

# AN ULTRAPRODUCT APPROACH TO LIMIT SPACE THEORY

LIANG GUO, JIN QIAN, AND QIN WANG

ABSTRACT. Limit space theory is initiated by Rabinovich, Roch, and Silbermann for  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ , and developed by Špakula and Willett for a discrete metric space. In this paper, we introduce an ultraproduct approach for the limit space theory by fixing an ultrafilter and changing the base point. We prove that the limit spaces we construct are stratified into distinct layers according to the Rudin-Keisler order of the chosen ultrafilter. When the ultrafilter is fixed, the limit spaces we can construct can extract one layer from all the limit spaces constructed by Špakula and Willett. We prove that if a finite propagation operator is Fredholm if and only if the limit operators in one layer and one higher layer are invertible, where the condition is weaker than that of Špakula and Willett. Moreover, we investigated the correspondence of coarse geometric properties of limit spaces and the original space, including Property A, coarse embeddability, asymptotic dimension, etc.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Limit spaces	3
3. Coarse geometry from infinity	12
4. Limit operators	17
5. Fredholm theory and uniform Roe algebras	23
References	31

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For a metric space  $X$  with bounded geometry, its Roe algebra, denoted by  $C^*(X)$ , encodes the coarse geometric information of the underlying space. The  $K$ -theory of this algebra serves as the set of higher indices of abstract elliptic differential operators on  $X$ , making it one of the most significant objects of study in non-commutative geometry, particularly in coarse geometry. Actually, a more intuitive concept is actually the uniform version of this algebra, the uniform Roe algebra  $C_u^*(X)$ . It also encodes the coarse geometric information of the underlying space and even fully determines the coarse geometric structure of the underlying space [BBF<sup>+</sup>22].

An operator  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X))$  can always be viewed as an  $X$ -by- $X$  matrix. We say  $T$  has *finite propagation* if there exists  $R > 0$  such that  $T_{xy} = 0$  for all pair  $(x, y)$  with  $d(x, y) \geq R$ , where  $T_{xy}$  is the

$(x, y)$ -entry of  $T$ . The uniform algebraic Roe algebra  $C_u[X]$  consists of all operators in  $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X))$  with finite propagation. When the space  $X$  is taken  $\mathbb{Z}^N$ , an element in the uniform algebraic Roe algebra  $T \in C_u[\mathbb{Z}^N]$  is also called a *band-dominated* operator. For this class of operators, there exists a significant and longstanding issue, i.e., when is a band-dominated operator on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^N)$  a Fredholm operator? One of the most successful approaches to this problem is to apply the *limit operator theory*, see [RRS04]. It is finally proved that  $T \in C_u[\mathbb{Z}^N]$  is Fredholm if and only if all the limit operators of  $T$  are uniformly invertible, i.e., the set of all inverses of limit operators is uniformly bounded. In [LS14], it is proved that the uniform boundedness of the inverse is actually redundant.

This idea was later extended to spaces beyond  $\mathbb{Z}^N$ . In [Roe05], J. Roe generalizes the result above to the case for all groups with Yu's Property A [Yu00]. In his proof, he applies the idea of coarse groupoid to show the set of all limit operators of  $T$  actually lives in the  $C^*$ -algebra of the boundary coarse groupoid, which is exactly the quotient algebra of  $C_u^*(X)$  by  $\mathcal{K}$ . The uniform invertibility of the limit space exactly means the operator  $T$  is invertible modulo  $\mathcal{K}$ , i.e.,  $T$  is Fredholm. This inspires the work [ŠW17] in which the setting is generalized to arbitrary strongly discrete metric space with bounded geometry and Yu's Property A.

Recall that in [ŠW17], to construct a limit space of  $X$ , one must first fix a non-principal ultrafilter  $\omega \in \beta X$ . The limit space associated with  $\omega$  is denoted by  $X(\omega)$  which consists of all the ultrafilters on  $X$  which can be obtained by a partial translation acting on  $\omega$ . The "limit" in the name of limit space manifests in the choice of non-principal ultrafilters. Each non-principal ultrafilter represents a direction tending towards infinity. The presence of two ultrafilters in the same limit space implies that these two ultrafilters tend towards similar directions of infinity. This description fits perfectly with the language of coarse groupoids in metric spaces. In fact, the closure of a limit space in  $\beta X$  is exactly a closed invariant subset of  $\beta X$  in the coarse groupoid  $G(X)$ , see [WZ23].

In this paper, we provide a new approach to the limit space theory by using the construction of ultraproduct which is a common technique in *nonstandard analysis*. An important motivation for the birth of nonstandard analysis is the hope to further extend the real number field  $\mathbb{R}$ , thereby realizing both infinitesimals and infinities as concrete "numbers". One of the most successful models for this is to apply ultrapower construction of the real number field, see [Gol22, Chapter 9]. Such an extended number field is called a "*hyperreal number field*". Inspired by this feature of ultraproduct, if one does the ultraproduct to the metric space  $X$  under a pre-selected ultrafilter  $\omega \in \beta \mathbb{N}$ , then  $X^\omega$  becomes a *hyperreal-valued metric space*. Since we have assumed  $X$  to be strongly discrete, any two elements in  $X^\omega$  can never take value in infinitesimals, but can take value in infinities. Moreover,  $X$  can be embedded into  $X^\omega$  as a subspace. We then define a limit space to be a maximal set of all elements in  $X^\omega$  which has an infinite distance with  $X$  but has a finite distance with other points in this set. An element in a limit space in this case becomes the equivalent class of an unbounded sequence, which represents a direction tending to infinity. We finally prove that the limit spaces we define coincide with those defined in [ŠW17] for some ultrafilters in  $\beta X$ .

However, an interesting fact is that if we **fix an ultrafilter** and construct the limit space through the aforementioned method, the resulting limit spaces are actually fewer than those constructed in [ŠW17]. In this case, there are some limit spaces defined in [ŠW17] that cannot be found if we fix our ultrafilter. The essential reason behind this is the existence of the so-called *Rudin-Keisler*

order, see [Kei10] (also see Definition 2.17). The Rudin-Keisler order stratifies the limit spaces in [ŠW17] into many layers. When we fix an ultrafilter, we can only read out the limit spaces that are on layers lower than this particular one.

Under this setting, we can still consider the Fredholm question of a finite propagation operator. For a metric space with bounded geometry and Property A, we prove that an element in  $C^*(X)$  is Fredholm if and only if its limit operators on one layer and one higher layer are pointwisely invertible, see Theorem 5.3 and Corollary 5.6. This condition is weaker than that in [ŠW17] since we need fewer limit operators to be invertible. Meanwhile, regarding the question of whether the uniform boundedness condition can be omitted, we have also generalized the conditions beyond spaces with Property A. We only need to assume that all limit spaces possess Property A to demonstrate that the uniform boundedness condition is automatically implied, see Theorem 5.3. And this condition is summarized as that the space has *Property A at infinity*.

In fact, this is not the first time that Property A at infinity has been proposed. Although our definition starts from limit spaces, making the name seem very apt, in [Pil18], T. Pillon first introduced Property A at infinity using a geometric characteristic of the space  $X$  itself. Subsequently, in [DGWZ22], this concept was generalized to *coarse embedding into Hilbert space at infinity*. In Section 3, we prove that Property A at infinity described by using limit spaces is equivalent to the description given in [Pil18]. There is also a parallel result for coarse embedding at infinity. Inspired by this phenomenon, we investigated the correspondence of coarse geometric properties of limit spaces and the original space, including coarse equivalence, asymptotic dimension, etc.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we introduce the definition of limit spaces via ultrapower construction and provide some examples. Moreover, we compare our definition with the original one in [ŠW17] and prove that these two definitions are equivalent for some special cases. Because of the existence of the Rudin-Keisler order, we also show that we can only construct part of the limit spaces as in [ŠW17] if we fix an ultrafilter. In Section 3, we study the coarse geometry behavior of limit spaces and its relationship with the original space. In Section 4, we introduce the definition of limit operators associated with a band-dominated operator in our language. We prove that mapping a finite propagation operator to the limit operator associated with a fixed limit space is actually a  $*$ -homomorphism. In Section 5, we study the Fredholm theory of an element in the Roe algebra and prove our main result in this paper.

## 2. LIMIT SPACES

The notion of limit space for a metric space is introduced by J. Špakula and R. Willett in [ŠW17]. In their setting, a limit space consists of *ultrafilters* on  $X$ , and each two of those can be translated by a *partial translation*. This definition is perfectly related to the coarse groupoid of  $X$ , see [ŠW17, Appendix B] and [WZ23, Section 3] for example. In this section, we shall introduce a new description of the limit space of a metric space by using *ultrapowers*.

**2.1. Limit spaces via ultrapower construction.** To begin with, we shall first recall the definition of ultrafilter.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $I$  be an index set and  $\mathcal{P}(I)$  be its power set. A *filter* on  $I$  is a set  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(I)$  such that

- (1)  $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{F}$  but  $I \in \mathcal{F}$ ;
- (2) if  $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $A \cap B \in \mathcal{F}$ ;
- (3) if  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $A \subseteq B$ , then  $B \in \mathcal{F}$ .

A filter  $\mathcal{F}$  is an *ultrafilter* if, for any  $A \subseteq I$ , either  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  or  $S \setminus A \in \mathcal{F}$  (but not both).

The reader is referred to [Gol22] for some basic knowledge on ultrafilters. An ultrafilter  $\omega$  is called *principal* if there exists some  $i \in I$  such that  $A \in \omega$  if and only if  $i \in A$ . To simplify the description, we shall take  $\mathbb{N}$  as the index set. In the following of this paper, we shall fix a non-principal ultrafilter  $\omega$  on  $\mathbb{N}$ .

The reader is referred to [Roe03] for some background on coarse geometry. We shall also recall some basic definitions in Section 3.1. To clarify the notation, we shall need the following two definitions here. A metric space  $(X, d)$  is *strongly discrete* if  $d(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}$  for any  $x, y \in X$ . For any given metric space  $X$ , one can define  $d'$  to be a function on  $X \times X$  by

$$d'(x, y) = \lceil d(x, y) \rceil,$$

where  $\lceil \cdot \rceil : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is the ceiling function (or smallest-integer function). It is not hard to check that  $d'$  is a well-defined metric on  $X$  such that  $(X, d')$  is strongly discrete and  $(X, d')$  is coarsely equivalent to  $(X, d)$ . Moreover,  $X$  is said to have *bounded geometry* if for any  $R > 0$ , there exists  $N > 0$  such that  $\#B(x, R) < N$  for any  $x \in X$ .

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $\omega$  be a non-principal ultrafilter as above,  $\{X_i\}$  a sequence of sets indexed by  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Denoted by

$$\prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} X_i = \left\{ f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} X_i \mid f(i) \in X_i \right\},$$

one can view it as the set of all sequences  $(x_i)$  in  $\bigcup X_i$  indexed by  $\mathbb{N}$  such that  $x_i \in X_i$ . Then

- two sequences  $(x_i), (y_i) \in \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} X_i$  are said to be  $\omega$ -equivalent, denoted by  $(x_i) \sim_{s, \omega} (y_i)$ , if

$$\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid x_i = y_i\} \in \omega.$$

The  $\omega$ -equivalent class of  $(x_i)$  is denoted by  $[x_i]_{s, \omega}$ .

- the *ultraproduct* of  $\{X_i\}$ , denoted by  $\prod_{\omega} X_i$ , is defined to be the quotient set

$$\prod_{\omega} X_i = \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} X_i / \sim_{s, \omega},$$

i.e., the set of all  $\omega$ -equivalent classes  $[x_i]_{s, \omega}$  (or  $[x_i]$ , for simplicity).

If the sequence  $\{X_i\}$  is constant, i.e.,  $X_i = X$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , then the ultraproduct of  $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is called the *ultrapower* of  $X$ , denoted by  $X^{\omega}$ .

Notice that there exists a canonical inclusion  $X \rightarrow X^{\omega}$  by identifying  $x \in X$  with the constant sequence in  $X^{\omega}$ . A celebrated usage of ultrapower is to construct a model of hyperreal numbers, i.e.,  $\mathbb{R}^{\omega}$ . The reader is referred to [Gol22, Section 9.4] for some relevant discussion. Addition and multiplication on  $\mathbb{R}^{\omega}$  is defined by pointwise calculation for two sequences, i.e.  $[r_i] + [s_i] = [r_i + s_i]$ . The order on  $\mathbb{R}^{\omega}$  is also defined in a canonical way,  $[x_i] \leq [y_i]$  if and only if  $\{i \in I \mid x_i \leq$

$y_i\} \in \omega$ . Since  $\omega$  is an ultrafilter, this order on  $\mathbb{R}^\omega$  is well-defined. It is a direct corollary of Łos' theorem [Gol22, Theorem 6.4.1] that  $\mathbb{R}^\omega$  is an ordered field<sup>1</sup>.

A hyperreal number  $[r_i] \in \mathbb{R}^\omega$  is

- *finite*, if there exists  $M > 0$  such that  $[[r_i]] \leq M$  ( $|r_i|$  means the absolute value);
- *infinite* (resp., *infinitesimal*), if for any  $M > 0$ ,  $[[r_i]] > M$ , (resp.,  $[[r_i]] < M$ ).

By definition, an infinitesimal number or a real number in  $\mathbb{R}$  is finite. For any finite hyperreal number  $[r_i]$ , if there exists  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $[r_i] - r$  is infinitesimal, then  $r$  is called the *standard part* of  $[r_i]$ , denoted by  $st([r_i])$ . The standard part of a finite hyperreal number uniquely exists, one can check that the *ultralimit*  $r = \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} r_i$  is the standard part of  $[r_i]$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *The set of all finite hyperreal numbers forms a subring of  $\mathbb{R}^\omega$  and the set of all infinitesimal numbers forms an ideal of  $\mathbb{R}^\omega$ .  $\square$*

The proof of the lemma above is followed directly from the definition, we leave it to the reader.

