

*SOME NOTIONS OF AMENABILITY FOR CERTAIN PRODUCTS
OF BANACH ALGEBRAS*

BY

EGHBAL GHADERI, RASOUL NASR-ISFAHANI and
MEHDI NEMATI (Isfahan and Tehran)

Abstract. For two Banach algebras \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , an interesting product $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$, called the θ -Lau product, was recently introduced and studied for some nonzero characters θ on \mathcal{B} . Here, we characterize some notions of amenability as approximate amenability, essential amenability, n -weak amenability and cyclic amenability between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} and their θ -Lau product.

1. Introduction. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two Banach algebras and $\theta \in \sigma(\mathcal{B})$, the spectrum of \mathcal{B} of all nonzero characters on \mathcal{B} . Then the θ -Lau product of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , denoted by $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$, is defined as the space $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ equipped with the multiplication

$$(a, b)(a', b') = (aa' + \theta(b)a' + \theta(b')a, bb'),$$

and the norm

$$\|(a, b)\| = \|a\| + \|b\|,$$

for all $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b, b' \in \mathcal{B}$. The θ -Lau product $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is a Banach algebra.

This product was first introduced by Lau [L1] for Lau algebras; recall that a *Lau algebra* is a Banach algebra which is the predual of a von Neumann algebra for which the identity of the dual is a multiplicative linear functional. The study of this large class of Banach algebras originated with a paper published in 1983 by Lau [L1] in which he referred to them as “F-algebras”; see also Lau [L2]. Later on, in his useful monograph Pier [Pi] introduced the name “Lau algebra”. Examples of Lau algebras include the group algebra and the measure algebra of a locally compact group or hypergroup (see Lau [L1]), and also the Fourier algebra and

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary 46H05, 46H25; Secondary 43A07, 43A10, 43A20.

Key words and phrases: amenability, Banach algebra, approximate amenability, (approximate) essential amenability, (approximate) n -weak amenability, (approximate) cyclic amenability.

the Fourier–Stieltjes algebra of a topological group (see Lau and Ludwig [LL]).

The algebraic and topological properties of the Banach algebra $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ were recently studied by Monfared [M]. If we allow $\theta = 0$, we obtain the usual direct product of Banach algebras. Since direct products often exhibit different properties, we exclude the case $\theta = 0$. In $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ we identify $\mathcal{A} \times \{0\}$ with \mathcal{A} , and $\{0\} \times \mathcal{B}$ with \mathcal{B} . Hence, \mathcal{A} is a closed two-sided ideal while \mathcal{B} is a closed subalgebra of $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$; moreover, $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})/\mathcal{A}$ is isometrically isomorphic to \mathcal{B} .

We note that if \mathcal{B} is the Banach algebra \mathbb{C} of all complex numbers and θ is the identity map on \mathbb{C} , then $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is the unitization $\mathcal{A}^{\#}$ of \mathcal{A} .

Furthermore, the dual $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})^{(1)}$ of $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ can be identified with $\mathcal{A}^{(1)} \times \mathcal{B}^{(1)}$ in the natural way

