

COMPOSITION IN MODULUS MAPS ON SEMIGROUPS OF CONTINUOUS FUNCTIONS

BAGHER JAFARZADEH AND FERESHTEH SADY¹

*Department of Pure Mathematics, Faculty of
Mathematical Sciences, Tarbiat Modares University,
Tehran, 14115-134, Iran*

b.jafarzadeh@modares.ac.ir, sady@modares.ac.ir

ABSTRACT. For locally compact Hausdorff spaces X and Y , and function algebras A and B on X and Y , respectively, surjections $T : A \rightarrow B$ satisfying norm multiplicative condition $\|TfTg\|_Y = \|fg\|_X$, $f, g \in A$, with respect to the supremum norms, and those satisfying $\| |Tf| + |Tg| \|_Y = \| |f| + |g| \|_X$ have been extensively studied. Motivated by this, we consider certain (multiplicative or additive) sub-semigroups A and B of $C_0(X)$ and $C_0(Y)$, respectively, and study surjections $T : A \rightarrow B$ satisfying the norm condition $\rho(Tf, Tg) = \rho(f, g)$, $f, g \in A$, for some class of two variable positive functions ρ . It is shown that T is also a composition in modulus map.

1. INTRODUCTION

The interaction between different structures of a space has been studied in many settings. In the context of function algebras, the classical Banach-Stone theorem and its generalizations characterize isometries between certain algebras of continuous functions as multiples by a continuous function of an algebra isomorphisms. By the Mazur-Ulam theorem, any surjective isometry between real normed spaces, preserves midpoints, and so it is a real-linear map up to a translation. That is, surjective isometries reveal real vector space structures of the normed spaces.

Multiplicative version of the Banach-Stone theorem characterizes surjections $T : A \rightarrow B$, not assumed to be linear, between different subsets A and B of $C_0(X)$ and $C_0(Y)$, for locally compact Hausdorff spaces X and Y , which are multiplicatively norm-preserving, i.e. $\|TfTg\|_Y = \|fg\|_X$ holds for all $f, g \in A$. The notations

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47B38, 46J10, Secondary 47B33.

Key words and phrases. function spaces, positive cone, Choquet boundaries, weighted composition operators, norm preserving.

¹ Corresponding author

$\|\cdot\|_X$ and $\|\cdot\|_Y$ stand for the supremum norms. In the setting of function algebras, such a map T is a composition in modulus map, i.e. there exists a homeomorphism $\Phi : \text{Ch}(B) \longrightarrow \text{Ch}(A)$ between the Choquet boundaries of A and B such that $|Tf(y)| = |f(\Phi(y))|$ for all $f \in A$ and $y \in \text{Ch}(B)$, see [9]. The idea of considering such maps comes from Molnar's result [12] concerning multiplicatively spectrum preserving maps between operator algebras and also $C(X)$ -spaces. The result has been improved in various directions for many different settings such as (Banach) function algebras and their multiplicative subsets, see for example [2, 3, 4, 6, 14, 15] and also the survey [1]. Norm additive in modulus maps between function algebras has been studied in [17]. Such mappings satisfy the norm condition $\| |Tf| + |Tg| \|_Y = \| |f| + |g| \|_X$, and it is shown in [17] that they are also composition in modulus maps. We note that for positive cones of spaces of functions, the above norm condition is, in fact, the norm additive condition $\|Tf + Tg\|_Y = \|f + g\|_X$. Motivated by the Mazur-Ulam theorem, the authors of [13] consider a more general problem for positive cones of operator algebras and positive cones of subalgebras of continuous functions. Indeed, by introducing the notation of mean, they study surjections T between operator algebras and between positive cones of subalgebras of continuous functions satisfying the norm condition $\|\mathcal{M}(Tf, Tg)\| = \|\mathcal{M}(f, g)\|$ with respect to a mean \mathcal{M} . A similar problem has been considered in the recent work [7] of the authors.

In [5], Hatori et. al. introduced the notations of subdistances, metricoid spaces and midpoint of the elements of metricoid spaces, and then give some Mazur-Ulam type theorem. In particular, for a compact Hausdorff space X , they characterize surjective maps T on the set of strictly positive functions in $C(X)$ preserving one of the subdistances

$$\delta_+(f, g) = \left\| \frac{f}{g} - 1 \right\|_X + \left\| \frac{g}{f} - 1 \right\|_X$$

and

$$\delta_{\max}(f, g) = \max \left(\left\| \frac{f}{g} - 1 \right\|_X, \left\| \frac{g}{f} - 1 \right\|_X \right).$$

Motivated by the above results, in this paper we consider two variable positive functions ρ_+ and ρ_{\max} defined by

$$\rho_+(f, g) = \|\varphi(f, g)\|_X + \|\varphi(g, f)\|_X$$

and

$$\rho_{\max}(f, g) = \max(\|\varphi(f, g)\|_X, \|\varphi(g, f)\|_X)$$

for $f, g \in C_0(X)$, where X is a locally compact Hausdorff space and $\varphi : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a certain continuous two variable function. Here for $f, g \in C_0(X)$, $\varphi(f, g)(x) = \varphi(f(x), g(x))$, $x \in X$. We study surjections $T : A \longrightarrow B$ between some

(multiplicative or additive) semigroups A and B of continuous functions on locally compact Hausdorff spaces X and Y , respectively, such that $\rho(Tf, Tg) = \rho(f, g)$, $f, g \in A$, where $\rho \in \{\rho_{\max}, \rho_+\}$. It is shown that such a map T is also a composition in modulus map (Theorems 4.2 and 5.1).

2. PRELIMINARIES

For a locally compact Hausdorff space X , $C_b(X)$ is the Banach space of bounded continuous complex-valued functions on X with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_X$ and $C_0(X)$ is the closed subalgebra of $C_b(X)$ consisting of continuous functions vanishing at infinity. A *function algebra* on X is a closed subalgebra A of $C_0(X)$ which strongly separates the points of X , that is, for any distinct points $x, y \in X$, there exists $f \in A$ with $f(x) \neq f(y)$, and for each point $x \in X$, there exists $g \in A$ with $g(x) \neq 0$.

