

**RELATIONS AMONGST THE DISTANCES BETWEEN  
 $C^*$ -SUBALGEBRAS AND SOME CANONICALLY ASSOCIATED  
OPERATOR ALGEBRAS**

VED PRAKASH GUPTA AND SUMIT KUMAR

ABSTRACT. We prove that the Christensen distance (resp., the Kadison-Kastler distance) between two  $C^*$ -subalgebras  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$  is equal to that between their enveloping von Neumann algebras  $\mathcal{A}^{**}$  and  $\mathcal{B}^{**}$  (resp., the tensor product algebras  $\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$ , for any unital commutative  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{D}$ ).

1. INTRODUCTION

Kadison and Kastler (in [8]) introduced a notion of distance between subspaces of  $B(\mathcal{H})$  and, over the last five decades, this notion has proved to be extremely relevant to the development of the theory of operator algebras. They suggested that sufficiently close operator subalgebras of  $B(\mathcal{H})$  must be unitarily equivalent. Some pathbreaking positive results in this direction were achieved in a series of seminal papers by Christensen. Later, Christensen (in [2, 3]) considered another similar notion of distance and proved some noteworthy perturbation results ([2, 3, 4, 5] and more).

In this article, we make an attempt to answer the following two fundamental questions related to these notions of distance:

- (1) For any two  $C^*$ -subalgebras  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ , is there any relationship amidst the (Kadison-Kastler or Christensen) distance between  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  (in  $\mathcal{C}$ ) and that between their enveloping von Neumann algebras  $\mathcal{A}^{**}$  and  $\mathcal{B}^{**}$  (in  $\mathcal{C}^{**}$ )?
- (2) For any two  $C^*$ -algebras  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$ ; and,  $C^*$ -subalgebras  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ , is there any relationship amidst the (Kadison-Kastler or Christensen) distance between  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  (in  $\mathcal{C}$ ) and that between  $\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$  (in  $\mathcal{C} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$ )?

The first question found an indirect appearance in the works of Kadison-Kastler ([8]) and Christensen ([3]) in the following sense:

(For the sake of clarity, as in [6], we denote the notions of the Kadison-Kastler distance and the Christensen distance by  $d_{KK}$  and  $d_0$ , respectively - see Section 2 for their definitions.)

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46L05, 47L40, 46M05.

*Key words and phrases.* Inclusions of  $C^*$ -algebras, Kadison-Kastler distance, Christensen distance, enveloping von Neumann algebra, minimal tensor product.

The second named author was supported by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (Government of India) through a Senior Research Fellowship with CSIR File No. **09/0263(12012)/2021-EMR-I**.

- In [8, Lemma 5], Kadison and Kastler showed that, for a scalar  $\gamma > 0$  and  $C^*$ -algebras  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  acting on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $d_{KK}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{SOT}, \overline{\mathcal{B}}^{SOT}) < \gamma$  whenever  $d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) < \gamma$ .

Thus, it can be deduced readily that for any two  $C^*$ -subalgebras  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}^{**}, \mathcal{B}^{**}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  - see Proposition 3.2.

- In [3, Theorem 6.5], Christensen used the above observation of Kadison and Kastler to conclude that if  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are sufficiently close  $C^*$ -subalgebras of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  is nuclear, then  $\mathcal{B}$  is nuclear,  $\mathcal{B}^{**}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{**}$  are isomorphic as  $W^*$ -algebras, and there exists a completely positive isometry from  $\mathcal{A}^*$  onto  $\mathcal{B}^*$ .

The second question was considered to a greater extent by Christensen (see, for instance, [3] and [5]). Here are some of his interesting observations in this direction:

**Theorem 1.1.** [3, Theorem 3.1] *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a nuclear  $C^*$ -algebra and,  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be  $C^*$ -subalgebras of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ . If  $\mathcal{A}$  has property  $D_k$  (for some  $k \in (0, \infty)$ ) and  $\mathcal{A} \subset_\gamma \mathcal{B}$ , then  $\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D} \subset_{6k\gamma} \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$ .*

*In particular, when  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  both have property  $D_k$ , then*

$$d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) \leq 6k d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}).$$

Interestingly, when  $\mathcal{D}$  is commutative, the comparison is more satisfying:

**Theorem 1.2.** [3, Theorem 3.2] *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a commutative  $C^*$ -algebra,  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be  $C^*$ -subalgebras of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\gamma$  be a positive scalar. If  $\mathcal{B} \subset_\gamma \mathcal{A}$ , then  $\mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D} \subset_\gamma \mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$ .*

*In particular,  $d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) \leq d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ .*

**Theorem 1.3.** [5, Proposition 2.10] *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a Hilbert space and,  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be  $C^*$ -subalgebras of  $B(\mathcal{H})$ . If  $\mathcal{A}$  has length at most  $\ell$  with length constant at most  $M$  and  $\mathcal{A} \subset_\gamma \mathcal{B}$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ , then  $\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathbb{M}_n \subseteq_\mu \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathbb{M}_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\mu = M((1 + \gamma)^\ell - 1)$ .*

*In particular, if  $\mathcal{B}$  also has length at most  $\ell$  with length constant at most  $M$ , then*

$$d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathbb{M}_n, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathbb{M}_n) \leq M \left( (1 + d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}))^\ell - 1 \right)$$

*for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

**Theorem 1.4.** [5, Corollary 4.7] *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be  $C^*$ -algebras and  $\mathcal{D}$  be nuclear. Then, for every pair  $\ell, M \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a constant  $L_{\ell, M}$  (depending only on  $\ell$  and  $M$ ) such that when  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are  $C^*$ -subalgebras of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  has length at most  $\ell$  and length constant at most  $M$ , then*

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) \leq L_{\ell, M} d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}).$$

Here is a quick overview of the flow of this article.

