

On isometry groups on the space of converging sequences

Valentin Ferenczi

Universidade de São Paulo

Linear and non-linear analysis in Banach spaces

Santander, July 20th, 2023

Supported by São Paulo Research Foundation - Fapesp,
"Geometry of Banach Spaces" Project 2016/25574-8

Group actions

Throughout the talk, G is a fixed **group**.

A linear action $\lambda : G \curvearrowright Z$ of G on a Banach space Z , i.e. a group homomorphism

$$\lambda : G \rightarrow GL(Z) \subseteq B(Z)$$

will always be assumed **bounded**, i.e. $\sup_{g \in G} \|\lambda(g)\| < +\infty$.

Group actions

Throughout the talk, G is a fixed **group**.

A linear action $\lambda : G \curvearrowright Z$ of G on a Banach space Z , i.e. a group homomorphism

$$\lambda : G \rightarrow GL(Z) \subseteq B(Z)$$

will always be assumed **bounded**, i.e. $\sup_{g \in G} \|\lambda(g)\| < +\infty$.

Given λ as above, a subspace $X \subseteq Z$ is **G -invariant** if $\lambda(g)(X) = X, \forall g \in G$.

Definition

Fix $\lambda : G \curvearrowright Z$ as above, and a G -invariant subspace $X \subseteq Z$.
 Then G acts **on X** , by $u(g)x := \lambda(g)|_X x$
 and **on $Y := Z/X$** , by $v(g)(z + X) := \lambda(g)z + X$.

Objective

Study relations between u, v, λ . In particular, given u, v , what are the possible λ 's (we call them **compatible** with u, v)?

Definition

Fix $\lambda : G \curvearrowright Z$ as above, and a G -invariant subspace $X \subseteq Z$.
 Then G acts on X , by $u(g)x := \lambda(g)|_X x$
 and on $Y := Z/X$, by $v(g)(z + X) := \lambda(g)z + X$.

Objective

Study relations between u, v, λ . In particular, given u, v , what are the possible λ 's (we call them **compatible** with u, v)?

- Kalton "centralizers" (≥ 1979): $G = \text{units}$ in a Banach lattice
- Pytlic-Szwarc, Ozawa, Pisier... (≥ 1986):
 $X, Y = \ell_2, Z = \ell_2 \oplus \ell_2, u = v$ a unitary action.
- F. - Rosenthal (2017): $Z = X \oplus Y$
- UEx + USP (≥ 2017): complex structures $G = \{1, i, -1, -i\}$
- Kuchment (2021), Castillo - F. (2023): $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Y \rightarrow 0$

Definition

Fix $\lambda : G \curvearrowright Z$ as above, and a G -invariant subspace $X \subseteq Z$.
 Then G acts on X , by $u(g)x := \lambda(g)|_X x$
 and on $Y := Z/X$, by $v(g)(z + X) := \lambda(g)z + X$.

Objective

Study relations between u, v, λ . In particular, given u, v , what are the possible λ 's (we call them **compatible** with u, v)?

- Kalton "centralizers" (≥ 1979): $G = \text{units}$ in a Banach lattice
- Pytlic-Szwarc, Ozawa, Pisier... (≥ 1986):
 $X, Y = \ell_2, Z = \ell_2 \oplus \ell_2, u = v$ a unitary action.
- F. - Rosenthal (2017): $Z = X \oplus Y$
- UEx + USP (≥ 2017): complex structures $G = \{1, i, -1, -i\}$
- Kuchment (2021), Castillo - F. (2023): $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Y \rightarrow 0$

Let us concentrate on the case $Z = X \oplus Y$.

Examples of compatible λ 's on $X \oplus Y$

On the blackboard:

- diagonal actions,
- conjugate actions,
- c_0 and c .

Derivations

Observation

Given X, Y and u, v as above, the following are equivalent

- 1 λ_d is a compatible bounded action on $X \oplus Y$, where

$$\lambda_d(g) := \begin{pmatrix} u(g) & d(g) \\ 0 & v(g) \end{pmatrix},$$

- 2 $d : G \rightarrow B(Y, X)$ is a bounded map such that $\forall g, h \in G$,
 $d(gh) = u(g)d(h) + d(g)v(h)$.

Definition

A map d is a **derivation** (for u, v on X, Y) if it satisfies (1)(2) above.

Inner derivations

The simplest example of derivation

Given any $A \in B(Y, X)$, the formula

$$d_A(g) = [u(g), A, v(g)] =: u(g)A - Av(g)$$

defines a derivation, called **inner**.