$$\langle (a^{(1)}, b^{(1)}), (a, b) \rangle = \langle a^{(1)}, a \rangle + \langle b^{(1)}, b \rangle,$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $b \in \mathcal{B}$, $a^{(1)} \in \mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ and $b^{(1)} \in \mathcal{B}^{(1)}$. The dual norm on $\mathcal{A}^{(1)} \times \mathcal{B}^{(1)}$ is of course the maximum norm $\|(a^{(1)}, b^{(1)})\| = \max\{\|a^{(1)}\|, \|b^{(1)}\|\}$. Moreover, suppose that the second duals $\mathcal{A}^{(2)}$, $\mathcal{B}^{(2)}$ and $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})^{(2)}$ are equipped with their first Arens products (see [M]). Then $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})^{(2)}$ is isometrically isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}^{(2)} \times_{\theta^{[2]}} \mathcal{B}^{(2)}$, where $\theta^{[2]} \in \sigma(\mathcal{B}^{(2)})$. Now, take $\mathcal{A}^{(n)} \times \mathcal{B}^{(n)}$ as the underlying space of $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})^{(n)}$. By induction, the $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})$ -bimodule actions on $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})^{(n)}$ are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (a, b) \cdot (a^{(n)}, b^{(n)}) &= \begin{cases} (a \cdot a^{(n)} + \theta^{[n]}(b)a^{(n)} + \theta^{[n]}(b^{(n)})a, b \cdot b^{(n)}) & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ (a \cdot a^{(n)} + \theta^{[n-1]}(b)a^{(n)}, a^{(n)}(a)\theta^{[n-1]} + b \cdot b^{(n)}) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (a^{(n)}, b^{(n)}) \cdot (a, b) &= \begin{cases} (a^{(n)} \cdot a + \theta^{[n]}(b)a^{(n)} + \theta^{[n]}(b^{(n)})a, b^{(n)} \cdot b) & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ (a^{(n)} \cdot a + \theta^{[n-1]}(b)a^{(n)}, a^{(n)}(a)\theta^{[n-1]} + b^{(n)} \cdot b) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

for all $(a, b) \in \mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ and $(a^{(n)}, b^{(n)}) \in \mathcal{A}^{(n)} \times \mathcal{B}^{(n)}$, where $\theta^{[2k]} \in \sigma(\mathcal{B}^{(2k)})$ denotes the k th adjoint of θ . Also, for $(m, n), (p, q) \in (\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})^{(2)}$ we have

$$(m, n) \square (p, q) = (m \square p + n(\theta)p + q(\theta)m, n \square q)$$

(see [M, Proposition 2.12]).

On the other hand, recently several important notions of amenability have been defined and studied on Banach algebras. In this paper, we are going to investigate these concepts on $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ and their relations with \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} .

2. Approximate amenability. Let \mathcal{A} be a Banach algebra and \mathcal{X} be an \mathcal{A} -bimodule. A *derivation* is a linear map $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ such that

$$D(aa') = D(a) \cdot a' + a \cdot D(a')$$

for all $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$. For $x \in \mathcal{X}$ set $\text{ad}_x : a \mapsto a \cdot x - x \cdot a$ from \mathcal{A} into \mathcal{X} . Hence, ad_x is a derivation; these are the *inner derivations*.

A derivation $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is *approximately inner* if there exists a net $(x_\alpha)_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ such that

$$D(a) = \lim_\alpha (a \cdot x_\alpha - x_\alpha \cdot a)$$

for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$, so that $D = \lim_\alpha \text{ad}_{x_\alpha}$ in the strong operator topology.

The dual space $\mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ of a Banach \mathcal{A} -bimodule \mathcal{X} becomes a Banach \mathcal{A} -bimodule with the module actions

$$\langle a \cdot x^{(1)}, x \rangle = \langle x^{(1)}, x \cdot a \rangle, \quad \langle x^{(1)} \cdot a, x \rangle = \langle x^{(1)}, a \cdot x \rangle,$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}, x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$. A Banach algebra \mathcal{A} is called *amenable* if for any \mathcal{A} -bimodule \mathcal{X} , every continuous derivation $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ is inner. This notion was first introduced and studied by Johnson [J1] in 1972. Amenability has known hereditary properties (see [D], [J1] and [R]). In particular, $\mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B}$ is amenable if and only if both \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are amenable (see [M]).

The Banach algebra \mathcal{A} is called *weakly amenable* if every continuous derivation from \mathcal{A} into $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ is inner. The notion of weak amenability for an arbitrary Banach algebra was defined by Johnson [J2]; the study of this notion was pursued by several authors: see for example [G], [J2], [LE], [M], [NS] and [R]. Monfared [M] shows that weak amenability of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} implies weak amenability of $\mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B}$, but in the general case the converse is not true. However, he proves that weak amenability of $\mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B}$ implies weak amenability of \mathcal{B} and cyclic amenability of \mathcal{A} .

