

# GEOMETRY OF THE SPECTRAL SEMIDISTANCE IN BANACH ALGEBRAS

G. BRAATVEDT AND R. BRITS

**ABSTRACT.** Let  $A$  be a unital Banach algebra over  $\mathbb{C}$ , and suppose that the nonzero spectral values of, respectively,  $a$  and  $b \in A$  are discrete sets which cluster at  $0 \in \mathbb{C}$ , if anywhere. We develop a plane geometric formula for the spectral semidistance of  $a$  and  $b$  which depends on the two spectra, and the orthogonality relationships between the corresponding sets of Riesz projections associated with the nonzero spectral values. Extending a result of Brits and Raubenheimer, it is further shown that  $a$  and  $b$  are quasinilpotent equivalent if and only if all the Riesz projections,  $p(\alpha, a)$  and  $p(\alpha, b)$ , correspond. For certain important classes of decomposable operators (compact, Riesz, etc.) the proposed formula reduces the involvement of the underlying Banach space  $X$  in the computation of the spectral semidistance, and appears to be a useful alternative to Vasilescu's geometric formula (which requires knowledge of the local spectra of the operators at each  $0 \neq x \in X$ ). The apparent advantage gained through the use of a global spectral parameter in the formula aside, the various methods of complex analysis could then be employed to deal with the spectral projections; we give examples illustrating the utility of the main results.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $A$  denote a complex Banach algebra with identity  $\mathbf{1}$ . For  $a, b \in A$  associate operators  $L_a$ ,  $R_b$ , and  $C_{a,b}$ , acting on  $A$ , by the relations

$$L_a x = ax, \quad R_b x = xb, \quad \text{and} \quad C_{a,b} x = (L_a - R_b)x \quad \text{for each } x \in A.$$

Since  $L_a$  and  $R_b$  commute it is easy that

$$C_{a,b}^n x = \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} a^{n-k} x b^k \quad \text{for each } x \in A,$$

with the convention that, if  $0 \neq a \in A$ , then  $a^0 = \mathbf{1}$ . Using the particular value  $x = \mathbf{1}$ , define  $\varrho : A \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$(1.1) \quad \varrho(a, b) = \limsup_n \|C_{a,b}^n \mathbf{1}\|^{1/n},$$

and then define

$$(1.2) \quad \rho(a, b) = \sup\{\varrho(a, b), \varrho(b, a)\}.$$

If  $X$  is a Banach space, and  $A = \mathcal{L}(X)$ , the Banach algebra of bounded linear operators from  $X$  into  $X$ , then the number  $\varrho(S, T)$  is a well-established quantity called the *local spectral radius* [5, p.235] of the commutator  $C_{S,T} \in \mathcal{L}(A)$  at  $I$ .

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46H05, 47A05, 47A10.

*Key words and phrases.* asymptotically intertwined, Riesz projections, spectral semidistance, quasinilpotent equivalent.

The number  $\rho(S, T)$  is called the *spectral distance* [5, p.251] of the operators  $S$  and  $T$ . Furthermore, the pair  $(S, T)$  is said to be *asymptotically intertwined* [5, p.248] by the identity,  $I$ , if  $\varrho(S, T) = 0$ . If each of the pairs  $(S, T)$  and  $(T, S)$  is asymptotically intertwined by the identity operator (i.e.  $\rho(S, T) = 0$ ), then  $S$  and  $T$  are called *quasinilpotent equivalent* [5, p.253]. A first generalization in the framework of Banach algebras on topics related to the commutator appeared in Section III.4 of the monograph [8]. In the paper [7]  $\rho$  is called the *spectral semidistance* which is perhaps a little more appropriate in view of the fact that  $\rho$  is only a semimetric [5, Proposition 3.4.9]. One may think of the spectral semidistance as a noncommutative generalization of the distance induced by the spectral radius when  $a$  and  $b$  do commute. Again, if  $\rho(a, b) = 0$ , then  $a$  and  $b$  are said to be *quasinilpotent equivalent*. A good source of results on the topic of the spectral (semi)distance is Laursen and Neumann's recent monograph [5]; the Reader may also want to look at [2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10]. We should mention the following simple but useful property of  $\varrho$  and  $\rho$  which appears explicitly in [2, Lemma 2.2]: If  $q_a$  and  $q_b$  are quasinilpotent elements of  $A$  commuting with, respectively,  $a$  and  $b$ , then  $\varrho(a, b) = \varrho(a + q_a, b + q_b)$ .

