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Abstract. Given an infinite set Γ, we prove that the space of complex null sequences $c_0(Γ)$ satisfies the Mazur-Ulam property, that is, for each Banach space $X$, every surjective isometry from the unit sphere of $c_0(Γ)$ onto the unit sphere of $X$ admits a (unique) extension to a surjective real linear isometry from $c_0(Γ)$ to $X$. We also prove that the same conclusion holds for the finite dimensional space $ℓ^m_∞$.

1. Introduction

The Mazur-Ulam property is intrinsically linked to the so-called Tingley’s problem. The latter problem has been intensively studied during the last thirty years, and asks whether a surjective isometry $Δ$ between the unit spheres, $S(X)$ and $S(Y)$, of two normed spaces $X$ and $Y$ can be extended to a surjective real linear isometry from $X$ to $Y$. Tingley’s problem has been revealed as a difficult problem which remains unsolved. A wide list of positive solutions to Tingley’s problem for concrete Banach spaces includes sequence spaces (see [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16]), finite dimensional polyhedral spaces [13], $C_0(L)$ spaces [30], finite dimensional C*-algebras and finite von Neumann algebras (see [27, 26, 28]), spaces of compact operators, compact C*-algebras and weakly compact JB*-triples (cf. [19, 10]), type I von Neumann factors, atomic von Neumann algebras and atomic JBW*-triples (see [11, 12]), and spaces of trace class operators [9].

In general, a surjective linear isometry between the unit spheres of two complex Banach spaces need not admit an extension to a surjective complex linear or conjugate linear isometry between the spaces. For example $Δ : S(C⊕∞ C) → S(C⊕∞ C)$, $Δ(λ_1, λ_2) := (λ_1, λ_2)$ cannot be extended to a complex linear nor to a conjugate linear isometry on $C⊕∞ C$. Due to these reasons most of the studies are restricted to real Banach spaces, real sequence spaces, and spaces of real-valued measurable functions. However, the results for $C(K)$ spaces and the recent progress for spaces of compact operators, $B(H)$ spaces and atomic von Neumann algebras reveal the importance, validity, and difficulty of the case of complex Banach spaces.

Following [1], we shall say that a Banach space $Z$ satisfies the Mazur-Ulam property if every surjective isometry from the unit sphere of $Z$ to the unit sphere of any Banach space $Y$ admits a (unique) extension to a surjective real linear isometry from $Z$ onto $Y$. A pioneering contribution due to G.G. Ding proves that the space $c_0(N, R)$ of all null sequences of real numbers satisfies the Mazur-Ulam property (cf. [7, Corollary 2]). Additional examples of Banach spaces satisfying the Mazur-Ulam property include $ℓ^m_∞$, for any $m ≥ 1$, and certain spaces of compact operators.
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property were provided by R. Liu and X.N. Fang and J.H. Wang. The list includes $c(\Gamma, \mathbb{R})$, $c_0(\Gamma, \mathbb{R})$, $\ell_\infty(\Gamma, \mathbb{R})$, and the space $C(K, \mathbb{R})$ of all real-valued continuous functions on an arbitrary compact metric space $K$ (see [16, Main Theorem and Corollary 6] and [8, Theorem 3.2] for the result concerning $C(K, \mathbb{R})$). D. Tan showed that the spaces $L^p((\Omega, \Sigma, \mu), \mathbb{R})$, of real-valued measurable functions on an arbitrary $\sigma$-finite measure space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$, satisfy the Mazur-Ulam property for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ [21, 20, 22]. Other references dealing with the Mazur-Ulam property can be found in [14, 23] and [24].

All previous examples of Banach spaces satisfying the Mazur-Ulam property are real sequence spaces and spaces of real-valued continuous or measurable functions. However, it is an open and intriguing problem whether the spaces $\ell_\infty(\Gamma)$, $c_0(\Gamma)$ and $c(\Gamma)$ of complex sequences satisfy the Mazur-Ulam property or not. The same question is also open for spaces of complex-valued continuous functions on a compact metric space and for complex-valued measurable functions. Practically nothing is known in the complex setting. In this note we establish the first result in this direction by proving that the space $c_0(\Gamma)$ satisfies the Mazur-Ulam property, that is, for each Banach space $X$ every surjective isometry $\Delta : S(c_0(\Gamma)) \to S(X)$ admits a unique extension to a surjective real linear isometry from $c_0(\Gamma)$ onto $X$ (see Theorem 3.8).

The technical results and arguments developed to prove the Mazur-Ulam property for $c_0(\Gamma)$ are also valid for $\ell_m^\infty$, and consequently $\ell_m^\infty$ satisfies the Mazur-Ulam property too.

2. Supports and maximal convex subsets of the unit sphere

Throughout this note, $X$ will be a complex Banach space, $\mathcal{B}_X$ will denote the closed unit ball of $X$, and $\Gamma$ will be an infinite set (equipped with the discrete topology). Following the standard notation, $c_0(\Gamma)$ will denote the Banach space of all functions $x : \Gamma \to \mathbb{C}$ such that, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, the set $\{n \in \Gamma : |x(n)| \geq \varepsilon\}$ is finite, while $\ell_\infty(\Gamma)$ will stand for the space of bounded functions from $\Gamma$ to $\mathbb{C}$. In the finite dimensional case, we shall write $\ell_m^\infty$ for $(\mathbb{C}^m, \| \cdot \|_\infty)$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The symbol $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\Gamma)$ will stand for any of the spaces of complex sequences $\ell_\infty(\Gamma)$ or $c_0(\Gamma)$ equipped with the supremum norm.

Henceforth, given an element $x \in \mathcal{L}_\infty(\Gamma)$, the symbol $x(k)$ will denote the $k$th component of $x$. For each $n \in \Gamma$ and each $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, we set

$$A(n, \lambda) := \{x \in S(\mathcal{L}_\infty(\Gamma)) : x(n) = \lambda\}$$

and

$$\text{Pick}(n, \lambda) := \{x \in A(n, \lambda) : |x(k)| < 1, \forall k \neq n\}.$$ 

Then $A(n, \lambda)$ is a maximal weak$^*$-closed proper face of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty(\Gamma)}$ and a maximal convex subset of $S(\mathcal{L}_\infty(\Gamma))$.

Our first result gathers a key property for later purposes.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let $\Delta : S(\mathcal{L}_\infty(\Gamma)) \to S(X)$ be a surjective isometry. Then, for each $n \in \Gamma$ and each $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, the set

$$\text{supp}(n, \lambda) := \{\varphi \in X^* : \|\varphi\| = 1, \text{ and } \varphi^{-1}(\{1\}) = \Delta(A(n, \lambda))\}$$

is a non-empty weak$^*$-closed face of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{L}_\infty(\Gamma)}$. 

