



King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals

**DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES**

---

Technical Report Series

TR 232

June 1998

**The Strict Topology on Topological Algebras**

L.A. Khan, N. Mohammad, A.B. Thaheem

# THE STRICT TOPOLOGY ON TOPOLOGICAL ALGEBRAS

L.A. Khan\*, N. Mohammad\*\*, and A.B. Thaheem\*\*\*

## Abstract

In this paper we introduce strict, uniform, and compact-open topologies on topological algebras and investigate their properties. In particular, we extend several results of R.C. Busby [Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 132(1968), 77–79] and F.D. Sentiilles and D.C. Taylor [ibid 142(1969), 141–152] on Banach algebras and the general strict topology to this general setting.

## 1. Introduction

Let  $C_b(S)$  be the Banach algebra of all bounded continuous scalar-valued functions on a locally compact space  $S$  and  $C_0(S)$  the subalgebra of all functions in  $C_b(S)$  which vanish at infinity. The strict topology  $\beta$  on  $C_b(S)$  was first introduced by R.C. Buck [3] in 1958 as the locally convex topology generated by the seminorms  $f \rightarrow \|\varphi f\|$  for  $\varphi \in C_0(S)$ . Wang [24] defined in an analogous way the strict topology on the multiplier (or centralizer) algebra  $M(A)$  of a commutative Banach algebra  $A$  and showed in particular that (1)  $A$  is a norm-closed ideal in  $M(A)$ , (2)  $A$  is strictly dense in  $M(A)$  if  $A$  has an approximate identity, and (3)  $M(A) = C_b(S)$  if  $A = C_0(S)$ . In the case of  $A$  a non-commutative  $B^*$ -algebra, Busby [4] introduced the strict topology on the double multiplier algebra  $M_d(A)$  as the one given by the seminorms  $x \rightarrow \max\{\|ax\|, \|xa\|\}$  for  $a \in A$ . The concept of double multiplier algebra was initially developed by Johnson

---

1991 AMS Subject Classifications: 46H05, 46A16.

Keywords and Phrases: Locally idempotent algebras, locally bounded algebras,  $F$ -algebras, double multiplier algebras, strict topology, approximate identity, factorization theorem, essential part.

[7] and it later became an extensively studied object; see e.g. [1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 20, 22, 23, 24].

Busby in [4] also defined in the above way a general strict topology on any  $B^*$ -algebra  $X$  which contains  $A$  as a closed two-sided ideal. Independently, this topology was studied in greater detail and in a more general setting by Sentiilles and Taylor in an interesting paper [18] where  $A$  is a Banach algebra having an approximate identity and  $X$  is a left Banach  $A$ -module. There have been several applications of this paper in the literature; see e.g. [17, 19, 20, 21]. As pointed out in [18], the essential ingredients of arguments used by Buck [3] and later authors is the presence of an approximate identity in  $C_0(S)$  or  $A$ .

The aim of the present paper is to extend several results of [4, 18] to a class of topological algebras which are not necessarily locally convex. For simplicity, we take  $X$  to be a topological algebra which contains  $A$  as a closed two-sided ideal. Our main results are given in section 3 while section 2 is devoted to some technical preliminaries required for the development of our results. The authors had initially established these results assuming  $X$  a locally  $m$ -convex algebra but later realized that “local convexity” can be dispensed with. In view of the increasing applications of (non-normed) topological algebras in other fields such as quantum mechanics and quantum statistics (see e.g. Lassner [9, 10]), these results would provide a framework for further applications.

## 2. Preliminaries

An algebra  $X$  (over  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ ) with a topology  $\tau$  is called a *topological algebra* (resp. *semitopological algebra*) if it is a topological vector space in which multiplication is