The results in the present paper are related to Vasilescu's geometric formula [10] for the spectral semidistance of decomposable operators  $S, T \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ :

$$\rho(S, T) = \sup\{\max\{\text{dist}(\lambda, \sigma_T(x)), \text{dist}(\mu, \sigma_S(x))\} : x \neq 0, \lambda \in \sigma_S(x), \mu \in \sigma_T(x)\}$$

where  $\sigma_S(x)$  and  $\sigma_T(x)$  are, respectively, the local spectra of  $S$  and  $T$  at  $x \in X$ . The usual spectrum of  $a \in A$  will be denoted by  $\sigma(a, A)$ , the “nonzero” spectrum,  $\sigma(a, A) \setminus \{0\}$ , by  $\sigma'(a, A)$ , and the spectral radius of  $a \in A$  by  $r_\sigma(a, A)$ . Whenever there is no ambiguity we shall omit the  $A$  in  $\sigma$  and  $r_\sigma$ .

If  $a \in A$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$  is not an accumulation point of  $\sigma(a)$ , then let  $\Gamma_\alpha$  be a small circle, disjoint from  $\sigma(a)$ , and isolating  $\alpha$  from the remaining spectrum of  $a$ . We denote by

$$p(\alpha, a) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_\alpha} (\lambda \mathbf{1} - a)^{-1} d\lambda$$

the *Riesz projection associated with  $a$  and  $\alpha$* . If  $\alpha \notin \sigma(a)$ , then, by Cauchy's Theorem,  $p(\alpha, a) = 0$ . For Riesz projections  $p(\alpha_1, a)$  and  $p(\alpha_2, a)$ , with  $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$ , the Functional Calculus implies that  $p(\alpha_1, a)p(\alpha_2, a) = p(\alpha_2, a)p(\alpha_1, a) = 0$ .

We recall the following well-known “spectral decomposition” (see [1, p.21]) from the Theory of Banach algebras:

**Lemma 1.1.** *Suppose  $a \in A$  has  $\sigma(a) = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ . Then  $a$  has the representation*

$$a = \lambda_1 p_1 + \dots + \lambda_n p_n + r_a$$

where  $p_i = p(\lambda_i, a)$ ,  $\sum p_i = \mathbf{1}$ , and  $r_a$  is a quasinilpotent element belonging to the bicommutant of  $a$ .

It is worthwhile to mention here a curious connection which relates  $\varrho$  to the growth characteristics of a certain entire map from  $\mathbb{C}$  into  $A$ : Let  $f$  be an entire  $A$ -valued function. Then  $f$  has an everywhere convergent power series expansion

$$f(\lambda) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \lambda^n,$$

with coefficients  $a_n$  belonging to  $A$ . Define a function  $M_f(r) = \sup_{|\lambda| \leq r} \|f(\lambda)\|$ ,  $r > 0$ . The function  $f$  is said to be of *finite order* if there exists  $K > 0$  and  $R > 0$  such that  $M_f(r) < e^{r^K}$  holds for all  $r > R$ . The infimum of the set of positive real numbers,  $K$ , such that the preceding inequality holds is called the *order* of  $f$ , denoted by  $\omega_f$ . If  $\omega_f = 1$  then  $f$  is said to be of *exponential order*. Suppose  $f$  is entire, and of finite order  $\omega := \omega_f$ . Then  $f$  is said to be of *finite type* if there exists  $L > 0$  and  $R > 0$  such that  $M_f(r) < e^{Lr^\omega}$  holds for all  $r > R$ . The infimum of the set of positive real numbers,  $L$ , such that the preceding inequality holds is called the *type* of  $f$ , denoted by  $\tau_f$ . It is known (see the monograph [6, p.41]) that the order and type are given by the formulas

$$\omega_f = \limsup_n \left( \frac{n \log n}{\log \|a_n\|^{-1}} \right) \text{ and } \tau_f = \frac{1}{e\omega_f} \limsup_n \left( n \sqrt[n]{\|a_n\|^{\omega_f}} \right).$$

Concerning the formula for  $\tau_f$ , we remark that if  $f$  is of order 0 and finite type, then it follows directly from the definition, together with Liouville's Theorem, that  $f$  must be constant.

Let  $a, b \in A$ , and define

$$f : \lambda \mapsto e^{\lambda a} e^{-\lambda b}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}.$$

The corresponding series expansion, valid for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , is given by

$$f(\lambda) = e^{\lambda a} e^{-\lambda b} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^n C_{a,b}^n \mathbf{1}}{n!}.$$

Since  $\|f(\lambda)\| \leq e^{(\|a\| + \|b\|)|\lambda|}$ , for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , it is immediate, from the definition, that  $f$  is of order at most one. Suppose we know that  $f$  is of exponential order (i.e.  $\omega_f = 1$ ). Recall now, using Stirling's formula, that  $\lim_n n(1/n!)^{1/n} = e$ , from which we subsequently obtain

$$\tau_f = \frac{1}{e} \limsup_n \left( n(1/n!)^{1/n} \|C_{a,b}^n \mathbf{1}\|^{1/n} \right) = \varrho(a, b).$$

To start with, we give a really brief argument, using these ideas, which quickly leads to (an improvement of) the main result in Section 4 of [2].

