

Author Queries

Journal: PEM (Proceedings of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society)

Manuscript: S0013091516000584jra

- Q1 The distinction between surnames can be ambiguous, therefore to ensure accurate tagging for indexing purposes online (eg for PubMed entries), please check that the highlighted surnames have been correctly identified, that all names are in the correct order and spelt correctly.

ON THE RANGE INCLUSION FOR NORMAL DERIVATIONS ON C^* -ALGEBRAS

BOJAN MAGAJNA

Q1

Department of Mathematics, University of Ljubljana, Jadranska 21,
Ljubljana 1000, Slovenia (bojan.magajna@mf.uni-lj.si)

(Received 28 August 2015)

Abstract For a von Neumann subalgebra $A \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and any two elements $a, b \in A$ with a normal, such that the corresponding derivations d_a and d_b satisfy the condition $\|d_b(x)\| \leq \|d_a(x)\|$ for all $x \in A$, there exist completely bounded (a) '-bimodule map $\varphi : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $d_b|_A = \varphi d_a|_A = d_a \varphi|_A$. (In particular $d_b(A) \subseteq d_a(A)$.) Moreover, if A is a factor, then φ can be taken to be normal and these equalities hold on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ instead of just on A . This result is not true for general (even primitive) C^* -algebras \mathcal{A} .

Keywords: C^* -algebra, derivation, completely bounded map

2010 *Mathematics subject classification:* Primary 46L57; 47B47; Secondary 47B15

1. Introduction

Derivations have continuously attracted attention (see for example, [2, Chapter 4]). Even determining the norm of an inner derivation on a C^* -algebra A turned out to be a much deeper and more interesting problem (connected with the structure of A) than it might have seemed at first sight (see [3] and the references therein).

For a C^* -algebra $A \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and elements $a, b \in A$ we consider the corresponding inner derivations d_a and d_b on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, where $d_a(x) := ax - xa$. In particular, we study the implications of the condition

$$\|d_b(x)\| \leq \kappa \|d_a(x)\| \quad (\forall x \in A), \quad (1.1)$$

where κ is a constant, in the case when a is normal. (Note that κ can be assumed to be 1 if we replace a by κa .) The first systematic study of the case when $A = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ was by Johnson and Williams in [12], who showed that, if a is normal, (1.1) is equivalent to the range inclusion

$$d_b(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})) \subseteq d_a(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})). \quad (1.2)$$

If a is not normal, (1.2) does not always imply (1.1), for by [11] it does not even imply that b is in the bicommutant of a . Conversely, if $A = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, it turned out that (1.1) implies (1.2)

under milder requirements on a than normality [16]. The work of Johnson and Williams was continued by several researchers (see example [5], [6], [8], [13]). In [13] Kissin and Shulman proved that if A is a C^* -subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $d_a(A) \subseteq A$, $d_b(A) \subseteq A$ and a is normal, then the range inclusion $d_b(A) \subseteq d_a(A)$ implies the inequality (1.1) with a suitable constant κ . Here we consider the reverse question, whether (1.1) implies the inclusion $d_b(A) \subseteq d_a(A)$? We have found, somewhat surprisingly, that contrary to the case of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, in a general C^* -algebra A (even a homogeneous one) (1.1) does not necessarily imply the range inclusion $d_b(A) \subseteq d_a(A)$, but it does imply if A is a von Neumann algebra. The latter fact is a part of the main result of §2 (Theorem 2.1). Condition (1.1) obviously implies the existence of a unique bounded linear operator $\varphi : d_a(A) \rightarrow d_b(A)$ such that $\varphi d_a = d_b$. This map φ must be a bimodule homomorphism over the commutant $(a)' \cap A$ of a in A since both d_a and d_b are such homomorphisms. When $A = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and a is normal, $(a)'$ is locally cyclic. Therefore, φ is automatically completely bounded by a result of Smith [21] and consequently can be extended to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ by [18, Theorem 8.2]. In Theorem 2.1 we will show that a similar conclusion holds in a general (not necessarily injective) von Neumann algebra. Then in §3, we formulate an analogous, but weaker, result for prime C^* -algebras.

\overline{S} denotes the weak* closure of a subset S in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $[a, x] := ax - xa$.

