

PRIMITIVE IDEAL SPACE OF HIGHER-RANK GRAPH C^* -ALGEBRAS AND DECOMPOSABILITY

HOSSEIN LARKI

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we describe primitive ideal space of the C^* -algebra $C^*(\Lambda)$ associated to any locally convex row-finite k -graph Λ . To do this, we will apply the Farthing's desourcifying method on a recent result of Carlsen, Kang, Shotwell, and Sims. We also characterize certain maximal ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$.

Furthermore, we study the decomposability of $C^*(\Lambda)$. We apply the description of primitive ideals to show that if I is a direct summand of $C^*(\Lambda)$, then it is gauge-invariant and isomorphic to a certain k -graph C^* -algebra. So, we may characterize decomposable higher-rank C^* -algebras by giving necessary and sufficient conditions for the underlying k -graphs. Moreover, we determine all such C^* -algebras which can be decomposed into a direct sum of finitely many indecomposable C^* -algebras.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

Motivated from [15], the C^* -algebras of higher-rank graphs (or k -graphs) were introduced by Kumjian and Pask in [8] as higher-rank analogous of the graph C^* -algebras. They were first considered in [8] only for row-finite k -graphs with no sources, and then generalized for locally convex row-finite and finitely aligned setting [12, 13]. Since then, they have received a great deal of attention and provided a very interesting source of examples rather than ordinary graph C^* -algebras (see [10, 11] among others).

For any countable directed graph E , Hong and Szymański described in [5] primitive ideal space of the C^* -algebra $C^*(E)$ and its hull-kernel topology. After that, there have been many efforts to characterize primitive ideals of higher-rank graph C^* -algebras (see [16, 6] for example). The substantial work of Carlsen, Kang, Shotwell and A. Sims in [2] is to catalogue all primitive (two-sided and closed) ideals of the C^* -algebra $C^*(\Lambda)$ of a row-finite higher-rank graph Λ with no sources. Despite some similarities, the structure of primitive ideals in higher-rank graph C^* -algebras are much more complicated compared with that of ordinary graphs. Although the main

Date: March 14, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 46L05.

Key words and phrases. k -graph, higher-rank graph C^* -algebra, primitive ideal, decomposability.

result of [2] is a generalization of the Hong-Szymański's description, but its methods and computations are quite different from [5].

In this paper, we let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph with possible sources. Our primary aim is to characterize all primitive ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$. To this end, we apply the Farthing's desourcification [4] on the results of [2]. Recall that Farthing in [4] constructed a specific k -graph $\bar{\Lambda}$ without sources which contains Λ as a subgraph. She showed in [4, Theorem 3.30] that $C^*(\Lambda)$ is a full corner in $C^*(\bar{\Lambda})$, and therefore they are Morita-equivalent (see Section 2.4 below for details). So, we may characterize the structure of primitive ideal space of $C^*(\Lambda)$ using that of $C^*(\bar{\Lambda})$. Note that the Farthing's desourcification was modified by Webster in [18, Section 4]. However, [18, Proposition 4.12] shows that the desourcifications constructed in [4, Section 3] and [18, Section 4] are isomorphic when Λ is row-finite. Furthermore, there is a mistake in the proof of [4, Theorem 3.30] (the proof works only for locally convex row-finite k -graphs), and Webster resolved it in [18, Theorem 6.3] (see [18, Remark 6.2]).

The rest of article will be devoted to some applications of the primitive ideal structure of $C^*(\Lambda)$. First, as any ideal is an intersection of primitive ideals, certain maximal ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$ will be determined. Then, we will describe ideals which are direct summands of $C^*(\Lambda)$, and study the decomposability of $C^*(\Lambda)$.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some elementary definitions and basic facts about k -graphs and their C^* -algebras from [8, 12]. We also review the Farthing's desourcification of a higher-rank graph Λ . In Section 3, we define an equivalent relation on a row-finite k -graph Λ , which will be used in Section 4 to describe generators of primitive ideals. We then discuss on relationships between equivalent paths in Λ and in its desourcification $\bar{\Lambda}$. In Section 4, for any locally convex row-finite k -graph Λ , we characterize primitive (two-sided and closed) ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$ and define specific irreducible representations whose kernels generate such ideals. Then, in Section 5, some certain maximal primitive ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$ are determined. As a consequence, we see that when Λ is a cofinal k -graph, then primitive ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$ are all maximal.

In Section 6, by applying the description of primitive ideals, we give some graph theoretic conditions for the decomposability of $C^*(\Lambda)$. In particular, we show that if $C^*(\Lambda)$ decomposes as $A \oplus B$, then A and B are gauge-invariant ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$, which are themselves isomorphic to certain k -graph C^* -algebras. Finally, in Section 7, we consider the question "when is $C^*(\Lambda)$ a direct sum of finitely many indecomposable C^* -algebras?". We describe all such higher-rank graph C^* -algebras by giving necessary and sufficient conditions on the underlying k -graphs.

2. HIGHER-RANK GRAPHS AND THEIR C^* -ALGEBRAS

In this section, we review some basic facts about higher-rank graphs and their C^* -algebras, which will be needed in the paper. We refer the reader to [8] and [12] for more details.

2.1. Higher-rank graphs. Fix a positive integer $k > 0$. We regard $\mathbb{N}^k := \{n = (n_1, \dots, n_k) : n_i \geq 0\}$ as an additive semigroup with identity 0. We denote by e_1, \dots, e_k the standard generators of \mathbb{N}^k . The relation $m \leq n \iff m_i \leq n_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, puts a partial order on \mathbb{N}^k . We write $m \vee n$ and $m \wedge n$ for the coordinatewise maximum and minimum of $m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k$, respectively.

Definition 2.1 ([8]). A k -graph (or graph of rank k) is a countable small category $\Lambda = (\Lambda^0, \Lambda^1, r, s)$ equipped with a degree functor $d : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^k$ satisfying the factorization property: for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ with $d(\lambda) = m + n$, there exist unique $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ such that $d(\mu) = m$, $d(\nu) = n$, and $\lambda = \mu\nu$. Note that for $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$, the composition $\mu\nu$ makes sense only if $s(\mu) = r(\nu)$.

Note that every directed graph may be considered as a 1-graph (and vice versa), in the usual manner. With this example in mind, we make some notations. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$, we think of $\Lambda^n := d^{-1}(n)$ as the paths of degree n ; in particular, $\Lambda^0 = d^{-1}(0)$ is the vertices in Λ . For $v \in \Lambda^0$, $H \subseteq \Lambda^0$, and $E, F \subseteq \Lambda$, we write $vE := \{\mu \in E : r(\mu) = v\}$, $HE := \{\mu \in E, r(\mu) \in H\}$ and

$$EF := \{\mu\nu : \mu \in E, \nu \in F, \text{ and } s(\mu) = r(\nu)\},$$

and we define Ev and EH analogously. A vertex $v \in \Lambda^0$ is called *source* if $v\Lambda^{e_i} = \emptyset$ for some $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Definition 2.2. Let Λ be a k -graph. We say that Λ is *row-finite* if the sets $v\Lambda^n$ are all finite for $v \in \Lambda^0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$. Also, Λ is called *locally convex*, if for every $v \in \Lambda^0$, $i \neq j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, $\lambda \in v\Lambda^{e_i}$ and $\mu \in v\Lambda^{e_j}$, we have $s(\lambda)\Lambda^{e_j} \neq \emptyset$ and $s(\mu)\Lambda^{e_i} \neq \emptyset$. Observe that if Λ has no sources, then Λ is locally convex. Throughout the paper, we work only with locally convex, row-finite k -graphs.

2.2. Boundary Paths. Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph. For $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$, we write

$$\Lambda^{\leq n} := \{\lambda \in \Lambda : d(\lambda) \leq n, \text{ and } d(\lambda)_i < n_i \implies s(\lambda)\Lambda^{e_i} = \emptyset\}.$$

Note that if Λ has no sources, then $\Lambda^{\leq n} = \Lambda^n$.

Example 2.3. For any $m \in (\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\})^k$, let $\Omega_{k,m} := \{(p, q) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : p \leq q \leq m\}$. If we define $r(p, q) := (p, p)$, $s(p, q) := (q, q)$, and $d(p, q) := q - p$, then $\Omega_{k,m}$ is a k -graph. For simplicity, each (p, p) is denoted by p . Thus, we regard $\Omega_{k,m}^0 = \{p : p \leq m\}$ as the object set of $\Omega_{k,m}$. For $m = (\infty, \dots, \infty)$, the k -graph $\Omega_{k,m}$ is denoted by Ω_k in [8].

A *boundary path* in Λ is a degree preserving functor $x : \Omega_{k,m} \rightarrow \Lambda$ such that $p \leq m$ and $p_i = m_i$ imply $x(p)\Lambda^{e_i} = \emptyset$. Then, m is called the *degree* of x and we write $d(x) = m$. When $m = (\infty, \dots, \infty)$, x is an *infinite path* in the sense of [8]. We denote by $\Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ the set of boundary paths in Λ . Note that if Λ has no sources, then every boundary path is an infinite path, so $\Lambda^{\leq \infty} = \Lambda^\infty$.

Given any $x \in \Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ and $n \leq d(x)$, we may define the n -shifted boundary path $\sigma^n(x) : \Omega_{k,d(x)-n} \rightarrow \Lambda$ by $\sigma^n(x)(p, q) := x(p+n, q+n)$ for $p \leq q \leq d(x)-n$. Moreover, if $\lambda \in \Lambda x(0)$, there is a unique boundary path $\lambda x \in \Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ such that $\lambda x(0, d(\lambda)) = \lambda$ and $(\lambda x)(d(\lambda), d(\lambda)+p) = x(0, p)$ for all $p \leq d(x)$. So, we have $\sigma^{d(\lambda)}(\lambda x) = x$.

2.3. The C^* -algebra of a higher-rank graph. Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph. A *Cuntz-Krieger Λ -family* is a set of partial isometries $\{S_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ satisfying the following relations:

- (1) $S_v S_w = \delta_{v,w} S_v$ for all $v, w \in \Lambda^0$;
- (2) $S_\lambda S_{\lambda'} = S_{\lambda\lambda'}$ for all $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda$ with $s(\lambda) = r(\lambda')$;
- (3) $S_\lambda^* S_\lambda = S_{s(\lambda)}$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$;
- (4) $S_v = \sum_{\lambda \in v\Lambda^{\leq n}} S_\lambda S_\lambda^*$ for all $v \in \Lambda^0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$.

