

MAXIMAL CONTRACTIVE TUPLES

B. KRISHNA DAS, JAYDEB SARKAR, AND SANTANU SARKAR

ABSTRACT. Maximality of a contractive tuple of operators is considered. Characterization of a contractive tuple to be maximal is obtained. Notion of maximality of a submodule of Drury-Arveson module on the d -dimensional unit ball \mathbb{B}_d is defined. For $d = 1$, it is shown that every submodule of the Hardy module over the unit disc is maximal. But for $d \geq 2$ we prove that any homogeneous submodule or submodule generated by polynomials is not maximal. A characterization of a submodule to be maximal is obtained.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $T = (T_1, \dots, T_d)$ be a d -tuple of bounded linear operators on some Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . We say that T is a *row contraction*, or, *contractive tuple* if the row operator $(T_1, \dots, T_d) : \mathcal{H}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a contraction or equivalently $\sum_{i=1}^d T_i T_i^* \leq I_{\mathcal{H}}$. The *defect operator* $D_T := (I - \sum_{i=1}^d T_i T_i^*)^{1/2}$ and the *defect dimension* $\Delta_T := \dim[\overline{\text{ran}} D_T]$ associated with the contractive tuple T is an important invariant in operator theory. For instance, a pair of shift operators are unitary equivalent if and only if the defect dimensions are the same. The same result holds true for d -tuple of pure isometries with orthogonal ranges ([Po]). In order to extract more information about contractive tuples one can proceed further to form a sequence of defect indices (defined below).

The defect sequence for contractive tuple and the notion of maximality of a contractive tuple was introduced in [GaW] for $d = 1$ case. In a recent paper this notion was extended for d -tuple of operators ([BDS]). The main aim of this paper is to characterize maximal contractive tuples in the commuting as well as non-commuting case. In the non-commuting setup it turns out that the restriction of creation operators on the full Fock space to an invariant subspace is always maximal but in the commuting setup same conclusion does not hold. Examples of submodules of the Drury-Arveson module are given to illustrate the above fact and a characterization of a submodule to be maximal is also obtained.

The plan of the paper is as follows. After introducing the completely positive map associated to a contractive tuple we define defect sequence and obtain its properties in Section 2. In Section 3, we provide a characterization for maximal contractive tuples and consequently establish some relations between minimal function of a particular type of single pure contraction and the dimension of the Hilbert space on which the contraction acts. In the last section we investigate the maximality for the tuple $(M_{z_1}|_{\mathcal{S}}, \dots, M_{z_d}|_{\mathcal{S}})$ where \mathcal{S} is a proper submodule

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 15A03, 47A13.

Key words and phrases. Contractive tuples, Defect operators, Defect spaces, Drury-Arveson module, Fock space.

of Drury-Arveson module and the tuple $(M_{z_1}, \dots, M_{z_d})$ is the d -shift of the Drury-Arveson module.

2. DEFECT SEQUENCE

In this section we define the notion of the defect sequence of a tuple of contraction and study its properties. Some of the result can be found in ([BDS]) and we include proofs of them as it uses different but simple method. We fix for this section a contractive d -tuple $T = (T_1, \dots, T_d)$ of operators acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} in which the tuple T is not necessarily commuting and the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is infinite dimensional in general unless otherwise we specify it.

We begin with defining the completely positive map associated to the contractive tuple T as follows:

$$(1) \quad \Psi_T : B(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}), \quad X \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^d T_i X T_i^*.$$

This map is very essence for simplifying the study of defect sequences. The following decreasing chain of operator inequality

$$I \geq \Psi_T(I) \geq \Psi_T^2(I) \geq \dots$$

is immediate from the contractivity of the tuple T . The contractive tuple T is said to be *pure* if $\Psi_T^n(I) \rightarrow 0$ in the strong operator topology (S.O.T.) as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The following rule of multiplication of operator tuples is in use. Let $\Lambda = \{1, \dots, d\}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote T^n by the following d^n -tuple of operators

$$T^n = (T_{i_1} T_{i_2} \dots T_{i_n} : i_j \in \Lambda, j = 1, \dots, n),$$

and for $n = 1$ we set $T^1 = T$. In particular, for $n = 2$, T^2 is the following d^2 -tuple

$$(T_1^2, T_1 T_2, \dots, T_1 T_d, T_2 T_1, T_2^2, \dots, T_d^2) : \mathcal{H}^{d^2} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}.$$

Under this rule of multiplication note that $\Psi_{T^2}(X) = \Psi_T(\Psi_T(X)) = \Psi_T^2(X)$ for all $X \in B(\mathcal{H})$, where Ψ_T is as in (1).

Definition. The defect operator of T , denoted by D_T , is the bounded linear operator on \mathcal{H} defined by

$$D_T := (I - \sum_{i=1}^d T_i T_i^*)^{1/2} = (I - \Psi_T(I))^{1/2}.$$

The *first defect index* Δ_T is the dimension of the *first defect space* \mathcal{D}_T where

$$\mathcal{D}_T := \overline{\text{ran}} D_T = \overline{\text{ran}} D_T^2 = \overline{\text{ran}}(I - \Psi_T(I)).$$

The *n-th defect index* of the tuple T is the dimension of the *n-th defect space* $\overline{\text{ran}} D_{T^n}$ where

$$D_{T^n}^2 = I - \Psi_{T^n}(I) = I - \Psi_T^n(I).$$

We denote by \mathcal{D}_n the n -th defect space of a contractive tuple T , where context dictate the tuple T . Here we note the following identity

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} I - \Psi_T^n(I) &= [I - \Psi_T(I)] + \Psi_T[I - \Psi_T(I)] + \cdots + \Psi_T^{n-1}[I - \Psi_T(I)] \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Psi_T^i(I - \Psi_T(I)) \end{aligned}$$

The properties of the defect sequence are as follows.

