Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. (Math. Sci.) Vol. 114, No. 1, February 2004, pp. 55–63.

Rank-one operators in reflexive one-sided $\mathcal{A}$-submodules

DONG ZHE

Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310 027, People's Republic of China
E-mail: dongzhe@zju.edu.cn

MS received 27 May 2003; revised 16 October 2003

Abstract. In this paper, we first characterize reflexive one-sided $\mathcal{A}$-submodules $\mathcal{U}$ of a unital operator algebra $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ completely. Furthermore we investigate the invariant subspace lattice Lat $\mathcal{R}$ and the reflexive hull Ref $\mathcal{R}$, where $\mathcal{R}$ is the submodule generated by rank-one operators in $\mathcal{U}$; in particular, if $\mathcal{L}$ is a subspace lattice, we obtain when the rank-one algebra $\mathcal{R}$ of Alg $\mathcal{L}$ is big enough to determined Alg $\mathcal{L}$ in the following senses: Alg $\mathcal{L}$ = Alg Lat $\mathcal{R}$ and Alg $\mathcal{L}$ = Ref $\mathcal{R}$.

Keywords. Reflexive one-sided $\mathcal{A}$-submodule; rank-one operator.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex Hilbert space, $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ the algebra of all bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ the complete lattice of all orthogonal projections in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital operator algebra in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and ϕ is an order homomorphism of Lat $\mathcal{A}$ into itself (i.e. $E \leq F$ implies $\phi(E) \leq \phi(F)$), where Lat $\mathcal{A}$ is the complete lattice of all invariant projections for $\mathcal{A}$. Then the set $\mathcal{U} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : TE \subseteq \phi(E) \text{ for all } E \in \text{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}$ is clearly a weakly closed two-sided $\mathcal{A}$-submodule of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

It became apparent that many interesting classes of non-self adjoint operator algebras arise as just such a module. Erdos and Power in [3] proved that any weakly closed $\mathcal{A}$-submodule of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ for a nest algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is of the above form. In [4], Han Deguang proved that this is also true for any reflexive algebra $\mathcal{A}$, which is σ-weakly generated by rank-one operators in itself. The purpose of this paper is to show that any reflexive right $\mathcal{A}$-submodule and $*$-reflexive left $\mathcal{A}$-submodule of a unital operator algebra $\mathcal{A}$ are determined by order homomorphisms from Lat $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{P}$. As a corollary, we obtain the complete characterization of all σ-weakly closed one-sided $\mathcal{A}$-submodules, where $\mathcal{A}$ is σ-weakly generated by rank-one operators in itself or, in particular, $\mathcal{A}$ is a nest algebra.

In [2], Erdos showed that if Lat $\mathcal{A}$ is a nest then the set of finite sums of rank-one operators in $\mathcal{A}$ is σ-weakly dense in $\mathcal{A}$. In [9], Longstaff asked whether the same conclusion holds for the more general case of completely distributive lattices, and showed that, in the opposite direction, complete distributivity is a necessary condition for this. Subsequently, Lambrou [6] showed that complete distributivity of the invariant subspace lattices implies a condition somewhat weaker than the strong density. Laurie and Longstaff [7] proved that the answer is affirmative if additional requirement of commutativity is imposed on the invariant subspace lattice. In §3, we will consider when the rank-one subalgebra $\mathcal{R}$ of Alg $\mathcal{L}$ determines Alg $\mathcal{L}$ in senses other than the σ-weak density.

Which subspace lattices $\mathcal{L}$ are determined by the rank-one subalgebra $\mathcal{R}$ of Alg $\mathcal{L}$ in the sense that $\mathcal{L} = \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{R}$? This question was answered by Longstaff in ([8], Proposition 3.2). A sufficient but not necessary condition ([8], Corollary 3.2.1) was given and it is shown in [8] that this condition is strictly weaker than complete distributivity. In §3, we investigate the invariant subspace lattice of the rank-one submodule of $\mathcal{U}$. As an application, we derive the sufficient and necessary condition obtained by Longstaff in [8] in order that $\mathcal{L} = \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{R}$. As another application, we also obtain an equivalent condition for which $\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L} = \mathrm{Alg}\,\mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{R}$.

