

CHARACTERISATIONS OF DILATIONS VIA APPROXIMANTS, EXPECTATIONS, AND FUNCTIONAL CALCULI

RAJ DAHYA

ABSTRACT. We consider characterisations of unitary dilations and approximations of irreversible classical dynamical systems on a Hilbert space. In the commutative case, building on the work in [9], one can express well known approximants (*e.g.* Hille- and Yosida-approximants) via expectations over certain stochastic processes. Using this, our first result characterises the simultaneous regular unitary dilatability of commuting families of C_0 -semigroups via the dilatability of such approximants as well as via regular polynomial bounds. This extends the results in [13] to the unbounded setting. We secondly consider characterisations of unitary and regular unitary dilations via two distinct functional calculi. Applying these tools to a large class of classical dynamical systems, these two notions of dilation exactly characterise when a system admits unitary approximations under certain distinct notions of weak convergence. This establishes a sharp topological distinction between the two notions of unitary dilations. Our results are applicable to commutative systems as well as non-commutative systems satisfying the *canonical commutation relations* (CCR) in the Weyl form.

1. INTRODUCTION

Classical dynamical systems on Hilbert or Banach spaces, which are in general irreversible, can be studied in at least two natural ways in terms of more ideal systems: via approximations and via embeddings into (or: ‘dilations’ to) larger reversible systems. Towards the former, see *e.g.* [24, 6, 9, 29]. The study of the latter was in part inspired by a result from Halmos [23], and properly initiated by Sz.-Nagy and Foias in [42, 43] with their work on unitary (power) dilations of contractions and of 1-parameter contractive C_0 -semigroups over Hilbert spaces. Remaining in the commutative setting, various results have been achieved for systems consisting of multiple operators as well as multi-parameter C_0 -semigroups (see *e.g.* [2, 39, 40, 35, 31, 38]). For a good overview, see *e.g.* [3, 37].

In the **first part** of this paper (§2–3), we shall first consider commutative systems of C_0 -semigroups. Note that a commuting family $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of unitary C_0 -semigroups on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} can be uniquely extended to an SOT-continuous unitary representation U of $(\mathbb{R}^d, +, \mathbf{0})$ on \mathcal{H} defined via $U(\mathbf{t}) := (\prod_{i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{t}^-)} U_i(t_i^-))^* (\prod_{i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{t}^+)} U_i(t_i^+))$ for all $\mathbf{t} = (t_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $t^- = \max\{-t, 0\}$ and $t^+ = \max\{t, 0\}$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ (*cf.* Stone’s theorem [22, Theorem I.4.7]). Bearing this in mind, a commuting family $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{H} is said to have a *simultaneous regular unitary dilation* if

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^d T(t_i^-) \right)^* \left(\prod_{i=1}^d T(t_i^+) \right) = r^* U(\mathbf{t}) r$$

holds for all $\mathbf{t} = (t_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for some SOT-continuous unitary representation U of $(\mathbb{R}^d, +, \mathbf{0})$ on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_1 and some isometry $r \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_1)$ (and in this case we shall refer to the data (\mathcal{H}_1, U, r) as the simultaneous regular unitary dilation).^a A *simultaneous unitary dilation* is defined by the above condition restricted to $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$.

For the cases $d \in \{1, 2\}$ it was proved in [43, Theorem I.8.1], [39], [40, Theorem 2], and [35, Theorem 2.3], that all contractive commuting families $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ have a simultaneous unitary dilation. In the case of $d = 1$, these are in fact regular unitary dilations. In the general case of $d \geq 1$, the existence of simultaneous regular unitary dilations was fully characterised

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47A20, 47D06, 60G55.

Key words and phrases. Semigroups of operators; dilations; approximations; point processes; functional calculus; group C^* -algebras.

