INSTITUTUL
DE
MATEMATICĂ

INSTITUTUL NAȚIONAL
PENTRU CREAȚIE
STIINȚIFICĂ ȘI TEHNICĂ

ON INTERTWINING DILATIONS IV

by

GR.ARSENE and ZOIA CEAUSESCU

PREPRINT SERIES IN MATHEMATICS
No.18/1976

BUCUREȘTI

ON INTERTWINING DILATIONS IV

by

GR.ARSENE* and ZOIA CEAUSESCU*

November 1976

* *National Institute for Scientific and Technical Creation, Calea Victoriei 114, Bucharest, Romania*

ON INTERTWINING DILATIONS IV.

by

Gr. Arsene and Zoia Ceauşescu

Abstract. We give a generalization of the theorems of the existence (see [9]) and the uniqueness (see [3]) of the contractive intertwining dilations in the presence of some representations of a C^* - algebra

1. Let H_j ($j = 1,2$) be some (complex) Hilbert spaces and let $\mathcal{L}(H_1, H_2)$ denote the set of all (linear bounded) operators from H_1 into H_2. For a Hilbert space H, $\mathcal{L}(H)$ will stay for $\mathcal{L}(H, H)$. If $T \in \mathcal{L}(H_1, H_2)$ is a contraction, then we denote $D_T = (I - T^*T)^{1/2}$ and $\mathcal{D}_T = (D_T(H_1))^-$. For a contraction $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, $U \in \mathcal{L}(K)$ will be the minimal isometric dilation of T; in other words :

$$K = H \oplus \mathcal{D}_T \oplus \mathcal{D}_T \oplus \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots$$

and

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} T & 0 & 0 & \ldots \\ D_T & 0 & 0 & \ldots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \ldots \\ 0 & 0 & I & \ddots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \end{pmatrix}$$

(For this and for any fact connected with the geometry of isometric dilations of contractions see [9] ch. I and II).

If $T_j \in \mathcal{L}(H_j)$ ($j = 1,2$) are two contractions, $I(T_1, T_2)$ will be the set of all operators $A \in \mathcal{L}(H_2, H_1)$ such that $T_1 A = A T_2$. Let $U_j \in \mathcal{L}(H_j)$ be the minimal isometric dilation of T_j, and P_j the (orthogonal) projection of K_j onto H_j ($j = 1,2$). For a contraction $A \in I(T_1, T_2)$, a <u>contractive intertwining dilation</u> ((T_1, T_2) - CID) of A will be a contraction $B \in I(T_1, T_2)$, such that $P_1 B = A P_2$.

The existence of a (T_1, T_2) - CID for every contraction of $I(T_1, T_2)$ was proved by B. Sz.-Nagy and C. Foiaş in 1968 (see [9] , ch. II, th. 2.3); recently

T. Andô, Z. Ceauşescu and C. Foiaş proved in [3] that the uniquness of the (T_1, T_2) - CID is equivalent with the fact that one of the factorizations $T_1 \cdot A$ or $A \cdot T_2$ be regular (in the sense of [9] , ch. VII, § 3). A generalization of this criterium is used in [6] for the uniqueness problem of the liftings of operators which commute with shifts (see [4] for the existence problem). In [5] it is given a generalization of the existence theorem of [4] for isometries (instead of shifts); the uniquness in this case asked for an uniqueness theorem of liftings involving representations of C^* - algebras.

In this note we formulate such a theorem (see section 2 below) and use it for a generalization of the uniqueness criterium of [3] , in the presence of representations of a C^* - algebra.

We take this opportunity to express our gratitude to Professor C. Foiaş for posing the problem and for helpful discussions concerning this matter. We also thank D. Voiculescu for discussions concerning Theorem 2.1.

In the sequel let $\mathcal{A}$ be a C^* - algebra and $\rho : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{L}(H)$ a representation of $\mathcal{A}$. We use the terminology of [7] concerning representations of C^* - algebras. So, for any set $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{L}(H)$, $\mathcal{M}'$ will be the commutant of $\mathcal{M}$ and for a projection $P = P_{H_0} \in [\rho(\mathcal{A})]'$ we denote by ρ_P (or ρ_{H_0}) the subrepresentation of ρ given by P . If $\rho_j : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{L}(H_j)$ $(j = 1,2)$ are representations of $\mathcal{A}$, we denote by $I(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ the set of operators $A : H_2 \longmapsto H_1$ such that $A \in I(\rho_1(x), \rho_2(x))$, for every $x \in \mathcal{A}$; ρ_1 and ρ_2 are disjoint ($\rho_1 \,\delta\, \rho_2$) if $I(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \{0\}$. We use without quotations the properties of $I(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ of disjointness or of equivalence of representations as they are presented in [7] , §§ 2 and 5.

The typical situation in this note is the following : for $j = 1,2$, $\rho_j : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{L}(H_j)$ are representations of $\mathcal{A}$ and $T_j \in [\rho_j(\mathcal{A})]'$ are contractions. Note that $P_{\mathcal{D}_{T_j}} \in [\rho_j(\mathcal{A})]'$ $(j = 1,2)$; we consider for every $n = 1,2,\ldots,\infty$ the representation

$$\rho_j^{(n)} = \rho_j \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \tau_{ji} \right) \qquad (j=1,2) \tag{1.1.}$$

where $\tau_{ji} = (\rho_j)_{\mathcal{D}_{T_j}}$ for every i.

An easy computation proves that

$$U_j \in [\rho_j^{(\infty)}(\mathcal{A})]' \qquad (j=1,2) \tag{1.2.}$$

where $U_j \in \mathcal{L}(K_j)$ is the minimal isometric dilation of T_j.
Let $A \in I(T_1, T_2)$ be a contraction such that $A \in I(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.

Definition 1.1. If B is a (T_1, T_2) - CID for A, we say that B is a $(\rho_1, \rho_2 ; T_1, T_2)$ - CID for A if $B \in I(\rho_1^{(\infty)}, \rho_2^{(\infty)})$.

