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#### Abstract

Let $1<p<+\infty$. Let $L^{p}(\mathcal{M})$ and $L^{p}(\mathcal{N})$ be the noncommutative $L^{p}$-spaces associated to von Neumann algebras $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$, respectively. Let $\varphi: L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{N})$ be a surjective map between positive elements preserving the norm of sum, i.e., $$
\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\|_{p}=\|x+y\|_{p}, \quad x, y \in L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M})
$$

We show that there is a Jordan $*$-isomorphism $J: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$, and $\varphi$ can be extended uniquely to a surjective real linear positive isometry from $L_{\mathrm{sa}}^{p}(\mathcal{M})$ onto $L_{\mathrm{sa}}^{p}(\mathcal{N})$. When $\mathcal{M}$ is approximately semifinite, especially semifinite or hyperfinite, $\varphi(R)=\Theta_{*}\left(R^{p}\right)^{1 / p}$ for every $R \in L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M})$, where $\Theta=J^{-1}$ and $\Theta_{*}: L^{1}(\mathcal{M})\left(\cong M_{*}\right) \rightarrow L^{1}(\mathcal{N})\left(\cong N_{*}\right)$ is its predual map. In the case when $\mathcal{M}$ has a normal faithful semifinite trace $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}$ (and so does $\mathcal{N}$ ), $\varphi(x)=h J(x)$ for every $x \in L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap M_{+}$, where $h^{p}=d\left(\tau_{\mathcal{M}} \circ \Theta\right) / d \tau_{\mathcal{N}}$ is the non-commutative Radon-Nikodym derivative of $\tau_{\mathcal{M}} \circ \Theta$ with respect to $\tau_{\mathcal{N}}$. We also provide a similar result when $p=+\infty$, and counter examples for the case $p=1$.


## 1. Introduction

The celebrated Mazur-Ulam theorem [9] states that every surjective map $T$ : $E \rightarrow F$ between normed spaces, preserving the norm of differences and fixing zero, extends to a real linear isometry from $E$ onto $F$. One may ask what happens if $T$ preserves the norm of sums instead of differences, i.e., if

$$
\|T x+T y\|=\|x+y\|, \quad \forall x, y \in E
$$

It turns out to be easy, by noting that we have $T 0=0$ and $T(-x)=-T x$ automatically, and the Mazur-Ulam theorem applies.

It then arises the question when the domain and range of $T$ are not the whole linear spaces; see, e.g., $[1,4,5,11,15]$. In [17], we propose the following open problem.

Problem 1.1. Let $E, F$ be ordered Banach spaces with positive cones $E_{+}, F_{+}$, respectively. Let $T: E_{+} \rightarrow F_{+}$be a surjective map preserving the norm of sums. Can $T$ be extended to a positive real linear isometry from $E$ onto $F$ ?

[^0]We answer Problem 1.1 affirmatively for the case when $E, F$ are smooth Banach lattices, and $L_{p}$ spaces when $p \in(1, \infty]$, while we also provide a counterexample for the case $p=1$ in [17]. There are also positive answers for $C(X)$ spaces in [1], for von Neumann algebras in [10], and for general unital $C^{*}$-algebras in [2]. The same is true if one considers bijective maps between positive definite cones in unital $C^{*}$-algebras but equipped with a sort of Schatten $p$-norm [4] for $p \in(1, \infty]$.

In this paper, we give a positive answer for non-commutative $L_{p}(\mathcal{M})$-spaces in Theorem 3.4; see also Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 below. Note that a noncommutative $L^{p}(\mathcal{M})$ space is not a Banach lattice unless $\mathcal{M}$ is abelian. This prevents us from directly applying the technique developed in the abelian case in [17]. Anyway, let us recall our result for commutative $L^{p}$-spaces.

Theorem 1.2 ([17, Theorem 3.3]). Let $\varphi: L_{+}^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}, \Sigma_{1}, \mu_{1}\right) \rightarrow L_{+}^{p}\left(\Omega_{2}, \Sigma_{2}, \mu_{2}\right)$ be a bijective map, where $1<p \leq \infty$. Suppose

$$
\|x+y\|_{p}=\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\|_{p}, \quad \forall x, y \in L_{+}^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}, \Sigma_{1}, \mu_{1}\right)
$$

Then $\varphi$ extends to a surjective positive linear isometry from $L^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}, \Sigma_{1}, \mu_{1}\right)$ onto $L^{p}\left(\Omega_{2}, \Sigma_{2}, \mu_{2}\right)$. More precisely, there exists a regular set isomorphism $\Psi$ from $\Sigma_{1}$ onto $\Sigma_{2}$ inducing a bijective positive linear map $\psi: L^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}, \Sigma_{1}, \mu_{1}\right) \rightarrow L^{p}\left(\Omega_{2}, \Sigma_{2}, \mu_{2}\right)$, and a locally measurable function $h$ on $\Omega_{2}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi(x)=h \cdot \psi(x), \quad \forall x \in L_{+}^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}, \Sigma_{1}, \mu_{1}\right) . \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

When $1<p<+\infty$, we have

$$
\int_{\Psi(A)}|h(t)|^{p} d \mu_{2}=\mu_{1}(A), \quad \text { for each } \sigma \text {-finite } A \in \Sigma_{1} .
$$

In other words, $|h|^{p}=\frac{d\left(\mu_{1} \circ \Psi^{-1}\right)}{d \mu_{2}}$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $\mu_{1} \circ \Psi^{-1}$ with respect to $\mu_{2}$. When $p=+\infty$, we have

$$
h(y)=1, \quad \text { locally almost everywhere on } \Omega_{2} .
$$

When the underlying measure spaces are localizable, $\mathcal{M}=L^{\infty}\left(\Omega_{1}, \Sigma_{1}, \mu_{1}\right)$ and $\mathcal{N}=L^{\infty}\left(\Omega_{2}, \Sigma_{2}, \mu_{2}\right)$ are commutative von Neumann algebras with predual spaces $L^{1}\left(\Omega_{1}, \Sigma_{1}, \mu_{1}\right)$ and $L^{1}\left(\Omega_{2}, \Sigma_{2}, \mu_{2}\right)$, respectively. In this case, the regular set isomorphism $\Psi$ defining $\psi$ in (1.1) can be thought of an orthomorphism between the projection lattices of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$. By Dye's Theorem [3], $\Psi$ extends uniquely to a Jordan $*$-isomorphism $J: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$. We simply have $\psi=J$ when $p=+\infty$. When $1<p<+\infty$, let $\Theta=J^{-1}$ with the predual map $\Theta_{*}: L^{1}\left(\Omega_{1}, \Sigma_{1}, \mu_{1}\right) \rightarrow$ $L^{1}\left(\Omega_{2}, \Sigma_{2}, \mu_{2}\right)$. Then we have $\psi(f)=\Theta_{*}\left(f^{p}\right)^{1 / p}$ for all $f$ in $L_{+}^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}, \Sigma_{1}, \mu_{1}\right)$.