2. The von Neumann algebra case

Theorem 2.1. *Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a von Neumann algebra and let $a, b \in A$ be such that a is normal and the corresponding derivations d_a and d_b satisfy the condition*

$$\|d_b(x)\| \leq \|d_a(x)\| \quad \text{for all } x \in A. \quad (2.1)$$

Then there exists a completely bounded $(a)'$ -bimodule map $\varphi : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\varphi(A) \subseteq A$ and $d_b|_A = \varphi d_a|_A = d_a \varphi|_A$. (Hence in particular $d_b(A) \subseteq d_a(A)$.) Moreover, if A is a factor, then a weak continuous φ can be found such that $d_b = \varphi d_a = d_a \varphi$ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.*

For a proof we need some preparation. The following lemma is proved in [16, 4.7].

Lemma 2.2. *Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a C^* -algebra, J a closed ideal in A , and let $a, b \in A$ satisfy $\|[b, x]\| \leq \|[a, x]\|$ for all $x \in A$. Then the same inequality holds for all $x \in \overline{A}$ and also for all cosets $\dot{x} \in A/J$.*

A function $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined on a subset $K \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is called a *Schur function* if there exists a constant κ such that for every sequence $(\lambda_i) \subseteq K$ the (infinite) matrix with the entries

$$\mu_{i,k} := \frac{f(\lambda_i) - f(\lambda_k)}{\lambda_i - \lambda_k}, \quad \text{where } \mu_{i,k} \text{ is interpreted as } 0 \text{ if } \lambda_i = \lambda_k,$$

is a Schur multiplier on $B(\ell^2)$ with the multiplier norm at most κ . The smallest such κ is called the Schur constant of f .

Now we can state a consequence of the main result of Johnson and Williams [12] and Lemma 2.2.

Theorem 2.3. *If A is a prime C^* -algebra and $a, b \in A$ are such that $\|[b, x]\| \leq \|[a, x]\|$ for all $x \in A$ and a is normal, then $b = f(a)$ for a Schur function f on the spectrum $\sigma(a)$ of a . Moreover, the Schur constant of f is ≤ 2 .*

Proof. By [7, Proposition 3.1] there exists a separable prime C^* -subalgebra B of A containing a and b (an elementary proof of this is in [15, Lemma 3.2]). Then B is primitive by [19, p. 102], hence we may assume that B is an irreducible C^* -subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ for a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . By Lemma 2.2 $\|[b, x]\| \leq \|[a, x]\|$ for all $x \in \overline{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, and hence by [12, Theorem 3.6] there exists a Schur function f (with $\kappa \leq 2$) on $\sigma(a)$ such that $b = f(a)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let Δ be the maximal ideal space of the center Z of A . For each $t \in \Delta$ we denote by $A(t)$ the quotient $A/(tA)$ and by $x(t)$ the coset in $A(t)$ of an element $x \in A$. By [9, Lemma 10] the function $t \mapsto \|x(t)\|$ is continuous. Also by [9] each $A(t)$ is a prime C^* -algebra (in fact, by [10] each $A(t)$ is primitive, but the proof of that is much harder). By Lemma 2.2 the condition (2.1) is also satisfied in $A(t)$, and hence by Theorem 2.3 there exists a Schur function f_t on $\sigma(a(t))$ with Schur constant less than or equal to 2 such that $b(t) = f_t(a(t))$.

Given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t \in \Delta$, there is an element of the form $a_{t,\varepsilon} = \sum \lambda_i e_i \in A$, where $\lambda_i \in \sigma(a(t))$ and the e_i are mutually orthogonal spectral projections of a in A with the sum $\sum_i e_i = 1$, such that $\|a(s) - a_{t,\varepsilon}(s)\| < \varepsilon$ for all s in a clopen neighborhood U_t of t . To show this, first choose $\mu_i \in \sigma(a)$ and (mutually orthogonal) projections $e_i \in A$ with the sum 1 such that $\|a - \sum_i \mu_i e_i\| < \varepsilon/2$. Then $\|a(t)e_i(t) - \mu_i e_i(t)\| < \varepsilon/2$ for each i , which implies that the distance of μ_i to the spectrum of $a(t)e_i(t)$ in the algebra $e_i(t)A(t)e_i(t)$ is less than $\varepsilon/2$ whenever $e_i(t) \neq 0$. Since this spectrum is contained in $\sigma(a(t))$, we can choose for each such i an element $\lambda_i \in \sigma(a(t))$ such that $|\lambda_i - \mu_i| < \varepsilon/2$. Then $\|\sum(\lambda_i - \mu_i)e_i(t)\| = \max_i |\lambda_i - \mu_i| < \varepsilon/2$, hence also $\|a(t) - \sum \lambda_i e_i(t)\| < \varepsilon$. By continuity this inequality persists in a neighborhood U_t of t . Moreover, since $b(t) = f_t(a(t))$ and f_t is continuous (in fact differentiable at each non-isolated point of $\sigma(a)$ by [12]), we can achieve (by choosing a possibly smaller neighborhood U_t) that $\|b(s) - b_{t,\varepsilon}(s)\| < \varepsilon$ for all $s \in U_t$, where $b_{t,\varepsilon} := \sum f_t(\lambda_i)e_i$. Covering Δ with finitely many such neighborhoods U_t and considering the corresponding partition of Δ , we see that there exist finitely many (say n) central projections $p_j \in A$ with the sum 1 and with the following property: for each j there exist finitely many scalars $\lambda_{i,j} \in \sigma(a(t_j))$, mutually orthogonal spectral projections $e_{i,j}$ of a with $\sum_i e_{i,j} = p_j$ and a Schur function $f_j := f_{t_j}$ (with the corresponding Schur constant at most 2) such that

