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Abstract A $C^*$-algebra $A$ is said to have the ideal property if each closed two-sided ideal of $A$ is generated by the projections inside the ideal, as a closed two sided ideal. $C^*$-algebras with the ideal property are generalization and unification of real rank zero $C^*$-algebras and unital simple $C^*$-algebras. It is long to be expected that an invariant (see [Stev] and [Ji-Jiang], [Jiang-Wang] and [Jiang1]), we call it $Inv^0(A)$ (see the introduction), consisting of scaled ordered total $K$-group $(K(A), K(A)^+\Sigma A)_\Lambda$ (used in the real rank zero case), the tracial state space $T(pAp)$ of cutting down algebra $pAp$ as part of Elliott invariant of $pAp$ (for each $[p] \in \Sigma A$) with a certain compatibility, is the complete invariant for certain well behaved class of $C^*$-algebras with the ideal property (e.g., $AH$ algebras with no dimension growth). In this paper, we will construct two non isomorphic AT algebras $A$ and $B$ with the ideal property such that $Inv^0(A) \cong Inv^0(B)$. The invariant to differentiate the two algebras is the Hausdorffifized algebraic $K_1$-groups $U(pAp)/DU(pAp)$ (for each $[p] \in \Sigma A$) with a certain compatibility condition. It will be proved in [GJL] that, adding this new ingredients, the invariant will become the complete invariant for $AH$ algebras (of no dimension growth) with the ideal property.
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§1. Introduction

A $C^*$-algebra $A$ is called an AH algebra (see Bl]) if it is the inductive limit $C^*$-algebra of

$$A_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_{1,2}} A_2 \xrightarrow{\phi_{2,3}} A_3 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow A_n \rightarrow \cdots$$

with $A = \lim_{n \to \infty} (A_n = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n P_{n,i}M_{n,i}(C(X_{n,i}))P_{n,i})$, where $X_{n,i}$ are compact metric spaces, $t_n$ and $[n,i]$ are positive integers, and $P_{n,i} \in M_{n,i}(C(X_{n,i}))$ are projections. An AH algebra is called of no dimension growth, if one can choose the spaces $X_{n,i}$ such that $\sup_{n,i} dim(X_{n,i}) < +\infty$. If all the spaces $X_{n,i}$ can be chosen to be the interval $[0,1]$ (or circle $T = \{ z \in C : |z| = 1 \}$, respectively), then $A$ is called an AI algebra (or AT algebras, respectively).

In 1989, G. Elliott (see [Ell1]) initiated the classification program by classifying all real rank zero AT algebras (without the condition of simplicity) and he conjectured that the scaled ordered $K_*$ group $(K_*(A), K_*(A)^+\Sigma A)$, where $K_*(A) = K_0(A) \oplus K_1(A)$, is a complete invariant for separable nuclear $C^*$-algebras of real rank zero and stable rank one. In 1993, Elliott (see [Ell2]) successfully classified all unital simple AI algebras by the so called Elliott invariant $Ell(A) = (K_0(A), K_0(A)^+, \Sigma A, K_1(A), TA, \rho_A)$, where $TA$ is the space of all unital traces on $A$, and $\rho_A$ is the nature map from $K_0(A)$ to $AffTA$ (the ordered Banach space of all affine maps from $TA$ to $\mathbb{R}$).

In 1994, the first named author (see [G1]) constructed two non isomorphic (not simple) real rank zero AH algebras (with 2-dimensional local spectra) $A$ and $B$ such that $(K_*(A), K_*(A)^+\Sigma A) \cong (K_*(B), K_*(B)^+, \Sigma B)$, which disproved the conjecture of Elliott for $C^*$-algebras of real rank zero and stable rank one. This result lead to a sequence of research by Dadarlat-Loring, Eilers (see [D1-2], [Eil]) end up with Dadarlat-Gong’s complete classification (see [DG]) of real rank zero AH algebras by scaled ordered total K-theory $(K(A), K(A)^+\Sigma A)_\Lambda$, where $K(A) = K_0(A) \oplus \bigoplus_{p=2}^\infty K_p(A, \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$ and $\Lambda$ is the system of Bockstein operations (also see [D1-2], [EG1-2],[EGLP], [EGS], [G1-4], [GL] and [Lin1-3]). In [EGL1], Elliott-Gong-Li completely classified simple AH algebras of no dimension growth by Elliott invariant (also see [Ell3], [EGL2], [EGJS], [G5], [Li1-5], [Lin4], [NT] and [Thm1-2]). A natural generalization and unification of real rank zero $C^*$-algebras and unital simple $C^*$-algebras is the class of $C^*$-algebras with the ideal property; each closed two-sided ideal is generated by.
the projections inside the ideal, as a closed two sided ideal. It is long to be expected that a combination of scaled ordered total K-theory (used in the classification of real rank zero C*-algebras) and the Elliott invariant (used in the the classification of simple C*-algebras), including tracial state spaces \( T(pA_p) \)—part of Elliott invariant of cutting down algebra \( \{pA_p|p \in \Sigma A \} \) with compatibility conditions, called \( \text{Inv}^0(A) \) (see 2.18 of [Jiang1]), is a complete invariant for certain well behaved (e.g., \( \mathbb{Z}\)-stable, where \( \mathbb{Z} \) is the Jiang-Su algebra of [JS]) C*-algebras with the ideal property (see [Stev], [Pa], [Ji-Jiang], [Jiang-Wang], [Jiang1]).

The main purpose of this paper is to construct two unital \( \mathbb{Z}\)-stable \( AH \) algebras \( A \) and \( B \) with the ideal property such that \( \text{Inv}^0(A) \cong \text{Inv}^0(B) \), but \( A \not\cong B \). The invariant to distinguish these two C*-algebras is the Hausdorffized algebraic \( K \) groups \( \{U(pA_p)\} \) of the cutting down algebra \( pA_p \) (for each element \( x \in \Sigma A \), we chose one projection \( p \in \Sigma A \) such that \( |p| = x \)) with a certain compatibility condition, where \( DU(A) \) is the \( \text{group generated by commutators } \{uvuv^* | u,v \in U(A)\} \). In this paper, we will introduce the invariant \( \text{Inv}'(A) \) and its simplified version \( \text{Inv}(A) \), by adding these new ingredients—the Hausdorffized algebraic \( K \) groups of cutting down algebras with compatibility conditions, to \( \text{Inv}^0(A) \).

In [GJL], we will prove that \( \text{Inv}(A) \) is a complete invariant for \( AH \) algebras (of no dimension growth) with the ideal property.

Let us point out that for the above \( C^*\)-algebras \( A \) and \( B \), we have that \( Cu(A) \cong Cu(B) \) and \( Cu(A \otimes C(S^1)) \cong Cu(B \otimes C(S^1)) \). That is, the new invariant can not be detected by Cuntz semigroup.

In section 2, we will define \( \text{Inv}(A) \) and discuss its properties. These properties will be used in [GJL]. In section 3, we will present the construction of \( AH \) algebras \( A \) and \( B \) with the ideal property such that \( \text{Inv}(A) \not\cong \text{Inv}(B) \), but \( \text{Inv}^0(A) \cong \text{Inv}^0(B) \).

2. The invariant

In this section, we will recall the definition of \( \text{Inv}^0(A) \) from [Jiang1] (also see [Stev], [Ji-Jiang], [Jiang-Wang]), and then introduce the invariant \( \text{Inv}(A) \). Furthermore, we will discuss the properties of \( \text{Inv}(A) \) in the context of \( AH \) algebras and \( AHD \) algebras (for definition of \( AHD \) algebras, see 2.3 below), which are used in [GJL].

2.1. In the notation for an inductive limit system \( \text{lim}(A_n, \phi_{n,m}) \), we understand that

\[
\phi_{n,m} = \phi_{n-1,m} \circ \phi_{n-2,m-1} \circ \cdots \circ \phi_{n,n+1},
\]

where all \( \phi_{n,m} : A_n \rightarrow A_m \) are homomorphisms.

We shall assume that, for any summand \( A_n^i \) in the direct sum \( A_n = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{l_n} A_n^i \), necessarily, \( \phi_{n,n+1}(1_{A_n^i}) \neq 0 \), since, otherwise, we could simply delete \( A_n^i \) from \( A_n \), without changing the limit algebra.

If \( A_n = \bigoplus_i A_n^i \), \( A_m = \bigoplus_j A_m^j \), we use \( \phi_{n,m}^{i,j} \) to denote the partial map of \( \phi_{n,m} \) from the \( i \)-th block \( A_n^i \) of \( A_n \) to the \( j \)-th block \( A_m^j \) of \( A_m \). Also, we use \( \phi_{n,m}^{-i,j} \) to denote the partial map of \( \phi_{n,m} \) from \( A_n \) to \( A_m^j \). That is, \( \phi_{n,m}^{-i,j} = \bigoplus_i \phi_{n,m}^{i,j} = \pi_j \phi_{n,m} \), where \( \pi_j : A_n \rightarrow A_m^j \) is the canonical projection. Some times, we also use \( \phi_{n,m}^{-i} \) to denote \( \phi_{n,m}^{-i,j} |_{A_n^i} : A_n^i \rightarrow A_m^j \).

2.2. As in [EG2], let \( T_{11,k} \) be the 2-dimensional connected simplicial complex with \( H^1(T_{11,k}) = 0 \) and \( H^2(T_{11,k}) = \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z} \), and let \( I_k \) be the subalgebra of \( M_k(\mathbb{C}) \) consisting of all functions \( f \) with the properties \( f(0) \in \mathbb{C} \cdot 1_k \) and \( f(1) \in \mathbb{C} \cdot 1_k \) (this algebra is called an Elliott dimension drop interval algebra). Denoted by \( \mathcal{H}D \) the class of algebras consisting of direct sums of the building blocks of the forms \( M_k(I_k) \) and \( PM_n(C(X))P \), with \( X \) being one of the spaces \( \{pt\}, \{0,1\}, S^1 \), and \( T_{11,k} \), and with \( P \in M_n(C(X)) \) being a projection. (In [DG], this class is denoted by \( SH(2) \), and in [Jiang1], this class is denoted by \( B \).) We will call a \( C^*\)-algebra an \( AHD \) algebra, if it is an inductive limit of the algebras in \( \mathcal{H}D \).

For each basic building block \( A = PM_n(C(X))P \), where \( X = \{pt\}, \{0,1\}, S^1, T_{11,k} \), or \( A = M_k(I_k) \), we
have $K_0(A) = \mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$ (for the case $A = PM_k(C(T_{1,k}))P$). Hence there is a natural map \( \text{rank} : K_0(A) \to \mathbb{Z} \). This map also gives a map from \( \{ p \in (M_{\infty}(A)) : p \text{ is a projection} \} \) to $\mathbb{Z}_+$. For example, if $p \in A = PM_k(C(X))P$, then \( \text{rank}(p) \) is the rank of projection $p(x) \in P(x)M_k(C)P(x) \cong M_{\text{rank}(p)}(C)$ for any $x \in X$; and if $p \in A = M_1(I_k)$, then \( \text{rank}(p) \) is the rank of projection $p(0) \in M_1(C)$. (Note that we regard $p(0)$ in $M_1(C) \cong 1_k \otimes M_1(C)$ (not regard it in $M_k(C)$).)

2.3. By $\mathcal{AHD}$ algebra, we mean the inductive limit of

$$A_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_{1,2}} A_2 \xrightarrow{\phi_{2,3}} A_3 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \cdots,$$

where $A_n \in \mathcal{HD}$ for each $n$.

For an $\mathcal{AHD}$ inductive limit $A = \lim(A_n, \phi_{nm})$, we write $A_n = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\infty} A^i_n$, where $A^i_n = P_{n,i}M_{[n,j]}(C(X_{n,i}))P_{n,i}$ or $A^i_n = M_{[n,j]}(I_{k,n,j})$. For convenience, even for a block $A^i_n = M_{[n,j]}(I_{k,n,j})$, we still use $X_{n,i}$ for $Sp(A^i_n) = [0,1]$—that is, $A^i_n$ is regarded as a homogeneous algebra or a sub-homogeneous algebra over $X_{n,i}$.

2.4. In [GJLP1-2], joint with Cornel Pasnicu, the authors proved the reduction theorem for $\mathcal{AH}$ algebras with the ideal property provided that the inductive limit systems have no dimension growth. That is, if $A$ is an inductive limit of $A_n = \bigoplus A^i_n = \bigoplus P_{n,i}M_{[n,j]}(C(X_{n,i}))P_{n,i}$ with $\sup_{n,i}\dim(X_{n,i}) < +\infty$, and if we further assume that $A$ has the ideal property, then $A$ can be rewritten as an inductive limit of $B_n = \bigoplus B^i_n = \bigoplus Q_{n,j}M_{[n,j]}(Y_{n,j})Q_{n,j}$, with $Y_{n,j}$ being one of \( \{ pt \}, [0,1], S^1, T_{1,k}, T_{1,k}, S^2 \). In turn, the second author proved in [Jiang2] (also see [Li4]), that the above inductive limit can be rewritten as the inductive limit of the direct sums of homogeneous algebras over \( \{ pt \}, [0,1], S^1, T_{1,k} \) and $M_1(I_k)$. Combining these two results, we know that all $\mathcal{AH}$ algebras of no dimension growth with the ideal property are $\mathcal{AHD}$ algebras. Let us point out that, as proved in [DG], there are real rank zero $\mathcal{AHD}$ algebras which are not $\mathcal{AH}$ algebras.

2.5. Let $A$ be a $C^*$-algebra. $K_0(A)^+ \subset K_0(A)$ is defined to be the semigroup of $K_0(A)$ generated by $[p] \in K_0(A)$, where $p \in M_{\infty}(A)$ are projections. For all $C^*$-algebras considered in this paper, for example, $A \in \mathcal{HD}$, or $A$ is an $\mathcal{AHD}$ algebra, or $A = B \otimes C(T_{1,k} \times S^1)$, where $B$ is an $\mathcal{HD}$ or $\mathcal{AHD}$ algebra, we always have

$$K_0(A)^+ \bigcap (-K_0(A)^+) = \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad K_0(A)^+ - K_0(A)^+ = K_0(A).$$

Therefore $(K_0(A), K_0(A)^+)$ is an ordered group. Define $\Sigma A \subset K_0(A)^+$ to be

$$\Sigma A = \{ [p] \in K_0(A)^+, p \text{ is a projection in } A \}.$$

Then $(K_0(A), K_0(A)^+, \Sigma A)$ is a scaled ordered group. (Note that for purely infinite $C^*$-algebras or stable projectionless $C^*$-algebras, the above condition $(\ast)$ does not hold.)

