

HIGHER DIMENSIONAL BOTT CLASSES AND THE STABILITY OF ROTATION RELATIONS

Sayan Chakraborty* and Jiajie Hua†

Abstract

Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk})_{n \times n}$ be a real skew-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix for $n \geq 2$. Under some mild non-integrality conditions on Θ , we construct Rieffel-type projections as higher dimensional Bott classes in the n -dimensional noncommutative torus \mathcal{A}_Θ . These projections generate $K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ when Θ is strongly totally irrational. As an application, when Θ is strongly totally irrational, we show that: For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ (depending only on ε and Θ) satisfying the following: For any unital simple separable C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} with tracial rank at most one, and for any n -tuple of unitaries u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n in \mathcal{A} , if u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n satisfy certain trace conditions and

$$\|u_k u_j - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k\| < \delta, \quad j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

then there exists an n -tuple of unitaries $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_n$ in \mathcal{A} such that

$$\tilde{u}_k \tilde{u}_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} \tilde{u}_j \tilde{u}_k \text{ and } \|\tilde{u}_j - u_j\| < \varepsilon, \quad j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

We also show that these trace conditions are also necessary in the above application.

Keywords: C^* -algebras; stability; noncommutative tori; unitary; Bott class

Mathematics Subject Classification 2010: 46L05, 46L35

1 Introduction

The n -dimensional noncommutative torus \mathcal{A}_Θ is the universal C^* -algebra generated by unitaries u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n subject to the relations

$$u_k u_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k,$$

for $j, k = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$, where $\Theta = (\theta_{jk})$ is a real skew-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix. The noncommutative tori play a major role in the theory of operator algebras and noncommutative geometry, and serve as key examples of noncommutative spaces. Rieffel (in [37]) had constructed projective modules over n -dimensional noncommutative tori while in [12], Elliott computed the K-theory and the range of tracial states of these algebras. Motivated by the work of [8], in [4] the first named author constructed projective modules over a certain field of C^* -algebras to provide explicit bases for $K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ for any higher dimensional noncommutative torus \mathcal{A}_Θ . The

*Stat-Math unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203 Barrackpore Trunk Road, Kolkata, 700108, India. Email: sayan2008@gmail.com

†College of data science, Jiaying University, 899 Guangqiong Road, Jiaying, Zhejiang, 314001, China. Email: jiajiehua@zjxu.edu.cn

explicit generators of the K_0 -group in [4] was given using the projective modules over the n -dimensional noncommutative torus \mathcal{A}_Θ . However, for some practical purposes it is desirable to have a description of the explicit generators of the K_0 -group in terms of the projections in \mathcal{A}_Θ . Here in this paper, under some non-integrality conditions (satisfied by many examples) on Θ , we construct projections in \mathcal{A}_Θ , which in turn provides a set of explicit generators of $K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$, when Θ is totally irrational.

For a skew-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix A , if we denote the sub-matrix of A consisting of rows and columns indexed by i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2p} , for some numbers $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{2p} \leq n$, $I := (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2p})$, $|I| := 2p$, by M_I^A , then Elliott's result on the range of the canonical tracial state τ_Θ of \mathcal{A}_Θ may be given as follows:

$$(\tau_\Theta)_*(K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)) = \mathbb{Z} + \sum_{0 < |I| \leq n} \text{pf}(M_I^\Theta) \mathbb{Z}, \quad (\text{e 1.1})$$

where $\text{pf}(M_I^\Theta)$ denotes the pfaffian (see Definition 3.1) of the matrix M_I^Θ . However, it is not clear whether the numbers $\text{pf}(M_I^\Theta)$ can be realized as traces of projections (which we call Rieffel-type projections, if exist) inside \mathcal{A}_Θ or not. This question, for $n = 4$, was raised by Elliott himself in [12, 1.2]. For $n = 2$, under non-integrality assumption on the non-zero entries in Θ , the well known Rieffel projection (see Definition 2.5) serves the purpose. It is not hard to see that this also works for $n = 3$, also, as for any n and $|I| = 2$, the Rieffel projections give elements in $K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$, whose traces are $\text{pf}(M_I^\Theta)$. For $n = 4$, and $|I| = 4$, Boca (see [3, Remark on page 198]) constructed a projection of trace $\text{pf}(M_I^\Theta)$ inside \mathcal{A}_Θ . In this paper, we generalize Boca's idea to construct Rieffel-type projections inside \mathcal{A}_Θ under some mild non-integrality conditions on Θ . Explicitly we prove,

Theorem 1.1 (cf. Corollary 3.15). *For any even number $n = 2l \geq 2$, if $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ satisfies*

$$\frac{\text{pf}\left(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-1,n-p)}^\Theta\right)}{\text{pf}\left(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta\right)} \in (0, 1) \quad \text{for } p = n - 2j - 2, \quad j = 1, \dots, l - 2, \quad (\text{e 1.2})$$

and $\frac{\text{pf}\left(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-1,n)}^\Theta\right)}{\text{pf}\left(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-2)}^\Theta\right)} \notin \mathbb{Z}$, then there exist a (Rieffel-type) projection p inside \mathcal{A}_Θ such that

$$\tau_\Theta(p) = \text{pf}(\Theta) + k_{(1,2)} \text{pf}(M_{(1,2)}^\Theta) + \dots + k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2)} \text{pf}(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-2)}^\Theta) + k_0$$

for some $k_I, k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $I = (1, 2, \dots, n - 2s)$ and $s = 1, 2, \dots, l - 1$, τ_Θ is the canonical tracial state on \mathcal{A}_Θ .

With the above theorem in hand, any tracial value in Equation (e 1.1) is realized by a projection in \mathcal{A}_Θ under certain assumptions on Θ (see Theorem 3.16). This provides an (generalized) answer to the question of Elliott mentioned before. The assumptions are quite natural to expect for such projections to exist in \mathcal{A}_Θ as these projections are constructed using an induction argument from the 2-dimensional case.

When $(\tau_\Theta)_*$ is injective on $K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$, we call such a Θ totally irrational. Moreover, when any even dimensional skew-symmetric submatrix of Θ satisfies (e 1.2), we call it strongly totally irrational (see Definition 3.17 for the explicit definition of strongly total irrationality). For a strongly totally irrational Θ , the above Rieffel-type projections also provide a basis for $K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ (see Theorem 3.19). In the second part of the paper, we use this fact to the study of the stability of rotation relations, which we describe below.

The notion of stability appears in many forms throughout mathematics, where it often expresses how much being a little bit wrong matters. Following Hyers and Ulam ([24]), a general sense of this notion can be expressed as follows: Are elements that “almost” satisfy some equation “close” to some elements that exactly satisfy the equation? In applied mathematics such a question is important since we should not expect computer models, or indeed the real world, to give answers that precisely match what our theory predicts.

An example of a concrete stability problem is the following: Given $\varepsilon > 0$, is there a $\delta > 0$, depending only on ε , such that if a and b are two $n \times n$ self-adjoint matrices with $\|a\|, \|b\| \leq 1$ satisfying

$$\|ab - ba\| < \delta,$$

then there exists a pair of $n \times n$ self-adjoint matrices \tilde{a} and \tilde{b} such that

$$\tilde{a}\tilde{b} = \tilde{b}\tilde{a}, \quad \|a - \tilde{a}\| < \varepsilon \text{ and } \|b - \tilde{b}\| < \varepsilon?$$

This is an old and famous question in matrix and operator theory, namely whether any pair of almost commuting self-adjoint matrices are norm close to a pair of exactly commuting self-adjoint matrices ([2, 7, 40]), which is popularized by Halmos ([18]).

In the above question, it is important that δ is a universal constant independent of the matrix size n . This question was solved affirmatively by Lin in the 1990’s (see [18, 26]). The corresponding questions for a pair of unitary matrices and for a triple of self-adjoint matrices are all false, as pointed out by Voiculescu in [43] and [44]. However the story does not end here. An obstruction has been found by Exel and Loring in [9] in the corresponding question for a pair of unitary matrices. The answer becomes yes if this obstruction vanishes (see [9, 10, 11, 14, 15]).

A natural generalization for pairs of almost commuting unitary matrices is to see what happens for pairs of unitaries that almost commute up to a scalar with norm one. It turns out that similar conclusion holds, and in fact one can deal with more general ambient C^* -algebras rather than just matrix algebras. More precisely, in [22], the second named author and Lin proved the following:

Theorem 1.2. *Let θ be a real number in $(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$, depending only on ε and θ , such that if u and v are two unitaries in any unital simple separable C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} with tracial rank zero satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \|vu - e^{2\pi i\theta}uv\| &< \delta \text{ and} \\ \tau(\log(vuv^*u^*)) &= 2\pi i\theta \end{aligned} \tag{e 1.3}$$

for all tracial states τ on \mathcal{A} , then there exists a pair of unitaries \tilde{u} and \tilde{v} in \mathcal{A} such that

$$\tilde{v}\tilde{u} = e^{2\pi i\theta}\tilde{u}\tilde{v}, \quad \|u - \tilde{u}\| < \varepsilon \text{ and } \|v - \tilde{v}\| < \varepsilon.$$

Note that the trace condition (e 1.3) is also necessary.

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. We call a pair of unitaries u, v with $vu = e^{2\pi i\theta}uv$ to satisfy the *rotation relation* with respect to θ , since the universal C^* -algebra generated by such unitaries is the rotation algebra. So another way to phrase Theorem 1.2 is to say that the rotation relation is stable in a unital simple separable C^* -algebras with tracial rank zero, provided that the trace condition (e 1.3) is satisfied.

In [23], the second named author and Wang further studied the stability of the rotation relations for three unitaries in unital simple separable C^* -algebras with tracial rank at most one, and proved the following theorem:

Theorem 1.3 ([23]). *Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk})_{3 \times 3}$ be a nondegenerate real skew-symmetric 3×3 matrix (here non-degeneracy is equivalent to $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}(\text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(1, \theta_{12}, \theta_{13}, \theta_{23})) \geq 3$, see Lemma 3.1 of [1]), where $\theta_{jk} \in [0, 1)$ for $j, k = 1, 2, 3$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ satisfying the following: For any unital simple separable C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} with tracial rank at most one, any three unitaries u_1, u_2, u_3 in \mathcal{A} such that*

$$\|u_k u_j - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k\| < \delta, \quad j, k = 1, 2, 3,$$

there exists a triple of unitaries $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \tilde{u}_3$ in \mathcal{A} such that

$$\tilde{u}_k \tilde{u}_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} \tilde{u}_j \tilde{u}_k \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{u}_j - u_j\| < \varepsilon, \quad j, k = 1, 2, 3$$

if and only if

$$\tau(\log_{\theta_{jk}}(u_k u_j u_k^* u_j^*)) = 2\pi i \theta_{jk} \quad \text{for } j, k = 1, 2, 3 \text{ and all tracial states } \tau \text{ on } \mathcal{A},$$

where $\log_{\theta_{jk}}(u_k u_j u_k^ u_j^*)$ is defined as in Definition 2.11.*

In [19] and [20], the second named author has also considered the stability of some other relations of three unitaries in certain classes of C^* -algebras.

In this paper, we will generalize the stability of rotation relations of three unitaries (Theorem 1.3) to the stability of rotation relations of n unitaries for any integer $n \geq 2$ in a unital simple separable C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} with tracial rank at most one, when Θ is strongly totally irrational.

Theorem 1.4 (cf. Theorem 4.19). *Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk})_{n \times n}$ be a strongly totally irrational real skew-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix for $n \geq 2$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ satisfying the following: For any unital simple separable C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} with tracial rank at most one, any n -tuple of unitaries u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n in \mathcal{A} such that*

$$\|u_k u_j - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k\| < \delta, \quad j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (\text{e 1.4})$$

and

$$\tau(R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)) = \text{pf}(M_I^\Theta) + k_I + \sum_{0 < |J| < l} \text{pf}(M_J^\Theta) k_{I,J}, \quad (\text{e 1.5})$$

for all possible $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l)$, $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l \leq n$, $l = 2m$, $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$, and for all tracial states τ on \mathcal{A} , where $R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$ is as in Definition 4.6, and $k_{I,J}, k_I \in \mathbb{Z}$ are the numbers as in Corollary 3.19; there exists an n -tuple of unitaries $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_n$ in \mathcal{A} such that

$$\tilde{u}_k \tilde{u}_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} \tilde{u}_j \tilde{u}_k \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{u}_j - u_j\| < \varepsilon, \quad j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (\text{e 1.6})$$

In particular, when $n = 2$ and θ_{12} is an irrational number, this is a generalization of any unital simple separable C^* -algebra with tracial rank zero in Theorem 1.2 to any unital simple separable C^* -algebra with tracial rank at most one. When $n = 3$, this is just Theorem 1.3 in the case that Θ is totally irrational (note that total irrationality of Θ implies that it is nondegenerate).

Finally, we will also prove that the trace conditions (e 1.5) are also necessary conditions in Theorem 1.4.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we list down some notations and known results. In Section 3, we give a very concrete description of higher dimensional Bott classes. Section 4 deals with proving the stability of the rotation relations of n unitaries in the class of C^* -algebras of tracial rank at most one with certain trace conditions when Θ is strongly totally irrational (Theorem 1.4). In Section 4 we also show that these trace conditions are necessary to prove the stability of rotation relations.

2 Preliminaries

Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer and \mathcal{T}_n denote the space of $n \times n$ real skew-symmetric matrices.

Definition 2.1. ([38]) Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk})_{n \times n} \in \mathcal{T}_n$. The noncommutative torus \mathcal{A}_Θ is the universal C^* -algebra generated by unitaries $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n$ subject to the relations

$$\mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{u}_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} \mathbf{u}_j \mathbf{u}_k$$

for $1 \leq j, k \leq n$. (Of course, if all $\theta_{j,k}$ are integers, it is not really noncommutative.) Throughout this paper, we will use $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n$ to represent the n generators of \mathcal{A}_Θ , sometimes without special emphasis. In particular, given $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, we also let \mathcal{A}_θ denote the universal C^* -algebra generated by a pair of unitaries \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{u}_2 subject to $\mathbf{u}_2 \mathbf{u}_1 = e^{2\pi i \theta} \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_2$. If θ is irrational (resp. rational), \mathcal{A}_θ is called the *irrational* (resp. *rational*) *rotation algebra*.

For any $\Theta = (\theta_{j,k})_{n \times n}$ in \mathcal{T}_n , \mathcal{A}_Θ has a canonical tracial state τ_Θ given by the integration over the canonical action of $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}^n}$ (see page 4 of [38] for more details). We denote this trace by τ_Θ .

Definition 2.2. A skew symmetric real $n \times n$ matrix Θ is *nondegenerate* if whenever $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfies $e^{(2\pi i \langle x, \Theta y \rangle)} = 1$ for all $y \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, then $x = 0$. Otherwise, we say Θ is *degenerate*.

The following theorem shows the structure and the K-theory of \mathcal{A}_Θ when Θ is nondegenerate.

Theorem 2.3 ([34]). *Let Θ be in \mathcal{T}_n , with $n \geq 2$. The C^* -algebra \mathcal{A}_Θ is simple if and only if Θ is nondegenerate. Moreover, if \mathcal{A}_Θ is simple, then it is a unital AT algebra and has the unique tracial state τ_Θ , and $K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) \cong K_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) = \mathbb{Z}^{2n-1}$.*

Definition 2.4 ([15]). Define

$$f_1(e^{2\pi i t}) = \begin{cases} 1 - 2t, & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq 1/2, \\ -1 + 2t, & \text{if } 1/2 < t \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

$$g_1(e^{2\pi i t}) = \begin{cases} (f_1(e^{2\pi i t}) - f_1(e^{2\pi i t})^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq 1/2, \\ 0, & \text{if } 1/2 < t \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

$$h_1(e^{2\pi i t}) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq 1/2, \\ (f_1(e^{2\pi i t}) - f_1(e^{2\pi i t})^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } 1/2 < t \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

These are non-negative continuous functions defined on the unit circle \mathbb{T} .

Let \mathcal{A} be a unital C^* -algebra and let $u, v \in \mathcal{A}$ be two unitaries. Define

$$e(u, v) = \begin{pmatrix} f_1(v) & g_1(v) + h_1(v)u^* \\ g_1(v) + uh_1(v) & 1 - f_1(v) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is a self-adjoint element. Furthermore if $vu = uv$, then $e(u, v)$ is a projection.

We denote by $C(\mathbb{T}^2)$ the C^* -algebra of continuous functions on the two-torus \mathbb{T}^2 generated by the two co-ordinate functions z and w . In $M_2(C(\mathbb{T}^2))$, $e(z, w)$ is a non-trivial rank one projection. Then

$$b = [e(z, w)] - \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right] \in K_0(C(\mathbb{T}^2)) \tag{e 2.7}$$

is often called the Bott element for $C(\mathbb{T}^2)$.

There is a $\delta > 0$ (independent of the unitaries u, v , and \mathcal{A} , see [33] for the existence of such δ) such that if $\|vu - uv\| < \delta$, then the spectrum of the element $e(u, v)$ has a gap at $1/2$. Let $\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, \infty)}$ be the characteristic function on $(\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$. The Bott element of u and v is an element in $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ as defined by

$$\text{bott}(u, v) = [\chi_{(1/2, \infty)}(e(u, v))] - \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right].$$

The reader is referred to [13, 14, 15, 32] for more information on the Bott element.

Definition 2.5 ([35]). Let $\theta \in (0, 1)$. Choose ε such that $0 < \varepsilon \leq \theta < \theta + \varepsilon \leq 1$. Set

$$f_2(e^{2\pi it}) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon^{-1}t, & 0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon, \\ 1, & \varepsilon \leq t \leq \theta, \\ \varepsilon^{-1}(\theta + \varepsilon - t), & \theta \leq t \leq \theta + \varepsilon, \\ 0, & \theta + \varepsilon \leq t \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$g_2(e^{2\pi it}) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \leq t \leq \theta, \\ [f_2(e^{2\pi it})(1 - f_2(e^{2\pi it}))]^{1/2}, & \theta \leq t \leq \theta + \varepsilon, \\ 0, & \theta + \varepsilon \leq t \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Then f_2 and g_2 are the real-valued functions on the circle which satisfy

- (1) $g_2(e^{2\pi it}) \cdot g_2(e^{2\pi i(t-\theta)}) = 0$,
- (2) $g_2(e^{2\pi it}) \cdot [f_2(e^{2\pi it}) + f_2(e^{2\pi i(t+\theta)})] = g_2(e^{2\pi it})$ and
- (3) $f_2(e^{2\pi it}) = [f_2(e^{2\pi it})]^2 + [g_2(e^{2\pi it})]^2 + [g_2(e^{2\pi i(t-\theta)})]^2$.

Let u_1, u_2 be the canonical generators of \mathcal{A}_θ . The *Rieffel projection* in \mathcal{A}_θ is the projection

$$p_\theta = g_2(u_1)u_2^* + f_2(u_1) + u_2g_2(u_1) \tag{e2.8}$$

(for the details of the above construction, see Theorem 1.1 of [35]).

For $\theta \in (0, 1)$, similar to the construction of the Rieffel projection, we give the following definition:

Definition 2.6. Let $\theta \in (0, 1)$. Let \mathcal{A} be a unital C^* -algebra and u, v be a pair of unitaries in \mathcal{A} . We define $e_\theta(u, v)$ to be the element $g_2(u)v^* + f_2(u) + vg_2(u)$, where f_2, g_2 are the functions on the unit circle defined as in Definition 2.5. In particular, $e_\theta(u, v)$ is a projection if u and v satisfy $vu = e^{2\pi i\theta}uv$.

It is clear that $e_\theta(u, v)$ is always self-adjoint.

Proposition 2.7 (Proposition 4.9 of [23]). *Let $\theta \in (0, 1)$. There exists $\delta > 0$, depending only on θ , such that for any unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , any pair of unitaries u, v in \mathcal{A} , if u and v satisfy $\|vu - e^{2\pi i\theta}uv\| < \delta$, then*

$$\|(e_\theta(u, v))^2 - e_\theta(u, v)\| < \frac{1}{4}.$$

In particular, the spectrum of $e_\theta(u, v)$ has a gap at $\frac{1}{2}$.