Remind that for $S \in \mathcal{L}(H_1, H_2)$ and $R \in \mathcal{L}(H_2, H_3)$, the product R.S is called a regular factorization of RS, if $\mathcal{R}(R.S) = 0$, where

$$(1.3.) \qquad \mathcal{R}(R\cdot S) = \mathcal{D}_R \oplus \mathcal{D}_S \ominus \{D_R S h_1 \oplus D_S h_1 \ : \ h_1 \in H_1\}^{-}.$$

With our notations we infer that

$$(1.4.) \qquad P_{\mathcal{R}(T_1\cdot A)} \in [(\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2)(\mathcal{A})]' \text{ and } P_{\mathcal{R}(A\cdot T_2)} \in [\rho_2^{(1)}(\mathcal{A})]'.$$

By (1.4.) the following defintition makes sense :

Definition 1.2. With previous notations, we say that A is $(\rho_1, \rho_2 ; T_1, T_2)$ - regular if

$$(1.5.) \qquad (\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2)_{\mathcal{R}(T_1\cdot A)} \ \delta \ (\rho_2^{(1)})_{\mathcal{R}(A\cdot T_2)}$$

Remark 1.1. If the representations ρ_1 and ρ_2 are non-disjoint and factorial, the condition (1.5.) is equivalent with the condition that one of the factorizations $T_1.A$ or $A.T_2$ be regular.

The mean result of this note is the following :

Theorem 1.1. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a C^*- algebra, $\rho_j : \mathcal{A} \longmapsto \mathcal{L}(H_j)$ a representation of $\mathcal{A}$, $T_j \in [\rho_j(\mathcal{A})]'$ a contraction $(j = 1,2)$ and $A \in I(T_1, T_2) \cap I(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ a contraction. Then :

(1) A has always a $(\rho_1, \rho_2 ; T_1, T_2)$ - CID.

(2) A has a unique $(\rho_1, \rho_2 ; T_1, T_2)$ - CID iff A is $(\rho_1, \rho_2 ; T_1, T_2)$ - regular.

In the last section we give an application concerning a recent result of T. Ando [2] .

2. In this section we analize the following situation : $\mathcal{A}$ is a C^* - algebra $\rho_j : \mathcal{A} \longmapsto \mathcal{L}(H_j)$ $(j = 1,2)$ are representations of $\mathcal{A}$, $H_0 \subset H_1$ is an invariant subspace for ρ_1 and $P = P_{H_0}$. Then $P \in [\rho_1(\mathcal{A})]'$.

Let also $T_o \in I(\rho_2, (\rho_1)_P)$ be a contraction.

Definition 2.1. A contraction $T \in I(\rho_2, \rho_1)$ is called a contractive intertwining lifting of T_o (shortly a CIL for T_o) if $T|_{H_o} = T_o$.

Note that $T_o P$ is always a CIL for T_o. Since $T_o \in I(\rho_2, (\rho_1)_P)$, we infer that $P_{\mathcal{D}_{T_o^*}} \in [\rho_2(\mathcal{A})]'$. Let $1-E$ be the central support of $1-P$ (in $[\rho_1(\mathcal{A})]'$) and $1-F$ be the central support of $P_{\mathcal{D}_{T_o^*}}$ (in $[\rho_2(\mathcal{A})]'$).

Theorem 2.1. The following conditions are equivalent :

(I) T_o has an unique CIL.

(II) $(\rho_1)_{1-P} \; \delta \; (\rho_2)_{\mathcal{D}_{T_o^*}}$.

(III) a) $(\rho_1)_{1-P} \; \delta \; (\rho_2)_{\ker T_o^*}$.
b) T_o is a partial isometry on $(1-E)P(H_1)$.

(IV) a) $(\rho_1)_{1-P} \; \delta \; (\rho_2)_{\ker T_o^*}$.
b) $T_o(\mathcal{D}_{T_o}) \subset T_o E(H_1)$.

Moreover if R is the projection on $\overline{(T_o(1-E)P(H_1))}$, then R is central in $[\rho_2(\mathcal{A})]'$.

Proof. The theorem is trivial when $H_o = H_1$. Let us suppose that $H_o \neq H_1$.

(I) $\Longrightarrow$ (II). Let us suppose that T_o has an unique CIL and though there exists $Y \in I((\rho_2)_{\mathcal{D}_{T_o^*}}, (\rho_1)_{1-P})$, $Y \neq 0$. We can choose Y such that $\|Y\| \leq 1$. Define $S : H_1 \longmapsto H_2$ by

(2.1.) $$S = T_o P + D_{T_o^*} Y(1-P)$$

From (2.1.) it is clear that

(2.2.) $$S|_{H_o} = T_o .$$

Because $D_{T_o^*}$ is a positive selfadjoint operator and Y takes values in $\mathcal{D}_{T_o^*}$, we have that $D_{T_o^*} Y \neq 0$. So :

(2.3.) $$S \neq T_o P$$

From $T_o \in I(\rho_2, (\rho_1)_P)$ we infer that $D_{T_o^*} \in I(\rho_2, \rho_2)$, whence $D_{T_o^*} Y \in I((\rho_2)_{\mathcal{D}_{T_o^*}}, (\rho_1)_{1-P})$. Using 2.1.) we obtain :

$$S \in I(\rho_2, \rho_1). \tag{2.4.}$$

We have :

$$SS^* = T_o T_o^* + D_{T_o^*} Y (1-P) Y^* D_{T_o^*} \leqslant T_o T_o^* + D_{T_o^*}^2 = I, \text{ so}$$

$$\|S\| = \|SS^*\|^{1/2} \leqslant 1. \tag{2.5.}$$

The relation (2.2), (2.4) and (2.5.) proves that S is a CIL for T_o; the relation (2.3.) contradicts the uniqueness of a CIL for T_o.

(II) $\Longrightarrow$(I) . Let T be a CIL for T_o; with respect to the decompositions :

$$H_1 = H_o \oplus (H_1 \ominus H_o) \text{ and } H_2 = T_o(H_1)^- \oplus \ker T_o^*,$$

T is the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} T_o & T_1 \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $T_1 \in I((\rho_2)_{T_o(H_1)^-}, (\rho_1)_{1-P})$ and $T_2 \in I((\rho_2)_{\ker T_o^*}, (\rho_1)_{1-P})$. Using the hypothesis and the fact that $\ker T_o^* \subset \mathcal{D}_{T_o}$ we have that $T_2 = 0$. Now, let us denote

$$H_{10} = T_o(H_1)^- \ominus T_o(\mathcal{D}_{T_o})^- \ ; \ H_{11} = T_o(\mathcal{D}_{T_o})^-$$

From this, $T_1 = T_{10} + T_{11}$, where $T_{10} \in I((\rho_2)_{H_{10}}, (\rho_1)_{1-P})$ and $T_{11} \in I((\rho_2)_{H_{11}}, (\rho_1)_{1-P})$.