Let \( A(n, \lambda) \) be a maximal convex subset of \( S(L^\infty(\Gamma)) \). Therefore, it follows from [1, Lemma 5.1(ii)] or [25, Lemma 3.5] that \( \Delta(A(n, \lambda)) \) is a maximal convex subset of \( X \). Thus, by Eidelheit’s separation Theorem [17, Theorem 2.2.26] there is a norm-one functional \( \varphi \in X^* \) such that \( \varphi^{-1}(\{1\}) = \Delta(A(n, \lambda)) \) (compare [26, Lemma 3.3]). The rest can be straightforwardly checked by the reader. \( \square \)

We shall isolate next a property which was essentially shown in [8, Lemmas 3.1 and 3.5], we include here an argument for completeness reasons. Following standard notation (compare [1, 8]), given a norm-one element \( x \) in a Banach space \( X \), we shall denote by \( \text{St}(x) \) the star-like subset of \( S(X) \) around \( x \), that is, the set given by

\[
\text{St}(x) := \{ y \in S(X) : \|x + y\| = 2 \}.
\]

It is known that \( \text{St}(x) \) is precisely the union of all maximal convex subsets of \( S(X) \) containing \( x \), and coincides with the set of all \( y \in X \) such that the set \([x, y] := \{ tx + (1 - t)y : t \in [0, 1]\} \) is contained in \( S(X) \).

**Lemma 2.2.** Let \( \Delta : S(L^\infty(\Gamma)) \to S(X) \) be a surjective isometry. Then for each \( n \) in \( \Gamma \) and each \( \lambda \) in \( \mathbb{T} \) we have \( \varphi\Delta(x) = -1 \) for every \( x \) in \( A(n, -\lambda) \) and every \( \varphi \) in \( \text{supp}(n, \lambda) \).

**Proof.** Let us take \( x \in A(n, -\lambda) \) and \( \varphi \in \text{supp}(n, \lambda) \). We can always pick \( y \) in \( \text{Pick}(n, \lambda) \cap c_0(\Gamma) \) (take, for example \( y = \lambda e_n \)). Clearly \(-x \in A(n, \lambda) \), and

\[
\|\Delta(x) - \Delta(y)\| = \|x - y\| = 2,
\]

and hence \(-\Delta(x) \in \text{St}(\Delta(y))\).

Now we argue as in [8, Lemma 3.1] to deduce that \( \text{St}(\Delta(y)) = \Delta(A(n, \lambda)) \).

Namely, \( z \in \text{St}(\Delta(y)) \) if and only if \( \|z + \Delta(y)\| = 2 \), which by [8, Corollary 2.2] is equivalent to \( \|\Delta^{-1}(z) + y\| = 2 \Leftrightarrow \Delta^{-1}(z) \in \text{St}(y) = A(n, \lambda) \).

Therefore \(-\Delta(x) \in \text{St}(\Delta(y)) = \Delta(A(n, \lambda)) \), and thus, by definition, we have

\[-\varphi(\Delta(x)) = \varphi(-\Delta(x)) = 1.\]

\( \square \)

Additional properties of the sets \( \text{supp}(n, \lambda) \) are established in the next lemma.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let \( \Delta : S(L^\infty(\Gamma)) \to S(X) \) be a surjective isometry. Then the following statements hold:

(a) For every \( n_0, n_1 \) in \( \Gamma \) with \( n_0 \neq n_1 \) and \( \lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{T} \), we have \( \text{supp}(n_0, \lambda) \cap \text{supp}(n_1, \mu) = \emptyset \);

(b) Given \( \mu, \nu \in \mathbb{T} \) and \( n_0 \) in \( \Gamma \), we have \( \text{supp}(n_0, \nu) \cap \text{supp}(n_0, \mu) = \emptyset \) if and only if \( \mu = \nu \).

**Proof.** (a) Arguing by contradiction we assume the existence of \( \varphi \in \text{supp}(n_0, \lambda) \cap \text{supp}(n_1, \mu) \). Let us take two elements \( y_0, y_1 \in L^\infty(\Gamma) \) such that \( 0 \leq y_0, y_1 \leq 1 \), \( y_0 y_j = 0 \) and \( y_j(n_j) = 1 \) for \( j = 0, 1 \). That is, \( \lambda y_0 \in A(n_0, \lambda) \) and \( \mu y_1 \in A(n_1, \mu) \).

Since \(-\mu y_1 \in A(n_1, \mu) \), Lemma 2.2 implies that \( \varphi\Delta(-\mu y_1) = -1 \). By definition \( \varphi\Delta(\lambda y_0) = 1 \), and then

\[
2 = \varphi\Delta(\lambda y_0) - \varphi\Delta(-\mu y_1) = |\varphi\Delta(\lambda y_0) - \varphi\Delta(-\mu y_1)|
\]

\[
\leq \|\Delta(\lambda y_0) - \Delta(-\mu y_1)\| = \|\lambda y_0 + \mu y_1\| = 1,
\]

which is impossible.
(b) As in (a), let us take \( \varphi \in \text{supp}(n_0, \nu) \cap \text{supp}(n_0, \mu) \), with \( \mu \neq \nu \), and \( y_0 \in A(n_0, 1) \). Since \( \mu y_0 \in A(n_0, \mu) \) and \( \nu y_0 \in A(n_0, \nu) \) we get

\[
2 = \varphi \Delta(\nu y_0) + \varphi \Delta(\mu y_0) \leq \| \Delta(\nu y_0) + \Delta(\mu y_0) \| \leq 2.
\]

By [8, Corollary 2.2] we have \( 2 = \| \nu y_0 + \mu y_0 \| = |\mu + \nu| \), which holds if and only if \( \mu = \nu \).

Henceforth \( e_n \) will denote the \( n \)th vector of the canonical basis of \( \ell_\infty(\Gamma) \).

**Proposition 3.1.** Let \( \Delta : S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \to S(X) \) be a surjective isometry. Let \( n_0 \) be an element in \( \Gamma \) and let \( \varphi \) be an element in \( \text{supp}(n_0, \lambda) \) where \( \lambda \in \mathbb{T} \). Then \( \varphi \Delta(x) = 0 \) for every \( x \in S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \) with \( x(n_0) = 0 \). Furthermore, \( |\varphi \Delta(x)| < 1 \) for every \( x \in S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \) with \( |x(n_0)| < 1 \).

**Proof.** Let us take \( x \in S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \) such that \( x(n_0) = 0 \). The functions \( x \pm \lambda e_{n_0} \) lie in \( S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \) with \( \lambda e_{n_0} \in A(n_0, \lambda) \) and \( -\lambda e_{n_0} \in A(n_0, -\lambda) \). Let us fix \( \varphi \in \text{supp}(n_0, \lambda) \).

Lemma 2.2 implies that \( \varphi \Delta(-\lambda e_{n_0}) = -1 \), and clearly \( \varphi \Delta(\lambda e_{n_0}) = 1 \). Thus

\[
|\varphi \Delta(x) \pm 1| = |\varphi \Delta(x) \pm \varphi \Delta(\lambda e_{n_0})| = |\varphi \Delta(x) - \varphi \Delta(\mp \lambda e_{n_0})| \\
\leq \| \varphi \| \| \Delta(x) - \Delta(\pm \lambda e_{n_0}) \| = \| x \pm \lambda e_{n_0} \| = 1,
\]

which assures that \( \varphi \Delta(x) = 0 \).

