PROCEEDINGS OF THE
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
Volume 59, Number 1, August 1976

K_1 OF THE COMPACT OPERATORS IS ZERO[1]

L. G. BROWN AND CLAUDE SCHOCHET

ABSTRACT. We prove that K_1 of the compact operators is zero. This theorem has the following operator-theoretic formulation: *any invertible operator of the form* (*identity*) + (*compact*) *is the product of* (*at most eight*) *multiplicative commutators* $(A_j B_j A_j^{-1} B_j^{-1})^{\pm 1}$, *where each* B_j *is of the form* (*identity*) + (*compact*). The proof uses results of L. G. Brown, R. G. Douglas, and P. A. Fillmore on essentially normal operators and a theorem of A. Brown and C. Pearcy on multiplicative commutators.

1. **Statement of results.** Let $\mathfrak{L}$ be the bounded operators on a separable, infinite dimensional Hilbert space, $\mathfrak{K}$ the closed two-sided ideal of compact operators, and $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{L}/\mathfrak{K}$ the Calkin algebra.

THEOREM. $K_1(\mathfrak{K}) = 0$.

That is, the "algebraic K_1" of $\mathfrak{K}$, regarded as an ideal in $\mathfrak{L}$, is zero. The result may be interpreted as follows. Let G be the set of invertible operators in $\mathfrak{L}$ of the form $I + K$, where $K \in \mathfrak{K}$. Let H denote the subgroup of G generated by all multiplicative commutators $(u,g) = ugu^{-1}g^{-1}$ where $u \in \mathfrak{L}$ is invertible and $g \in G$. Then $G = H$. (This uses the definition of K_1 [8, p. 36] and the fact that the matrix rings $M_n(\mathfrak{K})$ and $M_n(\mathfrak{L})$ are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{K}$ and $\mathfrak{L}$ respectively.) So the theorem is equivalent to the following operator-theoretic proposition.

PROPOSITION. *Let* $I + K$ *be invertible with* $K \in \mathfrak{K}$. *Then there exist invertible operators* A_j *and* $B_j = I + K_j$ $(j = 1, \ldots, n)$ *with* $K_j \in \mathfrak{K}$ *such that*

$$I + K = \prod_{j=1}^{n} (A_j, B_j)^{\pm 1}.$$

In fact $n \leqslant 8$. *This proposition is proved in* §2.

Combining the theorem with known information yields the first six terms of the Milnor long exact sequence in algebraic K-theory associated to $\mathfrak{K} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{L} \to \mathfrak{A}$. It reads:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccc} K_1(\mathfrak{K}) & \longrightarrow & K_1(\mathfrak{L}) & \longrightarrow & K_1(\mathfrak{A}) & \longrightarrow & K_0(\mathfrak{K}) & \longrightarrow & K_0(\mathfrak{L}) & \longrightarrow & K_0(\mathfrak{A}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \| & & \| & & \| & & \| & & \| & & \| & & \\ 0 & & 0 & & \mathbf{Z} & & \mathbf{Z} & & 0 & & 0 & & \end{array}$$

Received by the editors April 2, 1975 and, in revised form, September 22, 1975.

AMS (*MOS*) *subject classifications* (1970). Primary 47B47, 18F25.

Key words and phrases. Compact operator, essentially normal operator, algebraic K-theory, extensions of C^*-algebras.

[1] Research partially supported by NSF GP 29006.

2. **Proof of the proposition.** Let $I + K$ be invertible with $K \in \mathcal{K}$. Write $I + K = UP$ in polar decomposition. Then each of the operators U and P is of the form $I + N$ where N is compact normal. We may assume that N has an infinite dimensional null-space $\mathcal{K}_0$. So it suffices to show that any invertible operator of the form $I + N$ with N compact normal with infinite dimensional null-space $\mathcal{K}_0$ is a product of (two) multiplicative commutators of the correct sort.

A. Brown and C. Pearcy show [1, Theorem 3] that $I + N = (G_1, G_2)$ where G_1 and G_2 are invertible and G_1 is a bilateral shift. An examination of their proof shows that G_2 is also normal. Then the G_j live on $\mathcal{K}_0^{\perp}$. Let H_1 and H_2 be commuting normals living on $\mathcal{K}_0$ such that $\sigma(G_j) \subset \sigma_e(H_j)$ = an annulus (where σ_e denotes essential spectrum), and $\sigma_e(H_1) \times \sigma_e(H_2)$ = joint $\sigma_e\{H_1, H_2\} \equiv X$. Then $I + N = (G_1 \oplus H_1, G_2 \oplus H_2)$. The operators $G_1 \oplus H_1$ and $G_2 \oplus H_2$ thus essentially commute.

Let $\tau \in \operatorname{Ext}(X)$ be the extension

$$0 \to \mathcal{K} \to C^*\{I, \mathcal{K}, G_1 \oplus H_1, G_2 \oplus H_2\} \to C(X) \to 0,$$

where $C^*\{T_j\}$ denotes the C^*-algebra generated by $\{T_j\}$ [4], [5]. We claim that $\tau = 0$; the extension splits. The proof is as follows. The space X is homotopy equivalent to a torus, hence $\operatorname{Ext}(X) \cong \mathbf{Z} \oplus \mathbf{Z}$ via the index map [5]. A direct check shows that the index of $\pi(G_j \oplus H_j)$ is zero for $j = 1, 2$, hence $\tau = 0$. (A more economical choice of H_1 using the fact that G_1 is unitary would yield $X \subset R^3$ and allow avoidance of a homotopy argument.)

