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Abstract. Given a positive function on the set of edges of an arbitrary directed graph \( E = (E^0, E^1) \), we define a one-parameter group of automorphisms on the C*-algebra of the graph \( C^*(E) \), and study the problem of finding KMS states for this action. We prove that there are bijective correspondences between KMS states on \( C^*(E) \), a certain class of states on its core, and a certain class of tracial states on \( C_0(E^0) \). We also find the ground states for this action and give some examples.

1. Introduction

Given a directed graph \( E = (E^0, E^1) \), we can associate to it a C*-algebra \( C^*(E) \), and an interesting problem that arises is to find relations between the algebraic properties of the algebra and the combinatorial properties of the graph [?]. One such problem is to determine the set of KMS states for a certain action on the algebra.

Graph algebras are a generalization of Cuntz algebras and Cuntz-Krieger algebras. For the Cuntz algebra, there is a very natural action of the circle, the gauge action, which can be extended to an action of the real line. The KMS states for this action are studied in [?] and later generalized to a more general action of the line, that can be thought of as a generalized gauge action [?]. The same is done for the Cuntz-Krieger algebras [?], [?].

Recently there were similar results proven for the C*-algebra associated to a finite graph. This is done in [?] for an arbitrary finite graph, in [?] for a certain class of finite graphs via groupoid C*-algebras and in [?] for the Toeplitz C*-algebra of the graph.

Our goal is to generalize these results to the case of an arbitrary graph. First we analyze which conditions the restrictions of a KMS state to the core of \( C^*(E) \) and to \( C_0(E^0) \) must satisfy. By using a description of the core as an inductive limit, we can build a KMS state on \( C^*(E) \) from a tracial state on \( C_0(E^0) \) satisfying the conditions found.

In section 2 we review some of the basic definitions and results about graph algebras as well as the description of the core as an inductive limit. In section 3
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we establish the results concerning KMS states, followed by a discussion on ground states in section 4. In section 4 some examples are given.

2. Graph algebras

**Definition 2.1.** A (directed) graph $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ consists of nonempty sets $E^0, E^1$ and functions $r, s: E^1 \to E^0$; an element of $E^0$ is called a vertex of the graph, and an element of $E^1$ is called an edge. For an edge $e$, we say that $r(e)$ is the range of $e$ and $s(e)$ is the source of $e$.

**Definition 2.2.** A vertex $v$ in a graph $E$ is called a source if $r^{-1}(v) = \emptyset$, and is said to be singular if it is either a source, or $r^{-1}(v)$ is infinite.

**Definition 2.3.** A path of length $n$ in a graph $E$ is a sequence $\mu = \mu_1 \mu_2 \ldots \mu_n$ such that $r(\mu_i + 1) = s(\mu_i)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n - 1$. We write $|\mu| = n$ for the length of $\mu$ and regard vertices as paths of length 0. We denote by $E^n$ the set of all paths of length $n$ and $E^* = \cup_{n \geq 0} E^n$. We extend the range and source maps to $E^*$ by defining $s(\mu) = s(\mu_n)$ and $r(\mu) = r(\mu_1)$ if $n \geq 2$ and $s(v) = v = r(v)$ for $n = 0$.

**Definition 2.4.** Given a graph $E$, we define the $C^*$-algebra of $E$ as the universal $C^*$-algebra $C^*(E)$ generated by mutually orthogonal projections $\{p_v\}_{v \in E^0}$ and partial isometries $\{e_v\}_{v \in E^1}$ with mutually orthogonal ranges such that

1. $s_e^* s_e = p_s(e)$;
2. $s_e^* s_e \leq p_r(e)$ for every $e \in E^1$;
3. $p_v = \sum_{e \in r^{-1}(v)} s_e s_e^*$ for every $v \in E^0$ such that $0 < |r^{-1}(v)| < \infty$.

For a path $\mu = \mu_1 \ldots \mu_n$, we denote the composition $s_{\mu_1} \ldots s_{\mu_n}$ by $s_\mu$, and for $v \in E^0$ we define $s_v$ to be the projection $p_v$.

Propositions 2.5, 2.6, 2.8 and 2.9 below are found in [?](as Corollary 1.15, Proposition 2.1, Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 3.3, respectively) in the context of row-finite graphs, but their proofs hold just the same for general graphs as above.

**Proposition 2.5.** For $\alpha, \beta, \mu, \nu \in E^*$ we have

$$(s_\mu s_\nu^*)(s_\alpha s_\beta^*) = \begin{cases} s_{\mu \alpha'} s_{\beta}^* & \text{if } \alpha = \nu \alpha' \\ s_{\mu} s_{\beta}^* & \text{if } \nu = \alpha \nu' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and $C^*(E) = \overline{\text{span}}\{s_\mu s_\nu^* : \mu, \nu \in E^*, s(\mu) = s(\nu)\}$.

**Proposition 2.6.** Let $E$ be a graph. Then there is an action $\gamma$ of $\mathbb{T}$ on $C^*(E)$, called a gauge action, such that $\gamma_z(s_e) = z s_e$ for every $e \in E^1$ and $\gamma_z(p_v) = p_v$ for every $v \in E^0$.

**Definition 2.7.** The core of the algebra $C^*(E)$ is the fixed-point subalgebra for the gauge action, denoted by $C^*(E)^\gamma$.

**Proposition 2.8.** $C^*(E)^\gamma = \overline{\text{span}}\{s_\mu s_\nu^* : \mu, \nu \in E^*, s(\mu) = s(\nu), |\mu| = |\nu|\}$.

**Proposition 2.9.** There is a conditional expectation $\Phi : C^*(E) \to C^*(E)^\gamma$ such that $\Phi(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = |\mu| = |\nu| s_\mu s_\nu^*$.