Immediate

A derivation d is inner if and only if λ_d is conjugate to the diagonal representation.

Classical example: unitarizable actions

Assume G is countable, $X = Y = \ell_2(G)$, (with basis $(e_g)_{g \in G}$) and $u = v$ the regular unitary action on $\ell_2(G)$ defined by

$$u(g)(e_h) = e_{gh}.$$

Classical example: unitarizable actions

Assume G is countable, $X = Y = \ell_2(G)$, (with basis $(e_g)_{g \in G}$) and $u = v$ the regular unitary action on $\ell_2(G)$ defined by

$$u(g)(e_h) = e_{gh}.$$

Theorems

- Day (50) and Dixmier (50): G is amenable \Rightarrow all derivations for u, u are inner (\Leftrightarrow all actions λ on $\ell_2(G) \oplus \ell_2(G)$ compatible with u, u are conjugate to the diagonal (unitary) action)

Classical example: unitarizable actions

Assume G is countable, $X = Y = \ell_2(G)$, (with basis $(e_g)_{g \in G}$) and $u = v$ the regular unitary action on $\ell_2(G)$ defined by

$$u(g)(e_h) = e_{gh}.$$

Theorems

- Day (50) and Dixmier (50): G is amenable \Rightarrow all derivations for u, u are inner (\Leftrightarrow all actions λ on $\ell_2(G) \oplus \ell_2(G)$ compatible with u, u are conjugate to the diagonal (unitary) action)
- Pytlic-Szwarc (86): if $G = \mathbb{F}_\infty$, then there exists a non-inner derivation for u, u .
- **Open** in general for non-amenable groups (Day-Dixmier Pb)

Classical example: unitarizable actions

Assume G is countable, $X = Y = \ell_2(G)$, (with basis $(e_g)_{g \in G}$) and $u = v$ the regular unitary action on $\ell_2(G)$ defined by

$$u(g)(e_h) = e_{gh}.$$

Theorems

- Day (50) and Dixmier (50): G is amenable \Rightarrow all derivations for u, u are inner (\Leftrightarrow all actions λ on $\ell_2(G) \oplus \ell_2(G)$ compatible with u, u are conjugate to the diagonal (unitary) action)
- Pytlic-Szwarc (86): if $G = \mathbb{F}_\infty$, then there exists a non-inner derivation for u, u .
- **Open** in general for non-amenable groups (Day-Dixmier Pb)

Comments (linear unbounded maps, bounded non-linear maps)

A theorem

Let $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Y \rightarrow 0$, and actions u, v of a group G on X, Y respectively.

Theorem (Castillo, F. 23)

Assume G is amenable and X is a “ G -ultrassummand” (for example X reflexive). Then:

- all actions of G on Z compatible with u and v (attention: there could exist no such actions) are mutually conjugate.

A theorem

Let $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Y \rightarrow 0$, and actions u, v of a group G on X, Y respectively.

Theorem (Castillo, F. 23)

Assume G is amenable and X is a “ G -ultrassummand” (for example X reflexive). Then:

- all actions of G on Z compatible with u and v (attention: there could exist no such actions) are mutually conjugate.
- In particular, when $Z = X \oplus Y$, all such actions are conjugate to the diagonal action.

A theorem

Let $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Y \rightarrow 0$, and actions u, v of a group G on X, Y respectively.

Theorem (Castillo, F. 23)

Assume G is amenable and X is a “ G -ultrassummand” (for example X reflexive). Then:

- all actions of G on Z compatible with u and v (attention: there could exist no such actions) are mutually conjugate.
- In particular, when $Z = X \oplus Y$, all such actions are conjugate to the diagonal action.

Pytlic-Szwarc's is a counterexample without amenability, let us see a counterexample without reflexivity: the already mentioned $G = 2^{<\omega}$ (amenable) acting on $c = c_0 \oplus \mathbb{R}$.

The counterexample of the group $2^{<\omega}$ acting on $c = c_0 \oplus \mathbb{R}$
 (inspired by Antunes-F.-Grivaux-Rosendal (19))

We have $g = (\varepsilon_n)_n \in 2^{<\omega} = \{-1, 1\}^{<\omega}$, $X = c_0$, $Y = \mathbb{R}$, $Z = c$

$$u(g)(x) = (\varepsilon_n x_n)_n, \quad v(g)(y) = y,$$

and

$$\lambda(g) = \begin{pmatrix} u(g) & d(g) \\ 0 & \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

What is $d(g)$?

