TENSOR $D$ COACTION FUNCTORS
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Abstract. We develop an approach, using what we call “tensor $D$ coaction functors”, to the “C-crossed-product” functors of Baum, Guentner, and Willett. We prove that the tensor $D$ functors are exact, and identify the minimal such functor. This continues our program of applying coaction functors as a tool in the Baum-Guentner-Willett-Buss-Echterhoff campaign to attempt to “fix” the Baum-Connes conjecture.

1. Introduction

The Baum-Connes conjecture (with coefficients) says that, given an action of a locally compact group on a $C^*$-algebra, there is a natural isomorphism between the “topological K-theory” and the K-theory of the reduced crossed product. Unfortunately, the conjecture in this form is false because the topological K-theory is an exact functor of actions, while the reduced crossed product is not, due to the existence of Gromov’s non-exact groups.

In an attempt to fix the Baum-Connes conjecture, in [BGW16] Baum, Guentner, and Willett investigated “exotic crossed products” between the full and reduced crossed products. While the full crossed product is exact, it will not fix the Baum-Connes conjecture, for different reasons. So, [BGW16] propose the following strategy: replace the reduced crossed product by an exact exotic crossed product that is as “small” as possible, meaning as close as possible to the reduced crossed product. They showed abstractly that such a minimal exact crossed product exists, but then the question becomes, how to compute it? A big part of the problem is that it is nontrivial to find examples of exact crossed-product functors.

[BGW16] found one general construction: fix an action $\gamma$ of $G$ on a unital $C^*$-algebra $C$. Then for any action $(A, \alpha)$ of $G$ consider the homomorphism $\psi: A \to A \otimes_{\text{max}} C$ given by

$$\psi(a) = a \otimes 1.$$
(Note that it is important here to use the maximal tensor product, since we want the functor to be exact.) This homomorphism is $\alpha - (\alpha \otimes_{\max} \gamma)$ equivariant, so we can form the associated homomorphism

$$\psi \rtimes G: A \rtimes_{\alpha} G \to (A \otimes_{\max} C) \rtimes_{\alpha \otimes_{\max} \gamma} G.$$ 

[BGW16] define the $C$-crossed product as

$$A \rtimes_{\alpha,C} G := (\psi \rtimes G)(A \rtimes_{\alpha} G).$$

This is always an exact functor (and here is where it is important that $C$ be unital), and moreover in [BEW18] Buss, Echterhoff, and Willett proved that the minimal $C$-crossed product occurs when $\gamma$ is the action by left translation of $G$ on the algebra of left uniformly continuous bounded functions.

To explain our involvement (see, e.g., [KLQ16a, KLQ16c, KLQ18, KLQ20]), let us look a bit more closely. By definition a crossed product $\sigma$ is a functor $(A, \alpha) \mapsto A \rtimes_{\alpha,\sigma} G$ together with natural surjections $q, \Lambda$ such that for every action $(A, \alpha)$ the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A \rtimes_{\alpha} G & \xrightarrow{q_A} & A \rtimes_{\alpha,\sigma} G \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
A \rtimes_{\alpha,\tau} G & \xrightarrow{\Lambda_A} & \end{array}
\]

commutes, where the vertical arrow is the regular representation of the full crossed product onto the reduced one. A crossed product functor $\sigma$ is called exotic if it is different from both the full and the reduced crossed product functors. We reasoned that, since the full and reduced crossed products carry dual coactions of $G$, it is natural to require the exotic crossed product to have its own version of the dual coaction. This seems reasonable because, although not all exotic crossed products do carry such a coaction, all the “good ones” — namely those that behave nicely with correspondences — do (see [BEW18, Theorem 5.6]). And the minimal exact crossed product is good in this sense. We then view an exotic crossed product as the result of a two-step process: first form the full crossed product, then apply a coaction functor. Our plan is to basically ignore the actions, and do everything within the realm of coactions.

Of course we wanted our theory to include that of exotic crossed products. So, we needed to find a coaction functor to go along with the $C$-crossed product. Since the $C$-crossed product involves tensoring
with a fixed action \((C, \gamma)\), we guessed that the appropriate coaction functor should involve tensoring with a fixed coaction \((D, \zeta)\). However, we need a bit more: the crossed product \(C \rtimes_\gamma G\) comes equipped with not only a dual coaction \(\hat{\gamma}\), but also a canonical unitary homomorphism \(i_G: G \to M(C \rtimes_\gamma G)\). It turns out to be important that we similarly require that we have a unitary homomorphism \(V: G \to M(D)\). Also, the dual coaction \(\hat{\gamma}\) is maximal, and accordingly we require that the coaction \(\zeta\) be maximal. We then want a tensor D coaction functor \(\tau^D: (A, \delta) \mapsto (A^D, \delta^D)\) such that:

- we recover the \(C\)-crossed product: when \((D, \zeta, V) = (C \rtimes_\gamma G, \hat{\gamma}, i_G)\) and \((A, \delta) = (B \rtimes_\alpha G, \hat{\alpha})\) we have
  \[
  (B \rtimes_\alpha G)^{C \rtimes_\gamma G} \cong B \rtimes_{\alpha, C} G,
  \]
- the functor \(\tau^D\) is exact, and
- the minimal tensor \(D\) coaction functor is for
  \[
  (D, \zeta) = (\text{UCB}_r(G) \rtimes_{\text{rt}} G, \hat{\text{rt}})
  \]

(where \(\text{UCB}_r(G)\) denotes the right uniformly continuous functions on \(G\), and the change from \(\text{lt}\) to \(\text{rt}\) causes no trouble).

For discrete \(G\) we accomplished all this in \([KLQ20]\), primarily using Fell bundles. But for the general case of locally compact \(G\) we needed a new approach — not only are Fell bundles over continuous groups technically difficult, but, even worse, not all coactions come from Fell bundles.

In our work in the discrete case, it occurred to us that the homomorphism \(\psi: B \rtimes_\alpha G \to (B \otimes_{\text{max}} C) \rtimes_{\alpha \otimes_{\text{max}} \gamma} G\) is reminiscent of a coaction \(\delta: A \to M(A \otimes C^*(G))\), but with the minimal tensor product replaced by the maximal one \(\otimes_{\text{max}}\). This insight lead to our approach in the current paper, where we need to briefly switch to a modified type of coaction: we need a homomorphism

\[
\delta: A \to M(A \otimes_{\text{max}} C^*(G))
\]
satisfying all the other usual properties of coactions. We call these “R-coactions”; see \([KLQ21]\), Definition 4.2 for the definition and the comparison to the usual “standard” coactions. In fact, this is the approach Raeburn took in \([Rae92]\) (and we chose the “R” to stand for “Raeburn”), but the subsequent development, by various researchers, of his full coactions quickly settled on using the minimal tensor product instead. Now it seems that we need Raeburn’s version, in order to do this specific job.

In order to keep the current paper to a reasonable length, we developed the basic theory of R-coactions in a separate paper \([KLQ21]\), to
which we refer when appropriate. We summarize the basic facts and definitions in Section 2.

In order to show that our tensor $D$ coaction functors reproduce the $C$-crossed products, we will need to know that if we have two actions of $G$ then the crossed product of the diagonal tensor product action of $G$ embeds faithfully in the multipliers of the crossed product of the tensor-product action of $G \times G$. Replacing $G$ by the diagonal subgroup of $G \times G$, we see that this is an example of the following problem: given an action $K \curvearrowright A$ and a closed subgroup $H$ of $K$, does $A \rtimes H$ embed faithfully in $M(A \rtimes K)$? The answer is no in general (see the discussion preceding Proposition 3.4). However, it transpires that the embedding property is satisfied in our setting; we deduced this from Proposition 3.4, which shows that the embedding holds when $K$ is a semidirect product with quotient $H$. To further prepare for the proof that we recover the $C$-crossed products of [BGW16], we record in Theorem 3.7 the following general fact: the maximal tensor product of crossed products by actions of two groups $G$ and $H$ is isomorphic to the crossed product of the maximal tensor product by the associated action of $G \times H$. We initially suspected that this fact must be folklore, but we eventually found it stated without proof as [Tak75, Proposition 2.4], and Takai refers to two papers of Guichardet [Gui65, Gui66].

In Section 4 we introduce and study our tensor $D$ coaction functors $\tau^D$, and in Theorem 4.14 we show that they reproduce the $C$-crossed products. In Corollary 4.12 we also give sufficient conditions, involving only the nature of the data $(D, \zeta, V)$, for the tensor $D$ functor to coincide with normalization, and at the opposite extreme, in Proposition 4.13 we observe that we get maximalization when $D = C^*(G)$.

In Section 5 we verify that every tensor $D$ functor is exact. In [KLQ20] we were able to show this for discrete groups using a diagram chase together with the special situation that $A^D$ actually sits inside $A \otimes_{\text{max}} D$, rather than inside $\tilde{M}(A \otimes_{\text{max}} D)$ (when $G$ is discrete). However, in the case of general locally compact groups $G$, we cannot quite make the strategy of [KLQ20] work. As a consequence, we must give a completely different argument, requiring a long traverse through equivariant $C^*$-correspondences, natural Morita equivalence of functors, crossed-product duality, and the known fact that the $C$-crossed products are exact functors. We thank Alcides Buss for pointing out an error in our previous attempt to avoid resorting to this strategy.

In Section 6 we prove that $D = \text{UCB}_r(G) \rtimes_{rt} G$ gives the minimal tensor $D$ functor. We also apply a general result from Section 4 to
recover another fact proved in [BEW18]: if $G$ is amenable at infinity
then the $\text{UCB}_r$-crossed product is just the reduced one.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout, $G$ will be a locally compact group. We refer to [KLQ16a]
for coaction functors. Also, we now recall from [KLQ21, Section 4]
some of the basic theory of $R$-coactions. First of all, an $R$-coaction
of $G$ on a $C^*$-algebra $A$ is an injective nondegenerate homomorphism
$\delta: A \to \widetilde{M}(A \otimes_{\max} C^*(G))$ such that

$$(\delta \otimes_{\max} \text{id}) \circ \delta = (\text{id} \otimes_{\max} \delta^R_G) \circ \delta$$

and

$$\text{span}\{\delta(A)(1 \otimes_{\max} C^*(G))\} = A \otimes_{\max} C^*(G),$$

where for a $C^*$-algebra $D$ we define the “tilde multipliers” of the maximal
tensor product just as for the minimal tensor product:

$$\widetilde{\text{M}}(A \otimes_{\max} D) = \{m \in \text{M}(A \otimes_{\max} D) :
\text{m}(1 \otimes D) \cup (1 \otimes D)m \subseteq A \otimes_{\max} D\},$$

and where the homomorphism $\delta^R_G: C^*(G) \to \widetilde{M}(C^*(G) \otimes_{\max} C^*(G))$
is the integrated form of the unitary representation $s \mapsto s \otimes_{\max} s$ for
$s \in G$.