In §3, we also study when the rank-one submodule $\mathcal{R}$ of a reflexive one-sided $\mathcal{A}$-submodule $\mathcal{U}$ is big enough to determine $\mathcal{U}$ in the sense that $\mathrm{Ref}\,\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{U}$, where $\mathrm{Ref}\,\mathcal{R} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : Tx \in [\mathcal{R}x] \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{H}\}$ is the reflexive hull of $\mathcal{R}$. An equivalent condition for $\mathrm{Ref}\,\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{U}$ is given by means of order homomorphisms from Lat $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{P}$.

The terminology and notation of this paper concerning reflexive subspaces may be found in [5]. In what follows, we always assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital operator algebra in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Set

$$\mathrm{Hom}\,(\mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P}) = \{\phi : \phi \text{ is an order homomorphism from Lat}\,\mathcal{A} \text{ into } \mathcal{P}\}.$$

Given ϕ in Hom(Lat $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{P}$), a right $\mathcal{A}$-submodule is associated which is given by

$$\mathcal{U}_\phi^r = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : TE \subseteq \phi(E), \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\};$$

and a left $\mathcal{A}$-submodule which is given by

$$\mathcal{U}_\phi^l = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : T\phi(E) \subseteq E, \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}.$$

Clearly they are weakly closed. We say that $\mathcal{U}_\phi^r$ (and $\mathcal{U}_\phi^l$) are the right(left) $\mathcal{A}$-submodule determined by ϕ respectively. To each ϕ in Hom(Lat $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{P}$) there is naturally associated $\phi_\sim$ in Hom(Lat $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{P}$) given by

$$\phi_\sim(E) = \vee\{F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A} : \phi(F) \not\geq E\}, \quad \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$$

(with the convention that $\phi_\sim(0) = 0$). Observe that Hom(Lat $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{P}$) has a natural partial ordering given by $\phi \leq \psi$ if and only if $\phi(E) \leq \psi(E)$ for any $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$. It follows that $\phi \leq \psi$ implies $\phi_\sim \geq \psi_\sim$.

2. Basic properties of one-sided $\mathcal{A}$-submodules

A subspace $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be $*$-reflexive, if $\mathcal{S}^*$ is reflexive.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital operator algebra in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{U}$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then*

(1) *$\mathcal{U}$ is a reflexive right $\mathcal{A}$-submodule if and only if there exists $\phi \in$ Hom(Lat $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{P}$) such that $\mathcal{U} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : TE \subseteq \phi(E), \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}$;*
(2) *$\mathcal{U}$ is a $*$-reflexive left $\mathcal{A}$-submodule if and only if there exists $\psi \in$ Hom(Lat $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{P}$) such that $\mathcal{U} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : T\psi(E) \subseteq E, \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}$.*

Proof. (1) *Sufficiency.* Clearly $\mathcal{U}$ is a right $\mathcal{A}$-submodule, so we only need to prove that $\mathcal{U}$ is reflexive. Suppose that $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $Tx \in [\mathcal{U}x]$ for any $x \in \mathcal{H}$. Thus for any $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$,

$$TE \subseteq [\mathcal{U}E] = [\phi(E)\mathcal{U}E] = \phi(E)[\mathcal{U}E] \subseteq \phi(E).$$

So $T \in \mathcal{U}$ and it shows that $\mathcal{U}$ is reflexive.

Necessity. For any $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$, let $\phi(E) = [\mathcal{U}E]$. Clearly ϕ is an order homomorphism in Hom(Lat $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{P}$). Set

$$\mathcal{U}_\phi^r = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : TE \subseteq \phi(E), \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}.$$

It is obvious that $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_\phi^r$. Conversely, let $T \in \mathcal{U}_\phi^r$. For any $x \in \mathcal{H}$, denote by E the orthogonal projection onto $[\mathcal{A}x]$. Then $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$, $x \in E$ and

$$Tx \in TE \subseteq \phi(E) = [\mathcal{U}E] = [\mathcal{U}[\mathcal{A}x]] = [\mathcal{U}x]$$

since $\mathcal{U}$ is a right $\mathcal{A}$-submodule. From the reflexivity of $\mathcal{U}$, it follows that $T \in \mathcal{U}$. Accordingly, $\mathcal{U}_\phi^r \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_\phi^r$.

