

MEASURES OF NONCOMPACTNESS IN HILBERT C^* -MODULES

DRAGOLJUB J. KEČKIĆ AND ZLATKO LAZOVIĆ

ABSTRACT. Consider a countably generated Hilbert C^* -module \mathcal{M} over a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} . There is a measure of noncompactness λ defined, roughly as the distance from finitely generated projective submodules, which is independent of any topology. We compare λ to the Hausdorff measure of noncompactness with respect to the family of seminorms that induce a topology recently introduced by Troitsky, denoted by χ^* . We obtain $\lambda \equiv \chi^*$. Related inequalities involving other known measures of noncompactness, e.g. Kuratowski and Istrăţescu are also obtained as well as some related results on adjointable operators.

1. INTRODUCTION

Hilbert modules, i.e. modules over some C^* -algebra have been studied intensively for several decades. Briefly, they are counterparts of Hilbert spaces where the field \mathbb{C} of complex scalars is replaced by some C^* -algebra.

Definition 1.1. Let \mathcal{A} be some C^* -algebra. A pre-Hilbert C^* -module is a (right) C^* -module \mathcal{M} equipped with a sesquilinear form: $\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ with the following properties:

- i) $\langle x, x \rangle \geq 0$ for each $x \in \mathcal{M}$;
- ii) $\langle x, x \rangle = 0$ implies that $x = 0$;
- iii) $\langle x, y \rangle = \langle y, x \rangle^*$ for each $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$;
- iv) $\langle x, ya \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle a$ for any $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ and any $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

A pre-Hilbert C^* -module over \mathcal{A} is a Hilbert C^* -module if it is complete with respect to the norm $\|x\| = \|\langle x, x \rangle\|^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

A Cauchy-Schwartz type inequality holds for Hilbert C^* -modules ([15, Proposition 1.2.4])

$$\langle x, y \rangle \langle y, x \rangle \leq \|y\|^2 \langle x, x \rangle \quad \text{for each } x, y \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Example 1.2. Given a unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , the standard Hilbert module $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ is defined as

$$H_{\mathcal{A}} = \{x = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots) \mid \xi_j \in \mathcal{A}, \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \xi_j^* \xi_j \text{ converges in the norm topology}\}$$

with the \mathcal{A} -valued inner product

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \xi_j^* \eta_j, \quad x = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots), y = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots) \in H_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 46L08, 47H08; Secondary: 54E15.

Key words and phrases. Hilbert C^* -module, measures of noncompactness, uniform structure.

Unlike Hilbert spaces, an \mathcal{A} -linear bounded operator on a Hilbert module need not have an adjoint. Therefore, it is usual to consider $B^a(M)$ the set of all bounded, adjointable, \mathcal{A} -linear operators on a Hilbert module \mathcal{M} .

Among them, \mathcal{A} -linear combinations of

$$\Theta_{y,z} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}, y \in \mathcal{N}, z \in \mathcal{M}, \quad \Theta_{y,z}(x) = y \langle z, x \rangle$$

are called finite rank operators. Those belonging to the norm closure of the set of finite rank operators are called "compact" or \mathcal{A} -compact. In general, \mathcal{A} -compact operators need not map bounded sets into relatively compact sets, as is the case in the framework of Hilbert (and also Banach) spaces, though they share many properties of proper compact operators on a Hilbert space (see [10], [9]). Hence, "compact". Indeed, infinite dimensionality of the image of some bounded set is contained in the algebra of scalars.

For instance, $P_n : H_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{A}}$ given by

$$(1.1) \quad P_n(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots) = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n, 0, 0, \dots),$$

is \mathcal{A} -compact. Indeed, if \mathcal{A} is unital it can be written as $P_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \Theta_{e_k, e_k}$, where e_k is the basic vector consisting of zeros except on k th place it has the unity of \mathcal{A} . If \mathcal{A} is not unital, then P_n can be obtained as the limit of $\sum_{k=1}^n \Theta_{e_k^\alpha, e_k^\alpha}$, where e_k^α has e^α the approximate identity on its k th coordinate. However the image of the unit ball in $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the unit ball in \mathcal{A}^n which is obviously not compact, unless \mathcal{A} is finite dimensional itself.

For general literature concerning Hilbert modules over C^* -algebras, including the standard Hilbert module, the reader is referred to [8] or [11].

In [5], the authors pose a question whether there exists a topology on Hilbert module \mathcal{N} , where \mathcal{A} is a unital C^* -algebra, such that each operator on M is \mathcal{A} -compact iff it maps a unit ball (in the norm) to a totally bounded set, and gave a partial answer for the standard Hilbert module, $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ (Example 1.2), by constructing the appropriate topology, here denoted by τ_3

Soon after, in [18], Troitsky gave a complete answer in the case of countable generated Hilbert C^* -modules, constructing more suitable topology, here denoted by τ .

Both topologies were constructed via a family of seminorms, converting the underlying Hilbert module in a uniform space. This allows to consider measures of noncompactness that arise from some family of seminorms, in particular Hausdorff, Kuratowski and Istrăţescu measure of noncompactness, see [12] and [1].

Despite of any uniform structure, there is a natural distance of a given set from finite rank sets, based on [11, Proposition 2.6.2] and the definition preceding it. It was introduced in [6], as follows:

Definition 1.3. Let $E \subset H_{\mathcal{A}}$ be a bounded set. The measure of noncompactness of E , denoted by $\lambda(E)$, is the greatest lower bound of all $\eta > 0$ for which there exists a free finitely generated module $L \leq H_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that

$$d(E, L) := \sup_{x \in E} \inf_{y \in L} \|x - y\| < \eta.$$

In [6] there were considered Hausdorff, Kuratowski and Istrăţescu measures of noncompactness, with respect to topology τ_3 (or more precisely, the family of seminorms defining it), denoted by χ^* , α^* and I^* , respectively. Besides the expected

inequalities

$$(1.2) \quad \chi^*(E) \leq I^*(E) \leq \alpha^*(E) \leq 2\chi^*(E),$$

for any bounded subset E of the standard Hilbert module $H_{\mathcal{A}}$, the following relationships with the measure λ was obtained. For an arbitrary bounded $E \subseteq H_{\mathcal{A}}$ there holds

$$(1.3) \quad \chi^*(E) \leq \lambda(E) \leq \sqrt{\|E\|I^*(E)}, \quad \|E\| = \sup_{x \in E} \|x\|.$$

The first inequality is proved for an arbitrary C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , whereas the second holds if $\mathcal{A} = B(H)$.

