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Abstract. We define for real $q$ a unital $*$-algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ quantizing the universal enveloping $*$-algebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$. The $*$-algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ is realized as a $*$-subalgebra of the Drinfeld double of $U_q(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ and its dual Hopf $*$-algebra $\mathcal{O}_q(SU(2))$, generated by the equatorial Podleś sphere coideal $*$-subalgebra $\mathcal{O}_q(K\setminus SU(2))$ of $\mathcal{O}_q(SU(2))$ and its associated orthogonal coideal $*$-subalgebra $U_q(\mathfrak{u}(l) \subseteq U_q(\mathfrak{su}(2)))$. We then classify all the irreducible $*$-representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$.

Introduction

Let $I$ be a real Lie algebra with complexification $g = l_c$, so $I$ can be viewed as a real form of $g$. This real structure can be implemented on the universal enveloping algebra $U(g)$ by means of the $*$-structure

$$X^* = -X, \quad X \in I,$$

making $U(g)$ into a unital $*$-algebra we denote as $U(I)$.

In [Twi92] it was shown that for all semisimple $I$ the above real structure can be quantized: letting $U_q(g)$ be the standard Drinfeld-Jimbo quantization of $U(g)$ for $q$ real, there exists a Hopf $*$-algebra structure on $U_q(g)$ that has $U(I)$ as its classical limit. We denote $U_q^*(I)$ for $U_q(g)$ with the above $*$-structure. It is a quantization in the direction of the maximally compact Cartan subalgebra of $I$, in the sense that the enveloping algebra of the latter is quantized into a commutative and cocommutative Hopf $*$-subalgebra of $U_q^*(I)$.

When $I$ is a compact semisimple Lie algebra $u$, the quantum enveloping algebra $U_q(u) = U^*_q(u)$ can be integrated. Indeed, with $U$ the simply connected Lie group with Lie algebra $u$, there exists a compact quantum group $U_q$ whose associated coordinate Hopf $*$-algebra $\mathcal{O}_q(U)$ is a $q$-deformation of the algebra $O(U)$ of regular functions on $U$. The Hopf $*$-algebra $\mathcal{O}_q(U)$ is in duality with $U_q(u)$, and its associated quantum group $C^*$-algebra $C_q^*(U)$ has irreducible representations in direct one-to-one correspondence with the admissible (also known as type 1) irreducible representations of $U_q(u)$. When $I$ is non-compact, it is still an open problem to find a corresponding integrated version of $U_q^*(I)$ in the setting of locally compact quantum groups, with concrete results so far restricted to particular cases such as the complex case and the rank 1 case, see e.g. [KK03, VY20].

In this paper, we will show that a different quantization is possible for $U(I)$, by quantizing in the direction of a maximally non-compact Cartan subalgebra. The upshot is that this approach will lead to an easier setting in which to consider the integration problem (see [DCDz21], but the price we pay is that the resulting quantization $U_q(I)$ will no longer be a Hopf $*$-algebra but only a coideal $*$-subalgebra. However, this does not seem to form a serious problem in practice, as the resulting $*$-algebra has by itself still an interesting representation theory. This approach is motivated substantially by the work on coideal subalgebras of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ associated to symmetric pairs, as developed by G. Letzter [Let99] for general finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$ and by S. Kolb in the Kac-Moody setting [Kol14]. We illustrate the above considerations in this paper for the rank 1 case $I = \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$. In particular, we give a complete classification of all irreducible $*$-representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$. We also compare the resulting theory with the classical limit as $q$ tends to 1. The corresponding problem for $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}))$ has been considered in [Pus93, PW94], see also [BR99]. Note that there is also a different integrable quantization of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ (or rather its modular double) as a locally compact quantum group in the case of $q$ unimodular [ByTe03, Ip13].
The contents of this paper are as follows. In the first section, we develop the general theory of Drinfeld doubles of orthogonal coideals. In the second section we introduce the ∗-algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}))$. In the third section, we classify its irreducible representations.
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1. Drinfeld doubles for coideals

We work over the ground field $\mathbb{C}$. Let $A, U$ be two Hopf ∗-algebras, with coproduct, counit and antipode written as $\Delta, \varepsilon$ and $S$. We use the sunless Sweedler notation for the coproduct, $\Delta(a) = a^{(1)} \otimes a^{(2)}$.

Assume given a unitary pairing $\tau(-,-) : A \otimes U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, so, writing also $\tau$ for the tensor product pairing between $A \otimes A$ and $U \otimes U$, we have for $a, b \in A$ and $h, k \in U$ that

$$
\tau(\Delta(a), h \otimes k) = \tau(a, hk), \quad \tau(a \otimes b, \Delta(h)) = \tau(ab, h), \quad \tau(1, h) = \varepsilon(h), \quad \tau(a, 1) = \varepsilon(a).
$$

$$
\tau(a^*, h) = \tau(a, (S(h)^*)^*), \quad \tau(a, h^*) = \tau((S(a)^*)^*, h). \tag{1.1}
$$

Let $I \subseteq U$ be a (unital) left coideal ∗-subalgebra,

$$
\Delta(I) \subseteq U \otimes I.
$$

Definition 1.1. We define $I^\perp := \{a \in A \mid \forall h \in I : \tau(a^{(1)}, h)a^{(2)} = \varepsilon(h)a\} \subseteq A$.

The following lemma is well-known in some form or other, see e.g. [Let02 Theorem 3.1], [LVD07, KS14, DCM20 Proposition 2.42].

Lemma 1.2. The subspace $I^\perp \subseteq A$ is a right coideal ∗-subalgebra.

We call $I^\perp$ the coideal orthogonal to $I$.

Proof. It is immediate that $I^\perp$ is a right coideal containing 1. To see that it is an algebra, we compute that for $a, b \in I^\perp$ and $h \in U$

$$
\tau((ab)^{(1)}, h)(ab)^{(2)} = \tau(a^{(1)}, h^{(1)})\tau(b^{(1)}, h^{(2)})a^{(2)}b^{(2)} = \varepsilon(h)ab.
$$

To see that $I^\perp$ is ∗-invariant, we first show that

$$
a \in I^\perp \Leftrightarrow \forall h \in I : \tau(a^{(1)}, S^{-1}(h))a^{(2)} = \varepsilon(h)a. \tag{1.2}
$$

Indeed, consider

$$
T : A \otimes U \rightarrow U \otimes A, \quad a \otimes h \mapsto \tau(a^{(1)}, h^{(2)})h^{(1)} \otimes a^{(2)}.
$$

As $I$ is a left coideal, it is easily seen that

$$
a \in I^\perp \Leftrightarrow \forall h \in I : T(a \otimes h) = h \otimes a.
$$

Note now that $T$ is invertible, with inverse map

$$
T^{-1} : U \otimes A \rightarrow A \otimes U, \quad h \otimes a \mapsto \tau(a^{(1)}, S^{-1}(h^{(2)})a^{(2)})h^{(1)}.
$$

It is then also easily verified that for $a \in A$ we have

$$
\forall h \in I : \tau(a^{(1)}, S^{-1}(h))a^{(2)} = \varepsilon(h)a \Leftrightarrow \forall h \in I : T^{-1}(h \otimes a) = a \otimes h.
$$

Putting this together, we find (1.2). From this, the ∗-invariance of $I^\perp$ immediately follows: if $a \in I^\perp$ and $h \in I$, then

$$
\tau(a^{(1)}, h)a^{(2)*} = \tau(a^{(1)}, S(h^*))a^{(2)*} = (\tau(a^{(1)}, S^{-1}(h^*))a^{(2)})^* = \varepsilon(h^*)a^* = \varepsilon(h)a^*.
$$
Recall now the construction of the Drinfeld double $\mathcal{D}(A, U)$ of $A$ and $U$, which we will realize as the unital $*$-algebra generated by copies of $A$ and $U$ with interchange relations
\[
ha = \tau(a(2), h(1))a(1)h(2), \quad ah = \tau(S^{-1}(a(2)), h(1))h(2)a(1),
\]
and with coproduct inherited from $A = (A, \Delta)$ and $U^{\text{cop}} = (U, \Delta^{\text{op}})$.

**Definition 1.3.** Let $I$ be a left coideal $*$-subalgebra of $U$, and let $J \subseteq I^\perp \subseteq A$ be a right coideal $*$-subalgebra. Then we define their Drinfeld double
\[
\mathcal{D}(J, I) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(A, U)
\]
to be the unital $*$-algebra in $\mathcal{D}(A, U)$ generated by $I$ and $J$.