**Theorem 1.2.** *If  $\sigma(a)$  and  $\sigma(b)$  are finite, then  $\varrho(a, b) = 0$  if and only if  $a - r_a = b - r_b$  where  $r_a$  and  $r_b$  are quasinilpotent elements commuting with  $a$  and  $b$  respectively.*

*Proof.* The reverse implication is trivial as in [2]. With Lemma 1.1 we can write  $a - r_a = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j p_j$  and  $b - r_b = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j q_j$ . Denote  $\bar{a} = a - r_a$ ,  $\bar{b} = b - r_b$ , and define  $f(\lambda) = e^{\lambda \bar{a}} e^{-\lambda \bar{b}}$ . Notice, since  $\sum_{j=1}^n p_j = \mathbf{1}$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^k q_j = \mathbf{1}$ , and using the orthogonality, we have

$$(1.3) \quad f(\lambda) = \left[ \mathbf{1} + \sum_{j=1}^n (e^{\lambda_j \lambda} - 1) p_j \right] \left[ \mathbf{1} + \sum_{j=1}^k (e^{-\beta_j \lambda} - 1) q_j \right] = \sum_{i,j} e^{(\lambda_i - \beta_j) \lambda} p_i q_j.$$

Fix any  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  such that  $p_i q_j \neq 0$ , and define

$$g_{i,j}(\lambda) = p_i f(\lambda) q_j = e^{(\lambda_i - \beta_j) \lambda} p_i q_j.$$

Let us assume  $\lambda_i \neq \beta_j$ . If we notice, using Stirling's formula, that  $\lim_n \frac{n \log n}{\log n!} = 1$ , then the coefficient formula for the order applied to the representation  $g_{i,j}(\lambda) = e^{(\lambda_i - \beta_j)\lambda} p_i q_j$  shows that  $g_{i,j}$  is of exponential order. But now, on the one hand, using the submultiplicative norm inequality, the representation

$$g_{i,j}(\lambda) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^n p_i \left( C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m \mathbf{1} \right) q_j}{n!}$$

gives the type of  $g_{i,j}$  as  $\varrho(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = \varrho(a, b) = 0$ , and on the other, the representation  $g_{i,j}(\lambda) = e^{(\lambda_i - \beta_j)\lambda} p_i q_j$  says the type is equal to  $|\lambda_i - \beta_j| \neq 0$ . From this contradiction we may conclude that, for each pair  $i, j$ , either  $p_i q_j = 0$  or  $\lambda_i = \beta_j$ . It then follows from (1.3) that  $f$  is constant, so that  $f(\lambda) = e^{\lambda \bar{a}} e^{-\lambda \bar{b}} = \mathbf{1}$  for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . Differentiation finally gives  $\bar{a} = \bar{b}$ .  $\square$

## 2. GEOMETRY OF $\varrho$

To obtain the main result, Theorem 2.5, we first need to establish the formula in the case where  $\sigma(a)$  and  $\sigma(b)$  are finite sets. As in the proof of Theorem 1.2, using Lemma 1.1, we can then write  $a = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i p_i + r_a$  and  $b = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j q_j + r_b$ . Setting  $\bar{a} = a - r_a$  and  $\bar{b} = b - r_b$ , we obtain the following:

**Lemma 2.1.** *Suppose  $\sigma(a)$  and  $\sigma(b)$  are finite. Then there exists a finite dimensional Banach space  $X \subseteq A$  such that  $\varrho(a, b) = r_\sigma(L_{\bar{a}} - R_{\bar{b}}, \mathcal{L}(X))$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  denote the normed space spanned by the set

$$Y = \{p_i^r q_j^t : i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}, r \in \{0, 1\}, t \in \{0, 1\}\}.$$

It is elementary that  $L_{\bar{a}}$  and  $R_{\bar{b}}$  belong to  $\mathcal{L}(X)$ . Without loss of generality we may assume  $Y$  constitutes a linearly independent set of vectors. Since  $X$  has finite dimension there exist  $K_1, K_2 > 0$  such that if  $x$  is a linear combination of elements in  $Y$  with coefficients  $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_s$  then

$$K_1(|\gamma_0| + \dots + |\gamma_s|) \leq \|x\| \leq K_2(|\gamma_0| + \dots + |\gamma_s|).$$

Obviously we may take  $K_2$  as

$$K_2 = \sup\{\|p_i\| \|q_j\| + 1 : i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}\}.$$