The associated C^* -algebra $C^*(\Lambda)$ is the *universal C^* -algebra* generated by a Cuntz-Krieger Λ -family $\{s_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$. The universality implies that there is a *gauge action* $\gamma : \mathbb{T}^k \rightarrow \text{Aut } C^*(\Lambda)$ such that $\gamma_t(s_\lambda) = t^{d(\lambda)} s_\lambda$ for $t \in \mathbb{T}^k$, where $t^{d(\lambda)} := t_1^{d(\lambda)_1} \dots t_k^{d(\lambda)_k}$.

By *ideal* we mean a closed and two-sided one. An ideal I of $C^*(\Lambda)$ is called *gauge-invariant* if $\gamma_z(I) \subseteq I$ for every $z \in \mathbb{T}^k$. It is well-known by [12, Theorem 5.2] that gauge-invariant ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$ are associated to hereditary and saturated subsets of Λ^0 .

Definition 2.4. A subset H of Λ^0 is called *hereditary* if $r(\lambda) \in H$ implies $s(\lambda) \in H$ for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Also, we say that H is *saturated* if $v \in \Lambda^0$ and $s(v\Lambda^{\leq n}) \subseteq H$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$, then $v \in H$. If H is a subset of Λ^0 , the saturated closure of H is the smallest saturated subset $\Sigma(H)$ of Λ^0 containing H . Recall from [12, Lemma 5.1] that if $H \subseteq \Lambda^0$ is hereditary, then so is $\Sigma(H)$. We denote by \mathcal{H}_Λ the collection of saturated hereditary subsets of Λ^0 . Note that \mathcal{H}_Λ has a lattice structure by the operations

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 \wedge H_2 &:= H_1 \cap H_2 \\ H_1 \vee H_2 &:= \Sigma(H_1 \cup H_2). \end{aligned}$$

For every $H \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$, we denote by I_H the gauge-invariant ideal of $C^*(\Lambda)$ generated by $\{s_v : v \in H\}$, which is

$$I_H = \overline{\text{span}}\{s_\lambda s_{\lambda'}^* : \lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda, s(\lambda) = s(\lambda') \in H\}.$$

Also, [12, Theorem 5.2(b)] shows that $\Lambda \setminus \Lambda H$ is a locally convex k -subgraph of Λ and we have $C^*(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda H) \cong C^*(\Lambda)/I_H$. According to [12, Theorem 5.2(a)] the map $H \mapsto I_H$ is a lattice isomorphism from \mathcal{H}_Λ onto the set of

gauge-invariant ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$. Moreover, for each ideal I of $C^*(\Lambda)$, the set $H_I := \{v \in \Lambda^0 : s_v \in I\}$ is a saturated hereditary subset of Λ^0 .

2.4. Removing sources from a higher-rank graph. Here, we briefly review the desourcification constructions of Farthing [4] and Webster [18] with some minor modifications. We refer the reader to [4] and [18] for details and proofs. Note that, in case Λ is a row-finite k -graph, [18, Proposition 4.12] shows that the constructions of [18, Section 4] and [4, Section 3] produce isomorphic desourcifications.

Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph. Let P_Λ be the set

$$P_\Lambda := \{(x; (m, n)) : x \in \Lambda^{\leq \infty} \text{ and } m \leq n \in \mathbb{N}^k\}.$$

We define $(x; (m, n)) \approx (y; (p, q))$ if and only if

- P1) $x(m \wedge d(x), n \wedge d(x)) = y(p \wedge d(y), q \wedge d(y))$,
- P2) $m - m \wedge d(x) = p - p \wedge d(y)$, and
- P3) $n - m = q - p$.

Then, \approx is an equivalence relation on P_Λ and we denote the equivalence class of $(x; (m, n))$ by $[x; (m, n)]$. According to [4, Theorem 3.24], $\overline{\Lambda} := P_\Lambda / \approx$ equipped with

$$\begin{aligned} r([x; (m, n)]) &:= [x; (m, m)], \\ s([x; (m, n)]) &:= [x; (n, n)], \text{ and} \\ d([x; (m, n)]) &:= n - m. \end{aligned}$$

is a k -graph containing no sources. Also, the composition of paths in $\overline{\Lambda}$ is of the form

$$[x; (m, n)] \circ [y; (p, q)] = [x(0, n \wedge d(x))\sigma^{p \wedge d(y)}; (m, n + q - p)],$$

which makes sense only if $[x; (n, n)] = [y; (p, p)]$. For simplicity, we usually denote each $(x; (m, m))$ by $(x; m)$, so $\overline{\Lambda}^0 = \{[x; m] : x \in \Lambda^{\leq \infty}, m \in \mathbb{N}^k\}$ is the vertex set of $\overline{\Lambda}$. Note that, for $(x; m) \approx (y; n)$ it suffices to check only (P1) and (P2) because (P3) is trivial.

The correspondence $\lambda \mapsto [\lambda x; (0, d(\lambda))]$, where $x \in s(\lambda)\Lambda^{\leq \infty}$, is an injective k -graph morphism from Λ into $\overline{\Lambda}$ [18, Proposition 4.13]. Hence, we may regard Λ as a subgraph of $\overline{\Lambda}$. Also, the map $\pi : \overline{\Lambda} \rightarrow \Lambda$ defined by $\pi([x; (m, n)]) = [x; (m \wedge d(x), n \wedge d(x))]$, for $x \in \Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ and $m \leq n \in \mathbb{N}^k$, is a well-defined surjective k -graph morphism such that $\pi \circ \pi = \pi$. Recall from [4, Theorem 3.26] that if Λ is row-finite, then so is $\overline{\Lambda}$. The k -graph $\overline{\Lambda}$ is called the *desourcification* of Λ .

For every $x \in \Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}^k$, we may define an infinite path $[x; (p, \infty)] : \Omega_k \rightarrow \overline{\Lambda}$ by

$$[x; (p, \infty)](m, n) := [x; (p + m, p + n)]$$

for all $m \leq n \in \mathbb{N}^k$. The following Lemma says that every boundary path in $\overline{\Lambda}$ (which is an infinite path) is of the form $[x; (p, \infty)]$.

Lemma 2.5 (See [14, Proposition 2.3]). *Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph and let $\overline{\Lambda}$ be the desourcification of Λ . For each $z \in \overline{\Lambda}^\infty$, there exist $\pi(z) \in \Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ and $p_z \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that $p_z \wedge d(\pi(z)) = 0$ and $z = [\pi(z); (p_z, \infty)]$. Moreover, if $z(0) \in \Lambda^0$, then $p_z = 0$.*

Proof. The first statement is [14, Proposition 2.3]. For the second, if $[\pi(z); p_z] = z(0) \in \Lambda^0$, then $\pi([\pi(z); p_z]) = [\pi(z); p_z]$. So, we have

$$[\pi(z); p_z] = \pi([\pi(z); p_z]) = [\pi(z); p_z \wedge d(\pi(z))] = [\pi(z); 0].$$

Now condition (P2) for $(\pi(z); p_z) \approx (\pi(z); 0)$ implies that $p_z = p_z - p_z \wedge d(\pi(z)) = 0$. \square

In other words, we may define the map $\pi : \overline{\Lambda}^\infty \rightarrow \Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ by

$$\pi([x; (p, \infty)])(m, n) := x(p \wedge d(x) + m, p \wedge d(x) + n)$$

for $m \leq n \leq d(x) - p \wedge d(x)$. Thus, we have $\pi([x; (p, \infty)]) = \sigma^{p \wedge d(x)}(x)$.

If $\{s_\lambda : \lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}\}$ is a generating Cuntz-Krieger $\overline{\Lambda}$ -family for $C^*(\overline{\Lambda})$, then $\{s_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is a universal Cuntz-Krieger Λ -family [4, Theorem 3.28]. Hence, $C^*(\{s_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}) = C^*(\Lambda)$. Moreover, if we set $P := \sum_{v \in \Lambda^0} s_v$ as a projection in the multiplier algebra $\mathcal{M}(C^*(\overline{\Lambda}))$, then [4, Theorem 3.30] and [18, Theorem 6.3] say that $PC^*(\overline{\Lambda})P$ is a full corner in $C^*(\overline{\Lambda})$ such that $PC^*(\overline{\Lambda})P = C^*(\Lambda)$. In particular, the C^* -algebras $C^*(\Lambda)$ and $C^*(\overline{\Lambda})$ are Morita-equivalent. Therefore, the map $J \mapsto PJP$ is an isomorphism from the lattice of ideals in $C^*(\overline{\Lambda})$ onto that of $C^*(\Lambda)$.

Remark 2.6. There is an error in the proof [4, Theorem 3.30]; however, the proof may be considered for locally convex row-finite k -graphs. Webster resolved this result in [18, Theorem 6.3] (see [18, Remark 6.2]).

3. EQUIVALENT PATHS AND PERIODICITY

For any 1-graph E , Hong and Szymański in [5] described primitive ideals of $C^*(E)$ by specific collections of vertices T in E , called *maximal tails*, and periodicity in the quotient graphs ET . Recall that periodicity in 1-graphs can be determined by cycles with no entrances [6, Lemma 2.9]. Although we know that if a k -graph Λ is periodic (see Definition 3.2 below), then it contains a generalized cycle with no entrances [9, Lemma 4.4], but structure of periodic k -graphs is more complicated compared with 1-graphs and the arguments of [5] could not be generalized for k -graphs in general.

To deal with the periodicity, Carlsen et al. in [2] used the following equivalent relation on Λ which is inspired from [3].

Definition 3.1 ([2]). Let Λ be a row-finite k -graph. We set an equivalent relation on Λ by

$$\mu \sim_\Lambda \nu \iff s(\mu) = s(\nu) \text{ and } \mu x = \nu x \text{ for all } x \in s(\mu)\Lambda^{\leq \infty}.$$

(The subscript in \sim_Λ indicates the underlying k -graph.) We then define

$$\text{Per}(\Lambda) := \{d(\mu) - d(\nu) : \mu, \nu \in \Lambda \text{ and } \mu \sim_\Lambda \nu\},$$

which is a subset of \mathbb{Z}^k .

There are several conditions for aperiodicity in the literature, which are equivalent for finitely aligned k -graphs (cf. [17, Proposition 2.11]). We consider the following from [12] which was called *Condition (B)* there.

Definition 3.2. Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph. We say that Λ is *aperiodic* if for every $v \in \Lambda^0$, there exists $x \in v\Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ such that $\mu \neq \nu \in \Lambda v$ implies $\mu x \neq \nu x$. If Λ is not aperiodic, it is called *periodic*.

Proposition 3.3. Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph. Then the following are equivalent.

- (1) Λ is aperiodic.
- (2) $\text{Per}(\Lambda) = \{0\}$.
- (3) There are no distinct $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ such that $\mu \sim_{\Lambda} \nu$.

