

POWER-NORMS BASED ON HILBERT C^* -MODULES

SAJJAD ABEDI¹ and MOHAMMAD SAL MOSLEHIAN²

ABSTRACT. Suppose that \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} are Hilbert C^* -modules. We present a power-norm $\left(\|\cdot\|_n^{\mathcal{E}} : n \in \mathbb{N}\right)$ based on \mathcal{E} and obtain some of its fundamental properties. We introduce a new definition of the absolutely $(2, 2)$ -summing operators from \mathcal{E} to \mathcal{F} , and denote the set of such operators by $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ with the convention $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}) = \tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E})$. It is known that the class of all Hilbert–Schmidt operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is the same as the space $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{H})$. We show that the class of Hilbert–Schmidt operators introduced by Frank and Larson coincides with the space $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E})$ for a countably generated Hilbert C^* -module \mathcal{E} over a unital commutative C^* -algebra. These results motivate us to investigate the properties of the space $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

In 2012, Dales and Polyakov [7] introduced the notions of multi-norm and dual multi-norm based on a normed space. Although there are some analogies between this theory and the theory of operator spaces, there are serious differences between them. For example, the theory of multi-normed spaces deals with the general Banach spaces L^p for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, while the other theory is initiated for L^2 -spaces. After the seminal work [7], several mathematicians have explored and generalized these spaces. For example, the second author and Dales [6] investigated the perturbation of mappings between multi-normed spaces; and Blasco [3] worked on several aspects of power-normed spaces; see [25] for some open problems in this content.

We recall some definitions and notation from [15, 17, 19].

Throughout this paper, let \mathcal{E} be a normed space. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote the linear space $\mathcal{E} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{E}$ consisting of k -tuples (x_1, \dots, x_k) by \mathcal{E}^k , where $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathcal{E}$. As usual, the linear structure on \mathcal{E}^k is defined coordinatewise. Let $\mathcal{E}_{[1]}$ stand for the closed unit ball of \mathcal{E} . We assume that \mathfrak{A} is a C^* -algebra equipped with its usual partial order \leq on the self-adjoint part of \mathfrak{A} . We set $\mathfrak{A}_+ = \{a \in \mathfrak{A} : a \geq 0\}$. If \mathfrak{A} is unital, then the unit of \mathfrak{A} is denoted by $1_{\mathfrak{A}}$. A subalgebra \mathfrak{J} of a C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} is

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46L08, 46L05, 46B15, 47L10.

Key words and phrases. Hilbert C^* -module; power-normed space; C^* -power-norm.

said to be *(left) right ideal* if $(ba \in \mathfrak{I}) \implies ab \in \mathfrak{I}$ for each $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ and $b \in \mathfrak{I}$. In the case where \mathfrak{I} is a left and right ideal of \mathfrak{A} , we call it a *two-sided ideal* of \mathfrak{A} .

We say that a state τ is *pure* if for any positive linear functional $\rho : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $\rho \leq \tau$, there exists $0 \leq t \leq 1$ such that $\rho = t\tau$. The set of pure states on \mathfrak{A} is denoted by $\mathcal{PS}(\mathfrak{A})$. In the case where \mathfrak{A} is commutative, we observe that $\mathcal{PS}(\mathfrak{A}) = \Omega(\mathfrak{A})$, where $\Omega(\mathfrak{A})$ is the character space of \mathfrak{A} equipped with the weak* topology.

By a (right) *Hilbert C^* -module* over \mathfrak{A} , or shortly a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module, we mean a right \mathfrak{A} -module \mathcal{E} equipped with an \mathfrak{A} -valued inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ satisfying (i) $\langle x, x \rangle \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $x = 0$; (ii) it is linear at the second variable; (iii) $\langle x, ya \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle a$; (iv) $\langle y, x \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle^*$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{E}$, $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, and it is a Banach space endowed with the norm $\|x\| = \|\langle x, x \rangle\|^{1/2}$. Moreover set $|x| = \langle x, x \rangle^{1/2}$. A C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} is a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module if we define $\langle a, b \rangle = a^*b$ for all $a, b \in \mathfrak{A}$. Inspired by [15, Proposition 1.1], there exists a useful version of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality that asserts $|\langle x, y \rangle|^2 \leq \|x\|^2 \|y\|^2$. Furthermore, $|xa| \leq \|x\| |a|$ for every $x, y \in \mathcal{E}$ and $a \in \mathfrak{A}$. However, it need not be the case that $|x + y| \leq |x| + |y|$ in general. From now on, we assume that \mathcal{E} , \mathcal{F} , and \mathcal{G} are Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -modules.

A map $T : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is said to be *adjointable* if there exists a map $T^* : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ such that $\langle Tx, y \rangle = \langle x, T^*y \rangle$ for all $x \in \mathcal{E}$ and $y \in \mathcal{F}$. The set of all adjointable maps from \mathcal{E} into \mathcal{F} is denoted by $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, and we write $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ for $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E})$. It is known from [15, p. 8] that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ is a C^* -algebra. Assume that τ is a positive linear functional on \mathfrak{A} . Set $\mathcal{N}_\tau = \{x \in \mathcal{E} : \tau(\langle x, x \rangle) = 0\}$. Then \mathcal{N}_τ is a sub- \mathfrak{A} -module of \mathcal{E} . There is a well-defined inner product on the quotient \mathfrak{A} -module $\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{N}_\tau$ given by $\langle x + \mathcal{N}_\tau, y + \mathcal{N}_\tau \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle$ for $x, y \in \mathcal{E}$. The Hilbert completion of $\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{N}_\tau$ is denoted by \mathcal{H}_τ . Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$. Let us define the operator $\phi(T)$ on $\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{N}_\tau$ by setting $\phi(T)(x + \mathcal{N}_\tau) = Tx + \mathcal{N}_\tau$ for $x \in \mathcal{E}$. It follows from [15, Proposition 1.2] that $\|\phi(T)(x + \mathcal{N}_\tau)\|^2 = \tau(\langle Tx, Tx \rangle) \leq \|T\|^2 \tau(\langle x, x \rangle) = \|T\|^2 \|x + \mathcal{N}_\tau\|^2$. Thus, the operator $\phi(T)$ has a unique extension $\phi_\tau(T) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_\tau)$. It is easily seen that the map $\phi_\tau : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_\tau)$ is a $*$ -homomorphism.

For given $x \in \mathcal{E}$ and $y \in \mathcal{F}$, define $\theta_{y,x} : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ by $\theta_{y,x}(z) \mapsto y \langle x, z \rangle$ ($z \in \mathcal{E}$). Evidently $\theta_{y,x} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ with $(\theta_{y,x})^* = \theta_{x,y}$ and $\|\theta_{y,x}\| \leq \|x\| \|y\|$. We denote the linear subspace of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ spanned by $\{\theta_{y,x} : x \in \mathcal{E}, y \in \mathcal{F}\}$ by $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, and its norm-closure is denoted by $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. We write $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E})$ for $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E})$. The identity map in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ is denoted by $I_\mathcal{E}$. An operator $U \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is said to be unitary if $U^*U = I_\mathcal{E}$ and $UU^* = I_\mathcal{F}$. The set of all unitaries from \mathcal{E} to \mathcal{F} is denoted by $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. We shall abbreviate $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E})$ by $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{E})$.

A closed submodule \mathcal{F} of \mathcal{E} is said to be *orthogonally complemented* if $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F} \oplus \mathcal{F}^\perp$, where $\mathcal{F}^\perp = \{y \in \mathcal{E} : \langle x, y \rangle = 0, x \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} be closed submodules of \mathcal{E} . If $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}^\perp$, then we denote it by $\mathcal{F} \perp \mathcal{G}$. For an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, we have $\ker(T) \perp \overline{\text{ran}(T^*)}$. An operator $W \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a partial isometry if W^*W is a projection.

Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be Hilbert spaces. Assume that $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$. For $1 < p$, define the *Schatten p -norm* of T by $\|T\|_{(p)} = \left(\text{Tr } |T|^{(p)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$. The space of *p -th Schatten class operators* is denoted by $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) = \left\{ T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}) : \|T\|_{(p)} < \infty \right\}$. Recall that the second Schatten class is nothing than the *Hilbert–Schmidt operators*. Moreover, the first Schatten class is the space of *trace class operators* [19, pp. 59–65]. We write $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{H})$ for $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H})$. Now, we recall some definitions and notations from [7, 20].

