

CONTINUOUS FRAMES IN TENSOR PRODUCT HILBERT SPACES, LOCALIZATION OPERATORS AND DENSITY OPERATORS

P. BALAZS¹, N. TEOFANOV²,

ABSTRACT. We derive fundamental properties of continuous frames for tensor product of Hilbert spaces. This includes, for example, the consistency property, i.e. preservation of the frame property under the tensor product, and the description of canonical dual frames as inverses of the frame operator in the tensor product setting. We show the full characterization of all dual systems for a given continuous frame, a result interesting by itself, and apply this to dual tensor frames. Furthermore, we discuss the existence on non-simple tensor product (dual) frames. Schatten class properties of continuous frame multipliers are considered in the context of tensor products. In particular, we give sufficient conditions for obtaining partial traces multipliers the same form, which is illustrated with examples related to short-time Fourier transform and wavelet localization operators. As an application, we offer an interpretation of a class of tensor product continuous frame multipliers as density operators for bipartite quantum systems, and show how their structure can be restricted to the corresponding partial traces.

1. INTRODUCTION

Continuous frames extend the concept of frames when the indices are related to some measurable space, see [1, 6, 31, 38]. Apart from expected similarities, this extension pointed out various differences between the “discrete” and “continuous” theories. For example, continuous frames need not be norm bounded, and they may describe the states of quantum systems in a neighborhood of a point in phase space \mathbb{R}^{2d} , which is a more realistic situation than the corresponding discrete case related to some lattice in \mathbb{R}^{2d} , cf. [33].

We introduce the notion of continuous frames (and Bessel mappings) for tensor products of Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ with respect to a (tensor product) measure space (X, μ) . When the measure μ is chosen to be the counting measure, the main properties of tensor products of (discrete) frames considered in [17, 32, 39, 50] are recovered.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 42C40; Secondary 41A58, 47A58.

Key words and phrases. Frame, Continuous frame, Dual frame, Bessel mapping, Tensor products, Bilinear continuous frame multiplier, Localization operator, Density operator.

We show the expected consistence property, i.e. that the continuous frame/Bessel mapping condition is preserved by the tensor product, Theorem 3.5. To tackle the issue of representing vectors in tensor product Hilbert spaces, different systems can be used for analysis and synthesis, which gives rise to the notion of dual pairs of continuous frames. We study the corresponding operators, and give a representation of canonical dual frames for the tensor product continuous frames. In addition, we briefly discuss the existence of non-simple tensor product (dual) frames. For that result, a full characterization of all dual continuous frames is needed. We prove the generalization of the well-known result for (discrete) frames [18, Lemma 6.3.6] to the continuous frame setting, solving an open question. We use the powerful technique of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces in these investigations, see Theorem 4.4, and derive the corresponding property for tensor product continuous frames.

Let us recall that tensor product Hilbert spaces are important in different contexts. As noted in [13], *“the theory of tensor products is at the heart of kernel theorems for operators”*. In fact, tensor product of two Hilbert spaces can be introduced in terms of Hilbert-Schmidt operators which, in turn, can be identified with their kernels. In this paper we focus our attention to other aspects of tensor products, and the approach based on kernel theorems will be given in a separate contribution.

For example, in Section 5 we study the tensor product continuous frame multipliers and their compactness properties, thus extending results from [12] to the tensor product setting. In addition, we recall the partial trace theorem which is an important tool related to applications of our results to quantum systems. As an illustration, in Section 6 we consider particular examples of continuous frame multipliers in the form of familiar localization operators in the context of the short-time Fourier transform and wavelet multipliers. We recover some well-known results, but also point out some Schatten class results related to the wavelet and mixed type multipliers that so far seems to remain unconsidered

Specific instances of our general theory, which is one of the main motivations for our study. could be related to the states of quantum systems. Namely, motivated by their use in signal analysis, we propose the interpretation of a family of trace class operators as density operators for composite (bipartite) quantum systems. Recently, de Gosson in [33] considered Toeplitz density operators by using the approach which is closely related to the short-time Fourier transform multipliers of Section 6. The main feature of operators considered in Section 7 is that their partial traces (or reduced density operators) are operators of the same form. Thus we propose the study of generalized bilinear localization operators which, in principle, could be used to describe the state of subsystem in a prescribed region of the phase space. This is analogous to the use of localization operators in extracting an information about a signal in a specific region of time-frequency plane.

In our opinion observations given in Sections 6 and 7, open the perspective of using the mathematical tools developed in Sections 3 and 5 in the future study of bipartite quantum systems and their subsystems. This also gives a partial affirmative answer to the question of de Gosson [33, Section 5] which can be rephrased as follows: can the structure of a density operator be appropriately restricted to its partial traces?

2. PRELIMINARIES

For the reader's convenience in this section we collect some basic facts from operator theory and tensor products of Hilbert spaces which will be used in the sequel. We refer to [19, 28, 37, 43] for details.

2.1. Operator theory. By \mathcal{H} we denote a complex Hilbert space with the inner product $\langle x, y \rangle$ (linear in the first and conjugate linear in the second coordinate) and norm $\|x\| = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle}$, $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$. In the sequel we consider separable Hilbert spaces. A map $\Psi : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a sesquilinear form if it is linear in the first variable and conjugate-linear in the second. The sesquilinear form is bounded if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $|\Psi(x, y)| \leq C \cdot \|x\| \|y\|$, $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$. Then there is a unique operator O on \mathcal{H} such that

$$(2.1) \quad \Psi(x, y) = \langle O(x), y \rangle \quad x, y \in \mathcal{H},$$

and $\|O\| = \|\Psi\|$.

A bounded operator $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is positive (respectively non-negative), if $\langle Tx, x \rangle > 0$ for all $x \neq 0$ (respectively $\langle Tx, x \rangle \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$).

We denote the operator of orthogonal projection on a closed subspace $V \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ by P_V .

A linear operator T from the Banach space X into the Banach space Y is compact if the image under T of the closed unit ball in X is a relatively compact subset of Y , or, equivalently, if the image of any bounded sequence contains a convergent subsequence. If T is a compact operator on Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and if T^* is the adjoint of T (i.e. $\langle Tx, y \rangle = \langle x, T^*y \rangle$, $\forall x, y \in \mathcal{H}$) then the eigenvalues of the unique non-negative and compact operator S such that $S^2 = T^*T$ are called the singular values of T . The operator T belongs to the Schatten class $\mathcal{S}_p(\mathcal{H})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, if the sequence of its singular values (s_n) belongs to ℓ^p . In particular, $\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})$ consists of the trace class operators, and $\mathcal{S}_2(\mathcal{H})$ is the class of Hilbert-Schmidt operators (see also below), and $\mathcal{S}_p(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{S}_q(\mathcal{H})$, when $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$, where $\mathcal{S}_\infty(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the set of all bounded linear operators on \mathcal{H} .

Let \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 be separable Hilbert spaces. The set $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1)$ of all bounded linear operators from \mathcal{H}_2 to \mathcal{H}_1 is a Banach space with the usual operator norm $\|T\| = \sup_{\|x\|=1} \|Tx\|$, and $GL(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1)$ denotes the set of all bounded linear operators from \mathcal{H}_2 to \mathcal{H}_1 with bounded inverse. If $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{H}$, we write $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $GL(\mathcal{H})$ for short.

If $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1)$ and

$$\|T\|_{\mathcal{HS}}^2 := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|Te_n\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2 < \infty$$

for some orthonormal basis (ONB) (e_n) in \mathcal{H}_2 , then T is called a *Hilbert-Schmidt* (\mathcal{HS}) operator from \mathcal{H}_2 to \mathcal{H}_1 . We denote the class of Hilbert-Schmidt operators by $\mathcal{HS}(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1)$. If $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{H}$, then $\mathcal{HS}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{S}_2(\mathcal{H})$. $\mathcal{HS}(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1)$ is a Hilbert space (of compact operators) with the inner product

$$\langle S, T \rangle_{\mathcal{HS}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle Se_n, Te_n \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1}.$$

If $x \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $y \in \mathcal{H}_2$, then their *tensor product* $x \otimes y : \mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1$ is defined by

$$(2.2) \quad (x \otimes y)h = \langle h, y \rangle x, \quad h \in \mathcal{H}_2,$$

belongs to $\mathcal{HS}(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1)$.

For $P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ and $Q \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ we define the *tensor product of operators* $Q \otimes P : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1)$ by $(Q \otimes P)T = Q \circ T \circ P^*$. It is invertible if and only if P and Q are invertible, and $(Q \otimes P)^{-1} = Q^{-1} \otimes P^{-1}$.

2.2. Tensor product of Hilbert spaces. Let \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 be separable Hilbert spaces. Equipping the algebraic tensor product with the (extension of) the inner product

$$(2.3) \quad \langle x_1 \otimes y_1, x_2 \otimes y_2 \rangle_{\otimes} = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} \langle y_1, y_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_2}, \quad x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{H}_1, y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2,$$

makes it into a Hilbert space, denoted by $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, and $\|\cdot\|_{\otimes} = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\otimes}$.

The space $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ is unitary isomorphic to the class of Hilbert-Schmidt operators $\mathcal{HS}(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1)$. The unitary operator maps $(x_1 \otimes y_1)$ onto the operator given by (2.2) cf. [36].

Properties of tensor products given in the following lemma are often used.

Lemma 2.1. *Let \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 be separable Hilbert spaces and $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ their tensor product. Then we have:*

- a) $\|u \otimes v\| = \|u\| \|v\|$, $u \in \mathcal{H}_1, v \in \mathcal{H}_2$.
- b) if $S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ and $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$, then $\|S \otimes T\| = \|S\| \|T\|$, and

$$(S \otimes T)(u \otimes v) = Su \otimes Tv, \quad u \in \mathcal{H}_1, v \in \mathcal{H}_2.$$

- c) $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 = \overline{\text{span}} \{u \otimes v, : u \in \mathcal{H}_1, v \in \mathcal{H}_2\}$, i.e. $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ is the closure of the set of all finite linear combinations of elements of the form $u \otimes v$, $u \in \mathcal{H}_1, v \in \mathcal{H}_2$.
- d) the tensor product of two ONBs is an ONB in the tensor product space.

e) (*Schmidt decomposition*) for every $x \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ there are non-negative numbers c_n and ONB $e_n \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $f_n \in \mathcal{H}_2$, such that

$$x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n (e_n \otimes f_n), \quad \|x\| = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n^2.$$

Proof. The proof a)–d) is folklore, see e.g. [28, 30, 35]. For the proof of Schmidt decomposition e) we refer to [16]. \square

If the Schmidt decomposition of $x \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ contains more than one term, then x is called *entangled* vector/state. Otherwise, if $x = e \otimes f$ for some $e \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $f \in \mathcal{H}_2$, then it is called *simple* vector (or separable/product state, cf. [16]).

We end the section with a simple result interested by itself. It might be considered folklore by some, but the authors couldn't find its published version elsewhere.

Lemma 2.2. *Let \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 be separable Hilbert spaces. Then*

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 = \left\{ \sum_k f_k \otimes g_k \mid f_k \in \mathcal{H}_1, g_k \in \mathcal{H}_2 \text{ such that } \sum_k \|f_k\|^2 \|g_k\|^2 < \infty \right\}.$$

Proof. That the left hand side of (2.4) is a subset of the right hand side follows from the Schmidt decomposition, Lemma 2.1 e), so we show the opposite inclusion.

