

# Completely bounded isomorphisms and similarity to complete isometries

Raphaël Clouâtre

University of Waterloo

COSy 2014  
Fields Institute

## Jordan canonical form of a matrix

Let  $T \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ .

## Jordan canonical form of a matrix

Let  $T \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ .

There exists a polynomial  $p$  such that  $p(T) = 0$ .

## Jordan canonical form of a matrix

Let  $T \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ .

There exists a polynomial  $p$  such that  $p(T) = 0$ .

There exists an invertible matrix  $X$  such that  $XTX^{-1}$  is in Jordan form.

## Functional model for Jordan cells

Let  $J \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be the usual Jordan cell with eigenvalue 0,

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & \\ & 0 & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

## Functional model for Jordan cells

Let  $J \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be the usual Jordan cell with eigenvalue 0,

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & \\ & 0 & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Consider the Hardy space  $H^2 = \{f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n : \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_n|^2 < \infty\}$ . The unilateral shift  $S$  acts on  $H^2$  as  $(Sf)(z) = zf(z)$ .

## Functional model for Jordan cells

Let  $J \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be the usual Jordan cell with eigenvalue 0,

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & \\ & 0 & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Consider the Hardy space  $H^2 = \{f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n : \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_n|^2 < \infty\}$ . The unilateral shift  $S$  acts on  $H^2$  as  $(Sf)(z) = zf(z)$ .

Let  $\theta(z) = z^n$  and consider the space

$$K_\theta = (\theta H^2)^\perp.$$

## Functional model for Jordan cells

Let  $J \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be the usual Jordan cell with eigenvalue 0,

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & \\ & 0 & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Consider the Hardy space  $H^2 = \{f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n : \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_n|^2 < \infty\}$ . The unilateral shift  $S$  acts on  $H^2$  as  $(Sf)(z) = zf(z)$ .

Let  $\theta(z) = z^n$  and consider the space

$$K_\theta = (\theta H^2)^\perp.$$

Up to unitary equivalence, we have that  $J = P_{K_\theta} S|_{K_\theta}$ .



## Functional model for Jordan cells

Let  $J \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$  be the usual Jordan cell with eigenvalue 0,

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & \\ & 0 & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Consider the Hardy space  $H^2 = \{f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n : \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_n|^2 < \infty\}$ . The unilateral shift  $S$  acts on  $H^2$  as  $(Sf)(z) = zf(z)$ .

Let  $\theta(z) = z^n$  and consider the space

$$K_\theta = (\theta H^2)^\perp.$$

Up to unitary equivalence, we have that  $J = P_{K_\theta} S|_{K_\theta}$ .

Allowing for functions  $\theta$  with more than one root, we see that any linear operator on a finite dimensional Hilbert space is similar to such a functional model.

# Functional models in infinite dimension?

## Functional models in infinite dimension?

Let  $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$  be a completely non-unitary contraction. Define

$$D_T = (I - T^*T)^{1/2}, \mathcal{D}_T = \overline{D_T \mathcal{H}}$$

$$D_{T^*} = (I - TT^*)^{1/2}, \mathcal{D}_{T^*} = \overline{D_{T^*} \mathcal{H}}.$$

The characteristic function of  $T$  is the contractive operator-valued holomorphic function

$$\Theta_T : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{D}_T, \mathcal{D}_{T^*})$$

defined as

$$\Theta_T(\lambda) = (-T + \lambda D_{T^*} (1 - \lambda T^*)^{-1} D_T) |_{\mathcal{D}_T}.$$

We also have the pointwise defect function

$$\Delta_T : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{D}_T)$$

such that

$$\Delta_T(\zeta) = (I - \Theta_T(\zeta)^* \Theta_T(\zeta))^{1/2}.$$

One check that  $\Delta_T$  is essentially bounded. Finally, put

$$K_{\Theta_T} = (H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \oplus \overline{\Delta_T L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}) \ominus \{\Theta_T u \oplus \Delta_T u : u \in H^2(\mathcal{D}_T)\}$$

$$S_{\Theta_T} = P_{K_{\Theta_T}}(S \oplus U) |_{K_{\Theta_T}}.$$

Then,  $T$  is unitarily equivalent to  $S_{\Theta_T}$  (this whole machinery is known as the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model theory).