A morphism $\phi: (A, \delta) \to (B, \varepsilon)$ of $R$-coactions is a homomorphism
$\phi: A \to B$ that is $\delta - \varepsilon$ equivariant in the sense that the diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \widetilde{M}(A \otimes_{\max} C^*(G)) \\
\phi \downarrow & & \downarrow \delta \otimes_{\max} \text{id} \\
B & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & \widetilde{M}(B \otimes_{\max} C^*(G))
\end{array}
$$

commutes, and this gives a category of $R$-coactions.

Letting $\Upsilon: A \otimes_{\max} C^*(G) \to A \otimes C^*(G)$ be the canonical surjection,
every $R$-coaction $\delta$ has an associated standardization $\delta^S$ defined by the
commutative diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \widetilde{M}(A \otimes_{\max} C^*(G)) \\
\downarrow \delta^S & & \downarrow \Upsilon \\
\widetilde{M}(A \otimes C^*(G)),
\end{array}
$$

and this gives a functor from $R$-coactions to coactions.

[KLQ21] Theorem 5.16] gives a functor $(A, \delta) \mapsto (A, \delta^R)$ from maximal
coactions to $R$-coactions, where the morphisms are left unchanged:
$\phi \mapsto \phi$, and moreover $\delta^{RS} = \delta$. 

Note that if $A$ is nuclear then there is no difference between $R$-coactions and standard coactions.

3. Subgroups

Recall that we assume that all groups are locally compact and all homomorphisms between groups are continuous.

In this section we prove Corollary 3.5 below, which we will need in order to prove (see Theorem 4.14) that we can recover the $C^*$-crossed-product functors of [BGW16]. Our approach involves a type of functoriality of crossed products (see Lemma 3.2) that, although elementary, is not often used, so we will explain in detail.

**Definition 3.1.** Fix a $C^*$-algebra $A$. There is a category of actions on $A$ given as follows:

- **Objects:** actions $(G, \alpha)$ on $A$, i.e., $\alpha : G \curvearrowright A$;
- **Morphisms:** a morphism $\pi : (G, \alpha) \rightarrow (H, \beta)$ is a homomorphism $\pi : G \rightarrow H$ satisfying $\alpha = \beta \circ \pi$.

For our functoriality result Lemma 3.2, we will temporarily use the nondegenerate category of $C^*$-algebras, in which the objects are $C^*$-algebras and a morphism from $A$ to $B$ is a nondegenerate homomorphism $\phi : A \rightarrow M(B)$. We emphasize that in the rest of the paper, i.e., except for this section, we instead use the “classical” category of $C^*$-algebras and homomorphisms, i.e., a morphism from $A$ to $B$ is just a (possibly degenerate) homomorphism $\pi : A \rightarrow B$, as this is most appropriate when dealing with short exact sequences.

**Lemma 3.2.** For a fixed $C^*$-algebra $A$, the assignment

$$(G, \alpha) \mapsto A \rtimes_\alpha G$$

from actions on $A$ to $C^*$-algebras is a functor, where to a morphism $\pi : (G, \alpha) \rightarrow (H, \beta)$ we assign the morphism $A \rtimes \pi : A \rtimes_\alpha G \rightarrow M(A \rtimes_\beta H)$ given by the integrated form of the covariant homomorphism

$$(i^H_H, i_H \circ \pi),$$

where $(i^H_A, i_H)$ is the canonical covariant homomorphism of $(A, H)$ in $M(A \rtimes_\beta H)$.

**Proof.** Folklore. □

**Remark 3.3.** Elsewhere in this paper we are exclusively interested in morphisms of actions of a fixed group $G$, that only involve equivariant homomorphisms between the $C^*$-algebras. It is a routine exercise to combine the two types of morphism, allowing both the algebras and the groups to change, but we have no need for this, so we eschew it.
We need Lemma 3.2 to prove Proposition 3.4 below, which gives a sufficient condition for faithful embedding of crossed products by a subgroup. In general, if \((A, G, \alpha)\) is an action and \(H\) is a closed subgroup of \(G\), then the inclusion map \(i: H \to G\) gives a morphism \(i: (H, \beta) \to (G, \alpha)\) for the restricted action \(\beta = \alpha|_H\). The associated homomorphism

\[ i_A \times (i_G \circ i): A \rtimes_\beta H \to M(A \rtimes_\alpha G) \]

need not be injective in general; indeed, in the special case \(A = C\), an underappreciated paper of Bekka and Valette [BV95] shows the existence of groups \(G\) and closed subgroups \(H\) such that the canonical map \(C^*(H) \to M(C^*(G))\) is not injective (answering negatively a question of Rieffel [Rie74, discussion following Proposition 4.1]). We need injectivity for the case of the diagonal subgroup \(\Delta = \{(s, s): s \in G\}\) of \(G \times G\), which we prove in Corollary 3.5.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let

\[ G \xrightarrow{\pi} H \]

be a pair of homomorphisms such that \(\pi \circ \sigma = \text{id}_H\), and suppose that \(\pi: (G, \alpha) \to (H, \beta)\) is a morphism of actions on \(A\) (so that also \(\sigma: (H, \beta) \to (G, \alpha)\) is a morphism of actions on \(A\)). Then the associated homomorphism

\[ A \rtimes \sigma: A \rtimes_\beta H \to M(A \rtimes_\alpha G) \]

is injective.

**Proof.** Since \(\pi \circ \sigma = \text{id}_H\), by functoriality we have

\[ (A \rtimes \pi) \circ (A \rtimes \sigma) = A \rtimes (\pi \circ \sigma) = A \rtimes \text{id}_H = \text{id}_{A \rtimes_\beta H}, \]

which proves injectivity. \(\square\)

Note that the above hypothesis on \(G\) and \(H\) says that \(G\) is a semidirect product \(G = N \rtimes H\) with \(N = \ker \pi\) and quotient \(G/N = H\), and that \(A \rtimes \pi\) maps \(A \rtimes_\alpha G\) onto \(A \rtimes_\beta H\).

**Corollary 3.5.** Let \((A, \alpha)\) and \((B, \beta)\) be actions of \(G\). Let \(\alpha \otimes \beta: G \rtimes A \otimes_{\text{max}} B\) be the diagonal action

\[ (\alpha \otimes \beta)_s = \alpha_s \otimes_{\text{max}} \beta_s, \]

and let \(\alpha \boxtimes \beta : G \times G \rtimes A \otimes_{\text{max}} B\) be the tensor-product action

\[ (\alpha \boxtimes \beta)_{(s,t)} = \alpha_s \otimes_{\text{max}} \beta_t. \]

Then the canonical homomorphism

\[ (A \otimes_{\text{max}} B) \rtimes_{\alpha \otimes \beta} G \to M((A \otimes_{\text{max}} B) \rtimes_{\alpha \boxtimes \beta} (G \times G)) \]
associated to the homomorphism
\[ s \mapsto (s, s) : G \to (G \times G) \]
is injective.

Proof. Just apply Proposition 3.4 to the pair of homomorphisms
\[ G \times G \xrightarrow{\pi} G, \]
where \( \pi(s, t) = s \) and \( \sigma(s) = (s, s) \).
\[ \square \]

Remark 3.6. We will abuse notation by identifying \( (A \otimes_{\text{max}} B) \rtimes_{\alpha \otimes \beta} G \) with its image in \( M((A \otimes_{\text{max}} B) \rtimes_{\alpha \otimes \beta} (G \times G)) \). In particular, for \( s \in G \) we will blur the distinction between \( i_{G \times G}(s, s) \) and \( i_{G}^\alpha \otimes \beta(s) \).

We now record a fact in slightly more generality than we need, since it requires no extra work and might be useful elsewhere. As we mentioned in the introduction, the following result was stated in [Tak75, Proposition 2.4], with a vague reference to Guichardet.

Theorem 3.7. Let \((B, G, \alpha)\) and \((C, H, \beta)\) be actions. Then there is an isomorphism
\[ \Phi : (B \rtimes_{\alpha} G) \otimes_{\text{max}} (C \rtimes_{\beta} H) \xrightarrow{\cong} (B \otimes_{\text{max}} C)_{\alpha \otimes \beta}(G \times H) \]
determined on the generators by
\[ \Phi(i_{B}(b)i_{G}(s) \otimes i_{C}(c)i_{H}(t)) = i_{B \otimes_{\text{max}} C}(b \otimes c)i_{G \times H}(s, t). \]

Proof. This follows from universal properties of \( \otimes_{\text{max}} \) and crossed products. \( \square \)

Remark 3.8. Although we do not need this fact, we mention that it is routine to check on the generators that the isomorphism \( \Phi \) of Theorem 3.7 is \( \hat{\alpha} \boxtimes \hat{\beta} - \alpha \boxtimes \beta \) equivariant.

4. Tensor D functor via R-coactions

In preparation for our next definition, recall from [KLQ21, Definition 5.17] that we defined an R-coaction to be maximal if its standardization is maximal. Also, we need an extension result, recorded as Lemma 4.1 below. If \( A \) and \( D \) are \( C^* \)-algebras, the \( D \)-strict topology on \( \hat{M}(A \otimes_{\text{max}} D) \) is generated by the seminorms
\[ m \mapsto \|m(1 \otimes_{\text{max}} d)\| \quad \text{and} \quad m \mapsto \|(1 \otimes_{\text{max}} d)m\| \quad \text{for} \quad d \in D. \]
Lemma 4.1. Let $A, D, E$ be $C^*$-algebras, and let $\pi : D \to E$ be a non-degenerate homomorphism. Then the homomorphism $\text{id} \otimes_{\text{max}} \pi : A \otimes_{\text{max}} D \to A \otimes_{\text{max}} E$ extends uniquely to a $D$-strict to $E$-strictly continuous homomorphism

$$\text{id} \otimes_{\text{max}} \pi : \widehat{M}(A \otimes_{\text{max}} D) \to \widehat{M}(A \otimes_{\text{max}} E).$$

Proof. This follows from [DKQ12, Lemma A.5] (which is based upon [EKQR06, Proposition A.6]). □

Definition 4.2. An equivariant $R$-coaction is a triple $(D, \zeta, V)$, where $(D, \zeta)$ is a maximal $R$-coaction and $V : (C^*(G), \delta^R_G) \to (D, \zeta)$ is a morphism of $R$-coactions.