A Banach algebra \mathcal{A} is called *approximately amenable* if any continuous derivation $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ is approximately inner for all Banach \mathcal{A} -bimodules \mathcal{X} . Moreover, \mathcal{A} is called *approximately weakly amenable* if any continuous derivation $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ is approximately inner. The concepts of approximate amenability and approximate weak amenability were introduced and studied by Ghahramani and Loy [GL] (see also [GLZ]).

PROPOSITION 2.1. *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two Banach algebras and $\theta \in \sigma(\mathcal{B})$. If $\mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B}$ is approximately amenable, then \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are approximately amenable.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B}$ is approximately amenable. Then it is clear that $(\mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B})/\mathcal{A}$ is isometrically isomorphic to \mathcal{B} , and so \mathcal{B} is approximately amenable by [GL, Corollary 2.1]. Now, we show that \mathcal{A} is also approximately amenable. Let \mathcal{X} be a Banach \mathcal{A} -bimodule and $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ be a derivation.

Then it is easy to show that \mathcal{X} is an $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})$ -bimodule with the module actions

$$(a, b) \cdot x = a \cdot x + \theta(b)x, \quad x \cdot (a, b) = x \cdot a + \theta(b)x,$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$. We prove that the map

$$\tilde{D} : \mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$$

defined by $\tilde{D}((a, b)) = D(a)$ is a derivation for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$. In fact, for every (a, b) and (a', b') in $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad \tilde{D}((a, b)(a', b')) &= \tilde{D}((aa' + \theta(b')a + \theta(b)a', bb')) \\ &= D(aa') + \theta(b')D(a) + \theta(b)D(a') \\ &= a \cdot D(a') + D(a) \cdot a' + \theta(b')D(a) + \theta(b)D(a'). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} (2) \quad (a, b) \cdot \tilde{D}((a', b')) &= (a, b) \cdot D(a') = a \cdot D(a') + \theta(b)D(a'), \\ (3) \quad \tilde{D}((a, b)) \cdot (a', b') &= D(a) \cdot (a', b') = D(a) \cdot a' + \theta(b')D(a), \end{aligned}$$

for each $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b, b' \in \mathcal{B}$. Adding (2) to (3) and comparing with (1), we conclude that \tilde{D} is a derivation. From the approximate amenability of $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$, it follows that $\tilde{D} = \lim_{\alpha} \text{ad}_{x_{\alpha}^{(1)}}$ for some net $(x_{\alpha}^{(1)})_{\alpha} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ in the strong operator topology. We claim that $D = \lim_{\alpha} \text{ad}_{x_{\alpha}^{(1)}}$ in the strong operator topology; indeed,

$$D(a) = \tilde{D}((a, 0)) = \lim_{\alpha} ((a, 0) \cdot x_{\alpha}^{(1)} - x_{\alpha}^{(1)} \cdot (a, 0)) = \lim_{\alpha} (a \cdot x_{\alpha}^{(1)} - x_{\alpha}^{(1)} \cdot a)$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, as required. ■

We do not know if the converse of Proposition 2.1 is valid; here, we prove the converse under an extra assumption.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two Banach algebras and $\theta \in \sigma(\mathcal{B})$. If \mathcal{A} is amenable and \mathcal{B} is approximately amenable, then $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is approximately amenable.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{A} is amenable and $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})/\mathcal{A}$ is approximately amenable, $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is approximately amenable. So, the result follows from the fact that \mathcal{A} is a closed two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ and that $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})/\mathcal{A}$ is isometrically isomorphic to \mathcal{B} (see [GL], Corollary 2.1). ■

3. Essential amenability. An \mathcal{A} -bimodule \mathcal{X} is called *neo-unital* if $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{X} \cdot \mathcal{A}$, where

$$\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{X} \cdot \mathcal{A} = \{a \cdot x \cdot b : a, b \in \mathcal{A}, x \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

Recall from [GL] that a Banach algebra \mathcal{A} is called *essentially amenable* if for any neo-unital \mathcal{A} -bimodule \mathcal{X} , every continuous derivation $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ is inner. Moreover, a Banach algebra \mathcal{A} is called *approximately essentially amenable* if every continuous derivation $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ is approximately inner for any neo-unital \mathcal{A} -bimodule \mathcal{X} . The concepts of essential amenability and approximate essential amenability of Banach algebras were introduced and studied by Ghahramani and Loy [GL].