So for  $x \in X$  given by, say

$$x = \gamma_0 \mathbf{1} + \gamma_1 p_1 + \gamma_2 q_1 + \gamma_3 p_1 q_1 + \dots + \gamma_s p_n q_k$$

it follows that

$$C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m x = \gamma_0 [C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m \mathbf{1}] + \gamma_1 p_1 [C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m \mathbf{1}] + \gamma_2 [C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m \mathbf{1}] q_1 + \dots + \gamma_s p_n [C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m \mathbf{1}] q_k,$$

and thus that

$$\begin{aligned} \|C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m x\| &\leq (|\gamma_0| + |\gamma_1| \|p_1\| + |\gamma_2| \|q_1\| + \dots + |\gamma_s| \|p_n\| \|q_k\|) \|C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m \mathbf{1}\| \\ &\leq K_2(|\gamma_0| + |\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2| + \dots + |\gamma_s|) \|C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m \mathbf{1}\| \\ &\leq K_2 K_1^{-1} \|x\| \|C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m \mathbf{1}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over all  $x$  of norm 1 we see that

$$\|C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m\| \leq K_2 K_1^{-1} \|C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m \mathbf{1}\|$$

holds for each  $m$ . So it follows that

$$r_\sigma(L_{\bar{a}} - R_{\bar{b}}, \mathcal{L}(X)) = \limsup_m \|C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m\|^{1/m} \leq \limsup_m \|C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m \mathbf{1}\|^{1/m} = \varrho(\bar{a}, \bar{b}).$$

On the other hand it follows trivially, from  $\|C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m \mathbf{1}\| \leq \|C_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}^m\|$ , that  $\varrho(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \leq r_\sigma(L_{\bar{a}} - R_{\bar{b}}, \mathcal{L}(X))$ , and hence  $\varrho(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = r_\sigma(L_{\bar{a}} - R_{\bar{b}}, \mathcal{L}(X))$ . But of course  $\varrho(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = \varrho(a, b)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2.** *Suppose  $\sigma(a)$  and  $\sigma(b)$  are finite with  $\sigma(a) = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ ,  $\sigma(b) = \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k\}$ . If  $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  and  $\{q_1, \dots, q_k\}$  are the corresponding Riesz projections then*

$$(2.1) \quad \varrho(a, b) = \sup\{|\lambda_i - \beta_j| : p_i q_j \neq 0\}.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.1 we have that

$$(2.2) \quad \varrho(a, b) = r_\sigma \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i L_{p_i} - \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i R_{q_i}, \mathcal{L}(X) \right)$$

The preceding formula remains valid if we scale down to the commutative unital subalgebra generated by the  $L_{p_i}$  and the  $R_{q_i}$ . Notice that  $\sum_i L_{p_i} = I$ , and  $\sum_i R_{q_i} = I$ . From this, together with the fact that the  $L_{p_i}$  are mutually orthogonal, and the  $R_{q_i}$  are mutually orthogonal, we now have the following: Corresponding to each  $\chi$  belonging to the character space of the algebra there exists a unique pair, say  $L_{p_t}$  and  $R_{q_s}$ , such that  $\chi(L_{p_t}) = 1 = \chi(R_{q_s})$  and  $\chi(L_{p_i}) = 0 = \chi(R_{q_j})$  whenever  $i \neq t, j \neq s$ . Conversely, if the product  $p_t q_s \neq 0$ , then the projection  $L_{p_t} R_{q_s} \neq 0$  and hence there is  $\chi$  such that  $\chi(L_{p_t} R_{q_s}) = 1$ . So, for each of the two projections, we have  $\chi(L_{p_t}) = 1 = \chi(R_{q_s})$ . With these observations (2.2) gives the formula (2.1).  $\square$

It is not obvious from (1.1) that  $\varrho$  is not symmetric (see the comments in [5, p.251] regarding this matter). However, Theorem 2.2 prescribes the construction of  $a, b$  such that  $\varrho(a, b) \neq \varrho(b, a)$ ; the formula (2.1) suggests that one should look for Riesz projections, say  $p$  and  $q$ , such that  $pq \neq 0$  but  $qp = 0$ :

**Example 2.3.** Let  $A$  be the free algebra generated by the alphabet  $\{\mathbf{1}, x_1, x_2\}$ , subject to the conditions  $x_1^2 = x_1$ ,  $x_2^2 = x_2$ ,  $x_1 x_2 = 0$  and  $x_2 x_1 \neq 0$ .  $A$  is a Banach algebra with

$$\|\alpha_0 \mathbf{1} + \alpha_1 x_1 + \alpha_2 x_2 + \alpha_3 x_2 x_1\| = \sum_j |\alpha_j|.$$

Now take  $a = \frac{1}{2}x_1$  and  $b = -\frac{1}{2}x_2$ . Then

$$C_{a,b}^n \mathbf{1} = \frac{1}{2^n} (x_1 + x_2) \Rightarrow \|C_{a,b}^n \mathbf{1}\| = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \Rightarrow \varrho(a, b) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} C_{b,a}^n \mathbf{1} &= \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^n \left[ \binom{n}{0} x_2 + \binom{n}{1} x_2 x_1 + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} x_2 x_1 + \binom{n}{n} x_1 \right] \\ &\Rightarrow \|C_{b,a}^n \mathbf{1}\| = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} = 1 \Rightarrow \varrho(b, a) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

For a more concrete exposition, notice that  $A$  in Example 2.3 is isomorphic to a four-dimensional subalgebra of  $M_3(\mathbb{C})$ , the algebra of  $3 \times 3$  complex matrices.