Definition 2.8. ([23]) Let $\theta \in [0, 1)$. Let u, v be the canonical generators of \mathcal{A}_θ . If $\theta \neq 0$, we define $b_{u,v} \in K_0(\mathcal{A}_\theta)$ to be the equivalent class of the Rieffel projection as constructed in Definition 2.5. If $\theta = 0$, we let $b_{u,v} \in K_0(\mathcal{A}_\theta)$ be the Bott element (see (e2.7)).

Definition 2.9. Let $\theta \in [0, 1)$. If $\theta \neq 0$ let $\delta > 0$ be chosen as in Proposition 2.7, and let u, v be a pair of unitaries in a unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} with $\|vu - e^{2\pi i\theta}uv\| < \delta$. Also let $\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, \infty)}$ be the characteristic function on $(\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$. We define $R_\theta(u, v) = [\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, \infty)}(e_\theta(u, v))]$. If $\theta = 0$, let $\delta > 0$ be chosen as in the paragraph after Definition 2.4, we define $R_\theta(u, v) = \text{bott}(u, v)$.

In particular, we have $R_\theta(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = b_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}$.

Notation 2.10. For any real number, we use $[\cdot]$ to represent its integer part. Let \mathcal{A} be a unital C^* -algebra. Denote by $T(\mathcal{A})$ the tracial state space of \mathcal{A} . The set of all faithful tracial states on \mathcal{A} will be denoted by $T_f(\mathcal{A})$. Denote by $\text{Aff}(T(\mathcal{A}))$ the space of all real affine continuous functions on $T(\mathcal{A})$. If $\tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$, we will use $\tau^{\oplus k}$ for the trace $\tau \otimes \text{tr}$ on $M_k(\mathcal{A})$ for all integer $k \geq 1$, where tr is the unnormalized trace on the matrix algebra M_k . Denote by $\rho_{\mathcal{A}} : K_0(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Aff}(T(\mathcal{A}))$ the order preserving map induced by $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}([p]) = \tau^{\oplus n}(p)$, for all projections $p \in \mathcal{A} \otimes M_n$. Denote by $\mathcal{A}_{s.a.}$ the set of all self-adjoint elements in \mathcal{A} . If $a \in \mathcal{A}_{s.a.}$, let \hat{a} be the real affine function in $\text{Aff}(T(\mathcal{A}))$ defined by $\hat{a}(\tau) = \tau(a)$ for all $\tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$.

Denote by $U_n(\mathcal{A})$ the group of unitaries in $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ for $n \geq 1$. We often use $U(\mathcal{A})$ to express $U_1(\mathcal{A})$. Denote by $U_0(\mathcal{A})$ the subgroup of $U(\mathcal{A})$ consists of the unitaries path connected to $1_{\mathcal{A}}$. Denote by $CU(\mathcal{A})$ the closure of the subgroup generated by the commutators of $U(\mathcal{A})$. Let $U_\infty(\mathcal{A})$ be the increasing union of $U_n(\mathcal{A})$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, viewed as a topological group with the inductive limit topology. Define $U_{\infty, 0}(\mathcal{A})$ and $CU_\infty(\mathcal{A})$ in a similar fashion. For a unitary $u \in \mathcal{A}$, define $\text{Adu}(a) = u^*au$, for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. For any $a \in \mathcal{A}$, denote by $\text{spec}(a)$ the spectrum of a .

Definition 2.11 ([23]). Let $\theta \in [0, 1)$. Denote by \log_θ the continuous branch of logarithm defined on $F_\theta = \{e^{it} : t \in (2\pi\theta - \pi, 2\pi\theta + \pi)\}$ with values in $\{ri : r \in (2\pi\theta - \pi, 2\pi\theta + \pi)\}$ such that $\log_\theta(e^{2\pi i\theta}) = 2\pi i\theta$. Note that if u is any unitary in some C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} such that $\|u - e^{2\pi i\theta}\| < 2$, then $\text{spec}(u)$ has a gap at $e^{2\pi i\theta + \pi i}$, and thus $\log_\theta(u)$ is well defined. In particular, if $\theta = 0$, we simply write $\log(u)$ for $\log_0(u)$.

Theorem 2.12 (Theorem 4.14 of [23]). *Let \mathcal{A} be a unital C^* -algebra with $T(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\theta \in [0, 1)$, and δ be chosen as in Definition 2.9. Then for any $u, v \in U(\mathcal{A})$ with $\|vu - e^{2\pi i\theta}uv\| < \delta$, and with $R_\theta(u, v)$ defined as in Definition 2.9, we have*

$$\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(R_\theta(u, v))(\tau) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \tau(\log_\theta(vuv^*u^*)), \text{ for all } \tau \in T(\mathcal{A}). \quad (\text{e2.9})$$

The formula (e2.9) is called the *generalized Exel trace formula*.

Definition 2.13. Denote by $I^{(0)}$ the class of finite dimensional C^* -algebras. For an integer $k \geq 1$, denote by $I^{(k)}$ the class of C^* -subalgebras of the form $PM_r(C(X))P$, where $r \geq 1$ is an integer, X is a finite CW complex of covering dimension at most k , and $P \in M_r(C(X))$ is a projection.

Definition 2.14. Denote by $I_{(k)}$ the class of those C^* -algebras which are quotients of C^* -algebras in $I^{(k)}$. Let $\mathcal{C} \in I_{(k)}$. Then $\mathcal{C} = PM_r(C(X))P$, where X is a compact subset of a finite CW complex of covering dimension at most k , $r \geq 1$ and $P \in M_r(C(X))$ is a projection.

We recall the definition of tracial rank of C^* -algebras:

Definition 2.15 ([27]). Let \mathcal{A} be a unital simple C^* -algebra. Then \mathcal{A} is said to have tracial rank at most k if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, every finite subset $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{A}$ and every nonzero positive element $c \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists a C^* -subalgebra $\mathcal{B} \in I_{(k)}$ with $1_{\mathcal{B}} = p$ such that:

- (i) $\|pa - ap\| < \varepsilon$ for all $a \in \mathcal{F}$,
- (ii) $\text{dist}(pap, \mathcal{B}) < \varepsilon$ for all $a \in \mathcal{F}$,
- (iii) $1_{\mathcal{A}} - p$ is Murray-von Neumann equivalent to a projection in $\overline{c\mathcal{A}c}$.

If \mathcal{A} has tracial rank at most k , we write $\text{TR}(\mathcal{A}) \leq k$. If furthermore, $\text{TR}(\mathcal{A}) \not\leq k - 1$, then we say $\text{TR}(\mathcal{A}) = k$.

Definition 2.16. Let \mathcal{A} be a C^* -algebra. Following Dadarlat and Loring ([6]), we set

$$\underline{K}(\mathcal{A}) = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} (\text{K}_0(\mathcal{A}; \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) \oplus \text{K}_1(\mathcal{A}; \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})).$$

Let \mathcal{B} be another unital C^* -algebra. If, furthermore, \mathcal{A} is assumed to be separable and satisfy the Universal Coefficient Theorem ([39]), by [6],

$$\text{KL}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \cong \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(\underline{K}(\mathcal{A}), \underline{K}(\mathcal{B})).$$

Here $\text{KL}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \text{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})/\text{Pext}(\text{K}_*(\mathcal{A}), \text{K}_*(\mathcal{B}))$, where Pext is the subgroup of $\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{Z}}^1$ consisting of classes of pure extensions (see [6] for details).

Definition 2.17. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two unital C^* -algebras. Denote by $\text{KL}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})^{++}$ the set of those $\kappa \in \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(\underline{K}(\mathcal{A}), \underline{K}(\mathcal{B}))$ such that

$$\kappa(\text{K}_0(\mathcal{A})_+ \setminus \{0\}) \subset \text{K}_0(\mathcal{B})_+ \setminus \{0\}.$$

Denote by $\text{KL}_e(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})^{++}$ the set of those $\kappa \in \text{KL}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})^{++}$ such that $\kappa([1_{\mathcal{A}}]) = [1_{\mathcal{B}}]$.

Remark 2.18. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two unital C^* -algebras. Let $\varphi: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a unital homomorphism. Denote by φ_* the induced homomorphism on the K -groups, φ_{*0} the induced homomorphism on the K_0 -groups and φ_{*1} the induced homomorphism on the K_1 -groups. Also denote by φ_{\sharp} the induced map on the tracial state spaces and denote by φ^{\sharp} the induced map

$$\varphi^{\sharp}: U(M_{\infty}(\mathcal{A}))/CU(M_{\infty}(\mathcal{A})) \rightarrow U(M_{\infty}(\mathcal{B}))/CU(M_{\infty}(\mathcal{B})).$$

Note that if \mathcal{A} is a simple unital separable C^* -algebra with tracial rank at most one, then it has stable rank one (see Theorem 3.6.10 of [28]) and there is an isomorphism (see Corollary 3.5 of [30])

$$U(\mathcal{A})/CU(\mathcal{A}) \cong U(M_{\infty}(\mathcal{A}))/CU(M_{\infty}(\mathcal{A})).$$

Definition 2.19. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two C^* -algebras and $L: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a linear map. Let $\eta > 0$ and $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{A}$ be a finite subset. We say L is \mathcal{G} - η -multiplicative if

$$\|L(ab) - L(a)L(b)\| < \eta \text{ for all } a, b \in \mathcal{G}.$$

Let \mathcal{C}_n be a C^* -algebra such that $\text{K}_*(\mathcal{A}; \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) \cong \text{K}_*(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{C}_n)$. For convenience, if $L: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is a linear map, we will use the same symbol L to denote the induced map $L \otimes \text{id}_n: \mathcal{A} \otimes M_n \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \otimes M_n$ as well as $L \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}_n}: \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{C}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{C}_n$.

It is well known that if $a \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ is an ‘almost’ projection, then it is norm close to a projection. Two norm close projections are unitarily equivalent. So $[a] \in \text{K}_0(\mathcal{A})$ is well-defined. Similarly, if $b \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ is an ‘almost’ unitary, we shall use $[b]$ to denote the equivalent class in $\text{K}_1(\mathcal{A})$. If $L: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is an ‘almost’ homomorphism, we shall use L_* to denote the induced (partially defined) map on the K -theories. From [5] or [28], we know that for any finite set $\mathcal{P} \subset \underline{K}(\mathcal{A})$, there is a finite subset $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{A}$ and $\eta > 0$ such that, for any unital completely positive \mathcal{G} - η -multiplicative linear map L , L_* is well defined on \mathcal{P} .

If u is a unitary in $U_{\infty}(\mathcal{A})$, we shall use $[u]$ to denote the equivalence class in $\text{K}_1(\mathcal{A})$ and use \bar{u} to denote the equivalent class in $U_{\infty}(\mathcal{A})/CU_{\infty}(\mathcal{A})$. If $L: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is an ‘almost’ homomorphism so that $L(u)$ is invertible, we define

$$\langle L(u) \rangle = L(u)(L(u)^*L(u))^{-1/2}.$$

3 Higher dimensional Bott classes and construction of Rieffel-type projections

As the pfaffian of an even dimensional skew-symmetric matrix will play a central role in the construction of the projections in higher dimensional noncommutative tori, we recall the definition of the pfaffian.

Definition 3.1. Let $p \geq 1$ be an integer. The *pfaffian* of a $2p \times 2p$ skew-symmetric matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ is a polynomial, denoted by $\text{pf}(A)$, in the entries a_{ij} such that $\text{pf}(A)^2 = \det(A)$ and $\text{pf}(J'_0) = 1$, where

$$J''_0 = \begin{pmatrix} J'_0 & & & \\ & J'_0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & J'_0 \end{pmatrix}$$

is the block diagonal matrix constructed from p identical 2×2 blocks of the form $J'_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

It can be shown that $\text{pf}(A)$ always exists and is unique. Also it is well known that for any $2p \times 2p$ matrix B ,

$$\text{pf}(BAB^t) = \det(B)\text{pf}(A), \quad (\text{e 3.10})$$

where B^t is the transpose matrix of B .

To give some examples,

$$\text{pf} \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta_{12} \\ -\theta_{12} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \theta_{12}, \quad (\text{e 3.11})$$

$$\text{pf} \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta_{12} & \theta_{13} & \theta_{14} \\ -\theta_{12} & 0 & \theta_{23} & \theta_{24} \\ -\theta_{13} & -\theta_{23} & 0 & \theta_{34} \\ -\theta_{14} & -\theta_{24} & -\theta_{34} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \theta_{12}\theta_{34} - \theta_{13}\theta_{24} + \theta_{14}\theta_{23}. \quad (\text{e 3.12})$$

More generally, if $n = 2m$ for some integer $m \geq 1$, then for

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta_{12} & \cdots & \cdots & \theta_{1n} \\ -\theta_{12} & \ddots & \ddots & & \theta_{2n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & & & \\ & & & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\theta_{1(n-1)} & & \ddots & \ddots & \theta_{(n-1)n} \\ -\theta_{1n} & \cdots & \cdots & -\theta_{(n-1)n} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

the pfaffian of A is given by $\sum_{\xi} (-1)^{|\xi|} \prod_{s=1}^m \theta_{\xi(2s-1)\xi(2s)}$, where the sum is taken over all elements ξ of the permutation group S_n such that $\xi(2s-1) < \xi(2s)$ for all $1 \leq s \leq m$ and $\xi(1) < \xi(3) < \cdots < \xi(2m-1)$.

Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer, and let p be an integer such that $1 \leq p \leq \frac{n}{2}$.

Definition 3.2. A $2p$ -pfaffian minor (or just pfaffian minor) of a skew-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix A is the pfaffian of a sub-matrix M_I^A of A consisting of rows and columns indexed by i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2p} for some numbers $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{2p} \leq n$, and $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2p})$. We often use pf_I^A as the abbreviation of $\text{pf}(M_I^A)$ without special emphasis. We also use $M_{I,J}^A$ denote a sub-matrix of A consisting of rows and columns indexed by i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n and j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m , respectively, for some numbers $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_n, j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_m$, and $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n), J = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m)$.

Note that the number of $2p$ -pfaffian minors is the combinatorial number C_n^{2p} and the number of all pfaffian minors is $2^{n-1} - 1$.

We recall the following fact due to Elliott which will play a key role.

Theorem 3.3 (Elliott). *Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$. Then for all $\tau \in T(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$, $\tau_*(K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta))$ is the range of the exterior exponential*

$$\exp_\wedge : \Lambda^{\text{even}} \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

We refer to ([12, Theorem 3.1]) for the definition of exterior exponential and the proof of the above theorem. The range of the exterior exponential is well known and is given below as a corollary of the above theorem:

Corollary 3.4. For $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$, $\tau_*(K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta))$ is the subgroup of \mathbb{R} generated by 1 and the numbers

$$\sum_{\xi} (-1)^{|\xi|} \prod_{s=1}^p \theta_{j_{\xi(2s-1)} j_{\xi(2s)}}$$

for $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{2p} \leq n$, where the sum is taken over all elements ξ of the permutation group S_{2p} such that $\xi(2s-1) < \xi(2s)$ for all $1 \leq s \leq p$ and $\xi(1) < \xi(3) < \dots < \xi(2p-1)$ for any $\tau \in T(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$.

Noting that $\sum_{\xi} (-1)^{|\xi|} \prod_{s=1}^p \theta_{j_{\xi(2s-1)} j_{\xi(2s)}}$ is exactly the pfaffian of M_I^Θ , where $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2p})$, we have

$$\tau_*(K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)) = \mathbb{Z} + \sum_{0 < |I| \leq n} \text{pf}(M_I^\Theta) \mathbb{Z}, \text{ for all } \tau \in T(\mathcal{A}_\Theta), \quad (\text{e 3.13})$$

where $|I| = 2p$ for $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2p})$.

Definition 3.5 (Definition 1 of [17]). We say that $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ is *totally irrational* if \exp_\wedge is an injective map from $\Lambda^{\text{even}} \mathbb{Z}^n$ to \mathbb{R} (cf. Section 6 and 7 of [37]).

It is clear from Elliott's work that $(\tau_\Theta)_*$ is injective if and only if Θ is totally irrational. Now the range of \exp_\wedge is given by

$$\mathbb{Z} + \sum_{0 < |I| \leq n} \text{pf}(M_I^\Theta) \mathbb{Z},$$

where $|I| = 2p$ for $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2p})$. Thus Θ is totally irrational if and only if $1, \text{pf}(M_I^\Theta), 0 < |I| \leq n$ are rationally independent.

Note that if Θ is totally irrational, Θ is also nondegenerate and \mathcal{A}_Θ is a simple C^* -algebra by Theorem 2.3.

For

$$\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11} & \Theta_{12} \\ \Theta_{21} & \Theta_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11} & \Theta_{12} \\ -\Theta_{12}^t & \Theta_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{T}_n,$$

where $n = 2l, l > 1$, and

$$\Theta_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta_{12} \\ \theta_{21} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta_{12} \\ -\theta_{12} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{T}_2$$

is invertible 2×2 matrix,

$$\Theta_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta_{34} & \cdots & \theta_{3n} \\ -\theta_{34} & 0 & \cdots & \theta_{4n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\theta_{3n} & -\theta_{4n} & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{T}_{n-2},$$

$$\Theta_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_{13} & \theta_{14} & \cdots & \theta_{1n} \\ \theta_{23} & \theta_{24} & \cdots & \theta_{2n} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\Theta_{21} = \begin{pmatrix} -\theta_{13} & -\theta_{23} \\ -\theta_{14} & -\theta_{24} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ -\theta_{1n} & -\theta_{2n} \end{pmatrix},$$

we have $\Theta_{11}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{\theta_{12}} \\ \frac{1}{\theta_{12}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{T}_2$, and

$$\Theta_{22} - \Theta_{21} \Theta_{11}^{-1} \Theta_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta_{34} - \frac{-\theta_{23}\theta_{14} + \theta_{13}\theta_{24}}{\theta_{12}} & \cdots & \theta_{3n} - \frac{-\theta_{23}\theta_{1n} + \theta_{13}\theta_{2n}}{\theta_{12}} \\ -\theta_{34} + \frac{-\theta_{23}\theta_{14} + \theta_{13}\theta_{24}}{\theta_{12}} & 0 & \cdots & \theta_{4n} - \frac{-\theta_{24}\theta_{1n} + \theta_{14}\theta_{2n}}{\theta_{12}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\theta_{3n} + \frac{-\theta_{23}\theta_{1n} + \theta_{13}\theta_{2n}}{\theta_{12}} & -\theta_{4n} + \frac{-\theta_{24}\theta_{1n} + \theta_{14}\theta_{2n}}{\theta_{12}} & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus we have from (e.3.11) and (e.3.12) that

$$\Theta_{22} - \Theta_{21} \Theta_{11}^{-1} \Theta_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,4)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} & \cdots & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,n)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} \\ -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,4)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} & 0 & \cdots & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,4,n)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,n)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} & -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,4,n)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{e.3.14})$$

The following lemma reveals the relationship between the pfaffian of a matrix and the pfaffian of its partitioned matrix.

