and S_k denotes the unilateral shift of multiplicity $k(\in \mathbb{N})$, we prove the following (see Theorem 2.9):

THEOREM 1.2. *If $T = S_k + u \otimes v$ on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ is quasinormal, then $\ker(I - T^*T)$ is a finitely generated S_k -invariant subspace of $H^2(\mathbb{D})$.*

In particular, we obtain the following result:

COROLLARY 1.3. *Let $T = S + u \otimes v$ be on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$. If T is quasinormal then $\ker(I - T^*T) = \theta H^2(\mathbb{D})$, where θ is either a single Blaschke factor or a product of two Blaschke factors.*

The above theorem 1.2 plays a crucial role in obtaining the explicit characterizations of quasinormality for $S_k + u \otimes v$. Note that, there are only two possibilities: the vectors v, S_k^*u can either be linearly dependent or linearly independent. In the following sections, we discuss both the cases and obtain two Theorems 3.1, and 4.1, with complete sets of classifications. We would like to point out that all the three of the Theorems 2.9, 3.1, 4.1 can also be obtained in a general Hilbert space set up—the proof of which will follow verbatim from the existing ones,

only after the obvious changes in the basis vectors. For the sake of notational convenience, we stay on the Hardy space.

• Section 3 begins with the case on $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ being linearly dependent. We prove the following theorem (see also Theorem 3.1):

THEOREM 1.4. *Let $T = S_k + u \otimes v$ be non-isometric on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ with $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ being linearly dependent. Then T is quasinormal if and only if v is an eigenvector of S_k^* and*

$$(1.1) \quad (1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle) \langle z^k v, g_i \rangle + \|v\|^2 \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} \langle u, z^n \rangle \langle z^n, g_i \rangle = 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m(\leq k),$$

where $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ is an orthonormal set generating $\ker(I - T^*T)$.

Let us recall that, corresponding to $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$, the function $k_\alpha(z) = \frac{1}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}$ on \mathbb{D} denotes the kernel function at α on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$. Then as a corollary to the above theorem, we obtain the following result (see Corollary 3.4):

COROLLARY 1.5. *Let S be the unilateral shift and u, v be nonzero elements of $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ such that v, S^*u are linearly dependent and the operator $T = S + u \otimes v$ is not an isometry. Then T is quasinormal if and only if there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $v = (1 - |\alpha|^2)\overline{v(\alpha)}k_\alpha$ and*

$$1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}(1 - |\alpha|^2)S^*u(\alpha) = \overline{\alpha v(\alpha)}u(0) \text{ holds.}$$

Here we like to make the following remark.

REMARK 1.6. In [8], the Proposition 2.5 claims that the rank-one perturbation of the unilateral shift is not quasinormal. The above corollary provides a class of counter examples to this claim.

• Section 4 deals with the quasinormality of $S_k + u \otimes v$ with $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ linearly independent. Theorem 4.1 provides a complete characterization of their quasinormality. For $k = 1$ i.e., for $T = S + u \otimes v$, two subcases arise depending on the two possibilities for the inner function θ associated to $\ker(I - T^*T)$, which can be either the square of a single Blaschke factor or a product of two distinct Blaschke factors (see corollary 2.11). For $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$, if $B_\alpha(z)$ denotes the Blaschke factor $B_\alpha(z) = \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, then we call T quasinormal of type I if $\theta(z) = \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2$, and quasinormal of type II if $\theta(z) = \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)\left(\frac{z-\beta}{1-\bar{\beta}z}\right)$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{D}$. We provide complete characterizations of both types of quasinormality in Theorems 4.3, and 4.4. These classifications also serve as another set of counter examples for Proposition 2.5 of [8].

2. CHARACTERIZATION FOR COMPACT PERTURBATIONS

In this section, we consider the compact perturbations of isometries on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . We begin with the following easy Lemma:

LEMMA 2.1. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be of the form $T = \text{Isometry} + \text{Compact}$. Then $(T^*T)^{1/2}$ is diagonalizable with eigenvalues converging to 1 and each non-unital eigenvalue has finite multiplicity.*

Proof. Let $T = W + K$, where W is an isometry and K is compact on \mathcal{H} . Then

$$T^*T = (W^* + K^*)(W + K) = I + W^*K + K^*W + K^*K.$$

Since $T^*T - I$ is compact and self-adjoint, by Spectral theorem, there exist an orthonormal basis $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ and a unitary $U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad U(I - T^*T)U^* = D,$$

where D is a diagonal operator defined by $D(e_n) = \alpha_n e_n$, $\alpha_n \in \mathbb{C}$ for all n and the sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ converges to zero. Now by (2.1) $U(T^*T)^{1/2}U^* = (I - D)^{1/2}$, and $(I - D)^{1/2}e_n = (1 - \alpha_n)^{1/2}e_n$ for all $n \geq 1$. Hence $(1 - \alpha_n)^{1/2}$ are eigenvalues of $(I - D)^{1/2}$, and clearly the sequence $\{(1 - \alpha_n)^{1/2}\}_{n \geq 1}$ converges to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose $\alpha_k \in \{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a nonzero element for some $k \geq 1$. Since $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ converges to zero, α_k can occur only finitely many times. Hence $(1 - \alpha_k)^{1/2} \neq 1$ and has finite multiplicity. Since the non-unital eigenvalues of $(T^*T)^{1/2}$ are in one-one correspondence with the nonzero α_n 's, the proof follows. \blacksquare

With the help of the Lemma 2.1, we now provide the following classification result:

THEOREM 2.2. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a non-isometric operator of the form $T = \text{Isometry} + \text{Compact}$. Then T is quasinormal if and only if T can be written as the direct sum $D \oplus cU$, for some scalar $c \in \{0, 1\}$, where U is an isometry and D is a diagonal operator such that if \mathcal{P} denotes the set of all non-unital eigenvalues of $(T^*T)^{1/2}$ and k_n is the multiplicity of $\beta_n \in \mathcal{P}$ then*

$$D = \text{diag}_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P}} (\beta_n e^{it_j})_{j=1}^{k_n}.$$

Proof. Let $T = \text{Isometry} + \text{Compact}$, and also T is not an isometry. Then $I - T^*T$ is nonzero and by Lemma 2.1, there exist a unitary $U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ and an orthonormal basis $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad U(T^*T)^{1/2}U^* = (I - D)^{1/2},$$

where D is the diagonal operator defined by $D(e_n) = \alpha_n e_n$, $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ and $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 1} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Since $(I - T^*T) \neq 0$, α_n is nonzero for at least one n and also a nonzero α_n can appear only finitely many times. Hence $\alpha_n = 1$ only for finitely many n —which implies $\ker(I - D)^{1/2}$ has finite dimension.

Let $T = V(T^*T)^{1/2}$ be the unique polar decomposition of T with V as the appropriate partial isometry and $\ker T = \ker V = \ker(T^*T)^{1/2}$. Then with respect to the same unitary U above, we have by (2.2) $UTU^* = (UVU^*)(I - D)^{1/2}$. Let us denote $UTU^* = T_1$ and $UVU^* = V_1$. Then V_1 is a partial isometry and T_1 is unitarily equivalent to T with the polar decomposition

$$(2.3) \quad T_1 = V_1(I - D)^{1/2}, \quad \ker T_1 = \ker V_1 = \ker(I - D)^{1/2}.$$

Clearly, T is quasinormal if and only if T_1 is quasinormal. Let us assume that T is quasinormal. Then we have

$$(2.4) \quad V_1(I - D)^{1/2} = (I - D)^{1/2}V_1.$$

Two cases can arise.

Case 1: $\ker T \neq \{0\}$.

By (2.3), this is equivalent to $\ker(I - D)^{1/2} \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, let $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \dots = \alpha_k = 1$ for some $k \geq 1$ and $\alpha_n \neq 1$ for all $n \geq k + 1$. Let us denote $\beta_n = (1 - \alpha_n)^{1/2}$ for

all $n \geq 1$, and let $E(\beta)$ denote the eigenspace of $(T^*T)^{1/2}$ corresponding to an eigenvalue β . Then by Lemma 2.1, \mathcal{H} can be decomposed as

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{H} = E(0) \oplus \left(\oplus_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}} E(\beta_n) \right) \oplus E(1).$$

Note that, $\dim E(0) = k$ and $\dim E(1)$ may be finite or infinite. For $\beta_n \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}$, \mathcal{P} being the set of all non-unital eigenvalues of $(T^*T)^{1/2}$, let $\dim E(\beta_n) = k_n$, where k_n is the finite multiplicity of β_n . Then without loss of generality, we can write $(I - D)^{1/2}$ as

$$(2.6) \quad (I - D)^{1/2} = \text{diag}(0, \dots, 0) \oplus \left(\oplus_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}} \text{diag}(\beta_n^1, \beta_n^2, \dots, \beta_n^{k_n}) \right) \oplus I_{E(1)},$$

where 0 appears in first k diagonal positions, each non-unital $\beta_n \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}$ occurs consecutively k_n times, and $I_{E(1)} : E(1) \rightarrow E(1)$ is the identity operator.

Note by (2.3) and (2.6)

$$(2.7) \quad \ker V_1 = \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_k\} = E(0).$$

We now show that the eigenspaces $E(\beta)$ reduce V_1 for all β . Indeed by (2.4), for all $n \geq 1$

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} V_1(I - D)^{1/2}e_n &= (I - D)^{1/2}V_1e_n \\ \implies \beta_n V_1e_n &= (I - D)^{1/2}V_1e_n, \end{aligned}$$

and hence $e_n \in E(\beta_n)$ implies $V_1e_n \in E(\beta_n)$. Since for eigenvalues β_m, β_n with $\beta_m \neq \beta_n$ $E(\beta_m) \perp E(\beta_n)$, it follows that $E(\beta_n)$ reduces V_1 for all β_n .

Again, for each eigenvalue β of $(T^*T)^{1/2}$ let us define $V_1^{E(\beta)} : E(\beta) \rightarrow E(\beta)$ by

$$(2.9) \quad V_1^{E(\beta)} = V_1(f), \text{ if } f \in E(\beta).$$

Then one can write via (2.5), (2.8), and (2.9)

$$(2.10) \quad V_1 = V_0 \oplus \left(\oplus_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}} V_1^{E(\beta_n)} \right) \oplus V_1^{E(1)},$$

where $V_0 : E(0) \rightarrow E(0)$ is the zero operator. Now $T_1 = V_1(I - D)^{1/2}$ together with (2.5), (2.6), and (2.10) yield

$$(2.11) \quad T_1 = 0 \oplus \left(\oplus_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}} \beta_n V_1^{E(\beta_n)} \right) \oplus V_1^{E(1)},$$

where $0 : E(0) \rightarrow E(0)$ is the zero operator. Since for each $\beta_n \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}$, $V_1^{E(\beta_n)} : E(\beta_n) \rightarrow E(\beta_n)$ are finite isometry (and hence unitary), there exists a unitary $U_1^{E(\beta_n)} : E(\beta_n) \rightarrow E(\beta_n)$ such that

$$(2.12) \quad U_1^{E(\beta_n)} V_1^{E(\beta_n)} U_1^{E(\beta_n)*} = \text{diag}(e^{it_1}, e^{it_2}, \dots, e^{it_{k_n}}),$$

where $t_j \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, k_n$. Note that,

$$(2.13) \quad U_1 = I_{E(0)} \oplus \left(\oplus_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}} U_1^{E(\beta_n)} \right) \oplus I_{E(1)}$$

defines a unitary on \mathcal{H} and it follows by (2.10)—(2.13)

$$(2.14) \quad U_1 T_1 U_1^* = 0 \oplus \left(\oplus_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}} \beta_n \text{diag}(e^{it_1}, e^{it_2}, \dots, e^{it_{k_n}}) \right) \oplus V_1^{E(1)}.$$

Clearly

$$(2.15) \quad 0 \oplus \left(\oplus_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}} \beta_n \text{diag}(e^{it_1}, e^{it_2}, \dots, e^{it_{k_n}}) \right)$$

is a diagonal operator D on $E(0) \oplus (\oplus_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}} E(\beta_n))$ with diagonal entries consist of non-unital eigenvalues of $(T^*T)^{1/2}$ repeated according to their multiplicities and $V_1^{E(1)}$ is an isometry on $E(1)$. Note that, if $E(1) = 0$, then there will be no isometry part $V_1^{E(1)}$ in (2.14). In that case one can write (via (2.14))

$$(2.16) \quad T_1 = 0 \oplus \left(\oplus_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}} \beta_n \text{diag}(e^{it_1}, e^{it_2}, \dots, e^{it_{k_n}}) \right) \oplus cV_1^{E(1)},$$

with $c = 0$. If $E(1) \neq 0$, (2.16) holds with $c = 1$. Since T is unitarily equivalent to T_1 , the conclusion follows.

Case 2: $\ker T = \{0\}$.

In this case $E(0) = 0$ and proceeding exactly as the case 1, T_1 will have the following decomposition

$$(2.17) \quad T_1 = \oplus_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P}} \beta_n \text{diag}(e^{it_1}, e^{it_2}, \dots, e^{it_{k_n}}) \oplus cV_1^{E(1)},$$

where $c \in \{0, 1\}$, and $D = \oplus_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P}} \beta_n \text{diag}(e^{it_1}, e^{it_2}, \dots, e^{it_{k_n}})$ is the diagonal operator with the requisite properties. Then the conclusion will follow by the same argument as in case 1.

Conversely, let T can be written as the direct sum $D \oplus cU$ for some $c \in \{0, 1\}$, where U is an isometry and D is a diagonal operator of the form given in the statement. Since D is normal and an isometry is always quasinormal, T is quasinormal. We show that, with the prescribed form of D , T can be written as isometry + compact. Let us denote, $\oplus_{\beta \in \mathcal{P}} E(\beta) = E(\mathcal{P})$. Two case can arise—the set \mathcal{P} is either finite or infinite.