jointly (resp. separately) continuous. If  $(X, \tau)$  is a topological algebra, there exists a base  $\mathcal{W}$  of  $\tau$ -neighborhoods of 0 consisting of closed, balanced, and absorbing sets such that for each  $G \in \mathcal{W}$ , there exists a  $H \in \mathcal{W}$  with  $H^2 \subseteq G$ . (Here  $H^2 = HH = \{ab : a, b \in H\}$ ). A subset  $H$  of  $X$  is called *idempotent* if  $H^2 \subseteq H$ . Following Zelako ([25], p. 31),  $X$  is said to be *locally idempotent* if it has a base of neighborhoods of 0 consisting of idempotent sets.  $X$  is called *locally bounded* if there is a bounded neighborhood of 0. Every normed algebra and, more generally, every locally  $m$ -convex algebra is locally idempotent; every Hausdorff locally bounded algebra is metrizable. If a semitopological algebra is complete and metrizable, then it is a topological algebra. A complete metrizable topological algebra is called an *F-algebra*. A net  $\{e_\lambda : \lambda \in I\}$  in a topological algebra  $X$  is called a two-sided *approximate identity* if, for all  $x \in X$ ,  $\lim_\lambda e_\lambda x = \lim_\lambda x e_\lambda = x$ . A topological vector space (TVS)  $E$  is called *ultrabornological* if every linear map from  $E$  into any TVS which takes bounded sets into bounded sets is continuous. Every metrizable TVS is ultrabornological. For the general theory of TVS, see e.g. [15, 16] and of topological algebras, see [12] and the comments after each chapter in [26].

Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological algebra,  $A$  a fixed closed two-sided ideal in  $X$ , and  $\mathcal{W}$  a base of  $\tau$ -neighborhoods of 0 in  $X$ . For any bounded set  $D \subseteq A$  and  $G \in \mathcal{W}$ , we set

$$N(D, G) = \{x \in X : Dx \subseteq G, xD \subseteq G\}.$$

If  $\{a\} \subseteq A$  is a singleton, we write  $N(a, G)$  instead of  $N(\{a\}, G)$ . The *uniform topology*  $u = u_A$  (resp. *strict topology*  $\beta = \beta_A$ ) on  $X$  is defined as the linear topology which has a base of neighborhoods of 0 consisting of all sets of the form  $N(D, G)$ , where  $D$  is a bounded (resp. finite) subset of  $A$  and  $G \in \mathcal{W}$ . If  $A$  has a two-sided approximate identity  $\{e_\lambda : \lambda \in I\}$ , the *compact-open topology*  $k$  on  $X$  is defined just as above with

$D$  being a finite subset of  $\{e_\lambda : \lambda \in I\}$  (cf. [18], §.3).

As mentioned earlier,  $\beta$  was introduced independently by Busby ([4], p. 83) and Sentilles and Taylor ([18], p. 145) in the case of  $X$  a Banach algebra. As a classical example, let  $X = C_b(S)$  and  $A = C_0(S)$  with  $S$  a locally compact space and  $X$  endowed with the sup-norm topology. Then  $A$  is a closed two-sided ideal in  $X$  and has an approximate identity. In this example,  $\beta$  is the original strict topology introduced by Buck [3],  $u = \tau$  is the sup-norm topology, and  $k$  is the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets of  $S$ . Another instance of the above, due to Wang [24] and Johnson [7], is that  $A$  is a topological algebra and  $X = M_d(A)$ . This is discussed in the later part of section 3.

### 3. Main Results

Throughout this section we shall assume, unless stated otherwise, that  $(X, \tau)$  is a locally idempotent  $F$ -algebra,  $A$  a closed two-sided ideal in  $X$  having a bounded two-sided approximate identity  $\{e_\lambda : \lambda \in I\}$ , and  $\mathcal{W}$  a base of  $\tau$ -neighborhoods of 0 in  $X$  consisting of balanced idempotent sets. We shall also assume that  $A$  is *faithful* in  $X$  in the sense that, for each  $x \neq 0$  in  $X$ , there exists  $a \in A$  with  $ax \neq 0$ ; that is, if  $\{x \in X : Ax = \{0\}\} = \{0\}$  (cf [7, 18]).

**Theorem 3.1.** (a)  $k \leq \beta \leq u \leq \tau$ .

(b)  $k, \beta$ , and  $u$  are Hausdorff.

(c)  $(X, k)$ ,  $(X, \beta)$ , and  $(X, u)$  are semi-topological algebras.

(d) For each  $x \in X$ ,  $e_\lambda x \xrightarrow{\beta} x$  and  $x e_\lambda \xrightarrow{\beta} x$ .

(e)  $\bigcup_{\lambda \in I} e_\lambda X$  and  $\bigcup_{\lambda \in I} X e_\lambda$  are  $\beta$ -dense in  $X$ ; in particular,  $A$  is  $\beta$ -dense in  $X$ .

