

BEST APPROXIMATION AND QUASITRIANGULAR ALGEBRAS¹

BY

TIMOTHY G. FEEMAN

ABSTRACT. If $\mathcal{P}$ is a linearly ordered set of projections on a Hilbert space and $\mathcal{K}$ is the ideal of compact operators, then $\text{Alg } \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{K}$ is the quasitriangular algebra associated with $\mathcal{P}$. We study the problem of finding best approximants in a given quasitriangular algebra to a given operator: given T and $\mathcal{P}$, is there an A in $\text{Alg } \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{K}$ such that $\|T - A\| = \inf\{\|T - S\|: S \in \text{Alg } \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{K}\}$? We prove that if $\mathcal{A}$ is an operator subalgebra which is closed in the weak operator topology and satisfies a certain condition Δ , then every operator T has a best approximant in $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$. We also show that if $\mathcal{E}$ is an increasing sequence of finite rank projections converging strongly to the identity then $\text{Alg } \mathcal{E}$ satisfies the condition Δ . Also, we show that if T is not in $\text{Alg } \mathcal{E} + \mathcal{K}$ then the best approximants in $\text{Alg } \mathcal{E} + \mathcal{K}$ to T are never unique.

1. Introduction. The concept of quasitriangular operators on a Hilbert space was introduced by Halmos in [5], where an operator T is said to be quasitriangular if there is a sequence $\{E_n\}$ of finite rank projections strongly converging to the identity such that $\|(1 - E_n)TE_n\| \rightarrow 0$.

For a fixed increasing sequence $\{P_n\}$ of finite rank projections strongly converging to the identity, Arveson [2] defined the quasitriangular algebra $QT(\{P_n\})$ to be the set of all operators T for which $\|(1 - P_n)TP_n\| \rightarrow 0$. He proved a distance formula for $QT(\{P_n\})$ and showed that $QT(\{P_n\}) = \text{Alg}\{P_n\} + \mathcal{K}$, where $\text{Alg}\{P_n\} = \{T: (1 - P_n)TP_n = 0 \text{ for all } n\}$ is the triangular algebra associated with $\{P_n\}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ is the ideal of compact operators.

For any linearly ordered set $\mathcal{P}$ of projections which is closed in the strong operator topology and contains 0 and 1, Fall, Arveson, and Muhly [4] showed that the algebra $\text{Alg } \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{K}$ is norm closed, where $\text{Alg } \mathcal{P}$ is the triangular algebra associated with $\mathcal{P}$, namely $\text{Alg } \mathcal{P} = \{T: (1 - P)TP = 0, \text{ all } P \in \mathcal{P}\}$. They also gave a characterization of $\text{Alg } \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{K}$ as a generalized quasitriangular algebra.

In this paper we study the problem of finding best quasitriangular approximants to a given operator: given an operator T does there exist an operator A in $\text{Alg } \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{K}$ for which $\|T - A\| = \inf\{\|T - S\|: S \in \text{Alg } \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{K}\}$? We prove that if $\mathcal{A}$ is an operator subalgebra which is closed in the weak operator topology and satisfies a certain condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$, then every operator T has a best approximant in $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$.

Received by the editors March 13, 1984

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47D25; Secondary 41A50, 41A52.

Key words and phrases. Quasitriangular operator algebras, nest algebra, best approximation.

¹ This work represents a part of the author's doctoral dissertation at the University of Michigan. The author would like to thank Allen Shields for his guidance.

©1985 American Mathematical Society
0002-9947/85 \$1.00 + \$.25 per page

We also show that if $\{P_n\}$ is an increasing sequence of finite rank projections strongly converging to 1, then $\text{Alg}\{P_n\}$ satisfies the condition $\Delta(\text{Alg}\{P_n\})$. Hence, best approximants in $\text{Alg}\{P_n\} + \mathcal{K}$ exist for every operator T . Moreover, we show that if $T \notin \text{Alg}\{P_n\} + \mathcal{K}$, then such best approximants are never unique.