A morphism $\phi : (D, \zeta, V) \to (E, \eta, W)$ of equivariant $R$-coactions is a morphism $\phi : (D, \zeta) \to (E, \eta)$ of $R$-coactions such that

$$\phi(V(c)) = W(c) \quad \text{for all } c \in C^*(G),$$

and this gives a category of equivariant $R$-coactions.

Suppose that $(D, \zeta, V)$ is an equivariant $R$-coaction. Then the standardization $(D, \zeta^S, V)$ is an equivariant coaction, so by Landstad duality for full crossed products there exist an action $(D, \gamma)$ and an isomorphism

$$\Phi : (D, \zeta^S, V) \xrightarrow{\sim} (C \rtimes^\gamma G, \hat{\gamma}, i_G).$$

We will need an analogue of this for the given $R$-coaction. Unfortunately, due to our ignorance concerning $R$-coactions, we do not know whether the given $R$-coaction $\zeta$ will necessarily coincide with the dual $R$-coaction $R(\gamma)$. Consequently, we must impose this “by law”:

Definition 4.3. An equivariant $R$-coaction $(D, \zeta, V)$ is regular if

$$\zeta = (\zeta^S)^R.$$

Question 4.4. Is every equivariant $R$-coaction regular? This is a weaker version of [KLQ21, Question 4.5 (ii)] — in that paper we ask about uniqueness of $R$-coactions with a given standardization, while now we narrow the search down to $R$-coactions with a given equivariant homomorphism $V$.

In any event, this latest concept fixes the problem, and allows us to prove a version of Landstad duality for $R$-coactions.

Proposition 4.5. If $(D, \zeta, V)$ is a regular equivariant $R$-coaction, then there exist an action $(C, \gamma)$ and an isomorphism

$$\Phi : (D, \zeta, V) \xrightarrow{\sim} (C \rtimes^\gamma G, R(\gamma), i_G).$$
Proof. As in our discussion preceding Definition 4.3 we can choose an action \((C, \gamma)\) and an isomorphism \(\Phi\) satisfying (4.1). Then by functoriality the isomorphism \(\Phi\) is also equivariant for \(\zeta^S R = \zeta\) and \((\tilde{\gamma})^R\). Since \((\tilde{\gamma})^R = R(\gamma)\) by [KLQ21, Theorem 5.19], we are done. □

Proposition 4.6. Fix a regular equivariant \(R\)-coaction \((D, \zeta, V)\). For any \(R\)-coaction \((A, \delta)\) let \(Q = Q^D_A\) be the unique homomorphism making the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{\delta} & M(A \otimes_{\text{max}} C^*(G)) \\
\downarrow{Q} & & \downarrow{\text{id} \otimes_{\text{max}} V} \\
M(A \otimes_{\text{max}} D) & & \\
\end{array}
\]

commute, and put \(A^D = Q(A)\). Then there is a unique \(R\)-coaction \(\delta^{TD}\) on \(A^D\) such that \(Q\) is \(\delta - \delta^{TD}\) equivariant.

Moreover, if \(\phi: (A, \delta) \rightarrow (B, \varepsilon)\) is a morphism of \(R\)-coactions, then there is a unique homomorphism \(\phi^{TD}\) making the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{\phi} & B \\
\downarrow{Q_A} & & \downarrow{Q_B} \\
A^D & \xrightarrow{\phi^{TD}} & B^D \\
\end{array}
\]

commute, and moreover \(\phi^{TD}\) is \(\delta^{TD} - \varepsilon^{TD}\) equivariant.

In this way we get a functor \(\text{TD}: (A, \delta) \mapsto (A^D, \delta^{TD})\) on the category of \(R\)-coactions, and moreover \(Q\) is a natural surjection from the identity functor to \(\text{TD}\).

Note that we commit the common sin of frequently omitting some of the notation in \(Q^D_A\): sometimes we write \(Q^D\), sometimes \(Q_A\), and occasionally just \(Q\). But we only do this when the unwritten parts are clear from the context.

Proof. For the first part, by [KLQ21, Lemma 4.17] it suffices to show that the ideal ker \(Q\) of \(A\) is \(\delta\)-invariant. Note that since \(V\) is \(\delta^R_G - \zeta\) equivariant the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
C^*(G) & \xrightarrow{\delta_G} & M(C^*(G) \otimes_{\text{max}} C^*(G)) \\
\downarrow{V} & & \downarrow{V \otimes_{\text{max}} \text{id}} \\
M(D) & \xrightarrow{\zeta} & M(D \otimes_{\text{max}} C^*(G)) \\
\end{array}
\]

commutes.
Tensoring with $A$ and using the coaction identity, we see that the diagram

$$
\begin{align*}
A & \xrightarrow{\delta} M(A \otimes_{\max} C^*(G)) \\
\delta \downarrow & \quad \downarrow\delta \otimes \max \text{id} \\
M(A \otimes_{\max} C^*(G)) & \xrightarrow{id \otimes_{\max} \delta_R} M(A \otimes_{\max} C^*(G) \otimes_{\max} C^*(G)) \\
\text{id} \otimes_{\max} V \downarrow & \quad \downarrow \text{id} \otimes_{\max} V \otimes_{\max} \text{id} \\
M(A \otimes_{\max} D) & \xrightarrow{id \otimes_{\max} \zeta} M(A \otimes_{\max} D \otimes_{\max} C^*(G))
\end{align*}
$$

commutes, which immediately implies

$$
\ker Q = \ker (\text{id} \otimes_{\max} V) \circ \delta \\
\subseteq \ker (\text{id} \otimes_{\max} V \otimes_{\max} \text{id}) \circ (\delta \otimes_{\max} \text{id}) \circ \delta \\
= \ker (Q \otimes_{\max} \text{id}) \circ \delta,
$$

showing the required $\delta$-invariance.

Next, let $\phi: (A, \delta) \to (B, \varepsilon)$ be a morphism of $R$-coactions. Consider the diagram

$$
\begin{align*}
A & \xrightarrow{\phi} B \\
\delta \downarrow & \quad \varepsilon \downarrow \\
\widetilde{M}(A \otimes_{\max} C^*(G)) & \xrightarrow{\phi \otimes_{\max} \text{id}} \widetilde{M}(B \otimes_{\max} C^*(G)) \\
\text{id} \otimes_{\max} V \downarrow & \quad \text{id} \otimes_{\max} V \downarrow \\
\widetilde{M}(A \otimes_{\max} D) & \xrightarrow{\phi \otimes_{\max} \text{id}} \widetilde{M}(B \otimes_{\max} D).
\end{align*}
$$

The top rectangle commutes because $\phi$ is equivariant. The bottom rectangle commutes because both compositions coincide with the canonical extension, to tilde multipliers, of the homomorphism

$$
\phi \otimes_{\max} V: A \otimes_{\max} C^*(G) \to B \otimes_{\max} D.
$$

Therefore the outer rectangle, which can be regarded as

$$
\begin{align*}
A & \xrightarrow{\phi} B \\
Q_A \downarrow & \quad Q_B \downarrow \\
\widetilde{M}(A \otimes_{\max} D) & \xrightarrow{\phi \otimes_{\max} \text{id}} \widetilde{M}(B \otimes_{\max} D),
\end{align*}
$$
commutes. This immediately implies that $\phi \otimes_{\max} \text{id}$ takes $A^D$ to $B^D$, giving a suitable homomorphism $\phi^D$. Of course, $\phi^D$ is unique since $Q_A$ is surjective.

We must show that $\phi^D$ is $\delta^{TD} - \varepsilon^{TD}$ equivariant, i.e., the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A^D & \overset{\delta^{TD}}{\longrightarrow} & \hat{M}(A^D \otimes_{\max} C^*(G)) \\
\phi^D \downarrow & & \downarrow_{\phi^D \otimes_{\max} \text{id}} \\
B^D & \overset{\varepsilon^{TD}}{\longrightarrow} & \hat{M}(B^D \otimes_{\max} C^*(G))
\end{array}
\]

commutes. (4.2) is the front rectangle of a larger diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \overset{\delta}{\longrightarrow} & \hat{M}(A \otimes_{\max} C^*(G)) \\
\phi \downarrow & & \downarrow_{\phi \otimes_{\max} \text{id}} \\
A^D & \overset{\delta^{TD}}{\longrightarrow} & \hat{M}(A^D \otimes_{\max} C^*(G)) \\
\phi^D \downarrow & & \downarrow_{\phi^D \otimes_{\max} \text{id}} \\
B & \overset{\varepsilon}{\longrightarrow} & \hat{M}(B \otimes_{\max} C^*(G)) \\
Q_B \downarrow & & \downarrow_{Q_B \otimes_{\max} \text{id}} \\
B^D & \overset{\varepsilon^{TD}}{\longrightarrow} & \hat{M}(B^D \otimes_{\max} C^*(G)).
\end{array}
\]

We have shown above that the left-hand rectangle commutes, and upon tensoring with $C^*(G)$ it follows that the right-hand rectangle commutes. The top rectangle commutes by construction of $\delta^{TD}$, and similarly for the bottom rectangle. The back rectangle commutes since $\phi$ is equivariant. Since $Q_A$ is surjective, it follows that the front rectangle commutes, as desired.

To see that TD is functorial, note that it follows from [KLQ21, Lemma 4.7] that the assignments $(A, \delta) \mapsto \hat{M}(A \otimes_{\max} D)$ and $\phi \mapsto \phi \otimes_{\max} \text{id}$ give a functor from R-coactions to $C^*$-algebras, and we have seen above that $Q$ is a natural transformation from the identity functor to this functor. Since the images of the natural maps $Q_A$ are the $C^*$-algebras $A^D$, it follows that the assignments $(A, \delta) \mapsto A^D$ and $\phi \mapsto \phi^D$ give a functor from R-coactions to $C^*$-algebras. Keeping track of all the coactions, we see that $(A, \delta) \mapsto (A^D, \delta^{TD})$ and $\phi \mapsto \phi^D$ give a functor TD on the category of R-coactions, and $Q$ is natural from the identity functor to TD. \qed
We will now combine functors to produce what could be called a “D-ification” of maximal coactions. Note that the process passes ever so briefly through R-coactions.

**Definition 4.7.** The composition

\[ \sigma^D := \text{standardization} \circ TD \circ \text{R-ification} \]

is a functor from maximal coactions to coactions, and we write \( \sigma^D(A, \delta) = (A^D, \delta^D) \).

Thus, \( \delta^D = ((\delta^R)^{TD})^S \).

**Lemma 4.8.** Let \( \sigma \) be a functor from maximal coactions to coactions, let \( \mu: (A, \delta) \to \sigma(A, \delta) \) be a natural surjection such that

\[ \ker \mu_A \subseteq \ker \Lambda_A \]

where \( \Lambda_A: A \to A^n \) is the normalization. Then \( \sigma \circ \text{(maximalization)} \) is a coaction functor.