$$\left\| \left(a - \sum_i \lambda_{i,j} e_{i,j} \right) p_j \right\| < \varepsilon \text{ and } \left\| \left(b - \sum_i f_j(\lambda_{i,j}) e_{i,j} \right) p_j \right\| < \varepsilon. \quad (2.2)$$

Let $a_{j,\varepsilon} = \sum_i \lambda_{i,j} e_{i,j}$, $b_{j,\varepsilon} = \sum_i f_j(\lambda_{i,j}) e_{i,j}$ and define $\varphi_{j,\varepsilon} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ by

$$\varphi_{j,\varepsilon}(x) = \sum_{i,k} \frac{f_j(\lambda_{i,j}) - f_j(\lambda_{k,j})}{\lambda_{i,j} - \lambda_{k,j}} p_j e_{i,j} x e_{k,j} p_j, \quad (e_{k,j} p_j = e_{k,j}),$$

where the quotient is interpreted as 0 if $\lambda_{i,j} = \lambda_{k,j}$. Observe that

$$d_{a_j, \varepsilon} \varphi_{j, \varepsilon} = d_{b_j, \varepsilon} = \varphi_{j, \varepsilon} d_{a_j, \varepsilon}. \quad (2.3)$$

To prove that set $\{\varphi_{j, \varepsilon} : \varepsilon \in (0, 1]\}$ is bounded, fix j and denote $\lambda_{i,j}$ simply by λ_i , $e_{i,j}$ by e_i and f_j by f . Set

$$\mu_{i,k} = \frac{f(\lambda_i) - f(\lambda_k)}{\lambda_i - \lambda_k}.$$

Since f is a Schur function with the constant at most 2, by [18, Corollary 8.8] there exist vectors $\zeta_k = (\zeta_{m,k})$ and $\tau_k = (\tau_{m,k})$ in ℓ^2 such that $\mu_{i,k} = \langle \zeta_k, \tau_i \rangle$ and $\|\zeta_k\|, \|\tau_k\| \leq 2$. Now, for all $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with $\|x\| = 1$ and all vectors $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ we can estimate (using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality several times)

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \varphi_{j, \varepsilon}(x)\eta, \xi \rangle| &= \left| \sum_{i,k} \mu_{i,k} \langle x e_k \eta, e_i \xi \rangle \right| = \left| \sum_{i,k} \langle \zeta_k, \tau_i \rangle \langle x e_k \eta, e_i \xi \rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{i,k} \sum_m \zeta_{m,k} \bar{\tau}_{m,i} \langle x e_k \eta, e_i \xi \rangle \right| = \left| \sum_m \left\langle x \sum_k \zeta_{m,k} e_k \eta, \sum_i \tau_{m,i} e_i \xi \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq \|x\| \sum_m \left\| \sum_k \zeta_{m,k} e_k \eta \right\| \left\| \sum_i \tau_{m,i} e_i \xi \right\| \\ &= \sum_m \left(\sum_k |\zeta_{m,k}|^2 \|e_k \eta\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_i |\tau_{m,i}|^2 \|e_i \xi\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_m \sum_k |\zeta_{m,k}|^2 \|e_k \eta\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_m \sum_i |\tau_{m,i}|^2 \|e_i \xi\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(\sum_k \|\zeta_k\|^2 \|e_k \eta\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_i \|\tau_i\|^2 \|e_i \xi\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq 4 \left(\sum_k \|e_k \eta\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_i \|\eta_i \xi\|^2 \right)^{1/2} = 4 \|\eta\| \|\xi\|. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\frac{1}{4} \varphi_{j, \varepsilon}$ is a contraction and a similar computation (replacing $x \in \mathcal{H}$ with $x \in \mathcal{H}^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$) shows that it is a complete contraction. Since the sum $\varphi_\varepsilon := \sum_{j=1}^n \varphi_{j, \varepsilon}$ is orthogonal (because the p_j are mutually orthogonal), it follows that the map $\frac{1}{4} \varphi_\varepsilon$ is completely contractive and clearly it is an $(a)'$ -bimodule map. Now let φ be a weak* limit point of the net $(\varphi_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}$. Using (2.2) and (2.3) it is not hard to verify that $\|(\varphi_\varepsilon d_a - d_b)|A\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, hence $\varphi d_a|A = d_b|A = d_a \varphi|A$. Also, $\varphi(A) \subset A$ follows from the definition of φ .