**Proof.** (a) It is clear that  $k \leq \beta \leq u$ . Let  $D$  be a bounded set in  $A$  and  $G \in \mathcal{W}$ .

Choose  $H \in \mathcal{W}$  with  $H^2 \subseteq G$  and  $r > 0$  with  $D \subseteq rH$ . Then  $V = \frac{1}{r}H \in \mathcal{W}$  and it is easy to see that  $V \subseteq N(D, G)$ . This proves that  $u \leq \tau$ .

(b) We need only show that  $k$  is Hausdorff. Let  $x \in \bigcap_{\lambda \in I} \bigcap_{G \in \mathcal{W}} N(e_\lambda, G)$ . Since  $\tau$  is Hausdorff,  $\bigcap_{G \in \mathcal{W}} G = \{0\}$  and so  $e_\lambda x = 0 = x e_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda \in I$ . Then, for any  $a \in A$ ,  $ax = \lim_{\lambda} (ae_\lambda)x = 0$ . Since  $A$  is faithful in  $X$ , we have  $x = 0$ .

(c) We prove the result only for  $(X, u)$  as the proofs for  $(X, \beta)$  and  $(X, k)$  are similar to it. Fix  $z \neq 0$  in  $X$ , and let  $D$  be a bounded set in  $A$  and  $G \in \mathcal{W}$ . Choose a balanced idempotent  $H \in \mathcal{W}$  with  $H \subseteq G$  and  $r > 1$  with  $z \in rH$ . Put  $D_1 = D \cup Dz \cup zD$  and  $H_1 = \frac{1}{r}H$ . Then it is easy to verify that  $zN(D_1, H_1) \subseteq N(D, G)$  and  $N(D_1, H_1)z \subseteq N(D, G)$ . This implies that the multiplication in  $(X, u)$  is separately continuous.

(d) Let  $x \in X$ , and let  $D$  be a finite set in  $A$  and  $G \in \mathcal{W}$ . Choose a balanced idempotent  $H \in \mathcal{W}$  with  $H \subseteq G$  and  $r > 1$  with  $x \in rH$ . There exists  $\lambda_0 \in I$  such that  $ae_\lambda - a \in \frac{1}{r}H$  and  $e_\lambda xa - xa \in \frac{1}{r}H$  for all  $a \in D$  and  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ . Then, for any  $a \in D$  and  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ , we have  $a(e_\lambda x - x) \in G$  and  $(e_\lambda x - x)a \in G$ . Hence  $e_\lambda x \xrightarrow{\beta} x$ . In a similar way, we have  $xe_\lambda \xrightarrow{\beta} x$ .

(e) This follows immediately from (d).

The following result is an extension of ([5], Lemma 4).

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $S$  be a  $\beta$ -bounded set in  $X$ . Then, for any bounded set  $D \subseteq A$ ,  $DS \cup SD$  is  $\tau$ -bounded in  $X$ .*

**Proof.** For any  $x \in X$ , define  $L_x, R_x : A \rightarrow A$  by  $L_x(a) = xa$  and  $R_x(a) = ax, a \in A$ . Since  $S$  is  $\beta$ -bounded, for each  $a \in A$ ,  $aS \cup Sa$  is  $\tau$ -bounded in  $X$ . Hence  $B = \{L_x, R_x : x \in S\}$  is a pointwise bounded subset of  $CL(A, A)$ , the space of all continuous linear maps from  $A$  into  $A$ . By the principle of uniform boundedness ([15], Theorem 2.6),  $B$  is equicontinuous and hence uniformly bounded in  $CL(A, A)$ . This implies that, for

any bounded set  $D \subseteq A$ ,  $DS \cup SD$  is  $\tau$ -bounded.

**Theorem 3.3.** (a)  $\beta$  and  $u$  have the same bounded sets.

(b) If  $(X, \beta)$  is ultrabornological, then  $\beta = u$  on  $X$ .

**Proof.** (a) This follows immediately from Lemma 3.2.

(b) By (a), the identity map  $i = (X, \beta) \rightarrow (X, u)$  takes bounded sets into bounded sets. Hence, by hypothesis,  $i$  is continuous; that is,  $u \leq \beta$ .