For a subset A of $C_0(X)$, a point $x \in X$ is called a *strong boundary point* of A if for each $\epsilon > 0$ and neighborhood V of x , there exists $f \in A$ such that $f(x) = 1 = \|f\|_X$ and $|f| < \epsilon$ on $X \setminus V$. We denote the set of all strong boundary points of A by $\delta(A)$. For a point $x \in X$, the evaluation functional $e_x : A \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is defined by $e_x(f) = f(x)$, $f \in A$. For a subspace A of $C_0(X)$, the *Choquet boundary* of A , denoted by $\text{Ch}(A)$, consists of all points $x \in X$ such that e_x is an extreme point of the unit ball of A^* . It is well known that $\text{Ch}(A)$ is a boundary for A , that is, for each $f \in A$, there exists a point $x \in \text{Ch}(A)$ such that $|f(x)| = \|f\|_X$, see [16, Page 184]. In general, $\delta(A) \subseteq \text{Ch}(A)$ (see [8, Lemma 3.1]) and if A is a function algebra, then $\delta(A) = \text{Ch}(A)$ (see [10, Theorem 4.7.22] for compact case and [15, Theorem 2.1] for general case).

Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space and A be a subset of $C_0(X)$. For a point $x_0 \in X$, we fix the following notations

$$V_{x_0}(A) = \{f \in A : f(x_0) = 1 = \|f\|_X\}, \quad F_{x_0}(A) = \{f \in A : |f(x_0)| = 1 = \|f\|_X\}.$$

Clearly, for $x_0 \in \delta(A)$, these sets are nonempty. Meanwhile, for $x_1, x_2 \in \delta(A)$, each of the inclusions $V_{x_1}(A) \subseteq V_{x_2}(A)$ and $F_{x_1}(A) \subseteq F_{x_2}(A)$ implies that $x_1 = x_2$.

For $f \in C_0(X)$, we also set $M(f) = \{x \in X : |f(x)| = \|f\|_X\}$. The notation A_+ is used for the set of positive elements of A , i.e. $A_+ = \{f \in A : f(x) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in X\}$. We also put $|A| = \{|f| : f \in A\}$.

For a locally compact Hausdorff space X and a subspace A of $C_0(X)$, a function $f \in A$ with $\|f\|_X = 1$ is called a *peaking function* of A if for each $x \in X$, either $|f(x)| < 1$ or $f(x) = 1$. A closed subset F of X is a *peak set* of A if there exists a peaking function $f \in A$ such that $F = \{x \in X : f(x) = 1\}$. It is well known that in a function algebra A on X , each nonempty intersection of peak sets of A intersects $\text{Ch}(A)$.

3. CERTAIN TWO VARIABLE FUNCTIONS

In this section, we consider a positive two variable function φ with a property called (inc) and provide some required lemmas which will be used in the next sections.

Let $\varphi : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a continuous map. We define the following increasing property:

- (inc) φ is strictly increasing in modulus with respect to both variables, in the sense that for $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{C}$, if $|s_1| \leq |s_2|$, then $\varphi(s_1, t) \leq \varphi(s_2, t)$ and $\varphi(t, s_1) \leq \varphi(t, s_2)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{C}$, and the same implication holds for all $t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ if we replace " \leq " by " $<$ ".

Examples of two variable functions satisfying (inc) are as follows.

Example 3.1. (i) For strictly positive scalars a and b , the maps $\varphi_{a,b}$ and $\psi_{a,b}$ on $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ defined by $\varphi_{a,b}(s, t) = a|s| + b|t|$ and $\psi_{a,b}(s, t) = |s|^a |t|^b$ satisfy (inc).

(ii) For strictly positive scalar p , the map $\varphi_p : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ defined by $\varphi_p(s, t) = (|s|^p + |t|^p)^{1/p}$ satisfies (inc).

(iii) If $\varphi, \psi : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ are continuous maps such that φ is (not necessarily strictly) increasing in modulus and ψ satisfies (inc), then $\varphi + \psi$ also satisfies (inc). In particular, the following maps satisfy (inc)

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(s, t) &= a|s| + b|t| + |s|^c |t|^d \text{ for } a, b, c, d > 0, \\ \varphi(s, t) &= \max(|s|, |t|) + |s| + |t|, \quad \psi(s, t) = \max(|s|, |t|) + |st|, \\ \varphi(s, t) &= \min(|s|, |t|) + |s| + |t|, \quad \psi(s, t) = \min(|s|, |t|) + |st|.\end{aligned}$$

For functions $f, g \in C_b(X)$, the continuous function $\varphi(f, g)$ on X is defined by $\varphi(f, g)(x) = \varphi(f(x), g(x))$ for all $x \in X$.

Next lemma is easily verified. For the sake of completeness, we state and prove it here.

Lemma 3.2. *Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space and let $\varphi : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a continuous map satisfying (inc).*

- (i) *If $\varphi(0, 0) = 0$, then for all $f, g \in C_0(X)$, we have $\varphi(f, g) \in C_0(X)$.*
(ii) *For $s, t \in \mathbb{C}$, we have $\varphi(s, t) = \varphi(|s|, |t|)$.*
(iii) *For $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ and $c, d \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, if $|a| < |c|$ and $|b| \leq |d|$, then $\varphi(a, b) < \varphi(c, d)$ and $\varphi(b, a) < \varphi(d, c)$.*
(iv) *For $f, g \in C_0(X)$, if $r, s > 0$ such that $\varphi(f(x), g(x)) < \varphi(r, s)$ for all $x \in X$, then $\|\varphi(f, g)\|_X < \varphi(r, s)$.*

Proof. (i)-(iii) are easily verified by using (inc).

