

TOPOLOGICAL AND FRAME PROPERTIES OF CERTAIN PATHOLOGICAL C^* -ALGEBRAS

D.V. FUFÁEV

ABSTRACT. We introduce a classification of locally compact Hausdorff topological spaces with respect to the behavior of σ -compact subsets, and relying on this classification we study properties of corresponding C^* -algebras in terms of frame theory and the theory of \mathcal{A} -compact operators in Hilbert C^* -modules, some pathological examples are constructed.

INTRODUCTION

Originally the concept of frames was introduced for the Hilbert spaces theory, and then by Frank and Larson in [1] and [2] was generalized for the case of Hilbert C^* -modules. During the last decade it has been developing intensively (see, e.g., [3], [4]). It turns out that there is a connection between frame theory and the theory of \mathcal{A} -compact operators and uniform structures.

It is well-known that bounded linear operator in Hilbert space is compact (i.e. can be approximated in norm by operators of finite rank) if and only if it maps the unit ball to a totally bounded set with respect to the norm. For the case of Hilbert C^* -modules, i.e. if we consider some C^* -algebra instead of the scalar field \mathbb{C} (in this case operators are called \mathcal{A} -compact) it is not true: indeed, even in the case of any infinite-dimensional unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} the identity operator has finite rank (which is equal to one), but the unit ball is not totally bounded. So a question how to describe the \mathcal{A} -compactness in geometric terms arose.

First steps were done in papers [5], [6]. In [7] by E.V. Troitsky a significant development was obtained, namely, a specific uniform structure was constructed and it was proved that if \mathcal{N} is a countably generated Hilbert C^* -module then an adjointable operator $F : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is \mathcal{A} -compact if and only if the image of the unit ball of \mathcal{M} is totally bounded in \mathcal{N} with respect to this uniform structure.

In [8] it was proved that \mathcal{A} -compactness of an operator implies totally boundedness of the image of the unit ball with respect to this uniform structure for any Hilbert C^* -module \mathcal{N} . The inverse statement was proved for modules \mathcal{N} which could be represented as an orthogonal direct summand in the standard module over the unitalization algebra $\dot{\mathcal{A}}$ (which is equal to \mathcal{A} itself in unital case) for some cardinality — that is, in the module of the form $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \dot{\mathcal{A}}$. In particular it holds for modules which could be represented as an orthogonal direct summand in $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathcal{A}$ in case when C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} is countably generated as a module over itself (this in fact is equivalent to the fact that \mathcal{A} is σ -unital, i.e. it has a countable approximate unit, see. [9, Proposition 2.3]).

But in the case when \mathcal{A} is not σ -unital in [10] a counterexample was constructed, namely, an algebra \mathcal{A} , considered as a module over itself, such that the identity operator from \mathcal{A} into

The work was supported by the Foundation for the Advancement of Theoretical Physics and Mathematics “BASIS”.

itself is not \mathcal{A} -compact, but the unit ball is totally bounded with respect to the introduced uniform structure (and even with respect to some stronger one). The constructed algebra is commutative, so this result makes the study of underlying topological space interesting.

Also it turns out that the existence of a representation of a module \mathcal{N} as an orthogonal direct summand in $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{A}$ is equivalent to the existence of a standard frame in \mathcal{N} , so there is a connection between stated problem on \mathcal{A} -compact operators and the frame theory in Hilbert C^* -modules, and we will study constructed C^* -algebras from this point of view too.

More precisely, the existence of a standard frame is sufficient to satisfy the \mathcal{A} -compactness criterion. Hence, by proving that the criterion is not satisfied for some module, we, as a consequence, show that there is no standard frame for this module (which, by the way, does not mean that there is no outer standard frame in sense of [3], see [10, Remark 3.3]). In [11], [9], [12],[13] there is also a searching for modules without frames, more precisely, for algebras \mathcal{A} such that it is possible to say surely is there an \mathcal{A} -module without frames or not.

We introduce a scale of classes of locally compact Hausdorff topological spaces that decreases with respect to some property.

\mathcal{K}_I — σ -compact spaces (i.e. spaces which could be covered by countable family of compact subsets);

\mathcal{K}_{II} — non- σ -compact spaces which have a dense σ -compact subset;

\mathcal{K}_{III} — spaces in which no σ -compact subset is dense, that is, the complement to any σ -compact subset has an inner point, but the point at infinity (in a one-point compactification) may not be inner for the complement; equivalently, there exists a σ -compact not precompact subset;

\mathcal{K}_{IV} — spaces in which the complement to any σ -compact subset has an inner point, and (in a one-point compactification) the point at infinity is always inner for the complement; equivalently, every σ -compact subset is precompact.

In §1 some preliminaries on Hilbert C^* -modules, frames and topological spaces are given and some properties of \mathcal{K}_I and σ -unital algebras are established.

In §2 we obtain some properties of algebras $C_0(K)$ for $K \in \mathcal{K}_{II}$: we prove that such algebras never have standard frames (theorem 2.4). Nevertheless, this does not imply any conclusion about the existence of a non-standard frame (which we will define later): it is proved that in the case of separable space it really does not exist (theorem 2.6), but also an example of a space when such a frame exists is given (example 2.7). Also an example when the \mathcal{A} -compactness criterion does not hold is given, since the absence of a standard frame is not enough for this; there is also no non-standard frames for this example (example 2.11, theorems 2.17 and 2.19).

In §3 we study the algebras $C_0(K)$ for the class \mathcal{K}_{III} . This case seems to be worse (from the point of view of the behavior of σ -compact subsets), but the situation is better than in cases \mathcal{K}_{II} and \mathcal{K}_{IV} : we can find an example of an algebra for which there exists a standard frame (example 3.1), and hence the \mathcal{A} -compactness criterion is satisfied (one can say that in this context algebraic properties “are not monotonic with respect to topological properties”). On the other hand, there is an example for which the criterion does not hold (and so there is no standard frame), and there is also no non-standard frame (example 3.2, theorem 3.3). However, there is also an intermediate example, for which there is no standard frames, but a non-standard one exists (example 3.5).

In §4 it is established that for the class \mathcal{K}_{IV} there are no non-standard frames in the algebra $C_0(K)$. Earlier (in [10]) it was proved that for this class the Troitsky’s criterion never holds, which also means that there are no standard frames.

Author is grateful to E.V.Troitsky, V.M. Manuilov, K.L. Kozlov, A.Ya. Helemskii and A.I.Korchagin for helpful discussions.

1. PRELIMINARIES AND PROPERTIES OF \mathcal{K}_1

Let us recall basic notions and facts about Hilbert C^* -modules and operators in them, which one can find in [14],[15],[16].

Definition 1.1. A (right) pre-Hilbert C^* -module over a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} is an \mathcal{A} -module equipped with an \mathcal{A} -inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ being a sesquilinear form on the underlying linear space such that, for any $x, y \in \mathcal{M}, a \in \mathcal{A}$:

- (1) $\langle x, x \rangle \geq 0$;
- (2) $\langle x, x \rangle = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$;
- (3) $\langle y, x \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle^*$;
- (4) $\langle x, y \cdot a \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle a$.

A *Hilbert C^* -module* is a pre-Hilbert C^* -module over \mathcal{A} , which is complete w.r.t. its norm $\|x\| = \|\langle x, x \rangle\|^{1/2}$.

A pre-Hilbert C^* -module \mathcal{M} is called *countably generated* if there is a countable collection of its elements such that their \mathcal{A} -linear combinations are dense in \mathcal{M} .

The *Hilbert sum* of Hilbert C^* -modules in the evident sense will be denoted by \oplus .

