

VON NEUMANN EQUIVALENCE AND M_d TYPE APPROXIMATION PROPERTIES

BAT-OD BATTSEREN

ABSTRACT. We show that M_d -approximation-property, M_d -weak-amenability, and M_d -weak-Haagerup-property are invariant for von Neumann equivalence (hence also for Measure Equivalence and W^* -equivalence). We also show that these properties are inherited by lattices.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	3
3. Main section	6
Acknowledgements	10
References	10

1. INTRODUCTION

Von Neumann equivalence (vNE) was introduced in [IPR19] on the class of discrete countable groups as a coarser version of Gromov's Measure Equivalence (ME) and W^* -equivalence (W^*E). In the same paper, some group approximation and non-approximation type properties such as amenability, Haagerup property (also known as a-T-menability), Kazhdan's property (T) were shown to be invariant under vNE. It is followed by some extension works that weak amenability, weak Haagerup property, Haagerup-Kraus's approximation property [Ish21], and exactness [Bat22] are vNE invariant too. In this paper, we will contribute by more invariants, namely M_d type approximation properties.

One of the motivations to look into vNE is its similarity to ME. Many techniques used in measured group theory could be translated and used in vNE. Recall the Connes' rigidity conjecture which states that the group von Neumann algebras of $PSL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ for $n \geq 3$ are mutually non-isomorphic. These groups are not ME to each other [Fur99, Theorem A]. It would be delightful if the latter result could be done in analogue for vNE and prove Connes rigidity conjecture.

The algebras $M_d(G)$ were introduced in [Pis05] by means of characterizing the similarity problem. Let G be a locally compact group and let d be a positive integer. The space $M_d(G)$ consists of the functions $\varphi \in C_b(G)$ admitting Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_i and bounded maps $\xi_i : G \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i, \mathcal{H}_{i-1})$ with $i = 1, \dots, d$ and $\mathcal{H}_d = \mathcal{H}_0 = \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\varphi(x_1 \dots x_d) = \xi_1(x_1) \dots \xi_d(x_d)(1) \quad \text{for all } x_1, \dots, x_d \in G.$$

With the norm $\|\varphi\|_{M_d} = \inf \sup_{g \in G} \|\xi_1(g)\| \dots \sup_{g \in G} \|\xi_d(g)\|$ and pointwise product, $M_d(G)$ becomes a commutative Banach algebra. When $d = 2$, this is the algebra of completely bounded Fourier multipliers $M_{cb}A(G)$ (also denoted by $M_0A(G)$ or $B_2(G)$ in some literature). Let us recall the similarity problem from [Dix50]. Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space and $\pi : G \rightarrow GL(\mathcal{H})$ a SOT-continuous group homomorphism. We say that π is uniformly bounded representation if its image is bounded in norm. We say that π is unitarizable if there is a unitary representation (ρ, \mathcal{K}) and an invertible bounded operator $V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ such that $\pi(x) = V^{-1}\rho(x)V$ for all $x \in G$. We say that G is unitarizable if any of its uniformly bounded representation is unitarizable. It is known that all amenable groups are unitarizable [Dix50, Day50]. The converse is still open, and we refer it as the *similarity problem*. We refer the readers to [Pis01] for a survey on the similarity problem. The problem is partially solved for some cases. For example, non-abelian free groups are not unitarizable. Combining this fact with Tits alternative and the fact that unitarizability passes to subgroups, the similarity problem is solved for all linear groups. In [Pis05], the unitarizability of G was characterized by the equality of Fourier-Stieltjes algebra $B(G)$ and the algebra $M_d(G)$ for some $d \geq 2$. Furthermore, in [Ver22, Theorem 1.2], the M_d -approximation-property was introduced and proved the similarity problem for discrete groups satisfying M_d -approximation-property for all $d \geq 1$. It is natural to ask if the condition of unitarizability is redundant in the latter result. Yet [Ver22, Theorem 1.3] yields that the free group of two generators is not unitarizable and satisfies M_d -approximation-property for all $d \geq 1$. We will give an alternative proof for the latter fact by adapting the construction of [BP93].

Theorem 1. *Discrete groups acting properly on a tree are M_d -weakly-amenable with M_d -Cowling-Haagerup constant 1 for any $d \geq 1$.*

Note that Theorem 1 is an immediately consequence of [Ver22, Theorem 1.3], but the proof ideas differ.

Our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *The following are invariant for von Neumann equivalence.*

- (1) M_d -approximation-property.
- (2) M_d -weak-amenability and M_d -Cowling-Haagerup constant.
- (3) M_d -weak-Haagerup-property and M_d -weak-Haagerup constant.

We call these three properties M_d type approximation properties. The precise definitions will be given in Section 2.1. The case $d = 2$ is done in [Ish21]. The key point lies in proving that the induction map $\Phi : \ell^\infty(\Lambda) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(\Gamma)$ introduced in [Ish21] gives a norm decreasing map $\Phi : M_d(\Lambda) \rightarrow M_d(\Gamma)$.

As we mentioned before, vNE is coarser than both ME and W*E, hence the following.

