

## A Theorem on Operator Algebras

By

Tôzирô OGASAWARA

(Received Sep. 10, 1954)

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $B^*$ -algebra, that is, a Banach  $*$ -algebra with the property  $\|A^*A\| = \|A\|^2$  for every  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Such an algebra is  $*$ -isomorphically representable as a uniformly closed algebra of operators on a Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}$ . In the sequel we assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is represented such an algebra of operators on  $\mathfrak{H}$ . It is the purpose of this paper to prove the following theorem <sup>1)</sup>:

**THEOREM.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $B^*$ -algebra. Then for  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}^+$*

- (a) *if  $A \geq B$ , then  $A^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq B^{\frac{1}{2}}$ ;*
- (b) *if  $A \geq B$  implies always  $A^2 \geq B^2$ , then  $\mathcal{A}$  is commutative.*

**1. Proof of (a).** First consider the case that  $\mathfrak{H}$  is finite-dimensional. Suppose the contrary. Let  $Tr(C)$  stand for an ordinary trace of operators  $C$  on  $\mathfrak{H}$ . It is a positive linear functional and has the property that  $Tr(CD) \geq 0$  for  $C \geq 0$  and  $D \geq 0$ . Put  $S = A^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $T = B^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Owing to the spectral resolution of  $T - S$  there exists a non-zero projection  $P$  such that  $P(T - S) = (T - S)P \geq \delta P > 0$  for a positive number  $\delta$ . Then  $Tr(P(T - S)(T + S)) \geq \delta Tr(P(T + S)) \geq 0$ . On the other hand  $Tr(P(T - S)(T + S)) = \frac{1}{2} \{Tr(P(T - S)(T + S)) + Tr((T + S)(T - S)P)\} = \frac{1}{2} \{Tr(P(T - S)(T + S)) + Tr(P(T + S)(T - S))\} = Tr(P(B - A)) \leq 0$ . From these inequalities we have  $Tr(P(T + S)) = 0$  and therefore  $P(T + S)P = 0$ , which entails that  $PTP = PSP = 0$ . Then  $P(T - S) = P(T - S)P = PTS - PSP = 0$ . It contradicts  $P(T - S) \geq \delta P > 0$ .

Now we consider the general case. Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is the algebra  $\mathcal{B}$  of operators on  $\mathfrak{H}$ . For each finite-dimensional projection  $P_\delta$  we designate by  $A_\delta$  the greatest positive operator  $\leq A$  such that  $A_\delta P_\delta = P_\delta A_\delta = A_\delta$ . Such an  $A_\delta$  is determined by  $\langle A_\delta f, f \rangle = \text{g. l. b. } \langle Ag, g \rangle$  (cf. [1]).  $\{A_\delta\}$  is a directed set by the ordering " $\geq$ " of operator algebras and it is easy to see that  $\{A_\delta\}$  converges to  $A$  in the strong topology (cf. [1]).  $P_\delta \geq P_{\delta'}$  entails  $A_\delta \geq A_{\delta'}$  and therefore  $A_\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq A_{\delta'}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  by the above discussion. Let  $T$  be the strong limit of the directed

---

1) Added in proof. (a) follows as a special case from a theorem due to E. Heinz (Math. Ann. 123 (1951), 415-438, §1 Satz 2). Cf. also T. Kato, Math. Ann. 125 (1952/53), 208-212, Theorem 2.

set  $\{A_\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\}$ .  $\langle T^2f, f \rangle = \langle Tf, Tf \rangle = \lim_{\delta} \langle A_\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}f, A_\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}f \rangle = \lim_{\delta} \langle A_\delta f, f \rangle = \langle Af, f \rangle$  for every  $f \in \mathfrak{H}$ . Hence  $T = A^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Let  $\{B_\delta\}$  be the corresponding directed set of positive finite-dimensional operators for  $B$ . Evidently  $A_\delta \geq B_\delta$  and therefore  $A_\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq B_\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . This implies  $A^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq B^{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

**2. Some partial order in  $\mathcal{B}^+$ .** Let  $\mathcal{B}^+$  be the set of all positive operators on  $\mathfrak{H}$ . Let  $A = \int_0^\infty \lambda dE_\lambda$  and  $B = \int_0^\infty \lambda dF_\lambda$  be the spectral resolutions of positive operators  $A$  and  $B$  respectively. After Dixmier [2] we write  $A \gg B$  if  $E_\lambda \leq F_\lambda$  for every  $\lambda > 0$ .  $f \in E_\lambda \mathfrak{H}$  if and only if  $\langle A^{2n}f, f \rangle \leq \lambda^{2n} \langle f, f \rangle$  holds for every non-negative integer  $n$ . Therefore  $A \gg B$  is equivalent to  $A^{2n} \geq B^{2n}$  ( $n=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ). The order " $\gg$ " is evidently a partial order in  $\mathcal{B}^+$ . The l. u. b. of  $A$  and  $B$  exists and is given by  $\int_0^\infty \lambda dG_\lambda$  where  $G_\lambda = E_\lambda \cap F_\lambda$ . For example, if  $P$  and  $Q$  are projections, then  $P \vee Q$  coincides with the usually defined  $P \cup Q$ . We note that if  $A$  is any self-adjoint operator  $\in \mathcal{B}$  and  $A = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \lambda dE_\lambda$  is its spectral resolution, then  $|A| = A_+ \vee A_-$ , where  $A_+ = \int_0^\infty \lambda dE_\lambda$ ,  $A_- = -\int_{-\infty}^0 \lambda dE_\lambda$ .

