

On a question of A. Wilansky in normed algebras

by

A. BEDDAA and M. OUDADESS (Rabat)

Abstract. A. Wilansky asked whether there is a normed Q -algebra which is not inverse closed in its completion. The answer to this question is negative. In fact, we show that every p -normed Q -algebra ($0 < p \leq 1$) is inverse closed in its completion.

By a p -normed algebra ($0 < p \leq 1$) we mean an algebra A over K ($K = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C}) endowed with a mapping $\|\cdot\|$ from A to \mathbb{R}_+ satisfying:

- (i) $\|x\| = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$.
- (ii) $\|\lambda x\| = |\lambda|^p \|x\|$, for all x in A and $\lambda \in K$.
- (iii) $\|x + y\| \leq \|x\| + \|y\|$, for all x, y in A .
- (iv) $\|xy\| \leq \|x\| \cdot \|y\|$ for all x, y in A .

A p -normed algebra A is called a Q -algebra if its group $G(A)$ of invertible elements is open.

In the following A will always be a unital p -normed algebra and \hat{A} its completion. We denote by $m(A)$ and $m(\hat{A})$ the sets of all nontrivial continuous characters of A and \hat{A} respectively.

Recall that A is *inverse closed* in \hat{A} if, whenever $x \in A$ has an inverse x^{-1} in \hat{A} , then x^{-1} is in A .

Let us now state the first proposition, which characterizes the commutative p -normed Q -algebras.

PROPOSITION 1. *If A is commutative, the following assertions are equivalent:*

- 1° Every x in A such that $\chi(x) \neq 0$ for every $\chi \in m(A)$ is invertible.
- 2° $\text{sp } x = \{\chi(x) \mid \chi \in m(A)\}$ for every x in A .
- 3° A is inverse closed in \hat{A} .
- 4° A is a Q -algebra.

Proof. $1^\circ \Rightarrow 2^\circ$. Let λ be an element of $\text{sp } x$. Then $\lambda e - x$ is not invertible. By 1° , there exists χ in $m(A)$ such that $\chi(\lambda e - x) = 0$. Hence $\lambda = \chi(x)$. Thus $\text{sp } x \subset \{\chi(x) \mid \chi \in m(A)\}$. But the inverse inclusion is always satisfied, whence 2° .

$2^\circ \Rightarrow 3^\circ$. If $\text{sp } x = \{\chi(x) \mid \chi \in m(A)\}$, then $\text{sp } x = \{\chi(x) \mid \chi \in m(\hat{A})\}$ for every element of $m(A)$ can be extended to an element of $m(\hat{A})$. Since \hat{A} is a complete p -normed algebra, $\text{sp}_{\hat{A}} x = \{\chi(x) \mid \chi \in m(\hat{A})\}$ ([3]), so $\text{sp}_A x = \text{sp}_{\hat{A}} x$ for every x in A . This implies 3° .



3° ⇒ 4°. This is trivial, since $G(A) = G(\hat{A}) \cap A$ and \hat{A} is a Q -algebra ([3]).

4° ⇒ 1°. Let x be an element of A such that $x \notin \text{Ker } \chi$, for every χ in $m(A)$. Since A is a Q -algebra and the p -normed algebras satisfy the Gelfand-Mazur theorem, the only maximal ideals of A are $\text{Ker } \chi$, $\chi \in m(A)$. Thus x belongs to no maximal ideal of A . Hence x is invertible.

Remark. The four equivalent assertions imply that the Jacobson radical of A is given by $\text{Rad } A = \bigcap_{\chi \in m(A)} \text{Ker } \chi$. But the converse is false. Indeed, if we consider the normed algebra \hat{A} consisting of all polynomials provided with the norm $\|P\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |P(x)|$, it is easy to verify that A is not a Q -algebra but $\text{Rad } A = \{0\} = \bigcap_{\chi \in m(A)} \text{Ker } \chi$.

We now obtain another characterization in the noncommutative case.