Case 1: \mathcal{P} is finite. Then, D is a finite rank operator. Let us define $U_{\mathcal{P}} : E(\mathcal{P}) \rightarrow E(\mathcal{P})$ by $U_{\mathcal{P}} = \text{diag}_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P}}(e^{it_j})_{j=1}^{k_n}$ and $D_1 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ by

$$(2.18) \quad D_1(f) = \begin{cases} (D - U_{\mathcal{P}})f, & \text{if } f \in E(\mathcal{P}) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$(2.19) \quad T = D \oplus cU = (U_{\mathcal{P}} + D - U_{\mathcal{P}}) \oplus cU = D_1 + (U_{\mathcal{P}} \oplus cU).$$

Clearly, D_1 is compact and $U_{\mathcal{P}} \oplus cU$ is an isometry.

Case 2: \mathcal{P} is infinite. If $\mathcal{P} = \{\beta_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, then by Lemma 2.1, β_n converges to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. As in the case 1, we define $U_{\mathcal{P}} : E(\mathcal{P}) \rightarrow E(\mathcal{P})$ by $U_{\mathcal{P}} = \text{diag}_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P}}(e^{it_j})_{j=1}^{k_n}$ and $D_1 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ by

$$(2.20) \quad D_1(f) = \begin{cases} (D - U_{\mathcal{P}})f, & \text{if } f \in E(\mathcal{P}) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $D_1 = \text{diag}_{\beta_n \in \mathcal{P}}(\beta_n - 1)(e^{it_j})_{j=1}^{k_n} \oplus 0$ is compact and one can write

$$(2.21) \quad T = D \oplus cU = (U_{\mathcal{P}} + D - U_{\mathcal{P}}) \oplus cU = D_1 + (U_{\mathcal{P}} \oplus cU),$$

where $U_{\mathcal{P}} \oplus cU$ is an isometry. ■

The following is an easy corollary of Theorem 2.2:

COROLLARY 2.3. *Let T be a nonisometric operator on \mathcal{H} that can be written as $T = \text{Isometry} + \text{Compact}$. If T is quasinormal then T has a nontrivial, proper reducing subspace.*

Proof. If T is not an isometry, $(I - T^*T)$ is a nonzero compact operator. Suppose T is quasinormal. Then $T(T^*T) = (T^*T)T$ and hence $T(I - T^*T) = (I - T^*T)T$. If $\text{ran}(I - T^*T)$ is not dense, then $\overline{\text{ran}}(I - T^*T)$ is a nonzero proper reducing subspace of T . If $\text{ran}(I - T^*T)$ is dense in \mathcal{H} , then following the lines of proof of the Theorem 2.2, the operator $(T^*T)^{1/2}$ has a nonzero proper eigenspace that reduces T . ■

We now discuss the quasinormality in the settings of a contraction operator in below subsection. As we mentioned earlier, we only consider the c.n.u. contractions, which is sufficient.

2.1. Completely non-unitary contractions and quasinormality. Note that, if a contraction T is quasinormal, then it is also hyponormal i.e., $T^*T \geq TT^*$ ([5]). Again, by Douglas Lemma ([4]), $T^*T \geq TT^*$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{D}_T \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$. However, a c.n.u. T with $\mathcal{D}_T \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$ need not be quasinormal. For example, the operator T on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ defined by $T(1) = T(z) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $T(z^m) = z^{m+1}$ for all $m \geq 2$, is a c.n.u. with finite defect indices and also satisfies $\mathcal{D}_T \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$, but not even hyponormal (see Example 3.4, [2]). Recall that (see Theorem 3.2, [2]), a c.n.u. T with $\mathcal{D}_T \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$ and $\dim \mathcal{D}_{T^*} < \infty$ can be written as the sum $T = S_k + F$, where S_k is the unilateral shift of multiplicity $k (= \dim(\mathcal{D}_T \ominus \mathcal{D}_{T^*}))$ and F is a finite rank operator satisfying certain properties. Based on this, we now provide a characterization of their quasinormality. To begin with, we recall the Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 from [2]. We keep the same set of notions as used there:

Let us fix an orthonormal basis $\{e_m\}_{m \geq 1}$ on \mathcal{H} . By P_n , we denote the orthogonal projection onto the first n basis vectors $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$. Corresponding to $k \geq 1$, let S_k denote the unilateral shift of multiplicity k on \mathcal{H} defined by

$$(2.22) \quad S_k(e_m) = e_{m+k}, \quad m \geq 1.$$

With this S_k and P_n , let us define the following family of finite rank operators F_1, F and $F_r (r \geq 2)$ as follows:

$$(2.23) \quad F_1(x) = \begin{cases} T|_{\mathcal{D}_T}(x) & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{D}_T, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{D}_T^\perp. \end{cases}$$

$$(2.24) \quad F = F_1 - S_k P_n,$$

$$(2.25) \quad F_r = F_1^r + S_k(I - P_n)F_1^{r-1} + \dots + S_k^{r-1}(I - P_n)F_1 \quad \forall r \geq 2.$$

Then the Proposition 3.1 in [2] states that

PROPOSITION 2.4. *Let $n \geq 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary but fixed. Let \mathcal{H} , $\{e_m\}_{m \geq 1}$, S_k , F and F_r ($r \in \mathbb{N}$) be as above (2.22)–(2.25). Set $T = S_k + F$, and assume that T is a c.n.u. contraction with finite indices such that $\mathcal{D}_T \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$, $\dim \mathcal{D}_T = n$ and $\dim(\mathcal{D}_{T^*} \ominus \mathcal{D}_T) = k$. Then:*

- (1) $\text{rank}(P_n - F_1^* F_1) = n$.
- (2) $F_1(I - P_n) = (I - P_{n+k})F_1 = 0$.
- (3) $\lambda \|F_1^* x\|^2 - \|F_1 x\|^2 \leq \lambda \|P_{n+k} x\|^2 - \|P_n x\|^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and for some } \lambda \geq 0$.
- (4) $\|F_r x\| \leq \|P_n x\|$ and $\|F_r^* x\| \leq \|P_{n+kr} x\|$ hold for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathcal{H}$, with zero as the only common solution to the corresponding equalities.

Based on the above, we have the following characterization for a non-isometric c.n.u T (see also Theorem 3.2 [2]):

THEOREM 2.5. *Let T be a bounded linear operator on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then T is a c.n.u contraction such that $\mathcal{D}_T \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$ with $\dim \mathcal{D}_T = n$, $\dim \mathcal{D}_{T^*} < \infty$ and $\dim(\mathcal{D}_{T^*} \ominus \mathcal{D}_T) = k$, if and only if there exists an orthonormal basis $\{e_m\}_{m \geq 1}$ of \mathcal{H} with respect to which T can be written as $T = S_k + F$, where S_k is the unilateral shift of multiplicity k and F is a finite rank operator satisfying conditions (1) – (4) in Proposition 2.4.*

We are now ready to prove the following characterization result on quasinormality.

THEOREM 2.6. *Let $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and T be a c.n.u. with $\dim \mathcal{D}_T = n$ and $\dim(\mathcal{D}_{T^*} \ominus \mathcal{D}_T) = k$. Then T is quasinormal if and only if there exists an orthonormal basis $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ on \mathcal{H} with respect to which T can be written as $T = S_k + F$ where S_k and F are defined as above and satisfies the following conditions:*

- (1) $\text{rank}(P_n - F_1^* F_1) = n$.
- (2) $F_1(I - P_n) = (I - P_n)F_1 = 0$.
- (3) $\|F_1^* x\| = \|F_1 x\| \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{H}$.
- (4) $\|F_1^r x\| < \|P_n x\| \quad \forall r \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ and for all } x \in \mathcal{H} \text{ with } x \neq 0$.

Proof. Let T be a c.n.u. with $\dim \mathcal{D}_T = n$ and $\dim(\mathcal{D}_{T^*} \ominus \mathcal{D}_T) = k$. Assume T is quasinormal. Then $\mathcal{D}_T \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$ and by Theorem 2.5 there exists an orthonormal basis $\{e_m\}_{m \geq 1}$ of \mathcal{H} with $\text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_n\} = \mathcal{D}_T$ such that T can be written as $T = S_k + F$ where S_k and F are defined as in (2.22)–(2.24) and satisfies the conditions (1)–(4) of the Proposition 2.4. Note that the condition 1 is same as that of (1) in Proposition 2.4. Since T is quasinormal, \mathcal{D}_T reduces T and hence $\text{ran } F_1 \subseteq \mathcal{D}_T$. Therefore $(I - P_{n+k})F_1$ is the same as $(I - P_n)F_1$ and the property 2 follows by the property (2) in Proposition 2.4. Note that, T can now be written as

$$(2.26) \quad T = F_1 \oplus S_k \quad \text{on } \mathcal{D}_T \oplus (\mathcal{H} \ominus \mathcal{D}_T).$$

Since F_1 has finite rank and T is quasinormal (by assumption), F_1 must be normal i.e., the property 3 follows. However, 3 can also be derived as a consequence of Theorem 2.6 and the condition (3) in Proposition 2.4. Finally by 1 and 2, the equation (2.25) reduces to $F_r = F_1^r$ for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and as a consequence, one can deduce that $I - T^r T^{*r} = P_n - F_1^{*r} F_1^r$ (see also equation 3.19 in [2]). Then the property 4 follows as an immediate consequence of property 3 and the condition (4) in Proposition 2.4. \blacksquare

REMARKS 2.7. (1) It is easy to see that, an operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ that can be written as $T = F \oplus S_k$, where S_k is the unilateral shift of finite multiplicity k and F is some finite rank operator, is quasinormal if and only if F is normal. However, not every quasinormal operator T can be written as a direct sum of a compact or finite rank perturbation of the unilateral shift of finite multiplicity. Any diagonal operator is such an example. The Theorem 2.6 exhibits that the class of quasinormal contractions with finite defect indices has this particular property.

- (2) One can show that the decomposition in Theorem 2.6 coincides with the decomposition of Theorem 2.2 when applied on a quasinormal c.n.u. with finite indices.

We observed in the Corollary 3.7, [2], a c.n.u. T with $\mathcal{D}_T \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$, $\dim \mathcal{D}_T = 1$ and $\dim \mathcal{D}_{T^*} < \infty$ is always hyponormal. However T need not be quasinormal. Recall by Theorem 3.6, [2], with respect to some orthonormal basis $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ on \mathcal{H} , T can be written as $T = S_k + F$

where $S_k(e_n) = e_{n+k}$ for all $n \geq 0$, and F is defined by $F(e_0) = \sum_{i=0}^k \alpha_i e_i$ with $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}$, $\sum_{i=0}^k |\alpha_i|^2 < 1$ and $F(e_n) = 0$, $n \geq 1$. The matrix representation $[T]$ of T with respect to $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is given by

$$(2.27) \quad [T] = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \alpha_1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \alpha_k & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

We then have the following corollary:

COROLLARY 2.8. *Let T be a c.n.u. with $\mathcal{D}_T \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$, $\dim \mathcal{D}_T = 1$, $\dim \mathcal{D}_{T^*} < \infty$. Then T is quasinormal if and only if $\alpha_i = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, where the scalars α_i are associated with the matrix representation (2.27) of T .*

Proof. It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{D}_T = \text{span} \{e_0\}$. Let us assume that T is quasinormal. Then by (2) in Theorem 2.6, $(I - P_1)F = 0$ and hence $\alpha_i = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Conversely, if $\alpha_i = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, then T can be written as $T = \alpha_0 I_{e_0} \oplus S_k$ where $I_{e_0} : \mathbb{C}e_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}e_0$ is the identity operator. It is easy to verify that the conditions (1)–(4) of the Theorem 2.6 are satisfied. The proof now follows by the converse of the same Theorem. \blacksquare

We now focus on the rank-one perturbations of the unilateral shifts S_k of finite multiplicities k . We will stick to the Hardy space set-up for the notational convenience. except for the case of $k = 1$, we will state all the results for a general Hilbert space, that can be easily proved only by making the obvious changes. We start the next subsection with the following Lemma:

2.2. Kernel space of a rank-one perturbation of S_k .

LEMMA 2.9. *Let $T = S_k + u \otimes v$, where S_k is the unilateral shift of multiplicity $k (\geq 1)$ and u, v are nonzero elements of $H^2(\mathbb{D})$. If T is quasinormal, then $\ker(I - T^*T)$ is S_k -invariant and there exists an orthonormal set of complex functions $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$, $m \leq k$ such that*

$$\ker(I - T^*T) = g_1 H^2[z^k] \oplus \cdots \oplus g_m H^2[z^k], \quad \text{where}$$

$$H^2[z^k] := \{f(z^k) : f \in H^2(\mathbb{D})\}.$$

Proof. Let $T = S_k + u \otimes v$ be quasinormal, where S_k, u, v are as in the statement. If T is an isometry, $\ker(I - T^*T) = H^2(\mathbb{D})$ and one can write

$$H^2(\mathbb{D}) = H^2[z^k] \oplus z H^2[z^k] \oplus \cdots \oplus z^{k-1} H^2[z^k].$$

Assume T is non-isometric. Then $(I - T^*T)$ is a nonzero finite rank operator and hence, $\overline{\text{ran}}(I - T^*T)$ is a nontivial proper closed subspace of $H^2(\mathbb{D})$. Hence $\ker(I - T^*T) \neq \{0\}$. Since T is quasinormal, $\overline{\text{ran}}(I - T^*T)$ reduces T (follows by the proof of Corollary 2.3). Hence $\ker(I - T^*T)$ is T -invariant. Note that

$$(2.28) \quad (I - T^*T) = -(S_k^* u \otimes v + v \otimes S_k^* u + \|u\|^2 v \otimes v),$$

and hence $\overline{\text{ran}}(I - T^*T) \subseteq \text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\}$. We show that $v \in \text{ran}(I - T^*T)$. The following two cases can arise:

Case 1: $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ is linearly dependent.

Then it follows by (2.28), $\text{ran}(I - T^*T) = \text{span}\{v\}$.

Case 2: $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ is linearly independent.

Then there exist $f, g \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ such that $\langle f, v \rangle = 0$, $\langle f, S_k^*u \rangle \neq 0$, and $\langle g, S_k^*u \rangle = 0$, $\langle g, v \rangle \neq 0$. Then by equation (2.28),

$$(2.29) \quad (I - T^*T)f = -(v \otimes S_k^*u)f = -\langle f, S_k^*u \rangle v,$$

$$(2.30) \quad (I - T^*T)g = -(\langle g, v \rangle S_k^*u + \|u\|^2 \langle g, v \rangle v),$$

and further, by (2.29) and (2.30) $\text{ran}(I - T^*T) = \text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\}$.

