

JOSEPH A. BALL and HARIPADA SAU

**Dilation and Model Theory for Pairs of Commuting Contractions**

Joseph A. Ball

Department of Mathematics, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061-0123, USA

joball@math.vt.edu

Haripada Sau

Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Pashan,  
Pune, Maharashtra 411008, India

hsau@iiserpune.ac.in, haripadasau215@gmail.com

# Contents

1. Introduction .....	5
2. Functional models .....	12
2.1. The Schäffer functional model for the minimal isometric lift .....	12
2.2. The Douglas functional model for the minimal isometric dilation .....	14
2.3. The Sz.-Nagy–Foias model .....	17
3. Pairs of commuting isometries .....	23
3.1. Models for commuting pairs of isometries .....	24
3.2. Commuting unitary extensions .....	35
3.3. Doubly commuting pairs of isometries .....	36
3.4. Not doubly-commuting commuting isometries .....	42
4. Models for Andô lifts .....	46
4.1. Preliminaries .....	46
4.2. Type I Andô tuples and Douglas model .....	48
4.2.1. Canonical pair of commuting unitaries .....	48
4.2.2. Douglas-type structure of a general Andô lift .....	50
4.3. Special Andô tuples .....	59
4.4. The Sz.-Nagy–Foias model for an Andô isometric lift .....	66
4.5. Schäffer model .....	67
4.6. Strongly minimal Andô lifts via strongly minimal Andô tuples .....	78
4.7. Fundamental-Operator pairs .....	85
4.8. Appendix: examples .....	95
5. Classification of Andô lifts .....	98
5.1. Classification of model lifts .....	98
5.2. Classification of Schäffer-model Andô lifts .....	107
5.3. Type II Andô tuples versus strong Type II Andô tuples .....	108
6. Pseudo-commuting contractive lifts .....	111
6.1. Compressed Andô lifts versus pseudo-commuting contractive lifts .....	111
6.2. Douglas-model pseudo-commuting contractive lifts .....	114
6.3. Sz.-Nagy–Foias-model pseudo-commuting contractive lifts .....	119
6.4. Schäffer-model pseudo-commuting contractive lifts .....	120
7. Models and invariants for commuting contractive pairs .....	124
7.1. Characteristic triples and functional models .....	125
7.2. Canonical decomposition .....	126
7.3. Characteristic triple .....	128
7.4. Admissible triples .....	131
8. Joint invariant subspaces .....	139
References .....	146

## Abstract

The Sz.-Nagy dilation theorem is a seminal result in operator theory. In short, any contraction operator  $T$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  has a minimal isometric lift  $V$  on  $\mathcal{K} \supset \mathcal{H}$  which is unique up to a unitary change of coordinates in  $\mathcal{K}$  and correspondingly in  $\mathcal{H}$ . The Sz.-Nagy–Foiás functional-model identifies the change of coordinates which leads to a functional-model representation for  $V$  on a functional-model Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}_\Theta$  and for  $T$  on  $\mathcal{H}_\Theta \subset \mathcal{K}_\Theta$  defined solely in terms of the Sz.-Nagy–Foiás characteristic function  $\Theta = \Theta_T$  of  $T$ . This, combined with spectral theory for the unitary part of  $T$  if  $T$  has a unitary part, reduces the study of a general contraction operator  $T$  to the study of a contractive analytic function  $\Theta$  on the unit disk, in principle a much simpler object than  $T$  (at least in the case when  $\Theta$  is matrix-valued). The purpose of this manuscript is to obtain the analogue of these results for the case of a commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  in place of a single contraction operator  $T$ .

The first step has already appeared in the 1963 result of Andô: *any commuting pair of Hilbert-space contraction can be lifted to a commuting isometric pair*. We provide two more constructive new proofs of Andô’s result, each of which leads to a new functional-model representation for such a lift. The construction leads to the identification of a set of additional free parameters which serves to classify the distinct unitary-equivalence classes of minimal Andô lifts. However this lack of uniqueness limits the utility of such minimal Andô lifts for the construction of a functional model for a commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . We identify an intermediate type of lift, called *pseudo-commuting contractive lift*  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2)$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . The operators  $\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2$  are no longer commuting isometries, but are characterized by a slight weakening of the commutativity condition, which still guarantees that  $\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2$  are multiplication operators of a simple form acting on the Sz.-Nagy–Foiás minimal isometric lift space of the product contraction  $T = T_1 T_2$ . In the Sz.-Nagy–Foiás-like model form, the characteristic function  $\Theta_T$  is augmented by what is called the *Fundamental-Operator pair*  $(G_1, G_2)$ , together with a *canonical pair of commuting unitary operators*  $(W_{\sharp 1}, W_{\sharp 2})$ , so that the combined collection  $((G_1, G_2), (W_{\sharp 1}, W_{\sharp 2}), \Theta_{T_1 T_2})$  (called the *characteristic triple* for  $(T_1, T_2)$ ) is a complete unitary invariant for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . There is also a notion of *admissible triple*  $\Xi := ((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  as the substitute for a *purely contractive analytic function*  $\Theta$  in the Sz.-Nagy–Foiás theory, from which one can construct a functional-model commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_{\Xi, 1}, T_{\Xi, 2})$  having its characteristic triple *coinciding* with the original admissible triple in an appropriate sense.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary: 47A13; Secondary: 47A20, 47A25, 47A56, 47A68, 30H10

*Key words and phrases*: Schäffer dilation, Douglas dilation, Andô dilation, characteristic function, functional model, invariant subspace

# 1. Introduction

The starting point for many future developments in nonselfadjoint operator theory was the Sz.-Nagy dilation theorem from 1953 [40]: *if  $T$  is a contraction operator on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , then there is a unitary operator  $\mathcal{U}$  on a larger Hilbert space  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}} \supset \mathcal{H}$  such that  $T^n = P_{\mathcal{H}}\mathcal{U}^n|_{\mathcal{H}}$  for all  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$* . While the original proofs were more existential than constructive, there followed more concrete constructive proofs (e.g., the Schäffer-matrix construction from [37] to be discussed below) which evolved into a detailed geometric picture of the dilation space (see [43, Chapter II]). Analysis of how the original Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  fits into the dilation space  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$  and the appropriate implementations of the discrete Fourier transform convert the abstract spaces to spaces of functions (holomorphic or measurable as the case may be) led to the discovery of the characteristic function  $\Theta_T$  of any completely nonunitary (c.n.u.) contraction operator  $T$  and how the c.n.u. contraction operator  $T$  can be represented (up to unitary equivalence) as a compressed multiplication operator on a functional-model Hilbert space constructed directly from  $\Theta_T$ . Here we say that the contraction operator  $T$  is a *c.n.u. contraction* if  $T$  has no non-trivial reducing subspace on which  $T$  is unitary. We prefer to work with the equivalent notion of minimal isometric lifts  $V$  rather than minimal unitary dilations  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $T$ ; here we say that an operator  $V$  on  $\mathcal{K} \supset \mathcal{H}$  is a *lift* of  $T$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  if  $\mathcal{H}$  is invariant for  $V^*$  and  $V^*|_{\mathcal{H}} = T^*$ . More generally, if  $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  is an isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $V^*\Pi = \Pi T^*$ , we shall also say that  $(\Pi, V)$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  is a lift of  $T$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ .

To describe our results it is convenient to describe the Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional model for the c.n.u. contraction operator and the associated minimal isometric lift in some detail as follows. We define the defect operators

$$D_T = (I - T^*T)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad D_{T^*} = (I - TT^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and defect spaces

$$\mathcal{D}_T = \overline{\text{Ran } D_T}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{T^*} = \overline{\text{Ran } D_{T^*}},$$

introduce the characteristic function of  $T$

$$\Theta_T(z) = (-T^* + zD_{T^*}(I - zT^*)^{-1}D_T)|_{\mathcal{D}_T}: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T^*},$$

and the pointwise-defect operator of  $\Theta_T$ :

$$\Delta_{\Theta_T}(\zeta) = (I - \Theta_T(\zeta)^*\Theta_T(\zeta))^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ for } \zeta \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Define functional Hilbert spaces

$$\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T} := \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T}L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right], \quad \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T} := \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T} \ominus \left[ \begin{array}{c} \Theta_T \\ \Delta_{\Theta_T} \end{array} \right] H^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$$

and define operators  $V_{\Theta_T}$  on  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  and  $T_{\Theta_T}$  on  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}$  by

$$V_{\Theta_T} = \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & M_{\zeta}|_{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } T_{\Theta_T} = P_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}} V_{\Theta_T}|_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}}. \quad (1.1)$$

Then we have:

**Theorem A.**  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}$  is invariant for  $V_{\Theta_T}^*$ . If  $V$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  is any minimal isometric lift of  $T$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ , then there is a unitary transformation  $\tau: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  such that

$$\tau\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}, \quad \tau V = V_{\Theta_T}\tau, \quad (\tau|_{\mathcal{H}})T = T_{\Theta_T}(\tau|_{\mathcal{H}})$$

(so  $T$  is unitarily equivalent to  $T_{\Theta_T}$  via the unitary operator  $\tau|_{\mathcal{H}}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}$ ). Conversely, if  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  is a purely contractive analytic function on  $\mathbb{D}$  (meaning that  $\Theta(z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*)$  for  $z \in \mathbb{D}$  and that  $\|\Theta(0)d\| < \|d\|$  for  $0 \neq d \in \mathcal{D}$ ), and if we define  $\Delta_{\Theta}(\zeta)$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta}$ ,  $V_{\Theta}$ ,  $T_{\Theta}$  as above with  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  in place of  $(\mathcal{D}_T, \mathcal{D}_{T^*}, \Theta_T)$ , then  $V_{\Theta}$  is the minimal isometric lift of the c.n.u. contraction  $T_{\Theta}$  and the characteristic function  $(\mathcal{D}_{T_{\Theta}}, \mathcal{D}_{T_{\Theta}^*}, \Theta_{T_{\Theta}})$  coincides with  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$ , i.e., there are unitary operators  $u: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T_{\Theta}}$ ,  $u_*: \mathcal{D}_* \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T_{\Theta}^*}$  so that  $\Theta_{T_{\Theta}}(z)u = u_*\Theta(z)$  for  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ .

The Andô dilation theorem [3], coming ten years later, provides a 2-variable analogue of the Sz.-Nagy dilation theorem: *given a commuting pair of contraction operators  $(T_1, T_2)$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , there is a commuting pair of unitary operators  $(\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2)$  on a larger Hilbert space  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}} \supset \mathcal{H}$  so that, for all  $n, m \geq 0$ ,  $T_1^n T_2^m = P_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{U}_1^n \mathcal{U}_2^m|_{\mathcal{H}}$ .* The proof there is an expanded version of the Schäffer-matrix construction for the single-operator case which failed to shed much light on the geometry of the dilation space (a consequence of the lack of uniqueness up to a notion of unitary equivalence for Andô dilations). Consequently there has been essentially no follow-up to the Andô result in the direction of a Sz.-Nagy–Foias-type model theory for a commuting pair of contraction operators as there was in the single-operator setting, although there have now been some preliminary results in this direction (see [22, 11, 1]).

In an independent development, Berger-Coburn-Lebow [14] obtained a model for a commuting-tuple of isometries  $(V_1, \dots, V_d)$  by considering the Wold decomposition for the product  $V = V_1 \cdots V_d$  and understanding what form the factors  $V_1, \dots, V_d$  must take so as (i) to be themselves commuting isometries, and (ii) to have product equal to  $V$ . The conditions required to guarantee commutativity of the model isometries  $V_1, \dots, V_d$  are rather involved for the case  $d \geq 3$  but are immediately transparent and succinct for the case  $d = 2$ . For  $d = 2$  the model is determined by a collection of objects  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$  which we call a BCL-tuple consisting of

- (i) a coefficient Hilbert space  $\mathcal{F}$ ,
- (ii) a projection  $P$  and a unitary operator  $U$  on  $\mathcal{F}$ , and
- (iii) a commuting pair of unitary operators  $W_1, W_2$  on a common Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_u$ .

Given such a BCL-tuple, we associate a pair of operators in two distinct ways:

$$V_1 = \begin{bmatrix} M_{P^{\perp}U+zPU} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} M_{U^*P+zU^*P^{\perp}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{on} \quad \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1.2)$$

or

$$V_1 = \begin{bmatrix} M_{U^*P^\perp+zU^*P} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} M_{PU+zP^\perp U} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{on} \quad \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1.3)$$

Here, for a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{F}$ ,  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  denotes the  $\mathcal{F}$ -valued *Hardy space*

$$H^2(\mathcal{F}) := \{f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} : f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n f_n \text{ and } \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|f_n\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 < \infty\}.$$

In the first case (1.2) we say that  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$  is a *BCL1-model* for  $(V_1, V_2)$ , while in the second case (1.3) we say that  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$  is a *BCL2-model* for  $(V_1, V_2)$ . It is easily checked that in either case  $(V_1, V_2)$  is a commuting isometric pair. In fact there is a simple correspondence between BCL1 and BCL2 models for a given  $(V_1, V_2)$ :  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$  is a *BCL1-tuple* for  $(V_1, V_2)$  if and only if  $(\mathcal{F}, U^*P^\perp U, U^*)$  is a *BCL2-tuple* for  $(V_1, V_2)$ .

The result from [14] is the converse:

**Theorem B.** (See Theorem 3.1.4 below.) *Any commuting isometric pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}$  is unitarily equivalent to the BCL-model isometric pair (of either the BCL1 or BCL2 form) for some BCL-tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$ . If  $(\mathcal{F}', P', U', W'_1, W'_2)$  is another BCL-tuple giving rise to a BCL model commuting isometric pair  $(V'_1, V'_2)$  of the same form (BCL1 or BCL2) as  $(V_1, V_2)$  which is unitarily equivalent to  $(V_1, V_2)$ , then  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}', P', U', W'_1, W'_2)$  coincide in the sense that there are unitary transformations  $\omega : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$  and  $\tau : \mathcal{H}_u \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'_u$  so that*

$$\omega P = P' \omega, \quad \omega U = U' \omega, \quad \tau W_j = W'_j \tau \text{ for } j = 1, 2.$$

The goal of this manuscript is to develop a more complete analogue of the Sz.-Nagy–Foias dilation theory and operator model theory for the commuting contractive pair setting. This proceeds in several steps.

**1. Parametrization of Andô lifts.** Suppose that  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting contractive pair on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  is a minimal Andô lift for  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{K}$ , where  $\mathbf{\Pi} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  is an isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{K}$ . Then up to a unitary equivalence we have that  $T = T_1 T_2$  is in the Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional-model form:

$$T \cong_u T_{\Theta_T} := P_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}} \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & M_\zeta|_{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \end{array} \right] \Big|_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}} \quad (1.4)$$

and the operators  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are then commuting contraction operators on  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}$  which factor  $T_{\Theta_T} : T_{\Theta_T} = T_1 T_2 = T_2 T_1$ . Furthermore we may assume that  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  is in the BCL2-model form (1.3) for some BCL-tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$  acting on a space of the form  $\begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{bmatrix}$ . Then it remains to describe the (concrete) isometric identification map  $\mathbf{\Pi} : \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{bmatrix}$ . The result is as follows (see Theorem 4.4.1 and Corollary 5.1.2 below)

**Theorem C.** *Without loss of generality we may assume that the space  $\mathcal{H}_u$  is equal to the second component of the Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional-model space  $\mathcal{H}_u = \Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  and the operators  $W_1, W_2$  are the operators  $W_{\#1}, W_{\#2}$  canonically uniquely determined*

by the commuting, contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  (see Theorem 4.2.2 together with the notation (4.4.1) below), and that the operators  $\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2$  are in the BCL2-model form

$$(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2) = \left( \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{U^*P^\perp + zU^*P} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\sharp 1} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{PU + zP^\perp U} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\sharp 2} \end{array} \right] \right) \text{ on } \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{F})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right] \quad (1.5)$$

Then there is an isometric operator  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  such that the embedding operator  $\mathbf{\Pi}$  is given by

$$\mathbf{\Pi} = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\frac{H^2(\mathcal{F})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}} \end{array} \right] \Big|_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}} : \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T} \rightarrow \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{F})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right] \quad (1.6)$$

and the augmentation  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  of the BCL-tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$  is a Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  in the sense that  $\Lambda$  must satisfy two compatibility operator equations involving  $T_1^*, T_2^*$  and the BCL-tuple parameters  $(P, U)$  (namely, equations (4.2.9) and (4.2.10) with the subscript  $*$ 's dropped). Furthermore for the associated lift to be minimal, the Andô tuple should also satisfy an additional minimality condition (see Definition 4.1.3 below.).

Moreover, if  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  and  $(\mathbf{\Pi}', \mathbf{V}'_1, \mathbf{V}'_2)$  are two such lifts corresponding to minimal Type I  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ -Andô tuples  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}', \Lambda', P', U')$  respectively, then  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  and  $(\mathbf{\Pi}', \mathbf{V}'_1, \mathbf{V}'_2)$  are unitarily equivalent as lifts if and only if  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}', \Lambda', P', U')$  coincide in the sense that there is a unitary change of basis  $\omega: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$  so that

$$\omega\Lambda = \Lambda', \quad \omega P = P'\omega, \quad \omega U = U'\omega.$$

Putting all the pieces together, we can say: *unitary-equivalence classes of minimal Andô lifts  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  of a given commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  are in one-to-one correspondence with coincidence-equivalence classes of minimal Type I Andô tuples  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  of the commuting contractive pair  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ .*

We note that it is not immediately clear that the system of operator equations (4.2.9) - (4.2.10) has a solution  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  for a given commuting pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . However, there is a type of pre-Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  which we call a *special Andô tuple* for which it is possible to verify by direct computation that equations (4.2.9) - (4.2.10) do hold. This is discussed in Section 4.3 below. Let us point out that a direct construction of an Andô lift for a commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  such that the product operator  $T = T_1 T_2$  is of class  $C_0$  appears in the 2017 paper of Das-Sarkar-Sarkar [22].

**2. Pseudo-commuting contractive lifts.** One take-away from the preceding discussion is that Andô lifts for a given commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  always exist, but are not necessarily uniquely determined (up to lift-unitary equivalence) by the pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . We now introduce a weaker type of lift which is uniquely determined up to lift-unitary equivalence by  $(T_1, T_2)$  and arguably is a better parallel to the Sz.-Nagy–Foias minimal isometric lift of a single contraction operator  $T$  for the pair case  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

Towards this end, let us suppose that  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  is the Sz.-Nagy–Foias-like model for a minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  as in (1.5) and (1.6) with the product operator  $T = T_1 T_2 = T_2 T_1$  again assumed to be in the Sz.-Nagy-Foias model form as in (1.4). Note that the map  $\mathbf{\Pi}$  has an obvious extension to a map  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Pi}}$  acting on all of  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  with range



still in  $\left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{F})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right]$ :

$$\widehat{\Pi} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \end{bmatrix} : \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right] \rightarrow \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{F})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right]. \quad (1.7)$$

This map is still isometric and has the intertwining property

$$\widehat{\Pi} \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & M_\zeta|_{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{F}} & 0 \\ 0 & M_\zeta|_{\Delta_{\Theta} L^2(\mathcal{D})} \end{bmatrix} \widehat{\Pi} =$$

i.e.,

$$\widehat{\Pi} V_{\Theta_T} = \mathbf{V} \widehat{\Pi}$$

where  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{V}_2$  and where  $V_{\Theta_T}$  as in (1.1) is the minimal isometric lift of  $T_{\Theta_T}$  on  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$ . Furthermore, as the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model lift  $V_{\Theta_T}$  of  $T_{\Theta_T}$  is minimal, we know that

$$\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T} = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} V_{\Theta_T}^n \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}.$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{00} &:= \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{V}^n \text{Ran } \Pi = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{V}^n \widehat{\Pi} \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T} = \widehat{\Pi} \left( \bigvee_{n \geq 0} V_{\Theta_T}^n \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T} \right) = \widehat{\Pi} \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T} \\ &= \left[ \frac{H^2(\text{Ran } \Lambda)}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

It now follows that  $(\widehat{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}|_{\mathcal{K}_{00}})$  is a lift of  $T_{\Theta_T}$  unitarily equivalent to the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model lift  $(\iota_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}}, V_{\Theta_T})$  of  $T_{\Theta_T}$ . In particular  $\mathbf{V}|_{\mathcal{K}_{00}}$  is unitarily equivalent to  $V_{\Theta_T}$  via the unitary identification map  $\widehat{\Pi}: \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{00}$ . The next idea is to compress the Andô lift  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  augmented by the product operator  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{V}_2$  defined on  $\mathcal{K}$  to the copy of the embedded minimal lift space  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  for the single contraction operator  $T_{\Theta_T} = T_1 T_2$ , which in turn can be represented as operators on the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model space  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  by again making use of the unitary identification  $\widehat{\Pi}: \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{00}$ :

$$(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W}) = \widehat{\Pi}^* (\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2, \mathbf{V}) \widehat{\Pi} \text{ acting on } \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}.$$

Plugging in the formulas (1.5) and (1.7) for  $\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2, \widehat{\Pi}$  then gives us the explicit formulas in terms of the Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  associated with the Andô lift  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$ :

$$(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W}) = \left( \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_1^* + z G_2} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#1} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_2^* + z G_1} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#2} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & M_\zeta|_{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \end{array} \right] \right)$$

where we set  $G_1 = \Lambda^* P^\perp U \Lambda$ ,  $G_2 = \Lambda^* U^* P \Lambda$ . Such triples have their own abstract characterization: any such triple is a *pseudo-commuting, contractive operator-triple* meaning that  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  “almost commute” in the sense of Definition 6.1.2 below. In addition  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T_{\Theta_T} = T_1 T_2)$  with  $\mathbb{W}$  being equal to the minimal isometric lift  $V_{\Theta_T}$  of  $T_{\Theta_T}$  on  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$ , and conversely: any *pseudo-commuting, contractive lift*  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  of  $(T_1, T_2, T_{\Theta_T})$  with  $\mathbb{W}$  equal to the minimal isometric lift  $V_{\Theta_T}$  of  $T_{\Theta_T}$  is unique and arises in this way as the compression of any choice of minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  (see Theorem 6.1.4).

Moreover, there is an independent characterization of the operators  $(G_1, G_2)$  which shows that they are independent of the choice of minimal Andô lift, or equivalently, of minimal Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . In fact  $(G_1, G_2)$  can be alternatively characterized as the unique solution of a certain system of operator equations involving only  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  and not involving a choice of Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  (see Theorem 4.7.3). Following the precedent set in [16, 15], we call such  $(G_1, G_2)$  arising in this way to be the *Fundamental-Operator pair* for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . In summary, we conclude that, unlike the case for minimal Andô lifts, *the compression  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  of a minimal Andô lift  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2, \mathbf{V})$  of  $(T_1, T_2, T_{\Theta_T} = T_1 T_2)$  to the minimal isometric lift space  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  for  $T_{\Theta_T}$ , or equivalently, any pseudo-commuting, contractive lift  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  of  $(T_1, T_2, T_{\Theta_T})$  with third component  $\mathbb{W}$  equal to the minimal isometric lift  $V_{\Theta_T}$  of  $T_{\Theta_T}$ , is uniquely determined by the factor contractions  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ .* While  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is no longer commuting, it does have a functional model representation of a much simpler form than that of a general commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . This is what leads to a Sz.-Nagy–Foias-like functional model for the commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  discussed next.

**3. The Sz.-Nagy–Foias-like functional model for a contractive pair.** The idea behind the Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional model for a single contraction operator  $T$  is to obtain a relatively simple functional model for the essentially unique minimal isometric lift  $V$  of  $T$ , and then compress the action of  $V$  to its  $*$ -invariant subspace to arrive at a functional model for  $T$ . A key point is the uniqueness: *there is a one-to-one correspondence between unitary equivalence classes of contraction operators and unitary equivalence classes of minimal isometric lifts.* When we consider the pair case and use a minimal Andô lift for the pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  in place of a minimal isometric lift for the single operator  $T$ , this one-to-one correspondence fails; going to the minimal Andô lift introduces what one might call *noise* (extraneous data which has nothing to do with the original object of study, namely the commuting contractive pair). On the other hand, if we use the pseudo-commuting, contractive lift  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  for  $(T_1, T_2, T)$  in place of the minimal isometric lift  $V$  for  $T$ , the situation is more parallel to the classical case. Given a commuting, contractive pair, we define the collection

$$\Xi_{(T_1, T_2)} := ((G_1, G_2), (W_{\#1}, W_{\#2}), \Theta_T)$$

to be the *characteristic triple* of  $(T_1, T_2)$ , where  $\Theta_T$  is the characteristic function for  $T = T_1 T_2$ ,  $(G_1, G_2)$  is the Fundamental-Operator pair for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ , and  $(W_{\#1}, W_{\#2})$  is the commuting pair of unitary operators with product equal to  $M_\zeta|_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}}$  on the space  $\overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}$  canonically and uniquely associated with  $(T_1, T_2)$  appearing in (1.5). This characteristic triple turns out to be a *complete unitary invariant* for  $(T_1, T_2)$  in the following sense: *the commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  is unitarily equivalent to the commuting contractive pair  $(T'_1, T'_2)$  if and only if the associated characteristic triples  $\Xi_{(T_1, T_2)}$  and  $\Xi_{(T'_1, T'_2)}$  coincide in a certain natural sense.* The reverse procedure in the classical case relies on the clean characterization of the coincidence envelope of characteristic functions  $\Theta_T$  as the set of purely contractive analytic functions  $\Theta$ ; for the pair case, the characterization of the coincidence envelope of characteristic triples, namely what we call *admissible triples*  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  (see Definition 7.4.2), is less tractable. Never-

theless this analysis provides some insight into the structure of commuting contractive pairs in general and can be tractable in some special cases.

This manuscript is organized as follows: Following the Introduction, Chapter 2 reviews the unitary-dilation/isometric-lift/operator-model theory for a single contraction operator from four points of view: (i) the coordinate-free geometric picture as found in Chapter I of the classic book [43], (ii) the Douglas model theory as in [25], the Schäffer model theory [37], and the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model theory as found in Chapter VI of [43].

Chapter 3 develops from first principles the Berger–Coburn–Lebow model theory for a commuting contractive pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  [14] with inclusion of many illustrative examples.

In addition to the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model for a minimal Andô lift of a commuting contractive pair, Chapter 4 develops from first principles the Douglas and Schäffer models for a minimal Andô lift  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  for a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ ; in fact the Douglas model is developed first and then used as a bridge for understanding the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model. The *Fundamental-Operator pair*  $(F_1, F_2)$  for the commuting contractive pair  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  appears here for the first time in connection with characterizing when  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift (see Theorem 4.7.4 below):  *$(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift if and only if the Fundamental-Operator pair  $(G_1, G_2)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  satisfies the additional system of operator equations (4.7.26) given below; equivalently, there is a projection  $P$  and a unitary operator  $U$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  so that  $(G_1, G_2) = (P^\perp U, U^* P)$  (see Lemma 3.1.1 below) and the operator pair  $(M_{F_2^* + F_1 z}, M_{F_1^* + F_2 z})$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  assumes the BCL2-model form  $(M_{U^* P^\perp + z U^* P z}, M_{P U + z P^\perp U})$  for a commuting isometric pair. In view of the results in Chapter 6 on pseudo-commuting contractive lifts, this is just the statement that the pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  is actually an Andô lift which is also exactly the case when any minimal Andô lift is unique up to unitary equivalence of lifts. Also developed in Chapter 4 is the equivalence between existence of a strongly minimal Andô lift for  $(T_1, T_2)$  and the condition that the factorizations  $T = T_1 \cdot T_2$  and  $T = T_2 \cdot T_1$  are both *regular* in the sense of Sz.-Nagy–Foias (see [43]).*

Chapter 5 lays out the one-to-one correspondence between unitary-equivalence classes of minimal Andô lifts for a commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on the one hand, and coincidence-equivalence classes of the corresponding minimal Andô tuples, both in the Douglas-model setting (where one works with minimal Type I Andô tuples for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ ) and in the Schäffer-model setting (where one works with minimal strong Type II Andô tuples for  $(T_1, T_2)$ ).

Chapter 6 focuses on the pseudo-commuting contractive lift for a given commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Some preliminary results can be obtained in the abstract framework but other results (e.g., that *the final component  $\mathbb{W}$  of a pseudo-commuting contractive lift  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  of  $(T_1, T_2, T = T_1 T_2 = T_2 T_1)$  uniquely determines the other components  $\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2$* ) makes use of a functional model (any of Douglas, Sz.-Nagy–Foias, or Schäffer) for  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$ .

Chapter 7 develops the Sz.-Nagy–Foias-like functional model for a given commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  while Chapter 8 obtains an analogue of the Sz.-Nagy–Foias correspondence between invariant subspaces for  $T$  and regular factorizations  $\Theta(\zeta) =$

$\Theta''(\zeta)\Theta'(\zeta)$  of the characteristic function  $\Theta = \Theta_T$  of  $T$  (see [43]).

Finally, let us note that our companion paper [10] extends some of the framework of this manuscript to the higher-order tuple setting (commuting  $d$ -tuples  $\underline{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_d)$  of contraction operators on a Hilbert space with  $d > 2$ ), and that this manuscript essentially subsumes the preliminary report [36] posted on arXiv.

## 2. Functional models for isometric lifts of a contraction operator

The Sz.-Nagy dilation theorem asserts that any contraction operator  $T$  on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  can be dilated to a unitary operator  $\mathcal{U}$  on a space  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}} \supset \mathcal{H}$ , i.e., there is a unitary operator  $\mathcal{U}$  on a Hilbert space  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$  containing  $\mathcal{H}$  so that  $T^n = P_{\mathcal{H}}\mathcal{U}^n|_{\mathcal{H}}$  for  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . By a lemma of Sarason, this is the same as saying that  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$  has an orthogonal decomposition  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}_- \oplus \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K}_+$  and with respect to this decomposition  $\mathcal{U}$  has the block-matrix form  $\mathcal{U} = \begin{bmatrix} * & 0 & 0 \\ * & T & 0 \\ * & * & * \end{bmatrix}$ . The dilation is said to be *minimal* if it is the case that  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$  is the smallest reducing subspace for  $\mathcal{U}$  containing  $\mathcal{H}$ . An operator  $V$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K} \supset \mathcal{H}$  is said to be an *isometric lift* of  $T$  if  $V$  is isometric,  $\mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H}$  is invariant for  $V$  and  $T^n = P_{\mathcal{H}}V^n|_{\mathcal{H}}$  for  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . Equivalently, it works out that  $V$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  being a lift of  $T$  is the same as  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K}$  being an invariant subspace for  $V^*$  and furthermore  $V^*|_{\mathcal{H}} = T^*$ , i.e., with respect to the decomposition  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{H} \oplus (\mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H})$  the operator  $V$  has the block-matrix representation  $V = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ * & * \end{bmatrix}$ . There is a close connection between minimal unitary dilations and minimal isometric lifts, namely: *if  $\mathcal{U}$  is a unitary dilation of  $T$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}} \supset \mathcal{H}$  and if we set  $\mathcal{K} = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{U}^n \mathcal{H}$  and define  $V$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  as  $V = \mathcal{U}|_{\mathcal{K}}$ , then  $V$  is a minimal isometric lift of  $T$ , and conversely, if  $V$  is a minimal isometric lift of  $T$ , one can always extend  $V$  to a unitary operator  $\mathcal{U}$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}} \supset \mathcal{K}$  so that  $\mathcal{U}$  is a minimal unitary dilation of  $V$ .* For our purposes here, it is convenient to work almost exclusively with isometric lifts rather than unitary dilations.

To make various constructions to come more canonical, we shall make systematic use of a more general notion of lift where we do not insist that the space  $\mathcal{H}$  on which  $T$  acts is a subspace of the space  $\mathcal{K}$  but rather allow an isometric identification map  $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ . Thus we say that, for a given contraction operator  $T$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  the collection of objects  $(\Pi, V)$  is a *isometric lift* of  $T$  if

- $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  is an isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{K}$ , and
- $\text{Ran } \Pi$  is invariant for  $V^*$  and furthermore  $V^*\Pi = \Pi T^*$ .

In this chapter we shall discuss three types of functional models (Schäffer, Douglas, and Sz.-Nagy–Foias) for a given Hilbert-space contraction operator.

**2.1. The Schäffer functional model for the minimal isometric lift.** For a (coefficient) Hilbert space  $\mathcal{F}$ , we shall use the notation  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  for the *Hardy space*

$$H^2(\mathcal{F}) := \left\{ f: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} : f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n f_n \text{ and } \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|f_n\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 < \infty \right\}.$$

When  $\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{C}$ , we shall denote  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  simply by  $H^2$ . For a contraction operator  $T$  acting on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , we shall have use of the *defect operators*

$$D_T = (I_{\mathcal{H}} - T^*T)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad D_{T^*} = (I_{\mathcal{H}} - TT^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and the *defect spaces*

$$\mathcal{D}_T = \overline{\text{Ran } D_T}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{T^*} = \overline{\text{Ran } D_{T^*}}.$$

For  $\mathcal{F}$  any coefficient space, we shall use the notation

$$\mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}} := \mathbf{ev}_0 \otimes I_{\mathcal{F}}: f \mapsto f(0) \quad (2.1.1)$$

for the evaluation-at-0 map on the vector-valued Hardy space  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  with the adjoint

$$\mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^*: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{F})$$

given by the identification of an element  $x \in \mathcal{F}$  with the constant function  $f(z) = x$  considered as an element of  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$ . When  $\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{C}$ , we shall denote  $\mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}$  simply by  $\mathbf{ev}_0$ .

Let us write  $\mathcal{K}_S$  for the *Schäffer isometric lift space*

$$\mathcal{K}_S = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.1.2)$$

and  $\Pi_S$  for the isometric embedding operator

$$\Pi_S = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S \quad (2.1.3)$$

and let  $V_S$  on  $\mathcal{K}_S$  be the operator given by

$$V_S: \begin{bmatrix} h \\ f \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{D}_T}^* D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} h \\ f \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Th \\ D_T h + z f(z) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.1.4)$$

Then one can check that  $V_S$  is isometric on  $\mathcal{K}_S$  and that  $\Pi_S T^* = V_S^* \Pi_S$  (due to the block lower-triangular form in the matrix representation of  $V_S$ ), and hence  $(\Pi_S, V_S)$  is an isometric lift of  $T$ . Let us formally give this a name.

**DEFINITION 2.1.1.** If  $\mathcal{K}_S$ ,  $\Pi_S$ , and  $V_S$  are given as in (2.1.2), (2.1.3), (2.1.4), then  $(\Pi_S, V_S)$  is an isometric lift of  $T$  on  $\mathcal{K}_S$  and we shall say that  $(\Pi_S, V_S)$  is the *Schäffer-model isometric lift* of  $T$ .

It is easy to check that the Schäffer-model isometric lift  $(\Pi_S, V_S)$  is minimal, i.e., that

$$\bigvee_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} V_S^n \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \mathcal{K}_S := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that the Schäffer isometric-lift space  $\mathcal{K}_S = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \end{bmatrix}$  has first component  $\mathcal{H}$  equal to the original abstract Hilbert space while the second component  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  is a functional Hilbert space, so strictly speaking the Schäffer model is only a semi-functional model. The original Schäffer model as presented in [43, Section I.5.1] has a purely matricial form as the second component  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  is written in matricial form as  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}_+}^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  rather than in the functional form  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$ .

**2.2. The Douglas functional model for the minimal isometric dilation.** For  $T$  a contraction operator on  $\mathcal{H}$ , we shall have great use of the non-negative definite operator  $Q_{T^*}$  given by the strong limit

$$Q_{T^*}^2 = \text{SOT-lim } T^n T^{*n}. \quad (2.2.1)$$

A fundamental map for the construction of the Douglas model is the map

$$\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$$

given by <sup>(1)</sup>

$$\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} : h \mapsto \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} D_{T^*} T^{*n} h z^n = D_{T^*} (I - zT^*)^{-1} h. \quad (2.2.2)$$

The easy computation

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} x\|_{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}^2 &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|D_{T^*} T^{*n} x\|^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle T^n (I - TT^*) T^{*n} x, x \rangle \\ &= \|x\|^2 - \|Q_{T^*} x\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

shows that  $\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*}$  is contractive as an operator from  $\mathcal{H}$  into the Hardy space  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$ , and is an isometry exactly when  $Q_{T^*} = 0$ .

We now note that  $TQ_{T^*}^2 T^* = Q_{T^*}^2$ ; hence the formula

$$X^* Q_{T^*} h = Q_{T^*} T^* h \quad (2.2.3)$$

defines an isometry  $X^*$  on  $\text{Ran } Q_{T^*}$  which extends by continuity to an isometry (still denoted as  $X^*$ ) on  $\overline{\text{Ran } Q_{T^*}}$ . If not already unitary, this operator has a minimal unitary extension on a space  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \supset \overline{\text{Ran } Q_{T^*}}$  which we denote by  $W_D^*$ . A dense subspace of  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  is

$$\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} W_D^n \text{Ran } Q_{T^*} \text{ dense in } \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \quad (2.2.4)$$

and then the extension  $W_D^*$  is given densely by

$$\begin{aligned} W_D^* W_D^n Q_{T^*} h &= W_D^{n-1} X^* Q_{T^*} h = W_D^{n-1} Q_{T^*} T^* h \text{ for } n \geq 1, \\ W_D^* Q_{T^*} h &= X^* Q_{T^*} h = Q_{T^*} T^* h. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2.5)$$

Let us introduce the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{K}_D := \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.2.6)$$

---

<sup>(1)</sup> The notation  $\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*}$  is suggested by the fact that the operator  $\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*}$  can be viewed as the *frequence-domain observability operator* for the discrete-time state/output linear system

$$\begin{cases} x(t+1) &= T^* x(t) \\ y(t) &= D_{T^*} x(t) \end{cases}, \quad t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

( $x(t)$  equal to the *state* at time  $t$ ,  $y(t)$  equal to the output at time  $t$ ) since running the system with initial condition  $x(0)$  to produce an output string  $\{y(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$  results in the  $Z$ -transform  $\widehat{y}(z) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} y(n) z^n$  of the output string  $\{y(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$  being given by

$$\widehat{y}(z) = \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} x_0.$$

and define an isometric operator  $V_D$  on  $\mathcal{K}_D$  by

$$V_D = \begin{bmatrix} M_z & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.2.7)$$

There is a canonical isometric embedding operator  $\Pi_D: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D$  given by

$$\Pi_D: h \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} h. \quad (2.2.8)$$

Furthermore, we have the intertwining relation

$$\Pi_D T^* = (V_D)^* \Pi_D. \quad (2.2.9)$$

Let us give all this a formal name.

**DEFINITION 2.2.1.** Define the space  $\mathcal{K}_D$ , the operator  $\Pi_D$  and the operator  $V_D$  as in (2.2.6), (2.2.8), and (2.2.7). Then  $(\Pi_D, V_D)$  is a lift of  $T$  on the space  $\mathcal{K}_D$  which we shall refer to as the *Douglas-model isometric lift* of  $T$ .

One can also see as a consequence of Lemma 1 in Douglas's paper [25] that this Douglas-model lift is a minimal isometric lift. We include here a simple direct proof making use of the formulation which we are using here.

**PROPOSITION 2.2.2.** *The Douglas-model isometric lift  $(\Pi_D, V_D)$  ((2.2.7) and (2.2.8)) of a contraction operator  $T$  is minimal.*

*Proof.* Verification of the minimality of  $(\Pi_D, V_D)$  amounts to showing that

$$\mathcal{K}_{\min} := \bigvee_{n=0,1,2,\dots} \begin{bmatrix} M_z^n & 0 \\ 0 & W_D^n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} = \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.2.10)$$

To see this, note first that for each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  we have in particular that

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_z^n & 0 \\ 0 & W_D^n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} T^{*n} h \in \mathcal{K}_{\min}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} M_z^n & 0 \\ 0 & W_D^n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} T^{*n} h &= \begin{bmatrix} M_z^n & 0 \\ 0 & W_D^n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{*n} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D^{*n} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} h \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} M_z^n M_z^{*n} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D^n W_D^{*n} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} h = \begin{bmatrix} M_z^n M_z^{*n} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} h \\ Q_{T^*} h \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (2.2.11)$$

where

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|M_z^n M_z^{*n} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} h\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|M_z^{*n} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} h\| = 0$$

since  $M_z$  is a shift operator. Combining this observation with (2.2.11) leads us to

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \begin{bmatrix} M_z^n & 0 \\ 0 & W_D^n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} T^{*n} h = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ Q_{T^*} h \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{K}_{\min}.$$

Subtracting this element off from  $\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} h \in \mathcal{K}_{\min}$ , we conclude that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} h \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{K}_{\min}.$$

But then we also have, for all  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} - M_z \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} T^*) h \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{K}_{\min}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} ((\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} - M_z \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} T^*) h)(z) &= (D_{T^*} (I - zT^*)^{-1} - zD_{T^*} (I - zT^*)^{-1} T^*) h \\ &= \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_{T^*}}^* D_{T^*} h. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2.12}$$

Thus  $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_{T^*}}^* D_{T^*} h \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{K}_{\min}$  and hence also

$$\begin{aligned} \bigvee_{n=0,1,2,\dots} \begin{bmatrix} M_z^n & 0 \\ 0 & W_D^n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_{T^*}}^* D_{T^*} \mathcal{H} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \bigvee_{n=0,1,2,\dots} M_z^n \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_{T^*}}^* D_{T^*} \mathcal{H} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \subset \mathcal{K}_{\min}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally let us recall that  $\bigcup_{n \geq 0} W_D^n Q_{T^*} \mathcal{H}$  is dense in  $Q_{T^*}$  and hence

$$\bigvee_{n \geq 0} \begin{bmatrix} M_z^n & 0 \\ 0 & W_D^n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ Q_{T^*} \mathcal{H} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \subset \mathcal{K}_{\min}.$$

Putting all the pieces together then gives us

$$\mathcal{K}_D := \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \subset \mathcal{K}_{\min} \subset \mathcal{K}_D$$

and (2.2.10) follows as wanted. ■

REMARK 2.2.3. As the Douglas isometric-lift space  $\mathcal{K}_D = \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$  has first component  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$  equal to a functional Hilbert space but second component  $Q_{T^*}$  equal to an abstract (non-functional) Hilbert space, so strictly speaking one can think of the Douglas model is really being only a semi-functional model. However the space  $Q_{T^*}$  comes equipped with a unitary operator  $W_D$ . By the direct-integral version of the spectral theorem for unitary (more generally normal) operators (see [23, Theorem I.6.1], one can convert this space to a direct-integral  $L^2$ -space  $Q_{T^*} \cong \bigoplus_{\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{H}_{\zeta} d\nu(t)$  for a scalar spectral measure  $\nu$  and multiplicity function  $m(\zeta) = \dim \mathcal{H}_{\zeta}$ , with  $W_D$  then given as the multiplication operator  $W_D = M_{\zeta}: f(\zeta) \mapsto \zeta \cdot f(\zeta)$  (here  $\zeta \mapsto f(\zeta) \in \mathcal{H}_{\zeta}$  is a measurable square-integrable cross-section of  $\{\mathcal{H}_{\zeta}\}_{\zeta \in \mathbb{T}}$ ). This becomes more precise when we make connections with the Sz.-Nagy-Foias model in the next section.

REMARK 2.2.4. While the Douglas model is mostly explicitly constructed in terms of the operator  $T$ , one could ask for a more explicit construction of the residual part  $Q_{T^*}$  where the unitary part  $W_D$  of the minimal isometric lift  $V_D = M_z \oplus W_D$  is defined. There is a later construction due to Durszt [27], which, while arguably more difficult to work with, gives such an explicit construction, with first component exactly the same as in the Douglas construction (after interchanging the contraction operator  $T$  with its adjoint  $T^*$ ), while the second component is a bilateral unitary shift operator with a more complicated but completely explicit formula for the map from  $\mathcal{H}$  into this  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ -space.



**2.3. The Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional model for the minimal unitary dilation.** As in the approach of Sz.-Nagy and Foias towards a functional model for unitary dilations, we assume that we are given a completely non-unitary (c.n.u.) contraction operator  $T$  together with its minimal unitary dilation  $\mathcal{U}$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$  and minimal isometric lift  $V$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  with  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{K}}$  and  $V = \mathcal{U}|_{\mathcal{K}}$ . Following [43][Sections II.1 and II.2], one can see that the subspaces

$$\mathcal{L} = \overline{(\mathcal{U} - T)\mathcal{H}}, \quad \mathcal{L}_* = \overline{(I - \mathcal{U}T^*)\mathcal{H}}$$

contained in  $\mathcal{K} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{K}}$  are wandering subspaces for  $\mathcal{U}$  in the sense that

$$\mathcal{U}^n \mathcal{L} \perp \mathcal{U}^m \mathcal{L}, \quad \mathcal{U}^n \mathcal{L}_* \perp \mathcal{U}^m \mathcal{L}_* \text{ for } m \neq n \text{ in } \mathbb{Z}$$

and hence it makes sense to define subspace  $M_{\pm}(\mathcal{L})$  and  $M_{\pm}(\mathcal{L}_*)$  as well as  $M(\mathcal{L})$  and  $M(\mathcal{L}_*)$  via the internal direct sums in  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} M_+(\mathcal{L}) &:= \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{U}^n \mathcal{L}, & M_-(\mathcal{L}) &:= \bigoplus_{n < 0} \mathcal{U}^n \mathcal{L}, \\ M_+(\mathcal{L}_*) &:= \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{U}^n \mathcal{L}_*, & M_-(\mathcal{L}_*) &:= \bigoplus_{n < 0} \mathcal{U}^n \mathcal{L}_*, \\ M(\mathcal{L}) &:= M_-(\mathcal{L}) \oplus M_+(\mathcal{L}) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{U}^n \mathcal{L}, \\ M(\mathcal{L}_*) &:= M_-(\mathcal{L}_*) \oplus M_+(\mathcal{L}_*) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{U}^n \mathcal{L}_*. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $M_+(\mathcal{L})$  and  $M_+(\mathcal{L}_*)$  are invariant for  $\mathcal{U}$  while  $M_-(\mathcal{L})$ ,  $M_-(\mathcal{L}_*)$  are invariant for  $\mathcal{U}^*$  and  $M(\mathcal{L})$  and  $M(\mathcal{L}_*)$  are reducing for  $\mathcal{U}$ . If we set  $\mathcal{R} = \tilde{\mathcal{K}} \ominus M(\mathcal{L}_*)$ , then  $\mathcal{R}$  is reducing for  $\mathcal{U}$  and we have the two orthogonal decompositions of the space  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ :

$$\tilde{\mathcal{K}} = M(\mathcal{L}_*) \oplus \mathcal{R} = M_-(\mathcal{L}_*) \oplus \mathcal{H} \oplus M_+(\mathcal{L}),$$

and the space  $\mathcal{K}$  on which the minimal isometric lift  $V$  of  $T$  acts has the two orthogonal decompositions

$$\mathcal{K} = M_+(\mathcal{L}_*) \oplus \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{H} \oplus M_+(\mathcal{L}). \quad (2.3.1)$$

In particular we see that  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K}$ ; from the fact that  $\mathcal{K}$  is invariant for  $\mathcal{U}$  and by definition  $V = \mathcal{U}|_{\mathcal{K}}$ , we see that the wandering subspaces  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_*$  can equally well be defined as

$$\mathcal{L} = \overline{(V - T)\mathcal{H}}, \quad \mathcal{L}_* = \overline{(I - VT^*)\mathcal{H}}.$$

In summary, given any minimal isometric lift of the form  $(i_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}}, V)$  (i.e., having  $\mathcal{H}$  equal to a subspace of the dilation space  $\mathcal{K}$  on which  $V$  is acting), the space  $\mathcal{K}$  then has the two-fold orthogonal decomposition (2.3.1); let us refer to this structure for  $\mathcal{K}$  as the *coordinate-free Sz.-Nagy–Foias model* for a minimal isometric lift  $V$  of  $T$ .

We next use this coordinate-free model to arrive at the Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional model for a minimal isometric lift of  $T$  as follows. It is a straightforward computation to show that the maps

$$\iota: (V - T)h \mapsto D_T h, \quad \iota_*: (I - VT^*)h \mapsto D_{T^*} h \quad (2.3.2)$$

extend to unitary identification maps

$$\iota: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_T, \quad \iota_*: \mathcal{L}_* \mapsto \mathcal{D}_{T^*}. \quad (2.3.3)$$

From the two decompositions for  $\mathcal{K}$  in (2.3.1) we also see that  $M_+(\mathcal{L}) \perp M_-(\mathcal{L}_*)$  and hence

$$P_{M(\mathcal{L}_*)}M_+(\mathcal{L}) \subset M_+(\mathcal{L}_*) \quad (2.3.4)$$

It can also be shown that if  $T$  is completely nonunitary (as we are assuming), then we recover the so-called *residual space*  $\mathcal{R}$  from the wandering subspace  $\mathcal{L}$  via the formula

$$\mathcal{R} = \overline{(I - P_{M(\mathcal{L}_*)})M(\mathcal{L})}. \quad (2.3.5)$$

Define the operator  $\Theta: M(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow M(\mathcal{L}_*)$  as the restricted projection

$$\Theta = P_{M(\mathcal{L}_*)}|_{M(\mathcal{L})}.$$

Let  $\iota_*: M(\mathcal{L}_*) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$  and  $\iota: M(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  be the extensions of the operators  $\iota_*$  and  $\iota$  (2.3.3) to Fourier representation operators

$$\iota_*: \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} U^n \ell_{*n} \mapsto \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} (\iota_* \ell_{*n}) \zeta^n, \quad \iota: \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} U^n \ell_n \mapsto \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} (\iota \ell_n) \zeta^n \quad (2.3.6)$$

where  $\zeta$  is the independent variable on the unit circle  $\mathbb{T}$ . Then it is easily checked that

$$\Theta(\mathcal{U}|_{M(\mathcal{L})}) = (\mathcal{U}|_{M(\mathcal{L}_*)})\Theta.$$

Let  $\widehat{\Theta} = \iota_* \Theta \iota^*: L^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$ . Then the previous intertwining relation becomes the function-space intertwining

$$\widehat{\Theta} M_\zeta^{\mathcal{D}_T} = M_\zeta^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} \widehat{\Theta}.$$

By a standard result (see e.g. [43, Lemma V.3.1]), it follows that  $\widehat{\Theta}$  is a multiplication operator

$$\widehat{\Theta}: h(\zeta) \mapsto \Theta(\zeta) \cdot h(\zeta)$$

for a measurable  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_T, \mathcal{D}_{T^*})$ -valued function  $\zeta \mapsto \Theta(\zeta)$  on the unit circle  $\mathbb{T}$ . Here, for two Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$ , the notation  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  stands for the space of all bounded linear operators from  $\mathcal{E}$  into  $\mathcal{F}$ ; when  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F}$  we simply use  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E})$ . As  $\Theta$  is a restricted projection, it follows that  $\|\Theta\| \leq 1$ , and also  $\|M_\Theta\| \leq 1$  as an operator from  $L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  to  $L^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$ , from which it follows that  $\|\Theta(\zeta)\| \leq 1$  for almost all  $\zeta$  in the unit circle. Furthermore, by applying the Fourier transform to the subspace inclusion (2.3.4), we see that  $M_\Theta$  maps  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  into  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$ ; thus in fact  $\Theta$  is a contractive  $H^\infty$ -function with values in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_T, \mathcal{D}_{T^*})$ , known as the *Sz.-Nagy–Foias characteristic function* of  $T$ , given by the explicit formula

$$\Theta(z) = \Theta_T(z) = -T + zD_{T^*}(I_{\mathcal{H}} - zT^*)^{-1}D_T|_{\mathcal{D}_T}: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \quad (2.3.7)$$

(see [43, Proposition VI.2.2]).

Suppose next that  $k \in \mathcal{R}$  has the form  $k = P_{\mathcal{R}}\ell$  for some  $\ell = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} U^n \ell_n \in M(\mathcal{L})$ . Then

$$\|k\|^2 = \|P_{\mathcal{R}}\ell\|^2 = \|\ell\|^2 - \|\Theta\ell\|^2 = \|\iota\ell\|^2 - \|\Theta_T \cdot \iota\ell\|^2 = \|\Delta_{\Theta_T} \cdot \iota\ell\|^2$$

where we let  $\Delta_{\Theta_T}$  be the  $\mathcal{D}_T$ -valued operator function on the unit circle  $\mathbb{T}$  given by

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

(the pointwise defect operator of  $\Theta_T$ :  $\Delta_{\Theta_T}(\zeta) = D_{\Theta_T(\zeta)}$ ). As we are assuming that  $T$  is c.n.u., by formula (2.3.5) we get that the space  $(I - P_{M(\mathcal{L}_*)})M(\mathcal{L}) = P_{\mathcal{R}}M(\mathcal{L})$  is dense

in  $\mathcal{R}$ . Hence we can define a unitary map  $\omega_{\text{NF}}$  from  $\mathcal{R}$  to  $\overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}$  densely defined on  $P_{\mathcal{R}}M(\mathcal{L})$  by

$$\omega_{\text{NF}}: P_{\mathcal{R}}\ell \mapsto \Delta_{\Theta_T} \cdot \iota\ell. \quad (2.3.8)$$

From this formula, we can read off the validity of the intertwining relation

$$\omega_{\text{NF}}(V|_{\mathcal{R}}) = (M_{\zeta}^{\mathcal{D}_T}|_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}}) \omega_{\text{NF}}. \quad (2.3.9)$$

Let us introduce the Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional-model lift space (which depends only on the characteristic function  $\Theta_T$ )  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  by

$$\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T} := \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right]. \quad (2.3.10)$$

We next define a unitary identification map  $U_{\text{NF}}$  from  $\mathcal{K} = M_+(\mathcal{L}_*) \oplus \mathcal{R}$  to  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  by

$$U_{\text{NF}}k = \begin{bmatrix} \iota_* P_{M_+(\mathcal{L}_*)} k \\ \omega_{\text{NF}} P_{\mathcal{R}} k \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.3.11)$$

Since  $\iota_*$  is unitary from  $M_+(\mathcal{L}_*)$  to  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$ ,  $\omega_{\text{NF}}$  is unitary from  $\mathcal{R}$  to  $\overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}$ , and  $\mathcal{K}$  has the internal orthogonal decomposition  $\mathcal{K} = M_+(\mathcal{L}_*) \oplus \mathcal{R}$ , we see that  $U_{\text{NF}}$  so defined is unitary from  $\mathcal{K}$  onto  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$ . Observing the intertwining relation  $M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} \iota_*|_{M_+(\mathcal{L}_*)} = \iota V|_{M_+(\mathcal{L}_*)}$  and recalling (3.1.19), we arrive at the intertwining relation

$$U_{\text{NF}}V = V_{\text{NF}}U_{\text{NF}} \quad (2.3.12)$$

where we set  $V_{\text{NF}}$  equal to the isometric operator on  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  given by

$$V_{\text{NF}} = \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T} & 0 \\ 0 & M_{\zeta}|_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.3.13)$$

Define the isometric embedding  $\Pi_{\text{NF}}$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  as

$$\Pi_{\text{NF}} = U_{\text{NF}}|_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (2.3.14)$$

Then we make the formal definition:

**DEFINITION 2.3.1.** Given a c.n.u. contraction operator  $T$  and any choice of minimal isometric lift of the form  $(i_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}}, V)$ , we refer to  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, V_{\text{NF}})$  given by (2.3.14) and (2.3.13) as the *Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional model* for a minimal isometric lift  $T$ .

**REMARK 2.3.2.** The reader will note that for the case of the Schäffer and Douglas models discussed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 respectively, we were able to define the embedding maps  $\Pi_S: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S$  and  $\Pi_D: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D$  explicitly in terms of  $T$  whereas in Sz.-Nagy–Foias case the embedding map  $\Pi_{\text{NF}}$  is defined more implicitly by first introducing the map  $U_{\text{NF}}$  identifying the Sz.-Nagy–Foias coordinate-free space  $\mathcal{K}$  (2.3.1) and then getting  $\Pi_{\text{NF}}$  as the restriction of  $U_{\text{NF}}$  to  $\mathcal{H}$ . To repair this lack of symmetry, we shall now do two tasks:

- (i) By Theorem I.4.1 in [43], any two minimal isometric lift of a contraction are unitarily equivalent. Find explicitly the unitary operators  $U_S: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S$  and  $U_D: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D$  establishing the unitary equivalence of the coordinate-free Sz.-Nagy–Foias lift  $(i_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}}, V)$  acting on  $\mathcal{K}$  to the Schäffer-model lift  $(\Pi_S, V_S)$  acting on  $\mathcal{K}_S$  and the Douglas-model lift  $(\Pi_D, V_D)$  acting on  $\mathcal{K}_D$ , respectively.

- (ii) Find a more explicit form for the Sz.-Nagy–Foias embedding operator  $\Pi_{\text{NF}}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$ .

(i) For the case of the Schäffer model, we use the second of the decompositions (2.3.1) to see that

$$U_S = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & \iota P_{M_+(\mathcal{L})} \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{K} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ M_+(\mathcal{L}) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.3.15)$$

does the job, i.e.,

$$U_S V = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_T}^* D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T} \end{bmatrix} U_S = V_S U_S, \quad \Pi_S := \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = U_S|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Thus  $U_S: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S$  establishes a unitary equivalence between the coordinate-free lift  $(i_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}}, V)$  and the Schäffer-model lift  $(\Pi_S, V_S)$ .

For the case of the Douglas lift, we make use of the first decomposition of  $\mathcal{K}$  in (2.3.1):  $\mathcal{K} = M_+(\mathcal{L}_*) \oplus \mathcal{R}$ . Toward this end we need to make use of various connections between the space  $\mathcal{R}$  and the operator  $Q_{T^*}$  appearing in the Douglas model. We first note the connection that, for  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  we have (see [43, Proposition II.3.1])

$$\|P_{\mathcal{R}}h\|^2 = \langle Q_{T^*}^2 h, h \rangle.$$

Hence the map  $\omega_D: \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  defined densely by

$$\omega_D: P_{\mathcal{R}}h \mapsto Q_{T^*}h \in \mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$$

is isometric. Furthermore, it is known that, in case  $V$  is a minimal isometric lift of  $T$ , we have that

$$\mathcal{D}_R := \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} V^n P_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{R}$$

is dense in  $\mathcal{R}$  (see [43, Proposition II.3.1]). It is a routine matter to extend the map  $\omega_D$  to the space  $\mathcal{D}_R$  via the formula

$$\omega_D: V^n(P_{\mathcal{R}}h) \mapsto W_D^n Q_{T^*}h \quad (2.3.16)$$

with the result that  $\omega_D$  is still an isometry. We can then extend by continuity to a well-defined unitary identification map  $\omega_D$  from  $\mathcal{R}$  onto  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$ . We may then make use of the first decomposition  $\mathcal{K} = M_+(\mathcal{L}_*) \oplus \mathcal{R}$  in (2.3.1) to define the unitary identification  $U_D: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D = \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$  via the formula

$$U_D: k \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \iota_* P_{M_+(\mathcal{L}_*)} k \\ \omega_D P_{\mathcal{R}} k \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D := \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.3.17)$$

It is now a matter of checking that

$$U_D V = V_D U_D, \quad \Pi_D = U_D|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

We verify here only the first component of the second identity as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\iota_* P_{M_+(\mathcal{L}_*)} h &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n \iota_* (I - VV^*) V^{*n} h \text{ (by shift analysis)} \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n \iota_* (I - VT^*) T^{*n} h \text{ (since } T^* = V^*|_{\mathcal{H}}) \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n D_{T^*} T^{*n} h \text{ (by definition of } \iota_*) \\
&= D_{T^*} (I - zT^*)^{-1} h = \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} h.
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that  $U_D$  implements the unitary equivalence of  $(i_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}}, V_{\text{NF}})$  and  $(\Pi_D, V_D)$ .

(ii) By definition  $\Pi_{\text{NF}} = U_{\text{NF}}|_{\mathcal{H}}$ , so for  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  we have

$$\Pi_{\text{NF}} : h \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \iota_* P_{M_+(\mathcal{L}_*)} h \\ \omega_{\text{NF}} P_{\mathcal{R}} h \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.3.18)$$

We have seen from the final computation done in item (i) above that, for  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ , we have

$$\iota_* P_{M_+(\mathcal{L}_*)} h = \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} h.$$

Thus the first component of the Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional model embedding operator  $\Pi_{\text{NF}}$  agrees with the first component of the Douglas functional-model embedding operator  $\Pi_D$ . For  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  let us next compute the second component of the Sz.-Nagy–Foias embedding operator  $\Pi_{\text{NF}}$  applied to  $h$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_{\text{NF}} P_{\mathcal{R}} h &= \omega_{\text{NF}} P_{\mathcal{R}} h = \omega_{\text{NF}} (\omega_D)^* \cdot \omega_D P_{\mathcal{R}} h \\
&= \omega_{\text{NF}, D} Q_{T^*} h
\end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$\omega_{\text{NF}, D} := \omega_{\text{NF}} (\omega_D)^* \quad (2.3.19)$$

is a unitary identification map from the second component of the Douglas model space  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  onto the second component of the the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model space  $\overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}$ . One can argue that the map  $\omega_{\text{NF}, D}$  is again not particularly explicit, but this will be a convenient place to hide the lack of explicitness for our purposes here.

While it is problematical to identify the space  $U_{\text{NF}} \mathcal{H} \subset \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}{\Delta_T L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right]$  explicitly as detailed in part (ii) of Remark 2.3.2, its orthogonal complement in  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$ , namely the space  $U_{\text{NF}} M_+(\mathcal{L})$ , can be identified explicitly as follows. For  $\ell \in M_+(\mathcal{L})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
U_{\text{NF}} \ell &= \begin{bmatrix} \iota_* P_{M_+(\mathcal{L}_*)} \ell \\ \omega_{\text{NF}} P_{\mathcal{F}} \ell \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \iota_* P_{M_+(\mathcal{L}_*)} \iota^* \iota \ell \\ \Delta_{\Theta_T} \iota \ell \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \Theta_T \\ \Delta_{\Theta_T} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \iota \ell
\end{aligned}$$

and hence the space  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T} := \Pi_{\text{NF}}\mathcal{H} = U_{\text{NF}}\mathcal{H}$  (which turns out to depend only on the characteristic function  $\Theta_T$ ) is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T} = \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right] \ominus \left[ \frac{\Theta_T}{\Delta_{\Theta_T}} \right] \cdot H^2(\mathcal{D}_T). \quad (2.3.20)$$

Note that the subspace  $U_{\text{NF}}M_+(\mathcal{L}) = \left[ \frac{\Theta_T}{\Delta_{\Theta_T}} \right] \cdot H^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  is invariant for  $V_{\text{NF}}$  and hence  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}$  is invariant for  $V_{\text{NF}}^*$ . Rewrite (2.3.12) in the form

$$U_{\text{NF}}V^* = V_{\text{NF}}^*U_{\text{NF}}$$

and restrict this identity to  $\mathcal{H}$  to arrive at

$$\Pi_{\text{NF}}T^* = V_{\text{NF}}^*\Pi_{\text{NF}}.$$

This suggests the following formal definition.

**DEFINITION 2.3.3.** Let the space  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$ , the operators  $\Pi_{\text{NF}}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  and  $V_{\text{NF}}$  on  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  be given as in (2.3.10), (2.3.14), and (2.3.13). Then  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, V_{\text{NF}})$  is a minimal isometric lift of  $T$  on  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  which we shall refer to as the *Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional-model isometric lift of  $T$* .

Let us next note that the operator  $U_{\text{NF}}: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  implements a unitary equivalence of the Sz.-Nagy–Foias isometric lift  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, V_{\text{NF}})$  with the coordinate-free minimal isometric lift  $(\iota_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}}, V)$ , and hence the Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional-model isometric lift  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, V_{\text{NF}})$  is also minimal.

We note that both components of the Sz.-Nagy–Foias isometric-lift space  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T} = \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right]$  are functional Hilbert spaces (albeit with first component  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$  consisting of holomorphic functions while with second component consisting of  $L^2$ -measurable functions). For this reason it makes sense to say that  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  is a *functional model space* and that  $V_{\text{NF}}$  is the *Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional-model isometric lift of  $T$* .

**REMARK 2.3.4.** The isometric embedding operator  $\Pi_{\text{NF}}$  for the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model (the analogue of the operator  $\Pi_S$  (2.1.3) for the Schäffer model and of the operator  $\Pi_D$  (2.2.8) for the Douglas model) is the embedding operator

$$\Pi_{\text{NF}}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T} = \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right]$$

with range given by

$$\text{Ran } \Pi_{\text{NF}} = \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T} := \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right] \ominus \left[ \frac{\Theta_T}{\Delta_{\Theta_T}} \right] H^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$$

and

$$\Pi_{\text{NF}}T^* = V_{\text{NF}}^*\Pi_{\text{NF}}. \quad (2.3.21)$$

Let us write  $\Pi_{\text{NF},0}$  for the operator  $\Pi_{\text{NF}}$  but considered to have codomain equal to its range  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}$  rather than all of  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$ . Then  $\Pi_{\text{NF},0}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}$  is unitary and from (2.3.21) one can see that

$$T = \Pi_{\text{NF},0}^*(P_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}} V|_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}}) \Pi_{\text{NF},0},$$

thereby showing that  $T$  is unitarily equivalent to its functional-model operator  $T_{\Theta_T}$ :

$$T \underset{u}{\cong} T_{\Theta_T} := P_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}} \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & M_{\zeta}^{\mathcal{D}_T} \Big|_{\frac{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}} \end{array} \right] \Big|_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}}.$$

It turns out that the characteristic operator function  $\Theta_T$  (2.3.7) is a *complete unitary invariant* for a c.n.u. contraction operator  $T$  in the sense that two c.n.u. contraction operators  $T$  and  $T'$  are unitarily equivalent if and only if  $\Theta_T$  and  $\Theta_{T'}$  *coincide* (i.e., are the same after a unitary change of basis on the input coefficient Hilbert space and on the output coefficient Hilbert space).

But there is more. Let us first note that any characteristic function  $\Theta_T$  (written as  $(\mathcal{D}_T, \mathcal{D}_{T^*}, \Theta_T)$  when we wish to emphasize that the values of  $\Theta_T$  are operators from  $\mathcal{D}_T$  to  $\mathcal{D}_{T^*}$ ) is a *contractive analytic function* in the terminology of [43], meaning that  $\Theta_T$  an analytic function on the unit disk with contractive operator values. It works out that the *coincidence envelope* of the characteristic functions consists exactly of those contractive analytic functions  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  which are also *purely contractive* in the sense that  $\|\Theta(0)d\| < \|d\|$  for  $0 \neq d \in \mathcal{D}$ , and the model-theory point of view can be reversed: given any purely contractive contractive analytic function  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  one can form the space  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta}$  exactly as in (2.3.20) but with  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  in place of  $(\mathcal{D}_T, \mathcal{D}_{T^*}, \Theta_T)$ :

$$\mathcal{H}_{\Theta} := \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_*)}{\Delta_{\Theta} \cdot H^2(\mathcal{D})} \right] \ominus \left[ \frac{\Theta}{\Delta_{\Theta}} \right] H^2(\mathcal{D}),$$

where  $\Delta_{\Theta}(\zeta) = (I_{\mathcal{D}} - \Theta(\zeta)^* \Theta(\zeta))^{1/2}$  for  $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ . Define the *model operator* associated with the purely contractive analytic function  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$ :

$$T_{\Theta} := P_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta}} \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} M_z^{\mathcal{D}} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & M_{\zeta}^{\mathcal{D}_*} \Big|_{\frac{\Delta_{\Theta} L^2(\mathcal{D})}{\Delta_{\Theta} L^2(\mathcal{D})}} \end{array} \right] \Big|_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta}}.$$

Then it can be shown that the model operator  $T_{\Theta}$  is a c.n.u. contraction operator on  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta}$ , and its characteristic function  $(\mathcal{D}_{T_{\Theta}}, \mathcal{D}_{T_{\Theta}^*}, \Theta_{T_{\Theta}})$  coincides with the original purely contractive analytic function  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$ . Consequently, the study of abstract c.n.u. contraction operators  $T$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  is equivalent to the study of concrete functional-model operators of the form  $T_{\Theta}$  associated with a purely contractive analytic function  $\Theta$ . Furthermore, the restriction that  $T$  be c.n.u. is not really a restriction since any contraction operator can be decomposed as  $T_{\text{cnu}} \oplus T_u$  where  $T_{\text{cnu}}$  is c.n.u. and  $T_u$  is unitary where unitaries are essentially well understood via spectral theory. In Chapter 7 below we present an extension of all these ideas to the setting of a commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

### 3. Pairs of commuting isometries

Berger, Coburn and Lebow in [14, Theorem 3.1] gave a concrete model for  $d$ -tuples of commuting isometries which played a basic role in their investigation of the structure of the  $C^*$ -algebra generated by commuting isometries and Fredholm theory of its elements. In this chapter, we review the Berger-Coburn-Lebow model for pairs of commuting isometries for the pair case ( $d = 2$ ).

**3.1. Models for commuting pairs of isometries.** Before discussing the Berger-Coburn-Lebow (BCL) model for commuting pairs of isometries, we need a couple of lemmas. Let us first recall that the Wold decomposition represents any isometry  $V$  as the direct sum  $V = S \oplus W$  with  $S$  equal to a shift operator ( $S$  is an isometry such that  $S^{*n} \rightarrow 0$  strongly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  or equivalently  $\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \text{Ran } S^n = \{0\}$ ), while  $W$  is unitary. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, we shall use the term shift operator and pure isometry interchangeably.

The first gives a model for commuting partial isometries of a special form which is a key ingredient in the proof of the Berger-Coburn-Lebow model theory for commuting isometries. For completeness, we provide a detailed proof here.

LEMMA 3.1.1. *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be any Hilbert space and  $E_1, E_2$  be operators on  $\mathcal{F}$ . Then  $E_1, E_2$  are partial isometries of the form*

$$(E_1, E_2) = (U^* P^\perp, PU) \quad (3.1.1)$$

for some projection  $P$  and unitary  $U$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$  if and only if  $E_1, E_2$  satisfy

$$E_1 E_2 = E_2 E_1 = 0 \text{ and } E_1 E_1^* + E_2^* E_2 = E_1^* E_1 + E_2 E_2^* = I_{\mathcal{F}}. \quad (3.1.2)$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $(E_1, E_2)$  has the form (3.1.1). By direct substitution and making use of the unitary property of  $U$  one sees that then  $(E_1, E_2)$  satisfies (3.1.2).

Conversely, suppose that  $(E_1, E_2)$  satisfies conditions (3.1.2). Then one can use conditions (3.1.2) to see that

$$E_1 E_1^* E_1 = E_1 (E_1^* E_1 + E_2 E_2^*) = E_1, \quad E_2 E_2^* E_2 = E_2 (E_2^* E_2 + E_1 E_1^*) = E_2.$$

Hence we have

$$E_1 E_1^* E_1 = E_1, \quad E_2 E_2^* E_2 = E_2 \quad (3.1.3)$$

from which it follows that  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  are partial isometries. This in turn is equivalent to all of  $E_1 E_1^*, E_1^* E_1, E_2 E_2^*, E_2^* E_2$  being projections onto  $\text{Ran } E_1, \text{Ran } E_1^*, \text{Ran } E_2, \text{Ran } E_2^*$ , respectively. Therefore conditions (3.1.2) can be reformulated as

$$\text{Ran } E_1 \oplus \text{Ran } E_2^* = \mathcal{F} = \text{Ran } E_1^* \oplus \text{Ran } E_2. \quad (3.1.4)$$

By the polar-decomposition theorem, we have unitaries  $U_1 : \text{Ran } E_1 \rightarrow \text{Ran } E_1^*$  and  $U_2 : \text{Ran } E_2^* \rightarrow \text{Ran } E_2$  such that

$$E_1^* = U_1 (E_1 E_1^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } E_2 = U_2 (E_2^* E_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Let us define a unitary operator  $U$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  (making use of the decompositions (3.1.4) by

$$U := U_1 \oplus U_2 : \text{Ran } E_1 \oplus \text{Ran } E_2^* \rightarrow \text{Ran } E_1^* \oplus \text{Ran } E_2.$$

More explicitly, making use of the fact that  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  are partial isometries with  $E_1$  and  $E_2^*$  having complementary ranges, we can get a formula for the action of  $U$ :

$$Ux = U_1 E_1 E_1^* x + U_2 E_2^* E_2 x = (E_1^* + E_2)x \text{ for } x \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Let us now define a projection operator  $P$  and a unitary operator  $U$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  by

$$P = E_2 E_2^*, \quad U := E_1^* + E_2. \quad (3.1.5)$$

It is now a straightforward exercise to verify that we recover  $(E_1, E_2)$  from  $(P, U)$  according to the formula (3.1.1). ■



The first part of the next result is well-known (see e.g. [41, page 227]) and the second part is an easy corollary of the first part; we include short proofs of both results for completeness.

LEMMA 3.1.2. 1. *The only bounded linear operator intertwining a unitary operator with a shift operator is the zero operator, i.e.: if  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{K}'$  are Hilbert spaces,  $U$  is a unitary operator on  $\mathcal{K}$ ,  $S$  is a shift operator on  $\mathcal{K}'$ , and  $\Gamma: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}'$  is a bounded linear operator such that  $\Gamma U = S\Gamma$ , then  $\Gamma = 0$ .*

2. *Suppose that  $S$  and  $S'$  are shift operators on  $\mathcal{K}_1$  and  $\mathcal{K}'_1$  respectively,  $U$  and  $U'$  are unitary operators on  $\mathcal{K}_2$  and  $\mathcal{K}'_2$  respectively, and  $\Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{11} & \Gamma_{12} \\ \Gamma_{21} & \Gamma_{22} \end{bmatrix}$  is a unitary operator from  $\mathcal{K}_1 \oplus \mathcal{K}_2$  to  $\mathcal{K}'_1 \oplus \mathcal{K}'_2$  which intertwines  $S \oplus U$  with  $S' \oplus U'$ :*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{11} & \Gamma_{12} \\ \Gamma_{21} & \Gamma_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & U \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} S' & 0 \\ 0 & U' \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{11} & \Gamma_{12} \\ \Gamma_{21} & \Gamma_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.1.6)$$

*Then  $\Gamma$  is block-diagonal, i.e.:  $\Gamma_{12} = 0$  and  $\Gamma_{21} = 0$ .*

*Proof. (1):* The intertwining condition  $\Gamma U = S\Gamma$  implies that  $\Gamma U^n = S^n \Gamma$  for all  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . As  $U$  is unitary,  $\text{Ran } U^n$  is the whole space  $\mathcal{K}$  for all  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  and we conclude that  $\text{Ran } \Gamma \subset \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \text{Ran } S^n$ . As  $S$  is a shift,  $\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \text{Ran } S^n = \{0\}$ , and we are forced to conclude that  $\Gamma$  is the zero operator.

*(2):* From the (1,2)-entry of (3.1.6) we see that  $\Gamma_{12}U = S'\Gamma_{12}$ . From part (1) of the lemma we conclude that  $\Gamma_{12} = 0$ .

As  $\Gamma$  is unitary, it follows that (3.1.6) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{bmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & U \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{11}^* & \Gamma_{21}^* \\ 0 & \Gamma_{22}^* \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{11}^* & \Gamma_{21}^* \\ 0 & \Gamma_{22}^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} S' & 0 \\ 0 & U' \end{bmatrix}.$$

The (1,2)-entry of this equality gives

$$S\Gamma_{21}^* = \Gamma_{21}^*U'.$$

Again by part (1) of the Lemma, we conclude that  $\Gamma_{21}^* = 0$ , and hence also  $\Gamma_{21} = 0$ . ■

REMARK 3.1.3. We note that part (1) of Lemma 3.1.2 fails if the hypothesis is changed to:  $U$  is unitary on  $\mathcal{K}$ ,  $S$  is a shift on  $\mathcal{K}'$  and  $X: \mathcal{K}' \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  is such that  $XS = UX$ . As an example, take  $U = M_\zeta$  on  $\mathcal{K} = L^2$ ,  $S = M_z$  on  $\mathcal{K}' = H^2$  and  $X: H^2 \rightarrow L^2$  equal to the embedding  $X: f(z) \mapsto f(\zeta)$  of  $H^2$  into  $L^2$ .

We now have all the preparations needed to derive the BCL model for a commuting pair of isometries. We shall actually have use for two such models, each of which is easily derived from the other. A somewhat different proof follows from Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 in [12].

For a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , we shall use  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  for the space of all bounded linear operators from  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\mathcal{H}$ .

THEOREM 3.1.4. (See Berger-Coburn-Lebow [14].) *Let  $(V_1, V_2)$  be a pair of commuting isometries on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ .*

1. *Then there exist Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{K}_u$ , a unitary identification map  $\tau_{\text{BCL}}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{K}_u \end{bmatrix}$ , a projection  $P$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$ , a unitary  $U$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$  and commuting unitaries*

$W_1, W_2$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}_u)$  such that

$$\tau_{\text{BCL}}V_1 = \begin{bmatrix} M_{P^\perp U + z P U} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix} \tau_{\text{BCL}}, \quad \tau_{\text{BCL}}V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} M_{U^* P + z U^* P^\perp} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix} \tau_{\text{BCL}}. \quad (3.1.7)$$

Explicitly one can take

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}_{V^*}, \quad \tau_{\text{BCL}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}, V^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V^*} \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{V^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V^*} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.1.8)$$

where  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}, V^*}$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}_{V^*}$ , and  $\mathcal{Q}_{V^*}$  are as in (2.2.2), (2.2.1), (2.2.4) with  $V^*$  in place of  $T^*$ . We shall say that a pair of operators of the form

$$\left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{P^\perp U + z P U} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{U^* P + z U^* P^\perp} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

acting on  $H^2(\mathcal{F}) \oplus \mathcal{K}_u$  (with  $P, U$  as above) is a BCL1 model for a pair of commuting isometries.

2. Equivalently, there exist Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{K}_u$ , a unitary identification map  $\tau_{\text{BCL}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{K}_u \end{bmatrix}$ , a projection  $P^f$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$ , a unitary  $U^f$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$  and commuting unitaries  $W_1^f, W_2^f$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}_u)$  such that

$$\tau_{\text{BCL}}V_1 = \begin{bmatrix} M_{U^{f*} P^{f\perp} + z U^{f*} P^f} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1^f \end{bmatrix} \tau_{\text{BCL}}, \quad \tau_{\text{BCL}}V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} M_{P^f U^f + z P^{f\perp} U^f} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2^f \end{bmatrix} \tau_{\text{BCL}} \quad (3.1.9)$$

where again one can take  $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K}_u$  and  $\tau_{\text{BCL}}$ , as in (3.1.8). We shall say that a pair of operators of the form

$$\left[ \begin{bmatrix} M_{U^{f*} P^{f\perp} + z U^{f*} P^f} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1^f \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{P^f U^f + z P^{f\perp} U^f} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2^f \end{bmatrix} \right]$$

acting on  $\begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}^f) \\ \mathcal{K}_u^f \end{bmatrix}$  (with  $P^f, U^f$  as above) is a BCL2 model for a pair of commuting isometries.

*Proof.* We note that the flip-transformation acting on BCL-data sets  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$  given by

$$f : (\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2) \mapsto (\mathcal{F}^f, P^f, U^f, W_1^f, W_2^f) := (\mathcal{F}, U^* P U, U^*, W_1, W_2) \quad (3.1.10)$$

transforms the BCL1 model (3.1.7) into the form of the BCL2 model (3.1.9) and vice versa. Alternatively, note that one converts a BCL1 model to a BCL2 model by interchanging the indices (1,2) on  $V_1, V_2$  and interchanging  $P$  with  $P^\perp$ , and vice-versa. Hence it suffices to verify only one of the statements (1) and (2). We shall work out the details for the BCL2 model. As all the details will be worked out only for this setting, we drop the superscript- $f$  from the notation.

Let  $V$  be the isometry  $V = V_1 V_2$ , set  $D_{V^*} = (I - V V^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  equal to the defect operator for  $V^*$ , and let  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*} = \overline{\text{Ran}} D_{V^*}$ . Since  $V$  is an isometry, in fact  $D_{V^*} = (I - V V^*)$  is just the orthogonal projection onto  $(\text{Ran } V)^\perp$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*} = \text{Ran } D_{V^*} = (\text{Ran } V)^\perp$ . By an iterative and limiting procedure, one can show that any  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  decomposes orthogonally

as

$$h = \left( \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} V^n D_{V^*} V^{*n} h \right) \oplus h_u \text{ where } h_u = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V^n V^{*n} h \in \mathcal{H}_u := \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \text{Ran } V^n.$$

Hence the space  $\mathcal{H}$  decomposes as

$$\mathcal{H} = \left( \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} V^n \mathcal{D}_{V^*} \right) \oplus \mathcal{H}_u,$$

amounting to the coordinate-free version of the *Wold decomposition* for the isometry  $V$  (see [45, 46]). To convert this decomposition to a more functional form, we introduce a unitary Fourier representation operator

$$\tau_{\text{BCL}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{V^*}) \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{bmatrix}$$

given by

$$\tau_{\text{BCL}} : h \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (D_{V^*} V^{*n} h) z^n \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V^n V^{*n} h \end{bmatrix} h =: \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{V^*}, V^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V^*} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.1.11)$$

Then one easily checks that  $\tau_{\text{BCL}}$  has the intertwining property

$$\tau_{\text{BCL}} V = (M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} \oplus W) \tau_{\text{BCL}}$$

where  $M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}$  is the forward shift on  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{V^*})$  ( $M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} : f(z) \mapsto zf(z)$ ) and where  $W = V|_{\mathcal{H}_u}$  is a unitary. Let us set

$$\tilde{V}_1 = \tau_{\text{BCL}} V_1 \tau_{\text{BCL}}^*, \quad \tilde{V}_2 = \tau_{\text{BCL}} V_2 \tau_{\text{BCL}}^*.$$

Write out block-matrix representations

$$\tilde{V}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{V}_{j,11} & \tilde{V}_{j,12} \\ \tilde{V}_{j,21} & \tilde{V}_{j,22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad j = 1, 2 \quad (3.1.12)$$

for the operators  $\tilde{V}_j$  with respect to the decomposition  $\begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{V^*}) \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{bmatrix}$  on which they act. The commutativity of each  $V_1, V_2$  with  $V$  implies the commutativity of each  $\tilde{V}_1, \tilde{V}_2$  with  $\begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{bmatrix}$ . In particular, we get the corner intertwining conditions

$$\tilde{V}_{j,12} W = M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} \tilde{V}_{j,12}$$

for  $j = 1, 2$ . As  $W$  is unitary and  $M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}$  is a shift, part (1) of Lemma 3.1.2 implies that  $\tilde{V}_{j,12} = 0$  for  $j = 1, 2$ , and the representation (3.1.12) collapses to

$$\tilde{V}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{V}_{j,11} & 0 \\ \tilde{V}_{j,21} & \tilde{V}_{j,22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (3.1.13)$$

From the fact that  $V_1 V_2 = V_2 V_1 = V$ , we know that

$$\tilde{V}_1 \tilde{V}_2 = \tilde{V}_2 \tilde{V}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular, we must have

$$\tilde{V}_{1,22} \tilde{V}_{2,22} = \tilde{V}_{2,22} \tilde{V}_{1,22} = W$$

is unitary. Furthermore, the fact that each  $\tilde{V}_j$  is an isometry implies that each  $\tilde{V}_{j,22}$  is an isometry. Putting the pieces together, we see that each  $\tilde{V}_{j,22}$  is a surjective isometry, i.e., each  $\tilde{V}_{j,22}$  is unitary. As each  $\tilde{V}_j$  is an isometry, we see that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{V}_{j,11}^* & \tilde{V}_{j,21}^* \\ 0 & \tilde{V}_{j,22}^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{V}_{j,11} & 0 \\ \tilde{V}_{j,21} & \tilde{V}_{j,22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{V^*})} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{H}_u} \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular, equality of the (1,2)-entries gives that  $\tilde{V}_{j,21}^* \tilde{V}_{j,22} = 0$ . As we have already noted that  $\tilde{V}_{j,22}$  is surjective, it follows that  $V_{j,21}^* = 0$ , and hence also  $V_{j,21} = 0$ . Thus the representation (3.1.13) collapses further to

$$\tilde{V}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{V}_{j,11} & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{V}_{j,22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad (3.1.14)$$

i.e., the decomposition  $\left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{V^*}) \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \oplus \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  is reducing for each  $\tilde{V}_j$ .

As each  $\tilde{V}_j$  commutes with  $\left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{smallmatrix} \right]$ , it then follows that  $\tilde{V}_j = \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_{\varphi_j} & 0 \\ 0 & W_j \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  for  $j = 1, 2$ , where  $\varphi_j$  is an  $H^\infty(\mathcal{D}_{V^*})$ -function and  $(W_1, W_2)$  is a pair of commuting unitaries such that  $W_1 W_2 = W$ . Since  $V_1 = V_2^* V$ , consideration of the power series expansion of  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  enables one to conclude that  $\varphi_1(z) = E_1 + zE_2^*$  and  $\varphi_2(z) = E_2 + zE_1^*$  for some operators  $E_1, E_2$  acting on  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$ . Since  $M_{\varphi_1}$  is an isometry, we have

$$(I_{H^2} \otimes E_1 + M_z \otimes E_2^*)^* (I_{H^2} \otimes E_1 + M_z \otimes E_2^*) = I_{H^2} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}},$$

which implies that

$$E_1^* E_1 + E_2 E_2^* = I_{\mathcal{F}}. \quad (3.1.15)$$

Similarly since  $M_{\varphi_2}$  is an isometry, we have

$$E_2^* E_2 + E_1 E_1^* = I_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}. \quad (3.1.16)$$

Also, since  $V = V_1 V_2$ , we have  $M_z = M_{E_1+zE_2^*} M_{E_2+zE_1^*} = M_{E_2+zE_1^*} M_{E_1+zE_2^*}$ , which readily implies that

$$E_1 E_2 = 0 = E_2 E_1. \quad (3.1.17)$$

From equations (3.1.15), (3.1.16) and (3.1.17), we conclude by Lemma 3.1.1 that there exist a projection  $P$  and a unitary  $U$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{V^*})$  such that  $E_1, E_2$  are as in (3.1.1) (with  $\mathcal{F}$  taken to be  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}_{V^*}$ ). Consequently,

$$(M_{\varphi_1}, M_{\varphi_2}) = (M_{U^* P^\perp + z U^* P}, M_{P U + z P^\perp U}).$$

and the theorem now follows. ■

**DEFINITION 3.1.5.** For a pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  of commuting isometries, let the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{F}$  and the operators  $P, U$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$ ,  $W_1, W_2$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_u)$  be as in Theorem 3.1.4. Then a tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$  associated with the BCL1 model (3.1.7) for  $(V_1, V_2)$  will be called a *BCL1 tuple* for  $(V_1, V_2)$ , while a tuple  $(\mathcal{F}^f, P^f, U^f, W_1^f, W_2^f)$  associated with a BCL2 model (3.1.9) for  $(V_1, V_2)$  will be called a *BCL2 tuple* for  $(V_1, V_2)$ .

If  $P$  is a projection and  $U$  is a unitary operator on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{F}$  with no pair of commuting isometries or of BCL-model-type specified, we shall say simply that the tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$  is a *BCL tuple*.

The following uniqueness result was observed in [14] but not proved there. We outline the proof here.

**THEOREM 3.1.6.** *Let  $(V_1, V_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $(V'_1, V'_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}'$  be two pairs of commuting isometries with  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}', P', U', W'_1, W'_2)$  as respective BCL2 tuples. Then  $(V_1, V_2)$  and  $(V'_1, V'_2)$  are unitarily equivalent if and only if the associated BCL2-tuples are unitarily equivalent in the sense that there exist unitary operators  $\tau : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$  and  $\tau_u : \mathcal{H}_u \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'_u$  such that*

$$(\tau P \tau^*, \tau U \tau^*) = (P', U'), \quad (\tau_u W_1 \tau_u^*, \tau_u W_2 \tau_u^*) = (W'_1, W'_2). \quad (3.1.18)$$

Moreover, a BCL2 model uniquely determines the associated BCL tuple in the following sense: if  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}, P', U', W'_1, W'_2)$  are two BCL2 tuples with the same model coefficient spaces  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}'$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_u = \mathcal{H}'_u$  such that the associated model commuting isometric pairs are the same

$$\left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{U^* P^\perp + z U^* P} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{P U + z P^\perp U} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{U'^* P'^\perp + z U'^* P'} & 0 \\ 0 & W'_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{P' U' + z P'^\perp U'} & 0 \\ 0 & W'_2 \end{bmatrix} \right),$$

then in fact the BCL2 tuples are identical:

$$(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2) = (\mathcal{F}, P', U', W'_1, W'_2).$$

Similar statements hold true with BCL1 model and BCL1 tuples in place of BCL2 model and BCL2 tuples.

*Proof.* Due to the correspondence (3.1.10) between BCL1 tuples and BCL2 tuples, it suffices to prove the result for BCL2 tuples. Again we write a BCL2 tuple simply as  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$ .

If there exist unitary operators  $\tau : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$  and  $\tau_u : \mathcal{H}_u \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'_u$  such that (3.1.18) holds, then the pairs

$$\left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{U^* P^\perp + z U^* P} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{P U + z P^\perp U} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix} \right), \quad \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{U'^* P'^\perp + z U'^* P'} & 0 \\ 0 & W'_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{P' U' + z P'^\perp U'} & 0 \\ 0 & W'_2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

are unitarily equivalent via the unitary similarity

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2 \otimes \tau} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_u \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}') \\ \mathcal{H}'_u \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then by Theorem 3.1.4 the pairs  $(V_1, V_2)$  and  $(V'_1, V'_2)$  are unitarily equivalent.

Conversely, suppose that the pairs

$$\left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{U^* P^\perp + z U^* P} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{P U + z P^\perp U} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix} \right), \quad \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{U'^* P'^\perp + z U'^* P'} & 0 \\ 0 & W'_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{P' U' + z P'^\perp U'} & 0 \\ 0 & W'_2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

are unitarily equivalent via the unitary similarity

$$\hat{\tau} = \begin{bmatrix} \tau' & \tau_{12} \\ \tau_{21} & \tau_u \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}') \\ \mathcal{H}'_u \end{bmatrix}.$$

From the intertwining  $\hat{\tau} V_1 V_2 = V'_1 V'_2 \hat{\tau}$ , we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tau' & \tau_{12} \\ \tau_{21} & \tau_u \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{F}} & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{F}'} & 0 \\ 0 & W' \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tau' & \tau_{12} \\ \tau_{21} & \tau_u \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.1.19)$$

where we write  $M_z^{\mathcal{F}}$  for multiplication by  $z$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  and  $M_z^{\mathcal{F}'}$  for multiplication by  $z$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{F}')$ . By part (2) of Lemma 3.1.2 we conclude that  $\tau_{12} = 0$ ,  $\tau_{21} = 0$  and hence  $\hat{\tau}$

collapses to the diagonal form

$$\hat{\tau} = \begin{bmatrix} \tau' & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_u \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore the unitary  $\tau_u$  intertwines  $(W_1, W_2)$  with  $(W'_1, W'_2)$  and the unitary  $\tau'$  intertwines  $M_z^{\mathcal{F}}$  with  $M_z^{\mathcal{F}'}$  forcing  $\tau$  to have the form  $\tau' = I_{H^2} \otimes \tau$  for some unitary  $\tau : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$ . Since  $\tau'$  intertwines  $M_{U^*(P^\perp + zP)}$  with  $M_{U'^*(P'^\perp + zP')}$ , we have  $\tau U^* P^\perp = U'^* P'^\perp \tau$  and  $\tau U^* P = U'^* P' \tau$ . Therefore

$$\tau U^* = \tau U^* (P^\perp + P) = U'^* (P'^\perp + P') \tau = U'^* \tau$$

from which we see that

$$U'^* \tau P = \tau U^* P = U'^* P' \tau \Rightarrow \tau P = P' \tau.$$

In particular, if  $\hat{\tau}$  is the identity operator, then  $\tau$  and  $\tau_u$  are identity operators, implying that  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2) = (\mathcal{F}', P', U', W'_1, W'_2)$ , thereby verifying the last statement. This completes the proof. ■

Theorem 3.1.6 suggests that there should be a canonical choice of BCL tuple generating a BCL1 (or BCL2) model for a given commuting isometric pair. This is indeed the case and is the content of the next result (see also Proposition 7.1 in [13]). Since the unitary part can be handled separately by spectral theory, we assume that the product isometry  $V = V_1 V_2 = V_2 V_1$  is a pure isometry ( $V^{*n} \rightarrow 0$  strongly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ).

**THEOREM 3.1.7.** *Suppose that  $(V_1, V_2)$  is a commuting isometric pair on  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $V = V_1 V_2 = V_2 V_1$  is a pure isometry. Then:*

(1) *The operators*

$$D_{V^*}, D_{V_1^*}, D_{V_2^*}, V_1 D_{V_2^*} V_1^*, V_2 D_{V_1^*} V_2, D_{V_2^*} V_1^* + V_2 D_{V_1^*}, D_{V_2^*} V_1^* + V_2 D_{V_1^*}$$

*all have range and cokernel contained in  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*} = \text{Ran } D_{V^*}$  and therefore, when restricted to  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$ , can be viewed as elements of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{V^*})$  (bounded linear operators mapping  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$  into itself).*

(2) *The operators  $D_{V^*}, D_{V_1^*}, D_{V_2^*}, V_1 D_{V_2^*} V_1^*, V_2 D_{V_1^*} V_2^*$  all map  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$  into itself and thus the restriction of these operators to  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$  may be considered as elements of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{V^*})$  (bounded linear operators on  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$ ). When this is done, all are orthogonal projections on  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$  (with  $D_{V^*}|_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} = I_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}$ ) and we have the orthogonal decompositions:*

$$\mathcal{D}_{V^*} = \text{Ran } D_{V_1^*} \oplus \text{Ran } V_1 D_{V_2^*} V_1^*, \quad \mathcal{D}_{V^*} = \text{Ran } V_2 D_{V_1^*} V_2^* \oplus \text{Ran } D_{V_2^*}. \quad (3.1.20)$$

(3) *When considered as operators on  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$ , the operators*

$$U := (V_1 D_{V_2^*} + D_{V_1^*} V_2^*)|_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}, \quad U_* := (D_{V_2^*} V_1^* + V_2 D_{V_1^*})|_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}$$

*are unitary.*

(4) *A BCL1 tuple for  $(V_1, V_2)$  is given directly in terms of  $(V_1, V_2)$  by*

$$(\mathcal{F}, P, U) = (\mathcal{D}_{V^*}, D_{V_1^*}|_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}, (V_1 D_{V_2^*} + D_{V_1^*} V_2^*)|_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}) \quad (3.1.21)$$

*while a BCL2 tuple for  $(V_1, V_2)$  is similarly given by*

$$(\mathcal{F}_*, P_*, U_*) = (\mathcal{D}_{V^*}, V_2 D_{V_1^*} V_2^*|_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}, (D_{V_2^*} V_1^* + V_2 D_{V_1^*})|_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}). \quad (3.1.22)$$

*Proof.* From the fact that  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are isometries (so  $V_1^*V_1 = V_2^*V_2 = V^*V = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ ), it is easily checked that each of the operators  $X$  in statement (2) is a projection (i.e.,  $X = X^*$  and  $X^2 = X$ ). The two orthogonal decompositions in statement (2) then follow from the general identities

$$I - VV^* = (I - V_1V_1^*) + V_1(I - V_2V_2^*)V_1^* = I - V_2V_2^* + V_2(I - V_1V_1^*)V_2^*. \quad (3.1.23)$$

These identities also show that all the projection operators have range and cokernel (i.e., also the range for a projection operator) a subspace of  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$ .

As for  $U_* = D_{V_2^*}V_1^* + V_2D_{V_1^*}$ , noting that  $D_{V_2^*}V_2 = 0$  since  $V_2$  is an isometry, we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} U_*^*U_* &= (V_1D_{V_2^*} + D_{V_1^*}V_2^*)(D_{V_2^*}V_1^* + V_2D_{V_1^*}) \\ &= V_1(I - V_2V_2^*)V_1^* + (I - V_1V_1^*) = V_1V_1^* - VV^* + I - V_1V_1^* = I - VV^* = D_{V^*} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$U_*U_*^* = (D_{V_2^*}V_1^* + V_2D_{V_1^*})(V_1D_{V_2^*} + D_{V_1^*}V_2^*) = D_{V_2^*} + V_2D_{V_1^*}V_2^* = D_{V^*}.$$

These identities not only verify that  $U_*$  has range and cokernel inside  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$ , but furthermore that  $U_*$  is unitary when considered as an operator on  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$ . Similar computations verify the corresponding properties for  $U = D_{V_2}V_1^* + V_2D_{V_1}$ . This completes the verification of statements (1), (2), and (3).

Let us now assume that  $V_1, V_2$  are presented in the form of a BCL2 model

$$V_1 = M_{U_*^*(P_*^\perp + zP_*)}, \quad V_2 = M_{(P_* + zP_*^\perp)U_*}$$

acting on the Hardy space  $H^2(\mathcal{F}_*)$ . Our next goal is to understand how to recover the operator pair  $(P, U)$  directly in terms of the operator pair  $(V_1, V_2)$ . Note first that then

$$\begin{aligned} V_1^* - V_2V^* &= \\ &= ((I_{H^2} \otimes U_*^*P_*^\perp + M_z \otimes U_*^*P_*)^* - (I_{H^2} \otimes P_*U_* + M_z \otimes P_*^\perp U_*)(M_z \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}})^*) \\ &= ((I_{H^2} \otimes P_*^\perp U_* + M_z^* \otimes P_*U_*) - (M_z^* \otimes P_*U_* + M_zM_z^* \otimes P_*^\perp U_*)) \\ &= ((I_{H^2} - M_zM_z^*) \otimes P_*^\perp U_*) = \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}_*}^* P_*^\perp U_*. \end{aligned}$$

If we identify the coefficient space  $\mathcal{F}_*$  with the  $V^*$ -defect space  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*} = \text{Ran } I - VV^*$ , then it is convenient to view the operators  $P_*$  and  $U_*$  as operators on  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$  rather than just on  $\mathcal{F}_*$ , and then we have

$$D_{V^*}(V_1^* - V_2V^*) = P_*^\perp U_* D_{V^*} \text{ and } D_{V^*}V^{*n}(V_1^* - V_2V^*) = 0 \text{ for } n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

It follows that  $V_1^* - V_2V^*$  has range in  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$ , and hence we actually have

$$V_1^* - V_2V^* = P_*^\perp U_* D_{V^*} = D_{V^*}P_*^\perp U_* D_{V^*}. \quad (3.1.24)$$

A similar computation gives us

$$V_2^* - V_1V^* = D_{V^*}U_*^*P_* D_{V^*}. \quad (3.1.25)$$

Next note that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{V^*} U_*^* D_{V^*} &= D_{V^*} U_*^* (P_*^\perp + P_*) D_{V^*} = (V_1^* - V_2^* V^*)^* + (V_2^* - V_1^* V^*) \\ &= V_1 - V_1 V_2 V_2^* + V_2 - V_1 V_1^* V_2^* \\ &= V_1 D_{V_2^*} + D_{V_1^*} V_2^*. \end{aligned}$$

As we have already checked that the operator  $V_1 D_{V_2^*} + D_{V_1^*} V_2^*$  has range and cokernel contained in  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$ , we may cancel the projection  $D_{V^*}$  on the left and on the right of the left-hand side and deduce that necessarily  $U_*^* = (V_1 D_{V_2^*} + D_{V_1^*} V_2^*)|_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}$ . Hence  $U_* = (D_{V_2^*} V_1^* + V_2 D_{V_1^*})|_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}$  as in (3.1.22).

To find  $P_*$  we see from (3.1.25) that

$$\begin{aligned} P_* &= U_*(V_2^* - V_1^* V^*) = (D_{V_2^*} V_1^* + V_2 D_{V_1^*})(V_2^* - V_1^* V^*) \\ &= D_{V_2^*} V_1^* + V_2 D_{V_1^*}(V_2^* - V_1^* V^*) \\ &= D_{V_2^*} V^* - D_{V_2^*} V^* + V_2 D_{V_1^*} V_2^* - V_2 D_{V_1^*} V_1^* V^* \\ &= V_2 D_{V_1^*} V_2^* \quad (\text{since } D_{V_1^*} V_1 = 0) \end{aligned}$$

as in (3.1.22).

Parallel computations can be used to show that (3.1.21) is a BCL1 tuple for  $(V_1, V_2)$  in case  $(V_1, V_2)$  are in the model BCL1 form. Alternatively, it suffices to show that the flip map (3.1.10) applied to (3.1.22) produces (3.1.21), i.e., that, in the notation of (3.1.21)–(3.1.22),

$$(U_*^* P_* U_*, U_*^*) = (P, U). \quad (3.1.26)$$

The second relation in (3.1.26) is clear by inspection. As for the first, let us compute, using the various isometry identities, e.g.,  $D_{V_2^*} V_2 = 0$ ,  $V_2^* D_{V_2^*} = 0$ ,  $V_2^* V_2 = I$ ,  $D_{V_1^*}^2 = D_{V_1^*}$ ,  $V_2^* V_2 = I$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} U_*^* P_* U_* &= (V_1 D_{V_2^*} + D_{V_1^*} V_2^*) V_2 D_{V_1^*} V_2^* (D_{V_2^*} V_1^* + V_2 D_{V_1^*}) \\ &= D_{V_1^*} V_2^* (V_2 D_{V_1^*} V_2^*) V_2 D_{V_1^*} = D_{V_1^*} (V_2^* V_2) D_{V_1^*} (V_2^* V_2) D_{V_1^*} = D_{V_1^*}^3 = D_{V_1^*} \\ &= P \end{aligned}$$

and (3.1.26) follows.

It remains to argue that the same formulas hold in case the commuting isometric pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  is not presented in a BCL1 or BCL2 model form. However by Theorem 3.1.4 we know that any commuting isometric pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  (with  $V = V_1 V_2$  having no unitary part) is unitarily equivalent to a BCL2-model pair

$$(V'_1, V'_2) = (M_{U_*^* P_*^\perp + z U_*^* P_*}, M_{P_* U_* + z P_*^\perp U_*})$$

on  $H^2(\mathcal{F}')$ , with  $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{D}_{V^*}$ . It is now a routine observation that the unitary identification map  $\omega: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{F}')$  washes through all the formulas in (3.1.22) so as to give a BCL2 tuple  $(\mathcal{F}', U_*', P_*')$  unitarily equivalent to the BCL2 tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, U_*, P_*)$  built directly from the model commuting isometric pair  $(V'_1, V'_2)$ .

■

To facilitate computation, it is convenient to replace the space  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$  known to have the internal direct-sum decompositions (3.1.20) with the external direct sum  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{D}_{V_1^*} \\ \mathcal{D}_{V_2^*} \end{array} \right]$  via



either of the identification maps

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} D_{V_1^*} & V_1 D_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{V_1^*} \\ \mathcal{D}_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{V^*}, \quad \Phi_* = \begin{bmatrix} V_2 D_{V_1^*} & D_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{V_1^*} \\ \mathcal{D}_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{V^*}.$$

The same idea appears in [13, Corollary 7.2]. We then have the following result.

**COROLLARY 3.1.8.** *Given a commuting isometric pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  such that  $V := V_1 V_2$  is a shift, an alternative explicit BCL2-tuple for  $(V_1, V_2)$  is*

$$(\mathcal{F}_*, P_*, U_*) = \left( \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{V_1^*} \\ \mathcal{D}_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} D_{V_1^*} V_2 |_{\mathcal{D}_{V_1^*}} & D_{V_1^*} |_{\mathcal{D}_{V_2^*}} \\ V_1^* V_2 |_{\mathcal{D}_{V_1^*}} & V_1^* |_{\mathcal{D}_{V_2^*}} \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad (3.1.27)$$

*Proof.* We have already noted that

$$(\mathcal{F}'_*, P'_*, U'_*) = (\mathcal{D}_{V^*}, V_2 D_{V_1^*} V_2^*, (D_{V_2^*} V_1^* + V_2 D_{V_1^*}) |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}})$$

is a BCL2-tuple for  $(V_1, V_2)$ . One can see as a consequence of the identities (3.1.23) that  $\Phi_*$  acting from  $\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{V_1^*} \\ \mathcal{D}_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix}$  to  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$  given by

$$\Phi_* = \begin{bmatrix} V_2 D_{V_1^*} & D_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{V_1^*} \\ \mathcal{D}_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{V^*}$$

is unitary. It is then a matter of again repeatedly using the identities (3.1.23) to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_* P'_* \Phi_* &= \begin{bmatrix} D_{V_1^*} V_2^* \\ D_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix} V_2 D_{V_1^*} V_2^* \begin{bmatrix} V_2 D_{V_1^*} & D_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{D}_{V_2^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = P_*, \\ \Phi_* U'_* \Phi_* &= \begin{bmatrix} D_{V_1^*} V_2^* \\ D_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix} (D_{V_2^*} V_1^* + V_2 D_{V_1^*}) \begin{bmatrix} V_2 D_{V_1^*} & D_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} D_{V_1^*} V_2 D_{V_1^*} & D_{V_1^*} V_2^* D_{V_2^*} \\ D_{V_2^*} V_1^* V_2 D_{V_1^*} & D_{V_2^*} V_1^* D_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Let us note on the side that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{V_2^*} V_1^* V_2 D_{V_1^*} &= (I - V_2 V_2^*) V_1^* V_2 D_{V_1^*} = V_1^* V_2 D_{V_1^*} - V_2 V_1^* V_2^* V_2 D_{V_1^*} \\ &= V_1^* V_2 D_{V_1^*} - V_2 V_1^* D_{V_1^*} = V_1^* V_2 D_{V_1^*}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the formula for  $\Phi_* U'_* \Phi_*$  can be completed to

$$\Phi_* U'_* \Phi_* = \begin{bmatrix} D_{V_1^*} V_2 D_{V_1^*} & D_{V_1^*} V_2^* D_{V_2^*} \\ V_1^* V_2 D_{V_1^*} & D_{V_2^*} V_1^* D_{V_2^*} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} D_{V_1^*} V_2 |_{\mathcal{D}_{V_1^*}} & D_{V_1^*} |_{\mathcal{D}_{V_2^*}} \\ V_1^* V_2 |_{\mathcal{D}_{V_1^*}} & V_1^* |_{\mathcal{D}_{V_2^*}} \end{bmatrix} = U_*.$$

As  $(\mathcal{F}_*, P_*, U_*)$  is unitarily equivalent to the known BCL2-tuple  $(\mathcal{F}'_*, P'_*, U'_*)$  for  $(V_1, V_2)$ , it follows that  $(\mathcal{F}_*, P_*, U_*)$  is also a BCL2-tuple for  $(V_1, V_2)$ . ■

Finally the following model-characterization of joint reducing subspaces for a BCL-model pair of commuting isometries will be useful in the sequel.

**REMARK 3.1.9.** We show here how to use the spectral theory for unitary operators to work out a BCL-model for the commuting unitary operator-pair  $(W_1, W_2)$  as appearing in the second component of the general BCL-model for a pair of commuting isometries as follows. Suppose that  $(W_1, W_2)$  is a pair of commuting unitary operators on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then the product  $W = W_1 W_2 = W_2 W_1$  is also unitary, and hence, by the

direct-integral version of the spectral theorem for normal operators (see [23, Theorem II.6.1]),  $W$  can be represented as a diagonalized operator on the direct integral space  $\bigoplus \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{H}(\zeta) d\nu(\zeta)$  with the fiber space  $\mathcal{H}(\zeta)$  having dimension equal to the multiplicity function  $n(\zeta) = \dim \mathcal{H}(\zeta)$  well-defined  $\nu$ -a.e. For  $j = 1, 2$ , the unitary operator  $W_j$  commutes with  $W$  and hence is *decomposable* (see [23, Theorem II.2.1], meaning that there are measurable operator-valued functions  $\zeta \mapsto \varphi_j(\zeta) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}(\zeta))$  so that  $W_j$  is represented as a multiplication operator

$$W_j = M_{\varphi_j}: h(\zeta) \mapsto \varphi_j(\zeta)h(\zeta).$$

As  $M_{\varphi_j}$  is unitary, it must be the case that the multiplier value  $\varphi_j(\zeta)$  is unitary on  $\mathcal{H}(\zeta)$  for a.e.  $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ . As  $W_1W_2 = W_2W_1 = W$ , it then must also be the case that

$$\varphi_1(\zeta)\varphi_2(\zeta) = \zeta I_{\mathcal{H}(\zeta)} \text{ for a.e. } \zeta \in \mathbb{T}. \quad (3.1.28)$$

To parametrize the set of all such pairs  $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$  simply let  $\varphi_1$  be an arbitrary measurable unitary-operator-valued function  $\zeta \mapsto \varphi_1(\zeta)$ . Then we may solve (3.1.28) to see that  $\varphi_2(\zeta)$  is unique and is given by

$$\varphi_2(\zeta) = \zeta \cdot \varphi_1(\zeta)^*.$$

Thus  $(W_1, W_2) = (M_{\varphi_1}, \zeta \cdot M_{\varphi_1^*})$  with  $M_{\varphi_1}$  equal to an arbitrary unitary decomposable operator on  $\bigoplus \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{H}(\zeta) d\nu(\zeta)$  is the form for an arbitrary pair of unitary operators on  $\bigoplus \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{H}(\zeta) d\nu$  having product  $W = W_1W_2$  equal to  $M_{\zeta I_{\mathcal{H}(\zeta)}}$  on  $\bigoplus \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{H}(\zeta) d\nu(\zeta)$ .

We next seek a characterization of the joint reducing subspaces for the shift part of a commuting isometric pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  in terms of the associated BCL2 model:

$$(V_1, V_2) = (M_{U^*(P^\perp + zP)}, M_{(P + zP^\perp)U}) \text{ on } H^2(\mathcal{F}) \quad (3.1.29)$$

for a BCL tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$ . It is convenient to first introduce a definition.

**DEFINITION 3.1.10.** Suppose  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$  is a BCL-tuple (with commuting unitary operators  $W_1, W_2$  assumed to be trivial). Suppose that  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is a subspace of  $\mathcal{F}$  such that

- (i)  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is invariant for  $P$ , and
- (ii)  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is reducing for  $U$ .

Set  $P_0 = P|_{\mathcal{F}_0}$  and  $U_0 = U|_{\mathcal{F}_0}$ . Then we say that the Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_0, P_0, U_0)$  is a reduced sub-Andô tuple of  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$ .

Then we have the following result.

**THEOREM 3.1.11.** *Suppose that  $(V_1, V_2)$  is the BCL2 model commuting isometric pair (3.1.29) associated with the Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$ . Then joint reducing subspaces for  $(V_1, V_2)$  are in one-to-one correspondence with reducing sub-Andô tuples  $(\mathcal{F}_0, P_0, U_0)$  with associated reducing subspace equal to  $H^2(\mathcal{F}_0)$  viewed as a subspace of  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  in the natural way.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{M} \subset H^2(\mathcal{F})$  is a joint reducing subspace for  $(V_1, V_2)$  as in (3.1.29). Then in particular  $\mathcal{M}$  is reducing for  $V = V_1V_2 = M_z^{\mathcal{F}}$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$ . The Beurling-Lax theorem characterizes the invariant subspaces  $\mathcal{M}$  for the shift operator  $M_z^{\mathcal{F}}$  on a vectorial Hardy space  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  as those of the form  $\Theta \cdot H^2(\mathcal{E})$  for an inner function  $\Theta$  (i.e., an  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$ -valued function  $z \mapsto \Theta(z)$  on the unit disk with radial-limit boundary-value function

$\zeta \mapsto \Theta(\zeta)$  having isometric values a.e. on  $\mathbb{T}$ ). If  $\mathcal{M}$  is reducing for  $M_z$  then both  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{M}^\perp$  have Beurling-Lax representations

$$\mathcal{M} = \Theta \cdot H^2(\mathcal{E}), \quad \mathcal{M}^\perp = \Psi \cdot H^2(\mathcal{E}')$$

for inner functions  $\Theta$  and  $\Psi$  with values in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F})$  for appropriate coefficient Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{E}'$  respectively. Furthermore we have the orthogonal decomposition

$$H^2(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp = \Theta H^2(\mathcal{E}) \oplus \Psi H^2(\mathcal{E}')$$

implying that  $[\Theta \ \Psi]$  is also inner as a function with values in  $\mathcal{B}([\mathcal{E} \ \mathcal{E}'], \mathcal{F})$ . As in general the Beurling-Lax representer for a given shift-invariant subspace  $\mathcal{M}$  is unique up to a unitary-constant right factor, we see from all this that  $[\Theta \ \Psi]$  is a unitary constant from  $[\mathcal{E} \ \mathcal{E}']$  onto  $\mathcal{F}$ . In particular we see that  $\Theta$  must be equal to a constant  $\Theta(z) = \Theta(0)$  isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{E}$  onto a subspace  $\mathcal{F}_0$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  has the form  $\mathcal{M} = H^2(\mathcal{F}_0) \subset H^2(\mathcal{F})$  for the subspace  $\mathcal{F}_0 = \Theta(0)\mathcal{E}$  of the coefficient space  $\mathcal{F}$ .

It remains to understand when a subspace of this form is also reducing for  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ . Let  $f(z) = f_0$  where  $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ . Then  $V_1: f(z) \mapsto U^*P^\perp f_0 + zU^*P f_0 \in H^2(\mathcal{F}_0)$  forces  $U^*P^\perp f_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ ,  $U^*P f_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ , i.e.,

- (i) invariance of  $H^2(\mathcal{F}_0)$  under  $V_1$  implies invariance of  $\mathcal{F}_0$  under  $U^*P^\perp$  and  $U^*P$ .

Similarly,

- (ii) invariance of  $H^2(\mathcal{F}_0)$  under  $V_1^*$  implies invariance of  $\mathcal{F}_0$  under  $P^\perp U$ ,  
 (iii) invariance of  $H^2(\mathcal{F}_0)$  under  $V_2$  implies invariance of  $\mathcal{F}_0$  under  $PU$  and  $P^\perp U$ .  
 (iv) invariance of  $H^2(\mathcal{F}_0)$  under  $V_2^*$  implies invariance of  $\mathcal{F}_0$  under  $U^*P$ .

By summing the two operators in item (i) and in item (ii) respectively, we see that  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is invariant under  $U^*$  and under  $U$ . Then from either (ii) or (iv) we see that  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is invariant under  $P$  or  $P^\perp$  (and hence also under  $P^\perp = I - P$  or  $P = I - P^\perp$ ). Conversely, if  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is invariant under  $U$ ,  $U^*$ , and  $P$  (and hence also  $P^\perp$ ), it is routine to verify by direct computation that  $H^2(\mathcal{F}_0)$  is invariant under all of  $V_1, V_1^*, V_2, V_2^*$ , and hence is jointly reducing for  $(V_1, V_2)$ . Then restriction of  $(V_1, V_2)$  to  $H^2(\mathcal{F}_0)$  amounts to the BCL2 model corresponding to the reduced sub-BCL tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_0, P_0, U_0)$  as expected. ■

REMARK 3.1.12. A result parallel to Theorem 3.1.11 can be obtained for the direct-integral model for a unitary commuting pair  $(W_1, W_2)$  as in Remark 3.1.9. The result is: *a subspace  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $\bigoplus_{\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{H}(\zeta) \, d\nu(\zeta)$  is reducing for the commuting unitary pair  $(W_1, W_2) = (M_{\varphi_1}, \zeta M_{\varphi_1^*})$  on  $\bigoplus_{\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{H}(\zeta) \, d\nu(\zeta)$  if and only if  $\mathcal{M}$  has the form*

$$\mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} P(\zeta) \mathcal{H}(\zeta) \, d\nu(\zeta)$$

where  $\zeta \mapsto P(\zeta)$  is a measurable function with  $P(\zeta)$  equal to a orthogonal projection on  $\mathcal{H}(\zeta)$  which is reducing for  $\varphi_1(\zeta)$  (and hence also for  $\varphi_2(\zeta) = \zeta \cdot \varphi_1(\zeta)^*$ ) for a.e.  $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ . Combining this result with Theorem 3.1.11 then leads to a characterization of the reducing subspaces for a general BCL-model as in Theorem 3.1.4.

**3.2. Commuting unitary extension of a commuting pair of isometries.** It is well known (see [43, Section I.6]) that an arbitrary family of commuting isometries can always

be extended to a family of commuting unitaries. The following result shows that when the family is finite and one of the isometries in the family is the product of the rest of the isometries, then the family can be extended to a family of commuting unitaries with additional structure.

**LEMMA 3.2.1.** *Let  $(V_1, V_2)$  be a pair of commuting isometries. Then  $(V_1, V_2)$  has a commuting unitary extension  $(Y_1, Y_2)$  such that  $Y = Y_1 Y_2$  is the minimal unitary extension of  $V = V_1 V_2$ .*

*Proof.* Theorem 3.1.4 plays a pivotal role in the proof of this result. We can assume without loss of generality that  $\mathcal{H} = \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{bmatrix}$  and

$$(V_1, V_2, V_1 V_2) = \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{P^\perp U + z P U} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{U^* P + z U^* P^\perp} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_z & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{bmatrix} \right),$$

where  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$  is a BCL2 tuple for  $(V_1, V_2)$ . Now define a pair of operators  $Y_1, Y_2$  on  $L^2(\mathcal{F}) \oplus \mathcal{H}_u$  by

$$(Y_1, Y_2) := \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{P^\perp U + \zeta P U} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{U^* P + \zeta U^* P^\perp} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

where  $\zeta$  is the coordinate variable on the unit circle  $\mathbb{T}$ . Then one can check that  $(Y_1, Y_2)$  is a pair of commuting unitaries and that  $(Y_1, Y_2)$  is an extension of  $(V_1, V_2)$ , where  $\begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{bmatrix}$  is identified as a subspace of  $\begin{bmatrix} L^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{bmatrix}$  via

$$\begin{bmatrix} z^n \xi \\ \eta \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \zeta^n \xi \\ \eta \end{bmatrix} \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \eta \in \mathcal{H}_u \text{ for } n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Then  $Y = Y_1 Y_2 = \begin{bmatrix} M_\zeta & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{bmatrix}$  on  $\begin{bmatrix} L^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{bmatrix}$  is clearly the minimal unitary extension of  $V = V_1 V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} M_z & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{bmatrix}$  on  $\begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{H}_u \end{bmatrix}$ . ■

**3.3. Doubly commuting pairs of isometries.** Arguably (see [19]), the BCL-model for a commuting pair of isometries has proven to be of limited utility for understanding the finer geometric structure of a commuting pair of isometries. Consequently, there has been some investment in the use of other approaches (beginning with multivariable analogs of the *Wold decomposition*) toward this goal (see [18, 20, 38, 39]). While the most general case still remains mysterious, a particularly tractable special case is the case of a *doubly commuting isometric pair*, i.e., a commuting pair of isometries  $(V_1, V_2)$  such that  $V_1^* V_2 = V_2 V_1^*$  (and hence also  $V_2^* V_1 = V_1 V_2^*$ ); see [32, 29, 34]. The next result characterizes the double commutativity property for a commuting isometric pair in terms of an associated BCL2 tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$  for  $(V_1, V_2)$ ; this characterization was already observed by Berger-Coburn-Lebow [14] with further elaboration by Gaşper-Gaşper [28], Bercovci-Douglas-Foias [12, Proposition 2.10], and Bhattacharyya-Rostogi-Kashari [17, Lemma 3.2]. We include yet another proof which fits in with the ideas here.

**THEOREM 3.3.1.** *Let  $(V_1, V_2)$  be a pair of commuting isometries and let  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$  be a choice of BCL2 tuple for  $(V_1, V_2)$ . Then  $(V_1, V_2)$  is doubly commuting if and only if*

$$P^\perp U P = 0, \text{ i.e., } \text{Ran } P \text{ is invariant for } U. \quad (3.3.1)$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.1.4 we assume without loss of generality that  $(V_1, V_2)$  is given by a BCL2 model:

$$(V_1, V_2) = (M_{U^*P^\perp+zU^*P} \oplus W_1, M_{PU+zP^\perp U} \oplus W_2)$$

on  $H^2(\mathcal{F}) \oplus \mathcal{H}_u$ . As commuting unitaries are automatically doubly commuting, we see that  $V_1$  double commutes with  $V_2$  if and only if  $V_{1s} := M_{U^*(P^\perp+zP)}$  double commutes with  $V_{2s} := M_{(P+zP^\perp)U}$ .

It is convenient to view  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  as the tensor product Hilbert space  $H^2 \otimes \mathcal{F}$  and then to write

$$\begin{aligned} V_{1s} &= M_{U^*P^\perp+zU^*P} = I_{H^2} \otimes U^*P^\perp + M_z \otimes U^*P, \\ V_{2s} &= M_{PU+zP^\perp U} = I_{H^2} \otimes PU + M_z \otimes P^\perp U. \end{aligned}$$

We may then compute

$$\begin{aligned} V_{1s}^*V_{2s} &= ((I_{H^2} \otimes P^\perp U) + (M_z^* \otimes PU)) ((I_{H^2} \otimes PU) + (M_z \otimes P^\perp U)) \\ &= (I_{H^2} \otimes P^\perp UPU) + (M_z \otimes P^\perp UP^\perp U) + (M_z^* \otimes PUPU) + (I_{H^2} \otimes PUP^\perp U) \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} V_{2s}V_{1s}^* &= ((I_{H^2} \otimes PU) + (M_z \otimes P^\perp U)) ((I_{H^2} \otimes P^\perp U) + (M_z^* \otimes PU)) \\ &= (I_{H^2} \otimes PUP^\perp U) + (M_z \otimes P^\perp UP^\perp U) + (M_z^* \otimes PUPU) + (M_z M_z^* \otimes P^\perp UPU). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} V_{1s}^*V_{2s} - V_{2s}V_{1s}^* &= \\ &= I_{H^2} \otimes P^\perp UPU + M_z \otimes P^\perp UP^\perp U + M_z^* \otimes PUPU + I_{H^2} \otimes PUP^\perp U \\ &\quad - I_{H^2} \otimes PUP^\perp U - M_z \otimes P^\perp UP^\perp U - M_z^* \otimes PUPU - M_z M_z^* \otimes P^\perp UPU \\ &= (I - M_z M_z^*) \otimes P^\perp UPU. \end{aligned}$$

As  $I_{H^2} - M_z M_z^* = \mathbf{ev}_0^* \mathbf{ev}_0$  (where  $\mathbf{ev}_0$  is the evaluation-at-0 map) and  $\mathbf{ev}_0^* \mathbf{ev}_0$  is the projection on the constant functions on  $H^2$  and hence is not zero, we see that  $V_{1s}$  double commutes with  $V_{2s}$  exactly when  $P^\perp UPU = 0$ . As  $U$  is unitary, an equivalent formulation is  $P^\perp UP = 0$ . The theorem now follows. ■

As an illustration of Theorem 3.3.1 we now compute the BCL2 model for a standard example of doubly commuting isometries, namely the bidisk shift operators  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  acting on  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2$ .

**EXAMPLE 3.3.2.** Consider the commuting pair of shift operators  $(V_1, V_2) = (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  acting on the Hardy space over the bidisk

$$H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2 := \{f(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2} a_{ij} z_1^i z_2^j : \sum_{(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2} |a_{ij}|^2 < \infty\}.$$

Note that the operators  $M_{z_1}$  and  $M_{z_2}$  are shifts on  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2$  so the  $(W_1, W_2)$ -component in a BCL2 tuple for  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  is trivial. We shall show: *a BCL2 tuple for  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  is*

$$(\mathcal{F}, P, U) = (\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2, P_{\ell_{[1,\infty)}^2}^2, \mathbf{S}) \quad (3.3.2)$$

where  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$  is the space of absolutely square-summable sequences indexed by the integers  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $P_{\ell_{[1,\infty)}^2}^2$  is the orthogonal projection on  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$  with range equal to the subspace of sequences

supported on the subset  $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : 1 \leq n\}$ , and  $\mathbf{S}$  is the bilateral shift operator

$$\mathbf{S}: \mathbf{e}_n \mapsto \mathbf{e}_{n+1}$$

on  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$  (where  $\{\mathbf{e}_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  is the standard orthonormal basis for  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ ).

To construct a BCL2 model for  $(V_1, V_2)$  according to the construction in the proof of Theorem 3.1.4, we need to compute the wandering subspace for the shift  $V_1 V_2 = M_{z_1 z_2}$ . Note that  $\text{Ran } M_{z_1 z_2}$  consists of functions with Taylor coefficients  $a_{ij}$  supported on the set  $\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2 : i, j \geq 1\}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{F} = (\text{Ran } M_{z_1 z_2})^\perp$  is the subspace

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f(z_1, z_2) = a_{00} + \sum_{i>0} a_{i0} z_1^i + \sum_{j>0} a_{0j} z_2^j : |a_{00}|^2 + \sum_{i>0} |a_{i0}|^2 + \sum_{j>0} |a_{0j}|^2 < \infty\}. \quad (3.3.3)$$

It is convenient to identify  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$  via the map  $\tau_{\text{bd}}$  (the subscript bd suggesting *bidisk*) defined on the orthonormal basis of monomials for  $\mathcal{F}$  according to the formula

$$\tau_{\text{bd}}: z_1^i \mapsto \mathbf{e}_{-i} \text{ for } i \geq 0, \quad \tau_{\text{bd}}: z_2^j \mapsto \mathbf{e}_j \text{ for } j \geq 0. \quad (3.3.4)$$

We wish to extend  $\tau_{\text{bd}}$  to a map from all of  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2$  to  $H^2(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2) := H^2 \otimes \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$  so that we have the intertwining  $\tau_{\text{bd}} M_{z_1 z_2} = M_z \tau_{\text{bd}}$ . Thus we require that

$$\tau_{\text{bd}}((z_1 z_2)^k z_1^i) = z^k \tau_{\text{bd}}(z_1^i) = z^k \mathbf{e}_{-i}, \quad \tau_{\text{bd}}((z_1 z_2)^k z_2^j) = z^k \tau_{\text{bd}}(z_2^j) = z^k \mathbf{e}_j$$

for  $i \geq 0$  and  $j \geq 0$ , or in a more closed form,

$$\tau_{\text{bd}}: z_1^i z_2^j \mapsto \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_{j-i} z^j & \text{for } i \geq j, \\ \mathbf{e}_{j-i} z^i & \text{for } i \leq j. \end{cases} \quad (3.3.5)$$

As  $\tau_{\text{bd}}$  so defined is a well-defined bijection from an orthonormal basis for  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2$  to an orthonormal basis for  $H^2(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2)$ ,  $\tau_{\text{bd}}$  extends to a well-defined unitary map from the scalar-valued Hardy space over the bidisk  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2$  onto the  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ -valued Hardy space over the disk  $H^2(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2)$  which satisfies the intertwining property

$$\tau_{\text{bd}} M_{z_1 z_2} = M_z \tau_{\text{bd}}.$$

By the construction in the proof of Theorem 3.1.4 we are guaranteed that there is a projection operator  $P$  and a unitary operator  $U$  on  $\mathcal{F} \cong \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$  so that

$$\tau_{\text{bd}} M_{z_1} = M_{U^*(P^\perp + zP)} \tau_{\text{bd}}, \quad \tau_{\text{bd}} M_{z_2} = M_{(P + zP^\perp)U} \tau_{\text{bd}}.$$

Once one discovers the candidate, it is a matter of direct checking to see that  $P = P_{\ell_{[1, \infty)}^2}$ ,  $U = \mathbf{S}$  on  $\mathcal{F} = \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$  does the job. Note that  $\text{Ran } P = \ell_{[1, \infty)}^2$  is invariant under  $U = \mathbf{S}$ , as is to be expected from Theorem 3.3.1 since  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  is doubly commuting.

We can use the result of Theorem 3.3.1 combined with Example 3.3.2 to obtain the following Wold decomposition for a doubly commuting pair of isometries due to Słociński [39, Theorem 3]. We present a new proof using the structure of the BCL2 model for doubly commuting isometries given by Theorem 3.3.1 combined with the classical Wold decompositions for  $U|_{\text{Ran } P}$  and  $U^*|_{\text{Ran } P^\perp}$  and recognition of the BCL2 model for the bidisk shift-pair given in Example 3.3.2. Similar results have been obtained by Gašper-Gasper [28].

**THEOREM 3.3.3.** *Suppose that  $(V_1, V_2)$  is a doubly commuting pair of isometries on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $\mathcal{H}$  has an orthogonal direct sum decomposition*

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{dcs}} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\text{su}} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\text{us}} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\text{uu}} \quad (3.3.6)$$

such that

- (i) each of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dcs}}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{su}}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{us}}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{uu}}$  is reducing for  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ ,
- (ii)  $(V_1|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{dcs}}}, V_2|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{dcs}}})$  is a doubly commuting pair of shift operators,
- (iii)  $(V_1|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{su}}}, V_2|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{su}}})$  is a commuting pair of operators such that  $V_1|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{su}}}$  is a shift operator while  $V_2|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{su}}}$  is unitary,
- (iv)  $(V_1|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{us}}}, V_2|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{us}}})$  is a commuting pair of operators such that  $V_1|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{us}}}$  is unitary while  $V_2|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{us}}}$  is a shift operator, and
- (v)  $(V_1|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{uu}}}, V_2|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{uu}}})$  is a commuting pair of unitary operators.

Conversely, any pair of operators  $(V_1, V_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  with a decomposition (3.3.6) satisfying conditions (i)–(v) is a doubly commuting pair of isometries.

*Proof.* Suppose first that  $V_1, V_2$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  with  $\mathcal{H}$  decomposing as in (3.3.6) satisfies (i)–(v). Then clearly  $(V_1, V_2)$  is a commuting pair of isometries since the restriction to each piece is commuting. The restriction to  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dcs}}$  is doubly commuting by condition (ii). In general, if  $(S, W)$  is a commuting operator pair with  $W$  unitary, then

$$S^*W = WW^*S^*W = WS^*W^*W = WS^*$$

and hence  $(S, W)$  is in fact doubly commuting (this in fact holds with  $W$  any normal operator by the Putnam-Fuglede theorem – see [31] for a slick proof). Hence the restrictions of  $(V_1, V_2)$  to  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{su}}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{us}}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{uu}}$  are all doubly commuting as well, and it follows that the full commuting pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  is doubly commuting.

Conversely, suppose that  $(V_1, V_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  is a doubly commuting pair of isometries. By Theorem 3.3.1  $(V_1, V_2)$  is unitarily equivalent to a BCL2 model  $(M_{U^*(P^\perp + zP)} \oplus W_1, M_{(P+zP^\perp)U} \oplus W_2)$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{F}) \oplus \mathcal{K}_u$  for some coefficient Hilbert space  $\mathcal{F}$  and a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}_u$ , where the BCL2 tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U, W_1, W_2)$  for  $(V_1, V_2)$  has the additional property that  $P^\perp U P = 0$ . Let us consider the Wold decomposition for the isometry  $U|_{\text{Ran } P}$ :  $\text{Ran } P = \mathcal{P}_s \oplus \mathcal{P}_u$  with  $\mathcal{P}_s$  and  $\mathcal{P}_u$  invariant for  $U$  with  $U_{\mathcal{P}_s} := U|_{\mathcal{P}_s}$  equal to a shift operator and  $U_{\mathcal{P}_u} := U|_{\mathcal{P}_u}$  equal to a unitary operator. Similarly  $U^*|_{\text{Ran } P^\perp}$  has a Wold decomposition:  $\text{Ran } P^\perp = \mathcal{P}_{\perp s} \oplus \mathcal{P}_{\perp u}$  with  $\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\perp u}$  invariant for  $U^*$  with  $U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}^* := U^*|_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}$  equal to a shift operator and  $U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp u}}^* := U^*|_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp u}}$  equal to a unitary operator. With respect to the decomposition

$$\mathcal{F} = \text{Ran } P^\perp \oplus \text{Ran } P = \mathcal{P}_{\perp u} \oplus \mathcal{P}_{\perp s} \oplus \mathcal{P}_s \oplus \mathcal{P}_u, \quad (3.3.7)$$

$U$  has a  $(4 \times 4)$ -block matrix decomposition of the form

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp u}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}} & 0 & 0 \\ X & Y & U_{\mathcal{P}_s} & 0 \\ Z & W & 0 & U_{\mathcal{P}_u} \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $U_{\mathcal{P}_u}$  is unitary,  $U_{\mathcal{P}_s}$  is a shift,  $U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}$  is the adjoint of a shift, and  $U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp u}}$  is unitary.

The fact that  $U$ ,  $U_{\mathcal{P}_u}$  and  $U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp u}}$  are all unitary forces  $X = 0$ ,  $Z = 0$ ,  $W = 0$  as well as

$$Y^*Y = I - U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}^* U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}, \quad Y^*U_{\mathcal{P}_s} = 0, \quad YY^* = I - U_{\mathcal{P}_s} U_{\mathcal{P}_s}^*, \quad YU_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}^* = 0.$$

Hence  $Y$  is a partial isometry with initial space equal to

$$\mathcal{D}_{U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}} = \text{Ran}(I - U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}^* U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}) \subset \mathcal{P}_{\perp s}$$

and with final space equal to

$$\mathcal{D}_{U_{\mathcal{P}_s}^*} = \text{Ran}(I - U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}} U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}^*) \subset \mathcal{P}_s.$$

We then use the operator

$$W|_{\mathcal{D}_{U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}}} : \mathcal{D}_{U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{U_{\mathcal{P}_s}^*}$$

as a unitary identification map to identify  $\mathcal{D}_{U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{U_{\mathcal{P}_s}^*}$  with a common coefficient space which we shall call  $\mathcal{E}$ . As  $U_{\mathcal{P}_s}$  is shift with wandering subspace identified with  $\mathcal{E}$  while  $U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}^*$  is a shift with wandering subspace also identifiable with  $\mathcal{E}$ , we may view  $\mathcal{P}_s$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}$  as having the respective forms

$$\mathcal{P}_s = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} U_{\mathcal{P}_s}^{n-1} \mathcal{E}, \quad \mathcal{P}_{\perp s} = \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}^{*m} \mathcal{E}.$$

Let us introduce additional unitary identification maps

$$\tau_- : \mathcal{P}_{\perp s} \rightarrow \ell_{(-\infty, 0]}^2(\mathcal{E}) \text{ and } \tau_+ : \mathcal{P}_s \rightarrow \ell_{[1, \infty)}^2(\mathcal{E})$$

given by

$$\tau_- : \bigoplus_{n=0}^{-\infty} U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}^{*-n} e_n \mapsto \{e_n\}_{n \leq -1}, \quad \tau_+ : \bigoplus_{m=1}^{\infty} U_{\mathcal{P}_s}^{m-1} e_m \mapsto \{e_m\}_{m \geq 1}. \quad (3.3.8)$$

Then we see that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tau_- & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_+ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U_{\mathcal{P}_s} & 0 \\ Y & U_{\mathcal{P}_s} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{S} \begin{bmatrix} \tau_- & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_+ \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.3.9)$$

where  $\mathbf{S}$  is the bilateral shift operator on  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{E})$ :

$$\mathbf{S} : \{\mathbf{e}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mapsto \{\mathbf{e}_{n+1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}.$$

Note that  $\begin{bmatrix} U_{\mathcal{P}_s} & 0 \\ Y & U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp s}} \end{bmatrix}$  amounts to  $U|_{\mathcal{P}_s \oplus \mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}$ ; we have thus shown to this point that  $U|_{\mathcal{P}_s \oplus \mathcal{P}_{\perp s}}$  is unitarily equivalent to the bilateral shift  $\mathbf{S}$  on  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{E})$ .

Let us now rewrite the decomposition (3.3.7) as

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{P}_{\perp u} \oplus \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{E}) \oplus \mathcal{P}_u \quad (3.3.10)$$

where we use the identification

$$\mathcal{P}_{\perp s} \oplus \mathcal{P}_s \cong \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{E})$$

implemented by the unitary identification map

$$\tau = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_- & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_+ \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{P}_{\perp s} \\ \mathcal{P}_s \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \ell_{(-\infty, 0]}^2(\mathcal{E}) \\ \ell_{[1, \infty)}^2(\mathcal{E}) \end{bmatrix} \cong \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{E})$$

given by (3.3.8). If we let  $U_u$  and  $U_{\perp u}$  be the unitary operators

$$U_u = U|_{\mathcal{P}_u}, \quad U_{\perp u} = U|_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp u}},$$



then as a consequence of (3.3.9) we see that in these coordinates the first three objects in the BCL2 tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, U, P, W_+, W_-)$  assume the more detailed form

$$\mathcal{F} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{P}_{\perp u} \\ \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{E}) \\ \mathcal{P}_u \end{bmatrix}, \quad U = \begin{bmatrix} U_{\perp u} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{S} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & U_u \end{bmatrix}, \quad P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P_+ & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & P_{\mathcal{P}_u} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.3.11)$$

where  $P_+$  is the orthogonal projection on  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{E})$  with range equal to  $\ell_{[1, \infty)}^2(\mathcal{E})$  (considered as the subspace of  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{E})$  having all coordinates with indices in  $(-\infty, 0]$  equal to zero).

The BCL2 model for  $(V_1, V_2)$  is to take

$$V_1 \cong \begin{bmatrix} M_{U^*(P^{\perp} + zP)} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad V_2 \cong \begin{bmatrix} M_{(P + zP^{\perp})U} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

acting on

$$\mathcal{H} \cong \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{K}_u \end{bmatrix}.$$

From the decompositions (3.3.11) for  $\mathcal{F}$ ,  $P$ ,  $U$  we see that  $H^2(\mathcal{F}) \oplus \mathcal{K}_u$  has the finer decomposition

$$\mathcal{H} \cong H^2(\mathcal{F}) \oplus \mathcal{K}_u \cong H^2(\mathcal{P}_{\perp u}) \oplus H^2(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{E})) \oplus H^2(\mathcal{P}_u) \oplus \mathcal{K}_u$$

which split  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  as four-fold direct sums

$$V_1 \cong V_{1, \perp u} \oplus V_{1, s} \oplus V_{1, u} \oplus W_1, \quad V_2 \cong V_{2, \perp u} \oplus V_{2, s} \oplus V_{2, u} \oplus W_2$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_{1, \perp u} &= I_{H^2} \otimes U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp u}}^*, & V_{2, \perp u} &= M_z \otimes U_{\mathcal{P}_{\perp u}} \text{ on } H^2(\mathcal{P}_u), \\ V_{1, s} &= M_{\mathbf{S}^*(P_+^{\perp} + zP_+)}, & V_{2, s} &= M_{(P_+ + zP_+^{\perp})\mathbf{S}} \text{ on } H^2(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{E})), \\ V_{1, u} &= M_z \otimes U_{\mathcal{P}_u}^*, & V_{2, u} &= I_{H^2} \otimes U_{\mathcal{P}_u} \text{ on } H^2(\mathcal{P}_{\perp u}), \end{aligned}$$

and where  $(W_1, W_2)$  on  $\mathcal{K}_u$  is the commuting pair of unitary operators coming from the original BCL2 tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, U, P, W_1, W_2)$  for  $(V_1, V_2)$ . It is easily checked that  $V_{1, \perp u}$  is a shift operator commuting with the unitary operator  $V_{2, \perp u}$  and that  $V_{1, u}$  is a shift operator commuting with the unitary operator  $V_{2, u}$ . Let us set

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{dcs}} = H^2(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{E})), \quad \mathcal{H}_{\text{us}} = H^2(\mathcal{P}_{\perp u}), \quad \mathcal{H}_{\text{su}} = H^2(\mathcal{P}_u), \quad \mathcal{H}_{\text{uu}} = \mathcal{K}_u.$$

Then the above analysis shows that conditions (i), (iii), (iv), (v) in Theorem 3.3.3 are all verified. Hence it remains only to verify condition (ii), i.e., we must show that *the operator pair*

$$(V_{1, s} = M_{\mathbf{S}^*(P_+^{\perp} + zP_+)}, V_{2, s} = M_{(P_+ + zP_+^{\perp})\mathbf{S}}) \text{ on } H^2(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{E})) \quad (3.3.12)$$

*is a doubly commuting pair of shift operators.* But we recognize (3.3.12) as just the BCL2 model for the bidisk shift operators  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  on  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2$  computed in Example 3.3.2 tensored with the coefficient Hilbert space  $\mathcal{E}$ , i.e., (3.3.12) is the BCL2 model for the doubly commuting shift-operator pair  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  acting on  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{E})$ . Thus the theorem follows. ■

As a corollary we recover the another result of Słociński [39, Theorem 1] characterizing doubly commuting shift-pairs.

**COROLLARY 3.3.4.** *A pair of operators  $(V_1, V_2)$  is a doubly commuting pair of shift operators if and only if  $(V_1, V_2)$  is unitarily equivalent to the concrete pair of shift operators  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  acting on the vector-valued Hardy space over the bidisk  $H^2_{\mathbb{D}^2}(\mathcal{E})$  for some coefficient Hilbert space  $\mathcal{E}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $(V_1, V_2)$  is a doubly commuting pair of shift operators. Then in particular  $(V_1, V_2)$  has a Wold decomposition as in Theorem 3.3.3. But the only piece of this decomposition which involves a pair of shift operators is the piece  $(V_1|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{dcs}}}, V_2|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{dcs}}})$ , and as we have seen in the proof of Theorem 3.3.3, this pair in turn is unitarily equivalent to  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  on  $H^2_{\mathbb{D}^2}(\mathcal{E})$  for some coefficient Hilbert space  $\mathcal{E}$ . ■

**3.4. Commuting isometries which are not doubly commuting: examples.** In this section, we look at some examples of commuting isometric pairs which are not doubly commuting.

**EXAMPLE 3.4.1.**  $(M_z, M_\Theta)$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$ . For this example we take

$$\mathcal{H} = H^2(\mathcal{Y}), \quad V_1 = M_z, \quad V_2 = M_\Theta$$

where  $\Theta$  is an inner function with values in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y})$ . This in fact is the functional model of Bercovici-Douglas-Foias for a commuting isometric pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  such that  $V_1$  is a shift (see [12, 13]). To get a BCL2-tuple for this  $(V_1, V_2)$ , we convert the BCL2-tuple given by Corollary 3.1.8 for a general commuting isometric pair to a more functional form for this specific  $(V_1, V_2)$ . The first step is to look at the Wold decomposition for the shift operator  $V = V_1 V_2 = M_{z\Theta(z)}$  acting on  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$ . Note that the wandering subspace  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$  is given by

$$\mathcal{D}_{V^*} = H^2(\mathcal{Y}) \ominus z \cdot \Theta(z)H^2(\mathcal{Y})$$

which has the internal direct-sum decomposition

$$\mathcal{D}_{V^*} = V_2 \mathcal{D}_{V_1^*} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{V_2^*} = \Theta \cdot \mathcal{Y} \oplus \mathfrak{H}(\Theta)$$

where  $\mathfrak{H}(\Theta)$  is the Sarason/de Branges-Rovnyak model space associated with the inner function  $\Theta$ :

$$\mathfrak{H}(\Theta) = H^2(\mathcal{Y}) \ominus \Theta \cdot H^2(\mathcal{Y}).$$

Then the Wold decomposition for  $V = M_{z\Theta(z)}$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$  has the concrete form

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n \Theta(z)^n (\Theta(z)y_n + h_n(z))$$

for any  $f \in H^2(\mathcal{Y})$  where  $y_n \in \mathcal{Y}$  and  $h_n \in \mathfrak{H}(\Theta)$  are determined by

$$\Theta(z)y_n + h_n(z) = P_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} V^{*n} h.$$

We then define an identification map  $\tau_\Theta: H^2(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow H^2\left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix} \mathcal{Y} \\ \mathfrak{H}(\Theta) \end{smallmatrix}\right]\right) \cong \left[\begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{Y}) \\ H^2(\mathfrak{H}(\Theta)) \end{smallmatrix}\right]$  by

$$\tau_\Theta: \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n \Theta(z)^n (\Theta(z)y_n + h_n(z)) \mapsto \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n \begin{bmatrix} y_n \\ h_n(w) \end{bmatrix} =: \begin{bmatrix} y(z) \\ h(z, w) \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.4.1)$$

where we set

$$y(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} y_n z^n \in H^2(\mathcal{Y}), \quad h(z, w) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n h_n(w) \in H^2(\mathfrak{H}(\Theta)).$$

Then it is straightforward to see that  $\tau_\Theta$  implements the intertwining identity

$$\tau_\Theta M_{z\Theta(z)} = M_z \tau_\Theta.$$

It is less obvious to identify by inspection the inner operator pencils  $\Psi_1(z)$  and  $\Psi_2(z)$  so that

$$\tau_\Theta M_z = M_{\Psi_1(z)} \tau_\Theta, \quad \tau_\Theta M_\Theta = M_{\Psi_2(z)} \tau_\Theta. \quad (3.4.2)$$

However, from the general formulas obtained in Theorem 3.1.7 and Corollary 3.1.8 we know that

$$(M_{\Psi_1}, M_{\Psi_2}) \text{ with } \Psi_1(z) = U^* P^\perp + z U^* P, \quad \Psi_2(z) = P U + z P^\perp U \quad (3.4.3)$$

where we choose

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{Y}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathcal{Y}} M_\Theta | \mathcal{Y}} & \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{v}_{0,\mathcal{Y}} | \mathfrak{H}(\Theta)} \\ M_w^* M_\Theta | \mathcal{Y} & M_w^* | \mathfrak{H}(\Theta) \end{bmatrix} =: \begin{bmatrix} D & C \\ B & A \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Y} \\ \mathfrak{H}(\Theta) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Y} \\ \mathfrak{H}(\Theta) \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.4.4)$$

does the job (where we now use  $w$  as the independent variable for functions in  $\mathfrak{H}(\Theta)$ ), as is seen by specializing the formulas in (3.1.27) to the case where

$$\mathcal{D}_{V_1^*} = \mathcal{Y}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{V_2^*} = \mathfrak{H}(\Theta), \quad V_1 = M_z, \quad V_2 = M_{\Theta(z)}.$$

In summary, formulas (3.4.3), (3.4.4) gives the explicit conversion of the BDF-model  $(M_z, M_\Theta)$  to a BCL-model  $(M_{\Psi_1}, M_{\Psi_2})$ .

Let us note next that the action of  $U$  in (3.4.4) can be given a more explicit form

$$U: \begin{bmatrix} y \\ h(w) \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \Theta(0)y + h(0) \\ \frac{\Theta(w) - \Theta(0)}{w} y + \frac{h(w) - h(0)}{w} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.4.5)$$

If we use the identification  $\tau$  from  $\mathcal{Y} \oplus \mathfrak{H}(\Theta)$  to  $\mathfrak{H}(w \cdot \Theta)$  (where we set  $\mathfrak{H}(\Theta) = H^2(\mathcal{Y}) \ominus \Theta \cdot H^2(\mathcal{Y})$  and similarly  $\mathfrak{H}(w \cdot \Theta) = H^2(\mathcal{Y}) \ominus (w \cdot \Theta) H^2(\mathcal{Y})$  with  $w$  here used as the independent variable for functions in  $\mathfrak{H}(\Theta)$  or  $\mathfrak{H}(w \cdot \Theta)$  contained in  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$ ) given by

$$\tau: y \oplus h(w) \mapsto y + wh(w),$$

then we can get a possibly more convenient BCL2-tuple  $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{P}, \tilde{U})$  for  $(M_z, M_\Theta)$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$ , namely:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{F}} &= \mathfrak{H}(w \cdot \Theta), \quad \tilde{P}: y + wh(w) \mapsto y, \\ \tilde{U}: y + wh(w) &\mapsto (\Theta(0)y + h(0)) + w \left( \frac{\Theta(w) - \Theta(0)}{w} y + \frac{h(w) - h(0)}{w} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.6)$$

Curiously, from the point of view of system theory,  $U$  is just the system matrix for the canonical functional-model de Branges-Rovnyak transfer-function realization for  $\Theta$ :

$$\Theta(z) = D + zC(I - zA)^{-1}B \quad (3.4.7)$$

where  $D, C, A, B$  are as in (3.4.4) (see Theorem 1.2 in [7] for this point of view). In terms of the original presentation of  $(V_1, V_2)$  as  $V_1 = M_z$  and  $V_2 = M_{\Theta(z)}$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$ , it is easy to derive an alternative representation of  $\Theta(z)$  as

$$\Theta(z) = P_{\mathcal{Y}}(I - zV_1^*)^{-1}V_2|_{\mathcal{Y}}. \quad (3.4.8)$$

Indeed, let us use the notation  $S$  for the shift operator  $M_z$  on  $H^2$  and then expand  $\Theta(z)$  in its power series representation  $\Theta(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Theta_n z^n$ . If we identify  $\mathcal{Y}$  with the constant

functions in  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$  (whichever is more convenient for the particular context), we can then write  $V_2|_{\mathcal{Y}}$  as

$$V_2|_{\mathcal{Y}} = M_{\Theta}|_{\mathcal{Y}} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} S^n \Theta_n : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{Y}).$$

We then can write, for  $z$  in the unit disk  $\mathbb{D}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathcal{Y}}(I - zV_1^*)^{-1}V_2|_{\mathcal{Y}} &= P_{\mathcal{Y}}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z^k S^{*k}\right)\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} S^n \Theta_n\right) \\ &= P_{\mathcal{Y}}\sum_{k \geq 0, n \geq k} z^k S^{n-k} \Theta_n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n \Theta_n = \Theta(z). \end{aligned}$$

thereby verifying (3.4.8). If we make use of the intertwining relations (3.4.2) and use the map  $\tau_{\Theta} M_{\Theta}|_{\mathcal{Y}} : y \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} y \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$  to identify the coefficient input/output space  $\mathcal{Y} \subset H^2(\mathcal{Y})$  with the input/output space  $\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Y} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \subset \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{Y}) \\ \mathfrak{H}(\Theta) \end{bmatrix}$ , we see that the realization (3.4.8) leads immediately to an alternative realization involving the operators  $M_{\Psi_1}$  and  $M_{\Psi_2}$  on  $\begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{Y}) \\ H^2(\mathfrak{H}(\Theta)) \end{bmatrix}$ :

$$\Theta(z) = \begin{bmatrix} P_{\mathcal{Y}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} (I - zM_{\Psi_1}^*)^{-1} M_{\Psi_2} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{Y}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.4.9)$$

**EXAMPLE 3.4.2.**  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  on  $H_{\diamond}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ .

We now consider the subspace  $\mathcal{H}_{\diamond} := H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2 \ominus \{\text{constant functions}\}$  of  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2$ . It is clear that  $\mathcal{H}_{\diamond}$  is invariant under  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  so we can consider the rank-one perturbation of the Example 3.3.2, namely the commuting pair of shift operators

$$V_1 = M_{z_1}|_{\mathcal{H}_{\diamond}}, \quad V_2 = M_{z_2}|_{\mathcal{H}_{\diamond}}.$$

Let us note that this pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  is not doubly commuting: one way to see this is to observe that  $V_2^* V_1(z_2) = V_2^*(z_1 z_2) = z_1 \neq 0 = V_1 V_2^*(z_2)$ .

Note that both  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are shifts so the  $(W_1, W_2)$ -component of a BCL2 tuple for  $(V_1, V_2)$  is trivial. We shall show: a BCL2 tuple for  $(M_{z_1}|_{\mathcal{H}_{\diamond}}, M_{z_2}|_{\mathcal{H}_{\diamond}})$  is

$$(\mathcal{F}, P, U) = (\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2, P_{\ell_{\{0\} \cup [2, \infty)}^2}, \mathbf{S}) \quad (3.4.10)$$

where  $P_{\ell_{\{0\} \cup [2, \infty)}^2}$  is the orthogonal projection of  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$  onto the subspace of absolutely square-summable sequences with support on the subset  $\{0\} \cup [2, \infty) \subset \mathbb{Z}$  and where  $\mathbf{S} : \mathbf{e}_n \mapsto \mathbf{e}_{n+1}$  is the forward bilateral shift operator on  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ . Note that the criterion for double commutativity fails by one-dimension: while  $\text{Ran } P = \ell_{\{0\} \cup [2, \infty)}^2$  is not invariant under  $U = \mathbf{S}$ , it does have a codimension-one subspace, namely  $\ell_{[2, \infty)}^2$ , which is  $\mathbf{S}$ -invariant, fitting with the fact that the  $(V_1, V_2)$  in this example is only a rank-one perturbation of the  $(V_1, V_2)$  in Example 3.3.2.

To verify that (3.4.10) is a BCL2 tuple for  $(M_{z_1}|_{\mathcal{H}_{\diamond}}, M_{z_2}|_{\mathcal{H}_{\diamond}})$ , proceed as follows. Note that elements  $f$  of  $\mathcal{H}_{\diamond}$  have the form

$$f(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i0} z_1^i + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_{0j} z_2^j + \sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} a_{ij} z_1^i z_2^j.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} (Vf)(z_1, z_2) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i0} z_1^{i+1} z_2 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_{0j} z_1 z_2^{j+1} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} a_{ij} z_1^{i+1} z_2^{j+1} \\ &= \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} a_{i-1,0} z_1^i z_2 + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} a_{0,j-1} z_1 z_2^j + \sum_{i,j=2}^{\infty} a_{i-1,j-1} z_1^i z_2^j. \end{aligned}$$

so  $\text{Ran } V$  consists of all functions in  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2$  with Taylor coefficients supported on the set

$$\mathfrak{S} = \{(i, j): i \geq 2 \text{ and } j = 1, \text{ or } i = 1 \text{ and } j \geq 2, \text{ or } i \geq 2 \text{ and } j \geq 2\}.$$

It is now a counting exercise to see that the complement of this set inside  $\mathbb{Z}_+^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$  is

$$\mathfrak{S}' = \{(i, j): i \geq 1 \text{ and } j = 0, \text{ or } i = 0 \text{ and } j \geq 1, \text{ or } (i, j) = (1, 1)\}.$$

Thus the space  $\mathcal{H}_\circ \ominus (\text{Ran } V)^\perp$  can be described as

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f \in \mathcal{H}_\circ: f(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{i>0} a_{i0} z_1^i + \sum_{j>0} a_{0j} z_2^j + a_{11} z_1 z_2\}.$$

from which we see that  $\mathcal{F}$  has the set

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{z_1^i: i \geq 1\} \cup \{z_2^j: j \geq 1\} \cup \{z_1 z_2\}$$

as an orthonormal basis. Let us introduce the map  $\tau_\circ: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$  by defining it to map the orthonormal basis  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{F}}$  for  $\mathcal{F}$  onto the standard orthonormal basis for  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$  by

$$\tau_\circ: z_1^i z_2^j \mapsto \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_{-i} & \text{if } (i, j) = (i, 0) \text{ with } i > 0, \\ \mathbf{e}_0 & \text{if } (i, j) = (1, 1), \\ \mathbf{e}_j & \text{if } (i, j) = (0, j) \text{ with } j > 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.4.11)$$

As  $\mathcal{F}$  is the wandering subspace for the shift operator  $M_{z_1 z_2}$  on  $\mathcal{H}_\circ$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{H}_\circ$  has as an orthonormal basis the set  $\{z_1^k z_2^k z_1^i z_2^j: k \geq 0, z^i z^j \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{F}}\}$ , i.e., an orthonormal basis for  $\mathcal{H}_\circ$  is

$$\mathcal{S}_\circ = \{z_1^k z_2^k z_1^i: k \geq 0, i > 0\} \cup \{z_1^{k+1} z_2^{k+1}: k \geq 0\} \cup \{z_1^k z_2^{k+j}: k \geq 0, j > 0\},$$

or in a more closed form

$$\mathcal{S}_\circ = \{z_1^i z_2^j: i > j \geq 0 \text{ or } i = j \geq 1 \text{ or } 0 \leq i < j\}.$$

We wish to extend  $\tau_\circ$  to a unitary map from all of  $\mathcal{H}_\circ$  onto  $H^2(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2)$  so that we have the intertwining

$$\tau_\circ M_{z_1 z_2} = M_{\mathbb{Z}} \tau_\circ. \quad (3.4.12)$$

This requires that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\circ(z_1^k z_2^k z_1^i) &= z^k \tau_\circ(z_1^i) = z^k \mathbf{e}_{-i} \text{ for } k \geq 0, i > 0, \\ \tau_\circ(z_1^k z_2^k z_1 z_2) &= z^k \tau_\circ(z_1 z_2) = z^k \mathbf{e}_0, \\ \tau_\circ(z_1^k z_2^k z_2^j) &= z^k \tau_\circ(z_2^j) = z^k \mathbf{e}_j \text{ for } j > 0, \end{aligned}$$

or, in better closed form,

$$\tau_\diamond: z_1^i z_2^j \mapsto \begin{cases} z^j \mathbf{e}_{j-i} & \text{if } i > j \geq 0, \\ z^{i-1} \mathbf{e}_0 = z^{j-1} \mathbf{e}_0 & \text{if } i = j \geq 1, \\ z^i \mathbf{e}_{j-i} & \text{if } 0 \leq i < j. \end{cases} \quad (3.4.13)$$

Extending  $\tau_\diamond$  by linearity to a map  $\tau: \mathcal{H}_\diamond \rightarrow H^2(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2)$  gives us a unitary identification from  $\mathcal{H}_\diamond$  to  $H^2(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2)$  (3.4.13) satisfying the intertwining (3.4.12).

By Theorem 3.1.4 we are guaranteed the existence of a projection operator  $P$  and a unitary operator  $U$  on  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$  so that we have the intertwining

$$\tau_\diamond M_{z_1} = M_{U^* P^\perp + z U^* P} \tau_\diamond, \quad \tau_\diamond M_{z_2} = M_{P U + z P^\perp U} \tau_\diamond. \quad (3.4.14)$$

Using the above formulas, one can compute that

$$\tau_\diamond M_{z_1}(z_1^i z_2^j) = \begin{cases} z^i \mathbf{e}_0 & \text{if } i + 1 = j \geq 0, \\ z^j \mathbf{e}_{j-i-1} & \text{if } i + 1 > j > 0, \\ z^{i+1} \mathbf{e}_{j-i-1} & \text{if } 0 \leq i + 1 < j. \end{cases} \quad (3.4.15)$$

Careful bookkeeping making use of the formulas (3.4.13) shows that the three formulas in (3.4.15) force the following respective conditions on the operator pair  $(P, U)$ :

$$\begin{cases} P^\perp \mathbf{e}_1 = \mathbf{e}_1 \text{ and } U^* \mathbf{e}_1 = \mathbf{e}_0, \\ P \mathbf{e}_0 = \mathbf{e}_0 \text{ and } U^* \mathbf{e}_0 = \mathbf{e}_{-1} \text{ as well as } P^\perp \mathbf{e}_k = \mathbf{e}_k \text{ and } U^* \mathbf{e}_k = \mathbf{e}_{k-1} \text{ for } k < 0, \\ P \mathbf{e}_k = \mathbf{e}_k \text{ and } U^* \mathbf{e}_k = \mathbf{e}_{k-1} \text{ for } k > 1 \end{cases}$$

for which the only solution is  $(P, U)$  as in (3.4.10). Alternatively, once one has discovered this candidate, it is possible to check directly that it satisfies the first intertwining condition in (3.4.14). By general principles, the second is then automatic, as can also be checked directly.

## 4. Models for Andô lifts of a commuting contractive pair

**4.1. Preliminaries.** Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting pair of contraction operators on  $\mathcal{H}$ . We say that the triple  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  is an *Andô isometric lift* or, simply an *Andô lift*, of  $(T_1, T_2)$  if (i) there is a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}$  such that  $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  is an isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{K}$ , and (ii)  $(V_1, V_2)$  is a commuting pair of isometries on  $\mathcal{K}$  such that  $V_j^* \Pi = \Pi T_j^*$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . We shall be particularly interested in the case where the Andô lift is *minimal*, i.e., the case where the smallest jointly invariant subspace for  $(V_1, V_2)$  containing  $\text{Ran } \Pi$  is the whole space  $\mathcal{K}$ :

$$\mathcal{K} = \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} V_1^{n_1} V_2^{n_2} \text{Ran } \Pi. \quad (4.1.1)$$

We say that two such Andô lifts  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  with  $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  and  $(\Pi', V_1', V_2')$  with  $\Pi': \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}'$  are *unitarily equivalent* if there is a unitary operator  $\tau: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}'$  such that

$$\tau \Pi = \Pi', \quad \tau V_1 = V_1' \tau, \quad \tau V_2 = V_2' \tau. \quad (4.1.2)$$

In the single-variable case it is known that any two minimal isometric lifts are unitarily equivalent (see [43, Theorem I.4.1]). We shall see that this result fails in the bivariate setting of Andô lifts for a commuting, contractive pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  (see Chapter 5 to come); more precisely, there are additional invariants which must be equivalent in the appropriate sense before two minimal Andô lifts can be unitarily equivalent. As in the single-variable case, given an Andô lift  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$ , there is always a unitarily equivalent Andô lift  $(\Pi', V_1, V_2)$  so that  $\mathcal{H}$  is equal to a subspace of  $\mathcal{K}'$  and  $\Pi': \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}'$  is just the inclusion map. To see this, simply set  $\mathcal{K}' = \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ (I - \Pi\Pi^*)\mathcal{K} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  and observe that the map

$$\tau = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \Pi^* \\ I - \Pi\Pi^* \end{array} \right] : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}'$$

is unitary. If we then set

$$\Pi' = \left[ \begin{array}{c} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{array} \right] : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}', \quad V'_i = \tau V_i \tau^* \text{ for } i = 1, 2$$

we see that all of conditions (4.1.2) are satisfied. Furthermore, identifying  $\mathcal{H}$  with  $\left[ \begin{smallmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \subset \mathcal{K}'$  makes  $\mathcal{H}$  a subspace of  $\mathcal{K}'$  and then  $\Pi'$  is just the inclusion map. When  $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  is an inclusion map we write simply  $(V_1, V_2)$  rather than  $(\iota_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}}, V_1, V_2)$  for the Andô isometric lift.

In this chapter, given a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ , we give two new proofs of the existence of Andô isometric lifts and exhibit three distinct models for an Andô isometric lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  associated with the names Douglas, Sz.-Nagy–Foias and Schäffer. A basic ingredient in all three models is the notion of *pre-Andô tuple* defined as follows.

**DEFINITION 4.1.1.** A collection of objects of the form  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is said to be a *pre-Andô tuple* for the commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  if  $\mathcal{F}$  is a Hilbert space,  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_{T_1 T_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is an isometry,  $P$  is a projection operator on  $\mathcal{F}$ , and  $U$  is a unitary operator on  $\mathcal{F}$ .

Two pre-Andô tuples  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}', \Lambda', P', U')$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$  are said to *coincide* if there is a unitary operator  $\tau: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$  such that

$$\tau\Lambda = \Lambda', \quad \tau P \tau^* = P', \quad \tau U \tau^* = U'.$$

Thus a pre-Andô tuple amounts to a BCL-tuple (see Definition 3.1.5), but with the added ingredient of the isometry  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_{T_1 T_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ , while coincidence of pre-Andô tuples is a natural extension of the notion of unitary equivalence of BCL-tuples in the sense of Theorem 3.1.6 (with the possible commuting pairs of unitary operators  $(W_1, W_2)$  and  $(W'_1, W'_2)$  ignored). When a pre-Andô tuple satisfies some additional natural conditions to be discussed below, we shall refer to the collection  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  simply as an Andô tuple.

We shall have need of two distinct types of Andô tuples: *Andô tuples of Type I* (see Section 4.2) and *Andô tuples of Type II* (see Section 4.5).

We define a notion of irreducibility for pre-Andô tuples.

**DEFINITION 4.1.2.** The pre-Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is said to be *irreducible* if the smallest subspace of  $\mathcal{F}$  invariant under  $U, U^*, P$  and containing  $\text{Ran } \Lambda$  is the whole space  $\mathcal{F}$ .

In view of Theorem 3.1.11, the pre-Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is irreducible if and only if the only reduced sub-BCL tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_0, P_0, U_0)$  of the BCL tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$  such that  $\mathcal{F}_0 \supset \text{Ran } \Lambda$  is the whole Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$ . Another equivalent statement is:  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is an irreducible pre-Andô tuple if and only if the smallest joint reducing subspace for  $(M_{U^*(P^\perp+zP)}, M_{(P+zP^\perp)U})$  containing  $H^2(\text{Ran } \Lambda)$  is the whole space  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$ . We shall need a notion of minimality for a pre-Andô tuple which we shall call *minimal*.

DEFINITION 4.1.3. The pre-Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is said to be *Douglas minimal* if the smallest joint invariant subspace for the BCL2 model  $(M_{U^*(P^\perp+zP)}, M_{(P+zP^\perp)U})$  containing the space  $H^2(\text{Ran } \Lambda)$  is the whole space  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$ .

Since any reducing subspace is also invariant, it is at the level of a tautology to see that minimality of an Andô tuple implies its irreducibility. In all the examples which we have checked, the converse also holds, but to this point, we have not been able to determine if the converse holds in general.

**4.2. Type I Andô tuples and Douglas model for an Andô lift.** Let us recall that given a contraction operator  $T$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , we may define a positive semidefinite operator  $Q_{T^*}^2$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  as the strong limit

$$Q_{T^*}^2 := \text{SOT-} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T^n T^{*n}, \quad (4.2.1)$$

We set  $Q_{T^*}$  equal to the positive-semidefinite square root of  $Q_{T^*}^2$ . As explained in Section 2.2 (see (2.2.3)), the identity  $TQ_{T^*}^2T^* = Q_{T^*}^2$  implies that the formula

$$X^*Q_{T^*}h = Q_{T^*}T^*h \quad (4.2.2)$$

extends by continuity to a well-defined isometry  $X^*$  on  $\overline{\text{Ran } Q_{T^*}}$  which has a minimal unitary extension, denoted as  $W_D^*$ , on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  equal to the closure of  $\cup_{n=0}^{\infty} W_D^n \text{Ran } Q_T$  defined densely as in formula (2.2.5):

$$W_D^*W_D^n Q_{T^*}h = W_D^{n-1}Q_{T^*}h \text{ for } n \geq 1, \quad W_D^*Q_{T^*}h = X^*Q_{T^*}h = Q_{T^*}T^*h.$$

Then, as explained in Section 2.2,  $(\Pi_D, V_D)$  is the Douglas minimal isometric lift for the single contraction operator  $T$ , where the isometry  $V_D$  on  $\left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  is defined as  $V_D = \begin{bmatrix} M_z & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix}$  and  $\Pi_D: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  is the isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{H}$  defined as  $\Pi_D = \begin{bmatrix} D_{T^*}(I-zT^*)^{-1} \\ Q \end{bmatrix}$ . The goal of this section is to give a Douglas-type model for an Andô isometric lift of a given commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . We first need some preliminaries.

**4.2.1. Canonical pair of commuting unitaries.** As a preliminary for extending the Douglas-model isometric lift to the commuting contractive pair setting, we shall need the following simple but telling result of Douglas. Here we use the standard notation: if  $X$  and  $Y$  are operators on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , we write  $X \preceq Y$  if  $Y - X$  is *positive semidefinite*, i.e.,  $\langle (Y - X)h, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \geq 0$  for all  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ .

LEMMA 4.2.1 (Douglas Lemma [24]). *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two bounded operators on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then there exists a contraction  $C$  such that  $A = BC$  if and only if*

$$AA^* \preceq BB^*.$$



The Douglas-model minimal isometric lift for the single contraction operator  $T$  as summarized in the introductory part of Section 4.2, but now applied to the case where  $T = T_1T_2$  is the product operator coming from the commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ , leads to the following result which will play a significant role in what follows.

**THEOREM 4.2.2.** *Given a commuting contractive operator pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ , set  $T = T_1T_2$  and let  $Q_{T^*}$  be given by (2.2.1) and (2.2.4). Then there exist a pair of unitary operators  $(W_{b_1}, W_{b_2})$  on  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  so that*

$$W_{b_1}W_{b_2} = W_D \text{ and } W_{b_j}^*Q_{T^*} = Q_{T^*}T_j^*, \text{ for each } j = 1, 2. \quad (4.2.3)$$

*Proof.* First note that when  $Q_{T^*}$  is as in (2.2.1) and  $T = T_1T_2 = T_2T_1$ , then

$$\langle T_i Q_{T^*}^2 T_i^* h, h \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle T^n (T_i T_i^*) T^{*n} h, h \rangle \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle T^n T^{*n} h, h \rangle = \langle Q_{T^*}^2 h, h \rangle$$

for all  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  from which we conclude that

$$T_1 Q_{T^*}^2 T_1^* \preceq Q_{T^*}^2 \text{ and } T_2 Q_{T^*}^2 T_2^* \preceq Q_{T^*}^2. \quad (4.2.4)$$

By Lemma 4.2.1, the inequalities in (4.2.4) imply that there exist two contraction operators  $X_1^*$  and  $X_2^*$  on  $\overline{\text{Ran}} Q_{T^*}$  such that

$$X_1^* Q_{T^*} = Q_{T^*} T_1^*, \quad X_2^* Q_{T^*} = Q_{T^*} T_2^*. \quad (4.2.5)$$

From the equalities in (4.2.5) and (4.2.2) it is clear that  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  commute and that

$$X^* = X_1^* X_2^*. \quad (4.2.6)$$

Since  $X^*$  is an isometry, both  $X_1^*$  and  $X_2^*$  are isometries, as a consequence of the general fact that, whenever  $T$  is an isometry with factorization  $T = T_1T_2$  for some commuting contractions  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , then in fact  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are also isometries; one way to see this is to look at the following norm equalities easily derived by using the commutativity of the contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ :

$$\|D_{T_1} T_2 h\|^2 + \|D_{T_2} h\|^2 = \|D_T h\|^2 = \|D_{T_1} h\|^2 + \|D_{T_2} T_1 h\|^2 \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

By Lemma 3.2.1 we get a commuting unitary extension  $(W_{b_1}^*, W_{b_2}^*)$  of the commuting isometric pair  $(X_1^*, X_2^*)$  on  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*} = \overline{\text{span}}\{W_D^n x : x \in \text{Ran } Q_{T^*} \text{ and } n \geq 0\}$ . Thus the product  $W_D^* = W_{b_1}^* W_{b_2}^*$  is the minimal unitary extension of the product  $X^* = X_1^* X_2^*$ . ■

The pair  $(W_{b_1}, W_{b_2})$  will be referred to as the *canonical pair of commuting unitaries* associated with the contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

We next address uniqueness of a canonical pair of unitaries  $(W_{b_1}, W_{b_2})$  for a given commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

**LEMMA 4.2.3.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $(T'_1, T'_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}'$  be two pairs of commuting contractions and  $(W_{b_1}, W_{b_2})$  on  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  and  $(W'_{b_1}, W'_{b_2})$  on  $\mathcal{Q}_{T'^*}$  be the respective pairs of commuting unitaries obtained from them as above. If  $(T_1, T_2)$  is unitarily equivalent to  $(T'_1, T'_2)$  via the unitary similarity  $\phi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$ , then  $(W_{b_1}, W_{b_2})$  and  $(W'_{b_1}, W'_{b_2})$  are unitarily equivalent via the induced unitary transformation  $\tau_\phi: \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{T'^*}$  determined by  $\tau_\phi: W_D^n Q_{T^*} h \rightarrow W_D'^n Q_{T'^*} \phi h$ . In particular, if  $(T_1, T_2) = (T'_1, T'_2)$ , then  $(W_{b_1}, W_{b_2}) = (W'_{b_1}, W'_{b_2})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$  be a unitary that intertwines  $(T_1, T_2)$  and  $(T'_1, T'_2)$ . Let us denote  $T = T_1 T_2$  and  $T' = T'_1 T'_2$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_{T'^*}$  be the limits of  $T^n T^{*n}$  and  $T'^n T'^{*n}$ , respectively, in the strong operator topology. Clearly,  $\phi$  intertwines  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_{T'^*}$ . Therefore  $\phi$  takes  $\overline{\text{Ran}} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  onto  $\overline{\text{Ran}} \mathcal{Q}_{T'^*}$ . We denote the restriction of  $\phi$  to  $\overline{\text{Ran}} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  by  $\phi$  itself. Let  $(X_1, X_2)$  on  $\overline{\text{Ran}} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  and  $(X'_1, X'_2)$  on  $\overline{\text{Ran}} \mathcal{Q}_{T'^*}$  be the pairs of commuting co-isometries corresponding to the pairs  $(T_1, T_2)$  and  $(T'_1, T'_2)$  as in (4.2.5), respectively. It is easy to see from the definition that

$$\phi(X_1, X_2) = (X'_1, X'_2)\phi.$$

Let  $(W_{b1}, W_{b2})$  on  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  and  $(W'_{b1}, W'_{b2})$  on  $\mathcal{Q}_{T'^*}$  be the pairs of commuting unitaries corresponding to  $(T_1, T_2)$  and  $(T'_1, T'_2)$ , respectively. Remembering the formula (2.2.4) for the spaces  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_{T'^*}$ , we can densely define  $\tau_\phi : \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{T'^*}$  by

$$\tau_\phi : W_D^n x \mapsto W_D'^n \phi x, \text{ for every } x \in \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \text{ and } n \geq 0 \quad (4.2.7)$$

and extend linearly and continuously. Trivially,  $\tau_\phi$  is unitary and intertwines  $W_D$  and  $W'_D$ . For a non-negative integer  $n$  and  $x$  in  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$ , we have using (4.2.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\phi W_{b1}(W_D^n x) &= \tau_\phi W_D^{n+1}(W_{b2}^* x) = W_D'^{n+1} \phi(X_2^* x) \\ &= W_D'^{n+1} W_{b2}^* \phi x = W_{b1}' W_D'^n \phi x = W_{b1}' \tau_\phi(W_D^n x). \end{aligned}$$

A similar computation shows that  $\tau_\phi$  intertwines  $W_{b2}$  and  $W'_{b2}$  too. ■

Note that in the above lemma, when  $(T_1, T_2) = (T'_1, T'_2)$ , then

$$\mathcal{Q}_{T^*} = \mathcal{Q}_{T'^*}, \quad \phi = I_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_\phi = I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}}.$$

Therefore the following is a straightforward consequence of the above lemma.

**COROLLARY 4.2.4.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive operator-pair and  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  be as in (4.2.1) where  $T = T_1 T_2$ . Let  $(W_1, W_2)$  be some pair of commuting unitaries on  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  such that*

$$W_D = W_1 W_2 \text{ and } W_j^* \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} = \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} T_j^* \text{ for } j = 1, 2. \quad (4.2.8)$$

*Then  $(W_1, W_2) = (W_{b1}, W_{b2})$ .*

**4.2.2. Douglas-type structure of a general Andô lift.** We shall see that minimal Andô lifts  $(V_1, V_2)$  of a given commuting contractive-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  are in one-to-one correspondence with Andô tuples associated with  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  which satisfy some additional conditions as follows.

**DEFINITION 4.2.5.** Given a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  and a pre-Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ , we say that  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  is a *Type I Andô tuple* for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  if the following additional conditions are satisfied:

$$P_*^\perp U_* \Lambda_* D_{T^*} + P_* U_* \Lambda_* D_{T^*} T^* = \Lambda_* D_{T^*} T_1^*, \quad (4.2.9)$$

$$U_*^* P_* \Lambda_* D_{T^*} + U_*^* P_*^\perp \Lambda_* D_{T^*} T^* = \Lambda_* D_{T^*} T_2^*. \quad (4.2.10)$$

If the Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  is Douglas-minimal when considered as a pre-Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  (see Definition 4.1.3), we say that  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  is a *Douglas-minimal Type \* Andô tuple* for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ .

Let us note that the notion of Type I Andô tuple for a given commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  is *coordinate-free* in the following sense: if  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  is a Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$  and if  $(\mathcal{F}'_*, \Lambda'_*, P'_*, U'_*)$  is a pre-Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$  which coincides with  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  (in the sense of Definition 4.1.1), then  $(\mathcal{F}'_*, \Lambda'_*, P'_*, U'_*)$  is also a Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

The next result provides a functional model for minimal Andô lifts  $(V_1, V_2)$  of a given commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  in terms of a Douglas-minimal Type I Andô tuples for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ .

**THEOREM 4.2.6.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a pair of commuting contractions and let  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  be a Douglas-minimal Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . Set  $T = T_1 T_2$ , let the unitary operator  $W_D$  on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  be as in the Douglas model for the minimal isometric lift of  $T$  (see Section 2.2), and let  $W_{b1}, W_{b2}$  be the canonical pair of commuting unitaries associated with  $(T_1, T_2)$  as in Theorem 4.2.2. Define operators and spaces by*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_D &= \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}, \\ (\mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2}) &= \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{U_*^*(P_*^+ + zP_*)} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{(P_*^+ + zP_*^+)U_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \text{ acting on } \mathcal{K}_D, \\ \mathbf{\Pi}_D &= \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*, T^*}} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.11)$$

Then  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  is a minimal Andô lift for  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

Conversely, given any minimal Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$ , there is a Douglas-minimal Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  so that the lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  is unitarily equivalent to the Douglas-model Andô lift (4.2.11) associated with  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  as in (4.2.11).

*Proof.* Suppose that  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  is a minimal Type I Andô tuple for the commuting pair of operators  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}$  and let  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  be as in (4.2.11). Note that  $(\mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  on  $\mathcal{K}_D$  is a pair of commuting isometries since this pair has the form of the BCL model for commuting isometric operator-pairs. Note that  $\mathbf{\Pi}_D$  can be factored

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_D = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*, T^*}} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$$

as the product of isometries, and hence is itself an isometric embedding  $\mathbf{\Pi}_D: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D$ . To show that  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  is an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  it remains only to verify the intertwining relations  $\mathbf{V}_{D,j}^* \mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{\Pi} T_j^*$  for  $j = 1, 2$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} (M_{U_*^* P_*^+ + z U_*^* P_*})^* & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1}^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*, T^*}} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*, T^*}} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} T_1^*, \\ \begin{bmatrix} (M_{P_* U_*^+ + z P_*^+ U_*})^* & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b2}^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*, T^*}} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*, T^*}} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} T_2^*, \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently, the system of equations

$$(I_{H^2} \otimes P_*^\perp U_* + M_z^* \otimes P_* U_*)(I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*) \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} = (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*) \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} T_1^*, \quad (4.2.12)$$

$$W_{b_1}^* Q_{T^*} = Q_{T^*} T_1^*, \quad (4.2.13)$$

$$(I_{H^2} \otimes U_*^* P_* + M_z^* \otimes U_*^* P_*^\perp)(I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*) \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} = (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*) \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} T_2^*, \quad (4.2.14)$$

$$W_{b_2}^* Q_{T^*} = Q_{T^*} T_2^*. \quad (4.2.15)$$

Note that equations (4.2.13) and (4.2.15) follow immediately from Theorem 4.2.2 (see the second identity in (4.2.3)). Applying (4.2.12) to a generic vector  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  gives

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (P_*^\perp U_* \Lambda_* D_{T^*} T^{*n} h + P_* U_* \Lambda_* D_{T^*} T^{*(n+1)} h) z^n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\Lambda_* D_{T^*} T^{*n} T_1^* h) z^n.$$

This identity between power series is the same as the matching of power series coefficients of the two sides holding for all  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ :

$$P_*^\perp U_* \Lambda_* D_{T^*} T^{*n} + P_* U_* \Lambda_* D_{T^*} T^{*(n+1)} = \Lambda_* D_{T^*} T^{*n} T_1^* \text{ for all } n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (4.2.16)$$

Since  $T_1^*$  and  $T^*$  commute, we see that the identity for the case of a general  $n$  follows from the special case of  $n = 0$  by multiplying on the right by  $T^{*n}$ ; hence the system of equations (4.2.16) is equivalent to the single equation

$$P_*^\perp U_* \Lambda_* D_{T^*} + P_* U_* \Lambda_* D_{T^*} T^* = \Lambda_* D_{T^*} T_1^*$$

which amounts to the operator equation (4.2.9). In a similar way condition (4.2.14) reduces to (4.2.10).

With notation as in (4.2.11) let us set

$$\mathcal{K}_{D,0} = \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} \mathbf{V}_{D,1}^{n_1} \mathbf{V}_{D,2}^{n_2} \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi}_D$$

To show that  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  is a minimal Andô lift for  $(T_1, T_2)$ , it remains only to show that  $\mathcal{K}_D = \mathcal{K}_{D,0}$ .

As an intermediate step, we shall first identify the smaller space

$$\mathcal{K}_{D,00} := \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{V}_{D,1}^n \mathbf{V}_{D,2}^n \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi}_D = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{V}_D^n \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi}_D \subset \mathcal{K}_{D,0} \quad (4.2.17)$$

where  $\mathbf{V}_D = \mathbf{V}_{D,1} \mathbf{V}_{D,2} = \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{F}^*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix}$  on  $\begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}^*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$ . Once  $\mathcal{K}_{D,00}$  is identified, we can find  $\mathcal{K}_{D,0}$  via the formula

$$\mathcal{K}_{D,0} = \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 = 0, 1, 2, \dots} \mathbf{V}_{D,1}^{n_1} \mathbf{V}_{D,2}^{n_2} \mathcal{K}_{D,00}. \quad (4.2.18)$$

Note that  $\mathbf{\Pi}_D$  given by (4.2.11) factors as

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_D = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Pi}_D$$

where

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_D = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D = \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$$

is the embedding operator for the Douglas-model isometric lift of  $T$  as in (2.2.8). Let us also note the intertwining

$$\mathbf{V}_D^n \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} V_D^n$$

where  $V_D = \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix}$  is the isometric lift of  $T$  in the Douglas model as in (2.2.7). Hence we see that, for  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\mathbf{V}_D^n \mathbf{\Pi}_D h = \mathbf{V}_D^n \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Pi}_D h = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} V_D^n \mathbf{\Pi}_D h$$

where

$$\bigvee_{n=0,1,2,\dots, h \in \mathcal{H}} V_D^n \mathbf{\Pi}_D h = \mathcal{K}_D := \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$$

since the Douglas-model lift of  $T$  is minimal, as seen in Proposition 2.2.2. We have now identified the space  $\mathcal{K}_{D,00}$  as being exactly equal to

$$\mathcal{K}_{D,00} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.2.19)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\text{Ran } \Lambda_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.2.20)$$

We now use the formula (4.2.18) to see that

$$\mathcal{K}_{D,0} = \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} \mathbf{V}_{D,1}^{n_1} \mathbf{V}_{D,2}^{n_2} \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\text{Ran } \Lambda_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} = \left[ \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} M_1^{n_1} M_2^{n_2} H^2(\text{Ran } \Lambda_*) \right]_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}},$$

where we use the short-hand notation

$$M_1 := M_{U_*^*(P_*^\perp + zP_*)}, \quad M_2 := M_{(P_* + zP_*^\perp)U_*}. \quad (4.2.21)$$

This space is equal to the whole space  $\mathcal{K}_D = \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$  exactly when

$$\bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} M_1^{n_1} M_2^{n_2} H^2(\text{Ran } \Lambda_*) = H^2(\mathcal{F}_*),$$

i.e., when the original Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_*, P_*, U_*, \Lambda_*)$  is minimal as an Andô tuple.

Conversely, suppose that  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  is any Andô lift for the commuting, contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Thus  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  is a commuting isometric operator-pair on some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathbf{\Pi}$  is an isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{K}$  so that

$$\mathbf{V}_j^* \mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{\Pi} T_j^* \text{ for } j = 1, 2.$$

By Theorem 3.1.4 we know that the commuting pair of isometries  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  is unitarily equivalent to its BCL2 model as in (3.1.9) acting on the space  $\mathcal{K} := \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} \end{bmatrix}$  via the unitary identification map  $\tau_{\text{BCL}}: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_0$  given by

$$\tau_{\text{BCL}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} \end{bmatrix} : \mathbf{k} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{k}.$$

Here  $\mathbf{V} := \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{V}_2$  satisfies the intertwining relation  $\mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \mathbf{V} = M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}} \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*}$ . For the case here where  $\mathbf{V}$  is an isometry, the operator  $\mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*}$  is a partial isometry onto

the model space  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*})$  for the shift-part of  $\mathbf{V}$  in its Wold decomposition, while  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} = \text{SOT-lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{V}^n \mathbf{V}^{*n}$  is the projection of  $\mathcal{K}$  onto the unitary subspace  $\mathcal{H}_u = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \text{Ran } \mathbf{V}^n$  in the Wold decomposition of  $\mathbf{V}$ . Moreover we have the intertwining relations involving the operators  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  in the factorization of  $\mathbf{V}$ :

$$\mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \mathbf{V}_1 = M_1 \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*}, \quad \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \mathbf{V}_2 = M_2 \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*}$$

where  $M_1, M_2$  are as in (4.2.21) and the projection operator  $P_*$  and the unitary operator  $U_*$  on  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}$  form a Type II BCL-tuple  $(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}, P_*, U_*)$  as in Theorem 3.1.4. Let us also introduce operators  $W_1, W_2, W$  on  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} = \mathcal{H}_u$  according to

$$W_1 = \mathbf{V}_1|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*}}, \quad W_2 = \mathbf{V}_2|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*}}, \quad W = \mathbf{V}|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*}}$$

and define an isometric embedding map  $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K} = \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  according to

$$\Pi = \tau_{\text{BCL}} \mathbf{\Pi} = \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right] \mathbf{\Pi}. \quad (4.2.22)$$

Then it is easily checked that

$$\left( \Pi, \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_1 & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_2 & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) \quad (4.2.23)$$

is also an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  which is unitarily equivalent (as an Andô lift) to our original more abstract Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$ .

Embedded in the lift (4.2.23) is an isometric lift  $\left( \Pi, \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right)$  for the product contraction operator  $T = T_1 T_2$  but this lift is not necessarily minimal as a lift of  $T$ . However, we can always restrict the lift space  $\mathcal{K}$  appropriately to arrive at a minimal lift for  $T$ . Namely, if we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{00} &= \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{smallmatrix} \right]^n \text{Ran } \Pi_0, \\ \Pi_{00}: \mathcal{H} &\rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{00} \text{ given by } \Pi_{00} h = \Pi h \in \text{Ran } \Pi \subset \mathcal{K}_{00}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.24)$$

then

$$\left( \Pi_{00}, \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{smallmatrix} \right] \Big|_{\mathcal{K}_{00}} \right)$$

is a *minimal* isometric lift for the product contraction operator  $T = T_1 T_2$ .

On the other hand, the Douglas model for the minimal isometric lift of  $T$  (see Section 2.2.2) has the form  $(\Pi_D, V_D)$  where  $\Pi_D$  is the isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{K}_D := \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  given by

$$\Pi_D: h \mapsto \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right] h.$$

and where

$$V_D = \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{smallmatrix} \right]: \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right] \rightarrow \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right].$$

By the uniqueness of minimal isometric lifts, there exists a unique unitary operator  $\widehat{\Gamma}_0: \mathcal{K}_D \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{00} \subset \mathcal{K}$  so that

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_0 \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix} = \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{bmatrix} \Big|_{\mathcal{K}_{00}} \right) \widehat{\Gamma}_0, \quad (4.2.25)$$

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_0 \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} = \Pi_{00}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{00} \subset \mathcal{K}. \quad (4.2.26)$$

To gain added flexibility let us view the unitary operator  $\widehat{\Gamma}_0$  from  $\left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  to  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  as actually an isometry, now denoted more simply as  $\widehat{\Gamma}$ , mapping into  $\mathcal{K} = \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$ . Let us write out  $\widehat{\Gamma}$  as a  $2 \times 2$ -block operator matrix

$$\widehat{\Gamma} = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma & \Gamma_{12} \\ \Gamma_{21} & \Gamma_{22} \end{bmatrix}: \mathcal{K}_D = \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathcal{K} = \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.2.27)$$

Recalling the formula (4.2.24) for  $\Pi_{\min}$  and the formula for  $\Pi$  in (4.2.22) we may rewrite (4.2.26) as

$$\widehat{\Gamma} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \\ Q_{\mathbf{V}^*} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Pi}. \quad (4.2.28)$$

From (4.2.25) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} &= M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}} \Gamma, & \Gamma_{12} W_D &= M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}} \Gamma_{12}, \\ \Gamma_{21} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} &= W \Gamma_{21}, & \Gamma_{22} W_D &= W \Gamma_{22} \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.29)$$

As  $W_D$  is unitary and  $M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}}$  is a shift, we see from item (1) in Lemma 3.1.2 that the second intertwining condition in (4.2.29) implies that  $\Gamma_{12} = 0$  and hence  $\widehat{\Gamma}$  collapses to

$$\widehat{\Gamma} = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma & 0 \\ \Gamma_{21} & \Gamma_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.2.30)$$

From (4.2.28) we then pick up the additional relations

$$\Gamma \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} = \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \mathbf{\Pi}, \quad \Gamma_{21} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} + \Gamma_{22} Q_{T^*} = Q_{\mathbf{V}^*} \mathbf{\Pi}. \quad (4.2.31)$$

Consider next the following variants of the identity (2.2.12):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} - M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} T^* &= \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_{T^*}}^* D_{T^*}, \\ \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} - M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}} \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \mathbf{V}^* &= \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}}^* D_{\mathbf{V}^*}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.32)$$

Use the first relation in (4.2.31) together with the fact that  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V})$  is a lift of  $T$  to get

$$M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}} (\Gamma \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*}) T^* = M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}} (\mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \mathbf{\Pi}) T^* = M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}} \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \mathbf{V}^* \mathbf{\Pi}. \quad (4.2.33)$$

Using the second relation in (4.2.32) together with again (4.2.31) then enables us to compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_{T^*}}^* D_{T^*} &= \Gamma \left( \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} - M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} T^* \right) \text{ (by (4.2.32))} \\ &= \left( \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} - M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}} \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \mathbf{V}^* \right) \mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}}^* D_{\mathbf{V}^*} \mathbf{\Pi}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.34)$$

i.e., the operator  $\Gamma: H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*})$  maps constant functions in  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$  to constant functions in  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*})$ . Since  $\Gamma: H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*})$  has the shift intertwining property (the first relation in (4.2.29)), we conclude that there must be an operator  $\Lambda_*: \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}$  so that  $\Gamma$  is ‘‘multiplication by a constant’’:  $\Gamma = I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*$ . From the implicit formula (4.2.34) we see that  $\Lambda_*$  must be given by

$$\Lambda_*: D_{T^*}h \mapsto D_{\mathbf{V}^*}\mathbf{\Pi}h. \quad (4.2.35)$$

Let us note next that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_{T^*}h\|^2 &= \|h\|^2 - \|T^*h\|^2 = \|\mathbf{\Pi}h\|^2 - \|\mathbf{\Pi}T^*h\|^2 = \|\mathbf{\Pi}h\|^2 - \|\mathbf{V}^*\mathbf{\Pi}h\|^2 \\ &= \langle (I - \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^*)\mathbf{\Pi}h, \mathbf{\Pi}h \rangle = \|D_{\mathbf{V}^*}\mathbf{\Pi}h\|^2 = \|\Lambda_*D_{T^*}h\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

so  $\Lambda_*$  is an isometry. Combining the representation (4.2.30) with the fact that  $\Gamma = I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*$  is an isometry since  $\Lambda_*$  is isometric and that fact that  $\widehat{\Gamma}$  is also an isometry, we are now finally able to conclude that  $\Gamma_{21} = 0$  as well. We thus now have reduced  $\widehat{\Gamma}$  to the diagonal form

$$\widehat{\Gamma} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma_{22} \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.2.36)$$

where  $\Gamma_{22}$  is an isometry from  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  to  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*}$ . We note also that the four intertwining conditions (4.2.29) now collapse to the two intertwining conditions

$$(I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} = M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}}(I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*), \quad \Gamma_{22}W_D = W\Gamma_{22}, \quad (4.2.37)$$

and the condition (4.2.28) splits into the two operator equations

$$\mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*}\mathbf{\Pi} = (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*}, \quad \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*}\mathbf{\Pi} = \Gamma_{22}\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}. \quad (4.2.38)$$

We conclude that the transcription (4.2.28) of the lifting-embedding map for the Andô lift (4.2.23) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Pi} = \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \Gamma_{22}\mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.2.39)$$

and the lifting property for the collection (4.2.23) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} M_j^* & 0 \\ 0 & W_j^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \Gamma_{22}\mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \Gamma_{22}\mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} T_j^* \text{ for } j = 1, 2 \\ \begin{bmatrix} (M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}})^* & 0 \\ 0 & W^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \Gamma_{22}\mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \Gamma_{22}\mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} T^*. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.40)$$

Finally let us note that the fact that we have now identified  $\Lambda_*: \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}$  as an isometry means that the tuple  $(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}, P_*, U_*, \Lambda_*)$  is a pre-Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . As in the forward direction (the analysis following equations (4.2.12)-(4.2.15)), a comparison of the coefficients of

$$M_j^*(I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} = (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*}T_j^* \text{ for } j = 1, 2$$

yields that  $(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}, P_*, U_*, \Lambda_*)$  is actually a Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ .

By construction the ambient space  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  (4.2.24) for the minimal lift  $\left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{array} \right] \Big|_{\mathcal{K}_{00}}$



of the product contraction operator  $T = T_1 T_2$  embedded inside  $\mathcal{K}_0$  is given by

$$\mathcal{K}_{00} = \widehat{\Gamma} \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*) H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \Gamma_{22} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.2.41)$$

i.e., we finally see that the subspace  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  initially defined as in (4.2.24) splits with respect to the orthogonal block-decomposition appearing in the ambient space  $\mathcal{K} = \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} \end{bmatrix}$ .

We would like next to analyze the copy of the minimal Andô isometric lift for the commuting, contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  obtained by restricting  $\begin{bmatrix} M_1 & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_2 & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix}$  ( $(M_1, M_2)$  as in (4.2.21)) to the subspace  $\mathcal{K}_0$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_0 &= \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}^{n_1} \begin{bmatrix} M_2 & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix}^{n_2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \mathbf{V}^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} \end{bmatrix} \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi} \right\} \\ &= \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}^{n_1} \begin{bmatrix} M_2 & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix}^{n_2} \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*) \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \Gamma_{22} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

As  $\mathcal{K}_0$  a priori is given by the same formula but with the non-negative integers  $n_1, n_2$  constrained to satisfy  $n_1 = n_2$ , it is clear that we have the nesting of subspaces

$$\mathcal{K}_{00} \subset \mathcal{K}_0 \subset \mathcal{K}.$$

Due to the splitting appearing in the formula (4.2.41) for  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$ , we see that  $\mathcal{K}_0$  can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_0 &= \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}^{n_1} \begin{bmatrix} M_2 & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix}^{n_2} \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*) H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \Gamma_{22} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \right\} \\ &= \left[ \begin{array}{c} \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} M_1^{n_1} M_2^{n_2} \Gamma H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} W_1^{n_1} W_2^{n_2} \Gamma_{22} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{array} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.42)$$

We first analyze the bottom component

$$\bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} W_1^{n_1} W_2^{n_2} \Gamma_{22} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*}.$$

From the second intertwining relation in (4.2.37) we see that  $\text{Ran } \Gamma_{22}$  is invariant under  $W$ . On the other hand, we see from (4.2.40) and the intertwining properties (2.2.5) that

$$W^* \Gamma_{22} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} = \Gamma_{22} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} T^* = \Gamma_{22} W_D^* \mathcal{Q}_{T^*}.$$

More generally, for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} W^* \Gamma_{22} (W_D^k \mathcal{Q}_{T^*}) &= W^* W^k \Gamma_{22} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} = W^{k-1} \Gamma_{22} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} = \Gamma_{22} W_D^{k-1} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \\ &= \Gamma_{22} W_D^* (W_D^k \mathcal{Q}_{T^*}). \end{aligned}$$

As  $\bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} W_D^k \text{Ran } \mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  by definition (see (2.2.4)), we conclude that  $\text{Ran } \Gamma_{22}$  is also invariant under  $W^*$  and furthermore we have the intertwining  $W^* \Gamma_{22} = \Gamma_{22} W_D^*$ . Thus we conclude that  $\Gamma_{22}: \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \rightarrow \Gamma_{22} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  is unitary and implements a unitary equivalence between the unitary operator  $W|_{\text{Ran } \Gamma_{22}}$  on  $\text{Ran } \Gamma_{22}$  and the unitary operator  $W_D$  on  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$ .

We next argue that  $\text{Ran } \Gamma_{22}$  is reducing for  $W_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) as well and that the unitary operator  $\Gamma_{22}: \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \rightarrow \text{Ran } \Gamma_{22}$  implements a unitary equivalence between the operator

$W_{bj}$  on  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  (given by Theorem 4.2.2) and  $W_j|_{\text{Ran } \Gamma_{22}}$  on  $\text{Ran } \Gamma_{22}$ . Indeed, from (4.2.40) together with the intertwining given in Theorem 4.2.2, we see that, for  $j = 1, 2$ ,

$$W_j^* \Gamma_{22} Q_{T^*} = \Gamma_{22} Q_{T^*} T_j^* = \Gamma_{22} W_{bj}^* Q_{T^*}$$

and more generally, for  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} W_j^* \Gamma_{22} (W_D^k Q_{T^*}) &= W^k W_j^* \Gamma_{22} Q_{T^*} = W^k \Gamma_{22} W_{bj}^* Q_{T^*} = \Gamma_{22} W_D^k W_{bj}^* Q_{T^*} \\ &= \Gamma_{22} W_{bj}^* (W_D^k Q_{T^*}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.43)$$

As  $\cup_{k=0}^{\infty} \text{Ran } W_D^k Q_{T^*}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$ , these computations show not only that  $\text{Ran } \Gamma_{22}$  is invariant under  $W_j^*$  but also the intertwining:  $W_j^* \Gamma_{22} = \Gamma_{22} W_{bj}^*$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . Also, by taking adjoint of these intertwining relations and using the fact that the operators  $W_{bj}$  and  $W_j$  (for  $j = 1, 2$ ) all are unitary operators, we see that  $\Gamma_{22} W_{bj} = W_j \Gamma_{22}$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . This implies that  $\text{Ran } \Gamma_{22}$  is invariant under  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  as well.

Let us now recall the expression (4.2.42) for  $\mathcal{K}_0$ . From the preceding analysis, we see that

$$\mathcal{K}_0 = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} M_1^{n_1} M_2^{n_2} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \text{Ran } \Gamma_{22} \end{array} \right].$$

Note that minimality of the Andô lift (4.2.23) just means that

$$\mathcal{K}_0 = \mathcal{K} = \left[ \begin{array}{c} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}) \\ \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*} \end{array} \right]$$

which is equivalent to the following two conditions holding simultaneously:

$$H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}) = \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} M_1^{n_1} M_2^{n_2} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*) H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \quad (4.2.44)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*} = \Gamma_{22} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*}. \quad (4.2.45)$$

By definition, condition (4.2.44) holds exactly when the Andô tuple

$$(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$$

is *minimal*, while the second condition (4.2.45) holds exactly when  $\Gamma_{22}$  is *unitary* (i.e., a surjective isometry). When this is the case, the preceding analysis shows that we can use  $\Gamma_{22}$  to identify  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  with  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*}$  and that under this unitary identification the operators  $W$ ,  $W_1$ ,  $W_2$  on  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{V}^*}$  become the operators  $W_D$ ,  $W_{b,1}$ ,  $W_{b,2}$  on  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  and the collection (4.2.23) has the form of the functional-model Andô lift (4.2.11) based on the Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ .

Finally, let us recall that the Andô lift (4.2.23) is constructed so as to be unitarily equivalent to the original abstract Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$ . Hence minimality of  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  is equivalent to minimality of the collection (4.2.23) as an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Thus, if we start with a minimal abstract Andô lift, we have shown that it is unitarily equivalent to a functional model Andô lift (4.2.11) constructed from a minimal Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ , in this case  $(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{V}^*}, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$ . ■

We now illustrate the Douglas model for Andô lifts with a couple of special cases.

**EXAMPLE 4.2.7. Illustrative special cases for Douglas-model Andô lifts.**

**1.  $(T_1, T_2) = \text{BCL2-model commuting isometric operator-pair}$ :** Let us consider the special case where  $(T_1, T_2) = (V_1, V_2)$  is a BCL2-model for a commuting pair of isometries with product  $V = V_1 V_2$  equal to a shift

$$\begin{aligned} (T_1, T_2, T := T_1 T_2 = T_2 T_1) &= (M_{U^* P^\perp + z U^* P}, M_{P U + z P^\perp U}, M_z^{\mathcal{F}}) \\ &= ((I_{H^2} \otimes U^* P^\perp) + (M_z^{\mathcal{F}} \otimes U^* P), (I_{H^2} \otimes P U) + (M_z^{\mathcal{F}} \otimes P^\perp U), M_z^{\mathcal{F}}) \end{aligned}$$

on  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  (where the latter tensor-product formulation is often more convenient for computations), where  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$  is a BCL-tuple ( $\mathcal{F} =$  a coefficient Hilbert space while  $P$  is a projection and  $U$  is a unitary operator on  $\mathcal{F}$ ). In this case  $(T_1, T_2)$  is already a commutative isometric pair, so  $(V_1, V_2) = (T_1, T_2)$  is a minimal isometric lift of itself  $(T_1, T_2)$ . When we go through the construction in the proof of Theorem 4.2.6, we see that the Douglas-minimal Type II Andô tuple which we are led to consists of the original BCL-tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$  augmented by the isometric embedding map  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  given by  $\Lambda: D_{T^*} h = D_{V^*} h \mapsto h(0) \in \mathcal{F}$  for  $h \in H^2(\mathcal{F})$ . It is easy to check directly that  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  so defined is a Douglas-minimal Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*) = (V_1^*, V_2^*)$  (with trivial commuting unitary-operator piece  $(W_1, W_2)$ ), as expected from the general computations underlying the proof of Theorem 4.2.6. This makes precise how a BCL2-model embeds into a Douglas-model Andô lift.

More abstractly, using the BCL2-model for any commuting isometric operator-pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  such that  $V_1 V_2$  is a shift operator, we can assert: *if  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting isometric pair such that  $T = T_1 T_2$  is a shift operator, then any Douglas-minimal Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  has the property that  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is unitary and  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$  is a BCL2 tuple for the commuting isometric pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ .*

**2.  $(T_1, T_2) = \text{the adjoint of a BCL2-model commuting isometric operator pair}$ :** We now consider the case where  $(T_1, T_2) = (V_1^*, V_2^*)$  is a commuting co-isometric operator-pair, where  $(V_1, V_2)$  is as in the previous example (1). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (T_1, T_2, T) &= (V_1^*, V_2^*, V^*) = \\ &= ((I_{H^2} \otimes P^\perp U) + ((M_z^{\mathcal{F}})^* \otimes P U), (I_{H^2} \otimes U^* P) + ((M_z^{\mathcal{F}})^* \otimes U^* P^\perp), (M_z^{\mathcal{F}})^*). \end{aligned}$$

The Andô lifting problem comes down to the commuting-unitary extension problem treated in Lemma 4.2.3. The result is that the minimal isometric lift consists of the commuting unitary operators  $(M_{\varphi_1^*}, M_{\varphi_2^*})$  acting on  $L^2(\mathcal{F})$ , where

$$\varphi_1^*(\zeta) = P^\perp U + \bar{\zeta} P U, \quad \varphi_2^*(\zeta) = U^* P + \bar{\zeta} U^* P^\perp.$$

The BCL2-tuple has trivial shift part  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  and non-trivial commuting unitary part  $(M_{\varphi_1^*}, M_{\varphi_2^*})$  acting on  $L^2(\mathcal{F})$ .

**4.3. Special Andô tuples.** In this section, starting with a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ , we construct a class of pre-Andô tuples for  $(T_1, T_2)$  which we refer to as *special Andô tuples* for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Special Andô tuples, when put in canonical form, are defined in a constructive manner, so there is no issue with their existence as is the case for Type I Andô tuples defined in terms of the existence of solutions of some operator equations. We shall see that any special Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  is also a Type

I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ , thereby confirming the existence of Type I Andô tuples. Conversely, for each computable simple example that we have been able to work out the converse holds: any Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  turns out to be special. However, the validity of the converse statement in full generality remains an open problem. We think it instructive to push the formalism as far as possible without a commutativity assumption, and then see the further consequences arising from a commutativity assumption.

Suppose that  $T: \mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$  is a (possibly non-square) Hilbert-space contraction operator having a factorization

$$T = T'T''$$

where  $T': \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$  and  $T'': \mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1$  are also contraction operators. Then the identity

$$\begin{aligned} D_T^2 &= I - T^*T = I - T''^*T'^*T'T'' = T''^*(I - T'^*T')T'' + I - T''^*T'' \\ &= T''^*D_{T'}^2T'' + D_{T''}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.3.1)$$

implies that the map  $Z: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T'} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T''}$  defined densely by

$$Z: D_T h \mapsto D_{T'} T'' h \oplus D_{T''} h \text{ for } h \in \mathcal{H} \quad (4.3.2)$$

extends to an isometry. Such isometries come up in the characterization of invariant subspaces for a contraction operator in terms of its Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional model (see [43, Chapter VII] and Chapter 8 below). An important special case is the case where  $T = T' \cdot T''$  is a *regular factorization* as defined next.

**DEFINITION 4.3.1.** Given a contraction operator  $T: \mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  with factorization  $T = T' \cdot T''$  for contraction operators  $T': \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  and  $T'': \mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$ , we say that the factorization  $T = T' \cdot T''$  is *regular* if it is the case that the operator  $Z: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T'} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T''}$  in (4.3.2) is surjective (so  $Z: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T'} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T''}$  is unitary).

Now let us suppose that  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting contractive pair on  $\mathcal{H}$  and that we set  $T = T_1 \cdot T_2 = T_2 \cdot T_1$ . Then we have two versions of (4.3.1) corresponding to setting  $T' = T_1, T'' = T_2$  or the reverse  $T' = T_2, T'' = T_1$ :

$$D_T^2 = T_2^* D_{T_1}^2 T_2 + D_{T_2}^2, \quad D_T^2 = D_{T_1}^2 + T_1^* D_{T_2}^2 T_1 \quad (4.3.3)$$

from which we conclude in particular that

$$T_2^* D_{T_1}^2 T_2 + D_{T_1}^2 = D_{T_1}^2 + T_1^* D_{T_2}^2 T_1. \quad (4.3.4)$$

As a consequence of the first identity in (4.3.3), we see that the operator  $\Lambda_\dagger: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  defined densely by

$$\Lambda_\dagger: D_T h \mapsto D_{T_1} T_2 h \oplus D_{T_2} h \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{H} \quad (4.3.5)$$

is an isometry from  $\mathcal{D}_T$  into  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$ . Let us introduce the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{U_0} &:= \text{clos.}\{D_{T_1} T_2 h \oplus D_{T_2} h: h \in \mathcal{H}\} \subset \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}, \\ \mathcal{R}_{U_0} &:= \text{clos.}\{D_{T_1} h \oplus D_{T_2} T_1 h: h \in \mathcal{H}\} \subset \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3.6)$$

As a consequence of (4.3.4), we see that the operator  $U_0: \mathcal{D}_{U_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{U_0}$  defined densely by

$$U_0: D_{T_1} T_2 h \oplus D_{T_2} h \mapsto D_{T_1} h \oplus D_{T_2} T_1 h \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{H} \quad (4.3.7)$$

is unitary. If  $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{U}_0}^\perp$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{U}_0}^\perp$  have the same dimension, we can find a unitary identification map  $U_{00}: \mathcal{D}_{\bar{U}_0}^\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{\bar{U}_0}^\perp$  and then define a unitary operator

$$U_\dagger: \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$$

by setting

$$U_\dagger|_{\mathcal{D}_{U_0}} = U_0, \quad U_\dagger|_{\mathcal{D}_{\bar{U}_0}^\perp} = U_{00} \quad (4.3.8)$$

and then extending by linearity. Even if it is the case that  $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{U}_0}^\perp$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{U}_0}^\perp$  have different dimensions, we may introduce an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{F}_{\dagger 0}$  so that  $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{U}_0}^\perp \oplus \mathcal{F}_{\dagger 0}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{U}_0}^\perp \oplus \mathcal{F}_{\dagger 0}$  have the same dimension (here we are assuming that all Hilbert spaces are separable), introduce a unitary identification map  $U_{00}: \mathcal{D}_{\bar{U}_0}^\perp \oplus \mathcal{F}_{\dagger 0} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{\bar{U}_0}^\perp \oplus \mathcal{F}_{\dagger 0}$ , and then obtain a unitary operator  $U_\dagger$  on the larger space  $\mathcal{F}_\dagger := \mathcal{D}_{U_0} \oplus \mathcal{R}_{U_0} \oplus \mathcal{F}_{\dagger 0}$  by setting

$$U_\dagger|_{\mathcal{D}_{U_0}} = U_0, \quad U_\dagger|_{\mathcal{D}_{\bar{U}_0}^\perp \oplus \mathcal{F}_{\dagger 0}} = U_{00}$$

and extending by linearity.

In addition we let  $P_\dagger$  be any projection operator on  $\mathcal{F}_\dagger$  which is an extension of the projection operator

$$P_0: d \oplus r \mapsto d \oplus 0$$

defined on  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$ , i.e.,  $P_\dagger$  is any projection operator on  $\mathcal{F}_\dagger$  of the form

$$P_\dagger: d \oplus r \oplus f_0 \mapsto d \oplus 0 \oplus P_{\dagger 0} f_0 \text{ for } d \oplus r \oplus f_0 \in \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2} \oplus \mathcal{F}_{\dagger 0} = \mathcal{F}_\dagger \quad (4.3.9)$$

where  $P_{\dagger 0}$  is any choice of orthogonal projection on  $\mathcal{F}_{\dagger 0}$ . For future reference we now introduce the formal definition of *special Andô tuple*.

**DEFINITION 4.3.2.** Given a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , any collection of spaces and operators  $(\mathcal{F}_\dagger, \Lambda_\dagger, P_\dagger, U_\dagger)$  constructed as in (4.3.5), (4.3.8), (4.3.9) will be called a *canonical special Andô tuple* for the pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . We shall say that pre-Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}'_\dagger, \Lambda'_\dagger, P'_\dagger, U'_\dagger)$  coinciding (in the sense of Definition 4.1.1) with a canonical special Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_\dagger, \Lambda_\dagger, P_\dagger, U_\dagger)$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$  is simply a *special Andô tuple* for  $(T_1, T_2)$  (not necessarily in canonical form). Canonical special Andô tuples for the adjoint pair  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  will often be denoted by  $(\mathcal{F}_{\dagger*}, \Lambda_{\dagger*}, P_{\dagger*}, U_{\dagger*})$ . We shall say that  $(\mathcal{F}_\dagger, \Lambda_\dagger, P_\dagger, U_\dagger)$  is an *irreducible special Andô tuple* if in addition it is the case that the smallest subspace of  $\mathcal{F}_\dagger$  containing  $\text{Ran } \Lambda_\dagger$  which is invariant for  $U_\dagger, U_{\dagger}^*$ , and  $P_\dagger$  is the whole space  $\mathcal{F}_\dagger$ . If  $(\mathcal{F}_\dagger, \Lambda_\dagger, P_\dagger, U_\dagger)$  is a canonical special Andô tuple, irreducibility means that the smallest reducing subspace for  $U_\dagger$  containing  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  is the whole space  $\mathcal{F}_\dagger$ .

Note that the point of the distinction between *canonical special Andô tuple* and *special Andô tuple* for  $(T_1, T_2)$  is that the notion of *canonical special Andô tuple* is not coordinate-free. The enlarged class of *special Andô tuples* as in Definition 4.3.2 then is the coincidence envelope of the *canonical special Andô tuples* (the smallest collection of Andô tuples containing the canonical special Andô tuples which is invariant under the relation of coincidence).

*Notation 4.3.3.* For a given commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ , the Douglas model for Andô isometric lifts of  $(T_1, T_2)$  corresponding to some canonical special Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  will be denoted by  $(\Pi_b, V_{b1}, V_{b2})$  and  $V_b = V_{b1} V_{b2}$ .

REMARK 4.3.4. We note that canonical special Andô tuples are easily constructed. There are various scenarios possible which we discuss in turn.

**Scenario 1:**  $(T_1, T_2)$  such that both  $T = T_1 \cdot T_2$  and  $T = T_2 \cdot T_1$  are regular factorizations.

We have seen that the first identity in (4.3.3) implies that  $\Lambda_{\dagger}$  given by (4.3.5) is an isometry. Let us now note also that the second identity in (4.3.3) implies that the map  $\Lambda'_{\dagger}: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  given by

$$\Lambda'_{\dagger}: D_T h \mapsto D_{T_1} h \oplus D_{T_2} T_1 h \text{ for } h \in \mathcal{H}$$

is an isometry. Note also from the definitions that

$$\text{Ran } \Lambda_{\dagger} = \mathcal{D}_{U_0}, \quad \text{Ran } \Lambda'_{\dagger} = \mathcal{R}_{U_0}.$$

By definition  $T = T_1 \cdot T_2$  is a regular factorization exactly when  $\overline{\text{Ran } \Lambda_{\dagger}}$  is the whole space  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{D}_{U_0} = \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}.$$

Similarly,  $T = T_2 \cdot T_1$  is a regular factorization exactly when  $\text{Ran } \Lambda'_{\dagger} = \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$ , i.e., when

$$\mathcal{R}_{U_0} = \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}.$$

Thus, when it is the case that both  $T = T_1 \cdot T_2$  and  $T = T_2 \cdot T_1$  are regular factorizations,  $U_0$  given by (4.3.7) actually already defines a unitary operator on  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  and conversely: if  $\mathcal{D}_{U_0} = \mathcal{R}_{U_0} = \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  so  $U_0$  already defines a unitary operator on  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$ , then both  $T = T_1 \cdot T_2$  and  $T = T_2 \cdot T_1$  are regular factorizations. If this is the case, then any other unitary extension  $\tilde{U}$  must agree with  $U_0$  on  $\mathcal{D}_{U_0} = \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  and hence  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  is already reducing for  $\tilde{U}$  forcing us to the conclusion that  $\tilde{U} = U_0$ . We conclude: *in case both  $T_1 \cdot T_2$  and  $T_2 \cdot T_1$  are regular factorizations, then the commuting, contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a unique irreducible special Andô tuple in canonical form.*

**Scenario 2:**  $\dim \mathcal{D}_{U_0}^{\perp} = \dim \mathcal{R}_{U_0}^{\perp} > 0$  (here the orthogonal complements are taken with respect to the ambient space  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$ .) In this case, we can extend  $U_0$  to a unitary operator  $U$  on all of  $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  by choosing any unitary identification map  $U'_0: \mathcal{D}_{U_0}^{\perp} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{U_0}^{\perp}$ , then defining

$$U|_{\mathcal{D}_{U_0}} = U_0: \mathcal{D}_{U_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{U_0}, U|_{\mathcal{D}_{U_0}^{\perp}} = U'_0: \mathcal{D}_{U_0}^{\perp} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{U_0}^{\perp}$$

and then extending  $U$  to a unitary operator  $U$  on all of

$$\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2} = \mathcal{D}_{U_0} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{U_0}^{\perp} = \mathcal{R}_{U_0} \oplus \mathcal{R}_{U_0}^{\perp}$$

by linearity. Then any such  $U$  induces a irreducible Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}, P, U)$  since the subspace  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  is already reducing for  $U$ . However, we see that there is freedom in the choice of the operator  $U'_0: \mathcal{D}_{U_0}^{\perp} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{U_0}^{\perp}$ . We conclude that in this case *irreducible special Andô tuples exist but do not have a unique representative in canonical form.* In fact, as we shall see in examples to come, there are canonical minimal special Andô tuples with the ambient Hilbert space  $\mathcal{F}$  properly containing  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$ .

**Scenario 3:**  $\dim \mathcal{D}_{U_0}^{\perp} \neq \dim \mathcal{R}_{U_0}^{\perp}$ . In this case, we may enlarge the ambient space  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  to the space  $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2} \oplus \ell^2$  (here  $\ell^2$  can be taken to be any separable infinite-

dimensional Hilbert space). Then we are in the Scenario 2 setting

$$\dim \mathcal{D}_{U_0}^\perp = \dim \mathcal{D}_{R_0}^\perp = \infty$$

but where we now take the ambient space to be  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2} \oplus \ell^2$  rather than just  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$ . We may then proceed as in Scenario 2 to construct a unitary extension of  $U_0$ . We can always arrange for the resulting canonical-form special Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_\dagger, \Lambda_\dagger, U_\dagger, P_\dagger)$  to be irreducible by cutting  $\mathcal{F}_\dagger$  down to the smallest reducing subspace for  $U_\dagger$  containing  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$ . Due to the freedom in the choice of unitary extension of the partially defined  $U_0$ , it is clear that irreducible special Andô tuples for  $(T_1, T_2)$  are not unique.

As a corollary of the extended discussion in Remark 4.3.4 we get:

**COROLLARY 4.3.5.** (1) *A commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  always has a special Andô tuple.*

(2)  *$(T_1, T_2)$  has a unique (up to coincidence) irreducible special Andô tuple if and only if  $T_1 \cdot T_2$  and  $T_2 \cdot T_1$  are regular factorizations.*

The question arises as to whether it suffices to assume that only one of the factorizations  $T_1 \cdot T_2$  and  $T_2 \cdot T_1$  is regular. This issue is resolved by the following result.

**THEOREM 4.3.6.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting, contractive pair of contraction operators on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ .*

1. *Assume that all defect spaces  $\mathcal{D}_T, \mathcal{D}_{T_1}, \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  are finite-dimensional. Then  $T_1 \cdot T_2$  is a regular factorization if and only if  $T_2 \cdot T_1$  is a regular factorization.*
2. *In the infinite-dimensional setting, it is possible for one of the factorizations  $T_1 \cdot T_2$  (respectively  $T_2 \cdot T_1$ ) to be regular while the other  $T_2 \cdot T_1$  (respectively  $T_1 \cdot T_2$ ) is not regular.*
3. *Suppose that  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting pair of isometries (so that trivially both  $T_1 \cdot T_2$  and  $T_2 \cdot T_1$  are regular factorizations). Then  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  has the double regular-factorization property, namely: both  $T_1^* \cdot T_2^*$  and  $T_2^* \cdot T_1^*$  are regular factorizations.*

**Proof of (1):** Let us write  $\Lambda_r$  for the counterpart of  $\Lambda$  when the roles of  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are reversed:

$$\Lambda_r : \mathcal{D}_T h \mapsto \mathcal{D}_{T_1} T_2 h \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2} h.$$

Then as a consequence of the second identity in (4.3.3) we see that  $\Lambda_r$  is an isometry from  $\mathcal{D}_T$  onto  $\mathcal{R}(U_0)$ . Moreover, if  $T_1 \cdot T_2$  is a regular factorization, then

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{D}_T &= \dim \mathcal{D}(U_0) \text{ (since } \Lambda \text{ is an isometry from } \mathcal{D}_T \text{ onto } \mathcal{D}_{U_0}\text{)} \\ &= \dim(\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}) \text{ (by regularity of } T_1 \cdot T_2\text{)} \\ &\geq \dim \mathcal{R}_{U_0} \text{ (since } \mathcal{R}_{U_0} \subset \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}\text{)} \\ &= \dim \mathcal{D}_T \text{ (since } \Lambda_r \text{ is an isometry from } \mathcal{D}_T \text{ onto } \mathcal{R}_{U_0}\text{)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we see that necessarily the inequality in line 3 must be equality. If we are in the finite-dimensional setting ( $\mathcal{D}_T, \mathcal{D}_{T_1}, \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  all finite-dimensional), we necessarily then have  $\mathcal{R}_{U_0} = \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  which is the statement that the factorization  $T_2 \cdot T_1$  is also regular.

Proof of (2): Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be the following pair of contractions on  $\mathcal{H} := H^2 \oplus H^2$ :

$$(T_1, T_2) = \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} T_z & 0 \\ 0 & T_z \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

where  $T_z$  is the Toeplitz operator  $f(z) \mapsto zf(z)$  on  $H^2$ . Note that

$$T_1 T_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ T_z & 0 \end{bmatrix} = T_2 T_1 =: T.$$

Then

$$D_T^2 = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & T_z^* \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ T_z & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2} \end{bmatrix} = D_T, \quad \mathcal{D}_T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ H^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$D_{T_1}^2 = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} = D_{T_1}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{T_1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ H^2 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$D_{T_2}^2 = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} T_z^* & 0 \\ 0 & T_z^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_z & 0 \\ 0 & T_z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{T_2} = \{0\},$$

and  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ H^2 \end{bmatrix}$ .

We let  $\Lambda$  be the map associated with the factorization  $T_1 \cdot T_2$  given by (4.3.5) while  $\Lambda_r$  is the same map associated with the factorization  $T_2 \cdot T_1$  (i.e., (4.3.5) but with the indices and then the components interchanged). For  $h = \begin{bmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{H} = \begin{bmatrix} H^2 \\ H^2 \end{bmatrix}$  we compute

$$\Lambda: D_T h = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ h_2 \end{bmatrix} \mapsto D_{T_1} T_2 h \oplus D_{T_2} h = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ T_z h \end{bmatrix}$$

and we conclude that

$$\text{Ran } \Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ {}_z H^2 \end{bmatrix} \subsetneq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ H^2 \end{bmatrix} = \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$$

implying that  $T_1 \cdot T_2$  is not a regular factorization. On the other hand,

$$\Lambda_r: D_T h = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ h_2 \end{bmatrix} \mapsto D_{T_1} h \oplus D_{T_2} T_1 h = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ h_2 \end{bmatrix} \oplus 0$$

from which we see that

$$\text{Ran } \Lambda_r = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ H^2 \end{bmatrix} = \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$$

implying that the factorization  $T_2 \cdot T_1$  is regular.

Proof of (3): This is an immediate corollary of Proposition VII.3.2 (b) from [43] which asserts: for a contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , *the factorization  $T = T_1 T_2$  is regular whenever  $T_1$  or  $T_2^*$  is isometric*. However this fact in turn can be seen as an immediate corollary of the following alternative characterization of regular factorization discovered somewhat later (see [42]):  *$T_1 \cdot T_2$  is a regular factorization if and only if  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \cap \mathcal{D}_{T_2^*} = \{0\}$* . Let us note that this criterion also comes up in the characterization of triviality of overlapping spaces in the de Branges-Rovnyak model theory (see [5]). For a direct proof of item (3) in Theorem 4.3.6, see [36, Lemma 27]. ■

REMARK 4.3.7. The general issue arising here is the following: *given subspaces  $\mathcal{D}_{U_0}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{U_0}$  of some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_0$  and a unitary map  $U_0: \mathcal{D}_{U_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{U_0}$ , find a unitary extensions  $U: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  on a possibly larger Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H} \supset \mathcal{H}_0$  so that  $U|_{\mathcal{D}_{U_0}} = U_0: \mathcal{D}_{U_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{U_0}$  and  $U$  is minimal in the sense that the smallest reducing subspace for  $U$  containing  $\mathcal{H}_0$  is all of  $\mathcal{H}$* . This problem is the core of the *lurking isometry technique* in interpolation



theory (see e.g. [6]) but has a much earlier history as well (see e.g. [4] for a thorough treatment).

We note that the definitions of Type I Andô tuples is existential: we have not verified that one can solve the equations (4.2.9) and (4.2.10) for  $\Lambda_*$ ,  $P_*$ ,  $U_*$ , and at this stage we have not ruled out the possibility that the set of Type I Andô tuples is in fact empty. On the other hand, the preceding discussion shows in particular that it is always possible to construct special Andô tuples (for  $(T_1, T_2)$  or for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ ) and in general, there are many such choices: the possibilities are parametrized by a choice of unitary extension  $U$  for the partially defined isometry  $U_0$ . The next result, therefore, has crucial significance as it demonstrates that these constructions lead to a new proof of Andô's theorem on the existence of Andô lifts for a given commuting contractive operator pair.

**THEOREM 4.3.8.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be any commuting contractive operator-pair on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then any special Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  is also a Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . In particular, these latter classes are not empty and Andô lifts of  $(T_1, T_2)$  exist.*

*Proof.* As the notion of Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  is coordinate-free, we may without loss of generality suppose that the special Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_{\dagger*}, \Lambda_{\dagger*}, P_{\dagger*}, U_{\dagger*})$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  is given in canonical form. Clearly this is a pre-Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . To show that this collection is a Type I Andô tuple, we need only verify conditions (4.2.9) and (4.2.10). We deal in detail only with (4.2.9) as verification of (4.2.10) is completely analogous. Making use of the defining properties of a canonical special Andô tuple gives, for each  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{\dagger*}^\perp U_{\dagger*} \Lambda_{\dagger*} D_{T^*} h + P_{\dagger*} U_{\dagger*} \Lambda_{\dagger*} D_{T^*} T^* h \\ &= P_{\dagger*}^\perp U_{\dagger*} (D_{T_1^*} T_2^* h \oplus D_{T_2^*} h) + P_{\dagger*} U_{\dagger*} (D_{T_1^*} T_2^* T^* h \oplus D_{T_2^*} T^* h) \\ &= P_{\dagger*}^\perp (D_{T_1^*} h \oplus D_{T_2^*} T_1^* h) + P_{\dagger*} (D_{T_1^*} T^* h \oplus D_{T_2^*} T_1^* T^* h) \\ &= (0 \oplus D_{T_2^*} T_1^* h) + (D_{T_1^*} T_2^* T_1^* h \oplus 0) = \Lambda_{\dagger*} D_{T^*} T_1^* h. \end{aligned}$$

As  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  is arbitrary, this verifies (4.2.9) as wanted.

As we have seen in the extended Remark 4.3.4, there always exist special Andô tuples for any commuting contractive pair  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . As the class of special Andô tuples for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  forms a subclass of the class of Type I Andô tuples by the first part of the theorem, it follows that these latter classes are all non-empty. Then the constructions in Theorem 4.2.6 based on a special Andô tuple as a starting point leads to an explicit Andô lift for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . ■

**REMARK 4.3.9.** The reader may wonder why we use a BCL2 model for the Andô lift of a given contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  rather than a BCL1 model in our Douglas model for an Andô lift. Had we used a BCL1 model instead, we would have arrived at a notion of what we here call a Type I' Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}', \Lambda', P', Y')$  arising as follows. The form of the model (4.2.11) would have the adjusted form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K} &= \left[ \begin{array}{c} H^2(\mathcal{F}') \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{array} \right], \\ (V_1, V_2) &= \left( \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{(P'^\perp + zP')U'} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{U'^*(P'+zP'^\perp)U_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b2} \end{array} \right] \right) \text{ acting on } \mathcal{K}, \\ \Pi &= \left[ \begin{array}{c} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda') \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{array} \right] : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3.10}$$

and the operator equations characterizing when such a collection of operators and spaces would actually yield an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ , i.e., the analogue of (4.2.9) and (4.2.10) would be

$$U'^* P' \Lambda' D_{T^*} T^* + U'^* P'^\perp \Lambda' D_{T^*} = \Lambda' D_{T^*} T_1^* \quad (4.3.11)$$

$$P'^\perp U' \Lambda' D_{T^*} T^* + P' U' \Lambda' D_{T^*} = \Lambda' D_{T^*} T_2^*. \quad (4.3.12)$$

These equations are obtained by replacing the part of the data  $(P', U')$  with its flipped version (see (3.1.10))

$$(P'^f, U'^f) = (U'^* P' U', U'^*)$$

and then plugging this transformed data set into equations (4.2.9) and (4.2.10). The drawback of this approach is that then the analogue of Theorem 4.3.8 fails, i.e., it need not be the case that a special Andô tuple is a Type I' Andô tuple. An explicit example is given in the Appendix (Section 4.8) for the interested reader.

**4.4. The Sz.-Nagy–Foias model for an Andô isometric lift.** In this section, we convert the preceding analysis to a functional-model form to give a functional model for Andô lifts.

Let  $\omega_D$  and  $\omega_{\text{NF}}$  be the unitaries as defined in (2.3.16) and (2.3.8), respectively. We observed in part (ii) of Remark 2.3.2 that the unitary

$$\omega_{\text{NF},D} := \omega_{\text{NF}} \omega_D^* : \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \rightarrow \overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_{\Theta_T})}$$

intertwines  $W_D$  with  $M_\zeta^{\mathcal{D}_T} |_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}}$ . Let us adopt the notation

$$\begin{aligned} & (W_{\#1}, W_{\#2}, M_\zeta^{\mathcal{D}_T} |_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}}) \\ & := (\omega_{\text{NF},D} W_{b1} \omega_{\text{NF},D}^*, \omega_{\text{NF},D} W_{b2} \omega_{\text{NF},D}^*, \omega_{\text{NF},D} W_D \omega_{\text{NF},D}^*), \end{aligned} \quad (4.4.1)$$

where  $(W_{b1}, W_{b2})$  is the canonical pair of commuting unitaries for  $(T_1, T_2)$  as in (4.2.1). Let  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  be a Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  and  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  be the Douglas-model Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  corresponding to  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  of  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . By Theorem 4.2.6 such a lift exists and is given as  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  on  $\mathcal{K}_D := \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  in (4.2.11). Consider the unitary operator

$$\mathbf{U}_{\text{NF},D} := \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2(\mathcal{F}_*)} & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_{\text{NF},D} \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}_*) \\ \overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.4.2)$$

and define

$$(\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{NF}}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},2}) := (\mathbf{U}_{\text{NF},D} \mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{U}_{\text{NF},D} \mathbf{V}_{D,1} \mathbf{U}_{\text{NF},D}^*, \mathbf{U}_{\text{NF},D} \mathbf{V}_{D,2} \mathbf{U}_{\text{NF},D}^*). \quad (4.4.3)$$

Then we note that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},2}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},1} \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},2}) \\ & = \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{U_*^* (P_*^\perp + z P_*)} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#1} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{(P_* + z P_*^\perp) U_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#2} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{F}_*} & 0 \\ 0 & M_\zeta |_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.4.4)$$

and that the isometry  $\Pi_{\text{NF}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\text{NF}} := \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{F}_*)}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right]$  is given by

$$\Pi_{\text{NF}} = \mathbf{U}_{\text{NF,D}} \Pi_D = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_* \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \omega_{\text{NF,D}} Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\frac{H^2(\mathcal{F}_*)}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}} \end{bmatrix} \Pi_{\text{NF}} h \quad (4.4.5)$$

where  $\Pi_{\text{NF}}$  is the embedding of  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right]$  given by (2.3.14) (also by (2.3.18)). Consequently, by Theorem 4.2.6 we have proved the following theorem, which gives a Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional model for an Andô lift of commuting contractive operator-pair constructed canonically from a Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ .

**THEOREM 4.4.1.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting pair of contractions on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  be a Douglas-minimal Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . Define a pair  $(\mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},2})$  of commuting isometries on  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{NF}} := \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{F}_*)}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right]$  as in (4.4.4) and an embedding  $\Pi_{\text{NF}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\text{NF}}$  as in (4.4.5). Then  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},2})$  is a minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ .*

*Conversely, any minimal Andô lift  $(\Pi, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$  is unitarily equivalent (as an isometric lift) to an Andô lift of the form (4.4.4) coming from a Douglas-minimal Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ .*

#### 4.5. Type II Andô tuples and Schäffer models for an Andô isometric lift.

Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  be a pair of commuting contractions on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and let  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  with  $\Pi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  and  $V_1, V_2$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  be an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Up to unitary equivalence we may arrange that  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K}$  and  $\Pi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  is the inclusion map. Hence with respect to the decomposition  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{H} \oplus (\mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H})$  we have

$$(V_1, V_2) = \left( \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ C_1 & D_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 \\ C_2 & D_2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

for some operators

$$C_j : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H}, \quad D_j : \mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H} \quad (4.5.1)$$

for  $j = 1, 2$ . As  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  commute, we must also have that

$$\begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ C_1 & D_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 \\ C_2 & D_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 \\ C_2 & D_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ C_1 & D_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

leading to the matrix identity

$$V := V_1 V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} T_1 T_2 & 0 \\ C_1 T_2 + D_1 C_2 & D_1 D_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T_2 T_1 & 0 \\ C_2 T_1 + D_2 C_1 & D_2 D_1 \end{bmatrix} = V_2 V_1 \quad (4.5.2)$$

which gives us the operator identities (in addition to the assumed commutativity of  $(T_1, T_2)$ )

$$C_1 T_2 + D_1 C_2 = C_2 T_1 + D_2 C_1, \quad D_1 D_2 = D_2 D_1. \quad (4.5.3)$$

From the fact that each  $V_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) is an isometry, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} T_j^* & C_j^* \\ 0 & D_j^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_j & 0 \\ C_j & D_j \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H}} \end{bmatrix}$$

giving us the identities

$$C_j^* C_j = I - T_j^* T_j, \quad C_j^* D_j = 0, \quad D_j^* D_j = I_{\mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H}} \text{ for } j = 1, 2. \quad (4.5.4)$$

In particular, from the last identity in (4.5.3) and in (4.5.4) we see that the pair  $(D_1, D_2)$  is a commuting isometric pair on  $\mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H}$ . In constructing the Schäffer-type model for Andô isometric lift, for reasons to become clear later, we choose to work with a BCL1 model (3.1.7) for the commuting isometric pair  $(D_1, D_2)$  rather than with a BCL2 model (3.1.9) for  $(V_1, V_2)$  as we did for the Douglas model. Hence by Theorem 3.1.4 there exist a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{F}$ , a projection  $P$  and unitary  $U$  acting on  $\mathcal{F}$  and a pair  $(Y_1, Y_2)$  of commuting unitaries acting on some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{Y}$  and a unitary identification map  $\tau_{\text{BCL}} : \mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S := \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{Y} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  so that we have

$$\tau_{\text{BCL}}(D_1, D_2) = \left( \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_{(P^\perp + zP)U} & 0 \\ 0 & Y_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_{U^*(P + zP^\perp)} & 0 \\ 0 & Y_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) \tau_{\text{BCL}}$$

and with the product operator  $D = V_1 V_2$  satisfying

$$\tau_{\text{BCL}} D := \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_z & 0 \\ 0 & Y \end{smallmatrix} \right] \text{ where } Y = Y_1 Y_2 = Y_2 Y_1.$$

For  $j = 1, 2$  let us define operators  $\left[ \begin{smallmatrix} C_{s1} \\ C_{u2} \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} C_{s2} \\ C_{u2} \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} C_s \\ C_u \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  from  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{Y} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  by

$$\left[ \begin{smallmatrix} C_{s1} \\ C_{u1} \end{smallmatrix} \right] = \tau_{\text{BCL}} C_1, \quad \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} C_{s2} \\ C_{u2} \end{smallmatrix} \right] = \tau_{\text{BCL}} C_2, \quad \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} C_s \\ C_u \end{smallmatrix} \right] = \tau_{\text{BCL}} C$$

where the operators  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are as in (4.5.1) and where  $C$  is given by

$$C = [V_1 V_2]_{21} = C_1 T_2 + D_1 C_2 \text{ or } C = [V_2 V_1]_{21} = C_2 T_1 + D_2 C_1 \text{ as in (4.5.2).}$$

where the subscripts  $s$  and  $u$  indicate the *shift* component  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  and the *unitary* component  $\mathcal{Y}$  respectively. Let us denote  $V = V_1 V_2$  and  $Y = Y_1 Y_2$ . Then we have

$$\left[ \begin{smallmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_{\text{BCL}} \end{smallmatrix} \right] (V_1, V_2, V) = (\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2}, \mathbf{V}_S) \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_{\text{BCL}} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$$

where

$$(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2}, \mathbf{V}_S) = \left( \left( \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} T_1 & 0 & 0 \\ C_{s1} & M_{(P^\perp + zP)U} & 0 \\ C_{u1} & 0 & Y_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} T_2 & 0 & 0 \\ C_{s2} & M_{U^*(P + zP^\perp)} & 0 \\ C_{u2} & 0 & Y_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} T & 0 & 0 \\ C_s & M_z & 0 \\ C_u & 0 & Y \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right). \quad (4.5.5)$$

The identities (4.5.3) lead to the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} C_s \\ C_u \end{smallmatrix} \right] &= \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} C_{s1} \\ C_{u1} \end{smallmatrix} \right] T_2 + \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_{P^\perp U + z P U} & 0 \\ 0 & Y_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} C_{s2} \\ C_{u2} \end{smallmatrix} \right] \\ &= \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} C_{s2} \\ C_{u2} \end{smallmatrix} \right] T_1 + \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_{U^* P + z U^* P^\perp} & 0 \\ 0 & Y_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} C_{s1} \\ C_{u1} \end{smallmatrix} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5.6)$$

Similarly, (4.5.4) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\mathcal{H}} &= T_1^* T_1 + C_{s1}^* C_{s1} + C_{u1}^* C_{u1} = T_2^* T_2 + C_{s2}^* C_{s2} + C_{u2}^* C_{u2} = T^* T + C_s^* C_s + C_u^* C_u, \\ 0 &= C_{s1}^* M_{(P^\perp + zP)U} = C_{s2}^* M_{U^*(P+zP^\perp)} = C_s^* M_z = 0 \\ C_{u1}^* Y_1 &= C_{u2}^* Y_2 = C_u^* Y = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5.7)$$

Multiply the first equation in (4.5.6) on the left by  $\begin{bmatrix} M_{(P^\perp + zP)U} & 0 \\ 0 & Y_1 \end{bmatrix}^*$  to get

$$\begin{bmatrix} C_{s2} \\ C_{u2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{P^\perp U + zPU} & 0 \\ 0 & Y_1 \end{bmatrix}^* \begin{bmatrix} C_s \\ C_u \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} M_{P^\perp U + zPU} & 0 \\ 0 & Y_1 \end{bmatrix}^* \begin{bmatrix} C_{s1} \\ C_{u1} \end{bmatrix} T_2. \quad (4.5.8)$$

However, by taking adjoints in the second and third lines of (4.5.7) we see in particular that

$$\left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{P^\perp U + zPU} & 0 \\ 0 & Y_1 \end{bmatrix} \right)^* \begin{bmatrix} C_{s1} \\ C_{u1} \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

Thus equation (4.5.8) simplifies to

$$\begin{bmatrix} C_{s2} \\ C_{u2} \end{bmatrix} = \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{P^\perp U + zPU} & 0 \\ 0 & Y_1 \end{bmatrix} \right)^* \begin{bmatrix} C_s \\ C_u \end{bmatrix}.$$

or more simply

$$C_{s2} = (M_{P^\perp U + zPU})^* C_s, \quad C_{u2} = Y_1^* C_u. \quad (4.5.9)$$

A similar analysis starting with the second equation in (4.5.6) leads to

$$\begin{bmatrix} C_{s1} \\ C_{u1} \end{bmatrix} = \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{U^* P + zU^* P^\perp} & 0 \\ 0 & Y_2 \end{bmatrix} \right)^* \begin{bmatrix} C_s \\ C_u \end{bmatrix}$$

or more simply

$$C_{s1} = (M_{U^*(P+zP^\perp)})^* C_s, \quad C_{u1} = Y_2^* C_u. \quad (4.5.10)$$

From the second and third lines in (4.5.7) we see in particular that

$$M_z^* C_s = 0, \quad Y^* C_u = 0. \quad (4.5.11)$$

The first item in (4.5.11) forces  $C_s$  to have the form

$$C_s = \mathbf{e} \mathbf{v}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* C_{s0} \text{ where } C_{s0} : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}. \quad (4.5.12)$$

Since  $Y$  is unitary, the second item in (4.5.11) forces

$$C_u = 0. \quad (4.5.13)$$

From the second equation in (4.5.10) and (4.5.9) we get the further collapsing

$$C_{u1} = 0, \quad C_{u2} = 0. \quad (4.5.14)$$

From the first line in (4.5.7) we see in particular that  $I_{\mathcal{H}} - T^* T = C_s^* C_s + C_u^* C_u$ . Since we now have established that  $C_u = 0$ , this simplifies to

$$I_{\mathcal{H}} - T^* T = C_s^* C_s = C_{s0}^* C_{s0}.$$

This identity in turn tells us that we can factor  $C_{s0}$  as

$$C_{s0} = \Lambda D_T \quad (4.5.15)$$

where  $\Lambda : \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is an isometry.

Finally, by combining the first equations in (4.5.9), (4.5.10) together with (4.5.12), (4.5.15) and (4.5.14), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} C_{s1} \\ C_{u1} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} (M_{U^*(P+zP^\perp)})^* \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* P U \Lambda D_T \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \begin{bmatrix} C_{s2} \\ C_{u2} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} (M_{(P^\perp+zP)U})^* \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* U^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \begin{bmatrix} C_s \\ C_u \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5.16)$$

Let us summarize: given a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  having an Andô isometric lift  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$ , we have now come upon a collection  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, U, P)$  where  $\mathcal{F}$  is another Hilbert space,  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is an isometry (where  $T = T_1 T_2$ ),  $P$  and  $U$  are operators on  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $P$  equal to a projection and  $U$  equal to a unitary operator, respectively, i.e., in the terminology defined in Definition 4.1.1, the collection  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a *pre-Andô tuple* for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . All this leads to a Schäffer-type functional model for the Andô lift as follows.

**THEOREM 4.5.1.** *Given any Andô lift  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  of a given commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ , there is a pre-Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$ , another Hilbert space  $\mathcal{Y}$  along with a commuting pair  $(Y_1, Y_2)$  of unitary operators on  $\mathcal{Y}$ , together with a unitary operator  $\tau$  from  $\mathcal{K}$  onto the Schäffer model space  $\mathcal{K}_S$  defined below, so that*

$$(\tau \Pi, \tau V_1 \tau^*, \tau V_2 \tau^*, \tau V \tau^*) = (\Pi_S, \mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2}, \mathbf{V}_S)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_S &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{Y} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Pi_S = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S, \\ (\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2}) &= \left( \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* P U \Lambda D_T & M_{P^\perp U+zP U} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* U^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T & M_{U^* P+zU^* P^\perp} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y_2 \end{bmatrix} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5.17)$$

Furthermore one can choose the isometry  $\Lambda$  so that

$$\mathbf{V}_S := \mathbf{V}_{S,1} \mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \mathbf{V}_{S,2} \mathbf{V}_{S,1} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{F}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.5.18)$$

where we set  $T := T_1 T_2 = T_2 T_1$ ,  $Y := Y_1 Y_2 = Y_2 Y_1$ .

We now investigate the converse direction, i.e., given a pair of commuting contractions  $(T_1, T_2)$ , a pre-Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ , and a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{Y}$  equipped with a commuting pair of unitary operators  $(Y_1, Y_2)$ , when is the pair  $(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  as defined in (4.5.17) (clearly a lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  due to the triangular form in (4.5.17)) a commuting pair of isometries? It turns out that the answer to this question is negative in general: the pre-Andô tuple must satisfy some additional conditions which we now explore. This discussion motivates the following definition.

**DEFINITION 4.5.2.** Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a pair of commuting contractions on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . A pre-Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$  is called a *Type II Andô tuple* if

(i) **Commutativity:**

$$PU\Lambda D_T T_2 + P^\perp \Lambda D_T = U^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T T_1 + U^* PU\Lambda D_T;$$

and

(ii) **Isometry:**

$$D_T \Lambda^* U^* PU\Lambda D_T = D_{T_1}^2, \quad D_T \Lambda^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T = D_{T_2}^2.$$

We say that the Type II Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a *strong Type II Andô tuple* if item (i) is true in the strengthened form

$$(i') \quad PU\Lambda D_T T_2 + P^\perp \Lambda D_T = U^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T T_1 + U^* PU\Lambda D_T = \Lambda D_T.$$

Finally let us say that the Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is *Schäffer-minimal* if it is the case that

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* PU\Lambda D_T & M_{P^\perp U + z PU} \end{bmatrix}^{n_1} \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* U^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T & M_{U^* P + z U^* P^\perp} \end{bmatrix}^{n_2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us note that both notions, *Type II Andô tuple* and *strong Type II Andô tuple*, are *coordinate-free* in the following sense: if  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a Type II (respectively strong Type II) Andô tuple for the commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}', \Lambda', P', U')$  is a pre-Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$  which coincides with  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  in the sense of Definition 4.1.1, then  $(\mathcal{F}', \Lambda', P', U')$  is also a Type II (respectively strong Type II) Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . We shall see in Section 5.3 below that the class of strong Type II Andô tuples is strictly smaller than that of Type II Andô tuples.

Then we have the following result.

**THEOREM 4.5.3.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive operator-pair on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  be a Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Let  $(Y_1, Y_2)$  be any pair of commuting unitaries on some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Let  $\mathcal{K}_S$  be the space and  $\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2}$  on  $\mathcal{K}_S$  be the operators as in (4.5.17) above. Then  $(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  is a commuting pair of isometries on  $\mathcal{K}_S$  and is an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . In case  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a strong Type II Andô tuple, then in addition we have*

$$\mathbf{V}_S := \mathbf{V}_{S,1} \mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \mathbf{V}_{S,2} \mathbf{V}_{S,1} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{F}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y_1 Y_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.5.19)$$

If  $(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  is a minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ , then  $\mathcal{Y} = \{0\}$ , the Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is Schäffer-minimal, and (4.5.17) simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_S &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{\Pi}_S = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S, \\ (\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2}) &= \left( \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* PU\Lambda D_T & M_{P^\perp U + z PU} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* U^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T & M_{U^* P + z U^* P^\perp} \end{bmatrix} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.5.20)$$

and, in case  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a strong Type II Andô tuple, then the formula (4.5.19) for  $\mathbf{V}_S := \mathbf{V}_{S,1}\mathbf{V}_{S,2}$  simplifies to

$$\mathbf{V}_S := \mathbf{V}_{S,1}\mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \mathbf{V}_{S,2}\mathbf{V}_{S,1} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^*\Lambda D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{F}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.5.21)$$

Conversely any minimal Andô lift  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$  is unitarily equivalent (as a lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ ) to an Andô lift of the form (4.5.20)–(4.5.21) coming from a Schäffer-minimal, strong Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

*Proof.* A matrix computation from the formulas (4.5.17) shows that

$$\mathbf{V}_{S,1}\mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \begin{bmatrix} T_1T_2 & 0 & 0 \\ [\mathbf{V}_{S,1}\mathbf{V}_{S,2}]_{21} & M_z^{\mathcal{F}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y_1Y_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.5.22)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{V}_{S,1}\mathbf{V}_{S,2}]_{21} &= \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^*PU\Lambda D_T T_2 + M_{P^\perp U+zPU} \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^*U^*P^\perp\Lambda D_T \\ &= \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^*PU\Lambda D_T T_2 + \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^*P^\perp\Lambda D_T \\ &= \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^*(PU\Lambda D_T T_2 + P^\perp\Lambda D_T). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5.23)$$

Similarly one can compute that

$$\mathbf{V}_{S,2}\mathbf{V}_{S,1} = \begin{bmatrix} T_2T_1 & 0 & 0 \\ [\mathbf{V}_{S,2}\mathbf{V}_{S,1}]_{21} & M_z & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y_2Y_1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.5.24)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{V}_{S,2}\mathbf{V}_{S,1}]_{21} &= \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^*U^*P^\perp\Lambda D_T T_1 + (M_{U^*P+zU^*P^\perp} \oplus \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^*PU\Lambda D_T \\ &= \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^*(U^*P^\perp\Lambda D_T T_1 + U^*PU\Lambda D_T). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5.25)$$

We conclude that  $\mathbf{V}_{S,1}\mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \mathbf{V}_{S,2}\mathbf{V}_{S,1}$  exactly when the following system of equations hold:

$$\begin{aligned} T_1T_2 &= T_2T_1, \\ Y_1Y_2 &= Y_2Y_1, \\ PU\Lambda D_T T_2 + P^\perp\Lambda D_T &= U^*P^\perp\Lambda D_T T_1 + U^*PU\Lambda D_T. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5.26)$$

The first two equations are valid due to our assumptions that  $(T_1, T_2)$  and  $(Y_1, Y_2)$  are commuting pairs. Note that the last equation is just condition (i) in (4.5.2) (the commutativity condition).

In case  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a strong Andô tuple, then

$$[\mathbf{V}_{S,1}\mathbf{V}_{S,2}]_{21} = [\mathbf{V}_{S,2}\mathbf{V}_{S,1}]_{21} = \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^*\Lambda D_T.$$

From (4.5.22) and (4.5.24) we read off that

$$\mathbf{V}_S := \mathbf{V}_{S,1}\mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \mathbf{V}_{S,2}\mathbf{V}_{S,1} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^*\Lambda D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{F}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y \end{bmatrix}$$

where we set  $T = T_1T_2 = T_2T_1$  and  $Y = Y_1Y_2 = Y_2Y_1$ .



We next argue that condition (ii) in Definition 4.5.2 implies that  $\mathbf{V}_{S,1}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_{S,2}$  are isometries. Since  $\begin{bmatrix} M_{(P^\perp+zP)U} & 0 \\ 0 & Y_1 \end{bmatrix}$  is an isometry, to verify that  $\mathbf{V}_{S,1}$  is an isometry it suffices to check that the (1,1)-entry of  $\mathbf{V}_{S,1}^* \mathbf{V}_{S,1}$  equals  $I_{\mathcal{H}}$  and that the (1,2)-entry of  $\mathbf{V}_{S,1}^* \mathbf{V}_{S,1}$  is equal to 0, i.e., we need to show:

$$T_1^* T_1 + D_T \Lambda^* U^* P \mathbf{e} \mathbf{v}_{0,\mathcal{F}} \mathbf{e} \mathbf{v}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* P U \Lambda D_T = I_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad D_T \Lambda^* U^* P \mathbf{e} \mathbf{v}_{0,\mathcal{F}} M_{(P^\perp+zP)U} = 0.$$

The first identity is an immediate consequence of the first equality in condition (ii) (the isometry condition) in Definition 4.5.2. As for the second note that

$$D_T \Lambda^* U^* P \mathbf{e} \mathbf{v}_{0,\mathcal{F}} M_{(P^\perp+zP)U} = D_T \Lambda^* U^* P \mathbf{e} \mathbf{v}_{0,\mathcal{F}} M_{P^\perp U} = D_T \Lambda^* U^* P P^\perp U \mathbf{e} \mathbf{v}_{0,\mathcal{F}} = 0$$

as wanted. Hence  $\mathbf{V}_{S,1}$  is an isometry. Similarly one can show that  $\mathbf{V}_{S,2}$  is an isometry by making use of the second part of condition (ii) in Definition 4.5.2. This completes the proof of the direct side of Theorem 4.5.3.

If  $(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  as in (4.5.17) is a minimal lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ , then

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathcal{Y} \end{bmatrix} = \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} \mathbf{V}_{S,1}^{n_1} \mathbf{V}_{S,2}^{n_2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

From the triangular form of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ , we see that the right-hand side of this last display is contained in  $\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \\ \{0\} \end{bmatrix}$ . It thus follows that the space  $\mathcal{Y}$  is trivial, the formulas in (4.5.17) and (4.5.18) collapse to those in (4.5.20) and (4.5.21), and the minimality condition can now be expressed as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{bmatrix} = \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} \mathbf{V}_{S,1}^{n_1} \mathbf{V}_{S,2}^{n_2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{bmatrix} =: \mathcal{K}_S$$

which is exactly the condition that  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  be Schäffer-minimal.

Conversely, suppose that  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  is a minimal Andô lift of the commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . The discussion preceding the theorem tells us that the unitary operator

$$\tau := \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_{\text{BCL}} \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{K} \cong \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ \mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{bmatrix}$$

transforms the commuting isometric pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  to the pair  $(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  on  $\mathcal{K}_S$  as given by (4.5.17) with  $\mathbf{V}_S = \mathbf{V}_{S,1} \mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \mathbf{V}_{S,2} \mathbf{V}_{S,1}$  as in (4.5.18), where the tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is as in condition (i) in Definition 4.5.2. By reversing the analysis given in the direct analysis, the fact that  $\mathbf{V}_{S,1} \mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \mathbf{V}_{S,2} \mathbf{V}_{S,1}$  gives us the system of equations (4.5.26) which then forces the commutativity condition (i) in Definition 4.5.2) to hold, and the fact that  $\mathbf{V}_{S,1}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_{S,2}$  are isometries forces the isometry condition ((ii) in Definition 4.5.2) to hold. Furthermore, the fact that by construction  $\mathbf{V}_S = \mathbf{V}_{S,1} \mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \mathbf{V}_{S,2} \mathbf{V}_{S,1}$  has the form (4.5.19) forces the strong commutativity condition (i') in Definition 4.5.2) to hold, so in fact  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a strong Type II Andô tuple. Furthermore, the assumption that  $(\Pi_S, \mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  is minimal forces the space  $\mathcal{Y}$  to be trivial and the tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  to be Schäffer-minimal (see Definition 4.5.2). ■

In parallel with Example 4.2.7 for the Douglas-model Andô lift, we next introduce some special cases of Andô lifts for illustrative purposes.

**EXAMPLE 4.5.4. Illustrative special cases for Schäffer-model Andô lifts**

**1.  $(T_1, T_2) = \text{BCL1-model commuting isometric operator-pair}$ :** Suppose that  $(T_1, T_2) = (V_1, V_2)$  is a commutative isometric pair, so  $D_T = 0$ . Then we get a Type II (strong or otherwise) Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$  simply by taking the coefficient space  $\mathcal{F}$  to be the zero space and hence all operators  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ , projection  $P$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  and unitary operator  $U$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  are all zero. Then the Schäffer model for the lift becomes  $(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2}) = (T_1, T_2)$ , i.e.,  $(T_1, T_2)$  is the minimal Andô lift of itself. The reader should find the next special case to be more interesting.

**2.  $(T_1, T_2) = \text{adjoint of adjusted BCL2-model commuting isometric pair}$ :** We have seen that any commuting isometric operator-pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  with product  $V = V_1 V_2$  equal to a shift can be modelled in the BCL2-model form:

$$(V_1, V_2, V) = (M_{U^* P^\perp + z U^* P}, M_{P U + z P^\perp U}, M_z^{\mathcal{F}}) \text{ on } H^2(\mathcal{F}) \quad (4.5.27)$$

where  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$  is a choice of BCL tuple ( $\mathcal{F}$  is a coefficient Hilbert space,  $P$  is a projection and  $U$  is a unitary operator on  $\mathcal{F}$ ). Let us introduce the space  $L^2(\mathcal{F})$  consisting of functions of the form  $\zeta \mapsto f(\zeta)$  (with  $\zeta$  equal to the independent variable on the unit circle  $\mathbb{T}$ ) such that  $f(\zeta) \sim \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{f}_n \zeta^n$  with  $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\hat{f}_n\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 < \infty$ . Then we can view  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  as the subspace of  $L^2(\mathcal{F})$  consisting of such  $L^2(\mathcal{F})$ -functions  $f$  having negatively-indexed Fourier coefficients equal to zero:  $\hat{f}_n = 0$  for  $n < 0$ . Its Hilbert-space orthogonal complement in  $L^2(\mathcal{F})$  consists of  $L^2(\mathcal{F})$  functions with nonnegatively-indexed Fourier coefficients equal to zero:  $\hat{f}_n = 0$  for  $n \geq 0$ . Let us observe that the reflection operator

$$\mathbf{r}: f(\zeta) \mapsto \zeta^{-1} f(\zeta^{-1})$$

is a unitary involution operator on  $L^2(\mathcal{F})$  (so  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}^{-1} = \mathbf{r}^*$ ) which maps  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  unitarily onto  $H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp$  and  $H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp$  unitarily onto  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$ . We can view elements of  $H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp$  as analytic functions  $f(z^{-1}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \hat{f}_{-n} z^{-n}$  in the variable  $z^{-1}$  with zero constant term representing analytic functions on the exterior of the unit disk  $\mathbb{E} = \{1/z: z \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}\} \cup \{\infty\}$  with value at  $\infty$  equal to 0. Let us use the transformation

$$\mathbf{r}_+ := \mathbf{r}|_{H^2(\mathcal{F})}: H^2(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp$$

to transform the model operators (4.5.27) acting on  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  to a unitarily equivalent version but acting on the space  $H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{V}_1, \tilde{V}_2, \tilde{V}) &= \mathbf{r}_+(V_1, V_2, V) \mathbf{r}_+^{-1} \\ &= (M_{U^* P^\perp + z^{-1} U^* P}, M_{P U + z^{-1} P^\perp U}, M_{z^{-1}}^{\mathcal{F}}) \text{ on } H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5.28)$$

Let us summarize the analysis to this point: *given any commuting isometric operator pair  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  with product  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{V}_2$  equal to a shift operator, there is a BCL tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$  so that  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  is unitarily equivalent to the commuting isometric operator-pair  $(\tilde{V}_1, \tilde{V}_2)$  given by (4.5.28), and conversely any such pair  $(\tilde{V}_1, \tilde{V}_2)$  is a commuting isometric operator-pair with product operator  $\tilde{V} = \tilde{V}_1 \tilde{V}_2$  equal to the shift operator  $\tilde{V} = M_{z^{-1}}^{\mathcal{F}}$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp$ .*

Suppose now that  $(T_1, T_2) = (V_1^*, V_2^*)$  is the commuting pair of coisometries with product  $T = T_1 T_2 = V_1^* V_2^*$  equal to the adjoint of a shift operator. Then by the preceding discussion we may assume that  $(V_1, V_2) = (\tilde{V}_1, \tilde{V}_2)$  is in the model form (4.5.28). Let us compute

$$(T_1, T_2) = (\tilde{V}_1^*, \tilde{V}_2^*) \quad (4.5.29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= P_{H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp} (M_{P^\perp U + \zeta P U}, M_{P U + \zeta P^\perp U})|_{H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp}, \\ T &:= T_1 T_2 = P_{H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp} M_\zeta^{\mathcal{F}}|_{H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp} \end{aligned} \quad (4.5.30)$$

By inspection we see that

$$(\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2) := (M_{P^\perp U + \zeta P U}, M_{P U + \zeta P^\perp U}) \text{ on } L^2(\mathcal{F})$$

is a minimal commuting isometric (in fact commuting unitary) lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  with product  $\mathcal{U}_1 \mathcal{U}_2 = M_\zeta$  on  $L^2(\mathcal{F})$ .

Our next goal is to fit this construction into the Schäffer model. For these computations we view  $H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp$  as the subspace of  $L^2(\mathcal{F})$  consisting of functions  $f$  of the form  $f(\zeta) = \sum_{n=-1}^{-\infty} \hat{f}_n \zeta^n$ . Then compute:

$$D_T = D_T^2 = (I - T^* T): f(\zeta) = \sum_{n=-1}^{-\infty} \hat{f}_n \zeta^n \mapsto \hat{f}_{-1} \zeta^{-1}.$$

We define  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  by, for  $f(\zeta) = \sum_{n=-1}^{-\infty} \hat{f}_n \zeta^n \in H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp$ ,

$$\Lambda: D_T f = \hat{f}_{-1} \zeta^{-1} \mapsto f_{-1} \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (4.5.31)$$

Then  $\Lambda$  is a unitary operator from  $\mathcal{D}_T$  onto  $\mathcal{F}$ . We then define the model space  $\mathcal{K}_S$  and the model operators  $(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  as in (4.5.20). Here the space  $\mathcal{H}$  on which  $(T_1, T_2)$  is defined on  $H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp$ , so  $\mathcal{K}_S = \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  has an easy identification with the space  $L^2(\mathcal{F})$ . It is now straightforward to see that the block matrix decompositions for  $(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  in (4.5.20) amounts to the block matrix decompositions for the operators  $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2$  with respect to the decomposition of  $L^2(\mathcal{F})$  as  $H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp \oplus H^2(\mathcal{F})$  and similarly the matrix decomposition of  $\mathbf{V}_S = \mathbf{V}_{S,1} \mathbf{V}_{S,2}$  in (4.5.21) acting on  $H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp \oplus H^2(\mathcal{F})$  is the same as the matrix decomposition for the operator  $M_\zeta$  on  $L^2(\mathcal{F})$  with respect to the orthogonal decomposition  $L^2(\mathcal{F}) = H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp \oplus H^2(\mathcal{F})$ . By the necessity side of Theorem 4.5.3, it follows that  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a strong Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ , as can also be checked directly. This example gives the next simplest illustration (after #1 above) of the Schäffer-like model for Andô lifts.

Given any commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ , a special class of pre-Andô tuples, called *special Andô tuples*, associated with the pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  as well as with the adjoint pair  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  was introduced in Section 4.3 (see Definition 4.3.2). There we saw that special Andô tuples for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  are also Type I Andô tuples (see Theorem 4.3.8) and hence led to an explicit construction of Andô isometric lifts for  $(T_1, T_2)$  via the Douglas-model lift construction (see Theorem 4.2.6). We now show that, remarkably, special Andô tuples for  $(T_1, T_2)$  are automatically also strong Type II Andô-tuples, as explained next.

**THEOREM 4.5.5.** *Suppose that  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting contractive operator-pair on  $\mathcal{H}$  and that  $(\mathcal{F}_\dagger, \Lambda_\dagger, P_\dagger, U_\dagger)$  is a special Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$  constructed as in Definition 4.3.2. Then  $(\mathcal{F}_\dagger, \Lambda_\dagger, P_\dagger, U_\dagger)$  is in fact a strong Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ , i.e., conditions (i') and (ii) in Definition 4.5.2 are satisfied.*

*Proof.* let  $(\mathcal{F}_\dagger, \Lambda_\dagger, P_\dagger, U_\dagger)$  be the special Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$  constructed via the algorithm explained in Definition 4.3.2. We must verify that conditions (i') and (ii) in Definition 4.5.2 are satisfied. Let  $h$  be an arbitrary element of  $h$ . The computation

$$\begin{aligned} & P_\dagger U_\dagger \Lambda_\dagger D_T T_2 h + P_\dagger^\perp \Lambda_\dagger D_T h \\ &= P_\dagger U_\dagger (D_{T_1} T_2^2 h \oplus D_{T_2} T_2 h) + P_\dagger^\perp (D_{T_1} T_2 h \oplus D_{T_2} h) \\ &= P_\dagger (D_{T_1} T_2 h \oplus D_{T_2} T_1 T_2 h) + (0 \oplus D_{T_2} h) = D_{T_1} T_2 h \oplus D_{T_2} h = \Lambda_\dagger D_T h \end{aligned}$$

together with the computation

$$\begin{aligned} & U_\dagger^* (P_\dagger^\perp \Lambda_\dagger D_T T_1 + P_\dagger U_\dagger \Lambda_\dagger D_T) h \\ &= U_\dagger^* (P_\dagger^\perp (D_{T_1} T_2 T_1 h \oplus D_{T_2} T_1 h) + P_\dagger U_\dagger (D_{T_1} T_2 h \oplus D_{T_2} h)) \\ &= U_\dagger^* ((0 \oplus D_{T_2} T_1 h) + P_\dagger (D_{T_1} h \oplus D_{T_2} T_1 h)) \\ &= U_\dagger^* ((0 \oplus D_{T_2} T_1 h) + (D_{T_1} h \oplus 0)) = U_\dagger^* (D_{T_1} h \oplus D_{T_2} T_1 h) = \Lambda_\dagger D_T h \end{aligned}$$

verifies condition (i'). The following easy inner product computations for arbitrary  $h, h' \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D_T \Lambda_\dagger^* U_\dagger^* P_\dagger U_\dagger \Lambda_\dagger D_T h, h' \rangle &= \langle P_\dagger U_\dagger \Lambda_\dagger D_T h, P_\dagger U_\dagger \Lambda_\dagger D_T h' \rangle \\ &= \langle D_{T_1} h \oplus 0, D_{T_1} h' \oplus 0 \rangle = \langle D_{T_1}^2 h, h' \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D_T \Lambda_\dagger^* P_\dagger^\perp \Lambda_\dagger D_T h, h' \rangle &= \langle P_\dagger^\perp \Lambda_\dagger D_T h, P^\perp \Lambda_\dagger D_T h' \rangle \\ &= \langle 0 \oplus D_{T_2} h, 0 \oplus D_{T_2} h' \rangle = \langle D_{T_2}^2 h, h' \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

establish condition (ii). ■

**Notation 4.5.6.** For a given commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ , the Andô lift corresponding to the special Andô tuple of  $(T_1, T_2)$  given as in (4.5.20) will be denoted by  $(V_{\natural 1}, V_{\natural 2})$  and  $V_{\natural} = V_{\natural 1} V_{\natural 2}$ . Note that because any special Andô tuple of  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a strong Type II Andô tuple,  $V_{\natural} := V_{\natural 1} V_{\natural 2}$  is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} T_1 T_2 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda_\dagger D_T & M_z \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.5.32)$$

**REMARK 4.5.7.** We have already noted that the definition of special Andô tuple (whether for  $(T_1, T_2)$  or for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ ) is constructive and hence in principal special Andô tuples are easy to write down. In particular we are assured that the class of special Andô tuples for  $(T_1, T_2)$  is not empty. Furthermore, Theorem 4.5.5 combined with Theorem 4.5.3 shows us how to use special Andô tuples for  $(T_1, T_2)$  to construct a class of Andô isometric lifts for a given commuting contractive operator pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . In this way we arrive at a second new proof of Andô's theorem [3], via the Schäffer-model construction rather than by the Douglas-model construction as in Theorem 4.3.8. A priori it is conceivable that the unitary equivalence classes of Andô isometric lifts arising via the Douglas-model

construction from special Andô tuples for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  are distinct from those arising via the Schäffer-model construction from special Andô tuples for  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

REMARK 4.5.8. In parallel with the discussion in Remark 4.3.9 concerning the choice of BCL model in the construction of the Douglas model for an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ , here we discuss the choice of BCL model in the construction of the Schäffer model for an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . In the representation for an Andô lift  $(V_1, V_2)$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  for a commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K}$ , we could have used the BCL2 model (rather than the BCL1 model) for  $(V_1, V_2)|_{\mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H}}$  to arrive at the unitarily equivalent Andô lift having the form  $(\mathbf{V}'_S, \mathbf{V}'_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}'_{S,2})$  where

$$(\mathbf{V}'_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}'_{S,2}, \mathbf{V}'_S) = \left( \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 & 0 \\ C_{s1} & M_{U^*P^\perp+zU^*P} & 0 \\ C_{u1} & 0 & Y_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 & 0 \\ C_{s2} & M_{PU+zP^\perp U} & 0 \\ C_{u2} & 0 & Y_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 & 0 \\ C_s & M_z^{\mathcal{F}} & 0 \\ C_u & 0 & Y \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad (4.5.33)$$

in place of (4.5.5). Then the same analysis leading from (4.5.5) to (4.5.17) and (4.5.18) would lead us instead to

$$(\mathbf{V}'_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}'_{S,2}) = \left( \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* U^* P \Lambda D_T & M_{U^*P^\perp+zU^*P} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* P^\perp U \Lambda D_T & M_{PU+zP^\perp U} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y_2 \end{bmatrix} \right), \quad (4.5.34)$$

$$\mathbf{V}'_S := \mathbf{V}'_{S,1} \mathbf{V}'_{S,2} = \mathbf{V}'_{S,2} \mathbf{V}'_{S,1} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{F}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.5.35)$$

where we set  $T := T_1 T_2 = T_2 T_1$ ,  $Y := Y_1 Y_2 = Y_2 Y_1$  and where  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is an isometry; let us note that a short-cut way to see this is to make use of the flip transformation  $\mathfrak{f}$  given by (3.1.10).

Conversely, for a collection of spaces and operators of the form (4.5.34), (4.5.35) to be an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  requires the additional compatibility conditions

(a) **Commutativity condition:**

$$U^* P \Lambda D_T T_2 + U^* P^\perp U \Lambda D_T = P^\perp U \Lambda D_T T_1 + P \Lambda D_T;$$

(b) **Isometry condition:**

$$D_T \Lambda^* P \Lambda D_T = D_{T_1}^2, \quad D_T \Lambda^* U^* P^\perp U \Lambda D_T = D_{T_2}^2;$$

(a') **Strengthened commutativity condition:**

$$U^* P \Lambda D_T T_2 + U^* P^\perp U \Lambda D_T = P^\perp U \Lambda D_T T_1 + P \Lambda D_T = \Lambda D_T.$$

We note that these equations are obtained simply by replacing  $(P, U)$  by  $(U^* P U, U^*)$  (i.e., by applying the flip transformation  $\mathfrak{f}$  (3.1.10)) in the conditions (i), (ii), (i') in the definition of Type II Andô tuple (see Definition 4.5.2). Let us say that a pre-Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a *Type II' Andô tuple* for  $(T_1, T_2)$  if the modified compatibility conditions (a), (b) hold, and is a *strong Type II' Andô tuple* for  $(T_1, T_2)$  if the strengthened form of these conditions (a') (b) holds.

Just as in the Douglas-model setting, the drawback of this alternative approach is that a special Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$  need not be a strong Type II' Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ , i.e., the analogue of Theorem 4.5.5 with *strong Type II' Andô tuple* inserted in place of *strong Type II Andô tuple* fails in general. For an explicit example we refer to the Appendix (Section 4.8 below).

**4.6. Strongly minimal Andô lifts via strongly minimal Andô tuples.** We here introduce the notions of *strongly minimal Andô tuple* and *strongly minimal Andô lift* for a commutative contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

DEFINITION 4.6.1. A pre-Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$  is said to be *strongly minimal* if the isometry  $\Lambda : \mathcal{D}_{T_1 T_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is surjective. In case the pre-Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a Type I or strong Type II Andô tuple and is strongly minimal as an Andô pre-tuple, we say that  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a strongly minimal Type I (respectively strongly minimal strong Type II) Andô tuple.

The companion notion *strongly minimal Andô lift* defined as follows.

DEFINITION 4.6.2. An Andô lift  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  of a commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  is said to be *strongly minimal* if it acts on the space  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  given by

$$\mathcal{K}_{00} = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} V_1^n V_2^n \text{Ran } \Pi.$$

Note that, since  $\text{Ran } \Lambda = \mathcal{F}$  for a strongly minimal pre-Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$ , it is obvious that a strongly minimal pre-Andô tuple is Douglas-minimal (see Definition 4.1.3).

The next result makes precise the strong correlation between these two notions of strongly minimal.

THEOREM 4.6.3. *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive operator-pair acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then:*

1.  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  if and only if there is a strongly minimal Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . In more detail, Theorem 4.2.6 continues to hold with the substitutions:
  - Douglas-minimal Type I Andô tuple of  $(T_1^*, T_2^*) \rightarrow$  strongly minimal Type I Andô tuple of  $(T_1, T_2)$ ,
  - minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2) \rightarrow$  strongly minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ .
2.  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  if and only if there is a strongly minimal strong Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . In more detail, Theorem 4.5.3 continues to hold with the substitutions
  - Schäffer-minimal strong Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2) \rightarrow$  strongly minimal strong Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ ,
  - minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2) \rightarrow$  strongly minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

*Thus existence of a strongly minimal Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  is equivalent to existence of a strongly minimal strong Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ .*

*Proof of (1):* If  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  is a strongly minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ , then by definition  $V = V_1V_2$  is a minimal isometric lift of  $T = T_1T_2$ . By Theorem 4.2.6, the Andô lift  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  can be modeled as  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  in (4.2.11) for some Douglas-minimal Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . Consider the minimal isometric lift  $(\Pi_D, V_D)$  of  $T$  acting on  $\mathcal{K}_D = \left[ \begin{array}{c} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{array} \right]$  as in §2.2. By the unitary equivalence of any two Sz.-Nagy–Foias isometric lifts of a given contraction contraction operator and of the uniqueness of the implementing unitary transformation (see [43, Theorem I.4.1]), there is a unique unitary

$$\tau = \begin{bmatrix} \tau' & \tau_{12} \\ \tau_{21} & \tau'' \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$$

such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tau' & \tau_{12} \\ \tau_{21} & \tau'' \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{F}_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tau' & \tau_{12} \\ \tau_{21} & \tau'' \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.6.1)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tau' & \tau_{12} \\ \tau_{21} & \tau'' \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*) \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.6.2)$$

Applying Part (2) of Lemma 3.1.2 to (4.6.1) we conclude that

$$\tau = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda' & 0 \\ 0 & \tau'' \end{bmatrix}$$

for some unitary operators  $\Lambda' : \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_*$  and  $\tau'' : \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$ . Equation (4.6.2) therefore yields

$$(I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda') \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}, T^*} = (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*) \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}, T^*}, \quad (4.6.3)$$

$$\tau'' \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} = \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \quad \tau'' W_D = W_D \tau''. \quad (4.6.4)$$

Equating the constant coefficients in the series forms of (4.6.3), we get  $\Lambda' = \Lambda_*$ . Consequently, the Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  is strongly minimal.

Conversely, suppose  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  is a Type I Andô tuple of  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  such that  $\Lambda_* : \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_*$  is a unitary. By the forward direction of Theorem 4.2.6, the isometric operators  $\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2}$  given by

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_D = \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*) \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(\mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2}) = \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{U_*^*(P_*^\perp + zP_*)} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{(P_* + zP_*^\perp)U_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \text{ on } \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$$

constitute an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Note that the operator

$$\tau := \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$$

is unitary from  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{array} \right]$  onto  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} H^2(\mathcal{F}_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{array} \right]$  since  $\Lambda_*$  is unitary from  $\mathcal{D}_{T^*}$  onto  $\mathcal{F}_*$ , and has

the properties

$$\begin{aligned}\tau\Pi_D &= \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} = \Pi \quad \text{and} \\ \tau V_D &= \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{F}_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} = V_\tau,\end{aligned}$$

where  $V = V_1 V_2$  and  $(\Pi_D, V_D)$  is the Douglas-model minimal isometric lift of  $T = T_1 T_2$  as in §2.2. Consequently, the Andô lift  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$  is strongly minimal. This completes the proof of (1).

**Proof of (2):** For this proof we use the Schäffer model rather than the Douglas model. Suppose that  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  is a strongly minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Since a strongly minimal Andô lift is obviously minimal, by the converse part of Theorem 4.5.3 we know that there is a strong Type II Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$  so that the lift  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  is unitarily equivalent to the Schäffer-model lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_S, \mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  (4.5.20) determined by  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_S = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2}) = \left( \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* P U \Lambda D_T & M_{(P^\perp + zP)U} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* U^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T & M_{U^*(P+zP^\perp)} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

and also by (4.5.21)

$$\mathbf{V}_S = \mathbf{V}_{S,1} \mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{F}} \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.6.5)$$

By hypothesis,  $V$  is a minimal lift of  $T = T_1 T_2$ . On the other hand, consider the Schäffer-model minimal isometric lift  $(\Pi_S, V_S)$  of  $T = T_1 T_2$ , given by

$$\Pi_S = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \end{bmatrix}, \quad V_S = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{D}_T}^* D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T} \end{bmatrix} \text{ on } \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.6.6)$$

as discussed in §2.1. By the uniqueness of minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foias lifts of single contraction operators [43, Theorem I.4.1], there exists a unitary

$$\tau = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_{11} & \tau_{12} \\ \tau_{21} & \tau_{22} \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{bmatrix}$$

intertwining the isometries in (4.6.6) and (4.6.5) and such that  $\tau|_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Hence  $\tau$  is unitary with  $\tau_{11} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$  forcing also  $\tau_{12} = 0$ ,  $\tau_{21} = 0$ , so now  $\tau = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_{22} \end{bmatrix}$  with  $\tau_{22} : H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{F})$  unitary. The intertwining condition thus becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{D}_T}^* D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \tau_{22} D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{F}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda' \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.6.7)$$

Comparing the (2,1) and (2,2) entries in the above matrices then gives

$$\tau_{22} \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{D}_T}^* D_T = \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T, \quad \tau_{22} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T} = M_z^{\mathcal{F}} \tau_{22}.$$

From the first equation we see that  $\tau_{22}$  takes constants into constants. From the second equation we see that  $\tau_{22}$  is a multiplication operator. Putting these two conditions to-



gether says that  $\tau_{22}$  is multiplication by a constant, i.e.,  $\tau_{22}$  has the form  $\tau_{22} = I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda'$  for some  $\Lambda': \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ . Further inspection of the first equation tells us that the constant is  $\Lambda: \Lambda' = \Lambda$ . Moreover, as observed earlier,  $\tau_{22}$  is unitary, i.e., the operator  $I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda$  is unitary. This then forces  $\Lambda$  to be unitary as an operator from  $\mathcal{D}_T$  to  $\mathcal{F}$ . This in turn means that the tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is also strongly minimal as a Type II Andô tuple.

Conversely, let  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  be a strongly minimal strong Type II Andô tuple of the pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . By the forward direction of Theorem 4.5.3, for any Type II Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$ ,  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_S, \mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  given by (4.5.20) is an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  with  $\mathbf{V}_S := \mathbf{V}_{S,1}\mathbf{V}_{S,2}$  as in (4.5.21). The strongly minimal property of the Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  means that the operator  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is unitary, hence also the operator

$$\tau := \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{K}_S := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{bmatrix} =: \mathcal{K}_S$$

is unitary. By definition we have

$$\tau \mathbf{\Pi}_S = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{\Pi}_S$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tau V_S &= \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_T}^* D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{F}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \mathbf{V}_S \tau \end{aligned}$$

i.e., the Sz.-Nagy–Foiás lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_S, \mathbf{V}_S)$  of  $T$  is unitarily equivalent (via  $\tau$ ) to the Schäffer-model minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foiás lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_S, V_S)$  of  $T$ , and hence the lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_S, \mathbf{V}_S)$  must itself also be minimal, meaning that the original Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, V_1, V_2)$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$  is strongly minimal. This completes the proof of the theorem. ■

We have noted in Examples 4.2.7 (Douglas version) and 4.5.4 (Schäffer version) that commuting isometric operator-pairs with product operator equal to a shift and commuting coisometric operator-pairs with product operator equal to the adjoint of a shift have strongly minimal Type I Andô tuples (respectively, strongly minimal strong Type II Andô tuples). The restriction that the product be a shift or adjoint of a shift is not essential: the result still holds without this restriction. On the other hand we have seen in item (3) of Theorem 4.3.6 that both  $T_1 \cdot T_2$  and  $T_2 \cdot T_1$  are regular factorizations if  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commutative isometric operator-pair or a commutative co-isometric operator pair. The next result shows that this confluence of observations is no accident.

**THEOREM 4.6.4.** *A commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift if and only if both factorizations  $T_1 \cdot T_2$  and  $T_2 \cdot T_1$  are regular. In this case, there is a unique strongly minimal canonical-form special Andô tuple of  $(T_1, T_2)$ .*

*Proof.* We note that the last statement in the theorem is simply a direct application of item (2) in Corollary 4.3.5.

Suppose that  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting contractive pair such that both  $T_1 \cdot T_2$  and  $T_2 \cdot T_1$  are regular factorizations. This means that both spaces  $\mathcal{D}_{U_0}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{U_0}$  given by (4.3.6) are equal to the whole space  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$ . Thus both the operator  $\Lambda_{\dagger}$  and the operator  $\Lambda_{\dagger}^{\dagger}$

given on a dense set by

$$\Lambda_{\dagger}^{\sharp}: D_T h \mapsto D_{T_1} h \oplus D_{T_2} T_1 h \text{ for } h \in \mathcal{H}$$

define unitary operators from  $\mathcal{D}_T$  onto  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$ , and furthermore the operator  $U_0$  defined densely by (4.3.7) extends to define a unitary operator from  $\mathcal{F}_{\dagger} := \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  onto itself. Define a projection  $P_{\dagger}$  on  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$  by

$$P_{\dagger}: f_1 \oplus f_2 = f_1 \oplus 0 \text{ for } f_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{T_1}, f_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{T_2}.$$

Then the collection

$$(\mathcal{F}_{\dagger} = \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}, \Lambda_{\dagger}, P_{\dagger}, U_{\dagger} = U_0)$$

is a canonical-form special Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$  which is also strongly minimal as an Andô tuple. By Theorem 4.5.5, this is a strong Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . By Part (2) of Theorem 4.6.3,  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift.

Conversely, suppose that  $(T_1, T_2)$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift which we take to be of Schäffer type  $(\Pi = \iota_{\mathcal{H}}, V_1, V_2)$  with  $\iota_{\mathcal{H}}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  the inclusion map and with  $(V_1, V_2)$  acting on the ambient space for the minimal isometric lift of  $T = T_1 T_2$ :

$$\mathcal{K} = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} V_1^n V_2^n \mathcal{H}.$$

We first note that with  $V_0 := V = V_1 V_2$ ,

$$D_{V_j^*} \mathcal{K} = D_{V_j^*} \mathcal{H} \text{ for } j = 0, 1, 2. \quad (4.6.8)$$

Indeed, if  $n \geq 1$ , then since  $D_{V_j^*} = (I_{\mathcal{K}} - V_j V_j^*)$  we have

$$D_{V_1^*} V_1^n V_2^n = 0 = D_{V_2^*} V_2^n V_1^n \text{ and } D_{V^*} V^n = 0.$$

Furthermore note that the map  $\omega_j: \mathcal{D}_{T_j^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{V_j^*}$  given by

$$\omega_j: D_{T_j^*} h \mapsto D_{V_j^*} h \text{ for } h \in \mathcal{H}$$

for  $j = 0, 1, 2$  (here we set  $T_0 = T_1 T_2$ ) is isometric: indeed, simply note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_{V_j^*} h\|^2 &= \langle (I - V_j V_j^*) h, h \rangle = \|h\|^2 - \|V_j^* h\|^2 \\ &= \|h\|^2 - \|T_j^* h\|^2 \text{ (by the lifting property)} \\ &= \langle (I - T_j T_j^*) h, h \rangle = \|D_{T_j^*}^2 h\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the observation (4.6.8), we see that each of the maps  $\omega_j$  is unitary from  $\mathcal{D}_{T_j^*}$  onto  $\mathcal{D}_{V_j^*}$ . Focusing now just on the case  $j = 1, 2$  and defining the map  $\tau: \mathcal{D}_{T_1^*} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{V_1^*} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{V_2^*}$  defined densely by

$$\tau: D_{T_1^*} h \oplus D_{T_2^*} k \mapsto D_{V_1^*} h \oplus D_{V_2^*} k,$$

we see that  $\tau$  so defined is also unitary.

On the other hand, since  $(V_1^*, V_2^*)$  is a commuting coisometric pair, we know by item (3) in Theorem 4.3.6 that  $V_1^* \cdot V_2^*$  is a regular factorization. Hence the operator  $\sigma: \mathcal{D}_{V^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{V_1^*} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{V_2^*}$  defined densely by

$$\sigma: D_{V^*} h \mapsto D_{V_1^*} V_2^* h \oplus D_{V_2^*} h$$

is unitary as well. Now it just remains to read off from the definitions of the unitary operators  $\omega_0, \tau$  and  $\sigma$  that the isometry

$$\Lambda_{\dagger*} : D_{T^*}h \mapsto D_{T_1^*}T_2^*h \oplus D_{T_2^*}h$$

coincides with  $\tau^* \circ \sigma \circ \omega_0$  on a dense set, viz.,  $\{D_{T^*}h : h \in \mathcal{H}\}$ . Therefore  $\Lambda_{\dagger*}$  must be unitary and hence by definition, the factorization  $T_1^* \cdot T_2^*$  is regular, or equivalently  $T_2 \cdot T_1$  is so. Now note that if  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift, then so does the pair  $(T_2, T_1)$ . Thus proceeding as above for the pair  $(T_2, T_1)$ , one can conclude that the factorization  $T_1 \cdot T_2$  is regular. This completes the proof. ■

It is not clear whether the existence of a strongly minimal Andô lift for the commutative contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  is equivalent to the existence of a strongly minimal Andô lift for the adjoint pair  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . For the companion notion of existence of a strongly minimal Andô lift, this invariance-under-adjoint property can be worked out via a systematic calculation as follows.

**THEOREM 4.6.5.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive pair acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift if and only if  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift.*

*Proof.* Note that the two-way implications follow by symmetry once we establish one of them. We suppose that  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift and prove that then so does  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . Let  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  be a strongly minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ , i.e.,  $V_1, V_2$  act on  $\mathcal{K} = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \{V_1^n V_2^n \text{Ran } \Pi\}$ . By Lemma 3.2.1,  $(V_1, V_2)$  has a unitary extension  $(W_1, W_2)$  acting on the space

$$\tilde{\mathcal{K}} = \bigvee_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \{W_1^n W_2^n \text{Ran } \Pi\}.$$

Let us set

$$\mathcal{K}' := \bigvee_{n \geq 0} W_1^{*n} W_2^{*n} \text{Ran } \Pi = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} W^{*n} \text{Ran } \Pi, \quad (4.6.9)$$

where we use the notation  $W = W_1 W_2$ . We argue that  $\mathcal{K}'$  is a  $(W_1^*, W_2^*)$ -invariant subspace; the geometry of the minimal dilation space as discussed in Section 2.3 will be used here.

Let us consider the spaces

$$\mathcal{K}_+ = \mathcal{K} \ominus \text{Ran } \Pi \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}_- = \tilde{\mathcal{K}} \ominus \mathcal{K}.$$

This induces a three-fold orthogonal decomposition of the space  $\mathcal{K}'$ :

$$\tilde{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}_- \oplus \text{Ran } \Pi \oplus \mathcal{K}_+. \quad (4.6.10)$$

Since  $(W_1, W_2, W)$  is an extension of  $(V_1, V_2, V = V_1 V_2)$  and  $(V_1, V_2)$  is an isometric lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  we see that  $\mathcal{K} = \text{Ran } \Pi \oplus \mathcal{K}_+$  is invariant for  $(W_1, W_2, W)$ . From the facts that  $(V_1, V_2)$  is the restriction of  $(W_1, W_2)$  to  $\mathcal{K}$  and that  $(V_1, V_2)$  is a lift for  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  (with embedding operator  $\Pi$ ), we see that  $\mathcal{K}_+$  is also invariant for  $(W_1, W_2, W)$  and furthermore, that, with respect to the three-fold orthogonal decomposition (4.6.10) of the space  $\mathcal{K}'$ ,  $(W_1, W_2, W)$  have block lower-triangular  $3 \times 3$  matrix decompositions of the

form

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} * & 0 & 0 \\ * & \Pi T \Pi^* & 0 \\ * & * & * \end{bmatrix}, \quad W_j = \begin{bmatrix} * & 0 & 0 \\ * & \Pi T_j \Pi^* & 0 \\ * & * & * \end{bmatrix} \text{ for } j = 1, 2. \quad (4.6.11)$$

From these lower-triangular decompositions, we see that the space  $\mathcal{K}_- \oplus \text{Ran } \Pi$  is a  $(W_1^*, W_2^*, W^*)$ -invariant subspace.

We claim next that

$$\mathcal{K}_- \oplus \text{Ran } \Pi = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} W^{*n} \text{Ran } \Pi =: \mathcal{K}' \quad (4.6.12)$$

The containment

$$\mathcal{K}_- \oplus \text{Ran } \Pi \supset \bigvee_{n \geq 0} W^{*n} \text{Ran } \Pi.$$

is clear since we have seen that  $\mathcal{K}_- \oplus \text{Ran } \Pi$  is invariant for  $W^*$ . But from the definitions we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{K}} = \bigvee_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} W^n \text{Ran } \Pi, \quad \text{Ran } \Pi \oplus \mathcal{K}_+ = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} W^n \text{Ran } \Pi.$$

Combining these forces us to the conclusion that in fact we recover  $\mathcal{K}_- \oplus \text{Ran } \Pi \subset \tilde{\mathcal{K}}$  as

$$\mathcal{K}_- \oplus \text{Ran } \Pi = \bigvee_{n \leq 0} W^n \text{Ran } \Pi = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} W^{*n} \text{Ran } \Pi$$

and the claim (4.6.12) follows. Therefore

$$(V'_1, V'_2) := (W_1^*, W_2^*)|_{\mathcal{K}'}$$

is a pair of commuting isometries. By taking adjoints of the block matrices in (4.6.11) we see that  $(\Pi, V'_1, V'_2)$  is an Andô lift of  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  acting on the space  $\mathcal{K}_- \oplus \text{Ran } \Pi = \mathcal{K}'$  equal to the space for the minimal isometric lift for  $T^*$ , i.e.,  $(\Pi, V'_1, V'_2)$  is a strongly minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  as wanted. ■

Let us recall that the first part of Theorem 4.6.3 uses the Douglas model to obtain a criterion for  $(T_1, T_2)$  to have a strongly minimal Andô lift in terms of the existence of a particular kind of Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ , while the second part uses the Schäffer model to obtain a criterion for such a strongly minimal Andô lift, but now in terms of the existence of a particular type of Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . But by Theorem 4.6.5 we know that the existence of a strongly minimal Andô lift for  $(T_1, T_2)$  is equivalent to the existence of such a lift for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . Hence we may interchange  $(T_1, T_2)$  with  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  in either part of Theorem 4.6.3 and still have a valid statement. If we enhance Theorem 4.6.3 and succeeding theorems with these observations, we arrive at the following summary of all these results.

**COROLLARY 4.6.6.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive pair.*

1. *Then the following are equivalent.*

- (i)  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift.
- (ii) There is a strongly minimal Type I Andô tuple of  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ .
- (iii) There is a strongly minimal strong Type II Andô tuple of  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

(iv) Both factorizations  $T = T_1 \cdot T_2$  and  $T = T_2 \cdot T_1$  are regular. In this case, there is a unique strongly minimal canonical special Andô tuple of  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

2. If  $(T_1, T_2)$  is replaced by  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  in the above statements, then the corresponding statements are all mutually equivalent with each other and with any of the statements in part (1) above.

In the next Section we give yet another statement equivalent to any of the statements in Corollary 4.6.6 in terms of the Fundamental-Operator pair for  $(T_1, T_2)$  or  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ .

**4.7. Strongly minimal Andô lifts and Fundamental-Operator pairs.** Here we introduce the notion of *Fundamental-Operator pair*  $(F_1, F_2)$  for a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ ; such a notion has already been introduced and had an impact in the related theory of symmetrized-bidisk contractions [16] and tetrablock contractions [15]. We first need a preliminary lemma.

LEMMA 4.7.1. *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive pair acting on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $T = T_1 T_2$ . Then a pair of operators  $F_1, F_2$  on the defect space  $\mathcal{D}_T$  satisfies the pair of equations*

$$T_1 - T_2^* T = D_T F_1 D_T, \quad T_2 - T_1^* T = D_T F_2 D_T. \quad (4.7.1)$$

*if and only if  $F_1, F_2$  satisfies the pair of equations*

$$D_T T_1 = F_1 D_T + F_2^* D_T T, \quad D_T T_2 = F_2 D_T + F_1^* D_T T. \quad (4.7.2)$$

*Furthermore, the solution of either pair (4.7.1) or (4.7.2) is unique.*

*Proof.* Let us suppose that the operator pair  $(F_1, F_2)$  solves (4.7.1). We wish to prove that the same  $(F_1, F_2)$  also solves (4.7.2). Let us consider only the first equation in (4.7.2) for the moment. Since  $D_T$  is an injective, bounded operator on  $\mathcal{D}_T$ , the solution set of the first equation in (4.7.2) is unaffected if we multiply the equations (4.7.2) on the left by  $D_T$ . In particular, multiplying the first equation in (4.7.2) on the left by  $D_T$  results in

$$(I - T^* T) T_1 = D_T F_1 D_T + D_T F_2^* D_T T.$$

Now use that  $(F_1, F_2)$  solves (4.7.1) to eliminate  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  and rewrite this as

$$\begin{aligned} (I - T^* T) T_1 &= (T_1 - T_2^* T) + (T_2^* - T^* T_1) T \\ &= T_1 - T^* T_1 T = (I - T^* T) T_1 \end{aligned}$$

which is just an identity in  $T_1, T_2$ , and  $T = T_1 T_2$ , and we conclude that the first equation in (4.7.2) holds. A similar computation (which amounts to switching the roles of the indices (1, 2)) verifies that second equation in (4.7.2) holds. We conclude that any solution of (4.7.1) is also a solution of (4.7.2).

Conversely, suppose that  $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_T)$  solves the system (4.7.2) and we wish to show that the same  $F_1, F_2$  solves the system (4.7.1). Multiply both equations in (4.7.2) on the left by  $D_T$  to get the pair of equations

$$(I - T^* T) T_1 = D_T F_1 D_T + D_T F_2^* D_T T, \quad (I - T^* T) T_2 = D_T F_2 D_T + D_T F_1^* D_T T. \quad (4.7.3)$$

Our goal is to solve this system for  $D_T F_1 D_T$  and  $D_T F_2 D_T$  and then arrive at the equations (4.7.1) written in reverse order:

$$D_T F_1 D_T = T_1 - T_2^* T, \quad D_T F_2 D_T = T_2 - T_1^* T. \quad (4.7.4)$$

We shall give the details only for the first equation as the verification of the second is completely similar.

Let us take the adjoint of the second equation in (4.7.3) and solve for  $D_T F_2^* D_T$  to get

$$D_T F_2^* D_T = T_2^*(I - T^* T) - T^* D_T F_1 D_T.$$

Plugging this back into the first equation in (4.7.3) then gives us

$$(I - T^* T)T_1 = D_T F_1 D_T + T_2^*(I - T^* T)T - T^* D_T F_1 D_T T. \quad (4.7.5)$$

We now have  $D_T F_2 D_T$  eliminated and this becomes an equation for the single unknown  $D_T F_1 D_T$ : if we set

$$\Sigma_1 = D_T F_1 D_T, \quad Y = (I - T^* T)T_1 - T_2^*(I - T^* T)T, \quad (4.7.6)$$

with  $\Sigma_1$  now the unknown, then (4.7.5) has the form

$$\Sigma_1 - T^* \Sigma_1 T = Y. \quad (4.7.7)$$

Rewrite this as  $\Sigma_1 = T^* \Sigma_1 T + Y$ , plug in this expression for  $\Sigma_1$  back into the right-hand side, and iterate to get

$$\Sigma_1 = T^{*N+1} \Sigma_1 T^{N+1} + \sum_{n=0}^N T^{*n} Y T^n \text{ for all } N = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (4.7.8)$$

If it is the case that  $T^{*N+1} \Sigma_1 T^{N+1}$  tends to 0 (say in the weak operator topology), then we can take limits on both sides of (4.7.8) to arrive at a formula for  $\Sigma_1$ :

$$\Sigma_1 = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} T^{*n} Y T^n.$$

To analyze this further, let us recall the precise formulas (4.7.6) for what  $\Sigma_1$  and  $Y$  are for our case here. Thus (4.7.8) specializes to

$$D_T F_1 D_T = T^{*N+1} D_T F_1 D_T T^{N+1} + \sum_{n=0}^N T^{*n} ((I - T^* T)T_1 - T_2^*(I - T^* T)T) T^n. \quad (4.7.9)$$

Let us note next that, for each  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ , the following series is telescoping:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^N \|D_T T^n h\|^2 &= \sum_{n=0}^N \langle T^{*n} (I - T^* T) T^n h, h \rangle = \sum_{n=0}^N (\|T^n h\|^2 - \|T^{n+1} h\|^2) \\ &= \|h\|^2 - \|T^{N+1} h\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

As  $T$  is a contraction,  $\|T^{N+1} h\|^2$  is decreasing and bounded below by zero and hence convergent. In particular we see that the series  $\sum_{n=0}^N \|D_T T^n h\|^2$  is convergent for each  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ . By the  $n$ -th term test it follows that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|D_T T^n h\|^2 = 0$ . It follows that the operator sequence  $T^{*N+1} D_T F_1 D_T T^{N+1}$  certainly converges to 0 in the weak operator

topology. We conclude from (4.7.9) that we have solved for  $D_T F_1 D_T$ :

$$D_T F_1 D_T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T^{*n} ((I - T^* T) T_1 - T_2^* (I - T^* T) T) T^n \quad (4.7.10)$$

with the infinite series converging in the weak operator topology.

It remains only to show that the sum of this series is actually equal to  $T_1 - T_2^* T$ , i.e., that  $F_1$  satisfies the first of equations (4.7.1). Let us recall from Section 4.2.1 that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T^{*n} T^n$  exists in the strong operator topology with limit denoted as  $Q_T^2$  (with  $Q_T$  then set equal to the unique positive semi-definite square root of  $Q_T^2$ ) and moreover, given that  $T = T_1 \cdot T_2$  is a commuting, contractive factorization of  $T$ , we then also have the three identities

$$Q_T^2 = T^* Q_T^2 T, \quad Q_T^2 = T_1^* Q_T^2 T_1, \quad Q_T^2 = T_2^* Q_T^2 T_2. \quad (4.7.11)$$

Moreover, due to the telescoping property of the sequence of partial sums, we see that

$$\sum_{n=0}^N T^{*n} (I - T^* T) T^n = I - T^{*N+1} T^{N+1}$$

and hence also

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T^{*n} (I - T^* T) T^n = I - Q_T^2$$

with convergence in the strong operator topology. Let us rewrite (4.7.10) as

$$D_T F_1 D_T = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T^{*n} (I - T^* T) T_1 T^n - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T^{*n} T_2^* (I - T^* T) T T^n. \quad (4.7.12)$$

The first term on the right-hand side of (4.7.12) is

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T^{*n} (I - T^* T) T_1 T^n = \left( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T^{*n} (I - T^* T) T^n \right) T_1 = (I - Q_T^2) T_1$$

while the second term (without the minus sign) on the right-hand side is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T^{*n} T_2^* (I - T^* T) T T^n &= T_2^* \left( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T^{*n} (I - T^* T) T^n \right) T \\ &= T_2^* \left( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T^{*n} (I - T^* T) T^n \right) T = T_2^* (I - Q_T^2) T. \end{aligned}$$

Collecting terms and recalling (4.7.11) then gives

$$\begin{aligned} D_T F_1 D_T &= (I - Q_T^2) T_1 - T_2^* (I - Q_T^2) T = T_1 - Q_T^2 T_1 - T_2^* T + T_2^* Q_T^2 T_2 T_1 \\ &= T_1 - Q_T^2 T_1 - T_2^* T + Q_T^2 T_1 = T_1 - T_2^* T \end{aligned}$$

as required.

It remains to show that solutions of (4.7.1) (or equivalently of (4.7.2)) are unique whenever they exist. As for (4.7.2), uniqueness is immediate from the fact that  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are taken to be operators on  $\mathcal{D}_T$  and the fact that  $D_T|_{\mathcal{D}_T}$  is an injective bounded operator on  $\mathcal{D}_T$  with dense range. It is possible to give a direct proof of the uniqueness of solutions of (4.7.2) by showing that the only solution of the homogeneous equation is the

zero solution; however, this proof is rather elaborate (much like the proof of the existence of a solution for (4.7.2)). A much shorter proof is to note that this uniqueness follows immediately from the equivalence between solutions of (4.7.1) and (4.7.2) together with the uniqueness of solutions of (4.7.1) already observed. ■

Solutions of (4.7.1) are fundamental for later developments, so we now formally give them a name. Existence of such solutions for any commuting contractive pair will be shown shortly.

**DEFINITION 4.7.2.** Given a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ , the unique solution pair  $(F_1, F_2)$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_T)$  (where  $T = T_1 T_2$ ) of the pair of operator equations (4.7.1) is called the *Fundamental-Operator pair* of  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

We are now ready to prove the existence of a Fundamental-Operator pair for a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . We note that this theorem is already proved in [10, Theorem 3.2], where it was shown that the result is actually true for a tuple of any finite number of commuting contraction operators. However, the proof there appeals to the parallel result for the case of  $\Gamma$ -contractions (a commuting operator pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  having the symmetrized bidisk as a spectral set) whereas here we give three direct proofs for the setting of a commuting contractive pair. We take full advantage of the 2-dimensional dilation theory (i.e., the existence of an Andô lift for a commuting contractive pair) to arrive at the new proofs.

**THEOREM 4.7.3.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive pair acting on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $T = T_1 T_2$ . Then a Fundamental-Operator pair of  $(T_1, T_2)$  in the sense of Definition 4.7.2 exists, i.e., there exists a unique pair of contraction operators  $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_T)$  satisfying (4.7.1) (or equivalently, by Lemma 4.7.1, (4.7.2)).*

*Proof.* We shall give three proofs of this result.

**First Proof via Andô's Theorem:** We first consider two illustrative special cases, and then use the second special case to prove the result for the general case.

**Case 1.**  $(T_1, T_2) = (V_1, V_2)$  is a **commuting isometric pair**. Note that in this case (4.7.1) is obviously true since both sides of (4.7.1) are actually zero.

**Case 2.**  $(T_1, T_2) = (V_1^*, V_2^*)$  is a **commuting co-isometric pair**. To handle this case, one can apply the Berger-Coburn-Lebow model for the isometric pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  and then directly compute. It suffices to assume that the product  $V = V_1 V_2$  is a shift, since the unitary part washes out when computing the operators  $V_1 - V_2^* V$ ,  $V_2 - V_1 V^*$  as well as the defect operators  $D_V$ ,  $D_{V_1}$ ,  $D_{V_2}$  as seen from Case 1. Recall the notation  $\mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}$  (2.1.1) for the operator of evaluation-at-0 from  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  to  $\mathcal{F}$ .

If we use the BCL1 model

$$(V_1, V_2) = (I_{H^2} \otimes P^\perp U + M_z \otimes PU, I_{H^2} \otimes U^* P + M_z \otimes U^* P^\perp) \text{ on } H^2(\mathcal{F}),$$

one sees that

$$V_1^* - V_2 V^* = (I_{H^2} - M_z M_z^*) \otimes U^* P^\perp = D_{V^*} \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* U^* P^\perp \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}} D_{V^*}.$$

while

$$V_2^* - V_1 V^* = (I_{H^2} - M_z M_z^*) \otimes PU = D_{V^*} \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* PU \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}} D_{V^*}$$



leading to the operators

$$F_1 = \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* U^* P^\perp \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}} |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}, \quad F_2 = \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* P U \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}} |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{V^*}) \quad (4.7.13)$$

being the unique solutions of the Fundamental-Operator equations (4.7.1). However, if we use the BCL2 model

$$(V_1, V_2) = (I_{H^2} \otimes U^* P^\perp + M_z \otimes U^* P, I_{H^2} \otimes P U + M_z \otimes P^\perp U) \text{ on } H^2(\mathcal{F}),$$

one gets

$$V_1^* - V_2 V^* = (I_{H^2} - M_z M_z^*) \otimes P^\perp U = D_{V^*} \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* P^\perp U \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}} D_{V^*}$$

while

$$V_2^* - V_1 V^* = (I_{H^2} - M_z M_z^*) \otimes U^* P = D_{V^*} \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* U^* P \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}} D_{V^*}$$

leading to unique solutions  $F_1, F_2$  of the fundamental equations (4.7.1) for this case being given by

$$F_1 = \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* P^\perp U \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}} |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}, \quad F_2 = \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* U^* P \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}} |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{V^*}). \quad (4.7.14)$$

Note that one can go from (4.7.13) to (4.7.14) by replacing  $(P, U)$  in (4.7.13) by its flipped version  $(P^f, U^f) = (U^* P U, U^*)$  to arrive at the version (4.7.14) for the fundamental operators.

To avoid this phenomenon of the formula for the Fundamental-Operator pair  $(F_1, F_2)$  depending on the choice of representation of the coisometric pair  $(V_1^*, V_2^*)$ , we can apply the canonical version Theorem 3.1.7 of the BCL model by expressing the fundamental operator pair  $(F_1, F_2)$  directly in terms of  $(V_1, V_2)$  as follows. By part (4) of Theorem 3.1.7, a BCL1 tuple for  $(V_1, V_2)$  is  $(\mathcal{D}_{V^*}, P, U)$  with

$$P = D_{V_1^*} |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}, \quad U = (V_1 D_{V_2^*} + D_{V_1^*} V_2^*) |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}. \quad (4.7.15)$$

Let us also observe here that when we take  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}_{V^*}$ , then the operator  $\mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}$  acting from  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{V^*})$  to  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$  when restricted to  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$  amounts to the identity operator:

$$\mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} = I_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}.$$

Plugging the values for  $(P, U)$  given by (4.7.15) into the the expressions (4.7.13) for the corresponding Fundamental Operators and noting that  $P^\perp = V_1 D_{V_2^*} V_1^* |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}$  then gives us expressions for  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  directly in terms of  $(V_1, V_2)$ :

$$F_1 = \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}^* (D_{V_2^*} V_1^* + V_2 D_{V_1^*}) (V_1 D_{V_2^*} V_1^*) \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} = D_{V_2^*} V_1^* |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}$$

while

$$F_2 = \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}^* D_{V_1^*} (V_1 D_{V_2^*} + D_{V_1^*} V_2^*) \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}} |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} = D_{V_1^*} V_2^* |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}$$

arriving at the formulas

$$F_1 = D_{V_2^*} V_1^* |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}, \quad F_2 = D_{V_1^*} V_2^* |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} \quad (4.7.16)$$

We leave it to the reader to verify that, if we instead use the BCL2 model for  $(V_1, V_2)$  to get the expressions (4.7.14) for the Fundamental Operators, and then plug into these expressions the canonical values  $(P, U)$  in (3.1.22) for the BCL2 model for the commuting isometric pair  $(V_1, V_2)$

$$P = V_2 D_{V_1^*} V_2 |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}, \quad U = (D_{V_2^*} V_1^* + V_2 D_{V_1^*} V_2^*) |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}, \quad (4.7.17)$$

then the resulting expression for  $(F_1, F_2)$  expressed directly in terms of  $(V_1, V_2)$  turns out to be exactly the same as in (4.7.16). Alternatively, once one identifies the candidate (4.7.16), one can compute directly that it works:

$$V_1^* - V_2V^* = D_{V^*}D_{V_2^*}V_1^*D_{V^*}, \quad V_2^* - V_1V^* = D_{V^*}D_{V_1^*}V_2^*D_{V^*}. \quad (4.7.18)$$

It suffices to verify the first equation as then the second follows by interchanging the roles of the indices 1, 2. Note first that

$$V_1^* - V_2V^* = V_1^* - V_2V_2^*V_1^* = D_{V_2^*}V_1^*.$$

Furthermore

$$V^*D_{V_2^*}V_1^* = V_1^*V_2^*(I - V_2V_2^*)V_1^* = 0$$

and we conclude that

$$D_{V^*}D_{V_2^*}V_1^* = D_{V_2^*}V_1^*.$$

Similarly

$$D_{V_2^*}V_1^*VV^* = D_{V_2^*}V_1^*V_1V_2V^* = (I - V_2V_2^*)V_2V^* = 0$$

and hence we also have

$$D_{V_2^*}V_1^*D_V = D_{V_2^*}V_1^*(I - V^*V) = D_{V_2^*}V_1^*.$$

Putting all the pieces together we get the first of equations (4.7.18) as expected.

**Case 3: The general case.** Now let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be any commuting contractive pair acting on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . By Andô's theorem, we know that  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  has an Andô lift  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  with  $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  and  $V_1, V_2$  acting on  $\mathcal{K}$ . For notational convenience, we may assume  $\Pi = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K}$ . Recall that the lifting property can be reformulated as

$$V_j^*|_{\mathcal{H}} = T_j \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \text{ and hence also } V^*|_{\mathcal{H}} = T. \quad (4.7.19)$$

where we set  $V = V_1V_2 = V_2V_1$  and  $T = T_1T_2 = T_2T_1$ .

For  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  we then have

$$\|D_{V^*}h\|^2 = \langle h, h \rangle - \langle V^*h, V^*h \rangle = \langle h, h \rangle - \langle Th, Th \rangle = \|D_T h\|^2.$$

We conclude that the map  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{V^*}$  defined densely by

$$\Lambda: D_T h \mapsto D_{V^*}h \quad (4.7.20)$$

is an isometry. From this definition, we can also write

$$D_{V^*}|_{\mathcal{H}} = \Lambda D_T. \quad (4.7.21)$$

Taking adjoints then gives

$$P_{\mathcal{H}}D_{V^*} = D_T\Lambda^*. \quad (4.7.22)$$

From Case 2 above we know that there are fundamental operators  $(F_1^{\mathbf{V}}, F_2^{\mathbf{V}})$  for the commuting coisometric pair  $(V_1^*, V_2^*)$  for the record by (4.7.16) given by

$$F_1^{\mathbf{V}} = D_{V_2^*}V_1^*|_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}, \quad F_2^{\mathbf{V}} = D_{V_1^*}V_2^*|_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}$$

which by definition satisfies the equations

$$V_1^* - V_2V^* = D_{V^*}F_1^{\mathbf{V}}D_{V^*}, \quad V_2^* - V_1V^* = D_{V^*}F_2^{\mathbf{V}}D_{V^*}.$$

Let us compress both sides of each of these equations to the subspace  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K}$  to get

$$P_{\mathcal{H}}(V_1^* - V_2V^*)|_{\mathcal{H}} = P_{\mathcal{H}}D_{V^*}F_1^{\mathbf{V}}D_{V^*}|_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad P_{\mathcal{H}}(V_2^* - V_1V^*)|_{\mathcal{H}} = P_{\mathcal{H}}D_{V^*}F_2^{\mathbf{V}}D_{V^*}|_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (4.7.23)$$

Making use of the identities (4.7.19) then leads us to

$$P_{\mathcal{H}}(V_1^* - V_2V^*)|_{\mathcal{H}} = T_1 - T_2^*T, \quad P_{\mathcal{H}}(V_2^* - V_1V^*)|_{\mathcal{H}} = T_2 - T_1^*T.$$

On the other hand, the identities (4.7.21) and (4.7.22) gives us

$$P_{\mathcal{H}}D_{V^*}F_1^{\mathbf{V}}D_{V^*}|_{\mathcal{H}} = D_T\Lambda^*F_1^{\mathbf{V}}\Lambda D_T, \quad P_{\mathcal{H}}D_{V^*}F_2^{\mathbf{V}}D_{V^*}|_{\mathcal{H}} = D_T\Lambda^*F_2^{\mathbf{V}}\Lambda D_T.$$

Plugging these last two collections of identities back into (4.7.23) then gives us

$$T_1 - T_2^*T = D_T\Lambda^*F_1^{\mathbf{V}}\Lambda D_T, \quad T_2 - T_1^*T = D_T\Lambda^*F_2^{\mathbf{V}}\Lambda D_T$$

and we conclude that the operator pair

$$F_1 = \Lambda^*F_1^{\mathbf{V}}\Lambda, \quad F_2 = \Lambda^*F_2^{\mathbf{V}}\Lambda$$

serves as the fundamental-operator pair for the commuting, contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  as desired.

**Second Proof via Type I Andô Tuples:** Here we prove:

- *If  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ , then the fundamental operator pair  $(F_1, F_2)$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$  can be given by*

$$F_1 = \Lambda^*P^{\perp}U\Lambda, \quad F_2 = \Lambda^*U^*P\Lambda. \quad (4.7.24)$$

By Lemma 4.7.1, to find the fundamental operator pair, it suffices to find a pair of operators  $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_T)$  so that  $(F_1, F_2)$  solves (4.7.2) rather than (4.7.1). To see this, note that by Definition 4.2.5,  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  being a Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$  means that

$$P^{\perp}U\Lambda D_T + PU\Lambda D_T T = \Lambda D_T T_1, \quad U^*P\Lambda D_T + U^*P^{\perp}\Lambda D_T T = \Lambda D_T T_2. \quad (4.7.25)$$

Multiply each of these equations on the left by  $\Lambda^*$  to get the equations (4.7.2) with  $F_1, F_2$  as claimed.

**Third Proof via Type II Andô Tuples:** As in the Second Proof, we actually prove the following assertion:

- *If  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a strong Type II Andô tuple for a commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ , then the fundamental operator pair  $(F_1, F_2)$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$  is given as in (4.7.24).*

In the first step of the following computation we make use of the two expressions for  $\Lambda D_T$

given by condition (i') in Definition 4.5.2:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_T \Lambda^* P^\perp U \Lambda D_T &= (\Lambda D_T)^* P^\perp U (\Lambda D_T) \\
&= (P U \Lambda D_T T_2 + P^\perp \Lambda D_T)^* P^\perp U (U^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T T_1 + U^* P U \Lambda D_T) \\
&= (T_2^* D_T \Lambda^* U^* P + D_T \Lambda^* P^\perp) P^\perp (P^\perp \Lambda D_T T_1 + P U \Lambda D_T) \\
&= D_T \Lambda^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T T_1 \\
&= D_{T_2}^2 T_1 \text{ (by the second equation in Definition 4.5.2 (ii))} \\
&= T_1 - T_2^* T.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, in the first step of the next computation, we use the two expressions for  $\Lambda D_T$  given by condition (i') in Definition 4.5.2 but in reverse order:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_T \Lambda^* U^* P \Lambda D_T &= (\Lambda D_T)^* U^* P (\Lambda D_T) \\
&= (U^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T T_1 + U^* P U \Lambda D_T)^* U^* P (P U \Lambda D_T T_2 + P^\perp \Lambda D_T) \\
&= (T_1^* D_T \Lambda^* P^\perp + D_T \Lambda^* U^* P) P (P U \Lambda D_T T_2 + P^\perp \Lambda D_T) \\
&= D_T \Lambda^* U^* P U \Lambda D_T T_2 \\
&= D_{T_1}^2 T_2 \text{ (by the first equation in Definition 4.5.2 (ii))} \\
&= T_2 - T_1^* T.
\end{aligned}$$

This establishes the claim and completes the proof of Theorem 4.7.3. ■

The following theorem gives a characterization of existence of a strongly minimal Andô lift for a commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  in terms of the fundamental-operator pair  $(F_1, F_2)$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . The condition (4.7.26) on the Fundamental-Operator pair  $(F_1, F_2)$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$  is yet another equivalent condition that one can add to the list of equivalent conditions in Corollary 4.6.6.

**THEOREM 4.7.4.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive pair acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift if and only if its Fundamental-Operator pair  $(F_1, F_2)$  satisfies the system of equations*

$$F_1 F_2 = 0 = F_2 F_1, \quad F_1^* F_1 + F_2 F_2^* = I_{\mathcal{D}_T} = F_1 F_1^* + F_2^* F_2. \quad (4.7.26)$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift. By Part (2) of Theorem 4.6.3,  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal strong Type II Andô tuple, say  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$ . By the Third Proof of Theorem 4.7.3,  $(F_1, F_2) = (\Lambda^* P^\perp U \Lambda, \Lambda^* U^* P \Lambda)$  is the fundamental operator pair for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Since  $\Lambda$  here is a unitary, it is now a matter of easy computation to check that  $F_1, F_2$  satisfy equations (4.7.26).

Conversely, suppose  $F_1, F_2$  satisfy equations (4.7.26). Apply Lemma 3.1.1 to  $(F_1^*, F_2^*)$  to get a projection  $P$  and a unitary  $U$  on  $\mathcal{D}_T$  such that  $(F_1, F_2) = (P^\perp U, U^* P)$ . Since  $(F_1, F_2)$  is the fundamental operator pair for  $(T_1, T_2)$ , we have

$$T_1 - T_2^* T = D_T P^\perp U D_T, \quad T_2 - T_1^* T = D_T U^* P D_T, \quad (4.7.27)$$

$$D_T T_1 = P^\perp U D_T + P U D_T T, \quad D_T T_2 = U^* P D_T + U^* P^\perp D_T T. \quad (4.7.28)$$

We now unfold these equations to show that  $(\mathcal{D}_T, I_{\mathcal{D}_T}, P, U)$  is a (strongly minimal) strong Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Then by Part (2) of Theorem 4.6.3 we will be

done. Multiply both sides of the second equation in (4.7.28) on the left by  $D_T P U$  to get

$$D_T P U D_T T_2 = D_T P D_T.$$

Combining this with the adjoint of the second equation in (4.7.27) then gives us

$$\begin{aligned} D_T P^\perp D_T &= D_T^2 - D_T P D_T = D_T^2 - D_T P U D_T T_2 \\ &= (I - T^* T) - (T_2^* - T^* T_1) T_2 = D_{T_2}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7.29)$$

This is the second isometry condition in Definition 4.5.2 (here  $\Lambda = I_{\mathcal{D}_T}$ ).

For the other isometry condition, we multiply both sides of the first equation in (4.7.28) on the left by  $D_T U^* P^\perp$  to get

$$D_T U^* P^\perp D_T T_1 = D_T U^* P^\perp U D_T.$$

Combining this with the adjoint of the second equation in (4.7.27) then gives us

$$\begin{aligned} D_T U^* P U D_T &= D_T^2 - D_T U^* P^\perp U D_T = D_T^2 - D_T U^* P^\perp D_T T_1 \\ &= I - T^* T - (T_1^* - T^* T_2) T_1 = D_{T_1}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7.30)$$

By Definition 4.5.2, it just remains to show that

$$D_T = P U D_T T_2 + P^\perp D_T = U^* P^\perp D_T T_1 + U^* P U D_T.$$

Since this is an operator equation from  $\mathcal{D}_T$  into  $\mathcal{D}_T$  and  $D_T$  is injective on  $\mathcal{D}_T$ , the above will hold if and only if

$$D_T^2 = D_T P U D_T T_2 + D_T P^\perp D_T = D_T U^* P^\perp D_T T_1 + D_T U^* P U D_T$$

holds. In view of equations (4.7.27), (4.7.29) and (4.7.30), the above equations boil down to the operator equations

$$D_T^2 = T_2^* (I - T_1^* T_1) T_2 + (I - T_2^* T_2) = T_1^* (I - T_2^* T_2) T_1 + (I - T_1^* T_1),$$

which is true as observed before in (4.3.3). Consequently,  $(\mathcal{D}_T, I_{\mathcal{D}_T}, P, U)$  is a strongly minimal strong Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$  and therefore by Part (2) of Theorem 4.6.3,  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift. This completes the proof. ■

REMARK 4.7.5. We have noted in Examples 4.2.7 and 4.5.4 that a commuting isometric pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  as well as a commuting co-isometric pair  $(V_1^*, V_2^*)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift. As a further exercise, we now verify how this can also be seen as an application of Theorem 4.7.4.

We have seen in the course of the First Proof of Theorem 4.7.3 that a commuting pair of isometries  $(V_1, V_2)$  has a trivial fundamental operator pair  $(F_1, F_2) = (0, 0)$  acting on the zero space  $\mathcal{D}_{V^*}$  while a commuting pair of coisometries  $(V_1^*, V_2^*)$  has fundamental-operator pair  $(F_1, F_2)$  given explicitly by

$$F_1 = D_{V_2^*} V_1^* |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}, \quad F_2 = D_{V_2^*} V_1^* |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}. \quad (4.7.31)$$

For the case of a commuting isometric pair  $(V_1, V_2)$  we conclude that condition (4.7.26) holds trivially and hence (by Theorem 4.7.4)  $(V_1, V_2)$  has a strongly minimal isometric lift (namely, itself).

For the case of a commuting coisometric pair  $(V_1^*, V_2^*)$ , one can check directly that  $(F_1, F_2)$  given by (4.7.31) satisfies (4.7.26): e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 F_2 &= D_{V_2^*} V_1^* D_{V_1^*} V_2^* |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} = (I - V_2 V_2^*) V_1^* (I - V_1 V_1^*) V_2^* |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} \\ &= (I - V_2 V_2^*) V_1^* (I - V_1 V_1^*) V_2^* |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} = 0 \text{ since } V_1^* (I - V_1 V_1^*) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$F_2 F_1 = 0.$$

Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} F_1^* F_1 + F_2 F_2^* &= (V_1 (I - V_2 V_2^*) V_1^* + (I - V_1 V_1^*) V_2^* V_2 (I - V_1 V_1^*)) |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} \\ &= ((V_1 V_1^* - V V^*) + (I - V_1 V_1^*)) |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} = (I - V V^*) |_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} = I_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}} \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$F_1 F_1^* + F_2^* F_2 = I_{\mathcal{D}_{V^*}}.$$

As of this writing, we do not have an example of a Type I Andô tuple which is not special or of a strong Type II Andô tuple which is not special. In the next chapter, we produce an example of a Type II Andô tuple which is not strong Type II (and hence not special): see Proposition 5.3.1. There we shall also see that whenever  $(T_1, T_2)$  has at least one strongly minimal Type I or strongly minimal strong Type II Andô tuple, then any minimal Type I or minimal strong Type II Andô tuple is actually strongly minimal and coincides with the unique strongly minimal canonical-form special Andô tuple (see Theorem 6.4.2 and Corollary 6.4.3. The next result shows that within the category of strongly minimal Andô tuples, any Type I or strong Type II Andô tuple is in fact special. We include this result here as it illustrates how use of the Fundamental-Operator pair leads to explicit formulas.

**THEOREM 4.7.6.** *Every strongly minimal Type I or strongly minimal strong Type II Andô tuple of a commuting contractive pair coincides with a special Andô tuple.*

*Proof.* Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive pair and  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  be a strongly minimal Type I Andô tuple of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Then by Part (1) of Theorem 4.6.3 and Theorem 4.6.5,  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift. By Theorem 4.6.4, there is a strongly minimal special Andô tuple of  $(T_1, T_2)$ , call it  $(\mathcal{F}_\dagger, \Lambda_\dagger, P_\dagger, U_\dagger)$ ; note that  $\mathcal{F}_\dagger$  here is just the space  $\mathcal{D}_{T_1} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2}$ . By Definition 4.1.1, we will be done if we can find a unitary  $\tau : \mathcal{F}_\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  such that

$$\tau \cdot \Lambda_\dagger = \Lambda \quad \text{and} \quad (P, U) = (\tau P_\dagger \tau^*, \tau U_\dagger \tau^*). \quad (4.7.32)$$

Set  $\tau := \Lambda \Lambda_\dagger^* : \mathcal{F}_\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ . This is a unitary because both  $\Lambda_\dagger$  and  $\Lambda$  are unitary. First, note that  $\Lambda = \Lambda \Lambda_\dagger^* \cdot \Lambda_\dagger$ . Therefore the first equation in (4.7.32) is achieved. Second, since a special Andô tuple is of Type I (see Theorem 4.3.8), by the Second Proof of Theorem 4.7.3, both the pairs

$$(\Lambda^* P^\perp U \Lambda, \Lambda^* U^* P \Lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad (\Lambda_\dagger^* P_\dagger^\perp U_\dagger \Lambda_\dagger, \Lambda_\dagger^* U_\dagger^* P_\dagger \Lambda_\dagger)$$

are the fundamental operator pair for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Since the fundamental operators are

unique, we must have

$$\Lambda^* P^\perp U \Lambda = \Lambda_\dagger^* P_\dagger^\perp U_\dagger \Lambda_\dagger \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda^* U^* P \Lambda = \Lambda_\dagger^* U_\dagger^* P_\dagger \Lambda_\dagger. \quad (4.7.33)$$

Adding the first of these two equations with the adjoint of the other, we get

$$\Lambda^* U \Lambda = \Lambda_\dagger^* U_\dagger \Lambda_\dagger \quad \text{or, equivalently,} \quad U = \Lambda \Lambda_\dagger^* \cdot U_\dagger \cdot \Lambda_\dagger \Lambda^*.$$

Using this expression of  $U$  in the second equation of (4.7.33) and simplifying we get

$$P = \Lambda \Lambda_\dagger^* \cdot P_\dagger \cdot \Lambda_\dagger \Lambda^*.$$

Therefore the second set of equations in (4.7.32) is also established. This shows that the strongly minimal Type I Andô tuple of  $(T_1, T_2)$  coincides with the special strongly minimal Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_\dagger, \Lambda_\dagger, P_\dagger, U_\dagger)$  via the unitary  $\Lambda \Lambda_\dagger^* : \mathcal{F}_\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ .

Via a similar analysis using Theorem 4.5.5 and the Third Proof of Theorem 4.7.3, one can show that every strongly minimal strong Type II Andô tuple coincides with a special strongly minimal Andô tuple. ■

The following result shows how one can recover Andô tuples (up to coincidence) for a commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  from the Fundamental-Operator pair  $(F_1, F_2)$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$ , at least for the case where  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô dilation.

**PROPOSITION 4.7.7.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive pair and  $(F_1, F_2)$  be its fundamental-operator pair. Then every strongly minimal strong Type II Andô tuple of  $(T_1, T_2)$  coincides with  $(\mathcal{D}_T, I_{\mathcal{D}_T}, F_2^* F_2, F_2^* + F_1)$ . The same assertion holds for a strongly minimal Type I Andô tuple of  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  as well.*

*Proof.* Let  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  be a strongly minimal strong Type II Andô tuple of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Since  $\Lambda$  is a unitary and we are interested in the coincidence envelope of strongly minimal Andô tuples, without loss of generality we can suppose that the Andô tuple is  $(\Lambda^* \mathcal{F}, \Lambda^* \Lambda, \Lambda^* P \Lambda, \Lambda^* U \Lambda) = (\mathcal{D}_T, I_{\mathcal{D}_T}, P, U)$ . By the Third Proof of Theorem 4.7.3, the fundamental operators for  $(T_1, T_2)$  then are  $(F_1, F_2) = (P^\perp U, U^* P)$ . This readily implies that  $F_1 + F_2^* = U$  and hence  $P = (F_1 + F_2^*) F_2 = F_2^* F_2$ . Similarly, using the Second Proof of Theorem 4.7.3, one can prove the assertion for a strongly minimal Type I Andô tuple of  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . ■

#### 4.8. Appendix: examples. 1. Example of a special Andô tuple which is not a Type I' Andô tuple.

Recall from Remark 4.3.9 that a pre-Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  for the commuting contractive pair  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  is said to be a Type I' Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  if the system of equations (4.3.11) - (4.3.12) holds:

$$\begin{aligned} U^* P \Lambda \mathcal{D}_{T^*} T^* + U^* P^\perp \Lambda \mathcal{D}_{T^*} &= \Lambda \mathcal{D}_{T^*} T_1^*, \\ P^\perp U \Lambda \mathcal{D}_{T^*} T^* + P U \Lambda \mathcal{D}_{T^*} &= \Lambda \mathcal{D}_{T^*} T_2^*. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8.1)$$

We now complete the discussion in Remark 4.3.9 by showing that it can happen that there is a special Andô tuple which is not a Type I' Andô tuple.

To construct an example, proceed as follows. Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be the BCL2-model commuting isometric pair associated with the BCL-tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$ :

$$T_1 = (I_{H^2} \otimes U^* P^\perp) + (M_z \otimes U^* P), \quad T_2 = (I_{H^2} \otimes PU) + (M_z \otimes P^\perp U). \quad (4.8.2)$$

Then the product isometry  $T = T_1 T_2 = T_2 T_1$  is  $T = M_z^{\mathcal{F}}$  and the defect operator  $D_{T^*}$  is the projection to the constant functions in  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$ :  $D_{T^*} = \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}$ .

Let the map  $\Lambda$  be given by

$$\Lambda = \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}|_{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} : \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}.$$

As was discussed in item (1) of Remark 4.2.7, the collection  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  having the additional property that  $\Lambda$  is unitary (rather than only isometry). For the ensuing discussion

$$\Xi_{T_1, T_2} = (\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U). \quad (4.8.3)$$

refers to this specific choice of Andô tuple constructed as above from  $(T_1, T_2) = (V_1, V_2)$ .

It is possible to find a unitary transformation  $\tau: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T_1^*} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{T_2^*}$  which implements a coincidence between the Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  and a canonical-form special Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}', \Lambda', P', U')$ , but instead we present a higher-brow argument which uses some general principles which are developed later in this exposition. As we have already observed above, the embedding operator  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is actually unitary (i.e., a surjective isometry) which means in the terminology of Definition 4.6.1 that  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a *strongly minimal* Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  and that the Douglas-model Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  induced by the Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  is actually *strongly minimal*, meaning that the pair  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_{D,1} \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  is a minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foias lift for the product contraction  $T = T_1 T_2$  in Douglas-model form (in this case where  $T$  is isometric, actually  $V_D = T$  is the isometric lift of itself). By the general result Theorem 6.4.2 to come, it follows that all Andô lifts of  $(T_1, T_2)$  are unitarily equivalent, which in turn means (by Theorem 5.1.1 to come) that all associated Type I Andô tuples for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  coincide. By combining Remark 4.3.4 and Theorem 4.3.8 we see that special Andô tuples for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  exist and each such Andô tuple is in fact a Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . Thus any Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  in fact coincides with a canonical-form special Andô tuple, and hence (according to our terminology) is itself special. In particular the specific Andô tuple  $\Xi_{T_1, T_2}$  identified in (4.8.3) is a special Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ .

We next wish to check that  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is not a Type I' Andô lift for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ , i.e. we wish to check the lack of general validity of the system of equations (4.8.1). Applying the first equation to a general element  $h \in H^2(\mathcal{F})$ , we see that the first equation holds if and only if for all  $h \in H^2(\mathcal{F})$  we have

$$U^* P h'(0) + U^* P^\perp h(0) = (T_1^* h)(0) := P^\perp U h(0) + P U h'(0).$$

For this to hold, it must be the case that coefficients of  $h(0)$  and of  $h'(0)$  match:

$$U^* P^\perp = P^\perp U, \quad U^* P = P U. \quad (4.8.4)$$

One can easily construct counterexamples, even with  $\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{C}$ , e.g.

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{C}, \quad U^2 \neq 1, \quad P = 1.$$



Thus the analogue of Theorem 4.3.8 with Type I' Andô tuple in place of Type I Andô tuple fails in general. A similar analysis holds for the second equation: applying the second equation to a general element  $h \in H^2(\mathcal{F})$  leads to

$$P^\perp U h'(0) + P U h(0) = (T_2^* h)(0) := U^* P h(0) + U^* P^\perp h'(0)$$

which then leads to the same system of equations (4.8.4). This completes the verification that the example is as desired.

## 2. Example of a special Andô tuple which is not a strong Type II' Andô tuple.

Recall from Remark 4.5.8 that for a pre-Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$  to be a strong Type II' Andô tuple, it must satisfy

(a) **Commutativity condition:**

$$U^* P \Lambda D_T T_2 + U^* P^\perp U \Lambda D_T = P^\perp U \Lambda D_T T_1 + P \Lambda D_T.$$

We show that there can be a special Andô tuple of  $(T_1, T_2)$  which fails to satisfy condition (a) above and hence is not a strong Type II' Andô tuple.

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be any coefficient Hilbert space,  $P$  be any projection and  $U$  be any unitary operator on  $\mathcal{F}$ . We let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be the commuting coisometric pair on  $H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp$  as in (4.5.29):

$$\begin{aligned} (T_1, T_2) &= (\tilde{V}_1^*, \tilde{V}_2^*) \quad \text{where} \\ (\tilde{V}_1, \tilde{V}_2) &= (M_{U^* P^\perp + z^{-1} U^* P}, M_{P U + z^{-1} P^\perp U}) \text{ on } H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\Lambda : \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  be as in (4.5.31). We concluded in Example 4.5.4 that  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a strong Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$  with  $\Lambda$  actually a unitary. As in the discussion of part (1) above, the fact that  $\Lambda$  is unitary implies that this  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is also special. Thus it remains only to argue that it can happen that this Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is not a strong Type II' Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

Toward this goal, let us first compute, for  $f(\zeta) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{-1} f_n \zeta^n \in H^2(\mathcal{F})^\perp$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda D_T : f &\mapsto f_{-1}, \\ \Lambda D_T T_1 : f &\mapsto [M_{P^\perp U + \zeta P U} f]_{-1} = P^\perp U f_{-1} + P U f_{-2}, \\ \Lambda D_T T_2 : f &\mapsto [M_{U^* P + \zeta U^* P^\perp} f]_{-1} = U^* P f_{-1} + U^* P^\perp f_{-2}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} U^* P \Lambda D_T T_2 + U^* P^\perp U \Lambda D_T : f &\mapsto (U^* P U^* P + U^* P^\perp U) f_{-1} + U^* P U^* P^\perp f_{-2}, \\ P^\perp U \Lambda D_T T_1 + P \Lambda D_T : f &\mapsto (P^\perp U P^\perp U + P) f_{-1} + P^\perp U P U f_{-2}, \\ P \Lambda D_T : f &\mapsto P f_{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence condition (a) requires that

$$U^* P U^* P + U^* P^\perp U = P^\perp U P^\perp U + P, \quad U^* P U^* P^\perp = P^\perp U P U \quad (4.8.5)$$

while condition (a') requires in addition that the common value of the first expression is  $I$  and the common value of the second expression is  $0$ . To get a counterexample to condition (a) (and hence also to (a')), it again suffices to take  $\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{C}$ ,  $P = 1$ ,  $U^2 \neq 1$ .

It turns out that the isometry condition (b) also fails to hold in general. Indeed one can verify that

$$D_{T_1}: f \mapsto (U^* P U f_{-1}) \zeta^{-1}, \quad D_{T_2}: f \mapsto (P^\perp f_{-1}) \zeta^{-1}, \quad D_T: f \mapsto f_{-1} \zeta^{-1}.$$

and condition (b) requires

$$P = U^* P U, \quad U^* P^\perp U = P^\perp \tag{4.8.6}$$

which is violated as soon as  $P$  and  $U$  do not commute, requiring  $\dim \mathcal{F} \geq 2$ . One can verify that  $\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{C}^2$ ,  $U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $P = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  violates both (4.8.5) and (4.8.6). Thus Theorem 4.5.5 fails in general when *strong Type II Andô tuple* is replaced with *strong Type II' Andô tuple*.

## 5. Classification of Douglas/Schäffer-model lifts of commuting contractive operator-pairs

Recall that an Andô lift  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  of a commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  is minimal, if the lift pair acts on the minimal joint-invariant subspace for  $(V_1, V_2)$  containing  $\text{Ran } \Pi$  (see (4.1.1)). Unlike as in the classical case, a commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  can have two minimal Andô lifts that are not unitarily equivalent. For example, let  $(T_1, T_2) = (0, 0)$  on  $\mathbb{C}$ . Then both  $(M_z, M_z)$  on  $H^2$  and  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  on  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2$  are minimal Andô lifts of  $(T_1, T_2)$  (note that the first is commuting but not doubly commuting while the second is doubly commuting) but there is no unitary that intertwines these two pairs. In the previous chapter, we constructed Andô lifts out of Type I and Type II Andô tuples. In this chapter, we show that both the Douglas and Schäffer model of an Andô lift are uniquely associated to the Type I and Type II Andô tuples from which they are constructed. We first deal with the Douglas model.

**5.1. Classification of Douglas/Sz.-Nagy–Foias models for Andô lifts.** Suppose  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting contractive pair on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  is an Andô tuple of Type I for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . Let us recall from §4.2.2 that the Douglas model of an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  is given by  $(\Pi, V_1, V_2)$  on  $\mathcal{K}$ , where the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}$ , the pair of commuting isometries  $(V_1, V_2)$  and the embedding  $\Pi$  are as given in (4.2.11).

**THEOREM 5.1.1.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a pair of commuting contractions acting on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$ ,  $(\mathcal{F}'_*, \Lambda'_*, P'_*, U'_*)$  be Type I Andô tuples for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . Let  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$ ,  $(\mathbf{\Pi}'_D, \mathbf{V}'_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}'_{D,2})$  be the Douglas-model Andô lifts of  $(T_1, T_2)$  corresponding to  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}'_*, \Lambda'_*, P'_*, U'_*)$ , respectively as in Theorem 4.2.6. Then  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  and  $(\mathbf{\Pi}'_D, \mathbf{V}'_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}'_{D,2})$  are unitarily equivalent if and only if  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}'_*, \Lambda'_*, P'_*, U'_*)$  coincide.*

*Proof.* For the ‘if’ part, suppose two Andô tuples  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}'_*, \Lambda'_*, P'_*, U'_*)$  of Type I of  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  coincide, i.e. by Definition 4.1.1 there exists a unitary  $u_* : \mathcal{F}_* \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'_*$  such that

$$u_* \Lambda_* = \Lambda'_* \quad \text{and} \quad u_*(P_*, U_*) = (P'_*, U'_*) u_* \tag{5.1.1}$$

Define the unitary

$$\tilde{u}_* : \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes u_*) & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}'_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then it follows from (5.1.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_* \mathbf{\Pi}_D &= \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes u_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*) \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes u_* \Lambda_*) \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda'_*) \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{\Pi}'_D \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_* \mathbf{V}_{D,1} &= \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes u_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_{U_* P_*^\perp + z U_* P_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} M_{u_*(U_* P_*^\perp + z U_* P_*)} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{(U'^* P'^\perp + z U'^* P'_*) u_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{V}'_{D,1} \tilde{u}_*. \end{aligned}$$

The intertwining  $\tilde{u}_* \mathbf{V}_{D,2} = \mathbf{V}'_{D,2} \tilde{u}_*$  follows similarly. This establishes the equivalence of  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  and  $(\mathbf{\Pi}'_D, \mathbf{V}'_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}'_{D,2})$ .

Conversely, suppose that the two Andô lifts  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  and  $(\mathbf{\Pi}'_D, \mathbf{V}'_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}'_{D,2})$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$  are unitarily equivalent (as lifts of  $(T_1, T_2)$ ) and are in the model form coming from two Type I Andô tuples  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}'_*, \Lambda'_*, P'_*, U'_*)$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$ , respectively. This means that there exists a unitary  $\tau_* : \mathcal{K}_D \rightarrow \mathcal{K}'_D$  such that

$$\tau_* \mathbf{\Pi}_D = \mathbf{\Pi}'_D, \quad \tau_* (\mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2}) = (\mathbf{V}'_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}'_{D,2}) \tau_*. \quad (5.1.2)$$

For more detailed calculations let us introduce that  $2 \times 2$  matrix representation for the unitary  $\tau_*$  and the column representations for the spaces  $\mathcal{K}_D$  and  $\mathcal{K}'_D$ :

$$\tau_* = \begin{bmatrix} \tau' & \tau_{12} \\ \tau_{21} & \tau'' \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{K} := \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}' := \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}'_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}.$$

From the second equality in (5.1.2) we see that  $\tau_* \mathbf{V}_{D,1} \mathbf{V}_{D,2} = \mathbf{V}'_{D,1} \mathbf{V}'_{D,2} \tau_*$  which in detail becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tau' & \tau_{12} \\ \tau_{21} & \tau'' \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{F}_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{F}'_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tau' & \tau_{12} \\ \tau_{21} & \tau'' \end{bmatrix}.$$

As a consequence of part (2) of Lemma 3.1.2 we see that

$$\tau_{12} = 0, \quad \tau_{21} = 0.$$

and  $\tau_*$  has the diagonal form

$$\tau_* = \begin{bmatrix} \tau' & 0 \\ 0 & \tau'' \end{bmatrix}.$$

with  $\tau'$  and  $\tau''$  also unitary and satisfying the intertwining

$$\tau' M_z^{\mathcal{F}_*} = M_z^{\mathcal{F}'_*} \tau', \quad \tau'' W_D = W_D \tau''.$$

The first equality forces  $\tau'$  to have the form

$$\tau' = I_{H^2} \otimes u_* \text{ for some unitary } u_* : \mathcal{F}_* \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'_*.$$

Then

$$\tau_*\Pi = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes u_* & 0 \\ 0 & \tau'' \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes u_*\Lambda_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \tau''Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$$

while on the other hand

$$\mathbf{\Pi}'_D = \begin{bmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda'_*)\mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ Q_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$$

Thus the first equality in (5.1.2) implies that

$$(I_{H^2} \otimes u_*)\Lambda_* = \Lambda'_*, \quad \tau''Q_{T^*} = Q_{T^*}. \quad (5.1.3)$$

The second equality in (5.1.4) together with the intertwining  $\tau''W_D = W_D\tau''$  implies that  $\tau''$  is equal to the identity on vectors of the form  $W_D^n Q_{T^*} h$  with  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ . As  $\cup_{n=0}^\infty W_D^n Q_{T^*} \mathcal{H}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$ , we conclude that  $\tau'' = I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}}$ . Since  $\tau_* = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes u_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix}$  intertwines  $\mathbf{V}_{D,1}$  with  $\mathbf{V}'_{D,1}$  where

$$\mathbf{V}_{D,1} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{U_*^* P_*^\perp + z U_*^* P_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{V}'_{D,1} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{U_*'^* P_*'^\perp + z U_*'^* P_*'} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1} \end{bmatrix},$$

we see that

$$u_*(U_*^* P_*^\perp + z U_*^* P_*) = (U_*'^* P_*'^\perp + z U_*'^* P_*')u_*,$$

or equivalently,

$$u_* U_*^* P_*^\perp = U_*'^* P_*'^\perp u_*, \quad u_* U_*^* P_* = U_*'^* P_*' u_*. \quad (5.1.4)$$

These two equations together imply

$$u_* U_*^* = u_* U_*^* (P_*^\perp + P_*) = U_*'^* (P_*'^\perp + P_*') u_* = U_*'^* u_*. \quad (5.1.5)$$

This and the last equality in (5.1.4) together establish the intertwining

$$u_* P_* = P_*' u_*.$$

The coincidence of the two Andô tuples  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}'_*, \Lambda'_*, P_*', U_*')$  now follows. ■

We have seen in section 4.4 that the connection between the Douglas-model Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  and the Sz.-Nagy–Foiás model Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{NF}}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},2})$  is rather straightforward, namely:

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{NF}} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2(\mathcal{F}_*)} & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_{\text{NF},D} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Pi}_D,$$

$$\mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},j} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2(\mathcal{F}_*)} & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_{\text{NF},D} \end{bmatrix} V_{D,j} \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2(\mathcal{F}_*)} & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_{\text{NF},D}^* \end{bmatrix} \text{ for } j = 1, 2.$$

Using this correspondence combined with the result of Theorem 5.1.1 gives us the following immediate corollary.

**COROLLARY 5.1.2.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive operator-pair on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$ ,  $(\mathcal{F}'_*, \Lambda'_*, P_*', U_*')$  be two Type I Andô tuples for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . Let  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{NF}}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},2})$  and  $(\mathbf{\Pi}'_{\text{NF}}, \mathbf{V}'_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbf{V}'_{\text{NF},2})$  be the Sz.-Nagy–Foiás model Andô lifts of  $(T_1, T_2)$  corresponding to  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}'_*, \Lambda'_*, P_*', U_*')$  as in (4.4.4). Then*

$(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},2})$  and  $(\mathbf{\Pi}', \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbf{V}_{\text{NF},2})$  are unitarily equivalent (as lifts of  $(T_1, T_2)$ ) if and only if  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}'_*, \Lambda'_*, P'_*, U'_*)$  coincide (as pre-Andô tuples).

To illustrate the ideas we here set down some Andô lifts for a simple commuting pair of contractions  $(T_1, T_2)$  and compute some associated minimal Andô tuples. In particular the examples illustrates that a given commuting contractive pair can have many minimal Andô lifts which are not unitarily equivalent as lifts.

EXAMPLE 5.1.3. Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting pair of contraction operators on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  of say dimension  $N$ . For simplicity we assume that  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a basis of joint eigenvectors. For convenience we work in detail with a basis of joint eigenvectors for the adjoint pair  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . Let us denote by  $\{v_1, \dots, v_N\}$  the basis of joint eigenvectors for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  with joint eigenvalues

$$(\bar{\lambda}_1, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_N) = \left( (\bar{\lambda}_{1,1}, \bar{\lambda}_{1,2}), \dots, (\bar{\lambda}_{N,1}, \bar{\lambda}_{N,2}) \right).$$

Thus we have for  $r = 1, 2$  and  $j = 1, \dots, N$  that

$$T_r^* v_j = \bar{\lambda}_{j,r} v_j. \tag{5.1.6}$$

In particular we have

$$\langle (I - T_1 T_1^*) v_j, v_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = (1 - \lambda_{i,1} \bar{\lambda}_{j,1}) \langle v_j, v_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

As  $T_1$  is a contraction, the matrix on the left (with rows indexed by  $i$  and columns by  $j$ ) is positive semidefinite, say of rank  $d$ . Hence there are vectors  $y_1, \dots, y_N$  in a  $d$ -dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{Y}$  so that

$$\langle (I - T_1 T_1^*) v_j, v_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle y_j, y_i \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}. \tag{5.1.7}$$

Combining the last two displayed identities and using the assumption that each  $\lambda_{j,1}$  is in the open unit disk, we can solve for  $\langle v_j, v_i \rangle$  to get

$$\langle v_j, v_i \rangle = \frac{\langle y_j, y_i \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}}{1 - \lambda_{i,1} \bar{\lambda}_{j,1}}. \tag{5.1.8}$$

Let us now introduce the vectorial Hardy space  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$  and the vectorial kernel functions  $k_{\lambda} y$  (for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$  and  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ ) given by

$$(k_{\lambda} y)(z) = \frac{1}{1 - z \bar{\lambda}} y$$

having the reproducing kernel property

$$\langle f, k_{\lambda} y \rangle_{H^2(\mathcal{Y})} = \langle f(\lambda), y \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}.$$

The identity (5.1.8) implies that the map

$$\mathbf{\Pi}: v_j \mapsto k_{\lambda_{j,1}} y_j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, N \tag{5.1.9}$$

extends by linearity to a unitary map from  $\mathcal{H}$  onto the Hilbert space

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \sqrt{\{k_{\lambda_{j,1}} y_j : j = 1, \dots, N\}} \subset H^2(\mathcal{Y}) \tag{5.1.10}$$

equal to the span of the kernel functions  $k_{\lambda_{j,1}} y_j$  in the Hardy space  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$ . Furthermore the operators  $T_1^*$  and  $T_2^*$  are transformed via the unitary identification  $\mathbf{\Pi}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  to

the operators

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{T}_1^* &: k_{\lambda_{j,1}} y_j \mapsto \bar{\lambda}_{j,1} k_{\lambda_{j,1}} y_j, \\ \tilde{T}_2^* &: k_{\lambda_{j,1}} y_j \mapsto \bar{\lambda}_{j,2} k_{\lambda_{j,1}} y_j.\end{aligned}$$

Note next that the contractivity of the operator  $\tilde{T}_2^*$  implies that

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^N c_j k_{\lambda_{j,1}} y_j \right\|^2 - \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N c_j \bar{\lambda}_{j,2} k_{\lambda_{j,1}} y_j \right\|^2 \geq 0 \text{ for all } c_1, \dots, c_N \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Spelling out this condition gives us the positive-semidefiniteness condition

$$\left[ \frac{1 - \lambda_{i,2} \bar{\lambda}_{j,2}}{1 - \lambda_{i,1} \bar{\lambda}_{j,1}} \langle y_j, y_i \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} \right] \succeq 0.$$

By the standard theory of matrix-valued Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation (see e.g. [9]), there is an inner function  $\Theta$  with values in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y})$  so that

$$\Theta(\lambda_{j,1})^* y_j = \bar{\lambda}_{j,2} y_j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, N. \quad (5.1.11)$$

Let us now view  $\mathbf{\Pi}$  as an isometric embedding operator of  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$ . The previous computations show that

$$(M_z^*, M_{\Theta}^*) \mathbf{\Pi} v_j = \mathbf{\Pi} (T_1^*, T_2^*) v_j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, N,$$

Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is the span of  $v_1, \dots, v_N$ , we can rewrite this last identity in operator form

$$(M_z^*, M_{\Theta}^*) \mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{\Pi} (T_1^*, T_2^*),$$

i.e.,  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2) := (\mathbf{\Pi}, M_z, M_{\Theta})$  is an Andô lift for the commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

We argue next that the Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2) = (\mathbf{\Pi}, M_z, M_{\Theta})$  is minimal. Indeed, we shall prove the stronger statement

$$\bigvee_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{V}_1^j \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi} = H^2(\mathcal{Y}). \quad (5.1.12)$$

To see this observe that

$$((I - \bar{\lambda}_j \mathbf{V}_1) k_{\lambda_{j,1}} y_j)(z) = (1 - \bar{\lambda}_{j,1} z) \cdot \frac{y_j}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_{j,1} z} = y_j$$

and hence

$$\bigvee_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{V}_1^j \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi} \supset \bigvee_{j=1}^N \{y_j : j = 1, \dots, N\}.$$

Note that the Gramian matrix  $[\langle y_i, y_j \rangle]_{i,j=1,\dots,N}$  of the vectors  $y_1, \dots, y_N$  has rank equal to the rank  $d$  of the defect operator  $D_{T_1^*}$  as a consequence of the identity (5.1.7). But on the other hand we have chosen the space  $\mathcal{Y}$  to have dimension equal to  $d$  so we can conclude that  $\bigvee_{j=1}^d \{y_j : j = 1, \dots, N\} = \mathcal{Y}$  and the last displayed identity can be rewritten as

$$\bigvee_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{V}_1^j \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi} \supset \bigvee_{j=1}^N \{y_j : j = 1, \dots, N\} = \mathcal{Y}$$

(where here we identify  $\mathcal{Y}$  with the subspace of constant functions in  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$ ). It then follows that

$$\bigvee_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{V}_1^j \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi} \supset \bigvee_{j=1}^N M_z^j \mathcal{Y} = H^2(\mathcal{Y})$$

and (5.1.12) follows, i.e.,  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  in particular is a minimal Andô lift.

We are now at the starting point for the proof of the converse direction in Theorem 4.2.6. The BCL model for the isometric pair  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2) := (M_z, M_{\Theta})$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$  is computed in Example 3.4.1; we see there that the coefficient space  $\mathcal{F}$  should be taken to be  $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{Y} \oplus \mathfrak{H}(\Theta)$  with associated BCL tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P, U)$  including projection  $P$  and unitary  $U$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  given by (3.4.4), and with implementing unitary identification map  $\tau_{\text{BCL}}$  here taking the form of  $\tau_{\Theta}$  given by (3.4.1). The next step is to observe that  $\mathbf{\Pi} := \tau_{\Theta} \mathbf{\Pi}$  is an isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $H^2(\mathcal{Y} \oplus \mathfrak{H}(\Theta))$  and the collection

$$(\mathbf{\Pi}, M_1, M_2) := (\tau_{\Theta} \mathbf{\Pi}, M_{U^* P^{\perp} + z U^* P}, M_{P U + z P^{\perp} U})$$

is again a lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  which is unitarily equivalent (via  $\tau_{\Theta}$ ) to the previously discussed lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, M_z, M_{\Theta})$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$ , having the additional property that the commuting isometric pair  $(M_1, M_2)$  giving the Andô lift is in the BCL2-model form on  $H^2(\mathcal{Y} \oplus \mathfrak{H}(\Theta))$ . Note also that here we are in the somewhat simpler case where the product isometry  $M_1 \cdot M_2 = M_z$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{Y} \oplus \mathfrak{H}(\Theta))$  is a shift, and hence our model space involves only the top component of the block  $2 \times 1$  column matrices appearing for the general case. Specializing the explanation given in the proof of Theorem 4.2.6 to the situation here, we see that there is an isometric embedding

$$\Gamma: H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{Y} \oplus \mathfrak{H}(\Theta))$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} &= M_z^{\mathcal{Y} \oplus \mathfrak{H}(\Theta)} \Gamma, & \Gamma \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}, T^*} &= \mathbf{\Pi} \text{ (here } T = T_1 T_2), \\ \text{Ran } \Gamma &= \bigvee_{n \geq 0} (M_z^{\mathcal{Y} \oplus \mathfrak{H}(\Theta)})^n \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi} =: \mathcal{K}_{\min} \subset H^2(\mathcal{Y} \oplus \mathfrak{H}(\Theta)) \end{aligned}$$

and such that  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, M_z|_{\text{Ran } \Gamma})$  is a version of the essentially unique minimal isometric lift for the single contraction operator  $T$ . Furthermore  $\Gamma$  has the form of a multiplication by a constant  $\Gamma = I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda$  for an isometry from  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} \oplus \mathfrak{H}(\Theta)$ . The explicit formula (4.2.35) for  $\Lambda$  here can be given the form

$$\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_{T^*} v_j \mapsto (\tau_{\Theta} k_{\lambda_{j,1}} y_j)(0) \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, N. \tag{5.1.13}$$

It is then this  $\Lambda$  which serves as the embedding operator for the Type I Andô tuple

$$(\mathcal{Y} \oplus \mathfrak{H}(\Theta), \Lambda, P, U) \text{ with } U \text{ and } P \text{ as in (3.4.4)} \tag{5.1.14}$$

which is the parameter-set to build the Douglas-model Andô lift for the original commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  specified in terms of joint eigenvectors for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  (5.1.6). Since, as observed in the previous paragraph, the Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  is minimal, it follows that this Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  is minimal as an Andô tuple as well.

EXAMPLE 5.1.4. We again let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive pair on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  of finite dimension  $N$  with a basis of joint eigenvectors (5.1.6). With some additional

hypotheses in place we shall construct a lift  $(\Pi, M_{z_1}^{\mathcal{Y}}, M_{z_2}^{\mathcal{Y}})$  with the commuting isometric pair  $(M_{z_1}^{\mathcal{Y}}, M_{z_2}^{\mathcal{Y}})$  equal to the coordinate-function shift operators on the Hardy space over the bidisk  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y})$  for an appropriate coefficient Hilbert space  $\mathcal{Y}$ . We shall then find a Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  which provides the set of parameters to build a Douglas-model Andô lift unitarily equivalent to bidisk Andô lift  $(\Pi, M_{z_1}^{\mathcal{Y}}, M_{z_2}^{\mathcal{Y}})$ .

We first introduce the required added hypotheses. It is known that there is a couple of extra conditions required for a given commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  to have a lift  $(\Pi, M_{z_1}^{\mathcal{Y}}, M_{z_2}^{\mathcal{Y}})$  to the bidisk shift tuple  $(M_{z_1}^{\mathcal{Y}}, M_{z_2}^{\mathcal{Y}})$  acting on  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y})$ , namely (see Theorem 3.16 in [21] for  $n = 2$  and with  $T_j$  there replaced by  $T_j^*$ ):

1. The bidisk squared-defect operator

$$D_{T_1^*, T_2^*}^2 := I - T_1 T_1^* - T_2 T_2^* + T_1 T_2 T_2^* T_1^* \tag{5.1.15}$$

should be positive semi-definite:

$$D_{T_1^*, T_2^*} \succeq 0.$$

2. Both  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  should be *pure* in the sense that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|T_j^{*N} h\|^2 = 0 \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{H} \text{ for } j = 1, 2.$$

REMARK 5.1.5. Let us note that the bidisk defect operator  $D_{T_1^*, T_2^*}$  can be viewed as an application of a version of the Agler hereditary functional calculus

$$f(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) := \sum_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2} a_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\mathbf{n}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\mathbf{m}} \mapsto \sum_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2} a_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m}} \mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{T}^{*\mathbf{m}}$$

(here  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2)$ ,  $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, m_2)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\mathbf{n}} = \lambda_1^{n_1} \lambda_2^{n_2}$ ,  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{\mathbf{n}} = \bar{\mu}_1^{n_1} \bar{\mu}_2^{n_2}$  with similarly conventions for operators:  $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, T_2)$ ,  $\mathbf{T}^* = (T_1^*, T_2^*)$ ,  $\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{n}} = T_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2}$  and similarly for  $\mathbf{T}^* = (T_1^*, T_2^*)$  where here  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting operator pair) applied to the function

$$f(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = (1 - \lambda_1 \bar{\mu}_1)(1 - \lambda_2 \bar{\mu}_2) = 1 - \lambda_1 \bar{\mu}_1 - \lambda_2 \bar{\mu}_2 + \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \bar{\mu}_1 \bar{\mu}_2. \tag{5.1.16}$$

Here  $T_1, T_2$  and  $T_1^*, T_2^*$  commute but  $T_j$  does not necessarily commute with  $T_k^*$  for any pair of indices  $j, k \in \{1, 2\}$ . The hereditary functional calculus gives an ad hoc rule (in this case adjoint powers of  $T_j$  on the right) for plugging in non-commuting operator arguments into a function have commuting scalar arguments. The operator calculus of Ambrozie-Engliš-Müller [2] gets around this by defining a functional calculus on operators: define  $L_{T_j}, R_{T_j} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))$  for  $j = 1, 2$  by

$$L_{T_j} : X \mapsto T_j X, \quad R_{T_j^*} : X \mapsto X T_j^* \text{ for } X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}).$$

Then the set of operators  $L_{T_1}, L_{T_2}, R_{T_1^*}, R_{T_2^*}$  is a commuting set of operators in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))$  (given that  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting operator pair), and the function  $f(L_{T_1}, L_{T_2}, R_{T_1^*}, R_{T_2^*})$  is well-defined (here we use the substitution  $\bar{\mu}_j \mapsto L_{T_j^*}$ ). Then the desired operator  $D_{T_1^*, T_2^*}^2$  resulting from the hereditary functional calculus using the function (5.1.16) can be seen as applying the function (5.1.16) in the standard well-defined way to the commuting operator-tuple  $(L_{T_1}, L_{T_2}, R_{T_1^*}, R_{T_2^*})$  and then evaluating the result on the identity operator  $I_{\mathcal{H}}$ :

$$f(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \mapsto f(L_{\mathbf{T}}, R_{\mathbf{T}^*})(I_{\mathcal{H}}) = D_{T_1^*, T_2^*}^2 \text{ if } f \text{ is given by (5.1.16).}$$



REMARK 5.1.6. It turns out that the same condition  $D_{T_1^*, T_2^*} \succeq 0$  is necessary and sufficient for the commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  to have a regular unitary dilation, as originally discussed by Brehmer (see [43]). This connection between existence of polydisk shift dilation and a regular unitary dilation is also discussed in Curto-Vasilescu [21] and Timotin [44].

We now proceed as in Example 5.1.3 but with an adaptation to get a bi-disk shift lift  $(M_{z_1}^{\mathcal{Y}}, M_{z_2}^{\mathcal{Y}})$  on  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y})$  rather than a Bercovici-Douglas-Foias model lift  $(M_z^{\mathcal{Y}}, M_{\Theta})$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{Y})$ . We are given  $(T_1, T_2)$  on a finite-dimensional space with a basis  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  of joint eigenvectors for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  with associated joint eigenvalues  $(\bar{\lambda}_{j,1}, \bar{\lambda}_{j,2})$  for  $1 \leq j \leq N$  as in (5.1.6). Then we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D_{T_1^*, T_2^*}^2 v_j, v_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \langle (1 - \lambda_{i,1} \bar{\lambda}_{j,1} - \lambda_{i,2} \bar{\lambda}_{j,2} + \lambda_{i,1} \lambda_{i,2} \bar{\lambda}_{j,1} \bar{\lambda}_{j,2}) v_j, v_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= (1 - \lambda_{i,1} \bar{\lambda}_{j,1})(1 - \lambda_{i,2} \bar{\lambda}_{j,2}) \langle v_j, v_i \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Let us set  $d = \text{rank } D_{T_1^*, T_2^*}^2$ . If we assume that  $D_{T_1^*, T_2^*}^2 \succeq 0$  (as we know must be the case if  $(T_1, T_2)$  is to have a lift to the bi-disk shift pair  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  on  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y})$  for some coefficient Hilbert space  $\mathcal{Y}$ ), we see that the matrix on the left (rows indexed by  $i$ , columns indexed by  $j$ ) is positive semi-definite. Hence there are vectors  $y_1, \dots, y_N$  in a  $d$ -dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{Y}$  so that

$$\langle D_{T_1^*, T_2^*}^2 v_j, v_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle y_j, y_i \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}.$$

By combining various of the preceding displayed identities and using the assumption that each  $\lambda_{j,1}$  and  $\lambda_{j,2}$  is in the open unit disk, we see that

$$\langle v_j, v_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{\langle y_j, y_i \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}}{(1 - \lambda_{i,1} \bar{\lambda}_{j,1})(1 - \lambda_{i,2} \bar{\lambda}_{j,2})} \tag{5.1.17}$$

Let us now introduce the vectorial Hardy space over the bi-disk  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y})$  consisting of functions  $f(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{n,m \geq 0} \hat{f}_{n,m} z_1^n z_2^m$  with Fourier coefficients  $\hat{f}_{n,m} \in \mathcal{Y}$  subject to  $\|f\|^2 := \sum_{n,m \geq 0} \|\hat{f}_{n,m}\|_{\mathcal{Y}}^2 < \infty$ . This is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space with vectorial kernel functions  $k_{\lambda} y$  (for  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2$  and  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ ) given by

$$(k_{\lambda} y)(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{y}{(1 - z_1 \bar{\lambda}_1)(1 - z_2 \bar{\lambda}_2)} \text{ where we set } \mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2)$$

having the reproducing kernel property:

$$\langle f, k_{\lambda} y \rangle_{H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y})} = \langle f(\lambda), y \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}.$$

The identity (5.1.17) shows that the map

$$\mathbf{\Pi}: v_j \mapsto k_{\lambda_j} y_j \tag{5.1.18}$$

extends by linearity to a unitary map from  $\mathcal{H}$  to the Hilbert space

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \sqrt{\{k_{\lambda_j} y_j : j = 1, \dots, N\} \subset H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y})} \tag{5.1.19}$$

Furthermore, the operators  $T_1^*$  and  $T_2^*$  are transformed via the unitary identification map  $\mathbf{\Pi}$  to the operators

$$\tilde{T}_1^* : k_{\lambda_j} y_j \mapsto \bar{\lambda}_{j,1} k_{\lambda_j} y_j, \quad \tilde{T}_2^* : k_{\lambda_j} y_j \mapsto \bar{\lambda}_{j,2} k_{\lambda_j} y_j \text{ where } \lambda_j = (\lambda_{j,1}, \lambda_{j,2}).$$

But the operators  $M_{z_1}^{\mathcal{Y}*}$  and  $M_{z_2}^{\mathcal{Y}*}$  on  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y})$  have exactly the same action on kernel functions, and we conclude that

$$M_{z_1}^{\mathcal{Y}*}|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} = \tilde{T}_1^*, \quad M_{z_2}^{\mathcal{Y}*}|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} = \tilde{T}_2^*.$$

We conclude that

$$(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2) := (\mathbf{\Pi}, M_{z_1}^{\mathcal{Y}}, M_{z_2}^{\mathcal{Y}})$$

(where  $M_{z_1}^{\mathcal{Y}}, M_{z_2}^{\mathcal{Y}}$  are the coordinate-function shift operators on  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y})$ ) is an Andô lift for the commuting, contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

Furthermore we can see that this  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  is a minimal lift for  $T_1, T_2$  as follows. Note that

$$(I - \bar{\lambda}_{j,1} \mathbf{V}_1)(I - \bar{\lambda}_{j,2} \mathbf{V}_2)k_{\lambda_j} y_j = y_j \in \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbf{V}_1^{n_1} \mathbf{V}_2^{n_2} \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi} =: \mathcal{K}_0$$

(where here we view each  $y_j$  as a constant function in  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y})$ , the ambient subspace for the minimal lift contained inside  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$ ). We conclude that

$$\bigvee \{y_j : 1 \leq j \leq N\} \subset \mathcal{K}_0. \tag{5.1.20}$$

From (5.1.17) and the two displayed formulas preceding it, we see that

$$\langle y_i, y_j \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} = \langle D_{T_1^*, T_2^*}^2 v_i, v_j \rangle$$

implying that the Gramian matrix for  $y_1, \dots, y_d$  has the same rank as  $\text{rank } D_{T_1^*, T_2^*}^2 = d$ . As we chose  $\mathcal{H}$  to have  $\dim \mathcal{H} = d$ , we see that the rank of the Gramian matrix  $\langle y_i, y_j \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}$  is the same as the dimension of the whole space  $\mathcal{Y}$ , implying in turn that the span of the vectors  $y_1, \dots, y_N$  is equal to the whole space  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Combining with (5.1.20) then gives us

$$\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{K}_0.$$

But then also

$$H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y}) = \bigvee_{n_1, n_2} \mathbf{V}_1^{n_1} \mathbf{V}_2^{n_2} \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{K}_0 \subset H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y})$$

forcing the equality

$$\mathcal{K}_0 = H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y}),$$

i.e., the lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, V_1, V_2) = (\mathbf{\Pi}, M_{z_1}^{\mathcal{Y}}, M_{z_2}^{\mathcal{Y}})$  is minimal as a lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

We are now at the starting point of the proof of the converse direction in Theorem 4.2.6 to find the Douglas model for the commuting-isometric lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . As we saw in Example 3.3.2, a BCL2-tuple for  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  on  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y})$  can be taken to be

$$(\mathcal{F}, P, U) = (\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{Y}), P_{\ell_{(1, \infty)}^2(\mathcal{Y})}, \mathbf{S}^{\mathcal{Y}})$$

where  $\mathbf{S}^{\mathcal{Y}}$  is the bilateral shift acting on  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{Y})$ , with implementation operator

$$\tau_{\text{bd}, \mathcal{Y}}: H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{F}) = H^2(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{Y}))$$

suggested by (3.3.4):

$$\tau_{\text{bd}, \mathcal{Y}}: z_1^i z_2^j y \mapsto \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_{j-i} y z^j & \text{for } i \geq j, \\ \mathbf{e}_{j-i} y z^i & \text{for } i \leq j. \end{cases} \tag{5.1.21}$$

for  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . It remains to identify the isometric embedding operator  $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} = \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\mathcal{Y})$  so that the resulting Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is the parameter set generating a Douglas-model lift (4.2.11) unitarily equivalent to our original lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2) = (\mathbf{\Pi}, M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  with the commuting, isometric pair  $M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}$  acting on  $H_{\mathbb{D}^2}^2(\mathcal{Y})$ . A careful interpretation of formula (4.2.35) gives us

$$\Lambda: D_{T^*} v_j \mapsto (\tau_{bd, \mathcal{Y}} k_{\lambda_j} y_j)(0).$$

**5.2. Classification of Schäffer-model Andô lifts.** To classify the unitary equivalence of two Schäffer models of an Andô lift in terms of tuple coincidence of the associated Type II Andô tuples, it turns out to be essential to work only with strong Type II Andô tuples, as in the following result.

**THEOREM 5.2.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}', \Lambda', P', U')$  be two strong Type II Andô tuples of a given commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let  $(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  and  $(\mathbf{V}'_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}'_{S,2})$  be the minimal Andô lifts of  $(T_1, T_2)$  corresponding to the strong Type II Andô tuples  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}', \Lambda', P', U')$ , respectively, as in (4.5.20)–(4.5.21). Then  $(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  and  $(\mathbf{V}'_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}'_{S,2})$  are unitarily equivalent if and only if  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}', \Lambda', P', U')$  coincide.*

*Proof.* We first prove the sufficiency (or “if”) direction. Suppose  $u: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$  is a unitary such that

$$u\Lambda = \Lambda' \quad \text{and} \quad u(P, U) = (P', U')u. \quad (5.2.1)$$

Define the unitary

$$\tilde{u} := \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2 \otimes u} \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}') \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.2.2)$$

Then keeping the equations in (5.2.1) in mind, we conclude from the computations

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}\mathbf{V}_{S,1} &= \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2 \otimes u} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* P U \Lambda D_T & M_{P+U+zPU} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}'}^* u P U \Lambda D_T & M_{u(P+U+zPU)} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}'_{S,1} \tilde{u} &= \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}'}^* P' U' \Lambda' D_T & M_{(P'+U'+zP')U'} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2 \otimes u} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}'}^* P' U' \Lambda' D_T & M_{(P'+U'+zP')U'} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

that  $\tilde{u}\mathbf{V}_{S,1} = \mathbf{V}'_{S,1} \tilde{u}$ . Similarly one can prove that  $\tilde{u}\mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \mathbf{V}'_{S,2} \tilde{u}$ . Note that the proof of this direction works for any Type II Andô tuples not necessarily strong.

Conversely, suppose two Andô isometric lifts  $(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  and  $(\mathbf{V}'_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}'_{S,2})$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$  corresponding to two strong Type II Andô tuples  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}', \Lambda', P', U')$ , respectively, are unitarily equivalent. This means that there exists a unitary

$$\tau = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_{11} & \tau_{12} \\ \tau_{21} & \tau_{22} \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}') \end{bmatrix}$$

such that

$$\tau(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2}) = (\mathbf{V}'_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}'_{S,2})\tau, \quad \tau \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.2.3)$$

The second equality in (5.2.3) implies that  $\tau$  has the form

$$\tau = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & \tau_{12} \\ 0 & \tau_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

As  $\tau$  is unitary, this in turn forces  $\tau_{12} = 0$  and  $\tau_{22}: H^2(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{F}')$  to be unitary. The first equality in (5.2.3) implies in particular that

$$\tau \mathbf{V}_{S,1} \mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \mathbf{V}'_{S,1} \mathbf{V}'_{S,2} \tau \quad (5.2.4)$$

where  $\mathbf{V}_{S,1} \mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \mathbf{V}_{S,2} \mathbf{V}_{S,1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* T \Lambda D_T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}'}^* T \Lambda' D_T & M_z \end{bmatrix}$  and similarly for  $\mathbf{V}'_{S,1} \mathbf{V}'_{S,2} = \mathbf{V}'_{S,2} \mathbf{V}'_{S,1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}'}^* T \Lambda' D_T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* T \Lambda D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{F}} \end{bmatrix}$  by the assumption that  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}', \Lambda', P', U')$  are both strong Type II Andô tuples. Hence

$$\tau \mathbf{V}_{S,1} \mathbf{V}_{S,2} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{F}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \tau_{22} \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T & \tau_{22} M_z^{\mathcal{F}} \end{bmatrix}$$

while

$$\mathbf{V}'_{S,1} \mathbf{V}'_{S,2} \tau = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}'}^* \Lambda' D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{F}'} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}'}^* \Lambda' D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{F}'} \tau_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

As a consequence of (5.2.4) we are led to the identity

$$\begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \tau_{22} \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T & \tau_{22} M_z^{\mathcal{F}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}'}^* \Lambda' D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{F}'} \tau_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.2.5)$$

Equality of the (2, 2)-entries in (5.2.5) combined with the fact that  $\tau_{22}$  is unitary implies that  $\tau_{22}$  has the form  $\tau_{22} = I_{H^2} \otimes u$  for some unitary  $u: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$ , from which it then follows that  $\tau_{22} \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* = \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}'}^* u$ . Comparison of the (2, 1)-entries in (5.2.5) then gives  $u\Lambda = \Lambda'$ . A similar matrix computation and a comparison of the (2, 2)-entries of  $\tau(\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2}) = (\mathbf{V}'_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}'_{S,2})\tau$  implies

$$(M_{u(P^\perp U + z P U)}, M_{u(U^* P + z U^* P^\perp)}) = (M_{(P'^\perp U' + z P' U')u}, M_{(U'^* P' + z U'^* P'^\perp)u}),$$

which implies that

$$uP^\perp U = P'^\perp U' u, \quad u P U = P' U' u, \quad u U^* P = U'^* P' u, \quad u U^* P^\perp = U'^* P'^\perp u. \quad (5.2.6)$$

Adding the first two identities in (5.2.6) gives  $uU = U'u$ . Use this identity in the first equation in (5.2.6) to get  $uP^\perp = P'^\perp u$ . Apply a similar argument starting with the second identity in (5.2.6) instead, or alternatively plug in  $P^\perp = I - P$ ,  $P'^\perp = I - P'$  into  $uP^\perp = P'^\perp u$ , to arrive at  $uP = Pu$  as well. We conclude that indeed  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}', \Lambda', P', U')$  coincide as strong Type II Andô tuples. ■

**5.3. Type II Andô tuples versus strong Type II Andô tuples.** The class of strong Type II Andô tuples is strictly smaller than the class of Type II Andô tuples as the following result demonstrates.

PROPOSITION 5.3.1. *Let  $T_1$  be a contraction on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $T = T_1^2$  and  $\tau_1, \tau_2 : \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$  be two isometries. Let  $\Lambda_{\dagger}$  be the isometry as in Definition 4.3.2, i.e.,*

$$\Lambda_{\dagger} : \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \\ \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_{\dagger} : D_T \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} D_{T_1} T_1 \\ D_{T_1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then the pre-Andô tuple

$$\left( \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{G} \\ \mathcal{G} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \tau_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_2 \end{bmatrix} \Lambda_{\dagger}, \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{G}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{\mathcal{G}} \\ I_{\mathcal{G}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (5.3.1)$$

is a Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_1)$ . Furthermore:

1. The tuple (5.3.1) is a strong Type II Andô tuple if and only if

$$(\tau_1 - \tau_2)D_{T_1}T_1 = 0.$$

2. If  $\tau_1 = \tau_2$  is unitary, then (5.3.1) is a special Type II Andô tuple.

*Proof.* By simple matrix computation we have

$$PU = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = U^*P^{\perp} \quad \text{and} \quad U^*PU = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} = P^{\perp}. \quad (5.3.2)$$

This implies that the Commutativity condition for Type II Andô tuples (condition (i) in Definition 4.5.2), i.e.,

$$PU\Lambda D_T T_2 + P^{\perp}\Lambda D_T = U^*P^{\perp}\Lambda D_T T_1 + U^*PU\Lambda D_T$$

is readily satisfied by the tuple in (5.3.1) because in this case  $T_1 = T_2$ . Condition (ii) of Definition 4.5.2 is that

$$D_T \Lambda^* U^* P U \Lambda D_T = D_{T_1}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad D_T \Lambda^* P^{\perp} \Lambda D_T = D_{T_2}^2$$

which, in view of (5.3.2), boils down to just

$$D_T \Lambda^* P^{\perp} \Lambda D_T = D_{T_1}^2. \quad (5.3.3)$$

Since

$$P^{\perp} \Lambda D_T = P^{\perp} \begin{bmatrix} \tau_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_2 \end{bmatrix} \Lambda_{\dagger} D_T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tau_1 D_{T_1} T_1 \\ \tau_2 D_{T_1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \tau_2 D_{T_1} \end{bmatrix},$$

and  $\tau_2$  is an isometry, we see that

$$D_T \Lambda^* P^{\perp} \Lambda D_T = (P^{\perp} \Lambda D_T)^* (P^{\perp} \Lambda D_T) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & D_{T_1} \tau_2^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \tau_2 D_{T_1} \end{bmatrix} = D_{T_1}^2$$

and therefore (5.3.3) holds. Consequently (5.3.1) is always a Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_1)$ .

*Proof of (1):* Note that for the tuple (5.3.1) to be a strong Type II Andô tuple, it must, in addition, satisfy

$$PU\Lambda D_T T_1 + P^{\perp}\Lambda D_T = \Lambda D_T (= U^*P^{\perp}\Lambda D_T T_1 + U^*PU\Lambda D_T).$$

So we compute

$$\begin{aligned} PU\Lambda D_T T_1 + P^\perp \Lambda D_T &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tau_1 D_{T_1} T_1^2 \\ \tau_2 D_{T_1} T_1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tau_1 D_{T_1} T_1 \\ \tau_2 D_{T_1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \tau_2 D_{T_1} T_1 \\ \tau_2 D_{T_1} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the tuple (5.3.1) will be strong if and only if

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tau_2 D_{T_1} T_1 \\ \tau_2 D_{T_1} \end{bmatrix} = PU\Lambda D_T T_1 + P^\perp \Lambda D_T = \Lambda D_T = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_1 D_{T_1} T_1 \\ \tau_2 D_{T_1} \end{bmatrix}$$

which is true if and only if  $(\tau_1 - \tau_2)D_{T_1} T_1 \equiv 0$ . This proves (1).

Proof of (2): Let us denote  $\tau_1 = \tau_2 =: \tau$  and the unitary

$$\hat{\tau} := \begin{bmatrix} \tau & 0 \\ 0 & \tau \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \\ \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{G} \\ \mathcal{G} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Our goal is to show that the tuple (5.3.1) coincides (in the sense of Definition 4.1.1) with a special Andô tuple of  $(T_1, T_1)$  in its canonical form and therefore is special (see Definition 4.3.2). Since  $\tau : \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$  is a unitary, we make the following simple observations:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}^* \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{G} \\ \mathcal{G} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \\ \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \end{bmatrix} = \mathcal{F}_\dagger, \quad \hat{\tau}^* \Lambda = \Lambda_\dagger, \quad \hat{\tau}^* \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{G}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \hat{\tau} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = P_\dagger \\ \text{and lastly } \hat{\tau}^* U \hat{\tau} &= \hat{\tau}^* \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{\mathcal{G}} \\ I_{\mathcal{G}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \hat{\tau} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} \\ I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.4}$$

Note that the unitary  $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} \\ I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  satisfies

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} \\ I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} D_{T_1} T_1 \\ D_{T_1} \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} D_{T_1} \\ D_{T_1} T_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and consequently the tuple

$$\left( \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \\ \mathcal{D}_{T_1} \end{bmatrix}, \Lambda_\dagger, \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} \\ I_{\mathcal{D}_{T_1}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

is a special Andô tuple in its canonical form and it coincides with (5.3.1) by the observations (5.3.4). ■

The next result shows how close general Type II Andô tuples are to being strong Type II Andô tuples.

**PROPOSITION 5.3.2.** *Suppose that  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  is a Type II Andô tuple for the commuting contractive operator pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Then there is an isometry  $\tilde{u}$  from  $\text{Ran } \Lambda$  into  $\mathcal{F}$  so that condition (i') in Definition 4.5.2 holds in the somewhat weaker form*

$$(i'') \quad PU\Lambda D_T T_2 + P^\perp \Lambda D_T = U^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T T_1 + U^* PU\Lambda D_T = \tilde{u} D_T.$$

*Proof.* We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
& (PU\Lambda D_T T_2 + P^\perp \Lambda D_T)^* (PU\Lambda D_T T_2 + P^\perp \Lambda D_T) \\
&= T_2^* D_T \Lambda^* U^* PU\Lambda D_T T_2 + D_T \Lambda^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T \\
&= T_2^* D_{T_1}^2 T_2 + D_{T_2}^2 \quad (\text{by condition (ii) in Definition 4.5.2}) \\
&= T_2^* (I - T_1^* T_1) T_2 + (I - T_2^* T_2) = I - T_2^* T_1^* T_1 T_2 = I - T^* T = D_T \Lambda^* \Lambda D_T.
\end{aligned}$$

From this it follows that there is an isometry  $\tilde{u}: \text{Ran } \Lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  so that  $PU\Lambda D_T T_2 + P^\perp \Lambda D_T = \tilde{u} \Lambda D_T$  giving us equality of the first and third term in (i''). Equality of the first two terms in (i'') is a consequence of condition (i) (the Commutativity Condition) in the definition of Type II Andô tuple (Definition 4.5.2) and (i'') follows. ■

## 6. Pseudo-commuting contractive lifts of commuting contractive operator-pairs

**6.1. Compressed Andô lifts versus pseudo-commuting contractive lifts.** Given a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  and a Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{K}$ , as we saw in the proof of Theorem 4.2.6, it is always possible to restrict to the subspace

$$\mathcal{K}_0 := \bigvee_{n_1, n_2 \geq 0} \mathbf{V}^{n_1} \mathbf{V}^{n_2} \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi} \subset \mathcal{K}$$

to get a minimal Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_0, \mathbf{V}_{0,1}, \mathbf{V}_{0,2})$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$ , where we define  $\mathbf{\Pi}_0: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_0$  and  $\mathbf{V}_{0,1}, \mathbf{V}_{0,2}$  on  $\mathcal{K}_0$  via

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_0 h = \mathbf{\Pi} h \in \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi} \subset \mathcal{K}_0 \text{ for } h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \mathbf{V}_{0,1} = \mathbf{V}_1|_{\mathcal{K}_0}, \quad \mathbf{V}_{0,2} = \mathbf{V}_2|_{\mathcal{K}_0}. \quad (6.1.1)$$

If we are interested only in the product contraction  $T := T_1 T_2$ , by introducing in the principle even smaller subspace

$$\mathcal{K}_{00} := \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{V}_1^n \mathbf{V}_2^n \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi} \subset \mathcal{K}_0 \subset \mathcal{K}, \quad (6.1.2)$$

we can find a minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foiás lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_{00}, \mathbf{V}_{00})$  for the product contraction operator  $T$  by setting  $\mathbf{\Pi}_{00}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{00}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_{00}$  on  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  equal to

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_{00} h = \mathbf{\Pi} h \in \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi} \subset \mathcal{K}_{00} \text{ for } h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \mathbf{V}_{00} = \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{V}_2|_{\mathcal{K}_{00}}. \quad (6.1.3)$$

Note that it is always the case that  $\mathcal{K}_0$  is jointly invariant for  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  and that  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  is invariant for the product  $\mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{V}_2$ . However the case where  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  is invariant for  $\mathbf{V}_1$  and  $\mathbf{V}_2$  individually is the special situation studied in Section 4.6 where the minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  given by (6.1.1) is actually *strongly minimal* and  $\mathcal{K}_0 = \mathcal{K}_{00}$ . Nevertheless we show here that in the general situation it is still of interest to consider the compressions  $\mathbf{W}_1 := P_{\mathcal{K}_{00}} \mathbf{V}_1|_{\mathcal{K}_{00}}, \mathbf{W}_2 := P_{\mathcal{K}_{00}} \mathbf{V}_2|_{\mathcal{K}_{00}}$  of  $\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2$  to  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  even though when this is done the compressed pair  $(\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2)$  on  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  may not inherit the commuting and isometric properties of the original pair  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  on  $\mathcal{K}$ . Before continuing this analysis, it is useful to have the following more flexible definition of the *compression of an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  to an embedded Sz.-Nagy–Foiás lift for the product contraction  $T = T_1 T_2$* , which we shall

refer to as simply a *minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foias compression of an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$*  for short.

DEFINITION 6.1.1. Suppose that  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  is an Andô lift of the commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  with embedded minimal isometric lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_{00}, \mathbf{V}_{00})$  of the product contraction operator  $T = T_1T_2$  given by (6.1.3). Suppose that  $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  is an isometric embedding and  $V$  is an isometry on another Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}$  such that  $(\Pi, V)$  is a minimal isometric lift of the product contraction  $T = T_1T_2$ . By uniqueness of Sz.-Nagy–Foias minimal isometric lift, there is a unitary operator  $\tau: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{00}$  so that

$$\tau\Pi = \mathbf{\Pi}_{00}, \quad \tau V = \mathbf{V}_{00}\tau.$$

Let us also view  $\tau$  as an isometry from  $\mathcal{K}$  into  $\mathcal{K}$  with final space equal to  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  depending on the context. Define operators  $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W}$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  by

$$\Pi = \tau^*\mathbf{\Pi}, \quad \mathbb{W}_1 = \tau^*\mathbf{V}_1\tau, \quad \mathbb{W}_2 = \tau^*\mathbf{V}_2\tau, \quad \mathbb{W} = \tau^*\mathbf{V}_1\mathbf{V}_2\tau = \tau^*\mathbf{V}_{00}\tau = V.$$

Then we say that the collection  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, V)$  is the *compression of the Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2, \mathbf{V}_1\mathbf{V}_2)$  of  $(T_1, T_2, T = T_1T_2)$  to the minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foias lift  $(\Pi, V)$  of  $T$ .*

It turns out that such compressed Andô lifts to immersed minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foias lifts have an intrinsic characterization independent of any reference to having a dilation to some Andô lift. For further discussion, the following formal definitions will be useful.

DEFINITION 6.1.2. **1.** Suppose that  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a triple of operators on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{K}$ . We say that  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a *pseudo-commuting contractive operator-triple* if:

- (i)  $\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2$  are contractions while  $\mathbb{W}$  is an isometry.
- (ii) Both  $\mathbb{W}_1$  and  $\mathbb{W}_2$  commute with  $\mathbb{W}$  (but not necessarily with each other),
- (iii)  $\mathbb{W}_1 = \mathbb{W}_2^*\mathbb{W}$ .

We shall say that  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a *pseudo-commuting algebraic triple* if  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  satisfies conditions (ii) and (iii) as above, but condition (i) is weakened to

- (i')  $\mathbb{W}$  is an isometry,

i.e., if  $\mathbb{W}_1$  and  $\mathbb{W}_2$  are now only required to be bounded operators on  $\mathcal{K}$  rather than contractions.

**2.** Suppose that  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting contractive operator-pair on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  is an isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{K}$  and that  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive operator-triple on  $\mathcal{K}$ . We shall say that  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a *pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$*  if  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive operator-triple on  $\mathcal{K}$  and in addition:

- (iv)  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T := T_1T_2)$  in the sense that

$$(\mathbb{W}_1^*, \mathbb{W}_2^*, \mathbb{W}^*)\Pi = \Pi(T_1^*, T_2^*, T_1^*T_2^*)$$

(in particular,  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W})$  is an isometric lift of  $T = T_1T_2$ ), and in addition

- (v)  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W})$  is a minimal isometric lift for  $T = T_1T_2$ , i.e.

$$\mathcal{K} = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{W}^n \text{Ran } \Pi.$$



REMARK 6.1.3. Let us observe that, whenever  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive operator-triple, in addition to condition (ii) in the definition one also has

$$(iii') \quad \mathbb{W}_2 = \mathbb{W}_1^* \mathbb{W}.$$

Indeed, from the identity  $\mathbb{W}_1 = \mathbb{W}_2^* \mathbb{W}$  we get

$$\mathbb{W}^* \mathbb{W}_1 = \mathbb{W}^* (\mathbb{W}_2^* \mathbb{W}) = (\mathbb{W}^* \mathbb{W}_2^*) \mathbb{W} = (\mathbb{W}_2^* \mathbb{W}^*) \mathbb{W} = \mathbb{W}_2^* (\mathbb{W}^* \mathbb{W}) = \mathbb{W}_2^*.$$

The next result gives the promised intrinsic characterization of Andô lifts of  $(T_1, T_2)$  compressed to a minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foias lift of  $T = T_1 T_2$ , namely, they are the same as pseudo-commuting contractive lifts of  $(T_1, T_2)$  defined as above with no reference to any Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

THEOREM 6.1.4. *Suppose that  $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  is an isometry,  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a triple of operators on  $\mathcal{K}$ , and  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting contractive pair on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is the compression of an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  to an embedded minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foias lift of  $T$  as in Definition 6.1.1 if and only if  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  as in Definition 6.1.2.*

*Proof.* We suppose first that  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is the compression of the Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  to some minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foias lift  $(\Pi, V)$  of  $T$ . In detail, this means that there is a Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  (say  $\mathbf{\Pi}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2$  are commuting isometries on  $\mathcal{K}$ ) and a minimal isometric lift  $(\Pi, V)$  of the product contraction  $T = T_1 T_2$  (say  $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  and  $V$  is an isometry on  $\mathcal{K}$ ) and an isometry  $\tau: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  with range equal to  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  as in (6.1.2) so that

$$\Pi = \tau^* \mathbf{\Pi}, \quad \mathbb{W}_1 = \tau^* \mathbf{V}_1 \tau, \quad \mathbb{W}_2 = \tau^* \mathbf{V}_2 \tau, \quad \mathbb{W} = \tau^* \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{V}_2 \tau = V.$$

Since  $\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2, \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{V}_2$  are all isometries and furthermore  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  is invariant for  $\mathbf{V} := \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{V}_2$ , (i) follows.

Condition (ii) follows from the fact that  $\mathbf{V}_1$  and  $\mathbf{V}_2$  commute with  $\mathbf{V}$  and again  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  is invariant for  $\mathbf{V}$ .

Since  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{V}_2 = \mathbf{V}_2 \mathbf{V}_1$  and  $\mathbf{V}_1$  is isometric, we see that we can solve for  $\mathbf{V}_1$  as  $\mathbf{V}_1 = \mathbf{V}_2^* \mathbf{V}$ . The formulas for  $\mathbb{W}, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2$  combined with the fact that  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  is invariant for  $\mathbf{V}$  then leads us to condition (iii).

Since  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  is a lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ , we know that

$$(\mathbf{V}_1^*, \mathbf{V}_2^*, \mathbf{V}^*) \mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{\Pi} (T_1^*, T_2^*, T^*),$$

which is actually the same as

$$(\mathbf{V}_1^*, \mathbf{V}_2^*, \mathbf{V}^*) \mathbf{\Pi}_{00} = \mathbf{\Pi}_{00} (T_1^*, T_2^*, T^*).$$

Recalling now that  $\mathbf{\Pi}_{00} = \tau \mathbf{\Pi}$  and that  $\tau: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{00}$  is unitary, this last expression becomes

$$\tau^* (\mathbf{V}_1^*, \mathbf{V}_2^*, \mathbf{V}^*) \tau \mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{\Pi} (T_1^*, T_2^*, T^*)$$

and (iv) follows.

Finally, by construction  $\mathbb{W} = \tau^* \mathbf{V}_{00} \tau = V$  where by definition of compressed Andô tuple  $(\Pi, V)$  is a minimal lift of  $T$ , from which we see that (v) holds. This completes the proof of *compressed Andô lift*  $\Rightarrow$  *pseudo-commuting contractive lift*.

We postpone the proof of the converse (*pseudo-commuting contractive lift*  $\Rightarrow$  *compressed Andô lift*) until after we develop the Douglas-model for compressed Andô lifts in the next section (see Corollary 6.2.3 below). ■

**6.2. Douglas-model pseudo-commuting contractive lifts.** We know by Theorem 4.2.6 that minimal Andô lifts for a commuting contractive operator pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  can be given up to unitary equivalence in the Douglas-model form (4.2.11) specified by a Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . Identifying the embedded minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foiias lift space  $\mathcal{K}_{D,0,0}$  for the product contraction inside  $\mathcal{K}_D$  and then identifying this with the Douglas-model isometric lift  $(\Pi_D, V_D)$  for  $T$  then leads to a Douglas model for a compressed Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  as follows.

**THEOREM 6.2.1.** *Given a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ , let  $\mathcal{K}_D = \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  be the Douglas isometric-lift model space for  $T$ , let  $\Pi_D: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D$  be the Douglas isometric embedding operator  $\Pi_D = \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$ , let  $(G_1, G_2)$  be the Fundamental-Operator pair for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ , and define operators  $W_{b1}, W_{b2}, W_D$  on  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  as in Theorem 4.2.2. Finally define operators  $W_{D,1}, W_{D,2}, V_D$  on  $\mathcal{K}_D$  according to the formulas*

$$(\mathbb{W}_{D,1}, \mathbb{W}_{D,2}, V_D) = \left( \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_{G_1^*+zG_2} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1} \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_{G_2^*+zG_1} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b2} \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right). \quad (6.2.1)$$

Then  $(\Pi_D, \mathbb{W}_{D,1}, \mathbb{W}_{D,2}, V_D)$  is the compression of the Douglas-model Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  to the embedded Douglas-model Sz.-Nagy–Foiias lift  $(\Pi, V_D)$  and hence also is a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $(\Pi_D, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, V_D)$  a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  such that

$$(\Pi_D, V_D) = \left( \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right] : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D, \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{smallmatrix} \right] \text{ on } \mathcal{K}_D \right)$$

is the Douglas-model minimal isometric lift of  $T$  on  $\mathcal{K}_D = \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$ . Then necessarily  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2) = (\mathbb{W}_{D,1}, \mathbb{W}_{D,2})$  is given as in formula (6.2.1).

*Proof.* Let  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  be a Type I Andô tuple for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . Then the Douglas-model Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_D, \mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2})$  on  $\mathcal{K}_D$  associated with this Andô tuple is defined as in (4.2.11):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_D &= \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{F}_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right], \\ (\mathbf{V}_{D,1}, \mathbf{V}_{D,2}) &= \left( \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_{U_*^* P_*^\perp + z U_*^* P_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1} \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} M_{P_* U_* + z P_*^\perp U_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b2} \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) \text{ acting on } \mathcal{K}_D, \\ \mathbf{\Pi}_D &= \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*) \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right] : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D. \end{aligned}$$

Then, as seen in the proof of Theorem 4.2.6, the Sz.-Nagy–Foiias isometric lift of  $T$  embedded in the Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$  is  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_{D,0,0}, \mathbf{V}_{D,0,0})$  where  $\mathbf{\Pi}_{D,0,0}$  is the same as  $\mathbf{\Pi}$  but with codomain taken to be  $\mathcal{K}_{D,0,0} = \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} H^2(\text{Ran } \Lambda_*) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  and where  $\mathbf{V}_{D,0,0} =$

$\mathbf{V}_{D1} \mathbf{V}_{D2} |_{\mathcal{K}_{D,00}}$ , and furthermore, the unique unitary operator  $\tau: \mathcal{K}_D \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{D,00}$  implementing the unitary equivalence between the two minimal isometric lifts  $(\Pi_D, V_D)$  and  $(\Pi_{D,00}, \mathbf{V}_{D,00})$  of  $T = T_1 T_2$  is

$$\tau = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{K}_D \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{D,00}.$$

Hence the associated Douglas-model compressed Andô lift (obtained by using the Douglas model for the the Andô lift  $(T_1, T_2)$  as well as Douglas model for the Sz.-Nagy–Foias lift of the product contraction  $T = T_1 T_2$ ) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{W}_{D,1}, \mathbb{W}_{D,2}, V_D) &:= \tau^*(V_1, V_2, V_1 V_2) \tau := \\ &\left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{\Lambda_*^*(U_*^* P_*^+ + z U_*^* P_*^-) \Lambda_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{\Lambda_*^*(P_* U_*^* + z P_*^\perp U_*^-) \Lambda_*} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b2} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_z & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_1^* + z G_2} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_2^* + z G_1} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b2} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_z & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.2.2)$$

where here we make use of the connection between the Fundamental-Operator pair of  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  and a Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  (see (4.7.24)) coming out of the Second Proof of Theorem 4.7.3:

$$(G_1, G_2) = (\Lambda_*^* P_*^\perp U_* \Lambda_*, \Lambda_*^* U_*^* P_* \Lambda_*)$$

Then by definition the model triple (6.2.1) is a compressed Andô lift, and hence also, by the part of Theorem 6.1.4 already proved, is also a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

Conversely, suppose that the operator triple  $(\Pi_D, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . We break the proof into two steps:

**Step 1. Show:** *If  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive triple, then*

$$(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2) = \left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_1^* + z G_2} & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{W}_2^* W_D \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_2^* + z G_1} & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{W}_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (6.2.3)$$

for some operators  $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$  such that  $\varphi_1(z) := G_1^* + z G_2$  and  $\varphi_2(z) := G_2^* + z G_1$  are contractive analytic functions on  $\mathbb{D}$  and  $\widetilde{W}_2$  is some contraction operator on  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  commuting with  $W_D$ .

**Proof of Step 1.** Assume that  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \begin{bmatrix} M_z & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive triple on  $\mathcal{K}_D := \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$ . As a first step we write out  $\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2$  as block  $2 \times 2$  matrices with respect to the decomposition of  $\mathcal{K}_D$  as  $\begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix}$ :

$$\mathbb{W}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{W}_{j,11} & \mathbb{W}_{j,12} \\ \mathbb{W}_{j,21} & \mathbb{W}_{j,22} \end{bmatrix} \text{ for } j = 1, 2.$$

By Axiom (ii) in Definition 6.1.2 combined with Lemma 3.1.2, we see immediately that  $\mathbb{W}_{j,12} = 0$  for  $j = 1, 2$  and the commutativity of  $\mathbb{W}_j$  with  $\begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix}$  comes down to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{W}_{j,11} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ \mathbb{W}_{j,21} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & \mathbb{W}_{j,22} W_D \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} \mathbb{W}_{j,11} & 0 \\ W_D \mathbb{W}_{j,21} & W_D \mathbb{W}_{j,22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.2.4)$$

By Axiom (iii) in Definition 6.1.2 we know that  $\mathbb{W}_1 = \mathbb{W}_2^* \begin{bmatrix} M_z^{D_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix}$ ; writing this out in detail gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{W}_{1,11} & 0 \\ \mathbb{W}_{1,21} & \mathbb{W}_{1,22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{W}_{2,11}^* M_z^{D_{T^*}} & \mathbb{W}_{2,21}^* W_D \\ 0 & \mathbb{W}_{2,22}^* W_D \end{bmatrix}. \tag{6.2.5}$$

From the (2, 1) entry we see that  $\mathbb{W}_{1,21} = 0$  and from the (1, 2) entry we see that  $\mathbb{W}_{2,21} = 0$  since  $W_D$  is unitary. Thus both  $\mathbb{W}_1$  and  $\mathbb{W}_2$  are diagonal

$$\mathbb{W}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{W}_{j,11} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{W}_{j,22} \end{bmatrix} \text{ for } j = 1, 2.$$

and we see from (6.2.4) that

$$\mathbb{W}_{j,11} M_z^{D_{T^*}} = M_z^{D_{T^*}} \mathbb{W}_{j,11}, \quad \mathbb{W}_{j,22} W_D = W_D \mathbb{W}_{j,22} \text{ for } j = 1, 2. \tag{6.2.6}$$

From the first relation in (6.2.6), by standard Hardy-space theory we conclude that  $W_{j,11}$  must be a multiplication operator  $M_{\varphi_j} : h(z) \mapsto \varphi_j(z)h(z)$  for a contractive analytic function  $\varphi_j(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varphi_{j,k} z^k$  holomorphic on the unit disk  $\mathbb{D}$ , where the Taylor coefficients  $\varphi_{j,k}$  ( $j = 1, 2, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) are operators on  $\mathcal{D}_{T^*}$ . From (6.2.5) we see that  $M_{\varphi_1} = M_{\varphi_2}^* M_z^{D_{T^*}}$ . A Taylor-series argument then shows that the pair  $(\varphi_1(z), \varphi_2(z))$  must have the coupled pencil form

$$\varphi_1(z) = G_1^* + zG_2, \quad \varphi_2(z) = G_2^* + zG_1.$$

for some operators  $G_1, G_2$  on  $\mathcal{D}_{T^*}$ .

Finally, from (6.2.4) we see that both  $\widetilde{W}_1 := W_{1,22}$  and  $\widetilde{W}_2 := W_{2,22}$  commute with  $W_D$ . By the Fuglede-Putnam theorem, it follows that each of  $\widetilde{W}_1$  and  $\widetilde{W}_2$  also commutes with  $W_D^*$ . If we let  $\widetilde{W}_2$  be any contractive operator commuting with the unitary operator  $W_D$  and then set  $\widetilde{W}_1 = \widetilde{W}_2^* W_D$ , then  $\widetilde{W}_1$  automatically commutes with  $W_D$  and this is the general form for a pseudo-commuting contractive triple  $(W_1, W_2, W_D)$  with last component equal to the unitary operator  $W_D$ . This completes the proof of Step 1.

**Step 2. Show:** If  $G_1, G_2, \widetilde{W}_1 = W_D^* \widetilde{W}_2, \widetilde{W}_2$  are as in Step 1 and

$$\left( \Pi_D, \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_1^* + zG_2} & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{W}_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_2^* + zG_1} & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{W}_2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

is a lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ , then  $(G_1, G_2)$  is the Fundamental-Operator pair for  $(T_1, T_2)$  and  $(\widetilde{W}_1, \widetilde{W}_2) = (W_{b_1}, W_{b_2})$  is the canonical pair of unitaries on the space  $\mathcal{Q}_{T^*}$  associated with the contractive operator pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  as in Theorem 4.2.2.

**Proof of Step 2.** The hypothesis that  $\left( \Pi_D, \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_1^* + zG_2} & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{W}_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_2^* + zG_1} & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{W}_2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$  is a lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  means that

$$\left( \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_1^* + zG_2} & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{W}_1 \end{bmatrix}^*, \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_2^* + zG_1} & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{W}_2 \end{bmatrix}^* \right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} (T_1^*, T_2^*)$$

which breaks apart into the set of conditions

$$M_{G_1^* + zG_2}^* \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} = \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} T_1^*, \quad M_{G_2^* + zG_1}^* \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} = \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} T_2^* \tag{6.2.7}$$

$$\widetilde{W}_1^* \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} = \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} T_1^*, \quad \widetilde{W}_2^* \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} = \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} T_2^*. \tag{6.2.8}$$

By Theorem 4.2.2 it is immediate from (6.2.8) that

$$(\widetilde{W}_1, \widetilde{W}_2) = (W_{b,1}, W_{2,b})$$

as claimed. As for the first equation in (6.2.7), note that each side is an operator from  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})$ . Applying each side to a fixed vector in  $\mathcal{H}$  gives

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (G_1^* D_{T^*} T^{*k} + G_2 D_{T^*} T^{*k+1}) h z^k = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} D_{T^*} T^{*k} T_1^* h z^k.$$

Equating Taylor coefficients and cancelling off the vector  $h$  gives us the system of operator equations

$$G_1^* D_{T^*} T^{*k} + G_2 D_{T^*} T^{*k+1} = D_{T^*} T^{*k} T_1^* \text{ for all } k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

As  $T_1^*$  commutes with  $T^*$ , we can rewrite this with a common right factor of  $T^{*k}$ :

$$(G_1^* D_{T^*} + G_2 D_{T^*} T^*) T^{*k} = (D_{T^*} T_1^*) T^{*k} \text{ for } k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

For this to hold for all  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , it is now clear that it suffices that it hold for  $k = 0$ :

$$G_1^* D_{T^*} + G_2 D_{T^*} T^* = D_{T^*} T_1^*,$$

i.e.,  $(G_1, G_2)$  is a solution of the first of equations (4.7.2) (with  $(G_1, G_2)$  in place of  $(F_1, F_2)$  and with  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  in place of  $(T_1, T_2)$ ). A similar analysis starting with the second of equations (6.2.7) leads to the equation

$$G_2^* D_{T^*} + G_1 D_{T^*} T^* = D_{T^*} T_2^*,$$

i.e.,  $(G_1, G_2)$  also solves the second equation in (4.7.2) (again with  $(G_1, G_2)$  in place of  $(F_1, F_2)$  and  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  in place of  $(T_1, T_2)$ ). By Definition 4.7.2 and the uniqueness result Theorem 4.7.3, it follows that  $(G_1, G_2)$  turns out to be the Fundamental-Operator pair for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  as claimed. ■

**REMARK 6.2.2.** The proof of Theorem 6.2.1 made reference to the construction of the triple  $(\mathbb{W}_{D,1}, \mathbb{W}_{D,2}, V_D)$  as the compression (in the sense of Definition 6.1.1 of a Douglas-model Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  to the embedding of a Douglas-model minimal isometric lift of the product contraction  $T = T_1 T_2$  to conclude that the Douglas-model triple  $(\mathbb{W}_{D,1}, \mathbb{W}_{D,2}, V_D)$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive lift. However it is also of interest to see if it is possible to check this directly from the formula (6.2.1) which a priori has no reference to the existence of an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . To get the lifting property, the proof of the direct statement uses the connection of the fundamental operator pair  $(G_1, G_2)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  with the existence of a Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}_*, \Lambda_*, P_*, U_*)$  defining a Douglas-model Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . However in the proof of the converse it is shown how to get a more direct statement: the lifting property for  $(\Pi_D, \mathbb{W}_{D,1}, \mathbb{W}_{D,2}, V_D)$  is associated with the Fundamental-Operator system of equations (4.7.2) (with  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  in place of  $(T_1, T_2)$  and with  $(G_1, G_2)$  in place of  $(F_1, F_2)$ ). Conditions (ii), (iii) in Definition 6.1.2 follow by a direct check from the formulas (6.2.1) and we conclude that one can show directly that  $(\Pi_D, \mathbb{W}_{D,1}, \mathbb{W}_{D,2}, V_D)$  is at least a *pseudo-commuting algebraic lift* (as defined in Definition 6.1.2) of  $(T_1, T_2, T_1 T_2)$ . To show that  $\mathbb{W}_{D,1}$  and  $\mathbb{W}_{D,2}$  are contraction operators; to our knowledge the only argument for showing this goes through the fact that  $\mathbb{W}_{D,1}$

and  $\mathbb{W}_{D,2}$  are compressions of the commuting isometries  $(\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  in a Douglas-model Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_{D,1} &:= M_{G_1^*+zG_2} = (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*^*) M_{U_*^* P_*^\perp + z U_*^* P_*} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*^*), \\ \mathbb{W}_{D,2} &:= M_{G_2^*+zG_1} = (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*^*) M_{P_* U_* + z P_*^\perp U_*} (I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda_*^*). \end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to complete the proof of 6.1.4.

**COROLLARY 6.2.3.** *Suppose that  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting contractive pair on  $\mathcal{H}$  and suppose that  $\Pi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  is an embedding of  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{K}$  and that  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a triple of operators on  $\mathcal{K}$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

1.  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is the compression of an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T_1 T_2)$  to an immersed minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foias lift of  $T$ , i.e.,  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W})$  is a minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foias (isometric) lift of  $T = T_1 T_2$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  and there is an Andô lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  of  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  together with a unitary embedding

$$\tau: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{00} := \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{V}_1^n \mathbf{V}_2^n \text{Ran } \mathbf{\Pi} \subset \mathcal{K}$$

so that

$$\tau \Pi = \mathbf{\Pi}, \quad \tau^* (\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2, \mathbf{V}_1 \mathbf{V}_2) \tau = (\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W}).$$

2.  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T_1 T_2)$ .
3.  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is unitarily equivalent to the Douglas-model pseudo-commutative contractive lift  $\left( \Pi_D, \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_1^*+zG_2} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b1} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_2^*+zG_1} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b2} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_z & 0 \\ 0 & W_D \end{bmatrix} \right)$  given by Theorem 6.2.1.

Furthermore, if  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  and  $(\Pi', \mathbb{W}'_1, \mathbb{W}'_2, \mathbb{W}')$  are two pseudo-commuting contractive lifts of  $(T_1, T_2, T_1 T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{K}'$  respectively such that there is a unitary operator  $\tau': \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}'$  such that

$$\Pi' = \tau' \Pi, \quad \mathbb{W}' \tau' = \tau' \mathbb{W}, \tag{6.2.9}$$

then it follows that also

$$\mathbb{W}'_1 \tau' = \tau' \mathbb{W}_1, \quad \mathbb{W}'_2 \tau' = \tau' \mathbb{W}_2. \tag{6.2.10}$$

*Proof.* We first show that (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1).

**(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2):** This follows from the part of Theorem 6.1.4 already proved above.

**(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3):** Assume (2). Then  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W})$  is a minimal isometric lift of  $T = T_1 T_2$  on  $\mathcal{K}$ . By uniqueness of the minimal isometric lift for  $T$ , there is a unitary  $\tau: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D$  which brings the Sz.-Nagy–Foias lift  $(\Pi, V)$  to the Douglas-model Sz.-Nagy–Foias lift:

$$\tau \Pi = \Pi_D, \quad \tau \mathbb{W} = V_D \tau.$$

Since  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive triple and  $\tau$  is unitary, it is easily checked that

$$\tau (\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W}) \tau^* = (\tau \mathbb{W}_1 \tau^*, \tau \mathbb{W}_2 \tau^*, V_D)$$

is also a pseudo-commuting contractive triple. Similarly, since  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T_1 T_2)$ , it follows that  $(\tau \Pi = \Pi_D, \tau \mathbb{W}_1 \tau^*, \tau \mathbb{W}_2 \tau^*, V_D)$  is also a lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T_1 T_2)$ .

But as a consequence of Theorem 6.2.1 we see that this then forces

$$\tau\mathbb{W}_1\tau^* = \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_1^\dagger+zG_2} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b_1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tau\mathbb{W}_2\tau^* = \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_2^\dagger+zG_1} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{b_2} \end{bmatrix},$$

and hence  $\tau$  implements a unitary equivalence of the pseudo-commuting contractive lift  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  with  $(\Pi_D, W_1^D, W_2^D, V_D)$  (notation as in (6.2.1)), and (3) follows.

**(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1):** This is part of the content of the first part of Theorem 6.2.1.

We verify the last part of the corollary as follows. Suppose that  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  are  $(\Pi', \mathbb{W}'_1, \mathbb{W}'_2, \mathbb{W}')$  are two pseudo-commuting contractive lifts of  $(T_1, T_2, T_1T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{K}'$  such that (6.2.9) holds. Let  $\tau_D: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D$  be a unitary identification map bringing the pseudo-commuting contractive lift  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  to the Douglas model form:

$$\tau_D\Pi = \Pi_D, \quad \tau_D\mathbb{W}_1 = \mathbb{W}_{D,1}\tau_D, \quad \tau_D\mathbb{W}_2 = \mathbb{W}_{D,2}\tau_D, \quad \tau_D\mathbb{W}_D = V_D\tau_D.$$

Set  $\tau = \tau_D\tau'^*: \mathcal{K}' \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_D$ . Then note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau\Pi' &= \tau_D\Pi = \Pi_D, \\ \tau\mathbb{W}' &= \tau_D\tau'^*\mathbb{W}' = \tau_D\mathbb{W}\tau'^* = V_D\tau_D\tau'^* = V_D\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(\tau\Pi', \tau W'_1\tau^*, \tau W'_2\tau^*, \tau W'\tau^*) = (\Pi_D, \tau\mathbb{W}'_1\tau^*, \tau\mathbb{W}'_2\tau^*, V_D)$$

is a pseudo commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T_1T_2)$ . By the converse statement in Theorem 6.2.1, we see that we must have

$$\tau\mathbb{W}'_1\tau^* = \mathbb{W}_{D,1}, \quad \tau\mathbb{W}'_2\tau^* = \mathbb{W}_{D,2}.$$

Thus from the definitions we have

$$\mathbb{W}'_1 = \tau^*\mathbb{W}_{D,1}\tau = \tau'\tau_D^*\mathbb{W}_{D,1}\tau_D\tau'^* = \tau'\mathbb{W}_1\tau'^*$$

and similarly

$$\mathbb{W}'_2 = \tau'\mathbb{W}_2\tau'^*$$

and (6.2.10) follows as wanted.  $\blacksquare$

**6.3. Sz.-Nagy–Foias-model pseudo-commuting contractive lifts.** We have defined the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model minimal lift of a contraction operator  $T$ , as well as the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model Andô lift of a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ , as a simple transformation, using the unitary operator  $U_{\text{NF},D}: \mathcal{K}_D \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  or  $\mathbf{U}_{\text{NF},D}: \mathcal{K}_D \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\text{NF}}$ , of the corresponding Douglas model. The analogous procedure applies also to the construction of a Sz.-Nagy–Foias model pseudo commuting contractive lift of a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  as follows.

**THEOREM 6.3.1.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive operator-pair on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and set  $T = T_1T_2$ . Let*

$$U_{\text{NF},D} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})} & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_{\text{NF},D} \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \Delta_{\Theta_T}(L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)) \end{bmatrix}$$

be the unitary as in (4.4.2). Let us define operators

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}} &= (\mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},2}, V_{\text{NF}}) := U_{\text{NF},D}(\mathbb{W}_{D,1}, \mathbb{W}_{D,2}, V_D)U_{\text{NF},D}^* \\ &= \left( \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_1^*+zG_2} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#1} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_2^*+zG_1} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#2} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} & 0 \\ 0 & M_\zeta|_{\Delta_{\Theta_T}L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \end{array} \right] \right) \text{ on } \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}, \\ \Pi_{\text{NF}} &= U_{\text{NF},D}\Pi_D := \left[ \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{O}_{D_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \omega_{\text{NF},D}Q_{T^*} \end{array} \right] : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T} \end{aligned} \quad (6.3.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T} = \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T}(L^2(\mathcal{D}_T))} \right]$  and where  $(\mathbb{W}_{D,1}, \mathbb{W}_{D,2}, V_D)$  is the Douglas-model pseudo-commuting contractive triple as defined in (6.2.2) (so  $(G_1, G_2)$  is the Fundamental-Operator pair for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ ) and the pair  $(W_{\#1}, W_{\#2})$  is the commuting unitary operator-pair as in (4.4.1). Then  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, \mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},2}, V_{\text{NF}})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T)$ , called the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model pseudo-commuting contractive lift.

*Proof.* We showed in the proof of Theorem 6.2.1 that  $(\Pi_D, \mathbb{W}_{D,1}, \mathbb{W}_{D,2}, V_D)$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Since the isometry  $\Pi_{\text{NF}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  is given by  $\Pi_{\text{NF}} = U_{\text{NF},D}\Pi_D$ , it then follows that the collection  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, \underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}})$  is unitarily equivalent to the lift  $(\Pi_D, \underline{\mathbb{W}}_D)$  (where we set  $\underline{\mathbb{W}}_D = (\mathbb{W}_{D,1}, \mathbb{W}_{D,2}, V_D)$ ), and hence itself must also be a lift, of  $(T_1, T_2, T_1T_2)$ ; in detail we have

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}}^*\Pi_{\text{NF}} &= U_{\text{NF},D}\underline{\mathbb{W}}_D^*U_{\text{NF},D}^* \cdot U_{\text{NF},D}\Pi_D \\ &= U_{\text{NF},D}\underline{\mathbb{W}}_D^*\Pi_D = U_{\text{NF},D}\Pi_D\underline{T}^* = \Pi_{\text{NF}}\underline{T}^* \end{aligned}$$

(where here we set  $\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, T = T_1T_2)$ ) thereby verifying that  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, \underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}})$  is a lift of  $\underline{T}$ . Since the pseudo-commuting contractive property is invariant under unitary equivalence, it also follows that  $\underline{\mathbb{W}}_D$  being a pseudo-commuting contractive triple implies that  $\underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}}$  is also a pseudo-commuting contractive triple. ■

**REMARK 6.3.2.** Let us observe that, since  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, \underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}})$  is related to  $(\Pi_D, \underline{\mathbb{W}}_D)$  via the innocuous change of coordinates in the second coordinate  $U_{\text{NF},D}$ , it is a routine exercise to see that all the results concerning  $(\Pi_D, \underline{\mathbb{W}}_D)$  in Theorem 6.2.1, Remark 6.2.2, Corollary 6.2.3 hold equally well for  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, \underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}})$ . In particular, the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model pseudo-commuting contractive lift  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, \underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}})$  can also be viewed as the compression of a Sz.-Nagy–Foias model Andô lift to an embedded Sz.-Nagy–Foias model for a minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foias lift  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, V_{\text{NF}})$  of  $T = T_1T_2$ , thereby proving that  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, \underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $\underline{T}$ .

**6.4. Schäffer-model pseudo-commuting contractive lifts.** Unlike the case for the Douglas model, the Schäffer model for a general Andô lift arising from a Type II Andô tuple does not appear to be sufficiently tractable for the identification of a pseudo-commuting contractive lift. We therefore restrict ourselves to strong Type II Andô tuples (see Definition 4.5.2).

We have seen in Theorem 4.5.3 that any minimal Andô lift for a commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  is unitarily equivalent to the Schäffer-model Andô lift associated with some strong Type II Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$  and conversely, the Schäffer-model Andô lift associated with a strong Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$  is an Andô



lift for  $(T_1, T_2)$ . By Theorem 6.1.4 the compression of such a Schäffer-model Andô lift in the sense of Definition 6.1.1 yields a pseudo-commuting contractive lift  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  for  $(T_1, T_2, T_1T_2)$ . The next result computes such a Schäffer-model compressed Andô lift for a given commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  using also the Schäffer model for the minimal isometric lift of the product contraction operator  $T = T_1T_2$ .

**THEOREM 6.4.1.** *Given a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ , let  $\mathcal{K}_S = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \end{bmatrix}$  be the Schäffer-model isometric-lift space for the product contraction  $T := T_1T_2$ , let  $\Pi_S: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S$  be the Schäffer-model embedding operator  $\Pi_S = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , let  $(F_1, F_2)$  be the Fundamental-Operator pair for  $(T_1, T_2)$  (see Theorem 4.7.3), and define operators  $\mathbb{W}_{S,1}, \mathbb{W}_{S,2}, \mathbb{W}_S$  on  $\mathcal{K}_S$  according to the formula*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_{S,1} &= \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_T}^* F_2^* D_T & M_{F_1+zF_2^*} \end{bmatrix}, & \mathbb{W}_{S,2} &= \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_T}^* F_1^* D_T & M_{F_2+zF_1^*} \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbb{W}_S = V_S &= \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_T}^* D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T} \end{bmatrix} \text{ on } \mathcal{K}_S := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.4.1)$$

Then  $(\Pi_S, \mathbb{W}_{S,1}, \mathbb{W}_{S,2}, V_S)$  is a the compression of an Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T_1T_2)$  to an embedded minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foiias lift of  $T = T_1T_2$  and hence also a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T_1T_2)$ .

Conversely, if  $(\Pi_S, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, V_S)$  is any pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  such that

$$(\Pi_S, V_S) = \left( \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S, \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{D}_T}^* D_T & M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T} \end{bmatrix} \text{ on } \mathcal{K}_S \right) \quad (6.4.2)$$

is the Schäffer-model minimal isometric lift of  $T$  on  $\mathcal{K}_S = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \end{bmatrix}$ , then necessarily also  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2) = (\mathbb{W}_{S,1}, \mathbb{W}_{S,2})$  are given as in formula (6.4.1).

*Proof.* Let  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  be a strong Type II Andô tuple for the commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Then the associated Schäffer-model Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  is given by  $(\Pi_S, \mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  where the isometric embedding operator  $\Pi_S: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S$  and the isometries  $\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2}$  on  $\mathcal{K}_S$  are given as in Theorem 4.5.3:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_S &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\mathcal{F}) \end{bmatrix}, & \Pi_S &= \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S, \\ (\mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2}) &= \left( \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* P U \Lambda D_T & M_{P^\perp U+z P U} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* U^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T & M_{U^* P+z U^* P^\perp} \end{bmatrix} \right), \\ \mathbf{V}_S = \mathbf{V}_{S,1} \mathbf{V}_{S,2} &= \mathbf{V}_{S,2} \mathbf{V}_{S,1} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T & M_z \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

where  $T := T_1T_2 = T_2T_1$  is the product contraction operator on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let us next compute the space

$$\mathcal{K}_{S,00} := \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{V}_S^n \text{Ran } \Pi_S.$$

By an induction argument one can see that

$$\mathbf{V}_S^n \Pi_S = \begin{bmatrix} T^n \\ \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} M_z^j \mathbf{ev}_{0, \mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda D_T T^{n-1-j} \end{bmatrix}$$

where the bottom entry should be interpreted to be 0 for the case  $n = 0$ . By taking  $n = 0$  we see that  $\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda \mathcal{D}_T \end{bmatrix} \subset \mathcal{K}_{S,00}$ . By next taking  $n = 1$  we see that

$$\bigvee_{n=0,1} \text{Ran } \mathbf{V}_S^n \mathbf{\Pi}_S = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda \mathcal{D}_T \end{bmatrix} \subset \mathcal{K}_{S,00}.$$

Inductively assume that

$$\bigvee_{n=0,1,\dots,K} \text{Ran } \mathbf{V}_S^n \mathbf{\Pi}_S = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ \bigoplus_{j=0}^{K-1} (M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T})^j \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda \mathcal{D}_T \end{bmatrix}.$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \bigvee_{n=0,1,\dots,K,K+1} \text{Ran } \mathbf{V}_S^n \mathbf{\Pi}_S &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ \left( \bigoplus_{j=0}^{K-1} (M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T})^j \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda \mathcal{D}_T \right) \oplus (M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T})^K \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda \mathcal{D}_T \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ \bigoplus_{j=0}^K (M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T})^j \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda \mathcal{D}_T \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{K}_{S,00} = \text{closure} \left( \bigcup_{K \geq 0} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ \left( \bigoplus_{j=0}^{K-1} (M_z^{\mathcal{D}_T})^j \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* \Lambda \mathcal{D}_T \right) \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} \\ H^2(\text{Ran } \Lambda) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.4.3)$$

Let us now introduce the Schäffer model  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_S, V_S)$  for the minimal isometric lift of the product contraction operator  $T := T_1 T_2$ . By uniqueness of minimal isometric lifts for a single contraction operator, there exists an isometry  $\tau$  from  $\mathcal{K}_S$  onto  $\mathcal{K}_{S,00}$  so that

$$\tau \mathbf{\Pi}_S = \mathbf{\Pi}_{S,00}, \quad \tau V_S = \mathbf{V}_{S,00\tau}$$

where we set  $\mathbf{V}_{S,00} := \mathbf{V}_S|_{\mathcal{K}_{00}}$ . It is easy to check that

$$\tau := \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda \end{bmatrix} \quad (6.4.4)$$

does the job.

Putting all the pieces together, it follows by definition that the compressed Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  associated with

- (i) the Schäffer-model lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_S, \mathbf{V}_{S,1}, \mathbf{V}_{S,2})$  determined by  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  for  $(T_1, T_2)$  and
- (ii) the Schäffer-model minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foias lift  $(\mathbf{\Pi}_S, V_S)$  for  $T = T_1 T_2$

is given by

$$(\mathbb{W}_{S,1}, \mathbb{W}_{S,2}, \mathbb{W}_S) = (\tau^* \mathbf{V}_{S,1} \tau, \tau^* \mathbf{V}_{S,2} \tau, V_S) \text{ on } \mathcal{K}_S. \quad (6.4.5)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_{S,1} &= \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* P U \Lambda \mathcal{D}_T & M_{P^\perp U + z P U} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{D}_T}^* \Lambda^* P U \Lambda \mathcal{D}_T & M_{\Lambda^* P^\perp U \Lambda + z \Lambda^* P U \Lambda} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{D}_T}^* F_2^* \mathcal{D}_T & M_{F_1 + z F_2^*} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (6.4.6)$$

where  $(F_1, F_2)$  is the Fundamental-Operator pair for the commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . Here in the last step we used the characterization (4.7.24) of the Fundamental-Operator pair in terms of a strong Type II Andô tuple for  $(T_1, T_2)$

$$F_1 = \Lambda^* P^\perp U \Lambda, \quad F_2 = \Lambda^* U^* P \Lambda$$

coming out of the Third Proof of Theorem 4.7.3.

A similar computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_{S,2} &= \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{F}}^* U^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T \quad M_{U^* P + z U^* P^\perp} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{H^2} \otimes \Lambda \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{D}_T}^* \Lambda^* U^* P^\perp \Lambda D_T & M_{\Lambda^* U^* P \Lambda + z \Lambda^* U^* P^\perp \Lambda} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} T_2 & 0 \\ \mathbf{ev}_{0,\mathcal{D}_T}^* F_1^* D_T & M_{F_2 + z F_1^*} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We have now verified that the formula (6.4.1) gives a compressed Andô lift for the commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

The fact that then  $(\Pi_S, W_{S,1}, W_{S,2}, W_S = V_S)$  is also a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T = T_1 T_2)$  follows as a consequence of the general principle *compressed Andô lift*  $\Rightarrow$  *pseudo-commuting contractive lift* of  $(T_1, T_2)$  verified in Theorem 6.1.4.

The converse follows from the model-independent result in Corollary 6.2.3. More precisely, apply the “furthermore” part of Corollary 6.2.3 to the two pseudo-commuting contractive lifts  $(\mathbb{W}_{S1}, \mathbb{W}_{S2}, V_S)$  as in (6.4.1) and  $(\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, V_S)$  as in the converse part of Theorem 6.4.1. Observe that if  $\tau' : \mathcal{K}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_S$  is a unitary such that  $\tau' V_S = V_S \tau'$  and  $\tau'|_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ , then by minimality of the lift  $V_S$ , we must have  $\tau' = I_{\mathcal{K}_S}$ . Thus the unitary  $\tau'$  as in (6.2.9) must be the identity operator, and consequently, the converse here follows. Alternatively, one can prove it directly by following the steps in the proof of the converse part of Theorem 6.2.1 but with substitution of Schäffer models for the Douglas models.

■

Recall that two minimal isometric lifts of a commuting contractive pair need not be unitary equivalent. What if minimality is replaced by strong minimality? We end this chapter with the following result that shows that the existence of one strongly minimal Andô lift is a sufficiently strong condition to force uniqueness of any two minimal Andô lifts.

**THEOREM 6.4.2.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive pair such that it has a strongly minimal Andô lift. Then any minimal isometric Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  is strongly minimal and consequently, any two minimal isometric lifts of  $(T_1, T_2)$  are unitarily equivalent.*

*Proof.* Let  $(V_1, V_2)$  acting on  $\mathcal{K}$  be a minimal isometric lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  via the isometric embedding  $\Pi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ . Consider the space  $\mathcal{K}_{00} = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} V_1^n V_2^n \Pi \mathcal{H}$ . Let  $\iota : \mathcal{K}_{00} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  be the embedding of  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$  into  $\mathcal{K}$ . Consider the compression of the Andô lift  $(V_1, V_2)$  to  $\mathcal{K}_{00}$ :

$$(V_{1,00}, V_{2,00}, V_{00}) = \iota^*(V_1, V_2, V_1 V_2) \iota.$$

By Theorem 6.1.4,  $(V_{1,00}, V_{2,00}, V_{00})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

Let  $(W_1, W_2)$  be a strongly minimal Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  acting on the space  $\mathcal{W} = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} W_1^n W_2^n \mathcal{H}$ . For simplicity, we take the embedding to be the inclusion map. It is routine to see that the triple  $(W_1, W_2, W_1 W_2)$  satisfies all the conditions for a pseudo-commuting contractive lift. By Corollary 6.2.3, the compression  $(V_{1,00}, V_{2,00})$  is unitarily equivalent to the Andô lift  $(W_1, W_2)$ , which in turn implies that  $(V_{1,00}, V_{2,00})$  must also be Andô lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$ . By minimality of the Andô lift  $(V_1, V_2)$ , we must have  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_{00}$  showing that  $(V_1, V_2)$  is strongly minimal. Since strongly minimal Andô lifts are all pseudo-commuting contractive lifts, and since the latter class are all unique up to unitary equivalence, any two minimal isometric lifts of  $(T_1, T_2)$  must be unitarily equivalent. ■

This result leads to the following immediate corollary.

**COROLLARY 6.4.3.** *Suppose that  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting pair of isometries such that both  $T = T_1 \cdot T_2$  and  $T = T_2 \cdot T_1$  are regular factorizations (see Definition 4.3.1). The  $(T_1, T_2)$  has a strongly minimal Andô lift  $(V_1, V_2)$  and all minimal Andô lifts are strongly minimal and mutually unitarily equivalent as lifts.*

## 7. Characteristic/admissible triples and functional model for a commuting pair of contractions

As seen in the preceding chapters that there is a lack of uniqueness (up to unitary equivalence of lifts) in general for Andô lifts of a given contractive commuting operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  but there is uniqueness for a pseudo-commuting contractive lift  $(\Pi, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  of  $(T_1, T_2, T = T_1 T_2)$  which has embedded in it a minimal Sz.-Nagy–Foiás (isometric) lift  $(\Pi, V = \mathbb{W})$  of the single contraction operator  $T$ . When we use the Sz.-Nagy–Foiás model  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, V_{\text{NF}})$  of the minimal isometric lift for  $T$  (expressed in terms of the characteristic function  $\Theta_T$ ) for  $T$ , together with the Sz.-Nagy–Foiás model  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, \mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},2}, V_{\text{NF}})$  for the pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T)$  (expressed in terms of a larger characteristic triple  $\Xi_T = ((G_1, G_2), (W_{\#1}, W_{\#2}), \Theta_T)$  for  $(T_1, T_2, T)$  (where  $(G_1, G_2)$  and  $(W_{\#1}, W_{\#2})$  are as in (6.3.1)), we arrive at a functional model

$$(T_1, T_2, T) \underset{u}{\cong} P_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}}(\mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},2}, V_{\text{NF}})|_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}}$$

for the commuting triple  $(T_1, T_2, T)$  itself. Conversely, there is a notion of *admissible triple*  $\Xi$  for the case where no commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  is initially specified, from which one can build a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_{\Xi,1}, T_{\Xi,2})$  on a functional model space  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta}$  which in turn has a characteristic triple  $\Xi_{T_{\Xi,1}, T_{\Xi,2}}$  which can be shown to coincide with the original admissible triple, giving a complete parallel with the Sz.-Nagy–Foiás theory outlined in Remark 2.3.4 (where one now has *characteristic triple* in place of *characteristic function* and *admissible triple* in place of *purely contractive analytic function*). Perhaps as is to be expected, however, there are some compatibility conditions in the definition of admissible triple which may be difficult to check in practice. In the succeeding sections we spell out the details. The first order of business is to understand precisely the notion of *completely nonunitary* for the commuting contractive operator-pair case.

**7.1. Characteristic triples and functional models.** The following definition makes precise the notion of *characteristic triple* for a commuting contractive operator-pair.

DEFINITION 7.1.1. Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive operator-pair on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let us introduce the following objects:

- (i)  $(G_1, G_2) =$  the *Fundamental-Operator pair* for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  as in Definition 4.7.2.
- (ii)  $(W_{\#1}, W_{\#2}) =$  the commuting unitary operator-pair canonically associated with  $(T_1, T_2)$  as in (4.4.1).
- (iii)  $\Theta_T =$  the *characteristic operator function* (2.3.7) for the product contraction operator  $T = T_1 T_2$ . Here we set  $\underline{T}$  to the operator triple  $\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, T = T_1 T_2)$ .

Then the triple  $\Xi_{\underline{T}} := ((G_1, G_2), (W_{\#1}, W_{\#2}), \Theta_T)$  is called the *characteristic triple* for  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

Note that the components  $((G_1, G_2), (W_{\#1}, W_{\#2}), \Theta_T)$  is all that is needed to write down  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, W_{\text{NF},1}, W_{\text{NF},2}, V_{\text{NF}})$ , the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T = T_1 T_2)$  acting on the space  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  as in Theorem 6.3.1.

We now present the bivariate analogue of the result discussed in Remark 2.3.4 and reviewed in the preceding paragraphs.

THEOREM 7.1.2. *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a commuting contractive operator-pair and let its characteristic triple be*

$$\Xi_{\underline{T}} = ((G_1, G_2), (W_{\#1}, W_{\#2}), \Theta_T).$$

*Then the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model space*

$$\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T} = \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} \cdot L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right] \ominus \left[ \frac{\Theta_T}{\Delta_{\Theta_T}} \right] \cdot H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \tag{7.1.1}$$

*is coinvariant under*

$$\left( \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_1^*+zG_2} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#1} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_2^*+zG_1} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#2} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_z & 0 \\ 0 & M_{\zeta|_{\frac{0}{\Delta_{\Theta_T}(L^2(\mathcal{D}_T))}}} \end{array} \right] \right)$$

*and  $\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, T_1 T_2)$  is unitarily equivalent to*

$$P_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}} \left( \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_1^*+zG_2} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#1} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_2^*+zG_1} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#2} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_z & 0 \\ 0 & M_{\zeta|_{\frac{0}{\Delta_{\Theta_T}(L^2(\mathcal{D}_T))}}} \end{array} \right] \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}} \tag{7.1.2}$$

*via the unitary operator  $\Pi_{\text{NF},0}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}$  given by*

$$\Pi_{\text{NF},0}: h \mapsto \Pi_{\text{NF}} h \in \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T} \text{ for } h \in \mathcal{H}. \tag{7.1.3}$$

*Proof.* Let us denote by  $\underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}}$  the operator triple

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}} &:= (\mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},2}, V_{\text{NF}}) \\ &:= \left( \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_{\#1}^*+zG_{\#2}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#1} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_{\#2}^*+zG_{\#1}} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#2} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_z & 0 \\ 0 & M_{\zeta|_{\frac{0}{\Delta_{\Theta_T}(L^2(\mathcal{D}_T))}}} \end{array} \right] \right) \end{aligned} \tag{7.1.4}$$

acting on  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T} := \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*})}{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \right]$  and set  $\Pi_{\text{NF}} = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}, T^*} \\ \omega_{\text{NF}, \text{D}} \mathcal{Q}_{T^*} \end{array} \right]$  equal to the Sz.-Nagy–Foias embedding operator from  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  with range equal to  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}$ . By Theorem 6.3.1 we

know that  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, \mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},2}, V_{\text{NF}})$  is a lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T = T_1T_2)$ , i.e.,

$$(\mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},1}^*, \mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},2}^*, V_{\text{NF}}^*)\Pi_{\text{NF}} = \Pi_{\text{NF}}(T_1^*, T_2^*, T^* = T_1^*T_2^*). \tag{7.1.5}$$

where (as noted in Remark 2.3.4)  $\text{Ran } \Pi_{\text{NF}} = \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}$ . This shows immediately that  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}$  is coinvariant under  $\underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}}$ . Apply  $\Pi_{\text{NF}}^*$  on the left to both sides of (7.1.5), use that  $\Pi_{\text{NF}}$  is an isometry ( $\Pi_{\text{NF}}^*\Pi_{\text{NF}} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ ), and then take adjoints to arrive at

$$\Pi_{\text{NF}}^*(W_{\text{NF},1}, W_{\text{NF},2}, V_{\text{NF}})\Pi_{\text{NF}} = (T_1, T_2, T_1T_2).$$

Then use the connection (7.1.3) between  $\Pi_{\text{NF}}$  and  $\Pi_{\text{NF},0}$  to reinterpret this last identity as

$$\Pi_{\text{NF},0}^* \left( P_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}}(W_{\text{NF},1}, W_{\text{NF},2}, V_{\text{NF}})|_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}} \right) \Pi_{\text{NF},0} = (T_1, T_2, T_1T_2).$$

This last equality is the statement that the model operator-triple (7.1.2)

$$P_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}}(\mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},2}, V_{\text{NF}})|_{\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_T}}$$

is unitarily equivalent via  $\Pi_{\text{NF},0}$  to the original contractive operator-triple  $(T_1, T_2, T_1T_2)$  as claimed, and the theorem follows. ■

**7.2. Canonical decomposition for pairs of commuting contractions.** Our eventual goal is to prove that characteristic triples form a complete unitary invariant for commuting contractive pairs  $(T_1, T_2)$  with the condition that  $T = T_1T_2$  is a completely nonunitary (c.n.u.) contraction. The goal of this section is to argue that this c.n.u. assumption on  $T = T_1T_2$  can be discarded without any substantive loss of generality due to the existence of a *canonical decomposition* for any commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ . This is analogous to the single-variable phenomenon that every single contraction has a decomposition as the direct sum of a unitary operator and a c.n.u. contraction operator. This result actually follows as a special case of the canonical decomposition for tetrablock contractions recently obtained by Pal [30]. Here we present a more elementary direct proof for the special setting of commuting pairs of contractions. We shall need the following lemma.

LEMMA 7.2.1. *Let  $A$  be a bounded operator on a Hilbert space such that  $\omega A$  has negative semidefinite real part for all  $\omega$  on the unit circle:*

$$\text{Re}(\omega A) := \omega A + (\omega A)^* \preceq 0 \text{ for all } \omega \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Then  $A = 0$ .

*Proof.* The hypothesis means that the operator-valued function  $R(\omega) := \omega A + \bar{\omega}A^*$  satisfies  $R(\omega) \preceq 0$  for every  $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ . Note that  $R(-\omega) = -R(\omega)$  for every  $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$  and hence

$$R(\omega) := \omega A + \bar{\omega}A^* = 0 \text{ for all } \omega \in \mathbb{T},$$

which readily implies that  $A = \frac{1}{2}(R(1) - iR(i)) = 0$ . ■

THEOREM 7.2.2. *For every pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  of commuting contractions on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  there corresponds a decomposition of  $\mathcal{H}$  into the orthogonal sum of two subspaces reducing for both  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , say  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_u \oplus \mathcal{H}_c$ , such that, with notation*

$$(T_{1u}, T_{2u}) = (T_1, T_2)|_{\mathcal{H}_u} \text{ and } (T_{1c}, T_{2c}) = (T_1, T_2)|_{\mathcal{H}_c}, \tag{7.2.1}$$

we have that  $T_u = T_{1u}T_{2u}$  is a unitary and  $T_c = T_{1c}T_{2c}$  is a c.n.u. contraction. Moreover, then  $T_u \oplus T_c$  with respect to  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_u \oplus \mathcal{H}_c$  is the Sz.-Nagy–Foias canonical decomposition for the contraction operator  $T = T_1T_2$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  be a pair of commuting contractive operator-pair on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $(F_1, F_2)$  is the Fundamental-Operator pair for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$ . By Definition 4.7.2 (combined with Lemma 4.7.1), on the one hand  $(F_1, F_2)$  is characterized as the unique solution of the pair of operator equations

$$T_i - T_j^*T = D_T F_{ji}^* D_T \text{ where } (i, j) = (1, 2) \text{ or } (2, 1) \quad (7.2.2)$$

but on the other hand, as a consequence of the Second Proof of Theorem 4.7.3, can also be expressed directly in terms of a Type I Andô tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda, P, U)$  for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  as

$$(F_1, F_2) = \Lambda^*(P^\perp U, U^*P)\Lambda \quad (7.2.3)$$

Since both of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are contractions, we have for every  $\omega$  and  $\zeta$  in  $\mathbb{T}$

$$I_{\mathcal{D}_T} - \operatorname{Re}(\omega F_1) \succeq 0 \text{ and } I_{\mathcal{D}_T} - \operatorname{Re}(\zeta F_2) \succeq 0. \quad (7.2.4)$$

Adding these two inequalities then gives

$$2I_{\mathcal{D}_T} - \operatorname{Re}(\omega F_1 + \zeta F_2) \succeq 0, \text{ for all } \omega, \zeta \in \mathbb{T}. \quad (7.2.5)$$

Note that inequality (7.2.5) is equivalent to

$$2D_T^2 - \operatorname{Re}(\omega D_T F_1 D_T + \zeta D_T F_2 D_T) \succeq 0 \text{ for all } \omega, \zeta \in \mathbb{T}.$$

By (7.2.2) this is same as

$$2D_T^2 - \operatorname{Re}(\omega(T_1 - T_2^*T)) - \operatorname{Re}(\zeta(T_2 - T_1^*T)) \succeq 0, \text{ for all } \omega, \zeta \in \mathbb{T}. \quad (7.2.6)$$

Let

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} T_u & 0 \\ 0 & T_c \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{H}_u \oplus \mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_u \oplus \mathcal{H}_c \quad (7.2.7)$$

be the canonical decomposition of  $T$  into unitary piece  $T_u$  and completely nonunitary piece  $T_c$ . It remains to show that  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are also block-diagonal with respect to this decomposition. To get started, we consider the  $2 \times 2$ -matrix representation of each  $T_j$  with respect to the decomposition  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_u \oplus \mathcal{H}_c$ :

$$T_j = \begin{bmatrix} A_j & B_j \\ C_j & D_j \end{bmatrix} : \mathcal{H}_u \oplus \mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_u \oplus \mathcal{H}_c \text{ for } j = 1, 2. \quad (7.2.8)$$

Next apply (7.2.6) to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2D_{T_c}^2 \end{bmatrix} - \operatorname{Re} \left( \omega \begin{bmatrix} A_1 - A_2^*T_u & B_1 - C_2^*T_c \\ C_1 - B_2^*T_u & D_1 - D_2^*T_c \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ & - \operatorname{Re} \left( \zeta \begin{bmatrix} A_2 - A_1^*T_u & B_2 - C_1^*T_c \\ C_2 - B_1^*T_u & D_2 - D_1^*T_c \end{bmatrix} \right) \succeq 0 \text{ for all } \omega, \zeta \in \mathbb{T}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.2.9)$$

In particular, the (1, 1)-entry in this inequality works out to be

$$\mathbb{P}_{11}(\omega, \zeta) := \operatorname{Re}(\omega(A_1 - A_2^*T_u)) + \operatorname{Re}(\zeta(A_2 - A_1^*T_u)) \leq 0, \text{ for all } \omega, \zeta \in \mathbb{T}. \quad (7.2.10)$$

This in turn implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{11}(\omega, 1) + \mathbb{P}_{11}(\omega, -1) &= 2 \operatorname{Re}(\omega(A_1 - A_2^* T_u)) \preceq 0 \text{ and} \\ \mathbb{P}_{11}(1, \zeta) + \mathbb{P}_{11}(-1, \zeta) &= 2 \operatorname{Re}(\zeta(A_2 - A_1^* T_u)) \preceq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Now we apply Lemma 7.2.1 to conclude that

$$A_1 = A_2^* T_u, \quad A_2 = A_1^* T_u. \quad (7.2.11)$$

This shows that the  $(1, 1)$ -entry of the matrix on the left-hand side of (7.2.9) is zero. Since the matrix is positive semi-definite, the  $(1, 2)$ -entry (and hence also the  $(2, 1)$ -entry) is also zero, i.e., for all  $\omega, \zeta \in \mathbb{T}$

$$\mathbb{P}_{12}(\omega, \zeta) := \omega(B_1 - C_2^* T_c) + \bar{\omega}(C_1^* - T_u^* B_2) + \zeta(B_2 - C_1^* T_c) + \bar{\zeta}(C_2^* - T_u^* B_1) = 0.$$

In particular we then get that

$$\mathbb{P}(\omega) := \mathbb{P}_{12}(\omega, 1) + \mathbb{P}_{12}(\omega, -1) = 2\omega(B_1 - C_2^* T_c) + 2\bar{\omega}(C_1^* - T_u^* B_2) = 0$$

for every  $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ . This implies the first two of the following equations while the last two are obtained similarly:

$$B_1 = C_2^* T_c, \quad C_1^* = T_u^* B_2, \quad B_2 = C_1^* T_c \quad \text{and} \quad C_2^* = T_u^* B_1. \quad (7.2.12)$$

Now from the commutativity of  $T_j$  with  $T$  we have the following for  $j = 1, 2$ :

$$A_j T_u = T_u A_j, \quad B_j T_c = T_u B_j, \quad C_j T_u = T_c C_j \quad \text{and} \quad T_c D_j = D_j T_c. \quad (7.2.13)$$

Let us note that commutativity of  $(T_1, T_2)$  has been used in the beginning of the proof, viz.,  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are contractions because of the commutativity of  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ .

For  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$  or  $(2, 1)$  we obtain using the second and third equation in (7.2.12) and the third equation in (7.2.13) that

$$B_j^* T_u^2 = C_i T_u = T_c C_i = T_c B_j^* T_u, \quad (7.2.14)$$

which implies that  $B_j^* T_u = T_c B_j^*$ , for  $j = 1, 2$ . Using this and the second equality in (7.2.13) we obtain

$$T_c T_c^* B_j^* = T_c B_j^* T_u^* = B_j^* = B_j^* T_u^* T_u = T_c^* B_j^* T_u = T_c^* T_c B_j^*,$$

which implies that  $T_c$  is unitary on  $\overline{\operatorname{Ran} B_j^*}$ , for every  $j = 1, 2$ . Since  $T_c$  is completely nonunitary,  $B_j = 0$  for each  $j = 1, 2$ . Similarly one can show that  $C_j = 0$ , for each  $j = 1, 2$ . This completes the proof. ■

**7.3. Characteristic triple as a complete unitary invariant.** As already discussed in Remark 2.3.4, it was proved by Sz.-Nagy–Foias (see [43, Chapter VI] that the characteristic function  $\Theta_T$  for a c.n.u. contraction  $T$  is a complete unitary invariant. This means that two c.n.u. contractions  $T$  and  $T'$  are unitarily equivalent if and only if their characteristic functions *coincide* in the sense that there exist unitary operators  $u : \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T'}$



and  $u_* : \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T'^*}$  such that the following diagram commutes for every  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{D}_T & \xrightarrow{\Theta_T(z)} & \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \\
 u \downarrow & & \downarrow u_* \\
 \mathcal{D}_{T'} & \xrightarrow{\Theta_{T'}(z)} & \mathcal{D}_{T'^*}
 \end{array} \tag{7.3.1}$$

Theorem 7.3.3 below shows that such a result holds for characteristic triples of pairs of commuting contractions also. First we define a notion of coincidence for such a triple.

Let us recall (see Remark 2.3.4 and also [43] for complete details) that a contractive analytic function  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  is a  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*)$ -valued analytic function on  $\mathbb{D}$  such that

$$\|\Theta(z)\| \leq 1 \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Such a function is called *purely contractive* if  $\Theta(0)$  does not preserve the norm of any nonzero vector, i.e.,

$$\|\Theta(0)\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}_*} < \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}} \text{ for all nonzero } \xi \in \mathcal{D}. \tag{7.3.2}$$

We note that a Sz.-Nagy–Foiias characteristic function  $\Theta_T$  is always purely contractive (see [43, Section VI.1]), and that it is always the case that a general contractive analytic function  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  has a block diagonal decomposition  $\Theta = \Theta' \oplus \Theta^0$  where  $(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}'_*, \Theta')$  is a unitary constant function and  $(\mathcal{D}^0, \mathcal{D}^0_*, \Theta^0)$  is purely contractive. A key easily checked property of this decomposition is the following:

OBSERVATION 7.3.1. The model space associated with a contractive analytic function  $\Theta$  is defined to be

$$\mathcal{H}_\Theta := \left[ \frac{H^2(\mathcal{D}_*)}{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})} \right] \ominus \left[ \begin{array}{c} \Theta \\ \Delta_\Theta \end{array} \right] H^2(\mathcal{D})$$

where here we set

$$\Delta_\Theta(\zeta) = (I_{\mathcal{D}} - \Theta(\zeta)^* \Theta(\zeta))^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We define the model operator associated with the contractive analytic function  $\Theta$  to be

$$T_\Theta = P_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta} \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_z & 0 \\ 0 & M_\zeta \end{array} \right] \Big|_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta}.$$

The observation here is that the model operator  $T_\Theta$  remains exactly the same (after some natural identification of respective coefficient spaces) when  $\Theta$  is replaced by its purely contractive part  $\Theta^0$ . Thus only purely contractive analytic functions are relevant when discussing Sz.-Nagy–Foiias functional models.

In view of Observation 7.3.1, for the moment we consider only purely contractive analytic functions.

DEFINITION 7.3.2. Let  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$ ,  $(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}'_*, \Theta')$  be two purely contractive analytic functions, let  $(G_1, G_2)$  on  $\mathcal{D}_*$  and  $(G'_1, G'_2)$  on  $\mathcal{D}'_*$  be two pairs of contractions, and let  $(W_1, W_2)$  on  $\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})$   $(W'_1, W'_2)$  on  $\Delta_{\Theta'} L^2(\mathcal{D}')$  be two pairs of commuting unitaries having product equal to  $M_\zeta$  on the respective spaces. We say that the two triples  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  and  $((G'_1, G'_2), (W'_1, W'_2), \Theta')$  *coincide* if:

- (i)  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  and  $(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}'_*, \Theta')$  coincide, i.e., there exist unitary operators  $u : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'$  and  $u_* : \mathcal{D}_* \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'_*$  such that

$$u_*\Theta(z) = \Theta'(z)u \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{D},$$

i.e., the diagram (7.3.1) commutes with  $\Theta$  and  $\Theta'$  in place of  $\Theta_T$  and  $\Theta_{T'}$ , respectively.

- (ii) the unitary operators  $u, u_*$  also have the intertwining properties

$$\begin{cases} (G'_1, G'_2) = u_*(G_1, G_2)u_*^* = (u_*G_1u_*^*, u_*G_2u_*^*) \text{ and} \\ (W'_1, W'_2) = \omega_u(W_1, W_2)\omega_u^* = (\omega_uW_1\omega_u^*, \omega_uW_2\omega_u^*), \end{cases} \quad (7.3.3)$$

where  $\omega_u : \overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})} \rightarrow \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'} L^2(\mathcal{D}')}$  is the unitary map induced by  $u$  defined by

$$\omega_u := (I_{L^2} \otimes u)|_{\overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}}. \quad (7.3.4)$$

**THEOREM 7.3.3.** *Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  and  $(T'_1, T'_2)$  be two pairs of commuting contractions such that their products  $T = T_1T_2$  and  $T' = T'_1T'_2$  are c.n.u. contractions. Then  $(T_1, T_2)$  and  $(T'_1, T'_2)$  are unitarily equivalent if and only if their characteristic triples coincide.*

*Proof.* Let  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $(T'_1, T'_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}'$  be unitarily equivalent via the unitary operator  $U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$ . Let

$$((G_1, G_2), (W_{\#1}, W_{\#2}), \Theta_T), \quad ((G'_1, G'_2), (W'_{\#1}, W'_{\#2}), \Theta_{T'})$$

be their respective characteristic triples. It is easy to see that  $UD_T = D_{T'}U$  and  $UD_{T^*} = D_{T'^*}U$  and that the unitaries

$$u := U|_{\mathcal{D}_T} : \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T'} \text{ and } u_* := U|_{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} : \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T'^*} \quad (7.3.5)$$

have the following property:

$$u_*\Theta_T(z) = \Theta_{T'}(z)u \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (7.3.6)$$

Hence  $\Theta_T$  and  $\Theta_{T'}$  coincide.

We next show that the unitary  $u_*$  also implements a unitary equivalence of  $(G_1, G_2)$  with  $(G'_1, G'_2)$  as follows. Note first that since by definition  $(G_1, G_2)$  and  $(G'_1, G'_2)$  are the Fundamental-Operator pairs for  $(T_1^*, T_2^*)$  and  $(T_1'^*, T_2'^*)$  respectively, we have:

$$T_i^* - T_jT^* = D_{T^*}G_iD_{T^*}, \quad T_i'^* - T_j'T'^* = D_{T'^*}G'_iD_{T'^*} \text{ for } (i, j) = (1, 2) \text{ or } (2, 1).$$

It then follows that

$$u_*(G_1, G_2) = (G'_1, G'_2)u_*. \quad (7.3.7)$$

We have seen in Theorem 6.3.1 that for a pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  of commuting contractions,  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, \underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, T_1T_2))$  acting on the space  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$ . Let  $(\Pi'_{\text{NF}}, \underline{\mathbb{W}}'_{\text{NF}})$  be the corresponding pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $\underline{T}' = (T'_1, T'_2, T'_1T'_2)$  acting on the space  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_{T'}}$ . Let  $\Pi''$  denote the isometry

$$\Pi'' := \begin{bmatrix} I_{H^2} \otimes u_*^* & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_u^* \end{bmatrix} \Pi'_{\text{NF}} U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \end{bmatrix} \quad (7.3.8)$$

where  $\omega_u : \overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)} \rightarrow \overline{\Delta_{\Theta_{T'}} L^2(\mathcal{D}_{T'})}$  is the unitary  $\omega_u = (I_{L^2} \otimes u)|_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}}$ . We observe that  $(\Pi'', \mathcal{K}_{\text{NF}}, \underline{\mathbb{W}}'')$  is also a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2, T)$ ,

where  $(W_1'', W_2'') = \omega_u^*(W_{\#1}', W_{\#2}')\omega_u$  and

$$\underline{\mathbb{W}}'' := \left( \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_1^*+zG_2} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1'' \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_2^*+zG_1} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2'' \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{c} M_z \\ 0 \end{array} \middle| \frac{0}{\Delta_{\Theta_T}(L^2(\mathcal{D}_T))} \right] \right).$$

By making use of (7.3.7), we see that, for  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$  or  $(2, 1)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi'' T_i^* &= \left[ \begin{array}{cc} I_{H^2 \otimes u_*} & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_u^* \end{array} \right] \Pi'_{\text{NF}} T_i'^* U \text{ (by (7.3.8))} \\ &= \left[ \begin{array}{cc} I_{H^2 \otimes u_*} & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_u^* \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_i'^*+zG_j'} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#i'}' \end{array} \right] \Pi'_{\text{NF}} U \\ &= \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_i^*+zG_j} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#i}'' \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{cc} I_{H^2 \otimes u_*} & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_u^* \end{array} \right] \Pi'_{\text{NF}} U \text{ (by (7.3.7)).} \end{aligned}$$

Now since the last entry of  $\underline{\mathbb{W}}''$  is the same as that of  $\underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}}$ , applying Corollary 6.2.3, we get  $\underline{\mathbb{W}}'' = \underline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{NF}}$  and we conclude that

$$(W_1'', W_2'') = \omega_u^*(W_{\#1}', W_{\#2}')\omega_u = (W_{\#1}, W_{\#2}),$$

This together with equations (7.3.6) and (7.3.7) establishes the first part of the theorem.

Conversely, let  $((G_1, G_2), (W_{\#1}, W_{\#2}), \Theta_T)$  and  $((G_1', G_2'), (W_{\#1}', W_{\#2}'), \Theta_{T'})$  be the characteristic triples of  $(T_1, T_2)$  and  $(T_1', T_2')$  respectively, and suppose the respective characteristic triples coincide. Thus there exist unitaries  $u : \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T'}$  and  $u_* : \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{T'^*}$  such that part (i) and part (ii) in Definition 7.3.2 hold. Let  $\omega_u$  be the unitary induced by  $u$  as defined in (7.3.4). Then it is easy to see that the unitary

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cc} I_{H^2} \otimes u_* & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_u \end{array} \right] : \left[ \begin{array}{c} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[ \begin{array}{c} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T'^*}) \\ \Delta_{\Theta_{T'}} L^2(\mathcal{D}_{T'}) \end{array} \right] \quad (7.3.9)$$

intertwines

$$\underline{\mathbb{W}} = \left( \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_1^*+zG_2} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#1} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_2^*+zG_1} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#2} \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{c} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} \\ 0 \end{array} \middle| \frac{0}{M_\zeta^{\mathcal{D}_T} | \Delta_{\Theta_T}(L^2(\mathcal{D}_T))} \right] \right)$$

with

$$\underline{\mathbb{W}}' = \left( \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_1'^*+zG_2'} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#1}' \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} M_{G_2'^*+zG_1'} & 0 \\ 0 & W_{\#2}' \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{c} M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T'^*}} \\ 0 \end{array} \middle| \frac{0}{M_\zeta | \Delta_{\Theta_{T'}}(L^2(\mathcal{D}_{T'}))} \right] \right).$$

Also, the unitary in (7.3.9) clearly takes  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \Theta_T \\ \Delta_{\Theta_T} \end{array} \right] H^2(\mathcal{D}_T)$  onto  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \Theta_{T'} \\ \Delta_{\Theta_{T'}} \end{array} \right] H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T'})$  and hence

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T^*}) \\ \Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \end{array} \right] \ominus \left[ \begin{array}{c} \Theta_T \\ \Delta_{\Theta_T} \end{array} \right] H^2(\mathcal{D}_T) \text{ onto } \left[ \begin{array}{c} H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T'^*}) \\ \Delta_{\Theta_{T'}} L^2(\mathcal{D}_{T'}) \end{array} \right] \ominus \left[ \begin{array}{c} \Theta_{T'} \\ \Delta_{\Theta_{T'}} \end{array} \right] H^2(\mathcal{D}_{T'}).$$

Thus that the functional models for  $(T_1, T_2)$  and  $(T_1', T_2')$  as in (7.1.2) are unitarily equivalent and hence by (7.1.2) the pairs  $(T_1, T_2)$  and  $(T_1', T_2')$  are unitarily equivalent also. ■

**7.4. Admissible triples.** In this section, we consider general contractive analytic functions  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  and do not insist that  $\Theta$  be also pure. We start with a contractive analytic function  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$ , a commuting unitary operator-pair  $(W_1, W_2)$ , and a pair of contraction operators  $(G_1, G_2)$  and investigate when the triple  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  gives rise to a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  such that  $T = T_1 T_2$  is completely non-unitary (c.n.u.).

If  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  is equal to the characteristic triple  $(G_1, G_2), (W_{\#1}, W_{\#2}), \Theta_T$  for a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$ , it is easy to check from the fact that  $(\Pi_{\text{NF}}, \mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},1}, \mathbb{W}_{\text{NF},2}, V_{\text{NF}})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $(T_1, T_2)$  that the characteristic triple  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  in particular satisfies the set of *admissibility conditions* listed in following definition of *admissibility conditions* for such a triple.

**DEFINITION 7.4.1. Admissibility conditions:** For  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$  or  $(2, 1)$  we have:

1.  $M_{G_i^*+zG_j} \oplus W_i$  is a contraction.
2.  $W_1W_2 = W_2W_1 = M_\zeta|_{\overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}}$ .
3. The space  $\mathcal{Q}_\Theta := \{\Theta f \oplus \Delta_\Theta f : f \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\}$  is jointly invariant under  $(M_{G_i^*+zG_j} \oplus W_i, M_{G_j^*+zG_i} \oplus W_j, M_z \oplus M_\zeta|_{\overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}})$ .
4. With  $\mathcal{K}_\Theta := H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \oplus \overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\Theta := \mathcal{K}_\Theta \ominus \mathcal{Q}_\Theta$  we have

$$(M_{G_i^*+zG_j}^* \oplus W_i^*)(M_{G_j^*+zG_i}^* \oplus W_j^*)|_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta} = (M_z^* \oplus M_\zeta^*|_{\overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}})|_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta}.$$

In particular, since condition (4) holds for both  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$  and  $(i, j) = (2, 1)$ , we see that  $T_1^* := (M_{G_1^*+zG_2}^* \oplus W_1^*)|_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta}$  commutes with  $T_2^* := (M_{G_2^*+zG_1}^* \oplus W_2^*)|_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta}$ .

This motivates the following definition.

**DEFINITION 7.4.2.** Let  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  be a contractive analytic function and  $(G_1, G_2)$  on  $\mathcal{D}_*$  be a pair of contractions. Let  $(W_1, W_2)$  be a pair of commuting unitaries on  $\overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}$ . We say that the triple  $\Xi = ((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  is *admissible* if it satisfies the admissibility conditions (1)–(4) in Definition 7.4.1. We then say that the triple

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbf{T}}_\Xi &:= (\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2, \mathbf{T}_1\mathbf{T}_2)_\Xi \\ &:= P_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta}(M_{G_1^*+zG_2} \oplus W_1, M_{G_2^*+zG_1} \oplus W_2, M_z \oplus M_\zeta|_{\overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}})|_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta} \end{aligned} \tag{7.4.1}$$

is the functional model associated with the admissible triple  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$ .

Let us also say that the admissible triple  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  is *pure* if its last component  $\Theta$  is a purely contractive analytic function.

Then we have the following analogue of Observation 7.3.1 for the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model.

**PROPOSITION 7.4.3.** *Suppose  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  is an admissible triple and that  $\Theta$  has a (possibly nontrivial) decomposition  $\Theta = \Theta' \oplus \Theta^0$  with  $(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}'_*, \Theta')$  a unitary constant and  $\Theta^0$  a purely contractive analytic function. Then there is an admissible triple of the form  $((G_1^0, G_2^0), (W_1^0, W_2^0), \Theta^0)$  so that the functional model for  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  is unitarily equivalent to the functional model for  $((G_1^0, G_2^0), (W_1^0, W_2^0), \Theta^0)$ .*

We shall refer to  $((G_1^0, G_2^0), (W_1^0, W_2^0), \Theta^0)$  as the *pure part* of the admissible triple  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$ .

*Proof.* We suppose that  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  is an admissible triple and that  $\Theta$  has a (possibly nontrivial) decomposition  $\Theta = \Theta' \oplus \Theta^0$  with  $(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}'_*, \Theta')$  a unitary constant function and  $(\mathcal{D}^0, \mathcal{D}^0_*, \Theta^0)$  a purely contractive analytic function. Let

$$\mathcal{H}_\Theta = H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \oplus \overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})} \ominus \{\Theta f \oplus \Delta_\Theta f : f \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\}$$

be the Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional model space associated with  $\Theta$  (and hence also the functional model space associated with the admissible triple  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$ ), and let

$$(\mathbf{T}_1^*, \mathbf{T}_2^*, \mathbf{T}^*) = \left( (M_{G_1^*+zG_2} \oplus W_1)^*, (M_{G_2^*+zG_1} \oplus W_2)^*, (M_z \oplus M_\zeta|_{\overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}})^* \right) |_{\mathcal{H}(\Theta)}$$

be the associated functional-model triple of contraction operators. (with  $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}_1 \mathbf{T}_2$ ). As a result of [43, Theorem VI.3.1], we know that  $\mathbf{T}$  is c.n.u. with characteristic function  $\Theta_{\mathbf{T}}$  coinciding with  $\Theta^0$ . Thus the characteristic triple for  $(\mathbf{T}_1^*, \mathbf{T}_2^*, \mathbf{T}^*)$  has the form

$$\tilde{\Xi} := ((\tilde{G}_1, \tilde{G}_2), (\tilde{W}_1, \tilde{W}_2), \Theta_{\mathbf{T}})$$

and by Theorem 7.1.2 it follows that  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2, \mathbf{T})$  is unitarily equivalent to the model operators associated with  $\tilde{\Xi}$ . As already noted,  $\Theta_{\mathbf{T}}$  coincides with  $\Theta^0$ ; hence there are unitary operators  $u: \mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^0$ ,  $u_*: \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_*^0$  so that

$$\Theta^0(z)u = u_*\Theta_T(z) \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Define operators  $G_1^0, G_2^0$  on  $\mathcal{D}_*^0$  and  $W_1^0, W_2^0$  on  $\overline{\Delta_{\Theta^0} L^2(\mathcal{D}^0)}$  by

$$G_i^0 = u_*\tilde{G}_i u_*^*, \quad W_i^0 = (u \otimes I_{L^2})\tilde{W}_i(u^* \otimes I_{L^2})|_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta^0} L^2(\mathcal{D}^0)}}$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then by construction the triple

$$\Xi^0 = ((G_1^0, G_2^0), (W_1^0, W_2^0), \Theta^0)$$

coincides with  $\tilde{\Xi}$  and hence is also admissible. Then by Theorem 7.3.3 the commuting contractive pair  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$  is also unitarily equivalent to the functional-model commuting contractive pair associated with the admissible triple  $\Xi^0$ . This completes the proof of Proposition 7.4.3. ■

PROPOSITION 7.4.4. *Let  $\Xi = ((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  be a pure admissible triple and let  $\underline{\mathbf{T}}_\Xi$  be the functional model associated with  $\Xi$ . Then the model triple of operators*

$$\underline{\mathbb{W}} = (M_{G_1^*+zG_2} \oplus W_1, \quad M_{G_2^*+zG_1} \oplus W_2, \quad M_z \oplus M_\zeta|_{\overline{\Delta_\Theta(L^2(\mathcal{D}))}})$$

on  $\mathcal{K}_\Theta$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $\underline{\mathbf{T}}_\Xi$  with the inclusion map  $i: \mathcal{H}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_\Theta$  as the associated isometric embedding operator.

*Proof.* By the analysis of Case 1 in the proof of Theorem 6.2.1 we see that the content of the admissibility conditions (1), (2) in Definition 7.4.1 is that the triple  $\underline{\mathbb{W}} = (\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  given by

$$\mathbb{W}_1 = M_{G_1^*+zG_2} \oplus W_1, \quad \mathbb{W}_2 = M_{G_2^*+zG_1} \oplus W_2, \quad \mathbb{W} = M_z^{\mathcal{D}^*} \oplus M_\zeta|_{\overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}},$$

all acting on  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \oplus \overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}$ , is the general form for a pseudo-commuting contractive triple with third component specified to be  $\mathbb{W} = M_z^{\mathcal{D}^*} \oplus M_\zeta|_{\overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}}$ . Thus it follows that  $\underline{\mathbb{W}}$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive triple. Condition (3) in Definition 7.4.1 is equivalent to saying that  $\mathcal{H}_\Theta := \mathcal{K}_\Theta \ominus \mathcal{Q}_\Theta$  is jointly invariant for the adjoint  $\underline{\mathbb{W}}^* = (\mathbb{W}_1^*, \mathbb{W}_2^*, \mathbb{W}^*)$  and we can define  $\underline{\mathbf{T}}^*$  on  $\mathcal{H}(\Theta)$  by

$$\underline{\mathbf{T}}^* = \underline{\mathbb{W}}^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Theta)} =: (\mathbf{T}_1^*, \mathbf{T}_2^*, \mathbf{T}^*). \tag{7.4.2}$$

As a consequence of admissibility condition (4) in Definition 7.4.1 we see that  $\mathbf{T}_1^*$  and  $\mathbf{T}_2^*$  commute, and the product operator  $\mathbf{T}_1^* \mathbf{T}_2^*$  is equal to  $M_z^* \oplus M_\zeta^*|_{\overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}} = \mathbf{T}^*$ , and we

conclude that  $\mathbf{T}$  is equal to the functional model operator-triple (7.4.1) associated with the admissible triple  $\Xi$ . Next note that equation (7.4.2) is just the statement that  $(i, \mathbb{W})$  is a lift of  $\mathbf{T}_\Xi$  on  $\mathcal{H}(\Theta)$ , where the isometric embedding operator  $i: \mathcal{H}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_\Theta$  is just the inclusion map. Finally, the fact that  $(i, \mathbb{W})$  is a minimal lift of  $\mathbf{T}$  is part of the assertion of Theorem VI.3.1 in [43]. We can now conclude that  $(i, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{W})$  is a pseudo-commuting lift of  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2, \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}_1\mathbf{T}_2)$  in the sense of Definition 6.1.2. This completes the proof. ■

For  $\Theta$  a purely contractive analytic function, we have the following result.

**THEOREM 7.4.5.** *Let  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  be a purely contractive analytic function, let  $(G_1, G_2)$  on  $\mathcal{D}_*$  be a pair of contractions, and let  $(W_1, W_2)$  on  $\overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}$  be a pair of commuting unitaries such that their product  $W_1W_2$  is equal to  $M_\zeta|_{\overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}}$ . Then  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  is admissible if and only if it coincides with the characteristic triple of some commuting contractive pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  with product operator  $T = T_1T_2$  equal to a c.n.u. contraction. In fact, the triple  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  coincides with the characteristic triple of its functional model as defined in (7.4.1).*

*Proof.* We have already observed that the characteristic triple of a pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  of commuting contractions with  $T = T_1T_2$  being a c.n.u. contraction is indeed a pure admissible triple (since characteristic functions  $\Theta_T$  are necessarily purely contractive analytic functions).

Conversely suppose that  $\Xi = ((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  is a pure admissible triple. This means that the pair  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$  defined on

$$\mathcal{H}_\Theta := (H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \oplus \overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}) \ominus \{\Theta f \oplus \Delta_\Theta f : f \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\}$$

by

$$(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2) := P_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta}(M_{G_1^*+zG_2} \oplus W_1, M_{G_2^*+zG_1} \oplus W_2)|_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta}$$

is a commuting pair of contractions with product operator given by

$$\mathbf{T} := \mathbf{T}_1\mathbf{T}_2 = P_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta}(M_z \oplus M_\zeta|_{\overline{\Delta_\Theta(L^2(\mathcal{D}))}})|_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta}. \tag{7.4.3}$$

By the Sz.-Nagy–Foias model theory for a single contraction operator  $T$  (see [43, Theorem VI.3.1]), we conclude that  $\mathbf{T}$  is a c.n.u. contraction. We claim that the triple  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  coincides with the characteristic triple for  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$ , which we assume to be  $((G'_1, G'_2), (W'_1, W'_2), \Theta_{\mathbf{T}})$ . Since  $\Theta$  is a purely contractive analytic function, by (7.4.3) and Theorem VI.3.1 in [43], we conclude that  $\Theta$  coincides with  $\Theta_{\mathbf{T}}$ . By definition this means that there exist unitaries  $u: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{T}}$  and  $u_*: \mathcal{D}_* \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{T}^*}$  such that  $\Theta_{\mathbf{T}}u = u_*\Theta$ . Then the unitary operator  $u_* \oplus \omega_u$  takes the space  $\mathcal{K}_\Theta := H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \oplus \overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})}$  onto the space  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_{\mathbf{T}}} := H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{T}^*}) \oplus \overline{\Delta_{\Theta_{\mathbf{T}}} L^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{T}})}$  and also

$$u_* \oplus \omega_u: \{\Theta f \oplus \Delta_\Theta f : f \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\} \xrightarrow{\text{onto}} \{\Theta_{\mathbf{T}}g \oplus \Delta_{\Theta_{\mathbf{T}}}g : g \in H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{T}})\}.$$

We can therefore conclude that furthermore  $u_* \oplus \omega_u$  maps  $\mathcal{H}_\Theta$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_{\mathbf{T}}}$  where

$$\mathcal{H}_\Theta := \mathcal{K}_\Theta \ominus \{\Theta f \oplus \Delta_\Theta f : f \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\}, \quad \mathcal{H}_{\Theta_{\mathbf{T}}} := \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_{\mathbf{T}}} \ominus \{\Theta_{\mathbf{T}}g \oplus \Delta_{\Theta_{\mathbf{T}}}h : g \in H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{T}})\}.$$

Denote by  $\tau$  the restriction of  $u_* \oplus \omega_u$  to  $\mathcal{H}_\Theta$ . Then we have the following commuting

diagram, where  $i$  and  $i'$  are the inclusion maps:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{H}_\Theta & \xrightarrow{i} & \mathcal{K}_\Theta \\ \tau \downarrow & & \downarrow u_* \oplus \omega_u \\ \mathcal{H}_{\text{NF}} & \xrightarrow{i'} & \mathcal{K}_{\text{NF}} \end{array}$$

By Proposition 7.4.4, we know that  $(i, \underline{\mathbb{W}})$  is a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $\underline{\mathbf{T}}_\Xi$  on  $\mathcal{K}_\Theta$ , where

$$\underline{\mathbb{W}} = (M_{G_1^*+zG_2} \oplus W_1, M_{G_2^*+zG_1} \oplus W_2, M_z \oplus M_\zeta |_{\overline{\Delta_\Theta(L^2(\mathcal{D}))}}).$$

Theorem 6.3.1 and the diagram above shows that  $(i' \circ \tau, \underline{\mathbb{W}'})$  is also a pseudo-commuting contractive lift of  $\underline{\mathbf{T}}_\Xi$ , on  $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  where

$$\underline{\mathbb{W}'} = (M_{G_1'^*+zG_2'} \oplus W_1', M_{G_2'^*+zG_1'} \oplus W_2', M_z \oplus M_\zeta |_{\overline{\Delta_T(L^2(\mathcal{D}_T))}}).$$

Now by the uniqueness result in Corollary 6.2.3, there exists a unitary  $U : \mathcal{K}_\Theta \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\Theta_T}$  such that  $U\underline{\mathbb{W}} = \underline{\mathbb{W}'}U$  and  $U \circ i = i' \circ \tau$ . Since the last entries of  $\underline{\mathbb{W}}$  and  $\underline{\mathbb{W}'}$  are the minimal isometric dilations of  $T = T_1T_2$ , such a unitary is in fact unique. By the above commuting diagram we see that  $u_* \oplus \omega_u$  is one such unitary. Therefore we get

$$(u_* \oplus \omega_u)\underline{\mathbb{W}} = \underline{\mathbb{W}'}(u_* \oplus \omega_u).$$

Consequently  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  coincides with  $((G_1', G_2'), (W_1', W_2'), \Theta_T)$  and the theorem follows. ■

Let us mention that the results of this and the previous section can be stated more succinctly in the language of Category Theory as follows.

PROPOSITION 7.4.6. *Define the following categories:*

- (i) Let  $\mathfrak{C}_1$  be the category of all commuting pairs of contraction operators  $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, T_2)$  where we set  $T = T_1 \cdot T_2 = T_2 \cdot T_1$  and we assume that  $T$  is c.n.u.
- (ii) Let  $\mathfrak{C}_2$  be the category of all purely contractive admissible triples  $\Xi = ((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$ .

Define functors  $\mathfrak{f} : \mathfrak{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_2$  and  $\mathfrak{g} : \mathfrak{C}_2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_1$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{f} : \mathbf{T} &\mapsto \Xi_{\mathbf{T}} = \text{characteristic triple for } \mathbf{T}, \\ \mathfrak{g} : \Xi &\mapsto \mathbf{T}_\Xi = \text{functional-model commuting contractive pair} \\ &\text{associated with } \Xi \text{ as in (7.4.1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for  $\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T}' \in \mathfrak{C}_1$  and  $\Xi, \Xi' \in \mathfrak{C}_2$ , we have

1.  $\mathbf{T} \underset{u}{\cong} \mathbf{T}' \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{T}) \underset{c}{\cong} \mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{T}')$ ,
2.  $\Xi \underset{c}{\cong} \Xi' \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}(\Xi) \underset{u}{\cong} \mathfrak{g}(\Xi')$ ,
3.  $\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{T}) \underset{u}{\cong} \mathbf{T}$ ,
4.  $\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}(\Xi) \underset{c}{\cong} \Xi$

where  $\underset{u}{\cong}$  denotes unitary equivalence of operator tuples and  $\underset{c}{\cong}$  denotes coincidence of admissible triples.

Finally, we now show how it is possible to apply the theory of admissible triples to the following factorization problem:

**Commuting Contractive Factorization Problem:** *Given a c.n.u. contraction operator  $T$ , find all commuting contractive operator-pairs  $(T_1, T_2)$  which generate a commuting contractive factorization of  $T$ :  $T = T_1 T_2 = T_2 T_1$ .*

**COROLLARY 7.4.7.** *Solutions  $(T_1, T_2)$  of the commuting contractive factorization problem are in one-to-one correspondence with pairs  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2))$  which complete the characteristic function  $\Theta_T$  to an admissible triple, i.e., with such pairs such that*

$$((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta_T)$$

*is an admissible triple.*

*Proof.* If  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a solution of the commuting contractive factorization problem for  $T$ , then from the definitions we see that the characteristic triple of  $(T_1, T_2)$  solves the admissible-triple completion problem for  $\Theta_T$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2))$  solves the admissible-triple completion problem for  $T$ . Then the model operator-triple  $\underline{\mathbf{T}}_{\Xi}$  for  $\Xi = ((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta_T)$  (see (7.4.1)) generates a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$  with product  $\mathbf{T}_1 \mathbf{T}_2 = \mathbf{T}_2 \mathbf{T}_1$  equal to

$$\mathbf{T} := P_{\mathcal{H}(\Theta_T)}(M_z^{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} \oplus M_{\zeta} |_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta_T} L^2(\mathcal{D}_T)}}) |_{\mathcal{H}(\Theta_T)}$$

which is the Sz.-Nagy–Foias functional-model operator for  $T$  and hence is unitarily equivalent to  $T$ . ■

**EXAMPLE 7.4.8.** As an illustrative example of the previous result, let us suppose that  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  is a finite Blaschke-Potapov-product matrix inner function (so  $\dim \mathcal{D}_* < \infty$ ). Then the model space  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta}$  collapses to  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta} = H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \ominus \Theta H^2(\mathcal{D})$  and is finite-dimensional. As a mildly simplifying assumption, let us suppose that  $\mathcal{H}_{\Theta}$  has a basis consisting of vector-valued kernel functions

$$\mathfrak{B} = \{d_{m,n} k_{w_m} : 1 \leq m \leq M, 1 \leq n \leq n_m\}$$

where  $w_1, \dots, w_M$  are distinct points in  $\mathbb{D}$ , where for each  $m$  ( $1 \leq m \leq M$ ), the set  $\{d_{m,1}, \dots, d_{m,n_m}\}$  is a linearly independent set of vectors in  $\mathcal{D}_*$  (so  $n_m \leq \dim \mathcal{D}_*$  for each  $1 \leq m \leq M$ ), and where in general, for  $w \in \mathbb{D}$  and  $d \in \mathcal{D}_*$  the function  $(dk_w)(z) = \frac{d}{1-z\bar{w}}$  is the  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_*)$ -kernel function for evaluation of  $h \in H^2(\mathcal{D}_*)$  at the point  $w \in \mathbb{D}$  in direction  $d \in \mathcal{D}_*$ :

$$\langle h, dk_w \rangle_{H^2(\mathcal{D}_*)} = \langle h(w), d \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_*},$$

Since  $\Theta$  is inner, the second component  $(W_1, W_2)$  of any admissible triple solving the admissible-triple completion problem for  $\Theta$  is vacuous so any solution of the admissible-triple completion problem consists simply of two matrices  $G_1, G_2$  considered as operators on  $\mathcal{D}_*$ . Given such a pair of matrices, let us define two matrix pencils.

$$\varphi_1(z) = G_1^* + zG_2, \quad \varphi_2(z) = G_2^* + zG_1.$$

Then  $(G_1, G_2)$  solves the admissible-triple completion problem for  $\Theta$  if and only if:



- (i) the operators  $M_{\varphi_1}$  and  $M_{\varphi_2}$  are contractions on  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_*)$ , i.e.  $\|\varphi_i(z)\| \leq 1$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{D}$  and  $i = 1, 2$ .
- (ii) the space  $\mathcal{H}_\Theta$  is jointly invariant for  $(M_{\varphi_1}^*, M_{\varphi_2}^*)$ .
- (iii)  $M_{\varphi_1}^* M_{\varphi_2}^* |_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta} = M_{\varphi_2}^* M_{\varphi_1}^* |_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta} = (M_z^{\mathcal{D}_*})^* |_{\mathcal{H}_\Theta}$ .

If we can find a solution  $(G_1, G_2)$  of conditions (ii) and (iii), we get a solution of condition (i) simply by a rescaling  $(G_1, G_2) \mapsto (\mu G_1, \mu G_2)$  for a scalar  $\mu > 0$  sufficiently small, so it suffices to consider conditions (ii) and (iii). Let us note the action of  $M_{\varphi_i}^*$  on a general kernel function:

$$M_{\varphi_i}^* : dk_w \mapsto (G_i + \bar{w}G_j^*)dk_w.$$

Let us introduce for  $1 \leq m \leq M$  the subspace

$$\mathcal{S}_m = \bigvee \{d_{m,n} : 1 \leq n \leq n_m\}.$$

Then condition (ii) amounts to the collection of invariant subspace conditions:

$$(ii') \quad G_i + \bar{w}_m G_j^* : \mathcal{S}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_m \text{ for } 1 \leq m \leq N \text{ for } (i, j) = (1, 2) \text{ and } (2, 1).$$

Let us note next that for a general kernel function  $dk_w$  we have, for  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$  or  $(2, 1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\varphi_i}^* M_{\varphi_j}^* (dk_w) &= M_{\varphi_i}^* (G_j + \bar{w}G_i^*)dk_w \\ &= G_i(G_j + \bar{w}G_i^*)dk_w + \bar{w}G_j^*(G_j + \bar{w}G_i^*)dk_w \\ &= (G_i G_j + \bar{w}(G_i G_i^* + G_j^* G_j) + \bar{w}^2 G_j^* G_i^*) dk_w \end{aligned}$$

and hence condition (iii) boils down to the condition:

(iii') For  $1 \leq m \leq M$ , for all  $d \in \mathcal{S}_m$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(G_1 G_2 + \bar{w}_m(G_1 G_1^* + G_2^* G_2) + \bar{w}_m^2 G_2^* G_1^*) d \\ &= (G_2 G_1 + \bar{w}_m(G_2 G_2^* + G_1^* G_1) + \bar{w}_m^2 G_1^* G_2^*) d \\ &= \bar{w}_m d \end{aligned}$$

It appears to be difficult to sort out how to solve these conditions (ii') and (iii') in general. Therefore we resort to discussing a couple of more tractable special cases where a complete solution can be found.

**Special Case 1:**  $\mathcal{D}_* = \mathbb{C}$ ,  $M > 1$  and  $w_1 = 0$ . In this case condition (ii') is automatic as  $\mathcal{S}_m$  is the whole space  $\mathbb{C}$  and any solution  $(G_1, G_2)$  of the admissible-triple completion problem has the form  $(G_1, G_2) = (g_1, g_2)$  where  $g_1, g_2$  are complex numbers. We shall show:

**Claim:** *The only solution of the admissible-triple completion problem for this special case is that either  $(g_1, g_2)$  or  $(g_2, g_2)$  is in the set  $\mathbb{T} \times \{0\}$ .*

Indeed, note that condition (ii') now assumes the form

$$g_1 g_2 + \bar{w}_m(|g_1|^2 + |g_2|^2) + \bar{w}_m^2 \bar{g}_2 \bar{g}_1 = g_2 g_1 + \bar{w}_m(|g_2|^2 + |g_1|^2) + \bar{w}_m^2 \bar{g}_1 \bar{g}_2 = \bar{w}_m \quad (7.4.4)$$

for  $m = 1, \dots, M$ . In particular, if we apply criterion (7.4.4) to the case  $m = 1$  where by hypothesis  $w_1 = 0$  we get

$$g_1 g_2 = 0$$

and hence at least one of  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  is equal to 0. If both  $g_1 = g_2 = 0$  and we apply (7.4.4) to the case where  $w_m \neq 0$ , we get  $0 = \overline{w}_m$  leading to a contradiction. Hence exactly one of  $g_1, g_2$  is zero and the other is non-zero; say that  $g_1 \neq 0$  and  $g_2 = 0$ . Apply (7.4.4) again to the case of any  $\alpha$  where  $w_m \neq 0$  to get

$$\overline{w}_m |g_1|^2 = \overline{w}_m$$

leading to the conclusion that  $|g_1| = 1$ . Similarly, if we assume that  $g_1 = 0$ , we are forced to the solution  $(g_1, g_2) = (0, \omega)$  for some  $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ . Conversely, one can easily check that  $(g_1, g_2) = (\omega, 0)$  or  $(g_1, g_2) = (0, \omega)$  for some unimodular  $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$  leads to a solution of (7.4.4) for all  $m = 1, \dots, M$ , and the Claim follows.

As a corollary we get a solution of the associated commuting contractive factorization problem: *Suppose that  $T$  is a contraction operator on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  with  $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 2$  having defect rank  $\text{rank}(I - TT^*)$  equal to 1 and having distinct simple eigenvalues all in the open unit disk, one of which is 0, and suppose that  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are commuting contractive operators on  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $T = T_1 T_2$ . Then there is unimodular  $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$  so that*

$$\text{either } (T_1, T_2) = (\omega T, \overline{\omega} I) \text{ or } (T_1, T_2) = (\overline{\omega} I, \omega T).$$

**Special Case 2:**  $\Theta = (\{0\}, \mathcal{D}_*, 0)$ . We consider next the limiting special case where we replace the finite point-set  $(w_1, \dots, w_M)$  with the whole unit disk  $\mathbb{D}$  and the associated coefficient space  $\mathcal{S}_m$  (now indexed as  $\mathcal{S}_{w_m}$ ) with the whole coefficient space  $\mathcal{D}_*$ . Then the span of the kernels  $\{dk_w : d \in \mathcal{D}_*, w \in \mathbb{D}\}$  is the whole space  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_*)$  which can be viewed as  $\mathcal{H}_\Theta$  where  $\Theta$  is the zero function from  $\{0\}$  into  $\mathcal{D}_*$  (and hence can be viewed now as a non-square inner function). Then we seek a solution of the admissible-triple completion problem for the case where we have the non-square inner function  $(\{0\}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta = 0)$ . Note again that the third component  $(W_1, W_2)$  of an admissible triple solving the admissible-triple completion problem for the case  $\Theta = (\{0\}, \mathcal{D}_*, 0)$  is again vacuous since in this case the input space is trivial:  $\mathcal{D} = 0$ . Thus we wish to find an operator-pair  $(G_1, G_2)$  on the coefficient Hilbert space  $\mathcal{D}_*$  so that conditions (i), (ii), (iii) hold on  $\mathcal{H}_\Theta$  which now is equal to all of  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_*)$ . As the kernel functions  $\{dk_w : d \in \mathcal{D}_*, w \in \mathbb{D}\}$  has span equal to all of  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) = \mathcal{H}_\Theta$ , we can again formulate the problem just as was done above, but now with the point-set  $\{w_1, w_2, \dots\}$  equal to all of  $\mathbb{D}$  and with the associated vector spaces  $\mathcal{S}_w$  equal to the whole space  $\mathcal{D}_*$  for each  $w \in \mathbb{D}$ . This leads us to conditions (i), (ii), (iii) having to hold. Again condition (i) can be handled by a rescaling of  $(G_1, G_2)$  and conditions (ii) and (iii) become conditions (ii') and (iii'). Condition (ii') is again automatic since  $\mathcal{S}_w = \mathcal{D}_*$  for all  $w \in \mathbb{D}$ . Then condition (iii') must hold for all  $w_m \in \mathbb{D}$ . This leads to the system of quadratic operator polynomial equations in the variable  $\overline{w} \in \mathbb{D}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 G_2 + \overline{w}(G_1 G_1^* + G_2^* G_2) + \overline{w}^2 G_2^* G_1^* \\ = G_2 G_1 + \overline{w}(G_2 G_2^* + G_1^* G_1) + \overline{w}^2 G_1^* G_2^* = \overline{w} I_{\mathcal{D}_*}. \end{aligned}$$

As this must hold for all  $w \in \mathbb{D}$ , we are led to the system of operator equations

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 G_2 &= G_2 G_1 = 0, \\ G_1 G_1^* + G_2^* G_2 &= G_2 G_2^* + G_1^* G_1 = I_{\mathcal{D}_*}, \end{aligned}$$

$$G_2^*G_1^* = G_1^*G_2^* = 0.$$

Note that the third line of equations is just the adjoint version of the first line and hence can be dropped. Next observe that this slimmed-down system of operator equations is exactly the same as the system of equations (3.1.2) appearing in Lemma 3.1.1 (with  $(G_1, G_2)$  replacing the  $(E_1, E_2)$  appearing there). By Lemma 3.1.1 we know that any solution has the form

$$(G_1, G_2) = (U^*P^\perp, PU)$$

where  $U$  is a unitary operator and  $P$  is a projection operator on  $\mathcal{D}_*$ . As a corollary we get what we can call *the Berger-Coburn-Lebow solution of the associated commuting contractive factorization problem*: if  $(T_1, T_2)$  is a commuting contractive operator-pair on  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_*)$  solving the factorization problem

$$M_z^{\mathcal{D}_*} = T_1T_2 = T_2T_1,$$

then there is a projection  $P$  and unitary  $U$  on  $\mathcal{D}_*$  so that

$$T_1 = M_{P^\perp U + zPU}, \quad T_2 = M_{U^*P + zU^*P^\perp}.$$

In the special case where  $\mathcal{D}_* = \mathbb{C}$ , the possibilities for projection operators  $P$  and unitary operators  $U$  are limited to

$$P = 0 \text{ or } P = 1, \quad U = \omega \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Then solutions of the associated commuting contractive factorization problem *find a commuting contractive operator-pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  on  $H^2$  so that  $M_z = T_1T_2 = T_2T_1$  has the same trivial form as was the case for Special Case 1 discussed above: there is an  $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$  so that*

$$(T_1, T_2) = (\omega I_{H^2}, \bar{\omega} M_z) \text{ or } (T_1, T_2) = (\omega M_z, \bar{\omega} I_{H^2}).$$

## 8. Characterization of joint invariant subspaces for pairs of commuting contractions

In this chapter we characterize invariant subspaces for pairs  $(T_1, T_2)$  of commuting contractions such that  $T = T_1T_2$  is a c.n.u. contraction. Sz.-Nagy and Foias characterized how invariant subspaces for c.n.u. contractions arise in the functional model (see [43, Chapter VII]). They showed that invariant subspaces of a c.n.u. contraction  $T$  are in one-to-one correspondence with regular factorizations of the characteristic function of  $T$ . Recall that, given contractive analytic functions  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$   $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{F}, \Theta')$ ,  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta'')$  such that there is a factorization,  $\Theta = \Theta''\Theta'$ , the factorization is said to be *regular* if the contractive operator factorization  $\Theta(\zeta) = \Theta''(\zeta)\Theta'(\zeta)$  is regular in the sense discussed in Remark 4.3.4. This means that the map  $Z: \overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})} \rightarrow \overline{\Delta_{\Theta''} L^2(\mathcal{F})} \oplus \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'} L^2(\mathcal{D}_*)}$  defined densely by

$$Z: \Delta_\Theta(\zeta)h(\zeta) \mapsto \Delta_{\Theta''}(\zeta)\Theta'(\zeta)h(\zeta) \oplus \Delta_{\Theta'}(\zeta)h(\zeta), \tag{8.1}$$

which is necessarily an isometry (the pointwise version of the map (8.1) given in §4.3), is actually surjective and hence unitary. A minor complication in the theory is that the factors in a regular factorization of a purely contractive analytic function need not again

be purely contractive. We now recall their result as we shall have use of it later in this section.

**THEOREM 8.1** (Sz.-Nagy–Foias). *Let  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  be a purely contractive analytic function and  $\mathbf{T}$  be the contraction on*

$$\mathbb{H} := \mathcal{H}_\Theta = H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \oplus \overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})} \ominus \{\Theta f \oplus \Delta_\Theta f : f \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\}$$

defined by

$$\mathbf{T} = P_{\mathbb{H}}(M_z \oplus M_\zeta)|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{H}}}.$$

*A subspace  $\mathbb{H}'$  of  $\mathbb{H}$  is invariant under  $\mathbf{T}$  if and only if there exist contractive analytic functions  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{F}, \Theta')$ ,  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta'')$  such that*

$$\Theta = \Theta''\Theta'$$

*is a regular factorization, and with the unitary  $Z$  as in (8.1) we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}' = \{ \Theta'' f \oplus Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''} f \oplus g) : f \in H^2(\mathcal{F}), g \in \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'} L^2(\mathcal{D})} \} \\ \ominus \{ \Theta h \oplus \Delta_\Theta h : h \in H^2(\mathcal{D}) \} \end{aligned} \quad (8.2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}'' := \mathbb{H} \ominus \mathbb{H}' = H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \oplus Z^{-1}(\overline{\Delta_{\Theta''} L^2(\mathcal{F})} \oplus \{0\}) \\ \ominus \{ \Theta'' f \oplus Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''} f \oplus 0) : f \in H^2(\mathcal{F}) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.3)$$

*Moreover, the characteristic function of  $\mathbf{T}|_{\mathbb{H}'}$  coincides with the purely contractive part of  $\Theta'$ , and the characteristic function of  $P_{\mathbb{H}''}\mathbf{T}|_{\mathbb{H}''}$  coincides with the purely contractive part of  $\Theta''$ .*

**REMARK 8.2.** For future reference let us mention the special case of Theorem 8.1 where the input coefficient space  $\mathcal{D}$  is taken to be the zero space and the contractive analytic function  $\Theta$  is just the zero function  $\Theta(z) = 0: \{0\} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_*$ . In this case the only contractive analytic factorizations  $\Theta = \Theta''\Theta'$  have  $\Theta''$  equal to an arbitrary contractive analytic function  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta'')$  and  $\Theta'$  equal to a zero function  $(\{0\}, \mathcal{F}, \Theta')$  ( $\Theta'(z) = 0: \{0\} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ ). The only such factorizations which are regular are those for which  $\Theta''$  is an inner function. In this case, in the context of Theorem 8.1,  $\mathbb{H} = H^2(\mathcal{D}_*)$ ,  $\mathbf{T} = M_z$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{D}_*)$ , and the invariant subspace corresponding to the regular factorization  $0 = \Theta'' \cdot 0$  is  $\mathbb{H}' = \Theta'' H^2(\mathcal{F})$ . Thus Theorem 8.1 can be thought of as a generalization of the Beurling-Lax Theorem.

Let  $T$  be a c.n.u. contraction such that  $T = T_1 T_2$  for a pair  $(T_1, T_2)$  of commuting contractions. It is natural that one would need more conditions than (8.2) and (8.3) for an invariant subspace of  $T$  to be jointly invariant under  $(T_1, T_2)$ .

**THEOREM 8.3.** *Let  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  be a purely contractive analytic function and let the triple  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$  be admissible. Define the pair  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$  of commuting contractions on*

$$\mathbb{H} = H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \oplus \overline{\Delta_\Theta L^2(\mathcal{D})} \ominus \{\Theta f \oplus \Delta_\Theta f : f \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\} \quad (8.4)$$

by

$$(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2) = P_{\mathbb{H}}(M_{G_1^* + zG_2} \oplus W_1, M_{G_2^* + zG_1} \oplus W_2)|_{\mathbb{H}}. \quad (8.5)$$

A subspace  $\mathbb{H}'$  of  $\mathbb{H}$  is jointly invariant under  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$  if and only if there exist a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{F}$ , two contractions  $G'_1, G'_2$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$ , two contractive analytic functions  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{F}, \Theta')$ ,  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta'')$  such that

$$\Theta = \Theta''\Theta'$$

is a regular factorization, a pair  $(W'_1, W'_2)$  of unitary operators on  $\overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})}$  with the property

$$W'_1W'_2 = W'_2W'_1 = M_\zeta|_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})}}, \tag{8.6}$$

and also, with  $Z$  the pointwise unitary operator as in (8.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}' = \{ & \Theta''f \oplus Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''}f \oplus g) : f \in H^2(\mathcal{F}), g \in \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})} \\ & \ominus \{\Theta h \oplus \Delta_{\Theta}h : h \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\}, \end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}'' := \mathbb{H} \ominus \mathbb{H}' = & H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \oplus Z^{-1}(\overline{\Delta_{\Theta''}L^2(\mathcal{F})} \oplus \{0\}) \\ & \ominus \{\Theta''f \oplus Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''}f \oplus 0) : f \in H^2(\mathcal{F})\}, \end{aligned} \tag{8.8}$$

and for every  $f \in H^2(\mathcal{F})$  and  $g \in \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})}$

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_{G'_i+zG'_j} & 0 \\ 0 & W_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Theta''f \\ Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''}f \oplus g) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Theta''M_{G'_i+zG'_j}f \\ Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''}M_{G'_i+zG'_j}f \oplus W'_i g) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{8.9}$$

where  $(i, j) = (1, 2), (2, 1)$ .

*Proof.* We first prove the easier part—the proof of sufficiency. Suppose that

$$((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$$

is a purely contractive admissible triple (i.e.,  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  is a purely contractive analytic function) such that  $\Theta$  has a regular factorization  $\Theta = \Theta''\Theta'$  with  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{F}, \Theta')$  and  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta'')$  contractive analytic functions. We suppose also that  $G'_1$  and  $G'_2$  are contraction operators on  $\mathcal{F}$ ,  $W'_1, W'_2$  are unitary operators on  $\overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})}$  so that (8.6) and (8.9) hold. Then we have all the ingredients to define  $\mathbb{H}'$  and  $\mathbb{H}''$  as in (8.7) and (8.8). Note next that  $\mathbb{H}'$  is indeed a subspace of  $\mathbb{H}$ . We wish to show that the space  $\mathbb{H}'$  given in (8.7) is jointly invariant under the pair  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$  defined in (8.5). Firstly, it is easy to see that  $\mathbb{H}'$  is a subspace of  $\mathbb{H}$ . Since the operator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} : H^2(\mathcal{F}) \oplus \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})} & \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \oplus \overline{\Delta_{\Theta}L^2(\mathcal{D})} \\ f \oplus g & \mapsto \Theta''f \oplus Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''}f \oplus g) \end{aligned} \tag{8.10}$$

is an isometry, the space

$$\{\Theta''f \oplus Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''}f \oplus g) : f \in H^2(\mathcal{F}) \text{ and } g \in \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})}\}$$

is closed and by (8.9) we see that it is jointly invariant under

$$(M_{G'_1+zG'_2} \oplus W_1, M_{G'_2+zG'_1} \oplus W_2, M_z \oplus M_\zeta).$$

We also see that

$$\text{Ran } \mathcal{I} = (H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \oplus \overline{\Delta_{\Theta}L^2(\mathcal{D})}) \ominus (\mathbb{H} \ominus \mathbb{H}').$$

Now the sufficiency follows from the definition of  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$  and from the general fact that if  $V$  is an operator on  $\mathcal{K}$  containing  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $V(\mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{K} \ominus \mathcal{H}$ , and  $V^*|_{\mathcal{H}} = T^*$ , then for a

subspace  $\mathcal{H}'$  of  $\mathcal{H}$ ,

$$V(\mathcal{K} \ominus (\mathcal{H} \ominus \mathcal{H}')) \subseteq (\mathcal{K} \ominus (\mathcal{H} \ominus \mathcal{H}')) \text{ if and only if } T(\mathcal{H}') \subseteq \mathcal{H}'.$$

Now we show that the conditions are necessary. The first step of the proof is an application of Theorem 8.1. Indeed, if  $\mathbb{H}' \subset \mathbb{H}$  is jointly invariant under  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$ , then it is also invariant under the product  $\mathbf{T}_1 \mathbf{T}_2$  and by definition of admissibility

$$\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}_1 \mathbf{T}_2 = \mathbf{T}_2 \mathbf{T}_1 = P_{\mathbb{H}}(M_z \oplus M_{\zeta})|_{\mathbb{H}}.$$

Hence by Theorem 8.1, there exist two contractive analytic functions

$$(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{F}, \Theta'), \quad (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta'')$$

such that  $\Theta = \Theta'' \Theta'$  is a regular factorization and the spaces  $\mathbb{H}'$  and  $\mathbb{H}''$  are realized as in (8.7) and (8.8), respectively. It only remains to produce contraction operators  $G'_1, G'_2$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  and unitary operators  $W'_1, W'_2$  on  $\overline{\Delta_{\Theta'} L^2(\mathcal{D})}$  so that conditions (8.6) and (8.9) hold. Note that, once we have found  $G'_1, G'_2, W'_1, W'_2$ , verification of (8.9) breaks up into three linear pieces, where  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$  or  $(2, 1)$ :

$$M_{G_i^* + z G_j} \Theta'' f = \Theta'' M_{G_i^* + z G_j} f \text{ for all } f \in H^2(\mathcal{F}), \quad (8.11)$$

$$W_i(Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''} f \oplus 0)) = Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''} M_{G_i^* + z G_j} f \oplus 0) \text{ for all } f \in H^2(\mathcal{F}), \quad (8.12)$$

$$W_i Z^{-1}(0 \oplus g) = Z^{-1}(0 \oplus W'_i g) \text{ for all } g \in \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'} L^2(\mathcal{D})}. \quad (8.13)$$

As a first step, we define operators  $X_i$  on  $H^2(\mathcal{F})$  and  $W'_i$  on  $\overline{\Delta_{\Theta'} L^2(\mathcal{D})}$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ , such that for every  $f \in H^2(\mathcal{F})$  and  $g \in \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'} L^2(\mathcal{D})}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_i^* + z G_j} & 0 \\ 0 & W_i \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{I} \begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_i^* + z G_j} & 0 \\ 0 & W_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Theta'' f \\ Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''} f \oplus g) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \Theta'' X_i f \\ Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''} X_i f \oplus W'_i g) \end{bmatrix} = \mathcal{I} \begin{bmatrix} X_i & 0 \\ 0 & W'_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.14)$$

where  $\mathcal{I}$  is the isometry as defined in (8.10). The operators  $X_1, X_2$  and  $W'_1, W'_2$  are well-defined because the operator  $\mathcal{I}$  is an isometry. Indeed, it follows that  $X_1, X_2$  and  $W'_1, W'_2$  are contractions. Since the unitary  $Z$  commutes with  $M_{\zeta}$ , it is easy to see from the definition of  $\mathcal{I}$  that it has the following intertwining property

$$\mathcal{I}(M_z \oplus M_{\zeta}|_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta'} L^2(\mathcal{D})}}) = (M_z \oplus M_{\zeta}|_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta'} L^2(\mathcal{D})}}) \mathcal{I}. \quad (8.15)$$

From the intertwining properties (8.15) and (8.14) of  $\mathcal{I}$ , we get for  $i = 1, 2$

$$(X_i \oplus W'_i)(M_z \oplus M_{\zeta}|_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta'} L^2(\mathcal{D})}}) = (M_z \oplus M_{\zeta}|_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta'} L^2(\mathcal{D})}})(X_i \oplus W'_i),$$

which implies that  $(X_1, X_2) = (M_{\varphi_1}, M_{\varphi_2})$ , for some  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  in  $L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}))$ . We next show that  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  are actually linear pencils. Toward this end, notice from (8.14) that

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_{\varphi_1} & 0 \\ 0 & W'_1 \end{bmatrix} = \mathcal{I}^* \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_1^* + z G_2} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{I} \quad (8.16)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_{\varphi_2} & 0 \\ 0 & W'_2 \end{bmatrix} = \mathcal{I}^* \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_2^* + z G_1} & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{I} \quad (8.17)$$

Now multiplying (8.16) on the left by  $M_z^* \oplus M_{\zeta}^*|_{\overline{\Delta_{\Theta'} L^2(\mathcal{D})}}$ , then using the intertwining property (8.15) of  $\mathcal{I}$  and then remembering that  $(W_1, W_2)$  is a commuting pair of unitaries

such that  $W_1W_2 = M_\zeta^* \overline{\Delta_{\Theta}L^2(\mathcal{D})}$ , we get

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_z^* & 0 \\ 0 & M_\zeta^* \overline{\Delta_{\Theta}L^2(\mathcal{D})} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_{\varphi_1} & 0 \\ 0 & W_1' \end{bmatrix} = \mathcal{I}^* \begin{bmatrix} M_{G_2^*+zG_1}^* & 0 \\ 0 & W_2^* \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{I} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{\varphi_2}^* & 0 \\ 0 & W_2'^* \end{bmatrix}.$$

Consequently,  $M_{\varphi_2} = M_{\varphi_1}^* M_z$ . A similar argument as above yields  $M_{\varphi_1} = M_{\varphi_2}^* M_z$ . Considering these two relations and the power series expansions of  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$ , we get

$$\varphi_1(z) = G_1'^* + zG_2' \text{ and } \varphi_2(z) = G_2'^* + zG_1', \tag{8.18}$$

for some  $G_1', G_2' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$ . The fact that  $M_{\varphi_1}$  (and  $M_{\varphi_2}$ ) is a contraction implies that  $G_1'$  and  $G_2'$  are contractions too. Recalling (8.14) and the substitution  $(X_1, X_2) = (M_{\varphi_1}, M_{\varphi_2})$  where  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  are given by (8.18), we see that we have established (8.11) with the choice of  $G_1', G_2'$  as in (8.18).

Next note that the bottom component of (8.14) gives us

$$W_i Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''} f \oplus g) = Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''} X_i f \oplus W_i' g). \tag{8.19}$$

for all  $f \in H^2(\mathcal{F})$ ,  $g \in \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})}$ , and  $i = 1, 2$ . In particular, setting  $g = 0$  and recalling that  $X_i = M_{\varphi_i} = M_{G_i'^*+zG_j'}$ , we get

$$W_i Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''} f \oplus 0) = Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''} M_{G_i'^*+zG_j'} f \oplus 0), \tag{8.20}$$

thereby verifying (8.12). We next consider (8.19) with  $f = 0$  and  $g$  equal to a general element of  $\overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})}$  to get

$$W_i Z^{-1}(0 \oplus g) = Z^{-1}(0 \oplus W_i' g), \tag{8.21}$$

thereby verifying (8.13) and hence also completing the proof of (8.9).

It remains to show that  $(W_1', W_2')$  is a commuting pair of unitary operators satisfying condition (8.6). Toward this goal, let us rewrite (8.21) in the form

$$ZW_i Z^{-1}(0 \oplus g) = 0 \oplus W_i' g. \tag{8.22}$$

which implies that, for  $i = 1, 2$ ,

$$ZW_i Z^{-1}(\{0\} \oplus \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})}) \subseteq (\{0\} \oplus \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})}).$$

On the other hand, using (8.20) and noting that  $M_\zeta \overline{\Delta_{\Theta}L^2(\mathcal{D})}$  commutes with  $Z, W_1, W_2$  and  $\Delta_{\Theta''}$ , we get for every  $f \in H^2(\mathcal{F})$  and  $n \geq 0$

$$ZW_i Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''} e^{-int} f \oplus 0) = (\Delta_{\Theta''} e^{-int} X_i f \oplus 0),$$

which implies that  $ZW_i Z^{-1}(\overline{\Delta_{\Theta}L^2(\mathcal{D})} \oplus \{0\}) \subseteq (\overline{\Delta_{\Theta}L^2(\mathcal{D})} \oplus \{0\})$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . We conclude that  $Z^{-1}(\{0\} \oplus \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})})$  is a reducing subspace for the pair of unitaries  $(W_1, W_2)$  and hence  $(W_1, W_2)|_{Z^{-1}(\{0\} \oplus \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})})}$  is a pair of commuting unitary operators. The intertwining (8.22) shows that the pair  $(W_1', W_2')$  on  $\overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})}$  is jointly unitarily equivalent to the commuting unitary pair  $(W_1, W_2)|_{Z^{-1}(\{0\} \oplus \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})})}$  and hence is itself a commuting unitary pair. Furthermore, since  $W_1W_2 = M_\zeta$  in particular on  $Z^{-1}(\{0\} \oplus \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})})$  and  $M_\zeta$  commutes past  $Z$  and  $Z^{-1}$ , we conclude that condition (8.6) holds as well. This completes the proof of the necessary part. ■

As we see from the last part of the statement of Theorem 8.3, Sz.-Nagy and Foias went on to prove that, under the conditions of Theorem 8.1, the characteristic functions of  $\mathbf{T}|_{\mathbb{H}}$

and  $P_{\mathbb{H}\Theta'}\mathbf{T}|_{\mathbb{H}\Theta'}$  coincide with the purely contractive parts of  $\Theta'$  and  $\Theta''$ , respectively. We next find an analogous result (at least for the first part of this statement) for pairs of commuting contractions. The strategy of the proof is the same as that of Sz.-Nagy–Foias, namely: application of model theory.

**THEOREM 8.4.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 8.3, let  $\mathbb{H}'$  be a joint invariant subspace of  $\mathbb{H}$  induced by the regular factorization  $\Theta = \Theta''\Theta'$ . Then with the notations as in Theorem 8.3, the triple  $((G'_1, G'_2), (W'_1, W'_2), \Theta')$  is admissible and its purely contractive part coincides with the characteristic triple for  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)|_{\mathbb{H}'}$ .*

*Proof.* With the isometry  $\mathcal{I}$  as in (8.10), define a unitary  $U := \mathcal{I}^*|_{\text{Ran } \mathcal{I}}$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} U : \{\Theta''f \oplus Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''}f \oplus g) : f \in H^2(\mathcal{F}), g \in \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})}\} &\rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{F}) \oplus \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})} \\ U : \Theta''f \oplus Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''}f \oplus g) &\mapsto f \oplus g. \end{aligned} \quad (8.23)$$

For every  $g \in H^2(\mathcal{D})$ ,

$$U(\Theta g \oplus \Delta_{\Theta}g) = U(\Theta''\Theta'g \oplus Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''}\Theta'g \oplus \Delta_{\Theta'}g)) = \Theta'g \oplus \Delta_{\Theta'}g, \quad (8.24)$$

which implies that  $U$  takes  $\mathbb{H}'$  as given in (8.7) onto the Hilbert space

$$\mathfrak{H}' := H^2(\mathcal{F}) \oplus \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})} \ominus \{\Theta'g \oplus \Delta_{\Theta'}g : g \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\} \quad (8.25)$$

The basis of the proof is the following unitary equivalences:

$$U(M_{G_i^*+zG_j} \oplus W_i)U^* = M_{G_i'^*+zG_j'} \oplus W_i' \text{ for } (i, j) = (1, 2), (2, 1), \quad (8.26)$$

$$U(M_z \oplus M_{\zeta})U^* = (M_z \oplus M_{\zeta}). \quad (8.27)$$

To verify (8.26)–(8.27), proceed as follows. Since  $M_{\zeta}$  commutes with  $Z$  and  $\Delta_{\Theta''}$ , (8.27) follows easily. We establish equation (8.26) only for  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$  and omit the proof for the other case because it is similar. For  $f \in H^2(\mathcal{F})$  and  $g \in \overline{\Delta_{\Theta'}L^2(\mathcal{D})}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} U(M_{G_1^*+zG_2} \oplus W_1)U^*(f \oplus g) &= U(M_{G_1^*+zG_2} \oplus W_1)(\Theta''f \oplus Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''}f \oplus g)) \\ &= U(\Theta''M_{G_1^*+zG_2'}f \oplus Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''}M_{G_1^*+zG_2'}f \oplus W_1'g)) \text{ [by (8.9)]} \\ &= M_{G_1'^*+zG_2'}f \oplus W_1'g \end{aligned}$$

and (8.26) also follows.

We now show that the triple  $((G'_1, G'_2), (W'_1, W'_2), \Theta')$  is admissible. Recall that in the course of the proof of Theorem 8.3, we saw that both  $G'_1$  and  $G'_2$  are contractions and that  $(W'_1, W'_2)$  is a pair of commuting unitaries satisfying (8.6). From (8.26) we see that for every  $f \in H^2(\mathcal{F})$  and  $(i, j) = (1, 2), (2, 1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (M_{G_i'^*+zG_j'} \oplus W_i')(\Theta'f \oplus \Delta_{\Theta'}f) &= U(M_{G_i^*+zG_j} \oplus W_i)U^*(\Theta'f \oplus \Delta_{\Theta'}f) \\ &= U(M_{G_i^*+zG_j} \oplus W_i)(\Theta''\Theta'f \oplus Z^{-1}(\Delta_{\Theta''}\Theta'f \oplus \Delta_{\Theta'}f)) \\ &= U(M_{G_i^*+zG_j} \oplus W_i)(\Theta f \oplus \Delta_{\Theta}f). \end{aligned}$$

From the admissibility of  $((G_1, G_2), (W_1, W_2), \Theta)$ , we know that each of the contraction operators  $(M_{G_i^*+zG_j} \oplus W_i)$  takes the space  $\{\Theta f \oplus \Delta_{\Theta}f : f \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\}$  into itself. Therefore from the last term of the above computation and (8.24), we see that for each  $(i, j) = (1, 2), (2, 1)$ ,

$$(M_{G_i'^*+zG_j'} \oplus W_i')(\{\Theta'f \oplus \Delta_{\Theta'}f : f \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\}) \subset \{\Theta'f \oplus \Delta_{\Theta'}f : f \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\}.$$



From (8.26) it is also clear that for each  $(i, j) = (1, 2), (2, 1)$ , the operators  $(M_{G'_i+zG'_j} \oplus W'_i)$  are contractions and that with  $\mathfrak{H}'$  as in (8.25)

$$\begin{aligned} & (M_{G'_i+zG'_j} \oplus W'_i)^*(M_{G'_j+zG'_i} \oplus W'_j)^*|_{\mathfrak{H}'} = U(M_{G'_i+zG'_j} \oplus W_i)^*(M_{G'_j+zG'_i} \oplus W_j)^*|_{\mathbb{H}} \\ & = U(M_z \oplus M_\zeta)|_{\mathbb{H}} = U(M_z \oplus M_\zeta)U^*|_{\mathfrak{H}'} = (M_z \oplus M_\zeta)|_{\mathfrak{H}'} \quad [\text{by (8.27)}]. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of admissibility of  $((G'_1, G'_2), (W'_1, W'_2), \Theta')$ .

And finally to prove the last part we first observe that

$$(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2) = P_{\mathbb{H}'}(M_{G_1^*+zG_2} \oplus W_1, M_{G_2^*+zG_1} \oplus W_2)|_{\mathbb{H}'}$$

Now from equations (8.26) and (8.27) again and from the fact that  $U(\mathbb{H}') = \mathfrak{H}'$  (hence  $UP_{\mathbb{H}'} = P_{\mathfrak{H}'}U$ ), we conclude that

$$(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2, \mathbf{T}_1\mathbf{T}_2)|_{\mathbb{H}'} = P_{\mathbb{H}'}(M_{G_1^*+zG_2} \oplus W_1, M_{G_2^*+zG_1} \oplus W_2, M_z \oplus M_\zeta)|_{\mathbb{H}'}$$

is unitarily equivalent to the functional model associated to  $((G'_1, G'_2), (W'_1, W'_2), \Theta')$ , i.e.,

$$P_{\mathfrak{H}'}(M_{G_1^*+zG_2} \oplus W_1, M_{G_2^*+zG_1} \oplus W_2, M_z \oplus M_\zeta)|_{\mathfrak{H}'}$$

via the unitary  $U|_{\mathbb{H}'} : \mathbb{H}' \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}'$ . Therefore appeal to Theorem 7.3.3, Theorem 7.4.5 and Proposition 7.4.3 completes the proof. ■

In case the purely contractive analytic function  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  is inner, the results above are much simpler, as in the following statement.

**THEOREM 8.5.** *Let  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  be an inner function and  $((G_1, G_2), \Theta)$  be an admissible pair. Define the pair  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$  of commuting contractions on*

$$\mathbb{H} = H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \ominus \{\Theta f : f \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\} \tag{8.28}$$

by

$$(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2) = P_{\mathbb{H}}(M_{G_1^*+zG_2}, M_{G_2^*+zG_1})|_{\mathbb{H}}. \tag{8.29}$$

A subspace  $\mathbb{H}'$  of  $\mathbb{H}$  is jointly invariant under  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$  if and only if there exist two inner functions  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{F}, \Theta')$ ,  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta'')$  such that

$$\Theta = \Theta''\Theta'$$

is a regular factorization,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}' &= \{\Theta''f : f \in H^2(\mathcal{F})\} \ominus \{\Theta h : h \in H^2(\mathcal{D})\}, \\ \mathbb{H}'' &:= \mathbb{H} \ominus \mathbb{H}' = H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \ominus \{\Theta''f : f \in H^2(\mathcal{F})\}, \end{aligned} \tag{8.30}$$

and two contractions  $G'_1, G'_2$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$  such that

$$M_{G'_i+zG'_j}M_{\Theta''} = M_{\Theta''}M_{G_i^*+zG_j}. \tag{8.31}$$

Moreover, the pair  $((G'_1, G'_2), \Theta')$  coincides with the characteristic pair for  $(T_1, T_2)|_{\mathcal{H}'}$ .

Another interesting simplification is the case where the input space  $\mathcal{D}$  is the zero space and the purely contractive analytic functions  $(\{0\}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta)$  is necessarily the zero function  $\Theta(z) = 0: \{0\} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_*$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ . If  $\Theta = \Theta''\Theta'$  is any factorization into contractive analytic functions  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta'')$ ,  $(\{0\}, \mathcal{F}, \Theta')$ , then  $\Theta'$  is forced to be the zero function. One can then show that the factorization  $0 = \Theta'' \cdot 0$  is regular exactly when  $\Theta''$  is inner, so  $I - \Theta''(\zeta)^*\Theta''(\zeta) = I_{\mathcal{F}}$  for a.e.  $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ . Then Theorem 8.3 simplifies to the

following form; in view of Remark 8.2, this result can be viewed as a bivariate version of the Beurling-Lax Theorem. We note that an analogue of this result appears in the context of model theory for a commuting pair of operators  $(S, P)$  having the symmetrized bidisk as a spectral set (i.e., a  $\Gamma$ -contraction)—see Sarkar [33, Theorem 3.3], and for a triple of commuting operators  $(A, B, P)$  having the tetrablock as a spectral set (i.e., a tetrablock contraction)—see [35, Theorem 3.1].

**THEOREM 8.6.** *Suppose that  $(\mathcal{D}_*, P, U)$  is a BCL tuple. Define a pair of commuting isometries  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$  on  $\mathbb{H} = H^2(\mathcal{D}_*)$  as the associated BCL2 model pair of commuting isometries*

$$(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2) = (M_{U^*(P^\perp + zP)}, M_{(P + zP^\perp)U}).$$

*A subspace  $\mathbb{H}'$  of  $\mathbb{H}$  is jointly invariant under  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$  if and only if there exist an inner function  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_*, \Theta'')$  and another BCL tuple  $(\mathcal{F}, P', U')$  so that*

$$\mathbb{H}' = \Theta'' H^2(\mathcal{F}), \quad \mathbb{H}'' = H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \ominus \mathbb{H}' = H^2(\mathcal{D}_*) \ominus \Theta'' H^2(\mathcal{F}) \tag{8.32}$$

*and lastly*

$$M_{U^*(P^\perp + zP)} M_{\Theta''} = M_{\Theta''} M_{U'^*(P'^\perp + zP')}, \quad M_{(P + zP^\perp)U} M_{\Theta''} = M_{\Theta''} M_{(P' + zP'^\perp)U'}.$$

A particular choice of BCL tuple in Theorem 8.6 is  $(\mathcal{D}_*, P, U) = (\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2, P_{[1, \infty)}, \mathbf{S})$  as in Example 3.3.2, so that the resulting  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2)$  is just the BCL1 model for the bidisk shift-pair  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  on  $H^2_{\mathbb{D}^2}$ . In this model the operator  $M_{z_1 z_2}$  on  $H^2_{\mathbb{D}^2}$  becomes the operator  $M_z$  on  $H^2(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2)$ . The standard single-variable Beurling-Lax Theorem tells us that invariant subspaces for  $M_{z_1 z_2}$  on the Hardy space of the bidisk are then in one-to-one correspondence with inner functions of the form  $(\mathcal{F}, \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2, \Theta'')$ ; the latter object is not easy to classify since the target coefficient space  $\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$  is infinite-dimensional. Joint invariant subspaces for  $(M_{z_1}, M_{z_2})$  on  $H^2_{\mathbb{D}^2}$  then correspond to such inner  $\Theta''$  such that in addition  $\Theta'' \cdot H^2(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2)$  is jointly invariant for  $(M_{\mathbf{S}^*(P^\perp + zP)}, M_{(P + zP^\perp)\mathbf{S}})$  (where  $P = P_{[1, \infty)}$ ). The tradeoff between the bidisk setting versus the BCL-setting is: in the bidisk setting one has scalar-valued functions at the cost of the functions being of two variables, while in the BCL setting one has single-variable functions but with values in the infinite-dimensional space  $(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2)$ . Characterizing joint invariant subspaces in either setting appears to be rather intractable. There has been by now much work on the problem leading to deeper appreciation as to how complicated the structure is in the bidisk setting; a small sample of such work is [18, 26, 38, 47].

## References

- [1] J. Agler and J. McCarthy, *Distinguished Varieties*, Acta. Math. **194** (2005), 133-153.
- [2] C.-G. Ambrozie, M. Engliš, and V. Müller, *Operator tuples and analytic models over general domains in  $\mathbb{C}^n$* , J. Operator Theory 47 (2002), no. 2, 287-302.
- [3] T. Andô, *On a Pair of Commuting Contractions*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **24** (1963), 88-90.
- [4] D.Z. Arov and L.Z. Grossman, *Scattering matrices in the theory of unitary extension of isometric operators*, Math. Nachr. **157** (1992), 105-123.

- [5] J.A. Ball, *Factorization and model theory for contraction operators with unitary part*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 13 (1978), no. 198.
- [6] J.A. Ball, *Linear systems, operator model theory and scattering: multivariable generalizations*, in: Operator Theory and its Applications (Winnipeg, MB, 1998), 151–178, Fields Inst. Commun **25**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2000.
- [7] J.A. Ball and V. Bolotnikov, *Canonical de Branges-Rovnyak model transfer-function realization for multivariable Schur-class functions*, Hilbert Spaces of Analytic Functions, 1–39, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes **51**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.
- [8] J.A. Ball and N. Cohen, *de Branges-Rovnyak operator models and systems theory: a survey*, in: Topics in Matrix and Operator Theory, pp. 103–136. Oper. Th. Adv. Appl. **50**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1991.
- [9] J.A. Ball, I. Gohberg, and L. Rodman, *Interpolation Theory of Rational Matrix Functions*, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. **45** Birkhäuser-Verlag, Basel, 1990.
- [10] J.A. Ball and H. Sau, *Functional models for commuting Hilbert-space contractions*, in: Operator Theory, Operator Algebras and Their Interactions with Geometry and Topology: Ronald G. Douglas Memorial Volume, 11 - 54, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. **278**, Birkhäuser, Cham, 2020.
- [11] J.A. Ball and V. Vinnikov, *Hardy spaces on a finite bordered Riemann surface, multivariable operator model theory and Fourier analysis along a unimodular curve*, Systems, Approximation, Singular Integral Operators, and Related Topics (Bordeaux, 2000) 37–56, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. **129**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2001.
- [12] H. Bercovici, R.G. Douglas and C. Foias, *On the classification of multi-isometries*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) 72 (2006), 639-661.
- [13] H. Bercovici, R.G. Douglas and C. Foias, *Canonical models for bi-isometries*, in: A Panorama of Modern Operator Theory and Related Topics (The Israel Gohberg Memorial Volume), Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. **218**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2012.
- [14] C. A. Berger, L. A. Coburn and A. Lebow, *Representation and index theory for  $C^*$ -algebras generated by commuting isometries*, J. Funct. Anal. **27** (1978), no. 1, 51-99.
- [15] T. Bhattacharyya, *The tetrablock as a spectral set*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **63** (2014), 1601-1629.
- [16] T. Bhattacharyya, S. Pal and S. Shyam Roy, *Dilations of  $\Gamma$ -contractions by solving operator equations*, Adv. Math. **230** (2012) 577-606.
- [17] T. Bhattacharyya, S. Rastogi and U. V. Kumar, *The joint spectrum for a commuting pair of isometries in certain cases*, Complex Anal. Oper. Theory 16, 83 (2022).
- [18] Z. Burdak, *On the model and invariant subspaces for pairs of commuting isometries*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory (2019) 91: 22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00020-019-2516-4>.
- [19] Z. Burdak, M. Kosiek, P. Pagacz, and M. Słociński, *On the commuting isometries*, Linear Algebra Appl. **516** (2017), 167–185.
- [20] Z. Burdak, M. Kosiek, and M. Słociński, *Compatible pairs of commuting isometries*, Linear Algebra Appl. **479** (2015), 216–259.
- [21] R.E. Curto and F.-H. Vasilescu, *Standard operator models in the polydisc*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 42 (1993), no. 3, 791-810.
- [22] B. K. Das, S. Sarkar and J. Sarkar, *Factorizations of contractions*, Adv. Math. **322** (2017), 186-200.
- [23] J. Dixmier, *von Neumann Algebras* (with a preface by E.C. Lance), translated from the second French edition by F. Jellet, North-Holland Math. Library **27**, North Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam/New York, 1981.

- [24] R. G. Douglas, *On majorization, factorization and range inclusion of operators on Hilbert space*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **17** (1966), 413-415.
- [25] R. G. Douglas, *Structure theory for operators. I.*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **232** (1968) 180-193.
- [26] R.G. Douglas and K. Yan, *On the rigidity of Hardy submodules*, Integral Equations and Operator Theory **13** (1990), 350–363.
- [27] E. Durszt, *Contractions as restricted shifts*, Acta Sci. Math., **48** (1985), 129-134.
- [28] D. Gaşpar and P. Gaşpar, *Wold decompositions and the unitary model for bi-isometries*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **49** (2004), no. 4, 419 - 433.
- [29] V. Mandrekar, *The validity of Beurling theorem in polydisks*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **103** (1988), 145–148.
- [30] S. Pal, *Canonical decomposition of a tetrablock contraction and operator model*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **438** (2016), 274–284.
- [31] M. Rosenblum, *On a theorem of Fuglede and Putnam*, J. London Math. Soc. **33** (1958), 396–377.
- [32] J. Sarkar, *Wold decomposition for doubly commuting isometries*, Linear Algebra Appl. **445** (2014), 289–301.
- [33] J. Sarkar, *Operator theory on symmetrized bidisc*, Ind. U. Math. J. **64** no. 3 (2015), 847–873.
- [34] J. Sarkar, A. Sasane, and B. Wick, *Doubly commuting submodules of the Hardy module over polydisks*, Studia Math. **27901** (2013), 179–192.
- [35] H. Sau, *A note on tetrablock contractions*, New York J. Math. **21** (2015) 1347-1369.
- [36] H. Sau, *Andô dilations for a pair of commuting contractions: two explicit constructions and functional models*, arXiv:1710.11368 [math.FA].
- [37] J.J. Schäffer, *On unitary dilations of contractions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **6** (1955), 322. MR 16,934c.
- [38] M. Seto and R. Yang, *Inner sequence based invariant subspaces in  $H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$* , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **135** no. 8 (2017), 2519–2526.
- [39] M. Słociński, *On the Wold-type decomposition of a pair of commuting isometries*, Annales Polonici Mathematici XXXVII (1980), 255–262.
- [40] B. Sz.-Nagy, *Sur les contractions de l'espace de Hilbert*, Acta Sci. Math. **15** (1953), 87-92.
- [41] B. Sz.-Nagy and C. Foias, *On the structure of intertwining operators*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **35** (1973), 225–254.
- [42] B. Sz.-Nagy, C. Foias, *Regular Factorizations of Contractions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **43**(1974), 91-93.
- [43] B. Sz.-Nagy, C. Foias, and H. Bercovici, Kérchy, L. *Harmonic Analysis of Operators on Hilbert space*, Revised and enlarged edition, Universitext, Springer, New York, 2010.
- [44] D. Timotin, *Regular dilations and models for multicontractions*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **47** no.3 (1993), 671 - 684.
- [45] J. von. Neumann, *Allgemeine Eigenwerttheorie Hermitescher Funktionaloperatoren*, Math. Ann. **102** (1930), 49-131.
- [46] H. Wold, *A study in the analysis of stationary time series.*, 2nd edition, Stockholm, 1954.
- [47] R. Yang, *A Brief Survey of Operator Theory in  $H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$* , Lecture Notes for 2018 Summer School Dalian University of Technology, India, available at arXiv:1810.00133v4.