

STATIONARY MEASURE INDUCED BY THE EIGENVALUE PROBLEM OF THE ONE-DIMENSIONAL HADAMARD WALK

Takashi Komatsu*, Norio Konno†

Department of Mathematics and Physics, Faculty of Science, Kanagawa University

2946 Tsuchiya, Hiratsukashi, Kanagawa, 259-1293, Japan

Department of Applied Mathematics, Faculty of Engineering, Yokohama National University

79-5 Tokiwadai, Hodogaya, Yokohama, 240-8501, Japan

Abstract. In this paper, we consider the stationary measure of the Hadamard walk on the one-dimensional integer lattice. Here all the stationary measures given by solving the eigenvalue problem are completely determined via the transfer matrix method. Then these stationary measures can be divided into three classes, i.e., quadratic polynomial, bounded, and exponential types. In particular, we present an explicit necessary and sufficient condition for the bounded-type stationary measure to be periodic.

1 Introduction

The notion of quantum walks was introduced by Aharonov et al. [1] as a quantum counterpart of the classical one-dimensional random walks. It is known that the long-time asymptotic behavior of the transition probability for quantum walks on the one-dimensional lattice is quite different from that of classical random walks [8]. Recently, the quantum walk is intensively studied in various fields [12], [14].

We focus on a sequence of measures $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}}$ induced by the unitary operator (time evolution operator) for quantum walks, where $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Especially, one of the basic interests for quantum walks is to determine measures which do not depend on time $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}$, that is to say, our purpose is to obtain measures satisfied with $\mu_0 = \mu_n$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}$. These measures are called the *stationary measure*. The first result of stationary measures for quantum walks is given by Konno et al. [10]. The intensive study on stationary measures for quantum walks was reported and it is shown that there exists the uniform measure as stationary measure on regular graphs in Konno [9]. That is to say, Konno proved that the set of uniform measures is contained the set of stationary measures. After that Konno and Takei [11] gave non-uniform stationary measures. In our previous work [5], we investigated the stationary measures for the three-state quantum walks including the Fourier and Grover walks by solving the corresponding eigenvalue problem. Then we found the stationary measure with a periodicity. Recently, Komatsu and Konno [7] obtained the stationary measure for quantum walks on the higher-dimensional integer lattice.

The purpose of this paper is to determine the set of the stationary measures induced by the eigenvalue problem for the Hadamard walk. Our method is based on the transfer matrices introduced by Kawai et al. [6]. The following results will be proved by applying propositions which will be obtained in the subsequent section.

We have the following two main results.

*pt121199vy@kanagawa-u.ac.jp (e-mail of the corresponding author)

†konno-norio-bt@ynu.ac.jp

Abbr. title: Stationary measure induced by the eigenvalue problem of the one-dimensional Hadamard walk

AMS 2000 subject classifications: 60F05, 81P68

Keywords: Hadamard walk, Stationary measure, Periodicity, Quadratic polynomial type, Exponential type, Bounded type

Result 1. (Theorem 4.1 in Sect. 4) The set of the stationary measures induced by the eigenvalue problem for the Hadamard walk on \mathbb{Z} is divided into three classes, where \mathbb{Z} is the set of integers. One is the set of the measures with quadratic polynomial type. The second one is the set of the measures with bounded type. The last one is the set of the measures with exponential type.

Result 2. (Theorem 4.7 in Sect. 4) An explicit necessary and sufficient condition for the bounded-type stationary measure to be periodic is given.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to the definition of the space-homogeneous quantum walk on the one-dimensional integer lattice. In Sect. 3, the transfer matrices given by Kawai et al. [6] to analyze stationary measures are defined and we collect some general facts from [6]. In Sect. 4, we discuss some aspects of the stationary measure. More precisely, when we take the Hadamard coin as a coin matrix, the set of the measures with a stationarity is decomposed into three classes. In particular, we present an explicit necessary and sufficient condition for the stationary measure to be periodic. Conclusions are given in the last section.

2 Definition of the quantum walks on \mathbb{Z}

In this section, we give the definition of two-state quantum walk on \mathbb{Z} . A particle in the classical random walk moves at each step either one unit to the right with probability p or one unit to the left with probability q , where $p + q = 1$, $p, q > 0$. On the other hand, the discrete-time quantum walk describes not only the motion of a particle but also the change of the states of a particle.

In the present paper, we consider the discrete-time quantum walk on \mathbb{Z} defined by a unitary operator U_C of the following form

$$U_C = SC, \quad (2.1)$$

where the shift operator S is given by

$$S = \tau^{-1}P + \tau Q.$$

Here, the operator τ is defined by

$$(\tau f)(x) = f(x - 1) \quad (f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2, x \in \mathbb{Z}),$$

and C is the following 2×2 unitary matrix

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} \\ c_{21} & c_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.2)$$

We call this unitary matrix the *coin matrix*. To consider the time evolution Eq. (2.1), decompose the matrix C as

$$C = P + Q$$

with

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ c_{21} & c_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We put Δ and $\tilde{\Delta}$ as follows;

$$\Delta = \det(A) = c_{11}c_{22} - c_{12}c_{21}, \quad \tilde{\Delta} = c_{11}c_{22} + c_{12}c_{21}. \quad (2.3)$$

The above Eq. (2.3) is utilized in Sect. 3. Let \mathbb{C} be the set of complex numbers. The state at time n and location x can be expressed by a two-dimensional vector:

$$\Psi_n(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_n^L(x) \\ \Psi_n^R(x) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^2 \quad (x \in \mathbb{Z}, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}).$$

The time evolution of a quantum walk with a coin matrix C is defined by the unitary operator U_C in the following way:

$$\Psi_{n+1}(x) \equiv (U_C \Psi_n)(x) = P\Psi_n(x + 1) + Q\Psi_n(x - 1). \quad (2.4)$$

This equation means that the particle moves at each step one unit to the right with matrix Q or one unit to the left with matrix P . Let $\mathbb{R}_{\geq} = [0, \infty)$. For time $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}$, we define the measure $\mu_n : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq}$ by

$$\mu_n(x) = \|\Psi_n(x)\|_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{C}^2}$ denotes the standard norm on \mathbb{C}^2 . Let $\mathcal{M}(U_C)$ be the set of measures on \mathbb{Z} , where U_C is a unitary operator given by Eq. (2.4).

Let $\text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2)$ be the set of the functions from \mathbb{Z} to \mathbb{C}^2 . Now we define an operator ϕ

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \phi : \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}(U_C) \\ \Psi & \longmapsto & \mu \end{array}$$

such that for $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\Psi \neq \mathbf{0} \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2)$,

$$\phi(\Psi)(x) = |\Psi^L(x)|^2 + |\Psi^R(x)|^2, \quad \left(\Psi(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi^L(x) \\ \Psi^R(x) \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

From the above definition, we denote $\mu := \phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}(U_C)$.

3 Stationary measure and Transfer matrix

3.1 Definition of stationary measure for quantum walk

In this section, we discuss a sequence of measures $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}}$ induced by the unitary operator U_C for quantum walks. Especially, we focus on the a sequence of measures $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}}$ with a stationarity, namely

$$\mu_0 = \mu_1 = \cdots = \mu_n = \cdots \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}).$$

In other words, the measure with a stationarity is a non-negative real-valued function on \mathbb{Z} that does not depend on the time $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}$. We put the set of the stationary measures $\mathcal{M}_s(U_C)$ as

$$\mathcal{M}_s(U_C) = \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}(U_C) : \text{there exists } \Psi_0 \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2) \text{ such that} \right. \\ \left. \mu = \phi(U_C^n \Psi_0) \ (n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}) \right\}.$$

We call this measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s(U_C)$ the stationary measure for the quantum walk defined by the unitary operator U_C . If $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s(U_C)$, then $\mu_n = \mu$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}$, where μ_n is the measure of quantum walk given by U_C at time n .

