

BOUNDARIES FOR GELFAND TRANSFORM IMAGES OF BANACH ALGEBRAS OF HOLOMORPHIC FUNCTIONS

YUN SUNG CHOI AND MINGU JUNG

ABSTRACT. Let \mathcal{A} be a Banach algebra of bounded holomorphic functions on the open unit ball B_X of a complex Banach space X . Considering the Gelfand transform image $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ of the Banach algebra \mathcal{A} , which is a uniform algebra on the spectrum of \mathcal{A} , we obtain an explicit description of the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ for classical Banach spaces X in the case where \mathcal{A} is a certain Banach algebra, for instance, $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$, $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$. Some possible application of our result to the famous Corona theorem is also briefly discussed.

1. INTRODUCTION

For a complex Banach space X , let \mathcal{A} be a Banach algebra of bounded holomorphic functions on the open unit ball B_X endowed with the usual supremum norm. In contrast to a classical result due to G.E. Shilov [Š], the Shilov boundary for \mathcal{A} may not exist since the closed unit ball \overline{B}_X is not compact unless X is finite dimensional (all the definitions will be given later in Section 2). For instance, J. Globevnik observed in [GL2] that there is no Shilov boundary for $\mathcal{A}_u(B_{c_0})$ and $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_{c_0})$ by showing that there exists a sequence of closed boundaries whose intersection is empty. Since then, many authors have studied the Shilov boundary and obtained various characterizations of boundaries for $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ and $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$ in the case, for instance, when X is ℓ_p with $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $C(K)$, the predual of the Lorentz sequence space, or a Marcinkiewicz sequence space [Aco, AcoL, AcoM, AMR, ACLP, CGKM, CH, CHL, MR, MR2].

Our intention here is to study the Shilov boundary for the Gelfand transform image $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ of $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$ which turns to be a uniform algebra on the spectrum (maximal ideal space) $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$ of the Banach algebra \mathcal{A} . It is well known that if A is an algebra of bounded continuous functions on a Hausdorff space Ω , then A is isometric to $\widehat{A} := \{\widehat{f} : f \in A\}$, where $\widehat{f}(\phi) = \phi(f)$ for every $\phi \in \mathfrak{M}(A)$, which is a uniform algebra on its spectrum $\mathfrak{M}(A)$ via the Gelfand transform (see, for instance, [L]). As we consider a uniform algebra $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$, there is always a minimal closed boundary $\Gamma \subset \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$ with the property that every elements \widehat{f} of $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ attains its maximum absolute value at some point of Γ due to the aforementioned result of G.E. Shilov [Š]. From this point of view, it is

Date: October 15, 2021.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 46E50; Secondary: 46G20, 46J15.

Key words and phrases. Shilov boundary; Holomorphic functions; Peak points.

The first author was supported by NRF (NRF-2019R1A2C1003857) and the second author was supported by NRF (NRF-2019R1A2C1003857) and by POSTECH Basic Science Research Institute Grant (NRF-2021R1A6A1A10042944).

natural to investigate how closed boundaries for \mathcal{A} and $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ relate to each other, and the relation between the Shilov boundaries for \mathcal{A} and $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ when the Shilov boundary for \mathcal{A} exists.

The paper has the following structure. In Section 3, beginning by noticing some relation between those boundaries for \mathcal{A} and $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$, we obtain an explicit description of the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ when $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X), \mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$ for many classical Banach spaces X . For example, unlike the result of Globevnik on $\mathcal{A}_u(B_{c_0})$, we observe that the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_u(B_{c_0})}$ coincides with $\{\delta_z : z \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}\}$, where $\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}} = \{z = (z_n) \in \overline{B_{\ell_\infty}} : |z_n| = 1 \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Beside the case of $X = c_0$, the Shilov boundary for the Gelfand transform image of $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$ when X is locally uniformly convex Banach spaces, ℓ_1 , $d(w, 1)$ (the Lorentz sequence space), locally c -uniformly convex order continuous sequence space, $C(K)$ with K infinite countable compact Hausdorff space or $C_1(H)$ (the space of trace class operators) is concretely obtained. At the end of Section 3, we discuss a possible application of our results on the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)}$ to the famous Corona theorem in the context of infinite dimensional Banach spaces. In Section 4, we describe the Shilov boundary for the Gelfand transform image of $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$ for a large class of Banach spaces X , for example, Banach spaces X whose dual spaces X^* are separable, or Banach spaces X which have the Radon-Nikodým property and their dual spaces X^* have the approximation property.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the paper, all Banach spaces are assumed to be complex Banach spaces. Given a Banach space X , the unit sphere and the open unit ball are denoted by S_X and B_X , respectively. We are going to deal with the following Banach algebras of holomorphic functions:

- (a) $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}^\infty(B_X) : f \text{ is continuously extended to } \overline{B_X}\}$,
- (b) $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}^\infty(B_X) : f \text{ is uniformly continuous on } B_X\}$,
- (c) $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}^\infty(B_X) : f \text{ is weakly uniformly continuous on } B_X\}$,

where each of them is endowed with the supremum norm on B_X . Notice the following inclusions:

$$\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_u(B_X) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X).$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X) = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X) = \mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$ when X is a finite dimensional Banach space. On the other hand, it is known that those inclusions are strict in general when X is infinite dimensional (see [ACG, Section 12]). In addition, let us denote by $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$ the subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ which consists of all approximable holomorphic functions on B_X . That is, $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$ is the closure in $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ of the subalgebra generated by the constant functions and X^* .

Given a Banach algebra \mathcal{A} , let us denote by $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$ the spectrum of \mathcal{A} . That is, $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$ is the space of all homomorphisms on \mathcal{A} endowed with the Gelfand topology σ (i.e., restriction of the weak-star topology). If we restrict ourselves to the case when \mathcal{A} is one

of the above three Banach algebras $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$, $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ and $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$, there is a canonical mapping $\pi : \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \overline{B_{X^{**}}}$ which is given by $\pi(\phi) = \phi|_{X^*}$ for every $\phi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$. Moreover, if $z \in \overline{B_{X^{**}}}$, we can consider the point evaluation homomorphism δ_z in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$, that is, $\delta_z(f) = \tilde{f}(z)$ for every $f \in \mathcal{A}$, where \tilde{f} is the Aron-Berner extension of f [AB].

Let $A \subset C_b(\Omega)$ be an algebra of functions on a topological space Ω , where $C_b(\Omega)$ denotes the space of continuous and bounded functions on Ω endowed with the usual supremum norm on Ω . Recall that a point $x \in \Omega$ is a *strong boundary point* for A if, for each open neighborhood U of x , there exists $f \in A$ with $f(x) = \sup_{\Omega} |f| = 1$ and $\sup_{y \in \Omega \setminus U} |f(y)| < 1$. A point $x \in \Omega$ is a *peak point* for A if there exists $f \in A$ such that $f(x) = 1$ and $|f(y)| < 1$ for every $y \in \Omega \setminus \{x\}$. Moreover, a point $x \in \Omega$ is a *strong peak point* for A if there exists $f \in A$ such that $f(x) = 1$ and for each open neighborhood U of x , $\sup_{y \in \Omega \setminus U} |f(y)| < 1$. We say that a subset Γ of Ω is a *boundary* for the function algebra A (in the Globevnik sense [G11]) if

$$\|f\| = \sup\{|f(x)| : x \in \Gamma\}, \quad \text{for all } f \in A.$$

If the intersection of all the closed boundaries for A is again a boundary for A , then it is called the *Shilov boundary* for A , and denoted by ∂A . A classical result by Shilov states that if Ω is compact and $A \subset C_b(\Omega)$ is a separating subalgebra (i.e., a uniform algebra), then the intersection of all closed boundaries is again a closed boundary, which becomes a minimal closed boundary for A [Š]. Note that when Ω is a compact topological space, each peak point for A is a strong boundary point for A and any strong boundary point for A belongs to each closed boundary for A . For background information on function algebras, we refer to [Dal, S].