Although the maps d_a , d_b and φ are defined on all of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the identity $d_b = d_a \varphi$ can be verified only on A since the projections p_j do not commute with all $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. However, if A is a factor, then there is only one non-zero p_j , which is equal to the identity, and in this

185 case $d_a\varphi = d_b = \varphi d_a$ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Moreover, if $\varphi = \varphi_n + \varphi_s$ is the decomposition of φ into
 186 the normal and singular parts, then writing the identity $d_b = d_a\varphi$ as $d_b - d_a\varphi_n = d_a\varphi_s$,
 187 the left-hand side of this identity is normal while the right is singular, so both must be
 188 0. Since φ_n is normal and an $(a)'$ -bimodule map, it has the form $\varphi_n(x) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} a_j x b_j$
 189 for some index set \mathbb{J} and elements $a_j, b_j \in (a)'' \subseteq A$ such that the sums $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} a_j a_j^*$ and
 190 $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} b_j^* b_j$ are weak* convergent [21], and hence $\varphi(A) \subseteq A$. Thus φ can be replaced by
 191 φ_n . \square

192
 193 **Remark 2.4.** In Theorem 2.1, if A is not necessarily a factor, we may decompose
 194 $\psi := \varphi|_A$ into the normal part ψ_n and the singular part ψ_s and we still have $\psi_n(A) \subseteq A$,
 195 but ψ_n is not necessarily an $(a)'$ -bimodule map (only an A^c -bimodule map, where $A^c :=$
 196 $(a)' \cap A$ (since this hold for ψ)).

197
 198 A derivation d on a C^* -algebra A is called *normal* if $d^*d = dd^*$, where $d^*(x) := d(x^*)^*$.
 199 If d is an inner derivation (that is, if $d(x) = [a, x]$ for a fixed $a \in A$), then by a short
 200 direct calculation one can show that the condition $d^*d = dd^*$ means that $a^*a - aa^*$ is in
 201 the center Z of A . In the case $Z = \mathbb{C}$ it has been observed already in [13, p. 194] that
 202 this implies that a is normal. The same conclusion holds in a general C^* -algebra, for
 203 $a^*a - aa^*$ commutes in particular with a , hence by the Kleinecke–Shirokov theorem [4,
 204 p. 91], $a^*a - aa^*$ is quasi-nilpotent, and hence 0 (since it is skew-adjoint).

205 If d_1 and d_2 are derivations on a C^* -algebra $A \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $d_2(A) \subseteq d_1(A)$, then
 206 by [13, Theorem 6.5] there exists a constant κ such that $\|d_2(x)\| \leq \kappa \|d_1(x)\|$ for all $x \in A$.
 207 The two derivations extend weak* continuously to derivations on \overline{A} (see [20, Theorem
 208 2.2.2]), which are necessarily inner [20, Theorem 2.5.1] and thus of the form d_a, d_b for
 209 elements $a, b \in \overline{A}$. Since d_1 is normal so is its extension d_a , and hence by the previous
 210 paragraph a must be normal. Thus from Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 we deduce the
 211 following consequence.

212
 213 **Corollary 2.5.** *Let d_1 and d_2 be derivations on a C^* -algebra $A \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and assume
 214 that d_1 is normal. If $d_2(A) \subseteq d_1(A)$, then there exists a completely bounded $(a)'$ -bimodule
 215 map φ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\varphi(\overline{A}) \subseteq \overline{A}$ and $d_b|_{\overline{A}} = d_a\varphi|_{\overline{A}} = \varphi d_a|_{\overline{A}}$, where d_a and d_b are
 216 the weak* continuous extensions to \overline{A} of d_1 and d_2 .*

217
 218 Now we show by a simple example that Theorem 2.1 does not hold for general (even
 219 homogeneous) C^* -algebras.