^aFor Hilbert spaces, $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2$ the sets $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$ denote the set of bounded linear operators on \mathcal{H} and the set of bounded linear operators from \mathcal{H}_1 to \mathcal{H}_2 respectively.

in [35, Theorem 3.2] via a general condition which we may refer to as *Brehmer positivity*. Le Merdy fully classified the existence of simultaneous unitary dilations as well as dilations *up to similarity* via the complete boundedness of a certain functional calculus map (see [31, Theorems 2.2 and 3.1], which builds on [34, Corollaries 4.9 and 4.13]), and successfully applied the latter to commuting families of bounded analytic C_0 -semigroups. Moreover, Shamovich and Vinnikov provided sufficient embedding conditions on the generators for the existence of simultaneous unitary dilations (see [38]). Recent results contribute to this history by providing two further complete characterisations of the existence of simultaneous regular unitary dilations for commuting families of C_0 -semigroups under the assumption of bounded generators (see [13, Theorems 1.1 and 1.4]). The first characterisation was achieved via the notion of *complete dissipativity* (see [13, Definition 2.8]), which is defined by the positivity of certain combinatorial expressions involving the generators. The second characterisation builds on the first and characterises the existence of regular unitary dilations via *regular polynomial bounds* (see [13, Definition 6.2]). Furthermore, analogue to [31], it was shown that all commuting families of C_0 -semigroups with bounded generators have regular unitary dilations up to certain natural modification (see [13, Corollary 1.2]).

The latter reference left open the question, whether the characterisation via regular polynomial bounds could be extended to the unbounded setting (see [13, Remark 6.6]). Moreover, the characterisation via complete dissipativity involves a characterisation via approximants which raises the question, whether for certain *natural choices of approximants*, a commuting family of C_0 -semigroups has a simultaneous regular unitary dilation if and only if families of their approximants do. The current paper shall answer both these questions positively in the general setting without the boundedness assumption (see §3).

In the **second part** of this paper (§4–5), we consider classical dynamical systems more broadly described by *homomorphisms* defined over topological monoids. To motivate this, observe that there is a natural 1 : 1-correspondence between commuting families $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of (bounded/contractive/unitary) C_0 -semigroups and (bounded/contractive/unitary) SOT-continuous homomorphisms T between $(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d, +, \mathbf{0})$ and spaces of operators (cf. [13, §1]) via $T(\mathbf{t}) = \prod_{i=1}^d T_i(t_i)$ and $T_i(t) = T_i(t) = T(0, 0, \dots, t, \dots, 0)$ for $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. It is thus natural to consider homomorphisms defined over topological monoids. If G is a topological group and $M \subseteq G$ is a submonoid and $T : M \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is an SOT-continuous homomorphism from M to bounded operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , we define a *unitary dilation* of T to be a tuple (\mathcal{H}_1, U, r) , where \mathcal{H}_1 is a Hilbert space, U is an SOT-continuous unitary representation G on \mathcal{H}_1 , and $r \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_1)$ is an isometry, such that

$$T(x) = r^* U(x) r$$

holds for all $x \in M$. We shall also consider monoids for which one can define a *positivity structure*, which consists of continuous maps $\cdot^+, \cdot^- : G \rightarrow M$ (see Definition 1.11). Using this concept, we say that (\mathcal{H}_1, U, r) is a *regular unitary dilation* of T , if

$$(T(x^-))^* T(x^+) = r^* U(x) r$$

holds for all $x \in G$. Considering $(G, M) = (\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d)$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, by the above mentioned 1 : 1-correspondence one can see that these concepts agree with the definitions of simultaneous (regular) unitary dilations of commuting families.

We present in §4 characterisations of unitary and regular unitary dilations via the means of *functional calculi*, inspired by Sz.-Nagy and Phillips/le Merdy. These tools enable us to characterise the existence of unitary approximations for a broad class of classical systems (see §5).

Before proceeding, we recall the afore mentioned results from the bounded setting, define our terminology and state the main results of this paper.

1.1 Characterisation via complete dissipativity. For a C_0 -semigroup T on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with generator A , if T is contractive, then it has a regular unitary dilation (cf. [43,

Theorem I.8.1]). And clearly, the latter necessarily requires T to be contractive. On the other hand, by the Lumer-Phillips form of the Hille-Yosida theorem, T is contractive if and only if A is dissipative (see [22, Theorem I.3.3]). Thus the dissipativity of the generator characterises the regular unitary dilatability of a C_0 -semigroup.