In this paper, for a Banach space X and a Banach algebra \mathcal{A} with $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X) \subseteq \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$, we shall use the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho\mathcal{A} &= \{z \in \overline{B_X} : z \text{ is a peak point for } \mathcal{A}\}, \\ \rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}} &= \{\phi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}) : \phi \text{ is a peak point for } \widehat{\mathcal{A}}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ denotes the image of \mathcal{A} under the Gelfand transform, that is, $\widehat{\mathcal{A}} = \{\widehat{f} : f \in \mathcal{A}\}$. The Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$, which always exists due to the compactness of $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$, will be denoted by $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$. Let us denote by $\partial\mathcal{A}$ the Shilov boundary for \mathcal{A} only when it exists. In particular, when $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$, $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$, we will simply denote by $\rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{wu}$, $\rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_u$ or $\rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_\infty$ (resp., $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{wu}$, $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_u$ or $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_\infty$) the set of all peak points for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ (resp., the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$) when the underlying Banach space is understood.

3. ON THE SHILOV BOUNDARY FOR $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_u(B_X)$ OR $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_\infty(B_X)$

Proposition 3.1. *Let X be a Banach space and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$. If ϕ is a strong boundary point for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$, then there exists a net (x_α) in S_X such that (δ_{x_α}) converges in the Gelfand topology to ϕ in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof. Let U be an open neighborhood of ϕ in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$. It suffices to show that there exists $x_0 \in S_X$ such that $\delta_{x_0} \in U$. Since ϕ is a strong boundary point, there exists $f \in \mathcal{A}$

with $\|f\| = 1$ such that $\phi(f) = 1$ and $\sup\{|\psi(f)| : \psi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus U\} < 1$. Notice that $\|f\| = \sup_{x \in S_X} |f(x)|$ where f is understood as its extension to $\overline{B_X}$. Indeed, for a sequence (x_n) in B_X such that $|\delta_{x_n}(f)| = |f(x_n)| \rightarrow 1$, let $r_n = \|x_n\| < 1$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider the function $g_n : r_n^{-1}\overline{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ given by

$$g_n(\lambda) = f(\lambda x_n) \text{ for all } \lambda \in r_n^{-1}\overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

Note that g_n is holomorphic on $r_n^{-1}\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and (uniformly) continuous on $r_n^{-1}\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. By the Maximum Modulus Principle, there exists λ_n with $|\lambda_n| = r_n^{-1}$ such that $|g_n(\lambda_n)| \geq |g(1)|$, that is, $|f(\lambda_n x_n)| \geq |f(x_n)|$. Letting $y_n = \lambda_n x_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $(y_n) \subset S_X$ and $|f(y_n)| \rightarrow \|f\|$; hence $\|f\| = \sup_{x \in S_X} |f(x)|$. This implies that there exists $x_0 \in S_X$ such that $\delta_{x_0} \in U$. \square

One of direct consequences of Proposition 3.1 is that the set of strong boundary points for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ is contained in $\overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma$ where $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$; hence the Shilov boundary $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ is contained also in $\overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma$ since the set of strong boundary points for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ is dense in $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ [Dal, Corollary 4.3.7]. Moreover, note that if there is a subset $\Gamma \subset \overline{B_X}^{**}$ satisfying that $\|f\| = \sup_{z \in \Gamma} |\tilde{f}(z)|$, where \tilde{f} is the Aron-Berner extension of f , for all $f \in \mathcal{A}$, then

$$\|\widehat{f}\| = \|f\| = \|\tilde{f}\| = \sup_{z \in \Gamma} |\tilde{f}(z)| = \sup\{|\widehat{f}(\delta_z)| : z \in \Gamma\}.$$

This simple observation yields the following.

Proposition 3.2. *Let X be a Banach space and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$. If $\Gamma \subset \overline{B_X}^{**}$ is a boundary for $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} := \{\tilde{f} : f \in \mathcal{A}\}$, where \tilde{f} is the Aron-Berner extension of f , then $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ is contained in $\overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \Gamma\}}^\sigma$.*

As noticed in the above comment, for a uniform algebra, the set of strong boundary points is related to its Shilov boundary. Thus, in order to describe the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$, where $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$, it is natural to compare the behavior of strong boundary points for \mathcal{A} and for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$. The following result shows that they have some relevance, and it will play an important role in the sequel.

Theorem 3.3. *Let X be a Banach space and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$.*

- (1) *If $x \in S_X$ is a strong boundary point for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$, then δ_x is a strong boundary point for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$.*
- (2) *If $x \in S_X$ is a strong peak point for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$, then δ_x is a peak point for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$.*
- (3) *If δ_x is a peak point for $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$ for some $x \in S_X$, then x is a peak point for \mathcal{A} .*

Proof. (1): Let $x_0 \in S_X$ be a strong boundary point for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$.

STEP I. If $\phi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$ satisfies that $\pi(\phi) = x_0$, then $\phi = \delta_{x_0}$.

To this end, let $g \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{0\}$ be given. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, choose $r_n > 0$ such that $|\tilde{g}(z) - \tilde{g}(x_0)| < \frac{1}{n}$ for every $z \in \overline{B_X}^{**}$ with $\|z - x_0\| < r_n$, where \tilde{g} is the Aron-Berner extension of g . Since x_0 is a strong boundary point for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$, there exists $f_n \in \mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$ such that

$f_n(x_0) = \|f_n\| = 1$ and $\sup\{|f_n(y)| : \|y - x_0\| \geq r_n\} < 1$. It follows that there exists $M_n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sup \left\{ \left| \frac{1 + f_n(y)}{2} \right|^{M_n} : \|y - x_0\| \geq r_n \right\} < \frac{1}{2n\|g\|}.$$

Thus, we can conclude that

$$\left\| \left(\frac{1 + f_n}{2} \right)^{M_n} (g - g(x_0)) \right\| \leq \frac{1}{n};$$

hence

$$(3.1) \quad \left[1 - \left(\frac{1 + f_n}{2} \right)^{M_n} \right] (g - g(x_0)) \rightarrow g - g(x_0)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, since

$$\phi \left(\frac{1 + f_n}{2} \right) = \frac{1 + \phi(f_n)}{2} = \frac{1 + f_n(x_0)}{2} = 1$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have from (3.1) that $\phi(g) = g(x_0)$. Since g is arbitrarily chosen, we conclude that $\phi = \delta_{x_0}$.

STEP II. δ_{x_0} is a strong boundary point for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and set $W := \{\phi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}) : |(\phi - \delta_{x_0})(h_j)| < \varepsilon \text{ for each } j = 1, \dots, N\}$ with $h_1, \dots, h_N \in \mathcal{A}$. It suffices to prove that there exists $g \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $g(x_0) = \|g\| = 1$ and $|\psi(g)| < 1$ for every $\psi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus W$ thanks to the compactness of $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$. Since each h_j is continuous at x_0 , we can choose $r > 0$ small enough such that if $z \in \overline{B_{X^{**}}}$ satisfies $\|z - x_0\| < r$, then $\delta_z \in W$. Take $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $n_0^{-1} < r$ and for each $n \geq n_0$, consider $g_n \in \mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$ satisfying that $g_n(x_0) = \|g_n\| = 1$ and $\sup\{|g_n(y)| : \|y - x_0\| \geq n^{-1}\} < 1$. Define

$$g := \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{n-n_0+1}} g_n$$

and note that $g \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\|g\| = 1$. Note also that $g(x_0) = 1$. Now, for $\psi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus W$, if we assume that $|\psi(g)| = 1$, then this implies that

$$1 = |\psi(g)| = \left| \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{n-n_0+1}} g_n(\pi(\psi)) \right| \leq \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{n-n_0+1}} |g_n(\pi(\psi))| \leq \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{n-n_0+1}} \leq 1;$$

hence $|g_n(\pi(\psi))| = 1$ for all $n \geq n_0$. From this, we have that $\|\pi(\psi) - x_0\| < n^{-1}$ for all $n \geq n_0$, which implies that $\pi(\psi) = x_0$. By STEP I, we conclude that $\psi = \delta_{x_0}$. This contradicts to that $\psi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus W$; hence $|\psi(g)| < 1$. Thus, g is a desired one.