Note that if \mathcal{X} is a Banach \mathcal{A} -bimodule such that $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{X} \cdot \mathcal{A}$, then \mathcal{X} is a $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})$ -bimodule with $\mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}) \cdot \mathcal{X} \cdot (\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})$ with the module actions

$$(a, b) \cdot x = a \cdot x + \theta(b)x, \quad x \cdot (a, b) = x \cdot a + \theta(b)x,$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Now, we investigate these notions on $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two Banach algebras and $\theta \in \sigma(\mathcal{B})$. If $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is essentially amenable, then \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are essentially amenable.*

Proof. The result follows by an argument similar to Proposition 2.1. ■

The next result proves the converse of Proposition 3.1 under the assumption that \mathcal{A} is amenable. We do not know if it is true for all Banach algebras \mathcal{A} .

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two Banach algebras and $\theta \in \sigma(\mathcal{B})$. Moreover, suppose that \mathcal{A} is an amenable Banach algebra and \mathcal{B} is an essentially amenable Banach algebra. Then $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is essentially amenable.*

Proof. We know that \mathcal{A} is a closed ideal of $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ and $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})/\mathcal{A}$ is isometrically isomorphic to \mathcal{B} . Since \mathcal{A} is amenable and $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})/\mathcal{A}$ is essentially amenable, a standard argument as in [Pa, p. 42] shows that $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is essentially amenable.

PROPOSITION 3.3. *Let \mathcal{A} be an essentially amenable Banach algebra and I be a closed two-sided ideal of \mathcal{A} with a bounded approximate identity. Then I is amenable.*

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{X} is a neo-unital Banach I -bimodule and $D : I \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ is a continuous derivation. Then \mathcal{X} is a neo-unital Banach \mathcal{A} -bimodule and D has an extension $\tilde{D} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ by [R, Proposition 2.1.6]. Since \mathcal{A} is essentially amenable, \tilde{D} is inner and so D is inner. Thus I is essentially amenable. Since I is a Banach algebra with a bounded approximate identity, it follows from [R, Proposition 2.1.5] that I is amenable. ■

THEOREM 3.4. *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two Banach algebras for which there is a continuous epimorphism from \mathcal{A} onto \mathcal{B} . Then approximate essential amenability of \mathcal{A} implies approximate essential amenability of \mathcal{B} .*

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{A} is approximately essentially amenable and that \mathcal{X} is a neo-unital Banach \mathcal{B} -bimodule. Then \mathcal{X} is a neo-unital Banach \mathcal{A} -bimodule via the module actions defined by

$$a \cdot x = \Phi(a) \cdot x, \quad x \cdot a = x \cdot \Phi(a),$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$. If $D : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ is a derivation, then it is clear that the map $D \circ \Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a derivation, where $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is a continuous epimorphism. Therefore, there exists a net $(x_\alpha^{(1)})_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ such that for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ we have

$$(D \circ \Phi)(a) = \lim_\alpha (a \cdot x_\alpha^{(1)} - x_\alpha^{(1)} \cdot a) = \lim_\alpha (\Phi(a) \cdot x_\alpha^{(1)} - x_\alpha^{(1)} \cdot \Phi(a)).$$

Since Φ is epimorphism, we have $D(b) = \lim_\alpha (b \cdot x_\alpha^{(1)} - x_\alpha^{(1)} \cdot b)$ for every $b \in \mathcal{B}$. So, \mathcal{B} is approximately essentially amenable. ■