Proof. Implications (1) \Leftrightarrow (3) and (3) \Rightarrow (2) are immediate. To see (2) \Rightarrow (3), let $\mu \sim_{\Lambda} \nu$. Then $d(\mu) - d(\nu) \in \text{Per}(\Lambda) = \{0\}$, and so $d(\mu) = d(\nu)$. Fix $x \in s(\mu)\Lambda^{\leq \infty}$. Then for $m := d(\mu) = d(\nu)$ we have $\mu = \mu x(0, m) = \nu x(0, m) = \nu$, giving (3). \square

In the next proposition, we will relate equivalent paths in a k -graph Λ with those in its desourcification $\overline{\Lambda}$. Before that, we state a simple lemma.

Lemma 3.4. Let Λ be a row-finite k -graph and $\overline{\Lambda}$ the desourcification of Λ . Suppose $\mu, \nu \in \overline{\Lambda}$ such that $\mu \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \nu$. If $\mu = [x; (m, m + d(\mu))]$ for some $x \in \Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}^k$, then $\nu = [x; (m, m + d(\nu))]$.

Proof. By $\mu \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \nu$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} [x; (m, \infty)] &= [x; (m, m + d(\mu))] \circ [x; (m + d(\mu), \infty)] \\ &= \mu \circ [x; (m + d(\mu), \infty)] \\ &= \nu \circ [x; (m + d(\mu), \infty)]. \end{aligned}$$

So, we must have $\nu = [x; (m, m + d(\nu))]$ by the factorization property. \square

Proposition 3.5. Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k -graph and let $\overline{\Lambda}$ be the desourcification of Λ . For any $\mu, \nu \in \overline{\Lambda}$ with $r(\mu) = r(\nu)$, the following are equivalent:

- (1) $\mu \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \nu$;
- (2) $\pi(\mu) \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \pi(\nu)$ and $d(\mu) - d(\pi(\mu)) = d(\nu) - d(\pi(\nu))$;
- (3) $\pi(\mu) \sim_{\Lambda} \pi(\nu)$ and $d(\mu) - d(\pi(\mu)) = d(\nu) - d(\pi(\nu))$.

Proof. Write $\mu = [x; (m, m + d(\mu))]$ and $\nu = [y; (n, n + d(\nu))]$. For $q := m \wedge d(x)$, we have

$$[x; (m, m + d(\mu))] = [\sigma^q(x); (m - q, m - q + d(\mu))]$$

such that

$$(m - q) \wedge d(\sigma^q(x)) = (m - m \wedge d(x)) \wedge (d(x) - m \wedge d(x)) = m \wedge d(x) - m \wedge d(x) = 0.$$

So, without loss of generality, we may suppose $\mu = [x; (m, m + d(\mu))]$ and $\nu = [y; (n, n + d(\nu))]$ such that $m \wedge d(x) = n \wedge d(y) = 0$. Then

$$\pi(\mu) = [x; (m \wedge d(x), (m + d(\mu)) \wedge d(x))] = [x; (0, d(\mu) \wedge d(x))]$$

and similarly $\pi(\nu) = [y; (0, d(\nu) \wedge d(y))]$. Moreover, we have $[x; (0, m)] = [y; (0, m)]$. Indeed, conditions (P1) and (P2) for $[x; m] = r(\mu) = r(\nu) = [y; n]$ imply $x(0) = y(0)$ and

$$m = m - m \wedge d(x) = n - n \wedge d(y) = n,$$

giving $(x; (0, m)) \approx (y; (0, m))$.

(1) \implies (2): We suppose $\mu \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \nu$. By Lemma 3.4, $\nu = [x; (m, m + d(\nu))]$ and $\pi(\nu) = [x; (0, d(\nu) \wedge d(x))]$. So, (P2) for $[x; m + d(\mu)] = s(\mu) = s(\nu) = [x; m + d(\nu)]$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned} m + d(\mu) - (m + d(\mu)) \wedge d(x) &= m + d(\nu) - (m + d(\nu)) \wedge d(x) \\ \implies d(\mu) - d(\pi(\mu)) &= d(\nu) - d(\pi(\nu)). \end{aligned}$$

Now we prove $\pi(\mu) \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \pi(\nu)$. Using Lemma 2.5, every infinite path in $\overline{\Lambda}$ is of the form $[z; (p_z, \infty)]$ with $p_z \wedge d(z) = 0$. Fix $[z; (p_z, \infty)] \in s(\pi(\mu))\overline{\Lambda}^\infty$. In view of Lemma 2.5, we can assume $p_z = 0$ because $[z; p_z] = s(\pi(\mu)) \in \Lambda^0$. Set

$$p := m + d(\mu) - d(\pi(\mu)) = m + d(\nu) - d(\pi(\nu)).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} d(\sigma^{d(\pi(\mu))}(x)) \wedge p &= (d(x) - d(\pi(\mu))) \wedge (m + d(\mu) - d(\pi(\mu))) \\ &= (d(x) \wedge (m + d(\mu))) - d(\pi(\mu)) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

[14, Lemma 2.2] implies $[\sigma^{d(\pi(\mu))}(x); (0, p)] = [z; (0, p)]$. Thus, one may compute

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\mu) \circ [z; (0, \infty)] &= [x; (0, d(\pi(\mu)))] \circ [z; (0, p)] \circ [z; (p, \infty)] \\ &= [x; (0, d(\pi(\mu)))] \circ [\sigma^{d(\pi(\mu))}(x); (0, p)] \circ [z; (p, \infty)] \\ &= [x; (0, m + d(\mu))] \circ [z; (p, \infty)] \\ &= [x; (0, m)] \circ [x; (m, m + d(\mu))] \circ [z; (p, \infty)] \\ &= [x; (0, m)] \circ \mu \circ [z; (p, \infty)]. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, we have

$$\pi(\nu) \circ [z; (0, \infty)] = [x; (0, m)] \circ \nu \circ [z; (p, \infty)],$$

and hence $\pi(\mu) \circ [z; (0, \infty)] = \pi(\nu) \circ [z; (0, \infty)]$ by applying $\mu \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \nu$. This establishes $\pi(\mu) \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \pi(\nu)$.

(2) \implies (1): Assume that $\pi(\mu) \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \pi(\nu)$ and $d(\mu) - d(\pi(\mu)) = d(\nu) - d(\pi(\nu))$. We first claim

$$[x; (d(\pi(\mu)), m + d(\pi(\mu)))] = [y; (d(\pi(\nu)), m + d(\pi(\nu)))].$$

To this end, we can check conditions (P1)-(P3) for $(x; (d(\pi(\mu)), m + d(\pi(\mu)))) \approx (y; (d(\pi(\nu)), m + d(\pi(\nu))))$. Indeed, the fact $[x; d(\pi(\mu))] = s(\pi(\mu)) = s(\pi(\nu)) =$

$[y; d(\pi(\nu))]$ gives (P1), whereas (P2) is trivial because $d(\pi(\mu)) \wedge d(x) = d(\pi(\mu))$ and $d(\pi(\nu)) \wedge d(y) = d(\pi(\nu))$. Also, the relation

$$m + d(\mu) - d(\pi(\mu)) = m + d(\nu) - d(\pi(\nu))$$

yields (P3), therefore the claim holds.

Furthermore, since $[x; (d(\pi(\mu)), \infty)] \in s(\pi(\mu))\overline{\Lambda}^\infty$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} [x; (0, \infty)] &= \pi(\mu) \circ [x; (d(\pi(\mu)), \infty)] \\ &= \pi(\nu) \circ [x; (d(\pi(\mu)), m + d(\mu))] \circ [x; (m + d(\mu), \infty)] \\ &\quad \text{(by } \pi(\mu) \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \pi(\nu)) \\ &= [y; (0, d(\pi(\nu)))] \circ [y; (d(\pi(\nu)), m + d(\nu))] \circ [x; (m + d(\mu), \infty)] \\ &\quad \text{(by the claim)} \\ &= [y; (0, m + d(\nu))] \circ [x; (m + d(\mu), \infty)]. \end{aligned}$$

So, we get $[x; (0, m + d(\nu))] = [y; (0, m + d(\nu))]$ by the factorization property.

In particular, $\nu = [y; (m, m + d(\nu))] = [x; (m, m + d(\nu))]$.

Now fix an arbitrary $z \in s(\mu)\overline{\Lambda}^\infty$. Then $[x; (d(\pi(\mu)), d(\mu))] \circ z \in s(\pi(\mu))\overline{\Lambda}^\infty$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} [x; (0, m)] \circ \mu \circ z &= [x; (0, m)] \circ [x; (m, m + d(\mu))] \circ z \\ &= [x; (0, d(\pi(\mu)))] \circ [x; (d(\pi(\mu)), m + d(\mu))] \circ z \\ &= \pi(\mu) \circ [x; (d(\pi(\mu)), m + d(\mu))] \circ z \\ &= \pi(\nu) \circ [x; (d(\pi(\mu)), m + d(\mu))] \circ z \\ &\quad \text{(by } \pi(\mu) \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \pi(\nu)) \\ &= [y; (0, d(\pi(\nu)))] \circ [y; (d(\pi(\nu)), m + d(\nu))] \circ z \\ &= [y; (0, m)] \circ [y; (m, m + d(\mu))] \circ z \\ &= [x; (0, m)] \circ \nu \circ z. \end{aligned}$$

We therefore obtain $\mu \circ z = \nu \circ z$, following statement (1).

(2) \implies (3): Fix $y \in s(\pi(\mu))\Lambda^{\leq \infty}$. Then $[y; (0, \infty)] \in s(\pi(\mu))\overline{\Lambda}^\infty$. Note that $\pi([y; (0, \infty)]) = y$ because for every $p \leq q \leq d(y)$,

$$\pi([y; (0, \infty)])(p, q) = \pi([y; (p, q)]) = [y; (p, q)] = y(p, q).$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\pi(\mu) \circ [y; (0, \infty)] = \pi(\nu) \circ [y; (0, \infty)] \quad \text{(by } \pi(\mu) \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \pi(\nu)) \\ \implies &\pi(\pi(\mu) \circ [y; (0, \infty)]) = \pi(\pi(\nu) \circ [y; (0, \infty)]) \\ \implies &\pi(\mu) \circ \pi([y; (0, \infty)]) = \pi(\nu) \circ \pi([y; (0, \infty)]) \quad \text{(by } \pi \circ \pi = \pi) \\ \implies &\pi(\mu) \circ y = \pi(\nu) \circ y. \end{aligned}$$

This follows statement (3).