It is useful to describe the core as an inductive limit of subalgebras, as was done in an appendix in [?]. The idea is as follows. For $k \geq 0$ define the sets

$$F_k = \overline{\text{span}}\{s_\mu s_\nu^* : \mu, \nu \in E^k, s(\mu) = s(\nu)\}.$$
\[ \mathcal{E}_k = \text{span}\{s_\mu s_\nu^* : \mu, \nu \in E_k \text{ and } s(\mu) = s(\nu) \text{ is singular}\}, \]

\[ C_k = F_0 + \cdots + F_k. \]

Also, for a given vertex \( v \) we define

\[ F_k(v) = \text{span}\{s_\mu s_\nu^* : \mu, \nu \in E_k, s(\mu) = s(\nu) = v\} \]

so that

\[ F_k = \bigoplus_{v \in E^0} F_k(v) \]

as a direct sum of \( C^* \)-algebras.

**Lemma 2.10.** Let \( \Lambda \) be the set of all finite subsets of \( E^k \) and for \( \lambda \in \Lambda \) define

\[ u_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \in \lambda} s_\mu s_\mu^*. \]

Then \( \{u_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \) is an approximate unit of \( F_k \) consisting of projections.

**Proof.** This is a direct consequence of Proposition 2.5. \( \square \)

The following result is a combination of Proposition A.1 and Lemma A.2 in [?].

**Proposition 2.11.** With the notation as above for a graph \( E \), the following hold for \( k \geq 0 \):

(a) \( C_k \) is a \( C^* \)-subalgebra of \( C^*(E)^\gamma \), \( F_{k+1} \) is an ideal in \( C_k \), \( C_k \subseteq C_{k+1} \) and

\[ C^*(E)^\gamma = \lim_{\to \gamma} C_k. \]

(b) \( F_k \cap F_{k+1} = \bigoplus_{0 < |v^{-1}(u)| < \infty} \{F_k(v) : 0 < |v^{-1}(u)| < \infty\}. \) \( (C^*-algebraic \ direct \ sum) \)

(c) \( C_k = E_0 \oplus E_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus E_{k-1} \oplus E_k \) \( (vector \ space \ direct \ sum) \)

With the above, we can now prove the following.

**Proposition 2.12.** For each \( k \geq 0 \), \( C_k \cap F_{k+1} = F_k \cap F_{k+1} \).

**Proof.** Obviously one has \( F_k \cap F_{k+1} \subseteq C_k \cap F_{k+1} \). On the other hand, given \( x \in C_k \cap F_{k+1} \), one can decompose \( x \) as sums in \( C_k \) and \( C_{k+1} \) with Proposition 2.11 (c), use the fact that \( F_k = E_k \oplus F_k \cap F_{k+1} \) and the uniqueness of the direct sum decompositions of \( x \) to conclude that \( x \in F_k \). \( \square \)

### 3. KMS states for the generalized gauge action

In this section we define an action on \( C^*(E) \) from a function \( c : E^1 \to \mathbb{R}_+^* \)

similar to what is done in [?] for the Cuntz algebras and in [?] for the Cuntz-Krieger algebras. We will always suppose that there is a constant \( k > 0 \) such that \( c(e) > k \) for all \( e \in E^1 \) and that \( \beta > 0 \). Observe that in this case \( c^{-\beta} \) is bounded.

We extend a function as above to a function \( c : E^* \to \mathbb{R}_+^* \) by defining \( c(v) = 1 \) if \( v \in E^0 \) and \( c(\mu) = c(\mu_1) \cdots c(\mu_n) \) if \( \mu = \mu_1 \cdots \mu_n \in E^n \).

**Proposition 3.1.** Given a function \( c : E^1 \to \mathbb{R}_+^* \), there is a strongly continuous action \( \sigma^c : \mathbb{R} \to \text{Aut} (C^*(E)) \) given by \( \sigma^c_t(p_v) = p_v \) for all \( v \in E^0 \) and \( \sigma^c_t(s_e) = c(e)^t s_e \) for all \( e \in E^1 \).
Proof. Let $T_e = c(e)^{it}s_e$ and note that $T_e$ is a partial isometry with $T_e^*T_e = s_e^*s_e$ and $T_eT_e^* = s_e^*s_e$. It follows that the sets $\{p_v\}_{v \in E^0}$ and $\{T_e\}_{e \in E^1}$ satisfy the same relations as $\{p_v\}_{v \in E^0}$ and $\{s_e\}_{e \in E^1}$. By the universal property, there is a homomorphism $\sigma^e_\varepsilon : C^*(E) \to C^*(E)$ such that $\sigma^e_\varepsilon(p_v) = p_v$ for all $v \in E^0$ and $\sigma^e_\varepsilon(s_e) = T_e = c(e)^{it}s_e$ for all $e \in E^1$.

It is easy to see that $\sigma^e_{t_1} \circ \sigma^e_{t_2} = \sigma^e_{t_1 + t_2}$ and $\sigma^e_0 = Id$. Hence $\sigma^e_\varepsilon$ is an automorphism with inverse $\sigma^{-e}_{-\varepsilon}$.

To prove continuity, let $a \in C^*(E), t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Take $x = \sum_{\mu, \nu \in E^*} \lambda_{\mu, \nu}s_\mu s_\nu$, such that $\|a - x\| < \varepsilon/3$. For each pair of paths $\mu, \nu$ with $\lambda_{\mu, \nu} \neq 0$, there is $\delta_{\mu, \nu}$ such that

$$|c(\mu)^{it}c(\nu)^{-it} - c(\mu)^{it}c(\nu)^{-it}| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3\sum_{\mu, \nu \in E^*} \|\lambda_{\mu, \nu}s_\mu s_\nu\|}$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|t - u| < \delta_{\mu, \nu}$. If we take $\delta$ to be the minimum of all such $\delta_{\mu, \nu}$, then for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|t - u| < \delta$ we have

$$\|\sigma^e_\varepsilon(x) - \sigma^-e_u(x)\| \leq \sum_{\mu, \nu \in E^*} (c(\mu)^{it}c(\nu)^{-it} - c(\mu)^{it}c(\nu)^{-it})\lambda_{\mu, \nu}s_\mu s_\nu < \frac{\varepsilon}{3\sum_{\mu, \nu \in E^*} \|\lambda_{\mu, \nu}s_\mu s_\nu\|} \sum_{\mu, \nu \in E^*} \|\lambda_{\mu, \nu}s_\mu s_\nu\| = \frac{\varepsilon}{3},$$

and hence

$$\|\sigma^e_{\delta}(a) - \sigma^-e_u(a)\| = \|\sigma^e_\varepsilon(a) - \sigma^-e_u(x) + \sigma^e_\varepsilon(x) - \sigma^-e_u(x) + \sigma^-e_u(x) - \sigma^-e_u(a)\| \leq \|\sigma^e_\varepsilon(a - x)\| + \|\sigma^e_\varepsilon(x) - \sigma^-e_u(x)\| + \|\sigma^-e_u(x - a)\| \leq \varepsilon/3 + \varepsilon/3 + \varepsilon/3 = \varepsilon.$$  

\[\Box\]

From now on, we will write simply $\sigma$ instead of $\sigma_\varepsilon$. The next result shows that KMS states on $C^*(E)$ are determined by their values at the core algebra.