We are going to provide a noncommutative version of Theorem 1.2. To this end, we need the following counter part result about norm of difference preservers recently developed in [8]. Set

$$
L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M})_{\alpha}^{\beta}=\left\{S \in L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M}): \alpha \leq\|S\|_{p} \leq \beta\right\}, \quad 0 \leq \alpha<\beta<+\infty .
$$

Theorem 1.3 ([8, Theorem 1.3]). Let $p \in[1, \infty]$, and $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be two von Neumann algebras. Assume there is a metric preserving bijection $\Phi: L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M})_{\alpha}^{\beta} \rightarrow$
$L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{N})_{\alpha}^{\beta}$, i.e.,

$$
\|\Phi(x)-\Phi(y)\|_{p}=\|x-y\|_{p}, \quad \forall x, y \in L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M})_{\alpha}^{\beta} .
$$

(a) $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are $*$-isomorphic.
(b) If $\mathcal{M} \nsubseteq \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ is approximately semifinite, then there is a unique Jordan *-isomorphism $\Theta: \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ satisfying $\Phi(R)=\Theta_{*}\left(R^{p}\right)^{1 / p}$ for any $R \in$ $L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)_{\alpha}^{\beta}$.

Here is the main result in this paper.
Theorem 1.4. Let $p \in(1,+\infty]$, and $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be two von Neumann algebras. Assume there is a surjective map $\varphi: L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{N})$ such that

$$
\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\|_{p}=\|x+y\|_{p}, \quad \forall x, y \in L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M}) .
$$

(a) $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are $*$-isomorphic, and $\varphi$ extends uniquely to a positive surjective real linear isometry $\theta: L_{\mathrm{sa}}^{p}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow L_{\mathrm{sa}}^{p}(\mathcal{N})$.
(b) If $p=+\infty$ then $\varphi$ extends uniquely to a Jordan $*$-isomorphism $J: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$.
(c) If $1<p<+\infty$ and $\mathcal{M}$ is approximately semifinite, then there is a unique Jordan *-isomorphism $\Theta: \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ satisfying $\varphi(R)=\Theta_{*}\left(R^{p}\right)^{1 / p}$ for any $R \in L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M})$.

In the abelian case, every function in $L_{+}^{p}(\mu)$ can be approximated in norm by functions from $L_{+}^{\infty}(\mu)$. However, one of the difficulties in studying noncommutative $L^{p}(\mathcal{M})$ space arises from the fact that $L^{p}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathcal{M}=\{0\}$ when $\mathcal{M}$ is not semifinite. If $\mathcal{M}$ has a faithful semifinite trace $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}$, nevertheless, there is a weak* dense twosided self-adjoint ideal $S_{\mathcal{M}}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ embedded into the noncommutative $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$ space. In other words, the intersection $L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{+}$is reasonably big to represent $\mathcal{M}$, as well as $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$. This motivates us to include the following result in this paper. We note that any one of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ being semifinite suffices to ensure its conclusion due to Theorem 1.4(a).

Theorem 1.5. Let $1<p \leq+\infty$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be two semifinite von Neumann algebras with traces $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\tau_{\mathcal{N}}$, respectively. Suppose that $\varphi: L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{+} \rightarrow$ $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}}\right) \cap \mathcal{N}_{+}$is a surjective map satisfying that

$$
\|x+y\|_{p}=\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\|_{p}, \quad \forall x, y \in L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{+}
$$

Then there exists uniquely a Jordan $*$-isomorphism $J: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ such that

$$
\varphi(x)=J(x) h=h J(x), \quad x \in L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{+} .
$$

Here, $h^{p}=\frac{d \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \circ J^{-1}}{d \tau_{N}}$ is the noncommutative Radon-Nikodym derivative of $\tau_{\mathcal{M}} \circ$ $J^{-1}$ with respect to $\tau_{N}$ when $1<p<+\infty$; and $h=1$ if $p=+\infty$.

In Section 2, we will give a brief description of the construction of noncommutative $L^{p}$-spaces. The proofs of Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 are given in Section 3. We note that, however, neither of Theorems 1.4 nor 1.5 holds when $p=1$, as shown by counter examples. In Section 4, we will provide two concrete examples to demonstrate the case when $p=+\infty$.

## 2. Preliminaries

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a von Neumann algebra, that is, a self-adjoint algebra of operators on a Hilbert space $H$ that is closed in the weak operator topology. A trace on $\mathcal{M}$ is a nonnegative extended real-valued function $\tau$ defined on the positive part $\mathcal{M}_{+}$of $\mathcal{M}$ which satisfies
(1) $\tau(x+y)=\tau(x)+\tau(y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{M}_{+}$;
(2) $\tau(\lambda x)=\lambda \tau(x)$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathcal{M}_{+}$;
(3) $\tau\left(x x^{*}\right)=\tau\left(x^{*} x\right)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$.

If $\tau$ satisfies conditions (1) and (2) but not necessarily (3), then we call it a weight. We say that $\tau$ is normal if $\sup \tau\left(x_{\alpha}\right)=\tau\left(\sup x_{\alpha}\right)$ for any bounded increasing net $\left\{x_{\alpha}\right\}$ in $\mathcal{M}_{+}$, semifinite if for any nonzero $x \in \mathcal{M}_{+}$there is a nonzero $y \in \mathcal{M}_{+}$such that $y \leq x$ and $\tau(y)<+\infty$, and faithful if $\tau(x)=0$ implies $x=0$ for any $x \in \mathcal{M}_{+}$. If $\tau(1)<+\infty$, we say that $\tau$ is finite. A von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$ is said to be finite (resp. semifinite) if it admits a normal finite (resp. semifinite) faithful trace.

Definition 2.1. A von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$ is said to be approximately semifinite [14] if

- there is an increasing family $\left\{\mathcal{M}_{i}\right\}_{i \in \mathfrak{I}}$ of semifinite von Neumann subalgebras of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\bigcup_{i \in \mathfrak{I}} \mathcal{M}_{i}$ is $\sigma\left(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}_{*}\right)$-dense in $\mathcal{M}$, and
- there is a normal conditional expectation $E_{i}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{i}$ with $E_{i}(1)$ being the identity of $\mathcal{M}_{i}$ such that $E_{i} \circ E_{j}=E_{i}$ whenever $i \leq j$ in $\mathfrak{I}$.

The class of approximately semifinite von Neumann algebras includes, in particular, all semifinite algebras, all hyperfinite algebras, and all type $\mathrm{II}_{0}$-factors with separable preduals. See also [8] for more details.

We follow the construction of noncommutative $L^{p}$-spaces demonstrated in [13] and [16]. Let $\mathcal{M}$ denote a semifinite von Neumann algebra on a Hilbert space $H$ with a given normal semifinite faithful trace $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}$. Let $S_{\mathcal{M}}$ be the subset of $\mathcal{M}$ of elements $x$ of finite traces, i.e., $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(|x|)<+\infty$, where $|x|$ denotes the operator $\left(x^{*} x\right)^{1 / 2}$. The set $S_{\mathcal{M}}$ is quite big, as it is a self-adjoint two sided ideal of $\mathcal{M}$ and dense in $\mathcal{M}$ in the strong operator topology. Moreover, it is closed under taking $p$ powers, i.e., $|x|^{p} \in S_{\mathcal{M}}$ whenever $x \in S_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $0<p<+\infty$.

For $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and $1 \leq p<+\infty$, let

$$
\|x\|_{p}=\tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(|x|^{p}\right)^{1 / p}
$$

Then $\|\cdot\|_{p}$ defines a norm on $S_{\mathcal{M}}$. We call the norm completion of $S_{\mathcal{M}}$ the noncommutative $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$ space.

