

COMMUTING FAMILIES OF POLYGONAL TYPE OPERATORS ON HILBERT SPACE

CHRISTIAN LE MERDY AND M.N. RESHMI

ABSTRACT. Let $T: H \rightarrow H$ be a bounded operator on Hilbert space. We say that T has a polygonal type if there exists an open convex polygon $\Delta \subset \mathbb{D}$, with $\overline{\Delta} \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$, such that the spectrum $\sigma(T)$ is included in $\overline{\Delta}$ and the resolvent $R(z, T)$ satisfies an estimate $\|R(z, T)\| \lesssim \max\{|z - \xi|^{-1} : \xi \in \overline{\Delta} \cap \mathbb{T}\}$ for $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}^c$. The class of polygonal type operators (which goes back to De Laubenfels and Franks-McIntosh) contains the class of Ritt operators. Let T_1, \dots, T_d be commuting operators on H , with $d \geq 3$. We prove functional calculus properties of the d -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_d) under various assumptions involving polygonal type. The main ones are the following. (1) If the T_k are contractions for all $k = 1, \dots, d$ and if T_1, \dots, T_{d-2} have a polygonal type, then (T_1, \dots, T_d) satisfies a generalized von Neumann inequality $\|\phi(T_1, \dots, T_d)\| \leq C \|\phi\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}^d}$ for polynomials ϕ in d variables; (2) If T_k is polynomially bounded with a polygonal type for all $k = 1, \dots, d$, then there exists an invertible operator $S: H \rightarrow H$ such that $\|S^{-1}T_k S\| \leq 1$ for all $k = 1, \dots, d$.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification : 47A60, 47A20, 47A13.

Key words: Dilations, functional calculus.

1. INTRODUCTION

The starting point of this paper is the following famous open problem in operator theory. Let H be a Hilbert space, let $d \geq 3$ be an integer and let $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_d: H \rightarrow H$ be commuting linear contractions. Is there a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$(1.1) \quad \|\phi(T_1, \dots, T_d)\| \leq C \sup\{|\phi(z_1, \dots, z_d)| : (z_1, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{D}^d\}$$

for all complex polynomials ϕ in d variables? Here $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ denotes the open unit disc of the complex plane. Von Neumann's inequality and Ando's inequality assert that (1.1) holds true for $d = 1$ and $d = 2$, respectively, with $C = 1$. However not much is known for $d \geq 3$. We refer to [15, Chapter 1], [8] and [9] for information and references on this issue. An estimate (1.1) is usually called a generalized von Neumann inequality.

The main objective of this paper is to prove such an estimate in the case when the contractions T_k belong to the class of polygonal type operators. Let $\mathbb{T} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$ denote the unit circle. We say that a bounded operator $T: H \rightarrow H$ has a polygonal type if there exists an open convex polygon $\Delta \subset \mathbb{D}$, with $\overline{\Delta} \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$, such that the spectrum $\sigma(T)$ is included in $\overline{\Delta}$ and the resolvent $R(z, T)$ satisfies an estimate

$$\|R(z, T)\| \lesssim \max\{|z - \xi|^{-1} : \xi \in \overline{\Delta} \cap \mathbb{T}\}, \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}^c.$$

Date: July 18, 2024.

Note that this implies that $\sigma(T) \cap \mathbb{T}$ is finite.




FIGURE 1. Polygon containing the spectrum of T

Polygonal type operators were introduced (independently) by De Laubenfels in [6] and by Franks and McIntosh in [7], in order to give a partial solution to the so-called Halmos problem. Recall that in [11], Halmos had asked whether any polynomially bounded operator $T: H \rightarrow H$ is necessarily similar to a contraction. Pisier solved this question negatively (see [16] and [15, Chapter 9]). Pisier's result was followed by [6, 7], in which it is proved that if $T: H \rightarrow H$ has a polygonal type, then T is polynomially bounded (if and) only if T is similar to a contraction. It is also established in [6] that if T is a polynomially bounded operator with a polygonal type, then there exist an open convex polygon $\Delta \subset \mathbb{D}$ and a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$(1.2) \quad \|\phi(T)\| \leq C \sup\{|\phi(z)| : z \in \Delta\},$$

for all complex polynomials ϕ in one variable. This remarkable functional calculus property can be regarded as an improvement of von Neumann's inequality.

In this paper we construct a new unitary dilation property for polynomially bounded, polygonal type operators $T: H \rightarrow H$, see Section 3. Using this dilation property, we show in Section 4 that if $T_1, \dots, T_d: H \rightarrow H$ are commuting contractions and if $T_1, \dots, T_{d-2}: H \rightarrow H$ have a polygonal type, then there exist a Hilbert space H' , two bounded operators $J: H \rightarrow H'$ and $Q: H' \rightarrow H$ and commuting unitaries U_1, \dots, U_d on H' such that

$$T_1^{n_1} \dots T_d^{n_d} = QU_1^{n_1} \dots U_d^{n_d} J, \quad n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0.$$

This implies that if $T_1, \dots, T_d: H \rightarrow H$ are commuting contractions and $T_1, \dots, T_{d-2}: H \rightarrow H$ have a polygonal type, then (T_1, \dots, T_d) satisfies a generalized von Neumann inequality (1.1). We also extend [6, 7] by showing that $T_1, \dots, T_d: H \rightarrow H$ are commuting polynomially bounded, polygonal type operators, then they are jointly similar to contractions, that is, there exists an invertible operator $S: H \rightarrow H$ such that $\|S^{-1}T_k S\| \leq 1$ for all $k = 1, \dots, d$. Finally in Section 5, we extend (1.2) to d -tuples. More precisely, we show that $T_1, \dots, T_d: H \rightarrow H$ are commuting polynomially bounded, polygonal type operators, then there exist an open convex polygon $\Delta \subset \mathbb{D}$ and a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\|\phi(T_1, \dots, T_d)\| \leq C \sup\{|\phi(z_1, \dots, z_d)| : (z_1, \dots, z_d) \in \Delta^d\},$$

for all complex polynomials ϕ in d variables. The approach to prove this functional calculus estimate is different from the one in [6]. It relies on a Franks-McIntosh type decomposition established in [5].

Ritt operators are a sub-class of polygonal type operators (for which we refer to [14]). The results of the present paper, summarized in the previous paragraph, generalize results from [3, Section 5] which concerns Ritt operators only.

2. POLYGONAL TYPE OPERATORS

Throughout we consider a Hilbert space H and we let $B(H)$ denote the Banach algebra of all bounded operators on H , equipped with the operator norm. We let I_H denote the identity operator on H . For any $T \in B(H)$, we let $\sigma(T)$ denote the spectrum of T and for any z in the resolvent set $\mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(T)$, we let $R(z, T) = (z - T)^{-1}$ denote the resolvent operator at z . As usual in this context, z stands for zI_H . Also we let $\text{Ran}(T)$ and $\text{Ker}(T)$ denote the range and the kernel of T , respectively.

