

# LOCAL BOUNDARY REPRESENTATIONS FOR LOCAL OPERATOR SYSTEMS

MARIA JOIȚA

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we show that the local boundary representations of a local operator system in a Fréchet locally  $C^*$ -algebra on quantized Fréchet domains introduced by Arunkumar [6] are in fact local boundary representations on Hilbert spaces. Thus, the study of local boundary representations for local operator systems in Fréchet locally  $C^*$ -algebras on quantized Fréchet domains is reduced to the study of boundary representations for operator systems.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

An operator system is a self-adjoint linear subspace  $\mathcal{S}$  of a unital  $C^*$ -algebra that contains the unit. A boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}$  is an irreducible representation of  $C^*(\mathcal{S})$ , the  $C^*$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{S}$ , whose restriction to  $\mathcal{S}$  has the unique extension property. These are the objects that generalize points of the Choquet boundary of a function system in  $C(X)$ , the  $C^*$ -algebra of all continuous complex values functions on a Hausdorff compact space  $X$ . The notion of boundary representation for an operator system was introduced by Arveson [1] and studied extensively by him [2, 3, 4], Davidson and Kennedy [10], Muhly and Solel [18] and others.

Effros and Webster [14] initiated a study of the locally convex version of operator spaces called the local operator spaces. Lately, there has been extensive research on the local operator spaces [6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17]. Locally  $C^*$ -algebras are generalizations of  $C^*$ -algebras, the topology on a locally  $C^*$ -algebra is defined by a separating family of  $C^*$ -seminorms instead of a  $C^*$ -norm. A locally  $C^*$ -algebra can be identified with a certain  $*$ -algebra of unbounded linear operators on a Hilbert space [11, 16]. Dosiev [11] realized local operator spaces as subspaces of the locally  $C^*$ -algebra  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  of unbounded operators on a quantized domain  $\{\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{E}; \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}\}$ . Arunkumar [6] introduced the notion of local boundary representation for a local operator system and investigated certain properties of them. A local boundary representation for a local operator system  $\mathcal{S}$  is an irreducible local representation  $\pi$  of the locally  $C^*$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{S}$  on a quantized domain  $\{\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{E}; \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}\}$  such that it is the unique extension of the unital local  $\mathcal{CP}$ (completely positive)-map  $\pi|_{\mathcal{S}}$  to the locally  $C^*$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{S}$ . Arunkumar [6] limited his research on local boundary representations for local operator systems to the case of local operator systems in Fréchet locally  $C^*$ -algebras because an Arveson's extension type

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46L07; 46L05.

*Key words and phrases.* locally  $C^*$ -algebras, quantized domains, local completely positive maps, local operator systems, local boundary representations.

This work was supported by a grant of the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitization, CNCS/CCCDI-UEFISCDI, project number PN-III-P4-ID-PCE-2020-0458, within PNCDI III.

theorem in the context of locally  $C^*$ -algebras is only known for local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -maps on quantized Fréchet domains.

A local representation  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E})$  is irreducible, in the sense of Arunkumar [6, Definition 4.2] if  $\pi(\mathcal{A})' \cap C^*(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{C}I_{\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E}}$ , where  $\pi(\mathcal{A})' = \{T \in B(\mathcal{H}); T\pi(a) \subseteq \pi(a)T, \text{ for all } a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ . Unfortunately, the locally  $C^*$ -algebra  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E})$  does not play the role of  $B(\mathcal{H})$  in the locally convex space theory. We show that the irreducible local representations of a locally  $C^*$ -algebra on quantized Fréchet domains are in fact local representations on Hilbert spaces. Thus, the study of local boundary representations for local operator systems is reduced to the study of boundary representations for operator systems.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Locally  $C^*$ -algebras.** A *locally  $C^*$ -algebra* is a complete Hausdorff complex topological  $*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  whose topology is determined by an upward filtered family  $\{p_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$  of  $C^*$ -seminorms defined on  $\mathcal{A}$  (that means, if  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$ , then  $p_{\lambda_1}(a) \leq p_{\lambda_2}(a)$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ). A *Fréchet locally  $C^*$ -algebra* is a locally  $C^*$ -algebra whose topology is determined by a countable family of  $C^*$ -seminorms.

A locally  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  can be realized as a projective limit of an inverse family of  $C^*$ -algebras. If  $\mathcal{A}$  is a locally  $C^*$ -algebra with the topology determined by the family of  $C^*$ -seminorms  $\{p_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ , for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda = \{a \in \mathcal{A}; p_\lambda(a) = 0\}$  is a closed two sided  $*$ -ideal in  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda = \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{I}_\lambda$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra with respect to the  $C^*$ -norm induced by  $p_\lambda$ . The canonical quotient  $*$ -morphism from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  is denoted by  $\pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ . For each  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$ , there is a canonical surjective  $*$ -morphism  $\pi_{\lambda_2\lambda_1}^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_1}$ , defined by  $\pi_{\lambda_2\lambda_1}^{\mathcal{A}}(a + \mathcal{I}_{\lambda_2}) = a + \mathcal{I}_{\lambda_1}$  for  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then,  $\{\mathcal{A}_\lambda, \pi_{\lambda_2\lambda_1}^{\mathcal{A}}\}_{\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda}$  forms an inverse system of  $C^*$ -algebras, since  $\pi_{\lambda_1}^{\mathcal{A}} = \pi_{\lambda_2\lambda_1}^{\mathcal{A}} \circ \pi_{\lambda_2}^{\mathcal{A}}$  whenever  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$ . The projective limit

$$\lim_{\leftarrow \lambda} \mathcal{A}_\lambda := \{(a_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \in \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{A}_\lambda; \pi_{\lambda_2\lambda_1}^{\mathcal{A}}(a_{\lambda_2}) = a_{\lambda_1} \text{ whenever } \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda\}$$

of the inverse system of  $C^*$ -algebras  $\{\mathcal{A}_\lambda, \pi_{\lambda_2\lambda_1}^{\mathcal{A}}\}_{\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda}$  is a locally  $C^*$ -algebra that can be identified with  $\mathcal{A}$  by the map  $a \mapsto (\pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}}(a))_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ .

**2.2. Local positive elements.** An element  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  is *self-adjoint* if  $a^* = a$  and it is *positive* if  $a = b^*b$  for some  $b \in \mathcal{A}$ .

An element  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  is called *local self-adjoint* if  $a = a^* + c$ , where  $c \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $p_\lambda(c) = 0$  for some  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ , and we call  $a$  as  *$\lambda$ -self-adjoint*, and *local positive* if  $a = b^*b + c$  where  $b, c \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $p_\lambda(c) = 0$  for some  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ , we call  $a$  as  *$\lambda$ -positive* and write  $a \geq_\lambda 0$ . We write  $a =_\lambda 0$  whenever  $p_\lambda(a) = 0$ . Note that  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  is local self-adjoint if and only if there is  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  such that  $\pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}}(a)$  is self adjoint in  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  and  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  is local positive if and only if there is  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  such that  $\pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}}(a)$  is positive in  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ .

**2.3. Quantized domains.** Throughout the paper,  $\mathcal{H}$  is a complex Hilbert space and  $B(\mathcal{H})$  is the  $*$ -algebra of all bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ .

Let  $(\Upsilon, \leq)$  be a directed poset. A *quantized domain in a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$*  is a triple  $\{\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{E}; \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_\iota\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}$  is an upward filtered family of closed nonzero subspaces such that the union space  $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E} = \bigcup_{\iota \in \Upsilon} \mathcal{H}_\iota$  is dense in  $\mathcal{H}$  [11]. If

$\mathcal{E}$  is a countable family of closed nonzero subspaces, we say that  $\{\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{E}; \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}\}$  is a *quantized Fréchet domain* in  $\mathcal{H}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}$  be a quantized domain in a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . For each  $\iota \in \Upsilon$  and for each  $n \geq 1$ , we put  $\mathcal{H}^{\oplus n} := \underbrace{\mathcal{H} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{H}}_n$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_{\iota}^{\oplus n} := \underbrace{\mathcal{H}_{\iota} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\iota}}_n$ ,  $\mathcal{E}^{\oplus n} := \{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}^{\oplus n}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}^{\oplus n}} := \bigcup_{\iota \in \Upsilon} \mathcal{H}_{\iota}^{\oplus n}$ . Then  $\{\mathcal{H}^{\oplus n}; \mathcal{E}^{\oplus n}; \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}^{\oplus n}}\}$  is a quantized domain in the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}^{\oplus n}$ .

The quantized family  $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}$  determines an upward filtered family  $\{P_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}$  of projections in  $B(\mathcal{H})$ , where  $P_{\iota}$  is a projection onto  $\mathcal{H}_{\iota}$ .

Let

$$C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}) := \{T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}); TP_{\iota} = P_{\iota}TP_{\iota} \in B(\mathcal{H}) \text{ and } P_{\iota}T \subseteq TP_{\iota} \text{ for all } \iota \in \Upsilon\}$$

where  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  is the collection of all linear operators on  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}$ . Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$ . Then  $T \in C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  if and only if  $T(\mathcal{H}_{\iota}) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{\iota}$ ,  $T(\mathcal{H}_{\iota}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{\iota}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}$  and  $T|_{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}} \in B(\mathcal{H}_{\iota})$  for all  $\iota \in \Upsilon$ .

If  $T \in C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$ , then  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq \text{dom}(T^{\star})$ , where  $T^{\star}$  is the adjoint of  $T$ , and  $T^{\star}|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}} \in C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$ . Let  $T^* = T^{\star}|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}}$ . It is easy to check that  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  equipped with this involution is a unital  $*$ -algebra. For each  $\iota \in \Upsilon$ , the map  $\|\cdot\|_{\iota} : C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ ,

$$\|T\|_{\iota} = \|T|_{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}}\| = \sup\{\|T(\xi)\|; \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{\iota}, \|\xi\| \leq 1\}$$

is a  $C^*$ -seminorm on  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$ . Therefore,  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  is a locally  $C^*$ -algebra with respect to the family of  $C^*$ -seminorms  $\{\|\cdot\|_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}$ . If  $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}\}$ , then  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}) = B(\mathcal{H})$ .

A *local representation* of a locally  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ , whose topology is defined by the family of  $C^*$ -seminorms  $\{p_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ , on a quantized domain  $\{\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{E}; \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}\}$  with  $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}$  is a  $*$ -morphism  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  with the property that for each  $\iota \in \Upsilon$ , there exists  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  such that  $\|\pi(a)\|_{\iota} \leq p_{\lambda}(a)$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ . Given a locally  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ , whose topology is defined by the family of  $C^*$ -seminorms  $\{p_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ , there exist a quantized domain  $\{\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{E}; \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}\}$  with  $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$  and an local isometric representation  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$ , that is, for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $\|\pi(a)\|_{\lambda} = p_{\lambda}(a)$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , (see [11, Theorem 7.2] and [16, Theorem 5.1]). This result can be regarded as a unbounded analog of Gelfand-Naimark theorem.