**Theorem 3.4** (a)  $k = \beta$  on  $\tau$ -bounded sets in  $X$ .

(b) If a sequence  $\{x_n\} \subseteq X$  is  $\beta$ -convergent, it is  $u$ -bounded and  $k$ -convergent; conversely, if  $\{x_n\}$  is  $\tau$ -bounded and  $k$ -convergent, it is  $\beta$ -convergent.

**Proof.** (a) The proof is omitted since it is similar to and simpler than the one given for part (a) of the next theorem.

(b) Let  $\{x_n\} \subseteq X$  with  $x_n \xrightarrow{\beta} x \in x$ . Then it is  $\beta$ -bounded and hence  $u$ -bounded by Theorem 3.3(a). Further, since  $k \leq \beta$ ,  $x_n \xrightarrow{k} x$ . Conversely, suppose  $\{x_n\}$  is  $\tau$ -bounded and  $x_n \xrightarrow{k} x$ . By (a),  $k = \beta$  on the  $\tau$ -bounded set  $\{x, x_n = n \geq 1\}$ ; hence  $x_n \xrightarrow{\beta} x$ .

If, in addition,  $X$  is locally bounded, we obtain a stronger version of Theorem 3.4 which generalizes the corresponding results of Buck [3] and Sentilles and Taylor [18].

**Theorem 3.5.** Suppose  $(X, \tau)$  is locally bounded. Then

(a)  $k = \beta$  on  $u$ -bounded sets.

(b) A sequence  $\{x_n\} \subseteq X$  is  $\beta$ -convergent iff it is  $u$ -bounded and  $k$ -convergent.

**Proof.** (a) Let  $S$  be a  $u$ -bounded set in  $X$ , and let  $\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in J\} \subseteq S$  with  $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{k} x \in S$ . Let  $D$  be a finite set in  $A$  and  $G \in \mathcal{W}$ . Choose a balanced idempotent  $H \in \mathcal{W}$  with

$H + H + H \subseteq G$ . Let  $V$  be a closed bounded  $\tau$ -neighborhood of 0 in  $X$ . Choose  $r > 1$  with  $V \subseteq rH$ . Since  $S$  is  $u$ -bounded, it follows that  $(V \cap A)S$  is  $\tau$ -bounded. Choose  $t > 1$  with  $\{x\} \cup D \cup (V \cap A)S \subseteq tV$ . There exists  $\lambda_0 \in I$  such that

$$ae_{\lambda_0} - a \in \frac{1}{r^2t}V, \quad ae_{\lambda_0} - a \in \frac{1}{r^2t}V$$

for all  $a \in D$ . Choose  $\alpha_0 \in J$  such that

$$e_{\lambda_0}(x_\alpha - x) \in \frac{1}{r^2t}V, \quad (x_\alpha - x)e_{\lambda_0} \in \frac{1}{r^2t}V$$

for all  $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ . Now, let  $a \in D$  and  $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ . Then

$$a(x_\alpha - x) = (a - ae_{\lambda_0})x_\alpha + ae_{\lambda_0}(x_\alpha - x) + (ae_{\lambda_0} - a)x.$$

If  $p = p_V$  is the Minkowski functional of  $V$ , then

$$\frac{(a - ae_{\lambda_0})x_\alpha}{p(a - ae_{\lambda_0})} \in (V \cap A)S \subseteq tV \quad \text{and so} \quad (a - ae_{\lambda_0})x_\alpha \in \frac{1}{r^2}V \subseteq H.$$

Hence  $a(x_\alpha - x) \in H + H^2 + H^2 \subseteq G$ . Similarly, we have  $(x_\alpha - x)a \in G$ . So  $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\beta} x$  and hence  $\beta \leq k$ .

(b) The proof is the same as that of Theorem 3.4(b).

The next two results characterize the equivalence of two of the topologies  $\beta$ ,  $u$ , and  $\tau$  on  $X$ .

**Theorem 3.6.** *Suppose  $(X, \tau)$  is locally bounded. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a)  $u$  and  $\tau$  have the same bounded sets.
- (b)  $\beta$  and  $\tau$  have the same bounded sets.
- (c) The  $\beta$ -closure of a  $\tau$ -bounded set is  $\tau$ -bounded.
- (d)  $u = \tau$ .



**Proof.** (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b). This follows immediately from Theorem 3.3(a).

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c). Let  $S$  be a  $\tau$ -bounded set in  $X$ . Since  $\{e_\lambda : \lambda \in I\}$  is  $\tau$ -bounded,  $P = \bigcup_{\lambda \in I} e_\lambda S$  is also  $\tau$ -bounded. Since  $\beta \leq \tau$ ,  $P$  and hence  $\overline{P}^\beta$  is  $\beta$ -bounded. By (b),  $\overline{P}^\beta$  is  $\tau$ -bounded. By Theorem 3.1(d), for any  $x \in S$ ,  $e_\lambda x \xrightarrow{\beta} x$  and so  $S \subseteq \overline{P}^\beta$ . Hence  $\overline{S}^\beta$  is  $\tau$ -bounded.

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a). Let  $S$  be a  $u$ -bounded set in  $X$ . Then  $P = \bigcup_{\lambda \in I} e_\lambda S$  is  $\tau$ -bounded. Indeed, if  $G \in \mathcal{W}$ , then taking  $D = \{e_\lambda : \lambda \in I\}$  as a bounded set in  $A$ , there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $S \subseteq r(D, G)$  and so  $P \subseteq rG$ . By (c),  $\overline{P}^\beta$  is  $\tau$ -bounded. But, as before,  $S \subseteq \overline{P}^\beta$ ; hence  $S$  is  $\tau$ -bounded.

(a)  $\Rightarrow$  (d). Let  $G \in \mathcal{W}$ , and let  $V$  be a bounded  $\tau$ -neighborhood of 0 in  $X$ . Then  $D = V \cap A$  is a bounded  $\tau$ -neighborhood of 0 in  $A$ , and so it easily follows that  $N(D, V)$  is a bounded  $u$ -neighborhood of 0 in  $X$ . By (a),  $N(D, V)$  is  $\tau$ -bounded. There exists  $r > 0$  such that  $N(D, V) \subseteq rG$  or equivalently  $N(D, \frac{1}{r}V) \subseteq G$ . This shows that  $\tau \leq u$ .

(d)  $\Rightarrow$  (a). This is obvious.

**Theorem 3.7.** *Consider the following conditions:*

(a) *There exists  $a \in A$  such that the map  $x \rightarrow ax$  is an isomorphism.*

(b)  $\beta = \tau$  on  $X$ .

(c)  $(X, \beta)$  is metrizable.

(d)  $(X, \beta)$  is ultrabornological.

(e)  $\beta = u$  on  $X$ .

(f) For each  $x \in X$ ,  $e_\lambda x \xrightarrow{u} x$  and  $xe_\lambda \xrightarrow{u} x$ .

Then (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (d)  $\Rightarrow$  (e). If  $(X, \tau)$  is a Banach algebra, then (f)  $\Rightarrow$  (a); that is, (a) – (f) are equivalent.

**Proof.** (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b). Suppose (a) holds, and let  $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\beta} x$  in  $X$ . Now  $\varphi : x \rightarrow ax$  is a continuous, linear, and one-one map from  $(X, \tau)$  onto  $(X, \tau)$ . As a consequence of the open mapping theorem [15], the inverse map  $\varphi^{-1} : ax \rightarrow x$  is continuous. Since  $ax_\alpha \xrightarrow{\tau} ax$ , we have  $\varphi^{-1}(ax_\alpha) \xrightarrow{\tau} \varphi^{-1}(ax)$ ; that is,  $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\tau} x$ . So  $\tau \leq \beta$ .

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c). This is obvious since  $(X, \tau)$  is metrizable.

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  (d). This follows from ([15], Theorem 1.32).

(d)  $\Rightarrow$  (e). This follows from Theorem 3.3(b).

(e)  $\Rightarrow$  (f). This follows from Theorem 3.1(d).

Now suppose that  $(X, \tau)$  is a Banach algebra. Then (f)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) follows from ([18], Theorem 2.4).

Following Rieffel [14], the *essential part* of  $X_e$  is defined as the  $u$ -closed linear subalgebra of  $X$  spanned by  $AX \cup XA$ ; that is  $X_e = \overline{AX \cup XA}^u$ .  $X$  is called *essential* if  $X = X_e$ .