Let e_n and \tilde{e}_n be ONB for \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 respectively, and let $f_k \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $g_k \in \mathcal{H}_2$ be such that $\sum_k \|f_k\|^2 \|g_k\|^2 < \infty$. Then, by using Lemma 2.1 d)

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_k f_k \otimes g_k \right\|_{\otimes}^2 &= \sum_{ij} \left| \sum_k \langle f_k \otimes g_k, e_i \otimes \tilde{e}_j \rangle \right|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{ij} \left(\sum_k |\langle f_k \otimes g_k, e_i \otimes \tilde{e}_j \rangle| \right)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_k \|f_k\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2 \|g_k\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\sum_k f_k \otimes g_k \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, which finishes the proof. \square

3. FRAMES IN TENSOR PRODUCTS OF HILBERT SPACES

In this section we derive fundamental properties of continuous frames for tensor product of Hilbert spaces. We show the consistency property, i.e. that the frame property is preserved under the tensor product, and the description of canonical dual frames as inverses of the frame operator in the tensor product setting. In addition, we briefly discuss the existence of non-simple tensor product (dual) frames.

We first recall the definition of a (discrete) frame in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} .

Definition 3.1. A countable family $(f_n) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ is a *frame* for \mathcal{H} if there exist constants $A > 0$ and $B < \infty$ such that

$$A\|f\|^2 \leq \sum_n |\langle f, f_n \rangle|^2 \leq B\|f\|^2$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{H}$. If $A = B$, then it is called a *tight frame*, and if $A = B = 1$, then (f_n) is a *Parseval frame*.

We refer to [18] for a detailed account on frames, and recall that a frame (g_n) for \mathcal{H} is a *dual frame* for the frame (f_n) in \mathcal{H} if

$$f = \sum_n \langle f, g_n \rangle f_n, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{H}.$$

If we use a continuous index set we reach the so called continuous frames. We refer to [1, 2, 12] for the definition and properties of continuous frames in Hilbert spaces. In this paper we consider tensor products of Hilbert spaces instead.

3.1. Continuous Frames in Tensor Product Hilbert spaces.

Definition 3.2. Let \mathcal{H} be the tensor product $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ of separable complex Hilbert spaces, and $(X, \mu) = (X_1 \times X_2, \mu_1 \otimes \mu_2)$ be the product of measure spaces with σ -finite positive measures μ_1, μ_2 . The mapping $F : X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is called a *continuous frame for the tensor product Hilbert space* \mathcal{H} with respect to (X, μ) , if

- (1) F is weakly-measurable, i.e., for all $\vec{f} \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$x = (x_1, x_2) \rightarrow \langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle$$

is a measurable function on X ;

- (2) there exist constants $A > 0$ and $B < \infty$ such that

$$(3.1) \quad A\|\vec{f}\|^2 \leq \int_X |\langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x) \leq B\|\vec{f}\|^2,$$

for every $\vec{f} \in \mathcal{H}$.

The constants A and B are called the lower and the upper *continuous frame bound*, respectively. If $A = B$, then F is called a *tight continuous frame*, if $A = B = 1$ a *Parseval frame*.

The mapping F is called the *Bessel mapping* if only the second inequality in (3.1) is considered. In this case, B is called the *Bessel constant* or the *Bessel bound*.

To each continuous frame we define the frame related operators as follows.

Let (X, μ) and \mathcal{H} be as in Definition 3.2, and let $L^2(X, \mu)$ be the space of square-integrable functions on (X, μ) . The operator $T_F : L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$

defined weakly by

$$(3.2) \quad T_F \vec{\varphi} = \int_X \vec{\varphi}(x) F(x) d\mu(x) = \int_{X_1} \int_{X_2} \vec{\varphi}(x_1, x_2) F(x_1, x_2) d\mu_1(x_1) d\mu_2(x_2)$$

is called the *synthesis operator*, and the operator $T_F^* : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L^2(X, \mu)$, given by

$$(3.3) \quad (T_F^* \vec{f})(x) = \langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle, \quad x \in X$$

is called the *analysis operator* of F .

The *continuous frame operator* S_F of F is given by $S_F = T_F T_F^*$.

Remark 3.3. Occasionally we will slightly abuse the notation (as it is done in e.g. [42]) and \vec{f} will denote both the vector $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_2$ and the tensor product of simple tensors $\vec{f} = f_1 \otimes f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$. This will not cause confusion, since the meaning of \vec{f} will be clear from the context.

Remark 3.4. In parallel to frames and Bessel sequences, it is of interest to consider Riesz bases for discrete index sets. It does not make sense to address this question in the context of continuous frames, since all continuous Riesz bases are actually discrete, cf. [48].

When \mathcal{H} is a complex Hilbert space and (X, μ) a measure space (with positive measure μ), then Definition 3.2 is the usual definition of a continuous frame (Bessel mapping), cf. [12, Definition 2.4]. If, moreover, $X = \mathbb{N}$ and μ is the counting measure then F is a discrete frame, i.e. Definition 3.2 reduces to Definition 3.1.

The first inequality in (3.1), shows that F is complete, i.e.,

$$\overline{\text{span}}\{F(x)\}_{x \in X} = \mathcal{H},$$

where we have $\overline{\text{span}}\{F(x)\}_{x \in X} := \{f \in \mathcal{H} \mid \mu(\langle f, F(x) \rangle) \neq 0\}$. In contrast to discrete setting, in the continuous setting one has to be a bit more careful with this definition due to the null sets in X , cf. [14].

It is well-known that discrete Bessel sequences in a Hilbert space are norm bounded above: if

$$\sum_n |\langle f, f_n \rangle|^2 \leq B \|f\|^2$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{H}$, then

$$\|f_n\| \leq \sqrt{B}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For continuous Bessel mappings, however, this is not necessarily true, and continuous frames even need not be norm bounded, and if there exist a continuous frame for a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with respect to a measure space (X, μ) , then there are also norm-unbounded ones. We refer to [12] for examples and discussion related to the existence of continuous frames, and proceed by providing a natural construction of a continuous frame in a tensor product Hilbert space.

The next result shows that the continuous frame condition is preserved by the tensor product, generalizing the result for discrete frames.

Theorem 3.5. *Let \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 be separable Hilbert spaces, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, and let $(X, \mu) = (X_1 \times X_2, \mu_1 \otimes \mu_2)$ be the product of measure spaces with σ -finite positive measures μ_1, μ_2 . The mapping $F = F_1 \otimes F_2 : X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a continuous frame for \mathcal{H} with respect to (X, μ) if and only if F_1 is a continuous frame for \mathcal{H}_1 with respect to (X_1, μ_1) , and F_2 is a continuous frame for \mathcal{H}_2 with respect to (X_2, μ_2) .*

Furthermore, if $F = F_1 \otimes F_2$ is a continuous frame for \mathcal{H} with frame bounds A and B , then the continuous frame bounds for F_1 can be chosen as $A_1 = A/C_{F_2}$ and $B_1 = B/D_{F_2}$, where

$$(3.4) \quad C_{F_2} = \sup_{\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}=1} \int_{X_2} |\langle g, F_2(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu_2(x_2),$$

$$(3.5) \quad D_{F_2} = \inf_{\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}=1} \int_{X_2} |\langle g, F_2(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu_2(x_2),$$

and the continuous frame bounds for F_2 can be chosen as $A_2 = A/C_{F_1}$ and $B_2 = B/D_{F_1}$, where

$$(3.6) \quad C_{F_1} = \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}=1} \int_{X_1} |\langle f, F_1(x_1) \rangle|^2 d\mu_1(x_1),$$

$$(3.7) \quad D_{F_1} = \inf_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}=1} \int_{X_1} |\langle f, F_1(x_1) \rangle|^2 d\mu_1(x_1).$$

Vice versa, if F_j is a continuous frame for \mathcal{H}_j with the frame bounds A_j and B_j , $j = 1, 2$, then the frame bounds for $F = F_1 \otimes F_2$ can be chosen as $A = A_1 A_2$ and $B = B_1 B_2$.

Proof. Assume that $F = F_1 \otimes F_2$ is a continuous frame for $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ with respect to (X, μ) . Let $f \in \mathcal{H}_1 \setminus \{0\}$, and fix $g \in \mathcal{H}_2 \setminus \{0\}$. Then $f \otimes g \in \mathcal{H}$, and

$$T_{F_1 \otimes F_2}^*(f \otimes g) := \langle f \otimes g, F_1(x_1) \otimes F_2(x_2) \rangle = \langle f, F_1(x_1) \rangle \langle g, F_2(x_2) \rangle$$

implies that (by Fubini's theorem)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_X |\langle f \otimes g, F_1(x_1) \otimes F_2(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{X_1} |\langle f, F_1(x_1) \rangle|^2 d\mu_1(x_1) \int_{X_2} |\langle g, F_2(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu_2(x_2). \end{aligned}$$

Now, (3.1) and

$$\|f \otimes g\|_{\otimes} = \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$$

imply

$$\begin{aligned} A\|f \otimes g\|_{\otimes}^2 &\leq \int_{X_1} |\langle f, F_1(x_1) \rangle|^2 d\mu_1(x_1) \int_{X_2} |\langle g, F_2(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu_2(x_2) \\ &\leq B\|f \otimes g\|_{\otimes}^2, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{A\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2}{\int_{X_2} |\langle g, F_2(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu_2(x_2)} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2 &\leq \int_{X_1} |\langle f, F_1(x_1) \rangle|^2 d\mu_1(x_1) \\ &\leq \frac{B\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2}{\int_{X_2} |\langle g, F_2(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu_2(x_2)} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\int_{X_2} |\langle g, F_2(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu_2(x_2) \neq 0$ for all $g \in \mathcal{H}_2 \setminus 0$, and choose

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &:= \inf_{\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2=1} \frac{A}{\int_{X_2} |\langle g, F_2(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu_2(x_2)} = \frac{A}{C_{F_2}} > 0, \\ B_1 &:= \sup_{\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2=1} \frac{B}{\int_{X_2} |\langle g, F_2(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu_2(x_2)} = \frac{B}{D_{F_2}} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

with C_{F_2} and D_{F_2} given by (3.4) and (3.5) respectively, we conclude that F_1 is a continuous frame for \mathcal{H}_1 with respect to (X_1, μ_1) with the continuous frame bounds A_1 and B_1 .

By similar arguments we conclude that F_2 is a continuous frame for \mathcal{H}_2 with respect to (X_2, μ_2) with continuous frame bounds

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &:= \inf_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2=1} \frac{A}{\int_{X_1} |\langle f, F_1(x_1) \rangle|^2 d\mu_1(x_1)} = \frac{A}{C_{F_1}} > 0, \\ B_2 &:= \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2=1} \frac{B}{\int_{X_1} |\langle f, F_1(x_1) \rangle|^2 d\mu_1(x_1)} = \frac{B}{D_{F_1}} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

with C_{F_1} and D_{F_1} given by (3.6) and (3.7) respectively.

For the converse, assume that F_j is a continuous frame for \mathcal{H}_j with respect to (X_j, μ_j) with the frame bounds A_j and B_j , $j = 1, 2$. Then $F = F_1 \otimes F_2$ is weakly measurable on \mathcal{H} with respect to (X, μ) , and it remains to check (3.1).