Corollary 3. *M_d type approximation properties, M_d -Cowling-Haagerup constant, and M_d -weak-Haagerup constant are invariant for ME and W*E.*

Some group properties are extendable to von Neumann algebras in a way that a group has the property if and only if the group von Neumann algebra has the property. For example, a discrete group is amenable if and only if its group von Neumann algebra is injective [Con76]. This kind of characterization is usually observed for discrete groups. In this sense, working on discrete groups is advantageous. The following theorem allows one to work with discrete groups instead of its ambient group when investigating M_d type approximation properties.

Theorem 4. M_d type approximation properties, M_d -Cowling-Haagerup constant, and M_d -weak-Haagerup constant are inherited by lattices.

The case $d = 2$ of Theorem 4 is done in [HK94, Theorem 2.4], [Haa16, Theorem 2.6], and [Knu16, Theorem A].

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we will recall some definitions and useful facts.

2.1. M_d type approximation properties. Throughout the paper, d is a positive integer, G is a locally compact group, H is a closed subgroup of G , and Γ and Λ are discrete groups. We denote by G_d the discrete realization of G .

The *Fourier algebra* $A(G)$ consists of the coefficients of the left regular representation $\lambda : G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(L^2(G))$. The *Fourier-Stieltjes algebra* $B(G)$ consists of the coefficients of all unitary representations of G . For $\varphi \in B(G)$, its norm is given by $\|\varphi\|_B = \inf \|\xi\| \|\eta\|$ where the infimum runs through all unitary representations (π, \mathcal{H}) and vectors $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfying $\varphi(x) = \langle \pi(x)\xi, \eta \rangle$ for all $x \in G$. With this norm and pointwise product, $A(G)$ and $B(G)$ become commutative Banach algebras. See [Eym64] for more about these algebras.

Definition 5 ([Pis05]). A continuous bounded function $\varphi \in C_b(G)$ is called a M_d -multiplier if there exist Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_i and bounded maps $\xi_i : G \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i, \mathcal{H}_{i-1})$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$ such that $\mathcal{H}_d = \mathcal{H}_0 = \mathbb{C}$ and

$$\varphi(g_1 \dots g_d) = \xi_1(g_1) \dots \xi_d(g_d)(1) \quad \text{for all } g_1, \dots, g_d \in G.$$

We denote by $M_d(G)$ the space of all M_d -multipliers of G .

When $d = 1$, we simply have $M_1(G) = C_b(G)$. When $d = 2$, it is the algebra of completely bounded Fourier multipliers $M_{cb}A(G)$. It is obvious that the inclusion $M_{d+1}(G) \subseteq M_d(G)$ is norm decreasing.

The coefficients of a unitary representation are typical elements of $M_d(G)$. Take any $\varphi \in B(G)$. There exist a unitary representation (π, \mathcal{H}) and vectors $u, v \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfying $\varphi(x) = \langle \pi(x)u, v \rangle$ for all $x \in G$. Then by choosing $\mathcal{H}_1 = \dots = \mathcal{H}_{d-1} = \mathcal{H}$ and $\xi_d(g)(1) = \pi(g)u$, $\xi_i(g) = \pi(g)$, and $\xi_1(g)(w) = \langle \pi(g)w, v \rangle$ for all $g \in G$, $w \in \mathcal{H}$, and $i = 2, \dots, d-1$, we get $\varphi(g_1 \dots g_d) = \langle \pi(g_1 \dots g_d)u, v \rangle = \xi_1(g_1) \dots \xi_d(g_d)(1)$ for all $g_1 \dots g_d \in G$ and $\|\varphi\|_{M_d} \leq \|v\| \|u\|$. Thus we have the following norm decreasing inclusions

$$A(G) \subseteq B(G) \subseteq M_{d+1}(G) \subseteq M_d(G) \subseteq M_{cb}A(G) \subseteq C_b(G).$$

Note that the inclusion $M_d(G) \rightarrow M_d(G_d)$ is isometric. Indeed, we have $M_d(G) = M_d(G_d) \cap C(G)$. It is also worth noting that if H is a closed subgroup of G , then the restriction map $M_d(G) \rightarrow M_d(H)$ is norm decreasing.

Just like $M_{cb}A(G)$, the space $M_d(G)$ is a commutative Banach algebra that is dual to a Banach space. Indeed, if we denote $X_d(G)$ the completion of $L^1(G)$ with respect to the norm

$$\|\psi\| = \sup \left\{ \left| \int_G \psi \varphi dx \right| : \varphi \in M_d(G), \|\varphi\|_{M_d} \leq 1 \right\} \quad \text{for } \psi \in L^1(G),$$

then we have $X_d(G)^* \cong M_d(G)$ isometrically [Pis05, Section 3]. The duality is as usual $\langle \psi, \varphi \rangle = \int_G \psi \varphi dx$ for $\varphi \in M_d(G)$ and $\psi \in L^1(G)$.

Definition 6. Let G be a locally compact group and let d be a positive integer.

