

REGULAR IDEALS UNDER THE IDEAL INTERSECTION PROPERTY

R. EXEL*

The goal of this short note is to prove that when A is a closed $*$ -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B satisfying the ideal intersection property plus a mild axiom (INV), then the map $J \mapsto J \cap A$ establishes an isomorphism from the boolean algebra of all regular ideals of B to the boolean algebra of all regular, invariant ideals of A .

1. Introduction.

Recall that a closed $*$ -subalgebra A of a C^* -algebra B is said to satisfy the *ideal intersection property* if every nonzero ideal of B has a nonzero intersection with A .

This property has a long history, partially motivated by the celebrated uniqueness Theorem of Cuntz and Krieger [4: Theorem 2.13], originally stated in a different way but which can be directly linked to the ideal intersection property. In a more explicit fashion, Renault identified a situation [8: Proposition II.4.6] where the ideals of B and the ideals of A are even more closely related, namely the correspondence given by

$$J \in \mathcal{I}(B) \mapsto J \cap A \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{inv}}(A), \quad (1.1)$$

is a bijection, where $\mathcal{I}(B)$ denotes the collection of all ideals of B , and $\mathcal{I}_{\text{inv}}(A)$ denotes the collection of all *invariant ideals* of A (see below for the appropriate definitions).

The conditions under which this result was proven by Renault consist in taking B to be the reduced C^* -algebra of a twisted étale groupoid G , and taking A to be the abelian subalgebra associated to the unit space $G^{(0)}$. It is also required that G be an *essentially principal* groupoid [8: Definition II.4.3], in the sense that for every closed invariant subset $F \subseteq G^{(0)}$, one has that the set of points in F with trivial isotropy is dense in F .

A weaker notion of essential principality has been considered by several authors, Renault included, where the above requirement is made just for $F = G^{(0)}$, rather than for all closed invariant subsets (see [9: Proposition 3.1]).

This weaker version of essentially principal groupoids is not strong enough to guarantee (1.1) to be a bijection, but one may still recover the ideal intersection property, a fact I believe was first proved in [6: Theorem 4.4] (see also [3: Theorem 3.1.(b)]). In fact, in the second-countable case, the ideal intersection property turns out to be equivalent to the above weaker form of essential principality [1: Proposition 5.5.(2)].

In the recent paper [2] the authors take an intriguing middle of the road point of view, assuming the ideal intersection property (same as the weaker form of essential principality in the groupoid case, as already observed), and aiming for the conclusion of the stronger result proved by Renault mentioned above (which requires the full essential principality property), with the caveat that only regular ideals are considered, namely those coinciding with their second annihilator. To be precise, [2: Theorem 3.18] states that the correspondence

$$J \in \mathcal{R}(B) \mapsto J \cap A \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{inv}}(A), \quad (1.2)$$

is a bijection, where $\mathcal{R}(B)$ denotes the collection of all regular ideals of B , and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{inv}}(A)$ denotes the collection of all regular, invariant ideals of A . Besides assuming the ideal intersection property, this result requires that A be a regular subalgebra of B (in the sense that B is spanned by the normalizers of A), and that B admits an invariant faithful conditional expectation onto A (see [2] for more details).

The purpose of the present work is to generalize the above result by proving that (1.2) is a bijection under much weaker hypothesis. Besides the obvious assumption that A satisfy the ideal intersection property, we need only require axiom (INV), a weak form of regularity for subalgebras (see (3.3) below for the precise definition) and, more importantly, no assumptions are made on the existence of conditional expectations whatsoever. Our main result in this direction is Theorem (3.5).

* Departamento de Matemática – Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

Partially supported by CNPq.

We then specialize to the context of regular subalgebras in Corollary (4.5), where the only hurdle to be overcome is to check that axiom (INV) follows from regularity.

I'd like to express my thanks to David Pitts for many interesting conversations regarding regular ideals during his recent visit to Florianópolis, when he pointed me to the interesting preprint [2] by himself and collaborators.