Since $\overline{\text{ran}}(I - T^*T)^\perp$ is T -invariant, we have $\text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp$ is T -invariant. Now for any $f \in \text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp$,

$$Tf = (S_k + u \otimes v)f = S_k f + \langle f, v \rangle u = S_k f,$$

showing that $\text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp$ is S_k -invariant. Since S_k is an isometry and k is finite, by classical Wold-Kolmogorov decomposition, there exist $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp \ominus S_k\{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp$ with $m \leq k$ such that

$$\{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp = \ker(I - T^*T) = g_1 H^2[z^k] \oplus \dots \oplus g_m H^2[z^k],$$

where the set $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ is orthonormal and the subspace $H^2[z^k]$ is defined by

$$H^2[z^k] = \{f(z^k) : f \in H^2(\mathbb{D})\}.$$

■

On a general Hilbert space, the Lemma 2.9 can be reformulated as follows. The proof will be similar to that of Lemma 2.9.

LEMMA 2.10. *Let $T = S_k + u \otimes v$, where S_k is the unilateral shift of multiplicity $k(\geq 1)$ and u, v are nonzero elements on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . If T is quasinormal, then $\ker(I - T^*T)$ is S_k -invariant and there exists an orthonormal set $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ with $m \leq k$ such that*

$$\ker(I - T^*T) \ominus S_k \ker(I - T^*T) = \text{span} \{g_1, \dots, g_m\}.$$

As an application of the Theorem 2.9, we have the following corollary on the Hardy space—which will play a key role in classifying quasinormalities on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$:

COROLLARY 2.11. *Let $T = S + u \otimes v$, where u, v are nonzero and S is the unilateral shift of multiplicity one on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$. If T is quasinormal then $\ker(I - T^*T) = \theta H^2(\mathbb{D})$, where θ is either a single Blaschke factor or a product of two Blaschke factors.*

Proof. Let $T = S + u \otimes v$ be quasinormal. If T is an isometry, $\ker(I - T^*T) = H^2(\mathbb{D})$ and the corollary follows with $\theta = 1$. If T is not an isometry, then by Lemma 2.9, $\ker(I - T^*T)$ is a proper, closed S -invariant subspace of $H^2(\mathbb{D})$. Hence by Beurling's theorem, there exists an inner function θ such that $\ker(I - T^*T) = \theta H^2(\mathbb{D})$. Again, following the lines of the proof of lemma 2.9, $\ker(I - T^*T) = \{v, S^*u\}^\perp$, where v and S^*u can be either linearly dependent or linearly independent. Hence $\text{codim } \ker(I - T^*T) \leq 2$. Consequently, θ is either a single

Blaschke factor, or can be of the form $\theta(z) = \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2$, or $\theta(z) = \left(\frac{z-\beta}{1-\bar{\beta}z}\right)\left(\frac{z-\gamma}{1-\bar{\gamma}z}\right) \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{D}$, and for some $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}$. \blacksquare

We are now ready to proceed for the quasinormality of the rank one perturbation $T = S_k + u \otimes v$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ on the Hardy space. Since an isometry is always quasinormal, we will only consider the operators $S_k + u \otimes v$ that are non-isometric. Since the vectors v, S_k^*u can be either linearly dependent or linearly independent, we discuss the quasinormality in two separate theorems—Theorem 3.1, and Theorem 4.1 in the sections 3, and 4 respectively.

3. QUASINORMALITY, WHEN $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ IS LINEARLY DEPENDENT

We begin this section with the quasinormal characterization of $S_k + u \otimes v$ with $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ linearly dependent on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$. As a corollary (see Corollary 3.4), we obtain a complete classification result for this type of rank-one perturbations of the Hardy shift to be quasinormal. We first prove the following theorem, the main result of this section.

THEOREM 3.1. *Let $T = S_k + u \otimes v$ on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ be non-isometric with $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ linearly dependent. Then T is quasinormal if and only if v is an eigen vector of S_k^* and*

$$(3.1) \quad (1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle) \langle z^k v, g_i \rangle + \|v\|^2 \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} \langle u, z^n \rangle \langle z^n, g_i \rangle = 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m(\leq k),$$

where $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ is an orthonormal set associated to $\ker(I - T^*T)$ as in Lemma 2.9.

Proof. Let $T = S_k + u \otimes v$ be on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ with $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ linearly dependent and assume T to be quasinormal. Note that, $\text{ran}(I - T^*T) = \text{span}\{v\}$ (see the proof of Lemma 2.9, case 1) and following the proof of Corollary 2.3, $\overline{\text{ran}}(I - T^*T)$ reduces T . Again, by Lemma 2.9, $\ker(I - T^*T)$ is S_k -invariant. This implies, v is an eigenvector of S_k^* . The same lemma also says that, there exist orthonormal functions $g, \dots, g_m \in \ker(I - T^*T)$ with $m \leq k$ such that

$$(3.2) \quad \ker(I - T^*T) = \{v\}^\perp = \text{span}\{g_1, \dots, g_m\} \oplus z^k \{v\}^\perp$$

Our aim is to show that the relations in (3.1) hold. Since v, S_k^*u are linearly dependent, there exists $r \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$(3.3) \quad S_k^*u = rv,$$

and further by (3.3), one can write

$$(3.4) \quad u = Pu + rz^k v,$$

where P is the orthogonal projection onto $\{1, z, \dots, z^{k-1}\}$. Note that

$$(3.5) \quad Pu = u(0) + \langle u, z \rangle z + \dots + \langle u, z^{k-1} \rangle z^{k-1},$$

and by (3.3), $r = \frac{\langle S_k^*u, v \rangle}{\|v\|^2}$. Hence by (3.4),

$$(3.6) \quad u = Pu + \frac{\langle S_k^*u, v \rangle}{\|v\|^2} z^k v.$$

We now find Pu and $z^k v$ in terms of v and g_i ($i = 1, \dots, m$). Since $H^2(\mathbb{D}) = \mathbb{C}v \oplus \{v\}^\perp$ and $\langle Pu, z^{k+l} \rangle = 0$ (by (3.5)) for all $l \geq 0$, one can write by (3.2)

$$(3.7) \quad Pu = c_0 v + c_1 g_1 + \dots + c_m g_m,$$

for some $c_i \in \mathbb{C}$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$. Again since $\langle v, g_i \rangle = 0$ for all i and the set $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is orthonormal, we have by (3.7)

$$(3.8) \quad c_i = \begin{cases} \frac{\langle Pu, v \rangle}{\|v\|^2}, & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \langle Pu, g_i \rangle, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence by (3.7) and (3.8),

$$(3.9) \quad Pu = \frac{\langle Pu, v \rangle}{\|v\|^2} v + \sum_{i=1}^m \langle Pu, g_i \rangle g_i.$$

Similarly for $z^k v$, there exist $t_0, t_1, \dots, t_m, s \in \mathbb{C}$ and $f \in \{v\}^\perp$ such that

$$(3.10) \quad z^k v = t_0 v + t_1 g_1 + \dots + t_m g_m + s z^k f \quad (\text{by (3.2)}).$$

Since $z^k f \in z^k \{v\}^\perp$, we have $\langle z^k f, z^k v \rangle = \langle f, v \rangle = 0$ and also by (3.2), $\langle g_i, z^k f \rangle = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. These together with (3.10) yield

$$(3.11) \quad t_i = \begin{cases} \frac{\langle z^k v, v \rangle}{\|v\|^2}, & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \langle z^k v, g_i \rangle, & \text{if } i \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

and $s = 0$ if $f \neq 0$. Hence it follows by (3.10)

$$(3.12) \quad z^k v = \frac{\langle z^k v, v \rangle}{\|v\|^2} v + \sum_{i=1}^m \langle z^k v, g_i \rangle g_i.$$

Now, $Tv = (S_k + u \otimes v)v = z^k v + \|v\|^2 u$ and hence

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} Tv &= z^k v + \|v\|^2 \left(Pu + \frac{\langle S_k^* u, v \rangle}{\|v\|^2} z^k v \right) \quad (\text{by (3.6)}) \\ &= (1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) z^k v + \|v\|^2 Pu. \end{aligned}$$

On substituting Pu and $z^k v$ (from (3.9) and (3.12)) in (3.13), a little simplification yields

$$(3.14) \quad Tv = \left((1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) \frac{\langle z^k v, v \rangle}{\|v\|^2} + \langle Pu, v \rangle \right) v + \sum_{i=1}^m \left((1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) \langle z^k v, g_i \rangle + \|v\|^2 \langle Pu, g_i \rangle \right) g_i$$

Since $\text{ran}(I - T^*T) (= \mathbb{C}v)$ reduces T , it follows by (3.14)

$$(3.15) \quad (1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) \langle z^k v, g_i \rangle + \|v\|^2 \langle Pu, g_i \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Now (3.5) and (3.15) together imply

$$(3.16) \quad (1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) \langle z^k v, g_i \rangle + \|v\|^2 \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} \langle u, z^n \rangle \langle z^n, g_i \rangle = 0,$$

hold for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, where $m \leq k$.

For the converse part, let v be an eigenvector of S_k^* and the given relations hold. Since $v, S_k^* u$ are linearly dependent, as we noted earlier, $\text{ran}(I - T^*T) = \mathbb{C}v$. Since $S_k^* v = \lambda v$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, it follows that $\ker(I - T^*T) (= \{v\}^\perp)$ is S_k -invariant and

$$(3.17) \quad T^*v = (S_k^* + v \otimes u)v = (\lambda + \langle v, u \rangle)v,$$

implies that $\{v\}^\perp$ is T -invariant. Also, $T|_{\{v\}^\perp} = S_k|_{\{v\}^\perp}$. Now proceeding exactly as the first part above, the given relations (which are equivalent to (3.15)) reduce the equation (3.14) to

$$(3.18) \quad Tv = \left((1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) \frac{\langle z^k v, v \rangle}{\|v\|^2} + \langle Pu, v \rangle \right) v.$$

Hence on $H^2(\mathbb{D}) (= \mathbb{C}v \oplus \{v\}^\perp)$ one can write, $T = T|_{\mathbb{C}v} \oplus S_k$. Since v is an eigenvector of T (by (3.18)), it follows that T is quasinormal. \blacksquare

For $k = 1$ in the above theorem, if $\{v, S^*u\}$ is linearly dependent with $v = a + bz$ for some scalars $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$, then v is an eigenvector of S^* if and only if $b = 0$. However, v is always an eigenvector of S^{*2} . This leads to the following corollary:

COROLLARY 3.2. *Let $T = S^2 + u \otimes v$ be on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ with $\{v, S^{*2}u\}$ linearly dependent and $v = a + bz$ for some scalars a, b , not both zero. Suppose T is not an isometry. Then T is quasinormal if and only if*

- (1) $\langle S^{*2}u, v \rangle = -1$, and
- (2) $\langle u, z \rangle v(0) - \langle v, z \rangle u(0) = 0$ hold.

Proof. Let $T, v, S^{*2}u$ be as in the statement, and also T be non-isometric. By our previous observation, $\ker(I - T^*T) = \{v\}^\perp$. Clearly, v is an eigenvector of S^{*2} . Also, it is easy to see that

$$(3.19) \quad \{v\}^\perp = \overline{\text{span}} \{ \bar{b} - \bar{a}z, z^n : n \geq 2 \}.$$

Note that, if $\alpha = \frac{\bar{b}}{\sqrt{|a|^2 + |b|^2}}$ and $\beta = \frac{\bar{a}}{\sqrt{|a|^2 + |b|^2}}$, then $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ and $\{v\}^\perp$ is the parametric space $H_{\alpha, \beta}^2$ ([12]). It follows by (3.19)

$$(3.20) \quad \{v\}^\perp \ominus z^2 \{v\}^\perp = \text{span} \{ \bar{b} - \bar{a}z, az^2 + bz^3 \},$$

and hence the set $\left\{ \frac{\bar{b} - \bar{a}z}{\|v\|^2}, \frac{az^2 + bz^3}{\|v\|^2} \right\}$ forms an orthonormal basis for $\ker(I - T^*T) \ominus z^2 \ker(I - T^*T)$. By assumption, there exists a nonzero $d \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$(3.21) \quad S^{*2}u = dv.$$

It follows by (3.21),

$$(3.22) \quad d = \frac{\langle S^{*2}u, v \rangle}{\|v\|^2}$$

and further by (3.21), (3.22)

$$(3.23) \quad u(z) = u(0) + \langle u, z \rangle z + \frac{\langle S^{*2}u, v \rangle}{\|v\|^2} z^2 v.$$

In what follows, we show that the conditions (1) and (2) in the statement are equivalent to the equations in (3.1) of the Theorem 3.1 with $k = 1, m = 2$, and $g_1(z) = \frac{\bar{b} - \bar{a}z}{\|v\|^2}$, $g_2(z) = \frac{az^2 + bz^3}{\|v\|^2}$. Indeed, in our setting, the equations in (3.1) read as

$$(3.24) \quad (1 + \langle S^{*2}u, v \rangle) \langle z^2 v, \frac{\bar{b} - \bar{a}z}{\|v\|^2} \rangle + \|v\|^2 \sum_{n=0}^1 \langle u, z^n \rangle \langle z^n, \frac{\bar{b} - \bar{a}z}{\|v\|^2} \rangle = 0$$

$$(3.25) \quad (1 + \langle S^{*2}u, v \rangle) \langle z^2 v, \frac{az^2 + bz^3}{\|v\|^2} \rangle + \|v\|^2 \sum_{n=0}^1 \langle u, z^n \rangle \langle z^n, \frac{az^2 + bz^3}{\|v\|^2} \rangle = 0$$

Note that, $v(0) = a$, and $\langle v, z \rangle = b$. Then (3.24) simplifies to

$$(3.26) \quad \langle u, z \rangle v(0) - \langle v, z \rangle u(0) = 0,$$

and (3.25), simplifies to

$$(3.27) \quad \langle S^{*2}u, v \rangle = -1.$$

The proof now follows by the Theorem 3.1. ■

The analogue of the Theorem 3.1 on a general Hilbert space can be stated as follows:

THEOREM 3.3. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and there exists an orthonormal basis $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ with respect to which T can be written as $S_k + u \otimes v$. Suppose v, S_k^*u on \mathcal{H} are linearly dependent. Then T is quasinormal if and only if v is an eigen vector of S_k^* and*

$$(3.28) \quad (1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle) \langle S_k v, g_i \rangle + \|v\|^2 \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} \langle u, e_n \rangle \langle e_n, g_i \rangle = 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m(\leq k),$$

where $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ is an orthonormal set associated to $\ker(I - T^*T)$ as in Lemma 2.10.

