

AN EXTENSION OF PETEK-ŠEMRL PRESERVER THEOREMS FOR JORDAN EMBEDDINGS OF STRUCTURAL MATRIX ALGEBRAS

ILJA GOGIĆ, MATEO TOMAŠEVIĆ

ABSTRACT. Let M_n be the algebra of $n \times n$ complex matrices and $\mathcal{T}_n \subseteq M_n$ the corresponding upper-triangular subalgebra. In their influential work, Petek and Šemrl characterize Jordan automorphisms of M_n and \mathcal{T}_n , when $n \geq 3$, as (injective in the case of \mathcal{T}_n) continuous commutativity and spectrum preserving maps $\phi : M_n \rightarrow M_n$ and $\phi : \mathcal{T}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_n$. Recently, in a joint work with Petek, the authors extended this characterization to the maps $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow M_n$, where \mathcal{A} is an arbitrary subalgebra of M_n that contains \mathcal{T}_n . In particular, any such map ϕ is a Jordan embedding and hence of the form $\phi(X) = TXT^{-1}$ or $\phi(X) = TX^tT^{-1}$, for some invertible matrix $T \in M_n$.

In this paper we further extend the aforementioned results in the context of structural matrix algebras (SMAs), i.e. subalgebras \mathcal{A} of M_n that contain all diagonal matrices. More precisely, we provide both a necessary and sufficient condition for an SMA $\mathcal{A} \subseteq M_n$ such that any injective continuous commutativity and spectrum preserving map $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow M_n$ is necessarily a Jordan embedding. In contrast to the previous cases, such maps ϕ no longer need to be multiplicative/antimultiplicative, nor rank-one preservers.

1. INTRODUCTION

A *Jordan homomorphism* between associative algebras (or just rings) \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is a linear (additive) map $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ such that

$$\phi(ab + ba) = \phi(a)\phi(b) + \phi(b)\phi(a), \quad \text{for all } a, b \in \mathcal{A}.$$

When the algebras (rings) are 2-torsion-free, this is equivalent to

$$\phi(a^2) = \phi(a)^2, \quad \text{for all } a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

The theory of Jordan homomorphisms originates with Jordan algebras, a class of nonassociative algebras (similar to Lie algebras) which appear in various areas, including functional analysis and theoretical quantum mechanics. Since the vast majority of Jordan algebras with relevant applications arise as subalgebras of associative algebras in a natural way, Jordan homomorphisms are often studied precisely in the context of associative algebras. The basic examples of Jordan homomorphisms are algebra homomorphisms and antihomomorphisms. One of the central questions in the Jordan theory is determining conditions on algebras \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} such that any Jordan homomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ (possibly with some additional assumptions such as surjectivity) is multiplicative or antimultiplicative, or more generally, can be written as a suitable combination of such maps. This problem has a rich and long history (see e.g. [4, 15, 16, 22]).

Date: January 28, 2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 47B49, 15A27, 16S50, 16W20.

Key words and phrases. Jordan homomorphisms, spectrum preserver, commutativity preserver, matrix algebras, structural matrix algebras.

We thank Tatjana Petek for her comments on the first version of the paper. We are also very grateful to the referee for their meticulous review of the paper and for the insightful comments and suggestions they provided.

Our paper narrows down the scope to matrix algebras. Let M_n be the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices over the field of complex numbers. It is well-known that any nonzero Jordan homomorphism $\phi : M_n \rightarrow M_n$ is precisely of the form

$$(1.1) \quad \phi(X) = TXT^{-1} \quad \text{or} \quad \phi(X) = TX^tT^{-1},$$

for some invertible matrix $T \in M_n$ (see e.g. [15, 20]). Many attempts were made to characterize Jordan homomorphisms, particularly on matrix algebras, using simple preserving properties. In fact, a basis for this paper is the following (nonlinear) preserver problem which elegantly characterizes Jordan automorphisms of M_n :

Theorem 1.1 ([19, Theorem 1.1]). *Let $\phi : M_n \rightarrow M_n, n \geq 3$ be a continuous map which preserves commutativity and spectrum. Then there exists an invertible matrix $T \in M_n$ such that ϕ is of the form (1.1).*

The first version of this result was actually formulated by Petek and Šemrl in [18], where it contained an additional assumption, that ϕ preserves rank-one matrices, or commutativity in both directions. Its current form was obtained by Šemrl a decade later in [19], with the necessity of all assumptions being established via counterexamples. Furthermore, owing to a clever application of the Fundamental theorem of projective geometry, the proof of Theorem 1.1 turns out to be somewhat shorter than the proof of the initial version, which relied entirely on elementary calculations.

A direct and natural sequel to this result was Petek's paper [17] concerning the algebra \mathcal{T}_n of all upper-triangular matrices in M_n . More precisely, Petek gives a complete description of continuous commutativity and spectrum preservers $\mathcal{T}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_n$. The general form of these maps is somewhat nontrivial, but for $n \geq 3$, by additionally assuming injectivity (or surjectivity), one obtains precisely the maps of the form (1.1), for a suitable invertible matrix $T \in M_n$. In particular, all such maps are Jordan automorphisms of \mathcal{T}_n . More recently, in a joint work with Petek, the authors in [13] obtained a generalization of the aforementioned result to the next natural case: subalgebras $\mathcal{A} \subseteq M_n$ which contain the upper-triangular algebra \mathcal{T}_n . As it turns out, these are precisely the block upper-triangular algebras (see [24]). The result obtained was even more general, showing that any injective continuous commutativity and spectrum preserver $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow M_n$, where $n \geq 3$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq M_n$ is a block upper-triangular algebra, is in fact a Jordan embedding and therefore of the form (1.1).

In order to further extend (and unify) the aforementioned results, the next logical step would be to consider the subalgebras of M_n which contain all diagonal matrices. As it turns out, these are precisely unital subalgebras of M_n spanned by some set of matrix units (see [14, Proposition 3.1]). Such algebras were originally introduced in the literature by Van Wyk in [25] under the name *structural matrix algebras* (abbreviated as SMAs). They are closely related to incidence algebras and have been studied in many papers, such as [1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 21, 25]. In our recent paper [14], we determined the general form of Jordan embeddings between two SMAs in M_n (Theorem 2.2 further in the text), hence extending Coelho's description of their algebra automorphisms [9, Theorem C]. In the same paper [14] we also showed that for an arbitrary SMA $\mathcal{A} \subseteq M_n$ any linear unital rank-one preserver $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow M_n$ is necessarily a Jordan embedding [14, Theorem 5.7], while the converse fails in general. Furthermore, we described the general form of linear rank preservers $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow M_n$, as maps $X \mapsto S(PX + (I - P)X^t)T$, for some invertible matrices $S, T \in M_n$ and a central idempotent $P \in \mathcal{A}$.

The purpose of this paper is to extend the aforementioned Petek-Šemrl preserver theorems for Jordan embeddings in the context of SMAs. The main result of the paper is Theorem 3.7,

which provides both a necessary and sufficient condition on an SMA $\mathcal{A} \subseteq M_n$ such that any injective continuous commutativity and spectrum preserving map $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow M_n$ is necessarily a Jordan embedding.

This paper is organized as follows. We begin Section §2 by providing relevant terminology, notation and results that will be used throughout the paper. In Section §3, we state and prove our main result, Theorem 3.7. In Section §4 we first provide examples which demonstrate that, in contrast to the previous cases of M_n , \mathcal{T}_n , and the general block upper-triangular subalgebras of M_n , Jordan embeddings of arbitrary SMAs which satisfy the condition (i) of Theorem 3.7, no longer need to be multiplicative/antimultiplicative, nor rank(-one) preservers (Examples 4.1 and 4.2). Finally, we also discuss the indispensability of all the assumptions of Theorem 3.7 (Remark 4.3).

2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

We shall follow the same notation from [14]. More specifically, for any set S , by $|S|$ we denote its cardinality. If ρ is a binary relation on a set S , for a fixed $x \in S$ by $\rho(x)$ and $\rho^{-1}(x)$ we denote its image and preimage by ρ , respectively, i.e.

$$\rho(x) = \{y \in S : (x, y) \in \rho\}, \quad \rho^{-1}(x) = \{y \in S : (y, x) \in \rho\}.$$

For integers $k \leq l$, by $[k, l]$ we denote the set of all integers between k and l , inclusive.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

- We denote by Δ_n the diagonal relation $\{(i, i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ on $[1, n]$.
- As already stated, by M_n we denote the algebra of all $n \times n$ complex matrices. Further, by \mathcal{T}_n and \mathcal{D}_n we denote the subalgebras of all upper-triangular and diagonal matrices of M_n , respectively.
- For $A, B \in M_n$, by $A \leftrightarrow B$ and $A \perp B$ we denote that $AB = BA$ and $AB = BA = 0$, respectively.
- For $A \in M_n$ by $k_A(x) := \det(xI - A)$ we denote the characteristic polynomial of A .
- We denote by $\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{D}_n$ the diagonal matrix with diagonal entries equal to $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$ (in this order). The similar notation will be used for block diagonal matrices and the corresponding subalgebras.
- By $\Lambda_n \in \mathcal{D}_n$ we denote the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(1, \dots, n)$.
- For $i, j \in [1, n]$ we denote by $E_{ij} \in M_n$ the standard matrix unit with 1 at the position (i, j) and 0 elsewhere. Similarly, the canonical basis vectors of \mathbb{C}^n are denoted by e_1, \dots, e_n .
- For vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{C}^n$ by $u \parallel v$ we denote that the set $\{u, v\}$ is linearly dependent. The same notation is used for matrices.
- For any permutation $\pi \in S_n$ (where, as usual, S_n denotes the symmetric group), by

$$(2.1) \quad R_\pi := \sum_{k=1}^n E_{k\pi(k)}$$

we denote the permutation matrix in M_n associated to π .

As any matrix $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n \in M_n$ can be understood as a map $[1, n]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $(i, j) \mapsto A_{ij}$, we can consider its *support* $\text{supp } A$ as the set of all indices $(i, j) \in [1, n]^2$ such that $A_{ij} \neq 0$. Moreover, for a set $S \subseteq [1, n]^2$ we also say that the matrix A is *supported in* S if $\text{supp } A \subseteq S$. In a similar fashion we define the support of a vector in \mathbb{C}^n .

As usual, given a unital complex algebra \mathcal{A} , by $Z(\mathcal{A})$ and \mathcal{A}^\times we denote its centre and the set of all its invertible elements, respectively. By a *quasi-order* on $[1, n]$ we mean a reflexive transitive relation $\rho \subseteq [1, n]^2$. For a quasi-order ρ we define the unital subalgebra of M_n by

$$\mathcal{A}_\rho := \{A \in M_n : \text{supp } A \subseteq \rho\} = \text{span}\{E_{ij} : (i, j) \in \rho\},$$

which we call a *structural matrix algebra (SMA) defined by the quasi-order ρ* . Throughout the paper we also write ρ^\times for $\rho \setminus \Delta_n$.