**Proof.** This follows almost immediately, by [KLQ16a, Definition 4.1].

We are now ready for our main functor.

**Corollary 4.9.** \( \tau^D := \sigma^D \circ \text{(maximalization)} \) is a coaction functor.

**Proof.** The proof is surprisingly fussy. First, by the general theory of coactions, the maximalization gives a natural surjection

\[ \psi_A: (A^m, \delta^m) \to (A, \delta), \]

and the normalization gives a natural surjection

\[ \Lambda_A: (A, \delta) \mapsto (A^n, \delta^n). \]

By definition, we need natural surjections \( q^D \) and \( \Lambda^D \) fitting into commutative diagrams

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(A^m, \delta^m) & \xrightarrow{\psi_A} & (A, \delta) \\
\downarrow q^D & & \downarrow \Lambda_A \\
(A^D, \delta^D) & \xrightarrow{\Lambda^D} & (A^n, \delta^n),
\end{array}
\]

but by [KLQ16a, Lemma 4.3] the existence of the natural transformation \( \Lambda^D \) is automatic, provided we check that \( \ker q^D_A \subseteq \ker \Lambda_A \circ \psi_A \).
Note that $(A^D, \delta^D)$ is the image of the maximalization $(A^m, \delta^m)$ under the composition of functors

\[ \text{standardization} \circ \text{TD} \circ \text{R-ify}, \]

and we have

\[ A^D = Q_A^m(A^m). \]

In this composition of functors, the first and last do not change the $C^*$-algebra, and the middle functor replaces an $R$-coaction $(B, \varepsilon)$ by the quotient $(B^{TD}, \varepsilon^{TD})$. Thus we have a $\delta^m - \delta^D$ equivariant surjection

\[ Q_{A^m}: A^m \to A^D, \]

and we will check that we can take $q^D_A = Q_{A^m}$.

We must verify that $\ker Q_{A^m} \subseteq \ker \Lambda_A \circ \psi_A$. Since

\[ \Lambda_A \circ \psi_A = \Lambda_{A^m}, \]

we can simplify things by assuming that the coaction $\delta$ is already maximal and then showing that $\ker Q_A \subseteq \ker \Lambda_A$.

It will all rest upon the following: if $I$ is a proper ideal of $C^*(G)$ and there is a coaction $\varepsilon$ on $C^*(G)/I$ such that the quotient map $\pi: C^*(G) \to C^*(G)/I$ is $\delta_G - \varepsilon$ equivariant, then $I \subseteq \ker \lambda$. We cobble this together with the help of some results from [KLQ13]. Let $E = I^\perp$ be the annihilator of $I$ in the Fourier-Stieltjes algebra $B(G) = C^*(G)^*$. Then $E$ is weak*-closed, is nonzero since $I$ is proper, and is an ideal of $B(G)$ by [KLQ13, Corollary 3.13]. Because the pre-annihilator $I = \perp E$ is an ideal, $E$ is $G$-invariant by [KLQ13, Lemma 3.1]. Since $E$ is nonzero, it contains the regular Fourier-Stieltjes algebra $B_r(G)$ by [KLQ13, Lemma 3.14], and hence $I = \perp E$ is contained in $\ker \lambda = \perp(B_r(G))$.

Now we will see how to apply this to show $\ker Q_A \subseteq \ker \Lambda_A$. By crossed-product duality, we can take

\[ \Lambda_A = (\text{id} \otimes \lambda) \circ \delta. \]

Since $V: C^*(G) \to D$ is $\delta^S_G - \zeta$ equivariant, it is also $\delta - \zeta^S$ equivariant. Then by [KLQ16b, Lemma 3.17] there is a unique coaction $\varepsilon$ on the image $F = V(C^*(G)) \subseteq D$ such that $V$ is $\delta - \varepsilon$ equivariant.
Consider the commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \tilde{M}(A \otimes_{\text{max}} C^*(G)) \\
\downarrow{\delta^R} & & \downarrow{\gamma} \\
\tilde{M}(A \otimes_{\text{max}} D) & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \lambda} & \tilde{M}(A \otimes D).
\end{array}
\]

It follows from commutativity that the composition \(\gamma \circ Q_A\) maps into \(\tilde{M}(A \otimes F)\). Thus it suffices to show that there is a homomorphism \(\sigma: F \rightarrow C^*_r(G)\) such that the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \tilde{M}(A \otimes C^*(G)) \\
\downarrow{\gamma \circ Q_A} & & \downarrow{\text{id} \otimes \lambda} \\
\tilde{M}(A \otimes F) & \xrightarrow{- \otimes \sigma} & \tilde{M}(A \otimes C^*_r(G))
\end{array}
\]

commutes. Consider the slightly embellished diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \tilde{M}(A \otimes C^*(G)) \\
\downarrow{\gamma \circ Q_A} & & \downarrow{\text{id} \otimes \lambda} \\
\tilde{M}(A \otimes F) & \xrightarrow{- \otimes \sigma} & \tilde{M}(A \otimes C^*_r(G)).
\end{array}
\]

We’ve seen in (4.3) that the upper left triangle commutes, and the earlier discussion with \(\pi = V\) and \(I = \ker V\) implies that there is a homomorphism \(\sigma\) making the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
C^*(G) & \xrightarrow{V} & \tilde{M}(A \otimes C^*_r(G)) \\
\downarrow{\lambda} & & \downarrow{\text{id} \otimes \sigma} \\
F & \xrightarrow{- \otimes \sigma} & C^*_r(G)
\end{array}
\]

commute. It follows that the diagram (4.5), and hence (4.4), commutes, as desired. \(\square\)

**Definition 4.10.** We call \(\tau^D\) the tensor D coaction functor.

We pause to observe that if \(D\) is nuclear then we can avoid the R-coactions altogether, as shown in the following lemma.
Lemma 4.11. If \((D, \zeta, V)\) is an equivariant coaction such that \(D\) is nuclear, then the tensor \(D\) coaction functor can be computed, up to natural isomorphism of functors, as follows:

(i) First replace a given coaction \((A, \delta)\) by its maximalization (and keep the notation \((A, \delta)\));
(ii) let \(Q_{A}^{D} = (\text{id} \otimes V) \circ \delta\);
(iii) let \(A^{D} = Q_{A}^{D}(A)\);
(iv) let \(\delta^{D}\) be the unique coaction on \(A^{D}\) making \(Q_{A}^{D}\) equivariant.

Proof. This follows quickly from the following two observations: \((D, \zeta, V)\) is also a regular equivariant \(R\)-coaction, and the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{\delta^{R}} & A \otimes_{\text{max}} C^{\ast}(G) \\
\delta & \downarrow Q_{A} & \downarrow \text{id} \otimes_{\text{max}} V \\
A \otimes C^{\ast}(G) & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes V} & A \otimes D
\end{array}
\]

commutes. \(\square\)

Moreover, if not only \(D\) is nuclear but also \(\zeta\) is normal, then the tensor \(D\) coaction functor is familiar to us, as shown in the following corollary.

Corollary 4.12. If \((D, \zeta, V)\) is an equivariant coaction such that \(D\) is nuclear and \(\zeta\) is normal, then the tensor \(D\) coaction functor is naturally isomorphic to normalization.

Proof. Since

\[
\text{normalization} \circ \text{maximalization} \simeq \text{normalization},
\]

by construction of \(\tau^{D}\) it suffices, without loss of generality, to start with a maximal coaction \((A, \delta)\) and show that \((A^{D}, \delta^{D})\) is normal. For this, note that we have a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{A^{D}} & A^{D} \\
\downarrow & \downarrow \Lambda^{D} & \downarrow \Lambda^{D} \\
A^{\ast} & \xrightarrow{(Q_{A}^{D})^{\ast}} & (Q_{A}^{D})^{\ast} \circ \Lambda^{D}
\end{array}
\]

and it then follows that \(\Lambda^{D}\) is an isomorphism. \(\square\)

At the opposite extreme, we have the following elementary observation.
Proposition 4.13. Taking $(D, \zeta, V) = (C^*(G), \delta_G^\circ, \text{id})$, we see that the associated tensor $D$ functor $\tau^{C^*(G)}$ is naturally equivalent to maximalization, and is consequently the largest coaction functor.

Proof. This is immediate, since the functor $\sigma^{C^*(G)}$ is obviously naturally equivalent to the identify functor on maximal coactions. □

In preparation for the next theorem, we make some observations about various functors that have appeared, and we introduce a new one. First, given an action $(B, \alpha)$, in [KLQ21, Definition 4.12] we introduced the dual $R$-coaction $R(\alpha)$ on the full crossed product $B \rtimes_\alpha G$:

$$
R(\alpha) \circ i_B(b) = i_B(b) \otimes_{\text{max}} 1 \quad \text{for } b \in B
$$

$$
R(\alpha) \circ i_G(s) = i_G(s) \otimes_{\text{max}} s \quad \text{for } s \in G.
$$

It is easy to see that this gives a functor $R(\cdot)$ from actions to $R$-coactions, taking an action $(B, \alpha)$ to the $R$-coaction $(B \rtimes_\alpha G, R(\alpha))$ and a morphism $\phi: (B, \alpha) \to (C, \beta)$ to the morphism

$$
\phi \rtimes G: (B \rtimes_\alpha G, R(\alpha)) \to (C \rtimes_\beta G, R(\beta)).
$$

Combining this with [KLQ21] Theorem 5.19, it is furthermore easy to see that the functors $R(\cdot)$ and $(R(\cdot)) \circ (\rtimes G)$ coincide, where $\rtimes G$ is the functor

$$
(B, \alpha) \mapsto (B \rtimes_\alpha G, \tilde{\alpha})
$$

from actions to coactions.

Next, on the category of maximal coactions, the maximalization functor is naturally isomorphic to the identify functor. Consequently, on the category of maximal coactions we have

$$
\tau^D \simeq \text{standardization} \circ TD \circ \text{R-ification}.
$$

Composing with the full-crossed-product functor $\rtimes G$ on actions, we get

$$
\tau^D \circ \rtimes G \simeq \text{standardization} \circ TD \circ \text{R-ification} \circ \rtimes G
$$

$$
\simeq \text{standardization} \circ TD \circ R(\cdot),
$$

by [KLQ21] Theorem 5.19, where $R(\cdot)$ is the functor introduced above.

