

NUCLEARITY OF HYPERGRAPH C^* -ALGEBRAS

BJÖRN SCHÄFER AND MORITZ WEBER

*Department of Mathematics, Saarland University, D-66123 Saarbrücken,
Germany*

ABSTRACT. We partially characterize nuclearity for the recently introduced class of hypergraph C^* -algebras using a tailor-made hypergraph minor relation. The latter is generated by certain operations on hypergraphs which resemble the moves on directed graphs used by Eilers, Restorff, Ruiz and Sørensen to classify unital graph C^* -algebras. In particular, we obtain a new proof of the fact that every graph C^* -algebra associated to a finite graph is nuclear.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Main Definitions and Main Results	2
3.	Hypergraph Minors	7
4.	Hypergraph Normalization	25
5.	Hypergraph Reduction	29
6.	Reduced Hypergraphs and the Forbidden Minors	37
7.	Examples	44
8.	Problems	45
	References	46

1. INTRODUCTION

Graph C^* -algebras are an important class of C^* -algebras comprising all finite-dimensional C^* -algebras, the Toeplitz algebra as well as the Cuntz algebras and the Cuntz-Krieger algebras. For graph C^* -algebras there is a rich theory with many connections between properties of the C^* -algebra and easily accessible properties of the graph. A good general reference for this topic is [14].

Hypergraph C^* -algebras naturally generalize the concept of graph C^* -algebras by passing from directed graphs to directed hypergraphs where an edge can have multiple vertices in its range or source. These algebras have recently been introduced by Mirjam Trieb, Dean Zenner and the second author in [18]. Further, [11] introduces quantum automorphism groups of hypergraphs. Special cases of hypergraph C^* -algebras are algebras associated to ultragraphs that were introduced earlier in [17]. It emerged that hypergraph C^* -algebras truly extend the class of graph C^* -algebras. In particular, unlike the latter, hypergraph C^* -algebras can

E-mail address: bschaefer@math.uni-sb.de, weber@math.uni-sb.de.

Date: May 21, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 46L35, 46L09.

Key words and phrases. graph C^* -algebra, hypergraph C^* -algebra, nuclearity.

be non-nuclear with an example given by the unital free product $C(S^1) *_C \mathbb{C}^2$ [18, Proposition 4.2]. Let us mention that slightly similar free product constructions are achieved by separated graph C^* -algebras as constructed in [3] (or in [9] as C^* -algebras of edge-labelled graphs).

The literature on hypergraphs distinguishes between directed and undirected hypergraphs. For a general reference on hypergraphs we refer to [5], and for a survey on directed hypergraphs we refer to [4]. In this work, hypergraphs are generally assumed to be directed. However, our definition of a hypergraph encompasses both directed and undirected hypergraphs (see Definition 2.1).

The present paper continues the study of hypergraph C^* -algebras and aims at answering the following question:

For which hypergraphs $H\Gamma$ is the C^ -algebra $C^*(H\Gamma)$ nuclear?*

To this end, we introduce a tailor-made hypergraph minor relation \leq and obtain a result of the following form (see the next Section 2): For any hypergraph $H\Gamma$ one can construct a hypergraph minor $H\Delta$ of $H\Gamma$ such that $C^*(H\Gamma)$ is nuclear if, and only if, the same holds for $C^*(H\Delta)$. Further, if the minors of $H\Delta$ include one of four forbidden minors, then $C^*(H\Delta)$ is not nuclear. Thus, in the latter case we obtain a negative answer to the question of nuclearity of $C^*(H\Gamma)$. On the other hand, if $H\Delta$ has none of the forbidden minors then it is often found that $C^*(H\Delta)$ (and hence $C^*(H\Gamma)$) is obviously nuclear.

The relation \leq is generated by seven (hypergraph) *minor operations* which transform a given hypergraph $H\Gamma$ into a “simpler” hypergraph $H\Delta$. These operations resemble the moves for directed graphs used in [10] to classify unital graph C^* -algebras. However, (graph) moves aim at not changing the graph C^* -algebra in a suitable sense whereas the (hypergraph) minor operations aim at breaking down the hypergraph C^* -algebra in a controlled way. We remark that our definition of a (hypergraph) minor operation is mostly motivated by its behavior on the C^* -algebra. In particular, untypically some minor operations do increase the number of vertices or edges. For undirected hypergraphs, minors has been studied in [1].

In **Section 2** we present the main results of this paper. Next, **Section 3** introduces the notion of a hypergraph minor and investigates the minor operations on the C^* -algebra side. Then, in **Section 4** these results are used to obtain a normalization procedure which transforms a hypergraph without changing its C^* -algebra up to Morita equivalence. The normalization procedure is complemented with a reduction procedure in **Section 5**. The latter is a procedure which simplifies a hypergraph without changing nuclearity of its associated C^* -algebra. Reduced hypergraphs will turn out to be more amenable to combinatorial reasoning. **Section 6** combines the previous results to obtain a proof of the main theorem. Finally, in **Section 7** we demonstrate in three cases how to determine whether a hypergraph C^* -algebra is nuclear. In particular, we retain the fact that every graph C^* -algebra associated to a finite graph is nuclear. We end the paper with a discussion of open problems in **Section 8**.

Acknowledgements. This work has been part of the first author’s master’s thesis under the supervision of the second author. Both authors were supported by the SFB-TRR 195 Symbolic Tools in Mathematics and their Applications of the German Research Foundation (DFG). MW was further supported by the Heisenberg program of the DFG and a joint OPUS-LAP grant with Adam Skalski.

2. MAIN DEFINITIONS AND MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Notation. Throughout this paper, the variables A, B, C, D denote C^* -algebras. Every map between C^* -algebras is a $*$ -homomorphism. A map $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ is called

an embedding if it is injective. Whenever there is an embedding of B into A we write $B \subset A$, and if A and B are $*$ -isomorphic (Morita equivalent) we write $A = B$ ($A =_M B$). An ideal $I \subset A$ is generally two-sided and closed. If $S \subset A$ is a subset of a C^* -algebra, then (S) denotes the ideal generated by S . M_k is the matrix algebra of dimension k , and we denote its standard matrix units consistently E_{ij} for $i, j \leq k$. We write S^1 for the unit circle in the complex plane, $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ for the group $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ and \mathbb{F}_n for the free group with n generators. For unital C^* -algebras A and B , $A *_C B$ denotes their full unital free product. If p (q) is a projection in A (B), then we write $A *_p B$ for the full amalgamated free product of A and B where the amalgamation is over the C^* -algebra \mathbb{C} with the embeddings of \mathbb{C} into A and B given by $z \mapsto zp$ and $z \mapsto zq$, respectively. We refer to [6] for the definition of full (amalgamated) free products of C^* -algebras.

2.2. Main Definitions. In this section, we present the definition of a hypergraph and its associated C^* -algebra.

Definition 2.1 (hypergraph). *A hypergraph HG is a tuple (E^0, E^1, r, s) , where*

- $E^0 = E^0(\text{HG})$ is the (countable) set of vertices of HG ,
- $E^1 = E^1(\text{HG})$ is the (countable) set of edges of HG ,
- $r = r_{\text{HG}} : E^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E^0)$ maps every edge to its range (set),
- $s = s_{\text{HG}} : E^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E^1) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ maps every edge to its source (set).

We call HG finite if both E^0 and E^1 are finite sets, and we call HG undirected if every edge $e \in E^1(\text{HG})$ has empty range.

Throughout this paper we will only be interested in finite hypergraphs. Our notion of a hypergraph differs from definitions found in the literature. For instance, the directed hypergraphs from [4] have (in our language) the additional requirement that $|r(e)| = 1$ holds for all edges $e \in E^1$, while the directed hypergraphs from [12] are required to satisfy $s(e) \cap r(e) = \emptyset$ for all $e \in E^1$.

We say that an edge $e \in E^1$ starts from a set $V \subset E^0$ if $s(e) \cap V \neq \emptyset$. A vertex $v \in E^0$ is called a sink if there is no edge $e \in E^1$ with $v \in s(e)$. A path of length n is a sequence $\mu = e_1 \dots e_n$ of edges with $r(e_i) \cap s(e_{i+1}) \neq \emptyset$ for all $i < n$ and the vertices are considered as paths of length zero. One sets $s_\mu = s_{e_1} \dots s_{e_n} \in C^*(\text{HG})$ and $s(\mu) = s(e_1), r(\mu) = r(e_n)$. Further, μ is called closed if μ has non-zero length and $r(\mu) \cap s(\mu) \neq \emptyset$. The path μ is a cycle if μ is closed and if $r(e_i) \cap s(e_j) = \emptyset$ unless $j = i + 1 \leq n$ or $1 = j \leq i = n$.

The following definition of a hypergraph C^* -algebra is a slight generalization of the definition introduced in [18].

Definition 2.2 (hypergraph C^* -algebra). *Let HG be a finite hypergraph. The hypergraph C^* -algebra $C^*(\text{HG})$ is the universal C^* -algebra generated by pairwise orthogonal projections p_v and partial isometries s_e for $v \in E^0, e \in E^1$, respectively, such that the following holds:*

$$(HR1) \quad s_e^* s_f = \begin{cases} \delta_{ef} \sum_{v \in r(e)} p_v, & r(e) \neq \emptyset, \\ \delta_{ef} s_e, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } e, f \in E^1,$$

$$(HR2) \quad s_e s_e^* \leq \sum_{v \in s(e)} p_v \text{ for all } e \in E^1,$$

$$(HR3) \quad p_v \leq \sum_{e: v \in s(e)} s_e s_e^* \text{ for all } v \in E^0 \text{ such that } v \text{ is not a sink.}$$

Note that the hypergraph C^* -algebra $C^*(\text{HG})$ exists as a universal C^* -algebra since it is generated by projections and partial isometries.

HG_1	$E^0 = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}, \quad s(e) = s(f) = E^0,$ $E^1 = \{e, f\}, \quad r(e) = r(f) = \emptyset$	
HG_2	$E^0 = \{v_1, v_2\}, \quad s(e) = s(f) = s(g) = E^0,$ $E^1 = \{e, f, g\}, \quad r(e) = r(f) = r(g) = \emptyset$	
HG_3	$E^0 = \{v, w\}, \quad s(e) = s(f) = E^0,$ $E^1 = \{e, f\}, \quad r(e) = \emptyset, r(f) = \{w\}$	
HG_4	$E^0 = \{v_1, v_2, w\}, \quad s(e) = s(f) = \{v_1, v_2\},$ $E^1 = \{e, f\}, \quad r(e) = r(f) = \{w\}$	

TABLE 1. The Forbidden Minors $\text{HG}_1, \text{HG}_2, \text{HG}_3, \text{HG}_4$

The following proposition from [18] shows that hypergraph C^* -algebras truly generalize graph C^* -algebras. Here, we use the definition of a graph C^* -algebra from [14] with the role of ranges and sources swapped.

Proposition 2.3 ([18, Proposition 3.4]). *Let $\Gamma = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ be a finite, directed graph. Further, obtain the hypergraph $\text{HG} = (E^0, E^1, \hat{r}, \hat{s})$ by setting $\hat{s}(e) = \{s(e)\}$ and $\hat{r}(e) = \{r(e)\}$ for all edges $e \in E^1$. Then the graph C^* -algebra $C^*(\Gamma)$ is $*$ -isomorphic to the hypergraph C^* -algebra $C^*(\text{HG})$.*

2.3. Main Results. Leaving the details to Section 3, we call $\text{H}\Delta$ a (hypergraph) minor of HG , written $\text{H}\Delta \leq \text{HG}$, if the former is obtained from the latter by a combination of the following minor operations:

- edge/vertex deletion
- forward/backward edge contraction
- edge cutting
- source separation
- range decomposition

In Table 1 we list and sketch four concrete hypergraphs $\text{HG}_1, \text{HG}_2, \text{HG}_3, \text{HG}_4$ which we will call the *forbidden minors*. These hypergraphs turn out to account for non-nuclearity of a large portion of hypergraph C^* -algebras. Their C^* -algebras are easily determined.

Proposition 2.4. *We have*

- (1) $C^*(\text{HG}_1) = C^*(\text{HG}_2) = \mathbb{C}^2 *_\mathbb{C} \mathbb{C}^3$,
- (2) $C^*(\text{HG}_3)$ is the universal unital C^* -algebra generated by one partial isometry,
- (3) $C^*(\text{HG}_4)$ is Morita-equivalent to $M_2 *_\mathbb{C} \mathbb{C}^2$.

The C^ -algebras $C^*(\text{HG}_1), C^*(\text{HG}_2), C^*(\text{HG}_3)$ are not exact while $C^*(\text{HG}_4)$ is not nuclear.*

Proof. Ad (1): One readily checks that $C^*(\text{HG}_1)$ is

$$C^* \left(\begin{array}{l} p_{v_1}, p_{v_2}, p_{v_3}, s_e, s_f \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{l} p_{v_1}, p_{v_2}, p_{v_3} \text{ pairwise orthogonal projections,} \\ s_e, s_f \text{ orthogonal projections,} \\ p_{v_1} + p_{v_2} + p_{v_3} = s_e + s_f \end{array} \right. \right) \\ = \mathbb{C}^2 *_\mathbb{C} \mathbb{C}^3.$$

Analogously, one sees $C^*(\text{HG}_2) = \mathbb{C}^2 *_\mathbb{C} \mathbb{C}^3$. It is a well-known fact from group theory that the free group with two generators \mathbb{F}_2 is a subgroup of the free product $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_3$. Therefore,


$$C^*(\mathbb{F}_2) \subset C^*(\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_3) = \mathbb{C}^2 *_\mathbb{C} \mathbb{C}^3. \quad (1)$$

Since $C^*(\mathbb{F}_2)$ is not exact (see [19]) and exactness transfers to subalgebras, it follows that $\mathbb{C}^2 *_\mathbb{C} \mathbb{C}^3$ is not exact.

Ad (2): An inspection of $C^*(\text{HG}_3)$ reveals that all its generators can be expressed in terms of the unit and the partial isometry s_f . Therefore, $C^*(\text{HG}_3)$ is the universal unital C^* -algebra generated by one partial isometry. In [8] it is proved that the universal unital C^* -algebra \mathcal{P} generated by one partial isometry is not exact. Clearly, $\mathcal{P} \subset C^*(\text{HG}_3)$. Hence, $C^*(\text{HG}_3)$ is not exact since exactness transfers to subalgebras.

Ad (3): Let $\text{H}\Delta$ be the graph given by

- $E^0(\Delta) = \{\hat{v}, \hat{w}\}$,
- $E^1(\Delta) = \{\hat{e}, \hat{f}\}$,
- $s_\Delta(\hat{e}) = s_\Delta(\hat{f}) = \{\hat{v}\}$,
- $r_\Delta(\hat{e}) = r_\Delta(\hat{f}) = \{\hat{w}\}$.



On the right-hand side above, we sketch the hypergraph Δ . From [14, Proposition 1.18] we obtain $C^*(\Delta) = M_3$ where one makes the identifications $p_{\hat{w}} =$

$E_{11}, p_{\hat{v}} = E_{22} + E_{33}, s_{\hat{e}} = E_{21}, \hat{f} = E_{31}$. Now, one verifies

$$\begin{aligned}
& C^*(\text{HG}_4) \\
&= C^* \left(\begin{array}{c|l} p_{v_1}, p_{v_2}, p_w, s_e, s_f & \begin{array}{l} p_{v_1}, p_{v_2}, p_w \text{ are pairwise orthogonal projections,} \\ s_e, s_f \text{ are partial isometries,} \\ s_e^* s_e = s_f^* s_f = p_w, \\ s_e^* s_f = 0, \\ p_{v_1} + p_{v_2} = s_e s_e^* + s_f s_f^* \end{array} \end{array} \right) \\
&= C^* \left(\begin{array}{c|l} p_v, p_{v_1}, p_{v_2}, p_w, s_e, s_f & \begin{array}{l} p_v, p_w \text{ are orthogonal projections,} \\ p_{v_1}, p_{v_2} \text{ are orthogonal projections,} \\ s_e, s_f \text{ are partial isometries,} \\ s_e^* s_e = s_f^* s_f = p_w, \\ s_e^* s_f = 0, \\ p_v = s_e s_e^* + s_f s_f^*, \\ p_v = p_{v_1} + p_{v_2} \end{array} \end{array} \right) \\
&= C^* \left(\begin{array}{c|l} p_{\hat{v}}, p_{\hat{w}}, s_{\hat{e}}, s_{\hat{f}} & \begin{array}{l} p_{\hat{v}}, p_{\hat{w}} \text{ are orthogonal projections,} \\ s_{\hat{e}}, s_{\hat{f}} \text{ are partial isometries,} \\ s_{\hat{e}}^* s_{\hat{e}} = s_{\hat{f}}^* s_{\hat{f}} = p_w, \\ s_{\hat{e}}^* s_{\hat{f}} = 0, \\ p_{\hat{v}} = s_{\hat{e}} s_{\hat{e}}^* + s_{\hat{f}} s_{\hat{f}}^* \end{array} \end{array} \right) \\
&\quad *_{p_{\hat{v}}=p_{v_1}+p_{v_2}} C^*(p_{v_1}, p_{v_2} \mid p_{v_1}, p_{v_2} \text{ are orthogonal projections}) \\
&= C^*(\Delta) *_{p_{\hat{v}}=1_{\mathbb{C}^2}} \mathbb{C}^2 \\
&= M_3 *_{E_{22}+E_{33}=1_{\mathbb{C}^2}} \mathbb{C}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The latter C^* -algebra contains

$$M_2 *_\mathbb{C} \mathbb{C}^2 = (E_{22} + E_{33})(M_3 *_{E_{22}+E_{33}=1_{\mathbb{C}^2}} \mathbb{C}^2)(E_{22} + E_{33})$$

as a full corner. Therefore, $C^*(\text{HG}_4)$ is Morita-equivalent to $M_2 *_\mathbb{C} \mathbb{C}^2$. However, this C^* -algebra is non-nuclear by [2, Proposition 3+6]. The claim follows as nuclearity is preserved under Morita equivalence. \square

Finally, let us state the main theorem.

Theorem 2.5. *Let HG be a hypergraph. One can construct a hypergraph $\text{H}\Delta \leq \text{HG}$ such that $C^*(\text{HG})$ is nuclear if, and only if, the same holds for $C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$. Further, the following is true:*

- (1) *If $\text{HG}_i \leq \text{H}\Delta$ holds for some $i \leq 3$, then $C^*(\text{HG})$ is not exact.*
- (2) *If $\text{HG}_4 \leq \text{H}\Delta$ holds, then $C^*(\text{HG})$ is not nuclear.*
- (3) *If none of the above holds, then $\text{H}\Delta$ is an undirected hypergraph, i.e. all edges of $\text{H}\Delta$ have empty range.*

Here $\text{HG}_1, \text{HG}_2, \text{HG}_3$ and HG_4 are the forbidden minors from Table 1.

