

CARTAN SUBALGEBRAS OF C*-ALGEBRAS ASSOCIATED WITH COMPLEX DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS

KEI ITO

ABSTRACT. Let R be a rational function with degree ≥ 2 and X be its Julia set, its Fatou set, or the Riemann sphere. Suppose that X is not empty. We can regard R as a continuous map from X onto itself. Kajiwara and Watatani showed that in the case that X is the Julia set, $C_0(X)$ is a maximal abelian subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$, where $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$ denotes the C*-algebra associated with the dynamical system (X, R) introduced by them. In this paper, we develop their result and give the equivalent condition for $C_0(X)$ to be a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Historical Background. In this paper, we study a Cartan subalgebra of a C*-algebra associated with a complex dynamical system.

A C*-algebra associated with a complex dynamical system was introduced by Kajiwara and Watatani [5]. Their aim was to modify the definition of Deaconu and Muhly's algebra.

Deaconu and Muhly [3] introduced a C*-algebra associated with a branched covering by using Renault's groupoid method [10]. For a branched covering $\sigma: X \rightarrow X$, their algebra is defined as the groupoid C*-algebra induced by the topological groupoid $\Gamma(X, T)$, where T is the locally homeomorphic part of σ . Kajiwara and Watatani noted that Deaconu and Muhly used only the locally homeomorphic part of a branched covering. This means that their algebras forget branch points. Kajiwara and Watatani tried to create a C*-algebra which remembers branch points and introduced a C*-algebra associated with a complex dynamical system [5] and with a self-similar map [6] by the Cuntz–Pimsner construction [9].

The Deaconu and Muhly's algebra for a branched covering $\sigma: X \rightarrow X$ has the natural Cartan subalgebra as a groupoid C*-algebra. This is isomorphic to the C*-algebra $C_0(X)$ of all continuous functions on a space X vanishing at infinity. Kajiwara and Watatani [7] showed that their algebra for a dynamical system on a space X also has a similar C*-subalgebra. This is isomorphic to $C_0(X)$ and maximal abelian. But it is unsolved whether this subalgebra is a Cartan subalgebra or not.

Let R be a rational function with degree ≥ 2 and X be its Julia set, its Fatou set, or the Riemann sphere. Suppose that X is not empty. We can regard R as a continuous map from X onto itself. Let $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$ denote the Kajiwara and Watatani's algebra associated with the dynamical system (X, R) . Kajiwara and Watatani showed in [7] that $C_0(X)$ is a maximal abelian subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46L55.

Key words and phrases. Cartan subalgebra, C*-algebra, complex dynamical system, branch point.

in the case that X is the Julia set, and left the problem of whether $C_0(X)$ is a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$ or not. In this paper, we give the equivalent condition for $C_0(X)$ to be a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$ and solve the problem.

1.2. Main Theorem. A rational function is a function described as P/Q for some coprime polynomials P and Q and its degree is defined as the larger of the degrees of P and Q . A rational function is a holomorphic branched covering from the Riemann sphere to itself.

The Fatou set of a rational function R is the maximum one of open sets on which the iterations of R is normal. The Julia set is the complement of Fatou set. They are completely invariant, that is, their image and preimage under R coincides with themselves.

Let R be a rational function with $\deg \geq 2$ and X be its Julia set, its Fatou set, or the Riemann sphere. The Kajiwara and Watatani's algebra $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$ is defined for the complex dynamical system (X, R) . Kajiwara and Watatani [7] showed that $C_0(X)$ is a maximal abelian subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$ in the case that X is the Julia set of R . In this paper, we develop their result and give a simple necessary and sufficient condition for $C_0(X)$ to be a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$. The aim of this paper is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 4.13). Let R be a rational function with $\deg \geq 2$ and X be its Julia set, its Fatou set, or the whole of the Riemann sphere. Suppose that X is not empty. Then, the followings are equivalent.

- (1) $C_0(X)$ is a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$.
- (2) X has no branch point of R .

2. REVIEWS AND PREPARATIONS

2.1. Operator algebras.

2.1.1. Adjointable operators between right Hilbert modules. In this sub-subsection, we review adjointable operators between right Hilbert modules. See [1] Part II, Section 7 for more detail.

Let A be a C^* -algebra, E and F be right Hilbert A -modules, and $T: E \rightarrow F$ and $S: F \rightarrow E$ be maps. S is called an *adjointable operator of T* if the equation $\langle e|Sf \rangle_E = \langle Te|f \rangle_F$ holds for any $e \in E$ and $f \in F$. T is called *adjointable* if there exists an adjointable operator of T . An adjointable map is a bounded complex-linear operator and it is moreover A -linear. Let $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ denote the set of all adjointable operators from E to F . $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ with operator norm is a Banach space.

Let $\Theta(E, F) := \{\theta_{f,e} \mid e \in E \text{ and } f \in F\} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(E, F)$, where $\theta_{f,e}$ is defined as the operator which maps $x \in E$ to $f(e|x)_E$. $\Theta(E, F)$ is closed under complex-scalar multiplication. Let $\mathcal{K}(E, F)$ denote the closed subspace of $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ generated by $\Theta(E, F)$. $\mathcal{L}(E) := \mathcal{L}(E, E)$ is a C^* -algebra and $\mathcal{K}(E) := \mathcal{K}(E, E)$ is its closed ideal.

For the later argument, let $K(E)$ denote the algebraic additive subgroup of $\mathcal{L}(E)$ generated by $\Theta(E) := \Theta(E, E)$. Since $\Theta(E)$ is closed under complex-scalar multiplication, $K(E)$ is a linear subspace of $\mathcal{L}(E)$. Therefore, the closure of $K(E)$ is $\mathcal{K}(E)$.

2.1.2. *X-squared Matrices.* Let X be a set. Let $(\mathbf{e}_x)_{x \in X}$ be the standard basis of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_X := \mathbb{C}^{\oplus X}$. Let M_X denote the \mathbb{C}^* -algebra of all bounded linear operators on \mathcal{H}_X . We call an element of M_X an *X-squared matrix*. For $x, y \in X$, the (x, y) -entry of α means the value $\langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle$.

Definition 2.1. Let R be a binary relation on X .

- 1) R is the *identity* if xRy implies $x = y$ for any $x, y \in X$.
- 2) R is *one-to-one* if xRy and xRz imply $y = z$ and also xRz and yRz imply $x = y$ for any $x, y, z \in X$.

Definition 2.2. For an X -squared matrix α , we define a binary relation $[[\alpha]]$ on X by the following: for any $x, y \in X$,

$$x[[\alpha]]y \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \text{the } (x, y)\text{-entry of } \alpha \text{ does not vanish, i.e. } \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \neq 0.$$

Definition 2.3.

- 1) An X -squared matrix α is *diagonal* if the binary relation $[[\alpha]]$ is the identity. Let D_X denote the set of all diagonal X -squared matrices.
- 2) An X -squared matrix α is *quasi-monomial* if the binary relation $[[\alpha]]$ is one-to-one. Let QM_X denote the set of all quasi-monomial X -squared matrices.

Proposition 2.4. Let α and β be X -squared matrices, c be a complex number, and x and y be points in X .

- 1) $x[[\alpha + \beta]]y$ implies $x[[\alpha]]y$ or $x[[\beta]]y$.
- 2) $x[[\alpha c]]y$ implies $x[[\alpha]]y$.
- 3) $x[[\alpha\beta]]z$ implies $x[[\alpha]]y$ and $y[[\beta]]z$.
- 4) $x[[\alpha^*]]y$ implies $y[[\alpha]]x$.

Proof.

- 1) Assume that $x[[\alpha + \beta]]y$, i.e. $\langle \mathbf{e}_x | (\alpha + \beta) \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \neq 0$.

$$\langle \mathbf{e}_x | (\alpha + \beta) \mathbf{e}_y \rangle = \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y + \beta \mathbf{e}_y \rangle = \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle + \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \beta \mathbf{e}_y \rangle.$$

Therefore, by the assumption we have $\langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \neq 0$ or $\langle \mathbf{e}_x | \beta \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \neq 0$, i.e. $x[[\alpha]]y$ or $x[[\beta]]y$.

- 2) Assume that $x[[\alpha c]]y$, i.e. $\langle \mathbf{e}_x | (\alpha c) \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \neq 0$.

$$\langle \mathbf{e}_x | (\alpha c) \mathbf{e}_y \rangle = \langle \mathbf{e}_x | (\alpha \mathbf{e}_y) c \rangle = \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle c.$$

Therefore, by the assumption we have $\langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle c \neq 0$ and hence $\langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \neq 0$, i.e. $x[[\alpha]]y$.

- 3) Assume that $x[[\alpha\beta]]z$, i.e. $\langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \beta \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \neq 0$.

$$\langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \beta \mathbf{e}_z \rangle = \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \sum_{y \in X} \mathbf{e}_y \langle \mathbf{e}_y | \beta \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \rangle = \sum_{y \in X} \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \langle \mathbf{e}_y | \beta \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \rangle = \sum_{y \in X} \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_y | \beta \mathbf{e}_z \rangle.$$

Therefore, by the assumption there exists $y \in X$ such that $\langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_y | \beta \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \neq 0$, which implies both of $\langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \neq 0$ and $\langle \mathbf{e}_y | \beta \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \neq 0$, i.e. both of $x[[\alpha]]y$ and $y[[\beta]]z$. So we have $x[[\alpha]]y$ and $y[[\beta]]z$.

- 4) Assume that $x[[\alpha^*]]y$, i.e. $\langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha^* \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \neq 0$. Then, we have $\langle \mathbf{e}_y | \alpha \mathbf{e}_x \rangle = \overline{\langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha^* \mathbf{e}_y \rangle} \neq 0$, which implies $y[[\alpha]]x$. \square

Fact 2.5 ([1], II.6.10.3 Corollary). Let A be a C^* -algebra, B a C^* -algebra, and $\theta: A \rightarrow B$ an idempotent positive B -linear map. Then θ is a conditional expectation.

Proposition 2.6. Let $\delta: M_X \rightarrow D_X$ be the complex-linear operator defined by

$$\delta(\alpha)e_x := e_x \langle e_x | \alpha e_x \rangle \quad \text{for each } \alpha \in M_X \text{ and } x \in X.$$

Then the following five statements hold.

- 1) $\delta(\alpha) = \alpha$ holds for any $\alpha \in D_X$.
- 2) δ is idempotent, i.e. $\delta \circ \delta = \delta$.
- 3) δ is D_X -linear.
- 4) δ is positive as an operator. That is, for any positive element α in M_X , $\delta(\alpha)$ is a positive element of D_X . Therefore, δ is also bounded.
- 5) δ is faithful as a positive operator. That is, an positive element α of M_X satisfying that $\delta(\alpha) = 0$ is only the zero element.

Therefore, δ is a conditional expectation.

Proof.

1) For any $x \in X$, we have $\delta(\alpha)e_x = e_x \langle e_x | \alpha e_x \rangle = \sum_{y \in X} e_y \langle e_y | \alpha e_x \rangle = \alpha e_x$ and hence $\delta(\alpha) = \alpha$.

2) For any $\alpha \in M_X$, letting $\beta := \delta(\alpha)$, we have $(\delta \circ \delta)(\alpha) = \delta(\beta) = \beta = \delta(\alpha)$. Therefore the operator δ is idempotent.

3) Let $\alpha, \beta \in M_X$. The following holds for any $x \in X$; hence $\delta(\alpha + \beta) = \delta(\alpha) + \delta(\beta)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\alpha + \beta)e_x &= e_x \langle e_x | (\alpha + \beta)e_x \rangle = e_x \langle e_x | \alpha e_x \rangle + e_x \langle e_x | \beta e_x \rangle \\ &= \delta(\alpha)e_x + \delta(\beta)e_x = (\delta(\alpha) + \delta(\beta))e_x. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\alpha \in M_X$ and $\beta \in D_X$. Applying the result of 1), we have $\delta(\beta) = \beta$. The followings hold for any $x \in X$.