(3) \implies (2): Since $s(\pi(\mu)) \in \Lambda^0$, by Lemma 2.5, every infinite path in $s(\pi(\mu))\overline{\Lambda}^\infty$ is of the form $[z; (0, \infty)]$ with $z(0) = s(\pi(\mu))$. For every such

$[z; (0, \infty)] \in s(\pi(\mu))\overline{\Lambda}^\infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\mu) \circ [z; (0, \infty)] &= [\pi(\mu)z; (0, \infty)] \\ &= [\pi(\nu)z; (0, \infty)] \quad (\text{by } \pi(\mu) \sim_\Lambda \pi(\nu)) \\ &= \pi(\nu) \circ [z; (0, \infty)],\end{aligned}$$

giving $\pi(\mu) \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \pi(\nu)$. \square

The initial definition of maximal tails comes from [1] for the 1-graph C^* -algebras (see [6, 2] also).

Definition 3.6. Let Λ be a row-finite k -graph. A *maximal tail* in Λ is a nonempty subset T of Λ^0 satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $s(\lambda) \in T$ implies $r(\lambda) \in T$,
- (2) for every $v \in T$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$, there exists $\lambda \in v\Lambda^{\leq n}$ such that $s(\lambda) \in T$, and
- (3) for every $v, w \in T$, there exist $\mu \in v\Lambda$ and $\nu \in w\Lambda$ such that $s(\mu) = s(\nu)$.

It is clear that if T is a maximal tail in Λ , then $\Lambda^0 \setminus T$ is hereditary and saturated. We write $\text{MT}(\Lambda)$ for the collection of maximal tails in Λ .

Corollary 3.7. Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph, and let $\overline{\Lambda}$ be the desourscification of Λ . Then $\text{Per}(\Lambda) = \text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda})$. Moreover, if Λ^0 is a maximal tail, then $\text{Per}(\Lambda)$ is a subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^k .

Proof. For every $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$, Proposition 3.5 implies that $\mu \sim_\Lambda \nu$ if and only if $\mu \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \nu$. This follows $\text{Per}(\Lambda) \subseteq \text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda})$. For the reverse containment, suppose $\mu, \nu \in \overline{\Lambda}$, $\mu \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \nu$ and $d(\mu) - d(\nu) \in \text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda})$. Implication (1) \Rightarrow (3) of Proposition 3.5 yields that $\pi(\mu) \sim_\Lambda \pi(\nu)$ and $d(\mu) - d(\pi(\mu)) = d(\nu) - d(\pi(\nu))$. Thus

$$d(\mu) - d(\nu) = d(\pi(\mu)) - d(\pi(\nu)) \in \text{Per}(\Lambda),$$

and we have $\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda}) \subseteq \text{Per}(\Lambda)$.

By [7, Lemma 4.3], if Λ^0 is a maximal tail, then so is $\overline{\Lambda}^0$. Thus, the second statement follows immediately from the first and [2, Theorem 4.2(1)]. \square

Definition 3.8 ([2]). Given a row-finite k -graph Λ , we define the set

$$\begin{aligned}H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda)} &:= \{v \in \Lambda^0 : \text{for all } \mu \in v\Lambda \text{ and } m \in \mathbb{N}^k \text{ with} \\ &\quad d(\mu) - m \in \text{Per}(\Lambda), \text{ there exists } \nu \in v\Lambda^m \text{ such that } \mu \sim_\Lambda \nu\}.\end{aligned}$$

We will show in Corollary 3.10 that $H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda)}$ is a hereditary subset of Λ^0 .

Lemma 3.9. Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph such that Λ^0 is a maximal tail. Let $\overline{\Lambda}$ be the desourscification of Λ . Then for each $v \in \overline{\Lambda}^0$, $v \in H_{\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda})}$ if and only if $\pi(v) \in H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda)}$.

Proof. We first fix $v \in \bar{\Lambda}^0$ with $\pi(v) \in H_{\text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})}$. Since $\bar{\Lambda}$ has no sources and $\bar{\Lambda}^0$ is a maximal tail by [7, Lemma 4.3], Theorem 4.2 of [2] says that $H_{\text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})}$ is a hereditary subset of $\bar{\Lambda}^0$. So, we have $v \in H_{\text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})}$ because $\pi(v)\bar{\Lambda}v \neq \emptyset$.

Conversely, assume $v \in H_{\text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})}$. Let $\mu \in \pi(v)\bar{\Lambda}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that $d(\mu) - m \in \text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})$. To show $\pi(v) \in H_{\text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})}$, we must find $\nu \in \pi(v)\bar{\Lambda}^m$ such that $\mu \sim_{\bar{\Lambda}} \nu$. Write $v = [x; p]$ for some $x \in \Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}^k$ with $p \wedge d(x) = 0$. Let $\mu = [y; (0, d(\mu))]$ for $y \in \pi(v)\Lambda^{\leq \infty}$. Since $x, y \in \pi(v)\Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ and $p \wedge d(x) = 0$, [14, Lemma 2.2] implies $p \wedge d(y) = 0$ and $[x; (0, p)] = [y; (0, p)]$. In particular, $\pi(v) = [x; 0] = [y; 0]$ and $v = [x; p] = [y; p]$. If we set $\mu' := [y; (p, p + d(\mu))]$, then $\mu' \in v\bar{\Lambda}^{d(\mu)}$ and $d(\mu') - m = d(\mu) - m \in \text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})$. So, there exists $\nu' \in v\bar{\Lambda}^m$ such that $\mu' \sim_{\bar{\Lambda}} \nu'$, which is of the form $\nu' = [y; (p, p + m)]$ by Lemma 3.4.

We will show that $\nu := [y; (0, m)]$ is the desired path (i.e., $\mu \sim_{\bar{\Lambda}} \nu$). For, by Proposition 3.5, it suffices to prove $\pi(\mu) \sim_{\bar{\Lambda}} \pi(\nu)$ and $d(\mu) - d(\pi(\mu)) = d(\nu) - d(\pi(\nu))$. Note that $\pi(\nu) = [y; (0, m \wedge d(y))] = \pi(\nu')$ and

$$d(\nu) - d(\pi(\nu)) = m - m \wedge d(y) = d(\nu') - d(\pi(\nu')).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} d(\mu) - d(\pi(\mu)) &= d(\mu) - d(\mu) \wedge d(y) \\ &= d(\mu') - d(\pi(\mu')) \\ &= d(\nu') - d(\pi(\nu')) \quad (\text{by } \mu' \sim_{\bar{\Lambda}} \nu' \text{ and Proposition 3.5}) \\ &= d(\nu) - d(\pi(\nu)). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, since $\pi(\mu') = [y; (0, d(\mu) \wedge d(y))] = \pi(\mu)$, implication (1) \Rightarrow (2) of Proposition 3.5 yields $\pi(\mu) \sim_{\bar{\Lambda}} \pi(\nu') = \pi(\nu)$. Consequently, $\mu \sim_{\bar{\Lambda}} \nu$ and we have $\pi(v) \in H_{\text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})}$. \square

Corollary 3.10. *Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph and $\bar{\Lambda}$ its desourcification. Then $H_{\text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})} \cap \Lambda^0 = H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda)}$. In particular, if Λ^0 is a maximal tail, then $H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda)}$ is a nonempty hereditary subset of Λ^0 .*

Proof. To see $H_{\text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})} \cap \Lambda^0 \subseteq H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda)}$, take $v \in H_{\text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})} \cap \Lambda^0$. Suppose $\lambda \in v\Lambda$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that $d(\lambda) - m \in \text{Per}(\Lambda)$. Since $d(\lambda) - m \in \text{Per}(\Lambda) = \text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})$, there exists $\mu \in v\bar{\Lambda}^m$ such that $\lambda \sim_{\bar{\Lambda}} \mu$. As $s(\mu) = s(\lambda) \in \Lambda^0$, we have $\mu = \pi(\mu) \in \Lambda$, and hence $\lambda \sim_{\Lambda} \mu$ by Proposition 3.5. This follows $v \in H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda)}$.

To show $H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda)} \subseteq H_{\text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})} \cap \Lambda^0$, we fix $v \in H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda)}$. Let $\lambda \in v\bar{\Lambda}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that $d(\lambda) - m \in \text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda})$. Then $\pi(\lambda) \in v\Lambda$, and for $m' := m - (d(\lambda) - d(\pi(\lambda)))$ we have $d(\pi(\lambda)) - m' = d(\lambda) - m \in \text{Per}(\bar{\Lambda}) = \text{Per}(\Lambda)$. Since $v \in H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda)}$, there exists $\mu' \in v\Lambda^{m'}$ such that $\pi(\lambda) \sim_{\Lambda} \mu'$. Let $\lambda = [x; (0, d(\lambda))]$ for some $x \in v\Lambda^{\leq \infty}$. Then for $\mu := \mu' \circ [x; (d(\pi(\lambda)), d(\lambda))]$ $\in v\bar{\Lambda}^m$ we have

$$\pi(\mu) = \pi(\mu' \circ [x; (d(\pi(\lambda)), d(\lambda))])$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \pi(\mu') \circ \pi([x; (d(\pi(\lambda)), d(\lambda))]) \\
&= \mu' \circ [x; d(\pi(\lambda))] \\
&= \mu',
\end{aligned}$$

establishing $\pi(\lambda) \sim_{\Lambda} \pi(\mu)$ and $d(\lambda) - d(\pi(\lambda)) = d(\mu) - d(\pi(\mu))$. Now Proposition 3.5 implies $\lambda \sim_{\overline{\Lambda}} \mu$, and therefore $v \in H_{\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda})}$.

The second statement follows from [2, Theorem 4.2(2)]. Indeed, if Λ^0 is a maximal tail, then so is $\overline{\Lambda}^0$ by [7, Lemma 4.3]. Hence, [2, Theorem 4.2] implies that $H_{\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda})}$ is a nonempty hereditary subset of $\overline{\Lambda}^0$. Therefore, $H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda)} = H_{\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda})} \cap \Lambda^0$ is a hereditary subset of Λ^0 as well. Furthermore, we may apply Lemma 3.9 to see that $H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda)} = H_{\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda})} \cap \Lambda^0 \neq \emptyset$. \square

4. PRIMITIVE IDEALS IN HIGHER-RANK GRAPH C^* -ALGEBRAS

In this section, we characterize the primitive ideal space of $C^*(\Lambda)$ for any locally convex, row-finite k -graph Λ . Our results generalize [2, Theorem 5.3] and [2, Corollary 5.4].

Definition 4.1. Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph. A boundary path $x \in \Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ is called *cofinal* in case for every $v \in \Lambda^0$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that $n \leq d(x)$ and $v\Lambda x(n) \neq \emptyset$. If $x \in \Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ is cofinal, we set

$$F(x) := \{\lambda \sigma^n(x) : n \leq d(x) \text{ and } \lambda \in \Lambda x(n)\}.$$

Notice that $y \in F(x)$ if and only if $\sigma^m(x) = \sigma^n(y)$ for some $m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k$.