Proposition 2.1. (i) *Defect spaces of T are increasing subspaces of \mathcal{H} , that is, for $n \leq k$, $\mathcal{D}_n \subset \mathcal{D}_k$.*
(ii) $\Delta_T^n \leq \Delta_T^k$, for all $n \leq k$.
(ii) For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Delta_T^n \leq (1 + d + d^2 + \cdots + d^{n-1})\Delta_T$.

Proof. (i) For $k \geq n$, by row contractivity of T we have

$$I \geq \Psi_T^n(I) \geq \Psi_T^k(I).$$

Therefore,

$$0 \leq I - \Psi_T^n(I) \leq I - \Psi_T^k(I),$$

and consequently

$$\overline{\text{ran}}(I - \Psi_T^n(I)) \subseteq \overline{\text{ran}}(I - \Psi_T^k(I)).$$

Thus (i) follows. (ii) follows immediately from (i).

(iii) The result follows from (2) and the fact that

$$\dim[\overline{\text{ran}} \Psi_T^l(I - \Psi_T(I))] \leq d^l \Delta_T,$$

for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$. □

Remarks. (i) If T is a single contraction, that is, if $d = 1$ then $\Delta_T^n \leq n\Delta_T$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ([GaW]).

(ii) If T is a commuting d -tuple then $\Delta_T^n \leq (\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{k+d-1}{d-1})\Delta_T$.

Before we provide the explicit expression of the defect spaces we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $T|_{\mathcal{D}_n^d} : \mathcal{D}_n^d \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{n+1}$, where \mathcal{D}_n^d is the direct sum of d copies of \mathcal{D}_n .*

Proof. First note that,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^d T_i(I - \Psi_T^n(I))^{1/2}(I - \Psi_T^n(I))^{1/2}T_i^* &= \sum_{i=1}^d T_i T_i^* - \sum_{i=1}^d T_i \Psi_T^n(I) T_i^* \\ &\leq I - \Psi_T^{n+1}(I). \end{aligned}$$

Letting

$$R := (T_1, \dots, T_d) \begin{pmatrix} D_{T^n} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & D_{T^n} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & D_{T^n} \end{pmatrix}_{d \times d},$$

we have from the above inequality that $RR^* \leq I - \Psi_T^{n+1}(I)$. Thus

$$\text{ran } R \subseteq \text{ran}(I - \Psi_T^{n+1}(I)),$$

and this completes the proof. \square

Remark. Simple induction argument shows that $T^n|_{\mathcal{D}_l^{d^n}} : \mathcal{D}_l^{d^n} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{l+n}$ for all $l, n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The following expression of defect spaces in terms of first defect space is quite useful to compute defect spaces and used throughout the paper.

Proposition 2.3. *The defect spaces of a contractive tuple T has the following form:*

$$\mathcal{D}_n = \mathcal{D}_1 \vee T(\mathcal{D}_1^d) \vee T^2(\mathcal{D}_1^{d^2}) \vee \dots \vee T^{n-1}(\mathcal{D}_1^{d^{n-1}})$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. $\mathcal{D}_n \subseteq \mathcal{D}_1 \vee T(\mathcal{D}_1^d) \vee T^2(\mathcal{D}_1^{d^2}) \vee \dots \vee T^{n-1}(\mathcal{D}_1^{d^{n-1}})$ follows from (2) and the other inclusion follows from the previous lemma. \square

Remark. Let $n < m$. Then as $I - \Psi_T^m = (I - \Psi_T^n) + \Psi_T^n(I - \Psi_T^{m-n}(I))$, we have $\mathcal{D}_m \subseteq \mathcal{D}_n \vee T^n(\mathcal{D}_{m-n}^{d^n})$. The other inclusion follows from the remark after Lemma 2.2. Thus $\mathcal{D}_m = \mathcal{D}_n \vee T^n(\mathcal{D}_{m-n}^{d^n})$.

Corollary 2.4. *If $\Delta_T^n = \Delta_T^{n+1}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then $\Delta_T^n = \Delta_T^m$ for all $m > n$.*

Proof. If $\Delta_T^n = \Delta_T^{n+1}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then $\mathcal{D}_n = \mathcal{D}_{n+1}$. Note that $\mathcal{D}_{n+2} = \mathcal{D}_{n+1} \vee T^{n+1}(\mathcal{D}_1^{d^{n+1}})$ and $T^{n+1}(\mathcal{D}_1^{d^{n+1}}) = T\left((T^n(\mathcal{D}_1^{d^n}))^d\right)$. Since $T^n(\mathcal{D}_1^{d^n}) \subset \mathcal{D}_{n+1} = \mathcal{D}_n$ we have $\mathcal{D}_{n+2} = \mathcal{D}_n$. Thus an induction argument gives the result. \square

The above two propositions are from [BDS], Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.4 but the method used here will illuminate further studies in this direction.

3. MAXIMAL TUPLE OF OPERATORS

In this section we study the notion of maximality of contractive tuples. The necessary and sufficient condition for a contractive tuple to be maximal is obtained. For this section we always assume that the first defect dimension Δ_T of a contractive tuple T is finite.

The following set of notation is used throughout this section. Let $\Lambda = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ be a fixed index set. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $F(k, \Lambda)$ be the set of all functions from $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ to Λ , and set

$$(3) \quad F := \cup_{k=0}^{\infty} F(k, \Lambda), \quad F_n := \cup_{k=0}^n F(k, \Lambda)$$

where $F(0, \Lambda)$ stands for $\{0\}$. For $T = (T_1, T_2, \dots, T_d)$, a d -tuple of operators, and $f \in F(k, \Lambda)$, we denote

$$(4) \quad T_f = T_{f(1)}T_{f(2)} \dots T_{f(k)} \quad \text{and} \quad T_0 = I.$$

Definition. A contractive d -tuple T on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is called *maximal* if

$$\Delta_T^n = (1 + d + \cdots + d^{n-1})\Delta_T$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If \mathcal{H} is finite dimensional, then T is maximal if

$$\Delta_T^n = \begin{cases} (1 + d + \cdots + d^{n-1})\Delta_T & \text{if } (1 + d + \cdots + d^{n-1})\Delta_T \leq \dim \mathcal{H}, \\ \dim \mathcal{H} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

The maximality of a commuting contractive d -tuple is defined in the same way replacing the number $(1 + d + \cdots + d^{n-1})$ by $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{k+d-1}{d-1}$ in the above definition.

It is clear from the properties of defect sequence that if $\Delta_T^n = (1 + d + \cdots + d^{n-1})\Delta_T$ (or $\Delta_T^n = (\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{k+d-1}{d-1})\Delta_T$ in the commuting case) for some $n \geq 2$, then $\Delta_T^l = (1 + d + \cdots + d^{l-1})\Delta_T$ (respectively, $\Delta_T^l = (\sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \binom{k+d-1}{d-1})\Delta_T$) for all $l \leq n$. Thus for a non-commuting or commuting tuple, once the sequence of numbers Δ_T^n departs from the sequence of maximal possible values, it never returns.

Remark. For a non-commuting (commuting) contractive tuple T on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , let $\Delta_T = n$ and $\{\xi_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ be a basis of \mathcal{D}_1 . Then T is maximal if and only if the set

$$\{T_f \xi_i : f \in F, i = 1, \dots, n\},$$

(respectively, $\{T_1^{n_1} \dots T_d^{n_d} \xi_i : n_1, \dots, n_d \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$) is linearly independent, where T_f is as in (4).

A single contraction T acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with $\Delta_T = 1$ is maximal if $\Delta_T^n = n$ for all $n \leq \dim \mathcal{H}$. The next theorem provides a large class of contractions which are maximal.

Theorem 3.1. *Let T be a single pure contraction on \mathcal{H} with $\Delta_T = 1$. Then $\Delta_{T^n} = n$, for $0 \leq n \leq \dim \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. Since T is a pure contraction with $\Delta_T = 1$, so T is unitary equivalent to the operator $P_{H_\theta} M_z|_{H_\theta}$ where $H_\theta = H^2(\mathbb{D}) \ominus \theta H^2(\mathbb{D})$ is a co-invariant subspace of the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ on the unit disc and $\theta \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ is an inner function. Then it is enough to prove the theorem for the contraction $R = P_{H_\theta} M_z|_{H_\theta}$. A simple calculation reveals that $D_R = P_{H_\theta} P_{\mathbb{C}} P_{H_\theta}$ and as $\Delta_T = \Delta_R = 1$, we have $P_{\mathbb{C}} P_{H_\theta} \neq 0$ and $\text{ran}(P_{\mathbb{C}} P_{H_\theta}) = \mathbb{C}$. Note that (cf. [Ber])

$$P_{H_\theta}(1) = (I - P_{H_\theta^\perp})1 = 1 - \overline{\theta(0)}\theta.$$

Then the first defect space of the operator $P_{H_\theta} M_z|_{H_\theta}$ is

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \text{span}\{1 - \overline{\theta(0)}\theta\}.$$

By the following elementary calculation we have

$$(P_{H_\theta} M_z|_{H_\theta})(1 - \overline{\theta(0)}\theta) = P_{H_\theta}(z - \overline{\theta(0)}z\theta) = (I - P_{H_\theta^\perp})z = z - (\overline{\theta(0)}z + \overline{\theta'(0)})\theta.$$

Then by Proposition 2.3,

$$\mathcal{D}_2 = \text{span}\{1 - \overline{\theta(0)}\theta, z - (\overline{\theta(0)}z + \overline{\theta'(0)})\theta\}.$$

