



On extension of isometries between the positive unit spheres of $c_0(\Gamma)$

Longfa Sun · Yipeng Zhang · Yinghua Sun · Duanxu Dai

Received: 10 March 2023 / Accepted: 15 January 2024 / Published online: 24 January 2024
© The Indian National Science Academy 2024

Abstract Let Γ, Δ be two index sets and let $S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ = \{x = (x_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \in c_0(\Gamma) : \|x\| = 1; x_\gamma \geq 0, \forall \gamma \in \Gamma\}$. In this paper, we show that every surjective isometry $f : S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ \rightarrow S_{c_0(\Delta)}^+$ can be extended to a linear surjective isometry from $c_0(\Gamma)$ onto $c_0(\Delta)$.

Keywords Isometries · Positive unit spheres · $c_0(\Gamma)$ -spaces · Tingley's problem

Mathematics Subject Classification Primary 46B04 · 46B20

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, X, Y denote real Banach spaces, S_X, S_Y denote their unit spheres. A mapping f from X to Y is said to be an isometry if $\|f(x) - f(y)\| = \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in X$. The study on the properties of isometric mappings between Banach spaces has become very active since the important Mazur-Ulam theorem [17] which states that every surjective isometry between real Banach spaces is affine.

In 1972, Mankiewicz [16] first investigated the isometric extension problem and generalized the Mazur-Ulam's theorem as follows: Every surjective isometry between the connected open subsets or the closed convex bodies of two Banach spaces can be extended to whole space as a surjective affine isometry. In 1987, Tingley [30] introduced the isometric extension problem between the unit spheres of two Banach spaces which is nowadays

Communicated by Rahul Roy.

Longfa Sun is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12101234), the Natural Science Foundation of Hebei Province (Grant No. A2022502010), the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant No. 2023MS164) and the China Scholarship Council. Duanxu Dai is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 12126329, 12171266, 12126346), the Natural Science Foundation of Fujian Province of China (Grant No. 2023J01805) and the research start-up fund of Jimei University (Grant No. ZQ2021017).

L. Sun · Y. Zhang · Y. Sun

Hebei Key Laboratory of Physics and Energy Technology, School of Mathematics and Physics, North China Electric Power University, Baoding 071003, China
E-mail: sun.longfa@163.com

Y. Zhang

E-mail: 1903073732@qq.com

Y. Sun

E-mail: 591747581@qq.com

D. Dai (✉)

School of Science, Jimei University, Xiamen 361021, China
E-mail: dduanxu@163.com

called the Tingley's problem: Whether the surjective isometry $f : S_X \rightarrow S_Y$ can be extended to whole space as a linear surjective isometry?

Tingley's problem attracts a large number of mathematicians attention, and many positive answers on this topic have been obtained (see [1–11, 15, 25–29, 31]). Based on a variant Tingley's problem raised by Peralta [23], Leung, Ng and Wong [14] proposed the following isometric extension problem between the positive unit spheres of two ordered Banach spaces.

Problem 1.1 *Let X, Y be two ordered Banach spaces with generating cones, $S_X^+ = \{x \in X : x \geq 0, \|x\| = 1\}$ be the positive unit sphere of X . Suppose that $f : S_X^+ \rightarrow S_Y^+$ is a surjective isometry. Does there exists a linear surjective isometry $\tilde{f} : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $\tilde{f}|_{S_X^+} = f$?*

Recently, there are some positive results about Problem 1.1. For instance, it has positive answer when $X = Y$ is the space $C_p(H)$ of the Schatten p -class operators on a complex Hilbert space H for $p \in [1, \infty]$ (see [18, 19, 21, 22, 24]). For non-commutative L^p -spaces $X = L^p(M)$ and $Y = L^p(N)$ associated with two von Neumann algebras M and N , the case of $p = 1$ was proved by Lau, Ng, Wong and Mori (see [12, 20]), the case of $p = 2$ was proved by Leung, Ng and Wong [13]. In 2021, Leung, Ng and Wong [14] furthermore presented positive answers to Problem 1.1 when X, Y are two classical L^p -spaces with $p \in [1, \infty]$ or X, Y are two $C(K)$ -spaces where K is a compact Hausdorff space.

