

# The PCP question

- ▶ Which (positive) elements in a  $C^*$ -algebra are positive combinations of projections?(that is, linear combinations with positive coefficients.)

# The PCP question

- ▶ Which (positive) elements in a  $C^*$ -algebra are positive combinations of projections?(that is, linear combinations with positive coefficients.)

We were motivated by earlier work on:

- ▶ Which (positive) elements in a  $C^*$ -algebra are the sum of projections? (Question still open in  $B(H)$ . Recent interest due to frame theory.)

# The PCP question

- ▶ Which (positive) elements in a  $C^*$ -algebra are positive combinations of projections?(that is, linear combinations with positive coefficients.)

We were motivated by earlier work on:

- ▶ Which (positive) elements in a  $C^*$ -algebra are the sum of projections? (Question still open in  $B(H)$ . Recent interest due to frame theory.)

Of course, we first need to know:

- ▶ Which elements in a  $C^*$ -algebra are linear combinations of projections?

## What's known in $B(H)$

- ▶ Fillmore (1967) Every operator in  $B(H)$  is a linear combination of 257 projections. Percy & Topping (1967), Paszkiewicz (1980), Matsumoto (1984) reduced the number to 10 projections.

## What's known in $B(H)$

- ▶ Fillmore (1967) Every operator in  $B(H)$  is a linear combination of 257 projections. Percy & Topping (1967), Paszkiewicz (1980), Matsumoto (1984) reduced the number to 10 projections.
- ▶ Fillmore (1967) Positive invertibles are PCP.

## What's known in $B(H)$

- ▶ Fillmore (1967) Every operator in  $B(H)$  is a linear combination of 257 projections. Percy & Topping (1967), Paszkiewicz (1980), Matsumoto (1984) reduced the number to 10 projections.
- ▶ Fillmore (1967) Positive invertibles are PCP.
- ▶ A different proof by Fong & Murphy (1985) using “bounds on the coefficients” of the linear combinations.

## What's known in $B(H)$

- ▶ Fillmore (1967) Every operator in  $B(H)$  is a linear combination of 257 projections. Percy & Topping (1967), Paszkiewicz (1980), Matsumoto (1984) reduced the number to 10 projections.
- ▶ Fillmore (1967) Positive invertibles are PCP.
- ▶ A different proof by Fong & Murphy (1985) using “bounds on the coefficients” of the linear combinations.
- ▶ Fillmore's observation on PCP (1967): compact operators with infinite rank are not PCP. *Indeed, if  $b \in K(H)^+$  is PCP in  $B(H)$  then all the projections must be finite and hence its range projection  $R_b$  must be finite.*

## What's known in $B(H)$

- ▶ Fillmore (1967) Every operator in  $B(H)$  is a linear combination of 257 projections. Percy & Topping (1967), Paszkiewicz (1980), Matsumoto (1984) reduced the number to 10 projections.
- ▶ Fillmore (1967) Positive invertibles are PCP.
- ▶ A different proof by Fong & Murphy (1985) using “bounds on the coefficients” of the linear combinations.
- ▶ Fillmore's observation on PCP (1967): compact operators with infinite rank are not PCP. *Indeed, if  $b \in K(H)^+$  is PCP in  $B(H)$  then all the projections must be finite and hence its range projection  $R_b$  must be finite.*
- ▶ Fong & Murphy (1985): This is the only exception.

# What's known in $W^*$ -algebras

- ▶ Percy and Topping (1967), Fack&De La Harpe (1980), Goldstein&Paszkiewicz (1992): all elements in a  $W^*$ -algebra are linear combination of projections iff the algebra has no finite type I direct summand with infinite dimensional center.

## What's known in $W^*$ -algebras

- ▶ Percy and Topping (1967), Fack&De La Harpe (1980), Goldstein&Paszkiewicz (1992): all elements in a  $W^*$ -algebra are linear combination of projections iff the algebra has no finite type I direct summand with infinite dimensional center.
- ▶ Bikchentaev (2005) Every positive invertible element in a  $W^*$ -algebra without finite type I direct summands with infinite dimensional center is a positive combination of projections.