Let $f \otimes g$ be a simple tensor. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{F_1 \otimes F_2}^*(f \otimes g)\|^2 &= \int_{X_1} \int_{X_2} |\langle f \otimes g, F_1(x_1) \otimes F_2(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x_1) d\mu(x_2) \\ &= \int |\langle f, F_1(x_1) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x_1) \int |\langle g, F_2(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x_2) \\ &\leq B_1 B_2 \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2 \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 = B_1 B_2 \|f \otimes g\|_{\otimes}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\|T_{F_1 \otimes F_2}^*(f \otimes g)\|^2 \geq A_1 A_2 \|f \otimes g\|_{\otimes}^2.$$

This is true for the span of $f \otimes g$ which is dense in $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$. By [46, Proposition 2.5] it follows that $F_1 \otimes F_2$ is a continuous frame. The frame bounds are given by $A = A_1 A_2$ and $B = B_1 B_2$. \square

From the proof of Theorem 3.5 we also have the following observation.

Corollary 3.6. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 3.5 hold. Then the mapping $F = F_1 \otimes F_2 : X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a continuous bilinear Bessel mapping for \mathcal{H} with respect to (X, μ) if and only if F_1 is a continuous Bessel mapping for \mathcal{H}_1 with respect to (X_1, μ_1) and F_2 is a continuous Bessel mapping for \mathcal{H}_2 with respect to (X_2, μ_2) .*

3.2. Dual pairs of continuous frames. Next we discuss dual continuous frames. If F_j are continuous frames for \mathcal{H}_j , $j = 1, 2$, then we may consider dual frames G_j which fulfill

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \int_{X_j} \langle f, F_j(x_j) \rangle \langle G_j(x_j), g \rangle d\mu(x_j), \quad \forall f, g \in \mathcal{H}_j, \quad j = 1, 2,$$

cf. Definition 3.7 for a more general situation (see also [31]). It follows from Theorem 3.5 that such dual frames give rise to continuous (dual) frames for the tensor product Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$.

In this section we focus on the frame operator in the context of tensor products, and show that it gives rise to the *canonical dual frame* for a given frame. However, as we shall see, there always exist non-simple dual frames for tensor products of Hilbert spaces.

For the convenience of the reader, we shortly repeat some basic facts and notions on continuous frames which hold for the tensor products when the frame is given as in Theorem 3.5. Details may be found for example in [2] or in [46].

If F is a continuous frame for $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ with respect to the product measure space (X, μ) , then the mapping $\Psi_F : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$\Psi_F(\vec{f}, \vec{g}) = \int_X \langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle \langle F(x), \vec{g} \rangle d\mu(x), \quad \vec{f}, \vec{g} \in \mathcal{H},$$

is well defined, sesquilinear and bounded. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality it follows that $|\Psi_F(\vec{f}, \vec{g})| \leq B \|\vec{f}\| \|\vec{g}\|$, so that $\|\Psi\| \leq B$. For a thorough treatment of sesqui-linear forms in connection to frame theory see [24].

Therefore there exists a unique operator $S_F : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$\Psi_F(\vec{f}, \vec{g}) = \langle S_F \vec{f}, \vec{g} \rangle, \quad \vec{f}, \vec{g} \in \mathcal{H},$$

and $\|\Psi_F\| = \|S_F\|$, cf. [36, 43]. In fact, $S_F = T_F T_F^*$ where T_F and T_F^* are given by (3.2) and (3.3) respectively.

Since $\langle S_F \vec{f}, \vec{f} \rangle = \int_X |\langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x)$, it follows that $0 < AI \leq S_F \leq BI$. Hence S_F is invertible, positive and $1/B I \leq S_F^{-1} \leq 1/A I$. We call S_F the

continuous frame operator of F and use the weak formulation

$$S_F \vec{f} = \int_X \langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle F(x) d\mu(x), \quad \vec{f} \in \mathcal{H},$$

as well. Thus, every $\vec{f} \in \mathcal{H}$ has (weak) representations of the form

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \vec{f} &= S_F^{-1} S_F \vec{f} = \int_X \langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle S_F^{-1} F(x) d\mu(x) \\ &= S_F S_F^{-1} \vec{f} = \int_X \langle \vec{f}, S_F^{-1} F(x) \rangle F(x) d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

It can be proved that the mapping $F : X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a continuous frame with respect to (X, μ) for \mathcal{H} if and only if the operator S_F is a bounded and invertible operator. (If F is Bessel, then S_F is bounded, selfadjoint and non-negative.)

To each continuous frame F one can associate a dual continuous frame which is introduced as follows.

Definition 3.7. Let F and G be continuous frames for $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ with respect to $(X, \mu) = (X_1 \times X_2, \mu_1 \otimes \mu_2)$. The frame G is a continuous dual frame of F if

$$\vec{f} = \int_X \langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle G(x) d\mu(x), \quad \forall \vec{f} \in \mathcal{H},$$

in the weak sense, i.e. if

$$(3.9) \quad \langle \vec{f}, \vec{g} \rangle = \int_X \langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle \langle G(x), \vec{g} \rangle d\mu(x), \quad \forall \vec{f}, \vec{g} \in \mathcal{H}.$$

In this case the pair (F, G) is called a *dual pair of continuous frames*.

By Definition 3.7 and (3.8) it follows that for a given continuous frame F there always exists its dual pair, i.e. $(F, S_F^{-1} F)$ and $(S_F^{-1} F, F)$ are dual pairs. The frame $S_F^{-1} F$ is called the canonical dual frame for F .

In the next theorem we establish the tensor product version of the usual identification of continuous frame operator in terms of analysis and synthesis operators. We refer to [10, 46] when \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space.

Theorem 3.8. Let $(X, \mu) = (X_1 \times X_2, \mu_1 \otimes \mu_2)$ be a tensor product measure space and let F be a Bessel mapping from X to $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$. Then the synthesis operator $T_F : L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ given by (3.2) is a well defined, linear and bounded operator, and its adjoint operator is $T_F^* : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L^2(X, \mu)$ given by (3.3).

If $F = F_1 \otimes F_2$ is a continuous frame for \mathcal{H} with respect to (X, μ) , and $\vec{f} = f_1 \otimes f_2 \in \mathcal{H}$, then the analysis operator can be represented by

$$(3.10) \quad (T_F^* \vec{f})(x) = \langle f_1, F_1(x_1) \rangle \langle f_2, F_2(x_2) \rangle$$

The continuous frame operator S_F is given by $S_F = T_F T_F^*$, and

$$S_{F_1 \otimes F_2} = S_{F_1} \otimes S_{F_2}.$$

The canonical dual frame for F is $G = S_{F_1}^{-1} F_1 \otimes S_{F_2}^{-1} F_2$.

Proof. The first part of the claim follows immediately from the weak definition of T_F , i.e.

$$\langle T_F \vec{\varphi}, \vec{h} \rangle = \int_X \vec{\varphi}(x) \langle F(x), \vec{h} \rangle d\mu(x), \quad \forall \vec{h} \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Furthermore, if $F = F_1 \otimes F_2$ is a continuous bilinear frame for \mathcal{H} with respect to (X, μ) , then the representation (3.10) follows directly from (2.3).

Let $f_j \in \mathcal{H}_j$, $j = 1, 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} T_F T_F^* \vec{f} &= T_F T_F^* (f_1 \otimes f_2) = T_F (\langle f_1, F_1(x_1) \rangle \langle f_2, F_2(x_2) \rangle) \\ &= \int_X \langle f_1, F_1(x_1) \rangle \langle f_2, F_2(x_2) \rangle F_1(x_1) \otimes F_2(x_2) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{X_1} \langle f_1, F_1(x_1) \rangle F_1(x_1) d\mu_1(x_1) \otimes \int_{X_2} \langle f_2, F_2(x_2) \rangle F_2(x_2) d\mu_2(x_2) \\ &= S_{F_1} f_1 \otimes S_{F_2} f_2 = (S_{F_1} \otimes S_{F_2}) (f_1 \otimes f_2), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T_F T_F^* \vec{f} &= \int_X \langle f_1, F_1(x_1) \rangle \langle f_2, F_2(x_2) \rangle F_1(x_1) \otimes F_2(x_2) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_X \langle f_1 \otimes f_2, F_1(x_1) \otimes F_2(x_2) \rangle F_1(x_1) \otimes F_2(x_2) d\mu(x) \\ &= S_{F_1 \otimes F_2} (f_1 \otimes f_2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore on simple tensors we have that $S_F = S_{F_1} \otimes S_{F_2}$. By Lemma 2.1 (see also [46, Proposition 2.5]) this is true on all of \mathcal{H} .

Moreover, S_F is self-adjoint and we have

$$S_F^{-1} = (S_{F_1} \otimes S_{F_2})^{-1} = S_{F_1}^{-1} \otimes S_{F_2}^{-1} = S_{G_1} \otimes S_{G_2} = S_{G_1 \otimes G_2},$$

where G_1 and G_2 are canonical dual frames of F_1 and F_2 respectively.

Furthermore,

$$S_{F_1 \otimes F_2}^{-1} (F_1 \otimes F_2) = S_{F_1}^{-1} \otimes S_{F_2}^{-1} (F_1 \otimes F_2) = (S_{F_1}^{-1} F_1) \otimes (S_{F_2}^{-1} F_2) = G_1 \otimes G_2,$$

which proves the claim. \square

Recall that in $L^2(X_1 \times X_2, \mu_1 \otimes \mu_2)$ a simple tensor $f \otimes g$ is just the product $f \otimes g(x) = f(x_1)g(x_2)$ which is commonly identified with an operator with the integral kernel $f \otimes g$. Thus, in (3.10) we may put

$$T_F^* = T_{F_1}^* \otimes T_{F_2}^*.$$

Obviously, for a pair of continuous frames F and G the condition (3.9) can be written as $T_G T_F^* = I$ (in the weak sense).

Remark 3.9. If F is a continuous frame which is not a discrete one, then the analysis operator T_F^* is not onto $L^2(X, \mu)$. Otherwise it would be a Riesz mapping, i.e. F would be a discrete Riesz basis, which would give a

contradiction, see Remark 3.4. In fact, for $H \in L^2(X, \mu)$ there exists $\vec{h} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $H = T_F^* h$ if and only if

$$H(x) = \int_X \langle S_F^{-1} F(y), F(x) \rangle H(y) d\mu(y),$$

cf. [6].

3.3. Non-simple Frames. Let us digress a bit, and see if "everything is solved" now considering Theorem 3.5 and Subsection 3.2. In this subsection we actually discuss the existence of non-simple tensor frames, therefore the result mentioned above do *not* cover the full tensor frame theory (as they consider only simple tensors). Let us stress that by Definition 3.2 it follows that not every frame in a tensor product Hilbert space has to be represented as a (sequence of) simple tensor(s). A comprehensive study of non-simple continuous frames and their dual frames in tensor product Hilbert spaces is beyond the scope of this paper and will be a topic of the future research. To give a flavor of the topic here we present only a couple of results in that direction. For example, we will show that any continuous frame admits a non-simple dual frame.