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\alpha\beta)e_x &= e_x \langle e_x | \alpha\beta e_x \rangle = e_x \langle e_x | \alpha \sum_{y \in X} e_y \langle e_y | \beta e_x \rangle \rangle = \sum_{y \in X} e_x \langle e_x | \alpha e_y \langle e_y | \beta e_x \rangle \rangle \\ &= \sum_{y \in X} e_x \langle e_x | \alpha e_y \rangle \langle e_y | \beta e_x \rangle = e_x \langle e_x | \alpha e_x \rangle \langle e_x | \beta e_x \rangle = \delta(\alpha)e_x \langle e_x | \beta e_x \rangle = \delta(\alpha)\delta(\beta)e_x. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\beta\alpha)e_x &= e_x \langle e_x | \beta\alpha e_x \rangle = e_x \langle e_x | \beta \sum_{y \in X} e_y \langle e_y | \alpha e_x \rangle \rangle = \sum_{y \in X} e_x \langle e_x | \beta e_y \langle e_y | \alpha e_x \rangle \rangle \\ &= \sum_{y \in X} e_x \langle e_x | \beta e_y \rangle \langle e_y | \alpha e_x \rangle = e_x \langle e_x | \beta e_x \rangle \langle e_x | \alpha e_x \rangle = \delta(\beta)e_x \langle e_x | \alpha e_x \rangle = \delta(\beta)\delta(\alpha)e_x. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\delta(\alpha\beta) = \delta(\alpha)\delta(\beta) = \delta(\alpha)\beta$ and $\delta(\beta\alpha) = \delta(\beta)\delta(\alpha) = \beta\delta(\alpha)$ hold.

4) Let α be a positive element of M_X , i.e. a positive operator on \mathcal{H}_X . Then the inequality $\langle e_x | \alpha e_x \rangle \geq 0$ holds for any $x \in X$. So $\delta(\alpha)$ is a diagonal matrix whose all of diagonal entries are non-negative real numbers and hence is a positive element of D_X . Since this holds for any positive element α of M_X , δ is a positive operator.

5) Let α be a positive element of M_X with $\delta(\alpha) = 0$. The following holds for any $x \in X$ and hence all of diagonal entries of α are zero.

$$\langle e_x | \alpha e_x \rangle = \langle e_x | e_x \rangle \langle e_x | \alpha e_x \rangle = \langle e_x | e_x \langle e_x | \alpha e_x \rangle \rangle = \langle e_x | \delta(\alpha)e_x \rangle = \langle e_x | 0e_x \rangle = 0.$$

Let x and y be two distinct points in X and let $c := \langle e_x | \alpha e_y \rangle$. Since α is self-adjoint, we have $\bar{c} = \langle e_y | \alpha e_x \rangle$. Let $v := ce_x - |c|e_y$.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v | \alpha v \rangle &= \bar{c} \langle e_x | \alpha e_x \rangle c + \bar{c} \langle e_x | \alpha e_y \rangle (-|c|) + \overline{-|c|} \langle e_y | \alpha e_x \rangle c + \overline{-|c|} \langle e_y | \alpha e_y \rangle (-|c|) \\ &= \bar{c} 0 c + \bar{c} c (-|c|) + \overline{-|c|} \bar{c} c + \overline{-|c|} 0 (-|c|) \\ &= -2|c|^3. \end{aligned}$$

Since α is a positive element of M_X , i.e. a positive operator on \mathcal{H}_X , we obtain that $\langle v | \alpha v \rangle \geq 0$. Hence we have $\langle e_x | \alpha e_y \rangle = c = 0$. Since this equation holds for any two distinct points x and y in X , the matrix α is diagonal.

By the above results, α is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are zero; hence it is the zero matrix. \square

2.1.3. Cuntz–Pimsner algebras. In this sub-subsection, we review Cuntz–Pimsner algebras, which is induced in [9]. See [9] or [8] for more detail.

A C^* -correspondence over a C^* -algebra A is a right Hilbert A -module E endowed with the left A -scalar multiplication induced by a $*$ -homomorphism from A to $\mathcal{L}(E)$.

Let A and B be C^* -algebras, E be a C^* -correspondence over A , and $\rho_A: A \rightarrow B$ and $\rho_E: E \rightarrow B$ be maps. The pair $\rho = (\rho_A, \rho_E)$ is called a *representation of E* if ρ_A is a $*$ -homomorphism, ρ_E is a complex-linear map, and moreover the following two conditions hold.

- (1) ρ preserves inner product. That is, $\rho_A(\langle f | g \rangle) = \rho_E(f)^* \rho_E(g)$ holds for any $f, g \in E$.
- (2) ρ preserves left A -scalar multiplication. That is, $\rho_E(af) = \rho_A(a) \rho_E(f)$ holds for any $a \in A$ and $f \in E$.

If ρ is a representation of E , then the next holds automatically:

- (3) ρ preserves right A -scalar multiplication. That is, $\rho_E(fa) = \rho_E(f) \rho_A(a)$ holds for any $a \in A$ and $f \in E$.

For a representation $\rho = (\rho_A, \rho_E)$, let $C^*(\rho)$ denote the C^* -subalgebra of B generated by the set $\rho_A(A) \cup \rho_E(E)$.

A representation ρ is called *injective* if ρ_A is injective. In this case, ρ_E is also injective automatically.

Let A be a C^* -algebra, E be a C^* -correspondence over A , and $\rho = (\rho_A, \rho_E)$ be its representation. We define two $*$ -homomorphisms φ and ψ_ρ by the followings.

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi: A &\rightarrow \mathcal{L}(E), & \varphi(a)(f) &:= af & \text{for each } a \in A, f \in E. \\ \psi_\rho: \mathcal{K}(E) &\rightarrow C^*(\rho), & \psi_\rho(\theta_{f,g}) &:= \rho_E(f) \rho_E(g)^* & \text{for each } f, g \in E. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that φ is injective¹. Let $\mathcal{I}_E := \{a \in A | \varphi(a) \in \mathcal{K}(E)\}$. This is a closed ideal of A . We call ρ *covariant* if $\rho_A(a) = \psi_\rho(\varphi(a))$ holds for any $a \in \mathcal{I}_E$. There exist covariant representations whenever φ is injective, and also exists the universal one of them. *The Cuntz–Pimsner algebra associated with E* is the C^* -algebra induced by the universal covariant representation of E and denoted by \mathcal{O}_E .

Fact 2.7 ([8], Lemma 2.4). The equation $\psi_\rho(\theta) \rho_E(f) = \rho_E(\theta f)$ holds for any $\theta \in \mathcal{K}(E)$ and $f \in E$.

¹This condition is not necessary in the definition modified by Katsura in [8].

Proof. The equation holds for any $\theta \in \Theta(E)$ since we have the following for any $f, g, h \in E$:

$$\psi_\rho(\theta_{f,g})\rho_E(h) = \rho_E(f)\rho_E(g)^*\rho_E(h) = \rho_E(f\langle g|h \rangle) = \rho_E(\theta_{f,g}h).$$

By the linearity, it also holds for any $\theta \in K(E)$. Since two linear operators $\theta \mapsto \psi_\rho(\theta)\rho_E(f)$ and $\theta \mapsto \rho_E(\theta f)$ are bounded, the equation holds for any $\theta \in \mathcal{K}(E)$. \square

Proposition 2.8. The equation $\psi_\rho(\varphi(a))\rho_E(f) = \rho_A(a)\rho_E(f)$ holds for any $a \in \mathcal{I}_E$ and $f \in E$.

Proof. Using Fact 2.7, we have

$$\psi_\rho(\varphi(a))\rho_E(f) = \rho_E(\varphi(a)f) = \rho_E(af) = \rho_A(a)\rho_E(f). \quad \square$$

Definition 2.9 ([8], Definition 5.6). A representation $\rho = (\rho_A, \rho_E)$ of a C^* -correspondence E over a C^* -algebra A is said to *admit a gauge action* if for each complex number c with $|c| = 1$, there exists a $*$ -homomorphism $\Phi_c: C^*(\rho) \rightarrow C^*(\rho)$ such that $\Phi_c(\rho_A(a)) = \rho_A(a)$ and $\Phi_c(\rho_E(f)) = c\rho_E(f)$ for all $a \in A$ and $f \in E$.

Fact 2.10 ([8], Theorem 6.4). For a covariant representation ρ of a C^* -correspondence E , the $*$ -homomorphism $\mathcal{O}_E \rightarrow C^*(\rho)$ is an isomorphism if and only if ρ is injective and admits a gauge action.

Proposition 2.11. The equation $\lim_\lambda(f \cdot a_\lambda) = f$ holds for any approximate unit $\{a_\lambda\}$ of A and $f \in E$.

Proof. Since $\langle f|f \rangle$ is a positive element of A , we can let $|f| := \sqrt{\langle f|f \rangle}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \|fa_\lambda - f\|_E^2 &= \|f(a_\lambda - 1)\|_E^2 = \langle f(a_\lambda - 1)|f(a_\lambda - 1) \rangle \\ &= (a_\lambda - 1)^*\langle f|f \rangle(a_\lambda - 1) = (a_\lambda - 1)^*|f|^2(a_\lambda - 1) \\ &= \left\| |f|(a_\lambda - 1) \right\|_A^2 = \left\| |f|a_\lambda - |f| \right\|_A^2 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $\lim_\lambda \|fa_\lambda - f\|_E = 0$, which implies that $\lim_\lambda(f \cdot a_\lambda) = f$. \square

2.1.4. Z -squared B -valued matrices. Let Z be a set, B be a C^* -algebra and B_1 be its unitization. Let $B_1^{\oplus Z}$ denote the algebraic direct sum of $|Z|$ -many copies of B_1 as a right B_1 -module and $\mathcal{H}_Z(B)$ be the completion of the right pre-Hilbert B_1 -module defined as $B_1^{\oplus Z}$ endowed with the B_1 -valued inner product defined by $\langle \mathbf{a}|\mathbf{b} \rangle = \sum_{n \in Z} a_n^* b_n$ for any $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n \in Z}$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_n)_{n \in Z}$. Then, $\mathcal{H}_Z(B)$ becomes a right Hilbert B_1 -module (see [1], II.7.1.5 Proposition and II.7.1.7 Examples (iv)). We note that $\mathcal{H}_Z(\mathbb{C}) = \mathcal{H}_Z$. For the argument in this sub-subsection, let $\mathbf{e}_m := (\delta_{m,n})_{n \in Z}$ for each $m \in Z$.

Let $M_Z(B)$ denote the C^* -algebra $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_Z(B))$ of all adjointable operators from $\mathcal{H}_Z(B)$ to itself. We call an element of $M_Z(B)$ a *Z -squared B -valued matrix*. We note that $M_Z(\mathbb{C}) = M_Z$.

For $m, n \in Z$, the (m, n) -entry of a Z -squared B -valued matrix α is the value $\langle \mathbf{e}_m|\alpha\mathbf{e}_n \rangle$. For the argument in sub-subsection part, let $\epsilon_{m,n}$ be the matrix whose (m, n) -entry is 1 and the others are 0.

Remark. An entry of a Z -squared B -valued matrix may not be in B but in B_1 .

Proposition 2.12. A Z -squared B -valued matrix with no non-zero entries is only zero.

Proof. We note that the closed B_1 -linear span of \mathbf{e}_n 's coincides with $\mathcal{H}_Z(B)$. A Z -squared B -valued matrix with no non-zero entries maps any finite linear combination of \mathbf{e}_n 's to zero and hence any element of $\mathcal{H}_Z(B)$ to zero. Therefore, such a matrix is only zero. \square

Proposition 2.13. $M_Z(B)$ includes M_Z . That is, for any Z -squared matrix α , there exists a Z -squared B -valued matrix β such that $\langle \mathbf{e}_m | \alpha \mathbf{e}_n \rangle = \langle \mathbf{e}_m | \beta \mathbf{e}_n \rangle$ holds for all $m, n \in Z$.