Let  $X$  be a strongly discrete metric space with bounded geometry,  $X^\omega$  its ultrapower. Then the metric function  $d : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  extends to a hyperreal valued function

$$d^\omega : X^\omega \times X^\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\omega \quad \text{by} \quad ([x_i], [y_i]) \mapsto [d(x_i, y_i)].$$

One can check that  $d^\omega$  is a hyperreal-valued metric on  $X^\omega$ , i.e., for any  $[x_i], [y_i], [z_i] \in X^\omega$ , one has that

- (1)  $d^\omega([x_i], [y_i]) \geq 0$ ,  $d^\omega([x_i], [y_i]) = 0$  if and only if  $[x_i] = [y_i]$ ;
- (2)  $d^\omega([x_i], [y_i]) = d^\omega([y_i], [x_i])$ ;
- (3)  $d^\omega([x_i], [y_i]) + d^\omega([y_i], [z_i]) \geq d^\omega([x_i], [z_i])$ ,

where the operation  $+$  and order  $\leq$  are in  $\mathbb{R}^\omega$  which is defined as above. We define the *finite distance equivalent relation* on  $X^\omega$  by

$$[x_i] \sim_f [y_i] \iff d^\omega([x_i], [y_i]) \text{ is finite.} \quad (1)$$

By Lemma 2.3 and the fact that  $d^\omega$  is a hyperreal-valued metric, one can then see that  $\sim_f$  is indeed an equivalent relation.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $z \in X$  viewed as an element in  $X^\omega$ . The equivalent class of  $z$  under  $\sim_f$  is  $X$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show if  $[x_i] \in X^\omega$  satisfies  $d([x_i], z)$  is finite, then there exists  $y \in X \subseteq X^\omega$  such that  $[x_i] = y$ . Assume that  $d([x_i], z) \leq M$  for some  $M > 0$ , then  $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(x_i, z) \leq M\} \in \omega$ . Since  $X$  has bounded geometry, there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\#B(z, M) \leq N$ . Say  $B(z, M) = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N\}$ . Then  $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(x_i, z) \leq M\}$  is divided into  $A_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup A_N$ , where

$$A_k = \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid x_i = y_k\},$$

$k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . There is a unique  $k$  such that  $A_k \in \omega$ , this means that  $[x_i] = y_k$ .  $\square$

**Definition 2.5.** • An element  $[x_i] \in X^\omega$  is *afar*, if  $d^\omega([x_i], x)$  is infinite for any  $x \in X$ .

<sup>1</sup>It is actually not hard to check directly by definition if the reader is not familiar with Łos' theorem.

- For an afar element  $[w_i] \in X^\omega$ , the *limit space* of  $X$  associated with  $[w_i]$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{L}_{[w_i]}^\omega$ , is defined to be the set

$$\mathcal{L}_{[w_i]}^\omega = \{[x_i] \in X^\omega \mid [x_i] \sim_f [w_i]\}.$$

The metric on  $\mathcal{L}_{[w_i]}^\omega$  is defined by

$$d([x_i], [y_i]) = st(d^\omega([x_i], [y_i])) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} d(x_i, y_i),$$

for any  $[x_i], [y_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[w_i]}^\omega$ .

It is direct that if  $[v_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[w_i]}^\omega$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_{[v_i]}^\omega = \mathcal{L}_{[w_i]}^\omega$  (one should compare this with [ŠW17, Proposition 3.9]). The following proposition shows that  $(\mathcal{L}_{[w_i]}^\omega, d)$  is indeed a metric space.

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $X$  be a strongly discrete metric space with bounded geometry,  $[w_i]$  an afar element. For any  $[x_i], [y_i], [z_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[w_i]}^\omega$ , one has that*

- (1)  $d([x_i], [y_i]) \geq 0$ ,  $d([x_i], [y_i]) = 0$  if and only if  $[x_i] = [y_i]$ ;
- (2)  $d([x_i], [y_i]) = d([y_i], [x_i])$ ;
- (3)  $d([x_i], [y_i]) + d([y_i], [z_i]) \geq d([x_i], [z_i])$ .

This makes  $\mathcal{L}_{[w_i]}^\omega$  a strongly discrete metric space with bounded geometry.

If we assume that  $X$  is not uniformly discrete, then  $(\mathcal{L}_{[w_i]}^\omega, d)$  is only a pseudo metric, i.e, there exists  $[x_i] \neq [y_i]$  such that  $d([x_i], [y_i]) = 0$ .

Recall that  $X$  is uniformly discrete if there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $d(x, y) > r$  whenever  $x \neq y$ , and in this case, we say  $X$  is  $r$ -discrete. A strongly discrete metric space must be 1-discrete.

*Proof of Proposition 2.6.* We shall only prove (1) here, (2) and (3) are clear from definition. Since  $X$  is strongly discrete, if  $x \neq y \in X$ , then  $d(x, y) \geq 1$ . By definition, one then has that  $d([x_i], [y_i]) = 0$  if and only if for any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(x_i, y_i) < \varepsilon\} \in \omega$ . Notice that

$$\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(x_i, y_i) < \varepsilon\} = \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid x_i = y_i\}$$

for any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ . This means  $[x_i] = [y_i]$ . It is direct to see  $d([x_i], [y_i]) \in \mathbb{Z}$ . By a similar proof as in Lemma 2.4, it is also not hard to see  $\mathcal{L}_{[w_i]}^\omega$  has bounded geometry.

On the other hand, if  $X$  is not uniformly discrete (which is clearly not strongly discrete), then for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $x_i, y_i \in X$  such that  $x_i \neq y_i$  and  $d(x_i, y_i) \leq 1/i$ . Take  $[x_i], [y_i] \in X^\omega$ , it is clear that  $[x_i] \neq [y_i]$ . One also has that  $d^\omega([x_i], [y_i])$  is infinitesimal, thus  $[y_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$ . However,  $d([x_i], [y_i]) = 0$ .  $\square$

For simplicity and contrast with the original version in [ŠW17], we have set a rather strong condition for  $X$ . From the proof of Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.6, one can see that limit space can also be defined if  $X$  is a locally finite, uniformly discrete space in the same way. Even if  $X$  is not uniformly discrete, the limit space can be defined as the quotient of the pseudo metric space above modulo the relation

$$x \sim y \iff d(x, y) = 0.$$

In the extreme, one can also define the limit space for any proper metric space by using the idea above (need not be discrete, since proper metric spaces are locally compact).

**Definition 2.7.** Let  $M$  be a proper metric space,  $M^\omega$  the ultrapower of  $M$  equipped with a hyperreal-valued metric as before.

- A element  $[x_i] \in M^\omega$  is *afar*, if  $x_i$  tends to infinity as  $i$  tends to  $\omega$ , i.e., for any bounded  $K \subseteq X$ , there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x_i \notin K$  whenever  $i \geq N$ ;
- Two elements  $[x_i], [y_i] \in M^\omega$  are *infinitesimal equivalent*, denoted by  $[x_i] \approx [y_i]$ , if  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} d(x_i, y_i) = 0$ ;
- For any afar  $[x_i] \in M^\omega$ , the *pre-limit space* associated with  $[x_i]$  is defined to be all elements in  $M^\omega$  which have finite distance with  $[x_i]$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{F}_{[x_i]}^\omega = \{[y_i] \in M^\omega \mid [x_i] \sim_f [y_i]\}.$$

The *limit space* associated with  $[x_i]$  is defined to be  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega / \approx$ , equipped with the metric

$$d([x_i], [y_i]) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} d(x_i, y_i).$$

It is clear that  $\approx$  is a stronger equivalent relation than  $\sim_f$ . One can check that the metric on  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$  makes it a proper metric space. Moreover, let  $(x_i) \subseteq K \subseteq M$  for some compact  $K$ , then  $[x_i]$  is clearly not afar. Even though  $[x_i]$  is not afar, one can still do the construction to define a “limit space” associated with  $[x_i]$ . It is well-known that the limit space associated with  $[x_i]$  is isometric to  $M$  in this case (see [Gol22, Theorem 11.1.8] for example). We leave the proof of the above statement to the reader.

Since we mainly study coarse geometry in this paper, it would be more natural to consider discrete spaces. Thus we only provide the definition of limit space for proper metric space here, but still study the strongly discrete case.

When  $X = \mathbb{N}$ , any of its limit spaces  $\mathcal{L}_{[w_i]}^\omega$  is isometric with  $\mathbb{Z}$  and also known as a *galaxy*, see [Gol22, Page 161]. We should mention that the definition of the limit space does not rely on the choice of the index set of the ultrafilter  $\omega$  (it does not matter if we replace the index set with other sets, even uncountable ones). It would help to begin with some examples.

**Example 2.8.** Let  $X = \Gamma$  be a finitely generated group equipped with a left-invariant word length metric. Fix  $[\gamma_i]$  to be an afar element. If  $[\eta_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[\gamma_i]}^\omega$ , then  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} |\gamma_i^{-1} \eta_i| \leq M$  is finite. Since  $\Gamma$  is finitely generated, there are only finite elements in  $B(e, M)$ . By using a similar proof with Lemma 2.4,  $[\gamma_i^{-1} \eta_i]$  is equivalent to some constant sequence  $\zeta \in \Gamma$ . Then

$$\mathcal{L}_{[\gamma_i]}^\omega \rightarrow \Gamma, [\eta_i] \mapsto [\gamma_i^{-1} \eta_i] \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{[\gamma_i]}^\omega, \zeta \mapsto [\gamma_i \zeta]$$

define a pair of inverse isometric maps. Thus, we have that  $\mathcal{L}_{[\gamma_i]}^\omega$  is isometric to  $\Gamma$ . One can use a similar way to show all limit spaces of  $\mathbb{N}$  are isometric to  $\mathbb{Z}$ . The reader may compare this example with [ŠW17, Lemma B.1] and [WZ23, Example 3.10].

**Example 2.9.** Let  $X = \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  equipped with the product metric. For an afar element  $[(x_i, y_i)]$ , at least one of  $[x_i]$  and  $[y_i]$  is an afar element in  $\mathbb{N}^\omega$ .

- If  $[y_i]$  is afar while  $[x_i]$  is not, then there exists  $x_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $[x_i] = x_0$ . Then  $[(x_i, y_i)] = [(x_0, y_i)]$ . Then any element  $[(w_i, v_i)]$  with finite distance with  $[(x_0, y_i)]$  must satisfy that

$(w_i)$  is uniformly bounded, and  $[v_i]$  has finite distance with  $[y_i]$  in  $\mathbb{N}^\omega$ . Thus  $[w_i, v_i]$  can be write as  $[(w_0, v_i)]$  for some  $w_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , As a result, the limit space of  $X$  associated with  $[(x_i, y_i)]$  is isometric with  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}$ .

Similarly, if  $[x_i]$  is afar while  $[y_i]$  is not, then the limit space associated with  $[(x_i, y_i)]$  is isometric with  $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$ . One may compare this with [ŠW17, Example 3.14 (3)].

- If both  $[x_i]$  and  $[y_i]$  are afar, the limit space associated with  $[(x_i, y_i)]$  is isometric to  $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ .

**Example 2.10.** Let  $(X_n, d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of metric spaces. The coarse disjoint union of  $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is defined to be the set  $\bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$  equipped with a metric  $d$  such that  $d|_{X_n} = d_n$  and  $d(X_m, X_n) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n + m \rightarrow \infty$ . Coarse disjoint union is unique up to coarsely equivalent.

Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of single points viewed as a sequence of metric spaces, denoted by  $X = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x_i\}$  the coarse disjoint union. Then any two distinct afar elements must have infinite distance. Thus all limit spaces of  $X$  are single points.

**Example 2.11.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a finitely generated, residually finite group. A *filtration* of  $\Gamma$  is a nested sequence of finite index normal groups  $\Gamma_1 \triangleleft \cdots \triangleleft \Gamma_i \triangleleft \cdots$  of  $\Gamma$  such that  $\bigcap_{i=1}^\infty \Gamma_i = \{e\}$ . The box space of  $\Gamma$  according to  $\{\Gamma_i\}$  is defined to be the coarse disjoint union  $\bigsqcup_{i=1}^\infty \Gamma/\Gamma_i$ , denoted by  $\mathbf{Box}_{\{\Gamma_i\}}(\Gamma)$ , or simply  $\mathbf{Box}(\Gamma)$ , where each quotient is endowed with the quotient metric from  $\Gamma$ .

Let  $[x_i] \in \mathbf{Box}(\Gamma)$  be an afar element. If  $[y_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$ , then  $d([x_i], [y_i]) \leq M$  for some  $M > 0$ . By definition of coarse disjoint union, there exists  $N > 0$  such that  $d(\Gamma/\Gamma_n, \Gamma/\Gamma_m) > M$  whenever  $n, m \geq N$ . Denote  $n(x_i)$  to be such that  $x_i \in \Gamma/\Gamma_{n(x_i)}$ . Since  $[x_i]$  is afar, we have that  $n(x_i) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $i \rightarrow \omega$ . Combining the two facts above, we conclude that

$$\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid n(x_i) = n(y_i)\} \in \omega.$$

For sufficiently large  $n(x_i)$ , which corresponds to some  $A \in \omega$ , one has that  $B(x_i, M)$  is isometric to  $B_\Gamma(e, M)$  for all  $i \in A$ . Then for each  $i \in A$ , there exists  $\gamma_i \in B_\Gamma(e, M)$  such that  $[\gamma_i] = x_i^{-1}y_i \in \Gamma/\Gamma_{n(x_i)}$ . Since  $B_\Gamma(e, M)$  is a finite set, one can use a similar argument as in Lemma 2.4 to show there exists a unique  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  such that

$$\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid x_i[\gamma] = y_i \in \Gamma/\Gamma_{n(x_i)}\} \in \omega.$$

This shows that  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$  is isometric to  $\Gamma$ .

**2.2. Relations between different versions of limit spaces.** In this section, we shall recall the definition of the first version of limit spaces introduced by J. Špakula and R. Willett in [ŠW17]. We shall compare our definition of limit space with the original version and show that they are equivalent. Denote  $\beta X$  the Stone-Čech compactification of  $X$ , which consists of all ultrafilters on  $X$ . Denote  $\partial_\beta X = \beta X \setminus X$  to be the set of all non-principal ultrafilters on  $X$ .