(iv) Let X_∞ be the one point compactification of X . Then $\varphi(f, g)$ is an element of $C(X_\infty)$ and since $\varphi(0, 0) \leq \varphi(0, s) < \varphi(r, s)$, it follows from the hypothesis that $\varphi(f(x), g(x)) < \varphi(r, s)$ for all $x \in X_\infty$. Hence

$$\|\varphi(f, g)\|_X \leq \|\varphi(f, g)\|_{X_\infty} < \varphi(r, s). \quad \square$$

Definition 3.3. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a continuous map satisfying (inc). For a locally compact Hausdorff space X , we define $\rho_+, \rho_{\max} : C_b(X) \times C_b(X) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ by

$$\rho_+(f, g) = \|\varphi(f, g)\|_X + \|\varphi(g, f)\|_X$$

and

$$\rho_{\max}(f, g) = \max(\|\varphi(f, g)\|_X, \|\varphi(g, f)\|_X).$$

In the rest of this section, we assume that the continuous map $\varphi : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfies (inc), and positive functions ρ_+ and ρ_{\max} are as above.

Next lemma states some simple observations about ρ_+ and ρ_{\max} .

Lemma 3.4. Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space and $\rho \in \{\rho_+, \rho_{\max}\}$. Then the following statements hold.

(i) For $f_1, g_1, f_2, g_2 \in C_b(X)$, the inequality $\rho(f_1, g_1) < \rho(f_2, g_2)$ implies that either $\|\varphi(f_1, g_1)\|_X < \|\varphi(f_2, g_2)\|_X$ or $\|\varphi(g_1, f_1)\|_X < \|\varphi(g_2, f_2)\|_X$.

(ii) For $f, g \in C_b(X)$ and $r, s > 0$, if $\rho(f, g) < \rho(r, s)$, then for each $x \in X$, we have either $|f(x)| < r$ or $|g(x)| < s$.

Lemma 3.5. Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space and A be a subset of $C_0(X)$. Let $x_0 \in \delta(A)$ and $f \in A$. Then for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $h \in V_{x_0}(A)$ such that

$$\rho_{\max}(f, \|f\|_X h) \leq \rho_{\max}(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, \|f\|_X)$$

Proof. The inequality is obvious if $f = 0$. Hence we assume that $f \neq 0$.

For $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, consider the open neighborhood $V = \{x \in X : |f(x) - f(x_0)| < \epsilon\}$ of x_0 . Since $x_0 \in \delta(A)$, there exists $h \in V_{x_0}(A)$ such that $|h| < \frac{\epsilon}{\|f\|_X}$ on $X \setminus V$. Using condition (inc) on φ , we get $\varphi(f(x), \|f\|_X h(x)) \leq \varphi(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, \|f\|_X)$ for all $x \in V$, and moreover, $\varphi(f(x), \|f\|_X h(x)) \leq \varphi(\|f\|_X, \epsilon) \leq \varphi(\|f\|_X, |f(x_0)| + \epsilon)$ for all $x \in X \setminus V$. Therefore, $\|\varphi(f, \|f\|_X h)\|_X \leq \rho_{\max}(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, \|f\|_X)$. A similar discussion shows that $\|\varphi(\|f\|_X h, f)\|_X \leq \rho_{\max}(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, \|f\|_X)$. Hence

$$\rho_{\max}(f, \|f\|_X h) \leq \rho_{\max}(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, \|f\|_X). \quad \square$$

Lemma 3.6. Let X be a locally compact Hausdorff space and A be a subset of $C_0(X)$. Let $x_0 \in \delta(A)$, $f \in A$ and $\epsilon > 0$.

(i) If φ satisfies the additional condition $\varphi(t, 0) = 0 = \varphi(0, t)$ for all $t > 0$, then there exists $h \in V_{x_0}(A)$ such that

$$\rho_+(f, h) < \rho_+(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, 1).$$

(ii) If for all $a > 0$, $\varphi(t, a) \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varphi(a, t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, then there exist $\lambda > 0$ and $h \in V_{x_0}(A)$ such that

$$\rho_+(f, \lambda h) < \rho_+(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, \lambda).$$

Proof. (i) Since $\varphi(t, 0) = \varphi(0, t) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, it follows from the continuity of φ that there is a small enough $0 < \epsilon' < \epsilon$ such that $\epsilon' \|f\|_X < 1$, $\varphi(\|f\|_X, \epsilon' \|f\|_X) < \varphi(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, 1)$ and $\varphi(\epsilon' \|f\|_X, \|f\|_X) < \varphi(1, |f(x_0)| + \epsilon)$. We should note that $\varphi(1, |f(x_0)| + \epsilon) > \varphi(0, 0) \geq 0$. Let U be an open neighborhood of x_0 such that $|f(x)| < |f(x_0)| + \epsilon$ for all $x \in U$. Since $x_0 \in \delta(A)$, we can find $h \in A$ such that $h(x_0) = 1 = \|h\|_X$ and $|h| < \epsilon' \|f\|_X$ on $X \setminus U$. Using (inc), for each $x \in X \setminus U$, we have

$$\varphi(f(x), h(x)) \leq \varphi(\|f\|_X, \epsilon' \|f\|_X) < \varphi(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, 1).$$

On the other hand, for each $x \in U$, using Lemma 3.2(iii), we have

$$\varphi(f(x), h(x)) < \varphi(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, 1).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.2(iv), $\|\varphi(f, h)\|_X < \varphi(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, 1)$. Similarly, it follows that $\|\varphi(h, f)\|_X < \varphi(1, |f(x_0)| + \epsilon)$. Hence

$$\rho_+(f, h) < \rho_+(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, 1),$$

as desired.