Let Γ be an index set, $c_0(\Gamma) = \{x = (x_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma} : \forall \delta > 0, \{\gamma : |x_\gamma| \geq \delta\} \text{ is a finite set}\}$. In this paper, we study the isometric extension problem between the positive unit spheres of $c_0(\Gamma)$ spaces, and present another positive answer to Problem 1.1.

2 Main results

Let Γ, Δ be two index sets, $c_0(\Gamma)^+ = \{x = (x_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \in c_0(\Gamma) : x_\gamma \geq 0, \forall \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ be the positive cone of $c_0(\Gamma)$, and $S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ = \{x \in c_0(\Gamma)^+ : \|x\| = 1\}$ be the positive unit sphere of $c_0(\Gamma)$. In this paper, we will prove that every surjective isometry $f : S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ \rightarrow S_{c_0(\Delta)}^+$ can be extended to a linear surjective isometry from $c_0(\Gamma)$ onto $c_0(\Delta)$. To begin with, we present some notations.

For $x \in c_0(\Gamma)^+$ with $\|x\| = 1$, let

$$\begin{aligned} P(x) &= \{y \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ : \|x - y\| = 1\}, \\ I(x) &= \{\gamma \in \Gamma : x_\gamma = 1\}, \\ O(x) &= \{\gamma \in \Gamma : x_\gamma = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, let $e_\gamma = \{\xi_{\gamma'} : \xi_\gamma = 1, \xi_{\gamma'} = 0, \gamma' \neq \gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma\}$.

We first establish some lemmas.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $x \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$, then*

$$P(x) = \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in I(x)} \{y \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ : \alpha \in O(y)\} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{\gamma \in O(x)} \{y \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ : \gamma \in I(y)\} \right).$$

Proof For $x, h \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h \in P(x) &\Leftrightarrow \|x - h\| = 1; \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists \beta \in \Gamma, |(x - h)_\beta| = |x_\beta - h_\beta| = 1, \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists \beta \in \Gamma, \{x_\beta = 1, h_\beta = 0\} \text{ or } \{x_\beta = 0, h_\beta = 1\}, \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists \beta \in \Gamma, \{\beta \in I(x) \cap O(h)\} \text{ or } \{\beta \in O(x) \cap I(h)\}, \\ &\Leftrightarrow h \in \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in I(x)} \{y \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ : \alpha \in O(y)\} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{\gamma \in O(x)} \{y \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ : \gamma \in I(y)\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□



Lemma 2.2 Let $x, y \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$, then $P(x) \subset P(y)$ if and only if $I(x) \subset I(y)$ and $O(x) \subset O(y)$.

Proof The sufficiency follows from Lemma 2.1. We only need to prove the necessity. Suppose, to the contrary, that $I(x) \not\subset I(y)$ or $O(x) \not\subset O(y)$.

Case 1. $I(x) \not\subset I(y)$. Then there exists $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\gamma \in I(x)$ and $\gamma \notin I(y)$. Let $z = \sum_{i \in I(y)} e_i$. Note that $I(y)$ is a finite set, we have $z \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$. It is easy to observe that $z \in P(x)$ but $z \notin P(y)$. This contradicts $P(x) \subset P(y)$.

Case 2. $O(x) \not\subset O(y)$. Then there exists $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\gamma \in O(x)$ and $\gamma \notin O(y)$. Let $z' = \sum_{i \in I(y) \cup \{\gamma\}} e_i$. Since $I(y) \cup \{\gamma\}$ is a finite set, we have $z' \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$. Note that $z' \in P(x)$ but $z' \notin P(y)$. This contradicts $P(x) \subset P(y)$. $\square$

Lemma 2.3 Let $x, y \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$, then $I(x) \cap I(y) = \emptyset$ if and only if there is no $z \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$ such that $P(z) \subset P(x) \cap P(y)$.

Proof " $\Rightarrow$ " Suppose, to the contrary, that $I(x) \cap I(y) \neq \emptyset$. Then we have $z = \frac{1}{2}(x + y) \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$ and $P(z) \subset P(x) \cap P(y)$. This is a contradiction.

" $\Leftarrow$ " Suppose, to the contrary, that there exists $z \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$ such that $P(z) \subset P(x) \cap P(y)$, then $I(z) \subset I(x) \cap I(y)$.

Since $I(x) \cap I(y) = \emptyset$, we have $I(z) = \emptyset$. This contradicts $z \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$. $\square$

Lemma 2.4 Suppose that $f : S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ \rightarrow S_{c_0(\Delta)}^+$ is a surjective isometry, $x, y \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$, then $P(x) \subset P(y)$ if and only if $P(f(x)) \subset P(f(y))$.