**Definition 2.12** ([ŠW17]). Let  $X$  be a space. Let  $\omega_X \in \partial_\beta X$  be a non-principal ultrafilter.

- (1) A *partial translation* on  $X$  is a bijective function  $t : D \rightarrow R$  with domain and range  $D, R$  of  $X$  such that there exists  $R > 0$  satisfying that  $d(x, t(x)) \leq R$  for any  $x \in D$ . We denote

$$\text{Prop}(t) = \sup_{x \in D} d(x, t(x)),$$

which is called the *propagation* of  $t$ .



- (2) A partial translation  $t : D \rightarrow R$  is *compatible with  $\omega_X$*  if  $D \in \omega_X$ . We shall then view  $t$  as a function from  $D$  to  $\beta X$ . Since  $\beta X$  is compact and Hausdorff, we define

$$t(\omega_X) = \lim_{\omega_X} t(x) \in \partial_\beta X.$$

Since  $\omega_X$  is non-principal and  $t$  is partial translation, one can easily check that  $t(\omega_X)$  is also non-principal.

- (3) An ultrafilter  $\alpha_X \in \partial_\beta X$  is *compatible with  $\omega_X$*  if there exists a partial translation such that  $t : D \rightarrow R$  compatible with  $\omega_X$  such that  $t(\omega_X) = \alpha_X$ .
- (4) Denote by  $X(\omega_X)$  the set of all ultrafilters on  $X$  which are compatible with  $\omega_X$ . A *compatible family for  $\omega_X$*  is a collection of partial translations  $\{t_{\alpha_X}\}_{\alpha_X \in X(\omega)}$  such that  $t_{\alpha_X}(\omega_X) = \alpha_X$ .
- (5) The *limit space associated with  $\omega_X$*  is defined to be  $(X(\omega_X), d_{\omega_X})$ , where the metric is defined by

$$d_{\omega_X}(\alpha_X, \alpha'_X) = \lim_{\omega_X} d(t_{\alpha_X}(x), d_{\alpha'_X}(x))$$

for any  $\alpha_X, \alpha'_X \in X(\omega_X)$  and  $\{t_{\alpha_X}\}_{\alpha_X \in X(\omega_X)}$  is a fixed compatible family for  $\omega_X$ .

We should mention that the metric defined on  $X(\omega_X)$  does not depend on the choice of compatible families and makes  $X(\omega_X)$  a strongly discrete space with bounded geometry (see [ŠW17, Proposition 3.7]). Moreover, it is proved in [ŠW17, Proposition 3.9] that if  $\alpha_X \in X(\omega_X)$ , then  $X(\alpha_X) = X(\omega_X)$ .

Fix  $\omega$  to be an ultrafilter on  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $[x_i]$  to be an afar element in  $X^\omega$ . We can view the sequence  $(x_i)$  as a function  $I : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X \subseteq \beta X$ , which extends to a function  $\tilde{I} : \beta\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \beta X$  defined by

$$\tilde{I}(\alpha) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \alpha} x_i = \alpha_X \in \beta X.$$

We denote by  $\omega_X \in \beta X$  the image of  $\omega$  under  $\tilde{I}$ .

**Theorem 2.13.** *There exists a canonical bijective isometry between  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$  and  $X(\omega_X)$ .*

Before we can prove Theorem 2.13, we shall still need some preparations.

**Lemma 2.14.** *For any  $[y_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$ , there exists  $D \in \omega$  such that the map  $x_i \mapsto y_i$  is a partial translation on  $D_X = \{x_i \mid i \in D\} \subseteq X$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $(x_i)$  and  $(y_i)$  to be sequences of representative elements. Consider the following set:

$$\mathcal{G} = \{(x_i, y_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq X \times X.$$

Since  $[y_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$ , we have that  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} d(x_i, y_i) < \infty$ . Then there exists some  $R > 0$  and a subset  $D_0 \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  such that  $d(x_i, y_i) < R$  for any  $i \in D_0$ . Then

$$\mathcal{G}|_{D_0} = \{(x_i, y_i) \mid i \in D_0\}$$

has *propagation* at most  $R$ , i.e., for any  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{G}|_{D_0}$ , one has that  $d(x, y) < R$ . Since  $X$  has bounded geometry, by using [WY20, Lemma 12.2.3], there exists  $N$  sets  $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_N$  such that

$$\mathcal{G}|_{D_0} = \bigsqcup_{k=1}^N \mathcal{G}_k,$$

where each  $\mathcal{G}_k$  satisfies that for each  $x \in X$  there is at most one element of the form  $(x, y)$  or  $(y, x)$  in  $\mathcal{G}_k$ . Denoted by  $D_k = \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid (x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{G}_k\}$ , then  $\bigsqcup_{k=1}^N D_k = D_0 \in \omega$ . Since  $\omega$  is an ultrafilter,

there exists unique  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  such that  $D_k \in \omega$ . Denoted by  $D = D_k$ , then  $x_i \mapsto y_i$  defines a partial translation with domain in  $D_X$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.13.* For any  $[y_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$ , we shall view  $(y_i)$  as a map from  $\mathbb{N}$  to  $\beta X$ . Since  $\beta X$  is compact, there exists a unique  $\tau_X \in \beta X$  such that  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} y_i = \tau_X$ . Moreover, notice that if  $(y_i) \sim_\omega (z_i)$ , then the set  $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid y_i = z_i\} \in \omega$ . This shows that the limit of  $(y_i)$  only depends on the equivalent class  $[y_i]$  of  $(y_i)$ .

Moreover, let  $(y_i)$  be a sequence such that  $[y_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$ . By using Lemma 2.14, one can find a subset  $D \in \omega$  such that  $t : x_i \mapsto y_i$  for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  is a partial translation with domain in  $D_X = \{x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq X$ . Thus  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \omega_X} t(x) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} y_i \in \beta X$  is in the limit space  $X(\omega_X)$  associated with  $\omega_X$ .

Define  $F : \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega \rightarrow X(\omega)$  by

$$[y_i] \mapsto \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} y_i \in \beta X.$$

From the argument above, one can see that  $F$  is a well-defined map. For any  $[y_i], [z_i] \in L_\omega$ , by using Lemma 2.14 again, one can find two subsets  $D_{X,y}, D_{X,z} \subseteq X$  and partial translations  $t_y, t_z$  on  $D_{X,y}, D_{X,z}$  respectively such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} y_i = \lim_{x \rightarrow \omega_X} t_y(x) = t_y(\omega_X) \in X(\omega) \text{ and } \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} z_i = \lim_{x \rightarrow \omega_X} t_z(x) = t_z(\omega_X) \in X(\omega).$$

Notice that

$$d(t_y(\omega_X), t_z(\omega_X)) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \omega_X} d(t_y(x), t_z(x)) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} d(y_i, z_i) = d([y_i], [z_i]).$$

This shows that  $F$  is an isometry.

For any  $\alpha_X \in X(\omega_X)$ , by definition, there exists  $D_\alpha \in \omega$  and a partial translation

$$t_{\alpha_X} : D_{\alpha_X} = \{x_i \in X \mid i \in D_\alpha\} \rightarrow R_{\alpha_X}$$

such that  $t_{\alpha_X}(\omega_X) = \alpha_X$ . View  $t_{\alpha_X}$  as a function from  $D_\alpha$  to  $X$  by  $i \mapsto t_{\alpha_X}(x_i)$ . Then  $t_{\alpha_X}$  defines a sequence in  $X$ , which defines an element in  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$  whose image under  $F$  is exact  $\alpha_X$ . This shows that  $F$  is surjective. We then finish the proof.  $\square$

To understand Theorem 2.13 more clearly, a more natural way is to replace the ultrafilter in Definition 2.5 by the ultrafilter  $\omega_X \in \beta X$ . In this case, the limit space of  $X$  is the set of equivalent classes of functions  $f : X \rightarrow X$ . Denoted by  $id : X \rightarrow X$  the identity map, then Theorem 2.13 has a canonical corollary as follows.

**Corollary 2.15.** *There exists a canonical isometry between  $\mathcal{L}_{[id]}^{\omega_X}$  and  $X(\omega_X)$ .*

*Proof.* It is clear since  $id$  takes the ultrafilter  $\omega_X$  to  $\omega_X$ .  $\square$

Combining [ŠW17, Proposition 3.10], we also have the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.16** ([ŠW17]). *For any  $R > 0$  and  $[y_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$ , there exists  $D \in \omega$  such that there exists an isometric bijection*

$$\varphi_i : B([y_i], R) \rightarrow B(y_i, R), \quad [z_i] \mapsto z_i,$$

for any  $i \in D$ .  $\square$

One can also prove the proposition above by definition in a similar way with [ŠW17, Proposition 3.10], which is not hard, thus we leave it to the reader. We should mention that Proposition 2.16 essentially needs the condition that  $X$  is strongly discrete. If we replace strongly discrete with uniformly discrete, then the isometry above should be replaced by an  $\varepsilon$ -isometry for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , i.e.,

$$|d(f(x), f(y)) - d(x, y)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

From the view discussed in Corollary 2.15, to obtain all limit spaces, our strategy (Definition 2.5) is to fix an ultrafilter  $\omega_X \in \partial_\beta X$  and retrieve all *based points*  $[f]$ , where  $f : X \rightarrow X$ . The strategy in [ŠW17] is to fix the base point  $[id]$  and retrieve all ultrafilters on  $X$ . It is natural to ask when we fix a non-principal  $\omega$  on  $\mathbb{N}$ , whether one can get all limit spaces  $X(\omega_X)$  in [ŠW17] by  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$  for some carefully selected afar element  $[x_i]$ . Unfortunately, we have a negative answer to this question because of the existence of the *Rudin-Keisler order*.

**Definition 2.17.** Let  $\omega, \tau$  be ultrafilters on the set  $S$  and  $T$ , respectively. Then we say that  $\omega$  is below  $\tau$  in the *Rudin-Keisler order*, denoted by  $\tau \leq_{RK} \omega$ , if there exists a function  $f : S \rightarrow T$  such that  $\tau = f(\omega)$ . We write  $\omega =_{RK} \tau$  if both  $\tau \leq_{RK} \omega$  and  $\omega \leq_{RK} \tau$  hold, and  $\tau <_{RK} \omega$  if  $\tau \leq_{RK} \omega$  but not  $\tau =_{RK} \omega$ .

The reader is referred to [Kei10, Section 8] or [Gol22, Section 1.6]. It is direct that for a principal ultrafilter  $\tau$ , we have that  $\tau \leq_{RK} \omega$  for any ultrafilter  $\omega$ . If  $\omega$  is non-principal, then  $\tau <_{RK} \omega$ . For non-principal ultrafilters, one also has an example for a pair of ultrafilters with strict Rudin-Keisler order. Typical examples are constructed from *product of ultrafilters*.

**Definition 2.18.** Let  $\omega, \tau$  be ultrafilters on the set  $S$  and  $T$ , respectively. The *product of  $\omega$  and  $\tau$*  is defined to be an ultrafilter on  $S \times T$  by

$$\omega \times \tau := \{Y \in S \times T \mid \{t \in T \mid Y_t \in \omega\} \in \tau\},$$

where  $Y_t = \{s \in S \mid (s, t) \in Y\}$  is the section of  $Y$  at  $t$ .

One should notice that the product of two ultrafilters does not satisfy the commutative law, i.e.,  $\omega \times \tau \neq \tau \times \omega$ . When we take  $S = T = \mathbb{N}$ , the product  $\omega \times \tau$  is an ultrafilter on a countable set  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ , thus also can be seen as an ultrafilter on  $\mathbb{N}$ .

The following proposition is proved in [Gol22, Proposition 1.6.10].

**Proposition 2.19.** *For any non-principal ultrafilters  $\omega$  and  $\tau$ , we have  $\omega <_{RK} \omega \times \tau$  and  $\tau <_{RK} \omega \times \tau$ .*  $\square$

**Remark 2.20.** Since  $X$  is a countable set, for any non-principal  $\omega$  on  $\mathbb{N}$ , one can always find a  $<_{RK}$ -larger ultrafilter on  $\tau_X \in \partial_\beta X$  by Proposition 2.19, i.e.,  $\omega <_{RK} \tau_X$ . Then one can never find a map  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X$  such that  $f(\omega) = \tau_X$ . Thus there is no afar element  $[x_i]$  such that the image of  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$  under the canonical isometry defined in Theorem 2.13 is  $X(\tau_X)$ . To a certain extent, when we fix an ultrafilter, we can not get all limit spaces defined by J. Spakula and R. Willett by changing the base point.

## 3. COARSE GEOMETRY FROM INFINITY

In this section, we shall describe some coarse geometric properties by using limit space theory and ultrapowers. The reader is also referred to [Ima19] for some relevant discussion.

**3.1. Basic definitions in coarse geometry.** We shall begin with some basic definitions of coarse geometry.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $X, Y$  be proper metric spaces and  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ . Then

- $f$  is *bornologous* if for any  $R > 0$ ,

$$\sup\{d(f(x), f(y)) \mid x, y \in X, d(x, y) \leq R\} < \infty;$$

- $f$  is *coarse* if it is bornologous and metrically proper, i.e., the preimage of bounded sets are bounded;
- $f$  is a *coarse embedding* if it is bornologous and

$$\inf\{d(f(x), f(y)) \mid x, y \in X, d(x, y) \geq R\} \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty;$$

- $f$  is *coarsely surjective* if  $f(X)$  forms an  $r$ -net of  $Y$  for some  $r > 0$ ;
- $f$  is a *coarse equivalence* if it is a coarse embedding and also coarsely surjective;
- another map  $g : X \rightarrow Y$  is *close* to  $f$  if  $\sup\{d(f(x), g(x)) \mid x, y \in X\} < \infty$ ;
- the *ultra-extension* of  $f$  is a map  $f^\omega : X^\omega \rightarrow Y^\omega$  defined by

$$f^\omega([x_i]) = [f(x_i)]^\omega.$$

**Remark 3.2.** Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a coarse embedding. Define  $\rho_+, \rho_- : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  by

$$\rho_+(R) = \sup\{d(f(x), f(y)) \mid x, y \in X, d(x, y) \leq R\},$$

and

$$\rho_-(R) = \inf\{d(f(x), f(y)) \mid x, y \in X, d(x, y) \geq R\}.$$

Thus we have that

$$\rho_-(d(x, y)) \leq d(f(x), f(y)) \leq \rho_+(d(x, y)). \quad (2)$$

The existence of such two functions  $\rho_+, \rho_- : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  that satisfies  $\rho_-(t) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and (2) is equivalent to the coarse embeddability of  $X$ , see [NY23, Definition 1.4.4]. These two functions are also called the *control functions*.