(2): Let $x \in S_X$ be a strong peak point for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$ and let $\psi \in \mathfrak{M}(A) \setminus \{\delta_x\}$ be given. Find $f \in \mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$ with $\|f\| = 1$ which peaks strongly at x . Notice that $|\widehat{f}(\psi)| = |\psi(f)| = |\widehat{f}(\pi(\psi))|$, where \widehat{f} is the Aron-Berner extension of f . If $|\widehat{f}(\pi(\psi))| = 1$, then for a net (x_α) in B_X converging weak-star to $\pi(\psi)$, we obtain that $\lim_\alpha |f(x_\alpha)| = |\widehat{f}(\pi(\psi))| = 1$. This implies that (x_α) must converge in norm to the point x ; hence $\pi(\psi) = x$. Since x

is, in particular, a strong boundary point for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$, by the above STEP I, we see that $\psi = \delta_x$. This is a contradiction. Thus, $|\widehat{f}(\psi)| < 1$ and $\widehat{f} \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ peaks at δ_x .

(3): Suppose that δ_x is a peak point for some $x \in S_X$. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy that $f(x) = 1$ and $|\psi(f)| < 1$ for any ψ in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$ which is different from δ_x . As this implies that $|f(y)| < 1$ for every $y \in \overline{B}_X$ with $y \neq x$, we conclude that f peaks at the point x . \square

Let us remark that STEP I in the proof of Theorem 3.3 generalizes [ACGLM, Lemma 2.4], where it is observed that for any strong peak point x for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$, if $\phi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$ satisfies that $\pi(\phi) = x$, then $\phi = \delta_x$.

From the above results, we can obtain that if X is a finite dimensional Banach space and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ (which coincides with $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$ and with $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$), then the Shilov boundary $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ of $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ is essentially equal to the Shilov boundary for \mathcal{A} . Before stating this result, let us recall that for a Banach space X , $x \in \overline{B}_X$ is said to be a \mathbb{C} -extreme point if $y \in X$ satisfies that $\|x + \lambda y\| \leq 1$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda| = 1$, then $y = 0$. We denote by $\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B}_X)$ the set of all \mathbb{C} -extreme points of the closed unit ball \overline{B}_X .

Proposition 3.4. *Let X be a finite dimensional Banach space and let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$. Then,*

$$\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B}_X)\} \subseteq \rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B}_X)\}}.$$

In particular, $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} = \overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B}_X)\}}$.

Proof. Notice that the Shilov boundary for \mathcal{A} is $\overline{\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B}_X)}$ (see, for instance, [CHL, Proposition 1.1]). As $\overline{\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B}_X)}$ is compact, one can check that $\{\delta_z : z \in \overline{\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B}_X)}\}$ is closed in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$. It follows from Proposition 3.2 that the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ is contained in $\overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B}_X)\}}$. On the other hand, $\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B}_X)$ is the same as the set of all strong peak points for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$ [Are]. Thus, by Theorem 3.3, we have that $\overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B}_X)\}}$ is contained in $\rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$. \square

In the above proof, let us point out that $\overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B}_X)\}}$ is closed (hence compact) in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$ due to the relative compactness of $\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B}_X) \subseteq S_X$. For a Banach space X , we shall observe that this happens only when X is finite dimensional.

Proposition 3.5. *Let X be a Banach space and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$. Then the set $\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}$ is closed in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$ if and only if X is finite dimensional.*

Proof. Suppose that $\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}$ is closed in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$.

STEP I. X must have the Schur property.

Assume to the contrary that X does not have the Schur property. Then there is a sequence (x_n) in S_X such that (x_n) converges in weak topology to 0. Take a subnet (δ_{x_α}) which converges in the Gelfand topology to some ϕ in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$. Then $(x_\alpha) = (\pi(\delta_{x_\alpha}))$ converges weak-star to $\pi(\phi)$; hence $\pi(\phi) = 0$. It follows that $\phi \in \overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma \setminus \{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}$; hence the set $\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}$ is not closed.

STEP II. X must be a finite dimensional space.

Assume to the contrary that X is an infinite dimensional Banach space. Since X has the Schur property, by Rosenthal's ℓ_1 -theorem [Ros], X has an isomorphic copy of ℓ_1 . Let T be a norm one isomorphism from ℓ_1 into X and denote by (e_n) the canonical basis of ℓ_1 . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $x_n := T(e_n)$. Put $z_n = x_n/\|x_n\| \in S_X$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and take a subnet (z_α) so that (δ_{z_α}) converges in the Gelfand topology to some ϕ in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$. Since $\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}$ is closed, $\phi = \delta_u$ for some $u \in S_X$. In particular, this implies that (z_α) converges weakly to u in X . As $\|x_\alpha\| \geq 1/\|T^{-1}\|$ for each α , passing to a subnet, we may assume that $\|x_\alpha\| \rightarrow r$ for some $r > 0$. On the other hand, since $u \in T(\ell_1)$, we have that

$$\frac{1}{\|x_\alpha\|} e_\alpha = \frac{1}{\|x_\alpha\|} T^{-1}(x_\alpha) = T^{-1}(z_\alpha) \rightarrow T^{-1}(u)$$

weakly in ℓ_1 . On the other hand, $(\|x_\alpha\|^{-1} e_\alpha)$ converges weakly to 0 in ℓ_1 , which implies that $T^{-1}(u)$ must be zero; hence u is zero. This is a contradiction.

Conversely, assume that X is a finite dimensional Banach space. Then $\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}$ is clearly closed in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$ since the unit sphere S_X is compact. \square

Next, we present a result which will yield examples of Banach spaces X where the Shilov boundary for $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$ can be explicitly obtained. Recall that a point $x \in S_X$ is said to be a *strongly exposed point* if there exists $x^* \in S_{X^*}$ such that $x^*(x) = 1$ and (x_n) converges to x in norm whenever $(\operatorname{Re} x^*(x_n))$ converges to 1. Notice that each strongly exposed point in S_X is a strong peak point for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$. Indeed, for a strongly exposed point $x \in S_X$, take $x^* \in S_{X^*}$ which strongly exposes at x . Then it is easy to check that $f := \frac{1}{2}(1 + x^*)$ strongly peak at x .

Proposition 3.6. *Let X be a Banach space such that every point in S_X is a strongly exposed point and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$. Then*

$$\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\} \subseteq \rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma.$$

In particular, $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} = \overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma$.

Proof. By the comment after Proposition 3.1, it suffices to show that $\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}$ is contained in $\rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$. To this end, note that Theorem 3.3 combined with the fact that every point of S_X is a strong peak point for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$ implies that each δ_x with $x \in S_X$ is a peak point for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$. \square

It can be easily checked that when X is a locally uniformly convex Banach space, every point in S_X is a strongly exposed point; hence a strong peak point for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$.

Corollary 3.7. *Let X be a locally uniformly convex Banach space and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$. Then*

$$\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\} \subseteq \rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma.$$

In particular, $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} = \overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma$.