Lemma 3.6. *For any integer $n \geq 2$, let*

$$\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11} & \Theta_{12} \\ \Theta_{21} & \Theta_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11} & \Theta_{12} \\ -\Theta_{12}^t & \Theta_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{T}_n,$$

where Θ_{11} is invertible 2×2 matrix, one has

$$\text{pf}(\Theta_{11}) \text{pf}(M_{I'}^{\Theta_{22} - \Theta_{21} \Theta_{11}^{-1} \Theta_{12}}) = \text{pf}(M_I^\Theta), \quad (\text{e.3.15})$$

where $|I| = 2l + 2$ for $I = (1, 2, i_1 + 2, i_2 + 2, \dots, i_{2l} + 2)$, $I' = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2l})$. In particular, when n is an even number, we have

$$\text{pf}(\Theta) = \text{pf}(\Theta_{11}) \text{pf}(\Theta_{22} + \Theta_{12}^t \Theta_{11}^{-1} \Theta_{12}) = \text{pf}(\Theta_{11}) \text{pf}(\Theta_{22} - \Theta_{21} \Theta_{11}^{-1} \Theta_{12}). \quad (\text{e.3.16})$$

Proof. By using the following formula:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & M_{I'}^{\Theta_{22} + \Theta_{12}^t \Theta_{11}^{-1} \Theta_{12}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{id} & 0 \\ (M_{I, (1,2)}^\Theta)^t \Theta_{11}^{-1} & \text{id} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11} & M_{(1,2), I}^\Theta \\ -(M_{I, (1,2)}^\Theta)^t & M_{I'}^{\Theta_{22}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \text{id} & -\Theta_{11}^{-1} M_{(1,2), I}^\Theta \\ 0 & \text{id} \end{pmatrix},$$

and using (e 3.10), we have

$$\text{pf}(\Theta_{11})\text{pf}(M_I^{\Theta_{22}-\Theta_{21}\Theta_{11}^{-1}\Theta_{12}}) = \text{pf}(M_I^\Theta). \quad (\text{e 3.17})$$

In particular, when n is an even number, by taking $I = (1, 2, \dots, n)$ in (e 3.17), we have

$$\text{pf}(\Theta) = \text{pf}(\Theta_{11})\text{pf}(\Theta_{22} + \Theta_{12}^t \Theta_{11}^{-1} \Theta_{12}) = \text{pf}(\Theta_{11})\text{pf}(\Theta_{22} - \Theta_{21} \Theta_{11}^{-1} \Theta_{12}).$$

□

For the convenience of symbols, we give the following definition:

Definition 3.7. For

$$\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11} & \Theta_{12} \\ \Theta_{21} & \Theta_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{T}_n,$$

where Θ_{11} is an invertible 2×2 matrix, and $n = 2l$, $l > 1$, define

$$F(\Theta) = \Theta_{22} + \Theta_{12}^t \Theta_{11}^{-1} \Theta_{12} = \Theta_{22} - \Theta_{21} \Theta_{11}^{-1} \Theta_{12} \in \mathcal{T}_{n-2}. \quad (\text{e 3.18})$$

Hence from (e 3.16), we have

$$\text{pf}(\Theta) = \text{pf}(\Theta_{11})\text{pf}(F(\Theta)). \quad (\text{e 3.19})$$

If m be an integer less than l , we denote by F^m the composition of F taken m times (when makes sense) and $F^0(\Theta) := \Theta$. Note that F is defined for a Θ such that Θ_{11} is invertible, but still F^m may not make sense. The following lemma tells us when $F^m(\Theta)$ is well defined.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ with $n = 2l$ for $l > 1$. If $\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,2s)}^\Theta \neq 0$ for $s = 1, 2, \dots, l-1$, then $F^m(\Theta)$ is well defined for $m = 1, 2, \dots, l-1$.*

Proof. To show that $F^m(\Theta)$ is well defined for $m = 1, 2, \dots, l-1$, it is enough to show that $F^m(\Theta)_{11}$ is invertible for all $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots, l-2$. Since $\text{pf}_{(1,2)}^\Theta = \theta_{12} \neq 0$. Now, by (e 3.14) we have

$$F(\Theta) = \Theta_{22} - \Theta_{21} \Theta_{11}^{-1} \Theta_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,4)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} & \dots & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,n)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} \\ -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,4)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} & 0 & \dots & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,4,n)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,n)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} & -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,4,n)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,4)}^\Theta \neq 0$, we have that $F(\Theta)_{11}$ is also invertible as $\text{pf}(F(\Theta)_{11}) = \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,4)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} \neq 0$. Now we want to use induction on m . Assume $F^j(\Theta)_{11}$ is invertible for all $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m-1$ for some $m \leq l-2$, then we must prove that $F^m(\Theta)_{11}$ is invertible. Let's use M_k^Θ to express $M_{(1,2,\dots,k)}^\Theta$ briefly, for $k \leq n$. Note that, from (e 3.14), we have the following identity

$$F^j(\Theta)_{11} = F^j(M_{n-2}^\Theta)_{11} \quad (\text{e 3.20})$$

for all $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, l-2$. It follows that there will exist some even number p , depending on m , such that

$$F^m(M_{n-2}^\Theta)_{11} = F^m(M_{n-p}^\Theta)_{11} = F^m(M_{n-p}^\Theta). \quad (\text{e 3.21})$$

In particular, the matrix $F^m(M_{n-p}^\Theta)$ will be of size 2×2 . Since by induction hypothesis $F^j(\Theta)_{11}$ is invertible for all $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m-1$, $F^j(M_{n-p}^\Theta)_{11} = F^j(\Theta)_{11}$ are also invertible by using (e 3.20) for $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m-1$.

Now for the matrix $F^{m-1}(M_{n-p}^\Theta)$, since $F^{m-1}(M_{n-p}^\Theta)_{11}$ is invertible, we have from (e 3.16)

$$\text{pf}(F^{m-1}(M_{n-p}^\Theta)) = \text{pf}(F^{m-1}(M_{n-p}^\Theta)_{11})\text{pf}(F^m(M_{n-p}^\Theta)). \quad (\text{e 3.22})$$

Since $\text{pf}(F^{m-1}(M_{n-p}^\Theta))$ is non-zero, which follows from (e 3.22) by induction and using the fact that $\text{pf}(M_{n-p}^\Theta)$ is non-zero, we have $\text{pf}(F^m(M_{n-p}^\Theta))$ is also non-zero. But $F^m(M_{n-p}^\Theta)$ is $F^m(\Theta)_{11}$. Hence $F^m(\Theta)_{11}$ is invertible. \square

Remark 3.9. In fact, in the above lemma, if Θ is totally irrational, we can get a stronger result, i.e. $\text{pf}(F^m(\Theta)_{11})$ is irrational for $m = 0, 1, \dots, l-1$. For this let us consider the equation

$$\text{pf}(F^m(\Theta)) = \text{pf}(F^m(\Theta)_{11})\text{pf}(F^{m+1}(\Theta)),$$

thus

$$\text{pf}(F^{m+1}(\Theta)) = \frac{\text{pf}(F^m(\Theta))}{\text{pf}(F^m(\Theta)_{11})}. \quad (\text{e 3.23})$$

Combining (e 3.21) with (e 3.23), we get

$$\text{pf}(F^{m+1}(\Theta)) = \frac{\text{pf}(F^m(\Theta))}{\text{pf}(F^m(M_{n-p}^\Theta))}.$$

Now using (e 3.19) repeatedly for all $F^{m+1}(\Theta)$ and $F^m(M_{n-p}^\Theta)$,

$$\text{pf}(F^{m+1}(\Theta)) = \frac{\text{pf}(\Theta)}{\text{pf}(M_{n-p}^\Theta)}.$$

Similarly,

$$\text{pf}(F^m(\Theta)) = \frac{\text{pf}(\Theta)}{\text{pf}(M_{n-p-2}^\Theta)}.$$

So we have

$$\text{pf}(F^m(\Theta)_{11}) = \frac{\text{pf}(M_{n-p}^\Theta)}{\text{pf}(M_{n-p-2}^\Theta)} \quad (\text{e 3.24})$$

which is irrational since Θ is totally irrational.

The following lemma gives an explicit expression of $F^m(\Theta)$ for $m = 1, 2, \dots, l-1$.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ with $n = 2l$ for $l > 1$. If $\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,2s)}^\Theta \neq 0$ for $s = 1, 2, \dots, l-1$, then*

$$F^m(\Theta) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\text{Pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-1,n-p)}^\Theta}{\text{Pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta} & \dots & \frac{\text{Pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-1,n)}^\Theta}{\text{Pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta} \\ -\frac{\text{Pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-1,n-p)}^\Theta}{\text{Pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta} & 0 & \dots & \frac{\text{Pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p,n)}^\Theta}{\text{Pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\frac{\text{Pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-1,n)}^\Theta}{\text{Pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta} & -\frac{\text{Pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p,n)}^\Theta}{\text{Pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta} & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{e 3.25})$$

and in particular,

$$F^m(\Theta)_{jk} = \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s',s'+j,s'+k)}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s')}^\Theta}, \quad p = n - 2m - 2, \quad s' = n - p - 2 = 2m, \quad (\text{e 3.26})$$

for $m = 1, \dots, l - 1$.

Proof. We prove that (e 3.25) holds by using induction on m . Since $\text{pf}_{(1,2)}^\Theta = \theta_{12} \neq 0$, we have from (e 3.14) that

$$F(\Theta) = \Theta_{22} - \Theta_{21}\Theta_{11}^{-1}\Theta_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,4)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} & \cdots & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,n)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} \\ -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,4)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} & 0 & \cdots & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,4,n)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,n)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} & -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,4,n)}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}} & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

So (e 3.25) holds for $m = 1$. Now assume that (e 3.25) holds for $m - 1$. Then we must prove that the same holds for m . Hence we have

$$F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{jk} = \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s,s+j,s+k)}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s)}^\Theta}, \quad s = 2(m - 1),$$

and we have to show that

$$F^m(\Theta)_{j'k'} = \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s',s'+j',s+k')}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s')}^\Theta}, \quad s' = 2m.$$

Let σ_n denote the permutation in symmetric group \mathcal{S}_n of degree n which interchanges 1 and j' , and 2 and k' . Also let $\sigma_n(\Theta)$ denote the matrix obtained from conjugating Θ with the permutation matrix corresponding to the permutation σ_n . Now $F^m(\Theta)$ is a $(n - 2m) \times (n - 2m)$ matrix. Consider $\sigma_{n-2m}(F^m(\Theta))$. It is clear that $\sigma_{n-2m}(F^m(\Theta))_{12} = F^m(\Theta)_{j'k'}$. So we need to determine $\sigma_{n-2m}(F^m(\Theta))_{12}$. Now $\sigma_{n-2}(F(\Theta))_{12} = \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,2+j',2+k')}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}}$. If we denote the permutation in \mathcal{S}_n which interchanges 3 and $2 + j'$, and 4 and $2 + k'$ by σ'_n , then $F(\sigma'_n(\Theta))_{12} = \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,2+j',2+k')}^\Theta}{\theta_{12}}$. Hence we get

$$\sigma_{n-2}(F(\Theta))_{12} = F(\sigma'_n(\Theta))_{12}. \quad (\text{e 3.27})$$

Putting $\Theta = F^{m-1}(\Theta)$ in the above equation (e 3.27), we get

$$\sigma_{n-2m}(F^m(\Theta))_{12} = F(\sigma'_{n-2(m-1)}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)))_{12}. \quad (\text{e 3.28})$$

Now by induction hypothesis,

$$F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{jk} = \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s,s+j,s+k)}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s)}^\Theta}, \quad s = 2(m - 1). \quad (\text{e 3.29})$$

Denoting $F^{m-1}(\Theta)$ by $\tilde{\Theta}$, we have

$$F(\tilde{\Theta})_{12} = \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,4)}^{\tilde{\Theta}}}{\tilde{\Theta}_{12}}.$$

But from (e 3.24) we have

$$F(\tilde{\Theta})_{12} = \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,4)}^{\tilde{\Theta}}}{\tilde{\Theta}_{12}} = \frac{\text{pf}(M_{n-p}^{\Theta})}{\text{pf}(M_{n-p-2}^{\Theta})}.$$

Now let us look at the permutation ρ in \mathcal{S}_n which just interchanges $s' + 1$ and $s' + j'$, and $s' + 2$ and $s' + k'$, and consider $\text{pf}(M_{s'}^{\rho(\Theta)}) = \text{pf}(M_{s'}^{\Theta}) \neq 0$. So from (e 3.24),

$$F^m(\rho(\Theta))_{12} = \frac{\text{pf}(M_{n-p}^{\rho(\Theta)})}{\text{pf}(M_{n-p-2}^{\rho(\Theta)})} = \frac{\text{pf}(M_{s'+2}^{\rho(\Theta)})}{\text{pf}(M_{s'}^{\rho(\Theta)})},$$

where $s' = n - p - 2 = 2m$. But

$$F^m(\rho(\Theta))_{12} = \frac{\text{pf}(M_{s'+2}^{\rho(\Theta)})}{\text{pf}(M_{s'}^{\rho(\Theta)})} = \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s',s'+j',s'+k')}^{\Theta}}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s')}^{\Theta}}, \quad s' = 2m. \quad (\text{e 3.30})$$

But an easy observation from (e 3.29) shows that

$$F^m(\rho(\Theta))_{12} = F(F^{m-1}(\rho(\Theta)))_{12} = F(\sigma'_{n-2(m-1)}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)))_{12}. \quad (\text{e 3.31})$$

Combining (e 3.28), (e 3.30) with (e 3.31), we have

$$\sigma_{n-2m}(F^m(\Theta))_{12} = F(\sigma'_{n-2(m-1)}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)))_{12} = F^m(\rho(\Theta))_{12} = \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s',s'+j',s'+k')}^{\Theta}}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s')}^{\Theta}}, \quad s' = 2m.$$

Hence we prove the conclusion. \square

Remark 3.11. By using the above lemma, we can know more about the properties of $F^m(\Theta)$ and $\mathcal{A}_{F^m(\Theta)}$ when $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ is totally irrational with $n = 2l \geq 2$. For example, the entries (above the diagonal) of $F^m(\Theta)$ are all irrational and independent over \mathbb{Q} for $m = 0, 1, \dots, l - 1$. Hence $\mathcal{A}_{F^m(\Theta)}$ is a simple C^* -algebra and has a unique tracial state $\tau_{F^m(\Theta)}$ for $m = 0, 1, \dots, l - 1$. This is because when Θ is totally irrational, we have that $\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,2s)}^{\Theta} \neq 0$ for $s = 1, 2, \dots, l - 1$. By Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.10, we know that $F^m(\Theta)$ is well-defined and

$$F^m(\Theta) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-1,n-p)}^{\Theta}}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^{\Theta}} & \dots & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-1,n)}^{\Theta}}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^{\Theta}} \\ -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-1,n-p)}^{\Theta}}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^{\Theta}} & 0 & \dots & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p,n)}^{\Theta}}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^{\Theta}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-1,n)}^{\Theta}}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^{\Theta}} & -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p,n)}^{\Theta}}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^{\Theta}} & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and in particular,

$$F^m(\Theta)_{jk} = \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s',s'+j,s'+k)}^{\Theta}}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,s')}^{\Theta}}, \quad p = n - 2m - 2, \quad s' = n - p - 2 = 2m, \quad (\text{e 3.32})$$

for $m = 1, \dots, l - 1$. Now since Θ is totally irrational, the numbers $\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2,j,k)}^{\Theta}$, $n - p - 1 \leq j < k \leq n$ along with $\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^{\Theta}$, are irrational and independent over \mathbb{Q} . This means that

the numbers $\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2,j,k)}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta}$ are irrational numbers. Next, to show that these numbers are independent over \mathbb{Q} , let us write

$$\sum_{n-p-1 \leq j < k \leq n} c_{j,k} \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2,j,k)}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta} = 0, \quad c_{j,k} \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

This implies

$$\sum_{n-p-1 \leq j < k \leq n} c_{j,k} \text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2,j,k)}^\Theta = 0, \quad c_{j,k} \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

But since the numbers $\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2,j,k)}^\Theta$, $n-p-1 \leq j < k \leq n$ are independent over \mathbb{Q} , $c_{j,k}$'s are all zero. Hence the numbers $\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2,j,k)}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta}$, $n-p-1 \leq j < k \leq n$ are rationally independent. So we have shown that the entries (above the diagonal) of $F^m(\Theta)$ are irrational and rationally independent. Now, from this, it is easy to see that $F^m(\Theta)$ is non-degenerate in the sense of Definition 2.2. Hence $\mathcal{A}_{F^m(\Theta)}$ is simple and has a unique tracial state $\tau_{F^m(\Theta)}$ for $m = 0, 1, \dots, l-1$.

In the following we shall construct Rieffel-type projections for the higher dimensional non-commutative tori.

We fix a number p with $1 \leq p \leq n/2$ and let $q \geq 0$ be an integer such that $n = 2p + q$. Let us write $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11} & \Theta_{12} \\ \Theta_{21} & \Theta_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

partitioned into four sub-matrices $\Theta_{11}, \Theta_{12}, \Theta_{21}, \Theta_{22}$, and assume Θ_{11} to be an invertible $2p \times 2p$ matrix. Let

$$\Theta' = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11}^{-1} & -\Theta_{11}^{-1}\Theta_{12} \\ \Theta_{21}\Theta_{11}^{-1} & \Theta_{22} - \Theta_{21}\Theta_{11}^{-1}\Theta_{12} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Set $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_\Theta$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}_{\Theta'}$. Let \mathcal{M} be the group $\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{Z}^q$, $G = \mathcal{M} \times \widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the natural pairing between \mathcal{M} and its dual group $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ (our notation does not distinguish between the pairing of a group and its dual group, and the standard inner product on a linear space). Consider the Schwartz space $\mathcal{E}^\infty = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{M})$ consisting of smooth and rapidly decreasing complex-valued functions on \mathcal{M} .

Denote by $\mathcal{A}^\infty = \mathcal{A}_\Theta^\infty$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}_{\Theta'}^\infty$ the dense sub-algebras of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , respectively, consisting of formal series with rapidly decaying coefficients. Let us consider the following $(2p+2q) \times (2p+q)$ real valued matrix:

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & \text{id}_q \\ T_{31} & T_{32} \end{pmatrix},$$

where T_{11} is an invertible matrix such that $T_{11}^t J_0 T_{11} = \Theta_{11}$, $J_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \text{id}_p \\ -\text{id}_p & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $T_{31} = \Theta_{21}$ and T_{32} is any $q \times q$ matrix such that $\Theta_{22} = T_{32} - T_{32}^t$. For our purposes, we take $T_{32} = \Theta_{22}/2$.

We also define the following $(2p+2q) \times (2p+q)$ real valued matrix:

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} J_0(T_{11}^t)^{-1} & -J_0(T_{11}^t)^{-1}T_{31}^t \\ 0 & \text{id}_q \\ 0 & T_{32}^t \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} J_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \text{id}_q \\ 0 & -\text{id}_q & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and J' be the matrix obtained from J by replacing the negative entries of it by zeroes. Note that T and S can be thought as maps from $(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ to $\mathbb{R}^p \times (\mathbb{R}^p)^* \times \mathbb{R}^q \times (\mathbb{R}^q)^*$ (see the definition of an embedding map in Definition 2.1 of [25]), and $S(\mathbb{Z}^n), T(\mathbb{Z}^n) \subset \mathbb{R}^p \times (\mathbb{R}^p)^* \times \mathbb{Z}^q \times (\mathbb{R}^q)^*$. Then we can think of $S(\mathbb{Z}^n), T(\mathbb{Z}^n)$ as in G via composing $S|_{\mathbb{Z}^n}, T|_{\mathbb{Z}^n}$ with the natural covering map $\mathbb{R}^p \times (\mathbb{R}^p)^* \times \mathbb{Z}^q \times (\mathbb{R}^q)^* \rightarrow G$. Let P' and P'' be the canonical projections of G to \mathcal{M} and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$, respectively, and let

$$T' = P' \circ T, \quad T'' = P'' \circ T, \quad S' = P' \circ S, \quad S'' = P'' \circ S.$$

Then the following set of formulas define a \mathcal{B}^∞ - \mathcal{A}^∞ bimodule structure on \mathcal{E}^∞ :

$$\begin{cases} (fU_l^\Theta)(x) = e^{2\pi i \langle -T(l), J'T(l)/2 \rangle} \langle x, T''(l) \rangle f(x - T'(l)), & \text{(e 3.33)} \\ \langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{A}^\infty}(l) = e^{2\pi i \langle -T(l), J'T(l)/2 \rangle} \int_G \langle x, -T''(l) \rangle g(x + T'(l)) \overline{f(x)} dx, & \text{(e 3.34)} \\ (U_l^{\Theta'} f)(x) = e^{2\pi i \langle -S(l), J'S(l)/2 \rangle} \langle x, S''(l) \rangle f(x - S'(l)), & \text{(e 3.35)} \\ \mathcal{B}^\infty \langle f, g \rangle(l) = K e^{2\pi i \langle S(l), J'S(l)/2 \rangle} \int_G \langle x, S''(l) \rangle \overline{g(x + S'(l))} f(x) dx, & \text{(e 3.36)} \end{cases}$$

where $U_l^\Theta, U_l^{\Theta'}$ denote the canonical unitaries with respect to the group element $l \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ in \mathcal{A}^∞ and \mathcal{B}^∞ , respectively, and K is a positive constant. See Proposition 2.2 in [25] for the following well-known result.