For the last statement, let us take \( x \in S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \) with \( |x(n_0)| < 1 \). Let us find \( 1 > \varepsilon > 0 \) such that \( |x(n_0)| < 1 - \varepsilon \). We consider the non-empty set \( C_\varepsilon := \{ n \in \Gamma : |x(n)| \geq 1 - \varepsilon \} \). Let \( h \in S(\mathcal{L}_1(\Gamma)) \) be the characteristic function of the set \( C_\varepsilon \). It is easy to check that \( xh \in S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \), \( (xh)(n_0) = 0 \), and \( \| x - xh \| < 1 - \varepsilon < 1 \).

Since \( (xh)(n_0) = 0 \), the first statement in this proposition proves that \( \varphi \Delta(xh) = 0 \), and thus

\[
|\varphi \Delta(x)| = |\varphi \Delta(x) - \varphi \Delta(xh)| \leq \| \Delta(x) - \Delta(xh) \| = \| x - xh \| < 1 - \varepsilon < 1.
\]

Let us discuss a consequence of the previous proposition. We fix \( n_0 \in \Gamma \) and \( \lambda \in \mathbb{T} \). For each \( y \in \text{Pick}(n_0, \lambda) \) we know that \( |\varphi \Delta(y)| < 1 \) for all \( \varphi \in \text{supp}(n_1, \mu) \), with \( n_1 \in \Gamma \setminus \{ n_0 \} \) and \( \mu \in \mathbb{T} \).

3. The Mazur-Ulam property for \( c_0(\Gamma) \)

The next lemma is a particular case of [7, Lemma 1] and [20, Lemma 2.4]. A proof is included here for completeness reasons.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let \( \Delta : S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \to S(X) \) be a surjective isometry. Then, for each \( n \in \Gamma \) and each \( \mu \in \mathbb{T} \) we have \( \Delta(-\mu e_n) = -\Delta(\mu e_n) \).

**Proof.** Let us find \( x \in S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \) satisfying \( \Delta(x) = -\Delta(\mu e_n) \). By hypothesis

\[
2 = \| -2\Delta(\mu e_n) \| = \| \Delta(x) - \Delta(\mu e_n) \| = \| x - \mu e_n \|,
\]

which shows that \( x(n) = -\mu \).

Now, fix \( m \neq n \) and take another \( y \in S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \) satisfying \( \Delta(y) = -\Delta(\mu e_m) \). The above arguments also show that \( y(m) = -\mu \). On the other hand,

\[
\| x - y \| = \| \Delta(x) - \Delta(y) \| = \| -\Delta(\mu e_n) + \Delta(\mu e_m) \| = \| \mu e_m - \mu e_n \| = 1,
\]

and hence \( |x(m) + \mu| \leq 1 \) and \( |y(n) + \mu| \leq 1 \).
Finally pick \( z \in S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \) satisfying \( \Delta(z) = -\Delta(-\mu e_m) \). Under this assumption we know that
\[
\|z + \mu e_m\| = \|z - (-\mu e_m)\| = \|\Delta(z) - \Delta(-\mu e_m)\| = 2\| - \Delta(-\mu e_m)\| = 2,
\]
witnessing that \( z(m) = \mu \).

Since
\[
\|x - z\| = \|\Delta(x) - \Delta(z)\| = \| - \Delta(\mu e_n) + \Delta(-\mu e_m)\| = \| - \mu e_m - \mu e_n\| = 1,
\]
and thus \( |x(m) - \mu| \leq 1 \) and \( | - z(n) - \mu| \leq 1 \).

The inequalities \( |x(m) + \mu| \leq 1 \) and \( |x(m) - \mu| \leq 1 \) imply \( x(m) = 0 \). Therefore, \( x(m) = 0 \) for every \( m \neq n \) and consequently \( x = -\mu e_n \), which concludes the proof.

**Remark 3.2.** If in the previous proposition \( \mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma) \) is replaced with \( \ell^\infty_m \) then, the same conclusion remains true by the original Tingley’s theorem [29], which shows that for finite dimensional normed spaces \( X \) and \( Y \), every surjective isometry \( \Delta : S(X) \rightarrow S(Y) \) satisfies \( \Delta(-x) = -\Delta(x) \) for every \( x \in S(X) \).

The next proposition establishes the behavior of a surjective isometry on a spherical multiple of some element of the canonical basis.

**Proposition 3.3.** Let \( \Delta : S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \rightarrow S(X) \) be a surjective isometry. Then, for each \( n \in \Gamma \) and each \( \lambda \in \mathbb{T} \) we have \( \Delta(\lambda e_n) \in \{\lambda \Delta(e_n), \overline{\lambda} \Delta(e_n)\} \).

Furthermore, if for some \( n \in \Gamma \) we have \( \Delta(\lambda e_n) = \lambda \Delta(e_n) \) (respectively, \( \Delta(\lambda e_n) = \overline{\lambda} \Delta(e_n) \)) for some \( \lambda \in \mathbb{T}\setminus\{\pm 1\} \), then \( \Delta(\mu e_n) = \mu \Delta(e_n) \) (respectively, \( \Delta(\mu e_n) = \overline{\mu} \Delta(e_n) \)) for all \( \mu \in \mathbb{T} \).

**Proof.** The element \( \lambda \Delta(e_n) \) lies in \( S(X) \), so by the surjectivity of \( \Delta \) there exists \( x \in S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \) such that \( \Delta(x) = \lambda \Delta(e_n) \). We shall first prove that \( x(k) = 0 \) for all \( k \neq n \).

Suppose that \( |x(k)| = 1 \) for some \( k \neq n \). Then, by Lemma 2.1, we get \( \varphi \Delta(x) = 1 \) for all \( \varphi \in \text{supp}(k, x(k)) \). However \( 1 = \varphi \Delta(x) = \varphi(\lambda \Delta(e_n)) = \lambda \varphi \Delta(e_n) \), and since \( e_n(k) = 0 \), Proposition 2.4 gives \( \varphi \Delta(e_n) = 0 \), which is impossible. We have therefore shown that \( |x(k)| \leq 1 \) for \( k \neq n \).

