

**$M$ -IDEALS IN REAL OPERATOR ALGEBRAS**

DAVID P. BLECHER, MATTHEW NEAL, ANTONIO M. PERALTA, AND SHANSHAN SU

ABSTRACT. In a recent paper we showed that a subspace of a real  $\text{JBW}^*$ -triple is an  $M$ -summand if and only if it is a weak\*-closed triple ideal. As a consequence,  $M$ -ideals of real  $\text{JB}^*$ -triples, including real  $C^*$ -algebras, real  $\text{JB}^*$ -algebras and real TROs, correspond to norm-closed triple ideals. In the present paper we extend this result to (possibly non-selfadjoint) real operator algebras and Jordan operator algebras, where the argument is necessarily different. We also give simple characterizations of one-sided  $M$ -ideals in real operator algebras, and give some applications to that theory.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In 1972 Alfsen and Effros introduced the foundational notions of  $M$ - and  $L$ -summands and  $M$ -ideals of an abstract Banach space [1]. One of their motivations was to generalize to Banach spaces the closed ideals in a  $C^*$ -algebra and aspects of the theory of such ideals. Alfsen pointed out that the  $M$ -ideals in a complex  $C^*$ -algebra are just the closed ideals (see [45] for a full proof). However, it seems to have taken fifty years to identify the  $M$ -ideals in real  $C^*$ -algebras, and more generally in real TRO's, real  $\text{JB}^*$ -algebras, and real  $\text{JB}^*$ -triples. This omission is particularly odd since  $M$ -ideal theory had its origins in the example of  $M$ -ideals in a real  $JC$ -algebra (i.e. the selfadjoint part of a  $C^*$ -algebra; see Proposition 6.18 in conjunction with line 6–7 on p. 129 of [1]).

The formidable difficulties with identifying the  $M$ -ideals in such spaces were overcome in the recent paper [13]. It is shown there using deep facial structure that  $M$ -ideals of these objects correspond to norm-closed triple ideals. That is, purely geometric objects ( $M$ -ideals) are algebraically characterized. In the present paper we extend this result to (possibly non-selfadjoint) real operator algebras (that is, closed subalgebras of the algebra of bounded operators on a real Hilbert space), and to real Jordan operator algebras, where the argument is necessarily different, but shorter. (The reader who does not care about nonassociative algebras should simply ignore the word ‘Jordan’.) We also discuss one-sided  $M$ -ideals in real operator algebras, and characterize these objects metrically.

Our paper is structured as follows. We will begin with some background and notation. Since our paper is concerned in many places with real Jordan operator algebras, we will need some facts from that theory which we develop in Section 2. Section 3 contains our main result on  $M$ -ideals in real operator algebras, Jordan

---

*Date:* May 8, 2024.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46L07, 47L05, 47L25, 47L30, 17C65; Secondary: 46B04, 46L08, 47L75, 17C10.

*Key words and phrases.* Operator space, operator algebra, Jordan algebra, real operator space,  $M$ -ideal, complexification.

or otherwise, together with some sample applications. If the algebra is a real  $C^*$ -algebra we recover the main result of [13] in this special case, but with a completely different proof. We remark that this proof however does not generalize to the setting e.g. of real TRO's or  $JB^*$ -triples. In Section 4 we give simple characterizations of one-sided  $M$ -summands and  $M$ -ideals in real operator algebras, and we give some applications to that theory.

The reader will need to be familiar with some of the basics of complex operator spaces and von Neumann algebras as may be found in early chapters of e.g. [9, 22] and [38]. It may also be helpful to browse the (small) existing real operator space theory, e.g. [42, 43, 44, 15, 6]. A note on references: usually we will reference the real case of a result in the literature, but often these sources simply check that the complex argument (where usually the serious work was done) transfers. Some basic real  $C^*$ -algebra theory may be found in [35] (see also [30]).

We now turn to notation. For us a *projection* in a real or complex  $C^*$ -algebra is always an orthogonal projection (so  $p = p^2 = p^*$ ). A projection in a normed algebra or in a Jordan algebra  $A$  is a contractive idempotent element (this notation will not conflict with the one above in the settings of this paper). We say  $A$  is *unital* if it has an unit  $\mathbf{1}$  of norm 1, and a map  $T$  is unital if  $T(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$ . We will use silently the fact from basic functional analysis that for a subspace  $X$  of a Banach space  $Y$ ,  $X^{\perp\perp}$  is the weak\* closure of  $X$  in  $Y^{**}$ , and is isometric to  $X^{**}$ . An element  $a$  of a real  $C^*$ -algebra is *real positive* if  $a + a^* \geq 0$ .

Let  $V$  be a Banach space. A projection  $P$  on  $V$  is called an  *$L$ -projection* (respectively, an  *$M$ -projection*) if

$$\|x\| = \|P(x)\| + \|(I - P)(x)\|, \quad \text{for all } x \in V$$

(respectively,  $\|v\| = \max\{\|Pv\|, \|(I - P)(v)\|\}$  for all  $v \in V$ ). The image of an  $L$ -projection (respectively, an  $M$ -projection) on  $V$  is called an  *$L$ -summand* (respectively, an  *$M$ -summand*). A closed subspace  $M$  of a Banach space  $V$  is said to be an  *$M$ -ideal* if  $M^{\perp\perp}$  is an  $M$ -summand of  $V^{**}$ . See [32] for the theory of  $M$ -ideals.

A *real TRO* is a closed linear subspace  $Z \subseteq B(K, H)$ , for real Hilbert spaces  $K$  and  $H$ , satisfying  $ZZ^*Z \subseteq Z$ .

Complex operator spaces are an important umbrella category containing  $C^*$ -algebras, operator systems, operator algebras, von Neumann algebras, TRO's, and many other objects of interest (see e.g. [22, 9]). Ruan initiated the study of real operator spaces in [42, 43], and this study was continued in e.g. [44, 15, 6, 7]. A real operator space may either be viewed as a real subspace of  $B(H)$  for a real Hilbert space  $H$ , or abstractly as a vector space with a norm  $\|\cdot\|_n$  on  $M_n(X)$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying the conditions of Ruan's characterization in [42]. In [6] we verified that a large portion of the theory of complex operator spaces and operator algebras (as represented by the text [9] for specificity) transfers to the real case.

If  $T : X \rightarrow Y$  is a linear map between operator spaces we write  $T_n$  for the canonical 'entry-wise' amplification taking  $M_n(X)$  to  $M_n(Y)$ . We say that  $T$  is *completely bounded* if  $\|T\|_{\text{cb}} = \sup_n \|T_n\| < \infty$ . Then  $T$  is *completely contractive* (resp. *completely isometric*) if  $\|T\|_{\text{cb}} \leq 1$  (resp.  $T_n$  is an isometry for all  $n$ ). The space  $\text{CB}(X, Y)$  of such completely bounded maps is an operator space, and of course is a unital algebra if  $X = Y$ . An operator space  $X$  has a norm on the rectangular matrices over  $X$ . This norm is easy to describe for  $C_n(X) = M_{n,1}(X)$

and  $R_n(X) = M_{1,n}(X)$ . E.g.  $\|[x \ y]\|_{R_2(X)}^2 = \|xx^* + yy^*\|$  by the C\*-identity with respect to any C\*-algebra containing  $X$  completely isometrically.

A projection  $P$  on an operator space  $X$  is a *complete  $M$ -projection* if  $P_n$  is an  $M$ -projection on  $M_n(X)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Its range is a *complete  $M$ -summand*, and  $J$  is a *complete  $M$ -ideal* in  $X$  if  $J^{\perp\perp}$  is a complete  $M$ -summand of  $X^{**}$ . Several alternative characterizations of these objects may be found in e.g. [9, Section 4.8] (see also [15, 6]). It is known that  $M$ -ideals in C\*-algebras and in unital operator algebras are automatically complete  $M$ -ideals. However, this is not always true for operator spaces (cf. [21, Proposition 4.1]).

An *operator space complexification* of a real operator space  $X$  is a pair  $(X_c, \kappa)$  consisting of a complex operator space  $X_c$  and a real linear complete isometry  $\kappa : X \hookrightarrow X_c$  such that  $X_c = \kappa(X) \oplus i\kappa(X)$  as a vector space. For simplicity we usually identify  $X$  and  $\kappa(X)$  and write  $X_c = X + iX$ . We say that the complexification is *reasonable* if the map  $\kappa(x) + i\kappa(y) \mapsto \kappa(x) - i\kappa(y)$ , for  $x, y \in X$ , is a complete isometry on  $X_c$ . Ruan proved that a real operator space has a unique reasonable complexification  $X_c = X + iX$  up to complete isometry [43]. If  $T \in CB(X, Y)$  then we write  $T_c : X_c \rightarrow Y_c$  for the canonical complexification of  $T$ . We have  $\|T_c\|_{cb} = \|T\|_{cb}$ .