Our first result is to investigate if tensor Bessel sequences can be constructed with ranks different than 1.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $f_k(\omega)$ and $g_k(\nu)$ be continuous Bessel functions in \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 respectively with bounds B_k and B'_k such that $B := \sum_k B_k \cdot \sum_l B'_l < \infty$, then $F(\omega, \nu) = \sum_k f_k(\omega) \otimes g_k(\nu)$ is a Bessel mapping in $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ with the Bessel bound B .*

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \psi \otimes \phi, F(x_1, x_2) \rangle|^2 &= |\langle \psi \otimes \phi, \sum_k f_k(x_1) \otimes g_k(x_2) \rangle|^2 \\ &= \left| \sum_k \langle \psi, f_k(x_1) \rangle \langle \phi, g_k(x_2) \rangle \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int |\langle \psi \otimes \phi, F(x_1, x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x_1, x_2) &= \int \left| \sum_k \langle \psi, f_k(x_1) \rangle \langle \phi, g_k(x_2) \rangle \right|^2 d\mu(x_1, x_2) \\ &\leq \sum_k \int |\langle \psi, f_k(x_1) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x_1) \sum_l \int |\langle \phi, g_l(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x_2) \\ &\leq \sum_k B_{(f_k)} \|\psi\|^2 \cdot \sum_l B_{(g_l)} \|\phi\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(\sum_k B_{(f_k)} \right) \left(\sum_l B_{(g_l)} \right) \|\psi\|^2 \cdot \|\phi\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

The result now follows by extension from simple tensors to all of $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ (cf. [46, Proposition 2.5]). \square

A direct converse can never be true (consider e.g. any f_k and $g_k = 0$). Using the idea of semi-discrete frames [51], one can prove, though:

Lemma 3.11. *Let $F(\omega, \nu) = \sum_k f_k(\omega) \otimes g_k(\nu)$ fulfil the lower frame condition in $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ with bound A . Then the semi-discrete sets $(f_k(\omega))_{(k \in \mathbb{N}, \omega \in X)}$ resp. $(g_k(\omega))_{(k \in \mathbb{N}, \omega \in X)}$ fulfil the lower frame condition.*

Proof. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} A \|\psi\| \|\phi\| &\leq \int |\langle \psi \otimes \phi, F(x_1, x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x_1, x_2) \\ &= \int |\langle \psi \otimes \phi, \sum_k f_k(x_1) \otimes g_k(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x_1, x_2) \\ &= \int \left| \sum_k \langle \psi, f_k(x_1) \rangle \langle \phi, g_k(x_2) \rangle \right|^2 d\mu(x_1, x_2) \\ &\leq \int \sum_k |\langle \psi, f_k(x_1) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x_1) \underbrace{\int \sum_l |\langle \phi, g_l(x_2) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x_2)}_{\leq M_\phi \|\phi\|} \end{aligned}$$

Choose ϕ such that $M_\phi > 0$ then

$$\frac{A}{M_\phi} \|\psi\| \leq \int \sum_k |\langle \psi, f_k(x_1) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x_1) \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{H}_1,$$

and similarly for $(g_k(\omega))_{(k \in \mathbb{N}, \omega \in X)}$. \square

Finally we discuss the existence of dual frames which are not necessarily of the form given by Theorem 3.5 (see also [8]). More precisely, if $F_1 \otimes F_2$ is a frame for \mathcal{H} with respect to (X, μ) , then we examine the existence of its dual frame G such that $G \neq G_1 \otimes G_2$ for any $G_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1$, $G_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2$. Let us shortly digress from the logical order of results and rather use the proof of this result as a motivation for the next section.

We first recall that a continuous frame F is *redundant* if

$$R(F) := \dim(\text{ran}(T_F^*)^\perp) > 0.$$

It has been observed that $R(F)$ depends on the underlying measure space (X, μ) . For example, if (X, μ) is non-atomic, then $R(F) = \infty$. We refer to [47] for details.

Lemma 3.12. *Let $\dim(\mathcal{H}_1), \dim(\mathcal{H}_2) > 1$, and let $F_1 \otimes F_2$ be a redundant frame for \mathcal{H} . Then $F_1 \otimes F_2$ admits at least one non-simple tensor product dual.*

Proof. The idea is to follow the steps of the proof of [50, Theorem 2.3], and the case study examination given there. This proof uses the fact that for $T \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, $\dim(\text{ran}(T)) \leq 1$ if and only if $T = f \otimes g$ for some $f \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $g \in \mathcal{H}_2$ ([50, Lemma 2.2]). Replacing sums by integrations the proof of [50, Theorem 2.3] can be generalized in a straightforward way, if we can

show the tensor product version of [18, Theorem 6.3.7], i.e. a description of all dual tensor frames of a given tensor frame. This is Corollary 4.5. \square

4. FULL CLASSIFICATION OF DUAL CONTINUOUS FRAMES

In this section we extend the well known classification of dual discrete frames [18, Theorem 6.3.7] to the continuous frames setting. This is a new result in continuous frame theory, and we apply it to describe dual frames in the context of tensor products.

It turned out that the theory of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHS) provides convenient tools for the result in this section. The interplay between RKHS and frame theory is recently used in [48] in the study of stable analysis/synthesis processes. Recall, a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is a *reproducing kernel Hilbert space* on the set X if it is a subspace of the space of functions from X to \mathbb{C} such that for every $x \in X$ the linear *evaluation functional* $ev_x : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by $ev_x(f) = f(x)$ is bounded, cf. [44].

To give a flavor of results which relate frames with RKHS we mention the following result from [31], see also [48, Proposition 11].

Lemma 4.1. *If F satisfies the lower frame inequality, then $(\text{ran}(T_F^*), \|\cdot\|)$ is a RKHS. Moreover, for any subspace \mathcal{H}_K of $L^2(X, \mu)$, the following are equivalent:*

- a) \mathcal{H}_K is a RKHS.
- b) There exists a continuous frame F such that $\text{ran}(T_F^*) = \mathcal{H}_K$.

We first prove the continuous counterpart of [18, Lemma 6.3.5].

Lemma 4.2. *Let $F(x)$ be a continuous frame for the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Let e_k be an orthonormal basis for \mathcal{H} and let $V : L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be a bounded left-inverse of T_F^* , such that $(\ker V)^\perp$ is a reproducing kernel subspace of $L^2(X, \mu)$. Then the dual frames of F are precisely the functions $G(x) = \sum_{k \in K} \overline{V^*(e_k)(x)} e_k$.*

Proof. The function $G(x)$ is well defined if $\sum_{k \in K} |V^*(e_k)(x)|^2 < \infty$. By [48, Proposition 6], $\sum_{k \in K} |V^*(e_k)(x)|^2 < \infty$ if $V^*(e_k)$ is a discrete Bessel sequence in the RKHS $(\ker V)^\perp$. Now, from the proof of [18, Proposition 5.3.1] it follows that this is true.

Next, following [48, Proposition 21], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle VT_\Psi^* f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \langle T_\Psi^* f, V^* g \rangle_{L^2(X, \mu)} \\
&= \langle T_\Psi^* f, \sum_{k \in K} \langle g, e_k \rangle V^* e_k \rangle_{L^2(X, \mu)} \\
&= \langle T_\Psi^* f, \langle g, \sum_{k \in K} \overline{V^*(e_k)(\cdot)} \cdot e_k \rangle \rangle_{L^2(X, \mu)} \\
&= \langle T_\Psi^* f, T_\Phi^* g \rangle_{L^2(X, \mu)}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, let $G_0(x)$ be a frame and set $V = T_{G_0}$. We have that $\ker V^\perp = \text{ran}(T_{\Phi_0}^*)$, which is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space by Lemma 4.1. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} T_G^*(g)(x) &= \langle g, G(x) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle g, \sum_{k \in K} V^* e_k(x) e_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \sum_{k \in K} V^* e_k(x) \langle g, e_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = V^* g. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $T_G^* = T_{G_0}^*$ a.e. and so $G(x) = G_0(x)$ a.e. \square

Note that the left-inverse V in Lemma 4.2 can never be invertible. (Because then $\ker V^\perp = L^2(\mathbb{R})$, which is not a RKHS).

In the proof of our next result we use the following facts from the theory of RKHS: the sum of RKHS is again a RKHS, [44, Theorem 5.4.], and any closed subspace of an RKHS is again a RKHS, [44, Theorem 2.5.]. Now the continuous version of [18, Lemma 6.3.6] is given as follows.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $F(x)$ be a continuous frame for \mathcal{H} . The bounded left-inverses of T_F^* where the orthogonal complement of the kernel is a RKHS are precisely the operators of the form*

$$(4.1) \quad V = S_F^{-1} T_F + W (\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}} - T_F^* S_F^{-1} T_F),$$

where $W : L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a bounded operator with $\ker(W)^\perp$ being a RKHS.

Proof. The proof of [18, Lemma 6.3.6] can be used directly in the sense that all left-inverses V can be exactly represented by (4.1). It remains to prove the transfer of the RKHS property.

We have that $\ker(W)^\perp = \text{ran}(W^*)$. Clearly,

$$V^* = T_F^* S_F^{-1} + W^* + T_F^* S_F^{-1} T_F W^*,$$

so that

$$\text{ran}(V^*) \subseteq \text{ran}(T_F^*) + \text{ran}(W^*) + \text{ran}(T_F^*),$$

which shows one direction.

On the other hand, let us first consider $W = W_0 \oplus 0$ for the orthogonal sum $\ker(T_F) \oplus \text{ran}(T_F^*)^\perp$, where W_0 is any mapping from $\text{ran}(T_F^*)^\perp$ to \mathcal{H} . Then $V = S_F^{-1} T_F \oplus W_0$. In particular, $W_0 = \pi_{\text{ran}(T_F^*)^\perp} V$, therefore $\text{ran}(W_0^*) \subseteq \text{ran}(V^*)$. So if the latter is a RKHS the former is, too.

Now let $W = W_0 \oplus W_1$. Therefore $\ker(W) = \ker(W_0) \oplus \ker(W_1)$. In particular $\ker(W_0) = \ker(W) \cap \ker(T_F)$, therefore $\ker(W_0) \subseteq \ker(W)$ and $\ker(W)^\perp \subseteq \ker(W_0)^\perp$ and we are done. \square

Next we prove a continuous frame counterpart of [18, Theorem 6.3.7].

Theorem 4.4. *Let F be a continuous frame for \mathcal{H} . The dual frames of F are precisely the functions*

$$(4.2) \quad G(x) = S_F^{-1}F(x) + \Theta(x) - \int \langle S^{-1}F(x), F(y) \rangle \Theta(y) d\mu(y),$$

where Θ is a Bessel function.

Proof. Equation (4.2) is equivalent to

$$G(x) = S_F^{-1}F(x) + \Theta(x) - \pi_{\text{ran}(T_F^*)}\Theta(x).$$

By the construction it is Bessel function (as a sum of Bessel functions) and since $T_F T_G^* = \text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}$, it is a dual frame.

On the other hand let G_0 be dual frame of F . Then $V = T_{G_0}$ is a left inverse of T_F^* , where $\ker(V)^\perp$ is a RKHS. By Lemma 4.3 it follows that

$$V = S_F^{-1}T_F + W(I - T_F^*S_F^{-1}T_F),$$

where W is a bounded operator with $\ker(W)^\perp$ being a RKHS. By Lemma 4.2 we have $G(x) = \sum_{k \in K} \overline{W^*(e_k)(x)} e_k$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} G(x) &= \sum_{k \in K} \overline{T_F^* S_F^{-1}(e_k)(x)} e_k + \sum_{k \in K} \overline{W^*(e_k)(x)} e_k \\ &\quad - \sum_{k \in K} \overline{T_F^* S_F^{-1} T_F W^*(e_k)(x)} e_k \\ &= \sum_{k \in K} \underbrace{\overline{T_F^* S_F^{-1}(e_k)(x)}}_{=\tilde{F}(x)} e_k + (\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}} - T_F^* S_F^{-1} T_F) \sum_{k \in K} \underbrace{\overline{W^*(e_k)(x)}}_{=:\Theta(x)} e_k. \end{aligned}$$

The sequence $W^*(e_k)$ is a Bessel sequence in the RKHS $\text{ran}(W^*) = \ker(W)^\perp$ and so $\Theta(x)$ is well-defined. Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, \Theta(x) \rangle &= \left\langle f, \sum_{k \in K} \overline{W^*(e_k)(x)} e_k \right\rangle = \sum_{k \in K} W^*(e_k)(x) \langle f, e_k \rangle = \\ &= ev_x \left(\sum_{k \in K} W^*(e_k) \langle f, e_k \rangle \right) = ev_x \left(W^* \sum_{k \in K} \langle f, e_k \rangle e_k \right) = ev_x(W^* f). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\int |\langle f, \Theta(x) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x) = \|W^* f\|_{L^2(X, \mu)}^2 \leq \|W\|_{Op} \|f\|_{L^2(X, \mu)}^2,$$

and $\Theta(x)$ is a continuous Bessel function. \square

Adapting this to the tensor frame setting we reach the following:

Corollary 4.5. *Let $F_1 \otimes F_2$ be a frame for \mathcal{H} . Then the dual frames of $F_1 \otimes F_2$ are precisely the families of the form*

$$S_{F_1}^{-1}F_1(x_1) \otimes S_{F_2}^{-1}F_2(x_2) + W(x_1, x_2) \\ - \int_X \langle S_{F_1}^{-1}F_1(x_1), F(y_1) \rangle \langle S_{F_2}^{-1}F_2(x_2), F(y_2) \rangle W(y_1, y_2) d\mu(y),$$

where W is a Bessel mapping in \mathcal{H} .

Now let us come back to Lemma 3.12: To show that there are non-simple dual tensor frames, one has to find a non-simple Bessel mapping W such that the result is also non-simple. This can be done as in the case study of the proof of [50, Lemma 2.2].

5. TENSOR PRODUCT CONTINUOUS FRAME MULTIPLIERS

Gabor multipliers [27] led to the introduction of Bessel and frame multipliers for abstract Hilbert spaces. These operators are defined by a fixed multiplication pattern (the symbol) which is inserted between the analysis and synthesis operators [9, 10, 11]. This section is inspired by the continuous frame multipliers studied in [12]. We are interested in the tensor product setting as follows.

Definition 5.1. Let \mathcal{H} be the tensor product $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ of complex Hilbert spaces, and $(X, \mu) = (X_1 \times X_2, \mu_1 \otimes \mu_2)$ be the product of measure spaces with σ -finite positive measures μ_1, μ_2 . Also, let F and G be Bessel mappings for \mathcal{H} with respect to (X, μ) and $m : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a measurable function. The operator $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ weakly defined by

$$(5.1) \quad \langle \mathbf{M}_{m,F,G} \vec{f}, \vec{g} \rangle = \int_X m(x) \langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle \langle G(x), \vec{g} \rangle d\mu(x),$$

for all $\vec{f}, \vec{g} \in \mathcal{H}$, is called *tensor product continuous Bessel multiplier* of F and G with respect to the *symbol* m . If, in addition, F and G are continuous frames, then $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ given by (5.1) is called *tensor product continuous frame multiplier*.

In the weak sense (5.1) is given by

$$(5.2) \quad \mathbf{M}_{m,F,G} \vec{f} := \int_X m(x) \langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle G(x) d\mu(x).$$

Sometimes we will refer to $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ given by (5.1) or (5.2) as *localization operator*.

Remark 5.2. If $m \equiv 1$ and F and G are Bessel mappings for \mathcal{H} with respect to (X, μ) , then $\mathbf{M}_{1,F,G}$ given by (5.1) is a well-defined and bounded sesquilinear form on \mathcal{H} .

If, in addition, the corresponding operator given by (5.2) has a bounded inverse, then (F, G) is a reproducing pair for \mathcal{H} in the sense of [48] (when

the definition of reproducing pairs is suitably interpreted for tensor product of Hilbert spaces).

If (F, G) is a dual pair of continuous frames (cf. Definition 3.7), then $\mathbf{M}_{1,F,G}$ given by (5.2) is the identity operator.

If $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$, then it immediately follows that $(\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G})^* = \mathbf{M}_{\overline{m},G,F}$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let F and G be as in Definition 5.1, with the Bessel bounds B_F and B_G respectively. If $m \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$, then the continuous tensor product Bessel multiplier $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ given by (5.1) is well defined and bounded with*

$$\|\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}\| \leq \|m\|_\infty \sqrt{B_F B_G}.$$

Proof. We modify the proof of [12, Lemma 3.3] for the case of tensor products. For each $\vec{f}, \vec{g} \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbf{M}_{m,F,G} \vec{f}, \vec{g} \rangle| &\leq \|m\|_\infty \int_X |\langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle \langle G(x), \vec{g} \rangle| d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \|m\|_\infty \left(\int_X |\langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_X |\langle G(x), \vec{g} \rangle|^2 d\mu(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \|m\|_\infty \sqrt{B_F B_G} \|\vec{f}\| \|\vec{g}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ is well defined and bounded. \square

Here and in what follows the norm in Lebesgue spaces $L^p(X, \mu)$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_p$. As usual, $\|\cdot\|_2 = \|\cdot\|$.

If $m(x) > 0$ a.e., then for any Bessel function F the multiplier $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,F}$ is a positive operator, and if $m(x) \geq \delta > 0$ for some positive constant δ and $\|m\|_\infty < \infty$ then $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,F}$ is just the frame operator of $\sqrt{m}F$ and so it is positive, self-adjoint and invertible, cf. [12].

By using analysis and synthesis operators for F and G , it is easy to see that

$$(5.3) \quad \mathbf{M}_{m,F,G} = T_G \circ D_m \circ T_F^*$$

where $D_m : L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^2(X, \mu)$ is given by $(D_m \varphi)(x) = m(x)\varphi(x)$. If $m \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$, then D_m is bounded and $\|D_m\| = \|m\|_\infty$, [19].

It follows from [12, Proposition 3.6] that multiplication operator D_m on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)$ (with dx denoting the Lebesgue measure) with $m \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)$ is compact if and only if the symbol is trivial. This constitutes an important difference between the discrete and the continuous case, see [10]. To prove sufficient conditions for compactness of tensor product continuous frame multipliers we thus have to choose a different approach than in the discrete setting. In fact, we closely follow the approach suggested in [12].

5.1. Compact Multipliers. Recall, a mapping F is norm bounded on (X, μ) if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|F(x)\| \leq C$ for almost every $x \in X$. Furthermore, the support of measurable function $m : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is of a finite measure if there exists a subset $K \subseteq X$ with $\mu(K) < \infty$ such that $m(x) = 0$ for almost every $x \in X \setminus K$.

We will use the following compactness criterion.

Lemma 5.4. [19] *Let X, Y be Banach spaces. A bounded operator $T : X \rightarrow Y$ is compact if and only if $\|Tx_n\| \rightarrow 0$ whenever $x_n \rightarrow 0$ weakly in X .*

Theorem 5.5. *Let F and G be as in Definition 5.1, and let either F or G be norm bounded. If $m : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a (essentially) bounded measurable function with support of finite measure, then $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ given by (5.1) is a compact operator.*

Proof. The proof is the same as the proof of [12, Theorem 3.7]. We repeat it here for the sake of completeness.

Assume first that F is bounded, $\|F(x)\| \leq M$ for almost all $x \in X$.

Let us prove that $D_m \circ T_F^* : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L^2(\Omega, \mu)$ is compact. To that end, assume that $f_n \rightarrow 0$ weakly. Then, since a weakly convergent sequence (\vec{f}_n) is bounded, i.e. there is a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|f_n\| \leq C$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |m(x)| \cdot |\langle \vec{f}_n, F(x) \rangle| &\leq \|m\|_\infty \cdot \|\vec{f}_n\| \cdot \|F(x)\| \\ &\leq \|m\|_\infty \cdot C \cdot M, \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_m \circ T_F^* \vec{f}_n\|^2 &= \int_X |m(x)|^2 \cdot |\langle \vec{f}_n, F(x) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_K |m(x)|^2 \cdot |\langle \vec{f}_n, F(x) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \|m\|_\infty^2 \cdot C^2 \cdot M^2 \mu(K) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where K denotes the support of m .

Furthermore, the weak convergence of (\vec{f}_n) implies $\langle \vec{f}_n, F(x) \rangle \rightarrow 0$ for every $x \in X$ fixed, so that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |m(x)|^2 \cdot |\langle \vec{f}_n, F(x) \rangle|^2 = 0,$$

pointwise for every fixed $x \in K$. By the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem we obtain

$$\int_K |m(x)|^2 \cdot |\langle \vec{f}_n, F(x) \rangle|^2 d\mu(x) \rightarrow 0,$$

when $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence the operator $D_m \circ T_F^*$ maps weakly convergent sequences to norm convergent ones, and it is therefore compact by Lemma 5.4.

Since T_G (the synthesis operator for G) is a bounded operator and $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G} = T_G \circ D_m \circ T_F^*$ (see (5.3)), we conclude that $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ is a compact operator.

If G is norm bounded instead of F , then we consider the adjoint operator

$$\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}^* = \mathbf{M}_{\bar{m},G,F} = T_F \circ D_{\bar{m}} \circ T_G^*.$$

By what we already shown, $\mathbf{M}_{\bar{m},G,F}$ is compact, and so is $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$. \square

The conclusion of Theorem 5.5 remains the same if, instead of having the support of finite measure, we assume that $m : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ vanishes at infinity, i.e. for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a set of finite measure $K = K(\varepsilon) \subseteq X$, $\mu(K) < \infty$, such that $m(x) \leq \varepsilon$ for almost every $x \in X \setminus K$ (cf. [12, Corollary 3.8]).

If, in addition, we assume that *both* F and G are norm bounded, then we have the following trace class result.

Theorem 5.6. *Let F and G be as in Definition 5.1 which are norm bounded with norm bounds L_F and L_G , respectively. If $m \in L^1(X, \mu)$, then $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ is a trace class operator with the trace norm estimate given by*

$$\|\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}\|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \leq \|m\|_1 L_F L_G.$$

For the proof we use the following criterion.

Lemma 5.7. [45] *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space. A bounded operator $T : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is trace class if and only if $\sum_n |\langle T e_n, e_n \rangle| < \infty$ for any orthonormal basis (e_n) of \mathcal{H} . Moreover,*

$$\|T\|_{\mathcal{S}_1} = \sup \left\{ \sum_n |\langle T e_n, e_n \rangle| : (e_n) \text{ orthonormal basis} \right\}.$$

Proof. (proof of Theorem 5.6) We first show that $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ is a well defined and bounded operator. In fact, for arbitrary $\vec{f}, \vec{g} \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbf{M}_{m,F,G} \vec{f}, \vec{g} \rangle| &\leq \int_X |m(x)| \left| \langle \vec{f}, F(x) \rangle \right| \left| \langle G(x), \vec{g} \rangle \right| d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_X |m(x)| \|\vec{f}\| \|F(x)\| \|\vec{g}\| \|G(x)\| d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \|\vec{f}\| \|\vec{g}\| L_F L_G \int_X |m(x)| d\mu(x) \\ &= \|\vec{f}\| \|\vec{g}\| L_F L_G \|m\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ is a well defined bounded linear operator (cf. (2.1)).