Proof Since f is a surjective isometry, we just need to prove that $f(P(x)) = P(f(x))$. For $x \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(P(x)) &= \{f(h) : h \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+, \|x - h\| = 1\}, \\ &= \{f(h) : h \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+, \|f(x) - f(h)\| = 1\} = P(f(x)). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Lemma 2.5 Suppose that $f : S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ \rightarrow S_{c_0(\Delta)}^+$ is a surjective isometry, $x, y \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$, then $I(x) \cap I(y) = \emptyset$ if and only if $I(f(x)) \cap I(f(y)) = \emptyset$.

Proof Note that f is surjective, by Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(x) \cap I(y) = \emptyset &\Leftrightarrow \forall z \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+, P(z) \not\subset P(x) \cap P(y), \\ &\Leftrightarrow \forall f(z) \in S_{c_0(\Delta)}^+, P(f(z)) \not\subset P(f(x)) \cap P(f(y)), \\ &\Leftrightarrow I(f(x)) \cap I(f(y)) = \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Lemma 2.6 Suppose that $f : S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ \rightarrow S_{c_0(\Delta)}^+$ is a surjective isometry, $x \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$, then $I(x) \cup O(x) = \Gamma$ if and only if $I(f(x)) \cup O(f(x)) = \Delta$.

Proof Note that f is surjective, due to Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I(x) \cup O(x) = \Gamma &\Leftrightarrow \text{For any } y \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ \text{ with } P(x) \subset P(y), \text{ we have } y = x, \\ &\Leftrightarrow \text{For any } f(y) \in S_{c_0(\Delta)}^+ \text{ with } P(f(x)) \subset P(f(y)), \\ &\quad \text{we have } f(y) = f(x), \\ &\Leftrightarrow I(f(x)) \cup O(f(x)) = \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Lemma 2.7 Suppose that $f : S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ \rightarrow S_{c_0(\Delta)}^+$ is a surjective isometry, then there exists a unique bijective mapping $\tau : \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$ such that $f(e_\gamma) = e_{\tau(\gamma)}$.



Proof Fix $\gamma \in \Gamma$, for any $\alpha \in \Gamma$, $\alpha \neq \gamma$, we have $I(e_\alpha) \cap I(e_\gamma) = \emptyset$. According to Lemma 2.5, $I(f(e_\alpha)) \cap I(f(e_\gamma)) = \emptyset$. We assert that $I(f(e_\gamma))$ is a singleton subset. Since $f(e_\gamma) \in S_{c_0(\Delta)}^+$, $I(f(e_\gamma)) \neq \emptyset$. Assume that $I(f(e_\gamma))^\# \geq 2$, where $\#$ denotes the cardinality of the set, then there exist $\mu \neq \nu \in I(f(e_\gamma)) \subset \Delta$. Note that $I(e_\mu) \subset I(f(e_\gamma))$, we have $I(e_\mu) \cap I(f(e_\alpha)) = \emptyset$. Due to Lemma 2.5, $I(f^{-1}(e_\mu)) \cap I(e_\alpha) = \emptyset$. Since $f^{-1}(e_\mu) \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$, $I(f^{-1}(e_\mu)) \neq \emptyset$. By the arbitrariness of α , we obtain $I(f^{-1}(e_\mu)) = \{\gamma\}$. Note that $I(e_\mu) \cup O(e_\mu) = \Delta$, by Lemma 2.6, $I(f^{-1}(e_\mu)) \cup O(f^{-1}(e_\mu)) = \Gamma$, this implies that $f^{-1}(e_\mu) = e_\gamma$. By the same argument as above, we have $f^{-1}(e_\nu) = e_\gamma$. This contradicts f^{-1} is injective, and $I(f(e_\gamma))$ is a singleton subset. In the sequel, we will blur the distinction between the element γ and the singleton subset $\{\gamma\}$, and this should not lead to confusion.

