

1-1-2012

Invariant subspaces of weakly compact-friendly operators

MERT AĐLAR

REMZİ TUNÇ MISIRLIOĐLU

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dctubitak.researchcommons.org/math>



Part of the [Mathematics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

AĐLAR, MERT and MISIRLIOĐLU, REMZİ TUNÇ (2012) "Invariant subspaces of weakly compact-friendly operators," *Turkish Journal of Mathematics*: Vol. 36: No. 2, Article 10. <https://doi.org/10.3906/mat-1011-5>
Available at: <https://dctubitak.researchcommons.org/math/vol36/iss2/10>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by TÜBİTAK Academic Journals. It has been accepted for inclusion in Turkish Journal of Mathematics by an authorized editor of TÜBİTAK Academic Journals.

Invariant subspaces of weakly compact-friendly operators

Mert Çağlar and Tunç Mısırlıoğlu

Abstract

We prove that if a non-zero weakly compact-friendly operator B on a Banach lattice with topologically full center is locally quasi-nilpotent, then the super right-commutant $[B)$ of B has a non-trivial closed invariant ideal. An example of a weakly compact-friendly operator which is not compact-friendly is also provided.

Key Words: Banach lattice, topologically full center, invariant subspace, weakly compact-friendly

1. Introduction

Weakly compact-friendly operators have been defined in [3] as a natural extension of compact-friendly operators. Therein, it was shown [3, Theorem 2.3], among others, that a locally quasi-nilpotent weakly compact-friendly operator on a Banach lattice has a non-trivial closed invariant ideal. The purpose of this note is to extend some results in [1] and [4] in the setting of weakly compact-friendly operators on Banach lattices with topologically full center. In doing so, we also provide an example of a weakly compact-friendly operator which is not compact-friendly.

Throughout the paper E denotes an infinite-dimensional Banach lattice. As usual, $\mathcal{L}(E)$ and $\mathcal{L}(E)^+$ stand, respectively, for the algebra of all bounded linear operators and the collection of all positive operators on E . For a positive operator B on a Banach lattice E , the *super right-commutant* $[B)$ of B is defined by

$$[B) := \{A \in \mathcal{L}(E)^+ \mid AB - BA \geq 0\}.$$

A subspace V of a Banach space X is called *non-trivial* if $\{0\} \neq V \neq X$. If V is a subspace of a Banach lattice and if $v \in V$ and $|u| \leq |v|$ imply $u \in V$, then V is called an *ideal*. A subspace V of a Banach space X for which $TV \subseteq V$ for a bounded operator T on X is called an *invariant subspace* for T or a *T -invariant subspace*.

An operator T on E is said to be *dominated* by a positive operator B on E , denoted by $T \prec B$, provided $|Tx| \leq B|x|$ for each $x \in E$. An operator on E which is dominated by a multiple of the identity operator is called a *central operator*. The collection of all central operators on E is denoted by $Z(E)$ and is referred to as the *center* of the Banach lattice E . A positive operator $B : E \rightarrow F$ between two Banach lattices is said to be a *lattice homomorphism* if $B(x \vee y) = Bx \vee By$ for all $x, y \in E$. Every positive central operator is a lattice

homomorphism. A positive operator B on E is said to be *compact-friendly* [1] if there exist three non-zero operators R, K , and C on E with R, K positive and K compact such that R and B commute, and C is dominated by both R and K . It is worth mentioning that the notion of compact-friendliness is of substance only on infinite-dimensional Banach lattices, since every positive operator on a finite-dimensional Banach lattice is compact. Also, if B is compact, letting $R = K = C = B$ in the definition, it is seen that compact operators are compact-friendly, but the converse is not true, as the identity operator on an infinite-dimensional space shows. Furthermore, it is straightforward to observe that any power (even every polynomial with non-negative coefficients) of a compact-friendly operator is also compact-friendly. A fairly complete treatment of compact-friendly operators is given in [1]. Lastly, an operator from a Banach lattice to a Banach space is *AM-compact* if it takes order intervals into relatively compact sets. Clearly, each compact operator is necessarily *AM-compact*.

For all unexplained notation and terminology, we refer to [1, 2].