Next, we take an arbitrary orthonormal basis (\vec{e}_n) of \mathcal{H} to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_n |\langle \mathbf{M}_{m,F,G} \vec{e}_n, \vec{e}_n \rangle| \\
&= \sum_n \left| \int_X m(x) \langle \vec{e}_n, F(x) \rangle \langle G(x), \vec{e}_n \rangle d\mu(x) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_n \int_X |m(x)| \cdot |\langle \vec{e}_n, F(x) \rangle| \cdot |\langle G(x), \vec{e}_n \rangle| d\mu(x) \\
&= \int_X |m(x)| \sum_n |\langle \vec{e}_n, F(x) \rangle| \cdot |\langle G(x), \vec{e}_n \rangle| d\mu(x) \\
&\leq \int_X |m(x)| \left(\sum_n |\langle \vec{e}_n, F(x) \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_n |\langle G(x), \vec{e}_n \rangle|^2 \right)^{1/2} d\mu(x) \\
&= \int_X |m(x)| \|F(x)\| \|G(x)\| d\mu(x) \\
&\leq \|m\|_1 L_F L_G,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Fubini's theorem, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and Parseval's equality. By Lemma 5.7 it follows that $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ is a trace class operator with the norm estimate $\|\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}\|_{\mathcal{S}_1} \leq \|m\|_1 L_F L_G$. \square

Having established the boundedness in Lemma 5.3 and the trace class result in Theorem 5.6, we are now able to extend the result to the whole family of Schatten p -classes by complex interpolation, see e.g. [15]. We omit the proof since it follows by a slight modification of the proof of [12, Theorem 3.11].

Theorem 5.8. *Let F and G be norm bounded Bessel mappings for \mathcal{H} with norm bounds L_F and L_G , respectively. Let $m \in L^p(X, \mu)$, $1 < p < \infty$. Then $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ is a well defined bounded operator that belongs to the Schatten p -class $\mathcal{S}_p(\mathcal{H})$, with norm estimate*

$$\|\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}\|_{\mathcal{S}_p} \leq \|m\|_p (L_F L_G)^{1/p} (B_F B_G)^{1/2q}.$$

Recall, if $A \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})$, then its trace is defined to be

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(A) = \sum_n \langle A e_n, e_n \rangle,$$

for any ONB in \mathcal{H} . We have $|\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(A)| \leq \|A\|_{\mathcal{S}_1}$, with the equality if A is a positive operator.

For tensor product Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, the following partial trace theorem holds.

Theorem 5.9. *Let \mathcal{H} be a tensor product Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, and let $A \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})$. Then there is a continuous and linear map*

$$(5.4) \quad T : \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}_1)$$

such that the following properties hold:

$$(5.5) \quad T(A_1 \otimes A_2) = A_1 \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_2}(A_2), \quad \forall A_j \in \mathcal{S}_j(\mathcal{H}_j), \quad j = 1, 2,$$

$$(5.6) \quad \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_1}(T(A)) = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(A), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}).$$

Proof of Theorem 5.9 is contained in the proof of [16, Theorem 26.7], and therefore omitted.

If T is the mapping given by (5.4), then $T(A)$ is called the *partial trace* of A with respect to \mathcal{H}_1 . In a similar way we may define the partial trace of A with respect to \mathcal{H}_2 .

In Section 7 we will use the following simple consequence of Definition 5.1 and Theorem 5.9.

Corollary 5.10. *Let m_j be measurable functions on X_j , let F_j and G_j be continuous Bessel mappings (frames) for \mathcal{H}_j , $j = 1, 2$, and let $m = m_1 \otimes m_2$, $F = F_1 \otimes F_2$, and $G = G_1 \otimes G_2$. If $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G} \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)$, then its partial trace $T(\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G})$ with respect to \mathcal{H}_1 is a continuous Bessel (frame) multiplier given by*

$$T(\mathbf{M}_{m_1,F_1,G_1} \otimes \mathbf{M}_{m_2,F_2,G_2}) = \mathbf{M}_{m_1,F_1,G_1} \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_2}(\mathbf{M}_{m_2,F_2,G_2}),$$

i.e. it is a trace class operator of "the same form" as $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$.

Moreover, if $\mathbf{M}_{m_j,F_j,G_j} \in \mathcal{S}_j(\mathcal{H}_j)$, $j = 1, 2$, then $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G} \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)$ and

$$T(\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}) = \mathbf{M}_{m_1,F_1,G_1} \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_2}(\mathbf{M}_{m_2,F_2,G_2}).$$

Similar holds for the partial trace of $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ with respect to \mathcal{H}_2 .

5.2. Changing the Ingredients. Next we briefly discuss the sensitivity of $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ with respect to certain perturbations of m , F or G .

Let $m, m' \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$ and let F, F', G , and G' be Bessel functions for \mathcal{H} . By (5.3) and the linearity of $T_F, T'_F, T_G, T'_G, D_m$ and D'_m , we have

$$(5.7) \quad \mathbf{M}_{m,F,G} - \mathbf{M}_{m',F,G} = T_G D_{m-m'} T_F^* = \mathbf{M}_{m-m',F,G},$$

$$(5.8) \quad \mathbf{M}_{m,F,G} - \mathbf{M}_{m,F',G} = T_G D_m T_{F-F'}^* = \mathbf{M}_{m,F-F',G},$$

$$(5.9) \quad \mathbf{M}_{m,F,G} - \mathbf{M}_{m,F,G'} = T_{G-G'} D_m T_F^* = \mathbf{M}_{m,F,G-G'}.$$

Now Lemma 5.3, Theorem 5.8, and (5.7) give the following result.

Theorem 5.11. *Let F and G be Bessel mappings for \mathcal{H} with respect to (X, μ) and $m : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a measurable function. Let $m^{(n)}$ be functions indexed by $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m^{(n)} \rightarrow m$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Then $\mathbf{M}_{m^{(n)},F,G}$ converges to $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ in the Schatten- p -norm, i.e. $\|\mathbf{M}_{m^{(n)},F,G} - \mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}\|_{\mathcal{S}_p} \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Next we consider perturbations of Bessel mappings. The result can be proved in the same way as it is done in [12], and therefore the proof is omitted (see also [9]).

Theorem 5.12. *Let F and G be Bessel mappings for \mathcal{H} , and let $F^{(n)}$ be a sequence of Bessel mappings such that $F^{(n)}(x) \rightarrow F(x)$ in a uniform strong sense. Assume that one of the following conditions holds.*

- a) $m \in L^2(X, \mu)$.
- b) $m \in L^1(X, \mu)$ and G be norm-bounded.

Then $M_{m, F^{(n)}, G}$ converges to $M_{m, F, G}$ in the operator norm.

In Theorem 5.12 the roles of F and G can be switched, leading to the same conclusion.

6. BILINEAR LOCALIZATION OPERATORS

In this section we reveal bilinear localization operators as examples of tensor product continuous frame multipliers. In the case of time-frequency localization operators (STFT multipliers), the results from Section 5 are in line with those of [22, 49], while their interpretation in the case of wavelet multipliers (Calderón–Toeplitz operators) and mixed STFT/wavelet multipliers seems to be new, although their "linear" counterpart are well studied, see for example [12]. In addition, let us mention that the boundedness of localization operators for the ridgelet transform given in [41] can be derived from the results of [12].

Time-frequency localization operators are used in signal analysis as a mathematical tool to extract specific features of a signal from its phase space representations. In other contexts, they have been used as a quantization procedure, or as an approximation of pseudodifferential operators, cf. [23] and the references given there.

We first recall some necessary facts.

Let $T_x f(\cdot) := f(\cdot - x)$, $M_\omega f(\cdot) := e^{2\pi i \omega \cdot} f(\cdot)$, and $D_a f(\cdot) := |a|^{-d/2} f(\frac{\cdot}{a})$, denote translation, modulation, and dilation operators, respectively, $x, \omega \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. These operators are unitary on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and we use the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(x, \omega) &= M_\omega T_x, & \text{for } (x, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}, \\ \pi_{\text{aff}}(b, a) &= T_b D_a, & \text{for } b \in \mathbb{R}^d, a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let \hat{g} denote the Fourier transform of $g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ given by $\hat{g}(\omega) = \int g(t) e^{-2\pi i t \omega} dt$. This definition extends to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by density arguments. We say that $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is *admissible* if

$$0 < C_g := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\hat{g}(\omega)|^2}{|\omega|} d\omega < +\infty.$$

Definition 6.1. Let $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\}$. The short-time Fourier transform (STFT) of a function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with respect to the window function g is given by

$$V_g f(x, \omega) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(t) \overline{g(t-x)} e^{-2\pi i \omega t} dt = \langle f, M_\omega T_x g \rangle = \langle f, \pi(x, \omega) g \rangle,$$

$(x, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. If, in addition, g is admissible, then the (continuous) wavelet transform of $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with respect to the admissible wavelet g is given by

$$W_g(f)(b, a) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(t) \frac{1}{|a|^{\frac{d}{2}}} \overline{g(a^{-1}(t-b))} dt = \langle f, T_b D_a g \rangle = \langle f, \pi_{\text{aff}}(b, a)g \rangle,$$

$b \in \mathbb{R}^d, a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$.

Definition 6.1 can be extended to various spaces of (generalized) functions, but we focus our attention here to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to make the exposition of our main ideas more transparent.

By the orthogonality relation (see e.g. [34, Theorem 3.2.1])

$$\langle V_{g_1} f_1, V_{g_2} f_2 \rangle = \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle \overline{\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle}, \quad f_1, f_2 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad g_1, g_2 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\},$$

if $g_1 = g_2 = g$ it follows that $\pi(x, \omega)g$ is a continuous tight frame for $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with bound $\|g\|^2$, for any $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\}$. If $\|g\| = 1$, then we have a continuous Parseval frame.

Likewise, for the wavelet transform the following orthogonality relation holds:

$$\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} W_{g_1}(f_1)(b, a) \overline{W_{g_2}(f_2)(b, a)} \frac{db da}{a^{d+1}} = C_{g_1, g_2} \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad f_1, f_2 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

if $g_1, g_2 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are such that for almost all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|\omega| = 1$,

$$\int_0^\infty |\hat{g}_1(s\omega)| |\hat{g}_2(s\omega)| \frac{ds}{s} < \infty,$$

and the constant C_{g_1, g_2} given by

$$C_{g_1, g_2} := \int_0^\infty \overline{\hat{g}_1(s\omega)} \hat{g}_2(s\omega) \frac{ds}{s}$$

is finite, non-zero, and independent on ω , cf. [34, Theorem 10.2].

If $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is an admissible and rotation invariant function, then the orthogonality relation holds for $g = g_1 = g_2$, and $\pi_{\text{aff}}(b, a)g$ is a continuous tight frame for $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with respect to $(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, \frac{db da}{a^{d+1}})$. The frame bound is $1/C_{g, g}$, and if g is suitably normed so that $C_{g, g} = 1$, then we have a continuous Parseval frame.