In general, if unitary operators U_{C_1} and U_{C_2} are different, the sets of stationary measures $\mathcal{M}_s(U_{C_1})$ and $\mathcal{M}_s(U_{C_2})$ are different. For example, if we take the unitary operators U_{C_1} and U_{C_2} corresponding to the following coin matrices C_1 and C_2 respectively:

$$C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix},$$

then we have

$$\mathcal{M}_s(U_{C_1}) = \mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_{C_1}), \quad \mathcal{M}_s(U_{C_2}) \supsetneq \mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_{C_2}).$$

The above results are given in Konno and Takei [11]. Here $\mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_C)$ is the set of the uniform measures defined by

$$\mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_C) = \left\{ \mu_c \in \mathcal{M}(U_C) : \text{there exists } c > 0 \right. \\ \left. \text{such that } \mu_c(x) = c \ (x \in \mathbb{Z}) \right\}. \quad (3.5)$$

3.2 Transfer matrix induced by the eigenvalue problem

We define the transfer matrices to analyze stationary measures for quantum walks in this subsection. A method based on transfer matrices is one of the common approaches, for example, Ahlbrecht et al. [2], Bourget et al. [3] and Kawai et al. [6]. In this paper, we apply this method to two-state space-homogeneous quantum walks to obtain the stationary measures.

Let $S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}$ be the following unit circle in complex plane.

$$S^1 = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}.$$

Now we consider the following eigenvalue problem of the quantum walk determined by U_C :

$$U_C \Psi = \lambda \Psi \quad (\lambda \in S^1). \quad (3.6)$$

Then we see that $U_C \Psi = \lambda \Psi$ is equivalent to the following relations:

$$\begin{cases} \lambda \Psi^L(x) = c_{11} \Psi^L(x+1) + c_{12} \Psi^R(x+1), \\ \lambda \Psi^R(x) = c_{21} \Psi^L(x-1) + c_{22} \Psi^R(x-1). \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

Suppose that $c_{11} \neq 0$. Remark that $c_{11} \neq 0$ gives $c_{22} \neq 0$. From above Eq. (3.7), we get

$$\begin{cases} \bullet \begin{bmatrix} \Psi^L(x) \\ \Psi^R(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\lambda^2 - c_{12}c_{21}}{c_{11}\lambda} & -\frac{c_{12}c_{22}}{c_{11}\lambda} \\ \frac{c_{21}}{\lambda} & \frac{c_{22}}{\lambda} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Psi^L(x-1) \\ \Psi^R(x-1) \end{bmatrix}, \\ \bullet \begin{bmatrix} \Psi^L(x) \\ \Psi^R(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda} & \frac{c_{12}}{\lambda} \\ -\frac{c_{11}c_{21}}{\lambda} & \frac{\lambda^2 - c_{12}c_{21}}{c_{22}\lambda} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Psi^L(x+1) \\ \Psi^R(x+1) \end{bmatrix}. \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

Hence we put the following matrices $T^+(C)$, $T^-(C)$ as

$$T^+(C) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\lambda^2 - c_{12}c_{21}}{c_{11}\lambda} & -\frac{c_{12}c_{22}}{c_{11}\lambda} \\ \frac{c_{21}}{\lambda} & \frac{c_{22}}{\lambda} \end{bmatrix}, \quad T^-(C) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda} & \frac{c_{12}}{\lambda} \\ -\frac{c_{11}c_{21}}{c_{22}\lambda} & \frac{\lambda^2 - c_{12}c_{21}}{c_{22}\lambda} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.9)$$

We call these matrices the transfer matrices. These matrices have the following relation:

$$T^+(C) T^-(C) = T^-(C) T^+(C) = I,$$

where I is the identity matrix. It should be remarked that the transfer matrices defined by Eq. (3.9) are not always unitary. If $T^+(C)$ is a unitary matrix, the stationary measure induced by the transfer matrices is a uniform measure, because a unitary matrix preserves the norm. However, the converse is not true. In Sect. 4, this counterexample is given by the Hadamard walk.

We write $\Psi(0)$ ($\Psi \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$) as

$$\Psi(0) = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi^L(0) \\ \Psi^R(0) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathbb{C}). \quad (3.10)$$

From Eqs. (3.8) and (3.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^L(1) &= \frac{\varphi_1 \lambda^2 - c_{12}(c_{21}\varphi_1 + c_{22}\varphi_2)}{c_{11}\lambda}, & \Psi^R(1) &= \frac{c_{21}\varphi_1 + c_{22}\varphi_2}{\lambda}, \\ \Psi^L(-1) &= \frac{c_{11}\varphi_1 + c_{12}\varphi_2}{\lambda}, & \Psi^R(-1) &= \frac{\varphi_2 \lambda^2 - c_{21}(c_{11}\varphi_1 + c_{12}\varphi_2)}{c_{22}\lambda}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

The above Eq. (3.11) will be used in Sect. 4.

Our purpose of this paper is to find stationary measures for our two-state quantum walks by using Eq. (3.9). Here we define a subset $\mathcal{M}_s^{(\lambda)}(U_C)$ of $\mathcal{M}_s(U_C)$ as

$$\mathcal{M}_s^{(\lambda)}(U_C) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s(U_C) : \mu = \phi(\Psi) \text{ such that } U_C \Psi = \lambda \Psi\} \quad (\lambda \in S^1).$$

We put the set of collection stationary measure induced by the eigenvalue problem as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_s(U_C)} = \bigcup_{\lambda \in S^1} \mathcal{M}_s^{(\lambda)}(U_C).$$

For $\Psi \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ with Eq. (3.6), we note that

$$\phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}_s(U_C). \quad (3.12)$$

3.3 Previous study

In this subsection, we give some subsets of $\mathcal{M}_s(U_C)$ and briefly explain the previous study on stationary measures for quantum walks.

Now, we prepare some classes of the set of the stationary measures to explain our results. First one is the set of the measures with exponential type $\mathcal{M}_{s,exp}(U_C)$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{M}_{s,exp}(U_C) = \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}_s(U_C) : \text{there exist } c_+, c_- > 0 \text{ (} c_+, c_- \neq 1 \text{)} \right. \\ \left. \text{such that } 0 < \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\mu(x)}{c_+^x} < +\infty, \quad 0 < \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\mu(x)}{c_-^x} < +\infty \right\}.$$

We put the set $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{s,exp}(U_C)}$ as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{s,exp}(U_C)} = \mathcal{M}_{s,exp}(U_C) \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_s(U_C)}.$$

Second one is the set of the measures with quadratic polynomial type $\mathcal{M}_{s,qp}(U_C)$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{M}_{s,qp}(U_C) = \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}_s(U_C) : 0 < \lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{\mu(x)}{|x|^2} < +\infty \right\}.$$

We put the set $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{s,qp}(U_C)}$ as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{s,qp}(U_C)} = \mathcal{M}_{s,qp}(U_C) \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_s(U_C)}.$$

The last one is the set of the uniform measures given by Eq. (3.5). The uniform measure is a positive real-valued constant function on \mathbb{Z} . In other words, we can regard a uniform measure as a stationary measure with period 1. Therefore, we define the subset $\mathcal{M}_{s,period}^{(m)}(U_C)$ as

$$\mathcal{M}_{s,period}^{(m)}(U_C) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s(U_C) : \mu(x+m) = \mu(x) \text{ (} x \in \mathbb{Z} \text{)}\}.$$

Here, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. It is remarked that

$$\mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_C) = \mathcal{M}_{s,period}^{(1)}(U_C) \subset \mathcal{M}_{s,period}(U_C) \subset \mathcal{M}_s(U_C),$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{s,period}(U_C)$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{M}_{s,period}(U_C) = \bigcup_{m \geq 1} \mathcal{M}_{s,period}^{(m)}(U_C).$$

Moreover, we set the subset $\mathcal{M}_{s,bdd}(U_C)$ of $\mathcal{M}_s(U_C)$ as

$$\mathcal{M}_{s,bdd}(U_C) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s(U_C) : \text{there exists } M > 0 \\ \text{such that } \mu(x) \leq M \text{ (} x \in \mathbb{Z} \text{)}\}.$$

We put the set $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,bdd}(U_C)$ as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,bdd}(U_C) = \mathcal{M}_{s,bdd}(U_C) \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_s(U_C).$$

We briefly review the result of our previous work in [6].

THEOREM 3.1 (COROLLARY 3.4 IN [6]) *Let $\lambda \in S^1$ be an eigenvalue satisfied with Eq. (3.6). We put the function $\Psi \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and write*

$$\Psi(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi^L(x) \\ \Psi^R(x) \end{bmatrix} \quad (x \in \mathbb{Z}).$$

For a coin matrix C defined by Eq. (2.2) with $c_{11} \neq 0$, a solution of the eigenvalue problem induced by Eq. (3.6) is given in the following.

(i) *For case of $\lambda^2 = c_{11}c_{22} + c_{12}c_{21} \pm 2\sqrt{c_{11}c_{12}c_{21}c_{22}}$, we get*

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(x) &= \begin{bmatrix} \Psi^L(x) \\ \Psi^R(x) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\lambda^2 + \Delta}{2c_{11}\lambda} \right)^x \frac{1}{\lambda^2 + \Delta} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1(1+x)\lambda^2 - (\varphi_1\tilde{\Delta} + 2c_{12}c_{22}\varphi_2)x + \varphi_1\Delta \\ \varphi_2(1-x)\lambda^2 + (\varphi_2\tilde{\Delta} + 2c_{11}c_{21}\varphi_1)x + \varphi_2\Delta \end{bmatrix} & (x \geq 1), \\ \left(\frac{\lambda^2 + \Delta}{2c_{22}\lambda} \right)^{-x} \frac{1}{\lambda^2 + \Delta} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1(1+x)\lambda^2 - (\varphi_1\tilde{\Delta} + 2c_{12}c_{22}\varphi_2)x + \varphi_1\Delta \\ \varphi_2(1-x)\lambda^2 + (\varphi_2\tilde{\Delta} + 2c_{11}c_{21}\varphi_1)x + \varphi_2\Delta \end{bmatrix} & (x \leq -1). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *For case of $\lambda^2 \neq c_{11}c_{22} + c_{12}c_{21} \pm 2\sqrt{c_{11}c_{12}c_{21}c_{22}}$, we get*

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(x) &= \begin{bmatrix} \Psi^L(x) \\ \Psi^R(x) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_+^x(\Psi^L(1) - \Lambda_- \varphi_1) - \Lambda_-^x(\Psi^L(1) - \Lambda_+ \varphi_1) \\ \Lambda_+^x(\Psi^R(1) - \Lambda_- \varphi_2) - \Lambda_-^x(\Psi^R(1) - \Lambda_+ \varphi_2) \end{bmatrix} & (x \geq 1), \\ \frac{1}{\Gamma_+ - \Gamma_-} \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_+^{-x}(\Psi^L(-1) - \Gamma_- \varphi_1) - \Gamma_-^{-x}(\Psi^L(-1) - \Gamma_+ \varphi_1) \\ \Gamma_+^{-x}(\Psi^R(-1) - \Gamma_- \varphi_2) - \Gamma_-^{-x}(\Psi^R(-1) - \Gamma_+ \varphi_2) \end{bmatrix} & (x \leq -1). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Here, we denote that Λ_{\pm} and Γ_{\pm} are expressed by

$$\Lambda_{\pm} = \frac{h(\lambda) \pm \sqrt{h(\lambda)^2 - 4\lambda^2 c_{11}c_{22}}}{2c_{11}\lambda}, \quad \Gamma_{\pm} = \frac{h(\lambda) \pm \sqrt{h(\lambda)^2 - 4\lambda^2 c_{11}c_{22}}}{2c_{22}\lambda},$$

where $h(\lambda)$ is defined by $h(\lambda) = \lambda^2 + \Delta$. Furthermore, the definitions of Δ , $\tilde{\Delta}$, $\Psi^L(\pm 1)$ and $\Psi^R(\pm 1)$ are given in Eqs. (2.3) and (3.11).

By using Eq. (3.12), we have the following result.

COROLLARY 3.2 *For $\Psi \neq \mathbf{0} \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2)$ given by Theorem 3.1, we obtain*

$$\phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}_s(U_C).$$

4 Results

In this section, we consider some aspects of stationary measures. More precisely, when we take the Hadamard coin as a coin matrix C , the set of the measures with a stationarity is decomposed into three classes. First one is the set of the measures with quadratic polynomial type. This part of our results is mentioned by Konno and Takei [11]. The second one is the set of the measures with bounded type. Especially, we present an explicit necessary and sufficient condition for the bounded-type stationary measure to be periodic. The last one is the set of the measures with exponential type. The second and last sets are obtained in our paper for the first time. The purpose of this section is to prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 4.1 *We consider the stationary measures induced by the eigenvalue problem for the Hadamard walk on \mathbb{Z} . Then, we have*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_s(U_H) = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,qp}(U_H) \cup \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,bdd}(U_H) \cup \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,exp}(U_H).$$

Here these symbols $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,qp}(U_H)$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,bdd}(U_H)$, and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,exp}(U_H)$ are defined in Sect. 3.3.

From now on, we prepare some lemmas and propositions.

4.1 Characteristic polynomial

From Eq. (3.7), we obtain the following equation.

$$\lambda \frac{c_{11}}{c_{12}} \Psi^j(x+2) + \left(c_{21} - \frac{c_{11}c_{22}}{c_{12}} - \frac{\lambda^2}{c_{12}} \right) \Psi^j(x+1) + \lambda \frac{c_{22}}{c_{12}} \Psi^j(x) = 0 \quad (j = L, R). \quad (4.13)$$

We consider the characteristic polynomial induced by Eq. (4.13).

$$x^2 + lx + \frac{c_{22}}{c_{11}} = 0, \quad (4.14)$$

where l is given by

$$l = -\frac{1}{c_{11}} \left(\lambda + \frac{\Delta}{\lambda} \right), \quad \left| \frac{c_{22}}{c_{11}} \right| = 1.$$

Let Λ_+ and Λ_- be solutions for a characteristic polynomial defined by Eq. (4.14). Then, the solutions Λ_+ and Λ_- become any of the following Type 1, Type 2, and Type 3.

- Type 1 : $|\Lambda_+| = |\Lambda_-|$, $\Lambda_+ = \Lambda_-$
- Type 2 : $|\Lambda_+| = |\Lambda_-|$, $\Lambda_+ \neq \Lambda_-$.
- Type 3 : $|\Lambda_+| > 1 > |\Lambda_-| > 0$ or $|\Lambda_-| > 1 > |\Lambda_+| > 0$.

From now on, we treat the following orthogonal matrix $O(\zeta)$ as a unitary matrix C

$$O(\zeta) = \begin{bmatrix} c & s \\ s & -c \end{bmatrix} \quad (c, s \neq 0),$$

with $c = \cos \zeta$ and $s = \sin \zeta$. Note that the quantum walk determined by $O(\pi/4)$ becomes the Hadamard walk.

LEMMA 4.2 *Let $\lambda \in S^1$ be an eigenvalue in Eq. (3.6). The solutions of the equation $\lambda^2 = -c^2 + s^2 \pm 2i\sqrt{c^2 s^2}$ are given by*

$$\lambda_1 = e^{i\frac{\eta}{2}}, \quad \lambda_2 = e^{i(\pi - \frac{\eta}{2})}, \quad \lambda_3 = e^{i(\pi + \frac{\eta}{2})}, \quad \lambda_4 = e^{i(2\pi - \frac{\eta}{2})} \quad (\eta \in (0, \pi)),$$

where

$$\cos \eta = -(c^2 - s^2), \quad \sin \eta = 2cs.$$

4.2 Results of Type 1, 2, and 3

In this subsection, we consider the Hadamard walk corresponding to the following orthogonal matrix

$$O(\pi/4) \equiv H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

From Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\lambda_1 = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}}, \quad \lambda_2 = e^{i\frac{3\pi}{4}}, \quad \lambda_3 = e^{i\frac{5\pi}{4}}, \quad \lambda_4 = e^{i\frac{7\pi}{4}}. \quad (4.15)$$

We prepare the following subsets K_1 , K_2 , and K_3 of $K = [0, 2\pi)$.