Definition 1.2. An *operator* is a bounded \mathcal{A} -homomorphism. An operator having an adjoint (in an evident sense) is *adjointable* (see [15, Section 2.1]). We will denote the Banach space of all operators $F : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ by $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ and the Banach space of adjointable operators by $\mathbf{L}^*(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$.

Definition 1.3. Denote by $\theta_{x,y} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$, where $x \in \mathcal{N}$ and $y \in \mathcal{M}$, an *elementary \mathcal{A} -compact* operator, which is defined by formula $\theta_{x,y}(z) := x\langle y, z \rangle$. Then the Banach space $\mathbf{K}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ of *\mathcal{A} -compact* operators is the closure of the subspace generated by all elementary \mathcal{A} -compact operators in $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$.

To define a uniform structure, that is, the system of pseudometric, we need to remind the notions of the multiplier algebra and multiplier module (see [17], [18] for more details).

Recall that $M(\mathcal{A})$ is a C^* -algebra of multipliers of C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} (see [14, Chapter 2], for example), $M(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}$ if \mathcal{A} is unital. Also, if K is locally compact Hausdorff topological space and $\mathcal{A} = C_0(K)$ then $M(\mathcal{A}) = C_b(K)$ — the algebra of all continuous bounded functions on K .

For every Hilbert \mathcal{A} -module \mathcal{N} there exists a Hilbert $M(\mathcal{A})$ -module $M(\mathcal{N})$ (which is called the multiplier module of the module \mathcal{N}) containing \mathcal{N} as an ideal submodule associated with \mathcal{A} , i.e. $\mathcal{N} = M(\mathcal{N})\mathcal{A}$. Moreover, $\langle x, y \rangle \in \mathcal{A}$ holds for any $x \in \mathcal{N}, y \in M(\mathcal{N})$. $M(\mathcal{N}) = \mathcal{N}$ if the algebra \mathcal{A} is unital. Also, since each element of $x \in \mathcal{N}$ can be represented as $y \cdot a$ for some $y \in \mathcal{N}, a \in \mathcal{A}$ (see [15, 1.3.10]), the module \mathcal{N} and any its submodule can be considered as $M(\mathcal{A})$ -modules.

If we consider $\mathcal{N} = C_0(K)$ as a module over itself, then, as in the case of the multiplier algebra, $M(C_0(K)) = C_b(K)$.

The uniform structures on submodules of \mathcal{N} are defined as follows (see [10] and [7] for details).

Definition 1.4. Consider a Hilbert C^* -module \mathcal{N} over \mathcal{A} . A countable system $X = \{x_i\}$ of elements of the multiplier module $M(\mathcal{N})$ is called (outer) *admissible* for a (possibly not closed) submodule $\mathcal{N}^0 \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ (or outer \mathcal{N}^0 -*admissible*), if

- 1) for each $x \in \mathcal{N}^0$ the series $\sum_i \langle x, x_i \rangle \langle x_i, x \rangle$ is convergent in \mathcal{A} ;
- 2) its sum is bounded by $\langle x, x \rangle$, that is, $\sum_i \langle x, x_i \rangle \langle x_i, x \rangle \leq \langle x, x \rangle$;
- 3) $\|x_i\| \leq 1$ for any i .

Definition 1.5. Denote by Φ a countable collection $\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots\}$ of states on \mathcal{A} (i.e. positive linear functionals of norm 1). For each pair (X, Φ) with an outer \mathcal{N}^0 -admissible X , consider a non-negative function defined by the equality

$$\nu_{X, \Phi}(x)^2 := \sup_k \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} |\varphi_k(\langle x, x_i \rangle)|^2, \quad x \in \mathcal{N}^0.$$

It can be checked that this is a seminorm on the module \mathcal{N}^0 . Denote the system of all these functions by $\mathbb{O}SN(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}^0)$. Also we will write $(X, \Phi) \in \mathbb{O}A(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}^0)$ for pairs with outer admissible X .

Definition 1.6. Consider for $(X, \Phi) \in \mathbb{O}A(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}^0)$ the following function $d_{X, \Phi} : \mathcal{N}^0 \times \mathcal{N}^0 \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$

$$d_{X, \Phi}(x, y)^2 := \nu_{X, \Phi}(x - y)^2 = \sup_k \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} |\varphi_k(\langle x - y, x_i \rangle)|^2, \quad x, y \in \mathcal{N}^0.$$

We will write $d_{X, \Phi} \in \mathbb{O}PM(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}^0)$.

Evidently, $d_{X, \Phi}$ are *pseudometrics* in sense of [7, Definition 2.10] (and [19, Chapter IX, §1]), so they form a uniform structure.

If X contains only elements of the module \mathcal{N} , the word “outer” is not used, and in this case one may write SN , A and PM instead of $\mathbb{O}SN$, $\mathbb{O}A$ and $\mathbb{O}PM$.

The definition of *totally bounded* sets for the uniform structure under consideration (or for the system $\mathbb{O}PM(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}^0)$) takes the following form.

Definition 1.7. A set $Y \subseteq \mathcal{N}^0 \subseteq \mathcal{N} (\subseteq M(\mathcal{N}))$ is *totally bounded* with respect to this uniform structure, if for any (X, Φ) , where $X \subseteq M(\mathcal{N})$ is outer \mathcal{N}^0 -admissible, and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a finite collection y_1, \dots, y_n of elements of Y such that the sets

$$\{y \in Y \mid d_{X, \Phi}(y_i, y) < \varepsilon\}$$

form a cover of Y . This finite collection is called an ε -*net* in Y for $d_{X, \Phi}$.

If so, we will say that Y is *externally* $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}^0)$ -*totally bounded* (or $(M(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{N}^0)$ -totally bounded).

In these terms the \mathcal{A} -compactness of operators for some class of modules can be describe by following:

Theorem 1.8. ([8, Theorem 3.5]) *Suppose, \mathcal{M} , \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{K} are Hilbert \mathcal{A} -modules, $\mathcal{N} \oplus \mathcal{K} \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \dot{A}$ for some Λ , $F : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is an adjointable operator and $F(B)$ is $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N})$ -totally bounded, where B is the unit ball of \mathcal{M} . Then F is \mathcal{A} -compact as an operator from \mathcal{M} to \mathcal{N} .*

The inverse statement holds for arbitrary modules ([8, Theorem 2.4]). For the case when \mathcal{N} is a countably generated module a similar result was stated and proved as criterion of \mathcal{A} -compactness by E.V. Troitsky ([7, Theorem 2.13]).

Evidently $(M(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{N}^0)$ -totally bounded set is $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}^0)$ -totally bounded, so all results which state that $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N})$ -totally boundedness of the image of the unit ball implies \mathcal{A} -compactness of corresponding adjointable operator are still valid if we consider $(M(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{N})$ -totally boundedness.

Let us recall a notion of a frame in Hilbert C^* -module (see, e.g., [1], [2]). Among all frames, standard ones are also considered.

Definition 1.9. *Let \mathcal{N} be a Hilbert C^* -module over an unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} and J be some set. A family $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ of elements of \mathcal{N} is said to be a standard frame in \mathcal{N} if there exist positive constants c_1, c_2 such that for any $x \in \mathcal{N}$ the series $\sum_j \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle$ converges in norm in \mathcal{A} and the following inequalities hold:*

$$c_1 \langle x, x \rangle \leq \sum_j \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle \leq c_2 \langle x, x \rangle.$$

A frame is called *tight* if $c_1 = c_2$ and *normalized* if $c_1 = c_2 = 1$. If the series converges only in the ultraweak topology (also known as σ -weak) to some element of the universal enveloping von Neumann algebra \mathcal{A}'' , then the frame is said to be *non-standard*. Unlike the case of a standard frame, in this case the number of nonzero elements of the series can be uncountable, the convergence in this case is considered as the convergence of a net consisting of all finite partial sums (see remarks before [20, 1.2.19] and [20, 5.1.5]). We will write just “frame” if it is at least non-standard.