Also, it is known [AL] that any point of the unit sphere of $X = \ell_1$ or $X = d(w, 1)$ for a decreasing sequence $w = (w_n)$ of positive real numbers with $w_1 = 1$ and $w \in c_0 \setminus \ell_1$, the

complex Lorentz sequence space, is a strong peak point for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$. So, arguing in the same way as in Proposition 3.6, we have the following.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $X = \ell_1$ or $d(w, 1)$ for a decreasing sequence $w = (w_n)$ of positive real numbers with $w_1 = 1$ and $w \in c_0 \setminus \ell_1$, and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$. Then*

$$\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\} \subseteq \rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma.$$

In particular, $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} = \overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma$.

From a careful examination of the proofs of [CHL, Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 3.4], we can see that if X is a locally c -uniformly convex order continuous sequence space, then a finitely supported point x_0 in S_X is a strong peak point for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$. Indeed, it is shown that if x_0 is finitely supported, then there exists $g \in \mathcal{A}_u(B_Y)$ and P a projection from X onto Y such that $g \circ P$ strongly peak at x_0 , where Y is a finite dimensional subspace of X . Note that $\mathcal{A}_u(B_Y) = \mathcal{A}_a(B_Y)$ since Y is finite dimensional; hence $g \circ P$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$.

Proposition 3.9. *Let X be a locally c -uniformly convex order continuous sequence space and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$. Then*

$$\{\delta_x : x \text{ is finitely supported in } S_X\} \subseteq \rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma.$$

In particular, $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} = \overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma$.

Proof. It is shown in [CHL, Theorem 3.5] that S_X is the Shilov boundary for \mathcal{A} . Thus, $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma$ by Proposition 3.2. As any finitely supported point x in S_X is a strong peak point for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$, we observe from Theorem 3.3 that

$$\{\delta_x : x \text{ is finitely supported in } S_X\} \subseteq \rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}}.$$

As the set of finitely supported elements in S_X forms a dense subset of S_X , a density argument implies that $\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\} \subseteq \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$, which completes the proof. \square

On the other hand, it is known [G11] that for a Banach space, every peak point for $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$ is a \mathbb{C} -extreme point of \overline{B}_X . Since \overline{B}_{c_0} has no \mathbb{C} -extreme point; hence, Theorem 3.3 cannot be applied to compute the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_u(B_{c_0})}$. Nevertheless, we can describe the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_u(B_{c_0})}$ by using a well known result of Littlewood-Bogdanowicz-Pelczynski [Din, Proposition 1.59] which asserts that any bounded m -homogeneous polynomial on c_0 can be approximated uniformly on B_{c_0} by m -homogeneous finite type polynomials. Notice from this that $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_{c_0}))$ is actually nothing but $\{\delta_x : x \in \overline{B}_{\ell_\infty}\}$.

Proposition 3.10. *The set of peak points for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_u(B_{c_0})}$ and the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_u(B_{c_0})}$ both coincide with $\{\delta_z : z \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}\}$.*

Proof. It is shown in [ACLP, Theorem 2] that $\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a closed boundary for $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_{\ell_\infty})$; hence $\{\delta_z : z \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}\}$ is a boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_u}$. By Proposition 3.2, it follows that $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}_u}$ is contained in $\overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}\}}^\sigma$.

On the other hand, if $z_0 \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}$, then there is $x^* \in \ell_1$ such that $f = \frac{1+x^*}{2}$ satisfies that $\tilde{f}(z_0) = 1$ and $|\tilde{f}(w)| < 1$ whenever $w \in \overline{B}_{\ell_\infty}$ is different from z_0 , where \tilde{f} is the Aron-Berner extension of f (see [ADLM, Proposition 3.6]). Notice that \hat{f} attains its norm at a strong boundary point ϕ in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A})$ [Dal, Proposition 4.3.4]. Since $\phi(f) = \tilde{f}(\pi(\phi))$, we obtain that $\pi(\phi)$ must be z_0 . The fact that $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_{c_0}))$ coincides with $\{\delta_z : z \in \overline{B}_{\ell_\infty}\}$ implies that ϕ must be δ_{z_0} ; hence δ_{z_0} is a strong boundary point. Since ℓ_1 is separable, the spectrum $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_{c_0}))$ is compact metrizable which implies that δ_{z_0} is indeed a peak point for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_u(B_{c_0})}$ [Dal, Corollary 4.3.7]. It follows that

$$\{\delta_z : z \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}\} \subseteq \widehat{\rho\mathcal{A}_u} \subseteq \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}_u} \subseteq \overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}\}}^\sigma.$$

To complete the proof, we check that $\{\delta_z : z \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}\}$ is actually closed in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_{c_0}))$. Indeed, if a net (z_α) in $\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies that (δ_{z_α}) converges to some $\phi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_{c_0}))$, then $\phi = \delta_z$ for some z in $\overline{B}_{\ell_\infty}$. Since (z_α) converges weak-star to z , we see that z belongs to $\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}$. \square

By arguing similarly as in the proof of Proposition 3.10, we can obtain the description of the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_u(B_{C(K)})}$ for certain compact Hausdorff space K . It is worth to remark that Choi et al. [CGKM] first showed that there is no minimal closed boundary for $\mathcal{A}_u(B_{C(K)})$ when K is infinite and scattered. Afterwards, it is generalized by Acosta [Aco] that if K is an arbitrary infinite compact Hausdorff space, then $\mathcal{A}_u(B_{C(K)})$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_{C(K)})$ has no minimal closed boundary. Moreover, Acosta and Lourenço observed in [AL] that there are no strong peak points for $\mathcal{A}_u(B_{C(K)})$ if K is infinite, and the set of peak points for $\mathcal{A}_u(B_{C(K)})$ is the set of extreme points of $B_{C(K)}$ if K is separable.

Note that a compact Hausdorff space K is countable if and only if K is scattered and metrizable (see, for instance, [FHHMZ, Lemma 14.21]). We present a description of the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_u(B_{C(K)})}$ for an infinite countable compact Hausdorff space K . To this end, let us recall the following lemma which is already well known to experts. For the proof, we refer [Aro] or [Ga]. As usual, we denote by $\mathcal{P}({}^N X)$ the Banach space of all N -homogenous polynomials on a Banach space X and $\mathcal{P}_{wu}({}^N X)$ the subspace of $\mathcal{P}({}^N X)$ of all elements which are weakly uniformly continuous on bounded subsets of X .

Lemma 3.11. *Let X be a Banach space and $f \in \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$. If $\sum_N P_N$ is the Taylor series expansion of f at 0, then $f \in \mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$ if and only if $P_N \in \mathcal{P}_{wu}({}^N X)$ for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proposition 3.12. *Let X be a Banach space whose dual has the approximation property. Then $\mathcal{P}({}^N X) = \mathcal{P}_{wu}({}^N X)$ for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ if and only if $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)) = \{\delta_z : z \in \overline{B_{X^{**}}}\}$.*

Proof. We first prove the ‘only if’ part. Let $\phi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_X))$, $f \in \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Using Lemma 3.11, we can find a continuous polynomial P on X which is weakly uniformly continuous on bounded sets such that $\|f - P\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$. Since X^* has the approximation property, notice from [Din, Proposition 2.8] that there exists a finite type polynomial R such that $\|P - R\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$. Thus, we have that

$$|\phi(f) - \delta_{\pi(\phi)}(f)| \leq |\phi(f) - \phi(R)| + |\tilde{R}(\pi(\phi)) - \tilde{f}(\pi(\phi))| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we conclude that $\phi(f) = \delta_{\pi(\phi)}(f)$, so $\phi = \delta_{\pi(\phi)}$.

