

ON THE COMMUTANT OF $B(H)$ IN ITS ULTRAPOWER

EMMANUEL CHETCUTI AND BEATRIZ ZAMORA-AVILES

ABSTRACT. Let $B(H)$ be the algebra of bounded linear operators on a separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space H . We study the commutant of $B(H)$ in its ultrapower. We characterize the class of non-principal ultrafilters for which this commutant is non-trivial. Additionally, we extend the class of ultrafilters for which the commutant is trivial.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let α be a non-principal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} and let A be a unital C^* -algebra. We define,

$$\mathcal{A}_\infty := \left\{ (x_n) \in \prod_n A : \sup_n \|x_n\| < \infty \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}_\alpha := \left\{ (x_n) \in \mathcal{A}_\infty : \lim_\alpha \|x_n\| = 0 \right\}.$$

The quotient of \mathcal{A}_∞ by \mathcal{N}_α is a C^* -algebra and it is called the *ultrapower of A w.r.t. α* . We denote this C^* -algebra by $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(A)$. Note that if $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{C}_\alpha(A)$ is self-adjoint, then

$$\mathcal{F}_\alpha(\mathcal{K}) := \{ \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha(A) : \mathbf{b}\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{a}\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0} \forall \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{K} \}$$

is a C^* -subalgebra of $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(A)$ and it is called the commutant of \mathcal{K} in $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(A)$. It is easily seen that the algebra A embeds isometrically in $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(A)$ which implies that A and $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(A)$ can be identified as C^* -subalgebras of $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(A)$. The invariant $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(A)$ is important for the classification of separable nuclear unital purely infinite simple C^* -algebras, some of these applications can be found in [10], [12], [13] and [16]. If A is separable and the Continuum Hypothesis is assumed then the isomorphism class of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(A)$ is independent of the choice of α , see [9]. In the absence of the Continuum Hypothesis (CH), $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(A)$ depends on the choice of α for every infinite-dimensional separable C^* -algebra A , see [6] and [7].

Let $B(H)$ be the algebra of bounded operators on a separable infinite dimensional Hilbert space and let $K(H)$ be the ideal of compact operators on $B(H)$. For the Calkin algebra $C(H) = B(H)/K(H)$ (which is non-separable) Kirchberg proved in [11] that $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(C(H)) = \mathbb{C}$ for any ultrafilter α . This implies that $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H)) \subset \mathbb{C} + \mathcal{C}_\alpha(K(H))$. Kirchberg asked whether $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H)) = \mathbb{C}$ for any ultrafilter α .

It was surprising when I. Farah, C. Philips and J. Steprans in [8] proved that under the Continuum Hypothesis, $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ depends on the choice of the ultrafilter α . More specifically, they proved that if α is a selective ultrafilter then $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H)) = \mathbb{C}$. They also constructed an ultrafilter in ZFC for which $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H)) \neq \mathbb{C}$ that they called *flat*. J. Steprans also proved that $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H)) = \mathbb{C}$ for any P-point ultrafilter. Recall that every selective ultrafilter is a P-point and neither the existence of selective nor P-point ultrafilters are provable from the axioms of ZFC ; Shelah showed that it is consistent that there are no P-point ultrafilters, see [21]. However, they exist assuming the Continuum Hypothesis, [15] and [18].


The authors of [8] posed the following two questions:

Date: August 5, 2021.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 46L05, 03E50.

1. Is there an ultrafilter α on \mathbb{N} in ZFC such that $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H)) = \mathbb{C}$?
2. If an ultrafilter α satisfies $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H)) \neq \mathbb{C}$, does it follow that α is flat?

In this paper we give a positive answer to the second question. In addition, we make other advancements with regard to the first question by introducing the class of *quasi P-point ultrafilters* and show that for such ultrafilters the relative commutant of $B(H)$ is trivial. In our analysis we also show that the relative commutant of $B(H)$ is trivial for ultrafilters satisfying the 3f-property. The following diagram summarizes these results.



It is known that the existence of ultrafilters with the 3f-Property (and therefore of selective ultrafilters and P-points) cannot be proved in ZFC.

In order to prove $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H)) = \mathbb{C}$ for every selective ultrafilter α , the authors in [8] used a result by Sherman [20] about central sequences in $B(H)$. They also used a non-trivial characterization of selective ultrafilters by Mathias in [15]. It is worthwhile to mention that our methods are different in that they are totally elementary.

This paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we set up notation and introduce some preliminaries used in the rest of the paper. In section 3 we recall the definitions of the classes of ultrafilters we consider. Of particular interest is the characterization of *P-point* ultrafilters in terms of a quasi order on the Baire space $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ given in Corollary 4. This characterization of P-points leads to the definition of a possibly larger class of ultrafilters which we call *quasi P-point* ultrafilters, in Definition 1 and Proposition 6. In addition we consider ultrafilters with the *three functions property* (3f-property for short). This property for ultrafilters was studied in [2] and it was later isolated by A. Blass in [1]. It should be noted that our definition is weaker. It is easily seen that every P-point has the 3f-property, but there are ultrafilters that have the 3f-property which are not P-points [2]. Hence this class of ultrafilters properly contains the P-point ultrafilters. Some properties of ultrafilters with the 3f-property are proven. In particular, we prove that no flat ultrafilter can satisfy the three function property, Theorem 15. Section 5 explores $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ w.r.t. the ultrafilters introduced in Section 3. We prove the converse of [8, Theorem 4.1], namely that if $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H)) \neq \mathbb{C}$, then α is flat. This result combined with Corollary 15, implies that $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H)) = \mathbb{C}$ for any ultrafilter with the 3f-property. Further we show in Theorem 28 that if α is a quasi P-point then $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H)) = \mathbb{C}$. In section 4, we emphasize how [8, Theorem 1.5] can be stated and proved in a more general setting. This result could be of independent interest.

2. SOME NOTATION AND PRELIMINARY COMMENTS

- (1) Let \mathcal{N} denote the Baire space $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and \mathcal{N}^\uparrow the set of all strictly increasing members of \mathcal{N} .
- (2) For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let $[k, \rightarrow]$ denote the set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \geq k\}$. For any infinite $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ let $\mathcal{F}(A)$ denote the cofinite filter in A . We shall simply write \mathcal{F} instead of $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N})$.
- (3) Let $f \in \mathcal{N}$ and α a filter on \mathbb{N} .
 - (i) If P is a property associated with functions (like injectivity, surjectivity, etc.) we say that f is α -P (or has property P mod α) when there exists $A \in \alpha$ s.t. $f|_A$ has property P.
 - (ii) The family $\alpha^f := \{A \subset \mathbb{N} : f^{-1}A \in \alpha\}$ is a filter on \mathbb{N} containing $\{f[A] : A \in \alpha\}$. If α is a maximal filter, then α^f is also a maximal filter.
 - (iii) Note that α^f is principal if and only if f is α -constant, and if α is principal, then so is α^f . When f is surjective, (i.e. $f[f^{-1}A] = A$ for every $A \subset \mathbb{N}$) then one can show that $\alpha^f = \{f[A] : A \in \alpha\}$.

- (4) We shall primarily be concerned with non-principal ultrafilters on \mathbb{N} . Let $\beta\omega \setminus \omega$ denote the set of all non-principal ultrafilters on \mathbb{N} . Unless otherwise stated: ‘ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} ’ means ‘non-principal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} ’.
- (5) Let $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$.
- ‘ $A_n \downarrow \emptyset$ in α ’ means that (A_n) is a decreasing sequence in α and $\bigcap_n A_n = \emptyset$.
 - It is easy to see that if $f = g \pmod{\alpha}$ then $\alpha^f = \alpha^g$. We recall the fact that if $\alpha^f = \alpha$ then $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : f(n) = n\} \in \alpha$, [3, Theorem 3.3].
 - If $\beta \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ and there exists a bijection $f \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfying $\beta = \alpha^f$, we write $\alpha \sim_{\text{RK}} \beta$.¹ We recall that \sim_{RK} is an equivalence relation on $\beta\omega \setminus \omega$.
 - The Rudin-Keisler ordering on $\beta\omega \setminus \omega$ is defined as follows: $\beta \leq_{\text{RK}} \alpha$ if $\beta = \alpha^f$ for some non α -constant $f \in \mathcal{N}$. We recall that the Rudin-Keisler ordering induces a partial order on $(\beta\omega \setminus \omega) / \sim_{\text{RK}}$, and furthermore, every selective ultrafilter is an atom in this partially ordered set.
 - Let (X_n) be a sequence of subsets of \mathbb{N} satisfying $\bigcap_n X_n = \emptyset$. Let $A_n := \bigcap_{i=1}^n X_i$ and let $f \in \mathcal{N}$ be the function defined by $f(i) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : i \notin A_{n+1}\}$. Note that $A_n \downarrow \emptyset$ in the powerset of \mathbb{N} . Note further that for $k \geq 2$, $f^{-1}\{k\} = A_k \setminus A_{k+1}$. f is uniquely determined; we call it the ‘indicator function associated with (X_n) ’.