The aim of this note is to examine an arbitrary countably generated Hilbert module \mathcal{M} and the corresponding measures of noncompactness related to the topology τ defined by Troitsky in [18], i.e from the family of seminorms that define it, as well as their relationship to the measure λ .

In addition to the expected inequalities (1.2) we prove

$$\lambda(E) = \chi^*(E),$$

for all countably generated Hilbert modules over an arbitrary C^* -algebra, which is much stronger result then (1.3). Some related results for adjointable operators are also given.

2. PREREQUISITS

In this section we list known results and definitions necessary for the main result.

2.1. Measure of noncompactness on uniform spaces. Uniform spaces are usually defined as spaces endowed with a family of sets in $X \times X$ given as some kind of neighborhoods of the diagonal, or so-called entourages [3, p. 169], for our purposes it is more convenient to give an equivalent definition via a family of semimetrics.

Definition 2.1. A nonempty set X endowed with a family of pseudometrics $\{d_\alpha\}$ (functions $d_\alpha: X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ satisfying (i) $d_\alpha(x, x) = 0$; (ii) $d_\alpha(x, y) = d_\alpha(y, x)$; (iii) $d_\alpha(x, y) \leq d_\alpha(x, z) + d_\alpha(z, y)$ for each $x, y, z \in X$) is called a *uniform space*.

By [4, Theorem 1, p.142] this definition is equivalent to the usual definition via entourages.

The family of sets $B_{d_\alpha}(x; \varepsilon) = \{y \in X \mid d_\alpha(x, y) < \varepsilon\}$ forms a basis for the corresponding topology.

Definition 2.2. A set $E \subset X$ is *totally bounded* if for every d_α and every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a finite collection y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n of elements of E such that the sets $B_\alpha(y_j; \varepsilon) = \{x \in E \mid d_\alpha(x, y_j) < \varepsilon\}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ form a cover of E .

Remark 2.3. In the usual framework, where uniform space is defined by entourages, there is also another different definition of totally bounded sets. These two definitions are equivalent, see [7, page 198]

It is well known that every locally convex topological vector space is a uniform space.

Three most common measures of noncompactness on metric spaces are Hausdorff measure χ , Kuratowski measure α and Istrăţescu measure I . Nothing is lost if we replace metric by some pseudometric. Hence, for a given pseudometric d we have

$$\chi_d(E) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 \mid E \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^m B_d(x_j, \varepsilon), \text{ for some } x_j \in X\}.$$

$$\alpha_d(E) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 \mid E = \bigcup_{j=1}^m E_j, \text{ for some } E_j, \text{ diam}(E_j) < \varepsilon\},$$

$$I_d(E) = \sup\{\varepsilon > 0 \mid \exists \text{ infinite } S \subset E \text{ so that } \forall x_m \neq x_n \in S, d(x_n, x_m) \geq \varepsilon\}.$$

The following properties of χ , α and I are well known. Their proof can be found in [16] and [2].

Proposition 2.4. *Let E, E_1, E_2 be bounded subsets of some metric space X , and let μ denote either χ or α or I . Then*

- (1) *if $E_1 \subseteq E_2$ then $\mu(E_1) \leq \mu(E_2)$;*
- (2) *$\mu(E_1 + E_2) \leq \mu(E_1) + \mu(E_2)$, provided that X is a Banach space;*
- (3) *$\chi(E) \leq I(E) \leq \alpha(E) \leq 2\chi(E)$.*

Thus, on a uniform space we have a family of measures of noncompactness, one for each pseudometric. Sadovskii [17] considered them as functions that maps bounded (with respect to all pseudometrics) sets into functions which domain is the set of all pseudometrics. In other words he put $[\alpha(E)](d) := \alpha_d(E)$, $[\chi(E)](d) = \chi_d(E)$. A similar can be done for Istrăţescu measure I .

Instead of the family of measures of noncompactness, one for each pseudometric, it is possible to consider a single measure of noncompactness, as it was done in [1] and [12], in the following way. To each pseudometric d_i assign a function μ_i which satisfies some list of axioms (χ , α and I fulfill all of them). Such a function is called just measure of noncompactness, or shortly MNC. Then it is possible to take their supremum as the measure of noncompactness. Note, however, that such defined measure of noncompactness highly depend on the family of pseudometrics and can differ even if two families determine the same uniformity.

Definition 2.5. Let X be a uniform space and let $\{d_i \mid i \in J\}$ be a family of pseudometrics which defines topology on X . Denote by μ_i an arbitrary MNC with respect to the pseudometric space (X, d_i) for each $i \in J$. For a bounded (w.r.t all pseudometrics) $E \subseteq X$ We define

$$\mu^*(E) = \sup_{i \in J} \mu_i(E).$$

The following properties of such defined measure μ^* were proved.

Proposition 2.6. *Let X be a uniform space with a family of pseudometrics $\{d_i \mid i \in J\}$. The function μ^* has the following properties*

- (1) *$\mu^*(E) = +\infty$ if and only if E is unbounded;*
- (2) *$\mu^*(E) = \mu^*(\overline{E})$;*
- (3) *from $\mu^*(E) = 0$ it follows that E is totally bounded set;*
- (4) *from $E \subseteq F$ it follows $\mu^*(E) \leq \mu^*(F)$;*
- (5) *$\mu^*(E \cup \{x\}) = \mu^*(E)$;*

- (6) if X is complete, and if $\{E_n\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ is a sequence of closed subsets of X such that $E_{n+1} \subseteq E_n$ for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu^*(E_n) = 0$, then $K = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} E_n$ is a nonempty compact set.