2. Anihilators.

In this section we shall fix our notation regarding annihilators of subsets of a C^* -algebra and we will also introduce a notion of *invariance* which is important for the formulation of our main result and which we have not found in the literature.

► Throughout this section A will denote a fixed C^* -algebra.

2.1. Definition. Given any subset $S \subseteq A$,

(i) the *left-annihilator of S in A* is defined by

$$\text{Ann}_A^L(S) = \{x \in A : xs = 0, \forall s \in S\}.$$

(ii) the *right-annihilator of S in A* is defined by

$$\text{Ann}_A^R(S) = \{x \in A : sx = 0, \forall s \in S\}.$$

In case there is no question as to which ambient algebra we are referring, we will drop the subscript and write simply $\text{Ann}^L(S)$ and $\text{Ann}^R(S)$.

2.2. Proposition. Given a subset $S \subseteq A$, one has that:

- (i) $\text{Ann}^L(S)$ and $\text{Ann}^R(S)$ are norm-closed,
- (ii) $\text{Ann}^L(S)$ is always a left ideal,
- (iii) if S is a left ideal then $\text{Ann}^L(S)$ is a right (and hence two-sided) ideal,
- (iv) $\text{Ann}^R(S)$ is always a right ideal,
- (v) if S is a right ideal then $\text{Ann}^R(S)$ is a left (and hence two-sided) ideal.

Proof. Left for the reader. □

Recall that, given any subset $S \subseteq A$, it is customary to denote its closed linear span by $[S]$. In symbols:

$$[S] = \overline{\text{span}(S)}.$$

If T is another subset of A , the following notation will also be used

$$ST = \{st : s \in S, t \in T\}.$$

The closed two-sided ideal generated by S in A will be denoted by $\langle S \rangle_A$, so that

$$\langle S \rangle_A = [ASA].$$

As before we will write $\langle S \rangle$ when there is no chance of confusion.

2.3. Definition. We will say that a subset $S \subseteq A$ is *A -invariant* provided $[SA] = [AS]$.

See Section (4), below, for a discussion of the above concept in the context of regular inclusions.

Notice that $[SA]$ is always a right ideal and that $[AS]$ is always a left ideal. Thus, when S is A -invariant, one has that $[SA]$ is a closed two-sided ideal, clearly the smaller such ideal containing S , whence

$$[SA] = \langle S \rangle = [AS]. \tag{2.4}$$

In addition, when S is a closed two-sided ideal, it is easy to see that $[SA] = S = [AS]$, so S is A -invariant.

2.5. Proposition. *If S is A -invariant then*

$$\text{Ann}^L(S) = \text{Ann}^R(S) = \text{Ann}^L(\langle S \rangle) = \text{Ann}^R(\langle S \rangle).$$

Proof. Suppose first that S is a closed two-sided ideal, therefore also self-adjoint. Then, given $x \in \text{Ann}^L(S)$, and $s \in S$, we have that $x^*s^* \in S$, whence

$$(sx)(sx)^* = sxx^*s^* \in sxS = \{0\}.$$

This shows that $sx = 0$, and hence that $x \in \text{Ann}^R(S)$, proving that $\text{Ann}^L(S) \subseteq \text{Ann}^R(S)$, while the reverse inclusion follows similarly. In the general case observe that

$$\text{Ann}^L(S) = \text{Ann}^L(SA) = \text{Ann}^L([SA]) \stackrel{(2.4)}{=} \text{Ann}^L(\langle S \rangle),$$

and similarly

$$\text{Ann}^R(S) = \text{Ann}^R(AS) = \text{Ann}^R([AS]) \stackrel{(2.4)}{=} \text{Ann}^R(\langle S \rangle).$$

The final conclusion then follows from the first part of the proof. \square

2.6. Definition. If S is A -invariant (e.g. a closed two-sided ideal), we let the *annihilator of S in A* be defined by

$$\text{Ann}_A(S) := \text{Ann}_A^L(S) = \text{Ann}_A^R(S).$$

We remark that some authors use S^\perp for $\text{Ann}_A(S)$, but we shall prefer the latter notation due to the fact that we will soon consider another C^* -algebra B containing A , and it will therefore be important to specify the ambient algebra relative to which we are considering the annihilator of a subset $S \subseteq A$. In this case we feel that $\text{Ann}_A(S)$ and $\text{Ann}_B(S)$ are preferable to S^{\perp_A} and S^{\perp_B} . Meanwhile, when there is no question as to which ambient algebra we are considering, we will drop the subscript and write simply $\text{Ann}(S)$.