For $\gamma \in \Gamma$, define

$$\tau(\gamma) = I(f(e_\gamma)),$$

then $\tau : \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$ is well-defined. Since $I(e_\gamma) \cup O(e_\gamma) = \Gamma$, by Lemma 2.6, $I(f(e_\gamma)) \cup O(f(e_\gamma)) = \Delta$, this implies that

$$f(e_\gamma) = e_{\tau(\gamma)}.$$

In what follows, we will show that τ is bijective. For $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$, we have $I(e_{\gamma_1}) \cap I(e_{\gamma_2}) = \emptyset$. Due to Lemma 2.5, $I(f(e_{\gamma_1})) \cap I(f(e_{\gamma_2})) = \emptyset$, i.e., $\tau(\gamma_1) \neq \tau(\gamma_2)$, this implies that τ is injective. Since f is a surjective isometry, $f^{-1} : S_{c_0(\Delta)}^+ \rightarrow S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$ is also a surjective isometry. By the same argument as above, for $\mu \in \Delta$, define

$$\tau'(\mu) = I(f^{-1}(e_\mu)),$$

then $\tau' : \Delta \rightarrow \Gamma$ is well-defined, and $f^{-1}(e_\mu) = e_{\tau'(\mu)}$. It is easy to observe that $\tau(\tau'(\mu)) = I(f(e_{\tau'(\mu)})) = I(e_\mu) = \mu$, this implies that τ is surjective. The uniqueness of τ is obvious, and the proof is complete. $\square$

Lemma 2.8 Suppose that $f : S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ \rightarrow S_{c_0(\Delta)}^+$ is a surjective isometry, then there exists a unique bijective mapping $\tau : \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$ such that

$$x_\gamma = f(x)_{\tau(\gamma)}, \text{ for all } x \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+, \gamma \in \Gamma.$$

Proof Let $\tau : \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$ be as in Lemma 2.7, and let $x \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$, $\gamma \in \Gamma$. The proof is divided into three cases.

Case 1. $x_\gamma = 1$. Since $\gamma \in I(x)$, $I(e_\gamma) \cap I(x) \neq \emptyset$. According to Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 2.7, we obtain that $I(e_{\tau(\gamma)}) \cap I(f(x)) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, $f(x)_{\tau(\gamma)} = 1 = x_\gamma$.

Case 2. $x_\gamma = 0$. Let $Q(\gamma) = \{y \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ : \gamma \in I(y)\}$ and $Q(\tau(\gamma)) = \{z \in S_{c_0(\Delta)}^+ : \tau(\gamma) \in I(z)\}$. It follows from Case 1 that $Q(\tau(\gamma)) = f(Q(\gamma))$. By the proof of Lemma 2.4, we have $P(f(x)) = f(P(x))$. Since $Q(\gamma) \subset P(x)$, $Q(\tau(\gamma)) = f(Q(\gamma)) \subset f(P(x)) \subset P(f(x))$. Therefore, $f(x)_{\tau(\gamma)} = 0 = x_\gamma$.

Case 3. $x_\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Define

$$y_\alpha = \begin{cases} x_\alpha & \alpha \neq \gamma, \\ 0 & \alpha = \gamma. \end{cases}$$

Then $y = (y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Gamma} \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$ and $y + e_\gamma \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+$. Note that

$$\|y - x\| = x_\gamma, \quad \|y + e_\gamma - x\| = 1 - x_\gamma.$$

Since f is an isometry, we have

$$|(f(y) - f(x))_{\tau(\gamma)}| \leq \|f(y) - f(x)\| = \|y - x\| = x_\gamma,$$

and

$$|(f(y + e_\gamma) - f(x))_{\tau(\gamma)}| \leq \|f(y + e_\gamma) - f(x)\| = \|y + e_\gamma - x\| = 1 - x_\gamma.$$

By Case 1 and Case 2, we have $f(y)_{\tau(\gamma)} = 0$ and $f(y + e_\gamma)_{\tau(\gamma)} = 1$. Therefore, $f(x)_{\tau(\gamma)} = x_\gamma$ and the proof is complete. $\square$

Now, we are ready to show the main result of this paper.

Theorem 2.9 Suppose that $f : S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+ \rightarrow S_{c_0(\Delta)}^+$ is a surjective isometry, then f can be extended to a linear surjective isometry from $c_0(\Gamma)$ onto $c_0(\Delta)$.



Proof For $x \in c_0(\Gamma)^+$, define

$$\bar{f}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x = 0, \\ \|x\| f\left(\frac{x}{\|x\|}\right) & x \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Then $\bar{f} : c_0(\Gamma)^+ \rightarrow c_0(\Delta)^+$ is well-defined. Since f is surjective, $\bar{f}$ is also surjective. In what follows, we show that $\bar{f}$ is an additive isometry.