An easy induction argument yields

$$(P_{H_\theta} M_z^n |_{H_\theta})(1 - \overline{\theta(0)}\theta) = (I - P_{H_\theta^\perp})z^n = z^n - (\overline{\theta(0)}z^n + \overline{\theta'(0)}z^{n-1} + \cdots + \overline{\theta^{(n)}(0)})\theta,$$

for all $n \geq 0$. Therefore, one has the explicit expression of \mathcal{D}_n as follows. Let us denote

$$v_i = z^i - (\overline{\theta(0)}z^i + \overline{\theta'(0)}z^{i-1} + \cdots + \overline{\theta^{(i)}(0)})\theta \quad (i \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Then $\mathcal{D}_n = \text{span}\{v_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$. Now suppose that $\dim(\mathcal{D}_l) = \dim(\mathcal{D}_{l+1})$ for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Then as $\Delta_R = 1$ and defect sequence is an increasing sequence it suffices to prove that $H_\theta = \mathcal{D}_l$. For a contradiction let $f \in H_\theta \ominus \mathcal{D}_l$. Then for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\langle f, \theta z^i \rangle = 0$, and $\langle f, v_i \rangle = 0$ together implies that $\langle f, z^i \rangle = 0$ for all i . Thus $f = 0$ and the proof follows. \square

The above result is due to [GaW], Theorem 1.4. However, our proof is different and more analytic and explicit.

In case of a tuple of operators the above theorem is not true. The example of a pure tuple T with $\Delta_T = 1$ but is not maximal can be found in [BDS].

Set $\mathcal{D}_\infty := \cup_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{D}_n$, where \mathcal{D}_n 's are the defect spaces of T . The multi-variable analogue of the previous theorem is as follows.

Proposition 3.2. *Let T be a pure contractive d -tuple of operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Then $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{D}_\infty$.*

Proof. First note that

$$\mathcal{D}_\infty^\perp = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{D}_n^\perp = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \ker(I - T^n T^{n*}).$$

Therefore, if $x \in \mathcal{D}_\infty^\perp$ then $\|x\| = \|T^{n*}x\|$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since T is pure we have $\Psi_T^n(I) \rightarrow 0$ in S.O.T. as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, $\langle x, \Psi_T^n(I)x \rangle = \|(T^n)^*x\|^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We have thus obtained that $x = 0$ concluding the proof. \square

Corollary 3.3. *Let T be a pure contractive tuple of operators on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Then $\Delta_T^m \neq \Delta_T^n$ for $m \neq n$.*

Proof. Let $\Delta_T^m = \Delta_T^n$ for $m < n$. We know $\mathcal{D}_m \subset \mathcal{D}_n$ and they have same finite dimension implies $\mathcal{D}_m = \mathcal{D}_n$. Then by Corollary 2.4 $\mathcal{D}_k = \mathcal{D}_m$ for all $k \geq m$. Thus $\mathcal{D}_\infty = \mathcal{D}_m$ and is of finite dimension, which is a contradiction. \square

Now we provide a characterization of maximal contractive tuples.

Theorem 3.4. *Let T be a contractive d -tuple acting on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} such that $\Delta_T = 1$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *T is maximal.*
- (ii) *There is no polynomial P of d non-commuting variables such that*

$$P(T_1, \dots, T_d)|_{\mathcal{D}_1} = 0.$$

Proof. Since $\Delta_T = 1$, let $\mathcal{D}_1 = \mathbb{C}\xi$ for some $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$. Then by Proposition 2.3

$$\mathcal{D}_n = \text{span}\{T_f \xi : f \in F_{n-1}\}$$

where T_f is as in (4). Note that $|F(n, \Lambda)| = d^n$. Thus T is maximal if and only if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the set of vectors $\{T_f \xi : f \in F_{n-1}\}$ are linearly independent. Now it is clear that

sets of the above type are linearly independent if and only if (ii) holds. This concludes the proof. \square

Remarks. (i) A commuting contractive d -tuple T on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with $\Delta_T = 1$ is maximal if and only if

$$P(T_1, \dots, T_d)|_{\mathcal{D}_1} \neq 0,$$

for any polynomial P of commuting d variables.

(ii) Let $M_{z_i}, i = 1, \dots, d$, denote the multiplication operators on the Drury-Arveson module (see [Ar], [Dru] or Section 4) H_d^2 by co-ordinates. Then consider the tuple

$$M = (P_{\mathcal{Q}}M_{z_1}|_{\mathcal{Q}}, \dots, P_{\mathcal{Q}}M_{z_d}|_{\mathcal{Q}}),$$

where \mathcal{Q} is a quotient module of H_d^2 given by $\mathcal{Q} = H_d^2 \ominus \theta H_d^2$ and θ is a multiplier. Let $\Delta_M = 1$ and \mathcal{Q} is infinite dimensional. Then note that $\theta f \in \mathcal{Q}^\perp$ for any $f \in H_d^2$ and this implies $\theta(M) = 0$. Therefore by the first remark M is maximal if and only if θ is not a polynomial.

Corollary 3.5. *Let T be as in the above theorem. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\Delta_T^n = 1 + d + d^2 + \dots + d^{n-1}$ for all $n \leq m$ and $\Delta_T^n < 1 + d + \dots + d^{n-1}$ for all $n > m$.
- (ii) *There is no non-commuting polynomial P with d variable of degree less than m such that $P(T)|_{\mathcal{D}_1} = 0$ and there is a non-commuting polynomial Q with d variable of degree m such that $Q(T)|_{\mathcal{D}_1} = 0$.*

Proof. By the same argument as in the proof of the above theorem it follows that the dimension of \mathcal{D}_n is maximal for some n if and only if there is no polynomial P of degree smaller than n such that $P(T)|_{\mathcal{D}_1} = 0$. This completes the proof. \square

For a single contraction acting on a finite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , we have the following immediate corollary.

Corollary 3.6. *Let T be a single contraction acting on a finite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with $\Delta_T = 1$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i)

$$\Delta_T^n = \begin{cases} n, & n \leq m \leq \dim \mathcal{H} \\ m, & n > m \end{cases}.$$

- (ii) *The degree of the minimal polynomial of T is at least m and there is a polynomial P of degree m such that $P(T)|_{\mathcal{D}_1} = 0$.*

Now we recall some of the work of Popescu ([Po]) in order to characterize pure maximal tuple of operators. We denote by \mathcal{F}_d^2 the full Fock space over the d -dimensional Hilbert space \mathbb{C}^d with orthonormal basis (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_d) . It is often represented by

$$\mathcal{F}_d^2 = \mathbb{C} \oplus_{m \geq 1} (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes m}$$

but we use the notation (3) to describe it and simplify notation as follows. If $f \in F(k, \Lambda)$, let

$$e_f = e_{f(1)} \otimes e_{f(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{f(k)}, \quad \text{and for } k = 0, \quad e_0 = \omega.$$

We call ω the vacuum vector. Then \mathcal{F}_d^2 is the Hilbert space with basis $\{e_f : f \in F\}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the n -th particle space is denoted by Γ_n and is defined by

$$\Gamma_n := \text{span}\{e_f : f \in F_n\}.$$

Creation operators on the full Fock space \mathcal{F}_d^2 is denoted by $S_i, i = 1, \dots, d$ and defined by

$$S_i : \mathcal{F}_d^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d^2, \quad \psi \mapsto e_i \otimes \psi, \quad (i = 1, \dots, d).$$

The complete characterization of invariant subspaces (consequently co-invariant subspaces) for these creation operators on full Fock space by Popescu (see [Po89], [Po]) is given in the next theorem.

Theorem 3.7 (Popescu). *If $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F}_d^2$ is invariant for each S_1, \dots, S_d then there exists a sequence $\{\phi_j\}_{j \in J}$ of orthogonal inner functions such that*

$$\mathcal{S} = \bigoplus_{j \in J} \mathcal{F}_d^2 \otimes \phi_j.$$

Moreover, this representation is essentially unique.

The model for pure non-commuting d -tuple is the compression of creation operators to a co-invariant subspace as we state next (see [Po89]).

Theorem 3.8 (Popescu). *Let T be a pure non-commuting d -tuple. Then $T \cong (P_{\mathcal{Q}}(S_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_1})|_{\mathcal{Q}}, \dots, P_{\mathcal{Q}}(S_d \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_1})|_{\mathcal{Q}})$, where \mathcal{Q} is a co-invariant subspace for the creation tuples $(S_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_1}, \dots, S_d \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_1})$, \mathcal{D}_1 is the first defect space of T and $P_{\mathcal{Q}}$ denotes the projection on to \mathcal{Q} .*

The co-invariant subspace appears in the above theorem is the image of the Poisson kernel $K(T)$ corresponding to the tuple T defined by $K(T) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d^2 \otimes \mathcal{D}_1$, $h \mapsto (\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots)$ where $\xi_0 = \omega \otimes D_T h$ and for $k \geq 1$,

$$\xi_k = \sum_{f \in F(k, \Lambda)} e_f \otimes D_T(T_f)^* h.$$

In this case, $K(T)$ is an isometry. Moreover,

$$K(T)T_i^* = (S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_1})K(T),$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and

$$(5) \quad K(T)^* : \mathcal{F}_d^2 \otimes \mathcal{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}, \quad e_f \otimes \xi \mapsto T_f D_T \xi.$$

For the class of pure tuples the characterization of maximality is given in the next theorem.

Theorem 3.9. *Let T be a pure contractive d -tuple of operators on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with $\Delta_T = 1$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) T is maximal.
- (ii) There is no polynomial P of d non-commuting variables such that $P(T)|_{\mathcal{D}_1} = 0$.
- (iii) $T \cong (P_{\mathcal{Q}}S_1|_{\mathcal{Q}}, \dots, P_{\mathcal{Q}}S_d|_{\mathcal{Q}})$, where \mathcal{Q} is the co-invariant subspace of the creation tuple such that $\dim[\text{ran } P_{\mathcal{Q}}|_{\Gamma_n}] = 1 + d + \dots + d^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (iv) For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\Gamma_n \otimes \mathcal{D}_1) \cap \ker K(T)^* = \{0\}$ where $K(T)^*$ is the adjoint of the Poisson kernel as in (5).

Proof. (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) follows from Theorem 3.4.