220
 221 **Example 2.6.** Let $A = C([-1, 1], M_2(\mathbb{C}))$ be the C^* -algebra of all continuous functions
 222 from the interval $[-1, 1]$ into 2×2 complex matrices. Let $a, b \in A$ be defined by $a(t) = |t|u$
 223 and $b(t) = tu$ ($t \in [-1, 1]$), where $u \in A$ is the unitary

$$u(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

224
 225 For each $x \in A$ we have

$$\|d_b(x)\| = \sup_{-1 \leq t \leq 1} |t| \|ux(t) - x(t)u\| = \|ax - xa\| = \|d_a(x)\|.$$

But nevertheless, $d_b(A)$ is not contained in $d_a(A)$. To show this, let

$$p = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and hence } d_b(p) = t \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Each $x \in A$ is of the form

$$x = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{bmatrix},$$

where α, β, γ and δ are complex-valued continuous functions on $[-1, 1]$, and

$$d_a(x) = |t| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \beta \\ -\gamma & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

If $d_b(p) = d_a(x)$, then (considering elements in position $(1, 2)$) $|t|\beta = t$ for all $t \in [-1, 1]$, which is impossible for a continuous function β .

3. The case of prime C^* -algebras

We will show by an example below that Theorem 2.1 cannot be generalized to primitive C^* -algebras, but the following weaker result still holds.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a prime C^* -algebra and let $a, b \in A$ with a normal. Then there exists a constant κ such that*

$$\|d_b(x)\| \leq \kappa \|d_a(x)\| \text{ for all } x \in A \tag{3.1}$$

if and only if there exists a bounded net (φ_j) of completely bounded $(a)'$ -bimodule maps $\varphi_j : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\|\varphi_j(d_a(x)) - d_b(x)\| \xrightarrow{j} 0$ for each $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\varphi_j(A) \subseteq A$. In fact, if A is primitive, a sequence (φ_j) with the required properties can be found such that $\|\varphi_j d_a - d_b\|_{\text{cb}} \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0$.

Proof. If a net (φ_j) with the required properties exists, then clearly (3.1) is satisfied. Conversely, suppose that (3.1) holds. It suffices to find a net (φ_j) with the required properties (and $\|\varphi_j\|_{\text{cb}} \leq 9$) for each separable prime C^* -subalgebra of A containing a and b , since each separable subalgebra of A is contained in a prime separable C^* -subalgebra by [7]. Thus we may assume that A is primitive. By Lemma 2.2, $b = f(a)$ for a Schur function f and we may assume that the Schur constant of f is 1.

Now, to construct the appropriate maps $\varphi_j : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we first cover the plane \mathbb{C} with a grid of small closed rectangles with sides parallel to the coordinate axes, so that the intersection of any two rectangles is either empty or a common edge. Then each rectangle intersects at most eight other rectangles. By taking slightly larger open rectangles, we can cover $\sigma(a)$ by finitely many such open rectangles $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$, each still intersecting only eight other rectangles. Further, given $\varepsilon > 0$, we may assume that the rectangles are so small that $|\lambda - \mu| < \varepsilon$ and $|f(\lambda) - f(\mu)| < \varepsilon$ whenever λ and μ are both contained in a union of two intersecting rectangles U_i . Let $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a partition of unity subordinate

to the covering $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Choose, for each i , a point $\lambda_i \in U_i$; then a and $b = f(a)$ are approximated (in norm) by elements

$$a_\varepsilon = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i g_i(a) \text{ and } b_\varepsilon = \sum_{i=1}^n f(\lambda_i) g_i(a).$$

Set

$$\mu_{i,k} = \frac{f(\lambda_i) - f(\lambda_k)}{\lambda_i - \lambda_k}$$

(regarded as 0 if $\lambda_i = \lambda_k$) and define

$$\varphi_\varepsilon : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \quad \varphi_\varepsilon(x) = \sum_{i,k=1}^n \mu_{i,k} g_i(a) x g_k(a).$$

To show that the net (φ_ε) is bounded, as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 we use the fact that there exist vectors $\zeta_k = (\zeta_{m,k}), \tau_k = (\tau_{m,k}) \in \ell^2$ with $\|\zeta_k\|, \|\tau_k\| \leq 1$ such that $\mu_{i,k} = \langle \zeta_k, \tau_i \rangle$ (since f has the Schur constant 1). Then for all x in the unit ball of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \varphi_\varepsilon(x)\eta, \xi \rangle| &= \left| \sum_{i,k} \mu_{i,k} \langle x g_k(a)\eta, g_i(a)\xi \rangle \right| = \left| \sum_m \langle x \sum_k \zeta_{m,k} g_k(a)\eta, \sum_i \tau_{m,i} g_i(a)\xi \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \sum_m \left\| \sum_k \zeta_{m,k} g_k(a)\eta \right\| \left\| \sum_i \tau_{m,i} g_i(a)\xi \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