In the setting of commuting families of semigroups, dissipativity can be generalised as follows: For each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the k^{th} -order *dissipation operators* are defined by

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{|K|} \sum_{(C_1, C_2) \in \text{Part}(K)} \left(\prod_{i \in C_1} A_i \right)^* \prod_{j \in C_2} A_j$$

for $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ with $|K| = k$, where $(C_1, C_2) \in \text{Part}(K)$ denotes that $C_1, C_2 \subseteq K$ form a partition of K . We say that the generators $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^d$ are *completely dissipative*, if the dissipation operators of all finite orders are positive (cf. [13, Definition 2.8]). This notion leads to a characterisation result obtained in [13], which for the purposes of this paper we restate as follows:

Theorem 1.1 (Characterisation via complete dissipativity). *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, and $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a commuting family of C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{H} , with generators $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^d$. If the semigroups have bounded generators, then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *The family $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ has a simultaneous regular unitary dilation.*
- (b) *The generators $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^d$ are completely dissipative.*
- (c) *There exists a net $(\{T_i^{(\alpha)}\}_{i=1}^d)_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ consisting of a commuting families of C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{H} , which each have simultaneous regular unitary dilations, such that*

$$\sup_{t \in L} \left\| \left(\prod_{i=1}^d T_i^{(\alpha)}(t_i) - \prod_{i=1}^d T_i(t_i) \right) \xi \right\| \xrightarrow{\alpha} 0$$

for all $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ and compact $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$.

Furthermore, the notion of convergence in (c) can be replaced by pointwise SOT-convergence. The implication (c) \implies (a) also holds without the boundedness assumption.

See [13, Theorem 1.1 and Remark 4.4] for a proof. Note that (a) \implies (c) is trivial since one can choose a constant net. However, if one choses particular approximants in advance, it is not immediate that this implication holds. This leads to a natural question (in the general setting), which motivated the research in the present paper:

Question 1.2 Let $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a commuting family of C_0 -semigroups on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . For which choices of approximants $(\{T_i^{(\alpha)}\}_{i=1}^d)_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ does it hold that the simultaneous regular unitary dilatability of $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ implies that of each family $\{T_i^{(\alpha)}\}_{i=1}^d$?

1.2 Characterisation via polynomial bounds. For commuting operators $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^d \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, *regular polynomial evaluation* is defined as the unique linear map

$$\mathbb{C}[X_1, X_1^{-1}, X_2, X_2^{-1}, \dots, X_d, X_d^{-1}] \ni p \mapsto p(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_d) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$$

satisfying

$$p(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_d) = \left(\prod_{i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{n}^-)} S_i^{-n_i} \right)^* \left(\prod_{i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{n}^+)} S_i^{n_i} \right)$$

for all monomials of the form $p = \prod_{i=1}^d X_i^{n_i}$ with $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ (cf. [13, Definition 6.1]). We say that $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ satisfies *regular polynomial bounds* if

$$\|p(T_1(t_1), T_2(t_2), \dots, T_d(t_d))\| \leq \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{T}^d} |p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d)|$$

holds for all $\mathbf{t} = (t_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$, where \mathbb{T} is the unit circle in the complex plane. Using these notions, a second characterisation is obtained in [13], which for the purposes of this paper, we restate as follows:

Theorem 1.3 (Characterisation via polynomial bounds). *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, and $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a commuting family of C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{H} with generators $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^d$. If the semigroups have bounded generators, then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *The family $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ has a simultaneous regular unitary dilation.*
- (b) *The family $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ satisfies regular polynomial bounds.*
- (c) *For each $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and all $\mathbf{t} = (t_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ the operator $p_K(T_1(t_1), T_2(t_2), \dots, T_d(t_d))$ is positive, where*

$$p_K := \sum_{(C_1, C_2) \in \text{Part}(K)} \prod_{i \in C_1} (1 - X_i^{-1}) \cdot \prod_{j \in C_2} (1 - X_j).$$

- (d) *The generators $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^d$ are completely dissipative.*

Furthermore, the implications (a) \implies (b) \implies (c) hold without the boundedness assumption.

