

UNITARY INVARIANTS IN MULTIVARIABLE OPERATOR THEORY

GELU POPESCU

CONTENTS

*Introduction**Part I. Unitary invariants for n -tuples of operators*

1. *Joint numerical radius*
2. *Euclidean operator radius*
3. *Joint numerical range and spectrum*
4. *ρ -operator radius*

Part II. Joint operator radii, inequalities, and applications

5. *von Neumann inequalities*
6. *Constrained von Neumann inequalities*
7. *Multivariable Haagerup-de la Harpe inequalities*
8. *Multivariable Fejér inequalities*

References

INTRODUCTION

The problems considered in this paper come as a natural continuation of our program to develop a *free* analogue of Sz.-Nagy–Foiş theory, for row contractions. An n -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_n) of operators acting on a Hilbert space is called row contraction if

$$T_1 T_1^* + \dots + T_n T_n^* \leq I.$$

In this study, the role of the unilateral shift is played by the left creation operators on the full Fock space with n generators, $F^2(H_n)$, and the Hardy algebra $H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ is replaced by the noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebra F_n^∞ .

The algebra F_n^∞ and its norm closed version, the noncommutative disc algebra \mathcal{A}_n , were introduced by the author [47] in connection with a multivariable noncommutative von Neumann inequality. F_n^∞ is the algebra of left multipliers of $F^2(H_n)$ and can be identified with the weakly closed (or w^* -closed) algebra generated by the left creation operators S_1, \dots, S_n acting on $F^2(H_n)$, and the identity. The noncommutative disc algebra \mathcal{A}_n is the norm closed algebra generated by S_1, \dots, S_n , and the identity. When $n = 1$, F_1^∞ can be identified with $H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$, the algebra of bounded analytic functions on the open unit disc. The algebra F_n^∞ can be viewed as a multivariable noncommutative analogue of $H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$. There are many analogies with the invariant subspaces of the unilateral shift on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$, inner-outer factorizations, analytic operators, Toeplitz operators, $H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ -functional calculus, bounded (resp. spectral) interpolation, etc. The noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebra F_n^∞ has been studied in several papers [45], [46], [48], [49], [50], [52], [1], and recently in [15], [16], [17], [3], [54], [18], [40], and [56].

Date: April 12, 2004.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 47A13, 47A20, 47A12; Secondary: 47A56, 47A63 .

Key words and phrases. Multivariable operator theory; Joint numerical radius; Joint numerical range; Trigonometric polynomials; Fock space; Free semigroup; Row contraction; Dilation; von Neumann inequality; Joint spectrum; Unitary invariant.

Research supported in part by an NSF grant.

In [52], [5], [6], [3], [2], [17], [53], [54] and [40], a good case is made that the appropriate multivariable commutative analogue of $H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ is the algebra $W_n^\infty := P_{F_s^2(H_n)} F_n^\infty|_{F_s^2(H_n)}$, the compression of F_n^∞ to the symmetric Fock space $F_s^2(H_n) \subset F^2(H_n)$, which was also proved to be the w^* -closed algebra generated by the operators $B_i := P_{F_s^2(H_n)} S_i|_{F_s^2(H_n)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and the identity. The multivariable commutative disc algebra \mathcal{A}_n^c is the norm closed algebra generated by the creation operators B_1, \dots, B_n acting on the symmetric Fock space, and the identity. Arveson showed in [5] that the algebra W_n^∞ can be seen as the multiplier algebra of the reproducing kernel Hilbert space with reproducing kernel $K_n : \mathbb{B}_n \times \mathbb{B}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$K_n(z, w) := \frac{1}{1 - \langle z, w \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n}}, \quad z, w \in \mathbb{B}_n,$$

where \mathbb{B}_n is the open unit ball of \mathbb{C}^n .

In recent years, there has been exciting progress in multivariable operator theory, especially in connection with unitary invariants for n -tuples of operators and interpolation in several variables. In [45], we defined the characteristic function of a row contraction (a multi-analytic operator acting on Fock spaces) which, as in the classical case [64], turned out to be a complete unitary invariant for completely non-coisometric row contractions. In 2000, Arveson [6] introduced and studied the curvature and Euler characteristic associated with a row contraction with commuting entries. Non-commutative analogues of these numerical invariants were defined and studied by the author [54] and, independently, by D. Kribs [36]. Refinements of these unitary invariants were considered in [56].

This paper concerns unitary invariants for n -tuples (T_1, \dots, T_n) of (not necessarily commuting) bounded linear operators acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . First, we introduce a notion of *joint numerical radius* for (T_1, \dots, T_n) by setting

$$w(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \sup \left| \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle h_\alpha, T_j h_{g_j \alpha} \rangle \right|,$$

where the supremum is taken over all families of vectors $\{h_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \subset \mathcal{H}$ with $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \|h_\alpha\|^2 = 1$, and \mathbb{F}_n^+ is the free semigroup with generators g_1, \dots, g_n and neutral element g_0 . In Section 1, we work out the basic properties of the joint numerical radius and show that it is a natural multivariable generalization of the classical numerical radius of a bounded linear operator T , i.e.,

$$\omega(T) := \sup\{|\langle Th, h \rangle| : h \in \mathcal{H}, \|h\| = 1\}.$$

When $n = 1$, they coincide. The joint numerical radius turns out to be a norm equivalent to the operator norm on $B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$. Characterizations of the unit balls

$$\left\{ (T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)} : w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1 \right\}$$

and

$$\left\{ (T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)} : \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\| \leq 1 \right\}$$

in terms of certain completely positive maps on operator systems generated by the left creation operators S_1, \dots, S_n on the full Fock space, lead to a multivariable version of Berger's dilation theorem ([8]) and an appropriate generalization of Berger-Kato-Stampfli mapping theorem ([9], [35]), to n -tuples of operators. More precisely, we prove that if $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and f_1, \dots, f_k are in the noncommutative disc algebra \mathcal{A}_n , then

$$w(f_1(T_1, \dots, T_n), \dots, f_k(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \|[f_1, \dots, f_k]\| + 2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j(0)|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Actually, a matrix-valued version of this inequality is obtained. When $n = k = 1$, we obtain the classical result [9]. On the other hand, we provide a multivariable operatorial generalization of Schwarz's

lemma. In particular, if $\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| \leq 1$ and $f_1, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{A}_n$ with $f_j(0) = 0$, then

$$r(f_1(T_1, \dots, T_n), \dots, f_k(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \|[f_1, \dots, f_k]\|,$$

where $r(\cdot)$ is the joint spectral radius of a tuple of operators. A similar inequality holds true if we replace $r(\cdot)$ by the operator norm. Moreover, if $\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| < 1$, then \mathcal{A}_n can be replaced by the noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebra F_n^∞ .

We should add that if T_1, \dots, T_n are mutually commuting operators, we find commutative versions for all the results of this section. In this case, the noncommutative disc algebra \mathcal{A}_n (resp. F_n^∞) is replaced by its commutative version \mathcal{A}_n^c (resp. W_n^∞).

In Section 2, we present basic properties of the *euclidean operator radius* of an n -tuple of operators (T_1, \dots, T_n) , defined by

$$w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle T_i h, h \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

in connection with the joint numerical radius and several other operator radii. In general, when $n \geq 2$, $w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq w(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. However, the two notions coincide with the classical numerical radius if $n = 1$. We show that the euclidean operator radius is a norm equivalent to the operator norm and the joint numerical radius on $B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$, and provide sharp inequalities.

In Section 3, we study the *joint (spatial) numerical range* of (T_1, \dots, T_n) , defined by

$$W(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \{(\langle T_1 h, h \rangle, \dots, \langle T_n h, h \rangle) : h \in \mathcal{H}, \|h\| = 1\},$$

in connection with the *right spectrum* $\sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$, the joint numerical radius $w(T_1, \dots, T_n)$, the euclidean operator radius $w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n)$, and the *joint spectral radius* $r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. In particular, we show that

$$\sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \subseteq \overline{W(T_1, \dots, T_n)} \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n)} \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{w(T_1, \dots, T_n)},$$

where $(\mathbb{C}^n)_r$ denotes the open unit ball of radius $r > 0$. If T_1, \dots, T_n are commuting operators and $\sigma(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is the Harte spectrum of (T_1, \dots, T_n) with respect to any commutative closed subalgebra of $B(\mathcal{H})$ containing T_1, \dots, T_n , and the identity, then we deduce that

$$\sigma(T_1, \dots, T_n) \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{r(T_1, \dots, T_n)} \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{w(T_1, \dots, T_n)}.$$

It is well known that in general the joint numerical range $W(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is not a convex subset of \mathbb{C}^n if $n \geq 2$ (see [27]). We prove in Section 3 an analogue of Toeplitz-Hausdorff theorem ([65], [31]) on the convexity of the spatial numerical range of an operator on a Hilbert space, for the joint numerical range of operators in the noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebra F_n^∞ . We show that, if $f_1, \dots, f_k \in F_n^\infty$, then

1. $W(P_{\mathcal{P}_m} f_1|_{\mathcal{P}_m}, \dots, P_{\mathcal{P}_m} f_k|_{\mathcal{P}_m})$ is a convex compact subset of \mathbb{C}^k , where \mathcal{P}_m is the set of all polynomials in $F^2(H_n)$ of degree $\leq m$, and $P_{\mathcal{P}_m}$ is the projection of $F^2(H_n)$ onto \mathcal{P}_m ;
2. $\overline{W(f_1, \dots, f_k)}$ is a convex compact subset of \mathbb{C}^k .

If g_1, \dots, g_k are elements of Arveson's algebra W_n^∞ , we obtain a corona type result which provides a characterization of the Harte spectrum $\sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k)$ relative to W_n^∞ . Moreover, we show that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k) &\subseteq \overline{W(g_1, \dots, g_k)} \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{w_e(g_1, \dots, g_k)} \quad \text{and} \\ \sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k) &\subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{r(g_1, \dots, g_k)} \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{w_e(g_1, \dots, g_k)} \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{w(g_1, \dots, g_k)}. \end{aligned}$$

In Section 4, we provide an appropriate generalization of the Sz.-Nagy–Foiş theory of ρ -contractions ([61], [63], [64]), to our multivariable setting. We say that an n -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_n) of operators acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} belongs to the class \mathcal{C}_ρ , $\rho > 0$, if there is a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and isometries $V_i \in B(\mathcal{K})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, with orthogonal ranges such that

$$T_\alpha = \rho P_{\mathcal{H}} V_\alpha|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \text{for any } \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+ \setminus \{g_0\},$$

where $T_\alpha := T_{i_1} T_{i_2} \cdots T_{i_k}$ if $\alpha = g_{i_1} g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_k}$, and $P_{\mathcal{H}}$ is the orthogonal projection of \mathcal{K} on \mathcal{H} . If $n = 1$, one can easily see that this definition is equivalent to the classical one. The results of this section can be seen as the unification of the theory of isometric dilations for row contractions [61], [64], [25], [14], [43], [44], [45] (which corresponds to the case $\rho = 1$) and Berger type dilations of Section 1 for n -tuples (T_1, \dots, T_n) with the joint numerical radius $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ (which corresponds to the case $\rho = 2$). When T_1, \dots, T_n are commuting operators, we prove that $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$ if and only if there is a Hilbert space $\mathcal{G} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and a $*$ -representation $\pi : C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{G})$ such that

$$T_\alpha = \rho P_{\mathcal{H}} \pi(B_\alpha)|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \text{for any } \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+ \setminus \{g_0\},$$

where B_1, \dots, B_n are the left creation operators on the symmetric Fock space. We obtain in this section several intrinsic characterizations for n -tuples of operators of class \mathcal{C}_ρ (noncommutative and commutative case).

Following the classical case ([32], [67]), we define the operator radius $\omega_\rho : B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $\rho > 0$, by setting

$$\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \left(\frac{1}{t} T_1, \dots, \frac{1}{t} T_n \right) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho \right\}$$

and $\omega_\infty := \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. In particular, $\omega_1(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ coincides with the norm of the row operator $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$, and $\omega_2(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ coincides with the joint numerical radius of (T_1, \dots, T_n) . We present in this section basic properties of the joint ρ -operator radius $\omega_\rho(\cdot)$ and extend to our multivariable setting (noncommutative and commutative) several classical results obtained by Sz.-Nagy and Foiaş, Halmos, Berger and Stampfli, Holbrook, Paulsen, and others ([8], [9], [10], [29], [30], [32], [33], [35], [39], [41], [63], and [67]).

In Part II of this paper, we prove von Neumann type inequalities [66] (see also [42] and [39]) for arbitrary admissible (resp. strongly admissible) operator radii $\omega : B(\mathcal{H})^{(k)} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. We mention that the joint operator radii considered in Part I of this paper, namely, $\|\cdot\|$, $\|\cdot\|_e$, $w(\cdot)$, $w_e(\cdot)$, $r(\cdot)$, $r_e(\cdot)$, and $\omega_\rho(\cdot)$ ($0 < \rho \leq 2$) are strongly admissible, while $\omega_\rho(\cdot)$ ($\rho > 2$) is admissible. We show that, in general, given a row contraction $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$, the inequality

$$\omega(f_1(T_1, \dots, T_n), \dots, f_k(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \omega(f_1(S_1, \dots, S_n), \dots, f_k(S_1, \dots, S_n))$$

holds if $f_1(S_1, \dots, S_n), \dots, f_k(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ belong to operator algebras (resp. operator systems) generated by the left creation operators S_1, \dots, S_n and the identity such as the noncommutative disc algebra \mathcal{A}_n , the Toeplitz C^* -algebra $C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$, the noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebra F_n^∞ , the noncommutative Douglas type algebra \mathcal{D}_n , and the operator system $F_n^\infty(F_n^\infty)^*$. The operator $f_j(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is defined by an appropriate functional calculus for row contractions. Actually, we obtain matrix-valued generalizations of the above inequality. An important role in this investigation is played by the noncommutative Poisson transforms associated with row contractions (see [52], [3], [53], [54], and [56]).

If $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a row contraction satisfying certain constrains, we prove that there is a suitable invariant subspace $\mathcal{E} \subset F^2(H_n)$ under each operator S_1^*, \dots, S_n^* , such that

$$\omega(f_1(T_1, \dots, T_n), \dots, f_k(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \omega(P_{\mathcal{E}} f_1(S_1, \dots, S_n)|_{\mathcal{E}}, \dots, P_{\mathcal{E}} f_k(S_1, \dots, S_n)|_{\mathcal{E}}).$$

This type of constrained von Neumann inequalities as well as matrix-valued versions are considered in Section 6. In particular, we obtain appropriate multivariable generalizations of several von Neumann type inequalities obtained in [66], [58], [62], [22], [47], [48], [50], [52], [5], [3], and [53], to joint operator radii. For example, if $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a row contraction with commuting entries, then we prove that

$$\omega(f_1(T_1, \dots, T_n), \dots, f_k(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \omega(f_1(B_1, \dots, B_n), \dots, f_k(B_1, \dots, B_n))$$

if $f_1(B_1, \dots, B_n), \dots, f_k(B_1, \dots, B_n)$ are elements of operator algebras generated by the creation operators B_1, \dots, B_n acting on the symmetric Fock space, such as the commutative disc algebra \mathcal{A}_n^c , the Toeplitz C^* -algebra $C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n)$, Arveson's algebra W_n^∞ , the Douglas type algebra \mathcal{D}_n^c , and the operator system $W_n^\infty(W_n^\infty)^*$. The operator $f_j(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is defined by an appropriate functional calculus for row contractions with commuting entries. Applications of these inequalities are considered in the next sections.

In 1992, Haagerup and de la Harpe ([28]) proved that any bounded linear operator of norm 1 on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} such that $T^m = 0$, $m \geq 2$, satisfies the inequality

$$\omega(T) \leq \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1},$$

where $\omega(T)$ is the numerical radius of T . In Section 7, we apply the results of the previous sections to obtain several multivariable generalizations of the Haagerup–de la Harpe inequality. In particular, we show that if the operators T_1, \dots, T_n are such that $T_\alpha = 0$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ with length $|\alpha| = m$ ($m \geq 2$), then

$$w(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\|^{k/2} \cos \frac{\pi}{\left[\frac{m-1}{k} \right] + 2}$$

for $1 \leq k \leq m-1$, where $[x]$ is the integer part of x . A similar inequality holds for the euclidean operator radius. Using a result of Boas and Kac ([11]) as generalized by Janssen ([34]), we also obtain an epsilonized version of the above inequality, when one gives up the condition $T_\alpha = 0$. This extends a recent result of Badea and Cassier ([7]), to our setting.

Haagerup and de la Harpe showed in [28] that their inequality is equivalent to Fejér's inequality [24] for positive trigonometric polynomials of the form

$$f(e^{i\theta}) := \sum_{k=-m+1}^{m-1} a_k e^{ik\theta}, \quad a_k \in \mathbb{C},$$

which asserts that

$$|a_1| \leq a_0 \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}.$$

In the last section of this paper, we provide multivariable noncommutative (resp. commutative) analogues of classical inequalities (Fejér [24], Egerváry-Szász [23]) for the coefficients of positive trigonometric polynomials, and of recent extensions to positive rational functions, obtained by Badea and Cassier [7].

We obtain the following multivariable operator-valued generalization of the classical inequalities of Fejér and Egerváry-Szász, to the tensor product $C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n) \otimes B(\mathcal{H})$. Let $m \geq 2$ be a nonnegative integer and let $\{A_{(\alpha)}\}_{|\alpha| \leq m-1}$ be a sequence of operators in $B(\mathcal{H})$ such that the operator

$$\sum_{1 \leq k \leq m-1} S_\alpha^* \otimes A_{(\alpha)} + I \otimes A_0 + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq m-1} S_\alpha \otimes A_{(\alpha)}^*$$

is positive. Then,

$$w(A_{(\alpha)} : |\alpha| = k) \leq \|A_0\| \cos \frac{\pi}{\left[\frac{m-1}{k} \right] + 2}$$

for $1 \leq k \leq m-1$. Similar inequalities are obtained for the reduced group C^* -algebra $C_{red}^*(\mathbb{F}_n)$ and the full group C^* -algebra $C^*(\mathbb{F}_n)$. In particular, we deduce that if

$$f = \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} \bar{a}_\alpha S_\alpha^* + a_0 I + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} a_\alpha S_\alpha$$

is a positive polynomial in $C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$, then

$$\left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} |a_\alpha|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq a_0 \cos \frac{\pi}{\left[\frac{m-1}{k} \right] + 2}$$

for $1 \leq k \leq m-1$. Similar results hold for $C_{red}^*(\mathbb{F}_n)$ and $C^*(\mathbb{F}_n)$.

There is a large literature relating to the classical numerical range and no attempt has been made to compile a comprehensive list of reference here. For general proprieties, we refer to [29], [12], [13], and [27]. Finally, we want to acknowledge that we were strongly influenced in writing this paper by the work of Haagerup and de la Harpe [28], Arveson [4], Paulsen [39], Sz.-Nagy and Foiaş [64], and Badea and Cassier [7].

PART I. UNITARY INVARIANTS FOR n -TUPLES OF OPERATORS

1. JOINT NUMERICAL RADIUS

We introduce a notion of joint numerical radius for n -tuples (T_1, \dots, T_n) of operators acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , by setting

$$(1.1) \quad w(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \sup \left| \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle h_\alpha, T_j h_{g_j \alpha} \rangle \right|,$$

where the supremum is taken over all families of vectors $\{h_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \subset \mathcal{H}$ with $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \|h_\alpha\|^2 = 1$. In this

section, we present basic properties of the joint numerical range, which lead to a multivariable version of Berger's dilation theorem ([8]) and an appropriate generalization of Berger-Kato-Stampfli mapping theorem ([9], [35]), to n -tuples of operators with $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$. We also obtain a multivariable operatorial generalization of Schwarz's lemma. If T_1, \dots, T_n are mutually commuting operators, we find commutative versions for all the results of this section.

First notice that, when $n = 1$, our numerical radius coincides with the classical numerical radius of an operator $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$ (the algebra of all bounded linear operators on \mathcal{H}), i.e.,

$$\omega(T) := \sup\{|\langle Th, h \rangle| : h \in \mathcal{H}, \|h\| = 1\}.$$

Indeed, if $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|h_k\|^2 < \infty$ and $f_m(\theta) := \sum_{k=0}^m e^{ik\theta} h_k$, $h_k \in \mathcal{H}$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{k=0}^m \langle h_k, Th_{k+1} \rangle \right| &= \left| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \langle f_m(\theta), Tf_m(\theta) \rangle e^{i\theta} d\theta \right| \\ &\leq \omega(T) \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \|f_m(\theta)\|^2 d\theta \\ &= \omega(T) \sum_{k=0}^m \|h_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $m \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $w(T) \leq \omega(T)$. On the other hand, let $h \in \mathcal{H}$, $\|h\| = 1$, and define $h_k := \lambda^k \sqrt{1 - |\lambda|^2} h$, $k = 0, 1, \dots$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{D} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$. It is easy to see that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|h_k\|^2 = 1$ and

$$\left| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \langle h_k, Th_{k+1} \rangle \right| = |\lambda| |\langle Th, h \rangle|$$

for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. Hence, we deduce the inequality $w(T) \geq \omega(T)$, which proves our assertion, i.e., $w(T) = \omega(T)$.

Let H_n be an n -dimensional complex Hilbert space with orthonormal basis e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n , where $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ or $n = \infty$. We consider the full Fock space of H_n defined by

$$F^2(H_n) := \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} H_n^{\otimes k},$$

where $H_n^{\otimes 0} := \mathbb{C}1$ and $H_n^{\otimes k}$ is the (Hilbert) tensor product of k copies of H_n . Define the left creation operators $S_i : F^2(H_n) \rightarrow F^2(H_n)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, by

$$S_i \psi := e_i \otimes \psi, \quad \psi \in F^2(H_n).$$

Let \mathbb{F}_n^+ be the unital free semigroup on n generators g_1, \dots, g_n , and the identity g_0 . The length of $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ is defined by $|\alpha| := k$, if $\alpha = g_{i_1} g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_k}$, and $|\alpha| := 0$, if $\alpha = g_0$. We also define

$e_\alpha := e_{i_1} \otimes e_{i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_k}$ and $e_{g_0} = 1$. It is clear that $\{e_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $F^2(H_n)$. We denote by \mathcal{P} the set of all polynomials in $F^2(H_n)$, i.e., all the elements of the form

$$p = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} a_\alpha e_\alpha, \quad a_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

If $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$, define $T_\alpha := T_{i_1} T_{i_2} \cdots T_{i_k}$ if $\alpha = g_{i_1} g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_k}$, and $T_{g_0} := I_{\mathcal{H}}$. If p is a polynomial as the one above, we set $p(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} a_\alpha T_\alpha$.

The joint spectral radius associated with an n -tuple of operators (T_1, \dots, T_n) is given by

$$r(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/2k}.$$

In general, $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \neq r(T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*)$ if $n \geq 2$. Note for example that

$$r(S_1, \dots, S_n) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad r(S_1^*, \dots, S_n^*) = \sqrt{n},$$

where S_1, \dots, S_n are the left creation operators on the full Fock space.

For simplicity, throughout this paper, $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ denotes either the n -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_n) or the operator row matrix $[T_1 \cdots T_n]$.

In what follows we present basic properties of the joint numerical radius.

Theorem 1.1. *The joint numerical radius $w : B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ for n -tuples of operators satisfies the following properties:*

- (i) $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0$ if and only if $T_1 = \cdots = T_n = 0$;
- (ii) $w(\lambda T_1, \dots, \lambda T_n) = |\lambda| w(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$;
- (iii) $w(T_1 + T'_1, \dots, T_n + T'_n) \leq w(T_1, \dots, T_n) + w(T'_1, \dots, T'_n)$;
- (iv) $w(U^* T_1 U, \dots, U^* T_n U) = w(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any unitary operator $U : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$;
- (v) $w(X^* T_1 X, \dots, X^* T_n X) \leq \|X\|^2 w(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any operator $X : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$;
- (vi) $\frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\|^{1/2} \leq w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\|^{1/2}$;
- (vii) $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq w(T_1, \dots, T_n)$;
- (viii) $w(I_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes T_1, \dots, I_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes T_n) = w(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any separable Hilbert space \mathcal{E} ;
- (ix) w is a continuous map in the norm topology.

Proof. The first three properties follow easily using the definition (1.1), and show that the joint numerical radius is a norm on $B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$. To prove relations (iv) and (v), let $\{k_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+}$ be an arbitrary sequence of vectors in \mathcal{K} such that $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \|k_\alpha\|^2 = 1$. Fix an operator $X : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ and define the vectors

$$h_\alpha := \frac{1}{M} X k_\alpha, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+, \quad \text{where } M := \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \|X k_\alpha\|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad \text{Notice that } \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \|h_\alpha\|^2 = 1 \text{ and } M \leq \|X\|.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle k_\alpha, X^* T_j X k_{g_j \alpha} \rangle \right| &\leq \left| \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle h_\alpha, T_j h_{g_j \alpha} \rangle \right| \|X\|^2 \\ &\leq \|X\|^2 w(T_1, \dots, T_n). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over all sequences $\{k_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \subset \mathcal{K}$ with $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \|k_\alpha\|^2 = 1$, we deduce inequality

(v). A closer look reveals that, when $X = U$ is a unitary operator, we have equality in the above inequality. Therefore, relation (iv) holds true.

Now, let us prove (vi). Any vector $x \in F^2(H_n)$ with $\|x\| = 1$ has the form $x = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} e_\alpha \otimes h_\alpha$, where the sequence $\{h_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \subset \mathcal{H}$ is such that $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \|h_\alpha\|^2 = 1$. If S_1, \dots, S_n are the left creation operators

on the full Fock space $F^2(H_n)$, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left\langle \left(\sum_{j=1}^n S_j \otimes T_j^* \right) x, x \right\rangle \right| &= \left| \left\langle \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \sum_{j=1}^n e_{g_j \alpha} \otimes T_j^* h_\alpha, \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} e_\beta \otimes h_\beta \right\rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle e_{g_j \alpha}, e_\beta \rangle \langle T_j^* h_\alpha, h_\beta \rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle h_\alpha, T_j h_{g_j \alpha} \rangle \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we infer that

$$(1.2) \quad w(T_1, \dots, T_n) = w(S_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + S_n \otimes T_n^*).$$

On the other hand, it is well known that the classical numerical radius of an operator X satisfies the inequalities $\frac{1}{2}\|X\| \leq w(X) \leq \|X\|$. Using relation (1.2) and taking into account that the left creation operators have orthogonal ranges, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(T_1, \dots, T_n) &= w\left(\sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes T_i^*\right) \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes T_i^* \right\| \\ &= \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n S_i^* \otimes T_i \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes T_i^* \right) \right\|^{1/2} \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\|^{1/2} = \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can prove the first inequality in (vi).

To prove (vii), notice that, since $S_i^* S_j = \delta_{ij} I$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r\left(\sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes T_i^*\right) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} S_\alpha \otimes T_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/k} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} S_\alpha^* \otimes T_\alpha \right) \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} S_\alpha \otimes T_\alpha^* \right) \right\|^{1/2k} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| I \otimes \sum_{|\alpha|=k} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/2k} \\ &= r(T_1, \dots, T_n). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} r(T_1, \dots, T_n) &= r(S_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + S_n \otimes T_n^*) \\ &\leq w(S_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + S_n \otimes T_n^*) \\ &= w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the inequality (vii) is established.

To prove (viii), we use again relation (1.2) and the classical result $w(I_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes X) = w(X)$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} w(I_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes T_1, \dots, I_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes T_n) &= w\left(\sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes (I_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes T_i^*)\right) \\ &= w\left(I_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes \left(\sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes T_i^*\right)\right) \\ &= w(T_1, \dots, T_n). \end{aligned}$$

The property (ix) follows immediately from (vi). The proof is complete. \square

In general, $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \neq w(T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*)$ if $n \geq 2$. Indeed, we have

$$w(S_1^*, \dots, S_n^*) \geq r(S_1^*, \dots, S_n^*) = \sqrt{n}$$

and $w(S_1, \dots, S_n) = 1$.

Corollary 1.2. *If $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| &= \|S_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + S_n \otimes T_n^*\|, \\ r(T_1, \dots, T_n) &= r(S_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + S_n \otimes T_n^*), \text{ and} \\ w(T_1, \dots, T_n) &= w(S_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + S_n \otimes T_n^*), \end{aligned}$$

where S_1, \dots, S_n are the left creation operators on the full Fock space $F^2(H_n)$.

We need to recall from [45], [46], [47], [48], and [49] a few facts concerning multi-analytic (resp. multi-Toeplitz) operators on Fock spaces. We say that a bounded linear operator M acting from $F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{K}$ to $F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{K}'$ is multi-analytic if

$$(1.3) \quad M(S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}}) = (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}'})M \quad \text{for any } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Notice that M is uniquely determined by the operator $\theta : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{K}'$, which is defined by $\theta k := M(1 \otimes k)$, $k \in \mathcal{K}$, and is called the symbol of M . We denote $M = M_{\theta}$. Moreover, M_{θ} is uniquely determined by the ‘‘coefficients’’ $\theta_{(\alpha)} \in B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}')$, which are given by

$$\langle \theta_{(\tilde{\alpha})} k, k' \rangle := \langle \theta k, e_{\alpha} \otimes k' \rangle = \langle M_{\theta}(1 \otimes k), e_{\alpha} \otimes k' \rangle, \quad k \in \mathcal{K}, k' \in \mathcal{K}', \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+,$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}$ is the reverse of α , i.e., $\tilde{\alpha} = g_{i_k} \cdots g_{i_1}$ if $\alpha = g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_k}$. Note that

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \theta_{(\alpha)}^* \theta_{(\alpha)} \leq \|M_{\theta}\|^2 I_{\mathcal{K}}.$$

We can associate with M_{θ} a unique formal Fourier expansion

$$(1.4) \quad M_{\theta} \sim \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} R_{\alpha} \otimes \theta_{(\alpha)},$$

where $R_i := U^* S_i U$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are the right creation operators on $F^2(H_n)$ and U is the (flipping) unitary operator on $F^2(H_n)$ mapping $e_{i_1} \otimes e_{i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_k}$ into $e_{i_k} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_2} \otimes e_{i_1}$. Since M_{θ} acts like its Fourier representation on ‘‘polynomials’’, we will identify them for simplicity. Based on the noncommutative von Neumann inequality ([48], [53]) we proved that

$$M_{\theta} = \text{SOT} - \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^{|\alpha|} R_{\alpha} \otimes \theta_{(\alpha)},$$

where, for each $r \in (0, 1)$ the series converges in the uniform norm. The set of all multi-analytic operators in $B(F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{K}, F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{K}')$ coincides with $R_n^{\infty} \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}')$, the WOT closed algebra generated by the spatial tensor product, where $R_n^{\infty} = U^* F_n^{\infty} U$ (see [49] and [55]). We also denote $\theta(R_1, \dots, R_n) := M_{\theta}$.

An operator T acting on $F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{E}$, where \mathcal{E} is a Hilbert space, is called multi-Toeplitz if

$$(S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{E}})^* T (S_j \otimes I_{\mathcal{E}}) = \delta_{ij} I \quad \text{for any } i, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Basic properties for multi-Toeplitz operators on Fock spaces can be found in [46], [49].

Given $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$, we say that $\alpha > \beta$ if $\alpha = \beta\omega$ for some $\omega \in \mathbb{F}_n^+ \setminus \{g_0\}$. We denote $\omega := \alpha \setminus \beta$. A kernel $K : \mathbb{F}_n^+ \times \mathbb{F}_n^+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is called multi-Toeplitz if $K(g_0, g_0) = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ and

$$K(\alpha, \beta) = \begin{cases} K(\alpha \setminus \beta, g_0) & \text{if } \alpha > \beta \\ K(g_0, \beta \setminus \alpha) & \text{if } \alpha < \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is said to be positive definite provided that

$$\sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \langle K(\alpha, \beta)h(\beta), h(\alpha) \rangle \geq 0$$

for all finitely supported functions h from \mathbb{F}_n^+ into \mathcal{H} .

The next result, which will play an important role in this section, provides a characterization for the n -tuples of operators with the joint numerical radius $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$ and let $\mathcal{S} \subset C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ be the operator system defined by*

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{S} := \{p(S_1, \dots, S_n) + q(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* : p, q \in \mathcal{P}\}.$$

Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$;
- (ii) *The map $\Psi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by*

$$\Psi(p(S_1, \dots, S_n) + q(S_1, \dots, S_n)^*) := p(T_1, \dots, T_n) + q(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* + (p(0) + \overline{q(0)})I$$

is completely positive.