Finally, we need to embellish the $C$-crossed product to include an appropriate coaction. Since $\psi: B \to B \otimes_{\text{max}} C$ is $\alpha - (\alpha \otimes_{\text{max}} \gamma)$ equivariant, the crossed product is equivariant for the dual coactions:

$$
\psi \rtimes G: (B \rtimes_\alpha G, \tilde{\alpha}) \to ((B \otimes_{\text{max}} C) \rtimes_{\alpha \otimes_{\text{max}} \gamma} G, \alpha \otimes_{\text{max}} \gamma).
$$

Then there is a unique coaction $\alpha^C$ on the image $B \rtimes_{\alpha, C} G$ such that $\psi \rtimes G$ is $\tilde{\alpha} - \alpha^C$ equivariant. So, the $C$-crossed product functor becomes

$$
\rtimes_C G: (B, \alpha) \mapsto (B \rtimes_{\alpha, C} G, \alpha^C).
$$
We are ready to show that our approach using tensor $D$ coaction functors is compatible with $C$-crossed product functors for actions:

**Theorem 4.14.** Let $(C, \gamma)$ be an action of $G$ with $C$ unital, and let $(D, \zeta, V) = (C \rtimes_G \gamma, \hat{\gamma}, i_G)$.

Then the composition of the full-crossed-product functor with the tensor $D$ functor is naturally isomorphic to the $C$-crossed-product functor.

**Proof.** By the discussion preceding the theorem, it suffices to find a natural isomorphism

$$\text{standardization} \circ TD \circ R(\cdot) \simeq \rtimes_C G.$$ 

Let $(B, \alpha)$ be an action, and let $\psi: B \to B \otimes_{\text{max}} C$ be the $\alpha - (\alpha \otimes \gamma)$ equivariant homomorphism $a \mapsto a \otimes 1$. Consider the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\downarrow \psi \times G \\
(B \rtimes_{\alpha} G)^{TD} \xrightarrow{\vartheta_B} B \rtimes_{\alpha,C} G \\
\downarrow \left( B \otimes_{\text{max}} C \right) \rtimes_{\alpha \otimes \gamma} G \\
M((B \rtimes_{\alpha} G) \otimes_{\text{max}} (C \rtimes_{\gamma} G)) \xrightarrow{\vartheta_B} M((B \otimes_{\text{max}} C) \rtimes_{\alpha \otimes \gamma} (G \times G)),
\end{array}
\]

where $\iota: G \to G \times G$ is the embedding $s \mapsto (s, s)$, and we want to show that there is a unique isomorphism $\vartheta_B$ making the diagram commute. We will first show that it commutes at the perimeter, and that the isomorphism $\Phi$ of Theorem 3.7 takes $(B \rtimes_{\alpha} G)^{TD}$ onto the image of $B \rtimes_{\alpha,C} G$ under the embedding $i_{B \otimes_{\text{max}} C} \times (i_{G \times G} \circ \iota)$ afforded by Corollary 3.5. This will give a unique isomorphism $\vartheta_B$ making the entire diagram, and in particular the top triangle, commute, as desired.

Then we will show that $\vartheta_B$ is $\alpha^{TD} - \alpha^C$ equivariant.

For the commutativity at the perimeter, it suffices to check the generators: for $b \in B$,

\[
\Phi \circ Q^D(i_B(b)) = \Phi(i_B(b) \otimes 1)
\]

\[
= i_{B \otimes_{\text{max}} C}(b \otimes 1)
\]

\[
= (i_{B \otimes_{\text{max}} C} \times (i_{G \times G} \circ \iota))(i_{B \otimes_{\text{max}} C}(b \otimes 1))
\]

\[
= (i_{B \otimes_{\text{max}} C} \times (i_{G \times G} \circ \iota)) \circ (\psi \times G)(i_B(b)).
\]
and for \( s \in G \),
\[
\Phi \circ Q^D(i_G^α(s)) = \Phi(i_G^α(s) \otimes i_G^γ(s)) = i_{G \times G}(s, s) = (i_{B \otimes_{\max C}^α} \times (i_{G \times G} \circ \iota))(i_G^α \otimes i_G^γ(s)) = (i_{B \otimes_{\max C}^α} \circ (i_{G \times G} \circ \iota)) \circ (\psi \times G)(i_G^α(s)).
\]

The above computations also imply that \( \Phi \) maps \( (B \rtimes^α G)^D \) into the image of \( B \rtimes^α C \) under \( i_{B \otimes_{\max C}^α} \times (i_{G \times G} \circ \iota) \). It is easy to check that in fact it is mapped \textit{onto} the image.

We now have the isomorphism \( \vartheta \), and we need to check that it is natural: let \( \pi: (B, \alpha) \to (E, \beta) \) be a morphism of actions, so that \( \pi: B \to E \) is an \( \alpha - \beta \) equivariant homomorphism. We must show that the diagram
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(B \rtimes^α G)^D & \xrightarrow{(\pi \times G)^D} & (E \rtimes^β G)^D \\
\vartheta_B & & \vartheta_E \\
B \rtimes^α C G & \xrightarrow{\pi \times C G} & E \rtimes^β C G
\end{array}
\]
commutes. This fits into a larger diagram:
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
B \rtimes^α G & \xrightarrow{\tau \times G} & E \rtimes^β G \\
\psi_B \times G & & \psi_E \times G \\
\underline{\downarrow} & & \underline{\downarrow} \\
B \rtimes^α C G & \xrightarrow{\pi \times C G} & E \rtimes^β C G.
\end{array}
\]

As we showed above, the left and right triangles commute.

The upper rectangle commutes since \( Q \) gives a natural transformation from maximalization to the functor \( TD \).

The back rectangle commutes because the bottom arrow is the restriction to \( B \rtimes^α C G \) of the homomorphism
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
B \rtimes^α G & \xrightarrow{\pi \times G} & E \rtimes^β G \\
\psi_B \times G & & \psi_E \times G \\
(B \otimes_{\max C}^α G) \rtimes^α \otimes^γ G & \xrightarrow{(\pi \otimes_{\max C}^α \otimes \text{id}) \times G} & (E \otimes_{\max C}^β G) \rtimes^β \otimes^γ G
\end{array}
\]
commutes by functoriality of crossed products. Since the $Q$ maps are surjective, it follows that the diagram (4.6) — which is the lower rectangle of the diagram (4.7) — commutes, as desired.

Finally, for the equivariance, we must show that the diagram

$$
\begin{array}{c}
(B \rtimes_{\alpha} G)^D \xrightarrow{\hat{\alpha}^D} \tilde{M}((B \rtimes_{\alpha} G) \otimes C^*(G)) \\
\downarrow \vartheta_B \\
B \rtimes_{\alpha,C} G \xrightarrow{\alpha_c} \tilde{M}((B \rtimes_{\alpha,C} G) \otimes C^*(G))
\end{array}
$$

commutes. It fits into a larger diagram

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
(B \rtimes_{\alpha} G)^D \xrightarrow{\hat{\alpha}^D} \tilde{M}((B \rtimes_{\alpha} G) \otimes C^*(G)) \\
\downarrow Q \\
(B \rtimes_{\alpha} G)^D \xrightarrow{\hat{\alpha}^D} \tilde{M}((B \rtimes_{\alpha} G) \otimes C^*(G))
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\downarrow \vartheta_B \\
\downarrow \vartheta_B \otimes \text{id}
\end{array}
\end{array}
$$

(4.8)

in which we know that the top rectangle commutes by construction of $\hat{\alpha}^D$. Since $Q$ is surjective, it thus suffices to show that the outer perimeter of (4.8) commutes, and we do this on generators $i_B(b), i_G(s)$ for $a \in B, s \in G$. Since $\vartheta_B$ is a restriction of (the canonical extension to multipliers of) $\Phi$, and $\alpha^C$ is a restriction of $\alpha \otimes_{\text{max}} \gamma$, for $a \in B$ we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\alpha^C \circ \vartheta_B \circ Q \circ i_B(b) &= \alpha \otimes_{\text{max}} \gamma \circ \Phi \circ (\text{id} \otimes_{\text{max}} V) \circ \hat{\alpha}^R \circ i_B(b) \\
&= \alpha \otimes_{\text{max}} \gamma \circ \Phi \circ (\text{id} \otimes_{\text{max}} V)(i_B(b) \otimes_{\text{max}} 1) \\
&= \alpha \otimes_{\text{max}} \gamma \circ \Phi(i_B(b) \otimes_{\text{max}} 1) \\
&= \alpha \otimes_{\text{max}} \gamma (i_B \otimes_{\text{max}} C(b \otimes_{\text{max}} 1)) \\
&= i_B \otimes_{\text{max}} C(b \otimes_{\text{max}} 1) \\
&= \Phi(i_B(b) \otimes_{\text{max}} 1) \\
&= \Phi \circ Q \circ i_B(b) \\
&= \Phi \otimes \text{id}(Q \circ i_B(b) \otimes 1) \\
&= (\Phi \otimes \text{id}) \circ (Q \otimes \text{id})(i_B(b) \otimes 1) \\
&= (\Phi \otimes \text{id}) \circ (Q \otimes \text{id}) \circ \hat{\alpha} \circ i_B(b) \\
&= (\vartheta_B \otimes \text{id}) \circ (Q \otimes \text{id}) \circ \hat{\alpha} \circ i_B(b)
\end{align*}
$$
and
\[
\alpha^C \circ \vartheta_B \circ Q \circ i_G(s) = \alpha \otimes_{\max} \gamma \circ \Phi \circ (\text{id} \otimes_{\max} V) \circ \alpha^R \circ i_G(s)
\]
\[
= \alpha \otimes_{\max} \gamma \circ \Phi \circ (\text{id} \otimes_{\max} i^\gamma_G)(i^\alpha_G(s) \otimes_{\max} \text{id})
\]
\[
= \alpha \otimes_{\max} \gamma \circ \Phi(i^\alpha_G(s) \otimes_{\max} i^\gamma_G(s))
\]
\[
= \alpha \otimes_{\max} \gamma \circ i_{G \times G}(s, s)
\]
\[
= \alpha \otimes_{\max} \gamma \circ i^\otimes_{\max} i^\gamma_G(s) \quad (\text{see Remark 3.6})
\]
\[
= i^\otimes_{\max} i^\gamma_G(s) \otimes s
\]
\[
= i_{G \times G}(s, s) \otimes s
\]
\[
= \Phi \left( i^\otimes_{\max} i^\gamma_G(s) \otimes s \right)
\]
\[
= (\Phi \otimes \text{id}) \left( i^\otimes_{\max} i^\gamma_G(s) \otimes s \right)
\]
\[
= (\Phi \otimes \text{id}) \left( (\text{id} \otimes V)(i^\alpha_G(s) \otimes_{\max} \text{id}) \otimes s \right)
\]
\[
\text{(where } i_G \text{ now means } i^\otimes_{\max} i^\gamma_G(s))
\]
\[
= (\Phi \otimes \text{id}) \circ (\text{id} \otimes V) \circ \alpha^R \circ \text{id} \circ i_G(s) \otimes s
\]
\[
= (\Phi \otimes \text{id}) \circ (Q \otimes \text{id}) \circ i_G(s) \otimes s
\]
\[
= (\Phi \otimes \text{id}) \circ (Q \otimes \text{id}) \circ \alpha \circ i_G(s)
\]
\[
= (\vartheta_B \otimes \text{id}) \circ (Q \otimes \text{id}) \otimes \alpha \circ i_G(s).
\]

\[\square\]