If \( 0 < |x(k)| \leq 1 \), let \( y \in S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \) be the element defined by \( y(m) = x(m) \) for all \( m \neq k \) and \( y(k) = x(k)/|x(k)| \). Clearly
\[
\|y - x\| = |x(k) - \frac{1}{|x(k)|}x(k)| = \frac{|x(k)| - 1}{|x(k)|}|x(k)| = |x(k)| = 1 - |x(k)|,
\]
and for each \( \varphi \in \text{supp}(k, x(k)/|x(k)|) \), Lemma 2.1 assures that \( \varphi \Delta(y) = 1 \). Therefore
\[
1 - |\varphi \Delta(x)| = \varphi \Delta(y) - |\varphi \Delta(x)| \leq |\varphi \Delta(y) - \varphi \Delta(x)| \leq \|y - x\| = 1 - |x(k)|,
\]
which shows that
\[
|x(k)| \leq |\varphi \Delta(x)| = |\varphi(\lambda \Delta(e_n))| = |\varphi \Delta(e_n)| = (\text{by Proposition 2.4}) = 0,
\]
leading to a contradiction. This shows that \( \lambda \Delta(e_n) = \Delta(\mu e_n) \) for some \( \mu \in \mathbb{T} \).

By applying Proposition 3.1 we get
\[
|\lambda \pm 1| = \|\lambda \Delta(e_n) \pm \Delta(e_n)\| = \|\Delta(x) \pm \Delta(e_n)\|
= \|\Delta(\mu e_n) \pm \Delta(e_n)\| = \|\mu e_n \pm e_n\| = |\mu \pm 1|,
\]
and then $\mu \in \{\lambda, \overline{\lambda}\}$.

Let us finally prove the last statement. Let us assume that $\Delta(\lambda e_n) = \lambda \Delta(e_n)$ (respectively, $\Delta(\lambda e_n) = \overline{\lambda} \Delta(e_n)$) for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}\setminus\{\pm 1\}$. Let $\mu$ be an arbitrary element in $\mathbb{T}\setminus\mathbb{R}$. We have shown above that $\Delta(\mu e_n) = \mu \Delta(e_n)$ or $\Delta(\mu e_n) = \overline{\mu} \Delta(e_n)$. We shall prove that the second possibility (respectively, the first one) is impossible. Arguing by contradiction, we suppose that $\Delta(\mu e_n) = \overline{\nu} \Delta(e_n)$ (respectively, $\Delta(\mu e_n) = \mu \Delta(e_n)$). By the assumptions and Proposition 3.1 we have

$$|\lambda + \mu| = \|\lambda \Delta(e_n) + \mu \Delta(e_n)\| = \|\Delta(\lambda e_n) + \Delta(\overline{\nu} e_n)\|$$

(respectively,

$$|\lambda + \mu| = \|\lambda \Delta(e_n) + \mu \Delta(e_n)\| = \|\Delta(\overline{\nu} e_n) + \Delta(\mu e_n)\| = \|\overline{\lambda} e_n + \mu e_n\| = |\overline{\lambda} + \mu|$$

Any of the previous identities holds if and only if

$$2 + 2\text{Re}(\lambda \overline{\nu}) = |\lambda|^2 + |\mu|^2 + 2\text{Re}(\lambda \mu) = |\lambda + \mu|^2 = |\overline{\lambda} + \mu|^2 = 2 + 2\text{Re}(\lambda \mu),$$

equivalently

$$\text{Re}(\lambda)\text{Re}(\mu) + 3\text{m}(\lambda)\text{m}(\mu) = \text{Re}(\lambda)\text{Re}(\mu) - 3\text{m}(\lambda)\text{m}(\mu),$$

which is impossible because $\lambda, \mu \notin \mathbb{R}$.

Let $\Delta : S(C^\infty(\Gamma)) \to S(X)$ be a surjective isometry. Henceforth, we set

$$\Gamma_1^\Delta := \{n \in \Gamma : \Delta(\lambda e_n) = \lambda \Delta(e_n) \text{ for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}\},$$

and

$$\Gamma_2^\Delta := \{n \in \Gamma : \Delta(\lambda e_n) = \overline{\lambda} \Delta(e_n) \text{ for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{T}\}.$$ 

It follows from Proposition 3.3 that $\Gamma = \Gamma_1^\Delta \cup \Gamma_2^\Delta$. Given $n \in \Gamma_1^\Delta$ (respectively, $n \in \Gamma_2^\Delta$) and $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ we define $\sigma_n(\alpha) = \alpha$ (respectively, $\sigma_n(\alpha) = \overline{\alpha}$). We know from Proposition 3.3 that

$$\Delta(\lambda e_n) = \sigma_n(\lambda) \Delta(e_n), \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{T}, n \in \Gamma.$$ 

We also observe that $\sigma_n(\alpha) = \alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \Gamma$.

Let $x$ and $y$ be two vectors in a (real or complex) normed space $X$. The elements

$x, y$ are said to be $M$-orthogonal (denoted by $x \perp_M y$) if $\|x \pm y\| = \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\}$. In the setting of complex Banach spaces we can find more variants of geometric orthogonality. Accordingly to the notation in [18], we shall say that $x$ and $y$ are completely $M$-orthogonal (denoted by $x \perp_{cM} y$) if

$$\|\alpha x + \beta y\| = \max\{\|\alpha\| \|x\|, \|\beta\| \|y\|\},$$

for every $\alpha, \beta$ in $\mathbb{C}$.

The canonical notion of (algebraic) orthogonality in $\ell_\infty(\Gamma)$, $c_0(\Gamma)$ and $c(\Gamma)$ reads as follows: elements $a, b$ in any of these spaces are said to be orthogonal or disjoint if $ab = 0$. Algebraic orthogonality is stronger than complete $M$-orthogonality and the latter is stronger than $M$-orthogonality. For example, $x = (1, 1/2, 0)$ and $y = (0, 1/4, 1)$ are $M$-orthogonal and completely $M$-orthogonal with $xy \neq 0$ in $c_0^\infty$, the three dimensional $\ell_\infty$-space. While $x = (1, 1/2, 0)$ and $y = (0, \sqrt{3}/2, 1)$ are $M$-orthogonal but not completely $M$-orthogonal.
Finally, we shall say that a set \( \{x_1,\ldots,x_m\} \) in \( X \) is completely \( M \)-orthogonal if
\[
\left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j x_j \right\| = \max\{|\alpha_j| \|x_j\| : 1 \leq j \leq m\},
\]
for every \( \alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_m \) in \( \mathbb{C} \).

The following technical lemma will be required latter.

**Lemma 3.4.** Let \( \{x_1,\ldots,x_m\} \) be a subset of the unit sphere of a complex normed space \( X \). Then \( \{x_1,\ldots,x_m\} \) is completely \( M \)-orthogonal if and only if the equality
\[
\left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j x_j \right\| = 1
\]
holds for every \( \alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_m \) in \( \mathbb{T} \).

**Proof.** The “only if” implication is clear. For the “if” implication, let us regard \( X \) as a closed subspace of \( C(B_{X^*}) \), the space of all complex-valued continuous functions on the closed unit ball of \( X^* \). Under this identification, \( x_1,\ldots,x_m \) are norm-one functions in \( C(B_{X^*}) \) such that \( \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j x_j \right\| = 1 \) for every \( \alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_m \) in \( \mathbb{T} \).

It is easy to see that this is equivalent to say that \( \sum_{j=1}^m |x_j(t)| \leq 1 \) for every \( t \in B_{X^*} \).