THEOREM 3.5. *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two Banach algebras and $\theta \in \sigma(\mathcal{B})$. If $\mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B}$ is approximately essentially amenable, then \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are approximately essentially amenable.*

Proof. Approximate essential amenability of \mathcal{B} follows from Theorem 3.4. Now, suppose that the \mathcal{A} -bimodule \mathcal{X} is neo-unital. Then via the module actions defined by

$$x \cdot (a, b) = x \cdot a + \theta(b)x, \quad (a, b) \cdot x = a \cdot x + \theta(b)x,$$

it is clear that $(\mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B})$ -bimodule \mathcal{X} is neo-unital for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$. If $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ is a continuous derivation, then we can extend it to $\tilde{D} : \mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ via

$$\tilde{D}((a, b)) = D(a)$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Clearly, \tilde{D} is a derivation. Thus, there exists $(x_\alpha^{(1)})_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{(1)}$ such that

$$\tilde{D}((a, b)) = \lim_\alpha \text{ad}_{x_\alpha^{(1)}}(a, b) = \lim_\alpha ((a, b) \cdot x_\alpha^{(1)} - x_\alpha^{(1)} \cdot (a, b))$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} D(a) &= \tilde{D}((a, 0)) = \lim_\alpha ((a, 0) \cdot x_\alpha^{(1)} - x_\alpha^{(1)} \cdot (a, 0)) \\ &= \lim_\alpha (a \cdot x_\alpha^{(1)} - x_\alpha^{(1)} \cdot a) \end{aligned}$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. So, \mathcal{A} is approximately essentially amenable. ■

4. n -Weak amenability. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the concept of n -weak amenability was initiated and intensively developed by Dales, Ghahramani and Grønbaek [DGG].

A Banach algebra \mathcal{A} is said to be n -weakly amenable if every continuous derivation from \mathcal{A} into $\mathcal{A}^{(n)}$ is inner. Trivially, 1-weak amenability is nothing other than weak amenability, which was first introduced and intensively studied by Bade, Curtis and Dales [BCD] for commutative Banach algebras, and then by Johnson [J3] for a general Banach algebra.

THEOREM 4.1. *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two Banach algebras, $\theta \in \sigma(\mathcal{B})$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

- (i) *If $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is $(2n)$ -weakly amenable, then \mathcal{A} is $(2n)$ -weakly amenable.*
- (ii) *If \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are $(2n + 1)$ -weakly amenable, then $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is $(2n + 1)$ -weakly amenable.*

Proof. (i) Let $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ be $(2n)$ -weakly amenable. We show that \mathcal{A} is $(2n)$ -weakly amenable. If $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{(2n)}$ is a continuous derivation, then we can extend this derivation to $\tilde{D} : \mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{(2n)} \times_{\theta^{[2n]}} \mathcal{B}^{(2n)}$ via

$$\tilde{D}((a, b)) = (d(a), 0),$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Clearly, \tilde{D} is a derivation on $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$. Thus, there exists $(a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) \in \mathcal{A}^{(2n)} \times_{\theta^{[2n]}} \mathcal{B}^{(2n)}$ such that

$$\tilde{D}((a, b)) = (a, b) \cdot (a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) - (a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) \cdot (a, b)$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Therefore, $D(a) = a \cdot a^{(2n)} - a^{(2n)} \cdot a$ and $b \cdot b^{(2n)} = b^{(2n)} \cdot b$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$. So, \mathcal{A} is $(2n)$ -weakly amenable.