Remark 2.7. Although only one direction of item (3) is proved in [1] and [12], the other is easy to see. Indeed, if E is totally bounded then $\mu_i(E) = 0$ for all i and hence $\mu^*(E) = 0$.

Lemma 2.8. *There holds*

$$\chi^*(E) \leq I^*(E) \leq \alpha^*(E) \leq 2\chi^*(E).$$

Proof. It follows immediately from Proposition 2.4 (3) and the definition. \square

2.2. Measure of noncompactness λ . The measure of noncompactness λ defined by Definition 1.3 was studied in [6]. Among others, the following properties of λ were proved.

Proposition 2.9. *The measure of noncompactness λ has the following properties*

- (1) $\lambda(E) = \inf_{M \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{x \in E} d(x, M) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in E} \|x - P_n x\|$, where \mathcal{F} is the set of all free finitely generated modules and $P_n: H_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{A}}$ is given by $P_n(x_1, x_2, \dots) = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, 0, 0, \dots)$.
- (2) if $E \subset F$, then $\lambda(E) \leq \lambda(F)$;
- (3) $\lambda(E + F) \leq \lambda(E) + \lambda(F)$;
- (4) $\lambda(B_1) = 1$, where B_1 is the unit ball in $H_{\mathcal{A}}$;
- (5) $\lambda(E) \leq \sup_{x \in E} \|x\|$;
- (6) $\lambda(E) = 0$ iff E is \mathcal{A} -precompact.

2.3. Troitsky's topology.

Definition 2.10. Let \mathcal{N} be a Hilbert C^* -module over \mathcal{A} . A countable system $X = \{x_i\}$ of its elements is called admissible for a (possibly non-closed) submodule $\mathcal{N}^0 \subset \mathcal{N}$ (or \mathcal{N}^0 -admissible) if

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

Lemma 2.11. *Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}^0$ be as in the previous definition, and let Φ be a countable collection $\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots\}$ of states on \mathcal{A} . Further, let $X = \{x_i\}$ be an \mathcal{N}^0 -admissible system. The function $p_{X, \Phi}$ defined by*

$$(2.1) \quad p_{X, \Phi}(x) = \sqrt{\sup_k \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} |\varphi_k(\langle x, x_i \rangle)|^2}, \quad x \in \mathcal{N}^0.$$

is well-defined seminorm on \mathcal{N}^0 and $p_{X, \Phi}(x) \leq \|x\|$.

Proof. It was shown in [18, Lemma 2.5, Theorem 2.6]. \square

Definition 2.12. Let \mathcal{N} be a Hilbert C^* -module over a unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , and let \mathcal{N}^0 be some (possibly non closed) submodule of \mathcal{N} . Troitsky's topology τ (or more informatively $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}^0)$ -topology) is the locally convex topology defined by the family of seminorms (2.1), where $X = \{x_i\}$ is \mathcal{N}^0 -admissible and $\Phi = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots\}$ is a countable collection of states on \mathcal{A} .

This family of seminorms, which determine the uniform structure on \mathcal{N} was initially introduced in [18]. This uniform structure perfectly fits the notion of \mathcal{A} -compact operators.

Theorem 2.13. [18, Theorem 2.13] *Suppose, $F : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is an adjointable morphism of Hilbert C^* -modules over C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} . Then F is \mathcal{A} -compact if and only if $F(B)$ is $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N})$ -totally bounded with respect to uniform structure τ , where B is the unit ball of \mathcal{M} .*

Although [18] didn't deal with sets, but only with operators, the following statement is easy to derive.

Corollary 2.14. *Let $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the standard Hilbert C^* -module over a unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} and let $P_n : H_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the projection given by (1.1). If E is a norm bounded set, then $P_n(E)$ is totally bounded with respect to τ .*

Proof. Let e_n , $n \geq 1$ be the standard basis for $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ (n -th coordinate of e_n being the unity of \mathcal{A} and others vanishes). Then $P_n(x) = \sum_{k=1}^n \langle x, e_k \rangle e_k$, hence \mathcal{A} compact. If E is norm bounded then $E \subseteq tB$, for a suitable $t > 0$. Hence $P_n(E) \subseteq tP_n(B)$ which is totally bounded. \square

Finally, we quote a simple and well known property of positive elements.

Lemma 2.15. [13, Lemma 3.3.6] *If a is a normal element of a non-zero C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , then there is a state φ of \mathcal{A} such that $|\varphi(a)| = \|a\|$.*

3. MAIN RESULTS

3.1. Standard Hilbert module.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the standard Hilbert module over \mathcal{A} , and let $p_{\alpha}, \alpha \in J$ be a family of seminorms such that $p_{\alpha}(x) \leq \|x\|$ for every $\alpha \in J$, $x \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$, which turns $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ into a locally convex space.*

Let B_1 denote the unit ball in $H_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then $\chi^(B_1) \leq 1$.*

Proof. Indeed, from $p_{\alpha}(x) \leq \|x\|$ we have $B_1 \subseteq \{x \in H_{\mathcal{A}} \mid p_{\alpha}(x) < 1\}$ for any α . \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the standard Hilbert module over \mathcal{A} , and let $p_{\alpha}, \alpha \in J$ be a family of seminorms such that $p_{\alpha}(x) \leq \|x\|$ for every $\alpha \in J$, $x \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$, which turns $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ into a locally convex space.*

Let $P_n : H_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{A}}$ denote the projection (1.1) and let $E \subset H_{\mathcal{A}}$ be a norm bounded set. If $P_n E$ is totally bounded (with respect to all p_{α}) for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$(3.1) \quad \mu^*(E) \leq \lambda(E)\mu^*(B_1), \quad B_1 \text{ unit ball in } H_{\mathcal{A}},$$

for every measure of noncompactness μ that satisfies

$$(3.2) \quad \mu(F) = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad F \text{ is totally bounded.}$$

In particular, (3.1) holds for $\mu \in \{\chi, \alpha, I\}$ and the family of seminorms (2.1).