Let $(\mathcal{E}, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space over \mathbb{C} . A *power-norm* based on \mathcal{E} is a sequence $(\|\cdot\|_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ such that $\|\cdot\|_n$ is a norm on \mathcal{E}^n for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|x_0\|_1 = \|x_0\|$, where $x_0 \in \mathcal{E}$, and the following Axioms (A1)–(A3) hold for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{E}^n$:

(A1) for each $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, where \mathfrak{S}_n is the set of all permutation of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, we have

$$\|(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)})\|_n = \|x\|_n;$$

(A2) for each $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\|(\alpha_1 x_1, \dots, \alpha_n x_n)\|_n \leq \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\alpha_i| \right) \|x\|_n;$$

(A3) for each $x_1, \dots, x_{n-1} \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$\|(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, 0)\|_n = \|(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})\|_{n-1}.$$

In this case, $(\|\cdot\|_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is named as a *power-norm* based on \mathcal{E} , and $((\mathcal{E}^n, \|\cdot\|_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is a *power-normed space*. A power-norm $(\|\cdot\|_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ based on a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module \mathcal{E} is called a *C^* -power-norm* based on \mathcal{E} if, in addition to (A1)–(A3), we have

(B2) for each $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathfrak{A}$,

$$\|(x_1 a_1, \dots, x_n a_n)\|_n \leq \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|a_i\| \right) \|x\|_n.$$

A power-norm is a *multi-norm* based on \mathcal{E} , and $((\mathcal{E}^n, \|\cdot\|_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is a *multi-normed space* if, in addition to (A1)–(A3), we have

(A4) for each $x_1, \dots, x_{n-1} \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$\|(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_{n-1})\|_n \leq \|(x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}, x_{n-1})\|_{n-1}.$$

For a power-normed space $((\mathcal{E}^n, \|\cdot\|_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$, it holds that

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|x_i\| \leq \|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_n \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|.$$

Dales and Polyakov [7, Theorem 4.15] presented the concept of *Hilbert multi-norm* based on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} by

$$\|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_n^{\mathcal{H}} = \sup \|p_1 x_1 + \dots + p_n x_n\| = \sup (\|p_1 x_1\|^2 + \dots + \|p_n x_n\|^2)^{1/2}$$

for each $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$, where the supremum is taken over all families $(p_i, 1 \leq i \leq n)$ of mutually orthogonal projections summing to $I_{\mathcal{H}}$. In the second section, we extend the notion of Hilbert multi-norm to that of *Hilbert C^* -multi-norm* based on \mathcal{E} . In the third section, we start with the definition of *2-summing norm* based on a normed space \mathcal{E} such that

$$\mu_{2,n}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sup \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda(x_i)|^2 \right)^{1/2} : \lambda \in \mathcal{E}' \right\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where \mathcal{E}' is the dual space of \mathcal{E} ; see [7, Definition 3.15]. We introduce the following power-norms based on \mathcal{E} such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \sup \left\{ \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |Tx_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| : T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})_{[1]} \right\}, \\ \mu_n^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \sup \left\{ \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |(Tx_i)^*|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| : T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})_{[1]} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We transfer some properties of 2-summing norm stated in [12, p. 26] and [4, p. 66], to the new versions. In the last section, we introduce a new version of the absolutely $(2, 2)$ -summing operators from \mathcal{E} to \mathcal{F} stated in [7, p. 68]. We denote the set of these operators by $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. The space $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E})$ is abbreviated as $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E})$. It is shown [23, Proposition 10.1] that $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H})$ and $\tilde{\pi}_2(u) = \|u\|_{(2)}$ for each $u \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H})$. For a countably generated Hilbert C^* -module \mathcal{E} over a unital commutative C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} , Frank and Larson introduced the class of Hilbert–Schmidt operators in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ [9, p. 21], and Kaad [14, Remark 2.7] omitted the unital condition of \mathfrak{A} .

In this paper, we show that $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E})$ coincides with the class of Hilbert–Schmidt operators in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$. In 2021, Stern and van Suijlekom [22] introduced Schatten classes for Hilbert C^* -modules over commutative C^* -algebras. The classes form

two-sided ideals of compact operators and are equipped with a Banach norm and a C^* -valued trace with interesting properties. These results encourage us to explore the properties of the space $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. In what follows, for $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$, we set $\tilde{\pi}_1(T) := \tilde{\pi}_2(|T|^{1/2})^2$, and explore some fundamental properties of $\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{E}) := \{T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}) : \tilde{\pi}_1(T) < \infty\}$. Furthermore, we show that $\tilde{\pi}_p(T) \leq \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{PS}(\mathfrak{A})} \|\phi_\tau(T)\|_{(p)}$ for $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ and $p \in \{1, 2\}$. Finally, by making use of [24, Theorem 15.3.7] and [16, Lemma 3.12], we consider some conditions to obtain more properties of the spaces $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{E})$.

2. MULTI-NORM BASED ON A HILBERT C^* -MODULE

Let \mathcal{E} be a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module. Set

$$\|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_n^\mathcal{E} = \sup \|P_1 x_1 + \dots + P_n x_n\| = \sup \left\| |P_1 x_1|^2 + \dots + |P_n x_n|^2 \right\|^{1/2}, \quad (2.1)$$

for each $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$, where the supremum is taken over all families $(P_i : 1 \leq i \leq n)$ of mutually orthogonal projections in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ summing to $I_\mathcal{E}$ by allowing the possibility that $P_j = 0$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$. It immediately follows that $(\|\cdot\|_n^\mathcal{E} : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is a multi-norm based on \mathcal{E} . We call it the *Hilbert C^* -multi-norm* based on \mathcal{E} .

Example 2.1. Let \mathfrak{A} be a unital C^* -algebra. Since $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{A}) = \mathfrak{A}$ [15, p. 10], the power-norm $(\|\cdot\|_n^\mathcal{E} : n \in \mathbb{N})$ based on $\mathcal{E} = \mathfrak{A}$ can be written as

$$\|(a_1, \dots, a_n)\|_n^\mathcal{E} = \sup \|p_1 a_1 + \dots + p_n a_n\| \quad (2.2)$$

for $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathfrak{A}$, where the supremum is taken over all families $(p_i : 1 \leq i \leq n)$ of mutually orthogonal projections in \mathfrak{A} summing to $1_\mathfrak{A}$ by allowing the possibility that $p_j = 0$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$.

We recall some definitions and notation from [5, pp. 67–75].

Take $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, where $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is the space of all bounded linear maps from \mathcal{E} to \mathcal{F} . The n th amplification of \mathcal{T} is bounded as a linear map from a power normed space $((\mathcal{E}^n, \|\cdot\|_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$ to a power normed space $((\mathcal{F}^n, \|\cdot\|_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$ defined by

$$\mathcal{T}^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (\mathcal{T}x_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}x_n) \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

The n th amplification of \mathcal{T} is bounded as a linear map from $(\mathcal{E}^n, \|\cdot\|_n)$ to $(\mathcal{F}^n, \|\cdot\|_n)$ such that

$$\|\mathcal{T}\| \leq \|\mathcal{T}^{(n)}\| \leq n \|\mathcal{T}\| \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}). \quad (2.3)$$

Moreover, the sequence $(\|\mathcal{T}^{(n)}\| : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is increasing.

Definition 2.2. Let $((\mathcal{E}^n, \|\cdot\|_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$ and $((\mathcal{F}^n, \|\cdot\|_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$ be power-normed spaces. Suppose that $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Then \mathcal{T} is *multi-bounded* with norm $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{mb}$, if

$$\|\mathcal{T}\|_{mb} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{T}^{(n)}\| < \infty. \quad (2.4)$$

The collection of multi-bounded maps from \mathcal{E} to \mathcal{F} is denoted by $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. If $((\mathcal{E}^n, \|\cdot\|_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$ and $((\mathcal{F}^n, \|\cdot\|_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$ are power-normed spaces, then $(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}), \|\cdot\|_{mb})$ is a normed space. Furthermore, if \mathcal{F} is a Banach space, then $(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}), \|\cdot\|_{mb})$ is a Banach space [7, Theorem 6.20].

Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -modules. Suppose that $((\mathcal{E}^n, \|\cdot\|_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$ and $((\mathcal{F}^n, \|\cdot\|_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$ are power-normed spaces. Then the collection of multi-bounded adjointable operators from \mathcal{E} to \mathcal{F} is denoted by $\mathcal{ML}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Since $\|T\| \leq \|T\|_{mb}$ for each $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $\mathcal{ML}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \cap \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, it follows that $\mathcal{ML}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a Banach space. The space $\mathcal{ML}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E})$ is abbreviated as $\mathcal{ML}(\mathcal{E})$.

We conclude this section with the following proposition, which was proved in the setting of Hilbert spaces in [4, p. 127]. We shall prove it for Hilbert C^* -modules. To this end, we employ the Russo–Dye theorem asserting that if \mathfrak{A} is a C^* -algebra, then $\mathfrak{A}_{[1]}$ is equal to $\overline{\text{co}}(\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A}))$, the norm-closed convex hull of $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{A})$.

Proposition 2.3. Let $(\|\cdot\|_n^\mathcal{E} : n \in \mathbb{N})$ be the Hilbert C^* -multi-norm based on \mathcal{E} . Then

$$\mathcal{ML}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}) \quad \text{with} \quad \|T\|_{mb} = \|T\| \quad \text{for each} \quad T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}). \quad (2.5)$$

Proof. Let $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{E})$. Fix $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_n^\mathcal{E} \leq 1$. Then

$$\| |P_1 x_1|^2 + \dots + |P_n x_n|^2 \| \leq 1 \quad (2.6)$$

for some family $(P_i : 1 \leq i \leq n)$ of mutually orthogonal projections summing to $I_\mathcal{E}$. Hence the family $(U^* P_i U : 1 \leq i \leq n)$ is consisting of mutually orthogonal projections summing to $I_\mathcal{E}$. It follows from (2.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(Ux_1, \dots, Ux_n)\|_n^\mathcal{E} &= \sup \| |P_1 Ux_1|^2 + \dots + |P_n Ux_n|^2 \|^{1/2} \\ &= \sup \| |U^* P_1 Ux_1|^2 + \dots + |U^* P_n Ux_n|^2 \|^{1/2} \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $1 = \|U\| \leq \|U^{(n)}\| \leq 1$. Hence $\|U\|_{mb} = 1$. Thus $U \in \mathcal{ML}(\mathcal{E})$. Since the unitaries span the C^* -algebra $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$, we arrive at $\mathcal{ML}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$. From the Russo–Dye theorem, we observe that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})_{[1]} = \overline{\text{co}}(\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{E}))$. Pick a nonzero operator T in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$. Put $S = T/\|T\|$. There exists a sequence $(S_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ in $\text{co}(\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{E}))$ such that $S_n \rightarrow S$ in the norm topology. We immediately see that $\|S_n\|_{mb} \leq 1$.

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. From (2.3), we observe that $\|S_n^{(m)} - S^{(m)}\| \leq m \|S_n - S\|$. Therefore, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_n^{(m)} - S^{(m)}\| = 0$. Thus

$$\|S^{(m)}\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_n^{(m)}\| \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|S_n\|_{mb} \leq 1. \quad (2.7)$$

Hence $1 = \|S\| \leq \|S\|_{mb} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|S^{(m)}\| \leq 1$. Therefore $\|T\|_{mb} = \|T\|$. \square

3. NEW VERSIONS OF 2-SUMMING NORM

As stated in [4], for a Banach space \mathcal{E} and a nonzero power-normed space $((\mathcal{F}^n, \|\cdot\|_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$, there exists a norm on the space \mathcal{E}^n defined by

$$\|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_n^{\mathcal{F}} = \sup \{ \|(Tx_1, \dots, Tx_n)\|_n : T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})_{[1]} \}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$. Evidently, $(\|\cdot\|_n^{\mathcal{F}} : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is a power-norm based on \mathcal{E} and $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) = \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ with $\|T\|_{mb} = \|T\|$ for each $T \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, where $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is calculated with respect to the power-norm $(\|\cdot\|_n^{\mathcal{F}} : n \in \mathbb{N})$ based on \mathcal{E} .

In this section, we introduce a power-norm on $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})$ by mimicking the power-norm introduced in [4]. To this end, we state some concepts from [15]; see also [11].

Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -modules. The strict topology on $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is defined by the seminorms

$$T \mapsto \|Tx\| \quad (x \in \mathcal{E}), \quad T \mapsto \|T^*y\| \quad (y \in \mathcal{F}).$$

In virtue of [15, p. 12], the map

$$\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A}) \quad x \mapsto T_x, \quad (3.2)$$

is isometric and surjective, where $T_x : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ is defined by $y \mapsto \langle x, y \rangle$. Now, we introduce a power-norm based on \mathcal{E} depending on a power-norm based on \mathfrak{A} .

Proposition 3.1. *Let \mathcal{E} be a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module. Suppose that $(\|\cdot\|_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is a power norm (C^* -power norm) based on \mathfrak{A} . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_n^{\mathfrak{A}} &= \sup \{ \|(\langle y, x_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle y, x_n \rangle)\|_n : y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]} \} \\ &= \sup \{ \|(Tx_1, \dots, Tx_n)\|_n : T \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})_{[1]} \} \\ &= \sup \{ \|(Tx_1, \dots, Tx_n)\|_n : T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})_{[1]} \}, \end{aligned}$$

and $(\|\cdot\|_n^{\mathfrak{A}} : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is a power norm (C^* -power norm) based on \mathcal{E} . Moreover

$$\mathcal{ML}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A}) \quad \text{with} \quad \|S\|_{mb} = \|S\| \quad \text{for each} \quad S \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A}). \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. From $\|x\|_1^{\mathfrak{A}} = \sup \{ \|\langle x, y \rangle\| : y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]} \} = \|x\|$, where $x \in \mathcal{E}$, we immediately derive that $(\|\cdot\|_n^{\mathfrak{A}} : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is a power norm (C^* -power norm) based on \mathcal{E} . Take $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})_{[1]}$. Since $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})_{[1]}$ is strictly dense in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})_{[1]}$ [15, Proposition 1.3], there exists a net $(y_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda)$ in $\mathcal{E}_{[1]}$ such that

$$Tx = \lim_{\lambda} T_\lambda x = \lim_{\lambda} \langle y_\lambda, x \rangle \quad (x \in \mathcal{E}). \quad (3.4)$$

We deduce from (2.3) that

$$\|(Tx_1, \dots, Tx_n)\|_n = \lim_{\lambda} \|(\langle y_\lambda, x_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle y_\lambda, x_n \rangle)\|_n \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Thus, we observe that

$$\sup \{ \|(\langle y, x_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle y, x_n \rangle)\|_n : y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]} \} = \sup \{ \|(Tx_1, \dots, Tx_n)\|_n : T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})_{[1]} \}.$$

Suppose that $S \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})$. Consider the net $(z_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda)$ as in equation (3.4) for the operator $S/\|S\|$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Pick $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_n^{\mathfrak{A}} \leq 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|(Sx_1, \dots, Sx_n)\|_n &= \|S\| \left\| \left(\frac{S}{\|S\|} x_1, \dots, \frac{S}{\|S\|} x_n \right) \right\|_n \\ &= \|S\| \lim_{\lambda} \|(\langle z_\lambda, x_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle z_\lambda, x_n \rangle)\|_n \\ &\leq \|S\| \|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_n^{\mathfrak{A}} \leq \|S\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\|S\| \leq \|S^{(n)}\| \leq \|S\|$. Hence $\|S\|_{mb} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S^{(n)}\| = \|S\|$. \square

Definition 3.2. Let \mathcal{E} be a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module. We write $l_n^2(\mathcal{E})$ for \mathcal{E}^n as a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module with the inner product given by

$$\langle (x_1, \dots, x_n), (y_1, \dots, y_n) \rangle_{l_n^2(\mathcal{E})} = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle x_i, y_i \rangle.$$

We shall abbreviate $l_n^2(\mathbb{C})$ by l_n^2 .

