

# DOES EVERY CONTRACTIVE ANALYTIC FUNCTION IN A POLYDISK HAVE A DISSIPATIVE $n$ -DIMENSIONAL SCATTERING REALIZATION?

MICHAEL T. JURY

ABSTRACT. No.

The title question was posed by D. Kalyuzhnyi-Verbovetskyi [1, Problem 1.3]. Let  $L(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$  denote the set of all bounded linear operators between a pair of Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}$ , and let  $\mathbb{D}^n$  and  $\mathbb{T}^n$  denote the open unit polydisk, and the unit  $n$ -torus, respectively.

**Definition 1.** An *dissipative  $nD$  scattering system* is a tuple

$$(1) \quad \alpha = (n; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}; \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$$

where:

- i)  $n \geq 1$  is an integer;
- ii)  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}$  are Hilbert spaces;
- iii)  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}$  are  $n$ -tuples of operators (so  $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ , etc.) with

$$(2) \quad A_k \in L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}), \quad B_k \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{X}), \quad C_k \in L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}), \quad D_k \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y});$$

- iv) The operator  $\zeta \mathbf{G} \in L(\mathcal{X} \oplus \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{X} \oplus \mathcal{Y})$  is contractive for all  $\zeta$  in the unit  $n$ -torus  $\mathbb{T}^n$ , where

$$(3) \quad \zeta \mathbf{G} := \sum_{k=1}^n \zeta_k G_k$$

and the  $G_k$  are the  $2 \times 2$  block operators

$$(4) \quad G_k = \begin{pmatrix} A_k & B_k \\ C_k & D_k \end{pmatrix}$$

Given such a system, its *transfer function* is the  $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$ -valued function

$$(5) \quad \theta_\alpha(z) = z\mathbf{D} + z\mathbf{C}(I_{\mathcal{X}} - z\mathbf{A})^{-1}z\mathbf{B}.$$

defined for all  $z \in \mathbb{D}^n$ . It is shown in [3] that the transfer function  $\theta_\alpha$  is a *contractive operator function*; that is, it is analytic in the unit polydisk  $\mathbb{D}^n$  and satisfies

$$(6) \quad \|\theta_\alpha(z)\|_{L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})} \leq 1$$

for all  $z \in \mathbb{D}^n$ . The question is then whether every contractive operator function in  $\mathbb{D}^n$ , vanishing at the origin, is such a transfer function. The answer is known to be “yes” when  $n = 1$  or  $2$ , and in fact a stronger result is true; the  $\mathbf{G}$  can be chosen unitary (so the scattering system is *conservative*). It was also known that when  $n = 3$ , there exist contractive operator functions which do not have conservative realizations; this is due to the failure of von Neumann’s inequality in three variables. (See [1, 3] for a discussion.) In this note we show the answer is still “no” in the dissipative case when  $n = 3$ , and give an explicit counterexample (in the scalar case  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{C}$ ).

We first show that any polynomial with a dissipative realization must satisfy a restricted form of von Neumann’s inequality. Let  $\mathcal{T}$  denote the set of all  $n$ -tuples of commuting operators  $\mathbf{T} =$

---

*Date:* January 16, 2012.

Research partially supported by NSF grant DMS 1101134.

$(T_1, \dots, T_n)$  on Hilbert space satisfying the following condition: whenever  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$  is an  $n$ -tuple of operators satisfying

$$(7) \quad \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n z_k X_k \right\| \leq 1$$

for all  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{D}^n$ , then

$$(8) \quad \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n T_k \otimes X_k \right\|_{L(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})} \leq 1$$

where the  $T_k$  act on  $\mathcal{H}$  and the  $X_k$  act on  $\mathcal{K}$ .

It is easy to see that the  $\mathbf{T}$  satisfying this condition must be commuting contractions, but when  $n \geq 3$  it is known that not every  $n$ -tuple of commuting contractions belongs to  $\mathcal{T}$ .

**Theorem 2.** *If  $p$  is a polynomial which can be realized as the transfer function of a dissipative  $nD$  scattering system, then*

$$(9) \quad \|p(\mathbf{T})\| \leq 1$$

for all  $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}$ .

We will say such  $p$  satisfy the *restricted von Neumann inequality*.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Suppose  $p$  is a polynomial vanishing at 0 and  $p = \theta_\alpha$  for some  $\alpha$  as in Definition 1; we work only in the scalar case  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{C}$ . First note that since analytic functions in the polydisk satisfy a maximum principle relative to  $\mathbb{T}^n$ , the dissipativity condition (iv) implies

$$(10) \quad \|z\mathbf{G}\| := \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n z_k G_k \right\| \leq 1$$

for all  $z \in \mathbb{D}^n$ . Then by definition, if  $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}$ , we have

$$(11) \quad \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n T_k \otimes G_k \right\| \leq 1.$$

Next, we recall the classical fact that if

$$(12) \quad F = \begin{pmatrix} W & X \\ Y & Z \end{pmatrix}$$

is a block operator and  $\|F\| < 1$ , then the linear fractional operator

$$(13) \quad Z + Y(I - W)^{-1}X$$

is contractive. Now apply this to the block operator

$$(14) \quad r\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{G} = \begin{pmatrix} r\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{A} & r\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{B} \\ r\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{C} & r\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{D} \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{A} := \sum_{k=1}^n T_k \otimes A_k$ , etc., and  $r < 1$ . We conclude that if  $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}$ , then the linear fractional operator

$$(15) \quad r\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{D} + r\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{C}(I_{\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{X}} - r\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{A})^{-1}r\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{B}$$

is contractive for all  $r < 1$ . But it is straightforward to check that, since  $p$  is assumed to be given by the transfer function realization

$$(16) \quad p(z) = z\mathbf{D} + z\mathbf{C}(I_{\mathcal{X}} - z\mathbf{A})^{-1}z\mathbf{B},$$

the expression (15) is equal to  $p(r\mathbf{T})$  (This can be done by expanding (16) in a power series, substituting  $r\mathbf{T}$  for  $z$ , and comparing coefficients with the expansion of (15) in powers of  $rT_1, \dots, rT_n$ .) But then  $\|p(r\mathbf{T})\| \leq 1$  for all  $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $r < 1$ , which suffices to establish the theorem.  $\square$

It follows that any contractive polynomial which fails the restricted von Neumann inequality will fail to have a dissipative realization. In fact, the counterexample to the classical von Neumann inequality produced by Kaijser and Varopoulos is, it turns out, also a counterexample to the restricted inequality, as we now show. The computations are taken from a closely related example considered in [2].

Let  $e_1, \dots, e_5$  denote the standard basis of  $\mathbb{C}^5$ . Consider the unit vectors

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(-e_2 + e_3 + e_4) \\ v_2 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(e_2 - e_3 + e_4) \\ v_3 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(e_2 + e_3 - e_4) \end{aligned}$$

The Kaijser-Varopoulos contractions are the commuting  $5 \times 5$  matrices  $T_1, T_2, T_3$  defined by

$$T_j = e_{j+1} \otimes e_1 + e_5 \otimes v_j$$

If  $p$  is the polynomial

$$(17) \quad p(z_1, z_2, z_3) = \frac{1}{5}(z_1^2 + z_2^2 + z_3^2 - 2z_1z_2 - 2z_1z_3 - 2z_2z_3)$$

then it is known that  $\sup_{\zeta \in \mathbb{T}^3} |p(\zeta)| = 1$  but

$$(18) \quad \|p(\mathbf{T})\| = \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{5} > 1,$$

so  $p$  fails the classical von Neumann inequality [5]. To show that this  $p$  fails the restricted von Neumann inequality, we show that already this  $\mathbf{T}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{T}$ ; that is, if  $X_1, X_2, X_3$  are operators which satisfy

$$(19) \quad \|z_1X_1 + z_2X_2 + z_3X_3\| \leq 1$$

for all  $z \in \mathbb{D}^n$ , then  $\|\sum_{k=1}^3 T_k \otimes X_k\| \leq 1$ . To see this, we compute and find

$$(20) \quad T_1 \otimes X_1 + T_2 \otimes X_2 + T_3 \otimes X_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ X_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ X_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ X_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Y_1 & Y_2 & Y_3 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(-X_1 + X_2 + X_3) \\ Y_2 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(X_1 - X_2 + X_3) \\ Y_3 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(X_1 + X_2 - X_3) \end{aligned}$$

The norm of the matrix (20) is equal to the maximum of the norms of the first column and the last row. By (19), we have  $\|\pm X_1 \pm X_2 \pm X_3\| \leq 1$  for all choices of signs, so the last row of (20) has norm at most 1. To say that the first column has norm at most 1 amounts to saying that

$$(21) \quad I - \sum_{k=1}^n X_k^* X_k \geq 0.$$

This may be seen by averaging: by (19), the matrix valued function

$$I - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \zeta_i \bar{\zeta}_j X_j^* X_i$$

is positive semidefinite on  $\mathbb{T}^n$ . Integrating against normalized Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{T}^n$  gives (21).

There is a general principle that transfer function realizations should be equivalent to von Neumann-type inequalities. Some recent, general results in this direction may be found in [2, 4].

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Vincent D. Blondel and Alexandre Megretski, editors. *Unsolved problems in mathematical systems and control theory*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2004.
- [2] Michael T. Jury. Universal commutative operator algebras and transfer function realizations of polynomials. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1009.6219>.
- [3] Dmitriy S. Kalyuzhniy. Multiparametric dissipative linear stationary dynamical scattering systems: discrete case. *J. Operator Theory*, 43(2):427–460, 2000.
- [4] Meghna Mittal and Vern I. Paulsen. Operator algebras of functions. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 258(9):3195–3225, 2010.
- [5] N. Th. Varopoulos. On an inequality of von Neumann and an application of the metric theory of tensor products to operators theory. *J. Functional Analysis*, 16:83–100, 1974.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, BOX 118105, GAINESVILLE, FL 32611-8105, USA  
*E-mail address:* `mjury@ufl.edu`