(i) \Leftrightarrow (iii)

It follows from Theorem 3.8 that $T \cong (P_{\mathcal{Q}}S_1|_{\mathcal{Q}}, \dots, P_{\mathcal{Q}}S_d|_{\mathcal{Q}})$ where \mathcal{Q} is an co-invariant subspace for the creation tuple. Thus it is enough to show that the tuple $(P_{\mathcal{Q}}S_1|_{\mathcal{Q}}, \dots, P_{\mathcal{Q}}S_d|_{\mathcal{Q}})$ is maximal if and only if $\dim[\text{ran}(P_{\mathcal{Q}}|_{\Gamma_n})] = 1 + d + \dots + d^n$ for all n . Now we calculate the defect spaces of the tuple as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \text{ran}(P_{\mathcal{Q}} - \sum_{i=1}^d P_{\mathcal{Q}}S_iS_i^*|_{\mathcal{Q}}) = P_{\mathcal{Q}}P_{\mathbb{C}\omega}P_{\mathcal{Q}}.$$

Since the first defect dimension is one therefore $\mathcal{D}_1 = \text{span}\{\xi := P_{\mathcal{Q}}(\omega)\}$. Note that $P_{\mathcal{Q}}S_iP_{\mathcal{Q}}(\xi) = P_{\mathcal{Q}}S_i(I - P_{\mathcal{Q}^\perp})(\omega) = P_{\mathcal{Q}}(e_i)$ as \mathcal{Q}^\perp is an invariant subspace for each S_i , $i = 1, \dots, d$. By induction argument one can show that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in F(k, \Lambda)$, $P_{\mathcal{Q}}S_{f(1)}P_{\mathcal{Q}} \dots P_{\mathcal{Q}}S_{f(k)}\xi = P_{\mathcal{Q}}(e_f)$. Then by Proposition 2.3,

$$\mathcal{D}_n = \text{span}\{P_{\mathcal{Q}}(e_f) : f \in F_{n-1}\}$$

for all n . Therefore $\mathcal{D}_n = \text{ran}(P_{\mathcal{Q}}|_{\Gamma_{n-1}})$ and the result.

(ii) \Leftrightarrow (iv)

Since the first defect space is one dimensional then $\mathcal{D}_1 = \mathbb{C}\xi$. Now as $\text{ran } D_T = \text{ran } D_T^2$ we have $D_T\xi = \lambda\xi$ for some non-zero scalar λ . By definition of $K(T)^*$ it follows that $\sum_{f \in F_{k|}} a_f e_f \otimes \xi \in \ker K(T)^*$ if and only if $P(T)(\xi) = 0$ where $P = \sum_{f \in F_{k|}} \lambda a_f Z_f$, $Z_f = z_{f(1)} \dots z_{f(k)}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus the theorem. \square

Remarks. (i) The last equivalent condition in the above theorem is independent of the assumption $\Delta_T = 1$. More precisely, a pure contractive d -tuple T with finite Δ_T is maximal if and only if (iv) holds. To see this let $\Delta_T = n$ and $\mathcal{D}_1 = \text{span}\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n\}$. Set $\psi_i := D_T(\phi_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Now as $\text{ran } D_T^2 = \mathcal{D}_1$ and $\text{ran } D_T = \text{span}\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n\}$ we also have $\mathcal{D}_1 = \text{span}\{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n\}$. Thus T is maximal if and only if the set of vectors $\{T_f\psi_i : f \in F_{k|}, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ are linearly independent for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the claim readily follows from the following equivalent conditions:

$$\sum_{i=1, \dots, n, f \in F_{k|}} a_{f,i} e_f \otimes \phi_i \in \ker K(T)^* \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1, \dots, n, f \in F_{k|}} a_{f,i} T_f \psi_i = 0.$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) The condition (iii) in the above theorem can be made independent of the assumption $\Delta_T = 1$ as follows. If $\Delta_T = k$ then $T \cong (P_{\mathcal{Q}}(S_1 \otimes I_{\mathbb{C}^k})|_{\mathcal{Q}}, \dots, P_{\mathcal{Q}}(S_d \otimes I_{\mathbb{C}^k})|_{\mathcal{Q}})$ where \mathcal{Q} is a joint co-invariant subspace for the amplified creation tuple. Then the equivalence condition of maximality in this case is the following:

$$\dim[\text{ran } P_{\mathcal{Q}}|_{\Gamma_n \otimes \mathbb{C}^k}] = (1 + d + \dots + d^n)k$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

By Proposition 3.2, we know that if T is a single pure contraction T on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} then $\mathcal{D}_\infty = \mathcal{H}$. Then for every polynomial p such that $p(T)|_{\mathcal{D}_1} = 0$ implies $0 = T^n p(T)\xi =$

$p(T)T^n\xi$ for $\xi \in \mathcal{D}_1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now as $\mathcal{D}_\infty = \overline{\text{span}}\{T^n\xi : n \in \mathbb{N}, \xi \in \mathcal{D}_1\}$ we have $p(T) = 0$. Thus for a single pure contraction T ,

$$p(T)|_{\mathcal{D}_1} = 0 \Leftrightarrow p(T) = 0$$

for any polynomial p . This observation helps us to find connection with minimal function as follows. Below we denote by $H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ the multiplier algebra of the Hardy space on the unit disc $H^2(\mathbb{D})$.