Conversely, suppose that $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)) = \{\delta_z : z \in \overline{B_{X^{**}}}\}$. Pick $P \in \mathcal{P}({}^N X)$ and a bounded net (x_α) in X converging weakly to some $x_0 \in X$. By homogeneity of P , we may assume that $\|x_\alpha\| \leq 1$ for every α . We claim that $(P(x_\alpha))$ converges to $\tilde{P}(z)$, where \tilde{P} is the Aron-Berner extension of P . If not, there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and a subnet (x_β) such that $|P(x_\beta) - \tilde{P}(z)| \geq \varepsilon$ for every β . Passing to a subnet, we may assume that (δ_{x_β}) converges to some $\phi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_X))$. Indeed, ϕ is δ_{z_0} for some $z_0 \in \overline{B_{X^{**}}}$ by our assumption and this implies that (x_β) converges weak-star to z_0 . Therefore, $z_0 = x_0$ and $\tilde{P}(x_0) = \delta_{x_0}(P) = \lim_\beta \delta_{x_\beta}(P) = \lim_\beta P(x_\beta)$. This contradicts to that $|P(x_\beta) - \tilde{P}(z)| \geq \varepsilon$ for every β ; hence we conclude that $(P(x_\alpha))$ converges to $\tilde{P}(z)$. Thus, P is weakly continuous on bounded subsets on X ; hence $P \in \mathcal{P}_{wu}({}^N X)$ [AHV, Theorem 2.9]. \square

Proposition 3.13. *Let K be an infinite countable compact Hausdorff space. Then the set of peak points for $\mathcal{A}_u(\widehat{B_{C(K)}})$ and the Shilov boundary for $\mathcal{A}_u(\widehat{B_{C(K)}})$ both coincide with $\{\delta_u : u \in C(K)^{**}, |u(t)| = 1, \forall t \in K\}$.*

Proof. Recall that $C(S)$ has the Dunford-Pettis property for any compact Hausdorff space S [AK, Theorem 5.4.5]. For an infinite compact Hausdorff scattered space K , it is known [PS] that $C(K)$ does not have an isomorphic copy of ℓ_1 . It follows from [Din, Corollary 2.37] that $\mathcal{P}({}^N C(K)) = \mathcal{P}_{wu}({}^N C(K))$ for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand, as K is scattered, $C(K)^*$ is isometric to $\ell_1(K)$, which has the approximation property (see, for instance, [FHHMZ, Theorem 14.24]). Thus, we can apply Proposition 3.12 to conclude that $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_{C(K)})) = \{\delta_z : z \in \overline{B_{C(K)^{**}}}\}$. Let us write $K = \{k_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, and let $u \in C(K)^{**}$ be given so that $|u(t)| = 1$ for every $t \in K$. Consider $T \in \mathcal{A}_u(B_{C(K)})$ given by

$$T(v) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\overline{u(k_n)}}{2^n} v(k_n) \right)$$

for each $v \in C(K)$. Notice that $|\tilde{T}(z)| < 1$ for every $z \in \overline{B_{C(K)^{**}}} = \overline{B_{\ell_\infty(K)}}$ which is different from u . As a matter of fact, if $|\tilde{T}(z)| = 1$ for some $z \in \overline{B_{C(K)^{**}}}$, then $z(k_n) = u(k_n)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$; hence $z = u$. Note from [Dal, Proposition 4.3.4] that there exists a strong boundary point ϕ for $\mathcal{A}_u(\widehat{B_{C(K)}})$ in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_{C(K)}))$ so that $|\hat{T}(\phi)| = 1$. As observed, ϕ must be δ_u and it follows that $\delta_u = \phi$ is a strong boundary point. As $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_{C(K)}))$ is compact metrizable, δ_u is then a peak point. Hence,

$$\{\delta_u : u \in C(K)^{**}, |u(t)| = 1, \forall t \in K\} \subseteq \rho \mathcal{A}_u(\widehat{B_{C(K)}}).$$

Conversely, by a result of M.D. Acosta [Aco, Theorem 4.2], the set of extreme points in the unit ball of $C(K)$ is a boundary for $\mathcal{A}_u(B_{C(K)})$. Thus, we have that

$$\partial \mathcal{A}_u(\widehat{B_{C(K)}}) \subseteq \overline{\{\delta_u : u \in C(K), |u(t)| = 1, \forall t \in K\}}^\sigma$$

from Proposition 3.2 and the fact that the set of extreme points in $B_{C(K)}$ coincides with $\{u \in C(K) : |u(t)| = 1, \forall t \in K\}$. Because of the following inclusion

$$\overline{\{\delta_u : u \in C(K), |u(t)| = 1, \forall t \in K\}}^\sigma \subseteq \{\delta_u : u \in C(K)^{**}, |u(t)| = 1, \forall t \in K\},$$

we complete the proof. \square

The last example in this section concerns the Banach space $C_1(H)$ of trace class operators on a complex Hilbert space H . Recall that an operator T on H is called a *trace class operator* if there are orthonormal sequences (e_n) and (f_n) in H such that $Tx = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n \langle x, e_n \rangle f_n$ for every $x \in H$ and (λ_n) in ℓ_1 . In this case, the operator norm of T is given by $\|T\| = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_n|$. For an orthonormal basis $\{e_i : i \in I\}$ of H and $F \subset I$, let us denote by Π_F the norm one projection on $C_1(H)$ given by

$$\Pi_F(T) = P_F \circ T \circ P_F$$

where $P_F(x) = \sum_{i \in F} \langle x, e_i \rangle e_i$ for every $x \in H$. It is observed in [AcoL, Theorem 4.1] that the Shilov boundaries for $\mathcal{A}_u(B_{C_1(H)})$ and $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_{C_1(H)})$ both exist and coincide. From a careful analysis of the proof of [AcoL, Theorem 4.1], we describe the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ for $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_{C_1(H)})$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_{C_1(H)})$ as follows.

Proposition 3.14. *Let H be a complex Hilbert space and let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_{C_1(H)})$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_{C_1(H)})$. Then*

$$\{\delta_T : T \in \Gamma\} \subseteq \rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} = \overline{\{\delta_T : T \in \partial\mathcal{A}\}}^\sigma,$$

where

$$\Gamma := \{T \in B_{\Pi_F(C_1(H))} : T \text{ is a peak point for } \mathcal{A}_\infty(B_{\Pi_F(C_1(H))}), F \text{ is a finite subset of } I\}.$$

In particular, $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} = \overline{\{\delta_T : T \in \partial\mathcal{A}\}}^\sigma$.

Proof. It is proved in [AcoL, Theorem 4.1] that for a finite subset $F \subset I$, if T is a peak point for $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_{\Pi_F(C_1(H))})$ with peak function $g \in \mathcal{A}_\infty(B_{\Pi_F(C_1(H))})$, then $g \circ \Pi_F \in \mathcal{A}_\infty(B_{C_1(H)})$ strongly peaks at T . As $\Pi_F(C_1(H))$ is finite dimensional, g actually belongs to $\mathcal{A}_a(B_{\Pi_F(C_1(H))})$; hence $g \circ \Pi_F$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}_a(B_{C_1(H)})$. By Theorem 3.3, it follows that $\{\delta_T : T \in \Gamma\} \subseteq \rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$. Consequently,

$$\{\delta_T : T \in \Gamma\} \subseteq \rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$$

On the other hand, it is observed in the same result in [AcoL] that $\overline{\Gamma}$ is the Shilov boundary for \mathcal{A} , that is, $\overline{\Gamma} = \partial\mathcal{A}$. So, Proposition 3.2 yields that $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \overline{\{\delta_T : T \in \partial\mathcal{A}\}}^\sigma$. To see that $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}} = \overline{\{\delta_T : T \in \partial\mathcal{A}\}}^\sigma$, notice that if $T \in \partial\mathcal{A}$, then there exists a net (T_α) in Γ so that (δ_{T_α}) converges to δ_T . This shows that $\{\delta_T : T \in \partial\mathcal{A}\} \subseteq \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$. \square