Notice that, under the above assumption that S is A -invariant, $\text{Ann}(S)$ is a closed two-sided ideal of A . By (2.5) we moreover have that

$$\text{Ann}(S) = \text{Ann}(\langle S \rangle). \tag{2.7}$$

2.8. Definition. An ideal¹ $J \trianglelefteq A$ is said to be regular if

$$\text{Ann}(\text{Ann}(J)) = J.$$

2.9. Lemma. *Let S be an A -invariant subset of A . Then:*

- (i) $\text{Ann}(\text{Ann}(\text{Ann}(S))) = \text{Ann}(S)$,
- (ii) $\text{Ann}(S)$ is a regular ideal of A ,
- (iii) If J_1 and J_2 are regular ideals, then $J_1 \cap J_2$ is regular.

Proof. Consider the symmetric relation “ \perp ” defined on A by

$$x \perp y \Leftrightarrow xy = 0 = yx.$$

We then claim that

$$S^\perp := \{x \in A : x \perp s, \forall s \in S\} = \text{Ann}_A(S).$$

Indeed, by (2.6) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ann}_A(S) &= \text{Ann}_A^L(S) \cap \text{Ann}_A^R(S) = \\ &= \{x \in A : xs = 0, \forall s \in S\} \cap \{x \in A : sx = 0, \forall s \in S\} = \\ &= \{x \in A : x \perp s = 0, \forall s \in S\} = S^\perp, \end{aligned}$$

¹ Unqualified references to *ideals* will henceforth mean closed two-sided ideals.

proving the claim. Employing (2.10.ii), below, we then have that $S^\perp = ((S^\perp)^\perp)^\perp$, which translates into (i) and in turn implies (ii).

Regarding (iii), we have by (2.10.i) that

$$J_1 \cap J_2 \subseteq \text{Ann}(\text{Ann}(J_1 \cap J_2)).$$

On the other hand we have that $J_1 \cap J_2 \subseteq J_1$, so

$$\text{Ann}(\text{Ann}(J_1 \cap J_2)) \subseteq \text{Ann}(\text{Ann}(J_1)) = J_1,$$

and likewise $\text{Ann}(\text{Ann}(J_1 \cap J_2)) \subseteq J_2$, so

$$\text{Ann}(\text{Ann}(J_1 \cap J_2)) \subseteq J_1 \cap J_2.$$

This proves that $J_1 \cap J_2$ is regular. □

2.10. Lemma. *Let X be any set and let “ \perp ” be any symmetric relation on X . For each subset $S \subseteq X$ define*

$$S^\perp = \{x \in X : x \perp s, \forall s \in S\}.$$

Then

- (i) $S \subseteq (S^\perp)^\perp$, and
- (ii) $S^\perp = ((S^\perp)^\perp)^\perp$.

Proof. Despite sounding a bit like a tongue-twister it is obvious that every element in S is perpendicular to anything that is perpendicular to every element in S , hence (i). Substituting S for S^\perp in (i), we get $S^\perp \subseteq ((S^\perp)^\perp)^\perp$. Next observe that

$$S_1 \subseteq S_2 \Rightarrow S_2^\perp \subseteq S_1^\perp,$$

which we may apply to (i), leading to $((S^\perp)^\perp)^\perp \subseteq S^\perp$, and concluding the proof. □

Observe that (2.9.iii) implies that the collection of all regular ideals of A is a meet-semi-lattice under the operation

$$J_1 \wedge J_2 := J_1 \cap J_2,$$

in the sense that $J_1 \cap J_2$ is the largest regular ideal² smaller than both J_1 and J_2 .