Concerning Hausdorff measure of noncompactness, by virtue of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$(3.3) \quad \chi^*(E) \leq \lambda(E).$$

Proof. Let E be a bounded set. Since $E \subset P_n E + (I - P_n)E$, and since μ^* is subadditive (Proposition 2.4), we have

$$\mu^*(E) \leq \mu^*(P_n E) + \mu^*((I - P_n)E).$$

Since, by assumption $\mu^*(P_n E) = 0$ we have

$$\mu^*(E) \leq \mu^*((I - P_n)E) \leq \sup_{x \in E} \|(I - P_n)x\| \mu^*(B_1),$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. (The last inequality follows from $(I - P_n)(E) \subseteq \sup_{x \in E} \|(I - P_n)x\| B_1$.) Therefore, by Proposition 2.9, $\mu^*(E) \leq \lambda(E) \mu^*(B_1)$.

By Corollary 2.14 $P_n E$ is totally bounded, with respect to seminorms (2.1), whereas by Proposition 2.4, Theorem 2.6 and Remark 2.7 all χ^* , α^* and I^* are subadditive and satisfy (3.2). \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ be a standard Hilbert C^* -module over \mathcal{A} and $E \subset H_{\mathcal{A}}$. Let $Y = \{y_i\}, y_i \in E$ be a countable system and (n_k) be an increasing sequence in \mathbb{N} . Then*

$$X = \{z_i\}, \quad z_i = \|P_{n_i}(I - P_{n_{i-1}})y_i\|^{-1} P_{n_i}(I - P_{n_{i-1}})y_i$$

is $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ -admissible, where P_n is defined by (1.1).

Proof. 1) Let $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots) \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Since $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_i^* x_i$ is convergent in norm there exists $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $m > m_0$ and $p_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i=m}^{m+p_1} x_i^* x_i \right\| < \varepsilon.$$

Denote $T_i = P_{n_i}(I - P_{n_{i-1}})$; then $z_i = \|T_i y_i\|^{-1} T_i y_i$ and hence, taking into account that T_i are selfadjoint projections:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=m}^{m+p} \langle x, z_i \rangle \langle z_i, x \rangle \right\| &= \left\| \sum_{i=m}^{m+p} \langle x, \|T_i y_i\|^{-1} T_i y_i \rangle \langle \|T_i y_i\|^{-1} T_i y_i, x \rangle \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i=m}^{m+p} \langle T_i x, \|T_i y_i\|^{-1} T_i y_i \rangle \langle \|T_i y_i\|^{-1} T_i y_i, T_i x \rangle \right\| \end{aligned}$$

However, by Cauchy Schwartz inequality [11, Proposition 1.2.4],

$$\langle T_i x, \|T_i y_i\|^{-1} T_i y_i \rangle \langle \|T_i y_i\|^{-1} T_i y_i, T_i x \rangle \leq \langle T_i x, T_i x \rangle.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=m}^{m+p} \langle x, z_i \rangle \langle z_i, x \rangle \right\| &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=m}^{m+p} \langle T_i x, T_i x \rangle \right\| = \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i=n_{m-1}+1}^{n_{m+p}} x_i^* x_i \right\| = \left\| \sum_{i=n_{m-1}+1}^{n_{m-1}+p_1} x_i^* x_i \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

for $p_1 = n_{m+p} - n_{m-1} - 1$. Since $n_{m-1} + 1 \geq m$, the last term does not exceed ε . Therefore, $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle x, z_i \rangle \langle z_i, x \rangle$ is convergent in the norm.

2) For every $x \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$

$$\sum_i \langle x, z_i \rangle \langle z_i, x \rangle \leq \sum_i \langle T_i x, T_i x \rangle = \langle x, x \rangle$$

3) Obviously, $\|z_i\| \leq 1$ for each i . \square

Theorem 3.4. *Let $E \subset H_{\mathcal{A}}$ be a bounded set, let $u \in A$ be a unitary and let μ stands for any of Hausdorff, Kuratowski or Istrăţescu measure of noncompactness. Then $\mu^*(Eu) = \mu^*(E)$.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. There exists an $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ -admissible pair (X, Φ) , $X = \{x_i\}$, $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}$ such that $\mu(Eu)(p_{\Phi, X}) > \mu^*(Eu) - \varepsilon$. Let $\varphi_i^u(x) = \varphi_i(u^*xu)$ and $x_i^u = x_iu^*$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Obviously, $\varphi_i^u(1) = 1$ and $\varphi_i^u(x) \geq 0$ whenever $x \geq 0$, so φ_i^u are states on $H_{\mathcal{A}}$. Since

$$\langle x, x_i^u \rangle \langle x_i^u, x \rangle = \langle x, x_i \rangle u^*u \langle x_i, x \rangle = \langle x, x_i \rangle \langle x_i, x \rangle,$$

and

$$\|x_i^u\| = \|x_iu^*\| \leq \|x_i\| \cdot \|u^*\| = \|x_i\|,$$

the pair (X^u, Φ^u) is $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ -admissible, where $\Phi^u = \{\varphi_1^u, \varphi_2^u, \dots\}$ and $X^u = \{x_1^u, x_2^u, \dots\}$.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} p_{X^u, \Phi^u}^2(xu) &= \sup_k \sum_{i=k}^{+\infty} |\varphi_k(\langle xu, x_i \rangle)|^2 = \sup_k \sum_{i=k}^{+\infty} |\varphi_k(u^* \langle x, x_i \rangle)|^2 \\ &= \sup_k \sum_{i=k}^{+\infty} |\varphi_k(u^* \langle x, x_i u^* \rangle u)|^2 = \sup_k \sum_{i=k}^{+\infty} |\varphi_k^u(\langle x, x_i u^* \rangle)|^2 \\ &= \sup_k \sum_{i=k}^{+\infty} |\varphi_k^u(\langle x, x_i^u \rangle)|^2 = p_{X^u, \Phi^u}^2(x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $[\mu(E)](p_{X^u, \Phi^u}) > \mu^*(Eu) - \varepsilon$ and hence $\mu^*(E) \geq \mu^*(Eu)$. The opposite inequality follows by $E = (Eu)u^{-1}$. \square

Theorem 3.5. *For any bounded set $E \subset H_{\mathcal{A}}$, we have*

$$\chi^*(E) = \lambda(E).$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.2 we have $\chi^*(E) \leq \lambda(E)$. Therefore it is enough to prove the opposite inequality.

