OPERATOR ALGEBRAS GENERATED BY LEFT INVERTIBLES

DEREK DESANTIS

Abstract. Operator algebras generated by partial isometries and their adjoints form the basis for some of the most well studied classes of C*-algebras. Representations of such algebras encode the dynamics of orthonormal sets in a Hilbert space. We instigate a research program on concrete operator algebras that model the dynamics of Hilbert space frames.

The primary object of this paper is the norm-closed operator algebra generated by a left invertible \( T \) together with its Moore-Penrose inverse \( T^\dagger \). We denote this algebra by \( \mathfrak{A}_T \). In the isometric case, \( T^\dagger = T^* \) and \( \mathfrak{A}_T \) is a representation of the Toeplitz algebra. Of particular interest is the case when \( T \) satisfies a non-degeneracy condition called analytic. We show that \( T \) is analytic if and only if \( T^* \) is Cowen-Douglas. When \( T \) is analytic with Fredholm index \(-1\), the algebra \( \mathfrak{A}_T \) contains the compact operators, and any two such algebras are boundedly isomorphic if and only if they are similar.
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1. Introduction

Representations of operator algebras are often formed by choosing sufficiently nice linear maps on a Hilbert space that encapsulate the features of some underlying algebraic object. Often, these maps are rigid in the sense that they will preserve Hilbert space structure from the domain into their range. For example, if \( \mathcal{H} \) is a Hilbert space, \( \{e_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \) is an orthonormal basis for \( \mathcal{H} \), and \( U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) is a unitary, then \( \{Ue_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \) is once again an orthonormal basis. Similarly, an isometry \( S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) moves an orthonormal basis for \( \mathcal{H} \) to its range space. More generally, if \( S \) is a partial isometry, then \( S \) preserves orthonormality on \( \ker(S)^\perp \). In each case, the operator models the
movement from one orthonormal set (on the domain space) to another (on the range space). The adjoint models walking backwards between these two subspaces.

One can take a collection of partial isometries \( \{S_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A} \). Each \( S_\alpha \) and \( S_\alpha^* \) encodes this “single step” dynamics discussed above - moving one orthogonal set to another. To codify all possible finite walks, one would need to consider the algebra generated by the collection \( \{S_\alpha, S_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in A} \). Closing this algebra with respect to some topology, such as the operator norm, describes the infinite walks as well.

An important class of operator algebras generated by partial isometries are graph C*-algebras. Representations that reflect the directed graph structure are described as follows. Given a directed graph, a Hilbert space is chosen for each vertex of the graph. Let \( \mathcal{H} \) denote the direct sum of these spaces. By choosing orthonormal sequences for each of these closed, orthogonal spaces of \( \mathcal{H} \), one chooses partial isometries that map one summand to another subject to the Cuntz-Krieger relations coming from the graph \[28\]. Specifically, let \( E^0 \) be the set of vertices and \( E^1 \) is the set of edges for a graph. Let \( s(e) \) and \( r(e) \) denote the range and source of an edge respectively. Given a set \( \{P_v : v \in E^0\} \) of mutually orthogonal projections and a set \( \{S_e : e \in E^1\} \) of partial isometries, the Cuntz-Krieger relations are given by

1. \( S_e^*S_e = P_{s(e)} \) for all \( e \in E^1 \)
2. \( P_v = \sum_{e \in E^1: r(e) = v} S_eS_e^* \) whenever \( v \) is not a source.

This representation of the graph C*-algebra can be viewed as encoding walks on the graph.

Orthonormal bases are rigid structures. The requirement that each element within the set be orthogonal to one another is strict and has precluded them from finding applications in some realms of applied harmonic analysis. This naturally led to the definition of a frame for a Hilbert space. A sequence \( \{f_n\} \) of points in a Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \) is said to be a frame if there exists constants \( 0 < A \leq B \) such that

\[
A\|x\|^2 \leq \sum_n |\langle x, f_n \rangle|^2 \leq B\|x\|^2
\]

for all \( x \in \mathcal{H} \). Associated to each Hilbert space frame \( \{f_n\} \) is a (canonical) dual frame \( \{g_n\} \). Using this dual frame, one can reconstruct elements \( f \) of the Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \) in an analogous way to orthonormal basis:

\[
f = \sum_{n \geq 1} \langle f, g_n \rangle f_n
\]

It is easy to see that orthonormal bases are frames, but not all frames need be orthogonal, norm one, or even contain a unique set of elements. A frame does not enforce the rigidity of inner products that an orthonormal basis does - allowing for variation between individual frame elements (rather than just 0 or 1). The flexibility of the definition has found applications across signal processing and harmonic analysis. Frames may be constructed for particular features of a problem, allowing one choose linear dependent sets, or even add multiple copies of a single element. This extra redundancy helps to protect signals from degradation, ensuring that the effects of erasures are minimized. The looseness of the structure allows one to construct the analog of frames for structures that don’t necessarily come equipped with suitable generalization of an orthonormal basis. Indeed, certain classes of Hilbert C*-Modules and Banach spaces posses frames \[14, 3\]. For more on basics of frame theory, see \[2, 6, 5\].

As discussed, partial isometries between closed subspaces of \( \mathcal{H} \) preserve orthonormal sets. The adjoint of a partial isometry also preserves orthonormality, and acts as an inverse wherever it makes sense. More generally, if \( \{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \) is a frame, and \( T \in B(\mathcal{H}) \) is invertible, then \( \{T f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \) is a new frame for the Hilbert space. Hence, a left invertible operator moves a frame to its range space. Generalizing this one last step, closed range operators preserve the property of a frame on \( \ker(T)^\perp \). See Proposition \[2, 4\].

If \( T \) has closed range, \( T \) has a pseudo inverse \( T^\dagger \) that acts like an inverse wherever it makes sense. This operator, called the Moore-Penrose inverse encodes the dynamics of walking backward
from the range subspace to the source subspace. When $T$ is isometric, $T^\dagger = T^*$. See Proposition 2.1.

The previous discussion lays the groundwork for a natural extension of C*-algebras of isometries, one that codifies frames over orthonormal bases. One arrives at such an extension by replacing partial isometries and their adjoints with closed range operators and their Moore-Penrose inverses. As discussed above, the closed range operators preserve frame theoretic quantities. Therefore, by replacing all instances of “unitary” with “invertible”, we arrive at a natural generalization of concrete C*-algebras - one that integrates dynamics of frame theory over orthonormal bases.

One cannot hope to fully understand the C*-algebra generated by arbitrary set of partial isometries. For this reason, algebraic conditions, such as the Cuntz Krieger relations (constraints that arise from a directed graph), are imposed. This leads us to the following general program:

**Program.** Given a set of operators with closed range and their Moore-Penrose inverses, construct the norm-closed algebra subject to the constraints of a directed graph. What is the structure of these algebras?

The focus of this paper is on one particular class of examples within this program. Consider the following directed graph $\Gamma$:

```
  v1 --v2
```

It is well known that the graph C*-algebra associated to $\Gamma$ is isomorphic to the Toeplitz algebra $\mathcal{T}$. As a concrete operator algebra, $\mathcal{T}$ may be represented as the C*-algebra generated by $T = M_z$ on the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{T})$. The graph C*-algebra representations associated to $\Gamma$ can be described as follows. Let $\mathcal{H}_i$ represent the Hilbert space associated to vertex $v_i$, and $T_1 : \mathcal{H}_1 \to \mathcal{H}_2$, $T_2 : \mathcal{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}_2$ be chosen (partial) isometries. Since $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$, and $\text{ran}(T_1) \oplus \text{ran}(T_2) = \mathcal{H}_2$, we have that $T := T_1 \oplus T_2$ defines an isometry with Fredholm index equal to $-\dim(\mathcal{H}_1)$. Thus, the representations can be succinctly written as $C^*(T)$ for some isometry $T$.

The same argument can be applied to the operator algebras described above. Concretely, choose $T_1 : \mathcal{H}_1 \to \mathcal{H}_2$, $T_2 : \mathcal{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}_2$ closed range operators with orthogonal ranges summing to $\mathcal{H}_2$. Then $T := T_1 \oplus T_2$ is left invertible. The associated operator algebra can be expressed as

$$\mathfrak{A}_T := \overline{\text{Alg}(T, T^\dagger)}$$

where the closure is in the operator norm. The goal of this paper is to analyze the structure of the operator algebras $\mathfrak{A}_T$.

If $T$ is an isometry, then its Moore-Penrose inverse $T^\dagger$ is $T^*$. If $T$ is purely isometric (no unitary summand) with Fredholm index $-1$, then $T$ is unitarily equivalent to $T_z$ on $H^2(\mathbb{T})$. Hence, $\mathfrak{A}_T$ is the Toeplitz algebra $\mathcal{T}$. This representation is particularly nice, as every operator $A \in \mathcal{T}$ can be uniquely represented as a compact perturbation of a Toeplitz operator with continuous symbol. The purpose of this paper is to understand the following question:

**Question.** To what extent do the elements of $\mathfrak{A}_T$ have the form “compact perturbation of a continuous function”?

The paper is organized as follows. In the second section, we review the background material needed for this paper. This includes an explicit construction of the Moore-Penrose inverse, properties of left invertible operators, and elementary facts about $\mathfrak{A}_T$ frequently used. We discover that if the Fredholm index of $T$ is finite, $\mathfrak{A}_T$ has the following description:

**Heuristic 1.1.** If $T$ has finite Fredholm index, then the operators in $\mathfrak{A}_T$ are compact perturbations of Laurent series.
This description is intuitive, as $\mathfrak{A}_T$ is constructed by replacing instances of “unitary” in representations of graph algebras by “invertible”. Therefore our goal is to explore the extent to which this description is true. We justify that in order to make any serious progress understanding the rich structure of $\mathfrak{A}_T$, we need to restrict ourselves to a subclass of left invertible operators, known as analytic operators.

In the third section, we discuss Cowen-Douglas operators, a class of operators that have rich analytic structure. In that section, we connect analyticity of $T$ to the class of Cowen-Douglas operators. Given an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{D}$, we need to restrict ourselves to a subclass of left invertible operators, known as analytic operators.

Theorem A. Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be left invertible operator with Fredholm index equal to $-n$, for a positive integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following are equivalent:

i. $T$ is analytic

ii. $T^*\dagger$ (the Cauchy Dual of $T$) is analytic

iii. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $T^* \in B_n(\Omega)$ for $\Omega = \{z : |z| < \epsilon\}$

iv. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $T\dagger \in B_n(\Omega)$ for $\Omega = \{z : |z| < \epsilon\}$.

This result has several applications. First, it gives an analytic model for representing $T$ in the sense that $T$ is unitarily equivalent to $M_z$ on a reproducing kernel Hilbert space of analytic functions. This further furnishes our description of $\mathfrak{A}_T$ as “compacts plus Laurent series”. It also provides us with a decomposition theorem. If $T$ is an isometry, the Wold decomposition lets us decompose $T$ into a direct sum of Fredholm index $-1$ isometries (and a unitary). A corollary of Theorem A is that we cannot reduce our study to the case where the Fredholm index of $T$ is $-1$. Rather, $T \sim \oplus T_j$ where each $T_j$ are strongly irreducible operators - operators that are analogous to Jordan blocks in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

Theorem A also allows us to analyze the isomorphism classes of $\mathfrak{A}_T$ in the case when the Fredholm index of $T$ is $-1$. In Section Four, we focus on the case when the index of $T$ is $-1$. Here, we determine the conditions for two such algebras to be isomorphic, establishing our main theorem. It gives a rather rigid structure on bounded isomorphisms between the algebras $\mathfrak{A}_T$:

Theorem B. Let $T_i$, $i = 1, 2$ be left invertibles (analytic with Fredholm index $-1$) and $\mathfrak{A}_i = \mathfrak{A}_{T_i}$. Suppose that $\phi : \mathfrak{A}_1 \to \mathfrak{A}_2$ a bounded isomorphism. Then there exists some invertible $V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\phi(A) = VAV^{-1}$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}_1$.

In particular, this theorem shows that all bounded isomorphisms are completely bounded, and reduces the isomorphism problem to a similarity orbit problem. We remark that the problem of finding the similarity orbit of Cowen-Douglas operators is classic. Using the results of Jiang and others on $K_0$ groups of strongly irreducible operators, we complete the classification in this case. We also analyze the similarity orbit via associated reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces.

We conclude Section Four by investigating a class of illustrative examples arising from the theory of subnormal operators. If $S$ is a subnormal operator, we let $N = mne(S)$ denote the minimal normal extension of $S$, and $\sigma_{ap}(S)$ denote the approximate point spectrum of $S$. We show that in this case, $\mathfrak{A}_S$ can be described by the heuristic of compact perturbations of Toeplitz operators with Laurent series:

Theorem C. Let $S$ be an analytic left invertible, Fredholm index $-1$, essentially normal, subnormal operator with $N := mne(S)$ such that $\sigma(N) = \sigma_{ap}(S)$. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the uniform algebra generated by the functions $z$ and $z^{-1}$ on $\sigma_e(S)$. Then

$$\mathfrak{A}_S = \{T_f + K : f \in \mathcal{B}, K \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H})\}.$$ 

Moreover, the representation of each element as $T_f + K$ is unique.
2. Properties of Left Invertible Operators and $\mathfrak{A}_T$

The focus of this section is elementary properties of left invertible operators and the algebra $\mathfrak{A}_T$. We will begin by discussing the Moore-Penrose inverse of a closed range operator formally, and then move on to list some basic facts about left invertible operators frequently used. In order to make meaningful headway, we impose a Fredholm condition on our left invertibles. We then discover some coarse properties of the algebra $\mathfrak{A}_T$, noting that a dense set may be written as finite rank operator plus polynomials in $T$ and $T^\dagger$. This initiates our description of $\mathfrak{A}_T$ as compact perturbations of Laurent series. Drawing on analogies with isometric operators, we describe a non-degeneracy condition of left invertible operators called analytic. This allows one to build a type of basis on which $T$ acts like a shift operator. We conclude this section by demonstrating that one cannot hope to recover a decomposition exactly like the Wold decomposition for left invertible operators.

2.1. Basics of Closed Range and Left Invertible Operators. We begin this section by providing a definition of the Moore-Penrose inverse in general. We then shift our focus towards left invertible operators. After stating some equivalent definitions for an operator to be left invertible, we move towards proving general results that will be required throughout the text.

**Proposition 2.1.** Let $T \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be an operator with ran($T$) closed. Then there exists a unique operator $T^\dagger \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that

i. ker($T^\dagger$) = ran($T$)$^\perp$ = ker($T^*$$)$

ii. $T^\dagger Tx = x$ for each $x \in$ ker($T$)$^\perp$.

**Proof.** Consider the operator $\tilde{T} : \text{ker}(T)^\perp \to \text{ran}(T)$ obtained by restricting the domain of $T$ to ker($T$)$^\perp$ and the range of $T$ to ran($T$). Since $T$ has closed range, $\tilde{T}$ is a bijective operator between two Hilbert spaces, and therefore boundedly invertible by the open mapping theorem. Define $T^\dagger \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ via

$$
T^\dagger x = \begin{cases} 
\tilde{T}^{-1}x & x \in \text{ran}(T) \\
0 & x \in \text{ran}(T)^\perp.
\end{cases}
$$

By construction, $T^\dagger$ satisfies properties i. and ii..

For uniqueness, suppose that $L$ was another such operator. Then for all $x \in \text{ran}(T)^\perp$, $Lx = 0 = T^\dagger x$. Moreover, if $x \in \text{ran}(T)$, $x = Ty$ for some $y$. Using the second property, we have

$$Lx = LTy = y = T^\dagger Ty = T^\dagger x$$

So $L$ agrees with $T^\dagger$ on all of $\mathcal{H}$. □

**Definition 2.2.** The operator $T^\dagger$ that appears in Proposition 2.1 is called the Moore-Penrose Inverse of $T$.

The Moore-Penrose inverse behaves like a left inverse for an operator only where it makes sense. The focus of this paper is on left invertible operators. Note that left invertible operators have closed range, and therefore a Moore-Penrose inverse. In fact, the following are true:

**Proposition 2.3.** For $T \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the following are equivalent:

i. $T$ is left-invertible

ii. $T^*$ is right-invertible

iii. $T$ is bounded below; i.e. there exists a $c > 0$ such that for each $x \in \mathcal{H}$, $\|Tx\| \geq c\|x\|

iv. $T$ is injective and has closed range

v. $T^*T$ is invertible.
In the introduction we stated our interest in operator algebras that model dynamics of Hilbert space frames. Recall, a sequence \( \{f_n\} \) of points in a Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \) is a frame if there exists constants \( 0 < A \leq B \) such that
\[
A\|x\|^2 \leq \sum_n |\langle x, f_n \rangle|^2 \leq B\|x\|^2
\]
for all \( x \in \mathcal{H} \). We have the following result about relating Hilbert space frames and left invertible operators.

**Proposition 2.4.** If \( \{f_n\} \) is a frame for \( \mathcal{H} \), and \( T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) is left invertible, then \( \{Tf_n\} \) is a frame for \( \text{ran}(T) \).

**Proof.** Let \( x \in \text{ran}(T) \). The upper bound follows from the fact that \( T \) is bounded:
\[
\sum_n |\langle x, Tf_n \rangle|^2 = \sum_n |\langle T^* x, f_n \rangle|^2 \leq B\|T^* x\|^2 \leq B\|T\|^2\|x\|^2.
\]
By Proposition 2.3 if we regard \( T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \text{ran}(T)) \), then \( T \) is invertible. Consequently, \( T^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \text{ran}(T)) \) is also invertible, and in particular, is left invertible. Again by Proposition 2.3 \( T^* \) is bounded below by some constant \( c > 0 \). Hence,
\[
\sum_n |\langle x, Tf_n \rangle|^2 = \sum_n |\langle T^* x, f_n \rangle|^2 \geq A\|T^* x\|^2 \geq Ac^2\|x\|^2.
\]

In the case of left invertible operators, the Moore-Penrose inverse is a left inverse. It is a special left inverse that takes on a particular form as the following propositions demonstrate.

**Proposition 2.5.** Let \( T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) be left invertible. Then \( T^\dagger = (T^* T)^{-1} T^* \).

**Proof.** By Proposition 2.3 \( T^* T \) is invertible. Let \( L = (T^* T)^{-1} T^* \). Clearly \( L \) is a left inverse of \( T \), and since \( \ker(L) = \ker(T^*) \), it follows from Proposition 2.1 that \( L = T^\dagger \).

**Proposition 2.6.** Given any left invertible \( T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \), the following hold:

i. \( TT^\dagger \) is the (orthogonal) projection onto \( \text{ran}(T) \)
ii. \( I - TT^\dagger \) is the (orthogonal) projection onto \( \text{ran}(T)^\perp \)
iii. \( \ker(T^\dagger) = \text{ran}(T)^\perp = \ker(T^*) \)
iv. \( \text{ran}(T^\dagger) = \text{ran}(T^*) \).

**Proposition 2.7.** Let \( T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) be left invertible. Then every left inverse is of the form
\[
L = T^\dagger + A(I - TT^\dagger).
\]
for some \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \).