(2) *Sufficiency.* Suppose that there exists $\psi \in$ Hom(Lat $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{P}$) such that

$$\mathcal{U} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : T\psi(E) \subseteq E, \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}.$$

Define $\phi : \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}^* = (\mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A})^\perp \to \mathcal{P}$ by

$$\phi(E^\perp) = I - \psi(E), \quad \forall E^\perp \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}^* = (\mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A})^\perp.$$

Certainly $\phi \in$ Hom (Lat $\mathcal{A}^*$, $\mathcal{P}$). Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}^* &= \{T^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : T\psi(E) \subseteq E, \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}\\ &= \{T^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : T^*E^\perp \subseteq \psi(E)^\perp = \phi(E^\perp), \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}\\ &= \{S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : SE^\perp \subseteq \phi(E^\perp), \forall E^\perp \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}^* = (\mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A})^\perp\}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (1) that $\mathcal{U}^*$ is a reflexive right $\mathcal{A}^*$-submodule, and $\mathcal{U}$ is a $*$-reflexive left $\mathcal{A}$-submodule.

Necessity. Suppose that $\mathcal{U}$ is a $*$-reflexive left $\mathcal{A}$-submodule. Thus $\mathcal{U}^*$ is a reflexive right $\mathcal{A}^*$-submodule, it follows from (1) that there exists $\phi \in$ Hom (Lat $\mathcal{A}^*$, $\mathcal{P}$) such that

$$\mathcal{U}^* = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : TE^\perp \subseteq \phi(E^\perp),\ \forall E^\perp \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}^*\}.$$

Define $\psi : \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{P}$ by $\psi(E) = I - \phi(E^\perp)$. Clearly $\psi \in$ Hom(Lat $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{P}$) and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U} &= \{T^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : T^*\phi(E^\perp)^\perp \subseteq E,\ \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}\\ &= \{S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : S\psi(E) \subseteq E,\ \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}.\end{aligned}$$

□

From the proof of Theorem 2.1, we know that if $\mathcal{U}$ is a reflexive right $\mathcal{A}$-submodule then $\mathcal{U} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : TE \subseteq \tau_r(E), \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}$, where $\tau_r(E) = [\mathcal{U}E]$; if $\mathcal{U}$ is a $*$-reflexive left $\mathcal{A}$-submodule then $\mathcal{U} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : T\tau_l(E) \subseteq E, \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}$, where $\tau_l(E) = I - [\mathcal{U}^*E^\perp]$.

COROLLARY 2.2

If $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital σ-weakly closed algebra which is σ-weakly generated by rank-one operators in $\mathcal{A}$, then every σ-weakly closed right or left $\mathcal{A}$-submodule has the form given in Theorem 2.1(1) *or* (2), *respectively.*

Proof. By virtue of ([5], Theorem 2.2), every σ-weakly closed right or left $\mathcal{A}$-submodule is reflexive. So the result is true for σ-weakly closed right $\mathcal{A}$-submodule by Theorem 2.1(1). Now for any σ-weakly closed left $\mathcal{A}$-submodule $\mathcal{U}$, since the adjoint operation is continuous in the σ-weak topology, $\mathcal{U}^*$ is a σ-weakly closed right $\mathcal{A}^*$-submodule and $\mathcal{A}^*$ is σ-weakly generated by rank-one operators in $\mathcal{A}^*$. Therefore it follows from ([5], Theorem 2.2) that $\mathcal{U}^*$ is reflexive and $\mathcal{U}$ is $*$-reflexive. Thus $\mathcal{U}$ has the form in Theorem 2.1(2). □

COROLLARY 2.3

Suppose that $\mathcal{L}$ is a commutative and completely distributive subspace lattice, or specially, a nest. Then every σ-weakly closed right or left Alg $\mathcal{L}$*-submodule is of the form given in Theorem* 2.1(1) *or* (2), *respectively.*

Proof. This follows from Corollary 2.2 and ([7], Theorem 3). □

COROLLARY 2.4

Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital algebra in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

(1) *Let $\mathcal{U}$ be as in* (1) *of Theorem* 2.1. *Then $\mathcal{U}$ is a right ideal if and only if $\tau_r(E) \leq E$ for every $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$, where $\tau_r(E) = [\mathcal{U}E]$;*
(2) *Let $\mathcal{U}$ be as in* (2) *of Theorem* 2.1. *Then $\mathcal{U}$ is a left ideal if and only if $\tau_l(E) \geq E$ for any $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$, where $\tau_l(E) = I - [\mathcal{U}^*E^{\perp}]$.*

Proof.