Remark 4.2. In [2], the set $F(x)$ was denoted by $[x]$. Since $\overline{\Lambda}$ is defined by equivalent classes, we use the notation $F(x)$ instead of $[x]$ here.

The proof of [14, Proposition 3.5] derives the following.

Lemma 4.3. *Let x be a boundary path in Λ . Then x is cofinal in Λ if and only if the infinite path $[x; (0, \infty)]$ in $\overline{\Lambda}$ is cofinal.*

Recall from Corollary 3.7 that if T is a maximal tail in Λ , then $\text{Per}(\Lambda T)$ is a subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^k . Let $\widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}$ denote the character space of $\text{Per}(\Lambda T)$. So, for each character η of $\text{Per}(\Lambda T)$, there exists $t \in \mathbb{T}^k \cong \widehat{\mathbb{Z}^k}$ such that $\eta(m) = t^m$ for all $m \in \text{Per}(\Lambda T)$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k -graph and T a maximal tail in Λ . Suppose that x is a cofinal boundary path in the k -subgraph ΛT and consider the set $F(x)$ in ΛT as in Definition 4.1. Let $\eta \in \widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}$ and select some $t \in \mathbb{T}^k$ such that $\eta(m) = t^m$ for $m \in \text{Per}(\Lambda T)$. Then the representation $\pi_{x,t} : C^*(\Lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(F(x)))$ defined by*

$$(4.1) \quad \pi_{x,t}(s_\lambda)\xi_y = \begin{cases} t^{d(\lambda)}\xi_{\lambda y} & s(\lambda) = y(0) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (\lambda \in \Lambda, y \in F(x))$$

is an irreducible representation on $C^(\Lambda)$.*

Proof. We will apply the desourcifying method on [2, Theorem 5.3(1)]. Let $\overline{\Lambda}$ be the desourcification of Λ . Recall that $H := \Lambda^0 \setminus T$ is a hereditary and saturated subset of Λ^0 . We first claim that $\overline{H} := (H\overline{\Lambda})^0$ is hereditary and saturated in $\overline{\Lambda}$. Indeed, the hereditary property of \overline{H} follows from that of H and the fact $\pi(\overline{H}) = (\pi(H\overline{\Lambda}))^0 = (H\pi(\overline{\Lambda}))^0 = (H\Lambda)^0 = H$. To see that \overline{H} is saturated, fix $v \in \overline{\Lambda}^0$ with $s(v\overline{\Lambda}^n) \subseteq \overline{H}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$. Then, by $\pi(v\overline{\Lambda}^n) = \pi(v)\Lambda^{\leq n}$, we have

$$s(\pi(v)\Lambda^{\leq n}) = s(\pi(v\overline{\Lambda}^n)) = \pi(s(v\overline{\Lambda}^n)) \subseteq \pi(\overline{H}) = H,$$

and thus $\pi(v) \in H \subseteq \overline{H}$ as H is saturated. The fact $\pi(v)\overline{\Lambda}v \neq \emptyset$ combining with the hereditary property of \overline{H} yield $v \in \overline{H}$. Consequently, \overline{H} is saturated and the claim holds.

Write $\overline{T} := \overline{\Lambda}^0 \setminus \overline{H}$. Since $\overline{\Lambda} \setminus \overline{T} = \overline{\Lambda} \setminus \overline{H}$ contains no sources, it is the desourcification of ΛT ; which means $\widehat{\overline{\Lambda T}} = \overline{\Lambda} \overline{T}$. In particular, \overline{T} is a maximal tail [7, Lemma 4.3]. Moreover, $\overline{x} := [x; (0, \infty)]$ is a cofinal infinite path in $\overline{\Lambda T}$ by Lemma 4.3. As $\eta \in \text{Per}(\Lambda T) = \text{Per}(\widehat{\overline{\Lambda T}})$, [2, Theorem 5.3(1)] ensures that the representation $\pi_{\overline{x}, t} : C^*(\overline{\Lambda}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(F(\overline{x})))$ satisfying

$$\pi_{\overline{x}, t}(s_\lambda)\xi_y = \begin{cases} t^{d(\lambda)}\xi_{\lambda y} & s(\lambda) = y(0) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}, y \in \overline{\Lambda}^\infty)$$

is irreducible. Let $\phi : C^*(\Lambda) \rightarrow C^*(\overline{\Lambda})$ be the natural embedding map and define $\pi_{x, t} := \pi_{\overline{x}, t} \circ \phi : C^*(\Lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(F(\overline{x})))$. Observe that we may regard $\ell^2(F(x))$ as a subspace of $\ell^2(F(\overline{x}))$ by identifying ξ_y with $\xi_{[y; (0, \infty)]}$ for $y \in F(x)$. By the fact $\pi_{x, t}(s_\lambda)\xi_y = 0$ unless $s(\lambda) = y(0)$, $\ell^2(F(x))$ is an invariant subspace for operators $\pi(s_\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Therefore, we can restrict operators $\pi_{x, t}(s_\lambda)$ on $\ell^2(F(x))$ to get the desired representation $\pi_{x, t} : C^*(\Lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(F(x)))$ satisfying formula (4.1). \square

Now we have all requirements to characterize the primitive ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$. For any ideal J of $C^*(\Lambda)$, we write $T_J := \Lambda^0 \setminus H_J = \{v \in \Lambda^0 : s_v \notin J\}$ in the following.

Theorem 4.5. *Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph.*

- (1) *If J is a primitive ideal of $C^*(\Lambda)$, then $T := T_J = \Lambda^0 \setminus H_J$ is a maximal tail. Also, there exists a unique $\eta \in \text{Per}(\Lambda T)$ such that the ideal $J \cap (I_{H_J \cup H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}})$ in $C^*(\Lambda)$ is generated by $\{s_v : v \in \Lambda^0 \setminus T\}$ union*

$$\{s_\mu - \eta(d(\mu) - d(\nu))s_\nu : \mu \sim_{\Lambda T} \nu \text{ and } r(\mu) = r(\nu) \in H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}\}.$$

Moreover, if $x \in (\Lambda T)^{\leq \infty}$ is cofinal and $t \in \mathbb{T}^k$ with $\eta(m) = t^m$ for $m \in \text{Per}(\Lambda T)$, then we have $J = \ker \pi_{x, t}$.

- (2) *The map $(T_{\ker \pi_{x, t}}, \eta) \mapsto \ker \pi_{x, t}$ is a bijection between $\bigcup_{T \in \text{MT}(\Lambda)} (\{T\} \times \widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)})$ and $\text{Prim}(C^*(\Lambda))$, where $t \in \mathbb{T}^k$ satisfies $\eta(m) = t^m$ for every $m \in \text{Per}(\Lambda T)$.*

Proof. For statement (1), we fix a primitive ideal J of $C^*(\Lambda)$. Let $\overline{\Lambda}$ be the desourcification of Λ . Let \overline{J} denote the ideal of $C^*(\overline{\Lambda})$ corresponding with J . (Recall that $C^*(\Lambda)$ is a full corner of $C^*(\overline{\Lambda})$ and $\overline{J} = \langle J \rangle$ as an ideal of $C^*(\overline{\Lambda})$.) As the primitivity is preserved under Morita-equivalence, \overline{J} is a primitive ideal of $C^*(\overline{\Lambda})$. For simplicity in notation, we set $H := H_J \subseteq \Lambda^0$, $\overline{H} := H_{\overline{J}} \subseteq \overline{\Lambda}^0$, $T := \Lambda^0 \setminus H$, and $\overline{T} := \overline{\Lambda}^0 \setminus \overline{H}$. Since $\overline{\Lambda}$ is a row-finite k -graph with no sources, [2, Theorem 5.3(2)] implies that \overline{T} is a maximal tail in $\overline{\Lambda}^0$ and there exists unique $\eta \in \widehat{\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda} \ \overline{T})}$ such that $\overline{J} = \ker \pi_{\overline{x}, t}$ for any cofinal boundary path \overline{x} in $(H_{\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda} \ \overline{T})} \overline{\Lambda} \ \overline{T})^\infty$ and $t \in \mathbb{T}^k$ satisfying $\eta(m) = t^m$ for $m \in \text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda} \ \overline{T})$. By Corollary 3.10 we have $H_{\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda} \ \overline{T})} \cap (\Lambda T)^0 = H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)} \neq \emptyset$, so we may select such \overline{x} with $\overline{x}(0) \in H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}$. As seen in Lemma 2.5, \overline{x} is of the form $[x; (0, \infty)]$ for some $x \in (\Lambda T)^{\leq \infty}$.

Let $\overline{I}_{\overline{H} \cup H_{\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda} \ \overline{T})}}$ denote the ideal of $C^*(\overline{\Lambda})$ generated by $\{s_v : v \in \overline{H} \cup H_{\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda} \ \overline{T})}\}$. The argument of [2, Theorem 5.3(2)] proves that the ideal $\ker \pi_{\overline{x}, t} \cap \overline{I}_{\overline{H} \cup H_{\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda} \ \overline{T})}}$ in $C^*(\overline{\Lambda})$ is generated by the set

$$B := \{s_v : v \in \overline{H}\} \cup \{s_\mu - \eta(d(\mu) - d(\nu))s_\nu : \mu \sim_{\overline{\Lambda} \ \overline{T}} \nu, r(\mu) = r(\nu) \in H_{\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda} \ \overline{T})}\}.$$

Let $\psi : C^*(\overline{\Lambda}) \rightarrow C^*(\Lambda)$, $a \mapsto P_\Lambda a P_\Lambda$, be the restriction map, where $P_\Lambda := \sum_{v \in \Lambda^0} s_v \in \mathcal{M}(C^*(\overline{\Lambda}))$. Observe that P_Λ is a full projection, so ψ induces a one-to-one correspondence between ideal spaces of $C^*(\Lambda)$ and $C^*(\overline{\Lambda})$. In particular, we have $\psi(\overline{J}) = J$ and

$$\psi(\overline{J} \cap \overline{I}_{\overline{H} \cup H_{\text{Per}(\overline{\Lambda} \ \overline{T})}}) = J \cap I_{H \cup H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}}.$$

Therefore, the set

$$\psi(B) = \{s_v : v \in H\} \cup \{s_\mu - \eta(d(\mu) - d(\nu))s_\nu : \mu \sim_{\Lambda T} \nu, r(\mu) = r(\nu) \in H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}\}$$

generates the ideal $J \cap I_{H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)} \cup H}$ in $C^*(\Lambda)$.