(ii) Clearly, in this case, we can choose $\lambda > \|f\|_X$ such that $\varphi(\|f\|_X, \|f\|_X) < \varphi(\lambda, |f(x_0)| + \epsilon)$ and $\varphi(\|f\|_X, \|f\|_X) < \varphi(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, \lambda)$. Let U be an open neighborhood of x_0 such that $|f(x)| < |f(x_0)| + \epsilon$ for all $x \in U$. Since $x_0 \in \delta(A)$, there exists $h \in A$ such that $h(x_0) = 1 = \|h\|_X$ and $|h| < \frac{1}{\lambda} \|f\|_X$ on $X \setminus U$. Hence for each $x \in U$, $\varphi(f(x), \lambda h(x)) < \varphi(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, \lambda)$, and for $x \in X \setminus U$,

$$\varphi(f(x), \lambda h(x)) \leq \varphi(\|f\|_X, \|f\|_X) < \varphi(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, \lambda).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.2(iv), we have $\|\varphi(f, \lambda h)\|_X < \varphi(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, \lambda)$. Similarly, one can show that $\|\varphi(\lambda h, f)\|_X < \varphi(\lambda, |f(x_0)| + \epsilon)$. Hence

$$\rho_+(f, \lambda h) < \rho_+(|f(x_0)| + \epsilon, \lambda). \quad \square$$

4. ADDITIVE SEMIGROUPS OF CONTINUOUS FUNCTIONS

In this section, we assume that $\varphi : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a continuous map satisfying (inc) and also the following condition:

- (con) For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n, t \in \mathbb{C}$, $\varphi(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n s_i, t) \leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(s_i, t)$ and $\varphi(t, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n s_i) \leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(t, s_i)$.

We also consider ρ_+ and ρ_{\max} as in Definition 3.3 and study surjections whose domains are certain additive semigroups of continuous functions and preserve ρ_+ and ρ_{\max} .

Before stating our result, we give some examples of such two variable functions φ .

Example 4.1. (i) For each $a, b > 0$, the map $\varphi_{a,b}$, defined by $\varphi_{a,b}(s, t) = a|s| + b|t|$ for $s, t \in \mathbb{C}$, satisfies both (inc) and (con).

(ii) The map $\psi(s, t) = |st|$, $s, t \in \mathbb{C}$, satisfies (inc) and (con).

(iii) The sum $\varphi_1 + \varphi_2$ of continuous maps $\varphi_i : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, $i = 1, 2$, satisfying (inc) and (con), again satisfies these conditions.

(iv) The continuous maps $\varphi(s, t) = \max(|s|, |t|) + |s| + |t|$ and $\psi(s, t) = \max(|s|, |t|) + |st|$ satisfy (inc) and (con). In general, if $\varphi, \psi : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ are continuous maps such that φ is (not necessarily strictly) increasing in modulus, satisfying (con), and ψ satisfies both (inc) and (con), then $\varphi + \psi$ satisfies both (inc) and (con).

Next theorem is our main result in this section.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\varphi : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a continuous map satisfying (inc) and (con). Let X and Y be locally compact Hausdorff spaces, and A and B be either subspaces of $C_0(X)$ and $C_0(Y)$, or positive cones of some subspaces of $C_0(X)$ and $C_0(Y)$, respectively. Suppose that $\delta(A) = \text{Ch}(A)$ and $\delta(B) = \text{Ch}(B)$ for some function algebras \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} on X and Y , respectively, with $|A| \subseteq |\mathcal{A}|$ and $|B| \subseteq |\mathcal{B}|$. Let $\rho \in \{\rho_+, \rho_{\max}\}$ and $T : A \longrightarrow B$ be a surjective map satisfying*

$$\rho(Tf, Tg) = \rho(f, g) \quad (f, g \in A).$$

Then T induces a bijection $\Phi : \text{Ch}(B) \longrightarrow \text{Ch}(A)$ between the Choquet boundaries of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} . Moreover,

(i) *If $\rho = \rho_{\max}$, then Φ is a homeomorphism and $|Tf(y)| = |f(\Phi(y))|$ for all $f \in A$ and $y \in \text{Ch}(B)$.*

(ii) *If $\rho = \rho_+$ and either*

(a) *$\varphi(t, 0) = 0 = \varphi(0, t)$ for all $t \geq 0$, or*

(b) *$\varphi(t, a) \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varphi(a, t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $a > 0$,*

holds, then Φ is a homeomorphism and $|Tf(y)| = |f(\Phi(y))|$ for all $f \in A$ and $y \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$.

We prove the theorem through the subsequent lemmas.

In what follows, we assume that X, Y and A, B are as in Theorem 4.2 and $T : A \rightarrow B$ is a surjection satisfying

$$\rho(Tf, Tg) = \rho(f, g) \quad (f, g \in A),$$

where $\rho \in \{\rho_+, \rho_{\max}\}$.

Lemma 4.3. (i) For each $f \in A$, we have $\|Tf\|_Y = \|f\|_X$.

(ii) Let $r > 0$. Then for any convex subset C of the sphere $S_r(A) = \{f \in A : \|f\|_X = r\}$, we have $\cap_{f \in C} M(Tf) \neq \emptyset$. Similarly, for any convex subset C' of the sphere $S_r(B) = \{g \in B : \|g\|_Y = r\}$, we have $\cap_{Tf \in C'} M(f) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. (i) For each $f \in A$, it follows from (inc) that $\|\varphi(f, f)\|_X = \varphi(\|f\|_X, \|f\|_X)$ and $\|\varphi(Tf, Tf)\|_Y = \varphi(\|Tf\|_Y, \|Tf\|_Y)$. Hence for arbitrary $x_0 \in M(f)$ and $y_0 \in M(Tf)$, we have

$$\rho(|Tf(y_0)|, |Tf(y_0)|) = \rho(Tf, Tf) = \rho(f, f) = \rho(|f(x_0)|, |f(x_0)|).$$

Thus $|Tf(y_0)| = |f(x_0)|$, and consequently $\|Tf\|_Y = \|f\|_X$.