(1) Obvious.
(2) Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a left ideal of $\mathcal{A}$. Thus $\mathcal{U}^*$ is a right ideal of $\mathcal{A}^*$, it follows from (1) that $[\mathcal{U}^*E^{\perp}] \leq E^{\perp}$ for any $E^{\perp} \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}^* = (\mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A})^{\perp}$. This deduces that $\tau_l(E) = I - [\mathcal{U}^*E^{\perp}] \geq E$ for any $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$. The converse implication can be proved similarly. □

PROPOSITION 2.5

Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital algebra in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

(1) *Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a reflexive right $\mathcal{A}$-submodule. Then $P \in \mathrm{Lat}\mathcal{U}$ if and only if there exists $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$ such that $\tau_r(E) \leq P \leq E$;*
(2) *Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a $*$-reflexive left $\mathcal{A}$-submodule. Then $P \in \mathrm{Lat}\mathcal{U}$ if and only if there exists $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$ such that $E \leq P \leq \tau_l(E)$.*

Proof.

(1) From the proof of Theorem 2.1, $\mathcal{U} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : TE \subseteq \tau_r(E), E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}$. If $\tau_r(E) \leq P \leq E$ for some $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$ and $T \in \mathcal{U}$, then

$$TP = TEP = \tau_r(E)TEP = P\tau_r(E)TEP = PTP.$$

So $P \in \mathrm{Lat}\mathcal{U}$.

Conversely, if $P \in \mathrm{Lat}\mathcal{U}$, let $E = [\mathcal{A}P]$. Then $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$, $E \geq P$ and

$$\tau_r(E) = [\mathcal{U}E] = [\mathcal{U}[\mathcal{A}P]] \subseteq [\mathcal{U}P] \subseteq P$$

since $\mathcal{U}$ is a right $\mathcal{A}$-module. Thus $\tau_r(E) \leq P \leq E$.
(2) Follows from (1) and a simple calculation. □

For non-zero vectors $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$, the rank-one operator $x \otimes y$ is defined by the equation

$$(x \otimes y)z = \langle z, y\rangle x, \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital algebra in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.*

(1) *Let $\mathcal{U}_\phi^r$ be the reflexive right $\mathcal{A}$-submodule determined by ϕ in* $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P})$. *Then a rank-one operator $x \otimes y \in \mathcal{U}_\phi^r$ if and only if for some $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$, $x \in E$ and $y \in \phi_\sim(E)^\perp$, where $\phi_\sim(E) = \vee\{F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A} : \phi(F) \not\geq E\}$.*
(2) *Let $\mathcal{U}_\phi^l$ be the $*$-reflexive left $\mathcal{A}$-submodule determined by ϕ in* $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P})$. *Then a rank-one operator $x \otimes y \in \mathcal{U}_\phi^l$ if and only if for some $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$, $x \in \wedge\{F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A} : \phi(F) \not\leq E\}$ and $y \in E^\perp$.*

Proof.

(1) Suppose that there exists $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$ such that $x \in E$ and $y \in \phi_\sim(E)^\perp$. For any $F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$, if $\phi(F) \geq E$, then

$$(x \otimes y)F = E(x \otimes y)\phi_\sim(E)^\perp F \subseteq E \subseteq \phi(F);$$

if $\phi(F) \not\geq E$, it follows from the definition of $\phi_\sim(E)$ that $F \leq \phi_\sim(E)$. Thus

$$(x \otimes y)F = E(x \otimes y)\phi_\sim(E)^\perp F = 0 \subseteq \phi(F).$$

Accordingly, $x \otimes y \in \mathcal{U}_\phi^r$.

Conversely, if $x \otimes y \in \mathcal{U}_\phi^r$. Let

$$E = \wedge\{F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A} : Fx = x\}.$$

Naturally, $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$ and $x \in E$. For any $F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$ and $\phi(F) \not\geq E$, it follows from the definition of E that $\phi(F)x \neq x$. Since $x \otimes y \in \mathcal{U}_\phi^r$, we have

$$(x \otimes y)Fy = \phi(F)(x \otimes y)Fy$$

and

$$\|Fy\|^2 x = \|Fy\|^2 \phi(F)x.$$

So $Fy = 0$. From the definition of $\phi_\sim(E)$, it follows that $\phi_\sim(E)y = 0$ and $y \in \phi_\sim(E)^\perp$.