We can identify $L^{\infty}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$ with $\mathcal{M}$ and $L^{1}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$ with the predual $\mathcal{M}_{*}$ of $\mathcal{M}$. The positive cone $L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$ of $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$ is the completion of $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{+}$ under the norm $\|\cdot\|_{p}$. We will write $L^{p}(\mathcal{M})$ if the trace $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}$ is understood.

The situation when $\mathcal{M}$ is not semifinite is far more complicated. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a general von Neumann algebra on a Hilbert space $H$, but not necessarily semifinite. We note that every von Neumann algebra has a normal faithful semifinite weight.

Fix a normal semifinite faithful weight $\phi$ on $\mathcal{M}$. Consider the modular automorphism group $\alpha$ corresponding to $\phi$. There exists a normal faithful semifinite trace $\tau$ on the von Neumann algebra crossed product $\check{\mathcal{M}}:=\mathcal{M} \bar{\rtimes}_{\alpha} \mathbb{R}$ satisfying some compatibility condition with $\phi$. Denote by $L^{0}(\check{\mathcal{M}}, \tau)$ the completion of $\mathcal{M}$ under the vector topology defined by a neighborhood basis at 0 of the form

$$
U(\epsilon, \delta):=\{x \in \check{\mathcal{M}}:\|x p\| \leq \epsilon \text { and } \tau(1-p) \leq \delta, \text { for a projection } p \in \check{\mathcal{M}}\} .
$$

Then the ${ }^{*}$-algebra structure of $\check{\mathcal{M}}$ extends to a ${ }^{*}$-algebra structure of $L^{0}(\check{\mathcal{M}}, \tau)$.
Elements in $L^{0}(\check{\mathcal{M}}, \tau)$ can be regarded as closed densely defined operators on $L^{2}(\mathbb{R} ; H)$. More precisely, let $T$ be a densely defined closed operator on $L^{2}(\mathbb{R} ; H)$ affiliated with $\dot{\mathcal{M}}$, and $|T|$ be its absolute value with spectral projection-valued measure $E_{|T|}$. Then $T$ corresponds uniquely to an element in $L^{0}(\check{\mathcal{M}}, \tau)$ if and only if $\tau\left(1-E_{|T|}([0, \lambda])\right)<\infty$ when $\lambda$ is large. Conversely, every element in $L^{0}(\check{\mathcal{M}}, \tau)$ arises from a closed operator in this way. Under this identification, the *-operation on $L^{0}(\mathscr{\mathcal { M }}, \tau)$ coincides with the adjoint. The addition and the multiplication on $L^{0}(\check{\mathcal{M}}, \tau)$ are the closures of the corresponding operations for closed operators. Denote by $L_{+}^{0}(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ the set of all positive self-adjoint operators in $L^{0}(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$. For $x, y$ in $L^{0}(\check{\mathcal{M}}, \tau)$, we write $x \perp y$ if $|x||y|=0$, i.e., the positive operators have orthogonal support projections.

The dual action $\hat{\alpha}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \operatorname{Aut}(\check{\mathcal{M}})$ extends to an action on $L^{0}(\check{\mathcal{M}}, \tau)$. For any $p \in[1, \infty]$, we set

$$
L^{p}(\mathcal{M}):=\left\{T \in L^{0}(\check{\mathcal{M}}, \tau): \hat{\alpha}_{s}(T)=e^{-s / p} T \text { for all } s \in \mathbb{R}\right\}
$$

(where, by convention, $e^{-s / \infty}=1$ ). Then $L^{\infty}(\mathcal{M})$ coincides with the subalgebra $\mathcal{M}$ of $\check{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq L^{0}(\check{\mathcal{M}}, \tau)$. Moreover, if $T \in L^{0}(\check{\mathcal{M}}, \tau)$ and $T=u|T|$ is the polar decomposition, then $T \in L^{p}(\mathcal{M})$ if and only if $|T| \in L^{p}(\mathcal{M})$. The product of an element in $L^{\infty}(\mathcal{M})$ with an element in $L^{p}(\mathcal{M})$ (in whatever order) is again in $L^{p}(\mathcal{M})$. Hence, $L^{p}(\mathcal{M})$ is canonically an $\mathcal{M}$-bimodule. Let $L_{\mathrm{sa}}^{p}(\mathcal{M})$ denote the set of all self-adjoint operators in $L^{p}(\mathcal{M})$ and put $L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M}):=L^{p}(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_{+}^{0}(\check{\mathcal{M}}, \tau)$.

When $p \in(0, \infty)$, the Mazur map

$$
S \mapsto S^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad\left(S \in L_{+}^{0}(\check{\mathcal{M}}, \tau)\right)
$$

restricts to a bijection from $L_{+}^{1}(\mathcal{M})$ onto $L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M})$. Elements in $L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M})$ are identified with $S^{\frac{1}{p}}$ for a unique element $S \in L_{+}^{1}(M)$. When $p \in(1, \infty)$, the function

$$
\|T\|_{p}:=\left\||T|^{p}\right\|_{1}^{1 / p}
$$

is a norm on $L^{p}(\mathcal{M})$, and $\left(L^{p}(\mathcal{M}), L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M})\right)$ becomes an ordered Banach space.
It is known that $\left(L^{p}(\mathcal{M}), L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M})\right)$ is independent of the choice of the faithful semifinite weight $\phi$ up to an isometric order isomorphism (see, e.g., Theorem 37 and Corollary 38 in Chapter II of [16]). If $\mathcal{M}$ is semifinite with a faithful normal semifinite trace $\phi=\tau_{\mathcal{M}}$, then the above two constructions of noncommutative $L^{p}(\mathcal{M})$ space will be isometrically and order isomorphic to each other. In this paper, we usually write $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$ even when $\mathcal{M}$ is not semifinite; in this case, we refer to the Haagerup trace norm $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot)=\|\cdot\|_{1}$ instead.

## 3. Norm of positive sum preservers

All noncommutative $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$ spaces are uniformly convex and uniformly smooth with dual space $L^{q}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$ for $p, q \in(1, \infty)$ with $1 / p+1 / q=1$. In particular, the following result holds for general von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 3.1 ([7, Lemma 3.1]). If $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto h(t) \in L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right), 1<p<+\infty$, is differentiable (with respect to the $L_{p}$-norm) at $t=\alpha$ and $h(\alpha) \neq 0$, then $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto$ $\tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(h(t)^{p}\right) \in \mathbb{R}_{+}$is differentiable at $\alpha$ and its derivative is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{d}{d t}\right|_{t=\alpha} \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(h(t)^{p}\right)=p \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\left.h(\alpha)^{p-1} \frac{d}{d t}\right|_{t=\alpha} h(t)\right) . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

While it always holds that

$$
\|x \pm y\|_{p}^{p}=\|x\|_{p}^{p}+\|y\|_{p}^{p} \quad \text { whenever } \quad x, y \in L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \text { such that } x \perp y
$$

we also have a converse.
Lemma 3.2 ([7, Corollary 6.5]; see also [13, Proposition A.2]). Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a von Neumann algebra and $1<p<+\infty$. For any $x, y \in L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$, we have

$$
\|x+y\|_{p}^{p}=\|x\|_{p}^{p}+\|y\|_{p}^{p} \quad \text { if and only if } \quad x y=0
$$

Lemma 3.3. Let $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be two von Neumann algebras and $1<p<+\infty$. Suppose that $\varphi: L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \rightarrow L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}}\right)$ is a surjective map satisfying that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|x+y\|_{p}=\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\|_{p} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then we have
(1) $\varphi$ preserves orthogonality, that is $x y=0$ if and only if $\varphi(x) \varphi(y)=0$.
(2) $\varphi$ is additive and nonnegative homogeneous, i.e.
(i) $\varphi\left(y_{1}+y_{2}\right)=\varphi\left(y_{1}\right)+\varphi\left(y_{2}\right)$ for all $y_{1}, y_{2} \in L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$;
(ii) $\varphi(\lambda y)=\lambda \varphi(y)$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$ and $y \in L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$.