3. ON SOME DIFFERENT ULTRAFILTERS

3.1. Selective ultrafilters and P-points. We recall that for an ultrafilter $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) For every partition $\{A_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of \mathbb{N} with $A_n \notin \alpha$, there is $X \in \alpha$ such that $|X \cap A_n| = 1$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,
- (ii) Every $g \in \mathcal{N}$ is either α -injective or α -constant,
- (iii) For every $E \subset [\mathbb{N}]^2$ there exists $A \in \alpha$ such that either $[A]^2 \subset E$ or $[A]^2 \cap E = \emptyset$,
- (iv) For every analytic² $E \subset [\mathbb{N}]^\infty$ there is $A \in \alpha$ such that either $[A]^\infty \subset E$ or $[A]^\infty \cap E = \emptyset$.

In this case α is said to be *selective* (or *Ramsey*). The equivalence of (i)-(iii), and the implication (iv) \Rightarrow (i) are not difficult to see (see, for example, [8, Theorem 1.3]) but the implication (i) \Rightarrow (iv) is the Mathias’s Theorem [15]. It is well known that selective ultrafilters exist under CH [18].

The ultrafilter $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ is called a *P-point* (or *weakly selective*) if for every partition $\{A_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of \mathbb{N} with $A_n \notin \alpha$, there exists $X \in \alpha$ such that $X \cap A_n$ is finite for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly every selective ultrafilter is a P-point. However, the converse is not true. It was proven by Mathias and others that the Continuum Hypothesis ensures the existence of P-point ultrafilters that are non selective, (K. Kunen in [14] proved that under MA there exist P-points that are not selective). On the other hand Shelah in [19] constructed a model of ZFC in which there exists (up to isomorphism) exactly one P-point and this P-point has to be selective. Shelah also showed that it is consistent that there are no P-point ultrafilters [21]. Therefore the existence of selective and P-point ultrafilters cannot be proved in ZFC.

For a non α -constant function $f \in \mathcal{N}$, we say that f is α -faithful when there exists $K \in \alpha$ such that the condition $f[A \cap K] \in \alpha^f$ implies that $A \cap K \in \alpha$. For $f, g \in \mathcal{N}$ let us write $g \ll f$ if $g \leq hf$ for some $h \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow$.

Proposition 1. *Let $f \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) f is α -faithful.
- (ii) $\alpha \sim_{\text{RK}} \alpha^f$.
- (iii) There exists a bijection $g \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\alpha^{g^{-1} \circ f} = \alpha$.

¹Note that $\alpha \sim_{\text{RK}} \beta$ if and only if there exists α -injective $f \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfying $\beta = \alpha^f$.

²Recall that a subset of a Polish space is analytic if it is a continuous image of a Borel subset of a Polish space.

(iv) f is α -injective.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Let $K \in \alpha$ such that $f[A \cap K] \in \alpha^f$ implies $A \cap K \in \alpha$ for every $A \subset \mathbb{N}$. Let $A \subset K$ such that $f[A] = f[K]$ and $f|_A$ is injective. Faithfulness implies that $A \in \alpha$, and therefore $\alpha \sim_{\text{RK}} \alpha^f$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii). By definition, $\alpha \sim_{\text{RK}} \alpha^f$ implies that there exists α -injective $g' \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\alpha^{g'} = \alpha^f$. It is easy to see, then, that there exists a bijection $g \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfying $g = g' \bmod \alpha$ and $\alpha^g = \alpha^f$ and so, for an arbitrary $A \subset \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$A \in \alpha^{g^{-1} \circ f} \Leftrightarrow f^{-1}(g(A)) \in \alpha \Leftrightarrow g(A) \in \alpha^g \Leftrightarrow A \in \alpha.$$

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv). If there exists a bijection $g \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\alpha^{g^{-1} \circ f} = \alpha$, then (by the ‘fixed point theorem’) $g^{-1} \circ f$ is α -injective. Therefore f is α -injective.

(iv) \Rightarrow (i). If $K \in \alpha$, $f|_K$ is injective, and $f[A \cap K] \in \alpha^f$ for some $A \subset \mathbb{N}$, then, $A \cap K = f^{-1}(f[A \cap K]) \cap K \in \alpha$. This shows that if f is α -injective, then it is α -faithful. \square

Lemma 2. For $f, g \in \mathcal{N}$, we have $g \ll f$ if and only if there exists $s \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow$ such that

$$g^{-1}[s(n), \rightarrow] \subset f^{-1}[n, \rightarrow].$$

Proof. Suppose that $g \leq h \circ f$ for some $h \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow$. Then $g(i) \geq h(n)$ implies $h(f(i)) \geq h(n)$ and therefore $f(i) \geq n$, i.e. $g^{-1}[h(n), \rightarrow] \subset f^{-1}[n, \rightarrow]$. Conversely, suppose that there exists $s \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow$ such that $g^{-1}[s(n), \rightarrow] \subset f^{-1}[n, \rightarrow]$. The function $h \in \mathcal{N}$ defined by $h(i) := s(i+1)$ is strictly increasing. If $g(i) \geq h(f(i))$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then $g(i) \geq s(f(i)+1)$, and therefore $f(i) \geq f(i)+1$. So $g < h \circ f$. This proves the lemma. \square

If we set $f \sim g$ when there exists a bijective $h \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfying $f = hg$, then \sim defines an equivalence relation on \mathcal{N} and \ll induces a partial order on \mathcal{N}/\sim .

Proposition 3. Let $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ and $f \in \mathcal{N}$. The following statements are equivalent:

- (i) f is α -finite-to-one.
- (ii) $g \ll f$ for some α -injective $g \in \mathcal{N}$.
- (iii) There exists α -injective $g \in \mathcal{N}$ and $h \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $g \leq h \circ f$.
- (iv) There is $g \in \mathcal{N}$ that is α -injective and $h \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow$ such that $g^{-1}[h(n), \rightarrow] \subset f^{-1}[n, \rightarrow]$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. The equivalence of (ii) and (iv) follows by Lemma 2. The implication (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) is trivial. Let us show (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Let $X \in \alpha$ such that f is finite-to-one on X . For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ let $X_i := f^{-1}\{i\} \cap X$ and let $n_i := |X_i|$. Express the elements of X_i in ascending order, i.e. $X_i = \{k_1^i, \dots, k_{n_i}^i\}$ and $k_s^i < k_t^i$ when $s < t$. Define $h, g \in \mathcal{N}$ by setting

$$h(i) := \sum_{j=1}^i n_j + i \quad (i \in \mathbb{N})$$

and

$$g(k) := \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} n_j + i + p & \text{if there exist } i \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq p \leq n^i \text{ such that } k = k_p^i \\ h(f(k)), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that $h \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow$, g is α -injective and $g \leq hf$.

Remains to be shown that (iii) \Rightarrow (i); if $g \in \mathcal{N}$ is α -injective and $h \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfies $g \leq h \circ f$, then, there exists $X \in \alpha$ such that $g|_X$ is injective and, therefore, $f|_X$ is finite-to-one. \square

The following characterisation of P-points will be useful.

Corollary 4. The ultrafilter $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ is a P-point if and only if for every non α -constant $f \in \mathcal{N}$ there exists $g \in \mathcal{N}$ that is α -faithful such that $g \ll f$.

3.2. Ultrafilters on a countable metric space. Let $X = \{x(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a countable metric space. We suppose that all the $x(n)$'s are distinct, so that we need not distinguish between X and \mathbb{N} . A subset $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ is said to be δ -discrete, where $\delta > 0$, if the distance between any two points of A is at least δ . The ultrafilter α on \mathbb{N} ($= X$) is *discrete* if there exists $\delta > 0$ and $A \in \alpha$ such that A is δ -discrete. On the other extreme, α is said to be *Cauchy* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $A \in \alpha$ satisfying $\text{diam } A \leq \varepsilon$.