A *skew* element of a \*-algebra is an element with  $x^* = -x$ . Any element of the \*-algebra is the sum of a skew and a selfadjoint element. A skew real positive element need not be zero: in  $M_2$  the matrix  $a = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  is a counterexample. Moreover, this fails even if it has a square root which is real positive, as does this  $a$ .

By a real (resp. complex) *Jordan operator algebra* we mean a norm-closed real (resp. complex) *Jordan subalgebra*  $A$  of a real (resp. complex) C\*-algebra, namely a norm-closed real (resp. complex) subspace closed under the ‘Jordan product’  $a \circ b = \frac{1}{2}(ab + ba)$ . Or equivalently, with  $a^2 \in A$  for all  $a \in A$  (this follows since  $a \circ b = \frac{1}{2}((a+b)^2 - a^2 - b^2)$ ). There do exist abstract characterizations of such algebras [16, 11, 15, 46], but we will not take the time to state them here. The selfadjoint case, that is, closed selfadjoint real (resp. complex) subspaces of a real (resp. complex) C\*-algebra which are closed under squares, are called real (resp. complex) *JC\*-algebras*. Complex JC\*-algebras have a large literature, see e.g. [19, 47] for references. Also JC-algebras (i.e., the selfadjoint parts of JC\*-algebras, cf. [47]) are real Jordan operator algebras. The theory of (possibly non-selfadjoint) Jordan operator algebras over the complex field was initiated in [16, 11, 17]. If  $A$  is a Jordan operator subalgebra of  $B(H)$ , then the *diagonal*  $\Delta(A) = A \cap A^*$  is a JC\*-algebra. The bidual  $A^{**}$  of a Jordan operator algebra is again a Jordan operator algebra.

All real JC\*-algebras are contained in the strictly wider class of real JB\*-algebras, as considered in [2, 39, 25, 40, 3]. Real and complex C\*-algebras, complex JB\*-algebras, and JB-algebras are all examples of real JB\*-algebras. However, it should be noted that there are examples of exceptional JB- and JB\*-algebras which cannot be embedded as Jordan self-adjoint subalgebras of C\*-algebras (see, for example, [31, 19] for a more detailed account). We have indirectly employed that, by a result of J.D.M. Wright [47], JB-algebras are nothing but the real Jordan–Banach

algebras determined by the self-adjoint parts of JB\*-algebras. Because of the obvious obstacles from the point of view of operator spaces, the wider category of JB\*-algebras remains beyond the goals of this paper.

Recall that a closed subspace  $I$  of a real or complex JB\*-algebra  $A$  is a (Jordan) ideal of  $A$  if  $I \circ A \subseteq I$ . It is known that triple ideals of  $A$  are all self-adjoint (see, for example, the discussion in [29, page 8] or [19, Proposition 3.4.13]). The quotient of a JC\*-algebra by a closed ideal is again a JC\*-algebra (see [31, Proposition 4.7.4] or explicitly in [47, Lemma 3.1]), and thus, by passing through the complexification, the same conclusion remains true for real JC\*-algebras.

The next question which arises is whether to treat real Jordan operator algebras as Banach spaces or as real operator spaces. In this connection we remind the reader that the complexification of a real operator algebra is not uniquely defined up to isometry (see [15, Proposition 2.10]), but is uniquely defined up to complete isometry. For this reason we will usually treat all algebras as operator spaces for safety, so that when, for example, we view a (Jordan) operator algebra as a subalgebra of a C\*-algebra we mean that it is completely isometrically embedded. This is probably not necessary, perhaps nearly all of our results are easily adaptable to the Banach setting. Indeed usually the issue does not arise since any concrete Jordan operator algebra in  $B(H)$  already has an operator space structure.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES ON REAL JORDAN OPERATOR ALGEBRAS

The reader only interested in associative algebras could skip most of this section, particularly if they are familiar with real associative operator algebras.

The basic theory of (possibly non-selfadjoint) complex Jordan operator algebras may be found in [16, 11, 17]. The real case of this theory was initiated in [15, 46]. In addition to reviewing some aspects of the latter theory, we will focus in this section on results that we need which were omitted or not explicit in the latter sources. As just mentioned, we will assume for convenience that (Jordan) operator algebras are completely isometrically represented on a Hilbert space. Thus for us a C\*-cover of an operator algebra (resp. Jordan operator algebra)  $A$  is a pair  $(B, j)$  consisting of a real C\*-algebra  $B$  and a completely isometric homomorphism (resp. Jordan homomorphism)  $j : A \rightarrow B$  such that  $j(A)$  generates  $B$  as a real C\*-algebra. There exists a ‘smallest’ C\*-cover, the C\*-envelope  $C_e^*(A)$ , sometimes called the *noncommutative Shilov boundary* (see e.g. [7, Corollary 4.3] for the real case of this).

We say that an operator algebra  $A$  is *approximately unital* if it has a contractive approximate identity (cai). The situation is more complicated for a Jordan operator algebra, here there are partial cai’s, J-cai’s, etc. for which we refer the reader to [15, Section 4] in the real case. Fortunately such an algebra has a partial cai if and only if it has a J-cai, and if and only if the bidual  $A^{**}$  has an identity of norm 1. In this case we say that  $A$  is *approximately unital*. For example, all JC\*-algebras are approximately unital (see e.g. [19]). The unitization  $A^1$  of an approximately unital (Jordan) operator algebra is well defined up to isometric or completely isometric isomorphism [15, Corollary 3.4 and Lemma 4.10], and we have  $(A^1)_c = (A_c)^1$ .

It is well known that a (Jordan) \*-homomorphism on a real JC\*-algebra has closed range. Actually, \*-homomorphisms between C\*-algebras, Jordan \*-homomorphisms between JB\*-algebras, and triple homomorphisms between JB\*-triples are automatically continuous and contractive [4, Lemma 1]. Having in mind that

these maps extend in a natural way to the complexifications, the same conclusions hold for the corresponding real versions of these structures. An extension of the Cleveland–Kaplansky theorem to JB\*-triples asserts that a triple homomorphism  $T$  from a real JB\*-triple to a normed Jordan triple has closed range whenever it is continuous, and  $T$  is bounded below if and only if  $T$  is a triple monomorphism [23].

The celebrated Kaup–Kadison–Banach–Stone theorem assures us that a linear bijection between JB\*-triples is an isometry if and only if it is a triple isomorphism [34, Proposition 5.5]. This conclusion is not always true in the real setting [25]. However, the difficulties do not appear in the setting of real JB\*-algebras, where it is known that a linear bijection between real JB\*-algebras, in particular between real JC\*-algebras, is an isometry if and only if it is a triple isomorphism (see e.g. [25, Corollary 3.4] or [33, Theorem 4.8]).

The diagonal  $\Delta(A) = A \cap A^*$  of a real (Jordan) operator algebra  $A$  (with possibly no kind of identity) is a well-defined real JC\*-algebra independent of representation, just as in the complex case. Indeed by [15, Theorem 2.6], a contractive (Jordan) homomorphism (resp. isomorphism)  $\pi : A \rightarrow B$  between real (Jordan) operator algebras restricts to a (Jordan) \*-homomorphism (resp. isometric \*-isomorphism) from the diagonal  $\Delta(A)$  into a (Jordan) \*-subalgebra of  $\Delta(B)$ . Thus, the diagonal  $\pi(\Delta(A))$  is a real JC\*-subalgebra. It follows that the appropriate versions of the results in 2.1.2 in [9] hold in the real (Jordan) case. In particular, the definition of  $\Delta(A)$  does not depend of the particular representation of  $A$  (up to \*-isomorphism). For a real (Jordan) operator algebra  $A$  we have that  $\Delta(A_c) = A_c \cap A_c^* = \Delta(A)_c$ . Because the selfadjoint elements do not necessarily span a real C\*-algebra (or may be all of the C\*-algebra), one needs to be careful in places. So  $\Delta(A)$  need not be the span of the selfadjoint elements (nor of the projections if  $A$  is also weak\* closed), unlike in the complex case.