**Proof.** Let \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \). Then it follows that \( L = T^\dagger + A(I - TT^\dagger) \) is a left inverse of \( T \):
\[
LT = T^\dagger T + A(I - TT^\dagger) T = I + A(T - T) = I
\]
Conversely, suppose that \( L \) is a left inverse of \( T \). Then if \( x \in \text{ran}(T) \), \( x = Ty \) for some \( y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) so that
\[
Lx = LTy = y = T^\dagger Ty = T^\dagger x
\]
Hence, \( L \) agrees with \( T^\dagger \) on \( \text{ran}(T) \). It may be the case that \( L \) is non-zero on \( \text{ran}(T)^\perp \). Let \( A \) denote the action of \( L \) on \( \text{ran}(T)^\perp \). By Proposition 2.6 \( I - TT^\dagger \) is the projection onto \( \text{ran}T^\perp \), so that
\[
L = T^\dagger (TT^\dagger) + A(I - TT^\dagger) = T^\dagger + A(I - TT^\dagger)
\]
\( \square \)
Lemma 2.8. Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be left invertible. If $S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ satisfies $\|T - S\| < \|T^\dagger\|^{-1}$, then $S$ is also left invertible. The operator $(T^\dagger S)^{-1}T^\dagger$ is a left inverse of $S$.

Proof. Notice that

$$\|T^\dagger S - I\| = \|T^\dagger(S - T)\| \leq \|T^\dagger\||S - T|| < 1.$$ 

Therefore, $T^\dagger S$ is invertible. Hence, $(T^\dagger S)^{-1}T^\dagger$ is a left inverse of $S$. \qed

This paper will largely be concerned with the case when dim(ran$(T)^\perp$) $< \infty$. This Fredholm assumption on $T$ will make the theory more interesting. Furthermore, our interest is in left invertible operators which are not invertible. We make the following definition:

Definition 2.9. An left invertible operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be natural if the dim(ker$(T^*)$) is a natural number. Specifically,

$$0 < \text{dim}(\ker(T^*)) = \dim(\text{ran}(T)^\perp) < \infty$$

Note that if $T$ is a natural left invertible, then ker$(T^*)$ is a positive integer. Hence, $T^*$ is not invertible, so neither is $T$. Moreover, natural left invertibles are Fredholm:

Proposition 2.10. Let $T$ be a natural left invertible. Then $0 \not\in \sigma(T)$, and $0 \notin \sigma_c(T)$. Indeed, $T$ is Fredholm with ind$(T) = -\dim(\ker(T^\dagger)) = -\text{ind}(T^\dagger)$.

Proof. Since $T$ is not invertible, $0 \not\in \sigma(T)$. As dim(ran$(T)^\perp$) $< \infty$, and $I - TT^\dagger$ is the projection onto the ran$(T)^\perp$, $T$ is invertible in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})/\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. Therefore, $T$ is Fredholm. Because $T$ is injective, the Fredholm index of $T$ is

$$\text{ind}(T) = \dim(\ker(T)) - \dim(\ker(T^*)) = -\dim(\ker(T^\dagger)).$$

Note that $(T^\dagger)^* = T(T^*T)^{-1}$. Hence $(T^\dagger)^*$ is injective, so that

$$\text{ind}(T^\dagger) = \dim(\ker(T^\dagger)) - \dim(\ker((T^\dagger)^*)) = \dim(\ker(T^\dagger)) = -\text{ind}(T).$$ \qed

Corollary 2.11. If $T$ is a natural left invertible, then all left inverses $L$ of $T$ are finite rank perturbations of $T^\dagger$. Hence, all left inverses $L$ of $T$ are Fredholm with index $\text{ind}(L) = \dim(\ker(T^\dagger)) = \text{ind}(T^\dagger)$.

This type of result makes our study more interesting. Hence, going forward all left invertible operators will be assumed to be natural, unless otherwise specified.

Proposition 2.12. If $T, S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $T$ is a natural left invertible and $\|T - S\| < \|T^\dagger\|^{-1}$, then $S$ is Fredholm with $\text{ind}(S) = \text{ind}(T)$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{T} : \mathcal{H} \to \text{ran}(T)$ be the restriction of $T$. Then $\tilde{T}$ is invertible, with $\|\tilde{T}\| = \|T^\dagger\|$. Therefore, if $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \text{ran}(T))$ with

$$\|A - \tilde{T}\| < \|\tilde{T}\|^{-1} = \|T^\dagger\|^{-1}$$

then $A$ is invertible as well.

By assumption, $T$ has closed range. So, $\mathcal{H} = \text{ran}(T) \oplus \text{ran}(T)^\perp$. Write $S = S_1 + S_2$ where $S_1 = P_{\text{ran}(T)}S$ and $S_2 = P_{\text{ran}(T)^\perp}S$. Then,

$$\|S_1 - \tilde{T}\| = \|P_{\text{ran}(T)}(S - T)|| < \|T^\dagger\|^{-1}.$$ 

Hence, $S_1$ is invertible. Moreover since dim(ran$(T)^\perp$) is finite, $S_2 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. Therefore, $S$ is a compact perturbation of an invertible operator, and thus Fredholm.

By Lemma 2.8, $S$ is left invertible with left inverse $L = (T^\dagger S)^{-1}T^\dagger$. By Proposition 2.7, $S^\dagger = K + L$ for some compact $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. Therefore,

$$\text{ind}(S^\dagger) = \text{ind}((T^\dagger S)^{-1}T^\dagger) = \text{ind}((T^\dagger S)^{-1}) = \text{ind}(T^\dagger) = \text{ind}(T^\dagger)$$
By Proposition 2.10, \( \text{ind}(S) = \text{ind}(T) \).

We will always use \( \mathcal{E}_T := \text{ran}(T)^\perp \). If \( T \) is understood, we simply write \( \mathcal{E} \). That is,

\[
\mathcal{E} := \text{ran}(T)^\perp = \ker(T^\dagger) = \ker(T^*) .
\]

For isometric operators, \( T^n \mathcal{E} \perp T^m \mathcal{E} \) for all \( n \neq m \). This is not true for general left invertible operators, even though \( \mathcal{E} \) is perpendicular to the range of \( T \). However, it is true that \( \ker((T^\dagger)^n) = \bigvee_{k=0}^{n-1} T^k \mathcal{E} \):

**Proposition 2.13.** Let \( T \) be a natural left invertible, and \( P = I - TT^\dagger \) be the projection onto \( \mathcal{E} \). Then for each \( n \geq 1 \), we have

\[
(1) \quad I - T^n T^\dagger^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T^k P T^\dagger^k .
\]

Consequently,

\[
\ker((T^\dagger)^n) = \bigvee_{k=0}^{n-1} T^k \mathcal{E} .
\]

**Proof.** By a telescopic sum, 
\[
I - T^n T^\dagger^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T^k P T^\dagger^k .
\]

To prove the set equality, suppose \( x \in \bigvee_{k=0}^{n-1} T^k \mathcal{E} \). Then it follows immediately that \( T^\dagger^n x = 0 \). On the other hand, if \( x \in \ker((T^\dagger)^n) \), then by Equation \((1)\),

\[
x = (I - T^n T^\dagger^n) x = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T^k P T^\dagger^k x .
\]

Since \( PT^\dagger^k x \in \mathcal{E} \) for all \( k \), it follows that \( x \in \bigvee_{k=0}^{n-1} T^k \mathcal{E} \). \( \square \)

2.2. **Basic Properties of \( \mathfrak{A}_T \).** We now analyze the basics of the algebra \( \mathfrak{A}_T \). We note two ways in which left invertible operators are close to invertible. If \( S \) is an isometry, it dilates to a unitary. Moreover, \( \pi(S) \) is a unitary in \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})/\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) \). Similar statements are true for general left invertibles. This is done first by taking a particular quotient of \( \mathfrak{A}_T \), and then by looking at a dilation. This allows us to describe the algebra \( \mathfrak{A}_T \) as “Laurent series plus compacts”.

Throughout, let \( \mathcal{C} \) denote the commutator ideal of \( \mathfrak{A}_T \). We make the following trivial but important observation.

**Lemma 2.14.** The projection \( P = I - TT^\dagger = T^\dagger T - TT^\dagger \in \mathcal{C} \)

We prove that when the dimension of \( \ker(T^*) \) is finite, \( \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) \). We then show that \( \mathfrak{A}_T/\mathcal{C} \) consists of formal Laurent polynomials, namely polynomials in \( z \) and \( z^{-1} \). Moreover \( T \) may also be dilated to an invertible, allowing us to identify \( \mathfrak{A}_T \) as the corner of the algebra generated by this invertible. Combining these results allows one to heuristically describe \( \mathfrak{A}_T \) as sums of compact operators and Laurent series. We begin this section with a simple observation that will be used throughout the paper:

**Lemma 2.15.** Let \( T \) be a left invertible operator. Then \( \mathfrak{A}_T \subset C^*(T) \).

**Proof.** Since \( T^\dagger = (T^* T)^{-1} T^* \), \( T^\dagger \in C^*(T) \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 2.16.** Let \( T \) be left invertible. If \( T \) is natural, then \( \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) \).

**Proof.** Let \( X = T^n T^\dagger^m \) and \( Y = T^k T^\dagger^l \). If we can show that \( XY - YX \) is finite rank, then it will follow from taking linear combinations and limits that \( \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) \). To this end, notice that

\[
XY - YX = T^n T^\dagger^m T^k T^\dagger^l - T^k T^\dagger^l T^n T^\dagger^m
\]
Now if \( m \leq k \), \( T^nT^{\dagger}\tau T^{\dagger} = T^{n+k-m}T^{\dagger} \). On the other hand, if \( m \geq k \), then \( T^nT^{\dagger}\tau T^{\dagger} = T^{n+k-m}T^{\dagger} \). Likewise, \( T^nT^{\dagger}T^{m}T^{\dagger} = T^{n+k-m}T^{\dagger} \) if \( l \leq n \) and \( T^nT^{\dagger}T^{m} \) otherwise. Therefore, the expression \( T^nT^{\dagger}\tau T^{\dagger} - T^nT^{\dagger}T^{m} \) can be simplified depending on the values of \( n, m, k \) and \( l \). This leaves us with eight total cases to check. For example, two cases arise from \( m \geq k \) and \( l \geq n \). By above, if \( m \geq k \) and \( l \geq n \), then
\[
T^nT^{\dagger}\tau T^{\dagger} - T^nT^{\dagger}T^{m} = T^{n+k-m-k}T^{\dagger} - T^{n+k-m-n}.
\]
This leaves us with two sub-cases: either \( n \leq k \) or \( k \leq n \). If \( n \leq k \), we have
\[
T^nT^{\dagger}T^{m} - T^{n+k-m-k}T^{\dagger} = T^n(I - T^{n-k}T^{\dagger}T^{k-n})T^{l+m-k}.
\]
By Proposition 2.13 \( I - T^{n-k}T^{\dagger}T^{k-n} \) is a sum of finite rank operators, and thus, \( T^nT^{\dagger}T^{m} - T^{n+k-m-k}T^{\dagger} \) is finite rank. The case when \( k \leq n \) is the same. The other six cases are similar. □

We now investigate the quotient of \( \mathfrak{A}_T \) by the commutator ideal \( \mathcal{C} \). Let \( \pi \) denote the canonical map \( \pi : \mathfrak{A}_T \to \mathfrak{A}_T/\mathcal{C} \). As \( P = I - TT^{\dagger} \) is in \( \mathcal{C} \), it follows that \( \pi(T) \) is invertible with inverse \( \pi(T^{\dagger}) \).

Hence, \( \mathfrak{A}_T/\mathcal{C} \) is a commutative Banach algebra generated by the invertible \( \pi(T) \) and its inverse \( \pi(T^{\dagger}) \). We note the following:

**Lemma 2.17.** Let \( \mathfrak{A} \) be a commutative unital Banach algebra generated by an invertible \( a \) and its inverse \( a^{-1} \). Then the character space \( \Omega(\mathfrak{A}) \) is homeomorphic to \( \sigma(a) \).

By the previous lemma, the Gelfand map provides a norm decreasing homomorphism of
\[
\Gamma : \mathfrak{A}_T/\mathcal{C} \to C(\sigma(\pi(T))).
\]
For each \( \lambda \in \sigma(\pi(T)) \), let \( z : \sigma(\pi(T)) \to \mathbb{C} \) represent the inclusion function. Namely, \( z(\lambda) = \lambda \) for all \( \lambda \in \sigma(\pi(T)) \). Then \( z \) is invertible by construction, with inverse \( z^{-1}(\lambda) = z^{-1} \) for all \( \lambda \in \sigma(\pi(T)) \).

Under the Gelfand identification, \( \pi(T) \mapsto z \) and \( \pi(T^{\dagger}) \mapsto z^{-1} \) on \( \sigma(\pi(T)) \). Consequently, \( z \) and \( z^{-1} \) generate the image of \( \mathfrak{A}_T/\mathcal{C} \) under \( \Gamma \). In this sense, \( \mathfrak{A}_T/\mathcal{C} \) consists of Laurent polynomials centered at zero.

A few comments are necessary at this point. First, the Gelfand map need not have closed range, and thus, \( \Gamma(\mathfrak{A}_T/\mathcal{C}) \) may not be complete. Moreover, \( \Gamma \) may not even be injective in general. If \( \mathfrak{A} \) is a commutative Banach algebra, and \( a \in \mathfrak{A} \) has \( \sigma(a) = 0 \), then \( \Gamma(a) = 0 \). However, since \( \mathfrak{A}_T/\mathcal{C} \) is generated by \( \pi(T) \) and \( \pi(T^{\dagger}) = \pi(T)^{-1} \), it follows that \( z \) (and therefore \( z^{-1} \)) are non-zero. As \( \Gamma \) is norm decreasing, we do have that every function in the range of \( \Gamma \) is a Laurent series in \( z \) and \( z^{-1} \).

It will be shown in Section 4.1 that when the Fredholm index of \( T \) is \(-1 \), \( \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}) \). In some cases, this furnishes a rather detailed analysis of the quotient. In particular, the case of essentially normal subnormal operators will be studied in Section 4.4. However, presently we will concern ourselves with an algebraic characterization of the commutator ideal. To do this, we will first get a description of the algebra generated by \( T \) and \( T^{\dagger} \) pre-closure.

We just analyzed how quotienting by the commutator ideal results in \( T \) becoming invertible. As a consequence, “Laurent polynomials” in \( z \) and \( z^{-1} \) over \( \sigma(\pi(T)) \) are dense in the quotient. Next, we observe that if \( T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) is left invertible, then it dilates to an invertible. This will allow us to succinctly describe \( \text{Alg}(T,T^{\dagger}) \).

Let \( P = I - TT^{\dagger} \). Then the operator \( W \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}) \) given by
\[
W = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{H} & \mathcal{H} \\ T^{\dagger} & 0 \\ P & T \end{pmatrix}
\]
is invertible, with inverse given by
\[
W^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} T & P \\ 0 & T^{\dagger} \end{pmatrix}.
\]
Let $Q_1$ and $Q_2$ denote the projections onto $\mathcal{H}_1 := \mathcal{H} \oplus 0$ and $\mathcal{H}_2 := 0 \oplus \mathcal{H}$ respectively. By construction $T = Q_2W\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2}$ and $T^\dagger = Q_2W^{-1}\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2}$. Furthermore, for each $n$,

$$W^n = \begin{pmatrix} T^n & 0 \\ D_n & T^n \end{pmatrix}, \quad W^{-n} = \begin{pmatrix} T^n & D_n \\ 0 & T^n \end{pmatrix},$$

where $D_n := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T^kPT^{n-1-k}$. Since $\dim(\mathcal{E}) < \infty$ by assumption, $D_n$ is a finite rank operator for each $n$. Furthermore, for every $n$, $T^n = Q_2W^n\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2}$ and $T^n = Q_2W^{-n}\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2}$. It therefore follows that $\text{Alg}(T, T^\dagger) = Q_2\text{Alg}(W\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2}, W^{-1}\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2})$. Now, a straightforward calculation reveals the following:

$$Q_2W^{-n}Q_1W^n\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2} = 0$$

(2)

$$Q_2W^{-n}Q_2W^n\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2} = T^nT^m$$

$$Q_2W^nQ_1W^{-n}\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2} = D_mD_n$$

$$Q_2W^nQ_2W^{-n}\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2} = T^mT^n.$$

Since $\text{Alg}(T, T^\dagger) = Q_2\text{Alg}(W\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2}, W^{-1}\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2})$, the operators appearing in Equation (2) span $\text{Alg}(T, T^\dagger)$. Namely, using Equation (2) we have

$$D_mD_n + T^nT^m = Q_2W^nW^{-n}\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2} = Q_2W^{n-m}\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2} = \begin{cases} T^{m-n} & \text{if } m > n \\ T^{-n-m} & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

(3)

Also,

$$T^nT^m = Q_2W^{-n}W^n\mid_{\mathcal{H}_2} = \begin{cases} T^{m-n} & \text{if } m > n \\ T^{-n-m} & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

(4)

Thus, $T^nT^m$ is equal to some power of a generator, up to the finite rank perturbation $D_mD_n$. Consequently, every operator $A$ in $\text{Alg}(T, T^\dagger)$ may be “simplified” to an operator of the form

$$F + \sum_{k=0}^N a_kT^k + \sum_{l=1}^M b_lT^\dagger,$$

where $F$ is some finite rank operator. Hence, the dense subalgebra $\text{Alg}(T, T^\dagger)$ are finite rank operators plus Laurent polynomials in $T$ and $T^\dagger$. We record this result here for future reference:

**Proposition 2.18.** Let $T$ be a natural left invertible operator with $\text{ind}(T) = -n$ for some positive integer $n$. If $A \in \text{Alg}(T, T^\dagger)$ (pre-closure of $\mathfrak{A}_T$), is the operator

$$A = \sum_{n,m=0}^N \alpha_{n,m}T^nT^m$$

then $A$ may be rewritten as

$$A = F + \sum_{N\geq n\geq n\geq 0} \alpha_{n,m}T^{-n-m} + \sum_{N\geq n\leq m\geq 1} \alpha_{n,m}T^{n-m},$$

where $F$ is the finite rank operator given by $F = -\sum_{n,m=0}^N \alpha_{n,m}D_mD_n$, and $D_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T^kPT^{n-1-k}$.

Combining these two coarse descriptions of $\mathfrak{A}_T$ - one via the quotient and one via dilation, we arrive at our heuristic for $\mathfrak{A}_T$:

**Heuristic 2.19.** The algebra $\mathfrak{A}_T$ is compact perturbations of Laurent series centered at zero.
One further comment on the commutator ideal $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathfrak{A}_T$. Recall that $P = I - TT^\dagger \in \mathcal{C}$. Hence by the preceding, all the finite rank operators $F$ from this construction are in the commutator ideal $\mathcal{C}$. Combined with Proposition 2.18, this observation allows us to algebraically characterize a dense subset of $\mathcal{C}$.

**Proposition 2.20.** Let $P = I - TT^\dagger$ and set

$$\mathcal{K}_T := \text{span}\{T^n PT^{m\dagger} : n, m \geq 0\}.$$  

Then $\mathcal{K}_T = \mathcal{C}$.