Theorem 3.12. *The smooth module \mathcal{E}^∞ , with above structures, is an \mathcal{B}^∞ - \mathcal{A}^∞ Morita equivalence bimodule which can be extended to a strong Morita equivalence between \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{A} .*

Let \mathcal{E} denote the completion of \mathcal{E}^∞ with respect to the C^* -valued inner products given above. This becomes a finitely generated projective module over \mathcal{A} . This class is called the *Bott class*. The Bott class contributes to a part of a generating set of the K_0 -group of \mathcal{A}_Θ . Next, we will construct a specific projection to describe the Bott class.

Theorem 3.13. *For any even number $n = 2l \geq 2$, if $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ satisfy $\text{pf}(F^j(\Theta)_{11}) \in (0, 1)$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, l-2$, and $\text{pf}(F^{l-1}(\Theta)_{11}) \notin \mathbb{Z}$, then there exist a (Rieffel-type) projection p_m inside $\mathcal{A}_{F^m(\Theta)}$ such that*

$$\tau_{F^m(\Theta)}(p_m) = \text{pf}(F^m(\Theta)) + k_{(1,2)}^{(m)} \text{pf}(M_{(1,2)}^{F^m(\Theta)}) + \dots + k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{(m)} \text{pf}(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{F^m(\Theta)}) + k_0^{(m)}$$

for some $k_I^{(m)}, k_0^{(m)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots, l-1$, where $I = (1, 2, \dots, n-2s)$ and $s = m+1, m+2, \dots, l-1$, $\tau_{F^m(\Theta)}$ is the canonical tracial state on $\mathcal{A}_{F^m(\Theta)}$.

Proof. We do the proof using recursion on m . For $m = l-1$, $F^{l-1}(\Theta)$ is a 2×2 matrix and $\text{pf}(F^{l-1}(\Theta)_{11}) = \text{pf}(F^{l-1}(\Theta)) \notin \mathbb{Z}$, construction of such projection is well-known and the projection is known as Rieffel projection with trace $\text{pf}(F^{l-1}(\Theta)) + k_0^{(l-1)}$, for some $k_0^{(l-1)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ (see (e 2.8)).

Now suppose that for some $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, l-1\}$, there is such a projection in $\mathcal{A}_{F^m(\Theta)}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{F^m(\Theta)}(p_m) &= \text{pf}(F^m(\Theta)) + k_{(1,2)}^{(m)} \text{pf}(M_{(1,2)}^{F^m(\Theta)}) + \dots \\ &\quad + k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{(m)} \text{pf}(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{F^m(\Theta)}) + k_0^{(m)} \end{aligned} \quad \text{(e 3.37)}$$

for some $k_I^{(m)}, k_0^{(m)} \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $I = (1, 2, \dots, n-2s)$ and $s = m+1, m+2, \dots, l-1$.

Next we want to prove that there is a projection p_{m-1} in $\mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}$ with $\tau_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}(p_{m-1}) = \text{pf}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)) + k_{(1,2)}^{(m-1)} \text{pf}(M_{(1,2)}^{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}) + \dots + k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2m)}^{(m-1)} \text{Pf}(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-2m)}^{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}) + k_0^{(m-1)}$ for some $k_I^{(m-1)}, k_0^{(m-1)} \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $I = (1, 2, \dots, n-2s)$ and $s = m, m+1, \dots, l-1$. Now we follow the method of page 198-199 in [3] to construct such a projection. Write

$$F^{m-1}(\Theta) = \begin{pmatrix} F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11} & F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{12} \\ F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{21} & F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11} & F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{12} \\ -F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{12}^t & F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{T}_{n-2(m-1)},$$

where $F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11}$ is a 2×2 block. From the previous discussion of this section, $\mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}$ is strong Morita equivalent to $\mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)'}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} F^{m-1}(\Theta)' &= \begin{pmatrix} F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11}^{-1} & -F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11}^{-1} F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{12} \\ F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{21} F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11}^{-1} & F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{22} - F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{21} F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11}^{-1} F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{12} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11}^{-1} & -F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11}^{-1} F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{12} \\ F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{21} F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11}^{-1} & F^{m-1}(\Theta) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote the Rieffel projection in $\mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11}}$, by e and $\tau_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}(e) = \text{pf}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11})$ (see Appendix for the construction of such e , here we use the assumption that $\text{pf}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11})$ is in $(0, 1)$). It follows that $\mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)'} \cong e\mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}e$, and we denote this isomorphism by ψ . By (e.3.37) there exists a projection $e' \in \mathcal{A}_{F^m(\Theta)} \subset \mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)'}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{F^m(\Theta)}(e') &= \text{pf}(F^m(\Theta)) + k_{(1,2)}^{(m)} \text{pf}(M_{(1,2)}^{F^m(\Theta)}) + \dots \\ &\quad + k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{(m)} \text{pf}(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{F^m(\Theta)}) + k_0^{(m)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{e.3.38})$$

for some $k_I^{(m)}, k_0^{(m)} \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $I = (1, 2, \dots, n-2s)$ and $s = m+1, m+2, \dots, l-1$. Now for the tracial state $\tau_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}$ on $\mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}$, since $\psi(1_{\mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)'}}) = e$ and $\tau_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}(e) = \text{pf}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11})$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\text{pf}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11})} \tau_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)} \circ \psi$$

is a tracial state on $\mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)'}$. Note $e' \in \mathcal{A}_{F^m(\Theta)} \subset \mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)'}$, so $\tau_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)'}(e') = \tau_{F^m(\Theta)}(e')$. Then using the fact that all tracial states of $\mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)'}$ induce the same map on $K_0(\mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)'})$, and (e.3.38), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\text{pf}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11})} \tau_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)} \circ \psi(e') \\ &= \tau_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)'}(e') = \tau_{F^m(\Theta)}(e') \\ &= \text{pf}(F^m(\Theta)) + k_{(1,2)}^{(m)} \text{pf}(M_{(1,2)}^{F^m(\Theta)}) + \dots \\ &\quad + k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{(m)} \text{pf}(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{F^m(\Theta)}) + k_0^{(m)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{e.3.39})$$

for some $k_I^{(m)}, k_0^{(m)} \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $I = (1, 2, \dots, n-2s)$ and $s = m+1, m+2, \dots, l-1$. Let $p_{m-1} = \psi(e')$, from (e.3.39) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}(p_{m-1}) &= \tau_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}(\psi(e')) \\ &= \text{pf}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11}) \left(\frac{1}{\text{pf}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11})} \tau_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)} \circ \psi(e') \right) \\ &= \text{pf}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11}) (\text{pf}(F^m(\Theta)) + k_{(1,2)}^{(m)} \text{pf}(M_{(1,2)}^{F^m(\Theta)}) + \dots \\ &\quad + k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{(m)} \text{Pf}(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{F^m(\Theta)}) + k_0^{(m)}). \end{aligned}$$

But from (e.3.15) and (e.3.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{pf}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)_{11})(\text{pf}(F^m(\Theta)) + k_{(1,2)}^{(m)}\text{pf}(M_{(1,2)}^{F^m(\Theta)})) \\
& + \cdots + k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{(m)}\text{pf}(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{F^m(\Theta)}) + k_0^{(m)} \\
= & \text{pf}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)) + k_{(1,2)}^{(m)}\text{pf}(M_{(1,2,3,4)}^{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}) \\
& + \cdots + k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{(m)}\text{pf}(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-2m)}^{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}) + k_0^{(m)}\text{pf}(M_{(1,2)}^{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Put $k_0^{(m)} = k_{(1,2)}^{m-1}$, $k_{(1,2,3,4)}^{(m-1)} = k_{(1,2)}^{(m-1)}$, \dots , $k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2m)}^{(m-1)} = k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{(m)}$, then there is a projection p_{m-1} in $\mathcal{A}_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}(p_{m-1}) &= \text{pf}(F^{m-1}(\Theta)) + k_{(1,2)}^{(m-1)}\text{pf}(M_{(1,2)}^{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}) + \cdots \\
& + k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2m)}^{(m-1)}\text{pf}(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-2m)}^{F^{m-1}(\Theta)}) + k_0^{(m-1)}
\end{aligned}$$

for some $k_I^{(m-1)}, k_0^{(m-1)} \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $I = (1, 2, \dots, n-2s)$ and $s = m, m+1, \dots, l-1$. \square

The above theorem tells us how to construct a higher dimensional projection with corresponding trace values from a low dimensional projection under certain conditions. We call this type of projection a Rieffel-type projection. By Lemma 3.10, we know that

$$\text{pf}(F^j(\Theta)_{11}) = \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-1,n-p)}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta}, \quad p = n - 2j - 2, \quad j = 1, \dots, l-1. \quad (\text{e.3.40})$$

Therefore, the conditions of the above theorem can also be described as:

$$\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-1,n-p)}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta} \in (0, 1) \quad \text{for } p = n - 2j - 2, \quad j = 1, \dots, l-2, \quad (\text{e.3.41})$$

and

$$\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-1,n)}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-2)}^\Theta} \notin \mathbb{Z}. \quad (\text{e.3.42})$$

We record this fact as a corollary below.

Corollary 3.14. For any even number $n = 2l \geq 2$, if $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ satisfies

$$\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-1,n-p)}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta} \in (0, 1) \quad \text{for } p = n - 2j - 2, \quad j = 1, \dots, l-2, \quad (\text{e.3.43})$$

and $\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-1,n)}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-2)}^\Theta} \notin \mathbb{Z}$, then there exist a (Rieffel-type) projection p_m inside $\mathcal{A}_{F^m(\Theta)}$ such that

$$\tau_{F^m(\Theta)}(p_m) = \text{pf}(F^m(\Theta)) + k_{(1,2)}^{(m)}\text{pf}(M_{(1,2)}^{F^m(\Theta)}) + \cdots + k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{(m)}\text{pf}(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-2(m+1))}^{F^m(\Theta)}) + k_0^{(m)}$$

for some $k_I^{(m)}, k_0^{(m)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots, l-1$, where $I = (1, 2, \dots, n-2s)$ and $s = m+1, m+2, \dots, l-1$, $\tau_{F^m(\Theta)}$ is the canonical tracial state on $\mathcal{A}_{F^m(\Theta)}$.

In particular, when $m = 0$, we have the following:

Corollary 3.15. For any even number $n = 2l \geq 2$, if $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ satisfies

$$\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-1,n-p)}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-p-2)}^\Theta} \in (0, 1) \quad \text{for } p = n - 2j - 2, \quad j = 1, \dots, l - 2, \quad (\text{e 3.44})$$

and $\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-1,n)}^\Theta}{\text{pf}_{(1,2,\dots,n-2)}^\Theta} \notin \mathbb{Z}$, then there exist a (Rieffel-type) projection $p = p_0$ inside \mathcal{A}_Θ such that

$$\tau_\Theta(p) = \text{pf}(\Theta) + k_{(1,2)}\text{pf}(M_{(1,2)}^\Theta) + \dots + k_{(1,2,\dots,n-2)}\text{pf}(M_{(1,2,\dots,n-2)}^\Theta) + k_0$$

for some $k_I, k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $I = (1, 2, \dots, n - 2s)$ and $s = 1, 2, \dots, l - 1$, τ_Θ is the canonical tracial state on \mathcal{A}_Θ .

Let us now show that under suitable conditions on Θ , the numbers coming in the right hand side of the equation (e 3.13) may be realized as traces of the Rieffel-type projections in \mathcal{A}_Θ .

Theorem 3.16. Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ with $n \geq 2$. If

$$\text{pf}(F^j(M_I^\Theta)_{11}) \in (0, 1), \quad \text{and } \text{pf}(F^{m-1}(M_I^\Theta)_{11}) \notin \mathbb{Z} \quad (\text{e 3.45})$$

for all I with $2 \leq |I| \leq 2\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, $|I| = l = 2m$, and for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, m - 2$, then there exist (Rieffel-type) projections P_I , such that

$$\tau_\Theta(P_I) = \text{pf}(M_I^\Theta) + \sum_{0 < |J| < l} \text{pf}(M_J^\Theta)k_{I_J} + k_{I_0} \quad (\text{e 3.46})$$

for some $k_{I_J}, k_{I_0} \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $J = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_s)$ and $s = 2, 4, \dots, 2m - 2$, τ_Θ is the canonical tracial state on \mathcal{A}_Θ .

Proof. We use M_I^Θ instead of Θ in Corollary 3.15 to get $\tau_\Theta(P_I) = \text{pf}(M_I^\Theta) + \sum_{0 < |J| < l} \text{pf}(M_J^\Theta)k_{I_J} + k_{I_0}$. \square

The conditions in the above theorem are satisfied by many examples. For example, if $n = 2, 3$ any antisymmetric matrix with non-integer entries will work. For $n = 4$ let us consider the

following class of matrices: $\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \gamma & \gamma^2 & \gamma^8 \\ -\gamma & 0 & \gamma^4 & \gamma^{16} \\ -\gamma^2 & -\gamma^4 & 0 & \gamma^{32} \\ -\gamma^8 & -\gamma^{16} & -\gamma^{32} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. An easy computation

shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pf}(F^1(\Theta)_{11}) &\stackrel{(\text{e 3.12})}{=} \frac{\gamma \cdot \gamma^{32} - \gamma^2 \cdot \gamma^{16} + \gamma^8 \cdot \gamma^4}{\gamma} \\ &= \gamma^{11}(\gamma^{21} - \gamma^6 + 1) \notin \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence this class satisfies the conditions in the above theorem.

We will now see that the above projections form a generating set of $K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$, when Θ is totally irrational, under the assumptions of the above theorem.

Definition 3.17. We say that Θ is *strongly totally irrational* if $\Theta = (\theta_{jk}) \in \mathcal{T}_n$ is totally irrational matrix such that

$$\text{pf}(F^j(M_I^\Theta)_{11}) \in (0, 1) \quad (\text{when } n \geq 4) \quad (\text{e 3.47})$$

for all I with $4 \leq |I| \leq 2\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, and for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, m - 2$, where $|I| = 2m$. For $n = 2, 3$, we do not need the condition (e 3.47) to hold. (Here we don't need condition $\text{pf}(F^{m-1}(M_I^\Theta)_{11}) \notin \mathbb{Z}$ because it is satisfied automatically by (e 3.42) and Θ 's totally irrationality.)

Note that since $e^{2\pi i\theta} = e^{2\pi i(\theta+k)}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we can perturb Θ such a way that the condition (e 3.47) holds for $n = 4, 5$. Indeed, when $n = 4$, take $|I| = 4$. Then $M_I^\Theta = \Theta$ and $j = 0$ so that $\text{pf}(F^0(\Theta)_{11}) = \text{pf}(\Theta_{11}) = \theta_{12}$. If θ_{12} is not in $(0, 1)$, we can find some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\theta_{12} + k$ is in $(0, 1)$. Thus we can replace θ_{12} with $\theta_{12} + k$ in Θ (the corresponding noncommutative torus remains unchanged). When $n = 5$, all possible M_I^Θ 's are $M_{(1,2,3,4)}^\Theta, M_{(2,3,4,5)}^\Theta, M_{(1,3,4,5)}^\Theta, M_{(1,2,4,5)}^\Theta, M_{(1,2,3,5)}^\Theta$, and $j = 0$. As all possible $\text{pf}(F^j(M_I^\Theta)_{11})$'s are $\theta_{12}, \theta_{23}, \theta_{13}$, we can deal with them as in the case of $n = 4$.

For $n = 6$, we now determine a class of totally irrational matrices for which the condition (e 3.47) holds.

Proposition 3.18. *Let γ be a transcendental number in $(0, 1)$. Then for the matrix*

$$\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \gamma & \gamma^2 & \gamma^8 & \gamma^{64} & \gamma^{1024} \\ -\gamma & 0 & \gamma^4 & \gamma^{16} & \gamma^{128} & \gamma^{2048} \\ -\gamma^2 & -\gamma^4 & 0 & \gamma^{32} & \gamma^{256} & \gamma^{4096} \\ -\gamma^8 & -\gamma^{16} & -\gamma^{32} & 0 & \gamma^{512} & \gamma^{8192} \\ -\gamma^{64} & -\gamma^{128} & -\gamma^{256} & -\gamma^{512} & 0 & \gamma^{16384} \\ -\gamma^{1024} & -\gamma^{2048} & -\gamma^{4096} & -\gamma^{8192} & -\gamma^{16384} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

the condition (e 3.47) holds and Θ is totally irrational. Hence Θ is strongly totally irrational.

Proof. Since γ is transcendental, it is well known that the numbers $\gamma, \gamma^2, \dots, \gamma^{2^n}$, as well as any product the numbers are linear independent over \mathbb{Q} for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. So we have that Θ is totally irrational. For any $|I| = 4$, the condition (e 3.47) trivially holds for $j = 0$. For $|I| = 6$, namely $M_I^\Theta = \Theta$, again the condition (e 3.47) trivially holds for $j = 0$. For $j = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} F^1(\Theta) &= \Theta_{22} - \Theta_{21}\Theta_{11}^{-1}\Theta_{12} \\ \text{(e 3.14)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,4)}^\Theta}{\gamma} & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,5)}^\Theta}{\gamma} & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,6)}^\Theta}{\gamma} \\ -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,4)}^\Theta}{\gamma} & 0 & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,4,5)}^\Theta}{\gamma} & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,4,6)}^\Theta}{\gamma} \\ -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,5)}^\Theta}{\gamma} & -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,4,5)}^\Theta}{\gamma} & 0 & \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,5,6)}^\Theta}{\gamma} \\ -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,6)}^\Theta}{\gamma} & -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,4,6)}^\Theta}{\gamma} & -\frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,5,6)}^\Theta}{\gamma} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pf}(F^1(\Theta)_{11}) &= \frac{\text{pf}_{(1,2,3,4)}^\Theta}{\gamma} \\ \text{(e 3.12)} &= \frac{\gamma \cdot \gamma^{32} - \gamma^2 \cdot \gamma^{16} + \gamma^8 \cdot \gamma^4}{\gamma} \\ &= \gamma^{11}(\gamma^{21} - \gamma^6 + 1) \in (0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

□

In Appendix I, we provide a large class of examples of $n \times n$ skew-symmetric matrices, generalising Proposition 3.18, which satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.16. These skew-symmetric matrices can also be made totally irrational (see Corollary 4.27).

Theorem 3.19. *For any integer $n \geq 2$, let $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ be strongly totally irrational, then there exist (Rieffel-type) projections P_I , $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l)$, $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l \leq n$, $l = 2m$, $m = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, inside \mathcal{A}_Θ , such that*

$$\tau_\Theta(P_I) = \text{pf}(M_I^\Theta) + \sum_{0 < |J| < l} \text{pf}(M_J^\Theta)k_{I_J} + k_{I_0} \quad \text{(e 3.48)}$$

for some $k_{I_J}, k_{I_0} \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $J = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_s)$ and $s = 2, 4, \dots, 2m - 2$, τ_Θ is the canonical tracial state on \mathcal{A}_Θ . Moreover, the generators of $K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ are given by [1] and $\{P_I | I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l), 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l \leq n, l = 2m, m = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.16 and from the definition of strongly totally irrationality, we know that those projections $\{P_I\}$ exist. Note that since Θ is totally irrational, $(\tau_\Theta)_*$ is injective. So [1] and $\{P_I | I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l), 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l \leq n, l = 2m, m = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$ are the generators of $K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ by (e3.13). \square

In Appendix II, as an example, we will give explicit expressions of the Rieffel-type projections in \mathcal{A}_Θ when $n = 4$.

4 Stability of some relations in C^* -algebras of tracial rank at most one

From the above discussion, when $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ is strongly totally irrational, we know that P_I is in \mathcal{A}_Θ and P_I can be expressed in terms of $\mathbf{u}_{i_1}, \mathbf{u}_{i_2}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{i_l}$ by Theorem 3.19, where $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l)$, $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l \leq n$, $l = 2m$, $m = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Hence we can assume that

$$P_I = \sum_{k_1=-\infty}^{+\infty} \sum_{k_2=-\infty}^{+\infty} \cdots \sum_{k_l=-\infty}^{+\infty} a_{I, k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l} \mathbf{u}_{i_1}^{k_1} \mathbf{u}_{i_2}^{k_2} \cdots \mathbf{u}_{i_l}^{k_l}, \quad a_{I, k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l} \in \mathbb{C} \quad (\text{e 4.49})$$

where $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l)$, $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l \leq n$, $l = 2m$, $m = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$.