**Theorem 3.8.**  $X_e = \{x \in X : e_\lambda x \xrightarrow{u} x, x e_\lambda \xrightarrow{u} x\}$ .

**Proof.** If  $x \in X$  with  $e_\lambda x \xrightarrow{u} x$  and  $x e_\lambda \xrightarrow{u} x$ , then clearly  $x \in X_e$ . Now let  $x \in X_e$ , and consider any bounded set  $D \subseteq A$  and  $G \in \mathcal{W}$ . Choose a balanced idempotent  $H \in \mathcal{W}$  with  $H + H + H \subseteq G$ . Put  $D_1 = \{a, e_\lambda, a e_\lambda, e_\lambda a : a \in D, \lambda \in I\}$ , and choose  $r > 1$  with  $D_1 \subseteq rH$ . We may assume that  $x \in \overline{AX}^u$  and so there exist  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$  and  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i - x \in N\left(D_1, \frac{1}{r}H\right)$ . Choose  $\lambda_0 \in I$  such that

$$e_{\lambda_0} a_i x_i - a_i x_i \in \frac{1}{nr}H, \quad a_i x_i e_{\lambda_0} - a_i x_i \in \frac{1}{nr}H$$

for all  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Then, for any  $a \in D$  and  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ ,

$$a(e_\lambda x - x) = ae_\lambda \left( x - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right) + a \sum_{i=1}^n (e_\lambda a_i x_i - a_i x_i) + a \left( \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i - x \right) \in H + H^2 + H \subseteq G$$

and similarly  $(e_\lambda x - x)a \in G$ . Hence  $e_\lambda x \xrightarrow{u} x$ . In a similar way we can show that  $xe_\lambda \xrightarrow{u} x$ .

Under some additional hypotheses and using a factorization theorem we shall next show that  $X_e = AX = XA$ . But first we introduce some terminology. Following [2], a topological vector space  $E$  is called *fundamental* if there exists  $r > 1$  such that for any sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $E$  the convergence of  $r^n (x_{n+1} - x_n)$  to 0 in  $E$  implies that  $\{x_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence. Every locally convex space and every locally bounded space is fundamental. An approximate identity  $\{a_\lambda : \lambda \in I\}$  in a topological algebra  $E$  is said to be *uniformly bounded* if there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $\left\{ \left( \frac{a_\lambda}{r} \right)^n : \lambda \in I, n = 1, 2, \dots \right\}$  is a bounded set in  $E$ .

We shall require the following generalization of the famous Cohen factorization theorem due to Ansari-Puri [2].

**Theorem 3.9.** *Suppose  $X$  is essential, and let  $A$  be fundamental with  $\{e_\lambda : \lambda \in I\}$  uniformly bounded. Then*

- (i) *for each  $x \in X$ , there exists  $a \in A$  and  $y \in X$  such that  $x = ay$ ;*
- (ii) *for any sequence  $\{b_n\}$  in  $A$  with  $b_n \rightarrow 0$ , there exist  $a \in A$  and a sequence  $\{c_n\}$  in  $A$  with  $c_n \rightarrow 0$  such that  $b_n = ac_n, n = 1, 2, \dots$*

Note that this is a so-called left-hand version of the factorization theorem. Clearly

its right-hand version also holds.

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $X$  and  $A$  be as in Theorem 3.9. Then  $X_e = AX = XA$ .*

**Proof.** This follows immediately from Theorem 3.9.

The following result is an analogue of ([18], Theorem 3.1) and ([20], Lemma 2.5).

**Theorem 3.11.** *Let  $X$  and  $A$  be as in Theorem 3.8, and suppose that  $A$  is also commutative. Then the collection of all sets  $N(a, H)$  for  $a \in A$  and  $G \in \mathcal{W}$  is a base for  $\beta$ -neighborhoods of 0 in  $X$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $D$  be a finite set in  $X$  and  $G \in \mathcal{W}$ . Choose a balanced  $H_1 \in \mathcal{W}$  with  $H_1^2 \subseteq G$ . Suppose  $D = \{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$ . Taking  $b_{m+1} = b_{m+2} = \dots = 0$  in Theorem 3.9(ii), there exist  $a, c_1, \dots, c_m \in A$  such that  $b_i = ac_i, i = 1, \dots, m$ . Choose  $r > 1$  with  $\{c_1, \dots, c_m\} \subseteq rH_1$ , and put  $H = \frac{1}{r}H_1$ . Then using the commutativity of  $A$  it is easy to see that  $N(a, H) \subseteq N(D, G)$ , as required.