(2) By hypothesis, $\mathcal{U}_\phi^l = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : T\phi(E) \subseteq E, \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}$. Define $\psi : \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}^* \to \mathcal{P}$ by $\psi(E^\perp) = I - \phi(E)$. Thus $\psi \in \mathrm{Hom}\,(\mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{P})$ and

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{U}_\phi^l)^* &= \{T^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : T\phi(E) \subseteq E, \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}\\ &= \{T^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : T^*E^\perp \subseteq \phi(E)^\perp, \forall E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}\}\\ &= \{S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : SE^\perp \subseteq \psi(E^\perp), \forall E^\perp \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}^*\}.\end{aligned}$$

$(\mathcal{U}_\phi^l)^*$ is a reflexive right $\mathcal{A}^*$-submodule determined by ψ. From (1), it follows that $y \otimes x \in (\mathcal{U}_\phi^l)^*$ if and only if there exists $E^\perp \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}^*$ such that $y \in E^\perp$ and $x \in \psi_\sim(E^\perp)^\perp$. Now we compute $\psi_\sim(E^\perp)^\perp$. It follows from the definition of $\psi_\sim$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_\sim(E^\perp)^\perp &= (\vee\{F^\perp \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}^* : \psi(F^\perp) \not\geq E^\perp\})^\perp\\ &= \wedge\{F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A} : \phi(F)^\perp \not\geq E^\perp\}\\ &= \wedge\{F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A} : \phi(F) \not\leq E\}.\end{aligned}$$

□

3. Rank-one operators

In this section, we only consider the reflexive right $\mathcal{A}$-submodule, and omit the superscript and subscript r in the corresponding notation. The corresponding results for $*$-reflexive left $\mathcal{A}$-submodule hold naturally, we leave the details for the interested readers.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{U}_\phi$ is a reflexive right $\mathcal{A}$-submodule determined by ϕ in* $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P})$ *and $\mathcal{R}_\phi$ the rank-one submodule generated by rank-one operators in $\mathcal{U}_\phi$. Then $K \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{R}_\phi$ if and only if there exists $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$ such that $E \le K \le \phi_*(E)$, where $\phi_*(E) = \wedge\{\phi_\sim(F) : F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A},\ F \not\le E\}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $K \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{R}_\phi$. Let $E = \vee\{F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A} : F \le K\}$. Then $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$ and $E \le K$. Let $F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$ with $F \not\le E$. We will show that $K \le \phi_\sim(F)$. Let y be any element of K. Now $F \not\le K$. So we can choose a vector $e \in F$ and $e \notin K$. Since $K \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{R}_\phi$, for every vector $f \in \phi_\sim(F)^\perp$, we have $(e \otimes f)y = (y, f)e \in K$. But since $e \notin K$ it follows that $(y, f) = 0$ and $y \in \phi_\sim(F)$. Thus $K \le \phi_\sim(F)$ and so $K \le \phi_*(E)$.

Now suppose that there is a subspace $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$ with $E \le K \le \phi_*(E)$. Let $e \otimes f \in \mathcal{R}_\phi$. By Lemma 2.6(1) there is an element $F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$ such that $e \in F$ and $f \in \phi_\sim(F)^\perp$. If $F \le E$ then $(e \otimes f)K \subseteq F \subseteq E \subseteq K$. If $F \not\le E$ then $K \le \phi_*(E) \le \phi_\sim(F)$ and $(e \otimes f)K = (0) \subseteq K$. In either case K is invariant under $e \otimes f$ and $K \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{R}_\phi$. □

Suppose that $\mathcal{U}$ is a reflexive right $\mathcal{A}$-module and $\mathcal{R}$ is the rank-one submodule of $\mathcal{U}$, it follows from Theorems 2.1 and 3.1 that $K \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{R}$ if and only if for some $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{A}$, $E \le K \le \tau_*(E)$, where $\tau(E) = [\mathcal{U}E]$.

COROLLARY 3.2

If $\mathcal{L}$ is a subspace lattice, $\mathcal{R}$ is the rank-one subalgebra of $\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$. Then $K \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{R}$ if and only if for some $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$, $E \le K \le E_*$, where $E_* = \wedge\{F_- : F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L},\ F \not\le E\}$ and $F_- = \vee\{G \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L} : G \not\ge F\}$.