If the algebra \mathcal{A} is not unital, then \mathcal{N} can be considered as a module over its unitalization $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ and frame can be defined in \mathcal{N} as in an $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ -module. Further we will assume that frames are defined in this way.

Remark 1.10. *For a system $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ there is a connection between the so-called reconstruction formula and the property of being a frame: if for any $x \in \mathcal{N}$ it holds that $x = \sum_{j \in J} x_j \langle x_j, x \rangle$, then $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a normalized frame, and the convergence takes place in the same sense (see [2, Example 3.1])*

Remark 1.11. *If there exists a positive constant c such that for any $x \in \mathcal{N}$ and for any partial sum of the considered series the inequality $\sum_j \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle \leq c \langle x, x \rangle$ holds (that is, the right side of the inequality for the frame), then the system $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ is called the Bessel system. Due to [21, 2.4.19] the series with respect to the Bessel system always converges in the ultrastrong topology and, as a consequence, also in the ultraweak one.*

Recall the following characterization of non-standard frames:

Lemma 1.12. ([11, Proposition 3.1]) *A system $\{x_j\}_J$ is a frame in \mathcal{N} if and only if there exist positive constants c_1, c_2 such that for any $x \in \mathcal{N}$ and any state φ on \mathcal{A} the following inequalities hold:*

$$c_1 \varphi(\langle x, x \rangle) \leq \sum_j \varphi(\langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle) \leq c_2 \varphi(\langle x, x \rangle)$$

From this property and the definition of a standard frame it is obvious that any frame in the algebra $C_0(K)$ as a module over itself must separate points of the space K .

In our context the main structural result of the frame theory is the following: from the results of Frank and Larson ([2, 3.5, 4.1 and 5.3], see also [11, Theorem 1.1]) it follows that the Hilbert C^* -module \mathcal{N} over the C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} can be represented as an orthogonal direct summand in the standard module of some cardinality over the unitalization algebra $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \dot{\mathcal{A}}$ if and only if there exists a standard frame in \mathcal{N} .

Kasparov's stabilization theorem ([22], or [15, Theorem 1.4.2]) implies that every countably generated module has a standard frame. The construction of a module that does not have a standard frame will show that the stabilization property of the Kasparov type is not satisfied for this module.

Note that frames are well-defined even for the case when the algebra is not unital, but to use this stabilization property we need to take its unitalization.

Remark 1.13. *If an algebra \mathcal{A} has a standard frame as a module over itself, then any \mathcal{A} -module \mathcal{N} which can be represented as an orthogonal direct summand in the standard module $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{A}$ also has a standard frame (and hence can be represented as an orthogonal direct summand in the standard module $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda'} \dot{\mathcal{A}}$). For some special case it was noted in [8, remark 3.6].*

Let us recall now some preliminaries from topology.

For a locally compact Hausdorff topological space K we denote by $\alpha K = K \cup \{t_\infty\}$ its one-point compactification (see [23, 29.1]). We will also often use the fact that the C^* -algebra $C_0(K)$ of continuous functions vanishing at infinity (see [24, 436I]) is isomorphic to an ideal in C^* -algebra $C(\alpha K)$ consisting of functions vanishing at the point t_∞ ([25, Lemma 3.44]). We denote by βK the Stone-Ćech compactification of K ; it is known that $C_b(K) \cong C(\beta K) \cong M(C_0(K))$ (see [32, Chapter 1]).

Lemma 1.14. ([10, Corollary 1.3]) *Let K be a locally compact Hausdorff space, A be a closed subset of K and $f \in C_0(A)$, then f can be extended to a function from $C_0(K)$. Moreover, f is bounded and the extended function can be chosen to be bounded by the same constant. In particular, for every compact set $K' \subset K$ there is a function $g \in C_0(K)$ such that $g = 1$ on K' and $|g| \leq 1$ on K .*

We need the following useful examples of topological spaces: $[0, \omega_1]$ — the space of all ordinals α such that $\alpha \leq \omega_1$ with order topology, where ω_1 is the first uncountable ordinal; this space is uncountable. Also, $[0, \omega_1) \in \mathcal{K}_{IV}$. $[0, \omega_0]$ is the space of all ordinals α such that $\alpha \leq \omega_0$ with order topology, where ω_0 is the first infinite ordinal (this space is homeomorphic to $\{\frac{1}{n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \{0\}$, or $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$). See [10] or [29, chapters VI-VII] and [30, 3.1.27] for details.

The following well-known for specialists statement is useful for our goal.

Lemma 1.15. *The C^* -algebra $C_0(K)$ is σ -unital if and only if K is σ -compact.*

Proof. Recall that σ -unitality is equivalent to the existence of a strictly positive element, in our case — an everywhere positive function.

If the algebra $C_0(K)$ is σ -unital, then it contains an everywhere positive function f . The sets $\{t \in K : |f(t)| \geq \frac{1}{n}\}$ are compact (as closed subsets of such corresponding compact sets outside of which $|f(t)| < \frac{1}{n}$), and therefore form a countable cover of K by compacts.

Conversely, if there are compact sets K_n such that $K = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} K_n$, then there exist functions $f_n \in C_0(K)$ such that $f_n(t) = 1$ on K_n and $|f_n(t)| \leq 1$ everywhere on K . The function $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^n} |f_n(t)|$ is everywhere positive on K , since for any point there is a compact set K_n in which it is contained. \square

Lemma 1.16. *Let K be a locally compact, not σ -compact space. Then for any countable family of functions $\{f_n\} \subset C_0(K)$ the set $F = \{t \in K : f_n(t) = 0 \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is non-empty, and even uncountable.*

In particular, a countable family of functions cannot separate points of the space K .

Proof. Indeed, if the set F is countable and equals to $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a function $g_n \in C_0(K)$ such that $g_n(z_n) = 1$, $|g_n(t)| \leq 1$, and then the function $g(t) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{|f_n(t)|}{1+|f_n(t)|} + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^n} |g_n(t)|$ is everywhere positive on K , which contradicts the fact that K is not σ -compact.

The proof is also valid for the cases when F is finite or empty. \square

Lemma 1.17. *Let K be a locally compact, not σ -compact space, $\{K_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a countable collection of compact sets from K . Then for any countable family of functions $\{f_n\} \subset C_0(K)$ the set $F = \{t \in K \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} K_n : f_n(t) = 0 \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is non-empty, and even uncountable.*

Proof. Similarly to the previous lemma, consider the function $g(t) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{|f_n(t)|}{1+|f_n(t)|} + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^n} |g_n(t)| + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^n} h_n(t)$, where $h_n \in C_0(K)$ is a non-negative function which equals to 1 on K_n and bounded by 1. \square

It is known (see [2, Example 3.5]) that every σ -unital algebra as a module over itself has a normalized standard frame. Let us construct an example of a non- σ -unital algebra that has a frame with the same properties.

Recall that $\mathcal{A} = c_0 - \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{A}_\lambda$ is a c_0 -direct sum of the algebras \mathcal{A}_λ (see [31, §1.4] or [33, §1]), the elements $x = (x_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of this sum are enumerated by indices from Λ sets such that $x_\lambda \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$, there are at most countable set $\{x_{\lambda_m}\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of non-zero elements and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|x_{\lambda_m}\|_{\mathcal{A}_{\lambda_m}} = 0$. The norm in this algebra is given by the formula $\|x\|_{\mathcal{A}} = \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|x_\lambda\|_{\mathcal{A}_\lambda}$. In fact, this algebra is obtained by completing an algebra whose elements are non-zero only for a finite number of indices.