Proof. The same lines of proof with $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ in place of $\{z^n\}_{n \geq 0}$ in Theorem 3.1 will work. ■

We now prove the following corollary corresponding to $k = 1$ in Theorem 3.1:

COROLLARY 3.4. *Let S be the unilateral shift and u, v be nonzero elements of $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ such that v, S^*u are linearly dependent and the operator $T = S + u \otimes v$ is not an isometry. Then T is quasinormal if and only if there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $v = (1 - |\alpha|^2) \overline{v(\alpha)} k_\alpha$ and*

$$1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}(1 - |\alpha|^2) S^*u(\alpha) = \overline{\alpha} v(\alpha) u(0) \text{ holds.}$$

Proof. Let $T = S + u \otimes v$ where S, u, v are as given in the statement. Let T be non-isometric and quasinormal. Then by Corollary 2.11, $\ker(I - T^*T) = \theta H^2(\mathbb{D})$, where θ is a product of atmost two Blaschke factors. Since v, S^*u are linearly dependent, as we noted earlier $\text{ran}(I - T^*T) = \mathbb{C}v$ (see case 1, Lemma 2.9), and hence $\ker(I - T^*T) = \{v\}^\perp$. This implies, there exists an $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ such that θ can be taken as $\theta(z) = \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}$, $\forall z \in \mathbb{D}$. Since $\ker(I - T^*T)$ has codimension 1 and $\langle \theta f, k_\alpha \rangle = 0$ for all $f \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$, it follows that

$$(3.29) \quad v = ck_\alpha, \text{ where } c(\neq 0) \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Now taking the inner product with k_α on both sides of (3.29), one will have $c = (1 - |\alpha|^2)v(\alpha)$ and v will be

$$(3.30) \quad v = (1 - |\alpha|^2)v(\alpha)k_\alpha.$$

Note that, $v(\alpha) \neq 0$ and $\ker(I - T^*T) \ominus z \ker(I - T^*T) = \mathbb{C}\theta$. Since T is quasinormal (by assumption), The conditions of Theorem 3.1 will hold with $k = 1$ and $g_1 = \theta$ i.e.,

$$(1 + \langle S^*u, v, \rangle) \langle zv, \theta \rangle + \|v\|^2 (\langle u, 1 \rangle \langle 1, \theta \rangle) = 0,$$

and this further simplifies to

$$(3.31) \quad (1 + \langle S^*u, v, \rangle) \langle v, S^*\theta \rangle + \|v\|^2 u(0) \overline{\theta(0)} = 0.$$

Now, substituting $S^*\theta = (1 - |\alpha|^2)\frac{1}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}$, and v (from (3.30)) in (3.31), we have

$$(3.32) \quad \left(1 + (1 - |\alpha|^2) \overline{v(\alpha)} \langle S^*u, k_\alpha \rangle\right) v(\alpha) (1 - |\alpha|^2)^2 \langle k_\alpha, \frac{1}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \rangle - \bar{\alpha} |v(\alpha)|^2 (1 - |\alpha|^2) u(0) = 0.$$

Since $v(\alpha) \neq 0$, the equation (3.32) further simplifies to

$$(3.33) \quad 1 + (1 - |\alpha|^2) \overline{v(\alpha)} S^*u(\alpha) = \bar{\alpha} \overline{v(\alpha)} u(0).$$

For the converse part, let $v = (1 - |\alpha|^2)v(\alpha)k_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ and the given condition is satisfied. Clearly, v is an eigenvector of S^* . Since v, S^*u are linearly dependent, it follows that $\text{ran}(I - T^*T) = \mathbb{C}v$ and hence $\ker(I - T^*T) = \{v\}^\perp$ is S -invariant with codimension 1. Hence $\ker(I - T^*T) = \theta H^2(\mathbb{D})$ where θ is a single Blaschke factor. Since $\langle \theta, v \rangle = 0$, and $v = (1 - |\alpha|^2)v(\alpha)k_\alpha$, it follows that $\langle \theta, k_\alpha \rangle = 0$. Therefore one can take $\theta(z) = \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Again,

$$\ker(I - T^*T) \ominus z \ker(I - T^*T) = \text{span}\{\theta\}.$$

Now, the given condition (same as equation (3.33)) is same as the given condition of Theorem 3.1 with $k = 1$, and $g_1 = \theta$ and hence the proof of this part follows by the converse of the Theorem 3.1. \blacksquare

REMARKS 3.5. (1) As we mentioned earlier, the Corollary 3.4 provide counterexamples for the Proposition 2.5 in [8]: Rank-one perturbation of unilateral shift is not quasinormal.

(2) Let $u, v \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ be nonzero elements with $\|u\| = 1$. Suppose $T = S_k + u \otimes v$ is an isometry. Then by Proposition 1 in [9], $v = (\alpha - 1)S_k^*u$ where $|\alpha| = 1$ with $S_k^*u \neq 0$ and $\alpha \neq 1$. Hence $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ must be linearly dependent if T is an isometry. However, v need not be an eigenvector of S_k^* . For example, $S + \frac{e^{it}-1}{3}(1+z+z^2) \otimes (1+z)$ is an isometry but $S^*(1+z) = 1 \neq \beta(1+z)$ for any $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$. On the other hand, if $\{v, S_k^*u\}$

is linearly independent, then $S_k + u \otimes v$ is never an isometry (see Proposition 1, [9]). We consider quasinormality in this case in the next section.

4. QUASINORMALITY, WHEN $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ IS LINEARLY INDEPENDENT

We begin this section by setting up the following notations:

Let P be the orthogonal projection onto $\{1, z, \dots, z^{k-1}\}$. then for $u \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$, one can write

$$(4.1) \quad Pu = u(0) + \langle u, z \rangle z + \dots + \langle u, z^{k-1} \rangle z^{k-1}.$$

Let us set

$$(4.2) \quad r_0 = \langle z^k v, v \rangle + \langle u, v \rangle \|v\|^2,$$

$$(4.3) \quad r_1 = \langle z^k v, S_k^*u \rangle + \langle u, S_k^*u \rangle \|v\|^2,$$

$$(4.4) \quad s_0 = (1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle) \langle u, v \rangle + \langle Pu, v \rangle,$$

$$(4.5) \quad s_1 = (1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle) \langle u, S_k^*u \rangle + \langle Pu, S_k^*u \rangle,$$

and denote by A the following 2×2 matrix:

$$(4.6) \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} r_0 \|S_k^*u\|^2 - r_1 \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle & s_0 \|S_k^*u\|^2 - s_1 \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle \\ -r_0 \langle v, S_k^*u \rangle + r_1 \|v\|^2 & -s_0 \langle v, S_k^*u \rangle + s_1 \|v\|^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this setting, we will consider the quasinormality of $S_k + u \otimes v$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and v, S_k^*u being linearly independent. As we mentioned in the last section, such an operator is never an isometry. The following theorem characterizes their quasinormal behaviour:

THEOREM 4.1. *Let $T = S_k + u \otimes v$ be on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ and the vectors v, S_k^*u are linearly independent. Then T is quasinormal if and only if $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ is S_k^* -invariant, the matrix A in (4.6) is normal and*

$$(4.7) \quad \langle z^k v, g_i \rangle + \|v\|^2 \langle u, g_i \rangle = 0,$$

$$(4.8) \quad (1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle) \langle u, g_i \rangle + \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} \langle u, z^n \rangle \langle z^n, g_i \rangle = 0,$$

hold for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, where $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ is an orthonormal set associated to $\ker(I - T^*T)$ as in Lemma 2.9.

Proof. Let $T = S_k + u \otimes v$, and v, S_k^*u are linearly independent. Let us assume that T is quasinormal. We will split the proof into several steps.

Step 1: In this step we show that $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ is S_k^* -invariant.

As we noted earlier,

$$I - T^*T = -(S_k^*u \otimes v + v \otimes S_k^*u + \|u\|^2 v \otimes v),$$

and also it is easy to see that (case 2, Lemma 2.9)

$$(4.9) \quad \text{ran}(I - T^*T) = \text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\}.$$

By Lemma 2.9, $\ker(I - T^*T)$ is S_k -invariant and hence by (4.9), $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ is S_k^* -invariant.

Step 2: In this step we establish the equations (4.7), (4.8).

Since $\ker(I - T^*T)$ is S_k -invariant, it follows by Wold-Kolmogoroff decomposition (see also Lemma 2.9), there exists an orthonormal set $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\} \subseteq H^2(\mathbb{D})$ with $m \leq k$ such that

$$(4.10) \quad \{v, S_k^* u\}^\perp \ominus z^k \{v, S_k^* u\}^\perp = \text{span}\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}.$$

Since T is quasinormal, $\text{ran } (I - T^*T) (= \text{span } \{v, S_k^* u\})$ will reduce T . Note that,

$$(4.11) \quad Tv = (S_k + u \otimes v)v = z^k v + \|v\|^2 u,$$

and

$$(4.12) \quad T(S_k^* u) = (S_k + u \otimes v)S_k^* u = S_k S_k^* u + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle u.$$

Since $S_k S_k^* = (I - P)$, P being the orthogonal projection onto $\text{span}\{1, \dots, z^{k-1}\}$, it follows by (4.12)

$$(4.13) \quad T(S_k^* u) = (1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle)u - Pu.$$

We now express $u, z^k v, Pu$ in terms of $v, S_k^* u$ and g_i for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Since

$$H^2(\mathbb{D}) = \text{span } \{v, S_k^* u\} \oplus \{v, S_k^* u\}^\perp,$$

and (4.10) holds, it follows that there exist scalars $c_i, d_i, t_i \in \mathbb{C}$ with $i = 0, 1, \dots, m+2$ and functions $h_0, h_1, h_2 \in \{v, S_k^* u\}^\perp$ such that

$$(4.14) \quad u = c_0 v + c_1 S_k^* u + c_2 g_1 + \dots + c_{m+1} g_m + c_{m+2} z^k h_0,$$

$$(4.15) \quad z^k v = d_0 v + d_1 S_k^* u + d_2 g_1 + \dots + d_{m+1} g_m + d_{m+2} z^k h_1,$$

$$(4.16) \quad Pu = t_0 v + t_1 S_k^* u + t_2 g_1 + \dots + t_{m+1} g_m + t_{m+2} z^k h_2.$$

Since $v, S_k^* u$ are orthogonal to $h_0, z^k h_0$, and g_i for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, it follows by (4.14)

$$(4.17) \quad \langle u, v \rangle = c_0 \|v\|^2 + c_1 \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle,$$

$$(4.18) \quad \langle u, S_k^* u \rangle = c_0 \langle v, S_k^* u \rangle + c_1 \|S_k^* u\|^2,$$

and,

$$(4.19) \quad c_{i+1} = \begin{cases} \langle u, g_i \rangle, & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, m, \\ 0, & \text{if } i = m+1 \text{ and } h_0 \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Hence by (4.14) and (4.17)–(4.19),

$$(4.20) \quad u = c_0 v + c_1 S_k^* u + \sum_{i=1}^m \langle u, g_i \rangle g_i.$$

Proceeding exactly in the same way, it follows by (4.15)

$$(4.21) \quad \langle z^k v, v \rangle = d_0 \|v\|^2 + d_1 \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle,$$

$$(4.22) \quad \langle z^k v, S_k^* u \rangle = d_0 \langle v, S_k^* u \rangle + d_1 \|S_k^* u\|^2,$$

and further,

$$(4.23) \quad d_{i+1} = \begin{cases} \langle z^k v, g_i \rangle & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, m, \\ 0, & \text{if } i = m+1 \text{ and } h_1 \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

and equations (4.15) and (4.21)—(4.23) altogether imply

$$(4.24) \quad z^k v = d_0 v + d_1 S_k^* u + \sum_{i=1}^m \langle z^k v, g_i \rangle g_i.$$

Similarly, and finally by (4.16)

$$(4.25) \quad \langle Pu, v \rangle = t_0 \|v\|^2 + t_1 \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle,$$

$$(4.26) \quad \langle Pu, S_k^* u \rangle = t_0 \langle v, S_k^* u \rangle + t_1 \|S_k^* u\|^2,$$

and

$$(4.27) \quad t_{i+1} = \begin{cases} \langle Pu, g_i \rangle, & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, m, \\ 0, & \text{if } i = m+1, \text{ and } h_2 \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

and further by (4.16) and (4.25)—(4.27)

$$(4.28) \quad Pu = t_0 v + t_1 S_k^* u + \sum_{i=1}^m \langle Pu, g_i \rangle g_i.$$

Now substituting the value of u and $z^k v$ from (4.20), (4.24) to (4.11), a simple computation reveals that

$$(4.29) \quad Tv = (d_0 + c_0 \|v\|^2)v + (d_1 + c_1 \|v\|^2)S_k^* u + \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\langle z^k v, g_i \rangle + \|v\|^2 \langle u, g_i \rangle \right) g_i.$$

Similarly, substituting u, Pu from (4.20) and (4.28) to (4.13), a simplification yields

$$(4.30) \quad T(S_k^* u) = \left((1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) c_0 + t_0 \right) v + \left((1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) c_1 + t_1 \right) S_k^* u + \sum_{i=1}^m \left((1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) \langle u, g_i \rangle + \langle Pu, g_i \rangle \right) g_i.$$

Since $Tv, T(S_k^* u) \in \text{span} \{v, S_k^* u\}$, it follows by (4.29) and (4.30) that for all $i = 1, \dots, m$

$$(4.31) \quad \langle z^k v, g_i \rangle + \|v\|^2 \langle u, g_i \rangle = 0,$$

and

$$(4.32) \quad (1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) \langle u, g_i \rangle + \langle Pu, g_i \rangle = 0.$$

Note by (4.1), $Pu = \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} \langle u, z^n \rangle z^n$, and hence equation (4.32) further reduces to

$$(4.33) \quad (1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) \langle u, g_i \rangle + \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} \langle u, z^n \rangle \langle z^n, g_i \rangle = 0.$$

Step 3: In this step we show the matrix A given in the statement is normal. Since $\text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\}$ reduces T , quasinormality of T implies that the operator $T|_{\text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\}}$ must be normal. Let B denote the matrix representation of $T|_{\text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\}}$ with respect to the basis $\{v, S_k^*u\}$. We show that, A is a nonzero scalar multiple of B .