Let $\lambda = \lambda(E) = \inf_{i \geq 1} \sup_{x \in E} \|(I - P_i)x\|$ and let $0 < \varepsilon < \lambda$ be arbitrary. Suppose that the Hausdorff measure of noncompactness $\chi^*(E)$ is at most $\lambda - \varepsilon$, that is for every pair (X, Φ) with $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ -admissible X there are $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_l \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that for every $y \in E$ there exists $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\}$ such that $d_{X, \Phi}(y, y_k) < \lambda - \varepsilon$.

Since $\sup_{x \in E} \|(I - P_i)x\| = \lambda$, there is a sequence $z_i \in E$ such that $\|(I - P_i)z_i\| > \lambda - \varepsilon/4$. Further, there is an increasing sequence i_j of positive integers for which $\|P_{i_{j+1}}z_{i_j} - z_{i_j}\| < \varepsilon/4$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(P_{i_{j+1}} - P_{i_j})z_{i_j}\| &= \|(P_{i_j}z_{i_j} - z_{i_j}) - (P_{i_{j+1}}z_{i_j} - z_{i_j})\| \\ &> \|(I - P_{i_j})z_{i_j}\| - \|P_{i_{j+1}}z_{i_j} - z_{i_j}\| > \lambda - \varepsilon/4 - \varepsilon/4 \\ &= \lambda - \varepsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $x_j = \|(P_{i_{j+1}} - P_{i_j})z_{i_j}\|^{-1}(P_{i_{j+1}} - P_{i_j})z_{i_j}$. By Lemma 3.3 $X_0 = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ is $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ -admissible.

Note that

$$\langle x_j, (P_{i_{j+1}} - P_{i_j})z_{i_j} \rangle = \|(P_{i_{j+1}} - P_{i_j})z_{i_j}\| \langle x_j, x_j \rangle \geq 0,$$

as well as

$$\|\langle x_j, (P_{i_{j+1}} - P_{i_j})z_{i_j} \rangle\| = \|(P_{i_{j+1}} - P_{i_j})z_{i_j}\| > \lambda - \varepsilon/2.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2.15 there are states φ_j such that $|\varphi_j(\langle x_j, (P_{i_{j+1}} - P_{i_j})z_{i_j} \rangle)| > \lambda - \varepsilon/2$.

For the seminorm p_{X_0, Φ_0} , $\Phi_0 = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots\}$, let $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_l \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the corresponding $\lambda - \varepsilon$ net. One can find a number j_0 such that

$$\|(I - P_{i_j})y_k\| < \varepsilon/4 \quad j \geq j_0, \quad k = 1, \dots, D$$

and hence, for $j \geq j_0$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, l$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle y_k, x_j \rangle\| &= \|\langle (P_{i_{j+1}} - P_{i_j})z_{i_j} \rangle^{-1} (P_{i_{j+1}} - P_{i_j})z_{i_j}, (P_{i_{j+1}} - P_{i_j})y_k \rangle\| \\ &\leq \|(P_{i_{j+1}} - P_{i_j})y_k\| < \varepsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for all $k = 1, \dots, l$ and $y = z_{i_j}$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{X_0, \Phi_0}(y, y_k) &= \sqrt{\sup_m \sum_{i=m}^{\infty} |\varphi_k(\langle y - y_k, x_i \rangle)|^2} \\ &\geq |\varphi_j(\langle z_{i_j} - y_k, x_j \rangle)| \geq |\varphi_j(\langle z_{i_j}, x_j \rangle)| - |\varphi_j(\langle y_k, x_j \rangle)| \\ &= |\varphi_j(\langle (P_{i_{j+1}} - P_{i_j})z_{i_j}, x_j \rangle)| - |\varphi_j(\langle y_k, x_j \rangle)| > \lambda - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\ &= \lambda - \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the choice of y_1, \dots, y_l . Hence, the assumption that there is a $\lambda - \varepsilon$ net can not hold. Thus, $\lambda(E) \leq \chi^*(E)$. \square

Remark 3.6. Following [6, Theorem 4.7], one might prove the inequality $\lambda(E) \leq \sqrt{\|E\|I^*(E)}$. However, due to the previous theorem, it is trivial. Indeed, $\lambda(E) = \chi^*(E) \leq \|E\|, I^*(E)$.

Corollary 3.7. *Let E be a bounded set in standard Hilbert module $H_{\mathcal{A}}$. There holds*

$$\chi^*(E) = \lambda(E) \leq I^*(E) \leq \alpha^*(E) \leq 2\chi^*(E) = 2\lambda(E).$$

Proof. Follows immediately from Lemma 2.8 and Theorem 3.5. \square

Corollary 3.8. *Let B_1 be the closed unit ball of $H_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then $\chi(B_1) = 1$.*

Proof. Follows immediately from Proposition 2.9 and Theorem 3.5. \square

3.2. Arbitrary countably generated Hilbert module. We want to extend our results from standard Hilbert module $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ to an arbitrary countably generated Hilbert module \mathcal{M} over \mathcal{A} . As it is usual, we use the Kasparov stabilization theorem $\mathcal{M} \oplus H_{\mathcal{A}} \cong H_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Note that the measure of noncompactness λ is defined via free finitely generated submodules which was suitable for the standard Hilbert module. For more general purpose we need to calculate λ by finitely generated projective submodules.