Theorem 1.18. *Let $\mathcal{A} = c_0 - \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{A}_\lambda$, where each \mathcal{A}_λ has a normalized standard frame for which the reconstruction formula is valid (for example, due to [9, Proposition 2.3], when each \mathcal{A}_λ is σ -unital). Then \mathcal{A} as a $\dot{\mathcal{A}}$ -module has a normalized standard frame.*

Proof. Denote by $\{x_j\}_{j \in J_\lambda}$ the frame in \mathcal{A}_λ . For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, the elements of the frame can be considered as elements of the entire algebra \mathcal{A} by extending them by zero outside the corresponding index. Let us show that $\{x_j\}_{j \in \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J_\lambda}$ is a frame in \mathcal{A} .

Let $x \in \mathcal{A}$. Fix arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists an element $x^m \in \mathcal{A}$ which is non-zero only in a finite number of indices $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$ such that $\|x - x^m\| < \varepsilon$. For each λ_k , $k = 1, \dots, m$,

there exists a finite set $\{x_j\}_{j \in J'_{\lambda_k}}$ of elements of the frame such that

$$\|x_{\lambda_k}^m - \sum_{j \in J'_{\lambda_k}} x_j \langle x_j, x_{\lambda_k}^m \rangle\| < \varepsilon,$$

hence

$$\|x^m - \sum_{j \in \bigcup_{k=1}^m J'_{\lambda_k}} x_j \langle x_j, x^m \rangle\| < \varepsilon$$

and

$$\|x - \sum_{j \in \bigcup_{k=1}^m J'_{\lambda_k}} x_j \langle x_j, x^m \rangle\| < 2\varepsilon.$$

So we have $x = \sum_{j \in J} x_j \langle x_j, x \rangle$, and the series converges in norm in \mathcal{A} . Hence $\langle x, x \rangle = \sum_{j \in J} \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle$. □

Corollary 1.19. *Since \mathcal{A} has a frame, it can be represented as an orthogonal direct summand in the standard module $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \dot{\mathcal{A}}$ of some cardinality, and so, by [8, Theorem 3.5], it satisfies the \mathcal{A} -compactness criterion.*

Moreover, every \mathcal{A} -module which can be represented as an orthogonal direct summand in the standard module $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda'} \mathcal{A}$ also can be represented in the standard module $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \dot{\mathcal{A}}$ of some cardinality, and hence it satisfies the \mathcal{A} -compactness criterion too.

Remark 1.20. *If \mathcal{A} also is a commutative algebra, then $\mathcal{A} \cong c_0 - \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} C_0(K_\lambda) \cong C_0(\bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} K_\lambda)$, and $C_0(K_\lambda)$ is σ -unital if and only if K_λ is σ -compact; if Λ is uncountable, then $K = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} K_\lambda$ is not σ -compact, because a compact set in K intersects only a finite number of K_λ . If \mathcal{A}_λ is a unital algebra, then as a frame in \mathcal{A}_λ we can take just one element, the identity of the algebra (it corresponds to a function which identically equals to one in the commutative case).*

2. THE PROPERTIES OF \mathcal{K}_{II}

Let us introduce several examples of spaces from the class \mathcal{K}_{II} .

Example 2.1. K — the set of real numbers with rational sequence topology ([27, §65]). Moreover, it is separable.

Example 2.2. $K = \beta\mathbb{N} \setminus \{t'\}$, where $t' \in \beta\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathbb{N}$ — the Stone-Čech compactification of natural numbers without an arbitrary point from the growth. It is not σ -compact since [28, 9.6], and obviously it is separable. More generally, we can take instead of \mathbb{N} any separable non-compact space (or just σ -compact, but we can lost separability).

Example 2.3. $K = \alpha P \times [0, \omega_0] \setminus \{(p_\infty, \omega_0)\}$, where P is a locally compact, non- σ -compact Hausdorff space, $\alpha P = P \cup \{p_\infty\}$ — its one-point compactification.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_{II}$. Then there is no standard frame in the $\dot{C}_0(K)$ -module $C_0(K)$.*

Proof. Assume that there exists a frame $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ of elements from $C_0(K)$. It contains an uncountable number of nonzero elements, since countable cannot separate the points of K .

Let $\{K_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of compact sets in K such that $\overline{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} K_n} = K$.

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a function $g_n \in C_0(K)$ such that $g_n(t) = 1$ on K_n , $|g_n(t)| \leq 1$ on K . There is a non-empty at most countable set $\{x_j\}_{j \in J_n}$ of elements of the frame such that $x_j(t) \neq 0$ identically on K_n because the series $\sum_j \langle g_n, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, g_n \rangle(t) = \sum_j |x_j(t)|^2$ converges uniformly on K_n . That is, if $j \in J \setminus J_n$, then $x_j(t) = 0$ on K_n .

Hence, there is at most countable set $\{x_j\}_{j \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} J_n}$ such that $x_j(t) \neq 0$ identically on $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} K_n$. Hence, for every $j \in J \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} J_n$ we have $x_j(t) = 0$ for $t \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} K_n$, but due to the fact that $\overline{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} K_n} = K$ it also holds for $t \in K$. Hence, only a countable set of frame elements is not identically zero. A contradiction. \square

Corollary 2.5. *From this result it follows that $C_0(K)$ cannot be represented as an orthogonal direct summand of a standard module $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \dot{C}_0(K)$.*

Let now K be moreover separable, that is, finite sets can be taken as compacts in the definition of \mathcal{K}_{II} . Spaces from examples 2.1 or 2.2 can be taken as such spaces. Let us show that in this case non-standard frames also don't exist.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_{II}$ and K is separable. Then there is no frames in the $\dot{C}_0(K)$ -module $C_0(K)$.*

Proof. Assume that there exists a frame $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ of elements from $C_0(K)$. It must contain an uncountable number of nonzero elements, since countable cannot separate the points of K .

Let $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a countable dense subset of K .

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a function $g_n \in C_0(K)$ such that $g_n(t_n) = 1$, $|g_n(t)| \leq 1$ on K . There is a non-empty at most countable set $\{x_j\}_{j \in J_n}$ of elements of the frame such that $x_j(t_n) \neq 0$, because taking $x = g_n$ and φ — evaluation at the point t_n , due to lemma 1.12 we have that the series $\sum_j \langle g_n, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, g_n \rangle(t) = \sum_j |x_j(t)|^2$ converges at the point t_n . That is, if $j \in J \setminus J_n$, then $x_j(t_n) = 0$.

Hence, there is at most countable set $\{x_j\}_{j \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} J_n}$ such that $x_j(t) \neq 0$ identically on $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{t_n\}$. Hence, for every $j \in J \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} J_n$ we have that $x_j(t) = 0$ for $t \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{t_n\}$, but due to the fact that $\overline{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{t_n\}} = K$ it also holds for $t \in K$. Hence, only a countable set of frame elements is identically zero. A contradiction. \square

Despite the previous two theorems, it is possible to construct an example of a space $K \in \mathcal{K}_{II}$ such that a non-standard frame exists in $C_0(K)$.

Example 2.7. *Let P be a non- σ -compact space such that $C_0(P)$ has a normalized frame $\{u_\beta\}_{\beta \in B}$. We know that such a space exists (see remark 1.20).*

Take $K = \alpha P \times [0, \omega_0] \setminus \{(p_\infty, \omega_0)\}$ and define $y_\beta \in C_0(K)$, $\beta \in B$, by the formula $y_\beta(p, n) = u_\beta(p)$, where $(p, n) = t \in K$, i.e. $\{y_\beta\}_{\beta \in B}$ is a “copying” of functions $\{u_\beta\}_{\beta \in B}$ on each “row” $P \times \{n\}$, $n \in [0, \omega_0]$. Also consider $\{w_n\}_{n \in [0, \omega_0]}$ such that $w_n = 1$ on $\alpha P \times \{n\}$

and w_n vanishes outside $\alpha P \times \{n\}$ (obviously, $w_n \in C_0(K)$ for any $n \in [0, \omega_0)$, since every $\alpha P \times \{n\}$ is a clopen set). Define $\{x_j\}_{j \in J} = \{y_\beta\}_{\beta \in B} \cup \{w_n\}_{n \in [0, \omega_0)}$.