It is directly checked that  $f^\omega$  is well-defined. Indeed, if  $(x_i)$  is  $\omega$ -equivalent to  $(y_i)$ , then  $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid x_i = y_i\} \in \omega$ . Then  $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid f(x_i) = f(y_i)\} \in \omega$  which shows the sequences  $(f(x_i))$  and  $(f(y_i))$  are  $\omega$ -equivalent.

Coarse geometry can also be defined by using *entourages* (also called *controlled sets*) as in [Roe03]. A metric space is naturally endowed with a coarse structure. It can be seen as a dual structure of *uniform structure*, which is used to illustrate a uniformly continuous map. Before we introduce the ultrapower description to those coarse geometric properties, we shall begin with the following inspiring example.

**Proposition 3.3.** Let  $X, Y$  be proper metric spaces,  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  a map. Then  $f$  is uniformly continuous if and only if for any  $[x_i] \sim_{\text{inf}} [y_i] \in M^\omega$  (see Definition 2.7), one has that  $f^\omega([x_i]) \sim_{\text{inf}} f^\omega([y_i])$ .

*Proof.* ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Assume that  $f$  is uniformly continuous, i.e., for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist  $\delta > 0$  such that  $d(f(x), f(y)) \leq \varepsilon$  whenever  $d(x, y) \leq \delta$ . Then for given  $\varepsilon$ , one has that

$$\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(x_i, y_i) \leq \delta\} \subseteq \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(f(x_i), f(y_i)) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

Since  $[x_i] \sim_{\text{inf}} [y_i]$ , we have that  $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(x_i, y_i) \leq \delta\} \in \omega$ . This shows that

$$\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(f(x_i), f(y_i)) \leq \varepsilon\} \in \omega$$

for any  $\varepsilon$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Assume for a contradiction that  $f$  is not uniformly continuous. Then there exists  $(x_i)$  and  $(y_i)$  such that  $d(x_i, y_i)$  tends to 0 as  $i$  tends to infinity while  $d(f(x_i), f(y_i)) \geq \varepsilon_0$  for some  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ . Then  $[x_i] \sim_{\text{inf}} [y_i]$  while  $f^\omega([x_i])$  is not infinitesimal equivalent to  $f^\omega([y_i])$ .  $\square$

In a word, the proposition above tells us that uniformly continuous maps bring infinitesimal to infinitesimal. Back to coarse geometry, we have the following dual proposition.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $X, Y$  be strongly discrete metric spaces with bounded geometry. Then*

- a map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is bornologous if and only if  $f^\omega([x_i]) \sim_f f^\omega([y_i])$  whenever  $[x_i] \sim_f [y_i]$ , see (1);
- a bornologous map  $f$  is a coarse embedding if and only if  $d^\omega(f^\omega([x_i]), f^\omega([y_i]))$  is infinite whenever  $d^\omega([x_i], [y_i])$  is infinite;
- two maps  $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$  are closed if and only if  $d(f^\omega([x_i]), g^\omega([x_i]))$  is finite for any  $[x_i] \in X^\omega$ .

In a word, Proposition 3.4 tells us that coarse embeddings bring finite to finite, bring infinite to infinite.

*Proof.* • ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Assume that  $f$  is bornologous, i.e., for any  $R > 0$ , there exists  $S > 0$  such that  $d(f(x), f(y)) \leq S$  whenever  $d(x, y) \leq R$ . Since  $[x_i] \sim_f [y_i]$ , there exists  $R > 0$  such that  $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(x_i, y_i) \leq R\} \in \omega$ . Combining  $f$  is bornologous, one then has that

$$\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(f(x_i), f(y_i)) \leq S\} \in \omega.$$

This shows that  $f^\omega([x_i]) \sim_f f^\omega([y_i])$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Assume for a contradiction that  $f$  is not bornologous. By definition, there exist two sequences  $(x_i)$  and  $(y_i)$  such that  $d(x_i, y_i) \leq R$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  while  $d(f(x_i), f(y_i)) > i$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $[x_i] \sim_f [y_i]$  while  $f^\omega([x_i])$  has infinite distance to  $f^\omega([y_i])$ .

• ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Assume that  $f$  is a coarse embedding. Then for any  $R > 0$ , there exists  $S' > 0$  such that  $d(f(x), f(y)) \geq R$  whenever  $d(x, y) \geq S'$ . Recall that  $d^\omega([x_i], [y_i])$  is infinite means that for any  $R' > 0$ , one has that  $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(x_i, y_i) \geq R'\} \in \omega$ . Then for any  $R > 0$ ,

$$\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(x_i, y_i) \geq S'\} \subseteq \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(f(x_i), f(y_i)) \geq R\} \in \omega.$$

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Assume for a contradiction that  $f$  is not a coarse embedding. By definition, there exist  $M > 0$  and two sequences  $(x_i), (y_i)$  such that  $d(x_i, y_i) \geq i$  and  $d(f(x_i), f(y_i)) \leq M$  for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $d^\omega([x_i], [y_i])$  is infinite while  $d^\omega(f^\omega([x_i]), f^\omega([y_i]))$  is finite.

• The last item is direct, we leave it to the reader.  $\square$

From Proposition 3.4, a coarse map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  canonically induces a map between limit spaces. Indeed, for any afar element  $[x_i] \in X^\omega$ , the image  $f^\omega([x_i])$  must be afar. If not, the sequence  $(f(x_i))$  is a bounded sequence in  $Y$ . Since the preimage of bounded sets under  $f$  are bounded and  $[x_i]$  is afar, this leads to a contradiction. Moreover,  $f^\omega$  maps finite to finite, thus  $f^\omega$  restricts to a well-defined map from  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$  to  $\mathcal{L}_{f^\omega([x_i])}^\omega$ , we shall denote this map by

$$f_{[x_i]} : \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{f^\omega([x_i])}^\omega.$$

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $X, Y$  be strongly discrete metric spaces with bounded geometry,  $[x_i]$  an afar element in  $X^\omega$ .*

- If  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is a coarse embedding, so is  $f_{[x_i]}$ ;
- If  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is a coarse equivalence, so is  $f_{[x_i]}$ .

*Proof.* • Assume that  $f$  is a coarse embedding. From the proof of the first two items of Proposition 3.4, it is direct that  $f_{[x_i]}$  is also a coarse embedding.

• Assume that  $f$  is a coarse equivalence. Fix  $[y_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[f([x_i])]}^\omega$ . For any  $y_i \in Y$ , since  $f$  is coarsely surjective, there exists  $r > 0$  such that there exists  $z_i \in X$  such that  $d(f(z_i), y_i) \leq r$ . Thus one has that  $d(f^\omega([z_i]), [y_i]) \leq r$ . We claim that  $[z_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$ . Indeed, if  $[x_i]$  and  $[z_i]$  has infinite distance, then  $f^\omega([x_i])$  and  $f^\omega([z_i])$  both have finite distance to  $[y_i]$ , which makes  $f^\omega([x_i])$  and  $f^\omega([z_i])$  have finite distance. This leads to a contradiction according to Proposition 3.4.  $\square$

As a corollary of Proposition 3.5, we can use it to determine whether two spaces are coarsely equivalent.

**Example 3.6.** Let  $\{n^2 \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be the subset of  $\mathbb{N}$  equipped with the induced metric. Then there are no coarse equivalences between  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\{n^2 \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Indeed, if  $f$  is a coarse equivalent between these two spaces, combining Example 2.8 and Example 2.10,  $f$  induces a coarse equivalence between a single point  $\{pt\}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}$ . This can never happen since  $\{pt\}$  is bounded while  $\mathbb{Z}$  is not.

**3.2. Coarse properties at infinity.** In this section, we shall recall the definition of coarse embedding at infinity and characterize this property by using limit space theory.

**Definition 3.7** ([DGWZ22]). A metric space  $X$  admits a *coarse embedding into a Hilbert space at infinity* if there exist non-degenerate functions  $\rho_+, \rho_- : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for any  $R > 0$ , there exists a bounded set  $K_R \subseteq X$  such that for any  $x \notin K_R$  there exists a map

$$f_{x,R} : B(x, R) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$$

such that

$$\rho_-(d(y, z)) \leq \|f_{x,R}(y) - f_{x,R}(z)\| \leq \rho_+(d(y, z))$$

for any  $y, z \in B(x, R)$ .

A family of metric space  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  is said to admit a *uniformly coarse embedding into Hilbert space* if there exists a family of coarse embedding  $f_i : X_i \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  such that the family  $\{f_i\}$  share the same control functions  $\rho_+$  and  $\rho_-$  as in Remark 3.2.

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $X$  be a strongly discrete metric space with bounded geometry. Then  $X$  admits a coarse embedding into Hilbert space at infinity if and only if the sequence  $\{\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega\}_{[x_i] \text{ is afar}}$  admits a uniformly coarse embedding into Hilbert space.*

*Proof.* ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Assuming that  $X$  admits a coarse embedding into  $\mathcal{H}$  at infinity, we fix  $\rho_+, \rho_-$  to be the two non-degenerate functions in Definition 3.7. Recall that a metric space  $X$  is *locally coarsely embeddable* if the sequence  $\{B(x, n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  admits a uniformly coarse embedding into a Hilbert space. It is proved in [DGLY02, Proposition 3.2] that a metric space is coarsely embeddable if and only if it is locally coarsely embeddable.

Let  $[x_i]$  be an afar element, viewed as a base point of  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$ . For any  $R > 0$ , by Proposition 2.16, there exists  $Y \in \omega$  such that there exists an isometric bijection

$$f_i : B([x_i], R) \rightarrow B(x_i, R)$$

for any  $i \in Y$ . Since  $X$  admits a coarse embedding into  $\mathcal{H}$  at infinity, for given  $R > 0$ , there exists a bounded set  $K_R \subseteq X$  such that for any  $x \notin K_R$  there exists  $f_{x,R} : B(x, R) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  such that  $f_{x,R}$  is a coarse embedding associated with  $\rho_+, \rho_-$ . Notice that  $[x_i]$  is afar, then  $\{x_i \mid i \in Y\}$  is unbounded, and has a non-empty intersection with  $K_R^c$ . The composition

$$f_{x_i,R} \circ f_i : B([x_i], R) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$$

gives a coarse embedding associated with  $\rho_+$  and  $\rho_-$ . This shows that the sequence  $\{B([x_i], n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  admits a coarse embedding into  $\mathcal{H}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$  is locally coarsely embeddable.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Assume that the sequence  $\{\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega\}_{[x_i] \text{ is afar}}$  admits a uniformly coarse embedding into a Hilbert space. For any  $R > 0$  and afar element  $[x_i]$ , let  $Y_{[x_i]} \in \omega$  be as in Proposition 2.16. Since any ball with the center in  $D_{[x_i]} = \{x_i \mid i \in Y_{[x_i]}\}$  and radius  $R$  is coarsely embeddable with the same control functions, it suffices to show that the set

$$K = X \setminus \left( \bigcup_{\omega \in [x_i] \text{ is afar}} D_{[x_i]} \right)$$

is bounded and this holds clearly. Indeed, if  $K$  is unbounded, one can choose an afar element  $[y_i] \in X^\omega$  such that  $y_i \in K$  for every  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Notice that  $D_{[y_i]} \cap K = \emptyset$  and  $y_i \in K$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , this leads to a contradiction.  $\square$

**Example 3.9.** By Example 2.11, the limit space of  $\mathbf{Box}(\Gamma)$  associated with any afar element is isometric to  $\Gamma$ . By Theorem 3.8, we conclude that  $\mathbf{Box}(\Gamma)$  admits a coarse embedding into a Hilbert space at infinity if and only if  $\Gamma$  admits a coarse embedding into a Hilbert space. This provides a different proof to [DGWZ22, Theorem 2.3].

There is a parallel definition of Property A at infinity introduced in [Pil18]. The notion of *Property A* is introduced by G. Yu in [Yu00] as a coarse analogue of amenability. We will work with the following characterization of Property A in [HR00].

**Definition 3.10.** A discrete metric space  $X$  with bounded geometry has *Yu's Property A* if and only if for every  $R > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $S > 0$  and a map  $\zeta : X \rightarrow \ell^2(X)$ ,  $x \mapsto \zeta_x$  such that  $\|\zeta_x\| = 1$  for all  $x \in X$ , and such that

$$(1) \quad |1 - \langle \zeta_x - \zeta_y \rangle| \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } d(x, y) \leq R;$$

(2)  $\text{supp}(\xi_x) \subset B_X(x, S)$  for all  $x \in X$ .

Let  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a sequence of metric spaces. Then  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  is said to have *uniform Property A* if  $X_i$  has Property A with the same parameters  $R, \varepsilon, S$  as above.

In [Pil18], T. Pillon introduced a notion of *coarse amenability at infinity*. We shall call it *Property A at infinity* in this paper.

**Definition 3.11.** Let  $X$  be a strongly discrete metric space with bounded geometry.  $X$  has *Property A at infinity* if for all  $R, \varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $S \geq 0$  such that for all  $L \geq 0$ , there exist a finite subset  $K_L \subset X$  with the property that all finite subsets  $C \subset X \setminus K_L$  of diameter at most  $L$  has Property A with parameters  $R, \varepsilon, S$  as above, i.e., for each  $L > 0$ , there exists  $K_L \subset X$ , the family of all subsets of  $X \setminus K_L$  with diameters no more than  $L$  has uniform Property A and the parameters does not depend on  $L$ .