We have (see [9] , ch. I, section 3) :

$$\mathcal{D}_{T_o^*} = T_o(\mathcal{D}_{T_o})^- \oplus \ker T_o^* = T_o(\mathcal{D}_{T_o})^- \oplus (H_2 \ominus T_o(H_1))^- . \tag{2.6.}$$

Using (2.6.) we infer that :

$$H_{11} \subset \mathcal{D}_{T_o^*} \quad \text{and} \quad H_{10} \subset H_2 \ominus \mathcal{D}_{T_o^*} = \ker D_{T_o^*} = \{h_2 \in H_2 : \|T_o^* h_2\| = \|h_2\|\}.$$

So, by hypothesis, $T_{11} = 0$. Let $h_2 \in \ker D_{T_o^*}$; we have

$$\| (T_o^* + T_{10}^*) h_2 \|^2 = \| T_o^* h_2 \|^2 + \| T_{10} h_2 \|^2 = \| h_2 \|^2 + \| T_{10}^* h_2 \|^2 .$$

But $\|T\| \leq 1$, so $T_{1o} = 0$. This proves that $T = T_o P$, thus T_o has an unique CIL.

(II) $\Longrightarrow$ (III) The condition (a) follows from (2.6.) and the hypothesis. We infer also that

(2.7.) $$(\rho_1)_{1-E} \;\; \delta \;\; (\rho_2)_{1-F} .$$

Let denote by $\hat{T}_o$ the operator T_o from $(1-E)\, P(H_1)$ onto $R(H_2) = \overline{T_o (1-E) P(H_1)}$ where $R \in [\rho_2(\mathcal{A})]'$, is a projection. We have

(2.8.) $$\hat{T}_o \in I\left((\rho_2)_R ,\, (\rho_1)_{P-E} \right).$$

But $(1-E)\, P = P-E \leq 1-E$ and (2.7.) implies that $R \leq F$, which means that $R\,(H_2) \subset \ker D_{T_o^*}$. This proves that T_o is a co-isometry.

Moreover, R is central in $[\rho_2(\mathcal{A})]'$. Indeed, let R_1 be the central support of R in $[\rho_2(\mathcal{A})]'$. Because $R \leq F$ and F is central in $[\rho_2(\mathcal{A})]'$, $R_1 \leq F$. On the other hand, $\hat{T}_o$ is with dense range, so $(\rho_2)_R$ is equivalent with a subrepresentation of $(\rho_1)_{1-E}$ (see (2.8.). But $(\rho_1)_E \;\delta\; (\rho_1)_{1-E}$, so $(\rho_1)_E \;\delta\; (\rho_2)_R$ and then $(\rho_1)_E \;\delta\; (\rho_2)_{R_1}$. This implies that

$$T_o E\, (H_1) \subset (1-R_1)\, (H_2),$$

so

(2.9.) $$T_o^* R_1(H_2) \subset (1-E)\, P\, (H_1).$$

But $R_1 \leq F$ implies that :

(2.10) $$T_o T_o^* h_2 = h_2 \, , \text{ for every } h_2 \in R_1(H_2).$$

Using (2.10) in (2.9.), we obtain that

$$R_1(H_2) = T_o T_o^* R_1(H_2) \subset \overline{T_o(1-E)\, P\, (H_1)} = R\, (H_2)$$

which means $R_1 = R$.

(III) $\Longrightarrow$ (IV). We must prove (IV) b. We have :

$$T_o D_{T_o} \Big|_{(1-E)\, P(H_1)} = D_{T_o^*} T_o \Big|_{(1-E)\, P(H_1)} = 0$$

using that T_o is a partial isometry on $(1-E)\, P(H_1)$.

Thus :

$$\Gamma_o D_{T_o}(H_1) \subset T_o D_{T_o}(E(H_1)) = T_o E D_{T_o}(H_1) \subset T_o E(H_1)$$

(IV) $\Longrightarrow$ (II) From $T_o(\mathcal{D}T_o) \subset T_o E(H_1)$ it follows that

(2.11.) $$(\rho_1)_{1-P} \ \delta \ (\rho_2)_{\overline{T_o(\mathcal{D}_{T_o})}}$$

The conclusion results from (2.6.), (2.11.) and (IV)-a. The theorem is completely proved.

Remark 2.1. It is easy to see that in the conditions (III) and (IV) of Theorem 2.1. one can replace E by any central projection $E_1 \in [\rho_1(\mathcal{A})]'$ such that $E_1 \leqslant P$.

Corollary 2.1. With the notations of Theorem 2.1., if ρ_1 and ρ_2 are non-disjoint factorial representations of $\mathcal{A}$, then T_o has a unique CIL iff $H_o = H$ or T_o is a co-isometry.

Proof. Two non-disjoint factorial representations of $\mathcal{A}$ are equivalen so two subrepresentations of them are disjoint iff one of the subrepresentations is trivial. The corollary follows now from the condition (II) of Theorem 2.1.

Corollary 2.2. Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(H_1, H_2)$ be a contraction, $H_o \subset H$ a subspace of H and $T_o = T|_{H_o}$. The following conditions are equivalent :

(1) If $S \in \mathcal{L}(H_1, H_2)$ is a contraction such that $S|_{H_o} = T_o$, then $S = T$.

(2) $H_o = H$ or T_o is a co-isometry.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{C}$ and $\rho_j : \mathbb{C} \ni \lambda \longmapsto \lambda I_{H_j} \in \mathcal{L}(H_j)$ and apply Corollary 2.1.

Remark 2.2. Corollary 2.2. appeared (with a direct proof) in one of the preliminary versions of [3], (namely T. Ando's one).

Corollary 2.3. Let $U_j \in \mathcal{L}(H_j)$ be unitary on H_j - separable Hilbert space - $(j = 1,2)$, H_o a reducing subspace for U_1, $P = P_{H_o}$, $V_1 = U_1|_{H_o}$ and $T_o \in I(U_2, V_1)$. The following conditions are equivalent :

(i) $T_o P$ is the only contraction $S \in I(U_2, U_1)$ such that $S|_{H_o} = T_o$.

(ii) If $W_1 = U_1|_{H_1 \ominus H_o}$ and $W_2 = U_2|_{\mathcal{D}_{T_o^*}}$, then $I(W_2, W_1) = \{0\}$.

(iii) If $W_2' = U_2|_{\ker T^*}$, then :

a) $I(W_2', W_1) = \{0\}$.

b) There exists ω_j - Borel set in the spectrum of U_j - $(j = 1,2)$, such that $P_{\omega_1} \geq 1-P$ and T_0 is a co-isometry from $P_{\omega_1}(H_1)$ onto $P_{\omega_2}(H_2)$, where P_{ω_j} is the spectral projection of U_j corresponding to ω_j $(j = 1,2)$.