Related continuous frame multipliers, called STFT and Calderon-Toeplitz multipliers, were considered in [12]. Here we consider the tensor product space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

If $\vec{f}, \vec{\varphi} \in \mathcal{H}$, then

$$V_{\vec{\varphi}} \vec{f}(x, \omega) = \langle \vec{f}, \pi(x, \omega) \vec{\varphi} \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \vec{f}(t) \overline{\pi(x, \omega) \vec{\varphi}(t)} dt, \quad x, \omega \in \mathbb{R}^{2d},$$

and if $\vec{\varphi}(t) = \varphi_1 \otimes \varphi_2(t) = \varphi_1(t_1)\varphi_2(t_2)$, $t = (t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, then $V_{\vec{\varphi}}$ acts on a simple tensor $f_1 \otimes f_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ as

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{aligned} V_{\varphi_1 \otimes \varphi_2}(f_1 \otimes f_2)(x, \omega) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (f_1 \otimes f_2)(t) \overline{\pi(x, \omega)\varphi_1 \otimes \varphi_2(t)} dt \\ &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f_1 \otimes f_2)(t) \overline{\pi(x_1, \omega_1)\varphi_1(t_1)\pi(x_2, \omega_2)\varphi_2(t_2)} dt_1 dt_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi(x_j, \omega_j) = M_{\omega_j} T_{x_j}$, $j = 1, 2$. By (6.1) and [46, Proposition 2.5] we extend the orthogonality relation from simple tensors to conclude that

$$\pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}(t) = \pi(x_1, \omega_1)\varphi_1(t_1)\pi(x_2, \omega_2)\varphi_2(t_2), \quad x, \omega \in \mathbb{R}^{2d},$$

with $t = (t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, is a continuous tensor product tight frame, i.e.

$$\langle \vec{f}, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi} \rangle = \|\vec{f}\| \|\vec{\varphi}\|.$$

If, moreover, $\vec{\varphi} \in \mathcal{H}$ is chosen so that $\|\vec{\varphi}\| = 1$, then the $\pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}$ is a Parseval frame. For more on tensor representations see [13].

Let $\vec{\varphi}$ be given as above, $\vec{\phi} = \phi_1 \otimes \phi_2 \in \mathcal{H}$, $\|\vec{\phi}\| = 1$, and let $a : \mathbb{R}^{4d} \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ be a measurable function. Then the tensor product continuous frame multipliers of the form

$$M_{a, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\phi}}$$

can be identified with bilinear localization operators considered in [20, 49] (see Remark 1.2 in [49]), i.e.

$$(6.2) \quad \langle M_{a, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\phi}} \vec{f}, \vec{g} \rangle = \langle a V_{\varphi_1 \otimes \varphi_2}(f_1 \otimes f_2), V_{\phi_1 \otimes \phi_2}(g_1 \otimes g_2) \rangle,$$

$f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The function a is commonly called *the symbol* of the operator $M_{a, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\phi}}$.

Certain Schatten class properties of bilinear localization operators can be deduced from their linear counterparts given in e.g. [20, 21]. In these investigations, localization operators are interpreted as Weyl pseudodifferential operators. We note that these results extend results from Section 5 in the considered special case. However, if $a \in L^p(X, \mu)$, $1 < p < \infty$, with $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ and μ being the Lebesgue measure on X , then the fact that $M_{a, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\phi}} \in \mathcal{S}_p(\mathcal{H})$ follows from Theorem 5.8, which gives a simple alternative proof of related particular results from [20].

Next we discuss bilinear Calderón-Toeplitz operators. To that end we consider time-scale shifts, and the Haar measure $\mu = dbda/a^{d+1}$.

Let φ_1, φ_2 be admissible rotation invariant wavelets, $\vec{\varphi} = \varphi_1 \otimes \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{H}$, and let $\vec{f} \in \mathcal{H}$. Then the tensor product continuous wavelet transform is given by

$$W_{\vec{\varphi}}(\vec{f})(b, a) = \langle \vec{f}, \pi_{\text{aff}}(b, a)\vec{\varphi} \rangle, \quad b \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}, a \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}.$$

It acts on a simple tensor $f_1 \otimes f_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ as

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} W_{\vec{\varphi}}(f_1 \otimes f_2)(b, a) &= W_{\varphi_1}(f_1) \otimes W_{\varphi_2}(f_2)(b_1, b_2, a_1, a_2) \\ &= \langle f_1, \pi_{\text{aff}}(b_1, a_1)\varphi_1 \rangle \langle f_2, \pi_{\text{aff}}(b_2, a_2)\varphi_2 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $b = (b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, $a = (a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$, and

$$\pi_{\text{aff}}(b, a)\vec{\varphi} = \pi_{\text{aff}}(b_1, a_1)\varphi_1 \otimes \pi_{\text{aff}}(b_2, a_2)\varphi_2.$$

By (6.3) and [46, Proposition 2.5] the orthogonality relation extends from simple tensors and we conclude that

$$\pi_{\text{aff}}(b, a)\vec{\varphi}(t), \quad b \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}, a \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\},$$

is a continuous tensor product tight frame.

If, in addition, $\vec{\phi} = \phi_1 \otimes \phi_2 \in \mathcal{H}$, where ϕ_1, ϕ_2 are admissible rotation invariant wavelets such that $\|\vec{\phi}\| = 1$, and if $a : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\} \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ is a measurable function, then the tensor product continuous frame multipliers of the form

$$M_{a, \pi_{\text{aff}}(b, a)\vec{\varphi}, \pi_{\text{aff}}(b, a)\vec{\phi}}$$

can be interpreted as a bilinear extension of (two)wavelet localization operators considered in [52].

Now, we have the following simple result, which seems to be new.

Corollary 6.2. *Let $\vec{\phi} = \phi_1 \otimes \phi_2 \in \mathcal{H}$, where ϕ_1, ϕ_2 are admissible rotation invariant wavelets such that $\|\vec{\phi}\| = 1$. If $a \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}, \frac{dbda}{|a|^{d+1}})$, then*

$$M_{a, \pi_{\text{aff}}(b, a)\vec{\varphi}, \pi_{\text{aff}}(b, a)\vec{\phi}} \in \mathcal{S}_p(\mathcal{H}).$$

Proof. Follows immediately from Theorem 5.8. Again, we refer to [52] where the "linear" case is studied. \square

Finally, we may combine STFT and wavelet continuous tight frames and consider bilinear localization operators of the mixed-form

$$(6.4) \quad M_{a, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}, \pi_{\text{aff}}(b, a)\vec{\phi}} \quad \text{and} \quad M_{a, \pi_{\text{aff}}(b, a)\vec{\varphi}, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\phi}},$$

for suitable choices of (admissible) vectors $\vec{\varphi}$ and $\vec{\phi}$. Again, if the symbol $a \in L^p(X, \mu)$, $1 < p < \infty$, with the appropriate choice of X and μ , then Theorem 5.8 implies that the mixed type localization operators in (6.4) belong to $\mathcal{S}_p(\mathcal{H})$.

We refer to [13] where a general approach based on the coorbit space theory is used to obtain deep continuity results for related kernel type operators.

7. LOCALIZATION OPERATORS AS DENSITY OPERATORS OF QUANTUM SYSTEMS

In this section we first briefly recall the notion of a density operator, and then propose an interpretation of specific tensor product continuous frame multipliers as density operators.

In Section 2 we mentioned that a vector $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ is entangled if its Schmidt representation contains more than one term. Assume now that ψ represents the wave function which describes the quantum system of two particles, also called bipartite or combined system: $\psi = \psi(x, y)$, where x is the position of the first particle, and y is the position of the second particle, and typically $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^6)$.

If there is an interaction between the particles, then ψ is an entangled state, and there does not seem to be a way to associate a vector $\tilde{\psi} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ which could sensibly describe the state of the first (or second) particle, see [16, 35]. To overcome this obstacle a more general notion of the "state" of a quantum system is introduced by associating expectation value of an observable on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with respect to the wave function ψ . This notion turned out to be that of *density operator*, which is uniquely determined by a given family of expectation values. A density operator is a non-negative, self-adjoint operator $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)$ such that $\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2}(\rho) = 1$.

A class of density operators, called Toeplitz operators is recently studied in [33]. They correspond to quantum states obtained from a fixed function by position–momentum translations. This approach is closely related to the STFT multipliers, and we complement the investigations from [33] by considering the corresponding partial traces (reduced density operators).

By partial trace theorem (Theorem 5.9), a density operator of a subsystem can be defined as a partial trace of the density operator for the whole system. This procedure gives a reasonable description of a subsystem of bipartite system of interacting particles (entangled system). In particular, if $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)$ is of the form $\rho = \rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$, then the corresponding density operators for subsystems \mathcal{H}_j , $j = 1, 2$, given by partial trace theorem are exactly ρ_j , $j = 1, 2$. This describes the situation when the state of the first system is independent on the state of the second one. The opposite direction, i.e. the existence of a pure state ρ such that given ρ_j , $j = 1, 2$, are its partial traces is considered in [40]. Recently, for given ρ_j , $j = 1, 2$, necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of ρ with $\text{supp}\rho \subset \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ such that ρ_j , $j = 1, 2$, are its partial traces are given in [29]. These investigations lead to interesting insights related to different types of operator convergence. For example, the weak convergence is not preserved under the partial trace. We refer to [29] for details in that direction.

It is known that characteristic functions of a certain region in phase space give rise to trace class localization operators and may serve to extract time-frequency features of a signal when restricted to that region, see [25]. Thus, it seems plausible to identify convenient tensor product continuous frame

multipliers as "localized versions" of density operators of bipartite systems, and use their partial traces to study the features of a subsystem. Of course, to be appropriate candidate of a density operator, such multipliers should satisfy certain conditions.

Definition 7.1. Let $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ be a tensor product continuous Bessel (frame) multiplier of F and G with respect to the symbol m . Then, $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}$ is *admissible* if it is non-negative, self-adjoint trace class operator such that

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{M}_{m,F,G}) = 1.$$

As noted in Section 5, if F is a continuous frame, $m(x) \geq \delta > 0$ and $\|m\|_{\infty} < \infty$, then $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,F}$ is positive, self-adjoint and invertible. For a given F , the trace of $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,F}$ depends on the symbol m , which can be designed in such a way to ensure that $\mathbf{M}_{m,F,F}$ is in fact an admissible multiplier.

To illustrate this idea we consider a particular case of STFT multipliers.

Lemma 7.2. *Let there be given $\varphi, \phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $c_{\varphi,\phi} = \langle \varphi, \phi \rangle \neq 0$. If $a \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) \cap L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, then*

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_{a,\pi(x,\omega)\varphi,\pi(x,\omega)\phi}) = c_{\varphi,\phi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} a(x,\omega) dx d\omega, \quad x, \omega \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of [52, Theorem 16.1] which is formulated in terms of irreducible and square-integrable representations of locally compact Hausdorff groups. We give it here for the sake of completeness. Let $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an ONB in \mathcal{H} . Then, by Fubini's theorem, Parseval's equality, and since $\pi(x,\omega)$ acts unitary on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_{a,\pi(x,\omega)\varphi,\pi(x,\omega)\phi}) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle M_{a,\pi(x,\omega)\varphi,\pi(x,\omega)\phi} e_n, e_n \rangle \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} a(x,\omega) \langle e_n, \pi(x,\omega)\varphi \rangle \langle \pi(x,\omega)\phi, e_n \rangle dx d\omega \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} a(x,\omega) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle e_n, \pi(x,\omega)\varphi \rangle \langle \pi(x,\omega)\phi, e_n \rangle dx d\omega \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} a(x,\omega) \langle \pi(x,\omega)\varphi, \pi(x,\omega)\phi \rangle dx d\omega \\ &= c_{\varphi,\phi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} a(x,\omega) dx d\omega, \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is finished. \square

By Lemma 7.2 we have the following important conclusion, which also gives an affirmative answer to the question of de Gosson [33, Section 5] related to the restriction of the structure of a density operator to its partial traces.