We finish this section by giving a possible application of our result. Recall from [ACG, Theorem 4.3] that for an infinite dimensional Banach space X , the closure of S_X in the H_b -topology includes the closed unit ball $\overline{B_{X^{**}}}$, where H_b -topology is the weak topology on the spectrum of the algebra H_b of complex-valued entire functions on X determined by elements in H_b . This implies that, in particular, for any $z \in B_X$, there is a net (x_α) in S_X such that $f(x_\alpha) \rightarrow \tilde{f}(z)$ for every $f \in \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ where \tilde{f} is the Aron-Berner extension of f . Thus, we can observe that

$$\overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma = \overline{\{\delta_x : x \in B_X\}}^\sigma \text{ in } \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)).$$

On the other hand, we observed that if X is (1) a locally uniformly convex Banach space, (2) ℓ_1 , (3) $d(w, 1)$, or (4) a locally c -uniformly convex order continuous sequence space,

then the Shilov boundary $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_u$ for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_u(B_X)$ coincides with $\overline{\{\delta_x : x \in S_X\}}^\sigma$. Therefore, if X is one of (1)-(4) with infinite dimension, then we have that

$$\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_u = \overline{\{\delta_x : x \in B_X\}}^\sigma.$$

Recall from [CGMS, Section 2] that we say that the *Corona theorem* holds for $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ when $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_X))$ coincides with $\overline{\{\delta_x : x \in B_X\}}^\sigma$. Consequently, we have the following observation which shows the the Corona problem for $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ can be restated in terms of the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_u(B_X)$ in some cases.

Theorem 3.15. *Let X be one of the above (1)-(4) Banach spaces. Then the Corona theorem for $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ is equivalent to that $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_u(B_X))$ coincides with its Shilov boundary $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_u$.*

4. ON THE SHILOV BOUNDARY FOR $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{wu}(B_X)$

In this section, we show that the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{wu}(B_X)$ can be precisely described for a large class of Banach spaces X . Note that for each $f \in \mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$, the Aron-Berner extension \widetilde{f} of f belongs to $\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})$, where $\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})$ denotes the Banach algebra of all bounded holomorphic functions on $B_{X^{**}}$ which are weak-star uniformly continuous on $B_{X^{**}}$ [AAM, Proposition 2.1]. Indeed, $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$ is isometrically isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})$ via the mapping $\Phi : f \mapsto \widetilde{f}$. Observe that $\Phi^*|_{\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}}))}$ is a homeomorphism between $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}}))$ and $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X))$ which sends point evaluations to point evaluations. From this observation, we obtain the following.

Proposition 4.1. *Let X be a Banach space. Then the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{wu}(B_X)$ is homeomorphic to that of $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})$ and the set of peak points for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{wu}(B_X)$ is homeomorphic to that of $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})$.*

Proof. Let $\Gamma \subset \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}}))$ be a closed boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})$. Notice that for fixed $f \in \mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\| &= \|\widetilde{f}\| = \sup\{|\phi(\Phi(f))| : \phi \in \Gamma\} = \sup\{|\Phi^*(\phi)(f)| : \phi \in \Gamma\} \\ &= \sup\{|\psi(f)| : \psi \in \Upsilon(\Gamma)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Upsilon := \Phi^*|_{\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}}))} : \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X))$. This implies that $\Upsilon(\Gamma) \subset \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X))$ is a closed boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{wu}(B_X)$. Similarly, one can see that if $\Lambda \subset \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X))$ is a closed boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{wu}(B_X)$, then $\Upsilon^{-1}(\Lambda)$ is a closed boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})$.

Finally, note that if $\widehat{f} \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})$ peaks at $\phi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}}))$, then $\widehat{\Phi^{-1}(f)}$ peaks at $\Upsilon(\phi)$. This implies that $\Upsilon(\rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{w^*u}) \subseteq \rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{wu}$. Similarly, one can show that $\Upsilon^{-1}(\rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{wu}) \subseteq \rho\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{w^*u}$. \square

Let us denote by $P(B_{X^{**}})$ the closed subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})$ generated by constants and the restrictions to $B_{X^{**}}$ of the elements of X^* .

Theorem 4.2. *Let X be a Banach space. Then,*

$$\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})\} \subseteq \partial \widehat{\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}}.$$

If, in addition, X^ is separable, then*

$$\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})\} \subseteq \rho \widehat{\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}} \subseteq \partial \widehat{\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}} \subseteq \overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})\}}^{\sigma}.$$

*In this case, the Shilov boundary for $\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})$ coincides with $\overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})\}}^{\sigma}$.*

Proof. Due to E.L. Arenson [Are], it is known that $\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})$ is the set of strong boundary points for $P(B_{X^{**}})$. Thus, the same argument used in Theorem 3.3 shows that the $\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})\}$ is contained in the set of strong boundary points for $\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})$; hence $\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})\}$ is contained in $\partial \widehat{\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}}$.

Suppose that X^* is a separable Banach space. Then the domain $(B_{X^{**}}, w(X^{**}, X^*))$ is compact metrizable. From this, we can deduce that $\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})$ is the set of all strong peak points for $P(B_{X^{**}})$. It follows from Theorem 3.3 that $\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})\}$ is contained in $\rho \widehat{\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}}$. Moreover, it is observed in [AAM, Proposition 2.3] that $\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})$ is a minimal subset of $B_{X^{**}}$ satisfying that $\|f\| = \max\{|f(z)| : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})\}$ for all $f \in \mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})$. Thus, Proposition 3.2 implies that $\partial \widehat{\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}} \subseteq \overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})\}}^{\sigma}$. \square

Corollary 4.3. *Let X be a Banach space. Then,*

$$\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})\} \subseteq \partial \widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}}.$$

If, in addition, X^ is separable, then*

$$\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})\} \subseteq \rho \widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}} \subseteq \partial \widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}} \subseteq \overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})\}}^{\sigma}.$$

*In this case, the Shilov boundary for $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$ coincides with $\overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})\}}^{\sigma}$.*

Proof. Notice that $\Upsilon(\{\delta_z : z \in \Omega\}) = \{\delta_z : z \in \Omega\}$ for a subset Ω of $\overline{B_{X^{**}}}$, where Υ is the homeomorphism in Proposition 4.1 and the former δ_z is understood as a member of $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}}))$ while the latter δ_z is a member of $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X))$. Moreover, $\Upsilon(\overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \Omega\}}^{\sigma}) = \overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \Omega\}}^{\sigma}$ where the former σ denotes the Gelfand topology on $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}}))$ and the latter one is the Gelfand topology on $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X))$. Thus, the assertion follows from Theorem 4.2. \square

Recall from Lemma 3.11 and Proposition 3.12 that when X^* has the approximation property, the spectrum $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X))$ coincides with $\{\delta_z : z \in \overline{B_{X^{**}}}\}$. Using this fact, we observe that the Gelfand topology σ -closure of a set of point evaluations in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X))$ can be expressed in a simpler way as follows.

Lemma 4.4. *Let X be a Banach space whose dual has the approximation property and Γ be a subset of B_X . Then $\overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \Gamma\}}^{\sigma} = \left\{ \delta_z : z \in \overline{\Gamma}^{w^*} \right\}$ in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X))$.*

Proof. Let ϕ be an element of $\overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \Gamma\}}^\sigma$, then there exists a net (z_α) in Γ such that (δ_{z_α}) converges to ϕ . By Proposition 3.12, $\phi = \delta_{z_0}$ for some $z_0 \in \overline{B_{X^{**}}}$. Then $(z_\alpha) = (\pi(\delta_{z_\alpha}(\alpha)))$ converges weak-star to $\pi(\phi) = z_0$. It follows that $\phi \in \left\{ \delta_z : z \in \overline{\Gamma}^{w^*} \right\}$.