(ii) Suppose that $D : \mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{(2n+1)} \times \mathcal{B}^{(2n+1)}$ is a continuous derivation. Moreover, suppose that $\iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is the natural embedding,

$$\iota^{(2n+1)} : \mathcal{A}^{(2n+1)} \times \mathcal{B}^{(2n+1)} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{(2n+1)}$$

is the $(2n + 1)$ -th adjoint of ι , and $\pi : \mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow (\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})/\mathcal{A}$ is the quotient map. Then

$$\iota^{(2n+1)} \circ D \circ \iota : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{(2n+1)}$$

is a continuous derivation. So, there exists $a^{(2n+1)} \in \mathcal{A}^{(2n+1)}$ such that

$$(\iota^{(2n+1)} \circ D)(a) = \text{ad}_{a^{(2n+1)}}(a)$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. We can extend $a^{(2n+1)}$ to an element of $\mathcal{A}^{(2n+1)} \times \mathcal{B}^{(2n+1)}$. Thus, if we put

$$D_{a^{(2n+1)}} := D - \text{ad}_{a^{(2n+1)}},$$

then $(\iota^{(2n+1)} \circ D) = 0$ on \mathcal{A} .

Now, for any $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$ and $(a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) \in \mathcal{A}^{(2n)} \times_{\theta[2n]} \mathcal{B}^{(2n)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D(aa'), (a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) \rangle &= \langle D(a), (a', 0) \cdot (a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle D(a'), (a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) \cdot (a, 0) \rangle \\ &= \langle D(a), \iota^{(2n)}((a', 0) \cdot (a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)})) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle D(a'), \iota^{(2n)}((a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) \cdot (a, 0)) \rangle \\ &= \langle (\iota^{(2n+1)} \circ D)(a), (a', 0) \cdot (a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle (\iota^{(2n+1)} \circ D)(a'), (a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) \cdot (a, 0) \rangle \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta[2n] \in \sigma(\mathcal{B}^{(2n)})$. Thus, $D = 0$ on $\mathcal{A}^2 := \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}$. By the $(2n+1)$ -weak amenability of \mathcal{A} and Proposition 2.8.63(i) of [D], we have $D = 0$ on \mathcal{A} since $\overline{\mathcal{A}^2} = \mathcal{A}$.

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the closed linear subspace of $\mathcal{A}^{(2n)} \times_{\theta[2n]} \mathcal{B}^{(2n)}$ spanned by

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{A}^{(2n)} \times_{\theta[2n]} \mathcal{B}^{(2n)}) \cup (\mathcal{A}^{(2n)} \times_{\theta[2n]} \mathcal{B}^{(2n)})\mathcal{A},$$

then for all $(a, b) \in \mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ and $a' \in \mathcal{A}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= D((a, b)(a', 0)) = D((a, b)) \cdot (a', 0), \\ 0 &= D((a', 0)(a, b)) = (a', 0) \cdot D((a, b)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for all $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$, $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) \in \mathcal{A}^{(2n)} \times_{\theta[2n]} \mathcal{B}^{(2n)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D((a, b)), (a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)})(a', 0) \rangle &= \langle (a', 0) \cdot D((a, b)), (a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) \rangle = 0, \\ \langle D((a, b)), (a', 0)(a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) \rangle &= \langle D((a, b)) \cdot (a', 0), (a^{(2n)}, b^{(2n)}) \rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

So, $D(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}) \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\perp}$. Hence, $D(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}) \subseteq ((\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})/\mathcal{A})^{(n)}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a closed $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})$ -submodule of $\mathcal{A}^{(2n)} \times_{\theta[2n]} \mathcal{B}^{(2n)}$ and $(\mathcal{A}^{(2n)} \times_{\theta[2n]} \mathcal{B}^{(2n)})/\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an $((\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})/\mathcal{A})$ -bimodule. Now, we define a map

$$D_{\mathcal{A}} : (\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})/\mathcal{A} \rightarrow ((\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})/\mathcal{A})^{(n)}$$

via $D_{\mathcal{A}}((a, b) + \mathcal{A}) = D((a, b))$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Then $D_{\mathcal{A}}$ is continuous derivation. But $(\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})/\mathcal{A}$ is isometrically isomorphic to \mathcal{B} , and \mathcal{B} is $(2n+1)$ -weakly amenable. Thus, there exists $f^{(n)} \in ((\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B})/\mathcal{A})^{(n)}$ such that $D_{\mathcal{A}} = \text{ad}_{f^{(n)}}$. It follows that $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is $(2n+1)$ -weakly amenable. ■

REMARK. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two Banach algebras, $\theta \in \sigma(\mathcal{B})$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. An argument similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1 shows that:

- (i) If $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is approximately $(2n)$ -weakly amenable, then \mathcal{A} is approximately $(2n)$ -weakly amenable.
- (ii) If \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are approximately $(2n+1)$ -weakly amenable, then $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is approximately $(2n+1)$ -weakly amenable.

5. Cyclic amenability. Recall that a derivation $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ is called *cyclic* if $\langle D(a), b \rangle + \langle D(b), a \rangle = 0$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$; the Banach algebra \mathcal{A} is called *cyclic amenable* (resp. *approximately cyclic amenable*) if every cyclic continuous derivation $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ is inner (resp. approximately inner).

THEOREM 5.1. *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two Banach algebras with $\overline{\mathcal{A}^2} = \mathcal{A}$ and let $\theta \in \sigma(\mathcal{B})$. Then $\mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B}$ is cyclic amenable (resp. approximately cyclic amenable) if and only if \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are cyclic amenable (resp. approximately cyclic amenable).*

Proof. We give a proof for cyclic amenability; the proof for approximate cyclic amenability is similar.

To this end, suppose that $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ is a cyclic derivation. Then we can extend it to a derivation $\tilde{D} : \mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{(1)} \times \mathcal{B}^{(1)}$ defined via

$$\tilde{D}((a, b)) = (D(a), 0)$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$. On the other hand, it is clear that \tilde{D} is a cyclic derivation on $\mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B}$. Therefore, there exists $(a^{(1)}, b^{(1)}) \in \mathcal{A}^{(1)} \times \mathcal{B}^{(1)}$ such that for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}((a, b)) &= (a, b) \cdot (a^{(1)}, b^{(1)}) - (a^{(1)}, b^{(1)}) \cdot (a, b) \\ &= (a \cdot a^{(1)} - a^{(1)} \cdot a, b \cdot b^{(1)} - b^{(1)} \cdot b). \end{aligned}$$

But, on the other hand, $\tilde{D}((a, b)) = (D(a), 0)$ for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Therefore, $D(a) = a \cdot a^{(1)} - a^{(1)} \cdot a$ and $b \cdot b^{(1)} - b^{(1)} \cdot b = 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$; i.e. \mathcal{A} is cyclic amenable. Cyclic amenability of \mathcal{B} is proved similarly.

Conversely, if \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are cyclic amenable and $D : \mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{(1)} \times \mathcal{B}^{(1)}$ is a cyclic derivation, then there are two functions $\alpha : \mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ and $\beta : \mathcal{A} \times_\theta \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{(1)}$ are such that

$$D((a, b)) = (\alpha((a, b)), \beta((a, b)))$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Now, we define $D_1 : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ via $D_1(a) = \alpha((a, 0))$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $D_2 : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{(1)}$ via $D_2(b) = \beta((0, b))$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Thus, for every $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D_1(a), a' \rangle + \langle D_1(a'), a \rangle &= \langle (D_1(a), 0), (a', 0) \rangle + \langle (D_1(a'), 0), (a, 0) \rangle \\ &= \langle (\alpha((a, 0)), \beta((a, 0))), (a', 0) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle (\alpha((a', 0)), \beta((a', 0))), (a, 0) \rangle \\ &= \langle D((a, 0)), (a', 0) \rangle + \langle D((a', 0)), (a, 0) \rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