Furthermore, if $\phi : C^*(\Lambda) \rightarrow C^*(\overline{\Lambda})$ is the embedding map, Lemma 4.4 shows that $\pi_{x, t} := \pi_{\overline{x}, t} \circ \phi : C^*(\Lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(F(x)))$ is an irreducible representation on $C^*(\Lambda)$. Since

$$\ker \pi_{x, t} = (\pi_{\overline{x}, t} \circ \phi)^{-1}(0) = \phi^{-1}(\pi_{\overline{x}, t}^{-1}(0)) = \phi^{-1}(\overline{J}) = J,$$

this completes the proof of statement (1).

Statement (2) follows immediately from (1) combining with [2, Corollary 5.4]. \square

Notation 4.6. For every $(T, \eta) \in \bigcup_{T \in \text{MT}(\Lambda)} (\{T\} \times \widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)})$, we will denote $J_{(T, \eta)}$ the primitive ideal of $C^*(\Lambda)$ associated to (T, η) , as described in Theorem 4.5(2).

We say that Λ is *strongly aperiodic* if for every saturated hereditary subset $H \subseteq \Lambda^0$, the k -subgraph $\Lambda \setminus \Lambda H$ is aperiodic. According to [12, Theorem 5.3],

in case Λ is strongly aperiodic, then every ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$ is gauge-invariant and of the form I_H for some $H \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$.

In the following, we write $\text{MT}_a(\Lambda) := \{T \in \text{MT}(\Lambda) : \Lambda T \text{ is aperiodic}\}$.

Corollary 4.7. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k -graph. Then*

- (1) *The map $T \mapsto I_{\Lambda^0 \setminus T}$ is a bijection from $\text{MT}_a(\Lambda)$ onto the collection of primitive gauge-invariant ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$.*
- (2) *If Λ is strongly aperiodic, then $T \mapsto I_{\Lambda^0 \setminus T}$ is a bijection between $\text{MT}(\Lambda)$ and $\text{Prim}(C^*(\Lambda))$.*

Proof. Statement (1): Let T be a maximal tail in Λ such that the subgraph ΛT is aperiodic. We will show that the gauge-invariant ideal $I_{\Lambda^0 \setminus T}$ is primitive. As $\text{Per}(\Lambda T) = \{0\}$ by Proposition 3.3, we have $\widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)} = \{1\}$ and hence $H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)} = T$. If $\overline{\Lambda T}$ is the desourcification of ΛT , [2, Lemma 5.2] says that the k -graph $\overline{\Lambda T}$ contains a cofinal infinite path $[x; (0, \infty)]$. Moreover, x is a cofinal boundary path in ΛT by Lemma 4.4. If we set $J := \ker \pi_{x,1}$, Theorem 4.5(1) yields $\{v \in \Lambda^0 : s_v \in J\} = \Lambda^0 \setminus T$. Write $H := \Lambda^0 \setminus T$ for simplicity. Then ideal $J + I_H$ in the quotient C^* -algebra $C^*(\Lambda)/I_H \cong C^*(\Lambda T)$ contains no vertex projections. Since ΛT is aperiodic, the Cuntz-Krieger uniqueness theorem implies that $J = I_H$ (cf. [14, Proposition 4.3]). Therefore $I_{\Lambda^0 \setminus T} = \ker \pi_{x,1}$, which is a primitive ideal of $C^*(\Lambda)$ by Lemma 4.4.

Moreover, we may apply the fact $H_{I_H} = H$ for every $H \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$ and conclude injectivity of the map.

For surjectivity, we fix a primitive gauge-invariant ideal $I_{\Lambda^0 \setminus T}$ (Theorem 4.5(1) says that every primitive gauge-invariant ideal of $C^*(\Lambda)$ is of the form $I_{\Lambda^0 \setminus T}$ for some maximal tail T in Λ). Suppose on the contrary ΛT is periodic. To derive a contradiction, we will show $I_{\Lambda^0 \setminus T} \neq \ker \pi_{x,t}$ for every $x \in (H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)} \Lambda T)^{\leq \infty}$ and $t \in \mathbb{T}^k$ described in Theorem 4.5(1). So, let us fix some such x and t . Since ΛT is periodic, Proposition 3.3 implies that there are two distinct paths $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda T$ such that $\mu \sim_{\Lambda T} \nu$. By Theorem 4.5(1), $a = s_\mu - t^{d(\mu)-d(\nu)} s_\nu$ is a nonzero element in $\ker \pi_{x,t}$. But $a \notin I_{\Lambda^0 \setminus T}$ because $s(\mu), s(\nu) \in T$ and image of a under the quotient map $C^*(\Lambda) \rightarrow C^*(\Lambda)/I_{\Lambda^0 \setminus T} = C^*(\Lambda T)$ is nonzero. Consequently, $\ker \pi_{x,t} \neq I_{\Lambda^0 \setminus T}$ as desired.

For statement (2), we notice that in case Λ is strongly aperiodic, each quotient k -graph $\Lambda T = \Lambda \setminus \Lambda H$ is aperiodic and every ideal of $C^*(\Lambda)$ is gauge-invariant [12, Theorem 5.3]. So, statement (2) is an immediate consequence of (1). \square

5. MAXIMAL IDEALS

We know that every ideal of $C^*(\Lambda)$ is the intersection of a family of primitive ones. In particular, maximal ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$ are all primitive. Here, we want to use the characterization of Theorem 4.5 to determine certain maximal ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph. Suppose that T is a maximal tail in Λ and η_1, η_2 are two distinct characters of $\text{Per}(\Lambda T)$. If $J_{(T, \eta_1)}$ and $J_{(T, \eta_2)}$ are respectively the primitive ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$ corresponding with (T, η_1) and (T, η_2) (see Notation 4.6), then neither $J_{(T, \eta_1)} \subseteq J_{(T, \eta_2)}$ nor $J_{(T, \eta_2)} \subseteq J_{(T, \eta_1)}$.*

Proof. We suppose $J_{(T, \eta_1)} \subseteq J_{(T, \eta_2)}$ and derive a contradiction; the other case may be discussed analogously. Then, by Theorem 4.5(1), for every $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda T$ with $\mu \sim_{\Lambda T} \nu$, both elements $s_\mu - \eta_1(d(\mu) - d(\nu))s_\nu$ and $s_\mu - \eta_2(d(\mu) - d(\nu))s_\nu$ belong to $J_{(T, \eta_2)}$. But, Theorem 4.5(1) says that such $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \text{Per}(\Lambda T)$ are unique for $J_{(T, \eta_2)}$, hence $\eta_1 = \eta_2$. This contradicts our hypothesis. \square

Proposition 5.2. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k -graph. Let T be a maximal tail in Λ such that T is minimal in $\text{MT}(\Lambda)$ under \subseteq . Then for every $\eta \in \widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}$, the primitive ideal $J_{(T, \eta)}$ associated to (T, η) is a maximal ideal of $C^*(\Lambda)$.*

Proof. Recall that $H_{J_{(T, \eta)}} = \Lambda^0 \setminus T$ for every $\eta \in \widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}$. Take an ideal I of $C^*(\Lambda)$ such that $J_{(T, \eta)} \subseteq I \subsetneq C^*(\Lambda)$. As I is an intersection of primitive ideals, without loss of generality, we can assume I is primitive. Then by Theorem 4.5(1), $K := \Lambda^0 \setminus H_I$ is a maximal tail in Λ such that $K \subseteq T$. The minimality of T yields either $K = \emptyset$ or $K = T$. If $K = \emptyset$, then $I = C^*(\Lambda)$ which was not assumed. Thus we must have $K = T$. Since I is primitive, Theorem 4.5(1) implies that there exists $\eta' \in \widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}$ such that $I = J_{(T, \eta')}$. Now apply Lemma 5.1 to have $\eta = \eta'$, and hence $I = J_{(T, \eta)}$. Consequently, $J_{(T, \eta)}$ is a maximal ideal of $C^*(\Lambda)$. \square

Definition 5.3. Let Λ be a row-finite k -graph. We say Λ is *cofinal* in case all boundary paths $x \in \Lambda^{\leq \infty}$ are cofinal (in the sense of Definition 4.1). By definition, one may easily verify that Λ is cofinal if and only if $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda = \{\emptyset, \Lambda^0\}$.

Corollary 5.4. *Let Λ a locally convex row-finite k -graph which is cofinal. Then all primitive ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$, which are of the form $J_{\Lambda^0, \eta}$ for $\eta \in \widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda)}$, are maximal.*

Proof. We first claim that Λ^0 is a maximal tail. To see this, it suffices to check condition (3) of Definition 3.6 only. So, fix some $v, w \in \Lambda^0$. If $x \in w\Lambda^{\leq \infty}$, then x is cofinal in Λ , so there exists $n \leq d(x)$ such that $v\Lambda x(n) \neq \emptyset$. If we select some $\mu \in v\Lambda x(n)$ and set $\nu := x(0, n)$, we then have $\mu \in v\Lambda$ and $\nu \in w\Lambda$ with $s(\mu) = s(\nu)$. This follows the claim.

Moreover, since Λ is cofinal, we have $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda = \{\emptyset, \Lambda^0\}$. Hence $\text{MT}(\Lambda) = \{\Lambda^0\}$, and Theorem 4.5 says that primitive ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$ are of the form $J_{\Lambda^0, \eta}$ for $\eta \in \widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda)}$. Now Propositions 5.2 follows immediately that such ideals are all maximal. \square

6. DECOMPOSABILITY OF $C^*(\Lambda)$

In this section, we investigate the decomposability of a higher-rank graph C^* -algebra $C^*(\Lambda)$. Our aim here is to find necessary and sufficient conditions on the underlying k -graph Λ such that $C^*(\Lambda)$ is decomposable. Furthermore, we show that direct summands in any decomposition of $C^*(\Lambda)$ are themselves isomorphic to higher-rank graph C^* -algebras.

Definition 6.1. We say that $C^*(\Lambda)$ is *decomposable* if there exist two non-zero C^* -algebras A, B such that $C^*(\Lambda) = A \oplus B$. Otherwise, $C^*(\Lambda)$ is *indecomposable*. It is clear that in the case $C^*(\Lambda) = A \oplus B$, then A and B are two (closed) ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$.

The key step in our analysis is Corollary 6.4 below, which shows that any direct summand in a decomposition of $C^*(\Lambda)$ is a gauge-invariant ideal. To prove this, we use the structure of primitive ideals described in Section 4. Before that, we establish the following two lemmas.