Proposition 5. *Let α be an ultrafilter on an infinite countable metric space X .*

- (i) *If α is not Cauchy, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that every $A \in \alpha$ contains an infinite δ -discrete subset.*
- (ii) *If α is selective, then α is either Cauchy or discrete.*

Proof. If α is not Cauchy there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\text{diam } A > 2\delta$ for every $A \in \alpha$. Let $x : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X$ be an enumeration of X and let ρ denote the metric function. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$X_k := \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho(x(n), x(i)) > \delta \quad \forall i \leq k\}.$$

It can readily be seen that $X_k \in \alpha$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\bigcap_k X_k = \emptyset$. Let f be the indicator function associated with (X_k) . Note that if $f(n) \geq m$, then $\rho(x(n), x(i)) > \delta$ for every $i \leq m$. We shall recursively construct a strictly increasing sequence (n_k) in \mathbb{N} such that $f(n_k) < n_{k+1}$. Let $n_1 := 1$. The set $Y_1 := \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n > f(n_1)\} \in \alpha$. Let $n_2 \in Y_1$ be arbitrary. Then $\rho(x(n_2), x(n_1)) > \delta$ and therefore $n_2 > n_1$. Suppose that $n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_k$ have been selected and $f(n_i) < n_{i+1}$ for every $i \leq k-1$. The set $Y_k := \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n > f(n_k)\} \in \alpha$. Let $n_{k+1} \in Y_k$. Then $\rho(x(n_{k+1}), x(n)) > \delta$ for every $n \leq n_k$, and in particular, $n_{k+1} > n_k$. One has that either $O := \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} [n_{2i-1}, n_{2i}]$ or $E := \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} [n_{2i}, n_{2i+1}]$ belongs to α . Without loss of generality, suppose that $O \in \alpha$. Observe that if $n \geq n_{2i-1}$ and $i > 1$, then $n > f(n_{2i-2})$ and therefore $\rho(x(n), x(k)) > \delta$ for every $k < n_{2i-2}$.

Every $A \in \alpha$ must intersect an infinite number of the intervals $[n_{2i-1}, n_{2i}]$, i.e. every $A \in \alpha$ contains an infinite δ -discrete subset. This proves (i). If α is selective, there exists $A \in \alpha$ such that $A \cap [n_{2i-1}, n_{2i}]$ consists precisely of one element, for every $i \geq 1$, i.e. A is δ -discrete. \square

Definition 1. An ultrafilter $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ is called a *quasi P-point* if for every countable and decreasing uniformity base (\mathcal{E}_k) on \mathbb{N} , one of the following assertions is true:

- (i) $\exists X \in \alpha \quad \exists k \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad X^2 \cap \mathcal{E}_k \setminus \mathcal{D} = \emptyset$, where \mathcal{D} equals the diagonal of \mathbb{N}^2 ,
- (ii) $\forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad \exists X \in \alpha \quad \text{s.t.} \quad X^2 \subset \mathcal{E}_k$,
- (iii) $\forall A_n \downarrow \emptyset$ (in α) $\forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad \exists X \in \alpha \quad \text{s.t.}$

$$X_n^k := \{i \in X : \exists j \in A_n \text{ s.t. } (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_k\}$$

is cofinite in X , for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

For every $\varepsilon > 0$ we can define the relation \prec_ε on \mathcal{N} by setting $g \prec_\varepsilon f$ if there exists $s \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow$ such that³

$$g^{-1}[s(n), \rightarrow] \subset_\varepsilon f^{-1}[n, \rightarrow] \quad (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

The following proposition characterizes quasi P-points in a similar way that Corollary 4 characterizes P-points. This will be useful in the proof of Theorem 28.

Proposition 6. *An ultrafilter $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ is a quasi P-point if and only if for every metric on \mathbb{N} , w.r.t. which α is neither discrete nor Cauchy, the following statement holds*

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{N} \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0 \quad \exists \alpha\text{-faithful } g \in \mathcal{N} \text{ s.t. } g \prec_\varepsilon f.$$

³For two subsets A and B of a metric space let us write $A \subset_\varepsilon B$ when $d(a, B) < \varepsilon$ for every $a \in A$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let ρ be an arbitrary metric on \mathbb{N} , and let $f \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. The sets

$$\mathcal{E}_k := \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : \rho(m, n) < 1/k\} \quad (k \in \mathbb{N})$$

is a countable and decreasing uniformity base for \mathbb{N} . For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the set $A_n := f^{-1}[n, \rightarrow]$ belongs to α and $\bigcap_n A_n = \emptyset$. Let $k > 1/\varepsilon$. By hypothesis, α is neither discrete nor Cauchy, so there exists $X \in \alpha$ such that

$$X_n^k := \{i \in X : \exists j \in A_n \text{ s.t. } (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_k\}$$

is cofinite in X , for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e. for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a subset X_n^k that is cofinite in X , and satisfying $X_n^k \subset_\varepsilon A_n = f^{-1}[n, \rightarrow]$. Let F_1 be a finite subset of X such that $X \setminus F_1 \subset_\varepsilon f^{-1}[2, \rightarrow]$, and for every $n \geq 2$ let $F_n \subset X \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} F_i$ such that $X \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n F_i \subset_\varepsilon f^{-1}[n, \rightarrow]$. Let $h \in \mathcal{N}$ be the function defined by $h[F_n] = \{n\}$ and $h[\mathbb{N} \setminus X] = \{1\}$. Then, h is α -finite-to-one and $h^{-1}[n, \rightarrow] \subset_\varepsilon f^{-1}[n, \rightarrow]$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By virtue of Propositions 3 and 1, it follows that there exists an α -faithful $g \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $g \prec_\varepsilon f$.

(\Leftarrow) Let (\mathcal{E}_k) be a countable and decreasing uniformity base on \mathbb{N} . We recall (see, for example, [4, pg. 434, Theorem 8.1.21]) that in this case the uniformity on \mathbb{N} generated by (\mathcal{E}_k) is induced by some metric ρ . Note that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\varepsilon_k > 0$ such that $\rho(n, m) < \varepsilon_k$ implies that $(n, m) \in \mathcal{E}_k$. Suppose that (i) and (ii) of Definition 1 fail. Then, α is neither discrete, nor Cauchy, w.r.t. ρ . Suppose that $A_n \downarrow \emptyset$ in α . Let f denote the indicator function associated to (A_n) . Then, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists α -faithful $g \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfying $g \prec_{\varepsilon_k} f$, i.e. (by virtue of Propositions 3 and 1) there exists an α -finite-to-one function $h \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfying

$$h^{-1}[n, \rightarrow] \subset_{\varepsilon_k} f^{-1}[n, \rightarrow],$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $X \in \alpha$ such that $h|_X$ is finite-to-one. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $i \in X$ and $h(i) \geq n$, then there exists $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho(i, j) < \varepsilon_k$ and $f(j) \geq n$. This implies (since $h|_X$ is finite-to-one) that the set $\{i \in X : \exists j \in A_n \text{ s.t. } \rho(i, j) < \varepsilon_k\}$ is cofinite in X , and since

$$\{i \in X : \exists j \in A_n \text{ s.t. } \rho(i, j) < \varepsilon_k\} \subset \{i \in X : \exists j \in A_n \text{ s.t. } (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_k\}$$

it follows that $\{i \in X : \exists j \in A_n \text{ s.t. } (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_k\}$ is cofinite in X . \square

Corollary 7. *Every P -point is a quasi P -point.*

Proof. This follows by Proposition 6 and Corollary 4. \square

The following lemma will be used in the proof of Theorem 28.

Lemma 8. *Let $X_n \downarrow \emptyset$ in α , where $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ and let f be the indicator function of (X_n) . For every $g \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfying $g \prec_\varepsilon f$, and for every $h \in \mathcal{N}^\dagger$, there exists a family of consecutive intervals $\{I_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $\bigcup_n I_n \in \alpha^g$ and*

$$g^{-1}I_{n+1} \subset_\varepsilon X_{h(\max I_n)} \quad (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Proof. Let $s \in \mathcal{N}^\dagger$ such that $g^{-1}[s(n), \rightarrow] \subset_\varepsilon f^{-1}[n, \rightarrow]$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $g(i) \geq s(h(n))$, there exists $i' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho(i, i') < \varepsilon$ and $f(i') \geq h(n)$. Therefore $\rho(i, X_{h(n)}) < \varepsilon$. Let $n_1 := 1$, and for $k > 1$, let $n_k := s(h(n_{k-1}))$. Then, either $X := \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty [n_{2k}, n_{2k+1}]$ or $Y := \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty]n_{2k-1}, n_{2k}[$ belongs to α^g . Without loss of generality, assume that $X \in \alpha^g$. Let $I_k := [n_{2k}, n_{2k+1}]$. If $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $g(i) \in I_{k+1}$, then $g(i) \geq s(h(n_{2k+1}))$, and therefore $\rho(i, X_{h(n_{2k+1})}) < \varepsilon$. This implies that $g^{-1}I_{k+1} \subset_\varepsilon X_{h(\max I_k)}$. \square

3.3. Flat Ultrafilters. Let $x = (\eta_i) \in \ell^\infty$. For every $f \in \mathcal{N}^\dagger$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\omega_f^k(x) := \max\{|\eta_i - \eta_j| : f^{k-1}(1) \leq i \leq j < f^k(1)\},$$

where $f^0(1) := 1$ and $f^{k+1}(1) := f(f^k(1))$. Let

$$\omega_f(x) := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \omega_f^k(x).$$

In this way the set ℓ^∞ can be identified with a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ as follows: To every $x \in \ell^\infty$ one associates $x^* : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ defined by $x^* : f \mapsto \omega_f(x)$.

