

# Boundaries for operator systems

Craig Kleski

University of Virginia

Banach Algebras 2011 at Waterloo

# Boundaries for function spaces

Let  $X$  be a compact Hausdorff space and let  $M$  be a linear, separating, uniformly closed subspace of  $C(X)$  which contains constants. A *boundary* for  $M$  is a subset  $Y$  of  $X$  such that for any  $f \in M$ , there exists  $y \in Y$  such that  $\|f\| = |f(y)|$ . This definition is due to Bishop (1959).

# Boundaries for function spaces

Let  $X$  be a compact Hausdorff space and let  $M$  be a linear, separating, uniformly closed subspace of  $C(X)$  which contains constants. A *boundary* for  $M$  is a subset  $Y$  of  $X$  such that for any  $f \in M$ , there exists  $y \in Y$  such that  $\|f\| = |f(y)|$ . This definition is due to Bishop (1959).

Example (When  $M$  is a uniform algebra and  $X$  is metrizable)

- The *Shilov boundary* is the smallest closed boundary.

# Boundaries for function spaces

Let  $X$  be a compact Hausdorff space and let  $M$  be a linear, separating, uniformly closed subspace of  $C(X)$  which contains constants. A *boundary* for  $M$  is a subset  $Y$  of  $X$  such that for any  $f \in M$ , there exists  $y \in Y$  such that  $\|f\| = |f(y)|$ . This definition is due to Bishop (1959).

Example (When  $M$  is a uniform algebra and  $X$  is metrizable)

- ▶ The *Shilov boundary* is the smallest closed boundary.
- ▶ The *Choquet boundary* is a minimal boundary. These are the points having a unique representing measure.

# Boundaries for function spaces

Let  $X$  be a compact Hausdorff space and let  $M$  be a linear, separating, uniformly closed subspace of  $C(X)$  which contains constants. A *boundary* for  $M$  is a subset  $Y$  of  $X$  such that for any  $f \in M$ , there exists  $y \in Y$  such that  $\|f\| = |f(y)|$ . This definition is due to Bishop (1959).

Example (When  $M$  is a uniform algebra and  $X$  is metrizable)

- ▶ The *Shilov boundary* is the smallest closed boundary.
- ▶ The *Choquet boundary* is a minimal boundary. These are the points having a unique representing measure.
- ▶ The Choquet boundary is a dense subset of the Shilov boundary.

# Boundaries for function spaces

Let  $X$  be a compact Hausdorff space and let  $M$  be a linear, separating, uniformly closed subspace of  $C(X)$  which contains constants. A *boundary* for  $M$  is a subset  $Y$  of  $X$  such that for any  $f \in M$ , there exists  $y \in Y$  such that  $\|f\| = |f(y)|$ . This definition is due to Bishop (1959).

Example (When  $M$  is a uniform algebra and  $X$  is metrizable)

- ▶ The *Shilov boundary* is the smallest closed boundary.
- ▶ The *Choquet boundary* is a minimal boundary. These are the points having a unique representing measure.
- ▶ The Choquet boundary is a dense subset of the Shilov boundary.

If  $M \subset C(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$  is the disk algebra, then the Choquet boundary is  $\mathbb{T}$ .

# Operator systems

- ▶ A (concrete) *operator system*  $S$  is a unital self-adjoint linear subspace of  $B(H)$ . A linear map  $\phi$  from  $S$  to an operator system  $V$  is called *completely positive* (cp) if for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , whenever  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$  is positive, then

$$\phi^{(n)}((s_{ij})) = \left( \phi(s_{ij}) \right)$$

is also positive in  $M_n(V)$ . If  $\phi$  is also unital, we say  $\phi$  is ucp.

# Operator systems

- ▶ A (concrete) *operator system*  $S$  is a unital self-adjoint linear subspace of  $B(H)$ . A linear map  $\phi$  from  $S$  to an operator system  $V$  is called *completely positive* (cp) if for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , whenever  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$  is positive, then

$$\phi^{(n)}((s_{ij})) = \left( \phi(s_{ij}) \right)$$

is also positive in  $M_n(V)$ . If  $\phi$  is also unital, we say  $\phi$  is ucp.