In the following definition, we present two power-norms μ_n and μ_n^* based on a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module \mathcal{E} inspired by the power-norm $\mu_{2,n}$; see (1.1).

Definition 3.3. Let \mathcal{E} be a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module. Given $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$, define

$$\mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sup \left\{ \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |Tx_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| : T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})_{[1]} \right\} \quad (3.5)$$

and furthermore,

$$\mu_n^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sup \left\{ \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |(Tx_i)^*|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| : T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})_{[1]} \right\}. \quad (3.6)$$

In the case where \mathfrak{A} is commutative, $\mu_n^* = \mu_n$. Moreover, in the setting of Hilbert spaces, $\mu_n^* = \mu_n = \mu_{2,n}$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -modules.*

(1) *The sequence $(\mu_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is a power-norm based on \mathcal{E} and*

$$\mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sup_{y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]}} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle y, x_i \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|. \quad (3.7)$$

Moreover,

$$\mu_n(Tx_1, \dots, Tx_n) \leq \|T\| \mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad (T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})). \quad (3.8)$$

(2) *The sequence $(\mu_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is a C^* -power-norm based on \mathcal{E} and*

$$\mu_n^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sup_{y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]}} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x_i, y \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|. \quad (3.9)$$

Moreover,

$$\mu_n^*(Tx_1, \dots, Tx_n) \leq \|T\| \mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad (T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})). \quad (3.10)$$

Proof. (1) Consider the power-normed space $\left((\mathfrak{A}^n, \|\cdot\|_{l_n^2(\mathfrak{A})}) : n \in \mathbb{N} \right)$. From (3.5) and Proposition 3.1, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \sup \left\{ \|(Tx_1, \dots, Tx_n)\|_{l_n^2(\mathfrak{A})} : T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})_{[1]} \right\} \\ &= \sup_{y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]}} \|(\langle y, x_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle y, x_n \rangle)\|_{l_n^2(\mathfrak{A})} \\ &= \sup_{y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]}} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle y, x_i \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $(\mu_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is a power-norm based on \mathcal{E} . Thus, for $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n(Tx_1, \dots, Tx_n) &= \sup_{y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]}} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle T^*y, x_i \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| \\ &= \|T\| \sup_{y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]}} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \left\langle \frac{T^*}{\|T\|} y, x_i \right\rangle \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| \\ &\leq \|T\| \sup_{z \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]}} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle z, x_i \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| = \|T\| \mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n). \end{aligned}$$

(2) Define a norm $\|(b_1, \dots, b_n)\|_n^* = \|(b_1^*, \dots, b_n^*)\|_{l_n^2(\mathfrak{A})}$ in \mathfrak{A}^n . Clearly $(\|\cdot\|_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is a C^* -power-norm based on \mathfrak{A} . It follows from Proposition 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \sup \left\{ \|(Tx_1, \dots, Tx_n)\|_n^* : T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{A})_{[1]} \right\} \\ &= \sup_{y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]}} \|(\langle x_1, y \rangle, \dots, \langle x_n, y \rangle)\|_{l_n^2(\mathfrak{A})} \\ &= \sup_{y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]}} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x_i, y \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(\mu_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is a C^* -power-norm based on \mathcal{E} . Thus, for $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n^*(Tx_1, \dots, Tx_n) &= \sup_{y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]}} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x_i, T^*y \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| \\ &\leq \|T\| \sup_{y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]}} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \left\langle x_i, \frac{T^*}{\|T\|} y \right\rangle \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| \leq \|T\| \mu_n^*(x_1, \dots, x_n). \end{aligned}$$

□

Example 3.5. Let \mathfrak{A} be a C^* -algebra and \mathfrak{J} be a closed right ideal of \mathfrak{A} . Clearly \mathfrak{J} is a closed submodule of \mathfrak{A} . Then

$$\mu_n(b_1, \dots, b_n) = \|(b_1, \dots, b_n)\|_{l_n^2(\mathfrak{J})} \quad (3.11)$$

To see this, suppose that $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathfrak{J}$. It follows from [19, Theorem 3.1.2] that there exists an increasing net $(u_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of positive elements in $\mathfrak{J}_{[1]}$ such that $\lim_\lambda u_\lambda a = a$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(b_1, \dots, b_n)\|_{l_n^2(\mathfrak{J})} &= \lim_\lambda \|(u_\lambda b_1, \dots, u_\lambda b_n)\|_{l_n^2(\mathfrak{J})} \leq \sup_{\|c\|=1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i^* c^* c b_i \right\| \\ &= \mu_n(b_1, \dots, b_n) \\ &\leq \|(b_1, \dots, b_n)\|_{l_n^2(\mathfrak{J})}. \end{aligned}$$

In this section, we employ μ_n^* and obtain some of its fundamental properties.

Proposition 3.6. Let \mathcal{E} be a Hilbert C^* -module over a C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} . Then

$$\mu_n^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \min \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x_i, x \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \lambda \|x\| \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{E} \right\} \quad (3.12)$$

for $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$.

Proof. We first assume that \mathfrak{A} is unital. It follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality that $(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x_i, x \rangle|^2)^{1/2} \leq (\sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|^2)^{1/2} |x|$ for all $x \in \mathcal{E}$. Thus the set stated in (3.12) is nonempty. Suppose $\lambda > 0$ such that $\left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x_i, x \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| \leq \lambda \|x\|$ for all $x \in \mathcal{E}$. Set $T : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \ell_n^2(\mathfrak{A})$ defined by $Tx = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i \langle x_i, x \rangle$, where $\delta_i = (0, \dots, 0, 1_{\mathfrak{A}}, 0, \dots, 0)$ with the unit being the i th entry. The operator T is adjointable with $T^* : \ell_n^2(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ defined by $T^*(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i a_i$. Since

$$\|\langle Tx, Tx \rangle\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle x, x_i \rangle \langle x_i, x \rangle \right\| \leq \lambda^2 \|x\|^2,$$

we arrive at $\|T\| \leq \lambda$. Thus $|Tx| \leq \lambda |x|$ [15, Proposition 1.2] or, equivalently, $(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x_i, x \rangle|^2)^{1/2} \leq \lambda |x|$. From (3.9), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \sup_{y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]}} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x_i, y \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| \\ &= \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x_i, x \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| \leq \lambda \|x\| \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{E} \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x_i, x \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \lambda |x| \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{E} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the infimum is indeed a minimum.

In the case where \mathfrak{A} has no unit, we can consider \mathcal{E} as a Hilbert $\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathbb{C}I_{\mathfrak{A}}$ -module, where $I_{\mathfrak{A}}$ denotes the identity operator on \mathfrak{A} and $\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathbb{C}I_{\mathfrak{A}} = \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{A}) \oplus \mathbb{C}I_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is defined as a C^* -subalgebra of $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{A})$; see [19, p. 40]. The right action is defined by $x(a + \eta I_{\mathfrak{A}}) = xa + \eta x$ for each $x \in \mathcal{E}$, $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, and $\eta \in \mathbb{C}$. Thus, equation (3.12) is established. \square

Inspired by [12, p. 26], we present the following lemma used in the proof of Theorem 3.8.

Lemma 3.7. *Let \mathcal{E} be a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module. Then*

$$\mu_n^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i a_i \right\| : \|(a_1, \dots, a_n)\|_{\ell_n^2(\mathfrak{A})} \leq 1 \right\} \quad (3.13)$$

for $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$.

Proof. Put $\alpha = \mu_n^*(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\beta = \sup \{ \|\sum_{i=1}^n x_i a_i\| : \|\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^2\| \leq 1 \}$. If $\alpha = 0$, then $\alpha \leq \beta$. Let $\alpha \neq 0$. It follows from (3.9) that there exists $y \in \mathcal{E}_{[1]}$ such

that $\gamma = \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x_i, y \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| \neq 0$. Then

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x_i, y \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle y, x_i \rangle \frac{\langle x_i, y \rangle}{\gamma} \right\|. \quad (3.14)$$

Put $a_i = \langle x_i, y \rangle / \gamma$. Hence $\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^2 \right\| = 1$. It follows from (3.14) that

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x_i, y \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| = \left\| \left\langle y, \sum_{i=1}^n x_i a_i \right\rangle \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i a_i \right\| \leq \beta.$$

Therefore $\alpha \leq \beta$.