Our analysis of the first question yielded the following two relations:

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be  $C^*$ -subalgebras of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then,*

$$d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = d_0(\mathcal{A}^{**}, \mathcal{B}^{**}).$$

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  be von Neumann subalgebras of a von Neumann algebra  $\mathcal{L}$ . Then,*

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) = d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}^{**}, \mathcal{N}^{**}).$$

And, motivated by the above mentioned observations of Christensen from [3, 5], we prove the following results in the context of the second question:

An elementary observation (Corollary 4.2) provides the following improvement of [3, Theorem 3.2]:

*Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a commutative unital  $C^*$ -algebra and,  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be  $C^*$ -subalgebras of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then,  $d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) = d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ . (See Theorem 4.5.)*

It turns out that the preceding equality holds with respect to the Kadison-Kastler distance as well:

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a commutative  $C^*$ -algebra and,  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be  $C^*$ -subalgebras of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then,*

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}).$$

Moreover, if  $\mathcal{D}$  is unital, then

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) = d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}).$$

We conclude the article with the following relations with respect to the class of scattered  $C^*$ -algebras:

**Proposition 4.11.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a  $C^*$ -algebra and  $\mathcal{D}$  be a scattered  $C^*$ -algebra. Then, for any two  $C^*$ -subalgebras  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ ,*

$$d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}).$$

In particular, if  $\mathcal{D}$  is commutative as well, then

$$d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}).$$

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

### 2.1. Two notions of distance between subalgebras of normed algebras.

For the sake of brevity, let us first fix some notations:

For a normed algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ , let

$$\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}} := \{\text{subalgebras of } \mathcal{C}\};$$

$$C\text{-Sub}_{\mathcal{C}} := \{\text{closed subalgebras of } \mathcal{C}\};$$

and, if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra, then let

$$C^*\text{-Sub}_{\mathcal{C}} := \{C^*\text{-subalgebras of } \mathcal{C}\}.$$

2.1.1. *Kadison-Kastler distance.* For any normed space  $X$ , as is standard, its closed unit ball will be denoted by  $B_1(X)$  and for any subset  $S$  of  $X$  and an element  $x \in X$ , the distance between  $x$  and  $S$  is defined as  $d(x, S) = \inf\{\|x - s\| : s \in S\}$ . Also, for any  $r > 0$ ,  $B_r(X) := rB_1(X)$ .

Recall from [8] that the Kadison-Kastler distance between any two subspaces  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of a normed algebra  $\mathcal{C}$  (which we denote by  $d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ ) is defined as the Hausdorff distance between the closed unit balls of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , i.e.,

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \max \left\{ \sup_{x \in B_1(\mathcal{A})} d(x, B_1(\mathcal{B})), \sup_{z \in B_1(\mathcal{B})} d(z, B_1(\mathcal{A})) \right\}.$$

**Remark 2.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a normed algebra. Then, the following facts are well known:*

- (1)  $d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq 1$  for all  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$ .
- (2) If  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in C\text{-Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  is a proper subalgebra of  $\mathcal{B}$ , then  $d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = 1$ .
- (3)  $d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = d_{KK}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}, \overline{\mathcal{B}}) = d_{KK}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}, \overline{\mathcal{B}})$  for all  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$ .

(4) If  $\mathcal{C}$  is a Banach algebra, then  $d_{KK}$  is a metric on  $C\text{-Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$ .

2.1.2. *Near inclusions and Christensen distance.* Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a normed algebra. Recall from [2, 3] that, for  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$  and a scalar  $\gamma > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq_{\gamma} \mathcal{B}$  if for each  $x \in B_1(\mathcal{A})$ , there exists a  $y \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\|x - y\| \leq \gamma$ ; and, the Christensen distance between  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  is defined by

$$(2.1) \quad d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \inf\{\gamma > 0 : \mathcal{A} \subseteq_{\gamma} \mathcal{B} \text{ and } \mathcal{B} \subseteq_{\gamma} \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Further,  $\mathcal{A} \subset_{\gamma} \mathcal{B}$  if there exists a  $\gamma_0 < \gamma$  such that  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{B}$ .

The following is immediate and quite useful as well.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a normed algebra. Then,*

$$d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \inf\{\gamma > 0 : \mathcal{A} \subset_{\gamma} \mathcal{B} \text{ and } \mathcal{B} \subset_{\gamma} \mathcal{A}\}$$

for all  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$ .

**Remark 2.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a normed algebra. Then, the following useful facts are well known:*

- (1)  $d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq 1$  for all  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$ .
- (2)  $d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = d_0(\overline{\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{B}) = d_0(\overline{\mathcal{A}}, \overline{\mathcal{B}})$  for all  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$ .
- (3)  $d_0$  is not a metric on  $C\text{-Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$  (as it does not satisfy the triangle inequality).  
However,  $d_0$  and  $d_{KK}$  are “equivalent” in the sense that

$$d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq 2d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$$

for all  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$ .

- (4) If  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  is a norm closed proper subalgebra of  $\mathcal{B}$ , then  $d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = 1$ .