Proof. We note that $\epsilon_{m,n}$'s belong to both M_Z and $M_Z(B)$. Since \mathcal{H}_Z is included in $\mathcal{H}_Z(B)$, the norm of M_Z is less than or equal to the norm of $M_Z(B)$. Hence, the identity map on the algebraic complex-linear span of $\epsilon_{m,n}$'s has a continuous extension from the closure in the norm of $M_Z(B)$ to the closure in the norm of M_B . The two closures are C^* -subalgebras respectively and the extension is a $*$ -homomorphism between them. In particular, the codomain one coincides with the whole of M_B . By Lemma 2.12, the extension is injective and hence admits the inverse. Under the inverse, M_Z embeds into $M_Z(B)$. \square

2.1.5. *The reduced group C^* -algebra $C_r^*(\mathbb{Z})$.* For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define a \mathbb{Z} -squared matrix v_n by $v_n \mathbf{e}_k := \mathbf{e}_{n+k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. The reduced group C^* -algebra $C_r^*(\mathbb{Z})$ is the C^* -subalgebra of $M_{\mathbb{Z}}$ generated by $\{v_n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

For each complex number c with absolute value 1, we define a \mathbb{Z} -squared matrix ω_c by $\omega_c \mathbf{e}_k := \mathbf{e}_k c^k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. This is unitary. Let Φ_c be the bounded linear operator from $C_r^*(\mathbb{Z})$ to itself defined by $\Phi_c(\alpha) := \omega_c \alpha \omega_c^*$ for each $\alpha \in C_r^*(\mathbb{Z})$. The following holds for any $c \in \mathbb{T}$ and $n, k \in \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\Phi_c(v_n) \mathbf{e}_k = \omega_c v_n \omega_c^* \mathbf{e}_k = \omega_c v_n \mathbf{e}_k \bar{c}^k = \omega_c \mathbf{e}_{n+k} \bar{c}^k = \mathbf{e}_{n+k} c^{n+k} \bar{c}^k = v_n \mathbf{e}_k c^n.$$

Therefore, The equation $\Phi_c(v_n) = v_n c^n$ holds for any $c \in \mathbb{T}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

We consider the conditional expectation $\delta_{\mathbb{Z}}: M_{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow D_{\mathbb{Z}}$ defined in Proposition 2.6. This maps v_0 to $1_{M_{\mathbb{Z}}}$ and v_n ($n \neq 0$) to zero and hence the image of $C_r^*(\mathbb{Z})$ is $\mathbb{C}1_{M_{\mathbb{Z}}} \cong \mathbb{C}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define a bounded linear functional $\delta_n: C_r^*(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by $\delta_n(\alpha) := \delta_{\mathbb{Z}}(\alpha v_{-n})$ for all $\alpha \in C_r^*(\mathbb{Z})$.

Proposition 2.14. Let B be a C^* -algebra and ξ be an element of the tensor product $B \otimes C_r^*(\mathbb{Z})$. Assume that $(\text{id} \otimes \delta_n)(\xi) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, $\xi = 0$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.13, we have $C_r^*(\mathbb{Z}) \subseteq M_{\mathbb{Z}} \subseteq M_{\mathbb{Z}}(B)$. We embed B into $M_{\mathbb{Z}}(B)$ under the injective $*$ -homomorphism $b \mapsto 1_{M_{\mathbb{Z}}(B)} \cdot b$. Under these embeddings, B and $C_r^*(\mathbb{Z})$ are commute in $M_{\mathbb{Z}}(B)$. So there exists a unique natural $*$ -homomorphism $B \otimes C_r^*(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{Z}}(B)$. By the nuclearity of $C_r^*(\mathbb{Z})$, $B \otimes C_r^*(\mathbb{Z})$ is isomorphic to its image under the $*$ -homomorphism.

The assumption of this proposition implies that every entry of the \mathbb{Z} -squared B -valued matrix ξ vanishes. Therefore, by Proposition 2.12, we obtain that $\xi = 0$. \square

2.2. Complex dynamical systems.

2.2.1. *Branch points of holomorphic functions.* In this sub-subsection, we review branch points of holomorphic functions. See [4] for more detail.

The *branch index* of a non-constant holomorphic function R at a point x in its domain, which is denoted by $e_R(x)$ in this paper, is the minimum of the degrees of the non-constant terms with non-zero coefficients in the power series representation of R around x . The notion is derived from the next well-known fact.

Fact 2.15. Let R be a non-constant holomorphic function with open domain D in the complex plain and x be a point in D . Suppose $y := R(x)$ and $k := e_R(x)$. Then there exists charts $\varphi: U \rightarrow V$ on D and $\psi: U' \rightarrow V'$ on the complex plane with the following properties.

$$x \in U, \quad \varphi(x) = 0 \in V, \quad y \in U', \quad \psi(y) = 0 \in V', \quad R(U) \subseteq U', \quad \text{and} \\ \psi \circ R \circ \varphi^{-1}(z) = z^k \text{ for all } z \in V.$$

Proof. See [4], 2.1. Theorem. □

Corollary 2.16. Let R be a non-constant holomorphic function with an open domain in the complex plain and x be a point in the domain. Then the followings are equivalent.

- (1) x is a *branch point* of R , i.e. the restriction of R to any open neighborhood of x is not injective.
- (2) x is a *critical point* of R , i.e. the derivative of R vanishes at x .
- (3) The branch index of R at x is greater than 1.

Fact 2.17 ([4], 2.4. Corollary). Let X and Y be Riemann surfaces and let $R: X \rightarrow Y$ be a non-constant holomorphic mapping. Then R is open, i.e., the image of every open set under R is open.

2.2.2. *Branch points and fixed points of rational functions.* A rational function is a function which can be written as a quotient of polynomials. This is a holomorphic function from the Riemann sphere to itself. The degree of a rational function R is the larger of the degrees of P and Q , where P and Q are coprime polynomials with $R = P/Q$.

The next proposition follows from the compactness of the Riemann sphere and the identity theorem.

Proposition 2.18.

- (1) A rational function with infinite many critical points is a constant function.
- (2) A rational function with infinite many fixed points is an identity function.

In particular, a rational function with $\deg \geq 2$ has only finite many branch points and fixed points.

2.2.3. *Fatou and Julia set.* In this sub-subsection, we review the Fatou and Julia set of a rational function. See [2], Chapter III for more detail.

Let R be a rational function. Open sets U on which the family of all iterations of R is normal are closed under union, and hence there exists the largest one of such open sets. The largest one is called *the Fatou set* of R and its complement in the Riemann sphere is called *the Julia set* of R .

Fact 2.19 ([2], Section III Theorem 1.2, 1.3, 1.8). The Julia set J of a rational function R with $\deg \geq 2$ is

- non-empty,
- completely invariant under R (i.e. $R^{-1}(J) = J = R(J)$), and
- perfect (i.e. J has no isolated points).

Example 2.20 ([2], p.55).

- (1) The Julia set of $R(z) = z^2$ is the unit circle $|z| = 1$.
- (2) The Julia set of $R(z) = z^2 - 2$ is the closed interval $[-2, 2]$.

2.3. Kajiwara–Watatani algebras. In this subsection, we briefly review the definition of C^* -algebras associated with complex dynamical systems introduced in [5].

Let R be a rational function with $\deg \geq 2$ and X be its Julia set, its Fatou set, or the whole of the Riemann sphere. Suppose that X is not empty. We note that X is locally compact, completely invariant under R , and perfect.

Hereafter, we regard R as a map from X to itself and consider the dynamical system (X, R) .

Let $A := C_0(X)$ as a C^* -algebra and let E be the completion of the pre-Hilbert A - A -bimodule defined as the complex-linear space $C_c(X)$ endowed with the left and right A -scalar multiplication and A -valued inner product defined by the followings.

$$\begin{aligned} (a \cdot f)(x) &:= a(x)f(x) \\ (f \cdot a)(x) &:= f(x)a(R(x)) \end{aligned} \quad \text{for each } a \in A, f \in C_c(X) \text{ and } x \in X.$$

$$\langle f|g \rangle(y) := \sum_{\substack{x \in X \\ R(x)=y}} e_R(x) \overline{f(x)} g(x) \quad \text{for each } f, g \in C_c(X) \text{ and } y \in X.$$

Then, E is a C^* -correspondence over A , which is called *the Kajiwara–Watatani C^* -correspondence*.

The left action $A \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(E)$, $a \mapsto (f \mapsto a \cdot f)$ is injective. Therefore, we can define the Cuntz–Pimsner algebra associated with the C^* -correspondence E over A . The C^* -algebra is called *the Kajiwara–Watatani algebra* associated with the complex dynamical system (X, R) and denoted by $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$.

Remark. For any $f \in C_c(X)$, the inequality $\|f\|_{C_0(X)} \leq \|f\|_E \leq \sqrt{\deg R} \cdot \|f\|_{C_0(X)}$ holds and hence the two norms on $C_c(X)$ are equivalent. Therefore, E coincides with $C_0(X)$ as a complex-linear space.

3. CERTAIN REPRESENTATIONS OF KAJIWARA–WATATANI C^* -CORRESPONDENCES

3.1. Definition and fundamental properties of representation ρ . We define an equivalence relation \sim on X by the following: for each $x, y \in X$,

$$x \sim y \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} R^{\circ m}(x) = R^{\circ n}(y) \text{ holds for some } m, n \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}.$$

Here, $R^{\circ n}$ denotes the n -th iterate of R , that is, $R^{\circ 0} = \text{id}$, $R^{\circ 1} = R$, $R^{\circ 2} = R \circ R$, and so on. In this paper, we call the equivalence class of a point x under the relation \sim *the orbit of x under R* . Since R is a rational function, the orbit of a point under R is countable and completely invariant under R . *The orbit of a subset S under R* is the union of orbits of elements of S , which is the minimum of completely invariant subsets including S .

Consider the orbit under R of the set of all the fixed points and branch points of the iterations of $R: X \rightarrow X$. This is countable since each iteration of R has only finite many branch points and fixed points (Proposition 2.18). Let \mathbb{X} be the complement of the orbit. Here we recall that X has no isolated points. So \mathbb{X} is comeager and hence dense in X by the Baire category theorem, and also completely invariant under R .

We define maps $\rho_A: A \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{X}}$ and $\rho_E: E \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{X}}$ by the followings:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_A(a)\mathbf{e}_x &:= \mathbf{e}_x a(x) && \text{for each } a \in A = C_0(X) \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{X}. \\ \rho_E(f)\mathbf{e}_y &:= \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{X} \\ R(x)=y}} \mathbf{e}_x f(x) && \text{for each } f \in E = C_0(X) \text{ and } y \in \mathbb{X}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\rho = (\rho_A, \rho_E)$ is a representation of the C^* -correspondence E over A .

Proposition 3.1. The representation ρ is injective.

Proof. We only show the injectivity of ρ_A . Take any $a \in \ker \rho_A$. For any point $x \in \mathbb{X}$, we have

$$a(x) = \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_A(a)\mathbf{e}_x \rangle = \langle \mathbf{e}_x | 0\mathbf{e}_x \rangle = 0.$$

Since \mathbb{X} is dense in X , we have $a = 0$. Therefore, ρ_A is injective. \square

Lemma 3.2. Let α be an \mathbb{X} -squared matrix. Assume that $\alpha\rho_E(f) = 0$ holds for any $f \in E$. Then, $\alpha = 0$ holds.