Note that the pairs of equations (4.29),(4.31) and (4.30),(4.32) yield

$$(4.34) \quad Tv = (d_0 + c_0\|v\|^2)v + (d_1 + c_1\|v\|^2)S_k^*u, \text{ and}$$

$$(4.35) \quad T(S_k^*u) = \left((1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle)c_0 + t_0\right)v + \left((1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle)c_1 + t_1\right)S_k^*u$$

respectively. Hence the matrix B is given by

$$(4.36) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} d_0 + c_0\|v\|^2 & (1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle)c_0 + t_0 \\ d_1 + c_1\|v\|^2 & (1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle)c_1 + t_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We now find the scalars c_i, d_i, t_i for $i = 0, 1$. Note that, for v, S_k^*u linearly independent, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies

$$(4.37) \quad |\langle v, S_k^*u \rangle|^2 < \|v\|^2 \|S_k^*u\|^2.$$

With the help of (4.37), it is easy to see via (4.17), (4.18)

$$(4.38) \quad c_0 = \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^*u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^*u\|^2} \left(\langle u, v \rangle \|S_k^*u\|^2 - \langle u, S_k^*u \rangle \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle \right)$$

$$(4.39) \quad c_1 = \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^*u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^*u\|^2} \left(\langle u, v \rangle \langle v, S_k^*u \rangle - \langle u, S_k^*u \rangle \|v\|^2 \right)$$

Similarly, it follows by (4.21), (4.22), and (4.37)

$$(4.40) \quad d_0 = \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^*u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^*u\|^2} \left(\langle z^k v, v \rangle \|S_k^*u\|^2 - \langle z^k v, S_k^*u \rangle \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle \right)$$

$$(4.41) \quad d_1 = \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^*u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^*u\|^2} \left(\langle z^k v, v \rangle \langle v, S_k^*u \rangle - \langle z^k v, S_k^*u \rangle \|v\|^2 \right),$$

and finally by (4.25), (4.26), and (4.37)

$$(4.42) \quad t_0 = \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^*u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^*u\|^2} \left(\langle Pu, v \rangle \|S_k^*u\|^2 - \langle Pu, S_k^*u \rangle \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle \right)$$

$$(4.43) \quad t_1 = \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^*u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^*u\|^2} \left(\langle Pu, v \rangle \langle v, S_k^*u \rangle - \langle Pu, S_k^*u \rangle \|v\|^2 \right)$$

Our aim is to simplify the coefficients of v, S_k^*u in Tv and $T(S_k^*u)$ in (4.34), (4.35). Substituting c_0, d_0 from (4.38), (4.40) in $d_0 + c_0\|v\|^2$, a simple computation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.44) \quad d_0 + c_0 \|v\|^2 &= - \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^* u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^* u\|^2} \left((\langle z^k v, v \rangle + \langle u, v \rangle \|v\|^2) \|S_k^* u\|^2 - \right. \\
&\quad \left. (\langle z^k v, S_k^* u \rangle + \langle u, S_k^* u \rangle \|v\|^2) \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle \right) \\
&= - \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^* u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^* u\|^2} (r_0 \|S_k^* u\|^2 - r_1 \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows by using the notations r_0, r_1 from (4.2), and (4.3) respectively. Similarly, substituting c_1, d_1 from (4.39), (4.41) in the quantity $d_1 + c_1 \|v\|^2$, one will have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.45) \quad d_1 + c_1 \|v\|^2 &= \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^* u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^* u\|^2} \left((\langle z^k v, v \rangle + \langle u, v \rangle \|v\|^2) \langle v, S_k^* u \rangle - \right. \\
&\quad \left. (\langle z^k v, S_k^* u \rangle + \langle u, S_k^* u \rangle \|v\|^2) \|v\|^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^* u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^* u\|^2} (r_0 \langle v, S_k^* u \rangle - r_1 \|v\|^2) \quad (\text{by (4.2), (4.3)})
\end{aligned}$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.46) \quad (1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) c_0 + t_0 &= - \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^* u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^* u\|^2} \left(((1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) \langle u, v \rangle + \langle Pu, v \rangle) \|S_k^* u\|^2 - \right. \\
&\quad \left. ((1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) \langle u, S_k^* u \rangle + \langle Pu, S_k^* u \rangle) \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle \right) \quad (\text{by (4.38), (4.42), (4.37)}) \\
&= - \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^* u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^* u\|^2} (s_0 \|S_k^* u\|^2 - s_1 \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle), \quad (\text{by (4.4), (4.5)})
\end{aligned}$$

and finally

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.47) \quad (1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) c_1 + t_1 &= \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^* u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^* u\|^2} \left(((1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) \langle u, v \rangle + \langle Pu, v \rangle) \langle v, S_k^* u \rangle - \right. \\
&\quad \left. ((1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) \langle u, S_k^* u \rangle + \langle Pu, S_k^* u \rangle) \|v\|^2 \right) \quad (\text{by (4.39), (4.43), (4.37)}) \\
&= \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^* u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^* u\|^2} (s_0 \langle v, S_k^* u \rangle - s_1 \|v\|^2), \quad (\text{by (4.4), (4.5)})
\end{aligned}$$

Now the equations (4.44), (4.45), (4.46), and (4.47) together with (4.36), implies

$$B = \frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^* u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^* u\|^2} \begin{pmatrix} r_0 \|S_k^* u\|^2 - r_1 \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle & s_0 \|S_k^* u\|^2 - s_1 \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle \\ -r_0 \langle v, S_k^* u \rangle + r_1 \|v\|^2 & -s_0 \langle v, S_k^* u \rangle + s_1 \|v\|^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

and further by (4.6), one will have

$$B = \left(\frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^* u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^* u\|^2} \right) A.$$

For the converse part, let $T = S_k + u \otimes v$ be with $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ linearly independent and all the conditions in the statement hold. Then $\text{ran}(I - T^*T) = \text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\}$ (see case 2, Lemma 2.9). Since $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ is S_k^* -invariant (by one of the conditions), it follows that $\{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp (= \ker(I - T^*T))$ is S_k -invariant. Also, for any $f \in \{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp$

$$Tf = S_k f + \langle f, v \rangle u = S_k f,$$

and hence

$$(4.48) \quad T|_{\{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp} = S_k|_{\{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp}.$$

Again, by Wold-Kolmogoroff decomposition, (see also Lemma 2.9) there exist orthonormal functions $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^m$, $m \leq k$ such that

$$(4.49) \quad \{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp \ominus z^k \{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp = \text{span}\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}.$$

Since $H^2(\mathbb{D}) = \text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\} \oplus \{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp$, proceeding exactly as in the first part, it follows by (4.49)

$$(4.50) \quad Tv = (d_0 + c_0\|v\|^2)v + (d_1 + c_1\|v\|^2)S_k^*u + \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\langle z^k v, g_i \rangle + \|v\|^2 \langle u, g_i \rangle \right) g_i,$$

and

$$(4.51) \quad \begin{aligned} T(S_k^*u) &= \left((1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle) c_0 + t_0 \right) v + \left((1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle) c_1 + t_1 \right) S_k^*u + \\ &\quad \sum_{i=1}^m \left((1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle) \langle u, g_i \rangle + \langle Pu, g_i \rangle \right) g_i \end{aligned}$$

for some scalars $c_j, d_j, t_j \in \mathbb{C}$ for $j = 0, 1$ satisfying the same set of equations (4.38)–(4.43). Again, by the given conditions (4.7), (4.8), the equations (4.50), and (4.51) reduce to

$$(4.52) \quad Tv = (d_0 + c_0\|v\|^2)v + (d_1 + c_1\|v\|^2)S_k^*u, \text{ and}$$

$$(4.53) \quad T(S_k^*u) = \left((1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle) c_0 + t_0 \right) v + \left((1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle) c_1 + t_1 \right) S_k^*u.$$

Clearly by (4.52), (4.53), $\text{ran}(I - T^*T) (= \text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\})$ is T -invariant. This together with (4.48) implies that T on $H^2(\mathbb{D}) = \text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\} \oplus \{v, S_k^*u\}^\perp$ decomposes as

$$T = T|_{\text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\}} \oplus S_k.$$

Now following the same steps of simplifications as in the first part upon substituting the scalars $c_j, d_j, t_j \in \mathbb{C}$ for $j = 0, 1$ from (4.38)–(4.43), the coefficient matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} d_0 + c_0\|v\|^2 & (1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle) c_0 + t_0 \\ d_1 + c_1\|v\|^2 & (1 + \langle S_k^*u, v \rangle) c_1 + t_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

of $T|_{\text{span}\{v, S_k^*u\}}$ becomes $\frac{1}{|\langle v, S_k^*u \rangle|^2 - \|v\|^2 \|S_k^*u\|^2} A$, where A is given by (4.6). Since S_k is quasinormal, the proof now follows by the given condition: A is normal. \blacksquare

In a general Hilbert space set-up, Theorem 4.1 can be rephrased as:

THEOREM 4.2. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and there exists an orthonormal basis $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ with respect to which T can be written as $S_k + u \otimes v$. Suppose v, S_k^*u on \mathcal{H} are linearly independent. Then T is quasinormal if and only if $\{v, S_k^*u\}$ is S_k^* -invariant, the matrix A in (4.6) is normal and*

$$(4.54) \quad \langle S_k v, g_i \rangle + \|v\|^2 \langle u, g_i \rangle = 0,$$

$$(4.55) \quad (1 + \langle S_k^* u, v \rangle) \langle u, g_i \rangle + \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} \langle u, e_n \rangle \langle e_n, g_i \rangle = 0,$$

hold for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, where $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ is an orthonormal set associated to $\ker(I - T^*T)$ as in Lemma 2.10.

Proof. The proof will go in a similar way as that of the Theorem 4.1, replacing z^n by e_n for all $n \geq 0$. \blacksquare

Let us now consider the case $k = 1$ in the above theorem 4.1 i.e., let $T = S + u \otimes v$ where $\{v, S^*u\}$ is linearly independent. As we noted earlier (see case 2, Lemma 2.9), $\text{ran}(I - T^*T) = \text{span}\{v, S^*u\}$ and hence $\ker(I - T^*T) = \{v, S^*u\}^\perp$. If T is quasinormal, then it necessarily follows (Corollary 2.11) that $\ker(I - T^*T) = \theta H^2(\mathbb{D})$, where θ can be taken as either $\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ or $\left(\frac{z-\beta}{1-\bar{\beta}z}\right)\left(\frac{z-\gamma}{1-\bar{\gamma}z}\right)$ for some $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{D}$. Recall that (see section 1), T is quasinormal of type I if $\ker(I - T^*T) = \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ and quasinormal of type II if $\ker(I - T^*T) = \left(\frac{z-\beta}{1-\bar{\beta}z}\right)\left(\frac{z-\gamma}{1-\bar{\gamma}z}\right)$, $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{D}$. With the help of the kernel functions, we deduce (from Theorem 4.1) the more refined characterization of these two types of quasinormality in the following subsections.

4.1. Type I quasinormality.

THEOREM 4.3. *Let $T = S + u \otimes v$ be on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ with $\{v, S^*u\}$ linearly independent. Then T is quasinormal of type I if and only if there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ such that*

- (1) $v, S^*u \in \text{span} \left\{ k_\alpha, \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha \right\}$,
- (2) $v(\alpha) + \alpha B_\alpha^* v(\alpha) = 0$,
- (3) $\overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} \langle u, \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2 \rangle + 1 = 0$, and
- (4) the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{v(\alpha)u(0)} + \alpha(1 + \overline{v(\alpha)R}) & \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)u(0)} + \alpha \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)R} \\ 1 + \overline{v(\alpha)R} & \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)R} \end{pmatrix}$$

is normal, where $R = (1 - |\alpha|^2)S^*u(\alpha) - \bar{\alpha}u(0)$.

Proof. Let $T = S + u \otimes v$ and v, S^*u are linearly independent on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$. As we observed earlier, $\text{ran}(I - T^*T) = \text{span} \{v, S^*u\}$, and hence $\ker(I - T^*T) = \{v, S^*u\}^\perp$. Assume that, T is quasinormal of type I. Then $\text{span}\{v, S^*u\}$ reduces T , and is S^* -invariant (see theorem 4.1). Also in addition, there exists an $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $\ker(I - T^*T) = \{v, S^*u\}^\perp = \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2 H^2(\mathbb{D})$ (by the discussion prior to the statement). Since $k_\alpha, \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha$ are mutually orthogonal and

$$k_\alpha, \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha \perp \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2 z^n, \text{ for all } n \geq 0,$$

it follows that

$$(4.56) \quad v, S^*u \in \text{span} \left\{ k_\alpha, \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha \right\},$$

which is the condition 1 in the statement.

Note that, $\ker(I - T^*T) \ominus z(I - T^*T) = \mathbb{C} \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2$, and since T is quasinormal, it follows by Theorem 4.1, the relations 4.7, and 4.8 hold corresponding to $g_1(z) = \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2$ i.e.,

$$(4.57) \quad \langle zv, \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2 \rangle + \|v\|^2 \langle u, \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2 \rangle = 0,$$

$$(4.58) \quad (1 + \langle S^*u, v \rangle) \langle u, \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2 \rangle - \bar{\alpha}^2 u(0) = 0,$$

and the matrix A in (4.6) is normal. We show that the relations 4.57, and 4.58 are equivalent to the conditions 2, and 3 of the statement and also, the matrix A in (4.6) is similar to the given matrix in the statement.