There is also a smallest regular ideal³ larger than both J_1 and J_2 , namely

$$J_1 \vee J_2 := \text{Ann}(\text{Ann}(J_1 + J_2)),$$

so the collection of all regular ideals is actually a lattice. If we furthermore define the *negation* of a regular ideal J by

$$\neg J = \text{Ann}(J),$$

we get a boolean algebra which may be proved to be complete.

As seen above, any ideal I of A is automatically A -invariant, but in case A is a closed $*$ -subalgebra of another C^* -algebra B , there is no reason for I to be also B -invariant. In the most favorable case we have:

2.11. Proposition. *Let I be an ideal of A which is also B -invariant, where B is a C^* -algebra with $A \subseteq B$. Then*

$$\text{Ann}_A(I) = \text{Ann}_B(I) \cap A.$$

Proof. We have that

$$\text{Ann}_A(I) = \text{Ann}_A^L(I) = \text{Ann}_B^L(I) \cap A = \text{Ann}_B(I) \cap A. \quad \square$$

² Actually the *largest ideal*.

³ As opposed to the *smallest ideal*, which is $J_1 + J_2$, but which is not always regular.

3. Ideal intersection property.

► From now on we will fix a C^* -algebra B and a closed $*$ -subalgebra $A \subseteq B$.

3.1. Definition. We shall say that A satisfies the *ideal intersection property (relative to B)* if, for any nonzero ideal $J \trianglelefteq B$, one has that $J \cap A \neq \{0\}$.

The following is a key technical result. It is essentially the only place where we will explicitly invoke the ideal intersection property.

3.2. Lemma. *Assume that A satisfies the ideal intersection property, and let $J \trianglelefteq B$ be an ideal. Then $\text{Ann}_B(\langle J \cap A \rangle_B) = \text{Ann}_B(J)$.*

Proof. Given $b \in \text{Ann}_B(\langle J \cap A \rangle_B)$, let $K = \langle b \rangle_B \cap J$. We then have that

$$K \cap A = \langle b \rangle_B \cap J \cap A \subseteq \text{Ann}_B(\langle J \cap A \rangle_B) \cap \langle J \cap A \rangle_B = \{0\},$$

whence $K = \{0\}$ by the ideal intersection property. Therefore

$$bJ \subseteq \langle b \rangle_B \cdot J = \langle b \rangle_B \cap J = K = \{0\},$$

showing that $b \in \text{Ann}_B^L(J) = \text{Ann}_B(J)$. This proves that $\text{Ann}_B(\langle J \cap A \rangle_B) \subseteq \text{Ann}_B(J)$. The reverse inclusion is clear. \square

We now wish to replace the occurrence of $\text{Ann}_B(\langle J \cap A \rangle_B)$ in the above Lemma with $\text{Ann}_B(J \cap A)$ but, unless we know that $J \cap A$ is B -invariant, we cannot even make sense of $\text{Ann}_B(J \cap A)$.

3.3. Definition. We shall say that A satisfies *axiom (INV) relative to B* when $J \cap A$ is B -invariant for every ideal $J \trianglelefteq B$.

Please see the following section for more context on this axiom, where it is shown that (INV) holds for every regular subalgebra.

3.4. Corollary. *Assume that A satisfies the ideal intersection property and axiom (INV). Then, for every ideal $J \trianglelefteq B$, one has that*

- (i) $\text{Ann}_B(J \cap A) = \text{Ann}_B(J)$, and
- (ii) $\text{Ann}_A(J \cap A) = \text{Ann}_B(J) \cap A$.

Proof. In order to prove (i), observe that $J \cap A$ is B -invariant by (INV), so

$$\text{Ann}_B(J \cap A) \stackrel{(2.7)}{=} \text{Ann}_B(\langle J \cap A \rangle_B) \stackrel{(3.2)}{=} \text{Ann}_B(J).$$

Regarding (ii), we have that

$$\text{Ann}_A(J \cap A) \stackrel{(2.11)}{=} \text{Ann}_B(J \cap A) \cap A \stackrel{(i)}{=} \text{Ann}_B(J) \cap A. \quad \square$$

The following is our main result.