Following [9], given a quasi-order ρ on $[1, n]$ we say that a map $g : \rho \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ is *transitive* if

$$g(i, j)g(j, k) = g(i, k), \quad \text{for all } (i, j), (j, k) \in \rho.$$

A transitive map $g : \rho \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ is said to be *trivial* if there exists a map $s : [1, n] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ such that g separates through s , that is

$$g(i, j) = \frac{s(i)}{s(j)}, \quad \text{for all } (i, j) \in \rho.$$

Every transitive map g induces an (algebra) automorphism g^* of \mathcal{A}_ρ , defined on the basis of matrix units as

$$(2.2) \quad g^*(E_{ij}) = g(i, j)E_{ij}, \quad \text{for all } (i, j) \in \rho.$$

We explicitly state the results from our recent papers [13] and [14], which will be essentially used later on a few occasions.

Theorem 2.1 ([13, Theorem 1.4]). *Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq M_n$ be a block upper-triangular subalgebra. Then every injective continuous commutativity and spectrum preserver $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow M_n$ is of the form (1.1) for some $T \in M_n^\times$, and in particular a Jordan embedding.*

Theorem 2.2 ([14, Theorem 4.9]). *Let $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$ be an SMA and let $\phi : \mathcal{A}_\rho \rightarrow M_n$ be a Jordan embedding. Then there exists an invertible matrix $S \in M_n^\times$, a central idempotent $P \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$, and a transitive map $g : \rho \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ such that*

$$\phi(X) = S(Pg^*(X) + (I - P)g^*(X)^t)S^{-1}, \quad \text{for all } X \in \mathcal{A}_\rho.$$

Theorem 2.3 ([14, Theorem 3.4]). *Let $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$ be an SMA and let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_\rho$ be a commuting family of diagonalizable matrices. Then there exists $S \in \mathcal{A}_\rho^\times$ such that $S^{-1}\mathcal{F}S \subseteq \mathcal{D}_n$.*

At the end of this preliminary section, we also introduce the following auxiliary notation, which will play a crucial role in the proof of Theorem 3.7. Let $A \in M_n$ and $S \subseteq [1, n]$.

- If $S \neq [1, n]$, denote by $A^{bS} \in M_{n-|S|}$ the matrix obtained from A by deleting all rows i and columns j where $i, j \in S$. We also formally allow $A^{b\emptyset} = A$.
- Denote by $A^{\#S} \in M_{n+|S|}$ the matrix obtained from A by adding zero rows and columns so that $(A^{\#S})^{bS} = A$.

Note that if $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$, where $s_1 < \dots < s_k$, we have

$$(2.3) \quad A^{\#S} = (\dots (A^{\#\{s_k\}})^{\#\{s_{k-1}\}} \dots)^{\#\{s_1\}}, \quad A^{bS} = (\dots (A^{b\{s_k\}})^{b\{s_{k-1}\}} \dots)^{b\{s_1\}}.$$

The next simple lemmas outline some key properties of the maps $(\cdot)^{bS}$ and $(\cdot)^{\#S}$.

Lemma 2.4. *For each $S \subseteq [1, n]$, the map $(\cdot)^{\#S} : M_n \rightarrow M_{n+|S|}$ is an algebra monomorphism.*

Proof. Obviously, $(\cdot)^{\#S}$ is a linear map. In view of (2.3), it suffices to assume that $S = \{k\}$ for some $k \in [1, n]$. Moreover, we can further assume that $k \notin \{1, n\}$ as the proof for the

cases $k \in \{1, n\}$ is conceptually similar, only even simpler in terms of notation. By using block-matrix notation, if we denote $X, Y \in M_n$ as

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} X^{I,I}_{(k-1) \times (k-1)} & X^{I,II}_{(k-1) \times (n-k+1)} \\ X^{II,I}_{(n-k+1) \times (k-1)} & X^{II,II}_{(n-k+1) \times (n-k+1)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y = \begin{bmatrix} Y^{I,I}_{(k-1) \times (k-1)} & Y^{I,II}_{(k-1) \times (n-k+1)} \\ Y^{II,I}_{(n-k+1) \times (k-1)} & Y^{II,II}_{(n-k+1) \times (n-k+1)} \end{bmatrix}$$

we then have

$$X^{\#\{k\}} = \begin{bmatrix} X^{I,I}_{(k-1) \times (k-1)} & 0_{(k-1) \times 1} & X^{I,II}_{(k-1) \times (n-k+1)} \\ 0_{1 \times (k-1)} & 0_{1 \times 1} & 0_{1 \times (n-k+1)} \\ X^{II,I}_{(n-k+1) \times (k-1)} & 0_{(n-k+1) \times 1} & X^{II,II}_{(n-k+1) \times (n-k+1)} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$Y^{\#\{k\}} = \begin{bmatrix} Y^{I,I}_{(k-1) \times (k-1)} & 0_{(k-1) \times 1} & Y^{I,II}_{(k-1) \times (n-k+1)} \\ 0_{1 \times (k-1)} & 0_{1 \times 1} & 0_{1 \times (n-k+1)} \\ Y^{II,I}_{(n-k+1) \times (k-1)} & 0_{(n-k+1) \times 1} & Y^{II,II}_{(n-k+1) \times (n-k+1)} \end{bmatrix},$$

where both matrices are in M_{n+1} . By using block-matrix multiplication (see e.g. [23, Section 2]), it follows that $X^{\#\{k\}}Y^{\#\{k\}}$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} (X^{I,I}Y^{I,I} + X^{I,II}Y^{II,I})_{(k-1) \times (k-1)} & 0_{(k-1) \times 1} & (X^{I,I}Y^{I,II} + X^{I,II}Y^{II,II})_{(k-1) \times (n-k+1)} \\ 0_{1 \times (k-1)} & 0_{1 \times 1} & 0_{1 \times (n-k+1)} \\ (X^{II,I}Y^{I,I} + X^{II,II}Y^{II,I})_{(n-k+1) \times (k-1)} & 0_{(n-k+1) \times 1} & (X^{II,I}Y^{I,II} + X^{II,II}Y^{II,II})_{(n-k+1) \times (n-k+1)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} (X^{I,I}Y^{I,I} + X^{I,II}Y^{II,I})_{(k-1) \times (k-1)} & (X^{I,I}Y^{I,II} + X^{I,II}Y^{II,II})_{(k-1) \times (n-k+1)} \\ (X^{II,I}Y^{I,I} + X^{II,II}Y^{II,I})_{(n-k+1) \times (k-1)} & (X^{II,I}Y^{I,II} + X^{II,II}Y^{II,II})_{(n-k+1) \times (n-k+1)} \end{bmatrix}^{\#\{k\}}, \end{aligned}$$

while the latter matrix is precisely $(XY)^{\#\{k\}}$. Finally, the injectivity of $(\cdot)^{\#\{k\}}$ is clear. \square

Lemma 2.5. *For a nonempty $S \subseteq [1, n]$, the set*

$$(2.4) \quad M_n^{\subseteq S} := \{X \in M_n : \text{supp } X \subseteq S \times S\}$$

is a subalgebra of M_n and

$$(\cdot)^{bS^c} : M_n^{\subseteq S} \rightarrow M_{|S|}$$

is an algebra isomorphism.

Proof. Notice first that $(X^{bS^c})^{\#S^c} = X$ for each $X \in M_n^{\subseteq S}$, hence $(\cdot)^{bS^c}$ is injective. It is obvious that $M_n^{\subseteq S}$ is a subspace and that $(\cdot)^{bS}$ is a linear map. For $X, Y \in M_n^{\subseteq S}$ and $(i, j) \in [1, n]^2 \setminus (S \times S)$, for each $k \in [1, n]$ we have $(i, k) \notin S \times S$ or $(k, j) \notin S \times S$ and hence $(XY)_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^n X_{ik}Y_{kj} = 0$. We conclude that $\text{supp}(XY) \subseteq S \times S$, so $XY \in M_n^{\subseteq S}$. Moreover, we have

$$((XY)^{bS^c})^{\#S^c} = XY = (X^{bS^c})^{\#S^c} (Y^{bS^c})^{\#S^c} \stackrel{\text{Lemma 2.4}}{=} (X^{bS^c} Y^{bS^c})^{\#S^c}.$$

The injectivity of $(\cdot)^{\#S^c}$ from Lemma 2.4 yields

$$(XY)^{bS^c} = X^{bS^c} Y^{bS^c},$$

which shows that $(\cdot)^{bS^c}$ is also a multiplicative map and thus an algebra homomorphism. As $\dim M_n^{\subseteq S} = \dim M_{|S|} = |S|^2$, the map is an isomorphism. \square

We also extend the notation $(\cdot)^{bS}$ and $(\cdot)^{\#S}$ notation to sets of matrices by applying the respective operation elementwise.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$ be an SMA. For each nonempty $S \subseteq [1, n]$, \mathcal{A}_ρ^{bS} is again an SMA in $M_{n-|S|}$.*

Proof. In view of (2.3), it suffices to assume that $S = \{k\}$ for some $k \in [1, n]$. Consider the bijection

$$\kappa : [1, n] \setminus \{k\} \rightarrow [1, n-1], \quad \kappa(j) := \begin{cases} j, & \text{if } j < k, \\ j-1, & \text{if } j > k \end{cases}$$

and the relation

$$\rho' := \{(\kappa(i), \kappa(j)) : (i, j) \in \rho \text{ and } i, j \neq k\} \subseteq [1, n-1]^2.$$

We claim that ρ' is a quasi-order on $[1, n-1]$. Let $j \in [1, n-1]$ be arbitrary. We have

$$(j, j) = (\kappa(\kappa^{-1}(j)), \kappa(\kappa^{-1}(j))).$$

Since $(\kappa^{-1}(j), \kappa^{-1}(j)) \in \rho$ and $\kappa^{-1}(j) \neq k$, it follows that $(j, j) \in \rho'$ and thus ρ' is reflexive. To show the transitivity of ρ' , consider $i, j, l \in [1, n] \setminus \{k\}$ such that $(\kappa(i), \kappa(j)), (\kappa(j), \kappa(l)) \in \rho'$. This means that $(i, j), (j, l) \in \rho$ which, by the transitivity of ρ , implies that $(i, l) \in \rho$ and hence $(\kappa(i), \kappa(l)) \in \rho'$. Finally, from the definition of $(\cdot)^{b\{k\}}$ and ρ' it is clear that $\mathcal{A}_\rho^{b\{k\}} = \mathcal{A}_{\rho'}$, and the latter is an SMA. \square

3. MAIN RESULT

As already announced, in this section we prove our main result, Theorem 3.7, which is an extension of Petek-Šemrl theorems to SMAs. Since the rank-one matrices play an essential role in the proof of Theorem 3.7, our first task is to determine the (norm-)closure of rank-one diagonalizable matrices (i.e. non-nilpotents) in SMAs. Throughout this section, given an SMA $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$, we shall use the following notation

$$\mathcal{R} := \{A \in \mathcal{A}_\rho : A \text{ is a rank-one non-nilpotent}\}$$

and by $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ we denote its closure.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$ be an SMA. Then $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ is given by*

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}} = \{ab^* : a, b \in \mathbb{C}^n, \exists k \in [1, n] \text{ such that } ae_k^*, e_k b^* \in \mathcal{A}_\rho\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_\rho.$$

In particular, $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ contains all matrices in \mathcal{A}_ρ supported in a single row or a single column.