**Remark 3.12.** If  $A$  is a  $B^*$ -algebra, then the above theorem holds without the assumption of commutativity of  $A$ . Indeed, in view of the factorization result of Taylor ([20], Lemma 2.4), we can choose in the above proof elements  $a, c_1, \dots, c_m, c'_1, \dots, c'_m$  in  $A$  such that  $b_i = ac_i = c'_i a$ . This theorem also holds without commutativity if we modify the definition of  $\beta$  by setting either  $N(D, G) = \{x \in X : Dx \subseteq G\}$  or  $N(D, G) = \{x \in X : xD \subseteq G\}$  (cf. [18], §3).

Now consider  $(A, \tau)$  itself a Hausdorff topological algebra having a two-sided bounded approximate identity. A pair  $(S, T)$  of mappings  $S, T : A \rightarrow A$  is called a *double multiplier* (or a double centralizer) on  $A$  if  $aS(b) = T(a)b$  for all  $a, b \in A$ . Let  $M_d(A)$  denote the algebra of all double multipliers  $(S, T)$  on  $A$  with  $S$  and  $T$  continuous linear (see

Johnson [7] and Busby [4] for details). We define a topology  $\sigma$  (resp.  $s$ ) on  $M_d(A)$  as the linear topology which has a base of neighborhoods of 0 consisting of all sets of the form

$$U(D, G) = \{(S, T) \in M_d(A) : S(D) \subseteq G, T(D) \subseteq G\}$$

where  $D$  is a bounded (resp. finite) subset of  $A$  and  $G$  is a neighborhood of 0 in  $A$ . Clearly  $s \leq \sigma$ . If we define a map  $\mu_0 : A \rightarrow M_d(A)$  by  $\mu_0(a) = (L_a, R_a)$ , where  $L_a(x) = ax$  and  $R_a(x) = xa$  for all  $a \in A$ , then  $\mu_0$  is an algebra isomorphism and continuous with  $\mu_0(A)$  a two-sided ideal in  $M_d(A)$ . Further, if  $A$  is complete, then under the above embedding,  $A$  is  $\sigma$ -closed and  $s$ -dense in  $M_d(A)$ ; if  $A$  is complete and metrizable, then  $(M_d(A), \sigma), (M_d(A), s)$  are complete and  $\sigma, s$  have the same bounded sets in  $M_d(A)$  (see [4, 7, 8] for details).

Finally we consider the problem of completeness of  $(X, \beta)$  via an embedding of  $(X, \beta)$  into  $(M_d(A), s)$ . Define  $\mu : X \rightarrow M_d(A)$  by  $\mu(y) = (L_y, R_y)$ ,  $y \in X$ . Then, as in ([4], Proposition 3.7),  $\mu$  is a unique isomorphism satisfying  $\mu(a) = \mu_0(a)$  for all  $a \in A$ .

The following result is given in [4] for  $X$  a Banach algebra (see also [18], Theorem 3.5) and in [8] for  $X$  a topological algebra. For completeness, we include it here in a slightly improved form.

**Theorem 3.13.** *Let  $\mu$  and  $s$  be as above. Then*

- (a)  $\mu : (X, \beta) \rightarrow (M_d(A), s)$  is continuous and open onto  $\mu(X)$ .
- (b) If  $A$  is complete and metrizable, then  $(X, \beta)$  is complete iff  $\mu(X) = M_d(A)$ .

**Proof.** (a) Let  $\{y_\alpha\}$  be a net in  $X$  with  $y_\alpha \xrightarrow{\beta} y \in X$ . Then, for each  $a \in A$ ,  $y_\alpha a \xrightarrow{\tau} ya$  and  $ay_\alpha \xrightarrow{\tau} ay$  in  $A$ ; that is,  $(L_{y_\alpha}, R_{y_\alpha}) \xrightarrow{s} (L_y, R_y)$  in  $M_d(A)$ . So  $\mu$  is continuous. For

any finite set  $D \subseteq A$  and open  $G \in \mathcal{W}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(N(D, G)) &= \{(L_x, R_x) : x \in X \text{ with } L_x(D) \subseteq G, R_x(D) \subseteq G\} \\ &= \{\mu(x) : x \in X \text{ with } \mu(x) \in U(D, G)\}\end{aligned}$$

which is  $s$ -open in  $\mu(X)$ . Hence  $\mu$  is open onto  $\mu(X)$ .