**Lemma 1.4.** The multiplication maps
\[
I \otimes J \to \mathcal{D}(J, I), \quad J \otimes I \to \mathcal{D}(J, I)
\]
are bijective, and $\mathcal{D}(J, I)$ is a right coideal $*$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{D}(A, U)$.

**Proof.** It is immediate that $\mathcal{D}(J, I)$ is a right coideal $*$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{D}(A, U)$. The first point follows by observing that for $a \in J$ and $h \in I$ the commutation relations (1.3) simplify, using (1.2), to
\[
ha = \tau(a(2), h(1))a(1)h(2), \quad ah = \tau(S^{-1}(a(2)), h(1))h(2)a(1).
\]
□

The relations (1.5) show that $\mathcal{D}(J, I)$ can also be constructed in a different way. Recall that the Heisenberg double $\mathcal{H}(A, U)$ is the $*$-algebra generated by copies of $A$ and $U$ with multiplication law given by (1.5) for all $h \in U, a \in A$. Then $\mathcal{H}(A, U)$ is a $(A \otimes U^{\text{cop}}, \mathcal{D}(A, U))$-bicomodule $*$-algebra by $\Delta_A$ and $\Delta^{\text{op}}_U$, and in fact a bi-Galois object [Sch04]. By the above, we may also view $\mathcal{D}(J, I) \subseteq \mathcal{H}(A, U)$. This seems the more natural viewpoint given the Lagrangian nature of the Drinfeld double of a co-isotropic Lie subalgebra of a Lie bialgebra [Dri93].

2. The coideal $*$-algebras $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$

In this section, we will use basic results on the quantized enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ and the quantized function algebra of $SU(2)$. We refer to the monograph [KS97] for general information on these Hopf $*$-algebras.

2.1. **The quantized enveloping $*$-algebra** $U_q(\mathfrak{su}(2))$. Let $0 < q < 1$, and consider the Drinfeld-Jimbo quantized enveloping $*$-algebra $U = U_q(\mathfrak{su}(2))$, which is the complex algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}))$ generated by $e, f, k^{\pm 1}$ with universal relations
\[
ke = q^2ek, \quad kf = q^{-2}fk, \quad ef - fe = \frac{k - k^{-1}}{q - q^{-1}}.
\]
It becomes a Hopf $*$-algebra by the $*$-structure
\[
e^* = fk, \quad f^* = k^{-1}e, \quad k^* = k
\]
and
\[
\Delta(e) = e \otimes 1 + k \otimes e, \quad \Delta(f) = f \otimes k^{-1} + 1 \otimes f, \quad \Delta(k) = k \otimes k.
\]
We put
\[
\omega = ef + \frac{q^{-1}k + qk^{-1} - (q + q^{-1})}{(q^{-1} - q)^2} = fe + \frac{qk + q^{-1}k^{-1} - (q + q^{-1})}{(q^{-1} - q)^2}
\]
for the central Casimir element. We write $(V_{n/2}, \pi_{n/2})$ for the $n + 1$-dimensional unitary representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{su}(2))$. Concretely, we give $V_{n/2}$ the orthonormal basis $\xi_0, \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n$ and let $U_q(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ act by
\[
\pi_{n/2}(k)\xi_p = q^{n-2p}\xi_p,
\]
\[(q^{-1} - q)\pi_{n/2}(e)\xi_p = \sqrt{(q^{-n+p-1} - q^{n-p+1})(q^{-p} - q^p)q^{\frac{p}{2} - p+1}\xi_{p-1}},\]
\[(q^{-1} - q)\pi_{n/2}(f)\xi_p = \sqrt{(q^{-n+p} - q^{n-p})(q^{-p-1} - q^{p+1})q^{\frac{-p}{2} + p}\xi_{p+1}}.\]

The Casimir then acts by the scalar
\[
\pi_{n/2}(\omega) = \left[\frac{n}{2}, \frac{n}{2} + 1\right],
\]
where we use the standard \(q\)-number notation
\[
[a] = [a]_q = \frac{q^a - q^{-a}}{q - q^{-1}}.
\]

Upon letting \(q \to 1\) in each representation, we obtain the usual representations of \(U(\mathfrak{su}(2))\), interpreting \(k = q^H\) with \(H = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})\) (we will not formalize such limits explicitly in the setting of formal power series Hopf algebras, but this can easily be achieved).

It will be convenient to use also the rescaled elements
\[
X = q^{-1/2}(q^{-1} - q)e^*, \quad Y = X^* = q^{-1/2}(q^{-1} - q)e,
\]
\[
\Omega = (q^{-1} - q)^2\omega + (q^{-1} + q),
\]
so that the universal relations can be rewritten in terms of \(X, Y, k^\pm, \Omega\) as centrality and self-adjointness of \(\Omega\) and
\[
XY = -1 + q\Omega k - q^2k^2, \quad YX = -1 + q^{-1}\Omega k - q^{-2}k^2,
\]
with
\[
X^* = Y, \quad k^* = k, \quad \Omega^* = \Omega.
\]

Then
\[
\pi_{n/2}(X)\xi_p = \sqrt{(1 - q^{2n-2p})(q^{-2p-2} - 1)}\xi_{p+1}, \quad \pi_{n/2}(Y)\xi_p = \sqrt{(1 - q^{2n-2p+2})(q^{-2p-1} - 1)}\xi_{p-1}.
\]

Fix now \(t \in \mathbb{R}\). We recall the construction of the one-parameter family of coideals introduced in [Koo93], see also [NoMi92]. Define the following elements in \(U_q(\mathfrak{su}(2))\):
\[
B_t = q^{-1/2}(e -fq) - i(q - q^{-1})^{-1}tk, \quad \bar{B}_t = B_t + \frac{it}{q - q^{-1}}.
\]
Then \(B_t\) and \(\bar{B}_t\) generate the same unital algebra. Since
\[
B_t^* = -B_t, \quad \bar{B}_t^* = -\bar{B}_t,
\]
this is in fact a \(*\)-algebra. Since \(\bar{B}_t\) is a skew-primitive element,
\[
\Delta(\bar{B}_t) = \bar{B}_t \otimes 1 + k \otimes \bar{B}_t,
\]
the polynomial algebra \(U_q(\mathfrak{t}_t)\) generated by \(B_t\) is a left coideal \(*\)-subalgebra. Note that \(\bar{B}_t\) allows the classical analogue
\[
b_t = E - F - \frac{it}{2}H \in \mathfrak{su}(2)
\]
where \(E = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\), \(F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\) and \(H = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}\). We view \(\mathfrak{t}_t = \mathbb{R}b_t \subseteq \mathfrak{su}(2)\). See also [DCNTY20] for more on these quantizations in the formal setting.

In the following, we will use the notation
\[
[[a]] = [[a]]_q = [q^a - q^{-a}], \quad \{a\} = \{a\}_q = [q^a + q^{-a}]_q.
\]

The next theorem is essentially given by [Koo93, Theorem 4.3].

**Theorem 2.1.** The spectrum of \(\pi_{n/2}(iB_{[a]}\}]\) equals the set
\[
\text{Spec}(\pi_{n/2}(iB_{[a]}\}]) = \{[a + n - 2p] \mid p = 0, 1, \ldots, n\}.
\]
Proof. Let us write \( t = [a] \). Then
\[
(q - q^{-1})iB_t = iX - iY + tk,
\]
so \( T = (q - q^{-1})\pi_{n/2}(iB_t) \) is the selfadjoint tri-diagonal operator with
\[
T\xi_p = i\sqrt{(1 - q^{2n-2p})(q^{-2p-2} - 1)}\xi_{p+1} + q^{n-2p}\xi_p - i\sqrt{(1 - q^{2n-2p+2})(q^{-2p} - 1)}\xi_{p-1}.
\]
Write the formal eigenvector at \( \lambda \) as \( \xi(\lambda) = \sum_{p=0}^{n} Q_p(\lambda)\xi_p \) for polynomials \( Q_p \) of degree \( p \), normalized so that \( Q_0(\lambda) = 1 \). The \( Q_p \) then satisfy the following recurrence relation:
\[
-i\sqrt{(1 - q^{2n-2p})(q^{-2p-2} - 1)}Q_{p+1}(\lambda) + q^{n-2p}Q_p(\lambda) + i\sqrt{(1 - q^{2n-2p+2})(q^{-2p} - 1)}Q_{p-1}(\lambda) = \lambda Q_p(\lambda).
\]
Under the transformation
\[
Q_p(\lambda) = \frac{P_p(q^{(n-a)\lambda})}{(-i)^p(\lambda - a)q^{(n-a)p}},
\]
where we use the Pochhammer symbol \( (a; q^{-2})_m = (1 - a)(1 - q^{-2}a)\ldots(1 - q^{-2m+2}a) \), we obtain that
\[
\lambda P_p(\lambda) = P_{p+1}(\lambda) + (1 - q^{-2a})q^{2n-2p}P_p(\lambda) - q^{-2a+2n}(1 - q^{-2p})(1 - q^{-2p+2n})P_{p-1}(\lambda).
\]
By [KS98 Section 3.17], we see that the \( P_p(\lambda) \) are dual \( q^-2 \)-Krawtchouk polynomials,
\[
P_p(\lambda) = (q^{2n}; q^{-2})_pK_p(\lambda; -q^{-2a}, n \mid q^{-2}).
\]
From the orthogonality relations given loc. cit., we deduce that the eigenvalues of \( T \) need to be given by
\[
\text{Spec}(T) = \{q^{a+n-2p} - q^{-a-n+2p} \mid p = 0, 1, \ldots, n\}.
\]
\[\Box\]

In particular, we see that \( t \in \text{Spec}((q - q^{-1})\pi_{n/2}(iB_t)) \) if and only if \( n \) is even, and moreover the resulting eigenspace for \( t \) is then one-dimensional. Non-zero vectors in this eigenspace are called spherical vectors. We choose a spherical vector
\[
\xi(t;n/2) \in V_{n/2}, \quad n \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0},
\]
suitably normalised. In particular, in \( V_1 \) we have with \( t = [a] \) that
\[
iB_t = \begin{pmatrix}
q^{2}[a] & \sqrt{q} - 1 & 0 \\
-iq^{1/2}\sqrt{q} + q^{-1} & [a] & iq^{-1/2}\sqrt{q} + q^{-1} \\
0 & -iq^{-1/2}\sqrt{q} + q^{-1} & q^{-2}[a]
\end{pmatrix},
\]
and we define the standard \( iB_t \)-eigenvector at \([a] \) as
\[
\xi(t;1) = \begin{pmatrix}
q^{-1/2} \\
q^{1/2}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]
(2.6)
The other two eigenvectors at eigenvalues \([a + 2] \) and \([a - 2] \) in \( V_1 \) are respectively
\[
\xi(t;1)^+ = \begin{pmatrix}
-q^{a+1/2} \\
-i(q + q^{-1})^{1/2} - q^{-a-1/2}
\end{pmatrix}, \quad \xi(t;1)^- = \begin{pmatrix}
-q^{-a+1/2} \\
-i(q + q^{-1})^{1/2} - q^{-a-1/2}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Remark 2.2. In terms of \( \tilde{B}_t \), we can write that
\[
\text{Spec}(i\tilde{B}_{[a]}) = \{[a + p] \mid p \in \{-n/2, -n/2 + 1, \ldots, n/2 - 1, n/2\}\}.
\]
2.2. The Hopf ∗-algebra $O_q(SU(2))$. Consider the Hopf ∗-algebra $A = O_q(SU(2)) \subseteq \text{Lin}(U_q(\mathfrak{su}(2)), \mathbb{C})$ dual to $U_q(\mathfrak{su}(2))$, generated by the entries of the spin $1/2$-representation. Hence, by definition $O_q(SU(2))$ is generated by the entries of a unitary matrix

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix},$$

which satisfies the corepresentation identity and is such that $O_q(SU(2))$ is paired with $U_q(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ through the ∗-representation

$$\pi : U_q(\mathfrak{su}(2)) \to M_2(\mathbb{C}), \quad (U, e) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & q^{1/2} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (U, f) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ q^{-1/2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (U, h) = \begin{pmatrix} q & 0 \\ 0 & q^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

It can be shown that this pairing is non-degenerate (so $O_q(SU(2))$ separates the elements of $U_q(\mathfrak{su}(2))$), and that $O_q(SU(2))$ is the universal algebra generated by elements $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ such that

$$\alpha \beta = q \beta \alpha, \quad \alpha \gamma = q \gamma \alpha, \quad \beta \gamma = \gamma \beta, \quad \beta \delta = q \delta \beta, \quad \gamma \delta = q \delta \gamma,$$

(2.7a)

$$\alpha \delta - q \beta \gamma = 1, \quad \delta \alpha - q^{-1} \gamma \beta = 1.$$  

(2.7b)

The ∗-structure on $O_q(SU(2))$ induced by (1.1) is given by

$$U^* = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^* & \gamma^* \\ \beta^* & \delta^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta & -q^{-1}\beta \\ -q\gamma & \alpha \end{pmatrix},$$

and the universal relations simply say that the matrix on the right is the inverse of $U$.

Since the representations $\pi_{n/2}$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ are direct summands of a tensor power of $\pi_{1/2}$, they can also be implemented by a unitary corepresentation matrix $U_{n/2}$ of $O_q(SU(2))$. We write the matrix coefficients associated to the representations $\pi_{n/2}$ as $U_{n/2}$, so

$$(U_{n/2}(\xi, \eta), x) = (\xi, \pi_{n/2}(x)\eta), \quad \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}.$$

Note that by Drinfeld duality [Dri87, ES98], we may also interpret $O_q(SU(2))$ as the quantized enveloping algebra of the Lie bialgebra dual $a \oplus n$ of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$, where $a = \mathbb{R} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $n = \mathbb{C} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Concretely, put

$$x = q^{-1/2} \frac{\alpha - 1}{q^{1/2} - q^{-1/2}}, \quad y = \frac{\beta}{q^{1/2} - q^{-1/2}}, \quad w = \frac{\gamma}{q^{1/2} - q^{-1/2}}, \quad z = q^{-1/2} \frac{\delta - 1}{q^{1/2} - q^{-1/2}}.$$  

(2.8)

Then the universal relations (2.7) become

$$xy - qyx = y, \quad xw - qwx = c, \quad yw = wy, \quad yz - qzy = y, \quad wz - qzw = w,$$

$$x + z = (1 - q)(xz - yw) = (1 - q)(zx - q^2wy)$$

and

$$z^* = x, \quad w^* = -q^{-1}y, \quad y^* = -qw, \quad x^* = z.$$

Putting $q = 1$ (and noting that we obtain then $x + z = 0$, so that we can cancel $z$ from the generators), we obtain precisely the relations for $U(a \oplus n)$ by putting

$$\frac{1}{2}(y + w) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \frac{i}{2}(y - w) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad x = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.9)$$

In the following, we will then switch between the notations

$$O_q(SU(2)) = U_q(a \oplus n).$$

Let us now consider the coideal ∗-subalgebra orthogonal to $U_q(t_2)$.

**Definition 2.3.** Let $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We define $B = O_q(S_{2t}^2) = O_q(K_t \setminus SU(2))$ to be the ∗-algebra generated by the matrix entries of

$$E_t = U^* L_t U, \quad \text{where } L_t = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & -t \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.10)$$
It is easily seen that $E_t$ is of the form

$$E_t = \begin{pmatrix} q^{-1}Z_t & Y_t \\ X_t & -t-qZ_t \end{pmatrix}$$

where $X_t, Y_t, Z_t$ satisfy

$$X_t^* = Y_t, \quad Z_t^* = Z_t.$$ 

(2.11)

The $*$-algebra $\mathcal{O}_q(S^2)$ coincides with the function algebra of one of the Podleś quantum spheres [Pod87], and has the universal relations

$$X_tZ_t = q^2 Z_tX_t, \quad Y_tZ_t = q^{-2}Z_tY_t,$$

(2.12)

$$X_tY_t = 1 - qtZ_t - q^2 Z_t^2, \quad Y_tX_t = 1 - q^{-1}tZ_t - q^{-2}Z_t^2.$$ 

(2.13)

In particular, $\mathcal{O}_q(S^2)$ is a right coideal $*$-algebra. In fact, we have the following [NoMi92].

**Lemma 2.4.** We have $\mathcal{O}_q(S^2) = U_q(\mathfrak{t}_t)^\perp$.

**Proof.** From the definition of $U_q(\mathfrak{t}_t)^\perp$ and the fact that $(\text{id} \otimes \Delta)(U) = U_{12}U_{13}$, it is sufficient for the inclusion $\mathcal{O}_q(S^2) \subseteq U_q(\mathfrak{t}_t)^\perp$ to verify that

$$(\text{id} \otimes (-, B_t))(U^* (L_t \otimes 1) U) = \varepsilon(B_t)L_t.$$ 

(2.14)

However, the left hand side can be simplified to

$$\pi(S(Bt_{11}))L_t \pi_{1/2}(Bt_{22})$$

and (2.14) follows since $U_q(\mathfrak{t}_t)$ is a left coideal and $\pi_{1/2}(B_t) = -iq(q-q^{-1})^{-1} t - iL_t$ and $L_t$ commute.

The reverse inclusion follows since the space of spherical vectors for $\pi_{n/2}$ is zero- or one-dimensional according to whether $n$ is odd or even. It follows that the spectral pattern of $U_q(\mathfrak{t}_t)^\perp$ is $\pi_0 \oplus \pi_1 \oplus \ldots$, and hence coincides with the one for $\mathcal{O}_q(S^2)$.

Using the notation for spherical vectors introduced at the end of the previous section, we see that $\mathcal{O}_q(S^2)$ has the basis

$$\mathcal{B}_t = \{ U_{n/2}(\xi^{(t:n/2)}, \xi_r) \mid n \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, r = 0, 1, \ldots, n \}.$$ 

In particular, one can verify that

$$X_t = -iq^{1/2}U_1(\xi^{(t:1)}, \xi_0), \quad Y_t = iq^{-1/2}U_1(\xi^{(t:1)}, \xi_2)$$ 

(2.15)

and

$$Z_t = i(q^{-1} + q)^{-1/2}U_1(\xi^{(t:1)}, \xi_1) - (q^{-1} + q)^{-1} t.$$ 

(2.16)

Again, we will rather consider $\mathcal{O}_q(S^2)$ as a quantized enveloping algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{m}_t)$ of some coisotropic Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{m}_t \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{n}$ ([CG06]). It is easily derived from (2.19) what this algebra corresponds to. Indeed, we compute that

$$(q - 1)^{-1}(E_t - L_t) = L_t \begin{pmatrix} x & q^{-1/2}y \\ q^{1/2}w & -q^{-3/2}y \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} q^{-1/2}y & -q^{3/2}y \\ -q^{1/2}w & z \end{pmatrix} L_t$$

$$+ (q - 1) \begin{pmatrix} q^{-1/2}y & -q^{3/2}y \\ -q^{1/2}w & x \end{pmatrix} L_t \begin{pmatrix} x & q^{-1/2}y \\ q^{1/2}w & z \end{pmatrix},$$ 

(2.17)

so that the classical limit corresponds to the Lie algebra generated by the entries of $[L_t, \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ w & z \end{pmatrix}]$. This is seen to be the Lie algebra

$$\mathfrak{m}_t = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & -i\gamma \\ 0 & -\lambda \end{pmatrix} \mid \lambda, \gamma \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$ 

As one expects, this is indeed the orthogonal complement of $\mathfrak{t}_t$ under the natural real pairing of Lie bialgebras

$$(X, Y) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Im} \text{Tr}(XY).$$

between $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ and $\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{n}$. 
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In the following, we will also switch between the notations
\[ \mathcal{O}_q(S^2) = U_q(m_t). \]

2.3. The coideal *-algebra \( U_q(sl(2, \mathbb{R})_t) \). Using the coideal *-algebra \( U_q(t_t) \subseteq U_q(su(2)) \) and its dual \( U_q(t_t)^\perp = U_q(m_t) \subseteq U_q(a \oplus n) \), we can apply the construction method of Definition 1.3.

**Definition 2.5.** We define
\[ U_q(sl(2, \mathbb{R})_t) := \mathcal{D}(U_q(m_t), U_q(t_t)) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(U_q(a \oplus n), U_q(su(2))) =: U_q(sl(2, \mathbb{C})_R). \]

By construction, \( U_q(sl(2, \mathbb{R})_t) \) is a right coideal *-subalgebra of \( U_q(sl(2, \mathbb{C})_R) \). Here \( U_q(sl(2, \mathbb{C})_R) \) is seen as a quantization of the universal enveloping *-algebra of \( sl(2, \mathbb{C}) \) as a real Lie algebra. The associated Lie subalgebra \( sl(2, \mathbb{R})_t \) is then, according to the description in the previous section, the real Lie subalgebra of \( sl(2, \mathbb{C})_R \) generated by \( t_t \) and \( m_t \), which can be realized concretely as
\[ sl(2, \mathbb{R}) = Ad(g_t)sl(2, \mathbb{R}), \quad g_t = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & it/2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \]

In particular, \( sl(2, \mathbb{R})_0 = sl(2, \mathbb{R}) \).

The decomposition
\[ U_q(sl(2, \mathbb{R})_t) = U_q(t_t)U_q(m_t) \]
is an analogue of the KAN-decomposition for \( sl(2, \mathbb{R}) \), with the AN-factor grouped together.

The following lemma is immediate from Lemma 1.3.

**Lemma 2.6.** The *-algebra \( U_q(sl(2, \mathbb{R})_t) \) is the universal *-algebra generated by elements \( X_t, Y_t, Z_t, B_t \) satisfying the relations (2.9), (2.11), (2.12), (2.13) and
\[ B_t X_t = q^2 X_t B_t + q((q + q^{-1}) Z_t + t), \quad B_t Y_t = q^{-2} Y_t B_t + q^{-1}((q^{-1} + q) Z_t + t), \quad B_t Z_t = Z_t B_t - (X_t + Y_t). \] (2.18) (2.19)

We single out the following special element in \( U_q(sl(2, \mathbb{R})_t) \).

**Definition 2.7.** The Casimir element of \( U_q(sl(2, \mathbb{R})_t) \) is defined as the element
\[ \Omega_t := iq^{-1} X_t + (q - q^{-1}) i Z_t B_t - iq Y_t. \]

**Proposition 2.8.** The Casimir element \( \Omega_t \) is a central, self-adjoint element of \( U_q(sl(2, \mathbb{R})_t) \).

**Proof.** Using (2.19), we write
\[ \Omega_t = iq^{-1}(X_t - Z_t B_t) - iq(Y_t - Z_t B_t) = -iq^{-1}(B_t Z_t + Y_t) + iq(B_t Z_t + X_t) = -iq^{-1} Y_t + (q - q^{-1}) i B_t Z_t + iq X_t = \Omega_t^*, \]
so \( \Omega_t \) is self-adjoint.

It is clear on sight that \( Z_t \) and \( \Omega_t \) commute. Writing
\[ -i \Omega_t = (q^{-1} X_t - q Y_t) + (q - q^{-1}) Z_t B_t \]
and observing that from (2.18)
\[ B_t(q Y_t - q^{-1} X_t) = (q^{-1} Y_t - q X_t) B_t, \] (2.20)
it also follows from (2.19) that \( \Omega_t \) commutes with \( B_t \). Finally, from (2.20), we see that \( q Y_t - q^{-1} X_t \) commutes with \( Z_t B_t \), and hence with \( \Omega_t \). As \( \Omega_t \) is self-adjoint, it also commutes with \( q^{-1} Y_t - q X_t \), and so with \( X_t \) and \( Y_t \). It follows that \( \Omega_t \) is central. \( \Box \)
In this section, we classify all admissible irreducible $*$-representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, in the sense of the following definition. We use the notation $\tilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$ to refer to the simply connected cover of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$. We also use again the notation as introduced in (2.1) and (2.5), and we fix $t = [a]$.

**Definition 3.1.** A $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$-module $(V, \pi)$ is called $\tilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$-admissible if $\pi(iB_t)$ is diagonalizable with finite-dimensional eigenspaces.

If $V$ is moreover a pre-Hilbert space, we say that $V$ is an $\tilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$-admissible representation if the $\pi(X_t), \pi(Z_t)$ and $\pi(Y_t)$ act by bounded operators.

We say that $V$ is an $\tilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$-admissible $*$-representation if for all $\xi, \eta \in V$ and $x \in U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ we have

$$
\langle \xi, \pi(x)\eta \rangle = \langle \pi(x^*\xi), \eta \rangle, \quad x \in U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})).
$$

(3.1)

We say $V$ is an $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$-admissible module/representation/$*$-representation if the eigenvalues of $\pi(iB_t)$ are of the form $[c]$ for $c \in a + \mathbb{Z}$.

**Remarks 3.2.**

- The condition for $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$-admissibility is directly modeled on Theorem [2.1].

- As the $\pi(iB_t)$-eigenspaces are required to be finite-dimensional, there is no ambiguity between the notions of irreducibility in the module- and representation-theoretic setting.

- It follows from (2.13) that for any $\tilde{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$-admissible $*$-representation, the boundedness of the $\pi(X_t), \pi(Z_t)$ and $\pi(Y_t)$ is automatic.

Our first step is based on the following observation.

**Lemma 3.3.** Let $V = (V, \pi)$ be a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$-module. Assume $\nu$ is a $\pi(iB_t)$-eigenvector at eigenvalue $[c]$. Let $n \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then the vector space $V(n/2)$ spanned by the \{\(U_{n/2}(\xi^{(t;n/2)}, \xi_p)\nu \mid p \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}\} is invariant under $\pi(iB_t)$, and there is a map of $\mathbb{C}[x]$-modules

$$
V_{n/2} \to V(n/2), \quad \xi_p \mapsto U_{n/2}(\xi^{(n/2)}; \xi_p)\nu,
$$

where $x$ acts on the left via $\pi_{n/2}(iB_{[c]})$ and on the right via $\pi(iB_t)$.

Proof. If $z \in U_q(m_t)$, we have by (1.5) and (2.4) that

$$(q - q^{-1})\pi(iB_tz)v = (q - q^{-1})\tau(z(2), (iB_t)_{(1)})\pi(z(1))\pi(iB_t)_{(2)}v$$

$$= i\tau(z(2), X - Y)\pi(z(1))\xi + (q - q^{-1})\tau(z(2), k)\pi(z(1))\pi(iB_t)\xi$$

$$= (i\tau(z(2), X - Y)\pi(z(1)) + [c]\tau(z(2), k)\pi(z(1)))v.$$  

Putting

$$\eta_p^{([c]):n/2} = \pi(U_{n/2}(\xi^{(t;n/2)}, \xi_p)v),$$

we get

$$(q - q^{-1})\pi(iB_t)\eta_p^{([c]):n/2} = i\sqrt{(1 - q^{2n-2p})(q^{-2p-2} - 1)}\eta_{p+1}^{([c]):n/2}$$

$$+ q^{n-2p}[c]\eta_p^{([c]):n/2} - i\sqrt{(1 - q^{2n-2p+2})(q^{-2p-1} - 1)}\eta_{p-1}^{([c]):n/2}.$$  

So $\pi(iB_t)$ acts on the $\eta_p^{([c]):n/2}$ exactly as $\pi_{n/2}(iB_{[c]})$ acts on the $\xi_p \in V_{n/2}$. 

Consider then, for $c \in \mathbb{R}$, the following elements in $U_q(m_t)$:

$$T^+_c := U_1(\xi^{(t;1)}, \xi^{([c]):1}),$$

(3.2)

$$A_c := U_1(\xi^{(t;1)}, \xi^{([c]):1}) - (q^{-1} + q)^{-1}[c]t,$$  

(3.3)

$$T^-_c := (T^+_c)^* = U_1(\xi^{(t;1)}, \xi^{([c]):1}),$$  

(3.4)
Using (2.15) and (2.16), we can write

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
T^+_c + t \\
A_c \\
T^-_c + t
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
 iq^c & -q^{-1} - q & iq^{-c} \\
iq^{-1} & q - q^{-c} & -iq \\
-iq^{-c} & -q^{-1} - q & iq^{-1}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
X_t \\
Z_t \\
Y_t
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

It is clear from the definition that the span of 1, X_t, Y_t, Z_t is equal to the span of 1, T^+_c, A_c, T^-_c. Concretely, we have

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
X_t \\
Z_t \\
Y_t
\end{pmatrix} = (c - 1)^{-1}c^{-1}(c + 1)^{-1}
\begin{pmatrix}
-iq^{-c+1} & -i(q^{-1} + q) & iq^{-c+1} \\
-1 & q - q^{-c} & -1 \\
-iq^{-c+1} & i(q^{-1} + q) & iq^{-1}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
(c - 1)(T^+_c + t) \\
(c)A_c \\
(c + 1)(T^-_c + t)
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

(3.5)

From Lemma 3.3, we immediately obtain the following.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let V be an U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})_\epsilon)-module, and let V_c be the eigenspace at eigenvalue [c] for iB_\epsilon. Then

\[A_c V_c \subseteq V_c, \quad T^+_c V_c \subseteq V_{c+2}, \quad T^-_c V_c \subseteq V_{c-2}.\]

Let us now consider the following particular types of U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})_\epsilon)-modules. Recall the Casimir element introduced in Definition 2.7.

**Definition 3.5.** Let \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \). We call an U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})_\epsilon)-module \( V = (V, \pi) \) \( \lambda \)-basic if \( V \) admits a cyclic \( \pi(iB_\epsilon) \)-eigenvector and \( \pi(V) = \lambda \mathrm{id}_V \). We call a module \( V \) basic if it is \( \lambda \)-basic for some \( \lambda \).

**Lemma 3.6.** A U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})_\epsilon)-module \( (V, \pi) \) is \( \lambda \)-basic if and only if there exists \( b \in \mathbb{R} \) and a cyclic iB_\epsilon-eigenvector \( v \) at eigenvalue \( [b] \) such that \( A_b v = \lambda v \). In this case, any iB_\epsilon-eigenvector at eigenvalue \([c]\) is a \( \lambda \)-eigenvector of \( A_c \).

**Proof.** It follows immediately from the definition of \( A_c \) that \( \Omega_t v = A_c v \) for \( v \) an eigenvector for \( iB_\epsilon \) at eigenvalue \([c]\). \qed

To get at some structural results about basic modules, we need the following commutation relations between the \( T^+_c, A_c \) and \( T^-_c \). These relations are checked by direct computations (only two relations need to be computed, the other ones following by using that \( \overline{A_c} = A_{-c} \) and \( \overline{T_c} = T_{-c} \) with the complex conjugation leaving the generators \( X_t, Z_t, Y_t \) invariant).

**Lemma 3.7.** The following relations hold in U_q(\mathfrak{m}_\epsilon):

\[
T^+_c T^+_c = -A^2_c + t(q^{-c-1} - q^{c+1})A_c + t^2 + (q^{-c-1} + q^{c+1})^2;
\]

\[A_{c+2} T^+_c = T^+_c A_c, \quad A_{c-2} T^-_c = T^-_c A_c,\]

\[T^+_{c-2} T^-_c = -A^2_c + t(q^{-c-1} - q^{c-1})A_c + t^2 + (q^{-c-1} + q^{c-1})^2.\]

In the following, we will use the notation

\[T^{+, (n)}_c = T^{+, 2n-2} T^{+, 2n-4} \cdots T^{+, 2} T^+_c, \quad T^{-, (n)}_c = T^{-, 2n+2} T^{-, 2n+4} \cdots T^{-, 2} T^-_c,\]

where by convention \( T^{+, (0)}_c = T^{-, (0)}_c = 1 \).

**Proposition 3.8.** Every basic U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})_\epsilon)-module is \( \mathbf{\widehat{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})} \)-admissible, with one-dimensional iB_\epsilon-eigenspaces. Conversely, every irreducible \( \mathbf{\widehat{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})} \)-admissible U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})_\epsilon)-module is basic.
Proof. If $V$ is an irreducible $\widetilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$-admissible module, Schur’s lemma gives that the central element $\Omega$ must act by a scalar. As any eigenvector of $iB_t$ is then cyclic by the irreducibility condition, one direction is shown.

Conversely, if $V$ is a $\lambda$-basic module and $v$ is a cyclic eigenvector of $iB_t$ at eigenvalue $[c]$, we claim that the $T_c^{\pm}(n) v$ span $V$. Indeed, let $W$ be the span of these elements. It is sufficient to show that $W$ is an $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))_t$-submodule. But put $w = T_c^{\pm}(n)v$. Then clearly $T_{c+2n}^+ w \in W$. As $v$ is an $A_t$-eigenvector by Lemma 3.6 we deduce by induction from Lemma 3.7 that $A_{c+2n} w \in W$ and $T_{c+2n}^- w \in W$. This implies that $\{X_t w, Z_t w, Z_t w\} \subseteq W$. A similar result holds for the $T_{c}^\pm(n)v$. As $T_c^{\pm}(n)v$ is an eigenvector of $iB_t$ at eigenvalue $[c \pm 2n]$ when non-zero by Proposition 3.4, we are done. \[ \square \]

There is a canonical construction of a $\lambda$-basic module as follows. Let $b \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $C_b$ be the one-dimensional $U_q(t_t)$-module given by the character

$$\chi_b : iB_t \mapsto [b].$$

From (3.6), it follows that we can identify the vector spaces

$$U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))_t \otimes_{U_q(t_t)} C_b \cong U_q(m_t). \quad (3.6)$$

Let $I_{\lambda,b}$ be the left ideal of $U_q(m_t)$ generated by $A_b - \lambda$. From the discussion under Lemma 3.3 and Proposition 3.4 we see that $I_{\lambda,b}$ is an $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))_t$-submodule of $U_q(m_t)$. Put

$$M_{\lambda,b} = U_q(m_t)/I_{\lambda,b},$$

and let $\hat{1}$ be the image of the unit of $U_q(m_t)$. Clearly $M_{\lambda,b}$ is a $\lambda$-basic module.

Lemma 3.9. The left ideal $I_{\lambda,b}$ is a proper left ideal, and

$$\mathcal{B} = \{T_c^{+(n)}\hat{1} \mid n \geq 0\} \cup \{T_c^{-(n)}\hat{1} \mid n < 0\}$$

forms a basis of $M_{\lambda,b}$.

Proof. The same technique as in the proof of Proposition 3.8 shows that $I_{\lambda,b}$ is spanned as a vector space by elements of the form

$$T_c^{+(n)}P(A_b), \quad T_c^{-(n)}P(A_b),$$

where $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $P$ a polynomial with $\lambda$ as a root. By Proposition 3.4 it follows that the $[c]$-eigenspace of $iB_t$ in $I_{\lambda,b}$ must be the space of $P(A_b)$. Since $U_q(m_t) = O_q(S^2) \subseteq O_q(SU(2))$ is a domain, the space of $P(A_b)$ does not contain the unit (as $A_b$ must generate a free polynomial algebra in one variable).

Similarly, the domain property of $U_q(m_t)$ implies that $T_c^{\pm}(n) \notin \{T_c^{\pm}(n)P(A_b) \mid P(\lambda) = 0\}$, so the $T_c^{\pm}(n)\hat{1}$ are all non-zero. As they are eigenvectors for $iB_t$ at different eigenvalues, they are linearly independent. \[ \square \]

Definition 3.10. We call $M_{\lambda,b}$ the canonical $\lambda$-basic module centered at $[b]$.

We write the basis of Lemma 3.9 as

$$e_{b+2n} = T_{b}^{+(n)}\hat{1}, \quad e_{b-2n} = T_{b}^{-(n)}\hat{1}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0},$$

so that $e_{c}$ is an eigenvector for $iB_t$ at eigenvalue $[c]$.

Proposition 3.11. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Then any $\lambda$-basic $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))_t$-module $V$ is a quotient of some $M_{\lambda,b}$.

Proof. If $v \in V$ is a cyclic $iB_t$-eigenvector of $V$ at eigenvalue $[b]$, then it is clear from the universal construction of $M_{\lambda,b}$ that there exists a unique $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})_t)$-module map

$$M_{\lambda,b} \rightarrow V, \quad \hat{1} \mapsto v.$$ \[ \square \]

We now look at invariant forms on $M_{\lambda,b}$. 
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Lemma 3.12. Let \( \lambda, b \in \mathbb{R} \). There exists a unique \(*\)-invariant bilinear form on \( M_{\lambda,b} \) satisfying \( \langle e_b, e_b \rangle = 1 \).

The \(*\)-invariance means that we have a sesqui-linear form satisfying (3.1).

Proof. The uniqueness is clear, since the \( e_c \) need to be orthogonal and \( e_b \) is a cyclic vector.

To show existence, let \( l_b \) be the linear functional on \( M_{\lambda,b} \) determined by \( l_b(e_c) = \delta_{b,c} \). Then we can define on \( U_q(\mathfrak{m}_1) \) as a \( U_q(\mathfrak{m}_1) \)-module the \(*\)-invariant bilinear form

\[
\langle x, y \rangle = l_b(x^* e_b).
\]

We claim that this form is also \(*\)-invariant as a \( U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})_1) \)-module under the identification \( \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \). Indeed, let \( \chi_b \) be the character on \( U_q(\mathfrak{t}_1) \) determined by \( iB_t \mapsto [b] \). Then \( \chi_b \) is a \(*\)-character. We then compute for \( h \in U_q(\mathfrak{t}_1) \) and \( x, y \in U_q(\mathfrak{m}_1) \) that

\[
\langle x, hy \rangle = \tau(y(2), h(1)) l_b(x^* y_{(1)} h(2) e_b)
\]

\[
= \chi_b(h(2)) \tau(y(2), h(1)) l_b(x^* y_{(1)} e_b)
\]

\[
= \chi_b(h(2)) \tau(S^{-1}(x_{(3)})^*, x_{(2)}^* y_{(2)}, h(1)) l_b(x_{(1)}^* y_{(1)} e_b)
\]

\[
= \chi_b(h(3)) \tau(S^{-1}(x_{(3)}^*), h(1)) \tau(T_{(2)}^* y_{(2)}, h(2)) l_b(x_{(1)}^* y_{(1)} e_b)
\]

\[
= \tau(S^{-1}(x_{(3)}^*), h(1)) l_b(h(2)^* x_{(1)}^* y_{(1)} e_b)
\]

\[
= \chi_b(h(2)) \tau(S^{-1}(x^*_{(2)}), h(1)) l_b(x_{(1)}^* y_{(1)} e_b)
\]

\[
= \chi_b(h_{(2)}^*) \tau(x_{(2)}, h_{(1)})^* (x_{(1)}, y)
\]

\[
= (h^* x, y).
\]

Observe now that

\[
M_{\lambda,b} = U_q(\mathfrak{m}_1)/I_{\lambda,b} = U_q(\mathfrak{m}_1)/(\Omega - \lambda)U_q(\mathfrak{m}_1),
\]

from which it follows directly that our sesqui-linear form descends to \( M_{\lambda,b} \).

Clearly the kernel of the \(*\)-invariant form on \( M_{\lambda,b} \) is a submodule \( N_{\lambda,b} \). We denote

\[
L_{\lambda,b} = M_{\lambda,b}/N_{\lambda,b},
\]

and we obtain an induced non-degenerate \(*\)-invariant form on \( L_{\lambda,b} \). We determine when this form is positive definite, or, what is the same, when the form on \( M_{\lambda,b} \) is positive semi-definite. We introduce the following terminology.

Definition 3.13. Let \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \). We call a \( \lambda \)-basic \( U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})_1) \)-module \( V \) unitary if there exists a \(*\)-invariant positive definite form on \( V \). We call \( V \) a unitary basic module if it is unitary \( \lambda \)-basic for some \( \lambda \).

Proposition 3.14. The canonical \((\lambda, b)\)-basic module is unitary if and only if for all \( n \geq 0 \)

\[
0 \leq \prod_{0 \leq m \leq n} (\lambda + \{a + b + 2m + 1\})(\{a - b - 2m - 1\} - \lambda),
\]

\[
0 \leq \prod_{0 \leq m \leq n} (\lambda + \{a + b + 2m - 1\})(\{a - b + 2m + 1\} - \lambda).
\]

Proof. Denote

\[
r_c = \langle e_c, e_c \rangle.
\]

From (3.6) we see that

\[
(T^c_c)^* = T^c_c = \frac{\{c\}}{\{c+2\}} T^c_{c-2} + C_1 A_{c+2} + C_2 T^c_{c+2} + C_3
\]

for certain constants \( C_i \). We deduce that

\[
r_{c+2} = \langle e_c, (T^c_c)^* T^c_{c+2} e_c \rangle = \frac{\{c\}}{\{c+2\}} \langle e_c, T^c_{c-2} T^c_{c+2} e_c \rangle, \quad c \in b + 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}.
\]
By Lemma \ref{lem:sl2r-admissible-representations} we can simplify the right hand side and obtain, recalling that $t = \lfloor a \rfloor$,
\begin{align*}
    r_{c+2} &= \frac{\{c\}}{\{c + 2\}} (-\lambda^2 + \lfloor c + 1 \rfloor \lfloor |a| \rfloor) \lambda + \lfloor |a| \rfloor^2 + \lfloor c + 1 \rfloor^2) r_c \\
    &= \frac{\{c\}}{\{c + 2\}} (\lambda + \lfloor a + c + 1 \rfloor)((a - c - 1) - \lambda) r_c.
\end{align*}
Similarly, $T_c^+ = \frac{\{c\}}{\{c - 2\}} T_{c-2}^+$ plus other terms, and we obtain
\begin{equation*}
    r_{c-2} = \frac{\{c\}}{\{c - 2\}} (\lambda + \lfloor a + c - 1 \rfloor)((a - c + 1) - \lambda) r_c, \quad c \in b - 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}.
\end{equation*}
\hfill \Box

It follows from the above proposition (and its proof) that for each $(\lambda, b)$ there is at most one unitary $(\lambda, b)$-basic module, which must then necessarily coincide with $L_{\lambda, b}$. We also have the following.

**Proposition 3.15.** An $\widehat{\text{SL}}(2, \mathbb{R})$-admissible $*$-representation is irreducible if and only if it is a unitary basic module.

**Proof.** One direction follows from Proposition \ref{prop:sl2r-admissible-representations} and the comment just before the proposition. Conversely, if $V$ is a unitary basic module, then any $U_q(\widehat{\text{sl}}(2, \mathbb{R}))$-intertwiner must necessarily be trivial, as the $iB_t$-eigenspaces are one-dimensional and there is a cyclic $iB_t$-eigenvector. But if then $V$ is a non-zero submodule of $V$, it must be the direct sum of its intersections with the $iB_t$-eigenspaces, and in particular is closed. As we have a $*$-representation, the projection onto $W$ is a non-zero intertwiner and hence the identity map. This shows that $W = V$. \hfill \Box

We now come to the main classification theorem.

**Theorem 3.16.** Any unitary basic module is unitarily equivalent to one of the following mutually inequivalent $*$-representations:

- The $(\lambda, b)$-basic module $L_{\lambda, b}$ for some $b \in (a - 2, a]$ and
  \begin{equation}
  -\{a + b' + 1\} < \lambda < \{a - b - 1\},
  \end{equation}
  where $b' \in (-a - 2, -a]$ is uniquely determined by $b' - b \in 2\mathbb{Z}$. In this case, the $e_c$ with $c \in b + 2\mathbb{Z}$ form a basis of $L_{\lambda, b}$.
- The $(\lambda, b)$-basic module $L_{\lambda, b}$ with either $b > -a$ and $\lambda = -\{a + b - 1\}$, or $b > a$ and $\lambda = \{a - b + 1\}$. In this case, the $e_c$ with $c \in b + 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ form a basis of $L_{\lambda, b}$.
- The $(\lambda, b)$-basic module $L_{\lambda, b}$ with either $b < -a$ and $\lambda = -\{a + b + 1\}$, or $b < a$ and $\lambda = \{a - b - 1\}$. In this case, the $e_c$ with $c \in b - 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ form a basis of $L_{\lambda, b}$.
- The $(\lambda, b)$-basic module $L_{\lambda, b}$ with either $b = -a$ and $\lambda = -(q^{-1} + q)$, or $b = a$ and $\lambda = q^{-1} + q$. In this case, $L_{\lambda, b}$ is one-dimensional.

**Proof.** Note first that
\begin{equation*}
\{x\} \leq \{y\} \iff |x| \leq |y|.
\end{equation*}
Secondly, it is clear from the proof of Proposition \ref{prop:sl2r-admissible-representations} that the non-zero vectors in any unitarizable $L_{\lambda, b}$ must have indices which are consecutive to each other.

If the indices have no upper or lower bound, any basis vector $e_b$ is cyclic, and hence $L_{\lambda, b} \cong L_{\lambda, b + 2n}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We can hence assume that $b$ is such that $b \in (a - 2, a]$, and the inequalities in Proposition \ref{prop:sl2r-admissible-representations} give the desired inequality \eqref{eq:inequality}. \hfill \Box

If the indices have a lower bound but no upper bound, we are in the second case. Then we can choose our index $b$ such that $e_b \neq 0$ and $T_b^+ e_b = 0$. This latter condition forces $\lambda = -\{a + c - 1\}$ or $\lambda = \{a - c + 1\}$.
The other inequalities in Proposition 3.14 then lead to the respective conditions \( b > -a \) and \( b > a \). The third case is treated similarly.

Finally, if the indices have both a lower and upper bound, we must have either \( \lambda = -\{a + b + 2m + 1\} = -\{a + b - 2n - 1\} \) for \( m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) or \( \lambda = \{a - b - 2m - 1\} = \{a - b + 2n + 1\} \) for \( m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \). The remaining inequalities in Proposition 3.14 are then easily seen to force \( m = n \) and hence respectively \( a = -b \) and \( a = b \).

In particular, we obtain the following.

**Theorem 3.17.** Up to unitary equivalence, all the \( SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \)-admissible irreducible \(*\)-representations of \( U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})) \) with \( t = \|[a]\| \) are the following, all of them being mutually non-equivalent:

- The modules \( \mathcal{L}_\lambda^+ = L_{\lambda, a} \) with
  \[-(q^{2s-1} + q^{2s-1}) < \lambda < q^{-1} + q,\]
  where \( s \in [0, 1) \) and \( a + s \in \mathbb{Z} \).
- The modules \( \mathcal{L}_\lambda^- = L_{\lambda, a-1} \) with
  \[-(q^{-1} - 2s + q^{2s-1}) < \lambda < 2\]
  where \( s \in [0, 1) \) and \( a + s \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z} \).
- The modules \( \mathcal{D}_n^+ = L_{\{n-1\}, a+n} \) for \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \),
- The modules \( \mathcal{E}_n^+ = L_{\{(2a+n)\}, a+n} \) for \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>2a} \),
- The modules \( \mathcal{D}_n^- = L_{\{n-1\}, a-n} \) for \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \),
- The modules \( \mathcal{E}_n^- = L_{\{-2a+n\}, a-n} \) for \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>2a} \),
- The trivial module \( \mathcal{F} = L_{q^{-1}+q,a} \).
- The one-dimensional module \( \mathcal{G} = L_{-(q^{-1}+q),-a} \) if \( a \in \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{Z} \).

**Remark 3.18.** Let us determine in which way the above representations deform the usual ones of \( U(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})) \). For simplicity, we consider the case \( t = 0 \). Then \( B_0 = B_0 \), and a straightforward but tedious computation, using (2.17), shows that

\[
(q - 1)^{-2}(\Omega_0 - q - q^{-1}) = -2q^{-1}x + 2z - 2(xz - yw) + q^{-1}(w^2 + x^2) + q(z^2 + q^{-2}y^2) - (q + 1)(q^{-1/2}w + q^{-3/2}y)B_0 + O((q - 1)).
\]

Hence \( \omega_q := (q - 1)^{-2}(\Omega_0 - q - q^{-1}) \) converges to the Casimir operator \( \Omega = \frac{1}{4}H^2 - \frac{1}{2}H + EF \). Now our condition for the first case in Theorem 3.14 can be rewritten

\[
-\frac{\{\frac{b}{2}\}(\frac{b}{2} + 1)}{(q - q^{-1})^2} < \omega_q < \left[\frac{b}{2}\right] \left[\frac{b}{2} + 1\right].
\]

We see that the left hand side condition goes to minus infinity as \( q \) tends to 1, and in particular in that limit the representations \( \mathcal{E}_n^\pm \) and \( \mathcal{G} \) disappear. A similar phenomenon is known to happen in the setting of quantum \( SL(2, \mathbb{C}) \) [Pus93, PW94]. Of the remaining representations, the \( \mathcal{D}_n^\pm \) with \( n \geq 2 \) are the analogues of the positive and negative discrete series, with \( \mathcal{D}_n^+ \) corresponding to the limiting positive and negative discrete series representations. The \( \mathcal{L}_\lambda^\pm \) are analogues of the positive and negative principal series for \( \lambda \leq 2 \), with a complementary series given as \( \mathcal{L}_\lambda^\pm \) for \( 2 < \lambda < q^{-1} + q \). It will be motivated in future work that also the \( \mathcal{L}_\lambda^\pm \) with \( \lambda < -2 \) should also be interpreted as complementary series representations in the quantum setting (vanishing as \( q \) tends to 1).

To end, let us briefly return to the setting of general admissible modules, and clarify the link with admissible representations. First, we construct the following \( SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \)-admissible modules.
Lemma 3.19. Let \( \lambda, b \in \mathbb{R} \). Then there exists a vector space \( V_{\lambda, b, \pm 2\mathbb{Z}}^+ \) with basis \( \{ \xi_c \mid c \in b + 2\mathbb{Z} \} \) carrying a \( \tilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \)-admissible \( U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))_t \)-module structure such that each \( \xi_c \) is an \( \lambda B_t \)-eigenvector at eigenvalue \( [c] \) and such that
\[
A_c \xi_c = \lambda \xi_c, \quad T_c^\pm \xi_c = (\{ a \pm c + 1 \} \pm \lambda) \xi_{c \pm 1}.
\]

Similarly, there exists a vector space \( V_{\lambda, b, \pm 2\mathbb{Z}}^- \) with basis \( \{ \xi_c \mid c \in b + 2\mathbb{Z} \} \) carrying a \( \tilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \)-admissible \( U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))_t \)-module structure such that each \( \xi_c \) is an \( \lambda B_t \)-eigenvector at eigenvalue \( [c] \) and such that
\[
A_c \xi_c = \lambda \xi_c, \quad T_c^\pm \xi_c = (\{ a \mp c - 1 \} \mp \lambda) \xi_{c \pm 1}.
\]

Proof. Assume first that \( \lambda \geq 0 \), and choose \( b' \in b + 2\mathbb{Z} \) such that \( \{ a - c + 1 \} \neq \lambda \) for all \( c \in b' - 2\mathbb{Z} \geq 0 \). Consider inside \( M_{\lambda, b'} \) the following vectors for \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \),
\[
\xi_{b'+2n} = \left( \prod_{m=0}^{n-1} (a + b' + 2m + 1) + \lambda \right)^{-1} e_{b'+2n}, \quad \xi_{b'-2n} = \left( \prod_{m=0}^{n-1} (a - b' + 2m - 1) - \lambda \right)^{-1} e_{b'-2n}.
\]
Then one easily checks that this basis provides a realisation of \( V_{\lambda, b, \pm 2\mathbb{Z}}^+ \). A similar rescaling can be done in the case \( \lambda < 0 \), or to obtain the representation \( V_{\lambda, b, \pm 2\mathbb{Z}}^- \).

Proposition 3.20. Providing \( V_{\lambda, b, \pm 2\mathbb{Z}}^\pm \) with the pre-Hilbert space structure for which the \( \xi_c \) from Lemma 3.19 form an orthonormal basis, it becomes an \( \tilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \)-admissible representation.

Proof. Lemma 3.19 combined with (3.5) shows that
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
X_1 \xi_c \\
Z_1 \xi_c \\
Y_1 \xi_c
\end{pmatrix} = M_t N_t
\begin{pmatrix}
\xi_{c+2} \\
\xi_c \\
\xi_{c-2}
\end{pmatrix},
\]
where
\[
M_t = \begin{pmatrix}
-\text{i}q^{c+1} & -\text{i}(q^{-1} + q) & \text{i}q^{-c+1} \\
1 & q^2 - q^{-c} & -1 \\
-\text{i}q^{-c+1} & -\text{i}(q^{-1} + q) & \text{i}q^{c-1}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\{ c \}^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \{ c+1 \}^{-1} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \{ c-1 \}^{-1}
\end{pmatrix},
\]
\[
N_t = \begin{pmatrix}
\{ c+1 \}^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \{ c-1 \}^{-1} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \{ c \}^{-1}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\{ a \pm c + 1 \} \pm \lambda & t & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
t & \{ a \mp c + 1 \} \mp \lambda & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\]
As the entries of the matrices \( M_t \) and \( N_t \) are uniformly bounded when \( c \) varies, it follows that \( X_1, Z_1, Y_1 \) define bounded operators.

Corollary 3.21. Any irreducible \( \tilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \)-admissible module carries a pre-Hilbert space structure for which it becomes an irreducible \( \tilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \)-admissible representation.

Proof. Since any irreducible \( \tilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \)-admissible module is a quotient of some \( M_{\lambda, b} \), it is sufficient to show that \( M_{\lambda, c} \) can be made into \( \tilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \)-admissible representations. We give the proof for \( \lambda \geq 0 \), the proof for \( \lambda < 0 \) is similar.

By the proof of Lemma 3.19 we see that \( M_{\lambda, b} \cong V_{\lambda, b, \pm 2\mathbb{Z}}^+ \) for \( b \ll 0 \), which can be made into an irreducible \( \tilde{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \)-admissible representation by Proposition 3.20. To prove that the corollary holds for an arbitrary \( M_{\lambda, b} \), we can hence by induction assume that it already holds for all \( M_{\lambda, c} \) with \( c \in b + 2\mathbb{Z} \) and \( c < b \).

Consider the natural intertwiner \( M_{\lambda, b} \stackrel{\phi}{\rightarrow} V_{\lambda, b, \pm 2\mathbb{Z}}^+ \) with \( e_b \mapsto \xi_b \). As \( \lambda \geq 0 \), we see by the specific form of the action of the \( T_c^+ \) on \( V_{\lambda, b, \pm 2\mathbb{Z}}^+ \) that \( \phi \) is surjective. There hence exists a largest \( c \in b + 2\mathbb{Z} \) with \( c < b \) such that \( e_c \in \text{Ker}(\phi) \). Consider the natural intertwiner \( M_{\lambda, c} \stackrel{\psi}{\rightarrow} M_{\lambda, b} \) with \( e_c \mapsto e_c \). Then this map must land in \( \text{Ker}(\phi) \), and must be surjective by considering the action of the \( T_c^- \). By induction, \( M_{\lambda, c} \) can be made into...
an irreducible $\tilde{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$-admissible representation, and hence the same holds for $\text{Ker}(\phi)$. As this also holds for $V_{\lambda,b}^{\pm,2\mathbb{Z}}$, the same must hold for $M_{\lambda,b}$.

It is also not hard to classify the finite-dimensional irreducible $\tilde{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})_t$-admissible $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})_t)$-modules.

**Proposition 3.22.** For each $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, there exist exactly two finite-dimensional irreducible $\tilde{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})_t$-admissible $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})_t)$-modules $V^+_N$ and $V^-_N$ of dimension $N$, which are $\lambda$-basic for respectively $\lambda = \{N\}$ and $\lambda = -\{N\}$. The modules $V^+_N$ are automatically $\text{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})_t$-admissible, while for any $N$ the module $V^-_N$ is $\text{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})_t$-admissible if and only if $a$ is a half-integer.

**Proof.** Let $(V,\pi)$ be a finite-dimensional irreducible $\tilde{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})_t$-admissible $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})_t)$-module, which we may assume to be $\lambda$-basic for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Necessarily, by irreducibility and the way the $T_{\pm}$ act on $iB_t$-eigenvectors, the eigenvalues of $\pi(iB_t)$ must be of the form $\{[b],[b+2],\ldots,[b+2N-2]\}$ for some $b \in \mathbb{R}$.

We hence have a unique surjective intertwiner $M_{\lambda,b} \to V$ with $e_b \mapsto \xi_b$, for some non-zero eigenvector $\xi_b \in V$ at eigenvalue $[b]$. As $e_{b-2}$ and $e_{b+2N}$ lie in the kernel of this map, we must have $T_{b-2}^+ e_{b-2} = 0$ and $T_{b+2N}^- e_{b+2N} = 0$. By Lemma 3.17, we deduce that

$$0 = (\lambda - \{a-b+1\})(\lambda + \{a+b+1\}) = (\lambda - \{a-b-2N+1\})(\lambda + \{a+b+2N+1\}),$$

so either

$$\lambda = \{a-b+1\} = \{a-b-2N+1\},$$

hence $b = a-N+1$ and $\lambda = \{N\}$, or

$$\lambda = -\{a+b+1\} = -\{a+b+2N+1\},$$

hence the $b = -a-N-1$ and $\lambda = -\{N\}$. Conversely, it is clear using [3.15] that for $b, \lambda$ of the above form, the subspace of $M_{\lambda,b}$ spanned by the $e_c$ with $c < b$ or $c \geq b + 2N$ is indeed a submodule.

This proves the existence and uniqueness of the $N$-dimensional modules $V^\pm_N$. Clearly the $V^+_N$ are $\text{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})_t$-admissible, as the eigenvalues of $iB_t$ are of the form $a+M$ for an integer $M$. In the case of $V^-_N$ the eigenvalues of $iB_t$ are of the form $-a + M$ for $M$ integer, hence $V^-_N$ is $\text{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})_t$-admissible if and only if $a$ and $-a$ differ by an integer, i.e. when $a$ is a half-integer.
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