- (1) We say that G has M_d -approximation-property (M_d -AP in short) if there is a net (φ_i) of functions in the Fourier algebra $A(G)$ such that $\varphi_i \rightarrow 1$ in $\sigma(M_d(G), X_d(G))$ -topology.
- (2) We say that G has M_d -weak-amenability (M_d -WA in short) if there is a net (φ_i) of functions in $A(G)$ such that $\sup_i \|\varphi_i\|_{M_d} < \infty$ and $\varphi_i \rightarrow 1$ in $\sigma(M_d(G), X_d(G))$ -topology. The minimum possible value of $\sup_i \|\varphi_i\|_{M_d}$ is called M_d -Cowling-Haagerup constant and denoted by $\Lambda_{CH}(G, d)$.
- (3) We say that G has M_d -weak-Haagerup-property (M_d -WH in short) if there is a net (φ_i) of functions in $M_d(G) \cap C_0(G)$ such that $\sup_i \|\varphi_i\|_{M_d} < \infty$ and $\varphi_i \rightarrow 1$ in $\sigma(M_d(G), X_d(G))$ -topology. The minimum possible value of $\sup_i \|\varphi_i\|_{M_d}$ is called M_d -weak-Cowling-Haagerup constant and denoted by $\Lambda_{WH}(G, d)$.

Remark 7. For M_d -AP and M_d -WA, since $C_c(G) \cap A(G)$ is dense in $A(G)$ and the inclusion $A(G) \subseteq M_d(G)$ is norm decreasing, we can assume that the functions φ_i are compactly supported. The uniform convergence on compact subsets is stronger than the convergence in $\sigma(M_d, X_d)$ -topology. For M_d -WA and M_d -WH, it turns out that we can replace the convergence in $\sigma(M_d, X_d)$ -topology by the uniform convergence on compact subsets. Indeed, the argument in [Haa16, Lemma 2.2] is valid for any d .

Example 8. Let us check the simplest example, the infinite cyclic group $G = \mathbb{Z}$. Put $F_n = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\varphi_n = \langle \lambda(\cdot) \frac{\mathbb{1}_{F_n}}{n^{1/2}}, \frac{\mathbb{1}_{F_n}}{n^{1/2}} \rangle \in A(\mathbb{Z})$. Then $\|\varphi_n\|_{M_d} \leq \|\varphi_n\|_A \leq \left\| \frac{\mathbb{1}_{F_n}}{n^{1/2}} \right\|_2^2 = 1$, and for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\varphi_n(m) = \begin{cases} \frac{n - |m|}{n} & \text{if } |m| < n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \longrightarrow 1$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, \mathbb{Z} satisfies M_d -WA. Similar proof works for any locally compact amenable group.

We have the implications

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Amenability} &\Rightarrow M_d\text{-WA} \Rightarrow M_d\text{-AP} \Rightarrow \text{AP}, \\ M_d\text{-WA} &\Rightarrow M_d\text{-WH}, \quad M_{d+1}\text{-AP} \Rightarrow M_d\text{-AP}, \\ M_{d+1}\text{-WA} &\Rightarrow M_d\text{-WA}, \quad M_{d+1}\text{-WH} \Rightarrow M_d\text{-WH}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the non-abelian free groups are M_d -WA [Ver22], the first implication is strict for any $d \geq 1$. The second implication is also strict for any $d \geq 2$ because of the semidirect product $SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}^2$ [Ver22, Corollary 4.4].

We call the properties in Definition 6 the M_d type approximation properties. When $d = 1$, these properties are automatically satisfied. Indeed, take any non-negative function $f \in C_c(G)$ with $\|f\|_1 = 1$, and put $\varphi_K = \langle \lambda(\cdot)f, \mathbb{1}_K \rangle \in A(G)$ for all compact subset $K \subseteq G$. Then $\|\varphi_K\|_{M_1} = \|\varphi_K\|_\infty = 1$ and $\varphi_K \rightarrow 1$ uniformly on compact subsets. When $d = 2$, these properties and constants are extensively studied and provided many interesting examples and applications. We refer the readers to [DCH85, Haa16, CH89, HK94, BO08, Knu16] for further references.

Proof of Theorem 1. The proof idea is essentially from [BP93]. Suppose that Γ acts properly on a tree T . We identify T with its vertex set. Let d be the usual distance on T .

Fix a base point $v_0 \in T$ and a geodesic ray $\gamma_0 : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow T$ beginning from v_0 . Every point $v \in T$ admits a geodesic ray $\gamma_v : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow T$ that begins at v and eventually merges with γ_0 . For $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, define

$$E_n = \{x \in \Gamma : d(xv_0, v_0) = n\}, \quad \chi_n = \mathbb{1}_{E_n}, \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_n = \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \chi_{n-2i}.$$