Lemma 3.9. *Let E be a bounded subset of $H_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then*

$$\lambda(E) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in E} \|x - P_n x\| = \sup_{M \in \mathcal{P}} d(E, M) = \sup_{M \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{x \in E} d(x, M),$$

where P_n are defined by (1.1), and \mathcal{P} denotes the set of all finitely generated projective submodules of $H_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Proof. The first equality was proved in [6, Proposition 2.2] and literally the same argument leads to the second. Since it is short we repeat it.

Denote

$$\hat{\lambda}(E) = \sup_{M \in \mathcal{P}} d(E, M).$$

Since $P_n H_{\mathcal{A}}$ is finitely generated and projective (and moreover free), we have $\hat{\lambda}(E) \leq \sup_{x \in E} \|x - P_n x\|$ and hence $\hat{\lambda}(E) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in E} \|x - P_n x\|$.

For the opposite inequality, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Then, there is a finitely generated projective module $L \subseteq H_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\sup_{x \in E} d(x, L) < \hat{\lambda}(E) + \varepsilon$. By [19, Theorem 15.4.2], the corresponding projection P_L is \mathcal{A} -compact, and by [11, Proposition 2.2.1] $\|P_L(I - P_n)\| \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - P_n x\| &= d(x, P_n H_{\mathcal{A}}) \leq \|x - P_n P_L x\| \leq \\ &\leq \|x - P_L x\| + \|P_L x - P_n P_L x\| \leq \hat{\lambda}(E) + \varepsilon + \|E\| \|P_L - P_n P_L\|, \end{aligned}$$

and taking $\sup_{x \in E}$ and limit we obtain the desired inequality. \square

We will use the previous characterization as a definition of measure of noncompactness λ on an arbitrary countably generated Hilbert module.

Definition 3.10. Let \mathcal{M} be a countably generated Hilbert module over a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , and let $E \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ be a bounded set. We define

$$\lambda(E) = \inf_{L \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{x \in E} d(x, L),$$

where \mathcal{P} denotes the set of all finitely generated projective submodules of \mathcal{M} .

Proposition 3.11. Let $\mathcal{M}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{M}_2$ be two countably generated Hilbert modules over the same C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} , such that \mathcal{M}_1 is complemented in \mathcal{M}_2 , i.e.

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{M}_2 = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{N}$$

for some \mathcal{N} and let $E \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1$ be a bounded set. Consider two functions $\lambda_j(E)$, $j = 1, 2$, the measures of noncompactness regarding E as a subset of \mathcal{M}_j . Then $\lambda_1(E) = \lambda_2(E)$.

Proof. Obviously, $\lambda_1(E) \geq \lambda_2(E)$ since in the latter the infimum is taken over a larger set. Conversely, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Then, there is a finitely generated projective $L \subseteq \mathcal{M}_2$ such that $\sup_{x \in E} d(x, L) < \lambda_2(E) + \varepsilon$.

By (3.4) there exists the projection $Q : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1$. Obviously, $Q(L) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1$ is finitely generated. It is, also, projective, for if $\mathcal{A}^n \cong L \oplus L_1$ for some L_1 , then $\mathcal{A}^n \cong Q(L) \oplus (I - Q)(L) \oplus L_1$.

Now, let $x \in E \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1$ and $y \in L$. Then $x = Qx$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x - y, x - y \rangle &= \langle Q(x - y) - (I - Q)y, Q(x - y) - (I - Q)y \rangle = \\ &= \langle Q(x - y), Q(x - y) \rangle + \langle (I - Q)y, (I - Q)y \rangle \geq \langle Q(x - y), Q(x - y) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\|x - y\| \geq \|Qx - Qy\| = \|x - Qy\| \geq d(x, Q(L)).$$

Taking the infimum over all $y \in L$ we obtain $d(x, L) \geq d(x, Q(L))$, and taking the supremum over $x \in E$ we get

$$\sup_{x \in E} d(x, L) \geq \sup_{x \in E} d(x, Q(L)) \geq \lambda_1(E),$$

which finally leads to $\lambda_2(E) \geq \lambda_1(E)$. \square

Proposition 3.12. *Let \mathcal{M}_j $j = 1, 2$ be two countably generated modules and let \mathcal{M}_j^0 be their submodules. Also, let χ be Hausdorff measure of noncompactness of Troitsky $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^0)$ topology, where $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$ and $\mathcal{M}^0 = \mathcal{M}_1^0 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2^0$. Also, let χ_j be the corresponding Hausdorff measures of noncompactness related to $(\mathcal{M}_j; \mathcal{M}_j^0)$ topology.*

Denote by p_j projection from \mathcal{M} onto \mathcal{M}_j . If $E \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ is a bounded set, then

$$(3.5) \quad \max\{\chi_1(p_1E), \chi_2(p_2E)\} \leq \chi(E) \leq \chi_1(p_1E) + \chi_2(p_2E).$$

Proof. The proof can be obtained by a slight modification of the proof of [18, Lemma 2.15].

Denote $J_j = p_j^* : \mathcal{M}_j \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ the corresponding inclusions. Let $X = \{x_i\}$ be an arbitrary sequence in \mathcal{M} admissible for \mathcal{M}^0 and let $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}$ be an arbitrary sequence of states on \mathcal{A} . It is easy to see that $X^{(j)} = \{p_j x_i\}$ is admissible for \mathcal{M}_j^0 , for details see the proof of [18, Lemma 2.15], as well as (for $j = 1, 2$)

$$p_{X, \Phi}(J_j y) = \sqrt{\sup_{k \geq 1} \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} |\varphi_k(\langle J_j y, x_i \rangle)|^2} = \sqrt{\sup_{k \geq 1} \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} |\varphi_k(\langle y, p_j x_i \rangle)|^2} = p_{X^{(j)}, \Phi}(y).$$

Let $\delta_1 > \chi_1(p_1E)$, $\delta_2 > \chi_2(p_2E)$ be arbitrary. Then, there is a finite δ_1 net for p_1E in the seminorm $p_{X^{(1)}, \Phi}$, say $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \mathcal{M}_1$ and a finite δ_2 net for p_2E in the seminorm $p_{X^{(2)}, \Phi}$, say $w_1, \dots, w_r \in \mathcal{M}_2$.