Some of our results are reminiscent of those proved in [3] by Axler, Berg, Jewell, and Shields, where it is shown, for example, that every L^∞ function on the unit circle has a best approximant in the algebra $H^\infty + C$. In fact, the general approach to proving our main result is inspired by that paper.

2. Preliminaries. In what follows, H will be a separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space with $\mathcal{L}(H)$ denoting the algebra of all bounded linear operators on H and $\mathcal{K}(H)$, or simply $\mathcal{K}$, denoting the ideal of compact operators in $\mathcal{L}(H)$. All subspaces of H are assumed to be closed and all projections are selfadjoint. For a projection P let $P^\perp = 1 - P$.

If $\mathcal{S}$ is any subset of $\mathcal{L}(H)$ and $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, then the distance of T from $\mathcal{S}$ is given by $d(T, \mathcal{S}) = \inf\{\|T - S\| : S \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Also, $\text{Lat } \mathcal{S}$ will denote the set of all projections P for which $PSP = SP$ whenever $S \in \mathcal{S}$. If $\mathcal{P}$ is a set of projections in $\mathcal{L}(H)$, then $\text{Alg } \mathcal{P}$ denotes the set of all operators T in $\mathcal{L}(H)$ for which $PTP = TP$ whenever $P \in \mathcal{P}$. A subalgebra $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{L}(H)$ is said to be reflexive if $\text{Alg Lat } \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}$.

A nest is a family of projections which is linearly ordered by range inclusion, contains 0 and 1, and is closed in the strong operator topology (SOT). A nest algebra is a subalgebra $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{L}(H)$ for which $\mathcal{A} = \text{Alg } \mathcal{P}$ for some nest $\mathcal{P}$. Equivalently, it is not hard to see that a nest algebra is a reflexive algebra $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\text{Lat } \mathcal{A}$ is linearly ordered (cf. [9]).

In [2] Arveson established the following distance formula for a nest algebra $\mathcal{A}$.

$$(2.1) \quad d(T, \mathcal{A}) = \sup\{\|P^\perp TP\| : P \in \text{Lat } \mathcal{A}\} \quad \text{for } T \in \mathcal{L}(H).$$

For a nest $\mathcal{P}$ define the quasitriangular algebra associated with $\mathcal{P}$ by $QT(\mathcal{P}) = \text{Alg } \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{K}(H)$. In [4] Fall, Arveson, and Muhly showed that $QT(\mathcal{P})$ is a norm closed algebra and that

$$\begin{aligned} QT(\mathcal{P}) = \{T \in \mathcal{L}(H) : & \text{(i) } P^\perp TP \in \mathcal{K}(H), \text{ for all } P \in \mathcal{P}, \\ & \text{the map } P \mapsto P^\perp TP \text{ is continuous} \\ & \text{(ii) with respect to the SOT on } \mathcal{P} \text{ and} \\ & \text{the norm topology on } \mathcal{K}(H)\}. \end{aligned}$$

In the case when $\mathcal{P} = \{P_n\}$ is an increasing sequence of finite rank projections converging strongly to 1, this yields the definition of $QT(\{P_n\})$ given by Arveson in [2]. For this special case Arveson has established the following distance formula.

$$(2.2) \quad d(T, QT(\{P_n\})) = \overline{\lim} \|P_n^\perp TP_n\|, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \text{ for } T \in \mathcal{L}(H).$$

In this case (2.1) can be written as

$$(2.1') \quad d(T, \text{Alg}\{P_n\}) = \sup\{\|P_n^\perp TP_n\| : \text{all } n\} \quad \text{for } T \in \mathcal{L}(H).$$

We also need the following known result.

LEMMA 2.3. *If $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{L}(H)$ is closed in the weak operator topology (WOT), then every T in $\mathcal{L}(H)$ has a best approximant in $\mathcal{A}$.*

PROOF. The proof is a standard argument using the compactness, in the weak operator topology, of the closed unit ball in $\mathcal{L}(H)$. $\square$

Finally, we observe that if $\mathcal{P}$ is a nest then $\text{Alg } \mathcal{P}$ is closed in the WOT. Indeed, if $\{A_\lambda\} \subset \text{Alg } \mathcal{P}$ is a net of operators such that $A_\lambda \rightarrow A$ (WOT), then, for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $0 = P^\perp A_\lambda P \rightarrow P^\perp A P$ (WOT), which implies that $A \in \text{Alg } \mathcal{P}$.

