

UNIQUE EXTENSION OF PURE STATES OF C^* -ALGEBRAS

L.J. BUNCE and C.-H. CHU

Communicated by Șerban Strătilă

ABSTRACT. Let A be a C^* -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B . We say that A has the *pure extension property* in B if every pure state of A has a unique pure state extension to B .

We show that A has the pure extension property in B if and only if there is a weak expectation on B for the atomic representation of A , among several equivalent conditions, including the unique extension of type I factor states. If A is separable and B is a von Neumann algebra, we show that the pure extension property is equivalent to that every factor state of A extends to a unique factor state of B which is in turn equivalent to that A is dual and the minimal projections of A are minimal in B . If A has the pure extension property in B , then there is a natural map $\hat{\alpha}$ between their spectra \hat{A} and \hat{B} . We study the relationship of \hat{A} and \hat{B} under $\hat{\alpha}$ as well as the unique extension of atomic states.

KEYWORDS: C^* -algebra, pure extension property, atomic extension property, weak expectation, hereditary subalgebra.

MSC (2000): 46L05, 46L10, 46L30.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let A be a C^* -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B . The set of extensions, in the state space of B , of a pure state φ of A is a weak*-closed face so that by the Krein-Milman Theorem φ extends to at least one pure state of B which, if unique, is also the unique extension of φ in the state space of B ([25], 4.1.17).

We say that A has the *pure extension property* (PEP) in B if every pure state of A extends uniquely to a pure state of B .

When B is abelian, the pure extension property of A in B is in outcome a minor variation of the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem. But deep investigations of

Kadison and Singer ([21]), Anderson ([8]) and Archbold ([9]) reveal the subtlety of the pure extension property when A is abelian but B is not abelian. A strong form of pure extension property institutionalised in the theory of *perfect* C^* -algebras has been investigated in penetrating detail by Akemann and Shultz ([5]).

In this paper we investigate the pure extension property for arbitrary C^* -algebras A and B . Contrary to the special case in which A is abelian ([17]), the PEP of A in B need not be implemented by a conditional expectation from B onto A in general. Instead, as we will show, PEP is equivalent to the existence of certain *weak expectations* as well as to other conditions, including unique extension of type I factor states (cf. Theorem 2.8). A consequence of the classical Stone-Weierstrass Theorem is that if A is *abelian* and has the PEP in B , then A is an ideal of a maximal abelian subalgebra of B . With the assistance of a non-commutative version (Theorem 3.3) of this result for arbitrary A , we give several characterisations (Theorem 3.8) of the PEP for a separable C^* -subalgebra of a von Neumann algebra. When A has the PEP in B , there is a natural map $\widehat{\alpha} : \widehat{A} \rightarrow \widehat{B}$, between the corresponding spectra \widehat{A} and \widehat{B} , which we exploit in Section 4 to study the extensions of atomic states.

Generally we shall use standard notation to be found in [25]. If A is a C^* -algebra, $S(A)$ will denote the state space of A and $P(A)$ the set of pure states of A . Given a normal state φ of a von Neumann algebra M , we denote by $s(\varphi)$ and $c(\varphi)$, respectively, the support projection and the central support projection of φ in M . For a C^* -algebra A , here habitually identified with its canonical image in A^{**} , the states of A identify with the normal states of A^{**} . Given a state φ of A , we define the homomorphism $\tau_\varphi : A \rightarrow A^{**}c(\varphi)$ by $\tau_\varphi(a) = ac(\varphi)$. We let $(\pi_\varphi, H_\varphi, h_\varphi)$ denote the GNS-representation associated with φ . The normal extension of π_φ to A^{**} restricts to an isomorphism from $A^{**}c(\varphi)$ onto $\overline{\pi_\varphi(A)}$, the weak*-closure of $\pi_\varphi(A)$ in the algebra $B(H_\varphi)$ of bounded linear operators on H_φ . We call φ a *factor state* of A if $A^{**}c(\varphi)$ is a factor. Further, φ is called a *factor state of type I* if $A^{**}c(\varphi)$ is a factor of type I. The set of factor states and the set of factor states of type I will be denoted by $F(A)$ and $F_I(A)$ respectively. Let z_A be the supremum of all minimal central projections in A^{**} . Then $A^{**}z_A$ is the atomic part of A^{**} and we refer to $\tau_a : a \in A \mapsto az_A \in A^{**}z_A$ as the *atomic representation* of A . The canonical inclusion $A \hookrightarrow A^{**}$ is the *universal representation* of A .

It follows from [25], 3.1.6, 4.1.7 that A has the PEP in B if and only if A has the PEP in $H(A)$, the hereditary C^* -subalgebra generated by A in B . If e is the identity of A^{**} (identified with the weak*-closure of A in B^{**}), an increasing net (a_λ) in A , with $0 \leq a_\lambda \leq e$ for all λ , is an approximate unit of A if and only if

$a_\lambda \rightarrow e$ strongly. This follows from [4], 3.1, as does the fact that the following are equivalent (see also [5], 2.32):

- (a) $H(A) = B$;
- (b) A and B have a common approximate unit;
- (c) no pure state of B vanishes on A ;
- (d) every pure state of B restricts to a state of A .

Further, (b) implies that *every* approximate unit of A is an approximate unit of B ; and “pure state” in (c) and (d) may be replaced by “state”.

We also note that A is hereditary in B (i.e. $A = H(A)$) if (and only if) every state of A has unique extension to a state of B ([22]). We have been informed by the referee that this result has also appeared in [20].

A C^* -algebra B is called *scattered* if B^{**} is a direct sum of type I factors, or equivalently, if B has a composition series in which each successive quotient is isomorphic to the C^* -algebra $K(H)$ of compact operators on some Hilbert space H ([16], [23]). A C^* -algebra B is called *dual* if it is isomorphic to a C^* -subalgebra of some $K(H)$, or equivalently, every maximal abelian subalgebra of A is generated by minimal projections [19], 4.7.20.

We wish to thank the referee for many helpful suggestions.

2. UNIQUE EXTENSIONS AND WEAK EXPECTATIONS

Let A be a C^* -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B and let M be a von Neumann algebra. A *weak expectation* for a $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : A \rightarrow M$ is a linear contraction $\mathcal{P} : B \rightarrow \overline{\pi(A)}$ satisfying $\mathcal{P}|_A = \pi$, where $\overline{\pi(A)}$ is the *weak**-closure of $\pi(A)$ in M . Given a factor state φ of A with GNS representation π_φ , Tsui ([31]) has shown that φ can be extended to a factor state of B if there is a weak expectation for π_φ . Tsui’s proof is based on Sakai’s lecture in the 1973 Wabash Conference. The connection between weak expectations and factor state extensions has been developed in fine detail by Archbold and Batty ([12]). We note that the normal extension $\bar{\pi} : A^{**} \rightarrow M$ of $\pi : A \rightarrow M$ factors through the isomorphism $A^{**}c(\pi) = A^{**}/\bar{\pi}^{-1}(0) \rightarrow \overline{\pi(A)}$ where $c(\pi) \in A^{**}$ is the central support of π . Therefore the existence of a weak expectation \mathcal{P} for π amounts to the existence of a contractive projection $\mathcal{Q} : B^{**} \rightarrow A^{**}c(\pi)$ such that $\bar{\pi} \circ \mathcal{Q}|_{A^{**}} = \bar{\pi}$, where \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} are related by $\mathcal{P} = \bar{\pi} \circ \mathcal{Q}|_B$. It follows that \mathcal{P} is completely positive and satisfies

$$\mathcal{P}(aba') = \pi(a)\mathcal{P}(b)\pi(a')$$

for $a, a' \in A$ and $b \in B$ (cf. [12], Proposition 2.1). In particular, the latter property implies that, if $\varphi \in S(A)$ has the GNS representation $(\pi_\varphi, H_\varphi, h_\varphi)$ and if \mathcal{P} is a weak expectation for π_φ , then the map $\mathcal{P} \mapsto \varphi \circ \mathcal{P} = \langle \mathcal{P}(\cdot)h_\varphi, h_\varphi \rangle$ is injective ([12], Corollary 2.2). We will sometimes substitute for the GNS representation π_φ its equivalent $\tau_\varphi : A \rightarrow A^{**}c(\varphi)$ where $\tau_\varphi(a) = ac(\varphi)$. The normal extension of τ_φ to A^{**} will also be denoted by τ_φ .

Given $\varphi \in S(A)$, the (possibly empty) convex set \mathcal{E}_φ of weak expectations for $\tau_\varphi : A \rightarrow A^{**}c(\varphi)$ is compact in the point-weak topology. Let $S_\varphi = \{\varphi \circ \mathcal{P} : \mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{E}_\varphi\}$. Then $S_\varphi \subset E_\varphi \equiv \{\psi \in S(B) : \psi|_A = \varphi\}$. If \mathcal{E}_φ is nonempty, we define a map $\alpha_\varphi : \mathcal{E}_\varphi \rightarrow S_\varphi$ by $\alpha_\varphi(\mathcal{P}) = \varphi \circ \mathcal{P}$. This notation is retained in the following two results of which we shall make frequent use.

THEOREM 2.1. ([31]) *Let A be a C^* -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B . If $\varphi \in F(A)$ and \mathcal{E}_φ is nonempty, then the extreme points of S_φ are factor states of B (extending φ).*

THEOREM 2.2. ([12]) *Let A be a C^* -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B . We have:*

(i) $\alpha_\varphi : \mathcal{E}_\varphi \rightarrow S_\varphi$ is an affine homeomorphism for every $\varphi \in S(A)$ with $\mathcal{E}_\varphi \neq \emptyset$;

(ii) for every $\varphi \in P(A)$, $\mathcal{E}_\varphi \neq \emptyset$ and $E_\varphi = S_\varphi$.

Proof. (i) This is [12], Corollary 2.2 as remarked above.

(ii) This is implicit in [12], Theorem 2.3. Indeed, given $\varphi \in P(A)$ with extension $\psi \in E_\varphi$, employing the usual GNS notation as above, the following identification (cf. [19], 2.10.2) may be made: $h_\varphi = h_\psi = h$ say, $H_\varphi = [\pi_\psi(A)h]$ and $\pi_\varphi(a) = \pi_\psi(a)|_{H_\varphi}$ for $a \in A$. Let E be the orthogonal projection of H_ψ onto H_φ . Then the map $\mathcal{Q} : B \rightarrow \pi_\varphi(\overline{A}) = B(H_\varphi)$ given by

$$\mathcal{Q}(b) = E\pi_\psi(b)E$$

is a weak expectation for π_φ with $\psi(b) = \langle \mathcal{Q}(b)h, h \rangle$. Hence $\mathcal{P} : B \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Q}} \overline{\pi_\varphi(A)} \xrightarrow{\text{iso}} A^{**}c(\varphi)$ is a weak expectation for τ_φ and $\psi = \varphi \circ \mathcal{P}$. ■

LEMMA 2.3. *Let M be a von Neumann subalgebra of a von Neumann algebra N where M is a factor containing the identity of N . Suppose each normal state of M extends to a unique normal factor state of N . Then N contains a unique minimal central projection z , and also $Mz = Nz$.*

Proof. By assumption, N has normal factor states and hence at least one minimal central projection z say.

We show that every normal state of Mz extends to a unique normal state of Nz which will yield $Mz = Nz$.

Let φ be a normal state of Mz and let $\bar{\varphi}$ be a normal state of Nz extending φ . Then $\bar{\varphi}$ extends to a unique normal state ψ of N given by $\psi(\cdot) = \bar{\varphi}(\cdot z)$. As $\psi(z) = 1$, ψ is a factor state of N . On the other hand, the normal state $\varphi(\cdot z)$ of M extends to a unique normal factor state ω of N , and as $\psi|M = \varphi(\cdot z)$, we have $\psi = \omega$ which gives $\bar{\varphi} = \omega|Nz$.

Finally, fix any normal state ψ of M with unique normal factor state extension ω on N . As M is a factor, it is isomorphic to Mz via the isomorphism $x \mapsto xz$. So there is a normal state φ on Mz such that $\psi(\cdot) = \varphi(\cdot z)$. By the above arguments, we have $\omega|Nz = \omega|Mz = \varphi$. So $\omega(z) = 1$ and $z = c(\omega)$. This shows that z is unique. ■

REMARK 2.4. We note that in Lemma 2.3, the algebra N need not be a factor. For example, let $N = (L^\infty(0, 1) \bar{\otimes} A) \oplus (1 \otimes A)$ where A is a factor, and let $M = \{(x, x) : x \in 1 \otimes A\}$. Then $1_N \in M \subset N$ and $Me = Ne$ where $e = (0, f)$ with f being the identity of $1 \otimes A$. We have that e is the unique minimal central projection of N and each normal state of M has a unique extension to a normal factor state of N .

THEOREM 2.5. *Let A be a C^* -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B . Then we have (i) \Rightarrow (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) in the following conditions:*

- (i) *each factor state of A has a unique extension to a state of B ;*
- (ii) *each factor state of A has a unique extension to a factor state of B ;*
- (iii) *there is a weak expectation $\mathcal{P} : B \rightarrow A^{**}$ for $A \hookrightarrow A^{**}$ such that for each $\varphi \in F(A)$ with an extension $\bar{\varphi} \in F(B)$, we have $\bar{\varphi} = \varphi \circ \mathcal{P}$.*

Proof. (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) Let $\varphi \in F(A)$ and let $\bar{\varphi} \in F(B)$ extend φ . Consider the inclusion

$$A^{**}c(\varphi) \hookrightarrow c(\varphi)B^{**}c(\varphi).$$

We show that every normal state ψ of $A^{**}c(\varphi)$ extends uniquely to a normal factor state of $c(\varphi)B^{**}c(\varphi)$. Such a state ψ may be identified with $\psi \in F(A)$ satisfying $c(\psi) = c(\varphi)$. Let $\bar{\psi} \in F(B)$ extend ψ . Then $\bar{\psi}$ acts on $c(\varphi)B^{**}c(\varphi)$ as a normal factor state (as $\bar{\psi}(c(\varphi)c(\bar{\psi})) = 1$) extending ψ on $A^{**}c(\varphi)$. Now let ω be any normal factor state of $c(\varphi)B^{**}c(\varphi)$ extending ψ . Then $\omega(zc(\varphi)) = 1$ for some minimal central projection z in B^{**} . Hence the unique normal extension of ω to B^{**} is supported by z and therefore is a factor state extending ψ and must equal $\bar{\psi}$ by (ii). So ψ extends uniquely to a normal factor state of $c(\varphi)B^{**}c(\varphi)$. Hence, by Lemma 2.3, we have $A^{**}c(\varphi)c(\bar{\varphi}) = c(\varphi)B^{**}c(\varphi)c(\bar{\varphi})$.

Consider the maps

$$\sigma : b \in B \mapsto c(\varphi)bc(\varphi)c(\bar{\varphi}) \in c(\varphi)B^{**}c(\varphi)c(\bar{\varphi});$$

$$\tau : x \in A^{**}c(\varphi) \longmapsto xc(\bar{\varphi}) \in A^{**}c(\varphi)c(\bar{\varphi})$$

and note that σ is a linear contraction, that τ is a $*$ -isomorphism since $A^{**}c(\varphi)$ is a factor, and that $\tau^{-1} \circ \sigma|_A = \tau_\varphi$. Hence $\mathcal{P}_\varphi = \tau^{-1} \circ \sigma : B \rightarrow A^{**}c(\varphi)$ is a weak expectation for τ_φ which, by (ii), Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 (i), is the unique such weak expectation. It now follows from [12], Theorem 2.6 that there is a weak expectation $\mathcal{P} : B \rightarrow A^{**}$ for $A \hookrightarrow A^{**}$. Hence $\tau_\varphi \circ \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_\varphi$ by uniqueness, so that

$$\varphi \circ \mathcal{P} = \varphi \circ \tau_\varphi \circ \mathcal{P} = \varphi \circ \mathcal{P}_\varphi = \bar{\varphi}$$

where the final equality comes from Theorem 2.1.

(iii) \Rightarrow (ii) Given (iii), by [12], Theorem 2.6 (4) \Rightarrow (3), together with Theorem 2.1 (see also [12], Proposition 2.5) each $\varphi \in F(A)$ has an extension in $F(B)$ from which (ii) is now immediate.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii) Take $\varphi \in F(A)$ with extension $\bar{\varphi} \in S(B)$. By an argument similar to that in the proof of (ii) \Rightarrow (iii), every normal state of $A^{**}c(\varphi)$ extends to a unique normal factor state of $c(\varphi)B^{**}c(\varphi)$ and therefore, as before, the map $\mathcal{P}_\varphi : B \rightarrow A^{**}c(\varphi)$ is a weak expectation for τ_φ . Hence $\bar{\varphi} \in F(B)$ by Theorem 2.1. ■

COROLLARY 2.6. *Let A be a C^* -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B . Suppose that A is a von Neumann algebra. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) every $\varphi \in F(A)$ has a unique extension to some $\bar{\varphi} \in F(B)$;
- (ii) there is a contractive projection $\mathcal{P} : B \rightarrow A$ such that for each $\varphi \in F(A)$ with an extension $\bar{\varphi} \in F(B)$, we have $\bar{\varphi} = \varphi \circ \mathcal{P}$.

Proof. Let $\pi : A \rightarrow \pi(A) \subset B(H)$ be a faithful normal representation. If each factor state of A extends to a unique factor state of B , then by Theorem 2.5 (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) and [12], Theorem 2.6 (4) \Rightarrow (3), there is a weak expectation $\mathcal{Q} : B \rightarrow \overline{\pi(A)} = \pi(A)$ for π . Then $\mathcal{P} = \pi^{-1} \circ \mathcal{Q}$ is a contractive projection from B onto A . The proof is concluded as in Theorem 2.5. ■

PROPOSITION 2.7. *Let A be a C^* -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B . Let $\varphi \in P(A)$ with an extension $\bar{\varphi} \in P(B)$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $\bar{\varphi}$ is the unique extension of φ ;
- (ii) $s(\varphi) = s(\bar{\varphi})$;
- (iii) $A^{**}c(\varphi)$ is an hereditary subalgebra of $B^{**}c(\bar{\varphi})$;
- (iv) there is a unique weak expectation $\mathcal{P}_\varphi : B \rightarrow A^{**}c(\varphi)$ for $\tau_\varphi : A \rightarrow A^{**}c(\varphi)$ where $\mathcal{P}_\varphi(b) = c(\varphi)bc(\varphi)$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) As $\bar{\varphi}(s(\varphi)) = 1$, we have $s(\bar{\varphi}) \leq s(\varphi)$ in B^{**} . If $s(\bar{\varphi}) \neq s(\varphi)$, we can choose $\tau \in S(B)$ such that $\tau(s(\varphi) - s(\bar{\varphi})) = 1$. Then $\tau(s(\varphi)) = 1$ and

$\tau(s(\bar{\varphi})) = 0$. In particular, $s(\tau|A) = s(\varphi)$, by minimality, so that $\tau|A = \varphi$ and hence that $\tau = \bar{\varphi}$ contradicting $\tau(s(\bar{\varphi})) = 0$. Hence $s(\bar{\varphi}) = s(\varphi)$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) Let $s(\varphi) = s(\bar{\varphi})$. Then $s(\varphi)$ lies in the weak*-closed ideal $A^{**} \cap B^{**}c(\bar{\varphi})$ as therefore does $c(\varphi)$. Hence $c(\varphi) \leq c(\bar{\varphi})$. Therefore $c(\varphi)B^{**}c(\varphi)$ is a type I factor which we may identify with some $B(H)$ and $A^{**}c(\varphi)$ accordingly with a type I subfactor M containing 1_H and a minimal projection e of $B(H)$. Let $z \in M'$ and let f be any minimal projection of M . Then f is minimal in $B(H)$ as it is equivalent to e in M . Therefore we have $zf = fzf \in \mathbb{C} \cdot f \subset M$. It follows that $z \in M$ and hence $M' = \mathbb{C} \cdot 1$ which gives $M = M'' = B(H)$, proving (iii).

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) and (iv). Given any extension τ of φ , we have $\tau(c(\varphi)) = 1$ so that

$$\tau(b) = \tau(c(\varphi)bc(\varphi)) = \varphi(c(\varphi)bc(\varphi)) = \bar{\varphi}(b)$$

for $b \in B$, proving (i) which implies that the map \mathcal{P}_φ in (iv) is a weak expectation. Its uniqueness then follows from Theorem 2.2.

(iv) \Rightarrow (i) Since (iv) implies that $c(\varphi)Bc(\varphi) \subset A^{**}c(\varphi)$, we see (i) follows as in the proof of (iii) \Rightarrow (i). ■

THEOREM 2.8. *Let A be a C^* -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) each $\varphi \in P(A)$ has a unique extension in $P(B)$;
- (ii) Each $\varphi \in F_1(A)$ has a unique extension in $S(B)$;
- (iii) each $\varphi \in F_1(A)$ has a unique extension in $F(B)$;
- (iv) each $\varphi \in F_1(A)$ has a unique extension in $F_1(B)$;
- (v) $A^{**}z_A$ is an l^∞ -sum of hereditary subalgebras of $B^{**}z_B$;
- (vi) there is a unique weak expectation $\mathcal{P} : B \rightarrow A^{**}z_A$ for the atomic representation τ_a of A and it is given by $\mathcal{P}(b) = \sum e_j b e_j$ for $b \in B$, where e_j are minimal central projections in $A^{**}z_A$ with $z_A = \sum e_j$;
- (vii) there is a contractive projection $\mathcal{Q} : B^{**} \rightarrow A^{**}z_A$ such that $\varphi \circ \mathcal{Q}$ is the unique extension in $S(B)$ of each $\varphi \in P(A)$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (v) Let (φ_j) be a family of mutually inequivalent pure states of A such that $z_A = \sum c(\varphi_j)$. By Proposition 2.7, we have

$$A^{**}z_A = \sum A^{**}c(\varphi_j) = \sum c(\varphi_j)B^{**}c(\varphi_j) \subset B^{**}z_B.$$

(v) \Rightarrow (ii) Let $\varphi \in F_1(A)$. Then $c(\varphi) = c(\psi)$ for some $\psi \in P(B)$ and (v) implies that $A^{**}c(\varphi) = A^{**}c(\psi) = c(\psi)B^{**}c(\psi) = c(\varphi)B^{**}c(\varphi)$ which in turn implies (ii).

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) \Rightarrow (iv) Given $\varphi \in F_1(A)$, then $A^{**}c(\varphi)$ is a type I factor and hence injective. So there is a weak expectation $\mathcal{P} : B \rightarrow A^{**}c(\varphi)$ for $A \rightarrow A^{**}c(\varphi)$

implying that φ has a factor state extension on B , by Theorem 2.1, some of which must be type I ([12], Theorem 3.2).

(iv) \Rightarrow (i) This is obvious.

(i) \Rightarrow (vi) By injectivity of $A^{**}z_A$, there is a weak expectation $\mathcal{P} : B \rightarrow A^{**}z_A$ for the atomic representation $\tau_a : A \rightarrow A^{**}z_A$. Let \mathcal{Q} be another weak expectation for τ_a . Then (i) implies that $\varphi \circ \mathcal{P} = \varphi \circ \mathcal{Q}$ for all $\varphi \in P(A)$ which gives $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Q}$ since $P(A)$ separates points of $A^{**}z_A$. Now the formula for \mathcal{P} is seen from the proof of (i) \Rightarrow (v).

(vi) \Rightarrow (i), (vii) For each $\varphi \in P(A)$, the condition (vi) implies that $A^{**}c(\varphi) = c(\varphi)B^{**}c(\varphi)$ from which (i) follows as in the proof of Proposition 2.7 (iv) \Rightarrow (i). In addition, we see that $\mathcal{Q}(b) = \sum e_i b e_i$ where the e_i are minimal central projections in A^{**} with $\sum e_i = z_A$ and $b \in B^{**}$, defines a contractive projection $\mathcal{Q} : B^{**} \rightarrow A^{**}z_A$ satisfying (vii). ■

By Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 2.8, we have

COROLLARY 2.9. *Let A be a type I C^* -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) A has the PEP in B ;
- (ii) each $\varphi \in F(A)$ has a unique extension to $\bar{\varphi} \in F(B)$;
- (iii) each $\varphi \in F(A)$ has a unique extension to $\bar{\varphi} \in S(B)$;
- (iv) there is a weak expectation $\mathcal{P} : B \rightarrow A^{**}$ for $A \hookrightarrow A^{**}$ such that $\varphi \circ \mathcal{P} \in F(B)$ is the unique extension of each $\varphi \in F(A)$.

REMARK 2.10. In (iv) of the above corollary, the weak expectation $\mathcal{P} : B \rightarrow A^{**}$ for $A \hookrightarrow A^{**}$ cannot be replaced by a contractive projection $B \rightarrow A$ even when A is liminal and separable, as may be seen by combining [5], Proposition 3.14 and the proof of [11], Theorem 2.1.

3. RELATIVE COMMUTANTS

Given a C^* -subalgebra A of a C^* -algebra B , we let

$$A^c = \{b \in B : ab = ba \ \forall a \in A\}$$

$$A^\perp = \{b \in B : bA = Ab = 0\}$$

denote respectively the *relative commutant* and the *annihilator* of A in B . The centre of A is denoted by $Z(A)$. For subsets S and T of B , we let $S \cdot T = \{st : s \in S, t \in T\}$ and let $[S]$ denote the norm closed linear span of S while $C^*(S)$ denotes the C^* -subalgebra generated by S . If $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, we will also write $C^*(S) = C^*(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let A be a prime C^* -subalgebra of a unital C^* -algebra B and let A have the PEP in B . Then we have $A^c = A^\perp + \mathbb{C} \cdot 1$.*

Proof. We show that the quotient A^c/A^\perp has no zero divisor and hence is one-dimensional.

For self-adjoint $x \in A^c$, we let $C_x = [A \cdot C^*(1, x)]$ and $J_x = [A \cdot C^*(x)]$. Then A has PEP in C_x .

Note that the pure states of C_x restrict to pure states of A . Indeed, given $\varphi \in P(C_x)$ with the GNS-representation $\pi_\varphi : C_x \rightarrow B(H_\varphi)$ and normal extension $\tilde{\pi}_\varphi$, then $\tilde{\pi}_\varphi(x) \in \mathbb{C} \cdot 1$ so that $\overline{\pi_\varphi(A)} = B(H_\varphi)$. But A and C_x have common approximate unit so that $\varphi|_A$ is a state, hence $\pi_\varphi|_A$ is irreducible and so $\varphi|_A \in P(A)$. By PEP, A separates points of $P(C_x) \cup \{0\}$. As J_x is a two-sided ideal of C_x , by [19], 11.1.3 and 11.1.7 the irreducible representations of J_x restrict to those of $A \cap J_x$. So $J_x = 0$ if $A \cap J_x = 0$.

Now take self-adjoint elements x and y in A^c such that $xy \in A^\perp$. Then $C^*(x) \cdot C^*(y) \cdot A = 0$. Hence $J_x \cdot J_y = 0$ and therefore $(A \cap J_x) \cap (A \cap J_y) = A \cap J_x \cap J_y = 0$ which implies either $A \cap J_x = 0$ or $A \cap J_y = 0$ because A is prime. It follows that $J_x = 0$ or $J_y = 0$, that is, $x \in A^\perp$ or $y \in A^\perp$. This shows that A^c/A^\perp has no zero divisor. ■

Given a proper C^* -subalgebra A of a C^* -algebra B , consider the weak*-compact convex set

$$S = \{f \in B^* : f = f^*, \|f\| \leq 1, f(A) = 0\}.$$

Let $g \in \partial S$ and let $g = g_1 - g_2$ be its orthogonal decomposition with $g_1, g_2 \geq 0$. Put $\tau = g_1 + g_2$. The following lemma is taken from Sakai's book ([28]).

LEMMA 3.2. *Let A, B and τ be as above and suppose that:*

- (i) *A and B have a common approximate unit;*
- (ii) *$Z(\overline{\pi_\tau(A)}) \subset Z(\overline{\pi_\tau(B)})$.*

Then $\overline{\pi_\tau(A)}$ is a nonzero factor.

Proof. The required argument is the same as in [28], 4.1.9 with lines 10–14 of that proof omitted. ■

THEOREM 3.3. *Let A be a C^* -subalgebra with PEP in a C^* -algebra B . Then:*

- (i) *$A \cdot A^c \subset A$;*
- (ii) *$A^c = Z(A)$ if A and B have a common approximate unit.*

Proof. (i) We may suppose that B has a unit. Let x be a self-adjoint element of A^c . We show that the C^* -algebra $E = [A \cdot C^*(1, x)]$ is equal to A . Suppose

that $A \neq E$. Let g, g_1, g_2 and τ be chosen as in the remarks preceding Lemma 3.2. We claim that $\overline{\pi_\tau(A)}$ is a nonzero factor. Indeed, it is evident that Condition (i) of Lemma 3.2 is satisfied. To see that Condition (ii) of Lemma 3.2 holds, we note that E is a two-sided ideal of $D = C^*(A \cup \{x\})$ so that $\pi_\tau : E \rightarrow B(H_\tau)$ extends to $\overline{\pi_\tau} : D \rightarrow B(H_\tau)$ with $\overline{\pi_\tau(D)} = \overline{\pi_\tau(E)}$. But $\overline{\pi_\tau(D)}$ is generated by $\overline{\pi_\tau(x)}$ and $\overline{\pi_\tau(A)}$, and the former lies in the commutant of the latter. Hence we have $Z(\overline{\pi_\tau(A)}) \subset Z(\overline{\pi_\tau(D)}) = Z(\overline{\pi_\tau(E)})$.

Therefore $\pi_\tau(A)$ is a prime C^* -algebra. But $\pi_\tau(A) = \overline{\pi_\tau(A)}$ has the PEP in $\overline{\pi_\tau(D)}$. Therefore $\pi_\tau(E) = \overline{\pi_\tau(E)} = [\overline{\pi_\tau(A)} \cdot C^*(1, \overline{\pi_\tau(x)})] = \pi_\tau(A)$ where the final equality comes from Lemma 3.1. Hence we have $E = A + \ker \pi_\tau$. As $g(\ker \pi_\tau) = 0$, this implies that $g(E) = 0$ which is a contradiction proving (i).

(ii) Let (a_λ) be a common approximate unit of A and B , and let $x \in A^c$. Then by (i), we have $x = \lim a_\lambda x \in A$. ■

A Banach space X is called a *Grothendieck space* ([18]) if each $\sigma(X^*, X)$ -convergent sequence in X^* is $\sigma(X^*, X^{**})$ -convergent. The quotient of a Grothendieck space is also a Grothendieck space. Pfitzner ([26]) has shown that every von Neumann algebra is a Grothendieck space. In Proposition 3.6 and Theorem 3.8 below, one can actually replace the von Neumann algebra M by a C^* -algebra A which is a Grothendieck space. The proofs, however, only make use of a weaker property that $\sigma(A^*, A)$ -convergent sequence of *positive* functionals is $\sigma(A^*, A^{**})$ -convergent. This fact has been proved by Akemann, Dodd and Gamlen ([3]) for von Neumann algebras.

LEMMA 3.4. *Let A be a dual C^* -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) A has the PEP in B ;
- (ii) the minimal projections of A are minimal in B ;
- (iii) A is a c_0 -sum of hereditary C^* -subalgebras of B .

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Let $p \in A$ be a minimal projection. Then $\mathbb{C} \cdot p$ has PEP in A . By Condition (i), $\mathbb{C} \cdot p$ has PEP in pBp and hence pBp can not have two distinct pure states. So $pBp = \mathbb{C} \cdot p$, that is, p is minimal in B .

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) By [19], 4.7.20, we may suppose that A is simple dual. In this case, it follows from Proposition 2.7 (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) that the type I factor $A^{**} = A^{**}z_A$ is an hereditary subalgebra of $B^{**}z_B$. Hence $A = A^{**} \cap B$ is an hereditary subalgebra of B .

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) Each pure state of A is supported by a hereditary subalgebra of B and hence has unique extension in $S(B)$. ■

LEMMA 3.5. *Let A be a separable C^* -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B and let B be a Grothendieck space. If A has the PEP in B , then A is scattered.*

Proof. By [17], Theorem 7 together with Theorem 2.7, it suffices to show that A is of type I. To this end let $\varphi, \psi \in P(A)$ be such that $\ker \pi_\varphi = \ker \pi_\psi$. By a theorem of Glimm (see [19], p. 190), it is sufficient to show that π_φ and π_ψ are equivalent. By [19], 3.4.2 (ii) and separability, φ is the w^* -limit of a sequence of pure states (ψ_n) associated with π_ψ . By [17], Lemma 1, we have $\bar{\varphi} = w^*\text{-lim } \bar{\psi}_n$ where $\bar{\tau} \in P(B)$ denotes the unique extension of $\tau \in P(A)$. As B is a Grothendieck space, this implies $\bar{\varphi} = \sigma(B^*, B^{**})\text{-lim } \bar{\psi}_n$ which gives $\varphi(c_\psi) = \bar{\varphi}(c_\psi) = \lim \bar{\psi}_n(c_\psi) = 1$. Hence $c(\varphi) = c(\psi)$ proving that π_φ and π_ψ are equivalent. ■

PROPOSITION 3.6. *Let A be a nonzero separable C^* -subalgebra of M/I where M is a von Neumann algebra and I is the norm-closed ideal of M such that M/I is antiliminal. Then A does not have PEP in M/I .*

In particular, no nonzero separable C^ -subalgebra of the Calkin algebra $B(H)/K(H)$ has the PEP in $B(H)/K(H)$.*

Proof. Suppose otherwise, then by Lemma 3.5, A must contain a nonzero simple dual ideal which necessarily has the PEP in M/I . Now Lemma 3.4 contradicts the fact that M/I is antiliminal. ■

LEMMA 3.7. *Let A be a separable C^* -algebra acting irreducibly on a Hilbert space H . If A has the PEP in $B(H)$, then $A = K(H)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.5, A is type I and so contains $K(H)$ which implies that $A/K(H)$ has the PEP in $B(H)/K(H)$. Hence $A = K(H)$ by Proposition 3.6. ■

The following extends Theorem 6 and Theorem 7 of [17].

THEOREM 3.8. *Let A be a separable C^* -subalgebra of a von Neumann algebra M . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) A has the PEP in M ;
- (ii) every $\varphi \in F(A)$ has unique extension in $S(M)$;
- (iii) every $\varphi \in F(A)$ has unique extension in $\overline{F(M)}$;
- (iv) every $\varphi \in F(A)$ has unique extension in $F(M)$;
- (v) A is a dual C^* -algebra and each minimal projection of A is minimal in M ;
- (vi) A is a c_o -sum of hereditary subalgebras of M .

Proof. In view of Corollary 2.9 and Lemma 3.4, it is sufficient to show that (i) implies that A is dual.

By Lemma 3.5, Condition (i) implies that there is a sequence (z_n) of orthogonal central projections in the weak*-closure \bar{A} with $\bar{A} = \left(\bigoplus_n \bar{A}z_n\right)_{l_\infty}$ where each $\bar{A}z_n$ is a type I factor. As A has the PEP in \bar{A} , each Az_n has the PEP in $\bar{A}z_n$ implying that Az_n is simple dual, by Lemma 3.7, contained in A by Theorem 3.3 (i). Let $D = \left(\bigoplus_n Az_n\right)_{c_0}$ which is a dual C^* -subalgebra of A . We show that $A = D$. It is evident if (z_n) is finite. Suppose (z_n) is infinite. Let $a \in A$. If $\|az_n\| \not\rightarrow 0$, then passing to a subsequence and scaling, we may suppose that $\|az_n\| \geq 1$ for all n . Given any subset $\alpha \subset \mathbb{N}$, let $a_\alpha = \left(\bigoplus_{n \in \alpha} az_n\right)_{l_\infty} = a \left(\bigoplus_{n \in \alpha} z_n\right)_{l_\infty}$ which is in A by Theorem 3.3 (i). But for $\alpha, \beta \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$, we have $\|a_\alpha - a_\beta\| \geq 1$. This contradicts separability. Therefore $\|az_n\| \rightarrow 0$ and so $a = \left(\bigoplus_n az_n\right)_{c_0} \in D$. Hence $A = D$ and the proof is complete. ■

4. ATOMIC EXTENSIONS

Let A be a C^* -algebra and let $K \subset S(A)$. We define the σ -convex hull of K to be the following set in which the sum is norm-convergent:

$$\sigma(K) = \left\{ \sum \lambda_n \varphi_n : \varphi \in K, \lambda_n \geq 0, \sum \lambda_n = 1 \right\}.$$

We have $\sigma(P(A)) = \{\varphi \in S(A) : \varphi(z_A) = 1\}$, the set of *atomic states* of A which identifies with the normal state space of $A^{**}z_A$. It is more generally true that the normal state space of an atomic von Neumann algebra is the σ -convex hull of its pure normal states. We have $F_1(A) \subset \sigma(P(A))$. In fact, a state lies in $F_1(A)$ if and only if it is a σ -convex sum of equivalent pure states ([13]). In particular, $F_1(A)$ consists precisely of the atomic factor states of A . As a natural development of previous sections, we shall consider the general question of unique extension of atomic states.

Let A be a C^* -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra B . We say that A has the *atomic extension property* (AEP) in B if each atomic state of A has unique extension to an atomic state of B . Note that AEP implies PEP.

It is evident that every atomic state of A extends to an atomic state of B . In particular, if A is a hereditary subalgebra of B , then A has the AEP in B . However, this may not be true if A is the sum of two orthogonal hereditary subalgebras of B because, for instance, when A is finite-dimensional, the AEP in B implies unique extension of states of A .

Let \hat{A} and $\text{Prim } A$ denote the space of equivalence classes of irreducible representations of A and the primitive ideal space of A . In notation, we shall not

distinguish between an irreducible representation of A and its equivalence class. Recall that the canonical surjections ([26], 4.2.12, 4.3.3)

$$\varphi \in P(A) \rightarrow \pi_\varphi \in \widehat{A}, \quad \pi \in \widehat{A} \rightarrow \ker \pi \in \text{Prim } A$$

are open and continuous.

Let A have the PEP in B and let

$$\alpha : \varphi \in P(A) \rightarrow \overline{\varphi} \in P(B)$$

denote the unique extension map.

Let $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in P(A)$.

(a) If φ_1 and φ_2 are equivalent, then $\varphi_1(\cdot) = \varphi_2(a \cdot a^*)$ for some $a \in A$. By PEP, we have $\overline{\varphi}_1(\cdot) = \overline{\varphi}_2(a \cdot a^*)$. Hence $\overline{\varphi}_1$ and $\overline{\varphi}_2$ are equivalent. This gives rise to the mapping

$$\widehat{\alpha} : \pi_\varphi \in \widehat{A} \rightarrow \pi_{\overline{\varphi}} \in \widehat{B} \quad (\varphi \in P(A)).$$

(b) If $\ker \pi_{\varphi_1} = \ker \pi_{\varphi_2}$, then φ_2 is a weak*-limit of pure states equivalent to φ_1 by [19], 3.4.3. By (a), together with the continuity of α ([17], Lemma 1), $\overline{\varphi}_2$ is a weak*-limit of pure states equivalent to $\overline{\varphi}_1$ from which it follows that $\ker \pi_{\overline{\varphi}_1} \subset \ker \overline{\varphi}_2$ and hence that $\ker \pi_{\overline{\varphi}_1} \subset \ker \pi_{\overline{\varphi}_2}$ ([19], 2.4.11). Therefore $\ker \pi_{\overline{\varphi}_1} = \ker \pi_{\overline{\varphi}_2}$. Thus the mapping

$$\check{\alpha} : \ker \pi_\varphi \in \text{Prim } A \rightarrow \ker \pi_{\overline{\varphi}} \in \text{Prim } B \quad (\varphi \in P(A))$$

is well-defined.

Retaining the above notation, we have

PROPOSITION 4.1. *If A has the PEP in B , then the following*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} P(A) & \longrightarrow & \widehat{A} & \longrightarrow & \text{Prim } A \\ \alpha \downarrow & & \widehat{\alpha} \downarrow & & \check{\alpha} \downarrow \\ P(B) & \longrightarrow & \widehat{B} & \longrightarrow & \text{Prim } B \end{array}$$

is a commutative diagram of continuous maps, where the horizontal maps are the canonical ones.

Proof. The maps $\widehat{\alpha}$ and $\check{\alpha}$ are continuous because α is continuous and the horizontal maps are open and continuous surjections. ■

If A has PEP in B , we shall write

$$P_A(B) = \{\psi \in P(B) : \psi|_A \in P(A)\}.$$

A subset $K \subset P(B)$ is said to be *saturated* if K is a union of equivalence classes of pure states in $P(B)$.

THEOREM 4.2. *Let A have the PEP in B . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) A has the atomic extension property in B ;
- (ii) each atomic state of A has unique extension in $S(B)$;
- (iii) $A^{**}z_A$ is a hereditary subalgebra of $B^{**}z_B$;
- (iv) $c(\varphi) = c(\bar{\varphi})z_A$ for all $\varphi \in P(A)$ with extension $\bar{\varphi} \in P(B)$;
- (v) $\hat{\alpha} : \hat{A} \rightarrow \hat{B}$ is injective;
- (vi) $\sigma(P_A(B))$ is a norm-closed face of $S(B)$.

Proof. Given $\varphi \in P(A)$, let $\bar{\varphi} \in P(B)$ be its unique extension.

(i) \Rightarrow (iii) $A^{**}z_A$ and $z_AB^{**}z_A$ have the same predual and hence are equal.

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv) By the proof of Proposition 2.7, condition (iii) implies that for $\varphi \in P(A)$, $c(\bar{\varphi})z_A$ is a minimal central projection of $z_AB^{**}z_A = A^{**}z_A$ majorising, and hence being equal to, $c(\varphi)$.

(iv) \Rightarrow (v) This is obvious.

(v) \Rightarrow (iii) \Rightarrow (vi) Let $\hat{\alpha}$ be injective. Write $z_A = \sum c(\varphi_i)$ where (φ_i) is a family of mutually inequivalent pure states of A . By assumption, the $c(\bar{\varphi}_i)$ are mutually orthogonal, and each $c(\varphi_i) \leq c(\bar{\varphi}_i)$ by the proof of Proposition 2.7. It follows from this and Proposition 2.7 (i) \Rightarrow (iv) that

$$z_AB^{**}z_A = \sum c(\varphi_i)B^{**}c(\varphi_i) = \sum A^{**}c(\varphi_i) = A^{**}z_A,$$

giving (iii). In turn, this identifies $P_A(B)$ with the set of all pure normal states of $z_AB^{**}z_A$. Hence we have $\sigma(P_A(B)) = \{\psi \in S(B) : \psi(z_A) = 1\}$.

(vi) \Rightarrow (ii) Put $K = P_A(B)$. We have $\psi(z_A) = 1$ for all $\psi \in \sigma(K)$. Assuming (v), by [15], p. 245, we have $\sigma(K) = \{\psi \in S(B) : \psi(e) = 1\}$ for some projection $e \leq z_A$ in B^{**} . But Proposition 2.7 implies that $s(\varphi) = s(\bar{\varphi}) \leq e$ for all $\varphi \in P(A)$, from which we deduce that $e = z_A$. Hence $\psi \in S(B)$ lies in $\sigma(K)$ if and only if $\psi|_A$ is an atomic state.

Let φ be an atomic state of A and let $\psi \in S(B)$ be an extension of φ . We may write φ as a σ -convex sum of a sequence of pure states of A . Partitioning these pure states by equivalence classes, we may organise φ as a sum $\varphi = \sum_n \alpha_n \varphi_n$ where (α_n) is a finite or infinite sequence of positive real numbers and (φ_n) a

mutually disjoint sequence in $F_1(A)$ (cf. [13]). By Theorem 2.8, each φ_n has a unique extension to $\bar{\varphi}_n \in S(B)$. We claim that $\psi = \sum_n \alpha_n \bar{\varphi}_n$.

By earlier argument, we have $\psi = \sum_1^\infty \lambda_n \bar{\tau}_n$ for some $\lambda_n \geq 0$ with $\sum \lambda_n = 1$ and $\tau_n \in P(A)$. Hence

$$\sum_n \alpha_n \varphi_n = \sum_n \lambda_n \tau_n.$$

For each m and n , we have $c(\tau_n) = c(\varphi_m)$ or $c(\tau_n)c(\varphi_m) = 0$. Thus, putting for each m , $S_m = \{n : c(\tau_n) = c(\varphi_m)\}$, we have, for $x \in A$,

$$\alpha_m \varphi_m(x) = \sum_n \alpha_n \varphi_n(xc(\varphi_m)) = \sum_n \lambda_n \tau_n(xc(\varphi_m)) = \sum_{n \in S_m} \lambda_n \tau_n(x),$$

so that $\alpha_m^{-1} \sum_{n \in S_m} \lambda_n \bar{\tau}_n \in S(B)$ extends φ_m and therefore equals $\bar{\varphi}_m$. It follows that $\psi = \sum_n \alpha_n \bar{\varphi}_n$ as required. ■

REMARK 4.3. We are grateful to the referee for indicated to us condition (ii) in Theorem 4.2.

COROLLARY 4.4. *Let A have the PEP in B . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $P_A(B)$ is saturated;
- (ii) $c(\varphi) = c(\bar{\varphi})$ for every $\varphi \in P(A)$;
- (iii) $\sigma(P_A(B))$ is a split face of $S(B)$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Let $\varphi \in P(A)$ with extension $\bar{\varphi} \in P(B)$. By Proposition 2.7 (iii), we have $A^{**}c(\varphi) = c(\varphi)B^{**}c(\varphi) \subset B^{**}c(\bar{\varphi})$. Let e be a minimal projection of $B^{**}c(\bar{\varphi})$. Then $e = s(\psi)$ for some $\psi \in P(B)$ and $c(\bar{\varphi}) = c(\psi)$. As $P_A(B)$ is saturated, we have $\psi|_A \in P(A)$ so that $e \in A^{**}$ by Proposition 2.7 (ii). Therefore $B^{**}c(\bar{\varphi}) \subset A^{**}$ and $c(\bar{\varphi})$ must be a minimal central projection in A^{**} implying that $c(\bar{\varphi}) = c(\varphi)$. It follows that z_A is in the centre of B^{**} .

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) We have $c(\varphi) = c(\bar{\varphi})$ for every $\varphi \in P(A)$ and hence the proof of Theorem 4.2 gives

$$\sigma(P_A(B)) = \{\psi \in S(B) : \psi(z_A) = 1\}$$

which is a split face of $S(B)$ ([15], p. 245).

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) Let $\sigma(P_A(B))$ be a split face of $S(B)$. Then Theorem 4.2 together with [15], p. 245 implies that A has the atomic extension property in B and that z_A is a central projection in $B^{**}z_B$. Therefore, if $\psi \in P(B)$ is equivalent to a state in $P_A(B)$, then $\psi|_A$ must be atomic and ψ its unique extension, forcing $\psi|_A \in P(A)$ so that $\psi \in P_A(B)$. So $P_A(B)$ is saturated. ■

We remark that the map $\widehat{\alpha} : \widehat{A} \rightarrow \widehat{B}$ may be injective without being an *embedding* (i.e. $\widehat{\alpha}$ may not be a homeomorphism onto $\widehat{\alpha}(\widehat{A})$). In fact, it is possible for $\widehat{\alpha}$ to be a bijection without being a homeomorphism even when B is separable type I and A is abelian, as is shown by the following example.

EXAMPLE 4.5. Let H be an infinite dimensional separable Hilbert space. Let e be a minimal projection in $B(H)$ and let M be a maximal abelian von Neumann subalgebra of $(1 - e)B(H)(1 - e)$ without atomic part. Choose (as we may) a separable weak*-dense C^* -subalgebra D of M containing $1 - e$. Put $A = D + \mathbb{C} \cdot e$ and $B = D + K$ where $K = K(H)$. Then $1 \in A \subset B$ where A is abelian and B is separable of type I, and A has the PEP in B . To see the latter, let $\varphi \in P(A)$ and let $\overline{\varphi} \in P(B)$ be an extension of φ . If $\varphi(e) = 1$, then $\overline{\varphi}$ is concentrated on K and is clearly the *unique* extension of φ . Otherwise $\varphi(e) = 0$ in which case, to show that $\overline{\varphi}$ is unique, it is enough to show that $\overline{\varphi}(K) = 0$. But, if $\overline{\varphi}(K) \neq 0$, then $\overline{\varphi}$ has unique extension to a pure normal state ψ of $B(H)$. This leads to the contradiction that $\psi|_M$ is a pure normal state of M . Indeed, given $\psi|_M = 1/2(\psi_1 + \psi_2)$ with $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in S(M)$, then ψ_1, ψ_2 are normal and $\psi_1|_A = \psi_2|_A = \varphi$, so that $\psi_1 = \psi_2$, as required, since D is weak*-dense in M . The map $\check{\alpha} : \text{Prim}(A) \rightarrow \text{Prim}(B)$ is a bijection given by $\check{\alpha}(Q + \mathbb{C} \cdot e) = Q + K$ for each $Q \in \text{Prim}(D)$ and $\check{\alpha}(D) = \{0\}$. However, as B is not liminal, $\text{Prim}(B)$ is not Hausdorff so $\widehat{\alpha} (= \check{\alpha})$ is not a homeomorphism.

On the other hand, we have the following result.

PROPOSITION 4.6. *Let A have the PEP in B with $P_A(B)$ saturated. Then $\widehat{\alpha} : \widehat{A} \rightarrow \widehat{B}$ is an embedding.*

Proof. We note that $\widehat{\alpha}$ is injective by Corollary 4.4 (i) \Rightarrow (iii) and Theorem 4.2 (vi) \Rightarrow (v). Let \mathcal{I} be a closed two-sided ideal of A and put $\mathcal{J} = \bigcap \{ \ker \pi_{\overline{\varphi}} : \varphi \in P(A), \varphi(\mathcal{I}) = 0 \}$, where $\overline{\varphi} \in P(B)$ denotes the unique extension of $\varphi \in P(A)$. We have $c(\varphi) = c(\overline{\varphi})$ for each $\varphi \in P(A)$ by the proof of Corollary 4.4. It follows that $\mathcal{I} = A \cap \mathcal{J}$. Thus, for $\varphi \in P(A)$, we have $\pi_{\varphi}(\mathcal{I}) \neq \{0\}$ if and only if $\pi_{\overline{\varphi}}(\mathcal{J}) \neq \{0\}$. Hence $\widehat{\alpha}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}) = \widehat{\mathcal{J}} \cap \widehat{\alpha}(\widehat{A})$ which, together with Proposition 4.1, proves that $\widehat{\alpha} : \widehat{A} \rightarrow \widehat{\alpha}(\widehat{A})$ is a homeomorphism. ■

Given a C^* -algebra A , let $\text{Ideal}(A)$ denote the set of all norm-closed two-sided ideals of A .

PROPOSITION 4.7. *Let A have PEP in B and let $\hat{\alpha} : \hat{A} \rightarrow \hat{B}$ be a homeomorphism. Then the map $\beta : \mathcal{I} \in \text{Ideal}(A) \mapsto \mathcal{I}_B \in \text{Ideal}(B)$ is a bijection with inverse $\mathcal{J} \in \text{Ideal}(B) \mapsto \mathcal{J} \cap A \in \text{Ideal}(A)$ where \mathcal{I}_B is the norm-closed two-sided ideal in B generated by \mathcal{I} . Moreover, $\beta|_{\text{Prim}(A)} = \hat{\alpha} : \text{Prim}(A) \rightarrow \text{Prim}(B)$, which is also a homeomorphism.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I} \in \text{Ideal}(A)$. By assumption, $\hat{\alpha}(\hat{\mathcal{I}}) = \hat{\mathcal{J}}$ for some $\mathcal{J} \in \text{Ideal}(B)$. For $\varphi \in P(A)$, with unique extension $\bar{\varphi} \in P(B)$, we have $\varphi(\mathcal{I}) = 0$ if and only if $\bar{\varphi}(\mathcal{J}) = 0$; but $\bar{\varphi}(\mathcal{J}) = 0$ if and only if $\varphi(A \cap \mathcal{J}) = 0$. Hence $A \cap \mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}$. In particular $\mathcal{I}_B \subset \mathcal{J}$. Let $\pi \in \hat{B}$ with $\pi(\mathcal{I}_B) = 0$. By assumption, π is equivalent to $\pi_{\bar{\varphi}}$ for some $\varphi \in P(A)$. We have $\bar{\varphi}(\mathcal{I}_B) = 0$ so that $\varphi(\mathcal{I}) = 0$ and hence $\bar{\varphi}(\mathcal{J}) = 0$ which implies $\pi(\mathcal{J}) = 0$. Hence $\mathcal{I}_B = \mathcal{J}$. Given $K \in \text{Ideal}(B)$, a simple argument gives $K = (K \cap A)_B$, proving the first statement.

For $\varphi \in P(A)$, we have $A \cap \ker \pi_{\bar{\varphi}} \subset \ker \pi_{\varphi} = \mathcal{I}$, say, as π_{φ} is equivalent to a subrepresentation of $\pi_{\bar{\varphi}}|_A$. By the first part of the proof, $\varphi(\mathcal{I}) = 0$ implies $\bar{\varphi}(\mathcal{I}_B) = 0$. So

$$\mathcal{I} = A \cap \mathcal{I}_B \subset A \cap \ker \pi_{\bar{\varphi}} \subset \mathcal{I}$$

which gives $\mathcal{I}_B = \ker \pi_{\bar{\varphi}}$ since β^{-1} is injective. ■

REMARK 4.8. Let A have the PEP in B .

(a) It follows from Proposition 2.7, Theorem 4.2 and Corollary 4.4 (cf. [5], Proposition 2.24) that the following are equivalent:

- (i) $\hat{\alpha} : \hat{A} \rightarrow \hat{B}$ is a homeomorphism and z_A is a central projection in B^{**} ;
- (ii) $A^{**}z_A = B^{**}z_B$;
- (iii) A separates $P(B) \cup \{0\}$;
- (b) $\hat{\alpha} : \hat{A} \rightarrow \hat{B}$ may be a homeomorphism without $P_A(B)$ being saturated.

For example, if B is nonabelian, choose $\psi \in P(B)$ which is not a homomorphism and put $A = L_{\psi} \cap L_{\psi}^*$ where $L_{\psi} = \{x \in B : \psi(x^*x) = 0\}$. Restriction induces a homeomorphism $\hat{B} \rightarrow \hat{A}$ ([25], 4.1.0), the inverse of which is $\hat{\alpha}$. As $z_A = z_B - s(\psi)$ is not central in B^{**} , $P_A(B)$ is not saturated by Corollary 4.4. In Example 4.10 we will give another example in which $1 \in A \subset B$.

Given a C^* -algebra A , let

$$A_c = \{x \in A^{**}z_A : x, x^*x \text{ and } xx^* \text{ are continuous on } P(A) \cup \{0\}\}.$$

Then A_c is a C^* -algebra with an approximate unit in common with A and, when A is identified with Az_A , satisfies the following conditions ([5], 2.9):

- (i) A has the PEP in A_c .
- (ii) $P_A(A_c)$ is saturated and dense in $P(A_c)$.

PROPOSITION 4.9. *Let A have the atomic extension property in B .*

(i) *If all primitive quotients of B are scattered, then A is a hereditary subalgebra of B .*

(ii) *If all primitive quotients of A are scattered and if $\widehat{\alpha} : \widehat{A} \rightarrow \widehat{B}$ is a homeomorphism, then A is a hereditary subalgebra of B .*

Proof. (i) Let all primitive quotients of B be scattered and note that this condition is inherited by $H(A)$, the hereditary C^* -subalgebra of B generated by A . Note also that A has the AEP in $H(A)$. Thus, cutting down to $H(A)$, we may suppose that A and B have common approximate unit. Let $\psi \in P(B)$. Then $Ac(\psi)$ has the AEP in $Bc(\psi)$ and they have common approximate unit. But $Bc(\psi)$ is scattered, as therefore is $Ac(\psi)$, and so every state of $Ac(\psi)$ has unique extension to a state of $Bc(\psi)$. Hence $Ac(\psi) = Bc(\psi)$ by [22]. So $A^{**}c(\psi) = B^{**}c(\psi)$ is a type I factor implying that $c(\psi)z_A \neq 0$. It follows that $c(\psi) = c(\overline{\varphi}) \geq c(\varphi)$ for some $\varphi \in P(A)$ with extension $\overline{\varphi} \in P(B)$ (using the proof of Proposition 2.7) so that $A^{**}c(\varphi) = B^{**}c(\varphi)$ and we deduce that $c(\varphi)$ is central in B^{**} and in turn, that $c(\psi) = c(\varphi)$. Therefore $A^{**}z_A = B^{**}z_B$ and so A separates $P(B) \cup \{0\}$ (cf. Remark 4.8). Hence $A = B$ by Kaplansky's theorem ([19], 11.1.8), as B is type I.

(ii) The inclusions $A \hookrightarrow H(A)$ and $H(A) \hookrightarrow B$ exhibit the AEP. Let $\widehat{\alpha}_1 : \widehat{A} \rightarrow \widehat{H(A)}$ and $\widehat{\alpha}_2 : \widehat{H(A)} \rightarrow \widehat{B}$ be the corresponding continuous maps given by Proposition 4.1, both of which are injective, by Theorem 4.2, and hence bijective as $\widehat{\alpha} = \widehat{\alpha}_2 \circ \widehat{\alpha}_1$. Therefore $\widehat{\alpha}_1$ is a homeomorphism. Consequently we may suppose that $H(A) = B$.

Let $\psi \in P(B)$. Then $c(\psi) = c(\overline{\varphi})$ for some $\overline{\varphi} \in P(B)$ with $\varphi = \overline{\varphi}|_A \in P(A)$, by assumption. As in (i), $Ac(\psi)$, $Bc(\psi)$ have common approximate unit and $Ac(\psi)$ has AEP in $Bc(\psi)$. But $Ac(\psi)$ is scattered as $\ker \pi_\psi \cap A = \ker \pi_{\overline{\varphi}} \cap A = \ker \pi_\varphi$ by Proposition 4.7, and so $Ac(\psi) = Bc(\psi)$. Hence all the primitive quotients of B are scattered and the result follows from (i). ■

Regarding Proposition 4.9, if either A or B is liminal, then its primitive quotients are automatically scattered. We conclude with an example which shows that a slight relaxation in the conditions can render both parts of Proposition 4.9 false. To this end we exhibit below two unequal primitive type I C^* -algebras A and B such that $1 \in A \subset B$, A has the AEP in B and $\widehat{\alpha} : \widehat{A} \rightarrow \widehat{B}$ is a homeomorphism.

EXAMPLE 4.10. Let $D = C[0, 1]$ and embed D^{**} as a von Neumann subalgebra of some $B(H)$, with the same identity, such that all minimal projections of D^{**} are properly infinite in $B(H)$. Put $K = K(H)$ and let zD^{**} ($\neq D^{**}$) be the atomic part of D^{**} . We note that zKz is a hereditary C^* -subalgebra of $B = D + K$ and is an ideal of the C^* -algebra $A = D + zKz$. Further, as $D^{**} \cap K = \{0\}$, the map

$A \rightarrow zB(H)z : a \mapsto az$ is faithful, inducing a faithful irreducible representation $A \rightarrow B(zH)$. In particular, A and B are primitive type I with $1 \in A \not\subseteq B$. We claim that A has the PEP in B .

Indeed, let $\varphi \in P(A)$ with extension $\bar{\varphi} \in P(B)$. As zKz is hereditary in B , we may suppose to establish uniqueness of $\bar{\varphi}$ that $\varphi(zKz) = 0$. If $\bar{\varphi}(K) \neq 0$, then $\bar{\varphi}$ extends to a vector state $\omega_h = \langle \cdot, h \rangle$ on $B(H)$, in which case, $\omega_h|_{D^{**}}$ is a normal extension of $\varphi|_D \in P(D)$ which implies that $\omega_h(z) = 1$ and hence that $\omega_h(K) = \omega_h(zKz) = \varphi(zKz) = 0$. This contradiction proves that $\bar{\varphi}(K) = 0$ and in turn that A has the PEP in B , as claimed. Finally, by Theorem 4.2 (v) \Rightarrow (i), A has the AEP in B because the map $\hat{\alpha} = \check{\alpha} : \text{Prim } A \rightarrow \text{Prim } B$ is given by $\check{\alpha}(0) = 0$ and $\check{\alpha}(Q + zKz) = Q + K$ for each $Q \in \text{Prim } D$, which is easily seen to be a homeomorphism.

REFERENCES

1. C.A. AKEMANN, The general Stone-Weierstrass problem, *J. Funct. Anal.* **4**(1969), 277–294.
2. C.A. AKEMANN, J. ANDERSON, G.K. PEDERSEN, Diffuse sequences and perfect C^* -algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **298**(1986), 747–762.
3. C.A. AKEMANN, P.G. DODD, J.L.B. GAMLEN, Weak compactness in the dual of a C^* -algebra, *J. Funct. Anal.* **10**(1972), 446–450.
4. C.A. AKEMANN, G.K. PEDERSEN, Ideal perturbations of elements in C^* -algebras, *Math. Scand.* **41**(1977), 117–139.
5. C.A. AKEMANN, F.W. SHULTZ, *Perfect C^* -Algebras*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 55, 1985.
6. E.M. ALFSEN, T.B. ANDERSEN, Split faces of compact convex sets, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) **21**(1970), 415–442.
7. E.M. ALFSEN, H. HANCHE-OLSEN, F.W. SHULTZ, State spaces of C^* -algebras, *Acta Math.* **144**(1980), 267–305.
8. J. ANDERSON, Extensions, restrictions and representations of states of C^* -algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **249**(1979), 303–329.
9. R.J. ARCHBOLD, Extensions of states of C^* -algebras, *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) **21**(1980), 351–354.
10. R.J. ARCHBOLD, On factorial states of operator algebras, *J. Funct. Anal.* **55**(1984), 25–38.
11. R.J. ARCHBOLD, On perfect C^* -algebras, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **97**(1986), 413–417.
12. R.J. ARCHBOLD, C.J.K. BATTY, Extensions of factorial states of C^* -algebras, *J. Funct. Anal.* **63**(1985), 86–100.
13. R.J. ARCHBOLD, C.J.K. BATTY, On factorial states of C^* -algebras. II, *J. Operator Theory* **13**(1985), 131–142.
14. R.J. ARCHBOLD, J.W. BUNCE, K.D. GREGSON, Extensions of states of C^* -algebras. II, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **92**(1982), 113–122.
15. L. ASIMOW, A.J. ELLIS, *Convexity and its Applications in Functional Analysis*, Academic Press, London 1980.

16. C.-H. CHU, A note on scattered C^* -algebras and the Radon-Nikodym property, *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* **24**(1981), 533–536.
17. C.-H. CHU, M. KUSUDA, On factor states of C^* -algebras and their extensions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **124**(1996), 207–215.
18. J. DIESTEL, Grothendieck Spaces and Cector Measures, in *Vector and Operator-valued Measures and Applications*, Academic Press, New York, 1973, pp. 97–108.
19. J. DIXMIER, *C^* -Algebras*, North-Holland, New York 1982.
20. K.D. GREGSON, Extension of pure states of C^* -algebras, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Aberdeen, 1986.
21. R.V. KADISON, I.M. SINGER, Extensions of pure states, *Amer. J. Math.* **81**(1959), 383–400.
22. M. KUSUDA, Unique state extension and hereditary C^* -subalgebras, *Math. Ann.* **288**(1990), 201–209.
23. H.E. JENSEN, Scattered C^* -algebras, *Math. Scand.* **41**(1977), 308–314.
24. R. LONGO, Solution of the factorial Stone-Weierstrass conjecture, an application of standard split W^* -inclusions, *Invent. Math.* **26**(1984), 145–155.
25. G.K. PEDERSEN, *C^* -Algebras and their Automorphism Groups*, Academic Press, 1979.
26. H. PFITZNER, Weak compactness in the dual of a C^* -algebra is determined commutatively, *Math. Ann.* **298**(1994), 349–371.
27. S. POPA, Semiregular maximal abelian $*$ -subalgebras and the solution to the factor state Stone-Weierstrass problem, *Invent. Math.* **298**(1984), 157–161.
28. S. SAKAI, *C^* -Algebras and W^* -Algebras*, Springer-Verlag, New York 1971.
29. F.W. SHULTZ, Pure states as a dual object for C^* -algebras, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **82**(1982), 497–509.
30. M. TAKESAKI, *Theory of Operator Algebras. I*, Springer-Verlag, New York 1979.
31. S.-K. TSUI, Factor state extension on nuclear C^* -algebras, *Yokohama Math. J.* **29**(1981), 157–160.
32. S. WRIGHT, On factorial states, *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* **12**(1982), 569–579.

L.J. BUNCE
 Department of Mathematics
 University of Reading
 Reading RG6 2AX
 ENGLAND

C.-H. CHU
 Goldsmiths College
 University of London
 London SE14 6NW
 ENGLAND

Received October 11, 1996.