By the basic Brown-Douglas-Fillmore theorem [5], there exist commuting normals N_1, N_2 and compact operators C_j such that

$$G_j \oplus H_j = N_j(I + C_j), \qquad j = 1, 2.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} I + N &= (G_1 \oplus H_1, G_2 \oplus H_2) = (N_1(I + C_1), N_2(I + C_2)) \\ &= (B_1, A_1)(A_2, B_2) = (A_1, B_1)^{-1}(A_2, B_2) \end{aligned}$$

by direct computation, where

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= N_1 N_2 (I + C_2) N_1^{-1}, \qquad A_2 = N_1, \\ B_1 &= N_1(I + C_1)N_1^{-1} = I + N_1 C_1 N_1^{-1} \in I + \mathcal{K}, \\ B_2 &= N_2(I + C_2)N_2^{-1} = I + N_2 C_2 N_2^{-1} \in I + \mathcal{K}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

3. **Remarks.**

REMARK 1. Our interest in $K_1(\mathcal{K})$ arose from the following considerations (inspired by Helton and Howe [6]; see also [2], [3]). Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a $*$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{L}$ containing the trace class $\mathcal{T}$ and suppose that $\mathcal{Q}/\mathcal{T}$ is commutative. Let $\mathcal{K}_0 = \mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{Q}$. An invertible operator T in $I + \mathcal{K}_0$ represents zero in $K_1(\mathcal{K}_0)$ if T can be represented as a product of commutators $(A_j, B_j)^{\pm 1}$ as in the proposition, but with $A_j, B_j \in \mathfrak{A}$. If this is so, then det $T = 1$. The same holds true if $\mathfrak{A}$ is replaced by $M_n(\mathfrak{A})$ provided T is also in the determinant class $I + \mathfrak{T}$.

Which hypotheses on $\mathfrak{A}$ are really necessary for these conclusions to hold? Our proof shows that if K is compact normal then $I + K$ is a product of commutators $(A_j, B_j)^{\pm 1}$ where the A_j and B_j lie in a *-algebra which is commutative mod $\mathfrak{K}$. Thus the assumption that $\mathfrak{A}$ be commutative mod $\mathfrak{T}$ is necessary. A more interesting and difficult question is whether the hypothesis that $\mathfrak{A}$ be closed under * can be eliminated. The special case where T is a single commutator is equivalent to the corresponding question for traces of additive commutators. In the case $T \in \mathfrak{A}$, rather than $T \in M_n(\mathfrak{A})$, this special case is equivalent to the general case.

REMARK 2. The inequality $n \leqslant 8$ of the proposition can be improved to $n \leqslant 6$ by means of a trick used by Radjavi:

$$\begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & T \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & S^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & ST \end{pmatrix}.$$

Also

$$\begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & S^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = (A, B), \quad \text{where } A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} S^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

REMARK 3. A more constructive proof of the proposition (which yields $n \leqslant 8$) can be given by using an idea from [9]. At the cost of increasing n to 24, one can also require that both A_j and B_j be in $I + \mathfrak{K}$.

REMARK 4. The fact that $K_0(\mathfrak{K}) = \mathbf{Z}$ has a number of generalizations. If $\mathfrak{b}$ is any proper two sided ideal of $\mathfrak{L}$, then $K_0(\mathfrak{b}) = \mathbf{Z}$. Similarly, $K_0(\mathfrak{c}) = \mathbf{Z}$ for a large class of dense *-subalgebras of $\mathfrak{K}$–in particular for $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{A} \cap \mathfrak{K}$ where $\mathfrak{A}/\mathfrak{T}$ is commutative as before and $\mathfrak{A}$ is maximal in a certain sense. The situation for K_1 is quite different. Our result that $K_1(\mathfrak{K}) = 0$ contrasts with the fact that $K_1(\mathfrak{T}) \neq 0$ (by a determinant argument [2]). However, the methods alluded to in Remark 3 do apply to the Schatten classes $\mathcal{C}_p$ for some p. The fact that $K_1(\mathfrak{b})$ depends upon the ring in which $\mathfrak{b}$ is an ideal complicates such considerations.

REFERENCES

1. A. Brown and C. Pearcy, *Multiplicative commutators of operators*, Canad. J. Math. **18** (1966), 737–749. MR **34** #608.

2. L. G. Brown, *The determinant invariant for operators with trace class self-commutators*, Proc. Conf. on Operator Theory, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 345, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1973.

3. ———, *Operator algebras and algebraic K-theory*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **81** (1975), 1119–1121.

4. L. G. Brown, R. G. Douglas and P. A. Fillmore, *Unitary equivalence modulo the compact operators and extensions of C^*-algebras*, Proc. Conf. on Operator Theory, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 345, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1973.

5. ———, *Extensions of C^*-algebras, operators with compact self-commutators, and K-homology*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **79** (1973), 973–978.

6. J. W. Helton and R. E. Howe, *Integral operators: commutators, traces, index and homology*, Proc. Conf. on Operator Theory, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 345, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1973.

7. J. Kaminker and C. Schochet, *Steenrod homology and operator algebras*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **81** (1975), 431–434.

8. J. Milnor, *Introduction to algebraic K-theory*, Ann. of Math. Studies, no. 72, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N. J., 1971.

9. C. Pearcy and D. Topping, *On commutators in ideals of compact operators*, Michigan Math. J. **18** (1971), 247–252. MR **44** #2077.

Department of Mathematics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907 (Current address of L. Brown)

Department of Mathematics, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Current address: (C. Schochet): Department of Mathematics, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48202