(iv) a) $I(W_2', W_1) = \{0\}$

b) There exists ω_1' - Borel set in the spectrum of U_1 - such that $P_{\omega_1'} \leq$ $\leq P$ and $T_0(\mathcal{D}T_0) \subset T_0 P_{\omega_1'}(H_1)$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the C^*- algebra of continuous (complex valued) functions on $\mathbb{T} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z|=1\}$, ρ_j the representation of $\mathcal{A}$ given by U_j $(j = 1,2)$. Since H_j is separable, by a theorem of J. von Neumann, every central projections of $[\rho_j(\mathcal{A})]'$ corresponds (by the Borel functional calculus) to a Borel subset of the spectrum of U_j $(j = 1,2)$. Using Putnam - Fuglede theorem, the corollary follows from Theorem 2.1. (see also Remark 2.1.).

3. Consider again the situation of the first section:let $\mathcal{A}$ be a C^*- algebra, ρ_j a representation of $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{L}(H_j)$, $T_j \in [\rho_j(\mathcal{A})]'$ a contraction, $U_j \in \mathcal{L}(K_j)$ the minimal isometric dilation of T_j and $P_j = P_{H_j} \in \mathcal{L}(K_j)$ $(j = 1,2)$. Let $A \in I(T_1, T_2) \cap I(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ be a contraction. We will prove that in the Definition 1.2, T_2 can be replaced with U_2. More precisely, consider $\tilde{A} = AP_2 \in \mathcal{L}(K_2, H_1)$. It is clear that $\tilde{A} \in I(T_1, U_2) \cap I(\rho_1, \rho_2^{(\infty)})$.

Lemma 3.1. a) An operator $B \in \mathcal{L}(K_2, K_1)$ is a $(\rho_1, \rho_2; T_1, T_2)$-CID for A iff B is a $(\rho_1, \rho_2^{(\infty)}; T_1, U_2)$ - CID for $\tilde{A}$.

b) A is $(\rho_1, \rho_2; T_1, T_2)$ - regular iff $\tilde{A}$ is $(\rho_1, \rho_2^{(\infty)}; T_1, U_2)$ - regular.

Proof.

a) is an easy computation.

b) Because U_2 is an isometry, we can write that :

./.

(3.1.) $$\mathcal{R}(\tilde{A}\cdot U_2) = \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}} \ominus \left(D_{\tilde{A}}\, U_2(K_2)\right)^{-}.$$

Let $i_2 : H_2 \longmapsto K_2$ be defined by

$$i_2(h_2) = h_2 \oplus 0 \oplus 0 \oplus \ldots\ldots \qquad (h_2 \in H_2).$$

Since $\tilde{A}^* = i_2 A^*$, we infer that

$$D^2_{\tilde{A}} = I_{K_2} - \tilde{A}^* A = I_{K_2} - i_2 A^* A P_2 = D^2_A \oplus I_{K_2 \ominus H_2},$$

thus

$$D_{\tilde{A}} = D_A \oplus I_{K_2 \ominus H_2} = \begin{pmatrix} D_A & 0 & 0 & \ldots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \ldots \\ 0 & 0 & I & \ddots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using this, we obtain that :

(3.2.) $$\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}} = D_{\tilde{A}}(K_2)^{-} = \mathcal{D}_A \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2} \oplus \ldots.$$

Since

$$D_{\tilde{A}} U_2 = \begin{pmatrix} D_A & 0 & 0 & \ldots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \ldots \\ 0 & 0 & I & \ddots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} T_2 & 0 & 0 & \ldots \\ D_{T_2} & 0 & 0 & \ldots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \ldots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} D_A T_2 & 0 & 0 & \ldots \\ D_{T_2} & 0 & 0 & \ldots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \ldots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \end{pmatrix}$$

we infer that :

(3.3.) $$D_{\tilde{A}} U_2(K_2)^{-} = \left\{ D_A T_2 k_2 \oplus D_{T_2} k_2 : k_2 \in K_2 \right\}^{-} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2} \oplus \ldots$$

From (3.1.), (3.2.) and (3.3.) it follows that :

$$\mathcal{R}(\tilde{A}\cdot U_2) = \mathcal{R}(A\cdot T_2) \oplus \{0\} \oplus \{0\} \oplus \ldots.$$

which means that

(3.4.) $$\left(\rho_2^{(1)}\right)_{\mathcal{R}(A\cdot T_2)} \quad \text{is equivalent to} \quad \left(\rho_2^{(\infty)}\right)_{\mathcal{R}(\tilde{A}\cdot U_2)}$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(T_1\cdot\tilde{A}) &= \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}} \ominus \left\{ D_{T_1}\tilde{A} k_2 \oplus D_{\tilde{A}} k_2 : k_2 \in K_2 \right\}^{-} = \\ &= \left(\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_A \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2} \oplus \ldots\right) \ominus \left\{ D_{T_1} A h_2 \oplus D_A h_2 \oplus h_2' : \begin{array}{l} h_2 \in H_2, \\ h_2' \in K_2 \ominus H_2 \end{array} \right\} \\ &= \mathcal{R}(T_1\cdot A) \oplus \{0\} \oplus \{0\} \oplus \ldots. \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

(3.5.) $\quad (\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2)_{\mathcal{R}(T_1 \cdot A)}$ is equivalent to $(\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2^{(\infty)})_{\mathcal{R}(T_1 \cdot \tilde{A})}$

The relations (3.4.) and (3.5.) prove the lemma.

We will give now another characterization of the notion of $(\rho_1, \rho_2; T_1, T_2)$ - regularity.

Let $S = T_1 A \in \mathcal{L}(H_2, H_1)$ and $Z : \mathcal{D}_S \longmapsto \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_A$ be defined by :

(3.6.) $$Z\,(D_S h_2) = D_{T_1} A h_2 \oplus D_A h_2 \quad , \qquad h_2 \in H_2.$$

The operator Z is an isometry (see [9], ch. VII, section 3) and

(3.7.) $$\mathcal{R}(T_1 \cdot A) = \mathcal{D}_{Z^*} .$$

Put

$$Z_1 = P_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} Z : \mathcal{D}_S \longmapsto \mathcal{D}_T$$

We have that $S \in I(\rho_1, \rho_2)$, $Z \in I((\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2)_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_A}, (\rho_2)_{\mathcal{D}_S})$, $Z_1 \in I((\rho_1)_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}}, (\rho_2)_{\mathcal{D}_S})$ and $D_{Z_1^*} \in \left[(\rho_1)_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}}\right]'$.