2.6. Let $K_*(A) = K_*(A) \oplus \bigoplus_{k=2}^{\infty} K_*(A, \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z})$ be as in [DG]. Let $\wedge$ be the Bockstein operation on $K(A)$ (see 4.1 of [DG]). It is well known that $K_*(A, \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}) = K_0(A \otimes C(W_k \times S^1))$, where $W_k = T_{1,k}$.

As in [DG], let $K_*(A, \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z})^+ = K_0(A \otimes C(W_k \times S^1)^+)$ and let $\overline{K(A)}^+$ be the semigroup generated by $\{ K_*(A, \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z})^+, k = 2, 3, \cdots \}$.

2.7. Let $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(K(A), K(B))$ be the set of homomorphisms between $K(A)$ and $K(B)$ compatible with the Bockstein operations $\wedge$. There is a surjective map (see [DG])

$$\Gamma : KK(A,B) \to \text{Hom}_\Lambda(K(A), K(B)).$$

Following Rørdam (see [R]), we denote $KL(A, B) \triangleq KK(A,B)/\text{Pext}(K_*(A), K_{*+1}(B))$, where $\text{Pext}(K_*(A), K_{*+1}(B))$ is identified with $\text{ker} \Gamma$ by [DL2]. The triple $(K(A), \overline{K(A)}^+, \Sigma A)$ is part of our invariant. For two $C^*$-algebras $A$ and $B$, by a “homomorphism”

$$\alpha : (K(A), \overline{K(A)}^+, \Sigma A) \to (K(B), \overline{K(B)}^+, \Sigma B),$$
we mean a system of maps:

\[ \alpha_k^i : K_i(A, \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow K_i(B, \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}), \quad i = 0, 1, \quad k = 0, 2, 3, \ldots \]

which are compatible with the Bockstein operations and \( \alpha = \oplus_{k,i} \alpha_k^i \) satisfies \( \alpha(K(A)^+) \subset K(B)^+ \). And finally, \( \alpha_0^0(\Sigma A) \subset \Sigma B \).

2.8. For a unital \( C^* \)-algebra \( A \), let \( TA \) denote the space of tracial states of \( A \), i.e., \( \tau \in TA \) if and only if \( \tau \) is a positive linear map from \( A \) to \( \mathbb{C} \) with \( \tau(xy) = \tau(yx) \), and \( \tau(1) = 1 \). Endow \( TA \) with the weak-* topology, that is, for any net \( \{\tau_\alpha\} \subset TA \) and \( \tau \in TA \), \( \tau_\alpha \rightarrow \tau \) if and only if \( \lim_\alpha \tau_\alpha(x) = \tau(x) \) for any \( x \in A \). Then \( TA \) is a compact Hausdorff space with convex structure, that is, if \( \lambda \in [0,1] \) and \( \tau_1, \tau_2 \in TA \), then \( \lambda \tau_1 + (1 - \lambda) \tau_2 \in TA \). \( AffTA \) is the collection of all continuous affine maps from \( TA \) to \( \mathbb{R} \), which is a real Banach space with \( \|f\| = \sup_{\tau \in TA} |f(\tau)| \). Let \( (AffTA)_+ \) be the subset of \( AffTA \) consisting of all nonnegative affine functions. An element \( 1 \in AffTA \), defined by \( 1(\tau) = 1 \) for all \( \tau \in TA \), is called the order unit of \( TA \) (or scale) of \( AFFTA \). Note that any \( f \in AFFTA \) can be written as \( f = f_+ - f_- \) with \( f_1, f_2 \in AFFTA_+ \), \( \|f_1\| \leq \|f\| \) and \( \|f_2\| \leq \|f\| \). Therefore \( (AffTA, (AffTA)_+, 1) \) forms a scaled ordered real Banach space.

If \( \phi : AffTA \rightarrow AffTB \) is a unital positive linear map, then \( \phi \) is bounded and therefore continuous.

There is a natural homomorphism \( \rho_A : K_0(A) \rightarrow AFFTA \) defined by \( \rho_A([p])(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^n \tau(p_{ii}) \) for \( \tau \in TA \) and \( [p] \in K_0(A) \) represented by projection \( p = \{p_{ij}\} \in M_n(A) \).

Any unital homomorphism \( \phi : A \rightarrow B \) induces a continuous affine map \( T\phi : TB \rightarrow TA \), which, in turn, induces a unital positive linear map \( AffT\phi : AFFTA \rightarrow AFFTB \).

If \( \phi : A \rightarrow B \) is not unital, we still use \( AffT\phi \) to denote the unital positive linear map

\[ AffT\phi : AFFTA \rightarrow AffT(\phi(1_A)B\phi(1_A)) \]

by regarding \( \phi \) as the unital homomorphism from \( A \) to \( \phi(1_A)B\phi(1_A) \)—that is, for any \( l \in AFFTA \) represented by \( x \in A_{\lambda,\alpha} \) as \( l(t) = t(x) \) for any \( t \in TA \), we define

\[ ((AffT\phi)(l))(\tau) = \tau(\phi(x)) \quad \text{for any} \quad \tau \in AffT(\phi(1_A)B\phi(1_A)), \]

where \( \phi(x) \) is regarded as an element in \( \phi(1_A)B\phi(1_A) \). In the above equation, if we regard \( \phi(x) \) as an element in \( B \) (rather than in \( \phi(1_A)B\phi(1_A) \)), the homomorphism \( \phi \) also induces a positive linear map, denoted by \( \phi_T \) to avoid the confusion, from \( AFFTA \) to \( AFFTB \)—that is for the \( l \) as above,

\[ ((\phi_T)(l))(\tau) = \tau(\phi(x)) \quad \text{for any} \quad \tau \in AffTB, \]

where \( \phi(x) \) is now regarded as an element in \( B \). But this map will not preserve the unit \( 1 \). It has the property that \( \phi_T(1_{AFFTA}) \leq 1_{AFFTB} \).

In this paper, we will often use the notation \( \phi_T \) for the following situation: If \( p_1 < p_2 \) are two projections in \( A \), and \( \phi = \iota : p_1Ap_1 \rightarrow p_2Ap_2 \) is the inclusion, then \( \iota_T \) will denote the (not necessarily unital) map from \( AffT(p_1Ap_1) \) to \( AffT(p_2Ap_2) \) induced by \( \iota \).

2.9. If \( \alpha : (K(A), K(A)^+, \Sigma A) \rightarrow (K(B), K(B)^+, \Sigma B) \) is a homomorphism as in 2.7, then for each projection \( p \in A \), there is a projection \( q \in B \) such that \( \alpha([p]) = [q] \).

Since \( I_k \) has stable rank one and the spaces \( X \) involved in the definition of \( HD \) class (see \( PM_n(C(X))P \) in 2.2) are of dimension at most two, we know that for all \( C^* \)-algebras \( A \) considered in this paper—\( HD \) class or \( AH \) algebra, the following statement is true: If \( [p_1] = [p_2] \in K_0(A) \), then there is a unitary \( u \in A \) such that \( up_1u^* = p_2 \). Therefore, both \( AffT(pA) \) and \( AffT(qB) \) depend only on the classes \([p] \in K_0(A)\) and \([q] \in K_0(B)\), respectively. Furthermore, if \( [p_1] = [p_2] \), then the identification of \( AffT(p_1Ap_1) \) and \( AffT(p_2Ap_2) \) via the unitary equivalence \( up_1u^* = p_2 \) is canonical—that is, it does not depend on the choice of unitary \( u \). For classes \([p] \in \Sigma A \subset K_0(A)^+ \subset K_0(A)\), we will also take \( AffT(pAp) \) as part of our invariant. We will consider a system of unital positive linear maps

\[ \xi^{p,q} : AffT(pAp) \rightarrow AffT(qBq) \]
associated with all pairs of two classes \([p] \in \Sigma A\) and \([q] \in \Sigma B\), with \(\alpha([p]) = [q]\). Such system of maps is said to be compatible if for any \(p_1 \leq p_2\) with \(\alpha([p_1]) = [q_1]\), \(\alpha([p_2]) = [q_2]\), and \(q_1 \leq q_2\), the following diagram commutes

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Aff}T(p_1Ap_1) \\ \downarrow \tau_T \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{Aff}T(q_1Bq_1) \\ \downarrow \tau_T \end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Aff}T(p_2Ap_2) \\ \downarrow \tau_T \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{Aff}T(q_2Bq_2) \\ \downarrow \tau_T \end{array}
\]

(2.A)

where the vertical maps are induced by the inclusions. (See [Ji-Jiang] and [Stev].)

2.10. In this paper, we will denote

\[
(K(A), K(A)^+, \Sigma A, \{\text{Aff}T(pAp)\})_{[p] \in \Sigma A}
\]

by Inv\(^0\)(A), where Aff\(T(pAp)\) are scaled ordered Banach spaces as in 2.8. By a map between the invariants Inv\(^0\)(A) and Inv\(^0\)(B), we mean a map

\[
\alpha : (K(A), K(A)^+, \Sigma A) \rightarrow (K(B), K(B)^+, \Sigma B)
\]

as in 2.7, and for each pair \([p] \in \Sigma A, [q] \in \Sigma B\) with \(\alpha([p]) = [q]\), there is an associate unital positive linear map (which is automatically continuous as pointed out in 2.8)

\[
\xi^{p,q} : \text{Aff}T(pAp) \rightarrow \text{Aff}T(qBq)
\]

which are compatible in the sense of 2.9 (that is, the diagram (2.A) is commutative for any pair of projections \(p_1 \leq p_2\)).

2.11. Let \([p] \in \Sigma A\) be represented by \(p \in A\). Let \(\alpha([p]) = [q]\) for \(q \in B\). Then \(\alpha\) induces a map (still denoted by \(\alpha\)) \(\alpha : K_0(pAp) \rightarrow K_0(qBq)\). Note that the natural map \(\rho := \rho_{pAp} : K_0(pAp) \rightarrow \text{Aff}T(pAp)\), defined in 2.8, satisfies \(\rho(K_0(pAp)^+) \subseteq \text{Aff}T(pAp)^+\) and \(\rho([p]) = 1 \in \text{Aff}T(pAp)\). By 1.20 of [Ji-Jiang], the compatibility in 2.9 (diagram (2.A) in 2.9) implies that the following diagram commutes:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
K_0(pAp) \\ \downarrow \alpha \\
\text{Aff}T(pAp) \\ \downarrow \xi^{p,q} \\
K_0(qBq) \\ \downarrow \rho \\
\text{Aff}T(qBq)
\end{array}
\]

(2.B)

For \(p = 1_A\), this compatibility (the commutativity of diagram (2.B)) is included as a part of Elliott invariant for unital simple C\(^*\)-algebras. But this information is contained in our invariant Inv\(^0\)(A), as pointed out in [Ji-Jiang].

2.12. Let \(A\) be a unital C\(^*\)-algebra, \(B \in \mathcal{H}\mathcal{D}\) and \(\{p_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq B\) be mutually orthogonal projections with \(\Sigma p_i = 1_B\). Write \(B = \oplus_{j=1}^m B_j\) with \(B_j\) being either PM\(_\bullet\)(\(C(X)\))P or \(M_i(I_k)\), and for any \(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\) write \(p_i = \oplus_{j=1}^m p_i^j\) with \(p_i^j \in B_j\), for \(j = 1, 2, \ldots, m\). Note that for all \(\tau \in TB^j\), \(\tau(p_i^j) = \frac{\text{rank}(p_i^j)}{\text{rank}(p_i)}\) (see 2.2 for the definition of rank function), which is independent of \(\tau \in TB^j\).

Let \(\xi_i = (\xi_1^i, \xi_2^i, \ldots, \xi_m^i) : \text{Aff}TA \rightarrow \text{Aff}TB(p_iBp_i) = \oplus_{j=1}^m \text{Aff}T(p_i^jB_jp_i^j)\) be unital positive linear maps, then we can define \(\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_m) : \text{Aff}TA \rightarrow \text{Aff}TB = \oplus_{j=1}^m \text{Aff}TB^j\) as below

\[
\xi_j(f)(\tau) = \sum_{\{i: \tau(p_i^j) \neq 0\}} \tau(p_i^j)\xi_i^j(f)\left(\frac{\tau(p_i^jB_jp_i^j)}{\tau(p_i^j)}\right) \quad \text{for} \quad f \in \text{Aff}TA \quad \text{and} \quad \tau \in TB^j.
\]

Note that \(\frac{\tau(p_i^jB_jp_i^j)}{\tau(p_i^j)} \in T(p_i^jB_jp_i^j)\). So \(\xi_i^j(f)\) can evaluate at \(\frac{\tau(p_i^jB_jp_i^j)}{\tau(p_i^j)}\). Since the value of \(\tau(p_i^j)\) is independent of \(\tau \in TB^j\), it is straightforward to verify that \(\xi_i^j \in \text{Aff}TB^j\). We denote such \(\xi\) by \(\oplus \xi_i\). (For the case that
If $\phi_i : A \to p_i B p_i$ are unital homomorphisms and $\phi = \oplus \phi_i : A \to B$, then
\[ (AffT\phi)^j(f)(\tau) = \sum_{\{i \tau(p'_i) \neq 0\}} \tau(p'_i)\AffT\phi^j_i(f)\left(\frac{\tau|_{p'_i B p'_i}}{\tau(p'_i)}\right), \]
where $\phi^j_i : A \to p'_i B p'_i$ is the $j$-th component of the map of $\phi_i$. That is, $AffT\phi = \oplus AffT\phi_i$. In particular, if $\|AffT\phi_i(f) - \xi_i(f)\| < \varepsilon$ for all $i$, then
\[ \|AffT\phi(f) - \xi(f)\| < \varepsilon. \]

2.13. Now, we will introduce the new ingredient of our invariant, which is a simplified version of $U(pAp)/DU(pAp)$ for any $[p] \in \Sigma A$, where $DU(pAp)$ is the commutator subgroup of $U(pAp)$. Some notations and preliminary results are quoted from [Thm2], [Thm4] and [NT].