Definition 2. A *flatness scale* for an ultrafilter α is a sequence (s_n) in $[0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying:

- (i) there exists $r > 0$ such that $\sup_i s_n(i) \geq r$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s_n(i) = 0$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,
- (ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \alpha} \omega_f(s_n) = 0$ for every $f \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow$.

When $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ admits a flatness scale, α is called a *flat ultrafilter*.

Remark 9. Let (a_{ij}) be an infinite matrix with values in $[0, 1]$. Define $b_{ij} := \sup_{k \geq j} a_{ik}$. For $p \leq q$ in \mathbb{N} we have

$$\max\{|b_{ij} - b_{ik}| : p \leq j \leq k \leq q\} = b_{ip} - b_{iq} = \max_{p \leq j < q} a_{ij} \vee b_{iq} - b_{iq} \leq \max_{p \leq j < q} a_{ij} - a_{iq}$$

and therefore

$$\max\{|b_{ij} - b_{ik}| : p \leq j \leq k \leq q\} \leq \max\{|a_{ij} - a_{ik}| : p \leq j \leq k \leq q\}.$$

This shows that a flat ultrafilter admits a flatness scale (s_n) satisfying $s_n(i+1) \leq s_n(i) \leq s_n(1) = 1$ for every i and n in \mathbb{N} .

Proposition 10. An ultrafilter $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ is flat if and only if there is a sequence of decreasing functions (s_n) in $[0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$, such that

- (i) $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} s_n(i) = 0$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (ii) $s_n(1) = 1$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (iii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \alpha} \|s_n - s_n \circ f\|_\infty = 0$, for all $f \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow$.

Proof. Let (t_n) be a flatness scale for α and let $r > 0$ such that $\|t_n\|_\infty = \sup_i t_n(i) \geq r$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $s_n(j) := \sup_{k \geq j} t_n(k) / \|t_n\|_\infty$. It is clear that (s_n) satisfies (i) and (ii) and each s_n is decreasing. To check (iii), let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \|t_n - t_n \circ f\|_\infty < r\varepsilon\} \in \alpha$. Hence by Remark 9, $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \|t_n\|_\infty \|s_n - s_n \circ f\|_\infty < r\varepsilon\} \in \alpha$ and this implies $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \|s_n - s_n \circ f\|_\infty < \varepsilon\} \in \alpha$. □

Note that this characterization was the original definition of flat ultrafilter [8, Definition 3.2].

Proposition 11. [8, Theorem 3.3] *Flat ultrafilters exist in ZFC.*

Proof. Let X denote the set of all decreasing sequences in $[0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$, starting at 1, and eventually equal to 0. Since X is countable, the existence of a flat ultrafilter would follow if we show that 0^* belongs to the closure of $X^* := \{x^* : x \in X\}$. Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$ be an open neighborhood of 0^* , and let $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\} \subset \mathcal{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that

$$\{x^* : x \in X, \omega_{f_i}(x) < \varepsilon \forall i \leq n\} \subset \mathcal{U}.$$

It suffices to exhibit $x \in X$ satisfying $\omega_f(x) < \varepsilon$, where $f := \max(f_1, \dots, f_n)$. To this end, define, recursively, the sequence (k_i) by setting $k_1 := 1$ and, for $i \geq 2$, $k_i := f^{i-1}(1)$. Choose $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1/m < \varepsilon$ and let $x := (\xi_i)$ be defined by

$$\xi_i := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \geq k_{m+1} \\ 1 - (p-1)/m & \text{if } k_p \leq i < k_{p+1} \text{ for some } p \leq m. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $\omega_f(x) = 1/m$. □

Proposition 12. Let (s_n) be a flatness scale for $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$. Then the following statements are true.

- (i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \alpha} s_n(i) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \alpha} s_n(j)$ for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) For every $r > 0$ and for every $A \in \alpha$, the set

$$K(r, A) := \{k \in \mathbb{N} : (s_n(k) : n \in A) \text{ is eventually } \geq r\}$$

is finite.

Proof. (i) Define $s(i) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \alpha} s_n(i)$ and suppose that $|s(i) - s(j)| > \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $A \in \alpha$ such that $|s_n(i) - s(i)|$ and $|s_n(j) - s(j)|$ are both less than $\varepsilon/4$, for every $n \in A$. This implies that $|s_n(i) - s_n(j)| > \varepsilon/2$ for every $n \in A$. This contradicts the fact that (s_n) is a flatness scale for α .

(ii) Suppose that $K(r, A)$ is infinite, for some $r > 0$ and $A \in \alpha$. We show that (s_n) is not a flatness scale for α . To this end we shall construct a strictly increasing sequence $(\ell_i : i \geq 0)$ such that

$$\bigcup_{i \geq 0} \{n \in A : |s_n(\ell_i) - s_n(\ell_{i+1})| \geq r/2\} \in \alpha.$$

Let $\{k_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be an enumeration of $K(r, A)$ such that $k_n < k_m$ for $n < m$. For every finite subset F of A let

$$m(F) := \min\{i \in K(r, A) : (\forall n \in F) (\forall j \geq i) (s_n(j) \leq r/2)\}.$$

Let $(g(k_n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$ be a strictly increasing sequence in A such that $s_i(k) \geq r$ for every $i \in A$ satisfying $i \geq g(k_n)$. We shall construct a strictly increasing sequence $(I_i : i \geq 0)$ of intervals of A such that $\bigcup_{i \geq 0} I_i = A$, and

$$(1) \quad s_n(m(I_i)) \geq r \quad \text{and} \quad s_n(m(I_{i+2})) \leq r/2,$$

for every $n \in I_{i+2} \setminus I_{i+1}$ and $i \geq 0$. Note that we can suppose that $1 \in A$. Set $I_0 := \{1\}$ and, recursively, let $I_{i+1} := \{n \in A : 1 \leq n \leq g(m(I_i))\}$. Observe that

$$s_n(m(I_i)) \leq r/2 \quad \forall n \leq g(m(I_{i-1})) \quad \text{and} \quad s_n(m(I_i)) \geq r \quad \forall n \geq g(m(I_i)),$$

i.e. (1) follows and $m(I_i) > m(I_{i-1})$ for every $i \geq 1$. Therefore, $(I_i : i \geq 0)$ is a strictly increasing sequence of intervals of A and so $\bigcup_{i \geq 0} I_i = A$.

We conclude the proof as follows. For $i \geq 0$ let $\ell_i := m(I_{2i})$. Then,

$$|s_n(\ell_i) - s_n(\ell_{i+1})| \geq r/2$$

for every $n \in I_{2i+2} \setminus I_{2i+1}$ by (1). If $\bigcup_{i \geq 0} I_{2i+2} \setminus I_{2i+1} \in \alpha$ we are done. Otherwise, we have that $\bigcup_{i \geq 1} I_{2i+1} \setminus I_{2i} \in \alpha$. In this case, for every $i \geq 1$ we define $\ell_i := m(I_{2i-1})$ and observe that $|s_n(\ell_i) - s_n(\ell_{i+1})| \geq r/2$ for every $n \in I_{2i+1} \setminus I_{2i}$ by (1). \square

3.4. 3f-property.

Definition 3. The ultrafilter $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ is said to have the *three functions property* (3f-property in short) if there exists a bijection $\phi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^2$, such that for every $f \in \mathcal{N}$, there exists $A \in \alpha$ satisfying either

- (i) $f|_A$ is constant, or
- (ii) $f|_A$ is finite-to-one, or
- (iii) there is a one-to-one function $\bar{f} \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $f|_A = \bar{f} \circ \pi \circ \phi|_A$, where $\pi : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ denotes the projection onto the first coordinate.