We next discuss real Jordan multiplier algebras. The complex case was considered in [16] (mostly in Sections 2.8 there), and around Lemma 1.2 in [12]. Section 4.7 of [46] discusses briefly the left and right multiplier algebras of an approximately unital real Jordan operator algebra  $A$  but does not claim the real case of all of the assertions of [16, Theorem 2.24]. We claim much more here. One important principle is that two elements  $x$  and  $y$  in an approximately unital real Jordan subalgebra  $A$  of a C\*-algebra  $B$  may be multiplied using the associative product in the C\*-algebra—which is denoted by mere juxtaposition, and if this product  $xy$  is in  $A$  then it is independent of the particular C\*-algebra  $B$  containing  $A$  (such as the C\*-envelope  $C_e^*(A)$ ). We call this particular product the “C\*-product” below, and we shall denote it by mere juxtaposition. Note that we are using the operator space structure of  $A$  in this definition. We may then define the left multiplier algebra  $\text{LM}(A) = \{\eta \in A^{**} : \eta A \subset A\}$  (where the product is the C\*-product on  $A^{**} \subset B^{**}$ ). Note that  $\text{LM}(A) \subset \text{LM}(A_c)$  as a real subalgebra, indeed  $\text{LM}(A_c) = \text{LM}(A)_c$  completely isometrically (this may be deduced, for example, immediately from the next result and [6, Lemma 4.2]).

A mapping  $u$  on a real operator space  $X$  is called a *left multiplier of  $X$*  if there exists a linear complete isometry  $\sigma : X \rightarrow B(H)$  for some real Hilbert space  $H$ , and an operator  $S \in B(H)$  such that  $\sigma(u(x)) = S\sigma(x)$ , for all  $x \in X$ . The set of all left multipliers of  $X$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{M}_\ell(X)$  (see [44, §5] and [6, Section 4]). A mapping  $u \in \mathcal{M}_\ell(X)$  is said to be *left adjointable* if we can find  $H, S, \sigma$  as above satisfying  $S^*\sigma(X) \subseteq \sigma(X)$ . The collection of all left adjointable maps on  $X$

is denoted by  $\mathcal{A}_\ell(X) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\ell(X)$ . It is known that  $\mathcal{M}_\ell(X)$  is a unital subalgebra of a  $C^*$ -algebra and  $\mathcal{A}_\ell(X)$  is precisely the diagonal algebra,  $\Delta(\mathcal{M}_\ell(X)) = \mathcal{M}_\ell(X) \cap \mathcal{M}_\ell(X)^*$ , of  $\mathcal{M}_\ell(X)$ . We therefore have a well-defined involution  $u \mapsto u^*$  on  $\mathcal{A}_\ell(X)$ , in which  $u^*$  is determined by  $\sigma, \sigma^{-1}$  and  $S^*$  in a natural way (cf. [6, Proposition 4.3]).

By the arguments in [16, Theorem 2.24], but using real variants from [15, 46] of some facts from the complex theory, we have:

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $A$  be an approximately unital real Jordan operator algebra and let  $B = C_e^*(A)$ , with  $A$  considered as a Jordan subalgebra. Then  $\text{LM}(A) \cong \{\eta \in B^{**} : \eta A \subset A\}$ . This is completely isometrically isomorphic to the (associative) operator algebra  $\mathcal{M}_\ell(A)$  of operator space left multipliers of  $A$  in the sense of e.g. [6, Section 4], and is completely isometrically isomorphic to a unital subalgebra of  $CB(A)$ . Also,  $\|T\|_{\text{cb}} = \|T\|$  for every  $T \in \text{LM}(A)$  thought of as an operator on  $A$ .*

**Remark.** Theorem 2.24 in [16] also asserts that for any nondegenerate completely isometric Jordan representation  $\pi$  of  $A$  on a Hilbert space  $H$ , the algebra  $\{T \in B(H) : T\pi(A) \subset \pi(A)\}$  is completely isometrically isomorphic to a unital subalgebra of  $\text{LM}(A)$ , and this isomorphism maps onto  $\text{LM}(A)$  if  $\pi$  is a faithful nondegenerate  $*$ -representation of  $B$  for example. This appears to be valid in the real case too with the same proof.

Similar results hold for the right multipliers  $\text{RM}(A)$ . We define the multiplier algebra  $\text{M}(A) = \text{LM}(A) \cap \text{RM}(A)$  as in the complex case. The *Jordan multiplier algebra*  $\text{JM}(A)$  of  $A$  is defined to be the set of elements  $\eta \in A^{**}$  with  $a \circ \eta = \frac{1}{2}(\eta a + a\eta) \in A$  for all  $a \in A$ . We observe that we do not need the “external”  $C^*$ -product to define the Jordan multiplier algebra, and that this notion is precisely the usual Jordan multiplier algebra in the available literature [20].

As in Lemma 1.2 in [12] one sees that  $\text{JM}(A)$  is a real unital Jordan operator algebra containing  $A$  as an approximately unital Jordan ideal. It also contains  $\text{M}(A)$ . We shall not use this later, but by the definition one can see that  $\text{JM}(A_c) = \text{JM}(A)_c$ , and a similar relation holds for  $\text{M}(A)$ .

We will need the following result, which in the real case is essentially in [46].

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $A$  be an approximately unital real Jordan operator algebra. If  $p$  is a projection in  $\text{LM}(A)$  then  $p \in \text{M}(A)$ . More generally, the diagonal  $\Delta(\text{LM}(A)) \subset \text{M}(A)$ .*

*Proof.* This is proved by the same argument in [16, Theorem 2.23], once one knows that Lemma 2.1.6 in [9] holds in the real case. The latter was confirmed in [6, page 23] (see also [46]).  $\square$

Let  $X$  be a real (or complex) operator. A contractive projection  $P : X \rightarrow X$  is called a *complete left  $M$ -projection on  $X$*  (also called a *left  $M$ -projection on  $X$* ) if the operator  $\nu_P^c : X \rightarrow C_2(X) = M_{2,1}(X)$ ,  $x \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} P(x) \\ x - P(x) \end{pmatrix}$  is a complete isometry (see also Section 4 for more details).

The complete left  $M$ -projections on  $X$  are also exactly the projections in the algebra  $\mathcal{M}_\ell(X)$  above (see [8, Proposition 4.1], [44, Proposition 5.3]). More concretely, the complete left  $M$ -projections on  $X$  are precisely the operators of the form  $P(x) = e\sigma(x)$  for a completely isometric embedding  $\sigma : X \hookrightarrow B(H)$  and an orthogonal projection  $e$  in  $B(H)$ . Here  $x \in X$ . Therefore, Theorem 2.1 and Lemma

2.2 allow us to identify immediately the complete left  $M$ -projections on an approximately unital real Jordan operator algebra  $A$ . The corresponding summands are the subspaces  $eA$  for a projection  $e$  in  $M(A)$ . We give more details in Section 4.

States on a unital real Jordan operator algebra are, by definition, the unital contractive functionals. States on an approximately unital real Jordan operator algebra  $A$  are discussed in [15] (they are defined at the end of Section 4 there). More precisely, a norm-one functional  $\varphi \in A^*$  is a state if  $\varphi(e_j) \rightarrow 1$  for every (equivalently, some) partial cai  $(e_j)$  in  $A$ . It is equivalent to use Jordan cai in place of partial cai in this definition. It is also known that it is equivalent to say that  $\varphi(\mathbf{1}) = 1$  where  $\mathbf{1}$  is the identity of  $A^{**}$  [15, Lemma 4.13].

In the proof of our main theorem we will need to use such states, and their relation to states on the complexification. The following clarifies this relationship.

**Lemma 2.3.** *The real states  $\varphi$  on an approximately unital real Jordan operator algebra  $A$  are precisely the restrictions to  $A$  of real parts of complex states on  $A_c$  (such as  $\varphi_c$ ), or on a real (resp. complex)  $C^*$ -cover of  $A$  (resp.  $A_c$ ).*

*Proof.* If  $\varphi$  is a real state on  $A$  then  $\varphi_c : A_c \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\varphi_c(a + ib) := \varphi(a) + i\varphi(b)$  ( $a, b \in A$ ) has norm 1 and is a complex state. This is obvious if  $A$  is unital. In the approximately unital case this follows for example using [15, Lemma 4.13], since there is a partial cai for  $A$  which is also one for  $A_c$ , and is a cai for any  $C^*$ -cover of  $A_c$ . The converse is similar; and the rest is left as an exercise (using e.g. the statement after [15, Lemma 4.2 (iv)]).  $\square$

**Remark.** The real parts of two different complex states on  $A_c$  may coincide on  $A$ . For example consider the normalized trace  $\frac{1}{2} Tr$  on  $M_2(\mathbb{C})$  and the state  $Tr(\cdot p)$ , where  $p$  is the rank 1 projection associated with the vector  $\xi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [1 \ i]$ . On  $M_2(\mathbb{R})$  (or on the real upper triangular  $2 \times 2$  matrices) the real parts of these two states coincide. That is, the mapping  $\varphi \mapsto \Re \varphi|_A$  is not injective when considered from  $A_c^*$  to  $A^*$ .