Theorem 3.10. *Let T be a single pure contraction on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with $\Delta_T = 1$.*

- (a) *If \mathcal{H} is infinite dimensional and there is a non-zero function $m \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ such that $m(T) = 0$ then m can not be a polynomial.*
- (b) *If \mathcal{H} is finite dimensional then the degree of the minimal polynomial is $\dim \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. Part (a) follows from the above discussion and Theorem 3.4 and the fact that T is maximal. For part (b) note that the maximality of the operator T implies the defect spaces in this case are as follows:

$$\Delta_T^n = \begin{cases} n, & n \leq \dim \mathcal{H} \\ \dim \mathcal{H}, & n > \dim \mathcal{H} \end{cases}.$$

Then by the Corollary 3.6 we have the degree of the minimal polynomial is at least $\dim \mathcal{H}$ and this completes the proof. \square

Remark. It is well known that any single pure contraction T on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with $\Delta_T = 1$ is unitarily equivalent to $P_{H_\theta}M_z|_{H_\theta}$ where $H_\theta = H^2(\mathbb{D}) \ominus \theta H^2(\mathbb{D})$ is a co-invariant subspace for the co-ordinate multiplication operator M_z and θ is an inner function. In this case the minimal function of T is θ (see [SzF], Chapter 3, Proposition 4.3). Then the above theorem tells us that if \mathcal{H} is infinite dimensional then θ can not be polynomial and if θ is a polynomial then the dimension of \mathcal{H} is indeed same as the degree of θ .

4. MAXIMAL SUBMODULES OF H_d^2

This section concerns the maximality of submodules of the Drury-Arveson module ([Dru], [Ar]). We denote by H_d^2 the Drury-Arveson module on the unit ball \mathbb{B}_d and defined by the reproducing kernel $K_\lambda(z) = \frac{1}{(1-\langle \lambda, z \rangle)}$, where $\langle \lambda, z \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^d z_j \overline{\lambda_j}$ and $\lambda, z \in \mathbb{B}_d$. For $d = 1$, $H_1^2 = H^2(\mathbb{D})$ the Hardy space on the unit disc. The multiplication operators M_{z_i} by the co-ordinate functions z_i , $i = 1, \dots, d$, turns H_d^2 to a Hilbert module over $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}] := \mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_d]$ as follows:

$$\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}] \times H_d^2 \rightarrow H_d^2, (p, h) \mapsto p(M_{z_1}, \dots, M_{z_d})h.$$

A closed subspace \mathcal{S} of H_d^2 is said to be *submodule* of H_d^2 if $M_{z_i}\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$. Let \mathcal{S} be a submodule of H_d^2 and let $R_{\mathcal{S}} := (M_{z_1}|_{\mathcal{S}}, \dots, M_{z_d}|_{\mathcal{S}})$ be the restriction of the d -shift to \mathcal{S} . It is readily follows that the d -tuple $R_{\mathcal{S}}$ is contractive. A submodule \mathcal{S} of H_d^2 is *maximal* if the contractive tuple $R_{\mathcal{S}}$ is maximal. For $d = 1$, let $\mathcal{S} \subset H_1^2$ be a submodule of the Hardy space on the unit disc. Then $R_{\mathcal{S}} := M_z|_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a pure isometry ($R_{\mathcal{S}}^{*n} \rightarrow 0$ in S.O.T. as $n \rightarrow \infty$) with multiplicity one. In other words, that $R_{\mathcal{S}} \cong M_z$. Consequently we have the following result:

Theorem 4.1. *Any submodule \mathcal{S} of $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ is maximal.*

But for $d \geq 2$ the above theorem does not hold in general as we show next. For the *rest of the section* we assume $d \geq 2$.

Before proceeding, we shall recall a result concerning the defect space and the multipliers of submodules of the Drury-Arveson module (for details see [Ar], [GRS], [McT]). First note that the defect operator D_{R_S} and the defect dimension of the tuple R_S are given by

$$D_{R_S} = (P_S - \sum_{i=1}^d M_{z_i} P_S M_{z_i}^*)^{1/2},$$

and

$$\Delta_{R_S} = \dim[\overline{\text{ran}} D_{R_S}],$$

where P_S is the orthogonal projection in $B(H_d^2)$ with range \mathcal{S} .

Theorem 4.2. *Let \mathcal{S} be a submodule of H_d^2 with $\Delta_{R_S} = n$. Then there exists $\phi_i \in \text{ran } D_{R_S}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ such that each ϕ_i is a multiplier and*

$$P_S = \sum_{i=1}^n M_{\phi_i} M_{\phi_i}^*$$

and the submodule \mathcal{S} is generated by $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

By the above theorem one can describe all the defect spaces of R_S in terms of the generators of \mathcal{S} as follows. Let $\Delta_{R_S} = n$ and $\phi_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, are as above such that $P_S = \sum_i M_{\phi_i} M_{\phi_i}^*$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} D_{R_S}^2 &= P_S - \sum_{i=1}^d M_{z_i} P_S M_{z_i}^* \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n M_{\phi_k} (I_{H_d^2} - \sum_{i=1}^d M_{z_i} M_{z_i}^*) M_{\phi_k}^* \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n M_{\phi_k} |1\rangle \langle 1| M_{\phi_k}^* \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n |\phi_k\rangle \langle \phi_k|, \end{aligned}$$

where $|f\rangle \langle g|$ denote the rank one operator that takes h to $\langle g, h \rangle f$ for all $f, g, h \in H_d^2$. Thus