The following lemma is well known (we refer to the proof of Lemma 3 of [21]).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $f \in C([-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}] \cup [\frac{7}{8}, \frac{9}{8}])$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta' > 0$ such that for any unital C^* -algebra A and two self-adjoint elements $a, b \in A$ with $\text{spec}(a), \text{spec}(b) \subset [-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}] \cup [\frac{7}{8}, \frac{9}{8}]$, if $\|a - b\| < \delta'$, then $\|f(a) - f(b)\| < \epsilon$.*

From the lemma above, let $f = \chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}$ be the characteristic function on $(\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$, for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{8}$, there exists $\delta' > 0$ such that for any unital C^* -algebra A and two self-adjoint elements $a, b \in A$ with $\text{spec}(a), \text{spec}(b) \subset [-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}] \cup [\frac{7}{8}, \frac{9}{8}]$, if $\|a - b\| < \delta'$, then $\|\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(a) - \chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(b)\| < 1$.

Next we can choose a sufficiently large positive integer N such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|P_I - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{k_1=-N}^N \sum_{k_2=-N}^N \cdots \sum_{k_l=-N}^N a_{I, k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l} \mathbf{u}_{i_1}^{k_1} \mathbf{u}_{i_2}^{k_2} \cdots \mathbf{u}_{i_l}^{k_l} \right. \\ & \left. + \left(\sum_{k_1=-N}^N \sum_{k_2=-N}^N \cdots \sum_{k_l=-N}^N a_{I, k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l} \mathbf{u}_{i_1}^{k_1} \mathbf{u}_{i_2}^{k_2} \cdots \mathbf{u}_{i_l}^{k_l} \right)^* \right) \| < \delta' < \frac{1}{8}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{e 4.50})$$

for all P_I and $a_{I, k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l} \in \mathbb{C}$ is as in (e 4.49). Let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_I &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{k_1=-N}^N \sum_{k_2=-N}^N \cdots \sum_{k_l=-N}^N a_{I, k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l} \mathbf{u}_{i_1}^{k_1} \mathbf{u}_{i_2}^{k_2} \cdots \mathbf{u}_{i_l}^{k_l} \right. \\ & \left. + \left(\sum_{k_1=-N}^N \sum_{k_2=-N}^N \cdots \sum_{k_l=-N}^N a_{I, k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l} \mathbf{u}_{i_1}^{k_1} \mathbf{u}_{i_2}^{k_2} \cdots \mathbf{u}_{i_l}^{k_l} \right)^* \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{e 4.51})$$

It is obvious that \tilde{P}_I is a self-adjoint element, and $\text{spec}(\tilde{P}_I) \subset (-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}) \cup (\frac{7}{8}, \frac{9}{8})$. Thus by Lemma 4.1 we have

$$\|\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(P_I) - \chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(\tilde{P}_I)\| < 1, \quad (\text{e 4.52})$$

i.e.

$$\|P_I - \chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(\tilde{P}_I)\| < 1. \quad (\text{e 4.53})$$

Thus by Lemma 2.5.1 of [28], we know that

$$[P_I] = [\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(\tilde{P}_I)] \quad (\text{e 4.54})$$

in $K_0(A_\Theta)$.

Definition 4.2. Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk}) \in \mathcal{T}_n$ be strongly totally irrational. Let \mathcal{A} be a unital C^* -algebra and u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n be an n -tuple of unitaries in \mathcal{A} . We define

$$\begin{aligned} e_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{k_1=-N}^N \sum_{k_2=-N}^N \cdots \sum_{k_l=-N}^N a_{I, k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l} u_{i_1}^{k_1} u_{i_2}^{k_2} \cdots u_{i_l}^{k_l} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\sum_{k_1=-N}^N \sum_{k_2=-N}^N \cdots \sum_{k_l=-N}^N a_{I, k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l} u_{i_1}^{k_1} u_{i_2}^{k_2} \cdots u_{i_l}^{k_l} \right)^* \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l)$, $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_l \leq n$, $l = 2m$, $m = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, $a_{I, k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l}$ is as in (e 4.49), and N is as in (e 4.50). In the absence of ambiguity, we often use e_I to express $e_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$ briefly. It is clear that e_I is always self-adjoint.

Remark 4.3. In the above definition, we do not directly define e_I in the form of P_I , but instead use the form of \tilde{P}_I . This is because e_I may not converge if we use the form of P_I .

Remark 4.4. If u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n in a unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} satisfy $u_k u_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k$ for $j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, then $\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(e_I)$ is a projection in \mathcal{A} for every I . This is because \mathcal{A}_Θ is the universal C^* -algebra generated by u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n subject to the relations $u_k u_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k$, $j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, there exists a homomorphism $\varphi : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $\varphi(u_j) = u_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Thus $\varphi(\tilde{P}_I) = e_I$ for any possible I defined as in Definition 4.2, we have $\varphi(\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(\tilde{P}_I)) = \chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(e_I)$. It follows that $\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(e_I)$ is a projection in \mathcal{A} . In particular, by (e 4.54) we have

$$[\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(e_I(u_1, \dots, u_n))] = [\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(\tilde{P}_I)] = [P_I] \quad (\text{e 4.55})$$

in $K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ for any possible I defined in Definition 4.2.

Proposition 4.5. Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk}) \in \mathcal{T}_n$. There exists a $\delta > 0$ such that: For any unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , any n -tuple of unitaries u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n in \mathcal{A} satisfying $\|u_k u_j - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k\| < \delta$ for $j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we have $\|(e_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n))^2 - e_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)\| < \frac{1}{4}$ for any possible I defined in Definition 4.2. In particular, $\text{spec}(e_I)$ has a gap at $\frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. Suppose the statement is false. Let $(\delta_m)_{m=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of positive numbers decreasing to 0. Then for any positive integer m , there exists a unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A}_m , a n -tuple of unitaries $\tilde{u}_{1m}, \tilde{u}_{2m}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{nm}$ in \mathcal{A}_m such that $\|u_{km} u_{jm} - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_{jm} u_{km}\| < \delta_m$, but

$$\|(e_I(\tilde{u}_{1m}, \tilde{u}_{2m}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{nm}))^2 - e_I(\tilde{u}_{1m}, \tilde{u}_{2m}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{nm})\| \geq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Let $\mathcal{B} = \prod_{m=1}^\infty \mathcal{A}_m / \oplus_{m=1}^\infty \mathcal{A}_m$. Let $\pi : \prod_{m=1}^\infty \mathcal{A}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be the canonical quotient map. Let $\tilde{u}_j = (\tilde{u}_{j1}, \tilde{u}_{j2}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{jm}, \dots)$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then $\pi(\tilde{u}_j)$ satisfies $\pi(\tilde{u}_k)\pi(\tilde{u}_j) = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} \pi(\tilde{u}_j)\pi(\tilde{u}_k)$, hence there is a homomorphism

$$\phi : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{B}, \quad \phi(u_j) = \pi(\tilde{u}_j) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

where $\mathbf{u}_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ are the canonical generators of \mathcal{A}_Θ . In particular, the element

$$\pi(e_I(\tilde{u}_{11}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{n1}), e_I(\tilde{u}_{12}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{n2}), \dots) = \pi(e_I(\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_n)) = \phi(e_I(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n))$$

and $\text{spec}(\phi(e_I(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n))) = \text{spec}(\phi(\tilde{P}_I)) \subset (-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}) \cup (-\frac{7}{8}, \frac{9}{8})$. But this implies that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|(e_I(\tilde{u}_{1m}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{1m}))^2 - e_I(\tilde{u}_{1m}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{nm})\| < \frac{9}{64} < \frac{1}{4},$$

which is a contradiction. \square

Definition 4.6. Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk}) \in \mathcal{T}_n$ be strongly totally irrational. Let $\delta > 0$ be chosen as in Proposition 4.5. Let \mathcal{A} be a unital C^* -algebra and let u_1, \dots, u_n be an n -tuple of unitaries in \mathcal{A} with $\|u_k u_j - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k\| < \delta$ for $j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Let $\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, \infty)}$ be the characteristic function on $(\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$. We define $R_I(u_1, \dots, u_n) = \chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, \infty)}(e_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n))$. In particular, when $n = 2$, we have $R_{\theta_{12}}(u_1, u_2) = [R_{(1,2)}(u_1, u_2)]$, where $R_{\theta_{12}}(u_1, u_2)$ is defined as in Definition 2.9.

Let $\mathcal{C} = PM_n(C(X))P$ be a homogenous algebra, where X is a compact metric space and P is a projection in $M_n(C(X))$. Then for any tracial state τ on \mathcal{C} , there is a probability measure μ on X such that

$$\tau(f) = \int_{x \in X} \text{tr}_x(f(x)) d\mu,$$

where tr_x is the normalized trace on the fiber corresponding to x (which is isomorphic to a matrix algebra). We shall use μ_τ to denote the measure associated to τ .

Let \mathcal{A} be a unital C^* -algebra with $T(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$. By Theorem 3.2 of [42], the de la Harpe-Scandalis determinant provides a continuous homomorphism

$$\bar{\Delta}: U_0(M_\infty(\mathcal{A}))/CU(M_\infty(\mathcal{A})) \rightarrow \text{Aff}(T(\mathcal{A}))/\overline{\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbb{K}_0(\mathcal{A}))}. \quad (\text{e 4.56})$$

By Corollary 3.3 of [42], there is an induced split exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Aff}(T(\mathcal{A}))/\overline{\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbb{K}_0(\mathcal{A}))} \rightarrow U(M_\infty(\mathcal{A}))/CU(M_\infty(\mathcal{A})) \xrightarrow{\pi_{\mathcal{A}}} \mathbb{K}_1(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{e 4.57})$$

The reader is referred to [42] for more details of the homomorphism (e 4.56) and the exact sequence (e 4.57).

Since the exact sequence (e 4.57) is split, there is a homomorphism

$$J_{\mathcal{A}}: \mathbb{K}_1(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow U(M_\infty(\mathcal{A}))/CU(M_\infty(\mathcal{A}))$$

such that $\pi_{\mathcal{A}} \circ J_{\mathcal{A}} = \text{id}_{\mathbb{K}_1(\mathcal{A})}$. We shall use $U_c(\mathbb{K}_1(\mathcal{A}))$ to denote a set of representatives of $J_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbb{K}_1(\mathcal{A}))$ in $U(M_\infty(\mathcal{A}))$. For each \mathcal{A} , we shall fix a splitting map $J_{\mathcal{A}}$ and a set of representatives $U_c(\mathbb{K}_1(\mathcal{A}))$ if not mentioned explicitly.

For any two unitaries $u, v \in U(M_\infty(\mathcal{A}))$ such that $uv^* \in U_0(M_\infty(\mathcal{A}))$, define

$$\text{dist}(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = \|\bar{\Delta}(uv^*)\|,$$

where the norm is the quotient norm on $\text{Aff}(T(\mathcal{A}))/\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbb{K}_0(\mathcal{A}))$.

The following lemma allows us to estimate the norm we just defined:

Lemma 4.7 (Lemma 5.2 of [23]). *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that, whenever \mathcal{A} is a unital C^* -algebra, if u, v are unitaries in $U_\infty(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\|wuv^* - 1\| < \delta$ for some $w \in CU_\infty(\mathcal{A})$, then*

$$\text{dist}(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) < \varepsilon.$$

Definition 4.8. Let X be a compact metric space, let $x \in X$ and let $r > 0$. Denote by $O_r(x)$ the open ball with center at x and radius r . If x is not specified, O_r is an open ball of radius r .

Let us begin with a brief outline of our strategy of proving stability of rotation relations of n unitaries for $n \geq 2$. Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$. Suppose u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n are n unitaries in a unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , and u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n satisfy (e 1.4). Then there is an almost homomorphism from \mathcal{A}_Θ to \mathcal{A} . Now stability of relations (e 1.6) is equivalent to that this almost homomorphism is close to an actual homomorphism.

The latter problem is usually divided into two parts: the existence part and the uniqueness part. An almost homomorphism will induce an ‘almost’ homomorphism between the invariants of the two C^* -algebras, where the invariant consists of the K-theories. It is usually easier to show that an ‘almost’ homomorphism of the invariants is close to an actual homomorphism. The existence part says that a homomorphism at the invariant level lifts to a homomorphism at the C^* -algebra level. The uniqueness part says that, two almost homomorphisms which induces ‘almost’ the same maps on the invariants are almost unitarily equivalent. Therefore, conjugating suitable unitaries, one shows that an almost homomorphism is close to an actual homomorphism.

Now we are ready to state the uniqueness theorem and the existence theorem.

Theorem 4.9 (Theorem 5.3 and Corollary 5.5 of [31]). *Let $\mathcal{C} = PM_n(C(X))P$, where X is a compact metric space and P is a projection in $M_n(C(X))$. Let $\Delta: (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 1)$ be a non-decreasing function such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \Delta(r) = 0$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{C}$ be a finite subset. Then there exists $\eta > 0$, $\delta > 0$, a finite subset $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{C}$, a finite subset $\mathcal{P} \subset \underline{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{C})$, a finite subset $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{C}_{s.a.}$ and a finite subset $\mathcal{U} \subset U_c(\mathbb{K}_1(\mathcal{C}))$ satisfying the following:*

Suppose that \mathcal{A} is a unital separable simple C^ -algebra with $TR(\mathcal{A}) \leq 1$. Suppose $L_1, L_2: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ are two unital \mathcal{G} - δ -multiplicative completely positive contractive maps such that*

$$\begin{aligned} (L_1)_*|_{\mathcal{P}} &= (L_2)_*|_{\mathcal{P}}, \\ |\tau \circ L_1(g) - \tau \circ L_2(g)| &< \delta, \quad \text{for all } g \in \mathcal{H} \\ \text{dist}(\overline{\langle L_1(u) \rangle}, \overline{\langle L_2(u) \rangle}) &< \delta, \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathcal{U} \quad \text{and} \\ \mu_{\tau \circ L_i}(O_r) &> \Delta(r), \quad i = 1, 2, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$ and all open balls O_r in X with radius $r \geq \eta$. Then there exists a unitary $w \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\|\text{Ad}w \circ L_1(f) - L_2(f)\| < \varepsilon \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Definition 4.10. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two unital C^* -algebras. Let $\kappa \in \text{KL}_e(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A})^{++}$ and let $\lambda: T(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow T(\mathcal{B})$ be a continuous affine map. We say that λ is compatible with κ if λ is compatible with $\kappa|_{\mathbb{K}_0(\mathcal{B})}$. (i.e. $\rho_{\mathcal{B}}([p])(\lambda(\tau)) = \rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\kappa([p]))(\tau)$, for any projection $p \in M_\infty(\mathcal{B})$ and any tracial state $\tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$). Let

$$\alpha: U(M_\infty(\mathcal{B}))/CU(M_\infty(\mathcal{B})) \rightarrow U(\mathcal{A})/CU(\mathcal{A})$$

be a continuous homomorphism. Then by the exact sequence (e 4.57), there is an induced map $\alpha_1: \mathbb{K}_1(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_1(\mathcal{A})$. We say α and κ are compatible, if $\alpha_1 = \kappa|_{\mathbb{K}_1(\mathcal{B})}$. We say α, λ and κ are compatible if λ, κ are compatible, α, λ are compatible and α, κ are compatible.

Theorem 4.11 (Theorem 6.11 of [31]). *Let \mathcal{B} be a unital AH-algebra and let \mathcal{A} be a unital infinite dimensional separable simple C^* -algebra with $TR(\mathcal{A}) \leq 1$. Then for any $\kappa \in \text{KL}_e(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A})^{++}$, any affine continuous map $\gamma: T(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow T_f(\mathcal{B})$ and any continuous homomorphism*

$$\alpha: U(M_\infty(\mathcal{B}))/CU(M_\infty(\mathcal{B})) \rightarrow U(\mathcal{A})/CU(\mathcal{A})$$

such that κ, γ and α are compatible, there is a unital monomorphism $\varphi: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\varphi_* = \kappa, \quad \varphi_\# = \gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi^\ddagger = \alpha.$$

Below we will always use “c.p.c.” for the abbreviation of “completely positive contractive”.

Proposition 4.12. *Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk}) \in \mathcal{T}_n$. Let $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n$ be the canonical generators of \mathcal{A}_Θ . Then for any finite subset $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{A}_\Theta$, any $\eta > 0$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , any n -tuple of unitaries u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n in \mathcal{A} satisfying*

$$\|u_k u_j - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k\| < \delta \text{ for all } j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

there is a unital \mathcal{G} - η -multiplicative c.p.c. map $L : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\|L(\mathbf{u}_j) - u_j\| < \varepsilon \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Proof. Assume that the proposition is false. Let $(\delta_m)_{m=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of positive numbers decreasing to 0. Then there is a finite subset $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{A}_\Theta$, some $\varepsilon, \eta > 0$ such that for any integer $m > 0$, there is a unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A}_m , an n -tuple of unitaries $u_1^{(m)}, u_2^{(m)}, \dots, u_n^{(m)}$ in \mathcal{A}_m satisfying

$$\|u_k^{(m)} u_j^{(m)} - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j^{(m)} u_k^{(m)}\| < \delta_m,$$

but for any unital \mathcal{G} - η -multiplicative c.p.c. map $\varphi_m : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_m$, we have

$$\|\varphi_m(\mathbf{u}_{j_m}) - u_{j_m}^{(m)}\| \geq \varepsilon \text{ for some } j_m \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

Set $\mathcal{B} = \prod_{m=1}^\infty \mathcal{A}_m / \oplus_{m=1}^\infty \mathcal{A}_m$. Let $\ell : \prod_{m=1}^\infty \mathcal{A}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be the canonical quotient map. Let $u_j = (u_j^{(m)}) \in \prod_{m=1}^\infty \mathcal{A}_m$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then $\{\ell(u_j)\}_{j=1}^n$ are unitaries in \mathcal{B} satisfying

$$\ell(u_k) \ell(u_j) = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} \ell(u_j) \ell(u_k).$$

Therefore there is a unital homomorphism $\psi : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ such that

$$\psi(\mathbf{u}_j) = \ell(u_j) \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

It is well known that \mathcal{A}_Θ is nuclear. By the Choi–Effros lifting theorem, we can lift ψ to a unital c.p.c. map

$$\tilde{\psi} = (\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_m, \dots) : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \prod_{m=1}^\infty \mathcal{A}_m$$

such that $\psi = \ell \circ \tilde{\psi}$. In particular, each coordinate map ψ_m is unital completely positive, and we can also assume that they are contractive by normalization. By choosing m large enough, we can make sure that ψ_m is \mathcal{G} - η -multiplicative. From our construction,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|\psi_m(\mathbf{u}_j) - u_j^{(m)}\| = 0 \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

This is a contradiction. □

The following lemma follows from functional calculus and the fact that norm close projections (or unitaries) are equivalent.

Lemma 4.13. *Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ be strongly totally irrational. Let $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n$ be the canonical generators of \mathcal{A}_Θ . Then there is a finite subset $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{A}_\Theta$, some $\eta > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, such that for any unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , any n -tuple of unitaries u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n in \mathcal{A} , if $L : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a \mathcal{G} - η -multiplicative c.p.c. map such that*

$$\|L(\mathbf{u}_j) - u_j\| < \varepsilon, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

then

$$L_{*1}([\mathbf{u}_j]) = [u_j], \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

and

$$L_{*0}([P_I]) = [R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)], \text{ for all } I \text{ defined as in Definition 4.2.}$$

Lemma 4.14 (Lemma 4.1 of [29]). *Let \mathcal{A} be a separable unital C^* -algebra. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any finite subset $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{A}_{s.a.}$, there exists $\eta > 0$ and a finite subset $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{A}_{s.a.}$ satisfying the following: For any \mathcal{G} - η -multiplicative c.p.c. map $L : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, for any unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{B} with $T(\mathcal{B}) \neq \emptyset$, and any tracial state $t \in T(\mathcal{B})$, there exists a $\tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$ such that*

$$\|t \circ L(a) - \tau(a)\| < \varepsilon \text{ for all } a \in \mathcal{F}.$$

We say that $\Theta = (\theta_{jk}) \in \mathcal{T}_n$ is *not rational* if $\theta_{jk}, 1 \leq j < k \leq n$ are not all rational. Note that if Θ is nondegenerate, then it is not rational. If Θ is totally irrational, then it is also not rational.