Crucially, there is an explicit procedure for constructing $\text{H}\Delta$ starting from HG which we describe in Section 5 as Algorithm 2. The proof of the previous theorem is done in Section 6.3.

Remark 2.6. *If HG has none of the forbidden minors, then one checks that $\text{H}\Delta$ satisfies the following:*

- *Every edge has empty range.*
- *For any distinct vertices $v, w \in E^0(\text{H}\Delta)$ there are at most two distinct edges e, f with $\{v, w\} \subset s(e) \cap s(f)$.*
- *For any distinct edges $e, f \in E^1(\text{H}\Delta)$ there are at most two distinct vertices v, w with $\{v, w\} \subset s(e) \cap s(f)$.*

We believe that for any hypergraph $H\Delta$ with these properties the associated C^* -algebra $C^*(H\Delta)$ is nuclear. Then it would follow that any hypergraph C^* -algebra $C^*(H\Gamma)$ is nuclear if, and only if, $H\Delta$ has none of the forbidden minors.

3. HYPERGRAPH MINORS

3.1. Definition and Main Result of this Section. This section introduces the notion of a hypergraph minor and discusses the effect of the minor operations on the C^* -algebra side.

Definition 3.1 (hypergraph minor). *We say that $H\Delta$ is obtained from $H\Gamma$ by*

- (1) vertex deletion if there is a vertex v in $H\Gamma$ such that
 - $E^0(H\Delta) = E^0(H\Gamma) \setminus \{v\}$,
 - $E^1(H\Delta) = E^1(H\Gamma) \setminus \{e \in E^1(H\Gamma) : s(e) = \{v\}\}$,
 - $r_{H\Delta}(e) = r_{H\Gamma}(e) \setminus \{v\}$ for all $e \in E^1(H\Delta)$,
 - $s_{H\Delta}(e) = s_{H\Gamma}(e) \setminus \{v\}$ for all $e \in E^1(H\Delta)$,
- (2) edge deletion if there is an edge f in $H\Gamma$ such that
 - $E^0(H\Delta) = E^0(H\Gamma)$,
 - $E^1(H\Delta) = E^1(H\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}$,
 - $r_{H\Delta}(e) = r_{H\Gamma}(e)$ for all $e \in E^1(H\Delta)$,
 - $s_{H\Delta}(e) = s_{H\Gamma}(e)$ for all $e \in E^1(H\Delta)$,
- (3) forward edge contraction if there is an edge f and a vertex w in $H\Gamma$ with $s_{H\Gamma}(f) = \{w\}$ and
 - f is the only edge starting from w in $H\Gamma$, i.e.

$$s_{H\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{H\Gamma}(f) \neq \emptyset \implies e = f \quad \text{for all } e \in E^1(H\Gamma),$$
 - there is no edge $e \in E^1(H\Gamma)$ with $w \in r_{H\Gamma}(e)$ and $r_{H\Gamma}(e) \cap r_{H\Gamma}(f) \neq \emptyset$,
 - $E^0(H\Delta) = E^0(H\Gamma) \setminus \{w\}$,
 - $E^1(H\Delta) = E^1(H\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}$,
 - $r_{H\Delta}(e) = \begin{cases} r_{H\Gamma}(e), & w \notin r_{H\Gamma}(e), \\ (r_{H\Gamma}(e) \setminus \{w\}) \cup r_{H\Gamma}(f), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } e \in E^1(H\Delta),$
 - $s_{H\Delta}(e) = s_{H\Gamma}(e)$ for all $e \in E^1(H\Delta)$,
- (4) backward edge contraction if there is an edge f and a vertex w in $H\Gamma$ with $r_{H\Gamma}(f) = \{w\}$ and
 - f is the only edge starting from $s_{H\Gamma}(f)$ in $H\Gamma$, i.e.

$$s_{H\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{H\Gamma}(f) \neq \emptyset \implies e = f \quad \text{for all } e \in E^1(H\Gamma),$$
 - there is no edge $e \in E^1(H\Gamma)$ with $r_{H\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{H\Gamma}(f) \neq \emptyset$ and $w \in r_{H\Gamma}(e)$,
 - $E^0(H\Delta) = E^0(H\Gamma) \setminus \{w\}$,
 - $E^1(H\Delta) = E^1(H\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}$,
 - $r_{H\Delta}(e) = \begin{cases} r_{H\Gamma}(e), & w \notin r_{H\Gamma}(e), \\ (r_{H\Gamma}(e) \setminus \{w\}) \cup s_{H\Gamma}(f), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } e \in E^1(H\Delta),$
 - $s_{H\Delta}(e) = \begin{cases} s_{H\Gamma}(e), & w \notin s_{H\Gamma}(e), \\ (s_{H\Gamma}(e) \setminus \{w\}) \cup s_{H\Gamma}(f), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } e \in E^1(H\Delta),$
- (5) edge cutting if there is an edge f in $H\Gamma$ such that
 - $E^0(H\Delta) = E^0(H\Gamma)$,
 - $E^1(H\Delta) = E^1(H\Gamma)$,
 - $r_{H\Delta}(e) = \begin{cases} r_{H\Gamma}(e), & e \neq f, \\ \emptyset, & e = f, \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } e \in E^1(H\Delta),$
 - $s_{H\Delta}(e) = s_{H\Gamma}(e)$ for all $e \in E^1(H\Delta)$,
- (6) source separation if there is a set $F \subset E^1(H\Gamma)$, a vertex $w \in E^0(H\Gamma)$ and some vertex $w' \in E^0(H\Delta) \setminus E^0(H\Gamma)$ such that


- $\emptyset \neq F \subsetneq \{e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) : w \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)\}$
- $E^0(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \cup \{w'\}$
- $E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$,
- $r_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) = \begin{cases} r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e), & w \notin r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e), \\ r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \cup \{w'\}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta),$
- $s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) = \begin{cases} s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e), & e \notin F, \\ (s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \setminus \{w\}) \cup \{w'\}, & e \in F, \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta),$

(7) range decomposition if there is an edge f in $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ with nonempty range such that

- $E^0(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$,
- $E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = (E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}) \cup \{(f, v) : v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)\}$,
- $r_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) = \begin{cases} r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e), & e \notin \{(f, v) : v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)\}, \\ \{v\}, & e = (f, v), \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta),$
- $s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) = s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)$ for all $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$.

The hypergraph $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ is a minor of $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$, written $\mathbf{H}\Delta \leq \mathbf{H}\Gamma$, if it is obtained from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ by any finite combination of these operations.

Example 3.2. In Table 2 we give an example for every minor operation except for edge and vertex deletion. We trust that the sketches are self-explanatory and do not give explicit definitions of the involved hypergraphs. Vertices or edges relevant to the respective minor operation are highlighted in red.






TABLE 2. Examples for the Minor Operations

The next theorem describes the effect of the minor operations on the associated C^* -algebras.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $H\Gamma$ and $H\Delta$ be two hypergraphs. The algebra $C^*(H\Delta)$ is*

- *isomorphic to $C^*(H\Gamma)$ if $H\Delta$ is obtained from $H\Gamma$ by range decomposition,*
- *a quotient of $C^*(H\Gamma)$ if $H\Delta$ is obtained from $H\Gamma$ by source separation,*
- *a subalgebra of $C^*(H\Gamma)$ if $H\Delta$ is obtained from $H\Gamma$ by edge cutting,*
- *a quotient of a subalgebra of $C^*(H\Gamma)$ if $H\Delta$ is obtained from $H\Gamma$ by edge or vertex deletion,*
- *a full corner of $C^*(H\Gamma)$ if $H\Delta$ is obtained from $H\Gamma$ by forward or backward edge contraction.*

In particular, $H\Delta \leq H\Gamma$ implies that $C^(H\Delta)$ is – up to Morita equivalence – obtained from $C^*(H\Gamma)$ by alternatingly taking subalgebras and quotients. If $C^*(H\Gamma)$ is exact then the same holds for $C^*(H\Delta)$.*

In the next subsections we will investigate the different minor operations separately. We will not deal with range decomposition and instead refer to [18, Proposition 3.18], where this operation has been studied. This will combine to the proof of the previous theorem at the end of Section 3.5.

3.2. Source Separation. On the C^* -algebra side, source separation corresponds to taking a quotient. Under special conditions this improves to an isomorphism of the associated hypergraph C^* -algebras.

Proposition 3.4 (source separation). *Let $H\Delta$ be obtained from $H\Gamma$ by source separation of a nonempty set $F \subset E^1(H\Gamma)$ at $w \in \bigcap_{f \in F} s_{H\Gamma}(f)$. Then $C^*(H\Delta)$ is a quotient of $C^*(H\Gamma)$. Moreover, if*

$$w \in s_{H\Gamma}(g) \implies \{w\} = s_{H\Gamma}(f) \cap s_{H\Gamma}(g) \quad \text{for all } g \notin F, \quad (*)$$

then $C^(H\Delta) = C^*(H\Gamma)$.*

Proof. Let $w' \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ be as in Definition 3.1(6). Use the universal property of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ to obtain $\varphi : C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \rightarrow C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ with

$$\varphi : \begin{cases} p_v \mapsto \hat{p}_v, & v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{w\}, \\ p_w \mapsto \hat{p}_w + \hat{p}_{w'}, & v = w, \\ s_e \mapsto \hat{s}_e, & e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma), \end{cases}$$

Clearly the $\varphi(p_v)$ are pairwise orthogonal projections and the $\varphi(s_e)$ are partial isometries. One checks the following relations: (HR1): For $e, e' \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ it is

$$\varphi(s_e)^* \varphi(s_{e'}) = \hat{s}_e^* \hat{s}_{e'} = \begin{cases} \delta_{ee'} \sum_{v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{p}_v = \delta_{ee'} \varphi(\sum_{v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} p_v), & r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \neq \emptyset, \\ \delta_{ee'} \hat{s}_e = \delta_{ee'} \varphi(s_e), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(HR2): For $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ we have

$$\varphi(s_e) \varphi(s_e)^* = \hat{s}_e \hat{s}_e^* \leq \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{p}_v \leq \varphi \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} p_v \right).$$

(HR3): Let $v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{w\}$ not be a sink in $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$. Then v is not a sink in $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ as well and therefore

$$\varphi(p_v) = \hat{p}_v \leq \sum_{e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta): v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{s}_e \hat{s}_e^* = \sum_{e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma): v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} \varphi(s_e) \varphi(s_e)^*.$$

For the vertex w observe that neither w nor w' is a sink in $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(p_w) &= \hat{p}_w + \hat{p}_{w'} \\ &\leq \sum_{e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta): w \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) \vee w' \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{s}_e \hat{s}_e^* \\ &= \sum_{e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma): w \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} \varphi(s_e) \varphi(s_e)^*. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, observe

$$\hat{p}_{w'} = (\hat{p}_w + \hat{p}_{w'}) \sum_{f \in F} \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* = \varphi(p_w) \sum_{f \in F} \varphi(s_f) \varphi(s_f)^* \in \varphi(C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)).$$

Therefore, the image of φ contains all generators of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$. Hence, φ is surjective and $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)/\ker(\varphi)$.

Under the additional assumption (*) the universal property of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ yields a map $\psi : C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta) \rightarrow C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ with

$$\psi : \begin{cases} \hat{p}_v \mapsto p_v, & v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Delta) \setminus \{w, w'\}, \\ \hat{p}_w \mapsto \left(\sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^* \right) p_w \left(\sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^* \right), & v = w, \\ \hat{p}_{w'} \mapsto \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* \right) p_w \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* \right), & v = w', \\ \hat{s}_e \mapsto s_e, & e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta). \end{cases}$$

Indeed, observe for any $f \in F$ and $g \in G$

$$0 = s_f s_f^* s_g s_g^* = s_f s_f^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)} p_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g)} p_v \right) s_g s_g^* = s_f s_f^* p_w s_g s_g^*.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_w &= \left(\sum_{e:w \in s_{\text{HR}}(w)} s_e s_e^* \right) p_w \left(\sum_{e:w \in s_{\text{HR}}(w)} s_e s_e^* \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* \right) p_w \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* \right) + \left(\sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^* \right) p_w \left(\sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^* \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\hat{p}_{w'})^2 &= \left(\left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* \right) p_w \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* \right) \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* \right) p_w \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* \right) p_w \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* \right) p_w \left(\sum_{e \in F \cup G} s_e s_e^* \right) p_w \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* \right) p_w \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* \right) \\ &= \psi(\hat{p}_{w'}) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one sees that $\psi(\hat{p}_w)$ is a projection, and it is easily checked that $\psi(\hat{p}_w)$ and $\psi(\hat{p}_{w'})$ are orthogonal. Thus, the $\psi(\hat{p}_v)$ are pairwise orthogonal projections and evidently the $\psi(\hat{s}_e)$ are partial isometries. We check the relations (HR1), (HR2) and (HR3).

(HR1): Since in $\text{H}\Delta$ every edge e with $w \in r_{\text{H}\Delta}(e)$ has also w' in its range we have for any edges $e, f \in E^1(\text{H}\Delta)$

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\hat{s}_e)^* \psi(\hat{s}_f) &= s_e^* s_f \\ &= \begin{cases} \delta_{ef} \sum_{v \in r_{\text{HR}}(e)} p_v, & r_{\text{HR}}(e) \neq \emptyset, \\ \delta_{ef} s_e, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \delta_{ef} \psi \left(\sum_{v \in r_{\text{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{p}_v \right), & r_{\text{H}\Delta}(e) \neq \emptyset, \\ \delta_{ef} \psi(\hat{s}_e), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

using $\psi(\hat{p}_w) + \psi(\hat{p}_{w'}) = p_w$.

(HR2): For $e \in E^1(\text{H}\Delta) \setminus (F \cup G)$ we have

$$\psi(\hat{s}_e) \psi(\hat{s}_e)^* = s_e s_e^* \leq \sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(e)} p_v = \psi \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{p}_v \right).$$

For $f \in F$ it is

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(\hat{s}_f)\psi(\hat{s}_f)^* &= s_f s_f^* \\
&= \left(1 - \sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^*\right) (s_f s_f^*) \left(1 - \sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^*\right) \\
&\leq \left(1 - \sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^*\right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)} p_v\right) \left(1 - \sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^*\right) \\
&= \sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f) \setminus \{w\}} p_v + \left(1 - \sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^*\right) p_w \left(1 - \sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^*\right) \\
&= \sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f) \setminus \{w\}} p_v + \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^*\right) p_w \left(\sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^*\right) \\
&= \psi \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{p}_v\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one sees $\psi(\hat{s}_g)\psi(\hat{s}_g)^* \leq \psi \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(g)} \hat{p}_v\right)$ for all $g \in G$.

(HR3): Let $v \in E^0(\text{H}\Delta) \setminus \{w, w'\}$ not be a sink in $\text{H}\Delta$. Then v is not a sink in $\text{H}\Gamma$ neither and therefore

$$\psi(\hat{p}_v) = p_v \leq \sum_{e \in E^1(\text{H}\Gamma): v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e)} s_e s_e^* = \sum_{e \in E^1(\text{H}\Delta): v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(e)} \psi(\hat{s}_e)\psi(\hat{s}_e)^*.$$

For the vertex w we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(\hat{p}_w) &= \left(\sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^*\right) p_w \left(\sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^*\right) \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^*\right) \left(\sum_{e \in E^1(\text{H}\Gamma): w \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e)} s_e s_e^*\right) \left(\sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^*\right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^*\right) \left(\sum_{e \in F \cup G} s_e s_e^*\right) \left(\sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^*\right) \\
&= \sum_{g \in G} s_g s_g^* \\
&= \sum_{e \in E^1(\text{H}\Delta): w \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(e)} \psi(\hat{s}_e)\psi(\hat{s}_e)^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one obtains $\psi(\hat{p}_{w'}) \leq \sum_{e \in E^1(\text{H}\Delta): w' \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(e)} \psi(\hat{s}_e)\psi(\hat{s}_e)^*$.

It is not hard to check that φ and ψ are inverse to each other. Therefore, we obtain $C^*(\text{H}\Gamma) = C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$. \square

Remark 3.5. We will say that $\text{H}\Delta$ is obtained from $\text{H}\Gamma$ by separating the source of an edge $f \in E^1(\text{H}\Gamma)$ if $\text{H}\Delta$ is obtained from $\text{H}\Gamma$ by applying successively source separation on the non-empty set $\{f\} \subset E^1(\text{H}\Gamma)$ at all vertices $w \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)$ for which there is another edge $e \in E^1(\text{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}$ with $w \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e)$.

3.3. Edge Cutting. On the C^* -algebra side, edge cutting corresponds to taking a subalgebra.

Proposition 3.6 (edge cutting). *Assume that $H\Delta$ is obtained from $H\Gamma$ by cutting an edge f . Then $C^*(H\Delta)$ is a subalgebra of $C^*(H\Gamma)$.*

Proof. Use the universal property of $C^*(H\Delta)$ to obtain $\varphi : C^*(H\Delta) \rightarrow C^*(H\Gamma)$ with

$$\varphi : \begin{cases} p_v \mapsto \hat{p}_v, & v \in E^0(H\Delta), \\ s_e \mapsto \hat{s}_e, & e \in E^1(H\Delta) \setminus \{f\}, \\ s_e \mapsto \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^*, & e = f, \end{cases}$$

where we write again \hat{p}_v and \hat{s}_e for the generators of $C^*(H\Gamma)$ to avoid confusion. The hypergraph relations are checked by routine calculations.

We need to show that φ is injective. Let ρ be the universal representation of $C^*(H\Delta)$ on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} given by the GNS-construction. Further, let κ be a cardinal larger than the dimension of \mathcal{H} and let $\sigma : C^*(H\Delta) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}^\kappa)$ be κ times the representation ρ . Then $\sigma(s_f)\mathcal{H}^\kappa$ and $\sigma(\sum_{v \in r_{H\Delta}(f)} p_v)\mathcal{H}^\kappa$ have the same dimension and therefore $B(\mathcal{H}^\kappa)$ contains a partial isometry V with $VV^* = \sigma(s_f)$ and $V^*V = \sigma(\sum_{v \in r_{H\Delta}(f)} p_v)$. Now, one readily checks that the universal property of $C^*(H\Gamma)$ yields a representation τ of $C^*(H\Gamma)$ on \mathcal{H}^κ with

$$\tau : \begin{cases} \hat{p}_v \mapsto \sigma(p_v), & v \in E^0(H\Gamma), \\ \hat{s}_e \mapsto \sigma(s_e), & e \in E^1(H\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}, \\ \hat{s}_e \mapsto V, & e = f, \end{cases}$$

Evidently, $\sigma = \tau \circ \varphi$, so $x \in \ker(\varphi) \implies x \in \ker(\sigma) = \ker(\rho)$. Since ρ is faithful, the latter entails $x = 0$. Thus, φ is injective. \square

3.4. Edge and Vertex Deletion. On the C^* -algebra side, edge and vertex deletion correspond to taking the quotient of a subalgebra. Under special conditions this improves to taking the quotient, or to isomorphy of the associated C^* -algebras.