## More recent in $W^*$ -algebras

KNZ (T-AMS 2012?) The following positive elements are PCP:

- ▶ Type  $II_1$  or type III  $\sigma$ -finite factors (or finite direct sums): all.

## More recent in $W^*$ -algebras

KNZ (T-AMS 2012?) The following positive elements are PCP:

- ▶ Type  $II_1$  or type III  $\sigma$ -finite factors (or finite direct sums): all.
- ▶ Type  $II_\infty$  factors (or finite direct sums): if either  $R_b$  is finite or  $b$  is not in the Breuer ideal of compact operators. *Similar to  $B(H)$ .*

## More recent in $W^*$ -algebras

KNZ (T-AMS 2012?) The following positive elements are PCP:

- ▶ Type  $II_1$  or type III  $\sigma$ -finite factors (or finite direct sums): all.
- ▶ Type  $II_\infty$  factors (or finite direct sums): if either  $R_b$  is finite or  $b$  is not in the Breuer ideal of compact operators. *Similar to  $B(H)$ .*
- ▶ “Large center”: the central essential spectrum must be bounded away from 0.

# What's known in $C^*$ -algebras

The following **unital simple**  $C^*$ -algebras are the span of their projections (mostly work by Marcoux (1998-2010)):

- ▶ purely infinite  $C^*$ -algebras;
- ▶ with proper projections but no tracial states;
- ▶ real rank zero with unique tracial state satisfying strict comparison of projections ( $\tau(p) < \tau(q) \Rightarrow p \prec q$ );
- ▶ AF-algebras, AT-algebras, or AH-algebras (if with bounded dimension growth) of real rank zero and finitely many extremal tracial states.

# The purely infinite case-PCP

$\mathcal{A}$  a  $\sigma$ -unital **purely infinite simple**  $C^*$ -algebra.

# The purely infinite case-PCP

$\mathcal{A}$  a  $\sigma$ -unital **purely infinite simple**  $C^*$ -algebra.

Theorem (KNZ, P-AMS (2011))

*Every positive element of  $\mathcal{A}$  is PCP.*

# The purely infinite case-PCP

$\mathcal{A}$  a  $\sigma$ -unital **purely infinite simple**  $C^*$ -algebra.

Theorem (KNZ, P-AMS (2011))

*Every positive element of  $\mathcal{A}$  is PCP.*

Theorem (ibid))

- ▶ *Every positive element of the multiplier  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$  is PCP.*

# The purely infinite case-PCP

$\mathcal{A}$  a  $\sigma$ -unital **purely infinite simple**  $C^*$ -algebra.

Theorem (KNZ, P-AMS (2011))

*Every positive element of  $\mathcal{A}$  is PCP.*

Theorem (ibid))

- ▶ *Every positive element of the multiplier  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$  is PCP.*
- ▶ *If  $b \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})^+$  and  $\|b\|_{\text{ess}} > 1$ , then  $b$  is a finite sum of projections.*

# The purely infinite case-PCP

$\mathcal{A}$  a  $\sigma$ -unital **purely infinite simple**  $C^*$ -algebra.

Theorem (KNZ, P-AMS (2011))

*Every positive element of  $\mathcal{A}$  is PCP.*

Theorem (ibid))

- ▶ *Every positive element of the multiplier  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$  is PCP.*
- ▶ *If  $b \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})^+$  and  $\|b\|_{\text{ess}} > 1$ , then  $b$  is a finite sum of projections.*

Theorem (KNZ, P-AMS (2012))

*If  $K_0(\mathcal{A})$  is a torsion group and  $b \in \mathcal{A}^+$ ,  $\|b\| > 1$  then  $b$  is a finite sum of projections.*

# Finite $C^*$ -algebras: the hypotheses

- ▶  $\mathcal{A}$  unital,

# Finite $C^*$ -algebras: the hypotheses

- ▶  $\mathcal{A}$  unital,  
simple,

# Finite $C^*$ -algebras: the hypotheses

- ▶  $\mathcal{A}$  unital,  
simple,  
real rank zero,

# Finite $C^*$ -algebras: the hypotheses

- ▶  $\mathcal{A}$  unital,  
simple,  
real rank zero,  
stable rank one,

# Finite $C^*$ -algebras: the hypotheses

- ▶  $\mathcal{A}$  unital,  
simple,  
real rank zero,  
stable rank one,  
separable;