Since the action is proper, these functions are finitely supported. Put $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}_d = \mathbb{C}$ and

$$\mathcal{H}_1 = \dots = \mathcal{H}_{d-1} = \overline{\text{span}}\{\oplus_{k=0}^n \delta_{\gamma_{yv_0}(k)} : y \in \Gamma\} \subseteq \bigoplus_{k=0}^n \ell^2(T).$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_d(x)(1) &= \oplus_{k=0}^n \delta_{\gamma_{xv_0}(k)} \\ \xi_i(x) \left(\oplus_{k=0}^n \delta_{\gamma_{yv_0}(k)} \right) &= \oplus_{k=0}^n \delta_{\gamma_{xyv_0}(k)} \\ \xi_1(x) \left(\oplus_{k=0}^n \delta_{\gamma_{yv_0}(k)} \right) &= \langle \oplus_{k=0}^n \delta_{\gamma_{xyv_0}(k)}, \oplus_{k=0}^n \delta_{\gamma_{v_0}(n-k)} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

for $x, y \in \Gamma$ and $i = 2, \dots, d-1$. It is easily checked that these are well defined bounded operators with $\|\xi_d(x)\| \leq (n+1)^{1/2}$, $\|\xi_i(x)\| = 1$, and $\|\xi_1(x)\| \leq (n+1)^{1/2}$. Moreover,

$$\xi_1(x_1) \dots \xi_d(x_d)(1) = \sum_{k=0}^n \langle \delta_{\gamma_{x_1 \dots x_d v_0}(k)}, \delta_{\gamma_{v_0}(n-k)} \rangle = \varphi_n(x_1 \dots x_d)$$

for all $x_1, \dots, x_d \in \Gamma$. It follows that $\|\varphi_n\|_{M_d} \leq n+1$ and $\|\chi_n\|_{M_d} = \|\varphi_n - \varphi_{n-2}\|_{M_d} \leq \|\varphi_n\|_{M_d} + \|\varphi_{n-2}\|_{M_d} \leq 2n$.

On the other hand, the kernels $(u, v) \in T \times T \mapsto \exp(-td(u, v))$ are positive definite for any $t > 0$ [BP93, Proposition 3.2]. In particular, the functions $\rho_t : x \in \Gamma \mapsto \exp(-td(xv_0, v_0))$ are positive definite. Moreover, $\rho_t \rightarrow 1$ as $t \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\rho_t\|_{M_d} \leq \|\rho_t\|_B = \rho_t(e) = 1$. The only problem about the net (ρ_t) is that we do not know if ρ_t is in the Fourier algebra $A(\Gamma)$. To regulate that, we approximate ρ_t by the finitely supported functions defined as

$$\varphi_{n,t} = \rho_t \sum_{k=0}^n \chi_k = \sum_{k=0}^n \chi_k e^{-tk} \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Observe that

$$\|\rho_t - \varphi_{n,t}\|_{M_d} \leq \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} 2ke^{-tk} \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This completes the proof. \square

2.2. Von Neumann equivalence (vNE).

Definition 9. Let G , Λ , and Γ be discrete groups. Let (M, Tr) be a semifinite von Neumann algebra endowed with a faithful normal semifinite trace. The group of trace preserving $*$ -automorphisms of M is denoted by $\text{Aut}(M, \text{Tr})$. A group homomorphism $\sigma : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(M, \text{Tr})$ is called a G -action on (M, Tr) . A *fundamental domain* for the action σ is a projection $p \in M$ such that $\sum_{x \in G} \sigma_x(p) = 1$, where the convergence is with respect

to the strong operator topology. We say that Γ is a *von Neumann equivalence subgroup* (or *vNE-subgroup*) of Λ if there exists an action $\sigma : \Gamma \times \Lambda \rightarrow \text{Aut}(M, \text{Tr})$ and fundamental domains p and q for each of Λ and Γ actions, respectively, such that the trace $\text{Tr}(p)$ is finite. Furthermore, if the trace $\text{Tr}(q)$ is finite, we say Λ and Γ are von Neumann equivalent (vNE) and write $\Lambda \sim_{vNE} \Gamma$.

Example 10. Suppose that Γ is a subgroup of Λ . Then Γ is a vNE-subgroup of Λ . To see that, define $M = \ell^\infty(\Lambda)$ and $\text{Tr}(f) = \sum_{s \in \Lambda} f(s)$ for $f \in M_+$. Then we have the trace preserving action $\sigma : \Gamma \times \Lambda \rightarrow \text{Aut}(M, \text{Tr})$, $\sigma_{\gamma, s}(f)(x) = f(s^{-1}x\gamma)$ for all $s, x \in \Lambda$, $\gamma \in \Gamma$, and $f \in M$. The projection $\delta_e \in M$ is a finite trace fundamental domain for Λ -action. If $S \subseteq \Lambda$ is the representatives of left Γ -cosets, the projection $\mathbb{1}_S \in M$ is a fundamental domain for Γ -action.

The vNE is originated from Measure equivalence (ME) and W^* -equivalence (W^*E). The following two examples show their connection.

Example 11. Recall that Γ and Λ are said ME if there is a standard measure space (X, m) and commuting, measure preserving, free actions of Γ and Λ on (X, m) with a finite measure fundamental domain Ω_Γ and Ω_Λ , respectively. In this case, $\Gamma \times \Lambda$ acts on $M = \text{Tr} = (L^\infty(X, m), \int dm)$ with finite trace fundamental domains $\mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\Gamma}, \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\Lambda} \in M$, thus $\Lambda \sim_{vNE} \Gamma$.