For each k let $L(k) = \{i : g_k g_i \neq 0\}$; thus, by the definition of the functions g_k the set $L(k)$ contains at most nine elements. We can now estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_k \zeta_{m,k} g_k(a)\eta \right\|^2 &= \sum_k \sum_{i \in L(k)} \zeta_{m,k} \bar{\zeta}_{m,i} \langle g_i(a) g_k(a)\eta, \eta \rangle \\ &\leq \sum_k \sum_{i \in L(k)} \|\zeta_{m,k} g_k(a)\eta\| \|\zeta_{m,i} g_i(a)\eta\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \sum_{i \in L(k)} (\|\zeta_{m,k} g_k(a)\eta\|^2 + \|\zeta_{m,i} g_i(a)\eta\|^2) \\ &= \frac{9}{2} \sum_k \|\zeta_{m,k} g_k(a)\eta\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \sum_{i \in L(k)} \|\zeta_{m,i} g_i(a)\eta\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since each i is contained in at most nine sets $L(k)$, the last double sum is dominated by $9 \sum_k \|\zeta_{m,k} g_k(a)\eta\|^2$, and hence it follows that

$$\left\| \sum_k \zeta_{m,k} g_k(a)\eta \right\|^2 \leq 9 \sum_k \|\zeta_{m,k} g_k(a)\eta\|^2.$$

A similar inequality also holds for $\|\sum_i \tau_{k,i} g_i(a) \xi\|^2$, and we can therefore continue the above estimate of $|\langle \varphi_\varepsilon(x) \eta, \xi \rangle|$ as

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \varphi_\varepsilon(x) \eta, \xi \rangle| &\leq 9 \sum_m \left(\sum_k |\zeta_{m,k}|^2 \|g_k(a) \eta\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_i |\tau_{m,i}|^2 \|g_i(a) \xi\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq 9 \left(\sum_{m,k} |\zeta_{m,k}| \|g_k(a) \eta\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{m,i} |\tau_{m,i}| \|g_i(a) \xi\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq 9 \left(\sum_k \|g_k(a) \eta\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_i \|g_i(a) \xi\|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the functions $g_k g_i$ are non-negative,

$$\sum_k \|g_k(a) \eta\|^2 \leq \sum_{k,i} \langle g_i(a) \eta, g_k(a) \eta \rangle = \left\| \sum_k g_k(a) \eta \right\|^2 = \|\eta\|^2,$$

and hence (with a similar estimate for $\sum_i \|g_i(a) \xi\|^2$) we finally deduce that

$$|\langle \varphi_\varepsilon(x) \eta, \xi \rangle| \leq 9 \|\eta\| \|\xi\|.$$

This implies that $\|\varphi_\varepsilon\| \leq 9$ and the same arguments also apply to $\|\varphi_\varepsilon\|_{\text{cb}}$.

We will show that $\|\varphi_\varepsilon d_{a_\varepsilon} - d_{b_\varepsilon}\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Using the definition of a_ε and that $\sum_i g_i(a) = 1$, we have $d_{a_\varepsilon}(x) = \sum_{i,k} (\lambda_i - \lambda_k) g_i(a) x g_k(a)$ for each $x \in A$ and a similar formula also holds for $d_{b_\varepsilon}(x)$. Using that $\sum_m g_m(a) = 1$ and that $g_i(a) g_m(a) = 0$ if $m \notin L(i)$, we now compute

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(d_{a_\varepsilon}(x)) = \sum_{i,k} \frac{f(\lambda_i) - f(\lambda_k)}{\lambda_i - \lambda_k} g_i(a) \left(\sum_{m \in L(i), l \in L(k)} (\lambda_m - \lambda_l) g_m(a) x g_l(a) \right) g_k(a)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d_{b_\varepsilon}(x) &= \sum_{i,k} (f(\lambda_i) - f(\lambda_k)) g_i(a) x g_k(a) \\ &= \sum_{i,k} \frac{f(\lambda_i) - f(\lambda_k)}{\lambda_i - \lambda_k} g_i(a) \left(\sum_{m \in L(i), l \in L(k)} (\lambda_i - \lambda_k) g_m(a) x g_l(a) \right) g_k(a), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} &(\varphi_\varepsilon d_{a_\varepsilon} - d_{b_\varepsilon})(x) \\ &= \sum_{i,k} \mu_{i,k} g_i(a) t \left(\sum_{m \in L(i), l \in L(k)} ((\lambda_m - \lambda_i) - (\lambda_l - \lambda_k)) g_m(a) x g_l(a) \right) g_k(a). \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\lambda_m - \lambda_i| < \varepsilon$ and $|\lambda_l - \lambda_k| < \varepsilon$ if $m \in L(i)$ and $l \in L(k)$, we conclude (by essentially the same computation as above) that

$$\|\varphi_\varepsilon d_{a_\varepsilon} - d_{b_\varepsilon}\| \leq 2 \cdot 9 \cdot 9\varepsilon \|\varphi_\varepsilon\| \|x\| \leq 1458\varepsilon.$$