<u>Lemma 3.2.</u> <u>The representations</u> $(\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2)_{\mathcal{R}(T_1 \cdot A)}$ <u>and</u> $(\rho_1)_{\mathcal{D}_{Z_1^*}}$ <u>are equivalent</u>.

<u>Proof.</u> Let $V : \mathcal{D}_{Z_1^*} \longmapsto \mathcal{D}_{Z^*}$ be defined by :

(3.8.) $$V\,(D_{Z_1^*} h_1) = D_{Z^*} (h_1 \oplus 0) \quad , \; h_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{T_1}$$

From the equalities

$$\| D_{Z_1^*} h_1 \|^2 = \| h_1 \|^2 - \| Z_1^* h_1 \|^2 = \| h_1 \|^2 - \| Z^* (h_1 \oplus 0) \|^2 = \| D_{Z^*} (h_1 \oplus 0) \|^2 , \; h_1 \in H_1 ,$$

we obtain that V is isometric.

Note now that V is unitary, that is $D_{Z^*}(\mathcal{D}_T \oplus \{0\})^- = \mathcal{D}_{Z^*}$. Indeed, consider $h_1 \oplus h_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{Z^*} \ominus \mathcal{D}_{Z^*}(\mathcal{D}_T \oplus \{0\})^-$. Then, from

(3.7.) we obtain

$$\langle h_1 \oplus h_2, D_{T_1} A h_2' \oplus D_A h_2' \rangle = 0, \text{ for every } h_2' \in H_2,$$

which means

$$\langle A^* D_{T_1} h_1 + D_A h_2 \, , \, h_2' \rangle = 0 \qquad \text{for every } h_2' \in H_2,$$

therefore

(3.9.) $$\Lambda^{*} D_{T_1} h_1 + D_A h_2 = 0$$

But $h_1 \oplus h_2$ is orthogonal on $D_{Z^*}(\mathcal{D}_T \oplus \{0\})^-$, therefore

(3.10.) $$\langle h_1 \oplus h_2, D_{Z^*}(h_1' \oplus 0)\rangle = 0, \text{ for every } h_1' \in \mathcal{D}_{T_1}.$$

Because Z is an izometry, $D_{Z^*} = P_{\mathcal{D}_{Z^*}}$ and from (3.10.) we obtain that $\langle h_1 \oplus h_2, h_1' \oplus 0\rangle = 0$, for every $h_1' \in \mathcal{D}_{T_1}$, which means that $h_1 = 0$.

Using (3.8.), we deduce that $h_2 = 0$ and therefore V is unitary.

For $x \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$(\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2)_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_A}(x)\, V(D_{Z_1^*} h_1) = (\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2)_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_A}(x)\, D_{Z^*}(h_1 \oplus 0) =$$

$$= D_{Z^*}(\rho_1(x) h_1 \oplus 0) = V D_{Z_1^*} \rho_1(x)(h_1) = V(\rho_1)_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}}(x)\, D_{Z_1^*}(h_1),$$

for every $h_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{T_1}$,

which implies that

$$V \in I((\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2)_{\mathcal{R}(T_1 \cdot A)}, (\rho_1)_{\mathcal{D}_{Z_1^*}}).$$

The lemma is now completely proved.

<u>Corollary 3.1.</u> A <u>is</u> $(\rho_1, \rho_2; T_1, T_2)$ - <u>regular iff</u>

(3.10) $$(\rho_1)_{\mathcal{D}_{Z_1^*}} \;\delta\; (\rho_2^{(\infty)})_{\mathcal{R}(\tilde{A} \cdot U_2)}$$

<u>Proof.</u> First note that if $\tilde{Z}_1$ is the operator constructed as Z_1 (replacing A by $\tilde{A}$), then

(3.11.) $$D_{\tilde{Z}_1^*} = D_{Z_1^*}.$$

Now the lemma follows from Lemma 3.1. and Lemma 3.2.

4. We will analyse now the iterative construction (see [9] ch. II section 2 or [3] section 3) of a (T_1, U_2) - CID, in order to prove that the relation (3.10) can be also iterated, and that the presence of the representations is not difficult to handle. Let us start with $H_1^{(0)} = H_1$; $T_1^{(0)} = T_1$ and $B_0 = \tilde{A}$.

The first step consists in the following construction :

Let $H_1^{(1)} = H_1^{(o)} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_1}$ and $B_1 : K_2 \longmapsto H_1^{(1)}$ defined by :

(4.1.) $$B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} B_o \\ X_1 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where } X_1 : K_2 \longmapsto \mathcal{D}_{T_1}.$$

The problem is to find X_1 such that :

(4.2.) $$\begin{cases} \text{a)} & \|B_1\| \leqslant 1 \\ \text{b)} & B_1 \in I(T_1^{(1)}, U_2) \\ \text{c)} & B_1 \in I(\rho_1^{(1)}, \rho_2^{(\infty)}) \end{cases}$$

where $T_1^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ D_{T_1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

As in [9] or [3], we take $X_1 = \hat{C}_1 D_{B_o}$, where $\hat{C}_1$ is a "suitable" extension of the contraction $C_1 : D_{B_o} U_2(K_2)^- \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T_1}$, defined by :

(4.3.) $$C_1 D_{B_o} U_2 = D_{T_1}(o) \; B_o$$

Note that from (4.3.) it is clear that $C_1 \in I((\rho_1)_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}}, (\rho_2^{(\infty)})_{D_{B_o} U_2(K_2)^-})$. Using that, we deduce that there exists an extension of C_1 such that B_1 fulfills (4.2.) (take $\hat{C}_1 = C_1 P_{D_{B_o} U_2(K_2)^-}$).

<u>Lemma 4.1.</u> A <u>is</u> $(\rho_1, \rho_2 ; T_1, T_2)$ - <u>regular iff</u>

(4.4.) $$(\rho_1)_{\mathcal{D}_{C_1^*}} \;\delta\; (\rho_2^{(\infty)})_{\mathcal{R}(B_o \cdot U_2)}$$

<u>Proof.</u> The construction made in relations (3.6.) and (3.7.) can be made for every factorization : let $\tilde{Z}$ (resp. W) the operators constructed like Z in (3.6.) for factorization $T_1 . \tilde{A}$ (resp. $B_o . U_2$). Because U_2 is an isometry, W can be identified with the unitary from $\mathcal{D}_{B_o U_2}$ onto $(D_{B_o} U_2(K_2))^-$, defined by :

(4.5.) $$W(D_{B_o U_2} k_2) = D_{B_o} U_2 k_2, \qquad (k_2 \in K_2).$$

From (4.3.) and (4.5.) we infer that :

(4.6.) $$C_1 = P_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} \tilde{Z} W^*$$

Let $i_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} : \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \longmapsto H_1$ be the operator $i_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}}(h_1) = h_1$, $(h_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{T_1})$.