This is too complicated...

By restricting the class of contractions we consider, we can get a much simpler model, which is a much closer analogue of the Jordan form for matrices.

## This is too complicated...

By restricting the class of contractions we consider, we can get a much simpler model, which is a much closer analogue of the Jordan form for matrices.

Let  $T$  be a contraction on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . In general, there is no polynomial such that  $p(T) = 0$ .

## This is too complicated...

By restricting the class of contractions we consider, we can get a much simpler model, which is a much closer analogue of the Jordan form for matrices.

Let  $T$  be a contraction on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . In general, there is no polynomial such that  $p(T) = 0$ .

### Definition

A (completely non-unitary) contraction  $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$  is said to be of *class  $C_0$*  if the associated  $H^\infty$ -functional calculus has non-trivial kernel.

## This is too complicated...

By restricting the class of contractions we consider, we can get a much simpler model, which is a much closer analogue of the Jordan form for matrices.

Let  $T$  be a contraction on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . In general, there is no polynomial such that  $p(T) = 0$ .

### Definition

A (completely non-unitary) contraction  $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$  is said to be of class  $C_0$  if the associated  $H^\infty$ -functional calculus has non-trivial kernel.

### Theorem (Sz.-Nagy–Foias, Bercovici,...)

*Let  $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$  be a  $C_0$  contraction. Then, there exists a unique Jordan operator  $J \in B(\mathcal{K})$  which is quasisimilar to  $T$ : there exist two bounded linear injective operators  $W : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}, Z : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  with dense range and the property that  $WT = JW, ZJ = TZ$ .*

## This is too complicated...

By restricting the class of contractions we consider, we can get a much simpler model, which is a much closer analogue of the Jordan form for matrices.

Let  $T$  be a contraction on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . In general, there is no polynomial such that  $p(T) = 0$ .

### Definition

A (completely non-unitary) contraction  $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$  is said to be of class  $C_0$  if the associated  $H^\infty$ -functional calculus has non-trivial kernel.

### Theorem (Sz.-Nagy–Foias, Bercovici,...)

*Let  $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$  be a  $C_0$  contraction. Then, there exists a unique Jordan operator  $J \in B(\mathcal{K})$  which is quasisimilar to  $T$ : there exist two bounded linear injective operators  $W : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}, Z : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  with dense range and the property that  $WT = JW, ZJ = TZ$ .*

The relation of quasisimilarity is rather weak...Can this be improved?



## Unitary equivalence

- (Arveson 1967, C. 2013) Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  be two quasisimilar  $C_0$  contractions (satisfying some mild technical conditions). Assume that there exists a completely isometric algebra isomorphism

$$\varphi : \{T_1\}' \rightarrow \{T_2\}'$$

such that  $\varphi(T_1) = T_2$ . Then,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are unitarily equivalent.

## Unitary equivalence

- (Arveson 1967, C. 2013) Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  be two quasisimilar  $C_0$  contractions (satisfying some mild technical conditions). Assume that there exists a completely isometric algebra isomorphism

$$\varphi : \{T_1\}' \rightarrow \{T_2\}'$$

such that  $\varphi(T_1) = T_2$ . Then,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are unitarily equivalent.

- What about similarity between  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ ? Can it be obtained under the weaker assumption that  $\varphi$  be only a completely bounded homomorphism with completely bounded inverse?

## Unitary equivalence

- (Arveson 1967, C. 2013) Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  be two quasisimilar  $C_0$  contractions (satisfying some mild technical conditions). Assume that there exists a completely isometric algebra isomorphism

$$\varphi : \{T_1\}' \rightarrow \{T_2\}'$$

such that  $\varphi(T_1) = T_2$ . Then,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are unitarily equivalent.