### 3. M-IDEALS IN OPERATOR ALGEBRAS

The following is known, and is true in much greater generality. (See e.g. [28, Lemma 1.6], or more explicitly in [26, Identity (6) in page 360] in the complex case, from which the real case can be deduced. There is also direct proof in the setting of real  $C^*$ -algebras in [27, Lemma 3.1 and proof of Theorem 3.2]. The latter is close to the proof that we present here for the sake of completeness.)

**Lemma 3.1.** *If  $z$  is a tripotent in a real TRO  $Z$  (that is,  $z = zz^*z$ ), and  $\|z \pm b\| \leq 1$  for some  $b \in \text{Ball}(Z)$  then  $b = (1 - zz^*)b(1 - z^*z)$ .*

*Proof.* Pre- and postmultiplying by projections we have  $\|z \pm zz^*bz^*z\| \leq 1$ . Hence  $zz^*bz^*z = 0$ . This is clear if  $z$  is a projection, but a similar argument works for tripotents considering  $zz^*Zz^*z$  as a  $C^*$ -algebra with product  $xz^*y$  and identity  $z$ . Similarly, left multiplying by the projection  $zz^*$  we have

$$\|z \pm zz^*b(1 - z^*z)\| = \|z \pm zz^*b\| \leq 1.$$

So  $\|(z + zz^*b(1 - z^*z))(z^* + (1 - z^*z)b^*zz^*)\| \leq 1$ . That is,

$$\|zz^* + zz^*b(1 - z^*z)b^*zz^*\| \leq 1,$$

which forces  $zz^*b(1 - z^*z) = 0$ . In a similar way,  $(1 - zz^*)bz^*z = 0$ . Thus  $b = (1 - zz^*)b(1 - z^*z)$ .  $\square$

To say that a projection  $p$  in a Jordan operator algebra  $A$  commutes in the  $C^*$ -product with  $x \in A$  may be written in Jordan algebra terms as

$$p \circ x = pxp = 2(p \circ x) \circ p - p \circ x.$$

In this case we simply say that  $p$  *commutes with  $x$* . If  $p$  commutes with all elements of  $A$  we shall say that  $p$  is *central*. It is easy to see that a projection is central in  $JM(A)$  if and only if it commutes with all elements of  $A$ , assuming that  $A$  is approximately unital (cf. [15, Lemma 4.2, final statement]).

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $A$  be an approximately unital real operator algebra (resp. Jordan operator algebra).*

- (1) *The  $M$ -ideals in  $A$  are the complete  $M$ -ideals. These are exactly the closed ideals (resp. closed Jordan ideals)  $J$  in  $A$  which are approximately unital. Moreover in the Jordan case they are also ideals in  $A$  in the  $C^*$ -product:  $AJ + JA$  and  $AJA$  are contained in  $J$ .*
- (2) *The  $M$ -summands in  $A$  are the complete  $M$ -summands. These are exactly the ideals  $Ae$  for a projection  $e$  in  $M(A)$  (resp.  $JM(A)$ ) or equivalently in  $M(A)$ ) such that  $e$  commutes with all elements in  $A$ .*

*Proof.* (1) First suppose that  $A$  is a unital real Jordan operator algebra, inside a unital real  $C^*$ -algebra  $B$  which it generates. Let  $P$  be an  $M$ -projection on  $A$ , and let  $z = P(\mathbf{1})$ . For any state  $\varphi$  of  $A$  we have  $\varphi(z) = \|P^*(\varphi)\| \geq 0$  by the argument for (4.19) in the proof of Theorem 4.8.5 (2) in [9]. For completeness we repeat the argument. Since  $-1 \leq \varphi(P(\mathbf{1}))$ ,  $\varphi((I - P)(\mathbf{1})) \leq 1$ , since  $P^*$  is an  $L$ -projection, and since

$$1 = \varphi(P(\mathbf{1})) + \varphi((I - P)(\mathbf{1})) \leq \|P^*(\varphi)\| + \|(I - P)^*(\varphi)\| = \|\varphi\| = 1,$$

we have  $0 \leq \varphi(z) = \varphi(P(\mathbf{1})) = \|P^*(\varphi)\|$ .

We have  $\|1 - z\| = \|(I - P)(\mathbf{1})\| \leq 1$ . Taking adjoints we have  $\|1 - z^*\| \leq 1$ , so that  $\|1 - \frac{z+z^*}{2}\| \leq 1$ . It follows that  $a = \frac{z+z^*}{2}$  is positive. Write  $z = a + i\frac{z-z^*}{2i} = a + ib \in B_c$  -in the complexification of  $B$ , with  $a \geq 0$  and  $b = b^* = \frac{z-z^*}{2i}$  (note that  $b$  is not necessarily in  $B$  although  $b^2 \in B$ ).

Suppose that  $\varphi$  is a state of  $B$  with  $\varphi(z) = 1$ . Then  $\rho = \varphi_c$  is a state of  $B_c$ . We have  $1 = \varphi(z) = \rho(a) + i\rho(b)$ , and so  $\rho(a) = 1$  and  $\rho(b) = 0$ . We have  $z^2 = a^2 - b^2 + i(ab + ba)$ . Now  $1 = \rho(a)^2 \leq \rho(a^2) \leq 1$  by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, and so  $\rho(a^2) = 1$ . Similarly,  $1 = \varphi(z)^2 \leq \varphi(z^*z) \leq 1$ , and

$$1 = \varphi(z^*z) = \rho(a^2 + b^2 + i(ab - ba)) = \rho(a^2 + b^2) + i\rho(ab - ba).$$

Similarly

$$1 = \varphi(zz^*) = \rho(a^2 + b^2 - i(ab - ba)) = \rho(a^2 + b^2) - i\rho(ab - ba),$$

so that  $\rho(a^2 + b^2) = 1$ ,  $\rho(b^2) = 0$ , and  $\rho(ab - ba) = 0$ . Hence

$$\varphi(z^2) = \rho(a^2 - b^2 + i(ab + ba)) = 1 + i\rho(ab + ba).$$

Thus  $\varphi(z^2) = 1$ , and  $\varphi(z(\mathbf{1} - z)) = 0$ .

We have shown that  $\varphi(z(\mathbf{1} - z)) = 0$  for every state  $\varphi$  of  $B$  with  $\rho(z) = 1$ . We can bootstrap from this to show that the same formula also holds for any state  $\varphi$  of  $A$  or  $B$ , or equivalently, for the real part of every state on  $B_c$ , by following the argument to prove (4.20) in the proof of Theorem 4.8.5 (2) in [9]. We include the argument here for completeness. Consider any state  $\varphi$  of  $A$ . Note that  $\varphi(z) = 0$  if

and only if  $\varphi(\mathbf{1} - z) = 1$ . Having in mind that  $\mathbf{1} - z = (I - P)(\mathbf{1})$  and  $(I - P)$  is also an  $M$ -projection, the previous case gives  $\varphi((\mathbf{1} - z)z) = 0$ . We may therefore assume that  $0 \neq \varphi(z)$ . As we have seen above,  $\varphi(z) = \varphi(P(\mathbf{1})) = \|P^*(\varphi)\|$ , and thus  $\psi := \|P^*(\varphi)\|^{-1}P^*(\varphi)$  is a state of  $A$ . It is easy to check that

$$\psi(z) = \|P^*(\varphi)\|^{-1}\varphi(P(z)) = \|P^*(\varphi)\|^{-1}\varphi(P^2(\mathbf{1})) = \|P^*(\varphi)\|^{-1}\varphi(z) = 1.$$

We conclude from what we know that  $\psi(z(\mathbf{1} - z)) = 0$ , equivalently,  $\varphi(P(z(\mathbf{1} - z))) = 0$ . By replacing  $P$  with  $(I - P)$  and  $z$  with  $\mathbf{1} - z = (I - P)(\mathbf{1})$ , we arrive to  $\varphi(I - P)(z(\mathbf{1} - z)) = 0$ . Combining this with what we have just proved gives  $\varphi(z(\mathbf{1} - z)) = 0$ .