Lemma 6.2. *Let T be a maximal tail in Λ . Then the collection $\{J_{(T,\eta)} : \eta \in \widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}\}$ of primitive ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$ is invariant under the gauge action γ .*

Proof. Fix $\eta \in \widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}$ and take some $t \in \mathbb{T}^k$ such that $\eta(m) = t^m$ for all $m \in \text{Per}(\Lambda T)$. For every $s \in \mathbb{T}^k$, we may define the character $\eta' : \text{Per}(\Lambda T) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$, by $m \mapsto (ts^{-1})^m$. Note that we use the multi-index notation $(ts^{-1})^m := \prod_{i=1}^k (t_i s_i^{-1})^{m_i} \in \mathbb{T}$ here. Thus, for $\mu \sim_{\Lambda T} \nu$ with $r(\mu) = r(\nu) \in H_{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_s(s_\mu - \eta(d(\mu) - d(\nu))s_\nu) &= s^{d(\mu)} s_\mu - t^{d(\mu)-d(\nu)} (s^{d(\nu)} s_\nu) \\ &= s^{d(\mu)} (s_\mu - (ts^{-1})^{d(\mu)-d(\nu)} s_\nu) \\ &= s^{d(\mu)} (s_\mu - \eta'(d(\mu) - d(\nu))s_\nu). \end{aligned}$$

In view of Theorem 4.5(1), this yields that generators of $\gamma_s(J_{(T,\eta)})$ and $J_{(T,\eta')}$ are the same, so $\gamma_s(J_{(T,\eta)}) = J_{(T,\eta')}$. We are done. \square

Lemma 6.3. *Let Λ be locally convex row-finite k -graph. If $C^*(\Lambda)$ decomposes as $A \oplus B$, then the collection $D = \{J \in \text{Prim}(C^*(\Lambda)) : A \subseteq J\}$ is invariant under the gauge action γ .*

Proof. First, note that the decomposability implies that $\text{Prim}(C^*(\Lambda)) = \text{Prim}(A) \oplus \text{Prim}(B)$. In particular, $\text{Prim}(A)$ and $\text{Prim}(B)$ are clopen subsets of $\text{Prim}(C^*(\Lambda))$. Moreover, we have $J \in \text{Prim}(B)$ if and only if $A \oplus J \in \text{Prim}(C^*(\Lambda))$, hence $\text{Prim}(B)$ is homeomorphic to D .

Let us fix an arbitrary $J_0 \in \text{Prim}(C^*(\Lambda))$ with $A \subseteq J_0$ (i.e. $J_0 \in D$). By Theorem 4.5, $T := \{v \in \Lambda^0 : s_v \notin J_0\}$ is a maximal tail and there exists $\eta_0 \in \widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}$ such that $J_0 = J_{(T,\eta_0)}$. Using Theorem 4.5(2), we may define the homeomorphic embedding $\Psi : \widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)} \rightarrow \text{Prim}(C^*(\Lambda))$, by $\eta \mapsto J_{(T,\eta)}$.

Corollary 3.7 implies that $\widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}$ is a subgroup of $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}^k} \cong \mathbb{T}^k$, and thus $\widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)} \cong \mathbb{T}^l$ for some $0 \leq l \leq k$. In particular, $\Psi(\widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)})$ is a connected subset of $\text{Prim}(C^*(\Lambda))$. Since $\Psi(\eta_0) = J_0 \in D$ and D is clopen (because $\text{Prim}(B)$ is), this follows that $\Psi(\widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)})$ must be entirely contained in D .

Now, for every $t \in \mathbb{T}^k$, Lemma 6.2 yields that $\gamma_t(J_0) = J_{(T,\eta)}$ for some $\eta \in \widehat{\text{Per}(\Lambda T)}$. Since such $J_{(T,\eta)}$ lies in $\text{Rang}(\Psi) \subseteq D$, this concludes the result. \square

Corollary 6.4. *Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph. If $C^*(\Lambda)$ decomposes into $C^*(\Lambda) = A \oplus B$, then both A and B are gauge-invariant ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$.*

Proof. We know that every ideal of $C^*(\Lambda)$ is the intersection of primitive ideals containing it. So, it suffices to show that the collections $D = \{J \in \text{Prim}(C^*(\Lambda)) : A \subseteq J\}$ and $D' = \{J \in \text{Prim}(C^*(\Lambda)) : B \subseteq J\}$ are invariant under the gauge action. However, this follows from Lemma 6.3 immediately. \square

Once we find that $C^*(\Lambda)$ can be decomposed only by gauge-invariant ideals, we may investigate its decomposability by properties of the underlying k -graph Λ .

Definition 6.5. Let Λ be a row-finite k -graph. For $v \in \Lambda^0$, denote $T(v) := \{s(\mu) : \mu \in v\Lambda\}$ the smallest hereditary subset of Λ^0 containing v . When $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$ with $H_1 \supseteq H_2$, we also set the following subsets of Λ^0 :

$$\Delta(H_1, H_2) := \{v \in H_1 : T(v) \cap H_2 = \emptyset\}, \text{ and}$$

$$\Omega(H_1, H_2) := \{v \in H_1 \setminus H_2 : T(v) \cap H_2 \neq \emptyset\} = H_1 \setminus (H_2 \cup \Delta(H_1, H_2)).$$

Clearly, $\Delta(H_1, H_2)$ is always a hereditary subset of Λ^0 such that $\Delta(H_1, H_2) \cap H_2 = \emptyset$. So, we have $\Sigma(\Delta(H_1, H_2)) \cap H_2 = \emptyset$ also.

Now we define the relation \succ on \mathcal{H}_Λ by: $H_1 \succ H_2$ if and only if

- (1) $H_1 \supseteq H_2$,
- (2) $\Delta(H_1, H_2) \neq \emptyset$ (i.e., there exists $v \in H_1 \setminus H_2$ with $T(v) \cap H_2 = \emptyset$), and
- (3) for every $v \in \Omega(H_1, H_2)$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that $s(v\Lambda^{\leq n}) \subseteq H_2 \cup \Delta(H_1, H_2)$.

We now determine higher-rank graph C^* -algebras $C^*(\Lambda)$ which are decomposable. It is the generalization of [5, Theorem 4.1] for higher-rank graph C^* -algebras.

Theorem 6.6. *Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) $C^*(\Lambda)$ is decomposable.
- (2) There exist nonempty, disjoint $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$ with this property that for every $v \in \Lambda^0 \setminus (H_1 \cup H_2)$, there is some $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that $s(v\Lambda^{\leq n}) \subseteq H_1 \cup H_2$.

(3) *There exists nonempty $H \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$ such that $\Lambda^0 \succ H$.*

Moreover, in the case (2) we have

$$C^*(\Lambda) = I_{H_1} \oplus I_{H_2} \cong C^*(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda H_2) \oplus C^*(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda H_1),$$

and in the case (3),

$$C^*(\Lambda) \cong C^*(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda H) \oplus I_H \cong C^*(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda H) \oplus C^*(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda H')$$

where $H' = \Sigma(\Delta(\Lambda^0, H))$.

Proof. We will first prove (1) \iff (2), and then (2) \iff (3).

(1) \implies (2): Let $C^*(\Lambda) = A \oplus B$ be a decomposition for $C^*(\Lambda)$. According to Corollary 6.4, A and B are gauge-invariant ideals of $C^*(\Lambda)$; so, there exist $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$ such that $A = I_{H_1}$ and $B = I_{H_2}$ [12, Theorem 5.2(a)]. Moreover, we have $H_1 \cap H_2 = H_{I_{H_1}} \cap H_{I_{H_2}} = \emptyset$, while $\overline{H_1 \cup H_2} = \Lambda^0$ because $C^*(\Lambda) = I_{H_1} + I_{H_2} = I_{\overline{H_1 \cup H_2}}$. This follows statement (2).

(2) \implies (1): If $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$ satisfy conditions (2), then $\overline{H_1 \cup H_2} = \Lambda^0$. Thus, [12, Theorem 5.2(a)] implies $I_{H_1} \cap I_{H_2} = I_{H_1 \cap H_2} = (0)$ and $I_{H_1} + I_{H_2} = I_{\overline{H_1 \cup H_2}} = C^*(\Lambda)$. Consequently, $C^*(\Lambda)$ decomposes as $I_{H_1} \oplus I_{H_2}$.

(2) \implies (3): If $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$ satisfy (2), it is routine to check that $\Lambda^0 \succ H_1, H_2$.

(3) \implies (2): Let $\Lambda^0 \succ H$ for some nonempty $H \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$. Set $H' := \Sigma(\Delta(\Lambda^0, H))$ the saturated closure of $\Delta(\Lambda^0, H)$. Since $\Delta(\Lambda^0, H)$ is hereditary, H' is a hereditary and saturated subset of Λ^0 [12, Lemma 5.1]. For each $v \in H'$, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that $s(v\Lambda^{\leq n}) \subseteq \Delta(\Lambda^0, H)$, which concludes $H \cap H' = \emptyset$ because $\Delta(\Lambda^0, H) \cap H = \emptyset$. Now the property $\Lambda^0 \succ H$ implies that H and H' satisfy the conditions of (2).

For the last statement, it suffices to note that if $C^*(\Lambda) = I_{H_1} \oplus I_{H_2}$, then

$$I_{H_1} \cong C^*(\Lambda)/I_{H_2} \cong C^*(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda H_2)$$

and analogously $I_{H_2} \cong C^*(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda H_1)$. Now the proof is complete. \square

7. DECOMPOSING $C^*(\Lambda)$ WITH INDECOMPOSABLE COMPONENTS

In the final section, we want to determine higher-rank graph C^* -algebras $C^*(\Lambda)$ which are direct sums of finitely many indecomposable C^* -algebras. To this end, we use specific chains of hereditary and saturated subsets of Λ^0 .

Definition 7.1. Let Λ be a row-finite k -graph. A sequence $\mathcal{C} := \{H_i\}_{i=1}^n$, for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, of saturated hereditary subsets of Λ^0 is called a *chain in \mathcal{H}_Λ* whenever $H_1 = \Lambda^0$ and $H_i \succ H_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i < n$ (see Definition 6.5). Then, $n = |\mathcal{C}|$ is *length* of \mathcal{C} . A *refinement* of \mathcal{C} is a chain \mathcal{C}' in \mathcal{H}_Λ such that $\mathcal{C} \subsetneq \mathcal{C}'$. In case there are no refinements for \mathcal{C} , we say \mathcal{C} is a *maximal chain*.

Lemma 7.2. *Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph. If $\mathcal{C} : \Lambda^0 = H_1 \succ \dots \succ H_n$ is a finite chain in \mathcal{H}_Λ , then there exists a decomposition $C^*(\Lambda) = I_{K_1} \oplus \dots \oplus I_{K_n}$ such that K_i 's are pairwise disjoint and $H_i =$*

$\Sigma(\bigcup_{j=i}^n K_j)$ for each i . Moreover, \mathcal{C} is a maximal chain if and only if all I_{K_j} are indecomposable.