We claim that $J_1 z_i + J_2 w_s$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, $1 \leq s \leq r$ make a finite $\delta_1 + \delta_2$ net for E . Indeed, if $y \in E$, then $y = J_1 p_1 y + J_2 p_2 y$. Also, there is an $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that $p_{X^{(1)}, \Phi}(p_1 y - z_i) < \delta_1$ as well as an $1 \leq s \leq r$ such that $p_{X^{(2)}, \Phi}(p_2 y - w_s) < \delta_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} p_{X, \Phi}(y - J_1 z_i - J_2 w_s) &\leq p_{X, \Phi}(J_1(p_1 y - z_i)) + p_{X, \Phi}(J_2(p_2 y - w_s)) = \\ &= p_{X^{(1)}, \Phi}(p_1 y - z_i) + p_{X^{(2)}, \Phi}(p_2 y - w_s) \leq \delta_1 + \delta_2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\chi(E)$ does not exceed $\delta_1 + \delta_2$, and the second inequality in (3.5) is proved.

For the first inequality, let $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}$ and let $X = \{x_i\}$ be an arbitrary sequence in \mathcal{M}_1 admissible for \mathcal{M}_1^0 . Then it is easy to see that $J_1 X = \{J_1 x_i\}$ is admissible for \mathcal{M}^0 as well as

$$p_{X, \Phi}(p_1 y) = \sqrt{\sup_{k \geq 1} \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} |\varphi_k(\langle p_1 y, x_i \rangle)|^2} = \sqrt{\sup_{k \geq 1} \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} |\varphi_k(\langle y, J_1 x_i \rangle)|^2} = p_{J_1 X, \Phi}(y).$$

If $\delta > \chi(E)$ is arbitrary, then there is a finite δ net in the seminorm $p_{J_1 X, \Phi}$ for E , say z_1, \dots, z_k . Consequently, for an arbitrary $y \in p_1 E$, there is an $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that $p_{J_1 X, \Phi}(J_1 y - z_i) < \delta$. Then

$$p_{X, \Phi}(y - p_1 z_i) = p_{X, \Phi}(p_1(J_1 y - z_i)) = p_{J_1 X, \Phi}(J_1 y - z_i) < \delta.$$

Thus $\chi_1(E) \leq \delta$, which proves the first inequality. \square

Corollary 3.13. *Let $\mathcal{M}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{M}_2$ be two countably generated Hilbert modules over \mathcal{A} , such that \mathcal{M}_1 is complemented in \mathcal{M}_2 , and let $E \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1$ be an arbitrary bounded set.*

Then $\chi_1^(E) = \chi_2^*(E)$, where χ_j^* denote the Hausdorff measure of noncompactness for Troitsky's topology with respect to \mathcal{M}_j .*

Proof. After some changes in notations we can apply the previous proposition with $\mathcal{M}_j^0 = \mathcal{M}_j$ and $E \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1$. Then p_2E is trivial, implying $\chi_2^*(p_2E) = 0$. Thus the equation (3.5) becomes

$$\chi_1^*(E) \leq \chi^*(E) \leq \chi_1^*(E) + 0.$$

□

Theorem 3.14. *Let \mathcal{M} be a countably generated Hilbert C^* -module over a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} . Let χ denote the Hausdorff measure of noncompactness with respect to Troitsky's topology τ , and let λ denote the \mathcal{A} measure of noncompactness defined in Definition 3.10.*

If $E \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ is a bounded set, then $\chi(E) = \lambda(E)$.

Proof. By Kasparov stabilization theorem, we have

$$\mathcal{M} \oplus H_{\mathcal{A}} \cong H_{\mathcal{A}} =: \mathcal{M}_2.$$

Thus \mathcal{M} is complemented in \mathcal{M}_2 and $\mathcal{M}_2 \cong H_{\mathcal{A}}$. Denote by $\chi_2^*(E)$ and $\lambda_2(E)$ the corresponding measures of noncompactness with respect to $\mathcal{M}_2 \cong H_{\mathcal{A}}$. By Theorem 3.5 we have $\lambda_2(E) = \chi_2^*(E)$.

On the other hand, by Proposition 3.11 we have $\lambda(E) = \lambda_2(E)$. Finally, apply Corollary 3.13 to obtain $\chi^*(E) = \chi_2^*(E)$. □

3.3. Measures of noncompactness of operators.

Definition 3.15. Let \mathcal{M} be a countably generated Hilbert module over a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} and let $T \in B^a(\mathcal{M})$ be an adjointable operator. The functions $\alpha_o^*, \chi_o^*, I_o^*, \lambda_o^* : B^a(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_o^*(T) &= \chi^*(T(B_1)), & \alpha_o^*(T) &= \alpha^*(T(B_1)), \\ I_o^*(T) &= I^*(T(B_1)), & \lambda_o^*(T) &= \lambda(T(B_1)), \end{aligned}$$

where B_1 is the closed unit ball in \mathcal{M} are called, respectively, Hausdorff, Kuratowski, Istrăţescu and \mathcal{A} measure of noncompactness of the operator T .

Proposition 3.16. *Let \mathcal{M} be a countably generated Hilbert module over a C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} and let $T \in B^a(\mathcal{M})$. Then*

$$\chi_o^*(T) = \inf\{k \geq 0 \mid \chi^*(T(E)) \leq k\chi^*(M) \text{ for each bounded set } E\}.$$

Proof. The proof is, essentially, the same as in the case of metric spaces (see [14, Theorem 2.25].)