Since  $\varphi(z(\mathbf{1} - z)) = 0$  for every state  $\varphi$  of  $B$ , it follows from Lemma 2.3 that  $\Re \rho(z(\mathbf{1} - z)) = 0$  for any state  $\rho$  of  $B_c$ . That is,  $d = z(\mathbf{1} - z)$  is ‘‘skew symmetric’’:  $d^* = -d$ , or  $d + d^* = 0$ . Now  $d + d^* = 2(a(1 - a) + b^2)$ , and so  $b = 0 = a(1 - a)$ , and  $a = a^2$  and  $z = a$  is a projection.

Observe next that

$$\|P(x) \pm (\mathbf{1} - z)\| = \|P(x) \pm (I - P)(\mathbf{1})\| = \max\{\|x\|, \|\pm \mathbf{1}\|\} = 1$$

for any  $x \in \text{Ball}(A)$ . Hence  $P(x) \in zAz$  by Lemma 3.1. Similarly  $(I - P)(A) \subset (\mathbf{1} - z)A(\mathbf{1} - z)$ . Since  $A = P(A) + (I - P)(A)$  we have  $A = zAz + (\mathbf{1} - z)A(\mathbf{1} - z)$ , from which it follows that  $z$  is central in  $A$  in the  $C^*$ -product. We also have  $0 = z(I - P)(x) = zx - P(x)$  for  $x \in A$ , so that  $P$  is multiplication by  $z$ . We have in fact now proved (2) for unital  $A$ .

If  $J$  is an  $M$ -ideal in an approximately unital real operator algebra (resp. Jordan operator algebra)  $A$  then it follows from what we just proved that

$$J^{**} \cong \overline{J}^{w^*} = J^{\perp\perp} = eA^{**} = e \circ A^{**}$$

for a central projection  $e$  in  $A^{**}$ . Therefore,  $J^{\perp\perp}$  is a complete  $M$ -summand (see the proof of (2) for more detail). By [15, Lemma 4.1]  $J$  is approximately unital, and hence Proposition 4.8 in [15] assures us that  $J$  is an ideal (resp. Jordan ideal). Also,  $J$  is a complete  $M$ -ideal.

The converse is similar. If  $J$  is a closed Jordan ideal in an approximately unital real Jordan subalgebra  $A$  of  $C^*$ -algebra  $B$  then by Proposition 4.8 in [15] we have  $J^{\perp\perp} = eA^{**}$  for a central projection  $e$  in  $A^{**}$  as above. In the  $C^*$ -product we have e.g.  $aj \in eA^{**} \cap B = J^{\perp\perp} \cap B = J$ , for  $a \in A, j \in J$ .

(2) That the central projections in  $\text{JM}(A)$  coincide with the projections in  $\text{M}(A)$  commuting with  $A$ , is evident. Indeed a central projection in  $\text{JM}(A)$  commutes with  $A$  and hence with  $A^{**}$ , and in the  $C^*$ -product  $ea = e \circ a = ae \in A$  for  $a \in A$ . So  $e$  is in  $\text{M}(A)$ . The converse is similar.

Let  $P$  be an  $M$ -projection on an approximately unital Jordan operator algebra  $A$ . Then  $P^{**}$  is an  $M$ -projection on  $A^{**}$ , so that by the above there is a central projection in  $A^{**}$  with  $P^{**}(\eta) = e\eta$  for  $\eta \in A^{**}$ . Then

$$eA = Ae = P^{**}(A) = P(A) \subset A,$$

and so  $e \in \text{M}(A)$  and  $P(A) = eA$ . It can be easily seen (in several ways) that  $P(A)$  is a real complete  $M$ -summand of  $A$ . For example, multiplication by  $e$  on  $A$  is clearly a real adjointable (indeed selfadjoint) left multiplier of  $A$  in the sense of [44, 6]. Similarly it is a real adjointable right multiplier, so that it is in the centralizer algebra from [6], and hence is a complete  $M$ -projection. We can also simply check that for each natural  $n$ , the mapping given by entry-wise amplification

$P_n : M_n(A) \rightarrow M_n(A)$  satisfies  $P_n(x) = e_n x$ , where  $e_n = e \oplus \dots \oplus e_n$  is a central projection in  $M_n(A^{**})$ . Hence  $P_n$  is an  $M$ -projection. So  $P(A)$  is a complete  $M$ -summand.  $\square$

From the last theorem we recover Corollary 4.2 and a particular case of Corollary 4.1 in [13], by a quite different argument. We must admit however that the techniques here are not valid for more general structures like real TROs, real  $\text{JB}^*$ -algebras, and, more generally, real  $\text{JB}^*$ -triples.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Let  $M$  be a subspace of a real  $C^*$ -algebra (respectively, a real  $\text{JC}^*$ -algebra)  $A$ . Then  $M$  is an  $M$ -ideal of  $A$  if and only if it is an ideal (respectively, Jordan ideal) of  $A$ .*

Let  $A$  be a real Jordan operator algebra. As in the complex case one defines a projection  $p \in A^{**}$  to be  $A$ -open if  $p \in (pA^{**}p \cap A)^{\perp\perp}$ . (See [46] for this and most of the following facts, which follow in the real case by the same arguments for the complex case from [16].) This is equivalent to  $p$  being  $A^1$ -open. We call  $pA^{**}p \cap A$  a *hereditary subalgebra* (or HSA) of  $A$ , and we call  $p$  its *support (projection)*, which is an identity for the bidual of the HSA. If  $D$  is a HSA in  $A$ , then  $D_c$  is a HSA in  $A_c$ . In addition, a projection is open or closed if and only if it is open or closed with respect to  $D_c$ . A HSA in  $A$  is an approximately unital Jordan subalgebra. Indeed it is an inner ideal of  $A$  in the Jordan sense, that is,  $dad \in D$  for  $d \in D, a \in A$ . Indeed we have as in the complex case [16, Proposition 3.3] and with the same proof:

**Lemma 3.4.** *A closed subspace  $D$  of a real Jordan operator algebra  $A$  is a HSA of  $A$  if and only if  $D$  is an approximately unital inner ideal of  $A$  in the Jordan sense. Conversely, if  $E$  is a subspace of  $A^{**}$  such that  $E^{\perp\perp} = pA^{**}p$  for a projection  $p \in A^{**}$  then  $E$  is a HSA and  $p$  is its support projection, an open projection.*

It follows as a corollary that a closed approximately unital Jordan ideal  $J$  in a real Jordan operator algebra  $A$  is a HSA. These are exactly the  $M$ -ideals in Theorem 3.2 (1).

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let  $A$  be an approximately unital real (Jordan) operator algebra. The  $M$ -ideals in  $A$  are in bijective correspondence with the open projections for  $A$  which are central in  $A^{**}$ .*

*Proof.* According to Theorem 3.2, and its proof, the  $M$ -ideals  $J$  in  $A$  are in bijective correspondence with the central projections  $e \in A^{**}$  for which the  $M$ -summand  $J^{\perp\perp}$  equals  $eA^{**}$ . Such  $e$  is simply the support projection of  $J$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $A$  be an approximately unital real operator algebra (resp. Jordan operator algebra), and  $J$  a closed subspace of  $A$ . Then  $J$  is an  $M$ -ideal in  $A$  if and only if  $J$  is an  $M$ -ideal in  $A^1$ , and if and only if  $J + iJ$  is an  $M$ -ideal in  $A_c$ .*

*Proof.* We prove just the more difficult case. If  $J$  is a closed Jordan ideal in approximately unital real Jordan operator algebra  $A$  then  $J^{\perp\perp} = eA^{**}$  for a central projection  $e$  in  $A^{**}$ . So  $(J + iJ)^{\perp\perp} = eA_c^{**}$ . So  $J + iJ$  is an  $M$ -ideal in  $A_c$ . Conversely, if  $J + iJ$  is a closed Jordan ideal in  $A_c$  then  $aj + ja \in A \cap (J + iJ) = J$  for  $a \in A, j \in J$ . So  $J$  is a closed Jordan ideal in  $A$ . Suppose that  $(J + iJ)^{\perp\perp} = eA_c^{**}$  with  $e = f + ig$  for  $f, g \in J^{\perp\perp} \subset A^{**}$ . Then  $ae = af + iag = a$  in the  $C^*$ -product for  $a \in J^{\perp\perp}$ . So  $f$  is an identity for  $J^{\perp\perp}$ , so that  $J$  is approximately unital (cf. [15, Lemma 4.2]).  $\square$