By Lemma 2.8, there exists a unique bijective mapping $\tau : \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$ such that

$$x_\gamma = f(x)_{\tau(\gamma)}, \text{ for all } x \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+, \gamma \in \Gamma.$$

Let $\vartheta = \tau^{-1} : \Delta \rightarrow \Gamma$, then we have

$$f(x)_\mu = x_{\vartheta(\mu)}, \text{ for all } x \in S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+, \mu \in \Delta.$$

We assert that for every $x \in c_0(\Gamma)^+$, $\mu \in \Delta$, then

$$\bar{f}(x)_\mu = x_{\vartheta(\mu)}.$$

When $x = 0$, it is obviously true. Assume that $x \neq 0$, by the definition of $\bar{f}$, we have

$$\bar{f}(x)_\mu = \|x\| f\left(\frac{x}{\|x\|}\right)_\mu = \|x\| \left(\frac{x}{\|x\|}\right)_{\vartheta(\mu)} = x_{\vartheta(\mu)}.$$

For $x, y \in c_0(\Gamma)^+$, we get

$$\|\bar{f}(x) - \bar{f}(y)\| = \sup_{\mu \in \Delta} |\bar{f}(x)_\mu - \bar{f}(y)_\mu| = \sup_{\mu \in \Delta} |x_{\vartheta(\mu)} - y_{\vartheta(\mu)}| = \|x - y\|,$$

this implies that $\bar{f}$ is an isometry. For every $\mu \in \Delta$, we obtain

$$f(x + y)_\mu = (x + y)_{\vartheta(\mu)} = x_{\vartheta(\mu)} + y_{\vartheta(\mu)} = f(x)_\mu + f(y)_\mu,$$

this implies that $\bar{f}(x + y) = \bar{f}(x) + \bar{f}(y)$. Thus, $\bar{f}$ is an additive isometry.

Note that $c_0(\Gamma)^+$ is the reproducing cone of $c_0(\Gamma)$, i.e., $c_0(\Gamma)^+ - c_0(\Gamma)^+ = c_0(\Gamma)$. For every $x = (x_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \in c_0(\Gamma)$, let $m(\gamma) = \max\{x(\gamma), 0\}$, $n(\gamma) = \max\{-x(\gamma), 0\}$, then $m = (m_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}, n = (n_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \in c_0(\Gamma)^+$ and $x = m - n \in c_0(\Gamma)^+ - c_0(\Gamma)^+ = c_0(\Gamma)$. Define

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \bar{f}(m) - \bar{f}(n),$$

then $\tilde{f} : c_0(\Gamma) \rightarrow c_0(\Delta)$ is well-defined. The additivity of $\tilde{f}$ follows from the additivity of $\bar{f}$. For $x, y \in c_0(\Gamma)$, there exist $m^1, n^1, m^2, n^2 \in c_0(\Gamma)^+$ such that $x = m^1 - n^1, y = m^2 - n^2$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(y)\| &= \|(\bar{f}(m^1) - \bar{f}(n^1)) - (\bar{f}(m^2) - \bar{f}(n^2))\| \\ &= \|(\bar{f}(m^1) + \bar{f}(n^2)) - (\bar{f}(n^1) + \bar{f}(m^2))\| \\ &= \|\bar{f}(m^1 + n^2) - \bar{f}(n^1 + m^2)\| \\ &= \|(m^1 + n^2) - (n^1 + m^2)\| \\ &= \|(m^1 - n^1) - (m^2 - n^2)\| \\ &= \|x - y\|. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\tilde{f}$ is an isometry. Combining with the additivity of $\tilde{f}$, we have $\tilde{f}$ is a linear isometry satisfying

$$\tilde{f}|_{S_{c_0(\Gamma)}^+} = f.$$

It is easy to see that $\tilde{f}$ is surjective. The proof is complete. $\square$