$$K_1 = \left\{ \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4}, \frac{5\pi}{4}, \frac{7\pi}{4} \right\}, \quad K_2 = [0, \pi/4) \cup (3\pi/4, 5\pi/4) \cup (7\pi/4, 2\pi),$$

$$K_3 = K \setminus (K_1 \cup K_2).$$

Furthermore we set the subsets $\widetilde{K}_j \subset S^1$ as

$$\widetilde{K}_j = \{e^{i\theta} : \theta \in K_j\}, \quad (j = 1, 2, 3).$$

From Eq. (3.9), the transfer matrices of the Hadamard walk are given by

$$T^+(H) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2\lambda^2 - 1}{\sqrt{2}\lambda} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\lambda} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\lambda} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\lambda} \end{bmatrix}, \quad T^-(H) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\lambda} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\lambda} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\lambda} & -\frac{2\lambda^2 - 1}{\sqrt{2}\lambda} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Remark 1. We put $\lambda = e^{i\theta} \in S^1$ in Eq. (3.6), where $\theta \in K$. The transfer matrices $T^+(H)$, $T^-(H)$ are a unitary matrix if and only if $\theta = 0, \pi$. For any $\Psi(0) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, we define the function $\Psi \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2)$

$$\Psi(x) = \begin{cases} (T^+(H))^x \Psi(0) & (x \geq 1), \\ \Psi(0) & (x = 0), \\ (T^-(H))^{|x|} \Psi(0) & (x \leq -1). \end{cases}$$

Thus we have

$$\phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_H) \subset \mathcal{M}_{s,bdd}(U_C).$$

Thus, there exist stationary measures in $\mathcal{M}_{s,bdd}(U_H)$ that has a periodicity. Namely,

$$\mathcal{M}_{s,period}(U_H) \cap \mathcal{M}_{s,bdd}(U_H) \neq \emptyset.$$

More precisely, we discuss the stationary measures with periodicity in Sec. 4.2.2 Theorem 4.7.

Remark 2. In [10], it is mentioned that the following function $\Psi_0^{(\sigma,\tau)} \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ satisfies the eigenvalue problem, i.e., there exists $\lambda \in S^1$ such that $U_H \Psi_0^{(\sigma,\tau)} = \lambda \Psi_0^{(\sigma,\tau)}$. For $\sigma, \tau \in \{\pm 1\}$, the function $\Psi_0^{(\sigma,\tau)}$ is defined by

$$\Psi_0^{(\sigma,\tau)}(x) = (\tau \text{isgn}(x))^{|x|} \times \begin{cases} \varphi_1 \times \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -\sigma\tau i \end{bmatrix} & (x \geq 1) \\ \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_2 \end{bmatrix} & (x = 0) \\ \varphi_2 \times \begin{bmatrix} \sigma\tau i \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & (x \leq -1) \end{cases} \quad (\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathbb{C}).$$

where $\varphi_1 = \sigma\tau i\varphi_2$ and $\text{sgn}(x)$ is given by

$$\text{sgn}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & (x > 0) \\ 0 & (x = 0) \\ -1 & (x < 0) \end{cases}.$$

Then we can check the following equations.

$$U_H \Psi_0^{(\sigma,\tau)} = \frac{\sigma + \tau i}{\sqrt{2}} \Psi_0^{(\sigma,\tau)}, \quad \phi\left(\Psi_0^{(\sigma,\tau)}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_H).$$

From now on, we consider the relationship the transfer matrices $T^\pm(H)$ and the function $\Psi_0^{(\sigma,\tau)}$. For simplicity, we take $\sigma=\tau=1$, $\varphi_1 = 1$ and $\varphi_2 = -i$. Then we have

$$T^+(H)\Psi_0^{(1,1)}(x) = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}} \Psi_0^{(1,1)}(x), \quad T^-(H)\Psi_0^{(1,1)}(x) = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}} \Psi_0^{(1,1)}(x).$$

Hence, we see that the function $\Psi_0^{(1,1)} \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2)$ is an eigenfunction of the transfer matrices $T^+(H)$ and $T^-(H)$. Therefore, we conclude that this function $\Psi_0^{(1,1)}$ is one of the example that even if there exist $\Psi \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2)$ such that $\phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_H)$ and $T^\pm(H)\Psi = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}}\Psi$, the transfer matrices $T^+(H)$ and $T^-(H)$ induced by the eigenvalue $\lambda = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}}$ are not unitary matrix. Furthermore, we can also obtain the above statement for $\lambda = e^{i\frac{3\pi}{4}}$, $\lambda = e^{i\frac{5\pi}{4}}$, and $\lambda = e^{i\frac{7\pi}{4}}$ by the same discussion.

4.2.1 Result of Type 1

In the previous section, we introduced transfer matrices $T^+(C)$, $T^-(C)$ to obtain stationary measures of quantum walks for Type 1, 2, and 3. In this subsection, by using Theorem 3.1, we present that the stationary measures induced by a solution of the eigenvalue problem of Type 1, $U_C\Psi = \lambda\Psi$, are the stationary measure with quadratic polynomial type.

PROPOSITION 4.3 *Let $\lambda \in S^1$ be an eigenvalue in Eq. (3.6) and we put $\lambda = e^{i\theta}$ ($\theta \in K$). Then we have the following two statements.*

- (1) *The points $\lambda \in S^1$ that the characteristic polynomial defined by Eq. (4.14) has the double roots $\Lambda_+ = \Lambda_-$ are given by*

$$\lambda_1 = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}}, \quad \lambda_2 = e^{i\frac{3\pi}{4}}, \quad \lambda_3 = e^{i\frac{5\pi}{4}}, \quad \lambda_4 = e^{i\frac{7\pi}{4}}.$$

- (2) (a) *Suppose that $|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 \neq 2\text{Im}(\varphi_1\overline{\varphi_2})$ for $\theta = \pi/4, 5\pi/4$. The stationary measures $\phi(\Psi)$ induced by the function $\Psi \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2)$ in Theorem 3.1 (i) have the measures with quadratic polynomial type. That is to say,*

$$\phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}_{s,qp}(U_H).$$

On the other hand, assume that $|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 = 2\text{Im}(\varphi_1\overline{\varphi_2})$ for $\theta = \pi/4, 5\pi/4$. The stationary measures $\phi(\Psi)$ induced by the function $\Psi \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2)$ in Theorem 3.1 (i) have the measures with period 1. That is to say,

$$\phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_H).$$

- (b) *Suppose that $|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 \neq -2\text{Im}(\varphi_1\overline{\varphi_2})$ for $\theta = 3\pi/4, 7\pi/4$. The stationary measures $\phi(\Psi)$ induced by the function $\Psi \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2)$ in Theorem 3.1 (i) have the measures with quadratic polynomial type. That is to say,*

$$\phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}_{s,qp}(U_H).$$

On the other hand, assume that $|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 = -2\text{Im}(\varphi_1\overline{\varphi_2})$ for $\theta = 3\pi/4, 7\pi/4$. The stationary measures $\phi(\Psi)$ induced by the function $\Psi \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2)$ in Theorem 3.1 (i) have the measures with period 1. That is to say,

$$\phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_H).$$

Proof. From Eq. (4.15), the statement (1) immediately holds. So we show the statement (2). Let $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ be $x \geq 1$. Since $0, \pi \notin K_1$, we remark that $\lambda^2 + \Delta \neq 0$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2|\Psi^L(x)|^2 \\ &= \left(|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 + \varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2} \lambda^2 + \overline{\varphi_1} \varphi_2 \overline{\lambda^2} \right) x^2 \\ &+ \left(2|\varphi_1|^2 - (\varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2} + \overline{\varphi_1} \varphi_2) + \varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2} \lambda^2 + \overline{\varphi_1} \varphi_2 \overline{\lambda^2} - |\varphi_1|^2 \lambda^2 - |\varphi_1|^2 \overline{\lambda^2} \right) x \\ &+ 2|\varphi_1|^2 - |\varphi_1|^2 \lambda^2 - |\varphi_1|^2 \overline{\lambda^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & 2|\Psi^R(x)|^2 \\ &= \left(|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 - \varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2} \overline{\lambda^2} - \overline{\varphi_1} \varphi_2 \lambda^2 \right) x^2 \\ &+ \left(-2|\varphi_2|^2 - (\varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2} + \overline{\varphi_1} \varphi_2) + \varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2} \overline{\lambda^2} + \overline{\varphi_1} \varphi_2 \lambda^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 \overline{\lambda^2} + |\varphi_2|^2 \lambda^2 \right) x \\ &+ 2|\varphi_2|^2 - |\varphi_2|^2 \lambda^2 - |\varphi_2|^2 \overline{\lambda^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

Thus, we obtain the following stationary measure by using Eqs. (4.16) and (4.17).