Theorem 4.15 (Theorem 8.3 of [37]). *If Θ is not rational, then the natural map from $U(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)/U_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ to $K_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ is an isomorphism.*

Lemma 4.16. *Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk}) \in \mathcal{T}_n$ be totally irrational. Let $\pi_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta} : U_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)/CU_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) \rightarrow K_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ be the natural surjective homomorphism. Let $[u'_j], j = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{n-1}$ be a set of generators of $K_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$. Let $J_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta} : K_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) \rightarrow U_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)/CU_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ be the embedding induced by*

$$[u'_j] \rightarrow \overline{[u'_j]}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{n-1}.$$

Let $\{\overline{w}_1, \overline{w}_2, \dots, \overline{w}_m\}$ be a finite subset of $J_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}(K_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta))$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a finite subset $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{A}_\Theta$ and a $\eta > 0$ such that, for any unital C^ -algebra \mathcal{A} and any unital \mathcal{G} - η -multiplicative c.p.c. map $L : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, the homomorphism*

$$\alpha_1 : J_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}(K_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)) \rightarrow U_\infty(\mathcal{A})/CU_\infty(\mathcal{A}), \quad \alpha_1(\overline{u'_j}) = \overline{\langle L(u'_j) \rangle}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{n-1}$$

satisfies $\text{dist}(\overline{\langle L(w_j) \rangle}, \alpha_1(\overline{w}_j)) < \varepsilon$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Choose $\delta > 0$ according to Lemma 5.2 of [23]. We can also choose u'_j to be in \mathcal{A}_Θ according to Theorem 4.15. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{u'_j, (u'_j)^{-1} \mid j = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{n-1}\}$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\mathcal{F}_k = \{\text{diag}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \mid a_j \in \mathcal{F}, j = 1, 2, \dots, k\}.$$

It is easy to see that, there is some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough such that, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, we can find an element $b_j \in \mathcal{F}_N$ and unitaries v_j, s_j such that

$$\|w_j - b_j v_j s_j v_j^* s_j^*\| < \frac{\delta}{4} \text{ and } \alpha_1(\overline{w}_j) = \alpha_1(\overline{b}_j).$$

Since $\langle L(\cdot) \rangle$ is defined by continuous functional calculus on the set of unitaries, there is a η_1 such that whenever $L : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a unital \mathcal{F} - η_1 -multiplicative c.p.c. map, we have $\|\langle L(u'_j) \rangle^{-1} - \langle L((u'_j)^{-1}) \rangle\| < \frac{\delta}{4}$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{n-1}$.

Let $\mathcal{G}_1 = \{v_j, s_j, v_j^*, s_j^* \mid j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$. There is a η_2 such that whenever $L : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a unital \mathcal{G}_1 - η_2 -multiplicative c.p.c. map, we have

$$\|\langle L(v_j s_j v_j^* s_j^*) \rangle - \langle L(v_j) \rangle \langle L(s_j) \rangle \langle L(v_j) \rangle^* \langle L(s_j) \rangle^*\| < \frac{\delta}{4} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}_1$ and let $\eta = \min\{\eta_1, \eta_2, \frac{\delta}{4}\}$. Let \mathcal{A} be a unital C^* -algebra. Suppose that $L : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a unital \mathcal{G} - η -multiplicative c.p.c. map. Define α_1 to be the homomorphism:

$$\alpha_1 : J_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}(K_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)) \rightarrow U_\infty(\mathcal{A})/CU_\infty(\mathcal{A}), \quad \alpha_1(\overline{u'_j}) = \overline{\langle L(u'_j) \rangle}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{n-1}.$$

By our construction, for any $b_j \in \mathcal{F}_N$, there is a unitary $c_j \in U_\infty(\mathcal{A})$ such that

$$\alpha_1(\overline{b}_j) = \overline{c}_j \text{ and } \|c_j - \langle L(b_j) \rangle\| < \frac{\delta}{4}.$$

Therefore we have $\alpha_1(\overline{w_j}) = \overline{c_j}$. Moreover, we can compute that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|c_j - \langle L(w_j) \rangle \langle L(v_j) \rangle \langle L(s_j) \rangle \langle L(v_j) \rangle^* \langle L(s_j) \rangle^* \| \\ & < \|c_j - \langle L(b_j v_j s_j v_j^* s_j^*) \rangle \langle L(v_j) \rangle \langle L(s_j) \rangle \langle L(v_j) \rangle^* \langle L(s_j) \rangle^* \| + \frac{\delta}{4} \\ & < \eta + \frac{\delta}{4} + \frac{\delta}{4} + \|c_j - \langle L(b_j) \rangle\| < \delta. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.7, we have $\text{dist}(\alpha_1(\overline{w_j}), \overline{\langle L(w_j) \rangle}) < \varepsilon$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. \square

Lemma 4.17 (Lemma 5.11 of [23]). *Let (X, d) be an infinite compact metric space. Let $\mathcal{C} = PM_n(C(X))P$, where P is a projection in $M_n(C(X))$. Let τ_0 be a faithful tracial state on \mathcal{C} . Define a function $\Delta: (0, 10) \rightarrow (0, 1)$ by*

$$\Delta(r) = \min\{\mu_{\tau_0}(O_{\frac{r}{10}}(x)) \mid x \in X\}, \quad 0 < r < 10.$$

Then Δ is a strictly increasing function such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \Delta(r) = 0$.

Moreover, for any $\eta > 0$, there exists a finite subset $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{C}_+ \setminus \{0\}$ and a $\delta > 0$ such that, whenever $L: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a c.p.c. map and τ is a tracial state on \mathcal{A} , if

$$|\tau \circ L(h) - \tau_0(h)| < \delta \quad \text{for all } h \in \mathcal{H},$$

then $\mu_{\tau \circ L}(O_r) > \Delta(r)$ for all $r \geq \eta$.

Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk}) \in \mathcal{T}_n$ be strongly totally irrational. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Let $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n$ be the generators of \mathcal{A}_Θ satisfying

$$\mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{u}_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} \mathbf{u}_j \mathbf{u}_k \text{ for } j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Recall that \mathcal{A}_Θ is an AT-algebra with the unique tracial state τ_Θ , and $K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) \cong K_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{2n-1}$, by Theorem 2.3. By Lemma 4.1.2 of [28] we may assume $\mathcal{A}_\Theta = \overline{\cup_{k=1}^\infty \mathcal{B}_k}$, $\mathcal{B}_k \subset \mathcal{B}_{k+1}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, where each \mathcal{B}_k is a finite direct sum of C^* -algebras of the form $M_m(C(X))$, where X is S^1 , an arc or a point. Set $\mathcal{F} = \{1_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}, \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n\}$. Choose a sufficiently large k such that for every a in \mathcal{F} , there is an $\tilde{a} \in \mathcal{B}_k$ such that $\|a - \tilde{a}\| < \varepsilon$. Next we denote \mathcal{B}_k by \mathcal{C} . For simplicity, in the proof of Lemma 4.18 and Theorem 4.19 we assume that $\mathcal{C} = M_m(C(X))$. The proof for \mathcal{C} being the direct sum of such algebras is similar. Next we use $\iota: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\Theta$ to denote the inclusion map. Define a function $\Delta: (0, 10) \rightarrow (0, 1)$ by

$$\Delta(r) = \min\{\mu_{\tau_\mathcal{C}}(O_{\frac{r}{10}}(x))\}, \quad 0 < r < 10,$$

where $\tau_\mathcal{C} = \tau_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}|_{\mathcal{C}}$.

Lemma 4.18. *Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk}) \in \mathcal{T}_n$ be strongly totally irrational. Let $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n$ be the canonical generators of \mathcal{A}_Θ . Set $\mathcal{F} = \{1_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}, \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n\}$. Let \mathcal{C} and Δ be as in the above paragraph. Then for any finite subset $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{A}_\Theta$, and any $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $\eta > 0, \delta_1$ (in place of δ), a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \subset \mathcal{C}$, a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \subset \underline{K}(\mathcal{C})$, a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0 \subset \mathcal{C}_{s.a.}$ and a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} \subset U_c(K_1(\mathcal{C}))$ with respect to Δ, ε and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ (in place of \mathcal{F}) according to Theorem 4.9. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , any n -tuple of unitaries u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n in \mathcal{A} satisfying*

$$\|u_k u_j - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k\| < \delta \text{ for all } j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

there is a unital \mathcal{G} - δ_1 -multiplicative c.p.c. map $L: \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that:

(1) there is a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subset \mathcal{C}$, such that for any $a \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists $\tilde{a} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ such that

$$\|\iota(\tilde{a}) - a\| < \varepsilon,$$

(2)

$$\|L(\mathbf{u}_j) - u_j\| < \varepsilon \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

and

$$L_{*1}([\mathbf{u}_j]) = [u_j] \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

and

$$L_{*0}([P_I]) = [R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)] \text{ for all } I \text{ defined as in Definition 4.2,}$$

where P_I is as in Theorem 3.19 and $R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$ is defined as in Definition 4.6.

(3) the homomorphism

$$\alpha_1 : J_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}(\mathbf{K}_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)) \rightarrow U_\infty(\mathcal{A})/CU_\infty(\mathcal{A}), \quad \alpha_1(\bar{\mathbf{u}}_j) = \overline{\langle L(\mathbf{u}_j) \rangle}, \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

satisfies $\text{dist}(\overline{\langle L(\iota(s)) \rangle}, \alpha_1(\overline{\langle \iota(s) \rangle})) < \delta_1$ for all $s \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$.

(4) put $\tilde{L} = L \circ \iota$, we have

$$\|\tau \circ \tilde{L}(h) - \tau_\Theta(\iota(h))\| < \delta_1 \text{ for all } h \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0.$$

Moreover,

$$\mu_{\tau \circ \tilde{L}}(O_r) > \Delta(r)$$

for all $\tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$ and all open balls O_r in X with radius $r \geq \eta$.

Proof. For (1), it is obvious according to the discussion above this lemma.

Next we use $[u'_1], [u'_2], \dots, [u'_{2^n-1}]$ to denote a set of generators of $\mathbf{K}_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$. We define a splitting map:

$$J_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta} : \mathbf{K}_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) \rightarrow U_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)/CU_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta), \quad J_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}([u'_j]) = \bar{u}'_j, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, 2^n-1.$$

Then there is a splitting map $J_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathbf{K}_1(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow U_\infty(\mathcal{C})/CU_\infty(\mathcal{C})$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_\infty(\mathcal{C})/CU_\infty(\mathcal{C}) & \xleftarrow{J_{\mathcal{C}}} & \mathbf{K}_1(\mathcal{C}) \\ \downarrow \iota^\ddagger & & \downarrow \iota_* \\ U_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)/CU_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) & \xleftarrow{J_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}} & \mathbf{K}_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta). \end{array}$$

Choose $\eta > 0, \delta_1$ (in place of δ), a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \subset \mathcal{C}$, a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \subset \underline{\mathbf{K}}(\mathcal{C})$, a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0 \subset \mathcal{C}_{s.a.}$ and a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} \subset U_c(\mathbf{K}_1(\mathcal{C}))$ with respect to Δ, ε and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ (in place of \mathcal{F}) according to Theorem 4.9.

By Lemma 4.17, there exists a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1 \in \mathcal{C}_+ \setminus \{0\}$ and a $\delta_2 \leq \delta_1$ such that, for any C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , whenever $\tilde{L} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a c.p.c. map and τ is a tracial state on \mathcal{A} , if

$$\|\tau \circ \tilde{L}(h) - \tau_{\mathcal{C}}(h)\| < \delta_2 \text{ for all } h \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1,$$

then $\mu_{\tau \circ \tilde{L}}(O_r) > \Delta(r)$, for all $r \geq \eta$.

Let $\mathcal{H} = \iota(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0 \cup \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1)$. Choose a finite subset $\mathcal{G}_0 \subset \mathcal{A}_\Theta$, a $\delta_3 > 0$ and a positive integer N with respect to \mathcal{H} and δ_2 (in place of ε) according to Lemma 4.14.

Let $\bar{\mathcal{U}} = \{\overline{\langle \iota(s) \rangle} | s \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}\}$. Then $\bar{\mathcal{U}}$ is a finite subset of $J_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}(\mathbf{K}_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta))$. By Lemma 4.16, there is a finite subset \mathcal{G}_1 and a δ_4 such that, for any unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} and any unital \mathcal{G}_1 - δ_4 -multiplicative c.p.c. map $L : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, there is a homomorphism

$$\alpha_1 : J_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}(\mathbf{K}_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)) \rightarrow U_\infty(\mathcal{A})/CU_\infty(\mathcal{A})$$

such that $\text{dist}(\overline{\langle L(\iota(s)) \rangle}, \alpha_1(\overline{\iota(s)})) < \delta_1$ for all $s \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$.

Let $\mathcal{P} = \iota_*(\tilde{\mathcal{P}})$. Since $K_*(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ is torsion free, by Proposition 2.4 of [41], we have $K_*(\mathcal{A}_\Theta; \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}) \cong K_*(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. By the description of $K_*(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$, we may assume without loss of generality that $\mathcal{P} = \{[1_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}], [u'_1], [u'_2], \dots, [u'_{2n-1}]\} \cup \{[P_I] \mid I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l), 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor, l = 2m, m \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}\}$.

By Lemma 4.13, we can choose a finite subset $\mathcal{G}_2 \subset \mathcal{A}_\Theta$, $0 < \varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon$ and $\delta_5 > 0$ so that whenever u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n are unitaries in \mathcal{A} and $L : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a \mathcal{G}_2 - δ_5 -multiplicative c.p.c. map such that

$$\|L(u_j) - u_j\| < \varepsilon_0 \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

then

$$L_{*0}([P_I]) = [R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)] \text{ for every possible } I,$$

and

$$L_{*1}([u_j]) = [u_j] \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Set $\mathcal{G} = \iota(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}) \cup \mathcal{G}_0 \cup \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2$. Let $\delta_6 = \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4, \delta_5\}$. Find a positive number $\delta \leq \delta_6$ according to \mathcal{G} , δ_6 (in place of η) and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ (in place of ε) as in Proposition 4.12.

Now suppose that \mathcal{A} is a unital simple C^* -algebra with tracial rank at most one. Let $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n \in \mathcal{A}$ be unitaries such that

$$\|u_k u_j - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k\| < \delta, \quad j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

By Proposition 4.12, there is a unital \mathcal{G} - δ_6 -multiplicative c.p.c. map $L : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $\|L(u_j) - u_j\| < \varepsilon_0$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. By Lemma 4.16, the homomorphism

$$\alpha_1 : J_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}(K_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)) \rightarrow U_\infty(\mathcal{A})/CU_\infty(\mathcal{A}), \quad \alpha_1(\bar{u}_j) = \overline{\langle L(u_j) \rangle}, \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

satisfies $\text{dist}(\overline{\langle L(\iota(s)) \rangle}, \alpha_1(\overline{\iota(s)})) < \delta_1$ for all $s \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$.

Since τ_Θ is the only tracial state on \mathcal{A}_Θ , by Lemma 4.14, we have

$$\|\tau \circ L(h) - \tau_\Theta(h)\| < \delta_2 \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Therefore

$$\|\tau \circ \tilde{L}(h) - \tau_\Theta(\iota(h))\| = \|\tau \circ L(\iota(h)) - \tau \circ \tilde{\phi}(h)\| < \delta_2 \leq \delta_1$$

for all $\tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$ and $h \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0$.

The same computation shows that

$$\|\tau \circ \tilde{L}(h) - \tau_\Theta(\iota(h))\| < \delta_2 \text{ for all } h \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1.$$

So by Lemma 4.17, we have

$$\mu_{\tau \circ \tilde{L}}(O_r) > \Delta(r) \text{ for all } r \geq \eta.$$

□

Now let us prove our main result.

Theorem 4.19. *Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk}) \in \mathcal{T}_n$ be strongly totally irrational. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ satisfying the following: For any unital simple separable C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} with tracial rank at most one, any n -tuple of unitaries u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n in \mathcal{A} such that*

$$\|u_k u_j - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k\| < \delta, \quad j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

and

$$\tau(R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)) = \text{pf}(M_I^\Theta) + \sum_{0 < |J| < l} \text{pf}(M_J^\Theta) k_{I_J} + k_{I_0} \quad (\text{e 4.58})$$

for all possible $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l)$, $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l \leq n$, $l = 2m$, $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$, and all tracial states τ on \mathcal{A} , where $R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$ is defined as in Definition 4.6, $k_{I_J}, k_{I_0} \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the same as in Corollary 3.19, $J = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_s)$, $|J| = s$; there exists an n -tuple of unitaries $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_n$ in \mathcal{A} such that

$$\tilde{u}_k \tilde{u}_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} \tilde{u}_j \tilde{u}_k \text{ and } \|\tilde{u}_j - u_j\| < \varepsilon, \quad j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Let u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n be the generators of \mathcal{A}_Θ satisfying

$$u_k u_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k \text{ for } j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Set $\mathcal{F} = \{1_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$. Choose \mathcal{C} using Lemma 4.18 (replace ε with $\frac{\varepsilon}{3}$), so there is a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subset \mathcal{C}$ such that for every a in \mathcal{F} , there is an $\tilde{a} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ such that $\|a - \tilde{a}\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$. We use $\iota : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\Theta$ to denote the inclusion map.

Note that $[1]$ and $\{[P_I] \mid I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l), 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l \leq n, l = 2m, m = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$ are the generators of $K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ by Theorem 3.19. We define $\kappa_0 : K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) \rightarrow K_0(\mathcal{A})$ to be the homomorphism induced by

$$\kappa_0([1_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}]) = [1_{\mathcal{A}}], \quad \kappa_0([P_I]) = [R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)] \text{ for all possible } I.$$

We claim that this is a positive homomorphism. Indeed, let $[p] \in K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ be a positive element. Then $(\tau_\Theta)_*([p]) > 0$. There are integers n_0, n_I for every possible I such that

$$[p] = n_0[1_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}] + \sum_I n_I [P_I].$$

So for any tracial state τ on \mathcal{A} , by (e 3.48) and (e 4.58) we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_0([p])(\tau) &= n_0 \tau_*([1_{\mathcal{A}}]) + \sum_I n_I \tau_*([R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)]) \\ &= n_0 (\tau_\Theta)_*([1_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}]) + \sum_I n_I (\tau_\Theta)_*([P_I]) = (\tau_B)_*([p]) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 3.7.2 of [28] \mathcal{A} has strict comparison, which shows that $\kappa_0([p])$ is positive.

Define a map

$$\gamma : T(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow T(\mathcal{A}_\Theta), \quad \gamma(\tau) = \tau_\Theta, \text{ for all } \tau \in T(\mathcal{A}).$$

It induces an affine map $\gamma_\# : \text{Aff}(T(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)) \rightarrow \text{Aff}(T(\mathcal{A}))$. For any tracial state $\tau \in \mathcal{A}$, we can compute that

$$\gamma_\#(\hat{p})(\tau) = \hat{p}(\gamma(\tau)) = \hat{p}(\tau_\Theta) = \tau_\Theta(p) = \kappa_0([p])(\tau).$$

It follows that $\gamma_\#(\overline{\rho_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}(K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta))}) \subset \overline{\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(K_0(\mathcal{A}))}$. Therefore there is an induced homomorphism (denoted by the same symbol)

$$\gamma_\# : \text{Aff}(T(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)) / \overline{\rho_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}(K_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta))} \rightarrow \text{Aff}(T(\mathcal{A})) / \overline{\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(K_0(\mathcal{A}))}.$$

Since $K_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)$ is free abelian, it is clear that there is a homomorphism $\kappa_1 : K_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) \rightarrow K_1(\mathcal{A})$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) / CU_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) & \xleftarrow{J_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}} & K_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) \\ \downarrow \alpha_1 & & \downarrow \kappa_1 \\ U_\infty(\mathcal{A}) / CU_\infty(\mathcal{A}) & \xleftarrow{J_{\mathcal{A}}} & K_1(\mathcal{A}). \end{array}$$

Use the split exact sequence (e 4.57), we can find a homomorphism $\alpha : U_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)/CU_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) \rightarrow U_\infty(\mathcal{A})/CU_\infty(\mathcal{A})$ so that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Aff}(T(\mathcal{A}_\Theta))/\overline{\rho_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}(\mathbf{K}_0(\mathcal{A}_\Theta))} & \longrightarrow & U_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta)/CU_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta}} & \mathbf{K}_1(\mathcal{A}_\Theta) \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow \gamma_\# & & \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \kappa_1 \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Aff}(T(\mathcal{A}))/\overline{\rho_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{K}_0(\mathcal{A}))} & \longrightarrow & U_\infty(\mathcal{A})/CU_\infty(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\mathcal{A}}} & \mathbf{K}_1(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow 0.
\end{array}$$

Let $\kappa = (\kappa_0, \kappa_1)$. Then $\kappa \in \text{KL}_e(\mathcal{A}_\Theta, \mathcal{A})^{++}$. It follows from the commutative diagram that κ, γ and α are compatible. Therefore, by Theorem 4.11 there is a unital monomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\phi_* = \kappa, \quad \phi_\# = \gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \phi^\dagger = \alpha.$$

Now for any finite subset $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{A}_\Theta$, and any $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $\eta > 0, \delta_1$, a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \subset \mathcal{C}$, a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \subset \underline{\mathbf{K}}(\mathcal{C})$, a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0 \subset \mathcal{C}_{s.a.}$ and a finite subset $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} \subset U_c(\mathbf{K}_1(\mathcal{C}))$ with respect to $\Delta, \varepsilon/3$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ in Lemma 4.18. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , any n -tuple of unitaries u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n in \mathcal{A} satisfying

$$\|u_k u_j - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k\| < \delta \text{ for all } j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

there is a unital \mathcal{G} - δ_1 -multiplicative c.p.c. map $L : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that (1),(2),(3),(4) of Lemma 4.18 hold.