Proposition 3.2. Suppose $c : E^1 \to \mathbb{R}^+_*$ is such that $c(\mu) \neq 1$ for all $\mu \in E^* \setminus E^0$. If two $(\sigma, \beta)$-KMS states $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$ on $C^*(E)$ coincide at the core algebra $C^*(E)^\gamma$, then $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2$.

Proof. Taking an arbitrary $s_\mu s_\nu^*$ such that $s(\mu) = s(\nu)$, if $|\mu| = |\nu|$ then $s_\mu s_\nu^* \in C^*(E)^\gamma$ and thus $\varphi_1(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = \varphi_2(s_\mu s_\nu^*)$.

Suppose then that $|\mu| \neq |\nu|$, and denote the functional $\varphi_2 - \varphi_1$ by $\varphi$. Using the KMS condition, one obtains

$$\varphi(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = \varphi(s_\mu c(\mu)^{-\beta} s_\mu) = \begin{cases} c(\mu)^{-\beta} \varphi(s_\mu^*) & \text{if } \nu = \nu' \\ c(\mu)^{-\beta} \varphi(s_\nu^*) & \text{if } \mu = \nu' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$ 

It is therefore sufficient to show that $\varphi(s_\mu) = \varphi(s_\nu^*) = 0$ if $|\mu| \geq 1$. To see this, notice that if $C^*(E)$ has a unit, then

$$\varphi(s_\mu) = \varphi(s_\mu 1) = \varphi(c(\mu)^{-\beta} s_\mu) = c(\mu)^{-\beta} \varphi(s_\mu),$$

whence $\varphi(s_\mu) = 0$ since $c(\mu) \neq 1$ by hypothesis; the non-unital case is established analogously with the use of an approximate unit.  

\[\Box\]
THEOREM 3.3. Suppose \( c : E^1 \to \mathbb{R}^+_+ \) is such that \( c(\mu) \neq 1 \) for all \( \mu \in E^* \setminus E^0 \). If \( \varphi \) is a \((\sigma, \beta)\)-KMS state on \( C^*(E) \) then its restriction \( \omega = \varphi|_{C^*(E)^\gamma} \) to \( C^*(E)^\gamma \) satisfies
\[
\omega(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = [\mu = \nu] c(\mu)^{-\beta} \omega(p_{s(\mu)}); \tag{3.1}
\]
conversely, if \( \omega \) is a state on \( C^*(E)^\gamma \) satisfying (3.1) then \( \varphi = \omega \circ \Phi \) is a \((\sigma, \beta)\)-KMS state on \( C^*(E) \), where \( \Phi \) is the conditional expectation from proposition 2.4. The correspondence thus obtained is bijective and preserves convex combinations.

PROOF. Let \( \varphi \) be a \((\sigma, \beta)\)-KMS state on \( C^*(E) \) and \( \omega \) its restriction to \( C^*(E)^\gamma \). If \( \mu, \nu \) are paths such that \( |\mu| = |\nu| \) and \( s(\mu) = s(\nu) \) then
\[
\omega(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = \varphi(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = \varphi(s_\mu^* \sigma_{i;\beta}(s(\mu))) = \varphi(s_\mu^* c(\mu)^{-\beta} s_\mu) =
= [\mu = \nu] c(\mu)^{-\beta} \varphi(p_{s(\mu)}) = [\mu = \nu] c(\mu)^{-\beta} \omega(p_{s(\mu)}).
\]

Conversely, let \( \omega \) be a state on \( C^*(E)^\gamma \) satisfying (3.1) and \( \varphi = \omega \circ \Phi \); we have to show that \( \varphi \) satisfies the KMS condition. By continuity and linearity, it is sufficient to verify this for elements \( x = s_\mu s_\nu^* \) and \( y = s_\zeta s_\eta^* \) where \( \mu, \nu, \zeta, \eta \in E^* \) are paths such that \( s(\mu) = s(\nu) \) and \( s(\zeta) = s(\eta) \).

We need to check that \( \varphi(xy) = \varphi(y) \sigma_{i;\beta}(x) \). First note that
\[
xy = (s_\mu s_\nu^*)(s_\zeta s_\eta^*) = \begin{cases} s_\zeta s_\eta^* & \text{if } \zeta = \nu \zeta' \\ s_\mu s_\nu^* & \text{if } \nu = \zeta \nu' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{1, 2, 3}
\]
and
\[
y \sigma_{i;\beta}(x) = c(\mu)^{-\beta} c(\nu)^{\beta} (s_\zeta s_\eta^*)(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = c(\mu)^{-\beta} c(\nu)^{\beta} \begin{cases} s_{\zeta \mu} s_{\nu} & \text{if } \eta = \mu \nu' \\ s_{\zeta} s_{\nu \eta'} & \text{if } \eta = \mu \eta' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{a, b, c}.
\]

There are nine cases to consider. In each case it must be checked whether the resulting paths have the same size, for they will be otherwise sent to 0 by \( \Phi \).