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \text{span}\{\phi_i : i = 1, \dots, n\},$$

and by Proposition 2.3

$$\mathcal{D}_m = \text{span}\{z_1^{j_1} \cdots z_d^{j_d} \phi_i : i = 1, \dots, n \text{ and } \sum_{t=1}^d j_t = m - 1\},$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now we investigate the question of maximality of a homogeneous submodule \mathcal{S} when Δ_{T_S} is finite.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose \mathcal{S} is a homogeneous submodule of H_d^2 with $\Delta_{R_S} < \infty$. Then \mathcal{S} is not maximal.*

Proof. Let $\Delta_{R_S} = n$. Note that a submodule is homogeneous if and only if it is generated by homogeneous polynomials. Consequently, there exists an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{S} consisting of homogeneous polynomials, and hence there exists polynomials p_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ such that $\mathcal{D}_1 = \text{span}\{p_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$. For the contradiction suppose \mathcal{S} is maximal then by maximality of the tuple R_S , the set of vectors $\{z_1^{j_1} \cdots z_d^{j_d} p_i : i = 1, \dots, n \text{ and } j_1, \dots, j_d \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are linearly independent. However since p_k 's are polynomials those vectors can not be linearly independent. This concludes the proof. \square

Corollary 4.4. *Let \mathcal{S} be a submodule of H_d^2 with $\Delta_{R_S} < \infty$ and $P_S = \sum_{i=1}^n M_{p_i} M_{p_i}^*$ for non-constant polynomials p_i 's and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then \mathcal{S} is not maximal.*

Proof. Since $P_S = \sum_{i=1}^n M_{p_i} M_{p_i}^*$, the first defect space $\mathcal{D}_1 = \text{span}\{p_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. Now the argument used to prove the previous theorem can be adapted to show that \mathcal{S} is not maximal. \square

Since R_S is a pure contractive d -tuple for a submodule \mathcal{S} , the adjoint of the Poisson kernel $K(R_S)$ in this case is a unique bounded linear operator $K(R_S)^* : H_d^2 \otimes \mathcal{D}_1 \rightarrow H_d^2$ defined by taking linear and continuous extension of the following prescription:

$$p \otimes \xi \mapsto p D_{R_S} \xi, \quad (p \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}], \xi \in \mathcal{D}_1).$$

The range of this map is precisely \mathcal{S} . A characterization for maximal submodules in terms of this operator is given next.

Theorem 4.5. *Let \mathcal{S} be a submodule of H_d^2 and $\Delta_{R_S} < \infty$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) \mathcal{S} is maximal.
- (ii) $(\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}] \otimes \mathcal{D}_1) \cap \ker K(R_S)^* = \{0\}$, where the operator $K(R_S)^*$ is as above.

Proof. The proof follows from a slight modification of the argument given in the first remark after Theorem 3.9 as the tuple R_S in this case is a commuting tuple. \square

We conclude the paper with the comment that examples of proper maximal submodules for $d \geq 2$ are not known. We feel that any proper submodule of Drury-Arveson module is not maximal but we do not have any proof of it yet.

Acknowledgement: The hospitality of Indian Statistical Institute, Bangalore centre is warmly and gratefully acknowledged by the first author. The third author was supported by UGC Centre for Advanced Study.

REFERENCES

- [Ar] W. Arveson, Subalgebras of C^* -algebras III: Multivariable operator theory, *Acta Math.* **181** (1998), 159-228.
- [Ber] H. Bercovici, Operator theory and arithmetic in H^∞ , *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. No. 26, A.M.S., Providence, Rhode Island, 1988.
- [BDS] T. Bhattacharyya, B.K. Das, S. Sarkar, The defect sequence for contractive tuples, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **438** (2013), no. 1, 315–330.
- [Dru] S. Drury, A generalization of von Neumann’s inequality to the complex ball, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **68** (1978), no. 3, 300-304.
- [GaW] H.-L. Gau, P. Y. Wu, Defect indices of powers of a contraction, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **432** (2010), 2824–2833.
- [GRS] D. Greene, S. Richter and C. Sundberg, The structure of inner multiplications on space with complete Nevanlinna Pick kernels, *J. Funct. Anal.* **194** (2002), 311-331.
- [McT] S. McCullough and T. Trent, Invariant subspaces and Nevanlinna-Pick kernels, *J. Funct. Anal.* **178** (2000), 226-249.
- [Po89] G. Popescu, Characteristic functions for infinite sequences of noncommuting operators, *J. Operator Theory.* **22** (1989), no. 1, 51-71.
- [Po] G. Popescu, Isometric dilations for infinite sequences of noncommuting operators, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **316** (1989), no. 2, 523-536.
- [SzF] B. Sz.-Nagy and C. Foias, Harmonic analysis of operators on Hilbert space, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1970.

(B. K. DAS) INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, STATISTICS AND MATHEMATICS UNIT, 8TH MILE, MYSORE ROAD, BANGALORE, 560059, INDIA

E-mail address: dasb@isibang.ac.in

(J. SARKAR) INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, STATISTICS AND MATHEMATICS UNIT, 8TH MILE, MYSORE ROAD, BANGALORE, 560059, INDIA

E-mail address: jay@isibang.ac.in, jaydeb@gmail.com

(S. SARKAR) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANGALORE, 560 012, INDIA

E-mail address: santanu@math.iisc.ernet.in