- What about similarity between  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ ? Can it be obtained under the weaker assumption that  $\varphi$  be only a completely bounded homomorphism with completely bounded inverse?
- Possible strategy: up to similarity, reduce to the situation addressed by the theorem

## Paulsen's similarity theorem

### Theorem (Paulsen 1984)

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a unital operator algebra and  $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be a unital completely bounded homomorphism. Then, there exists an invertible operator  $X$  with

$$\|X\|^2 = \|X^{-1}\|^2 = \|\varphi\|_{cb}$$

and such that map

$$a \mapsto X\varphi(a)X^{-1}$$

is completely contractive.

## The problem

What about a two-sided version of Paulsen's theorem?

## The problem

What about a two-sided version of Paulsen's theorem?

**QUESTION** Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be unital operator algebras and  $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a unital completely bounded homomorphism with completely bounded inverse ("completely bounded isomorphism"). Can we find two invertible operators  $X$  and  $Y$  with the property that the map

$$XaX^{-1} \mapsto Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}$$

is completely isometric?

## A general result

### Theorem (C., 2014)

Let  $\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{B} \subset B(\mathcal{H}_2)$  be unital operator algebras. Let  $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a unital completely bounded isomorphism. Then, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any finite set  $\mathcal{A}_0 \subset \mathcal{A}$ , there exist two invertible operators  $X \in B(\mathcal{H}_1)$  and  $Y \in B(\mathcal{H}_2)$  such that the map

$$XaX^{-1} \mapsto Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}$$

is a complete contraction and such that

$$\|XaX^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) (1 + \varepsilon / \rho(\varepsilon)) \|Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}\|$$

for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , where  $\rho(\varepsilon)$  is a positive constant depending only on  $\varepsilon$ .

## A general result

### Theorem (C., 2014)

Let  $\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{B} \subset B(\mathcal{H}_2)$  be unital operator algebras. Let  $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a unital completely bounded isomorphism. Then, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any finite set  $\mathcal{A}_0 \subset \mathcal{A}$ , there exist two invertible operators  $X \in B(\mathcal{H}_1)$  and  $Y \in B(\mathcal{H}_2)$  such that the map

$$XaX^{-1} \mapsto Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}$$

is a complete contraction and such that

$$\|XaX^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)(1 + \varepsilon/\rho(\varepsilon)) \|Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}\|$$

for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , where  $\rho(\varepsilon)$  is a positive constant depending only on  $\varepsilon$ .

Moreover, if the subset  $\mathcal{A}_0$  contains no non-trivial quasi-nilpotent element, then we have the sharper inequality

$$\|XaX^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon/\rho) \|Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}\|$$

for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , where

$$\rho = \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}_0} r(a).$$



## A general result

### Theorem (C., 2014)

Let  $\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{B} \subset B(\mathcal{H}_2)$  be unital operator algebras. Let  $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a unital completely bounded isomorphism. Then, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any finite set  $\mathcal{A}_0 \subset \mathcal{A}$ , there exist two invertible operators  $X \in B(\mathcal{H}_1)$  and  $Y \in B(\mathcal{H}_2)$  such that the map

$$XaX^{-1} \mapsto Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}$$

is a complete contraction and such that

$$\|XaX^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)(1 + \varepsilon/\rho(\varepsilon)) \|Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}\|$$

for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , where  $\rho(\varepsilon)$  is a positive constant depending only on  $\varepsilon$ .

Moreover, if the subset  $\mathcal{A}_0$  contains no non-trivial quasi-nilpotent element, then we have the sharper inequality

$$\|XaX^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon/\rho) \|Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}\|$$

for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , where

$$\rho = \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}_0} r(a).$$

Paulsen's theorem does not give lower bounds.

## A general result

### Theorem (C., 2014)

Let  $\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{B} \subset B(\mathcal{H}_2)$  be unital operator algebras. Let  $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a unital completely bounded isomorphism. Then, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any finite set  $\mathcal{A}_0 \subset \mathcal{A}$ , there exist two invertible operators  $X \in B(\mathcal{H}_1)$  and  $Y \in B(\mathcal{H}_2)$  such that the map

$$XaX^{-1} \mapsto Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}$$

is a complete contraction and such that

$$\|XaX^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)(1 + \varepsilon/\rho(\varepsilon)) \|Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}\|$$

for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , where  $\rho(\varepsilon)$  is a positive constant depending only on  $\varepsilon$ .

Moreover, if the subset  $\mathcal{A}_0$  contains no non-trivial quasi-nilpotent element, then we have the sharper inequality

$$\|XaX^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon/\rho) \|Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}\|$$

for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , where

$$\rho = \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}_0} r(a).$$

Paulsen's theorem does not give lower bounds. Can we do better?

## A general result

### Theorem (C., 2014)

Let  $\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{B} \subset B(\mathcal{H}_2)$  be unital operator algebras. Let  $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a unital completely bounded isomorphism. Then, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any finite set  $\mathcal{A}_0 \subset \mathcal{A}$ , there exist two invertible operators  $X \in B(\mathcal{H}_1)$  and  $Y \in B(\mathcal{H}_2)$  such that the map

$$XaX^{-1} \mapsto Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}$$

is a complete contraction and such that

$$\|XaX^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)(1 + \varepsilon/\rho(\varepsilon)) \|Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}\|$$

for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , where  $\rho(\varepsilon)$  is a positive constant depending only on  $\varepsilon$ .

Moreover, if the subset  $\mathcal{A}_0$  contains no non-trivial quasi-nilpotent element, then we have the sharper inequality

$$\|XaX^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon/\rho) \|Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}\|$$

for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , where

$$\rho = \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}_0} r(a).$$

Paulsen's theorem does not give lower bounds. Can we do better? Can we get a complete isometry?

## Special case

### Theorem (C.,2014)

Let  $\mathcal{A} \subset B(\mathcal{H}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{B} \subset B(\mathcal{H}_2)$  be unital operator algebras. Assume that there exists a unital completely bounded isomorphism  $\theta : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  where  $\mathcal{C}$  is either a  $C^*$ -algebra or a uniform algebra. Let  $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a unital completely bounded isomorphism. Then, there exist two invertible operators  $X \in B(\mathcal{H}_1)$  and  $Y \in B(\mathcal{H}_2)$  such that the map

$$XaX^{-1} \mapsto Y\varphi(a)Y^{-1}$$

is a complete isometry.

# Operator algebras similar to $C^*$ -algebras

## Operator algebras similar to $C^*$ -algebras

The previous theorem shows that we can deal with any algebra that is similar to a  $C^*$ -algebra.

## Operator algebras similar to $C^*$ -algebras

The previous theorem shows that we can deal with any algebra that is similar to a  $C^*$ -algebra.

In particular, it covers the case of commutative amenable operator algebras (Marcoux-Popov, 2013).

## Operator algebras similar to $C^*$ -algebras

The previous theorem shows that we can deal with any algebra that is similar to a  $C^*$ -algebra.

In particular, it covers the case of commutative amenable operator algebras (Marcoux-Popov, 2013).

What about general amenable operator algebras?



## Operator algebras similar to $C^*$ -algebras

The previous theorem shows that we can deal with any algebra that is similar to a  $C^*$ -algebra.

In particular, it covers the case of commutative amenable operator algebras (Marcoux-Popov, 2013).

What about general amenable operator algebras?

### Example (Choi-Farah-Ozawa, 2013)

Let  $\mathcal{C} = \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}, M_2(\mathbb{C}))$  and  $\mathcal{J} = c_0(\mathbb{N}, M_2(\mathbb{C}))$ . Denote by  $Q : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} / \mathcal{J}$  the quotient map. Let  $\Gamma$  be an abelian group and  $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow Q(\mathcal{C})$  be a uniformly bounded representation. A clever choice of  $\Gamma$  and  $\pi$  yields that the operator algebra

$$\mathcal{A} = Q^{-1} \left( \overline{\text{span } \pi(\Gamma)} \right)$$

is amenable but not similar to a  $C^*$ -algebra.

## Operator algebras similar to $C^*$ -algebras

The previous theorem shows that we can deal with any algebra that is similar to a  $C^*$ -algebra.

In particular, it covers the case of commutative amenable operator algebras (Marcoux-Popov, 2013).

What about general amenable operator algebras?

### Example (Choi-Farah-Ozawa, 2013)

Let  $\mathcal{C} = \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N}, M_2(\mathbb{C}))$  and  $\mathcal{J} = c_0(\mathbb{N}, M_2(\mathbb{C}))$ . Denote by  $Q : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} / \mathcal{J}$  the quotient map. Let  $\Gamma$  be an abelian group and  $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow Q(\mathcal{C})$  be a uniformly bounded representation. A clever choice of  $\Gamma$  and  $\pi$  yields that the operator algebra

$$\mathcal{A} = Q^{-1} \left( \overline{\text{span } \pi(\Gamma)} \right)$$

is amenable but not similar to a  $C^*$ -algebra.

We can answer the question in the affirmative for the algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  (C.-Marcoux 2014)

Theorem (C.,2014)

Let  $\theta \in H^\infty$  be an inner function.

- (i) *The algebra  $H^\infty/\theta H^\infty$  contains no non-trivial quasi-nilpotent elements if and only if  $\theta$  is a Blaschke product with simple roots.*

Theorem (C.,2014)

Let  $\theta \in H^\infty$  be an inner function.

- (i) *The algebra  $H^\infty / \theta H^\infty$  contains no non-trivial quasi-nilpotent elements if and only if  $\theta$  is a Blaschke product with simple roots.*
- (ii) *The algebra  $H^\infty / \theta H^\infty$  is a uniform algebra if and only if  $\theta$  is an automorphism of the disc. In that case, the algebra is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}$ . In particular,  $H^\infty / \theta H^\infty$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra if and only if it is a uniform algebra.*

Theorem (C.,2014)

Let  $\theta \in H^\infty$  be an inner function.

- (i) *The algebra  $H^\infty / \theta H^\infty$  contains no non-trivial quasi-nilpotent elements if and only if  $\theta$  is a Blaschke product with simple roots.*
- (ii) *The algebra  $H^\infty / \theta H^\infty$  is a uniform algebra if and only if  $\theta$  is an automorphism of the disc. In that case, the algebra is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}$ . In particular,  $H^\infty / \theta H^\infty$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra if and only if it is a uniform algebra.*
- (iii) *The following statements are equivalent.*

Theorem (C.,2014)

Let  $\theta \in H^\infty$  be an inner function.

- (i) The algebra  $H^\infty / \theta H^\infty$  contains no non-trivial quasi-nilpotent elements if and only if  $\theta$  is a Blaschke product with simple roots.
- (ii) The algebra  $H^\infty / \theta H^\infty$  is a uniform algebra if and only if  $\theta$  is an automorphism of the disc. In that case, the algebra is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}$ . In particular,  $H^\infty / \theta H^\infty$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra if and only if it is a uniform algebra.
- (iii) The following statements are equivalent.
  - (a) There exists a unital completely bounded isomorphism

$$\Phi : H^\infty / \theta H^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$$

for some uniform algebra  $\mathcal{F}$ .

Theorem (C.,2014)

Let  $\theta \in H^\infty$  be an inner function.

- (i) The algebra  $H^\infty / \theta H^\infty$  contains no non-trivial quasi-nilpotent elements if and only if  $\theta$  is a Blaschke product with simple roots.
- (ii) The algebra  $H^\infty / \theta H^\infty$  is a uniform algebra if and only if  $\theta$  is an automorphism of the disc. In that case, the algebra is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}$ . In particular,  $H^\infty / \theta H^\infty$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra if and only if it is a uniform algebra.
- (iii) The following statements are equivalent.

- (a) There exists a unital completely bounded isomorphism

$$\Phi : H^\infty / \theta H^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$$

for some uniform algebra  $\mathcal{F}$ .

- (b) There exists a unital completely bounded isomorphism

$$\Phi : H^\infty / \theta H^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

for some unital  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Theorem (C.,2014)

Let  $\theta \in H^\infty$  be an inner function.

- (i) The algebra  $H^\infty/\theta H^\infty$  contains no non-trivial quasi-nilpotent elements if and only if  $\theta$  is a Blaschke product with simple roots.
- (ii) The algebra  $H^\infty/\theta H^\infty$  is a uniform algebra if and only if  $\theta$  is an automorphism of the disc. In that case, the algebra is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}$ . In particular,  $H^\infty/\theta H^\infty$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra if and only if it is a uniform algebra.
- (iii) The following statements are equivalent.

- (a) There exists a unital completely bounded isomorphism

$$\Phi : H^\infty/\theta H^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$$

for some uniform algebra  $\mathcal{F}$ .

- (b) There exists a unital completely bounded isomorphism

$$\Phi : H^\infty/\theta H^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

for some unital  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (c) the function  $\theta$  is a Blaschke product whose roots  $\{\lambda_n\}_n \subset \mathbb{D}$  satisfy the Carleson condition

$$\inf_n \left\{ \prod_{k \neq n} \left| \frac{\lambda_k - \lambda_n}{1 - \overline{\lambda_k} \lambda_n} \right| \right\} > 0.$$



## The general case?

A counter-example (suggested by Ken Davidson) shows that this stronger version does not hold in general, and answers the original question in the negative.

## Idea behind the counterexample

Consider the operator space  $\mathcal{D} \subset M_2(\mathbb{C})$  consisting of elements of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} z_1 & 0 \\ 0 & z_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $z_1, z_2$  are complex numbers, along with the operator space  $\mathcal{R} \subset M_2(\mathbb{C})$  consisting of elements of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} z_1 & z_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $z_1, z_2$  are complex numbers.

## Idea behind the counterexample

Consider the operator space  $\mathcal{D} \subset M_2(\mathbb{C})$  consisting of elements of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} z_1 & 0 \\ 0 & z_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $z_1, z_2$  are complex numbers, along with the operator space  $\mathcal{R} \subset M_2(\mathbb{C})$  consisting of elements of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} z_1 & z_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $z_1, z_2$  are complex numbers.

The map  $\psi : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  defined as

$$\psi \left( \begin{pmatrix} z_1 & z_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 & 0 \\ 0 & z_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

is easily seen to be a completely bounded linear isomorphism with completely bounded inverse. Intuitively, it is clear that this cannot be made similar to a complete isometry:  $\|\cdot\|_2$  gives rise to Hilbert space structure while  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  does not.

## Idea behind the counterexample

Consider the operator space  $\mathcal{D} \subset M_2(\mathbb{C})$  consisting of elements of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} z_1 & 0 \\ 0 & z_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $z_1, z_2$  are complex numbers, along with the operator space  $\mathcal{R} \subset M_2(\mathbb{C})$  consisting of elements of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} z_1 & z_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $z_1, z_2$  are complex numbers.

The map  $\psi : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  defined as

$$\psi \left( \begin{pmatrix} z_1 & z_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 & 0 \\ 0 & z_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

is easily seen to be a completely bounded linear isomorphism with completely bounded inverse. Intuitively, it is clear that this cannot be made similar to a complete isometry:  $\|\cdot\|_2$  gives rise to Hilbert space structure while  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  does not.

Embedding these operator spaces in the upper-right corner of an operator algebra together with some easy but tedious computations yields the desired counter-example.

Thank you!