Theorem 2.8. *In example 2.7 the system $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a (non-standard) frame in $C_0(K)$.*

Proof. Take an arbitrary $x \in C_0(K)$. For any partial sum of the series $\sum_j \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle (t) = \sum_j |x(t)|^2 |x_j(t)|^2$ we have $\sum_j |x(t)|^2 |x_j(t)|^2 \leq 2|x(t)|^2 = 2\langle x, x \rangle (t)$ (actually, if $p = p_\infty$ or $n = \omega_0$, where $t = (p, n)$, then two can be replaced by one), which means that the series converges in the ultrastrong topology.

Hence we obtain the right side of the inequality of lemma 1.12 with $c_2 = 2$ for any state φ (in particular, the corresponding series converges). Indeed, if for some state φ we have $\sum_j \varphi(\langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle) > 2\varphi(\langle x, x \rangle)$, then there exists some partial sum of the series for which it also holds that $\sum_{j \in J'} \varphi(\langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle) > 2\varphi(\langle x, x \rangle)$. And then we have $\varphi(2\langle x, x \rangle - \sum_{j \in J'} \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle) < 0$, which contradicts the inequality $2\langle x, x \rangle \geq \sum_{j \in J'} \langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle$ and positivity of φ .

Let us show that the left side holds too.

Let φ be a state on $C_0(K)$, that is, there is a Radon measure μ on K such that $\varphi(x) = \int_K x(t) d\mu(t)$ (see [24, 436K]). Then μ can be represented as a sum of the Radon measures μ_1 which support is $P \times \{\omega_0\}$ and μ_2 which support is $\alpha P \times [0, \omega_0)$. Then for any $x \in C_0(K)$ we have $\varphi(\langle x, x \rangle) = \int_{P \times \{\omega_0\}} |x(t)|^2 d\mu_1(t) + \int_{\alpha P \times [0, \omega_0)} |x(t)|^2 d\mu_2(t)$. The representation of a measure as a sum corresponds to the representation of φ as a sum of states φ_1 and φ_2 .

Identify the restrictions of $y_\beta(p, n)$ on $P \times \{\omega_0\}$ with $u_\beta(p)$, then $\{u_\beta\}_{\beta \in B}$ is a normalized frame in $C_0(P \times \{\omega_0\})$. For the restriction of x to $P \times \{\omega_0\}$ (and hence for x itself, since μ_1 vanishes outside this subset) we have $\varphi_1(\langle x, x \rangle) \leq \sum_{\beta \in B} \varphi_1(\langle x, u_\beta \rangle \langle u_\beta, x \rangle) = \sum_j \varphi_1(\langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle)$ (φ_1 can be considered as a state on $C_0(P \times \{\omega_0\})$).

$P \times \{\omega_0\}$ is a closed set in K , so $\alpha P \times [0, \omega_0)$ is open and hence it is Borel set. Therefore μ_2 is a Radon measure on $\alpha P \times [0, \omega_0)$ ([24, 416R(b)]). By the monotone convergence theorem (see, for example, [25, Theorem 2.25] or [26, Proposition 8.7(b)]) we have

$$\int_{\alpha P \times [0, \omega_0)} |x(t)|^2 d\mu_2(t) = \int_{\alpha P \times [0, \omega_0)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x(t)|^2 |w_n(t)|^2 d\mu_2(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\alpha P \times [0, \omega_0)} |x(t)|^2 |w_n(t)|^2 d\mu_2(t),$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_2(\langle x, x \rangle) &= \int_{\alpha P \times [0, \omega_0)} |x(t)|^2 d\mu_2(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\alpha P \times [0, \omega_0)} |x(t)|^2 |w_n(t)|^2 d\mu_2(t) = \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi_2(\langle x, w_n \rangle \langle w_n, x \rangle) \leq \sum_j \varphi_2(\langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

By summing up the obtained inequalities, we have $\varphi(\langle x, x \rangle) \leq \sum_j \varphi(\langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle)$.

Thus, for every state φ on $C_0(K)$ and every $x \in C_0(K)$ the inequalities $\varphi(\langle x, x \rangle) \leq \sum_j \varphi(\langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle) \leq 2\varphi(\langle x, x \rangle)$ hold, so $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a frame in $C_0(K)$ with constants 1 and 2. \square

Remark 2.9. *It is clear that the proof of the previous theorem is still valid if instead of normalized frame in $C_0(P)$ we take a frame with arbitrary frame constants.*

The existence of a standard frame is a sufficient but not necessary condition for the \mathcal{A} -compactness criterion to be satisfied. Therefore we cannot assert that for any topological space from the class \mathcal{K}_{II} the criterion is not valid, but we can construct an example of a space (more precisely, some subclass of spaces) for which the criterion actually fails.

First, let us consider several properties of topological spaces (it is assumed everywhere that K is a locally compact Hausdorff space).

1) $\beta K = \alpha K$ (in other words, every continuous bounded function has a limit at infinity).

2) Any σ -compact subset of K is precompact in K (that is, $K \in \mathcal{K}_{IV}$).

2.1) Any continuous function which tends to zero at infinity is constant outside some compact K' .

2.2) Any continuous function that has a limit at infinity is constant outside some compact K' .

3) Any continuous function on K is constant outside some compact K' .

Let's observe the relationships between these properties.

Lemma 2.10. *The properties 2), 2.1), 2.2) are equivalent.*

Proof. Indeed, 2.1) obviously follows from 2.2).

Let's prove 2.2) if 2.1) is true. Let f be a continuous function which has a limit at infinity equals to f_∞ . Then the continuous function $f - f_\infty$ tends to zero at infinity, so it vanishes outside some compact set, so the function f is constant and equals to f_∞ outside the same compact set.

Let's prove 2) if 2.1) is true. Let $\{K_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of compact sets in K . For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a function $g_n \in C_0(K)$ such that $g_n(t) = 1$ on K_n , $|g_n(t)| \leq 1$ on K . Define the function $g \in C_0(K)$ by formula $g(t) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^n} g_n(t)$. It tends to zero at infinity, so it vanishes outside some compact K' , and moreover, it is nonzero at $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} K_n$, so $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} K_n \subset K'$.

Q.E.D.

Implication 2) \Rightarrow 2.1) was proved in [10, Lemma 1.5]. \square

Obviously, 3) implies 2). The converse, in general, is false; it suffices to consider a disjoint union of sets with property 2), for example, $[0, \omega_1)$. The same example shows that 2) does not imply 1).

From 3) it also obviously follows that 1) holds. The converse is not true, as will follow from the example we will construct. Also, this example will not satisfy 2). Also, this example will represent a class of spaces for which the criterion of \mathcal{A} -compactness fails.

Example 2.11. *Take $K = \alpha P \times [0, \omega_0] \setminus \{(p_\infty, \omega_0)\}$, where $P \in \mathcal{K}_{IV}$ (that is, P satisfies the property 2)), $\alpha P = P \cup \{p_\infty\}$ — its one-point compactification.*

A special case of this construction is the deleted Tychonoff plank ([27, §87]) if $P = [0, \omega_1)$, $\alpha P = [0, \omega_1]$.

This space does not satisfy 2) (and, as a consequence, does not satisfy 3)), since it contains a countable dense family of compact sets $\{\alpha P \times \{n\}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let us show that it satisfies 1) (this generalizes the properties of the deleted Tychonoff plank, see [28, 8.20]).

Theorem 2.12. *Let K be the space from the example 2.11. Then $\alpha K = \beta K$, that is, every continuous bounded function has a limit at infinity. Moreover, K is pseudo-compact, that is, every continuous function on K is bounded.*

Proof. Let $f \in C(K)$. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the restriction of f to $\alpha P \times \{n\}$ is continuous, and the restriction of f to $P \times \{n\}$ is a continuous function that has a limit at infinity. Hence, by property 2), for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a compact set $P_n \subset P$ such that f is constant (and equals to some $p_{n,\infty}$) outside the compact $P_n \times \{n\} \subset P \times \{n\}$. $\{P_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a countable family of compact sets in P , so there exists a compact set $P' \subset P$ which contains all of them. So outside $P' \times [0, \omega_0)$ the function f depends only on the number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and is equals to $p_{n,\infty}$ on the “ n th row” $P \times \{n\}$.

Consider $(p, \omega_0) \in P \times \{\omega_0\}$ with $p \notin P'$. Since f is continuous at (p, ω_0) , we have $f(p, \omega_0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(p, n)$, this limit does not depend on p outside P' , hence the function $f(p, \omega_0)$ is constant outside P' , so the function f can be extended by continuity at the point (p_∞, ω_0) by $f(p_\infty, \omega_0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(p_\infty, n) = \lim_{p \rightarrow p_\infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(p, n)$. Thus, we have proved the property 1). \square

Corollary 2.13. *For K from the example 2.11 we have $C(K) = C_b(K) = \dot{C}_0(K) = M(C_0(K)) \cong C(\alpha K) = C(\beta K)$ (except the first equality, this is also true for any space with property 1)).*

To show that Troitsky's theorem does not hold for $C_0(K)$ as a module over itself with such K , we need one more intermediate step.

Theorem 2.14. *A system $\{x_j\} \subset C_b(K)$ is $(C_b(K), C_0(K))$ -admissible if and only if it is $(C_b(K), C_b(K))$ -admissible.*

Proof. An implication \Leftarrow is obvious; let us prove the inverse.

Let $\{x_j\} \subset C_b(K)$ be $(C_b(K), C_0(K))$ -admissible, i.e., for every $x \in C_0(K)$ we have

- 1) the series $\sum_i \langle x, x_i \rangle \langle x_i, x \rangle$ converges in norm (i.e., uniformly);
- 2) its sum is bounded by $\langle x, x \rangle$;
- 3) $\|x_i\| \leq 1$ for any i .

Let us take an arbitrary function $x \in C_b(K)$ and show that these conditions are also satisfied for it (it suffices to show 1) and 2), obviously).

Similar to the previous proof, there exists a compact set $P' \subset P$ such that the function x and all the functions x_j are constant outside $P' \times [0, \omega_0]$ on each “row”. There exists $p' \in P \setminus P'$, denote $P'' = P' \cup \{p'\}$.

There exists a function $g \in C_0(P)$ such that $g(p) = 1$ on P'' , $|g(p)| \leq 1$ on P . Define $\tilde{x} \in C_0(K)$ by the formula $\tilde{x}(t) = x(t)g(p)$, where $t = (p, n) \in K$. \tilde{x} satisfies conditions 1) and 2) on K , and hence on the set $P'' \times [0, \omega_0]$ on which $\tilde{x} = x$. Outside P'' we have $\sum_i \langle x, x_i \rangle \langle x_i, x \rangle(p, n) = \sum_i \langle x, x_i \rangle \langle x_i, x \rangle(p'', n)$. That is, outside P'' conditions 1) and 2) are satisfied, since they are satisfied for $p = p'$. If the uniform convergence on each of two sets holds, then it also holds on their union; if the inequality holds on sets, then it also holds on their union. Hence, conditions 1), 2) are satisfied on the whole K for any $x \in C_b(K)$. Q.E.D. \square

Corollary 2.15. *A set $Y \subset C_0(K)$ is $(C_b(K), C_0(K))$ -totally bounded if and only if it is $(C_b(K), C_b(K))$ -totally bounded.*

Remark 2.16. *Using [32, 4.2] one can construct more complex examples of spaces with the described properties, by taking instead of $[0, \omega_0]$ an arbitrary infinite compact set and choosing for P instead of ω_1 a sufficiently large ordinal if it necessary — to use the condition that on each “row” the function is eventually constant.*

Theorem 2.17. *The unit ball in $C_0(K)$ (and hence the image of the unit ball with respect to the identity operator $Id : C_0(K) \rightarrow C_0(K)$) is $(C_b(K), C_0(K))$ -totally bounded, but the identity operator is not $C_0(K)$ -compact.*

Proof. The unit ball in $C_0(K)$ is a subset of the unit ball in $C_b(K)$, which is $(C_b(K), C_b(K))$ -totally bounded since it is the image of the unit ball with respect to the identity operator $Id : C_b(K) \rightarrow C_b(K)$, which is $C_b(K)$ -compact because $C_b(K)$ is unital and it is countably generated as a module over itself. Hence, the unit ball in $C_0(K)$ is also $(C_b(K), C_b(K))$ -totally bounded, and by the previous corollary it is $(C_b(K), C_0(K))$ -totally bounded.

The identity operator is not $C_0(K)$ -compact since the image of \mathcal{A} -compact operator must be countably generated ([7, Lemma 1.10]), but $C_0(K)$ is not. \square

Let us also prove that for the constructed example there is no non-standard frames, and we must start with the following useful lemma.

Lemma 2.18. *Let K be a locally compact Hausdorff space, A its closed subset. If there is a frame $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ (standard or not) in $C_0(K)$, then its restriction to A $\{y_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a frame in $C_0(A)$ in the same sense.*

Proof. Since uniform convergence on a set implies uniform convergence on a subset, the proposition is obvious for standard frames. Let us prove it for non-standard.

Take $x \in C_0(A)$ and let φ be a state on $C_0(A)$, i.e. a Radon measure μ on A . It can be extended to a measure on whole K by zero outside A — that is, to the state φ' on $C_0(K)$. The function x can be extended to the function $x' \in C_0(K)$ due to Lemma 1.14. Since $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a frame, we have

$$c_1 \varphi'(\langle x', x' \rangle) \leq \sum_j \varphi'(\langle x', x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x' \rangle) \leq c_2 \varphi'(\langle x', x' \rangle).$$

Since φ' is a measure which is actually calculated on the restrictions of functions on A , for x we have

$$c_1 \varphi(\langle x, x \rangle) \leq \sum_j \varphi(\langle x, y_j \rangle \langle y_j, x \rangle) \leq c_2 \varphi(\langle x, x \rangle),$$

i.e. $\{y_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a non-standard frame in $C_0(K)$. \square

Theorem 2.19. *For K from the example 2.11 there are no non-standard frames in $C_0(K)$.*

Proof. Suppose that there exists a non-standard frame $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ in $C_0(K)$. Then its restriction $\{y_j\}_{j \in J}$ to $P \times \{\omega_0\}$ is a non-standard frame in $C_0(P \times \{\omega_0\})$, so $C_0(P)$ also has a frame, which cannot be, as we will see later (theorem 4.1). A contradiction. \square

3. THE PROPERTIES OF \mathcal{K}_{III}

Example 3.1. Due to 1.18 and 1.20 as a “good” example when there exists a standard frame it suffices to take $K = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} K_\lambda$ with uncountable Λ , where all K_λ are σ -compact. Indeed, any compact set in $K = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} K_\lambda$ intersects only a finite number of K_λ , which means that a σ -compact set intersects only a countable number of them. Hence, the complement to any σ -compact subset contains some K_β , which is an open set in K .

Let us now introduce an example when the \mathcal{A} -compactness criterion is not satisfied, which implies that there is no standard frame; there is also no frames for it at all.

Example 3.2. Let $K = P_1 \sqcup P_2$, where $P_1 \in \mathcal{K}_{IV}$, $P_2 \in \mathcal{K}_I, \mathcal{K}_{II}$ or \mathcal{K}_{III} . A σ -compact set in K is a union of σ -compact sets from P_1 and P_2 respectively. The complement to a σ -compact set in P_1 is open, so the same is true for K . However, one can reach a point at infinity with a countable set of compact sets from P_2 , so $K \in \mathcal{K}_{III}$.

Theorem 3.3. Let K be a space from example 3.2. Then the operator $F : C_0(K) \rightarrow C_0(K)$ of multiplication by the identity function on P_1 and by zero function on P_2 is not $C_0(K)$ -compact, but the image of the unit ball with respect to this operator is $(C_b(K), C_0(K))$ -totally bounded. Obviously, this operator is adjointable. Also, $C_0(K)$ has no frames.

Proof. The image of this operator is an uncountably generated module $C_0(P_1)$, so the operator cannot be $C_0(K)$ -compact.

The image of the unit ball is the unit ball in $C_0(P_1)$, and since the restriction of the Radon measure to a measurable subset is the Radon measure ([24, 416R(b)]), the seminorm $\nu_{X,\Phi}$ on the image has the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{X,\Phi}(x)^2 &= \sup_k \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \left| \int_K \overline{x(t)} \cdot x_i(t) d\mu_k(t) \right|^2 = \sup_k \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \left| \int_{K'} \overline{x(t)} \cdot x_i(t) d\mu_k(t) \right|^2 = \\ &= \sup_k \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \left| \int_{P_1 \sqcup P_2} \overline{x(t)} \cdot x_i(t) d\mu_k(t) \right|^2 = \sup_k \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \left| \int_{P_1} \overline{x(t)} \cdot x_i(t) d\mu_k(t) \right|^2, \end{aligned}$$

that is, the seminorm on the image is calculated as a seminorm on $C_0(P_1)$. Obviously, the restriction to P_1 of any $(C_b(K), C_0(K))$ -admissible system is $(C_b(P_1), C_0(P_1))$ -admissible. Hence, the unit ball in $C_0(P_1)$ is $(C_b(K), C_0(K))$ -totally bounded by reasons similar to [10, Theorem 2.5] because the unit ball in $C_0(P_1)$ is $(C_b(P_1), C_0(P_1))$ -totally bounded (more specifically, since the elements of the ε -net, which are functions on P_1 , can be extended to whole K).

If there exists a frame in $C_0(K)$, its restriction to P_1 would also be a frame, but as we will see later (theorem 4.1), $C_0(P_1)$ has no frames, so there are no frames in $C_0(K)$ too. \square

There is also an intermediate example of space: there is no standard frame, but a non-standard one exists. But first let us prove the following another one useful lemma.

Lemma 3.4. Let P_1, P_2 be locally compact Hausdorff spaces, and both $C_0(P_1)$ and $C_0(P_2)$ have frames $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ (with constants d_1, d_2) and $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$ (with constants c_1, c_2) respectively. Then in $C_0(K)$, where $K = P_1 \sqcup P_2$ there also exists a frame $\{w_g\}_{g \in G} = \{x_j\}_{j \in J} \cup \{y_i\}_{i \in I}$. If each of the original frames is standard, then $\{w_g\}_{g \in G}$ is standard too.

Proof. Uniform convergence on a finite number of sets implies uniform convergence on their union. The same is true for the inequalities, so the case when both frames are standard is obvious. Let us prove for non-standard.

Let φ be a state on $C_0(K)$, i.e. a measure on K . It can be represented as the sum of measures on P_1 and P_2 respectively, i.e. $\varphi = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2$, where φ_1, φ_2 are states on P_1, P_2 respectively. It is also possible to represent in such a way the function $w \in C_0(K)$, $w = x + y$ and $\langle w, w \rangle = |w|^2 = \langle x, x \rangle + \langle y, y \rangle$. Hence we get that

$$\sum_g \varphi(\langle w, w_g \rangle \langle w_g, w \rangle) = \sum_j \varphi_1(\langle x, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, x \rangle) + \sum_i \varphi_2(\langle y, y_i \rangle \langle y_i, y \rangle),$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_g \varphi(\langle w, w_g \rangle \langle w_g, w \rangle) &\leq d_2 \varphi_1(\langle x, x \rangle) + c_2 \varphi_2(\langle y, y \rangle) = \\ &= d_2 \varphi(\langle x, x \rangle) + c_2 \varphi(\langle y, y \rangle) \leq \max\{d_2, c_2\} (\varphi(\langle x, x \rangle) + \varphi(\langle y, y \rangle)) = \max\{d_2, c_2\} \varphi(\langle w, w \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have that

$$\min\{d_1, c_1\} \varphi(\langle w, w \rangle) \leq \sum_g \varphi(\langle w, w_g \rangle \langle w_g, w \rangle) \leq \max\{d_2, c_2\} \varphi(\langle w, w \rangle),$$

i.e. $\{w_g\}_{g \in G}$ is a frame in $C_0(K)$. Q.E.D. □

Example 3.5. Let $K = P_1 \sqcup P_2$, where P_1 is the space from example 3.1, P_2 is the space from example 2.7. Similar to the previous discussion, $K \in \mathcal{K}_{III}$.

Theorem 3.6. There is no standard frame in $C_0(K)$, but there exists a non-standard one.

Proof. If $C_0(K)$ has a standard frame, its restriction to P_1 would also be a standard frame, but since $P_2 \in \mathcal{K}_{II}$, $C_0(P_2)$ has no standard frame (theorem 2.4), hence $C_0(K)$ also does not have.

Let us show that there exists a non-standard one. We know that in $C_0(P_1)$ there is a normalized standard frame $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$, and in $C_0(P_2)$ there is a frame $\{y_i\}_{i \in I}$ with constants $c_1 = 1, c_2 = 2$. By the previous lemma their union $\{w_g\}_{g \in G} = \{x_j\}_{j \in J} \cup \{y_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a frame in $C_0(K)$. □

4. NON-EXISTENCE OF NON-STANDARD FRAMES IN \mathcal{K}_{IV}

Theorem 4.1. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_{IV}$. Then the $\dot{C}_0(K)$ -module $C_0(K)$ has no frame.

Proof. Assume that there exists a frame $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ in $C_0(K)$. Take an arbitrary point $t_1 \in K$. There exists a function $g_1 \in C_0(K)$ such that $g_1(t_1) = 1, |g_1(t)| \leq 1$ on K . There is a non-empty at most countable set $\{x_j\}_{j \in J_1}$ of elements of the frame such that $x_j(t_1) \neq 0$ because by taking $x = g_1$ and $\varphi = \delta_{t_1}$ — evaluation at the point t_1 , due to lemma 1.12 we have that the series $\sum_j \langle g_1, x_j \rangle \langle x_j, g_1 \rangle(t) = \sum_j |x_j(t)|^2$ converges at the point t_1 . That is, if $j \in J \setminus J_1$, then $x_j(t_1) = 0$. For every $j \in J_1$ there is a compact set $K_{1,j} \subset K$ such that $x_j = 0$ outside $K_{1,j}$. J_1 is at most a countable set, so there is a compact set K_1 such that $\bigcup_{j \in J_1} K_{1,j} \subset K_1$. That is, $x_j = 0$ outside K_1 for any $j \in J_1$.