**Theorem 2.4.** *Suppose  $\sigma'(a)$  and  $\sigma'(b)$  are discrete sets which cluster at  $0 \in \mathbb{C}$ , if anywhere. If  $\sigma'(a) = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots\}$  and  $\sigma'(b) = \{\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots\}$  denote the nonzero spectral points of  $a$  and  $b$ , and if  $\{p_1, p_2, \dots\}$  and  $\{q_1, q_2, \dots\}$  are the corresponding Riesz projections, then  $\varrho$  takes at least one of the following values:*

- (i)  $\varrho(a, b) = \sup\{|\lambda_i - \beta_j| : p_i q_j \neq 0\}$ , or
- (ii)  $\varrho(a, b) = |\lambda_i|$  for some  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , or
- (iii)  $\varrho(a, b) = |\beta_i|$  for some  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Moreover,  $\varrho(a, b) = 0$  if and only if the spectra and the corresponding Riesz projections of  $a$  and  $b$  coincide.

*Proof.* We prove the result where both  $\sigma(a)$  and  $\sigma(b)$  are infinite sets; the other cases follow similarly: For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $a_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i p_i$  and  $b_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i q_i$ , and put  $p_{0,n} = \mathbf{1} - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i$ ,  $q_{0,n} = \mathbf{1} - \sum_{i=1}^n q_i$ . As  $\sigma(a)$ ,  $\sigma(b)$  are assumed to be infinite, we must have  $p_{0,n} \neq 0$ ,  $q_{0,n} \neq 0$ . Note that  $\sigma(a_n) = \{\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$  with  $\lambda_0 = 0$  and similarly  $\sigma(b_n) = \{\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}$  with  $\beta_0 = 0$  (because  $a_n p_{0,n} = 0$  and  $b_n q_{0,n} = 0$  respectively). Further, for each  $n$ , let  $\Gamma_{a,n}$  be a simple closed curve, disjoint from  $\sigma(a)$ , and surrounding only the subset  $\{\lambda_{n+1}, \lambda_{n+2}, \dots\} \cup \{0\} \subset \sigma(a)$ . If we notice that, for each  $n$ ,

$$a = \sum_{i=1}^n a p_i + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{a,n}} \lambda (\lambda \mathbf{1} - a)^{-1} d\lambda,$$

and that  $a_n$  commutes with  $a$ , then it follows that  $\sigma(a - a_n) \subseteq \{\lambda_{n+1}, \lambda_{n+2}, \dots\} \cup \{0\}$ , and hence  $r_\sigma(a - a_n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In the same way it follows that  $r_\sigma(b - b_n) \rightarrow 0$ . Using the triangle inequality for  $\varrho$ , together with the fact that  $\varrho(x, y) = r_\sigma(x - y)$  whenever  $x$  and  $y$  commute, we then obtain

$$|\varrho(a_n, b_n) - \varrho(a, b)| \leq r_\sigma(a - a_n) + r_\sigma(b - b_n),$$

whence it follows that  $\varrho(a, b) = \lim_n \varrho(a_n, b_n)$ . We now want to use Theorem 2.2 to calculate  $\varrho(a_n, b_n)$ ; this requires knowledge of the Riesz projections  $p(\lambda_i, a_n)$  and  $p(\beta_i, b_n)$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ : Observe, for  $\lambda \notin \sigma(a_n)$ , that

$$(\lambda \mathbf{1} - a_n)^{-1} = \frac{1}{\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda(\lambda - \lambda_i)} p_i.$$

So it follows from the Cauchy Integral Formula, and the Cauchy Integral Theorem, that for each  $0 < i \leq n$ ,  $p(\lambda_i, a_n) = p_i$ . A similar argument yields  $p(\beta_i, b_n) = q_i$  when  $0 < i \leq n$ . It is then obvious that  $p(\lambda_0, a_n) = p_{0,n}$  and  $p(\beta_0, b_n) = q_{0,n}$ . Define, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} U_{1,n} &= \{|\lambda_i - \beta_j| : p_i q_j \neq 0, i, j = 1, \dots, n\}, \\ U_{2,n} &= \{|\lambda_i| : p_i q_{0,n} \neq 0, i = 1, \dots, n\}, \\ U_{3,n} &= \{|\beta_i| : p_{0,n} q_i \neq 0, i = 1, \dots, n\}, \end{aligned}$$

and  $U_n = \cup_{j=1}^3 U_{j,n}$ . If we keep  $n$  fixed for the moment, writing  $p_0 = p_{0,n}$ ,  $q_0 = q_{0,n}$ , then, by Theorem 2.2, we obtain

$$(2.3) \quad \varrho(a_n, b_n) = \sup\{|\lambda_i - \beta_j| : p_i q_j \neq 0, i, j = 0, 1, \dots, n\} = \sup U_n.$$

Notice that  $U_n \neq \emptyset$ , because if  $U_{1,n} = \emptyset$ , then, for instance,  $p_1 q_j = 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$  so that  $p_1 q_{0,n} = p_1 \neq 0$  whence  $|\lambda_1| \in U_{2,n} \subseteq U_n$ . Having established (2.3), we are now in a position to derive the conclusion of Theorem 2.4. We shall first prove the statement that  $\varrho(a, b) = 0$  if and only if the spectra and the corresponding Riesz

projections of  $a$  and  $b$  coincide: For the reverse implication notice that we can take  $a_n = b_n$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus  $\varrho(a, b) = \lim_n \varrho(a_n, b_n) = 0$ . Suppose, conversely, that  $\varrho(a, b) = 0$ . First let us remark that for each index  $i_*$  we can find an index  $j_*$  such that  $p_{i_*} q_{j_*} \neq 0$ ; if this was not true, i.e.  $p_{i_*} q_j = 0$  for all  $j$ , then we may infer that  $0 \neq p_{i_*} = p_{i_*} q_{0,n}$  for all  $n \geq i_*$ . But this means that  $|\lambda_{i_*}| \in U_{2,n} \subseteq U_n$  for all  $n \geq i_*$  which in turn implies  $\varrho(a, b) = \lim_n \sup U_n \geq |\lambda_{i_*}| > 0$ , contradicting  $\varrho(a, b) = 0$ . We therefore have the implication:

$$(2.4) \quad \varrho(a, b) = 0 \Rightarrow W := \{|\lambda_i - \beta_j| : p_i q_j \neq 0\} \neq \emptyset.$$

We proceed to prove  $\sigma(a) = \sigma(b)$ . Since the spectra of both  $a$  and  $b$  are infinite, the hypothesis implies  $0 \in \sigma(a) \cap \sigma(b)$ . For a contradiction, suppose that  $0 \neq \lambda_{i_*} \in \sigma(a)$  but  $\lambda_{i_*} \notin \sigma(b)$ . Then, as in the paragraph preceding (2.4), we can find an index  $j_*$  such that  $p_{i_*} q_{j_*} \neq 0$ . If  $n \geq \max\{i_*, j_*\}$  is arbitrary, then  $|\lambda_{i_*} - \beta_{j_*}| \in U_{1,n} \subseteq U_n$  from which

$$\varrho(a, b) = \limsup_n U_n \geq |\lambda_{i_*} - \beta_{j_*}| \geq \text{dist}(\lambda_{i_*}, \sigma(b)) > 0$$

giving the required contradiction. Therefore  $\sigma(a) \subseteq \sigma(b)$ . Similarly  $\sigma(b) \subseteq \sigma(a)$ , and we have  $\sigma(a) = \sigma(b)$ . It remains to show that the Riesz projections,  $p(\lambda_{i_*}, a) =: p_{i_*}$  and  $p(\lambda_{i_*}, b) =: q_{i_*}$ , corresponding to a common nonzero spectral value  $\lambda_{i_*} \in \sigma(a) = \sigma(b)$ , are in fact equal: First observe that  $\sup W = 0$ ; indeed if for some indices  $i_*, j_*$  we have  $0 \neq |\lambda_{i_*} - \lambda_{j_*}| \in W$ , then  $|\lambda_{i_*} - \lambda_{j_*}| \in U_{1,n}$  for all  $n \geq \max\{i_*, j_*\}$ , and hence, as before,  $\varrho(a, b) > 0$  which is absurd. If we fix an index  $i_*$ , then  $p_{i_*} q_j = 0$  whenever  $j \neq i_*$  because otherwise  $p_{i_*} q_j \neq 0$  implies  $|\lambda_{i_*} - \lambda_j| \in W$ , forcing  $\lambda_{i_*} = \lambda_j$ , which is possible only if  $j = i_*$  (as the points in the spectrum are distinct). Therefore

$$p_{i_*} - p_{i_*} q_{i_*} = p_{i_*} q_{0,n} = p_{i_*} \left( \mathbf{1} - \sum_{j=1}^n q_j \right) \text{ for all } n \geq i_*.$$

Now if  $p_{i_*} \neq p_{i_*} q_{i_*}$ , then  $\varrho(a_n, b_n) \geq |\lambda_{i_*}|$  for all  $n \geq i_*$ , which again leads to  $\varrho(a, b) \geq |\lambda_{i_*}| > 0$ . So we conclude that  $p_{i_*} = p_{i_*} q_{i_*}$ . A similar argument, using the sets  $U_{3,n}$  instead, gives  $q_{i_*} = p_{i_*} q_{i_*}$ , and thus  $p_{i_*} = q_{i_*}$ . We have now shown that  $\varrho(a, b) = 0$  if and only if the spectra and the corresponding Riesz projections of  $a$  and  $b$  coincide.