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(x) &= |\Psi^L(x)|^2 + |\Psi^R(x)|^2 \\ &= (|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 - 2 \sin 2\theta \operatorname{Im}(\varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2})) x^2 \\ &\quad + (|\varphi_1|^2 - |\varphi_2|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2})) x + |\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that the condition $|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 \neq 2 \operatorname{Im}(\varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2})$ for $\theta = \pi/4, 5\pi/4$ and assume that $|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 \neq -2 \operatorname{Im}(\varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2})$ for $\theta = 3\pi/4, 7\pi/4$ ($\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathbb{C}$). Then it holds

$$\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{s,qp}(U_H).$$

Moreover, note that

$$|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 = 2 \operatorname{Im}(\varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2}) \implies |\varphi_1| = |\varphi_2|, \operatorname{Re}(\varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2}) = 0$$

and

$$|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 = -2 \operatorname{Im}(\varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2}) \implies |\varphi_1| = |\varphi_2|, \operatorname{Re}(\varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2}) = 0.$$

Suppose that the condition $|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 = 2 \operatorname{Im}(\varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2})$ for $\theta = \pi/4, 5\pi/4$ and assume that $|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 = -2 \operatorname{Im}(\varphi_1 \overline{\varphi_2})$ for $\theta = 3\pi/4, 7\pi/4$. Then we obtain

$$\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_H).$$

In case of $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $x \leq -1$, we get the same results by the same argument. Hence the statement (2) holds. \square

From the above argument, we have obtained an explicit necessary and sufficient condition to have the uniform measures for $\theta \in K_1$.

COROLLARY 4.4 For $\theta \in K_1$, we have the following results.

(1) For $\theta = \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{5\pi}{4}$, we obtain

$$\phi(\Psi)(x) = \begin{cases} \|(T^+(H))^x \varphi\|_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 & (x \geq 1) \\ \|\varphi\|_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 & (x = 0) \\ \|(T^-(H))^{|x|} \varphi\|_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 & (x \leq -1) \end{cases} \in \mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_H) \iff \varphi \in S_{unif}^{(1)},$$

where $S_{unif}^{(1)}$ is given by

$$S_{unif}^{(1)} = \left\{ \varphi = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |\varphi_1| = |\varphi_2|, \arg(\varphi_1) - \arg(\varphi_2) = \frac{\pi}{2} + 2n\pi \ (n \in \mathbb{Z}) \right\}.$$

(2) For $\theta = \frac{3\pi}{4}, \frac{7\pi}{4}$, we obtain

$$\phi(\Psi)(x) = \begin{cases} \|(T^+(H))^x \varphi\|_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 & (x \geq 1) \\ \|\varphi\|_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 & (x = 0) \\ \|(T^-(H))^{|x|} \varphi\|_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 & (x \leq -1) \end{cases} \in \mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_H) \iff \varphi \in S_{unif}^{(2)},$$

where $S_{unif}^{(2)}$ is given by

$$S_{unif}^{(2)} = \left\{ \varphi = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |\varphi_1| = |\varphi_2|, \arg(\varphi_1) - \arg(\varphi_2) = \frac{3\pi}{2} + 2n\pi \ (n \in \mathbb{Z}) \right\}.$$

4.2.2 Result of Type 2

In the previous subsection, we determined the points $\lambda \in S^1$ that the characteristic polynomial defined by Eq. (4.14) has the double roots. After that we showed that the stationary measures of Type 1 are measures with quadratic polynomial type. This subsection deals with the stationary measures of Type 2. We prepare the following lemma to prove Proposition 4.6 and Proposition 4.8.

LEMMA 4.5 Let $f(\lambda)$ and $g(\lambda)$ be the following functions on S^1 .

$$f(\lambda) = \lambda^2 - 1, \quad g(\lambda) = \sqrt{\lambda^4 + 1},$$

and we define $z(\lambda)$ as

$$z(\lambda) = \overline{f(\lambda)}g(\lambda).$$

(1) For $\theta \in K_2$, we have the followings.

(i) $\operatorname{Re}(z(\lambda)) = 0.$

(ii)
$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{Im}(z(\lambda)) = -2 \sin \theta \sqrt{2 \cos 2\theta} & (0 \leq \theta < \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4} < \theta \leq \pi), \\ \operatorname{Im}(z(\lambda)) = 2 \sin \theta \sqrt{2 \cos 2\theta} & (\pi \leq \theta < \frac{5\pi}{4}, \frac{7\pi}{4} < \theta < 2\pi). \end{cases}$$

(2) For $\theta \in K_3$, we have the followings.

(i)
$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{Re}(z(\lambda)) = 2 \sin \theta \sqrt{-2 \cos 2\theta} & (\frac{\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2} \leq \theta < \frac{7\pi}{4}), \\ \operatorname{Re}(z(\lambda)) = -2 \sin \theta \sqrt{-2 \cos 2\theta} & (\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \theta < \frac{3\pi}{4}, \frac{5\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{3\pi}{2}). \end{cases}$$

(ii) $\operatorname{Im}(z(\lambda)) = 0.$

Proof. We define the function $z(\lambda)$ on S^1 as

$$z(\lambda) = \overline{f(\lambda)}g(\lambda).$$

Let $t = \cos 2\theta$. It holds that

$$t = 0 \iff \theta \in K_1, \quad 0 < t \leq 1 \iff \theta \in K_2, \quad -1 \leq t < 0 \iff \theta \in K_3.$$

We set $g(\lambda) = re^{in}$ ($r \neq 0$). Then we get the following relation.

$$r^2 \cos 2\eta = 2 \cos^2 2\theta, \quad r^2 \sin 2\eta = 2 \sin 2\theta \cos 2\theta. \quad (4.18)$$

From the above Eq. (4.18), it holds

$$\eta = \theta + \frac{\pi}{2}n \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}).$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{cases} r = \sqrt{2 \cos 2\theta} & (\theta \in K_2), \\ r = \sqrt{-2 \cos 2\theta} & (\theta \in K_3). \end{cases}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} z(\lambda) &= r(e^{-2i\theta} - 1)e^{i\eta} \\ &= r\{\cos(2\theta - \eta) - \cos \eta\} + ir\{\sin(\eta - 2\theta) - \sin \eta\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re}(z(\lambda)) &= r\{\cos(2\theta - \eta) - \cos \eta\} \\ &= 2r \sin \theta \sin \frac{\pi}{2} n \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & (\theta \in K_2), \\ \begin{cases} 2 \sin \theta \sqrt{-2 \cos 2\theta} & (\frac{\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2} \leq \theta < \frac{7\pi}{4}), \\ -2 \sin \theta \sqrt{-2 \cos 2\theta} & (\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \theta < \frac{3\pi}{4}, \frac{5\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{3\pi}{2}). \end{cases} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im}(z(\lambda)) &= r\{\sin(\eta - 2\theta) - \sin \eta\} \\ &= -2r \sin \theta \cos \frac{\pi}{2} n \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & (\theta \in K_3), \\ \begin{cases} -2 \sin \theta \sqrt{2 \cos 2\theta} & (0 \leq \theta < \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4} < \theta \leq \pi), \\ 2 \sin \theta \sqrt{2 \cos 2\theta} & (\pi \leq \theta < \frac{5\pi}{4}, \frac{7\pi}{4} < \theta < 2\pi), \end{cases} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

which shows the statements (1) and (2). \square

PROPOSITION 4.6 *Let $\lambda \in S^1$ be an eigenvalue in Eq. (3.6) and we put $\lambda = e^{i\theta}$ ($\theta \in K$). Suppose that $\theta \in K_2$. Then we have the following two statements.*