Note by (4.56), there exist scalars $c_i, d_i \in \mathbb{C}$, $i = 0, 1$ with $(c_0, c_1), (d_0, d_1)$ different from $(0, 0)$ such that

$$(4.59) \quad v = c_0 k_\alpha + c_1 \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha,$$

$$(4.60) \quad S^*u = d_0 k_\alpha + d_1 \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha.$$

By (4.60)

$$(4.61) \quad u = u(0) + d_0 z k_\alpha + d_1 z \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right) k_\alpha,$$

and also an easy computation via (4.59), (4.60) yield

$$(4.62) \quad c_0 = (1 - |\alpha|^2) v(\alpha),$$

$$(4.63) \quad c_1 = (1 - |\alpha|^2) B_\alpha^* v(\alpha),$$

$$(4.64) \quad d_0 = (1 - |\alpha|^2) S^*u(\alpha),$$

$$(4.65) \quad d_1 = (1 - |\alpha|^2) (z B_\alpha)^* u(\alpha).$$

Note that

$$(4.66) \quad \left\langle k_\alpha, M_z^* \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2 \right\rangle = -\bar{\alpha}.$$

$$(4.67) \quad \left\langle k_\alpha, M_z^* \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right) \right\rangle = 1.$$

Then

$$(4.68) \quad \begin{aligned} \left\langle zv, \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2 \right\rangle &= \left\langle c_0 z k_\alpha + c_1 z \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha, \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2 \right\rangle \quad (\text{by 4.59}) \\ &= -\bar{\alpha} c_0 + c_1 \quad (\text{by 4.66, and 4.67}) \end{aligned}$$

Also, it follows by (4.59)

$$(4.69) \quad \|v\|^2 = \left\langle c_0 k_\alpha + c_1 \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha, c_0 k_\alpha + c_1 \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha \right\rangle = \frac{1}{1 - |\alpha|^2} (|c_0|^2 + |c_1|^2),$$

and by (4.61), (4.66), and (4.67)

$$(4.70) \quad \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2 \right\rangle = \bar{\alpha}^2 u(0) - \bar{\alpha} d_0 + d_1.$$

Now by equations (4.68), (4.69), (4.70), the relation (4.57) reduces after a simple computation to

$$(4.71) \quad c_0 \left(\overline{v(\alpha)} (\bar{\alpha}^2 u(0) - \bar{\alpha} d_0 + d_1) - \bar{\alpha} \right) + c_1 \left(\overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} (\bar{\alpha}^2 u(0) - \bar{\alpha} d_0 + d_1) + 1 \right) = 0.$$

Next,

$$(4.72) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle S^* u, v \rangle &= \left\langle d_0 k_\alpha + d_1 \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha, c_0 k_\alpha + c_1 \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha \right\rangle \quad (\text{by (4.59), (4.60)}) \\ &= \frac{d_0 \bar{c}_0}{1 - |\alpha|^2} + \frac{d_1 \bar{c}_1}{1 - |\alpha|^2} \\ &= d_0 \overline{v(\alpha)} + d_1 \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)}. \quad (\text{by (4.62), (4.63)}) \end{aligned}$$

Now by (4.70), (4.72), equation (4.58) reduces to

$$(4.73) \quad d_0 \left(\overline{v(\alpha)} (\bar{\alpha}^2 u(0) - \bar{\alpha} d_0 + d_1) - \bar{\alpha} \right) + d_1 \left(\overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} (\bar{\alpha}^2 u(0) - \bar{\alpha} d_0 + d_1) + 1 \right) = 0.$$

Note by (4.59) and (4.60), $(c_0, d_0) \neq (0, 0)$ and $(c_1, d_1) \neq (0, 0)$. Suppose one of c_0 or d_0 is zero. For the sake of definiteness, let $c_0 = 0$. Since $v \neq 0$, it follows by (4.59), $c_1 \neq 0$. Then by (4.71)

$$(4.74) \quad \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} (\bar{\alpha}^2 u(0) - \bar{\alpha} d_0 + d_1) + 1 = 0,$$

which by (4.70) is equivalent to

$$(4.75) \quad \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2 \right\rangle + 1 = 0.$$

Again, as d_0 can not be zero, it follows by (4.73) and (4.74)

$$(4.76) \quad \overline{v(\alpha)} (\bar{\alpha}^2 u(0) - \bar{\alpha} d_0 + d_1) - \bar{\alpha} = 0,$$

which is again by (4.70), equivalent to

$$(4.77) \quad \overline{v(\alpha)} \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2 \right\rangle - \bar{\alpha} = 0.$$

Similarly, one will obtain same equations (4.74)—(4.77) if $d_0 = 0$ or only one of c_1, d_1 is zero. Let us now assume that all c_i, d_i are non-zero for $i = 1, 2$. Then, since $\{v, S^* u\}$ are linearly independent, it follows by (4.59) and (4.60)

$$(4.78) \quad \det \begin{pmatrix} c_0 & c_1 \\ d_0 & d_1 \end{pmatrix} = (c_0 d_1 - c_1 d_0) \neq 0.$$

Then, multiplying (4.71) by d_0 and (4.73) by c_0 , one will have on subtraction

$$(4.79) \quad (c_1 d_0 - d_1 c_0) \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} (\bar{\alpha}^2 u(0) - \bar{\alpha} d_0 + d_1) + 1 = 0.$$

which is further by (4.78) and (4.70) becomes

$$(4.80) \quad \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha} z} \right)^2 \right\rangle + 1 = 0.$$

Again, multiplying (4.71) by d_1 and (4.73) by c_1 , one will have on subtraction

$$(4.81) \quad (c_0 d_1 - d_0 c_1) \overline{v(\alpha)} (\bar{\alpha}^2 u(0) - \bar{\alpha} d_0 + d_1) - \bar{\alpha} = 0.$$

which is further by (4.78) and (4.70) becomes

$$(4.82) \quad \overline{v(\alpha)} \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha} z} \right)^2 \right\rangle - \bar{\alpha} = 0.$$

Hence in all the possible cases of (c_i, d_i) , $i = 1, 2$, one will obtain

$$(4.83) \quad \overline{v(\alpha)} \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha} z} \right)^2 \right\rangle - \bar{\alpha} = 0,$$

$$(4.84) \quad \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha} z} \right)^2 \right\rangle + 1 = 0.$$

Note by (4.84), $\overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)}$ and $\left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha} z} \right)^2 \right\rangle$ are both nonzero. Assume $\alpha \neq 0$. Then the equations (4.83) and (4.84) together imply

$$(4.85) \quad \begin{aligned} \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha} z} \right)^2 \right\rangle (\overline{v(\alpha)} + \bar{\alpha} \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)}) &= 0 \\ \iff v(\alpha) + \alpha B_\alpha^* v(\alpha) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha} z} \right)^2 \right\rangle \neq 0$ it follows by (4.83), $v(\alpha) = 0$ if and only if $\alpha = 0$. Hence the relations (4.83), and (4.84) are equivalent to

$$(4.86) \quad v(\alpha) + \alpha B_\alpha^* v(\alpha) = 0,$$

$$(4.87) \quad \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha} z} \right)^2 \right\rangle + 1 = 0.$$

Since T is quasinormal (by assumption), by Theorem 4.1, the matrix A given by (4.6) is normal. It follows along the lines of proof of the Theorem 4.1 that, A is the matrix representation of the compression operator $P_1 T|_{\text{span}\{v, S^* u\}}$, where P_1 is the orthogonal projection of $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ onto $\text{span}\{v, S^* u\}$. Note by (4.56), $\text{span}\{v, S^* u\} = \text{span}\{k_\alpha, \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha} z} k_\alpha\}$. If P_2 denotes the orthogonal projection of $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ onto $\text{span}\{k_\alpha, \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha} z} k_\alpha\}$, then the operator $P_2 T|_{\text{span}\{k_\alpha, \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha} z} k_\alpha\}}$ is

same as $P_1T|_{\text{span}\{v, S^*u\}}$. Hence, if B is the matrix representation of $P_2T|_{\text{span}\{k_\alpha, \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}k_\alpha\}}$ with respect to the basis $\{k_\alpha, \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}k_\alpha\}$, then B is similar to A and hence must be normal. We now show that B is exactly the matrix given in the statement.

Note that,

$$Tk_\alpha = (S + u \otimes v)k_\alpha = zk_\alpha + \overline{v(\alpha)}u,$$

which by (4.61) simplifies to

$$(4.88) \quad Tk_\alpha = \overline{v(\alpha)}u(0) + (1 + d_0\overline{v(\alpha)})zk_\alpha + d_1\overline{v(\alpha)}z\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha$$

Next

$$T\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha = (S + u \otimes v)\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha = z\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha + \overline{B_\alpha^*v(\alpha)}u,$$

which together with (4.61) yield

$$(4.89) \quad T\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha = \overline{B_\alpha^*v(\alpha)}u(0) + d_0\overline{B_\alpha^*v(\alpha)}zk_\alpha + (1 + d_1\overline{B_\alpha^*v(\alpha)})z\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha$$

Note that $1, zk_\alpha, z\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha \perp \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2 z^n$ for all $n \geq 1$. Hence

$$1, zk_\alpha, z\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha \in \text{span} \left\{ k_\alpha, \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha, \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2 \right\}.$$

Then a simple computation via (4.66), (4.67) yield

$$(4.90) \quad 1 = (1 - |\alpha|^2)k_\alpha - \bar{\alpha}(1 - |\alpha|^2)\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha + \bar{\alpha}^2\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2$$

$$(4.91) \quad zk_\alpha = \alpha k_\alpha + (1 - |\alpha|^2)\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha - \bar{\alpha}\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2$$

$$(4.92) \quad z\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha = \alpha\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha + \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2$$

Substituting $1, zk_\alpha, z\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha$ from (4.90), (4.91), (4.92) respectively to (4.88), a simple computation reveals that

$$(4.93) \quad \begin{aligned} Tk_\alpha &= \left(\overline{v(\alpha)}u(0)(1 - |\alpha|^2) + \alpha(1 + d_0\overline{v(\alpha)}) \right) k_\alpha + \\ &\left(-\bar{\alpha}(1 - |\alpha|^2)\overline{v(\alpha)}u(0) + (1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 + d_0\overline{v(\alpha)}) + \alpha d_1\overline{v(\alpha)} \right) \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha + \\ &\left(-\bar{\alpha} + \overline{v(\alpha)}(\bar{\alpha}^2 u(0) - \bar{\alpha} d_0 + d_1) \right) \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2 k_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.76), the coefficient of $\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2 k_\alpha$ in Tk_α above is zero. If a, b denote the coefficients of k_α and $\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}k_\alpha$ in (4.93), then one can write

$$(4.94) \quad Tk_\alpha = ak_\alpha + b\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}k_\alpha.$$

We now simplify the coefficients a and b . Note by (4.64) the given quantity R is

$$(4.95) \quad R = d_0 - \bar{\alpha}u(0) = (1 - |\alpha|^2)S^*u(\alpha) - \bar{\alpha}u(0).$$

Then By (4.93),

$$a = \overline{v(\alpha)}u(0)(1 - |\alpha|^2) + \alpha(1 + d_0\overline{v(\alpha)}) = \overline{v(\alpha)}u(0) + \alpha\left(1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}(d_0 - \bar{\alpha}u(0))\right),$$

and further by (4.95)

$$(4.96) \quad a = \overline{v(\alpha)}u(0) + \alpha(1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}R)$$

Next by (4.93)

$$(4.97) \quad b = -\bar{\alpha}(1 - |\alpha|^2)\overline{v(\alpha)}u(0) + (1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 + d_0\overline{v(\alpha)}) + \alpha d_1\overline{v(\alpha)}.$$

The equation (4.76) can also be written as

$$(4.98) \quad \overline{v(\alpha)}d_1 = \bar{\alpha}\left(1 + d_0\overline{v(\alpha)} - \bar{\alpha}\overline{v(\alpha)}u(0)\right).$$

Then substituting $\overline{v(\alpha)}d_1$ from (4.98) to (4.97), a simple computation yield

$$b = 1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}(d_0 - \bar{\alpha}u(0)),$$

and hence by (4.95)

$$(4.99) \quad b = 1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}R.$$

Similarly, substituting $1, zk_\alpha, z\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha$ from (4.90), (4.91), (4.92) respectively to (4.89), a simple computation yield

$$(4.100) \quad \begin{aligned} T\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha &= \overline{B_\alpha^*v(\alpha)}\left((1 - |\alpha|^2)u(0) + \alpha d_0\right)k_\alpha + \\ &\quad \left(-\bar{\alpha}(1 - |\alpha|^2)u(0)\overline{B_\alpha^*v(\alpha)} + (1 - |\alpha|^2)d_0\overline{B_\alpha^*v(\alpha)} + \alpha(1 + d_1\overline{B_\alpha^*v(\alpha)})\right)\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}k_\alpha \\ &\quad + \left(1 + \overline{B_\alpha^*v(\alpha)}(\bar{\alpha}^2u(0) - \bar{\alpha}d_0 + d_1)\right)\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note by (4.74), the coefficient of $\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2$ in $T\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha$ above is zero. Let c, d denote the coefficients of k_α , and $\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}k_\alpha$ respectively in the representation of $T\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha$ in (4.100). Then it follows by (4.74) and (4.100)

$$(4.101) \quad T\left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha = ck_\alpha + d\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}k_\alpha.$$

Note by (4.100),

$$c = \overline{B_\alpha^*v(\alpha)}\left((1 - |\alpha|^2)u(0) + \alpha d_0\right) = \overline{B_\alpha^*v(\alpha)}u(0) + \alpha\overline{B_\alpha^*v(\alpha)}(d_0 - \bar{\alpha}u(0)),$$

and hence by (4.95)

$$(4.102) \quad c = \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} u(0) + \alpha \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} R.$$

Again, by (4.74)

$$(4.103) \quad \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} d_1 = \bar{\alpha} \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} (d_0 - \bar{\alpha} u(0)) - 1.$$

By (4.100)

$$(4.104) \quad d = -\bar{\alpha}(1 - |\alpha|^2) u(0) \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} + (1 - |\alpha|^2) d_0 \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} + \alpha(1 + d_1 \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)}).$$