Case 1-a. In this case \( \zeta = \nu \zeta' \) and \( \mu = \eta \mu' \) so that \( |\zeta| = |\nu| + |\zeta'| \) and \( |\mu| = |\eta| + |\mu'| \). We claim that \( |\mu \zeta'| = |\mu| + |\zeta'| = |\eta| \) if and only if \( |\zeta \mu'| = |\zeta| + |\mu'| = |\eta| \), and in this case \( \mu = \eta \) and \( \nu = \zeta \). In fact,
\[
|\mu| + |\zeta'| = |\eta| \iff |\nu| + |\nu'| + |\zeta'| = |\eta| \iff |\mu'| + |\zeta'| = 0 \iff
\iff |\nu| + |\zeta'| + |\mu'| = |\eta| \iff |\zeta| + |\mu'| = |\eta|.
\]
Observe that, in this case, we have \( |\mu'| + |\zeta'| = 0 \) so that \( |\mu'| = |\zeta'| = 0 \), and hence \( \mu = \eta, \nu = \zeta \).

It follows that, if \( |\mu \zeta'| \neq |\eta| \), then
\[
\varphi(xy) = \omega \circ \Phi(xy) = \omega(0) = \omega \circ \Phi(y \sigma_{i;\beta}(x)) = \varphi(y \sigma_{i;\beta}(x))
\]
and, if \( |\mu \zeta'| = |\eta| \), we get
\[
\varphi(xy) = \varphi(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = \omega(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = c(\mu)^{-\beta} \omega(p_{s(\mu)}),
\]
and on the other hand
\[
\varphi(y \sigma_{i;\beta}(x)) = c(\mu)^{-\beta} c(\nu)^{\beta} \varphi(s_\nu s_\mu^*) = c(\mu)^{-\beta} c(\nu)^{\beta} \omega(s_\nu s_\mu^*) =
= c(\mu)^{-\beta} c(\nu)^{\beta} c(\nu)^{-\beta} \omega(p_{s(\mu)}) = c(\mu)^{-\beta} \omega(p_{s(\mu)}).
\]

Case 1-b. Now, we have that \( \zeta = \nu \zeta' \) and \( \eta = \mu \eta' \) so that \( |\zeta| = |\nu \zeta'| = |\nu| + |\zeta'| \) and \( |\eta| = |\mu \eta'| = |\mu| + |\eta'| \); as before, we can check that \( |\mu| + |\zeta'| = |\eta| \) if and
only if \(|\zeta| = |\nu| + |\eta'|\). If that is not the case then \(\varphi(xy) = 0 = \varphi(y\sigma_{i\beta}(x))\). If the equivalent conditions are true then

\[
\varphi(xy) = \varphi(s_{\mu\zeta} s^*_\eta) = \omega(s_{\mu\zeta} s^*_\eta) = [\mu\zeta' = \eta']c(\eta')^{-\beta}\omega(p_s(\eta))
\]

and

\[
\varphi(y\sigma_{i\beta}(x)) = c(\mu)^{-\beta}c(\nu)\varphi(s_{\zeta s_{\eta'}}e) = c(\mu)^{-\beta}c(\nu)^{\beta}\zeta = \nu\eta'c(\zeta)^{-\beta}\omega(p_s(\zeta)).
\]

Since \(\zeta = \nu\zeta'\) and \(\eta = \mu\eta'\), we have that \(\mu\zeta' = \eta\) if and only if \(\zeta = \nu\eta'\) and if both are true, then \(\zeta' = \eta'\) and

\[
c(\mu)^{\beta}c(\nu)^{-\beta}c(\zeta)^{-\beta} = c(\mu)^{-\beta}c(\nu)^{\beta}c(\eta')^{-\beta} = c(\mu)^{-\beta}c(\eta')^{-\beta} = c(\mu)^{-\beta}c(\zeta')^{-\beta} = c(\eta)^{-\beta}.
\]

From our original hypothesis, we have that \(s(\eta) = s(\zeta)\) so we conclude that \(\varphi(xy) = \varphi(y\sigma_{i\beta}(x))\).

Case 1-c. In this case \(\varphi(y\sigma_{i\beta}(x)) = 0\), so we need to check that \(\varphi(xy) = 0\). As with the previous case, we have that \(\varphi(xy) = [\mu\zeta' = \eta']c(\eta')^{-\beta}\omega(p_s(\eta));\) however, in case (c) \(\mu\zeta' \neq \eta\) for all \(\zeta'\) and therefore \(\varphi(xy) = 0\).

The other cases are analogous to these three, except for case 3-c, where \(\varphi(xy) = 0 = \varphi(y\sigma_{i\beta}(x))\) since \(xy = 0 = y\sigma_{i\beta}(x)\).

That the correspondence obtained is bijective follows from Proposition 3.2 and that it preserves convex combinations is immediate.

Next, we want to show that there is also a bijective correspondence between \((\sigma, \beta)\)-KMS states on \(C^*(E)\) and a certain class of tracial states on \(C_0(E^0)\). We build this correspondence by first describing a correspondence between this class of tracial states on \(C_0(E^0)\) and states \(\omega\) on \(C^*(E)\) satisfying (3.1).

The conditions found for the states on \(C_0(E^0)\) are similar to those in [8], although as discussed in [7], their results cannot be used directly for an arbitrary graph; nevertheless, the results of Theorem 1.1 of [7] still apply in the general setting, and we use them to build a certain kind of transfer operator on the dual of \(C_0(E^0)\).

Let us first recall how to construct \(C^*(E)\) as \(C^*\)-algebra associated to a \(C^*\)-correspondence [8]. If we let \(A = C_0(E^0)\), then \(C_c(E^1)\) has a pre-Hilbert A-module structure given by

\[
\langle \xi, \eta \rangle (v) = \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(e)} \overline{\xi(e)}\eta(e) \quad \text{for} \quad v \in E^0,
\]

\[
(\xi a)(e) = \xi(e)a(s(e)) \quad \text{for} \quad e \in E^1,
\]

where \(\xi, \eta \in C_c(E^1)\) and \(a \in A\); it follows that the completion \(X\) of \(C_c(E^1)\) with respect to the norm given by \(\|\xi\| = \|\langle \xi, \xi \rangle\|^{1/2}\) is a Hilbert A-module. A representation \(i_X : A \to \mathcal{L}(X)\) is then defined by by

\[
i_X(a)(\xi)(e) = a(r(e))\xi(e) \quad \text{for} \quad v \in E^0,
\]

where \(\mathcal{L}(X)\) is the \(C^*\)-algebra of adjointable operators on \(X\).