References

1. L. Cheng, Y. Dong, On a generalized Mazur-Ulam question: extension of isometries between unit spheres of Banach spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 377(2011), 464-470.
2. G. Ding, The 1-Lipschitz mapping between the unit spheres of two Hilbert spaces can be extended to a real linear isometry of the whole space, *Sci. China Ser. A* 45(2002)(4), 479-483.
3. G. Ding, The isometric extension problem in the spheres of $\ell_p(\Gamma)$ ($p > 1$) type spaces, *Sci. China Ser. A* 46(2003), 333-338.
4. G. Ding, The representation theorem of onto isometric mappings between two unit spheres of ℓ_∞ -type spaces and the application on isometric extension problem, *Sci. China Ser. A* 47(2004), 722-729.
5. G. Ding, On isometric extension problem between two unit spheres, *Sci. China Ser. A* 52(2009), 2069-2083.
6. F.J. Fernández-Polo, J.J. Garcés, A.M. Peralta, I. Villanueva, Tingley's problem for spaces of trace class operators, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 529(2017), 294-323.
7. F.J. Fernández-Polo, A.M. Peralta, Tingley's problem through the facial structure of an atomic JBW^* -triple, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 455 (2017), 750-760.
8. F.J. Fernández-Polo, A.M. Peralta, On the extension of isometries between the unit spheres of a C^* -algebra and $B(H)$, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc., Ser. B* 5 (2018), 63-80.
9. F.J. Fernández-Polo, A.M. Peralta, On the extension of isometries between the unit spheres of von Neumann algebras, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 466 (2018), 127-143.
10. F.J. Fernández-Polo, A.M. Peralta, Low rank compact operators and Tingley's problem, *Adv. Math.* 338 (2018), 1-40.
11. V. Kadets, M. Martín, Extension of isometries between unit spheres of infinite-dimensional polyhedral Banach spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 396(2012), 441-447.
12. A.T.M. Lau, C.K. Ng, N.C. Wong, Normal states are determined by their facial distances, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* 52 (3)2020, 505-514.
13. C.W. Leung, C.K. Ng, N.C. Wong, Transition probabilities of normal states determine the Jordan structure of a quantum system, *J. Math. Phys.* 57 (2016), 015212.
14. C.W. Leung, C.K. Ng, N.C. Wong, On a variant of Tingley's problem for some function spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 496(2021), 124800.
15. R. Liu, On extension of isometries between unit spheres of $L^\infty(\Gamma)$ -type space and a Banach space E , *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 333 (2007), 959-970.
16. P. Mankiewicz, On extension of isometries in normed linear spaces, *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Ser. Sci. Math. Astron. Phys.* 20 (1972), 367-371.
17. S. Mazur, S. Ulam, Sur les transformations isométriques d'espaces vectoriels normés, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris* 194(1932), 946-948.
18. L. Molnár, G. Nagy, Isometries and relative entropy preserving maps on density operators, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 60(2012), 93-108.
19. L. Molnár, W. Timmermann, Isometries of quantum states, *J. Phys. A, Math. Gen.* 36 (2003), 267-273.
20. M. Mori, Tingley's problem through the facial structure of operator algebras, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 266 (2018), 1281-1298.
21. G. Nagy, Isometries on positive operators of unit norm, *Publ. Math. (Debr.)* 82 (2013), 183-192.
22. G. Nagy, Isometries of spaces of normalized positive operators under the operator norm, *Publ. Math. (Debr.)* 92 (1-2)(2018), 243-254.
23. A.M. Peralta, A survey on Tingley's problem for operator algebras, *Acta Sci. Math.* 84 (1-2) (2018), 81-123.
24. A.M. Peralta, On the unit sphere of positive operators, *Banach J. Math. Anal.* 13 (1) (2019), 91-112.
25. A.M. Peralta, R. Tanaka, A solution to Tingley's problem for isometries between the unit spheres of compact C^* -algebras and JB^* -triples, *Sci. China Math.* 62(2019), 553-568.
26. D. Tan, Extension of isometries on unit sphere of L^∞ , *Taiwanese J. Math.* 15(2011), 819-827.
27. D. Tan, On extension of isometries on the unit spheres of L^p -spaces for $0 < p \leq 1$, *Nonlinear Anal.* 74(2011), 6981-6987.
28. D. Tan, Extension of isometries on the unit sphere of L^p -spaces, *Acta. Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)* 28(2012), 1197-1208.
29. R. Tanaka, Tingley's problem on finite von Neumann algebras, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 451(2017), 319-326.
30. D. Tingley, Isometries of the unit sphere, *Geom. Dedicata* 22 (1987), 371-378.
31. R. Wang, Isometries between the unit spheres of $C_0(\Omega)$ type spaces, *Acta Math. Sci.* 14(1)(1994), 82-89.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.