# Finite $C^*$ -algebras: the hypotheses

- ▶  $\mathcal{A}$  unital,  
simple,  
real rank zero,  
stable rank one,  
separable;
- ▶ the tracial state space  $T(\mathcal{A})$  is non-empty and has finitely many extreme points; (recall that  $T(\mathcal{A})$  is convex and  $w^*$ -cpt);

# Finite $C^*$ -algebras: the hypotheses

- ▶  $\mathcal{A}$  unital,  
simple,  
real rank zero,  
stable rank one,  
separable;
- ▶ the tracial state space  $T(\mathcal{A})$  is non-empty and has finitely many extreme points; (recall that  $T(\mathcal{A})$  is convex and  $w^*$ -cpt);
- ▶ strict comparison of projections:

$$\tau(p) < \tau(q) \quad \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A}) \Rightarrow p \precsim q.$$

# Finite $C^*$ -algebras: linear combinations

# Finite C\*-algebras: linear combinations

$\mathcal{A}$  a C\*-algebra with the listed properties/

## Theorem

$\mathcal{A}$  is the linear span of its projections with “control on the coefficients”. That is, there is a constant  $V_0$  s.t. for every  $b \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\exists \lambda_j \in \mathbb{C}, p_j \in \mathcal{A}$  projections s.t

$$b = \sum_1^n \lambda_j p_j \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_1^n |\lambda_j| \leq V_0 \|b\|.$$

# Finite $C^*$ -algebras: linear combinations

$\mathcal{A}$  a  $C^*$ -algebra with the listed properties/

## Theorem

$\mathcal{A}$  is the linear span of its projections with “control on the coefficients”. That is, there is a constant  $V_0$  s.t. for every  $b \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\exists \lambda_j \in \mathbb{C}, p_j \in \mathcal{A}$  projections s.t

$$b = \sum_1^n \lambda_j p_j \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_1^n |\lambda_j| \leq V_0 \|b\|.$$

## Question

If  $\mathcal{A}$  is the span of its projections, does control of the coefficients follow automatically?

# Why control of the coefficients?

Lemma (proof as in Fong & Murphy's (1985) for  $B(H)$ )

*If a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}^+$  is the span of it projections with control on the coefficients and has  $RR(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ , then every positive invertible is PCP.*

# Why control of the coefficients?

Lemma (proof as in Fong & Murphy's (1985) for  $B(H)$ )

*If a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}^+$  is the span of it projections with control on the coefficients and has  $RR(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ , then every positive invertible is PCP.*

Beyond invertibles:

Lemma

*Let  $\mathcal{A}$  have the property that positive invertibles in any corner  $r\mathcal{A}r$  are PCP. If  $b := \alpha p \oplus a$  with  $\alpha > \|a\|$  and  $a = qa q \geq 0$ ,  $q \lesssim p$ , then  $b$  is PCP.*

# Why control of the coefficients?

Lemma (proof as in Fong & Murphy's (1985) for  $B(H)$ )

*If a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}^+$  is the span of its projections with control on the coefficients and has  $RR(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ , then every positive invertible is PCP.*

Beyond invertibles:

Lemma

*Let  $\mathcal{A}$  have the property that positive invertibles in any corner  $r\mathcal{A}r$  are PCP. If  $b := \alpha p \oplus a$  with  $\alpha > \|a\|$  and  $a = qaq \geq 0$ ,  $q \preceq p$ , then  $b$  is PCP.*

This lemma is the essential tool for attacking the general PCP problem.

# First step: commutators

## Theorem

*If  $b \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\tau(b) = 0 \quad \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$ , then  $b$  is the sum of 2 commutators (with control on their norms.)*

# First step: commutators

## Theorem

*If  $b \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\tau(b) = 0 \quad \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$ , then  $b$  is the sum of 2 commutators (with control on their norms.)*

*This theorem holds even when  $\text{card}(T(\mathcal{A})) = \infty$ .*

## Ingredients in the proof

- ▶ Embed in  $\mathcal{A}$  a unital simple AH-algebra  $\mathcal{C}$  with real rank zero and dimension growth bounded by 3 and same K-invariants (Lin (2001), Elliott& Gong, Gong (1996, 1997,1998)).  
(Here is the only place where we use separability.)