Proof. Take any $x \in \mathbb{X}$. Since the set $R^{-1}(R(x))$ is finite, there exists a continuous function f on X with the following conditions:

$$f(x) = 1, \quad f(y) = 0 \quad \text{for each } y \in R^{-1}(R(x)) \setminus \{x\}.$$

We have

$$\alpha\mathbf{e}_x = \alpha \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{X} \\ R(y)=R(x)}} \mathbf{e}_y f(y) = \alpha\rho_E(f)\mathbf{e}_{R(x)} = 0\mathbf{e}_{R(x)} = \mathbf{0}.$$

Therefore, $\alpha\mathbf{e}_x = \mathbf{0}$ holds for any $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and hence $\alpha = 0$. \square

Proposition 3.3. The representation ρ is covariant.

Proof. It immediately follows from Proposition 2.8 and Lemma 3.2. \square

3.2. ρ_n and E_n . For each $n \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$, we define ρ_n and E_n as below.

- $\rho_n: C_0(X) \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{X}}$ is the complex-linear operator defined by

$$\rho_n(f)\mathbf{e}_y := \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{X} \\ R^{o_n}(x)=y}} \mathbf{e}_x f(x) \quad \text{for each } f \in E = C_0(X) \text{ and } y \in \mathbb{X}.$$

Endowing the domain with the supremum norm and the codomain with the operator norm, the operator ρ_n is bi-Lipschitz. We note that $\rho_0 = \rho_A$ and $\rho_1 = \rho_E$.

- E_n is the range of ρ_n . This is a Banach subspace of $M_{\mathbb{X}}$.

The next equation follows immediately from the definition of ρ_n :

$$(\text{the } (x, y)\text{-entry of } \rho_n(f)) = \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_n(f) \mathbf{e}_y \rangle = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } R^{\circ n}(x) = y, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proposition 3.4. The following equation holds for any $f, g \in C_0(X)$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$:

$$\rho_m(f)\rho_n(g) = \rho_{m+n}(f \cdot (g \circ R^{\circ m})).$$

Proof. We have the following for any $x, z \in \mathbb{X}$, which is followed by this proposition.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_m(f)\rho_n(g) \mathbf{e}_z \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_m(f) \sum_{y \in \mathbb{X}} \mathbf{e}_y \langle \mathbf{e}_y | \rho_n(g) \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \rangle \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{X}} \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_m(f) \mathbf{e}_y \langle \mathbf{e}_y | \rho_n(g) \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \rangle \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{X}} \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_m(f) \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_y | \rho_n(g) \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_m(f) \mathbf{e}_{R^{\circ m}(x)} \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_{R^{\circ m}(x)} | \rho_n(g) \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \\ &= f(x) \langle \mathbf{e}_{R^{\circ m}(x)} | \rho_n(g) \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \\ &= \begin{cases} f(x)g(R^{\circ m}(x)) & \text{if } R^{\circ(m+n)}(x) = z \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_{m+n}(f \cdot (g \circ R^{\circ m})) \mathbf{e}_z \rangle. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.5. The map $(f, g) \mapsto f \cdot (g \circ R^{\circ m})$ maps $C_c(X) \times C_c(X)$ onto $C_c(X)$.

Proof. First, we show that the image of $C_c(X) \times C_c(X)$ is included in $C_c(X)$. The continuity of $f \cdot (g \circ R^{\circ m})$ follows immediately from the continuity of f and g . The zeros of f are also zeros of $f \cdot (g \circ R^{\circ m})$ and hence the support of f includes the support of $f \cdot (g \circ R^{\circ m})$. Therefore, the compactness of the support of $f \cdot (g \circ R^{\circ m})$ follows from the compactness of the support of f . By the above, $f \cdot (g \circ R^{\circ m})$ is continuous and compactly supported for any $f, g \in C_c(X)$.

Next, we show that the image of $C_c(X) \times C_c(X)$ includes $C_c(X)$. Take any $f \in C_c(X)$. The support of f is compact and so is its image under $R^{\circ m}$. There exists a compactly supported continuous function g which values 1 on $R^{\circ m}(\text{supp } f)$. The following holds for any $x \in X$:

$$f(x) \cdot g(R^{\circ m}(x)) = \begin{cases} f(x) \cdot 1 & \text{if } x \in \text{supp } f \\ 0 \cdot g(R^{\circ m}(x)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in \text{supp } f \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} = f(x).$$

Therefore, $f = f \cdot (g \circ R^{\circ m})$ holds. \square

Lemma 3.6. The map $(f, g) \mapsto f \cdot (g \circ R^{\circ m})$ maps $C_0(X) \times C_0(X)$ densely into $C_0(X)$.

Proof. The map in the statement of Lemma 3.5 is a bounded bilinear map and hence has a unique continuous extension to $C_0(X) \times C_0(X)$. The range of the extension includes $C_c(X)$ and therefore dense in $C_0(X)$. \square

Proposition 3.7. The equation $\overline{E_m E_n} = E_{m+n}$ holds for any $m, n \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$, where $E_m E_n$ denotes the set $\{\alpha\beta \mid \alpha \in E_m \text{ and } \beta \in E_n\}$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.4, Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6, we have the followings, which imply $\overline{E_m E_n} = E_{m+n}$.

$$E_m E_n = \rho_m(C_0(X))\rho_n(C_0(X)) \subseteq \rho_{m+n}(C_0(X)) = E_{m+n}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{E_m E_n} &\supseteq \overline{\rho_m(C_c(X))\rho_n(C_c(X))} = \overline{\rho_{m+n}(C_c(X))} \\ &= \rho_{m+n}(\overline{C_c(X)}) = \rho_{m+n}(C_0(X)) = E_{m+n}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Corollary 3.8. E_n 's are included in $C^*(\rho)$.

3.3. $X_{m,n}$ and $\mathbb{X}_{m,n}$. For each $m, n \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$, we define sets $X_{m,n}$ and $\mathbb{X}_{m,n}$ by the followings:

$$\begin{aligned} X_{m,n} &:= \{(x, y) \in X \times X \mid R^{om}(x) = R^{on}(y)\}, \\ \mathbb{X}_{m,n} &:= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X} \mid R^{om}(x) = R^{on}(y)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.9. Let Ω be a set, $R: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be a map, and X be a subset of Ω . Suppose that X is completely invariant under R . Then, the equation $R(X \cap U) = X \cap R(U)$ holds for any subset U of Ω .

Proof. The inclusion " \subseteq " follows from

$$R(X \cap U) \subseteq R(X) \cap R(U) = X \cap R(U).$$

We show the inverse inclusion. Take any element y in $X \cap R(U)$. There exists $x \in U$ such that $y = R(x)$. We have

$$x \in R^{-1}(y) \subseteq R^{-1}(X) = X.$$

So x is in $X \cap U$ and y is in $R(X \cap U)$. Therefore, $X \cap R(U) \subseteq R(X \cap U)$ holds. \square

Proposition 3.10. R is open as a map from X to itself, i.e. the image of every open set of X under R is open in X .

Proof. We recall that R is open as a map from the Riemann sphere to itself by Fact 2.17. The open set of X can be described as $X \cap U$ for some open set U of the Riemann sphere. By Lemma 3.9, its image under R coincides with $X \cap R(U)$, which is open in X . \square

Proposition 3.11. The spaces $X_{m,n}$ are non-empty, locally compact, and perfect.

Proof. We recall that X is not empty. So we can take a point z in X . Since X is completely invariant under R , there exists $x, y \in X$ such that $R^{om}(x) = R^{on}(y) = z$, which implies $(x, y) \in X_{m,n}$. In particular, $X_{m,n}$ is not empty.

Since $X_{m,n}$ coincides the preimage of the diagonal set of $X \times X$ under the continuous map $(x, y) \mapsto (R^{om}(x), R^{on}(y))$, it is closed in $X \times X$ and hence locally compact.

We show the perfectness of $X_{m,n}$. Take any point (x, y) in $X_{m,n}$ and any open neighborhoods U and V of x and y in X , respectively. Let $z := R^{\circ m}(x) = R^{\circ n}(y)$. By Proposition 3.10, $R^{\circ m}(U)$ and $R^{\circ n}(V)$ are open neighborhoods of z and so is their intersection W . Since X is perfect, W has a point w distinct from z . There exists $u \in U$ and $v \in V$ such that $w = R^{\circ m}(u) = R^{\circ n}(v)$, which implies $u \neq x$, $v \neq y$ and $(u, v) \in X_{m,n}$. Therefore, the basic open neighborhood $U \times V$ of (x, y) has the point (u, v) distinct from (x, y) . By the above, every point (x, y) in $X_{m,n}$ is not isolated and hence $X_{m,n}$ is perfect. \square

Proposition 3.12. $\mathbb{X}_{m,n}$ is dense in $X_{m,n}$ for any $m, n \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$.

Proof. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$. Take any point (x, y) in $X_{m,n}$. Let $z := R^{\circ m}(x) = R^{\circ n}(y)$.

Take any open neighborhoods U and V of x and y in X , respectively. By Proposition 3.10, $R^{\circ m}(U)$ and $R^{\circ n}(V)$ are open neighborhoods of z and so is their intersection W . By the denseness of \mathbb{X} , we can take a point w in $\mathbb{X} \cap W$. There exist $u \in U$ and $v \in V$ such that $w = R^{\circ m}(u) = R^{\circ n}(v)$, which implies $(u, v) \in X_{m,n}$ and $u, v \in \mathbb{X}$. Therefore, the basic open neighborhood $U \times V$ of (x, y) meets $\mathbb{X}_{m,n}$ at (u, v) .

By the above, every point (x, y) in $X_{m,n}$ is an adherent point of $\mathbb{X}_{m,n}$ and hence $\mathbb{X}_{m,n}$ is dense in $X_{m,n}$. \square

Proposition 3.13. Let $m, n, j, k \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$.

- (1) If $m - n \neq j - k$, then $\mathbb{X}_{m,n}$ and $\mathbb{X}_{j,k}$ are disjoint.
- (2) If $m - n = j - k$ and $m \leq j$, then $X_{m,n} \subseteq X_{j,k}$ and $\mathbb{X}_{m,n} \subseteq \mathbb{X}_{j,k}$ hold.

Proof.

(1) Assume that $m - n \neq j - k$ and $\mathbb{X}_{m,n} \cap \mathbb{X}_{j,k} \neq \emptyset$. Then, we can take a point (x, y) belonging to both $\mathbb{X}_{m,n}$ and $\mathbb{X}_{j,k}$. We note that x belongs to \mathbb{X} .

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\circ(m+k)}(x) &= R^{\circ k}(R^{\circ m}(x)) = R^{\circ k}(R^{\circ n}(y)) \\ &= R^{\circ n}(R^{\circ k}(y)) = R^{\circ n}(R^{\circ j}(x)) = R^{\circ(n+j)}(x). \end{aligned}$$

The assumption implies $m + k \neq n + j$ and hence x does not belong to \mathbb{X} . This leads to the contradiction. Therefore, $m - n \neq j - k$ implies $\mathbb{X}_{m,n} \cap \mathbb{X}_{j,k} = \emptyset$.

(2) Assume that $m - n = j - k$. Then, for any point (x, y) in $X_{m,n}$, we have

$$R^{\circ j}(x) = R^{\circ(j-m)}(R^{\circ m}(x)) = R^{\circ(j-m)}(R^{\circ n}(y)) = R^{\circ(j-m+n)}(y) = R^{\circ k}(y),$$

and hence (x, y) belongs to $X_{j,k}$. Therefore, $X_{m,n} \subseteq X_{j,k}$ holds. Similarly, we can show that $\mathbb{X}_{m,n} \subseteq \mathbb{X}_{j,k}$. \square

3.4. $\rho_{m,n}$.

Lemma 3.14. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \leq n$. The operator norm of an $m \times n$ matrix is less than or equal to n times by the max norm of the matrix. Here, the *max norm* of a matrix is the maximum of the absolute values of entries of the matrix.