(ii) Let C be a convex subset of $S_r(A)$. It suffices to show that the family $\{M(Tf) : f \in C\}$ of compact subsets of Y has finite intersection property. Let $f_1, \dots, f_n \in C$. Since C is a convex subset of S_r , we have $h = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i \in C$. By (i), $\|Th\|_Y = \|h\|_X = r$. Since $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ is a boundary for \mathcal{B} and $|B| \subseteq |\mathcal{B}|$, we can choose $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ such that $|Th(y_0)| = r = \|h\|_X$. We claim that $y_0 \in M(Tf_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Assume on the contrary that $|Tf_j(y_0)| < r$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then there exists a neighborhood V of y_0 such that $|Tf_j| < r$ on V . Since $y_0 \in \delta(B)$, we can find $h' \in A$ such that $Th'(y_0) = 1 = \|Th'\|_Y$ and $|Th'| < 1$ on $Y \setminus V$. Since $|Tf_j(y)| < r$ and $|Th'(y)| \leq 1$ for all $y \in V$, and $|Tf_j(y)| \leq r$ and $|Th'(y)| < 1$ for all $y \in Y \setminus V$, it follows by Lemma 3.2(iii) that $\varphi(Tf_j(y), Th'(y)) < \varphi(r, 1)$ and $\varphi(Th'(y), Tf_j(y)) < \varphi(1, r)$ hold for all $y \in Y$. Hence according to Lemma 3.2(iv), we have $\|\varphi(Tf_j, Th')\|_Y < \varphi(r, 1)$ and $\|\varphi(Th', Tf_j)\|_Y < \varphi(1, r)$, that is $\rho(Tf_j, Th') < \rho(r, 1)$. The hypotheses imply that

$$\rho(f_j, h') < \rho(r, 1).$$

Thus, for each $x \in X$, at least one of the inequalities $|f_j(x)| < r$ and $|h'(x)| < 1$ holds. Now it follows from (con) that for each $x \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(h(x), h'(x)) &\leq \frac{1}{n}\varphi(f_j(x), h'(x)) + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i \neq j} \varphi(f_i(x), h'(x)) \\ &< \frac{1}{n}\varphi(r, 1) + \frac{n-1}{n}\varphi(r, 1) = \varphi(r, 1)\end{aligned}$$

and similarly $\varphi(h'(x), h(x)) < \varphi(1, r)$. Hence

$$\rho(Th, Th') = \rho(h, h') < \rho(r, 1),$$

and consequently

$$\rho(r, 1) = \rho(Th(y_0), Th'(y_0)) \leq \rho(Th, Th') < \rho(r, 1)$$

which is a contradiction. This argument shows that $y_0 \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n M(Tf_i)$, as desired.

The other part is similarly proven. \square

In this section, for $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ and $r > 0$, we set $I_{y_0}^r = \bigcap_{Tf \in rV_{y_0}(B)} M(f)$. Similarly, for $x_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ and $r > 0$, we set $J_{x_0}^r = \bigcap_{f \in rV_{x_0}(A)} M(Tf)$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ and $x_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$. Then for each $r > 0$, $I_{y_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$ and $J_{x_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. We prove the first assertion, the second one is proven in a similar manner. Let $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(B)$. Since for each $r > 0$, the set $rV_{y_0}(B)$ is a convex subset of $S_r(B) = \{g \in B : \|g\|_Y = r\}$, it follows from Lemma 4.3(ii) that $I_{y_0}^r \neq \emptyset$. Now, let $x_0^r \in I_{y_0}^r$. Then for each $f \in A$ with $Tf \in rV_{y_0}(B)$, we have $x_0^r \in M(f)$. By assumption, for each $f \in A$ there exists $g \in \mathcal{A}$ with $|f| = |g|$, which implies that $M(f) = M(g)$. The maximum modulus set $M(g)$ of g contains a peak set of the function algebra \mathcal{A} containing x_0^r , hence using the fact that any nonempty intersection of peak sets of \mathcal{A} intersects $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$, we get $I_{y_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let $x_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ and $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$. Let $s > 0$ be given. Then*

- (i) $x_0 \in I_{y_0}^1$ if and only if $y_0 \in J_{x_0}^s$,
- (ii) $y_0 \in J_{x_0}^1$ if and only if $x_0 \in I_{y_0}^s$.

Proof. (i) Assume first that $x_0 \in I_{y_0}^1$ and $y_0 \notin J_{x_0}^s$. Then, by the definition of $J_{x_0}^s$, there exists $f \in sV_{x_0}(A)$ such that $|Tf(y_0)| < s$. We note that $\|Tf\|_Y = \|f\|_X = s$. Since Tf is continuous and $|Tf(y_0)| < s$, we can choose a neighborhood U of y_0 in Y such that $|Tf| < s$ on U . Since $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) = \delta(B)$ and T is surjective, we can find a function $h \in A$ with $Th \in V_{y_0}(B)$ such that $|Th| < 1$ on $Y \setminus U$. Thus for each $y \in Y$, at least one of the inequalities $|Th(y)| < 1$ and $|Tf(y)| < s$ holds. This easily implies, by Lemma 3.2(iii), that for each $y \in Y$, we have $\varphi(Tf(y), Th(y)) < \varphi(s, 1)$,

and using Lemma 3.2(iv), we get $\|\varphi(Tf, Th)\|_Y < \varphi(s, 1)$. Similar argument shows that $\|\varphi(Th, Tf)\|_Y < \varphi(1, s)$, and consequently

$$\rho(f, h) = \rho(Tf, Th) < \rho(s, 1).$$

On the other hand, since $Th \in V_{y_0}(B)$ and $x_0 \in I_{y_0}^1$, it follows that $|h(x_0)| = 1 = \|h\|_X$. Therefore,

$$\rho(s, 1) = \rho(|f(x_0)|, |h(x_0)|) = \rho(f(x_0), h(x_0)) \leq \rho(f, h) < \rho(s, 1),$$

a contradiction. The other implication is similarly proven.