Now substituting $\overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} d_1$ from (4.103) in (4.104), it follows by a simple computation

$$d = \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} (d_0 - \bar{\alpha} u(0)),$$

and hence by (4.95)

$$(4.105) \quad d = \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} R.$$

Therefore, it follows by (4.94), (4.101) (4.96), (4.99), (4.102), and (4.105) that the matrix representation B of $P_2 T|_{\text{span}\{k_\alpha, \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha\}}$ with respect to the basis $\{k_\alpha, \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)k_\alpha\}$ is given by

$$(4.106) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{v(\alpha)} u(0) + \alpha(1 + \overline{v(\alpha)} R) & \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} u(0) + \alpha \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} R \\ 1 + \overline{v(\alpha)} R & \overline{B_\alpha^* v(\alpha)} R \end{pmatrix}.$$

Conversely, let $T = S + u \otimes v$, $\{v, S^* u\}$ linearly independent, and the conditions (1)—(4) of the statement holds. Since by (1), $v, S^* u \in \text{span}\{k_\alpha, \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha\}$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$, it follows that $\{v, S^* u\}$ is S^* -invariant and $\{v, S^* u\}^\perp = \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2 H^2(\mathbb{D})$. Then one can show via condition (1)

$$(4.107) \quad v = (1 - |\alpha|^2) \left(v(\alpha) k_\alpha + B_\alpha^* v(\alpha) \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha \right),$$

$$(4.108) \quad S^* u = (1 - |\alpha|^2) \left(S^* u(\alpha) k_\alpha + (z B_\alpha)^* u(\alpha) \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} k_\alpha \right).$$

As we show earlier, $\ker(I - T^* T) = \{v, S^* u\}^\perp$, it follows that

$$\ker(I - T^* T) \ominus z \ker(I - T^* T) = \mathbb{C} \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2.$$

Now proceeding exactly like the first part, one can show that the conditions (2), (3) of the statement are equivalent to (4.7), (4.8) with $g_1(z) = \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)^2$ of the Theorem 4.1. Again, since the matrix in the statement is normal and can be shown (by the same argument as in the first part) to be similar to the matrix A in (4.6), the proof follows by the converse part of the Theorem 4.1. ■

4.2. Type II quasinormality.

THEOREM 4.4. *Let $T = S + u \otimes v$ be on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ with $\{v, S^*u\}$ linearly independent. Then T is quasinormal of type II if and only if there exists distinct $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{D}$ such that*

- (1) $v, S^*u \in \text{span} \{k_\alpha, k_\beta\}$
- (2) $\overline{v(\alpha)} \left\langle u, \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z-\beta}{1-\bar{\beta}z} \right\rangle - \bar{\beta} = 0$
- (3) $\overline{v(\beta)} \left\langle u, \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z-\beta}{1-\bar{\beta}z} \right\rangle - \bar{\alpha} = 0$, and
- (4) If $s_0 = \frac{1}{\alpha-\beta} \langle S^*u, z-\beta \rangle$, and $s_1 = -\frac{1}{\alpha-\beta} \langle S^*u, z-\alpha \rangle$, then the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\alpha} (1 + \overline{v(\alpha)} s_0) & \frac{\overline{v(\beta)}}{\alpha} s_0 \\ \overline{v(\alpha)} u(0) - \frac{1}{\alpha} (1 + \overline{v(\alpha)} s_0) & \overline{v(\beta)} u(0) - \frac{\overline{v(\beta)}}{\alpha} s_0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{is normal if } \alpha \text{ is nonzero,}$$

or the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{v(\alpha)} u(0) - \frac{\overline{v(\alpha)}}{\beta} s_1 & \overline{v(\beta)} u(0) - \frac{1}{\beta} (1 + s_1 \overline{v(\beta)}) \\ \frac{\overline{v(\alpha)}}{\beta} s_1 & \frac{1}{\beta} (1 + \overline{v(\beta)} s_1) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{is normal if } \beta \text{ is nonzero.}$$

Proof. Let $T = S + u \otimes v$, $\{v, S^*u\}$ be linearly independent, and assume T to be quasinormal of type II on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$. Then $\text{ran}(I - T^*T) = \text{span} \{v, S^*u\}$ reduces T , S^* -invariant, and by the discussion prior to Theorem 4.3, there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{D}$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$ such that

$$\ker(I - T^*T) = \{v, S^*u\}^\perp = \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z-\beta}{1-\bar{\beta}z} \right) H^2(\mathbb{D}).$$

Since $k_\alpha, k_\beta \perp \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z-\beta}{1-\bar{\beta}z} \right) f$ for all $f \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$, it follows that $v, S^*u \in \text{span} \{k_\alpha, k_\beta\}$, which proves the condition (1). It also follows that there exist scalars t_i, s_i , $i = 0, 1$ with $(t_0, t_1), (s_0, s_1)$ different from $(0, 0)$ such that

$$(4.109) \quad v = t_0 k_\alpha + t_1 k_\beta,$$

$$(4.110) \quad S^*u = s_0 k_\alpha + s_1 k_\beta.$$

Note by (4.110)

$$(4.111) \quad u = u(0) + s_0 z k_\alpha + s_1 z k_\beta,$$

and a simple computation via (4.109), (4.110) implies

$$(4.112) \quad t_0 = \frac{1}{\alpha - \beta} \langle v, z - \beta \rangle,$$

$$(4.113) \quad t_1 = -\frac{1}{\alpha - \beta} \langle v, z - \alpha \rangle,$$

$$(4.114) \quad s_0 = \frac{1}{\alpha - \beta} \langle S^*u, z - \beta \rangle,$$

$$(4.115) \quad s_1 = -\frac{1}{\alpha - \beta} \langle S^*u, z - \alpha \rangle.$$

Note that

$$\ker(I - T^*T) \ominus z(I - T^*T) = \mathbb{C} \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right).$$

Since T is quasinormal, by Theorem 4.1, the equations (4.7), (4.8) hold with

$$g_1(z) = \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right),$$

i.e.

$$(4.116) \quad \left\langle zv, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right) \right\rangle + \|v\|^2 \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right) \right\rangle = 0,$$

$$(4.117) \quad (1 + \langle S^*u, v \rangle) \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right) \right\rangle - \bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}u(0) = 0,$$

hold and the matrix A in (4.6) is normal. We show that (4.116), (4.117) are equivalent to the given equations (2) and (3), and the matrix A is similar to the one given in the statement.

Note that

$$(4.118) \quad \left\langle k_\alpha, M_z^* \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right\rangle = -\bar{\beta},$$

$$(4.119) \quad \left\langle k_\beta, M_z^* \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right\rangle = -\bar{\alpha}.$$

Then by (4.109)

$$(4.120) \quad \left\langle zv, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right) \right\rangle = \left\langle t_0 k_\alpha + t_1 k_\beta, M_z^* \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right\rangle,$$

and further by (4.118), (4.119)

$$(4.121) \quad \left\langle zv, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right) \right\rangle = -(t_0 \bar{\beta} + t_1 \bar{\alpha}).$$

Again, by (4.109)

$$(4.122) \quad \|v\|^2 = \langle t_0 k_\alpha + t_1 k_\beta, v \rangle = t_0 \overline{v(\alpha)} + t_1 \overline{v(\beta)}.$$

Now by (4.111)

$$(4.123) \quad \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right) \right\rangle = \left\langle u(0) + s_0 z k_\alpha + s_1 z k_\beta, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right) \right\rangle,$$

which by (4.118), (4.119), further reduces to

$$(4.124) \quad \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right) \right\rangle = \bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}u(0) - s_0 \bar{\beta} - s_1 \bar{\alpha}.$$

Now by (4.121), (4.122), and (4.124), the equation (4.116) simplifies to

$$(4.125) \quad t_0 \left(\overline{v(\alpha)} (\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}u(0) - s_0 \bar{\beta} - s_1 \bar{\alpha}) - \bar{\beta} \right) + t_1 \left(\overline{v(\beta)} (\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}u(0) - s_0 \bar{\beta} - s_1 \bar{\alpha}) - \bar{\alpha} \right) = 0.$$

Note by (4.109),

$$\langle v, k_\alpha \rangle = \langle t_0 k_\alpha + t_1 k_\beta, k_\alpha \rangle = \frac{t_0}{1 - |\alpha|^2} + \frac{t_1}{1 - \bar{\beta}\alpha},$$

and hence

$$(4.126) \quad v(\alpha) = \frac{t_0}{1 - |\alpha|^2} + \frac{t_1}{1 - \bar{\beta}\alpha}.$$

Similarly it follows by (4.109)

$$(4.127) \quad v(\beta) = \langle v, k_\beta \rangle = \frac{t_0}{1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta} + \frac{t_1}{1 - |\beta|^2}.$$

Now by (4.109), and (4.110)

$$(4.128) \quad \langle S^*u, v \rangle = \langle s_0 k_\alpha + s_1 k_\beta, t_0 k_\alpha + t_1 k_\beta \rangle = s_0 \left(\frac{\bar{t}_0}{1 - |\alpha|^2} + \frac{\bar{t}_1}{1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta} \right) + s_1 \left(\frac{\bar{t}_0}{1 - \bar{\beta}\alpha} + \frac{\bar{t}_1}{1 - |\beta|^2} \right),$$

and further by (4.126), and (4.127)

$$(4.129) \quad \langle S^*u, v \rangle = s_0 \overline{v(\alpha)} + s_1 \overline{v(\beta)}.$$

Substituting (4.129), (4.124) in (4.117), one will obtain after a simplification

$$(4.130) \quad s_0 \left(\overline{v(\alpha)} (\bar{\alpha}\beta u(0) - s_0 \bar{\beta} - s_1 \bar{\alpha}) - \bar{\beta} \right) + s_1 \left(\overline{v(\beta)} (\bar{\alpha}\beta u(0) - s_0 \bar{\beta} - s_1 \bar{\alpha}) - \bar{\alpha} \right) = 0.$$

Since v, S^*u are linearly independent, it follows by (4.109), and (4.110) that both the pair $(t_0, s_0), (t_1, s_1)$ are different from $(0, 0)$. There are the possibilities of exactly one element from one or both the pairs $(t_0, s_0), (t_1, s_1)$ is zero or t_i, s_i are nonzero for all $i = 1, 2$. In the later case, one will have

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} t_0 & s_0 \\ t_1 & s_1 \end{pmatrix} = (t_0 s_1 - s_0 t_1) \neq 0.$$

Then for each of the possible cases, proceeding exactly as in the Theorem 4.3, one will obtain

$$(4.131) \quad \overline{v(\alpha)} \left(\bar{\alpha}\beta u(0) - s_0 \bar{\beta} - s_1 \bar{\alpha} \right) - \bar{\beta} = 0,$$

$$(4.132) \quad \overline{v(\beta)} \left(\bar{\alpha}\beta u(0) - s_0 \bar{\beta} - s_1 \bar{\alpha} \right) - \bar{\alpha} = 0,$$

which can also be written via 4.124

$$(4.133) \quad \overline{v(\alpha)} \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right) \right\rangle - \bar{\beta} = 0,$$

$$(4.134) \quad \overline{v(\beta)} \left\langle u, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right) \left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} \right) \right\rangle - \bar{\alpha} = 0.$$

As we observed, the matrix A (equation (4.6)) in the Theorem 4.1 represents the operator $P_1 T|_{\text{span}\{v, S^*u\}}$ with respect to the basis $\{v, S^*u\}$, where P_1 is the orthogonal projection of $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ onto $\text{span}\{v, S^*u\}$. Again, since $\text{span}\{k_\alpha, k_\beta\} = \text{span}\{v, S^*u\}$, it follows that $P_2 T|_{\text{span}\{k_\alpha, k_\beta\}} = P_1 T|_{\text{span}\{v, S^*u\}}$, where P_2 is the orthogonal projection of $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ onto $\text{span}\{k_\alpha, k_\beta\}$. Hence, if B denotes the matrix of $P_2 T|_{\text{span}\{k_\alpha, k_\beta\}}$ with respect to the basis $\{k_\alpha, k_\beta\}$, then B must be similar to A . This implies B is normal if and only if A is normal. We show that B is exactly the matrix given in the statement. Since T is quasinormal by assumption, the proof of the first part will then be complete by the forward implication of the Theorem 4.1.

Note by (4.111)

$$(4.135) \quad Tk_\alpha = zk_\alpha + \overline{v(\alpha)}u = zk_\alpha + \overline{v(\alpha)}(u(0) + s_0zk_\alpha + s_1zk_\beta),$$

$$(4.136) \quad Tk_\beta = zk_\beta + \overline{v(\beta)}u = zk_\beta + \overline{v(\beta)}(u(0) + s_0zk_\alpha + s_1zk_\beta).$$

As easy computation shows that

$$(4.137) \quad \left\langle k_\alpha, M_z^* \frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} k_\alpha \right\rangle = \frac{1 - |\beta|^2}{1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta} + \frac{\alpha}{1 - |\alpha|^2} \frac{\bar{\alpha} - \bar{\beta}}{1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta},$$

$$(4.138) \quad \left\langle k_\beta, M_z^* \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} k_\beta \right\rangle = \frac{1 - |\alpha|^2}{1 - \alpha\bar{\beta}} - \frac{\beta}{1 - |\beta|^2} \frac{\bar{\alpha} - \bar{\beta}}{1 - \alpha\bar{\beta}},$$

$$(4.139) \quad \left\langle k_\alpha, M_z^* \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} k_\beta \right\rangle = 1,$$

$$(4.140) \quad \left\langle k_\beta, M_z^* \frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z} k_\alpha \right\rangle = 1.$$

Since $1, zk_\alpha, zk_\beta \perp \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z}\right)\left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z}\right)z^n$ for all $n \geq 1$, it follows that

$$1, zk_\alpha, zk_\beta \in \text{span} \left\{ k_\alpha, k_\beta, \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z}\right)\left(\frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z}\right) \right\},$$

and it can be shown by (4.118), (4.119), and (4.137)—(4.140)

$$(4.141) \quad 1 = -\frac{\bar{\beta}(1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta)(1 - |\alpha|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}}k_\alpha + \frac{\bar{\alpha}(1 - \alpha\bar{\beta})(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}}k_\beta + \frac{\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z},$$

$$(4.142) \quad zk_\alpha = \left(\alpha + \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \right) k_\alpha - \frac{(1 - \bar{\beta}\alpha)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} k_\beta - \bar{\beta} \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z},$$

$$(4.143) \quad zk_\beta = \frac{(1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta)(1 - |\alpha|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} k_\alpha + \left(\beta - \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \right) k_\beta - \bar{\alpha} \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z}.$$