It has been proved in [Yu00] that a metric space  $X$  with Property A is coarsely embeddable into Hilbert space and the control functions  $\rho_{\pm}$  are only determined by three parameters  $R, \varepsilon$  and  $S$  above (also see [NY23]). Thus it is clear that a metric space with bounded geometry with Property A at infinity is coarse embeddable at infinity. One can also imitate the proof of Theorem 3.8 to show the following theorem, we leave the detail to the readers.

**Theorem 3.12.** *Let  $X$  be a strongly discrete metric space with bounded geometry. Then  $X$  has Property A at infinity if and only if the sequence  $\{\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^{\omega}\}_{[x_i]}$  is afar has uniform Property A.*  $\square$

**3.3. Asymptotic dimension.** In the last part of this section, we shall study the asymptotic dimension introduced by Gromov in [Gro93] of the limit spaces. First, we shall recall the definition. Let  $X$  be a proper metric space. For any  $R > 0$ , we say a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of subsets of a metric space  $X$  is  *$r$ -disjoint* if  $d(U, U') \geq r$  for every distinct pair  $U, U' \in \mathcal{U}$ . We say  $\mathcal{U}$  is *uniformly bounded* if there exists  $S > 0$  such that  $\text{diam}(U) \leq S$  for each  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ . The following characterization of the asymptotic dimension is from [NY23, Theorem 2.7.1].

**Definition 3.13.** Let  $X$  be a metric space with bounded geometry. We say that the *asymptotic dimension* of  $X$  does not exceed  $n$  and denoted  $\text{asdim } X \leq n$  if for every  $r > 0$ , there exists  $r$ -disjoint families  $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathcal{U}^{(n)}$  such that each  $\mathcal{U}^{(i)}$  is uniformly bounded and  $\bigcup \mathcal{U}^{(i)}$  is a cover of  $X$ .

We write  $\text{asdim } X = n$  if it is true that  $\text{asdim } X \leq n$  and  $\text{asdim } X \not\leq n - 1$ .

**Theorem 3.14.** *Let  $X$  be a strong metric space with finite asymptotic dimension and bounded geometry. For any afar element  $[x_i]$ , we have that  $\text{asdim } \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^{\omega} \leq \text{asdim } X$ .*

Before we prove this theorem, we still need the following preparation.

**Lemma 3.15.** *Let  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\}$  be a finite disjoint cover of  $X$ . Then  $\{U_1^{\omega}, \dots, U_n^{\omega}\}$  also forms a cover of  $X^{\omega}$ , where  $U_i^{\omega}$  is the ultrapower of  $U_i$  defined as Definition 2.2.*

*Proof.* For any  $[x_i] \in X^{\omega}$  and  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , define

$$I_k = \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid x_i \in U_k\}.$$



Since  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\}$  is a disjoint cover, each  $I_k$  is well-defined and forms a finite cover of  $\mathbb{N}$ . Since  $\omega$  is an ultrafilter, there exists a unique  $k$  such that  $I_k \in \omega$ . Choose a base point  $x_0 \in U_k$ , define

$$x'_i = \begin{cases} x_i, & i \in I_k \\ x_0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

then  $[x_i] = [x'_i] \in U_k^\omega$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.14.* Assume that  $\text{asdim } X = n$ . Then for any  $r > 0$ , there exists a  $r$ -disjoint and uniformly bounded family of subsets  $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathcal{U}^{(n)}$  such that  $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup \mathcal{U}^{(i)}$  forms a cover of  $X$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume  $\mathcal{U}$  is a disjoint cover and  $\text{diam}(U) \leq S$  for all  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ . For each  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , write

$$U_k = \bigsqcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}^{(k)}} U.$$

Then  $\{U_1, \dots, U_k\}$  forms a finite disjoint cover of  $X$ . By Lemma 3.15,  $\{U_1^\omega, \dots, U_n^\omega\}$  forms a cover of  $X^\omega$ . For any afar  $[x_i]$ , denoted by  $U_{\mathcal{L},k}^\omega = U_k^\omega \cap \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$ . Then it is clear that

$$\{U_{\mathcal{L},1}^\omega, \dots, U_{\mathcal{L},n}^\omega\}$$

forms a disjoint cover of  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$ . We then show that each  $U_{\mathcal{L},k}^\omega$  is a union of a family of uniformly bounded,  $r$ -disjoint sets.

If  $[y_i] \in U_{\mathcal{L},k}^\omega$ , then  $\mathcal{U}^{(k)}$  forms a cover of  $\{y_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Then for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a unique  $U_{y_i}^{(k)} \in \mathcal{U}^{(k)}$  such that  $y_i \in U_{y_i}^{(k)}$ . Define

$$U_{[y_i],k}^\omega = \{[w_i] \in U_{\mathcal{L},k}^\omega \mid w_i \in U_{y_i}^{(k)} \text{ for each } i \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

We then have that

- $\text{diam}(U_{[y_i],k}^\omega) \leq S$ . Indeed, for any  $[w_i], [v_i] \in U_{[y_i],k}^\omega$ , since  $\text{diam}(U_{y_i}^{(k)}) \leq S$ , then  $d(w_i, v_i) \leq S$  for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus  $d([w_i], [v_i]) \leq S$ .
- for any  $[w_i] \in U_{\mathcal{L},k}^\omega$  but  $[w_i] \notin U_{[y_i],k}^\omega$ , one has that  $d([w_i], U_{[y_i],k}^\omega) \geq r$ . Indeed, since  $[w_i] \notin U_{[y_i],k}^\omega$ , one has that

$$\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid w_i \in U_k \setminus (U_{y_i}^{(k)})\} \in \omega.$$

That means  $d(w_i, U_{y_i}^{(k)}) \geq r$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  since  $\mathcal{U}^{(k)}$  is  $r$ -disjoint. Thus  $d([w_i], U_{[y_i],k}^\omega) \geq r$ .

Repeat the process for another  $[z_i] \in U_{\mathcal{L},k}^\omega \setminus (U_{[y_i],k}^\omega)$ , one can then see  $U_{\mathcal{L},k}^\omega$  can be split into a family of  $r$ -disjoint, uniformly bounded sets for each  $k = 1, \dots, n$ . By definition, we conclude that  $\text{asdim } \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega \leq n$ .  $\square$

**Question.** *Is it true that  $\text{asdim } X$  is equal to the supremum of the asymptotic dimension of all limit spaces, i.e.,  $\text{asdim } X = \sup_{[x_i]: \text{afar}} \text{asdim } \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$ ?*

#### 4. LIMIT OPERATORS

In this section, we shall introduce the notion of limit operator in our setting. For the sake of brevity, we only consider the case when  $X$  is a strongly discrete metric space with bounded

geometry, and we only consider the operators on the Hilbert space  $\ell^2(X)$ . Actually, the same argument can also be used to deal with bounded operators on  $\ell^p(X, E)$ , where  $E$  is a Banach space and  $p \in (1, \infty)$ .

Throughout this paper, we shall always assume that the inner product on  $\ell^2(X)$  is linear on the second variable, and conjugate linear on the first variable. Let  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X))$  be a bounded operator. For any  $x, y \in X$ , the  $(x, y)$ -th entry of  $T$  is defined by

$$T(x, y) = \langle \delta_x, T\delta_y \rangle.$$

$T$  can also be viewed as a function from  $X \times X$  to  $\mathbb{C}$  which is defined by  $(x, y) \mapsto T(x, y)$ , it is called the *kernel function* associated with  $T$ . On the other hand, a kernel function is a bounded function  $k : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . Such a function is *operator norm bounded* if the associated operator  $T_k$  defined by

$$(T_k \xi)(y) = \sum_{x \in X} T(x, y) \xi(x), \quad \text{for any } \xi \in C_c(X)$$

extends to a bounded operator on  $\ell^2(X)$ . Let  $\ell^2(X^\omega)$  be the Hilbert space of all  $\ell^2$ -sequence on  $X^\omega$ . One should notice that the set  $X^\omega$  is uncountable whenever  $X$  is infinite, thus we should mention that an  $\ell^2$ -sequence on  $X^\omega$  is assumed to be countable. There is a canonical isometric inclusion  $\ell^2(X) \rightarrow \ell^2(X^\omega)$  induced by the canonical inclusion  $X \hookrightarrow X^\omega$  defined before.

A kernel function  $k \in \ell^\infty(X \times X)$  can be extended to a function  $\tilde{k} \in \ell^\infty(X^\omega \times X^\omega)$  by

$$\tilde{k}([x_i], [y_i]) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} k(x_i, y_i).$$

The corresponding  $k \mapsto \tilde{k}$  gives a map from kernel functions on  $X$  to kernel functions on  $X^\omega$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *The kernel function  $k \in \ell^\infty(X)$  is operator norm bounded if and only if  $\tilde{k} \in \ell^\infty(X^\omega)$  is operator norm bounded.*

*Proof.* ( $\Leftarrow$ ) Let  $P_X : \ell^2(X^\omega) \rightarrow \ell^2(X)$  be the canonical projection. One can see that  $T_k = P_X T_{\tilde{k}} P_X$  and this finishes the proof.

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Assume that  $T_k$  is bounded. That means for any complex numbers  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  with  $\sum_{k=1}^m |a_k|^2 = \sum_{l=1}^n |b_l|^2 = 1$ , and  $x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n \in X$ , one has that

$$\left| \sum_{k,l} \overline{a_k} \cdot b_l \cdot k(x_k, y_l) \right| \leq \|T_k\|.$$

Then for any  $[x_i^{(1)}], \dots, [x_i^{(m)}], [y_i^{(1)}], \dots, [y_i^{(n)}] \in X^\omega$ , one has that

$$\left| \sum_{k,l} \overline{a_k} \cdot b_l \cdot \tilde{k}([x_i^{(k)}], [y_i^{(l)}]) \right| = \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} \left| \sum_{k,l} \overline{a_k} \cdot b_l \cdot \tilde{k}(x_i^{(k)}, y_i^{(l)}) \right| \leq \|T_k\|.$$

Here we can exchange the order of  $\sum$  and  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \omega}$  since it is a finite sum. We then conclude that  $\|T_{\tilde{k}}\| \leq \|T_k\|$ , i.e.,  $\tilde{k}$  is operator norm bounded.  $\square$

**Remark 4.2.** The map  $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X^\omega))$  defined by  $T \mapsto \tilde{T}$ , where we view  $T$  as a kernel function on  $X$ . This map is a bounded linear map but not a homomorphism. For example, let

$X = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}_n$  be the coarse disjoint union of  $\{\mathbb{Z}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Define

$$T_n = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{n \times n},$$

viewed as a bounded operator on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ . Let

$$T = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T_n = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & & & \\ & T_2 & & \\ & & T_3 & \\ & & & \cdots \end{pmatrix} \in \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_n)) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X)).$$

We then have that  $\|T\| = 1$  and

$$T^*T = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} P_{\delta_0}^{(n)},$$

where  $P_{\delta_0}^{(n)}$  is the canonical projection onto the 1-dimensional space spanned by  $\delta_0 \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ ,  $0 \in \mathbb{Z}_n$  is the unit element.

For any afar  $[x_i] \in X^\omega$ , it is clear that  $\tilde{T}([x_i], [y_i]) = \tilde{T}([y_i], [x_i]) = 0$ . Then

$$(1 - P_X)\tilde{T} = \tilde{T}(1 - P_X) = 0,$$

where  $P_X : \ell^2(X^\omega) \rightarrow \ell^2(X)$  is the canonical projection. Then we conclude that

$$\tilde{T} = \begin{pmatrix} T & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X) \oplus \ell^2(X^\omega \setminus X)) = \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X^\omega)).$$

We then can calculate that

$$\tilde{T}^*\tilde{T} = \begin{pmatrix} T^*T & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

However, one can see that  $\widetilde{T^*T}([0^{(n)}], [0^{(n)}]) = 1$ , where  $0^{(n)} \in \mathbb{Z}_n$  is the unit element. Thus  $(1 - P_X)\widetilde{T^*T} \neq 0$ , which shows that

$$\widetilde{T^*T} \neq \tilde{T}^*\tilde{T}.$$

For a kernel function, the following two conditions will guarantee its operator norm boundedness. Moreover, when we narrow down our consideration to the following kinds of operators, the map defined by extension will become a homomorphism.

**Definition 4.3.** A kernel function  $k : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  has

- *finite measure amplification*, if there exists  $L > 0$  such that for any  $x \in X$ , one has that  $\#\{y \in X \mid k(x, y) \neq 0\} \leq L$  and  $\#\{y \in X \mid k(y, x) \neq 0\} \leq L$ ;
- *finite propagation*, if there exists  $R > 0$  such that  $k(x, y) = 0$  whenever  $d(x, y) \geq R$ .

We shall say an operator is of finite measure amplification (resp. finite propagation) if its corresponding kernel function is of finite measure amplification (resp. finite propagation).

Since  $X$  has bounded geometry, an operator with finite propagation has finite measure amplification. The proof of the following lemma shares the same idea with [WY20, Lemma 12.2.3].