Example 12. Recall that we say Γ and Λ are W^*E if their group von Neumann algebras $L(\Gamma)$ and $L(\Lambda)$ are $*$ -isomorphic. In this case, by the standard representation argument, the Hilbert spaces $\ell^2(\Gamma)$, $L^2(L(\Gamma))$, $L^2(L(\Lambda))$, and $\ell^2(\Lambda)$ are isomorphic, and $\Gamma \times \Lambda$ acts on $M = \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(\Gamma)) \cong \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(\Lambda))$ by left and right regular representations. The projection onto the subspace $\mathbb{C}\delta_e$ becomes a common fundamental domain with finite trace for both Γ and Λ actions, hence $\Lambda \sim_{vNE} \Gamma$.

We will need the following fact from [IPR19, Ish21].

Lemma 13. *Suppose that we have a trace preserving action $\sigma : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(M, \text{Tr})$. If $p \in M$ is a fundamental domain for σ , then the map $\theta_p : \ell^\infty(G) \rightarrow M$, $\theta_p(f) = \sum_{x \in G} f(x)\sigma_{x^{-1}}(p)$ is a normal faithful $*$ -representation.*

3. MAIN SECTION

3.1. Induction map. In this subsection, we will prove Theorem 2. The main tool is the induction map derived from vNE. We explain the construction now. Suppose that we have an action $\sigma : \Gamma \times \Lambda \rightarrow \text{Aut}(M, \text{Tr})$ that establishes Γ as a vNE-subgroup of Λ . Let p and q be fundamental domains for Λ and Γ actions, respectively. We assume that the trace is normalized so that $\text{Tr}(p) = 1$. The induction map is defined as

$$\Phi : \varphi \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda) \mapsto \hat{\varphi} \in \ell^\infty(\Gamma), \quad \hat{\varphi}(\gamma) = \text{Tr}(\sigma_\gamma(p)\theta_p(\varphi)) \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \Gamma,$$

where θ_p is as in Lemma 13. In [Ish21, Lemma 3.1], it was shown that the restriction of the above mapping $\Phi : M_2(\Lambda) \rightarrow M_2(\Gamma)$ is well defined and norm decreasing. The following lemma extends the latter result.

Lemma 14. *If $\varphi \in M_d(\Lambda)$, then $\hat{\varphi} \in M_d(\Gamma)$ and $\|\hat{\varphi}\|_{M_d} \leq \|\varphi\|_{M_d}$.*

Proof. Let $\varphi \in M_d(\Lambda)$. There exist Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_1, \dots, \mathcal{H}_d$ and bounded maps $\xi_i : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i, \mathcal{H}_{i-1})$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$ such that $\mathcal{H}_d = \mathcal{H}_0 = \mathbb{C}$ and

$$\varphi(s_1 \dots s_d) = \xi_1(s_1) \dots \xi_d(s_d)(1) \quad \text{for all } s_1, \dots, s_d \in \Lambda.$$

We assume that d is even so that we can write $d = 2k$ for some integer k . The odd case is done similarly. Define $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_0 = \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_d = \mathbb{C}$, $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2i} = (L^2(M, \text{Tr})p) \overline{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_i$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{2i+1} = (pL^2(M, \text{Tr})) \overline{\otimes} \mathcal{H}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$. For $\gamma \in \Gamma$, define the operators $\widehat{\xi}_i(\gamma) : \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_i \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{i-1}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\xi}_d(\gamma)(1) &= \sum_{s \in \Lambda} p \sigma_{\gamma, s}(p) \otimes \xi_d(s)(1) \\ \widehat{\xi}_{2i}(\gamma)(x \otimes u) &= \sum_{s \in \Lambda} p \sigma_{\gamma, s}(x) \otimes \xi_i(s)(u) \\ \widehat{\xi}_{2i+1}(\gamma)(x \otimes v) &= \sum_{s \in \Lambda} \sigma_{\gamma, s}(x) p \otimes \xi_i(s)(v) \\ \widehat{\xi}_1(\gamma)(x \otimes w) &= \sum_{s \in \Lambda} \text{Tr}(\sigma_{\gamma, s}(x) p) \xi_1(s)(w) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in L^2(M, \text{Tr})$, $u \in \mathcal{H}_{2i}$, $v \in \mathcal{H}_{2i+1}$, and $w \in \mathcal{H}_1$. We claim that these are well defined bounded operators. Let us check $\widehat{\xi}_{2i}(\gamma)$. Take any $x = xp \in L^2(M, \text{Tr})p$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Since p is a Tr -finite fundamental domain of Λ -action, the elements $\{p \sigma_{\gamma, s}(xp) : s \in \Lambda\}$ are pairwise orthogonal and summable in $pL^2(M, \text{Tr})$. The same thing happens for $\{p \sigma_{\gamma, s}(x) \otimes \xi_i(s)(v) : s \in \Lambda\} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_i$ because the operators $\{\xi_i(s) : s \in \Lambda\}$ are uniformly bounded. Now, take any finite sum $z = \sum_{j=1}^N x_j \otimes v_j \in \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_i$ where $x_j = x_j p \in L^2(G)p$ are pairwise orthogonal. Then, noting that the elements $\{p \sigma_{\gamma, s}(x_j) \otimes \xi_i(s)(v_j) : s \in \Lambda, j = 1, \dots, N\}$ are pairwise orthogonal, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\xi}_i(\gamma)(z)\|^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{s \in \Lambda} \|p \sigma_{\gamma, s}(x_j)\|^2 \|\xi_i(s)(v_j)\|^2 \\ &\leq \sup_{s \in \Lambda} \|\xi_i(s)\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{s \in \Lambda} \text{Tr}(\sigma_s^{-1}(p) \sigma_\gamma(x_j x_j^*)) \|v_j\|^2 \\ &= \sup_{s \in \Lambda} \|\xi_i(s)\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^N \|x_j\|^2 \|v_j\|^2 \\ &= \sup_{s \in \Lambda} \|\xi_i(s)\|^2 \|z\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By density, it follows that $\widehat{\xi}_i(\gamma)$ is a well defined bounded operator with $\|\widehat{\xi}_i(\gamma)\| \leq \sup_{s \in \Lambda} \|\xi_i(s)\|$. Similar argument works for $\widehat{\xi}_d(\gamma)$, $\widehat{\xi}_{2i+1}(\gamma)$, and $\widehat{\xi}_1(\gamma)$. Our next claim is that