Therefore given \( t_0 \in B_{X^*} \) and \( j_0 \in \{1,\ldots,m\} \) with \( |x_{j_0}(t_0)| = 1 \) then \( x_k(t_0) = 0 \) for all \( k \neq j_0 \).

Take \( \beta_1,\ldots,\beta_m \) in \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} \), with \( |\beta_{j_0}| = \max\{|\beta_j| : 1 \leq j \leq m\} \) for an index \( j_0 \). Since
\[
\| \beta x_j \| = |\beta_{j_0}| \left( \|x_{j_0}\| + \sum_{j \neq j_0} \|x_j\| \right) \leq |\beta_{j_0}| \sum_{j=1}^m |x_j| \leq |\beta_{j_0}| \sum_{j=1}^m \|x_j\| \leq |\beta_{j_0}|,
\]
we deduce that \( \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j x_j \right\| \leq \max\{|\beta_j| : 1 \leq j \leq m\} \). Now, by taking \( t_0 \in B_{X^*} \) with \( |x_{j_0}(t_0)| = 1 \), we get \( \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j x_j \right\| \geq \left| \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j x_j(t_0) \right| = |\beta_{j_0}| \left| x_{j_0}(t_0) \right| = |\beta_{j_0}|. \)

**Corollary 3.5.** Let \( \Delta : S(C^\infty(\Gamma)) \to S(X) \) be a surjective isometry. Then, for each \( n,m \in \Gamma \) with \( n \neq m \) we have \( \Delta(e_n) \perp_{cm} \Delta(e_m) \).

**Proof.** Take \( \lambda, \mu \) in \( \mathbb{T} \). By applying (1) and Proposition 3.3 we get
\[
\| \lambda \Delta(e_n) + \mu \Delta(e_m) \| = \| \Delta(\sigma_n(\lambda)e_n) + \Delta(\sigma_m(\mu)e_m) \|
= \| \Delta(\sigma_n(\lambda)e_n) - \Delta(-\sigma_m(\mu)e_m) \| = \| \sigma_n(\lambda)e_n + \sigma_m(\mu)e_m \| = 1.
\]
The desired conclusion follows from Lemma 3.4.

We shall establish next a series of strengthened versions and consequences of the above corollary.
Proposition 3.6. Let $\Delta : S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma)) \to S(X)$ be a surjective isometry. Let $n_1, \ldots, n_k$ be different elements in $\Gamma$. Then the identity

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \Delta(\alpha_j e_{n_j}) = \Delta \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j e_{n_j} \right)$$

holds for every $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$ in $\mathbb{T}$. As a consequence, the set $\{\Delta(e_{n_1}), \ldots, \Delta(e_{n_k})\}$ is completely $M$-orthogonal, that is,

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \Delta(e_{n_j}) \right\| = \max\{|\alpha_j| : j = 1, \ldots, k\},$$

for every $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$ in $\mathbb{C}$.

Proof. We shall argue by induction on $k$. The case $k = 1$ is clear. Let us assume that the desired statement is true for $k - 1$ with $k \geq 2$. We shall first show that

$$(2) \quad \left\| \sum_{j=1}^k \Delta(\alpha_j e_{n_j}) \right\| = 1.$$  

By the induction hypothesis we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \Delta(\alpha_j e_{n_j}) = \Delta \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \alpha_j e_{n_j} \right) + \Delta(\alpha_k e_{n_k}),$$

and thus, by the assumptions on $\Delta$ and Proposition 3.3 (see also (1)) we deduce that

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^k \Delta(\alpha_j e_{n_j}) \right\| = \left\| \Delta \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \alpha_j e_{n_j} \right) + \Delta(\alpha_k e_{n_k}) \right\|$$

$$= \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \alpha_j e_{n_j} + \alpha_k e_{n_k} \right\| = 1,$$

which proves the claim in (2).

Since, by (2), $\sum_{j=1}^k \Delta(\alpha_j e_{n_j}) \in S(X)$, there exists $x \in S(\mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma))$ satisfying

$$\Delta(x) = \sum_{j=1}^k \Delta(\alpha_j e_{n_j}) = \Delta \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \alpha_j e_{n_j} \right) + \Delta(\alpha_k e_{n_k}).$$

To prove the first statement, it suffices to show that

$$(3) \quad x = \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j e_{n_j}.$$  

To this end, pick an arbitrary $m \in \Gamma \setminus \{n_1, \ldots, n_k\}$. If $|x(m)| = 1$, we take $\phi \in \text{supp}(m, x(m))$. By construction $\phi \Delta(x) = 1$. However, having in mind that
Proposition 2.1 implies that
\[ 1 = \phi \Delta(x) = \phi \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k} \Delta(\alpha_j e_{n_j}) \right) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \phi \Delta(\alpha_j e_{n_j}) = 0, \]
which is impossible.

Suppose now that \( 0 < |x(m)| < 1 \). Let \( y \in \mathcal{S}(C^\infty(\Gamma)) \) be the element defined by \( y(n) = x(n) \) for all \( n \neq m \), and \( y(m) = x(m)/|x(m)| \). Clearly \( \|x - y\| = 1 - |x(m)| \), and given \( \phi \in \text{supp}(m, x(m)/|x(m)|) \), Lemma 2.1 implies that \( \phi \Delta(y) = 1 \).

Combining all these facts together we have
\[ 1 - |\phi \Delta(x)| = |\phi \Delta(y) - |\phi \Delta(x)| \leq |\phi \Delta(y) - \phi \Delta(x)| \leq \|y - x\| = 1 - |x(m)|, \]
which shows that
\[ 0 < |x(m)| \leq |\phi \Delta(x)| = \left| \phi \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k} \Delta(\alpha_j e_{n_j}) \right) \right| \]
\[ \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} \left| \phi \left( \Delta(\alpha_j e_{n_j}) \right) \right| = (\text{again by Proposition 2.4}) = 0, \]
providing a contradiction. Therefore \( x(m) = 0 \), for every \( m \in \Gamma \setminus \{n_1, \ldots, n_k\} \). We have therefore shown that \( x = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mu_j e_{n_j} \), with \( \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k \in \mathbb{C} \) and \( \max\{|\mu_j| : 1 \leq j \leq k\} = 1 \).

Since \( |\alpha_l| = 1 \) for every \( 1 \leq l \leq k \), given \( \phi \in \text{supp}(n_l, \alpha_l) \), we deduce from Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 2.4 that
\[ 2 \geq \|\Delta(x) + \Delta(\alpha_l e_{n_l})\| \geq |\phi(\Delta(x) + \Delta(\alpha_l e_{n_l}))| \]
\[ = \left| \sum_{j=1}^{k} \phi \left( \Delta(\alpha_j e_{n_j}) \right) + \phi(\Delta(\alpha_l e_{n_l})) \right| = 2 |\phi(\Delta(\alpha_l e_{n_l}))| = 2, \]
and it follows from the assumptions and Proposition 3.1 that
\[ 2 = \|\Delta(x) + \Delta(\alpha_l e_{n_l})\| = |x + \alpha_l e_{n_l}| = \max\{|\mu_j| : j \neq l\} + |\mu_l + \alpha_l|, \]
which implies that
\[ |\mu_l + \alpha_l| = 2, \]
and thus \( \alpha_l = \mu_l \) for every \( 1 \leq l \leq k \), which concludes the proof of (3).