The required sequence of maps is therefore $\varphi_{1/j}$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots$). □

In the context of Proposition 3.1, in general $d_b(A) \not\subseteq d_a(A)$ (hence there does not exist $\varphi : A \rightarrow A$ satisfying $d_b = d_a\varphi$), as shown by the following example.

Example 3.2. Let $A = C^*(s)$ be the C^* -algebra generated by the unilateral shift s on $\mathcal{H} = \ell^2$ and let a be the diagonal operator with the entries $\alpha_n = \frac{1}{(2n+1)\pi/2}$ on the diagonal. A is irreducible [17, Theorem 3.5.5] and contains all compact operators, and in particular $a \in A$. It follows from [14, Theorem 3.8 and Corollary 3.6(ii)] that the function $f(t) = t^2 \sin(1/t)$ (with $f(0) := 0$) is a Schur function on any compact interval in \mathbb{R} , and thus the operator $b := f(a)$ satisfies (3.1). Clearly, b is a diagonal operator with the entries

$$\beta_n = f(\alpha_n) = \frac{(-1)^n}{(2n+1)^2\pi^2/4}$$

along the diagonal. For every matrix $x = [x_{i,j}] \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2)$, the matrix of $d_a(x)$ is $[(\alpha_i - \alpha_j)x_{i,j}]$, and similarly $d_b(x) = [(\beta_i - \beta_j)x_{i,j}]$. We claim that $d_b(s) \notin d_a(A)$. Suppose the contrary: that $d_b(s) = d_a(x)$ for some $x \in A$; that is, that $[(\alpha_i - \alpha_j)x_{i,j}] = [(\beta_i - \beta_j)\delta_{i,j+1}]$, where $\delta_{i,j} = 1$ if $i = j$ and $\delta_{i,j} = 0$ if $i \neq j$. (We have used the fact that the matrix of s is $[\delta_{i,j+1}]$.) Then x is the matrix that has the entries

$$x_{i+1,i} = \gamma_i := \frac{\beta_{i+1} - \beta_i}{\alpha_{i+1} - \alpha_i} = \frac{(-1)^i (2i+1)^2 + (2i+3)^2}{\pi (2i+1)(2i+3)}$$

just below the main diagonal and zeros elsewhere. However, since the quotient algebra $A/\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ is commutative [17, Theorem 3.5.11], the operator $[x, s]$ must be compact. In particular, the entries on the positions $(i+2, i)$ of the matrix of $[x, s]$ must tend to 0 as $i \rightarrow \infty$. But these entries are $\gamma_{i+1} - \gamma_i$ and have two accumulation points $\pm(4/\pi)$, which is a contradiction.

Problem. Suppose that a, b are elements of a simple unital W^* -algebra A such that (1.1) holds and a is normal. Is it then necessarily the case that $d_b(A) \subseteq d_a(A)$?

Remark 3.3. The topic of range inclusion of derivations is connected with the perturbation theory of normal operators (see [1, 14]), which works well for a quite general class of functions (in a certain Besov space). In our context, if a function f on $\sigma(a)$ is sufficiently nice, then there exists a completely bounded map φ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $d_{f(a)} = \varphi d_a = d_a\varphi$ and $\varphi(A) \subseteq A$ for every unital C^* -subalgebra A of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ containing a . For example, if $a^* = a$, then it suffices that f is a restriction of a compactly supported function on \mathbb{R} , denoted again by f , such that f''' is continuous, hence $t^3 \hat{f}(t)$ is bounded, where \hat{f} is the Fourier transform of f . For convenience we sketch the proof, although a

similar argument has already been used by others in different contexts. We use that

$$f(a) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(t) e^{ita} dt$$

to express

$$d_{f(a)}(x) = [f(a), x] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(t) [e^{ita}, x] dt.$$

Then from

$$[e^{ita}, x] = (e^{ita} x e^{-ita} - x) e^{ita} = \int_0^t \frac{d}{ds} (e^{isa} x e^{-isa}) ds e^{ita} = i \int_0^t e^{isa} [a, x] e^{i(t-s)a} ds$$

it follows that $[f(a), x] = \varphi([a, x]) = [a, \varphi(x)]$, where

$$\varphi(x) = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(t) \int_0^t e^{isa} x e^{i(t-s)a} ds dt \quad (x \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})), n \in \mathbb{N}). \quad (3.2)$$

Thus

$$\|\varphi\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\hat{f}(t)| t dt \right) < \infty,$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of boundedness of $t^3 \hat{f}(t)$. Approximating the first integral in (3.2) by an integral over a finite interval and then the double integral by Riemann sums, we see that $\varphi(A) \subseteq A$. The condition that f''' exists and is continuous is probably much too strong and we may instead ask the following.