3.5. Theorem. *Let B be a C^* -algebra and let A be a closed $*$ -subalgebra of B satisfying the ideal intersection property and axiom (INV). Also let:*

- $\mathcal{R}(B)$ be the family formed by all regular ideals of B , and
- $\mathcal{R}_{\text{inv}}(A)$ be the family formed by all regular, B -invariant ideals of A .

Then the correspondence

$$\alpha : J \in \mathcal{R}(B) \mapsto J \cap A \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{inv}}(A)$$

is a boolean algebra isomorphism, and its inverse is given by

$$\beta : I \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{inv}}(A) \mapsto \text{Ann}_B(\text{Ann}_B(I)) \in \mathcal{R}(B).$$

Proof. We first show that α does indeed map $\mathcal{R}(B)$ into $\mathcal{R}_{\text{inv}}(A)$. Given a regular ideal $J \trianglelefteq B$, we have that $J \cap A$ is B -invariant by axiom (INV) , so it remains to prove that it is also regular as an ideal of A . For this we need to show that

$$\text{Ann}_A(\text{Ann}_A(J \cap A)) = J \cap A. \quad (3.5.1)$$

Plugging (3.4.ii) into the left-hand-side above yields

$$\text{Ann}_A(\text{Ann}_A(J \cap A)) = \text{Ann}_A(\text{Ann}_B(J) \cap A) \stackrel{(!)}{=} \text{Ann}_B(\text{Ann}_B(J)) \cap A = J \cap A,$$

where the passage marked with (!) follows by substituting $\text{Ann}_B(J)$ for J in (3.4.ii). This proves (3.5.1).

Observe that, for every B -invariant regular ideal $I \trianglelefteq A$, one has that $\beta(I)$ is a regular ideal of B by (2.9.ii). Therefore β maps $\mathcal{R}_{\text{inv}}(A)$ into $\mathcal{R}(B)$.

Given I in $\mathcal{R}_{\text{inv}}(A)$, we next show that $\alpha(\beta(I)) = I$. Because I is regular in A , we have that

$$I = \text{Ann}_A(\text{Ann}_A(I)) \stackrel{(2.11)}{=} \text{Ann}_A(\text{Ann}_B(I) \cap A) \stackrel{(3.4.ii)}{=} \text{Ann}_B(\text{Ann}_B(I)) \cap A = \alpha(\beta(I)).$$

On the other hand, given a regular ideal $J \trianglelefteq B$, we have

$$\beta(\alpha(J)) = \text{Ann}_B(\text{Ann}_B(J \cap A)) \stackrel{(3.4.i)}{=} \text{Ann}_B(\text{Ann}_B(J)) = J.$$

This shows that α and β are each other's inverse. It is also clear that both α and β preserve inclusion of ideals, so α is a boolean algebra isomorphism, as required. \square

As an aside, observe that the map β referred to in (3.5) may be equivalently defined by

$$\beta(J) = \text{Ann}_B(\text{Ann}_A(I)),$$

because

$$\text{Ann}_B(\text{Ann}_A(I)) \stackrel{(2.11)}{=} \text{Ann}_B(\text{Ann}_B(I) \cap A) \stackrel{(3.4.i)}{=} \text{Ann}_B(\text{Ann}_B(I)).$$

4. Regular inclusions.

Recall that axiom (INV) was introduced in (3.3) as a solution to the problem as to whether or not $J \cap A$ is B -invariant for every ideal $J \trianglelefteq B$.

Postulating away one's problems might of course sound like a cheap solution, so we will now attempt to dispel this impression by identifying a very common situation (Proposition (4.2.iii), below) in which the above axiom is automatically satisfied.

► As before, we fix a C^* -algebra B and a closed $*$ -subalgebra $A \subseteq B$.

Recall from [7: 2.3.1] that a *normalizer* of A in B is any element n of B such that both n^*An and nAn^* are contained in A . When the normalizers span a dense subspace of B , and A contains an approximate unit for B , we say that A is a *regular subalgebra*⁴.

Besides the concept of B -invariance, there is another notion of invariance frequently featuring in works dealing with regular subalgebras, as follows:

4.1. Definition. A subset $S \subseteq A$ will be called *normalizer-invariant* when $nSn^* \subseteq S$, for every normalizer n .

The two notions of invariance are closely related to each other, as we now show.

⁴ Despite the formal similarity there is no relationship between the concepts of *regular subalgebras* and *regular ideals*. The former was perhaps first introduced in [5] in the context of von Neumann algebras, while the latter is related to the concept of *regular open sets*, namely sets coinciding with the interior of its closure.

4.2. Proposition. *Assume that A is a regular subalgebra of B . Then*

- (i) *for every ideal $J \trianglelefteq B$, one has that $J \cap A$ is normalizer-invariant,*
- (ii) *every normalizer-invariant ideal of A is B -invariant,*
- (iii) *A satisfies axiom (INV) relative to B .*

Proof. Point (i) is trivial and hence is left for the reader. As for (ii), let I be a normalizer-invariant ideal of A . Given a normalizer n , and given a in I , we first claim that

$$na \in [IB]. \quad (4.2.1)$$

To prove this it is clearly enough to show that, choosing an approximate unit $\{e_i\}_i$ for I , one has that

$$na = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} e_i na.$$

Let us therefore compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_i na - na\|^2 &= \|(e_i na - na)(e_i na - na)^*\| = \\ &= \|e_i naa^*n^*e_i - e_i naa^*n^* - naa^*n^*e_i + naa^*n^*\| \leq \\ &\leq \|e_i\| \|naa^*n^*e_i - naa^*n^*\| + \|naa^*n^*e_i - naa^*n^*\|, \end{aligned}$$

which converges to zero as $i \rightarrow \infty$, because $naa^*n^* \in nIn^* \subseteq I$, hence proving (4.2.1). Since the linear span of the normalizers is dense in B , we then conclude that $BI \subseteq [IB]$, whence also

$$[BI] \subseteq [IB].$$

The reverse inclusion follows by taking adjoints, so (ii) is proved. Finally (iii) follows immediately from (i) and (ii). \square

Let us now discuss the naturally arising question as to whether the converse of (4.2.ii) holds. Unfortunately we have no direct proof for this fact but we are nevertheless able to settle it for the special case of regular ideals under the ideal intersection property:

4.3. Proposition. *Let B be a C^* -algebra and let A be a regular subalgebra of B satisfying the ideal intersection property. Then every B -invariant regular ideal of A is normalizer-invariant.*

Proof. Given a B -invariant regular ideal $I \trianglelefteq A$, we have by (3.5) that

$$I = \alpha(\beta(I)) = \beta(I) \cap A.$$

Since $\beta(I)$ is an ideal of B , the result follows from (4.2.i). \square

As a consequence of (4.2.ii) and (4.3) we observe that, under the hypotheses above (A is regular and satisfies the ideal intersection property), the family of all regular, B -invariant ideals of A , denoted by $\mathcal{R}_{\text{inv}}(A)$ in (3.5), coincides with the family

- $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{inv}}(A)$ formed by all regular, normalizer-invariant ideals of A . (4.4)

We are not aware of any nontrivial example of a subalgebra satisfying axiom (INV) , except for those satisfying the stronger hypotheses of (4.2). In fact our motivation has always been the study of regular subalgebras where axiom (INV) emerged somewhat naturally.

Since axiom (INV) is more general and concise if compared to regularity, and since it is enough to prove Theorem (3.5), we believe its use is partially justified. A full justification will of course come with the discovery of a nontrivial and relevant example of a non-regular subalgebra A satisfying axiom (INV) .

The statement of the following immediate consequence of (3.5), (4.2.iii), and (4.3) makes no reference to the perhaps less popular concepts of B -invariance and axiom (INV) . A first version of it appears in [2: Theorem 3.18] under somewhat more stringent hypotheses.