Proof. In this case, $\tau(E) = [(\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L})E] = E$ and $\tau_\sim(E) = \vee\{G \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L} : \tau(G) \not\ge E\} = \vee\{G \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L} : G \not\ge E\} = E_-$ and $\tau_*(E) = \wedge\{\tau_\sim(F) : F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L},\ F \not\le E\} = \wedge\{F_- : F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L},\ F \not\le E\} = E_*$. The corollary follows from Theorem 3.1. □

If $\mathcal{L}$ is a subspace lattice and $E \in \mathcal{L}$, we define $E_-^{\mathcal{L}} = \vee\{F \in \mathcal{L} : F \not\ge E\}$ and $E_*^{\mathcal{L}} = \wedge\{F_-^{\mathcal{L}} : F \in \mathcal{L},\ F \not\le E\}$. The following proposition is due to Longstaff. It gives a similar characterization of $\mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{R}$ by means of the elements in $\mathcal{L}$.

The next two theorems comprise some of the main results of this paper.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that $\mathcal{L}$ is a subspace lattice and $\mathcal{R}$ is the rank-one subalgebra of* $\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$. *The following statements are equivalent.*

(1) $\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L} = \mathrm{Alg}\,\mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{R}$;
(2) $\mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L} = \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathcal{R}$;
(3) $[E, E_*] \subseteq \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$ *for any* $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$, *where* $[E, E_*] = \{K \in \mathcal{P} : E \le K \le E_*\}$.

Proof. It is clear that (1) is equivalent to (2), we only need to show that (2) is equivalent to (3).

(2) ⇒ (3). By definition, $E_* = \wedge\{F_- : F \in \operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}, F \not\leq E\}$. It follows from the definition of F_- that $E \leq F_-$ for any $F \not\leq E$. Thus $E \leq E_*$ for any $E \in \operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$, so the symbol $[E, E_*]$ is meaningful. For any $E \in \operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$ and $K \in [E, E_*]$, it follows from Corollary 3.2 that $K \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R} = \operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$. Hence $[E, E_*] \subseteq \operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$ for any $E \in \operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$.
(3) ⇒ (2). Since $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$, $\operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L} \subseteq \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R}$. For any $K \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R}$, it follows from Corollary 3.2 that there is an element $E \in \operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$ such that $E \leq K \leq E_*$. So $K \in [E, E_*] \subseteq \operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$. Thus $\operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R} \subseteq \operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$ and $\operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R} = \operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$. □

PROPOSITION 3.4 ([8], Proposition 3.2)

Suppose that $\mathcal{R}$ is the rank-one subalgebra of $\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$. *Then the subspace K belongs to* $\operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R}$ *if and only if there is a subspace E of $\mathcal{L}$ such that $E \leq K \leq E_*^{\mathcal{L}}$.*

COROLLARY 3.5

Suppose that $\mathcal{L}$ is a subspace lattice and $\mathcal{R}$ is the rank-one subalgebra of $\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$. *Then* $\mathcal{L} = \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R}$ *if and only if $[E, E_*^{\mathcal{L}}] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ for any $E \in \mathcal{L}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{L} = \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R}$. For any $E \in \mathcal{L}$, we can show $E \leq E_*^{\mathcal{L}}$ similarly as in Theorem 3.3. For $K \in [E, E_*^{\mathcal{L}}]$, it follows from Proposition 3.4 that $K \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{L}$. So $[E, E_*^{\mathcal{L}}] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ for any $E \in \mathcal{L}$.

Conversely, if $[E, E_*^{\mathcal{L}}] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ for any $E \in \mathcal{L}$. For any $K \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R}$, it follows from Proposition 3.4 that there is an element $E \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $E \leq K \leq E_*^{\mathcal{L}}$. So $K \in [E, E_*^{\mathcal{L}}] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$. Thus $\operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$. Combining with the fact that $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L} \subseteq \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R}$, we obtain $\mathcal{L} = \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R}$. □

COROLLARY 3.6

Suppose that $\mathcal{L}$ is a subspace lattice. If $[E, E_*] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ for any $E \in \mathcal{L}$, then $\mathcal{L}$ is a reflexive subspace lattice.