Problem. What minimal smoothness properties must a Schur function f have in order that $d_{f(a)}(A) \subseteq d_a(A)$ for all unital (simple) C^* -algebras A ? Is it sufficient that f can be extended to a continuously differentiable function on \mathbb{C} ?

Acknowledgements. The author acknowledges the financial support from the Slovenian Research Agency (research core funding no. P1-0288).

References

1. A. B. ALEKSANDROV, V. V. PELLER, D. POTAPOV AND F. SUKOCHEV, Functions of normal operators under perturbations, *Adv. Math.* **226** (2011), 5216–5251.
2. P. ARA AND M. MATHIEU, *Local multipliers of C^* -algebras*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics (Springer, 2003).
3. R. J. ARCHBOLD, E. KANIUTH AND D. W. B. SOMERSET, Norms of inner derivations for multiplier algebras of C^* -algebras and group C^* -algebras II, *Adv. Math.* **280** (2015), 225–255.
4. F. F. BONSALL AND J. DUNCAN, *Complete Normed Algebras*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete Volume 80 (Springer, 1973).
5. M. BREŠAR, The range and kernel inclusion of algebraic derivations and commuting maps, *Q. J. Math.* **56** (2005), 31–41.
6. M. BREŠAR, B. MAGAJNA AND S. ŠPENKO, Identifying derivations through the spectra of their values, *Integ. Eqns Operat. Theory* **73**, (2012), 395–411.
7. G. A. ELLIOTT AND L. ZSIDO, Almost uniformly continuous automorphism groups of operator algebras, *J. Operat. Theory* **8** (1982), 227–277.

- 461 8. C. K. FONG, Range inclusion for normal derivations, *Glasgow Math. J.* **25** (1984), 255–262.
- 462 9. J. GLIMM, A Stone-Weierstrass theorem for C^* -algebras, *Ann. Math.* **72** (1960), 216–244.
- 463 10. H. HALPERN, Irreducible module homomorphisms of a von Neumann algebra into its
464 center, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **140** (1969), 195–221.
- 465 11. Y. HO, Commutants and derivation ranges, *Tohoku Math. J.* **27** (1975), 509–514.
- 466 12. B. E. JOHNSON AND J.P. WILLIAMS, The range of a normal derivation, *Pac. J. Math.* **58**
467 (1975), 105–122.
- 468 13. E. KISSIN AND V. S. SHULMAN, On the range inclusion of normal derivations: variations
469 on a theme by Johnson, Williams and Fong, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* **83** (2001), 176–198.
- 470 14. E. KISSIN AND V. S. SHULMAN, Classes of operator smooth functions, I, operator Lipschitz
471 functions, *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc.* **48** (2005), 151–173.
- 472 15. B. MAGAJNA, The Haagerup norm on the tensor product of operator modules, *J. Funct.*
473 *Analysis* **129** (1995), 325–348.
- 474 16. B. MAGAJNA, Variance of operators and derivations, *J. Math. Analysis Applic.* **433** (2016),
475 1–30.
- 476 17. G. J. MURPHY, *C^* -algebras and operator theory* (Academic Press, 1990).
- 477 18. V. I. PAULSEN, *Completely bounded maps and operator algebras*, Cambridge Studies in
478 Advanced Mathematics, Volume 78 (Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- 479 19. G. K. PEDERSEN, *C^* -algebras and their automorphism groups* (Academic Press, 1979).
- 480 20. A. M. SINCLAIR AND ROGER R. SMITH, *Hochschild cohomology of von Neumann algebras*,
481 London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes Series, Volume 203 (Cambridge Universit
482 Press, 1995).
- 483 21. R. R. SMITH, Completely bounded module maps and the Haagerup tensor product, *J.*
484 *Funct. Analysis* **102** (1991), 156–175.
- 485
- 486
- 487
- 488
- 489
- 490
- 491
- 492
- 493
- 494
- 495
- 496
- 497
- 498
- 499
- 500
- 501
- 502
- 503
- 504
- 505
- 506