*Proof.* First we show that $\mathcal{K}_T$ is an ideal of $\mathfrak{A}_T$. If $A \in \text{Alg}(T, T^\dagger)$, then by Proposition 2.18

$$A = - \sum_{n,m=0}^N \alpha_{n,m} D_m D_n + \sum_{N \geq m \geq n \geq 0} \alpha_{n,m} T^{m-n} + \sum_{N \geq n \geq m \geq 1} \alpha_{n,m} T^{n-m}.$$  

Now consider the product $A(T^k PT^{l\dagger})$ for some $k, l$. Using Equations (3) and (4), it follows that $T^k PT^{l\dagger}$ multiplied by any part in the decomposition of $A$ above is once again in $\text{span}\{T^n PT^{m\dagger} : n, m \geq 0\}$. Similarly, $(T^k PT^{l\dagger}) A \in \text{span}\{T^n PT^{m\dagger} : n, m \geq 0\}$. It follows that all polynomials from $\text{span}\{T^n PT^{m\dagger} : n, m \geq 0\}$ multiplied by $A$ belong to $\text{span}\{T^n PT^{m\dagger} : n, m \geq 0\}$. If $B \in \mathcal{K}_T$, it follows from taking limits and using the closure of $\mathcal{K}_T$ that $AB, BA \in \mathcal{K}_T$. By density of $\text{Alg}(T, T^\dagger)$ in $\mathfrak{A}_T$, we have that $\mathcal{K}_T$ is an ideal for $\mathfrak{A}_T$.

By definition, $P \in \mathcal{K}_T$ and so, $\mathfrak{A}_T / \mathcal{K}_T$ is commutative. Hence, $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{K}_T$. However, notice that $\mathcal{K}_T$ is the principal ideal generated by $P$. Indeed, if $\mathcal{J}$ is an ideal of $\mathfrak{A}_T$, and $P \in \mathcal{J}$, then at a minimum each $T^n PT^{m\dagger}$ must be inside of $\mathcal{J}$. Hence, $\mathcal{K}_T = \mathcal{C}$.  

Ideally, we would like a canonical representation of $T$ as multiplication by $z$ on some reproducing kernel Hilbert space. If we further have $T^\dagger$ represented as multiplication by $z^{-1}$, then $\mathfrak{A}_T$ could be further described as compact perturbations of multiplication operators with symbols Laurent series. This turns out to be the case for special class of operators, which we call analytic. We will expand on this particular topic in our discussion of Cowen-Douglas operators.

### 2.3. Wold-Type Decompositions

Much of the model theory and elementary properties of left invertible operators draws its inspiration from isometric operators. Isometries are a tractable class of operators due to the celebrated Wold decomposition. For future notational considerations, we state the Wold Decomposition here:

**Theorem 2.21** (Wold Decomposition for Isometries). Let $S$ be an isometry on $\mathcal{H}$. Define

$$\mathcal{H}_I := \bigcap_{n \geq 1} S^n \mathcal{H}, \quad \mathcal{H}_A := \bigvee_{n \geq 0} S^n \mathcal{E}.$$  

Then $\mathcal{H}_I$ and $\mathcal{H}_A$ are reducing for $S$, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_I \oplus \mathcal{H}_A$, $S |_{\mathcal{H}_I}$ is a unitary and $S |_{\mathcal{H}_A}$ is a unilateral shift of rank $n$.

In other words, all isometries decompose the Hilbert space into two orthogonal, reducing subspaces for $S$. On $\mathcal{H}_I$, the isometry $S$ is invertible, and hence, a unitary. On $\mathcal{H}_A$, the isometry is purely isometric. The isometric summand yields an analytic model. Concretely, $S |_{\mathcal{H}_A}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\dim(\mathcal{E})$ orthogonal copies of the unilateral shift. The unilateral shift is unitarily equivalent to the operator of multiplication by $z$ on a reproducing kernel Hilbert space of analytic functions. For a general left invertible operator $T \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$, one would like to arrive at a similar type of decomposition. We make the following definition:

**Definition 2.22.** Given a left invertible $T \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we define:

$$\mathcal{H}_I := \bigcap_{n \geq 1} T^n \mathcal{H}, \quad \mathcal{H}_A := \bigvee_{n \geq 0} T^n \mathcal{E}.$$
As a caution to the reader, \(H_I\) and \(H_A\) need not be reducing. However, \(H_I\) and \(H_A\) are clearly invariant subspaces for \(T\). Moreover, \(H_I\) is invariant for \(T^\dagger\) and \(T \mid_{H_A}\) is invertible, with inverse \(T^\dagger \mid_{H_A}\). We shall show that \(T \mid_{H_A}\) acts like a shift, not on a orthonormal basis, but on a more general basis. This will be discussed below.

For some isometries, the Wold-decomposition is trivial. For example, the unilateral shift on \(\ell^2(N)\) is purely isometric since the subspace \(H_I = 0\). This leads us to the following definition:

**Definition 2.23** ([30]). An operator \(T \in \mathcal{B}(H)\) is **analytic** if \(H_I = 0\).

The terminology analytic is appropriate because we show that when a natural left invertible operator is analytic, then \(T\) is unitarily equivalent to \(M_z\) on a reproducing kernel Hilbert space of analytic functions.

In general, there is no Wold-type decomposition for \(T\) with regards to the spaces \(H_I\) and \(H_A\). See Example 2.34 below. However, Shimorin in [30] observed that there is almost a Wold-type decomposition. This decomposition is related to a canonical left invertible operator associated to \(T\), called the Cauchy dual of \(T\):

**Definition 2.24** ([30]). Given a left invertible operator \(T\), the **Cauchy dual** of \(T\), denoted \(T'\), is the left invertible given by

\[
T' := T(T^*T)^{-1} = T^\dagger^*.
\]

**Proposition 2.25.** Let \(T\) be a left invertible operator, and \(T'\) its Cauchy dual. The following statements hold:

i. \(T'\) is left invertible with Moore-Penrose inverse \(T'^\dagger = T^*\)

ii. \(E' := \ker((T')^*) = \ker(T^\dagger) = \ker(T^*) = E\)

iii. \(\text{ind}(T') = \text{ind}(T)\)

**Proof.** It is clear from the definition that \(T'\) is left invertible with \(T^*\) a left inverse. That \(T'^\dagger = T^*\) follows from a simple computation:

\[
T'^\dagger = (T'^*T')^{-1}T'^* = (T^\dagger T^\dagger)^{-1}T^\dagger = (T^*T)T^\dagger = T^*.
\]

The remaining observations now follow. □

For the Cauchy dual \(T'\), we define the analogous invariant subspaces:

\[
\begin{align*}
H'_I & := \bigcap_{n \geq 1} T'^n H \\
H'_A & := \bigvee_{n \geq 0} T'^n E.
\end{align*}
\]

We now explain why the terminology of Cauchy dual is sensible. While one cannot hope to arrive at a decomposition \(H = H_I \oplus H_A\), there is a duality between the spaces \(H_I, H'_I\) and \(H_A, H'_A\).

**Proposition 2.26** ([30], Prop 2.7). Let \(T\) be a left invertible operator. Then

\[
H = H_I \oplus H'_A = H'_I \oplus H_A.
\]

where \(\oplus\) is an orthogonal direct summand of closed subspaces.

This duality is key in analyzing \(A_T\). We will leverage information between \(T\) and \(T'\) (or \(T^\dagger\) and \(T^*\)) in order to prove theorems about \(A_T\). The first example of this is the construction of a Schauder bases used throughout the subsequent analysis.

### 2.4. Basis and Dual Basis

We now explore how \(T \mid_{H_A}\) acts as a shift on a general basis. This will be done by showing if \(T\) is a natural analytic left invertible, then it endows the Hilbert space with a type of basis analogous to that of a (Hamel) basis for a vector space, called a Schauder basis.
**Definition 2.27.** A Banach space $X$ is said to have a Schauder basis if there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ of $X$ such that for every element $x \in X$, there is a unique sequence of scalars $\alpha_n$ such that

$$x = \sum_{n \geq 0} \alpha_n x_n$$

where the above sum is converging in the norm topology of $X$. Alternatively, $\{x_n\}$ is a Schauder basis if and only if

i. $\overline{\text{span}}\{x_n\} = X$

ii. $\sum a_n x_n = 0$ if and only if $a_n = 0$ for all $n$.

Recall that a subspace $\mathcal{E}$ is said to be a wandering subspace for an operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ if for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{E} \perp T^n \mathcal{E}$ \cite{13}. In the case of isometric operators, one further has $T^n \mathcal{E} \perp T^m \mathcal{E}$ for each $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \neq m$.

Let $T$ be a natural analytic left invertible operator, and $L$ be a left inverse of $T$. The next result shows that $\mathcal{E} = \ker(T^*)$ is a wandering subspace for $T$ and $L^*$. However, $T^n \mathcal{E}$ may not be orthogonal to $T^m \mathcal{E}$ for $n \neq m$. The invariant subspace generated in this fashion is the whole Hilbert space. Thus, the orbit of $T$ and $L^*$ on $\ker(T^*)$ give rise to a Schauder basis:

**Theorem 2.28.** Let $T$ be a natural analytic left invertible operator with $\text{ind}(T) = -n$ for some positive integer $n$. Let $\{x_{i,0}\}_{i=1}^n$ be an orthonormal basis for $\ker(T^*)$, and $L$ be a left inverse of $T$. Then

i. $x_{i,j} := T^j x_{i,0}, i = 1, \ldots, n, j = 0, 1, \ldots$ is a Schauder basis for $\mathcal{H}$

ii. $x'_{i,j} := (L^*)^j x_{i,0}, i = 1, \ldots, n, j = 0, 1, \ldots$ is a Schauder basis for $\mathcal{H}$.

**Proof.** We will only prove the case when $\text{ind}(T) = -1$. The general case is no more complicated, but simply requires extra notation for bookkeeping. In this case, $\ker(T^*) = \overline{\text{span}}\{x_0\}$ for some norm one element $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$.

The proof will proceed as follows. First we will show that the wandering space for $T^* := T^{\dagger *}$ produces a Schauder basis. Then we show that the orbit of $x_0$ under powers of $T$ will produce a Schauder basis, which will allow us to conclude that for any left inverse $L$, the orbit of $L^*$ yields a Schauder basis.

Since $T$ is analytic, by Proposition \textbf{2.26} we have that

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A = \bigvee_{j \geq 0} T^{ij} \ker(T^*).$$

Let $x'_j := T^j x_0$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots$. Then by construction, $T^j x'_j = x'_{j+1}$ and

$$T^{m} x'_j = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m > j \\ x'_{j-m} & \text{if } m \leq j \end{cases}$$

Notice that $\{x'_j\}$ is a Schauder basis. Indeed by \textbf{5}, $\overline{\text{span}}\{x'_j\} = \mathcal{H}$. Furthermore, if $\sum_{j \geq 0} a_j x'_j = 0$, then

$$0 = (I - TT^\dagger) T^{m} \left( \sum_{j \geq 0} a_j x'_j \right) = (I - TT^\dagger) \left( \sum_{j \geq m} a_j x'_{j-m} \right) = a_m x_0.$$ 

Thus, $a_j = 0$ for all $j$. Therefore $\{x'_j\}$ form a Schauder basis.

We now show that $x_j := T^j x_0$ is a Schauder basis. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be the closed subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ given by $\mathcal{K} := \overline{\text{span}}\{x_j\}$. Suppose that $z \perp \mathcal{K}$. Then by above, $z$ has a unique expansion in the Schauder basis $x'_j$. Say, $z = \sum_{j \geq 0} b_j x'_j$. Thus,

$$0 = \langle z, x_m \rangle = \langle T^{m} z, x_0 \rangle = \langle T^{m} z, (I - TT^\dagger) x_0 \rangle = \langle (I - TT^\dagger) T^{m} z, x_0 \rangle = b_m.$$
Hence, $b_j = 0$ for all $j$, so $z = 0$. Therefore, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{K}$. Now suppose that $\sum_{j \geq 0} c_j x_j = 0$. Then the exact same argument appearing in Equation (6) with $T^m$ replaced with $T^p$ shows $c_j = 0$ for all $j$.

Finally, suppose $L$ is any left inverse of $T$. Let $y_j = L^* j x_0$. Replacing the roles of $x_j$ with $y_j$ and $x_j^\prime$ with $x_j$ in the preceding paragraph, one concludes that $y_j$ is a Schauder basis for $\mathcal{H}$. □

**Corollary 2.29.** Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be left invertible. Then $T$ is analytic if and only if $T$ is analytic.

**Proof.** If $T$ is analytic, then by Theorem 2.28, $\mathcal{H}_A = \mathcal{H}$. Hence $\mathcal{H}_T = 0$. The converse statement is identical. □

Theorem 2.28 illustrates how to construct Schauder bases for $\mathcal{H}$ using a natural analytic left invertible operator $T$ and its Cauchy dual. We reserve the notation of Theorem 2.28 for these bases. We make the following definition:

**Definition 2.30.** Let $T$ be a natural analytic left invertible operator and $L$ be a left inverse of $T$. Fix an orthonormal basis $\{x_i,0\}_{i=1}^n$ for $\mathcal{E} = \ker(T^*)$. Then
\[
\begin{align*}
x_{i,j} &:= T^j x_i,0 \\
x_i,j' &:= L^j x_i,0.
\end{align*}
\]

We refer to the Schauder basis $\{x_i,j\}$ in Equation (7) as the basis of $T$ with respect to $\{x_i,0\}_{i=1}^n$. Similarly, we refer to the basis $\{x_i,j\}$ as the dual basis of $T$ with respect to $\{x_i,0\}_{i=1}^n$ and $L$.

If no mention is made to the choice of left inverse $L$, it is assumed that $L = T'$. While the above definition depends on the choice of orthonormal basis $\{x_i,0\}_{i=1}^n$ for $\mathcal{E}_T$, we will usually refer to each as the basis of $T$ and dual basis of $T$ without reference.

By definition of a Schauder basis, for each $f \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists a unique sequences of scalars $\{\alpha_{i,j}\}$ and $\{\alpha_{i,j}'\}$ such that
\[
f = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,j} x_{i,j} = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,j}' x_i,j'.
\]

Naturally, one would like to have a relationship between $\{\alpha_{i,j}\}$ or $\{\alpha_{i,j}'\}$ in terms of the element $f \in \mathcal{H}$. We have the following useful characterization:

**Proposition 2.31.** For each $f \in \mathcal{H}$, we have the following expansions:
\[
f = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle f, x_{i,j} \rangle x_{i,j} = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle f, x_i,j \rangle x_i,j'.
\]

**Proof.** Suppose that $f = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,j} x_{i,j}$. Now, $T^m x_{i,j} = 0$ if $j \leq m$ and $x_{i,j-m}$ otherwise. Also, since $\{x_i,0\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\ker(T^*)$, we have for each $m \geq 0$,
\[
\langle f, x_{i,m} \rangle = \langle T^m f, x_i,0 \rangle = \alpha_{i,m}.
\]

The same argument shows that if we expand $f$ in terms of the dual basis of $T$ as $f = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,j}' x_i,j'$, then $\alpha_{i,m}' = \langle f, x_i,m \rangle$. □

**Corollary 2.32.** The basis of $T$ is bi-orthogonal to the dual basis of $T$. That is, $\langle x_{l,m}, x_i,j' \rangle = \delta_{l,i} \delta_{m,j}$

**Proof.** By Proposition 2.31 we have that
\[
x_{l,m} = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle x_{l,m}, x_{i,j} \rangle x_{i,j}.
\]

However by definition, Schauder bases have a unique expansion in terms of the basis. Hence, $\langle x_{l,m}, x_i,j' \rangle = 0$ unless $i = l$ and $j = m$. □
Briefly, we would like to caution the reader about the order of basis and dual basis of $T$. A convergent series $\sum_{n \geq 0} x_n$ in a Banach space $X$ is said to be \textit{unconditionally convergent} if for every permutation $\sigma$ of $\mathbb{N}$, the series $\sum_{n \geq 0} x_{\sigma(n)}$ converges. Otherwise, the series is said to be \textit{conditionally convergent}. A Schauder basis $\{x_n\}$ in a Banach space $X$ is said to be an \textit{unconditional basis} if the series expansion $x = \sum_{n \geq 0} \alpha_n x_n$ is unconditional for every $x \in X$. Otherwise, the basis is said to be \textit{conditional}. Examples of unconditional bases for Hilbert spaces include orthonormal bases, and more generally, some frames.

Unfortunately, all infinite dimensional Banach spaces with a basis must have conditional bases [25]. What is worse, verifying that a basis is unconditional is, in general, a very difficult task. Explicit constructions of conditional bases exist for Hilbert spaces. Indeed, there is a class of examples for \textit{conditionally convergent} bases, and more generally, some frames.

Example 2.34. Let $H = \ell^2(\mathbb{N}) \oplus \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, and define $T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ as

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ B & C \end{pmatrix}$$

where $A$ is the unilateral shift on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$, $C$ is the bilateral shift on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, and $B : \ell^2(\mathbb{N}) \to \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ is the inclusion map given by

$$B((a_n)_{n \geq 1}) = (\ldots, 0, a_1, a_2, \ldots)$$

where the $\ldots$ symbol denotes the entry in the zeroth slot. Let $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and $\{f_n\}_{n=-\infty}^\infty$ denote the standard orthonormal basis for $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ and $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ respectively.

In order to compute the subspaces $H_f$ and $H_A$ above, we will first need to analyze $T^n$. Note that

$$T^n = \begin{pmatrix} A^n & 0 \\ D_n & C^n \end{pmatrix}$$

where $D_n := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} C^k B A^{n-1-k}$. By construction, $D_n e_m = nf_{m+n-1}$. Therefore, $D_n = nC^{n-1}B$, so

$$T^n = \begin{pmatrix} A^n & 0 \\ nC^{n-1}B & C^n \end{pmatrix}$$.
Notice that if \( x \oplus y \in \mathcal{H} \), then

\[ T^n \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A^n x \\ nC^{n-1} B x + C^n y \end{pmatrix}. \]

We now show that

\[ \mathcal{H}_1 = 0 \oplus \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}). \]

Indeed, suppose that \( x \oplus y \in \mathcal{H}_1 \). Then for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) there exists a sequence \( x_n \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}) \) and \( y_n \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \) such that \( T^n(x_n \oplus y_n) = x \oplus y \). By Equation (8), we must have \( A^n x_n = x \). But since the unilateral shift \( A \) is analytic, it follows that \( x = 0 \) so that \( \mathcal{H}_1 \subseteq 0 \oplus \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \). On the other hand, suppose \( y \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \). Since the bilateral shift \( C \) is invertible, \( C^n \) is invertible for all \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \). Thus, for all \( n \) there exists \( y_n \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \) such that \( C^n y_n = y \). Hence, \( 0 \oplus y \in \mathcal{H}_1 \), demonstrating equality.