Proof. From Corollary 3.5, it follows that $\mathcal{L} = \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R}$. Since $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L} \subseteq \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R}$, so $\mathcal{L} = \operatorname{Lat}\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ is reflexive. □

Proposition 3.4, and its Corollary 3.5, answer the question of which subspace lattices $\mathcal{L}$ are determined by the rank-one subalgebra of $\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$ in the sense that $\mathcal{L} = \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R}$. This proposition was used as the basis of an abstract, lattice-theoretic, way of constructing reflexive lattices in [10]. Theorem 3.3 gives a sufficient and necessary condition for which reflexive algebra $\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$ is determined by the rank-one subalgebra of $\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$ in the sense that $\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L} = \operatorname{Alg}\operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{R}$. In the following, we will consider another sense that $\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$ is determined by the rank-one subalgebra of $\operatorname{Alg}\mathcal{L}$.

Theorem 3.7. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital algebra in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{U}$ is a reflexive right $\mathcal{A}$-submodule, and that $\mathcal{R}$ the rank-one submodule of $\mathcal{U}$. Then* $\operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{U}$ *if and only if $\tau = (\tau_\sim)_\sim$, where $\tau(E) = [\mathcal{U}E]$ for any $E \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. Necessity. Recall that the reflexive hull $\operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{R} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : Tx \in [\mathcal{R}x], \forall x \in \mathcal{H}\}$ for any $E \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A}$ and $e \otimes f \in \mathcal{U}$. We first show

$$(e \otimes f)E \subseteq (\tau_\sim)_\sim(E) = \vee\{F \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A} : \tau_\sim(F) \not\geq E\}.$$

By virtue of Lemma 2.6(1), there is an element $L \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A}$ such that $e \in L$ and $f \in \tau_\sim(L)^\perp$. If $\tau_\sim(L) \geq E$ then

$$(e \otimes f)E = L(e \otimes f)\tau_\sim(L)^\perp E = (0) \subseteq (\tau_\sim)_\sim(E);$$

if $\tau_\sim(L) \not\geq E$ then $L \leq (\tau_\sim)_\sim(E)$. Thus

$$(e \otimes f)E = L(e \otimes f)\tau_\sim(L)^\perp E \subseteq L \subseteq (\tau_\sim)_\sim(E).$$

So each rank-one operator of $\mathcal{U}$ maps E into $(\tau_\sim)_\sim(E)$ for any $E \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A}$. For any $A \in \mathcal{U}$ and $x \in E(\in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A})$, since $\mathcal{U} = \operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{R} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : Tx \in [\mathcal{R}x], \forall x \in \mathcal{H}\}$, so $Ax \in [\mathcal{R}x] \subseteq [\mathcal{R}E] \subseteq (\tau_\sim)_\sim(E)$ and $AE \subseteq (\tau_\sim)_\sim(E)$. Accordingly, $\tau(E) = [\mathcal{U}E] \subseteq (\tau_\sim)_\sim(E)$ and $\tau \leq (\tau_\sim)_\sim$. For any $E \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A}$, it follows from the definitions that

$$(\tau_\sim)_\sim(E) = \vee\{G \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A} : \tau_\sim(G) \not\geq E\} \tag{1}$$

and

$$\tau_\sim(G) = \vee\{F \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A} : \tau(F) \not\geq G\}. \tag{2}$$

For $G \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A}$ and $\tau_\sim(G) \not\geq E$, if $\tau(E) \not\geq G$ then it follows from (2) that $\tau_\sim(G) \geq E$. This contradiction shows that $\tau(E) \geq G$. Thus eq. (1) tells us that $\tau \geq (\tau_\sim)_\sim$. Hence $\tau = (\tau_\sim)_\sim$.

Sufficiency. Suppose that $\tau = (\tau_\sim)_\sim$. It is clear that $\operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, it suffices to show that $\operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{R} \supseteq \mathcal{U}$. Suppose that $A \in \mathcal{U}$ and $x \in \mathcal{H}$. From the definition $\operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{R}$, we only need to prove that $Ax \in [\mathcal{R}x]$.