(b) If  $(X, \beta)$  is complete, then  $\mu(X)$  is complete and hence a closed subset of  $(M_d(A), s)$ . Since  $A \subseteq X$  and  $\mu(A)$  is  $s$ -dense in  $M_d(A)$ , ([8], Theorem 3.2(b)),  $\mu(X)$  is also  $s$ -dense in  $M_d(A)$ . By ([8], Theorem 3.2(a)),  $(M_d(A), s)$  is complete. Thus  $(X, \beta)$  is complete iff  $\mu(X) = M_d(A)$ .

**Acknowledgment.** One of the authors, A.B. Thaheem, gratefully acknowledges the support provided by the King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals during this research.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C.A. Akemann, G.K. Pederson, and J. Tomiyama, Multipliers of  $C^*$ -algebras, *J. Functional Analysis* 13(1973), 277–301
- [2] E. Ansari-Piri, A class of factorizable topological algebras, *Proc. Edinbrugh Math. Soc.* 33(1990), 53–59.
- [3] R.C. Buck, Bounded continuous functions on a locally compact space, *Michigan Math. J.* 5(1958), 95–104.
- [4] R.C. Busby, Double centralizers and extension of  $C^*$ -algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 132(1968), 79–99.
- [5] R.A. Davenport, The strict dual of  $B^*$ -algebras, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 65(1977), 309–312.
- [6] R.A. Fontenot, The double centralizer algebra as a linear space, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 53(1975), 99–103.
- [7] B.E. Johnson, An introduction to the theory of centralizers, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 53(1975), 99–103.
- [8] L.A. Khan, N. Mohammad, and A.B. Thaheem, Double multipliers of topological algebras (to appear in *Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci.*).
- [9] G. Lassner, Topological algebras of operators, *Report on Math. Physics* 3(1972), 279–293.
- [10] G. Lassner, Topological algebras and their applications in quantum statistics, *Wiss. Z., Karl-Max. Univ. Leipzig, Math. Naturwiss. Reihe* 30(1981), 572–595.
- [11] A.J. Lazar and D.C. Taylor, *Multipliers of Pederson's Ideal*, *Memoir Amer. Math. Soc.* No. 169(1976).
- [12] A. Mallios, *Topological Algebras – Selected Topics*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986.
- [13] N.C. Phillips, Inverse limits of  $C^*$ -algebras, *J. Operator Theory*, 19(1988), 159–195.
- [14] M. Rieffel, Induced Banach representations of Banach algebras and locally compact groups, *J. Functional Analysis* 1(1967), 443–491.
- [15] W. Rudin, *Functional Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1973.
- [16] H.H. Schaeffer, *Topological Vector Spaces*, McMillan, New York, 1966.
- [17] F.D. Sentiiles, The strict topology on bounded sets, *Pacific J. Math.* 34(1970), 529–542.

- [18] F.D. Sentilles and D.C. Taylor, Factorization in Banach algebras and the general strict topology, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 142(1969), 141–152.
- [19] J.H. Shapiro, The bounded weak star topology and the general strict topology, *J. Functional Analysis* 8(1971), 275–286.
- [20] D.C. Taylor, The strict topology for double centralizer algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 150(1970), 633–643.
- [21] D.C. Taylor, Interpolations in algebra of operator fields, *J. Functional Analysis* 10(1972), 159–190.
- [22] B.J. Tomiuk, Multipliers on Banach algebras, *Studia Math.* 54(1976), 267–283.
- [23] A. Van Daele, Multiplier Hopf algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 342(1994), 917–932.
- [24] J.K. Wang, Multipliers of commutative Banach algebras, *Pacific J. Math.* 11(1961), 1131–1149.
- [25] W. Żelazko, On the locally bounded and  $m$ -convex topological algebras, *Studia Math.* 19(1960), 333–358.
- [26] W. Żelazko, *Banach Algebras*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1973.

\* Department of Mathematics  
 King Abdul Aziz University  
 P.O. Box # 9028  
 Jeddah 21413  
 Saudi Arabia

\*\* Department of Mathematics  
 Quaid-Azam University  
 Islamabad 45320, Pakistan

\*\*\* Department of Mathematical Sciences  
 King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals  
 Dhahran 31261  
 Saudi Arabia