Conversely, fix $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^2 \right\| \leq 1$. For each $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$, set $y_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i a_i / \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i a_i \right\|$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i a_i \right\| &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle y_0, x_i \rangle a_i \right\| = \left\| \langle (\langle x_1, y_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{E}}, \dots, \langle x_n, y_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{E}}), (a_1, \dots, a_n) \rangle_{l_n^2(\mathfrak{A})} \right\| \\ &\leq \mu_n^*(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad (\text{by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality}) \end{aligned}$$

whence $\beta \leq \alpha$. Hence $\alpha = \beta$. \square

In virtue of [5, p. 22], we present the following theorem.

Theorem 3.8. *Let \mathcal{E} be a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module. For $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{E}^n$, consider*

$$T_x : l_n^2(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}, \quad (a_1, \dots, a_n) \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n x_i a_i.$$

The following statements hold.

- (1) *The map $T : (\mathcal{E}^n, \mu_n^*) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(l_n^2(\mathfrak{A}), \mathcal{E})$ defined by $x \mapsto T_x$ is isometric.*
- (2) *$\text{ran}(T) = \mathcal{K}(l_n^2(\mathfrak{A}), \mathcal{E})$.*
- (3) *If \mathfrak{A} is unital, then the map is surjective.*

Proof. (1) Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{E}^n$. It is easy to verify that $T_x^* : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow l_n^2(\mathfrak{A})$ is defined by $y \mapsto (\langle x_1, y \rangle, \dots, \langle x_n, y \rangle)$. Thus $T_x \in \mathcal{L}(l_n^2(\mathfrak{A}), \mathcal{E})$. It follows from Lemma 3.7 that $\|T_x\| = \mu_n^*(x)$. Hence the map is isometric.

(2) Let $x \in \mathcal{E}$ and $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in l_n^2(\mathfrak{A})$. Then

$$\theta_{x,a}(b_1, \dots, b_n) = x \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^* b_i = \sum_{i=1}^n (x a_i^*) b_i \quad (3.15)$$

for each $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in l_n^2(\mathfrak{A})$. Thus, $\theta_{x,a} = T_{x_0}$, where $x_0 = (x a_1^*, \dots, x a_n^*)$. Clearly, $\mathcal{F}(l_n^2(\mathfrak{A}), \mathcal{E}) \subseteq \text{ran}(T)$. Since T is isometric, we conclude that $\text{ran}(T)$ is closed. Hence $\mathcal{K}(l_n^2(\mathfrak{A}), \mathcal{E}) \subseteq \text{ran}(T)$.

Conversely, let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{E}^n$. It follows from [15, p. 13] that the map $S_{x_i} : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ defined by $S_{x_i}(a) = x_i a$ lies in $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{E})$. We observe that $T_x = [S_{x_1}, \dots, S_{x_n}]$, a $1 \times n$ matrix over $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{E})$. It is deduced from [15, p. 11] that $T_x \in \mathcal{K}(l_n^2(\mathfrak{A}), \mathcal{E})$. Hence, $\text{ran}(T) = \mathcal{K}(l_n^2(\mathfrak{A}), \mathcal{E})$.

(3) Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(l_n^2(\mathfrak{A}), \mathcal{E})$. Pick $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in l_n^2(\mathfrak{A})$. Then $T(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n T\delta_i a_i$, where $\delta_i = (0, \dots, 0, 1_{\mathfrak{A}}, 0, \dots, 0)$ with the unit being the i th entry. Thus $T = T_y$, where $y = (T\delta_1, \dots, T\delta_n)$. \square

Remark 3.9. In the case when \mathfrak{A} is nonunital, the map need not be surjective. For example, let $n = 1$ and $\mathcal{E} = \mathfrak{A} = \mathbb{K}(\mathcal{H})$, where the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is infinite dimensional. Then $\text{ran}(T) = \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{H})) = \mathbb{K}(\mathcal{H}) \neq \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{H}))$; see [19, p. 82].

4. NEW VERSION OF ABSOLUTELY $(2, 2)$ -SUMMING OPERATORS

Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be Banach spaces. For $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, set

$$\pi_2(T) := \sup \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|Tx_i\|^2 \right)^{1/2} : x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}, \mu_{2,n}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq 1, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\},$$

where $\mu_{2,n}$ was defined at (1.1). In the case where $\pi_2(T) < \infty$, the operator T is said to be absolutely $(2, 2)$ -summing operator; see [7, p. 68] and [23, pp. 45–70]. The set of these operators is denoted by $\Pi_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. The space $\Pi_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E})$ is abbreviated by $\Pi_2(\mathcal{E})$. In fact, $\Pi_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $\pi_2(T) = \|T\|_{mb}$ for $T \in \Pi_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Here, the space $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is calculated with respect to the power-normed spaces $((\mathcal{E}^n, \mu_{2,n}) : n \in \mathbb{N})$ and $((\mathcal{F}^n, \|\cdot\|_{l_n^2}) : n \in \mathbb{N})$; see [20, p. 59]. Hence $(\Pi_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}), \pi_2(\cdot))$ is a Banach space whenever so is \mathcal{F} .

For a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} Jaegermann [23, Proposition 10.1] stated that

$$\Pi_2(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H}) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_2(u) = \|u\|_{(2)} \quad (u \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H})). \quad (4.1)$$

This result motivates us to introduce the following class of adjointable operators from \mathcal{E} to \mathcal{F} .

Definition 4.1. Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -modules. For $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, we define

$$\tilde{\pi}_2(T) := \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n |Tx_i|^2 \right\|^{1/2} : x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}, \mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq 1, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}. \quad (4.2)$$

The set of adjointable operators with $\tilde{\pi}_2(T) < \infty$ is denoted by $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. In fact, $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{ML}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $\tilde{\pi}_2(T) = \|T\|_{mb}$ for $T \in \tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Here, the space

$\mathcal{ML}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is calculated with respect to the power-normed spaces $((\mathcal{E}^n, \mu_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$ and $((\mathcal{F}^n, \|\cdot\|_{l_n^2(\mathcal{F})}) : n \in \mathbb{N})$. Hence $(\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}), \tilde{\pi}_2(\cdot))$ is a Banach space. The proof of the next result is straightforward. However, we prove it for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 4.2. *Let \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F} , and \mathcal{G} be Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -modules.*

- (1) *For $x \in \mathcal{E}$ and $y \in \mathcal{F}$, it holds that $\tilde{\pi}_2(\theta_{y,x}) \leq \|x\| \|y\|$ and that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) \subseteq \tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$.*
- (2) *For $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $S \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$, it holds that $\tilde{\pi}_2(ST) \leq \|S\| \tilde{\pi}_2(T)$ and that $\tilde{\pi}_2(ST) \leq \tilde{\pi}_2(S) \|T\|$.*

Proof. (1) Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq 1$. It follows from (3.7) that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \theta_{y,x} x_i, \theta_{y,x} x_i \rangle \right\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle x_i, x \rangle \langle y, y \rangle \langle x, x_i \rangle \right\| \leq \|y\|^2 \|x\|^2.$$

Thus $\tilde{\pi}_2(\theta_{y,x}) \leq \|x\| \|y\|$.

- (2) For $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq 1$, we have

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |STx_i|^2 \right) \right\|^{1/2} \leq \|S\| \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |Tx_i|^2 \right) \right\|^{1/2} \quad (4.3)$$

since $|STx_i|^2 \leq \|S\|^2 |Tx_i|^2$ [15, Proposition 1.2]. Thus $\tilde{\pi}_2(ST) \leq \|S\| \tilde{\pi}_2(T)$. Moreover,

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |STx_i|^2 \right) \right\|^{1/2} \leq \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| S \left(\frac{T}{\|T\|} x_i \right) \right|^2 \right) \right\|^{1/2} \|T\|. \quad (4.4)$$

We deduce from (3.7) that $\mu_n(\frac{T}{\|T\|} x_1, \dots, \frac{T}{\|T\|} x_n) \leq 1$. Thus $\tilde{\pi}_2(ST) \leq \tilde{\pi}_2(S) \|T\|$. \square

From Proposition 4.2, we obtain that $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E})$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$.