To prove this, we need some more general considerations. Let $H\Gamma$ be hypergraph. Given a set $S \subset E^0(H\Gamma) \cup E^1(H\Gamma)$, we say that $H\Delta$ is obtained from $H\Gamma$ by deleting the set S , if one gets $H\Delta$ from $H\Gamma$ by successively deleting the edges and vertices in S . Clearly, the order in which these operations are performed is irrelevant.

Sometimes deleting a set S of vertices and edges successively, turns out to behave better than an arbitrary single deletion. This is the case if the set S has the property given by the next definition.

Definition 3.7 (ideally closed set). *Let $S \subset E^0(H\Gamma) \cup E^1(H\Gamma)$ be a subset of the edges and vertices of a hypergraph $H\Gamma$. The set S is called ideally closed if*

- whenever an edge e is in S , then $r(e) \subset S$,
- whenever an edge $e \in E^1(H\Gamma)$ satisfies $s(e) \subset S$ or $\emptyset \neq r(e) \subset S$, then $e \in S$,
- whenever a vertex $v \in E^0(H\Gamma)$ is not a sink and satisfies

$$v \in s(e) \implies e \in S \quad \text{for all edges } e \in E^1(H\Gamma),$$

then $v \in S$.

Lemma 3.8. *Assume that $H\Delta$ is obtained from $H\Gamma$ by deleting an ideally closed set $S \subset E^0(H\Gamma) \cup E^1(H\Gamma)$. Then $C^*(H\Delta)$ is isomorphic to the quotient $C^*(H\Gamma)/(S)$, where $(S) \subset C^*(H\Gamma)$ is the ideal generated by*

$$\{p_v, s_e : v \in S \cap E^0(H\Gamma), e \in S \cap E^1(H\Gamma)\}.$$

Proof. Use the universal property of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ to obtain $\varphi : C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \rightarrow C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ with

$$\varphi : \begin{cases} p_v \mapsto \hat{p}_v, & v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus S, \\ p_v \mapsto 0, & v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \cap S, \\ s_e \mapsto \hat{s}_e, & e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus S, \\ s_e \mapsto 0, & e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \cap S, \end{cases}$$

where we write \hat{p}_v and \hat{s}_e for the generators of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ to avoid confusion. Using that the set S is ideally closed one checks the hypergraph relations.

Clearly the $\varphi(p_v)$ are pairwise orthogonal projections and the $\varphi(s_e)$ are partial isometries.

(HR1): Let $e, f \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus S$. If e has nonempty range in $\mathbf{H}\Delta$, then the same holds in $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ since otherwise the edge e would have been deleted, too. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(s_e)^* \varphi(s_f) &= \hat{s}_e^* \hat{s}_f \\ &= \begin{cases} \delta_{ef} \sum_{v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{p}_v, & r_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) \neq \emptyset, \\ \delta_{ef} \hat{s}_e, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \delta_{ef} \varphi \left(\sum_{v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} p_v \right), & r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \neq \emptyset, \\ \delta_{ef} \varphi(s_e), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

For $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \cap S$ and $f \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ it is

$$\varphi(s_e)^* \varphi(s_f) = 0 = \begin{cases} \delta_{ef} \varphi \left(\sum_{v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} p_v \right), & r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \neq \emptyset, \\ \delta_{ef} \varphi(s_e), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

since together with e all vertices in $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)$ are deleted. By taking adjoints one obtains the same equality for $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ and $f \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \cap S$.

(HR2): For $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus S$ observe

$$\varphi(s_e) \varphi(s_e)^* = \hat{s}_e \hat{s}_e^* \leq \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{p}_v = \varphi \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} p_v \right).$$

If $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \cap S$, then $\varphi(s_e) \varphi(s_e)^* = 0 \leq \varphi \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} p_v \right)$ is trivial.

(HR3): If $v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus S$ were a sink in $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ but not in $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ then it would have been deleted since S is ideally closed. Thus, we have for every $v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus S$ that is not a sink in $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(p_v) = \hat{p}_v &\leq \sum_{e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta): v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{s}_e \hat{s}_e^* \\ &= \sum_{e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta): v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e)} \varphi(s_e) \varphi(s_e)^* \\ &= \sum_{e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma): v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} \varphi(s_e) \varphi(s_e)^*. \end{aligned}$$

If $v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \cap S$, then $\varphi(p_v) = 0 \leq \sum_{e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma): v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} \varphi(s_e) \varphi(s_e)^*$ is trivial.

Evidently, the image of φ contains all generators of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$. Hence, it is $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)/\ker(\varphi)$.

Moreover, it turns out that $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ satisfies the universal property of the quotient $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)/(S)$ with the quotient map given by φ . Indeed, let A be any C^* -algebra and $\chi : C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \rightarrow A$ a $*$ -homomorphism with $S \subset \ker(\chi)$. The universal

property of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ yields a map $\psi : C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta) \rightarrow A$ with

$$\psi : \begin{cases} \hat{p}_v \mapsto \chi(p_v), & v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Delta), \\ \hat{s}_e \mapsto \chi(s_e), & e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta). \end{cases}$$

Evidently, the $\psi(\hat{p}_v)$ are pairwise orthogonal projections and the $\psi(\hat{s}_e)$ are partial isometries. We check the hypergraph relations.

(HR1): For $e, f \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\hat{s}_e)^* \psi(\hat{s}_f) &= \chi(s_e)^* \chi(s_f) \\ &= \chi(s_e^* s_f) \\ &= \begin{cases} \chi(\delta_{ef} \sum_{v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} p_v) = \delta_{ef} \sum_{v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \cap S \cap r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} \chi(p_v), & r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \neq \emptyset, \\ \chi(\delta_{ef} s_e), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \delta_{ef} \psi(\sum_{v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{p}_v), & r_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) \neq \emptyset, \\ \delta_{ef} \psi(\hat{s}_e), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

using $\chi(p_v) = 0$ for $v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \cap S$.

(HR2): For $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ observe

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\hat{s}_e) \psi(\hat{s}_e)^* &= \chi(s_e) \chi(s_e)^* \\ &= \chi(s_e s_e^*) \\ &\leq \chi\left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} p_v\right) \\ &= \sum_{v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \cap S \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} \chi(p_v) \\ &= \psi\left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{p}_v\right). \end{aligned}$$

(HR3): If $v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ is not a sink, then v is not a sink in $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ neither, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\hat{p}_v) &= \chi(p_v) \\ &\leq \chi\left(\sum_{e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma): v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} s_e s_e^*\right) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \cap S: v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)} \chi(s_e s_e^*) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta): v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e)} \psi(\hat{s}_e) \psi(\hat{s}_e)^*. \end{aligned}$$

One readily checks $\chi = \psi \circ \varphi$. Clearly, ψ is the unique map from $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ into A with this property. It follows $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)/(S)$ as desired. \square

The next preparatory lemma allows removing a vertex from the source of an edge without changing the associated hypergraph C^* -algebra.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ be a hypergraph and let $w \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$, $f \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ with $w \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$ and $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) = \emptyset$. Assume that f is the only edge starting from w , i.e. for all $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}$ it is $w \notin s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)$, and obtain $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ by removing w from the source of f , possibly deleting the edge f if $\{w\} = s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$, i.e.*

- $E^0(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$,

- $E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = \begin{cases} E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}, & \text{if } \{w\} = s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f), \\ E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$
- $s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) = \begin{cases} s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e), & e \neq f, \\ s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \setminus \{w\}, & e = f, \end{cases}$ for all $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$,
- $r_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) = r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)$ for all $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$.

Then $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$. In particular, if for all edges $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}$ we have $s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) = \emptyset$, then we can delete the edge f from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ without changing the associated C^* -algebra.

Proof. If $\{w\} = s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$, then set $\hat{s}_f = 0 \in C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$. Using the universal property of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ and $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$, respectively, one obtains maps $\varphi : C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \rightarrow C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ and $\psi : C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta) \rightarrow C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ with

$$\varphi : \begin{cases} p_v \mapsto \hat{p}_v, & v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma), \\ s_e \mapsto \hat{s}_e, & e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}, \\ s_e \mapsto \hat{s}_f + \hat{p}_w, & e = f, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\psi : \begin{cases} \hat{p}_v \mapsto p_v, & v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Delta), \\ \hat{s}_e \mapsto s_e, & e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta) \setminus \{f\}, \\ \hat{s}_e \mapsto s_f - p_w, & e = f. \end{cases}$$

As usually we write \hat{p}_v and \hat{s}_e for the generators of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ to avoid confusion with the elements of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$. For both φ and ψ the hypergraph relations are checked by routine calculations. Moreover, one easily checks that φ and ψ are inverse to each other. Thus, $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$.

Finally, if for all edges $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}$ it is $s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) = \emptyset$, then we can use the previous result to successively remove every vertex $w \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$ from the source of f without changing the associated C^* -algebra. In the end, this deletes the edge f . \square

Proposition 3.10 (edge/vertex deletion). *Assume that $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ is obtained from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ by*

- (1) deleting an edge f , or
- (2) deleting a vertex w .

Then $C^(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ is the quotient of a subalgebra of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$.*

Proof. Ad (1): First obtain $\mathbf{H}\Gamma'$ from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ by cutting the edge f . Then we have $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma') \subset C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ by Proposition 3.6. Let $v_1, \dots, v_n \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma')$ be those vertices in $s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(f)$ which have only f as outgoing edge and obtain $\mathbf{H}\Gamma''$ from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma'$ by removing the v_i from the source of f and leaving everything else invariant. By Lemma 3.9 this does not change the associated C^* -algebra, i.e. we have $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma'') = C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma')$. If f has been deleted in the process we are done. Otherwise, observe that in $\mathbf{H}\Gamma''$ the set $\{f\} \subset E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma'') \cup E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma'')$ is ideally closed. Since $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ is obtained from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma''$ by deleting the edge f , it follows from Lemma 3.8 that $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ is a quotient of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma'') \subset C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$.

Ad (2): First, obtain $\mathbf{H}\Gamma'$ from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ by cutting all edges e with $s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) = \{v\}$ or $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) = \{v\}$. Then $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma')$ is a subalgebra of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ by Lemma 3.6. One readily verifies that $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ is obtained from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma'$ by deleting the vertex v together with all edges e with $s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(e) = \{v\}$. Fortunately, the set $S = \{v\} \cup \{e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma') : s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(e) = \{v\}\}$ is ideally closed in $\mathbf{H}\Gamma'$ and therefore $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ is a quotient of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma') \subset C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ by Lemma 3.8. \square

3.5. Edge Contraction. On the C^* -algebra side, forward and backward edge contraction do not change the C^* -algebra up to Morita equivalence.

To prepare for the proof, the following two lemmas allow rearranging certain edges of a hypergraph without changing the associated C^* -algebra.

Lemma 3.11. *Assume that $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ is a hypergraph and $f \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ an edge with nonempty range such that*

- $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) = \emptyset$,
- $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) \neq \emptyset \implies r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) = s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$ for all $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}$ and
- f is the only edge starting from $s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$, i.e. $s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) = \emptyset$ for all $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}$.

Further, let $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ be given by

- $E^0(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$,
- $E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$,
- $r_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) = \begin{cases} r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e), & r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \neq s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f), \\ r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$
- $s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) = s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)$,

for all edges $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$. Then $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$.

Intuitively, $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ is obtained from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ by changing the range of every edge e with $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) = s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$ to $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$.

Proof. We use induction over the number n of edges $g \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ which satisfy $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g) = s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$. If $n = 0$, then $\mathbf{H}\Delta = \mathbf{H}\Gamma$ and there is nothing to do. For the induction step let g be an edge with $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g) = s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$ and obtain $\mathbf{H}\Gamma'$ from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ by changing the range of g to $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$ and leaving everything else invariant. Then the universal property of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ yields a map $\varphi : C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \rightarrow C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma')$ with

$$\varphi : \begin{cases} p_v \mapsto \hat{p}_v, & v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma), \\ s_e \mapsto \hat{s}_e, & e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{g\}, \\ s_e \mapsto \hat{s}_g \hat{s}_f^*, & e = g, \end{cases}$$

where we write \hat{p}_v and \hat{s}_e for the generators of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma')$ to avoid confusion. Evidently, the $\varphi(p_v)$ are pairwise orthogonal projections and since

$$\varphi(s_g)\varphi(s_g)^*\varphi(s_g) = \hat{s}_g(\hat{s}_f^*\hat{s}_f)\hat{s}_g^*\hat{s}_g\hat{s}_f^* = \hat{s}_g(\hat{s}_g^*\hat{s}_g)\hat{s}_g^*\hat{s}_g\hat{s}_f^* = \hat{s}_g\hat{s}_f^* = \varphi(s_g),$$

the $\varphi(s_e)$ are partial isometries. Further, we have

$$\varphi(s_g)^*\varphi(s_g) = \hat{s}_f\hat{s}_g^*\hat{s}_g\hat{s}_f^* = \hat{s}_f\hat{s}_f^*\hat{s}_f\hat{s}_g^* = \hat{s}_f\hat{s}_f^* = \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(f)} \hat{p}_v = \varphi\left(\sum_{v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g)} p_v\right)$$

and

$$\varphi(s_g)\varphi(s_g)^* = \hat{s}_g\hat{s}_f^*\hat{s}_f\hat{s}_g^* = \hat{s}_g\hat{s}_g^*\hat{s}_g\hat{s}_f^* = \hat{s}_g\hat{s}_g^* \leq \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(g)} \hat{p}_v = \varphi\left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g)} p_v\right).$$

The other hypergraph relations are checked by routine calculations. At the same time, one obtains a map $\psi : C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma') \rightarrow C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ with

$$\psi : \begin{cases} \hat{p}_v \mapsto p_v, & v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma'), \\ \hat{s}_e \mapsto s_e, & e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma') \setminus \{g\} \\ \hat{s}_e \mapsto s_g s_f, & e = g. \end{cases}$$

Indeed, $\psi(\hat{s}_g)$ is a partial isometry since

$$\psi(\hat{s}_g)\psi(\hat{s}_g)^*\psi(\hat{s}_g) = s_g(s_f s_f^*)s_g^* s_g s_f = s_g(s_g^* s_g)s_g^* s_g s_f = s_g s_f = \psi(\hat{s}_g).$$

Moreover,

$$\psi(\hat{s}_g)^*\psi(\hat{s}_g) = s_f^*(s_g^* s_g)s_f = s_f^*(s_f s_f^*)s_f = s_f^* s_f = \sum_{v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)} p_v = \psi\left(\sum_{v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(g)} \hat{p}_v\right)$$

and

$$\psi(\hat{s}_g)\psi(\hat{s}_g)^* = s_g(s_f s_f^*)s_g^* = s_g(s_g^* s_g)s_g^* = s_g s_g^* \leq \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g)} p_v = \psi\left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(g)} \hat{p}_v\right).$$

Again the other hypergraph relations are checked by routine calculations. As

$$\varphi(\psi(\hat{s}_g)) = \varphi(s_g s_f) = \hat{s}_g \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f = \hat{s}_g \hat{s}_g^* \hat{s}_g = \hat{s}_g$$

and

$$\psi(\varphi(s_g)) = \psi(\hat{s}_g \hat{s}_f^*) = s_g s_f s_f^* = s_g s_g^* s_g = s_g$$

the maps φ and ψ are inverse to each other. Thus, $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) = C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma')$ and we may apply the induction hypothesis to obtain $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) = C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$. \square

Lemma 3.12. *Assume that $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ is a hypergraph and $f \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ an edge with nonempty range such that*

- $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) = \emptyset$,
- $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \neq \emptyset \implies r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) \subset s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)$ for all $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$,
- f is the only edge starting from $s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$, i.e. $s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) = \emptyset$ for all $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}$.

Further, let $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ be given by

- $E^0(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$,
- $E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$,
- $r_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) = \begin{cases} r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e), & e \neq f, \\ s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f), & e = f, \end{cases}$
- $s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) = \begin{cases} s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e), & e \neq f \wedge r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) \not\subset s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e), \\ r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f), & e = f, \\ (s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \setminus r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)) \cup s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$

for all edges $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$. Then $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$.

Intuitively, $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ is obtained from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ by inverting the direction of the edge f and by replacing $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$ with $s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$ in the source of every edge e different from f .

Proof. Let $g_1, \dots, g_n \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}$ be those edges with $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) \subset s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i)$ and use the universal property of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ to obtain a map $\varphi : C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \rightarrow C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ with

$$\varphi : \begin{cases} p_v \mapsto \hat{p}_v, & v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma), \\ s_e \mapsto \hat{s}_e, & e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{f, g_1, \dots, g_n\}, \\ s_e \mapsto \hat{s}_f^*, & e = f, \\ s_e \mapsto (\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) \hat{s}_{g_i}, & e = g_i \text{ and } r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i) \neq \emptyset, \\ s_e \mapsto (\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) \hat{s}_{g_i} (\hat{s}_f^* + \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v), & e = g_i \text{ and } r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i) = \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

where we write \hat{p}_v and \hat{s}_e for the generators of $C^*(H\Delta)$ to avoid confusion. Evidently, the $\varphi(p_v)$ are pairwise orthogonal projections. Using

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{s}_f^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) &= \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \\ &= \hat{s}_f^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{H\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \\ &= \hat{s}_f^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{H\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v \right) \\ &= \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* = \hat{s}_f^* \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_{g_i} = \hat{s}_f^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{H\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{H\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_{g_i} = 0$$

one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi(s_{g_i}) \varphi(s_{g_i})^* \varphi(s_{g_i}) \\ &= (\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) \hat{s}_{g_i} \hat{s}_{g_i}^* (\hat{s}_f^* + \sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) (\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\ &= (\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) \hat{s}_{g_i} \hat{s}_{g_i}^* (\hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v + \hat{s}_f^* + \hat{s}_f) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\ &= (\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) \hat{s}_{g_i} \hat{s}_{g_i}^* (\hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\ &= (\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) \hat{s}_{g_i} \hat{s}_{g_i}^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{H\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in r_{H\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v + \sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\ &= (\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) \hat{s}_{g_i} \hat{s}_{g_i}^* \hat{s}_{g_i} \\ &= (\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{H\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\ &= \varphi(s_{g_i}) \end{aligned}$$

for edges g_i with nonempty range. Otherwise, the same calculation can be used to show that $\varphi(s_{g_i})$ is a projection. Thus, the $\varphi(s_e)$ are partial isometries. We check the hypergraph relations.

(HR1): For $e, e' \notin \{f, g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ we have

$$\varphi(s_e^* s_{e'}) = \hat{s}_e^* \hat{s}_{e'} = \begin{cases} \delta_{ee'} \sum_{v \in r_{H\Delta}(e)} \hat{p}_v = \delta_{ee'} \varphi \left(\sum_{v \in r_{H\Gamma}(e)} p_v \right), & r_{H\Gamma}(e) \neq \emptyset, \\ \delta_{ee'} \hat{s}_e = \delta_{ee'} \varphi(s_e), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and for $e = f$ it is

$$\varphi(s_f)^* \varphi(s_f) = \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* = \sum_{v \in s_{H\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v = \varphi \left(\sum_{v \in r_{H\Gamma}(f)} p_v \right)$$

since f is the only edge in $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ that starts from $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)(= s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(f))$. Further, one obtains for g_i with nonempty range the equality

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(s_{g_i})^* \varphi(s_{g_i}) &= \hat{s}_{g_i}^* (\hat{s}_f^* + \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) (\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\
&= \hat{s}_{g_i}^* \hat{s}_{g_i} \\
&= \sum_{v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \\
&= \varphi \left(\sum_{v \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} p_v \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and for g_i with empty range the equality

$$\varphi(s_{g_i})^* \varphi(s_{g_i}) = \varphi(s_{g_i})$$

similarly as in the calculation of $\varphi(s_{g_i})\varphi(s_{g_i})^*\varphi(s_{g_i})$ above. For g_i with nonempty range and $e \notin \{g_1, \dots, g_n, f\}$ observe

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(s_e)^* \varphi(s_{g_i}) &= \hat{s}_e^* (\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\
&= \hat{s}_e^* \hat{s}_f + \hat{s}_e^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\
&= \hat{s}_e^* \hat{s}_f + \hat{s}_e^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\
&= \hat{s}_e^* \hat{s}_f + \hat{s}_e^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\
&= \hat{s}_e^* \hat{s}_f + \hat{s}_e^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\
&= \hat{s}_e^* \hat{s}_f + \hat{s}_e^* \hat{s}_{g_i} \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

and for $g_j \neq g_i$ with nonempty range

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varphi(s_{g_i})^* \varphi(s_{g_j}) &= \hat{s}_{g_i}^* \left(\hat{s}_f^* + \sum_{v \in s_{\text{HG}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{\text{HG}}(g_j)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{g}_j \\
 &= \hat{s}_{g_i}^* \left(\hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HG}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HG}}(g_j)} \hat{p}_v \right) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \hat{s}_f^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HG}}(g_j)} \hat{p}_v \right) + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HG}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_f \right) \hat{g}_j \\
 &= \hat{s}_{g_i}^* \left(\sum_{v \in r_{\text{H}\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HG}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HG}}(g_j)} \hat{p}_v \right) + \hat{f}^* + \hat{s}_f \right) \hat{g}_j \\
 &= \hat{s}_{g_i}^* \left(\sum_{v \in r_{\text{H}\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HG}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HG}}(g_j)} \hat{p}_v \right) \right) \hat{g}_j \\
 &= \hat{s}_{g_i}^* \hat{s}_{g_j} \\
 &= 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Similar calculations apply if g_i and/or g_j has empty range. Further, for any edge $e \notin \{g_1, \dots, g_n, f\}$ use $s_{\text{H}\Delta}(e) \cap r_{\text{H}\Delta}(f) = \emptyset$ to obtain

$$\varphi(s_e)^* \varphi(s_f) = \hat{s}_e^* \hat{s}_f^* = \hat{s}_e^* \hat{s}_e \hat{s}_e^* \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* = 0.$$

Finally, observe that for g_i with nonempty range

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varphi(s_{g_i})^* \varphi(s_f) &= \hat{s}_{g_i}^* \left(\hat{s}_f^* + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HG}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \right) \hat{s}_f^* \\
 &= \hat{s}_{g_i}^* \left(\hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f^* + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HG}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_f^* \right) \\
 &= \hat{s}_{g_i}^* \left(\hat{s}_f^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in r_{\text{H}\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_f^* + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HG}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in r_{\text{H}\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_f^* \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

is zero, using $s_{\text{H}\Delta}(f) \cap r_{\text{H}\Delta}(f) = \emptyset$ and $s_{\text{HG}}(g_i) \cap r_{\text{H}\Delta}(f) = \emptyset$. Similarly, one obtains $\varphi(s_{g_i})^* \varphi(s_f) = 0$ for g_i with empty range.

(HR2): For $e \notin \{f, g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ the second hypergraph relation is easily checked. For the remaining edges observe

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varphi(s_{g_i})\varphi(s_{g_i})^* \\
&= \left(\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{g}_i \hat{g}_i^* \left(\hat{s}_f^* + \sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \\
&\leq \left(\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\hat{s}_f^* + \sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \\
&= \left(\hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \right) \\
&= \left(\hat{s}_f + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) - \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \right) \left(\hat{s}_f^* + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) - \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \right) \\
&= \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* + \hat{s}_f \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) - \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_f^* + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) - \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \\
&\quad - \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f - \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) + \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \\
&= \sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \\
&= \varphi \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} p_v \right)
\end{aligned}$$

using

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* &= \sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v = \sum_{v \in r_{\text{HR}}(f)} \hat{p}_v \leq \sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \\
&\perp \sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(f)} \hat{p}_v = \sum_{v \in r_{\text{H}\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v = \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f \leq \sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \perp \hat{s}_{\text{H}\Delta}(f) = \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^*
\end{aligned}$$

Note that these (in)equalities hold for g_i with empty or nonempty range at the same time. Moreover, it is

$$\varphi(s_f)\varphi(s_f)^* = \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f = \sum_{v \in r_{\text{H}\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v = \sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(f)} \hat{p}_v = \varphi \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{HR}}(f)} p_v \right).$$

(HR3): If $v \notin r_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f) \cup s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)$ is not a sink in $\text{H}\Gamma$, then with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{s}_f \hat{p}_v &= \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f \hat{p}_v \\ &= 0 \\ &= \hat{s}_f \left(\sum_{v \in r_{\text{H}\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_e \hat{s}_e^* \\ &= \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_e \hat{s}_e^* \\ &= \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_e \hat{s}_e^* \end{aligned}$$

for all $e \notin \{g_1, \dots, g_n, f\}$ one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(p_v) &= \hat{p}_v \\ &= (\hat{s}_f + 1 - \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f) \hat{p}_v (\hat{s}_f^* + 1 - \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f) \\ &\leq (\hat{s}_f + 1 - \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f) \left(\sum_{e \in E^1(\text{H}\Delta): v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(e)} \hat{s}_e \hat{s}_e^* \right) (\hat{s}_f^* + 1 - \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E^1(\text{H}\Delta): e \neq g_i \wedge v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e)} \hat{s}_e \hat{s}_e^* \\ &\quad + \sum_{g_i: v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \left(\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_{g_i} \hat{s}_{g_i}^* \left(\hat{s}_f^* + \sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E^1(\text{H}\Delta): v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e)} \varphi(s_e) \varphi(s_e)^*. \end{aligned}$$

Further, if $v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)$, then f is the only edge in $\text{H}\Gamma$ starting from v and therefore

$$\varphi(p_v) = \hat{p}_v \leq \sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)} \hat{p}_v = \sum_{v \in r_{\text{H}\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v = \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f = \sum_{e \in E^1(\text{H}\Gamma): v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e)} \varphi(s_e) \varphi(s_e)^*.$$

Finally, let $v \in r_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)$ not be a sink in $\text{H}\Gamma$. Then in $\text{H}\Gamma$ the g_i are all edges that start from v while in $\text{H}\Delta$ the g_i are all edges that start from $s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)(= r_{\text{H}\Delta}(f))$. Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(p_v) &= \hat{p}_v \leq \sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Delta}(f)} \hat{p}_v \\ &= \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \\ &= \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f \hat{s}_f^* \\ &= (\hat{s}_f + 1 - \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f) \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f (\hat{s}_f^* + 1 - \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f) \\ &\leq (\hat{s}_f + 1 - \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{s}_{g_i} \hat{s}_{g_i}^* \right) (\hat{s}_f^* + 1 - \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{g}_i \hat{g}_i^* \left(\hat{s}_f^* + \sum_{v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E^1(\text{H}\Gamma): v \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e)} \varphi(s_e) \varphi(s_e)^*. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to find an inverse map $\psi : C^*(\text{H}\Delta) \rightarrow C^*(\text{H}\Gamma)$. A close inspection of $\text{H}\Delta$ reveals that it satisfies the assumptions required from $\text{H}\Gamma$ and indeed we get back $\text{H}\Gamma$ from $\text{H}\Delta$ by the same procedure that gave us $\text{H}\Delta$ from $\text{H}\Gamma$. Thus, by the

very same arguments as above one obtains a map ψ with

$$\psi : \begin{cases} \hat{p}_v \mapsto p_v, & v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Delta), \\ \hat{s}_e \mapsto s_e, & e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta) \setminus \{f, g_1, \dots, g_n\}, \\ \hat{s}_e \mapsto s_f^*, & e = f, \\ \hat{s}_e \mapsto \left(s_f + \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i)} p_v \right) s_{g_i}, & e = g_i \text{ and } r_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i) \neq \emptyset, \\ \hat{s}_e \mapsto \left(s_f + \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i)} p_v \right) s_{g_i} \left(s_f^* + \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i)} p_v \right), & e = g_i \text{ and } r_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i) = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

Using

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\psi(\hat{s}_{g_i})) &= \varphi \left(\left(s_f + \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i)} p_v \right) s_{g_i} \right) \\ &= \left(\hat{s}_f^* + \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\hat{s}_f + \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\ &= \left(\hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f + \hat{s}_f^* \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \hat{s}_f + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) \right) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\ &= \left(\hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f + \hat{s}_f^* + 0 + \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(g_i)} \hat{p}_v \right) - \hat{s}_f^* \hat{s}_f \right) \hat{s}_{g_i} \\ &= \hat{s}_{g_i} \end{aligned}$$

for g_i with nonempty range and a similar calculation for g_i with empty range, one readily checks that φ and ψ are inverse to each other. This concludes the proof. \square

Proposition 3.13 (edge contraction). *Assume that $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ is obtained from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ by*

- (1) *forward contracting an edge f with $s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) = \{w\}$, or*
- (2) *backward contracting an edge f with $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) = \{w\}$.*

Then $C^(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = (1 - p_w)C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)(1 - p_w)$ and the latter is a full corner in $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$. In particular, $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ and $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ are Morita equivalent.*

Proof. Ad (1): Because of the range decomposition operation we may assume without loss of generality that

$$w \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \implies \{w\} = r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \quad (*)$$

holds for all edges $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$. Otherwise, first decompose the ranges of all edges e with $w \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)$ and then apply forward contraction on f . Since $w \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)$ implies $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \cap r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) = \emptyset$ by assumption, we may apply range decomposition backwards to obtain the desired hypergraph $\mathbf{H}\Delta$.

Now, assume that (*) is true and obtain $\mathbf{H}\Gamma'$ from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ by changing the range of every edge e with $\{w\} = r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)$ to $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f)$. By Lemma 3.11, $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma') = C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$. It remains to show that $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$ is a full corner of $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma')$.

Observe that $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ is obtained from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma'$ by first cutting the edge f and then deleting the ideally closed set $\{w, f\}$. Let $\mathbf{H}\Gamma''$ be the hypergraph obtained after the

first operation. Then $C^*(\text{HG}'')$ is a subalgebra of $C^*(\text{HG}')$ by a previous proposition. As w has no incoming or outgoing edges in HG'' one has $C^*(\text{HG}'') = C^*(\text{H}\Delta) \oplus \mathbb{C}p_w$. Thus, $C^*(\text{H}\Delta) \subset C^*(\text{HG}'') \subset C^*(\text{HG}') = C^*(\text{HG})$. A closer look at the embeddings reveals that $C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$ is the subalgebra generated by the projections p_v for $v \neq w$ and the partial isometries s_e for $e \neq f$. All of these elements are in the corner $(1-p_w)C^*(\text{HG}')(1-p_w)$, and therefore we have $C^*(\text{H}\Delta) \subset (1-p_w)C^*(\text{HG}')(1-p_w)$.

To show equality, use that a dense subset of $C^*(\text{HG}')$ is spanned by words of the form $x = x_1 \dots x_n$ with $x_i \in \{p_v, s_e, s_e^* : v \in E^0(\text{HG}'), e \in E^1(\text{HG}')\}$. We claim that if x is in $(1-p_w)C^*(\text{HG}')(1-p_w)$, then it is also in $C^*(p_v, s_e : v \neq w, e \neq f)$ which is equal to $C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$. This implies immediately

$$(1-p_w)C^*(\text{HG}')(1-p_w) \subset C^*(\text{H}\Delta).$$

We prove the claim by induction over the number N of occurrences of s_f or p_w in the word x . Without loss of generality, however, x does not contain the letter p_w since we could replace it with $s_f s_f^*$. If $N = 0$ there is nothing to show. For the induction step distinguish the following cases:

Case 1 $x = s_f x'$ for some x' . Then $x \in (1-p_w)C^*(\text{HG}')(1-p_w)$ implies

$$x = (1-p_w)x = (1-p_w)s_f x' = (1-p_w)s_f s_f^* s_f x' = (1-p_w)p_w s_f x' = 0.$$

Case 2 $x = x' s_e s_f x''$ for some x', x'' and an edge $e \in E^1(\text{HG}')$. The properties of HG' imply that the intersection $r_{\text{HG}'}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}'}(f)$ is empty. Therefore, $x = 0$.

Case 3 $x = x' s_e^* s_f x''$ for some x', x'' and an edge $e \in E^1(\text{HG})$. Unless x is zero the intersection $s_{\text{HG}'}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}'}(f)$ must not be empty. This leaves only the possibility $e = f$. Then

$$x = x' s_e^* s_f x'' = x' s_f^* s_f x'' = x' \sum_{v \in r_{\text{HG}'}(f)} p_v x'' = \sum_{v \in r_{\text{HG}'}(f)} x' p_v x''.$$

On the last term we may apply the induction hypothesis.

Case 4 $x = x' p_v s_f x''$ for some x', x'' and a vertex $v \in E^0(\text{HG})$. By assumption, we have without loss of generality $v \neq w$. Thus,

$$x = x' p_v s_f x'' = 0.$$

Case 5 $x = x' s_f^*$, $x = x' s_f^* s_e x''$, $x = x' s_f^* s_e^* x''$ or $x = x' s_f^* p_v x''$. By passing to the adjoint one of the previous cases applies.

Ad (2): One checks that the edge f satisfies the assumptions from Lemma 3.12. Thus, we may obtain HG' by changing the source of every edge e with $w \in s_{\text{HG}}(e)$ from $s_{\text{HG}}(e)$ to $(s_{\text{HG}}(e) \setminus \{w\}) \cup s_{\text{HG}}(f)$ and invert the direction of the edge f without changing the associated C^* -algebra. Then one readily checks that $\text{H}\Delta$ is obtained from HG' by forward contracting the edge f . Now, the claim follows from (1). \square

Proof of Theorem 3.3. For range decomposition we refer to the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [Tri22] which is easily adapted to the present situation. The other statements in the bullet points are identical to Propositions 3.4, 3.6, 3.10 and 3.13, respectively. The last statement follows since the class of exact C^* -algebras is closed under taking quotients and subalgebras, and because Morita equivalence preserves exactness. \square

4. HYPERGRAPH NORMALIZATION

Assume that we have given a hypergraph HG and its associated C^* -algebra $C^*(\text{HG})$. In the previous Section 3 we have seen that certain minor operations do not change the C^* -algebra up to Morita equivalence, see Theorem 3.3. This can be used to put any given hypergraph in a ‘‘normalized’’ form. Let us first define the notion of a normal hypergraph.

Definition 4.1 (normal hypergraph). *A hypergraph HG is called normal if it has the following properties.*

- (1) $|r(e)| \leq 1$ for all edges $e \in E^1(\text{HG})$.
- (2) For every edge e there exists another edge f such that $s(e) \cap s(f) \neq \emptyset$ or $\emptyset \neq r(e) \subset s(e)$.
- (3) Whenever (e, f) is a pair of distinct edges with $|s(e) \cap s(f)| = 1$, then one of the following holds:
 - a) $|s(e)| = |s(f)| = 1$.
 - b) There is an edge $g \neq e$ with $s(e) \cap s(f) \subsetneq s(e) \cap s(g)$.

The next lemma asserts that, without changing the associated C^* -algebra up to Morita equivalence, any hypergraph HG can be normalized by passing to a suitable hypergraph minor.

Lemma 4.2. *Let HG be a hypergraph. Then there is a normal hypergraph $\text{H}\Delta \leq \text{HG}$ such that $C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$ is Morita equivalent to $C^*(\text{HG})$. We call $\text{H}\Delta$ a normalized version of HG .*

The idea of the proof is to use source separation, backward contraction and range decomposition as often as possible without changing the C^* -algebra up to Morita equivalence.

Proof. Consider the sets $S_i := S_i(\text{HG})$ given by

$$S_1 := \{e \in E^1(\text{HG}) \mid e \text{ violates condition (2) from Definition 4.1}\},$$

$$S_2 := \left\{ (e, f) \in E^1(\text{HG}) \times E^1(\text{HG}) \left| \begin{array}{l} e \neq f \text{ and the pair } (e, f) \text{ violates} \\ \text{condition (3) from Definition 4.1} \end{array} \right. \right\},$$

and set $n_i := n_i(\text{HG}) := |S_i|$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Step 1 First, let us assume $n_2(\text{HG}) = 0$. By applying range decomposition on all edges we may further assume that every edge $e \in E^1(\text{HG})$ satisfies $|r_{\text{HG}}(e)| \leq 1$. We prove the claim by induction over the number of vertices.

If HG has no vertices or $n_1(\text{HG}) = 0$, then HG is normal and there is nothing to do. Otherwise, choose some edge $e \in S_1(\text{HG})$. If $r_{\text{HG}}(e) = \emptyset$ then we can delete the edge e without changing the associated C^* -algebra, see Lemma 3.9. Hence, without loss of generality we may assume $r_{\text{HG}}(e) \neq \emptyset$. Then by assumption we have $r_{\text{HG}}(e) \not\subset s_{\text{HG}}(e)$, $|r_{\text{HG}}(e)| = 1$ and e is the only edge starting from $s_{\text{HG}}(e)$, i.e. it is $s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f) = \emptyset$ for all $f \in E^1(\text{HG}) \setminus \{e\}$.

Therefore, we may construct a hypergraph HG' by applying backward contraction on e . Further, obtain another hypergraph HG'' from HG' by applying range decomposition on all edges. Evidently, $\text{HG}'' \leq \text{HG}$ and HG'' has fewer vertices than HG . Moreover, we have $C^*(\text{HG}'') =_M C^*(\text{HG})$ by Theorem 3.3.

In order to apply the induction hypothesis we need to check $n_2(\text{HG}'') = 0$. Assume that there is a pair $(e'', f'') \in S_2(\text{HG}'')$, i.e. e'' and f'' are distinct edges in HG'' with

- $|s_{\text{HG}''}(e'') \cap s_{\text{HG}''}(f'')| = 1$,
- $|s_{\text{HG}''}(e'')| > 1$ or $|s_{\text{HG}''}(f'')| > 1$ and
- there is no edge g'' in HG'' with $s_{\text{HG}''}(e'') \cap s_{\text{HG}''}(f'') \subsetneq s_{\text{HG}''}(e'') \cap s_{\text{HG}''}(g'')$.

Clearly, it is not $s_{\text{HG}''}(e'') = s_{\text{HG}''}(f'')$. A moment's thought shows that there are edges e', f' in HG' with $s_{\text{HG}'}(e') = s_{\text{HG}''}(e'')$ and $s_{\text{HG}'}(f') = s_{\text{HG}''}(f'')$ such that $(e', f') \in S_2(\text{HG}')$. Recall that HG' is obtained from HG by deleting the edge e together with the vertex in $r_{\text{HG}}(e)$ and by replacing $r_{\text{HG}}(e)$ with $s_{\text{HG}}(e)$ in the range or source of every edge different from e . With this in mind, it is not difficult

to see $|s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f')| = 1$ as well as $|s_{\text{HG}}(e')| > 1$ or $|s_{\text{HG}}(f')| > 1$. Assume that there is an edge g in HG with

$$s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f') \subsetneq s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(g).$$

Let w be the unique vertex in $r_{\text{HG}}(e)$. One checks

$$\begin{aligned} & s_{\text{HG}'}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}'}(f') \\ &= \begin{cases} ((s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f')) \setminus \{w\}) \cup s_{\text{HG}}(e), & w \in s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f'), \\ s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f'), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ &\subsetneq \begin{cases} ((s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(g)) \setminus \{w\}) \cup s_{\text{HG}}(e), & w \in s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f'), \\ s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(g), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} s_{\text{HG}'}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}'}(g), & w \in s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f'), \\ ((s_{\text{HG}'}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}'}(g)) \setminus s_{\text{HG}}(e)) \cup \{w\}, & w \in (s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(g)) \setminus s_{\text{HG}}(f'), \\ s_{\text{HG}'}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}'}(g), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Using that the intersection on the left-hand side does not contain w , it follows

$$s_{\text{HG}'}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}'}(f') \subsetneq s_{\text{HG}'}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}'}(g).$$

This contradicts the assumption $(e', f') \in S_2(\text{HG}')$. Thus, there is no such edge g , and we have $(e', f') \in S_2(\text{HG})$. However, we assumed $S_2(\text{HG}) = \emptyset$. By contradiction, $S_2(\text{HG}') = \emptyset$ and $n_2(\text{HG}') = 0$.

Since in HG'' every edge has at most one vertex in its range we may apply the induction hypothesis on HG'' and conclude.

Step 2 In the general case, let us use induction over $n_2(\text{HG})$. If $n_2(\text{HG}) = 0$, then the previous step applies. Otherwise, choose a pair $(e, f) \in S_2(\text{HG})$ and let $\{w\} = s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f)$. The negation of condition (3) from Definition 4.1 entails

$$w \in s_{\text{HG}}(g) \implies \{w\} = s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(g) \quad \text{for all } g \in E^1(\text{HG}) \setminus \{e\}. \quad (*)$$

Construct a hypergraph HG' by applying source separation on $\{e\}$ at w , i.e. HG' is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \bullet E^0(\text{HG}') = E^0(\text{HG}) \cup \{w'\} \\ & \bullet E^1(\text{HG}') = E^1(\text{HG}), \\ & \bullet r_{\text{HG}'}(g) = \begin{cases} r_{\text{HG}}(g), & w \notin r_{\text{HG}}(g), \\ r_{\text{HG}}(g) \cup \{w'\}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } g \in E^1(\text{HG}'), \\ & \bullet s_{\text{HG}'}(g) = \begin{cases} s_{\text{HG}}(g), & g \neq e, \\ (s_{\text{HG}}(g) \setminus \{w\}) \cup \{w'\}, & g = e, \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } g \in E^1(\text{HG}'). \end{aligned}$$

In view of Proposition 3.4 and (*) we have $C^*(\text{HG}') = C^*(\text{HG})$. In order to apply the induction hypothesis we need to show $n_2(\text{HG}') < n_2(\text{HG})$. To do this, let us first show $S_2(\text{HG}') \subset S_2(\text{HG})$. For that, assume $(e', f') \notin S_2(\text{HG})$. We show $(e', f') \notin S_2(\text{HG}')$. As $(e', f') \notin S_2(\text{HG})$ one of the following cases applies.

- i) $|s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f')| \neq 1$. We show that then $|s_{\text{HG}'}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}'}(f')| \neq 1$ holds as well. Indeed, when passing from HG to HG' the vertex w in the source of the edge e is replaced with w' , but the sources of all other edges remain unchanged. Thus, the only possibility that $|s_{\text{HG}'}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}'}(f')| = 1$, is that either $e' = e$ or $f' = e$, and $w \in s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f')$. Without loss of generality, assume $e' = e$. Then we have

$$s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f) = s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f) = \{w\} \subsetneq s_{\text{HG}}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f')$$

which contradicts the assumption $(e, f) \in S_2(\text{HG})$. Thus,

$$|s_{\text{HG}'}(e') \cap s_{\text{HG}'}(f')| \neq 1.$$

- ii) $|s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e')| = |s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f')| = 1$. Since passing from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ to $\mathbf{H}\Gamma'$ does not change the cardinalities of the sources of the edges, it follows directly

$$|s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(e')| = |s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(f')| = 1.$$

- iii) There is some $g' \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{e'\}$ with $s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f') \subsetneq s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g')$. Without loss of generality, the intersection on the left-hand side has cardinality 1 since otherwise case (i) applies. Then, $|s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g')| \geq 2$. We show

$$s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(f') \subsetneq s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(g'). \quad (+)$$

If $e', f', g' \neq e$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(f') &= s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f') \subsetneq s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g') \\ &= s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(g') \end{aligned}$$

since the involved source sets remain unchanged when passing from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ to $\mathbf{H}\Gamma'$. However, if one of the edges e', f', g' equals e , then one of the two intersections might lose the vertex w and get smaller. This matters only, if it happens on the right-hand side of (+) but not on the left-hand side. In this case, one has $g' = e$ or $e' = e$ and $w \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g')$. It follows

$$s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) = \{w\} \subsetneq s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g') = \begin{cases} s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(g'), & \text{or} \\ s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e), \end{cases}$$

contradicting the assumption $(e, f) \in S_2(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$. Altogether, we get

$$s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(f') \subsetneq s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(e') \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma'}(g').$$

In any of the above cases it follows $(e', f') \notin S_2(\mathbf{H}\Gamma')$. Thus, we have the implication

$$(e', f') \notin S_2(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \implies (e', f') \notin S_2(\mathbf{H}\Gamma')$$

which is equivalent to $S_2(\mathbf{H}\Gamma') \subset S_2(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$. At the same time, one readily checks that the pair (e, f) is in $S_2(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ but not in $S_2(\mathbf{H}\Gamma')$. Thus, the subset relation is strict, and we have $n_2(\mathbf{H}\Gamma') < n_2(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$. Now, we may apply the induction hypothesis and conclude. \square

The proof of Lemma 4.2 translates directly into an algorithm that produces for any given hypergraph $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ a normalized version $\mathbf{H}\Delta \leq \mathbf{H}\Gamma$ with $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) =_M C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$. We present this algorithm in pseudocode below.

Algorithm 1 Hypergraph Normalization

```

procedure NORMALIZE(hypergraph  $H\Gamma$ )
   $H\Gamma \leftarrow$  take  $H\Gamma$  and apply range decomposition on all edges
  while True do
    if there is a pair  $(e, f)$  violating condition (3) from Definition 4.1 then
       $H\Gamma \leftarrow$  take  $H\Gamma$  and separate the source of  $\{e\}$  at  $s(e) \cap s(f)$ 
    else if there is an edge  $e$  violating condition (2) from Definition 4.1 then
      if  $r(e) = \emptyset$  then
         $H\Gamma \leftarrow$  take  $H\Gamma$  and delete the edge  $e$ 
      else
         $H\Gamma \leftarrow$  take  $H\Gamma$  and apply backward contraction on  $e$ 
      end if
     $H\Gamma \leftarrow$  take  $H\Gamma$  and apply range decomposition on all edges
    else if none of the previous cases applies then
      break
    end if
  end while
  return  $H\Gamma$ 
end procedure

```

5. HYPERGRAPH REDUCTION

In this section, we identify situations where cutting some edges of a hypergraph $H\Gamma$ does not change nuclearity of the associated C^* -algebra. More precisely, given a hypergraph $H\Gamma$ we find three different kinds of sets $S \subset E^1(H\Gamma)$ with the following property: If $H\Delta$ is the hypergraph obtained from $H\Gamma$ by cutting all edges in S , then $C^*(H\Gamma)$ is nuclear if, and only if, the same holds for $C^*(H\Delta)$.

To prepare these results, Section 5.1 introduces the notion of an entry- or exit-closed edge set. In Section 5.2 we introduce the notion of an *easy edge set* and show that it has the desired behavior described above. The same result is obtained in Section 5.3 for *easy cycles* and in Section 5.4 for edges ending in a *simple quasisink*.

5.1. Entry-/Exit-Closed Edge Sets. Let $H\Gamma$ and $H\Delta$ be hypergraphs and let $p \in C^*(H\Gamma), q \in C^*(H\Delta)$ be projections. Sometimes one observes that the corners $pC^*(H\Gamma)p$ and $qC^*(H\Delta)q$ are equal although the hypergraphs themselves are different. In the following, we identify two situations where this is true.

First, we need a lemma that describes a dense subset of a hypergraph C^* -algebra. Its proof is evident from the definitions.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $H\Gamma$ be a hypergraph. A dense subset of $C^*(H\Gamma)$ is spanned by products of the form*

$$x = x_1 \dots x_n \quad \text{with } n \in \mathbb{N}, x_i \in \{p_v, s_e, s_e^* : v \in E^0, e \in E^1\},$$

where for every $i < n$ neither of the following is true:

- a) $x_i x_{i+1} = s_e^* s_f$ for some edges $e, f \in E^1$.
- b) $x_i x_{i+1} = s_e p_v$ or $x_i x_{i+1} = p_v s_e^*$ for some $e \in E^1, v \in E^0$ with $r(e) \neq \emptyset$, and either $v \notin r(e)$ or $\{v\} = r(e)$.
- c) $x_i x_{i+1} = s_e p_v$ or $x_i x_{i+1} = p_v s_e^*$ for some $e \in E^1, v \in E^0$ with $r(e) = \emptyset$, and either $v \notin s(e)$ or $\{v\} = s(e)$.
- d) $x_i x_{i+1} = p_v s_e$ or $x_i x_{i+1} = s_e^* p_v$ for some $e \in E^1, v \in E^0$ with $v \notin s(e)$ or $\{v\} = s(e)$.
- e) $x_i x_{i+1} = s_e s_f$ or $x_i x_{i+1} = s_f^* s_e^*$ for some $e, f \in E^1$ with $r(e) \cap s(f) = \emptyset$.
- f) $x_i x_{i+1} = s_e s_f^*$ for some $e, f \in E^1$ with $r(e) \neq \emptyset$ and $r(e) \cap r(f) = \emptyset$.

g) $x_i x_{i+1} = s_e s_f^*$ for some $e, f \in E^1$ with $r(e) = \emptyset$ and $s(e) \cap r(f) = \emptyset$.

Definition 5.2. Let HG be a hypergraph and let $F \subset E^1(\text{HG})$ be a set of edges in HG . Then F is closed under source entries if

$$\forall f \in F, e \in E^1(\text{HG}) : s(f) \cap r(e) \neq \emptyset \implies e \in F.$$

Similarly, F is closed under range exits if

$$\forall f \in F, e \in E^1(\text{HG}) : r(f) \cap s(e) \neq \emptyset \implies e \in F.$$

Lemma 5.3. Let HG be a hypergraph, $F \subset E^1(\text{HG})$ and let $p \in C^*(\text{HG})$ be a projection. Further, obtain $\text{H}\Delta$ from HG by cutting all edges in F , and assume that one of the following holds:

- (1) F is closed under source entries, and $|s_{\text{HG}}(f)| = 1$, $ps_f = 0$ hold for all $f \in F$.
- (2) F is closed under range exits, and $|r_{\text{HG}}(f)| = 1$, $s_f p = 0$ hold for all $f \in F$.
Further, we have

$$\forall f \in F, e \in E^1(\text{HG}) : r_{\text{HG}}(f) \cap r_{\text{HG}}(e) \neq \emptyset \implies e = f. \quad (*)$$

Then $pC^*(\text{HG})p = pC^*(\text{H}\Delta)p$.

Proof. Recall from Theorem 3.3 that $C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$ is a subalgebra of $C^*(\text{HG})$. Further, let $x = x_1 \dots x_n$ be a word with $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_i \in \{p_v, s_e, s_e^* : v \in E^0(\text{HG}), e \in E^1(\text{HG})\}$ as in Lemma 5.1. Assume $pxp \neq 0$. It suffices to show $x \in C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$ in the situations (1) and (2).

Ad (1): We show $x_i \notin \{s_f, s_f^* : f \in F\}$ for all $i \leq n$. Indeed, for any $f \in F$ and all $e \in E^1(\text{HG}), v \in E^0(\text{HG})$ one observes the following:

- $r_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f) \neq \emptyset$ implies $e \in F$, since F is closed under source entries.
- $v \in s_{\text{HG}}(f)$ implies $\{v\} = s_{\text{HG}}(f)$ since $|s_{\text{HG}}(f)| = 1$.

Combining these observations with the properties of x , one checks that as soon as $x_i = s_f$ for some $f \in F, i > 1$, then $x_{i-1} = s_g$ for some $g \in F$. Inductively, it follows that either $x_1 \in \{s_f : f \in F\}$ or $x_i \notin \{s_f : f \in F\}$ holds for all $i \leq n$. However, in the first case we have $pxp = (px_1)x_2 \dots x_n p = 0$ since $ps_f = 0$ holds for all $f \in F$. Hence, it is $x_i \notin \{s_f : f \in F\}$ for all $i \leq n$. By symmetry, $x_i \notin \{s_f^* : f \in F\}$ for all $i \leq n$ holds as well. As $\{p_v, s_e, s_e^* : v \in E^0(\text{HG}), e \in E^1(\text{HG}) \setminus F\}$ is a subset of $C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$, we obtain $x \in C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$ as desired.

Ad (2): Let x be as above and assume $pxp \neq 0$. This time, we show that every occurrence of some s_f with $f \in F$ in the product x is followed by s_f^* . Indeed, for all $e \in E^1(\text{HG})$ and $v \in E^0(\text{HG})$ one observes the following:

- $r_{\text{HG}}(f) \neq \emptyset$ since $|r_{\text{HG}}(f)| = 1$.
- $r_{\text{HG}}(f) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e) \neq \emptyset$ implies $e \in F$ since F is closed under range exits.
- $r_{\text{HG}}(f) \cap r_{\text{HG}}(e) \neq \emptyset$ implies $e = f$ due to (*).
- $v \in r_{\text{HG}}(f)$ implies $\{v\} = r_{\text{HG}}(f)$ since $|r_{\text{HG}}(f)| = 1$.

Combining these observations with the properties of x , one checks that for all $i < n$, $x_i = s_f$ with $f \in F$ entails $x_{i+1} = s_f^*$ or $x_{i+1} \in \{s_g : g \in F\}$. So, assume $x_i = s_f$ as above and $x_{i+1} \neq s_f^*$ for some $i < n$. Without loss of generality $i < n$ is maximal with this property. Then $x_{i+1} \in \{s_g : g \in F\}$ and by induction one obtains $x_n \in \{s_g : g \in F\}$ as well using maximality of i . Then, however, we have $pxp = px_1 \dots x_{n-1}(x_n p) = 0$ contradicting the assumption that $pxp \neq 0$. Thus, every occurrence of some s_f with $f \in F$ as a factor in the product x is followed by s_f^* . By symmetry, every occurrence of s_f^* with $f \in F$ in x is preceded by s_f as well. Altogether, we get $x \in C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$ since $C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$ contains $s_f s_f^*$ for all $f \in F$ as well as $\{p_v, s_e, s_e^* : v \in E^0(\text{HG}), e \in E^1(\text{HG}) \setminus F\}$. \square

5.2. Elimination of Easy Edge Sets. In this section, we introduce the notion of an easy edge and the easy edge set it generates. In a hypergraph, all edges in an easy edge set may be cut without changing nuclearity of the associated hypergraph C^* -algebra.

Definition 5.4 (easy edge). *Let $\mathbb{H}\Gamma$ be a hypergraph and let $f_0 \in E^1(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$. Let F be the set*

$$\{e_1 \in E^1(\mathbb{H}\Gamma) \mid \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, e_2, \dots, e_n \in E^1(\mathbb{H}\Gamma) : e_n = f_0 \wedge e_1 \dots e_n \text{ is a path in } \mathbb{H}\Gamma\}.$$

The edge f_0 is called easy if for all $f \in F$ it is $|s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(f)| = |r_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(f)| = 1$. In this case, we call F the easy edge set generated by f_0 .

Example 5.5. *In the hypergraph $\mathbb{H}\Gamma$ below the edge f is easy, and the edges colored in red form the easy edge set generated by f .*




FIGURE 1. Example of an easy edge

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\mathbb{H}\Gamma$ be a hypergraph and $f \in E^1(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$ with $|s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(f)| = 1$. Further, assume that $s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(f)$ is a source, i.e.*

$$\forall e \in E^1(\mathbb{H}\Gamma) : r_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(f) = \emptyset.$$

Obtain $\mathbb{H}\Delta$ from $\mathbb{H}\Gamma$ by cutting the edge f . Then $C^(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$ is nuclear iff the same holds for $C^*(\mathbb{H}\Delta)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, the edge f has non-empty range. If there is an edge $e \in E^1(\mathbb{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}$ with $s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(f) \neq \emptyset$, then obtain $\mathbb{H}\Gamma'$ from $\mathbb{H}\Gamma$ by separating the source of f , i.e.

- $E^0(\mathbb{H}\Gamma') = E^0(\mathbb{H}\Gamma) \cup \{w_f\}$,
- $E^1(\mathbb{H}\Gamma') = E^1(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$,
- $r_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma'}(e) = r_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(e)$ for all $e \in E^1(\mathbb{H}\Gamma')$,
- $s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma'}(e) = \begin{cases} s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(e), & e \neq f, \\ \{w_f\}, & e = f, \end{cases}$ for all $e \in E^1(\mathbb{H}\Gamma')$.

Otherwise, set $\mathbb{H}\Gamma' := \mathbb{H}\Gamma$ and let $w_f \in E^0(\mathbb{H}\Gamma')$ be the vertex with $s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(f) = \{w_f\}$. By Proposition 3.4 we have in any case $C^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma') = C^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$. Further, in $C^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma')$, f is the only edge starting from w_f . Hence, applying forward contraction on f does not change the associated C^* -algebra up to Morita equivalence, see Proposition 3.13. Let $\mathbb{H}\Gamma''$ be the obtained hypergraph. One readily checks

$$C^*(\mathbb{H}\Delta) = \mathbb{C} \oplus C^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma'') =_M \mathbb{C} \oplus C^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$$

and this yields the claim. \square

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\mathbb{H}\Gamma$ be a hypergraph that contains an easy edge f_0 . Further, let F be the easy edge set generated by f_0 and obtain $\mathbb{H}\Delta$ from $\mathbb{H}\Gamma$ by cutting all edges in F . Then $C^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$ is nuclear if, and only if, the same holds for $C^*(\mathbb{H}\Delta)$.*

Proof. Recall from Theorem 3.3 that $C^*(H\Delta)$ is a subalgebra of $C^*(H\Gamma)$.

Step 1 First, assume

$$r_{H\Gamma}(f_0) = s_{H\Gamma}(f) \quad \text{for some } f \in F. \quad (*)$$

Let $S \subset E^0(H\Gamma) \cup E^1(H\Gamma)$ be given by

$$S := (E^1(H\Gamma) \setminus F) \cup \left(E^0(H\Gamma) \setminus \bigcup_{f \in F} s_{H\Gamma}(f) \right).$$

We show that S is ideally closed in the sense of Definition 3.7. Indeed, we have the following:

- Whenever an edge e is in S , then $r_{H\Gamma}(e)$ is a subset of S . Otherwise, there would be an edge $f \in F$ with $r_{H\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{H\Gamma}(f) \neq \emptyset$. By definition of F this implies $e \in F$, i.e. $e \notin S$.
- Whenever an edge $e \in E^1(H\Gamma)$ satisfies $s_{H\Gamma}(e) \subset S$ or $\emptyset \neq r_{H\Gamma}(e) \subset S$, then $e \in S$. Indeed, if e is not in S , then we have $e \in F$, and this implies $s_{H\Gamma}(e) \cap S = \emptyset = r_{H\Gamma}(e) \cap S$. For the latter equality, use $(*)$ to obtain that for every $f \in F$ there is an $f' \in F$ with $r_{H\Gamma}(f) = s_{H\Gamma}(f')$.
- Whenever a vertex $v \in E^0(H\Gamma)$ is not a sink and satisfies

$$v \in s_{H\Gamma}(e) \implies e \in S \text{ for all edges } e \in E^1(H\Gamma),$$

then $v \in S$. Indeed, if $v \notin S$, then there is an edge $f \in F$ with $v \in s_{H\Gamma}(f)$.

Step 2 As S is ideally closed, Lemma 3.8 yields the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow (S) \rightarrow C^*(H\Gamma) \rightarrow C^*(\Phi) \rightarrow 0,$$

where Φ is obtained from $H\Gamma$ by deleting all edges and vertices in S . Since all edges that are not in S have exactly one vertex in their range and source, respectively, one verifies that Φ is an ordinary graph. Thus, $C^*(\Phi)$ is nuclear. Since the class of nuclear C^* -algebras is closed under extensions and ideals, it follows that $C^*(H\Gamma)$ is nuclear iff the same holds for (S) .

Step 3 Set,

$$p := 1 - \sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^* = \sum_{e \in S \cap E^1(H\Gamma)} s_e s_e^* + \sum_{v \in S \cap E^0(H\Gamma): v \text{ is a sink}} p_v.$$

Let us show $(S) = (pC^*(H\Gamma)p)$. Evidently, $p \in (S)$ and therefore $pC^*(H\Gamma)p \subset (S)$. Further, for vertices v in S one has that v is a sink or every edge $e \in E^1(H\Gamma)$ with $v \in s_{H\Gamma}(e)$ is in S . In any case, $p_v = pp_v = p_v p = pp_v p$. On the other hand, for every edge e in S with non-empty range, the range $r_{H\Gamma}(e)$ contains only vertices from S . Thus, one checks

$$ps_e p = s_e s_e^* s_e \left(\sum_{w \in r_{H\Gamma}(e)} p_w \right) p = s_e \left(\sum_{w \in r_{H\Gamma}(e)} p_w \right) = s_e \quad \text{for all } e \in S.$$

If $e \in S \cap E^1(H\Gamma)$ has empty range, then

$$ps_e p = (s_e s_e^*) s_e (s_e s_e^*) = s_e.$$

Altogether, we have $\{p_v, s_e : v \in S \cap E^0(H\Gamma), e \in S \cap E^1(H\Gamma)\} \subset pC^*(H\Gamma)p \subset (S)$, and this entails $(S) = (pC^*(H\Gamma)p)$.

Step 4 Next, use Lemma 5.3 to obtain $pC^*(H\Gamma)p = pC^*(H\Delta)p$. Indeed, by definition the set F is closed under source entries and for every edge $f \in F$ it is

$|s_{\text{HG}}(f)| = |r_{\text{HG}}(f)| = 1$. Further, for every $f \in F$ one has

$$ps_f = \left(1 - \sum_{f \in F} s_f s_f^*\right) s_f s_f^* s_f = 0.$$

Hence, the conditions for Lemma 5.3(1) are satisfied, and therefore we have the identity $pC^*(\text{HG})p = pC^*(\text{H}\Delta)p$.

Step 5 Let us show $C^*(\text{H}\Delta) = \mathbb{C}^{|F|} \oplus pC^*(\text{H}\Delta)p$. Indeed, from the proof of Proposition 3.6 it is clear that $C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$ is the subalgebra of $C^*(\text{HG})$ generated by the elements in

$$\left\{ p_v, s_e : v \in E^0(\text{HG}) \setminus \bigcup_{f \in F} s_{\text{HG}}(f), e \in E^1(\text{HG}) \setminus F \right\}$$

and

$$\{s_f s_f^* : f \in F\}.$$

One checks that the elements in the first set are contained in $pC^*(\text{H}\Delta)p$ while the elements in the latter set are pairwise orthogonal projections. Further, for every $f \in F$ we have $s_f s_f^* \perp p$. From that one gets immediately

$$\begin{aligned} C^*(\text{H}\Delta) &= C^*(s_f s_f^* : f \in F) \oplus C^*\left(p_v, s_e : v \in E^0(\text{HG}) \setminus \bigcup_{f \in F} s_{\text{HG}}(f), e \in E^1(\text{HG}) \setminus F\right) \\ &= \mathbb{C}^{|F|} \oplus pC^*(\text{H}\Delta)p. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $pC^*(\text{H}\Delta)p$ is nuclear iff the same holds for $C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$. Putting everything together and using $pC^*(\text{H}\Delta)p =_M (pC^*(\text{H}\Delta)p)$, we obtain the following equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} &C^*(\text{HG}) \text{ is nuclear} \\ \Leftrightarrow &(S) = (pC^*(\text{HG})p) = (pC^*(\text{H}\Delta)p) \text{ is nuclear} \\ \Leftrightarrow &pC^*(\text{H}\Delta)p \text{ is nuclear} \\ \Leftrightarrow &C^*(\text{H}\Delta) \text{ is nuclear.} \end{aligned}$$

Step 6 Finally, let us remove the assumption (*) that there is an edge $f \in F$ with $r_{\text{HG}}(f_0) = s_{\text{HG}}(f)$. We show the general claim by induction over $|F|$. If $|F| = 1$ then the claim follows from Lemma 5.6. For $|F| > 1$, there are two possibilities: If (*) is true, then the claim follows from the previous steps. Otherwise, let $f_1, \dots, f_k \in F$ be the edges with $r_{\text{HG}}(f_i) = s_{\text{HG}}(f_0)$. Then the f_i for $i \leq k$ are easy edges in HG and their generated easy edge sets F_i do not contain f_0 since otherwise (*) would be true. Thus, $|F_i| < |F|$ holds for all $i \leq k$. By induction, we may cut all edges in the sets F_i . Afterwards, $s_{\text{HG}}(f_0)$ is a source. By Lemma 5.6 we may cut the edge f_0 without changing nuclearity of the associated C^* -algebra, and this yields the claim. \square

The following corollary is immediate.

Corollary 5.8. *Let HG be a normal hypergraph that contains no easy edge. Then, for all edges e in HG with non-empty range one of the following holds:*

- (1) $|s_{\text{HG}}(e)| > 1$.
- (2) *There are edges $e_1, \dots, e_n \in E^1(\text{HG})$ with $n \geq 2$ and $e_n = e$ such that $e_1 \dots e_n$ is a path in HG and*

$$|s_{\text{HG}}(e_1)| > 1 = |s_{\text{HG}}(e_2)| = |s_{\text{HG}}(e_3)| = \dots = |s_{\text{HG}}(e_n)|.$$

5.3. Elimination of Easy Cycles. In this section, we introduce the notion of an easy cycle. In a hypergraph, all edges from an easy cycle may be cut without changing nuclearity of the associated C^* -algebra.

Definition 5.9. Let $\text{H}\Gamma$ be a hypergraph. A cycle $\mu = f_1 \dots f_n$ is called easy if for all $i \leq n$ and all $e \in E^1(\text{H}\Gamma)$ we have

- $r_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f_i) = \{w_i\}$ for suitable vertices w_i ,
- $\{w_i\} \cap r_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e) \neq \emptyset \implies e = f_i$,
- $\{w_i\} \cap s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e) \neq \emptyset \implies e = f_{i+1}$ if $i < n$,
- $\{w_n\} \cap s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e) \neq \emptyset \implies e = f_1$,

i.e. the edges f_i have exactly one vertex w_i in their range and every vertex w_i has exactly one incoming and exactly one outgoing edge.

Example 5.10. Below we present two hypergraphs $\text{H}\Delta_1$ and $\text{H}\Delta_2$. While in $\text{H}\Delta_1$ the edges f_1 and f_2 form an easy cycle, this is not true in $\text{H}\Delta_2$.




FIGURE 2. (Non-)Example of an easy cycle

Lemma 5.11. Let $\text{H}\Gamma$ contain an easy cycle $\mu = f_1 \dots f_n$ and obtain $\text{H}\Delta$ from $\text{H}\Gamma$ by cutting all edges f_i . Then $C^*(\text{H}\Gamma)$ is nuclear if, and only if, the same holds for $C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$.

Proof. Let $r_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f_i) = \{w_i\}$ for all $i \leq n$ and recall from Theorem 3.3 that $C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$ is a subalgebra of $C^*(\text{H}\Gamma)$.

Step 1 Define $S := (E^0(\text{H}\Gamma) \cup E^1(\text{H}\Gamma)) \setminus \bigcup_i \{f_i, w_i\}$. Let us check that S is ideally closed in the sense of Definition 3.7.

- If $e \in S$, then $\{w_1, \dots, w_n\} \cap r_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e) = \emptyset$ since μ is an easy cycle. Thus, $r_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e) \subset S$.
- If $\emptyset \neq r_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e) \subset S$ or $s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e) \subset S$ holds for an edge e , then e cannot be any of the f_i . Thus, $e \in S$.
- If v is not a sink and every edge that starts from v is in S , then v cannot be any of the w_i since f_i starts from w_i and is not in S . Hence, $v \in S$.

Step 2 As S is ideally closed, Lemma 3.8 yields the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow (S) \rightarrow C^*(\text{H}\Gamma) \rightarrow C^*(\Phi) \rightarrow 0,$$

where Φ is obtained from $\text{H}\Gamma$ by deleting all edges and vertices in S . It is not hard to verify, that Φ is an ordinary graph, i.e. $|s_\Phi(e)| = |r_\Phi(e)| = 1$ for all $e \in E^1(\Phi)$. Indeed, $E^1(\Phi) = \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ and $E^0(\Phi) = \{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$. Therefore, $C^*(\Phi)$ is nuclear as a graph C^* -algebra. Since the class of nuclear C^* -algebras is closed under extensions and ideals, it follows that $C^*(\text{H}\Gamma)$ is nuclear iff the same holds for the ideal (S) .

Step 3 Set $p := 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n p_{w_i} \in C^*(\text{H}\Gamma)$. One readily checks $pp_v = p_v$ and $ps_e = s_e p = s_e$ for all vertices $v \in E^0(\text{H}\Gamma) \cap S$ and all edges $e \in E^1(\text{H}\Gamma) \cap S$.

Furthermore, we have

$$p = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n p_{w_i} = \sum_{v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)} p_v - \sum_{i=1}^n p_{w_i} = \sum_{v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma) \cap S} p_v.$$

Combining both observations, one obtains

$$\{p_v, s_e : v \in S \cap E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma), e \in S \cap E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)\} \subset pC^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)p \subset (S),$$

and therefore $(pC^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)p) = (S)$. In particular, (S) and $pC^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)p$ are Morita-equivalent, so that nuclearity of the former C^* -algebra is equivalent to nuclearity of the latter C^* -algebra.

Step 4 We show $pC^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)p = pC^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)p$ using Lemma 5.3(2). Evidently, the set $\{f_i\}$ is closed under range exits. Moreover, $|r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f_i)| = 1$ and $s_{f_i}p = s_{f_i}p_{w_i}p = 0$ hold for all $i \leq n$. Finally, for all $i \leq n$ and $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ it is

$$r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f_i) \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) = \{w_i\} \cap s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) \neq \emptyset \implies e = f_i.$$

As $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ is obtained from $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ by cutting all edges f_i , the claim follows from Lemma 5.3(2).

Putting the previous steps together, $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ is nuclear iff the same holds for $pC^*(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)p = pC^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)p$.

Step 5 It remains to show that $pC^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)p$ is nuclear iff the same holds for $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$. However, since in $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ the vertices w_i have no incoming edge and the only outgoing edge f_i has empty range, it is not hard to check

$$C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = \mathbb{C}^n \oplus pC^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta)p.$$

The claim follows immediately. \square

5.4. Elimination of Simple Quasisinks. In this section, we introduce the notion of a simple quasisink. We will see that in a hypergraph $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ all edges which end in a simple quasisink may be cut without changing nuclearity of the associated C^* -algebra.

Definition 5.12. Let $\mathbf{H}\Gamma$ be a hypergraph. A vertex $w \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ is called a simple quasisink if

- there is at most one edge $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ with $w \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)$ and in this case we have $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e) = \emptyset$, and
- there is at most one edge $e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Gamma)$ with $w \in r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(e)$.

We say that an edge f ends in a simple quasisink if we have $r_{\mathbf{H}\Gamma}(f) = \{w\}$ for a simple quasisink w .

Example 5.13. The figure below presents three hypergraphs $\mathbf{H}\Delta_1, \mathbf{H}\Delta_2, \mathbf{H}\Delta_3$. While the vertex w is not a simple quasisink in the first two hypergraphs, it is a simple quasisink in $\mathbf{H}\Delta_3$.




FIGURE 3. (Non-)Examples of a simple quasisink

Lemma 5.14. *Let $\mathbb{H}\Gamma$ be a hypergraph. Assume that $w \in C^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$ is a simple quasisink in $\mathbb{H}\Gamma$ with $\{w\} = r_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(f)$ for some $f \in E^1(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$ and let $\mathbb{H}\Delta$ be obtained from $\mathbb{H}\Gamma$ by cutting the edge f . Then $C^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$ is nuclear iff the same holds for $C^*(\mathbb{H}\Delta)$.*

Proof. First, assume that there is an edge $e \in E^1(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$ with both $r_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(e) = \emptyset$ and $w \in s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(e)$. Then e is the only edge which has w in its source. It follows from Lemma 3.9 that we can remove w from the source of e without changing the associated C^* -algebra. If $\{w\} = s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(e)$, then this means to delete the edge e .

Thus, without loss of generality w is a sink in $\mathbb{H}\Gamma$. Evidently, the set $\{f\}$ is closed under range exits in the sense of Definition 5.2. Now, let

$$p := 1 - p_w \in C^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma).$$

One readily checks $s_f p = s_f p_w p = 0$. Moreover, it is $|r_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(f)| = |\{w\}| = 1$ and f is the only edge in $\mathbb{H}\Gamma$ which has w in its range. Therefore, the conditions for Lemma 5.3(2) are satisfied, and we obtain

$$pC^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)p = pC^*(\mathbb{H}\Delta)p.$$

The corner on the left-hand side is a full corner in $C^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$ since

$$\begin{aligned} w \notin s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(f) &\implies \sum_{v \in s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(f)} p_v \in pC^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)p \\ &\implies s_f = \left(\sum_{v \in s_{\mathbb{H}\Gamma}(f)} p_v \right) s_f \in (pC^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)p) \\ &\implies p_w = s_f^* s_f \in (pC^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)p) \\ &\implies 1 = p + p_w \in (pC^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)p). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $C^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$ and $pC^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)p$ are Morita-equivalent. In particular, $C^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$ is nuclear iff the same holds for $pC^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)p = pC^*(\mathbb{H}\Delta)p$.

Finally, in $\mathbb{H}\Delta$ the vertex w has neither an incoming nor an outgoing edge. Therefore, it is not hard to check that

$$C^*(\mathbb{H}\Delta) = \mathbb{C} \oplus pC^*(\mathbb{H}\Delta)p.$$

In particular, $pC^*(\mathbb{H}\Delta)p$ is nuclear iff the same holds for $C^*(\mathbb{H}\Delta)$. This concludes the proof. \square

5.5. Reduction Algorithm. We combine the results of the previous sections with the normalization procedure from Section 4 to obtain a reduction procedure which transforms any hypergraph $\mathbb{H}\Gamma$ into another hypergraph $\mathbb{H}\Delta$ such that $C^*(\mathbb{H}\Gamma)$ is nuclear if, and only if, the same holds for $C^*(\mathbb{H}\Delta)$.

Algorithm 2 Hypergraph Reduction

```

1: procedure REDUCE(hypergraph  $H\Gamma = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ )
2:    $H\Gamma \leftarrow$  normalize  $H\Gamma$ 
3:   while True do
4:     if  $\exists f \in E^1 : f$  is an easy edge then
5:        $H\Gamma \leftarrow$  take  $H\Gamma$  and cut all edges in the easy edge set generated by  $f$ 
6:     else if  $\exists f_1, \dots, f_n \in E^1 : f_1 \dots f_n$  is an easy cycle then
7:        $H\Gamma \leftarrow$  take  $H\Gamma$  and cut the edges  $f_1, \dots, f_n$ 
8:     else if  $\exists f \in E^1, w \in E^0 : r_{H\Gamma}(f) = \{w\} \wedge w$  is a simple quasisink then
9:        $H\Gamma \leftarrow$  take  $H\Gamma$  and cut the edge  $f$ 
10:    else if  $\exists f \in E^1 \forall e \in E^1 \setminus \{f\} : r_{H\Gamma}(f) = \emptyset = s_{H\Gamma}(f) \cap s_{H\Gamma}(e)$  then
11:       $H\Gamma \leftarrow$  take  $H\Gamma$  and delete the edge  $f$ 
12:    else if none of the previous cases applies then
13:      break
14:    end if
15:  end while
16:  return  $H\Gamma$ 
17: end procedure

```

Theorem 5.15. *Algorithm 2 terminates for every hypergraph $H\Gamma$. The obtained hypergraph $H\Delta := \text{reduce}(H\Gamma)$ is a normal hypergraph minor of $H\Gamma$ which contains no easy edge, no easy cycle and no edge that ends in a simple quasisink. We call a hypergraph with these properties reduced. Further, $C^*(H\Gamma)$ is nuclear if, and only if, the same holds for $C^*(H\Delta)$.*

Proof. Evidently, $H\Delta$ is a hypergraph minor of $H\Gamma$. Moreover, the algorithm terminates since in each application of lines 4 – 14 either an edge with nonempty range is cut, or an edge is deleted, or the loop breaks. As there are only finitely many edges and vertices in $H\Gamma$, at some point neither of the first two cases applies. Then the algorithm terminates.

The hypergraph $H\Delta$ contains no easy edge, no easy cycle and no edge that ends in a simple quasisink since the "while" loop only breaks if in all three of these cases the involved edges had been cut. Let us show that $H\Delta$ is normal. Evidently, $H\Gamma$ is normal after line 2. The operations in lines 4 – 9 only cut some edges and otherwise leave $H\Gamma$ unchanged. Looking at the conditions for normality from Definition 4.1, there is only one way how this operation can destroy normality of $H\Gamma$: If one cuts an edge f which satisfies $\emptyset \neq r_{H\Gamma}(f) \subset s_{H\Gamma}(f)$ and where there is no edge $e \in E^1(H\Gamma) \setminus \{f\}$ with $s_{H\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{H\Gamma}(f) \neq \emptyset$. However, in this case the operation in line 11 ensures that the edge f is deleted later on which restores normality of $H\Gamma$. By the conditions in line 10, the edge deletion operation in line 11 never destroys normality of $H\Gamma$. Thus, $H\Delta$ is normal.

Finally, $C^*(H\Gamma)$ is nuclear iff the same holds for $C^*(H\Delta)$. Indeed, by Lemmas 5.7, 5.11, and 5.14 the operations in lines 5, 7, and 9 change the hypergraph $H\Gamma$ so that nuclearity for the original and the modified hypergraph C^* -algebra are equivalent. By Lemma 3.9 the operation in line 11 does not change the associated hypergraph C^* -algebra at all. This concludes the proof. \square

6. REDUCED HYPERGRAPHS AND THE FORBIDDEN MINORS

In this section, we find that a reduced hypergraph $H\Gamma$ has one of the forbidden minors from Table 1 as soon as $H\Gamma$ contains an edge with nonempty range. Moreover, in Section 6.2 we investigate a special situation where the minor $H\Gamma_4$ can be obtained from $H\Gamma$ using only a restricted set of operations which preserve nuclearity

of the associated C^* -algebra. Both results together will be the main combinatorial ingredient for the proof of the main result of this article, Theorem 2.5, which we present in Section 6.3.

6.1. Forbidden Minors. The following lemma prepares the proof of the next theorem.

Lemma 6.1. *Let HG be a normal hypergraph. Further, let $f_1 \dots f_n$ be a path in HG with $|s_{\text{HG}}(f_i)| = 1$ for all $i \geq 2$. Then the hypergraph $\text{H}\Delta$ given by*

- $E^0(\text{H}\Delta) = E^0(\text{HG})$,
- $E^1(\text{H}\Delta) = E^1(\text{HG}) \setminus \{f_2, \dots, f_n\}$,
- $s_{\text{H}\Delta}(e) = s_{\text{HG}}(e)$ for all $e \in E^1(\text{H}\Delta)$,
- $r_{\text{H}\Delta}(e) = \begin{cases} r_{\text{HG}}(e), & e \neq f_1, \\ r_{\text{HG}}(f_n), & e = f_1, \end{cases}$ for all $e \in E^1(\text{H}\Delta)$,

is a hypergraph minor of HG .

Proof. Without loss of generality, we have

$$f_i f_{i+1} \dots f_j \text{ is not a cycle for all } 2 \leq i \leq j \leq n, \quad (*)$$

i.e. the path $f_2 \dots f_n$ does not contain a cycle. Indeed, assume that the statement holds under this additional assumption (*), and let $\mu = f_2 \dots f_n$ contain a cycle. In this case, obtain a shorter path $f_{i_1} \dots f_{i_m}$ by removing all edges from μ that are part of a cycle, and construct the hypergraph $\text{H}\Delta'$ by applying the statement on the path $f_1 f_{i_1} \dots f_{i_m}$. Then, $\text{H}\Delta$ is obtained from $\text{H}\Delta'$ by deleting all edges in $\{f_2, \dots, f_n\} \setminus \{f_{i_1} \dots f_{i_m}\}$. Hence, we have $\text{H}\Delta \leq \text{HG}$ as desired.

Let us prove the claim under the assumption (*) by induction over n . If $n = 1$, then we have $\text{H}\Delta = \text{HG}$ and there is nothing to show. For the induction step, let f_1, \dots, f_n be a path in HG with $n \geq 2$ and $|s_{\text{HG}}(f_i)| = 1$ for all $i \geq 2$ such that $f_2 \dots f_n$ does not contain a cycle. The induction hypothesis applied on the path $f_2 \dots f_n$ yields a minor $\text{HG}^{(1)} \leq \text{HG}$ with

- $E^0(\text{HG}^{(1)}) = E^0(\text{HG})$,
- $E^1(\text{HG}^{(1)}) = E^1(\text{HG}) \setminus \{f_3, \dots, f_n\}$,
- $s_{\text{HG}^{(1)}}(e) = s_{\text{HG}}(e)$ for all $e \in E^1(\text{HG}^{(1)})$,
- $r_{\text{HG}^{(1)}}(e) = \begin{cases} r_{\text{HG}}(e), & e \neq f_2, \\ r_{\text{HG}}(f_n), & e = f_2, \end{cases}$ for all $e \in E^1(\text{HG}^{(1)})$.

Let $w \in E^0(\text{HG}^{(1)})$ be the vertex with $\{w\} = s_{\text{HG}^{(1)}}(f_2)$. Now, consider the following constructions:

- (1) Obtain $\text{HG}^{(2)}$ from $\text{HG}^{(1)}$ by separating the source of f_2 in the sense of Remark 3.5. Note that f_2 must not be a cycle, and therefore due to condition (2) from the definition of normality (Definition 4.1) there is an edge $e \neq f_2$ in HG with $w \in s_{\text{HG}}(e)$. As the path $f_2 \dots f_n$ does not contain a cycle, we have $e \notin \{f_2, \dots, f_n\}$. Therefore, it is $e \in E^1(\text{HG}^{(1)})$. Since e is an edge different from f_2 with $w \in s_{\text{HG}^{(1)}}(e)$, the hypergraph $\text{HG}^{(2)}$ contains a new edge $w' \in E^0(\text{HG}^{(2)}) \setminus E^0(\text{HG}^{(1)})$ such that f_2 is the only edge with $w' \in s_{\text{HG}^{(2)}}(f_2)$.
- (2) Obtain $\text{HG}^{(3)}$ from $\text{HG}^{(2)}$ by applying range decomposition on all edges in the set

$$F := \{e \in E^1(\text{HG}^{(2)}) \mid w' \in r_{\text{HG}^{(2)}}(e)\}.$$

Since in $\text{HG}^{(1)}$ every edge has exactly one vertex in its range, we can write

$$E^1(\text{HG}^{(3)}) = E^1(\text{HG}^{(2)}) \cup \{e' : e \in F\}$$

where for every $e \in F$ it is $r_{\text{HG}^{(3)}}(e') = \{w'\}$ and $r_{\text{HG}^{(3)}}(e) = \{w\}$.

(3) Obtain $\text{H}\Gamma^{(4)}$ from $\text{H}\Gamma^{(3)}$ by deleting all edges in the set

$$\{e' : e \in F \setminus \{f_1\}\} \cup \{f_1\}.$$

(4) Finally, obtain $\text{H}\Delta$ from $\text{H}\Gamma^{(4)}$ by applying forward contraction on the edge f_2 .

In this way, we get $\text{H}\Delta$ from $\text{H}\Gamma^{(1)} \leq \text{H}\Gamma$ by applying suitable hypergraph minor operations. It follows $\text{H}\Delta \leq \text{H}\Gamma$. \square

Recall that $\text{H}\Gamma$ is a reduced hypergraph if $\text{H}\Gamma$ is normal and contains no easy edge, no easy cycle and no edge that ends in a simple quasisink.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $\text{H}\Gamma$ be a reduced hypergraph and assume that $\text{H}\Gamma$ contains an edge with non-empty range. Then we have $\text{H}\Gamma_i \leq \text{H}\Gamma$ for some $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, where the $\text{H}\Gamma_i$ are the forbidden minors from Table 1.*

Proof. Let $e \in E^1(\text{H}\Gamma)$ and $w \in E^0(\text{H}\Gamma)$ satisfy $r_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e) = \{w\}$. As $\text{H}\Gamma$ does not contain an easy edge, by Corollary 5.8 we may assume without loss of generality that $|s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e)| \geq 2$. By assumption, the vertex w is not a simple quasisink. Therefore, one of the following cases applies:


- A) It is $w \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e)$.
- B) There is an edge $f \neq e$ with nonempty range and $w \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)$.
- C) There are two distinct edges $f, g \in E^1(\text{H}\Gamma) \setminus \{e\}$ with empty range and $w \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f) \cap s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(g)$.
- D) There is an edge $f \neq e$ with $r_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f) = \{w\}$.

We discuss each of these cases separately. It will be suitable to consider Case (B) last.

Case A Assume that (A) holds and observe that the edge e must not be an easy cycle in $\text{H}\Gamma$. Therefore, one of the following three cases (A1) – (A3) applies.


Case A1. There is an edge $f \neq e$ with $w \in s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)$. By condition (3) from the definition of normality (Definition 4.1), without loss of generality there is at least one vertex v different from w in the intersection $s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(e) \cap s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)$. Now, cut the edge f and delete all edges and vertices except for e, f, v and w . This yields the minor $\text{H}\Gamma_3$.

Case A2. There is an edge $f \neq e$ with $\{w\} = r_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)$ and $|s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)| \geq 2$. In this case, separate the source of the edge f and then delete all edges and vertices except for e, f as well as two vertices in $s(e)$ and $s(f)$, respectively. Afterwards, apply backward contraction on the edge f , followed by range decomposition of e . Cutting all resulting edges leaves us with the minor $\text{H}\Gamma_1$. Below we sketch the involved operations schematically.




Case A3. There is an edge $f \neq e$ with $\{w\} = r_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)$ and $|s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f)| = 1$. The edge f must not be easy and therefore by Corollary 5.8 there is a path $f_1 \dots f_n$ with $f_n = f$ and $|s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f_1)| > 1 = |s_{\text{H}\Gamma}(f_i)|$ for all $i \geq 2$. Using that $\text{H}\Gamma$ is normal one checks $f_i \neq e$ for all $i \leq n$. Use Lemma 6.1 with the path $f_1 \dots f_n$ to obtain a minor $\text{H}\Gamma'$ where $|s_{\text{H}\Gamma'}(f_1)| \geq 2$ and $r_{\text{H}\Gamma'}(f_1) = \{w\}$ hold. Then the construction from Case (A2) applied on the hypergraph $\text{H}\Gamma'$ yields the minor $\text{H}\Gamma_1 \leq \text{H}\Gamma' \leq \text{H}\Gamma$.

Case C Assume that (C) holds. Without loss of generality case (A) does not apply. Using condition (2) from the definition of normality (Definition 4.1) one finds an edge $e' \neq e$ with $s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e') \neq \emptyset$. Combining with condition (3) from the same definition, without loss of generality there are at least two vertices v_1 and v_2 in the intersection $s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e')$. Now, separate the source of $\{f\}$ at w and afterwards apply range decomposition on the edge e . This operation replaces the edge e with two edges e_1, e_2 that have the same source as e . Finally, cut all edges, and then delete all edges and vertices except for v_1, v_2, e_1, e_2 and e' . This yields the minor HG_2 . Note that $e' = f$ or $e' = g$ is allowed. Below we sketch the involved operations schematically.



Case D Assume that (D) holds and observe that f must not be an easy edge. Further, we may assume $w \notin s_{\text{HG}}(e)$ since otherwise Case (A) applies. This leaves the following three possibilities (D1) – (D3).

Case D1. It is $|s_{\text{HG}}(f)| \geq 2$ and $s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f) = \emptyset$. We may assume $w \notin s_{\text{HG}}(f)$ since otherwise Case (A) applies for f in the place of e . By conditions (2) and (3) from the definition of normality (Definition 4.1) there is another edge $e' \neq e$ with $|s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e')| \geq 2$. Now, transform the hypergraph HG as follows: First, delete all edges and vertices except for e, e', f and two vertices in $s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e')$ and $s_{\text{HG}}(f)$, respectively. Afterwards, apply backward contraction on the edge f , and then decompose the range of e . This replaces the edge e with two new edges e_1, e_2 that have the same source as e . Cutting all edges and deleting all vertices except for those in $s(e) \cap s(e')$ gives the minor HG_2 . Below we sketch the involved operations schematically.



Case D2. It is $|s_{\text{HG}}(f)| \geq 2$ and $s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f) \neq \emptyset$. Again we may assume $w \notin s_{\text{HG}}(f)$. By condition (3) from the definition of normality (Definition 4.1) there are two possibilities:


- It is $|s_{\text{HG}}(f) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e)| \geq 2$.
- There is an edge $g \neq e, f$ such that $s_{\text{HG}}(f) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e) \subsetneq s_{\text{HG}}(g) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e)$.

In the latter case, separate the source of f and then use the same construction as in Case (D1) to obtain the minor HG_2 . In the first case, there are at least two vertices v_1, v_2 in the intersection $s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f)$. Delete all edges and vertices except for e, f, v_1, v_2 and w . This yields the minor HG_4 .

Case D3. It is $|s_{\text{HG}}(f)| = 1$. Since f must not be an easy edge, there is a path $f_1 \dots f_n$ in HG with $n \geq 2$, $f_n = f$ and $|s_{\text{HG}}(f_1)| > 1 = |s_{\text{HG}}(f_i)|$ for all $i \geq 2$ (see Corollary 5.8). Let us distinguish two cases:

Case D3.1. We have $s_{\text{HG}}(f_1) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e) = \emptyset$. One easily checks, that then $f_i \neq e$ holds for all $i \leq n$. Use Lemma 6.1 to obtain a minor HG' where $r(f_1) = \{w\}$. Then Case (D1) applies and yields the minor HG_2 .


Case D3.2. We have $f_1 = e$. Then Lemma 6.1 applied on the path $f_2 \dots f_n$ yields a hypergraph minor $\text{HG}' \leq \text{HG}$ where $\{w\} = s(f_2) = r(f_2)$. Delete all edges and vertices except for e, f_2, w and two vertices in $s(e)$. Finally, apply backward contraction on the edge e , range decomposition on the edge f_2 and afterwards cut one of the obtained edges. This yields the minor HG_3 . Below we sketch the involved operations schematically.



Case D3.3. It is $f_1 \neq e$ and $s_{\text{HG}}(f_1) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e) \neq \emptyset$. Due to condition (3) from the definition of normality (Definition 4.1) there are two possibilities:

- It is $|s_{\text{HG}}(f_1) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e)| \geq 2$.
- There is an edge $g \neq e, f_1$ such that $s_{\text{HG}}(f_1) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e) \subsetneq s_{\text{HG}}(g) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e)$.

In the latter case, separate the source of f_1 and then use the same construction as in Case (D3.1) to obtain the minor HG_2 . Otherwise, there are at least two vertices in the intersection $s_{\text{HG}}(f_1) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e)$. Moreover, without loss of generality $r_{\text{HG}}(f_1) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f_1) = \emptyset$ since otherwise Case (A) applies for the edge f_1 . Similarly, we may assume without loss of generality that $r_{\text{HG}}(f_2) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f_2) = \emptyset$ since otherwise Case (D3.2) applies for the edge f_1 in the place of e . Now, by conditions (2) and (3) from the definition of normality, there is an edge $f'_2 \neq f_2$ in HG with $s_{\text{HG}}(f_2) = s_{\text{HG}}(f'_2)$. Separate the source of f'_2 and afterwards apply range decomposition on f_1 . This operation replaces f_1 with two new edges $f_1^{(1)}$ and $f_1^{(2)}$. Finally, delete all edges and vertices except for $e, f_1^{(1)}, f_1^{(2)}$ and two vertices in $s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f_1)$. This yields the minor HG_2 . Below we sketch the involved operations schematically.



Case B Finally, assume that (B) holds and distinguish the following two cases (B1) – (B2).

Case B1. It is $|s_{\text{HG}}(f)| = 1$. Then there are two possibilities. If $s_{\text{HG}}(f) = r_{\text{HG}}(f)$, then Case (D) applies. Otherwise, by conditions (2) and (3) from the definition of normality (Definition 4.1), there is another edge $f' \neq f$ with $s_{\text{HG}}(f') = \{w\}$. After

cutting the edges f and f' one is in the same situation as in Case (C). Similarly as above, one obtains the minor HG_2 .

Case B2. None of the previous cases (A), (C), (D), (B1) applies for any edge with nonempty range. Then there is an edge e_2 with $\{w\} \subsetneq s_{\text{HG}}(e_2)$ and $r_{\text{HG}}(e_2) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\{w_2\} := r_{\text{HG}}(e_2)$. Due to the fact that none of the cases (A), (C), (D), (B1) applies for e_2 , there is an edge e_3 and a vertex w_3 with $\{w_2\} \subsetneq s_{\text{HG}}(e_3)$ and $\{w_3\} = r_{\text{HG}}(e_2) \neq \emptyset$. Inductively repeating this argument and using that HG has only finitely many edges, one finds a cycle $f_1 \dots f_n \in \text{HG}$ and vertices v_1, \dots, v_n such that

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\text{HG}}(f_n) &= \{v_n\} \subsetneq s_{\text{HG}}(f_1), \\ r_{\text{HG}}(f_1) &= \{v_1\} \subsetneq s_{\text{HG}}(f_2), \\ &\dots, \\ r_{\text{HG}}(f_{n-1}) &= \{v_{n-1}\} \subsetneq s_{\text{HG}}(f_n). \end{aligned}$$

As f_1, \dots, f_n must not be an easy cycle, there is an $i \leq n$ such that the vertex v_i has two different incoming edges or v_i has two different outgoing edges. Without loss of generality, v_1 has this property. However, v_1 must not have an incoming edge different from f_1 since then Case (D) would apply for the edge f_1 . Hence, v_1 has an outgoing edge different from f_2 which we call f'_2 . After cutting the edges f_2 and f'_2 the edge f_1 has the same property as the edge e in Case (C). Therefore, the argument from the discussion of Case (C) yields the minor HG_2 . \square

6.2. Special Situation for $\text{HG}_4 \leq \text{HG}$. From Theorem 6.2 we know that any reduced hypergraph HG which contains an edge with non-empty range has one of the forbidden minors $\text{HG}_1, \dots, \text{HG}_4$. In this section, we investigate the case where we have $\text{HG}_4 \leq \text{HG}$ and $\text{HG}_i \not\leq \text{HG}$ for all $i \leq 3$ at the same time.

Proposition 6.3. *Let HG be a reduced hypergraph. Assume that HG_4 is a minor of HG and that $\text{HG}_i \not\leq \text{HG}$ holds for $i \leq 3$. Then HG_4 can be obtained from HG using only the following operations:*

- deletion of an ideally closed set in the sense of Definition 3.7
- removing a vertex from the source of an edge as in Lemma 3.9

Both operations preserve nuclearity of the associated C^ -algebra.*

Proof. Step 1 If every edge $e \in E^1(\text{HG})$ has empty range, then HG cannot have the minor HG_4 . Using Corollary 5.8, there is an edge e with $r_{\text{HG}}(e) \neq \emptyset$ and $|s_{\text{HG}}(e)| \geq 2$. A close investigation of the case distinction from the proof of Theorem 6.2 reveals that Case (D2) must apply since in all other cases HG has one of the hypergraphs $\text{HG}_1, \text{HG}_2, \text{HG}_3$ as a minor. Hence, for every edge e with $r_{\text{HG}}(e) \neq \emptyset$ and $|s_{\text{HG}}(e)| \geq 2$ there is another edge $e' \neq e$ with $r_{\text{HG}}(e) = r_{\text{HG}}(e')$ and $|s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e')| \geq 2$.

Step 2 Let $F := \{f \in E^1(\text{HG}) : |s_{\text{HG}}(f)| \geq 2 \text{ and } r_{\text{HG}}(f) \neq \emptyset\}$. By the previous step, the set F is nonempty. We show that there is an edge $f \in F$ such that $r_{\text{HG}}(f) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e) = \emptyset$ holds for all edges $e \in E^1(\text{HG})$ with $r_{\text{HG}}(e) \neq \emptyset$. Indeed, assume that this is not true, and let $f_1 \in F$. By assumption there is another edge $f_2 \in E^1(\text{HG}) \setminus \{f_1\}$ such that $r_{\text{HG}}(f_1) \subset s_{\text{HG}}(f_2)$ and $r_{\text{HG}}(f_2) \neq \emptyset$. We prove $f_2 \in F$. First, assume $|s_{\text{HG}}(f_2)| = 1$. There are two possibilities:

- It is $r_{\text{HG}}(f_2) = s_{\text{HG}}(f_2)$. Then it is not difficult to obtain the minor HG_3 similarly as in Case (D3.2) from the proof of the previous theorem.
- It is not $r_{\text{HG}}(f_2) = s_{\text{HG}}(f_2)$. Then conditions (2) and (3) from the definition of normality (Definition 4.1) yield another edge f'_2 with $s_{\text{HG}}(f_2) = s_{\text{HG}}(f'_2)$. Using the construction from Case (C) in the proof of Theorem 6.2 we get the minor HG_2 .

In any event, this contradicts the assumption $\text{HG}_i \not\leq \text{HG}$ for $i \leq 3$. Hence, $|s_{\text{HG}}(f_2)| \geq 2$ and f_2 is in the set F . It follows that there is a path $f_1 \dots f_{|E^1(\text{HG})|+1}$ in HG which contains only edges from F . Clearly, this path has a closed subpath. By removing superfluous edges one obtains a cycle $g_1 \dots g_n$ with $g_i \in F$ for all $i \leq n$. Now, it is not difficult to obtain the hypergraph minor HG_3 from HG . By contradiction this proves that there is an edge $f \in F$ such that $r_{\text{HG}}(f) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e) = \emptyset$ holds for all edges $e \in E^1(\text{HG})$ with nonempty range.

Step 3 By the previous steps there are $v_1, v_2, w \in E^0(\text{HG})$ and $f, f' \in E^1(\text{HG})$ such that

$$\{v_1, v_2\} \subset s_{\text{HG}}(f) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(f'), \quad \{w\} = r_{\text{HG}}(f) = r_{\text{HG}}(f'), \quad r_{\text{HG}}(f) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e) = \emptyset$$

hold for all $e \in E^1(\text{HG})$ with $r_{\text{HG}}(e) \neq \emptyset$. We show that there is no edge $e \in E^1(\text{HG}) \setminus \{f, f'\}$ such that $r_{\text{HG}}(e) = \{w\}$. Assume that this is not true and let $e \in E^1(\text{HG})$ have range $\{w\}$. There are two possibilities: If $|s_{\text{HG}}(e)| \geq 2$, then the construction from Case (D1) in the proof of Theorem 6.2 yields the minor HG_2 . Otherwise, the argument from Case (D3.1) yields the same minor. However, by assumption $\text{HG}_2 \not\leq \text{HG}$, and therefore we obtain the claim by contradiction.

Step 4 Let us show that there is no edge $e \in E^1(\text{HG})$ with $r_{\text{HG}}(e) \subset \{v_1, v_2\}$. Assume the opposite and, without loss of generality, let $e \neq f, f'$ be an edge with $r_{\text{HG}}(e) = \{v_1\}$. Distinguish the following cases:

Case 1. It is $|s_{\text{HG}}(e)| \geq 2$. In this case, separate the source of e , and delete all edges and vertices except for e, f, f', v_1, v_2, w as well as two vertices in $s(e)$. Afterwards, apply backward contraction on the edge e . This yields the minor HG_1 .

Case 2. It is $|s_{\text{HG}}(e)| = 1$. Since the edge e must not be easy, by Corollary 5.8 there is a path $e_1 \dots e_n$ in HG' with $e_n = e$ and $|s_{\text{HG}}(e_1)| > 1 = |s_{\text{HG}}(e_i)|$ for all $i \geq 2$. Apply Lemma 6.1 to obtain a minor where $|s_{\text{HG}}(e_1)| > 1$ and $s_{\text{HG}}(e_1) = r_{\text{HG}}(e_1) = \{v_1\}$. Now, the construction from Case (1) yields the minor HG_1 .

Summarizing, as soon as there is an edge $e \neq f, f'$ with $r_{\text{HG}}(e) \subset \{v_1, v_2\}$, then HG_1 is a minor of HG . By contradiction, it follows that there are no edges e with $r_{\text{HG}}(e) \subset \{v_1, v_2\}$.

Step 5 Next, let us show that there is at most one edge $e \in E^1(\text{HG})$ with $w \in s_{\text{HG}}(e)$. Assume the opposite, and let $e, e' \in E^1(\text{HG})$ be edges with $w \in s_{\text{HG}}(e) \cap s_{\text{HG}}(e')$. Then a similar construction as in Case (C) of the proof of Theorem 6.2 yields the minor HG_2 . This proves the claim by contradiction.

Assume that $e \in E^1(\text{HG})$ is an edge with $w \in s_{\text{HG}}(e)$. By Step (2) we know that e has empty range. Construct a hypergraph HG' by removing the vertex w from the source of e as in Lemma 3.9. One easily checks that the assumptions for this lemma are satisfied. Hence, we have $C^*(\text{HG}') = C^*(\text{HG})$. In HG' the vertex w is a sink.

Step 6 Set

$$S := (E^0(\text{HG}') \cup E^1(\text{HG}')) \setminus \{v_1, v_2, w, f, f'\}.$$

We show that S is ideally closed. We check the three conditions from Definition 3.7.

- Assume that e is an edge in S . Then it is $e \notin \{f, f'\}$. Combining Steps (3) and (4) one observes $r_{\text{HG}}(e) \subset E^0(\text{HG}') \setminus \{v_1, v_2, w\} \subset S$.
- Assume that $e \in E^1(\text{HG}')$ satisfies $s_{\text{HG}}(e) \subset S$ or $\emptyset \neq r_{\text{HG}}(e) \subset S$. Both claims are not true for f, f' . Therefore, $e \in E^1(\text{HG}) \setminus \{f, f'\} \subset S$.
- Finally, assume that $v \in E^0(\text{HG}')$ is not a sink and satisfies $v \in s_{\text{HG}}(e) \implies e \in S$ for all edges $e \in E^1(\text{HG}')$. Clearly, this is not true for neither v_1, v_2 nor w and therefore $v \in E^0(\text{HG}') \setminus \{v_1, v_2, w\} \subset S$.

Evidently, HG_4 is obtained from HG' by deleting the set S . This concludes the proof. \square

6.3. Proof of Theorem 2.5. Finally, let us prove Theorem 2.5, the main result of this article.

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Let $\text{H}\Delta := \text{reduce}(\text{HG})$ be the reduced version of HG obtained by Algorithm 2. By Theorem 5.15, $\text{H}\Delta$ is a normal hypergraph minor of HG , and $C^*(\text{HG})$ is nuclear if, and only if, the same holds for $C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$.

Ad (1): From Theorem 3.3 we know that the minor operations preserve exactness of the associated hypergraph C^* -algebra. By Proposition 2.4 the C^* -algebras $C^*(\text{HG}_1)$, $C^*(\text{HG}_3)$ and $C^*(\text{HG}_4)$ are not exact. Thus, $\text{HG}_i \leq \text{H}\Delta \leq \text{HG}$ for some $i \leq 3$ implies that $C^*(\text{HG})$ is not exact.

Ad (2): If $\text{HG}_i \leq \text{HG}$ holds for some $i \leq 3$, then the claim follows from (1) using that nuclearity implies exactness. Otherwise, by Proposition 6.3 we may obtain HG_4 from $\text{H}\Delta$ using only two operations which preserve nuclearity of the associated hypergraph C^* -algebra. As $C^*(\text{HG}_4)$ is not nuclear (see Proposition 2.4) it follows that $C^*(\text{H}\Delta)$ is not nuclear. Then $C^*(\text{HG})$ is not nuclear as well.


Ad (3): The hypergraph $\text{H}\Delta$ satisfies the conditions for Theorem 6.2. Thus, if $\text{H}\Delta$ has none of the forbidden minors, then it must be an undirected hypergraph. \square

7. EXAMPLES


In this section, we use the previous results to determine whether the C^* -algebra associated to a particular hypergraph is nuclear. In the first example, we retain the fact that every graph C^* -algebra associated to a finite graph is nuclear.

Example 7.1. Assume that Γ is a finite directed graph, i.e. $|r_\Gamma(e)| = |s_\Gamma(e)| = 1$. One verifies that the normalization procedure will only apply backward contraction on every edge e with $s_\Gamma(e) \cap s_\Gamma(f) = \emptyset$ for all $f \in E^1(\Gamma) \setminus \{e\}$ and $s_\Gamma(e) \not\subset r_\Gamma(e)$. Clearly, the obtained normalized version of Γ is again an ordinary graph which we may call Γ' . Now, in Γ' every edge is easy in the sense of Definition 5.4. Therefore, the reduction procedure will cut every edge of Γ' . This leaves us with an undirected (hyper)graph Δ where every edge has exactly one vertex in its source. It is not hard to check that $C^*(\Delta) = \mathbb{C}^{n+m}$, where n is the number of edges and m the number of sinks in Δ . In particular, $C^*(\Delta)$ is nuclear. By Theorem 2.5 it follows that $C^*(\Gamma)$ is nuclear as well.


Example 7.2. Consider the hypergraph HG sketched below.



The normalization procedure applies first range decomposition on the edge e and then backward contraction on the edge f . We sketch these two steps below.




Let us call the hypergraph on the right-hand side above $H\Gamma'$. One checks that $H\Gamma'$ is normal. The reduction procedure will cut both edges in $H\Gamma'$ since they end in a simple quasisink. Thus, one obtains the reduced hypergraph $H\Delta$ sketched below.




One verifies $C^*(H\Delta) = (\mathbb{C}^2 *_\mathbb{C} \mathbb{C}^2) \oplus \mathbb{C}^2$. Since, both factors in this direct sum are nuclear, $C^*(H\Delta)$ is nuclear as well. By Theorem 2.5 it follows that $C^*(H\Gamma)$ is nuclear.

Example 7.3. Let $H\Gamma$ be the hypergraph sketched below.



The normalization procedure will apply range decomposition on the only edge of this hypergraph, which leads to the hypergraph $H\Delta$ below.



Clearly, $H\Delta$ is normal. Moreover, one checks that $H\Delta$ contains no easy edge, no easy cycle and no edge ending in a simple quasisink. Thus, $H\Delta$ is a reduced hypergraph. As it contains an edge with nonempty range we know from Theorem 6.2 that $H\Delta$ has one of the forbidden minors $H\Gamma_1, \dots, H\Gamma_4$. What's more, we may investigate the proof of Theorem 6.2 and find that for $H\Delta$ Case (A1) applies. In particular, $H\Delta$ has the minor $H\Gamma_3$. Indeed, one obtains $H\Gamma_3$ from $H\Delta$ by simply cutting one of the two edges. With Theorem 2.5 it follows that $C^*(H\Gamma)$ is not exact.

Indeed, $C^*(H\Gamma) = \mathbb{C}^2 *_\mathbb{C} C(S^1) \supset C^*(\mathbb{F}_2)$ has been observed in [18, Proposition 4.2] as first example of a non-nuclear hypergraph C^* -algebra.

8. PROBLEMS

In this section, we present three problems which came up during our research.

Problem 8.1. The main theorem of this article, Theorem 2.5, gives a criterion that guarantees a hypergraph C^* -algebra to be non-nuclear. If this criterion is not met, then the problem of nuclearity of the given hypergraph C^* -algebra is reduced to the problem of nuclearity of a undirected hypergraph C^* -algebra. Thus, to completely characterize nuclearity of hypergraph C^* -algebras one needs to answer the following question: For which undirected hypergraphs $H\Delta$ is the C^* -algebra $C^*(H\Delta)$ nuclear?

The problem might be better phrased using the following definition of a C^* -algebra associated to a bipartite graph. Let $G = (U \sqcup V, E)$ be a bipartite graph, where U and V are the two sets of vertices and $E \subset \mathcal{P}(U \sqcup V)$ is the set of edges. For

vertices $u \in U$ and $v \in V$ write $u \sim v$ if the edge $\{u, v\}$ exists in E . Associated to G consider the C^* -algebra

$$C^*(G) = \mathbb{C}^U *_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^V / (p_u p_v : u \not\sim v),$$

where we write p_u (p_v) for the projections generating \mathbb{C}^U (\mathbb{C}^V). If $\mathbf{H}\Delta$ is an undirected hypergraph, then $C^*(\mathbf{H}\Delta) = C^*(G)$ where $G = (E^0(\mathbf{H}\Delta) \sqcup E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta), \sim)$ is a bipartite graph given by $v \sim e \Leftrightarrow v \in s_{\mathbf{H}\Delta}(e)$ for all $v \in E^0(\mathbf{H}\Delta), e \in E^1(\mathbf{H}\Delta)$. As discussed in Remark 2.6, we believe that $C^*(G)$ is nuclear if, and only if, the following holds: For any vertex $u \in U \sqcup V$ there are at most two distinct vertices $v_1, v_2 \in U \sqcup V$ with $u \sim v_1$ and $u \sim v_2$.

Problem 8.2. A special case of a C^* -algebra associated to a bipartite graph as in Problem 8.1 is the unital free product $\mathbb{C}^2 *_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^2$. For this C^* -algebra [13] gives an explicit description as quotient of $C([0, 1], M_2)$ (see also [15] or the survey [7]). Is there a similar description of the C^* -algebras associated to other bipartite graphs?

Problem 8.3. Compute the K -theory of a hypergraph C^* -algebra. For separated graph C^* -algebras [3] determines their K -theory using a free product description (similar to [9]) of the C^* -algebra in combination with a powerful six term exact sequence from [16]. Although hypergraph C^* -algebras achieve certain free product constructions, they are generally not as easily described as free product C^* -algebra.

REFERENCES

- [1] Isolde Adler, Tomáš Gavenčiak, and Tereza Klimošová. “Hypertree-Depth and Minors in Hypergraphs”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 463 (2012), pp. 84–95.
- [2] Sergio Albeverio, Kate Jushenko, Daniil Proskurin, and Yurii Samoilenko. “*-Wildness of Some Classes of C^* -Algebras”. In: *Methods of Functional Analysis and Topology* 12 (2006), pp. 315–325.
- [3] P. Ara and K.R. Goodearl. “ C^* -Algebras of Separated Graphs”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 261 (2011), pp. 2540–2568.
- [4] Giorgio Ausiello and Luigi Laura. “Directed Hypergraphs: Introduction and Fundamental Algorithms—A Survey”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 658 (2017), pp. 293–306.
- [5] Claude Berge. *Graphs and Hypergraphs*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publ. Co., 1976.
- [6] Bruce Blackadar. *Operator Algebras: Theory of C^* -Algebras and von Neumann Algebras*. Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, Operator Algebras and Non-Commutative Geometry v. 122. 3. Berlin ; New York: Springer, 2006.
- [7] A. Böttcher and I.M. Spitkovsky. “A Gentle Guide to the Basics of Two Projections Theory”. In: *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 432.6 (2010), pp. 1412–1459.
- [8] Berndt Brenken and Zhuang Niu. “The C^* -Algebra of a Partial Isometry”. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 140.1 (2011), pp. 199–206.
- [9] Benton L. Duncan. “Certain Free Products of Graph Operator Algebras”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 364.2 (2010), pp. 534–543.
- [10] Søren Eilers, Gunnar Restorff, Efred Ruiz, and Adam P. W. Sørensen. “The Complete Classification of Unital Graph C^* -Algebras: Geometric and Strong”. In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 170.11 (2021), pp. 2421–2517.
- [11] Nicolas Faroß. *Quantum Automorphism Groups of Hypergraphs*. 2024. arXiv: 2405.09894 [math].

- [12] Giorgio Gallo, Giustino Longo, Stefano Pallottino, and Sang Nguyen. “Directed Hypergraphs and Applications”. In: *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 42.2-3 (1993), pp. 177–201.
- [13] Gert K. Pedersen. “Measure Theory for C*-Algebras II”. In: *Mathematica Scandinavica* 22 (1968), pp. 63–74.
- [14] Iain Raeburn. *Graph Algebras*. CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics 103. Providence: American Mathematical Society, 2005.
- [15] Iain Raeburn and Allan M. Sinclair. “The C*-Algebra Generated by Two Projections.” In: *Mathematica Scandinavica* 65 (1989), p. 278.
- [16] Klaus Thomsen. “On the KK-theory and the E-theory of Amalgamated Free Products of C*-Algebras”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 201.1 (2003), pp. 30–56.
- [17] Mark Tomforde. “A Unified Approach to Exel-Laca Algebras and C*-Algebras Associated to Graphs”. In: *Journal of Operator Theory* 50 (2003), pp. 345–368.
- [18] Mirjam Trieb, Moritz Weber, and Dean Zenner. *Hypergraph C*-Algebras*. 2024. arXiv: 2405.09214 [math].
- [19] Simon Wassermann. “On Tensor Products of Certain Group C*-Algebras”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 23.3 (1976), pp. 239–254.