Proof. Note that

$$\mathcal{R} = \{uv^* \in \mathcal{A}_\rho : u, v \in \mathbb{C}^n, v^*u \neq 0\}.$$

\square By the lower semicontinuity of the rank, clearly any nonzero element $A \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}$ has rank one and hence is of the form $A = ab^*$ for some nonzero vectors $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Since $A \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$, we have

$$(\text{supp } a) \times (\text{supp } b) = \text{supp } A \subseteq \rho.$$

For the sake of concreteness, we assume that M_n is equipped with the norm

$$\|X\|_\infty := \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} |X_{ij}|.$$

Denote

$$\mu := \min_{(i, j) \in \text{supp } A} |A_{ij}| > 0.$$

By the assumption, there exists a matrix $uv^* \in \mathcal{R}$ (where $u, v \in \mathbb{C}^n, v^*u \neq 0$) such that $\|uv^* - A\|_\infty < \mu$. In particular, for each $(i, j) \in \text{supp } A$ we have

$$|A_{ij}| - |(uv^*)_{ij}| \leq |A_{ij} - (uv^*)_{ij}| < \mu \implies |(uv^*)_{ij}| > |A_{ij}| - \mu \geq 0$$

so $u_i \bar{v}_j = (uv^*)_{ij} \neq 0$. It follows

$$(\text{supp } a) \times (\text{supp } b) = \text{supp } A \subseteq \text{supp } (uv^*) = (\text{supp } u) \times (\text{supp } v),$$

which implies $\text{supp } a \subseteq \text{supp } u$ and $\text{supp } b \subseteq \text{supp } v$. Since $v^*u \neq 0$, we can choose some $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that $u_k \bar{v}_k \neq 0$. Then $k \in (\text{supp } u) \cap (\text{supp } v)$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} ((\text{supp } a) \times \{k\}) \cup (\{k\} \times (\text{supp } b)) &\subseteq ((\text{supp } u) \times \{k\}) \cup (\{k\} \times (\text{supp } v)) \\ &\subseteq (\text{supp } u) \times (\text{supp } v) \subseteq \rho. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have

$$\text{supp}(ae_k^*) = (\text{supp } a) \times \{k\} \subseteq \rho \implies ae_k^* \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$$

and

$$\text{supp}(e_k b^*) = \{k\} \times (\text{supp } b) \subseteq \rho \implies e_k b^* \in \mathcal{A}_\rho.$$

\square Clearly $0 \in \bar{\mathcal{R}}$. Suppose now that $ab^* \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$ for some nonzero vectors $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $ae_k^*, e_k b^* \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$ for some $1 \leq k \leq n$. We claim that $ab^* \in \bar{\mathcal{R}}$. If $b^*a \neq 0$, then clearly $ab^* \in \mathcal{R} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{R}}$, so assume $b^*a = 0$.

For $\varepsilon > 0$ consider

$$A_\varepsilon := (a + \varepsilon e_k)(b + \varepsilon e_k)^* \in M_n.$$

We have

$$A_\varepsilon = ab^* + \varepsilon(ae_k^* + e_k b^*) + \varepsilon^2 E_{kk} \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$$

and clearly $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} A_\varepsilon = ab^*$. Furthermore,

$$(b + \varepsilon e_k)^*(a + \varepsilon e_k) = b^*a + \varepsilon(e_k^*a + b^*e_k) + \varepsilon^2 e_k e_k^* = \varepsilon(a_k + \bar{b}_k) + \varepsilon^2,$$

which is nonzero when $\varepsilon \neq -(a_k + \bar{b}_k)$, implying that $A_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{R}$ for such ε . This completes the proof of the inclusion.

Finally, suppose that a matrix $A \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$ is supported in a single row $j \in [1, n]$. Then there exists a vector $b \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $A = e_j b^*$. We have $e_j b^*, e_j e_j^* = E_{jj} \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$ so $A \in \bar{\mathcal{R}}$. The case when a matrix is supported in a single column is treated by a similar argument. \square

The next example shows that for a general SMA $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$, the set \mathcal{R} does not need to be dense in the set of all rank-one matrices in \mathcal{A}_ρ .

Example 3.2. Consider the quasi-order

$$\rho := \Delta_4 \cup \{(1, 3), (1, 4), (2, 3), (2, 4)\}$$

on $[1, 4]$ and the corresponding SMA

$$A_\rho = \begin{bmatrix} * & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & * \end{bmatrix} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_4.$$

Then

$$A := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$$

is a rank-one matrix such that $A \notin \bar{\mathcal{R}}$, as for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -ball $B(A, \varepsilon)$ in \mathcal{A}_ρ does not intersect \mathcal{R} . Indeed, if $X \in B(A, \varepsilon)$ is a diagonalizable matrix in \mathcal{A}_ρ , then there exists some $j \in [1, 4]$ such that $([1, 2] \times [3, 4]) \cup \{(j, j)\} \subseteq \text{supp } X$. Hence, X cannot be of rank-one.

Alternatively, suppose that $A = ab^*$ for some nonzero vectors $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Then one easily sees that $a \parallel (e_1 + e_2)$ and $b \parallel (e_3 + e_4)$. On the other hand, we have

$$(e_1 + e_2)e_1^*, (e_1 + e_2)e_2^*, e_3(e_3 + e_4)^*, e_4(e_3 + e_4)^* \notin \mathcal{A}_\rho$$

and these conclusions are invariant under scalar multiplication by a nonzero scalar. It follows that A does not satisfy the condition of Lemma 3.1 and thus $A \notin \overline{\mathcal{R}}$.

Remark 3.3. In fact, given a quasi-order ρ on $[1, n]$, one easily sees that \mathcal{R} is dense in the set of all rank-one matrices in \mathcal{A}_ρ if and only if for all subsets $S, T \subseteq [1, n]$ we have

$$S \times T \subseteq \rho \implies \exists k \in [1, n] \text{ such that } (S \times \{k\}) \cup (\{k\} \times T) \subseteq \rho.$$

It is not difficult to check that this condition is fulfilled for all block upper-triangular subalgebras of M_n . This is reflected in the fact that the maps resulting from Theorem 2.1 are automatically rank-one (and, a posteriori, rank) preservers (see Claim 6 further in the text and compare it to Step 5.2 in the proof of [13, Theorem 1.4]).

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$ be an SMA. Then the set*

$$\{S \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) S^{-1} : S \in \mathcal{A}_\rho^\times, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C} \text{ pairwise distinct}\}$$

is dense in \mathcal{A}_ρ .

Proof. Following the notation of [13], by $\mathcal{A}_{k_1, \dots, k_p}$ we denote the block upper-triangular subalgebra of M_n whose diagonal blocks are M_{k_1}, \dots, M_{k_p} , where $k_1 + \dots + k_p = n$.

Case 1. First we consider the case when $\operatorname{diag}(M_{k_1}, \dots, M_{k_p}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{k_1, \dots, k_p}$. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$ be arbitrary and let $\varepsilon > 0$. By applying the Schur triangularization on each diagonal block, we obtain a unitary block-diagonal matrix $U \in \mathcal{A}_\rho^\times$ such that $U^*AU \in \mathcal{T}_n$. Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{T}_n$ be a matrix which is identical to U^*AU outside the diagonal, while its diagonal $D \in \mathcal{D}_n$ consists of pairwise distinct complex numbers $\Theta_{11}, \dots, \Theta_{nn}$ such that

$$\sum_{k \in [1, n]} |(U^*AU)_{kk} - \Theta_{kk}|^2 < \varepsilon^2.$$

Clearly, $\operatorname{supp} \Theta \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(U^*AU) \cup \Delta_n \subseteq \rho$, so $\Theta \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$. If $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm on M_n , we have

$$\|A - U\Theta U^*\|_F = \|U^*AU - \Theta\|_F = \left(\sum_{k \in [1, n]} |(U^*AU)_{kk} - \Theta_{kk}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \varepsilon.$$

Since $U\Theta U^* \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$ has n distinct eigenvalues, it remains to apply Theorem 2.3.

Case 2. Now we consider the general case. By [1, p. 432] (see also [14, Lemma 3.2]), there exists a permutation $\pi \in S_n$ such that

$$\operatorname{diag}(M_{k_1}, \dots, M_{k_p}) \subseteq R_\pi \mathcal{A}_\rho R_\pi^{-1} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{k_1, \dots, k_p},$$

where $R_\pi \in M_n^\times$ is defined by (2.1). By Case 1, the set

$$\mathcal{S} := \{S \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) S^{-1} : S \in (R_\pi \mathcal{A}_\rho R_\pi^{-1})^\times = R_\pi \mathcal{A}_\rho^\times R_\pi^{-1}, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C} \text{ p. d.}\}$$

is dense in $R_\pi \mathcal{A}_\rho R_\pi^{-1}$, which immediately implies that $R_\pi^{-1} \mathcal{S} R_\pi$, which equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \{(R_\pi^{-1} S R_\pi) \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_{\pi^{-1}(1)}, \dots, \lambda_{\pi^{-1}(n)}) (R_\pi^{-1} S R_\pi)^{-1} : S \in R_\pi \mathcal{A}_\rho^\times R_\pi^{-1}, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C} \text{ p. d.}\} \\ & = \{T \operatorname{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n) T^{-1} : T \in \mathcal{A}_\rho^\times, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_n \in \mathbb{C} \text{ p. d.}\}, \end{aligned}$$

is dense in \mathcal{A}_ρ (where p. d. abbreviates ‘‘pairwise distinct’’).

□

Following the notation from [14], for a quasi-order ρ on $[1, n]$, by \approx_0 we denote the relation on $[1, n]$ given by

$$i \approx_0 j \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} (i, j) \in \rho \text{ or } (j, i) \in \rho,$$

while by \approx we denote its transitive closure, which is an equivalence relation. The respective quotient set $[1, n]/\approx$ will be denoted by \mathcal{Q} . Now we introduce a new auxiliary definition: we say that an SMA $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$ is *2-free* if $|C| \neq 2$ for all $C \in \mathcal{Q}$. Note that by [14, Remark 3.3], each SMA $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of central SMAs (each contained in some M_k for some $1 \leq k \leq n$). In this context, an SMA is 2-free if and only if this decomposition does not possess a central summand contained in M_2 (i.e. isomorphic either to M_2 or \mathcal{T}_2). Also note that this condition precludes the existence of nonlinear maps $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow M_n$ such as on M_2 (from [18, Example 7]) and \mathcal{T}_2 (from [17, Theorem 4]).