4.5. Corollary. *Let B be a C^* -algebra and let A be a regular subalgebra of B satisfying the ideal intersection property. Then the conclusion of (3.5) holds with $\mathcal{R}_{\text{inv}}(A)$ replaced by $\mathcal{R}'_{\text{inv}}(A)$, as defined in (4.4).*

5. The importance of regularity for ideals.

As we already mentioned in the introduction, the fact that (1.1) is a bijection requires stronger assumptions as compared to the ideal intersection property, at least in the case of groupoid C^* -algebras. Theorem (3.5) is therefore not expected to be extendable to non-regular ideals. In what follows we describe an elementary example to show that this is indeed the case.

Let X be the topological space $[0, 2]$, and let $Y = [0, 1] \cup [2, 3]$. Consider the continuous map

$$h : Y \rightarrow X$$

given by $h(y) = y$, when y is in $[0, 1]$, while $h(y) = y - 1$, otherwise. Thus, h maps the first connected component of Y bijectively onto the first half of X , and it maps the second component of Y bijectively onto the second half of X . We then see that h is onto X , but it is not one-to-one due to the fact that $h(1) = h(2)$.

Let $B = C(Y)$, and let $A = C(X)$, viewed as a subalgebra of B under the monomorphism

$$f \in A \mapsto f \circ h \in B.$$

Since B is commutative and hence all subsets of B whatsoever are B -invariant, we see that A satisfies axiom (INV). Also it follows from [7: 2.11.14] that A satisfies the ideal intersection property. Theorem (3.5) then applies but we claim that it cannot be extended beyond regular ideals. To see this we will exhibit two distinct ideals J_1 and J_2 of B , not all regular, such that $J_1 \cap A = J_2 \cap A$.

Choosing

$$J_1 = \{f \in C(Y) : f(1) = 0\},$$

and

$$J_2 = \{f \in C(Y) : f(1) = f(2) = 0\},$$

it is easy to see that

$$J_1 \cap A = J_2 \cap A = \{g \in C(X) : g(1) = 0\},$$

so the map α referred to in (3.5) fails to be injective.

Returning to the analysis of regular ideals, observe that, in the present example, there is no conditional expectation from $C(Y)$ onto $C(X)$, so [2: Theorem 3.18] does not apply. However, as already mentioned, the hypotheses of (3.5) are satisfied, so one concludes that the boolean algebra of regular ideals of $C(Y)$ is isomorphic to the boolean algebra of all regular ideals of $C(X)$ (notice that, due to commutativity, every ideal of $C(X)$ is $C(Y)$ -invariant).

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Brown, L. Clark, C. Farthing, and A. Sims, “Simplicity of algebras associated to étale groupoids”, *Semigroup Forum*, **88** (2014), no. 2, 433–452.
- [2] J. Brown, A. Fuller, D. Pitts and S. Reznikoff, “Regular ideals, ideal intersections, and quotients”, arXiv:2208.09943 [math.OA], 2022.
- [3] J. Brown, G. Nagy, S. Reznikoff, A. Sims and D. Williams, “Cartan subalgebras in C^* -algebras of Hausdorff étale groupoids”, *Integral Equations Operator Theory*, **85** (2016), no. 1, 109–126.
- [4] J. Cuntz and W. Krieger, “A class of C^* -algebras and topological Markov chains”, *Inventiones Math.*, **56** (1980), 251–268.
- [5] J. Dixmier, “Sous-anneaux abéliens maximaux dans les facteurs de type fini”, *Ann. of Math.*, **59** (1954), 279–286.
- [6] R. Exel, “Non-Hausdorff groupoids”, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **139** (2011), 897–907.
- [7] R. Exel and D. Pitts, “Characterizing groupoid C^* -algebras of non-Hausdorff étale groupoids”, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 2306. Springer, Cham, 2022. viii+158 pp.
- [8] J. Renault, “A groupoid approach to C^* -algebras”, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* vol. 793, Springer, 1980.
- [9] J. Renault, “Cartan subalgebras in C^* -algebras”, *Irish Math. Soc. Bulletin*, **61** (2008), 29–63.