3. Main results.

DEFINITION 3.1. A subalgebra $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{L}(H)$ satisfies condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ provided that, for each $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, for each sequence of operators $\{A_n\} \subset \mathcal{L}(H)$ satisfying $A_n \rightarrow 0$ (SOT), and for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an N such that

$$d(T + A_N, \mathcal{A}) \leq \varepsilon + \max\{d(T, \mathcal{A}), d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}) + d(A_N, \mathcal{A})\}.$$

Two remarks are in order. First, if condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ holds and $T, \{A_n\}$, and ε are chosen as indicated, then there exists an N such that

$$d(T + \beta A_N, \mathcal{A}) \leq \varepsilon + \max\{d(T, \mathcal{A}), d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}) + d(\beta A_N, \mathcal{A})\}$$

for all $\beta \in [0, 1]$. Otherwise, for each n , take $\beta_n \in [0, 1]$ such that the inequality fails for $\beta_n A_n$. The sequence $\{\beta_n A_n\}$ satisfies $\beta_n A_n \rightarrow 0$ (SOT), so the assumption that condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ holds yields a contradiction. Secondly, for any fixed M , N can be chosen so that $N \geq M$ by restricting attention to the sequence $\{A_n; n \geq M\}$.

The next result enables us to reduce the problem of finding best approximants in $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}(H)$ to that of finding best approximants in $\mathcal{A}$.

THEOREM 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{L}(H)$ be a subalgebra satisfying condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$. Choose $T \in \mathcal{L}(H) \setminus \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$ and suppose the sequence $\{T_n\} \subset \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$ satisfies $T_n \rightarrow T$ (SOT). Then there is a sequence $\{a_n\}$ of nonnegative real numbers satisfying $\sum a_n = 1$ and such that, if $K = \sum a_n T_n$, then $d(T - K, \mathcal{A}) = d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K})$.*

PROOF. Let $A_n = T - T_n$ so that $A_n \rightarrow 0$ (SOT). For convenience let

$$r = d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}).$$

CLAIM. There exists an increasing sequence of positive integers $\{n(k)\}$ and a sequence $\{\alpha_k\}$ of positive real numbers such that $\sum \alpha_k = 1$ and such that, for all $N = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$d\left(\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k A_{n(k)}, \mathcal{A}\right) = r - \varepsilon_N, \quad \text{where } \varepsilon_N = r/3^N.$$

PROOF OF CLAIM. Choose $n(1) = 1$. Since $A_1 \notin \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$, it follows that $d(A_1, \mathcal{A}) \neq 0$. Choose α_1 such that $\alpha_1 \cdot d(A_1, \mathcal{A}) = r - \varepsilon_1$. Since $\alpha_1 \cdot d(A_1, \mathcal{A}) = d(\alpha_1 A_1, \mathcal{A})$, it follows that $d(\alpha_1 A_1, \mathcal{A}) = r - \varepsilon_1$. The relations

$$d(A_1, \mathcal{A}) = d(T, \mathcal{A} + T_1) \geq d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K})$$

imply $0 < \alpha_1 < 1$.

Suppose $n(1), \dots, n(N)$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N$ have been chosen as required. Applying condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ to the operator $\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k A_{n(k)}$, the sequence $\{A_n\}$, and ε_{N+1} , choose

$n(N+1) > n(N)$ such that

$$(3.3) \quad d\left(\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k A_{n(k)} + \beta A_{n(N+1)}, \mathcal{A}\right) \\ \leq \varepsilon_{N+1} + \max\left\{d\left(\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k A_{n(k)}, \mathcal{A}\right), d\left(\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k A_{n(k)}, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}\right) + d(\beta A_{n(N+1)}, \mathcal{A})\right\} \\ \text{for all } \beta \in [0, 1].$$