We now compare the two maps $\tilde{L} = L \circ \iota$ and $\tilde{\phi} = \phi \circ \iota$. It is easy to see from (1),(2),(3),(4) of Lemma 4.18 and the construction of ϕ that

$$\tilde{L}_*|_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}} = \tilde{\phi}_*|_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}}$$

and

$$\text{dist}(\overline{\langle \tilde{L}(s) \rangle}, \overline{\langle \tilde{\phi}(s) \rangle}) = \text{dist}(\overline{\langle L(\iota(s)) \rangle}, \overline{\langle \phi(\iota(s)) \rangle}) < \delta_1 \text{ for all } s \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}.$$

Since τ_Θ is the only tracial state on \mathcal{A}_Θ , we have

$$\|\tau \circ \tilde{L}(g) - \tau \circ \tilde{\phi}(g)\| = \|\tau \circ L(\iota(g)) - \tau_\Theta(\iota(g))\| < \delta_1$$

for all $\tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$ and $g \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0$.

Note that

$$\|\tau \circ \tilde{\phi}(h) - \tau_\Theta(\iota(h))\| = 0 < \delta_2 \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{C}.$$

So by Lemma 4.17, we have

$$\mu_{\tau \circ \tilde{\phi}}(O_r) > \Delta(r) \text{ for all } r \geq \eta.$$

Note that $\mu_{\tau \circ \tilde{L}}(O_r) > \Delta(r)$ for all $r \geq \eta$ by (4) of Lemma 4.18.

Now by Theorem 4.9, there is a unitary $s \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\|s^* \tilde{\phi}(a) s - \tilde{L}(a)\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \text{ for all } a \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}.$$

So we can find $v_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ such that

$$\|\iota(v_j) - u_j\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

We can then compute that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|s^*\phi(\mathbf{u}_j)s - u_j\| &\leq \|s^*\phi(\iota(v_j))s - L(\mathbf{u}_j)\| + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \\
&\leq \|s^*\tilde{\phi}(v_j)s - L(\iota(v_j))\| + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \\
&\leq \|s^*\tilde{\phi}(v_j)s - \tilde{L}(v_j)\| + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3} < \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Let $\tilde{u}_j = s^*\phi(\mathbf{u}_j)s$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then

$$\tilde{u}_k\tilde{u}_j = e^{2\pi i\theta_{jk}}\tilde{u}_j\tilde{u}_k \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{u}_j - u_j\| < \varepsilon, \quad j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

□

Next let us see some low-dimensional examples, i.e. the cases of $n = 2, 3, 4$.

(i) **Case $n = 2$.**

Corollary 4.20. Let θ be an irrational number in $(0, 1)$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ satisfying the following: For any unital simple separable C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} with tracial rank at most one, any pair of unitaries u_1, u_2 in \mathcal{A} with

$$\|u_2u_1 - e^{2\pi i\theta}u_1u_2\| < \delta,$$

and

$$\tau(\log_\theta(u_2u_1u_2^*u_1^*)) = 2\pi i\theta \quad \text{for all } \tau \in T(\mathcal{A}),$$

there exists a pair of unitaries \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2 in \mathcal{A} such that

$$\tilde{u}_2\tilde{u}_1 = e^{2\pi i\theta}\tilde{u}_1\tilde{u}_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{u}_1 - u_1\| < \varepsilon, \quad \|\tilde{u}_2 - u_2\| < \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Since $n = 2$, the only possible value of I is $(1, 2)$ in Theorem 4.19. By the generalized Exel trace formula (e.2.9), $\tau(R_I(u_1, u_2)) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\tau(\log_\theta(u_2u_1u_2^*u_1^*)) = \theta$ for all $\tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$. So u_1 and u_2 satisfy the conditions of Theorem 4.19, we get the conclusion. □

This case is a generalization of any unital simple separable C^* -algebra with tracial rank zero in Theorem 1.2 to any unital simple separable C^* -algebra with tracial rank at most one when θ is an irrational number.

(ii) **Case $n = 3$.**

Corollary 4.21. Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk})_{3 \times 3}$ be a totally irrational real skew-symmetric matrix in \mathcal{T}_3 and $\theta_{jk} \in (0, 1)$ for $j, k = 1, 2, 3$. In this case total irrationality means that the three numbers $\theta_{12}, \theta_{13}, \theta_{23}$ are independent over \mathbb{Q} . Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ satisfying the following: For any unital simple separable C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} with tracial rank at most one, any triple of unitaries u_1, u_2, u_3 in \mathcal{A} with

$$\|u_ku_j - e^{2\pi i\theta_{jk}}u_ju_k\| < \delta \quad \text{for } j, k = 1, 2, 3,$$

and

$$\tau(\log_{\theta_{jk}}(u_ku_ju_k^*u_j^*)) = 2\pi i\theta_{jk} \quad \text{for all } \tau \in T(\mathcal{A}) \text{ and } j, k = 1, 2, 3,$$

there exists a triple of unitaries $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \tilde{u}_3$ in \mathcal{A} such that

$$\tilde{u}_k\tilde{u}_j = e^{2\pi i\theta_{jk}}\tilde{u}_j\tilde{u}_k \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{u}_j - u_j\| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for } j, k = 1, 2, 3.$$

Proof. Since $n = 3$, the possible values of I are $(1, 2)$, $(1, 3)$ and $(2, 3)$ in Theorem 4.19. By the generalized Exel trace formula (e 2.9), $\tau(R_{(j,k)}(u_1, u_2, u_3)) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \tau(\log_{\theta_{jk}}(u_k u_j u_k^* u_j^*)) = \theta_{jk}$ for $1 \leq j < k \leq 3$ and all $\tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$. So u_1, u_2 and u_3 satisfy the conditions of Theorem 4.19, we get the conclusion. \square

Of course, this case is included in Theorem 1.3.

(iii) Case $n = 4$.

Corollary 4.22. Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk})_{4 \times 4}$ be a strongly totally irrational real skew-symmetric matrix in \mathcal{T}_4 , where $\theta_{jk} \in [0, 1)$ for $j, k = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ satisfying the following: For any unital simple separable C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} with tracial rank at most one, any 4-tuple of unitaries u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 in \mathcal{A} such that

$$\|u_k u_j - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k\| < \delta, \text{ for } j, k = 1, 2, 3, 4,$$

there exists a 4-tuple of unitaries $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \tilde{u}_3, \tilde{u}_4$ in \mathcal{A} such that

$$\tilde{u}_k \tilde{u}_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} \tilde{u}_j \tilde{u}_k \text{ and } \|\tilde{u}_j - u_j\| < \varepsilon, \text{ for } j, k = 1, 2, 3, 4$$

if and only if

$$\tau(\log_{\theta_{jk}}(u_k u_j u_k^* u_j^*)) = 2\pi i \theta_{jk} \text{ for all } \tau \in T(\mathcal{A}) \text{ and } j, k = 1, 2, 3, 4, \quad (\text{e 4.59})$$

and

$$\tau(R_{(1,2,3,4)}(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4)) = \theta_{12}\theta_{34} - \theta_{13}\theta_{24} + \theta_{14}\theta_{23} + k\theta_{12} \text{ for all } \tau \in T(\mathcal{A}), \quad (\text{e 4.60})$$

where $R_{(1,2,3,4)}(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4)$ is defined as in Definition 4.6, k is an integer as in (e 3.48).

Proof. Since $n = 4$, the possible values of I are $\{(j, k) | 1 \leq j < k \leq 4\} \cup \{(1, 2, 3, 4)\}$ in Theorem 4.19. By the generalized Exel trace formula (e 2.9) and the assumption (e 4.59), $\tau(R_{(j,k)}) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \tau(\log_{\theta_{jk}}(u_k u_j u_k^* u_j^*)) = \theta_{jk}$ for $1 \leq j < k \leq 4$, and by the assumption (e 4.60) $\tau(R_{(1,2,3,4)}(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4)) = \theta_{12}\theta_{34} - \theta_{13}\theta_{24} + \theta_{14}\theta_{23} + k\theta_{12}$ for all $\tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$. So u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 satisfy the conditions of Theorem 4.19, we get the conclusion. \square

Finally, we show that the trace conditions (e 4.58) are necessary to prove the stability of rotation relations in Theorem 4.19.

Proposition 4.23. Let $\Theta = (\theta_{jk}) \in \mathcal{T}_n$ be strongly totally irrational. There exists a $\delta > 0$ such that: For any unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} with $T(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$, any unitaries u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n and $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_n$ in \mathcal{A} satisfying the following:

- (1) $\|u_k u_j - e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} u_j u_k\| < 2$ for $j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n$,
- (2) $\tilde{u}_k \tilde{u}_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} \tilde{u}_j \tilde{u}_k$ for $j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n$,
- (3) $\|\tilde{u}_j - u_j\| < \delta$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$,

we have

$$\tau(R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)) = \text{pf}(M_I^\Theta) + \sum_{0 < |J| < l} \text{pf}(M_J^\Theta) k_{I_J} + k_{I_0}$$

for all possible $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l)$, $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l \leq n$, $l = 2m$, $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$, and all tracial states τ on \mathcal{A} , where $R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$ is defined as in Definition 4.6, $k_{I_J}, k_{I_0} \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the same as in Corollary 3.19, $J = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_s)$, $|J| = s$.

Proof. Choose δ_0 according to Proposition 4.5. Since $R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$ is defined in terms of continuous functional calculus of u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n , there is a δ_1 such that whenever $\|\tilde{u}_j - u_j\| < \delta_1$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we have $\|R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) - R_I(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_n)\| < \frac{1}{2}$. Let $\delta = \min\{\delta_0, \delta_1\}$. Then for any unitaries u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n and $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_n$ in \mathcal{A} satisfies conditions (1), (2), (3), we have

$$[R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)] = [R_I(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_n)] \quad (\text{e 4.61})$$

in $K_0(\mathcal{A})$. Since $\tilde{u}_k \tilde{u}_j = e^{2\pi i \theta_{jk}} \tilde{u}_j \tilde{u}_k$ for $j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we have

$$R_I(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_n) = e_I(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_n). \quad (\text{e 4.62})$$

By Remark 4.4, there exists a homomorphism $\varphi : \mathcal{A}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $\varphi(u_j) = \tilde{u}_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Thus $\varphi(P_I) = e_I(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_n)$. From (e 4.61), (e 4.62) and (e 3.48), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_*([R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)]) &= \tau_*([R_I(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_n)]) \\ &= \tau_*([\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(e_I(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots, \tilde{u}_n))]) \\ (\text{e 4.54}) \quad &= \tau_*([\varphi(\chi_{(\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)}(\tilde{P}_I))]) \\ &= \tau_*([\varphi(P_I)]) \\ &= (\tau_\Theta)_*([P_I]) \\ &= \text{pf}(M_I^\Theta) + \sum_{0 < |J| < l} \text{pf}(M_J^\Theta) k_{I_J} + k_{I_0} \end{aligned}$$

for all possible I and all tracial states τ on \mathcal{A} , where $R_I(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$ is as in Definition 4.6, P_I is as in Theorem 3.19, \tilde{P}_I is as in (e 4.51), $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l)$, $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l \leq n$, $l = 2m$, $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$, $k_{I_J}, k_{I_0} \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the same as in Corollary 3.19, $J = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_s)$, $|J| = s$. \square

Appendix I

In this section we will provide a large class of examples of $n \times n$ skew-symmetric matrices, generalising Proposition 3.18, which satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.16.

Let $s = \{s_i\}_i$ be a sequence of integers such that $s_i > \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} s_j$ with $s_1 = 1$. We call such a sequence a super-increasing sequence. For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ define the $n \times n$ antisymmetric matrix $\Theta(n) = (\Theta(n)_{ij})$ by induction: $\Theta(2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha^{s_1} \\ -\alpha^{s_1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$; $\Theta(n)_{ij} = \Theta(n-1)_{ij}$, for $1 < i < j < n$, and $\Theta(n)_{in} := \alpha^{s_{p+i}}$, for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, where $p = \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}$.

Hence

$$\Theta(3) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha^{s_1} & \alpha^{s_2} \\ -\alpha^{s_1} & 0 & \alpha^{s_3} \\ -\alpha^{s_2} & -\alpha^{s_3} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Theta(4) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha^{s_1} & \alpha^{s_2} & \alpha^{s_4} \\ -\alpha^{s_1} & 0 & \alpha^{s_3} & \alpha^{s_5} \\ -\alpha^{s_2} & -\alpha^{s_3} & 0 & \alpha^{s_6} \\ -\alpha^{s_4} & -\alpha^{s_5} & -\alpha^{s_6} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Remark 4.24. Note that any sub-matrix $M_I^{\Theta(n)}$ of $\Theta(n)$ is like $\Theta(m)$, for some $m \leq n$, but for a different super increasing sequence $s' = \{s'_i\}_i$, which is a subsequence of s .

We then have $\text{pf}(\Theta(2)) = \alpha^{s_1}$, and

$$\text{pf}(\Theta(4)) = \alpha^{s_1+s_6} - \alpha^{s_2+s_5} + \alpha^{s_4+s_3}.$$

Note that, using the super-increasing property of s , we have that

$$s_1 + s_6 > s_2 + s_5 > s_4 + s_3.$$

Let us first recall the following recursive definition of pfaffian from [16, Page 116]. Let $\text{pf}^{ij}(A)$ denote the pfaffian of the skew-symmetric matrix obtained from $A = (a_{mn})$ by removing the i^{th} , j^{th} row and the i^{th} , j^{th} column. Let n be even. Then for a fixed integer $j, 1 \leq j \leq n$, one has

$$\text{pf}(A) = \sum_{i < j} (-1)^{i+j-1} a_{ij} \text{pf}^{ij}(A) + \sum_{i > j} (-1)^{i+j} a_{ij} \text{pf}^{ij}(A).$$

In particular, when $j = n$, we have

$$\text{pf}(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (-1)^{i+1} a_{in} \text{pf}^{in}(A). \quad (\text{e 4.63})$$

Lemma 4.25.

$$0 < \text{pf}(\Theta(n)) < \text{pf}(\Theta(n-2)) < 1,$$

for an even n .

We will give the proof after Remark 4.29.

Corollary 4.26. With the notations of Theorem 3.16,

$$0 < \text{pf} \left(F^j \left(M_I^{\Theta(n)} \right)_{11} \right) < 1,$$

for all I with $2 \leq |I| \leq 2 \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, and for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$, where $|I| = 2m$.

Proof. Follows from the above lemma and Remark 4.24 with the explicit expression of $\text{pf} \left(F^j \left(M_I^{\Theta(n)} \right)_{11} \right)$ (using Lemma 3.10) in hand. \square

Choose the super-increasing sequence $\{s_i = 2^{i-1}\}_i$. When α is a transcendental number, it is well known that the numbers $\alpha, \alpha^2, \dots, \alpha^{2^i}, \dots$ as well as any product the numbers are linear independent over \mathbb{Q} . So we have that $\Theta(n)$ is totally irrational. Then by using the above corollary, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 4.27. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be a transcendental number and let $s := \{s_i = 2^{i-1}\}_i$. Let $\Theta(n)$ be the $n \times n$ antisymmetric matrix involving α and s . Then we have that $\Theta(n)$ is a strongly totally irrational matrix for $n \geq 2$.

It is clear that the above corollary is a generalisation of Proposition 3.18. This corollary gives general examples of strongly totally irrational matrices.

The above lemma (Lemma 4.25) will follow from the next lemma.

Lemma 4.28. For an even n we have

$$\text{pf}(\Theta(n)) = \alpha^{M(n)_1} - \alpha^{M(n)_2} + \alpha^{M(n)_3} - \alpha^{M(n)_4} + \dots + \alpha^{M(n)_{R(n)}},$$

for a strictly decreasing sequence of numbers $M(n)_1, M(n)_2, \dots, M(n)_{R(n)}$, where $R(n) = (n-1)!!^1$.

¹double factorial

Proof. We prove this by induction on n . We have seen that the statement is true for $n = 2, 4$ for all super-increasing sequences. Now assume the statement is true for $n - 2$, for all super-increasing sequences. Then we must prove that the statement is true for n , for all super-increasing sequences. Fix a super-increasing sequence $s = \{s_i\}_i$. Write $\Theta = \Theta(n)$. From (e 4.63), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pf}(\Theta) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (-1)^{i+1} \Theta_{in} \text{pf}^{in}(\Theta) \\ &= \Theta_{(n-1)n} \text{pf}^{(n-1)n}(\Theta) - \Theta_{(n-2)n} \text{pf}^{(n-2)n}(\Theta) + \Theta_{(n-3)n} \text{pf}^{(n-3)n}(\Theta) - \dots \\ &\quad - \Theta_{2n} \text{pf}^{2n}(\Theta) + \Theta_{1n} \text{pf}^{1n}(\Theta) \\ &= \alpha^{s_{(n-1),n}} \text{pf}^{(n-1)n}(\Theta) - \alpha^{s_{(n-2),n}} \text{pf}^{(n-2)n}(\Theta) + \alpha^{s_{(n-3),n}} \text{pf}^{(n-3)n}(\Theta) - \dots \\ &\quad - \alpha^{s_{2,n}} \text{pf}^{2n}(\Theta) + \alpha^{s_{1,n}} \text{pf}^{1n}(\Theta), \end{aligned}$$

where $s_{i,j}$ is the exponent of α in Θ_{ij} . Now by the induction hypothesis we have that all $\text{pf}^{in}(\Theta), i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, are of the form as in the statement with $R(n-2) = (n-3)!!$. Now if we expand all $\text{pf}^{in}(\Theta), i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, keeping the form, we see that the expression

$$\alpha^{s_{(n-1),n}} \text{pf}^{(n-1)n}(\Theta) - \alpha^{s_{(n-2),n}} \text{pf}^{(n-2)n}(\Theta) + \alpha^{s_{(n-3),n}} \text{pf}^{(n-3)n}(\Theta) - \dots - \alpha^{s_{2,n}} \text{pf}^{2n}(\Theta) + \alpha^{s_{1,n}} \text{pf}^{1n}(\Theta)$$

is already of the required form, using the super-increasing property of s , and noting that the exponents of α in the expressions of $\text{pf}^{in}(\Theta), i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, contain no term involving $s_{*,n}$. Note that the total number of terms (after expanding) in the above expression is $(n-1)(n-3)!! = (n-1)!!$. \square

Remark 4.29. It is also clear from above, again using the super-increasing property of s , that $M(n)_{R(n)} > M(n-2)_1$.