The counterexample of the group $2^{<\omega}$ acting on $c = c_0 \oplus \mathbb{R}$
(inspired by Antunes-F.-Grivaux-Rosendal (19))

We have $g = (\varepsilon_n)_n \in 2^{<\omega} = \{-1, 1\}^{<\omega}$, $X = c_0$, $Y = \mathbb{R}$, $Z = c$

$$u(g)(x) = (\varepsilon_n x_n)_n, \quad v(g)(y) = y,$$

and

$$\lambda(g) = \begin{pmatrix} u(g) & d(g) \\ 0 & \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

What is $d(g)$? Well, since $\lambda(g)(\mathbf{1}) = (\varepsilon_n)_n = \mathbf{1} - 2 \sum_{\varepsilon_n = -1} e_n$,

$$d(g)y = -2y \sum_{\varepsilon = -1} e_n = -2p_{[\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon_n = -1]}(y\mathbf{1})$$

Is it inner?

The counterexample of the group $2^{<\omega}$ acting on $c = c_0 \oplus \mathbb{R}$
(inspired by Antunes-F.-Grivaux-Rosendal (19))

We have $g = (\varepsilon_n)_n \in 2^{<\omega} = \{-1, 1\}^{<\omega}$, $X = c_0$, $Y = \mathbb{R}$, $Z = c$

$$u(g)(x) = (\varepsilon_n x_n)_n, \quad v(g)(y) = y,$$

and

$$\lambda(g) = \begin{pmatrix} u(g) & d(g) \\ 0 & \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

What is $d(g)$? Well, since $\lambda(g)(\underline{1}) = (\varepsilon_n)_n = \underline{1} - 2 \sum_{\varepsilon_n = -1} e_n$,

$$d(g)y = -2y \sum_{\varepsilon = -1} e_n = -2p_{[\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon_n = -1]}(y\underline{1})$$

Is it inner? if $d(g) = [u(g), L, v(g)]$ holds for some L , then

$$d(g)y = u(g)Ly - Ly = (u(g) - \text{Id}_{c_0})Ly = -2p_{[\varepsilon_n, \varepsilon_n = -1]}(Ly).$$

This holds $\forall g$ iff $Ly = y\underline{1}$, but this L does not belong to $B(\mathbb{R}, c_0)$.

So d is **not** inner and λ **not** conjugate to the diagonal action.

So d is **not** inner and λ **not** conjugate to the diagonal action.

This is equivalent to observing that c_0 is **badly** complemented in c in the sense that it is **not** complemented by a **G -equivariant** projection, which is the same as saying that c_0 does **not** admit a **G -invariant** complement.

Why is it equivalent?

So d is **not** inner and λ **not** conjugate to the diagonal action.






This is equivalent to observing that c_0 is **badly** complemented in c in the sense that it is **not** complemented by a **G -equivariant** projection, which is the same as saying that c_0 does **not** admit a **G -invariant** complement.

Why is it equivalent? If P is a **G -equivariant** projection from $Z = X \oplus Y$ onto X , then let $A : Y \rightarrow X$ be defined by $A(y) = P(0, y)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} u(g)Ay &= u(g)P(0, y) = P(\lambda(g)(0, y)) = P(d(g)y, v(g)y) \\ &= P((d(g)y, 0)) + P(0, v(g)y) = d(g) + Av(g)y, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $d = d_A$ is **inner**. Conversely, given $d = d_A$, then $P(x, y) = x + Ay$ is G -equivariant.

THANK YOU - GRACIAS!

-  L. Antunes, V. Ferenczi, S. Grivaux and Ch. Rosendal, *Light groups of isomorphisms of Banach spaces and invariant LUR renormings*, Pacific J. Math., 301 (1) (2019) 31–54.
-  J. Castillo and V. Ferenczi, *Group actions on twisted sums of Banach spaces*, Bulletin of the Malaysian Mathematical Sciences Society, 46, Article number: 135 (2023).
-  V. Ferenczi and Ch. Rosendal, *Non-unitarisable representations and maximal symmetry*, J. IMJ 16 (2017) 421–445.
-  P. Kuchment, *Three-representation problem in Banach spaces*, Complex Analysis and Operator Theory 15, 34 (2021).
-  G. Pisier, *Similarity problems and completely bounded maps. Includes the solution to “The Halmos problem”*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1618. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.