Remark 3.5. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq M_n$ is an arbitrary subalgebra and let $S \in M_n^\times$. Clearly, every injective continuous commutativity and spectrum preserver $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow M_n$ is a Jordan embedding if and only if the same holds for the corresponding maps $S^{-1}\mathcal{A}S \rightarrow M_n$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$ be a 2-free SMA and let $\phi : \mathcal{A}_\rho \rightarrow M_n$ be an injective continuous commutativity and spectrum preserver. Then there exists $S \in M_n^\times$, a transitive map $g : \rho \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ and quasi-orders $\rho_M^\phi, \rho_A^\phi \subseteq \rho$ such that $\rho_M^\phi \cup \rho_A^\phi = \rho$, $\rho_M^\phi \cap \rho_A^\phi = \Delta_n$ and*

$$\phi(E_{ij}) = \begin{cases} g(i, j)SE_{ij}S^{-1}, & \text{if } (i, j) \in \rho_M^\phi, \\ g(i, j)SE_{ji}S^{-1}, & \text{if } (i, j) \in \rho_A^\phi. \end{cases}$$

Proof. In view of Theorem 1.1, we may assume throughout that $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subsetneq M_n$.

Claim 1. *ϕ preserves characteristic polynomial.*

ϕ clearly preserves characteristic polynomial on the set

$$\{S \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)S^{-1} : S \in \mathcal{A}_\rho^\times, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C} \text{ pairwise distinct}\},$$

so the claim follows by the continuity of ϕ and the characteristic polynomial $k_{(\cdot)} : M_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[x]$ (see also the proof of [13, Lemma 4.1]). \diamond

Claim 2. *Without loss of generality we can assume $\phi(\Lambda_n) = \Lambda_n$ and hence that ϕ acts as the identity map on \mathcal{D}_n .*

Since the matrix $\phi(\Lambda_n) \in M_n$ has eigenvalues $1, \dots, n$, there exists an $S \in M_n^\times$ such that $\phi(\Lambda_n) = S\Lambda_n S^{-1}$. By passing to the map $S^{-1}\phi(\cdot)S$, we can assume $\phi(\Lambda_n) = \Lambda_n$. Fix an arbitrary $D \in \mathcal{D}_n$. We have $D \leftrightarrow \Lambda_n$ and hence $\phi(D) \leftrightarrow \phi(\Lambda_n) = \Lambda_n$. We conclude $\phi(D) \in \mathcal{D}_n$. The same argument from [19, Lemma 2.1] (see also the proof of Step 1 of [13, Theorem 1.4]) now gives that $\phi(D) = D$. \diamond

In view of Claim 2, in the sequel we assume that $n \geq 3$ (as when $n < 3$, the only 2-free SMA is \mathcal{D}_n) and that ϕ acts as the identity map on \mathcal{D}_n .

Claim 3. *For each $S \in \mathcal{A}_\rho^\times$ there exists $T \in M_n^\times$ such that*

$$\phi(SDS^{-1}) = TDT^{-1}, \quad \text{for all } D \in \mathcal{D}_n.$$

For a fixed $S \in \mathcal{A}_\rho^\times$ there exists $T \in M_n^\times$ such that $\phi(S\Lambda_n S^{-1}) = T\Lambda_n T^{-1}$. Now we can apply Claim 2 to the map $T^{-1}\phi(S(\cdot)S^{-1})T$ which satisfies the same properties as ϕ , as well as $\Lambda_n \mapsto \Lambda_n$. \diamond

Claim 4. *Let $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$ be two diagonalizable matrices such that $A \perp B$. Then $\phi(A) \perp \phi(B)$.*

Follows directly from Theorem 2.3 and Claim 3. \diamond

Claim 5.

(a) *Let $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$ be diagonalizable matrices such that $A \leftrightarrow B$. Then $\phi(\alpha A + \beta B) = \alpha\phi(A) + \beta\phi(B)$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$.*

(b) *ϕ is a homogeneous map.*

(a) follows directly from Theorem 2.3 and Claim 3, while (b) follows from (a), Lemma 3.4 and the continuity of ϕ . \diamond

Claim 6. *ϕ maps every nonzero matrix from $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ to a rank-one matrix.*

If $A \in \mathcal{R}$, then A is diagonalizable in \mathcal{A}_ρ (Theorem 2.3) so the assertion follows directly from Claim 3.

Now suppose that $A \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}$ and let $(A_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of matrices in \mathcal{R} such that $A_k \rightarrow A$. By continuity we have $\phi(A_k) \rightarrow \phi(A)$ and then by lower semicontinuity of the rank we conclude that $\phi(A)$ has rank one. \diamond

Claim 7. *Suppose that nonzero matrices $A_1, A_2 \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}$ satisfy $A_1 \perp A_2$. Then $\phi(A_1) \perp \phi(A_2)$.*

In view of Claim 6, for $j = 1, 2$ denote $\phi(A_j) = x_j y_j^*$ for some nonzero vectors $x_j, y_j \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Since in particular $A_1 \leftrightarrow A_2$, we obtain

$$(y_1^* x_2) x_1 y_2^* = (x_1 y_1^*)(x_2 y_2^*) = (x_2 y_2^*)(x_1 y_1^*) = (y_2^* x_1) x_2 y_1^*.$$

If $y_1^* x_2 = y_2^* x_1 = 0$, it follows $\phi(A_1) \perp \phi(A_2)$, as desired. Assume therefore $y_1^* x_2, y_2^* x_1 \neq 0$. Then $x_1 y_2^* \parallel x_2 y_1^*$, so $x_1 \parallel x_2$ and $y_1 \parallel y_2$. It follows $\phi(A_1) = x_1 y_1^* \parallel x_2 y_2^* = \phi(A_2)$, so by the injectivity and the homogeneity (Claim 5) of ϕ it follows $A_1 \parallel A_2$. Then $A_2 = \alpha A_1$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ so $A_1 \perp A_2$ implies $A_1^2 = 0$. By Claim 6, $\phi(A_1)$ has rank-one, and it is also a nilpotent since ϕ preserves spectrum. Therefore $\phi(A_1)^2 = 0$. By the homogeneity of ϕ (Claim 5), we conclude $\phi(A_1) \perp \alpha\phi(A_1) = \phi(\alpha A_1) = \phi(A_2)$, as desired. \diamond

Claim 8. *We have $\phi(E_{ij}) \parallel E_{ij}$ or $\phi(E_{ij}) \parallel E_{ji}$ for all $(i, j) \in \rho^\times$.*

By Lemma 3.1, note that all matrix units of \mathcal{A}_ρ are contained in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$. For each $(i, j) \in \rho^\times$ we have $E_{ij} \perp E_{kk}$ for all $k \in [1, n] \setminus \{i, j\}$ so by Claims 2 and 7 we obtain

$$\text{supp } \phi(E_{ij}) \subseteq \{i, j\} \times \{i, j\}.$$

Via a direct computation we now show that for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have

$$|\rho(i)| \geq 3 \implies (\phi(E_{ij}) \parallel E_{ij}, \forall j \in \rho(i)) \text{ or } (\phi(E_{ij}) \parallel E_{ji}, \forall j \in \rho(i)).$$

Indeed, if $(i, j), (i, k) \in \rho^\times$ for $j \neq k$, then there exist scalars $\alpha_{ii}, \alpha_{ij}, \alpha_{ji}, \alpha_{jj}, \beta_{ii}, \beta_{ik}, \beta_{ki}, \beta_{kk} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(E_{ij}) &= \alpha_{ii} E_{ii} + \alpha_{ij} E_{ij} + \alpha_{ji} E_{ji} + \alpha_{jj} E_{jj}, \\ \phi(E_{ik}) &= \beta_{ii} E_{ii} + \beta_{ik} E_{ik} + \beta_{ki} E_{ki} + \beta_{kk} E_{kk}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $E_{ij} \perp E_{ik}$, by invoking Claim 7, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \phi(E_{ij})\phi(E_{ik}) = \alpha_{ii}\beta_{ii}E_{ii} + \alpha_{ii}\beta_{ik}E_{ik} + \alpha_{ji}\beta_{ii}E_{ji} + \alpha_{jj}\beta_{ik}E_{jk}, \\ 0 &= \phi(E_{ik})\phi(E_{ij}) = \alpha_{ii}\beta_{ii}E_{ii} + \alpha_{ij}\beta_{ii}E_{ij} + \alpha_{ij}\beta_{ki}E_{kj} + \alpha_{ii}\beta_{ki}E_{ki}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $\beta_{ii} \neq 0$. Then $\alpha_{ii}\beta_{ii} = \alpha_{ij}\beta_{ii} = \alpha_{ji}\beta_{ii} = 0$ imply $\alpha_{ii} = \alpha_{ij} = \alpha_{ji} = 0$ and hence $\phi(E_{ij}) = \alpha_{jj}E_{jj}$, which contradicts injectivity (as $\phi(\alpha_{jj}E_{jj}) = \alpha_{jj}E_{jj}$). We run into a similar

contradiction when assuming $\alpha_{ii} \neq 0$ so we conclude $\alpha_{ii} = \beta_{ii} = 0$. Since $\phi(E_{ij})$ and $\phi(E_{ik})$ are rank-one nilpotents, we have

$$0 = \phi(E_{ij})^2 = \alpha_{ij}\alpha_{ji}E_{ii} + \alpha_{ij}\alpha_{jj}E_{ij} + \alpha_{jj}\alpha_{ji}E_{ji} + (\alpha_{ij}\alpha_{ji} + \alpha_{jj}^2)E_{jj}$$

and

$$0 = \phi(E_{ik})^2 = \beta_{ik}\beta_{ki}E_{ii} + \beta_{ik}\beta_{kk}E_{ik} + \beta_{kk}\beta_{ki}E_{ki} + (\beta_{ik}\beta_{ki} + \beta_{kk}^2)E_{kk}.$$

We first conclude $\alpha_{jj} = \beta_{kk} = 0$ and then $\alpha_{ij} = 0$ or $\alpha_{ji} = 0$ (but not both since otherwise we would have $\phi(E_{ij}) = 0$) and similarly $\beta_{ik} = 0$ or $\beta_{ki} = 0$ but not both. If $\alpha_{ij} \neq 0$, then $\phi(E_{ij}) = \alpha_{ij}E_{ij}$ and $\alpha_{ij}\beta_{ki} = 0$ implies $\beta_{ki} = 0$ from which we conclude $\phi(E_{ik}) = \beta_{ik}E_{ik}$. Similarly, if $\alpha_{ji} \neq 0$, we conclude $\phi(E_{ij}) = \alpha_{ji}E_{ji}$ and $\phi(E_{ik}) = \beta_{ki}E_{ki}$.