$$\widehat{\varphi}(\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_d) = \widehat{\xi}_1(\gamma_1) \dots \widehat{\xi}_d(\gamma_d)(1) \quad \text{for all } \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d \in \Gamma.$$

Should this be true, we get $\widehat{\varphi} \in M_d(\Gamma)$ and $\|\widehat{\varphi}\|_{M_d} \leq \|\varphi\|_{M_d}$. Observe that for $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d \in \Gamma$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\xi}_1(\gamma_1) \dots \widehat{\xi}_d(\gamma_d)(1) &= \widehat{\xi}_1(\gamma_1) \dots \widehat{\xi}_{d-1}(\gamma_{d-1}) \sum_{s_d \in \Lambda} p \sigma_{\gamma_d, s_d}(p) \otimes \xi_d(s_d)(1) \\ &= \widehat{\xi}_1(\gamma_1) \dots \widehat{\xi}_{d-2}(\gamma_{d-2}) \sum_{s_{d-1} \in \Lambda} \sum_{s_d \in \Lambda} \sigma_{\gamma_{d-1}, s_{d-1}}(p) \sigma_{\gamma_{d-1} \gamma_d, s_{d-1} s_d}(p) \otimes \xi_d(s_d)(1) \\ &\dots \\ &= \sum_{s_d \in \Lambda} \dots \sum_{s_1 \in \Lambda} \text{Tr} \left(\Pi \left(\sigma_{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_d, s_1 \dots s_d}(p), \sigma_{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_{d-1}, s_1 \dots s_{d-1}}(p), \dots, \sigma_{\gamma_1, s_1}(p), p \right) \right) \xi_1(s_1) \dots \xi_d(s_d)(1) \\ &= \sum_{s_d \in \Lambda} \dots \sum_{s_1 \in \Lambda} \text{Tr} \left(\Pi \left(\sigma_{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_d, s_1 \dots s_d}(p), \sigma_{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_{d-1}, s_1 \dots s_{d-1}}(p), \dots, \sigma_{\gamma_1, s_1}(p), p \right) \right) \varphi(s_1 \dots s_d), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Pi : M^{d+1} \rightarrow M$ is the permuted multiplication map such that

$$\Pi(a_1, \dots, a_{d+1}) = a_d a_{d-2} \dots a_2 a_1 a_3 \dots a_{d+1} \quad \text{for all } a_1, \dots, a_{d+1} \in M.$$

Since the sum over $s_1 \in \Lambda$ is right invariant, by the change of variable $s_1 \mapsto s_1 s_d^{-1} \dots s_2^{-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\xi}_1(\gamma_1) \dots \widehat{\xi}_d(\gamma_d)(1) &= \sum_{s_d \in \Lambda} \dots \sum_{s_1 \in \Lambda} \text{Tr} \left(\Pi \left(\sigma_{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_d, s_1}(p), \sigma_{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_{d-1}, s_1 s_d^{-1}}(p), \dots, \sigma_{\gamma_1, s_1 s_2^{-1} \dots s_d^{-1}}(p), p \right) \right) \varphi(s_1) \\ &= \sum_{s_d \in \Lambda} \dots \sum_{s_2 \in \Lambda} \text{Tr} \left(\Pi \left(\sigma_{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_d}(p), \sigma_{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_d, s_d^{-1}}(p), \dots, \sigma_{\gamma_1, s_d^{-1} \dots s_2^{-1}}(p), \left[\sum_{s_1 \in \Lambda} \varphi(s_1) \sigma_{s_1^{-1}}(p) \right] \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{s_d \in \Lambda} \dots \sum_{s_2 \in \Lambda} \text{Tr} \left(\Pi \left(\sigma_{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_d}(p), \sigma_{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_d, s_d^{-1}}(p), \dots, \sigma_{\gamma_1, s_d^{-1} \dots s_2^{-1}}(p), \theta_p(\varphi) \right) \right) \\ &= \text{Tr} \left(\sigma_{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_d}(p) \theta_p(\varphi) \right) = \widehat{\varphi}(\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_d). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

We are ready to prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. Let (φ_i) be a net of functions in $M_d(\Lambda)$. Then by Lemma 14, the net $(\widehat{\varphi}_i)$ is in $M_d(\Gamma)$ and $\sup_i \|\widehat{\varphi}_i\|_{M_d} \leq \sup_i \|\varphi_i\|_{M_d}$. Since we also have $\varphi_i \in M_2(\Lambda)$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_i \in M_2(\Gamma)$, we can use the following facts.