Proof. (1) Taking $x=y$ in equation (3.2), one has $\|x\|_{p}=\|\varphi(x)\|_{p}$. Hence, from Lemma 3.2,

$$
\begin{aligned}
x y=0 & \Leftrightarrow\|x+y\|_{p}^{p}=\|x\|_{p}^{p}+\|y\|_{p}^{p} \\
& \Leftrightarrow\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\|_{p}^{p}=\|\varphi(x)\|_{p}^{p}+\|\varphi(y)\|_{p}^{p} \\
& \Leftrightarrow \varphi(x) \varphi(y)=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

(2) To see $\varphi$ is nonnegative homogeneous, for $\lambda>0$ we observe that

$$
\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(\lambda x)\|_{p}=\|x+\lambda x\|_{p}=\|x\|_{p}+\|\lambda x\|_{p}=\|\varphi(x)\|_{p}+\|\varphi(\lambda x)\|_{p}
$$

From the strictly convexity of $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$, we have $\varphi(\lambda x)=\delta \varphi(x)$ for some $\delta>0$. Then $\lambda\|x\|_{p}=\|\varphi(\lambda x)\|_{p}=\|\delta \varphi(x)\|_{p}=\delta\|x\|_{p}$, we get $\delta=\lambda$, and thus $\varphi(\lambda x)=$ $\lambda \varphi(x)$ for all $x$ in $L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$ and for all $\lambda \geq 0$.

To see $\varphi$ is additive, we observe again that $\|\varphi(x)+t \varphi(y)\|_{p}=\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(t y)\|_{p}=$ $\|x+t y\|_{p}$ for all $t \geq 0$. Using Lemma 3.1 and setting $h(t)=x+t y$, we have

$$
\left.\frac{d\|x+t y\|_{p}^{p}}{d t}\right|_{t=0^{+}}=\left.\frac{d \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(h(t)^{p}\right)}{d t}\right|_{t=0^{+}}=p \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(x^{p-1} y\right)
$$

Hence, differentiating both sides of $\|x+t y\|_{p}^{p}=\|\varphi(x)+t \varphi(y)\|_{p}^{p}$ with respect to $t$ at 0 , we have

$$
\tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(x^{p-1} y\right)=\tau_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\varphi(x)^{p-1} \varphi(y)\right) .
$$

It follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tau_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\varphi(x)^{p-1}\left(\varphi\left(y_{1}+y_{2}\right)-\varphi\left(y_{1}\right)-\varphi\left(y_{2}\right)\right)\right) \\
= & \tau_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\varphi(x)^{p-1}\left(\varphi\left(y_{1}+y_{2}\right)\right)\right)-\tau_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\varphi(x)^{p-1} \varphi\left(y_{1}\right)\right)-\tau_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\varphi(x)^{p-1} \varphi\left(y_{2}\right)\right) \\
= & \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(x^{p-1}\left(y_{1}+y_{2}\right)\right)-\tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(x^{p-1} y_{1}\right)-\tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(x^{p-1} y_{2}\right)=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\varphi$ is surjective, choosing $\varphi(x)=\left[\varphi\left(y_{1}+y_{2}\right)-\varphi\left(y_{1}\right)-\varphi\left(y_{2}\right)\right]^{+}$, the positive part of $\varphi\left(y_{1}+y_{2}\right)-\varphi\left(y_{1}\right)-\varphi\left(y_{2}\right)$, we get $\left\|\left[\varphi\left(y_{1}+y_{2}\right)-\varphi\left(y_{1}\right)-\varphi\left(y_{2}\right)\right]^{+}\right\|_{p}^{p}=0$ since the positive part and the negative part of $\varphi\left(y_{1}+y_{2}\right)-\varphi\left(y_{1}\right)-\varphi\left(y_{2}\right)$ are orthogonal. Hence, the positive part of $\varphi\left(y_{1}+y_{2}\right)-\varphi\left(y_{1}\right)-\varphi\left(y_{2}\right)$ is 0 . Similarly, the negative part is also 0 , and therefore $\varphi\left(y_{1}+y_{2}\right)=\varphi\left(y_{1}\right)+\varphi\left(y_{2}\right)$.

Theorem 3.4. Let $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be two von Neumann algebras and $1<p<+\infty$. Suppose that $\varphi: L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \rightarrow L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}}\right)$ is a surjective map satisfying that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|x+y\|_{p}=\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\|_{p} . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then there exists a unique surjective complex linear map $\omega: L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \rightarrow L^{p}\left(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}}\right)$ extending $\varphi$. Moreover, its restriction defines a surjective positive real linear isometry $\theta: L_{\mathrm{sa}}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \rightarrow L_{\mathrm{sa}}^{p}\left(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}}\right)$.

Proof. Observe that for any $x, y \in L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$, we have $x-y=(x-y)^{+}-(x-y)^{-}$, and thus $(x-y)^{+}+y=(x-y)^{-}+x$. Since $\varphi$ is additive by Lemma 3.3, we have $\varphi\left((x-y)^{+}\right)+\varphi(y)=\varphi\left((x-y)^{-}\right)+\varphi(x)$. This gives $\varphi(x)-\varphi(y)=\varphi\left((x-y)^{+}\right)-$ $\varphi\left((x-y)^{-}\right)$. Since $(x-y)^{+} \perp(x-y)^{-}$, we have $\varphi\left((x-y)^{+}\right) \perp \varphi\left((x-y)^{-}\right)$by Lemma 3.3 again. It follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\varphi(x)-\varphi(y)\|_{p}^{p} & =\left\|\varphi\left((x-y)^{+}\right)-\varphi\left((x-y)^{-}\right)\right\|_{p}^{p}=\left\|\varphi\left((x-y)^{+}\right)+\varphi\left((x-y)^{-}\right)\right\|_{p}^{p} \\
& =\left\|(x-y)^{+}+(x-y)^{-}\right\|_{p}^{p}=\|x-y\|_{p}^{p}, \quad \forall x, y \in L_{+}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

That is, $\varphi$ preserves norm of differences.
For $x \in L_{\mathrm{sa}}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$, we define

$$
\theta(x)=\varphi\left(x^{+}\right)-\varphi\left(x^{-}\right) .
$$

It follows from Lemma 3.3 that $\theta$ is well-defined and real linear. Moreover, $\theta(x) \perp \theta(y)$ if $x \perp y$. Furthermore,

$$
\|\theta(x)\|_{p}=\left\|\varphi\left(x^{+}\right)-\varphi\left(x^{-}\right)\right\|_{p}=\left\|x^{+}-x^{-}\right\|_{p}=\|x\|_{p} .
$$

Thus, $\theta$ is a positive real linear isometry from $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)_{\text {sa }}$ onto $L_{\text {sa }}^{p}\left(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}}\right)$ extending $\varphi$.