Proof. An $m \times n$ matrix α can be regarded as a $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ matrix. For each $k = 1, \dots, n$, let β_k be the $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ matrix whose (i, j) -entry coincides with the (i, j) -entry of α if $i = j + k$ and otherwise vanishes. Each β_k is quasi-monomial

and hence its operator norm is equal to its max norm, which is less than or equal to the max norm of α . Therefore, the operator norm of α , which can be described as the sum of β_k 's, is less than or equal to n times by the max norm of α . \square

Proposition 3.15. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$ and let f be a bounded function on $\mathbb{X}_{m,n}$. Then, there exists a unique \mathbb{X} -squared matrix α whose (x, y) -entry values $f(x, y)$ if $(x, y) \in \mathbb{X}_{m,n}$ and otherwise zero. Moreover, the following inequality holds:

$$\sup f \leq (\text{the operator norm of } \alpha) \leq d \times \sup f,$$

where we let $d := \max(\deg R^{\circ m}, \deg R^{\circ n})$.

In this proposition, f need not be continuous.

Proof. The uniqueness follows immediately from Proposition 2.12.

Let α be the the linear map from the algebraic linear span of \mathbf{e}_x 's to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{X}}$ whose (x, y) -entry $\langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle$ values $f(x, y)$ if $(x, y) \in \mathbb{X}_{m,n}$ and otherwise zero. We will show the boundedness of α .

We recall that \mathbb{X} is completely invariant under R and has no branch points of the iterations of R . Therefore, the preimage of any point $z \in \mathbb{X}$ under $R^{\circ m}$, denoted by $R^{-m}(z)$, is included in \mathbb{X} and the number of its elements is $\deg R^{\circ m}$. The similar statement for n also holds. For each $z \in \mathbb{X}$, let α_z be the $R^{-m}(z) \times R^{-n}(z)$ matrix whose (x, y) -entry coincides with the (x, y) -entry of α . The size of α_z is $\deg R^{\circ m} \times \deg R^{\circ n}$ and hence α_z is a usual matrix. By Lemma 3.14, the next inequality holds:

$$(\text{the operator norm of } \alpha_z) \leq d \times (\text{the max norm of } \alpha_z) \leq d \times \sup f.$$

Take any finite linear combination \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} of \mathbf{e}_x 's. For each $z \in \mathbb{X}$, we define vectors \mathbf{u}_z and \mathbf{v}_z by

$$\mathbf{u}_z := \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{X} \\ R^{\circ m}(x)=z}} \mathbf{e}_x \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \mathbf{u} \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_z := \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{X} \\ z=R^{\circ n}(y)}} \mathbf{e}_y \langle \mathbf{e}_y | \mathbf{v} \rangle.$$

Then, we have the followings.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{u} | \alpha \mathbf{v} \rangle &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{X}} \langle \mathbf{u} | \mathbf{e}_x \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_y | \mathbf{v} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathbb{X}} \sum_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{X}_{m,n} \\ R^{\circ m}(x)=z=R^{\circ n}(y)}} \langle \mathbf{u} | \mathbf{e}_x \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_y | \mathbf{v} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathbb{X}} \sum_{\substack{x \in R^{-m}(z) \\ y \in R^{-n}(z)}} \langle \mathbf{u}_z | \mathbf{e}_x \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha_z \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_y | \mathbf{v}_z \rangle \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathbb{X}} \langle \mathbf{u}_z | \alpha_z \mathbf{v}_z \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbf{u} | \alpha \mathbf{v} \rangle| &\leq \sum_{z \in \mathbb{X}} |\langle \mathbf{u}_z | \alpha_z \mathbf{v}_z \rangle| \leq \sum_{z \in \mathbb{X}} \|\mathbf{u}_z\| \|\alpha_z\| \|\mathbf{v}_z\| \leq d \times \sup f \times \sum_{z \in \mathbb{X}} \|\mathbf{u}_z\| \|\mathbf{v}_z\| \\ &\leq d \times \sup f \times \left(\sum_{z \in \mathbb{X}} \|\mathbf{u}_z\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{z \in \mathbb{X}} \|\mathbf{v}_z\|^2 \right)^{1/2} = d \times \sup f \times \|\mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{v}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the linear operator α is bounded and hence has a continuous extension to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{X}}$. The extension is an \mathbb{X} -squared matrix with operator norm $\leq d \times \sup f$ and its (x, y) -entry values $f(x, y)$ if $\mathbb{X}_{m,n}$ and otherwise zero.

All that remains to show is that the operator norm of α is greater than or equal to $\sup f$. For any $(x, y) \in \mathbb{X}_{m,n}$, we have

$$f(x, y) = \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \leq \|\mathbf{e}_x\| \|\alpha\| \|\mathbf{e}_y\| = \|\alpha\|.$$

Therefore, the inequality $\sup f \leq \|\alpha\|$ holds. \square

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$. By Proposition 3.15, we can define a bounded linear operator $\rho_{m,n}$ from $C_0(X_{m,n})$ to $M_{\mathbb{X}}$ which maps f to the \mathbb{X} -squared matrix whose (x, y) -entry values $f(x, y)$ if $(x, y) \in \mathbb{X}_{m,n}$ and otherwise zero. This operator $\rho_{m,n}$ is bi-Lipschitz.

Proposition 3.16. Let $f, g \in C_0(X)$. Then, the function on $X_{m,n}$ which maps (x, y) to $f(x)\overline{g(y)}$ belongs to $C_0(X_{m,n})$.

Proof. Consider the bounded bi-linear operator from $C(X) \times C(X)$ to $C(X_{m,n})$ which maps the pair (f, g) to the function which maps (x, y) to $f(x)\overline{g(y)}$. This operator maps the pair (f, g) of compactly supported functions to a function supported by the compact set $\text{supp } f \times \text{supp } g$. Therefore, it maps $C_c(X) \times C_c(X)$ into $C_c(X_{m,n})$ and hence $C_0(X) \times C_0(X)$ into $C_0(X_{m,n})$. \square

Proposition 3.17. Let $f, g \in C_0(X)$ and let h be the function on $X_{m,n}$ which maps (x, y) to $f(x)\overline{g(y)}$. Then, the equation $\rho_m(f)\rho_n(g)^* = \rho_{m,n}(h)$ holds.

Proof. We have the following for any $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$, which is followed by this proposition.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_m(f)\rho_n(g)^* \mathbf{e}_y \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_m(f) \sum_{z \in \mathbb{X}} \mathbf{e}_z \langle \mathbf{e}_z | \rho_n(g)^* \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \rangle \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathbb{X}} \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_m(f) \mathbf{e}_z \langle \mathbf{e}_z | \rho_n(g)^* \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \rangle \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathbb{X}} \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_m(f) \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_z | \rho_n(g)^* \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathbb{X}} \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_m(f) \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \overline{\langle \mathbf{e}_y | \rho_n(g) \mathbf{e}_z \rangle} \\ &= f(x) \overline{\langle \mathbf{e}_y | \rho_n(g) \mathbf{e}_{R^{\circ m}(x)} \rangle} \\ &= \begin{cases} f(x)\overline{g(y)} & \text{if } R^{\circ m}(x) = R^{\circ n}(y) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} h(x, y) & \text{if } (x, y) \in \mathbb{X}_{m,n} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \rho_{m,n}(h) \mathbf{e}_y \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

3.5. \mathcal{U}_n and $\mathcal{U}_{m,n}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$, let \mathcal{U}_n be the family of all relatively compact open sets U of X on which $R^{\circ n}$ is homeomorphic. This covers the complement of the branch set (i.e. the set of all branch points) of $R^{\circ n}$. The family \mathcal{U}_n is closed

under open subset, that is, an open set included in some open set belonging to \mathcal{U}_n also belongs to \mathcal{U}_n .

For each $m, n \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$, we define $\mathcal{U}_{m,n}$, $S_{m,n}$ and $C_c(\mathcal{U}_{m,n})$ by the following:

$$\mathcal{U}_{m,n} := \{X_{m,n} \cap (U \times V) \mid U \in \mathcal{U}_m, V \in \mathcal{U}_n \text{ and } R^{\circ m}(U) = R^{\circ n}(V)\}.$$

$$S_{m,n} := \{(x, y) \in X_{m,n} \mid R^{\circ m} \text{ is branched at } x \text{ or } R^{\circ n} \text{ is branched at } y\}.$$

$$C_c(\mathcal{U}_{m,n}) := \{f \in C_c(X_{m,n}) \mid \text{supp } f \subseteq U \text{ holds for some } U \in \mathcal{U}_{m,n}\}.$$

$\mathcal{U}_{m,n}$ is a family of open sets of $X_{m,n}$. Since a rational function has only finite many branch points, $S_{m,n}$ is finite and hence closed in $X_{m,n}$. So the complement of $S_{m,n}$ is locally compact.

Proposition 3.18. The family $\mathcal{U}_{m,n}$ covers the complement of $S_{m,n}$ in $X_{m,n}$.

Proof. Take any point $(x, y) \in X_{m,n} \setminus S_{m,n}$. Then, $R^{\circ m}$ is not branched at x and hence there exists an open neighborhood U of x belonging to \mathcal{U}_m . Similarly, there exists an open neighborhood V of y belonging to \mathcal{U}_n . Since R is an open map, the images $R^{\circ m}(U)$ and $R^{\circ n}(V)$ are open neighborhoods of $z := R^{\circ m}(x) = R^{\circ n}(y)$ and so is their intersection, denoted by W . Let U' and V' be the preimage of W under $R^{\circ m}$ and $R^{\circ n}$, respectively. Since $R^{\circ m}$ and $R^{\circ n}$ are respectively homeomorphic and in particular bijective on U and V , the equation $R^{\circ m}(U) = W = R^{\circ n}(V)$ holds. Since U belongs to \mathcal{U}_m , so is its subset U' . Similarly, since V belongs to \mathcal{U}_n , so is its subset V' . By the above, $X_{m,n} \cap (U' \times V')$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}_{m,n}$ and has the point (x, y) . \square

Proposition 3.19. Let $W \in \mathcal{U}_{m,n}$ and let U and V be the image of W under the first and second projection, respectively. Then, the followings hold: $U \in \mathcal{U}_m$, $V \in \mathcal{U}_n$, and $R^{\circ m}(U) = R^{\circ n}(V)$. Moreover, the restriction of the first projection to W is a homeomorphism onto U , and similarly for V .

Proof. By the definition of $\mathcal{U}_{m,n}$, W can be described as $X_{m,n} \cap (U' \times V')$ for some $U' \in \mathcal{U}_m$ and $V' \in \mathcal{U}_n$ satisfying the condition $R^{\circ m}(U') = R^{\circ n}(V') =: W'$. By the definition of \mathcal{U}_m , the restriction of $R^{\circ m}$ to U' has the continuous inverse $s: W' \rightarrow U'$. Similarly, the restriction of $R^{\circ n}$ to V' has the continuous inverse $t: W' \rightarrow V'$.

Now we claim that $W = \{(s(w), t(w)) \mid w \in W'\}$, which implies $U = U'$ and $V = V'$. For any $w \in W'$, the point $(s(w), t(w))$ is in $W = X_{m,n} \cap (U' \times V')$ since $s(w) \in U'$, $t(w) \in V'$, and $R^{\circ m}(s(w)) = w = R^{\circ n}(t(w))$; and hence the inclusion “ \supseteq ” holds. Take any point $(x, y) \in W$. Since $W \subseteq X_{m,n}$, the equation $R^{\circ m}(x) = R^{\circ n}(y) =: w$ holds. The point w is in W' . We have $x = s(R^{\circ m}(x)) = s(w)$ and $y = t(R^{\circ n}(y)) = t(w)$. Therefore, the inclusion “ \subseteq ” also holds.