PROPOSITION 2. *The following conditions are equivalent:*

- 1° A is inverse closed in its completion \hat{A} .
- 2° For every subset of A which contains no invertible element in A , its closure in \hat{A} contains no invertible element in \hat{A} .
- 3° The closure in \hat{A} of a (left or right) maximal ideal contains no invertible element in \hat{A} .
- 4° $\text{sp}_{\hat{A}} x = \text{sp}_A x$, for every x in A .
- 5° A is a Q -algebra.

Proof. 1° ⇒ 2°. Let B be a subset of A which contains no invertible element in A . Suppose that the closure \bar{B} of B in \hat{A} contains an element x invertible in \hat{A} . Since \hat{A} is a Q -algebra ([3]), there exists a neighborhood U of x such that every element of U is invertible in \hat{A} . Since $x \in \bar{B}$, there exists a sequence $(x_n)_n$ in B which converges to x in \hat{A} . Hence $x_n \in U$ for large n . Then x_n is invertible in \hat{A} and hence in A , contrary to the hypothesis.

2° ⇒ 3°. Evident.

3° ⇒ 4°. The inclusion $\text{sp}_{\hat{A}} x \subset \text{sp}_A x$ is always satisfied. Conversely, if $\lambda \in \text{sp}_A x$, i.e. $\lambda e - x$ is not invertible, then there exists a (left or right) maximal ideal M such that $\lambda e - x \in M \subset \bar{M}$, where \bar{M} is the closure of M in \hat{A} . Since A is dense in \hat{A} , \bar{M} is a (left or right) ideal in \hat{A} and by 3°, $\bar{M} \neq \hat{A}$. Thus $\lambda e - x$ is not invertible in \hat{A} , i.e. $\lambda \in \text{sp}_{\hat{A}} x$.

4° ⇒ 5°. $G(A) = G(\hat{A}) \cap A$ and $G(\hat{A})$ is open in \hat{A} , whence the result.

5° ⇒ 1°. Let x be an element of A . If $x \notin G(A)$, there exists a maximal ideal M in A such that $x \in M$. Then $x \in \bar{M}$, where \bar{M} is the closure of M in \hat{A} . It is a proper ideal in \hat{A} . Thus $x \notin G(\hat{A})$.

Remark. The last proposition shows that the answer to Wilansky's question is negative even for p -normed algebras. We point out that a negative answer for normed algebras has been given by Alberto Arosio ([1]).

We now give some examples.

1° Let $A = C^{(N)} = \{(x_n)_n \in C \mid \exists N \in N: x_n = 0 \text{ for } n \geq N\}$ provided with the pointwise operations and the p -norm defined by $\|x\| = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |x_n|^p$, where $x = (x_n)_n \in A$ and p is a fixed number such that $0 < p < 1$. Then $(A, \|\cdot\|)$ is a p -normed (not normed) algebra. It is not complete. Its completion is

$$\hat{A} = \{(x_n)_n \in C \mid \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |x_n| < \infty\}.$$

Consider $A^\# = A \times C$, the unitization of A , with the p -norm $\|(x, \lambda)\| = \|x\| + |\lambda|^p$. Then $A^\#$ is a p -normed Q -algebra which is not normed.

2° Consider the same algebra A with the convolution product:

$$(x_n)_n * (y_m)_m = \left(\sum_{n+m=k} x_n y_m \right)_k.$$

The algebra A is not inverse closed in its completion \hat{A} . Indeed, the element $x = (2, 1, 0, 0, \dots)$ of A is invertible in \hat{A} . Its inverse is $x^{-1} = (\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{4}, \dots, (-1)^{n-1}/2^n, \dots)$, which is not in A . Thus A is not a Q -algebra.

References

[1] A. Arosio, *Locally convex inductive limits of normed algebras*, Rend. Sem. Math. Univ. Padova 51 (1974), 334-359.
 [2] A. Wilansky, Letter to the editor, Amer. Math. Monthly 91 (8) (1984), 531.
 [3] W. Zelazko, *Metric generalizations of Banach algebras*, Dissertationes Math. 47 (1965).

ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE TAKADDIUM
 B. P. 5118, Rabat, Morocco

Received July 7, 1988

(2462)