

2.22 Proposition: If  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $\mathcal{O}$ -unital, then it suffices in the def. of  $KK(A, \mathcal{B})$  to consider only those triples  $(E, \phi, T)$  where  $E = \hat{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$ .

Pf:  $(\hat{H}_{\mathcal{B}}, 0, 0) \in \mathcal{D}(A, \mathcal{B})$  and hence  $(E, \phi, T) \sim (E \oplus \hat{H}_{\mathcal{B}}, \phi \oplus 0, T \oplus 0)$ .

(and  $ev_{t,x}^{\mathcal{B}}(\hat{H}_{\mathcal{B}[0,1]}) \cong \hat{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$  for all  $t \in [0,1]$ )  $\square$

2.23 Definition: Let  $E = (E, \phi, T) \in \mathcal{E}(A, \mathcal{B})$ . Then a "compact perturbation" of  $T$  (or of  $E$ ) is an operator  $T'$  (or the cycle  $(E, \phi, T')$ ) such that

$$\forall a \in A: \phi(a)(T - T') \in K_{\mathcal{B}}(E).$$

2.24 Lemma: In this case:  $E' := (E, \phi, T') \in \mathcal{E}(A, \mathcal{B})$  and  $E \sim E'$ .

Pf: Consider the straight line segment.  $\square$

2.25 Proposition: If  $(E, \phi, T) \in \mathcal{E}(A, \mathcal{B})$ , then there is a "compact perturbation"  $(E, \phi, S)$  of  $(E, \phi, T)$  such that  $S^* = S$ ; so in the definition of  $KK(A, \mathcal{B})$  it suffices to consider only those triples with self-adjoint operator; and "compact perturbations", homotopies and operator homotopies may be taken within this class.

Pf: Replace  $T$  with  $(T + T^*)/2$ .  $\square$

2.26 Proposition: If  $(E, \phi, T) \in \mathcal{E}(A, \mathcal{B})$ , then there is a "compact perturbation"  $(E, \phi, S) \in \mathcal{E}(A, \mathcal{B})$  of  $(E, \phi, T)$  with  $S = S^*$  and  $\|S\| \leq 1$ . If  $A$  is unital we may in addition obtain an  $S$  with  $S^2 - 1 \in K(E)$ .

"Compact perturbations", homotopies and operator homotopies may be taken within this class.

Pf WLOG  $T = T^*$ . Use functional calculus 

If  $A$  is unital:  $P := \phi(1)$ . Replace  $S$  with  $PSP + (1-P)S(1-P)$   
or id

Let  $A$  be unital (the  $\sigma$ -unital case is more complicated).

In the definition of  $KK$ -theory it suffices to consider only those triples  $(E, \phi, T)$  with  $\phi$  unital (replace  $E$  with  $PE$  and  $T$  with  $PTP$ ).

If there exists a unital graded  $*$ -hom. from  $A$  to  $L_B(\hat{H}_B)$  then  
WLOG  $E = \hat{H}_B$ .

If  $A$  and  $B$  are trivially graded:

Identify  $L(\hat{H}_B)$  with  $M_2(L(H_B))$  with grading given by  $\text{diag}(1, -1)$ .  $\phi = \text{diag}(\phi_0, \phi_1)$  with  $\phi_i: A \rightarrow L_S(H_B)$  unital.

$T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & S^* \\ S & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  for some  $S \in L_S(H_B)$  with  $\|S\| \leq 1$ .

The intertwining conditions become  $S^*S - 1, SS^* - 1 \in K_B(H_B)$ ,

$S\phi_1(a) - \phi_0(a)S \in K_B(H_B) \forall a \in A$ .

homotopy becomes homotopy of triples  $(\phi_0, \phi_1, S)$  (with strong continuity)

In this picture modules are denoted by

$(E_0 \oplus E_1, \phi_0 \oplus \phi_1, S)$  where  $S \in L_B(E_0, E_1)$ .

In particular, if  $A=B$  then

$KK(B, B) \cong \{[T] : T \in L_B(H_B), T^*T - 1, TT^* - 1 \in K_B(H_B)\}$ .

2.28  $KK(C, \mathcal{B}) \cong K_0(\mathcal{B})$  for  $\mathcal{B}$  trivially graded &  $\mathcal{B}$ -unital (35)

Three methods of proof:

1) Assuming  $KK(C, \mathcal{B})$  can be described as the set of all triples  $(\widehat{H}_{\mathcal{B}}, \phi, \tau)$  where  $\phi$  is unital,  $\tau = \tau^*$ ,  $\|\tau\| \leq 1$  and  $\tau^2 - 1 \in K(\widehat{H}_{\mathcal{B}})$  modulo the equivalence relation

generated by

a) operator homology

b) addition of degenerate cycles (with unital  $C$ -action).

I.e. we assume  $KK(C, \mathcal{B}) = \widehat{KK}(C, \mathcal{B})$ .

Then for all such triples  $\tau$  has the form  $\tau = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & S^* \\ S & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ .

The condition on  $\tau$  is equivalent to  $\pi(S)$  being unitary in

$Q := L_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{H}_{\mathcal{B}}) / K_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{H}_{\mathcal{B}})$ , where  $\pi: L_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{H}_{\mathcal{B}}) \rightarrow Q$  is the canonical projection  $\pi(\mathcal{E})$ .

So every cycle  $\mathcal{E}$  for  $KK(C, \mathcal{B})$  gives an element in  $K_1(Q)$ .

The exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow K_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{H}_{\mathcal{B}}) \xrightarrow{\kappa} L_{\mathcal{B}}(\widehat{H}_{\mathcal{B}}) \xrightarrow{\pi} Q \rightarrow 0$  gives a long exact sequence in  $K$ -theory

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} K_0(K) & \rightarrow & K_0(L) & \rightarrow & K_0(Q) \\ & & \uparrow \text{index} & & \downarrow \\ K_1(Q) & \leftarrow & K_1(L) & \leftarrow & K_1(K) \end{array}$$

So  $K_1(Q) \cong K_0(K) = K_0(K \otimes \mathcal{B}) \cong K_0(\mathcal{B})$ .

So we obtain a map from  $KK(C, \mathcal{B})$  to  $K_0(\mathcal{B})$  after observing that the  $K_1$ -elements are invariant under the elementary "moves" a) and b).

By a general lifting argument you can lift homotopies from  $Q$  to  $L$ , so  $\pi$  is injective. It is clearly surjective and a homeomorphism.

Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be unital.

2) Let  $(\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{B}}, \phi, \tau)$  be a cycle as above, so  $T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & S^* \\ S & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ .

We try to define an "index" of  $S: \mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$  as an element of  $K_0(\mathcal{B})$ . Problem: The image of  $S$  does not have to be closed and  $\ker S, \text{coker} S$  don't have to be finitely generated and projective.

Solution: One can show that there is an  $S' \in L_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{B}})$  such that  $S - S' \in K_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{B}})$  and

$\ker S', \text{coker} S'^*$  are f.g.p.

Definition:  $\text{index}(S) := [\ker S'] - [\ker S'^*] \in K_0(\mathcal{B})$

Problems: 1) Is this well-defined and a homomorphism?

2) Is this invariant under homology (again, use  $\tilde{K}$  instead of  $KK$ )?

3) Is it a bijection on the level of  $KK(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B})$ ?

For details, see chapter 17 of Wegge-Olsen or section 4.3 of Bonda, Várilly, Figueroa

3) We define a map from  $K_0(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow KK(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B})$  for  $\mathcal{B}$  unital.

Start with a finitely generated projective  $\mathcal{B}$ -module  $E$ . Find a  $\mathcal{B}$ -valued inner product on  $E$  (one can show that there is an essentially unique one). Define  $\Phi([E]) := (E \xrightarrow{\phi} 0) \in E(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B})$ . Moreover,

define  $\Phi([-E]) := (0 \xrightarrow{\phi} E)$ . Then  $\Phi([E] \oplus [-E]) = (E \xrightarrow{\phi} E) \sim (E \xrightarrow{\text{id}} E) \sim 0$  because  $\text{id}_E \in K_{\mathcal{B}}(E)$  (which one has to show).

So  $\Phi$  is well defined as a map from  $K_0(\mathcal{B})$  to  $KK(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B})$ .

We indicate how to show that it is surjective:

37)

Let  $E = \left( E_0 \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{f} \\ \xleftarrow{g} \end{array} E_1 \right) \in \mathbb{E}(C, \mathcal{B})$ . Find an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $R \in K_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{B}^n, E_1)$ ,  
 $S \in K_{\mathcal{B}}(E_0, \mathcal{B}^n)$  such that

$$\| \underbrace{1 - fg}_{\text{compact}} - RS \| < \frac{1}{2}$$

("every compact operator almost factors through some  $\mathcal{B}^n$ ")

$\Rightarrow fg + RS$  is invertible in  $L_{\mathcal{B}}(E_1)$ . Define  $w := (fg + RS)^{-1}$

note that  $w \in 1 + K_{\mathcal{B}}(E_1)$  (exercise).

Now:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( E_0 \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{f} \\ \xleftarrow{g} \end{array} E_1 \right) \oplus \left( \mathcal{B}^n \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{0} \\ \xleftarrow{0} \end{array} 0 \right) = \left( E_0 \oplus \mathcal{B}^n, \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{(f, 0)} \\ \xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} g \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}} \end{array} E_1 \right) \\ & \sim \left( E_0 \oplus \mathcal{B}^n, \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\check{f} := (f, R)} \\ \xleftarrow{\check{g} := \begin{pmatrix} g \\ S \end{pmatrix} w} \end{array} E_1 \right) =: (*). \end{aligned}$$

observe:

$$\check{f}\check{g} = fgw + RSw = (fg + RS)w = id_{E_1}$$

hence  $\check{p} := \check{g}\check{f} \in L_{\mathcal{B}}(E_0 \oplus \mathcal{B}^n)$  is idempotent.

Let us assume (with some handwaving) that  $\check{p} = \check{p}^*$ .

Then  $E_0 \oplus \mathcal{B}^n \cong \text{Im } \check{p} \oplus \text{Im } (1 - \check{p})$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow (*) & = \underbrace{\left( \text{Im } \check{p} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\check{f}} \\ \xleftarrow{\check{g}} \end{array} E_1 \right)}_{\sim 0 \text{ in } KK(C, \mathcal{B})} \oplus \left( \text{Im } (1 - \check{p}) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{0} \\ \xleftarrow{0} \end{array} 0 \right) \\ & \sim 0 \text{ in } KK(C, \mathcal{B}) \end{aligned}$$

observe  $\check{p}\check{p} = \check{p}$  and  $\check{p}\check{q} = \check{q}$ . Note

$$1 - \check{p} \in K_{\mathbb{B}}(\Xi_0 \oplus \mathbb{B}^n) \quad (\text{exercise})$$

$\Rightarrow \text{Im}(1 - \check{p})$  has compact identity  $\Rightarrow \text{Im}(1 - \check{p})$  is f.g. & p.

$$\Rightarrow [\mathcal{E}] = \underbrace{[\text{Im}(1 - \check{p})]}_{\in \Phi(K_0(\mathbb{B}))} - \underbrace{[\mathbb{B}^n]}_{\in \Phi(K_0(\mathbb{B}))} \in \bar{\Phi}(K_0(\mathbb{B}))$$

injectivity: similar.