Then :

$$D^2_{C_1^*} = I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} - P_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} \tilde{Z} W^* W \tilde{Z}^* i_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} = I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} - P_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} \tilde{Z}\tilde{Z}^* i_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} = D^2_{\tilde{Z}_1^*} = D^2_{Z_1^*}.$$

(for the last equality see (3.11.)).

Now lemma follows from Corollary 3.1.

Next steps consist in repeating the construction with the new objects; more precisely :

$$H_1^{(n)} = H_1 \oplus \underbrace{\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_1}}_{n\text{ - times}}, \quad B_n : K_2 \longmapsto H_1^{(n)} \quad \text{by}$$

(4.7.) $$B_n = \begin{pmatrix} B_{n-1} \\ X_n \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where } X_n : K_2 \longmapsto \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \quad (n \geqslant 2)$$

such that

(4.8.) $$\begin{cases} \text{a)} & \|B_n\| \leqslant 1 \\ \text{b)} & B_n \in I(T_1^{(n)}, U_2) \\ \text{c)} & B_n \in I(\rho_1^{(n)}, \rho_2^{(\infty)}), \text{ where} \end{cases}$$

$$T_1^{(n)} = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ D_{T_1} & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & I & \ddots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \end{pmatrix} \qquad ((n+1) \times (n+1) \text{ -matrix})$$

We take also $X_n = \hat{C}_n D_{B_{n-1}}$ $(n \geqslant 2)$, where $\hat{C}_n$ is a "suitable" extension of the contraction $C_n : D_{B_{n-1}} U_2 (K_2)^- \longmapsto \mathcal{D}_{T_1}$, defined by

(4.9.) $$C_n D_{B_{n-1}} U_2 = D_{T_1^{(n-1)}} B_{n-1} \qquad (n \geqslant 2).$$

The same argument as in the first step shows that such a "suitable" extension always exists. Note also that $D_{T_1^{(n)}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$ $((n+1) \times (n+1)$ - matrix), for every $n \geqslant 1$, therefore (4.9.) implies that :

(4.10.) $$C_n D_{B_{n-1}} U_2 = X_{n-1} = \hat{C}_{n-1} D_{B_{n-2}}, \qquad (n \geqslant 2).$$

<u>Lemma 4.2.</u>

(1) $\mathcal{D}_{C_n^*} = \mathcal{D}_{\hat{C}_{n-1}^*}$, for every $n \geqslant 2$.

(2) If $\hat{C}_n = C_n P_{D_{B_n} U_2(K_2)^-}$, then the representations

$$\left(\rho_2^{(\infty)}\right)_{\mathcal{R}(B_{n-1}\cdot U_2)} \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\rho_2^{(\infty)}\right)_{\mathcal{R}(B_n\cdot U_2)} \quad \text{are equivalent,} \quad (n \geqslant 1).$$

Proof.

(1) Define $M_n : D_{B_n} U_2 (K_2)^- \longmapsto \mathcal{D}_{B_{n-1}}$ by

$$M_n(D_{B_n} U_2 k_2) = D_{B_{n-1}} k_2, \qquad k_2 \in K_2, \quad n \geqslant 1$$

Then :

$$\|D_{B_n} U_2 k_2\|^2 = \|U_2 k_2\|^2 - \|B_n U_2 k_2\|^2 = \|k_2\|^2 -$$

$$\|B_{n-1} U_2 k_2\|^2 - \|X_n U_2 k_2\|^2 = \|k_2\|^2 - \|B_{n-1} U_2 k_2\|^2 -$$

$$- \|\hat{C}_n D_{B_{n-1}} U_2 k_2\|^2 = \|k_2\|^2 - \|B_{n-1} U_2 k_2\|^2 - \|C_n D_{B_{n-1}} U_2 k_2$$

$$= \|k_2\|^2 - \|B_{n-1} U_2 k_2\|^2 - \|D_{T_1^{(n-1)}} B_{n-1} k_2\|^2 =$$

$$= \|k_2\|^2 - \|B_{n-1} U_2 k_2\|^2 - \|B_{n-1} k_2\|^2 + \|T_1^{(n-1)} B_{n-1} k_2\|^2 =$$

$$= \|D_{B_{n-1}} k_2\|^2 - \|B_{n-1} U_2 k_2\|^2 + \|B_{n-1} U_2 k_2\|^2 =$$

$$= \|D_{B_{n-1}} k_2\|^2,$$

$$\left(k_2 \in K_2, \quad n \geqslant 1\right).$$

Therefore M_n is an isometry with dense range, that is an unitary $(n \geqslant 1)$. Using (4.10), we infer that

(4.11) $$C_n = \hat{C}_{n-1} M_{n-1}, \qquad (n \geqslant 2),$$

therefore

$$D^2_{C_n^*} = I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} - C_n C_n^* = I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} - \hat{C}_{n-1} M_{n-1} M_{n-1}^* \hat{C}^*_{n-1} = D^2_{\hat{C}^*_{n-1}},$$

$(n \geqslant 2)$,

which implies that $\mathcal{D}_{C_n^*} = \mathcal{D}_{\hat{C}_{n-1}^*}$, $\quad n \geq 2$.

(2) Define $Q_n : D_{\hat{C}_n} D_{B_{n-1}} (K_2)^- \longmapsto \mathcal{D}_{B_n}$ by

(4.12.) $$Q_n(D_{\hat{C}_n} D_{B_{n-1}} k_2) = D_{B_n} k_2, \quad k_2 \in K_2, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Then :

$$\| D_{B_n} k_2 \|^2 = \| k_2 \|^2 - \| B_n k_2 \|^2 = \| k_2 \|^2 - \| B_{n-1} k_2 \|^2 -$$
$$- \| \hat{C}_n D_{B_{n-1}} k_2 \|^2 = \| D_{B_{n-1}} k_2 \|^2 - \| \hat{C}_n D_{B_{n-1}} k_2 \|^2 =$$
$$= \| D_{\hat{C}_n} D_{B_{n-1}} k_2 \|^2, \quad k_2 \in K_2, \quad n \geq 1$$

Therefore Q_n is unitary.
Because $\hat{C}_n = C_n P_{D_{B_n} U_2 (K_2)^-}$, we have that :

$$\mathcal{D}_{\hat{C}_n} = \mathcal{R}(B_{n-1} \cdot U_2) \oplus D_{C_n} D_{B_n} U_2 (K_2)^-$$