We will say in this case that α has the 3f-property w.r.t. ϕ . This property has been isolated by A. Blass in [1]. It should be noted that the definition given in [1] differs slightly from ours because for the second case A. Blass requires f to be α -injective instead of α -finite-to-one. It is easy to see that every P-point has the three function property (we can think of P-point ultrafilters as ultrafilters having the two functions property). However there are ultrafilters with the three function property that are not P-points. In fact, in [2] the authors study certain ultrafilters added generically by a countably closed Forcing notion. They refer to these ultrafilters as "the next best thing to a P-point" ultrafilters. These ultrafilter enjoy

the 3f-property and they are not P-points but they are weak P-points. They also consider sums of non-isomorphic selective ultrafilters indexed by a selective ultrafilter, they showed that these ultrafilters share the 3f-property but they are neither P-points nor weak P-points. In [1], it is also shown that ultrafilters that are not P-points but satisfy certain Ramsey-like partition properties have the 3f-property. Hence the class of ultrafilters with the 3f-property properly contains the P-point ultrafilters. However, the existence of ultrafilters with the 3f-property cannot be proved within ZFC, for if α has the 3f-property and it is not a P-point, then there is $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ witnessing the later and it is easy to see that $\alpha^f = \{f^{-1}(A) : A \in \alpha\}$ is a P-point.

For a subset $X \subset \mathbb{N}^2$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $X^i := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : (i, j) \in X\}$. Recall that if ϕ is bijective, then $\alpha^\phi = \{\phi(A) : A \in \alpha\}$ and $\alpha \sim_{RK} \alpha^\phi$.

Remark 13. Suppose that the ultrafilter α satisfies the 3f-property w.r.t. ϕ . For every $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ let $\hat{A} := \phi[A]$,

$$\hat{A}_0 := \bigcup \{\hat{A}^j : |\hat{A}^j| < \infty\},$$

and

$$\hat{A}_\infty := \bigcup \{\hat{A}^j : |\hat{A}^j| = \infty\}.$$

Observe that if $\hat{A}_0 \in \alpha^\phi$ for some $A \in \alpha$, then α is a P-point. Otherwise, for every $A \in \alpha$, there exists $B \in \alpha$, $B \subset A$ such that every vertical section $\phi[B]^j$ ($j \in \mathbb{N}$) is an infinite set.

Proposition 14. Let $(a_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N})$ be an infinite matrix with entries in $[0, 1]$ satisfying:

- (i) $1 = a_{i1} \geq a_{ij} \geq a_{i,j+1}$, for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, and
- (ii) $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{ij} = 0$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let α be an ultrafilter satisfying the 3f-property. Then, for every $0 < \delta < 1/4$ there exists $A \in \alpha$ and two non-decreasing sequences (m_k) and (n_k) in \mathbb{N} satisfying $m_k < n_k$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$A = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{i \in A : a_{im_k} - a_{in_k} > \delta\}.$$

Proof. Let $0 < \delta < 1/4$. For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ let $f(i) := \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} : a_{ij} < 1 - \delta\}$, $g(i) := \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} : a_{ij} < 1 - 2\delta\}$ and $h(i) := \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} : a_{ij} < 1 - 3\delta\}$. Note that $f \leq g \leq h$.

If there exists $A \in \alpha$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(i) = n$ for every $i \in A$ (i.e. f is α -constant) we let $m_k := 1$ and $n_k := n$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that if h is α -constant, then so is g , and if g is α -constant, then so is f .

Suppose that f is α -finite-to-one. In this case there exists $A \in \alpha$ and a partition $\{F_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of A into finite subsets such that $f(i) = f(i')$ if and only if i and i' belong to the same F_k for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $m_k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f[F_k] = \{m_k + 1\}$. After reorganization (if necessary) we can suppose that (m_k) is (strictly) increasing. Inductively, one can construct a (strictly) increasing sequence (n_k) such that $g(i) \leq n_k$ for every $i \in F_k$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that $a_{im_k} \geq 1 - \delta$ and $a_{in_k} < 1 - 2\delta$ for every $i \in F_k$. A similar argument (involving g and h) holds if we suppose that g is α -finite-to-one.

Let us suppose that neither f nor g is α -constant or α -finite-to-one. Then there are finite-to-one functions \bar{f} and \bar{g} in \mathcal{N} , and $A \in \alpha$, such that $f|_A = \bar{f} \circ \pi \circ \phi|_A$ and $g|_A = \bar{g} \circ \pi \circ \phi|_A$. Let $\{F_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a partition of \mathbb{N} into finite subsets such that $f(i) = f(i')$ if and only if i and i' belong to the same F_k for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $m_k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f[F_k] = \{m_k + 1\}$. After reorganization, we can suppose that (m_k) is (strictly) increasing. Inductively, one can construct a (strictly) increasing sequence (n_k) such that $\bar{g}(i) \leq n_k$ for every $i \in F_k$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that if $i \in A \cap ((\phi^{-1} \circ \pi^{-1})(F_k))$, then $g(i) = (\bar{g} \circ \pi \circ \phi)(i) \leq n_k$, and therefore, $a_{im_k} \geq 1 - \delta$ and $a_{in_k} < 1 - 2\delta$. \square

Corollary 15. If an ultrafilter α is flat, then it cannot satisfy the 3f-property.

Proof. This follows by Propositions 14 and 10; one simply needs to consider a function $f \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow$ satisfying $f(m_k) \geq n_k$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

Remark 16. With the same notation of the proof of Proposition 14, note that if we don't have the (simple) case where (m_k) and (n_k) are constant (i.e. if f is not α -constant), we can define a strictly increasing sequence (k_j) in \mathbb{N} such that $n_{k_j} < m_{k_{j+1}}$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe then, that either

$$A_o = \bigcup_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{N} \\ j \text{ is odd}}} \{i \in A : a_{im_{k_j}} - a_{im_{k_{j+2}}} > \delta\} \in \alpha$$

or

$$A_e = \bigcup_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{N} \\ j \text{ is even}}} \{i \in A : a_{im_{k_j}} - a_{im_{k_{j+2}}} > \delta\} \in \alpha.$$

4. ULTRAPOWERS OF A METRIC SPACE - SOME CONSIDERATIONS

Let (M, ρ) be a metric space and let \mathcal{M} denote the set of all bounded sequences in M . Denote the members of \mathcal{M} by $\mathbf{x} = (x_n)$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_n)$ and so on. The following is easily seen to be an equivalence relation on \mathcal{M}

$$\Delta := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) : \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho(x_n, y_n) < \varepsilon\} \in \mathcal{F} \ \forall \varepsilon > 0\},$$

and associated to the ultrafilter $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ we further have the following equivalence relations:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_0^\alpha &:= \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) : \{n \in \mathbb{N} : x_n = y_n\} \in \alpha\}, \\ \Delta_1^\alpha &:= \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) : \exists A \in \alpha \text{ s.t. } \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho(x_n, y_n) < \varepsilon\} \in \mathcal{F}(A) \ \forall \varepsilon > 0\}, \\ \Delta_2^\alpha &:= \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) : \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho(x_n, y_n) < \varepsilon\} \in \alpha \ \forall \varepsilon > 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The functions

$$\rho_\infty : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, 1] : ((x_n), (y_n)) \mapsto \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rho(x_n, y_n),$$

and

$$\rho_\alpha : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, 1] : ((x_n), (y_n)) \mapsto \lim_{\alpha} \rho(x_n, y_n),$$

define, respectively, a metric and a pseudo-metric on \mathcal{M} .

The following inclusions can easily be verified.

$$\begin{array}{c} \Delta \\ \cap \\ \Delta_0^\alpha \subset \Delta_1^\alpha \subset \Delta_2^\alpha \end{array}$$

In the complete lattice of all the equivalence relations on \mathcal{M} (ordered by set-theoretic inclusion) one has the equality $\Delta_1^\alpha = \Delta \vee \Delta_0^\alpha$.