- ▶ Denote the collection of ucp maps from  $S$  to  $B(H)$  by  $\text{UCP}(S, B(H))$ . When  $H$  is finite-dimensional, these are *matrix states*.



# Boundary ideals and boundary representations

Let  $S$  be a concrete operator system and let  $A = C^*(S)$ .

- ▶ An ideal  $J$  of  $A$  is a *boundary ideal* for  $S$  if the quotient  $A \rightarrow A/J$  is completely isometric on  $S$ . A boundary ideal that contains all other boundary ideals is called the *Shilov ideal* for  $S$ .

# Boundary ideals and boundary representations

Let  $S$  be a concrete operator system and let  $A = C^*(S)$ .

- ▶ An ideal  $J$  of  $A$  is a *boundary ideal* for  $S$  if the quotient  $A \rightarrow A/J$  is completely isometric on  $S$ . A boundary ideal that contains all other boundary ideals is called the *Shilov ideal* for  $S$ .
- ▶ An irreducible representation  $\pi$  of  $A$  is called a *boundary representation* for  $S$  if  $\pi|_S$  extends uniquely, as a ucp map, to all of  $A$  (i.e., the only ucp extension of  $\pi|_S$  is  $\pi$ ). Denote the collection of boundary representations for  $S$  by  $\partial_S$ .

# Boundary ideals and boundary representations

Let  $S$  be a concrete operator system and let  $A = C^*(S)$ .

- ▶ An ideal  $J$  of  $A$  is a *boundary ideal* for  $S$  if the quotient  $A \rightarrow A/J$  is completely isometric on  $S$ . A boundary ideal that contains all other boundary ideals is called the *Shilov ideal* for  $S$ .
- ▶ An irreducible representation  $\pi$  of  $A$  is called a *boundary representation* for  $S$  if  $\pi|_S$  extends uniquely, as a ucp map, to all of  $A$  (i.e., the only ucp extension of  $\pi|_S$  is  $\pi$ ). Denote the collection of boundary representations for  $S$  by  $\partial_S$ .
- ▶ Boundary representations are the analogues of Choquet points in the commutative case.

# Arveson's theorem

The existence of boundary representations was an open problem for almost 40 years.

# Arveson's theorem

The existence of boundary representations was an open problem for almost 40 years.

## Theorem (Arveson, 2006)

*If  $S$  is a separable concrete operator system, then the Shilov ideal for  $S$  is intersection of the kernels of boundary representations. Equivalently, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$ ,*

$$\|(s_{ij})\| = \sup_{\pi \in \partial S} \|\pi^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\|$$

Proof uses some deep disintegration theory.

# Boundaries for operator systems

We can improve this result.

## Theorem (K., 2011)

*Let  $S$  be a separable operator system. Then for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$ ,*

$$\|(s_{ij})\| = \max_{\pi \in \partial_S} \|\pi^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\|$$

In other words, the Choquet boundary is a boundary in the classical sense.

## $C^*$ -convexity

Let  $A$  be a unital  $C^*$ -algebra and let  $\Lambda \subset A$ .

- ▶ A (proper)  $C^*$ -convex combination of  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\} \subset \Lambda$  is a sum of the form

$$a = \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^* a_i x_i$$

where  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\} \subset A$  are invertible and  $\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^* x_i = I$ .

## $C^*$ -convexity

Let  $A$  be a unital  $C^*$ -algebra and let  $\Lambda \subset A$ .

- ▶ A (proper)  $C^*$ -convex combination of  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\} \subset \Lambda$  is a sum of the form

$$a = \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^* a_i x_i$$

where  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\} \subset A$  are invertible and  $\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^* x_i = I$ .

- ▶ The set  $\Lambda$  is  $C^*$ -convex if  $\Lambda$  is closed under  $C^*$ -convex combinations.



# $C^*$ -convexity

Let  $A$  be a unital  $C^*$ -algebra and let  $\Lambda \subset A$ .

- ▶ A (proper)  $C^*$ -convex combination of  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\} \subset \Lambda$  is a sum of the form

$$a = \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^* a_i x_i$$

where  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\} \subset A$  are invertible and  $\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^* x_i = I$ .