- (1) ([IPR19, Proposition 4.2.(ii)]) If $\varphi_i \in A(\Lambda)$, then $\widehat{\varphi}_i \in A(\Gamma)$.
- (2) ([Ish21, Lemma 3.1.(b)]) If $\varphi_i \in c_0(\Lambda)$, then $\widehat{\varphi}_i \in c_0(\Gamma)$.
- (3) ([Ish21, Proposition 3.2.(b)]) The induction map $\Phi : M_2(\Lambda) \rightarrow M_2(\Gamma)$ is $\sigma(M_2, X_2)$ - $\sigma(M_2, X_2)$ -continuous.

The topologies $\sigma(M_d, X_d)$, $\sigma(M_2, X_2)$, and $\sigma(\ell^\infty, \ell^1)$ coincide on M_d because ℓ^1 is dense in X_2 and X_d , so the induction map $\Phi : M_d(\Lambda) \rightarrow M_d(\Gamma)$ is $\sigma(M_d, X_d)$ - $\sigma(M_d, X_d)$ -continuous. Now, Theorem 2 is direct. \square

Remark 15. *The proof did not use the condition that the fundamental domain of Γ action has finite trace. In other words, we also proved that the M_d type approximation properties pass to vNE -subgroups. However, the existence of the fundamental domain for Γ -action is important. Indeed, in general the induction map sends $\varphi \in A(\Lambda)$ to a coefficient of the*

the Koopman representation $\lambda_M : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(L^2(M, \text{Tr}))$, and λ_M is isomorphic to a multiple of the left regular representation (and is mixing) provided the existence of a fundamental domain for Γ -action.

Remark 16. Theorem 2 also shows that discrete countable amenable groups are M_d -weakly amenable for all $d \geq 1$. Indeed, if Γ is discrete countable and amenable, then Γ is a ME-subgroup of \mathbb{Z} [OW80], hence Γ is M_d -weakly-amenable by Example 8.

3.2. Inheritance by lattices. Recall that weak amenability, weak Haagerup property, and approximation property are inherited by lattices. It is also true for M_d type approximation properties for any d . Although previous works implicitly shows this fact, we provide an explanation for convenience.

Let us recall first how the case $d = 2$ was handled. A discrete subgroup Γ of G is called a lattice if there is a finite measure subset $\Omega \subseteq G$ such that $G = \bigsqcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \Omega\gamma$. In this case, there exist measurable maps $\gamma : G \rightarrow \Lambda$ and $\omega : G \rightarrow \Omega$ such that every element $g \in G$ can be uniquely written as $g = \omega(g)\gamma(g)$. The induction map used in [Haa16, Section 2] is defined as

$$\Phi_1 : \varphi \in M_2(\Gamma) \mapsto \tilde{\varphi} \in M_2(G), \quad \tilde{\varphi} = \mathbb{1}_\Omega * (\varphi \mu_\Gamma) * \mathbb{1}_\Omega^*,$$

where μ_Γ is the measure on G that counts the Γ -elements. In other terms, we can write

$$\tilde{\varphi}(g) = \int_\Omega \varphi(\gamma(gw))dw \quad \text{for all } g \in G.$$

It is a crucial fact that $\tilde{\varphi}$ is a continuous bounded function on G . Moreover, we have the following.

- (1) If $\varphi \in A(\Gamma)$, then $\tilde{\varphi} \in A(G)$ (see [Haa16, Lemma 2.1]).
- (2) Φ_1 is $\sigma(M_2, X_2)$ - $\sigma(M_2, X_2)$ -continuous (see [HK94, Lemma 1.16]).
- (3) If $\varphi \in c_0(\Gamma)$, then $\tilde{\varphi} \in C_0(G)$ (see [Knu16, Lemma 5.13]).

On the other hand, putting $(M, \text{Tr}) = (L^\infty(G), \int dx)$, we have the action $\sigma : G \times \Lambda \rightarrow \text{Aut}(M, \text{Tr})$ given by $\sigma_{(g,s)}f(x) = f(g^{-1}x\gamma)$ for $f \in M$, $g, x \in G$, and $\gamma \in \Gamma$. The projection $p = \mathbb{1}_\Omega$ is a finite measure fundamental domain for Γ -action. This data is enough to construct the induction map

$$\Phi : M_d(\Lambda) \rightarrow M_d(G_d), \quad \hat{\varphi}(g) = \text{Tr}(\sigma_g(p)\theta_p(\varphi)) \quad \text{for all } g \in G,$$