## 2.2. Universal representation and enveloping von Neumann algebra of a $C^*$ -algebra.

For any  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ , let  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{C})$  denote its state space. For each  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{C})$ , let  $\pi_{\varphi} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_{\varphi})$  denote the GNS representation of  $\mathcal{C}$  associated with  $\varphi$ ; and, let  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{C}} := \bigoplus_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{C})} \mathcal{H}_{\varphi}$ . Recall that the representation  $\pi_{\mathcal{C}} := \bigoplus_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{C})} \pi_{\varphi} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{C}})$  is faithful and is called the universal representation of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Further,  $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}$  extends to a surjective linear isometry  $\tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C}^{**} \rightarrow \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C})''$ , which is also a  $(w^*, \sigma\text{-weak})$ -homeomorphism; and, via this identification,  $\mathcal{C}^{**}$  inherits a  $W^*$ -algebra structure, which is known as the enveloping von Neumann algebra of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

We shall need the following well-known facts - see, for instance, [9, §3.7].

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a  $C^*$ -algebra. Then, every continuous linear functional on  $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C})$  is W.O.T.-continuous.*

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a  $C^*$ -algebra and  $\mathcal{B}$  be a  $C^*$ -subalgebra of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then, the following hold:*

- (1) If  $i : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  denotes the natural inclusion, then  $i^{**}$  is an isometric  $*$ -isomorphism from  $\mathcal{B}^{**}$  onto  $\overline{J_{\mathcal{C}}(i(\mathcal{B}))}^{w^*}$ , where  $J_{\mathcal{C}}$  is the canonical linear isometry from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{C}^{**}$ .
- (2) There exists an isometric  $*$ -isomorphism from the enveloping von Neumann algebra  $\mathcal{B}^{**}$  (of  $\mathcal{B}$ ) onto  $\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.}$ , which maps  $i(b)$  to  $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(b)$  for all  $b \in \mathcal{B}$ . Moreover, the  $*$ -isomorphism is also a  $(w^*, \sigma\text{-weak})$ -homeomorphism.

**2.3. Minimal tensor product.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be  $C^*$ -algebras and  $\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}$  denote their algebraic tensor product. Then, for any  $z \in \mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}$ , its  $C^*$ -minimal (tensor) norm is given by

$$\|z\|_{\min} = \sup \left\{ \frac{(\varphi \otimes \psi)\left((w^* z^* z w)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)}{(\varphi \otimes \psi)\left((w^* w)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)} : \varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{C}), \psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{D}), w \in \mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}, (\varphi \otimes \psi)(w) \neq 0 \right\}.$$

The completion of  $\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}$  with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_{\min}$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra and is denoted by  $\mathcal{C} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$ .

**Remark 2.6.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be  $C^*$ -algebras. The following well-known facts will be used ahead:

- (1) If  $\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  and  $\sigma : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$  are two faithful representations, then

$$\left\| \sum_i c_i \otimes d_i \right\|_{\min} = \left\| \sum_i \pi(c_i) \otimes \sigma(d_i) \right\|$$

for all  $\sum_i c_i \otimes d_i \in \mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}$ .

- (2) The minimal tensor product is an injective tensor product, i.e., for any  $\mathcal{A} \in C^*\text{-Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $\mathcal{B} \in C^*\text{-Sub}_{\mathcal{D}}$ , there exists a unique isometric  $*$ -isomorphism from  $\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{B}$  onto the  $C^*$ -subalgebra  $\overline{\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}}^{\|\cdot\|_{\min}}$  of  $\mathcal{C} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$  which fixes  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ . (This allows us to consider  $\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{B}$  as a  $C^*$ -subalgebra of  $\mathcal{C} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$ .)

### 3. RELATIONS AMIDST DISTANCES BETWEEN $C^*$ -SUBALGEBRAS AND THEIR ENVELOPING VON NEUMANN ALGEBRAS

The proof of the following theorem uses some techniques employed in the proofs of [3, Theorem 3.1] and [8, Lemma 5].

**Theorem 3.1.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be  $C^*$ -subalgebras of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then,

$$d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = d_0(\mathcal{A}^{**}, \mathcal{B}^{**}).$$

*Proof.* Note that, by Proposition 2.5(1), we can identify  $\mathcal{B}^{**}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{**}$  with the  $w^*$ -closed  $*$ -subalgebras  $\overline{J_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{w^*}$  and  $\overline{J_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})}^{w^*}$  of  $\mathcal{C}^{**}$ , respectively. Thus, via these identifications, in view of Proposition 2.5(2), the isometric  $*$ -isomorphism  $\tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C}^{**} \rightarrow \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C})''$  maps  $\mathcal{A}^{**}$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{B}^{**}$ ) isometrically isomorphically onto  $\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})}^{W.O.T.}$  (resp.,  $\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.}$ ). So, it suffices to show that

$$d_0(\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}), \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})) = d_0\left(\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})}^{W.O.T.}, \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.}\right),$$

which clearly holds if we can show, for any scalar  $\gamma > 0$ , that  $\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})}^{W.O.T.} \subset_{\gamma} \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.}$  if and only if  $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}) \subset_{\gamma} \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})$ .

First, suppose that  $\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})}^{W.O.T.} \subset_{\gamma} \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.}$ .