For simplicity we call ‘‘polygon’’ any open convex polygon of \mathbb{C} (that is, a bounded, finite intersection of open complex half-planes). All polygons considered in this paper will be included in the unit disc \mathbb{D} .

Definition 2.1. *We say that $T \in B(H)$ has a polygonal type if there exist a polygon $\Delta \subset \mathbb{D}$, with $\overline{\Delta} \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$, and a constant $M \geq 0$ such that*

$$\sigma(T) \subset \overline{\Delta}$$

and

$$\|R(z, T)\| \leq M \max\{|z - \xi|^{-1} : \xi \in \overline{\Delta} \cap \mathbb{T}\}, \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}^c.$$

As mentioned in the introduction, the class of Hilbert space operators with a polygonal type first appeared in [6] and [7], although not with this terminology. They were recently studied in [5] (see also [4]) in the Banach space setting, as generalisations of Ritt operators.

Let $E \subset \mathbb{T}$ be a non-empty finite set. Following [5, Definition 2.1 and Remark 2.3], we say that $T \in B(H)$ is a Ritt_E operator if $\sigma(T) \subset \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and there exists a constant $M \geq 0$ such that $\|R(z, T)\| \leq M \max\{|z - \xi|^{-1} : \xi \in E\}$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}^c$. Following [5, Definition 2.6], we let E_r be the interior of the convex hull of E and of the disc $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda| < r\}$, for any $r \in (0, 1)$. If T is Ritt_E , then there exists $r \in (0, 1)$ and a constant $M \geq 0$ such that $\sigma(T) \subset \overline{E_r}$, by [5, Lemma 2.8]. Furthermore for all $r \in (0, 1)$, there exists a polygon Δ such that

$$E_r \subset \Delta \subset \mathbb{D}.$$

We easily deduce the following.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $T \in B(H)$.*

- (1) *If T is a Ritt_E operator for some non-empty finite set $E \subset \mathbb{T}$, then T has a polygonal type and we have $\sigma(T) \cap \mathbb{T} \subset E$.*
- (2) *If T has a polygonal type, then T is a Ritt_E operator for any non-empty finite subset $E \subset \mathbb{T}$ containing $\sigma(T) \cap \mathbb{T}$.*

We note for further use that if T has a polygonal type, then for any $\xi \in \sigma(T) \cap \mathbb{T}$, the operator $I_H - \bar{\xi}T$ is a sectorial operator of type $< \frac{\pi}{2}$ (see [5, Lemma 2.4]). We refer e.g. to [10, Section 2.1] for the definition and basic properties of sectorial operators.

Let \mathcal{P} denote the algebra of all complex polynomials (in one variable). For any non-empty bounded open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ and any $\phi \in \mathcal{P}$, we set

$$\|\phi\|_{\infty, \Omega} = \sup\{|\phi(\lambda)| : \lambda \in \Omega\}.$$

Let us recall a few classical definitions and results. An operator $T \in B(H)$ is called polynomially bounded if there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that $\|\phi(T)\| \leq C\|\phi\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}}$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{P}$. Further $T \in B(H)$ is called similar to a contraction if there exists an invertible $S \in B(H)$ such that $S^{-1}TS$ is a contraction, i.e. $\|S^{-1}TS\| \leq 1$. Von Neumann's inequality implies that any operator similar to a contraction is polynomially bounded. A famous result of Pisier [16] asserts that the converse is wrong. We refer to [15, Chapter 9] for more information on this. Just after Pisier's result was circulated, De Laubenfels [6] showed the following remarkable property (the paper [7] also contains the equivalence “(i) \Leftrightarrow (ii)”).

Theorem 2.3. ([6, Theorem 4.4]) *Let $T \in B(H)$ be an operator of polygonal type. The following assertions are equivalent.*

- (i) *T is polynomially bounded.*
- (ii) *T is similar to a contraction.*
- (iii) *There exists a polygon $\Delta \subset \mathbb{D}$ and a constant $C \geq 1$ such that*

$$\|\phi(T)\| \leq C\|\phi\|_{\infty, \Delta}, \quad \phi \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Note that an operator $T \in B(H)$ with a polygonal type is necessarily power bounded, by [5, Theorem 2.10]. However there exist operators of polygonal type on Hilbert space which are not polynomially bounded, see [13, Section 5].

We now review a recent result of Bouabdillah [4] on square functions associated with operators of polygonal type. Bouabdillah's work is carried out in the Banach space setting, however we will present it in the Hilbertian case only. We fix a finite set

$$E = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N\} \subset \mathbb{T},$$

where $N \geq 1$ and ξ_1, \dots, ξ_N are pairwise distinct. For any Ritt $_E$ operator T , we define a square function associated with T by setting, for any $x \in H$,

$$\|x\|_T = \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|T^k (I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T)^{\frac{1}{2}} (I_H - \bar{\xi}_2 T)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdots (I_H - \bar{\xi}_N T)^{\frac{1}{2}} x\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For all $j = 1, \dots, N$, the operator $I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T$ is sectorial (see above) hence the square root $(I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a well-defined element of $B(H)$ obtained by the usual functional calculus of sectorial operators, see e.g. [10, Section 3]. We note that $\|x\|_T$ may be infinite.

Theorem 2.4. ([4]) *Let $T \in B(H)$ be a Ritt $_E$ operator. If T is polynomially bounded, then there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ such that*

$$\|x\|_T \leq C\|x\|, \quad x \in H.$$

Here are a few comments on Theorem 2.4. First, we note that if T is polynomially bounded, then its adjoint T^* is polynomially bounded as well. Hence Theorem 2.4 implies that in this case, we have an estimate $\|y\|_{T^*} \leq C'\|y\|$ for all $y \in H$. Second, it is shown in [4] that conversely, if there exist constants $C, C' \geq 0$ such that $\|x\|_T \leq C\|x\|$ and $\|y\|_{T^*} \leq C'\|y\|$ for all $x, y \in H$, then T is polynomially bounded. Third, [4] considers other square functions than the above $\|\cdot\|_T$ and proves analogous results for them.

3. A SPECIFIC DILATION

Let H be a Hilbert space. If $T \in B(H)$ is a polynomially bounded operator of polygonal type, then there exists an invertible $S \in B(H)$ and a contraction $W \in B(H)$ such that $T = SWS^{-1}$, by Theorem 2.3. According to Nagy's dilation theorem (see e.g. [15, Theorem 1.1]), there exist a Hilbert space K , a unitary $V \in B(K)$ and an isometry $J_0: H \rightarrow K$ such that $W^n = J_0^*V^nJ_0$ for all $n \geq 0$. Set $J = J_0S^{-1}$ and $Q = SJ_0^*$. Then we obtain that

$$T^n = QV^nJ, \quad n \geq 0.$$

This is a unitary dilation of T . The aim of this section is to devise a specific unitary dilation for polynomially bounded operators of polygonal type, without any recourse to Nagy's dilation theorem. This will be achieved in Proposition 3.1.