(ii) It is proven by a similar argument in (i). \square

Lemma 4.6. *For each $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$, there exists a point $x_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ such that for all $r > 0$, $I_{y_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) = \{x_0\}$ and $J_{x_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) = \{y_0\}$.*

Proof. Let $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ and let x_0 be an arbitrary element in $I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$. Then, using Lemma 4.5(i), we get $y_0 \in J_{x_0}^1$. Part (ii) of this lemma shows that $x_0 \in I_{y_0}^r$ for all $r > 0$. That is $I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq I_{y_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ for all $r > 0$. Conversely, if $r > 0$ and x_0 is an arbitrary point of $I_{y_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$, then by Lemma 4.5(ii), we have $y_0 \in J_{x_0}^1$, and so, using part (i) of this lemma, we get $x_0 \in I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$. Therefore, $I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \supseteq I_{y_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$, that is

$$I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) = I_{y_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \text{ for all } r > 0.$$

Hence it suffices to show that $I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ is a singleton. Assume on the contrary that x_0, x_1 are distinct points in this intersection. Choose disjoint neighborhoods U and V of x_0 and x_1 , respectively. As $x_0, x_1 \in \delta(A)$, we can find functions $f \in V_{x_0}(A)$ and $g \in V_{x_1}(A)$ such that $|f| < 1$ on $X \setminus U$ and $|g| < 1$ on $X \setminus V$. This easily implies that $\|\varphi(f, g)\|_X < \varphi(1, 1)$ and $\|\varphi(g, f)\|_X < \varphi(1, 1)$, that is $\rho(Tf, Tg) = \rho(f, g) < \rho(1, 1)$. On the other hand, by Lemma 4.5, we have $y_0 \in J_{x_0}^1$ and $y_0 \in J_{x_1}^1$ which yield $|Tf(y_0)| = 1 = |Tg(y_0)|$. Thus

$$\rho(1, 1) = \rho(Tf(y_0), Tg(y_0)) \leq \rho(Tf, Tg) = \rho(f, g) < \rho(1, 1),$$

a contradiction. Consequently, there exists $x_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ such that for any $r > 0$, $I_{y_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) = I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) = \{x_0\}$.

In a similar manner, we can show that $J_{x_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) = \{y_0\}$ for all $r > 0$. \square

Using the above lemmas, we can define a function $\Phi : \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ which associates to each $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$, the unique point $x_0 \in I_{y_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ for all $r > 0$.

Lemma 4.7. *If $\rho = \rho_{\max}$, then $|Tf(y_0)| = |f(\Phi(y_0))|$ for all $f \in A$ and $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$.*

Proof. The assertion is trivial for $f = 0$ since T is norm preserving. Assume that $f \in A$ is nonzero and $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ such that $|f(\Phi(y_0))| < |Tf(y_0)|$. Then for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, we have $|f(\Phi(y_0))| + \epsilon < |Tf(y_0)|$. Using Lemma 3.5, there exists $h \in \|f\|_X V_{\Phi(y_0)}(A)$ satisfying

$$\rho_{\max}(f, h) \leq \rho_{\max}(|f(\Phi(y_0))| + \epsilon, \|f\|_X).$$

Hence

$$\rho_{\max}(Tf(y_0), \|f\|_X) \leq \rho_{\max}(Tf, Th) = \rho_{\max}(f, h) < \rho_{\max}(Tf(y_0), \|f\|_X),$$

which is impossible. Thus $|f(\Phi(y_0))| \geq |Tf(y_0)|$. The other inequality is similarly proven. Consequently, $|Tf(y_0)| = |f(\Phi(y_0))|$. \square

Lemma 4.8. *If $\rho = \rho_+$ and φ satisfies either*

- (a) $\varphi(t, 0) = 0 = \varphi(0, t)$ for all $t \geq 0$, or
- (b) $\varphi(t, a) \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varphi(a, t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $a > 0$,

then $|Tf(y_0)| = |f(\Phi(y_0))|$ for all $f \in A$ and $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$.

Proof. The assertion is again trivial for $f = 0$, so we assume that $f \in A$ is nonzero. Let $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ and $|f(\Phi(y_0))| < |Tf(y_0)|$. Then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $|f(\Phi(y_0))| + \epsilon < |Tf(y_0)|$.

Assume that (a) holds. Then, using Lemma 3.6(i), we can find $h \in V_{\Phi(y_0)}(A)$ such that $\rho_+(f, h) < \rho_+(|f(\Phi(y_0))| + \epsilon, 1)$. Hence

$$\rho_+(Tf, Th) = \rho_+(f, h) < \rho_+(|f(\Phi(y_0))| + \epsilon, 1) < \rho_+(Tf(y_0), 1),$$

which is impossible since, by Lemma 4.5, $y_0 \in J_{\Phi(y_0)}^1$, that is $|Th(y_0)| = 1$.

Now assume that (b) holds. Then, using Lemma 3.6(ii), there exist $\lambda > 0$ and $h \in V_{\Phi(y_0)}(A)$ such that $\rho_+(f, \lambda h) < \rho_+(|f(\Phi(y_0))| + \epsilon, \lambda)$. We note that $\lambda h \in \lambda V_{\Phi(y_0)}(A)$, and since, by Lemma 4.5(i), $y_0 \in J_{\Phi(y_0)}^\lambda$, we have $|T(\lambda h)(y_0)| = \lambda$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_+(Tf(y_0), \lambda) &= \rho_+(Tf(y_0), T(\lambda h)(y_0)) \leq \rho_+(Tf, T(\lambda h)) \\ &= \rho_+(f, \lambda h) < \rho_+(|f(\Phi(y_0))| + \epsilon, \lambda) < \rho_+(Tf(y_0), \lambda), \end{aligned}$$

which is impossible.

We showed that in both cases (a) and (b), $|f(\Phi(y_0))| \geq |Tf(y_0)|$. In the same manner, the other inequality is proven. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.2. By the above lemmas, we need only to show that the function $\Phi : \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ is a homeomorphism. We first note that Φ is surjective. Indeed, for each $x_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$, it follows from Lemma 4.6 that there exists a point $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ such that $J_{x_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) = \{y_0\}$. Now, Lemma 4.5 implies that

$I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) = \{x_0\}$. Since, by the definition of Φ , $I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) = \{\Phi(y_0)\}$, we have $\Phi(y_0) = x_0$, i.e. Φ is surjective.

Similar argument shows that Φ is injective.