Proposition 7.3. *Let there be given $\varphi_j, \phi_j \in \mathcal{H}_j$ such that $\langle \varphi_j, \phi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_j} \neq 0$ and $\|\varphi_j\| = \|\phi_j\| = 1$, $j = 1, 2$. If $\vec{\varphi} = \varphi_1 \otimes \varphi_2$, $\vec{\phi} = \phi_1 \otimes \phi_2 \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, and if $a \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{4d}) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{4d})$ is chosen so that*

$$(7.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4d}} a(x, \omega) dx d\omega = \frac{1}{\langle \vec{\varphi}, \vec{\phi} \rangle},$$

then $\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_{a, \pi(x, \omega)\varphi, \pi(x, \omega)\phi}) = 1$, where $M_{a, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\phi}}$ is given by (6.2).

If, in addition $\vec{\varphi} = \vec{\phi}$, and a is a positive function, then $M_{a, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}}$ is an admissible multiplier.

Proof. To proof the first part, it is enough to consider the extension of Lemma 7.2 to tensor product Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$.

The second part follows from the fact that $M_{a, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}}$ is the frame operator of $\sqrt{a}\vec{\varphi}$ and so it is positive, self-adjoint and invertible. Since by Lemma 7.2 and (7.1)

$$\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(M_{a, \pi(x, \omega)\varphi, \pi(x, \omega)\phi}) = \langle \vec{\varphi}, \vec{\phi} \rangle \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4d}} a(x, \omega) dx d\omega = \langle \vec{\varphi}, \vec{\phi} \rangle \cdot \frac{1}{\langle \vec{\varphi}, \vec{\phi} \rangle} = 1,$$

it follows that $M_{a, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}, \pi(x, \omega)\vec{\varphi}}$ is an admissible multiplier. \square

If $a(x, \omega) = a_1(x_1, \omega_1) \otimes a_2(x_2, \omega_2)$, $x_j, \omega_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $j = 1, 2$, then by Corollary 5.10 and Proposition 7.3, we conclude that the partial traces are localization operators of the form $M_{a_j, \pi(x, \omega)\varphi_j, \pi(x, \omega)\varphi_j}$, $j = 1, 2$.

Lemma 7.2 and Proposition 7.3 can be formulated in terms of Calderón-Toeplitz and mixed type multipliers.

Thus, in principle, the window functions $\varphi_j, \phi_j, j = 1, 2$, and the symbol a can be chosen in a particular way for the study of different aspects of bipartite quantum systems. This issue will be discussed elsewhere.

Acknowledgments: This work is supported by projects ANACRES and TIFREFUS, MPNTR of Serbia Grant No. 451-03-9/2021-14/200125, MN-RVOID of the Republic of Srpska project 19.032/961103/1, and the project P 34624 "Localized, Fusion and Tensors of Frames" (LoFT) of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF). The first author thanks Nora Simovich for help with typing.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ali, S.T., Antoine, J.P., Gazeau, J.P.: *Coherent States, Wavelets, and Their Generalizations*, Springer-Verlag, 2000.
- [2] Ali, S.T., Antoine, J.P. and Gazeau, J.P.: *Continuous Frames in Hilbert Spaces*, Annals of Physics. **222**, 1–37, 1993.
- [3] Antoine, J.P., Balazs, P.: *Frames and semi-frames*. J. Phys. A-Math. Theor., **44**, 205201, 2011.
- [4] Antoine, J.P., Speckbacher, M., Trapani, C.: *Reproducing pairs of measurable functions*, Acta Appl. Math. **150**, 81–101, 2017.

- [5] Arefijamaal, A. A., Razghandi, A.: *Characterization of alternate duals of continuous frames and representation frames*. Results in Mathematics, **74**: 191, 2019 .
- [6] Askari-Hemmat, A., Dehghan, M.A. and Radjabalipour, M.: *Generalized Frames and Their Redundancy*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **129**, 1143–1147, 2001.
- [7] Balazs, P.: *Regular and Irregular Gabor Multipliers with Application to Psychoacoustic Masking*, PhD thesis, University of Vienna, 2005.
- [8] Balazs, P., Feichtinger, H. G., Hampejs, M., Kracher, G.: *Double preconditioning for Gabor frames*. IEEE Trans. Signal Process., **54**, 4597–4610, 2006.
- [9] Balazs, P.: *Basic Definition and Properties of Bessel Multipliers*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications **325**, 571–585, 2007.
- [10] Balazs, P.: *Hilbert-Schmidt Operators and Frames - Classifications, Approximation by Multipliers and Algorithms*, International Journal of Wavelets, Multiresolution and Information Processing **6**, 315–330, 2008.
- [11] Balazs, P.: *Matrix Representations of Operators Using Frames*, Sampling Theory in Signal and Image Processing **7**, 39–54, 2008.
- [12] Balazs, P., Bayer, D. and Rahimi, A.: *Multipliers for continuous frames in Hilbert spaces*, Journal of Physcis A: Mathematical and Theoretical, **45**, 244023, 2012.
- [13] Balazs, P., Gröchenig, K., Speckbacher, M.: *Kernel theorems in coorbit Theory*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. Ser. B **6**, 346–364, 2019.
- [14] Balazs, P., Osgooei, E., Rahimi, A., *Classification of functions by frame related operators in measure spaces*, preprint.
- [15] Bergh, J., Löfström, J.: *Interpolation Spaces. An Introduction*, Grundlehren der math. Wissenschaften 223, Springer, Berlin, 1976.
- [16] Blanchard, P., Brüning, E.: *Mathematical Methods in Physics* , Progress in Mathematical Physics 69, Birkhäuser Basel, 2015.
- [17] Bourouhiya, A.: *The tensor product of frames*, Sampl. Theory Signal Image Process. **7**, 65–76, 2008.
- [18] Christensen, O.: *An Introduction to Frames and Riesz Bases*, second edition, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2016.
- [19] Conway, J.B. : *A Course in Functional Analysis*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, second edition, Springer, Berlin, 1990.
- [20] Cordero, E., Gröchenig, K.: *Time-frequency analysis of localization operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **205**, 107–131, 2003.
- [21] Cordero, E., Pilipović, S., Rodino, L., Teofanov, N.: *Localization operators and exponential weights for modulation spaces*, Mediterr. J. Math. **2**, 381–394, 2005.
- [22] Cordero, E., Okoudjou, K. A.: *Multilinear localization operators*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **325**, 1103–1116, 2007.
- [23] Cordero, E., Rodino, L.: *Time-Frequency Analysis of Operators*, De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics **75**, De Gruyter, Berlin, 2020.
- [24] Corso, R.: *Generalized frame operator, lower semi-frames and sequences of translates*, preprint, arXiv:1912.03261
- [25] Daubechies, I.: *Time-Frequency Localization Operators: a Geometric Phase Space Approach I*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **34**, 605–612, 1988.
- [26] Daubechies, I. and Paul, T.: *Time-Frequency Localization Operators: a Geometric Phase Space Approach II. The Use of Dilations*, Inverse Probl. **4**, 661–680, 1988.
- [27] Feichtinger, H. G., Nowak, K.: *A First Survey of Gabor Multipliers*, in *Advances in Gabor Analysis* (Feichtinger H. G., Strohmer, T. eds.) 99–128, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2003.
- [28] Folland, G.B.: *A Course in Abstract Harmonic Analysis*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1995.
- [29] Friedland, S., Ge, J., Zhi L.: *Quantum Strassen's theorem*, Infinite Dimensional Analysis, Quantum Probability and Related Topics **23**, 2050020, 2020.

- [30] Gaal, S. A.: *Linear Analysis and Representation Theory*, Springer, Berlin, New York, 1973.
- [31] Gabardo, J.-P. and Han, D.: *Frames associated with measurable space*, Adv. Comp. Math. **18**, 127–147, 2003.
- [32] García, A. G., Ibort, A., Muñoz-Bouzo, M. J.: *Modeling sampling in tensor products of unitary invariant subspaces*, J. Funct. Spaces **2016**, Art. ID 4573940, 2016.
- [33] de Gosson M.: *Generalized Anti-Wick Quantum States*, in *Landscapes of Time-Frequency Analysis ATFA 2019* (Boggiatto P. et al. (eds), Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis, 123–134, Birkhäuser, Cham, 2020.
- [34] Gröchenig, K.: *Foundations of Time-Frequency Analysis*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2001.
- [35] Hall, B.C.: *Quantum Theory for Mathematicians*, Springer, New York, 2013.
- [36] Heil, C.: *A Basis Theory Primer: Expanded Edition*, Springer, New York, 2011.
- [37] Kadison, R. V. and Ringrose, J. R., *Fundamentals of the theory of operator algebras. Vol. I. Elementary theory*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.
- [38] Kaiser, G.: *A Friendly Guide to Wavelets*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1994.
- [39] Khosravi, A., Asgari, M.S.: *Frames and bases in tensor product of Hilbert spaces*, Int. Math. J. **4**, 527–537, 2003.
- [40] Klyachko, A.: *Quantum marginal problem and representations of the symmetric group*, arXiv:quant-ph/0409113, 2004.
- [41] Li, J., Wong, M.W.: *Localization Operators for Ridgelet Transforms*, Math. Model. Nat. Phenom. **9**, 194–203, 2014.
- [42] Molahajloo, S., Okoudjou K. A. and Pfander, G. E., Boundedness of Multilinear Pseudodifferential Operators on Modulation Spaces, J. Fourier Anal. Appl., **22**, 1381–1415, 2016.
- [43] Murphy, G.J.: *C*-Algebras and Operator Theory*, Academic Press, 1990.
- [44] Paulsen, V. I. and Raghupathi, M., *An introduction to the theory of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [45] Pietsch, A.: *Operator Ideals*, North-Holland Publishing Company, 1980.
- [46] Rahimi, A., Najati, A. and Dehghan, Y.N.: *Continuous Frames in Hilbert Spaces*, Methods of Functional Analysis and Topology **12**, 170–182, 2006.
- [47] Speckbacher, M., Balazs, P.: *Reproducing pairs and the continuous nonstationary Gabor transform on LCA groups*, J. Phys. A **48** 395201, 2015.
- [48] Speckbacher, M., Balazs, P.: *Frames, their relatives and reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor., **53**, 015204, 2020.
- [49] Teofanov, N.: *Bilinear Localization Operators on Modulation Spaces*, Journal of Function Spaces, **2018**, Article ID 7560870, 10 pages, 2018.
- [50] Wang, Y.-H.; Li, Y.-Z.: *Tensor product dual frames*. J. Inequal. Appl. **2019**, 76, 2019.
- [51] Wiatowski, T., and Bölcskei H., *Deep convolutional neural networks based on semi-discrete frames*, IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), 1212–1216, 2015.
- [52] Wong, M. W.: *Wavelet transforms and localization operators*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2002.

¹ ACOUSTICS RESEARCH INSTITUTE, AUSTRIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, WOHLLEBEN-GASSE 12-14, 1040 WIEN, AUSTRIA.

Email address: peter.balazs@oeaw.ac.at

² DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NOVI SAD FACULTY OF SCIENCES, TRG D. OBRADOVIĆA 4, NOVI SAD, SERBIA.

Email address: nenad.teofanov@dmi.uns.ac.rs