Let \(K(X)\) be the \(C^*\)-subalgebra of \(\mathcal{L}(X)\) generated by the operators \(\theta_{\xi, \eta}(\zeta) = \xi \langle \eta, \zeta \rangle\). For each \(e \in E^1\), let \(\chi_e \in C_c(E^1)\) be the characteristic function of \(\{e\}\) and observe that

\[
\left\{ t_\lambda = \sum_{e \in \Lambda} \theta_{\chi_e, \chi_e} \right\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda},
\]
where $\Lambda$ is the set of all finite subsets of $E^1$, is an approximate unit of $K(X)$ . It is essentially the same approximate unit given by Lemma 2.10.

If $\tau$ is a tracial state on $C_0(E^0)$, as in Theorem 1.1 of [?], we define a trace $\text{Tr}_\tau$ on $L(X)$ by

$$\text{Tr}_\tau(T) = \lim_{\lambda \to \infty} \sum_{e \in \lambda} \tau(\langle \chi_e, T \chi_e \rangle)$$

where $T \in L(X)$.

For a function $c : E^1 \to \mathbb{R}_+^*$ as in the beginning of the section and $\beta > 0$, we have that $c^{-\beta} \in C_b(E^1)$ and so it defines an operator on $L(X)$ by pointwise multiplication.

**Definition 3.4.** Given $c$ and $\beta$ as above and $\tau$ a tracial state on $C_0(E^0)$, we define a trace $F_{c,\beta}(\tau)$ on $C_0(E^0)$ by

$$F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(a) = \text{Tr}_\tau(i_X(a)c^{-\beta}).$$

Now, observe that $C_0(E^0) \cong \text{span}\{p_v\}_{v \in E^0}$: regarding this as an equality, for a given tracial state $\tau$ on $C_0(E^0)$ we will write $\tau(p_v) = \tau_v$. For $v \in E^0$, it can be verified that

$$F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(p_v) = \lim_{D \to r^{-1}(v)} \sum_{e \in D} c(e)^{-\beta} \tau_{s(e)};$$

where the limit is taken on finite subsets $D$ of $r^{-1}(v)$, and $F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(p_v) = 0$ if $r^{-1}(v) = \emptyset$.

**Remark 3.5.** By Theorem 1.1 of [?], if $F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(a) < \infty$ for all $a \in C_0(E^0)$, then $F_{c,\beta}(\tau)$ is actually a positive linear functional; also, if $V \subseteq E^0$ and $F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(p_v) < \infty$ for all $v \in V$ then $F_{c,\beta}(\tau)$ is a positive linear functional on $\text{span}\{p_v : v \in V\}$.

**Definition 3.6.** For a vertex $v \in E^0$ and a positive integer $n$, we define

$$r^{-n}(v) = \{\mu \in E^n : r(\mu) = v\}.$$

**Lemma 3.7.** If $F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(p_v) = \tau_v$ for all $v \in E^0$ then

$$\lim_{D \to r^{-n}(v)} \sum_{\mu \in D} c(\mu)^{-\beta} \tau_{s(\mu)} \leq \tau_v$$

for all $v \in E^0$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

**Proof.** This is proved by induction. The case $n = 1$ is the hypothesis. Now suppose it is true for $n$, then

$$\lim_{D \to r^{-(n+1)}(v)} \sum_{\mu \in D} c(\mu)^{-\beta} \tau_{s(\mu)} = \lim_{D \to r^{-n}(v)} \sum_{\nu \in r^{-n}(v)} c(\nu)^{-\beta} \sum_{e \in r^{-1}(s(\nu))} c(e)^{-\beta} \tau_{s(e)} \leq \lim_{D \to r^{-n}(v)} \sum_{\nu \in D} c(\nu)^{-\beta} \tau_{s(\nu)} \leq \tau_v$$

where the first inequality is true due to the fact that since $c$ is a positive function then the net $\sum_{e \in D} c(e)^{-\beta} \tau_{s(e)}$ for finite subsets $D$ of $r^{-1}(s(\nu))$ is nondecreasing and less than or equal to $\tau_{s(\nu)}$ by hypothesis. The last inequality is the induction hypothesis.

The next lemma is found in [?] for unital algebras, but their proof carries out the same in the non-unital case by using an approximate unit instead of a unit.
Lemma 3.8 (Exel-Laca). Let $B$ be a $C^*$-algebra, $A$ be a $C^*$-subalgebra such that an approximate unit of $A$ is also an approximate unit of $B$ and $I$ a closed bilateral ideal of $B$ such that $B = A + I$. Let $\varphi$ be a state on $A$ and $\psi$ a linear positive functional on $I$ such that $\varphi(x) = \psi(x)$ $\forall x \in A \cap I$ and $\overline{\psi}(x) \leq \varphi(x)$ $\forall x \in A^+$, where $\overline{\psi}(x) = \lim_\lambda \psi(bu_\lambda)$ for an approximate unit $\{u_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of $I$. Then there is a unique state $\Phi$ on $B$ such that $\Phi |_A = \varphi$ and $\Phi |_I = \psi$.

We want to use this lemma for $A = C_n$, $I = F_{n+1}$ and $B = C_{n+1}$, defined in section 2. For that, we first note that $F_{n+1}$ is indeed an ideal of $C_{n+1}$ by Proposition 2.11 and that the approximate unit for $F_0$ given by Lemma 2.10 is also an approximate unit of $C_n$ for all $n$. We also need to know what the intersection $A \cap I$ is, and for that we need a preliminary result.