- (1) $|\Lambda_+| = |\Lambda_-|$ ($\Lambda_+ \neq \Lambda_-$).
- (2) Suppose that $|\varphi_1|, |\varphi_2| < \infty$. The stationary measures $\phi(\Psi)$ induced by the function $\Psi \in \operatorname{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2)$ in Theorem 3.1 (ii) have the measures with bounded type. That is to say,

$$\phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}_{s,bda}(U_H).$$

Proof. At first, we show the statement (1). From Theorem 3.1, it holds that

$$\Lambda_{\pm} = \frac{f(\lambda) \pm g(\lambda)}{\sqrt{2}\lambda}.$$

From Lemma 4.5, we can compute $|\Lambda_+|^2$ and $|\Lambda_-|^2$ as

$$\begin{aligned} |\Lambda_+|^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ (\lambda^2 - 1) + \sqrt{\lambda^4 + 1} \right\} \left\{ (\bar{\lambda}^2 - 1) + \sqrt{\lambda^4 + 1} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ |f(\lambda)|^2 + |g(\lambda)|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re}(z(\lambda)) \right\} \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & (\theta \in K_2), \\ \begin{cases} 1 - 2 \cos 2\theta + 2 \sin \theta \sqrt{-2 \cos 2\theta} & (\frac{\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2} \leq \theta < \frac{7\pi}{4}), \\ 1 - 2 \cos 2\theta - 2 \sin \theta \sqrt{-2 \cos 2\theta} & (\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \theta < \frac{3\pi}{4}, \frac{5\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{3\pi}{2}). \end{cases} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Lambda_-|^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ (\lambda^2 - 1) - \sqrt{\lambda^4 + 1} \right\} \left\{ (\bar{\lambda}^2 - 1) - \sqrt{\lambda^4 + 1} \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ |f(\lambda)|^2 + |g(\lambda)|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re}(z(\lambda)) \right\} \\
&= \begin{cases} 1 & (\theta \in K_2), \\ \begin{cases} 1 - 2 \cos 2\theta - 2 \sin \theta \sqrt{-2 \cos 2\theta} & (\frac{\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2} \leq \theta < \frac{7\pi}{4}), \\ 1 - 2 \cos 2\theta + 2 \sin \theta \sqrt{-2 \cos 2\theta} & (\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \theta < \frac{3\pi}{4}, \frac{5\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{3\pi}{2}). \end{cases} \end{cases} \quad (4.20)
\end{aligned}$$

By using Eqs. (4.19) and (4.20), we obtain

$$|\Lambda_+| = |\Lambda_-| \quad (\theta \in K_2).$$

Since $g(\lambda) \neq 0$ for $\theta \in K_2$, we remark that $\Lambda_+ \neq \Lambda_-$. Thus, the statement (1) holds. Next, we show the statement (2). Let $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $x \geq 1$. We note the following.

$$|\Lambda_+| = |\Lambda_-| = 1 \quad (\theta \in K_2), \quad \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4 \cos 2\theta} & (\theta \in K_2), \\ \frac{1}{-4 \cos 2\theta} & (\theta \in K_3). \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, we obtain the following formula about $\Lambda_+ \cdot \bar{\Lambda_-}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_+ \cdot \bar{\Lambda_-} &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ (\lambda^2 - 1) + \sqrt{\lambda^4 + 1} \right\} \left\{ (\bar{\lambda}^2 - 1) - \sqrt{\lambda^4 + 1} \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ |f(\lambda)|^2 - |g(\lambda)|^2 + 2i \operatorname{Im}(z(\lambda)) \right\} \\
&= \begin{cases} 1 & (\theta \in K_3), \\ \begin{cases} 1 - 2 \cos 2\theta - i2\sqrt{2 \cos 2\theta} \sin \theta & (0 \leq \theta < \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4} < \theta \leq \pi), \\ 1 - 2 \cos 2\theta + i2\sqrt{2 \cos 2\theta} \sin \theta & (\pi \leq \theta < \frac{5\pi}{4}, \frac{7\pi}{4} < \theta < 2\pi). \end{cases} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

In case of $\theta \in K_2$, there exists $\xi_j \in (0, 2\pi)$ such that

$$\Lambda_+ \cdot \bar{\Lambda_-} = \begin{cases} e^{i\xi_1} & (0 \leq \theta < \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4} < \theta \leq \pi), \\ e^{i\xi_2} & (\pi \leq \theta < \frac{5\pi}{4}, \frac{7\pi}{4} < \theta < 2\pi). \end{cases}$$

Here, ξ_1 and ξ_2 are defined by

$$\cos \xi_1 = 1 - 2 \cos 2\theta, \quad \sin \xi_1 = -2\sqrt{2 \cos 2\theta} \sin \theta, \quad e^{i\xi_2} = e^{-i\xi_1}. \quad (4.21)$$

From now on, we consider $\theta \in K_2$. By using Theorem 3.1, it holds that

$$|\Psi^L(x)|^2 = \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ |h_1|^2 + |h_2|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re}((\Lambda_+ \cdot \bar{\Lambda_-})^x h_1 \bar{h}_2) \right\},$$

where h_1 and h_2 are given by

$$h_1 = \Psi^L(1) - \Lambda_- \varphi_1, \quad h_2 = \Psi^L(1) - \Lambda_+ \varphi_1. \quad (4.22)$$

Furthermore, $|\Psi^R(x)|^2$ is computed as

$$|\Psi^R(x)|^2 = \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ |h_3|^2 + |h_4|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re}((\Lambda_+ \cdot \bar{\Lambda_-})^x h_3 \bar{h}_4) \right\},$$

where h_3 and h_4 are given by

$$h_3 = \Psi^R(1) - \Lambda_- \varphi_2, \quad h_4 = \Psi^R(1) - \Lambda_+ \varphi_2. \quad (4.23)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(x) &= |\Psi^L(x)|^2 + |\Psi^R(x)|^2 \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^4 |h_i|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re} ((\Lambda_+ \cdot \overline{\Lambda_-})^x (h_1 \overline{h_2} + h_3 \overline{h_4})) \right\} \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ W_1(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) - 2 \operatorname{Re} ((\Lambda_+ \cdot \overline{\Lambda_-})^x W_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta)) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $W_1(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta)$ and $W_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta)$ are defined by

$$W_1(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^4 |h_i|^2, \quad W_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = h_1 \overline{h_2} + h_3 \overline{h_4}.$$

We put k_1 and k_2 as

$$k_1 = \Psi^L(-1) - \Gamma_- \varphi_1, \quad k_2 = \Psi^L(-1) - \Gamma_+ \varphi_1$$

and k_3 and k_4 are given by

$$k_3 = \Psi^R(-1) - \Gamma_- \varphi_2, \quad k_4 = \Psi^R(-1) - \Gamma_+ \varphi_2.$$

For $x \leq -1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(x) &= |\Psi^L(x)|^2 + |\Psi^R(x)|^2 \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^4 |k_i|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re} ((\Lambda_+ \cdot \overline{\Lambda_-})^x (k_1 \overline{k_2} + k_3 \overline{k_4})) \right\} \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ W_3(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) - 2 \operatorname{Re} ((\Lambda_+ \cdot \overline{\Lambda_-})^x W_4(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta)) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $W_3(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta)$ and $W_4(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta)$ are defined by

$$W_3(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^4 |k_i|^2, \quad W_4(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = k_1 \overline{k_2} + k_3 \overline{k_4}.$$

We set $W_j(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = r_j e^{i\eta_j} \in \mathbb{C}$, where $r_j \geq 0$ and $j = 2, 4$. By using the assumption $|\varphi_1|, |\varphi_2| < \infty$, we obtain

$$W_i(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) < \infty \quad (i = 1, 3), \quad 0 \leq r_j < \infty \quad (j = 2, 4).$$

Therefore, we have $\mu(x) < \infty$. Namely,

$$\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{s,bdd}(U_H).$$

□

Remark 3. For $\theta = 0$ and π , it holds

$$W_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = 0, \quad W_4(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = 0 \quad \left(\varphi = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^2 \right).$$

Remark 4. If $W_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) &= (h_1 - h_2)(\overline{h_1} - \overline{h_2}) + (h_3 - h_4)(\overline{h_3} - \overline{h_4}) \\ &= 4 \cos 2\theta (|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2) \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

If $W_4(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} W_3(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) &= (k_1 - k_2)(\overline{k_1} - \overline{k_2}) + (k_3 - k_4)(\overline{k_3} - \overline{k_4}) \\ &= 4 \cos 2\theta (|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2) \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

THEOREM 4.7 *Suppose that $\theta \in K_2$. Then it holds the following two statements.*

(1) *Assume that $W_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = 0$ and $W_4(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = 0$. Then we have*

$$\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{s,period}^{(1)}(U_H) = \mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_H).$$