For any index set I , we let $\ell_I^2(H)$ denote the Hilbert space of all 2-summable families $(x_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ of H . If $J: H \rightarrow \ell_I^2(H)$ is a bounded operator, the operators $J_\iota \in B(H)$, $\iota \in I$, such that $J(x) = (J_\iota(x))_{\iota \in I}$ for all $x \in H$, will be called the coordinates of J .

We fix a set

$$E = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N\} \subset \mathbb{T},$$

where $N \geq 1$ and the ξ_j are pairwise distinct. In the sequel, we will use the Hilbertian direct sum $\ell_N^2(H) \oplus^2 \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H)$. We note that the latter can be regarded as $\ell_I^2(H)$, where I is the disjoint union $I = \{1, \dots, N\} \sqcup \mathbb{Z}$. For any $T_1 \in B(\ell_N^2(H))$ and $T_2 \in B(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H))$, we let

$$T_1 \oplus T_2: \ell_N^2(H) \oplus^2 \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H) \longrightarrow \ell_N^2(H) \oplus^2 \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H)$$

be the operator taking (y_1, y_2) to $(T_1(y_1), T_2(y_2))$ for all $y_1 \in \ell_N^2(H)$ and $y_2 \in \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H)$.

We let $V_H: \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H) \rightarrow \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H)$ be the shift operator defined by

$$(3.1) \quad V_H((x_k)_k) = (x_{k+1})_k, \quad (x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H).$$

Then we let $D_H: \ell_N^2(H) \rightarrow \ell_N^2(H)$ be the diagonal operator defined by

$$(3.2) \quad D_H(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = (\xi_1 x_1, \xi_2 x_2, \dots, \xi_n x_n), \quad x_1, \dots, x_n \in H.$$

Both V_H and D_H are unitaries.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $T \in B(H)$ be a polynomially bounded Ritt_E operator. Then there exist two bounded operators*

$$J: H \longrightarrow \ell_N^2(H) \oplus^2 \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H) \quad \text{and} \quad Q: \ell_N^2(H) \oplus^2 \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H) \longrightarrow H$$

such that

$$T^n = Q(D_H \oplus V_H^2)^n J, \quad n \geq 0,$$

and all the coordinates of J belong to the bicommutant of $\{T\}$.

Note that $D_H \oplus V_H^2$ is a unitary, so this proposition provides a unitary dilation of T . We will prove it at the end of this section. We need preparation lemmas.

Throughout the rest of this section, we let $(a_m)_{m \geq 0}$ denote the sequence of complex numbers provided by the Taylor expansion,

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^N (1 - \bar{\xi}_j z)} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m z^m, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(a_m)_{m \geq 0}$ be defined by (3.3).*

- (1) *There exist $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_N \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $a_m = \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i (\bar{\xi}_i)^m$ for all $m \geq 0$.*
- (2) *The sequence $(a_m)_{m \geq 0}$ is bounded.*

Proof. Property (2) clearly follows from property (1), so we only need to prove (1). We use induction on N . For convenience we write $a_{m,N}$ instead of a_m for the coefficients in (3.3). In the case $N = 1$, we have

$$\frac{1}{1 - \bar{\xi}_1 z} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \bar{\xi}_1^m z^m, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

hence the result follows at once. Now let us assume that $N \geq 2$ and that property (1) holds true for $N - 1$. Thus we have an expansion

$$\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{N-1} (1 - \bar{\xi}_j z)} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_{m,N-1} z^m, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

where $a_{m,N-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \alpha_i (\bar{\xi}_i)^m$ for some constants $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N-1} \in \mathbb{C}$. We write

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_{m,N} z^m = \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\xi}_N z} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_{j,N-1} z^j \right) = \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \bar{\xi}_N^k z^k \right) \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_{j,N-1} z^j \right).$$

This implies, for all $m \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} a_{m,N} &= \sum_{j=0}^m a_{j,N-1} \bar{\xi}_N^{m-j} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \alpha_i (\bar{\xi}_i)^j \right) (\bar{\xi}_N)^{m-j} \\ &= (\bar{\xi}_N)^m \sum_{j=0}^m \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \alpha_i (\bar{\xi}_i)^j (\xi_N)^j \\ &= (\bar{\xi}_N)^m \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \alpha_i \left[\frac{1 - (\bar{\xi}_i \xi_N)^{m+1}}{1 - \bar{\xi}_i \xi_N} \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \alpha_i \frac{(\bar{\xi}_N)^m}{1 - \bar{\xi}_i \xi_N} - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \alpha_i \frac{\bar{\xi}_i \xi_N}{1 - \bar{\xi}_i \xi_N} (\bar{\xi}_i)^m. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\beta_i = -\frac{\alpha_i \bar{\xi}_i \xi_N}{1 - \bar{\xi}_i \xi_N} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq N-1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_N = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{\alpha_i}{1 - \bar{\xi}_i \xi_N}.$$

Then we have $a_{m,N} = \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i (\bar{\xi}_i)^m$, which proves (1). \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let $T \in B(H)$ be a Ritt_E operator, and assume that T is polynomially bounded. Then for any $x \in \overline{\text{Ran}}\left(\prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)\right)$, we have*

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m T^m \prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)x = x.$$

(The convergence of the series is part of the result.)

Proof. Consider the polynomial expansion

$$\prod_{j=1}^N (1 - \bar{\xi}_j z) = \sum_{i=0}^N c_i z^i, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

for some $c_0, c_1, \dots, c_N \in \mathbb{C}$. For convenience, we set $c_i = 0$ if $i > N$. Observe that

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i z^i\right) \left(\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m z^m\right) = \prod_{j=1}^N (1 - \bar{\xi}_j z) \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m z^m = 1, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

This implies that $c_0 a_0 = 1$ and that for any integer $r \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{i+m=r} c_i a_m = 0.$$

For any integer $k \geq N$, we let $S_k \in \mathcal{P}$ be defined by

$$S_k(z) = \left(\sum_{i=0}^N c_i z^i\right) \left(\sum_{m=0}^k a_m z^m\right),$$

and we write it as

$$S_k(z) = \sum_{r=0}^{k+N} \gamma_{r,k} z^r.$$

We note that if $r \leq k$, then $\gamma_{r,k} = \sum_{i+m=r} c_i a_m$. Hence $\gamma_{0,k} = 1$ and $\gamma_{r,k} = 0$ if $1 \leq r \leq k$. Thus we actually have

$$S_k(z) = 1 + \sum_{r=k+1}^{k+N} \gamma_{r,k} z^r, \quad \text{with} \quad \gamma_{r,k} = \sum_{m=r-N}^k c_{r-m} a_m \quad \text{for } k+1 \leq r \leq k+N.$$