where G_d is the discrete realization of G . It turns out that Φ_1 and Φ coincide. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\varphi}(g) &= \text{Tr}(\sigma_g(p)\theta_p(\varphi)) = \int_G \mathbb{1}_\Omega(g^{-1}x) \sum_{s \in \Lambda} \varphi(s) \mathbb{1}_\Omega(xs^{-1})dx \\ &= \int_\Omega \sum_{s \in \Lambda} \varphi(s) \mathbb{1}_\Omega(gxs^{-1})dx = \int_\Omega \varphi(\lambda(gw))dw = \tilde{\varphi}(g) \end{aligned}$$

for all $g \in G$. It follows that the map $\Phi : M_d(\Gamma) \rightarrow M_d(G)$ is well defined, norm decreasing, $\sigma(M_d, X_d)$ - $\sigma(M_d, X_d)$ -continuous map. Now, Theorem 4 is immediate.

3.3. Some questions. We end the paper with the following naturally arising questions.

- (1) Is unitarizability invariant under vNE? Does unitarizability pass to vNE-subgroups?

- (2) Is it possible to define M_d type approximation properties for C^* -algebras, operator spaces, and von Neumann algebras in a compatible way with the current definition on (discrete) groups?

The first question follows from the similarity problem because amenability pass to vNE-subgroups. The second question is quite promising firstly because if two groups have isomorphic group von Neumann algebras, then they share the same value for M_d type approximation properties by Theorem 2, and secondly because the case $d = 2$ is done in [Haa16, HK94, Knu16].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is supported by JSPS fellowship program (P21737). The author is sincerely grateful to Narutaka Ozawa for the hospitality at the Research Institute of Mathematical Sciences (RIMS), Kyoto University, and for the fruitful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [Bat22] Bat-Od Battseren, *Von neumann equivalence and group exactness*, [arXiv:2202.13872](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.13872), 2022.
- [BO08] Nathaniel P. Brown and Narutaka Ozawa, *C^* -algebras and finite-dimensional approximations*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 88, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008. MR 2391387
- [BP93] Marek Bożejko and Massimo A. Picardello, *Weakly amenable groups and amalgamated products*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **117** (1993), no. 4, 1039–1046. MR 1119263
- [CH89] Michael Cowling and Uffe Haagerup, *Completely bounded multipliers of the Fourier algebra of a simple Lie group of real rank one*, Invent. Math. **96** (1989), no. 3, 507–549. MR 996553
- [Con76] A. Connes, *Classification of injective factors. Cases II_1 , II_∞ , III_λ , $\lambda \neq 1$* , Ann. of Math. (2) **104** (1976), no. 1, 73–115. MR 454659
- [Day50] Mahlon M. Day, *Means for the bounded functions and ergodicity of the bounded representations of semi-groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **69** (1950), 276–291. MR 44031
- [DCH85] Jean De Cannière and Uffe Haagerup, *Multipliers of the Fourier algebras of some simple Lie groups and their discrete subgroups*, Amer. J. Math. **107** (1985), no. 2, 455–500. MR 784292
- [Dix50] Jacques Dixmier, *Les moyennes invariantes dans les semi-groupes et leurs applications*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **12** (1950), 213–227. MR 37470
- [Eym64] Pierre Eymard, *L’algèbre de Fourier d’un groupe localement compact*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **92** (1964), 181–236. MR 228628
- [Fur99] Alex Furman, *Gromov’s measure equivalence and rigidity of higher rank lattices*, Ann. of Math. (2) **150** (1999), no. 3, 1059–1081. MR 1740986
- [Haa16] Uffe Haagerup, *Group C^* -algebras without the completely bounded approximation property*, J. Lie Theory **26** (2016), no. 3, 861–887. MR 3476201
- [HK94] Uffe Haagerup and Jon Kraus, *Approximation properties for group C^* -algebras and group von Neumann algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **344** (1994), no. 2, 667–699. MR 1220905
- [IPR19] Ishan Ishan, Jesse Peterson, and Lauren Ruth, *Von neumann equivalence and properly proximal groups*, [arxiv:1910.08682](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.08682), 2019.
- [Ish21] Ishan Ishan, *Von neumann equivalence and group approximation properties*, [arxiv:1910.08682](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.08682), 2021.
- [Knu16] Søren Knudby, *The weak Haagerup property*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **368** (2016), no. 5, 3469–3508. MR 3451883
- [OW80] Donald S. Ornstein and Benjamin Weiss, *Ergodic theory of amenable group actions. I. The Rohlin lemma*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **2** (1980), no. 1, 161–164. MR 551753
- [Pis01] Gilles Pisier, *Similarity problems and completely bounded maps*, expanded ed., Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1618, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001, Includes the solution to “The Halmos problem”. MR 1818047

- [Pis05] ———, *Are unitarizable groups amenable?*, Infinite groups: geometric, combinatorial and dynamical aspects, Progr. Math., vol. 248, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2005, pp. 323–362. MR 2195457
- [Ver22] Ignacio Vergara, *The m_d -approximation property and unitarisability*, [arXiv:2202.12198](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.12198), 2022.

RIMS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, 606-8502 KYOTO, JAPAN

Email address: `batoddd@gmail.com`