An analogous argument shows that for each $1 \leq j \leq n$ we have

$$|\rho^{-1}(j)| \geq 3 \implies (\phi(E_{ij}) \parallel E_{ij}, \forall i \in \rho^{-1}(j)) \text{ or } (\phi(E_{ij}) \parallel E_{ji}, \forall i \in \rho^{-1}(j)).$$

It remains to consider the case $(i, j) \in \rho^\times$ when $|\rho(i)| = 2$ (or $|\rho^{-1}(j)| = 2$). For concreteness, assume $\rho(i) = \{i, j\}$ for some $j \in [1, n] \setminus \{i\}$. Since, by assumption, \mathcal{A}_ρ is 2-free, clearly there exists some $k \in [1, n] \setminus \{i, j\}$ such that $k \approx_0 i$ or $k \approx_0 j$. The possibilities $(i, k) \in \rho$ and $(j, k) \in \rho$ can be excluded, as they would lead to $k \in \rho(i)$, which is false. The possibilities which remain are $(k, i) \in \rho$ or $(k, j) \in \rho$, so in either case we can assume $(k, j) \in \rho$. Then $i, j, k \in \rho^{-1}(j)$ and hence $|\rho^{-1}(j)| \geq 3$, which allows us to reach the desired conclusion that $\phi(E_{ij}) \parallel E_{ij}$ or $\phi(E_{ij}) \parallel E_{ji}$. \diamond

In view of Claim 8, for each $(i, j) \in \rho$, denote by $g(i, j) \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ the unique scalar such that

$$\phi(E_{ij}) = g(i, j)E_{ij} \quad \text{or} \quad \phi(E_{ij}) = g(i, j)E_{ji}.$$

In this manner we obtain a function $g : \rho \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ whose transitivity we intend to show in the remainder of the proof. As, by assumption, $\phi|_{\mathcal{D}_n}$ is the identity map, it is immediate that $g|_{\Delta_n} \equiv 1$. Define

$$(3.1) \quad \rho_M^\phi := \{(i, j) \in \rho : \phi(E_{ij}) \parallel E_{ij}\}, \quad \rho_A^\phi := \{(i, j) \in \rho : \phi(E_{ij}) \parallel E_{ji}\}.$$

Clearly, $\rho_M^\phi \cup \rho_A^\phi = \rho$ and $\rho_M^\phi \cap \rho_A^\phi = \Delta_n$.

Claim 9. *Suppose $(i, j) \in \rho^\times$. Then*

$$(\{i\} \times \rho(i)) \cup (\rho^{-1}(i) \times \{i\}) \cup (\{j\} \times \rho(j)) \cup (\rho^{-1}(j) \times \{j\}) \subseteq \rho_M^\phi$$

or

$$(\{i\} \times \rho(i)) \cup (\rho^{-1}(i) \times \{i\}) \cup (\{j\} \times \rho(j)) \cup (\rho^{-1}(j) \times \{j\}) \subseteq \rho_A^\phi.$$

For concreteness suppose that $(i, j) \in \rho_M^\phi$, as the other case is similar.

- If $k \in \rho^\times(i)$, then $E_{ij} \perp E_{ik}$ and Claim 7 imply $(i, k) \in \rho_M^\phi$.
- If $k \in (\rho^\times)^{-1}(j)$, then $E_{ij} \perp E_{kj}$ and Claim 7 imply $(k, j) \in \rho_M^\phi$.
- Let $k \in (\rho^\times)^{-1}(i)$. If $k \neq j$, then by transitivity we obtain $(k, j) \in \rho^\times$ and hence $(k, j) \in \rho_M^\phi$ and then $(k, i) \in \rho_M^\phi$, by the previous two cases. On the other hand, the case $k = j$ follows from the injectivity and homogeneity of ϕ .
- Let $k \in \rho^\times(j)$. The case $k = i$ again follows from the injectivity and homogeneity of ϕ . If $k \neq i$, then by transitivity we obtain $(i, k) \in \rho^\times$ and hence $(i, k) \in \rho_M^\phi$ and then $(j, k) \in \rho_M^\phi$, by the first two cases.

\diamond

Claim 10. *Suppose that $X \in \mathcal{A}_\rho \cap M_n^{\subseteq S}$ for some $S \subseteq [1, n]$ (where $M_n^{\subseteq S}$ is defined in (2.4)). Then $\phi(X) \in M_n^{\subseteq S}$.*

Following our notation from Section 2, by applying Lemma 3.4 to the matrix $X^{\flat S^c} \in \mathcal{A}_\rho^{\flat S^c}$, by the continuity of ϕ it suffices to assume that X is a diagonalizable matrix. Now the assertion follows from $X \perp E_{kk}$ for all $k \in [1, n] \setminus S$, Claim 4 and $\phi(E_{kk}) = E_{kk}$. \diamond

Claim 11. *Let $S \subseteq [1, n]$ be a nonempty set. The map*

$$\psi : \mathcal{A}_\rho^{\flat S^c} \rightarrow M_{|S|}, \quad X \mapsto \phi(X^{\sharp S^c})^{\flat S^c}$$

is an injective continuous commutativity and spectrum preserver.

By Lemma 2.6, $\mathcal{A}_\rho^{\flat S}$ is an SMA in $M_{|S|}$. In view of Claim 10 it makes sense to consider the maps

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_1 : \mathcal{A}_\rho^{\flat S^c} &\rightarrow M_n^{\subseteq S}, & X &\mapsto X^{\sharp S^c}, \\ \psi_2 : M_n^{\subseteq S} &\rightarrow M_n^{\subseteq S}, & X &\mapsto \phi(X), \\ \psi_3 : M_n^{\subseteq S} &\rightarrow M_{|S|}, & X &\mapsto X^{\flat S^c}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\psi = \psi_3 \circ \psi_2 \circ \psi_1$. By Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, ψ_1 and ψ_3 are algebra monomorphisms so it follows that ψ is an injective continuous commutativity preserver. Finally, for each $X \in \mathcal{A}_\rho^{\flat S^c}$ we have the equality of polynomials

$$\begin{aligned} x^{n-|S|} k_{\psi(X)}(x) &= x^{n-|S|} k_{\phi(X^{\sharp S^c})^{\flat S^c}}(x) = k_{(\phi(X^{\sharp S^c})^{\flat S^c})^{\sharp S^c}}(x) \stackrel{\text{Claim 10}}{=} k_{\phi(X^{\sharp S^c})}(x) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Claim 1}}{=} k_{X^{\sharp S^c}}(x) = x^{n-|S|} k_X(x), \end{aligned}$$

which implies $k_{\psi(X)} = k_X$. In particular, ψ is a spectrum preserver. \diamond

It remains to show that ρ_M^ϕ and ρ_A^ϕ are quasi-orders and that the map g is transitive. The reflexivity of ρ_M^ϕ and ρ_A^ϕ is immediate, while their transitivity follows from Claim 9. In order to show that g is a transitive map, first note that Claim 9 implies

$$(3.2) \quad (i, j), (j, k) \in \rho \quad \implies \quad ((i, j), (j, k) \in \rho_M^\phi \quad \text{or} \quad (i, j), (j, k) \in \rho_A^\phi).$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that $g|_{\rho_M^\phi}$ and $g|_{\rho_A^\phi}$ are transitive maps. We focus on ρ_M^ϕ as the proof for ρ_A^ϕ is analogous. Suppose that $(i, j), (j, k) \in \rho_M^\phi$. We show that $g(i, j)g(j, k) = g(i, k)$. This is obvious if $i = j$ or $j = k$, so assume further that $(i, j), (j, k) \in (\rho_M^\phi)^\times$. We first focus on the case $i \neq k$. By deleting l -th row and column in \mathcal{A}_ρ for each $l \in [1, n] \setminus \{i, j, k\}$, the elements which remain are

$$\begin{bmatrix} (i, i) & (i, j) & (i, k) \\ * & (j, j) & (j, k) \\ * & * & (k, k) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{A}_\rho^{\flat(\{i, j, k\}^c)} \subseteq M_3$ contains \mathcal{T}_3 . Hence, in view of Lemma 2.6 and Claim 11 we can apply Theorem 2.1 to the map

$$\psi : \mathcal{A}_\rho^{\flat(\{i, j, k\}^c)} \rightarrow M_3, \quad X \mapsto \phi(X^{\sharp(\{i, j, k\}^c)})^{\flat(\{i, j, k\}^c)}$$

to conclude that ψ is a Jordan embedding (and thus multiplicative or antimultiplicative). As $(i, j), (j, k) \in \rho_M^\phi$, one easily verifies

$$\psi|_{\mathcal{D}_3} = \text{id}, \quad \psi(E_{12}) = g(i, j)E_{12}, \quad \psi(E_{13}) = g(i, k)E_{13}, \quad \psi(E_{23}) = g(j, k)E_{23},$$

whence ψ is a multiplicative map. In particular, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g(i, k)E_{13} &= \psi(E_{13}) = \psi(E_{12}E_{23}) = \psi(E_{12})\psi(E_{23}) \\ &= g(i, j)g(j, k)E_{13}, \end{aligned}$$

yielding $g(i, k) = g(i, j)g(j, k)$.

It remains to consider the shorter case $i = k$. Since \mathcal{A}_ρ is 2-free, there exists some $l \in [1, n] \setminus \{i, j\}$ such that $i \approx_0 l$ or $j \approx_0 l$. Since i and j play a symmetric role, without loss of generality suppose the former. If $(i, l) \in \rho^\times$, then from $(j, i) \in \rho_M^\phi$ via Claim 9 we conclude $(i, l) \in (\rho_M^\phi)^\times$. Now from $(j, i), (i, l) \in (\rho_M^\phi)^\times$ by the previous case it follows $(j, l) \in (\rho_M^\phi)^\times$ and

$$g(j, l) = g(j, i)g(i, l), \quad g(i, l) = g(i, j)g(j, l).$$

We obtain

$$g(i, j)g(j, i) = \frac{g(i, l)}{g(j, l)} \cdot \frac{g(j, l)}{g(i, l)} = 1$$

as desired. On the other hand, if $(l, i) \in \rho^\times$ then similarly we obtain

$$g(l, j) = g(l, i)g(i, j), \quad g(l, i) = g(l, j)g(j, i),$$

again yielding $g(i, j)g(j, i) = 1$. \square

Theorem 3.7. *Let $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$ be an SMA. Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

(i) *For each $(i, j) \in \rho^\times$ we have*

$$|(\rho(i) \cup \rho^{-1}(i)) \cap (\rho(j) \cup \rho^{-1}(j))| \geq 3.$$

(ii) *Every continuous injective commutativity and spectrum preserver $\phi : \mathcal{A}_\rho \rightarrow M_n$ is necessarily a Jordan embedding.*

Remark 3.8. Note that for $(i, j) \in \rho^\times$, the condition (i) of Theorem 3.7 (i) is equivalent to

$$(\rho(i) \cup \rho^{-1}(i)) \cap (\rho(j) \cup \rho^{-1}(j)) \not\subseteq \{i, j\}.$$

In particular, (i) implies that \mathcal{A}_ρ is 2-free.

In the next lemma we first consider the $n = 3$ case.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_3$ be an SMA distinct from \mathcal{D}_3 . The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) *\mathcal{A}_ρ satisfies the condition (i) from Theorem 3.7.*

(b) *There exist distinct $i, j \in [1, 3]$ such that $\rho(i) = \rho^{-1}(j) = [1, 3]$.*

(c) *There exists a permutation $\pi \in S_3$ such that $R_\pi \mathcal{A}_\rho R_\pi^{-1}$ is a block upper-triangular subalgebra of M_3 .*

Proof. For $\pi \in S_3$, denote the quasi-order

$$\rho' := \{(\pi(i), \pi(j)) : (i, j) \in \rho\}.$$

Note that for all $i, j \in [1, 3]$ we have

$$(3.3) \quad \rho(i) = \rho^{-1}(j) = [1, 3] \iff \rho'(\pi(i)) = (\rho')^{-1}(\pi(j)) = [1, 3].$$

Notice also that an SMA in M_3 is a block upper-triangular subalgebra if and only if it contains the first row and third column.