By definition, there exists a  $\gamma_0 < \gamma$  such that  $\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})}^{W.O.T.} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.}$ . Fix a scalar  $\gamma_1$  satisfying  $\gamma_0 < \gamma_1 < \gamma$ . We show that  $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq_{\gamma_1} \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})$ . This will then imply that  $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}) \subset_{\gamma} \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})$ .

Let  $z \in B_1(\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}))$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $z \in B_1(\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})) \setminus \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})$ . Then, by the Hahn-Banach theorem, there exists a  $\varphi \in \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C})^*$  such that

$\varphi(\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})) = (0)$ ,  $\varphi(z) = d(z, \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B}))$  and  $\|\varphi\| = 1$ . In view of Proposition 2.4,  $\varphi$  is W.O.T.-continuous and hence  $\sigma$ -weakly continuous. Thus, by the Hahn-Banach theorem (for the  $\sigma$ -weak topology), we can extend  $\varphi$  uniquely to a  $\sigma$ -weakly continuous linear functional  $\tilde{\varphi} : \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C})'' \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . Clearly,  $\tilde{\varphi}|_{\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.}} = 0$  and an appeal to the Kaplansky's density theorem shows that  $\|\tilde{\varphi}\| = 1$ , as well. We assert that  $\|\tilde{\varphi}|_{\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})}^{W.O.T.}}\| \leq \gamma_0$ .

Let  $x \in B_1(\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})}^{W.O.T.})$ . Since  $\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})}^{W.O.T.} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.}$ , there exists a  $y \in \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.}$  such that  $\|x - y\| \leq \gamma_0$ . Thus,

$$|\tilde{\varphi}(x)| = |\tilde{\varphi}(x - y)| \leq \|x - y\| \leq \gamma_0;$$

so that,  $\|\tilde{\varphi}|_{\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})}^{W.O.T.}}\| \leq \gamma_0$ ; as was asserted.

Thus,  $d(z, \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})) = |\varphi(z)| = |\tilde{\varphi}(z)| \leq \gamma_0 < \gamma_1$ . So, there exists a  $w \in \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})$  such that  $\|z - w\| \leq \gamma_1 < \gamma$ . Thus,  $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq_{\gamma_1} \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})$  and, hence,  $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}) \subset_{\gamma} \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}) \subset_{\gamma} \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})$ .

Fix a  $\beta < \gamma$  such that  $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}) \subset_{\beta} \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})$ . We shall show that  $\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})}^{W.O.T.} \subseteq_{\beta} \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.}$ , as well.

Let  $x \in B_1(\overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})}^{W.O.T.})$ . It suffices to show that there exists a  $z \in \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.}$  such that  $|\langle (x - z)\zeta, \eta \rangle| \leq \beta$  for all  $\zeta, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ . Towards this end, let  $\delta = 1 + \gamma$  and, for every ordered pair  $(\zeta, \eta) \in B_1(\mathcal{H}) \times B_1(\mathcal{H})$ , consider

$$S_{\zeta, \eta} = \left\{ y \in B_{\delta} \left( \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.} \right) : |\langle (x - y)\zeta, \eta \rangle| \leq \beta \right\}.$$

**Claim (1):**  $S_{\zeta, \eta}$  is non-empty and W.O.T. closed in  $B_{\delta} \left( \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.} \right)$ .

Clearly,  $S_{\zeta, \eta}$  is W.O.T.-closed in  $B_{\delta} \left( \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.} \right)$ . We just need to show that it is non-empty. By the Kaplansky's density theorem, there exists a net  $\{x_{\alpha}\} \subset B_1(\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}))$  such that  $x_{\alpha} \rightarrow x$  in the weak operator topology. Since  $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}) \subset_{\beta} \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})$ , for each  $\alpha$ , there exists a  $y_{\alpha} \in \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})$  such that  $\|x_{\alpha} - y_{\alpha}\| < \beta$ . Clearly,  $\|y_{\alpha}\| < \delta$  for all  $\alpha$ .

Note that  $B_{\delta} \left( \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.} \right)$  is W.O.T.-compact, by Proposition 2.5(2); so, there exists a W.O.T.-convergent subnet  $\{y_{\alpha_j}\}$  of  $\{y_{\alpha}\}$ . Let  $y = \lim_j y_{\alpha_j}$  in the weak operator topology. Since  $|\langle (x_{\alpha} - y_{\alpha})\zeta, \eta \rangle| \leq \beta$  for every  $\alpha$ , it follows that

$$|\langle (x - y)\zeta, \eta \rangle| = \lim_j |\langle (x_{\alpha_j} - y_{\alpha_j})\zeta, \eta \rangle| \leq \beta,$$

i.e.,  $y \in S_{\zeta, \eta}$ . Thus,  $S_{\zeta, \eta} \neq \emptyset$ .

**Claim (2):** The collection  $\{S_{\zeta, \eta} : (\zeta, \eta) \in B_1(\mathcal{H}) \times B_1(\mathcal{H})\}$  satisfies the finite intersection property in  $B_{\delta} \left( \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.} \right)$ .

Let  $\{(\zeta_1 \times \eta_1), \dots, (\zeta_n \times \eta_n)\} \subset B_1(\mathcal{H}) \times B_1(\mathcal{H})$ . Fix a  $0 < \lambda < \beta$  such that  $\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}) \subset_{\lambda} \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})$ .