Remark 4.15. In [KLQ20, Proposition 3.4] we proved that, for discrete \( G \), if \((B, \alpha) \) and \((C, \gamma) \) are two actions of \( G \), then
\[
(B \rtimes_{\alpha} G) \otimes_{G} (C \rtimes_{\gamma} G) \simeq (B \otimes_{\max} C) \rtimes_{\alpha \otimes \gamma} G,
\]
where the \( G \)-balanced tensor product \((B \rtimes_{\alpha} G) \otimes_{G} (C \rtimes_{\gamma} G)\) is the closed span in \((B \rtimes_{\alpha} G) \otimes_{\max} (C \rtimes_{\gamma} G)\) of products \(i_B(b)i^\alpha_G(s)i_C(c)i^\gamma_G(s)\) for \(b \in B, c \in C, s \in G\), and then we went on to use this isomorphism to prove that the tensor \( D \) coaction functors for a discrete group allow us to reproduce the \( C \) -crossed-product functors upon composing with full crossed product. In Theorem 4.14 above we used Theorem 3.7 in a similar way, for arbitrary locally compact groups. In this paper we would not want to try to prove an analogue of [KLQ20, Proposition 3.4], because it would require us to define \( G \)-balanced tensor products of coactions, which would be significantly harder for non-discrete \( G \). Luckily, we have Theorem 3.7 for our present purposes. On the other hand, in [KLQ20] it would not have been convenient to use an approach similar to Theorem 4.14 below, because it would require all of the \( R \)-coaction technology we develop in the next section.
5. Exactness

In this section we prove that the tensor $D$ functors $\tau^D$ are exact. As we mentioned in the introduction, our proof will require a long traverse through equivariant $C^*$-correspondences, natural Morita equivalence of functors, crossed-product duality, and the known fact that the $C$-crossed products are exact functors.

Before we formally implement our strategy, we pause to give a rough explanation of why it is necessary, and what we must expect to be involved. We aim to parlay exactness of $C$-crossed-product functors into exactness of tensor $D$ coaction functors. This is certainly plausible, since every $C$-crossed product factors through an associated tensor $D$ functor. Moreover, by crossed-product duality every maximal coaction is Morita equivalent to a dual coaction, and this leads quickly to the suspicion that every tensor $D$ functor is exact. However, we must keep in mind that since everything must be functorial, we must introduce a sufficient amount of categorical technology. To make all this work will take a significant amount of effort.

We start with a discussion of Morita equivalence between coaction functors. We adopt the following conventions: all our $A-B$ correspondences $X$ will be assumed to be nondegenerate in the sense that $AX = X$. (Recall that the corresponding property $XB = X$ follows automatically from the existence of the inner product.) Also, we adopt the convention that if $\phi: A \to B$ is a homomorphism then the $A-B$ correspondence $\phi B$ is the Hilbert $B$-module $\phi(A)B$ equipped with the left $A$-module structure given by

$$a \cdot b = \phi(a)b \quad \text{for } a \in A, b \in \phi(A)B.$$ 

Next, we will adapt to our present context of $R$-coactions the concept of correspondence coactions (see [EKQR06, Definition 2.10]). To prepare for this we review the basics of correspondence multipliers (see [EKQR06, Section 1.2]). If $X$ is an $A-B$ correspondence, the multiplier correspondence is defined as

$$M(X) = \mathcal{L}_B(B, X).$$

$M(X)$ becomes an $M(A) - M(B)$ correspondence as follows: for $m \in M(A), p, q \in M(X), n \in M(B), b \in B$,

$$(mp)(b) = mp(b)$$

$$(pn)(b) = p(nb)$$

$$\langle p, q \rangle_{M(B)} = p^* q.$$
If \(X\) and \(Y\) are \(A - B\) and \(C - D\) correspondences, respectively, and \(\phi: A \to M(C)\) and \(\psi: B \to M(D)\) are nondegenerate homomorphisms, then a linear map \(\Phi: X \to M(Y)\) is a \(\phi - \psi\) compatible correspondence homomorphism if it is an \(A - B\) bimodule map such that

\[
\langle \Phi(x), \Phi(y) \rangle_{M(D)} = \psi(\langle x, y \rangle_B) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X.
\]

\(\Phi\) is nondegenerate if \(\text{span}\{\Phi(X)D\} = Y\).

We review here some of the basic facts concerning maximal tensor products \(X \otimes_{\text{max}} Y\) of correspondences. This was not easy to find in the published literature. Two particularly useful references [AF17, KR02] were written in the context of \(C^*\)-ternary rings, which were introduced by Zettl [Zet83]. These two papers did specifically study maximal tensor products: [AF17, Section 5.2], [KR02, Section 5]. In an earlier (perhaps never to be published) preprint, Abadie [AV] defines tensor products of correspondences using arbitrary \(C^*\)-tensor products of the \(C^*\)-algebras, using \(C^*\)-ternary rings as the main tool. Also, there is a brief remark [RW98, Hooptedoodle 3.41] regarding maximal tensor products of imprimitivity bimodules.

As explained in [AF17, Section 4], \(C^*\)-ternary rings and imprimitivity bimodules are equivalent concepts. In particular, given \(A - B\) and \(C - D\) imprimitivity bimodules \(X\) and \(Y\), respectively, the \((A \otimes_{\text{max}} C) - (B \otimes_{\text{max}} D)\) imprimitivity bimodule \(X \otimes_{\text{max}} Y\) corresponds to the maximal tensor product of the associated \(C^*\)-ternary rings. We must deal with more general \(C^*\)-correspondences, although we do always assume that they are nondegenerate. Let \(X\) be an \(A - B\) correspondence, with associated ideal \(B_X = \overline{\text{span}\{X,X\}}_B\) of \(B\), and denote by \(K_X\) the \(C^*\)-algebra \(\mathcal{K}(X)\) of compact adjointable operators, so that \(X\) may be viewed as a \(K_X - B_X\) imprimitivity bimodule, and similarly we can regard the \(C - D\) correspondence \(Y\) as a \(K_Y - D_Y\) imprimitivity bimodule. Then as in [AF17, KR02] we can form the associated \((K_X \otimes_{\text{max}} K_Y) - (B_X \otimes_{\text{max}} D_Y)\) imprimitivity bimodule \(X \otimes_{\text{max}} Y\). Since \(B_X \otimes_{\text{max}} D_Y\) can be canonically identified with an ideal of \(B \otimes_{\text{max}} D\), the right-module structure on \(X \otimes_{\text{max}} Y\) extends uniquely to \(B \otimes_{\text{max}} D\), so \(X \otimes_{\text{max}} Y\) may be regarded as a Hilbert \((B \otimes_{\text{max}} D)\)-module. On the other hand, the homomorphism \(\phi_X: A \to \mathcal{L}(X)\) may be regarded as a nondegenerate homomorphism \(\phi_Y: C \to M(K_Y)\), and similarly for \(\phi_Y: C \to M(K_Y)\), so we can form the maximal tensor product

\[
\phi_X \otimes_{\text{max}} \phi_Y: A \otimes_{\text{max}} C \to M(K_X \otimes_{\text{max}} K_Y) = \mathcal{L}(X \otimes_{\text{max}} Y).
\]

Thus we get an \((A \otimes_{\text{max}} B) - (C \otimes_{\text{max}} D)\) correspondence \(X \otimes_{\text{max}} Y\).

Now we adapt the basics of correspondence coactions (see [EKQR06, Section 2.3]) to \(R\)-coactions. The entire development in [EKQR06] ...
carries over without pain. If \((A, \delta)\) and \((B, \varepsilon)\) are R-coactions and \(X\) is an \(A - B\) correspondence, then an \((A, \delta) - (B, \varepsilon)\) coaction on \(X\) is a nondegenerate \(\delta - \varepsilon\) compatible correspondence homomorphism \(\zeta: X \to M(X \otimes_{\text{max}} C^*(G))\) such that

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{span}\{(1_{M(A)} \otimes_{\text{max}} C^*(G))\zeta(X)\} &= X \otimes_{\text{max}} C^*(G) \\
(\zeta \otimes \text{id}) \circ \zeta &= (\text{id} \otimes_{\text{max}} \delta_R G) \circ \zeta.
\end{align*}
\]

Note that here we have built nondegeneracy of the correspondence coaction ([EKQR06, Definition 2.10] directly into the definition, as is common nowadays with \(C^*\)-coactions. Further, an \((A, \delta) - (B, \varepsilon)\) correspondence coaction \((X, \zeta)\) is called an \((A, \delta) - (B, \varepsilon)\) imprimitivity bimodule if \(X\) is an \(A - B\) imprimitivity bimodule.

If \(X\) and \(Y\) are \(A - B\) and \(B - C\) correspondences, respectively, and \(D\) is a \(C^*\)-algebra, then there is a unique \((A \otimes_{\text{max}} D) - (C \otimes_{\text{max}} D)\) correspondence isomorphism

\[
\Theta: (X \otimes_{\text{max}} D) \otimes_{B \otimes_{\text{max}} D} (Y \otimes_{\text{max}} D) \to (X \otimes_B Y) \otimes_{\text{max}} D
\]

such that

\[
\Theta((x \otimes_{\text{max}} d) \otimes_{B \otimes_{\text{max}} D} (y \otimes_{\text{max}} e)) = (x \otimes_B y) \otimes_{\text{max}} de
\]

for all \(x \in X, y \in Y, d, e \in D\). For minimal tensor products, this is [EKQR06, Lemma 2.12]. We use the auxiliary map \(\Theta\) to form the balanced tensor product of correspondence coactions: given R-coactions \((A, \delta), (B, \varepsilon),\) and \((C, \mu),\) if \((X, \zeta)\) and \((Y, \eta)\) are \((A, \delta) - (B, \varepsilon)\) and \((B, \varepsilon) - (C, \mu)\) correspondence coactions, respectively, then

\[
\zeta \sharp_B \eta := \Theta \circ (\zeta \otimes_B \eta)
\]

is an \((A, \delta) - (C, \mu)\) correspondence coaction on \(X \otimes_B Y\). For minimal tensor products, this is [EKQR06, Proposition 2.13].