Since $(a_m)_{m \geq 1}$ is a bounded sequence, by Lemma 3.2, the above expression of $\gamma_{r,k}$ implies that

$$(3.4) \quad \{\gamma_{r,k} : k \geq N, k+1 \leq r \leq k+N\} \quad \text{is bounded.}$$

Consequently, the set $\{S_k(z) : k \geq N, z \in \mathbb{D}\}$ is bounded. Since T is polynomially bounded, this implies that

$$(3.5) \quad \sup_{k \geq N} \|S_k(T)\| < \infty.$$

Let $x \in \text{Ran}\left(\prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)\right)$ and write $x = \prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)y$ for some $y \in H$. Then for any $k \geq N$, we have

$$S_k(T)x = \left(I_H + \sum_{r=k+1}^{k+N} \gamma_{r,k} T^r\right)x = x + \sum_{r=k+1}^{k+N} \gamma_{r,k} \left(T^r \prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)\right)y.$$

Since T is polynomially bounded, we have

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \left\| T^r (I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T)^{\frac{1}{2}} (I_H - \bar{\xi}_2 T)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdots (I_H - \bar{\xi}_N T)^{\frac{1}{2}} y \right\|^2 < \infty,$$

by Theorem 2.4. Thus, $\left\| T^r (I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T)^{\frac{1}{2}} (I_H - \bar{\xi}_2 T)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdots (I_H - \bar{\xi}_N T)^{\frac{1}{2}} y \right\| \rightarrow 0$, and hence

$$\left(T^r \prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)\right)y \rightarrow 0,$$

when $r \rightarrow \infty$. Using (3.4) again, we deduce that $S_k(T)x \rightarrow x$ when $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Now assume that $x \in \overline{\text{Ran}}\left(\prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)\right)$. It follows from above and from the uniform estimate (3.5) that $S_k(T)x \rightarrow x$ when $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since

$$S_k(T) = \sum_{m=0}^k a_m T^m \prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T),$$

this yields the result. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $T \in B(H)$ be any power bounded operator. Then H admits a direct sum decomposition*

$$H = \bigoplus_{j=1}^N \text{Ker}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T) \oplus \overline{\text{Ran}}\left(\prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)\right).$$

Furthermore, the $(N + 1)$ projections associated with this decomposition all belong to the bicommutant of $\{T\}$.

Proof. The operator $\bar{\xi}_1 T$ is power bounded. Since H is reflexive, the Mean ergodic theorem (see e.g. [12, Subsection 2.2.1]) asserts that we have a direct sum decomposition

$$H = \text{Ker}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T) \oplus \overline{\text{Ran}}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T).$$

Moreover, if we let $P \in B(H)$ be the projection with range equal to $\text{Ker}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T)$ and kernel equal to $\overline{\text{Ran}}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T)$, we have

$$P(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^n (\bar{\xi}_1 T)^k x, \quad x \in H.$$

Hence P belongs to the bicommutant of $\{T\}$.

Consider the restriction $T_1 = T|_{\overline{\text{Ran}}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T)} \in B(\overline{\text{Ran}}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T))$. Now applying the Mean ergodic theorem to T_1 , we obtain a direct sum decomposition

$$\overline{\text{Ran}}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T) = (\text{Ker}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_2 T) \cap \overline{\text{Ran}}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T)) \oplus \overline{\text{Ran}}((I_H - \bar{\xi}_2 T)(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T)).$$

Moreover the projections associated with this decomposition belong to the bicommutant of T_1 .

Let $x \in \text{Ker}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_2 T)$. Then $x = \bar{\xi}_2 T x$ and hence

$$(I - \bar{\xi}_1 T)x = \bar{\xi}_2 T x - \bar{\xi}_1 T x = (1 - \xi_2 \bar{\xi}_1) \bar{\xi}_2 T x = (1 - \xi_2 \bar{\xi}_1)x.$$

Since $\xi_2 \neq \xi_1$, we have $1 - \xi_2 \bar{\xi}_1 \neq 0$ and we obtain that

$$x = \frac{(I - \bar{\xi}_1 T)}{(1 - \xi_2 \bar{\xi}_1)} x.$$

This implies that $x \in \overline{\text{Ran}}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T)$. Consequently, $\text{Ker}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_2 T) \cap \overline{\text{Ran}}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T)$ is equal to $\text{Ker}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_2 T)$, and hence

$$H = \text{Ker}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T) \oplus \text{Ker}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_2 T) \oplus \overline{\text{Ran}}((I_H - \bar{\xi}_2 T)(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T)).$$

Moreover the projections associated with this direct sum decomposition belong to the bicommutant of T .

Since $\xi_i \neq \xi_j$ for any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq N$, the result now follows by induction. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.1. We set

$$A = \prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since T is polynomially bounded, it satisfies a square function estimate

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|T^k (I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T)^{\frac{1}{2}} (I_H - \bar{\xi}_2 T)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdots (I_H - \bar{\xi}_N T)^{\frac{1}{2}} x\|^2 \leq C^2 \|x\|^2, \quad x \in H,$$

by Theorem 2.4. According to Lemma 3.4, any $x \in H$ can be uniquely written as

$$x = x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_N + x_{N+1},$$

where $x_j \in \text{Ker}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)$ for $1 \leq j \leq N$ and $x_{N+1} \in \overline{\text{Ran}}\left(\prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)\right)$. Applying the above square function estimate to x_{N+1} , we may therefore define a bounded operator

$$J: H \longrightarrow \ell_N^2(H) \oplus^2 \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H)$$

by

$$J(x) = (x_1, \dots, x_N) + (\dots, 0, \dots, 0, Ax_{N+1}, TAx_{N+1}, TAx_{N+1}, \dots, T^k Ax_{N+1}, T^k Ax_{N+1}, T^{k+1} Ax_{N+1}, \dots),$$

In the definition of J , the term $T^k Ax_{N+1}$ appears at the $2k$ -th position and the term $T^{k+1} Ax_{N+1}$ appears at the $(2k+1)$ -th position of the sequence, for every $k \geq 0$.