Consider the quantity $d(\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k A_{n(k)} + \alpha A_{n(N+1)}, \mathcal{A})$ as a function of α . When $\alpha = 0$ this quantity equals $r - \varepsilon_N$. Note that $r - \varepsilon_N < r - \varepsilon_{N+1}$. As $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ this quantity also approaches ∞ . (Here we use the fact that A_k does not belong to $\mathcal{A}$ for any k .) Thus, there exists some value of α , call it α_{N+1} , for which

$$d\left(\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k A_{n(k)} + \alpha_{N+1} \cdot A_{n(N+1)}, \mathcal{A}\right) = r - \varepsilon_{N+1}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} r - \varepsilon_{N+1} &= d\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N+1} \alpha_k A_{n(k)}, \mathcal{A}\right) = d\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N+1} \alpha_k (T - T_{n(k)}), \mathcal{A}\right) \\ &\geq d\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N+1} \alpha_k T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}\right) \quad \text{since } T_{n(k)} \in \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K} \\ &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^{N+1} \alpha_k\right) \cdot d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}) = \left(\sum_{k=1}^{N+1} \alpha_k\right) \cdot r \end{aligned}$$

and, hence, $\sum_{k=1}^{N+1} \alpha_k < 1$. It remains to show that $\sum \alpha_k = 1$.

Referring to inequality (3.3), with α_{N+1} in place of β , suppose that

$$d\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N+1} \alpha_k A_{n(k)}, \mathcal{A}\right) \leq \varepsilon_{N+1} + d\left(\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k A_{n(k)}, \mathcal{A}\right).$$

Then $r - \varepsilon_{N+1} \leq \varepsilon_{N+1} + (r - \varepsilon_N)$, which implies that $\varepsilon_N \leq 2\varepsilon_{N+1}$, a contradiction of the definition of $\{\varepsilon_n\}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} r - \varepsilon_{N+1} &= d\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N+1} \alpha_k A_{n(k)}, \mathcal{A}\right) \\ &\leq \varepsilon_{N+1} + d\left(\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k A_{n(k)}, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}\right) + d(\alpha_{N+1} A_{n(N+1)}, \mathcal{A}) \\ &= \varepsilon_{N+1} + \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k\right) \cdot r + \alpha_{N+1} \cdot d(A_{n(N+1)}, \mathcal{A}). \end{aligned}$$

If $N \rightarrow \infty$ then $\varepsilon_{N+1} \rightarrow 0$ and, since $\sum \alpha_k \leq 1$, it follows that $\alpha_{N+1} \rightarrow 0$. Since $A_n \rightarrow 0$ (SOT) we see that $\{\|A_n\|\}$, and hence $\{d(A_n, \mathcal{A})\}$, is a bounded set. Thus,

letting $N \rightarrow \infty$ in the above yields $r = d(\sum \alpha_k A_{n(k)}, \mathcal{A}) \leq (\sum \alpha_k) \cdot r$, which implies that $\sum \alpha_k \geq 1$. This completes the proof of the claim.

To complete the proof of the theorem, define the sequence $\{a_n\}$ by $a_{n(k)} = \alpha_k$ and $a_j = 0$ if j is not of the form $n(k)$ for any k . Also, let $K = \sum a_n T_n = \sum \alpha_k T_{n(k)} = T - \sum \alpha_k A_{n(k)}$. This sum converges since $\sum \alpha_k = 1$ and since $\{\|A_n\|\}$ is a bounded set. It follows from the foregoing discussion that $d(T - K, \mathcal{A}) = d(\sum \alpha_k A_{n(k)}, \mathcal{A}) = r = d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K})$, which completes the proof. $\square$

Note that if $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}(H)$ is norm closed then $K \in \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}(H)$. Also, if $\{T_n\}$ is taken to be a sequence of compact operators converging to T (SOT), then $K \in \mathcal{K}(H)$, since $\mathcal{K}(H)$ is norm closed.

We are now in a position to prove one of our main results on the existence of best approximants.