Conversely, let $z_0 \in \overline{\Gamma}^{w^*}$ be given. Then there is a net (z_α) in Γ so that (z_α) converges weak-star to z_0 . For any $f \in \mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$, the net $(\tilde{f}(z_\alpha))$ converges to $\tilde{f}(z_0)$ since $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{A}_{w^*u}(B_{X^{**}})$. This implies that (δ_{z_α}) converges to δ_{z_0} in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X))$; hence $\delta_{z_0} \in \overline{\{\delta_z : z \in \Gamma\}}^\sigma$. \square

Corollary 4.5. *Let X be a Banach space whose dual space is a separable Banach space with the approximation property. Then the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)}$ coincides with $\left\{ \delta_z : z \in \overline{\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})}^{w^*} \right\}$.*

One of direct consequences of Corollary 4.5 is that if X is a strictly convex Banach space whose dual space is separable and has the approximation property, such as ℓ_p ($1 < p < \infty$), then $\partial \widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)} = \left\{ \delta_z : z \in \overline{S_X}^{w^*} \right\} = \left\{ \delta_z : z \in \overline{B_{X^{**}}} \right\}$.

Moreover, notice that if X is c_0 , the Tsirelson or the Tsirelson-James space, then $\mathcal{P}_{wu}(^N X) = \mathcal{P}(^N X)$; hence $\mathcal{A}_u(B_X) = \mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$ (see [AD] and [Gu]). Besides, it is known that $\mathcal{A}_u(B_{d_*(w,1)}) = \mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_{d_*(w,1)})$ whenever $w \notin \ell_p$ for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$ [AAM, Proposition 2.6]. As all the just mentioned Banach spaces have separable dual spaces satisfying the approximation property, Corollary 4.5 yields the following.

Corollary 4.6. *If a Banach space X is one of the following:*

- (a) c_0
- (b) Tsirelson's space,
- (c) Tsirelson-James space,
- (d) $d_*(w, 1)$ with $w \notin \ell_p$ for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$,

*then the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_u(B_X)} = \widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)}$ coincides with $\left\{ \delta_z : z \in \overline{\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{X^{**}}})}^{w^*} \right\}$.*

Let us remark that, in contrast to (d) of Corollary 4.6, it is known that there is no minimal closed boundary for $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_{d_*(w,1)})$ [AAM, Corollary 3.6]. Moreover, the item (a) of Corollary 4.6 reproves Proposition 3.10 since $\text{Ext}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{B_{\ell_\infty}}) = \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Finally, we would like to present the descriptions of the Shilov boundaries for $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X))$ for Banach spaces X which have the Radon-Nikodým property and whose duals have the approximation property. To this end, we observe first the following lemma by using the result of [CLS] concerning on the denseness of strong peak functions.

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose that a Banach space X has the Radon-Nikodým property and X^* has the approximation property. Let $x_0 \in S_X$ be a strong peak point for $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then there is a strong peak point x_1 for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$ such that $\|x_0 - x_1\| < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Let $f_0 \in \mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$ be the strong peak function corresponding to x_0 . Take $\delta > 0$ such that $|f(x)| < 1 - \delta$ whenever $\|x - x_0\| > \varepsilon$. For $0 < r < 1$, consider $f_r(x) := f(rx)$ and note that (f_r) converges to f uniformly on B_X as r increases to 1. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.11, the Taylor coefficients of $f_r|_{B_X}$ at 0 are also weakly uniformly continuous on bounded sets, and the Taylor series expansion of $f_r|_{B_X}$ converges uniformly on B_X . It follows that there exists a continuous polynomial Q which is weakly uniformly continuous on bounded sets such that $\|Q - f_0\| < \frac{\delta}{3}$. Since X^* has the approximation property, notice from [Din, Proposition 2.8] that there exists a finite type polynomial R such that $\|R - Q\| < \frac{\delta}{3}$. Notice that X has the Radon-Nikodým property, so the proof of [CLS, Theorem 4.4] implies that there exists a finite type polynomial R' such that $\|R'\| < \frac{\delta}{3}$ and $P := R + R' \in \mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$ peaks strongly at $x_1 \in S_X$. It follows that $\|f_0 - P\| < \delta$. In particular, we have that $|f_0(x_1)| \geq 1 - \delta$. This implies that $\|x_1 - x_0\| \leq \varepsilon$. Therefore, x_1 is the desired strongly peak point for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$. \square

Theorem 4.8. *Suppose that a Banach space X has the Radon-Nikodým property and X^* has the approximation property. Then the Shilov boundary for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)}$ coincides with $\{\delta_z : z \in \overline{\partial\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)}^{w*}\}$*

Proof. We divide the proof in two steps.

STEP I. If $x_0 \in S_X$ is a strong peak point for $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$, then δ_{x_0} belongs to $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}}$.

If not, there exists an open neighborhood U of δ_{x_0} such that $U \cap \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}} = \emptyset$. Without loss of generality, we write

$$U = \bigcap_{j=1}^N \{\phi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)) : |(\phi - \delta_{x_0})(f_j)| < \varepsilon\}$$

for some $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Take $r > 0$ so small so that whenever $x \in B_X$ satisfies $\|x - x_0\| < r$, then $|f_j(x) - f_j(x_0)| < \varepsilon$ for any $j = 1, \dots, N$. By Lemma 4.7, there exists a strong peak point $x_1 \in S_X$ for $\mathcal{A}_a(B_X)$ such that $\|x_1 - x_0\| < r$. By observing that Theorem 3.3 can also be applied to the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$, we can deduce that δ_{x_1} is a peak point for $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)}$. Notice that δ_{x_1} belongs to the open set U ; hence $\delta_{x_1} \in U \cap \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}}$; which is a contradiction. Thus,

$$\{\delta_x : x \text{ is a strong peak point for } \mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)\} \subseteq \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}}.$$

STEP II. $\{\delta_z : z \in \partial\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)\} \subseteq \partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}}$.

Arguing as in [CLS, Theorem 4.4], we can see that the set of strong peak points for $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$ is dense in $\partial\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$. Thus, for $z \in \partial\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$, there is a sequence $(x_n) \subset S_X$ of strong peak points for $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$ such that $\|x_n - z\| \rightarrow 0$. As we have checked in STEP I, each δ_{x_n} is an element of $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}}$. Thus, δ_z belongs to $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}}$ since (δ_{x_n}) converges in the Gelfand topology to δ_z in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X))$ and $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}}$ is closed. Therefore, the assertion follows.