$\boxed{(a) \implies (b)}$ Since $\mathcal{A}_\rho \neq \mathcal{D}_3$, choose some $(i, j) \in \rho^\times$. By (i), there exists $k \in [1, 3] \setminus \{i, j\}$ such that

$$k \in (\rho(i) \cup \rho^{-1}(i)) \cap (\rho(j) \cup \rho^{-1}(j)).$$

We consider two cases:

- If $k \in \rho(j)$, then from $(i, j), (j, k) \in \rho$ it follows $(i, k) \in \rho$ and hence $\rho(i) = \rho^{-1}(k) = [1, 3]$.
- If $k \in \rho^{-1}(j)$, then from $(i, j), (k, j) \in \rho$ it follows $\rho^{-1}(j) = [1, 3]$. Moreover, since $k \in \rho(i) \cup \rho^{-1}(i)$, we obtain $(i, k) \in \rho$ or $(k, i) \in \rho$, which implies $\rho(i) = [1, 3]$ or $\rho(k) = [1, 3]$, respectively.

(b) \implies (c) Let $\pi \in S_3$ be any permutation such that $\pi(i) = 1$ and $\pi(j) = 3$. Then by (3.3), $R_\pi \mathcal{A}_\rho R_\pi^{-1} = \mathcal{A}_{\rho'}$ satisfies $\rho'(1) = (\rho')^{-1}(3) = [1, 3]$, so $R_\pi \mathcal{A}_\rho R_\pi^{-1}$ is a block upper-triangular subalgebra of M_3 .

(c) \implies (a) By assumption, there exists a permutation $\pi \in S_3$ such that $\rho'(1) = (\rho')^{-1}(3) = [1, 3]$. Denote $i := \pi^{-1}(1)$ and $j := \pi^{-1}(3)$. Again, by (3.3), we have $\rho(i) = \rho^{-1}(j) = [1, 3]$. Let $k \in [1, 3] \setminus \{i, j\}$. Since $k \in \rho(i)$ and $k \in \rho^{-1}(j)$, we also have $\rho(k) \cup \rho^{-1}(k) = [1, 3]$. Therefore, \mathcal{A}_ρ satisfies (i). \square

Proof of Theorem 3.7.

(i) \implies (ii) First note that the $n = 1$ case is trivial, while the only SMA in M_2 which satisfies (i) is \mathcal{D}_2 . In the $n = 3$ case, this implication follows directly from Lemma 3.9, Theorem 2.1 and Remark 3.5. In the remainder of the proof, we can therefore assume $n \geq 4$ (although this is not necessary).

Since \mathcal{A}_ρ is 2-free, in view of Proposition 3.6 (and Claim 5) without loss of generality by passing to the map $S^{-1}\phi((g^*)^{-1}(\cdot))S$ (where g^* is the automorphism induced by g , as defined in (2.2)) we can assume that

$$(3.4) \quad \phi(E_{ij}) = \begin{cases} E_{ij}, & \text{if } (i, j) \in \rho_M^\phi, \\ E_{ji}, & \text{if } (i, j) \in \rho_A^\phi \end{cases}$$

where ρ_M^ϕ and ρ_A^ϕ are quasi-orders on $[1, n]$ defined by (3.1).

Claim 12. *Both quasi-orders ρ_M^ϕ and ρ_A^ϕ satisfy (i). In particular, by Remark 3.8, both SMAs $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_M^\phi}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_A^\phi}$ are 2-free.*

For simplicity, we prove the claim for ρ_M^ϕ , as the argument for ρ_A^ϕ is almost identical. Suppose that $(i, j) \in (\rho_M^\phi)^\times$. In particular, $(i, j) \in \rho^\times$ so by Remark 3.8 there exists some $k \in [1, n] \setminus \{i, j\}$ such that

$$k \in (\rho(i) \cup \rho^{-1}(i)) \cap (\rho(j) \cup \rho^{-1}(j)).$$

Then at least one of the following holds: $(i, k) \in \rho, (k, i) \in \rho$ is true, and similarly for $(j, k) \in \rho, (k, j) \in \rho$. In both cases, Claim 9 implies that the corresponding pair is in fact contained in ρ_M^ϕ . Thus,

$$k \in (\rho_M^\phi(i) \cup (\rho_M^\phi)^{-1}(i)) \cap (\rho_M^\phi(j) \cup (\rho_M^\phi)^{-1}(j)).$$

\diamond

Claim 13. *Every rank-one matrix in \mathcal{A}_ρ is contained in $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_M^\phi}$ or in $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_A^\phi}$.*

Assume $ab^* \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$ for some nonzero vectors $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^n$. We have

$$(\text{supp } a) \times (\text{supp } b) \subseteq \rho.$$

Let $(i, j), (k, l) \in ((\text{supp } a) \times (\text{supp } b)) \cap \rho^\times$ be distinct but otherwise arbitrary. We need to show that $(i, j), (k, l) \in \rho_M^\phi$ or $(i, j), (k, l) \in \rho_A^\phi$. If $j = k$ or $i = l$, this follows from (3.2). Otherwise, since $\{i, k\} \times \{j, l\} \subseteq \rho$, we have

$$\begin{cases} (i, l) \in \rho^\times \implies (i, j), (i, l), (k, l) \in \rho^\times, \\ (k, j) \in \rho^\times \implies (i, j), (k, j), (k, l) \in \rho^\times, \end{cases}$$

so in either case we obtain the desired assertion from Claim 9. \diamond

Claim 14. ϕ acts as the identity on $\mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\rho_M}^\phi$, and as transposition on $\mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\rho_A}^\phi$.

For concreteness assume that $ab^* \in \mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\rho_M}^\phi$ for some (nonzero) vectors $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^n$, as the other case is similar. In view of Claim 6, denote $\phi(ab^*) = xy^*$ for some nonzero $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$. As $b^*a \neq 0$, we can fix some

$$j \in (\text{supp } a) \cap (\text{supp } b).$$

Let $i \in [1, n] \setminus \{j\}$ be arbitrary and consider the matrix

$$A := (\overline{b_j}e_i - \overline{b_i}e_j)(\overline{a_i}e_j - \overline{a_j}e_i)^*.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (\overline{b_j}e_i - \overline{b_i}e_j)e_i^* &= \begin{cases} \overline{b_j}E_{ii} - \overline{b_i}E_{ji}, & \text{if } i \in \text{supp } b, \\ \overline{b_j}E_{ii}, & \text{if } i \notin \text{supp } b, \end{cases} \\ e_i(\overline{a_i}e_j - \overline{a_j}e_i)^* &= \begin{cases} a_iE_{ij} - a_jE_{ii}, & \text{if } i \in \text{supp } a, \\ -a_jE_{ii}, & \text{if } i \notin \text{supp } a. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

In all cases, these matrices belong to \mathcal{A}_ρ , so by Lemma 3.1 we have $A \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}$ and in particular $A \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$.

We claim that $\phi(A) = A$. Consider the following cases:

- If $i \notin (\text{supp } a) \cup (\text{supp } b)$, then $A = -a_j\overline{b_j}E_{ii}$ and hence $\phi(A) = A$ by the homogeneity of ϕ (Claim 5).
- Suppose that $i \in \text{supp } a$. Then $(i, j) \in \text{supp } A \subseteq \{i, j\} \times \{i, j\}$, so $(i, j) \in \rho^\times$. By (i) there exists $k \in [1, n] \setminus \{i, j\}$ such that

$$k \in (\rho(i) \cup \rho^{-1}(i)) \cap (\rho(j) \cup \rho^{-1}(j)).$$

It is immediate that

$$\{i, j, k\} \subseteq (\rho(i) \cup \rho^{-1}(i)) \cap (\rho(j) \cup \rho^{-1}(j)) \cap (\rho(k) \cup \rho^{-1}(k)),$$

which via Lemma 2.6 implies that the SMA $\mathcal{A}_\rho^{b(\{i, j, k\}^c)} \subseteq M_3$ satisfies (i). Furthermore, since

$$(i, j) \in (\text{supp } a) \times (\text{supp } b) = \text{supp}(ab^*) \subseteq \rho_M^\phi,$$

by Claim 9 we conclude that

$$(\{i, j, k\} \times \{i, j, k\}) \cap \rho \subseteq \rho_M^\phi.$$

In particular, by (3.4), ϕ acts as the identity on all matrix units supported in $(\{i, j, k\} \times \{i, j, k\}) \cap \rho$. We can now invoke Lemma 2.6 and Claim 11 with the $n = 3$ case (which was already covered) to conclude that the map

$$\psi : \mathcal{A}_\rho^{b(\{i, j, k\}^c)} \rightarrow M_3, \quad X \mapsto \phi(X^{\sharp(\{i, j, k\}^c)})^{b(\{i, j, k\}^c)}$$

is a Jordan embedding. Since ψ acts as the identity on all matrix units of $\mathcal{A}_\rho^{b(\{i, j, k\}^c)}$, we conclude that ψ is the identity map. In particular, Claim 10 implies that $\phi(A) = A$.

- Suppose that $i \in \text{supp } b$. Then $(j, i) \in \rho^\times$ so by the symmetry of our assumption (i), the exact same discussion as above yields $\phi(A) = A$.

Now notice that $ab^* \perp A$ so by Claim 7 we obtain

$$xy^* = \phi(ab^*) \perp \phi(A) = A \implies (\overline{a_i}e_j - \overline{a_j}e_i)^*x = y^*(\overline{b_j}e_i - \overline{b_i}e_j) = 0.$$

Overall, it follows

$$x \perp \{\overline{a_i}e_j - \overline{a_j}e_i : i \in [1, n] \setminus \{j\}\}, \quad y \perp \{\overline{b_j}e_i - \overline{b_i}e_j : i \in [1, n] \setminus \{j\}\}.$$

In fact, these sets are bases for $\{a\}^\perp$ and $\{b\}^\perp$ respectively. We conclude $x \parallel a$ and $y \parallel b$, which implies $\phi(ab^*) \parallel ab^*$. Equating the traces yields $\phi(ab^*) = ab^*$. \diamond

Claim 15. ϕ acts as the identity on $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_M}^\phi$, and as transposition on $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_A}^\phi$.