Next we compute \( \mathcal{H}_A \). Notice that

\[ T^* = \begin{pmatrix} A^* & B^* \\ 0 & C^* \end{pmatrix} \]

where \( B^* : \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \to \ell^2(\mathbb{N}) \) is the projection onto the coordinates greater than zero. Consequently, if \( x \oplus y \in \mathcal{H} \),

\[ T^* \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A^* x + B^* y \\ C^* y \end{pmatrix}. \]

If \( x \oplus y \in \ker(T^*) \), then since \( C^* \) is invertible, it follows that \( y = 0 \). Consequently, \( x \in \ker(A^*) = \text{span}\{e_1\} \). Therefore, \( \mathcal{E} = \ker(T^*) = \ker(A^*) \oplus 0 = \text{span}\{e_1\} \oplus 0 \). Now, by Equation (8),

\[ T^n \begin{pmatrix} e_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e_{n+1} \\ nf_n \end{pmatrix}. \]

As a result, we have that

\[ \text{span}_{0 \leq n \leq N} \{ T^n(e_1 \oplus 0) \} = \left\{ \left( \sum_{n=0}^N \alpha_n e_{n+1} \right) \oplus \left( \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n nf_n \right) : \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_N \in \mathbb{C} \right\}. \]

Now because

\[ \left\| \left( \sum_{n=0}^N \alpha_n e_{n+1} \right) \oplus \left( \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n nf_n \right) \right\|^2 = \left\| \sum_{n=0}^N \alpha_n e_{n+1} \right\|^2 + \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n nf_n \right\|^2 = |\alpha_0|^2 + |\alpha_{N+1}|^2 + \sum_{n=1}^N (1 + n^2) |\alpha_n|^2 \]

it follows that

\[ \mathcal{H}_A = \left\{ \left( \sum_{n \geq 0} \alpha_n e_{n+1} \right) \oplus \left( \sum_{n \geq 1} \alpha_n nf_n \right) : \sum_{n \geq 1} (1 + n^2) |\alpha_n|^2 < \infty \right\}. \]

With \( \mathcal{H}_A \) computed, we now remark that \( \mathcal{H}_1 = 0 \oplus \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \) is not orthogonal to \( \mathcal{H}_A \). Nevertheless, \( \mathcal{H}_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_A = 0 \). This is clear by the form of \( \mathcal{H}_A \) and \( \mathcal{H}_1 \).

Finally, we remark that \( \mathcal{H}_1 + \mathcal{H}_A \) is dense in \( \mathcal{H} \), but not closed. To see this, note that \( 0 \oplus f_n \in 0 \oplus \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) = \mathcal{H}_1 \) for all \( n \). By Equation (8), it follows that \( \{e_n \oplus 0\}_{n \geq 0} \subset \mathcal{H}_1 + \mathcal{H}_A \). Since \( \{0 \oplus f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \subset \mathcal{H}_1 \), it follows that \( \mathcal{H}_1 + \mathcal{H}_A \) is dense in \( \mathcal{H} \). However, \( \mathcal{H}_1 + \mathcal{H}_A \neq \mathcal{E} \), as \( \mathcal{H}_1 + \mathcal{H}_A \) is not closed. Indeed, if we let \( z = ((1 + n^2)^{-1/2}) \oplus 0 \), then \( z \in \mathcal{E} \) but \( z \notin \mathcal{H}_1 + \mathcal{H}_A \). This concludes the example.

The above example turns out to be generic. If \( T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) is left invertible, then \( \mathcal{H}_1 + \mathcal{H}_A \) is dense in \( \mathcal{H} \) with \( \mathcal{H}_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_A = 0 \). To show this, we establish a few simple results.
Proposition 2.35. Let \( T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) be left invertible. Consider the decomposition \( \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \oplus \mathcal{H}_I \) afforded by Proposition 2.26. Then with respect to this decomposition,

\[
T = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ B & C \end{pmatrix}
\]

with \( A \) analytic left invertible, and \( C \) invertible.

Proof. Note that \( \mathcal{H}_I \) is invariant for \( T \). Therefore, \( T \) necessarily has the form above. That the operator \( C = T \mid_{\mathcal{H}_I} \) is invertible is clear. Let \( Q \) be the projection onto \( \mathcal{H}_A' \). To show that \( A = QT \mid_{\mathcal{H}_A'} \) is left invertible, we show that \( A^* \) is right invertible. Indeed, notice that \( \mathcal{H}_A' \) is invariant under \( T' \), and that

\[
T^* = \begin{pmatrix} A^* & B^* \\ 0 & C^* \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Thus, if \( x \in \mathcal{H}_A' \), we have

\[
A^*(T'x) = T^*(T'x) = x
\]

since \( T^*T' = I \). Therefore \( A^* \) is right invertible, so \( A \) is left invertible. That \( A \) is analytic follows from the orthogonality of the decomposition. To see this, observe

\[
T^n = \begin{pmatrix} A^n & 0 \\ * & C^n \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Hence, \( A^n = QT^n \mid_{\mathcal{H}_A'} \). Now,

\[
\bigcap A^n \mathcal{H}_A' = \bigcap QT^n \mathcal{H}_A' \subset Q \bigcap T^n \mathcal{H} = Q \mathcal{H}_I = 0.
\]

Proposition 2.36. Suppose that \( T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \), \( \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \) and

\[
T = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ B & C \end{pmatrix}
\]

with \( A \) analytic left invertible, and \( C \) invertible. Then \( T \) is left invertible, with \( \mathcal{H}_I = 0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \), \( \ker(T^*) = \ker(A^*) \oplus 0 \), and \( \mathcal{H}_I \cap \mathcal{H}_A = 0 \).

Proof. Let \( L \) be the operator defined by

\[
L = \begin{pmatrix} A^\dagger & 0 \\ -C^{-1}BA^\dagger & C^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Then \( L \) is a left inverse of \( T \), so \( T \) is left invertible. Now, we remark that

\[
T^n = \begin{pmatrix} A^n & 0 \\ D_n & C^n \end{pmatrix}
\]

where \( D_n \) is an operator whose formula is not relevant for the remainder of the proof. If \( x \oplus y \in \bigcap T^n \mathcal{H} \), then there exists \( x_n, y_n \) such that

\[
T^n \begin{pmatrix} x_n \\ y_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A^n x_n \\ D_n x_n + C^n y_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Since \( A \) is analytic, it follows that \( x = 0 \). Thus, \( \bigcap T^n \mathcal{H} \subset 0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \). Conversely, given \( y \in \mathcal{H}_2 \), since \( C^n \) is invertible, there exists \( y_n \) such that \( C^n y_n = y \). So, \( T^n(0 \oplus y_n) = 0 \oplus y \). It follows that \( \bigcap T^n \mathcal{H} = 0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \).

Concerning the intersection of \( \mathcal{H}_I \) and \( \mathcal{H}_A \), notice that

\[
T^* = \begin{pmatrix} A^* & B^* \\ 0 & C^* \end{pmatrix}.
\]
Since $C^*$ is invertible, it follows that $x \oplus y \in \ker(T^*)$ if and only if $y = 0$ and $x \in \ker(A^*)$. Thus, $E' = \ker(A^*) \oplus 0$. Consequently if $x_0 \in \ker(A^*)$, $\mathcal{H}_A$ is densely spanned by elements of the form

$$T^n(x_0 \ 0) = \begin{pmatrix} A^n x_0 \\ D_n x_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$ 

Since $A$ is analytic, $A^n x_0$ form a Schauder basis for $\mathcal{H}_A$ by Theorem (2.28). As a result, $0 \oplus y \in \mathcal{H}$ if and only if $y = 0$. □

**Corollary 2.37.** Given a left invertible operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{H}_I + \mathcal{H}_A$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$ with $\mathcal{H}_I \cap \mathcal{H}_A = 0$.

**Proof.** Proposition (2.36) established that $\mathcal{H}_I \cap \mathcal{H}_A = 0$. All that remains to be shown is that $\mathcal{H}_I + \mathcal{H}_A$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$. To this end, consider the decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \oplus \mathcal{H}_I$. Write,

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ B & C \end{pmatrix}.$$ 

Let $x_0 \oplus 0 \in \ker(T^*) = \ker(A^*) \oplus 0$, so that

$$T^n(x_0 \ 0) = \begin{pmatrix} A^n x_0 \\ D_n x_0 \end{pmatrix}$$

as before. Given that $0 \oplus (-D_n x_0) \in 0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_I$, we have

$$T^n(x_0 \ 0) + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -D_n x_0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A^n x_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{H}_A + \mathcal{H}_I.$$ 

Since $A$ is an analytic left invertible on $\mathcal{H}_A$, $A^n x_0$ is a Schauder basis for $\mathcal{H}_A$. It follows that the closure of $\mathcal{H}_A + \mathcal{H}_I$ contains $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_I$, and therefore is dense in $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \oplus \mathcal{H}_I$. □

3. **Cowen-Douglas Operators - The Analytic Model**

In the late 70s, Cowen and Douglas discovered that operators possessing an open set of eigenvalues can be associated with a particular Hermitian holomorphic bundle [10], [11]. These operators, now called Cowen-Douglas operators, could in some cases be completely classified by simple geometric properties. For example, when the rank of the bundle is one, the curvature serves as a complete set of unitary invariants [11].

Cowen-Douglas operators have played an important role in operator theory, servicing as a bridge between operator theory and complex geometry. The definition is rigid enough to allow for classification based on local spectral data. However, the definition is also flexible enough to allow for rich examples - including many backward weighted shifts and adjoints of some subnormal operators. The definition of Cowen-Douglas operators is as follows:

**Definition 3.1.** Given an open subset $\Omega$ of $\mathbb{C}$ and a positive integer $n$, we say that $R$ is of Cowen-Douglas class $n$, and write $R \in B_n(\Omega)$ if

i. $\Omega \subset \sigma(R)$
ii. $(R - \lambda)\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}$ for all $\lambda \in \Omega$
iii. $\dim(\ker(R - \lambda)) = n$ for all $\lambda \in \Omega$
iv. $\bigvee_{\lambda \in \Omega} \ker(R - \lambda) = \mathcal{H}$

Thus if $R \in B_n(\Omega)$, then $R$ contains an open set of eigenvalues such that each eigenspace has dimension $n$, and the span of these eigenspaces is dense in $\mathcal{H}$. Associated to Cowen-Douglas operators is a bundle structure known as a Hermitian holomorphic vector bundle.

**Definition 3.2.** A Hermitian holomorphic vector bundle of rank $n$ over $\Omega$ consists of the following data:

i. A complex manifold $E$
ii. A holomorphic map \( \pi : E \rightarrow \Omega \) such that each fiber \( E_\lambda := \pi^{-1}(\lambda) \) is isomorphic to \( \mathbb{C}^n \)

iii. For each \( \lambda_0 \in \Omega \), there exists a neighborhood \( \Delta \) of \( \lambda_0 \) and functions \( \{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^n \) with \( \gamma_i : \Omega \rightarrow E \)

such that \( \{\gamma_i(\lambda)\}_{i=1}^n \) form a basis for \( E_\lambda \).

A cross-section \( E \) is a map \( \gamma : \Omega \rightarrow E \) such that \( \pi(\gamma(\lambda)) = \lambda \) for all \( \lambda \in \Omega \) (namely \( \gamma(\lambda) \in E_\lambda \) for each \( \lambda \)). The bundle is trivial if \( \Delta \) may be taken to be \( \Omega \). The trivial bundle of rank \( n \) over \( \Omega \) is \( \Omega \times \mathbb{C}^n \) with \( \pi(\lambda, x) = \lambda \).

If \( R \in B_n(\Omega) \), then the set

\[
E_R := \{ (\lambda, x) \in \Omega \times \mathcal{H} : x \in \ker(R - \lambda) \}
\]

with the mapping \( \pi : E_R \rightarrow \Omega \) via \( \pi(\lambda, x) = \lambda \) defines sub-bundle of the trivial bundle of rank \( n \) over \( \Omega \). It is known that \( E_R \) provides a complete set of unitary invariants for operators in the Cowen-Douglas class [10]. Specifically, if \( E_{R_1} \) is isomorphic to \( E_{R_2} \) as holomorphic vector bundles, then \( R_1 \) is unitarily equivalent to \( R_2 \). This approach to Cowen-Douglas theory highlights the beautiful connections that exist between complex geometry and operator theory.

The sections of the bundle \( E_R \) provide an equivalent avenue of study. Given \( R \in B_n(\Omega) \), we can represent \( R \) as the adjoint of multiplication by \( z \) on a reproducing kernel Hilbert space. The approach of this paper more closely follows this model. We will outline this construction below, and connect it to our work on bases in Section Two. For more information about Cowen-Douglas operators, see [10, 12, 33].

3.1. Analytic Left Invertibles and Cowen-Douglas Operators. The connection between Cowen-Douglas operators and left invertibles is found in the following:

**Theorem A.** Let \( T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) be a left invertible operator with \( \text{ind}(T) = -n \), for \( n \geq 1 \). Then the following are equivalent:

i. \( T \) is analytic

ii. \( T^* \) is analytic

iii. There exists \( \epsilon > 0 \) such that \( T^* \in B_n(\Omega) \) for \( \Omega = \{ z : |z| < \epsilon \} \)

iv. There exists \( \epsilon > 0 \) such that \( T^\dagger \in B_n(\Omega) \) for \( \Omega = \{ z : |z| < \epsilon \} \)

Theorem A is a cornerstone result for this work. It serves two fundamental roles. First, Theorem A allows us to leverage the powerful machinery associated with Cowen-Douglas operators into classifying the algebras \( \mathfrak{A}_T \). Second, it provides us with a desirable canonical model. Concretely, Theorem A allows us to represent \( T \) as multiplication by \( z \) restricted to a reproducing kernel Hilbert space of analytic functions.

To help illuminate this relationship, we will take a constructive approach to proving Theorem A. This will also connect to our results on Schauder bases from the previous section. We prove the implication iii. implies i. after stating the following lemma noted in Cowen and Douglas’ original work:

**Lemma 3.3** ([10]). Let \( \Theta \) be an open subset of \( \mathbb{C} \) and \( S \in B_m(\Theta) \). Then for any fixed \( \mu_0 \in \Theta \),

\[
\bigvee_{k \geq 1} \ker(S - \mu_0)^k = \mathcal{H}.
\]

Moreover, if \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{C} \) is open, \( \lambda_0 \in \Omega \), \( n \) is a positive integer, and \( R \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) satisfies

i. \( \Omega \subset \sigma(S) \)

ii. \( (R - \lambda)\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H} \) for all \( \lambda \in \Omega \)

iii. \( \dim(\ker(R - \lambda)) = n \) for all \( \lambda \in \Omega \)

iv. \( \bigvee_{k \geq 1} \ker((R - \lambda_0)^k) = \mathcal{H} \).

Then \( R \in B_n(\Omega) \).
Corollary 3.4. Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $\Omega = \{z : |z| < \epsilon\}$. If $T^* \in B_n(\Omega)$, then $T$ is an analytic, left invertible operator with $\text{ind}(T) = -n$.

Proof. By assumption, $0 \in \Omega \subset \sigma(T^*)$. By condition ii. of the definition of Cowen-Douglas operators, $T^*$ is onto. Therefore, $T$ is left invertible.

As $T$ is left invertible, its Cauchy dual $T'$ is well defined. Recall that $T^* = (T')^\dagger$. Since $T^* \in B_n(\Omega)$, it follows that $\text{ind}(T') = -n$. By Proposition 2.25 and condition iii. of Cowen-Douglas operators, we have $\text{ind}(T) = \text{ind}(T') = -n$. Thus, all that remains to be shown is that $T$ is analytic. By lemma 3.3, $\mathcal{H} = \bigvee_{k \geq 1} \ker(T^{*k})$. Therefore,

\[ 0 = \left( \bigvee_{k \geq 1} \ker(T^{*k}) \right)^\perp = \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \ker(T^{*k}) \perp = \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \text{ran}(T^k). \]

Next we show that if $T$ is a natural analytic left invertible, then $T^* \in B_n(\Omega)$. This will be done in several steps. First, we will show that $T^*$ possess an open set $\Omega$ of eigenvalues. We establish some notation for the open set $\Omega$ that will appear in the implication i. implies iii. of Theorem A

Definition 3.5. Suppose $T$ is a natural analytic left invertible operator. We define

\[ \Omega_T := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < \|T^\dagger\|^{-1}\}. \]

Corollary 3.6. If $T$ is a natural analytic left invertible operator, and $\lambda \in \Omega_T$, then $T + \lambda$ is left invertible with $\text{ind}(T) = \text{ind}(T + \lambda)$.

Proof. Notice that

\[ \| (T + \lambda) - T \| = |\lambda| < \|T^\dagger\|^{-1}. \]

By Lemma 2.8 and Proposition 2.12 $T + \lambda$ is left invertible with the same Fredholm index as $T$. \hfill \Box

Lemma 3.7. Let $T$ be an analytic left invertible operator with $\text{ind}(T) = -n$ for some $n \geq 1$. Then for all $\lambda \in \Omega_T$, the operator $I - \lambda T'$ is invertible with

\[ (I - \lambda T')^{-1} = \sum_{j \geq 0} \lambda^j T'^j. \]

Proof. As $|\lambda| < \|T^\dagger\|^{-1}$ and $T' = T'^\dagger$, the operator $\lambda T'$ has norm less than 1. \hfill \Box

Lemma 3.8. Let $T$ be an analytic left invertible operator with $\text{ind}(T) = -n$ for some positive integer $n$. Let $\{x_i, 0\}_{i=1}^n$ be an orthonormal basis for $\ker(T^*)$, and

\[ x'_{i,j} = T'^j x_{i,0} = ((T^\dagger)^*)^j x_{i,0} \]

be the dual basis of $T$ with respect to $T^\dagger$. Then for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the maps $\gamma_i : \Omega_T \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ via

\[ \gamma_i(\lambda) := \sum_{j \geq 0} \lambda^j x'_{i,j} \]

are well defined. Furthermore, the maps $\gamma_i : \Omega_T \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ are analytic.

Proof. By Lemma 3.7 $I - \lambda T'$ is invertible. Thus for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$,

\[ (I - \lambda T')^{-1} (x_{i,0}) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \lambda^j T'^j (x_{i,0}) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \lambda^j x'_{i,j} = \gamma_i(\lambda) \]

exists for each $\lambda \in \Omega_T$. Since the map $\lambda \mapsto (I - \lambda T')^{-1}$ is well defined and analytic on $\Omega_T$, we have that the maps $\gamma_i$ are analytic. \hfill \Box

In light of these observations, we make the following definition:
**Definition 3.9.** Given an analytic left invertible $T$ with $\text{ind}(T) = -n$ for some positive integer $n$, let $\Omega_T$ be as in Definition 3.5. Let $\{x_{i,0}\}_{i=1}^{n}$ be an orthonormal basis for $\ker(T^*)$, and $x'_{i,j} = T^{j} x_{i,0}$ be the dual basis of $T$ with respect to $T^*$. We define 
$$
\gamma_i(\lambda) := \sum_{j \geq 0} \lambda^j x'_{i,j}.
$$

**Lemma 3.10.** Let $T$ be an analytic left invertible with $\text{ind}(T) = -n$, and $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$ be as in Definition 3.9. Then for each $i$, 
$$
\gamma_i(\lambda) \in \ker(T^* - \lambda).
$$
Hence, $\Omega_T \subset \sigma_p(T^*)$.

**Proof.** Since $T^*$ is the Moore-Penrose inverse of $T'$, it follows from the definition of $\gamma_i$ that 
$$
T^* \gamma_i(\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda^j T^* x'_{i,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda^j x'_{i,j-1} = \lambda \gamma_i(\lambda).
$$
The rest of the statement follows. \[\square\]

**Proposition 3.11.** Let $T$ be an analytic left invertible operator with $\text{ind}(T) = -n$ for some positive integer $n$. Let $\Omega_T$ be as in Definition 3.5. Then $T^* \in B_n(\Omega_T)$.

**Proof.** Pick an orthonormal basis $\{x_{i,0}\}$ for $\ker(T^*)$. By Corollary 3.6 if $\lambda \in \Omega_T$, then $T - \lambda I$ is left invertible with Fredholm index $-n$. Therefore, each eigenspace $\ker(T^* - \lambda)$ is $n$-dimensional for each $\lambda \in \Omega_T$. By Lemma 3.10 we have $\{\gamma_i(\lambda)\}_{i=1}^{n} \subset \ker(T^* - \lambda)$. Moreover, since $\{x'_{i,j}\}$ form a Schauder basis, we must have that the collection $\{\gamma_i(\lambda)\}_{i=1}^{n}$ is linearly independent.

Indeed, suppose there exists a $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\gamma_i(\lambda) = \mu \gamma_k(\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in \Omega_T$ with $i \neq k$. If $x_{i,j} = T^j x_{i,0}$ is the basis associated to $T$, then by Lemma 2.32 we have for each $j$ 
$$
\lambda^j = \langle \gamma_i(\lambda), x_{i,j} \rangle = \mu \langle \gamma_k(\lambda), x_{i,j} \rangle = \mu \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda^j \langle x'_{k,j}, x_{i,j} \rangle = 0.
$$
This forces $\lambda = 0$. Hence, $x'_{i,0} = \gamma_i(0) = \mu x_{i,0}$, but since $\{x_{i,0}\}_{i=1}^{n}$ form an orthonormal basis for $\ker(T^*)$, this cannot happen. Hence, $\{\gamma_i(\lambda)\}_{i=1}^{n}$ form a (perhaps non-orthogonal) basis for $\ker(T^* - \lambda)$.

Lastly, if we choose $\lambda_0 = 0$, then 
$$
\ker(T^* - \lambda_0)^k = \ker((T^*)^k) = (\text{ran}T^k)^\perp = \left( \bigcap_{j=0}^{k} T^j \mathcal{H} \right)^\perp.
$$
Since $T$ is analytic, it follows that $\bigvee_{k \geq 1} \ker((T^*)^k) = \mathcal{H}$. By Lemma 3.3 we have that $T^* \in B_n(\Omega)$. \[\square\]

We highlight an important and interesting feature of the basis $\{x'_{i,j}\}$ that came up in the previous proof:

**Corollary 3.12.** Let $T$ be an analytic left invertible operator with $\text{ind}(T) = -n$ for some positive integer $n$, and $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$ be the analytic maps from Definition 3.9. Then for each $\lambda \in \Omega_T$, $\{\gamma_i(\lambda)\}_{i=1}^{n}$ form a spanning set for $\ker(T^* - \lambda)$.

We have thus shown that statements $i$ and $iii$. of Theorem A are equivalent. However, when paired with Corollary 2.29 we see that $T^\dagger$ must also be Cowen-Douglas. This completes the proof of Theorem A.
One consequence of Theorem \[ \mathfrak{A}_T \] is a reformulation of the definition of \( \mathfrak{A}_T \) and the operator algebra generated by a Cowen-Douglas operator and a particular right inverse. Indeed, recall that \( \mathfrak{A}_T \) is defined by

\[
\mathfrak{A}_T := \overline{\mathfrak{Mg}\{T,T^\dagger\}}.
\]

If \( \epsilon > 0 \), \( \Omega = \{ z : |z| < \epsilon \} \), and \( R \in B_n(\Omega) \), then by definition \( R \) is right invertible. There exists a canonical right inverse of \( R \), which we denote by \( T \), such that \( \text{ran}(T) = \ker(R)^\perp \). By construction, \( T \) is left invertible, and \( R = T^\dagger \), the Moore-Penrose inverse of \( T \). Thus, we arrive at an equivalent viewpoint of study:

**Corollary 3.13.** Let \( \epsilon > 0 \), \( \Omega = \{ z : |z| < \epsilon \} \), and \( R \in B_n(\Omega) \). If \( T \) is the right inverse of \( R \) such that \( \text{ran}(T) = \ker(R)^\perp \), then \( T \) is an analytic left invertible operator with \( R = T^\dagger \). Hence,

\[
\mathfrak{A}_T = \overline{\mathfrak{Mg}\{T,R\}}.
\]

### 3.2. The Associated Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space.

As previously remarked, the general theory of Cowen-Douglas operators allows one to represent \( T \) as multiplication by \( z \) on a reproducing kernel Hilbert space of analytic functions over \( \Omega \). This construction is highlighted here. We then connect this model to the Schauder bases associated to \( T \) and \( T^\dagger \) discussed in Section Two. First, let us establish some notation. Given a set \( G \subset \mathbb{C} \), let \( G^* := \{ \lambda : \lambda \in G \} \). Notice that \( \Omega_T^* = \Omega_T \) as a set. We make the following definition:

**Definition 3.14.** Let \( R \in B_n(\Omega) \). A holomorphic cross-section of \( \gamma : \Omega \to E_R \) of the bundle \( E_R \) is a spanning holomorphic cross-section if

\[
\text{span}\{\gamma(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Omega\} = \mathcal{H}.
\]

Spanning holomorphic cross-sections give rise to reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces of analytic functions. Indeed, fix a spanning holomorphic section \( \gamma \). For each \( f \in \mathcal{H} \), define an analytic function \( f_\gamma \in H(\Omega^*) \) as follows:

\[
(10) \quad f_\gamma(\lambda) = \langle f, \gamma(\lambda) \rangle \quad \lambda \in \Omega^*.
\]

Let \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma := \{ f_\gamma : f \in \mathcal{H} \} \subset H(\Omega^*) \). Equip \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma \) with the inner product afforded by \( \mathcal{H} \). That is, for each \( f, g \in \mathcal{H} \), define the inner product on \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma \) via

\[
\langle f_\gamma, g_\gamma \rangle := \langle f, g \rangle.
\]

Define a linear map \( U_\gamma : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}_\gamma \) via \( U_\gamma(f) = f_\gamma \). Notice that because \( \gamma \) is a spanning section, \( U_\gamma \) is a unitary. Indeed, if \( f_\gamma = g_\gamma \), then for each \( \lambda \in \Omega^* \),

\[
0 = f_\gamma(\lambda) - g_\gamma(\lambda) = \langle f - g, \gamma(\lambda) \rangle
\]

Since the span of \( \{ \gamma(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Omega \} \) is dense in \( \mathcal{H} \), \( f - g = 0 \).

Furthermore, \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma \) is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space over the set \( \Omega^* \). Indeed, as \( \gamma(\lambda) \in \mathcal{H} \), there exists a function \( \gamma(\lambda)_\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma \). For all \( f \in \mathcal{H} \) and \( \lambda \in \Omega \),

\[
f_\gamma(\lambda) = \langle f, \gamma(\lambda) \rangle = \langle f_\gamma, \gamma(\lambda)_\gamma \rangle_\gamma.
\]

Hence, the reproducing kernel at \( \lambda \in \Omega^* \) is given by \( k_\lambda = \gamma(\lambda)_\gamma \). Therefore, given \( \lambda, \mu \in \Omega^* \), the reproducing kernel may be computed as follows:

\[
K(\lambda,\mu) = \langle k_\mu, k_\lambda \rangle = \langle \gamma(\mu)_\gamma, \gamma(\lambda)_\gamma \rangle_\gamma = \langle \gamma(\mu), \gamma(\lambda) \rangle.
\]

If \( R \in B_n(\Omega) \), then the Hermitian holomorphic vector bundle \((E_R, \pi)\) has many choices of cross sections \( \gamma : \Omega \to E_R \). For example, if \( T \) is a natural analytic left invertible, the \( \gamma_i \) in Definition 3.9
are cross sections for $T^*$. By construction, the collection of cross-sections $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^n$ satisfy $\{\gamma_i(\lambda)\}_{i=1}^n$ form a basis for $E_\lambda$. Since the fibers $E_\lambda$ of $E_R$ are ker$(R - \lambda)$, and $\bigvee$ ker$(R - \lambda) = \mathcal{H}$, we have that the collection of $\gamma_i : \Omega \to \mathcal{H}$ have dense span in $\mathcal{H}$. The following theorem states that we can combine these sections to get a spanning holomorphic cross-section:

**Theorem 3.15** ([33] - Theorem 5). Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space, and $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be holomorphic functions from $\Omega$ to $\mathcal{H}$ such that

$$\bigvee_{\lambda \in \Omega} \text{span}_{i=1,...,n}\{\gamma_i(\lambda)\} = \mathcal{H}.$$  

Then there exists holomorphic functions $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ from $\Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ such that the map $\gamma : \Omega \to \mathcal{H}$ defined by

$$\gamma(\lambda) := \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(\lambda) \gamma_i(\lambda) \quad \lambda \in \Omega$$

also spans $\mathcal{H}$.

The functions $\phi_i$ that appear in Theorem 3.15 are built as follows. Let $\mathcal{H}_1 = \bigvee_{\lambda \in \Omega} \gamma_1(\lambda)$. Then by construction, $\gamma_1$ is a holomorphic spanning cross-section for $\mathcal{H}_1$. Consider the RKHS of analytic functions built from $\gamma_1$. One can find a set of points $\{a_k\} \subset \Omega$ that is a uniqueness set of $\Omega$, in the sense that the only function in this space associated to $\gamma_1$ that vanishes on $\{a_k\}$ is the zero function. Using a separation theorem due to Weierstrass, one can pick a holomorphic function $\phi_2$ that vanishes exactly on $\{a_k\}$. Then $\gamma_1 + \phi_2 \gamma_2$ ends up being a spanning section for the space $\mathcal{H}_2 = \bigvee_{\lambda \in \Omega} \text{span}_{i=1,2}\{\gamma_i(\lambda)\}$. Iteratively, one selects holomorphic functions $\phi_i$ until a spanning section for the whole Hilbert space is built. In particular, one can choose $\phi_1$ to be the identity function on $\Omega$. For details, see [33].

For a concrete example of how this idea may be applied, let $\mathcal{H} = H^2(\mathbb{D}) \oplus H^2(\mathbb{D})$ and $T = T_2 \oplus T_2$. Then $T^* \in B_2(\mathbb{D})$. Define $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 : \mathbb{D} \to \mathcal{H}$ via

$$\gamma_1(\lambda)(z) = k_\lambda(z) \oplus 0$$

$$\gamma_2(\lambda)(z) = 0 \oplus k_\lambda(z)$$

It is well-known that if $f \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ is non-zero, then the zero set $Z(f) = \{a_n\}$ satisfies the Blaschke condition: $\sum |a_n| < \infty$. Therefore, if $S = \{1 - \frac{1}{n}\}_{n \geq 1}$, the only function $f \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ that vanishes on $S$ is the zero function. Using Blaschke products, there exists an analytic function $\phi$ over $\mathbb{D}$ with $Z(\phi) = S$. Now, define $\gamma : \mathbb{D} \to \mathcal{H}$ via

$$\gamma(\lambda)(z) = \gamma_1(\lambda)(z) + \phi(\lambda) \gamma_2(\lambda)(z) = k_\lambda(z) \oplus (\phi(\lambda)k_\lambda(z)).$$

The map $\gamma$ is a spanning section for $\mathcal{H}$. Indeed, if $f = f_1 \oplus f_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ is orthogonal to $\gamma(\lambda)$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$, then

$$0 = \langle f, \gamma(\lambda) \rangle = \langle f_1, k_\lambda \rangle + \overline{\phi(\lambda)} \langle f_2, k_\lambda \rangle = f_1(\lambda) + \overline{\phi(\lambda)} f_2(\lambda).$$

Since $\phi$ vanishes on $S$, we have that for each $\lambda \in S$, $0 = f_1(\lambda) + 0 = f_1(\lambda)$. Hence, $f_1$ vanishes on $S$ so $f_1 = 0$. Therefore, $0 = \phi(\lambda) f_2(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. In particular, $f_2$ vanishes on a set with a limit point in $\mathbb{D}$, and thus is the zero function as well. Therefore, $\gamma$ spans $\mathcal{H}$.

Notice that this construction is far from unique. Indeed, $\gamma$ depends on a choice $S$ and function $\phi$ which vanishes on $S$. Nevertheless, Theorem 3.15 provides a method for constructing spanning sections for all $R \in B_n(\Omega)$.

**Corollary 3.16.** If $R \in B_n(\Omega)$, then $(E_R, \pi)$ admits a spanning holomorphic cross-section.

Suppose $R \in B_n(\Omega)$. A consequence of Corollary 3.16 is that $R$ is unitarily equivalent to multiplication by $z$ on a collection of analytic functions over $\Omega^*$. Let $M_z$ denote the operator of multiplication by the indeterminate $z$. That is, for each $\lambda \in \Omega^*$, $M_z(f)(\lambda) = \lambda f(\lambda)$. Since $z \in \Omega$, it follows from the definition Cowen-Douglas operators that $z$ is an eigenvalue for $R$. Consequently, $U_{\gamma}^z$ intertwines $M_z$ on $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}$ and $R^*$ on $\mathcal{H}$. Indeed for all $f \in \mathcal{H}$,
(U_\gamma R^* f)(\lambda) = \overline{(R^* f)(\lambda)} = \langle R^* f, \gamma(x) \rangle
(11)

Thus, we have \( U_\gamma R^* = M_z U_\gamma \), so \( R^* \) is unitarily equivalent to \( M_z \) on \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma \).

In our current study of natural analytic left invertible operators, Theorem A says that \( T^* \in B_n(\Omega_T) \). Therefore, Equation (11) tells us that \( T \) is unitarily equivalent to \( M_z \) on \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma \). Furthermore, \( \Omega_T = \Omega_T^* \) as sets, so for ease of notation, we consider the functions in \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma \) on \( \Omega_T \). We record this as a corollary.

**Corollary 3.17.** Let \( T \) be an analytic, left invertible operator with \( \text{ind}(T) = -n \) for some positive integer \( n \). Then \( T \) is unitarily equivalent to multiplication by \( z \) on a reproducing kernel Hilbert space of analytic functions on \( \Omega_T^* = \Omega_T \).

A natural question one might ask is, “What are the analytic functions in \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma \)”? The answer will depend on the choice of analytic section \( \gamma \) described above. We will describe a salient representation \( U_\gamma \) that blends together the Cowen-Douglas theory with the basis theory developed in Section Two.

Let \( \{x_{i,0}\}_{i=1}^n \) be an orthonormal basis for \( \ker(T^*) \), and \( \{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^n \) be defined as in Definition 3.9. By Corollary 3.12 and Theorem 3.15, there exist holomorphic functions \( \{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^n \) from \( \Omega \to \mathbb{C} \) such that
\[
\gamma(\lambda) := \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(\lambda) \gamma_i(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(\lambda) \sum_{j \geq 0} \lambda^j x'_{i,j}
\]
is a holomorphic spanning cross-section for \( \mathcal{H} \). By the comments following Theorem 3.15, \( \phi_1 \) may be chosen to be the identity function. For each \( f \in \mathcal{H} \) and \( \lambda \in \Omega_T \), we have by Equation (10)
\[
\hat{f}(\lambda) = \langle f, \gamma(x) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(\lambda) \sum_{j \geq 0} \lambda^j \langle f, x'_{i,j} \rangle
\]

where here we have repressed the subscript \( \gamma \) on \( \hat{f} \). The reproducing kernel Hilbert space associated with this choice of analytic section will be simply denoted \( \mathcal{\tilde{H}} \). We store this information in a definition:

**Definition 3.18.** Given a natural analytic left invertible \( T \), let \( \Omega_T \) be as in Definition 3.5. Let \( \{x_{i,0}\}_{i=1}^n \) be an orthonormal basis for \( \ker(T^*) \). Pick \( \{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^n \) holomorphic functions such that the map
\[
\gamma(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(\lambda) \sum_{j \geq 0} \lambda^j x'_{i,j}
\]
each \( \lambda \in \Omega_T \) is a spanning holomorphic cross-section with \( \phi_1 = 1 \). For each each \( f \in \mathcal{H} \), set
\[
\hat{f}(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(\lambda) \sum_{j \geq 0} \lambda^j \langle f, x'_{i,j} \rangle.
\]

Let \( \mathcal{\tilde{H}} \) denote the reproducing kernel Hilbert space of functions \( \hat{f} \) arising from Equation (12) with inner product \( \langle \hat{f}, \hat{g} \rangle = \langle f, g \rangle \). The representation of \( T \) as \( M_z \) on \( \mathcal{\tilde{H}} \) is called the **canonical representation of \( T \) relative to \( \{x_{i,0}\}_{i=1}^n \) and \( \{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^n \)**.

The terminology canonical is fitting for the above representation. In the canonical representation, the basis elements associated to \( T \) become the functions \( \phi_k z^l \). That is, if \( k = 1, \ldots, n \), then \( \phi_k z^l(\lambda) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \lambda^j \langle f, x'_{i,j} \rangle \).
\( \phi_k(\lambda) \lambda^l \) for each \( \lambda \in \Omega \). This follows directly by Corollary 2.32 and Equation (12):

\begin{equation}
\hat{x}_{k,l}(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi_i(\lambda) \sum_{j=0}^{l} \lambda_j \langle x_{k,l}, x_{i,j}' \rangle = \phi_k(\lambda) \lambda^l
\end{equation}

In particular, since \( \phi_1 = 1 \), we have that \( \hat{H} \) contains the functions of the form \( z^l \). Furthermore, \( \hat{x}_{k,0} = \phi_k \in \mathcal{H} \) for each \( k = 1, \ldots, n \). Since \( \{x_{k,0}\}_{k=1}^{n} \) form an orthonormal basis for \( \ker(T^*) \), the functions \( \{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^{n} \) are also orthogonal.

Recall that in general, the reproducing kernel at \( \lambda \) is given by \( K(\lambda) \). Hence, for the canonical representation, the reproducing kernel \( K_{\gamma} : \Omega \to \mathbb{C} \) for \( \hat{H} \) takes on the following form:

\[ K(\lambda, \mu) = \langle \gamma(\lambda), \gamma(\lambda) \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \phi_i(\lambda) \phi_k(\mu) \sum_{l=0}^{l} \sum_{j=0}^{l} \lambda_j \langle x_{k,l}, x_{i,j}' \rangle \]

where by Proposition 2.33 convergence does not depend on the order of the four sums. The kernel is analytic in \( \lambda \), and co-analytic in \( \mu \) by construction.