Just as in the complex case in [16, Section 3.3] we obtain:

**Corollary 3.7.** *If  $J$  is an  $M$ -ideal in approximately unital real Jordan operator algebra  $A$  then  $A/J$  is (completely isometrically Jordan isomorphic to) an approximately unital real Jordan operator algebra.*

**Corollary 3.8.**  *$M$ -projections on an approximately unital real operator algebra  $A$  are completely real positive as maps on  $A$  in the sense of [15], and take selfadjoint (resp. skew) elements of  $A$  to selfadjoint (resp. skew) elements.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.2 above, every  $M$ -projection  $P$  on  $A$  is multiplication operator by a fixed central projection  $e$  in  $M(A)$ . From this it is easy to see that  $P$  is completely real positive and takes selfadjoint (resp. skew) elements to selfadjoint (resp. skew) elements.  $\square$

**Remark.** For an  $M$ -projection  $P$  on a unital real operator algebra  $A$  we have the stronger condition that  $\|\mathbf{1} - x\| \leq 1$  implies that  $\|\mathbf{1} - P(x)\| = \max\{\|P(\mathbf{1} - x)\|, \|\mathbf{1} - e\|\} = 1$ . Also,  $P$  is a real positive element of  $B(A)$ . Real positive projections are studied in [12] (see also [5, 15]), with many general results given there.

#### 4. ONE-SIDED $M$ -IDEALS

One-sided  $M$ -summands and one-sided  $M$ -ideals were defined in [8] in the complex case, and in [44] in the real case. See also e.g. [9, Section 4.8] and [18] for the complex case, and [6] in the real case. Recall that a *complete left  $M$ -projection* on a real operator space  $X$ , is an idempotent map  $P$  on  $X$  such that the map  $\nu_P^c : X \rightarrow C_2(X)$ ,  $x \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} P(x) \\ x - P(x) \end{bmatrix}$  is a complete isometry. A subspace  $J$  of  $X$  is a *right  $M$ -summand* (resp. *right  $M$ -ideal*) if  $J$  (resp.  $J^{\perp\perp}$ ) is the range of a complete left  $M$ -projection on  $X$  (resp.  $X^{**}$ ). In an approximately unital real operator algebra  $A$  the right  $M$ -ideals are easier to characterize (see [44, Section 5]) than the two-sided case in our previous section. Indeed the right  $M$ -ideals are the closed right ideals with a left cai, and correspond just as in the complex case to the open projections in  $A^{**}$ . (The just quoted reference did not however characterize the right  $M$ -summands in the nonunital case.)

One may ask if, similarly to the previous section and [13], closed one-sided ideals in  $C^*$ -algebras may be characterized by a Banach space condition, or without using the operator space structure. However this is impossible, since for example the transpose map is a surjective isometry on  $M_n$  yet switches ‘left’ and ‘right’. In the complex case Theorem 1.1 in [14] comes close to find a Banach space characterization. This theorem gives a list of conditions, most of which involve  $1 \times 2$  or  $2 \times 1$  matrices, each of which characterize closed one-sided  $M$ -summands. It is tempting to presume that these characterizations hold in the real case. In particular on first inspection one would expect, based on the complex case, that an idempotent linear map  $P : A \rightarrow A$  on a real  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$  is a left  $M$ -projection, that is of form  $P(x) = ex$  for a projection  $e$ , if and only if  $\tau_P$  is contractive, where

$$\tau_P \left( \begin{bmatrix} (x) \\ y \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} [Px] \\ y \end{bmatrix}.$$

In fact many of the items in [14, Theorem 1.1] fail to characterize left  $M$ -projections on real  $C^*$ -algebras, as we show in the remark after the next theorem.

Let  $X$  be an operator space and  $x, y \in X$ . We recall from [14] that  $x$  and  $y$  are *left orthogonal* (written  $x \perp_L y$ ) if there exists a complete isometry  $\sigma : X \rightarrow B(H)$ , for a Hilbert space  $H$ , such that  $\sigma(x)^*\sigma(y) = 0$ . As in [8, Theorem 5.1], an idempotent linear map  $P$  on  $X$  is a left  $M$ -projection if and only if  $P(X) \perp_L (I - P)(X)$ . The equivalence of items (i) and (iv) in [14, Theorem 1.1] also holds in the real case, indeed even in not-necessarily selfadjoint associative or Jordan operator algebras:

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a real or complex approximately unital operator algebra or Jordan operator algebra, and let  $P : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be an idempotent linear map. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $P$  is a left  $M$ -projection,
- (2)  $P(x) = ex$  for a projection  $e$  of norm 1 in  $M(\mathcal{B})$ ,
- (3)  $\|[P(x) \ (I - P)(y)]\|_{R_2(\mathcal{B})} = \max\{\|P(x)\|, \|(I - P)(y)\|\}$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{B}$ ,
- (4)  $P(\mathcal{B})^*(I - P)(\mathcal{B}) = 0$  inside some (equivalently, every)  $C^*$ -cover of  $\mathcal{B}$ .

Also,  $P$  is an  $M$ -projection if and only if

$$\left\| \left[ \begin{array}{c} P(x) \\ (I - P)(y) \end{array} \right] \right\|_{C_2(\mathcal{B})} = \|[P(x) \ (I - P)(y)]\|_{R_2(\mathcal{B})} = \max\{\|P(x)\|, \|(I - P)(y)\|\},$$

for all  $x, y$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) Since the projections in  $\mathcal{M}_\ell(X)$  are exactly the left  $M$ -projections on  $X$  of [8, 44], this follows from Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 (and their original complex variants).

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) This is just as in the complex operator algebra case.

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) This is essentially also as in the complex case. That is, the proof of [14, Corollary 6.5] and the previous several supporting results carry through essentially verbatim, even in the Jordan case, to give the required projection  $e$  in  $LM(\mathcal{B})$ , hence in  $M(\mathcal{B})$  by Lemma 2.2. One key point in the proof that needs to be amplified is the point (used twice in the argument from [14]) that we can always represent a (real in our case) operator space  $X \subset B(H)$  in such a way that for every  $x \in X$  there exists  $\xi \in \text{Ball}(H)$  with  $\|x\| = \|x\xi\|$ . A quick way to see this is to apply the complex case of this to  $X_c$ , and then use the fact that every complex Hilbert space is a real Hilbert space.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) This is obvious, for every  $C^*$ -cover of  $A$ .

(4)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) If  $P(\mathcal{B})^*(I - P)(\mathcal{B}) = 0$  then  $P(\mathcal{B}) \perp_L (I - P)(\mathcal{B}) = 0$  and so  $P$  is a left  $M$ -projection by the discussion above Theorem 4.1.

If the last centered condition in the theorem statement holds then by symmetry we have that  $P(x) = ex = xf$  for  $x \in \mathcal{B}$ , for certain projections  $e, f$ . Taking  $x$  in a cai for  $\mathcal{B}$  and taking a weak\* limit shows that  $e = f$ , and it is now easy to see that this is central in  $M(\mathcal{B})$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.2.** *We exhibit some counterexamples showing that many of the statements in [14, Theorem 1.1] fail to characterize left  $M$ -projections on real  $C^*$ -algebras. Indeed let  $\mathbb{H}$  be the quaternions, regarded as a real  $C^*$ -algebra (cf. [35]), and let  $P$  be any nontrivial contractive projection on  $\ell_2^4(\mathbb{R}) \cong \mathbb{H}$ . The key point is that the norm of the column with entries  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{H}$  has norm in  $C_2(\mathbb{H})$  equal to*

$$\left\| \left[ \begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \beta \end{array} \right] \right\|_{C_2(\mathbb{H})} = \sqrt{\|\alpha^*\alpha + \beta^*\beta\|_{\mathbb{H}}} = \sqrt{\|(\|\alpha\|_2^2 + \|\beta\|_2^2)\mathbf{1}\|_{\mathbb{H}}} = \sqrt{\|\alpha\|_2^2 + \|\beta\|_2^2}.$$

It follows that  $\tau_P$  is contractive, and  $\nu_P^c$  is an isometry, indeed

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} P(\alpha) \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{C_2(\mathbb{H})}^2 = \|P(\alpha)\|_2^2 + \|\beta\|_2^2 \leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{C_2(\mathbb{H})}^2, \quad \|P(\alpha)\|_2^2 + \|(I-P)(\alpha)\|_2^2 = \|\alpha\|_2^2.$$

Similarly (v) in [14, Theorem 1.1] says that  $\|P(\alpha)\|^2 \mathbf{1} \leq \|\alpha\|^2 \mathbf{1}$ , which is valid. So (ii), (iii) and (v) in [14, Theorem 1.1] hold, but (i) fails. However,  $\mathbb{H}$  contains no nontrivial projections, indeed no selfadjoint elements besides real multiples of  $\mathbf{1}$ .