For the sake of variety, we prove the second claim, as the first one is similar. By Claim 3, for each $S \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_A}^\times$ there exists $T \in M_n^\times$ such that

$$\phi(SDS^{-1}) = TDT^{-1}, \quad \text{for all } D \in \mathcal{D}_n.$$

In particular, for all $j \in [1, n]$ we have

$$TE_{jj}T^{-1} = \phi(\underbrace{SE_{jj}S^{-1}}_{\in \mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\rho_A}^\phi}) \stackrel{\text{Claim 14}}{=} (SE_{jj}S^{-1})^t.$$

Hence, by the linearity of the maps $T(\cdot)T^{-1}$ and $(S(\cdot)S^{-1})^t$, for all $D \in \mathcal{D}_n$ we have

$$\phi(SDS^{-1}) = TDT^{-1} = (SDS^{-1})^t.$$

The Claim now follows by the continuity of ϕ from Lemma 3.4 applied to $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_A}^\phi$. \diamond

Claim 16. Let $P \in \mathcal{D}_n$ be a diagonal idempotent defined by

$$P_{ii} = 1 \iff \text{there exists } j \in [1, n] \setminus \{i\} \text{ such that } (i, j) \in \rho_M^\phi \text{ or } (j, i) \in \rho_M^\phi.$$

Then $P \in Z(\mathcal{A}_\rho)$, $PX \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_M}^\phi$ and $(I - P)X \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_A}^\phi$ for all $X \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$.

A variant of this argument (when ϕ is assumed to be a Jordan homomorphism) already appears in [14, Lemma 4.8 (c)] and a similar proof applies here. Indeed, it suffices to show that for all $(i, j) \in \rho$ we have

$$(3.5) \quad P \leftrightarrow E_{ij}, \quad PE_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_M}^\phi, \quad (I - P)E_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_A}^\phi.$$

Since all three claims are trivially true when $i = j$, fix $(i, j) \in \rho^\times$. We consider two separate cases:

- If $(i, j) \in \rho_M^\phi$, then $P_{ii} = P_{jj} = 1$ by definition, so

$$PE_{ij} = \underbrace{E_{ij}}_{\in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_M}^\phi} = E_{ij}P \implies (I - P)E_{ij} = 0 \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_A}^\phi,$$

which establishes (3.5).

- If $(i, j) \in \rho_A^\phi$, then by Claim 9, $P_{ii} = P_{jj} = 0$. Hence,

$$PE_{ij} = \underbrace{0}_{\in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_M}^\phi} = E_{ij}P \implies (I - P)E_{ij} = E_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_A}^\phi,$$

so again (3.5) follows.

◇

Claim 17. *Let $P \in Z(\mathcal{A}_\rho)$ be the idempotent from Claim 16. Then for all $X \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$ we have*

$$\phi(X) = PX + (I - P)X^t.$$

In particular, ϕ is a Jordan embedding.

Fix a diagonalizable matrix $X \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$. Since the idempotent P is central, from Theorem 2.3 it easily follows that PX and $(I - P)X$ are both (in fact, simultaneously) diagonalizable. By Claim 16, we have $PX \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_M}^\phi$, $(I - P)X \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_A}^\phi$ and trivially $PX \perp (I - P)X$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(X) &= \phi(PX + (I - P)X) \stackrel{\text{Claim 5}}{=} \phi(PX) + \phi((I - P)X) \stackrel{\text{Claim 15}}{=} PX + ((I - P)X)^t \\ &= PX + (I - P)X^t. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the continuous maps ϕ and $P(\cdot) + (I - P)(\cdot)^t$ coincide on the set of all diagonalizable matrices in \mathcal{A}_ρ , so Lemma 3.4 implies their overall equality. ◇

$(ii) \implies (i)$ Suppose that an SMA $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$ fails to satisfy (i). Then by Remark 3.8 there exists $(r, s) \in \rho^\times$ such that

$$(\rho(r) \cup \rho^{-1}(r)) \cap (\rho(s) \cup \rho^{-1}(s)) = \{r, s\}.$$

We consider two separate cases:

Case 1. Suppose that $(s, r) \in \rho$. Then by the transitivity of ρ it easily follows

$$(3.6) \quad \rho(r) = \rho^{-1}(r) = \rho(s) = \rho^{-1}(s) = \{r, s\}.$$

Define a rank-two idempotent

$$P := E_{rr} + E_{ss} \in \mathcal{A}_\rho.$$

Note that P is central. Indeed, fix $(i, j) \in \rho$ and note that $i \in \{r, s\}$ if and only if $j \in \{r, s\}$. On the other hand, we clearly have

$$PE_{ij} = \begin{cases} E_{ij}, & \text{if } i \in \{r, s\}, \\ 0, & \text{if } i \notin \{r, s\}, \end{cases} \quad E_{ij}P = \begin{cases} E_{ij}, & \text{if } j \in \{r, s\}, \\ 0, & \text{if } j \notin \{r, s\}, \end{cases}$$

so $P \leftrightarrow E_{ij}$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{A}_\rho = P\mathcal{A}_\rho \oplus (I - P)\mathcal{A}_\rho$$

is an inner direct sum of algebras. Moreover, by (3.6), $P\mathcal{A}_\rho$ is isomorphic to M_2 so let $\psi : M_2 \rightarrow M_2$ be a slight modification of the nonlinear counterexample due to [18, Example 7] (in order to ensure its injectivity). Let $f : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$ be any nonconstant continuous map such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f(t) = 1$ (concretely, we can choose $f(t) := e^{\frac{i\pi}{t+1}}$). Define $\psi : M_2 \rightarrow M_2$ by

$$\psi \left(\begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \right) := \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ c & d \end{bmatrix}, & \text{if } b = 0, \\ \begin{bmatrix} a & bf \left(\left| \frac{c}{b} \right| \right) \\ cf \left(\left| \frac{c}{b} \right| \right) & d \end{bmatrix}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then ψ is a nonlinear injective continuous spectrum and commutativity preserver (and hence not a Jordan homomorphism). Then the same holds for the map

$$\phi : \mathcal{A}_\rho \rightarrow M_n, \quad \phi(X) := \underbrace{\psi(X^{\{r,s\}^c})}_{\in P\mathcal{A}_\rho} + \underbrace{(X^{\{r,s\}})^{\#\{r,s\}}}_{=(I-P)X}.$$

Case 2. Suppose that $(s, r) \notin \rho$. By the assumption and the transitivity of ρ it easily follows that

$$(3.7) \quad \rho^{-1}(r) = \{r\}, \quad \rho(s) = \{s\}.$$

Each $X \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$ can be written as

$$X = X^\diamond + X_{rs}E_{rs},$$

where

$$X^\diamond := X - X_{rs}E_{rs} \in \mathcal{A}_\rho.$$

Consider the map

$$f : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad f(u, v) := \begin{cases} v, & \text{if } |u| \leq |v|, \\ v \frac{v}{u}, & \text{if } |u| > |v|. \end{cases}$$

It is straightforward to check that f is continuous, homogeneous, and that $f(u, \cdot) : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is injective for each fixed $u \in \mathbb{C}$. Define a map

$$\phi : \mathcal{A}_\rho \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\rho, \quad \phi(X) := X^\diamond + f(X_{ss} - X_{rr}, X_{rs})E_{rs},$$

that is

$$\phi(X)_{ij} = \begin{cases} X_{ij}, & \text{if } (i, j) \neq (r, s), \\ f(X_{ss} - X_{rr}, X_{rs}), & \text{if } (i, j) = (r, s). \end{cases}$$

We claim that ϕ is a continuous injective commutativity and spectrum preserver, but not a linear map (and hence not a Jordan homomorphism).

- The continuity of ϕ follows directly from the continuity of f .
- Using the Laplace expansion along the s -th row and the r -th column, we obtain

$$k_X(x) = (X_{rr} - x)(X_{ss} - x)k_{X^{\flat\{r,s\}}}(x) = k_{X^\diamond}(x).$$

In particular, the spectrum of X is equal to the spectrum of X^\diamond . As $\phi(X)^\diamond = X^\diamond$, we conclude that ϕ is a spectrum preserver.

- Suppose that $\phi(X) = \phi(Y)$ for some $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$. Immediately we obtain
 - $X^\diamond = Y^\diamond$,
 - $f(X_{ss} - X_{rr}, X_{rs}) = f(Y_{ss} - Y_{rr}, Y_{rs})$,
 whence we conclude $f(X_{ss} - X_{rr}, X_{rs}) = f(X_{ss} - X_{rr}, Y_{rs})$. This implies $X_{rs} = Y_{rs}$, since $f(X_{ss} - X_{rr}, \cdot)$ is injective. Therefore, $X = Y$, so ϕ is injective.
- Suppose that $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} XY &= (X^\diamond + X_{rs}E_{rs})(Y^\diamond + Y_{rs}E_{rs}) \\ &= X^\diamond Y^\diamond + Y_{rs}X^\diamond E_{rs} + X_{rs}E_{rs}Y^\diamond \\ &= X^\diamond Y^\diamond + Y_{rs} \left(\sum_{i \in \rho^{-1}(r)} X_{ir}E_{ir} \right) E_{rs} + X_{rs}E_{rs} \left(\sum_{i \in \rho(s)} Y_{si}E_{si} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(3.7)}{=} X^\diamond Y^\diamond + (X_{rr}Y_{rs} + X_{rs}Y_{ss})E_{rs}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $(XY)^\diamond = X^\diamond Y^\diamond$, as $E_{rr}(X^\diamond Y^\diamond)E_{ss} = 0$. Indeed, if $E_{rr}E_{ij}E_{kl}E_{ss} \neq 0$ for some $(i, j), (k, l) \in \rho \setminus \{(r, s)\}$, then $i = r, j = k$ and $l = s$, which implies that $j \in \rho(r) \cap \rho^{-1}(s) = \{r, s\}$; a contradiction. Similarly,

$$YX = Y^\diamond X^\diamond + (Y_{rr}X_{rs} + Y_{rs}X_{ss})E_{rs}, \quad (YX)^\diamond = Y^\diamond X^\diamond.$$

Hence,

$$(3.8) \quad X \leftrightarrow Y \iff \begin{cases} X^\diamond \leftrightarrow Y^\diamond, \\ (X_{ss} - X_{rr})Y_{rs} = (Y_{ss} - Y_{rr})X_{rs}. \end{cases}$$

Assume now $X \leftrightarrow Y$. Since $\phi(X)^\diamond = X^\diamond$ and $\phi(Y)^\diamond = Y^\diamond$, to show that $\phi(X) \leftrightarrow \phi(Y)$, it remains to verify that

$$(X_{ss} - X_{rr})f(Y_{ss} - Y_{rr}, Y_{rs}) = (Y_{ss} - Y_{rr})f(X_{ss} - X_{rr}, X_{rs}).$$

By the homogeneity of f , this is equivalent to

$$f((X_{ss} - X_{rr})(Y_{ss} - Y_{rr}), (X_{ss} - X_{rr})Y_{rs}) = f((X_{ss} - X_{rr})(Y_{ss} - Y_{rr}), (Y_{ss} - Y_{rr})X_{rs}),$$

which is true by (3.8). We conclude that ϕ preserves commutativity.