Example 4.3. Let \mathfrak{A} be a C^* -algebra and \mathfrak{J} be a closed right ideal of \mathfrak{A} . Then $\tilde{\pi}_2(T) = \|T\|$ for each $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{J})$. To see this, suppose that $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathfrak{A}$ with $\mu_n(b_1, \dots, b_n) \leq 1$. Then

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle I_{\mathfrak{J}} b_i, I_{\mathfrak{J}} b_i \rangle \right\|^{1/2} = \|(b_1, \dots, b_n)\|_{l_n^2(\mathfrak{J})} = \mu_n(b_1, \dots, b_n) \leq 1. \quad (\text{by (3.11)})$$

Hence, $\tilde{\pi}_2(I_{\mathfrak{J}}) \leq 1$. It follows from Proposition 4.2(2) that

$$\|T\| \leq \tilde{\pi}_2(T) \leq \|T\| \tilde{\pi}_2(I_{\mathfrak{J}}) \leq \|T\|.$$

Therefore, $\tilde{\pi}_2(T) = \|T\|$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathfrak{J}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{J})$.

A countable subset \mathbb{S} of \mathcal{E} is a set of generators of \mathcal{E} (as a Banach \mathfrak{A} -module), if the \mathfrak{A} -linear span of \mathbb{S} is norm-dense in \mathcal{E} . The following definition is borrowed from [22, Definition 2.3].

Definition 4.4. Let \mathcal{E} be a countably generated Hilbert C^* -module over a C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} . A sequence $(f_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$ of elements of \mathcal{E} is said to be a *frame* if

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle x, f_i \rangle \langle f_i, y \rangle, \quad (4.5)$$

in the norm topology, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{E}$. Such objects were called *standard normalized frames* in [9, p. 21].

Frank and Larson [9, p. 21] introduced Hilbert–Schmidt operators on a countably generated Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module \mathcal{E} over a unital commutative C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} . Kasparov’s theorem [13, Theorem 1] states that such a Hilbert C^* -module \mathcal{E} has a frame $(f_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$. The operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ is (weakly) Hilbert–Schmidt if the sum $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T f_i, T f_i \rangle$ weakly converges in \mathfrak{A}'' , where \mathfrak{A}'' is the bidual of \mathfrak{A} as a von Neumann algebra; see [21, Theorem 2.4]. This definition is justified by the fact that if the sum $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T f_i, T f_i \rangle$ converges weakly, then the sum $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T g_i, T g_i \rangle$ also converges weakly and gives the same value in \mathfrak{A}'' , where $(f_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$ and $(g_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$ are two frames. Kaad [14, Remark 2.7] omitted the unital condition in the above statements.

The following lemma immediately follows from [19, Theorems 4.1.1 and 4.2.4] and [21, Theorem 2.4].

Lemma 4.5. *Let $(a_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda)$ be a net of self-adjoint elements in \mathfrak{A} . Then $(a_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda)$ is weakly converges in \mathfrak{A}'' if it is increasing and bounded above.*

Theorem 4.6. *Let \mathcal{E} be a countably generated Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module over a commutative C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} with frame $(f_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T f_i, T f_i \rangle$ converges weakly if and only if $T \in \tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E})$. Moreover, $\tilde{\pi}_2(T) = \|\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T f_i, T f_i \rangle\|^{1/2}$ for each $T \in \tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E})$.*

Proof. Let $T \in \tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E})$. From (4.5), we get

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle x, f_i \rangle \langle f_i, x \rangle \right\|^{1/2} \leq \|x\| \quad (x \in \mathcal{E}).$$

It follows that $\mu_n(f_1, \dots, f_n) \leq 1$. Thus $\|\sum_{i=1}^n \langle T f_i, T f_i \rangle\|^{1/2} \leq \tilde{\pi}_2(T)$. Put $a_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle T f_i, T f_i \rangle$. The sequence $(a_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is increasing and bounded above in \mathfrak{A} . Hence $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T f_i, T f_i \rangle$ converges weakly in \mathfrak{A}'' in virtue of Lemma 4.5.

Conversely, let $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T f_i, T f_i \rangle$ converge weakly in \mathfrak{A}'' . Pick $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{j=1}^n \langle T x_j, T x_j \rangle &= \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T x_j, f_i \rangle \langle f_i, T x_j \rangle && \text{(by (4.5))} \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle T^* f_i, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, T^* f_i \rangle && \text{(by the commutativity of } \mathfrak{A} \text{)} \\
 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T^* f_i, T^* f_i \rangle && \text{(by (3.12) and the fact that } \mu_n = \mu_n^* \text{)} \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T f_i, T f_i \rangle. && \text{(by [9, Proposition 4.8])}
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\tilde{\pi}_2(T) \leq \|\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T f_i, T f_i \rangle\|^{1/2}$. Therefore $T \in \tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E})$. Hence $\tilde{\pi}_2(T) = \|\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T f_i, T f_i \rangle\|^{1/2}$. \square

From the above theorem and the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T f_i, T f_i \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle T^* f_i, T^* f_i \rangle$ [9, Proposition 4.8], we conclude that $(\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}), \tilde{\pi}_2(\cdot))$ is a Banach $*$ -algebra.

For $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$, set $\tilde{\pi}_1(T) := \tilde{\pi}_2(|T|^{1/2})^2$. Define

$$\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{E}) = \{T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}) : \tilde{\pi}_1(T) < \infty\}. \quad (4.6)$$

In fact, from Definition 4.1, we get

$$\tilde{\pi}_1(T) = \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle |T| x_i, x_i \rangle \right\| : x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}, \mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq 1, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}. \quad (4.7)$$

Suppose that \mathfrak{I} is a closed right ideal of \mathfrak{A} . In virtue of Example 4.3, $\tilde{\pi}_1(T) = \|T\|$ for each $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{I})$. Hence $\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathfrak{I}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{I})$. In the case where \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space, we have $\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})$ and $\tilde{\pi}_1(T) = \|T\|_{(1)}$ for each $T \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})$.

Example 4.7. Suppose that \mathcal{E} is a countably generated Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module over a commutative C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} with frame $(f_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$. It follows from Theorem 4.6 that

$$\tilde{\pi}_1(T) = \tilde{\pi}_2(|T|^{1/2}) = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle |T| f_i, f_i \rangle \right\|,$$

where $T \in \tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{E})$. It follows from [22, Definition 3.2 and Theorem 3.28] that $\tilde{\pi}_1(T) = \sup_{\tau \in \Omega(\mathfrak{A})} \|\phi_{\tau}(T)\|_{(1)}$ and $\tilde{\pi}_1(T) = \tilde{\pi}_1(T^*)$. Moreover, $\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{E})$ is a Banach space.

We intend to show that $(\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{E}), \tilde{\pi}_1(\cdot))$ is a Banach space in general. To this end, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.8. [1, Theorem 4.2] *Let \mathfrak{A} be a unital C^* -algebra. For each a and b in \mathfrak{A} and $\epsilon > 0$, there are unitaries u and v in \mathfrak{A} such that*

$$|a + b| \leq u^* |a| u + v^* |b| v + \epsilon 1_{\mathfrak{A}}. \quad (4.8)$$

Proposition 4.9. *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and let $T, S \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$. Then*

- (1) $\tilde{\pi}_1(T + S) \leq \tilde{\pi}_1(T) + \tilde{\pi}_1(S)$ and $\tilde{\pi}_1(\lambda T) = |\lambda| \tilde{\pi}_1(T)$.
- (2) $\|T\| \leq \tilde{\pi}_1(T)$.
- (3) $\tilde{\pi}_1(TS) \leq \|T\| \tilde{\pi}_1(S)$.
- (4) $(\tilde{\pi}_2(T))^2 \leq \|T\| \tilde{\pi}_1(T)$.