By the above, we obtain the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} U' & \xleftarrow{s} & W' & \xrightarrow{t} & V' \\ \parallel & & \downarrow (s,t) & & \parallel \\ U & \xleftarrow{\text{proj}_1} & W & \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_2} & V \end{array}$$

Since s and (s, t) are homeomorphic, the restriction of the first projection to W is a homeomorphism from W onto U , and similarly for V . \square

Proposition 3.20. The algebraic linear span of $C_c(\mathcal{U}_{m,n})$ coincides with

$$C_c(X_{m,n} \setminus S_{m,n}) := \{f \in C_c(X_{m,n}) \mid f \text{ vanishes on } S_{m,n}\}.$$

Proof. The span is clearly included in $C_c(X_{m,n} \setminus S_{m,n})$. Now we show the inverse inclusion. Take any $f \in C_c(X_{m,n} \setminus S_{m,n})$. $\mathcal{U}_{m,n}$ covers the compact set $\text{supp } f$ and hence has a finite subcover $\{U_1, \dots, U_k\}$. Let U_0 be the complement of $\text{supp } f$. Then, $\{U_0, U_1, \dots, U_k\}$ covers $X_{m,n}$. Let $\{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ be a partition of unity subordinated to $\{U_0, U_1, \dots, U_k\}$. $\text{supp } a_0$ is disjoint from $\text{supp } f$ and hence $a_0 f = 0$. Therefore, we have $a_1 f + \dots + a_k f = f$. For each $i = 1, \dots, k$, the function $a_i f$ is continuous and $\text{supp } a_i f \subseteq \text{supp } a_i \subseteq U_i$ holds. So $a_i f$'s belong to $C_c(\mathcal{U}_{m,n})$ and their sum f is belongs to its algebraic linear span. \square

Corollary 3.21. The closed linear span of $C_c(\mathcal{U}_{m,n})$ coincides with

$$C_0(X_{m,n} \setminus S_{m,n}) := \{f \in C_0(X_{m,n}) \mid f \text{ vanishes on } S_{m,n}\}.$$

3.6. $E_{m,n}$. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$. We define $E_{m,n}$ as the range of $\rho_{m,n}$. Since $\rho_{m,n}$ is bi-Lipschitz, $E_{m,n}$ is complete and hence closed in $M_{\mathbb{X}}$. Therefore, $E_{m,n}$ is a Banach subspace of $M_{\mathbb{X}}$. We note that $E_{m,0} = E_m$. In particular, $E_{0,0} = E_0 = \rho_A(A)$ and $E_{1,0} = E_1 = \rho_E(E)$ hold.

Lemma 3.22. $E_m E_n^* := \{\alpha \beta^* \mid \alpha \in E_m \text{ and } \beta \in E_n\}$ is included in $E_{m,n}$.

Proof. It immediately follows from Proposition 3.16 and 3.17. \square

Lemma 3.23. The operator $\rho_{m,n}$ maps $C_c(\mathcal{U}_{m,n})$ into $E_m E_n^*$.

Proof. Take any $f \in C_c(\mathcal{U}_{m,n})$. There exists $W \in \mathcal{U}_{m,n}$ with $\text{supp } f \subseteq W$. Let U and V be the image of W under the first and second projection, respectively. By Proposition 3.19, the restriction of the first projection to W is a homeomorphism onto U and hence has the continuous inverse, denoted by s . Let f_s be the continuous function on X which values $f(s(x))$ at $x \in U$ and otherwise zero. The image of $\text{supp } f$ under the second projection is compact and included in V ; hence there exists a continuous function g on X which values 1 on the image and whose support included in V . For any $(x, y) \in X_{m,n}$, we have

$$f_s(x) \overline{g(y)} = f(x, y) \cdot \overline{g(y)} = \begin{cases} f(x, y) \cdot \bar{1} & \text{if } (x, y) \in \text{supp } f \\ 0 \cdot \overline{g(y)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} = f(x, y).$$

Therefore, by Proposition 3.17, $\rho_{m,n}(f) = \rho_m(f_s) \rho_n(g)^* \in E_m E_n^*$ holds. \square

Corollary 3.24. The operator $\rho_{m,n}$ maps $C_0(X_{m,n} \setminus S_{m,n})$ into the closed linear span of $E_m E_n^*$.

Proof. It immediately follows from Corollary 3.21 and Lemma 3.23. \square

Proposition 3.25. $E_{m,n}$ coincides with the closed linear span of $E_m E_n^*$, and hence is included in $C^*(\rho)$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.22, $E_{m,n}$ includes the closed linear span of $E_m E_n^*$. Now we show the inverse inclusion.

Take any $f \in C_0(X_{m,n})$. Let $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k)$ be all the elements of the finite set $S_{m,n}$. We can take relatively compact open neighborhoods U_i of x_i and V_i of y_i in X for each i such that $U_i \times V_i$'s are pairwise disjoint. Also, for each i , we can take

- a continuous function g_i on X supported by U_i which values $f(x_i, y_i)$ at x_i and vanishes at the other x_j 's and
- a continuous function h_i on X supported by V_i which values 1 at y_i and vanishes at the other y_j 's.

Let f_i be the function on $X_{m,n}$ which values $g_i(x)\overline{h_i(y)}$ at (x, y) . By Proposition 3.17, $\rho_{m,n}(f_i) = \rho_m(g_i)\rho_n(h_i)^* \in E_m E_n^*$ holds. Each f_i coincides with f at (x_i, y_i) and vanishes at the other (x_j, y_j) 's. Hence, $f_0 := f - (f_1 + \dots + f_k)$ vanishes on $S_{m,n}$ and belongs to $C_0(X_{m,n} \setminus S_{m,n})$. By Corollary 3.24, $\rho_{m,n}(f_0)$ belongs to the closed linear span of $E_m E_n^*$.

By the above, $\rho_{m,n}(f) = \rho_{m,n}(f_0) + \rho_{m,n}(f_1) + \dots + \rho_{m,n}(f_k)$ belongs to the closed linear span of $E_m E_n^*$. \square

Proposition 3.26.

- (1) $E_{0,0}$ coincides with $E_0 = \rho_A(A)$.
- (2) $E_{m,0}$ coincides with the closed linear span of

$$E_1^m := \{\rho_E(f_1) \cdots \rho_E(f_m) \mid f_1, \dots, f_m \in E\}.$$

- (3) $E_{0,n}$ coincides with the closed linear span of

$$E_1^{*n} := \{\rho_E(f_1)^* \cdots \rho_E(f_n)^* \mid f_1, \dots, f_n \in E\}.$$

- (4) $E_{m,n}$ coincides with the closed linear span of

$$E_1^m E_1^{*n} := \{\alpha\beta \mid \alpha \in E_1^m \text{ and } \beta \in E_1^{*n}\}.$$

Proof. (1) follows from that $X_{0,0}$ is isomorphic to X . (2) follows from Proposition 3.7 and the fact that $X_{m,0}$ is isomorphic to X . (3) follows from (2). (4) follows from Proposition 3.7 and 3.25. \square

3.7. $\widehat{\rho}$. We define maps $\widehat{\rho}_A: A \rightarrow C^*(\rho) \otimes C^*(\mathbb{Z})$ and $\widehat{\rho}_E: E \rightarrow C^*(\rho) \otimes C^*(\mathbb{Z})$ by the followings:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\rho}_A(a) &:= \rho_A(a) \otimes v_0 \quad \text{for } a \in A, \\ \widehat{\rho}_E(f) &:= \rho_E(f) \otimes v_1 \quad \text{for } f \in E. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\widehat{\rho} = (\widehat{\rho}_A, \widehat{\rho}_E)$ is a representation of the C^* -correspondence E over A .

Lemma 3.27. Let ξ be an element of $C^*(\rho) \otimes C_r^*(\mathbb{Z})$. Assume that $\xi\widehat{\rho}_E(f) = 0$ holds for any $f \in E$. Then, $\xi = 0$.

Proof. By the assumption, we have the following for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and any $f \in E$:

$$(\text{id} \otimes \delta_n)(\xi)\rho_E(f) = (\text{id} \otimes \delta_{n+1})(\xi\widehat{\rho}_E(f)) = (\text{id} \otimes \delta_{n+1})(0) = 0.$$

Applying Proposition 3.2, we obtain that $(\text{id} \otimes \delta_n)(\xi) = 0$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Applying Proposition 2.14, we obtain that $\xi = 0$. \square

Lemma 3.28. The representation $\widehat{\rho}$ is injective and covariant and also admits a gauge action.

Proof. The injectivity of $\widehat{\rho}$ follows from the injectivity of ρ (Proposition 3.1). The covariantness follows from Proposition 2.8 and Lemma 3.27. Recall the operator Φ_c in sub-subsection 2.1.5. The operator $\text{id} \otimes \Phi_c: C^*(\rho) \otimes C_r^*(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow C^*(\rho) \otimes C_r^*(\mathbb{Z})$ is a gauge action for c . Therefore, $\widehat{\rho}$ admits a gauge action. \square

Lemma 3.29. The representation $\widehat{\rho}$ is universal as a covariant representation and $C^*(\widehat{\rho})$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$.

Proof. It immediately follows from Fact 2.10 and Proposition 3.28. \square

3.8. The universality of ρ . By the universality of $\widehat{\rho}$ (Proposition 3.29), we obtain the natural $*$ -homomorphism from $C^*(\widehat{\rho})$ to $C^*(\rho)$, denoted by ν .

For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define \mathcal{E}_n , \mathcal{X}_n , $F_b(\mathcal{X}_n)$, and ent_n as below.

- \mathcal{E}_n is the closure of the range of $\text{id} \otimes \delta_n$ included in $C^*(\rho)$. This is a Banach subspace of $C^*(\rho)$.
- \mathcal{X}_n is the union of $\mathbb{X}_{i,j}$'s, where the indices i and j run over $\mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$ such that $i - j = n$. By Proposition 3.13, \mathcal{X}_n 's are pairwise disjoint.
- $F_b(\mathcal{X}_n)$ is the Banach space of all bounded functions on \mathcal{X}_n with supremum norm.
- ent_n is the map from $C^*(\rho)$ to $F_b(\mathcal{X}_n)$ which maps α to the function on \mathcal{X}_n which values the (x, y) -entry of α at $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X}_n$.

Proposition 3.30. $C^*(\rho)$ coincides with the closure of the additive subgroup of $C^*(\rho)$ generated by the union of $E_{m,n}$'s, where the indices m and n run over $\mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$.

Proof. Since $E_1^* E_1 = \rho_E(E)^* \rho_E(E)$ is included in $E_0 = \rho_A(A)$, the union of E_0 , E_1^m 's, $(E_1^n)^*$'s and $(E_1^m)(E_1^n)^*$'s is closed under multiplication and involution. Therefore, the algebraic additive subgroup of $C^*(\rho)$ generated by the union is a $*$ -subalgebra of $C^*(\rho)$ including $E_0 \cup E_1 = \rho_A(A) \cup \rho_E(E)$, and its closure coincides with $C^*(\rho)$. By Proposition 3.25 and 3.26, the closure of the algebraic additive subgroup of $C^*(\rho)$ generated by the union of $E_{m,n}$'s also coincides with $C^*(\rho)$. \square

Proposition 3.31. $C^*(\widehat{\rho})$ coincides with the closure of the additive subgroup of $C^*(\widehat{\rho})$ generated by the union of $E_{m,n} \otimes v_{m-n}$'s, where the indices m and n run over $\mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.26, $E_{m,n} \otimes v_{m-n}$'s are included in $C^*(\widehat{\rho})$. Therefore, we can apply the similar argument as in the proof of Proposition 3.30. \square

Proposition 3.32. Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. \mathcal{E}_n is the closure of the additive subgroup of $C^*(\rho)$ generated by the union of $E_{i,j}$'s, where the indices i and j run over $\mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$ such that $i - j = n$.