**Lemma 4.4.** *A kernel function with finite measure amplification is operator norm bounded.*

*Proof.* Let  $k \in \ell^\infty(X \times X)$  be a kernel function with finite measure amplification. Choose  $F_1 \subseteq \text{supp}(k)$  to be a maximal set such that there is at most one element of the form  $(x, y)$  or  $(y, x)$  in  $F_1$ , the existence of  $F_1$  is guaranteed by Zorn's lemma. Having defined  $F_1, \dots, F_n$ , define  $F_{n+1}$  to be a maximal subset of  $\text{supp}(k) \setminus (F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_n)$  to be a maximal set such that there is at most one element of the form  $(x, y)$  or  $(y, x)$  in  $F_{n+1}$ . We claim that there is  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $F_n$  is empty for all  $n \geq N$ . Indeed, if not, there exists  $(x, y) \in \text{supp}(k)$  such that  $(x, y) \notin F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_n$ . Then one has that

$$\#\{z \in X \mid k(x, z) \neq 0\} \geq [n/2] \quad \text{or} \quad \#\{z \in X \mid k(z, y) \neq 0\} \geq [n/2],$$

this contradicts finite measure amplification. We then have that

$$\text{supp}(k) = F_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup F_N.$$

Define  $k_n \in \ell^\infty(X)$  to be the restriction of  $k$  on  $F_n$ . Then the operator  $T_{k_n}$  associated with the kernel function  $k_n$  satisfies that

$$\|T_{k_n}\| \leq \sup_{(x,y) \in F_n} \|k_n(x, y)\|.$$

To sum up,  $\|T_k\|$  is upper bounded by  $N \cdot \|k\|_\infty$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  is the canonical norm of the Banach space  $\ell^\infty(X \times X)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Assume that  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X))$  has finite measure amplification. Then  $\tilde{T}$  also has finite measure amplification.*

*Proof.* Fix  $[x_i] \in X^\omega$ . For any  $i \in I$ , we can label elements in the set

$$A_i = \{y \in X \mid T(x_i, y) \neq 0\}$$

with  $\{1, \dots, L\}$ , where such  $L$  exists by Definition 4.3. Say  $A_i = \{y_i^{(1)}, \dots, y_i^{(L)}\}$ . One can always assume the number  $\#A_i$  are equal for all  $y_i$ , since there exists a unique  $L$  such that the set  $\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid \#A_i = L\} \in \omega$ . Then for any sequence  $[z_i] \in X^\omega$  such that  $T([x_i], [z_i]) \neq 0$ , the set  $J = \{i \in I \mid \tilde{T}(x_i, z_i) \neq 0\}$  are in the ultrafilter  $\omega$ . It means that  $z_i = y_i^{(k)}$  for some  $k$  when  $i$  takes values in the set  $J$  above. Then split  $J$  into the finite disjoint union of  $J^{(k)}$ , where  $k \in \{1, \dots, L\}$  and

$$J^{(k)} = \{i \in J \mid z_i = y_i^{(k)}\}.$$

There must be some  $J^{(k)} \in \omega$ , thus  $[z_i] = [y_i^{(k)}] \in X^\omega$ . To sum up, there are only  $L$  elements  $[z_i] \in X^\omega$  such that  $\tilde{T}([x_i], [z_i]) \neq 0$ . Similarly, one can do the same thing to the column. This proves that  $\tilde{T}$  has finite measure amplification.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X))$  be an operator with finite measure amplification. Then for any  $S \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X))$ , we then have that*

$$\tilde{S}\tilde{T} = \tilde{S}\tilde{T} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{T}\tilde{S} = \tilde{T}\tilde{S}.$$

*Proof.* For any  $[x_i], [y_i] \in X^\omega$ , one has that

$$(\tilde{S}\tilde{T})([x_i], [y_i]) = \sum_{[z_i] \in X^\omega} \tilde{S}([x_i], [z_i]) \cdot \tilde{T}([z_i], [y_i]) \quad (3)$$

and

$$(\widetilde{ST})([x_i], [y_i]) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} \sum_{z_i \in X} \widetilde{S}(x_i, z_i) \cdot \widetilde{T}(z_i, y_i). \quad (4)$$

Since  $T$  has finite measure amplification, both equality above are finite sums by Lemma 4.5. For fixed  $[y_i]$ , there are at most  $L$  elements in  $X^\omega$ , say  $\{[z_i^{(1)}], \dots, [z_i^{(L)}]\}$  such that  $\widetilde{T}([z_i^{(k)}], [y_i]) \neq 0$  for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ . Thus (3) and (4) can be rewritten respectively as

$$(\widetilde{ST})([x_i], [y_i]) = \sum_{k=1}^L \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} \widetilde{S}(x_i, z_i^{(k)}) \cdot \widetilde{T}(z_i^{(k)}, y_i),$$

$$(\widetilde{ST})([x_i], [y_i]) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} \sum_{k=1}^L \widetilde{S}(x_i, z_i^{(k)}) \cdot \widetilde{T}(z_i^{(k)}, y_i).$$

Since the sum is finite, one can directly exchange the order of  $\sum_{k=1}^L$  and  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \omega}$ .  $\square$

For any  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X^\omega))$ , we can similarly discuss the propagation of  $T$  since there is a hyperreal metric on  $X^\omega$ , see Section 2. In this case, we say  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X^\omega))$  has *finite propagation* if  $\widetilde{T}([x_i], [y_i]) = 0$  whenever  $d^\omega([x_i], [y_i])$  is infinite.

**Lemma 4.7.** *Assume that  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X))$  is an operator with finite propagation, then  $\widetilde{T} \in \ell^2(X^\omega)$  also has finite propagation.*

*Proof.* Assume for a contradiction that  $\widetilde{T}$  has infinite propagation, i.e., there exists  $[x_i], [y_i] \in X^\omega$  such that  $|\widetilde{T}([x_i], [y_i])| = \varepsilon_0 > 0$  while  $d^\omega([x_i], [y_i])$  is infinite. Since  $T$  has finite propagation, then  $T(x, y) = 0$  whenever  $d(x, y) \geq R$  for some  $R > 0$ . By definition, there exists  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $d(x_i, y_i) > R$  and  $|T(x_i, y_i)| \geq \varepsilon/2$ , this leads to a contradiction.

Moreover, with a similar argument as above, if  $\text{Prop}(T) \leq R$ , then one also has that  $\text{Prop}(\widetilde{T}) \leq R$ .  $\square$

Now, we are ready to define the limit operator associated with a limit space.

**Definition 4.8.** Let  $X$  be a strongly discrete metric space with bounded geometry,  $[x_i]$  an afar element. Denote by  $P_{[x_i]} \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X^\omega))$  the canonical projection onto the subspace  $\ell^2(\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega)$ .

- The *algebraic uniform Roe algebra*, denoted by  $C_u[X]$ , is defined to be the set of all operators  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X))$  with finite propagation.
- The *uniform Roe algebra*, denoted by  $C_u^*(X)$ , is defined to be the norm closure of  $C_u[X]$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X))$ .
- For any  $T \in C_u^*(X)$ , the *limit operator of  $T$  associated with  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$* , denoted by  $\widetilde{T}_{[x_i]}$ , is defined by

$$\widetilde{T}_{[x_i]} = P_{[x_i]} T P_{[x_i]},$$

viewed as an operator on  $\ell^2(\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega)$ .

**Theorem 4.9.** *Let  $X$  be a strongly discrete metric space with bounded geometry,  $[x_i]$  an afar element. Then the map  $T \mapsto \widetilde{T}_{[x_i]}$  defines a  $C^*$ -homomorphism*

$$\Phi : C_u^*(X) \rightarrow C_u^*(\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega).$$



where  $t_{\alpha_X}$  and  $t_{\beta_X}$  are the partial translations associated with  $\alpha_X$  and  $\beta_X$ , respectively. By Theorem 2.13, the map  $F : \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega \rightarrow X(\omega_X)$  defined by

$$[y_i] \mapsto \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} y_i \in \beta X$$

is an isometry. Define  $U : \ell^2(\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega) \rightarrow \ell^2(X(\omega))$  by  $\delta_{[y_i]} \mapsto \delta_{F([y_i])}$ . For any  $[y_i], [z_i] \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega$ , combining the construction in Theorem 2.13, one directly has that

$$(U^* \Phi_\omega(T) U)([y_i], [z_i]) = (\Phi_\omega(T))(F([y_i]), F([z_i])) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} T(y_i, z_i) = \tilde{T}_{[x_i]}([y_i], [z_i]).$$

This finishes the proof.  $\square$

## 5. FREDHOLM THEORY AND UNIFORM ROE ALGEBRAS

In this section, we shall study the Fredholm theory for operators with bounded propagation. Such operators are also called band-dominated operators whose Fredholm theory has been widely studied, especially for operators in  $\ell^p(\mathbb{Z}^n)$  with  $p \in [1, \infty)$ . The reader is referred to [RRS04, Sei14] for relative discussion. One of the most successful methods for this question is so-called the limit operator method. In [ŠW17], J. Spakula and R. Willett generalized this method and studied the Fredholm theory for Band-dominated operators on a metric space with Yu's Property A. In this paper, we shall provide a new approach to this theory by using the ultraproduct construction. For the sake of brevity, we shall only study the case for  $p = 2$ . Before we state the main theorem of this paper, we still need the following two definitions.

**Definition 5.1.** An operator  $T \in C_u^*(X)$  is called a *ghost operator* if for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a bounded  $K \subseteq X$  such that  $|T(x, y)| \leq \varepsilon$  for all  $(x, y) \notin K \times K$ .

Ghost operators are introduced by G. Yu to study the coarse Baum-Connes conjecture. It is easy to check that all ghost operators form an ideal of  $C_u^*(X)$ , this ideal is called the ghost ideal, denoted by  $\mathcal{G}$ . An operator in  $C_u^*(X)$  is called  $\mathcal{G}$ -Fredholm if  $\pi(T) \in C_u^*(X)/\mathcal{G}$  is invertible, where  $\pi : C_u^*(X) \rightarrow C_u^*(X)/\mathcal{G}$  is the canonical quotient map.

**Definition 5.2.** Let  $T \in C_u^*(X)$ ,  $\sigma_\omega(T)$  the symbol of  $T$ . Then

- $\sigma_\omega(T)$  is *elementwise invertible* if  $\tilde{T}_{[x_i]}$  is invertible for any  $\tilde{T}_{[x_i]} \in \sigma_\omega(T)$ ;
- $\sigma_\omega(T)$  is *uniformly invertible* if  $\sigma_\omega(T)$  is elementary invertible and there exists  $M > 0$  such that  $\|\tilde{T}_{[x_i]}^{-1}\| \leq M$  for any  $\tilde{T}_{[x_i]} \in \sigma_\omega(T)$ .

The main result of this section is stated as follows.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $X$  be a strongly discrete metric space with bounded geometry. Then*

- (1)  $T \in C_u^*(X)$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -Fredholm if and only if  $\sigma_\omega(T)$  is uniformly invertible.
- (2) If we moreover assume  $X$  has Property A at infinity, then  $\sigma_\omega(T)$  is uniformly invertible if and only if  $\sigma_\omega(T)$  and  $\sigma_{\omega \times \omega}(T)$  are elementwise invertible.

By Remark 2.20 and Theorem 4.11,  $\sigma_\omega(T)$  only contains a part of the limit operators defined in [ŠW17]. To that extent, our result has made some progress based on [ŠW17, Theorem 5.1]. The second item in Theorem 5.3 is so-called the “big question”. In [ŠW17], the space  $X$  is required to be with Property A, and we weaken the condition to that  $X$  has Property A at infinity in this paper.

**5.1. Operator norm localization and Ghost operators.** Before we start the proof, we shall first discuss the relationship between Theorem 5.3 and [ŠW17, Theorem 5.1]. Recall that in [RW14], R. Willett and J. Roe show that a metric space has *Yu's Property A* if and only if all ghost operators in  $C_u^*(X)$  are compact. Property A is first introduced by G. Yu in [Yu00] to provide a sufficient condition for coarse embedding into Hilbert space. Developed over the last decades, it now has various equivalent definitions. In this paper, we shall recall the equivalent definition for Property A named *operator norm localization property* (abbrev. (ONL)). This property is introduced in [CTWY08]. For metric space with bounded geometry, ONL is equivalent to Property A, see [BNŠ<sup>+</sup>13, Sak14].

**Definition 5.4.** Let  $X$  be a metric space with bounded geometry.  $X$  has *operator norm localization property* (ONL for short) if for any  $c \in (0, 1)$  and  $R > 0$ , there exists  $S > 0$  satisfying that for any  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X))$  with  $\text{Prop}(T) \leq R$ , there exists  $\xi \in \ell^2(X)$  with  $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\xi)) \leq S$  such that

$$\|T\xi\| \geq c\|T\| \cdot \|\xi\|.$$

The “regular” method to prove that all ghost operators on spaces with Property A are compact is to use the Schur multiplier (constructed by using Property A) to show any ghost operator can be approximated in norm by ghost operators with finite propagation, see [Roe03, CW05] for examples. While ghost operators with finite propagation are compact, this finishes the proof. In this section, we shall provide a new proof.

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $X$  be a metric space with ONL and bounded geometry. Then all ghost operators in  $C_u^*(X)$  are compact.*

*Proof.* Assume  $T \in C_u^*(X)$  is a non-compact ghost. Without loss of generality, assume that the equivalent class of  $T$  has *norm one* in the Calkin algebra  $\mathcal{Q}(\ell^2(X)) = \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X))/\mathcal{K}$ . We shall begin with the following claim.

**Claim.** For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $S > 0$ , there exists a bounded  $K \subseteq X$  such that for any  $\xi \in \ell^2(X \setminus K)$  with  $\|\xi\| = 1$  and  $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\xi)) \leq S$ , one has that

$$\|T\xi\| \leq \varepsilon.$$

*Proof of Claim.* Since  $X$  has bounded geometry, there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\#B(x, S/2) \leq N$ . Then for any  $\xi$  with  $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\xi)) \leq S$ , one can write  $\xi = \sum_{i=1}^N a_i \delta_{x_i}$ , where we denote  $\text{supp}(\xi) = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$  and  $\delta_i$  is the Dirac function on  $x_i$ .

All ghost operators in  $C_u^*(X)$  form a closed ideal of  $C_u^*(X)$ , thus  $T^*T$  is also a ghost element. By the definition of ghost operator, there exists  $K \subseteq X$  such that  $|(T^*T)(x, y)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{N^2}$ . If  $\text{supp}(\xi) \subseteq X \setminus K$ , then

$$\|T\xi\|^2 = \langle T\xi, T\xi \rangle = \langle \xi, T^*T\xi \rangle = \left| \sum_{i,j=1}^N a_i \bar{a}_j (T^*T)(x_i, x_j) \right| \leq \varepsilon^2 \cdot \sum_{i,j=1}^N \frac{1}{N^2} = \varepsilon^2.$$

To sum up, one has that  $\|T\xi\| \leq \varepsilon$ . This proves the claim.