Finally, arguing as in Proposition 3.2, we see that $\partial\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}} \subseteq \overline{\{\delta_x : x \in \partial\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)\}}^\sigma = \{\delta_x : x \in \overline{\partial\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)}^{w*}\}$, where the second equality holds by Lemma 4.4. \square

Corollary 4.9. *If a Banach space X is one of the following:*

- (a) *A uniformly convex space having the approximation property,*
- (b) ℓ_1 ,
- (c) *$d(w, 1)$ with a decreasing sequence $w = (w_n)$ of positive real numbers satisfying $w_1 = 1$ and $w \in c_0 \setminus \ell_1$,*

*then $\partial \widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}}(B_X) = \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)) = \{\delta_z : z \in \overline{B_{X^{**}}}\}$.*

Proof. We already observed in Section 3 that if X is one of the Banach spaces (a), (b) or (c), then the unit sphere S_X is the Shilov boundary for $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_u(B_X)$ or $\mathcal{A}_\infty(B_X)$, thus it is also the Shilov boundary for $\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X)$. Moreover, X has the Radon-Nikodým property and X^* has the approximation property. By Theorem 4.8, it follows that the Shilov boundary $\partial \widehat{\mathcal{A}_{wu}}(B_X)$ coincides with $\left\{ \delta_z : z \in \overline{S_X^{w^*}} \right\}$ which is nothing but $\left\{ \delta_z : z \in \overline{B_{X^{**}}} \right\} = \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}_{wu}(B_X))$. \square

REFERENCES

- [Aco] M.D. ACOSTA, Boundaries for spaces of holomorphic functions on $C(K)$, *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **42** (2006) 27–44.
- [AcoL] M.D. ACOSTA AND M.L. LOURENÇO, Šilov boundary for holomorphic functions on some classical Banach spaces, *Studia Math.* **179** (2007), 27–39.
- [AcoM] M.D. ACOSTA AND L.A. MORAES, On boundaries for spaces of holomorphic functions on the unit ball of a Banach space, In: *Banach spaces and their Applications in Analysis*, B. Randrianantoanina and N. Randrianantoanina (Eds.), Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2007, pp. 229–240.
- [AMR] M.D. ACOSTA, L.A. MORAES AND L. ROMERO GRADOS, On boundaries on the predual of the Lorentz sequence space, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **336** (2007), 470–479.
- [AAM] M.D. ACOSTA, R.M. ARON AND L. MORAES, Boundaries for Spaces of Holomorphic Functions on M -ideals in Their Biduals, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* (2009), **58** (6), 2575–2595.
- [AL] M. D. ACOSTA AND M.L. LOURENÇO, Šilov boundary for holomorphic functions on cal Banach spaces, *Studia Math.* **179**, (2007), 27–39.
- [AK] F. ALBIAC AND N. KALTON, *Topics in Banach Space Theory* (second edition), Graduate Texts in Mathematics **233**, Springer, New York, 2016.
- [Are] E. L. ARENSON, Gleason parts and the Choquet boundary of the algebra of functions on a convex compactum, *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)* **113** (1981), 204–207.
- [Aro] R. M. ARON, Weakly uniformly continuous and weakly sequentially continuous entire functions. In: Barroso, J.A. (ed.) *Advances in Holomorphy*. North-Holland Math. Stud., vol. 34, pp. 47–66. North Holland, Amsterdam (1979)
- [AB] R. M. ARON AND P. D. BERNER, A Hahn-Banach extension theorem for analytic mappings, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **106** (1978), no. 1, 3–24.
- [ACGLM] R. M. ARON, D. CARANDO, T. W. GAMELIN, S. LASSALLE AND M. MAESTRE, Cluster values of analytic functions on a Banach space. *Math. Ann.* (2012), **353**, 293–303.
- [ACLP] R. M. ARON, Y. S. CHOI, M. L. LOURENÇO, O. W. PAQUES Boundaries for algebras of analytic functions on infinite dimensional Banach spaces, B.L. Lin, W.B. Johnson (Eds.), *Banach Spaces*, Contemporary Mathematics, **144**, American Mathematical Society (1993), pp. 15–22.
- [ACG] R. M. ARON, B. COLE AND T. GAMELIN, Spectra of algebras of analytic functions on a Banach space. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* (1991), **415** 51–93.
- [ADLM] R. M. ARON, V. DIMANT, S. LASSALLE AND M. MAESTRE, Gleason parts for algebras of holomorphic functions in infinite dimensions. *Rev. Mat. Complut.* (2020), **33** 415–436

- [AD] R. M. ARON AND S. DINEEN, Q -Reflexive Banach spaces, *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* **27** (4) (1997), 1009–1025. 1009–1025.
- [AHV] R. M. ARON, C. HERVÉS, M. VALDIVIA, Weakly continuous mappings on Banach spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **52** (1983), 189–204.
- [CGMS] D. CARANDO, D. GARCÍA, M. MAESTRE AND P. SEVILLA-PERIS, On the spectra of algebras of analytic functions, in: *Topics in Complex Analysis and Operator Theory*, 2012, pp. 165–198.
- [CGKM] Y. S. CHOI, D. GARCÍA, S. G. KIM AND M. MAESTRE, Norm or numerical radius attaining polynomials on $C(K)$, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **295** (2004), 80–96.
- [CH] Y. S. CHOI AND K. H. HAN, Boundaries for algebras of holomorphic functions on Marcinkiewicz sequence spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **323** (2006), 1116–1133.
- [CHL] Y. S. CHOI, K. H. HAN AND H. J. LEE, Boundaries for algebras of holomorphic functions on Banach spaces, *Illinois J. Math.* **51** (2007), no. 3, 883–896.
- [CLS] Y. S. CHOI, H. J. LEE AND S. G. SONG, Bishop’s theorem and differentiability of a subspace of $C_b(K)$, *Isr. J. Math.* **180**, 93–118 (2010).
- [Dal] H.G. Dales, *Banach Algebras and Automatic Continuity*, vol.24, London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series, the Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2000
- [Din] S. DINEEN, *Complex analysis on infinite dimensional spaces*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag London Ltd., London, 1999.
- [FHHMZ] M. FABIAN, P. HABALA, P. HÁJEK, V. M. SANTALUCÍA AND V. ZIZLER, *Banach space theory. The basis for linear and nonlinear analysis*, Springer, New York, 2011.
- [Ga] T. W. GAMELIN, Analytic functions on Banach spaces. In: Gauthier P.M., Sabidussi G. (eds) *Complex Potential Theory*. NATO ASI Series (Series C: Mathematical and Physical Sciences), (1994), **439**. Springer, Dordrecht.
- [Gl1] J. GLOBEVNIK, On interpolation by analytic maps in infinite dimensions, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **83** (1978), 243–252.
- [Gl2] J. GLOBEVNIK, Boundaries for polydisc algebras in infinite dimensions, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **85** (1979), 291–303.
- [Gu] J. M. GUTIÉRREZ, Weakly continuous functions on Banach spaces not containing ℓ_1 , *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **119** (1993), 147–152.
- [L] H. J. LEE, Generalized numerical index for function algebras, *Journal of Function Spaces*, vol. 2019, Article ID 9080867, 6 pages, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/9080867>
- [MR] L. A. MORAES AND L. ROMERO GRADOS, Boundaries for algebras of holomorphic functions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **281** (2003), 575–586.
- [MR2] L. A. MORAES AND L. ROMERO GRADOS, Boundaries for an algebra of bounded holomorphic functions, *J. Korean Math. Soc.* **41** (2004), 231–242.
- [PS] A. PEŁCZYŃSKI AND Z. SEMADENI, Spaces of continuous functions (III), *Studia Math.* **18** (1959), 211–222.
- [Ros] H. ROSENTHAL, A characterization of Banach spaces containing ℓ_1 , *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, **71** (1974), 2411–2413.
- [Š] G. E. ŠILOV, On the decomposition of a commutative normed ring into a direct sum of ideals, *Mat. Sb.* **32** (1954) 353–364 (Russian); *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2* **1** (1955), 37–48 (English).
- [S] E. L. STOUT, *The theory of uniform algebras*. Bogden & Quigley, Inc., Tarrytown-on-Hudson, N. Y., 1971.

(Y. S. Choi) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, POSTECH, POHANG 790-784, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Email address: mathchoi@postech.ac.kr

(Jung) BASIC SCIENCE RESEARCH INSTITUTE AND DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, POSTECH,
POHANG 790-784, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

[ORCID: 0000-0003-2240-2855](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2240-2855)

Email address: jmingoo@postech.ac.kr