So, D_1 is a cyclic derivation. Thus, there exists $a^{(1)} \in \mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ such that

$$D_1(a) = a \cdot a^{(1)} - a^{(1)} \cdot a$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Similarly, D_2 is a cyclic derivation. Therefore, there exists $b^{(1)} \in \mathcal{B}^{(1)}$ such that

$$D_2(b) = b \cdot b^{(1)} - b^{(1)} \cdot b$$

for all $b \in \mathcal{B}$. It follows from the assumption that for each $(a^{(1)}, b^{(1)}) \in \mathcal{A}^{(1)} \times \mathcal{B}^{(1)}$ we have

$$D((a, b)) = (a, b) \cdot (a^{(1)}, b^{(1)}) - (a^{(1)}, b^{(1)}) \cdot (a, b)$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$. So, D is an inner derivation; i.e. $\mathcal{A} \times_{\theta} \mathcal{B}$ is cyclic amenable. ■

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank the referee for his useful comments and suggestions. They acknowledge that this research was partially carried out at the IPM – Isfahan Branch.

The research of R. Nasr-Isfahani was in part supported by a grant from IPM (No. 91430417).

The research of M. Nemati was in part supported by a grant from IPM (No. 91470050).

REFERENCES

- [BCD] W. G. Bade, P. C. Curtis, and H. G. Dales, *Amenability and weak amenability for Beurling and Lipschitz algebras*, Proc. London Math. Soc. 55 (1987), 359–377.
- [D] H. G. Dales, *Banach Algebras and Automatic Continuity*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2000.
- [DGG] H. G. Dales, F. Ghahramani, and N. Grønbæk, *Derivations into iterated duals of Banach algebras*, Studia Math. 128 (1998), 19–54.
- [GL] F. Ghahramani and R. J. Loy, *Generalized notions of amenability*, J. Funct. Anal. 208 (2004), 229–260.
- [GLZ] F. Ghahramani, R. J. Loy and Y. Zhang, *Generalized notions of amenability, II*, J. Funct. Anal. 254 (2008), 1776–1810.
- [G] N. Grønbæk, *Weak and cyclic amenability for non-commutative Banach algebras*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. 35 (1992), 315–328.
- [J1] B. E. Johnson, *Cohomology in Banach algebras*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 127 (1972).
- [J2] B. E. Johnson, *Derivations from $L^1(G)$ into $L^1(G)$ and $L^\infty(G)$* , in: Lecture Notes in Math. 1359, Springer, 1988, 191–198.
- [J3] B. E. Johnson, *Weak amenability of group algebras*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 23 (1991), 281–284.
- [LE] J. Laali and M. Etefagh, *Weak amenability of general measure algebras*, Colloq. Math. 111 (2008), 1–9.
- [L1] A. T. Lau, *Analysis on a class of Banach algebras with application to harmonic analysis on locally compact groups and semigroups*, Fund. Math. 118 (1983), 161–175.
- [L2] A. T. Lau, *Uniformly continuous functionals on Banach algebras*, Colloq. Math. 51 (1987), 195–205.
- [LL] A. T. Lau and J. Ludwig, *Fourier–Stieltjes algebra of a topological group*, Adv. Math. 229 (2012), 2000–2023.
- [M] M. S. Monfared, *On certain products of Banach algebras with applications to harmonic analysis*, Studia Math. 178 (2007), 277–294.

- [NS] R. Nasr-Isfahani and S. Soltani Renani, *Character contractibility of Banach algebras and homological properties of Banach modules*, *Studia Math.* 202 (2011), 205–225.
- [Pa] A. L. T. Paterson, *Amenability, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, Amer. Math. Soc. 29, Providence, RI, 1988.
- [Pi] J. P. Pier, *Amenable Banach Algebras*, Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser. 172, Longman, Harlow, 1988.
- [R] V. Runde, *Lectures on Amenability*, Springer, New York, 2002.

Eghbal Ghaderi, Rasoul Nasr-Isfahani, Mehdi Nemati
Department of Mathematical Sciences
Isfahan University of Technology
Isfahan 84156-83111, Iran
and
School of Mathematics
Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM)
E-mail: ghaderi@math.iut.ac.ir
isfahani@cc.iut.ac.ir
m.nemati@cc.iut.ac.ir

Received 6 January 2012;
revised 28 June 2012

(5608)