**3. Proof of (b).** The condition of (b) is the same as the following: For any  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $A \geq B$  is equivalent to  $A \gg B$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}'$  be the linear space of all self-adjoint operators of  $\mathcal{A}$ . We shall show that the order " $\geq$ " is a lattice order. To this end it is sufficient to show that, for any  $A \in \mathcal{A}'$ ,  $|A|$  is the l. u. b. of  $A$  and  $-A$ , where  $|A|$  is the absolute of  $A$  in the usual sense. Let  $C$  be any operator  $\in \mathcal{A}'$  such that  $A, -A \leq C$ . Then  $A_+ \leq C + A_-$  and  $A_- \leq C + A_+$ . As the order " $\geq$ " coincides with the order " $\gg$ ", we have  $|A| = A_+ + A_- \leq C + A_-$  from the remark given in 2, and therefore  $A_+ \leq C$ . Similarly  $A_- \leq C$ . Hence  $|A| \leq C$ . Since  $A, -A \leq |A|$ , it follows that  $|A|$  is the l. u. b. of  $A$  and  $-A$ . Then by a result of Sherman [4] we can conclude that  $\mathcal{A}$  is commutative. The proof is completed.

The above proof is based on a result of Sherman. Without using his result we can prove that  $\mathcal{A}$  is commutative. For any  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}'$ ,  $A+B \geq A-B$ ,  $B-A$ . Therefore  $(A+B)^2 \geq |A-B|^2 = (A-B)^2$ , which entails that  $AB+BA = \frac{1}{2}\{(A+B)^2 - (A-B)^2\} \geq 0$ . We can write  $AB = C + iD$ ,  $C \in \mathcal{A}'$ ,  $D \in \mathcal{A}'$ . We have only to show that  $D=0$ . Suppose the contrary.  $A(BAB) = C^2 - D^2 + i(CD + DC)$ .  $C^2 \geq D^2$  since  $BAB \geq 0$ . Let  $\alpha$  be the greatest positive number such that  $C^2 \geq \alpha D^2$  for every

$A, B \in A^+$ .  $(C^2 - D^2)^2 \geq \alpha(CD + DC)^2$ , which is written as  $C^4 + D^4 - C^2D^2 - D^2C^2 \geq \alpha(CDCD + DCDC + CD^2C + DC^2D)$ .  $2D^4 \leq C^2D^2 + D^2C^2$  since  $(C^2 - D^2)D^2 + D^2(C^2 - D^2) \geq 0$ .  $CDCD + DCDC \geq 0$  since  $DCD = (DC^{\frac{1}{2}})(DC^{\frac{1}{2}})^*$ .  $CD^2C \geq 0$ .  $DC^2D \geq \alpha D^4$  since  $DC^2D - \alpha D^4 = D(C^2 - \alpha D^2)D \geq 0$ . Therefore we have  $C^4 - D^4 \geq \alpha^2 D^4$ , which implies  $C^2 \geq \sqrt{\alpha^2 + 1} D^2$ . This is a contradiction.

**4. A generalization of (a).** Hitherto we have been only concerned with bounded operators. We shall generalize (a) for unbounded operators. Let  $T$  and  $S$  be self-adjoint operators such that  $T \geq S \geq 0$ . We show that  $T^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq S^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . We first assume that  $S$  is bounded. Let  $T = \int_0^\infty \lambda dE_\lambda$  be the spectral resolution of  $T$ . Put  $T_n = TE_n = \int_0^n \lambda dE_\lambda$ . We have  $T_n \geq E_n S E_n$  and therefore  $T_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq (E_n S E_n)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  by (a). Since  $E_n S E_n$  converges strongly to  $S$ , it follows from a theorem of Kaplansky [3] that  $\{E_n S E_n\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  converges strongly to  $S^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Therefore  $T^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq S^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Next we omit the assumption that  $S$  is bounded. Let  $S = \int_0^\infty \lambda dF_\lambda$  be the spectral resolution of  $S$  and put  $S_n = S F_n = \int_0^n \lambda dF_\lambda$ .  $T \geq S \geq S_n$  implies that  $T^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq S_n^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and therefore  $T^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq S^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . The proof is completed.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Dixmier, *Sur les opérateurs self-adjoint d'un espace de Hilbert*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, **230** (1950), 267-269.  
 [2] ———, *Remarques sur les applications  $\sharp$* , *Archi. der Math.*, **3** (1952), 290-297.  
 [3] I. Kaplansky, *A theorem on rings of operators*, *Pacific J. Math.*, **1** (1951), 227-232.  
 [4] S. Sherman, *Order in operator algebras*, *Amer. J. Math.*, **73** (1951), 227-232