Due to the inclusion of the intermediate step (c), we sketch the proof for the reader's convenience.

Proof (of Theorem 1.3, sketch). The equivalence of (a), (b), and (d) is proved directly in [13, Theorem 1.4] in reliance upon Theorem 1.1. For (a) \implies (b) the assumption of bounded generators is not required (see [13, Remark 6.6]).

Towards (b) \implies (c): Suppose (without the boundedness assumption!) that the family $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ satisfies regular polynomial bounds. Let $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and $\mathbf{t} = (t_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ be arbitrary. Using binomial expansions, one can see that the regular polynomial p_K can be expressed as $p_K = \prod_{i=1}^d (2 - X_i - X_i^{-1})$, and thus $p_K(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d) = \prod_{i=1}^d (2 - \lambda_i - \lambda_i^{-1}) = \prod_{i=1}^d (2 - 2\Re \lambda_i) \in [0, 4^d]$ for all $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d) \in \mathbb{T}^d$. It follows that $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} |1 - \alpha p_K(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d)| \leq 1$ for sufficiently small $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Since the family of semigroups satisfies regular polynomial bounds, it follows that $\|\mathbf{I} - \alpha p_K(T_1(t_1), T_2(t_2), \dots, T_d(t_d))\| \leq 1$ for sufficiently small $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. As argued in the proof of [13, Theorem 1.4], this implies that $p_K(T_1(t_1), T_2(t_2), \dots, T_d(t_d))$ is a positive operator.

Finally, the implication (c) \implies (d) (under the assumption of bounded generators) is proved exactly as in [13, Theorem 1.4]. By taking limits of these positive operators appropriately scaled, one obtains that the generators are completely dissipative. \blacksquare

This result raises the following question (cf. [13, Remark 6.6]), which along with Question 1.2 also motivated the research in the current paper.

Question 1.4 Does the equivalence of (a) and (b) in Theorem 1.3 continue to hold without the assumption of bounded generators?

1.3 Characterisation via expectation-approximants. We shall demonstrate a further characterisation related to the above two results without the assumption of bounded generators. The key idea is to make the implication (a) \implies (c) of Theorem 1.1 work by considering suitable canonical choices for approximants (cf. Question 1.2).

Let T be an arbitrary C_0 -semigroup on a Banach space \mathcal{E} with generator $A: \mathcal{D}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$. We now consider two concrete nets of approximants of the form $(T^{(\lambda)} = (e^{tA^{(\lambda)}})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d})_{\lambda \in I}$ for some $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ directed by increasing values of λ .

If $\omega_0(T) \in [-\infty, \infty)$ is the growth bound for T (cf. [20, Proposition I.5.5 and Definition I.5.6], [22, Lemma I.2.12]), the λ^{th} -Yosida-approximant is defined by $T^{(\lambda)} = (e^{tA^{(\lambda)}})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d}$ for each $\lambda \in (\omega_0(T), \infty)$, where

$$A^{(\lambda)} := \lambda AR(\lambda, A) = \lambda^2 R(\lambda, A) - \lambda \mathbf{I} \quad (1.1)$$

is a bounded operator, where $R(\lambda, A) = (\lambda \mathbf{I} - A)^{-1}$ denotes the resolvent operator. The Yosida-approximants satisfy

$$\sup_{t \in L} \|(T^{(\lambda)}(t) - T(t))\xi\| \longrightarrow 0$$

as $(\omega_0(T), \infty) \ni \lambda \longrightarrow \infty$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$ and compact $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Furthermore, if T is contractive, then each of the Yosida-approximants are contractive. (For a proof of these classical results, see e.g. [26, Theorem G.4.3], [20, Theorem II.3.5, pp. 73–74], [24, (12.3.4), p. 361].)

Now, if a family $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of commuting C_0 -semigroups has a simultaneous regular unitary dilation, then in particular each of the T_i must be contractive, and thus the family $\{T_i^{(\lambda_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$ of Yosida-approximants consists of contractive C_0 -semigroups for each $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ (cf. the subsequent paragraph below (3.8) in [20]). Furthermore, the commutativity of the T_i implies the commutativity of the resolvents,^b which by (1.1) implies the commutativity of the generators $\{A_i^{(\lambda_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$, which in turn implies that $\{T^{(\lambda_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$ is a commuting family.