This also shows that e.g. the preparatory lemmata in [14, Section 4] seem to fail, or have no relevant real version. Indeed if these results were true in our setting, by combining Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 there would give the statement that if  $\nu_P^c$  is an isometry then  $P(x) = hx + xk$  for  $h, k \in R_{\text{sa}}$ . However, taking  $P(\alpha) = \frac{\alpha + \alpha^*}{2}$  on  $\mathbb{H}$  then  $\nu_P^c$  is an isometry. If  $P(x) = hx + xk$  as above then we have  $P(\mathbf{1}) = h + k = \mathbf{1}$ , and then it is easily seen that  $0 = P(i)$  gives a contradiction.

**Remark 4.3.** Corollary 6.7 in [14] gives a characterization of left  $M$ -projections in TROs which is similar to the above. Namely, let  $X$  be a TRO (or, equivalently, a Hilbert  $C^*$ -module) and let  $P : X \rightarrow X$  be an idempotent linear map. Then  $P$  is a left  $M$ -projection if and only if

$$\|[P_n(x) \ (I - P_n)(y)]\|_{R_2(X)} = \max\{\|P_n(x)\|, \|(I - P_n)(y)\|\}, \quad x, y \in M_n(X), n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

If  $X$  is a right Hilbert  $C^*$ -module say, then such  $P$  are exactly the adjointable projections on  $X$ . We leave the proof in the real case to the reader. It is verified on the last page of [6] that the characterizations of left  $M$ -summands and left  $M$ -ideals in a TRO in [9, Lemma 8.5.16 (iv) and Theorem 8.5.19] (see also [8, Theorem 6.6]), are true in the real case.

**Corollary 4.4.** Let  $A$  be an approximately unital real operator algebra and  $J$  a closed subspace of  $A$ . Then  $J$  is a right  $M$ -ideal in  $A$  if and only if  $J$  is a right  $M$ -ideal in  $A^1$ , and if and only if  $J + iJ$  is a right  $M$ -ideal in  $A_c$ .

*Proof.* This is similar to Corollary 3.6 so we prove just one case (see also [44, Corollary 5.9] for a more general but more complicated result). If  $J + iJ$  is a closed right ideal in  $A_c$  then  $ja \in A \cap (J + iJ) = J$  for  $a \in A, j \in J$ . So  $J$  is a closed right ideal in  $A$ . Suppose that  $(J + iJ)^{\perp\perp} = eA_c^{**}$  with  $e = f + ig$  for  $f, g \in J^{\perp\perp} \subset A^{**}$ . Then  $ea = fa + iga = a$  for  $a \in J^{\perp\perp}$ . So  $f$  is a left identity for  $J^{\perp\perp}$ , so that  $J$  has a left cai by a standard argument seen above.  $\square$

One may now proceed to check which other results in the one-sided  $M$ -ideal theory (see e.g. [8, 18, 9]) work in the real case. Some part of this tedious process has already been done in [44, 6], and it quickly becomes apparent that nearly all of the theory should work. We content ourselves here by mentioning three results of independent interest from [18, Section 5.2], leaving other results in that source to the interested reader.

**Definition 4.5.** Let  $X$  be a real or complex operator space,  $Y$  a closed linear subspace of  $X$ , and  $T : X \rightarrow X$  a linear map such that  $T(Y) \subset Y$ . By  $T|_Y : Y \rightarrow Y$  we denote the restriction of  $T$  to  $Y$ , and by  $T/Y : X/Y \rightarrow X/Y$  we denote the (well-defined) quotient linear map

$$(T/Y)(x + Y) = Tx + Y.$$

As in the complex case [8], if  $T$  is completely bounded, then so are  $T|_Y$  and  $T/Y$ , and  $\|T|_Y\|_{cb}, \|T/Y\|_{cb} \leq \|T\|_{cb}$ . In the following,  $\mathcal{M}_\ell(X)$  (resp.  $\mathcal{A}_\ell(X)$ ) is the real operator algebra (resp. real  $C^*$ -algebra) of *real operator space multipliers* (resp. *left adjointable multipliers*), introduced above Theorem 2.1. See e.g. [6, Section 4] and references therein.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $X$  be a real operator space,  $Y$  a closed linear subspace of  $X$ , and  $T : X \rightarrow X$  a real linear map such that  $T(Y) \subset Y$ .*

- (i) *If  $T \in \mathcal{M}_\ell(X)$ , with  $\|T\|_{\mathcal{M}_\ell(X)} \leq 1$ , then  $T|_Y \in \mathcal{M}_\ell(Y)$  and  $T/Y \in \mathcal{M}_\ell(X/Y)$ , with  $\|T|_Y\|_{\mathcal{M}_\ell(Y)} \leq 1$  and  $\|T/Y\|_{\mathcal{M}_\ell(X/Y)} \leq 1$ .*
- (ii) *If  $T \in \mathcal{A}_\ell(X)$  and  $T^*(Y) \subset Y$ , then  $T|_Y \in \mathcal{A}_\ell(Y)$  and  $T/Y \in \mathcal{A}_\ell(X/Y)$ . Furthermore,  $(T|_Y)^* = T^*|_Y$  and  $(T/Y)^* = T^*/Y$ .*

*Proof.* One may appeal to the proof of [8, Proposition 5.8] up to the point where it is shown that the set of  $T \in \mathcal{A}_\ell(X)$  such that  $T(Y) \subset Y$  and  $T^*(Y) \subset Y$  is a  $*$ -subalgebra  $B$ , and that  $T \mapsto T/Y$  is a norm decreasing unital homomorphism  $\theta$  from  $B$  into  $\mathcal{M}_\ell(X/Y)$ . Unfortunately the next step uses a selfadjoint element trick that fails in the real case. However instead we appeal to [15, Theorem 2.6], which yields that  $\theta$  is a  $*$ -homomorphism into  $\Delta(\mathcal{M}_\ell(X/Y)) = \mathcal{A}_\ell(X/Y)$ . The rest is clear.  $\square$

Since the projections in  $\mathcal{M}_\ell(X)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_\ell(X)$  are exactly the left  $M$ -projections on  $X$  (cf. [8, Proposition 4.1], [44, Proposition 5.3]), as corollaries one obtains hereditary and quotient properties of right  $M$ -summands (resp. right  $M$ -ideals). This is just as in [18, Propositions 5.3 and 5.9] but using Proposition 4.6 above:

**Corollary 4.7.** *Let  $X$  be a real operator space,  $J$  a closed linear subspace of  $X$ , and let  $Y$  be a closed linear subspace of  $J$ .*

- (i) *If  $Y$  is a right  $M$ -summand of  $X$ , then  $Y$  is a right  $M$ -summand of  $J$ .*
- (ii) *If  $Y$  is a right  $M$ -ideal of  $X$ , then  $Y$  is a right  $M$ -ideal of  $J$ .*

**Remark.** The converse of the last result fails in general unlike for classical  $M$ -ideals: If  $J$  is a right summand of  $X$  and  $Y$  is a right summand of  $J$ , then  $Y$  need not be a right summand in  $X$ . See [18, Example 5.2.4].

**Corollary 4.8.** *Let  $X$  be a real operator space,  $J$  be a closed linear subspace of  $X$ , and  $Y$  be a closed linear subspace of  $J$ .*

- (i) *If  $J$  is a right  $M$ -summand of  $X$ , then  $J/Y$  is a right  $M$ -summand of  $X/Y$ .*
- (ii) *If  $J$  is a right  $M$ -ideal of  $X$ , then  $J/Y$  is a right  $M$ -ideal of  $X/Y$ .*

### Acknowledgements

We dedicate this paper to Roger Smith for the occasion of his belated 70th birthday. We thank him for his warm friendship over the years, and also for some history about the early days of  $M$ -ideals.

D.P. Blecher acknowledges support by a Simons Foundation Collaboration Grant and NSF Grant DMS-2154903. M. Neal was supported by Denison University. A.M. Peralta supported by grant PID2021-122126NB-C31 funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by ERDF/EU, by Junta de Andalucía grant FQM375, IMAG–María de Maeztu grant CEX2020-001105-M/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and (MOST) Ministry of Science and Technology of China grant G2023125007L. S.