THEOREM 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{L}(H)$ be a subalgebra which is WOT-closed and satisfies condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$, and suppose $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$. Then there exists $B \in \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}(H)$ such that $\|T - B\| = d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}(H))$.*

PROOF. Assume $T \in \mathcal{L}(H) \setminus \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$, since otherwise the result is obvious. Let $\{e_j: j \geq 0\}$ be an orthonormal basis for H and define E_n to be the projection onto the subspace spanned by $\{e_j: j \leq n\}$. Each E_n has finite rank and $E_n \rightarrow 1$ (SOT). Set $T_n = E_n T E_n$. Each T_n is compact and $T_n \rightarrow T$ (SOT).

By Theorem 3.2 there is a sequence $\{a_n\}$ of nonnegative real numbers satisfying $\sum a_n = 1$ and such that, if $K = \sum a_n T_n$, $d(T - K, \mathcal{A}) = d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K})$. Note that $K \in \mathcal{K}$. By Lemma 2.3 there exists $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\|(T - K) - A\| = d(T - K, \mathcal{A})$. Therefore, the operator $B = A + K$ is in $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$ and satisfies

$$\|T - B\| = d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}).$$

In other words, B is a best approximant to T in $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$. $\square$

We remarked earlier that every nest algebra is WOT-closed, so Theorem 3.4 applies, in particular, to any nest algebra $\mathcal{A}$ which satisfies condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$.

The following corollary shows that if $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$ is norm closed, then the operator K in the conclusion of Theorem 3.2 is not unique.

COROLLARY 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{A}$, T , and $\{T_n\}$ be as in the statement of Theorem 3.2, and also suppose that $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$ is norm closed. Then there exist two sequences $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ of nonnegative real numbers such that $\sum a_n = \sum b_n = 1$ and such that, if $K = \sum a_n T_n$ and $K_1 = \sum b_n T_n$, then $K \neq K_1$ and $d(T - K, \mathcal{A}) = d(T - K_1, \mathcal{A}) = d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K})$.*

PROOF. Let $\{a_n\}$ and $K = \sum a_n T_n$ be as in the conclusion of Theorem 3.2. Then $(T_n - K) \rightarrow (T - K)$ (SOT). Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a convex neighborhood of $T - K$ in the strong operator topology whose closure does not contain $\mathcal{O}$. Deleting a finite number of terms if necessary, assume that $T_n - K \in \mathcal{O}$ for all n .

Since $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$ is norm closed, we see that $K \in \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$ and, hence, $(T_n - K) \in \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$ for all n . Thus by Theorem 3.2 we can construct a sequence $\{b_n\}$ such that $\sum b_n = 1$ and such that if $K' = \sum b_n (T_n - K)$, then

$$d((T - K) - K', \mathcal{A}) = d(T - K, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}) = d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}).$$

Thus, the operator $K_1 = K + K'$ satisfies $d(T - K_1, \mathcal{A}) = d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K})$. Since K' is a convex combination of elements of $\mathcal{O}$, it follows that $K' \neq 0$ and, hence, $K_1 \neq K$. This proves the corollary. $\square$

We noted earlier that $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$ is norm closed whenever $\mathcal{A}$ is a nest algebra, so Corollary 3.5 applies, in particular, to any nest algebra satisfying condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$. Also note that if $\{T_n\}$ is taken to be a sequence of compact operators, then K is compact as well and the requirement that $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}$ be norm closed is superfluous.

4. More main results. Throughout this section let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_n\}$ be a fixed increasing sequence of finite rank projections such that $P_n \rightarrow 1$ (SOT). Let

$$\mathcal{A} = \text{Alg}\{P_n\} = \{T \in \mathcal{L}(H) : P_n^\perp TP_n = 0 \text{ for all } n\}$$

and let

$$QT = QT(\{P_n\}) = \{T \in \mathcal{L}(H) : \|P_n^\perp TP_n\| \rightarrow 0, n \rightarrow \infty\}.$$

The following result establishes the validity of condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ in this special case. It then follows from Theorem 3.4 that best approximants in QT exist for every operator in $\mathcal{L}(H)$.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *The algebra $\mathcal{A} = \text{Alg}\{P_n\}$ satisfies condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$.*