Using this, we infer that :

$$\mathcal{R}(B_n \cdot U_2) = \mathcal{D}_{B_n} \ominus D_{B_n} U_2 (K_2)^- = Q_n (D_{\hat{C}_n} D_{B_{n-1}} (K_2)^-) \ominus$$
$$\ominus D_{B_n} U_2 (K_2)^- = Q_n (\mathcal{R}(B_{n-1} \cdot U_2)) \oplus Q_n (D_{C_n} D_{B_{n-1}} U_2 (K_2)^-) \ominus$$
$$\ominus D_{B_n} U_2 (K_2)^- = Q_n (\mathcal{R}(B_{n-1} \cdot U_2)), \qquad (n \geq 1).$$

It is easy now to deduce from (4.12.) that

$Q_n \in I((\rho_2^{(\infty)})_{\mathcal{R}(B_n \cdot U_2)}, (\rho_2^{(\infty)})_{\mathcal{R}(B_{n-1} \cdot U_2)})$, which proves the lemma.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.1.

(1) Since B_n satisfies (4.8.), ($n \geq 1$), taking B the strong limit of the sequence $\{B_n\}$ $n \geq 1$, it is easy to prove that B is a $(\rho_1, \rho_2^{(\infty)}; T_1, U_2)$ - CID for $\tilde{A}$, so (using lemma 3.1. (a)) B is a $(\rho_1, \rho_2 ; T_1, T_2)$ - CID for A.

(2) Let A be $(\rho_1, \rho_2 ; T_1, T_2)$ - regular; using Lemma 4.1. we obtain that $(\rho_1)_{\mathcal{D}_{C_1^*}}$ δ $(\rho_2^{(\infty)})_{\mathcal{R}(\tilde{A}\cdot U_2)}$, which means by (3.1.) that $(\rho_2^{(\infty)})_{\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}} \ominus \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}} U_2(K_2)^-}$ δ $(\rho_1)_{\mathcal{D}_{C_1^*}}$. The application of Theorem 2.1. shows that the only $\hat{C}_1$ such that B_1 satisfies (4.2.) is $\hat{C}_1 = C_1 P_{\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}} U_2(K_2)^-}$. Therefore $\mathcal{D}_{\hat{C}_1^*} = \mathcal{D}_{C_1^*}$ and Lemma 4.2. implies that

$$(\rho_2^{(\infty)})_{\mathcal{D}_{B_1} \ominus \mathcal{D}_{B_1} U_2(K_2)^-} \quad \delta \quad (\rho_1)_{\mathcal{D}_{C_2^*}} .$$

Theorem 2.1. shows again that $\hat{C}_2$ is unique such that B_2 satisfies (4.8.) for $n = 2$. By induction, $\hat{C}_n$ is unique such that B_n satisfies (4.8.) and therefore A has an unique $(\rho_1, \rho_2 ; T_1, T_2)$ - CID.

Conversely, if A has an unique $(\rho_1, \rho_2 ; T_1, T_2)$ - CID, then $\hat{C}_1 = C_1 P_{\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}} U_2(K_2)^-}$, therefore (by Theorem 2.1.)

$$(\rho_2^{(\infty)})_{\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}} \ominus \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{A}} U_2(K_2)^-} \quad \delta \quad (\rho_1)_{\mathcal{D}_{C_1^*}}$$

This condition implies (by Lemma 4.1.) that A is $(\rho_1, \rho_2; T_1, T_2)$ - regular.

The theorem is completely proved.

Corallary 5.1. If ρ_1 and ρ_2 are two non-disjoint factorial representations of $\mathcal{A}$, then A has an unique $(\rho_1, \rho_2 ; T_1, T_2)$ - CID iff one of the factorizations $T_1 \cdot A$ or $A \cdot T_2$ is regular.

Proof. Use a similar argument as in the proof of Corollary 2.1.

Corollary 5.2. ([3]) A has an unique (T_1, T_2) - CID iff one of the factorizations $T_1 \cdot A$ or $A \cdot T_2$ is regular.

Proof. Take $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{C}$ and $\rho_j : \mathbb{C} \ni \lambda \longrightarrow \lambda I_{H_j} \in \mathcal{L}(H_j)$ ($j = 1,2$) and apply Corollary 5.1.

6. We give now some applications to the case of a pair of commuting contractions. Fix the following notations. Let $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be a pair of commuting contractions, $\mathcal{A}$ a C - algebra, $\rho : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{L}(H)$ a representation of $\mathcal{A}$ such that $T_j \in [\rho(\mathcal{A})]'$, ($j = 1,2$). From Ando's theorem [1], the pair $\{T_1, T_2\}$ always

has a minimal isometric dilation $\{U_1, U_2\}$, $U_j \in \mathcal{L}(K)$, $(j = 1,2)$.

Definition 6.1. A minimal isometric dilation of $\{T_1, T_2\}$ on K namely $\{U_1, U_2\}$, is called ρ - adequate if there exists a representation $\tilde{\rho}: \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{L}(K)$ such that H is an invariant subspace for $\tilde{\rho}$, $(\tilde{\rho})_H = \rho$ and $U_j \in [\tilde{\rho}(\mathcal{A})]'$, $(j = 1,2)$.

Theorem 6.1. 1) The pair $\{T_1, T_2\}$ always has a ρ - adequate minimal isometric dilation.

2) The pair $\{T_1, T_2\}$ has an unique ρ - adequate minimal isometric dilation iff $(\rho \oplus \rho)_{\mathcal{R}(T_1 \cdot T_2)} \nmid (\rho \oplus \rho)_{\mathcal{R}(T_2 \cdot T_1)}$.

3) If ρ is a factor representation, then the pair $\{T_1, T_2\}$ has an unique ρ - adequate minimal isometric dilation iff one of the factorizations $T_1 \cdot T_2$ or $T_2 \cdot T_1$ is regular.