Substituting $1, zk_\alpha, zk_\beta$ from (4.141)—(4.143) in (4.135), a simplification implies

(4.144)

$$\begin{aligned}
Tk_\alpha = & \left[(1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}s_0) \left(\alpha + \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \right) + \overline{v(\alpha)}(s_1 - \bar{\beta}u(0)) \frac{(1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta)(1 - |\alpha|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \right] k_\alpha + \\
& \left[\frac{(1 - \bar{\beta}\alpha)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \left(-1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}(\bar{\alpha}u(0) - s_0) \right) + \overline{v(\alpha)}s_1 \left(\beta - \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \right) \right] k_\beta \\
& \left[\overline{v(\alpha)} \left(\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}u(0) - s_0\bar{\beta} - s_1\bar{\alpha} \right) - \bar{\beta} \right] \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.131), the coefficient of $\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z-\beta}{1-\bar{\beta}z}$ in Tk_α above is zero. Suppose c_α, d_α denote the coefficients of k_α, k_β respectively in Tk_α . Then the equation (4.144) can be written as

$$(4.145) \quad Tk_\alpha = c_\alpha k_\alpha + d_\alpha k_\beta.$$

Note that, (4.131) can also be written as

$$(4.146) \quad -\bar{\alpha}\overline{v(\alpha)}(s_1 - \bar{\beta}u(0)) = \bar{\beta}(1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}s_0).$$

Note that, one of α and β must be nonzero (as $\alpha \neq \beta$ by assumption). Let $\alpha \neq 0$. Then by (4.146), c_α in (4.144) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.147) \quad c_\alpha = & (1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}s_0) \left(\alpha + \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \right) - \frac{\bar{\beta}}{\bar{\alpha}}(1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}s_0) \frac{(1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta)(1 - |\alpha|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \\
= & (1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}s_0) \left[\alpha + \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} - \frac{\bar{\beta}}{\bar{\alpha}} \frac{(1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta)(1 - |\alpha|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

and a further simplification yields

$$(4.148) \quad c_\alpha = \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}}(1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}s_0).$$

If $\beta \neq 0$, then by (4.144), and (4.146), c_α in (4.145) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.149) \quad c_\alpha = & -\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{\bar{\beta}}\overline{v(\alpha)}(s_1 - \bar{\beta}u(0)) \left(\alpha + \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \right) + \overline{v(\alpha)}(s_1 - \bar{\beta}u(0)) \frac{(1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta)(1 - |\alpha|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \\
= & \overline{v(\alpha)}(s_1 - \bar{\beta}u(0)) \left[-\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{\bar{\beta}} \left(\alpha + \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \right) + \frac{(1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta)(1 - |\alpha|^2)}{\alpha - \bar{\beta}} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

and further by a simple computation one will have

$$(4.150) \quad c_\alpha = -\frac{\overline{v(\alpha)}}{\bar{\beta}}(s_1 - \bar{\beta}u(0)).$$

We now simplify d_α in (4.145). Note by (4.146)

$$(4.151) \quad \bar{\alpha}\overline{v(\alpha)}s_1 = \bar{\beta} \left[-1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}(\bar{\alpha}u(0) - s_0) \right].$$

If $\alpha \neq 0$, the one can write via (4.144), and (4.151)

$$(4.152) \quad d_\alpha = \left(-1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}(\bar{\alpha}u(0) - s_0) \right) \left[\frac{(1 - \bar{\beta}\alpha)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} + \frac{\bar{\beta}}{\bar{\alpha}} \left(\beta - \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} \right) \right],$$

and further by a simplification

$$(4.153) \quad d_\alpha = \overline{v(\alpha)}u(0) - \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}}(1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}s_0).$$

Again, if $\beta \neq 0$, then it follows by (4.144), and (4.151)

$$(4.154) \quad d_\alpha = \overline{v(\alpha)}s_1 \left[\frac{\bar{\alpha}(1 - \bar{\beta}\alpha)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\bar{\beta}} + \beta - \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} \right],$$

and a further simplification yields

$$(4.155) \quad d_\alpha = \frac{\overline{v(\alpha)}}{\bar{\beta}}s_1.$$

Hence it follows by (4.145), (4.148), (4.153), (4.150), (4.155)

$$(4.156) \quad Tk_\alpha = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}}(1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}s_0)k_\alpha + \left(\overline{v(\alpha)}u(0) - \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}}(1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}s_0) \right)k_\beta, & \text{if } \alpha \neq 0 \\ -\frac{\overline{v(\alpha)}}{\bar{\beta}}(s_1 - \bar{\beta}u(0))k_\alpha + \frac{\overline{v(\alpha)}}{\bar{\beta}}s_1k_\beta, & \text{if } \beta \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Next, substituting $1, zk_\alpha, zk_\beta$ from (4.141)—(4.143) in (4.136) a simplification implies

$$(4.157) \quad \begin{aligned} Tk_\beta = & \left[\frac{(1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta)(1 - |\alpha|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} \left(1 + \overline{v(\beta)}(s_1 - \bar{\beta}u(0)) \right) + \overline{v(\beta)}s_0 \left(\alpha + \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} \right) \right] k_\alpha \\ & \left[\frac{(1 - \bar{\beta}\alpha)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} \left(\overline{v(\beta)}(\bar{\alpha}u(0) - s_0) \right) + (1 + \overline{v(\beta)}s_1) \left(\beta - \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} \right) \right] k_\beta \\ & \left[\overline{v(\beta)} \left(\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}u(0) - s_0\bar{\beta} - s_1\bar{\alpha} \right) - \bar{\alpha} \right] \frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z}. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.132), the coefficient of $\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z - \beta}{1 - \bar{\beta}z}$ in Tk_β above vanishes. Let c_β, d_β denote the coefficients of k_α and k_β respectively in Tk_β above. Then (4.157) becomes

$$(4.158) \quad Tk_\beta = c_\beta k_\alpha + d_\beta k_\beta.$$

We now simplify c_β, d_β . Note that (4.132) can be written as

$$(4.159) \quad -\bar{\alpha} \left[1 + \overline{v(\beta)}(s_1 - \bar{\beta}u(0)) \right] = \bar{\beta}\overline{v(\beta)}s_0.$$

If $\alpha \neq 0$, one will have by (4.159) and (4.157)

$$(4.160) \quad c_\beta = -\frac{\bar{\beta}}{\bar{\alpha}} \overline{v(\beta)} s_0 \frac{(1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta)(1 - |\alpha|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} + s_0 \overline{v(\beta)} \left(\alpha + \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} \right),$$

which further reduced to (by a simple computation)

$$(4.161) \quad c_\beta = \frac{\overline{v(\beta)}}{\bar{\alpha}} s_0.$$

Again, (4.132) can also be written as

$$(4.162) \quad \bar{\alpha} \left(1 + \overline{v(\beta)} s_1 \right) = \bar{\beta} \overline{v(\beta)} \left(\bar{\alpha} u(0) - s_0 \right).$$

Hence for $\alpha \neq 0$, it follows via (4.162), and (4.157)

$$(4.163) \quad d_\beta = \frac{(1 - \bar{\beta}\alpha)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} \overline{v(\beta)} \left(\bar{\alpha} u(0) - s_0 \right) + \frac{\bar{\beta}}{\bar{\alpha}} \overline{v(\beta)} \left(\bar{\alpha} u(0) - s_0 \right) \left(\beta - \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} \right),$$

and again simplifies to

$$(4.164) \quad d_\beta = \frac{\overline{v(\beta)}}{\bar{\alpha}} \left(\bar{\alpha} u(0) - s_0 \right).$$

Next, if $\beta \neq 0$, it follows by (4.157), and (4.159)

$$(4.165) \quad c_\beta = \frac{(1 - \bar{\alpha}\beta)(1 - |\alpha|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} \left(1 + \overline{v(\beta)} (s_1 - \bar{\beta} u(0)) \right) - \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{\bar{\beta}} \left(1 + \overline{v(\beta)} (s_1 - \bar{\beta} u(0)) \right) \left(\alpha + \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} \right),$$

and a further simplification yield

$$(4.166) \quad c_\beta = \overline{v(\beta)} u(0) - \frac{1}{\bar{\beta}} \left(1 + s_1 \overline{v(\beta)} \right).$$

Now for $\beta \neq 0$, it follows by (4.157), and (4.162)

$$(4.167) \quad d_\beta = \frac{\bar{\alpha} (1 - \bar{\beta}\alpha)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\bar{\beta}} (1 + \overline{v(\beta)} s_1) + (1 + \overline{v(\beta)} s_1) \left(\beta - \frac{(1 - |\alpha|^2)(1 - |\beta|^2)}{\bar{\alpha} - \beta} \right),$$

and further simplifies to

$$(4.168) \quad d_\beta = \frac{1}{\bar{\beta}} \left(1 + \overline{v(\beta)} s_1 \right).$$

Therefore it follows by (4.158), (4.161), (4.164), (4.166), (4.168)

$$(4.169) \quad Tk_\beta = \begin{cases} \frac{\overline{v(\beta)}}{\bar{\alpha}} s_0 k_\alpha + \frac{\overline{v(\beta)}}{\bar{\alpha}} (\bar{\alpha} u(0) - s_0) k_\beta, & \text{if } \alpha \neq 0 \\ \left(\overline{v(\beta)} u(0) - \frac{1}{\bar{\beta}} (1 + s_1 \overline{v(\beta)}) \right) k_\alpha + \frac{1}{\bar{\beta}} (1 + \overline{v(\beta)} s_1) k_\beta, & \text{if } \beta \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Hence it follows by (4.156), and (4.169) that the matrix representation B of $P_2T|_{\text{span}\{k_\alpha, k_\beta\}}$ with respect to the basis $\{k_\alpha, k_\beta\}$ is given by

$$(4.170) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}}(1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}s_0) & \frac{\overline{v(\beta)}}{\bar{\alpha}}s_0 \\ \overline{v(\alpha)}u(0) - \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}}(1 + \overline{v(\alpha)}s_0) & \overline{v(\beta)}u(0) - \frac{\overline{v(\beta)}}{\bar{\alpha}}s_0 \end{pmatrix},$$

if α is nonzero or

$$(4.171) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{v(\alpha)}u(0) - \frac{\overline{v(\alpha)}}{\bar{\beta}}s_1 & \overline{v(\beta)}u(0) - \frac{1}{\bar{\beta}}(1 + s_1\overline{v(\beta)}) \\ \frac{\overline{v(\alpha)}}{\bar{\beta}}s_1 & \frac{1}{\bar{\beta}}(1 + \overline{v(\beta)}s_1) \end{pmatrix},$$

if β is nonzero.

Conversely let $T = S + u \otimes v$ on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ with $\{v, S^*u\}$ linearly independent and there exist distinct $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{D}$ such that the conditions (1)–(4) of the statement hold. Since by (1), $v, S^*u \in \text{span}\{k_\alpha, k_\beta\}$, it follows that $\{v, S^*u\}$ is S^* -invariant, and also $\{v, S^*u\}^\perp = \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}\right)\left(\frac{z-\beta}{1-\bar{\beta}z}\right)H^2(\mathbb{D})$. We have shown earlier, $\ker(I - T^*T) = \{v, S^*u\}^\perp$ (case 2, Lemma 2.9), and hence

$$\ker(I - T^*T) \ominus z \ker(I - T^*T) = \mathbb{C} \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z-\beta}{1-\bar{\beta}z}.$$

By (1), it also follows that there exist scalars $t_i, s_i \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$v = t_0 k_\alpha + t_1 k_\beta,$$

and

$$S^*u = s_0 k_\alpha + s_1 k_\beta,$$

where the scalars t_i, s_i are given by the same equations (4.112)–(4.115).

Now proceeding exactly as in the first part, one can show that the conditions (2), (3) of the statement are equivalent to the equations (4.7) and (4.8) with $k = 1$, and $g_1(z) = \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z} \frac{z-\beta}{1-\bar{\beta}z}$ of the Theorem (4.1). Also, by a same argument as in the first part, the matrices (for $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$) given by (4) in the statement are similar to the matrix A in (4.6). Since they are normal by the same condition, the proof follows by the converse part of the Theorem 4.1. ■

REMARK 4.5. Theorems 4.3, and 4.4 also provide counterexamples to the Proposition 2.5 in [8].

Acknowledgement: The author is thankful to Prof. E. K. Narayanan for many helpful discussions, suggestions, and corrections throughout the work. The research of the author is supported by the NBHM-Postdoctoral fellowship at the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India.

REFERENCES

1. A. Brown, *On a class of operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 4 (1953), 723–728.
2. S. Das, *Completely non-unitary contractions and analyticity*, J. Oper. Theory, 94:1 (2025), 65–91.
3. S. Das, J. Sarkar, *Invariant subspaces of analytic perturbations*, St. Petersburg Math. J., 35 (2024), 677–695.
4. R. G. Douglas, *On Majorization, Factorization, and Range Inclusion of Operators on Hilbert Space*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 17 (1966), 413–415.

5. P. Halmos, *A Hilbert space problem book*. Second edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 19. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. 17. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1982.
6. E. J. Ionascu, *Rank-one perturbations of diagonal operators*, Integr. Equat. Oper. Th., 39 (2001), 421–440.
7. I. B. Jung, E. Y. Lee, *Rank one perturbations of Normal operators and hyponormality*, Oper. matrices, 8 (2014), 691–698.
8. E. Ko, J. E. Lee, *On rank one perturbations of the unilateral shift*, Commun. Kor. Math. Soc., 26 (2011), 79–88.
9. Y. Nakamura, *One-dimensional perturbations of the shift*, Integr. Equat. Oper. Th., 17 (1993), 373–403.
10. Y. Nakamura, *One-dimensional perturbations of isometries*, Integr. Equat. Oper. Th., 9 (1986), 286–294.
11. B. Sz.-Nagy, C. Foias, *Harmonic analysis of operators on Hilbert space*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1970.
12. K. Davidson, V. Paulsen, M. Raghupathi, D. Singh, *A constrained Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation problem*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 58 (2009), 709–732.

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BANGALORE, 560012, INDIA

Email address: susmitadas@iisc.ac.in, susmita.das.puremath@gmail.com