Since  $x \in B_1 \left( \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A})}^{W.O.T.} \right)$ , by the Kaplansky's density theorem again, there exists a  $z \in B_1(\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}))$  such that  $|\langle (z - x)\zeta_i, \eta_i \rangle| < \beta - \lambda$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Further, by the choice of  $\lambda$ , there exists a  $w \in \pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})$  such that  $\|z - w\| < \lambda$ . This implies that  $|\langle (z - w)\zeta_i, \eta_i \rangle| < \lambda$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Thus,

$$|\langle (x - w)\zeta_i, \eta_i \rangle| \leq |\langle (x - z)\zeta_i, \eta_i \rangle| + |\langle (z - w)\zeta_i, \eta_i \rangle| < \beta \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq n,$$

i.e.,  $w \in \cap_{i=1}^n S_{\zeta_i, \eta_i}$ . This proves Claim (2).

Thus,  $B_\delta \left( \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.} \right)$  being W.O.T.-compact, there is a  $z \in \cap \{S_{\zeta, \eta} : (\zeta, \eta) \in B_1(\mathcal{H}) \times B_1(\mathcal{H})\}$ . In particular,  $z \in \overline{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{B})}^{W.O.T.}$  and  $|\langle (x-z)\zeta, \eta \rangle| \leq \beta < \gamma$  for all  $(\zeta, \eta) \in B_1(\mathcal{H}) \times B_1(\mathcal{H})$ , as was desired.  $\square$

At this moment, it is not clear to us whether the preceding equality holds with respect to the Kadison-Kastler distance or not. However, in view of Proposition 2.5, the following comparison can be deduced easily from [8, Lemma 5]:

**Proposition 3.2.** [8, Lemma 5] *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be  $C^*$ -subalgebras of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then,*

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}^{**}, \mathcal{B}^{**}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}).$$

When we restrict to the category of von Neumann algebras, we observe that even the Kadison-Kastler distance between von Neumann subalgebras and their biduals are equal. In order to see this, we need the following well-known result - see, for instance, [1, III.5.2.15].

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a von Neumann algebra. Then, there exists a surjective normal  $*$ -homomorphism  $E_{\mathcal{L}} : \mathcal{L}^{**} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  that fixes  $\mathcal{L}$  (where  $\mathcal{L}$  is identified with its canonical isometric embedding in  $\mathcal{L}^{**}$ ).*

*In particular, for any von Neumann subalgebra  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $\mathcal{L}$ , the restriction map  $E_{\mathcal{M}} := E_{\mathcal{L}} \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{M}^{**}}$  maps  $\mathcal{M}^{**}$  onto  $\mathcal{M}$ .*

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  be von Neumann subalgebras of a von Neumann algebra  $\mathcal{L}$ . Then,*

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) = d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}^{**}, \mathcal{N}^{**}).$$

*Proof.* In view of Proposition 3.2, it just remains to show that  $d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}^{**}, \mathcal{N}^{**})$ .

Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $x \in B_1(\mathcal{M}) \subset B_1(\mathcal{M}^{**})$ . Then, there exists a  $y \in B_1(\mathcal{N}^{**})$  such that  $\|x - y\| < d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}^{**}, \mathcal{N}^{**}) + \epsilon$ , since  $d(x, B_1(\mathcal{N}^{**})) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}^{**}, \mathcal{N}^{**})$ .

Consider the surjective normal  $*$ -homomorphisms  $E_{\mathcal{L}} : \mathcal{L}^{**} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  and its restriction  $E_{\mathcal{N}} : \mathcal{N}^{**} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$  as in Proposition 3.3. Let  $z = E_{\mathcal{N}}(y) \in B_1(\mathcal{N})$ . Since  $E_{\mathcal{L}}(x) = x$  and  $E_{\mathcal{L}}(y) = E_{\mathcal{N}}(y) = z$ , we observe that

$$\|x - z\| = \|E_{\mathcal{L}}(x - y)\| \leq \|x - y\| < d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}^{**}, \mathcal{N}^{**}) + \epsilon;$$

so that,

$$d(x, B_1(\mathcal{N})) < d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}^{**}, \mathcal{N}^{**}) + \epsilon.$$

Thus,

$$\sup_{x \in B_1(\mathcal{M})} d(x, B_1(\mathcal{N})) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}^{**}, \mathcal{N}^{**}) + \epsilon.$$

By symmetry,

$$\sup_{y \in B_1(\mathcal{N})} d(y, B_1(\mathcal{M})) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}^{**}, \mathcal{N}^{**}) + \epsilon$$

as well. Hence,

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}^{**}, \mathcal{N}^{**}) + \epsilon.$$

Since  $\epsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, we get

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{M}^{**}, \mathcal{N}^{**})$$

and we are done.  $\square$

4. KADISON-KASTLER AND CHRISTENSEN DISTANCE BETWEEN TENSOR  
PRODUCT SUBALGEBRAS

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be  $C^*$ -algebras;  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in C^*\text{-Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $\mathcal{P} \in C^*\text{-Sub}_{\mathcal{D}}$ . If there exists a conditional expectation from  $\mathcal{D}$  onto  $\mathcal{P}$ , then*

$$d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}) \leq d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D})$$

and

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $E : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  be a conditional expectation. Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and fix a  $\gamma_0 > 0$  such that

$$d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) < \gamma_0 < d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) + \epsilon.$$

This implies that  $\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$ .