Take  $T_0 \in C_u[X]$  with  $\text{Prop}(T_0) = R$  and  $\|T - T_0\| \leq \frac{1}{3}$ . Then  $\|T_0\|$  is larger than  $\frac{2}{3}$  in the Calkin algebra, which means  $T_0$  is non-compact. Then for any bounded set  $K$ , viewing  $\chi_{K^c}$  as a bounded operator, we have that  $\|T_0 \cdot \chi_{K^c}\| \geq \frac{2}{3}$ . Since  $X$  has ONL, there exists  $S \geq 0$  such that for any



bounded  $K \subseteq X$  there exists  $\xi \in \ell^2(X)$  with  $\|\xi\| = 1$  and  $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\xi)) \leq S$  and

$$\|T_0 \cdot \chi_{K^c}(\xi)\| \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

By using the Claim above, for such above  $S$ , there exists bounded  $K \subseteq X$  such that for any  $\xi \in \ell^2(X)$  with  $\|\xi\| = 1$  and  $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\xi)) \leq S$ , one has that  $\|T\chi_{K^c}(\xi)\| < \frac{1}{6}$ . Then

$$\|(T - T_0)\chi_{K^c}(\xi)\| > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6} = \frac{1}{3}.$$

However,  $\|(T - T_0)\chi_{K^c}\| \leq \|T - T_0\| \leq \frac{1}{3}$ , which leads to a contradiction.  $\square$

It is direct to check that spaces with Property A have Property A at infinity. As a corollary of Theorem 5.3 and Theorem 5.5, we have the following result.

**Corollary 5.6.** *Let  $X$  be a strongly discrete metric space with bounded geometry and ONL. Then the following are equivalent.*

- $T \in C_u^*(X)$  is Fredholm;
- $\sigma_\omega(T)$  is uniformly invertible;
- for any  $\mu \in \beta\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\sigma_\omega(T)$  and  $\sigma_{\omega \times \mu}(T)$  are elementwise invertible.  $\square$

It is worth mentioning specifically that the method used in our proof can also be applied parallelly to  $\ell^p$ -spaces. But for the sake of brevity, we only provide the  $\ell^2$  version of the proof here, which is already sufficiently enlightening.

**5.2. Proof of the main theorem.** Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 5.3. Denoted by

$$P_\sigma : \ell^2(X^\omega) \rightarrow \ell^2(X^\omega \setminus X) = \bigoplus_{[x_i] \in \text{Clu}(X)} \ell^2(\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega)$$

the canonical projection. Then one has that

$$P_\sigma \tilde{T} P_\sigma = \bigoplus \tilde{T}_{[x_i]} = \begin{pmatrix} T_{[x_i]} & & \\ & T_{[y_i]} & \\ & & \ddots \end{pmatrix} \in \prod_{[x_i] \in \text{Clu}(X)} C_u^*(\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega),$$

we denoted by  $\tilde{T}_\sigma = P_\sigma \tilde{T} P_\sigma$  for simplicity. As a natural corollary of Theorem 4.9, the map  $T \mapsto \tilde{T}_\sigma$  induces a  $C^*$ -homomorphism

$$\Phi_\sigma : C_u^*(X) \rightarrow \prod_{[x_i] \in \text{Clu}(X)} C_u^*(\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega).$$

*Proof of Theorem 5.3 (1).* We claim that  $\ker(\Phi_\sigma) = \mathcal{G}$ . For any  $T \in \mathcal{G}$ , it is clear that

$$\tilde{T}([x_i], [y_i]) = 0$$

whenever  $[x_i], [y_i]$  are afar. Thus it suffices to show that  $\ker(\Phi_\sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ . Fix a base point  $x_0 \in X$ . Assume that  $T \notin \mathcal{G}$ , then there exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that for any bounded  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $(x_n, y_n) \notin B(x_0, n) \times B(x_0, n)$  such that  $|T(x_n, y_n)| \geq \varepsilon_0$ . Then at least one of  $[x_i]$  and  $[y_i]$  is afar and  $\tilde{T}([x_i], [y_i]) \geq \varepsilon_0$ . Since  $T \in C_u^*(X)$ , by Lemma 4.7, both  $[x_i]$  and  $[y_i]$  are afar and  $d^\omega([x_i], [y_i])$  is finite. Thus  $\tilde{T}_{[x_i]}$  is non-zero. This shows that  $\ker(\Phi_\sigma) = \mathcal{G}$ .

Denoted by

$$\text{Symb}(X) \subseteq \prod_{[x_i] \in \text{Clu}(X)} C_u^*(\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]}^\omega)$$

the  $C^*$ -subalgebra generated by  $\{\tilde{T}_\sigma \mid T \in C_u^*(X)\}$ . We then have the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow C_u^*(X) \xrightarrow{\Phi_\sigma} \text{Symb}(X) \rightarrow 0.$$

Then  $T \in C_u^*(X)$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -Fredholm if and only if  $\Phi_\sigma(T)$  is invertible, i.e.,  $\oplus \tilde{T}_{[x_i]}$  is invertible. This means  $\tilde{T}_{[x_i]}$  is invertible and the inverse of all  $\tilde{T}_{[x_i]}$  has a uniform bound, i.e.,  $\sigma_\omega(T)$  is uniformly invertible.  $\square$

For the second item, we still need some preparations. For any  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X))$ , the *lower norm* of  $T$ , denoted by  $\nu(T)$ , is defined to be

$$\nu(T) = \inf\{\|T\xi\| \mid \xi \in \ell^2(X) \text{ with } \|\xi\| = 1\}.$$

Moreover, for any  $F \subseteq X$ , we shall denote

$$\nu(T \cdot \chi_F) = \inf\{\|T\xi\| \mid \xi \in \ell^2(F) \text{ with } \|\xi\| = 1\}.$$

If  $T$  is invertible, then  $\nu(T) = \|T^{-1}\|^{-1} \neq 0$ . For spaces with ONL, one can also show that the lower norm of an operator  $T \in C_u[X]$  can also be approximated by bounded supported vectors  $\xi \in \ell^2(X)$  whose diameter is only dependent on  $\text{Prop}(T)$ .

**Proposition 5.7** ([ŠW17]). *Let  $\{X_i\}$  be a sequence of metric space with uniform Property A and bounded geometry. For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $R > 0$ , there exists  $S > 0$  such that for any  $T \in C_u[X_i]$  with  $\text{Prop}(T) \leq R$  and  $\|T\| = 1$ , for any  $F \subseteq X_i$ , there exists  $A \subseteq F$  with  $\text{diam}(A) \leq S$  such that*

$$\nu(T \cdot \chi_F) \leq \nu(T \cdot \chi_A) \leq \nu(T \cdot \chi_F) + \varepsilon,$$

for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\square$

The proposition above has been proved in [ŠW17, Proposition 7.6]. The difference is that we state a uniform version here. The constant  $S$  only depends on  $R$ ,  $\varepsilon$ , and Property A of  $X_i$ , the result holds directly since  $\{X_i\}$  has uniform Property A (see Definition 3.10).

Fix another ultrafilter  $\mu \in \beta\mathbb{N}$ . For each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , we choose a sequence  $(x_{ij})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  whose equivalent class  $[x_{ij}]$  defines an afar element in  $X^\omega$ . Then  $\{\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  forms a sequence of metric spaces. Denote by  $\prod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$  the set of all sequences as in Definition 2.2 by viewing  $X_j = \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$ . An element in  $\prod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$  is denoted by a sequence  $([y_{ij}])_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  where for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $[y_{ij}] \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$  is the equivalent class of sequence  $(y_{ij})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $X$  indexed by  $i$ . Define

$$\prod_{j \rightarrow \mu}^m \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega = \left\{ ([y_{ij}]) \in \prod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega \mid \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} d_{\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega}([x_{ij}], [y_{ij}]) < \infty \right\} / \sim,$$

where

$$([y_{ij}]) \sim ([z_{ij}]) \iff \{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid [y_{ij}] = [z_{ij}]\} \in \mu.$$

The equivalent class of  $(y_{ij})$  is denoted as  $[y_{ij}]_m$ . The metric on  $\prod_{j \rightarrow \mu}^m \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$  is given by

$$d([y_{ij}]_m, [z_{ij}]_m) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \mu} d_{\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega}([y_{ij}], [z_{ij}]).$$

Since each  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$  is strongly discrete, this metric is well-defined by using a similar proof with Proposition 2.6, and  $\prod_{j \rightarrow \mu}^m \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$  is strongly discrete with bounded geometry under this metric. This construction is known as the *metric ultraproduct* of  $\{\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ . The letter “m” on  $\prod^m$  is the abbreviation for metric product.

Let  $\omega \times \mu$  be an ultrafilter on  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  as in Definition 2.18. We shall also view  $(x_{ij})$  as a sequence in  $X$  indexed by  $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ . To clarify the equivalent class in  $X^{\omega \times \mu}$ , element in  $X^{\omega \times \mu}$  is denoted by  $[x_{ij}]_n$  to make a distinction. Then  $[x_{ij}]_n$  is an afar element in  $X^{\omega \times \mu}$ . Indeed, for any  $x_0 \in X$  and  $R > 0$ , one has that

$$A_j = \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(x_{ij}, x_0) > R\} \in \omega,$$

since  $[x_{ij}] \in X^\omega$  is afar for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, by definition, one has that

$$\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \mid d(x_{ij}, x_0) > R\} = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \mid i \in A_j\} \in \omega \times \mu.$$

This means that  $d^{\omega \times \mu}(x_0, [x_{ij}]_n) > R$  for any  $R > 0$ , thus  $[x_{ij}]_n$  is afar. Define  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]_n}^{\omega \times \mu}$  to be the limit space of  $X$  with respect to the base point  $[x_{ij}]_n$  and ultrafilter  $\omega \times \mu$ .

Notice that for each  $[y_{ij}]_m \in \prod_{j \rightarrow \mu}^m \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$ , we can view it as a sequence indexed by  $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ . By definition, one has that there exists  $R > 0$  such that for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(x_{ij}, y_{ij}) < R\} \in \omega.$$

Thus  $(y_{ij})$  defines an element in  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]_n}^{\omega \times \mu}$ . Define

$$F : \prod_{j \rightarrow \mu}^m \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]_n}^{\omega \times \mu} \quad (6)$$

by  $[y_{ij}]_m \mapsto [y_{ij}]_n$ .

**Lemma 5.8.** *The map  $F$  as in (6) is a bijective isometry.*

*Proof.* For any  $[y_{ij}]_m, [z_{ij}]_m \in \prod_{j \rightarrow \mu}^m \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$  with  $d([y_{ij}]_m, [z_{ij}]_m)$ , by definition, it means that

$$\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid d([y_{ij}], [z_{ij}]) = R\} \in \mu,$$

and

$$\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(y_{ij}, z_{ij}) = R\} \in \omega.$$

By definition, this means that

$$\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \mid d(y_{ij}, z_{ij}) = R\} \in \omega \times \mu.$$

To see  $F$  is surjective, if  $[y_{ij}]_n \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]_n}^{\omega \times \mu}$ , it means that there exists  $R > 0$  such that

$$A = \{y_{ij} \mid d(y_{ij}, x_{ij}) \leq R\} \in \omega \times \mu.$$

Define a sequence  $z_{ij}$  by

$$z_{ij} = \begin{cases} y_{ij}, & (i, j) \in A; \\ x_{ij}, & (i, j) \notin A. \end{cases}$$

Then  $(z_{ij})$  defines an element in  $\prod_{j \rightarrow \mu}^m \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$  with  $F([z_{ij}]_m) = [y_{ij}]_n$ .  $\square$

Let  $T \in \mathbf{C}_u[X]$ . Denoted by  $\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]}$  the limit operator of  $T$  associated with the limit space  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$  for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . To clarify the notation, we shall denote the limit operator of  $T$  associated with  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]_n}^{\omega \times \mu}$  by  $\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_n}$ . Define the kernel function  $k$  on  $\prod_{j \rightarrow \mu}^m \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$  by

$$k([y_{ij}]_m, [z_{ij}]_m) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \mu} \tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]}([y_{ij}], [z_{ij}]). \quad (7)$$

Since  $\text{Prop}(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]}) \leq \text{Prop}(T)$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , one can also show that  $\text{Prop}(k) \leq \text{Prop}(T)$  by using a similar proof with Lemma 4.7. As a result of Lemma 4.4,  $k$  is operator norm bounded. We shall denote the operator associated with this kernel function by

$$\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_m} \in \mathcal{B}\left(\ell^2\left(\prod_{j \rightarrow \mu}^m \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega\right)\right).$$

Let  $F$  be the isometry defined as in Lemma 5.8. Define

$$U_F : \ell^2\left(\prod_{j \rightarrow \mu}^m \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega\right) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]_n}^{\omega \times \mu}) \quad \text{by} \quad \delta_{[y_{ij}]_m} \mapsto \delta_{[y_{ij}]_n} = \delta_{F([y_{ij}]_m)}.$$

It is direct that  $U_F$  is a unitary since  $F$  is an isometry. We then have the following result.

**Lemma 5.9.** *With the notation stated above, one has that*

$$U_F \tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_m} U_F^* = \tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_n}.$$

The proof of Lemma 5.9 follows directly from an elementary calculation combining Lemma 5.8. One only needs to check that

$$U_F \tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_m} U_F^*([y_{ij}]_n, [z_{ij}]_n) = \tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_n}([y_{ij}]_n, [z_{ij}]_n).$$

We leave the details to the reader.

Now, we are ready to prove the second part of Theorem 5.3. Since the proof is quite technical, we shall split it into several lemmas.