To prove that Φ is continuous, let $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ and let U be an open neighborhood of $\Phi(y_0)$ in X . Choose $h \in V_{\Phi(y_0)}(A)$ with $|h| < \frac{1}{2}$ on $X \setminus U$ and consider the open subset $V = \{y \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) : |Th(y)| > \frac{1}{2}\}$ of $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$. Then, since $|Th| = |h \circ \Phi|$ on $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$, we have $\Phi(V) \subseteq U \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$. Hence Φ is continuous. Similarly, Φ^{-1} is also continuous. \square

5. MULTIPLICATIVE SEMIGROUPS OF CONTINUOUS FUNCTIONS

In this section, we assume that $\varphi : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a continuous map satisfying (inc). We consider ρ_+ and ρ_{\max} as in Definition 3.3 and study surjections between certain multiplicative semigroups of continuous functions which preserve either ρ_+ or ρ_{\max} .

The main result of this section is as follows.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\varphi : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a continuous map satisfying (inc). Let X and Y be locally compact Hausdorff spaces, and let A and B be either multiplicative subsets of $C_0(X)$ and $C_0(Y)$, respectively, or positive parts of such subsets, which are also closed under multiplication by strictly positive scalars. Suppose that $\delta(A) = \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\delta(B) = \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ for some function algebras \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} on X and Y , respectively, with $|A| \subseteq |\mathcal{A}|$ and $|B| \subseteq |\mathcal{B}|$. Let $\rho \in \{\rho_+, \rho_{\max}\}$ and $T : A \rightarrow B$ be a surjective map satisfying*

$$\rho(Tf, Tg) = \rho(f, g) \quad (f, g \in A).$$

Then T induces a bijection $\Phi : \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ between the Choquet boundaries of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} . Moreover,

(i) *If $\rho = \rho_{\max}$, then Φ is a homeomorphism and $|Tf(y)| = |f(\Phi(y))|$ for all $f \in A$ and $y \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$.*

(ii) *If $\rho = \rho_+$ and either*

(a) *$\varphi(t, 0) = 0 = \varphi(0, t)$ for all $t \geq 0$, or*

(b) *$\varphi(t, a) \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varphi(a, t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $a > 0$,*

holds, then Φ is a homeomorphism and $|Tf(y)| = |f(\Phi(y))|$ for all $f \in A$ and $y \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$.

In what follows, we assume that X, Y and A, B are as in Theorem 5.1 and $T : A \rightarrow B$ is a surjection satisfying

$$\rho(Tf, Tg) = \rho(f, g) \quad (f, g \in A),$$

where $\rho \in \{\rho_+, \rho_{\max}\}$.

Lemma 5.2. (i) For each $f \in A$, we have $\|Tf\|_Y = \|f\|_X$.

(ii) Let $r > 0$. Then for any multiplicative subset D of the sphere $S(A) = \{f \in A : \|f\|_X = 1\}$, we have $\cap_{f \in rD} M(Tf) \neq \emptyset$. Similarly, for any multiplicative subset D' of the sphere $S(B) = \{f \in B : \|g\|_Y = 1\}$, we have $\cap_{Tf \in rD'} M(f) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. (i) The proof is similar to Lemma 4.3(i).

(ii) Let D be a multiplicative subset of $S(A)$ and let $f_1, \dots, f_n \in rD$. Since D is multiplicative, we have $h = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{f_i}{r} \in D$. By (i), $\|Th\|_Y = \|h\|_X = 1$. Let $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ such that $|Th(y_0)| = 1 = \|h\|_X$. We claim that $y_0 \in M(Tf_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Assume on the contrary that $|Tf_j(y_0)| < r$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then there exists a neighborhood V of y_0 such that $|Tf_j| < r$ on V and there exists $h' \in A$ such that $Th'(y_0) = 1 = \|Th'\|_Y$ and $|Th'| < 1$ on $Y \setminus V$. We note that for all $y \in V$, we have $|Tf_j(y)| < r$ and $|Th'(y)| \leq 1$, and for all $y \in Y \setminus V$, we have $|Tf_j(y)| \leq r$ and $|Th'(y)| < 1$. Hence, by Lemma 3.2(iii), we get $\varphi(Tf_j(y), Th'(y)) < \varphi(r, 1)$ and $\varphi(Th'(y), Tf_j(y)) < \varphi(1, r)$ for all $y \in Y$. Thus, using Lemma 3.2(iv), we have $\|\varphi(Tf_j, Th')\|_Y < \varphi(r, 1)$ and $\|\varphi(Th', Tf_j)\|_Y < \varphi(1, r)$, that is $\rho(Tf_j, Th') < \rho(r, 1)$. The hypotheses imply that

$$\rho(f_j, h') < \rho(r, 1),$$

and consequently for each $x \in X$, at least one of the inequalities $|f_j(x)| < r$ and $|h'(x)| < 1$ holds. Now it follows that for each $x \in X$,

$$\varphi(h(x), h'(x)) = \varphi\left(\frac{1}{r^n} f_j(x) \prod_{i \neq j} f_i(x), h'(x)\right) < \varphi(1, 1)$$

and similarly $\varphi(h'(x), h(x)) < \varphi(1, 1)$. Hence

$$\rho(Th, Th') = \rho(h, h') < \rho(1, 1),$$

and consequently

$$\rho(1, 1) = \rho(Th(y_0), Th'(y_0)) \leq \rho(Th', Th) < \rho(1, 1)$$

which is a contradiction. This argument shows that $y_0 \in \cap_{i=1}^n M(Tf_i)$, as desired.

The other part has a similar proof. \square

In this section, for $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ and $r > 0$, we set $I_{y_0}^r = \cap_{Tf \in rF_{y_0}(B)} M(f)$. Similarly, for $x_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ and $r > 0$, we set $J_{x_0}^r = \cap_{f \in rF_{x_0}(A)} M(Tf)$.