Proof. First, we prove that (i) \implies (ii). For each $q = 0, 1, \dots$, define the operator

$$(1.6) \quad M_q := P_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}} \left(\sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq q} R_\alpha^* \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}} + 2I + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq q} R_\alpha \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}}^* \right) |_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}},$$

where $P_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}}$ is the orthogonal projection of $F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ onto $\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}$, and \mathcal{P}_q is the set of all polynomials of degree $\leq q$ in $F^2(H_n)$. Let \mathcal{R} be the operator system obtained from \mathcal{S} by replacing the left creation operators S_1, \dots, S_n with the right creation operators R_1, \dots, R_n . Any element $G \in \mathcal{R} \otimes B(\mathbb{C}^m)$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$, has the form

$$G = G(R_1, \dots, R_n) := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} R_\alpha^* \otimes B_{(\alpha)} + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} R_\alpha \otimes A_{(\alpha)}$$

for some operators $A_{(\alpha)}, B_{(\alpha)} \in B(\mathbb{C}^m)$, $|\alpha| \leq q$. Note that G is a multi-Toeplitz operator acting on the Hilbert space $F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$, i.e.,

$$(S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathbb{C}^m})G(S_j \otimes I_{\mathbb{C}^m}) = \delta_{ij}G, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Assume that $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and $G \geq 0$. Then, according to the Fejér type factorization theorem of [46], there exists a multi-analytic operator $\Theta \in B(F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathbb{C}^m)$ such that $G = \Theta^* \Theta$ and

$$(S_\alpha^* \otimes I_{\mathbb{C}^m})\Theta(1 \otimes h) = 0$$

for any $h \in \mathbb{C}^m$ and $|\alpha| > q$. Therefore, $\Theta = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} R_\alpha \otimes \Theta_{(\alpha)}$ for some operators $\Theta_{(\alpha)} \in B(\mathbb{C}^m)$ and

$$G = \Theta^* \Theta = \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} R_\alpha^* R_\beta \otimes \Theta_{(\alpha)}^* \Theta_{(\beta)}.$$

Since $R_i^* R_j = \delta_{ij}$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$(1.7) \quad G = \sum_{\alpha > \beta, |\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} R_{\alpha \setminus \beta}^* \otimes \Theta_{(\alpha)}^* \Theta_{(\beta)} + \sum_{\beta \geq \alpha, |\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} R_{\beta \setminus \alpha} \otimes \Theta_{(\alpha)}^* \Theta_{(\beta)}.$$

To prove that (i) \implies (ii), it is enough to show that the operator $G(T_1, \dots, T_n) + G(0)I$ is positive whenever $G \geq 0$. To this end, define the multi-Toeplitz kernel $K_{T,2} : \mathbb{F}_n^+ \times \mathbb{F}_n^+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ by setting

$$K_{T,2}(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} T_{\beta \setminus \alpha} & \text{if } \beta > \alpha \\ 2I & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \\ T_{\alpha \setminus \beta}^* & \text{if } \alpha > \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that

$$G(T_1, \dots, T_n) + G(0)I = \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} K_{T,2}(\alpha, \beta) \otimes \Theta_{(\alpha)}^* \Theta_{(\beta)}.$$

Hence, for any element $\sum_{i=1}^p h_i \otimes z_i \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$, $p = 1, 2, \dots$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle [G(T_1, \dots, T_n) + G(0)I] \left(\sum_{i=1}^p h_i \otimes z_i \right), \sum_{i=1}^p h_i \otimes z_i \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^p \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} \left\langle K_{T,2}(\alpha, \beta) h_i \otimes \Theta_{(\alpha)}^* \Theta_{(\beta)} z_i, h_j \otimes z_j \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^p \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} \left\langle K_{T,2}(\alpha, \beta) h_i \otimes \Theta_{(\beta)} z_i, h_j \otimes \Theta_{(\alpha)} z_j \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} \left\langle (K_{T,2}(\alpha, \beta) \otimes I_{\mathbb{C}^m}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^p h_i \otimes \Theta_{(\beta)} z_i \right), \sum_{i=1}^p h_i \otimes \Theta_{(\alpha)} z_i \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We need to prove that the operator matrix $[K_{T,2}(\alpha, \beta)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q}$ is positive. Since $[K_{T,2}(\alpha, \beta)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q}$ is the matrix representation of the operator M_q with respect to the decomposition $\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^N \mathcal{H}$, where $N := 1 + n + \dots + n^q$, it is enough to prove that $M_q \geq 0$. Let the operator $A_q : \mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}$ be defined by

$$(1.8) \quad A_q := P_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}} (R_1^* \otimes T_1 + \dots + R_n^* \otimes T_n) |_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}}.$$

Since $A_q^{q+1} = 0$, we have

$$M_q = \sum_{k=0}^q A_q^k + \sum_{k=0}^q A_q^{*k} = (I - A_q)^{-1} + (I - A_q^*)^{-1}.$$

Let $h := (I - A_q)k$, $k \in \mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}$, and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M_q h, h \rangle &= \langle k + (I - A_q^*)^{-1} (I - A_q)k, (I - A_q)k \rangle \\ &= \langle k, (I - A_q)k \rangle + \langle (I - A_q)k, k \rangle \\ &= 2\|k\|^2 - 2\operatorname{Re} \langle A_q k, k \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $M_q \geq 0$ if and only if $\operatorname{Re} \langle A_q k, k \rangle \leq 1$ for all $k \in \mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}$ with $\|k\| = 1$. We prove now the latter condition is equivalent to $\omega(A_q) \leq 1$. Since one implication is clear, assume that $\operatorname{Re} \langle A_q k, k \rangle \leq 1$ for all $k \in \mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}$ with $\|k\| = 1$. If $\omega(A_q) > 1$, then there exists $x = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} e_\alpha \otimes h_\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}$ such that

$\|x\| = 1$ and $|\langle A_q x, x \rangle| > 1$. A short calculation reveals that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle A_q x, x \rangle| &= \left| \left\langle \left(\sum_{j=1}^n R_i^* \otimes T_j \right) x, x \right\rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \left\langle \sum_{|\beta| \leq q} e_\beta \otimes h_\beta, \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} e_{\alpha g_j} \otimes T_j^* h_\alpha \right\rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} \langle e_\beta, e_{\alpha g_j} \rangle \langle T_j h_\beta, h_\alpha \rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} \langle T_j h_{\alpha g_j}, h_\alpha \rangle \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $\theta_\alpha \in [0, 2\pi]$, $|\alpha| \geq 1$, be such that $\langle T_j h_{g_j}, h_{g_0} \rangle e^{i\theta_{g_j}} \geq 0$ for any $j = 1, \dots, n$, and

$$\langle T_j h_{\alpha g_j}, h_\alpha \rangle e^{i\theta_{\alpha g_j}} e^{-i\theta_\alpha} \geq 0$$

for any $j = 1, \dots, n$, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ with $|\alpha| \leq q - 1$. Let $h'_\alpha := e^{i\theta_\alpha} h_\alpha$ if $0 < |\alpha| \leq q$ and $h'_{g_0} := h_{g_0}$, and note that

$$\langle T_j h'_{\alpha g_j}, h'_\alpha \rangle = \langle T_j h_{\alpha g_j}, h_\alpha \rangle e^{i\theta_{\alpha g_j}} e^{-i\theta_\alpha} \geq 0.$$

Therefore, $\sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} \|h'_\alpha\|^2 = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} \|h_\alpha\|^2 = 1$ and, if $y := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} e_\alpha \otimes h'_\alpha$, then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_q y, y \rangle &= \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} e^{i\theta_{\alpha g_j}} e^{-i\theta_\alpha} \langle T_j h_{\alpha g_j}, h_\alpha \rangle \\ &\geq \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} \langle T_j h_{\alpha g_j}, h_\alpha \rangle \right| > 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $1 < \operatorname{Re} \langle A_q k', k' \rangle$, which is a contradiction. This proves that we must have $\omega(A_q) \leq 1$. Therefore,

$$(1.9) \quad M_q \geq 0 \text{ if and only if } \omega(A_q) \leq 1.$$

According to Corollary 1.2, we have

$$(1.10) \quad w(T_1, \dots, T_n) = w(S_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + S_n \otimes T_n^*).$$

Since $U^* S_i U = R_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and U is unitary, the unitary invariance of the joint numerical radius and relation (1.10) imply

$$w(T_1, \dots, T_n) = w(R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^*).$$

Therefore, if $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$, then $\omega(A_q) \leq w(R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^*) \leq 1$. Now, relation (1.9) implies condition (ii) of the theorem.

Conversely, assume that (ii) holds. Define the multi-Toeplitz kernel $K_{S,1} : \mathbb{F}_n^+ \times \mathbb{F}_n^+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ by setting

$$K_{S,1}(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} S_{\beta \setminus \alpha} & \text{if } \beta > \alpha \\ I & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \\ S_{\alpha \setminus \beta}^* & \text{if } \alpha > \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $S_i^* S_j = \delta_{ij} I$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} \langle K_{S,1}(\alpha, \beta) h_\beta, h_\alpha \rangle &= \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} \langle S_\alpha^* S_\beta h_\beta, h_\alpha \rangle \\ &= \left\| \sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} S_\alpha h_\alpha \right\|^2 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

for any $\{h_\alpha\}_{|\alpha| \leq q} \subset \mathcal{H}$ and $q = 1, 2, \dots$. Therefore, the operator matrix $[K_{S,1}(\alpha, \beta)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q}$ is positive. Since Ψ is a completely positive map and

$$[\Psi(K_{S,1}(\alpha, \beta))]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} = [K_{T,2}(\alpha, \beta)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q},$$

we deduce that $M_q \geq 0$. Hence and using (1.9), we get $\omega(A_q) \leq 1$ for any $q = 1, 2, \dots$. According to relations (1.8) and (1.10), we obtain $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$. The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 1.4. *If (T_1, \dots, T_n) is an n -tuple of operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , then*

$$r(T_1, \dots, T_n) = r(R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^*).$$

Moreover, if the spectral radius $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and $z_i \in \mathbb{D}$, for any $i = 1, \dots, n$, then the operator $I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^*$ is invertible and

$$(1.11) \quad \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^* \right)^{-1} = I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} z_\alpha R_\alpha \otimes T_\alpha^*,$$

where the series converges in the operator norm.

Proof. The first part of the theorem follows from Corollary 1.2 and the fact that $R_i = U^* S_i U$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, where U is the (flipping) unitary operator. Assume now that $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and $z_i \in \mathbb{D}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then we have

$$r \left(\sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^* \right) = r(\bar{z}_1 T_1, \dots, \bar{z}_n T_n) \leq \gamma r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \gamma,$$

where $\gamma := \max\{|z_1|, \dots, |z_n|\} < 1$. This proves that the operator $I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^*$ is invertible. On the other hand, the root test implies the convergence of the series in the operator norm. The equality in (1.11) is now obvious. \square

The following result provides a characterization for row contractions as well as a new proof of the noncommutative von Neumann inequality obtained in [47].

Theorem 1.5. *Let $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$ and let $\mathcal{S} \subset C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ be the operator system defined by (1.5). Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $T_1 T_1^* + \dots + T_n T_n^* \leq 1$;
- (ii) The map $\Psi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$\Psi(p(S_1, \dots, S_n) + q(S_1, \dots, S_n)^*) := p(T_1, \dots, T_n) + q(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*$$

is completely positive.

- (iii) The spectral radius $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and the multi-Toeplitz operator A_r defined by

$$A_r := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k R_\alpha^* \otimes T_\alpha^* + I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k R_\alpha \otimes T_\alpha^*$$

is positive for any $0 < r < 1$, where the convergence is in the operator norm.

Proof. First we prove that (i) \implies (ii). For each $q = 0, 1, \dots$, define the operator

$$(1.12) \quad N_q := P_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}} \left(\sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq q} R_\alpha^* \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}} + I + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq q} R_\alpha \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}}^* \right) |_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}},$$

where $P_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}}$ is the orthogonal projection of $F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ onto $\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}$, and \mathcal{P}_q is the set of all polynomials of degree $\leq q$ in $F^2(H_n)$. The multi-Toeplitz kernel $K_{T,1} : \mathbb{F}_n^+ \times \mathbb{F}_n^+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is given by

$$K_{T,1}(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} T_{\beta \setminus \alpha} & \text{if } \beta > \alpha \\ I & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \\ T_{\alpha \setminus \beta}^* & \text{if } \alpha > \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As in the proof of Theorem 1.3, the Fejér type factorization theorem of [49] shows that any positive operator $G \in \mathcal{R} \otimes B(\mathbb{C}^m)$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$, has the form (1.7), and similar calculations show that

$$G(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} K_{T,1}(\alpha, \beta) \otimes \Theta_{(\alpha)}^* \Theta_{(\beta)}.$$

Hence, for any element $\sum_{i=1}^p h_i \otimes z_i \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$, $p = 1, 2, \dots$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle [G(T_1, \dots, T_n)] \left(\sum_{i=1}^p h_i \otimes z_i \right), \sum_{i=1}^p h_i \otimes z_i \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} \left\langle (K_{T,1}(\alpha, \beta) \otimes I_{\mathbb{C}^m}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^p h_i \otimes \Theta_{(\beta)} z_i \right), \sum_{i=1}^p h_i \otimes \Theta_{(\alpha)} z_i \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, to show that $G(T_1, \dots, T_n) \geq 0$, we need to prove that the matrix $[K_{T,1}(\alpha, \beta)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q}$ is positive. Since $[K_{T,1}(\alpha, \beta)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q}$ is the matrix representation of the operator N_q with respect to the decomposition $\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^N \mathcal{H}$, where $N := 1 + n + \dots + n^q$, it is enough to prove that $N_q \geq 0$. Let the operator $A_q : \mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}$ be defined by

$$A_q := P_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}} (R_1^* \otimes T_1 + \dots + R_n^* \otimes T_n) |_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}}.$$

Since $A_q^{q+1} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N_q &= \sum_{k=1}^q A_q^k + I + \sum_{k=1}^q A_q^{*k} = (I - A_q)^{-1} + (I - A_q^*)^{-1} - I \\ &= (I - A_q)^{-1} (I - A_q A_q^*) (I - A_q^*)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a row contraction and $R_i^* R_j = \delta_{ij} I$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_q A_q^* &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n R_i^* \otimes T_i \right) P_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n R_i \otimes T_i^* \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n R_i^* R_j \otimes T_i T_j^* \leq I. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $N_q \geq 0$, which shows that $G(T_1, \dots, T_n) \geq 0$. This proves that (i) \implies (ii).

Assume now that (ii) holds. According to Arveson's extension theorem [4], there exists a completely positive map $\Phi : C^*(R_1, \dots, R_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ extending Ψ . Using Stinespring's dilation theorem [60], there exists a $*$ -representation $\pi : C^*(R_1, \dots, R_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$ such that

$$\Phi(x) = P_{\mathcal{H}} \pi(x) |_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad x \in C^*(R_1, \dots, R_n).$$

Since $R_i^* R_j = \delta_{ij} I$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, it is clear that

$$\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| \leq \|\pi(R_1), \dots, \pi(R_n)\| \leq 1.$$

This completes the proof of (ii) \implies (i).

Now we prove the implication (i) \implies (iii). Assume that condition (i) holds. Since

$$r \left(\sum_{i=1}^n R_i \otimes T_i^* \right) = r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1,$$

Lemma 1.4 shows that the operator $I - \sum_{i=1}^n r R_i \otimes T_i^*$ is invertible and

$$\left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n r R_i \otimes T_i^* \right)^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k R_\alpha \otimes T_\alpha^*.$$

Moreover, we have

$$A_r = \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n r R_i \otimes T_i^* \right)^{-1} \left[I \otimes \left(I - r^2 \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right) \right] \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n r R_i^* \otimes T_i \right)^{-1} \geq 0$$

for any $0 < r < 1$.

To prove the implication (iii) \implies (i), assume that $A_r \geq 0$ for any $0 < r < 1$. First we show that

$$(1.13) \quad \left\langle A_r \left(\sum_{|\beta| \leq q} e_\beta \otimes h_\beta \right), \sum_{|\gamma| \leq q} e_\gamma \otimes h_\gamma \right\rangle = \sum_{|\beta|, |\gamma| \leq q} \langle K_{T,1,r}(\gamma, \beta) h_\beta, h_\gamma \rangle,$$

where the multi-Toeplitz kernel $K_{T,1,r} : \mathbb{F}_n^+ \times \mathbb{F}_n^+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is defined by

$$K_{T,1,r}(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} r^{|\beta \setminus \alpha|} T_{\beta \setminus \alpha} & \text{if } \beta > \alpha \\ I & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \\ r^{|\alpha \setminus \beta|} (T_{\alpha \setminus \beta})^* & \text{if } \alpha > \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$, the series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k R_\alpha \otimes T_\alpha^*$ is convergent in norm for any $0 < r < 1$. Note that if $\{h_\beta\}_{|\beta| \leq q} \subset \mathcal{H}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k R_\alpha \otimes T_\alpha^* \right) \left(\sum_{|\beta| \leq q} e_\beta \otimes h_\beta \right), \sum_{|\gamma| \leq q} e_\gamma \otimes h_\gamma \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} \left\langle \sum_{|\beta| \leq q} r^k R_\alpha e_\beta \otimes T_\alpha^* h_\beta, \sum_{|\gamma| \leq q} e_\gamma \otimes h_\gamma \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \sum_{|\beta|, |\gamma| \leq q} r^{|\alpha|} \langle e_{\beta \bar{\alpha}}, e_\gamma \rangle \langle T_\alpha^* h_\beta, h_\gamma \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \geq \beta; |\beta|, |\gamma| \leq q} r^{|\gamma \setminus \beta|} \langle T_{\gamma \setminus \beta}^* h_\beta, h_\gamma \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \geq \beta; |\beta|, |\gamma| \leq q} \langle K_{T,1,r}(\gamma, \beta) h_\beta, h_\gamma \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, taking into account that $K_{T,1,r}(\gamma, \beta) = K_{T,1,r}^*(\beta, \gamma)$, relation (1.13) follows. Now, since $A_r \geq 0$, we must have $[K_{T,1,r}(\alpha, \beta)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} \geq 0$ for any $0 < r < 1$ and $q = 0, 1, \dots$. Taking $r \rightarrow 1$, we get $[K_{T,1}(\alpha, \beta)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} \geq 0$ for any $q = 0, 1, \dots$. Using the Naimark type dilation theorem of [51], we deduce that $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a row contraction. The proof is complete. \square

Corollary 1.6. ([47]) *If $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a row contraction, then*

$$\|p(T_1, \dots, T_n)\| \leq \|p(S_1, \dots, S_n)\|$$

for any polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Moreover the map Ψ of Theorem 1.5 is completely contractive and can be extended to $\mathcal{A}_n + \mathcal{A}_n^*$.

A consequence of the noncommutative von Neumann inequality and the noncommutative commutant lifting theorem [44] is the following multivariable matrix-valued generalization of Schwarz's lemma. We denote by M_m the set of all $m \times m$ complex matrices.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ be a row contraction and $m, k \geq 1$.*

(i) *If $F_j := F_j(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in M_m \otimes \mathcal{A}_n$ such that $F_j(0) = 0$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, then*

$$\omega(F_1(T_1, \dots, T_n), \dots, F_k(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \omega(T_1, \dots, T_n) \|[F_1, \dots, F_k]\|,$$

where ω is the norm or the joint spectral radius.

(ii) *If \mathcal{A}_n is replaced by F_n^∞ in (i), then the above inequality holds true for any completely non-coisometric row contraction, in particular if $\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| < 1$.*

(iii) *If $T_i T_j = T_j T_i$ for any $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, then (i) and (ii) remain true if we replace \mathcal{A}_n (resp. F_n^∞) by the commutative algebra \mathcal{A}_n^c (resp. W_n^∞).*

Proof. Let $X_q := X_q(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ be the row matrix with entries F_α , $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ with $|\alpha| = k$, and denote $X_q := [F_\alpha : |\alpha| = q]$. Note that $X_q \in M_{m, mk^q} \otimes \mathcal{A}_n$, i.e., a $m \times mk^q$ matrix with entries in \mathcal{A}_n . Taking into account the structure of the elements in F_n^∞ , the condition $F_j(0) = 0$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, implies

$$X_q(S_1, \dots, S_n) = \sum_{|\beta|=q} (I_m \otimes S_\beta) \Phi_\beta(S_1, \dots, S_n)$$

for some operator matrices $\Phi_\beta(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in M_{m, mk^q} \otimes \mathcal{A}_n$. Since the operators S_β , $|\beta| = q$, are isometries with orthogonal ranges, we have

$$X_q(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* X_q(S_1, \dots, S_n) = \sum_{|\beta|=q} \Phi_\beta(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \Phi_\beta(S_1, \dots, S_n).$$

Now, using the noncommutative von Neumann inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_q(T_1, \dots, T_n)\| &= \left\| \sum_{|\beta|=q} (I_m \otimes T_\beta) \Phi_\beta(T_1, \dots, T_n) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| [I_m \otimes T_\beta : |\beta| = q] \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_\beta(T_1, \dots, T_n) \\ \vdots \\ \Phi_\beta(T_1, \dots, T_n) \end{bmatrix} \right\| \\ &\leq \|[I_m \otimes T_\beta : |\beta| = q]\| \left\| \sum_{|\beta|=q} \Phi_\beta(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \Phi_\beta(S_1, \dots, S_n) \right\|^{1/2} \\ &= \|[T_\beta : |\beta| = q]\| \|X_q(S_1, \dots, S_n)\| \\ &= \|[T_\beta : |\beta| = q]\| \|[F_1, \dots, F_k]\|^q. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{|\beta|=q} F_\beta(T_1, \dots, T_n) F_\beta(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* \right\|^{1/2q} \leq \left\| \sum_{|\beta|=q} T_\beta T_\beta^* \right\|^{1/2q} \|[F_1, \dots, F_k]\|.$$

Taking $q = 1$ or $q \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain the inequality (i). Part (ii) follows in a similar manner if one uses the F_n^∞ -functional calculus for completely non-coisometric row contractions (see [48]).

To prove (iii), let $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ be a completely non-coisometric row contraction with commuting entries. Let $G_j := G_j(B_1, \dots, B_n) \in M_m \otimes W_n^\infty$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, be such that $[G_1, \dots, G_k]$ is a row contraction with $G_j(0) = 0$, $j = 1, \dots, k$. Since $G := [G_1, \dots, G_k] \in M_{m, mk} \otimes W_n^\infty$, according to [53], we have

$$G(I_{\mathbb{C}^{mk}} \otimes B_i) = (I_{\mathbb{C}^m} \otimes B_i) G$$

for any $i = 1, \dots, n$. Using the noncommutative commutant lifting theorem [44] (see also [3]), we find $F(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in M_{m, mk} \otimes F_n^\infty$ with the properties

$$P_{\mathbb{C}^m \otimes F_s^2(H_n)} F(S_1, \dots, S_n) | (\mathbb{C}^{mk} \otimes F_s^2(H_n)) = G(B_1, \dots, B_n)$$

and $\|F(S_1, \dots, S_n)\| = \|G(B_1, \dots, B_n)\|$. Since $G(0) = 0$, we also have $F(0) = 0$. On the other hand, the commutativity of the operators T_1, \dots, T_n implies $F(T_1, \dots, T_n) = G(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. Applying now part (ii) of the theorem to $F(S_1, \dots, S_n)$, we obtain

$$\|G(T_1, \dots, T_n)\| = \|F(T_1, \dots, T_n)\| \leq \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|.$$

Assume now that $G(B_1, \dots, B_n) \in M_m \otimes \mathcal{A}_n^c$ and let $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ be an arbitrary row contraction with commuting entries. Note that $[rT_1, \dots, rT_n]$ is completely non-coisometric for $0 < r < 1$. Therefore, we have

$$\|G(rT_1, \dots, rT_n)\| \leq \|[rT_1, \dots, rT_n]\|.$$

Since $G(rT_1, \dots, rT_n)$ converges in norm to $G(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ as $r \rightarrow 1$, the above inequality implies $\|G(T_1, \dots, T_n)\| \leq \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|$. The proof is complete. \square

Note that in the particular case when $n = m = k = 1$, $\|T\| < 1$, and $f \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ with $f(0) = 0$ and $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1$, we get

$$\|f(T)\| \leq \|T\| \quad \text{and} \quad r(f(T)) \leq r(T).$$

Now we can obtain the following multivariable version of Berger's dilation theorem (see [8]).

Theorem 1.8. *Let $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$. Then $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ if and only if there exists a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and isometries with orthogonal ranges $V_1, \dots, V_n \in B(\mathcal{K})$ such that*

$$T_\sigma = 2P_{\mathcal{H}}V_\sigma|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \text{for any } \sigma \in \mathbb{F}_n^+ \setminus \{g_0\}.$$

Proof. According to the proof of Theorem 1.3, the multi-Toeplitz kernel $\frac{1}{2}K_{T,2} : \mathbb{F}_n^+ \times \mathbb{F}_n^+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is positive definite if and only if the numerical radius $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$. Using the Naimark type dilation theorem of [51], the result follows. \square

Let us point out another proof of Theorem 1.8. According to Arveson's extension theorem [4], the map Ψ of Theorem 1.3 has a completely positive extension $\tilde{\Psi} : C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$. By Stinespring's theorem [60], there exists a representation $\pi : C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$ and an operator $V \in B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ such that $\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\Psi}(x) = V^*\pi(x)V$ for any $x \in C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$. Since $\Psi(I) = 2I$, we have $V^*V = I$. Identifying \mathcal{H} with $V\mathcal{H}$, we get $\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\Psi}(x) = P_{\mathcal{H}}\pi(x)|_{\mathcal{H}}$. In particular, this shows that $T_\sigma = 2P_{\mathcal{H}}\pi(S_\sigma)|_{\mathcal{H}}$, for any $\sigma \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$, $\sigma \neq g_0$. Since $V_i := \pi(S_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are isometries with orthogonal ranges, the result follows.

Corollary 1.9. *Let $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$ be an n -tuple of operators with the numerical radius $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$. Then there is a completely bounded map $\Phi : \mathcal{A}_n + \mathcal{A}_n^* \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that*

$$\Phi(p(S_1, \dots, S_n) + q(S_1, \dots, S_n)^*) = p(T_1, \dots, T_n) + q(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*$$

for any polynomials $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$, and $\|\Phi\|_{cb} \leq 3$. Moreover, the n -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_n) is simultaneously similar to a row contraction.

Proof. Note that Theorem 1.8 implies

$$p(T_1, \dots, T_n) + q(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* = P_{\mathcal{H}}[-(p(0) + \overline{q(0)})I_{\mathcal{K}} + 2(p(V_1, \dots, V_n) + p(V_1, \dots, V_n)^*)]|_{\mathcal{H}}$$

for any polynomials p and q . Using the noncommutative von Neumann inequality (see Corollary 1.6), we deduce that the map Φ is completely bounded and $\|\Phi\|_{cb} \leq 3$. According to Theorem 2.4 of [50] (which uses Paulsen's similarity result [38]) applied to $\Phi|_{\mathcal{A}_n}$, there exists a row contraction $[A_1, \dots, A_n]$ and an invertible operator X such that $T_i = X^{-1}A_iX$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. This completes the proof. \square

According to Corollary 1.9, if $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in \mathcal{A}_n$, then

$$f(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \Phi(f(S_1, \dots, S_n)) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} p_m(T_1, \dots, T_n),$$

where $\{p_m(S_1, \dots, S_n)\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of polynomials in \mathcal{A}_n which converges to $f(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ in the operator norm. Using Theorem 1.8, we have

$$(1.14) \quad f(T_1, \dots, T_n) + f(0)I = 2P_{\mathcal{H}}f(V_1, \dots, V_n)|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Hence, and using the fact that $f(rV_1, \dots, rV_n)$ converges to $f(V_1, \dots, V_n)$ in norm as $r \rightarrow 1$ (see [52]), we deduce that

$$f(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f(rT_1, \dots, rT_n),$$

where the limit exists in the norm topology and

$$f(rT_1, \dots, rT_n) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k a_\alpha T_\alpha$$

for $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} a_\alpha S_\alpha$.

The next result is a multivariable generalization of Berger-Kato-Stampfli mapping theorem (see [9]), to n -tuples of operators.

Theorem 1.10. *If $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$ is an n -tuple of operators with joint numerical radius $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and $F_1, \dots, F_k \in M_m \otimes \mathcal{A}_n$, then*

$$w(F_1(T_1, \dots, T_n), \dots, F_k(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \|[F_1, \dots, F_k]\| + 2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|F_j(0)\|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. First, we prove the result when $m = 1$, $g_j \in \mathcal{A}_n$, $\|[g_1, \dots, g_k]\| \leq 1$, and $g_j(0) = 0$ for any $j = 1, \dots, k$. Let $\mathcal{S} \subset C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ be the operator system defined by

$$\mathcal{S} := \{p(S_1, \dots, S_n) + q(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* : p, q \in \mathcal{P}\}.$$

According to Theorem 1.3, the map $\Psi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$\Psi(p(S_1, \dots, S_n) + q(S_1, \dots, S_n)^*) := p(T_1, \dots, T_n) + q(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* + (p(0) + \overline{q(0)})I$$

is completely positive. Let L_1, \dots, L_k be the left creation operators on the full Fock space $F^2(H_k)$ and let $\mathcal{X} \subset C^*(L_1, \dots, L_k)$ be the operator system defined by

$$\mathcal{X} := \{r(L_1, \dots, L_k) + s(L_1, \dots, L_k)^* : r, s \text{ are polynomials}\}.$$

Given $g_j = g_j(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in \mathcal{A}_n$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, with $\|[g_1, \dots, g_k]\| \leq 1$, define the mapping $\Phi_{g_1, \dots, g_k} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ by setting

$$\Phi_{g_1, \dots, g_k}(r(L_1, \dots, L_k) + s(L_1, \dots, L_k)^*) := r(g_1, \dots, g_k) + s(g_1, \dots, g_k)^*.$$

Using Theorem 1.5, we conclude that the map Φ_{g_1, \dots, g_k} is completely positive. Assume for the moment that $g_j(S_1, \dots, S_n)$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, are polynomials in S_1, \dots, S_n . Notice that $\Psi \circ \Phi_{g_1, \dots, g_k} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is completely positive and, since $g_j(0) = 0$ for any $j = 1, \dots, k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi \circ \Phi_{g_1, \dots, g_k}(r(L_1, \dots, L_k) + s(L_1, \dots, L_k)^*) \\ = r(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) + s(Y_1, \dots, Y_k)^* + (r(0) + \overline{s(0)})I, \end{aligned}$$

where $Y_j := g_j(T_1, \dots, T_n)$, $j = 1, \dots, k$. Since $\Psi \circ \Phi_{g_1, \dots, g_k}$ is completely positive, we can apply Theorem 1.3 to deduce that $w(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \leq 1$. Since the numerical radius is norm continuous, the conclusion remains true for any $g_j(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ in the noncommutative disc algebra \mathcal{A}_n .

Now, for each $j = 1, \dots, k$, define

$$g_j(S_1, \dots, S_n) := \frac{1}{K} (f_j(S_1, \dots, S_n) - f_j(0)I),$$

where $K := \|[f_1, \dots, f_k]\| + \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j(0)|^2\right)^{1/2}$. Notice that $\|[g_1, \dots, g_k]\| \leq 1$ and $g_j(0) = 0$ for any $j = 1, \dots, k$. Applying the first part of the proof to the n -tuple (g_1, \dots, g_k) , we obtain

$$w(f_1(T_1, \dots, T_n) - f_1(0)I, \dots, f_k(T_1, \dots, T_n) - f_k(0)I) \leq K.$$

Taking into account that the joint numerical radius is a norm on $B(\mathcal{H})^{(k)}$, the result follows. The matrix-valued extension of this result follows in a similar manner. The proof is complete. \square

Corollary 1.11. *If $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and $F(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in M_m \otimes \mathcal{A}_n$, $F(0) = 0$, then*

$$w(F(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \|F(S_1, \dots, S_n)\|.$$

Note that if $n = m = 1$, we find again the classical result of Berger-Kato-Stampfli [9], [35]. We recall that the numerical range of an operator $X \in B(\mathcal{H})$ is defined by

$$W(X) := \{\langle Xh, h \rangle : h \in \mathcal{H}, \|h\| = 1\}.$$

Theorem 1.12. *If $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and $f \in \mathcal{A}_n$ with $\operatorname{Re} f \geq 0$, then*

$$\operatorname{Re} W(f(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \geq -\operatorname{Re} f(0).$$

Proof. According to the remarks following Corollary 1.9, we have

$$(1.15) \quad f(T_1, \dots, T_n) + f(0)I = 2P_{\mathcal{H}}f(V_1, \dots, V_n)|_{\mathcal{H}}$$

for some isometries with orthogonal ranges acting on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$. If $0 < r < 1$, then $\|[rV_1, \dots, rV_n]\| < 1$, and according to [44], there is a Hilbert space \mathcal{G} such that \mathcal{K} can be identified with a subspace of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{G} \otimes F^2(H_n)$ and

$$rV_i^* = (I_{\mathcal{G}} \otimes S_i^*)|_{\mathcal{K}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Hence,

$$(1.16) \quad f(rV_1, \dots, rV_n)^* = (I_{\mathcal{G}} \otimes f(S_1, \dots, S_n)^*)|_{\mathcal{K}}.$$

Since $\operatorname{Re} f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \geq 0$, relation (1.16) implies

$$f(rV_1, \dots, rV_n)^* + f(rV_1, \dots, rV_n) \geq 0$$

for $0 < r < 1$. Since

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f(rV_1, \dots, rV_n) = f(V_1, \dots, V_n)$$

in the operator norm, we infer that $\operatorname{Re} f(V_1, \dots, V_n) \geq 0$. Hence and using relation (1.15), we obtain

$$\operatorname{Re} \langle f(T_1, \dots, T_n)h, h \rangle \geq -\operatorname{Re} \langle f(0)h, h \rangle.$$

for any $h \in \mathcal{H}$. The proof is complete. \square

Another consequence of Theorem 1.10, is the following multivariable power inequality.

Corollary 1.13. *If $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$, then*

$$(1.17) \quad w(T_{\alpha} : |\alpha| = k) \leq w(T_1, \dots, T_n)^k$$

for any $k = 1, 2, \dots$

Proof. Since the joint numerical radius is homogeneous, we can assume that $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 1$. Applying Theorem 1.10 to $(S_{\alpha} : |\alpha| = k)$, we obtain

$$w(T_{\alpha} : |\alpha| = k) \leq \|[S_{\alpha} : |\alpha| = k]\| = 1,$$

which completes the proof. \square

We remark that if $n = 1$ we obtain the classical power inequality [8] (originally a conjecture of Halmos). Notice also that if (A_1, \dots, A_n) and (B_1, \dots, B_n) are arbitrary n -tuples of operators then

$$w(A_i B_j : i, j = 1, \dots, n) \leq 4w(A_1, \dots, A_n)w(B_1, \dots, B_n).$$

Indeed, using Theorem 1.1, we deduce that

$$(1.18) \quad \begin{aligned} w(A_i B_j : i, j = 1, \dots, n) &\leq \|[A_i B_j : i, j = 1, \dots, n]\| \\ &\leq \|[A_1, \dots, A_n]\| \|[B_1, \dots, B_n]\| \\ &\leq 2\|[A_1, \dots, A_n]\| w(B_1, \dots, B_n) \\ &\leq 4w(A_1, \dots, A_n)w(B_1, \dots, B_n). \end{aligned}$$

According to Theorem 1.1, we have

$$(1.19) \quad r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|.$$

In what follows we characterize the n -tuples of operators for which equalities in (1.19) occur.

Proposition 1.14. *If $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$, then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|$;
- (ii) $\|[T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k]\| = \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|^k$ for any $k = 1, 2, \dots$;
- (iii) $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|$.

Proof. Using Corollary 1.2, it is easy to deduce that

$$(1.20) \quad r(T_1, \dots, T_n)^k = r(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Consequently, if condition (i) holds, then

$$\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|^k = r(T_1, \dots, T_n)^k = r(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \leq \|[T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k]\|.$$

Since the reverse inequality is always true, we deduce (ii). The implication (ii) \implies (i) follows immediately using the definition of the joint spectral radius. The inequality (1.19) shows that (i) \implies (iii). It remains to prove that (i) \implies (iii). Assume that $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| = 1$. Using Corollary 1.2, we get

$$w\left(\sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes T_i^*\right) = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes T_i^* \right\| = 1.$$

Hence, there is a sequence $\{y_m\} \subset F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ such that $\|y_m\| = 1$ and $\langle (\sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes T_i^*) y_m, y_m \rangle$ converges to 1, as $m \rightarrow \infty$. A standard argument shows that 1 is in the approximate spectrum of $\sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes T_i^*$. Consequently, $r(\sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes T_i^*) = 1$. Using again Corollary 1.2, the result follows. \square

Proposition 1.15. *If $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$, then $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) = r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ if and only if*

$$w(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) = w(T_1, \dots, T_n)^k \quad \text{for any } k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Proof. Assume that $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) = r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. Using relations (1.20) and (1.19), we have

$$w(T_1, \dots, T_n)^k = r(T_1, \dots, T_n)^k = r(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \leq w(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k).$$

Hence and using the power inequality (1.17), we deduce that $w(T_1, \dots, T_n)^k = w(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k)$ for any $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Conversely, assume that the latter equality holds. Using again (1.19), we have

$$w(T_1, \dots, T_n) = w(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k)^{1/k} \leq \|[T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k]\|^{1/k}$$

for any $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Taking $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. The reverse inequality is always true (see (1.19)). This completes the proof. \square

We consider now the case when the n -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_n) has commuting entries.

Theorem 1.16. *Let $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be commuting operators and let $\mathcal{S}_c \subset C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n)$ be the operator system defined by*

$$(1.21) \quad \mathcal{S}_c := \{p(B_1, \dots, B_n) + q(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* : p, q \in \mathcal{P}\},$$

where B_1, \dots, B_n are the creation operators on the symmetric Fock space. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$;
- (ii) The map $\Psi_c : \mathcal{S}_c \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$\Psi_c(p(B_1, \dots, B_n) + q(B_1, \dots, B_n)^*) := p(T_1, \dots, T_n) + q(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* + (p(0) + \overline{q(0)})I$$

is completely positive.

- (iii) There is a Hilbert space $\mathcal{G} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and a $*$ -representation $\pi : C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{G})$ such that

$$T_\alpha = 2P_{\mathcal{H}}\pi(B_\alpha)|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \text{for any } \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+ \setminus \{g_0\}.$$

Proof. Assume that $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$. According to the proof of Theorem 1.3, the multi-Toeplitz kernel $\frac{1}{2}K_{T,2} : \mathbb{F}_n^+ \times \mathbb{F}_n^+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$\frac{1}{2}K_{T,2}(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}T_{\beta \setminus \alpha} & \text{if } \beta > \alpha \\ I & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \\ \frac{1}{2}T_{\alpha \setminus \beta}^* & \text{if } \alpha > \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

is positive definite. Since T_1, \dots, T_n are commuting operators, according to Theorem 3.3 of [57], there exists a completely positive linear map $\Phi : C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\Phi(I) = I$ and

$$\Phi(B_\sigma) = \frac{1}{2}T_\sigma, \quad \sigma \in \mathbb{F}_n^+ \setminus \{g_0\}.$$

According to Stinespring's theorem (see [60]), there exists a Hilbert space $\mathcal{G} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and a $*$ -representation $\pi : C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that (iii) holds.

Assume now (iii) and let $W_i := \pi(B_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since $[W_1, \dots, W_n]$ is a row contraction, there exists a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \supseteq \mathcal{G}$ and $V_1, \dots, V_n \in B(\mathcal{K})$ isometries with orthogonal ranges such that $W_\alpha^* = V_\alpha^*|_{\mathcal{K}}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Since $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, (iii) implies $T_\alpha = 2P_{\mathcal{H}}V_\alpha|_{\mathcal{H}}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Using Theorem 1.8, we deduce that $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$, therefore (iii) \implies (i). Now we show that (iii) \implies (ii). Notice that (iii) implies

$$\begin{aligned} p(T_1, \dots, T_n) + q(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* + (p(0) + \overline{q(0)})I \\ = 2P_{\mathcal{H}}\pi[p(B_1, \dots, B_n) + q(B_1, \dots, B_n)^*]|_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

This clearly implies (ii). To prove that (ii) \implies (i), note that there is a completely positive linear map $\gamma : C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n) \rightarrow C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n)$ such that $\gamma(S_\alpha S_\beta^*) = B_\alpha B_\beta^*$ (see [52]). Since the map $\Psi_c \circ \gamma$ is completely positive and $(\Psi_c \circ \gamma)|_{\mathcal{S}} = \Psi$, where \mathcal{S} and Ψ are defined in Theorem 1.3, the latter theorem implies $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$. The proof is complete. \square

Remark 1.17. *If T_1, \dots, T_n are commuting operators, then ‘‘commutative’’ versions of Corollary 1.9, Theorem 1.10, Corollary 1.11, and Theorem 1.12 hold true, if we replace the noncommutative disc algebra \mathcal{A}_n with its commutative version \mathcal{A}_n^c . The proofs are exactly the same but one uses Theorem 1.16.*

2. EUCLIDEAN OPERATOR RADIUS

In this section we present basic properties of the *euclidean operator radius* of an n -tuple of operators (T_1, \dots, T_n) , defined by

$$w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle T_i h, h \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

in connection with the joint numerical radius and several other operator radii. We define a new norm and “spectral radius” on $B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$ by setting

$$(2.1) \quad \|(T_1, \dots, T_n)\|_e := \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} \|\lambda_1 T_1 + \dots + \lambda_n T_n\|$$

and

$$(2.2) \quad r_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} r(\lambda_1 T_1 + \dots + \lambda_n T_n),$$

where $r(X)$ denotes the usual spectral radius of an operator $X \in B(\mathcal{H})$. Notice that $\|\cdot\|_e$ is a norm on $B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$,

$$\|(T_1, \dots, T_n)\|_e = \|(T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*)\|_e, \quad \text{and} \quad r_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) = r_e(T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*).$$

In what follows we show that $\|\cdot\|_e$ is equivalent to the operator norm on $B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$.

Theorem 2.1. *If $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$, then*

$$(2.3) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| \leq \|(T_1, \dots, T_n)\|_e \leq \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|,$$

where the constants $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ and 1 are the best possible, and

$$(2.4) \quad r_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq r(T_1, \dots, T_n).$$

Proof. Let σ be the rotation-invariant normalized positive Borel measure on the unit sphere $\partial\mathbb{B}_n$. Using the relations (see [59])

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_n} |\lambda_i|^2 d\sigma(\lambda) = \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_n} \lambda_i \bar{\lambda}_j d\sigma(\lambda) = 0 \quad \text{if } i \neq j, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n,$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(T_1, \dots, T_n)\|_e^2 &= \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left\langle \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i T_i \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{\lambda}_j T_j^* \right) h, h \right\rangle \\ &\geq \sup_{\|h\|=1} \int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_n} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \lambda_i \bar{\lambda}_j \langle T_i T_j^* h, h \rangle d\sigma(\lambda) \\ &= \sup_{\|h\|=1} \frac{1}{n} \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* h, h \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(T_1, \dots, T_n)\|_e &= \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} \|\lambda_1 T_1 + \dots + \lambda_n T_n\| \\ &\leq \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\|^{1/2} \\ &= \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|. \end{aligned}$$

Now, notice that if S_1, \dots, S_n are the left creation operators, then

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|[S_1^*, \dots, S_n^*]\| \leq \|[S_1^*, \dots, S_n^*]\|_e \\ &= \|[S_1, \dots, S_n]\|_e \leq \|[S_1, \dots, S_n]\| = 1. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the inequalities (2.3) are best possible.

To prove inequality (2.4), notice that

$$\begin{aligned} r_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) &= \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} \inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i T_i \right)^m \right\|^{1/m} \\ &\leq \inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\lambda}_i T_i^* \right)^m \right\|^{1/m} \\ &\leq \inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} \left[\left(\sum_{|\alpha|=m} |\lambda_\alpha|^2 \right)^{1/2m} \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=m} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/2m} \right] \\ &\leq \inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=m} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/2m} \\ &= r(T_1, \dots, T_n). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the inequality (2.4) is strict in general. For example, we have $r(S_1^*, \dots, S_n^*) = \sqrt{n}$ and $r_e(S_1^*, \dots, S_n^*) = r_e(S_1, \dots, S_n) = 1$. Therefore, $r_e(S_1^*, \dots, S_n^*) < r(S_1^*, \dots, S_n^*)$ if $n \geq 2$. On the other hand, we have equality in (2.4) if $T_i = S_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Indeed, $r_e(S_1, \dots, S_n) = r(S_1, \dots, S_n) = 1$. This completes the proof. \square

The next result summarizes some of the basic properties of the euclidean operator radius of an n -tuple of operators.

Theorem 2.2. *The euclidean operator radius $w_e : B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ for n -tuples of operators satisfies the following properties:*

- (i) $w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0$ if and only if $T_1 = \dots = T_n = 0$;
- (ii) $w_e(\lambda T_1, \dots, \lambda T_n) = |\lambda| w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$;
- (iii) $w_e(T_1 + T'_1, \dots, T_n + T'_n) \leq w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) + w_e(T'_1, \dots, T'_n)$;
- (iv) $w_e(U^* T_1 U, \dots, U^* T_n U) = w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any unitary operator $U : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$;
- (v) $w_e(X^* T_1 X, \dots, X^* T_n X) \leq \|X\|^2 w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any operator $X : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$;
- (vi) $\frac{1}{2} \|(T_1, \dots, T_n)\|_e \leq w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \|(T_1, \dots, T_n)\|_e$;
- (vii) $r_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n)$;
- (viii) $w_e(I_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes T_1, \dots, I_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes T_n) = w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any separable Hilbert space \mathcal{E} ;
- (ix) w_e is a continuous map in the norm topology.

Proof. The first five properties can be easily deduced using the definition of w_e . Now, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) &= \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle T_i h, h \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \sup_{\|h\|=1} \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \langle T_i h, h \rangle \right| \\ &= \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left| \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i T_i h, h \right\rangle \right| \\ &= \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} w(\lambda_1 T_1 + \dots + \lambda_n T_n). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$(2.6) \quad w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} w(\lambda_1 T_1 + \dots + \lambda_n T_n).$$

It is well known that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|X\| \leq w(X) \leq \|X\| \quad \text{and} \quad r(X) \leq \|X\|$$

for any $X \in B(\mathcal{H})$. Applying these inequalities to the operator $X := \lambda_1 T_1 + \dots + \lambda_n T_n$ for $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$, and using relation (2.6), we deduce (vi) and (vii).

To prove (viii), we use relation (2.6) and the fact that the classical numerical radius satisfies the equation $w(I_{\mathcal{G}} \otimes X) = w(X)$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_e(I_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes T_1, \dots, I_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes T_n) &= \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} w \left(I_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i T_i \right) \\ &= \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} w \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i T_i \right) \\ &= w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n). \end{aligned}$$

According to (vi) and Theorem 2.1, we obtain

$$w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\|^{1/2}.$$

Hence, we deduce that w_e is continuous in the norm topology. The proof is complete. \square

Corollary 2.3. *If $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$, then*

$$w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} w(\lambda_1 T_1 + \dots + \lambda_n T_n).$$

The next result shows that the euclidean operator radius is equivalent to the operator norm and the joint numerical radius on $B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$.

Proposition 2.4. *If $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$, then*

$$(2.7) \quad w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \text{ and}$$

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| \leq w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|.$$

Moreover, the inequalities are sharp.

Proof. Given $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$, define the vector $z_\lambda \in F^2(H_n)$ by setting

$$(2.9) \quad z_\lambda := \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \|\lambda\|^2}} \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \bar{\lambda}_\alpha e_\alpha \right).$$

We remark that $S_i^* z_\lambda = \bar{\lambda}_i z_\lambda$ for any $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $\|z_\lambda\| = 1$. For any vector $h \in \mathcal{H}$, $\|h\| = 1$, and $\lambda \in \mathbb{B}_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n (S_i \otimes T_i^*)(z_\lambda \otimes h), z_\lambda \otimes h \right\rangle &= \sum_{i=1}^n \langle z_\lambda \otimes h, \bar{\lambda}_i z_\lambda \otimes T_i h \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \langle h, T_i h \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|z_\lambda \otimes h\| = 1$ and $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) = w(S_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + S_n \otimes T_n^*)$, we infer that

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \langle h, T_i h \rangle \right| \leq w(T_1, \dots, T_n).$$

Hence, we deduce that

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\langle T_i h, h \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq w(T_1, \dots, T_n).$$

Taking now the supremum over all $h \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|h\| = 1$, we obtain inequality (2.7). Note that we have equality in (2.7) if $T_i = S_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Indeed $w_e(S_1, \dots, S_n) = w(S_1, \dots, S_n) = 1$ (see Theorem 3.4). On the other hand, the inequality (2.7) is strict if $T_i = S_i^*$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. More precisely, we have

$$\sqrt{n} = r(S_1^*, \dots, S_n^*) \leq w(S_1^*, \dots, S_n^*) > w_e(S_1^*, \dots, S_n^*) = w_e(S_1, \dots, S_n) = 1.$$

Combining inequality (vi) of Theorem 2.2 with inequality (2.3), we obtain (2.8). Notice also that

$$w_e(S_1, \dots, S_n) = \|[S_1, \dots, S_n]\| = 1.$$

On the other hand, here is an example when we have equality in the first inequality of (2.8). Take $T_i := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} S^{(2)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $S^{(2)} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. It is easy to see that $\|S^{(2)}\| = 1$ and $w(S^{(2)}) = \frac{1}{2}$. We also have

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| = \frac{1}{2} \|S^{(2)}\| = \frac{1}{2}.$$

and

$$w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} w_e(S^{(2)}, \dots, S^{(2)}) = w(S^{(2)}) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Combining inequalities (2.7), (2.8), and using Theorem 1.1 part (vi), we deduce that the euclidean operator radius is equivalent to the joint numerical radius. We obtain

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq w(T_1, \dots, T_n).$$

Now, we can prove the following von Neumann type inequality for the numerical range.

Theorem 2.5. *If $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$, then*

$$w(p(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \|p\|_2 \left(\frac{1 - w(T_1, \dots, T_n)^{2(m+1)}}{1 - w(T_1, \dots, T_n)^2} \right)^{1/2}$$

for any polynomial $p = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} a_\alpha e_\alpha$ in $F^2(H_n)$.

Proof. According to Proposition 2.4, we have

$$(2.10) \quad \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} |\langle T_\alpha h, h \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} = w_e(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \leq w(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k)$$

for $1 \leq k \leq m$. On the other hand, the joint numerical radius is a norm (see Theorem 1.1). Consequently, using (2.10), the multivariable power inequality (1.17), and applying Cauchy's inequality

twice, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
w(p(T_1, \dots, T_n)) &\leq \sum_{k=0}^m w\left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} a_\alpha T_\alpha\right) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^m \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} a_\alpha \langle T_\alpha h, h \rangle \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^m \left[\left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} |a_\alpha|^2 \right)^{1/2} \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} |\langle T_\alpha h, h \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^m \left[\left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} |a_\alpha|^2 \right)^{1/2} w(T_\alpha : |\alpha|=k) \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^m \left[\left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} |a_\alpha|^2 \right)^{1/2} w(T_1, \dots, T_n)^k \right] \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} |a_\alpha|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{k=0}^m w(T_1, \dots, T_n)^{2k} \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Theorem 2.5 and the \mathcal{A}_n -functional calculus for n -tuples of operators with joint numerical radius $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) < 1$ (see Section 1) can be used to deduce the following result.

Corollary 2.6. *If $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$, $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) < 1$, and $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in \mathcal{A}_n$, then*

$$w(f(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - w(T_1, \dots, T_n)^2}} \|f\|_2,$$

where $\|f\|_2 := \|f(S_1, \dots, S_n)(1)\|$. Moreover, if $f(0) = 0$, then

$$w(f(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \frac{w(T_1, \dots, T_n)}{\sqrt{1 - w(T_1, \dots, T_n)^2}} \|f\|_2.$$

Notice that these inequalities are quite different from the multivariable Berger-Kato-Stampfli type inequality obtained in Section 1 (see Corollary 1.11).

3. JOINT NUMERICAL RANGE AND SPECTRUM

The joint (spatial) numerical range of an n -tuple of operators $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$ is the subset of \mathbb{C}^n defined by

$$W(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \{(\langle T_1 h, h \rangle, \dots, \langle T_n h, h \rangle) : h \in \mathcal{H}, \|h\| = 1\}.$$

There is a large literature relating to the classical numerical range ($n = 1$). For general proprieties, we refer to [29], [12], [13], and [27]. In this section we study the joint numerical range of an n -tuple of operators (T_1, \dots, T_n) in connection with unitary invariants such as the *right spectrum* $\sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$, the joint numerical radius $w(T_1, \dots, T_n)$, the euclidean operator radius $w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n)$, and the *joint spectral radius* $r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. On the other hand, we obtain an analogue of Toeplitz-Hausdorff theorem ([65], [31]) on the convexity of the spatial numerical range of an operator on a Hilbert space, for the joint numerical range of operators in the noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebra F_n^∞ .

We recall that the joint right spectrum $\sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ of an n -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_n) of operators in $B(\mathcal{H})$ is the set of all n -tuples $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ of complex numbers such that the right ideal of $B(\mathcal{H})$

generated by the operators $\lambda_1 I - T_1, \dots, \lambda_n I - T_n$ does not contain the identity operator. Notice that the joint left spectrum $\sigma_l(T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*)$ is the complex conjugate of $\sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. We should mention the connection between the joint right spectrum of an n -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_n) and the solutions of linear equations of the form

$$(3.1) \quad T_1 x_1 + T_2 x_2 + \dots + T_n x_n = y,$$

where $y \in \mathcal{H}$ is a given vector. Notice that if $(0, \dots, 0) \notin \sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ then the equation (3.1) has solutions in \mathcal{H} .

For each $r > 0$, define

$$(\mathbb{C}^n)_r := \{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n : |\lambda_1|^2 + \dots + |\lambda_n|^2 < r^2\}$$

and let $\mathbb{B}_n := (\mathbb{C}^n)_1$ be the open unit ball of \mathbb{C}^n .

Theorem 3.1. *If $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$, then*

- (i) $\sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \subseteq \overline{W(T_1, \dots, T_n)} \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n)} \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{w(T_1, \dots, T_n)} \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|}$;
- (ii) $\sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{r(T_1, \dots, T_n)} \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{w(T_1, \dots, T_n)}$;
- (iii) $\sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is a compact subset of \mathbb{C}^n .

Proof. First we prove that $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \notin \sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ if and only if there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(3.2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \|(\bar{\lambda}_i I - T_i^*)h\|^2 \geq \delta \|h\|^2 \quad \text{for any } h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Assume that $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \notin \sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. Then there exist some operators $X_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i(\bar{\lambda}_i I - T_i^*) = I$. Therefore, at least one of the operators X_i is different from zero and

$$\|h\| \leq \|[X_1, \dots, X_n]\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|(\bar{\lambda}_i I - T_i^*)h\|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

which proves (3.2). Conversely, assume that inequality (3.2) holds for some $\delta > 0$. Then $AA^* \geq CC^*$, where $A := [\lambda_1 I - T_1, \dots, \lambda_n I - T_n]$ and $C := \sqrt{\delta}I$. Applying Douglas factorization theorem [20], we find a contraction $X : \overline{A^* \mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that $XA^* = C^*$. Extend X to an operator $\tilde{X} : \oplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ by setting $\tilde{X}k = 0$ if $k \in (A^* \mathcal{H})^\perp$. Since $\tilde{X} = [\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n]$ for some operators $\tilde{X}_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, the equation $\tilde{X}A^* = C^*$ implies $\sum_{i=1}^n (\lambda_i I - T_i)\tilde{X}_i^* = \sqrt{\delta}I$, which shows that $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \notin \sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$.

Now let us show that $\sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \subseteq \overline{W(T_1, \dots, T_n)}$. Notice that if $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$, then (3.2) implies that there exists a sequence of vectors $\{h_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ with $\|h_m\| = 1$ and such that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \|(\bar{\lambda}_i I - T_i^*)h_m\|^2 = 0.$$

Hence, we deduce that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\bar{\lambda}_i I - T_i^*)h_m, h_m \rangle = 0$ and therefore $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \langle T_i h_m, h_m \rangle = \lambda_i$ for any $i = 1, \dots, n$. This shows that $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \overline{W(T_1, \dots, T_n)}$.

The second inclusion in (i) is due to the definition of w_e , and the third (resp. fourth) inclusion is due to Proposition 2.4 (resp. Theorem 1.1 part (vii)). Now let us prove the inclusions of part (ii). Let $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. Since the left ideal of $B(\mathcal{H})$ generated by the operators $T_1^* - \bar{\lambda}_1 I, \dots, T_n^* - \bar{\lambda}_n I$ does not contain the identity, there is a pure state μ on $B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\mu(X(T_i^* - \bar{\lambda}_i I)) = 0$ for any $X \in B(\mathcal{H})$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$. In particular, we have $\mu(T_i) = \lambda_i = \overline{\mu(T_i^*)}$ and

$$\mu(T_\alpha T_\alpha^*) = \bar{\lambda}_\alpha \mu(T_\alpha) = |\lambda_\alpha|^2, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+.$$

Hence, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} &= \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=m} |\lambda_\alpha|^2 \right)^{1/2m} = \left| \mu \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=m} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right) \right|^{1/2m} \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=m} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/2m} \leq r(T_1, \dots, T_n). \end{aligned}$$

The last inclusion in (ii) is due to Theorem 1.1 part (viii). To prove (iii), it is enough to show that $\sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is a closed subset of \mathbb{C}^n . Let $\{(\lambda_1^{(m)}, \dots, \lambda_n^{(m)})\}_{m=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of vectors in $\sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_i^{(m)} = \lambda_i$, $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}$, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. Assume that $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \notin \sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ and choose m large enough such that

$$\gamma := \delta - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i^{(m)} - \lambda_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} > 0.$$

Using inequality (3.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left\| (\bar{\lambda}_i^{(m)} I - T_i^*) h \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} &\geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left\| (\bar{\lambda}_i I - T_i^*) h \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i - \lambda_i^{(m)}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \|h\| \\ &\geq \gamma \|h\| \end{aligned}$$

for any $h \in \mathcal{H}$. This shows that $(\lambda_1^{(m)}, \dots, \lambda_n^{(m)}) \notin \sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, we must have $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. The proof is complete. \square

From the proof of Theorem 3.1, we can deduce the following characterization for the right spectrum of an n -tuple of operators.

Corollary 3.2. *If $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$, then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \notin \sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$;
- (ii) *there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n (\lambda_i I - T_i)(\bar{\lambda}_i I - T_i^*) \geq \delta I$;*
- (iii) $(\lambda_1 I - T_1)B(\mathcal{H}) + \dots + (\lambda_n I - T_n)B(\mathcal{H}) = B(\mathcal{H})$.

Another consequence of Theorem 3.1 is the following result.

Corollary 3.3. *If $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in W(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ and*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i|^2 = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\|,$$

then $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$.

Proof. Since $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in W(T_1, \dots, T_n)$, there is $h \in \mathcal{H}$, $\|h\| = 1$, such that $\lambda_i = \langle T_i h, h \rangle$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\| &= \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n |\langle T_i h, h \rangle|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|T_i h\|^2 \|h\|^2 \leq \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* h, h \right\rangle \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we must have

$$|\langle T_i h, h \rangle| = \|T_i h\| \|h\|, \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

which implies $T_i^* h = \mu_i h$ for some $\mu_i \in \mathbb{C}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. On the other hand, we have

$$\bar{\lambda}_i = \langle T_i^* h, h \rangle = \langle \mu_i h, h \rangle = \mu_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Therefore, $T_i^* h = \bar{\lambda}_i h$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Now, Corollary 3.2 implies $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. The proof is complete. \square

Notice that if the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is finite dimensional and $w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \|\sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^*\|^{1/2}$, then Corollary 3.3 implies $\sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \neq \emptyset$.

We remark that the spectral inclusion of Theorem 3.1 part (i) enables us to locate the right spectrum of the sum of two n -tuples of operators. More precisely, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_r(T_1 + T'_1, \dots, T_n + T'_n) &\subseteq \overline{W(T_1 + T'_1, \dots, T_n + T'_n)} \\ &\subseteq \overline{W(T_1, \dots, T_n) + W(T'_1, \dots, T'_n)} \\ &\subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)_{w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) + w_e(T'_1, \dots, T'_n)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume now that $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$ are mutually commuting operators. Let \mathcal{B} be a closed subalgebra of $B(\mathcal{H})$ containing T_1, \dots, T_n , and the identity. Denote by $\sigma(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ the Harte spectrum, i.e., $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \sigma(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ if and only if

$$(\lambda_1 I - T_1)X_1 + \dots + (\lambda_n I - T_n)X_n \neq I$$

for all $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathcal{B}$. According to [37], the joint numerical radius has the following property;

$$r(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \max\{\|(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)\|_2 : (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \sigma(T_1, \dots, T_n)\}.$$

Hence, and using Theorem 1.1 part (vii), we deduce that

$$(3.3) \quad \sigma(T_1, \dots, T_n) \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)_{r(T_1, \dots, T_n)}} \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)_{w(T_1, \dots, T_n)}}.$$

In what follows, we calculate the joint right spectrum and joint numerical range for certain classes of n -tuples of operators.

Theorem 3.4. *Let (V_1, \dots, V_n) be an n -tuple of operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{K} .*

(i) *If V_1, \dots, V_n are isometries with orthogonal ranges, then $V_1 V_1^* + \dots + V_n V_n^* \neq I$ if and only if*

$$\sigma_r(V_1, \dots, V_n) = \overline{W(V_1, \dots, V_n)} = \overline{\mathbb{B}_n}.$$

(ii) *If $V_1 V_1^* + \dots + V_n V_n^* = I$, then $\sigma_r(V_1, \dots, V_n) \subseteq \partial \mathbb{B}_n$ and $w(V_1, \dots, V_n) = 1$.*

In particular, if S_1, \dots, S_n are the left creation operators on the Fock space $F^2(H_n)$, then

$$\sigma_r(S_1, \dots, S_n) = \overline{W(S_1, \dots, S_n)} = \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)_{w_e(S_1, \dots, S_n)}} = \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)_{w(S_1, \dots, S_n)}} = \overline{\mathbb{B}_n}.$$

Proof. According to the Wold decomposition for isometries with orthogonal ranges [44], the Hilbert space \mathcal{K} admits an orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_s \oplus \mathcal{K}_c$ such that $\mathcal{K}_s, \mathcal{K}_c$ are reducing subspaces for each isometry V_1, \dots, V_n , the row isometry $[V_1|_{\mathcal{K}_s}, \dots, V_n|_{\mathcal{K}_s}]$ is unitarily equivalent to $[S_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}}, \dots, S_n \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}}]$ for some Hilbert space \mathcal{G} , and $[V_1|_{\mathcal{K}_c}, \dots, V_n|_{\mathcal{K}_c}]$ is a Cuntz row isometry, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^n (V_i|_{\mathcal{K}_c})(V_i|_{\mathcal{K}_c})^* = I_{\mathcal{K}_c}$. Notice that $V_1 V_1^* + \dots + V_n V_n^* \neq I$ if and only if $\mathcal{G} \neq \{0\}$.

According to the proof of Theorem 3.1, given $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$, we have $S_i^* z_\lambda = \bar{\lambda}_i z_\lambda$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, where z_λ is defined by (2.9). Therefore, if $h \in \mathcal{G}$, $\|h\| = 1$, then

$$\langle (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}})(z_\lambda \otimes h), z_\lambda \otimes h \rangle = \langle z_\lambda \otimes h, \bar{\lambda}_i z_\lambda \otimes h \rangle = \lambda_i$$

for any $i = 1, \dots, n$. This shows that

$$\mathbb{B}_n \subseteq W(S_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}}, \dots, S_n \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}}) \subseteq W(V_1, \dots, V_n).$$

Since $\|[V_1, \dots, V_n]\| = 1$, Theorem 3.1 implies $\overline{W(V_1, \dots, V_n)} = \overline{\mathbb{B}_n}$. To complete the proof of part (i), it is enough to prove that $\mathbb{B}_n \subseteq \sigma_r(V_1, \dots, V_n)$. To this end, let $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$ and $h \in \mathcal{G}$ with $\|h\| = 1$. Using the above-mentioned Wold type decomposition, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|(\overline{\lambda}_i I_{\mathcal{K}} - V_i^*)(z_\lambda \otimes h)\|^2 = 0.$$

Due to Corollary 3.2, we deduce that $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \sigma_r(V_1, \dots, V_n)$.

To prove part (ii), fix $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$. Since

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i V_i^* \right\| \leq \|\lambda\|_2 \|[V_1, \dots, V_n]\| = \|\lambda\|_2,$$

we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\overline{\lambda}_i V_i^* + \lambda_i V_i) \leq 2\|\lambda\|_2.$$

Using this inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n (\lambda_i I_{\mathcal{K}} - V_i)(\overline{\lambda}_i I_{\mathcal{K}} - V_i^*) &= \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i|^2 I_{\mathcal{K}} - \sum_{i=1}^n (\overline{\lambda}_i V_i^* + \lambda_i V_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n V_i V_i^* \\ &\geq (\|\lambda\|_2^2 - 2\|\lambda\|_2 + 1) I_{\mathcal{K}} = (1 - \|\lambda\|_2)^2 I_{\mathcal{K}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\lambda\|_2 \neq 1$, Corollary 3.2 implies $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \notin \sigma_r(V_1, \dots, V_n)$. Using part (i) of Theorem 3.1, we deduce that $\sigma_r(V_1, \dots, V_n) \subseteq \partial \mathbb{B}_n$.

To prove that $w(V_1, \dots, V_n) = 1$, notice that the operator $Z := \sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes V_i^*$ is a nonunitary isometry. Applying part (ii) of this theorem (in the particular case of a single isometry) to Z , we deduce that $w(V_1, \dots, V_n) = w(Z) = 1$.

The particular case when S_1, \dots, S_n are the left creation operators follows from part (i) of this theorem and Theorem 3.1 (part (i) and (ii)). The proof is complete. \square

We established a strong connection between the algebra F_n^∞ and the function theory on the open unit ball

$$\mathbb{B}_n := \{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n : |\lambda_1|^2 + \dots + |\lambda_n|^2 < 1\},$$

through the noncommutative von Neumann inequality [47] (see also [48], [50], [52], and [53]). In particular, we proved that there is a completely contractive homomorphism $\Phi : F_n^\infty \rightarrow H^\infty(\mathbb{B}_n)$ defined by

$$[\Phi(f(S_1, \dots, S_n))](\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = f(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$ and $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$. A characterization of the analytic functions in the range of the map Φ was obtained in [3], and independently in [17]. Moreover, it was proved that the quotient $F_n^\infty / \ker \Phi$ is an operator algebra which can be identified with $W_n^\infty := P_{F_s^2(H_n)} F_n^\infty |_{F_s^2(H_n)}$, the compression of F_n^∞ to the symmetric Fock space $F_s^2(H_n) \subset F^2(H_n)$.

It is well-known that the joint numerical range of an n -tuple of operators is not convex in general if $n \geq 2$. The only known exceptions are in the commutative case, when T_1, \dots, T_n are either bounded analytic operators or double commuting operators (see [19]). In what follows, we show that there are important classes of noncommuting operators for which the joint numerical range or its closure are convex.

If $f_i \in F_n^\infty$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, we denote by $\sigma_r(f_1, \dots, f_k)$ the right joint spectrum with respect to the noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebra F_n^∞ .

Theorem 3.5. *Let (f_1, \dots, f_k) be a k -tuple of operators in the noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebra F_n^∞ . Then the following properties hold:*

- (i) $W(P_{\mathcal{P}_m} f_1 |_{\mathcal{P}_m}, \dots, P_{\mathcal{P}_m} f_k |_{\mathcal{P}_m})$ is a convex compact subset of \mathbb{C}^k , where \mathcal{P}_m is the set of all polynomials in $F^2(H_n)$ of degree $\leq m$;
- (ii) $\overline{W(f_1, \dots, f_k)}$ is a convex compact subset of \mathbb{C}^k ;

(iii) $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \notin \sigma_r(f_1, \dots, f_k)$ if and only if there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(\lambda_1 I - f_1)(\bar{\lambda}_1 I - f_1^*) + \dots + (\lambda_k I - f_k)(\bar{\lambda}_k I - f_k^*) \geq \delta^2 I;$$

(iv) $\sigma_r(f_1, \dots, f_k)$ is a compact subset of \mathbb{C}^k and

$$\{(f_1(\lambda), \dots, f_k(\lambda)) : \lambda \in \mathbb{B}_n\}^- \subseteq \sigma_r(f_1, \dots, f_k) \subseteq \overline{W(f_1, \dots, f_k)}.$$

Proof. We recall that the flipping operator $U \in B(F^2(H_n))$ is defined by setting $U(1) = 1$ and $U(e_\alpha) = e_{\tilde{\alpha}}$, where $\tilde{\alpha} := g_{i_m} \cdots g_{i_2} g_{i_1}$ is the reverse of $\alpha := g_{i_1} g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_m}$. If $f = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} a_\alpha e_\alpha$ is a vector in $F^2(H_n)$, we denote $\tilde{f} := \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} a_\alpha e_{\tilde{\alpha}}$. Now, let $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_m$ such that $\|p\|_2 = \|q\|_2 = 1$, and let $t \in (0, 1)$. For each $j = 1, \dots, k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t \langle f_j(S_1, \dots, S_n)p, p \rangle + (1-t) \langle f_j(S_1, \dots, S_n)q, q \rangle &= t \langle \tilde{p} \otimes \tilde{f}_j, \tilde{p} \rangle + (1-t) \langle \tilde{q} \otimes \tilde{f}_j, \tilde{q} \rangle \\ &= t \langle \tilde{f}_j, \tilde{p}(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \tilde{p}(S_1, \dots, S_n)(1) \rangle + (1-t) \langle \tilde{f}_j, \tilde{q}(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \tilde{q}(S_1, \dots, S_n)(1) \rangle \\ &= \langle \tilde{f}_j, [t\tilde{p}(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \tilde{p}(S_1, \dots, S_n) + (1-t)\tilde{q}(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \tilde{q}(S_1, \dots, S_n)](1) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Define the operator $X \in B(F^2(H_n))$ by setting

$$X := t\tilde{p}(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \tilde{p}(S_1, \dots, S_n) + (1-t)\tilde{q}(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \tilde{q}(S_1, \dots, S_n)$$

and notice that $U^* X U$ is a positive multi-Toeplitz operator. Applying Theorem 1.6 from [49] to $U^* X U$, we find a polynomial $s \in \mathcal{P}_m$ such that

$$U^* X U = \tilde{s}(R_1, \dots, R_n)^* \tilde{s}(R_1, \dots, R_n),$$

where R_1, \dots, R_n are the right creation operators on the full Fock space $F^2(H_n)$. Notice also that

$$\begin{aligned} \|s\|_2^2 &= \langle \tilde{s}(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \tilde{s}(S_1, \dots, S_n)(1), 1 \rangle \\ &= \langle [t\tilde{p}(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \tilde{p}(S_1, \dots, S_n) + (1-t)\tilde{q}(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \tilde{q}(S_1, \dots, S_n)](1), 1 \rangle \\ &= t\|p\|_2^2 + (1-t)\|q\|_2^2 = 1. \end{aligned}$$

The above calculations reveal that

$$\begin{aligned} t \langle f_j(S_1, \dots, S_n)p, p \rangle + (1-t) \langle f_j(S_1, \dots, S_n)q, q \rangle &= \langle \tilde{f}_j, U^* \tilde{s}(R_1, \dots, R_n)^* \tilde{s}(R_1, \dots, R_n)U(1) \rangle \\ &= \langle \tilde{f}_j, \tilde{s}(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \tilde{s}(S_1, \dots, S_n)(1) \rangle \\ &= \langle \tilde{s} \otimes \tilde{f}_j, \tilde{s} \rangle = \langle f_j \otimes s, s \rangle \\ &= \langle f_j(S_1, \dots, S_n)s, s \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

for any $j = 1, \dots, k$. This shows that the joint numerical range of the n -tuple $(P_{\mathcal{P}_m} f_1 |_{\mathcal{P}_m}, \dots, P_{\mathcal{P}_m} f_k |_{\mathcal{P}_m})$ is convex.

Now, we prove (ii). Let $\phi, \psi \in F^2(H_n)$ be such that $\|\phi\|_2 = \|\psi\|_2 = 1$, and define the vectors

$$\phi_m := \frac{1}{\|P_{\mathcal{P}_m} \phi\|} P_{\mathcal{P}_m} \phi \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_m := \frac{1}{\|P_{\mathcal{P}_m} \psi\|} P_{\mathcal{P}_m} \psi.$$

Notice that $\phi_m, \psi_m \in \mathcal{P}_m$ and $\|\phi_m\|_2 = \|\psi_m\|_2 = 1$ for any $m = 1, 2, \dots$. Moreover, it is clear that $\|\phi_m - \phi\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\psi_m - \psi\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. According to (i), there exist polynomials $s_m \in \mathcal{P}_m$ with $\|s_m\|_2 = 1$ such that

$$t \langle f_j(S_1, \dots, S_n)\phi_m, \phi_m \rangle + (1-t) \langle f_j(S_1, \dots, S_n)\psi_m, \psi_m \rangle = \langle f_j(S_1, \dots, S_n)s_m, s_m \rangle$$

for any $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $m = 1, 2, \dots$. Taking $m \rightarrow \infty$, we deduce that

$$t \langle f_j(S_1, \dots, S_n)\phi, \phi \rangle + (1-t) \langle f_j(S_1, \dots, S_n)\psi, \psi \rangle = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_j(S_1, \dots, S_n)s_m, s_m \rangle$$

for any $j = 1, \dots, k$. Therefore

$$(3.4) \quad \text{conv } W(f_1, \dots, f_k) \subseteq \overline{W(f_1, \dots, f_k)}.$$

Now, let $\lambda, \mu \in \overline{W(f_1, \dots, f_k)}$ and let $\{\lambda^{(m)}\}_{m=1}^\infty, \{\mu^{(m)}\}_{m=1}^\infty$ be sequences of vectors in $W(f_1, \dots, f_k)$ such that $\lambda^{(m)} \rightarrow \lambda$ and $\mu^{(m)} \rightarrow \mu$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Using relation (3.4), we deduce that

$$t\lambda^{(m)} + (1-t)\mu^{(m)} \in \overline{W(f_1, \dots, f_k)}.$$

Taking $m \rightarrow \infty$, we complete the proof of part (ii). The property (iii) follows from Theorem 3.3 of [49].

We prove now part (iv). According to Theorem 3.1, $\sigma_r(f_1, \dots, f_k)$ is a compact subset of \mathbb{C}^k . Let $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$, $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$, and $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Using the properties of z_λ (see the proof of Theorem 3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* z_\lambda, p \rangle &= \langle z_\lambda, f \otimes p \rangle = \overline{f(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) p(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)} \\ &= \left\langle \overline{f(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) z_\lambda}, p \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

for any polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Since \mathcal{P} is dense in $F^2(H_n)$, we deduce that

$$f(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* z_\lambda = \overline{f(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) z_\lambda}.$$

Denote $\mu_j := f_j(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, and notice that

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \|(\overline{\mu_j} I - f(S_1, \dots, S_n)^*) z_\lambda\|^2 = 0.$$

Since $\|z_\lambda\| = 1$, we can use again Corollary 3.2 and deduce that $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k) \in \sigma_r(f_1, \dots, f_k)$. This completes the proof of part (iv). \square

The next result is a commutative version of Theorem 3.1 from [49]. The proof follows the same lines. We include it for completeness.

Theorem 3.6. *If $A \in W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$ and $B \in W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H}'', \mathcal{H}')$, then there exists a contraction $C \in W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}'')$ such that $A = BC$ if and only if $AA^* \leq BB^*$.*

Proof. One implication is clear, so assume that $AA^* \leq BB^*$. Therefore, there is a contraction $X : \mathcal{M} := \overline{B^*(F_s^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}')} \rightarrow F_s^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ satisfying $XB^* = A^*$. Since $B \in W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H}'', \mathcal{H}')$, we have

$$B(B_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}''}) = (B_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}'})B, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $B_i := P_{F_s^2(H_n)} S_i |_{F_s^2(H_n)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Hence, the subspace $\mathcal{M} \subseteq F_s^2(H_n)$ is invariant under each operator $B_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}''}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Now, we define the operators $T_i := (B_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}''})|_{\mathcal{M}}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, acting from \mathcal{M} to \mathcal{M} . Since $A \in W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$, $B \in W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H}'', \mathcal{H}')$, and $XB^* = A^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} X(B_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}''})B^*k &= XB^*(B_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}'})k = A^*(B_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}'})k \\ &= (B_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})A^*k = (B_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})XB^*k \end{aligned}$$

for any $k \in F_s^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}'$. Hence,

$$(3.5) \quad X(B_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}''}) = (B_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})X, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Since $F_s^2(H_n)$ is an invariant subspace under each operator S_1^*, \dots, S_n^* , and $B_i^* = S_i^*|_{F_s^2(H_n)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, relation (3.5) implies

$$[P_{\mathcal{M}}(S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}''})|_{\mathcal{M}}]Y^* = Y^*(S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $Y : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ and $Yh = Xh$ for any $h \in \mathcal{M}$. Since $[S_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}''}, \dots, S_n \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}''}]$ is an isometric dilation of the row contraction $[P_{\mathcal{M}}(S_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}''})|_{\mathcal{M}}, \dots, P_{\mathcal{M}}(S_n \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}''})|_{\mathcal{M}}]$, we use the noncommutative commutant lifting theorem [44] (see [64] for the classical case) to find a contraction $\tilde{C} \in B(F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}, F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}'')$ such that

$$(S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}''})\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

and $\tilde{C}^*k = Yk = Xk$ for any $k \in \mathcal{M}$. Hence, we have $X = P_{F_s^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}} \tilde{C}^*|_{\mathcal{M}}$ and, taking into account that $B\mathcal{M}^\perp = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A &= BX^* = BP_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{C} |_{F_s^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}} \\ &= BP_{\mathcal{M}} P_{F_s^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}} \tilde{C}^* |_{F_s^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}} = BC, \end{aligned}$$

where $C := P_{F_s^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}} \tilde{C}^* |_{F_s^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}}$. According to [49], since \tilde{C} is a multi-analytic operator, we have $\tilde{C} \in F_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}'')$ and therefore $C \in W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}'')$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Applying Theorem 3.6 to the particular case when $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}'$ and $A = \delta I_{F_s^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}'}$, $\delta > 0$, one can easily obtain the following consequence.

Corollary 3.7. *Let $B \in W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H}'', \mathcal{H}')$. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There is $D \in B(F_s^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}', F_s^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}'')$ such that $BD = I$;*
- (ii) *There is $\delta > 0$ such that $\|B^*k\| \geq \delta\|k\|$, for any $k \in F_s^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}'$;*
- (iii) *There is $C \in W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H}', \mathcal{H}'')$ such that $BC = I$.*

Now, we can obtain as a consequence the following corona type result for the algebra $W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H})$.

Corollary 3.8. *If $f_1, \dots, f_k \in W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H})$, then there exist $g_1, \dots, g_k \in W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H})$ such that*

$$f_1 g_1 + \dots + f_k g_k = I$$

if and only if there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$f_1 f_1^* + \dots + f_k f_k^* \geq \delta^2 I.$$

Proof. Take $B := [f_1, \dots, f_k] \in W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H}^{(k)}, \mathcal{H})$, $C := \begin{bmatrix} g_1 \\ \vdots \\ g_k \end{bmatrix} \in W_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}^{(k)})$, and apply Corollary 3.7. \square

The proof of the following result is straightforward, so we omit it.

Lemma 3.9. *Let (T_1, \dots, T_n) , $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, and (V_1, \dots, V_n) , $V_i \in B(\mathcal{K})$, be n -tuples of operators such that $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$.*

- (i) *If $T_i = P_{\mathcal{H}} V_i |_{\mathcal{H}}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, then $W(T_1, \dots, T_n) \subseteq W(V_1, \dots, V_n)$*

$$w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq w_e(V_1, \dots, V_n), \quad \text{and} \quad w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq w(V_1, \dots, V_n).$$

- (ii) *If $T_i^* = V_i^* |_{\mathcal{H}}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, then*

$$\sigma_r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \subseteq \sigma_r(V_1, \dots, V_n) \quad \text{and} \quad r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq r(V_1, \dots, V_n).$$

We recall that the Harte spectrum of a k -tuple (g_1, \dots, g_k) , $g_i \in W_n^\infty$, relative to the commutative algebra algebra W_n^∞ , is defined by

$$\sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k) := \{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \mathbb{C}^n : (\lambda_1 I - g_1) W_n^\infty + \dots + (\lambda_k I - g_k) W_n^\infty \neq W_n^\infty\}.$$

Here are some of the properties of the Harte spectrum of (g_1, \dots, g_k) .

Theorem 3.10. *If $g_1, \dots, g_k \in W_n^\infty$, then*

- (i) *$(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \notin \sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k)$ if and only if there is $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$(\lambda_1 I - g_1)(\bar{\lambda}_1 I - g_1^*) + \dots + (\lambda_k I - g_k)(\bar{\lambda}_k I - g_k^*) \geq \delta^2 I.$$

- (ii) *The Harte spectrum $\sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k)$ is a compact subset of \mathbb{C}^k and*

$$\{(g_1(\lambda), \dots, g_k(\lambda)) : \lambda \in \mathbb{B}_n\}^- \subseteq \sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k).$$

- (iii) *$\sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k) \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^n)_{r(g_1, \dots, g_k)} \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^n)_{w_e(g_1, \dots, g_k)}$.*

(iv) *The following inclusions hold:*

$$(3.6) \quad \sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k) \subseteq \bigcap \sigma_r(f_1, \dots, f_k) \subseteq \bigcap \overline{[W(f_1, \dots, f_k)]}$$

and

$$(3.7) \quad \sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k) \subseteq \overline{W(g_1, \dots, g_k)} \subseteq \bigcap \overline{W(f_1, \dots, f_k)} \subseteq \overline{(\mathbb{C}^k)}_q,$$

where the intersections are taken over all $f_i \in F_n^\infty$ with $P_{F_s^2(H_n)} f_i | F_s^2(H_n) = g_i$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, and

$$q := \inf \{w_e(f_1, \dots, f_k) : f_i \in F_n^\infty, P_{F_s^2(H_n)} f_i | F_s^2(H_n) = g_i, i = 1, \dots, k\}.$$

Proof. Part (i) follows from Corollary 3.8 if we take $f_i = \lambda_i I - g_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. To prove part (ii), we recall that any element of W_n^∞ has the form $g(B_1, \dots, B_n)$, where $g(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$, $B_i = P_{F_s^2(H_n)} S_i | F_s^2(H_n)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $g(B_1, \dots, B_n)$ is defined by the F_n^∞ -functional calculus for row contractions (see [48]). Using the proof of part (iv) of Theorem 3.5, we have

$$g(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* z_\lambda = \overline{g(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)} z_\lambda,$$

where the vector z_λ is defined by (2.9). Since $z_\lambda \in F_s^2(H_n)$ and the symmetric Fock space is an invariant subspace under each operator S_1^*, \dots, S_n^* , and F_n^∞ is the WOT-closure of the polynomials in S_1, \dots, S_n and the identity, we deduce that

$$(3.8) \quad g(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* z_\lambda = \overline{g(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)} z_\lambda.$$

Let $g_1, \dots, g_n \in W_n^\infty$ and denote $\mu_j := g_j(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$. Using relation (3.8), we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \|(\overline{\mu_j} I - g_j(B_1, \dots, B_n)^*) z_\lambda\|^2 = 0.$$

Since $\|z_\lambda\| = 1$, part (i) of this theorem shows that $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k) \in \sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k)$, which completes the proof of (ii).

Part (iii) follows from Theorem 3.1 and the fact that, in the commutative case (see [37]),

$$r(g_1, \dots, g_k) = \sup\{\|\lambda\|_2 : \lambda \in \sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k)\}.$$

To prove (iv), note that if $\lambda \notin \bigcap \sigma_r(f_1, \dots, f_k)$, then there exist operators $f_1, \dots, f_k \in F_n^\infty$ such that $\lambda \notin \sigma_r(f_1, \dots, f_k)$. According to Theorem 3.5 part (iii), there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(\lambda_1 I - f_1)(\overline{\lambda_1} I - f_1^*) + \dots + (\lambda_k I - f_k)(\overline{\lambda_k} I - f_k^*) \geq \delta^2 I.$$

Since $F_s^2(H_n)$ is invariant under S_1^*, \dots, S_n^* and taking the compression to the symmetric Fock space, the latter inequality implies

$$(3.9) \quad (\lambda_1 I - g_1)(\overline{\lambda_1} I - g_1^*) + \dots + (\lambda_k I - g_k)(\overline{\lambda_k} I - g_k^*) \geq \delta^2 I.$$

Using now part (i) of the theorem we deduce that $\lambda \notin \sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k)$, which proves the first inclusion in (3.6). The second inclusion is implied by Theorem 3.1 part (i). Now, notice that

$$(3.10) \quad \sigma(g_1, \dots, g_k) \subseteq \sigma_r(g_1, \dots, g_k).$$

Indeed, if $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \notin \sigma_r(g_1, \dots, g_k)$, then, according to Corollary 3.2, there is $\delta > 0$ such that (3.9) holds. Using part (i) of the theorem, we obtain (3.10). According to Theorem 3.1 part (i), we get the first inclusion in (3.7). The second inclusion follows from Lemma 3.9. Once again, if we apply Theorem 3.1 part (i) to our setting, we deduce the last inclusion in (3.7). The proof is complete. \square

Notice that if B_1, \dots, B_n are the creation operators acting on the symmetric Fock space, then Theorem 3.10 implies

$$\sigma(B_1, \dots, B_n) = \overline{W(B_1, \dots, B_n)} = \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{w_e(B_1, \dots, B_n)} = \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)}_{w(B_1, \dots, B_n)} = \overline{\mathbb{B}}_n.$$

4. ρ -OPERATOR RADIUS

The results of this section can be seen as the unification of the theory of isometric dilations for row contractions [61], [64], [25], [14], [43], [44], [45] (which corresponds to the case $\rho = 1$) and Berger type dilations of Section 1 for n -tuples (T_1, \dots, T_n) with the joint numerical radius $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ (which corresponds to the case $\rho = 2$). We obtain several intrinsic characterizations for n -tuples of operators of class \mathcal{C}_ρ , present basic properties of the joint ρ -operator radius ω_ρ , and extend to our multivariable setting (noncommutative and commutative) several classical results obtained by Sz. Nagy and Foiaş, Halmos, Berger and Stampfli, Holbrook, Paulsen, and others ([8], [9], [10], [29], [30], [32], [33], [35], [39], [41], [63], and [67]).

An n -tuple of operators (T_1, \dots, T_n) , $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, belongs to the class \mathcal{C}_ρ , $\rho > 0$, if there exist a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and isometries $V_i \in B(\mathcal{K})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, with orthogonal ranges, such that

$$(4.1) \quad T_\alpha = \rho P_{\mathcal{H}} V_\alpha |_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \text{for any } \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+ \setminus \{g_0\},$$

where $P_{\mathcal{H}}$ is the orthogonal projection of \mathcal{K} onto \mathcal{H} . We call (V_1, \dots, V_n) a ρ -isometric dilation of the n -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_n) . Notice that relation (4.1) implies that any n -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_n) of class \mathcal{C}_ρ is power bounded and $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$. We recall that an n -tuple of operators (T_1, \dots, T_n) is called power bounded if there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/2} \leq M$$

for any $k = 1, 2, \dots$

The first result of this section provides characterizations for n -tuples of operators of class \mathcal{C}_ρ . We recall that R_1, \dots, R_n denote the right creation operators acting on the full Fock space.

Theorem 4.1. *If $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$, then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$;
- (ii) *The inequality*

$$(4.2) \quad (\rho - 2) \left\| \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^* \right) k \right\|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^* \right) k, k \right\rangle \geq 0$$

holds for any $k \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ and $z_i \in \mathbb{D}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

- (iii) *The inequality*

$$(4.3) \quad \left(1 - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{z}_i R_i^* \otimes T_i + z_i R_i \otimes T_i^*) + \left(\frac{2}{\rho} - 1 \right) \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i|^2 (I \otimes T_i T_i^*) \leq I$$

holds for any $z_i \in \mathbb{D}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

- (iv) *The spectral radius $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and the multi-Toeplitz operator*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} \bar{z}_\alpha R_\alpha^* \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}} + \rho I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} z_\alpha R_\alpha \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}}^*$$

is positive for any $z_i \in \mathbb{D}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, where the convergence is in the operator norm.

- (v) *The spectral radius $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and the multi-Toeplitz operator $M_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ defined by*

$$(4.4) \quad M_r(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k R_\alpha^* \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}} + \rho I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k R_\alpha \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}}^*$$

is positive for any $0 < r < 1$, where the convergence is in the operator norm.

Proof. Assume that $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$. Then there exist a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and isometries $V_i \in B(\mathcal{K})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, with orthogonal ranges, such that relation (4.1) holds. According to Lemma 1.4, if $z_i \in \mathbb{D}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, then the series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} z_\alpha R_\alpha \otimes V_\alpha^*$ is convergent in the operator norm and

$$I + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} z_\alpha R_\alpha \otimes V_\alpha^* = \left(I + \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes V_i^* \right) \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes V_i^* \right)^{-1}.$$

Hence, using relation (4.1) and Lemma 1.4, we deduce that

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{2}{\rho} \right) I + \frac{2}{\rho} \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^* \right)^{-1} \\ &= P_{F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}} \left(I + \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes V_i^* \right) \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes V_i^* \right)^{-1} |_{F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $P_{F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}}$ is the orthogonal projection of $F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{K}$ onto $F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$. Setting $y := (I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes V_i^*) x$, where $x \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{K}$, straightforward calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \left(I + \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes V_i^* \right) \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes V_i^* \right)^{-1} y, y \right\rangle \\ &= \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \left(I + \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes V_i^* \right) x, \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes V_i^* \right) x \right\rangle \\ &= \|x\|^2 - \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (z_i R_i \otimes V_i^*) x \right\|^2 \\ &= \left\langle \left[I \otimes \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i|^2 V_i V_i^* \right) \right] x, x \right\rangle \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence and using relation (4.5), we deduce that

$$(4.6) \quad \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \left[\left(1 - \frac{2}{\rho} \right) I + \frac{2}{\rho} \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^* \right)^{-1} \right] y, y \right\rangle \geq 0$$

for any $y \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$. If $k \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$, then $y := (I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^*) k$ is in $F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ and inequality (4.6) implies (4.2) for any $z_i \in \mathbb{D}$. Now, note that relation (4.2) is equivalent to the inequality

$$(4.7) \quad \left(\frac{2}{\rho} - 1 \right) \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i|^2 \|(R_i \otimes T_i^*) k\|^2 + \left(2 - \frac{2}{\rho} \right) \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \left(\sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^* \right) k, k \right\rangle \leq \|k\|^2$$

for any $k \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ and $z_i \in \mathbb{D}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Moreover, the latter inequality is equivalent to (4.3), which proves that (ii) is equivalent to (iii).

Now assume that condition (iii) holds. We show that the spectrum of the operator $\sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^*$ is contained in \mathbb{D} . Suppose that there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ such that λ_0^{-1} is in the boundary of the spectrum of $\sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^*$. Since λ_0^{-1} is in the approximative spectrum, there exists a sequence $\{k_m\} \subset F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ such that $\|k_m\| = 1$ for any $m = 1, 2, \dots$, and

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(I - \lambda_0 \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^* \right) k_m = 0.$$

Hence, we have:

- (1) $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \langle \lambda_0 (\sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^*) k_m, k_m \rangle = 1$;
- (2) $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda_0 (\sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^*) k_m\| = 1$.

Let $0 < \gamma < \min \left\{ \frac{1}{|\lambda_0||z_i|} - 1 : i = 1, \dots, n \right\}$ and note that $w_i := (\lambda_0 + \gamma\lambda_0)z_i \in \mathbb{D}$ for any $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii), we can use inequality (4.2) to obtain

$$(\rho - 2) \left\| \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n w_i R_i \otimes T_i^* \right) k_m \right\|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n w_i R_i \otimes T_i^* \right) k_m, k_m \right\rangle \geq 0$$

for any $m = 1, 2, \dots$. Taking $m \rightarrow \infty$ in this inequality and using relations (1) and (2), we get $(\rho - 2)\gamma - 2 \geq 2$. Letting $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, we get a contradiction. Therefore, the operator $I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^*$ is invertible for any $z_i \in \mathbb{D}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Using Lemma 1.4, we deduce that

$$r(z_1 T_1, \dots, z_n T_n) = r \left(\sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^* \right) < 1$$

and the equality (1.11) holds. Let $y = (I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^*)k \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$, where $k \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$. The inequality (4.2) implies

$$(4.8) \quad (\rho - 2)\|y\|^2 + \operatorname{Re} \left\langle y, \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^* \right)^{-1} y \right\rangle \geq 0$$

for any $y \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ and $z_i \in \mathbb{D}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. It is clear that the inequality (4.8) and Lemma 1.4 imply (iv). The implication (iv) \implies (v) is obvious.

Assume now that condition (v) holds. As in the proof of Theorem 1.5 (the implication (iii) \implies (i)), one can show that

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{\rho} M_r \left(\sum_{|\beta| \leq q} e_\beta \otimes h_\beta \right), \sum_{|\gamma| \leq q} e_\gamma \otimes h_\gamma \right\rangle = \sum_{|\beta|, |\gamma| \leq q} \langle K_{T, \rho, r}(\gamma, \beta) h_\beta, h_\gamma \rangle,$$

where the multi-Toeplitz kernel $K_{T, \rho, r} : \mathbb{F}_n^+ \times \mathbb{F}_n^+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is defined by

$$K_{T, \rho, r}(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\rho} r^{|\beta| \setminus |\alpha|} T_{\beta \setminus \alpha} & \text{if } \beta > \alpha \\ I & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \\ \frac{1}{\rho} r^{|\alpha| \setminus |\beta|} (T_{\alpha \setminus \beta})^* & \text{if } \alpha > \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now, since $M_r \geq 0$, we must have $[K_{T, \rho, r}(\alpha, \beta)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} \geq 0$ for any $0 < r < 1$ and $q = 0, 1, \dots$. Taking $r \rightarrow 1$, we get $[K_{T, \rho}(\alpha, \beta)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} \geq 0$ for any $q = 0, 1, \dots$. Using the Naimark type dilation theorem of [51], we find a row isometry $[V_1, \dots, V_n]$ such that condition (4.1) holds. This proves the implication (v) \implies (i) and completes the proof of the theorem. \square

We remark that if $n \geq 2$, then $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$ does not imply that $(T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$. Given an arbitrary n -tuple of operators (T_1, \dots, T_n) and $\rho > 0$, it is easy to see that there is $t > 0$ such that $r \left(\frac{1}{t} T_1, \dots, \frac{1}{t} T_n \right) \leq 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} M_r \left(\frac{1}{t} T_1, \dots, \frac{1}{t} T_n \right) &\geq \rho I - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{r}{t} \right)^k \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} R_\alpha \otimes T_\alpha^* \right\| I \\ &\geq \rho I - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{r}{t} \right)^k \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\|^{k/2} I \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the operator M_r is defined by (4.4). Consequently, Theorem 4.1 shows that the n -tuple of operators $\left(\frac{1}{t} T_1, \dots, \frac{1}{t} T_n \right)$ is of class \mathcal{C}_ρ . Following the classical case (see [32], [67]), we define the map $\omega_\rho : B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ for $\rho > 0$, by setting

$$(4.9) \quad \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \inf \left\{ t : t > 0, \left(\frac{1}{t} T_1, \dots, \frac{1}{t} T_n \right) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho \right\}.$$

When $\rho = \infty$, we set $\omega_\infty := \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. We present now some of the basic properties of the joint ρ -operator radius.

Theorem 4.2. *Let (T_1, \dots, T_n) be an n -tuple of operators $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. The ρ -operator radius has the following properties:*

- (i) $\omega_\rho(zT_1, \dots, zT_n) = |z| \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$;
- (ii) $\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| \leq \rho \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n)$;
- (iii) $\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0$ if and only if $T_1 = \dots = T_n = 0$;
- (iv) $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$ if and only if $\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$;
- (v) $\omega_\infty(T_1, \dots, T_n) = r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n)$;
- (vi) If $0 < \rho \leq \rho'$, then $\mathcal{C}_\rho \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\rho'}$ and

$$\omega_{\rho'}(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n).$$

Proof. Part (i) follows immediately from Theorem 4.1 and relation (4.9). If $(\frac{1}{t}T_1, \dots, \frac{1}{t}T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$, then, according to (4.1), we have $\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| \leq t\rho$. Consequently, using the definition (4.9), we obtain the inequality (ii). Part (iii) follows from (ii), and (iv) is a simple consequence of (4.9). We prove now (v). If $t > 0$ and $(\frac{1}{t}T_1, \dots, \frac{1}{t}T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$, then $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq t$. Hence, we deduce that

$$(4.10) \quad r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n).$$

Now, we prove that if $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) < 1$, then there is $\rho > 0$ such $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$. Indeed, since the spectral radius $r(\cdot)$ is homogeneous, there is $t > 1$ such that $r(tT_1, \dots, tT_n) < 1$. Therefore, there is $M > 0$ such that

$$t^{2k} \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right\| \leq M, \quad \text{for any } k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Hence, we deduce that, for $0 < r < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} M_r(T_1, \dots, T_n) &\geq \rho I - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} r^k \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} R_\alpha \otimes T_\alpha^* \right\| I \\ &\geq \rho I - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} r^k \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\|^{k/2} I \\ &\geq \rho I - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^k \sqrt{M} I \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large $\rho > 0$. According to Theorem 4.1 part (v), we infer that $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$. Now, if $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \neq 0$, let $\gamma > 1$ and denote

$$X_i := \frac{1}{\gamma r(T_1, \dots, T_n)} T_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Since $r(X_1, \dots, X_n) < 1$, there is $\rho > 0$ such that $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$, i.e., $\omega_\rho(X_1, \dots, X_n) \leq 1$. Hence, $\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \gamma r(T_1, \dots, T_n)$, for any $\gamma > 1$, which together with (4.10) imply (v). If $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0$, then $r(mT_1, \dots, mT_n) = 0$ for any $m = 1, 2, \dots$. Therefore, $(mT_1, \dots, mT_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$ for some $\rho > 0$, i.e., $\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \frac{1}{m}$. This implies

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0.$$

Part (vi) follows from the equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) of Theorem 4.1. The proof is complete. \square

Corollary 4.3. $\bigcup_{\rho > 0} \mathcal{C}_\rho$ is dense in the set of all power bounded n -tuples of operators in $B(\mathcal{H})$.

Proof. If (T_1, \dots, T_n) is power bounded n -tuple of operators, then $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and therefore $r(sT_1, \dots, sT_n) < 1$ for $0 \leq s < 1$. According to the proof of Theorem 4.2 part (v), there is $\rho > 0$ such that $(sT_1, \dots, sT_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$. This proves our assertion. \square

Corollary 4.4. *If $(A_1, \dots, A_n), (B_1, \dots, B_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$ and $\rho \geq 1$, then*

$$\omega_\rho(A_i B_j : i, j = 1, \dots, n) \leq \rho^2 \omega_\rho(A_1, \dots, A_n) \omega_\rho(B_1, \dots, B_n).$$

Proof. Since $\rho \geq 1$, we can use Theorem 4.2 part (ii) and (vi), and deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_\rho(A_i B_j : i, j = 1, \dots, n) &\leq \omega_1(A_i B_j : i, j = 1, \dots, n) \\ &\leq \|[A_1, \dots, A_n]\| \| [B_1, \dots, B_n] \| \\ &\leq \rho^2 \omega_\rho(A_1, \dots, A_n) \omega_\rho(B_1, \dots, B_n). \end{aligned}$$

□

More properties of the ρ -operator radius are considered in the following

Theorem 4.5. *Let $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$ be an n -tuple of operators and let $\omega_\rho : B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the ρ -operator radius. Then*

- (i) $\omega_\rho(U^* T_1 U, \dots, U^* T_n U) = \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any unitary operator $U : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$;
- (ii) $\omega_\rho(T_1|_{\mathcal{E}}, \dots, T_n|_{\mathcal{E}}) \leq \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any subspace $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ invariant under each operator T_1, \dots, T_n ;
- (iii) $\omega_\rho(I_{\mathcal{G}} \otimes T_1, \dots, I_{\mathcal{G}} \otimes T_n) = \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any separable Hilbert space \mathcal{G} ;
- (iv) If $0 < \rho \leq 2$, then ω_ρ is a norm on $B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$ and

$$(4.11) \quad \omega_\rho(V^* T_1 V, \dots, V^* T_n V) \leq \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n)$$

for any isometry $V : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$.

Proof. According to Theorem 4.1, if $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in C_\rho$, then the n -tuples $(U^* T_1 U, \dots, U^* T_n U)$, $(T_1|_{\mathcal{E}}, \dots, T_n|_{\mathcal{E}})$, and $(I_{\mathcal{G}} \otimes T_1, \dots, I_{\mathcal{G}} \otimes T_n)$ are of class C_ρ . Fix $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})$ and $\epsilon > 0$. According to the definition of ω_ρ , there exists $r > 0$ such that

$$r < \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) + \epsilon$$

and $(\frac{1}{r} T_1, \dots, \frac{1}{r} T_n) \in C_\rho$. Using the above observation, we have $(\frac{1}{r} U^* T_1 U, \dots, \frac{1}{r} U^* T_n U) \in C_\rho$. This shows that

$$\omega_\rho(U^* T_1 U, \dots, U^* T_n U) \leq r < \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) + \epsilon.$$

Taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$(4.12) \quad \omega_\rho(U^* T_1 U, \dots, U^* T_n U) \leq \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n).$$

Consequently, replacing (T_1, \dots, T_n) with $(U^* T_1 U, \dots, U^* T_n U)$, we obtain the reverse inequality. Therefore, the property (i) holds. The properties (ii) and (iii) can be proved in a similar manner.

To show that ω_ρ is a norm if $0 < \rho \leq 2$, it is enough to prove that C_ρ is a convex body in $B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$. Let $(A_1, \dots, A_n), (B_1, \dots, B_n)$ be n -tuples of operators in C_ρ and let $a, b \geq 0$ be such that $a + b = 1$. Applying Theorem 4.1 (see the equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii)) to each of the n -tuples, and summing up, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &2\operatorname{Re} \left\langle \left[I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes (aA_i^* + bB_i^*) \right] k, k \right\rangle \\ &\geq (2 - \rho) \left[a \left\| \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes A_i^* \right) k \right\|^2 + b \left\| \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes B_i^* \right) k \right\|^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

for any $k \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$. Since

$$a\|x\|^2 + b\|y\|^2 \geq \|ax + by\|^2, \quad x, y \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H},$$

$a + b = 1$, and $2 - \rho \geq 0$, the above inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\operatorname{Re} \left\langle \left[I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes (aA_i^* + bB_i^*) \right] k, k \right\rangle \\ & \geq (2 - \rho) \left\| I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes (aA_i + bB_i)^* k \right\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for any $k \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$. Using again Theorem 4.1 part (ii), we deduce that

$$a(A_1, \dots, A_n) + b(B_1, \dots, B_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho.$$

To prove the last part of the theorem, note that, according to Theorem 4.1, $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$ if and only if the operator

$$F(T_1, \dots, T_n) := I - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\rho}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{z}_i R_i^* \otimes T_i + z_i R_i \otimes T_i^*) - \left(\frac{2}{\rho} - 1\right) \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i|^2 (I \otimes T_i T_i^*)$$

is positive for any $z_i \in \mathbb{D}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} F(V^* T_1 V, \dots, V^* T_n V) &= (I \otimes V^*) [F(T_1, \dots, T_n) \\ &+ \left(\frac{2}{\rho} - 1\right) \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i|^2 (I \otimes T_i (I - V V^*) T_i^*)] (I \otimes V). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $0 < \rho \leq 2$, then $F(V^* T_1 V, \dots, V^* T_n V) \geq 0$ for any $z_i \in \mathbb{D}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Using again Theorem 4.1, we infer that $(V^* T_1 V, \dots, V^* T_n V) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$. Notice that the inequality (4.11) can be deduced similarly to (4.12). The proof is complete. \square

According to the noncommutative dilation theory for row contractions, it is clear that

$$\omega_1(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\|^{1/2} = \omega_1(R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^*).$$

In what follows we obtain a generalization of this fact and more characterizations for the n -tuples of operators of class \mathcal{C}_ρ .

Theorem 4.6. *Let $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$ and let $\mathcal{S} \subset C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ be the operator system defined by*

$$(4.13) \quad \mathcal{S} := \{p(S_1, \dots, S_n) + q(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* : p, q \in \mathcal{P}_n\}.$$

Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$;
- (ii) $R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^* \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$;
- (iii) *The map $\Psi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by*

$$\Psi(p(S_1, \dots, S_n) + q(S_1, \dots, S_n)^*) := p(T_1, \dots, T_n) + q(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* + (\rho - 1)(p(0) + \overline{q(0)})I$$

is completely positive;

- (iv) *The spectral radius $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and*

$$\rho I + (1 - \rho)r \sum_{i=1}^n (R_i^* \otimes T_i + R_i \otimes T_i^*) + (\rho - 2)r^2 \left(I \otimes \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right) \geq 0$$

for any $0 < r < 1$.

Moreover, for any $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \omega_\rho(R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^*).$$

Proof. Assume that $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$. In the particular case when $z_1 = \dots = z_n = z \in \mathbb{D}$ and $X := R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^*$, the inequality (4.2) from Theorem 4.1 implies

$$(\rho - 2)\|(I - zX)k\|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle (I - zX)k, k \rangle \geq 0$$

for any $k \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$. According to [64], we deduce that $X \in C_\rho$.

Conversely, assume that $X \in C_\rho$. Using again [64], we have $r(X) \leq 1$ and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} r^k e^{-ik\theta} X^{*k} + \rho I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} r^k e^{ik\theta} X^k \geq 0$$

for any $0 < r < 1$ and $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. In particular, when $\theta = 0$, we get the inequality

$$(4.14) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k R_\alpha^* \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}} + \rho I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k R_\alpha \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}}^* \geq 0$$

for any $0 < r < 1$. On the other hand, Corollary 1.2 shows that $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) = r(X) \leq 1$. According to Theorem 4.1, the inequality (4.14) implies $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$. Therefore, (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii).

Now, we prove that (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii). Assume that $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$. Using Theorem 4.1, we have $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and the operator

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k R_\alpha^* \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}} + \rho I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k R_\alpha \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}}^*$$

is positive for any $0 < r < 1$, where the convergence is in the operator norm. This shows that, for any $q = 0, 1, \dots$, the operator

$$P_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}} \left(\sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq q} r^{|\alpha|} R_\alpha^* \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}} + \rho I + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq q} r^{|\alpha|} R_\alpha \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}}^* \right) |_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}}$$

is positive. Taking $r \rightarrow 1$, we infer that

$$M_{\rho, q} := P_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}} \left(\sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq q} R_\alpha^* \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}} + \rho I + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq q} R_\alpha \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}}^* \right) |_{\mathcal{P}_q \otimes \mathcal{H}}$$

is positive. Now, the proof is similar to that of the implication (i) \implies (ii) of Theorem 1.3, where the multi-Toeplitz kernel $K_{T,2}$ is replaced by the kernel

$$K_{T, \rho}(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} T_{\beta \setminus \alpha} & \text{if } \beta > \alpha \\ \rho I & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \\ T_{\alpha \setminus \beta}^* & \text{if } \alpha > \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We leave the details to the reader. Conversely, assume condition (iii) holds. As in the proof of Theorem 1.3 (implication (ii) \implies (i)) one can show that the kernel $K_{T, \rho}$ is positive. Using the Naimark type dilation theorem of [51], we deduce that $[T_1, \dots, T_n] \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$.

Now, it remains to prove that (iv) \Leftrightarrow (i). Note that the operator M_r of Theorem 4.1 satisfies the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} M_r &= \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n r R_i^* \otimes T_i \right)^{-1} + (\rho - 2)I + \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n r R_i \otimes T_i^* \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n r R_i^* \otimes T_i \right)^{-1} \Gamma_{\rho, r} \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n r R_i \otimes T_i^* \right)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Gamma_{\rho, r} := \rho I + (1 - \rho)r \sum_{i=1}^n (R_i^* \otimes T_i + S_i \otimes T_i^*) + (\rho - 2)r^2 \left(I \otimes \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right).$$

This shows that the condition (v) of Theorem 4.1 is equivalent to $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and $\Gamma_{\rho, r} \geq 0$ for any $0 < r < 1$. Therefore, (iv) \Leftrightarrow (i). Using the equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii), we deduce the last part of the theorem. The proof is complete. \square

Corollary 4.7. *Let (T_1, \dots, T_n) be an n -tuple of operators and let $w(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ be the joint numerical radius. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $T \in \mathcal{C}_2$;
- (ii) $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$;
- (iii) $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n (R_i^* \otimes T_i + R_i \otimes T_i^*) \leq 2I$;
- (iv) $\operatorname{Re} \left\langle \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^n z_i R_i \otimes T_i^* \right) k, k \right\rangle \geq 0$ for any $k \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ and $z_i \in \mathbb{D}$.
- (v) $\sum_{i=1}^n | \langle (R_i \otimes T_i^*) k, k \rangle | \leq \|k\|^2$ for any $k \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$.

Moreover, $\omega_2(T_1, \dots, T_n) = w(T_1, \dots, T_n)$.

Proof. Theorem 1.8 shows that (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii). Consequently, using Theorem 4.2 part (iv) 4.6 (in the particular case $\rho = 2$) and the homogeneity of ω_2 and w , we deduce that

$$\omega_2(T_1, \dots, T_n) = w(T_1, \dots, T_n).$$

According to Theorem 4.6, $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_2$ if and only if $r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and

$$t \sum_{i=1}^n (R_i^* \otimes T_i + R_i \otimes T_i^*) \leq 2I$$

for any $0 < t < 1$. This proves that (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii). The equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (iv) is a particular case of Theorem 4.1 (see (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii)). The equivalence (iv) \Leftrightarrow (v) is obvious. The proof is complete. \square

As we have seen in this paper, an important role in multivariable operator theory for n -tuples of operators $T := (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is played by the multi-analytic operator

$$R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^*.$$

We can prove that this operator is a complete unitary invariant. More precisely, if $T' := (T'_1, \dots, T'_n)$, $T'_i \in B(\mathcal{H}')$, is another n -tuple of operators, one can prove that T is unitarily equivalent to T' if and only if the multi-analytic operators $R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^*$ and $R_1 \otimes T_1'^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n'^*$ are unitarily equivalent, i.e., there exists a unitary multi-analytic operator W from $F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ to $F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}'$ such that

$$W(R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^*) = (R_1 \otimes T_1'^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n'^*)W.$$

One implication is clear, so assume that the above equality holds. Since W is a unitary multi-analytic operator, we must have $W = I \otimes U^*$ for some unitary U operator from \mathcal{H} to \mathcal{H}' (see [45]). Hence, and using the fact that R_1, \dots, R_n are the right creation operators on $F^2(H_n)$, we deduce that $UT_i = T_i'U$ for any $i = 1, \dots, n$.

The proof of the following result is similar to that of Corollary 1.9. We shall omit it.

Theorem 4.8. *Let (T_1, \dots, T_n) be an n -tuple of operators $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$ with $\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$. Then there is a completely bounded map $\Phi : \mathcal{A}_n + \mathcal{A}_n^* \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that*

$$\Phi(p(S_1, \dots, S_n) + q(S_1, \dots, S_n)^*) = p(T_1, \dots, T_n) + q(T_1, \dots, T_n)$$

for any $p(S_1, \dots, S_n), q(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in \mathcal{P}$, and $\|\Phi\|_{cb} \leq |1-\rho| + \rho$. Consequently, the n -tuple (T_1, \dots, T_n) is simultaneously similar to a row contraction.

Corollary 4.9. *If $R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^*$ has the spectrum in the open unit disc, then (T_1, \dots, T_n) is simultaneously similar to a row contraction.*

Proof. Since

$$r(T_1, \dots, T_n) = r(R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^*) < 1,$$

the condition (v) of Theorem 4.1 holds for some large $\rho > 0$. Now, the result follows from Theorem 4.8. \square

Now, as in the case of the joint numerical range ($\rho = 2$), Theorem 4.8 can be used to show that if $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$, then

$$f(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f(rT_1, \dots, rT_n),$$

where $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in \mathcal{A}_n$ and the limit exists in the operator norm. Moreover,

$$f(T_1, \dots, T_n) + (\rho - 1)f(0)I = \rho P_{\mathcal{H}} f(V_1, \dots, V_n)|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

where V_1, \dots, V_n are the isometries from (4.1). Our multivariable Berger-Kato-Stampfli type theorem for the operator radius ω_ρ is the following. The proof is similar to the proofs of Theorem 1.10 and Theorem 1.12, but uses Theorem 4.6.

Theorem 4.10. *If $\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and $F_j \in M_m \otimes \mathcal{A}_n$ with $F_j(0) = 0$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, then*

$$\omega_\rho(F_1(T_1, \dots, T_n), \dots, F_k(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \|[F_1, \dots, F_k]\|.$$

Moreover, if $\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$ and $f \in \mathcal{A}_n$ with $\operatorname{Re} f \geq 0$, then

$$\operatorname{Re} W(f(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \geq (1 - \rho)\operatorname{Re} f(0).$$

We can now provide the following power inequality for the ρ -operator radius.

Corollary 4.11. *If $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$ and $\rho \in (0, \infty)$, then*

$$\omega_\rho(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \leq \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n)^k.$$

Moreover, $\omega_\infty(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) = \omega_\infty(T_1, \dots, T_n)^k$.

Proof. Since ω_ρ is homogeneous, we can assume that $\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 1$. Hence, $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$ and therefore there is a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and $V_1, \dots, V_n \in B(\mathcal{K})$ isometries with orthogonal ranges such that $T_\beta = \rho P_{\mathcal{H}} V_\beta|_{\mathcal{H}}$ for any $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Notice that the operators V_α , $|\alpha| = k$, are isometries with orthogonal ranges. Now, the above equation implies that $(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$, which is equivalent to $\omega_\rho(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \leq 1$. According to Theorem 4.2 part (v), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_\infty(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) &= r(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \\ &= r(T_1, \dots, T_n)^k = \omega_\infty(T_1, \dots, T_n)^k. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

In the commutative case, we can obtain the following characterization for n -tuples of operators of class \mathcal{C}_ρ .

Theorem 4.12. *Let $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be commuting operators and let $\mathcal{S}_c \subset C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n)$ be the operator system defined by*

$$(4.15) \quad \mathcal{S}_c := \{p(B_1, \dots, B_n) + q(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* : p, q \in \mathcal{P}\},$$

where B_1, \dots, B_n are the creation operators on the symmetric Fock space. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$;
- (ii) The map $\Psi_c : \mathcal{S}_c \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$\Psi_c(p(B_1, \dots, B_n) + q(B_1, \dots, B_n)^*) := p(T_1, \dots, T_n) + q(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* + (\rho - 1)(p(0) + \overline{q(0)})I$$

is completely positive.

- (iii) There is a Hilbert space $\mathcal{G} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and a $*$ -representation $\pi : C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{G})$ such that

$$T_\alpha = \rho P_{\mathcal{H}} \pi(B_\alpha)|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \text{for any } \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+ \setminus \{g_0\}.$$

Proof. Assume that $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$. According to the proof of Theorem 4.1, the multi-Toeplitz kernel $K_{T, \rho} : \mathbb{F}_n^+ \times \mathbb{F}_n^+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$K_{T, \rho}(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\rho} T_{\beta \setminus \alpha} & \text{if } \beta > \alpha \\ I & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \\ \frac{1}{\rho} T_{\alpha \setminus \beta}^* & \text{if } \alpha > \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

is positive definite. Since T_1, \dots, T_n are commuting operators, according to Theorem 3.3 of [57], there exists a completely positive linear map $\Phi : C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\Phi(I) = I$ and

$$\Phi(B_\sigma) = \frac{1}{\rho} T_\sigma, \quad \sigma \in \mathbb{F}_n^+ \setminus \{g_0\}.$$

Consequently, using Stinespring's theorem, there exists a Hilbert space $\mathcal{G} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and a $*$ -representation $\pi : C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that (iii) holds.

Assume now that condition (iii) holds and let $W_i := \pi(B_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since $[W_1, \dots, W_n]$ is a row contraction, there exists a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \supseteq \mathcal{G}$ and $V_1, \dots, V_n \in B(\mathcal{K})$ isometries with orthogonal ranges such that $W_\alpha^* = V_\alpha^* | \mathcal{K}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Since $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, (iii) implies $T_\alpha = \rho P_{\mathcal{H}} V_\alpha | \mathcal{H}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Using Theorem 4.1, we deduce that $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$, therefore (iii) \implies (i). Now we show that (iii) \implies (ii). It is clear that (iii) implies

$$\begin{aligned} p(T_1, \dots, T_n) + q(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* + (\rho - 1)(p(0) + \overline{q(0)})I \\ = \rho P_{\mathcal{H}} \pi[p(B_1, \dots, B_n) + q(B_1, \dots, B_n)^*] | \mathcal{H}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we deduce (ii). To prove that (ii) \implies (i), note that there is a completely positive linear map $\gamma : C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n) \rightarrow C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n)$ such that $\gamma(S_\alpha S_\beta^*) = B_\alpha B_\beta^*$ (see [52]). Since the map $\Psi_c \circ \gamma$ is completely positive and $(\Psi_c \circ \gamma) | \mathcal{S} = \Psi$, where \mathcal{S} and Ψ are defined in Theorem 4.6, the latter theorem implies $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$. The proof is complete. \square

The next result contains more properties for the ρ -operator radius.

Proposition 4.13. (i) *Let $0 < \rho \leq \rho'$ and $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$. Then*

$$(4.16) \quad \omega_{\rho'}(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \left(\frac{2\rho'}{\rho} - 1 \right) \omega_{\rho'}(T_1, \dots, T_n).$$

In particular, the map $\rho \mapsto \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is continuous on $(0, \infty)$.

(ii) *The operator radius $\omega_\rho : B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is continuous in the norm topology of $B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$.*

(iii) *For any $\rho > 0$,*

$$\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) \geq \max \left\{ 1, \frac{2}{\rho} - 1 \right\} r(T_1, \dots, T_n).$$

Proof. It is well-known (see [32]) that for any $X \in B(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\omega_{\rho'}(X) \leq \omega_\rho(X) \leq \left(\frac{2\rho'}{\rho} - 1 \right) \omega_{\rho'}(X).$$

Applying this result to the operator $X := R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^*$ and taking into account that

$$\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \omega_\rho(R_1 \otimes T_1^* + \dots + R_n \otimes T_n^*)$$

(see Theorem 4.6), we deduce (4.16). The continuity of the map $\rho \mapsto \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is now obvious. According to (4.16), we have

$$\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| \leq \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \left(\frac{2}{\rho} - 1 \right) \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|$$

if $0 < \rho \leq 1$, and

$$\frac{1}{2\rho - 1} \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| \leq \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|$$

if $\rho > 1$. Hence, the continuity of ω_ρ follows. To prove (iii), we recall from [32] the inequality $\omega_\rho(X) \geq \max\left\{1, \frac{2}{\rho} - 1\right\}r(X)$ for $X \in B(\mathcal{H})$. Applying this result to the operator X and using Theorem 4.6, we deduce the inequality (iii). The proof is complete. \square

In what follows we calculate the ρ -operator radius for a class of row contractions.

Example 4.14. Let $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$ be an n -tuple of operators with $\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| = 1$ and $T_\alpha = 0$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ with $|\alpha| = 2$. Then

$$\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \frac{1}{\rho}, \quad \text{for } \rho \in (0, \infty),$$

and $\omega_\infty(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0$. Indeed, since $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a row contraction, there is a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and $V_1, \dots, V_n \in B(\mathcal{K})$ isometries with orthogonal ranges such that $T_\beta = P_{\mathcal{H}}V_\beta|_{\mathcal{H}}$ for any $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Set $X_i := \rho T_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and note that the condition $T_\alpha = 0$ if $|\alpha| = 2$ implies

$$X_\beta = \rho T_\beta = \rho P_{\mathcal{H}}V_\beta|_{\mathcal{H}}$$

for any $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+ \setminus \{g_0\}$. Therefore, $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$, i.e., $\omega_\rho(X_1, \dots, X_n) \leq 1$, which implies $\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \frac{1}{\rho}$. The reverse inequality follows from Theorem 4.2 part (ii). Now, it is clear that

$$\omega_\infty(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0.$$

PART II. JOINT OPERATOR RADII, INEQUALITIES, AND APPLICATIONS

5. VON NEUMANN INEQUALITIES

In this section, we prove von Neumann type inequalities [66] for arbitrary admissible or strongly admissible operator radii $\omega : B(\mathcal{H})^{(k)} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. We show that, given a row contraction $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$, an inequality of the form

$$\omega(f_1(T_1, \dots, T_n), \dots, f_k(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \omega(f_1(S_1, \dots, S_n), \dots, f_k(S_1, \dots, S_n))$$

holds if $f_1(S_1, \dots, S_n), \dots, f_k(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ belong to operator algebras or operator systems generated by the left creation operators S_1, \dots, S_n and the identity such as the noncommutative disc algebra \mathcal{A}_n , the Toeplitz C^* -algebra $C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$, the noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebra F_n^∞ , the noncommutative Douglas type algebra \mathcal{D}_n , and the operator system $F_n^\infty(F_n^\infty)^*$. The operator $f_j(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is defined by an appropriate functional calculus for row contractions. Actually, we obtain matrix-valued generalizations of the above inequality.

Let $\omega := \{\omega_{\mathcal{H}, n}\}$ (\mathcal{H} is any separable Hilbert space and $n = 1, 2, \dots$) be a family of mappings $\omega_{\mathcal{H}, n} : B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. If $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$ we denote $\omega(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \omega_{\mathcal{H}, n}(T_1, \dots, T_n)$. We say that ω is a *joint operator radius* if, for any $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$,

- (i) $\omega(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \omega(T_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, T_{\sigma(n)})$ for any permutation $\sigma : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$;
- (ii) $\omega(T_1, \dots, T_n, 0) = \omega(T_1, \dots, T_n)$.

A joint operator radius ω is called *admissible* if, for any $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$, it satisfies the following properties:

- (iii) $\omega(U^*T_1U, \dots, U^*T_nU) = \omega(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any unitary operator $U : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$;
- (iv) $\omega(I_{\mathcal{G}} \otimes T_1, \dots, I_{\mathcal{G}} \otimes T_n) = \omega(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any separable Hilbert space \mathcal{G} ;
- (v) $\omega(T_1|_{\mathcal{M}}, \dots, T_n|_{\mathcal{M}}) \leq \omega(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any invariant subspace $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ under each operator T_1, \dots, T_n .

A joint operator radius ω is called *strongly admissible* if it satisfies the properties (iii), (iv), and

- (v') $\omega(P_{\mathcal{M}}T_1|_{\mathcal{M}}, \dots, P_{\mathcal{M}}T_n|_{\mathcal{M}}) \leq \omega(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ for any $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$ and any closed subspace $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$.

We remark that one can easily prove that conditions (iii) and (v') hold if and only if

$$\omega(V^*T_1V, \dots, V^*T_nV) \leq \omega(T_1, \dots, T_n)$$

for any $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)}$ and any isometry $V : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. Obviously, any strongly admissible radius is admissible.

We say that a joint operator radius $\omega : B(\mathcal{K})^{(n)} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is norm (resp. strongly, *-strongly, weakly) *quasi-continuous* if, for any $b \geq 0$, the ball

$$B_{\omega, b} := \left\{ (T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{K})^{(n)} : \omega(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq b \right\}$$

is closed in the product topology of $B(\mathcal{K})^{(n)}$, where $B(\mathcal{K})$ is endowed with the norm (resp. strong, *-strong, weak) operator topology.

Proposition 5.1. (i) *The joint operator radii $\|\cdot\|$, $\|\cdot\|_e$, $w(\cdot)$, $w_e(\cdot)$, $r(\cdot)$, $r_e(\cdot)$, and $\omega_\rho(\cdot)$, $0 < \rho \leq 2$, are strongly admissible;*
(ii) *The joint operator radii $\|\cdot\|$, $\|\cdot\|_e$, $w(\cdot)$, and $w_e(\cdot)$ are WOT quasi-continuous;*
(iii) *The joint operator radius $\omega_\rho(\cdot)$, ($\rho > 0$), is admissible and *-SOT quasi-continuous.*

Proof. Part (i) of the theorem concerning $w(\cdot)$, $w_e(\cdot)$, and $\omega_\rho(\cdot)$, $0 < \rho \leq 2$, follows from Theorem 1.1, Theorem 2.2, and Theorem 4.5, respectively. To prove that $\|\cdot\|$, $\|\cdot\|_e$, $r(\cdot)$, and $r_e(\cdot)$ are strongly admissible is a simple exercise, so we leave it to the reader. Now we prove (ii). For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $\{T_i^{(\alpha)}\}_{\alpha \in J}$ be a net of operators in $B(\mathcal{H})$ which is WOT convergent to $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$. If $\| [T_1^{(\alpha)}, \dots, T_n^{(\alpha)}] \| \leq 1$ for any $\alpha \in J$, then

$$\left| \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n T_i^{(\alpha)} h_i, k \right\rangle \right| \leq \| (h_1, \dots, h_n) \| \| k \|$$

for any $h_1, \dots, h_n, k \in \mathcal{H}$. This implies that $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a contraction, which proves that $\|\cdot\|$ is WOT quasi-continuous. Similarly one can prove that $\|\cdot\|_e$ is WOT quasi-continuous.

Now, assume that $w(T_1^{(\alpha)}, \dots, T_n^{(\alpha)}) \leq 1$ for any $\alpha \in J$. According to Theorem 1.1 part (vi), we deduce that $\|T_i^{(\alpha)}\| \leq 2$. Since the net $\{T_i^{(\alpha)}\}_{\alpha \in J}$ is WOT convergent to T_i , it is also w^* -convergent to T_i . This is equivalent to the WOT convergence of the net $\{I \otimes T_i^{(\alpha)}\}_{\alpha \in J}$ to $I \otimes T_i$. Therefore, the net $\{R_i \otimes T_i^{(\alpha)*}\}_{\alpha \in J}$ is WOT convergent to $R_i \otimes T_i^*$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Using Corollary 4.7, we deduce that $w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$, which proves that the joint numerical range is WOT quasi-continuous. Similarly, one can prove that the euclidean numerical radius is WOT quasi-continuous.

To prove part (iii), notice first that $\omega_\rho(\cdot)$ is admissible due to Theorem 4.5. Now, assume that the net $\{T_i^{(\alpha)*}\}_{\alpha \in J}$ is SOT convergent to T_i^* for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $\omega_\rho(T_1^{(\alpha)}, \dots, T_n^{(\alpha)}) \leq 1$. According to Theorem 4.2, we have $\|T_i^{(\alpha)}\| \leq \rho$. Since the map $A \mapsto I \otimes A$ is SOT-continuous on bounded subsets of $B(\mathcal{H})$, we can use Theorem 4.1 (the equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii)) to deduce that $(T_1, \dots, T_n) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$. Consequently, Theorem 4.2 implies $\omega_\rho(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$, which completes the proof. \square

We need to recall from [52] a few facts about noncommutative Poisson transforms associated with row contractions $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$. For each $0 < r \leq 1$, define the defect operator $\Delta_r := (I - r^2 T_1 T_1^* - \dots - r^2 T_n T_n^*)^{1/2}$. The Poisson kernel associated with T is the family of operators $K_{T,r} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$, $0 < r \leq 1$, defined by

$$K_{T,r} h := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} e_\alpha \otimes r^{|\alpha|} \Delta_r T_\alpha^* h, \quad h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

When $r = 1$, we denote $\Delta := \Delta_1$ and $K_T := K_{T,1}$. The operators $K_{T,r}$ are isometries if $0 < r < 1$ and

$$K_T^* K_T = I - \text{SOT-} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} T_\alpha T_\alpha^*.$$

This shows that K_T is an isometry if and only if T is a C_0 -row contraction ([44]), i.e.,

$$\text{SOT-} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* = 0.$$

A key property of the Poisson kernel is that

$$(5.1) \quad K_{T,r}(r^{|\alpha|} T_\alpha^*) = (S_\alpha^* \otimes I) K_{T,r}$$

for any $0 < r < 1$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. If T is C_0 -row contraction, then equality (5.1) holds also for $r = 1$. In [52], we introduced the Poisson transform associated with $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$ as the unital completely contractive linear map $\Phi_T : C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$(5.2) \quad \Phi_T(f) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r}^*(f \otimes I) K_{T,r},$$

where the limit exists in the norm topology of $B(\mathcal{H})$. Moreover, we have

$$\Phi_T(S_\alpha S_\beta^*) = T_\alpha T_\beta^*, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+.$$

When T is a completely noncoisometric (c.n.c.) row-contraction, i.e., there is no $h \in \mathcal{H}$, $h \neq 0$, such that

$$\sum_{|\alpha|=k} \|T_\alpha^* h\|^2 = \|h\|^2, \quad \text{for any } k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

an F_n^∞ -functional calculus was developed in [48]. More precisely, if $f = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} a_\alpha S_\alpha$ is in F_n^∞ , then

$$(5.3) \quad \Phi_T(f) = f(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \text{SOT-} \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^{|\alpha|} a_\alpha T_\alpha$$

exists and $\Phi_T : F_n^\infty \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is a WOT-continuous completely contractive homomorphism. More about noncommutative Poisson transforms on C^* -algebras generated by isometries can be found in [52], [3], [53], [54], and [56].

In what follows we will see that the Poisson transform Φ_T can be extended to the noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebra F_n^∞ by the formula (5.2), where $f \in F_n^\infty$ and the limit is taken in the SOT-topology. Moreover, $\Phi_T|_{F_n^\infty}$ coincides with the F_n^∞ -functional calculus. Let \mathcal{F}_n be the operator system defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_n := \text{span}\{fg^* : f, g \in F_n^\infty\}.$$

Assume that $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, is a C_0 -row contraction and let $\Phi_T : \mathcal{F}_n \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be the linear map defined by

$$(5.4) \quad \Phi_T(fg^*) := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)g(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*, \quad f, g \in F_n^\infty,$$

where $f(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ and $g(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ are defined by formula (5.3).

Throughout this section, $\omega : B(\mathcal{K})^{(k)} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a joint operator radius, where \mathcal{K} is a separable Hilbert space. For each $p \in \mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$, let M_p denote the $p \times p$ complex matrices and set $\Phi_{T,p} := I_{M_p} \otimes \Phi_T$.

We present now von Neumann type inequalities for arbitrary admissible or strongly admissible joint operator radii.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, be a C_0 -row contraction and let ω be a joint operator radius.*

(i) *If Φ_T is the F_n^∞ -functional calculus for C_0 -row contractions and ω is admissible, then*

$$(5.5) \quad \omega([\Phi_{T,p}(F_1)]^*, \dots, [\Phi_{T,p}(F_k)]^*) \leq \omega(F_1^*, \dots, F_k^*)$$

for any $F_1, \dots, F_k \in M_p \otimes F_n^\infty$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) The map Φ_T defined by (5.4) is a unital completely contractive linear map which extends the F_n^∞ -functional calculus for C_0 -row contractions, and we have

$$(5.6) \quad \Phi_T(fg^*) = K_T^*(fg^* \otimes I)K_T, \quad f, g \in F_n^\infty,$$

where K_T is the Poisson kernel associated with T . Moreover, if ω is strongly admissible, then

$$(5.7) \quad \omega(\Phi_{T,p}(X_1), \dots, \Phi_{T,p}(X_k)) \leq \omega(X_1, \dots, X_k)$$

for any $X_1, \dots, X_k \in M_p \otimes \mathcal{F}_n$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Since T is C_0 -row contraction, equality (5.1) (case $r = 1$) implies

$$(5.8) \quad K_T^*(p(S_1, \dots, S_n) \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) = p(T_1, \dots, T_n)K_T^*$$

for any polynomial $p(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in \mathcal{P}$. According to [48], if $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} a_\alpha S_\alpha$ is in F_n^∞ ,

then, for any $0 < r < 1$, $f_r(S_1, \dots, S_n) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^{|\alpha|} a_\alpha S_\alpha$ is in the noncommutative disc algebra \mathcal{A}_n and $\|f_r(S_1, \dots, S_n)\| \leq \|f(S_1, \dots, S_n)\|$. Since

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^{|\alpha|} a_\alpha S_\alpha = f_r(S_1, \dots, S_n)$$

in the norm topology, the noncommutative von Neumann inequality (see Corollary 1.6) and relation (5.8) imply

$$K_T^*(f_r(S_1, \dots, S_n) \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) = f_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)K_T^*$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$. Using the F_n^∞ -functional calculus (see (5.3)) and taking $r \rightarrow 1$ in the above equality, we obtain

$$(5.9) \quad K_T^*(f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) = f(T_1, \dots, T_n)K_T^*$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$, where $f(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is defined by formula (5.3). Hence, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} K_T & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & K_T & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & K_T \end{bmatrix} [f_{ij}(T_1, \dots, T_n)]_{p \times p}^* \\ &= \left([f_{ij}(S_1, \dots, S_n)]_{p \times p}^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}} \right) \begin{bmatrix} K_T & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & K_T & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & K_T \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

for any operator matrix $[f_{ij}(S_1, \dots, S_n)]_{p \times p} \in M_p \otimes F_n^\infty$. Let $\tilde{K}_T : \mathcal{H}^{(p)} \rightarrow [F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}]^{(p)}$ denote the p -fold ampliation of the Poisson kernel K_T . Since \tilde{K}_T is an isometry, the above equation shows that the operator matrix $[f_{ij}(T_1, \dots, T_n)]_{p \times p}^*$ is unitarily equivalent to the restriction of $[f_{ij}(S_1, \dots, S_n)]_{p \times p}^* \otimes I$ to its invariant subspace $\tilde{K}_T(\mathcal{H}^{(p)})$. Taking into account that

$$\Phi_{T,p} \left([f_{ij}(S_1, \dots, S_n)]_{p \times p} \right) = [f_{ij}(T_1, \dots, T_n)]_{p \times p}$$

and ω is an admissible operator radius, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega([\Phi_{T,p}(F_1)]^*, \dots, [\Phi_{T,p}(F_k)]^*) &= \omega \left((F_1^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})|_{\tilde{K}_T(\mathcal{H}^{(p)})}, \dots, (F_k^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})|_{\tilde{K}_T(\mathcal{H}^{(p)})} \right) \\ &\leq \omega(F_1^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, F_k^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &= \omega(F_1^*, \dots, F_k^*) \end{aligned}$$

for any $F_1, \dots, F_k \in M_p \otimes F_n^\infty$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$. This completes the proof of part (i) of the theorem.

To prove part (ii), note that relation (5.9) implies

$$(5.10) \quad K_T^*[f(S_1, \dots, S_n)g(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}]K_T = f(T_1, \dots, T_n)g(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n), g(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$, which proves (5.6). Since K_T is an isometry, it is clear that Φ_T is a unital completely contractive linear map. Moreover, using relation (5.10), we get

$$\tilde{K}_T^*(X_j \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})\tilde{K}_T = \Phi_{T,p}(X_j)$$

for any $X_j \in M_p \otimes \mathcal{F}_n$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, and taking into account that ω is strongly admissible, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\Phi_{T,p}(X_1), \dots, \Phi_{T,p}(X_k)) &= \omega\left(\tilde{K}_T^*(X_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})\tilde{K}_T, \dots, \tilde{K}_T^*(X_k \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})\tilde{K}_T\right) \\ &\leq \omega(X_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, X_k \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &= \omega(X_1, \dots, X_k). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

We remark that the map Φ_T defined by (5.4) can be extended to a completely contractive linear map from $B(F^2(H_n))$ to $B(\mathcal{H})$ by setting

$$\Phi_T(X) = K_T^*(X \otimes I)K_T, \quad X \in B(F^2(H_n)).$$

If $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a row contraction and $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} a_\alpha S_\alpha$ is in F_n^∞ , we denote

$$f_r(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} a_\alpha r^{|\alpha|} T_\alpha, \quad 0 < r < 1,$$

where the convergence is in the operator norm topology.

Lemma 5.3. *If $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, is a row contraction, then*

$$(5.11) \quad K_{T,r}^*(f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) = f_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)K_{T,r}^*$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$ and $0 < r < 1$. Moreover, if T is c.n.c., then

$$(5.12) \quad f(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \text{SOT-}\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r}^*(f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})K_{T,r}$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$.

Proof. The relation (5.1) implies

$$(5.13) \quad K_{T,r}^*[p(S_1, \dots, S_n) \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] = p(rT_1, \dots, rT_n)K_{T,r}^*$$

for any polynomial $p(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ in \mathcal{P} . If $0 < t < 1$, then $f_t(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ is in noncommutative disc algebra \mathcal{A}_n and

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} t^{|\alpha|} a_\alpha S_\alpha = f_t(S_1, \dots, S_n),$$

where the convergence is in the operator norm. Since $[rT_1, \dots, rT_n]$ is a C_0 -row contraction, the noncommutative von Neuman inequality implies

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} t^{|\alpha|} r^{|\alpha|} a_\alpha T_\alpha = f_t(rT_1, \dots, rT_n)$$

in the operator norm. Using now relation (5.13) where $p(S_1, \dots, S_n) := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} t^{|\alpha|} a_\alpha S_\alpha$ and taking

limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$(5.14) \quad K_{T,r}^*(f_t(S_1, \dots, S_n) \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) = f_t(rT_1, \dots, rT_n)K_{T,r}^*.$$

Let us prove that

$$(5.15) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 1} f_t(rT_1, \dots, rT_n) = f_r(T_1, \dots, T_n),$$

where the convergence is in the operator norm. First, notice that, if $\epsilon > 0$, there is $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\left(\sum_{k=m_0}^{\infty} r^k\right) \|f\|_2 < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, where $\|f\|_2 := \|f(S_1, \dots, S_n)(1)\|$. Since $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a row contraction, the latter inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=m_0}^{\infty} r^k \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} a_{\alpha} T_{\alpha} \right\| &\leq \sum_{k=m_0}^{\infty} r^k \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} |a_{\alpha}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{k=m_0}^{\infty} r^k \right) \|f\|_2 < \frac{\epsilon}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} t^{|\alpha|} r^{|\alpha|} a_{\alpha} T_{\alpha} - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^{|\alpha|} a_{\alpha} T_{\alpha} \right\| &\leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{m_0-1} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k (t^k - 1) a_{\alpha} T_{\alpha} \right\| + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{m_0-1} r^k (t^k - 1) \|f\|_2 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, it clear that there exists $0 < \delta < 1$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^{m_0-1} r^k (t^k - 1) \|f\|_2 < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for any $t \in (\delta, 1)$. This proves relation (5.15). Since $\text{SOT-}\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} f_t(S_1, \dots, S_n) = f(S_1, \dots, S_n)$, we can use relation (5.15) and then take the limit in (5.14), as $t \rightarrow 1$, to obtain relation (5.11). The last part of the lemma follows from relations (5.11) and (5.3). The proof is complete. \square

Under the additional condition of norm quasi-continuity of the joint operator radius, we can prove the following result.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, be a row contraction, Φ_T be the Poisson transform associated with T , and let ω be a joint operator radius.*

(i) *If ω is norm quasi-continuous and admissible, then*

$$(5.16) \quad \omega([\Phi_{T,p}(F_1)]^*, \dots, [\Phi_{T,p}(F_k)]^*) \leq \omega(F_1^*, \dots, F_k^*)$$

for any $F_1, \dots, F_k \in M_p \otimes \mathcal{A}_n$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) *If ω is norm quasi-continuous and strongly admissible, then*

$$(5.17) \quad \omega(\Phi_{T,p}(X_1), \dots, \Phi_{T,p}(X_k)) \leq \omega(X_1, \dots, X_k)$$

for any $X_1, \dots, X_k \in M_p \otimes C^(S_1, \dots, S_n)$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. According to Lemma 5.3, we have

$$(F(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \otimes I) \tilde{K}_{T,r} = \tilde{K}_{T,r} F(rT_1, \dots, rT_n)^*$$

for any $F = F(S_1, \dots, S_n) := [f_{ij}(S_1, \dots, S_n)]_{p \times p} \in M_p \otimes \mathcal{A}_n$, where $\tilde{K}_{T,r}$ is the ampliation of the Poisson kernel $K_{T,r}$. Since $K_{T,r}$ is an isometry and ω is admissible, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(F_1(rT_1, \dots, rT_n)^*, \dots, F_k(rT_1, \dots, rT_n)^*) \\ &= \omega\left((F_1^* \otimes I) | \tilde{K}_{T,r}(\mathcal{H}^{(p)}), \dots, (F_k^* \otimes I) | \tilde{K}_{T,r}(\mathcal{H}^{(p)})\right) \\ &\leq \omega(F_1^* \otimes I, \dots, F_k^* \otimes I) \\ &= \omega(F_1^*, \dots, F_k^*) \end{aligned}$$

for any $F_1, \dots, F_k \in M_p \otimes \mathcal{A}_n$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. According to relation (5.2), $F_j(rT_1, \dots, rT_n) \rightarrow \Phi_{T,p}(F_j)$ in the operator norm as $r \rightarrow 1$. Consequently, since ω is norm quasi-continuous the above inequality implies (5.16). This completes the proof of part (i) of the theorem.

Let us prove part (ii). Since ω is strongly admissible and $K_{T,r}$ is an isometry, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\tilde{K}_{T,r}^*(X_1 \otimes I)\tilde{K}_{T,r}, \dots, \tilde{K}_{T,r}^*(X_k \otimes I)\tilde{K}_{T,r}) &\leq \omega(X_1 \otimes I, \dots, X_k \otimes I) \\ &= \omega(X_1, \dots, X_k) \end{aligned}$$

for any $X_1, \dots, X_k \in M_p \otimes C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$. Now, using relation (5.2), the norm continuity of ω , and taking $r \rightarrow 1$, we deduce inequality (5.17). The proof is complete. \square

Consider the linear span

$$\mathcal{D}_n := \text{span} \{f(S_1, \dots, S_n)S_\alpha^* : f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty, \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+\}.$$

We remark that the norm closed non-selfadjoint algebra generated by the noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebra F_n^∞ and the C^* -algebra $C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ coincides with the norm closure of \mathcal{D}_n . Indeed, since $C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ is the norm closure of polynomials of the form $\sum a_{\alpha\beta} S_\alpha S_\beta^*$, it is clear that $f(S_1, \dots, S_n)Y \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_n}$ for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$ and $Y \in C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$. To show that $Yf(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_n}$, it is enough to prove that

$$S_j^* f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in \mathcal{P}^* + F_n^\infty.$$

Since

$$f(S_1, \dots, S_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n S_i \varphi_i(S_1, \dots, S_n) + a_0 I$$

for any $j = 1, \dots, n$, for some elements $\varphi_i(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$ and $a_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, and taking into account that $S_i S_j^* = \delta_{ij} I$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$S_j^* f(S_1, \dots, S_n) = a_0 S_j^* + \varphi_j(S_1, \dots, S_n),$$

which proves our assertion. We can view \mathcal{D}_n as a noncommutative Douglas type subalgebra (see [21]) of $B(F^2(H_n))$. Let $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, be a c.n.c. row contraction and define the linear map $\Phi_T : \mathcal{D}_n + \mathcal{D}_n^* \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ by setting

$$(5.18) \quad \Phi_T(f(S_1, \dots, S_n)S_\alpha^* + S_\beta g(S_1, \dots, S_n)^*) := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)T_\alpha^* + T_\beta g(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n), g(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$, and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$.

Theorem 5.5. *Let T be a c.n.c. row contraction and let ω be a joint operator radius. The map Φ_T defined by (5.18) can be extended to a unital completely contractive linear map from the norm closure of $\mathcal{D}_n + \mathcal{D}_n^*$ to $B(\mathcal{H})$ by setting*

$$(5.19) \quad \Phi_T(X) := \text{WOT-}\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r}^*[X \otimes I]K_{T,r}, \quad X \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_n + \mathcal{D}_n^*},$$

where $\{K_{T,r}\}_{0 < r < 1}$ is the Poisson kernel associated with T .

(i) *If ω is *-SOT quasi-continuous and admissible, then*

$$(5.20) \quad \omega([\Phi_{T,p}(F_1)]^*, \dots, [\Phi_{T,p}(F_k)]^*) \leq \omega(F_1^*, \dots, F_k^*)$$

for any $F_1, \dots, F_k \in M_p \otimes F_n^\infty$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) *If ω is SOT quasi-continuous and strongly admissible, then*

$$(5.21) \quad \omega(\Phi_{T,p}(Y_1), \dots, \Phi_{T,p}(Y_k)) \leq \omega(Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$$

for any $Y_1, \dots, Y_k \in M_p \otimes \overline{\mathcal{D}_n}$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

(iii) *If ω is WOT quasi-continuous and strongly admissible, then inequality (5.21) holds for any $Y_1, \dots, Y_k \in M_p \otimes \overline{\mathcal{D}_n + \mathcal{D}_n^*}$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. According to Lemma 5.3, we have

$$(5.22) \quad K_{T,r}^*(f(S_1, \dots, S_n)p(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})K_{T,r} = f_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)p_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$ and any polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Since

$$\|f_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)\| \leq \|f(S_1, \dots, S_n)\| \quad \text{for any } 0 < r < 1,$$

and $p_r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \rightarrow p(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ in norm as $r \rightarrow 1$, one can use relations (5.3) and (5.22) to deduce that

$$(5.23) \quad \text{SOT-} \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r} [f(S_1, \dots, S_n) p(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] K_{T,r} = f(T_1, \dots, T_n) p(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*$$

Hence, we obtain

$$(5.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{WOT-} \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r} [(q(S_1, \dots, S_n) g(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* + f(S_1, \dots, S_n) p(S_1, \dots, S_n)^*) \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] K_{T,r} \\ = q(T_1, \dots, T_n) g(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* + f(T_1, \dots, T_n) p(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* \end{aligned}$$

for any $f, g \in F_n^\infty$ and $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$. This shows that the linear map $\Phi_T : \mathcal{D}_n + \mathcal{D}_n^* \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by (5.18) is completely contractive and the limit in (5.19) exists for any $X \in \mathcal{D}_n + \mathcal{D}_n^*$.

Now, we show that the limit in (5.19) exists for any $X \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_n + \mathcal{D}_n^*}$. Let $\{X_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of operators in $\mathcal{D}_n + \mathcal{D}_n^*$ such that $X_m \rightarrow X$ in norm as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\Phi|_{(\mathcal{D}_n + \mathcal{D}_n^*)}$ is a completely contractive linear map, we have

$$\|\Phi_T(X_p) - \Phi(X_m)\| \leq \|X_p - X_m\|, \quad p, m \in \mathbb{N},$$

which implies that $\{\Phi_T(X_m)\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence in the operator norm. Therefore, there exists $Y \in B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\Phi_T(X_m) \rightarrow Y$ in norm as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Note that, for any $h, k \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle K_{T,r}^* X K_{T,r} h, k \rangle - \langle Y h, k \rangle| \\ & \leq |\langle K_{T,r}^* (X - X_m) K_{T,r} h, k \rangle| + |\langle K_{T,r}^* X_m K_{T,r} h, k \rangle - \langle \Phi_T(X_m) h, k \rangle| \\ & \quad + |\langle \Phi_T(X_m) h, k \rangle - \langle Y h, k \rangle|. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $h \neq 0, k \neq 0$, and choose m_0 such that

$$\|X_m - X\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3\|h\|\|k\|} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Phi(X_m) - Y\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3\|h\|\|k\|}$$

for any $m \geq m_0$. According to relations (5.24) and (5.18), we can find $0 < \delta < 1$ such that

$$|\langle K_{T,r}^* X_m K_{T,r} h, k \rangle - \langle \Phi_T(X_m) h, k \rangle| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}$$

for any $r \in (\delta, 1)$. Now, the above inequalities imply

$$|\langle K_{T,r}^* X K_{T,r} h, k \rangle - \langle Y h, k \rangle| \leq \epsilon$$

for any $r \in (\delta, 1)$. This proves that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \langle K_{T,r}^* X K_{T,r} h, k \rangle = \langle Y h, k \rangle, \quad h, k \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Therefore, the limit in (5.19) exists for any $X \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_n + \mathcal{D}_n^*}$ and Φ_T is a completely contractive linear map. Similarly, using equation (5.23) instead of (5.24), one can prove that

$$(5.25) \quad \Phi_T(X) = \text{SOT-} \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r}^* [X \otimes I] K_{T,r}, \quad \text{for any } X \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_n}.$$

Now, to prove (i), notice that Lemma 5.3 implies

$$\tilde{K}_{T,r} [\Phi_{T,p}((F)_r)]^* = (F^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) \tilde{K}_{T,r}$$

for any $F = [f_{ij}]_{p \times p} \in M_p \otimes F_n^\infty$, where $F_r := [(f_{ij})_r]_{p \times p}$, $0 < r < 1$. Since ω is admissible, the latter equality implies

$$(5.26) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega([\Phi_{T,p}((F_1)_r)]^*, \dots, [\Phi_{T,p}((F_k)_r)]^*) & \leq \omega(F_1^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, F_k^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ & = \omega(F_1^*, \dots, F_k^*) \end{aligned}$$

for any $F_1, \dots, F_k \in M_p \otimes F_n^\infty$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. According to the F_n^∞ -functional calculus for c.n.c. row contractions, $[\Phi_{T,p}((F_j)_r)]$ is SOT convergent to $[\Phi_{T,p}(F_j)]$ as $r \rightarrow 1$. Since ω is *-SOT quasi-continuous, inequality (5.26) implies (5.20).

Let us prove part (ii) of the theorem. Since ω is strongly admissible and $K_{T,r}$ is an isometry, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\tilde{K}_{T,r}^*(Y_1 \otimes I) \tilde{K}_{T,r}, \dots, \tilde{K}_{T,r}^*(Y_k \otimes I) \tilde{K}_{T,r}) & \leq \omega(Y_1 \otimes I, \dots, Y_k \otimes I) \\ & = \omega(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \end{aligned}$$

for any $Y_1, \dots, Y_k \in M_p \otimes \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, using relation (5.25) and the SOT-continuity of ω , we deduce inequality (5.21). The proof of part (iii) is similar to that of part (ii) but uses relation (5.19) instead and the WOT-continuity of ω . The proof is complete. \square

Corollary 5.6. *If $X \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n$, then*

$$\Phi_T(X) = \text{SOT-}\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r}^*[X \otimes I]K_{T,r}.$$

Moreover, the map defined by (5.19) extends the F_n^∞ -functional calculus for c.n.c. row contractions and the Poisson transform defined by (5.2).

6. CONSTRAINED VON NEUMANN INEQUALITIES

If a row contraction $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ satisfies certain constrains, we prove that there is a suitable invariant subspace $\mathcal{E} \subset F^2(H_n)$ under each operator S_1^*, \dots, S_n^* , such that an inequality of the form

$$\omega(f_1(T_1, \dots, T_n), \dots, f_k(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \omega(P_{\mathcal{E}}f_1(S_1, \dots, S_n)|_{\mathcal{E}}, \dots, P_{\mathcal{E}}f_k(S_1, \dots, S_n)|_{\mathcal{E}})$$

holds, where ω is an admissible or strongly admissible joint operator radii.

This type of constrained von Neumann inequalities as well as matrix-valued versions are considered in this section. In particular, we obtain appropriate multivariable generalizations of several von Neumann type inequalities obtained in [66], [58], [62], [22], [47], [48], [50], [52], [5], [3], and [53], to joint operator radii. For example, if $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a row contraction with commuting entries, then we prove that

$$\omega(f_1(T_1, \dots, T_n), \dots, f_k(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \omega(f_1(B_1, \dots, B_n), \dots, f_k(B_1, \dots, B_n))$$

if $f_1(B_1, \dots, B_n), \dots, f_k(B_1, \dots, B_n)$ are elements of operator algebras such as the commutative disc algebra \mathcal{A}_n^c , the Toeplitz C^* -algebra $C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n)$, Arveson's algebra W_n^∞ , the commutative Douglas type algebra $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n^c$, and the operator system $W_n^\infty(W_n^\infty)^*$. The operator $f_j(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is defined by an appropriate functional calculus for row contractions with commuting entries.

Let \mathcal{H} be a separable complex Hilbert space, J be a WOT-closed two-sided ideal of F_n^∞ , and let $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, be a C_0 -row contraction such that

$$\varphi(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0, \quad \text{for any } \varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in J.$$

Denote by W_J^∞ the WOT-closed algebra generated by the operators $B_i := P_{\mathcal{N}_J}S_i|_{\mathcal{N}_J}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and the identity, where

$$\mathcal{N}_J := F^2(H_n) \ominus \mathcal{M}_J \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}_J := \overline{JF^2(H_n)}.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{M}_J := \overline{\{\varphi : \varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in J\}}^{\|\cdot\|^2}$ where $\varphi := \varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n)(1)$, and

$$\mathcal{N}_J = \bigcap_{\varphi \in J} \ker \varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n)^*.$$

We proved in [3] that

$$(6.1) \quad W_J^\infty = P_{\mathcal{N}_J}F_n^\infty|_{\mathcal{N}_J} = \{f(B_1, \dots, B_n) : f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty\},$$

where $f(B_1, \dots, B_n)$ is defined by the F_n^∞ -functional calculus for C_0 -row contractions. Moreover, the map $\Phi_T^J : W_J^\infty \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$(6.2) \quad \Phi_T^J(f(B_1, \dots, B_n)) := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)$$

is a WOT-continuous, completely contractive homomorphism (see Section 4 of [3]), which we call the W_J^∞ -functional calculus. Now, consider the operator system defined by

$$\mathcal{W}_n^J := \text{span}\{f(B_1, \dots, B_n)g(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* : f(B_1, \dots, B_n), g(B_1, \dots, B_n) \in W_J^\infty\}.$$

Let $\Phi_T^J : \mathcal{W}_n^J \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ be the linear map defined by

$$(6.3) \quad \Phi_T^J[f(B_1, \dots, B_n)g(B_1, \dots, B_n)^*] := f(T_1, \dots, T_n)g(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*,$$

where $f(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ and $g(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ are defined by formula (5.3).

In what follows, we obtain constrained von Neumann inequalities for arbitrary admissible (resp. strongly admissible) joint operator radii.

Theorem 6.1. *Let ω be a joint operator radius, J be a WOT-closed two-sided ideal of F_n^∞ , and let $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, be a C_0 -row contraction such that*

$$\varphi(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0, \quad \varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in J.$$

Then, the map Φ_T^J defined by (6.3) is a unital completely contractive linear map and

$$(6.4) \quad \Phi_T^J(f(B_1, \dots, B_n)g(B_1, \dots, B_n)^*) = K_T^*[f(S_1, \dots, S_n)g(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \otimes I]K_T$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n), g(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$, where K_T is the Poisson kernel associated with T .

(i) If ω is admissible, then

$$(6.5) \quad \omega([\Phi_{T,p}^J(F_1)]^*, \dots, [\Phi_{T,p}^J(F_k)]^*) \leq \omega(F_1^*, \dots, F_k^*)$$

for any $F_1, \dots, F_k \in M_p \otimes W_J^\infty$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) If ω is strongly admissible, then

$$(6.6) \quad \omega(\Phi_{T,p}^J(X_1), \dots, \Phi_{T,p}^J(X_k)) \leq \omega(X_1, \dots, X_k)$$

for any $X_1, \dots, X_k \in M_p \otimes \mathcal{W}_n^J$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. According to Theorem 5.2 (see relation (5.9)), we have

$$(6.7) \quad \langle (\varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \otimes I)K_T h, 1 \otimes k \rangle = \langle K_T \varphi(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* h, 1 \otimes k \rangle$$

for any $\varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$ and $h, k \in \mathcal{H}$. Note that if $\varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in J$, then $\varphi(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0$, and relation (6.7) implies $\langle K_T h, \varphi \otimes k \rangle = 0$ for any $h, k \in \mathcal{H}$. Taking into account the definition of \mathcal{M}_J , we deduce that $K_T(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_J \otimes \mathcal{H}$. This implies

$$(6.8) \quad K_T = (P_{\mathcal{N}_J} \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) K_T.$$

Since J is a left ideal of F_n^∞ , \mathcal{N}_J is an invariant subspace under each operator S_1^*, \dots, S_n^* and therefore $B_\alpha = P_{\mathcal{N}_J} S_\alpha |_{\mathcal{N}_J}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Since $[B_1, \dots, B_n]$ is a C_0 -row contraction, we can use the F_n^∞ -functional calculus to deduce that

$$(6.9) \quad f(B_1, \dots, B_n) = P_{\mathcal{N}_J} f(S_1, \dots, S_n) |_{\mathcal{N}_J}$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$. Taking into account relations (5.9) (see Theorem 5.2), (6.8), and (6.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} K_T f(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* &= (P_{\mathcal{N}_J} \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) [f(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] (P_{\mathcal{N}_J} \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) K_T \\ &= [(P_{\mathcal{N}_J} f(S_1, \dots, S_n) |_{\mathcal{N}_J})^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] K_T \\ &= [f(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] K_T. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$(6.10) \quad K_T f(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* = [f(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] K_T$$

for any $f(B_1, \dots, B_n) \in W_J^\infty$. Hence, we obtain

$$(6.11) \quad f(T_1, \dots, T_n)g(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* = K_T^*[f(B_1, \dots, B_n)g(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}]K_T,$$

which proves relation (6.4) and that Φ_T^J is a unital completely contractive linear map.

To prove part (i) of the theorem, notice that relation (6.10) implies

$$(6.12) \quad \tilde{K}_T [f_{ij}(T_1, \dots, T_n)]_{p \times p}^* = \left([f_{ij}(B_1, \dots, B_n)]_{p \times p}^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}} \right) \tilde{K}_T,$$

where \tilde{K}_T is the p -fold ampliation of K_T . Since \tilde{K}_T is an isometry, ω is admissible, and

$$\Phi_{T,p}^J([f_{ij}(B_1, \dots, B_n)]_{p \times p}) = [f_{ij}(T_1, \dots, T_n)]_{p \times p},$$

one can use relation (6.12) to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega([\Phi_{T,p}(F_1)]^*, \dots, [\Phi_{T,p}(F_k)]^*) &= \omega\left((F_1^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})|\tilde{K}_T(\mathcal{H}^{(p)}), \dots, (F_k^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})|\tilde{K}_T(\mathcal{H}^{(p)})\right) \\ &\leq \omega(F_1^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, F_k^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &= \omega(F_1^*, \dots, F_k^*) \end{aligned}$$

for any $F_1, \dots, F_k \in M_p \otimes W_J^\infty$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

To prove the last part of the theorem, notice that relation (6.11) implies

$$\Phi_{T,p}(X) = \tilde{K}_T^*(X \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})\tilde{K}_T$$

for any $X \in M_p \otimes \mathcal{W}_n^J$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Since ω is strongly admissible and \tilde{K}_T is an isometry, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\Phi_{T,p}^J(X_1), \dots, \Phi_{T,p}^J(X_k)) &= \omega\left(\tilde{K}_T^*(X_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})\tilde{K}_T, \dots, \tilde{K}_T^*(X_k \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})\tilde{K}_T\right) \\ &\leq \omega(X_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, X_k \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &= \omega(X_1, \dots, X_k) \end{aligned}$$

for any $X_1, \dots, X_k \in M_p \otimes \mathcal{W}_n^J$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. The proof is complete. \square

Let us remark that the map Φ_T^J defined by (6.3) can be extended to a completely contractive linear map from $B(\mathcal{N}_J)$ to $B(\mathcal{H})$ by setting

$$\Phi_T(X) = K_T^*(X \otimes I)K_T, \quad X \in B(\mathcal{N}_J).$$

We consider now some examples.

Example 6.2. In the particular case when $n = 1$, F_1^∞ can be identified with the classical Hardy algebra $H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$. It is well-known (see [26]) that any w^* -closed ideal J of H^∞ is generated by an inner function $u \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$, i.e., $J = uH^\infty(\mathbb{D})$. In this case, we have

$$\mathcal{N}_J = H^2 \ominus uH^2 = \ker u(S)^*.$$

Let $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be a c.n.u. contraction such that $u(T) = 0$. Then, according to [64], T is of class C_0 , which in our notation means $T \in C_0$. If ω is a strongly admissible operator radius, then applying Theorem 6.1 to T , we obtain

$$\omega\left(\sum_{j=1}^m f_j(T)g_j(T)^*, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^m \chi_j(T)\psi_j(T)^*\right) \leq \omega\left(\sum_{j=1}^m f_j(B)g_j(B)^*, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^m \chi_j(B)\psi_j(B)^*\right)$$

for any functions $f_j, g_j, \dots, \chi_j, \psi_j \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where $B := P_{\ker u(S)^*}S|_{\ker u(S)^*}$ and S is the unilateral shift on the Hardy space H^2 . In the particular case when $k = 1$, $m = 1$, and ω is the operator norm on $B(\mathcal{H})$, we get

$$\|f(T)g(T)^*\| \leq \|f(B)g(B)^*\|$$

for any $f, g \in H^\infty$. When $g = 1$, we find the constrained von Neumann inequality obtained by Sz.-Nagy [62].

Example 6.3. Let J_m be the WOT-closed two-sided ideal of F_n^∞ generated by the monomials S_α for $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ with $|\alpha| = m$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{N}_{J_m} = \mathcal{P}_{m-1}$, the set of all polynomials in $F^2(H_n)$ of degree $\leq m - 1$. Let $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$ be a row contraction such that

$$T_\alpha = 0 \quad \text{for any } \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+ \text{ with } |\alpha| = m.$$

Since T is clearly a C_0 -row contraction, one can apply Theorem 6.1 to T and J_m . Therefore, if ω is a strongly admissible operator radius, then

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \left(\sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq m-1} a_\alpha T_\alpha T_\beta^*, \dots, \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq m-1} b_\alpha T_\alpha T_\beta^* \right) \\ \leq \omega \left(\sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq m-1} a_\alpha S_\alpha^{(m)} S_\beta^{(m)*}, \dots, \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq m-1} b_\alpha S_\alpha^{(m)} S_\beta^{(m)*} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $S_i^{(m)} := P_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}} S_i |_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are the truncated left creation operators acting on \mathcal{P}_{m-1} .

Now, let J_s be the WOT-closed two-sided ideal of F_n^∞ generated by the commutators $S_i S_j - S_j S_i$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. Notice that if $J := J_m + J_s$, then

$$\mathcal{M}_J = J_s F^2(H_n) \vee J_m F^2(H_n)$$

and $\mathcal{N}_J = F_s^2(H_n) \cap \mathcal{P}_{m-1}$, where $F_s^2(H_n) \subset F^2(H_n)$ is the symmetric Fock space. Now, assume that $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a row contraction such that $T_i T_j = T_j T_i$ for any $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, and $T_\alpha = 0$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$, $|\alpha| = m$. Then we can apply Theorem 6.1 to T and the two-sided ideal J and obtain a commutative version of the above inequality. More precisely, the operators $S_i^{(m)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are replaced by the mutually commuting operators

$$Z_i^{(m)} := P_{F_s^2(H_n) \cap \mathcal{P}_{m-1}} S_i |_{F_s^2(H_n) \cap \mathcal{P}_{m-1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Example 6.4. Let W_n^∞ be the WOT-closed algebra generated by the operators

$$Z_i := P_{F_s^2(H_n)} S_i |_{F_s^2(H_n)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

and the identity on the symmetric Fock space $F_s^2(H_n)$. Fix an operator $\varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$ and let $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$ be a C_0 -row contraction such that $T_i T_j = T_j T_i$ for any $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ and

$$\varphi(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0.$$

Let J_φ be the WOT-closed two-sided ideal of F_n^∞ generated by φ and let $J_{\varphi, s} := J_\varphi + J_s$. Straightforward computations reveal that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_{J_{\varphi, s}} &= F_s^2(H_n) \cap \left(\bigcap_{\psi \in J_\varphi} \ker \psi(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \right) \\ &= \ker \varphi(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)^*. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used the fact that the symmetric Fock space is invariant under each operator S_1^*, \dots, S_n^* and Z_1, \dots, Z_n are mutually commuting. Now, we can apply Theorem 6.1 to our setting and obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \left(\sum_{j=1}^m f_j(T_1, \dots, T_n) g_j(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^m \chi_j(T_1, \dots, T_n) \psi_j(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* \right) \\ \leq \omega \left(\sum_{j=1}^m f_j(B_1, \dots, B_n) g_j(B_1, \dots, B_n)^*, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^m \chi_j(B_1, \dots, B_n) \psi_j(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \right) \end{aligned}$$

for any elements $f_j, g_j, \dots, \chi_j, \psi_j \in F_n^\infty$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$B_i := P_{\ker \varphi(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)^*} Z_i |_{\ker \varphi(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)^*}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

In the particular case when $k = 1$, $m = 1$, and ω is the operator norm on $B(\mathcal{H})$, we get

$$\|f(T_1, \dots, T_n) g(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*\| \leq \|f(B_1, \dots, B_n) g(B_1, \dots, B_n)^*\|$$

for any $f, g \in F_n^\infty$. This inequality is a multivariable commutative version of the constrained von Neumann inequality obtained by Sz.-Nagy [62] (case $n = 1$ and $g = 1$).

In what follows, we need the following result.

Lemma 6.5. *Let J be the WOT-closed two-sided ideal of F_n^∞ generated by some homogenous polynomials $q_1, \dots, q_d \in \mathcal{P}$. If $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, is a row contraction such that*

$$q_j(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, d,$$

then

$$(6.13) \quad K_{T,r}^*(f(B_1, \dots, B_n) \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) = f_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)K_{T,r}^*$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$ and $0 < r < 1$. Moreover, if T is c.n.c., then

$$(6.14) \quad f(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \text{SOT-}\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r}^*(f(B_1, \dots, B_n) \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})K_{T,r}$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$.

Proof. According to Lemma 5.3, we have

$$(6.15) \quad [f(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}]K_{T,r} = K_{T,r}f_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$ and $0 < r < 1$. Hence, we deduce that

$$(6.16) \quad \langle K_{T,r}k, \varphi \otimes h \rangle = \langle k, \varphi_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)\Delta_r h \rangle$$

for any $\varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in J$ and $h, k \in \mathcal{H}$. Since the F_n^∞ -functional calculus is a homomorphism and q_j are homogenous polynomials such that $q_j(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0$, $j = 1, \dots, d$, we have

$$(6.17) \quad (f q_j)(rT_1, \dots, rT_n) = r^{\deg(q_j)} f(rT_1, \dots, rT_n) q_j(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$ and $j = 1, \dots, d$, where $\deg(q_j)$ denotes the degree of the polynomial q_j . On the other hand, J is the WOT-closed two-sided ideal of F_n^∞ generated by q_1, \dots, q_d , and the F_n^∞ -functional calculus for C_0 -row contractions is WOT-continuous. Consequently, since $[rT_1, \dots, rT_n]$ is a C_0 -row contraction, relation (6.17) implies $\varphi(rT_1, \dots, rT_n) = 0$ for any $\varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in J$ and $0 < r < 1$. Hence, relation (6.16) implies $\langle K_{T,r}k, \varphi \otimes h \rangle = 0$ for any $\varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in J$ and $h, k \in \mathcal{H}$. Since $\{\varphi : \varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in J\}$ is dense in \mathcal{M}_J , the latter equality shows that

$$(6.18) \quad K_{T,r}(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_J \otimes \mathcal{H}$$

for any $0 < r < 1$. Now, relations (6.15), (6.18), and (6.9) imply

$$\begin{aligned} K_{T,r}f_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* &= (P_{\mathcal{N}_J} \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})[f(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}](P_{\mathcal{N}_J} \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})K_{T,r} \\ &= [f(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}]K_{T,r}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves relation (6.13). Notice that relation (6.13) implies

$$(6.19) \quad f_r(T_1, \dots, T_n) = K_{T,r}^*[f(B_1, \dots, B_n) \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}]K_{T,r}.$$

If $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a c.n.c. row contraction, then the F_n^∞ -functional calculus implies

$$\text{SOT-}\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f_r(T_1, \dots, T_n) = f(T_1, \dots, T_n),$$

which together with (6.19) imply relation (6.14). The proof is complete. \square

Let \mathcal{A}_n^J be the norm closed algebra generated by $B_i := P_{\mathcal{N}_J} S_i |_{\mathcal{N}_J}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and the identity $I_{\mathcal{N}_J}$. We denote by \mathcal{B} the linear span of $\{B_\alpha B_\beta^* : \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+\}$ and by $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ its norm closure.

Under the additional condition of norm quasi-continuity of the joint operator radius, we can obtain more constrained von Neumann inequalities.

Theorem 6.6. *Let ω be a joint operator radius, J be the WOT-closed two-sided ideal of F_n^∞ generated by some homogenous polynomials $q_1, \dots, q_d \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, be a row contraction such that*

$$q_j(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, d.$$

Then there is a unital completely contractive linear map $\Phi_T^J : \overline{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\Phi_T^J(B_\alpha B_\beta^*) = T_\alpha T_\beta^*$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Moreover,

$$(6.20) \quad \Phi_T^J(X) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r}^*(X \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})K_{T,r}, \quad X \in \overline{\mathcal{B}},$$

where the convergence is in the operator norm topology, and $\{K_{T,r}\}_{0 < r < 1}$ is the Poisson kernel associated with T .

(i) If ω is norm quasi-continuous and admissible, then

$$(6.21) \quad \omega([\Phi_{T,p}^J(F_1)]^*, \dots, [\Phi_{T,p}^J(F_k)]^*) \leq \omega(F_1^*, \dots, F_k^*)$$

for any $F_1, \dots, F_k \in M_p \otimes \mathcal{A}_n^J$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) If ω is norm quasi-continuous and strongly admissible, then

$$(6.22) \quad \omega(\Phi_{T,p}^J(X_1), \dots, \Phi_{T,p}^J(X_k)) \leq \omega(X_1, \dots, X_k)$$

for any $X_1, \dots, X_k \in M_p \otimes \overline{\mathcal{B}}$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. According to Lemma 6.5, we have

$$(6.23) \quad K_{T,r}^*(B_\alpha B_\beta^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})K_{T,r} = r^{|\alpha|+|\beta|} T_\alpha T_\beta^*$$

for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ and $0 < r < 1$. Since $K_{T,r}$ is an isometry, relation (6.23) implies

$$(6.24) \quad \left\| \sum a_{\alpha\beta} T_\alpha T_\beta^* \right\| \leq \left\| \sum a_{\alpha\beta} B_\alpha B_\beta^* \right\|$$

for any $\sum a_{\alpha\beta} B_\alpha B_\beta^* \in \mathcal{B}$. Moreover, the von Neumann type inequality (6.24) implies the existence of a unique unital completely contractive linear map $\Phi_T^J : \overline{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\Phi_T^J(B_\alpha B_\beta^*) = T_\alpha T_\beta^*$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. The proof of (6.20) is similar to that of Theorem 3.8 from [52]. We shall omit it.

Now, let us prove part (i) of the theorem. Since $\mathcal{A}_n^J \subset W_J^\infty = P_{\mathcal{N}_J} F_n^\infty | \mathcal{N}_J$, Lemma 6.5 implies

$$(6.25) \quad \tilde{K}_{T,r} F(rT_1, \dots, rT_n)^* = [F(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] \tilde{K}_{T,r}$$

for any $F(B_1, \dots, B_n) := [f_{ij}(B_1, \dots, B_n)]_{p \times p} \in M_p \otimes \mathcal{A}_n^J$, where $\tilde{K}_{T,r}$ is the ampliation of $K_{T,r}$. Since $K_{T,r}$ is an isometry and ω is admissible, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \omega(F_1(rT_1, \dots, rT_n)^*, \dots, F_k(rT_1, \dots, rT_n)^*) \\ &= \omega\left((F_1(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) \tilde{K}_{T,r}(\mathcal{H}^{(p)}), \dots, (F_k(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) \tilde{K}_{T,r}(\mathcal{H}^{(p)})\right) \\ &\leq \omega(F_1(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, F_k(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &= \omega(F_1(B_1, \dots, B_n)^*, \dots, F_k(B_1, \dots, B_n)^*) \end{aligned}$$

for any $F_1(B_1, \dots, B_n), \dots, F_k(B_1, \dots, B_n) \in M_p \otimes \mathcal{A}_n^J$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. According to relations (6.25) and (6.20), we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} F_j(rT_1, \dots, rT_n) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \tilde{K}_{T,r}^* [F(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] \tilde{K}_{T,r} = \Phi_{T,p}^J(F_j),$$

where the convergence is in operator norm topology. Consequently, since ω is norm quasi-continuous the above inequality implies (6.21). This completes the proof of (i) of the theorem.

Let us prove part (ii). Since ω is strongly admissible and $K_{T,r}$ is an isometry, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\tilde{K}_{T,r}^*(X_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) \tilde{K}_{T,r}, \dots, \tilde{K}_{T,r}^*(X_k \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) \tilde{K}_{T,r}) &\leq \omega(X_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, X_k \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &= \omega(X_1, \dots, X_k) \end{aligned}$$

for any $X_1, \dots, X_k \in M_p \otimes \overline{\mathcal{B}}$. Now, using relation (6.20), the norm continuity of ω , and taking $r \rightarrow 1$, we deduce inequality (6.22). The proof is complete. \square

Let $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, be a c.n.c. row contraction and let J be a WOT-closed two-sided ideal of F_n^∞ such that

$$\varphi(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0, \quad \varphi(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in J.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{D}_n^J := \text{span} \{f(B_1, \dots, B_n) B_\alpha^* : f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty, \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+\}$$

and define the linear map $\Phi_T^J : \mathcal{D}_n^J + (\mathcal{D}_n^J)^* \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ by setting

$$(6.26) \quad \Phi_T^J(f(B_1, \dots, B_n) B_\alpha^* + B_\beta g(B_1, \dots, B_n)^*) := f(T_1, \dots, T_n) T_\alpha^* + T_\beta g(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n), g(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$, and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$.

Theorem 6.7. *Let ω be a joint operator radius and J be the WOT-closed two-sided ideal of F_n^∞ generated by some homogenous polynomials $q_1, \dots, q_d \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, be a c.n.c. row contraction such that*

$$q_j(T_1, \dots, T_n) = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, d.$$

Then, the map Φ_T^J defined by (6.26) can be extended to a unital completely contractive linear map from the norm closure of $\mathcal{D}_n^J + (\mathcal{D}_n^J)^$ to $B(\mathcal{H})$ by setting*

$$(6.27) \quad \Phi_T^J(X) := \text{WOT-} \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r}^*[X \otimes I]K_{T,r}, \quad X \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_n^J + (\mathcal{D}_n^J)^*},$$

where $\{K_{T,r}\}_{0 < r < 1}$ is the Poisson kernel associated with T .

(i) *If ω is *-SOT quasi-continuous and admissible, then*

$$(6.28) \quad \omega([\Phi_{T,p}^J(F_1)]^*, \dots, [\Phi_{T,p}^J(F_k)]^*) \leq \omega(F_1^*, \dots, F_k^*)$$

for any $F_1, \dots, F_k \in M_p \otimes W_J^\infty$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) *If ω is SOT quasi-continuous and strongly admissible, then*

$$(6.29) \quad \omega(\Phi_{T,p}^J(Y_1), \dots, \Phi_{T,p}^J(Y_k)) \leq \omega(Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$$

for any $Y_1, \dots, Y_k \in M_p \otimes \overline{\mathcal{D}_n^J}$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

(iii) *If ω is WOT quasi-continuous and strongly admissible, then inequality (6.29) holds for any $Y_1, \dots, Y_k \in M_p \otimes \overline{\mathcal{D}_n^J + (\mathcal{D}_n^J)^*}$, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. According to Lemma 6.5, we have

$$(6.30) \quad K_{T,r}^*(f(B_1, \dots, B_n)p(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}})K_{T,r} = f_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)p_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*$$

for any $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \in F_n^\infty$ and any polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Since

$$\|f_r(T_1, \dots, T_n)\| \leq \|f(B_1, \dots, B_n)\| \quad \text{for any } 0 < r < 1,$$

and $p_r(T_1, \dots, T_n) \rightarrow p(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ in norm as $r \rightarrow 1$, one can use relations (5.3) and (6.30) to deduce that

$$(6.31) \quad \text{SOT-} \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r}^*[f(B_1, \dots, B_n)p(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}]K_{T,r} = f(T_1, \dots, T_n)p(T_1, \dots, T_n)^*$$

Hence, we obtain

$$(6.32) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{WOT-} \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r}^*[(q(B_1, \dots, B_n)g(B_1, \dots, B_n)^* \\ & \quad + f(B_1, \dots, B_n)p(B_1, \dots, B_n)^*) \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}]K_{T,r} \\ & = q(T_1, \dots, T_n)g(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* + f(T_1, \dots, T_n)p(T_1, \dots, T_n)^* \end{aligned}$$

for any $f, g \in F_n^\infty$ and $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$. This shows that the linear map $\Phi_T : \mathcal{D}_n^J + (\mathcal{D}_n^J)^* \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by (6.26) is completely contractive and the limit in (6.27) exists for any $X \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_n^J + (\mathcal{D}_n^J)^*}$. The rest of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 5.5. We shall omit it. \square

Corollary 6.8. *If $X \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_n^J}$, then*

$$\Phi_T^J(X) = \text{SOT-} \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r}^*[X \otimes I]K_{T,r}.$$

Remark 6.9. *Let J_s be the WOT-closed two-sided ideal of F_n^∞ generated by the homogenous polynomials*

$$\{S_i S_j - S_j S_i : i, j = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

It is easy to see that the subspace N_{J_s} is equal to the symmetric Fock space $F_s^2(H_n) \subset F^2(H_n)$. Let $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, be a row contraction such that

$$T_i T_j = T_j T_i, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then Theorem 6.6 can be applied to the n -tuple T . As a particular case, if ω is norm quasi-continuous and strongly admissible operator radius, we obtained the following inequality

$$(6.33) \quad \omega \left(\sum a_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} T_\alpha T_\beta^*, \dots, \sum a_{\alpha\beta}^{(k)} T_\alpha T_\beta^* \right) \leq \omega \left(\sum a_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} B_\alpha B_\beta^*, \dots, \sum a_{\alpha\beta}^{(k)} B_\alpha B_\beta^* \right)$$

for any polynomials $\sum a_{\alpha\beta}^{(j)} B_\alpha B_\beta^*$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, in $C^*(B_1, \dots, B_n)$, where $B_i := P_{F_s^2(H_n)} S_i | F_s^2(H_n)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are the creation operators on the symmetric Fock space $F_s^2(H_n)$. We should remark that when $k = 1$ and ω is the operator norm the inequality (6.33) was obtained by the author in [52] and Arveson in [5].

We also remark that if T is a C_0 - (resp. c.n.c.) row contraction, one can apply Theorem 6.1 (resp. Theorem 6.7) to T and obtain commutative versions of these theorems.

7. MULTIVARIABLE HAAGERUP–DE LA HARPE INEQUALITIES

In [28], Haagerup and de la Harpe proved that any nilpotent contraction $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$ with $T^m = 0$, $m \geq 2$, satisfies the inequality

$$\sup_{\|h\|=1} |\langle Th, h \rangle| = \omega(T) \leq \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}.$$

We apply the results of the previous sections to obtain several multivariable generalizations of the Haagerup–de la Harpe inequality. Using a result of Boas and Kac [11] as generalized by Janssen [34], we also obtain an epsilonized version of the above inequality, when one gives up the condition $T_\alpha = 0$. This extends a recent result of Badea and Cassier [7], to our setting.

First, we prove the following nilpotent dilation result, which extends a result of Arveson [4], to our multivariable (noncommutative and commutative) setting.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $m \geq 2$ be a nonnegative integer and let $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, be an n -tuple of operators. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exist a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and a row contraction $[N_1, \dots, N_n]$, $N_i \in B(\mathcal{K})$, such that $N_\alpha = 0$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$, $|\alpha| = m$, and*

$$(7.1) \quad p(T_1, \dots, T_n) = P_{\mathcal{H}} p(N_1, \dots, N_n) | \mathcal{H} \quad \text{for any } p \in \mathcal{P}_{m-1};$$

- (ii) *There is a Hilbert space \mathcal{G} such that \mathcal{H} can be identified with a subspace of $\mathcal{P}_{m-1} \otimes \mathcal{G}$ and*

$$(7.2) \quad p(T_1, \dots, T_n) = P_{\mathcal{H}} p(S_1^{(m)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}}, \dots, S_n^{(m)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}}) | \mathcal{H} \quad \text{for any } p \in \mathcal{P}_{m-1},$$

where $S_i^{(m)} := P_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}} S_i | \mathcal{P}_{m-1}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$;

- (iii) *The multi-Toeplitz operator*

$$(7.3) \quad \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} R_\alpha^* \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}} + I \otimes I + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} R_\alpha \otimes T_\alpha^*$$

is positive.

If T_1, \dots, T_n are mutually commuting operators, then the above statements are also equivalent to

- (iv) *There is a Hilbert space \mathcal{G} such that \mathcal{H} can be identified with a subspace of $\mathcal{P}_{m-1}^s \otimes \mathcal{G}$ and*

$$(7.4) \quad p(T_1, \dots, T_n) = P_{\mathcal{H}} p(B_1^{(m)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}}, \dots, B_n^{(m)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}}) | \mathcal{H} \quad \text{for any } p \in \mathcal{P}_{m-1},$$

where $B_i^{(m)} := P_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}^s} S_i | \mathcal{P}_{m-1}^s$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $\mathcal{P}_{m-1}^s := P_{F_s^2(H_n)} (\mathcal{P}_{m-1})$.

Proof. Assume that condition (i) holds. According to Theorem 1.5, we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} r^{|\alpha|} R_\alpha^* \otimes N_{\bar{\alpha}} + I + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} r^{|\alpha|} R_\alpha \otimes N_\alpha^* \geq 0$$

for any $0 < r < 1$. Taking $r \rightarrow 1$, we get (iii). Since the implication (ii) \implies (i) is clear, it remains to prove that (iii) \implies (ii). To this end, we assume that the multi-Toeplitz operator given by (7.3) is positive. Define the linear map

$$\Phi : \text{span}\{S_\alpha^{(m)} : |\alpha| \leq m-1\} \rightarrow \text{span}\{T_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq m-1\}$$

by setting $\Phi(S_\alpha^{(m)}) = T_\alpha$, $|\alpha| \leq m-1$, where $S_i^{(m)} := P_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}} S_i |_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. In what follows, we prove that Φ is completely contractive. Define the sequence of operators $A_{(\sigma)} := T_\sigma$ if $0 \leq |\sigma| \leq m-1$ and $A_{(\sigma)} := 0$ if $|\sigma| \geq m$. Consider the multi-Toeplitz kernel $K : \mathbb{F}_n^+ \times \mathbb{F}_n^+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by $K(g_0, \sigma) = K(\sigma, g_0)^* := A_{(\sigma)}$. As in the proof of Theorem 1.5, one can show that condition (iii) implies the positivity of the operator $M_q := [K(\omega, \sigma)]_{|\omega|, |\sigma| \leq q}$ for any $q = 1, 2, \dots$, i.e., the kernel K is positive definite. According to Theorem 3.1 of [51], there is a completely positive linear map $\mu : C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\mu(S_\sigma) = A_{(\sigma)}$ for any $\sigma \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Since $\mu(I) = I$, μ is completely contractive. Therefore, $\mu_0 := \mu|_{\mathcal{A}_n}$ is completely contractive and

$$\mu_0(S_\sigma) = \begin{cases} T_\sigma & \text{if } |\sigma| \leq m-1 \\ 0 & \text{if } |\sigma| \geq m. \end{cases}$$

Note that μ_0 is not multiplicative (in general $T_\sigma \neq 0$ if $|\sigma| \geq m$). However, since $\mu_0(J) = 0$, where J is the two-sided ideal generated by $\{S_\alpha : |\alpha| = m\}$, μ_0 induces a completely linear map $\hat{\mu}_0 : \mathcal{A}_n/J \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ such that

$$\hat{\mu}_0(S_\sigma + J) = T_\sigma, \quad |\sigma| \leq m-1.$$

On the other hand, according to Theorem 4.1 of [3], the linear map

$$\Psi : \text{span}\{S_\alpha^{(m)} : |\alpha| \leq m-1\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n/J$$

defined by $\Psi(S_\alpha^{(m)}) = S_\alpha + J$, $|\alpha| \leq m-1$, is completely isometric and onto the quotient \mathcal{A}_n/J . Since $\Phi = \hat{\mu}_0 \circ \Psi$, it follows that Φ is completely contractive. Since $\Phi(I) = I$, Arveson's extension theorem shows that Φ has a completely positive extension $\tilde{\Phi}$ to $C^*(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)})$. By Stinespring's theorem, there exists a representation $\pi : C^*(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$ such that $\tilde{\Phi}(x) = P_{\mathcal{H}} \pi(x) |_{\mathcal{H}}$ for any $x \in C^*(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)})$. Note that if p, q are polynomials in $F^2(H_n)$, then

$$(7.5) \quad p(S_1, \dots, S_n) P_{\mathbb{C}} q(S_1, \dots, S_n)^* \xi = \langle \xi, q(S_1, \dots, S_n)(1) \rangle p(S_1, \dots, S_n)(1)$$

for any $\xi \in F^2(H_n)$, where $P_{\mathbb{C}} = I - S_1 S_1^* - \dots - S_n S_n^*$. The operator $p(S_1, \dots, S_n) P_{\mathbb{C}} q(S_1, \dots, S_n)^*$ has rank one and takes q into $\|q\|p$. If p, q are polynomials in \mathcal{P}_{m-1} and since \mathcal{P}_{m-1} is an invariant subspace under each operator S_1^*, \dots, S_n^* , we deduce that

$$p(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)})(I - S_1^{(m)} S_1^{(m)*} - \dots - S_n^{(m)} S_n^{(m)*}) q(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)})^*$$

is a rank one operator acting on \mathcal{P}_{m-1} . Therefore, $C^*(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)}) = B(\mathcal{P}_{m-1})$ and, consequently, π must be unitarily equivalent to a multiple of the identity representation. In particular, we have

$$T_\sigma = P_{\mathcal{H}} \pi(S_\sigma^{(m)}) |_{\mathcal{H}} = P_{\mathcal{H}} (S_\sigma^{(m)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}}) |_{\mathcal{H}}$$

for any $|\sigma| \leq m-1$, where \mathcal{G} is a separable Hilbert space.

Now, assume that T_1, \dots, T_n are commuting operators. As in the noncommutative case, but now the ideal J is replaced by the two sided ideal generated by $\{S_\alpha : |\alpha| = m\}$ and the commutators $S_i S_j - S_j S_i$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, we find a *-representation $\pi : C^*(B_1^{(m)}, \dots, B_n^{(m)}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$ such that $\tilde{\Phi}(x) = P_{\mathcal{H}} \pi(x) |_{\mathcal{H}}$ for any $x \in C^*(B_1^{(m)}, \dots, B_n^{(m)})$.

On the other hand, taking the compression of (7.5) to $\mathcal{P}_{m-1}^s := P_{F_s^2(H_n)}(\mathcal{P}_{m-1})$ and taking into account that the subspace \mathcal{P}_{m-1}^s is invariant under each operator S_1^*, \dots, S_n^* , we infer that

$$C^*(B_1^{(m)}, \dots, B_n^{(m)}) = B(\mathcal{P}_{m-1}^s).$$

Now the result follows, as in to the noncommutative case. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 7.2. *If the multi-Toeplitz operator defined by condition (7.3) is positive and ω is any strongly admissible operator radius, then*

$$\omega(p_1(T_1, \dots, T_n), \dots, p_k(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \omega(p_1(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)}), \dots, p_k(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)}))$$

for any polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \mathcal{P}_{m-1}$. If, in addition, T_1, \dots, T_n are mutually commuting operators, then

$$\omega(p_1(T_1, \dots, T_n), \dots, p_k(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \omega(p_1(B_1^{(m)}, \dots, B_n^{(m)}), \dots, p_k(B_1^{(m)}, \dots, B_n^{(m)})).$$

We remark that in the particular case when $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a row contraction such that $T_\alpha = 0$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ with $|\alpha| = m$, we already obtained more general inequalities in Example 6.3.

Let $S^{(m)}$ be the m -dimensional shift on \mathbb{C}^m , given by the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is well-known (see [27], [28]) that

$$(7.6) \quad w(S^{(m)}) = \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}$$

and $\langle S^{(m)}\xi, \xi \rangle = \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}$, where the vector $\xi = (\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{C}^m$ is given by

$$(7.7) \quad \xi_k = \sqrt{\frac{2}{m+1}} \sin \frac{km}{m+1}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, m-1.$$

In what follows, we obtain a multivariable version of formula (7.6).

Theorem 7.3. *Let $S_i^{(m)} := P_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}} S_i |_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, be the truncated left creation operators acting on the set of all polynomials in $F^2(H_n)$ of degree $\leq m-1$. Then the joint numerical range $W(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)})$ is a convex compact subset of \mathbb{C}^n and*

$$(7.8) \quad w_e(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)}) = w(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)}) = \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}.$$

Proof. The fact that the joint numerical range $W(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)})$ is a convex compact subset of \mathbb{C}^n is a consequence of Theorem 3.5 part (i). Now, notice that $S_\alpha^{(m)} = 0$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ with $|\alpha| = m$, and consequently

$$(S_1 \otimes S_1^{(m)*} + \cdots + S_n \otimes S_n^{(m)*})^m = 0.$$

Applying Theorem 7.1 (when $n = 1$) to the operator $T := S_1 \otimes S_1^{(m)*} + \cdots + S_n \otimes S_n^{(m)*}$ acting on $\mathcal{H} := F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{P}_{m-1}$, we find a countable Hilbert space \mathcal{G} such that $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathcal{G}$ and

$$T^k = P_{\mathcal{H}}(S^{(m)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}})^k |_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m-1.$$

Hence, using Lemma 3.9 and formula (7.6), we get

$$w(T) \leq w(S^{(m)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}}) = w(S^{(m)}) = \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}.$$

Since $w(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)}) = w(T)$ (see Corollary 1.2), we infer that

$$(7.9) \quad w(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)}) \leq \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}.$$

On the other hand, according to Theorem 3.1, we have

$$(7.10) \quad w_e(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)}) \leq w(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)}).$$

Now, define the vector $q \in \mathcal{P}_{m-1}$ by setting

$$q := \xi_0 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \xi_k e_1^k,$$

where the coefficients ξ_k are those defined by (7.7). Since $\|q\|_2 = 1$ and $\langle S_i^{(m)} q, q \rangle = 0$ for any $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$, we can use (7.6) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w_e(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)}) &= \sup \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \langle S_i^{(m)} p, p \rangle \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} : p \in \mathcal{P}_{m-1}, \|p\| = 1 \right\} \\ &\geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \langle S_i^{(m)} q, q \rangle \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} = \left| \langle S_1^{(m)} q, q \rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \langle S^{(m)} \xi, \xi \rangle \right| = \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, and using inequalities (7.9) and (7.10), we deduce (7.8). The proof is complete. \square

We should remark that q is not unique with the above property. Indeed, we can take for example $q = \xi_0 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \xi_k e_i^k$, where $i = 2, \dots, n$.

Corollary 7.4. *Let $m \geq 2$ and let $B_i^{(m)} := P_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}} B_i |_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, be the truncated left creation operators acting on the set of all polynomials in $F_s^2(H_n)$ of degree $\leq m-1$. Then*

$$(7.11) \quad w_e(B_1^{(m)}, \dots, B_n^{(m)}) = w(B_1^{(m)}, \dots, B_n^{(m)}) = \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}.$$

Now, we can prove the following multivariable generalization of Haagerup-de la Harpe inequality.

Theorem 7.5. *Let $m \geq 2$ be a nonnegative integer and let $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be such that the multi-Toeplitz operator*

$$(7.12) \quad \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} R_\alpha^* \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}} + I + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} R_\alpha \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}}^*$$

is positive. Then, for each $1 \leq k \leq m-1$,

$$(7.13) \quad w(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \leq \cos \frac{\pi}{\left[\frac{m-1}{k} \right] + 2},$$

where $[x]$ is the integer part of x .

Proof. According to Theorem 7.1, we have

$$T_\beta = P_{\mathcal{H}}(S_\beta^{(m)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}})|_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad |\beta| \leq m-1.$$

Therefore, for each $1 \leq k \leq m-1$, we have

$$(7.14) \quad w(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \leq w(S_\alpha^{(m)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}} : |\alpha| = k).$$

Let X_1, \dots, X_{n^k} be an arrangement of the operators $S_\alpha^{(m)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}}$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ and $|\alpha| = k$, in a sequence. Notice that $X_\beta = 0$ for any $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ with

$$|\beta| = q := \left[\frac{m-1}{k} \right] + 1.$$

Applying again Theorem 7.1 to the row contraction $[X_1, \dots, X_{n^k}]$, we find a Hilbert space \mathcal{M} such that

$$X_j = P_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1} \otimes \mathcal{G}}(S_j^{(q)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{M}})|_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1} \otimes \mathcal{G}}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n^k,$$

where $S_1^{(q)}, \dots, S_{n^k}^{(q)}$ are the truncated left creation operators on the full Fock space $F^2(H_{n^k})$. Hence, using Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 7.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w(X_1, \dots, X_{n^k}) &\leq w(S_1^{(q)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{M}}, \dots, S_{n^k}^{(q)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{M}}) \\ &= w(S_1^{(q)}, \dots, S_{n^k}^{(q)}) \\ &\leq \cos \frac{\pi}{q+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, and using inequality (7.14), we obtain (7.13). The proof is complete. \square

Corollary 7.6. *Let $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ be a row contraction such that the multi-Toeplitz operator given by (7.12) is positive, and let $p := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} a_\alpha e_\alpha$ be a polynomial. Then*

$$(7.15) \quad w(p(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq K \|p\|_2,$$

where the constant K is given by

$$K := \left(\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{\lfloor \frac{m-1}{k} \rfloor + 2} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Since, according to Proposition 2.4,

$$w_e(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \leq w(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k),$$

Theorem 7.5 implies

$$(7.16) \quad \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} |\langle T_\alpha h, h \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \cos \frac{\pi}{\lfloor \frac{m-1}{k} \rfloor + 2}.$$

On the other hand, according to Theorem 1.1 the joint numerical radius is a norm. Applying Cauchy's inequality twice and using (7.16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w(p(T_1, \dots, T_n)) &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} w \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} a_\alpha T_\alpha \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} a_\alpha \langle T_\alpha h, h \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left[\left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} |a_\alpha|^2 \right)^{1/2} \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} |\langle T_\alpha h, h \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left[\left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} |a_\alpha|^2 \right)^{1/2} \cos \frac{\pi}{\lfloor \frac{m-1}{k} \rfloor + 2} \right] \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} |a_\alpha|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{\lfloor \frac{m-1}{k} \rfloor + 2} \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we make the convention that the term corresponding to $k = 0$ in the latter summation is 1. The proof is complete. \square

Notice that since $\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| \leq 2w(T_1, \dots, T_n)$, inequality (7.15) implies

$$\|p(T_1, \dots, T_n)\| \leq 2K \|p\|_2$$

for any polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}_{m-1}$. On the other hand, since

$$\sigma(p(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \subset \overline{(\mathbb{C}^n)_{w(p(T_1, \dots, T_n))}},$$

one can use Corollary 7.6 to locate the spectrum of the operator $p(T_1, \dots, T_n)$.

As consequences of Theorem 7.5, we obtain the following multivariable Haagerup–de la Harpe type inequalities.

Corollary 7.7. *Let $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be such that $T_\alpha = 0$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$, $|\alpha| = m$ ($m \geq 2$). Then*

$$(7.17) \quad w(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right\|^{k/2} \cos \frac{\pi}{\left[\frac{m-1}{k} \right] + 2},$$

for $1 \leq k \leq m-1$. If, in addition, $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a row contraction and $p := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} a_\alpha e_\alpha$ is a polynomial, then inequality (7.15) holds.

Proof. Since $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a row contraction and $T_\alpha = 0$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$, $|\alpha| = m$, we can use Theorem 1.5 to deduce that the operator given by (7.12) is positive. Applying Theorem 7.5, the result follows. If T_1, \dots, T_n are arbitrary operators, one can use the homogeneity of the joint numerical radius (see Theorem 1.1) to deduce the inequality (7.17). \square

Corollary 7.8. *Let $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be such that $T_\alpha = 0$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$, $|\alpha| = m$ ($m \geq 2$). Then*

$$(7.18) \quad w_e(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \leq \|(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k)\|_e \cos \frac{\pi}{\left[\frac{m-1}{k} \right] + 2},$$

for each $1 \leq k \leq m-1$.

Proof. Since $(\lambda_1 T_1 + \dots + \lambda_n T_n)^m = 0$ for any $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$, we can use Corollary 7.7 in the particular case when $k = 1$ and deduce that

$$w(\lambda_1 T_1 + \dots + \lambda_n T_n) \leq \|\lambda_1 T_1 + \dots + \lambda_n T_n\| \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}.$$

Consequently, taking the supremum over $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$ and using Corollary 2.3, we obtain

$$(7.19) \quad w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \|(T_1, \dots, T_n)\|_e \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}.$$

Now, let us consider the general case when $1 \leq k \leq m-1$. Let Y_1, \dots, Y_{n^k} be an arrangement of $\{T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k\}$. Notice that $Y_\beta = 0$ for any $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$, $|\beta| = \left[\frac{m-1}{k} \right] + 1$. Applying the first part of the proof to (Y_1, \dots, Y_{n^k}) , we deduce inequality (7.18). \square

Now, we present some results concerning the range of the joint numerical range and the euclidean operator radius for n -tuples of operators.

Theorem 7.9. *The joint numerical radius and the euclidean operator radius have the following properties:*

$$(7.20) \quad \{w(T_1, \dots, T_n) : \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| = 1\} = \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1 \right]$$

and

$$(7.21) \quad \{w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) : \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|_e = 1\} = \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1 \right].$$

Moreover, $\text{range } w = \text{range } w_e = [0, \infty)$.

Proof. According to Theorem 1.1, if $\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| = 1$, then $\frac{1}{2} \leq w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq 1$. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $t \in [0, 1]$, define the operator $T_i(t)$ on the Fock space $F^2(H_n)$ by

$$T_i(t) \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} a_\alpha e_\alpha \right) := a_0 e_{g_i} + t \sum_{|\alpha| \geq 1} a_\alpha e_{g_i \alpha}.$$

Note that $\|[T_1(t), \dots, T_n(t)]\| = 1$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$. On the other hand, using Theorem 3.4 and Theorem 7.3, we have

$$w(T_1(1), \dots, T_n(1)) = w(S_1, \dots, S_n) = 1$$

and

$$w(T_1(0), \dots, T_n(0)) = w(S_1^{(2)}, \dots, S_n^{(2)}) = \frac{1}{2}$$

Since the joint numerical radius is norm continuous (see Theorem 1.1), we deduce relation (7.20). Now, one can easily show that $\|[T_1(t), \dots, T_n(t)]\|_e = 1$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$. As above, using Theorem 3.4, Theorem 7.3, and the norm continuity of w_e (see Theorem 2.2) we complete the proof. \square

For each $m \geq 2$, define

$$\mathcal{N}_m := \left\{ (T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)} : \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| = 1, \text{ and } T_\beta = 0, |\beta| = m \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}_m^e := \left\{ (T_1, \dots, T_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^{(n)} : \|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|_e = 1, \text{ and } T_\beta = 0, |\beta| = m \right\}$$

Theorem 7.10. *If $m \geq 2$, then*

$$\text{range } w|\mathcal{N}_m = \text{range } w_e|\mathcal{N}_m^e = \left[\frac{1}{2}, \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1} \right].$$

Proof. According to Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 7.7, if $\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\| = 1$ and $T_\beta = 0$ for any $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ with $|\beta| = m$, then

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}.$$

Similarly, if $\|[T_1, \dots, T_n]\|_e = 1$ and $T_\beta = 0$ for any $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ with $|\beta| = m$, then, according to Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 7.8, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}.$$

For each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, define the operator $T_i^{(m)}(t)$ on \mathcal{P}_{m-1} by

$$T_i^{(m)}(t) \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} a_\alpha e_\alpha \right) := a_0 e_{g_i} + t \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-2} a_\alpha e_{g_i \alpha}.$$

Straightforward computations reveal that

$$\|[T_1^{(m)}(t), \dots, T_n^{(m)}(t)]\| = \|[T_1^{(m)}(t), \dots, T_n^{(m)}(t)]\|_e = 1$$

for any $t \in [0, 1]$. On the other hand, using Theorem 7.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(T_1^{(m)}(1), \dots, T_n^{(m)}(1)) &= w_e(T_1^{(m)}(1), \dots, T_n^{(m)}(1)) \\ &= w(S_1^{(m)}, \dots, S_n^{(m)}) \\ &= \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} w(T_1^{(m)}(0), \dots, T_n^{(m)}(0)) &= w_e(T_1^{(m)}(0), \dots, T_n^{(m)}(0)) \\ &= w(S_1^{(2)}, \dots, S_n^{(2)}) = \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Since the joint numerical radius and the euclidean numerical radius are norm continuous (see Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 2.2), we can complete the proof. \square

Another multivariable generalization of Haagerup-de la Harpe inequality is the following.

Theorem 7.11. *Let $m \geq 2$ and $T_1, \dots, T_n \in B(\mathcal{H})$ be such that*

$$(7.22) \quad \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} \bar{\lambda}_\alpha T_\alpha^* + I + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} \lambda_\alpha T_\alpha \geq 0$$

for any $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$. Then the euclidean radius satisfies the inequality

$$(7.23) \quad w_e(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}.$$

Moreover, if $1 \leq k \leq m-1$, then

$$(7.24) \quad \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left[\sum_{|\alpha|=k} \left(\int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_n} |\xi_\alpha|^2 d\sigma(\xi) \right) |\langle T_\alpha h, h \rangle|^2 \right]^{1/2} \leq \cos \frac{\pi}{\left[\frac{m-1}{k} \right] + 2}.$$

Proof. Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$, and denote $\lambda_j := e^{i\theta} \xi_j$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Note that condition (7.22) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m-1} e^{-ik\theta} (\bar{\xi}_1 T_1^* + \dots + \bar{\xi}_n T_n^*)^k + I + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} e^{ik\theta} (\xi_1 T_1 + \dots + \xi_n T_n)^k$$

for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$. The latter inequality is equivalent to

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m-1} S^{*k} \otimes (\bar{\xi}_1 T_1^* + \dots + \bar{\xi}_n T_n^*)^k + I + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} S^k \otimes (\xi_1 T_1 + \dots + \xi_n T_n)^k \geq 0,$$

where S is the unilateral shift on the Hardy space H^2 . Using Theorem 7.5 (in the particular case $n = k = 1$) in our setting, we obtain

$$w_e(\xi_1 T_1 + \dots + \xi_n T_n) = w(\xi_1 T_1 + \dots + \xi_n T_n) \leq \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}.$$

Taking the supremum over $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$ and using Corollary 2.3, we obtain inequality (7.23). Similarly, using Theorem 7.5, we deduce that

$$(7.25) \quad w((\xi_1 T_1 + \dots + \xi_n T_n)^k) \leq \cos \frac{\pi}{\left[\frac{m-1}{k} \right] + 2}.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} w((\xi_1 T_1 + \dots + \xi_n T_n)^k) &\geq \sup_{(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} \xi_\alpha \langle T_\alpha h, h \rangle \right| \\ &= \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left[\sup_{(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n} \left| \sum_{|\alpha|=k, |\beta|=k} \xi_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\beta \langle T_\alpha h, h \rangle \overline{\langle T_\beta h, h \rangle} \right| \right]^{1/2} \\ &\geq \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left| \sum_{|\alpha|=k, |\beta|=k} \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_n} \xi_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\beta \langle T_\alpha h, h \rangle \overline{\langle T_\beta h, h \rangle} \right|^{1/2} \\ &= \sup_{\|h\|=1} \left[\sum_{|\alpha|=k} \left(\int_{\partial \mathbb{B}_n} |\xi_\alpha|^2 d\sigma(\xi) \right) |\langle T_\alpha h, h \rangle|^2 \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, and using inequality (7.25), we deduce (7.24). The proof is complete. \square

Let us point out two particular cases of Theorem 7.11. If $n = 1$, we get a result of Badea-Cassier (see [7]). If $n = 2$ and $T_1 T_2 = T_2 T_1$, then

$$w_e(T_1^2, T_2^2, T_1 T_2) \leq \sqrt{3} \cos \frac{\pi}{\left[\frac{m-1}{2} \right] + 2}.$$

We need to recall from [7] the following epsilonized version of Fejér inequality, which is a consequence of a result of Boas and Kac ([11]) as generalized by Janssen ([34]).

If $f(e^{i\theta}) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_k e^{ik\theta}$ is positive such that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |c_k| < \infty$ with $c_0=1$ and $c_k \leq \epsilon$ for any $k \geq m$, then

$$|c_1| \leq \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m+1}\right) + 3 \left[\pi \cos^4 \frac{\pi}{2(m+1)} \right]^{1/3} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{m+1} \right)^{2/3}.$$

We denote by $K(\epsilon, m)$ the right side of this inequality.

Theorem 7.12. *Let $m \geq 2$ be a positive integer and let $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ be a row contraction such that*

$$\left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=m} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/2} \leq \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/2} < \infty.$$

Then the joint numerical radius satisfies the inequality

$$w(T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k) \leq \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{\lceil \frac{m-1}{k} \rceil + 2}\right) + 3 \left[\pi \cos^4 \frac{\pi}{2(\lceil \frac{m-1}{k} \rceil + 2)} \right]^{1/3} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\lceil \frac{m-1}{k} \rceil + 2} \right)^{2/3}.$$

Proof. Since $[e^{i\theta} T_1, \dots, e^{i\theta} T_n]$ is a row contraction for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, Theorem 1.5 implies that the operator

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k e^{-ik\theta} R_\alpha^* \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}} + I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^k e^{ik\theta} R_\alpha \otimes T_{\bar{\alpha}}^*$$

is positive for any $0 < r < 1$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, where the convergence is in the operator norm. Hence, we deduce that

$$(7.26) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} r^k e^{-ik\theta} X^{*k} + I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} r^k e^{ik\theta} X^k \geq 0,$$

where $X := \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \otimes T_i^*$. Since

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|X^k\| = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/2} < \infty$$

and taking $r \rightarrow 1$ in (7.26), we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-ik\theta} \langle X^{*k} y, y \rangle + 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{ik\theta} \langle X^k y, y \rangle \geq 0$$

for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$. Fix $y \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ with $\|y\| = 1$ and denote

$$c_k := \langle X^k y, y \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad c_{-k} := \langle X^{*k} y, y \rangle$$

for any $k = 0, 1, \dots$. Notice that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |c_k| < \infty$ and, for any $q \geq m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_q &= |\langle X^q y, y \rangle| \leq \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=q} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=m} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/2} \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=q-m} T_\alpha T_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/2} \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the result preceding this theorem, we obtain

$$|\langle X y, y \rangle| = |c_1| \leq K(\epsilon, m)$$

for any $y \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ with $\|y\| = 1$. Using now Corollary 1.2 and the unitary invariance of the joint numerical radius, we obtain inequality

$$w(T_1, \dots, T_n) \leq \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m+1}\right) + 3 \left[\pi \cos^4 \frac{\pi}{2(m+1)} \right]^{1/3} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{m+1} \right)^{2/3},$$

which proves the inequality of the theorem, when $k = 1$. Now, let us consider the general case when $1 \leq k \leq m-1$. Let Y_1, \dots, Y_{n^k} be an arrangement of $\{T_\alpha : |\alpha| = k\}$. Notice that if $q := \left[\frac{m-1}{k}\right] + 1$, then

$$\left\| \sum_{|\beta|=q} Y_\beta Y_\beta^* \right\|^{1/2} \leq \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{|\beta|=k} Y_\beta Y_\beta^* \right\|^{1/2} < \infty.$$

Applying the first part of the proof to (Y_1, \dots, Y_{n^k}) , we complete the proof of the theorem. \square

The proof of the next result is similar to that of Corollary 7.6. We shall omit it.

Corollary 7.13. *Under the conditions of Theorem 7.12, the following inequalities hold:*

$$\frac{1}{2} \|p(T_1, \dots, T_n)\| \leq w(p(T_1, \dots, T_n)) \leq \|p\|_2 \left(\sum_{k=0}^m K^2 \left(\epsilon, \left[\frac{m-1}{k}\right] + 1 \right) \right)^{1/2}$$

for any polynomial $p := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} a_\alpha e_\alpha$.

8. MULTIVARIABLE FEJÉR INEQUALITIES

Haagerup and de la Harpe proved ([28]) that their inequality is equivalent to Fejér's inequality for positive trigonometric polynomials $\sum_{k=-m+1}^{m-1} a_k e^{ik\theta}$, namely

$$|a_1| \leq a_0 \cos \frac{\pi}{m+1}.$$

In what follows we prove multivariable analogues of classical inequalities (Fejér [24], Egerváry-Szász [23]) for the coefficients of positive trigonometric polynomials, and of recent extensions to positive rational functions, obtained by Badea and Cassier [7].

The main result of this section is the following

Theorem 8.1. *Let $m \geq 2$ be a nonnegative integer and let $\{A_{(\alpha)}\}_{|\alpha| \leq m-1}$, be a sequence of operators in $B(\mathcal{H})$ such that the multi-Toeplitz operator*

$$(8.1) \quad \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} R_\alpha^* \otimes A_{(\alpha)} + I \otimes A_0 + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} R_\alpha \otimes A_{(\alpha)}^*$$

is positive. Then, for each $1 \leq k \leq m-1$,

$$(8.2) \quad w_e(A_{(\alpha)} : |\alpha| = k) \leq w(A_{(\alpha)} : |\alpha| = k) \leq \|A_0\| \cos \frac{\pi}{\left[\frac{m-1}{k}\right] + 2},$$

where $[x]$ is the integer part of x .

Proof. Let F denote the multi-Toeplitz operator defined by (8.1) and assume that $F \geq 0$ and $F \neq 0$. According to the Fejér type factorization theorem for multi-Toeplitz polynomials [49], there exists a multi-analytic operator $G := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} R_\alpha \otimes C_{(\alpha)}$ such that $F = G^*G$. Hence, we have

$$(8.3) \quad F = \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq m-1} R_\alpha^* R_\beta \otimes C_{(\alpha)}^* C_{(\beta)}.$$

This implies $A_0 = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} C_{(\alpha)}^* C_{(\alpha)} \geq 0$. Assume for the moment that $A_0 = I$. Given $\gamma \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ such that $|\gamma| \leq m-1$, relation (8.3) implies

$$(8.4) \quad A_{(\gamma)} = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-|\gamma|-1} C_{(\alpha)}^* C_{(\alpha\gamma)}.$$

Define the operator $V : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{m-1} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ be setting

$$Vh := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} C_{(\alpha)}^* h \otimes e_\alpha.$$

Since $A_0 = I$, we have

$$\|Vh\|^2 = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-1} \|C_{(\alpha)}^* h\|^2 = \langle A_0 h, h \rangle = \|h\|^2,$$

so V is an isometry. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Vh, (I \otimes R_\gamma^{(m)}) Vh \rangle &= \left\langle \sum_{|\beta| \leq m-1} C_{(\beta)}^* h \otimes e_\beta, \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-|\gamma|-1} C_{(\alpha)}^* k \otimes e_{\alpha\bar{\gamma}} \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m-|\gamma|-1} \langle C_{(\alpha\bar{\gamma})} h, C_{(\alpha)} \rangle \\ &= \langle h, A_{(\bar{\gamma})} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

for any $h, k \in \mathcal{H}$. Therefore,

$$A_{(\bar{\gamma})} = V^*(I \otimes R_\gamma^{(m)})V$$

for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ such that $|\gamma| \leq m-1$. Since $R_\alpha^{(m)} = 0$ for any $|\alpha| = m$, we can apply Corollary 7.7 and deduce that, for each $1 \leq k \leq m-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} w(A_{(\gamma)} : |\gamma| = k) &\leq w(V^*(I \otimes R_\gamma^{(m)})V : |\gamma| = k) \\ &\leq w(I \otimes R_\gamma^{(m)} : |\gamma| = k) \\ &\leq w(R_\gamma^{(m)} : |\gamma| = k) \\ &\leq \cos \frac{\pi}{\lceil \frac{m-1}{k} \rceil + 2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now let us consider the case when $A_0 \geq 0$ but $A_0 \neq I$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and define the multi-Toeplitz operator

$$F_\epsilon := \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} R_\alpha^* \otimes C_{(\alpha)} + I \otimes C_0 + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} R_\alpha \otimes C_{(\alpha)}^*,$$

where

$$(8.5) \quad C_{(\alpha)} := (A_0 + \epsilon I)^{-1/2} A_{(\alpha)} (A_0 + \epsilon I)^{-1/2} \quad \text{if } 1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1,$$

and $C_0 = I$. Since $F_\epsilon \geq 0$, we can apply the first part of the proof and obtain

$$(8.6) \quad w(C_{(\alpha)} : |\alpha| = k) \leq \cos \frac{\pi}{\lceil \frac{m-1}{k} \rceil + 2}.$$

Now, using Theorem 1.1 part (v) and relation (8.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w(A_{(\alpha)} : |\alpha| = k) &= w(X_\epsilon^* C_{(\alpha)} X_\epsilon : |\alpha| = k) \\ &\leq \|X_\epsilon\|^2 w(C_{(\alpha)} : |\alpha| = k), \end{aligned}$$

where $X_\epsilon := A_0 + \epsilon I$. Consequently, using inequality (8.6) and taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the second inequality in (8.2). The first inequality of (8.2) is a consequence of Proposition 2.4. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

In the particular case when $n = 1$, we obtain the following operatorial version of the Fejér and Egerváry-Szász inequalities.

Corollary 8.2. *Let $m \geq 2$ be a nonnegative integer and let $\{A_k\}_{k=1}^{m-1}$ be a sequence of operators in $B(\mathcal{H})$ such that the operator*

$$\sum_{1 \leq k \leq m-1} e^{-ik\theta} A_k^* + A_0 + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq m-1} e^{ik\theta} A_k$$

is positive for any $e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{T}$. Then, for each $1 \leq k \leq m-1$,

$$(8.7) \quad w(A_k) \leq \|A_0\| \cos \frac{\pi}{\left[\frac{m-1}{k}\right] + 2}.$$

Let \mathbb{F}_n be the free group with generators g_1, \dots, g_n , and let $\ell^2(\mathbb{F}_n)$ the Hilbert space defined by

$$\ell^2(\mathbb{F}_n) := \{f : \mathbb{F}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C} : \sum_{\sigma \in \mathbb{F}_n} |f(\sigma)|^2 < \infty\}.$$

The canonical basis of $\ell^2(\mathbb{F}_n)$ is $\{\xi_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \mathbb{F}_n}$, where $\xi_\sigma(t) = 1$ if $t = \sigma$ and $\xi_\sigma(t) = 0$ otherwise. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $U_i \in B(\ell^2(\mathbb{F}_n))$ be the unitary operator defined by

$$U_i \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathbb{F}_n} a_\sigma \xi_\sigma \right) := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathbb{F}_n} a_\sigma \xi_{g_i \sigma}, \quad \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \mathbb{F}_n} |a_\sigma|^2 < \infty \right).$$

The reduced group C^* -algebra $C_{\text{red}}^*(\mathbb{F}_n)$ is the C^* -algebra generated by U_1, \dots, U_n . The full group C^* -algebra $C^*(\mathbb{F}_n)$ is generated by an n -tuple of universal unitaries $\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_n$.

Theorem 8.3. *Let*

$$f(X_1, \dots, X_n) := \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} \bar{a}_\alpha X_\alpha^* + a_0 I + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} a_\alpha X_\alpha,$$

where $a_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and X_1, \dots, X_n are bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space. If $f(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ (resp. $f(U_1, \dots, U_n)$, $f(\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_n)$) is a positive element in $C^(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ (resp. $C_{\text{red}}^*(\mathbb{F}_n)$, $C^*(\mathbb{F}_n)$), then*

$$\left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} |a_\alpha|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq a_0 \cos \frac{\pi}{\left[\frac{m-1}{k}\right] + 2}$$

for each $1 \leq k \leq m-1$, where $[x]$ is the integer part of x .

Proof. If $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \geq 0$, then the result is a particular case of Theorem 8.1. To prove the second part of the theorem, notice that the Hilbert space $\ell^2(\mathbb{F}_n^+)$ can be seen as a subspace of $\ell^2(\mathbb{F}_n)$ and the full Fock space $F^2(H_n)$ can be naturally identified to $\ell^2(\mathbb{F}_n^+)$. Under this identification, we have $U_i|_{F^2(H_n)} = S_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, where S_1, \dots, S_n are the left creation operators. Consequently, we have

$$f(S_1, \dots, S_n) = P_{\ell^2(\mathbb{F}_n^+)} f(U_1, \dots, U_n)|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{F}_n^+)}.$$

Therefore, if $f(U_1, \dots, U_n) \geq 0$, then $f(S_1, \dots, S_n) \geq 0$ and the result follows from the first part of the proof. Now assume that $f(\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_n) \geq \mathbf{0}$. Due to the universal property of $\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_n$, there is a $*$ -representation π of $C^*(\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_n)$ onto $C^*(U_1, \dots, U_n)$ such that $\pi(\mathbf{U}_i) = U_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Therefore, $f(U_1, \dots, U_n) = \pi(f(\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_n)) \geq \mathbf{0}$. Using again the first part of the proof, the result follows. \square

We remark that, in a similar manner, one can use Theorem 8.1 to obtain an operator-valued version of Theorem 8.3 for the tensor products $C_{\text{red}}^*(\mathbb{F}_n) \otimes B(\mathcal{H})$ and $C^*(\mathbb{F}_n) \otimes B(\mathcal{H})$.

The next result is a multivariable generalization of a recent result obtained by Badea and Cassier (see Theorem 6.3 of [7]). Since the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 7.1, we shall omit it.

Theorem 8.4. *Let $m \geq 2$ be a positive integer and let $\{A_{(\alpha)}\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+}$ be a sequence of operators in $B(\mathcal{H})$ such that the multi-Toeplitz operator*

$$\sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} R_\alpha^* \otimes A_{(\alpha)} + I \otimes I + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq m-1} R_\alpha \otimes A_{(\alpha)}^*$$

is positive. Then there is a Hilbert space \mathcal{G} such that \mathcal{H} can be identified with a subspace of $\mathcal{P}_{m-1} \otimes \mathcal{G}$ and

$$A_{(\alpha)} = P_{\mathcal{H}}(S_{\alpha}^{(m)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}})|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \text{for any } |\alpha| \leq m-1,$$

where $S_i^{(m)} := P_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}} S_i |_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Moreover, if, in addition, $A_{(\alpha)} = A_{(\beta)}$ whenever $\lambda_{\alpha} = \lambda_{\beta}$ for any $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$, then

$$A_{(\alpha)} = P_{\mathcal{H}}(B_{\alpha}^{(m)} \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}})|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \text{for any } |\alpha| \leq m-1,$$

where $B_i^{(m)} := P_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}^s} S_i |_{\mathcal{P}_{m-1}^s}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Finally, we mention that Theorem 8.4 and Theorem 7.3 can be used to provide another proof of Theorem 8.1.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. ARIAS AND G. POPESCU, Factorization and reflexivity on Fock spaces, *Integr. Equat. Oper. Th.* **23** (1995), 268–286.
- [2] A. ARIAS AND G. POPESCU, Noncommutative interpolation and Poisson transforms II, *Houston J. Math.* **25** (1999), 79–98.
- [3] A. ARIAS AND G. POPESCU, Noncommutative interpolation and Poisson transforms, *Israel J. Math.* **115** (2000), 205–234.
- [4] W.B. ARVESON, Subalgebras of C^* -algebras, *Acta Math.* **123** (1969), 141–224.
- [5] W.B. ARVESON, Subalgebras of C^* -algebras III: Multivariable operator theory, *Acta Math.* **181** (1998), 159–228.
- [6] W.B. ARVESON, The curvature invariant of a Hilbert module over $\mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **522** (2000), 173–236.
- [7] C. BADEA AND G. CASSIER, Constrained von Neumann inequalities, *Adv. Math.* **166** (2002), 260–297.
- [8] C.A. BERGER, A strange dilation theorem, Abstract 625–152, *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.* **12** (1965), 590.
- [9] C.A. BERGER AND J.G. STAMPFLI, Mappings theorems for numerical ranges, *Amer. J. Math.* **89** (1967), 1047–1055.
- [10] C.A. BERGER AND J.G. STAMPFLI, Norm relations and skew dilations, *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **28** (1967), 191–195.
- [11] R.P. BOAS AND M. KAC, Inequalities for Fourier transforms of positive functions, *Duke Math. J.* **12** (1945), 189–206.
- [12] F.F. BONSALL AND J. DUNCAN, *Numerical ranges of operators on normed spaces and of elements of normed algebras*, Cambridge U.P., 1971.
- [13] F.F. BONSALL AND J. DUNCAN, *Numerical ranges II*, Cambridge U.P., 1973.
- [14] J.W. BUNCE, Models for n -tuples of noncommuting operators, *J. Funct. Anal.* **57** (1984), 21–30.
- [15] K. R. DAVIDSON AND D. PITTS, Invariant subspaces and hyper-reflexivity for free semigroup algebras, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **78** (1999), 401–430.
- [16] K.R. DAVIDSON AND D. PITTS, Automorphisms and representations of the noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebras, *Math. Ann.* **311** (1998), 275–303.
- [17] K. R. DAVIDSON AND D. PITTS, Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation for noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebras, *Integr. Equat. Oper. Th.* **31** (1998), 321–337.
- [18] K.R. DAVIDSON, E. KATSOUKIS, AND D. PITTS, The structure of free semigroup algebras, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **533** (2001), 99–125.
- [19] N.P. DEKKER, Joint numerical range and joint spectrum of Hilbert space operators, Ph. D. thesis, Amsterdam, 1969.
- [20] R.G. DOUGLAS, On majorization, factorization, and range inclusion of operators on Hilbert space, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **17** (1966), 413–415.
- [21] R.G. DOUGLAS *Banach algebra techniques in operator theory*, Second edition, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 179. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [22] S. DRURY, A generalization of von Neumann’s inequality to the complex ball, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **68** (1978), 300–304.
- [23] E.V. EGERVÁRY AND O. SZÁSZ, Einige Extremalprobleme im Bereiche der trigonometrischen Polynome, *Math. Zeitschrift* **27** (1928), 641–652.
- [24] L. FEJÉR, Über trigonometrische Polynome, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **146** (1916), 53–82.
- [25] A. E. FRAZHO, Models for noncommuting operators, *J. Funct. Anal.* **48** (1982), no.1, 1–11.
- [26] J. GARNETT, *Bounded analytic functions*, Academic Press, New York, 1981.
- [27] K.E. GUSTAFSON AND D.K.M. RAO, *Numerical range*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.
- [28] U. HAAGERUP AND P. DE LA HARPE, The numerical radius of a nilpotent operator on a Hilbert space, *Proc. Amer. Math.* **115** (1992), 371–379.
- [29] P.R. HALMOS, *A Hilbert space problem book*, D. Van Nostrand, Princeton, NJ, 1967.
- [30] P.R. HALMOS, Positive definite sequences and the miracle of w , 17 pages, mimeographed.
- [31] F. HAUSDORFF, Der Wertvorrat einer Bilinearform, *Math. Z.* **3** (1919), 314–316.

- [32] J.A.R. HOLBROOK, On the power-bounded operators of Sz.-Nagy and Foias, *Acta. Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **29** (1968), 299–310.
- [33] J.A.R. HOLBROOK, Multiplicative properties of the numerical radius in operator theory, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **237** (1969), 166–174.
- [34] A.J.E.M. JANSSEN, More epsilonized bounds of the Boas-Kac-Lukosz type, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* **1** (1994), 171–191.
- [35] T. KATO, Some mapping theorems for the numerical range, *Proc. Japan Acad.* **41** (1965), 652–655.
- [36] D. KRIBS, The curvature invariant of a non-commuting N -tuple, *Integral Equations Operator Theory*, **41** (2001), no. 4, 426–454.
- [37] V. MÜLLER, On the joint spectral radius, *Ann. Polon. Math.* **66** (1997), 173–182.
- [38] V.I. PAULSEN, Every completely polynomially bounded operator is similar to a contraction, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **55** (1984), 1–17.
- [39] V.I. PAULSEN, *Completely Bounded Maps and Dilations*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics, Vol.146, New York, 1986.
- [40] V.I. PAULSEN, G. POPESCU, AND D. SINGH, On Bohr’s inequality, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **85** (2002), 493–512.
- [41] C. PEARCY, An elementary proof of the power inequality for the numerical range, *Michigan Math. J.* **13** (1966), 289–291.
- [42] G. PISIER, *Similarity Problems and Completely Bounded Maps*, Springer Lect. Notes Math., Vol.1618, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995
- [43] G. POPESCU, Models for infinite sequences of noncommuting operators, *Acta. Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **53** (1989), 355–368.
- [44] G. POPESCU, Isometric dilations for infinite sequences of noncommuting operators, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **316** (1989), 523–536.
- [45] G. POPESCU, Characteristic functions for infinite sequences of noncommuting operators, *J. Operator Theory* **22** (1989), 51–71.
- [46] G. POPESCU, Multi-analytic operators and some factorization theorems, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **38** (1989), 693–710.
- [47] G. POPESCU, Von Neumann inequality for $(B(H)^n)_1$, *Math. Scand.* **68** (1991), 292–304.
- [48] G. POPESCU, Functional calculus for noncommuting operators, *Michigan Math. J.* **42** (1995), 345–356.
- [49] G. POPESCU, Multi-analytic operators on Fock spaces, *Math. Ann.* **303** (1995), 31–46.
- [50] G. POPESCU, Noncommutative disc algebras and their representations, *Proc. Amer. Math.* **124** (1996), 2137–2148.
- [51] G. POPESCU, Positive-definite functions on free semigroups, *Canad. J. Math.* **48** (1996), 887–896.
- [52] G. POPESCU, Poisson transforms on some C^* -algebras generated by isometries, *J. Funct. Anal.* **161** (1999), 27–61.
- [53] G. POPESCU, Commutant lifting, tensor algebras, and functional calculus, *Proc. Edimb. Math. Soc.* **44** (2001), 389–406.
- [54] G. POPESCU, Curvature invariant for Hilbert modules over free semigroup algebras, *Adv. Math.* **158** (2001), 264–309.
- [55] G. POPESCU, Central intertwining lifting, suboptimization, and interpolation in several variables, *J. Funct. Anal.* **189** (2002), 132–154.
- [56] G. POPESCU, Similarity and ergodic theory of positive linear maps, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **561** (2003), 87–129.
- [57] G. POPESCU, Multivariable moment problems, Positivity, to appear.
- [58] V. PTÁK AND N.J. YOUNG, Functions of operators and the spectral radius, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **29** (1980), 357–392.
- [59] W. RUDIN, *Function Theory in the Unit Ball of \mathbb{C}^n* , Springer-Verlag, New York/Berlin, 1980.
- [60] W.F. STINESPRING, Positive functions on C^* -algebras, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **6** (1955) 211–216.
- [61] B. SZ.-NAGY, Sur les contractions de l’espace de Hilbert, *Acta. Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **15** (1953), 87–92.
- [62] B. SZ.-NAGY, Sur la norme des fonctions de certains opérateurs, *Acta. Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* **20** (1969), 331–334.
- [63] B. SZ.-NAGY AND C. FOIAŞ, On certain classes of power-bounded operators in Hilbert space, *Acta. Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **27** (1966), 17–25.
- [64] B. SZ.-NAGY AND C. FOIAŞ, *Harmonic Analysis of Operators on Hilbert Space*, North Holland, New York 1970.
- [65] O. TOEPLITZ, Das algebraische Analogon zu einem Satze von Fejér, *Math. Z.* **2** (1918), 187–197.
- [66] J. VON NEUMANN, Eine Spectraltheorie für allgemeine Operatoren eines unitären Raumes, *Math. Nachr.* **4** (1951), 258–281.
- [67] J.P. WILLIAMS, Schwarz norms for operators, *Pacific J. Math.* **24** (1968), 181–188.