Under the canonical representation, \( T^\dagger \) becomes “division by \( z^l \). To make this precise, we require a simple lemma:

**Lemma 3.19.** Let \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) be left invertible operators with Moore-Penrose inverses \( T_1^\dagger \) and \( T_2^\dagger \). If \( T_2 = UT_1U^* \) for some unitary \( U \), then \( T_2^\dagger = UT_1^\dagger U^* = (UT_1U^*)^\dagger \).

**Proof.** Recall that \( T_2^\dagger = (T_2^*T_2)^{-1}T_2^* \). Hence,

\[ T_2^\dagger = (UT_1^\dagger T_1U^*)^{-1}UT_1^\dagger U^* = U(T_1^\dagger T_1)^{-1}U^*UT_1^\dagger U^* = UT_1^\dagger U^*. \]

\[ \square \]

**Corollary 3.20.** If \( T \) is analytic with index \( -n \), and \( U_\gamma : \mathcal{H} \to \hat{H}_\gamma \) is the unitary such that \( M_z = U_\gamma TU_\gamma^* \), then \( M_z^\dagger = (U_\gamma TU_\gamma^*)^\dagger \).

Now, the functions inside \( \ker(M_z^\dagger) \) are the span of the orthogonal functions \( \{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^{n} \). Furthermore, \( \text{ran}(M_z) = \ker(M_z^\dagger)^\perp \) consists of functions of the form \( z\tilde{g} \). From the preceding corollary, \( M_z^\dagger M_z = I \), so it follows that either \( M_z^\dagger \tilde{f} = 0 \) (if \( \tilde{f} \) is linear combination of the \( \phi_i \)) or \( M_z^\dagger \tilde{f} = z^{-n}\tilde{f} \) otherwise.

Expanding on this computation, suppose that \( \tilde{f} \in \mathcal{H} \) is of the form \( \phi_i z^j \). Consider the action of \( M_z^\dagger \) on \( \tilde{f} \). By construction, \( M_z^\dagger \phi_i z^j(\lambda) = 0 \) if \( \lambda \leq n \) and \( \phi_i z^j \) otherwise.

For emphasis, the operator \( M_z^{-1} \) of division by \( z \) is not well defined on \( \mathcal{H} \) since \( 0 \not\in \Omega \) and \( \mathcal{H} \) contains the constant functions. Yet \( M_z^{-1} \) is well defined as a map from \( \text{ran}(M_z) = \ker(M_z^\dagger)^\perp \) to \( \hat{H} \). By the above computation, \( M_z^\dagger \) is \( M_z^{-1} \) on \( \ker(M_z^\dagger)^\perp \). Hence, \( T^\dagger \) is \( M_z^{-1} \) wherever the operator \( M_z^{-1} \) is well defined, and 0 otherwise. This can be succinctly written as

\[ M_z^\dagger = M_z^{-1} \]

where \( Q_1 \) is the projection onto \( \ker(M_z^\dagger)^\perp \). More generally for each \( n \), we have that

\[ M_z^{\dagger n} = M_z^{-n} Q_n \]

where \( Q_n \) is the projection onto \( \ker(M_z^{\dagger n})^\perp \).

This model gives intuition into the structure of \( \mathfrak{A}_T \). By Proposition 2.18 \( \text{Alg}(M_z, M_z^\dagger) \) consists of operators of the form

\[ F + \sum_{k=0}^{N} a_k M_z^k + \sum_{l=1}^{M} b_l M_z^l = F + \sum_{k=0}^{N} a_k M_z^k + \sum_{l=1}^{M} b_l M_{z-1} Q_l \]
where $F$ is a finite rank operator. One could combine via linearity the “analytic” component of the above sum to get

$$F + M \sum_{k=0}^{N} a_k z^k + \sum_{l=1}^{M} b_l M_{z^{-l}} Q_l.$$ 

In some sense, the “principal part” $\sum_{l=1}^{M} b_l M_{z^{-l}} Q_l$ may also be combined into a single multiplication operator. Unfortunately, this is not done as effortlessly. We do have that $Q_l \leq Q_k$ for all $k \leq l$. Therefore, for all $\hat{f} \in \ker(T^+M)^{\perp}$, the sum of the principal pieces combine into a single multiplication operator. That is,

$$\left( \sum_{l=1}^{M} b_l M_{z^{-l}} Q_l \right) (\hat{f})(\lambda) = \sum_{l=1}^{M} b_l \hat{f}(\lambda) \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^l} = \left( M \sum_{l=1}^{M} b_l z^{-l} \hat{f} \right)(\lambda).$$

However, this fails on $\ker(T^+M)$, as some operators in the principal part have kernels contained in $\ker(T^+M)$. For example, if $\hat{f}$ is perpendicular to $\ker(T^+L)$ but not perpendicular to $\ker(T^+L+1)$, then

$$\left( \sum_{l=1}^{M} b_l M_{z^{-l}} Q_l \right) (\hat{f})(\lambda) = \sum_{l=1}^{L} b_l \hat{f}(\lambda) \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^l} = \left( M \sum_{l=1}^{L} b_l z^{-l} \hat{f} \right)(\lambda).$$

This discussion demonstrates that we have a canonical analytic model to represent $\mathfrak{A}_T$. It is the norm limit of finite rank operators plus multiplication operators that have “Laurent” polynomials as symbols.

**Heuristic 3.21.** If $T$ is a natural analytic left invertible operator, then the algebra $\mathfrak{A}_T$ is compact perturbations of multiplication operators whose symbols are Laurent series centered at zero.

In this section, we have shown that $T = M_z$ on a RKHS of analytic functions. To some extent, a converse statement is true as well. In [29], Richter shows if $T$ is $M_z$ on a reproducing kernel Hilbert space of analytic functions, then under suitable assumptions, $T$ is an analytic left invertible operator.

### 3.3. Reduction of Index - Strongly Irreducible Operators

Suppose that $T$ is an analytic (pure) isometry with Fredholm index $-n$ for $n \geq 2$. Then $T$ can be decomposed as a direct sum of pure isometries $T_i$ each with Fredholm index $-1$. This decomposition is clearly unique up to unitary equivalence. A similar, though much weaker, statement is true for general analytic left invertible operators. We require some terminology.

**Definition 3.22** ([16]). An operator $R \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is **strongly irreducible** if there is no non-trivial idempotent in $\{R\}^\prime$, the commutant of $R$. Equivalently, $R$ is strongly irreducible if $XRX^{-1}$ is an irreducible operator for every invertible operator $X$. We denote the set of all strongly irreducible operators over $\mathcal{H}$ by $(SI)$.

Strong irreducibility is a similarity invariant. Moreover, it follows by definition that $R \in (SI)$ if and only if $R^* \in (SI)$.

Strongly irreducible operators play an important role in single operator theory. They serve a role equivalent to the Jordan blocks in the infinite dimensional setting. To see why, we recall some facts about Jordan canonical forms.

**Definition 3.23.** For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, let

$$J_k(\lambda) := \begin{pmatrix}
\lambda & 0 \\
1 & \lambda \\
\vdots & \ddots \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & \lambda
\end{pmatrix}$$

denote the **Jordan block of size $k$ for $\lambda$**.
The next proposition lists some important facts about Jordan blocks for our current conversation. It will also be useful in characterizing the similarity orbit of Cowen-Douglas operators in Section 4.3.

**Proposition 3.24** ([19]). For \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and all \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \), the following hold:

i. The commutant of the Jordan block \( J_k(\lambda) \) is

\[
\{J_k(\lambda)\}' = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & & & 0 \\ a_2 & \ddots & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ a_k & & a_2 & a_1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.
\]

ii. \( J_k(\lambda) \) is strongly irreducible.

iii. If \( A \in M_k \) is strongly irreducible, then \( A \) is similar to \( J_k(\mu) \) for some \( \mu \in \mathbb{C} \).

If \( A \in M_n \), the Jordan canonical forms theorem states that \( A \) is similar to a direct sum of Jordan blocks. This decomposition is unique, up to the ordering of the blocks. If \( \sigma(A) = \{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^n \), then we write

\[
A \sim \bigoplus_{i=1}^l J_k(\lambda_i)^{(m_i)}
\]

where the superscript \( (m_i) \) denotes the orthogonal direct sum of \( m_i \) copies of the Jordan block \( J_k(\lambda_i) \). In other words, the Jordan decomposition theorem states that, up to similarity, each matrix has a unique decomposition as a direct sum of strongly irreducible operators.

Our current goal is to understand how this statement translates into the infinite dimensional setting. To help make this more precise, we have the following definition:

**Definition 3.25** ([16]). A sequence \( \{E_j\}_{j=1}^l \), \( 1 \leq l \leq \infty \) of non-zero idempotents on \( \mathcal{H} \) is called a spectral family if

i. there exists an invertible operator \( X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) such that \( \{XE_jX^{-1}\} \) are pairwise orthogonal projections

ii. \( \sum_{j=1}^l E_j = I \).

Furthermore, if \( R \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \), then the spectral family is a strongly irreducible decomposition of \( R \) if

iii. \( E_jR = RE_j \) for all \( j \)

iv. \( R \mid \text{ran}(E_j) \in (SI) \).

In other words, \( R \) has a strongly irreducible decomposition if \( R \) is the topological direct sum of strongly irreducible operators. Equivalently, \( R \) is similar to the orthogonal direct sum of strongly irreducible operators. We denote this by \( R \sim \oplus_{j=1}^l R_j \).

In finite dimensions, Jordan canonical forms force each matrix to have a unique SI decomposition up to similarity. This is not the case for operators in \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \). Not every operator in \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) has a strongly irreducible decomposition. Moreover, even if an operator has a strongly irreducible decomposition, it may not be unique [19]. Therefore, we make the following definition:

**Definition 3.26.** Let \( R \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \), and \( \mathcal{E} = \{E_j\}_{j=1}^{l_1} \) and \( \mathcal{E}' = \{E'_j\}_{j=1}^{l_2} \) be two strongly irreducible decompositions of \( R \). We say \( \mathcal{E} \) and \( \mathcal{E}' \) are similar if

i. \( l_1 = l_2 = l \)

ii. there exists an invertible operator \( X \in \{R\}' \), the commutant of \( R \), such that \( XE_jX^{-1} = E'_j \) for all \( 1 \leq j \leq l \).

If \( R \) has a strongly irreducible decomposition, we say that \( R \) has a unique strongly irreducible decomposition up to similarity if any two of the decompositions are similar.
There is an extensive amount of work relating strongly irreducible decompositions of operators to K-theory [1, 10, 13, 19]. We will mention some of these results in a later section. Of particular interest to us in the present are the following deep results due to Y. Cao, J. Fang and C. Jiang:

**Theorem 3.27** ([19] - Theorem 5.5.12). Each operator in $S \in B_1(\Omega)$ is strongly irreducible. Moreover for any $n$, if $R \in B_n(\Omega)$, then $R$ has a unique SI decomposition up to similarity. Furthermore, $R \sim \oplus_{j=1}^m R_j$ where $R_j \in (SI) \cap B_{n_j}(\Omega)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^m n_j = n$.

**Corollary 3.28.** Let $T$ be an analytic left invertible operator with $\text{ind}(T) = -n$ for some $1 \leq n < \infty$. Then $T \sim \oplus_{j=1}^m T_j$ where $T_j$ are analytic, $\sum_{j=1}^m \text{ind}(T_j) = -n$ and $T_j \in (SI)$.

Theorem 3.27 states that operators in the Cowen-Douglas class have a decomposition analogous to the Jordan canonical forms for matrices. Without loss of generality, we may assume that if $R \in B_n(\Omega)$, then $R = \oplus_{j=1}^m R_j$ where $R_j \in (SI) \cap B_{n_j}(\Omega)$ where $\sum_{j=1}^m n_j = n$. This decomposition suggests that in order to understand $\Delta_T$, we should first study the natural analytic left invertible operators that are strongly irreducible. In particular, we should study the analytic left invertible operators with Fredholm index $-1$.

In the isometric case, $T^* \in B_n(\Omega)$ decomposes to a direct sum of $n$ strongly irreducible operators in $B_1(\Omega)$. Equivalently, pure isometric operators with $\text{ind}(T) = -n$ decompose into $n$ “Jordan blocks” of size 1. This turns out to not be the case in general. Notice that if $R \in B_n(\Omega) \cap (SI)$, then it cannot be further decomposed as a direct sum. Indeed, suppose to the contrary that $R \in B_n(\Omega) \cap (SI)$ and $R \sim \oplus_{k=1}^n R_k$ with $R_k \in B_1(\Omega)$. By Theorem 3.27, each operator in $B_1(\Omega)$ is strongly irreducible. Hence, $R$ would have two strongly irreducible decompositions that are dissimilar. But Theorem 3.27 states that all Cowen-Douglas operators have a unique SI decomposition up to similarity, contradicting the assumption that $R \in B_n(\Omega) \cap (SI)$ and $R \sim \oplus_{k=1}^n R_k$.

Thus, if there exists left invertible operators with $T^* \in B_n(\Omega) \cap (SI)$ for $n \geq 2$, it would not be possible to decompose $T$ as a direct sum of left invertibles with Fredholm index $-1$. This is the case, as the following example outlines:

**Example 3.29.** In this example, we will construct Toeplitz operators on a subspace of a Sobolev space. These operators will be strongly irreducible, and after combining them into an operator that looks like a Jordan block, we can form strongly irreducible operators of any index. Throughout, we fix $\epsilon > 0$, and let $\Omega = \{ \lambda : |\lambda| < \epsilon \}$. We begin with a definition.

**Definition 3.30.** If $dm$ denotes the planar Lebesgue measure, then the Hilbert space $W^{2,2}(\Omega)$ consists of the $f \in L^2(\Omega, dm)$ such that the first and second order distributional partial derivatives of $f$ belong to $L^2(\Omega, dm)$.

Let $M_\omega$ be multiplication by the independent variable on $\Omega$. Then $M_\omega \in W^{2,2}(\Omega)$. Let $A$ denote the algebra generated by rational functions of $M_\omega$ with poles off $\overline{\Omega}$. Consider the action of this algebra on the identity function $1$ over $\Omega$. We let $R(\Omega)$ be the subspace of $W^{2,2}(\Omega)$ given by $R(\Omega) := A1$.

Note that $R(\Omega)$ is the subspace generated by rational functions with poles off of $\overline{\Omega}$. Moreover, $R(\Omega)$ is invariant under $M_f$ for $f \in R(\Omega)$. For $f \in R(\Omega)$, define $T_f \in A(R(\Omega))$ via $T_f := M_f |_{R(\Omega)}$. Then we have the following:

**Lemma 3.31** ([16] - Corollary 3.3). $T_z$ is a left invertible operator with $\text{ind}(T_z) = -1$. In particular, $T_z^* \in B_1(\Omega)$.
Now for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $J_n(T_z) \in \mathcal{B}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{H})$ via

$$J_n(T_z) := \begin{pmatrix} T_z & 0 \\ 1 & T_z \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 1 & T_z \end{pmatrix}.$$ 

**Proposition 3.32** ([16] - Theorem 3.5). For $J_n(T_z)$ defined above, we have

$$\{J_n(T_z)\}' = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} f_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ f_2 & f_1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ f_n & f_{n-1} & \cdots & f_1 \end{pmatrix} : f_1, \ldots, f_n \in R(\Omega) \right\}.$$ 

From Proposition 3.32, it follows that $J_n(T_z)$ is strongly irreducible. Indeed, if $P \in \{J_n(T_z)\}'$ is an idempotent, then since $P^2 = P$, it follows that $f_2 = f_1$ on $\Omega$. Hence, $f_1 = 1$ or $f_1 = 0$. In either case, if $P^2 = P$, then the terms on the off diagonal must all be zero. This concludes our example.

The previous example illustrates a general result about Cowen-Douglas operators. Namely, Cowen-Douglas operators of rank $n$ take the form of triangular operators of size $n$:

**Theorem 3.33** ([16] - Theorem 1.49). Let $R \in B_n(\Omega)$ for $1 \leq n < \infty$. Then there exists $n$ operators $R_1, \ldots, R_n$ such that $R = \begin{pmatrix} R_1 & * & * & * \\ R_2 & * & * \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_n \end{pmatrix}$ and

with respect to some decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{H}_i$.

**Corollary 3.34.** If $T$ is an analytic left invertible with $\text{ind}(T) = -n$ for $1 \leq n < \infty$, then there exists $n$ analytic left invertibles $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ such that $\text{ind}(T_i) = -1$ and

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & * & T_2 & * & \cdots & T_n \\ * & T_2 & * & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ * & * & \cdots & T_n \end{pmatrix}$$

with respect to some decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{H}_i$.

Corollary 3.34 further emphasizes the need to analyze analytic left invertible operators with $\text{ind}(T) = -1$. We showed above that we can always decompose $T$ into a direct sum of strongly irreducible pieces. The strongly irreducible blocks have the form of lower triangular operators. If $T$ is decomposed as in Corollary 3.34 then $T_n = T \mid \mathcal{H}_n$ and $T_n$ is an analytic left invertible operator with $\text{ind}(T_n) = -1$. If we are to gain any insight into a general $\mathcal{A}_T$, it is mandatory to understand the index $-1$ case first. This analysis will be taken up next section.

### 4. The Algebra $\mathcal{A}_T$

The preceding sections showed that, in general, we cannot reduce to the assumptions analytic or $\text{ind}(T) = -1$ as we could in the isometric case. Example 2.34 demonstrated that $T$ cannot be decomposed as a direct sum of an analytic operator and an invertible operator. Furthermore, Example 3.29 shows that even if an operator is analytic, it cannot be reduced to the index $-1$ case. Nevertheless, there is a summand on which $T$ will be analytic. Similar statements may be made about strong irreducibility and the Fredholm index. Under the assumption of analytic, Theorem [A]
implies that $T^*$ is Cowen-Douglas. Corollary 3.34 tells us that, in this case, $T$ may be written as a triangular operator where each element on the diagonal is an analytic left invertible of index $-1$.

Although we cannot reduce to the case of analytic or index $-1$, the epistemological viewpoint of the author is that an important first step in understanding $\mathfrak{A}_T$ is simplifying to this case. We therefore make the following minimality assumptions on $T$ for the remainder of this section:

**Assumption.** Henceforth, our left invertible operators will satisfy

1. The Fredholm index: $\text{ind}(T) = -1$
2. Analytic: $T \cap T^n ^* \mathcal{H} = 0$

If $T$ is an analytic isometry with $\text{ind}(T) = -1$, we can represent $T$ as $M_z$ on $H^2(\mathbb{T})$. This yields an elegant representation for $C^*(T)$. The analyticity ensures that the basis associated to $M_z$, the orthonormal basis $z_n$, spans the Hilbert space. The Fredholm index guarantees that $T$ will be an irreducible C*-algebra, which contains a compact $I - TT^*$, and therefore all the compacts. Furthermore, one discovers that each element of $T$ may be uniquely written as $Tf + K$ for some $f \in C(\mathbb{T})$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$.

The general case is similar. That is, if $T$ is an analytic, left invertible operator with Fredholm index $-1$, then $\mathfrak{A}_T$ contains the compact operators. This will allow us to determine the isomorphism classes of $\mathfrak{A}_T$.