Assume that we have already found points t_1, \dots, t_n , compact sets K_1, \dots, K_n and index sets $J_1, \dots, J_n \subset J$ such that $t_i \notin \bigcup_{l=1}^{i-1} K_l$ for $i = 2, \dots, n$, $x_j(t_i) \neq 0$ only for $j \in J_i$ (as a consequence, different sets J_l do not intersect), $x_j = 0$ outside K_l for $j \in J_l$.

Take an arbitrary point $t_{n+1} \in K \setminus \bigcup_{l=1}^n K_l$. As in the case when $n = 1$, there exists a non-empty at most countable set $\{x_j\}_{j \in J_{n+1}}$ of elements of the frame such that $x_j(t_{n+1}) \neq 0$ for $j \in J_{n+1}$ (and hence J_{n+1} does not intersect any J_l , $l = 1, \dots, n$, since the functions x_j for $j \in \bigcup_{l=1}^n J_l$ vanishes outside $\bigcup_{l=1}^n K_l$). There also exists a compact set K_{n+1} such that $x_j = 0$ outside K_{n+1} for any $j \in J_{n+1}$. By induction, we can continue this construction for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The sequence $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a σ -compact set, so there exists a compact set K' containing this sequence.

Hence the sequence has a limit point $t_0 \in K'$. Let us show that $x_j(t_0) = 0$ for all $j \in J$, which will contradict the fact that $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a frame.

First let it be that $j \in J \setminus \bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} J_l$. Then $x_j(t_n) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, $x_j(t_0) = 0$, because otherwise if $x_j(t_0) = q \neq 0$ then in any neighborhood of the point t_0 there is a point t_n such that $|x_j(t_0) - x_j(t_n)| = |q| > 0$ — a contradiction with the continuity of x_j .

Let now $j \in \bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} J_l$, i.e. $j \in J_k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and suppose that $x_j(t_0) \neq 0$. Then $t_0 \in K_k$ (because $x_j = 0$ outside K_k). Hence, $x_j(t_{k+l}) = 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$ (because $t_{k+l} \notin K_k$) and t_0 is still a limit point for the sequence $\{t_n\}_{n=k+1}^{\infty}$, and then $x_j(t_0) = 0$ similarly to the previous case.

Hence $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$ is not a frame. Q.E.D. □

REFERENCES

- [1] M. FRANK, D. R. LARSON. A module frame concept for Hilbert C^* -modules. *The functional and harmonic analysis of wavelets and frames (San Antonio, TX, 1999)*, volume 247 of *Contemp. Math.* (1999), 207–233. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI.
- [2] M. FRANK, D. R. LARSON. Frames in Hilbert C^* -modules and C^* -algebras. *J. Operator Theory*, **48:2** (2002), 273–314.
- [3] LJ. ARAMBASIC, D. BAKIC. Frames and outer frames for Hilbert C^* -Modules. *Linear and multilinear algebra*, **65:2** (2017), 381–431.
- [4] D. BAKIC. Weak frames in Hilbert C^* -modules with application in Gabor analysis. *Banach J. Math. Anal.*, **13:4** (2019), 1017–1075.
- [5] D. J. KEČKIĆ, Z. LAZOVIĆ. Compact and “compact” operators on standard Hilbert modules over W^* -algebras. *Ann. Funct. Anal.*, **9:2** (2018), 258–270. (arXiv:1610.06956).
- [6] Z. LAZOVIĆ. Compact and “compact” operators on standard Hilbert modules over C^* -algebras. *Adv. Oper. Theory*, **3:4** (2018), 829–836.
- [7] E. V. TROITSKY. Geometric essence of “compact” operators on Hilbert C^* -modules. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, **485:2** (2020), 123842.
- [8] E.V. TROITSKY, D.V. FUFÁEV. Compact Operators and Uniform Structures in Hilbert C^* -Modules. *Funct. Anal. Its Appl.*, **54** (2020), 287–294.
- [9] M.B. ASADI. Frames in right ideals of C^* -algebras. *Bull. Iranian Math. Soc.*, **42:1** (2016), 61–67.
- [10] D. V. FUFÁEV. A Hilbert C^* -module with extremal properties. *(Russian) Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.*, **56:1** (2022), 94–105; *translation in Funct. Anal. Appl. (to appear) arXiv:2107.03782*.

- [11] H. LI. A Hilbert C^* -module admitting no frames. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, **42**:3 (2010), 388–394.
- [12] M. AMINI, M.B. ASADI, G. ELLIOTT, F. KHOSRAVI. Frames in Hilbert C^* -modules and Morita equivalent C^* -algebras. *Glasg. Math. J.*, **59**:1 (2017), 1–10.
- [13] M.B. ASADI, M. FRANK, Z. HASSANPOUR-YAKHDANI. Frame-Less Hilbert C^* -modules II. *Complex Anal. Oper. Theory*, **14**:32 (2020).
- [14] E. C. LANCE. *Hilbert C^* -modules - a toolkit for operator algebraists*, volume 210 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, England, 1995.
- [15] V.M. MANUILOV, E.V. TROITSKY. *Hilbert C^* -Modules*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 2005.
- [16] V. M. MANUILOV, E. V. TROITSKY. Hilbert C^* - and W^* -modules and their morphisms. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, **98**:2 (2000), 137–201.
- [17] D. BAKIC, B. GULJAS. On a class of module maps of Hilbert C^* -modules. *Math. Commun.*, **7**:2 (2002), 177–192.
- [18] D. BAKIC, B. GULJAS. Extensions of Hilbert C^* -modules, I. *Houston J. Math.*, **30**:2 (2004), 537–558.
- [19] N. BOURBAKI. *General topology. Chapters 5–10*. Elements of Mathematics (Berlin). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. Translated from the French, Reprint of the 1989 English translation.
- [20] R.V. KADISON, J.R. RINGROSE. *Fundamentals of the Theory of Operator Algebras. Volume I: Elementary theory*. Am. Math. Soc., Providence, 1997.
- [21] O. BRATTELI, D.W. ROBINSON. *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics 1*, Springer-Verlag, New York Heidelberg Berlin, 1979.
- [22] G. G. KASPAROV. Hilbert C^* -modules: theorems of Stinespring and Voiculescu. *J. Operator Theory* **4**:1(1980), 133–150.
- [23] J.R. MUNKRES. *Topology*, Prentice Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2000.
- [24] D.H. FREMLIN. *Measure theory, vol. 4 Topological Measure Spaces*. Torres Fremlin, Colchester, 2003.
- [25] N. WEAVER. *Measure Theory and Functional Analysis*. World Scientific, 2014.
- [26] J. YEH. *Real Analysis: Theory of Measure and Integration*. World Scientific, 2006.
- [27] L.A. STEEN, J.A. SEEBACH JR.. *Counterexamples in Topology*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1978.
- [28] L. GILLMAN, M. JERISON. *Rings of Continuous Functions*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1960.
- [29] K. KURATOWSKI, A. MOSTOWSKI. *Set theory. With an introduction to descriptive set theory*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam New York Oxford, 1976.
- [30] R. ENGELKING. *General Topology*, PWN, Warsaw, 1977.
- [31] W. ARVESON. *An Invitation to C^* -Algebras*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.
- [32] R.C. WALKER. *The Stone-Ćech Compactification*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1974.
- [33] R. ESKANDARI, M. FRANK, V.M. MANUILOV, M.S. MOSLEHIAN. Extensions of the Lax–Milgram theorem to Hilbert C^* -modules *Positivity* , **24** (2020), 1169–1180.

MOSCOW CENTER FOR FUNDAMENTAL AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS,
 DEPT. OF MECH. AND MATH., LOMONOSOV MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY
Email address: denis.fufaev@math.msu.ru, fufaevdv@rambler.ru