Let  $x \in B_1(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}) \subseteq B_1(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D})$ . Then, there exists a  $y \in \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$  such that  $\|x - y\|_{\min} \leq \gamma_0$ . Consider the conditional expectation  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{C}} \otimes^{\min} E : \mathcal{C} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}$ . Clearly, it maps  $\mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$  onto  $\mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}$ . Thus,  $y_0 := (\text{id}_{\mathcal{C}} \otimes^{\min} E)(y) \in \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - y_0\|_{\min} &= \|(\text{id}_{\mathcal{C}} \otimes^{\min} E)(x - y)\|_{\min} \\ &\leq \|x - y\|_{\min} \leq \gamma_0. \end{aligned}$$

So,  $\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}$ . Similarly,  $\mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}$ ; so that

$$d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}) \leq \gamma_0 < d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) + \epsilon.$$

Hence,

$$d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{P}) \leq d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}).$$

Since  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{C}} \otimes^{\min} E$  is a contraction, the proof for the Kadison-Kastler distance follows verbatim and we leave the details to the reader.  $\square$

Since every state on a unital  $C^*$ -algebra is a conditional expectation onto  $\mathbb{C}$ , we immediately deduce the following:

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be  $C^*$ -algebras. If  $\mathcal{D}$  is unital, then*

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D})$$

and

$$d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D})$$

for all  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in C^*\text{-Sub}_{\mathcal{C}}$ .

The following well-known fact about the so-called ‘left slice maps’ will be useful ahead:

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be two  $C^*$ -algebras and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}^*$ . Then, there exists a unique (left slice map)  $L_{\varphi} \in B(\mathcal{C} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C})$  such that  $\|L_{\varphi}\| = \|\varphi\|$  and  $L_{\varphi}(c \otimes d) = c\varphi(d)$  for all  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ .*

It is not yet clear (at least to us) whether we can drop unitality of  $\mathcal{D}$  in Corollary 4.2. However, if we restrict to finite-dimensional  $*$ -subalgebras of  $\mathcal{C}$ , we have the following positive answer:



**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be  $C^*$ -algebras. Then, for any two finite-dimensional  $*$ -subalgebras  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ ,*

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D})$$

and

$$d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}).$$

*Proof.* Fix a  $\varphi \in S(\mathcal{D})$  and an approximate unit  $\{u_\lambda\}$  for  $\mathcal{D}$  in  $B_1(\mathcal{D})$ . It is a well-known fact that  $\lim_\lambda \varphi(u_\lambda) = \|\varphi\| = 1$  - see [9, Proposition 3.1.4].

Let  $a \in B_1(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then,  $a \otimes u_\lambda \in B_1(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D})$  for all  $\lambda$ . Thus, for each  $\lambda$ , there exists a  $w_\lambda \in B_1(\mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D})$  such that

$$\|a \otimes u_\lambda - w_\lambda\|_{\min} \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) + \epsilon.$$

Consider the left slice map  $L_\varphi \in B(\mathcal{C} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C})$  as in Lemma 4.3. Note that  $\{L_\varphi(w_\lambda)\}$  is a bounded net in the finite-dimensional space  $\mathcal{B}$ ; so, it has a convergent subnet in  $\mathcal{B}$ , say,  $\{L_\varphi(w_{\lambda_i}) : i \in I\}$ , with limit  $b_0 \in B_1(\mathcal{B})$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|a - b_0\| &= \|\lim_i \varphi(u_{\lambda_i})a - \lim_i L_\varphi(w_{\lambda_i})\| \\ &= \lim_i \|L_\varphi(a \otimes u_{\lambda_i} - w_{\lambda_i})\| \\ &\leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) + \epsilon. \quad (\text{since } L_\varphi \text{ is a contraction}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\sup_{a \in B_1(\mathcal{A})} d(a, B_1(\mathcal{B})) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) + \epsilon.$$

Likewise,

$$\sup_{b \in B_1(\mathcal{B})} d(b, B_1(\mathcal{A})) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) + \epsilon.$$

Hence,  $d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) + \epsilon$ . Since  $\epsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, we get

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}).$$

Similarly, one can do for the Christensen distance as well.  $\square$

#### 4.1. Tensor product with commutative $C^*$ -algebras.

In view of Corollary 4.2, we readily deduce the following improvement of [3, Theorem 3.2] when the commutative  $C^*$ -algebra is unital (see Theorem 1.2 above for the statement).

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a commutative unital  $C^*$ -algebra and,  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be  $C^*$ -subalgebras of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then,*

$$d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) = d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}).$$

The proof of the following theorem is an appropriate adaptation of that of [3, Theorem 3.2]:

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a commutative  $C^*$ -algebra and,  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be  $C^*$ -subalgebras of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then,*

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}).$$

Moreover, if  $\mathcal{D}$  is unital, then

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) = d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}).$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{D} = C_0(\Omega)$  for some locally compact Hausdorff space  $\Omega$ . Then, it is a standard fact that there exists a  $*$ -isomorphism from  $\mathcal{C} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$  onto  $C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{C})$ , which maps  $\mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$  onto  $C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$  and  $\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$  onto  $C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ . Thus, it suffices to show that  $d_{KK}(C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{A}), C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{B})) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ .

Let  $\delta > 0$  and  $f \in B_1(C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{B}))$ . Then, there exists a compact set  $K$  in  $\Omega$  such that  $\|f(t)\| \leq \delta$  for all  $t \in \Omega \setminus K$ . Further, by the compactness of  $K$ , there exists a finite collection  $\{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\} \subset B_1(\mathcal{B}) \cap f(K)$  such that  $K \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^n V_i$ , where  $V_i := f^{-1}(B_{\frac{\delta}{2}}^o(b_i))$  and  $B_{\frac{\delta}{2}}^o(b_i)$  denotes the open ball of radius  $\frac{\delta}{2}$  with center  $b_i$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ . Note that, for any two points  $t$  and  $s$  in any  $V_i$ ,  $\|f(t) - f(s)\| < \delta$ .

Let  $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset C_c(\Omega)$  be a partition of unity on  $\Omega$  subordinate to the open cover  $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^n$ , i.e.,  $\text{supp}(h_i) \subset V_i$ ,  $0 \leq h_i \leq 1$  for every  $i$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^n h_i = 1$  on  $K$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n h_i \leq 1$  on  $\Omega$ .

For each  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , fix a  $t_j \in \text{supp}(h_j)$ . So,  $f(t_j) \in B_1(\mathcal{B})$  and, since  $d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) < d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + \delta$ , there exists an  $a_j \in B_1(\mathcal{A})$  such that  $\|f(t_j) - a_j\| \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + \delta$ . Consider  $g := \sum_{i=1}^n h_i a_i \in B_1(C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{A}))$ .

We show that  $\|f - g\| \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + 4\delta$ . Let  $t \in \Omega$ .

**Case (1).** If  $t \in K$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(t) - g(t)\| &\leq \|f(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t) a_i\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t) f(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t) a_i \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t) (f(t) - a_i) \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t) \|f(t) - a_i\| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t) \|f(t) - f(t_i)\| + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t) \|f(t_i) - a_i\| \\ &\leq \delta + d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because when  $t \in V_j$  for some  $j$ , then  $\|f(t) - f(t_j)\| < \delta$  and when  $t \notin V_r$  for some  $r$ , then  $h_r(t) = 0$ .

**Case (2).** If  $t \in \Omega \setminus \cup_{i=1}^n V_i$ , then  $g(t) = 0$  and  $\|f(t)\| \leq \delta < d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + 4\delta$ .

**Case (3).** If  $t \in \cup_{i=1}^n V_i \setminus K$ . Then, as  $\sum_{i=1}^n h_i \leq 1$ , we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(t) - g(t)\| &= \|f(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t) a_i\| \\ &\leq \|f(t)\| + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t) a_i \right\| \\ &\leq \delta + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t) (a_i - f(t_i) + f(t_i)) \right\| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \delta + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t)(a_i - f(t_i)) \right\| + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t)f(t_i) \right\| \\
 &\leq \delta + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t)\|a_i - f(t_i)\| + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t)(f(t_i) - f(t) + f(t)) \right\| \\
 &\leq \delta + (d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + \delta) \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t) + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t)(f(t_i) - f(t)) \right\| + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t)f(t) \right\| \\
 &\leq \delta + d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + \delta + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t)\|f(t_i) - f(t)\| + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t)\|f(t)\| \\
 &\leq \delta + d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + \delta + \delta + \delta \\
 &\leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + 4\delta.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\|f - g\| \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + 4\delta$ .

In particular,

$$d(f, B_1(C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{A}))) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + 4\delta.$$

Thus,

$$\sup_{f \in B_1(C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{B}))} d(f, B_1(C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{A}))) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + 4\delta.$$

By symmetry, we also have,

$$\sup_{g \in B_1(C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{A}))} d(g, B_1(C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{B}))) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + 4\delta.$$

Hence,  $d_{KK}(C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{A}), C_0(\Omega, \mathcal{B})) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + 4\delta$ . Since  $\delta > 0$  was arbitrary, we get

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) \leq d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}).$$

□

By Proposition 4.4, Theorem 4.6 and Theorem 1.2 we obtain the following:

**Corollary 4.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a commutative  $C^*$ -algebra. Then, for any two finite-dimensional  $*$ -subalgebras  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ , we have*

$$d_{KK}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = d_{KK}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D})$$

and

$$d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}).$$

#### 4.2. Tensor product with scattered $C^*$ -algebras.

First, we briefly recall the notion of support of a positive linear functional on a  $C^*$ -algebra.

If  $\omega$  is a positive linear functional on a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ , then identifying  $\mathcal{A}$  with  $\pi_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})$ , we can extend it to a normal positive linear functional on  $\mathcal{A}^{**}$  (by Proposition 2.4 and the Hahn-Banach theorem for the weak\*-topology on  $\mathcal{A}^{**}$ ), say  $\hat{\omega}$ . The support projection of  $\hat{\omega}$  in  $\mathcal{A}^{**}$  is called the support of  $\omega$  - see, for instance, [12, Page no.-140].

**Definition 4.8.** [7] *Let  $f$  be a positive linear functional on a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$  with support  $s$ . Then,  $f$  is called atomic, if for each projection  $p \in \mathcal{C}^{**}$  with  $p \leq s$ , there exists a minimal projection  $q \in \mathcal{C}^{**}$  such that  $q \leq p$ .*

**Definition 4.9.** [7] *A  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$  is called scattered, if each positive linear functional on  $\mathcal{C}$  is atomic.*

Here are some standard examples of scattered  $C^*$ -algebras.