It is worth remarking that since $\mathfrak{A}_T$ is a concrete operator algebra, it belongs to many reasonable categories. A priori, it is not clear which choice of morphism one should consider (bounded, completely bounded, etc.). Fortunately, all reasonable choices are equivalent. It will be shown that two such algebras are boundedly isomorphic if and only if the isomorphism is implemented by an invertible. This will bring us to analyze the similarity orbit of $T$. For Cowen-Douglas operators, the similarity orbit has been extensively studied. We will leverage these results into our analysis of the study of $\mathfrak{A}_T$.

### 4.1. The Compact Operators

In this section, we show that if $T$ is analytic left invertible with $\text{ind}(T) = -1$, then $\mathfrak{A}_T$ contains the compact operators. Our approach is to show that, more generally $\overline{\text{Alg}}(T,L)$ contains the compact operators for any left inverse $T$ and left inverse $L$. This will allow us to conclude that $\overline{\text{Alg}}(T,L) = \mathfrak{A}_T$ for any left inverse $L$. First, let us establish some notation.

Fix a left inverse $L$ of $T$. We set $F_{0,0} = I - TT^\dagger$. That is, $F_{0,0}$ is the projection onto $\ker(T^\dagger)$. We define

$$F_{n,m,L} := T^n(I - TT^\dagger)L^m$$

for each $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. For $x, y, z \in \mathcal{H}$ we use $\theta_{z,y}$ to denote the rank one operator $z \mapsto \langle z, y \rangle x$.

Recall the Schauder basis and dual basis associated to $T$ and $L$. Notice that since $\text{ind}(T) = -1$, we have a simplified notation. Let $x_0 \in \ker(T^*)$ be a unit vector, so $\text{span}\{x_0\} = \ker(T^*)$. Denote the Schauder basis of $T$ and dual basis $T$ (with respect to $L$) via $x_n := T^n x_0$ and $x'_n := (L^*)^n x_0$. Then by definition, $I - TT^\dagger$ is the projection $\theta_{x_0,x_0}$. So for each $n, m$ and $x \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$F_{n,m,L}(x) = T^n(I - TT^\dagger)L^m(x) = T^n(\langle L^m(x), x_0 \rangle x_0) = \langle x, x'_m \rangle x_n.$$ 

That is, $F_{n,m,L}$ is the rank one operator $\theta_{x_n, x'_m}$. Let

$$\mathcal{K}_L := \text{span}\{F_{n,m,L}\}_{n,m \geq 1}.$$ 

Recall from Proposition 2.20 that if $L = T^\dagger$, then $\mathcal{K}_L = \mathcal{K}_T = \mathcal{C}$, the commutator ideal. As $F_{n,m,L} \in \overline{\text{Alg}}(T,L)$, $\mathcal{K}_L \subset \overline{\text{Alg}}(T,L)$. Furthermore, the $F_{n,m,L}$ are rank one operators for each $n, m$; and so $\mathcal{K}_L \subset \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. Our previous work on Schauder bases allows us to conclude that $\mathcal{K}_L = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. 

Theorem 4.1. Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be an analytic, left invertible with $\text{ind}(T) = -1$, and $L$ be a left inverse of $T$. Then $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{K}_L$. Thus, $\overline{\text{Alg}}(T, L)$ contains the algebra of compact operators $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$.

Proof. Let $y, z \in \mathcal{H}$. Since $\overline{\text{span}}\{x_n\} = \mathcal{H} = \overline{\text{span}}\{x'_n\}$, there exists a sequence of sums in $x_n$ and $x'_n$ converging to $y$ and $z$ respectively. It follows that the rank one operator $\theta_{y,z}$ is a norm limit of the span of the $\{F_{n,m,L}\}$ by simple estimates. Thus, $\mathcal{K}_L$ contains all the rank one operators. Since $\mathcal{K}_L$ is norm-closed by definition, $\mathcal{K}_L \supset \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. Since $\mathcal{K}_L \subset \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$, we have $\mathcal{K}_L = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. □

Corollary 4.2. Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be left invertible (analytic with $\text{ind}(T) = -1$), and $L$ be a left inverse of $T$. Then $\mathfrak{A}_T = \overline{\text{Alg}}(T, L)$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.7 each left inverse $L$ of $T$ has the form

$$L = T^\dagger + A(J - TT^\dagger)$$

for some $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Thus, each left inverse of $T$ differs from $T^\dagger$ by a compact operator. By Theorem 4.1, $\overline{\text{Alg}}(T, L)$ contains $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$, and therefore $T^\dagger$. So $\overline{\text{Alg}}(T, L) \subset \mathfrak{A}_T$. Reversing the argument, $\overline{\text{Alg}}(T, L) = \mathfrak{A}_T$. □

Recall that an ideal $\mathcal{K}$ of a Banach Algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ is said to be essential if it has non-trivial intersection with all non-zero ideals of $\mathfrak{A}$. Alternatively, if $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ and $A\mathcal{K} = 0$, then $A = 0$. In the next section, we investigate the morphisms between algebras of the form $\mathfrak{A}_T$. An important result required in subsequent analysis is the following:

Proposition 4.3. The compact operators $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ are an essential ideal of $\mathfrak{A}_T$. In fact, $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ is contained in any closed ideal of $\mathfrak{A}_T$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{J}$ be a non-zero closed two sided ideal of $\mathfrak{A}_T$, and $A \in \mathfrak{J}$ be non-zero. Then there is some $x \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\|Ax\| = 1$. Fix $y \in \mathcal{H}$, and let $B := \theta_{y,A(x)}$. Then $B(A(x)) = y$. Thus for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$BA\theta_{x,x}A^*B^*(h) = BA(\langle h, BA(x) \rangle x) = \langle h, y \rangle y = \theta_{y,y}(h).$$

Since $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathfrak{A}_T$, it follows that the rank one operators $B$ and $\theta_{x,x}A^*B^*$ are in $\mathfrak{A}_T$. Since $A \in \mathfrak{J}$ and $\mathfrak{J}$ is an ideal, we must have that $\theta_{y,y}$ is inside of $\mathfrak{J}$. Thus for any $w, z \in \mathcal{H}$, $\theta_{w,z} = \theta_{y,y}\theta_{y,y}\theta_{y,z}$ is in $\mathfrak{J}$, so $\mathfrak{J}$ contains all the finite rank operators, and thus contains $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. □

4.2. Isomorphisms of $\mathfrak{A}_T$. Now that we have established that the compact operators $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathfrak{A}_T$ as a minimal ideal, we may identify the isomorphism classes of $\mathfrak{A}_T$. We will show that if $T_1$ and $T_2$ are two analytic left invertible operators with Fredholm index $-1$, then $\mathfrak{A}_{T_1}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{A}_{T_2}$ if and only if the algebras are similar. This will be done by looking at how the bounded isomorphism behaves on the compact operators.

An interesting fact about bounded homomorphisms of C*-algebras is that they necessarily have closed range. Indeed, we have the following observation due to Pitts:

Theorem 4.4 (26 - Theorem 2.6). Suppose $\mathfrak{A}$ is a C*-algebra and $\phi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a bounded homomorphism. Let $\mathfrak{J} = \ker \phi$. Then there exists a real number $k > 0$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $R \in M_n(\mathfrak{A})$,

$$k \text{dist}(R, M_n(\mathfrak{J})) \leq \|\phi_n(R)\|.$$ 

Corollary 4.5. If $\phi : \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a bounded monomorphism, then there exists a real number $k$ such that

$$k\|R\| \leq \|\phi(R)\|.$$ 

That is, $\phi$ has closed range.
Given an invertible operator $V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we define $\text{Ad}_V : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ via $\text{Ad}_V(T) = VTV^{-1}$. As previously mentioned, to fully analyze $\mathfrak{A}_T$, we need to determine which category we are working in. On the one hand, we can view $\mathfrak{A}_T$ as an operator algebra, with our morphisms being completely bounded homomorphisms. On the other hand, we may want to simply view $\mathfrak{A}_T$ as a Banach algebra, where the morphisms are bounded homomorphisms. Fortunately, Theorem 4.1 forces the monomorphisms of these two categories to coincide:

**Theorem B.** Let $T_i, i = 1, 2$ be left invertibles (analytic with $\text{ind}(T_i) = -1$) and $\mathfrak{A}_1 = \mathfrak{A}_{T_2}$. Suppose that $\phi : \mathfrak{A}_1 \to \mathfrak{A}_2$ is a bounded isomorphism. Then $\phi = \text{Ad}_V$ for some invertible $V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

**Proof.** Let $\phi : \mathfrak{A}_1 \to \mathfrak{A}_2$ be a bounded isomorphism. A brief outline of the proof is as follows.

We first show that $\phi \mid_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})}$ is similar to a $*$-automorphism of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. It is well known that all $*$-automorphisms of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ have the form $\text{Ad}_U$ for some unitary operator $U$. We then use the fact that $\phi$ restricted to an essential ideal has the form $\text{Ad}_V$ to conclude that it must be equal to $\text{Ad}_V$ on all of $\mathfrak{A}_1$. The details are as follows.

Note that $\phi \mid_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})} : \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathfrak{A}_2 \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a bounded representation of the compact operators. It can be shown that every bounded representation of the compact operators is similar to a $*$-representation (more generally, every bounded representation of a nuclear C*-algebra is similar to a $*$-representation [4]). Let $W \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be the invertible that conjugates $\phi \mid_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})}$ to a $*$-representation $\psi$. That is, $\phi(u) = W\psi(u)W^{-1}$ for every $u \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$.

Now let us consider the $*$-representation $\psi$. Note that $\psi : \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) \to W^{-1}\mathfrak{A}_2W$. The map $\text{Ad}_{W^{-1}} : \mathfrak{A}_2 \to W^{-1}\mathfrak{A}_2W$ carries $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ to $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. Since every ideal of $W^{-1}\mathfrak{A}_2W$ has the form $W^{-1}\mathfrak{A}_2W$ for $\mathfrak{A}_2$ an ideal of $\mathfrak{A}_2$, it follows that $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ is minimal in $W^{-1}\mathfrak{A}_2W$. Therefore, we must have that $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \psi(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}))$.

Now, $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ is equal to the closed span of the rank one projections on $\mathcal{H}$. As a result, if we can show that each rank one projection $p$ gets sent to another rank one projection under $\psi$, then $\psi(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})) \subset \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$, yielding equality.

To this end, let $p$ be a rank one projection, and $p' = \psi(p)$. If $p'$ is not rank one, then there exists a non-zero projection $q'$ properly contained under $p'$. Since $\psi(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}))$ contains $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$, there exists a projection $q \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\psi(q) = q'$. Regarding $\psi$ mapping from $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ to $\psi(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}))$, $\psi$ is a $*$-isomorphism and hence invertible. $\psi^{-1}$ is of course also a $*$-isomorphism, and therefore a positive map. Hence, if $q' < p'$, then $q < p$ by positivity of $\psi^{-1}$. This is absurd, since $p$ was rank one. Thus, $\psi(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})) \subset \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$, so that $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) = \psi(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}))$.

What we have just shown is that $\phi \mid_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})}$ is similar to a $*$-automorphism $\psi$ of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. Every $*$-automorphism of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ is of the form $\text{Ad}_U$ for some unitary operator $U$. Hence, we have that

$$\phi \mid_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})} = \text{Ad}_U \psi = \text{Ad}_W \text{Ad}_U = \text{Ad}_V$$

where $V = UW$. We now show that $\phi = \text{Ad}_V$. To do this, first note that for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}_1$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\phi(A)\phi(K) = \phi(AK) = \psi(AK) = \text{Ad}_V(AK) = \text{Ad}_V(A)\text{Ad}_V(K) = \text{Ad}_V(A)\phi(K)$$

So it follows that

$$(\phi(A) - \text{Ad}_V(A))\text{Ad}_V(K) = 0$$

for each $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$. Cycling over all $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$, we see that

$$(\phi(A) - \text{Ad}_V(A))\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) = 0.$$ 

Since $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ is essential in $\mathfrak{A}_2$, we have that $\phi(A) = \text{Ad}_V(A)$. \qed

Theorem 4.1 is a harsh rigidity statement about classification. Indeed, $\mathfrak{A}_1$ is boundedly isomorphic to $\mathfrak{A}_2$ if and only if the algebras are similar. Consequently, if we wish to delineate these operator
algebras into isomorphism classes, we need to understand the similarity orbit of left invertible operators. We define the following notation for the similarity orbit:
\[ S(T) := \{ VTV^{-1} : V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \text{ is invertible} \}. \]

In classifying the algebra \( \mathfrak{A}_T \), we do not need to keep track of the similarity orbit of the Moore-Penrose inverse. Indeed, suppose \( T \) is left invertible with Moore-Penrose inverse \( T^\dagger \), \( V \) is an invertible operator, and \( T_2 := VTV^{-1} \). Then \( L_2 := VT_1V^{-1} \) is a left inverse of \( T_2 \). By Corollary 4.2, \( \overline{\mathrm{alg}}(T_2, L_2) = \mathfrak{A}_{T_2} \). Therefore to identify the isomorphism class of \( \mathfrak{A}_T \), we may disregard \( S(T^\dagger) \).

Hence, we pose the following question:

**Question.** If \( T \) is left invertible (analytic, \( \text{ind}(T) = -1 \)), what is \( S(T) \)?

In general, it is impossible to completely classify the similarity orbit of an operator. However, analytic left invertible operators have added structure that aid in this analysis. By Theorem 4.7, similarity orbit of Cowen-Douglas operators can be completely described by K-theoretic means. We will highlight these results in the next section.

While the question of addressing the similarity orbit is paramount to a complete classification of our algebras \( \mathfrak{A}_T \), it is not sufficient. Explicitly, suppose \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) are left invertible operators (analytic, \( \text{ind}(T) = -1 \)) with \( \mathfrak{A}_1 \) and \( \mathfrak{A}_2 \) isomorphic. Let \( V \) be the invertible that implements the isomorphism between \( \mathfrak{A}_1 \) and \( \mathfrak{A}_2 \), and let \( T_3 := VT_1V^{-1} \) and \( L_3 := VT_1V^{-1} \). Notice \( L_3 \) is a left inverse of \( T_3 \) and that \( \overline{\mathrm{alg}}(T_3, L_3) = \mathfrak{A}_2 \). By Corollary 4.2, \( \mathfrak{A}_3 = \mathfrak{A}_2 \).

One would therefore be tempted to reduce to the case where \( T_2 = T_3 = \text{Ad}_V(T_1) \). However, it turns out that not every left invertible \( S \in \mathfrak{A}_T \) will satisfy \( \mathfrak{A}_S = \mathfrak{A}_T \). Consider the following example:

**Example 4.6.** We will construct a left invertible operator \( T \) inside the Toeplitz algebra \( \mathcal{T} \) such that \( \mathfrak{A}_T \neq \mathcal{T} \). Consider the Hardy space \( H^2(\mathbb{T}) \). Let \( \phi_0 \in C(\mathbb{T}) \) be given by
\[
\phi_0(z) := \exp\left( \frac{\pi i}{2}(z - 1)z \right)
\]
for all \( z \in \mathbb{T} \). Then \( \phi_0(1) = 1 \) and \( \phi_0(-1) = -1 \). Let
\[
\epsilon_n(z) = z^n.
\]
Define \( \phi := M_{\epsilon_n} \phi_0 \). Then \( \phi \) satisfies \( \phi(1) = \phi(-1) = 1 \). Recall the following facts about invertible functions on \( C(\mathbb{T}) \) and their associated Toeplitz operators:

**Theorem 4.7** ([23] Lem. 3.5.14, Thm. 3.5.15). Let \( \phi \in C(\mathbb{T}) \) be invertible. Then

i. There exists a unique integer \( n \) such that \( \phi = \epsilon_n e^{\psi} \) some \( \psi \in C(\mathbb{T}) \)

ii. If \( \phi = \epsilon_n e^{\psi} \), then the winding number is \( n \)

iii. We have \( \text{ind}(T_\phi) = \text{negative the winding number of } \phi \)

iv. \( T_\phi \) is invertible if and only if the winding number is zero if and only if \( \phi = e^{\psi} \) some \( \psi \in C(\mathbb{T}) \)

By Theorem 4.7, the winding number of \( \phi \) is 1, so \( \text{ind}(T_\phi) = -1 \). Since both \( \epsilon_1 \) and \( \phi_0 \) belong to \( H^\infty(\mathbb{T}) \) we have that \( T_{\epsilon_1} \) and \( T_{\phi_0} \) commute, so the Toeplitz operator \( T_\phi \) factors:
\[
T_\phi = T_{\epsilon_1}T_{\phi_0} = T_{\epsilon_1}T_{\phi_0}.
\]
Also by Theorem 4.7, \( T_{\phi_0} \) is invertible. The point-wise inverse of \( \phi_0 \) is also continuous on \( \mathbb{T} \). Therefore, the Toeplitz operator \( T_\phi \) is left invertible with left inverse
\[
L = T_{\phi_0}^{-1}T_{\epsilon_1} = T_{\phi_0}^{-1}T_{\epsilon_1} \in \mathcal{T}.
\]
Moreover, since $T_{\epsilon_1}$ and $T_{\epsilon_0}$ commute, we have $(T_{\epsilon_0})^n = T_{\epsilon_n} T_{\epsilon_0}^n$. Since $T_{\epsilon_0}$ is invertible, $T_{\epsilon_0}^n H^2(\mathbb{T}) = H^2(\mathbb{T})$. Consequently,

$$\bigcap T_{\epsilon_0}^n H^2(\mathbb{T}) = \bigcap T_{\epsilon_n} H^2(\mathbb{T}) = 0$$

so $T_{\epsilon}$ is analytic. Recall that $\mathcal{A}_T \subset C^*(T)$ for any left invertible $T$. We remark that $C^*(T_{\epsilon}) \neq \mathcal{T}$. This follows from the following result due to Coburn:

**Lemma 4.8** ([7] Cor. 6.3). If $\phi$ is in the disc algebra, then $C^*(T_{\epsilon}) = \mathcal{T}$ if and only if $\phi$ is injective.

It is shown in [7] that $C^*(T_{\epsilon})/\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{K})$ is isomorphic to continuous functions on $\mathbb{T}/\sim$, where $\sim$ is an equivalence relation identifying all points $z, w \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $\phi(z) = \phi(w)$. Since $\phi(1) = \phi(-1)$, it follows by the above lemma that $\mathcal{A}_T \subset C^*(T_{\epsilon}) \neq \mathcal{T}$. This concludes our example.

What the above example demonstrates is that not every left invertible operator in $\mathcal{A}_T$ generates $\mathcal{A}_T$. Therefore, determining the similarity orbit is not sufficient to delineate the isomorphism classes of $\mathcal{A}_T$. Concretely, suppose $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are generated by $T_1$ and $T_2$ respectively. To determine if $\mathcal{A}_1$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}_2$, it is not sufficient to verify that $\mathcal{A}_2$ possesses an operator $T_3$ similar to $T_1$. This would demonstrate that $\mathcal{A}_1$ is isomorphic to a subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}_2$. If one wanted $\mathcal{A}_1$ to be isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}_2$, it is necessary to show that $T_3$ also generates $\mathcal{A}_2$. With this caveat emphasized, we spend the next section investigating the similarity orbit of our class of left invertible operators.