Proof of Lemma 4.25. Since

$$\text{pf}(\Theta(n)) = \alpha^{M(n)_1} - \alpha^{M(n)_2} + \alpha^{M(n)_3} - \alpha^{M(n)_4} + \dots + \alpha^{M(n)_{R(n)}},$$

we have that

$$\text{pf}(\Theta(n)) > \alpha^{M(n)_1} > 0,$$

using $-\alpha^{M(n)_{2i}} + \alpha^{M(n)_{2i+1}} > 0$ (since $\alpha \in (0, 1)$). To show $\text{pf}(\Theta(n)) < \text{pf}(\Theta(n-2))$, we look at the expression $\text{pf}(\Theta(n)) - \text{pf}(\Theta(n-2))$, which is

$$\alpha^{M(n)_1} - \alpha^{M(n)_2} + \alpha^{M(n)_3} - \dots + \alpha^{M(n)_{R(n)}} - \alpha^{M(n-2)_1} + \alpha^{M(n-2)_2} - \alpha^{M(n-2)_3} + \dots - \alpha^{M(n-2)_{R(n-2)}}.$$

Note that $M(n)_1, M(n)_2, \dots, M(n)_{R(n)}, M(n-2)_1, M(n-2)_2, \dots, M(n-2)_{R(n-2)}$ is still a strictly decreasing finite sequence due to the above remark. Now using $\alpha^{M(n)_i} - \alpha^{M(n)_{i+1}} < 0$, $\alpha^{M(n)_{R(n)}} - \alpha^{M(n-2)_1} < 0$, and $\alpha^{M(n-2)_{2i}} - \alpha^{M(n-2)_{2i+1}} < 0$, we get the above expression less than zero.

The last inequality in the statement of Lemma 4.25 follows from an argument using induction on n . \square

Appendix II

In this section we will give a description of the map ψ (for a general n) used in Theorem 3.13 of Section 3, and an explicit expression of the Rieffel-type projection for $n = 4$, which was constructed in Theorem 3.13. This section essentially resembles the construction of [3, Remark of page 198], however no explicit expression of the Rieffel-type projection (for $n = 4$) is given in [3].

Let us first write down the Morita equivalence construction of Section 3 explicitly for $p = 1$, i.e. when \mathcal{M} is the group $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}^q$, $q = n - 2$. As before, write

$$\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11} & \Theta_{12} \\ \Theta_{21} & \Theta_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11} & \Theta_{12} \\ -\Theta_{12}^t & \Theta_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{T}_n,$$

where

$$\Theta_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta_{12} \\ \theta_{21} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta_{12} \\ -\theta_{12} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{T}_2$$

is an invertible 2×2 matrix. Then consider the matrix $T = \begin{pmatrix} T_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & \text{id}_q \\ T_{31} & T_{32} \end{pmatrix}$, where $T_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$,

$T_{31} = \Theta_{21}$ and $T_{32} = \frac{\Theta_{22}}{2}$. Also consider $S = \begin{pmatrix} S_0 & -S_0 T_{31}^t \\ 0 & \text{id}_q \\ 0 & T_{32}^t \end{pmatrix}$, where $S_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \theta_{12}^{-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then

eqs. (e.3.33) to (e.3.36) make $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}^q)$ an $\mathcal{A}_{\Theta'}^\infty - \mathcal{A}_\Theta^\infty$ Morita equivalence bimodule, where $\Theta' = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11}^{-1} & -\Theta_{11}^{-1}\Theta_{12} \\ \Theta_{21}\Theta_{11}^{-1} & \Theta_{22} - \Theta_{21}\Theta_{11}^{-1}\Theta_{12} \end{pmatrix}$. Let us denote by $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n$ and $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$ the canonical generators of \mathcal{A}_Θ and $\mathcal{A}_{\Theta'}$, respectively. For the following, we consider the conjugate space of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}^q)$ as an $\mathcal{A}_{\Theta'}^\infty - \mathcal{A}_\Theta^\infty$ bimodule.

Following Boca ([3, page 190]), if we can find a $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}^q)$ such that $\langle f, f \rangle_{\mathcal{A}_{\Theta'}^\infty} = 1$, then $e = {}_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta^\infty} \langle f, f \rangle$ is a projection of trace θ_{12} in $\mathcal{A}_\Theta^\infty \subset \mathcal{A}_\Theta$, and we have an isomorphism $\psi : \mathcal{A}_{\Theta'} \rightarrow e\mathcal{A}_\Theta e$, given by $\psi(a) = {}_{\mathcal{A}_\Theta} \langle fa, f \rangle$. Choose a function ϕ on \mathbb{R} as in the definition of f_2 in Definition 2.5 for θ_{12} , assuming $\theta_{12} \in (0, 1)$. By using a standard regularization argument as in [3, Lemma 2.1], we can assume that ϕ is smooth and $\sqrt{\phi}$ is also smooth. Define a function $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}^q)$, given by $f(x, l) = c\sqrt{\phi}(x)$, $c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K\theta_{12}}}$ (K is as in Equation (e.3.36)), when $\mathbb{Z}^q \ni l = 0$ and $f(x, l) = 0$ otherwise. Let us first show that $\langle f, f \rangle_{\mathcal{A}_{\Theta'}^\infty} = 1$. To this end, from Equation (e.3.36), we have the following:

$$\langle f, f \rangle_{\mathcal{A}_{\Theta'}^\infty}(m) = K e^{-2\pi i \langle S(m), J' S(m) \rangle / 2} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}^q} \overline{\langle x, S''(m) \rangle} f(x + S'(m)) f(x) dx,$$

for $m = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, noting that f is real valued. Using the formula of S' and f , it is clear that the above expression is zero for any non-zero values of $(m_3, m_4, \dots, m_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^q$. Also when $m_2 \neq 0$, the above expression for $m = (m_1, m_2, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is zero since $x + S'(m) = (x_0 + m_2, x_1, \dots, x_q)$, where $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_q)$, and ϕ is supported in the unit interval. Finally for an $m = (m_1, 0, \dots, 0)$ the expression becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & K c^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\frac{-2\pi i x_0 m_1}{\theta_{12}}} \phi(x_0) dx_0 \\ &= c^2 K \theta_{12} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i x m_1} \phi(x \theta_{12}) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i x m_1} \tilde{\phi}(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\phi}(x) = \phi(x\theta_{12})$. Then the expression is

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i x m_1} \tilde{\phi}(x) dx = \widehat{\tilde{\phi}}(m_1) = \widehat{\Phi}(m_1),$$

where $\widehat{\cdot}$ denotes the Fourier transform and Φ is the periodic function defined by $\Phi(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{\phi}(x+n)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$. But $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{\phi}(x+n) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \phi(\theta_{12}x + \theta_{12}n) = 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence we get $\langle f, f \rangle_{\mathcal{A}_{\Theta'}}(m) = \widehat{\Phi}(\mathbf{v}_1) = 1$. Now let us write an explicit expression for $e =_{\mathcal{A}_{\Theta}} \langle f, f \rangle$. From Equation (e.3.34), we have

$$\mathcal{A}_{\Theta} \langle f, f \rangle(m) = e^{2\pi i \langle T(m), J'T(m)/2 \rangle} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}^q} \langle x, T''(m) \rangle f(x + T'(m)) f(x) dx.$$

If we write $m = (m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots, m_n)$, an easy observation shows that the above expression is zero unless $m_3 = m_4 = \dots = m_n = 0$. For $m = (m_1, m_2, 0, \dots, 0)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\Theta} \langle f, f \rangle(m) &= c^2 e^{\pi i \theta_{12} m_1 m_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i x_0 m_2} \sqrt{\phi}(x_0 + \theta_{12} m_1) \sqrt{\phi}(x_0) dx_0 \\ &= c^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i x_0 m_2} \sqrt{\phi}(x_0 - \frac{\theta_{12} m_1}{2}) \sqrt{\phi}(x_0 + \frac{\theta_{12} m_1}{2}) dx_0. \end{aligned}$$

The above expression is non-zero only when $m_1 = 0, \pm 1$, and the expression of $e =_{\mathcal{A}_{\Theta}} \langle f, f \rangle$ becomes $G_-(\mathbf{u}_2^{-1})\mathbf{u}_1^{-1} + G(\mathbf{u}_2^{-1}) + G_+(\mathbf{u}_2^{-1})\mathbf{u}_1$, which is a projection of trace θ_{12} (this gives $c = 1$ and $K = 1/\theta_{12}$), where G and G_{\pm} are the following: $G(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \phi(x+n)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $G_{\pm}(x) =$

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \sqrt{\phi(x+n + \frac{\theta_{12}}{2}) \phi(x+n - \frac{\theta_{12}}{2})}, x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Next we want specialize to the case $n = 4$, where we will to compute the Rieffel-type projection explicitly. Although the computations are messy, they are quite straight forward. As discussed in Section 3, the image e_1 of a Rieffel projection $e' \in C^*(\mathbf{v}_3, \mathbf{v}_4) \subset \mathcal{A}_{\Theta'}$ of trace $\theta' = \frac{\text{pf}(\Theta)}{\theta_{12}} + k$ by the isomorphism $\mathcal{A}_{\Theta'} \simeq e\mathcal{A}_{\Theta}e$ is a projection in $e\mathcal{A}_{\Theta}e$ of trace $\text{pf}(\Theta) + k\theta_{12}$ in \mathcal{A}_{Θ} , for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since the isomorphism between $\mathcal{A}_{\Theta'}$ and $e\mathcal{A}_{\Theta}e$ is given by $\psi(x) =_{\mathcal{A}_{\Theta}} \langle f x, f \rangle$, $x \in \mathcal{A}_{\Theta'}$, we must compute the expression $\mathcal{A}_{\Theta} \langle f e', f \rangle$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\Theta} \langle f e', f \rangle = e_1 = \psi(e') &= \psi(G_-(\mathbf{v}_4^{-1})\mathbf{v}_3^{-1}) + G(\mathbf{v}_4^{-1}) + G_+(\mathbf{v}_4^{-1})\mathbf{v}_3 \\ &= G_-(\psi(\mathbf{v}_4^{-1}))\psi(\mathbf{v}_3^{-1}) + G(\psi(\mathbf{v}_4^{-1})) + G_+(\psi(\mathbf{v}_4^{-1}))\psi(\mathbf{v}_3). \end{aligned}$$

Hence if we can compute the expressions of $\psi(\mathbf{v}_3)$ and $\psi(\mathbf{v}_4)$ explicitly, we will get an explicit expression of e_1 . Let us give an explicit expression of $\psi(\mathbf{v}_3)$. Similar computations will also hold for $\psi(\mathbf{v}_4)$. From Equation (e.3.35),

$$(f\mathbf{v}_3)(x) = e^{2\pi i \langle S(l), J'S(l)/2 \rangle} \langle -x, S''(l) \rangle f(x - S'(l)),$$

where $l = (0, 0, -1, 0)$. A direct computation gives

$$(f\mathbf{v}_3)(x_0, x_1, x_2) = e^{-\pi i \frac{\theta_{23}\theta_{13}}{\theta_{12}}} e^{-2\pi i x_0 \frac{\theta_{13}}{\theta_{12}} - x_2 \frac{\theta_{34}}{2}} f(x_0 + \theta_{23}, x_1 + 1, x_2).$$

Finally, from Equation (e.3.34)

$$\mathcal{A}_{\Theta} \langle f\mathbf{v}_3, f \rangle(m) = e^{2\pi i \langle T(m), J'T(m)/2 \rangle} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}^2} \langle x, T''(m) \rangle f(x + T'(m)) f\mathbf{v}_3(x) dx$$

The above expression is zero unless $m = (m_1, m_2, 1, 0)$, and when $m = (m_1, m_2, 1, 0)$, the expression becomes

$$e^{2\pi i \theta_{13} m_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i m_2 x} e^{-2\pi i x \frac{\theta_{13}}{\theta_{12}}} \sqrt{\phi}\left(x + \frac{\theta_{12} m_1}{2} - \frac{\theta_{23}}{2}\right) \sqrt{\phi}\left(x - \frac{\theta_{12} m_1}{2} + \frac{\theta_{23}}{2}\right) dx,$$

which is non-zero only when $|m_1 \theta_{12} - \theta_{23}| < 2\theta_{12}$, i.e. when $-2 + \frac{\theta_{23}}{\theta_{12}} < m_1 < 2 + \frac{\theta_{23}}{\theta_{12}}$. Let $t_1 = \lfloor -2 + \frac{\theta_{23}}{\theta_{12}} \rfloor$ and $t_2 = \lfloor 2 + \frac{\theta_{23}}{\theta_{12}} \rfloor$. Then $\psi(\mathbf{v}_3) = \sum_{a=t_1}^{t_2} u_3 H_{-a}^-(u_2^{-1}) u_1^a$, where $H_{-a}^-(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \Phi_a(x+n)$,

$$\Phi_a(x) = e^{2\pi i \theta_{13} a} e^{-2\pi i x \frac{\theta_{13}}{\theta_{12}}} \sqrt{\phi}\left(x + \frac{\theta_{12} a}{2} - \frac{\theta_{23}}{2}\right) \sqrt{\phi}\left(x - \frac{\theta_{12} a}{2} + \frac{\theta_{23}}{2}\right).$$

Acknowledgments

The first named author acknowledges the support of DST, Government of India (*DST-INSPIRE Faculty Scheme* with Faculty Reg. No. IFA19-MA139). The second named author was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11401256) and the Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China (No. LQ13A010016).

References

- [1] Benjamín A. Itzá-Ortiz and N. C. Phillips, *Realization of a simple higher-dimensional non-commutative torus as a transformation group C^* -algebra*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **40**(2008), no. 2, 217-226.
- [2] I. D. Berg and K. R. Davidson, *Almost commuting matrices and the Brown-Douglas-Fillmore theorem*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **16**(1987), no. 1, 97-100.
- [3] P. Boca, *The structure of higher-dimensional noncommutative tori and metric diophantine approximation*, J. reine angew. Math., **492**(1997), 179-219.
- [4] S. Chakraborty, *Some remarks on K_0 of noncommutative tori*. Math. Scand., **126**(2020), no.2, 387-400.
- [5] M. Dadarlat, *Morphisms of simple tracially AF algebras*, Internat. J. Math. **15**(2004), no. 9, 919-957.
- [6] M. Dadarlat and T. A. Loring, *A universal multicoefficient theorem for the Kasparov groups*, Duke Math. J. **84**(1996), no. 2, 355-377.
- [7] K. R. Davidson, *Almost commuting Hermitian matrices*, Math. Scand. **56**(1985), no. 2, 222-240.
- [8] S. Echterhoff, W. Lück, N. C. Phillips and S. Walters, *The structure of crossed products of irrational rotation algebras by finite subgroups of $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$* , J. Reine Angew. Math. **639**(2010), 173-221.
- [9] S. Eilers and T. A. Loring, *Computing contingencies for stable relations*, Internat. J. Math. **10**(1999), no. 3, 301-326.
- [10] S. Eilers, T. A. Loring and G. K. Pedersen, *Stability of anticommutation relations: an application of noncommutative CW complexes*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **499**(1998), 101-143.

- [11] S. Eilers, T. A. Loring and G. K. Pedersen, *Morphisms of extensions of C^* -algebras: pushing forward the Busby invariant*, Adv. Math. **147**(1999), no. 1, 74-109.
- [12] G. A. Elliott, *On the K -theory of the C^* -algebra generated by a projective representation of a torsion-free discrete abelian group*, In: Operator Algebras and Group Representations, Vol. I (Neptun, 1980), 157-184, Monogr. Stud.Math., **17**, Pitman, Boston, MA, 1984.
- [13] R. Exel, *The soft torus and applications to almost commuting matrices*, Pacific J. Math. **160**(1993), no. 2, 207-217.
- [14] R. Exel and T. A. Loring, *Almost commuting unitary matrices*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **106**(1989), no. 4, 913-915.
- [15] R. Exel and T. A. Loring, *Invariants of almost commuting unitaries*, J. Funct. Anal. **95**(1991), no. 2, 364-376.
- [16] W. Fulton and P. Pragacz, *Schubert varieties and degeneracy loci*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1689, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. Appendix J by the authors in collaboration with I. CiocanFontanine.
- [17] C. Farsi and N. Watling, *Symmetrized non-commutative tori*, Math. Ann. **296**(1993), 739-741.
- [18] P. R. Halmos, *Some unsolved problems of unknown depth about operators on Hilbert space*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **76**(1976/77), no. 1, 67-76.
- [19] J. Hua, *Stability of certain relations of three unitaries in C^* -algebras*, Internat. J. Math., **32**(2021), no. 9, Paper No. 2150065, 35 pp.
- [20] J. Hua, *Stability of rotation relation of two unitaries with the flip action in C^* -algebras*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **506**(2022), no. 2, Paper No. 125690.
- [21] J. Hua, X. Fang and X. Xu, *Continuity of functors with respect to generalized inductive limits*, Front. Math. China, **14**(2019), no. 3, 551-566.
- [22] J. Hua and H. Lin, *Rotation algebras and the Exel trace formula*, Canad. J. Math. **67**(2015), no. 2, 404-423.
- [23] J. Hua and Q. Wang, *Stability of rotation relations in C^* -algebras*, Canad. J. Math. **73**(2021), no. 4, 1171-1203.
- [24] D. H. Hyers, *On the stability of the linear functional equation*. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., (1941), 27: 222-224.
- [25] H. Li, *Strong Morita equivalence of higher-dimensional noncommutative tori*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **576**(2004), 167-180.
- [26] H. Lin, *Almost commuting self-adjoint matrices and applications*, Operator Algebras and Their Applications (Waterloo, ON, 1994/1995), Fields Inst. Commun., vol. 13, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997, 193-233.
- [27] H. Lin, *The tracial topological rank of C^* -algebra*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **83**(2001), no. 1, 199-234.
- [28] H. Lin, *An introduction to the classification of amenable C^* -algebras*, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc. River Edge, NJ, 2001.

- [29] H. Lin, *Classification of homomorphisms and dynamical systems*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **359**(2007), no. 2, 859-895.
- [30] H. Lin, *Homotopy of unitaries in simple C^* -algebras with tracial rank one*, J. Funct. Anal. **258**(2010), 1822-1882.
- [31] H. Lin, *Homomorphisms from AH-algebras*, J. Topol. Anal. **9**(2017), no. 1, 67-125.
- [32] T. A. Loring, *K-theory and asymptotically commuting matrices*, Canad. J. Math. **40**(1988), no. 1, 197-216.
- [33] T. A. Loring, *Quantitative K-theory related to spin Chern numbers*, Symmetry, Integrability and Geometry: Methods and Applications. **10**(2014), 077, 25 pages.
- [34] N. C. Phillips, *Every simple higher dimensional noncommutative torus is an AT algebra*, arXiv: math.OA/0609783.
- [35] M. A. Rieffel, *C^* -algebras associated with irrational rotations*, Pacific J. Math. **93**(1981), no. 2, 415-429.
- [36] M. A. Rieffel, *The cancellation theorem for projective modules over irrational rotation C^* -algebras*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **47**(1983), no. 2, 285-302.
- [37] M. A. Rieffel, *Projective modules over higher-dimensional non-commutative tori*, Canad. J. Math. **40**(1988), 257-338.
- [38] M. A. Rieffel, *Non-commutative tori—a case study of non-commutative differentiable manifolds*, pages 191-211 in: Geometric and topological invariants of elliptic operators (Brunswick ME, 1988), J. Kaminker (ed.), Contemporary Mathematics vol. 105, 1990.
- [39] J. Rosenberg and C. Schochet, *The Künneth theorem and the universal coefficient theorem for Kasparov's generalized K-functor*, Duke Math. J. **55**(1987), no. 2, 431-474.
- [40] P. Rosenthal, *Research Problems: Are almost commuting matrices near commuting matrices?*, Amer. Math. Monthly **76**(1969), no. 8, 925-926.
- [41] C. Schochet, *Topological methods for C^* -algebras. IV. Mod p homology*, Pacific J. Math. **114**(1984), no. 2, 447-468.
- [42] K. Thomsen, *Traces, unitary characters and crossed products by \mathbf{Z}* , Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **31**(1995), no. 6, 1011-1029.
- [43] D. Voiculescu, *Remarks on the singular extension in the C^* -algebra of the Heisenberg group*, J. Operator Theory **5**(1981), no. 2, 147-170.
- [44] D. Voiculescu, *Asymptotically commuting finite rank unitary operators without commuting approximants*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **45**(1983), no. 1-4, 429-431.