To prove the last affirmation, let \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k \) be arbitrary elements in \( \mathbb{T} \). Applying Proposition 3.3 (see (1)) and (2) we have
\[ \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_k \Delta(e_{n_k}) \right\| = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{k} \Delta(\sigma_k(\alpha_k) e_{n_k}) \right\| = 1. \]

Finally, Lemma 3.4 gives the desired conclusion. \( \square \)

One more technical result is separating us from our first main goal.
Proposition 3.7. Let $\Delta : S(L^\infty(\Gamma)) \to S(X)$ be a surjective isometry. Then, for every $n_1, \ldots, n_k \in \Gamma$ and every $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ with $\max\{|\lambda_1|, \ldots, |\lambda_k|\} = 1$, we have

$$\Delta \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j e_{n_j} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j) \Delta(e_{n_j}).$$

Proof. Proposition 3.6 guarantees that the set $\{\Delta(e_{n_1}), \ldots, \Delta(e_{n_k})\} \subset S(X)$ is completely $M$-orthogonal, therefore $\sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j) \Delta(e_{n_j})$ is an element in the unit sphere of $X$. By the surjectivity of $\Delta$ there exists $x$ in $S(L^\infty(\Gamma))$ satisfying $\Delta(x) = \sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j) \Delta(e_{n_j})$. We shall show that $x = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j e_{n_j}$.

In the next four paragraphs we shall follow arguments similar to those in the proof of Proposition 3.3 (see also (1)). Take $m \in \Gamma\setminus\{n_1, \ldots, n_k\}$. If $|x(m)| = 1$, we take $\phi \in \text{supp}(m, x(m))$. Lemma 2.1 implies that $\phi \Delta(x) = 1$. However, having in mind that $e_{n_j}(m) = 0$ for every $j$, Proposition 2.4 applies to prove that

$$1 = \phi \Delta(x) = \phi \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j) \Delta(e_{n_j}) \right) = \sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j) \phi(\Delta(e_{n_j})) = 0,$$

which is impossible.

Suppose now that $0 < |x(m)| < 1$. Let $y \in S(L^\infty(\Gamma))$ be the element defined by $y(n) = x(n)$ for all $n \neq m$ and $y(m) = x(m)/|x(m)|$. Clearly $\|y - x\| = 1 - |x(m)|$. Given $\phi \in \text{supp}(m, x(m)/|x(m)|)$, Lemma 2.1 assures that $\phi \Delta(y) = 1$. Combining all these facts together we have

$$1 - |\phi \Delta(x)| = \phi \Delta(y) - |\phi \Delta(x)| \leq |\phi \Delta(y) - \phi \Delta(x)| \leq \|y - x\| = 1 - |x(m)|,$$

which shows that

$$0 < |x(m)| \leq |\phi \Delta(x)| = \left| \phi \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j) \Delta(e_{n_j}) \right) \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^k |\sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j)| \left| \phi \left( \Delta(e_{n_j}) \right) \right| = (\text{again by Proposition 2.4}) = 0,$$

providing a contradiction. Therefore $x(m) = 0$ for every $m \in \Gamma\setminus\{n_1, \ldots, n_k\}$.

We have shown that $x = \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j e_{n_j}$, and $\Delta \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j e_{n_j} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j) \Delta(e_{n_j})$, where $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\max\{|\mu_j| : j = 1, \ldots, k\} = 1$.

Our next goal is to prove that $\mu_j = \lambda_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.

We consider the spectrum of $x$, $\sigma(x) = \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k\}$. By a little abuse of notation the set $\sigma(\Delta(x)) = \{\sigma_{n_1}(\lambda_1), \ldots, \sigma_{n_k}(\lambda_k)\}$ will be called the spectrum of $\Delta(x)$. Up to an appropriate reordering we may assume that

$$1 = |\lambda_1| = \ldots = |\lambda_m| \geq |\lambda_{m+1}| \geq \ldots \geq |\lambda_k|.$$
In a first step, let us take an index $j_0$ such that $|\lambda_{j_0}| = 1$. It follows from the assumptions, Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 3.3 (see also (1)) that
\[
2 = \|\Delta(x) + \sigma_{n_0}(\lambda_{j_0})\Delta(e_{n_0})\| = \|\Delta(x) + \Delta(\lambda_{j_0} e_{n_0})\| = \|x + \lambda_{j_0} e_{n_0}\|
\]
which implies that
\[
|\lambda_{j_0} + \mu_{j_0}| = 2,
\]
and thus $\mu_{j_0} = \lambda_{j_0}$. We have shown that
\[
(4) \quad \mu_j = \lambda_j, \text{ for all } j \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \text{ with } |\lambda_j| = 1.
\]
On the other hand, let us choose an index $j_0$ such that $|\mu_{j_0}| = 1$. It follows from Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 3.3 (see also (1)) that
\[
\max\{|\sigma_{n_0}(\lambda_{j_0})| : j \neq j_0\} \lor |\sigma_{n_0}(\lambda_{j_0}) + \sigma_{n_0}(\mu_{j_0})| = \|\Delta(x) + \sigma_{n_0}(\mu_{j_0})\Delta(e_{n_0})\| = \|\Delta(x) + \Delta(\mu_{j_0} e_{n_0})\| = \|x + \mu_{j_0} e_{n_0}\| = 2|\mu_{j_0}| = 2,
\]
which implies that
\[
|\sigma_{n_0}(\lambda_{j_0}) + \sigma_{n_0}(\mu_{j_0})| = 2,
\]
and thus $\sigma_{n_0}(\lambda_{j_0}) = \sigma_{n_0}(\mu_{j_0})$, or equivalently $\lambda_{j_0} = \mu_{j_0}$. We have shown that
\[
(5) \quad \lambda_j = \mu_j, \text{ for all } j \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \text{ with } |\mu_j| = 1.
\]
Therefore $\sigma(x) = \{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m, \mu_{m+1}, \ldots, \mu_k\}$ with $|\lambda_1| = \ldots = |\lambda_m| = 1$, and $|\mu_j| < 1$ for all $j > m + 1$.

We claim that $\mu_j \neq 0$ for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Namely, we already know that $\mu_j \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m$. Arguing by contradiction, we assume the existence of $j_0 \in \{m+1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $\mu_{j_0} = 0$. Take the element $z = -\frac{\lambda_{j_0}}{|\lambda_{j_0}|} e_{n_0} + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_j e_{n_j}$.