**Definition 5.1.** Let \((A, \delta), (B, \varepsilon), (C, \mu),\) and \((D, \nu)\) be R-coactions, and let \((X, \zeta)\) and \((Y, \eta)\) be \((A, \delta) - (C, \mu)\) and \((B, \varepsilon) - (D, \nu)\) imprimitivity bimodules, respectively. Further let \(\phi: A \to B\) and \(\psi: C \to D\) be \(\delta - \varepsilon\) and \(\mu - \nu\) equivariant homomorphisms, respectively. We say that the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(A, \delta) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & (B, \varepsilon) \\
\downarrow (X, \zeta) & & \downarrow (Y, \eta) \\
(C, \mu) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & (D, \nu)
\end{array}
\]

*commutes* if there is an isomorphism

\[(\phi_B \otimes_{B \otimes_B Y} \varepsilon \sharp_B \eta) \simeq (X \otimes_{C \otimes D} \zeta \sharp_{C \otimes D} \nu)
\]

of \((A, \delta) - (D, \nu)\) correspondence coactions.
Remark 5.2. We could have stated the above definition for correspondences $X,Y$ rather than imprimitivity bimodules, but we do not have an application of this extra generality.

Remark 5.3. Because we want all our correspondences to be nondegenerate, we need to adapt to maximal tensor products the technical lemma [EKQR06, Lemma 2.24] to see that, for example, the restriction of $\varepsilon$ to the nondegenerate $A-B$ correspondence $Z = \rho B$ is a correspondence coaction (which would be denoted by $\varepsilon_Z$ in [EKQR06]). Then in the commutativity condition

$$\varepsilon \cdot_B \eta \simeq \zeta \cdot_C \nu,$$

the coactions $\varepsilon$ and $\nu$ should be regarded as referring to their restrictions in the above sense.

For the remainder of this section we return to coactions:

Definition 5.4. Let $\tau$ and $\sigma$ be coaction functors. A natural $\tau -$ $\sigma$ Morita equivalence is an assignment to each coaction $(A,\delta)$ of an $(A^\tau,\delta^\tau) - (A^\sigma,\delta^\sigma)$ imprimitivity bimodule $(X_{(A,\delta)},\zeta_{(A,\delta)})$ such that for any morphism $\phi: (A,\delta) \rightarrow (B,\varepsilon)$ the diagram

$$(A^\tau,\delta^\tau) \xrightarrow{\phi^\tau} (B^\tau,\varepsilon^\tau)$$

$$(X_{(A,\delta)},\zeta_{(A,\delta)}) \downarrow \quad \downarrow (X_{(B,\varepsilon)},\zeta_{(B,\varepsilon)})$$

$$(A^\sigma,\delta^\sigma) \xrightarrow{\phi^\sigma} (B^\sigma,\varepsilon^\sigma)$$

commutes in the sense of Definition 5.1. If such a natural Morita equivalence $X$ exists, we say that $\tau$ and $\sigma$ are naturally Morita equivalent, written $\tau \sim_{ME} \sigma$.

The following definition is standard in coaction theory; we record it formally for convenient reference.

Definition 5.5. If $(A,\delta)$ is a coaction, then an ideal $I$ of $A$ is called strongly $\delta$-invariant if $\text{span}\{\delta(I)(I \otimes C^*(G)) = I \otimes C^*(G)$, and a coaction functor $\tau$ is said to have the ideal property if for every coaction $(A,\delta)$ and every strongly $\delta$-invariant ideal $I$ of $A$, the map $\iota^\tau: I^\tau \rightarrow A^\tau$ associated to the inclusion map $\iota: I \hookrightarrow A$ is injective.

Corollary 5.6. Let $\tau$ and $\sigma$ be naturally Morita equivalent coaction functors having the ideal property. Then $\tau$ is exact if and only if $\sigma$ is exact.
Proof. Since the category of coactions has objects consisting of $C^*$-algebras with extra structure, and since the morphisms are $C^*$-homomorphisms preserving structure, it suffices to prove the following: if we have a diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \rightarrow & I & \xrightarrow{\phi} & A & \xrightarrow{\psi} & C & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow{y} & & \downarrow{x} & & \downarrow{z} & & \\
0 & \rightarrow & J & \xrightarrow{\rho} & B & \xrightarrow{\pi} & D & \rightarrow & 0,
\end{array}
\]

where

- the horizontal arrows are $C^*$-homomorphisms,
- $\phi$ and $\rho$ are isomorphisms onto ideals of $A$ and $B$ respectively,
- $\psi$ and $\pi$ are surjective,
- $\psi \circ \phi$ and $\pi \circ \rho$ are both $0$,
- $Y, X, Z$ are imprimitivity bimodules,
- and the squares commute in the sense of Definition 5.4,

then the top sequence is exact if and only if the bottom sequence is exact. Moreover, by symmetry it suffices to prove that if the bottom is exact then so is the top.

By hypothesis, we can identify $I$ with an ideal of $A$ and $\phi$ with the inclusion map, and similarly for $J$. We are assuming that $\ker \pi = J$, and we must show that $\ker \psi = I$.

Routine computations, similar to [EKQR06, discussion preceding Proposition 2.27], show that we can identify $\phi A \otimes_A X$ with the $I-B$ correspondence $IX$, whose left $I$-module structure is given by

\[ c \cdot x = \phi(c)x \quad \text{for } c \in I, x \in IX. \]

Similarly (see for example [EKQR06, discussion following Remark 2.31]), we can identify $Y \otimes_J \rho B$ with the $I-B$ correspondence $Y$, with the same inner product but right $B$-module structure given by

\[ y \cdot b = y' \cdot (cb), \]

where $y = y'c$ is any factorization of $y$ with $y' \in Y$ and $c \in J$, which is possible by the Hewitt-Cohen factorization theorem because $Y$ is a nondegenerate right $J$-module. Then we have an isomorphism $Y \simeq IX$ as $I-B$ correspondences. Thus

\[ XJ = X\langle IX, IX \rangle_B = A\langle X, IX \rangle IX = A\langle X, X \rangle IX = AI IX = IX, \]

where we use, e.g., $\langle X, X \rangle$ to denote the closed span of the inner products. Therefore

\[ (5.1) \quad X\text{-Ind} J = A\langle X, XJ \rangle = A\langle X, IX \rangle = A\langle X, X \rangle I = AI = I. \]
Routine computations show that we can identify \(\pi C \otimes C Z\) with the \(A \rightarrow D\) correspondence \(Z\), with left \(A\)-module structure given by
\[
a \cdot z = \psi(a)z \quad \text{for } a \in A, z \in Z.
\]
On the other hand, following the standard \(A \rightarrow B\) correspondence isomorphism
\[
X \cong X \otimes_B B
\]
with the surjective correspondence homomorphism
\[
\text{id}_X \otimes_B \pi : A(X \otimes_B B)_B \rightarrow A(X \otimes_B C)_C
\]
gives a correspondence homomorphism
\[
\Upsilon : AX_B \rightarrow A(X \otimes_B D)_D
\]
with right-hand coefficient homomorphism \(\pi : B \rightarrow D\). Combining with an isomorphism \(\Psi : X \otimes_B \pi D \rightarrow \psi C \otimes_C Y\), whose existence is hypothesized, we get a correspondence homomorphism \(\Gamma\) with right-hand coefficient homomorphism \(\pi\) that makes the diagram
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \xrightarrow{\Gamma} & Z \\
\Upsilon \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
X \otimes_B \pi D & \approx & \psi C \otimes_C Z
\end{array}
\]
commute. It now follows from [EKQR06, Lemma 1.20] that
\[
X-\text{Ind ker } \pi = \ker \psi.
\]
Since \(\ker \pi = J\), combining with (5.1) gives \(\ker \psi = I\), as required. \(\Box\)

**Remark 5.7.** Note that the proof of Corollary 5.6 is similar to that of [KLQ20, Lemma 4.1].

**Maximized coaction functors.** For the remainder of this paper, we use the notation Max to refer to the maximalization coaction functor.

**Definition 5.8.** We say that a coaction functor \(\tau\) is maximized if it is naturally isomorphic to
\[
\tau \circ \text{Max}.
\]

**Example 5.9.** The maximalization and normalization functors are maximized.

**Example 5.10.** Let \(E\) be a large ideal of \(B(G)\). Then the \(E\)-ization functor (see [KLQ16a, Definition 6.12]) is maximized.

The following lemma shows how maximized coaction functors usually arise:
Lemma 5.11. Let $\sigma$ be a functor from maximal coactions to coactions, let $\mu$ be a natural surjection from the identity functor (on maximal coactions) to $\sigma$ such that for every maximal coaction $(A, \delta)$ we have $\ker \mu_A \subseteq \ker \Lambda_A$, where $\Lambda_A : A \to A^n$ is the normalization, and let $\tau = \sigma \circ \text{Max}$ be the associated coaction functor. Then $\tau$ is maximized.

Proof. We have

$$\tau \circ \text{Max} = \sigma \circ \text{Max} \circ \text{Max} \simeq \sigma \circ \text{Max} = \tau.$$  

Let CPC be the functor from maximal coactions to actions, defined on objects by

$$(A, \delta) \mapsto (A \rtimes_\delta G, \widehat{\delta})$$

and on morphisms by

$$\phi \mapsto \phi \rtimes G,$$

and similarly for the full-crossed-product functor CPA from actions to maximal coactions. Then both functors CPC and CPA are exact, as noted in [KLQ16a, Examples 3.18 and 3.19]; as those examples mention, the exactness for actions goes back to [Gre78, Proposition 12], and for coactions it is [Nil99, Theorem 2.3]. Further, the composed functor $\text{CPC} \circ \text{CPA}$ on maximal coactions is naturally Morita equivalent to the identity functor, by crossed-product duality.

Theorem 5.12. A maximized coaction functor $\tau$ is exact if and only if the crossed-product functor

$$\tau \circ \text{CPA} : \text{actions} \to \text{coactions}$$

is exact.

Proof. We already know that if $\tau$ is exact then so is $\tau \circ \text{CPA}$, so suppose that $\tau \circ \text{CPA}$ is exact. Then

$$\tau \simeq \tau \circ \text{Max} \sim \tau \circ \text{CPA} \circ \text{CPC} \circ \text{Max} \quad \text{(since CPC} \circ \text{CPA} \underset{\text{ME}}{\simeq} \text{id}).$$

Since $\tau \circ \text{CPA}$ is exact by assumption, and both CPC and Max are exact in general, the composition $\tau \circ \text{CPA} \circ \text{CPC} \circ \text{Max}$ is exact, and hence the naturally Morita equivalent functor $\tau$ is exact, by Corollary 5.6. 