Let  $\{\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}; \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}\}$  be a quantized domain in  $\mathcal{H}$ . If the family  $\{P_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}$  of projections in  $B(\mathcal{H})$  induced by  $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}$  is a mutually commuting family projections in  $B(\mathcal{H})$ , we say that  $\{\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}; \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}\}$  is a *commutative domain* in  $\mathcal{H}$ , and  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  is a local convex version of  $B(\mathcal{H})$  [13]. The center  $\mathcal{Z}(C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}))$  of  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  is the local von Neumann algebra generated by the family of projections  $\{P_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}$ . Given a quantized domain  $\{\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{E}; \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}\}$ , there exists a commutative domain  $\{\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{E}_c; \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}_c}\}$  such that  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  identifies with a locally  $C^*$ -subalgebra in  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}_c})$  [13, Proposition 3.1].

**2.4. Local completely positive maps.** For each  $n \geq 1$ ,  $M_n(\mathcal{A})$  denotes the collection of all matrices of order  $n$  with elements in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Note that  $M_n(\mathcal{A})$  is a locally  $C^*$ -algebra, the associated family of  $C^*$ -seminorms being denoted by  $\{p_{\lambda}^n\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ , and  $M_n(C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}))$  can be identified with  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}^{\oplus n}})$ .

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the  $n$ -amplification of a linear map  $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  is the map  $\varphi^{(n)} : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}^{\oplus n}})$  defined by

$$\varphi^{(n)}\left([a_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n\right) = [\varphi(a_{ij})]_{i,j=1}^n$$

for all  $[a_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ .

A linear map  $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  is called :

- (1) *positive* if  $\varphi(a)$  is positive in  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  whenever  $a$  is positive in  $\mathcal{A}$ ;
- (2) *completely positive* if  $\varphi^{(n)}\left([a_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n\right)$  is positive in  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}^{\oplus n}})$  whenever  $[a_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n$  is positive in  $M_n(\mathcal{A})$  for all  $n \geq 1$ ;
- (3) *local positive* if for each  $\iota \in \Upsilon$ , there is  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  such that  $\varphi(a)|_{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}}$  is positive in  $B(\mathcal{H}_{\iota})$  whenever  $a \geq_{\lambda} 0$  and  $\varphi(a)|_{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}} = 0$  whenever  $a =_{\lambda} 0$ ;
- (4) *local completely positive (local CP)* if for each  $\iota \in \Upsilon$ , there is  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  such that  $\varphi^{(n)}\left([a_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n\right)|_{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}^{\oplus n}}$  is positive in  $B(\mathcal{H}_{\iota}^{\oplus n})$  whenever  $[(a_{ij})]_{i,j=1}^n \geq_{\lambda} 0$  and  $\varphi^{(n)}\left([a_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n\right)|_{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}^{\oplus n}} = 0$  whenever  $[(a_{ij})]_{i,j=1}^n =_{\lambda} 0$ , for all  $n \geq 1$ .

### 3. IRREDUCIBLE LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS, LOCAL BOUNDARY REPRESENTATIONS AND PURE LOCAL CP-MAPS

**3.1. Irreducible local representations.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a unital locally  $C^*$ -algebra with the topology defined by the family of  $C^*$ -seminorms  $\{p_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$  and  $\{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}\}$  be a quantized domain in a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ .

**Definition 3.1.** [6, Definition 4.2] *A local representation  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  is irreducible if  $\pi(\mathcal{A})' \cap C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}) = \mathbb{C}I_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}}$ , where  $\pi(\mathcal{A})' = \{T \in B(\mathcal{H}); T\pi(a) \subseteq \pi(a)T, \text{ for all } a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ .*

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $\{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}\}$  be a commutative domain and  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  be a local representation. If  $\pi$  is irreducible, then  $\mathcal{H}_{\iota} = \mathcal{H}$  for all  $\iota \in \Upsilon$  and  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}) = B(\mathcal{H})$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_{\iota}\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}\}$  is a commutative domain, for each  $\iota \in \Upsilon$ ,  $P_{\iota}|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}} \in C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$ . On the other hand, for each  $\iota \in \Upsilon$ ,  $P_{\iota} \in B(\mathcal{H})$  and  $P_{\iota}\pi(a) \subseteq \pi(a)P_{\iota}$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , and so  $P_{\iota} \in \pi(\mathcal{A})'$ . Therefore,  $P_{\iota}|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}} \in \pi(\mathcal{A})' \cap C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  for all  $\iota \in \Upsilon$ , and since  $\pi$  is irreducible and  $P_{\iota} \neq 0$ , we have  $P_{\iota} = I_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}}$ . Consequently,  $\mathcal{H}_{\iota} = \mathcal{H}$  for all  $\iota \in \Upsilon$ , and then  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}) = B(\mathcal{H})$ .  $\square$

A local representation of a locally  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  is in fact a continuous  $*$ -morphism from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $B(\mathcal{H})$  and it is called a continuous  $*$ -representation of  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  [15, § 13]. Therefore, the irreducible local representations of a locally  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  on commutative domains are local representations of  $\mathcal{A}$  on Hilbert spaces. Moreover, we have the following characterization of the irreducible local representations of a locally  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  on a Hilbert space.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be a local representation. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\pi$  is irreducible;
- (2) *There exist  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$  and an irreducible representation of  $\mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0}$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $\pi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ , such that  $\pi = \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}$ .*

**Remark 3.4.** *If  $\pi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  is an irreducible representation, then for every  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda$ ,  $\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}$  is an irreducible representation of  $\mathcal{A}_{\lambda}$ .*

**3.2. Pure local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -maps.** A *local operator system* is a self-adjoint subspace of a unital locally  $C^*$ -algebra which contains the unity of the algebra.

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a unital locally  $C^*$ -algebra with the topology defined by the family of  $C^*$ -seminorms  $\{p_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}$  be a local operator system in  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_\iota\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}, \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E}\}$  be a quantized domain in a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ .

**Definition 3.5.** [6, Definition 4.6] *A local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map  $\varphi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E})$  is pure, if for any local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map  $\psi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E})$  such that  $\varphi - \psi$  is a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map, there exists  $t_0 \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\psi = t_0\varphi$ .*

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $\{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_\iota\}_{\iota \in \Upsilon}, \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E}\}$  be a commutative domain and  $\varphi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E})$  be a unital local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map. If  $\varphi$  is pure, then  $\mathcal{H}_\iota = \mathcal{H}$  for all  $\iota \in \Upsilon$  and  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E}) = B(\mathcal{H})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\iota_0 \in \Upsilon$  and  $\psi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E})$  be a linear map defined by  $\psi(a) = P_{\iota_0}\varphi(a)P_{\iota_0}|_{\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E}}$ . Since  $\varphi$  is a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map, there exists  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$  such that  $\varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}])|_{\mathcal{H}_{\iota_0}^{\oplus n}} \geq 0$  whenever  $[a_{ij}] \geq_{\lambda_0} 0$  and  $\varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}])|_{\mathcal{H}_{\iota_0}^{\oplus n}} = 0$  whenever  $[a_{ij}] =_{\lambda_0} 0$  for all  $n$ .

Let  $\iota \in \Upsilon$ ,  $(\xi_k)_{k=1}^n \in \mathcal{H}_\iota^{\oplus n}$  and  $[a_{ij}] \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . From

$$\left\langle \varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}]) (\xi_k)_{k=1}^n, (\xi_k)_{k=1}^n \right\rangle = \left\langle \varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}]) (P_{\iota_0}\xi_k)_{k=1}^n, (P_{\iota_0}\xi_k)_{k=1}^n \right\rangle$$

and taking into account that  $\varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}])|_{\mathcal{H}_{\iota_0}^{\oplus n}} \geq 0$  whenever  $[a_{ij}] \geq_{\lambda_0} 0$  and  $\varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}])|_{\mathcal{H}_{\iota_0}^{\oplus n}} = 0$  whenever  $[a_{ij}] =_{\lambda_0} 0$  for all  $n$ , we deduce that  $\psi^{(n)}([a_{ij}])|_{\mathcal{H}_\iota^{\oplus n}} \geq 0$  whenever  $[a_{ij}] \geq_{\lambda_0} 0$  and  $\psi^{(n)}([a_{ij}])|_{\mathcal{H}_\iota^{\oplus n}} = 0$  whenever  $[a_{ij}] =_{\lambda_0} 0$  for all  $n$ . Therefore,  $\psi$  is a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map.

To show that  $\varphi - \psi$  is a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map, let  $\iota \in \Upsilon$ ,  $(\xi_k)_{k=1}^n \in \mathcal{H}_\iota^{\oplus n}$  and  $[a_{ij}] \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left( \varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}]) - \psi^{(n)}([a_{ij}]) \right) (\xi_k)_{k=1}^n, (\xi_k)_{k=1}^n \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}]) (\xi_k)_{k=1}^n, (\xi_k)_{k=1}^n \right\rangle - \left\langle \varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}]) (P_{\iota_0}\xi_k)_{k=1}^n, (P_{\iota_0}\xi_k)_{k=1}^n \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}]) (\xi_k - P_{\iota_0}\xi_k)_{k=1}^n, (\xi_k - P_{\iota_0}\xi_k)_{k=1}^n \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Upsilon$  is a directed poset, there exists  $\tilde{\iota} \in \Upsilon$  such that  $\iota_0 \leq \tilde{\iota}$  and  $\iota \leq \tilde{\iota}$ , and then  $(\xi_k - P_{\iota_0}\xi_k)_{k=1}^n \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\iota}}^{\oplus n}$ . On the other hand, since  $\varphi$  is a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map, there exists  $\tilde{\lambda} \in \Lambda$  such that  $\varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}])|_{\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\iota}}^{\oplus n}} \geq 0$  whenever  $[a_{ij}] \geq_{\tilde{\lambda}} 0$  and  $\varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}])|_{\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\iota}}^{\oplus n}} = 0$  whenever  $[a_{ij}] =_{\tilde{\lambda}} 0$  for all  $n$ . Therefore,

$$\left\langle \varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}]) (\xi_k - P_{\iota_0}\xi_k)_{k=1}^n, (\xi_k - P_{\iota_0}\xi_k)_{k=1}^n \right\rangle \geq 0$$

whenever  $[a_{ij}] \geq_{\tilde{\lambda}} 0$  and

$$\left\langle \varphi^{(n)}([a_{ij}]) (\xi_k - P_{\iota_0}\xi_k)_{k=1}^n, (\xi_k - P_{\iota_0}\xi_k)_{k=1}^n \right\rangle = 0$$

whenever  $[a_{ij}] =_{\tilde{\lambda}} 0$  for all  $n$ . Consequently,  $\varphi - \psi$  is a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map. Since  $\varphi$  is pure, there exists  $t_0 \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\psi = t_0\varphi$ . Then

$$0 \neq P_{\iota_0}|_{\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E}} = \psi(1_{\mathcal{A}}) = t_0\varphi(1_{\mathcal{A}}) = t_0I_{\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E}}$$

and so,  $P_{\iota_0} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{H}_\iota = \mathcal{H}$  for all  $\iota \in \Upsilon$ , and then  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E}) = B(\mathcal{H})$ .  $\square$

So, the pure unital local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -maps of a locally  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  on commutative domains are pure unital continuous  $\mathcal{CP}$ -maps with values in the  $C^*$ -algebra of all bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space.

If  $\mathcal{S}$  is a local operator system in  $\mathcal{A}$ , then, for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda = \pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S})$  is an operator system in  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ . Moreover, if  $\varphi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  is a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map, then there exist  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  and a  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map  $\varphi_\lambda : \mathcal{S}_\lambda \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\varphi = \varphi_\lambda \circ \pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}}|_{\mathcal{S}}$  (see [17, Remark 3.1]).

We have the following characterization for the pure local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -maps.

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $\varphi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\varphi$  is pure;
- (2) There exist  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$  and a pure  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map,  $\varphi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ , such that  $\varphi = \varphi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}|_{\mathcal{S}}$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) By [17, Remark 3.1], there exist  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$  and a  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map  $\varphi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\varphi = \varphi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}|_{\mathcal{S}}$ . Let  $\psi_0 : \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be a  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map such that  $\psi_0 \leq \varphi_{\lambda_0}$ . Then  $\psi = \psi_0 \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}|_{\mathcal{S}}$  is a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map and  $\psi \leq \varphi$ . Since  $\varphi$  is pure, there exists  $t_0 \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\psi = t_0\varphi$ , and consequently  $\psi_0 = t_0\varphi_{\lambda_0}$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) Let  $\varphi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be a pure  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map such that  $\varphi = \varphi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}|_{\mathcal{S}}$  and  $\psi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map such that  $\psi \leq \varphi$ . From  $0 \leq \psi \leq \varphi$  and taking into account that  $\varphi(a) \geq 0$  whenever  $a \geq_{\lambda_0} 0$  and  $\varphi(a) = 0$  whenever  $a =_{\lambda_0} 0$ , we deduce that there exists a linear map  $\psi_{\lambda_0} : (\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0})_+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\psi_{\lambda_0}(\pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}(a)) = \psi(a)$ , and which extends by linearity to a  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map  $\psi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ . Moreover,  $\psi = \psi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}|_{\mathcal{S}}$  (see [17, Remark 3.1]). Then  $\psi_{\lambda_0} \leq \varphi_{\lambda_0}$ , and since  $\varphi_{\lambda_0}$  is pure, there exists  $t_0 \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\psi_{\lambda_0} = t_0\varphi_{\lambda_0}$ , and consequently  $\psi = t_0\varphi$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.8.** *It is easy to check that if  $\varphi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  is a pure  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map, then for every  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda$ ,  $\varphi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}$  is a pure  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map on  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$ .*

**3.3. Local boundary representations.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a unital locally  $C^*$ -algebra with the topology defined by the family of  $C^*$ -seminorms  $\{p_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}$  be a local operator system in  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_i\}_{i \in \Upsilon}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}}\}$  be a quantized domain in a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ .

**Definition 3.9.** [6, Definition 5.5] *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a local operator space in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{S}$  generates  $\mathcal{A}$ . A local representation  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{E}})$  is a local boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}$  if:*

- (1)  $\pi$  is irreducible;
- (2)  $\pi$  is the unique local completely positive extension of the unital local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map  $\pi|_{\mathcal{S}}$  to  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Remark 3.10.** *According to Proposition 3.2, the local boundary representations for a local operator system on commutative domains are local representations on Hilbert spaces.*

In the following proposition we give a characterization of a local boundary representation on a Hilbert space for a local operator system  $\mathcal{S}$  in terms of the boundary representations for the operator systems  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$ ,  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ .

**Proposition 3.11.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a local operator system in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{S}$  generates  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be a local representation. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\pi$  is a boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}$ ;
- (2) There exist  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$  and a boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0}$ ,  $\pi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ , such that  $\pi = \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^A$ , and for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda$ ,  $\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^A$  is a boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) By Proposition 3.3, there exists  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$  and an irreducible representation  $\pi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\pi = \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^A$ . Let  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda$ . By Remark 3.4,  $\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^A$  is an irreducible representation of  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ . Let  $\varphi_\lambda : \mathcal{A}_\lambda \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be a  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map such that  $\varphi_\lambda|_{\mathcal{S}_\lambda} = (\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^A)|_{\mathcal{S}_\lambda}$ . Then  $\varphi_\lambda \circ \pi_\lambda^A$  is a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map, and

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_\lambda \circ \pi_\lambda^A)|_{\mathcal{S}} &= (\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^A)|_{\mathcal{S}_\lambda} \circ \pi_\lambda^A|_{\mathcal{S}} = \pi_{\lambda_0}|_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0}} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^A|_{\mathcal{S}} \\ &= (\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^A)|_{\mathcal{S}} = \pi|_{\mathcal{S}} \end{aligned}$$

whence, since  $\pi$  is a local boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}$ , we deduce that  $\varphi_\lambda \circ \pi_\lambda^A = \pi = \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^A \circ \pi_\lambda^A$ . Consequently,  $\varphi_\lambda = \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^A$ . Therefore,  $\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^A$  is a boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) By Proposition 3.3, the map  $\pi := \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^A$  is an irreducible local representation of  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let  $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map such that  $\varphi|_{\mathcal{S}} = \pi|_{\mathcal{S}}$ . Since  $\varphi$  is a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map and  $\Lambda$  is a directed poset, there exist  $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda$ ,  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda_1$  and a  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map  $\varphi_{\lambda_1} : \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_1} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\varphi = \varphi_{\lambda_1} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1}^A$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\lambda_1}|_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1}} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1}^A|_{\mathcal{S}} &= \varphi_{\lambda_1} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1}^A|_{\mathcal{S}} = \varphi|_{\mathcal{S}} = \pi|_{\mathcal{S}} \\ &= \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1\lambda_0}^A \circ \pi_{\lambda_1}^A|_{\mathcal{S}} = \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1\lambda_0}^A|_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1}} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1}^A|_{\mathcal{S}}. \end{aligned}$$

From the above relation and taking into account that  $\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1\lambda_0}^A$  is a boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1}$ , we conclude that  $\varphi_{\lambda_1} = \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1\lambda_0}^A$ . Then  $\varphi = \varphi_{\lambda_1} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1}^A = \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1\lambda_0}^A \circ \pi_{\lambda_1}^A = \pi$ . Therefore,  $\pi$  is a local boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.12.** *Since a quantized Fréchet domain is a commutative domain, the local boundary representations for a local operator system  $\mathcal{S}$  in a Fréchet locally  $C^*$ -algebra considered by Arunkumar [6] are local boundary representations on Hilbert spaces (Proposition 3.2), and according to the above proposition, the proofs of the main theorems [6, Theorems 5.7; 5.10 and 5.11] are reduced to the case of boundary representations for operator systems (see the following section).*

**Proposition 3.13.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a local operator system in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{S}$  generates  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E})$  be a local boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}$ . If  $\{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{H}_i\}_{i \in \Upsilon}, \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E}\}$  is a commutative domain, then  $\pi|_{\mathcal{S}} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow C^*(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E})$  is a pure local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map.*

*Proof.* By Remark 3.10,  $C^*(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{E}) = B(\mathcal{H})$ . Since  $\pi$  is a local boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}$ , by Proposition 3.11, there exist  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$  and a boundary representation  $\pi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  for  $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0}$ , such that  $\pi = \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^A$ . By [1, Lemma 2.4.3], since  $\pi_{\lambda_0}$  is a boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0}$ ,  $\pi_{\lambda_0}|_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0}} : \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  is pure, whence, according Proposition 3.7, it follows that  $\pi_{\lambda_0}|_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0}} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^A|_{\mathcal{S}}$  is a pure local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map. But  $\pi|_{\mathcal{S}} = \pi_{\lambda_0}|_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0}} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^A|_{\mathcal{S}}$ , and the proposition is proved.  $\square$

**Remark 3.14.** *Since the quantized Fréchet domains are commutative domains, Theorem 5.10 [6] is a particular case of the above proposition.*

#### 4. LOCAL BOUNDARY REPRESENTATIONS ON HILBERT SPACES

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a unital locally  $C^*$ -algebra with the topology defined by the family of  $C^*$ -seminorms  $\{p_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  be a local operator systems in  $\mathcal{A}$ . If  $\mathcal{B}$  is the locally  $C^*$ -subalgebra of  $\mathcal{A}$  generated by  $\mathcal{S}$ , then, clearly, for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_\lambda$  is  $C^*$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$ .

By [17, Theorem 3.3], a local  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map  $\varphi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  extends to a  $\mathcal{CP}$ -map  $\tilde{\varphi} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ .

Arveson [1] calls the set of all boundary representations of an operator system the non-commutative Choquet boundary. The collection of all local boundary representations on Hilbert spaces of a local operator system  $\mathcal{S}$  is called the *local non-commutative Choquet boundary for  $\mathcal{S}$* .

**Remark 4.1.** *It is known that the Choquet boundary for the unital commutative  $C^*$ -algebra  $C(X)$  of all continuous complex values functions on a Hausdorff compact space  $X$  is  $X$ .*

Let  $\{X_n; i_{nm} : X_n \hookrightarrow X_m; n \leq m; n, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be an inductive system of Hausdorff compact spaces and  $X := \varinjlim X_n$ . Then  $C(X) := \{f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}; f \text{ is continuous}\}$  is a unital commutative Fréchet locally  $C^*$ -algebra with respect to the topology defined by the family of  $C^*$ -seminorms  $\{p_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $p_n(f) = \sup\{|f(x)|; x \in X_n\}$ . Moreover,  $C(X)$  can be identified with  $\varinjlim C(X_n)$  [19]. According to Proposition 3.11, as in the case of unital commutative  $C^*$ -algebras, we obtained that the local Choquet boundary for  $C(X)$  is  $X$ .

The following theorem is a local version of [1, Theorem 2.1.2].

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  be two locally  $C^*$ -algebras with the topology defined by the family of  $C^*$ -seminorms  $\{p_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ , respectively  $\{q_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  be two local operator systems such that  $\mathcal{S}_1$  generated  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  generated  $\mathcal{A}_2$ . If  $\Phi : \mathcal{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_2$  is a unital surjective local completely isometric linear map, then for each local boundary representation  $\pi_1 : \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  for  $\mathcal{S}_1$ , there exists a local boundary representation  $\pi_2 : \mathcal{A}_2 \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  for  $\mathcal{S}_2$  such that  $\pi_2 \circ \Phi = \pi_1|_{\mathcal{S}_1}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\Phi : \mathcal{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_2$  is a unital surjective local completely isometric linear map, for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ , there exists a unital surjective local completely isometric linear map  $\Phi_\lambda : (\mathcal{S}_1)_\lambda \rightarrow (\mathcal{S}_2)_\lambda$  such that  $\pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}_2} \circ \Phi = \Phi_\lambda \circ \pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}_1}|_{(\mathcal{S}_1)_\lambda}$ .

Let  $\pi_1 : \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be a local boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}_1$ . By Proposition 3.11, there exist  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$  and a boundary representation  $(\pi_1)_{\lambda_0} : (\mathcal{A}_1)_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  for  $(\mathcal{S}_1)_{\lambda_0}$  such that  $\pi_1 = (\pi_1)_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_1}$  and for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda$ ,  $(\pi_1)_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_1}$  is a boundary representation for  $(\mathcal{S}_1)_\lambda$ . Then, by [1, Theorem 2.1.2], for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda$ , there exists a boundary representation  $(\pi_2)_\lambda : (\mathcal{A}_2)_\lambda \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  for  $(\mathcal{S}_2)_\lambda$  such that  $(\pi_2)_\lambda \circ \Phi_\lambda = (\pi_1)_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_1}|_{(\mathcal{S}_1)_\lambda}$ . For each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda$ ,  $(\pi_2)_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_2}$  is an irreducible representation of  $(\mathcal{A}_2)_\lambda$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Moreover,

$$(\pi_2)_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_2} \circ \Phi_\lambda = (\pi_2)_{\lambda_0} \circ \Phi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_1}|_{(\mathcal{S}_1)_\lambda} = (\pi_1)_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_1}|_{(\mathcal{S}_1)_\lambda} = (\pi_2)_\lambda \circ \Phi_\lambda$$



whence we deduce that  $(\pi_2)_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_2} \Big|_{(\mathcal{S}_2)_\lambda} = (\pi_2)_\lambda \Big|_{(\mathcal{S}_2)_\lambda}$ , and since  $(\pi_2)_\lambda$  is a boundary representation for  $(\mathcal{S}_2)_\lambda$ , it follows that  $(\pi_2)_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_2} = (\pi_2)_\lambda$ . Therefore,  $(\pi_2)_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_2}$  is a boundary representation for  $(\mathcal{S}_2)_\lambda$ . Then,  $\pi_2 := (\pi_2)_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_2}$  is a local boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}_2$ , and moreover,

$$\pi_2 \circ \Phi = (\pi_2)_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_2} \circ \Phi = (\pi_2)_{\lambda_0} \circ \Phi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_1} \Big|_{\mathcal{S}_1} = (\pi_1)_{\lambda_0} \Big|_{(\mathcal{S}_1)_{\lambda_0}} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}_1} \Big|_{\mathcal{S}_1} = \pi_1 \Big|_{\mathcal{S}_1}. \quad \square$$

**Remark 4.3.** *Since the local boundary representations for a local operator system  $\mathcal{S}$  in a Fréchet locally  $C^*$ -algebra on quantized Fréchet domains are local boundary representations on Hilbert spaces (Proposition 3.2), Theorem 5.7 [6] is a particular case of the above theorem.*

A local representation  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  is a *finite representation* for  $\mathcal{S}$  if for every isometry  $V \in B(\mathcal{H})$ , the condition  $\pi(a) = V^* \pi(a) V$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{S}$  implies  $V$  is unitary. It is easy to check that a local representation  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  is a finite representation for  $\mathcal{S}$  if and only if there exist  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$  and a finite representation for  $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0}$ ,  $\pi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ , such that  $\pi = \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}$ . Clearly, if  $\pi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  is a finite representation for  $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0}$ , then  $\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A}_\lambda \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  is a finite representation for  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda$ .

We say that  $\mathcal{S}$  *separates* the irreducible local representation  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  if for any irreducible local representation  $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$  and an isometry  $V \in B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  such that  $\pi(a) = V^* \rho(a) V$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{S}$  implies that  $\pi$  and  $\rho$  are unitarily equivalent.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a local operator system in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{S}$  generates  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be an irreducible local representation. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{S}$  separates  $\pi$ ;
- (2) There exist  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$  and an irreducible representation  $\pi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\pi = \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}$  and for every  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$  separates  $\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  is an irreducible local representation, by Proposition 3.3 and Remark 3.4, there exist  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$  and an irreducible representation of  $\mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0}$ ,  $\pi_{\lambda_0} : \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_0} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ , such that  $\pi = \pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}$ , and for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda$ ,  $\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}$  is an irreducible representation of  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ .

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) Let  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda$ ,  $\rho_\lambda : \mathcal{A}_\lambda \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$  be an irreducible representation and  $V \in B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  be an isometry such that  $(\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}})(\pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}}(a)) = V^* \rho_\lambda(\pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}}(a)) V$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{S}$ . Then  $\rho_\lambda \circ \pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$  is an irreducible local representation and

$$\pi(a) = (\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}})(\pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}}(a)) = V^* \rho_\lambda(\pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}}(a)) V = V^* (\rho_\lambda \circ \pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}})(a) V$$

for all  $a \in \mathcal{S}$ , whence, since  $\mathcal{S}$  separates  $\pi$ , we deduce that  $\pi$  and  $\rho_\lambda \circ \pi_\lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  are unitarily equivalent. Then, from the above relation, we deduce that  $\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\rho_\lambda$  are unitarily equivalent. Consequently,  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda$  separates  $\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda\lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) Let  $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$  be an irreducible local representation and  $V \in B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  be an isometry such that  $\pi(a) = V^* \rho(a) V$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{S}$ . There exist

$\lambda_1 \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda_1$  and an irreducible representation  $\rho_{\lambda_1} : \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_1} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$  such that  $\rho = \rho_{\lambda_1} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1}^{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then

$$(\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1 \lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}) (\pi_{\lambda_1}^{\mathcal{A}}(a)) = \pi(a) = V^* \rho(a) V = V^* \rho_{\lambda_1} (\pi_{\lambda_1}^{\mathcal{A}}(a)) V$$

for all  $a \in \mathcal{S}$ , whence, since  $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1}$  separates  $\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1 \lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}$ , we deduce that  $\pi_{\lambda_0} \circ \pi_{\lambda_1 \lambda_0}^{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\rho_{\lambda_1}$  are unitarily equivalent. Consequently,  $\pi$  and  $\rho$  are unitarily equivalent. Therefore,  $\mathcal{S}$  separates  $\pi$ .  $\square$

As in the case of operator systems, we obtain a characterization of the local boundary representations on Hilbert spaces for a local operator system in terms of their restrictions on the local operator system. The following theorem is a local version of [1, Theorem 2.4.5].

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a local operator system in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{S}$  generates  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then an irreducible local representation  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  is a local boundary representation for  $\mathcal{S}$  if and only if*

- (1)  $\pi|_{\mathcal{S}}$  is a pure local  $\mathcal{CP}$  -map;
- (2)  $\pi$  is a finite local representation for  $\mathcal{S}$ ;
- (3)  $\mathcal{S}$  separates  $\pi$ .

*Proof.* It follows from Propositions 3.7 and 3.11, Lemma 4.4 and [1, Theorem 2.4.5].  $\square$

**Remark 4.6.** *Since the local boundary representations for a local operator system  $\mathcal{S}$  in a Fréchet locally  $C^*$ -algebra on quantized Fréchet domains are local boundary representations on Hilbert spaces (Proposition 3.2), Theorem 5.11 [6] is a particular case of the above theorem.*

**Acknowledgement 1.** *The author thanks to the referees for the proposed comments which improved the paper.*

#### REFERENCES

- [1] W.B. Arveson, *Subalgebras of  $C^*$ -algebras*, Acta Math. 123(1969), 141-224.
- [2] W.B. Arveson, *Subalgebras of  $C^*$ -algebras II*, Acta Math. 128(1972), 3-4, 271-308.
- [3] W.B. Arveson, *The noncommutative Choquet boundary*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 21(2008), 4, 1065-1084.
- [4] W.B. Arveson, *The noncommutative Choquet boundary II; hyperrigidity*, Israel J. Math. 184(2011), 349-385.
- [5] W.B. Arveson, *The noncommutative Choquet boundary III; operator system in matrix algebras*, Math. Scand. 106(2010), 2, 196-210.
- [6] C.S. Arunkumar, *Local boundary representations of locally  $C^*$ -algebras*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 515(2022),2, Paper No. 126416, 14pp.
- [7] S. Beniwal, A. Kumar and P. Luthra, *Local operator system structures and their tensor products*. Adv. Oper. Theory, 6(2021),2, Paper No. 39, 21 pp.
- [8] S. Beniwal, A. Kumar and P. Luthra, *Quantized Hilbert modules over local operator algebras and hyperrigidity of local operator systems*, Ann. Funct. Anal. 13(2022), 1, Paper No. 1. 11 pp.
- [9] B. V. R. Bhat, A. Ghatak and P. S. Kumar, *Stinespring's theorem for unbounded operator valued local completely positive maps and its applications*, Indag. Math. **32**(2021),2, 547-578.
- [10] K.R. Davidson, M. Kennedy, *The Choquet boundary of an operator system*, Duke Math. J. 164(2015), 15, 2989-3004.
- [11] A. Dosiev, *Local operator spaces, unbounded operators and multinormed  $C^*$ -algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **255**(2008), 1724-1760.
- [12] A. Dosiev, *A representation theorem for local operator space*, Funct. Anal. Appl., 41(2007),4 306-310.

- [13] A. Dosiev, *Multinormed  $W^*$ -algebras and unbounded operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **140**(2012), 12, 4187-4202.
- [14] E. G. Efros and C. Webster, *Operator analogues of locally convex spaces*, Operator Algebras and Applications, 163–207. Springer (1997)
- [15] M. Fragoulopoulou, *Topological algebras with involution*, Elsevier, 2005.
- [16] A. Inoue, *Locally  $C^*$ -algebras*, Mem. Fac. Sci. Kyushu Univ. Ser. A, **25** (1971), 197–235.
- [17] M. Joița, *Unbounded local completely contractive maps*, Bull. Iranian Math. Soc. 48(2022), 6, 4015-4028.
- [18] P.S. Muhly, B. Solel, *An algebraic characterization of boundary representation*, Nonseladjoint Operator Algebras, Operator Theory and Related Topics, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., vol 104, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1998, pp. 189-196.
- [19] N.C. Phillips, *Inverse limits of  $C^*$ -algebras*, J. Operator Theory **19** (1988), no. 1, 159–195.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY POLITEHNICA OF BUCHAREST, 313 SPL. INDEPENDENTEI, 060042, BUCHAREST, ROMANIA AND, SIMION STOILOW INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS OF THE ROMANIAN ACADEMY, P.O. BOX 1-764, 014700, BUCHAREST, ROMANIA

*Email address:* [mjoita@fmi.unibuc.ro](mailto:mjoita@fmi.unibuc.ro) and [maria.joita@mathem.pub.ro](mailto:maria.joita@mathem.pub.ro)

*URL:* <http://sites.google.com/a/g.unibuc.ro/maria-joita/>