Definition 1.1 *A positive operator $B \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ is called weakly compact-friendly if there exist three non-zero operators R, K , and C on E with R, K positive and K compact such that $R \in [B]$, and C is dominated by both R and K .*

Let us start by recalling some more terminology. A continuous function $\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where Ω is a topological space, has a *flat* if there exists a non-empty open set Ω_0 in Ω such that φ is constant on Ω_0 . If Ω is a compact Hausdorff space and $\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function, then $M_\varphi : C(\Omega) \rightarrow C(\Omega)$ denotes the *multiplication operator* generated by φ , i.e., for each function $f \in C(\Omega)$ and each $\omega \in \Omega$ we have $(M_\varphi f)(\omega) := \varphi(\omega)f(\omega)$, or briefly $M_\varphi f = \varphi f$. The function φ is called the *multiplier*. It is straightforward to check that a multiplication operator M_φ is positive if and only if the multiplier φ is positive.

The following result, which is Theorem 10.65 in [1], characterizes compact-friendly multiplication operators on $C(\Omega)$ -spaces.

Theorem 1.2 *A positive multiplication operator M_φ on a $C(\Omega)$ -space, where Ω is a compact Hausdorff space, is compact-friendly if and only if the multiplier φ has a flat.*

Unlike Theorem 1.2, the multiplier of a positive multiplication operator having a flat is not necessary for the multiplication operator to be weakly compact-friendly. This fact, which is the subject matter of the following example, also shows that there are weakly compact-friendly operators that are not compact-friendly.

Example 1.3 *Consider the space E of all continuous functions $f : [0, 1/2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ equipped with the usual uniform norm. The multiplication operator $M_\varphi : E \rightarrow E$ with the multiplier φ defined by $\varphi(\omega) := 1 - 2\omega$ for all $\omega \in [0, 1/2]$ is not compact-friendly by Theorem 1.2, since φ has no flats. To see that M_φ is weakly compact-friendly, choose $R = C = K$ as the required three operators for the weak compact-friendliness of M_φ , where K is the rank-one (and hence, compact) operator on E defined by $(Kf)(\omega) := (1 - 2\omega)f(0)$ for all $f \in E$ and $\omega \in [0, 1/2]$.*

2. Invariant subspaces of weakly compact-friendly operators

We start this section, in which the main results of the present note are provided, with the notion of topological fullness of the center of a Banach lattice.

Definition 2.1 *The center $Z(E)$ of a Banach lattice E is called topologically full if whenever $x, y \in E$ with $0 \leq x \leq y$ one can find a sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $Z(E)$ such that $\|T_n y - x\| \rightarrow 0$.*

Banach lattices with topologically full center were initiated in [5]. Spaces of this kind are quite large and contain, for instance, Banach lattices with quasi-interior points and Dedekind σ -complete Banach lattices (see [5, 6] for details).

Before proceeding, let us first observe that [6] if $0 \leq x \leq y$ and $T_n y \rightarrow x$, then one has $(T_n^+ \wedge I)y = (T_n y)^+ \wedge y \rightarrow x \wedge y = x$, so we may assume that $0 \leq T_n \leq I$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Set $Z(E)_{1+} := \{T \in Z(E) \mid 0 \leq T \leq I\}$.

It is shown in [4, Theorem 3.10] that for a locally quasi-nilpotent positive operator B on a Banach lattice E with a quasi-interior point for which $[B]$ contains an operator which dominates a non-zero AM -compact operator, $[B]$ has an invariant closed ideal. The following result extends this to positive operators on a Banach lattice with topologically full center, following similar lines of thought.

Theorem 2.2 *Suppose that B is a positive operator on a Banach lattice E with topologically full center such that*

- (i) *B is locally quasi-nilpotent at some $x_0 > 0$, and*
- (ii) *there is $S \in [B]$ such that S dominates a non-zero AM -compact operator K .*

Then $[B]$ has an invariant closed ideal.