Corollary 5.13. Every tensor $D$ coaction functor $\tau^D$ is exact.

Proof. By Proposition 4.5, up to isomorphism we have

$$(D, \zeta, V) \simeq (C \rtimes_\gamma G, \widehat{\gamma}, i_G)$$

for some action $(C, \gamma)$ with $C$ unital. Then $\tau^D \circ \text{CPA}$ is the $C$-crossed-product functor $\rtimes C$, which is exact [BGW16, Lemma 5.4]. Therefore $\tau^D$ is exact by Theorem 5.12. 

6. The Smallest Tensor $D$ Functor

In [BEW18, Lemma 9.1] Buss, Echterhoff, and Willet prove that among all $C$-crossed-product functors, the smallest is for the action of right translation on the $C^*$-algebra $UCB_r(G)$ of right uniformly continuous bounded functions. (Actually, they use left instead of right, but we switched the direction for our own convenience, which causes no harm.) We will “recover” this minimality result using our coaction-functor approach; more precisely, we will prove that among all tensor $D$ coaction functors, the smallest is obtained when the equivariant coaction $(D,\zeta,V)$ is

$$
(UCB_r(G) \rtimes \mathcal{G}, \hat{rt}, i_G),
$$

where we use the notation $\rtimes$ for the action of $G$ on $UCB_r(G)$ by right translation. First, recall from [KLQ16a, Definition 4.7, Lemma 4.8] that an inequality $\tau \leq \sigma$ between coaction functors means that for every coaction $(A,\delta)$ there is a homomorphism $\Gamma$ making the diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
A^m & \xrightarrow{q^\sigma_A} & A^\sigma \\
\downarrow & & \searrow \\
A^\tau & \xrightarrow{\Gamma} & A^\tau
\end{array}
$$

commute, and if $S$ is a family of coaction functors and $\tau \in S$, we say that $\tau$ is the smallest element of $S$ if $\tau \leq \sigma$ for all $\sigma \in S$.

This partial ordering of coaction functors is compatible with the partial ordering of action-crossed-product functors in the sense that an inequality between crossed products induces the same inequality between the corresponding coaction functors. We introduce some notation in preparation for Theorem 6.1. Let $UCB_r(G)$ denote the commutative $C^*$-algebra of right uniformly continuous functions on $G$. Then $C_0(G) \subseteq UCB_r(G)$, and the action $rt$ of $G$ on $C_0(G)$ by right translation extends to an action on $UCB_r(G)$; to help keep things straight we will denote this extended action by $\rtimes$. Let $C$ be a $C^*$-algebra, and let $UCB_r(G,C)$ denote the $C^*$-algebra of right uniformly continuous bounded functions from $G$ to $C$. We have inclusions

$$
C \otimes C_0(G) = C_0(G,C) \subseteq UCB_r(G,C) \subseteq C_0(G,C) \subseteq M(C \otimes C_0(G)),
$$

and in view of this we write $id \otimes rt$ for the extension of the diagonal action $id \otimes rt$ from $C \otimes C_0(G)$ to $UCB_r(G,C)$. We must take care, however, because $C \otimes UCB_r(G)$ is typically a proper $C^*$-subalgebra of $UCB_r(G,C)$. 
Now suppose that we have an action \((C, \gamma)\) of \(G\). Define a homomorphism \(\psi: C \to UCB_t(G, C)\) by
\[
\psi(c)(s) = \gamma_s(c) \quad \text{for} \quad c \in C, s \in G.
\]
Then \(\psi\) is nondegenerate and \(\gamma \cdot (\text{id} \otimes \widehat{\text{rt}})\) equivariant, so we have a crossed-product homomorphism
\[
\psi \rtimes G: C \rtimes_G UCB_t(G, C) \to UCB_t(G, C) \rtimes \text{id} \otimes \widehat{\text{rt}} G.
\]
We want to compose this with other homomorphisms. However, combinations of inclusions and full crossed products are delicate, so we proceed slowly.\(^1\) Since \(UCB_t(G, C)\) sits equivariantly as a nondegenerate subalgebra of \(M(C \otimes C_0(G))\), we get a natural homomorphism
\[
UCB_t(G, C) \rtimes \text{id} \otimes \widehat{\text{rt}} G \to M\left(\left(C \otimes C_0(G)\right) \rtimes \text{id} \otimes \widehat{\text{rt}} G\right).
\]
We apply a standard isomorphism:
\[
\left(C \otimes C_0(G)\right) \rtimes \text{id} \otimes \widehat{\text{rt}} G \cong C \otimes_{\text{max}} \left(C_0(G) \rtimes \text{id} \otimes \widehat{\text{rt}} G\right).
\]
Note that we used the maximal tensor product on the right-hand side, since we are using full crossed products. In fact, however, in this case we happen to be tensoring with the nuclear algebra \(C_0(G) \rtimes \text{id} \otimes \widehat{\text{rt}} G = \mathcal{K}(L^2(G))\). Continuing, the equivariant inclusion \(C_0(G) \hookrightarrow UCB_t(G)\) gives rise to a canonical homomorphism
\[
C \otimes_{\text{max}} \left(C_0(G) \rtimes \text{id} \otimes \widehat{\text{rt}} G\right) \to C \otimes_{\text{max}} \left(UCB_t(G) \rtimes \widehat{\text{rt}} G\right).
\]
In fact, this homomorphism is injective. To see this, note that \(C_0(G)\) is an invariant ideal of \(UCB_t(G)\), so the full crossed product \(C_0(G) \rtimes \text{id} \otimes \widehat{\text{rt}} G\) embeds as an ideal of \(UCB_t(G) \rtimes \widehat{\text{rt}} G\), and maximal tensor products enjoy the following abstract property: if \(I\) is an ideal of \(B\) then \(C \otimes_{\text{max}} I\) embeds as an ideal of \(C \otimes_{\text{max}} B\).

Composing the above homomorphisms, we get a homomorphism
\[
\Psi: C \rtimes_G UCB_t(G) \to M\left(\left(C \otimes_{\text{max}} \left(UCB_t(G) \rtimes \widehat{\text{rt}} G\right)\right)\right).
\]

**Theorem 6.1.** Let \((D, \zeta, V) = (E, \eta, W)\), where \(E = UCB_t(G) \rtimes \text{rt} G, \eta = \widehat{\text{rt}},\) and \(W = \overline{\eta}^G_G: G \to M(E)\). Then \(\tau^E\) is the smallest among all tensor \(D\) functors.

**Proof.** Let \((D, \zeta, V)\) be a regular equivariant maximal R-coaction. Since by definition the coaction functors \(\tau^D\) and \(\tau^E\) are formed by first maximalizing and then applying the surjections \(Q^D\) and \(Q^E\), by [KLQ16a].

\(^1\)An example of the pitfalls: regrettably, [KLQ20, Lemma 5.1 and Theorem 5.2] have a (correctable) error: \(C \otimes_{\text{max}} \ell^\infty(G)\) should be replaced by \(M(C \otimes C_0(G))\), and similarly throughout these two results and their proofs.
Lemma 4.8] it suffices to show that for every maximal coaction \((A, \delta)\) there is a homomorphism \(\Gamma\) making the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{Q^D} & A^D \\
\downarrow \Gamma & & \downarrow \delta \\
A^E & \xrightarrow{Q^E} & A^E
\end{array}
\]

commute.

By Proposition 4.5, we can assume that we have an action \((C, \gamma)\) with \(C\) unital such that \(D = C \rtimes \gamma \mathbb{G}, \zeta = R(\gamma), \) and \(V = i_G^\gamma.\) The discussion preceding the present theorem gives us a nondegenerate homomorphism \(\Psi: D \to M(C \otimes_{\max} E),\)

and it is routine to verify that

\[\Psi \circ V = 1 \otimes_{\max} W.\]

Taking maximal tensor products gives a homomorphism

\[\text{id} \otimes_{\max} \Psi: A \otimes_{\max} D \to M(A \otimes_{\max} C \otimes_{\max} E)\]

such that

\[(\text{id} \otimes_{\max} \Psi) \circ (\text{id} \otimes_{\max} V) = \text{id} \otimes_{\max} \Psi \circ V = \text{id} \otimes_{\max} 1 \otimes_{\max} W.\]

It follows that the composition

\[\Phi = (\text{id} \otimes_{\max} \Psi) \circ Q^D = (\text{id} \otimes_{\max} \Psi) \circ (\text{id} \otimes_{\max} V) \circ \delta\]

has image in \(M(A \otimes_{\max} C \otimes_{\max} E).\) In support of the latter assertion, we again err on the side of caution by inserting a bit more detail. Note that \(Q^D(A)\) is contained in the strict closure of

\[(\text{id} \circ V)(A \circ C^*(\mathbb{G})) = A \circ V(C^*(\mathbb{G})).\]

Thus \(\Phi(A)\) is contained in the strict closure of

\[A \circ \Psi(V(C^*(\mathbb{G}))) \subseteq A \circ 1 \circ E.\]

Using the obvious isomorphism

\[\sigma: A \otimes_{\max} 1 \otimes_{\max} E \xrightarrow{\sim} A \otimes_{\max} E,\]

we see that

\[\sigma \circ (\text{id} \otimes_{\max} \Psi) \circ Q^D = \sigma \circ (\text{id} \otimes_{\max} C \otimes_{\max} W) \circ \delta\]

\[= (\text{id} \otimes_{\max} W) \circ \delta\]

\[= Q^E,\]

so we can take

\[\Gamma = \sigma \circ (\text{id} \otimes_{\max} \Psi)|_{A^D}.\]
We recover [BEW18, Lemma 9.3] in the following corollary.

**Corollary 6.2 ([BEW18]).** If $G$ is amenable at infinity then the crossed-product functor $(A, \alpha) \mapsto A \rtimes_{\alpha, \text{UCB}_r(G)} G$ is naturally isomorphic to the reduced crossed product $(A, \alpha) \mapsto A \rtimes_{\alpha, r} G$, and is consequently strictly smaller than the full crossed product functor.

**Proof.** When $G$ is amenable at infinity, [AD02, Proposition 3.4 and Theorem 5.3] imply that the equivariant coaction $(\text{UCB}_r(G) \rtimes_{\alpha} G, \overline{\alpha}, \overline{i}^G)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemmas 4.11 and 4.12 of our paper. The proposition follows upon composing with the full crossed product functor. □

**Remark 6.3.** The beginning of the proof of [BEW18, Lemma 9.3] also refers to the above-mentioned results of [AD02].
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