For any $x \in L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$, we write $x=\frac{x+x^{*}}{2}+i \frac{x-x^{*}}{2 i}:=x_{1}+i x_{2}$, where $x_{1}, x_{2}$ are self-adjoint elements in $L_{\mathrm{sa}}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$. Define

$$
\omega\left(x_{1}+i x_{2}\right)=\theta\left(x_{1}\right)+i \theta\left(x_{2}\right) .
$$

It is easy to check that

$$
\omega(x+y)=\omega(x)+\omega(y), \quad \omega(\lambda x)=\lambda \omega(x),
$$

for all $x=x_{1}+i x_{2}, y=y_{1}+i y_{2}$ in $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$ and $\lambda=a+i b$ in $\mathbb{C}$. The uniqueness of $\theta$ and $\omega$ is plain.

Note again that for any von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$, we have $L^{\infty}(\mathcal{M}) \cong \mathcal{M}$ and $L^{1}(\mathcal{M}) \cong \mathcal{M}_{*}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. The case $p=+\infty$ can be derived from a result of Molnár [10, Theorem 2.7] which states that every surjective norm of sum preserver $\varphi$ : $\mathcal{M}_{+} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{+}$extends uniquely to a Jordan $*$-isomorphism $J: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$.

For the case $1<p<+\infty$, by Theorem 3.4 we see in particular that $\varphi$ extends to a bijection from the positive unit ball $L_{+}^{1}(\mathcal{M})_{0}^{1}$ of $L_{+}^{1}(\mathcal{M})$ onto the positive unit ball $L_{+}^{1}(\mathcal{N})_{0}^{1}$ of $L_{+}^{1}(\mathcal{N})$ such that $\|\varphi(x)-\varphi(y)\|_{p}=\|x-y\|_{p}$ for all $x, y$ in $L_{+}^{1}(\mathcal{M})_{0}^{1}$. If $\mathcal{M}$ is not one-dimensional, then the assertions follow from Theorem 1.3.

Finally, when $\mathcal{M}=\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{C}$, we have

$$
L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)=L^{p}(\mathbb{C}, \mu) \quad \text { and } \quad L^{p}\left(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}}\right)=L^{p}(\mathbb{C}, \nu)
$$

for some positive measures $\mu$ and $\nu$ on $\mathbb{C}$. The assertions follow from our previous results for the abelian case, namely, Theorem 1.2, and the discussion after it.

When $p=1$, we have a counter example in [17, Example 4.1]. There we have a norm of positive sum preserver of the commutative $\ell_{n}^{1}=L^{1}\left(\ell_{n}^{\infty}\right)$ space associated to the $n$-dimensional abelian von Neumann algebra $\ell_{n}^{\infty}$ with $n \geq 2$, which is neither affine nor continuous. See also Example 3.8 for a noncommutative counter example.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Arguing as in Lemma 3.3 and noticing that all operations are done inside the domain $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{+}$and range $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}}\right) \cap \mathcal{N}_{+}$of $\varphi$, we have again the same conclusions there. More precisely, we have
(1) $\varphi$ preserves orthogonality, that is, $x y=0$ if and only if $\varphi(x) \varphi(y)=0$;
(2) $\varphi$ is additive and nonnegative homogeneous, that is,
(i) $\varphi(x+y)=\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)$;
(ii) $\varphi(\lambda y)=\lambda \varphi(y)$;
(3) $\varphi$ preserves metric, that is, $\|\varphi(x)-\varphi(y)\|_{p}=\|x-y\|_{p}$;
where $x, y \in L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{+}$and $\lambda \geq 0$.
We extend the domain of $\varphi$ from $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{+}$to $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{\text {sa }}$ by defining

$$
\theta(x)=\varphi\left(x^{+}\right)-\varphi\left(x^{-}\right), \quad \forall x \in L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{sa}} .
$$

It follows from the fact $\theta\left(x^{+}\right)=\theta(x)^{+}$that $\theta$ also preserves the metric, i.e.,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\theta(x)-\theta(y)\|_{p}^{p} & =\left\|\theta(x-y)^{+}-\theta(x-y)^{-}\right\|_{p}^{p}=\left\|\theta(x-y)^{+}\right\|_{p}^{p}+\left\|\theta(x-y)^{-}\right\|_{p}^{p} \\
& =\left\|(x-y)^{+}\right\|_{p}^{p}+\left\|(x-y)^{-}\right\|_{p}^{p}=\|x-y\|_{p}^{p},
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $x, y$ in $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{sa}}$. In particular, $\varphi$ can be extended to a surjective real linear isometry from $L_{\mathrm{sa}}^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right)$ onto $L_{\mathrm{sa}}^{p}\left(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}}\right)$, and thus provides a surjective metric preserving map between their positive unit balls. Then Theorem 1.4 applies.

In particular, there is a unique Jordan $*$-isomorphism $\Theta: \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ satisfying that $\varphi(R)=\Theta_{*}\left(R^{p}\right)^{1 / p}$ for any $R \in L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M})$.

Let $J=\Theta^{-1}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ and let $h=\left(\frac{d \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \circ \Theta}{d \tau_{N}}\right)^{1 / p}$ be the $1 / p$ th power of the non-commutative Radon-Nikodym derivative of $\tau_{\mathcal{M}} \circ \Theta$ with respect to $\tau_{\mathcal{N}}$ (see, e.g., [12, Theorem 5.12]). Note that the unbounded operator $h$ is affiliated with $\mathcal{N}$, and commutes with all elements in $\mathcal{N}$. Then for all $x$ in $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}+$ we have

$$
\tau_{\mathcal{N}}\left((J(x) h)^{p} y\right)=\tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(x^{p} \Theta(y)\right)=\tau_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\Theta_{*}\left(x^{p}\right) y\right)=\tau_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\varphi(x)^{p} y\right),
$$

for all $y \in L^{\infty}\left(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}}\right)_{+}=\mathcal{N}_{+}$. Thus $\varphi(x)=J(x) h$ for all $x$ in $L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{+}$ as asserted.

Corollary 3.5. Assume $\mathcal{M}$ is a factor and $1<p<+\infty$. Suppose $\varphi: L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap$ $\mathcal{M}_{+} \rightarrow L^{p}\left(\mathcal{N}, \tau_{\mathcal{N}}\right) \cap \mathcal{N}_{+}$is a surjective map satisfying that $\|x+y\|_{p}=\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\|_{p}$ for all $x, y \in L^{p}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{+}$. Then there is a $*$-algebra isomorphism or antiisomorphism $J$ of $\mathcal{M}$ onto $\mathcal{N}$ and a positive scalar $\lambda$ such that $\varphi=\lambda J$.

Proof. The assertion follows from Theorem 1.5 and well-known facts on Jordan *-isomorphisms (cf. [6]).