**Lemma 5.10.** *Assume that  $T \in \mathbf{C}_u[X]$  and  $\{[x_{ij}]\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of afar elements in  $X^\omega$  such that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \mu} \nu(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]} \cdot \chi_{B([x_{ij}], R)}) = c$ . Then we have that*

$$\nu(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_m} \cdot \chi_{B([x_{ij}]_m, R)}) = c.$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.16 and the fact that  $X$  has bounded geometry, the sequence  $\{\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  has uniform bounded geometry, the metric ultraproduct  $\prod_{j \rightarrow \mu}^m \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$  also has bounded geometry. Since  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \mu} \nu(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]} \cdot \chi_{B([x_{ij}], R)}) = c$ , for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $D \in \mu$  such that  $|\nu(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]} \cdot \chi_{B([x_{ij}], R)}) - c| \leq \frac{1}{2n}$  for any  $j \in D$ . By definition of lower-norm, for each  $j \in D$ , there exists  $\xi_j \in \ell^2(\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega)$  with  $\|\xi_j\| = 1$  and  $\text{supp}(\xi_j) \subseteq B([x_{ij}], R)$  such that

$$\left| \|\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]} \xi_j\| - c \right| \leq \frac{1}{n}.$$

Define  $\xi \in \ell^2(\prod_{j \rightarrow \mu}^m \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega)$  by

$$\xi([y_{ij}]_m) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \mu} \xi_j([y_{ij}]).$$

Notice that  $\xi([y_{ij}]_m) \neq 0$  if and only if

$$\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid [y_{ij}] \in A_j\} \in \mu.$$

Since  $\{\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega\}$  has uniformly bounded geometry, there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\#B([x_{ij}], R) \leq N$  for any  $j \in D$ . By using a similar trick with Lemma 4.5, one can see that  $\#\text{supp}(\xi) \leq N$ . Moreover, one also has that

$$\|\xi\|^2 = \sum |\xi([y_{ij}]_m)|^2 = \sum \lim_{j \rightarrow \mu} |\xi_j([y_{ij}])|^2 = \lim_{j \rightarrow \mu} \sum |\xi_j([y_{ij}])|^2 = \lim_{j \rightarrow \mu} \|\xi_j\| = 1.$$

Notice that we can exchange the order of  $\sum$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \mu}$  since it is a finite sum. Moreover, the support  $\text{supp}(\xi) \subseteq B([x_{ij}]_m, R)$ .

Note that

$$\|\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_m} \xi\|^2 = \sum_{[y_{ij}]_m, [z_{ij}]_m} \left| \tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_m}([y_{ij}]_m, [z_{ij}]_m) \cdot \xi([z_{ij}]_m) \right|^2. \quad (8)$$

Since  $T$  has finite propagation, one then concludes that the limit operator  $\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_n}$  has finite propagation. By Lemma 5.9 and  $F$  is an isometry,  $\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_m}$  also has finite propagation. Thus the sum in (8) is a finite sum. Thus we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_m} \xi\|^2 &= \sum_{[y_{ij}]_m, [z_{ij}]_m} \lim_{j \rightarrow \mu} \left| \tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_m}([y_{ij}], [z_{ij}]) \cdot \xi_j([z_{ij}]) \right|^2 \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \mu} \sum_{[y_{ij}], [z_{ij}]} \left| \tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_m}([y_{ij}], [z_{ij}]) \cdot \xi_j([z_{ij}]) \right|^2 \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \mu} \|\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_m} \xi_j\|. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $\left| \nu(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_m} \cdot \chi_{B([x_{ij}]_m, R)}) - c \right| \leq \frac{1}{n}$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We finish the proof.  $\square$

The following lemma shares the same strategy with [LS14, Theorem 8] and [ŠW17, Theorem 7.13], but in an ultraproduct setting. We still assume  $T \in \mathbf{C}_u[X]$  and  $\{[x_{ij}]\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  to be a sequence of afar elements in  $X^\omega$  such that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \mu} \nu(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]} \cdot \chi_{B([x_{ij}], R)}) = 0$ . Since  $X$  has Property A at infinity, thus the sequence of limit space  $\{\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega\}$  has uniform Property A by Theorem 3.12. Thus for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we denote  $S_n$  to be the parameter as in Proposition 5.7 associated with  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2^n}$  and  $R = \text{Prop}(T)$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $S_n > 2S_{n-1}$ .

**Lemma 5.11.** *With the notation stated above, for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , one can find  $[y_{ij}] \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$  such that for any  $n \in \{1, \dots, j\}$ ,*

$$\nu(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]} \cdot \chi_{B([y_{ij}], 3S_n)}) \leq \nu(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]}) + \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}.$$

The Lemma above is to say the process of lower norm localization can be realized in the neighborhood of the same point as the parameter  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2^n}$  varies within a finite range.

*Proof of Lemma 5.11.* To simplify the notation, we shall denote  $A = \tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]}$ . By using Property A, there exists  $\eta_0 \in \ell^2(\mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega)$  with  $\|\eta_0\| = 1$  such that  $\text{supp}(\eta_0) \subseteq B([y_{ij}^{(0)}], S_j)$  for some  $[y_{ij}^{(0)}] \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$ ,

and

$$\nu(A) \leq \|A\eta_0\| \leq \nu(A) + \frac{1}{2^j}.$$

To simplify the notation, we shall denote  $F_0 = B([y_{ij}^{(0)}], S_j)$ . Use Proposition 5.7 to  $A \cdot \chi_{F_0}$  associated with parameter  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2^{j-1}}$ , we conclude that there exists  $\eta_1 \in \ell^2(F_0)$  with  $\|\eta_0\| = 1$  such that  $\text{supp}(\eta_1) \subseteq B([y_{ij}^{(1)}], S_{j-1})$  for some  $[y_{ij}^{(1)}] \in F_0$ , and

$$\nu(A \cdot \chi_{F_0}) \leq \|A\eta_1\| \leq \nu(A \cdot \chi_{F_0}) + \frac{1}{2^{j-1}}.$$

Now, we conclude that

$$\|A\eta_1\| \leq \nu(A) + \frac{1}{2^j} + \frac{1}{2^{j-1}} \leq \frac{1}{2^{j-2}}.$$

Moreover, one can also check that  $\text{supp}(\eta_0) \subseteq B([y_{ij}^{(1)}], 2S_j + S_{j-1}) \subseteq B([y_{ij}^{(1)}], 3S_j)$ . By induction, we can obtain a sequence of  $\{y_{ij}^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^j$  and a sequence of unit vectors  $\{\eta_n\}_{n=1}^j$  such that

- for any  $n \in \{1, \dots, j\}$ ,  $\|A\eta_n\| \leq \nu(A) + \frac{1}{2^{j-n-1}}$ ;
- for any  $n \in \{1, \dots, j\}$ ,  $\text{supp}(\eta_n) \subseteq B([y_{ij}^{(n)}], S_{j-1})$ ;
- for any  $n \in \{1, \dots, j\}$  and  $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ ,  $\text{supp}(\eta_k) \subseteq B([y_{ij}^{(n)}], 3S_{n-k+1})$ .

Choose  $[y_{ij}] = [y_{ij}^{(j)}]$  in the above sequence. We then conclude that

$$\text{supp}(\eta_{n+1}) \subseteq B([y_{ij}], 3S_{j-n}).$$

Then

$$\nu(A \cdot \chi_{B([y_{ij}], 3S_n)}) \leq \|A\eta_{j-n+1}\| \leq \nu(A) + \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}.$$

This finishes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.3 (2).* If  $\sigma_\omega(T)$  is uniformly invertible, by using Theorem 5.3 (1), one concludes that  $T$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -Fredholm. Then  $\sigma_{\omega \times \mu}(T)$  is uniformly invertible, which is clearly elementwise invertible. Thus we only need to show the sufficiency part.

Assume for a contradiction that  $\sigma_\omega(T)$  is not uniformly invertible, i.e., there exists a sequence of limit operators  $\{\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]}\}$  such that  $\|\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]}\| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . Then  $\nu(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $j$  tends to infinity. Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $\|T\| = 1$  and  $T$  is of finite propagation since  $\nu(T - S) \leq \|T - S\|$  and the norm of limit operators of  $T$  is less than  $\|T\|$ . Write  $R = \text{Prop}(T)$ .

By Lemma 5.11, there exists  $[y_{ij}] \in \mathcal{L}_{[x_{ij}]}^\omega$  such that for any  $n \in \{1, \dots, j\}$ ,

$$\nu(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]} \cdot \chi_{B([y_{ij}], 3S_n)}) \leq \nu(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]}) + \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}.$$

Without loss of generality, we can replace  $[x_{ij}]$  by  $[y_{ij}]$  for the base point of the limit spaces, which gives us the same limit operators, i.e.,

$$\nu(\tilde{T}_{[y_{ij}]} \cdot \chi_{B([y_{ij}], 3S_n)}) \leq \nu(\tilde{T}_{[y_{ij}]}) + \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}.$$

Thus the sequence  $\{\nu(\tilde{T}_{[y_{ij}]} \cdot \chi_{B([y_{ij}], 3S_n)})\}$  forms a bounded sequence. As we discussed above, let  $\tilde{T}_{[y_{ij}]_m}$  be the operator defined as in (7). We claim that  $\nu(\tilde{T}_{[y_{ij}]_m}) = 0$ . Indeed, by Lemma 5.10, we have that

$$\nu(\tilde{T}_{[y_{ij}]_m} \cdot \chi_{B([x_{ij}]_m, R)}) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \mu} \nu(\tilde{T}_{[y_{ij}]} \cdot \chi_{B([y_{ij}], 3S_n)}) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \mu} \nu(\tilde{T}_{[y_{ij}]}) + \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}.$$

Thus  $\nu(\tilde{T}_{[y_{ij}]_m}) \leq \nu(\tilde{T}_{[y_{ij}]_m} \cdot \chi_{B([x_{ij}]_m, R)}) \leq \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus  $\nu(\tilde{T}_{[y_{ij}]_m}) = 0$ . By Lemma 5.9, it leads to a contradiction since  $\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_n}$  is invertible as it is the limit operator associated with  $\mathcal{L}_{[x_i]_n}^{\omega \times \mu}$  by assumption but

$$\nu(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_m}) = \nu(\tilde{T}_{[x_{ij}]_n}) = 0.$$

This finishes the proof.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [BBF<sup>+</sup>22] F. P. Baudier, B. M. Braga, I. Farah, A. Khukhro, A. Vignati, and Rufus Willett. Uniform Roe algebras of uniformly locally finite metric spaces are rigid. *Invent. Math.*, 230(3):1071–1100, 2022.
- [BNŠ<sup>+</sup>13] J. Brodzki, G. A. Niblo, J. Špakula, R. Willett, and N. Wright. Uniform local amenability. *J. Noncommut. Geom.*, 7(2):583–603, 2013.
- [CTWY08] X. Chen, R. Tessera, X. Wang, and G. Yu. Metric sparsification and operator norm localization. *Adv. Math.*, 218(5):1496–1511, 2008.
- [CW05] X. Chen and Q. Wang. Ghost ideals in uniform Roe algebras of coarse spaces. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 84(6):519–526, 2005.
- [DGLY02] A. N. Dranishnikov, G. Gong, V. Lafforgue, and G. Yu. Uniform embeddings into Hilbert space and a question of Gromov. *Canad. Math. Bull.*, 45(1):60–70, 2002.
- [DGWZ22] J. Deng, L. Guo, Q. Wang, and Y. Zhang. Coarse embeddings at infinity and generalized expanders at infinity. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2206.11151, June 2022.
- [Gol22] I. Goldbring. *Ultrafilters throughout mathematics*, volume 220 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, [2022] ©2022.
- [Gro93] M. Gromov. Asymptotic invariants of infinite groups. In *Geometric group theory, Vol. 2 (Sussex, 1991)*, volume 182 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 1–295. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [HR00] N. Higson and J. Roe. Amenable group actions and the Novikov conjecture. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 519:143–153, 2000.
- [Ima19] T. Imamura. Nonstandard methods in large-scale topology. *Topology Appl.*, 257:67–84, 2019.
- [Kei10] H. J. Keisler. The ultraproduct construction. In *Ultrafilters across mathematics*, volume 530 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 163–179. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.
- [LS14] M. Lindner and M. Seidel. An affirmative answer to a core issue on limit operators. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 267(3):901–917, 2014.
- [NY23] P. W. Nowak and G. Yu. *Large scale geometry*. EMS Textbooks in Mathematics. EMS Press, Berlin, second edition, [2023] ©2023.
- [Pil18] T. Pillon. Coarse amenability at infinity. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1812.11745, December 2018.

- [Roe03] J. Roe. *Lectures on coarse geometry*, volume 31 of *University Lecture Series*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [Roe05] J. Roe. Band-dominated Fredholm operators on discrete groups. *Integral Equations Operator Theory*, 51(3):411–416, 2005.
- [RRS04] V. Rabinovich, S. Roch, and B. Silberman. *Limit operators and their applications in operator theory*, volume 150 of *Operator Theory: Advances and Applications*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2004.
- [RW14] J. Roe and R. Willett. Ghostbusting and property A. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 266(3):1674–1684, 2014.
- [Sak14] H. Sako. Property A and the operator norm localization property for discrete metric spaces. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 690:207–216, 2014.
- [Sei14] M. Seidel. Fredholm theory for band-dominated and related operators: a survey. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 445:373–394, 2014.
- [ŠW17] J. Špakula and R. Willett. A metric approach to limit operators. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 369(1):263–308, 2017.
- [WY20] R. Willett and G. Yu. *Higher index theory*, volume 189 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2020.
- [WZ23] Q. Wang and J. Zhang. Ghostly ideals in uniform Roe algebras. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2301.04921, January 2023.
- [Yu00] G. Yu. The coarse Baum-Connes conjecture for spaces which admit a uniform embedding into Hilbert space. *Invent. Math.*, 139(1):201–240, 2000.

(L. Guo) SHANGHAI INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS AND INTERDISCIPLINARY SCIENCES, SHANGHAI, 200433, P. R. CHINA

*Email address:* liangguo@simis.cn

(J. Qian) RESEARCH CENTER FOR OPERATOR ALGEBRAS, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, EAST CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, 200241, P. R. CHINA

*Email address:* 52265500013@stu.ecnu.edu.cn

(Q. Wang) RESEARCH CENTER FOR OPERATOR ALGEBRAS, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, EAST CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, 200241, P. R. CHINA.

*Email address:* qwang@math.ecnu.edu.cn