Lemma 3.9. Suppose $c$, $\beta$ and $\tau$ are such that $\mathcal{F}_{c,\beta}(\tau)(a) \leq \tau(a)$ for all $a \in C_0(E^k)^+$, then for each $k \geq 1$ there is a unique positive linear functional $\psi_k$ on $F_k$ defined by

$$(3.2) \quad \psi_k(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = [\mu = \nu]c(\mu)^{-\beta} \tau(\mu).$$

Proof. Since $\{s_\mu s_\nu^* : \mu, \nu \in E^k, s(\mu) = s(\nu)\}$ is linearly independent, equation (3.2) defines a unique linear functional on $\text{span}\{s_\mu s_\nu^* : \mu, \nu \in E^k, s(\mu) = s(\nu)\}$.

To extend to the closure, it is sufficient to prove that $\psi_k$ is continuous.

If $x \in \text{span}\{s_\mu s_\nu^* : \mu, \nu \in E^k, s(\mu) = s(\nu)\}$ then

$$x = \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{(\mu, \nu) \in G_v} a_{\mu, \nu}^v s_\mu s_\nu^*$$

where $V$ is a finite subset of $E^0$ and $G_v$ is a finite subset of $\{(\mu, \nu) \in E^n \times E^n : s(\mu) = s(\nu) = v\}$. Using the decomposition given by equation (2.1) and observing that $\{s_\mu s_\nu^* : (\mu, \nu) \in G_v\}$ can be completed to generators of a matrix algebra, we have that

$$\|x\| = \max_{v \in V} \left\| \sum_{(\mu, \nu) \in G_v} a_{\mu, \nu}^v s_\mu s_\nu^* \right\| = \max_{v \in V} \|(a_{\mu, \nu}^v)_{\mu, \nu}\|$$

where the last norm is the matrix norm.

If $\text{Tr}$ is the usual matrix trace we have

$$|\psi_k(x)| = \left| \psi_k \left( \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{(\mu, \nu) \in G_v} a_{\mu, \nu}^v s_\mu s_\nu^* \right) \right| =$$

$$= \left| \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{(\mu, \nu) \in G_v} a_{\mu, \nu}^v [\mu = \nu]c(\mu)^{-\beta} \tau(\mu) \right| =$$

$$= \left| \sum_{v \in V} \text{Tr}((a_{\mu, \nu}^v)_{\mu, \nu} \text{diag}(c(\mu)^{-\beta} \tau(\mu))) \right| \leq$$

$$\leq \sum_{v \in V} \left| \text{Tr}((a_{\mu, \nu}^v)_{\mu, \nu} \text{diag}(c(\mu)^{-\beta} \tau(\mu))) \right| \leq$$

$$\leq \sum_{v \in V} \|(a_{\mu, \nu}^v)_{\mu, \nu}\| \sum_{\mu, \mu} c(\mu)^{-\beta} \tau(\mu) \leq \text{lemma 3.8}.$$
\[
\leq \sum_{v \in V} \| (a_{\mu,\nu}^v)_{\mu,\nu} \| \tau_v \leq \max_{v \in V} \left( \sum_{v \in V} \tau_v \right) = \| x \| \sum_{v \in V} \tau_v \leq \| x \|
\]

where the last inequality comes from the fact that \( \tau \) comes from a probability measure on a discrete space.

**Theorem 3.10.** If \( \omega \) is a state on \( C^*(E)_\gamma \) satisfying (3.4) then its restriction \( \tau \) to \( C_0(E_0) \) satisfies:

(K1) \( F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(a) = \tau(a) \) for all \( a \in \overline{\text{span}} \{ p_v : 0 < |r^{-1}(v)| < \infty \} \),

(K2) \( F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(a) \leq \tau(a) \) for all \( a \in C_0(E_0)^+ \).

Conversely, if \( \tau \) is a tracial state on \( C_0(E_0) \) satisfying (K1) and (K2) then there is a unique state \( \omega \) on \( C^*(E)_\gamma \) satisfying (3.4). This correspondence preserves convex combinations.

**Proof.** Let \( \omega \) be a state on \( C^*(E)_\gamma \) satisfying (3.4) and \( \tau \) its restriction to \( C_0(E_0) \). By Remark 3.8 to establish (K1) it is sufficient to consider \( a = p_v \) where \( v \in E_0 \) is such that \( 0 < |r^{-1}(v)| < \infty \), and in this case

\[
\tau(p_v) = \omega(p_v) = \omega \left( \sum_{e \in r^{-1}(v)} s_e s_e^* \right) = \sum_{e \in r^{-1}(v)} c(e)^{-\beta} \omega(p_{s(e)}) = \sum_{e \in r^{-1}(v)} c(e)^{-\beta} \tau_{s(e)} = F_{c,\beta} \tau(p_v).
\]

For (K2), let \( a \in C_0(E_0)^+ \) and write \( a = \sum_{v \in E_0} a_v p_v \); again, by Remark 3.8 it is sufficient to show the result for \( a = p_v \) where \( v \in E_0 \) if \( 0 < |r^{-1}(v)| < \infty \), then we have an equality as shown above. If \( |r^{-1}(v)| = 0 \), then \( F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(p_v) = 0 \leq \tau(p_v) \). If \( |r^{-1}(v)| = \infty \), then

\[
F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(p_v) = \lim_{D \to r^{-1}(v)} \sum_{e \in D} c(e)^{-\beta} \tau_{s(e)} = \lim_{D \to r^{-1}(v)} \sum_{e \in D} \omega(s_e s_e^*) = \lim_{D \to r^{-1}(v)} \sum_{e \in D} \omega(p_v s_e s_e^*) \leq \omega(p_v) = \tau(p_v).
\]

To see the inequality above, we observe that \( s_e s_e^* \) are mutually orthogonal projections that commute with \( p_v \) so that

\[
p_v - \sum_{e \in D} p_v s_e s_e^* = p_v \left(1 - \sum_{e \in D} s_e s_e^* \right) = \left(1 - \sum_{e \in D} s_e s_e^* \right) p_v \left(1 - \sum_{e \in D} s_e s_e^* \right) \geq 0.
\]

Now, let \( \tau \) be a tracial state on \( C_0(E_0) \) satisfying (K1) and (K2). We will use Lemma 3.8 and the discussion after it. Observe that \( F_0 = C_0(E_0) \) and let \( \psi_0 = \tau \). For \( n \geq 1 \), by Lemma 3.8 there exists a positive linear functional \( \psi_n \) on \( F_n \) defined by

\[
\psi_n(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = [\mu = \nu] c(\mu)^{-\beta} \tau_{s(\mu)}.
\]

Let us show by induction that there is a unique state \( \varphi_n \) on \( C_n \) such that the restriction to \( F_n \) is \( \psi_n \). For \( n = 1 \), we use Lemma 3.8 with \( A = C_0(E_0) \), \( I = F_1 \),
\[ B = C_1, \varphi = \tau \text{ and } \psi = \psi_1. \] By Proposition 2.12 in this case \( A \cap I = \text{span}\{p_v : v \in E^0, 0 < |r^{-1}(v)| < \infty\} \) and if \( p_v \in A \cap I \) then
\[ \psi(p_v) = \psi_1(p_v) = \psi_1(s_\nu s_\nu^*) = \tau(p_v). \]
Using the approximate unit given by Lemma 2.10 for any \( v \in E^0 \) we have
\[ \overline{\psi}(p_v) = \overline{\psi}_1(p_v) = \lim_{\lambda \to \infty} \psi_1(p_v, u_\lambda) = \lim_{D \to r^{-1}(v)} \lim_{\mu \to \infty} \sum_{e \in D} c(e)^{-\beta} \tau_s(e) = \mathcal{F}_{c, \beta}(\tau)(p_v) \leq \tau(p_v), \]
where the last inequality is given by Lemma 3.7, which is a consequence of (K2).

Now suppose that there is a unique state \( \varphi_n \) on \( C_n \) such that the restriction to \( F_n \) is \( \psi_n \) and let us show that this is also true for \( n + 1 \). We set \( A = C_n, I = F_{n+1}, B = C_{n+1}, \varphi = \varphi_n \) and \( \psi = \psi_{n+1} \) on Lemma 3.8. By Proposition 2.12 we have that \( A \cap I = \text{span}\{s_\mu s_\mu^* : \mu, \nu \in E^0, s(\mu) = s(\nu), |\mu| = |\nu|, 0 < |r^{-1}(s(\mu))| < \infty\} \). Let \( s_\mu s_\mu^* \in A \cap I \). Since \( 0 < |r^{-1}(s(\mu))| < \infty \) we have that
\[ \psi(s_\mu s_\mu^*) = \psi_{n+1}(s_\mu s_\mu^*) = \sum_{e \in r^{-1}(s(\mu))} \psi_{n+1}(s_\mu s_\mu^*) = \sum_{e \in r^{-1}(s(\mu))} [\mu e = \nu e] c(\mu e)^{-\beta} \tau_s(\mu e) = \]
\[ = \sum_{e \in r^{-1}(s(\mu))} [\mu = \nu] c(\mu)^{-\beta} c(e)^{-\beta} \tau_s(e) = [\mu = \nu] c(\mu)^{-\beta} \mathcal{F}_{c, \beta}(\tau)(\rho_{s(\mu)}) = [\mu = \nu] c(\mu)^{-\beta} \tau(\rho_{s(\mu)}) = \varphi_n(s_\mu s_\mu^*) = \varphi_n(s_\mu s_\mu^*). \]

Again, using the approximate unit given by Lemma 2.10 if \( s_\mu s_\mu^* \in C_n \), then
\[ \overline{\psi}(s_\mu s_\mu^*) = \overline{\psi}_{n+1}(s_\mu s_\mu^*) = \lim_{\lambda \to \infty} \psi_{n+1}(s_\mu s_\mu^* u_\lambda) = \lim_{D \to r^{-n+1-|s(\mu)|}} \lim_{\mu \to \infty} \sum_{e \in D} \psi_{n+1}(s_\mu s_\mu^*) = \]
\[ = \lim_{D \to r^{-n+1-|s(\mu)|}} \sum_{\zeta \in D} [\mu \zeta = \nu \zeta] c(\nu \zeta)^{-\beta} \tau_{s(\nu \zeta)} = \]
\[ = \lim_{D \to r^{-n+1-|s(\nu)|}} \lim_{\mu \to \infty} \sum_{\zeta \in D} [\mu = \nu] c(\nu)^{-\beta} c(\zeta)^{-\beta} \tau_s(\zeta) = \]
\[ = [\mu = \nu] c(\nu)^{-\beta} \lim_{D \to r^{-n+1-|s(\nu)|}} \sum_{\zeta \in D} c(\zeta)^{-\beta} \tau_s(\zeta) \leq \]
\[ \leq [\mu = \nu] c(\nu)^{-\beta} \tau_s(\nu) = \varphi_n(s_\mu s_\mu^*), \]
where the inequality is given by Lemma 3.7, which is a consequence of (K2).

By the description of the core \( C^*(E) \) as an inductive limit of the \( C_n \), we can define a state \( \omega \) as the inductive limit of \( \varphi_n \). By construction, \( \omega \) satisfies (3.1) and, since each \( \varphi_n \) is uniquely defined by (3.1), so is \( \omega \).

Finally, it is easily seen that the correspondence built preserves convex combinations by construction.

\[ \square \]
4. Ground states

In this section, we let a function \( c : E^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^* \) be given and define a one-parameter group of automorphisms \( \sigma \) as in the last section.

The following definition of a ground state will be used [?].

**Definition 4.1.** We say that \( \phi \) is a \( \sigma \)-ground state if for all \( a, b \in C^*(E)^a \), the entire analytic function \( \zeta \mapsto \phi(a \sigma_\zeta(b)) \) is uniformly bounded in the region \( \{ \zeta \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im}(\zeta) \geq 0 \} \), where \( C^*(E)^a \) is the set of analytic elements for \( \sigma \).

**Proposition 4.2.** If \( \tau \) is a tracial state on \( C_0(E^0) \) such that \( \text{supp}(\tau) \subseteq \{ v \in E^0 : v \text{ is singular} \} \) then there is a unique state \( \phi \) on \( C^*(E) \) such that

(i) \( \phi(p_v) = \tau(p_v) \) for all \( v \in E^0 \);

(ii) \( \phi(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = 0 \) if \( |\mu| > 0 \) or \( |\nu| > 0 \).