Proposition 3.6 assures that
\[
\Delta(z) = -\frac{\sigma_{n_0}(\lambda_{j_0})}{|\lambda_{j_0}|} \Delta(e_{n_0}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j) \Delta(e_{n_j}).
\]
Another application of Proposition 3.6 gives
\[
1 < 1 + |\lambda_{j_0}| = (1 + |\lambda_{j_0}|) \lor \max\{|\lambda_j| : m + 1 \leq j \leq k, j \neq j_0\}
\]
\[
= \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j) \Delta(e_{n_j}) - \left( -\frac{\sigma_{n_0}(\lambda_{j_0})}{|\lambda_{j_0}|} \Delta(e_{n_0}) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j) \Delta(e_{n_j}) \right) \right\|
\]
\[
= \|\Delta(x) - \Delta(z)\| = \|x - z\| = |\lambda_{j_0}| \lor \max\{|\mu_j| : m + 1 \leq j \leq k, j \neq j_0\} = 1,
\]
which is impossible. Therefore $\mu_j \neq 0$ for every $j$.

We shall next prove that $\lambda_{m+1} = \mu_{m+1}$.

We pick now $j_0 \in \{m+1, \ldots, k\}$. In this case $0 < |\mu_{j_0}| < 1$. We know that
\[
\max\{|\sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j)| : j \neq j_0\} \lor \left| \sigma_{n_0}(\lambda_{j_0}) + \frac{\sigma_{n_0}(\mu_{j_0})}{|\mu_{j_0}|} \right|
\]
\[
= \left\| \Delta(x) + \frac{\sigma_{n_0}(\mu_{j_0})}{|\mu_{j_0}|} \Delta(e_{n_0}) \right\| = \left\| \Delta(x) + \Delta\left( \frac{\mu_{j_0}}{|\mu_{j_0}|} e_{n_0} \right) \right\|
\]
\[
\| x + \frac{\mu_{j_0}}{|\mu_{j_0}|} e_{n_{j_0}} \| = \| \mu_{j_0} + \frac{\mu_{j_0}}{|\mu_{j_0}|} \| = 1 + |\mu_{j_0}| > 1,
\]
which implies that
\[
1 + |\mu_{j_0}| = |\sigma_{n_{j_0}}(\lambda_{j_0}) + \frac{\sigma_{n_{j_0}}(\mu_{j_0})}{|\mu_{j_0}|}| = |\lambda_{j_0} + \frac{\mu_{j_0}}{|\mu_{j_0}|}| \leq |\lambda_{j_0}| + 1,
\]
and hence \(|\mu_{j_0}| \leq |\lambda_{j_0}|\), for every \(j_0 \geq m + 1\).

Now taking \(y \in S(\mathcal{L}_\infty(\Gamma))\) such that
\[
\Delta(y) = -\sigma_{n_{m+1}}(\lambda_{m+1}) \Delta(e_{n_{m+1}}) + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j) \Delta(e_{n_j}),
\]
we know from the above arguments that \(y = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_j e_{n_j}\) and
\[
\Delta \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_j e_{n_j} \right) = -\sigma_{n_{m+1}}(\lambda_{m+1}) \Delta(e_{n_{m+1}}) + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j) \Delta(e_{n_j}),
\]
where \(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}\) with \(\max\{|\gamma_j| : j = 1, \ldots, k\} = 1\), \(\gamma_j = \lambda_j\) for all \(1 \leq j \leq m, 0 < |\gamma_j| < 1\) for all \(m + 1 \leq j \leq k\) (compare the arguments leading to (4) and (5)), and by Proposition 3.6
\[
\max\{|\sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j)| : j \neq m + 1\} \forall \left| -\sigma_{n_{m+1}}(\lambda_{m+1}) + \frac{\sigma_{n_{m+1}}(\gamma_{m+1})}{|\gamma_{m+1}|} \right| = \left\| \Delta(y) + \frac{\sigma_{n_{m+1}}(\gamma_{m+1})}{|\gamma_{m+1}|} \Delta(e_{n_{m+1}}) \right\| = \left\| y + \frac{\gamma_{m+1}}{|\gamma_{m+1}|} e_{n_{m+1}} \right\| = 1 + |\gamma_{m+1}| > 1,
\]
and thus
\[
-\lambda_{m+1} + \frac{\gamma_{m+1}}{|\gamma_{m+1}|} = -\sigma_{n_{m+1}}(\lambda_{m+1}) + \frac{\sigma_{n_{m+1}}(\gamma_{m+1})}{|\gamma_{m+1}|} = 1 + |\gamma_{m+1}|,
\]
and in particular \(|\gamma_{m+1}| \leq |\lambda_{m+1}|\). Actually, for each \(j \geq m + 2\), the equality
\[
\left\| \Delta(y) + \frac{\sigma_{n_j}(\gamma_j)}{|\gamma_j|} \Delta(e_{n_j}) \right\| = \left\| y + \frac{\gamma_j}{|\gamma_j|} e_{n_j} \right\|
\]
implies that
\[
|\lambda_j + \frac{\gamma_j}{|\gamma_j|}| = 1 + |\gamma_j|,
\]
and in particular \(|\gamma_j| \leq |\lambda_j|\) for all \(j \geq m + 2\).

Now, we compute
\[
2|\lambda_{m+1}| = \|2\sigma_{n_{m+1}}(\lambda_{m+1}) \Delta(e_{n_{m+1}})\| = \| \Delta(x) - \Delta(y) \| = \| x - y \| = \max\{|\mu_j - \gamma_j| : j \geq m + 1\}.
\]
So, there exists \(j_0 \geq m + 1\) such that \(|\mu_{j_0} - \gamma_{j_0}| = 2|\lambda_{m+1}|\). We deduce from the assumptions that
\[
2|\lambda_{m+1}| = |\mu_{j_0} - \gamma_{j_0}| \leq |\mu_{j_0}| + |\gamma_{j_0}| \leq 2|\lambda_{j_0}| \leq 2|\lambda_{m+1}|,
\]
which proves that $|\lambda_{j_0}| = |\mu_{j_0}| = |\gamma_{j_0}| = |\lambda_{m+1}|$. Now, applying (6) we get

$$1 + |\lambda_{j_0}| = 1 + |\mu_{j_0}| = \left|\lambda_{j_0} + \frac{\mu_{j_0}}{|\mu_{j_0}|}\right|,$$

and thus $\mu_{j_0} = \lambda_{j_0}$. If $j_0 = m + 1$ we obtain $\mu_{m+1} = \lambda_{m+1}$, as desired.