Similarly since T^* is polynomially bounded, it also satisfies a square function estimate

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|T^{*k}(I_H - \xi_1 T^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_H - \xi_2 T^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdots (I_H - \xi_N T^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} y\|^2 \leq C'^2 \|y\|^2, \quad y \in H.$$

Moreover Lemma 3.4 ensures that we have a direct sum decomposition

$$H = \bigoplus_{j=1}^N \text{Ker}(I_H - \xi_j T^*) \oplus \overline{\text{Ran}}\left(\prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \xi_j T^*)\right).$$

For any $y \in H$, let

$$y = y_1 + y_2 + \cdots + y_N + y_{N+1},$$

with $y_j \in \text{Ker}(I_H - \xi_j T^*)$ for $1 \leq j \leq N$ and $y_{N+1} \in \overline{\text{Ran}}\left(\prod_{j=1}^N (I - \xi_j T^*)\right)$, and define a bounded linear operator

$$\tilde{J}: H \longrightarrow \ell_N^2(H) \oplus^2 \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H)$$

by

$$\tilde{J}(y) = (y_1, \dots, y_N) + \left(\dots, 0, \dots, 0, \overline{a_0} A^* y_{N+1}, \overline{a_1} A^* y_{N+1}, \dots, \right. \\ \left. \overline{a_{2k-1}} T^{*(k-1)} A^* y_{N+1}, \overline{a_{2k}} T^{*k} A^* y_{N+1}, \dots \right),$$

where the coefficients a_k are given by (3.3). In this definition, $\overline{a_{2k-1}} T^{*(k-1)} A^* y_{N+1}$ appears at the $(2k-1)$ -th position for all $k \geq 1$ whereas $\overline{a_{2k}} T^{*k} A^* y_{N+1}$ appears at the $2k$ -th position for all $k \geq 0$.

We set $Q = \tilde{J}^*: \ell_N^2(H) \oplus^2 \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H) \rightarrow H$ and

$$V = D_H \oplus V_H^2: \ell_N^2(H) \oplus^2 \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H) \longrightarrow \ell_N^2(H) \oplus^2 \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H).$$

For any integer $n \geq 0$, we have

$$V^n J(x) = (\xi_1^n x_1, \xi_2^n x_2, \dots, \xi_N^n x_N) + \left(\dots, *, \dots, *, T^n A x_{N+1}, T^{n+1} A x_{N+1}, T^{n+1} A x_{N+1}, \dots, \right. \\ \left. T^{n+k} A x_{N+1}, T^{n+k} A x_{N+1}, T^{n+k+1} A x_{N+1}, \dots \right),$$

where the $*$ stand for terms at negative positions and for every $k \geq 0$, $T^{n+k} A x_{N+1}$ appears at the $2k$ -th position and $T^{n+k+1} A x_{N+1}$ appears at the $(2k+1)$ -th position, for every $k \geq 0$.

Combining with the definition of \tilde{J} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle QV^n J(x), y \rangle &= \langle V^n J(x), \tilde{J}(y) \rangle \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j^n \langle x_j, y_j \rangle \\
&\quad + \left\langle (T^n Ax_{N+1}, T^{n+1} Ax_{N+1}, T^{n+1} Ax_{N+1}, \dots, T^{n+k} Ax_{N+1}, T^{n+k} Ax_{N+1}, \dots), \right. \\
&\quad \left. (\bar{a}_0 A^* y_{N+1}, \bar{a}_1 A^* y_{N+1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{2k-1} T^{*(k-1)} A^* y_{N+1}, \bar{a}_{2k} T^{*k} A^* y_{N+1}, \dots) \right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j^n \langle x_j, y_j \rangle \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(a_{2k} \langle T^{n+k} Ax_{N+1}, T^{*k} A^* y_{N+1} \rangle + a_{2k+1} \langle T^{n+k+1} Ax_{N+1}, T^{*k} A^* y_{N+1} \rangle \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\langle QV^n J(x), y \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j^n \langle x_j, y_j \rangle + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m \langle T^{m+n} A^2 x_{N+1}, y_{N+1} \rangle.$$

Since $x_{N+1} \in \overline{\text{Ran}}\left(\prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)\right)$ we deduce, using Lemma 3.3, that

$$\langle QV^n J(x), y \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j^n \langle x_j, y_j \rangle + \langle T^n x_{N+1}, y_{N+1} \rangle.$$

For any $1 \leq j \leq N$, $x_j \in \text{Ker}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)$, hence $Tx_j = \bar{\xi}_j x_j$. Thus, $T^n x_j = \bar{\xi}_j^n x_j$ for all $n \geq 0$. Therefore, we have proved that

$$\langle QV^n J(x), y \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^N \langle T^n x_j, y_j \rangle + \langle T^n x_{N+1}, y_{N+1} \rangle.$$

It follows from the proof of Lemma 3.4 that

$$\overline{\text{Ran}}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T) = \bigoplus_{j=2}^N \text{Ker}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T) \oplus \overline{\text{Ran}}\left(\prod_{j=1}^N (I_H - \bar{\xi}_j T)\right).$$

Since $\overline{\text{Ran}}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T) = \text{Ker}(I_H - \bar{\xi}_1 T^*)^\perp$, this implies that $\langle x_j, y_1 \rangle = 0$ for all $j \geq 2$. Similarly, we have $\langle x_j, y_i \rangle = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \neq i \leq N+1$. Applying this with $T^n x$ instead of x , we finally obtain that $\langle T^n x_j, y_i \rangle = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \neq i \leq N+1$. Hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \langle T^n x_j, y_j \rangle + \langle T^n x_{N+1}, y_{N+1} \rangle = \langle T^n x, y \rangle.$$

Thus, the above calculation yields $T^n = QV^n J$.

The coordinates of J are either the projections $x \mapsto x_j$, for $1 \leq j \leq N$, the zero operator or the operators $x \mapsto T^k A x_{N+1}$, for $k \geq 0$. They all belong to the bicommutant of $\{T\}$ by the last sentence of Proposition 3.4. \square

4. GENERALIZED VON NEUMANN INEQUALITIES AND JOINT SIMILARITIES

In this section we deal with finite commuting families of operators on H . We will extend most of the results of [3, Section 5] to operators of poygonal type.

We aim at writing a unitary dilation for a d -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_d) of commuting elements of $B(H)$, of which at least $(d - 2)$ of them have a poygonal type and are polynomially bounded. For this purpose we will appeal to [3, Lemma 4.1], that we state (and explain) in the Hilbertian setting for convenience.

Given a second Hilbert space K , we let $K \overset{2}{\otimes} H$ denote the Hilbertian tensor product of K and H . We recall that for any $T \in B(H)$ and $A \in B(K)$, the operator $A \otimes T: K \otimes H \rightarrow K \otimes H$ uniquely extends to a bounded operator

$$A \overline{\otimes} T: K \overset{2}{\otimes} H \longrightarrow K \overset{2}{\otimes} H,$$

with $\|A \overline{\otimes} T\| = \|A\| \|T\|$. Furthermore, $A \overline{\otimes} T$ is a unitary if A and T are unitaries.

In the sequel, for any integer $j \geq 1$, we set $K^{\otimes j} = K \overset{2}{\otimes} \dots \overset{2}{\otimes} K$ (j copies).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $1 \leq m < d$ be integers. Let $T_1, \dots, T_d \in B(H)$ be commuting operators. Assume that there exist two Hilbert spaces K, L for which the following properties hold:*

- (a) *For every $k = 1, \dots, m$, there exist a unitary $V_k \in B(K)$ and two bounded operators $J_k: H \rightarrow K \overset{2}{\otimes} H$ and $Q_k: K \overset{2}{\otimes} H \rightarrow H$ such that*

$$T_k^{n_k} = Q_k (V_k \overline{\otimes} I_H)^{n_k} J_k, \quad n_k \geq 0.$$

- (b) *There exist two bounded operators $J_{m+1}: H \rightarrow L$ and $Q_{m+1}: L \rightarrow H$ and commuting unitaries $V_{m+1}, \dots, V_d \in B(L)$ such that*

$$T_{m+1}^{n_{m+1}} \dots T_d^{n_d} = Q_{m+1} V_{m+1}^{n_{m+1}} \dots V_d^{n_d} J_{m+1}, \quad n_{m+1}, \dots, n_d \geq 0.$$

- (c) *For every $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = 1, \dots, d$, we have*

$$J_i T_j = (I_K \overline{\otimes} T_j) J_i.$$

Then there exist commuting unitaries U_1, \dots, U_d on $K^{\otimes m} \overset{2}{\otimes} L$, as well as two bounded operators $J: H \rightarrow K^{\otimes m} \overset{2}{\otimes} L$ and $Q: K^{\otimes m} \overset{2}{\otimes} L \rightarrow H$ such that

$$(4.1) \quad T_1^{n_1} \dots T_d^{n_d} = Q U_1^{n_1} \dots U_d^{n_d} J, \quad n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0.$$

Proof. For any $k = 1, \dots, m$, define U_k on $K^{\otimes m} \overset{2}{\otimes} L$ by

$$U_k = I_{K^{\otimes(k-1)}} \overline{\otimes} V_k \overline{\otimes} I_{K^{\otimes(m-k)}} \overline{\otimes} I_L.$$

Next for $k = m + 1, \dots, d$, define U_k on $K^{\otimes m} \overset{2}{\otimes} L$ by

$$U_k = I_{K^{\otimes m}} \overline{\otimes} V_k.$$

Then U_1, \dots, U_d are commuting unitaries.

Next define $J: H \rightarrow K^{\otimes m} \overset{2}{\otimes} L$ and $Q: K^{\otimes m} \overset{2}{\otimes} L \rightarrow H$ by

$$J = (I_{K^{\otimes m}} \overline{\otimes} J_{m+1})(I_{K^{\otimes(m-1)}} \overline{\otimes} J_m) \cdots (I_{K^{\otimes 2}} \overline{\otimes} J_3)(I_K \overline{\otimes} J_2)J_1$$

and

$$Q = Q_1(I_K \overline{\otimes} Q_2)(I_{K^{\otimes 2}} \overline{\otimes} Q_3) \cdots (I_{K^{\otimes(m-1)}} \overline{\otimes} Q_m)(I_{K^{\otimes m}} \overline{\otimes} Q_{m+1}).$$

Then the proof of [3, Lemma 4.1] shows that the operators J, Q, U_1, \dots, U_d satisfy the dilation property (4.1). \square

Let $d \geq 1$ be an integer. Extending definitions from Section 2, we let \mathcal{P}_d denote the algebra of all complex polynomials in d variables. Further given any non-empty bounded open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ and any $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_d$, we set $\|\phi\|_{\infty, \Omega} = \sup\{|\phi(\lambda)| : \lambda \in \Omega\}$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_d$.

Let (T_1, \dots, T_d) be a d -tuple of commuting operators on H . We say that (T_1, \dots, T_d) is similar to a d -tuple of contractions if there exists an invertible $S \in B(H)$ such that $S^{-1}T_k S$ is a contraction for all $k = 1, \dots, d$. Note that there exist couples (T_1, T_2) of commuting operators such that T_1 and T_2 are each similar to a contraction but (T_1, T_2) is not similar to a couple of contractions. That is, there exist invertibles $S_1, S_2 \in B(H)$ such that

$$(4.2) \quad \|S_1^{-1}T_1 S_1\| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|S_2^{-1}T_2 S_2\| \leq 1,$$

but (4.2) cannot be achieved with $S_2 = S_1$. We refer to [17] for an example.

Theorem 4.2. *Assume that $d \geq 3$ and let $T_1, \dots, T_d \in B(H)$ be commuting operators such that:*

- (a) *For every $k = 1, \dots, d-2$, T_j is polynomially bounded with a polygonal type;*
- (b) *The couple (T_{d-1}, T_d) is similar to a couple of contractions.*

Then the following two properties hold.

- (1) *There exist a Hilbert space H' , two bounded operators $J: H \rightarrow H'$ and $Q: H' \rightarrow H$ and commuting unitaries U_1, \dots, U_d on H' such that*

$$T_1^{n_1} \cdots T_d^{n_d} = Q U_1^{n_1} \cdots U_d^{n_d} J, \quad n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0.$$

- (2) *There exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that*

$$\|\phi(T_1, \dots, T_d)\| \leq C \|\phi\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}^d}, \quad \phi \in \mathcal{P}_d.$$

Proof. To prove (1), we will show that (T_1, \dots, T_d) satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 4.1 for $m = d-2$. Since (T_{d-1}, T_d) is similar to a couple of contractions, there exist an invertible operator $S \in B(H)$ such that $S^{-1}T_{d-1}S$ and $S^{-1}T_d S$ are contractions. These contractions commute. Hence by Ando's dilation theorem (see [1] or [15, Theorem 1.2]), there exist a Hilbert space L , an isometry $J_0: H \rightarrow L$ and commuting unitaries V_{d-1}, V_d on L such that

$$(S^{-1}T_{d-1}S)^{n_{d-1}}(S^{-1}T_d S)^{n_d} = J_0^*(V_{d-1}^{n_{d-1}}V_d^{n_d})J_0, \quad n_{d-1}, n_d \geq 0.$$

This readily implies that (T_{d-1}, T_d) satisfies the assumption (b) of Lemma 4.1, with

$$J_{d-1} = J_0 S^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{d-1} = S J_0^*.$$

Let $E = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N\} \subset \mathbb{T}$ such that T_k is a Ritt_E operator for every $1 \leq k \leq d-2$. We consider V_H and D_H defined by (3.1) and (3.2) and we introduce their scalar versions $V = V_{\mathbb{C}} \in B(\ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2)$ and $D = D_{\mathbb{C}} \in B(\ell_{\mathbb{N}}^2)$.

For any index set I , we have a natural identification $\ell_I^2(H) \simeq \ell_I^2 \overset{2}{\otimes} H$. Hence we may write

$$\ell_N^2(H) \overset{2}{\oplus} \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(H) = K \overset{2}{\otimes} H, \quad \text{with } K = \ell_N^2 \overset{2}{\oplus} \ell_{\mathbb{Z}}^2.$$

Under this identification, we have

$$D_H \oplus V_H^2 = (D \oplus V^2) \overline{\otimes} I_H.$$

Applying Proposition 3.1 with every $1 \leq k \leq d-2$, we find bounded operators $J_k: H \rightarrow K \overset{2}{\otimes} H$ and $Q_k: K \overset{2}{\otimes} H \rightarrow H$ such that (T_1, \dots, T_{d-2}) satisfies the assumption (a) of Lemma 4.1, with $V_k = D \oplus V^2$, and the coordinates of J_k belong to the bicommutant of $\{T_k\}$. Since T_1, \dots, T_d are commuting, the latter property ensures that (T_1, \dots, T_d) satisfies the assumption (c) of Lemma 4.1. This completes the proof of (1).

Using (1), we may write

$$\phi(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_d) = Q\phi(U_1, U_2, \dots, U_d)J$$

for all $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_d$. This implies

$$\|\phi(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_d)\| \leq \|J\| \|Q\| \|\phi(U_1, U_2, \dots, U_d)\|.$$

Hence $\|\phi(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_d)\| \leq C \|\phi\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}^d}$, with $C = \|J\| \|Q\|$, for all polynomial $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_d$. \square

The following corollary asserts that a von Neumann type inequality for a commuting d -tuple of contractions holds if at least $d-2$ of these contractions have a polygonal type. This is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 4.2.

Corollary 4.3. *Assume that $d \geq 3$ and let $T_1, \dots, T_d \in B(H)$ be commuting contractions such that T_1, \dots, T_{d-2} have a polygonal type. Then there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that*

$$(4.3) \quad \|\phi(T_1, \dots, T_d)\| \leq C \|\phi\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}^d}, \quad \phi \in \mathcal{P}_d.$$

The following is a multivariable analogue of the equivalence “(i) \Leftrightarrow (ii)” of Theorem 2.3.

Corollary 4.4. *Let H be a Hilbert space, let $d \geq 1$ and let $T_1, \dots, T_d \in B(H)$ be commuting, polynomially bounded operators with a polygonal type. Then (T_1, \dots, T_d) is similar to a d -tuple of contractions.*

Proof. Let us apply Theorem 4.2 to the $(d+2)$ -tuple $(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_d, I_H, I_H)$. For some Q, J and commuting unitaries U_1, U_2, \dots, U_d , we may write

$$T_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} \dots T_d^{n_d} = Q U_1^{n_1} U_2^{n_2} \dots U_d^{n_d} J, \quad n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 0.$$

Then the argument in Part (3) of [3, Theorem 5.1] shows the existence of an invertible operator $S \in B(H)$ such that $S^{-1} T_j S$ is a contraction for any $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$. We skip the details. \square

5. A MULTIVARIABLE POLYGONAL FUNCTIONAL CALCULUS

The aim of this section is to improve the inequality (4.3) in the case when T_1, \dots, T_d are all of polygonal type. This will provide a multivariable analogue of the equivalence “(i) \Leftrightarrow (iii)” of Theorem 2.3.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $d \geq 1$ and let $T_1, \dots, T_d \in B(H)$ be commuting, polynomially bounded operators with a polygonal type. Then there exist a polygon $\Delta \subset \mathbb{D}$ and a constant $C \geq 1$ such that*

$$\|\phi(T_1, \dots, T_d)\| \leq C \|\phi\|_{\infty, \Delta^d}, \quad \phi \in \mathcal{P}_d.$$

Proof. The scheme of proof will be similar to the one of [2, Theorem 6.2] so we will be deliberately quick on some arguments. We need ingredients (different from those in [2]) that we now introduce.

Let $E = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N\} \subset \mathbb{T}$ such that T_k is a Ritt_E operator for every $1 \leq k \leq d$. We will use the H^∞ -functional calculus of Ritt_E operators, for which we refer to [5, Section 3]. Let $H_0^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ be the space of all bounded analytic functions $\phi: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that there exist $s, c > 0$ for which

$$|\phi(z)| \leq c \prod_{j=1}^N |z - \xi_j|^s, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

For any $1 \leq k \leq d$ and any $\phi \in H_0^\infty(\mathbb{D})$, $\phi(T_k)$ is a well-defined element of $B(H)$. Since T_k is polynomially bounded, the argument in the proof of [14, Proposition 2.5] shows as well that

$$(5.1) \quad \|\phi(T_k)\| \leq K \|\phi\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}}, \quad \phi \in H_0^\infty(\mathbb{D}),$$

for some constant $K \geq 1$ not depending on ϕ .

Let $F_0 \in \mathcal{P}_d$ be defined by

$$F_0(z_1, \dots, z_d) = \prod_{k=1}^d \prod_{j=1}^N (z_k - \xi_j),$$

and let $\mathcal{P}_{d,0} \subset \mathcal{P}_d$ be the ideal generated by F_0 . Arguing as in the proof of [5, Proposition 3.4], we see that to prove Theorem 5.1, it suffices to find a polygon $\Delta \subset \mathbb{D}$ and a constant $C' \geq 1$ such that

$$(5.2) \quad \|\phi(T_1, \dots, T_d)\| \leq C' \|\phi\|_{\infty, \Delta^d}, \quad \phi \in \mathcal{P}_{d,0}.$$

Recall that for any $r \in (0, 1)$, we let E_r be the interior of the convex hull of E and of the disc $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda| < r\}$. According to [5, Proposition 3.4], there exist three sequences $(\theta_i)_{i \geq 1}$,

$(\phi_i)_{i \geq 1}$ and $(\psi_i)_{i \geq 1}$ of $H_0^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ such that:

- (a) $\sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\phi_i(z)| < \infty$ and $\sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\psi_i(z)| < \infty$;
- (b) $\sup_{i \geq 1} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} |\theta_i(z)| < \infty$;
- (c) $\forall r \in (0, 1), \sup_{i \geq 1} \int_{\partial E_r} \frac{|\theta_i(z)|}{\prod_{j=1}^N |\xi_j - z|} |dz| < \infty$;
- (d) $\forall z \in \mathbb{D}, 1 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \theta_i(z) \phi_i(z) \psi_i(z)$.

We claim that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(5.3) \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|\phi_i(T_k)x\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \|x\|,$$

for all $x \in H$ and $1 \leq k \leq d$. Indeed, for any $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|\phi_i(T_k)x\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sup_{\varepsilon_i = \pm 1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \phi_i(T_k)x \right\|.$$

Furthermore for any $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \phi_i(T_k)x \right\| \leq \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \phi_i \right) (T_k) \right\| \|x\| \leq K \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \phi_i \right\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}} \|x\| \leq C_0 K \|x\|,$$

where K comes from (5.1) and C_0 is the first supremum in (a).

Let $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_{d,0}$. According to [5, Lemma 2.8], there exists $r \in (0, 1)$ such that $\sigma(T_k) \subset E_r \cup E$ and

$$(5.4) \quad \sup \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^N |\xi_j - z| \|R(z, T_k)\| : z \in \partial E_r \setminus E \right\} < \infty,$$

for all $1 \leq k \leq d$. Then for any $i_1, \dots, i_d \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi(T_1, \dots, T_d) \prod_{k=1}^d \theta_{i_k}(T_k) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^d \int_{(\partial E_r)^d} \phi(z_1, \dots, z_d) \prod_{k=1}^d (\theta_{i_k}(z_k) R(z_k, T_k)) dz_1 \cdots dz_d. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the uniform estimate (5.4) and to (c), this integral representation implies that

$$\left\| \phi(T_1, \dots, T_d) \prod_{k=1}^d \theta_{i_k}(T_k) \right\| \leq M \|\phi\|_{\infty, (\partial E_r)^d},$$

for some constant $M > 0$ not depending on ϕ .

Writing (d) for independent variables z_1, \dots, z_d and multiplying the resulting identities, we obtain that

$$1 = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^{\infty} \prod_{k=1}^d \theta_{i_k}(z_k) \prod_{k=1}^d \phi_{i_k}(z_k) \prod_{k=1}^d \psi_{i_k}(z_k), \quad (z_1, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{D}^d.$$

Then by an entirely classical Fubini argument based on (5.4), we deduce that

$$(5.5) \quad \phi(T_1, \dots, T_d) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^{\infty} \phi(T_1, \dots, T_d) \prod_{k=1}^d \theta_{i_k}(T_k) \prod_{k=1}^d \phi_{i_k}(T_k) \prod_{k=1}^d \psi_{i_k}(T_k),$$

the family on the right hand side being absolutely summable in $B(H)$. In the sequel, we set

$$(5.6) \quad \Lambda_n = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^n \phi(T_1, \dots, T_d) \prod_{k=1}^d \theta_{i_k}(T_k) \prod_{k=1}^d \phi_{i_k}(T_k) \prod_{k=1}^d \psi_{i_k}(T_k),$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

Let $x, y \in H$ and let $n \geq 1$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \Lambda_n x, y \rangle| &\leq \sup_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_d \leq n} \left\| \phi(T_1, \dots, T_d) \prod_{k=1}^d \theta_{i_k}(T_k) \right\| \\ &\quad \times \left(\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^n \left\| \prod_{k=1}^d \phi_{i_k}(T_k) x \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^n \left\| \prod_{k=1}^d \psi_{i_k}(T_k)^* y \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which is less than or equal to

$$M \|\phi\|_{\infty, (\partial E_r)^d} \left(\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^n \left\| \prod_{k=1}^d \phi_{i_k}(T_k) x \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^n \left\| \prod_{k=1}^d \psi_{i_k}(T_k)^* y \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Applying (5.3) d times, we obtain that

$$\left(\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^n \left\| \prod_{k=1}^d \phi_{i_k}(T_k) x \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C^d \|x\|.$$

Using the second supremum in (a), we obtain as well an estimate

$$\left(\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d=1}^n \left\| \prod_{k=1}^d \psi_{i_k}(T_k)^* y \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C^d \|y\|.$$

Hence we finally have

$$|\langle \Lambda_n x, y \rangle| \leq M C^{2d} \|\phi\|_{\infty, (\partial E_r)^d} \|x\| \|y\|.$$

Taking the supremum over all x, y with $\|y\| = \|x\| = 1$ and applying (5.5) and (5.6), we deduce the estimate

$$\|\phi(T_1, \dots, T_d)\| \leq M C^{2d} \|\phi\|_{\infty, (\partial E_r)^d}.$$

Now choose a polygon Δ such that $E_r \subset \Delta \subset \mathbb{D}$. Then we obtain (5.2) with $C' = M C^{2d}$. \square

Acknowledgements. The first author was supported by the ANR project Noncommutative analysis on groups and quantum groups (No./ANR-19-CE40-0002).

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Ando, *On a pair of commutative contractions*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) 24 (1963), 88–90.
- [2] O. Arrigoni, *Square functions for commuting families of Ritt operators*, Complex Analysis and Operator Theory 15 (2021), no. 3, Paper No. 46, 36 pp.
- [3] O. Arrigoni and C. Le Merdy, *H^∞ -functional calculus for commuting families of Ritt operators and sectorial operators*, Oper. Matrices 13 (2019), no. 4, 1055–1090.
- [4] O. Bouabdillah, *Square functions associated to Ritt_E operators*, in preparation.
- [5] O. Bouabdillah, C. Le Merdy, *Polygonal functional calculus for operators with finite peripheral spectrum*, Israël J. Math., to appear in 2024 (see also arXiv:2203.05373).
- [6] R. de Laubenfels, *Similarity to a contraction, for power-bounded operators with finite peripheral spectrum*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 350 (1998), no. 8, 3169–3191.
- [7] E. Franks and A. McIntosh, *Discrete quadratic estimates and holomorphic functional calculi in Banach spaces*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. 58 (1998), no. 2, 271–290.
- [8] D. Gaşpar and N. Suciuc, *On the generalized von Neumann inequality*, Recent advances in operator theory and related topics (Szeged, 1999), 291–304, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., 127, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2001.
- [9] R. Gupta and S. K. Ray, *On a question of N. Th. Varopoulos and the constant $C_2(n)$* , Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 68 (2018), no. 6, 2613–2634.
- [10] M. Haase, *The functional calculus for sectorial operators*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, 169. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2006. xiv+392 pp.
- [11] P. R. Halmos, *Ten problems in Hilbert space*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 76 (1970), 887–933.
- [12] U. Krengel, *Ergodic theorems*, De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, 6. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1985. viii+357 pp.
- [13] C. Le Merdy, *The similarity problem for bounded analytic semigroups on Hilbert space*, Semigroup Forum 56 (1998), no. 2, 205–224.
- [14] C. Le Merdy, *H^∞ -functional calculus and square function estimates for Ritt operators*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. 30 (2014), no. 4, 1149–1190.
- [15] G. Pisier, *Similarity problems and completely bounded maps (2nd expanded edition)*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1618, Springer, 2001.
- [16] G. Pisier, *A polynomially bounded operator on Hilbert space which is not similar to a contraction*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 10 (1997), no. 2, 351–369.
- [17] G. Pisier, *Joint similarity problems and the generation of operator algebras with bounded length*, Integral Equations Operator Theory 31 (1998), no. 3, 353–370.

Email address: clemerdy@univ-fcomte.fr

LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE BESANÇON, UNIVERSITÉ DE FRANCHE-COMTÉ, 16 ROUTE DE GRAY 25030 BESANÇON CEDEX, FRANCE

Email address: rmazhava@math.univ-toulouse.fr

INSTITUTE DE MATHÉMATIQUES TOULOUSE, UNIVERSITÉ PAUL SABATIER, 118, ROUTE DE NARBONNE F-31062 TOULOUSE CEDEX 9, FRANCE