PROOF. Choose $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ and let $\{A_n\} \subset \mathcal{L}(H)$ satisfy $A_n \rightarrow 0$ (SOT). Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. If condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ is not satisfied, then by the distance formulas (2.2) and (2.1') there is a sequence $\{m_n\}$ of nonnegative integers such that $\|P_{m_n}^\perp(T + A_n)P_{m_n}\| > \varepsilon + \alpha_n$, where

$$\alpha_n = \max\left(\sup_{j \geq 0} \|P_j^\perp TP_j\|, \overline{\lim}_k \|P_k^\perp TP_k\| + \sup_{j \geq 0} \|P_j^\perp A_n P_j\|\right).$$

Consider two cases.

Case 1. Suppose no nonnegative integer appears infinitely often in the sequence $\{m_n\}$. Passing to a subsequence if necessary, assume that $\{m_n\}$ is an increasing sequence. By the definition of lim sup, there exists some N such that $n \geq N$ implies that $\|P_{m_n}^\perp TP_{m_n}\| \leq \overline{\lim}_k \|P_k^\perp TP_k\| + \varepsilon/2$. Thus, for $n \geq N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{m_n}^\perp(T + A_n)P_{m_n}\| &\leq \|P_{m_n}^\perp TP_{m_n}\| + \|P_{m_n}^\perp A_n P_{m_n}\| \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_k \|P_k^\perp TP_k\| + \varepsilon/2 + \sup_j \|P_j^\perp A_n P_j\| \\ &\leq \alpha_n + \varepsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the definition of the sequence $\{m_n\}$.

Case 2. Suppose some nonnegative integer, call it M , appears infinitely often in the sequence $\{m_n\}$. Passing to a subsequence if necessary, assume that

$$\|P_M^\perp(T + A_n)P_M\| > \varepsilon + \alpha_n \quad \text{for all } n.$$

Since P_M is compact and $A_n \rightarrow 0$ (SOT), it follows that $\|A_n P_M\| \rightarrow 0$. Choose N such that $\|A_N P_M\| < \varepsilon/2$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_M^\perp(T + A_N)P_M\| &\leq \|P_M^\perp TP_M\| + \|P_M^\perp A_N P_M\| \\ &\leq \sup_j \|P_j^\perp TP_j\| + \varepsilon/2 \leq \alpha_N + \varepsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

This yields a contradiction to the definition of the sequence $\{m_n\}$ and completes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

We now show that best approximants in QT are never unique for operators not in QT .

PROPOSITION 4.2. *For each $T \in \mathcal{L}(H) \setminus QT$ there exist operators B and B_1 in QT such that $B \neq B_1$ and $\|T - B\| = \|T - B_1\| = d(T, QT)$.*

PROOF. Consider two cases.

Case 1. Suppose there is a subsequence $\{n_k\}$ such that $(P_{n_{k+1}} - P_{n_k})TP_{n_0} \neq 0$ for all $k \geq 0$. Set $E_k = P_{n_k}$ and let $T_k = E_kTE_k$. Now, let $K = \sum a_k T_k$ and $K_1 = \sum b_k T_k$ be as in the conclusion of Corollary 3.5. Note that K and K_1 are compact. By Lemma 2.3 we can find operators A and A_1 in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\|T - K - A\| = d(T - K, \mathcal{A})$ and $\|T - K_1 - A_1\| = d(T - K_1, \mathcal{A})$. Thus, $B = A + K$ and $B_1 = A_1 + K_1$ are best approximants in QT to T . To show that $B \neq B_1$, it suffices to show that $K - K_1 \notin \mathcal{A}$.

Suppose, to the contrary, that $K - K_1 \in \mathcal{A}$. Then it follows, in particular, that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= E_0^\perp (K - K_1) E_0 = \sum_{k \geq 0} (a_k - b_k) E_0^\perp E_k T E_k E_0 \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} (a_k - b_k) (E_k - E_0) T E_0. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $C_k = \sum_{j \geq k} (a_j - b_j)$, a summation by parts shows that

$$\sum_{k=1}^N C_k (E_k - E_{k-1}) T E_0 = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} (a_k - b_k) E_k T E_0 + C_N E_N T E_0 - C_1 E_0 T E_0.$$

As $N \rightarrow \infty$, $|C_N| \rightarrow 0$, so $\|C_N E_N T E_0\| \rightarrow 0$. Thus,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C_k (E_k - E_{k-1}) T E_0 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (a_k - b_k) E_k T E_0 - C_1 E_0 T E_0.$$

We thus have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j \geq k} (a_j - b_j) \right) (E_k - E_{k-1}) T E_0 \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (a_k - b_k) E_k T E_0 - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (a_k - b_k) E_0 T E_0 \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (a_k - b_k) (E_k - E_0) T E_0 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since the range of $(E_l - E_{l-1})$ is orthogonal to that of $(E_j - E_{j-1})$ whenever $l \neq j$, and since, by assumption, $(E_k - E_{k-1}) T E_0 \neq 0$ for $k \geq 1$, it follows that

$$\sum_{j \geq k} (a_j - b_j) = 0 \quad \text{for } k \geq 1.$$

The fact that $\sum a_n = \sum b_n = 1$ implies that $\sum_{j \geq 0} (a_j - b_j) = 0$ as well. Hence, $a_j = b_j$ for all $j \geq 0$, which contradicts the assumption that $K \neq K_1$. Thus, $K - K_1 \notin \mathcal{A}$ and, consequently, $B \neq B_1$.

Case 2. Suppose there is no subsequence $\{n_k\}$ for which $(P_{n_{k+1}} - P_{n_k})TP_{n_0} \neq 0$ for all k . Then for each k there is a smallest integer $m(k)$ such that $P_{m(k)}^\perp TP_k = 0$. We claim that $m(k) \geq k + 1$ for infinitely many k . Indeed, were this not so then there would exist N such that $m(k) \leq k$ for $k \geq N$. Hence, $P_k^\perp TP_k = 0$ for $k \geq N$, which implies that $d(T, QT) = 0$, contradicting the assumption that $T \notin QT$.

We make the following remarks.

(a) If $m(k) \geq k + 1$, then $(P_{m(k)} - P_k)TP_k \neq 0$. This follows from the choice of $m(k)$ as the *smallest* integer such that $P_{m(k)}^\perp TP_k = 0$.

(b) It is clear that if $(P_{m(k)} - P_k)TP_k \neq 0$, then $(P_j - P_k)TP_k \neq 0$ for $j \geq m(k)$.

Now, choose k_0 such that $m(k_0) \geq k_0 + 1$ and $TP_{k_0} \neq 0$. For $j \geq 1$ inductively choose k_j such that $m(k_j) \geq k_j + 1$ and $k_j > m(k_{j-1})$. Set $E_j = P_{k_j}$ and let $T_j = E_j TE_j$. From this we get $K = \sum a_n T_n$ and $K_1 = \sum b_n T_n$, as in the conclusion of Corollary 3.5. To complete the proof it suffices, as in the previous case, to show that $K - K_1 \notin \mathcal{A}$.

First observe that remarks (a) and (b) imply that $(E_n - E_l)TE_l \neq 0$ for $n \geq l + 1$. Also, by the construction of the sequence $\{E_n\}$, it follows that $(E_{j+1} - E_j)TE_l = 0$ for $j \geq l + 1$. Putting these together we see that, for $n \geq l + 1$,

$$(E_n - E_l)TE_l = \sum_{j=l}^{n-1} (E_{j+1} - E_j)TE_l = (E_{l+1} - E_l)TE_l \neq 0.$$

To see that $K - K_1 \notin \mathcal{A}$, suppose the contrary. Then, for $l \geq 0$, we must have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= E_l^\perp (K - K_1)E_l = \sum_{n \geq 0} (a_n - b_n)E_l^\perp E_n TE_n E_l \\ &= \sum_{n \geq l+1} (a_n - b_n)(E_n - E_l)TE_l \\ &= \sum_{n \geq l+1} (a_n - b_n)(E_{l+1} - E_l)TE_l \\ &= \left[\sum_{n \geq l+1} (a_n - b_n) \right] (E_{l+1} - E_l)TE_l. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(E_{l+1} - E_l)TE_l \neq 0$, it follows that $\sum_{n \geq l+1} (a_n - b_n) = 0$ for $l \geq 0$. Since $\sum a_n = \sum b_n = 1$, it follows that $\sum_{n \geq l} (a_n - b_n) = 0$ for all $l \geq 0$ and, hence, $a_n = b_n$ for all n , contradicting the assumption that $K \neq K_1$. Hence, $K - K_1 \notin \mathcal{A}$ and the corollary is proved. $\square$

5. Remarks. The obvious question is to ask which subalgebras $\mathcal{A}$ satisfy the condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$. Our proof of Proposition 4.1 and Arveson's proof of the distance formula (2.2) both use the finite dimensionality of the projections P_n in an important way. Some means of eliminating this dependence would apparently be needed to establish a broader validity of condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$. A generalization of Proposition 4.2 to the setting of §3 would also be useful.

A question related to Theorem 3.2 is the following. If the operators $\{T_n\}$ are taken to be compact, then the resulting K is also compact. It is possible that this K is a best compact approximant to T ?

In [3] Axler, Berg, Jewell, and Shields employ what they call the “Basic Inequality” for a Banach space X . This inequality is similar to condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ for $\mathcal{A} = \{0\}$, the zero operator. They show that the Basic Inequality is satisfied for $X = l^p$, $1 < p < \infty$. They also prove that the closed unit ball of $L^\infty/H^\infty + C$ has no extreme points. Two questions which arise are whether $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ holds when $\mathcal{A}$ is the algebra of operators on l^p ($1 < p < \infty$) with upper triangular matrix representations with respect to the standard basis, and whether the closed unit ball of $\mathcal{L}(H)/\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}(H)$ has any extreme points if $\mathcal{A}$ is a nest algebra satisfying condition $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$.

Another line of questioning is related to the theory of M -ideals, introduced in 1972 by Alfsen and Effros [1]. Luecking [8] showed that $H^\infty + C/H^\infty$ is an M -ideal in L^∞/H^∞ , and it seems reasonable to ask if $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}(H)/\mathcal{A}$ is an M -ideal in $\mathcal{L}(H)/\mathcal{A}$ for any nest algebra $\mathcal{A}$. An affirmative answer would imply, by a result of Holmes, Scranton, and Ward [7], that the collection $\mathcal{S}_T = \{A + \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}(H)/\mathcal{A} : d(T - A, \mathcal{A}) = d(T, \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}(H))\}$ would algebraically span $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}(H)/\mathcal{A}$ for each $T \in \mathcal{L}(H) \setminus \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{K}(H)$.

REFERENCES

1. Eric M. Alfsen and Edward G. Effros, *Structure in real Banach spaces*, Ann. of Math. (2) **96** (1972), 98–173.
2. William Arveson, *Interpolation problems in nest algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **20** (1975), 208–233.
3. Sheldon Axler, I. David Berg, Nicholas Jewell and Allen Shields, *Approximation by compact operators and the space $H^\infty + C$* , Ann. of Math. (2) **109** (1979), 601–612.
4. T. Fall, W. Arveson and P. Muhly, *Perturbations of nest algebras*, J. Operator Theory **1** (1979), 137–150.
5. P. R. Halmos, *Quasitriangular operators*, Acta Sci. Math (Szeged) **29** (1968), 283–293.
6. Richard B. Holmes and Bernard R. Kripke, *Best approximation by compact operators*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **21** (1971), 255–263.
7. Richard Holmes, Bruce Scranton and Joseph Ward, *Approximation from the space of compact operators and other M -ideals*, Duke Math. J. **42** (1975), 259–269.
8. Daniel H. Luecking, *The compact Hankel operators form an M -ideal in the space of all Hankel operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **79** (1980), 222–224.
9. J. R. Ringrose, *On some algebras of operators*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **15** (1965), 61–83.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, LEWISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17837