Corollary 3.6. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a finite factor with a normal faithful finite trace $\tau$. Let $\varphi$ be a transformation from $L^{p}(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ onto itself satisfying that $\varphi\left(\mathcal{M}_{+}\right)=\mathcal{M}_{+}$and $\|x+y\|_{p}=\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\|_{p}$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{M}_{+}$. Then the restriction of $\varphi$ to $\mathcal{M}$ is either $a *$-algebra isomorphism or anti-isomorphism of $\mathcal{M}$.

Corollary 3.7. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a type I factor with the canonical trace $\tau$, and let $\varphi$ be a transformation from $L^{p}(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ onto itself satisfying that $\varphi\left(L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M}, \tau)\right)=L_{+}^{p}(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ and $\|x+y\|_{p}=\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\|_{p}$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{M}_{+}$. Then there exists a $*$-algebra isomorphism or anti-isomorphism $\Phi$ of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\varphi(x)=\Phi(x)$ for every $x \in$ $L^{p}(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$.

Example 3.8. For the case $p=1$, Theorem 1.5 may not hold. For example, let $\varphi: L^{1}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{+} \rightarrow L^{1}\left(\mathcal{M}, \tau_{\mathcal{M}}\right) \cap \mathcal{M}_{+}$satisfy that $\varphi(x)=u_{r} x u_{r}^{*}$, where $\|x\|_{1}=r$ and $u_{r}$ is a randomly chosen unitary element in $\mathcal{M}$ associated with each $r \geq 0$. Clearly, $\varphi$ is surjective. Moreover,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\|_{1} & =\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\varphi(x))+\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(\varphi(y))=\tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(u_{\|x\|} x u_{\|x\|}^{*}\right)+\tau_{\mathcal{M}}\left(u_{\|y\|} y u_{\|y\|}^{*}\right) \\
& =\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(x)+\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(y)=\tau_{\mathcal{M}}(x+y)=\|x+y\|_{1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

However, $\varphi$ does not carry the form stated in Theorem 1.5.

## 4. Two examples when $p=+\infty$

In this section, two examples of norm of positive sum preservers are provided for the case $p=+\infty$. We verify the details by direct arguments.

Example 4.1. Consider the two dimensional abelian von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}=$ $\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{C} \oplus_{\infty} \mathbb{C}$. Suppose $\varphi: \mathbb{R}_{+} \oplus_{\infty} \mathbb{R}_{+} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{+} \oplus_{\infty} \mathbb{R}_{+}$is a map satisfying $\|x+y\|_{\infty}=$
$\|\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)\|_{\infty}$ for all $x, y$ in $\mathbb{R}_{+} \oplus_{\infty} \mathbb{R}_{+}$. We show directly that $\varphi(x)=U x$ where $U$ is a permutation; namely, $\varphi$ assumes either the form

$$
\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right) \mapsto\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right) \quad \text { or } \quad\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right) \mapsto\left(y_{1}, x_{1}\right) .
$$

Proof. It is easy to see that $\varphi((0,0))=(0,0)$ and $\|x\|_{\infty}=\|\varphi(x)\|_{\infty}$ for all $x$ in $\mathbb{R}_{+} \oplus_{\infty} \mathbb{R}_{+}$.

Claim 1: Either the case $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, 0\right)\right)=\left(x_{1}, 0\right)$ and $\varphi\left(\left(0, x_{1}\right)\right)=\left(0, x_{1}\right)$, or the case $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, 0\right)\right)=\left(0, x_{1}\right)$ and $\varphi\left(\left(0, x_{1}\right)\right)=\left(x_{1}, 0\right)$ holds for all $x_{1} \geq 0$.

Suppose that $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, 0\right)\right)=\left(x_{1}^{\prime}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and $\varphi\left(\left(0, x_{1}\right)\right)=\left(x_{2}^{\prime}, y_{2}^{\prime}\right)$. We have

$$
\max \left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right\}=\max \left\{x_{2}^{\prime}, y_{2}^{\prime}\right\}=\max \left\{x_{1}^{\prime}+x_{2}^{\prime}, y_{1}^{\prime}+y_{2}^{\prime}\right\}=x_{1} .
$$

If $x_{1}^{\prime}=x_{1}$, then $x_{2}^{\prime}=0, y_{2}^{\prime}=x_{1}$ and $y_{1}^{\prime}=0$. The other case arises when $x_{2}^{\prime}=x_{1}$.
Claim 2: $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, x_{1}\right)\right)=\left(x_{1}, x_{1}\right)$ for all $x_{1} \geq 0$.
Suppose that $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, x_{1}\right)\right)=\left(x_{1}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ in which $y_{1}^{\prime}<x_{1}$. If $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, 0\right)\right)=\left(x_{1}, 0\right)$ and $\varphi\left(\left(0, x_{1}\right)\right)=\left(0, x_{1}\right)$, one gets $\left\|\left(x_{1}, x_{1}\right)+(0,1)\right\|_{\infty}=\left\|\left(x_{1}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right)+(0,1)\right\|_{\infty}$. Thus, $x_{1}+1=y_{1}^{\prime}+1$, which is a contradiction. If $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, 0\right)\right)=\left(0, x_{1}\right)$ and $\varphi\left(\left(0, x_{1}\right)\right)=$ $\left(x_{1}, 0\right)$, one gets $\left\|\left(x_{1}, x_{1}\right)+(1,0)\right\|_{\infty}=\left\|\left(x_{1}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right)+(0,1)\right\|_{\infty}$. This gives again the contradiction $x_{1}+1=y_{1}^{\prime}+1$.

The same argument also removes the case $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, x_{1}\right)\right)=\left(x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{1}\right)$ such that $x_{1}^{\prime}<$ $x_{1}$. Since $\left\|\varphi\left(x_{1}, x_{1}\right)\right\|_{\infty}=x_{1}$, we verify the claim.

Set
$A=\left\{\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right): x_{1}>0, y_{1}>0, x_{1}>y_{1}\right\}, \quad B=\left\{\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right): x_{1}>0, y_{1}>0, x_{1}<y_{1}\right\}$.
Claim 3: Either $\varphi(A) \subseteq A, \varphi(B) \subseteq B$, or $\varphi(A) \subseteq B, \varphi(B) \subseteq A$.
We prove that $\varphi(A) \subseteq A, \varphi(B) \subseteq B$ when the case $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, 0\right)\right)=\left(x_{1}, 0\right)$ and $\varphi\left(\left(0, x_{1}\right)\right)=\left(0, x_{1}\right)$ ever happens. Suppose on the contrary $\varphi(A) \nsubseteq A$, that is to say $\varphi\left(\left(x_{2}, y_{2}\right)\right)=\left(x_{2}^{\prime}, y_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ for some $x_{2}>y_{2}>0$ and $0 \leq x_{2}^{\prime} \leq y_{2}^{\prime}$. Then one has $y_{2}^{\prime}=x_{2}$. It shows that $\left\|\left(x_{2}, y_{2}\right)+\left(0, x_{2}\right)\right\|_{\infty}=\left\|\left(x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{2}\right)+\left(0, x_{2}\right)\right\|_{\infty}$. Thus, $x_{2}+y_{2}=2 x_{2}$ which conflicts with $x_{2}>y_{2}$. Similarly, $\varphi(B) \subseteq B$ is satisfied under this condition.