Su supported by grant PID2021-122126NB-C31 funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by China Scholarship Council Program (Grant No.202306740016).

**Data availability.** There is no data set associated with this submission.

**Statements and Declarations.** The authors declare they have no financial nor conflicts of interests.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] E.M. Alfsen, E.G. Effros, Structure in real Banach spaces. Part I and II, *Ann. of Math.* **96** (1972), 98–173.
- [2] K. Alvermann, Real normed Jordan Banach algebras with an involution, *Arch. Math.* **47** (1986), 135–150.
- [3] M. Apazoglou, A. M. Peralta, Linear isometries between real JB\*-triples and C\*-algebras, *Quart. J. Math.*, **65** (2014), 485–503.
- [4] T.J. Barton, T. Dang, G. Horn, Normal representations of Banach Jordan triple systems, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* **102** (1988), No. 3, 551–555.
- [5] D.P. Blecher, *Real positive maps and conditional expectations on operator algebras*, p. 63–102 in *Positivity and its applications*, (Eds. E. Kikianty, M. Mabula, M. Messerschmidt, J. H. van der Walt, and M. Wortel), Trends in Mathematics, Birkhauser (2021).
- [6] D.P. Blecher, Real operator spaces and operator algebras, 40 pages, *Studia Math* (ArXiv 2303.17050) Published online 14 March 2024, DOI: 10.4064/sm230329-23-12.
- [7] D.P. Blecher, A. Cecco, M. Kalantar, Real structure in operator spaces, injective envelopes and  $G$ -spaces, *J. Integral Equations Operator Theory* (ArXiv 2303.17054), DOI: 10.1007/s00020-024-02766-7, Published online 24 April 2024.
- [8] D.P. Blecher, E.G. Effros, V. Zarikian, One-sided  $M$ -ideals and multipliers in operator spaces, I, *Pacific J. Math.*, **206** (2002), 287–319.
- [9] D.P. Blecher, C. Le Merdy, *Operator algebras and their modules—an operator space approach*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford (2004).
- [10] D.P. Blecher, M. Neal, Metric characterizations II, *Illinois J. Math.* **57**(2013), 25–41.
- [11] D.P. Blecher, M. Neal, Noncommutative topology and Jordan operator algebras, *Math. Nach.* **292** (2019), 481–510.
- [12] D.P. Blecher, M. Neal, Contractive projections and real positive maps on operator algebras, *Studia Math.* **256** (2021), 21–60.
- [13] D.P. Blecher, M. Neal, A.M. Peralta, S. Su,  $M$ -ideals, yet again: the case of real JB\*-triples, preprint (2024), (ArXiv 2401.05565).
- [14] D.P. Blecher, R.R. Smith, V. Zarikian, One-sided projections on C\*-algebras, *Journal of Operator Theory* **51** (2004), 201–220.
- [15] D.P. Blecher, W. Tepsan, Real operator algebras and real positive maps, *Integral Equations and Operator Theory* **90** (2021), no. 5, Paper No. 49, 33 pp.
- [16] D.P. Blecher, Z. Wang, Jordan operator algebras: basic theory, *Math. Nach.* **291** (2018), 1629–1654.
- [17] D.P. Blecher, Z. Wang, Jordan operator algebras revisited, *Math. Nach.* **292** (2019), 2129–2136.
- [18] D.P. Blecher, V. Zarikian, *The calculus of one-sided  $M$ -ideals and multipliers in operator spaces*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **179** (2006), no. 842.
- [19] M. Cabrera Garcia, A. Rodríguez Palacios, *Non-associative normed algebras. Vol. 1*, The Vidav-Palmer and Gelfand-Naimark theorems. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 154. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [20] C.M. Edwards, Multipliers of JB-algebras, *Math. Ann.*, **249**, 265–272 (1980).
- [21] E.G. Effros, Z.J. Ruan, Mapping spaces and liftings for operator spaces, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, III. Ser. **69** (1994), No. 1, 171–197.
- [22] E.G. Effros, Z.-J. Ruan, *Operator spaces*, London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series, 23. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.
- [23] F.J. Fernández-Polo, J. Garcés, A.M. Peralta, A Kaplansky theorem for JB\*-triples, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* **140** (2012), No. 9, 3179–3191.

- [24] F.J. Fernández-Polo, J. Martínez, A.M. Peralta, Geometric characterization of tripotents in real and complex JB\*-triples, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **295** (2004), No. 2, 435–443.
- [25] F.J. Fernández-Polo, J. Martínez, A.M. Peralta, Surjective isometries between real JB\*-triples, *Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **137** (2004), No. 3, 709–723.
- [26] F.J. Fernández-Polo, J. Martínez, A.M. Peralta, Contractive perturbations in JB\*-triples, *J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser.* **85** (2012), No. 2, 349–364.
- [27] F.J. Fernández-Polo, A.M. Peralta, Partial isometries: a survey, *Adv. Oper. Theory* **3** (2018), No. 1, 75–116.
- [28] Y. Friedman, B. Russo, Structure of the predual of a JBW\*-triple, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **356** (1985), 67–89.
- [29] J.J. Garcés, A.M. Peralta, One-parameter semigroups of orthogonality preservers of JB\*-algebras, *Adv. Oper. Theory* **6** (2021), No. 2, Paper No. 43.
- [30] K. Goodearl, *Notes on real and complex C\*-algebras*, Shiva Mathematics Series vol. 5, Shiva Publishing Ltd., Nantwich, 1982.
- [31] H. Hanche-Olsen, E. Størmer, *Jordan Operator Algebras*, Pitman, London, 1984.
- [32] P. Harmand, D. Werner, W. Werner, *M-ideals in Banach spaces and Banach algebras*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1547. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.
- [33] J.M. Isidro, W. Kaup, A. Rodríguez Palacios, *On real forms of JB\*-triples*, *Manuscripta Math.* **86** (1995), 311–335.
- [34] W. Kaup, A Riemann mapping theorem for bounded symmetric domains in complex Banach spaces, *Math. Z.* **183** (1983), no. 4, 503–529.
- [35] B. Li, *Real operator algebras*, World Scientific, River Edge, N.J., 2003.
- [36] M.S. Moslehian, G.A. Muñoz-Fernández, A.M. Peralta, J.B. Seoane-Sepúlveda, Similarities and differences between real and complex Banach spaces: an overview and recent developments, *Rev. Real Acad. Cienc. Exactas Fis. Nat. Ser. A-Mat.* **116** (2022), Paper No. 88.
- [37] T. Palmer, Real C\*-algebras, *Pacific J. Math.* **35** (1970), 195–204.
- [38] G.K. Pedersen, *C\*-algebras and their automorphism groups*, Academic Press, London (1979).
- [39] A.M. Peralta, On the axiomatic definition of real JB\*-triples, *Math. Nachr.* **256** (2003), 100–106.
- [40] Á. Rodríguez Palacios, Banach space characterizations of unitaries: a survey, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **369** (2010), No. 1, 168–178.
- [41] J. Rosenberg, Structure and application of real C\*-algebras, *Contemporary Mathematics*, **671** (2016), 235–258.
- [42] Z.-J. Ruan, On real operator spaces, *Acta Mathematica Sinica*, **19** (2003), 485–496.
- [43] Z.-J. Ruan, Complexifications of real operator spaces, *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, **47** (2003), 1047–1062.
- [44] S. Sharma, Real operator algebras and real completely isometric theory, *Positivity* **18** (2014), 95–118.
- [45] R.R. Smith, J.D. Ward, M-ideal structure in Banach algebras, *J. Funct. Anal.* **27** (1978), 337–349.
- [46] W. Tepsan, *Real operator spaces, real operator algebras, and real Jordan operator algebras*, PhD thesis, University of Houston (May 2020).
- [47] J.D.M. Wright, Jordan C\*-algebras, *Mich. Math. J.* **24** (1977), 291–302.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON, HOUSTON, TX 77204-3008, USA  
*Email address:* `dpbleche@central.uh.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DENISON UNIVERSITY, GRANVILLE, OH 43023  
*Email address:* `nealm@denison.edu`

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICAS DE LA UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA (IMAG), DEPARTAMENTO DE ANÁLISIS MATEMÁTICO, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA, 18071 GRANADA, SPAIN.

*Email address:* `aperalta@ugr.es`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, EAST CHINA UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, SHANGHAI, 200237 CHINA., (CURRENT ADDRESS) DEPARTAMENTO DE ANÁLISIS MATEMÁTICO, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA, 18071 GRANADA, SPAIN.

*Email address:* `lat875rina@gmail.com`