Proof. The operator $\text{id} \otimes \delta_n$ maps any element $\alpha \otimes v_{i-j} \in E_{i,j} \otimes v_{i-j}$ to α if $i-j = n$ and to zero otherwise. Therefore, by Proposition 3.31, \mathcal{E}_n coincides with the closed linear span of $E_{i,j}$'s, where the indices i and j run over $\mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$ such that $i-j = n$. Since $E_{i,j}$'s are closed under scalar-multiplication, the span can be described as the closure of the additive subgroup of $C^*(\rho)$ generated by such $E_{i,j}$'s. \square

Proposition 3.33. Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$, and $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}_n$. Then, $x[[\alpha]]y$ implies that $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X}_n$.

Proof. We prove the contrapositive. Assume that $(x, y) \notin \mathcal{X}_n$. Then, the (x, y) -entry of an \mathbb{X} -squared matrix belonging to some $E_{i,j}$ with $i-j = n$ values zero. This means that the bounded linear functional on $M_{\mathbb{X}}$ which maps α to its (x, y) -entry vanishes on the dense subset of \mathcal{E}_n ; hence the functional vanishes on the whole of \mathcal{E}_n . In other words, $x[[\alpha]]y$ does not hold for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{E}_n$. \square

Proposition 3.34. Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The restriction of ent_n to \mathcal{E}_n is injective.

Proof. Take any \mathbb{X} -squared matrix α belonging to the kernel of ent_n . Since $\text{ent}_n(\alpha) = 0$, the (x, y) -entry of α vanishes for any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X}_n$. By Proposition 3.33, the other entries also vanishes. Therefore, all entries of α values zero. By Proposition 2.12, such matrix is only zero. \square

Proposition 3.35. Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The following diagram is commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C^*(\hat{\rho}) & \xrightarrow{\nu} & C^*(\rho) \\ \text{id} \otimes \delta_n \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{ent}_n \\ \mathcal{E}_n & \xrightarrow{\text{ent}_n} & F_b(\mathcal{X}_n) \end{array}$$

Proof. Let $i, j \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$ and $\alpha \in E_{i,j}$. For any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X}_n$, we have the followings.

$$\text{ent}_n(\nu(\alpha \otimes v_{i-j}))(x, y) = \text{ent}_n(\alpha)(x, y).$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ent}_n(\text{id} \otimes \delta_n(\alpha \otimes v_{i-j}))(x, y) &= \text{ent}_n(\text{id}(\alpha) \cdot \delta_n(v_{i-j}))(x, y) \\ &= \begin{cases} \text{ent}_n(\alpha \cdot 1)(x, y) & \text{if } i-j = n \\ \text{ent}_n(\alpha \cdot 0)(x, y) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \text{ent}_n(\alpha)(x, y) & \text{if } i-j = n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 3.13, the (x, y) -entry of α vanishes if $i-j \neq n$. Therefore, we have the equation

$$\text{ent}_n(\nu(\alpha \otimes v_{i-j}))(x, y) = \text{ent}_n(\text{id} \otimes \delta_n(\alpha \otimes v_{i-j}))(x, y).$$

By the above, for each $i, j \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$, the equation $\text{ent}_n \circ \nu = \text{ent}_n \circ (\text{id} \otimes \delta_n)$ holds on $E_{i,j} \otimes v_{i-j}$ and hence, by Proposition 3.31, on the whole of $C^*(\hat{\rho})$, too. \square

Lemma 3.36. The $*$ -homomorphism ν is isometry.

Proof. It suffices to show the injectivity of ν . Take any element ξ of the kernel of ν . By Proposition 3.35, we have

$$\text{ent}_n(\text{id} \otimes \delta_n(\xi)) = \text{ent}_n(\nu(\xi)) = \text{ent}_n(0) = 0.$$

By Proposition 3.34, we obtain that $\text{id} \otimes \delta_n(\xi) = 0$. This holds for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, by applying Proposition 2.14, we have $\xi = 0$. \square

Proposition 3.37. The representation ρ is universal as a covariant representation and $C^*(\rho)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$.

Proof. It follows from Proposition 3.29 and Lemma 3.36. \square

4. IS $C_0(X)$ A CARTAN SUBALGEBRA OF $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$?

The definition of a Cartan subalgebra of a C^* -algebra was introduced in [10].

Definition 4.1 ([10], Definition 4.5). Let A be a sub C^* -algebra of a C^* -algebra B .

(1) Its *normalizer* is the set

$$N(A) := \{b \in B \mid bAb^* \subseteq A \text{ and } b^*Ab \subseteq A\}.$$

(2) One says that A is *regular* if its normalizer $N(A)$ generates B as a C^* -algebra.

Definition 4.2 ([10], Definition 5.1). We shall say that an abelian sub- C^* -algebra A of a C^* -algebra B is a *Cartan subalgebra* if

- (1) A contains an approximate unit of B ;
- (2) A is maximal abelian;
- (3) A is regular;
- (4) there exists a faithful conditional expectation P of A onto B .

In this section, the normalizer of $\rho_A(A)$ in $C^*(\rho)$ is simply denoted by N . Let $C^*(N)$ denote the C^* -subalgebra of $C^*(\rho)$ generated by N .

Definition 4.3. Let $m \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$ and α be an \mathbb{X} -squared matrix. The function on $\mathbb{X}_{m,0}$ which sends (x, y) to the (x, y) -entry of α is called *the m -th entry function for α* . Also, its continuous extension to $X_{m,0}$, if exists, is called *the m -th extended entry function*.

Proposition 4.4. Let $m \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$. Every \mathbb{X} -squared matrix belonging to $C^*(\rho)$ admits the m -th extended entry function, which vanishes at infinity.

Proof. By Proposition 3.13, the m -th entry function for an \mathbb{X} -squared matrix belonging to $E_{i,j}$ is the restriction of a continuous function on $X_{i,j}$ vanishing at infinity if $i - j = m$ and the constant zero function otherwise. Therefore, in any case, it has a continuous extension to $X_{m,0}$. Moreover, the extension vanishes at infinity. \square

Proposition 4.5. $C^*(\rho) \cap D_{\mathbb{X}} = \rho_A(A)$.

Proof. The inclusion “ \supseteq ” holds obviously. Now we show the inverse inclusion. Take any $\alpha \in C^*(\rho) \cap D_{\mathbb{X}}$. Let a be the 0-th extended entry function for α , whose existence is guaranteed by Proposition 4.4. Since α is diagonal, we have that $\alpha = \rho_{0,0}(a)$ and hence it belongs to $E_{0,0} = \rho_A(A)$. \square

Lemma 4.6. An approximate unit of $\rho_A(A)$ is also an approximate unit of $C^*(\rho)$.

Proof. Let $\{\alpha_\lambda\}$ be an approximate unit of A . Since ρ_A is isomorphism between A and $\rho_A(A)$, letting $a_\lambda := \rho_A^{-1}(\alpha_\lambda)$ for each λ , the family $\{a_\lambda\}$ is also an approximate unit for A .

First we show that $\lim_\lambda(\rho_E(f)\rho_A(a_\lambda)) = \rho_E(f)$ for any $f \in E$. Using Proposition 2.11, we obtain this as following:

$$\lim_\lambda(\rho_E(f)\rho_A(a_\lambda)) = \lim_\lambda \rho_E(f a_\lambda) = \rho_E(\lim_\lambda f a_\lambda) = \rho_E(f).$$

Next we show that $\lim_\lambda(\rho_A(a_\lambda)\rho_E(f)) = \rho_E(f)$ for any $f \in E$. Since ρ_E is isometry, it suffices to show that $\lim_\lambda(a_\lambda f) = f$ in E . Here we recall that the left A -scalar multiplication of E is defined by $(a \cdot f)(x) := a(x)f(x)$ for all $x \in X$. Therefore, $a_\lambda f$ coincides the product of a and f in $A = C_0(X)$. We note that the norm of $E = C_0(X)$ is equivalent to the supremum norm. The equation $\lim_\lambda(a_\lambda f) = f$ in A is followed by that $\lim_\lambda(a_\lambda f) = f$ in E .

By the above, we have $\lim_\lambda(\beta\alpha_\lambda) = \beta$ and $\lim_\lambda(\alpha_\lambda\beta) = \beta$ for any $\beta \in E_1$. After applying involutions on both hand sides of the latter equation, we obtain that $\lim_\lambda(\beta^*\alpha_\lambda) = \beta^*$. These results are followed by that the equation $\lim_\lambda(\beta\alpha_\lambda) = \beta$ holds for every element β of the algebraic subalgebra B of $C^*(\rho)$ generated by $E_0 \cup E_1 \cup E_1^*$. B is a *-subalgebra of $C^*(\rho)$ including E_0 and E_1 ; and hence dense in $C^*(\rho)$.

Take any $\beta \in C^*(\rho)$. Let ε be a positive real number. We can take $\beta' \in B$ satisfying $\|\beta' - \beta\| < \varepsilon$. Then, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta\alpha_\lambda - \beta\| &\leq \|(\beta - \beta')\alpha_\lambda - (\beta - \beta')\| + \|\beta'\alpha_\lambda - \beta'\| \\ &= \|\beta - \beta'\|(\|\alpha_\lambda\| + \|1\|) + \|\beta'\alpha_\lambda - \beta'\| \\ &< 2\varepsilon + \|\beta'\alpha_\lambda - \beta'\|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking limits on λ , we get $\lim_\lambda \|\beta\alpha_\lambda - \beta\| < 2\varepsilon$. Since this holds for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we obtain that $\lim_\lambda \|\beta\alpha_\lambda - \beta\| = 0$. In other words, $\lim_\lambda(\beta\alpha_\lambda) = \beta$ holds.

Therefore, $\{\alpha_\lambda\}$ is an approximate unit for $C^*(\rho)$. \square

Lemma 4.7 ([7], Theorem 4.11). $\rho_A(A)$ is a maximal abelian subalgebra of $C^*(\rho)$.

We give another simple proof based on the representation ρ here.

Proof. Take any $\alpha \in C^*(\rho) \setminus \rho_A(A)$. By Proposition 4.5, we have that $\alpha \notin D_{\mathbb{X}}$ and hence there exists distinct two elements $x, z \in \mathbb{X}$ satisfying that $\langle e_x | \alpha e_z \rangle \neq 0$. We can choose $b \in C_0(X) = A$ with $b(x) \neq b(z)$. Let $\beta := \rho_A(b)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e_x | (\alpha\beta - \beta\alpha) e_z \rangle &= \langle e_x | \alpha \beta e_z \rangle - \langle e_x | \beta \alpha e_z \rangle \\ &= \langle e_x | \alpha \sum_{y \in \mathbb{X}} e_y \langle e_y | \beta e_z \rangle \rangle - \langle e_x | \beta \sum_{y \in \mathbb{X}} e_y \langle e_y | \alpha e_z \rangle \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{X}} \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_y | \beta \mathbf{e}_z \rangle - \sum_{y \in \mathbb{X}} \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \beta \mathbf{e}_y \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_y | \alpha \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \\
 &= \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_z | \beta \mathbf{e}_z \rangle - \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \beta \mathbf{e}_x \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \\
 &= \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_z \rangle b(z) - b(x) \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_z \rangle \\
 &= \langle \mathbf{e}_x | \alpha \mathbf{e}_z \rangle (b(z) - b(x)) \\
 &\neq 0
 \end{aligned}$$

By the above, we have $\alpha\beta \neq \beta\alpha$. Therefore, $\rho_A(A)$ is a maximal abelian subalgebra of $C^*(\rho)$. \square

Lemma 4.8. The restriction to $C^*(\rho)$ of the operator δ defined in Proposition 2.6 is a faithful conditional expectation from $C^*(\rho)$ onto $\rho_A(A)$.