Proof. Since the null ideal N_B of B is $[B]$ -invariant, we may assume that $N_B = \{0\}$. Let $z \in E$ such that $Kz \neq 0$. This means that at least one of the vectors $(Kz)^+$ and $(Kz)^-$ is non-zero. Suppose $(Kz)^+ \neq 0$. Then, by topological fullness of $Z(E)$, there exists an operator $M \in Z(E)_{1+}$ such that $M|Kz| \neq 0$. Indeed, otherwise for all $M \in Z(E)_{1+}$ we would have $M|Kz| = 0$. But then, for the sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $Z(E)_{1+}$ with $T_n(|Kz|) \rightarrow (Kz)^+$ in norm, we would have $(Kz)^+ = 0$, which is a contradiction. Suppose now that there exists $M \in Z(E)_{1+}$ such that $M|Kz| \neq 0$. From $M((Kz)^+) + M((Kz)^-) \neq 0$ it follows that $M((Kz)^+) \neq 0$ or $M((Kz)^-) \neq 0$. Suppose that $M((Kz)^+) \neq 0$. But since M is a lattice homomorphism, we have $(MKz)^+ \neq 0$, and so it follows from $M((Kz)^+) \wedge M((Kz)^-) = (MKz)^+ \wedge (MKz)^- = 0$ that $(MKz)^- = 0$ and $MKz > 0$. Put $K_1 := MK$. It follows from $N_B = \{0\}$ that $BK_1 z \neq 0$, hence $BK_1 \neq 0$. It is also clear that BK_1 is AM -compact and is dominated by BS .

Let \mathcal{J} be the semigroup ideal in $[B]$ generated by BS , that is,

$$\mathcal{J} = \{A_1 B S A_2 \mid A_1, A_2 \in [B]\}.$$

It can be verified directly that \mathcal{J} is finitely quasi-nilpotent at x_0 . Since $BS \in \mathcal{J}$ and BS dominates a non-zero AM -compact operator, \mathcal{J} has an invariant closed ideal by [1, Theorem 10.44]. Now [1, Theorem 10.49] yields that $[B]$ has an invariant closed ideal. □

The next result is a generalization of [1, Theorem 10.57] which states that if a non-zero compact-friendly operator B on a Dedekind-complete Banach lattice E is locally quasi-nilpotent, then there exists a non-trivial closed ideal that is invariant under $[B]$. We show that Dedekind completeness and compact-friendliness are not

needed and that E having topologically full center and B being weakly compact-friendly are sufficient. The proof is a modification of the proof of Theorem 10.57 in [1] and uses Theorem 2.2.

Theorem 2.3 *Let E be a Banach lattice with topologically full center. If B is a locally quasi-nilpotent weakly compact-friendly operator on E , then $[B]$ has a non-trivial closed invariant ideal.*

Proof. For each $x > 0$, denote by J_x the ideal generated by the orbit $[B]x$; that is

$$J_x := \{y \in E \mid |y| \leq Ax \text{ for some } A \in [B]\}.$$

Since the identity operator belongs to $[B]$, we have that $x \in J_x$, so this is a non-zero ideal. Note that J_x is $[B]$ -invariant: because, if $y \in J_x$, then $|y| \leq Ax$ for some $A \in [B]$ and hence for any $A_1 \in [B]$ we have

$$|A_1y| \leq A_1|y| \leq A_1Ax,$$

yielding that $A_1y \in J_x$ since the operator A_1A belongs to $[B]$ which is a multiplicative semigroup. Therefore, in case where there exists a positive $x \in E$ such that the ideal J_x is not norm-dense in E , the proof is complete. So, suppose that $\overline{J_x} = E$ for each $x > 0$.

Fix three non-zero operators with R, K positive, K compact, and satisfying

$$BR \leq RB, |Cx| \leq C|x|, \quad \text{and} \quad |Cx| \leq K|x| \quad \text{for each } x \in E.$$

Since $C \neq 0$ there exists some $x_1 > 0$ such that $Cx_1 \neq 0$. This means that at least one of the vectors $(Cx_1)^+$ and $(Cx_1)^-$ is non-zero. Suppose $(Cx_1)^+ \neq 0$. Then, by topological fullness of $Z(E)$, there exists an operator $M_1 \in Z(E)_{1+}$ such that $M_1|Cx_1| \neq 0$. Indeed, otherwise for all $M_1 \in Z(E)_{1+}$ we would have $M_1|Cx_1| = 0$. But then, for the sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $Z(E)_{1+}$ with $T_n(|Cx_1|) \rightarrow (Cx_1)^+$ in norm, we would have $(Cx_1)^+ = 0$, which is a contradiction. Suppose now that there exists $M_1 \in Z(E)_{1+}$ such that $M_1|Cx_1| \neq 0$. From $M_1((Cx_1)^+) + M_1((Cx_1)^-) \neq 0$ it follows that $M_1((Cx_1)^+) \neq 0$ or $M_1((Cx_1)^-) \neq 0$. Suppose that $M_1((Cx_1)^+) \neq 0$. But since M_1 is a lattice homomorphism, we have $(M_1Cx_1)^+ \neq 0$, and so it follows from $M_1((Cx_1)^+) \wedge M_1((Cx_1)^-) = (M_1Cx_1)^+ \wedge (M_1Cx_1)^- = 0$ that $(M_1Cx_1)^- = 0$ and $M_1Cx_1 > 0$. Let $x_2 := M_1Cx_1 > 0$ and $\pi_1 := M_1C$. Note that π_1 is dominated by R and K .

Now we have $\overline{J_{x_2}} = E$, and since $C \neq 0$ there exists some $y \in J_{x_2}$ and an operator $A_1 \in [B]$ such that $0 < y \leq A_1x_2$ and $Cy \neq 0$. We claim that there exists $M \in Z(E)_{1+}$ such that $CMA_1x_2 \neq 0$. Otherwise, if $CMA_1x_2 = 0$ for all $M \in Z(E)_{1+}$, we would have $CT_nA_1x_2$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for the sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ for which $T_nA_1x_2 \rightarrow y$. This would yield $CT_nA_1x_2 \rightarrow Cy$ and $Cy = 0$, which is a contradiction. Since $CMA_1x_2 \neq 0$, one has $|CMA_1x_2| \neq 0$. Suppose $(CMA_1x_2)^+ \neq 0$. By topological fullness of $Z(E)$, there exists a sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $Z(E)_{1+}$ such that $T_n(|CMA_1x_2|) \rightarrow (CMA_1x_2)^+$. Since $(CMA_1x_2)^+ \neq 0$, not all $T_n(|CMA_1x_2|)$ are zero, and we can choose $M_2 \in Z(E)_{1+}$ with $M_2|CMA_1x_2| \neq 0$. Notice that $M_2((CMA_1x_2)^+) \wedge M_2((CMA_1x_2)^-) = 0$. Since $M_2((CMA_1x_2)^+) \neq 0$, we have $M_2((CMA_1x_2)^-) = (M_2CMA_1x_2)^- = 0$, which yields $M_2CMA_1x_2 > 0$. Put $x_3 := M_2CMA_1x_2 > 0$ and $\pi_2 := M_2CMA_1$ and observe that π_2 is dominated by RA_1 and KA_1 . Repeating once more the preceding argument with x_2 replaced by x_3 , we then obtain an operator $A_2 \in [B]$ and an operator $\pi_3 : E \rightarrow E$ such that $\pi_3x_3 > 0$ and π_3 is dominated by RA_2 and KA_2 . From $\pi_3\pi_2\pi_1x_1 = \pi_3x_3 > 0$, we see that $\pi_3\pi_2\pi_1 \neq 0$.

Set $S := RA_2RA_1R \geq 0$. Since $|\pi_3\pi_2\pi_1x| \leq S|x|$ for each $x \in E$, it follows that $S \neq 0$. Moreover, since each π_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) is dominated by a compact operator, we have by [2, Theorem 5.14] that $\pi_3\pi_2\pi_1$ is compact. Moreover, because R , A_1 , and A_2 belong to $[B]$, so does S . Thus, $[B]$ contains a non-zero positive operator which dominates a compact operator. Now, invoke Theorem 2.2 to complete the proof. \square

References

- [1] Abramovich, Y.A., Aliprantis, C.D.: An Invitation to Operator Theory. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. Vol. 50. Providence-RI. American Mathematical Society 2002.
- [2] Aliprantis, C.D., Burkinshaw, O.: Positive Operators. The Netherlands. Springer 2006.
- [3] Çağlar, M., Mısırlıoğlu, T.: Weakly compact-friendly operators. Vladikavkaz Mat. Zh. 11(2), 27–30 (2009).
- [4] Flores, J., Tradacete, P., Troitsky, V.G.: Invariant subspaces of positive strictly singular operators on Banach lattices. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 343(2), 743–751 (2008).
- [5] Wickstead, A.W.: Extremal structure of cones of operators. Quart. J. Math. Oxford. 32(2), 239–253 (1981).
- [6] Wickstead, A.W.: Banach lattices with topologically full centre. Vladikavkaz Mat. Zh. 11(2), 50–60 (2009).

Mert ÇAĞLAR, Tunç MISIRLIOĞLU
 Department of Mathematics and Computer Science,
 İstanbul Kültür University,
 Bakırköy 34156, İstanbul-TURKEY
 e-mail: t.misirlioglu@iku.edu.tr

Received: 03.11.2010