## Ingredients in the proof

- ▶ Embed in  $\mathcal{A}$  a unital simple AH-algebra  $\mathcal{C}$  with real rank zero and dimension growth bounded by 3 and same K-invariants (Lin (2001), Elliott& Gong, Gong (1996, 1997,1998)).  
(Here is the only place where we use separability.)
- ▶ Extend the Fack (1982), Thomsen (1994) construction to this inductive limit case so to approximate  $b$  by a bounded number of commutators.

## Ingredients in the proof

- ▶ Embed in  $\mathcal{A}$  a unital simple AH-algebra  $\mathcal{C}$  with real rank zero and dimension growth bounded by 3 and same K-invariants (Lin (2001), Elliott& Gong, Gong (1996, 1997,1998)).  
(Here is the only place where we use separability.)
- ▶ Extend the Fack (1982), Thomsen (1994) construction to this inductive limit case so to approximate  $b$  by a bounded number of commutators.
- ▶ Use the Marcoux (2002, 2006) machinery to express  $b$  as the sum of commutators and then reduce their number to two.  
(Still keep control on the norms.)

## From commutators to projections

- ▶ Marcoux (2002) proved that if in a  $C^*$ -algebra there exist three mutually orthogonal projections  $p_1, p_2$  and  $p_3$  such that  $1 = p_1 + p_2 + p_3$  and  $p_i \precsim 1 - p_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ , then every commutator is a linear combination of 84 projections, with control on the coefficients. (Commutators = sums of certain nilpotents of order two = sums of idempotents = (by Davidson) = linear combinations of projections)

## From commutators to projections

- ▶ Marcoux (2002) proved that if in a  $C^*$ -algebra there exist three mutually orthogonal projections  $p_1, p_2$  and  $p_3$  such that  $1 = p_1 + p_2 + p_3$  and  $p_i \precsim 1 - p_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ , then every commutator is a linear combination of 84 projections, with control on the coefficients. (Commutators = sums of certain nilpotents of order two = sums of idempotents = (by Davidson) = linear combinations of projections)

This condition is easily satisfied in our case. Thus so far we have:

- ▶ every  $b \in \mathcal{A}$  s.t.  $\tau(b) = 0$  for every tracial state  $\tau$  is a linear combination of projections with control on the coefficients.

## Beyond zero trace

- ▶ If there is a unique tracial state  $\tau$ , then  $b = \tau(b)1 + (b - \tau(b)1)$  is a linear combination of projections (just one...) plus a zero-trace element.

## Beyond zero trace

- ▶ If there is a unique tracial state  $\tau$ , then  $b = \tau(b)1 + (b - \tau(b)1)$  is a linear combination of projections (just one...) plus a zero-trace element.
- ▶ Using the density of  $K_o(\mathcal{A})$  in the continuous affine functions on  $T(\mathcal{A})$  (Blackadar (1982)) we get:

### Lemma

*If  $\text{card}(\text{Ext}(T(\mathcal{A}))) < \infty$  then every element in  $\mathcal{A}$  is the sum of linear combination of projections plus an element in the kernel of all the traces.*

## Beyond zero trace

- ▶ If there is a unique tracial state  $\tau$ , then  $b = \tau(b)1 + (b - \tau(b)1)$  is a linear combination of projections (just one...) plus a zero-trace element.
- ▶ Using the density of  $K_o(\mathcal{A})$  in the continuous affine functions on  $T(\mathcal{A})$  (Blackadar (1982)) we get:

### Lemma

*If  $\text{card}(\text{Ext}(T(\mathcal{A}))) < \infty$  then every element in  $\mathcal{A}$  is the sum of linear combination of projections plus an element in the kernel of all the traces.*

- ▶ These 3 steps conclude the proof. To recap:  
 $b =$  linear combination of projections +  $c$ ,  $\tau(c) = 0 \forall \tau \text{ in } T(\mathcal{A})$ ;  
 $c = [x_1, y_1] + [x_2, y_2]$ ;  
 $[x_i, y_i] =$  linear combination of projections;

and all that with control of the coefficients.