**Proof.** First, observe that a state \( \phi \) satisfying (ii) is uniquely determined by its values on \( C^*(E)^\gamma \) because (ii) implies that \( \phi = \phi|_{C^*(E)^\gamma} \circ \Phi \), where \( \Phi \) is the conditional expectation given by Proposition [2.3]

Given \( \tau \) as in the statement of the proposition, a state \( \omega \) on \( C^*(E)^\gamma \) can be built in the same way as in the proof of Theorem [3.10] For each \( n \), use Lemma [3.8] with \( A = C_n, B = C_{n+1}, I = F_{n+1}, \psi_n \equiv 0 \) and \( \varphi_n \) is given by the previous step, where for the first step we have \( \varphi_0 = \tau \). For \( \omega = \lim \varphi_n \), we have that \( \phi = \omega \circ \Phi \) satisfies (i) and (ii) and is unique by construction. \( \square \)

**Proposition 4.3.** If \( c \) is such that \( c(e) > 1 \) for all \( e \in E^1 \), then a state \( \phi \) on \( C^*(E) \) is a \( \sigma \)-ground state for \( \sigma \) if and only if \( \phi(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = 0 \) whenever \( |\mu| > 0 \) or \( |\nu| > 0 \).

**Proof.** If \( \phi \) is a ground state then for each pair \( \mu, \nu \in E^* \) the function \( \zeta \mapsto |\phi(s_\mu \sigma_\zeta(s_\nu^*))| \) is bounded on the upper half of the complex plane. If \( \zeta = x + iy \) then

\[
|\phi(s_\mu \sigma_\zeta(s_\nu^*))| = |\phi(s_\mu c(\nu)^{-ix} s_\nu^*)| = |c(\nu)^{y-ix} \phi(s_\mu s_\nu^*)| = c(\nu)^x|\phi(s_\mu s_\nu^*)|.
\]

If \( |\nu| > 0 \), we have that \( c(\nu) > 1 \) and so the only possibility for the above function to be bounded is if \( \phi(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = 0 \). It is shown analogously that if \( |\mu| > 0 \) then \( \phi(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = 0 \).

For the converse, observe that if \( |\mu| = |\nu| = 0 \) then \( |\phi(s_\mu \sigma_\zeta(s_\nu^*))| = |\phi(s_\mu s_\nu^*)| \leq 1 \). It can be now readily verified that if \( \phi(s_\mu s_\nu^*) = 0 \) whenever \( |\mu| > 0 \) or \( |\nu| > 0 \) then \( \phi \) is a ground state. \( \square \)

**Theorem 4.4.** If \( c \) is such that \( c(e) > 1 \) for all \( e \in E^1 \) then there is a bijective correspondence, given by restriction, between \( \sigma \)-ground states \( \phi \) and tracial states \( \tau \) on \( C_0(E^0) \) such that \( \text{supp}(\tau) \subseteq \{ v \in E^0 : v \text{ is singular} \} \).

**Proof.** This is an immediate consequence of Propositions [4.2] and [4.3]. Just note that if \( \phi \) is a \( \sigma \)-ground state and \( v \in E^0 \) is not singular then

\[
\phi(p_v) = \phi \left( \sum_{c \in r^{-1}(v)} s_c s_c^* \right) = 0.
\]

\( \square \)
5. Examples

In this section we give two examples with infinite graphs and study the KMS states on the $C^*$-algebras associated to these graphs.

Example 5.1 (The Cuntz algebra $O_\infty$). Let $E^0 = \{v\}$ be any unitary set and $E^1 = \{e_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ any countably infinite set with $r(e_n) = s(e_n) = v \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $C^\ast(E) \cong O_\infty$.

If $c(e_n) = e$ (Euler’s number) then we have the usual gauge action. In this case, $F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(p_v) = \infty$ so that condition (K2) from Theorem 3.10 is not satisfied and we have no KMS states for finite $\beta$. Since we have only one state on $C_0(E^0)$ and $v$ is a singular vertex, by Theorem 4.4 there exists a unique ground state.

Now if $c(e_n) = a_n$ where $a_n \in (1,\infty)$ is such that there is $\beta > 0$ for which $\sum_{n=0}^\infty a_n^{-\beta}$ converges, then there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that $\sum_{n=0}^\infty a_n^{-\beta} = 1$. Observing that $F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(p_v) = \sum_{n=0}^\infty a_n^{-\beta}$ and using again the fact that there exists only one state on $C_0(E^0)$, we conclude from Theorems 3.3 and 3.10 that there is no KMS state for $\beta < \beta_0$, there exists a unique KMS state for each $\beta \geq \beta_0$ and, as with the gauge action, there is a unique ground state.

Example 5.2 (A graph with infinitely many sources). Let $E^0 = \{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $E^1 = \{e_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}}$ be countably infinite sets and define $r(e_n) = v_0$ and $s(e_n) = v_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$.

Again, let $a_n \in (1,\infty)$, $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, be such that $\sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n^{-\beta}$ converges for some $\beta > 0$. For $n \neq 0$ we have that $F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(p_{v_n}) = 0$ and for $n = 0$ we have $F_{c,\beta}(\tau)(p_{v_0}) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n^{-\beta} \tau_{v_n}$. Condition (K1) of Theorem 3.10 is trivially satisfied, and for condition (K2) we need $\sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n^{-\beta} \tau_{v_n} \leq \tau_{v_0}$.

If $\tau_{v_0} > 0$, since $0 \leq \tau_{v_0} \leq 1$ for all $n$ there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that $\sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n^{-\beta_0} \tau_{v_n} = \tau_{v_0}$ so that (K2) is verified for all $\beta \geq \beta_0$ and so there are infinitely many KMS states. And for $\beta < \beta_0$ (K2) is not verified so that there are no KMS states.

For ground states, since all vertices are singular, we have no restriction on $\tau_{v_0}$; every state $\tau$ on $C_0(E^0)$ gives a ground state on $C^\ast(E)$.
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