Analogously, we have $\varphi(A) \subseteq B, \varphi(B) \subseteq A$ when the case $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, 0\right)\right)=\left(0, x_{1}\right)$ and $\varphi\left(\left(0, x_{1}\right)\right)=\left(x_{1}, 0\right)$ ever holds.

Claim 4: Either $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)\right)=\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)$ or $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)\right)=\left(y_{1}, x_{1}\right)$ for all $\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right) \in$ $\mathbb{R}_{+} \oplus_{\infty} \mathbb{R}_{+}$.

In the case $\varphi(A) \subseteq A$, we can assume that $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)\right)=\left(x_{1}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ where $x_{1}>$ $y_{1}, x_{1}>y_{1}^{\prime}$. It follows that $\left\|\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)+\left(0, x_{1}\right)\right\|_{\infty}=\left\|\left(x_{1}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right)+\left(0, x_{1}\right)\right\|_{\infty}$. Therefore, $y_{1}^{\prime}=y_{1}$. Same argument can be used for the case $\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right) \in B$. This shows that $\varphi\left(\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)\right)=\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)$ for all $\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right) \in \mathbb{R}_{+} \oplus_{\infty} \mathbb{R}_{+}$.

On the other-hand, if $\varphi(A) \subseteq B, \varphi(B) \subseteq A$, similar arguments produce the other desired conclusion.
Example 4.2. Consider the von Neumann algebra $M_{2}$ of $2 \times 2$ complex matrices with positive cone $P_{2}$. Suppose that $\varphi: P_{2} \rightarrow P_{2}$ is a surjective map such that $\|A+B\|_{\infty}=\|\varphi(A)+\varphi(B)\|_{\infty}$ for any positive semidefinite matrices $A, B$ in $P_{2}$.

We show directly that there exists a unitary matrix $U$ such that $\varphi$ assumes either the form

$$
A \mapsto U A U^{*} \quad \text { or } \quad A \mapsto U A^{t} U^{*} .
$$

Proof. Fix $\lambda \geq 0$. Let $A=\left(\begin{array}{cc}\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0\end{array}\right)$ and $B=\left(\begin{array}{ll}0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda\end{array}\right)$. Assume that there are unitary matrices $U, V$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \varphi(A)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
a_{11} & a_{12} \\
a_{21} & a_{22}
\end{array}\right)=U\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\lambda_{1} & 0 \\
0 & \lambda_{2}
\end{array}\right) U^{*} \text { and } \\
& \varphi(B)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
b_{11} & b_{12} \\
b_{21} & b_{22}
\end{array}\right)=V\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\mu_{1} & 0 \\
0 & \mu_{2}
\end{array}\right) V^{*},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $a_{11}, a_{22}, b_{11}, b_{22} \geq 0$, and $a_{21}=\overline{a_{12}}$ and $b_{21}=\overline{b_{12}}$ are complex conjugates.
As $\|\varphi(A)\|_{\infty}=\|\varphi(B)\|_{\infty}=\|\varphi(A)+\varphi(B)\|_{\infty}=\lambda$, computing traces we have

$$
\lambda \leq a_{11}+a_{22} \leq 2 \lambda, \lambda \leq b_{11}+b_{22} \leq 2 \lambda, \quad \text { and } \quad \lambda \leq a_{11}+a_{22}+b_{11}+b_{22} \leq 2 \lambda
$$

Hence, $\lambda_{1}+\lambda_{2}=a_{11}+a_{22}=\lambda$ and $\mu_{1}+\mu_{2}=b_{11}+b_{22}=\lambda$.
Since $\max \left\{\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}\right\}=\max \left\{\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}\right\}=\lambda$, it can be assumed that $\lambda_{1}=\lambda$ and $\lambda_{2}=0$. Furthermore, set $\varphi(B)=U\left(\begin{array}{ll}c_{11} & c_{12} \\ c_{21} & c_{22}\end{array}\right) U^{*}$, where $c_{11}, c_{22} \geq 0$ and $c_{21}=\overline{c_{12}}$. Hence,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \varphi(A)+\varphi(B)=U\left(\begin{array}{cc}
c_{11}+\lambda & c_{12} \\
c_{21} & c_{22}
\end{array}\right) U^{*} \text { with } \\
& \quad\|\varphi(A)+\varphi(B)\|_{\infty}=\frac{c_{11}+c_{22}+\lambda+\sqrt{\left(c_{11}+\lambda-c_{22}\right)^{2}+4 c_{12} c_{21}}}{2}=\lambda
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the trace of the matrix $\varphi(B)$ equals $c_{11}+c_{22}=\mu_{1}+\mu_{2}=\lambda$, we see that $c_{11}=c_{12}=c_{21}=0$ and $c_{22}=\lambda$. Thus, there exists a unitary matrix $U_{\lambda}$ such that

$$
\varphi\left(\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\lambda & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right)\right)=U_{\lambda}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\lambda & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right) U_{\lambda}^{*} \quad \text { and } \quad \varphi\left(\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0 \\
0 & \lambda
\end{array}\right)\right)=U_{\lambda}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0 \\
0 & \lambda
\end{array}\right) U_{\lambda}^{*}
$$

Suppose that for another scalar $0 \leq \mu \leq \lambda$ and the matrix $D=\left(\begin{array}{cc}\mu & 0 \\ 0 & 0\end{array}\right)$, we have $\varphi(D)=U_{\lambda}\left(\begin{array}{ll}d_{11} & d_{12} \\ d_{21} & d_{22}\end{array}\right) U_{\lambda}^{*}$, where $d_{11}, d_{22} \geq 0$ and $d_{21}=\overline{d_{12}}$. Note that

$$
\|\varphi(D)\|_{\infty}=\mu=\left\|\left(\begin{array}{ll}
d_{11} & d_{12} \\
d_{21} & d_{22}
\end{array}\right)\right\|_{\infty}
$$

and observe

$$
\lambda+\mu=\left\|\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\lambda & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\mu & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right)\right\|_{\infty}=\left\|\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\lambda & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{ll}
d_{11} & d_{12} \\
d_{21} & d_{22}
\end{array}\right)\right\|_{\infty} .
$$

The last sum of positive semi-definite matrices attains its norm $\lambda+\mu$ at the unit eigenvector $\binom{1}{0}$. Consequently, $d_{11}=\mu$ and $d_{12}=d_{21}=0$. Moreover, $0 \leq d_{22} \leq \mu$. On the other hand,

$$
\max \{\lambda, \mu\}=\left\|\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0 \\
0 & \lambda
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\mu & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right)\right\|_{\infty}=\left\|\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & 0 \\
0 & \lambda
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\mu & 0 \\
0 & d_{22}
\end{array}\right)\right\|_{\infty}
$$

Hence $d_{22}=0$ since $\mu \leq \lambda$. Therefore,

$$
\varphi\left(\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\mu & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right)\right)=U_{\lambda}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\mu & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right) U_{\lambda}^{*}, \quad \text { whenever } 0 \leq \mu \leq \lambda .
$$