Proposition 17. *The closure of Δ_0^α is equal to Δ_2^α w.r.t. both metrics $\rho_\infty \times \rho_\infty$ and $\rho_\alpha \times \rho_\alpha$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that Δ_0^α is dense in Δ_2^α w.r.t. $\rho_\infty \times \rho_\infty$ (and therefore w.r.t. $\rho_\alpha \times \rho_\alpha$). We show that Δ_2^α is closed w.r.t. $\rho_\alpha \times \rho_\alpha$. (This will imply that Δ_2^α is closed w.r.t. $\rho_\infty \times \rho_\infty$.) Suppose that $(\mathbf{x}^n), (\mathbf{y}^n)$ are sequences in \mathcal{M} such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}^n = \mathbf{x}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{y}^n = \mathbf{y}$ (w.r.t. ρ_α) and suppose that $(\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{y}^n) \in \Delta_2^\alpha$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Fix an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. We show that $\{i \in \mathbb{N} : \rho(x_i, y_i) < \varepsilon\} \in \alpha$. Let $\delta := \varepsilon/3$. The assumption $(\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{y}^n) \in \Delta_2^\alpha$ implies that $\{i \in \mathbb{N} : \rho(x_i^n, y_i^n) < \delta\} \in \alpha$. We also have that

$$J := \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho_\alpha(\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{x}) \vee \rho_\alpha(\mathbf{y}^n, \mathbf{y}) < \delta\} \in \mathcal{F},$$

and so, for every $n \in J$ we have

$$\{i \in \mathbb{N} : \rho(x_i^n, x_i) \vee \rho(x_i^n, y_i^n) \vee \rho(y_i^n, y_i) < \delta\} \in \alpha.$$

Hence, $\{i \in \mathbb{N} : \rho(x_i, y_i) < \varepsilon\} \in \alpha$. \square

Proposition 18. *If α is a P-point, then $\Delta_1^\alpha = \Delta_2^\alpha$.*

Proof. Suppose that $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \Delta_2^\alpha$. Let $\varepsilon_i \downarrow 0$ in \mathbb{R} and let $A_i := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : \rho(x_j, y_j) < \varepsilon_i\}$. Then $A_i \in \alpha$ and $A_i \downarrow$. If $\bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} A_i \in \alpha$, then $\{i \in \mathbb{N} : x_i = y_i\} \in \alpha$ and $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \Delta_0^\alpha$. So, suppose that $\bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} A_i \notin \alpha$ and let $B_j := A_j \setminus \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} A_i$. Then $B_j \downarrow \emptyset$ in α and $-\alpha$ being a P-point $-\alpha$ contains X such that $X \cap (B_j \setminus B_{j+1})$ is finite, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies that

$$\lim_{\substack{j \in X \\ j \rightarrow \infty}} \rho(x_j, y_j) = 0,$$

i.e. $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \Delta_1^\alpha$. □

Theorem 19. *Let X be a separable topological space, and suppose that (f_n) is an equicontinuous sequence of functions from X into the metric space Y , converging pointwise to the function f along the ultrafilter $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$. If α is a P-point, then there exists $N \in \alpha$ such that*

$$(2) \quad \lim_{\substack{n \rightarrow \infty \\ n \in N}} f_n(x) = f(x) \quad \forall x \in X.$$

Proof. If U is an equicontinuous set of functions mapping the separable space X into Y , then, the restriction to U of the product topology on Y^X is metrizable. So the assertion follows by Proposition 18. □

When the ultrafilter is selective, one can use deep Mathias's Theorem to prove that the same conclusion can be drawn when one relaxes equicontinuity to measurability. The proof of the next theorem follows the same arguments of [8, Theorem 1.5]. We prefer to present it in this more general setup because we believe that it could be interesting in its own right.

Theorem 20. [8, Theorem 1.5] *Let X be a Polish space, and suppose that (f_n) is a sequence of Borel functions from X into a metric space Y , converging pointwise to the Borel function f along the ultrafilter α . If $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ is selective, then there exists $N \in \alpha$ such that*

$$(3) \quad \lim_{\substack{n \rightarrow \infty \\ n \in N}} f_n(x) = f(x) \quad \forall x \in X.$$

Proof. Let ρ denote the metric function on Y . Consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : X \times \mathbb{N} &\rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \\ (x, i) &\mapsto \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho(f_n(x), f(x)) > 1/i\}, \end{aligned}$$

and define

$$\mathcal{E} := \{N \in [\mathbb{N}]^\infty : \exists (x, i) \in X \times \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } N \subset \Phi(x, i)\}.$$

If one were to show that \mathcal{E} is analytic, the result would follow by Mathias's Theorem as follows: There is $N \in \alpha$ such that $[N]^\infty \subset \mathcal{E}$ or $[N]^\infty \cap \mathcal{E} = \emptyset$. Since we cannot have the first possibility because of our assumption $\lim_{n \rightarrow \alpha} f_n(x) = f(x)$ for every $x \in X$, it follows that $[N]^\infty \cap \mathcal{E} = \emptyset$; i.e. for every $(x, i) \in X \times \mathbb{N}$ the set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho(f_n(x), f(x)) > 1/i\}$ is finite. So (3) would follow.

We show that Φ is a Borel function – since $X \times \mathbb{N}$ is a Polish space, and $[\mathbb{N}]^\infty$ (being a co-countable set in a metric space) is a Borel subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$, this would imply that $\mathcal{E} = [\mathbb{N}]^\infty \cap \Phi(X \times \mathbb{N})$ is analytic.

For any pair $(F, G) \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega} \times [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}$ define

$$\mathcal{U}(F, G) := \{N \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) : N \cap F = \emptyset \text{ and } N \cap G = G\}.$$

It is clear that $\{\mathcal{U}(F, G) : (F, G) \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega} \times [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}\}$ is a countable base for $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$. For our purpose, therefore, it suffices to show that $\Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}(F, G))$ is a Borel set. This follows because

$$\Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}(F, G)) = \bigcup_i X_i \times \{i\},$$

where

$$X_i := \bigcap_{n \in F} \{x \in X : \rho(f_n(x), f(x)) \leq 1/i\} \cap \bigcap_{n \in G} \{x \in X : \rho(f_n(x), f(x)) > 1/i\}$$

and the later is a Borel set by the assumption on the Borel-measurability of the functions f_n and f . \square

Corollary 21. *Let X be a dual Banach space that is separable w.r.t. the w^* -topology. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $T_n \in B(X)$ be a compact operator and suppose that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \alpha} T_n x = 0$ for every $x \in X$, where α is a selective ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} . Then, there exists $N \in \alpha$ s.t.*

$$\lim_{\substack{n \rightarrow \infty \\ n \in N}} \|T_n x\| = 0 \quad \text{for every } x \in X.$$

Proof. The closed unit ball X_1 , of X , is a Polish space when equipped with the w^* -topology. Since T_n is compact, it follows that T_n is w^* -norm continuous. Thus, the theorem implies that there exists $N \in \alpha$ s.t. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T_n x\| = 0$ for every $x \in X$. \square

5. THE COMMUTANT OF $B(H)$ IN ITS ULTRAPOWER.

Given an ultrafilter $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$, when is the commutant of $B(H)$ in its ultrapower w.r.t. α trivial?

5.1. Non-trivial commutant – Flat ultrafilters.

Theorem 22. [8, Theorem 4.1] *Let (s_n) be a flatness scale for the ultrafilter $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$, satisfying (i)-(iii) of Proposition 10. Let $\{e_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be the set of pairwise orthogonal, one-dimensional projections onto the canonical basis of ℓ^2 ($= H$). For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let*

$$a_n := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} s_n(k) e_k$$

and let $\mathbf{a} := (a_n)$. Then \mathbf{a} is a non-trivial element of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$.

The proof makes use of a ‘stratification’ property of $B(H)$ as described in the following interesting lemma. This lemma was originally proved in [5, Lemma 3.1] and generalised in [8, Lemma 4.6]. For every $g \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$p^g(k) := \sum_{i=g^{k-1}(1)}^{g^k(1)-1} e_i,$$

and let

$$D(g) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p^g(k) B(H) p^g(k).$$

Lemma 23. *For every $a \in B(H)$ and $\delta > 0$, there exist $g_0, g_1 \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow$, $a^0 \in D(g_0)$ and $a^1 \in D(g_1)$ such that $a - a^0 - a^1$ is compact, $\|a^i\| \leq 2\|a\|$ for $i \in \{0, 1\}$, and $\|a - a^0 - a^1\| < \delta/2$.*

Lemma 23 implies that the span of $\bigcup_{g \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow} D(g)$ is norm dense in $B(H)$. It follows, therefore, that a sufficient (and necessary) condition for a given (a_n) in $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(B(H))$ to be in $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ is that $\lim_\alpha \|a_n b - b a_n\| = 0$ for every $b \in \bigcup_{g \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow} D(g)$. So, to proceed to the proof of Theorem 22 we fix an arbitrary $g \in \mathcal{N}^\uparrow$. Observe that $y_n := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} s_n(k) p^g(k)$ is in the centre of $\mathcal{D}(g)$. The flatness property of α implies that $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \|a_n - y_n\| \leq \varepsilon\} \in \alpha$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover, since each a_n is compact and of norm one, the sequence (a_n) is non-trivial, i.e. (a_n) is a non-trivial element of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$.

We shall now proceed to prove the necessity of the flatness property for $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ to be non-trivial. This answers [8, Question 5.2].

Remark 24. Note that if $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ is non-trivial, then, in view of [11, Corollary 2.21], and since the set of finite rank operators $F(H)$ is norm dense in $K(H)$, there is $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H)) \cap \mathcal{C}_\alpha(F(H))$. Moreover, we can assume that \mathbf{a} is of norm one and self-adjoint, i.e. if $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)$, we can suppose that each a_n has norm one, is of finite rank and is self-adjoint. In addition, by making a small perturbation (if necessary) we can further assume that all the a'_n s are distinct, so we can identify α with an ultrafilter on $\{a_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Theorem 25. *Let $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$. Then $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ is non-trivial if and only if α is flat.*

Proof. In Theorem 22 it was already shown that if α is flat, then $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ is not trivial. Here we show the converse.