## Infinitely many extremal traces?

The condition that  $\text{card}(\text{Ext}(T(\mathcal{A}))) < \infty$  is essential:

# Infinitely many extremal traces?

The condition that  $\text{card}(\text{Ext}(T(\mathcal{A}))) < \infty$  is essential:

## Proposition

*If  $\text{card}(\text{Ext}(T(\mathcal{A}))) = \infty$  and the collection  $D(\mathcal{A})$  of Murray-von Neumann equivalence classes of projections of  $\mathcal{A}$  is countable, then  $\mathcal{A}$  is not the linear span of its projections.*

# Infinitely many extremal traces?

The condition that  $\text{card}(\text{Ext}(T(\mathcal{A}))) < \infty$  is essential:

## Proposition

*If  $\text{card}(\text{Ext}(T(\mathcal{A}))) = \infty$  and the collection  $D(\mathcal{A})$  of Murray-von Neumann equivalence classes of projections of  $\mathcal{A}$  is countable, then  $\mathcal{A}$  is not the linear span of its projections.*

The proof mimics the one that a Hamel basis of an infinite separable Banach space cannot be countable.

## Finite nonunital $C^*$ -algebras: obstruction to PCP

- ▶ When  $b \in \mathcal{A}$ , its range projection  $R_b$  exists in  $\mathcal{A}^{**}$  (it is an *open* projection).

## Finite nonunital $C^*$ -algebras: obstruction to PCP

- ▶ When  $b \in \mathcal{A}$ , its range projection  $R_b$  exists in  $\mathcal{A}^{**}$  (it is an *open* projection).
- ▶ Every (finite, faithful) trace  $\tau$  has an extension  $\bar{\tau}$  to a (not necessarily faithful nor finite) tracial weight on  $(\mathcal{A}^{**})^+$  (Combes(1968)- Ortega, Rordam, Thiel (2011))

## Finite nonunital $C^*$ -algebras: obstruction to PCP

- ▶ When  $b \in \mathcal{A}$ , its range projection  $R_b$  exists in  $\mathcal{A}^{**}$  (it is an *open* projection).
- ▶ Every (finite, faithful) trace  $\tau$  has an extension  $\bar{\tau}$  to a (not necessarily faithful nor finite) tracial weight on  $(\mathcal{A}^{**})^+$  (Combes(1968)- Ortega, Rordam, Thiel (2011))
- ▶ The condition that  $\bar{\tau}(R_b) < \infty \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$  is necessary for  $b$  to be a linear combination of projections. Indeed:

# Finite nonunital $C^*$ -algebras: obstruction to PCP

- ▶ When  $b \in \mathcal{A}$ , its range projection  $R_b$  exists in  $\mathcal{A}^{**}$  (it is an *open* projection).
- ▶ Every (finite, faithful) trace  $\tau$  has an extension  $\bar{\tau}$  to a (not necessarily faithful nor finite) tracial weight on  $(\mathcal{A}^{**})^+$  (Combes(1968)- Ortega, Rordam, Thiel (2011))
- ▶ The condition that  $\bar{\tau}(R_b) < \infty \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$  is necessary for  $b$  to be a linear combination of projections. Indeed:

$$b = \sum \lambda_j p_j \Rightarrow \bar{\tau}(R_b) \leq \bar{\tau}(\bigvee p_j) \leq \sum \tau(p_j) < \infty \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$$

# Finite nonunital $C^*$ -algebras: obstruction to PCP

- ▶ When  $b \in \mathcal{A}$ , its range projection  $R_b$  exists in  $\mathcal{A}^{**}$  (it is an *open* projection).
- ▶ Every (finite, faithful) trace  $\tau$  has an extension  $\bar{\tau}$  to a (not necessarily faithful nor finite) tracial weight on  $(\mathcal{A}^{**})^+$  (Combes(1968)- Ortega, Rordam, Thiel (2011))
- ▶ The condition that  $\bar{\tau}(R_b) < \infty \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$  is necessary for  $b$  to be a linear combination of projections. Indeed:

$$b = \sum \lambda_j p_j \Rightarrow \bar{\tau}(R_b) \leq \bar{\tau}(\bigvee p_j) \leq \sum \tau(p_j) < \infty \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$$

- ▶ The condition is also sufficient. But first, we need the PCP result.