Set $U=U_{\lambda}$ for a very large $\lambda>0$. Then $\varphi\left(\left(\begin{array}{ll}t & 0 \\ 0 & 0\end{array}\right)\right)=U\left(\begin{array}{ll}t & 0 \\ 0 & 0\end{array}\right) U^{*}$ for any $t \in[0, \lambda]$. For any $2 \times 2$ positive semi-definite matrix $A=\left(\begin{array}{ll}a & b \\ b & c\end{array}\right)$, let $\varphi(A)=$ $U\left(\begin{array}{ll}a^{\prime} & b^{\prime} \\ \overline{b^{\prime}} & c^{\prime}\end{array}\right) U^{*}$. Hence,

$$
\left\|\left(\begin{array}{ll}
t & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{ll}
a & b \\
\bar{b} & c
\end{array}\right)\right\|_{\infty}=\left\|\left(\begin{array}{cc}
t & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{cc}
a^{\prime} & b^{\prime} \\
\overline{b^{\prime}} & c^{\prime}
\end{array}\right)\right\|_{\infty}, \quad \forall t \in[0, \lambda] .
$$

It amounts to say that

$$
\begin{equation*}
t+a+c+\sqrt{(t+a-c)^{2}+4 b \bar{b}}=t+a^{\prime}+c^{\prime}+\sqrt{\left(t+a^{\prime}-c^{\prime}\right)^{2}+4 b^{\prime} \overline{b^{\prime}}} \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Differentiating (4.1) with respect to $t$, we get

$$
(t+a-c)^{2}\left(\left(t+a^{\prime}-c^{\prime}\right)^{2}+4 b^{\prime} \bar{b}^{\prime}\right)=\left(t+a^{\prime}-c^{\prime}\right)^{2}\left((t+a-c)^{2}+4 b \bar{b}\right),
$$

or

$$
b^{\prime} \overline{b^{\prime}}(t+a-c)^{2}=b \bar{b}\left(t+a^{\prime}-c^{\prime}\right)^{2} .
$$

Comparing the coefficient of $t^{2}$, we get $b \bar{b}=b^{\prime} \bar{b}^{\prime}$.
In the case when $b=0$, we have $b^{\prime}=0$. Put this into equation (4.1), we have $a=a^{\prime}$ when $t$ is chosen sufficiently large. Using the equation

$$
\left\|\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0 \\
0 & t
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{ll}
a & 0 \\
0 & c
\end{array}\right)\right\|_{\infty}=\left\|\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0 \\
0 & t
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{cc}
a & 0 \\
0 & c^{\prime}
\end{array}\right)\right\|_{\infty},
$$

we can also see $c=c^{\prime}$.
On the other hand, $a-c=a^{\prime}-c^{\prime}$ when $b \neq 0$. In this case, the equation (4.1) ensures that $a+c=a^{\prime}+c^{\prime}$, and thus $a=a^{\prime}$ and $c=c^{\prime}$. Let $b^{\prime}=e^{i \theta_{b}} b$ for some real scalar $\theta_{b}$. It follows from the norm equality

$$
\left\|\left(\begin{array}{cc}
a & b_{1} \\
b_{1} & c
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{cc}
a & b_{2} \\
b_{2} & c
\end{array}\right)\right\|_{\infty}=\left\|\left(\begin{array}{cc}
a & e^{i \theta_{b_{1}} b_{1}} \\
e^{-i \theta_{b_{1}} \overline{b_{1}}} & c
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{cc}
a & e^{i \theta_{b_{2}}} b_{2} \\
e^{-i \theta_{b_{2}} \overline{b_{2}}} & c
\end{array}\right)\right\|_{\infty}
$$

that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2 a+2 c+\sqrt{4(a-c)^{2}+4\left(b_{1}+b_{2}\right)\left(\overline{b_{1}}+\overline{b_{2}}\right)} \\
= & 2 a+2 c+\sqrt{4(a-c)^{2}+4\left(e^{i \theta_{b_{1}}} b_{1}+e^{i \theta_{b_{2}}} b_{2}\right)\left(e^{-i \theta_{b_{1}} \overline{b_{1}}}+e^{-i \theta_{b_{2}} \overline{b_{2}}}\right)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

It forces both $b_{1} \overline{b_{2}}$ and $e^{i\left(\theta_{b_{1}}-\theta_{b_{2}}\right)} b_{1} \overline{b_{2}}$ have the same real parts.
Replacing $U$ by the unitary $U\left(\begin{array}{cc}1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i \theta_{1}}\end{array}\right)$, we can assume $e^{i \theta_{1}}=1$.

We discuss in two situations. The first case is for $e^{i \theta_{i}}=-1$, and we claim that $e^{i \theta_{b}} b=\bar{b}$ for all $b$ in this situation. To this end, setting $\left(b_{1}, b_{2}\right)=(b, 1)$ and $(b, i)$ respectively, we observe the real parts of complex numbers

$$
\operatorname{Re} b=\operatorname{Re} e^{i \theta_{b}} b \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{Re}(-i b)=\operatorname{Re}\left(-i e^{i\left(\theta_{b}-\pi\right)} b\right)=\operatorname{Re}\left(i e^{i \theta_{b}} b\right) .
$$

It follows that $e^{i \theta_{b}} b=\bar{b}$ as claimed.
The second case is for $e^{i \theta_{i}} \neq-1$, and we claim that $e^{i \theta_{b}}=1$ for all $b$ in this situation. Setting $\left(b_{1}, b_{2}\right)=(b, 1)$ and $(b, i)$ respectively, we observe the real parts of complex numbers

$$
\operatorname{Re} b=\operatorname{Re} e^{i \theta_{b}} b \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{Re}(-i b)=\operatorname{Re}\left(-i e^{i\left(\theta_{b}-\theta_{i}\right)} b\right) .
$$

If $e^{i \theta_{b}} \neq 1$ then $e^{i \theta_{b}} b=\bar{b}$, and thus $\operatorname{Re}(-i b)=\operatorname{Re}\left(-i e^{-i \theta_{i}} \bar{b}\right) \neq-\operatorname{Re}(-i \bar{b})$. This contradiction shows that $e^{i \theta_{b}}=1$ for all $b$ as claimed.

Therefore, we have either

$$
\varphi\left(\left(\begin{array}{ll}
a & b \\
\bar{b} & c
\end{array}\right)\right)=U\left(\begin{array}{ll}
a & b \\
\bar{b} & c
\end{array}\right) U^{*} \quad \text { or } \quad U\left(\begin{array}{ll}
a & \bar{b} \\
b & c
\end{array}\right) U^{*}
$$

That is to say, for any three $2 \times 2$ positive semi-definite matrices $A_{1}, A_{2}, A_{3}$, we can choose a large enough $\lambda$ (depending on $A_{1}, A_{2}, A_{3}$ ) such that either

$$
\varphi\left(A_{j}\right)=U_{\lambda} A_{j} U_{\lambda}^{*} \quad \text { or } \quad \varphi\left(A_{j}\right)=U_{\lambda} A_{j}^{\mathrm{t}} U_{\lambda}^{*}, \quad \forall j=1,2,3 .
$$

This implies that $\varphi$ is affine and preserves squares on the positive semi-definite cone $P_{2}$ of $M_{2}$. It then extends to a nonzero linear map from $M_{2}$ into $M_{2}$ sending projections to projections, and thus a Jordan homomorphism. The assertion then follows from known facts about Jordan $*$-homomorphisms of matrices.
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