2.14. Let $A$ be a unital $C^*$-algebra. Let $U(A)$ denote the group of unitaries of $A$ and, $U_0(A)$, the connected component of $1_A$ in $U(A)$. Let $DU(A)$ and $DU_0(A)$ denote the commutator subgroups of $U(A)$ and $U_0(A)$, respectively. (Recall that the commutator subgroup of a group $G$ is the subgroup generated by all elements of the form $aba^{-1}b^{-1}$, where $a, b \in G$.) One can introduce the following metric $D_A$ on $U(A)/DU(A)$ (see [NT, §3]). For $u, v \in U(A)/DU(A)$
\[ D_A(u, v) = \inf \{\|uv^* - c\| : c \in DU(A)\}, \]
where, on the right hand side of the equation, we use $u, v$ to denote any elements in $U(A)$, which represent the elements $u, v \in U(A)/DU(A)$.

Remark 2.15. Obviously, $D_A(u, v) \leq 2$. Also, if $u, v \in U(A)/DU(A)$ define two different elements in $K_1(A)$, then $D_A(u, v) = 2$. (This fact follows from the fact that $\|u - v\| < 2$ implies $uv^* \in U_0(A)$.)

2.16. Let $A$ be a unital $C^*$-algebra. Let $AffTA$ and $\rho_A : K_0(A) \to AffTA$ be as defined as in 2.8.

For simplicity, we will use $\rho K_0(A)$ to denote the set $\rho_A(K_0(A))$. The metric $d_A$ on $AffTA/\rho K_0(A)$ is defined as follows (see [NT, §3]).

Let $d'$ denote the quotient metric on $AffTA/\rho K_0(A)$, i.e., for $f, g \in AffTA/\rho K_0(A)$,
\[ d'(f, g) = \inf \{\|f - g - h\| : h \in \rho K_0(A)\}. \]
Define $d_A$ by
\[ d_A(f, g) = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } d'(f, g) \geq \frac{1}{2} \\ |e^{2\pi i d'(f, g)} - 1|, & \text{if } d'(f, g) < \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases} \]

Obviously, $d_A(f, g) \leq 2\pi d'(f, g)$.

2.17. For $A = PM_k(C(X))P$, define $SU(A)$ to be the set of unitaries $u \in PM_k(C(X))P$ such that for each $x \in X$, $u(x) \in PM_k(C)P(x) \cong M_{\text{rank}(P)}(C)$ has determinant $1$ (note that the determinant of $u(x)$ does not depend on the identification of $P(x)M_k(C)P(x) \cong M_{\text{rank}(P)}(C)$). For $A = M_l(I_k)$, by $u \in SU(A)$ we mean that $u \in SU(M_{l_k}(C[0, 1]))$, where we consider $A$ to be a subalgebra of $M_{l_k}(C[0, 1])$. For all basic building blocks $A \neq M_l(I_k)$, we have $SU(A) = DU(A)$. But for $A = M_l(I_k)$, this is not true (see 2.18 and 2.19 below).

In [EGL1], the authors also defined $SU(A)$ for $A$ being a homogeneous algebra and a certain $AH$ inductive limit $C^*$-algebra. This definition can not be generalized to a more general class of $C^*$-algebras. But we will
define $SU(A)$ for any unital $C^*$ algebra $A$. Later, in our definition of $Inv(A)$, we will only make use of $SU(A)$ (rather than $SU(A)$).

2.18. Let $A = I_k$. Then $K_1(A) = \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$, which is generated by $[u]$, where $u$ is the following unitary

$$u = \begin{pmatrix}
e^{2\pi i \frac{j}{k} t} & \cdots & \ne^{2\pi i \frac{k-1}{k} t} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
e^{2\pi i \frac{k-1}{k} t} & \cdots & \ne^{2\pi i \frac{1}{k} t} \end{pmatrix} \in I_k.$$ 

(Note that $u(0) = 1_k$, $u(1) = e^{2\pi i \frac{1}{k}}, 1_k$.)

Note that the above $u$ is in $SU(A)$, but not in $U_0(A)$, and therefore not in $DU(A)$.

2.19. By [Thm4] (or [GLN]), $u \in M_l(I_k)$ is in $DU(A)$ if and only if for any irreducible representation $\pi : M_l(I_k) \rightarrow B(H)$ ($\dim H < +\infty$), $\det(\pi(u)) = 1$. For the unitary $u$ in 2.18, and irreducible representation $\pi$ corresponding to 1, $\pi(u) = e^{2\pi i \frac{1}{k}}$ whose determinant is $e^{2\pi i \frac{1}{k}}$ which is not 1. By [Thm2, 6.1] one knows that if $A = I_k$, then

$$U_0(A) \cap SU(A) = \{e^{2\pi i \frac{j}{k}}, j = 0, 1, \cdots, k-1\} \cdot DU(A).$$

If $A = M_l(I_k)$, then for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $e^{2\pi i \frac{j}{k}} \cdot 1_A \in DU(A).$ Consequently,

$$U_0(A) \cap SU(A) = \{e^{2\pi i \frac{j}{k}}, j = 0, 1, \cdots, kl-1\} \cdot DU(A).$$

2.20. Let $T = \{z \in \mathbb{C}, |z| = 1\}$. Then for any $A \in \mathcal{HD}$, $T \cdot DU(A) \subset U_0(A)$. From 2.17 and 2.19, we have either $SU(A) = DU(A)$ or $U_0(A) \cap SU(A) \subset T \cdot DU(A)$.

**Lemma 2.21.** Let $A = PM_k(C(X))P \in \mathcal{HD}$. For any $u, v \in U(A)$, if $uv^* \in T \cdot DU(A)$ (in particular if both $u, v$ are in $T \cdot DU(A)$), then $D_A(u, v) \leq 2\pi/rank(P)$.

Let $A = M_l(I_k)$. For any $u, v$, if $uv^* \in T \cdot DU(A)$, then $D_A(u, v) \leq 2\pi/1$.

**Proof.** There is $\omega \in DU(A)$ such that $uv^* = \lambda \omega$ for some $\lambda \in T$. Choose $\lambda_0 = e^{2\pi i \frac{j}{rank(P)}}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $|\lambda - \lambda_0| < 2\pi/rank(P)$. And $\lambda_0 \cdot P \in PM_k(C(X))P$ has determinant 1 everywhere and is in $DU(A)$. And so does $\lambda_0 \omega$. Also we have $|uv^* - \lambda_0 \omega| < 2\pi/rank(P)$.

The case $A = M_l(I_k)$ is similar. \hfill \Box

2.22. Let $path(U(A))$ denote the set of piecewise smooth paths $\xi : [0, 1] \rightarrow U(A)$. Recall that de la Harp-Skandalis determinant (see [dH-S]) $\Delta : path(U(A)) \rightarrow AffTA$ is defined by

$$\Delta(\xi)(\tau) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^1 \tau(\frac{d\xi}{dt} \cdot \xi^*)dt.$$ 

It is proved in [dH-S] (see also [Thm4]) that $\Delta$ induces a map $\Delta^0 : \pi_1(U_0(A)) \rightarrow AffTA$. For any two paths $\xi_1, \xi_2$ starting at $\xi_1(0) = \xi_2(0) = 1 \in A$ and ending at the same unitary $u = \xi_1(1) = \xi_2(1),$ we have that

$$\Delta(\xi_1) - \Delta(\xi_2) = \Delta(\xi_1 \cdot \xi_2^*) \subset \Delta^0(\pi_1(U_0(A))).$$

Consequently $\Delta$ induces a map
\( \bar{\Delta} : U_0(A) \to \text{Aff} TA/\Delta^0(\pi_1(U_0(A))). \) (See [Thm4, section 3].)

Passing to matrix over \( A \), we have a map \( \bar{\Delta}_n : U_0(M_n(A)) \to \text{Aff} TA/\Delta^0_n(\pi_1(U_0(M_n(A)))) \).

If \( 1 \leq m < n \), then \( \text{path}(U(M_m(A))) \) (and \( U_0(M_n(A)) \) ) can be embedded into \( \text{path}(U(M_n(A))) \) (and \( U_0(M_n(A)) \)) by sending \( u(t) \) to \( \text{diag}(u(t), 1_{n-m}) \). From the above definition, and the formula

\[
\frac{d}{dt}(\text{diag}(u(t), 1_{n-m})) = \text{diag}\left(\frac{d}{dt}(u(t)), 0_{n-m}\right),
\]

one gets

\[
\bar{\Delta}_n|_{U_0(M_m(A))} = \bar{\Delta}_m.
\]

Recall that the Bott isomorphism \( b : K_0(A) \to K_1(SA) \) is given by the following: for any \( x \in K_0(A) \) represented by a projection \( p \in M_n(A) \), we have

\[
b(x) = [e^{2\pi ip} + (1_n - p)] \in K_1(SA).
\]

If \( \xi(t) = e^{2\pi it}p + (1_n - p) \), then

\[
(\Delta^0\xi)(\tau) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^1 \tau((2\pi i e^{2\pi it}p) \cdot (e^{-2\pi it}p + (1_n - p))) dt = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^1 \tau(2\pi ip) dt = \tau(p).
\]

Since Bott map is an isomorphism, it follows that each loop in \( \pi_1(U_0(A)) \) is homotopic to a product of loops of the above form \( \xi(t) \). Consequently \( \Delta^0(\pi_1(U_0(M_n(A)))) \subset \rho_A K_0(A) \). Hence \( \bar{\Delta}_n \) can be regarded as a map

\[
\bar{\Delta}_n : U_0(M_n(A)) \to \text{Aff} TA/\rho_A K_0(A).
\]

**Proposition 2.23.** For \( A \in \mathcal{H}D \) or \( A \in A\mathcal{H}D, \overline{DU_0(A)} = DU(A) \).

**Proof.** Let the determinant function \( \bar{\Delta}_n : U_0(M_n(A)) \to \text{Aff} TA/\Delta^0_n(\pi_1(U_0(M_n(A)))) \) be defined as in §3 of [Thm4] (see 2.22 above). As observed in [NT] (see top of page 33 of [NT]), Lemma 3.1 of [Thm4] implies that \( \overline{DU_0(A)} = U_0(A) \cap DU(A) \). For reader’s convenience, we give a brief proof of this fact. Namely, the equation

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
    uvu^{-1}v & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & 1 & 0 \\
    0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
    u & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & u^{-1} & 0 \\
    0 & 0 & v
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
    v & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & 1 & 0 \\
    0 & 0 & v^{-1}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
    u^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & u & 0 \\
    0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
    v^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & 1 & 0 \\
    0 & 0 & v
\end{pmatrix}
\]

implies that \( DU(A) \subset \overline{DU_0(M_n(A))} \). Therefore by Lemma 3.1 of [Thm4], \( \overline{DU(A)} \subset \ker \bar{\Delta}_1 \). If \( x \in U_0(A) \cap DU(A) \), then \( \bar{\Delta}_1 \) is defined at \( x \). By calculation in 2.22, \( \overline{\Delta}_1|_{U_0(A)} = \Delta_1 \). Hence we have \( \bar{\Delta}_1(x) = 0 \). And therefore \( x \in \overline{DU_0(A)} = \ker \bar{\Delta}_1 \), by Lemma 3.1 of [Thm4]. Note that if \( A \in \mathcal{H}D \) or \( A\mathcal{H}D \), then \( DU(A) \subset U_0(A) \).

\( \square \)

(It is not known to the authors whether it is always true that \( \overline{DU_0(A)} = DU(A) \).)

2.24. There is a natural map \( \alpha : \pi_1(U(A)) \to K_0(A) \), or more generally, \( \alpha_n : \pi_1(U(M_n(A)) \to K_0(A) \) for any \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). We need the following notation. For a unital \( C^* \)-algebra \( A \), let \( \mathcal{P}_n K_0(A) \) (see [GLX]) be the subgroup of \( K_0(A) \) generated by the formal difference of projections \( p, q \in M_n(A) \) (instead of \( M_\infty(A) \)). Then

\[
\mathcal{P}_n K_0(A) \subset \text{Image}(\alpha_n).
\]

In particular, if \( \rho : K_0(A) \to \text{Aff} TA \) satisfies \( \rho(\mathcal{P}_n K_0(A)) = \rho K_0(A) \), then by Theorem 3.2 of [Thm4],

\[
U_0(M_n(A))/\overline{DU_0(M_n(A))} \cong U_0(M_\infty(A))/\overline{DU_0(M_\infty(A))} \cong \text{Aff} TA/\rho K_0(A).
\]
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Note that for all $A \in \mathcal{HD}$, we have $\rho(\mathcal{P}_1 K_0(A)) = \rho K_0(A)$ (see below). Consequently,

$$U_0(A)/DU_0(A) \cong \text{Aff}TA/\rho K_0(A).$$

If $A$ does not contain building blocks of form $PM_n(C(T_{II,k}))P$, then such $A$ is the special case of [Thm2], and the above fact is observed in [Thm2] (for circle algebras in [NT] earlier)—in this special case, we ever have $\mathcal{P}_1 K_0(A) = K_0(A)$ (as used in [NT] and [Thm2] in the form of surjectivity of $\alpha : \pi_1(U(A)) \to K_0(A)$).

For $A = PM_n(C(T_{II,k}))P$, we do not have the surjectivity of $\alpha : \pi_1(U(A)) \to K_0(A)$ any more. But $K_0(A) = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$ and image($\alpha$) = $\mathcal{P}_1 K_0(A)$ contains at least one element which corresponds to a rank one projection (any bundle over $T_{II,k}$ has a subbundle of rank 1)—that is,

$$\rho(\mathcal{P}_1 K_0(A)) = \rho K_0(A)(\subseteq \text{Aff}TA)$$

consisting all constant functions from $T_{II,k}$ to $\frac{1}{\text{rank}(\mathcal{P})}\mathbb{Z}$.

As in [NT, Lemma 3.1] and [Thm 2, Lemma 6.4], the map $\overline{\Delta} : U_0(A) \to \text{Aff}TA/\rho K_0(A)$ (in 2.22) has $\text{Ker}(\overline{\Delta}) = DU_0(A)$ and the following lemma holds.

**Lemma 2.25.** If a unital $C^*$-algebra $A$ satisfies $\rho(\mathcal{P}_1 K_0(A)) = \rho K_0(A)$ and $DU_0(A) = DU(A)$ (see 2.24 and 2.23), in particular, if $A \in \mathcal{HD}$ or $A \in A\mathcal{HD}$, then the following hold:

1. There is a split exact sequence

   $$0 \to \text{Aff}TA/\rho K_0(A) \xrightarrow{\lambda_A} U_0(A)/DU(A) \to K_1(A) \to 0.$$ 

2. $\lambda_A$ is an isometry with respect to the metrics $d_A$ and $D_A$.

**2.26.** Recall from §3 of [Thm4], the de la Harpe—Skandalis determinant (see [dH-S]) can be used to define

$$\overline{\Delta} : U_0(A)/DU(A) \to \text{Aff}TA/\rho K_0(A).$$

With the condition of Lemma 2.25 above, this map is an isometry with respect to the metrics $d_A$ and $D_A$. In fact, the inverse of this map is $\lambda_A$ in Lemma 2.25.

It follows from the definition of $\overline{\Delta}$ (see §3 of [Thm4]) that

$$\overline{\Delta}(e^{2\pi i\alpha}) = t \cdot \rho([p]) \quad (\text{mod } \rho K_0(A)).$$

where $[p] \in K_0(A)$ is the element represented by projection $p \in A$.

It is convenient to introduce the extended commutator group $DU^+(A)$, which is generated by $DU(A) \subset U(A)$ and the set $\{e^{2\pi i\alpha} = e^{2\pi itp} + (1 - p) \in U(A) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}, p \in A \text { is a projection}\}$. Let $DU(A)$ denote the closure of $DU^+(A)$. That is, $DU(A) = DU^+(A)$.

Let us use $\rho \overline{K_0(A)}$ to denote the real vector space spanned by $\rho K_0(A)$. That is,

$$\rho \overline{K_0(A)} := \{\sum \lambda_i \phi_i \mid \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}, \phi_i \in \rho K_0(A)\}.$$ 

Suppose that $\rho \overline{K_0(A)} = \rho(\mathcal{P}_1 K_0(A))$. It follows from (2.c), the image of $DU(A)/DU(A)$ under the map $\overline{\Delta}$ is exactly $\rho \overline{K_0(A)}/\rho K_0(A)$. Therefore $\lambda_A$ takes $\rho \overline{K_0(A)}/\rho K_0(A)$ to $DU(A)/DU(A)$. Hence $\overline{\Delta} : U_0(A)/DU(A) \to \text{Aff}TA/\rho K_0(A)$ also induces a quotient map (still denoted by $\overline{\Delta}$)

$$\overline{\Delta} : U_0(A)/DU(A) \to \text{Aff}TA/\rho \overline{K_0(A)}$$

which is an isometry using the quotient metrics of $d_A$ and $D_A$. The inverse of this quotient map $\overline{\Delta}$ gives rise to the isometry

$$\overline{\lambda_A} : \text{Aff}TA/\rho \overline{K_0(A)} \to U_0(A)/DU(A) \to U(A)/DU(A)$$
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which is an isometry with respect to the quotient metrics $\tilde{d}_A$ and $\overline{D}_A$ as described below.

For any $u, v \in U(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A)$,

$$\overline{D}_A(u, v) = \inf \{ \| uv^* - c \| \mid c \in \widetilde{DU}(A) \}.$$  

Let $\tilde{d}'$ denote the quotient metric on $\text{Aff} TA/\rho \tilde{K}_0(A)$ of $\text{Aff} TA$, that is,

$$\tilde{d}'(f, g) = \inf \{ \| f - g - h \| \mid h \in \rho \tilde{K}_0(A) \} \quad \forall f, g \in \text{Aff} TA/\rho \tilde{K}_0(A).$$  

Define $\tilde{d}_A$ by

$$\tilde{d}_A(f, g) = \begin{cases} 
2, & \text{if } \tilde{d}'(f, g) \geq \frac{1}{2} \\
|e^{2\pi i \tilde{d}'(f, g)} - 1|, & \text{if } \tilde{d}'(f, g) < \frac{1}{2}.
\end{cases}$$

The following result is a consequence of Lemma 2.25.

**Lemma 2.27.** If a unital $C^*$-algebra $A$ satisfies $\rho(\mathcal{P}_1 K_0(A)) = \rho K_0(A)$ and $\widetilde{DU}_0(A) = \widetilde{DU}(A)$ (see 2.24 and 2.23), in particular, if $A \in \mathcal{HD}$ or $A \in A\mathcal{HD}$, then we have

1. There is a split exact sequence

$$0 \to \text{Aff} TA/\rho \tilde{K}_0(A) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\lambda}_A} U(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A) \xrightarrow{\pi_A} K_1(A) \to 0.$$  

2. $\tilde{\lambda}_A$ is an isometry with respect to $\tilde{d}_A$ and $\overline{D}_A$.

**Proof.** As we mentioned in 2.26, the map $\lambda_A$ in Lemma 2.25 takes $\rho \tilde{K}_0(A)/\rho K_0(A)$ to $\widetilde{DU}(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A)$. From the exact sequence in Lemma 2.25, passing to quotient, one gets the exact sequence in (1).

Note that $\tilde{d}_A$ on $\text{Aff} TA/\rho \tilde{K}_0(A)$ is the quotient metric induced by $d_A$ on $\text{Aff} TA/\rho K_0(A)$ and $\overline{D}_A$ on $U(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A)$ is the quotient metric induced by $D_A$ on $U(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A)$. Hence $\tilde{\lambda}_A$ is an isometry, since so is $\lambda_A$. 

\[\blacksquare\]

2.28. Instead of $\widetilde{DU}(A)$, we will need the group

$$\widetilde{SU}(A) := \{ x \in U(A) \mid x^n \in \widetilde{DU}(A) \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \{0\} \}.$$  

For $A \in \mathcal{HD}$, say $A = PM_i(C(X))P$ ($X = [0, 1], S^1$ or $T_{II,k}$) or $A = M_i(I_k)$, $\widetilde{SU}(A)$ is the set of all unitaries $u \in P(M_iC(X))P$ or $u \in M_i(I_k)$ such that the determinant function

$$X \ni x \mapsto \det(u(x)) \quad \text{or} \quad (0, 1) \ni t \mapsto \det(u(t))$$

is a constant function. Comparing with the set $SU(A)$ in [EGL1] or 2.17 above (which only defines for $\mathcal{HD}$ blocks), where the function will be constant 1, here we allow the function to be arbitrary constant in $\mathbb{T}$. Hence for a basic building block $A = PM_i(C(X))P \in \mathcal{HD}$ or $A = M_i(I_k)$,

$$\widetilde{SU}(A) = \mathbb{T} \cdot SU(A).$$  

The notations $\rho K_0(A)$, $\widetilde{DU}(A)$ and $\widetilde{SU}(A)$ reflect that they are constructed from $\rho K_0(A)$, $DU(A)$ and $SU(A)$, respectively. To make the notation simpler, from now on, we will use $\rho K_0(A)$ to denote $\rho K_0(A) = \rho_A(K_0(A))$, $\widetilde{DU}(A)$ to denote $\widetilde{DU}(A)$, and $\widetilde{SU}(A)$ to denote $\widetilde{SU}(A)$. 
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Lemma 2.29. Let \( \alpha, \beta : K_1(A) \rightarrow U(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A) \) be two splittings of \( \pi_A \) in Lemma 2.27. Then
\[
\alpha_{\text{tor } K_1(A)} = \beta_{\text{tor } K_1(A)}
\]
and \( \alpha(\text{tor } K_1(A)) \subset \widetilde{SU}(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A) \). Furthermore, \( \alpha \) identifies \( \text{tor}(K_1(A)) \) with \( \widetilde{SU}(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A) \).

Proof. For any \( z \in \text{tor } K_1(A) \), with \( kz = 0 \) for some integer \( k > 0 \), we have
\[
\pi_A \alpha(z) = z = \pi_A \beta(z).
\]
By the exactness of the sequence, there is an element \( f \in AffT\alpha/\rho\widetilde{K_0}(A) \) such that
\[
\alpha(z) - \beta(z) = \tilde{\lambda}(f).
\]
Since \( k\alpha(z) - k\beta(z) = \alpha(kz) - \beta(kz) = 0 \), we have \( \tilde{\lambda}(kf) = 0 \). By the injectivity of \( \tilde{\lambda}_A \), \( kf = 0 \). Note that \( AffT\alpha/\rho\widetilde{K_0}(A) \) is an \( \mathbb{R} \)-vector space, \( f = 0 \). Furthermore, \( k\alpha(z) = 0 \) in \( U(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A) \) implies that
\[
\alpha(z) \in \widetilde{SU}(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A).
\]
Hence we get \( \alpha(\text{tor } K_1(A)) \subset \widetilde{SU}(A) \). If \( u \in \widetilde{SU}(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A) \) then \( \alpha(\pi_A(u)) = u \).

2.30. Let \( U_{\text{tor}}(A) \) denote the set of unitaries \( u \in A \) such that \( [u] \in \text{tor } K_1(A) \). For any \( C^* \) algebra \( A \) we have \( \widetilde{SU}(A) \subset U_{\text{tor}}(A) \). If we further assume \( \widetilde{DU}(A) = \widetilde{DU}(A) \), then
\[
\widetilde{DU}(A) = U_0(A) \cap \widetilde{SU}(A) \quad \text{and} \quad U_{\text{tor}}(A) = U_0(A) \cdot \widetilde{SU}(A).
\]
Evidently, we have \( U_0(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A) \cong U_{\text{tor}}(A)/\widetilde{SU}(A) \). The metric \( \overline{D}_A \) on \( U(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A) \) induces a metric \( \overline{D}_{\text{tor}} \) on \( U(A)/\widetilde{SU}(A) \). And the above identification \( U_0(A)/\widetilde{DU}(A) \) with \( U_{\text{tor}}(A)/\widetilde{SU}(A) \) is an isometry with respect to \( \overline{D}_A \) and \( \overline{D}_{\text{tor}} \). Hence \( \tilde{\lambda}_A \) in 2.26 can be regarded as a map (still denoted by \( \tilde{\lambda}_A \)):
\[
\tilde{\lambda}_A : AffT\alpha/\rho\widetilde{K_0}(A) \rightarrow U_{\text{tor}}(A)/\widetilde{SU}(A) \rightarrow U(A)/\widetilde{SU}(A).
\]

Similar to Lemma 2.27, we have

Lemma 2.31. If a unital \( C^* \)-algebra \( A \) satisfies \( \rho(P_1K_0(A)) = \rho K_0(A) \) and \( \overline{DU}(A) = \overline{DU}(A) \) (see 2.24 and 2.23), in particular, if \( A \in \mathcal{H}D \) or \( A \in A^{\mathcal{H}D} \), then the following hold:
(1) There is a split exact sequence
\[
0 \rightarrow AffT\alpha/\rho\widetilde{K_0}(A) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\lambda}} U(A)/\widetilde{SU}(A) \xrightarrow{\pi_A} K_1(A)/\text{tor } K_1(A) \rightarrow 0.
\]
(2) \( \tilde{\lambda}_A \) is an isometry with respect to the metrics \( \overline{d}_A \) and \( \overline{D}_A \).

2.32. For each pair of projections \( p_1, p_2 \in A \) with \( p_1 = up_2u^* \),
\[
U(p_1A_1)/\widetilde{SU}(p_1A_1) \cong U(p_2Ap_2)/\widetilde{SU}(p_2Ap_2).
\]
Also, since in any unital \( C^* \)-algebra \( A \) and unitaries \( u, v \in U(A) \), \( v \) and \( wv^* \) represent the same element in \( U(A)/\widetilde{SU}(A) \), and the above identification does not depend on the choice of \( u \) to implement \( p_1 = up_2u^* \). That is for any \( [p] \in \Sigma A \), the group \( U(pAp)/\widetilde{SU}(pAp) \) is well defined, which does not depend on choice of \( p \in [p] \). We will include this group (with metric) as part of our invariant. If \( [p] \leq [q] \), then we can choose \( p, q \) such that \( p \leq q \). In this case, there is a natural inclusion map \( i_* : pAp \rightarrow qAq \) which induces
\[
i_* : U(pAp)/\widetilde{SU}(pAp) \rightarrow U(qAq)/\widetilde{SU}(qAq),
\]
where \( \iota_* \) is defined by
\[
\iota_*(u) = u \oplus (q - p) \in U(qAq), \quad \forall u \in U(pAp).
\]

A unital homomorphism \( \phi : A \to B \) induces a contractive group homomorphism
\[
\phi^\# : U(A)/\widetilde{SU}(A) \to U(B)/\widetilde{SU}(B).
\]
If \( \phi \) is not unital, then the map \( \phi^\# : U(A)/\widetilde{SU}(A) \to U(\phi(1_A)B\phi(1_A))/\widetilde{SU}(\phi(1_A)B\phi(1_A)) \) is induced by the corresponding unital homomorphism. In this case, \( \phi \) also induces the map \( \iota_* \circ \phi^\# : U(A)/\widetilde{SU}(A) \to U(B)/\widetilde{SU}(B) \), which is denoted by \( \phi_* \) to avoid confusion. If \( \phi \) is unital, then \( \phi^\# = \phi_* \). If \( \phi \) is not unital, then \( \phi^\# \) and \( \phi_* \) have different codomains. That is, \( \phi^\# \) has codomain \( U(\phi(1_A)B\phi(1_A))/\widetilde{SU}(\phi(1_A)B\phi(1_A)) \), but \( \phi_* \) has codomain \( U(B)/\widetilde{SU}(B) \). (See some further explanation with an example in the last paragraph of 3.7 below.)

Since \( U(A)/\widetilde{SU}(A) \) is an Abelian group, we will call the unit \([1] \in U(A)/\widetilde{SU}(A)\) the zero element. If \( \phi : A \to B \) satisfies \( \phi(U(A)) \subset \widetilde{SU}(\phi(1_A)B\phi(1_A)) \), then \( \phi^\# = 0 \). In particular, if the image of \( \phi \) is of finite dimensional, then \( \phi^\# = 0 \).

**2.33.** In this paper and [GJL], we will denote
\[
(\mathcal{K}(A), \mathcal{K}(A)^+, \Sigma A, \{AffT(pAp)\}_{[p] \in \Sigma A}, \{U(pAp)/\widetilde{SU}(pAp)\}_{[p] \in \Sigma A})
\]
by \( Inv(A) \). By a map from \( Inv(A) \) to \( Inv(B) \), we mean
\[
\alpha : (\mathcal{K}(A), \mathcal{K}(A)^+, \Sigma A) \to (\mathcal{K}(B), \mathcal{K}(B)^+, \Sigma B)
\]
as in 2.7, and for each pair \( ([p], [\overline{p}]) \in \Sigma A \times \Sigma B \) with \( \alpha([p]) = [\overline{p}] \), there exist an associate unital positive (continuous) linear map
\[
\xi^{p, \overline{p}} : AffT(pAp) \to AffT(\overline{p}B\overline{p})
\]
and an associate contractive group homomorphism
\[
\chi^{p, \overline{p}} : U(pAp)/\widetilde{SU}(pAp) \to U(\overline{p}B\overline{p})/\widetilde{SU}(\overline{p}B\overline{p})
\]
satisfying the following compatibility conditions. (Note that \( \chi^{p, \overline{p}} \) is continuous, as it is a contractive group homomorphism from a metric group to another metric group.)

(a) If \( p < q \), then the diagrams
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
AffT(pAp) & \xrightarrow{\xi^{p, \overline{p}}} & AffT(\overline{p}B\overline{p}) \\
\downarrow{\iota_*} & & \downarrow{\iota_*} \\
AffT(qAp) & \xrightarrow{\xi^{q, \overline{p}}} & AffT(\overline{q}B\overline{p})
\end{array}
\]
and
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
U(pAp)/\widetilde{SU}(pAp) & \xrightarrow{\chi^{p, \overline{p}}} & U(\overline{p}B\overline{p})/\widetilde{SU}(\overline{p}B\overline{p}) \\
\downarrow{\iota_*} & & \downarrow{\iota_*} \\
U(qAp)/\widetilde{SU}(qAp) & \xrightarrow{\chi^{q, \overline{p}}} & U(\overline{q}B\overline{p})/\widetilde{SU}(\overline{q}B\overline{p})
\end{array}
\]
commutes, where the vertical maps are induced by inclusions.

(b) The following diagram commutes
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
K_0(pAp) & \xrightarrow{\rho} & AffT(pAp) \\
\downarrow{\alpha} & & \downarrow{\xi^{p, \overline{p}}} \\
K_0(\overline{p}B\overline{p}) & \xrightarrow{\rho} & AffT(\overline{p}B\overline{p})
\end{array}
\]
and therefore $\xi^{p,\overline{\rho}}$ induces a map (still denoted by $\xi^{p,\overline{\rho}}$):

$$\xi^{p,\overline{\rho}} : \text{Aff}(pAp) / \overline{\rho}K_0(pAp) \to \text{Aff}(\overline{\rho}B\overline{p}) / \overline{\rho}K_0(\overline{\rho}B\overline{p}).$$

(The commutativity of $(III)$ follows from the commutativity of $(I)$, by 1.20 of [Ji-Jiang]. So this is not an extra requirement.)

(c) The following diagrams

$$\text{Aff}(pAp) / \overline{\rho}K_0(pAp) \xrightarrow{\xi^{p,\overline{\rho}}} U(pAp) / \overline{SU}(pAp)$$
\[ (IV) \]

and

$$U(pAp) / \overline{SU}(pAp) \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} K_1(pAp) / \text{tor} K_1(pAp)$$
\[ (V) \]

commute, where $\alpha_1$ is induced by $\alpha$.

We will denote the map from $\text{Inv}(A)$ to $\text{Inv}(B)$ by

$$(\alpha, \xi, \lambda) : (K(A), \{\text{Aff}(pAp)\}_{[p] \in \Sigma_A}, \{U(pAp) / \overline{SU}(pAp)\}_{[p] \in \Sigma_A}) \to (K(B), \{\text{Aff}(\overline{\rho}B\overline{p})\}_{[\overline{\alpha}] \in \Sigma_B}, \{U(\overline{\rho}B\overline{p}) / \overline{SU}(\overline{\rho}B\overline{p})\}_{[\overline{\alpha}] \in \Sigma_B}).$$

Completely similar to [NT, Lemma 3.2] and [Thm2, Lemma 6.5], we have the following propositions.

**Proposition 2.34.** Let unital $C^*$-algebra $A$ (resp.) satisfy $\rho(\overline{P}_1K_0(A)) = \rho K_0(A)$ ($\rho(\overline{P}_1K_0(B)) = \rho K_0(B)$, resp.) and $\overline{DU}(A) = \overline{DU}(A)$ ($\overline{DU}(B) = \overline{DU}(B)$, resp.). In particular, let $A, B \in \mathcal{H}D$ or $A\mathcal{H}D$ be unital $C^*$-algebras. Assume that

$$\psi_1 : K_1(A) \to K_1(B) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_0 : \text{Aff}(A) / \overline{\rho}K_0(A) \to \text{Aff}(B) / \overline{\rho}K_0(B)$$

are group homomorphisms such that $\psi_0$ is a contraction with respect to $d_A$ and $d_B$. Then there is a group homomorphism

$$\psi : U(A) / \overline{DU}(A) \to U(B) / \overline{DU}(B)$$

which is a contraction with respect to $D_A$ and $D_B$ such that the diagram

$$0 \to \text{Aff}(A) / \overline{\rho}K_0(A) \xrightarrow{\lambda_A} U(A) / \overline{DU}(A) \xrightarrow{\pi_A} K_1(A) \xrightarrow{\psi_1} 0$$

and

$$0 \to \text{Aff}(B) / \overline{\rho}K_0(B) \xrightarrow{\lambda_B} U(B) / \overline{DU}(B) \xrightarrow{\pi_B} K_1(B) \xrightarrow{\psi_1} 0$$

commutes. If $\psi_0$ is an isometric isomorphism and $\psi_1$ is an isomorphism, then $\psi$ is an isometric isomorphism.

**Proposition 2.35.** Let unital $C^*$-algebra $A$ (resp.) satisfy $\rho(\overline{P}_1K_0(A)) = \rho K_0(A)$ ($\rho(\overline{P}_1K_0(B)) = \rho K_0(B)$, resp.) and $\overline{DU}(A) = \overline{DU}(A)$ ($\overline{DU}(B) = \overline{DU}(B)$, resp.). In particular, let $A, B \in \mathcal{H}D$ or $A\mathcal{H}D$ be unital $C^*$-algebras. Assume that

$$\psi_1 : K_1(A) \to K_1(B) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_0 : \text{Aff}(A) / \overline{\rho}K_0(A) \to \text{Aff}(B) / \overline{\rho}K_0(B)$$

are group homomorphisms such that $\psi_0$ is a contraction with respect to $\overline{d}_A$ and $\overline{d}_B$. Then there is a group homomorphism

$$\psi : U(A) / \overline{SU}(A) \to U(B) / \overline{SU}(B)$$
which is a contraction with respect to $D_A$ and $D_B$ such that the diagram

$$
\begin{align*}
0 & \to AffTA/\rho K_0(A) \xrightarrow{\psi} U(A)/SU(A) \xrightarrow{\pi_A} K_1(A)/tor K_1(A) \to 0 \\
0 & \to AffTA/\rho K_0(B) \xrightarrow{\psi} U(B)/SU(B) \xrightarrow{\pi_B} K_1(B)/tor K_1(B) \to 0
\end{align*}
$$

commutes. If $\psi_0$ is an isometric isomorphism and $\psi_1$ is an isomorphism, then $\psi$ is an isometric isomorphism.

**Remark 2.36.** As in Proposition 2.35 (or Proposition 2.34), for each fixed pair $p \in A, \bar{\tau} \in B$ with

$$
\alpha([p]) = [\bar{\tau}],
$$

if we have an isometric isomorphism between $AffT(pAp)/\rho K_0(pAp)$ and $AffT(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})/\rho K_0(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})$ (or between $AffT(pAp)/\rho K_0(pAp)$ and $AffT(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})/\rho K_0(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})$) and isomorphism between $K_1(pAp)$ and $K_1(pBp)$, then we have an isometric isomorphism between $U(pAp)/SU(pAp)$ and $U(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})/SU(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})$ (or $U(pAp)/DU(pAp)$ and $U(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})/DU(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})$) making both diagrams $(IV)$ and $(V)$ commute. This is the reason $U(A)/DU(A)$ is not included in the Elliott invariant in the classification of simple $C^*$-algebras. For our setting, even though for each pair of projections $(p, \bar{\tau})$ with $\alpha([p]) = [\bar{\tau}]$, we can find an isometric isomorphism between $U(pAp)/SU(pAp)$ and $U(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})/SU(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})$, provided that the other parts of invariants $Inv^0(A)$ and $Inv^0(B)$ are isomorphic, we still cannot make such system of isometric isomorphisms compatible—that is, cannot make the diagram $II$ commutes for $p < q$. We will present two non isomorphic $C^*$-algebras $A$ and $B$ in our class such that $Inv^0(A) \cong Inv^0(B)$, in next section, where $Inv^0(B)$ is defined in 2.10. Hence it is essential to include $\{U(pAp)/SU(pAp)\}_{p \in \Sigma}$ with the compatibility as part of $Inv(A)$.

**2.37.** Replacing $U(pAp)/SU(pAp)$, one can also use $U(pAp)/DU(pAp)$ as the part of the invariant. That is, one can define $Inv'(A)$ as

$$(K(A), K(A)^+, \Sigma A, \{AffT(pAp)\}_{p \in \Sigma A}, \{U(pAp)/DU(pAp)\}_{p \in \Sigma A}),$$

with corresponding compatibility condition—one needs to change diagrams $(IV)$ and $(V)$ to the corresponding ones. It is not difficult to see that $Inv'(A) \cong Inv'(B)$ implies $Inv(A) \cong Inv(B)$. We choose the formulation of $Inv(A)$, since it is much more convenient for the proof of the main theorem in [JGL] and it is formally a weaker requirement than the one to require the isomorphism between $Inv'(A)$ and $Inv'(B)$, and the theorem is formally stronger. (Let us point out that, in the construction of the example (and its proof) in section 3 of this article, $Inv'(A)$ is as convenient as $Inv(A)$, and therefore if only for the sake of example in section 3 of this paper, it is not necessary to introduce $SU(A)$.)

Furthermore, it is straightforward to check the following proposition:

**Proposition 2.38.** Let unital $C^*$-algebra $A$ ($B$, resp.) satisfy $\rho(P_1K_0(A)) = \rho K_0(A)$ ($\rho(P_1K_0(B)) = \rho K_0(B)$, resp.) and $DU_0(A) = DU(A)$ ($DU_0(B) = DU(B)$, resp.). In particular, let $A, B \in \mathcal{H}D$ or $AHD$ be unital $C^*$-algebras. Suppose that $K_1(A) = tor(K_1(A))$ and $K_1(B) = tor(K_1(B))$. It follows that $Inv^0(A) \cong Inv^0(B)$ implies that $Inv(A) \cong Inv(B)$.

**Proof.** It follows from the fact that any isomorphism

$$
\xi^{p, \bar{\tau}} : AffT(pAp)/\rho K_0(pAp) \to AffT(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})/\rho K_0(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})
$$

induces a unique isomorphism

$$
\chi^{p, \bar{\tau}} : U(pAp)/SU(pAp) \to U(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})/SU(\bar{\tau}B\bar{\tau})
$$
Let $f$ be the corresponding component of the map $\xi$ by $\alpha$ be projections satisfying $\text{Aff} T\rho A \rho \to \text{Aff} T\rho B \rho$ and $\xi_2 : \text{Aff} T\rho A \rho \to \text{Aff} T\rho B \rho$ are compatible with $\alpha$ (see diagram (2.2) in 2.11) and compatible with each other (see diagram (2.A) in 2.9). Since the (not necessarily unital) maps $\text{Aff} T\rho A \rho \to \text{Aff} T\rho A \rho$ and $\text{Aff} T\rho B \rho \to \text{Aff} T\rho B \rho$ induced by inclusions, are injective, we know that the map $\xi_1$ is completely decided by $\xi_2$. Let

$$\xi^{i,j}_2 : \text{Aff} T\rho A \rho \to \text{Aff} T\rho B \rho$$

be the following formula, for any $f \in \text{Aff} T\rho B \rho$

$$\xi^{i,j}_1(f) = \frac{\text{rank } \overline{\theta}}{\text{rank } \overline{\eta}} \cdot \frac{\text{rank } \alpha^{i,j}(p^i)}{\text{rank } \alpha^{i,j}(q^j)} \cdot \xi^{i,j}_2(f).$$

In particular, if $q = 1_A$ with $\overline{\eta} = \alpha_0 [1_A]$, and $\xi_2 = \xi : \text{Aff} TA \to \text{Aff} \alpha_0 [1_A] B \alpha_0 [1_A]$ (note that since $\text{Aff} T\rho Q \rho B \rho$ only depends on the unitary equivalence class of $Q$, it is convenient to denote it as $\text{Aff} T\rho Q \rho B \rho$), then we will denote $\xi_1$ by $\xi_1\rho [i,\alpha_0[p]]$. Even for the general case, we can also write $\xi_1 = \xi_2\rho [i,\alpha_0[p]]$, when $p < q$ as above.

As in 2.40, let $A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n A^i$, $B = \bigoplus_{j=1}^m B^j$ and $p < q \in A$, $\overline{\eta} < \overline{\eta} \in B$, with $\alpha_0[p] = \overline{\eta}$ and $\alpha_0[q] = \overline{\eta}$. If

$$\gamma_1 : U(p A) / \overline{\text{SU}}(p A) \to U(\overline{\eta} B \overline{\eta}) / \overline{\text{SU}}(\overline{\eta} B \overline{\eta})$$

is compatible with

$$\gamma_2 : U(q A) / \overline{\text{SU}}(q A) \to U(\overline{\eta} B \overline{\eta}) / \overline{\text{SU}}(\overline{\eta} B \overline{\eta}),$$

then $\gamma_1$ is completely determined by $\gamma_2$ (since both maps

$$U(p A) / \overline{\text{SU}}(p A) \to U(q A) / \overline{\text{SU}}(q A), \quad U(\overline{\eta} B \overline{\eta}) / \overline{\text{SU}}(\overline{\eta} B \overline{\eta}) \to U(\overline{\eta} B \overline{\eta}) / \overline{\text{SU}}(\overline{\eta} B \overline{\eta})$$

are injective). Therefore we can denote $\gamma_1$ by $\gamma_2\rho [i,\alpha_0[p]]$.

Let us point out that, in 2.40 and 2.41, if $A \in AHD$ and $B \in AHD$, $\xi_1$ is not completely determined by $\xi_2$ and $\gamma_1$ is not completely determined by $\gamma_2$.

§3. The counter example

(Note that by the split exact sequence in Lemma 2.31, we have $\text{Aff} T(p A) / \rho K_0(p A) \cong U(p A) / \overline{\text{SU}}(p A)$.)
3.1. In this section, we will present an example of AT algebras to prove that \( \text{Inv}'(A) \) or \( \text{Inv}(A) \) is not completely determined by \( \text{Inv}^0(A) \). That is, the Hausdorffized algebraic \( K_1 \) group \( (U(pAp)/DU(pAp))_{p \in \text{proj}(A)} \) or \( (U(pAp)/\overline{SU}(pAp))_{p \in \text{proj}(A)} \) with the corresponding compatibilities are indispensable as a part of the invariant for \( \text{Inv}'(A) \) or \( \text{Inv}(A) \). This is one of the essential differences between the simple \( C^* \)-algebras and the \( C^* \)-algebras with the ideal property. In fact, for all the unital \( C^* \)-algebras \( A \) satisfy a reasonable condition (e.g., \( \rho(\mathcal{P}_1 K_0(A)) = \rho K_0(A) \) and \( DU_0(A) = DU(A) \)), we have

\[
U(pAp)/DU(pAp) \cong AffTpAp/\overline{\rho K_0(pAp)} \oplus K_1(pAp), \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
U(pAp)/\overline{SU}(pAp) \cong AffTpAp/\overline{\rho K_0(pAp)} \oplus K_1(pAp)/tor K_1(pAp),
\]

i.e., the metric groups \( U(pAp)/DU(pAp) \) and \( U(pAp)/\overline{SU}(pAp) \) themselves are completely determined by \( AffTpAp \) and \( K_1(pAp) \), which are included in other parts of the invariants i.e., there are decided by \( \text{Inv}^0(A) \), but the compatibilities make the difference. The point is that the above isomorphisms are not natural and therefor the isomorphisms corresponding to the cutting down algebras \( pAp \) and \( qAq \) \( (p < q) \) may not be chosen to be compatible.

As pointed out in 2.37, \( \text{Inv}'(A) \cong \text{Inv}(B) \) implies \( \text{Inv}(A) \cong \text{Inv}(B) \). For the \( C^* \) algebras \( A \) and \( B \) constructed in this paper, we only need to prove \( \text{Inv}^0(A) \cong \text{Inv}^0(B) \) but \( \text{Inv}(A) \not\cong \text{Inv}(B) \). Consequently, \( \text{Inv}(A) \not\cong \text{Inv}'(B) \).

3.2. Let \( p_1 = 2 \), \( p_2 = 3 \), \( p_3 = 5 \), \( p_4 = 7 \), \( p_5 = 11, \cdots \), \( p_n \) be the \( n \)-th prime number, let \( 1 < k_1 < k_2 < k_3 < \cdots \) be a sequence of positive integers. Let

\[
A_1 = B_1 = C(S^1),
\]

\[
A_2 = B_2 = M_{p_1}(C[0,1]) \oplus M_{p_1}(C(S^1)) = A_1^1 \oplus A_2^1 = B_1^1 \oplus B_2^1,
\]

\[
A_3 = B_3 = M_{p_2} M_{p_1}(C[0,1]) \oplus M_{p_2} M_{p_1}(C[0,1]) \oplus M_{p_2} M_{p_1}(C(S^1)) = A_1^1 \oplus A_2^1 \oplus A_3^1 = B_1^1 \oplus B_2^1 \oplus B_3^1,
\]

\[
A_4 = B_4 = M_{p_3} M_{p_2} M_{p_1}(C[0,1]) \oplus M_{p_3} M_{p_2} M_{p_1}(C[0,1]) \oplus M_{p_3} M_{p_2} M_{p_1}(C(S^1)) = A_1^1 \oplus A_2^1 \oplus A_3^1 \oplus A_4^1 = B_1^1 \oplus B_2^1 \oplus B_3^1 \oplus B_4^1.
\]

In general, let

\[
A_n = B_n = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-1} M_{p_{i+1}^{k_{i+1}} \cdots p_{i}^{k_{i}}}(C[0,1]) \oplus M_{p_{i+1}^{k_{i+1}} \cdots p_{i}^{k_{i}}}(C(S^1))
\]

\[
= \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-1} M_{\prod_{j=1}^{i} p_{j}^{k_{j}} \cdot \prod_{j=i+1}^{n-1} p_{j}^{k_{j}}}(C[0,1]) \oplus M_{\prod_{j=1}^{i} p_{j}^{k_{j}} \cdot \prod_{j=i+1}^{n-1} p_{j}^{k_{j}}}(C(S^1)).
\]

For \( 1 \leq i \leq n-1 \), let \( [n,i] = \prod_{j=1}^{i} p_{j}^{k_{j}} \cdot \prod_{j=i+1}^{n-1} p_{j}^{k_{j}} \) and \( [n,n] = [n,n-1] \). Then

\[
A_n = B_n = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-1} M_{[n,i]}(C[0,1]) \oplus M_{[n,n]}(C(S^1)).
\]

(Note that last two blocks have same size \( [n,n] = [n,n-1] \).)

Note that \( [n+1,i] = [n,i] \cdot p_{i}^{k_{i}} \) for all \( i \in \{1,2,\cdots,n-1\} \) and \( [n+1,n] = [n+1,n] = [n,n+n] \cdot p_{n}^{k_{n}} \).

3.3. Let \( \{t_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \) be a dense subset of \([0,1]\) and \( \{z_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \) be a dense subset of \( S^1 \).

In this subsection, we will define the connecting homomorphisms

\[
\phi_{n,n+1} : A_n \rightarrow A_{n+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_{n,n+1} : B_n \rightarrow B_{n+1}.
\]
For \( i \leq n - 1 \), define \( \phi_{n,n+1}^{i,i} = \psi_{n,n+1}^{i,i} : M_{[n,i]}(C[0,1]) \rightarrow M_{[n+1,i]}(C[0,1]) = M_{[n,i]}p_{n}^{k_n}(C[0,1]) \) by

\[
\phi_{n,n+1}^{i,i}(f)(t) = \psi_{n,n+1}^{i,i}(f)(t) = diag(f(t), f(t), \ldots, f(t), f(t_n)), \ \forall f \in M_{[n,i]}(C[0,1]).
\]

Define \( \phi_{n,n+1}^{n,n+1} = \psi_{n,n+1}^{n,n+1} : M_{[n,n]}(C(S^1)) \rightarrow M_{[n+1,n+1]}(C(S^1)) = M_{[n,n]}p_{n}^{k_n}(C(S^1)) \) by

\[
\phi_{n,n+1}^{n,n+1}(f)(z) = \psi_{n,n+1}^{n,n+1}(f)(z) = diag(f(z), f(z_n), f(z_n), \ldots, f(z_n)), \ \forall f \in M_{[n,n]}(C(S^1)).
\]

But \( \phi_{n,n+1}^{n,n} \) and \( \psi_{n,n+1}^{n,n} \) are defined differently—this is the only non-equal component of \( \phi_{n,n+1} \) and \( \psi_{n,n+1} \).

Let \( l = p_{n}^{k_n} - 1 \), then

\[
\phi_{n,n+1}^{n,n}(f)(t) = diag(f(e^{2\pi it}), f(e^{-2\pi it}), f(e^{2\pi i\frac{t}{l}}), \ldots, f(e^{2\pi i\frac{t}{l}})),
\]

\[
\psi_{n,n+1}^{n,n}(f)(t) = diag(f(e^{2\pi ilt}), f(e^{-2\pi ilt}), f(e^{2\pi i\frac{t}{l}}), \ldots, f(e^{2\pi i\frac{t}{l}})),
\]

for any \( f \in M_{[n,n]}(C(S^1)) \), where \( l_n = 4^n \cdot [n + 1, n] \in \mathbb{N} \).

Let all other parts \( \phi_{n,n+1}^{i,j}, \psi_{n,n+1}^{i,j} \) of \( \phi_{n,n+1}^{i,j}, \psi_{n,n+1}^{i,j} \) (except \( i = j \leq n \) or \( i = n, j = n + 1 \), defined above) be zero.

Note that all \( \phi_{n,n+1}^{i,j}, \psi_{n,n+1}^{i,j} \) are either injective or zero.

Let \( A = lim(A_n, \phi_{n,m}), B = lim(B_n, \psi_{n,m}) \). Then it follows from the density of the sets \( \{t_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \) and \( \{z_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \) that both \( A \) and \( B \) have the ideal property (see the characterization theorem for \( A H \) algebras with the ideal property \( [P_\alpha] \)).

**Proposition 3.4.** There is an isomorphism between \( Inv^0(A) \) and \( Inv^0(B) \) (see 2.10)—that is, there is an isomorphism

\[
\alpha : (K(A), K(A)^+, \Sigma A) \rightarrow (K(B), K(B)^+, \Sigma B),
\]

which is compatible with Bockstein operations, and for pairs \( (p, q) \) with \( p \in \Sigma A, q \in \Sigma B \) and \( \alpha([p]) = [q] \), there are associated unital positive linear maps

\[
\xi^{p,q} : AffT(pAp) \rightarrow AffT(qBq)
\]

which are compatible in the sense of 2.9 (see diagram (2.A) in 2.9).

**Proof.** Since \( KK(\phi_{n,m}) = KK(\psi_{n,m}) \) and \( \phi_{n,m} \sim, \psi_{n,m} \), the identity maps \( \eta_n : A_n \rightarrow B_n \) induce a shape equivalence between \( A = lim(A_n, \phi_{n,m}) \) and \( B = lim(B_n, \psi_{n,m}) \), and therefore induce an isomorphism

\[
\alpha : (K(A), K(A)^+, \Sigma A) \rightarrow (K(B), K(B)^+, \Sigma B).
\]

Note that \( \phi_{n,n+1}^{i,i} = \psi_{n,n+1}^{i,i} \) for \( i \leq n - 1 \), \( \phi_{n,n+1}^{n,n+1} = \psi_{n,n+1}^{n,n+1} \), and

\[
\|AffT\phi_{n,n+1}^{n,n}(f) - AffT\psi_{n,n+1}^{n,n}(f)\| \leq \frac{2}{p_{n}^{k_n}} \|f\|
\]

(see the definition of \( \phi_{n,n+1} \) and \( \psi_{n,n+1} \)). Therefore,

\[
AffT\eta_n : AffTA_n \rightarrow AffTB_n \quad \text{and} \quad AffT\eta_n^{-1} : AffTB_n \rightarrow AffTA_n
\]
induce the approximately intertwining diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c c c c c}
\text{Aff}TA_1 & \rightarrow & \text{Aff}TA_2 & \rightarrow & \cdots & \rightarrow & \text{Aff}TA \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & & & \\
\text{Aff}TB_1 & \rightarrow & \text{Aff}TB_2 & \rightarrow & \cdots & \rightarrow & \text{Aff}TB
\end{array}
\]

in the sense of Elliott [Ell1]. Therefore, there is a unital positive isomorphism

\[
\xi : \text{Aff}TA \rightarrow \text{Aff}TB.
\]

Also, for any projection \([P] \in K_0(A)\), there is a projection \(P_n \in A_n = B_n\) (for \(n\) large enough) with \(P_n^i = \text{diag}(1, \cdots, 1, 0, \cdots, 0) \in M_{n,1}(C(X_i))\), where \(X_i = [0, 1]\) for \(i \leq n - 1\), and \(X_n, n = S^1\), such that \(\phi_{n, \infty}(\{P_n\}) = [P] \in K_0(A)\). Note that for any constant functions \(f \in A_n^i = B_n^i\) (e.g., \(P_n^i\) above) and for any \(j, \phi_{n, n+1}^j(f)\) and \(\psi_{n+1}^{j+1}(f)\) are still constant functions and \(\phi_{n, n+1}^j(f) = \psi_{n+1}^{j+1}(f)\). That is, we have

\[
\phi_{n, n+1}^j(P_n) = \psi_{n, n+1}^j(P_n) \quad \text{(denoted by } P_{n+1}^j) \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
\phi_{n, m}^j(P_n) = \psi_{n, m}^j(P_n) \quad \text{(denoted by } P_m^j).
\]

Let \(P_\infty = \phi_{n, \infty}(P_n)\) and \(Q_\infty = \psi_{n, \infty}(P_n)\). Then the identity maps \(\{\eta_n\}_{m > n}\) also induce the following approximate intertwining diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{c c c c c}
\text{Aff}T(P_n A_n P_n) & \rightarrow & \text{Aff}T(P_{n+1} A_{n+1} P_{n+1}) & \rightarrow & \cdots & \rightarrow & \text{Aff}T P_\infty A P_\infty \\
\downarrow & & \uparrow & & & & \\
\text{Aff}T(P_n B_n P_n) & \rightarrow & \text{Aff}T(P_{n+1} B_{n+1} P_{n+1}) & \rightarrow & \cdots & \rightarrow & \text{Aff}T Q_\infty B Q_\infty,
\end{array}
\]

and hence induce a positive linear isomorphism

\[
\xi^{[P], \alpha[P]} : \text{Aff}T P_\infty A P_\infty \rightarrow \text{Aff}T Q_\infty B Q_\infty.
\]

(Note that \([P_\infty] = [P], [Q_\infty] = \alpha[P]\) in \(K_0(A)\) and \(K_0(B)\), respectively.) Evidently those maps are compatible since, they are induced by the same sequence of homomorphisms \(\{\eta_n\}\) and \(\{\eta_n^{-1}\}\).

The following Definition 3.5 and Proposition 3.6 are inspired by [Ell3].

**Definition 3.5.** Let \(C = \lim(C_n, \phi_{n, m})\) be an \(AHD\) inductive limit. We say the system \((C_n, \phi_{n, m})\) has the uniformly varied determinant if for any \(C^i_n = M_{[i, j]}(C(S^1))\) (that is, \(C_n^i\) has spectrum \(S^1\)) and \(C_{n+1}^j\) and \(f \in C_n^i\) defined by

\[
f(z) = \begin{pmatrix} z & \cdots & 1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots \\ 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{[i, j] \times [i, j]},
\]

we have that \(\det(\phi_{n+1, n}^{j+1}(f)(x)) = \text{constant for } x \in Sp(C_{n+1}^j) \neq S^1\) or \(\det(\phi_{n+1, n}^{j+1}(f)(z)) = \lambda z^k (\lambda \in \mathbb{C})\) for \(z \in Sp(C_{n+1}^j) = S^1\), where \(j\) satisfy \(\phi_{n+1, n}^{j+1} \neq 0\) and the determinant is taken inside \(\phi_{n+1, n}^{j+1}(1_{C_n^i})C_{n+1}^j \phi_{n+1, n}^{j+1}(1_{C_n^i})\).

**Proposition 3.6.** If the inductive limit system \(C = (C_n, \phi_{n, m})\) has the uniformly varied determinant, then for any elements \([p] \in \Sigma C\), there are a splitting maps

\[
K_1(p Cp)/\text{tor} K_1(p Cp) \xrightarrow{\pi_{p Cp}} U(p Cp)/\widehat{SU}(p Cp)
\]

of the exact sequences

\[
0 \rightarrow \text{Aff}T p Cp/\widehat{K}_0(p Cp) \rightarrow U(p Cp)/\widehat{SU}(p Cp) \xrightarrow{\pi_{p Cp}} K_1(p Cp)/\text{tor} K_1(p Cp) \rightarrow 0
\]
(that is, \( \pi_{pCp} \circ \rho_{pCp} = id \) on \( K_1(pCp)/\text{tor } K_1(pCp) \)) such that the system of maps \( \{ \rho_{pCp} \}_{p \in \sum C} \) are compatible in the following sense: if \( p < q \), then the following diagram commutes
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
K_1(pCp)/\text{tor } K_1(pCp) & \overset{\rho_{pCp}}{\longrightarrow} & U(pCp)/\overline{SU}(pCp) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
K_1(qCq)/\text{tor } K_1(qCq) & \overset{\rho_{qCq}}{\longrightarrow} & U(qCq)/\overline{SU}(qCq),
\end{array}
\]
where the vertical maps are induced by the inclusions \( pCp \rightarrow qCq \).

**Proof.** Fix \( p \in C \). Let \( x \in K_1(pCp)/\text{tor } K_1(pCp) \). There exist a \( C_n \) and \( p_n \in C_n \) such that \( [\phi_n,\infty(p_n)] = [p] \in K_0(C) \). Without lose of generality, we can assume \( \phi_n,\infty(p_n) = p \). By increasing \( n \) if necessary, we can assume that there is an element \( x_n \in K_1(p_nC_n p_n)/\text{tor } K_1(p_nC_n p_n) \), such that \( (\phi_n,\infty)_*(x_n) = x \in K_1(pCp)/\text{tor } K_1(pCp) \).

Write \( p_nC_n p_n = D = \oplus D^i \). Let \( I = \{ i \mid Sp(D^i) = S^1 \} \). For \( i \in I \), \( D^i \) can be identified with \( M_{i,k}(C(S^1)) \). Let \( u_i \in D^i \) be defined by
\[
u_i(z) = \begin{pmatrix} z & \cdots & 1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall z \in S^1,
\]
which represents the standard generator of \( K_1(D^i) \). Then \( x_n \) can be represented by
\[
u = \bigoplus_{i \in I} u_i^{k_i} \oplus \bigoplus_{j \notin I} D^j \in \bigoplus_{i \in I} D^i \oplus \bigoplus_{j \notin I} D^j = D \subseteq p_nC_n p_n.
\]
Define \( S(x) = [\phi_n,\infty(u)] \in U(pCp)/\overline{SU}(pCp) \). Note that all unitaries with constant determinants are in \( \overline{SU} \), and that the inductive system has the uniformly varied determinant, it is routine to verify that \( S(x) \) is well defined and the system \( \{ \rho_{pCp} \}_{p \in \sum C} \) makes the diagram (3.6.A) commute.

3.7. Let \( A \) be a unital \( C^* \)-algebra. Then \( AffT \) is a real Banach space with quotient space \( AffT/\rho \overline{K_0}(A) \). Let us use \( \| \cdot \| \sim \) to denote the quotient norm. Note that \( \chi_A \) identifies \( U_{\text{tor}}(A)/\overline{SU}(A) \) with \( AffT/\rho \overline{K_0}(A) \). In this way, \( U_{\text{tor}}(A)/\overline{SU}(A) \) is regarded as a real Banach space, whose norm is also denoted by \( \| \cdot \| \sim \). In general, we have
\[
U(A)/\overline{SU}(A) \cong U_{\text{tor}}(A)/\overline{SU}(A) \times K_1(A)/\text{tor } K_1(A);
\]
but the identification is not canonical. Even though \( U(A)/\overline{SU}(A) \) is not a Banach space, it is an Abelian group: for \( [u], [v] \in U(A)/\overline{SU}(A) \), define \( [u] - [v] = [uv^*] \).

The norm \( \| \cdot \| \sim \) is related to the metrics \( \overline{d}_A \) (on \( AffT/\rho \overline{K_0}(A) \); see 2.26) and \( d_A \) (on \( U_{\text{tor}}(A)/\overline{SU}(A) \); see 2.30) as below. Let \( \varepsilon < 1 \). For any \( f, g \in AffT/\rho \overline{K_0}(A) \),
\[
\| f - g \| \sim < \frac{\varepsilon}{2\pi} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad d_A(f, g) < \varepsilon \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \| f - g \| \sim < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.
\]
And for any \( [u], [v] \in U(A)/\overline{SU}(A) \) with \( [u] - [v] = [uv^*] \in U_{\text{tor}}(A)/\overline{SU}(A) \),
\[
\| [u] - [v] \| \sim < \frac{\varepsilon}{2\pi} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad D_A([u], [v]) < \varepsilon \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \| [u] - [v] \| \sim < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.
\]

For \( A = PM_{i}(C(X))P \in \mathcal{H} \) or \( A = M_1(I_k) \) (at this case we also denote \([0, 1] \) by \( X \)), there are canonical identification (see 2.39)
\[
U_{\text{tor}}(A)/\overline{SU}(A) \cong AffT/\rho \overline{K_0}(A) \cong C(X, \mathbb{R})/\{ \text{constant functions} \}.
\]
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Choose a base point \(x_0 \in X\). Let \(C_{x_0}(X, \mathbb{R})\) be the set of functions \(f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})\) with \(f(x_0) = 0\). Then \(C(X, \mathbb{R})/(\text{constant functions}) \cong C_{x_0}(X, \mathbb{R})\). For \([f] = AfT_{\mathcal{A}}/\rho_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{A})\) (or \([f] \in U_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{A})/SU(\mathcal{A})\)) identified with a function \(f \in C_{x_0}(X, \mathbb{R})\), we have
\[
\|[f]\| = \frac{1}{2} \left( \max_{x \in X} (f(x)) - \min_{x \in X} (f(x)) \right),
\]
(rather than \(\sup_{x \in X} |f(x)|\)).

In the above case, if \(p \in \mathcal{A}\) is a non zero projection, then \(U_{\mathcal{T}}(pA_p)/SU(pA_p) \cong \text{Aff}(\mathcal{A})\) is also identified with \(C_{x_0}(X, \mathbb{R})\). Consider the inclusion map \(i : pA_p \to A\). Then the map \(i_\ast\) as map from \(U_{\mathcal{T}}(pA_p)/SU(pA_p) \cong \text{Aff}(\mathcal{A})\) to \(U_{\mathcal{T}}(A)/SU(A)\) can be described as below: if \(u \in U_{\mathcal{T}}(pA_p)/SU(pA_p) \cong \text{Aff}(\mathcal{A})\) is identified with \(f \in C_{x_0}(X, \mathbb{R})\), then \(i_\ast(u) \in U_{\mathcal{T}}(A)/SU(A)\) is identified with \(\frac{\text{rank}(i_\ast f)}{\text{rank}(i)} f\). But \(i_\ast\) is the identity map from \(U_{\mathcal{T}}(pA_p)/SU(pA_p) \cong \text{Aff}(\mathcal{A})\) to itself (not to \(U_{\mathcal{T}}(A)/SU(A)\)).

3.8. It is easy to see that \(K_1(A) = K_1(B) = \mathbb{Z}\).

In the definition of \(A_n = \oplus_{i=1}^n A_i\), only one block \(A_n^n = M_{n,n}(\mathcal{S}(1))\) has spectrum \(S^1\), and only two partial maps \(\phi^{n-j}_{n,n+1}\) for \(j = n, j = n + 1\) (of \(\phi^{n-j}_{n,n+1}\) from \(A_n^n\)) are nonzero. Let \(f \in A_n^n\). Let \(f \in A_n^n\) be defined as in Definition 3.5. Then \(\det(\phi^{n+1}_{n,n+1}(f)(z)) = z\) and \(\det(\phi^{n,j}_{n,n+1}(f)(t)) = e^{2\pi i t} e^{-2\pi i t} e^{2\pi i t} e^{\pi i t} e^{-\pi i t} \cdots e^{\pi i t} e^{-\pi i t} = \pm 1\) (see 3.3). So the inductive limit system \((A_n, \phi_{n,m})\) has the uniformly varied determinant, and therefore the limit algebra \(A\) has compatible splitting maps \(S_n : K_1(pA_p) \to U(pA_p)/SU(pA_p)\).

We will prove that \(B = \lim(B_n, \psi_{n,m})\) does not have such compatible system of splitting maps \(\{K_1(pB_p) \to U(pB_p)/SU(pB_p)\}|p|\in\mathcal{B}\).

Before proving the above fact, let us describe the \(K_0\)-group of \(A\) and \(B\). Let
\[
G_1 = \{ \frac{m}{p} \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \},
\]
\[
G_2 = \{ \frac{m}{p^1 p^2} \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \},
\]
\[
G_3 = \{ \frac{m}{p_1 p_2 p_3} \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \},
\]
\[
\vdots
\]
\[
G_n = \{ \frac{m}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{n-1} p_n} \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \},
\]
\[
G_\infty = \{ \frac{m}{p_1^{k_1} p_2^{k_2} \cdots p_t^{k_t}} \mid t \in \mathbb{Z}_+, m \in \mathbb{Z} \},
\]
where \(p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, \ldots, p_i, \ldots\) and \(k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_t \cdots\) are defined in 3.2. Then
\[
K_0(A) = K_0(B) = \left\{ (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n, \cdots) \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} G_n \mid \exists N \text{ such that } a_N = a_{N+1} = \cdots \in \mathbb{Q} \right\}\hat{\cong} \hat{G}.
\]
Furthermore, their positive cones consist of the elements whose coordinates are non-negative, and their order units are \(\lfloor 1_A \rfloor = \lfloor 1_B \rfloor = (1, 1, \cdots, 1, \cdots) \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} G_n\). Let
\[
\alpha_0 : (K_0(A), K_0(A)^+, \lfloor 1_A \rfloor) = (\hat{G}, \hat{G}^+, (1, 1, \cdots, 1, \cdots)) \to (K_0(B), K_0(B)^+, \lfloor 1_B \rfloor) = (\hat{G}, \hat{G}^+, (1, 1, \cdots, 1, \cdots))
\]
be a scaled ordered isomorphism. Then \( \alpha_0(1,1,\cdots,1,\cdots) = (1,1,\cdots,1,\cdots) \). Note that an element \( x \in \hat{G} \) is divisible by power \( p^i \) (for any \( n \)) of the first prime number \( p_1 = 2 \) if and only if \( x = (t,0,0,\cdots,0,\cdots) \in G_1 \subset \hat{G} \). Hence \( \alpha_0((1,0,0,\cdots,0,\cdots)) = (t,0,0,\cdots,0,\cdots) \) for some \( t \in G_1 \) with \( t > 0 \).

\[
\alpha_0(t,1,1,\cdots,1,\cdots) = (1-t,1,1,\cdots,1,\cdots).
\]

Since \( \alpha_0 \) preserves the positive cone, we have \( 1-t \geq 0 \) which implies \( t \leq 1 \). On the other hand, \( (\alpha_0)^{-1} \) takes \((1,0,0,\cdots,0,\cdots)\) to \((1/t,0,0,\cdots,0,\cdots)\). But \( (\alpha_0)^{-1} \) also preserves the positive cone. Symmetrically, we get \( t \geq 1 \). That is, \( \alpha_0((1,0,0,\cdots,0,\cdots)) = (1,0,0,\cdots,0,\cdots) \). Similarly, using the fact that \( G_k \) is the subgroup of all elements in \( \hat{G} \) which can be divisible by any power of \( p_k \)—the \( k \)th prime number, we can prove that

\[
\alpha_0\left(\underbrace{0,\cdots,0,1,0,\cdots,0,\cdots}_k\right) = \left(\underbrace{0,\cdots,0,1,0,\cdots,0,\cdots}_k\right) \in G_k \subset \hat{G}.
\]

That is, \( \alpha_0 \) is the identity on \( \hat{G} \).

Note that \( Sp(A) = Sp(B) \) is the one point compactification of \( \{1,2,3,\cdots\} \) —or, in other words, \( \{1,2,3,\cdots,\infty\} \).

If we let \( I_n \) (or \( J_n \)) be the primitive ideal \( A \) (or \( B \)) corresponding to \( n \) (including \( n = \infty \)), then

\[
K_0(A/I_n) = K_0(B/J_n) = G_n.
\]

Note also that if \( m' > m > n \in \mathbb{N} \), then \( \phi_{m,m'}(A_{m''}^n) \subset A_{m''}^n \) and \( \psi_{m,m'}(B_{m''}^n) \subset B_{m''}^n \). Hence \( A/I_n = \lim_{n < m \to \infty} (A_{m''}^n, \phi_{m,m'}(A_{m''}^n)) \) (and \( B/J_n = \lim_{n < m \to \infty} (B_{m''}^n, \psi_{m,m'}(B_{m''}^n)) \) resp.) are ideals of \( A \) (and \( B \) resp.). But \( A/I_\infty \) (or \( B/J_\infty \)) is not an ideal of \( A \) (or \( B \)).

Let \( \alpha : (K(A), (K(A))^+, \Sigma A) \to (K(B), (K(B))^+, \Sigma B) \) be an isomorphism. By 3.8 the induced map \( \alpha_0 \) on \( K_0 \) group is identity, when both \( K_0(A) \) and \( K_0(B) \) are identified with \( \hat{G} \) as scaled ordered groups. That is, \( \alpha_0 \) is the same as the \( \alpha_0 \) induced by the shape equivalence in the proof of Proposition 3.4. In particular, if there is an isomorphism \( \wedge : A \to B \), then for all \( i \leq n-1, \wedge_n[\phi_{n,\infty}(1_{A_k})] = [\psi_{n,\infty}(1_{B_k})] \). This implies \( \wedge(\phi_{n,\infty}(1_{A_k})) = \psi_{n,\infty}(1_{B_k}) \), since \( \psi_{n,\infty}(1_{B_k}) = 1_{B_k}/1, \) which is in the center of \( B \) (any element in the center of the \( C^* \)-algebra can only unitary equivalent to itself). Hence it is also true that \( \wedge(\phi_{n,\infty}(1_{A_k})) = \psi_{n,\infty}(1_{B_k}) \) for \( i = n \).

3.9. Let \( P_1 = 1_B = \psi_{1,\infty}(1_{B_1}), P_2 = \psi_{2,\infty}(1_{B_2}), P_3 = \psi_{3,\infty}(1_{B_3}), \cdots, P_n = \psi_{n,\infty}(1_{B_n}), \cdots \). Then \( P_1 > P_2 > \cdots > P_n, \cdots \). We will prove that there are no splittings

\[
K_1(P_nBP_n) \to U(P_nBP_n)/SU(P_nBP_n)
\]

which are compatible for all pairs of projections \( P_n > P_m \) (see diagram (3.6.A)), in the next subsection. Before doing so, we need some preparations.

Set \( Q_1 = P_1 - P_2, \; Q_2 = P_2 - P_3, \cdots, \; Q_n = P_n - P_{n+1}. \) Then for each \( n \), we have the inductive limit

\[
Q_nBQ_n = \lim_{m \to \infty} (B_m^n, \psi_{m,m''}^{n,n})
\]

(note that for \( m > n, \psi_{m,m''}^{n,j} = 0 \) if \( j \neq n \)), which is the quotient algebra corresponding to the primitive ideal of \( n \in Sp(B) = \{1,2,3,\cdots,\infty\} \). Note that \( Q_nBQ_n \) is a simple \( AI \) algebra. The inductive limit of the \( C^* \)-algebras

\[
B_{n+1}^n \to B_{n+2}^n \to B_{n+3}^n \to \cdots \to Q_nBQ_n
\]

induces the inductive limit of the ordered Banach spaces

\[
AFBTB_{n+1}^n \xrightarrow{\xi_{n+1,n+2}} AFBTB_{n+2}^n \xrightarrow{\xi_{n+2,n+3}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\xi_{n,n+1}} AFBTQ_nBQ_n,
\]

whose connecting maps \( \xi_{m,m+1} : C_\underline{\mathbb{R}}([0,1]) \to C_\underline{\mathbb{R}}([0,1]) \) (for \( m > n \)) satisfy that

\[
\|\xi_{m,m+1}(f) - f\| \leq \frac{1}{p^m_n\|f\|}, \; \forall f \in C_\underline{\mathbb{R}}[0,1], \; m > n.
\]
Hence we have the following approximate intertwining diagram

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\mathbb{C}[0,1] & \xrightarrow{\xi_{n,n+1}} & \mathbb{C}[0,1] & \xrightarrow{\xi_{n+1,n+2}} & \mathbb{C}[0,1] & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & AffTQ_nBQ_n \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & \\
\mathbb{C}[0,1] & \xrightarrow{id} & \mathbb{C}[0,1] & \xrightarrow{id} & \mathbb{C}[0,1] & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{C}[0,1].
\end{array}
\]

Consequently, \( AffTQ_nBQ_n \cong \mathbb{C}[0,1] \), and the maps

\[
\xi_{m,\infty} : AffTB_m^n = \mathbb{C}[0,1] \longrightarrow AffTQ_nBQ_n \cong \mathbb{C}[0,1]
\]

(under the identification) satisfy

\[
\|\xi_{m,\infty}(f) - f\| \leq \left( \frac{1}{p_n} + \frac{1}{p_{m+1}} + \cdots \right)\|f\| \leq \frac{1}{4}\|f\|, \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{C}[0,1].
\]

Therefore \( \|\xi_{m,\infty}(f)\| \geq \frac{3}{4}\|f\| \).

Note that \( \rho\overline{K}_0(Q_nBQ_n) = \mathbb{R} = \rho\overline{K}_0(B_m^n) \) consists of constant functions on \([0,1]\). Let \( h \in \mathbb{C}[0,1] = AffT(B_m^n) \). Considering the element \( \xi_{m,\infty}(h) \) as in \( AffT(Q_nBQ_n)/\rho\overline{K}_0(Q_nBQ_n) \), we have

\[
\|\xi_{m,\infty}(h)\| \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{3}{4} \left( \max_{t \in [0,1]} h(t) - \min_{t \in [0,1]} h(t) \right),
\]

where \( \| - \| \) is defined in 3.7.

3.10. We now prove that no compatible splittings

\[ S_n : K_1(P_nBP_n) \longrightarrow U(P_nBP_n)/\overline{SU}(P_nBP_n) \]

exists. Suppose such splittings exist. Then consider the generator \( x \in K_1(B) = \mathbb{Z} \).

Note that \( x \in K_1(P_nBP_n) \cong K_1(B) \), for all \( P_n \). Note also that the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
K_1(P_{n+1}BP_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{S_{n+1}} & U(P_{n+1}BP_{n+1})/\overline{SU}(P_{n+1}BP_{n+1}) \\
\downarrow{id} & & \downarrow{1_x} \\
K_1(P_1BP_1) & \xrightarrow{S_1} & U(P_1BP_1)/\overline{SU}(P_1BP_1)
\end{array}
\]

commutes \((P_1BP_1 = B)\). The composition

\[
U(P_{n+1}BP_{n+1})/\overline{SU}(P_{n+1}BP_{n+1}) \longrightarrow U(P_1BP_1)/\overline{SU}(P_1BP_1) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^n U(Q_iBQ_i)/\overline{SU}(Q_iBQ_i)
\]

is the zero map. (Note that \( Q_iBQ_i \) is an ideal of \( B \) and is also the quotient \( B/J_i \).) Consequently, we have

\[
(*) \quad \pi_n^b(S_1(x)) = \pi_n^b(t_xS_{n+1}(x)) = 0,
\]

where \( \pi_n : B \rightarrow Q_nBQ_n \) is the quotient map. Let \( S_1(x) \) be represented by a unitary \( u \in U(B) \). Then there are an \( n \) (large enough) and \([u_n] \in U(B_n)/\overline{SU}(B_n)\), represented by unitary \( u_n \in B_n \), such that \( \psi_{n,\infty}([u_n]) - S_1(x) \in U_{tor}(B_n)/\overline{SU}(B_n) \) and

\[
\|\psi_{n,\infty}([u_n]) - S_1(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{16}.
\]

Note that

\[
(\psi_{n,m})_* : K_1(B_n) \longrightarrow K_1(B_m)
\]
is the identity map from \( Z \) to \( Z \). Let \( g \in M_{[n,n]}(C(S^1)) = B_n^n \) be defined by

\[
g(z) = \begin{pmatrix} z & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \\ & \ddots \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{[n,n] \times [n,n]}.\]

Then \([g^{-1}u_n] = 0\) in \( K_1(B_n)\). By the exactness of the sequence

\[
0 \rightarrow AffTB_n/\rho\overline{\mathcal{K}}_0(B_n) \rightarrow U(B_n)/\overline{SU}(B_n) \rightarrow K_1(B_1) \rightarrow 0,
\]
there is an \( h \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^n C_\mathbb{R}[0,1] \oplus C_\mathbb{R}(S^1) = AffTB_n \) such that

\[
[u_n] = [g] \cdot (e^{2\pi ih} \cdot 1_{B_n}) \in U(B_n)/\overline{SU}(B_n).
\]
Let \( ||h|| = M \). Choose \( m > n \) such that \( 4^{m-1} > 8M + 8 \).

Consider

\[
\psi_{n,m}^{-1} : B_n^n = M_{[n,n]}(C(S^1)) \rightarrow B_{m}^{m-1} = M_{[m,m-1]}(C([0,1]))
\]
which is the composition

\[
\psi_{m-1,m}^{-1} \circ \psi_{n,m}^{-1} : M_{[n,n]}(C(S^1)) \rightarrow M_{[m-1,m-1]}(C(S^1)) \rightarrow M_{[m,m-1]}(C([0,1])).
\]
Let \( g' = \psi_{n,m}^{-1}(g) \). We know that

\[
g'(t) = \psi_{n,m}^{-1}(g)(t) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi il_{m-1}t} & * \\ * & \ddots \\ & & * \end{pmatrix}_{[m,m-1] \times [m,m-1]},
\]
where the *’s represent constant functions on \([0,1]\), and therefore

\[
g' = e^{2\pi ih'} \pmod{\overline{SU}(B_{m-1}^{-1})}
\]
with \( h'(t) = \frac{l_{m-1}}{[m,m-1]} \cdot t \cdot 1_{[m,m-1]} \). When we identify \( U(B_{m-1}^{-1})/\overline{SU}(B_{m-1}^{-1}) \) with

\[
AffTB_{m-1}^{-1}/\rho\overline{\mathcal{K}}_0(B_{m-1}^{-1}) = C_\mathbb{R}[0,1]/\{\text{constants}\},
\]
g’ is identified with \( \overline{h} \in C_\mathbb{R}[0,1] \) with

\[
\overline{h}(t) = \frac{l_{m-1}}{[m,m-1]} t.
\]

Since \( \frac{l_{m-1}}{[m,m-1]} \geq 8M + 8 \), we have

\[
||\overline{h}|| = \frac{1}{2} \left( \max_{t \in [0,1]} \overline{h}(t) - \min_{t \in [0,1]} \overline{h}(t) \right) \geq 4M + 4
\]
(see 3.7). On the other hand,

\[
[u_n] = [g] + \overline{\lambda}_{B_n}([h]) \in U(B_n)/\overline{SU}(B_n),
\]

23
where \([h] \in AffTB_n/\rho K_0(B_n)\) is the element defined by \(h\), and

\[
\tilde{\lambda}_{B_n} : AffTB_n/\rho K_0(B_n) \longrightarrow U(B_n)/\hat{SU}(B_n)
\]

is the map defined in 2.30 (also see 2.26). Consequently,

\[
(\psi_{n,m}^{n,m-1})^2(u) = AffT\psi_{n,m}^{n,m-1}(h) + \tilde{h} \triangleq \tilde{h} \in AffTB_n/\rho K_0(B_n) \cong U(B_n)/\hat{SU}(B_n)
\]

with

\[
\|\tilde{h}\| = \frac{1}{2} \left( \max_{t \in [0,1]} \tilde{h}(t) - \min_{t \in [0,1]} \tilde{h}(t) \right) \geq 4,
\]

since \(\|h\| \leq M\). Therefore,

\[
(\pi_{m-1} \circ \psi_{n,\infty})^2(u) \in U(Q_m^{-1}BQ_{m-1})/\hat{SU}(Q_m^{-1}BQ_{m-1}) \cong AffT(Q_m^{-1}BQ_{m-1})/\rho K_0(Q_m^{-1}BQ_{m-1}),
\]

satisfies

\[
\| (\pi_{m-1} \circ \psi_{n,\infty})^2(u) \| = \frac{1}{2} \left( \max_{t \in [0,1]} (\pi_{m-1} \circ \psi_{n,\infty})^2(u)(t) - \min_{t \in [0,1]} (\pi_{m-1} \circ \psi_{n,\infty})^2(u)(t) \right) \geq \frac{3}{4} \cdot 4 = 3,
\]

where \(\pi_{m-1} : B \longrightarrow Q_m^{-1}BQ_{m-1}\) is the quotient map. On the other hand,

\[
\pi_{m-1}^2(S_1(x)) = 0
\]

as calculated in (*). Recall that

\[
||(\psi_{n,\infty})^2(u) - S_1(x)|| < \frac{1}{16},
\]

We get

\[
||(\pi_{m-1} \circ \psi_{n,\infty})^2(u)|| < \frac{1}{16}
\]

which is a contradiction. This contradiction proves that such system of splittings do not exist. Hence \(Inv(A) \not\cong Inv(B)\) and \(A \not\cong B\).

### 3.11.

One can easily verify that

\[
AffTA = AffTB = \{(f_1, f_2, \cdots, f_n, \cdots) \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} C_R[0,1] | \exists r \in R \text{ such that } f_n(x) \text{ converges to } r \text{ uniformly} \}.
\]

\[
\rho K_0(A)(= \rho K_0(B)) = \{(r_1, r_2, \cdots, r_n, \cdots) \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} R | \exists r \in R \text{ such that } r_n \text{ converges to } r \} \subset AffTA(= AffTB).
\]

Since \(\rho K_0(A)(= \rho K_0(B))\) is already a vector space, we have \(\rho K_0(A) = \rho K_0(A)\) and \(\rho K_0(B) = \rho K_0(B)\). Therefore

\[
U_{tor}(A)/\hat{SU}(A) \cong AffTA/\rho K_0(A) = AffTA/\rho K_0(A) = U_0(A)/DU(A).
\]

On the other hand, \(U_{tor}(A) = U_0(A)\). Hence \(\hat{SU}(A) = DU(A)\). Furthermore the map \(\lambda_A : AffTA/\rho K_0(A) \longrightarrow U(A)/\hat{SU}(A)\) can be identified with the map \(\tilde{\lambda}_A : AffTA/\rho K_0(A) \longrightarrow U(A)/SU(A)\). That is \(Inv'(A) = Inv(A)\). Similarly, \(Inv(B) = Inv'(B)\).

### 3.12.

A routine calculation shows (we omit the details) that for any finite subset \(F \subset A_n\), and \(\varepsilon > 0\), there is an \(m > n\) and two finite dimensional unital sub \(C^*\)-algebras \(C, D \subset A_m\) with non-abelian central projection such that

\[
\|\phi_{n,m}(f)\| < \varepsilon\|c\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|\psi_{n,m}(f)\| < \varepsilon\|d\| \quad \text{for all} \quad f \in F, \ c \in C, \ d \in D.
\]

Consequently, both \(C^*\)-algebras \(A\) and \(B\) are approximately divisible in the sense of Definition 1.2 of [BKR]. By Theorem 2.3 of [TW], both \(A\) and \(B\) are \(Z\)-stable. That is, \(A \otimes Z \cong A\) and \(B \otimes Z \cong B\), where \(Z\) is the Jiang-Su algebra (see [JS]). Furthermore, by using [Ti] (see [Cow-Ell-I] also), one can prove that \(Cu(A) \cong Cu(B)\) and \(Cu(A \otimes C(S^1)) \cong Cu(B \otimes C(S^1))\).
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