- (1) Every finite dimensional  $C^*$ -algebra is scattered.
- (2) The  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{K}$  of compact operators on  $l^2(\mathbb{N})$  is scattered.
- (3) If  $X$  is a scattered locally compact Hausdorff space, then  $C_0(X)$  is scattered. (Recall that by a scattered topological space we mean that it does not contain any perfect subset.)

The following theorem is due to Huruya ([11]), which was also proved later, by a different method, by Quigg ([10]):

**Theorem 4.10.** [11] *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be two  $C^*$ -algebras and one of them be scattered. Then,*

$$(\mathcal{C} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D})^{**} \cong \mathcal{C}^{**} \bar{\otimes} \mathcal{D}^{**},$$

where  $\bar{\otimes}$  denotes the  $W^*$ -tensor product.

**Proposition 4.11.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a  $C^*$ -algebra and  $\mathcal{D}$  be a scattered  $C^*$ -algebra. Then, for any two  $C^*$ -subalgebras  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ ,*

$$d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}).$$

*In particular, if  $\mathcal{D}$  is commutative as well, then*

$$d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and fix a  $\gamma_0 > 0$  such that

$$d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) < \gamma_0 < d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) + \epsilon.$$

This implies that  $\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$ . We shall show that  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{A}$ .

Since  $\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}$ , it follows from Theorem 3.1 that  $(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D})^{**} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} (\mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D})^{**}$ . Further, as  $\mathcal{D}$  is scattered,  $\mathcal{A}^{**} \bar{\otimes} \mathcal{D}^{**} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{B}^{**} \bar{\otimes} \mathcal{D}^{**}$ , by Theorem 4.10. We assert that  $\mathcal{A}^{**} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{B}^{**}$ .

Let  $w \in B_1(\mathcal{A}^{**})$ . Then,  $w \otimes 1 \in B_1(\mathcal{A}^{**} \bar{\otimes} \mathcal{D}^{**})$  and, as  $\mathcal{A}^{**} \bar{\otimes} \mathcal{D}^{**} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{B}^{**} \bar{\otimes} \mathcal{D}^{**}$ , there exists a  $z \in \mathcal{B}^{**} \bar{\otimes} \mathcal{D}^{**}$  such that  $\|w \otimes 1 - z\| \leq \gamma_0$ . Let  $\varphi$  be a normal state on  $\mathcal{D}^{**}$ . Then, the slice map  $L_\varphi : \mathcal{C}^{**} \bar{\otimes} \mathcal{D}^{**} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{**}$  is a normal conditional expectation - see [1, III.2.2.6.]. Clearly,  $L_\varphi$  maps  $\mathcal{B}^{**} \bar{\otimes} \mathcal{D}^{**}$  onto  $\mathcal{B}^{**}$ , so,  $v := L_\varphi(z) \in \mathcal{B}^{**}$  and

$$\|w - v\| = \|w \otimes 1 - v \otimes 1\| = \|L_\varphi(w \otimes 1 - z)\| \leq \|w \otimes 1 - z\| \leq \gamma_0.$$

This proves our assertion. Thus,  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{B}$ , by Theorem 3.1 again. Similarly, we can conclude that  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{A}$ . Hence,

$$d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq \gamma_0 < d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}) + \epsilon.$$

Since  $\epsilon > 0$  was arbitrary,

$$d_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq d_0(\mathcal{A} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B} \otimes^{\min} \mathcal{D}).$$

□

## REFERENCES

- [1] B. Blackadar, Operator algebras, Theory of  $C^*$ -algebras and von Neumann algebras, Encyclopaedia Math. Sci. **122**, Oper. Alg. Non-commut. Geom. **III**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [2] E. Christensen, Subalgebras of a finite algebra, Math. Ann. **243** (1979), no. 1, 17-29.
- [3] E. Christensen, Near inclusions of  $C^*$ -algebras, Acta Math. **144** (1980), no. 2, 249-265.
- [4] E. Christensen, A. Sinclair, R. R. Smith, S. White and W. Winter, Perturbations of nuclear  $C^*$ -algebras, Acta math. **208** (2012), no. 1, 93-150.
- [5] E. Christensen, A. Sinclair, R. R. Smith and S. White, Perturbations of  $C^*$ -algebraic invariants, Geom. Funct. Anal. **20** (2010), no. 2, 368-397.
- [6] V. P. Gupta and S. Kumar, On various notions of distance between subalgebras of operator algebras, Münster J. of Math. (to appear).
- [7] H. E. Jensen, Scattered  $C^*$ -algebras, Math. Scand. **41** (1977), no. 2, 308-314.
- [8] R. V. Kadison and D. Kastler, Perturbations of von Neumann algebras. I. Stability of type, Amer. J. Math. **94** (1972), 38-54.
- [9] G. K. Pedersen,  $C^*$ -algebras and their automorphism groups, London Math. Soc. Monogr. **14**, Academic Press Inc., London- New York, 1979.
- [10] J. C. Quigg, On biduals of  $C^*$ -tensor products, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **100** (1987), no. 4, 666-668.
- [11] T. Huruya, A spectral characterization of a class of  $C^*$ -algebras, Sci. Rep. Niigata Univ. Ser. A **15** (1978), 21-24.
- [12] M. Takesaki, Theory of Operator Algebras I, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1979.

SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL SCIENCES, JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY, NEW DELHI, INDIA  
*Email address:* vedgupta@mail.jnu.ac.in  
*Email address:* sumitkumar.sk809@gmail.com