Suppose that $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ is not trivial. In view of Remark 24, there exists $\mathbf{a} = (a_i) \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ such that every a_i has norm one and has finite rank. Let $\{\xi_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a fixed orthonormal basis of H . For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let q_k denote the projection of H onto $\text{span}\{\xi_i : i < k\}$. Note that $q_1 = 0$. For every $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ define $s_n(m) := \|a_n(\mathbf{1} - q_m)\|$. Observe that the sequence (s_n) satisfies (i) and (ii) of Proposition 10. So, either (s_n) is a flatness scale for α and we're done, or there is $\varepsilon > 0$ and a strictly increasing sequence (m_k) in \mathbb{N} such that

$$A := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{n \in \mathbb{N} : s_n(m_k) - s_n(m_{k+1}) > \varepsilon\}$$

belongs to α . Without loss of generality we can suppose that (m_k) increases in a way so that the sequence (d_k) where $d_k := m_{k+1} - m_k$ is also strictly increasing. Observe that if $s_n(m_k) - s_n(m_{k+1}) > \varepsilon$, then

$$\|a_n(q_{m_{k+1}} - q_{m_k})\| = \|a_n(\mathbf{1} - q_{m_k}) - a_n(\mathbf{1} - q_{m_{k+1}})\| \geq s_n(m_k) - s_n(m_{k+1}) > \varepsilon.$$

For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ define $p_k := q_{m_{k+1}} - q_{m_k}$. Then (p_k) is a sequence of pairwise orthogonal, finite-rank projections and for every $n \in A$ there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|a_n p_k\| > \varepsilon$. Observe that the dimension of the range space of p_k equals d_k . For every $n, j \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$t_n(j) := \sup_{k \geq j} \|a_n p_k\|.$$

Note that $t_n(j+1) \leq t_n(j) \leq t_n(1) > \varepsilon$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in A$. We show that (t_n) is flatness scale for α . Let $\delta > 0$ be given and let (ℓ_i) be a strictly increasing sequence in \mathbb{N} . Want to show that

$$\{n \in \mathbb{N} : t_n(\ell_i) - t_n(\ell_{i+1}) \geq \delta \exists i \in \mathbb{N}\} \notin \alpha.$$

It is harmless to assume that $\ell_{i+2} - \ell_{i+1} \geq \ell_{i+1} - \ell_i$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Together with the fact that the sequence (d_k) is strictly increasing, this assumption guarantees the existence of a partial isometry u satisfying $u^*u = \mathbf{1}$ and

$$u p_{\ell_i+k} \leq p_{\ell_{i+1}+k},$$

for every $0 \leq k \leq \ell_{i+1} - \ell_i - 1$ and for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\mu(n, i)$ be the number satisfying $\ell_i \leq \mu(n, i) < \ell_{i+1}$ and such that $\|a_n p_{\mu(n, i)}\| = \max\{\|a_n p_k\| : \ell_i \leq k < \ell_{i+1}\}$. Then

$$t_n(\ell_i) - t_n(\ell_{i+1}) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \|a_n p_{\mu(n, i)}\| \leq t_n(\ell_{i+1}) \\ \|a_n p_{\mu(n, i)}\| - t_n(\ell_{i+1}), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and therefore, if $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ are such that $t_n(\ell_i) - t_n(\ell_{i+1}) > \delta$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta < t_n(\ell_i) - t_n(\ell_{i+1}) &= \|a_n p_{\mu(n,i)}\| - t_n(\ell_{i+1}) \\ &= \|u a_n p_{\mu(n,i)}\| - \sup_{k \geq \ell_{j+1}} \|a_n p_k\| \\ &\leq \|u a_n p_{\mu(n,i)}\| - \|a_n u p_{\mu(n,i)}\| \\ &\leq \|(u a_n - a_n u) p_{\mu(n,i)}\| \\ &\leq \|u a_n - a_n u\|. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\{n \in \mathbb{N} : t_n(\ell_i) - t_n(\ell_{i+1}) \geq \delta \exists i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \|u a_n - a_n u\| \geq \delta\},$$

and completes the proof \square

5.2. Trivial commutant – 3f-property. Although the following theorem follows also by Theorem 25 and Corollary 15, we here give a direct proof.

Theorem 26. *If $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ has the 3f-property, then $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ is trivial.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ is not trivial and that α has the 3f-property. We shall seek a contradiction. In view of Remark 24, there exists $\mathbf{a} = (a_i) \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ such that every a_i has norm one and has finite rank. Pick an arbitrary strictly decreasing sequence (p_j) of projections on H converging to 0 w.r.t. the strong operator topology and such that $p_1 = \mathbf{1}$. For every $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ let $a_{i,j} := \|a_i p_j\|$. Observe that the infinite matrix $(a_{i,j})$ satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 14, and therefore, by the same proposition and by Remark 16, for every $0 < \delta < 1/4$ there exists $A \in \alpha$ and a strictly increasing sequence (j_k) such that

$$\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{i \in A : a_{i,j_k} - a_{i,j_{k+1}} > \delta\} \in \alpha.$$

Let u be a partial isometry such that $uu^* = \mathbf{1}$ and $u p_{j_k} \leq p_{j_{k+1}}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|u a_i - a_i u\| &\geq \|u a_i p_{j_k} - a_i u p_{j_k}\| \geq \|u a_i p_{j_k}\| - \|a_i u p_{j_k}\| \\ &\geq \|a_i p_{j_k}\| - \|a_i p_{j_{k+1}}\| \\ &= a_{i,j_k} - a_{i,j_{k+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\{i \in \mathbb{N} : \|u a_i - a_i u\| > \delta\} \in \alpha$, contradicting the centrality assumption of \mathbf{a} . \square

Remark 27. In [8, Theorem 2], it was shown that when α is selective, $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ is trivial. This follows by Theorem 20 and by invoking a result by Sherman [20] which says that no factor von Neumann algebra (in particular $B(H)$) can admit any non-trivial central sequences⁴. Indeed, if (a_n) is a representing sequence of $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ and each a_n is a compact operator, the sequence of operators $T_n : B(H) \rightarrow B(H)$ defined by $x \mapsto a_n x - x a_n$ satisfy the hypothesis of Corollary 21, and therefore there exists an increasing sequence (n_i) in \mathbb{N} such that $\{n_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \in \alpha$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{n_i} x = 0$ for every $x \in B(H)$. Note that besides from being a proper generalization, Theorem 26, allows for a more elementary proof.

⁴Recall that a sequence (a_n) in a von Neumann algebra M is a non-trivial central sequence if $\lim_n \|a_n a - a a_n\| = 0$ for every $a \in M$ and $\lim_n \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \|a_n - \lambda \mathbf{1}\| \neq 0$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.

5.3. Trivial commutant – quasi P-point.

Theorem 28. *If $\alpha \in \beta\omega \setminus \omega$ is a quasi P-point, then $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ is trivial.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ is not trivial and that α is a quasi P-point. We shall seek a contradiction. In view of Remark 24, there exists⁵ $\mathbf{a} = (a(i)) \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha(B(H))$ such that every $a(i)$ has norm one, has finite rank and is self-adjoint. Moreover, we can assume that all the $a(n)$'s are distinct, so we can identify \mathbb{N} with $\{a(i) : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ by identifying i with $a(i)$.

We first note that α cannot be Cauchy because if otherwise, it would converge in $K(H)$ (w.r.t. the norm) and the limit – being in the centre of $K(H)$ – must be equal to 0, contradicting the assumption that $(a(n))$ is not trivial. Therefore, Proposition 5 implies that there is $\delta > 0$ such that every $A \in \alpha$ contains an infinite δ -discrete subset.