# Finite $C^*$ -algebras: N&S condition for PCP

## Theorem

*Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be  $\sigma$ -unital, with all properties as above and  $\text{card}(\text{Ext}(T(\mathcal{A}))) < \infty$ . Then  $b \in \mathcal{A}^+$  is PCP if and only if  $\bar{\tau}(R_b) < \infty \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$ . (Always true if  $\mathcal{A}$  is unital.)*

# Finite $C^*$ -algebras: N&S condition for PCP

## Theorem

*Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be  $\sigma$ -unital, with all properties as above and  $\text{card}(\text{Ext}(T(\mathcal{A}))) < \infty$ . Then  $b \in \mathcal{A}^+$  is PCP if and only if  $\bar{\tau}(R_b) < \infty \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$ . (Always true if  $\mathcal{A}$  is unital.)*

## Corollary

*With  $\mathcal{A}$  as above,  $b \in \mathcal{A}$  is a linear combination of projections in  $\mathcal{A}$  if and only if  $\bar{\tau}(R_b) < \infty \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$ .*

## Ingredients in the proof, part I

We can work in a corner where the “identity is not too far from the range projection” .

### Lemma

*If  $\bar{\tau}(R_b) < \infty \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$  then there is a trace preserving isomorphism*

$$\Psi : her(b) \rightarrow \Psi(her(b)) \subset rAr \text{ for some } r \in \mathcal{A}, \tau(r) < 2\bar{\tau}(R_b).$$

# Ingredients in the proof, part I

We can work in a corner where the “identity is not too far from the range projection”.

## Lemma

*If  $\bar{\tau}(R_b) < \infty \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$  then there is a trace preserving isomorphism*

$$\Psi : \text{her}(b) \rightarrow \Psi(\text{her}(b)) \subset r\mathcal{A}r \text{ for some } r \in \mathcal{A}, \tau(r) < 2\bar{\tau}(R_b).$$

Why solving PCP question first? Notice that

- ▶ decomposing  $\Psi(b)$  into a PCP in  $r\mathcal{A}r$ , *necessarily* in  $\Psi(\text{her}(b))$  gives a PCP decomposition of  $b$ ;
- ▶ decomposing  $\Psi(b)$  into a linear combination of projections in  $r\mathcal{A}r$  does not yield a decomposition of  $b$ .

## Ingredients in the proof, part II

- ▶ Previous lemma permits to embed  $b$  into a unital algebra so that  $\bar{\tau}(N_b) < \bar{\tau}(R_b) \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$ .

## Ingredients in the proof, part II

- ▶ Previous lemma permits to embed  $b$  into a unital algebra so that  $\bar{\tau}(N_b) < \bar{\tau}(R_b) \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$ .
- ▶ By Brown's interpolation theorem find projections  $p \perp q$  in  $T(\mathcal{A})$  with  $N_b \leq q \preceq p \leq R_b$

## Ingredients in the proof, part II

- ▶ Previous lemma permits to embed  $b$  into a unital algebra so that  $\bar{\tau}(N_b) < \bar{\tau}(R_b) \forall \tau \in T(\mathcal{A})$ .
- ▶ By Brown's interpolation theorem find projections  $p \perp q$  in  $T(\mathcal{A})$  with  $N_b \leq q \lesssim p \leq R_b$
- ▶ Use the key lemma that we have seen before:

### Lemma

*Let  $\mathcal{A}$  have the property that positive invertibles in any corner  $r\mathcal{A}r$  are PCP. If  $b := \alpha p \oplus a$  with  $\alpha > \|a\|$  and  $a = qaq \geq 0$ ,  $q \lesssim p$ , then  $b$  is PCP.*

- ▶ Plus more work - the proof is technical.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION