

An asymmetric multiparameter CCR flow

S. Sundar

January 25, 2022

Abstract

In this note, we exhibit an example of a multiparameter CCR flow which is not cocycle conjugate to its opposite. This is in sharp contrast to the one parameter situation.

AMS Classification No. : Primary 46L55; Secondary 46L99.

Keywords : Decomposable product systems, opposite of a CCR flow.

1 Opposite of an E_0 -semigroup

Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a closed convex cone. We assume that $d \geq 2$, P spans $\mathbb{R}^d$ and P contains no line, i.e. $P \cap -P = \{0\}$. We denote the interior of P by Ω . For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we write $x \leq y$ ($x < y$) if $y - x \in P$ ($y - x \in \Omega$). Let $\alpha := \{\alpha_x\}_{x \in P}$ be an E_0 -semigroup over P on $B(\mathcal{H})$ where $\mathcal{H}$ is an infinite dimensional separable Hilbert space. For $x \in P$, let

$$E(x) := \{T \in B(\mathcal{H}) : \alpha_x(A)T = TA \text{ for all } A \in B(\mathcal{H})\}.$$

For $x \in P$, $E(x)$ is a separable Hilbert space where the inner product is given by $\langle T|S \rangle = S^*T$. The disjoint union of Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{E} := \coprod_{x \in \Omega} E(x)$ has a structure of a product system and is called the product system associated with α . It is indeed a cocycle conjugacy invariant. For more on product systems and E_0 -semigroups in the multiparameter context, we refer the reader to [5].

Keep the foregoing notation. Let

$$\mathcal{E}^{op} := \{(x, T) \in \Omega \times B(\mathcal{H}) : x \in \Omega, T \in E(x)\}.$$

Define a semigroup multiplication on $\mathcal{E}^{op}$ by the following formula:

$$(x, T).(y, S) = (x + y, ST) \tag{1.1}$$

for $(x, T), (y, S) \in \mathcal{E}^{op}$. Then $\mathcal{E}^{op}$ is an abstract product system over Ω (in the sense of Definition 2.1 of [5]). Arveson's bijection between product systems and E_0 -semigroups, established in [5] for the case of a cone, ensures that there exists an E_0 -semigroup denoted $\alpha^{op} := \{\alpha_x^{op}\}_{x \in P}$, which is unique up to cocycle conjugacy, such that the product system associated to α^{op} is isomorphic to $\mathcal{E}^{op}$. The E_0 -semigroup α^{op} is called the opposite of α .

A natural question that arises in this context is the following. Are the E_0 -semigroups α and α^{op} cocycle conjugate? If α is cocycle conjugate to α^{op} , we call α symmetric otherwise we call α asymmetric. In the one parameter context, we have the following.

- (1) One parameter CCR flows are symmetric. This follows from Arveson's classification of type I E_0 -semigroups and the index computation.
- (2) Tsirelson in his remarkable papers [8] and [9] constructed examples of type II_0 E_0 -semigroups which are asymmetric by probabilistic means.

It is natural to ask whether (1) stays true in the multiparameter context. More precisely, suppose $d \geq 2$ and V is a pure isometric representation of P on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Let α^V be the CCR flow associated to V acting on $B(\Gamma(\mathcal{H}))$ where $\Gamma(\mathcal{H})$ is the symmetric Fock space of $\mathcal{H}$. Is α^V symmetric? We show that for the left regular representation of P on $L^2(P)$, the associated CCR flow is asymmetric.

2 Decomposable product systems

Following Arveson, the author in [7] has defined the notion of a decomposable product system. Let us review the definitions. Let $\alpha := \{\alpha_x\}_{x \in P}$ be an E_0 -semigroup on $B(\mathcal{H})$ and let $E := \{E(x)\}_{x \in P}$ be the associated product system. Suppose $x \in P$ and $u \in E(x)$ is a non-zero vector. We say that u is decomposable if given $y \leq x$ with $y \in P$, there exists $v \in E(y)$ and $w \in E(x - y)$ such that $u = vw$. The set of decomposable vectors is denoted by $D(x)$. We say that α is decomposable if

- (1) for $x, y \in P$, $D(x)D(y) = D(x + y)$, and
- (2) for $x \in P$, $D(x)$ is total in $E(x)$.

Proposition 2.1 *The opposite of a decomposable E_0 -semigroup is decomposable.*

Remark 2.2 *The subtle point that we wish to stress is that apriori the product rule in the opposite product system given by Eq. 1.1 holds only over Ω . However to prove Prop. 2.1, we need the validity of the product rule over the whole semigroup P which is assured by the next lemma.*

Let us fix a few notation. Let $\alpha := \{\alpha_x\}_{x \in P}$ be a decomposable E_0 -semigroup acting on $B(\mathcal{H})$. The product system of α is denoted by $E := \{E(x)\}_{x \in P}$. We denote the opposite of α by $\beta := \{\beta_x\}_{x \in P}$. Suppose that β acts on $B(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})$. Denote the product system of β by $F := \{F(x)\}_{x \in P}$.

Lemma 2.3 *For every $x \in P$, there exists a unitary $\tilde{\theta}_x : E(x) \rightarrow F(x)$ such that for $x, y \in P$, $T \in E(x)$ and $S \in E(y)$,*

$$\tilde{\theta}_{x+y}(ST) = \tilde{\theta}_x(T)\tilde{\theta}_y(S).$$

Proof. From the definition of β , it follows that for $x \in \Omega$, there exists a unitary operator $\theta_x : E(x) \rightarrow F(x)$ such that for $x, y \in \Omega$, $T \in E(x)$ and $S \in E(y)$,

$$\theta_{x+y}(ST) = \theta_x(T)\theta_y(S).$$

Fix an element $a \in \Omega$. Let $x \in P$ and $T \in E(x)$ be given. We claim that there exists a unique bounded linear operator on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, which we denote by $\tilde{\theta}_x(T)$, such that for $S \in E(a)$ and $\xi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$,

$$\tilde{\theta}_x(T)\theta_a(S)\xi = \theta_{a+x}(ST)\xi.$$

For any $b \in \Omega$, the map $E(b) \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \ni S \otimes \xi \rightarrow \theta_b(S)\xi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is a unitary operator. This way, we can identify $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ with $E(b) \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ for every $b \in \Omega$. Right multiplication by T induces a bounded linear operator from $E(a) \rightarrow E(a+x)$ of norm $\|T\|$. Tensor with identity to obtain the desired operator $\tilde{\theta}_x(T)$ from $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} \equiv E(a) \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow E(a+x) \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \equiv \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. This proves our claim.

As the set $\{\theta_a(S)\xi : S \in E(a), \xi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}\}$ is total in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\{\theta_x\}_{x \in \Omega}$ is anti multiplicative, it follows that $\tilde{\theta}_x = \theta_x$ if $x \in \Omega$. Let $x \in P$, $y \in \Omega$, $T \in E(x)$ and $S \in E(y)$ be given. For $R \in E(a)$ and $\xi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, calculate as follows to observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\theta}_{x+y}(TS)\theta_a(R)\xi &= \theta_{(a+x)+y}(RTS)\xi \\ &= \theta_y(S)\theta_{a+x}(RT)\xi \\ &= \theta_y(S)\tilde{\theta}_x(T)\theta_a(R)\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Hence it follows that

$$\tilde{\theta}_{x+y}(TS) = \theta_y(S)\tilde{\theta}_x(T) \tag{2.2}$$

for $x \in P$, $y \in \Omega$, $T \in E(x)$ and $S \in E(y)$.

Let $x, y \in P$, $T \in E(x)$ and $S \in E(y)$ be given. Let $R \in E(a)$ be of unit norm. Calculate as follows to observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_a(R)\tilde{\theta}_{x+y}(TS) &= \theta_{x+y+a}(TSR) \quad (\text{by Eq. 2.2}) \\
&= \theta_{x+(y+a)}(T(SR)) \\
&= \theta_{y+a}(SR)\tilde{\theta}_x(T) \quad (\text{by Eq. 2.2}) \\
&= \theta_a(R)\tilde{\theta}_y(S)\tilde{\theta}_x(T) \quad (\text{by Eq. 2.2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Premultiplying the above equation by $\theta_a(R)^*$, we get

$$\tilde{\theta}_{x+y}(TS) = \tilde{\theta}_y(S)\tilde{\theta}_x(T) \quad (2.3)$$

for $x, y \in P$, $T \in E(x)$ and $S \in E(y)$.

Note that for $x \in P$, the map $E(x) \ni T \rightarrow \tilde{\theta}_x(T) \in B(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})$ is linear and norm preserving. A direct calculation reveals that for $x \in P$, $T_1, T_2 \in E(x)$,

$$\tilde{\theta}_x(T_2)^*\tilde{\theta}_x(T_1) = \langle T_1 | T_2 \rangle_{E(x)}. \quad (2.4)$$

For $x \in P$, let $\tilde{F}(x) := \{\tilde{\theta}_x(T) : T \in E(x)\}$. Fix $x \in P$. It follows from Eq. 2.4 that there exists a unique normal $*$ -endomorphism denoted $\tilde{\beta}_x$ on $B(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})$ such that the intertwining space of $\tilde{\beta}_x$ is $\tilde{F}(x)$. Eq. 2.3 implies that the family $\tilde{\beta} := \{\tilde{\beta}_x\}_{x \in P}$ forms a semigroup of endomorphisms.

Note that $\tilde{F}(x) = F(x)$ for every $x \in \Omega$. Hence $\tilde{\beta}_x = \beta_x$ for $x \in \Omega$. The semigroup $\tilde{\beta}$ agrees with an E_0 -semigroup β on the interior Ω . Thanks to Lemma 4.1 of [6], it follows that $\tilde{\beta}$ is an E_0 -semigroup. Since Ω is dense in P , it follows that $\tilde{\beta}_x = \beta_x$ for every $x \in P$. Consequently, we have $\tilde{F}(x) = F(x)$ for every $x \in P$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 2.1: Let $\{\tilde{\theta}_x\}_{x \in P}$ be a family of unitary operators as in Lemma 2.3. For $x \in P$, denote the set of decomposable vectors in $E(x)$ by $D(x)$. A moment's reflection on the definition shows that the decomposable vectors of $F(x)$ is $\{\tilde{\theta}_x(T) : T \in D(x)\}$. The conclusion is now immediate. $\square$

3 A counterexample

In this section, we produce the promised counterexample, i.e. a CCR flow which is asymmetric. Let us recall the definition of a CCR flow associated to a pure isometric representation. Suppose $V : P \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ is a pure isometric representation. Recall that V is said to be pure if $\bigcap_{x \in P} V_x \mathcal{H} = \{0\}$. Denote the symmetric Fock space of $\mathcal{H}$ by $\Gamma(\mathcal{H})$.

The CCR flow associated to V , denoted $\alpha^V := \{\alpha_x\}_{x \in P}$, is the unique E_0 -semigroup on $B(\Gamma(\mathcal{H}))$ such that the following equation is satisfied. For $x \in P$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\alpha_x(W(\xi)) = W(V_x \xi)$$

where $\{W(\xi) : \xi \in \mathcal{H}\}$ is the set of Weyl operators on $\Gamma(\mathcal{H})$. For more details regarding multiparameter CCR flows, we refer the reader to [1] and [2].

Remark 3.1 *A few remarks are in order.*

- (1) *In [7], a strongly continuous isometric representation, indexed by Ω , is constructed out of a decomposable E_0 -semigroup (see Proposition 4.1 of [7]). Moreover the resulting isometric representation, up to unitary equivalence, is a cocycle conjugacy invariant.*
- (2) *It is shown in [7] that the CCR flow α^V is decomposable. Moreover the isometric representation constructed out of the decomposable E_0 -semigroup α^V is V itself (see Proposition 5.1 of [7]).*

Fix a pure isometric representation V of P on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Denote the CCR flow α^V by α and its opposite by α^{op} . Denote the isometric representation constructed out of α^{op} by V^{op} . If we unwrap all the details regarding the construction of V^{op} , which is routine, we see that V^{op} has the following explicit description. Denote the Hilbert space on which V^{op} acts by $\mathcal{H}^{op}$.

Define an equivalence relation on $\{(\xi, a) : \xi \in \text{Ker}(V_a^*), a \in \Omega\}$ as follows. We say $(\xi, a) \sim (\eta, b)$ if and only if $V_b \xi = V_a \eta$. Let H^{op} be the set of equivalence classes. Then H^{op} has an inner product space structure where the addition, scalar multiplication and inner product are given by

$$\begin{aligned} [(\xi, a)] + [(\eta, b)] &= [(V_b \xi + V_a \eta, a + b)] \\ \lambda [(\xi, a)] &= [(\lambda \xi, a)] \\ \langle [(\xi, a)], [(\eta, b)] \rangle &= \langle V_b \xi | V_a \eta \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathcal{H}^{op}$ is the completion of H^{op} and for $a \in \Omega$, the operator V_a^{op} is given by the equation

$$V_a^{op}[(\xi, b)] = [(\xi, a + b)].$$

To produce a counter example of a CCR flow which is asymmetric, it suffices to construct a pure isometric representation V such that V and V^{op} are not unitarily equivalent. For if $\alpha := \alpha^V$ and α^{op} are cocycle conjugate then by Remark 3.1, it follows that V and V^{op} are unitarily equivalent.

First we obtain a better description of V^{op} . Let U be the minimal unitary dilation of V . More precisely, there exists a Hilbert space $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ containing $\mathcal{H}$ as a closed subspace and a strongly continuous unitary representation $U := \{U_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ such that the following conditions are satisfied.

- (1) For $a \in \Omega$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$, $U_a \xi = V_a \xi$, and
- (2) the increasing union $\bigcup_{a \in \Omega} U_a^* \mathcal{H}$ is dense in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$.

The minimal unitary dilation is unique up to unitary equivalence and the existence of such a dilation is given by an inductive limit procedure.

Set $\mathcal{K} := \mathcal{H}^\perp$. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is invariant under $\{U_a\}_{a \in \Omega}$, it follows that $\mathcal{K}$ is invariant under $\{U_{-a} : a \in \Omega\} = \{U_a^* : a \in \Omega\}$. For $a \in \Omega$, let W_a be the operator on $\mathcal{K}$ which is the restriction of U_{-a} . Then $W := \{W_a\}_{a \in \Omega}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup of isometries on $\mathcal{K}$.

Proposition 3.2 *With the foregoing notation, we have the following.*

- (1) *The isometric representation W is pure, i.e. $\bigcap_{a \in \Omega} W_a \mathcal{K} = \{0\}$.*
- (2) *The isometric representations W and V^{op} are unitarily equivalent.*

Proof. Fix a point $a \in \Omega$. Set $S := V_a$. Recall the following Archimedean property. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a positive integer n such that $na > x$ (see Lemma 3.1 of [5]). Thus $\{0\} = \bigcap_{b \in \Omega} V_b \mathcal{H} = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} V_{na} \mathcal{H} = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} S^n \mathcal{H}$. In other words, S is a pure isometry.

By the Archimedean principle, we have the equality $\bigcup_{b \in \Omega} U_b^* \mathcal{H} = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} U_a^{*n} \mathcal{H}$. Hence $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} U_a^{*n} \mathcal{H}$ is dense in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. In other words, the discrete one parameter group of unitaries $\{U_{na} : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is the minimal unitary dilation of the discrete one parameter isometric representation $\{S^n\}_{n \geq 0}$.

Using Wold decomposition, we can identify $\mathcal{H}$ with $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}) \otimes K$ for some Hilbert space K and S with the standard one sided shift with multiplicity. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ can be identified with $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes K$ with U_a identified with the bilateral shift with multiplicity. Once this identification is made, it is clear that $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} W_{na} \mathcal{K} = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} U_a^{*n} \mathcal{K} = \{0\}$. Once again by the Archimedean principle, we have the equality $\bigcap_{b \in \Omega} W_b \mathcal{K} = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} W_{na} \mathcal{K} = \{0\}$. This proves (1).

Let $a \in \Omega$. We claim that the image of the map

$$Ker(W_a^*) \ni \xi \rightarrow U_a \xi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$$

is contained in $Ker(V_a^*)$. Let $\xi \in Ker(W_a^*)$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{K}$ be given. Observe that

$$\langle U_a \xi | \eta \rangle = \langle \xi | U_a^* \eta \rangle = \langle \xi | W_a \eta \rangle = \langle W_a^* \xi | \eta \rangle = 0.$$

This proves that for $\xi \in Ker(W_a^*)$, $U_a \xi \in \mathcal{H}$. Let $\xi \in Ker(W_a^*)$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$ be given. Using the fact that $\xi \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$, observe that

$$\langle U_a \xi | V_a \eta \rangle = \langle U_a \xi | U_a \eta \rangle = \langle \xi | \eta \rangle = 0.$$

Thus $U_a \xi$ is orthogonal to $Ran(V_a)$. Coupled with the fact that $U_a \xi \in \mathcal{H}$, we conclude that $U_a \xi \in Ker(V_a^*)$. This proves our claim. A calculation similar to the one above implies that the image of the map $Ker(V_a^*) \ni \eta \rightarrow U_{-a} \eta \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is contained in $Ker(W_a^*)$. Consequently the map $Ker(W_a^*) \ni \xi \rightarrow U_a \xi \in Ker(V_a^*)$ is a unitary.

By (1), we have $\mathcal{K} = \overline{\bigcup_{a \in \Omega} Ker(W_a^*)}$. Note that the family of inner product preserving maps

$$\left\{ Ker(W_a^*) \ni \xi \rightarrow [(U_a \xi, a)] \in \mathcal{H}^{op} \right\}_{a \in \Omega}$$

patch together and defines a unitary map from $\mathcal{K} = \overline{\bigcup_{a \in \Omega} Ker(W_a^*)}$ to $\mathcal{H}^{op}$, which we denote by T , such that the following holds. If $\xi \in Ker(W_a^*)$ for some $a \in \Omega$ then

$$T\xi = [(U_a \xi, a)].$$

It is clear that T intertwines the isometric representations W and V^{op} . This proves (2). The proof is now complete. $\square$

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be such that A is non-empty, proper, closed and $A + P \subset A$. Such subsets were called P -modules in [2]. Consider the Hilbert space $L^2(A)$. For $x \in P$, let V_x be the isometry on $L^2(A)$ defined by the equation

$$V_x(f)(y) := \begin{cases} f(y - x) & \text{if } y - x \in A, \\ 0 & \text{if } y - x \notin A. \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

Then $(V_x)_{x \in P}$ is an isometric representation of P which we denote by V^A . We call V^A the isometric representation associated to the P -module A . Moreover the representation V^A is pure. In what follows, $Int(A)$ denotes the interior of A .

Lemma 3.3 *Let A be a P -module. We have the following.*

- (1) *The increasing union $\bigcup_{a \in \Omega} (\text{Int}(A) - a) = \mathbb{R}^d$.*
- (2) *Given a compact subset $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists $a \in \Omega$ such that K is contained in $\text{Int}(A) - a$.*
- (3) *The minimal unitary dilation of V^A is the left regular representation of $\mathbb{R}^d$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Proof. Since A is a P -module, it is clear that if $a < b$ with $a, b \in \Omega$ then $\text{Int}(A) - a$ is contained in $\text{Int}(A) - b$. By translating, if necessary, we can assume $0 \in A$. Hence $P \subset A$ and $\Omega \subset \text{Int}(A)$. Observe the equality $\mathbb{R}^d = \Omega - \Omega = \bigcup_{a \in \Omega} (\Omega - a) \subset \bigcup_{a \in \Omega} (\text{Int}(A) - a)$.

This proves (1).

Fix an interior point $a \in \Omega$. By (1) and by the Archimedean property, it follows that $(\text{Int}(A) - na)_{n \geq 1}$ is an increasing sequence of open sets which increases to $\mathbb{R}^d$. Now (2) is immediate.

Let $\{U_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ be the left regular representation of $\mathbb{R}^d$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. From the definition it follows that for $a \in \Omega$, V_a is the compression of U_a onto $L^2(A)$. Observe that for $a \in \Omega$, $U_a^* L^2(A) = L^2(A - a)$. It follows from (2) that $\bigcup_{a \in \Omega} U_a^* L^2(A)$ contains the space of continuous functions with compact support. Consequently $\bigcup_{a \in \Omega} U_a^* L^2(A)$ is dense in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Hence $\{U_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ has all the properties required to be the minimal unitary dilation of V^A . This completes the proof. $\square$

Note that if A is a P -module then $-(\text{Int} A)^c$ is a P -module. Fix a P -module A and let $V := V^A$ be the isometric representation associated to A . Set $B := -(\text{Int}(A))^c$.

Proposition 3.4 *Keep the foregoing notation.*

- (1) *The isometric representation V^{op} is unitarily equivalent to the representation V^B .*
- (2) *The representations V and V^{op} are unitarily equivalent if and only if there exists $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $A = B + z$.*

Proof. Thanks to Lemma II.12 of [4], A and $\text{Int}(A)$ differ by a set of measure zero. Thus we can identify $L^2(A)$ with $L^2(\text{Int}(A))$. Lemma 3.3 and Proposition 3.2 implies that V^{op} is equivalent to the isometric representation $W = \{W_a\}_{a \in \Omega}$ acting on the Hilbert

space $L^2((Int(A))^c)$ where the operators $\{W_a\}_{a \in \Omega}$ are given by the following equation. For $a \in \Omega$ and $f \in L^2((Int(A))^c)$

$$W_a(f)(y) := \begin{cases} f(y+a) & \text{if } y+a \in (Int(A))^c, \\ 0 & \text{if } y+a \notin (Int(A))^c. \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

The inversion $\mathbb{R}^d \ni x \rightarrow -x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ induces a unitary between the Hilbert spaces $L^2((Int(A))^c)$ and $L^2(B)$ and intertwines the representations W and V^B . This proves (1).

It is clear that if A is a translate of B then $V = V^A$ and $V^{op} = V^B$ are unitarily equivalent. On the other hand, suppose V^A and V^B are unitarily equivalent. Then the associated CCR flows α^{V^A} and α^{V^B} are cocycle conjugate. By Theorem 1.2 of [2], it follows that A and B are translates of each other.¹ This completes the proof. $\square$

Thus to produce a counterexample of a CCR flow which is not cocycle conjugate to its opposite, it suffices to produce a P -module A such that A is not a translate of $-(Int(A))^c$. The cone P itself is one such candidate. Recall that we have assumed $d \geq 2$. Let us recall the notion of extreme points. For a subset C of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and a point $x \in C$, we say x is an extreme point of C if $x = \frac{y+z}{2}$ with $y, z \in C$ then $y = z = x$.

Lemma 3.5 *The sets P and $-\Omega^c$ are not translates of each other.*

Proof. First we claim that $P \cup -P \neq \mathbb{R}^d$. Suppose not. Since we have assumed that $P \cap -P = \{0\}$, it follows that the only boundary point of P is $\{0\}$. Fix $a \in \Omega$. Proposition 2.3 of [2] implies that the map

$$\partial(P) \times (0, \infty) \ni (x, s) \rightarrow x + sa \in \Omega$$

is a homeomorphism. But $\partial(P) = \{0\}$ and hence $\Omega = \{sa : s > 0\}$. Since Ω spans $\mathbb{R}^d$, it follows that $d = 1$ contradicting our assumption. Therefore $P \cup -P \neq \mathbb{R}^d$.

Note that the set of extreme points of P is $\{0\}$. For we have assumed that P contains no line. On the other hand, we claim that Ω^c has no extreme point. Note that $t\Omega^c \subset \Omega^c$ for $t > 0$. Hence the set of extreme points of Ω^c is contained in $\{0\}$. But 0 is not an extreme point of Ω^c . To see this, pick $x \notin P \cup -P$. Then $x \in \Omega^c$, $-x \in \Omega^c$ and $x \neq 0$. But $0 = \frac{x+(-x)}{2}$. This proves that the set of extreme points of Ω^c is empty. Consequently, the set of extreme points of any translate of $-\Omega^c$ is empty. Hence P and $-\Omega^c$ are not translates of each other. This completes the proof. $\square$.

¹See also Page 26 of [7].

Remark 3.6 Let V be a pure isometric representation of P and $\alpha = \alpha^V$ be the associated CCR flow. Let V^{op} be the isometric representation corresponding to the decomposable E_0 -semigroup α^{op} . Since α is spatial, it follows that α^{op} is spatial. (Recall that an E_0 -semigroup is said to be spatial if its product system admits a nowhere vanishing multiplicative measurable cross section). By Theorem 4.4 of [7], it follows that α^{op} and $\alpha^{V^{op}}$ are cocycle conjugate. Thus, to summarise, an opposite of a CCR flow is a CCR flow but not necessarily the same as the original one.

References

- [1] Arjunan Anbu, R. Srinivasan, and S. Sundar, *E-semigroups over closed convex cones*, arxiv/math.OA:1807.11375.
- [2] Arjunan Anbu and S. Sundar, *CCR flows associated to closed convex cones*, to appear in Muenster Journal of Mathematics, arxiv/math.OA:1901.00265.
- [3] William Arveson, *Noncommutative dynamics and E-semigroups*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [4] Joachim Hilgert and Karl-Hermann Neeb, *Wiener-Hopf operators on ordered homogeneous spaces. I*, J. Funct. Anal. **132** (1995), no. 1, 86–118.
- [5] S. P. Murugan and S. Sundar, *On the existence of E_0 -semigroups—the multiparameter case*, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. **21** (2018), no. 2, 1850007, 20.
- [6] S.P. Murugan and S. Sundar, *E_0^P -semigroups and Product systems*, arxiv/math.OA:1706.03928.
- [7] S. Sundar, *Arveson’s characterisation of CCR flows: the multiparameter case*, arxiv/math.OA:1906.05493v2.
- [8] Boris. Tsirelson, *From random sets to continuous tensor products: answers to three questions of W. Arveson*, arxiv/math.FA:0001070.
- [9] Boris Tsirelson, *Non-isomorphic product systems*, Advances in quantum dynamics (South Hadley, MA, 2002), Contemp. Math., vol. 335, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003, pp. 273–328.

S. SUNDAR (sundarsobers@gmail.com)
Institute of Mathematical Sciences (HBNI), CIT Campus,
Taramani, Chennai, 600113, Tamilnadu, INDIA.