If $j_0 \in \{m + 2, \ldots, k\}$, by applying (8) we deduce that $\mu_{j_0} = \gamma_{j_0}$. In this case the equation in (9) writes in the form

$$2|\lambda_{m+1}| = \|\Delta(x) - \Delta(y)\| = \|x - y\| = \max\{|\mu_j - \gamma_j| : j \geq m + 1, j \neq j_0\}.$$

Therefore, there exists $j_1 \in \{m + 1, \ldots, k\}$, $j_1 \neq j_0$ such that $2|\lambda_{m+1}| = |\mu_{j_1} - \gamma_{j_1}|$, and the previous arguments show that $\mu_{j_1} = \lambda_{j_1}$ and $|\lambda_{j_1}| = |\mu_{j_1}| = |\gamma_{j_1}| = |\lambda_{m+1}|$. If $j_1 = m + 1$ we have $\mu_{m+1} = \lambda_{m+1}$, otherwise it follows from (8) that $\mu_{j_1} = \lambda_{j_1} = \gamma_{j_1}$, and hence (9) writes in the form

$$2|\lambda_{m+1}| = \|\Delta(x) - \Delta(y)\| = \|x - y\| = \max\{|\mu_j - \gamma_j| : j \geq m + 1, j \neq j_0, j_1\}.$$

We therefore obtain $j_2 \in \{m + 1, \ldots, k\}$, $j_2 \neq j_0, j_1$ such that $2|\lambda_{m+1}| = |\mu_{j_2} - \gamma_{j_2}|$. Repeating the above arguments to $j_2$ we deduce that one of the next statement holds:

(1) $j_2 = m + 1$ and $\mu_{m+1} = \lambda_{m+1}$;
(2) There exist $j_3 \in \{m + 1, \ldots, k\}$, $j_3 \neq j_0, j_1, j_2$ such that $2|\lambda_{m+1}| = |\mu_{j_3} - \gamma_{j_3}|$.

By repeating this argument a finite number of steps we derive that $\lambda_{m+1} = \mu_{m+1}$.

Finally, the above arguments subsequently applied to $m + 2, \ldots, k$ give $\mu_j = \lambda_j$ for all $j \geq m + 1$.

\[\Box\]

**Theorem 3.8.** Let $\Gamma$ be an infinite set. The complex space $c_0(\Gamma)$ satisfies the Mazur-Ulam property, that is, given a Banach space $X$, every surjective isometry $\Delta : S(c_0(\Gamma)) \to S(X)$ admits a unique extension to a surjective real linear isometry from $c_0(\Gamma)$ to $X$; in particular $X$ is isometrically isomorphic to $c_0(\Gamma)$.

**Proof.** Let $\Delta : S(c_0(\Gamma)) \to S(X)$ be a surjective isometry. Corollary 3.5 assures that, for each finite subset $\Gamma_0 \subseteq \Gamma$ the set $\{\Delta(e_n) : n \in \Gamma_0\} \subseteq S(X)$ is completely $M$-orthogonal. For each $n \in \Gamma$, let $\sigma_n : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ be the mapping defined by Proposition 3.3 and (1).

We define a mapping $F : c_0(\Gamma) \to X$, given by

$$F(x) := \sum_{n \in \Gamma} \sigma_n(x(n)) \Delta(e_n).$$

We shall show that $F$ is well defined. For each $x \in c_0(\Gamma)$ there exists an at most countable subset $\Gamma_x$ such that $\{n \in \Gamma : x(n) \neq 0\} \subseteq \Gamma_x$ and $x = \sum_{n \in \Gamma_x} x(n)e_n$ and $(x(n))_{n \in \Gamma_x}$ can be regarded as a sequence in $c_0(\mathbb{N})$. Let us identify $\Gamma_x$ with $\mathbb{N}$. We claim that the sequence $\left(\sum_{1 \leq n \leq m} \sigma_n(x(n))\Delta(e_n)\right)$ is Cauchy. Namely, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|x(n)| < \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq n_0$ in $\Gamma_x$. Pick $m_1, m_2 \in \Gamma_x$ with $m_1 > m_2 \geq n_0$. Let $k_0 \in \{m_2 + 1, \ldots, m_1\}$ satisfying
we have can be literally applied to obtain our last result.

| \Delta : S(\ell_\infty^m) \to S(X) |

If |x(k_0)| > 0, then, by Proposition 3.7 we have

\[ |x(k_0)| \left| \sum_{1 \leq n \in \Gamma_x}^{m_1} \sigma_n(x(n)) \Delta(e_n) \right| = \left| x(k_0) \right| \left| \Delta \left( \sum_{1 \leq n \in \Gamma_x}^{m_1} \frac{x(n)}{|x(k_0)|^n} e_n \right) \right| = |x(k_0)| < \varepsilon. \]

Since \( \left( \sum_{1 \leq n \in \Gamma_x}^{m_1} \sigma_n(x(n)) \Delta(e_n) \right) \) is a Cauchy sequence and \( X \) is a Banach space, the mapping \( F \) is well defined, and it is clearly real linear.

The previous arguments also show, via Proposition 3.7, that for each \( x \in S(c_0(\Gamma)) \), and for each natural \( m \) with \( 1 = \|x\| = \max\{|x(k)| : 1 \leq k \leq m\} \), we have

\[ \left| \sum_{1 \leq n \in \Gamma_x}^{m_1} \sigma_n(x(n)) \Delta(e_n) \right| = \left| \Delta \left( \sum_{1 \leq n \in \Gamma_x}^{m_1} x(n) e_n \right) \right| = \left| \sum_{1 \leq n \in \Gamma_x}^{m_1} x(n) e_n \right| \leq \|x\| = 1. \]

Consequently, \( \|F(x)\| \leq \|x\| = 1 \), and thus \( F \) is continuous and contractive.

Proposition 3.7 implies that for every \( n_1, \ldots, n_k \in \Gamma \) and every \( \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{C} \) with \( \max\{|\lambda_1|, \ldots, |\lambda_k|\} = 1 \), we have

\[ \Delta \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_j e_{n_j} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sigma_{n_j}(\lambda_j) \Delta(e_{n_j}) = F \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_j e_{n_j} \right). \]

Since every element in \( S(c_0(\Gamma)) \) can be approximated in norm by elements in \( S(c_0(\Gamma)) \) which are of the form \( \sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_j e_{n_j} \) with \( \max\{|\lambda_1|, \ldots, |\lambda_k|\} = 1 \), we deduce from the fact that \( \Delta \) and \( F \) are continuous that \( F|_{S(c_0(\Gamma))} = \Delta \), witnessing the desired conclusion. \( \square \)

All technical results established above for \( \mathcal{L}^\infty(\Gamma) \) remain valid when this space is replaced with \( \ell_\infty^m \), so the above arguments in Theorem 3.8 can be literally applied to obtain our last result.

**Theorem 3.9.** The finite dimensional complex space \( \ell_\infty^m \) satisfies the Mazur-Ulam property, concretely, given a Banach space \( X \), every surjective isometry \( \Delta : S(\ell_\infty^m) \to S(X) \) admits a unique extension to a surjective real linear isometry from \( \ell_\infty^m \) to \( X \); in particular \( X \) is isometrically isomorphic to \( \ell_\infty^m \). \( \square \)
We conjecture that the complex spaces $\ell_\infty(\Gamma)$ and $C(K)$ also satisfy the Mazur-Ulam property, however our current technology is not enough to prove this affirmation.
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