- ▶ The set  $\Lambda$  is  $C^*$ -convex if  $\Lambda$  is closed under  $C^*$ -convex combinations.
- ▶ Element  $a$  is called  $C^*$ -extreme if whenever it's written as above, then  $a \sim_u a_i$  for each  $i$ .

## $C^*$ -convexity

Let  $A$  be a unital  $C^*$ -algebra and let  $\Lambda \subset A$ .

- ▶ A (proper)  $C^*$ -convex combination of  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\} \subset \Lambda$  is a sum of the form

$$a = \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^* a_i x_i$$

where  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\} \subset A$  are invertible and  $\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^* x_i = I$ .

- ▶ The set  $\Lambda$  is  $C^*$ -convex if  $\Lambda$  is closed under  $C^*$ -convex combinations.
- ▶ Element  $a$  is called  $C^*$ -extreme if whenever it's written as above, then  $a \sim_u a_i$  for each  $i$ .

### Theorem (Morenz, 1994)

Let  $\Lambda \subset M_n$  be compact and  $C^*$ -convex. Then  $\Lambda$  is the  $C^*$ -convex hull of its  $C^*$ -extreme points.

## Example: Algebraic matricial ranges

Let  $x \in B(H)$  and let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . The  $n^{\text{th}}$  (*algebraic*) *matricial range* of  $x$ , denoted  $W^n(x)$ , is

$$\{\phi(x) : \phi : B(H) \rightarrow M_n, \phi \text{ is ucp}\}$$

$W^n(x)$  is always  $C^*$ -convex.

## Pure ucp maps

A ucp map  $\phi : S \rightarrow B(H)$  is called *pure* if whenever  $\psi : S \rightarrow B(H)$  is another cp map with  $\phi - \psi$  also cp, then there exists  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\psi = t\phi$ .

# Pure ucp maps

A ucp map  $\phi : S \rightarrow B(H)$  is called *pure* if whenever  $\psi : S \rightarrow B(H)$  is another cp map with  $\phi - \psi$  also cp, then there exists  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\psi = t\phi$ .

## Example

- Suppose  $A$  is a unital  $C^*$ -algebra. Then  $\phi : A \rightarrow B(H)$  is pure iff  $\phi$  is a compression of an irreducible representation of  $A$ .

# Pure ucp maps

A ucp map  $\phi : S \rightarrow B(H)$  is called *pure* if whenever  $\psi : S \rightarrow B(H)$  is another cp map with  $\phi - \psi$  also cp, then there exists  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\psi = t\phi$ .

## Example

- ▶ Suppose  $A$  is a unital  $C^*$ -algebra. Then  $\phi : A \rightarrow B(H)$  is pure iff  $\phi$  is a compression of an irreducible representation of  $A$ .
- ▶ Let  $x \in B(H)$  and let  $S = \text{span}\{x, x^*, I\}$ . Then  $\phi : S \rightarrow M_k$  is pure iff  $\phi(x)$  is irreducible and  $C^*$ -extreme in  $W^k(x)$ .

# Pure ucp maps

A ucp map  $\phi : S \rightarrow B(H)$  is called *pure* if whenever  $\psi : S \rightarrow B(H)$  is another cp map with  $\phi - \psi$  also cp, then there exists  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\psi = t\phi$ .

## Example

- ▶ Suppose  $A$  is a unital  $C^*$ -algebra. Then  $\phi : A \rightarrow B(H)$  is pure iff  $\phi$  is a compression of an irreducible representation of  $A$ .
- ▶ Let  $x \in B(H)$  and let  $S = \text{span}\{x, x^*, I\}$ . Then  $\phi : S \rightarrow M_k$  is pure iff  $\phi(x)$  is irreducible and  $C^*$ -extreme in  $W^k(x)$ .
- ▶ Let  $\phi : S \rightarrow M_1 = \mathbb{C}$  be ucp. Then  $\phi$  is pure (i.e. a pure state) iff  $\phi$  is a (linear) extreme point of the state space for  $S$ .

# Pure ucp maps

A ucp map  $\phi : S \rightarrow B(H)$  is called *pure* if whenever  $\psi : S \rightarrow B(H)$  is another cp map with  $\phi - \psi$  also cp, then there exists  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\psi = t\phi$ .

## Example

- ▶ Suppose  $A$  is a unital  $C^*$ -algebra. Then  $\phi : A \rightarrow B(H)$  is pure iff  $\phi$  is a compression of an irreducible representation of  $A$ .
- ▶ Let  $x \in B(H)$  and let  $S = \text{span}\{x, x^*, I\}$ . Then  $\phi : S \rightarrow M_k$  is pure iff  $\phi(x)$  is irreducible and  $C^*$ -extreme in  $W^k(x)$ .
- ▶ Let  $\phi : S \rightarrow M_1 = \mathbb{C}$  be ucp. Then  $\phi$  is pure (i.e. a pure state) iff  $\phi$  is a (linear) extreme point of the state space for  $S$ .

Note: if  $\phi : S \rightarrow B(H)$  is linearly extreme in  $\text{UCP}(S, B(H))$ ,  $\phi$  is not necessarily pure ucp.



# Sketch of proof

Recall:

Theorem (K., 2011)

*Let  $S$  be a separable operator system. Then for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$ ,*

$$\|(s_{ij})\| = \max_{\pi \in \partial S} \|\pi^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\|$$

## Sketch of proof, II

- ▶ For any  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$ , there exists a matrix state realizing the norm of  $(s_{ij})$ .

## Sketch of proof, II

- ▶ For any  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$ , there exists a matrix state realizing the norm of  $(s_{ij})$ .
- ▶ Using Morenz's Krein-Milman theorem, we can find a *pure* matrix state  $\phi$  on  $S$  such that  $\|\phi((s_{ij}))\| = \|(s_{ij})\|$ .

## Sketch of proof, II

- ▶ For any  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$ , there exists a matrix state realizing the norm of  $(s_{ij})$ .
- ▶ Using Morenz's Krein-Milman theorem, we can find a *pure* matrix state  $\phi$  on  $S$  such that  $\|\phi((s_{ij}))\| = \|(s_{ij})\|$ .
- ▶ Every pure ucp map (and in particular, every pure matrix state) has a pure extension to  $C^*(M_n(S))$ . This extension can be written as a compression of a boundary representation. So an extension of  $\phi$  is  $V^*\pi|_S V$ , where  $\pi \in \partial_S$ .

## Sketch of proof, II

- ▶ For any  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$ , there exists a matrix state realizing the norm of  $(s_{ij})$ .
- ▶ Using Morenz's Krein-Milman theorem, we can find a *pure* matrix state  $\phi$  on  $S$  such that  $\|\phi((s_{ij}))\| = \|(s_{ij})\|$ .
- ▶ Every pure ucp map (and in particular, every pure matrix state) has a pure extension to  $C^*(M_n(S))$ . This extension can be written as a compression of a boundary representation. So an extension of  $\phi$  is  $V^*\pi|_S V$ , where  $\pi \in \partial_S$ .
- ▶ Irrep  $\pi$  is equivalent to  $\sigma^{(n)}$ , where  $\sigma$  is an irrep of  $C^*(S)$ , and also a boundary representation for  $S$ . This is a result of Hopenwasser (1973).

## Sketch of proof, II

- ▶ For any  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$ , there exists a matrix state realizing the norm of  $(s_{ij})$ .
- ▶ Using Morenz's Krein-Milman theorem, we can find a *pure* matrix state  $\phi$  on  $S$  such that  $\|\phi((s_{ij}))\| = \|(s_{ij})\|$ .
- ▶ Every pure ucp map (and in particular, every pure matrix state) has a pure extension to  $C^*(M_n(S))$ . This extension can be written as a compression of a boundary representation. So an extension of  $\phi$  is  $V^*\pi|_S V$ , where  $\pi \in \partial_S$ .
- ▶ Irrep  $\pi$  is equivalent to  $\sigma^{(n)}$ , where  $\sigma$  is an irrep of  $C^*(S)$ , and also a boundary representation for  $S$ . This is a result of Hopenwasser (1973).
- ▶ Then
$$\|(s_{ij})\| = \|\phi((s_{ij}))\| \leq \|\pi((s_{ij}))\| = \|\sigma^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\| \leq \|(s_{ij})\|.$$

# Consequences

- ▶ In the commutative case  $M \subseteq C(X)$ , there is a notion of a “peak point” for  $M$ .

# Consequences

- ▶ In the commutative case  $M \subseteq C(X)$ , there is a notion of a “peak point” for  $M$ .
- ▶ Arveson generalized this to irreducible representations: call irreducible representation  $\pi$  of  $C^*(S)$  *peaking for  $S$*  if there exist  $n$  and  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$  such that

$$\|\pi^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\| = \|(s_{ij})\|$$

$$\|\sigma^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\| < \|(s_{ij})\| \text{ for all irreps } \sigma \not\sim_u \pi$$



# Consequences

- ▶ In the commutative case  $M \subseteq C(X)$ , there is a notion of a “peak point” for  $M$ .
- ▶ Arveson generalized this to irreducible representations: call irreducible representation  $\pi$  of  $C^*(S)$  *peaking for  $S$*  if there exist  $n$  and  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$  such that

$$\|\pi^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\| = \|(s_{ij})\|$$

$$\|\sigma^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\| < \|(s_{ij})\| \text{ for all irreps } \sigma \approx_u \pi$$

- ▶ The fact that boundary representations form a boundary when  $S$  is separable makes it clear that in this case, all peaking representations are boundary representations.

# Consequences

- ▶ In the commutative case  $M \subseteq C(X)$ , there is a notion of a “peak point” for  $M$ .
- ▶ Arveson generalized this to irreducible representations: call irreducible representation  $\pi$  of  $C^*(S)$  *peaking for  $S$*  if there exist  $n$  and  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$  such that

$$\|\pi^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\| = \|(s_{ij})\|$$

$$\|\sigma^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\| < \|(s_{ij})\| \text{ for all irreps } \sigma \approx_u \pi$$

- ▶ The fact that boundary representations form a boundary when  $S$  is separable makes it clear that in this case, all peaking representations are boundary representations.
- ▶ In contrast to the commutative case, there are operator algebras with no peaking representations. The operator algebra generated by the unilateral shift on  $\ell^2$  is one such example.

## Strong boundary points

Let  $S$  be a concrete operator system, and let  $A = C^*(S)$ .

- ▶ There are other notions of peaking in the commutative case that have noncommutative analogues, and some of them are boundary representations.

## Strong boundary points

Let  $S$  be a concrete operator system, and let  $A = C^*(S)$ .

- ▶ There are other notions of peaking in the commutative case that have noncommutative analogues, and some of them are boundary representations.
- ▶ Let  $\hat{A}$  be the spectrum of  $A$ , topologized with the hull-kernel topology from the primitive ideal space.

# Strong boundary points

Let  $S$  be a concrete operator system, and let  $A = C^*(S)$ .

- ▶ There are other notions of peaking in the commutative case that have noncommutative analogues, and some of them are boundary representations.
- ▶ Let  $\hat{A}$  be the spectrum of  $A$ , topologized with the hull-kernel topology from the primitive ideal space.
- ▶  $[\pi] \in \hat{A}$  is called a *strong boundary point* if for any open  $U$  containing  $[\pi]$ , there exist  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$  such that  $\|\pi^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\| = \|(s_{ij})\|$  and  $\|\sigma^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\| < \|\pi^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\|$  for all  $\sigma \notin U$ .

# Strong boundary points

Let  $S$  be a concrete operator system, and let  $A = C^*(S)$ .

- ▶ There are other notions of peaking in the commutative case that have noncommutative analogues, and some of them are boundary representations.
- ▶ Let  $\hat{A}$  be the spectrum of  $A$ , topologized with the hull-kernel topology from the primitive ideal space.
- ▶  $[\pi] \in \hat{A}$  is called a *strong boundary point* if for any open  $U$  containing  $[\pi]$ , there exist  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(s_{ij}) \in M_n(S)$  such that  $\|\pi^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\| = \|(s_{ij})\|$  and  $\|\sigma^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\| < \|\pi^{(n)}((s_{ij}))\|$  for all  $\sigma \notin U$ .

## Theorem (K., 2011)

*Every Choquet point for an operator system is a strong boundary point. Thus every separable operator system has a boundary consisting of strong boundary points.*

Thanks!