Proof. (1) Because $T_2 \in I(T_1, T_1) \cap I(\rho, \rho)$ we can apply Theorem 1.1. (a) to find a $(\rho, \rho\,;\, T_1, T_1)$ - CID for T_2. This means that if $U_1 \in \mathcal{L}(K_1)$ is the minimal isometric dilation of T_1, then there exists a contraction $\tilde{T}_2 \in \mathcal{L}(K_1)$ such that $\tilde{T}_2 U_1 = U_1 \tilde{T}_2$, $P_H \tilde{T}_2 = T_2 P_H$ and $\tilde{T}_2 \in [\rho^{(\infty)}(\mathcal{A})]'$, where $\rho^{(\infty)}$ is defined by (1.1.). Now $U_1 \in I(\tilde{T}_2, \tilde{T}_2) \cap I(\rho^{(\infty)}, \rho^{(\infty)})$ and we apply again Theorem 1.1. (a) to find a $(\rho^{(\infty)}, \rho^{(\infty)}\,;\, T_2, T_2)$ - CID for U_1. This means that if $\tilde{U}_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\tilde{K}_2)$ is the minimal isometric dilation of $\tilde{T}_2$, then there exists an unique isometry $\tilde{U}_1 \in \mathcal{L}(\tilde{K}_2)$ such that $P_{K_1} \tilde{U}_1 = U_1 P_{K_1}$, $\tilde{U}_1 \tilde{U}_2 = \tilde{U}_2 \tilde{U}_1$ and $\tilde{U}_1 \in [(\rho^{(\infty)})^{(\infty)}(\mathcal{A})]'$, (see [8], Proposition 10.8).

The pair $\{\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2\}$ which is an isometric dilation for $\{T_1, T_2\}$ contains a minimal isometric dilation $\{U_1, U_2\}$ on the space $K = \bigvee_{n=0, m=0}^{\infty} \tilde{U}_1^n \tilde{U}_2^m (H)$. It is clear that $P_K \in [(\rho^{(\infty)})^{(\infty)}(\mathcal{A})]'$, therefore, taking $\tilde{\rho} = ((\rho^{(\infty)})^{(\infty)})_K$, we see that $\{U_1, U_2\}$ is ρ - adequate.

(2) Let $\{U_1, U_2\}$ be a ρ - adequate minimal isometric dilation (on K) for $\{T_1, T_2\}$ and let $K_1 = \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} U_1^n (H)$. The minimality condition implies that H is invariat for U_1^* and therefore K_1 is reducing for U_1. Denote $V_1 = U_1|_{K_1}$ and $V_2 = P_{K_1} U_2|_{K_1}$; then V_1 is a minimal isometric dilation for T_1 and, up to an isomorphism of dilations (see [9] ch. I, section 4.1. for definition), we can consider that $V_1 \in \mathcal{L}(K_1)$ is the "standard" minimal isometric dilation described in section 1. Let $\tilde{\rho}$ be the representation which appear in the definition of the fact that $\{U_1, U_2\}$ is ρ - adequate. Then K_1 is invariant for $\tilde{\rho}$ and because $V_1 \in [(\tilde{\rho})_{K_1}(\mathcal{A})]'$ we have (up to an isomorphism) that $\tilde{\rho} = \rho^{(\infty)}$ (see 1.1). This implies that V_2 is a $(\rho, \rho\,;\, T_1, T_1)$ - CID for T_2, and, by Theorem 1.1. (a), that $\{U_1, U_2, \tilde{\rho}\}$ is

unitary equivalent to the ρ - adequate minimal isometric dilation obtained from $\{V_1, V_2, \rho^{(\infty)}\}$ (see the second part of (1)). Because the factorization $V_1 \cdot V_2$ is always regular (see [9], ch. VII, Proposition 3.2. (b)), the uniqueness problem for a ρ - adequate minimal isometric dilation of $\{T_1, T_2\}$ is solved by the uniqueness of V_2. So we can apply Theorem 1.1. (b) in order to get the conclusion.

(3) is a consequence of (2).

The theorem is completely proved.

Corollary 6.1. A pair $\{T_1, T_2\}$ of commuting contractions has an unique minimal unitary dilations iff one of the factorizations $T_1 \cdot T_2$ or $T_2 \cdot T_1$ is regular.

Proof. Apply theorem 6.1. (c) for $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{C}$ and $\rho : \mathbb{C} \ni \lambda \longmapsto \lambda I_H \in \mathcal{L}(H)$.

Remark 6.1. This corollary was comunicated to us by Professor C. Foiaş in connection to [3].

T. Ando proved in [2] that if T_1, T_2, T_3 are contractions on H such that T_3 doubly commutes with T_1 and T_2 and T_1 commutes with T_2, then the system $\{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$ has an unitary dilation. Using the techniques of [2], one can prove the following more general result, which we present here as a consequence of the techniques involved in Theorem 6.1.

Corollary 6.2. Let $\{T_1, T_2, \{S_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}\}$ be contractions on H such that S_ω doubly commutes with T_1 and T_2, for every $\omega \in \Omega$, T_1 commutes with T_2 and the system $\{S_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$ has regular unitary dilation (see [9], ch. I, § 9). Then the system $\{T_1, T_2, \{S(\omega)\}_{\omega\in\Omega}\}$ has an unitary dilation.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the C^* - algebra generated by $\{S_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$ and ρ the identical representation of $\mathcal{A}$ on H. Making the same construction as in the proof of Theorem 6.1. (1), we obtain the system $\{U_1, \tilde{T}_2, \{\tilde{S}_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}\}$ on K_1, where $U_1 \in \mathcal{L}(K_1)$ is the minimal isometric dilation of T_1, $\tilde{T}_2$ is a dilation of T_2 which commutes with U_1 and doubly commutes with

$$\tilde{S}_\omega = S \oplus S_\omega\big|_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} \oplus S_\omega\big|_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} \oplus \ldots\ldots \qquad \omega \in \Omega .$$

It is easy to see (using for exemple the condition (9.12) from [9] ch. I) that the system $\{\tilde{S}_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$ has a regular unitary dilation. The proposition 9.2. ch. I of [9] finishes the proof.

REFERENCES

[1] T. Ando, On a pair of commutative contractions, Acta Sci. Math., 24 (1963), 88 - 90.

[2] T. Ando, Unitary dilation for a triple of commuting contractions, preprint, 1976.

[3] T. Ando; Zoia Ceauşescu; C. Foiaş, On intertwining dilations II, to appear in Acta Sci. Math.

[4] J. G. W. Carswell; C. F. Schubert, Lifting of operators that commute with with shifts, Michigan Math. J., 22 (1975), 65 - 69.

[5] Zoia Ceauşescu, Lifting of contractions intertwining two isometries , preprint 1976.

[6] Zoia Ceauşescu; C. Foiaş, On intertwining dilations III, to appear in Rev. Roum. Math. Pures et Appl.

[7] J. Dixmier, Les C^* - algèbres et leurs representations, Gauthier - Villars, 1969.

[8] I. Suciu, Function algebras, Bucharest , 1973.

[9] B. Sz.-Nagy; C. Foiaş, Harmonic Analysis of operators on Hilbert space, Budapest - Amsterdam - London, 1970.