Proof. (1) Given $\epsilon > 0$, pick $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq 1$. Let $T, S \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$. It follows from Lemma 4.8 that there are unitaries U and V in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ such that

$$|T + S| \leq U^* |T| U + V^* |S| V + \frac{\epsilon}{n} I_{\mathcal{E}}. \quad (4.9)$$

Using (4.9), we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle |T + S| x_i, x_i \rangle \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle |T| U x_i, U x_i \rangle \right\| + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle |S| V x_i, V x_i \rangle \right\| + \epsilon.$$

Since $\mu_n(U x_1, \dots, U x_n) \leq 1$ and $\mu_n(V x_1, \dots, V x_n) \leq 1$, we have $\tilde{\pi}_1(T + S) \leq \tilde{\pi}_1(T) + \tilde{\pi}_1(S)$. The equality $\tilde{\pi}_1(\lambda T) = |\lambda| \tilde{\pi}_1(T)$ can be easily proved.

Clause (2) follows from the corresponding property for the norm $\tilde{\pi}_2(\cdot)$, and clause (3) follows from Proposition 4.2.

(4) Suppose that $S \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})_{[1]}$. Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq 1$. Then

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle S x_i, S x_i \rangle \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle |S| |S|^{1/2} x_i, |S|^{1/2} x_i \rangle \right\| \leq \tilde{\pi}_1(S).$$

Thus $(\tilde{\pi}_2(S))^2 \leq \tilde{\pi}_1(S)$. Hence clause (4) follows. \square

Clause (3) shows that $\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{E})$ is a left ideal of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$. Clause (4) shows that $\tilde{\pi}_2(T) \leq \tilde{\pi}_1(T)$. As a result, $\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{E}) \subseteq \tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E})$.

Proposition 4.10. *Let \mathcal{E} be a Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -module. Then $(\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{E}), \tilde{\pi}_1(\cdot))$ is a Banach space.*

Proof. Let $(T_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ be a Cauchy sequence in $(\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{E}), \tilde{\pi}_1(\cdot))$. It is a Cauchy sequence with respect to the operator norm; see Proposition 4.9(2). There exists $T \in$

$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ such that $\|T_n - T\| \rightarrow 0$. Assume towards a contradiction that $\tilde{\pi}_1(T_n - T) \not\rightarrow 0$. Then equation (4.7) ensures that there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\tilde{\pi}_1(T_{n_0} - T) > \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\pi}_1(T_{n_0} - T_m) < \frac{\epsilon}{3} \quad \text{for each } m \geq n_0. \quad (4.10)$$

Then there exist $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\mu_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) \leq 1$ such that

$$\epsilon < \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k \langle |T_{n_0} - T| x_i, x_i \rangle \right\|. \quad (4.11)$$

Pick $m_0 \geq n_0$ such that $\|T_{m_0} - T\| < \epsilon/3k$. Lemma 4.8 ensures that there exist $U, V \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{E})$ such that

$$|T_{n_0} - T| = U^* |T_{n_0} - T_{m_0}| U + V^* |T_{m_0} - T| V + \frac{\epsilon}{3k} I_{\mathcal{E}}. \quad (4.12)$$

It follows from (4.10), (4.11), and (4.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon < \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k \langle |T_{n_0} - T| x_i, x_i \rangle \right\| &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k \langle |T_{n_0} - T_{m_0}| U x_i, U x_i \rangle \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k \langle |T_{m_0} - T| V x_i, V x_i \rangle \right\| + \frac{\epsilon}{3} < \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Thus $\tilde{\pi}_1(T_n - T) \rightarrow 0$. Hence $(\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{E}), \tilde{\pi}_1(\cdot))$ is a Banach space. \square

Stern and van Suijlekom [22, Theorem 3.28] introduced a Schatten p -norm $\|\cdot\|_{[p]}$ for $1 \leq p$ such that $\|T\|_{[p]} = \sup_{\tau \in \Omega(\mathfrak{A})} \|\phi_\tau(T)\|_{(p)}$ for $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$, where \mathcal{E} is a Hilbert C^* -module over a commutative C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A} . In this case, it is deduced from [22, Theorems 3.5 and 3.28] and Theorem 4.6 that $\tilde{\pi}_p(T) = \|T\|_{[p]}$ for $p \in \{1, 2\}$. In what follows, we extend the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{[p]}$ for an arbitrary Hilbert C^* -module \mathcal{E} . We define $\|T\|_{[p]} = \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{PS}(\mathfrak{A})} \|\phi_\tau(T)\|_{(p)}$ for $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$. It follows from [19, Theorem 5.1.11] that $\|T\| = \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{PS}(\mathfrak{A})} \|\phi_\tau(T)\|$. Define $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{E}) = \{T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}) : \|T\|_{[p]} < \infty\}$. It is easy to see that $\|T\|_{[p]}$ is a norm on $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{E})$ with expected properties. In the case where $p \in \{1, 2\}$, we will show that $\tilde{\pi}_p(T) \leq \|T\|_{[p]}$ for $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$.

Proposition 4.11. *If $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$, then $\tilde{\pi}_p(T) \leq \|T\|_{[p]}$ for $p \in \{1, 2\}$.*

Proof. Fix $p \in \{1, 2\}$. Pick $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\mu_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq 1$. It follows from [19, Theorem 5.1.11] that there exists $\tau \in \mathcal{PS}(\mathfrak{A})$ such that

$\tau \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle |T|^p x_i, x_i \rangle \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) = \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle |T|^p x_i, x_i \rangle \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|$. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\|x + \mathcal{N}_\tau\| \leq 1} \sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x + \mathcal{N}_\tau, x_i + \mathcal{N}_\tau \rangle|^2 &= \sup_{\|x + \mathcal{N}_\tau\| \leq 1} \sum_{i=1}^n |\tau(\langle x, x_i \rangle)|^2 \\ &\leq \tau \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle x, x_i \rangle|^2 \right) \quad (\text{by [19, Theorem. 3.3.2]}) \\ &\leq \sup_{\|y\| \leq 1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n |\langle y, x_i \rangle|^2 \right\| = \mu_n^\mathcal{E}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{H}_τ is the Hilbert completion of $\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{N}_\tau$, we arrive at $\mu_n(x_1 + \mathcal{N}_\tau, \dots, x_n + \mathcal{N}_\tau) \leq 1$, where μ_n is calculated in the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_τ . We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle |T|^p x_i, x_i \rangle \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\| &= \tau \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle |T|^p x_i, x_i \rangle \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) \\ &\leq \tau \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle |T|^p x_i, x_i \rangle \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (\text{by [19, Theorem. 3.3.2]}) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \phi_\tau(|T|^p)(x_i + \mathcal{N}_\tau), x_i + \mathcal{N}_\tau \rangle \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle |\phi_\tau(T)|^p(x_i + \mathcal{N}_\tau), x_i + \mathcal{N}_\tau \rangle \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \|\phi_\tau(T)\|_{(p)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\tilde{\pi}_p(T) \leq \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{PS}(\mathfrak{A})} \|\phi_\tau(T)\|_{(p)} = \|T\|_{[p]}$. \square

In the following example, we show that the equality $\tilde{\pi}_p(T) = \|T\|_{[p]}$ is not true, in general.

Example 4.12. Suppose that $\mathcal{E} = \mathfrak{A} = \mathbb{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$. Let $\tau \in \mathcal{PS}(\mathfrak{A})$. It follows from [19, Example 5.1.1] that there exists a unit vector f_1 in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = l_n^2$ such that $\tau(S) = \langle Sf_1, f_1 \rangle$ for each $S \in \mathbb{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$. The Hilbert space \mathcal{H} has an orthonormal basis $\{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n\}$. Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$. Then T is uniquely determined by the matrix $[\langle Tf_j, f_i \rangle]_{i,j=1}^n$. Suppose that $S \in \mathcal{N}_\tau$. We observe that $\|Sf_1\| = \tau(S^*S)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0$. Thus, \mathcal{N}_τ consists of all matrices in $\mathbb{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$ such that their first column is zero. Hence $\mathcal{H}_\tau = l_n^2$ and $\|\phi_\tau(T)\|_{(p)} = \|T\|_{(p)}$. Therefore, $\|T\|_{[p]} = \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{PS}(\mathfrak{A})} \|\phi_\tau(T)\|_{(p)} = \|T\|_{(p)}$. For example, if $p = 1$, then $\|I_{\mathfrak{A}}\|_{[1]} = n$ while $\tilde{\pi}_1(I_{\mathfrak{A}}) = 1$.

In general, an operator in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ does not necessarily have a polar decomposition. Weggo-Olsen stated a necessary and sufficient condition for operators in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ to admit a polar decomposition; see also [10].

Lemma 4.13. [24, Theorem 15.3.7] *Suppose $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The operator T has a unique polar decomposition $T = W |T|$, where $W \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a partial isometry for which $\ker(W) = \ker(T) = \ker(|T|)$ and $\ker(W^*) = \ker(T^*) = \ker(|T^*|)$.*
- (2) *$\mathcal{E} = \ker(T) \oplus \overline{\text{ran}(T^*)}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \ker(T^*) \oplus \overline{\text{ran}(T)}$.*

*In this situation, W^*W is the projection onto $\overline{\text{ran}(|T|)} = \overline{\text{ran}(T^*)}$ and WW^* is the projection onto $\overline{\text{ran}(|T^*|)} = \overline{\text{ran}(T)}$.*

Lemma 4.14. [16, Lemma 3.12] *Let $T = W |T|$ be the polar decomposition of $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Then for all $\alpha > 0$, the following statements hold:*

- (1) $W |T|^\alpha W^* = (W |T| W^*)^\alpha = |T^*|^\alpha$;
- (2) $W^* |T^*|^\alpha W = (W^* |T^*| W)^\alpha = |T|^\alpha$.

The following proposition gives a condition to achieve more properties for $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{E})$.

Proposition 4.15. *Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} be Hilbert \mathfrak{A} -modules.*

- (1) *For $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, where $\mathcal{E} = \ker(T) \oplus \overline{\text{ran}(T^*)}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \ker(T^*) \oplus \overline{\text{ran}(T)}$, it holds that*

$$\tilde{\pi}_2(T) = \tilde{\pi}_2(T^*). \quad (4.13)$$

- (2) *For $T, S \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{E} = \ker(T) \oplus \overline{\text{ran}(T^*)} = \ker(T^*) \oplus \overline{\text{ran}(T)}$, it holds that*

$$\tilde{\pi}_1(T) = \tilde{\pi}_1(T^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\pi}_1(TS) \leq \|S\| \tilde{\pi}_1(T). \quad (4.14)$$

Proof. (1) From Lemma 4.14, the operator T has a polar decomposition $T = W |T|$. In Lemma 4.13, put $\alpha = 2$. We observe that $W |T|^2 W^* = |T^*|^2$ and $W^* |T^*|^2 W = |T|^2$. It follows from (4.2) that $\tilde{\pi}_2(T) = \tilde{\pi}_2(T^*)$.

(2) From Lemma 4.14, the operator T has a polar decomposition $T = W |T|$. In Lemma 4.13, put $\alpha = 1$. We see that $W |T| W^* = |T^*|$ and $W^* |T^*| W = |T|$. It follows from (4.7) that $\tilde{\pi}_1(T) = \tilde{\pi}_1(T^*)$. We conclude from Proposition 4.9(3) that $\tilde{\pi}_1(TS) = \tilde{\pi}_1(S^*T^*) \leq \|S\| \tilde{\pi}_1(T)$. \square

Remark 4.16. Inspired by [15, Theorem 3.2] and (4.13), if T is a closed range operator in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, we have $\tilde{\pi}_2(T) = \tilde{\pi}_2(T^*)$. Furthermore, for a closed range operator in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$, equation (4.14) is established.

Remark 4.17. In virtue of Proposition 4.15, if $\ker(T)$ is complemented for each $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, then $\tilde{\Pi}_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a Banach $*$ -algebra. Furthermore, for $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$, we conclude that $\tilde{\Pi}_1(\mathcal{E})$ is a Banach $*$ -algebra and a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$. The complementedness of $\ker(T)$ is possible in the case where \mathcal{E} is a Hilbert C^* -module over a C^* -algebra of compact operators; see [18, p. 2] and [2, 8].

Conflict of Interest Statement. On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement. Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

REFERENCES

1. C. A. Akemann, J. Anderson, and G. Pedersen, *Triangle inequalities in operator algebras*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **11** (1982), no.2 , 167–178.
2. D. Bakić and B. Guljaš, *Hilbert C^* -modules over C^* -algebras of compact operators*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **68** (2002), no. 1-2, 249–269.
3. O. Blasco, *Power-normed spaces*, Positivity **21** (2017), no. 2, 593–632.
4. H. G. Dales, M. Daws, H. L. Pham, and P. Ramsden, *Multi-norms and the injectivity of $L^p(G)$* , J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **86** (2012), no. 3, 779–809.
5. H. G. Dales, N. J. Laustsen, T. Oikhberg, and V. G. Troitsky, *Multi-norms and Banach lattices*, Dissertationes Math. **524** (2017), 115 pp.
6. H. G. Dales and M. S. Moslehian, *Stability of mappings on multi-normed spaces*, Glasg. Math. J. **49** (2007), no. 2, 321–332.
7. H. G. Dales and M. E. Polyakov, *Multi-normed spaces*, Dissertationes Math. **488** (2012), 165 pp.
8. M. Frank, *Characterizing C^* -algebras of compact operators by generic categorical properties of Hilbert C^* -modules*, J. K-Theory **2** (2008), no. 3, 453–462.
9. M. Frank, and D. R. Larson, *Frames in Hilbert C^* -modules and C^* -algebras*, J. Operator Theory **48** (2002), no.2 , 273–314.
10. M. Frank, and K. Sharifi, *Generalized inverses and polar decomposition of unbounded regular operators on Hilbert C^* -modules*, J. Operator Theory **64** (2010), no. 2, 377–386.
11. M. Frank, *Geometrical aspects of Hilbert C^* -modules*, Positivity **3**(1999), 215–243.
12. G. J. O. Jameson, *Summing and Nuclear Norms in Banach Space Theory*, Cambridge, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, Cambridge University Press, 1987.
13. J. Kaad, *Differentiable absorption of Hilbert C^* -modules, connections, and lifts of unbounded operators*, J. Noncommut. Geom. **11** (2017), no.3 , 1037–1068.
14. G. G. Kasparov, *Hilbert C^* -modules: The theorems of Stinespring and Voiculescu*, J. Operator Theory **4** (1980), no.1 , 133–150 .

15. E. C. Lance, *Hilbert C^* -modules: a toolkit for operator algebraists*, Vol. 210, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
16. N. Liu, W. Luo, and Q. Xu, *The polar decomposition for adjointable operators on Hilbert C^* -modules and n -centered operators*, Banach J. Math. Anal. **13** (2019), no.3 , 627–646.
17. V. M. Manuilov and E. V. Troitsky, *Hilbert C^* -modules*, In: Translations of Mathematical Monographs. 226, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005.
18. M. S. Moslehian and A. Zamani, *Mappings preserving approximate orthogonality in Hilbert C^* -modules*, Math Scand. **122** (2018), 257–276.
19. G. J. Murphy, *C^* -algebras and operator theory*, Academic Press, Boston, 1990.
20. P. Ramsden, *Homological properties of semigroup algebras* J. Funct. Anal. **258** (2010), no. 12, 3988–4009.
21. M. Takesaki, *Theory of Operator Algebras I*, Springer, New York, 1979.
22. A. B. Stern and W. D. van Suijlekom, *Schatten classes for Hilbert C^* -modules over commutative C^* -algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **281** (2021), no. 4, article 109042.
23. N. Tomczak-Jaegermann, *Banach–Mazur distance and finite-dimensional operator ideals*, Longman Scientific and Technical, Harlow, Essex, 1989.
24. N. E. Wegge-Olsen, *K -theory and C^* -algebra, a Friendly Approach*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, England, 1993.
25. A. W. Wickstead, *Ordered Banach algebras and multi-norms: some open problems*, Positivity **21** (2017), no. 2, 817–823.

¹DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, FERDOWSI UNIVERSITY OF MASHHAD, P. O. BOX 1159, MASHHAD 91775, IRAN

Email address: sajjadabedy1995@gmail.com

²DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, CENTER OF EXCELLENCE IN ANALYSIS ON ALGEBRAIC STRUCTURES (CEAAS), FERDOWSI UNIVERSITY OF MASHHAD, P. O. BOX 1159, MASHHAD 91775, IRAN.

Email address: moslehian@um.ac.ir; moslehian@yahoo.com