Proof. Let ent_Δ be the bounded linear operator from $C^*(\rho)$ onto $C_0(X_{0,0})$ which maps α to the 0-th extended entry function for α , whose existence is guaranteed by Proposition 4.4. Then, $\delta|_{C^*(\rho)} = \rho_{0,0} \circ \text{ent}_\Delta$ holds and hence the image of $C^*(\rho)$ under δ coincides with $E_{0,0} = \rho_A(A)$.

By Proposition 2.6, the restriction $\delta|_{C^*(\rho)}$ is idempotent, positive, and $\rho_A(A)$ -linear, and moreover it is faithful as a positive operator. Therefore we can apply Fact 2.5 to $\delta|_{C^*(\rho)}$; and it is a faithful conditional expectation. \square

Lemma 4.9. $N = C^*(\rho) \cap QM_{\mathbb{X}}$.

Proof. First we show the inclusion “ \supseteq ”. Take any $\alpha \in C^*(\rho) \cap QM_{\mathbb{X}}$ and $\beta \in \rho_A(A)$. Take any two points $w, z \in \mathbb{X}$ satisfying the condition $w[[\alpha^* \beta \alpha]]z$. This condition implies that $w[[\alpha^*][[\beta][[\alpha]]z]$. That is, $w[[\alpha^*]x, x[[\beta]y, and $y[[\alpha]z$ hold for some $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$. $w[[\alpha^*]x$ is followed by $x[[\alpha]w$. Since β is diagonal, $x[[\beta]y$ implies that $x = y$. Since α is quasi-monomial, $x[[\alpha]w$ and $x = y[[\alpha]z$ are followed by that $w = z$. Therefore, the binary relation $[[\alpha^* \beta \alpha]]$ is diagonal and the matrix $\alpha^* \beta \alpha$ is diagonal. Besides this matrix belongs to $C^*(\rho)$. By Proposition 4.5, the matrix $\alpha^* \beta \alpha$ belongs to $\rho_A(A)$. In the same way, we can show that the matrix $\alpha \beta \alpha^*$ also belongs to $\rho_A(A)$. Since these results hold for any $\beta \in \rho_A(A)$, we obtain that $\alpha \in N$. By the above discussion, N includes $C^*(\rho) \cap QM_{\mathbb{X}}$.$

Next we show the inverse inclusion “ \subseteq ”. Take any $\alpha \in C^*(\rho) \setminus QM_{\mathbb{X}}$. There exist three points $u, v, w \in \mathbb{X}$ satisfying the condition

$$(1) \ u[[\alpha]v, u[[\alpha]w, \text{ and } v \neq w \quad \text{or} \quad (2) \ u[[\alpha]w, v[[\alpha]w, \text{ and } u \neq v.$$

Without loss of generality, we may suppose that the condition (1) holds. Let f and g be the functions on \mathbb{X} which maps x to the (x, v) - and (x, w) -entry of α , respectively. They are L^2 functions on the measure space \mathbb{X} with counting measure and do not vanish at u . Since X is first-countable and locally compact, we can take a decreasing sequence $U_1 \supseteq U_2 \supseteq \dots$ of relatively compact open neighborhoods of u satisfying that $\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} U_k = \{u\}$. For each k , we can take a $[0, 1]$ -valued continuous function h_k on X which values 1 at u and which supported by U_k . The sequence $\{\bar{f}h_k g\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is dominated by $|fg|$ and converges pointwise to the function which values 1 at u and vanishes otherwise. Applying the dominated convergence theorem, we obtain that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \overline{f(x)} h_k(x) g(x) = f(u)g(u) \neq 0.$$

Therefore, letting $h := h_K$ for some K , we have that $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \overline{f(x)} h(x) g(x) \neq 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle e_v | \alpha^* \rho_A(h) \alpha e_w \rangle &= \langle e_v | \alpha^* \sum_{x \in \mathbb{X}} e_x \langle e_x | \rho_A(h) \sum_{y \in \mathbb{X}} e_y \langle e_y | \alpha e_w \rangle \rangle \rangle \\
&= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{X}} \langle e_v | \alpha^* e_x \rangle \langle e_x | \rho_A(h) e_y \rangle \langle e_y | \alpha e_w \rangle \\
&= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{X}} \overline{\langle e_x | \alpha e_v \rangle} \langle e_x | \rho_A(h) e_y \rangle \langle e_y | \alpha e_w \rangle \\
&= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \overline{\langle e_x | \alpha e_v \rangle} \langle e_x | \rho_A(h) e_x \rangle \langle e_x | \alpha e_w \rangle \\
&= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \overline{f(x)} h(x) g(x) \\
&\neq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the \mathbb{X} -squared matrix $\alpha^* \rho_A(h) \alpha$ is not diagonal and hence does not belong to $\rho_A(A)$. From the existence of such h , it follows that $\alpha^* \rho_A(A) \alpha \not\subseteq \rho_A(A)$ and hence that $\alpha \notin N$.

By the above discussion, we have that $C^*(\rho) \setminus QM_{\mathbb{X}}$ is included in $C^*(\rho) \setminus N$ and hence that $N \subseteq C^*(\rho) \cap QM_{\mathbb{X}}$. \square

Lemma 4.10. Let $m \in \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$. The m -th extended entry function of an \mathbb{X} -squared matrix belonging to $C^*(N)$ vanishes on $S_{m,0}$.

Proof. First we prove the weaker statement that the m -th extended entry function of an \mathbb{X} -squared matrix belonging to N vanishes on $S_{m,0}$. To prove this statement, take $\alpha \in N$ and a branch point t of $R^{\circ m}$. Let f be the m -th extended entry function for α . Now we show that $f(t, R^{\circ m}(t)) = 0$ by contradiction. Assume that $f(t, R^{\circ m}(t)) \neq 0$. Let $U := \{x \in X \mid f(x, R^{\circ m}(x)) \neq 0\}$. This is an open neighborhood of t . Since $R^{\circ m}$ branches at t , there exist distinct two points $u, v \in U$ such that $R^{\circ m}(u) = R^{\circ m}(v) =: w$. Since \mathbb{X} is dense in X , we may suppose that $u \in \mathbb{X}$, from which it follows automatically that $v, w \in \mathbb{X}$ and that $(u, w), (v, w) \in \mathbb{X}_{m,0}$. The relation $u \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket w$ follows from

$$\langle e_u | \alpha e_w \rangle = f(u, w) = f(u, R^{\circ m}(u)) \neq 0.$$

The relation $v \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket w$ follows from the similar calculation. Therefore, α is not quasinominal. This contradicts Lemma 4.9. So $f(t, R^{\circ m}(t)) = 0$ holds. By the above argument, the weaker statement is true.

The normalizer N has the zero element of $C^*(\rho)$ and is closed under multiplication, complex-scalar multiplication, and involution. Hence, the algebraic additive subgroup of $C^*(\rho)$ generated by N is a $*$ -subalgebra of $C^*(\rho)$ and hence dense in $C^*(N)$. Since the map from $C^*(\rho)$ to $C_0(X_{m,0})$ which maps α to the m -th extended entry function for α is a bounded linear operator, the m -th extended entry function of an \mathbb{X} -squared matrix belonging to $C^*(N)$ vanishes on $S_{m,0}$. \square

Lemma 4.11. If X has a branch point of R , $\rho_A(A)$ is not regular as a C^* -subalgebra of $C^*(\rho)$.

Proof. Assume that X has a branch point of R . Then, the set $S_{1,0}$ is not empty and we can take a compactly supported continuous function f on $X_{1,0}$ which does not vanish on $S_{1,0}$. The 1st extended function for $\rho_{1,0}(f)$ is f itself; and hence although $\rho_{1,0}(f)$ belongs to $C^*(\rho)$, by Lemma 4.10, it does not belong to $C^*(N)$. Therefore, N does not generate $C^*(\rho)$ and $\rho_A(A)$ is not regular as a C^* -subalgebra of $C^*(\rho)$. \square

Lemma 4.12. If X has no branch point of R , $\rho_A(A)$ is regular as a C^* -subalgebra of $C^*(\rho)$.

Proof. Assume that X has no branch point of R . Then, X also has no branch points of iterations of R and hence all of $S_{m,n}$'s are empty. By Proposition 3.19, an \mathbb{X} -squared matrix belongs to $\rho_{m,n}(C_c(\mathcal{U}_{m,n}))$ is quasi-monomial and hence, by Lemma 4.9, N includes $\rho_{m,n}(C_c(\mathcal{U}_{m,n}))$. By the bi-Lipschitzness of $\rho_{m,n}$ and Corollary 3.21, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{span}} \rho_{m,n}(C_c(\mathcal{U}_{m,n})) &= \rho_{m,n}(\overline{\text{span}} C_c(\mathcal{U}_{m,n})) \\ &= \rho_{m,n}(C_0(X_{m,n} \setminus S_{m,n})) \\ &= \rho_{m,n}(C_0(X_{m,n})) \\ &= E_{m,n}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $C^*(N)$ includes all of $E_{m,n}$'s and hence coincides with $C^*(\rho)$. This means that $\rho_A(A)$ is regular as a C^* -subalgebra of $C^*(\rho)$. \square

Theorem 4.13. The followings are equivalent.

- (1) $C_0(X)$ is a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_R(X)$. That is, $\rho_A(A)$ is a Cartan subalgebra of $C^*(\rho)$.
- (2) X has no branch point of R .

Proof. We check the four conditions in Definition 4.2.

- By Lemma 4.6, $\rho_A(A)$ contains an approximate unit of $C^*(\rho)$.
- By Lemma 4.7, $\rho_A(A)$ is a maximal abelian subalgebra of $C^*(\rho)$.
- By Lemma 4.11 and 4.12, $\rho_A(A)$ is regular if and only if X has no branch point of R .
- By Lemma 4.8, there exists a faithful conditional expectation of $\rho_A(A)$ onto $C^*(\rho)$.

From these results, we conclude this theorem. \square

Example 4.14. Consider the case of $R(z) = z^2$. In this case, R branches only at the point 0 and its Julia set J is the unit circle $|z| = 1$ (Example 2.20). J has no branch points of R . Therefore, $C_0(J) = C(J)$ is a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_R(J)$.

Example 4.15. Consider the case of $R(z) = z^2 - 2$. In this case, R branches only at the point 0 and its Julia set J is the closed interval $[-2, 2]$ (Example 2.20). J has the branch point 0. Therefore, $C_0(J) = C(J)$ is not a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_R(J)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Blackadar, *Operator algebras*, Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, vol. 122, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. Theory of C^* -algebras and von Neumann algebras; Operator Algebras and Non-commutative Geometry, III.

- [2] L. Carleson and T. W. Gamelin, *Complex dynamics*, Universitext: Tracts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.
- [3] V. Deaconu and P. S. Muhly, *C*-algebras associated with branched coverings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **129** (2001), 1077–1086.
- [4] O. Forster, *Lectures on Riemann surfaces*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 81, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1981. Translated from the German by Bruce Gilligan.
- [5] T. Kajiwara and Y. Watatani, *C*-algebras associated with complex dynamical systems*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **54** (2005), 755–778.
- [6] ———, *C*-algebras associated with self-similar sets*, J. Operator Theory **56** (2006), 225–247.
- [7] ———, *Maximal abelian subalgebras of C*-algebras associated with complex dynamical systems and self-similar maps*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **455** (2017), 1383–1400.
- [8] T. Katsura, *On C*-algebras associated with C*-correspondences*, J. Funct. Anal. **217** (2004), 366–401.
- [9] M. V. Pimsner, *A class of C*-algebras generalizing both Cuntz-Krieger algebras and crossed products by \mathbf{Z}* , Free probability theory (Waterloo, ON, 1995), Fields Inst. Commun., vol. 12, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997, pp. 189–212.
- [10] J. Renault, *Cartan subalgebras in C*-algebras*, Irish Math. Soc. Bull. **61** (2008), 29–63.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO, 3-8-1 KOMABA, TOKYO, 153-8914, JAPAN

Email address: itokei@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp