

UNIQUE PSEUDO-EXPECTATIONS FOR HEREDITARILY ESSENTIAL C^* -INCLUSIONS

VREJ ZARIKIAN

Dedicated to the memory of Gary Weiss.

ABSTRACT. The C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is said to be hereditarily essential if for every intermediate C^* -algebra $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and every non-zero ideal $\{0\} \neq \mathcal{J} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{C}$, we have that $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{A} \neq \{0\}$. That is, \mathcal{A} detects ideals in every intermediate C^* -algebra $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. By a result of Pitts and Zariqian, a unital C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential if and only if every pseudo-expectation $\theta : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})$ for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is faithful. A decade-old open question asks whether hereditarily essential C^* -inclusions must have unique pseudo-expectations? In this note, we answer the question affirmatively for some important classes of C^* -inclusions, in particular those of the form $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} G$, for a twisted C^* -dynamical system $(\mathcal{A}, G, \alpha, \sigma)$. On the other hand, we settle the general question negatively by exhibiting C^* -irreducible inclusions of the form $C_r^*(G) \subseteq C(X) \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ with multiple conditional expectations. Our results leave open the possibility that the question might have a positive answer for regular hereditarily essential C^* -inclusions.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. C^* -Inclusions. By a C^* -inclusion we mean an inclusion $\{0\} \neq \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ of C^* -algebras. We say that a C^* -inclusion is *unital* if \mathcal{A} is unital and $1_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a unit for \mathcal{B} . We say that a C^* -inclusion is *approximately unital* if there exists an approximate unit $\{e_i : i \in I\}$ for \mathcal{A} which is also an approximate unit for \mathcal{B} . We note that if $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is a unital C^* -inclusion, then $\mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{B}$ is an approximately unital C^* -inclusion, where \mathbb{K}_J denotes the compact operators on the Hilbert space $\ell^2(J)$ and \otimes is the minimal tensor product.

1.2. Hereditarily Essential C^* -Inclusions. The C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is *essential* if for every non-zero ideal $\{0\} \neq \mathcal{J} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{B}$, we have that $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{A} \neq \{0\}$. In other words, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is essential if \mathcal{A} “detects ideals” in \mathcal{B} . The C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is *hereditarily essential* if for every intermediate C^* -algebra $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$, the C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is essential. Thus, a C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential if and only if \mathcal{A} “detects ideals” in every intermediate C^* -algebra $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. Heuristically, the C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential when \mathcal{A} is a “large” subalgebra of \mathcal{B} , and is not hereditarily essential when \mathcal{A} is a “small” subalgebra of \mathcal{B} . The following three propositions help make this intuition a bit more precise.

Proposition 1.2.1. *Let \mathcal{B} be a unital C^* -algebra. Then*

- (i) *the unital C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is always hereditarily essential.*

Date: July 1, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 46L07 Secondary: 46L55.

Key words and phrases. inclusions of C^* -algebras, pseudo-expectations, crossed products.

(ii) the unital C^* -inclusion $\mathbb{C}1_{\mathcal{B}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential if and only if $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{C}1_{\mathcal{B}}$.

Proof. (i) Trivial. (ii) Suppose that $\mathbb{C}1_{\mathcal{B}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential. Then every intermediate C^* -algebra $\mathbb{C}1_{\mathcal{B}} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ must be simple. It follows that if $b \in \mathcal{B}_{sa}$, then $C(\sigma(b)) \cong C^*(1_{\mathcal{B}}, b)$ is simple, which implies $\sigma(b)$ is a singleton, which in turn implies $b \in \mathbb{C}1_{\mathcal{B}}$. \square

Proposition 1.2.2. *Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ be a C^* -inclusion and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ be an intermediate C^* -algebra. If $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential, then so are $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. The converse is false in general.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is an intermediate C^* -algebra. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be an intermediate C^* -algebra. Since $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ is essential. Therefore $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is hereditarily essential. Likewise, let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ be an intermediate C^* -algebra. Since $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ is essential. A fortiori, $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ is essential. Therefore $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential. For an example of hereditarily essential C^* -inclusions $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ such that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is not hereditarily essential, see [20, Remark 3.9]. \square

Proposition 1.2.3 ([18], Theorems 3.5 and 3.12). *Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ be a unital C^* -inclusion. If $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential, then the relative commutant $\mathcal{A}^c = \mathcal{A}' \cap \mathcal{B}$ is abelian.*

1.3. C^* -Irreducible Inclusions. A unital C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is said to be C^* -irreducible if every intermediate C^* -algebra $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is simple [20, Definition 3.1]. It is easy to see that a C^* -irreducible inclusion is hereditarily essential. Recently Rørdam, undertook a systematic study of C^* -irreducible inclusions [20].

1.4. Pseudo-Expectations. A *conditional expectation* for the C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is a c.c.p. (contractive completely positive) map $E : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $E(a) = a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Since we assume that $\mathcal{A} \neq \{0\}$, it follows that $\|E\|_{cb} = \|E\| = 1$. Thus, by Choi's Lemma, E is an \mathcal{A} -bimodule map, meaning that $E(a_1 b a_2) = a_1 E(b) a_2$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $a_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ (see [4, Section 1.3.12] for the unital case).

In order to deal with the fact that many C^* -inclusions have no conditional expectations at all, Pitts introduced pseudo-expectations in [16, Definition 1.3]. A *pseudo-expectation* for the C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is a c.c.p. map $\theta : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\theta(a) = a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Here $I(\mathcal{A})$ is the *injective envelope* of \mathcal{A} , i.e., the smallest injective operator space containing \mathcal{A} [9]. (In fact, $I(\mathcal{A})$ is a unital C^* -algebra containing \mathcal{A} as a C^* -subalgebra.) Pseudo-expectations generalize conditional expectations, but always exist because of injectivity. If $\theta : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})$ is a pseudo-expectation for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$, then (just like conditional expectations) $\|\theta\|_{cb} = \|\theta\| = 1$ and θ is an \mathcal{A} -bimodule map. A pseudo-expectation is said to be *faithful* if $\theta(b^*b) = 0$ implies $b = 0$.

1.5. The Main Question. Pitts and Zarikian showed that a unital C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential if and only if every pseudo-expectation for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is faithful [18, Theorem 3.5]. Owing to the absence of any known examples of C^* -inclusions with multiple pseudo-expectations, all of which are faithful, they asked the following question [18, Section 7.1, Q6]:

Question 1.5.1. *If every pseudo-expectation for a unital C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is faithful, must there be a unique pseudo-expectation?*

By [18, Theorem 3.5], Question 1.5.1 is equivalent to the following:

Question 1.5.2. *If a unital C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential, does it have a unique pseudo-expectation?*

If Question 1.5.2 had an affirmative answer, then one would have a nice structural characterization of unital C^* -inclusions with a faithful unique pseudo-expectation, namely they would be precisely the hereditarily essential inclusions.

For some classes of unital C^* -inclusions, Question 1.5.1 is known to have an affirmative answer. In particular, this is the case for

- (1) abelian C^* -inclusions $C(X) \subseteq C(Y)$ [18, Corollary 3.22];
- (2) W^* -inclusions $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ with \mathcal{D} injective [18, Proposition 7.5].

In this note, we expand this list of positive results, adding

- (3) unital C^* -inclusions $\mathcal{A} \subseteq B(\mathcal{H})$ (Theorem 2.1.1);
- (4) unital C^* -inclusions $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$, where (\mathcal{A}, G, α) is a C^* -dynamical system (Theorem 2.2.2);
- (5) more generally, unital C^* -inclusions $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} G$, where $(\mathcal{A}, G, \alpha, \sigma)$ is a twisted C^* -dynamical system (Theorem 2.3.4);
- (6) more generally yet, unital C^* -inclusions $\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} N \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} G$, where $(\mathcal{A}, G, \alpha, \sigma)$ is a twisted C^* -dynamical system and $N \trianglelefteq G$ is a normal subgroup (Corollary 2.3.5).

On the other hand, we settle Question 1.5.1 negatively by constructing a C^* -irreducible inclusion of the form

$$C_r^*(G) \subseteq C(X) \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$$

with multiple conditional expectations (Theorem 3.1.1).

2. SOME POSITIVE RESULTS

In this section we exhibit particular classes of C^* -inclusions for which Question 1.5.1 has an affirmative answer.

2.1. Subalgebras of $B(\mathcal{H})$.

Theorem 2.1.1. *If every pseudo-expectation for the unital C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq B(\mathcal{H})$ is faithful, then there exists a unique pseudo-expectation. In that case, $I(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}''$ and the unique pseudo-expectation is a faithful normal conditional expectation $E : B(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}''$.*

Proof. By Proposition 1.2.3, \mathcal{A}' is abelian, therefore injective. It follows that \mathcal{A}'' is injective [3, Theorem IV.2.2.7], which allows us to choose $I(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}''$. We will now show that the reverse inclusion holds as well. To that end, let $\theta : B(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})$ be a pseudo-expectation for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq B(\mathcal{H})$ (faithful, by assumption). Then $\theta|_{I(\mathcal{A})} : I(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})$ is a c.c.p. map such that $\theta|_{\mathcal{A}} = \text{id}_{\mathcal{A}}$. By the rigidity of the injective envelope, $\theta|_{I(\mathcal{A})} = \text{id}_{I(\mathcal{A})}$ (see [6, Theorem 6.2.1] or [4, Lemma 4.2.4]). If $\{x_i\} \subseteq I(\mathcal{A})_{sa}$ is an increasing net with supremum $x \in B(\mathcal{H})_{sa}$, then $x_i = \theta(x_i) \leq \theta(x)$ for all i , which implies $x \leq \theta(x)$. Since $\theta(x) - x \geq 0$ and $\theta(\theta(x) - x) = 0$,

we conclude that $x = \theta(x) \in I(\mathcal{A})_{sa}$. Likewise if $\{x_i\} \subseteq I(\mathcal{A})_{sa}$ is a decreasing net with infimum $x \in B(\mathcal{H})_{sa}$, then $x \in I(\mathcal{A})_{sa}$. By Pedersen's Up-Down-Up Theorem [22, Theorem II.4.24],

$$(\mathcal{A}'')_{sa} = (((\mathcal{A}_{sa})^m)_m)^m \subseteq I(\mathcal{A})_{sa},$$

which implies $\mathcal{A}'' \subseteq I(\mathcal{A})$.

Since $I(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}''$, every conditional expectation for the inclusion $\mathcal{A}'' \subseteq B(\mathcal{H})$ is a pseudo-expectation for the inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq B(\mathcal{H})$. Conversely, every pseudo-expectation for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq B(\mathcal{H})$ is a conditional expectation for $\mathcal{A}'' \subseteq B(\mathcal{H})$, by the rigidity of the injective envelope. Thus every conditional expectation for $\mathcal{A}'' \subseteq B(\mathcal{H})$ is faithful. By [18, Proposition 7.5], there exists a unique conditional expectation for $\mathcal{A}'' \subseteq B(\mathcal{H})$, which is faithful and normal, and this is the unique pseudo-expectation for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq B(\mathcal{H})$. \square

2.2. Crossed Products by Discrete Groups. In Theorem 2.2.2 below, we show that Question 1.5.1 has an affirmative answer for C^* -inclusions of the form $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$, where α is the action of a discrete group G on a unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{A} . In fact, with some extra care, we are able to show that the result holds for C^* -algebras $\mathcal{A} \neq \{0\}$ which are not necessarily unital. This turns out to be important later in the paper, when we need to apply Theorem 2.2.2 to C^* -algebras of the form $\mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{A}$, where \mathcal{A} is a unital C^* -algebra.

The following lemma will be needed for the proof of Theorem 2.2.2. It says that a pointwise inner action of a discrete cyclic group on an AW^* -algebra is actually an inner action. The corresponding statement for general C^* -algebras is false [8, Example 8.2.8].

Lemma 2.2.1. *Let \mathcal{A} be an AW^* -algebra, $G = \langle g \rangle$ be a discrete cyclic group, and $\alpha : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{A})$ be a homomorphism. If α_g is inner, then there exists a unitary representation $u : G \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $\alpha_h = \text{Ad}(u_h)$, $h \in G$.*

Proof. By assumption, $\alpha_g = \text{Ad}(v)$ for some $v \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{A})$. It follows that $\alpha_{g^k} = \text{Ad}(v^k)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $|g| = \infty$, then we may define $u_{g^k} = v^k$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose instead that $|g| = n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\text{Ad}(v^n) = \alpha_{g^n} = \text{id}$, which implies $v^n \in Z(\mathcal{A})$. Since \mathcal{A} is an AW^* -algebra, so is $Z(\mathcal{A})$ [2, Section 4, Proposition 8(v)]. By [21, Lemma 6], there exists $t \in Z(\mathcal{A})_{sa}$ such that $v^n = e^{it}$. Then we may define $u_{g^k} = (e^{-it/n}v)^k$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. \square

Before turning to the proof of the Theorem 2.2.2, we highlight three facts about discrete crossed products which will be used without explicit mention:

- If G is amenable, then $\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G = \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha} G$ [15, Theorem 7.7.7].
- If $\mathcal{A}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is α -invariant, then $\mathcal{A}_0 \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ [15, Proposition 7.7.9].
- If $H \subseteq G$ is a subgroup, then $\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} H \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$.

We also remind the reader that if \mathcal{A} is C^* -algebra and $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{A})$, then there exists a unique $\tilde{\alpha} \in \text{Aut}(I(\mathcal{A}))$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}|_{\mathcal{A}} = \alpha$ [9, Corollary 4.2]. Thus if (\mathcal{A}, G, α) is a discrete C^* -dynamical system, we have $\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G \subseteq I(\mathcal{A}) \rtimes_{\tilde{\alpha},r} G$.

Theorem 2.2.2. *Let (\mathcal{A}, G, α) be a discrete C^* -dynamical system, with $\mathcal{A} \neq \{0\}$ (but not necessarily unital). If every pseudo-expectation for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ is faithful, then there exists a unique pseudo-expectation.*

Proof. Suppose that every pseudo-expectation for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ is faithful. To show that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ has a unique pseudo-expectation, it suffices to show that $I(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq I(\mathcal{A}) \rtimes_{\tilde{\alpha},r} G$ has a unique pseudo-expectation, since every pseudo-expectation for the former inclusion extends to a pseudo-expectation for the latter inclusion. Indeed, if $\Theta : \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})$ is a c.c.p. map such that $\Theta(a) = a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, then (by injectivity) there exists a c.c.p. $\tilde{\Theta} : I(\mathcal{A}) \rtimes_{\tilde{\alpha},r} G \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\tilde{\Theta}|_{\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G} = \Theta$. Then $\tilde{\Theta}|_{I(\mathcal{A})} : I(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})$ is a c.c.p. map such that $\tilde{\Theta}(a) = a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. By the rigidity of the injective envelope, $\tilde{\Theta}(x) = x$ for all $x \in I(\mathcal{A})$.

Now $I(\mathcal{A})$ is an AW^* -algebra, in particular a unital C^* -algebra. Thus, by [23, Theorem 3.5], to show that $I(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq I(\mathcal{A}) \rtimes_{\tilde{\alpha},r} G$ has a unique pseudo-expectation, it suffices to show that $\tilde{\alpha}$ is properly outer. To that end, assume that there exists $e \neq g \in G$ and $0 \neq p \in \text{Proj}(Z(I(\mathcal{A})))$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}_g(p) = p$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_g|_{I(\mathcal{A})p}$ is inner. Define $H = \langle g \rangle \subseteq G$. Since $I(\mathcal{A})p$ is an AW^* -algebra [2, Section 4, Proposition 8 (iii)], Lemma 2.2.1 implies there exists a unitary representation $u : H \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})p$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}_h|_{I(\mathcal{A})p} = \text{Ad}(u_h)$ for all $h \in H$. By the amenability of H and the universal property of full crossed products [5, Proposition 4.1.3], there exists a $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} H \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})p$ such that $\pi(ah) = au_h$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $h \in H$. In particular, $\pi(a) = ap$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Define a c.c.p. map $\theta : \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} H \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})$ by the formula

$$\theta(x) = \pi(x) + \mathbb{E}(x)p^\perp, \quad x \in \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} H,$$

where $\mathbb{E} : \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} H \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is the canonical faithful conditional expectation (see [5, Proposition 4.1.9]). Note that

$$\theta(a) = \pi(a) + \mathbb{E}(a)p^\perp = ap + ap^\perp = a, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Let $\Theta : \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})$ be a c.c.p. extension of θ . Then Θ is a pseudo-expectation for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$, therefore faithful. A fortiori, θ is faithful. Define $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}p$. Then $\mathcal{J} \neq \{0\}$ [11, Lemma 1.2] and $I(\mathcal{J}) = I(\mathcal{A})p$ [11, Lemma 1.3]. Since $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is α -invariant, $\mathcal{J} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} H \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} H$. Moreover,

$$\theta(x) = \pi(x) + \mathbb{E}(x)p^\perp = \pi(x), \quad x \in \mathcal{J} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} H.$$

Thus π is faithful on $\mathcal{J} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} H$. By injectivity, there exists a c.c.p. map $\gamma : I(\mathcal{J}) \rightarrow I(\mathcal{J})$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I(\mathcal{J}) & & \\ \uparrow \pi & \searrow \gamma & \\ \mathcal{J} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} H & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{E}} \mathcal{J} & \longrightarrow I(\mathcal{J}) \end{array}$$

For all $j \in \mathcal{J}$, we have that

$$\gamma(j) = \gamma(jp) = \gamma(\pi(j)) = \mathbb{E}(j) = j.$$

By the rigidity of the injective envelope, we conclude that $\gamma = \text{id}_{I(\mathcal{J})}$. Thus $\pi = \mathbb{E}$. But then

$$ju_g = \pi(jg) = \mathbb{E}(jg) = 0, \quad j \in \mathcal{J},$$

which implies $\mathcal{J} = \{0\}$, a contradiction. □

We end this section with an example of a unital C^* -inclusion of the form $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ with a continuum of pseudo-expectations, all but two of which are faithful. This shows that one can come very close to satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 2.2.2, but fail the conclusion.

Example 2.2.3. Let $\mathcal{A} = K(\ell^2) + \mathbb{C}I \subseteq B(\ell^2)$ and $U \in B(\ell^2) \setminus \mathcal{A}$ be a self-adjoint unitary. Define $\alpha : \mathbb{Z}_2 \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{A})$ by $\alpha_e = \text{id}$ and $\alpha_g = \text{Ad}(U)$. Then the pseudo-expectations for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} \mathbb{Z}_2$ are precisely the maps

$$\theta_t : \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} \mathbb{Z}_2 \rightarrow B(\ell^2) : A_0 + A_1g \mapsto A_0 + tA_1U, \quad -1 \leq t \leq 1.$$

We have that θ_t is faithful for all $-1 < t < 1$, but $\theta_{\pm 1}$ are $*$ -homomorphisms which are not faithful. Only θ_0 is a conditional expectation.

Proof. Note that $I(\mathcal{A}) = B(\ell^2)$ [10, Example 5.3]. An easy computation shows that $\theta_{\pm 1}$ are $*$ -homomorphisms, therefore c.c.p. maps. (Alternatively, this follows from the amenability of \mathbb{Z}_2 and the universal property of full crossed products.) Since $\theta_{\pm 1}$ restrict to the identity on \mathcal{A} , they are pseudo-expectations. Then θ_t is a pseudo-expectation for each $-1 < t < 1$, since it is a convex combination of $\theta_{\pm 1}$. Clearly $\theta_0 = \mathbb{E}$, the canonical faithful conditional expectation. For $0 < t < 1$, we have that θ_t is faithful since it is a nontrivial convex combination of θ_0 and θ_1 . On the other hand, θ_1 is not faithful, since for any $0 \neq T \in K(\ell^2)$, we have that $\theta_1(TU - Tg) = 0$, even though $0 \neq TU - Tg \in \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} \mathbb{Z}_2$. Similarly, θ_t is faithful for $-1 < t < 0$, while θ_{-1} is not faithful. If $t \neq 0$, then θ_t is not a conditional expectation, since $\theta_t(g) = tU \notin \mathcal{A}$.

It remains to show that there are no other pseudo-expectations. To that end, let $\theta : \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G \rightarrow B(\ell^2)$ be a c.c.p. map such that $\theta(A) = A$, for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Then

$$\theta(g)A = \alpha_g(A)\theta(g) = UAU\theta(g), \quad A \in \mathcal{A},$$

which implies $U\theta(g) \in \mathcal{A}' = \mathbb{C}I$. Thus $\theta(g) = tU$ for some $t \in \mathbb{C}$. Since $g^* = g^{-1} = g$ and θ is adjoint-preserving, we conclude that $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\|g\| = 1$ and θ is contractive, we conclude that $-1 \leq t \leq 1$. Therefore $\theta = \theta_t$. \square

2.3. Twisted Crossed Products by Discrete Groups. Let $(\mathcal{A}, G, \alpha, \sigma)$ be a twisted C^* -dynamical system, where \mathcal{A} is a unital C^* -algebra and G is a discrete group [14]. In this section we show that Question 1.5.1 has an affirmative answer for unital C^* -inclusions of the form $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^\sigma G$. We do this by using a “stabilization” trick to upgrade Theorem 2.2.2 from crossed products to twisted crossed products. Namely, we use that

$$\mathbb{K}_G \otimes (\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^\sigma G) \cong (\mathbb{K}_G \otimes \mathcal{A}) \rtimes_{\beta,r} G,$$

for some action β of G on $\mathbb{K}_G \otimes \mathcal{A}$ [14, Corollary 3.7]. For our argument to work, we need to know that pseudo-expectations behave well with respect to stabilization, which in turn requires injective envelopes to behave well with respect to stabilization. Fortunately this is the case, as we now explain.

If \mathcal{A} is a unital C^* -algebra and J is any index set, we denote by $\mathbb{M}_J(\mathcal{A})$ the set of all $J \times J$ matrices with entries in \mathcal{A} whose finite submatrices are uniformly bounded in norm. This may not be a C^* -algebra, but it is an operator system (see [6, Section 10.1] or [4, Section

1.2.26]). We denote by $\mathbb{K}_J(\mathcal{A})$ the closure in $\mathbb{M}_J(\mathcal{A})$ of the finitely-supported matrices, and note that this is a C^* -algebra with respect to the (well-defined) product

$$[a_{ij}] [b_{ij}] = [\sum_{k \in J} a_{ik} b_{kj}].$$

Indeed, $\mathbb{K}_J(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{A}$. In fact, $\mathbb{M}_J(\mathcal{A})$ is a $\mathbb{K}_J(\mathcal{A})$ -bimodule with respect to the same product [4, Section 1.2.7]. The following formula, which can be found in [4, Corollary 4.6.12], shows that the injective envelope behaves well with respect to stabilization:

$$I(\mathbb{K}_J(\mathcal{A})) = \mathbb{M}_J(I(\mathcal{A})).$$

If $u : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is a c.c.p. map between C^* -algebras, then the *amplification*

$$u_J : \mathbb{M}_J(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_J(\mathcal{B}) : [a_{ij}] \mapsto [u(a_{ij})]$$

is a c.c.p. map as well. It restricts to a c.c.p. map $\mathbb{K}_J(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_J(\mathcal{B})$, which may be identified with $\text{id}_J \otimes u : \mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{B}$, where $\text{id}_J : \mathbb{K}_J \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_J$ is the identity map. The following well-known lemma, which we include for completeness, shows that \mathbb{K}_J -bimodule maps always arise as amplifications.

Lemma 2.3.1. *Let \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} be unital C^* -algebras and $\Theta : \mathbb{M}_J(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_J(\mathcal{B})$ be a c.c.p. map. Assume that Θ is a \mathbb{K}_J -bimodule map, in the sense that*

$$\Theta((S \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}) [a_{ij}] (T \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}})) = (S \otimes 1_{\mathcal{B}}) \Theta([a_{ij}]) (T \otimes 1_{\mathcal{B}})$$

for all $[a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{M}_J(\mathcal{A})$ and all $S, T \in \mathbb{K}_J$. Then there exists a unique c.c.p. map $\theta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ such that $\Theta = \theta_J$.

Proof. For $i, j \in J$, let $E_{ij} \in \mathbb{K}_J$ be the rank-one operator that maps $\delta_j \in \ell^2(J)$ to $\delta_i \in \ell^2(J)$. Define $\theta_{ij} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ by the formula

$$\theta_{ij}(a) = \Theta(E_{ij} \otimes a)_{ij}, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

We claim that

$$\Theta([a_{ij}]) = [\theta_{ij}(a_{ij})].$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{ij}(a_{ij}) &= \Theta(E_{ij} \otimes a_{ij})_{ij} \\ &= \Theta((E_{ii} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}) [a_{st}] (E_{jj} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}))_{ij} \\ &= ((E_{ii} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{B}}) \Theta([a_{st}]) (E_{jj} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{B}}))_{ij} \\ &= (E_{ij} \otimes \Theta([a_{st}])_{ij})_{ij} \\ &= \Theta([a_{st}])_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\Theta(E_{ij} \otimes a) = E_{ij} \otimes \theta_{ij}(a).$$

But then

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{st} \otimes \theta_{st}(a) &= \Theta(E_{st} \otimes a) \\
&= \Theta((E_{si} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}})(E_{ij} \otimes a)(E_{jt} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}})) \\
&= (E_{si} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{B}})\Theta(E_{ij} \otimes a)(E_{jt} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{B}}) \\
&= (E_{si} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{B}})(E_{ij} \otimes \theta_{ij}(a))(E_{jt} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{B}}) \\
&= E_{st} \otimes \theta_{ij}(a),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $\theta_{st}(a) = \theta_{ij}(a)$. Thus if we define $\theta = \theta_{ii}$ for any fixed $i \in J$, then $\theta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is a c.c.p. map and

$$\Theta([a_{ij}]) = [\theta(a_{ij})] = \theta_J([a_{ij}]).$$

□

Remark 2.3.2. We observe that Lemma 2.3.1 remains valid (with the same proof) if one replaces $\mathbb{M}_J(\mathcal{A})$ by $\mathbb{K}_J(\mathcal{A})$.

We are now properly equipped to show that pseudo-expectations behave well with respect to stabilization.

Theorem 2.3.3. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ be a unital C^* -inclusion and J be any index set. Then the map $\theta \mapsto \text{id}_J \otimes \theta$ is a bijective correspondence between the pseudo-expectations $\theta : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})$ for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and the pseudo-expectations $\Theta : \mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{B} \rightarrow I(\mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{A})$ for $\mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{B}$. Moreover, θ_J is faithful if and only if θ is faithful.

Proof. If $\theta : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})$ is a c.c.p. map such that $\theta(a) = a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\text{id}_J \otimes \theta : \mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_J \otimes I(\mathcal{A})$ is a c.c.p. map such that $(\text{id}_J \otimes \theta)(T \otimes a) = T \otimes a$ for all $T \in \mathbb{K}_J$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Since

$$\mathbb{K}_J \otimes I(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathbb{K}_J(I(\mathcal{A})) \subseteq \mathbb{M}_J(I(\mathcal{A})) = I(\mathbb{K}_J(\mathcal{A})) \cong I(\mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{A}),$$

we see that $\text{id}_J \otimes \theta$ is a pseudo-expectation for $\mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{B}$. Conversely, suppose $\Theta : \mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{B} \rightarrow I(\mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{A})$ is a c.c.p. map such that $\Theta(T \otimes a) = T \otimes a$ for all $T \in \mathbb{K}_J$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Since $\mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{B} \cong \mathbb{K}_J(\mathcal{B})$ and $I(\mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{A}) \cong \mathbb{M}_J(I(\mathcal{A}))$ are C^* -algebras, Θ is a \mathbb{K}_J -bimodule map, by Choi's Lemma. Thus by Lemma 2.3.1, there exists a c.c.p. map $\theta : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow I(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\Theta = \text{id}_J \otimes \theta$. It follows that $\theta(a) = a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, so that θ is a pseudo-expectation for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$.

Now suppose that θ_J is faithful. If $\theta(b^*b) = 0$, then

$$\theta_J((E_{ii} \otimes b)^*(E_{ii} \otimes b)) = \theta_J(E_{ii} \otimes b^*b) = E_{ii} \otimes \theta(b^*b) = 0,$$

which implies $E_{ii} \otimes b = 0$, which in turn implies $b = 0$. Conversely, suppose θ is faithful. If

$$\theta_J([b_{ij}]^* [b_{ij}]) = \theta_J([b_{ji}^*] [b_{ij}]) = [\theta(\sum_{k \in J} b_{ki}^* b_{kj})] = 0,$$

then $\sum_{k \in J} b_{ki}^* b_{kj} = 0$ for all $i \in J$, which implies $[b_{ij}] = 0$. □

Here is the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.3.4. Let $(\mathcal{A}, G, \alpha, \sigma)$ be a twisted C^* -dynamical system, where \mathcal{A} is a unital C^* -algebra and G is a discrete group. If the unital C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha, \sigma}^r G$ is hereditarily essential, then it has a unique pseudo-expectation.

Proof. If every pseudo-expectation for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} G$ is faithful, then every pseudo-expectation for $\mathbb{K}_G \otimes \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{K}_G \otimes (\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} G)$ is faithful, by Theorem 2.3.3. By [14, Corollary 3.7], there exists an action β of G on $\mathbb{K}_J \otimes \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\mathbb{K}_G \otimes (\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} G) \cong (\mathbb{K}_G \otimes \mathcal{A}) \rtimes_{\beta,r} G$$

via an isomorphism that identifies the copies of $\mathbb{K}_G \otimes \mathcal{A}$. Thus every pseudo-expectation for $\mathbb{K}_G \otimes \mathcal{A} \subseteq (\mathbb{K}_G \otimes \mathcal{A}) \rtimes_{\beta,r} G$ is faithful, and so there is a unique pseudo-expectation by Theorem 2.2.2. Then $\mathbb{K}_G \otimes \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{K}_G \otimes (\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} G)$ has a unique pseudo-expectation by [14, Corollary 3.7], which implies $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} G$ has a unique pseudo-expectation by Theorem 2.3.3. \square

Another trick allows one to upgrade from inclusions of the form $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} G$ to inclusions of the form $\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} N \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} G$, for $N \trianglelefteq G$ a normal subgroup.

Corollary 2.3.5. *Let $(\mathcal{A}, G, \alpha, \sigma)$ be a twisted C^* -dynamical system, where \mathcal{A} is a unital C^* -algebra and G is a discrete group, and let $N \trianglelefteq G$ be a normal subgroup. If the unital C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} N \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} G$ is hereditarily essential, then it has a unique pseudo-expectation.*

Proof. By [14, Theorem 4.1], there exists a twisted C^* -dynamical system $(\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} N, G/N, \beta, \tau)$ such that

$$\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} G \cong (\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} N) \otimes_{\beta,r}^{\tau} (G/N)$$

via an isomorphism which identifies the copies of $\mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} N$. Then the result follows immediately from Theorem 2.3.4. \square

3. A NEGATIVE RESULT

3.1. A Counterexample. In this section, we show that in general, Question 1.5.1 has a negative answer. We thank Mikael Rørdam for suggesting that we search for counterexamples among C^* -irreducible inclusions of the form $C_r^*(G) \subseteq C(X) \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$.

Theorem 3.1.1. *There exist C^* -irreducible inclusions of the form $C_r^*(G) \subseteq C(X) \rtimes_r G$ with multiple conditional expectations.*

Proof. Let G be a countably-infinite discrete group such that $C_r^*(G)$ is simple (one could take $G = \mathbb{F}_2$, by a result of Powers [19, Theorem 2]). By [7, Corollary 1.1], there exists a free minimal action $G \curvearrowright X$ on the Cantor set that is not uniquely ergodic. Denote by α the induced action $G \curvearrowright C(X)$. By [1, Theorem 1.3], the inclusion $C_r^*(G) \subseteq C(X) \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ is C^* -irreducible. But if μ is any G -invariant Borel probability measure on X and ϕ_{μ} is the G -invariant state on $C(X)$ defined by integration against μ , then there exists a unique conditional expectation $E_{\mu} : C(X) \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G \rightarrow C_r^*(G)$ such that

$$E_{\mu} \left(\sum_g a_g g \right) = \sum_g \phi_{\mu}(a_g) g, \quad a \in C_c(G, C(X)).$$

(See [5, Exercise 4.1.4].) In particular,

$$E_{\mu}(a) = \phi_{\mu}(a) = \int_X a(x) d\mu(x), \quad a \in C(X).$$

Since there are multiple G -invariant Borel probability measures on X , there are multiple conditional expectations for $C_r^*(G) \subseteq C(X) \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$. \square

3.2. Future Directions. A principal difference between inclusions of the form $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rtimes_{\alpha,r}^{\sigma} G$, for which Question 1.5.2 has an affirmative answer by Theorem 2.3.4, and inclusions of the form $C_r^*(G) \subseteq C(X) \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$, for which Question 1.5.2 can have a negative answer by Theorem 3.1.1, is that the former inclusions are regular while the latter inclusions need not be. A unital C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is *regular* if

$$\mathcal{B} = \overline{\text{span}}\{u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}) : u \mathcal{A} u^* = \mathcal{A}\}.$$

This suggests that Question 1.5.2 should be modified into the following:

Question 3.2.1. *If a regular C^* -inclusion $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential, does it have a unique pseudo-expectation?*

In conclusion, we provide some additional evidence in favor of an affirmative answer to Question 3.2.1.

- (7) Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ be a regular C^* -inclusion, where \mathcal{A} is abelian. If $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential, then so are $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^c$ and $\mathcal{A}^c \subseteq \mathcal{B}$, where $\mathcal{A}^c = \mathcal{A}' \cap \mathcal{B}$ is the relative commutant (Proposition 1.2.2). Since \mathcal{A}^c is abelian (Proposition 1.2.3), [17, Theorem 5.2] applies to show that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ has a unique pseudo-expectation.
- (8) Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ be a regular C^* -inclusion, where \mathcal{A} is simple. Assume that there exists a conditional expectation $E : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. If $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is hereditarily essential (and therefore C^* -irreducible), then $\mathcal{A}^c = \mathbb{C}1_{\mathcal{A}}$ [20, Remark 3.8]. Thus $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is aperiodic [12, Corollary 7.4] and therefore has a unique pseudo-expectation [13, Theorem 3.6].

REFERENCES

- [1] Amrutam, Tattwamasi; Kalantar, Mehrdad *On simplicity of intermediate C^* -algebras*. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 40 (2020), no. 12, 3181-3187.
- [2] Berberian, Sterling K. *Baer *-rings*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 195. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1972. xiii+296 pp.
- [3] Blackadar, B. *Operator algebras. Theory of C^* -algebras and von Neumann algebras*. Encyclopaedia Math. Sci., 122. Oper. Alg. Non-commut. Geom., III. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. xx+517 pp.
- [4] Blecher, David P.; Le Merdy, Christian *Operator algebras and their modules—an operator space approach*. London Math. Soc. Monogr. (N.S.), 30. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004. x+387 pp.
- [5] Brown, Nathaniel P.; Ozawa, Narutaka *C^* -algebras and finite-dimensional approximations*. Grad. Stud. Math., 88. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008. xvi+509 pp.
- [6] Effros, Edward G.; Ruan, Zhong-Jin *Operator spaces*. London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series, 23. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000. xvi+363 pp.
- [7] Elek, Gábor *Free minimal actions of countable groups with invariant probability measures*. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 41 (2021), no. 5, 1369-1389.
- [8] Giordano, Thierry; Kerr, David; Phillips, N. Christopher; Toms, Andrew *Crossed products of C^* -algebras, topological dynamics, and classification*. Lecture notes based on the course held at the Centre de Recerca Matemàtica (CRM) Barcelona, June 14–23, 2011. Edited by Francesc Perera. Adv. Courses Math. CRM Barcelona. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2018. x+498 pp.
- [9] Hamana, Masamichi *Injective envelopes of C^* -algebras*. J. Math. Soc. Japan 31 (1979), no. 1, 181-197.
- [10] Hamana, Masamichi *Injective envelopes of operator systems*. Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. 15 (1979), no. 3, 773-785.
- [11] Hamana, Masamichi *The centre of the regular monotone completion of a C^* -algebra*. J. London Math. Soc. (2) 26 (1982), no. 3, 522-530.
- [12] Kwaśniewski, Bartosz Kosma; Meyer, Ralf *Noncommutative Cartan C^* -subalgebras*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 373 (2020), no. 12, 8697-8724.

- [13] Kwaśniewski, Bartosz Kosma; Meyer, Ralf *Aperiodicity: the almost extension property and uniqueness of pseudo-expectations*. Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2022), no. 18, 14384-14426.
- [14] Packer, Judith A.; Raeburn, Iain *Twisted crossed products of C^* -algebras*. Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 106 (1989), no. 2, 293-311.
- [15] Pedersen, Gert K. *C^* -algebras and their automorphism groups*. London Mathematical Society Monographs, 14. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London-New York, 1979. ix+416 pp.
- [16] Pitts, David R. *Structure for regular inclusions. I*. J. Operator Theory 78 (2017), no. 2, 357-416.
- [17] Pitts, David R. *Structure for regular inclusions. II: Cartan envelopes, pseudo-expectations and twists*. J. Funct. Anal. 281 (2021), no. 1, Paper No. 108993, 66 pp.
- [18] Pitts, David R.; Zarikian, Vrej *Unique pseudo-expectations for C^* -inclusions*. Illinois J. Math. 59 (2015), no. 2, 449–483.
- [19] Powers, Robert T. *Simplicity of the C^* -algebra associated with the free group on two generators*. Duke Math. J. 42 (1975), 151-156.
- [20] Rørdam, Mikael *Irreducible inclusions of simple C^* -algebras*. Enseign. Math. 69 (2023), no. 3-4, 275-314.
- [21] Sakai, Shôichirô *On the group isomorphism of unitary groups in AW^* -algebras*. Tôhoku Math. J. (2) 7 (1955), 87-95.
- [22] Takesaki, Masamichi *Theory of operator algebras. I*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1979. vii+415 pp.
- [23] Zarikian, Vrej *Unique expectations for discrete crossed products*. Ann. Funct. Anal. 10 (2019), 60-71.

U. S. NAVAL ACADEMY, ANNAPOLIS, MD 21402
 Email address: zarikian@usna.edu