(2) *Assume that $W_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) \neq 0$ and $W_4(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) \neq 0$. The necessary and sufficient condition for ξ_j ($j = 1, 2$) given in Eq. (4.21) to have the stationary measure μ with a periodicity is*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{2n\pi}{\xi_1} \in \mathbb{N} & \left(0 \leq \theta < \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4} < \theta \leq \pi \right), \\ \frac{2n\pi}{\xi_2} \in \mathbb{N} & \left(\pi \leq \theta < \frac{5\pi}{4}, \frac{7\pi}{4} < \theta < 2\pi \right). \end{cases}$$

Here $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. For $\mu \in \bigcup_{\lambda \in \widetilde{K}_2} \mathcal{M}_s^{(\lambda)}(U_H)$, it holds

$$\mu(x) = \begin{cases} \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left(W_1(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) - 2\Re \left((\Lambda_+ \cdot \overline{\Lambda_-})^x W_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) \right) \right) & x \geq 1, \\ |\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 & x = 0, \\ \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left(W_3(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) - 2\Re \left((\Lambda_+ \cdot \overline{\Lambda_-})^x W_4(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) \right) \right) & x \leq -1. \end{cases}$$

From the above equation and Remark 4, the statement (1) holds. Next, we show the statement (2). Suppose that $W_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) \neq 0$ and $W_4(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) \neq 0$. We put $W_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = re^{i\eta} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, where r is a positive real number. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(x+m) &= \mu(x) \\ \iff \operatorname{Re} \left((\Lambda_+ \cdot \overline{\Lambda_-})^{x+m} W_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) \right) &= \operatorname{Re} \left((\Lambda_+ \cdot \overline{\Lambda_-})^x W_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) \right) \\ \iff \operatorname{Re} \left(e^{i\xi_j(x+m)} \cdot e^{i\eta} \right) &= \operatorname{Re} \left(e^{i\xi_j x} \cdot e^{i\eta} \right) \\ \iff \cos(x\xi_j + \eta + m\xi_j) &= \cos(x\xi_j + \eta) \\ \iff x\xi_j + \eta + m\xi_j &= x\xi_j + \eta + 2n\pi \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}) \\ \iff m &= \frac{2n\pi}{\xi_j} \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}). \end{aligned}$$

In case of $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $x \leq -1$, we get the same results by the same argument. Hence, this completes the proof of Theorem 4.7. \square

Let m_{min} be the minimum value satisfied with $\mu(x+m) = \mu(x)$ ($x \in \mathbb{Z}$). We call this natural number m_{min} periodicity to the stationary measure μ .

Example 1. We consider the case of $\theta = 0$ ($\theta = \pi$). Note that $W_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = 0$ ($\theta = 0, \pi$). Then it holds $m_{min} = 1$. The stationary measure induced by $U_H \Psi = \Psi$ ($U_H \Psi = \pi \Psi$) is satisfied with

$$\phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}_{s,period}^{(1)}(U_H) = \mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_H).$$

Example 2. We consider the case of $\theta = \pi/6$. Then we obtain

$$\Lambda_+ = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}}, \quad \Lambda_- = e^{i\frac{3\pi}{4}}, \quad \Lambda_+ \cdot \overline{\Lambda_-} = e^{i\frac{3\pi}{2}}.$$

Thus ξ is $3\pi/2$. From Theorem 4.7, we have

$$m_{min} = \min_m \left\{ m \in \mathbb{N} : m = 2n\pi \times \frac{2}{3\pi} \ (n \in \mathbb{N}) \right\} = 4.$$

Therefore, the stationary measure induced by $U_H \Psi = \pi/6 \Psi$ for the Hadamard walk has a period 4. That is to say,

$$\phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}_{s,period}^{(4)}(U_H).$$

4.2.3 Result of Type 3

In the previous subsection, we determined the stationary measures of Type 2 given by the characteristic polynomial for $\theta \in K_2$. Moreover, we see that there exists $\theta \in K_2$ such that $\phi(\Psi)$ is a stationary measure with periodicity, where $U_H \Psi = e^{i\theta} \Psi$. This subsection deals with the stationary measures of Type 3.

PROPOSITION 4.8 *Let $\lambda \in S^1$ be an eigenvalue in Eq. (3.6) and we put $\lambda = e^{i\theta}$ ($\theta \in K$). Suppose that $\theta \in K_3$. Then we have the following two statements.*

(1) *For $\theta \in K_3$, we have*

$$\begin{cases} |\Lambda_+| > 1 > |\Lambda_-| > 0 & \left(\frac{\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{5\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{3\pi}{2} \right), \\ |\Lambda_-| > 1 > |\Lambda_+| > 0 & \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \theta < \frac{3\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{2} \leq \theta < \frac{7\pi}{4} \right). \end{cases}$$

(2) *The stationary measures $\phi(\Psi)$ induced by the function $\Psi \in \text{Map}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}^2)$ in Theorem 3.1 (ii) have the measures with exponential type. That is to say,*

$$\phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}_{s,exp}(U_H).$$

Proof. *From Eqs. (4.19) and (4.20), we obtain*

$$\begin{cases} |\Lambda_+| > 1 > |\Lambda_-| > 0 & \left(\frac{\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{5\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{3\pi}{2} \right), \\ |\Lambda_-| > 1 > |\Lambda_+| > 0 & \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \theta < \frac{3\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{2} \leq \theta < \frac{7\pi}{4} \right). \end{cases}$$

It holds the statement (1). Next, we show that thae statement (2). Since the proof of Proposition 4.8 (2) under the conditions $|\Lambda_-| > 1 > |\Lambda_+| > 0$ is the same as that of Proposition 4.8 (2) under the condition $|\Lambda_+| > 1 > |\Lambda_-| > 0$, we only give the proof of the latter. From Theorem 3.1, it holds that

$$|\Psi^L(x)|^2 = \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ (|\Lambda_+|^2)^x |h_1|^2 + (|\Lambda_-|^2)^x |h_2|^2 - 2 \text{Re}(h_1 \overline{h_2}) \right\},$$

where h_1 and h_2 are given by Eq. (4.22). Furthermore, $|\Psi^R(x)|^2$ is computed as

$$|\Psi^R(x)|^2 = \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ (|\Lambda_+|^2)^x |h_3|^2 + (|\Lambda_-|^2)^x |h_4|^2 - 2 \text{Re}(h_3 \overline{h_4}) \right\},$$

where h_3 and h_4 are given by Eq. (4.23). Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(x) &= |\Psi^L(x)|^2 + |\Psi^R(x)|^2 \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ (|\Lambda_+|^2)^x (|h_1|^2 + |h_3|^2) + (|\Lambda_-|^2)^x (|h_2|^2 + |h_4|^2) \right. \\ &\qquad \qquad \qquad \left. - 2 \operatorname{Re} (h_1 \bar{h}_2 + h_3 \bar{h}_4) \right\} \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ (|\Lambda_+|^2)^x W_5(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) + (|\Lambda_-|^2)^x W_6(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) \right. \\ &\qquad \qquad \qquad \left. - 2 \operatorname{Re} (h_1 \bar{h}_2 + h_3 \bar{h}_4) \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Here, $W_5(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta)$ and $W_6(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta)$ are defined by

$$W_5(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = |h_1|^2 + |h_3|^2, \quad W_6(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \theta) = |h_2|^2 + |h_4|^2.$$

Let $r_+(\theta) \equiv |\Lambda_+|^2$ and $r_-(\theta) \equiv |\Lambda_-|^2$. Remark that

$$r_+(\theta) > 1, \quad 0 < r_-(\theta) < 1.$$

We put $\Lambda_+ = r_1 e^{i\theta_1}$ and $\Lambda_- = r_2 e^{i\theta_2}$. Since $\Lambda_+ \cdot \bar{\Lambda}_- = 1$, we get

$$r_2 = \frac{1}{r_1}, \quad \theta_1 = \theta_2 + 2n\pi \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}).$$

Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(x) &= \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ (r_+(\theta))^x (|h_1|^2 + |h_3|^2) + r_-(\theta)^x (|h_2|^2 + |h_4|^2) \right. \\ &\qquad \qquad \qquad \left. - 2 \operatorname{Re} (h_1 \bar{h}_2 + h_3 \bar{h}_4) \right\} \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ (r_+(\theta))^x (|h_1|^2 + |h_3|^2) + \left(\frac{1}{r_+(\theta)} \right)^x (|h_2|^2 + |h_4|^2) \right. \\ &\qquad \qquad \qquad \left. - 2 \operatorname{Re} (h_1 \bar{h}_2 + h_3 \bar{h}_4) \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we denote

$$\Gamma_+ = -\Lambda_+, \quad \Gamma_- = -\Lambda_-.$$

For $x \leq -1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(x) &= \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ (r_+(\theta))^{-x} (|k_1|^2 + |k_3|^2) + r_-(\theta)^{-x} (|k_2|^2 + |k_4|^2) \right. \\ &\qquad \qquad \qquad \left. - 2 \operatorname{Re} (k_1 \bar{k}_2 + k_3 \bar{k}_4) \right\} \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-} \right|^2 \left\{ (r_+(\theta))^{-x} (|k_1|^2 + |k_3|^2) + \left(\frac{1}{r_+(\theta)} \right)^{-x} (|k_2|^2 + |k_4|^2) \right. \\ &\qquad \qquad \qquad \left. - 2 \operatorname{Re} (k_1 \bar{k}_2 + k_3 \bar{k}_4) \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Here k_1 and k_2 are given by

$$k_1 = \Psi^L(-1) - \Gamma_- \varphi_1, \quad k_2 = \Psi^L(-1) - \Gamma_+ \varphi_1$$

and k_3 and k_4 are given by

$$k_3 = \Psi^R(-1) - \Gamma_- \varphi_2, \quad k_4 = \Psi^R(-1) - \Gamma_+ \varphi_2.$$

Since $\sum_{j=1}^2 |\ell_j|^2 \neq 0$ and $\sum_{j=3}^4 |\ell_j|^2 \neq 0$ ($\ell = h, k$), we have

$$\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{s,exp}(U_H).$$

□

4.3 Proof of Theorem 4.1

We put $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \equiv \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{s,qp}(U_H)} \cup \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{s,bdd}(U_H)} \cup \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{s,exp}(U_H)}.$$

At first, we show that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_s(U_H)}$. This statement is trivial by the definition. Let us show that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}_s(U_H)} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. For any $\mu \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_s(U_H)}$, there exists $\lambda \in S^1$ such that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s^{(\lambda)}(U_H)$. We put $\lambda = e^{i\theta}$, where $\theta \in K = K_1 \cup K_2 \cup K_3$. By using Proposition 4.3, 4.6, and 4.8, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \theta \in K_1 \implies \mu \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{s,qp}(U_H)} \text{ or } \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{unif}(U_H) \\ \theta \in K_2 \implies \mu \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{s,bdd}(U_H)} \\ \theta \in K_3 \implies \mu \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}_{s,exp}(U_H)} \end{cases}.$$

From this, the theorem follows. □

Remark 5. We consider the spectrum $\sigma(U_H)$ of the time evolution operator U_H for the Hadamard walk on \mathbb{Z} . Grimmett et al. [4] have derived a weak limit theorem for the quantum walk on \mathbb{Z} based on the Fourier transform. This method (the GJS method) is useful to obtain the spectrum $\sigma(U_H)$. Now, we briefly see the GJS method and refer the interested readers to [4]. Let $f : [-\pi, \pi) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ and $k \in [-\pi, \pi)$. The Fourier transform of the function f is defined by the integral

$$(\mathcal{F}f)(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{ikx} f(k) dk \quad (x \in \mathbb{Z}).$$

Then the inverse of the Fourier transform \mathcal{F}^* is given by

$$\hat{g}(k) \equiv (\mathcal{F}^*g)(k) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ikx} g(x) \quad (g : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2, k \in [-\pi, \pi)).$$

From the inverse of the Fourier transform and Eq. (2.4), we have

$$\hat{\Psi}_{n+1}(k) = \hat{U}_C(k) \hat{\Psi}_n(k),$$

where $\Psi_n : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ and matrix $\hat{U}_C(k)$ is determined by

$$\hat{U}_C(k) = e^{ik} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} C + e^{-ik} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} C.$$

We remark that matrix $\hat{U}_C(k)$ is a unitary matrix. If we take the Hadamard coin, we have

$$\hat{U}_H(k) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{ik} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{ik} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-ik} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-ik} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, the eigenvalues of $\hat{U}_H(k)$ are given by

$$\lambda_1(k) = \frac{\sqrt{1 + \cos^2 k} + i \sin k}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \lambda_2(k) = \frac{-\sqrt{1 + \cos^2 k} + i \sin k}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

From the above argument, we get

$$\sigma(U_H) = \{e^{i\xi} : \xi \in K_1 \cup K_2\} = \widetilde{K}_1 \cup \widetilde{K}_2.$$

Here the definitions of K_1 and K_2 are given in Sec. 4.2. In terms of the spectral analysis, Morioka [13] showed that the generalized eigenfunctions are not square summable but belong to ℓ^∞ -space on \mathbb{Z} . Namely, the eigenfunction Ψ satisfied with $U_H \Psi = \lambda \Psi$ belongs to ℓ^∞ -space, where $\lambda \in \sigma(U_H) \setminus \widetilde{K}_1$.

5 Summary

The present paper dealt with stationary measures of the Hadamard walk on \mathbb{Z} . By solving the eigenvalue problem via the transfer matrices $T^+(H)$ and $T^-(H)$, all the stationary measures $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_s(U_H)$ were divided into three classes, i.e., quadratic polynomial type $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,qp}(U_H)$, bounded type $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,bdd}(U_H)$, and exponential type $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,exp}(U_H)$. In other words, we obtained

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_s(U_H) = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,qp}(U_H) \cup \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,bdd}(U_H) \cup \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{s,exp}(U_H).$$

In particular, we presented an explicit necessary and sufficient condition for the bounded-type stationary measure to be periodic. Furthermore, we confirmed that any stationary measure in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_s(U_H)$ is not probability measure. This result is striking different from the corresponding one for three-state Grover walk on \mathbb{Z} . In fact, the set of stationary measures for this walk contains ℓ^2 -function and functions with finite support. It would be interesting future problems to prove that

$$\mathcal{M}_s(U_H) = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_s(U_H).$$

References

- [1] Y. Aharonov, L. Davidovich and N. Zagury, *Quantum random walks*, Phys. Rev. A **48**, pp.1687-1690 (1993).
- [2] A. Ahlbrecht, V. B. Scholz and A. H. Werner, Disordered quantum walks in one lattice dimension, J. Math. Phys., **52**, 102201 (2011).
- [3] O. Bourget, J. S. Howland and A. Joye, Spectral analysis of unitary band matrices, Comm. Math. Phys., **234**, 191-227 (2003).
- [4] G. Grimmett, S. Janson and P. F. Scudo, *Weak limits for quantum random walks*, Phys. Rev. E **69**, 026119 (2004).
- [5] H. Kawai, T. Komatsu and N. Konno, Stationary measures of three-state quantum walks on the one-dimensional lattice, Yokohama Math. J. **63**, 59-74 (2017).
- [6] H. Kawai, T. Komatsu and N. Konno, Stationary measure for two-state space-inhomogeneous quantum walk in one dimension, Yokohama Math. J. (in press).

- [7] T. Komatsu and N. Konno, Stationary amplitudes of quantum walks on the higher-dimensional integer lattice, *Quantum Inf. Process.*, **16**, 291 (2017).
- [8] N. Konno, *A new type of limit theorems for the one-dimensional quantum random walk*, *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **57**, pp.1179-1195 (2005).
- [9] N. Konno, *The uniform measure for discrete-time quantum walks in one dimension*. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **13**, pp.1103-1125 (2014).
- [10] N. Konno, T. Luczak and E. Segawa, *Limit measures of inhomogeneous discrete-time quantum walks in one dimension*, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **12**, pp.33-53 (2013).
- [11] N. Konno and M. Takei, *The non-uniform stationary measure for discrete-time quantum walks in one dimension*, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **15**, pp.1060-1075 (2015).
- [12] K. Manouchehri and J. Wang, *Physical Implementation of Quantum Walks*, Springer (2013).
- [13] H. Morioka, *Generalized eigenfunctions and scattering matrices for position-dependent quantum walks*, *Rev. Math. Phys.*, (2019).
- [14] R. Portugal, *Quantum Walks and Search Algorithms*, Springer (2013).