### 4.3. The Similarity Orbit of $T$

If $T$ is an analytic left invertible operator with $\text{ind}(T) = -1$, then by Theorem [13] $T^* \in B_1(\Omega)$ for $\Omega = \{ \lambda : |\lambda| < \epsilon \}$. Therefore, classifying $\mathcal{S}(T)$ is equivalent to classifying the similarity orbit of Cowen-Douglas operators over a small disc centered at the origin. The problem of identifying when two Cowen-Douglas operators are similar is a classic one. In Cowen and Douglas' original work, they show that two operators $R_1, R_2 \in B_1(\Omega)$ are unitarily equivalent if and only if the curvature on the associated hermitian holomorphic vector bundles are equal [11]. Cowen and Douglas did not find a similarity classification however. They asked what is a complete similarity invariant of $B_1(\Omega)$, and more generally, $B_n(\Omega)$. Various authors have since worked on this problem, successfully describing the similarity orbit of Cowen-Douglas operators.

There are two approaches one could take to classification of the algebra $\mathcal{A}_T$ for $T$ analytic, left invertible with Fredholm index $-1$. One might try to parameterize the similarity orbit $\mathcal{S}(T)$ via some abstract object. Another approach is to try to find computable methods for determining when two left invertibles $T_1$ and $T_2$ are similar. In this section, we tackle both of these problems.

We begin by discussing some results of Jiang et. al. that allow us to classify $\mathcal{S}(T)$ via a $K_0$ group. This approach also provides a semi-computable method to determine when $T_1 \sim T_2$. We then seek a more concrete invariant that would allow one to quickly determine when two analytic left invertible operators with index $-1$ are not similar. We leverage the canonical reproducing kernel Hilbert space associated with $T$ to achieve this result.

In [17], Jiang describes the similarity orbit of strongly irreducible Cowen-Douglas operators using the $K_0$-group of the commutant algebra. Later, Jiang, Guo, and Ji gave a similarity classification of all Cowen-Douglas operators using the commutant [19]. Here we briefly outline these results, and how they connect to the discussion about strongly irreducible operators and Jordan forms from Section 3.3.

We begin by demonstrating how the classic Jordan canonical forms theorem can be phrased in terms of K-theory. Let $A \in M_n$. Then $A \sim \bigoplus_{i=1}^l J_{k_i}(\lambda_i)^{(m_i)}$ as in Section 3.3. We then have the following:

**Proposition 4.9** ([19] - Theorem 2.2.6, 2.2.7). Let $A \in M_n$, with $A \sim \bigoplus_{i=1}^l J_{k_i}(\lambda_i)^{(m_i)}$. Then

$$\begin{align*}
V(\{A\}') &\cong \mathbb{N}^l \\
K_0(\{A\}') &\cong \mathbb{Z}^l.
\end{align*}$$
The map that induces this isomorphism is given by

$$h([I]) = (m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_l)$$

where $[I]$ is the equivalence class corresponding to the identity matrix. Moreover, let $B, C \in M_n$ and $B = \bigoplus_{i=1}^l B_i^{(m_i)}$ where $B_i^{(m_i)}$ are strongly irreducible (i.e. $B_i^{(m_i)}$ are similar to Jordan block) and $B_i^{(m_i)}$ is not similar to $B_j^{(m_j)}$ for $i \neq j$. Then $B \sim C$ if and only if there exists an isomorphism

$$h : K_0(\{B \oplus C\}') \to \mathbb{Z}^l$$

with $h([I]) = (2m_1, 2m_2, \ldots, 2m_l)$.

In other words, the $K_0$ group of the commutant of $A$ contains all the information of the Jordan decomposition. Two matrices are similar if and only if they are both similar to the same Jordan decomposition $\bigoplus_{i=1}^l J_i(\lambda_i)^{(m_i)}$. This is equivalent to the direct sum of the matrices having Jordan decomposition $\bigoplus_{i=1}^l J_k(\lambda_i)^{(2m_i)}$, and this information is encoded in the $K_0$ group of the commutant.

This theory extends to the infinite dimensional setting. We have the following deep result due to Jiang et al.:

**Theorem 4.10** ([19] - Theorem 4.2.1, 4.3.1). Let $R \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then the following are equivalent:

i. $R \sim \bigoplus_{i=1}^l R_i^{(m_i)}$, $R_i \in (SI)$, $R_i$ is not similar to $R_j$ for $i \neq j$ and $R^{(m)}$ has a unique SI decomposition for all $n$.

ii. $K_0(\{R_i\}') \cong \mathbb{Z}^l$ via the isomorphism

$$h([I]) = (m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_l).$$

By Theorem 3.27, we know that Cowen-Douglas operators have a unique SI decomposition. By definition, if $R \in B_n(\Omega)$, then $R^{(m)} \in B_{n,m}(\Omega)$, and hence has a unique SI decomposition. Combining Theorems 3.27 and 4.10, Jiang, Guo and Ji gave the complete classification of Cowen-Douglas operators up to similarity:

**Theorem 4.11** ([17]). Let $A, B \in B_n(\Omega)$. Suppose that $A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^l A_i^{(m_i)}$ where $A_i \in (SI)$ and $A_i$ is not similar to $A_j$ for $i \neq j$. Then $A \sim B$ if and only if $(K_0(\{A \oplus B\}')', V(\{A \oplus B\}'), I) \cong (\mathbb{Z}^l, \mathbb{N}^l, 1)$ via the isomorphism

$$h([I]) = (2m_1, 2m_2, \ldots, 2m_l).$$

In particular, the result for Cowen-Douglas operators with Fredholm index 1 is as follows:

**Theorem 4.12** ([19] - Proposition 5.1.7). Let $A, B \in B_1(\Omega)$. Then $A$ is similar to $B$ if and only if

$$K_0(\{A \oplus B\}') \cong \mathbb{Z}.$$

This result and its generalizations solve the question of the similarity orbit, and therefore, the isomorphism problem for $\mathfrak{R}$ from the last section. As stated, Theorem 4.12 is a rather difficult theorem to apply. Luckily in [17], Jiang provided the following theorem which concretely identifies the requirements on the isomorphism between the $K_0$ groups generated by $A$ and $B$:

**Theorem 4.13** ([17] - Theorem 4.4). Two strongly irreducible Cowen-Douglas operators $A$ and $B$ are similar if and only if there is a group isomorphism $\alpha : K_0(\{A\}') \to K_0(\{B\}')$ satisfying the following:

i. $\alpha(V(\{A\}')) = V(\{B\}')$

ii. $\alpha([I_{\{A\}'}]) = [I_{\{B\}'}]$, where $[I_{\{A\}'}]$ is the equivalence class associated to the identity in the idempotents of $M_\infty(\{A\}')$

iii. there exists non-zero idempotents $p \in M_\infty(\{A\}')$ and $q \in M_\infty(\{B\}')$ such that $\alpha([p]) = [q]$ and $p$ is equivalent to $q$ in $M_\infty(\{A \oplus B\}')$. 

4.4. Example from Subnormal Operators. We now turn to an important class of non-trivial examples of \( \mathcal{H} \). These examples will involve the theory of subnormal operators. We recall the definitions of subnormal operators and minimal normal extensions:

**Definition 4.14.** An operator \( S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) is called subnormal if there exists a Hilbert space \( \mathcal{K} \supset \mathcal{H} \) and a normal operator \( N \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}) \) such that

i. \( N \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H} \)

ii. \( S = N \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{H}} \)

Such a normal operator \( N \) is called a normal extension of \( S \). The operator \( N \) is said to be a minimal normal extension if \( \mathcal{H} \) has no proper subspace reducing \( N \) and containing \( \mathcal{H} \).

It can be shown that any two minimal normal extensions of a subnormal operator \( S \) are unitarily equivalent \( \mathcal{S} \). Thus, we usually refer to the minimal normal extension, and denote it by \( N := mne(S) \).

Classic examples of a subnormal operators are the Toeplitz operators \( T_f \) on \( H^2(\mathbb{T}) \) for \( f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T}) \). The minimal normal extension is given by \( M_f \) on \( L^2(\mathbb{T}) \) (for \( f \) non-constant). It is not hard to see that all subnormal operators have this form. We make the following definition:

**Definition 4.15.** Let \( S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) be a subnormal operator, and \( N = mne(S) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}) \). If \( \mu \) is a scalar-valued spectral measure associated to \( N \), and \( f \in L^\infty(\sigma(N), \mu) \), we define the Toeplitz operator \( T_f \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) via

\[
T_f := P(f(N)) \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{H}}
\]

where \( P \) is the orthogonal projection of \( \mathcal{K} \) onto \( \mathcal{H} \).

In the case when \( S \) is the unilateral shift, the above are the Toeplitz operators on \( H^2(\mathbb{T}) \). For any subnormal operator \( S \), we have that \( T_z = S \), and that \( T_z \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H} \). Consequently, \( \{T_f : f \in C(\sigma(N))\} \subset C^*(S) \). We remark that, while the map from \( L^\infty(\sigma(N), \mu) \) to \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) via \( f \mapsto T_f \) is positive and norm decreasing, it is not multiplicative.

Ultimately, we are interested in algebras of operators generated by left invertible operators. Salient examples will arise from the subnormal operators, due in large part to their rich spectral theory. The following is the first useful result in that direction.

**Proposition 4.16** \( \mathcal{S} \). Let \( S \) be a subnormal operator with \( N = mne(S) \). Then the following inclusions hold:

\[
\partial \sigma(S) \subseteq \sigma_{ap}(S) \subseteq \sigma_{ap}(N) = \sigma(N) \subseteq \sigma(S)
\]

where \( \sigma_{ap}(S) \) is the approximate point spectrum of \( S \).

Next we highlight some C*-algebraic results about subnormal operators due to Olin, Thomson, Keough and McGuire. If \( N \) is a normal operator, there is a natural identification of \( C^*(N) \) with \( C(\sigma(N)) \) given by the Gelfand transform. There is also an intimate connection between the C*-algebra generated by a subnormal operator \( S \) and its minimal normal extension \( N \).

When \( S \) is the unilateral shift, its minimal normal extension \( N \) is a unitary. The commutative C*-algebra \( C^*(N) \cong C^*(\sigma(N)) \cong C(\mathbb{T}) \) appears in the symbols of the Toeplitz operators. Being a subnormal operator, by definition \( S \) dilates to a normal operator. The unilateral shift also has the additional property the image of \( S \) in the Calkin algebra is normal (in fact, unitary). Recall that an operator \( S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) is called essentially normal if its image \( \pi(S) \) is normal in the Calkin algebra \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})/\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}) \).

In summary, three key properties that the unilateral shift possesses are irreducibility, subnormality and essential normality. If \( S \) is any operator with these three properties, one obtains a construction similar to the Toeplitz algebra. It is helpful to view the following theorem with Proposition 4.16 in mind.
Theorem 4.17 (\textsuperscript{20} \textsuperscript{22} \textsuperscript{24}). If $S$ is an irreducible, subnormal, essentially normal operator, then

i. $\sigma_{ap}(S) = \sigma_e(S)$

ii. For each $f,g \in C(\sigma(N))$, we have
   a. $T_f \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$ if and only if $f$ vanishes on $\sigma_e(S)$
   b. $\|T_f + \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})\| = \|f\|_{\sigma_e(S)}$
   c. $T_fg - T_fT_g \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$
   d. $\sigma_e(T_f) = f(\sigma_e(S))$

iii. Every element of $C^*(S)$ can be written as a sum of a Toeplitz operator and compact:

$$C^*(S) = \{T_f + K : f \in C(\sigma(N)), K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})\}.$$

Moreover, if $\sigma(N) = \sigma_{ap}(S)$, then each element has $A \in C^*(S)$ has a unique representation of the form $T_f + K$. If $\sigma(N) \neq \sigma_{ap}(S)$, $A$ may be expressed as $A = T_{f_1} + K_1 = T_{f_2} + K_2$, where $f_1 \mid_{\sigma_e(S)} = f_2 \mid_{\sigma_e(S)}$.

Using the work of Olim, Thomson, Keough and McGuire describing the $C^*$-algebra generated by a subnormal, essentially normal, irreducible operator (Theorem 4.17), we characterize the algebras $\mathfrak{A}_S$ for $S$ a subnormal, essentially normal left invertible operator. We begin with a simple connection between spectral data of the operators appearing in Theorem 4.17 and left invertibility.

Lemma 4.18. Let $S$ be a subnormal operator with $N = mne(S)$. If $N$ is invertible, then $S$ is left invertible with $L = T_{z^{-1}}$ a left inverse. If $\sigma(N) = \sigma_{ap}(S)$, then $S$ is left invertible if and only if $N$ is invertible.

Proof. If $N$ is invertible, then the Toeplitz operator $T_{z^{-1}} = P(N^{-1}) \mid_{\mathcal{H}}$ is well defined. Since $N$ is a normal extension of $S$, we have for each $x \in \mathcal{H}$

$$T_{z^{-1}}Sx = T_{z^{-1}}(Nx) = P(N^{-1}Nx) = Px = x.$$

If $\sigma(N) = \sigma_{ap}(S)$, then $S$ is left invertible implies $0 \notin \sigma_e(S) = \sigma(N)$. \hfill \Box

Using the basic theory of subnormal operators, we now describe the structure of $\mathfrak{A}_S$ for a prototypical class of subnormal operators.

Theorem C. Let $S$ be an analytic left invertible, $\text{ind}(S) = -1$, essentially normal, subnormal operator with $N := mne(S)$ such that $\sigma(N) = \sigma_{ap}(S)$. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the uniform algebra generated by the functions $z$ and $z^{-1}$ on $\sigma_e(S)$. Then

$$\mathfrak{A}_S = \{T_f + K : f \in \mathcal{B}, K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})\}.$$

Moreover, the representation of each element as $T_f + K$ is unique.

Proof. By Lemma 4.18 $L := T_{z^{-1}}$ is a left inverse of $S$. By Corollary 4.2 $\mathfrak{A}_S$ is the norm-closed subalgebra of $C^*(S)$ generated by $T_z$ and $T_{z^{-1}}$. Since $S$ is analytic, it is strongly irreducible, and hence, irreducible. Therefore by Theorem 4.17, each element of $\mathfrak{A}_S$ has a unique representation as $T_f + K$ for some $f \in C(\sigma(N))$ and $\sigma(N) = \sigma_{ap}(S) = \sigma_e(S)$. Moreover by Theorem 4.17, $L^n = T_{z^{-n}} + K$ for some compact operator $K$. Since $\mathfrak{A}_S$ contains the compacts, it follows that $T_{z^k} \in \mathfrak{A}_S$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence, for each $p \in \text{Alg}(z, z^{-1})$, we have that $T_p \in \mathfrak{A}_S$. Using this information, we now show that $\mathfrak{A}_S = \{T_f + K : f \in \mathcal{B}, K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})\}$. To do this, it suffices to show that $T_f \in \mathfrak{A}_S$ if and only if $f \in \mathcal{B}$.

First, suppose that $T_f \in \mathfrak{A}_S$ for some $f \in C(\sigma(N))$. Since $\text{Alg}\{T_z, T_{z^{-1}}\}$ is dense in $\mathfrak{A}_S$, for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a Laurent polynomial $p \in \text{Alg}(z, z^{-1})$ and compact $K$ such that $\|T_f - (T_p + K)\| < \epsilon$. By Theorem 4.17

$$\epsilon > \|T_f - (T_p + K)\| = \|T_{f_p} - K\| \geq \|T_{f_p} + \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})\| = \|f - p\|.$$
Hence, $f \in B$. For the other inclusion, suppose to the contrary that $f \in B$ but $T_f \notin A_S$. Then there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for each $p \in \text{Alg}(z, z^{-1})$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})$, we have $\|T_f - (T_p + K)\| > \delta$. In particular, this should hold for any $p$ such that $\|f - p\| < \frac{\delta}{2}$. Hence

$$\delta \leq \inf_{K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})} \|T_f - (T_p + K)\| = \|T_{f-p} + \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H})\| = \|f - p\| < \frac{\delta}{2}$$

which is absurd. Hence, $T_f$ must be in $A_S$, completing the proof. \(\square\)

Notice that in Theorem C, we can drop the requirement that $\sigma(N) = \sigma_{ap}(S)$, so long as the minimal normal extension is invertible. In this case however, one will lose the uniqueness of the representation $T_f + K$ as discussed in Theorem 4.17. As a corollary to Theorem C, we get a description of $A_T$ for analytic Toeplitz operators on $H^2(T)$ with Fredholm index $-1$.

**Corollary 4.19.** Let $g$ be an analytic function on $T$ and $X = \text{ran}(g)$ with winding number of $g$ equal to 1. Then $\sigma_e(T_g) = X$, and $T_g$ is an analytic left invertible operator with $\text{ind}(T_g) = -1$. If $\mathcal{B}$ is the uniform algebra generated by $z$ and $z^{-1}$ on $X$, then we have the following short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}(H^2(T)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{T_g} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_T \longrightarrow 0$$

Moreover, each element of $\mathcal{A}_{T_g}$ has a unique representation of $T_f + K$ for $f$ in the uniform algebra generated by $g$ and $g^{-1}$ and $K$ compact.

The hypotheses of Theorem C are natural, but numerous. This is to guarantee that $S$ remain within our current focus of study. We remark that even if $S$ is left invertible, irreducible, subnormal, essentially normal operator, it need not be analytic.

Recall, an operator $R \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be cyclic if there exists an $x \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\{R^n x\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is norm dense in $\mathcal{H}$. A result by Qing shows that every Cowen-Douglas operator is cyclic [27]. While all Cowen-Douglas operators must be cyclic, the adjoints of general subnormal operators need not be cyclic. A long-standing problem posed by Deddens and Wogen asked which subnormal operators had cyclic adjoints [8]. Feldman answered this question in [13]. A subnormal operator is said to be pure if it has no non-trivial normal summand. Every subnormal operator can be decomposed as $S = S_p \oplus N$, where $S_p$ is pure and $N$ is normal. The general cyclicity result is as follows:

**Theorem 4.20** (Feldman [13]). If $S = S_p \oplus N$ is a subnormal operator, then $S^*$ is cyclic if and only if $N$ is cyclic. In particular, pure subnormal operators have cyclic adjoints.

Having a cyclic vector clearly is not sufficient for an operator to be Cowen-Douglas. However, Theorem 4.20 is a condition of necessity. Thomson showed in [32] that if $S$ is a pure, cyclic subnormal operator, then $S^*$ is Cowen-Douglas. However, as far the author is aware, there is no known elementary equivalence to guarantee $S^*$ is Cowen-Douglas.

We remark that the similarity orbit of subnormal operators was classified by Conway [9]. He showed two subnormal operators are similar if and only if the scalar valued spectral measure associated to the minimal normal extensions were the same. In this case, there is no need to investigate the $K_0$ group of the commutant. Rather, the spectral data encodes all the information about the similarity orbit.

**Acknowledgements**

The author would like to thank David Pitts for his mathematical insights and intuition.
References