For the remaining part of the statement: If  $\varrho(a, b) = 0$ , then (2.4) says  $W \neq \emptyset$ , and, as we have shown,  $\sup W = 0$ ; hence (i) is valid. Suppose that  $\varrho(a, b) > 0$  and that  $\sup W < \lim_n \sup U_n$  (if  $W = \emptyset$  we let  $\sup W = 0$ ). If we set  $\tau_n = \sup(U_{2,n} \cup U_{3,n})$ , then  $\lim_n \sup U_n = \lim_n \tau_n$  whence it follows that there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\tau_n > \sup W$  for all  $n \geq N$ . In particular, we can build either a sequence  $(\lambda_{i,n_k})$  whose members belong to  $\sigma'(a)$ , or a sequence  $(\beta_{j,n_k})$  whose members belong to  $\sigma'(b)$ , such that  $|\lambda_{i,n_k}| = \tau_{n_k}$  or  $|\beta_{j,n_k}| = \tau_{n_k}$ , and  $\lim_k |\lambda_{i,n_k}| = \lim_n \sup U_n$  or  $\lim_k |\beta_{j,n_k}| = \lim_n \sup U_n$ . To avoid trivial misunderstanding, the notation indicates that these sequences are not subsequences of, respectively,  $(\lambda_i)$  and  $(\beta_j)$  but, rather, sequences constructed by extracting individual members of the sets  $\sigma'(a)$  and  $\sigma'(b)$  (i.e. repetition of terms may occur). Anyhow, if we assume the existence of the sequence  $(\lambda_{i,n_k})$  satisfying the aforementioned properties, then, since  $\lim_n \sup U_n > 0$ , it follows that the sequence  $(|\lambda_{i,n_k}|)$  must eventually be constant (because the spectrum of  $a$  clusters only at  $0 \in \sigma(a)$ ). This means there exists an index,  $i_*$ , such that  $\lim_n \sup U_n = |\lambda_{i_*}|$  and hence that  $\varrho(a, b) = |\lambda_{i_*}|$ , so

that (ii) holds. If the sequence  $(\lambda_{i,n_k})$  cannot be found, then a similar argument, with the sequence  $(\beta_{j,n_k})$ , shows that (iii) holds.  $\square$

For elements  $a, b \in A$  satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 2.4 it follows that  $\varrho(a, b) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \varrho(b, a) = 0$  which simplifies the requirement for quasinilpotent equivalence. The proof of Theorem 2.4 also establishes a formula for  $\varrho$ : Let us assume the hypothesis of Theorem 2.4, where both  $\sigma(a)$  and  $\sigma(b)$  are infinite sets. Define, as in the proof of Theorem 2.4,

$$W := \{|\lambda_i - \beta_j| : p_i q_j \neq 0\}.$$

If  $W = \emptyset$ , then the proof of Theorem 2.4 shows that, for each  $n$ , we have  $\varrho(a_n, b_n) = \sup\{r_\sigma(a_n), r_\sigma(b_n)\}$ . Therefore

$$\varrho(a, b) = \lim_n \varrho(a_n, b_n) = \lim_n \sup\{r_\sigma(a_n), r_\sigma(b_n)\} = \sup\{r_\sigma(a), r_\sigma(b)\}.$$

Suppose now  $W \neq \emptyset$ . If for some index  $k$  we have  $|\lambda_k| > \sup W$  then, since  $\lim_j \beta_j = 0$ , there exists  $N > 0$  such that  $p_k q_j = 0$  for all  $j \geq N$ ; if this was not true then some subsequence, say  $(q_{j_m})$ , of  $(q_j)$  satisfies  $p_k q_{j_m} \neq 0$  for each  $m$ . But then, by definition,  $|\lambda_k - \beta_{j_m}| \in W$  for each  $m$ . Letting  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , so that  $\beta_{j_m} \rightarrow 0$ , we see that  $\sup W \geq |\lambda_k|$  contradicting the assumption. So for any index  $k$  satisfying  $|\lambda_k| > \sup W$  we have that  $\lim_n \sum_{j=1}^n p_k q_j =: \sum_{j=1}^\infty p_k q_j$  exists in  $A$ . Moreover, in the same way we can prove that if  $|\beta_k| > \sup W$  then  $\sum_{j=1}^\infty p_j q_k$  exists in  $A$ . Thus, if  $W \neq \emptyset$ , we may define:

$$W_\lambda := \left\{ |\lambda_k| : |\lambda_k| > \sup W \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^\infty p_k q_j \neq p_k \right\},$$

$$W_\beta := \left\{ |\beta_k| : |\beta_k| > \sup W \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^\infty p_j q_k \neq q_k \right\}.$$

The arguments leading to Theorem 2.4 now proves the following formula:

**Theorem 2.5** (global spectral formula for  $\varrho$ ). *With the hypothesis of Theorem 2.4 (where both  $\sigma(a)$  and  $\sigma(b)$  are infinite sets), we have*

$$\varrho(a, b) = \begin{cases} \sup W \cup W_\lambda \cup W_\beta & \text{if } W \neq \emptyset \\ \sup\{r_\sigma(a), r_\sigma(b)\} & \text{if } W = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

We may remark that if both  $\sigma(a)$  and  $\sigma(b)$  are finite sets then the formula in Theorem 2.2 applies. If one spectrum is infinite ( $\sigma(a)$ ), and the other finite ( $\sigma(b)$ ), then one can easily adjust the formula in Theorem 2.4: Specifically, if  $\sigma(b)$  is finite, then every spectral value has a corresponding Riesz projection whence the set  $W_\lambda$  becomes redundant with its role being taken over by an adjusted version of the set  $W$  (where  $q_0$  is the Riesz projection corresponding to  $\beta_0 = 0$ ). To deal with the cluster point  $0 \in \sigma(a)$  one needs a limiting process, as in the proof of Theorem 2.4, which necessitates the definition of  $W_\beta$ .

To illustrate the implementation as well as the practical value of Theorem 2.5 consider the following:

**Example 2.6.** With the usual understanding, let  $X$  be the Banach space  $L^1[1, \infty)$ . Given  $f \in X$  define noncommuting  $T, S \in \mathcal{L}(X)$  by

$$(Tf)(t) = \frac{f(t)}{k} \quad \text{if } t \in [k, k+1), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}$$



and

$$(Sf)(t) = \begin{cases} f(t) & \text{if } t \in [1, 2) \\ [f(t) + f(t - k + 1)]/k^2 & \text{if } t \in [k, k + 1), 1 < k \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases}$$

It is straightforward to calculate  $\sigma(T) = \{\frac{1}{k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0\}$ , and  $\sigma(S) = \{\frac{1}{k^2} : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0\}$ . Write  $p(\frac{1}{k}, T) =: P_k$  and  $p(\frac{1}{k^2}, S) =: Q_k$ . If  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $f \in X$  then it follows readily, by Cauchy's formula, that:

- (1)  $(P_k f)(t) = \chi_{[k, k+1)}(t) f(t)$ ,
- (2)  $Q_1 = P_1$ ,
- (3)  $(Q_k f)(t) = \chi_{[k, k+1)}(t) \left[ f(t) + \frac{f(t - k + 1)}{1 - k^2} \right] \quad (k \neq 1)$ .

Then  $P_k Q_l = Q_l$  if  $k = l$ , and  $P_k Q_l = 0$  if  $k \neq l$ . In terms of Theorem 2.5, we observe that  $W = \{\frac{1}{k} - \frac{1}{k^2} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ ,  $W_\lambda = \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}\}$ , and  $W_\beta = \emptyset$ . Thus  $\varrho(T, S) = \frac{1}{2}$ . Also,  $Q_k P_l = P_l$  if  $k = l$ , and  $Q_k P_l = 0$  if  $k \neq l$  implies that  $\varrho(S, T) = \frac{1}{2}$ . So  $\rho(T, S) = \frac{1}{2}$ .

#### REFERENCES

1. *H. Alexander and J. Wermer*: Several complex variables and Banach algebras, Springer-Verlag, 1998. Zbl 0894.46037, MR 1482798
2. *R. Brits and H. Raubenheimer*: Finite spectra and quasinilpotent equivalence in Banach algebras. Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal **62** (2012), 1101–1116. Zbl 1274.46094, MR 3010259
3. *I. Colojară and C. Foiaş*: Quasinilpotent equivalence of not necessarily commuting operators. J. Math. Mech. **15** (1966), 521–540. Zbl 0138.07701, MR 0192344
4. *C. Foiaş and F.-H. Vasilescu*: On the spectral theory of commutators. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **31** (1970), 473–486. Zbl 0175.13604, MR 0290146
5. *K.B. Laursen and M.M. Neumann*: An introduction to local spectral theory. Oxford University Press, 2000. Zbl 0957.47004, MR 1747914
6. *B. Ya. Levin*: Lectures on entire functions. AMS 1996. Zbl 0856.30001, MR 1400006
7. *M. Razpet*: The quasinilpotent equivalence in Banach algebras. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **166** (1992), 378–385. Zbl 0802.46064, MR 1160933
8. *F.-H. Vasilescu*: Analytic Functional Calculus and Spectral Decompositions. Editura Academiei and D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1982. Zbl 0495.47013, MR 0690957
9. *F.-H. Vasilescu*: Some properties of the commutator of two operators. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **23** (1968), 440–446. Zbl 0159.43402, MR 0229078
10. *F.-H. Vasilescu*: Spectral distance of two operators. Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl. **12** (1967), 733–736. Zbl 0156.38204, MR 0222699

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA  
*E-mail address*: `gabratvedt@uj.ac.za`, `rbrits@uj.ac.za`