Define E by $E = \wedge\{F \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A} : x \in F\}$. Observe that the intersection is over a non-empty family of subspaces of $\operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A}$ since $x \in \mathcal{H}$. Clearly $x \in E$ and $E \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A}$. By the hypothesis,

$$\tau(E) = [\mathcal{U}E] = \vee\{G \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A} : \tau_\sim(G) \not\geq E\}$$

and hence the set of all $G \in \operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A}$ with $\tau_\sim(G) \not\geq E$ has a dense linear span in $[\mathcal{U}E]$. Therefore for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a finite set $G_i (1 \leq i \leq n)$ of subspaces of $\operatorname{Lat}\mathcal{A}$ with $\tau_\sim(G_i) \not\geq E$ and a set of vectors $x_i \in G_i (1 \leq i \leq n)$ with the property that

$$\|Ax - (x_1 + \cdots + x_n)\| < \epsilon.$$

The definition of E and the condition $\tau_\sim(G_i) \not\geq E(1 \leq i \leq n)$ implies that $x \notin \tau_\sim(G_i)(1 \leq i \leq n)$ and so there exists $y_i \in \tau_\sim(G_i)^\perp$ with

$$\langle x, y_i \rangle \neq 0, \qquad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

By suitably scaling y_i if needed we may assume that $\langle x, y_i \rangle = 1$ and so $(x_i \otimes y_i)x = x_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. By Lemma 2.6(1), $x_i \otimes y_i \in \mathcal{R}$. Thus

$$\left\| Ax - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \otimes y_i\right) x \right\| = \|Ax - (x_1 + \cdots + x_n)\| < \epsilon,$$

and this shows that $Ax \in [\mathcal{R}x]$ and $A \in \operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{R}$. Hence $\operatorname{Ref}\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{U}$. □

COROLLARY 3.8

Suppose that $\mathcal{L}$ *is a subspace lattice and* $\mathcal{R}$ *is the rank-one subalgebra of* Alg $\mathcal{L}$. *Then* $\mathcal{L}$ *is completely distributive if and only if* Ref $\mathcal{R} = \mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$.

Proof. In this case, $\tau(E) = [(\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L})E] = E$, $\tau_{\sim}(E) = E_{-}$ and $(\tau_{\sim})_{\sim}(E) = \vee\{F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L} : \tau_{\sim}(F) \not\geq E\} = \vee\{F \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L} : F_{-} \not\geq E\} = E_{\sharp}$. Now suppose that Ref $\mathcal{R} = \mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$. So from Theorem 3.7, it follows that $E = E_{\sharp}$ for any $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$. Theorem 5.2 of ref. [8] shows that Lat Alg $\mathcal{L}$ is completely distributive. $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$ implies that $\mathcal{L}$ is also completely distributive.

Conversely, suppose that $\mathcal{L}$ is completely distributive. From ([8], Theorem 6.1), it follows that $\mathcal{L} = \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$. So $E = E_{\sharp}$ for any $E \in \mathcal{L} = \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$. It follows from Theorem 3.7 that Ref $\mathcal{R} = \mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$. □

Corollary 3.8 was first proved by Lambrou ([6], Theorem 3.1). From the above proof, we can easily obtain that Ref $\mathcal{R} = \mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$ is equivalent to the complete distributivity of Lat Alg $\mathcal{L}$. Thus it follows from ([8], Theorem 5.2) that Ref $\mathcal{R} = \mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$ if and only if $E = E_{*}$ for any $E \in \mathrm{Lat}\,\mathrm{Alg}\,\mathcal{L}$. Comparing with Theorem 3.3, shows the differences between Alg Lat $\mathcal{R}$ and Ref $\mathcal{R}$.

References

[1] Bradley S, Finite rank operators in certain algebras, *Can. Math. Bull.* **42** (1999) 452–462

[2] Erdos J A, Operators of finite rank in nest algebras, *J. London Math. Soc.* **43** (1968) 391–397

[3] Erdos J A and Power S C, Weakly closed ideals of nest algebras, *J. Op. Theory* **7** (1982) 219–235

[4] Han Deguang, On $\mathcal{A}$-submodules for reflexive operator algebras, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* **104** (1988) 1067–1070

[5] Kraus J and Larson D, Reflexivity and distance formulae, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **53(3)** (1986) 340–356

[6] Lambrou M S, Approximants, commutants and double commutants in normed algebras, *J. London Math. Soc.* **25(2)** (1982) 499–512

[7] Laurie C and Longstaff W E, A note on rank-one operators in reflexive algebras, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* **89** (1983) 293–297

[8] Longstaff W E, Strongly reflexive lattices, *J. London Math. Soc.* **11(2)** (1975) 491–498

[9] Longstaff W E, Operators of rank one in reflexive algebras, *Can. J. Math.* **28** (1976) 19–23

[10] Longstaff W E, Nation J B and Oreste Panaia, Abstract reflexive sublattices and completely distributive collapsibility, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **58** (1998) 245–260