Proof. Since $H_1 \succ H_2$, implication (3) \Rightarrow (1) of Theorem 6.6 implies that $C^*(\Lambda) = I_{K_1} \oplus I_{H_2}$ where $K_1 = \Sigma(\Delta(H_1, H_2))$. Then $I_{H_2} \cong C^*(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda K_1)$, and the saturation of H_2 in the subgraph $\Lambda \setminus \Lambda K_1$ is all $(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda K_1)^0$. So $(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda K_1)^0 \succ H_3$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\Lambda \setminus \Lambda K_1}$ because $H_2 \succ H_3$, and we have again $I_{H_2} \cong C^*(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda K_1) = I_{K_2} \oplus I_{H_3}$ for some $K_2 \in \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda \setminus \Lambda K_1}$. Since I_{K_2} is a direct summand of $C^*(\Lambda)$, it is a gauge-invariant ideal of $C^*(\Lambda)$ by Corollary 6.4. Hence, $K_2 \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$. Continuing this process gives a decomposition

$$C^*(\Lambda) = I_{K_1} \oplus I_{K_2} \oplus \cdots \oplus I_{K_n}$$

for $C^*(\Lambda)$, where $K_n = H_n$. The above process says that $I_{H_i} = \bigoplus_{j=i}^n I_{K_j}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, which follows $H_i = \Sigma(\bigcup_{j=i}^n K_j)$ by Theorem 5.2(a) of [12].

For the last statement, if some I_{K_j} decomposes as $A \oplus B$, then A and B are two direct summands of $C^*(\Lambda)$; so $I_{K_j} = I_{K'_j} \oplus I_{K''_j}$ for some $\emptyset \neq K'_j, K''_j \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$ by applying Corollary 6.4. Therefore, we have a refinement

$$\Lambda^0 = H_1 \succ \cdots \succ H_j \succ \Sigma(H_{j+1} \cup K'_j) \succ H_{j+1} \succ \cdots \succ H_n$$

of \mathcal{C} . Conversely, if

$$\mathcal{C}' : \Lambda^0 = H_1 \succ \cdots \succ H_j \succ H \succ H_{j+1} \succ \cdots \succ H_n$$

is a refinement of \mathcal{C} , then I_{K_j} will be decomposable by (3) \Rightarrow (1) in Theorem 6.6. This completes the proof. \square

Definition 7.3. Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph. We say that $C^*(\Lambda)$ is n -decomposable, for $n \geq 1$, if there exists an n -term decomposition $C^*(\Lambda) = A_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_n$ for $C^*(\Lambda)$ such that each direct summand A_i is indecomposable (1-decomposable equals to indecomposable). Note that such n , if exists, is unique (see the last paragraph in Proof of Theorem 7.4 below).

We now characterize n -decomposable higher-rank graph C^* -algebras.

Theorem 7.4. Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph. Then $C^*(\Lambda)$ is n -decomposable for some $n \geq 1$ if and only if $n = \max\{|\mathcal{C}| : \mathcal{C} \text{ is a chain in } \mathcal{H}_\Lambda\}$. Moreover, if this is the case, then there is a unique decomposition (up to permutation) $C^*(\Lambda) \cong C^*(\Lambda_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus C^*(\Lambda_n)$, where Λ_i are k -subgraphs of Λ and each $C^*(\Lambda_i)$ is indecomposable.

Remark 7.5. In view of Lemma 6.2, every maximal chain of length $n \geq 1$ in \mathcal{H}_Λ induces an n -term decomposition for $C^*(\Lambda)$ with indecomposable direct summands. Since such decompositions are unique up to permutation, Theorem 7.4 follows that maximal chains in \mathcal{H}_Λ are all of length n . In particular, in this case, any chain in \mathcal{H}_Λ has a refinement with length n .

Proof of Theorem 7.4. (\Rightarrow): Let $C^*(\Lambda) = A_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_n$ be a decomposition of $C^*(\Lambda)$ with indecomposable summands. By Corollary 6.4, each A_j is a

gauge-invariant ideal of $C^*(\Lambda)$, so $A_j = I_{K_j}$ for some $K_j \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$. If we set $H_i := \Sigma(\bigcup_{j=i}^n K_j)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, Lemma 7.2 implies that

$$\mathcal{C} : \Lambda^0 = H_1 \succ \cdots \succ H_n$$

is a chain in \mathcal{H}_Λ . We hence have $n \leq \max\{|\mathcal{C}| : \mathcal{C} \text{ is a chain in } \mathcal{H}_\Lambda\}$.

On the other hand, assume $\Lambda^0 = H_1 \succ \cdots \succ H_l$ is a chain in \mathcal{H}_Λ . By Lemma 7.2, there is a decomposition $C^*(\Lambda) = I_{K_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus I_{K_l}$ such that $H_i := \Sigma(\bigcup_{j=i}^l K_j)$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$. So, for each i , we have $I_{K_i} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^n I_{K_i} \cap A_j$, and thus either $I_{K_i} \cap A_j = (0)$ or $A_j \subseteq I_{K_i}$ because A_j is indecomposable. This follows $l \leq n$, and consequently $n = \max\{|\mathcal{C}| : \mathcal{C} \text{ is a chain in } \mathcal{H}_\Lambda\}$.

The “ \Leftarrow ” part follows from Lemma 7.2. Indeed, if $n = \max\{|\mathcal{C}| : \mathcal{C} \text{ is a chain in } \mathcal{H}_\Lambda\}$ and \mathcal{C} is a maximal chain in \mathcal{H}_Λ with $|\mathcal{C}| = n$, then \mathcal{C} induces a decomposition $C^*(\Lambda) = A_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_n$ with indecomposable summands. Therefore, $C^*(\Lambda)$ is n -decomposable.

For the last statement, suppose that $C^*(\Lambda)$ is n -decomposable and $C^*(\Lambda) = I_{K_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus I_{K_n}$. Then, for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have $C^*(\Lambda) = I_{K_i} \oplus I_{K'_i}$ where $K'_i := \Sigma(\bigcup_{j \neq i} K_j)$; in particular,

$$I_{K_i} \cong \frac{C^*(\Lambda)}{I_{K'_i}} \cong C^*(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda K'_i).$$

Therefore, $\Lambda_i := \Lambda \setminus \Lambda K'_i$ are k -subgraphs of Λ and we have $C^*(\Lambda) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n I_{K_i} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n C^*(\Lambda_i)$.

To see that this decomposition is unique, assume $C^*(\Lambda) = A_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_m$ with indecomposable components. For any $1 \leq j \leq m$, $A_j = A_j \cap C^*(\Lambda) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n A_j \cap I_{K_i}$. Since A_j is indecomposable, there is $1 \leq l_j \leq n$ such that $A_j \subseteq I_{K_{l_j}}$ and $A_j \cap I_{K_i} = (0)$ for $i \neq l_j$. By a same argument we have $I_{K_{l_j}} \subseteq A_j$ also, and hence they are equal. This follows that $m = n$ and $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^n$ is a permutation of $\{I_{K_i}\}_{i=1}^n$. \square

The following is an immediate consequence of Theorem 7.4.

Corollary 7.6. *Let Λ be a locally convex row-finite k -graph. If Λ contains only finitely many saturated hereditary subsets, then there exist finitely many k -subgraphs $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n$ of Λ such that $C^*(\Lambda) \cong C^*(\Lambda_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus C^*(\Lambda_n)$ and each $C^*(\Lambda_i)$ is indecomposable.*

Acknowledgement. The author would like to kindly acknowledge the referee for his/her useful comments and pointing the related article [18].

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Bates, D. Pask, I. Raeburn and W. Szymański, *The C^* -algebras of row-finite graphs*, New York J. Math. **6** (2000), 307-324.
- [2] T. Carlsen, S. Kang, J. Shotwell, and A. Sims, *The primitive ideals of the Cuntz-Krieger algebra of a row-finite higher-rank graph with no sources*, J. Funct. Anal. **266** (2014), 2570-2589.
- [3] K.R. Davidson and D. Yang, *Periodicity in rank 2-graph algebras*, Canad. J. Math. **61**(6) (2009), 1239-1261.

- [4] C. Farthing, *Removing sources from higher rank graphs*, J. Operator Theory. **60** (2008), 165-198.
- [5] J.H. Hong and W. Szymański, *The primitive ideal space of the C^* -algebras of infinite graphs*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **56** (2004), 45-64.
- [6] S. Kang and D. Pask, *Aperiodicity and primitive ideals of row-finite k -graphs*, Internat. J. Math. **25**(3) (2014), 1450022 (25 pages).
- [7] M. Kashoul-Radjabzadeh, H. Larki, and A. Aminpour, *Prime and primitive Kumjian-Pask algebras*, J. Algebra Appl. **16**(9) (2017), 1750169 [14 pages].
- [8] A. Kumjian and D. Pask, *Higher rank graph C^* -algebras*, New York J. Math. **6** (2000), 1-20.
- [9] H. Larki, *Purely infinite simple Kumjian-Pask algebras*, Forum Math. **30**(1) (2018), 253-268.
- [10] D. Pask, I. Raeburn, M. Rørdam, and A. Sims, *Rank-two graphs whose C^* -algebras are direct limits of circle algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **239** (2006), 137-178.
- [11] D. Pask, I. Raeburn, N.A. Weaver, *A family of 2-graphs arising from two-dimensional subshifts*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **29** (2009), 1613-1639.
- [12] I. Raeburn, A. Sims, and T. Yeend, *Higher rank graphs and their C^* -algebras*, Proc. E dinb. Math. Soc. **46** (2003), 99-115.
- [13] I. Raeburn, A. Sims, and T. Yeend, *The C^* -algebras of finitely aligned higher-rank graphs*, J. Funct. Anal. **213** (2004), 206-240.
- [14] D. Robertson and A. Sims, *Simplicity of C^* -algebras associated to row-finite locally convex higher-rank graphs*, Israel J. Math. **172** (2009), 171-192.
- [15] G. Robertson and T. Steger, *Affine buildings, tiling systems and higher rank Cuntz-Krieger algebras*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **513** (1999), 115-144.
- [16] J. Shotwell, *Ideals in k -graph algebras*, PhD thesis, Arizona State University, 2009.
- [17] J. Shotwell, *Simplicity of finitely aligned k -graph C^* -algebras*, J. Operator Theory **67** (2012), 335- 347.
- [18] S.B.G. Webster, *The path space of a higher-rank graph*, Studia Math. **204** (2011), 155-185.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHAHID CHAMRAN UNIVERSITY OF AHVAZ, AHVAZ, IRAN

E-mail address: `h.larki@scu.ac.ir`