Let $p(n)$ be the range projection of $a(n)$ and let $q(n) := \bigvee_{m \leq n} p(m)$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the set

$$Y(n) := \{m \geq n : \|q(n) a(m) (q(m) - q(n))\| < \delta/12\}$$

belongs to α by the assumption of centrality. Let

$$X'(n) := \{m \in Y(n) : \|(q(m) - q(n)) a(m) (q(m) - q(n))\| < \delta/12\}$$

For any s, t in $X'(n)$ we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|a(s) - a(t)\| &\leq \|q(n) a(s) q(n) - q(n) a(t) q(n)\| \\ &\quad + 2\|(q(s) - q(n)) a(s) q(n)\| + 2\|(q(t) - q(n)) a(t) q(n)\| \\ (4) \quad &\quad + \|(q(s) - q(n)) a(n) (q(s) - q(n))\| \\ &\quad + \|(q(t) - q(n)) a(n) (q(t) - q(n))\| \\ &< \|q(n) a(s) q(n) - q(n) a(t) q(n)\| + \delta/2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $X(n) := \mathbb{N} \setminus X'(\mathbb{N})$. We shall need to consider two cases:

Case (i) Suppose that there exists $A \in \alpha$ and $\delta' > 0$ such that A is δ' -discrete. By taking a smaller δ (if necessary) we can suppose that A is δ -discrete. The above estimation shows that if $X'(n) \cap A$ is infinite for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the unit ball of $q(n) B(H) q(n)$ would contradictorily contain an infinite $\delta/2$ -discrete subset. Thus, $A \cap X(n) \in \mathcal{F}(A)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that $X(n) \cap A \downarrow \emptyset$ in α and the indicator function f associated with the sequence $(X(n) \cap A : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is α -finite-to-one.

Case (ii) Suppose that α is neither discrete nor Cauchy, i.e. by Proposition 6 we have

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{N} \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0 \quad \exists \alpha\text{-faithful } g \in \mathcal{N} \text{ s.t. } g \prec_\varepsilon f.$$

Note that the estimation of (4) implies that if $X'(n) \in \alpha$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then – by Proposition 5 – the unit ball of $q(n) B(H) q(n)$ would contradictorily contain an infinite $\delta/2$ -discrete subset. Therefore $X(n) \in \alpha$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let f denote the indicator function associated with the sequence $(X(n) : n \in \mathbb{N})$.

In both cases, therefore, it is possible to find an α -injective $g \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfying $g \prec_\varepsilon f$, where $\varepsilon < \delta/24$. Let $h \in \mathcal{N}^\dagger$ satisfy $h(k) > \min g^{-1}\{k\}$ for every $k \in \text{range } g$. By Lemma 2, there exists a consecutive⁶ family of finite sets $\{I_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of \mathbb{N} such that $\bigcup_k I_k \in \alpha^g$ and $g^{-1}I_{k+1} \subset_\varepsilon X(h(\max I_k))$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $I_k \subset \text{range } g$. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $I_k = \{i^k(1), i^k(2), \dots, i^k(l_k)\}$ and for $1 \leq p \leq l_k$ let $n^k(p) := \min g^{-1}\{i^k(p)\}$. Observe that $n^k(p) \leq h(\max I_k)$ for every $1 \leq p \leq l_k$.

Let $e_1 := q(h(\max I_1))$ and for $k > 1$ let $e_k := q(h(\max I_k)) - q(h(\max I_{k-1}))$. Then (e_k) is a sequence of pairwise orthogonal projections satisfying:

⁵To avoid cumbersome notation with subscripts we write $(a(i))$ instead of (a_i) .

⁶i.e. $i < j$ for every $i \in I_n, j \in I_m$ and $n < m$.

- $\left(\sum_{i=1}^k e_i\right) a(n^k(p)) = q(h(\max I_k)) a(n^k(p)) = a(n^k(p)),$
- $a(n^k(p)) \sum_{i>k} e_i = 0,$ and
- $\|e_k a(n^k(p)) e_k\| > \frac{\delta}{12} - \varepsilon > \frac{\delta}{24},$

for every $k > 1$ and $1 \leq p \leq l_k$. Let $\eta^k(p)$ be a unit vector in $e_k H$ such that

$$\|a(n^k(p)) (\eta^k(p))\| > \delta/24 \quad (1 \leq p \leq l_k).$$

Let (f_k) be a sequence of pairwise orthogonal projections in $B(H)$ such that $f_k \leq \sum_{i>k} e_i$ and $e_k \sim f_k$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let u_k be a partial isometry on H satisfying $u_k^* u_k = e_k$ and $u_k u_k^* = f_k$. Then, $u := \sum_k u_k$ belongs to $B(H)$ and satisfies

$$a(n^k(p)) u (\eta^k(p)) = a(n^k(p)) u_k (\eta^k(p)) = 0,$$

and

$$\|u a(n^k(p)) (\eta^k(p))\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k (u_i e_i) a(n^k(p)) (\eta^k(p)) \right\| = \|a(n^k(p)) (\eta^k(p))\| > \delta/24,$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq p \leq l_k$. This shows that $\|a(n^k(p)) u - u a(n^k(p))\| > \delta/24$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq p \leq l_k$.

So, we have

$$\bigcup_k \{i^k(1), i^k(2), \dots, i^k(l_k)\} \subset \{g(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}, \|a(n) u - u a(n)\| > \delta/24\},$$

i.e. $\{g(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}, \|a(n) u - u a(n)\| > \delta/24\}$ belongs to α^g . Since g is α -injective, this implies that $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \|a(n) u - u a(n)\| \leq \delta/24\} \in \alpha$. But, since $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha(\mathcal{A}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\alpha(F(H))$, we also have that $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \|a(n) u - u a(n)\| \leq \delta/24\} \in \alpha$. The contradiction completes the proof. \square

Question (i) below becomes more relevant in the light of Theorem 25. We believe that Question (ii) is also natural to ask.

Problem 29. (i) Do non-flat ultrafilters exist in ZFC?

(ii) What is the precise relation between the notion of quasi P-points and flat ultrafilters?

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Blass. *Partitions and conservativity*. Topology and its Applications (2015), 213.
- [2] A. Blass, N. Dobrinen, D. Raghavan. *The next best thing to a P-point*. Journal of Symbolic Logic 80 (3) (2013), 866-900.
- [3] D. Booth. *Ultrafilters on a countable set*. Annals of Mathematical Logic, Volume 2 (1)(1970)1-24.
- [4] R. Engelking. *General Topology*. Revised and completed edition, Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics Volume 6, 1989.
- [5] I. Farah. *All automorphisms of the Calkin algebra are inner*. Ann. of Math. (173) (2011), 619-661.
- [6] I. Farah. *The relative commutant of separable C*-algebras of real rank zero*. J. Funct. Anal. 256 (2009), 3841-3846.
- [7] I. Farah, B. Hart, D. Sherman. *Model Theory of Operator Algebras I: stability*. Bull. London Math. Soc. 45 (2013), 825-838.
- [8] I. Farah, N. C. Phillips, J. Steprans. *The commutant of L(H) in its ultrapower may or may not be trivial*. Math. Ann. 347 (2010), 839-857.
- [9] L. Ge, D. Hadwin. *Ultraproducts of C*-algebras*. Recent advances in operator theory and related topics (Szeged, 1999), Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., vol 127, Birkhäuser, Basel (2001), 305-326.
- [10] M. Izumi. *Finite group actions on C*-algebras with the Rohlin property, I*. Duke Math. J. 122 (2004), 233-280.
- [11] E. Kirchberg. *Central Sequences in C*-algebras and strong purely infinite algebras*. Operator Algebras: The Abel Symposium 2004, Abel Symp., vol.1, Springer, Berlin (2006), 175-231.

- [12] E.Kirchberg. *The classification of purely infinite C^* -algebras using Kasparov's theory*. Fields Inst. Commun, Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, to appear.
- [13] E.Kirchberg, N. C. Phillips. *Embedding of exact C^* -algebras in the Cuntz algebra \mathcal{O}_2* . J. reine angew Math. 525 (2000), 17-53.
- [14] K. Kunen. *Some points in $\beta\omega$* . Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc., Vol. 80 (1976), 385-398.
- [15] A.R.D. Mathias. *Happy Families*. Annals of Mathematical Logic 12 (1977), 59- 111.
- [16] N. C. Phillips. *A classification theorem for nuclear purely infinite simple C^* -algebras*. Documenta Math. 5 (2000), 185-202.
- [17] M.E. Rudin. *Partial Orders on the types in $\beta\omega$* . Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 155 (1971), 353-362.
- [18] W. Rudin. *Homogeneity problems in the theory of Čech compactifications*. Duke Math. J. 23 (1956), 409-429.
- [19] S. Shelah. *Proper Forcing*. Lecture Notes in Math. 940 (Springer, Berlin, 1982).
- [20] D. Sherman. *Divisible operators in von Neumann algebras*. Illinois Journal of Mathematics. 54 (2) (2010), 567-600.
- [21] E. Wimmers. *The Shelah P -point independence theorem*. Israel Journal of Mathematics 43 (1) (1982), 28-48.

EMMANUEL CHETCUTI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF MALTA, MSIDA MSD 2080 MALTA

Email address: emanuel.chetcuti@um.edu.mt

BEATRIZ ZAMORA-AVILES, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF MALTA, MSIDA MSD 2080, MALTA

Email address: beatriz.zamora@um.edu.mt