Lemma 5.3. Let $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ and $x_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$. Then for all $r > 0$, we have $I_{y_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$ and $J_{x_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Let $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ and let $r > 0$. Since the set $F_{y_0}(B)$ is a multiplicative subset of unit sphere $S(B) = \{g \in B : \|g\|_Y = 1\}$ of B , it follows from Lemma 5.2(ii) that $I_{y_0}^r \neq \emptyset$. Choosing $z_0 \in I_{y_0}^r$, we have $z_0 \in M(f)$ for all $f \in A$ with $Tf \in rF_{y_0}(B)$. By assumption, for each $f \in A$ there exists $g \in \mathcal{A}$ with $|f| = |g|$, which yields $M(f) = M(g)$. Since any nonempty intersection of peak sets of \mathcal{A} intersects $\text{Ch}(A)$, as in Lemma 4.4, we conclude that $I_{y_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$.

Similarly, for each $x_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$, we have $J_{x_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) \neq \emptyset$. \square

Lemma 5.4. *For each $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$, there exists $x_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) = \{x_0\}$ and $T(F_{x_0}(A)) = F_{y_0}(B)$.*

Proof. Let $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ and let x_0 be an arbitrary point in $I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$. Then clearly, $T^{-1}(F_{y_0}(B)) \subseteq F_{x_0}(A)$. Since, by Lemma 5.3, $J_{x_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) \neq \emptyset$, there exists a point $z_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$ such that $T(F_{x_0}(A)) \subseteq F_{z_0}(B)$. Thus

$$F_{y_0}(B) = T(T^{-1}(F_{y_0}(B))) \subseteq T(F_{x_0}(A)) \subseteq F_{z_0}(B),$$

and hence $y_0 = z_0$ since $y_0, z_0 \in \delta(B)$. Therefore, $T(F_{x_0}(A)) = F_{y_0}(B)$. In particular, $F_{x_0}(A) \subseteq T^{-1}(F_{y_0}(B))$. As it was noted before, the reverse inclusion also holds, and consequently we get $F_{x_0}(A) = T^{-1}(F_{y_0}(B))$. Since this equality holds for all $x_0 \in I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$, it follows that the intersection $I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ is the singleton $\{x_0\}$. Note that for this unique point x_0 , we have $T(F_{x_0}(A)) = F_{y_0}(B)$. \square

Using the above lemma, we can define a bijective map $\Phi : \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) \longrightarrow \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ which associates to each $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$, the unique point $x_0 \in I_{y_0}^1 \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$.

A minor modification of the proofs of Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 yields the next lemma.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(B)$. Then for any $r > 0$, we have $I_{y_0}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) = \{\Phi(y_0)\}$ and $J_{\Phi(y_0)}^r \cap \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B}) = \{y_0\}$.*

The next two lemmas also have similar proofs to Lemmas 4.7 and 4.8, and hence we ignore their proofs.

Lemma 5.6. *If $\rho = \rho_{\max}$, then $|Tf(y_0)| = |f(\Phi(y_0))|$ for all $f \in A$ and $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$.*

Lemma 5.7. *If $\rho = \rho_+$ and φ satisfies either*

- (a) $\varphi(t, 0) = 0 = \varphi(0, t)$ for all $t \geq 0$, or
- (b) $\varphi(t, a) \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varphi(a, t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $a > 0$,

then $|Tf(y_0)| = |f(\Phi(y_0))|$ for all $f \in A$ and $y_0 \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{B})$.

The same proof as in Theorem 4.2 can be applied to show that Φ is a homeomorphism. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hatori, O., Lambert, S., Luttmann, A., Miura, T., Tonev, T., Yates, R.: Spectral preservers in commutative Banach algebras. *Contemp. Math.* 547, 103–123 (2011)
- [2] Hatori, O., Miura, T., Takagi, H.: Characterizations of isometric isomorphisms between uniform algebras via nonlinear range-preserving properties. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 134, 2923–2930 (2006)
- [3] Hatori, O., Hino, K., Miura T., Oka, H.: Peripherally monomial-preserving maps between uniform algebras. *Mediterr. J. Math.* 6, 47–59 (2009)
- [4] Hatori, O., Miura, T., Shindo, R., Takagi, H.: Generalizations of spectrally multiplicative surjections between uniform algebras. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo* 59, 161–183 (2010)
- [5] Hatori, O., Kobayashi K., Miura T., Takahasi, S. E.: Reflections and a generalization of the Mazur-Ulam theorem. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* 42, No.1, 117–150 (2012)
- [6] Hosseini M., Sady, F.: Multiplicatively range-preserving maps between Banach function algebras. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 357, 314–322 (2009)
- [7] Jafarzadeh, B., Sady, F.: Generalized norm preserving maps between subsets of continuous functions. *Positivity* (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11117-018-0597-y>
- [8] Jamshidi, A., Sady, F.: Extremely strong boundary points and real-linear isometries. *Tokyo J. Math.* 38, 477–490 (2015)
- [9] Lambert, S., Luttmann, A., Tonev, T.: Weakly peripherally-multiplicative mappings between uniform algebras. *Contemp. Math.* 435, 265–281 (2007)
- [10] Leibowitz, G. M.: *Lectures on Complex Function Algebras*. Scott-Foresman, Glenview, Illinois (1970)
- [11] Miura, T., Tonev, T.: Mappings onto multiplicative subsets of function algebras and spectral properties of their products. *Ark. Mat.* 53, 329–358 (2015)
- [12] Molnár, L.: Some characterizations of the automorphisms of $B(H)$ and $C(X)$. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 130, 111–120 (2002)
- [13] Molnár, L., Szokol, P.: Transformations preserving norms of means of positive operators and nonnegative functions. *Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory* 83, 271–290 (2015)
- [14] Rao, N. V., Roy, A. K.: Multiplicatively spectrum-preserving maps of function algebras. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 133, 1135–1142 (2005)
- [15] Rao, N. V., Roy, A. K.: Multiplicatively spectrum-preserving maps of function algebras II. *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc.* 48, 219–229 (2005)
- [16] Taylor, A. E., Lay, D. C.: *Introduction to Functional Analysis*. 2nd Ed., Wiley, New York (1980)
- [17] Tonev, T., Yates, R.: Norm-linear and norm-additive operators between uniform algebras. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 57, 45–53 (2009)