- That ϕ is not an additive map follows from

$$\phi(2E_{rr} + E_{rs}) = 2E_{rr} + \frac{1}{2}E_{rs}, \quad \phi(E_{rs}) = E_{rs}, \quad \phi(2E_{rr} + 2E_{rs}) = 2E_{rr} + 2E_{rs}.$$

The proof of Theorem 3.7 is now complete. \square

4. EXAMPLES AND FINAL REMARKS

In contrast to the previous cases of M_n , \mathcal{T}_n , and the general block upper-triangular subalgebras of M_n , note that for an arbitrary SMA $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$, Jordan embeddings $\mathcal{A}_\rho \rightarrow M_n$ are not necessarily multiplicative or antimultiplicative, even when \mathcal{A}_ρ satisfies the condition (i) of Theorem 3.7.

Example 4.1. Consider the quasi-order on $[1, 6]$ defined by

$$\rho := ([1, 3] \times [1, 3]) \cup ([4, 6] \times [4, 6]).$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{A}_\rho = \text{diag}(M_3, M_3) \subseteq M_6$ satisfies the condition (i) of Theorem 3.7. However, the Jordan automorphism ϕ of \mathcal{A}_ρ given by $\phi(\text{diag}(X, Y)) := \text{diag}(X, Y^t)$ is obviously neither multiplicative nor antimultiplicative.

Further, when \mathcal{A}_ρ is a block-upper triangular subalgebra of M_n , it is easy to see that ρ admits only trivial transitive maps. In that case by Theorem 2.2 (or Theorem 2.1), all Jordan embeddings $\mathcal{A}_\rho \rightarrow M_n$ are necessarily rank(-one) preservers. This is no longer true for general SMAs $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$ which satisfy the condition (i) of Theorem 3.7.

Example 4.2. Consider the quasi-order

$$\rho := \Delta_7 \cup ([1, 3] \times [4, 7]) \cup \{(1, 3), (4, 5), (6, 7)\}$$

on $[1, 7]$ and the corresponding SMA

$$\mathcal{A}_\rho := \begin{bmatrix} * & 0 & * & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & * & 0 & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & * & * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * \end{bmatrix} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_7.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(1) \cup \rho^{-1}(1) &= \rho(3) \cup \rho^{-1}(3) = \{1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}, \\ \rho(2) \cup \rho^{-1}(2) &= \{2, 4, 5, 6, 7\}, \\ \rho(4) \cup \rho^{-1}(4) &= \rho(5) \cup \rho^{-1}(5) = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}, \\ \rho(6) \cup \rho^{-1}(6) &= \rho(7) \cup \rho^{-1}(7) = \{1, 2, 3, 6, 7\}.\end{aligned}$$

One easily checks that \mathcal{A}_ρ satisfies (i) of Theorem 3.7 and that the map

$$g : \rho \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times, \quad g(i, j) := \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } (i, j) \in \{(2, 4), (2, 5)\}, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is transitive. On the other hand, g is nontrivial. Indeed, if g separates through the map $s : [1, 7] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$, we obtain

$$\frac{s(1)}{s(4)} = g(1, 4) = 1, \quad \frac{s(1)}{s(6)} = g(1, 6) = 1 \quad \implies \quad s(4) = s(1) = s(6),$$

so

$$2 = g(2, 4) = \frac{s(2)}{s(4)} = \frac{s(2)}{s(6)} = g(2, 6) = 1,$$

which is a contradiction.

Further, as for the induced algebra automorphism g^* of \mathcal{A}_ρ we have

$$g^*(E_{14} + E_{16} + E_{24} + E_{26}) = E_{14} + E_{16} + 2E_{24} + E_{26},$$

it is clear that g^* does not preserve rank-one matrices (see also [14, Theorem 5.7]).

Remark 4.3. For an SMA $\mathcal{A}_\rho \subseteq M_n$ which satisfies (i) of Theorem 3.7, we discuss the necessity of all assumptions in (ii). In view of the first paragraph of the proof of (i) \implies (ii) in Theorem 3.7, we assume $n \geq 3$.

- Spectrum preserving is necessary to assume for all SMAs \mathcal{A}_ρ , as the map $\phi : \mathcal{A}_\rho \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\rho$, $\phi(X) := 2X$ shows (for a nonlinear variant of the example see [13, Example 5.1]).
- Commutativity preserving is necessary to assume for all SMAs \mathcal{A}_ρ . Indeed, when $\mathcal{A}_\rho \neq \mathcal{D}_n$, this follows from a small modification of [13, Example 5.2], by defining the map $\phi : \mathcal{A}_\rho \rightarrow M_n$,

$$\phi(X) := \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1, e^{\det X}, 1, \dots, 1)X \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1, e^{-\det X}, 1, \dots, 1),$$

where both $e^{\det X}$ and $e^{-\det X}$ stand at some position $i \in [1, n]$ for which $\rho^\times(i) \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, when $\mathcal{A}_\rho = \mathcal{D}_n$, we can consider the map

$$\phi : \mathcal{D}_n \rightarrow M_n, \quad \phi(X) := X + X_{11}E_{2n},$$

which is clearly a linear (hence continuous) injective spectrum preserver, but not a Jordan homomorphism.

- Continuity is necessary to assume for all SMAs \mathcal{A}_ρ . This follows from [13, Example 5.3], without any change.
- Injectivity is necessary to assume if and only if \mathcal{A}_ρ is not semisimple (note that by [9], \mathcal{A}_ρ is semisimple if and only if ρ is symmetric). Indeed, suppose that \mathcal{A}_ρ is semisimple and that $\phi : \mathcal{A}_\rho \rightarrow M_n$ is a continuous commutativity and spectrum preserver. In view of Remark 3.5 and [1, p. 432] (see also [14, Lemma 3.2]), we can assume that $\mathcal{A}_\rho = \text{diag}(M_{k_1}, \dots, M_{k_p})$ where, by (i), each $k_j \neq 2$. By analysing the proofs of Claims 1, 2, 3 and 4 we observe that they do not require the injectivity

of the map ϕ . Therefore, without loss of generality, one can assume that ϕ acts as the identity map on \mathcal{D}_n . Further, using Claim 4 and a standard density argument, it easily follows that ϕ maps each diagonal block of \mathcal{A}_ρ into itself. Therefore, for each $1 \leq j \leq k$ the map ϕ restricts to a continuous spectrum and commutativity preserver $\phi_j : M_{k_j} \rightarrow M_{k_j}$. If $k_j = 1$, clearly ϕ_j is the identity, while if $k_j \geq 3$ we apply Theorem 1.1 to ϕ_j to conclude that it acts as the identity or as the transposition map. Putting everything back together, it follows that ϕ is a Jordan embedding. Now, on the other hand, suppose that \mathcal{A}_ρ is not semisimple. Again, in view of Remark 3.5 and [1, p. 432], we can assume that \mathcal{A}_ρ is in the block upper-triangular form with at least one nonzero entry in the strict block upper triangle. Then, as in [13, Example 5.4], a map $\phi : \mathcal{A}_\rho \rightarrow M_n$ which only leaves the diagonal blocks intact and annihilates everything else is an example of a non-injective unital Jordan homomorphism (in particular, ϕ is a continuous spectrum and commutativity preserver).

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Akkurt, E. Akkurt, G. P. Barker, *Automorphisms of structural matrix algebras*, Oper. Matrices **7** (2013), no. 2, 431–439.
- [2] M. Akkurt, E. Akkurt, G. P. Barker, *Jordan homomorphisms of the structural matrix algebras*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **63** (2015), no. 12, 2518–2525.
- [3] M. Akkurt, G. P. Barker, M. Wild, *Structural matrix algebras and their lattices of invariant subspaces*, Linear Algebra Appl. **394** (2005), 25–38.
- [4] D. Benkovič, *Jordan homomorphisms on triangular matrices*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **53**(2005), 345–356.
- [5] F. Beşleagă, S. Dăscălescu, *Classifying good gradings on structural matrix algebras*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **67** (2019), no. 10, 1948–1957.
- [6] F. Beşleagă, S. Dăscălescu, *Structural matrix algebras, generalized flags, and gradings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **373** (2020), no. 10, 6863–6885.
- [7] R. Brusamarello, E. Z. Fornaroli, M. Khrypchenko, *Jordan isomorphisms of finitary incidence algebras*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **66** (2018), no. 3, 565–579.
- [8] R. Brusamarello, E. Z. Fornaroli, M. Khrypchenko, *Jordan isomorphisms of the finitary incidence ring of a partially ordered category*, Colloq. Math. **159** (2020), no. 2, 285–307.
- [9] S. Coelho, *The automorphism group of a structural matrix algebra*, Linear Algebra Appl. **195** (1993), 35–58.
- [10] S. Coelho, *Automorphism groups of certain structural matrix rings*, Comm. Algebra **22** (1994), no. 14, 5567–5586.
- [11] J. J. Garcés, M. Khrypchenko, *Potent preservers of incidence algebras*, Linear Algebra Appl. **635** (2022), 171–200.
- [12] J. J. Garcés, M. Khrypchenko, *Linear maps preserving products equal to primitive idempotents of an incidence algebra*, J. Algebra **612** (2022), 460–474.
- [13] I. Gogić, T. Petek, M. Tomašević, *Characterizing Jordan embeddings between block upper-triangular subalgebras via preserving properties*, Linear Algebra Appl. **704** (2025), 192–217.
- [14] I. Gogić, M. Tomašević, *Jordan embeddings and linear rank preservers of structural matrix algebras*, Linear Algebra Appl. **707** (2025), 1–48.
- [15] I. N. Herstein, *Jordan homomorphisms*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **81** (1956), 331–341.
- [16] N. Jacobson, C. E. Rickart, *Jordan homomorphisms of rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **69** (1950), 479–502.
- [17] T. Petek, *Spectrum and commutativity preserving mappings on triangular matrices*, Linear Algebra Appl. **357** (2002), 107–122.
- [18] T. Petek, P. Šemrl, *Characterization of Jordan homomorphisms on M_n using preserving properties*, Linear Algebra Appl. **269** (1998), 33–46.
- [19] P. Šemrl, *Characterizing Jordan automorphisms of matrix algebras through preserving properties*, Oper. Matrices **2** (2008), no. 1, 125–136.
- [20] P. Šemrl, *Maps on matrix spaces*, Linear Algebra Appl. **413** (2006), no. 2–3, 364–393.
- [21] R. Słowik, L. van Wyk, *Automorphisms of some structural infinite matrix rings*, Oper. Matrices **10** (2016), no. 1, 163–188.

- [22] M. F. Smiley, *Jordan homomorphisms onto prime rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **84** (1957), 426–429.
- [23] G. W. Stewart, *Matrix algorithms, Vol. I. Basic decompositions*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 1998.
- [24] D. Wang, H. Pan, X. Wang, *Non-linear maps preserving ideals on a parabolic subalgebra of a simple algebra*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **60** (135) (2010), no. 2, 371–379.
- [25] L. van Wyk, *Special radicals in structural matrix rings*, Comm. Algebra **16** (1988) 421–435.

I. GOGIĆ, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB, BIJENIČKA 30, 10000 ZAGREB, CROATIA
Email address: `ilja@math.hr`

M. TOMAŠEVIĆ, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB, BIJENIČKA 30, 10000 ZAGREB, CROATIA
Email address: `mateo.tomasevic@math.hr`