Indeed, let $k > 0$ be such that

$$(3.6) \quad \chi^*(T(E)) \leq k\chi^*(E),$$

holds for all bounded $E \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. For $E = B_1$ we obtain $\chi_o^*(T) = \chi^*(T(B_1)) \leq k\chi^*(B_1) = k$. Thus the infimum of such k is greater or equal to $\chi_o^*(T)$.

For the other inequality, let E be an arbitrary bounded set, let $k > \chi_o^*(T)$, and let $\eta > \chi^*(E)$. For any seminorm p_α there are two finite nets, the first y_1, y_2, \dots, y_l makes a finite k net for B_1 , and the other z_1, z_2, \dots, z_p makes a finite η net for E . If $B(a; \delta)$ denote the ball with center at a and radius δ , then $E \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^p B(z_i; \eta)$ and hence

$$T(E) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^p T(B(z_i; \eta)) = \bigcup_{i=1}^p (Tz_i + \eta T(B_1)).$$

On the other hand, $T(B_1) \subseteq \cup_{j=1}^l B(y_j; k)$ and therefore

$$T(E) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^p \left(Tz_i + \eta \bigcup_{j=1}^l B(y_j; k) \right) = \bigcup_{i=1}^p \bigcup_{j=1}^l B(Tz_i + \eta y_j; \eta k).$$

Thus $\chi^*(T(E))$ does not exceed ηk , which can be arbitrarily close to $k\chi^*(E)$. \square

Proposition 3.17. *Let \mathcal{A} be an arbitrary C^* -algebra, let $T, S \in B^a(H_{\mathcal{A}})$ and let μ stands for any of MNCs α, χ, I . Then*

a) All α_o^*, χ_o^* and I_o^* are subadditive and positive homogeneous, i.e. there holds

$$\mu_o^*(T + S) \leq \mu_o^*(T) + \mu_o^*(S), \quad \mu_o(cT) = c\mu_o^*(T) \quad \text{for all } c > 0.$$

b) The functions $\alpha_o^*, \chi_o^*, I_o^*$ and λ_o are equivalent to each other, that is,

$$\chi_o^*(T) \leq I_o(T) \leq \alpha_o^*(T) \leq 2\chi_o^*(T), \quad \chi_o^*(T) = \lambda_o(T).$$

c) $\chi_o^*(T) \leq \|T\|$ and $\alpha_o^*(T), I_o^*(T) \leq 2\|T\|$.

d) Operator T is \mathcal{A} -compact iff $\lambda_o(T) = 0$ iff $\mu_o^*(T) = 0$.

e) $\mu_o^*(T + K) = \mu_o^*(T)$, as well as $\lambda_o(T + K) = \lambda_o(T)$ for all \mathcal{A} -compact operators K .

f) There holds

$$\chi_o^*(T) = \lambda_o(T) \leq I_o^*(T) \leq \alpha_o^*(T) \leq 2\chi_o^*(T).$$

Proof. Parts a), b), c), and f) follow from the properties of α, χ, I and λ . Part d) follows from part b) and Theorem 2.13. Parts e) follows from part d) and the properties of α, χ, I and λ . \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Ivan D. Arandjelović, Measure of noncompactness on uniform spaces, *Math. Morav.* **2** (1998), 1–8.
- [2] Ivan D. Arandjelović, Some properties of Istrăţescu's measure of noncompactness, *Filomat* **13** (1999), 99–104.
- [3] Nicolas Bourbaki, General Topology, Chapters 1–4, Elements of Mathematics (Berlin), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1998), translated from the French, reprint of the 1989 English translation.
- [4] Nicolas Bourbaki, General Topology, Chapters 5–10, Elements of Mathematics (Berlin), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1998), translated from the French, reprint of the 1989 English translation.
- [5] D. Kečkić, Z. Lazović, Compact and "compact" operators on the standard Hilbert module over a W^* -algebra, *Ann. Funct. Anal.* **9(2)** (2018), 258–270.
- [6] D. Kečkić, Z. Lazović, Measures of noncompactness on the standard Hilbert C^* -module, *Filomat* **33(12)** (2019), 3683–3695.
- [7] J. L. Kelly, General topology, *Van Nostrand* (1951)
- [8] E. C. Lance, Hilbert C^* -modules: A Toolkit for Operator Algebraists, *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note* **210**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge (1995).
- [9] V. M. Manuilov, Diagonalization of compact operators on Hilbert modules over finite W^* -algebras, *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* **13** (1995), 207–226.
- [10] V. M. Manuilov, Diagonalization of compact operators on Hilbert modules over C^* -algebras of real rank zero, *Math notes* **62** (1997), 726–730.
- [11] V. M. Manuilov, E. V. Troitsky, Hilbert C^* -Modules, *American Mathematical Society* (2005).
- [12] M. Milovanović-Arandjelović, Measure of noncompactness on uniform spaces-the axiomatic approach, *Filomat* **15** (2001), 221–225.
- [13] G. M. Murphy, C^* -algebras and operator theory, *Academic press* (1990).

- [14] E. Malkowsky and V Rakočević, An introduction into the theory of sequence spaces and measures of noncompactness, *Zbornik radova (Matematički institut SANU)* **17** (2000), 143–234.
- [15] W. L. Paschke, Inner product modules over B^* -algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **182** (1973), 443–468.
- [16] V. Rakočević, Measures of noncompactness and some applications, *Filomat* **12:2** (1998), 87–120
- [17] A. I. Sadvskii, Limit-compact and condensing operators, *Russian. Math. Surveys* **27(1)** (1972), 85–155.
- [18] E. V. Troitsky, Geometric essence of "compact" operators on Hilbert C^* -modules, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **485** (2020), 123842.
- [19] N. E. Wegge-Olsen, *K*-Theory and C^* -Algebras – a friendly approach, *Oxford University Press* (1993)

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS UNIVERSITY OF BELGRADE 11000 BELGRADE SERBIA
Email address: keckic@matf.bg.ac.rs

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS UNIVERSITY OF BELGRADE 11000 BELGRADE SERBIA
Email address: zlatkol@matf.bg.ac.rs