Another appropriate approximation is constructed in *Hille's first exponential formula*. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ call $T^{(\lambda)} = (e^{tA^{(\lambda)}})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ the λ^{th} -Hille-approximant for T , where

$$A^{(\lambda)} := \lambda(T(\frac{1}{\lambda}) - \mathbf{I}). \quad (1.2)$$

is a bounded operator. Then again it holds that $T^{(\lambda)}(t) \longrightarrow T(t)$ for $\mathbb{R}_{>0} \ni \lambda \longrightarrow \infty$ wrt. the SOT-topology uniformly in t on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ (see [6, §1.2 and Theorem 1.2.2]). It is easy to verify that $\|T^{(\lambda)}(t)\| \leq e^{-\lambda t} e^{\lambda t \|T(\frac{1}{\lambda})\|}$. Thus the Hille-approximants of contractive C_0 -semigroups are themselves contractive C_0 -semigroups with bounded generators. Moreover, if $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is a commuting family of (contractive) C_0 -semigroups, then for each $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$, by (1.2), the generators $\{A^{(\lambda_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$ clearly commute, so that the family of Hille-approximants $\{T^{(\lambda_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$ is a commuting family of (contractive) C_0 -semigroups.

It turns out that these classically defined approximants in semigroup theory can be naturally generalised to a class of approximants, which we shall call *expectation-approximants* (see Definition 2.3 below). We now state the first main result of this paper:

Theorem 1.5 *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, and $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a commuting family of contractive C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{H} . Further let $(T_i^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda_i}$ be a net of expectation-approximants for T_i (e.g. Hille- or Yosida-approximants) for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *The family $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ has a simultaneous regular unitary dilation.*
- (b) *The family $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ satisfies regular polynomial bounds.*
- (c) *For each $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and all $\mathbf{t} = (t_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ the operator $p_K(T_1(t_1), T_2(t_2), \dots, T_d(t_d))$ is positive, where*

$$p_K(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_d) := \sum_{(C_1, C_2) \in \text{Part}(K)} \prod_{i \in C_1} (1 - X_i^{-1}) \cdot \prod_{j \in C_2} (1 - X_j).$$

- (d) *The family $\{T_i^{(\alpha_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$ of approximants has a simultaneous regular unitary dilation for each $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^d \in \prod_{i=1}^d \Lambda_i$.*

By Theorem 1.5, we shall be able to positively address Questions 1.2 and 1.4. Note that the main implication to prove is (c) \implies (d), as the others have essentially been proved in [13] (cf. the discussion in §1.1–1.2). Now, in the case of bounded generators the spectral-theoretic concept

^bsee e.g. [1, Theorem 1], where this is proved under slightly more general assumptions. One can also directly verify this by relying on the Laplace integral representation of resolvents.

of complete dissipativity was crucial for the characterisations. In the unbounded setting, it is unclear how to extend the notion of dissipation operators and thus of complete dissipativity. Nonetheless, one possibility and its limitations shall be discussed (*cf.* Remark 3.5). Instead, we make use of stochastic methods, building on the results in [9]. Using suitable stochastic processes and expectations computed strongly via Bochner-integrals, which we lay out in §2, we show that expectation-approximants can be expressed in terms of their original semigroups. This provides a key ingredient to prove (c) \implies (d). This shall all be covered in §2–3.

1.4 Special conditions on topological monoids. In the second part of this paper, we concentrate on classical dynamical systems defined more broadly over topological monoids. We are particularly interested in topological monoids M which occur as (closed or at least measurable) submonoids of (ideally locally compact) topological groups G .

Example 1.6 Simple examples of locally compact topological groups and closed submonoids thereof include any discrete group and submonoid thereof, *e.g.* $(\mathbb{Z}^d, +, \mathbf{0})$ and $\mathbb{N}_0^d \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ for $d \in \mathbb{N}$. We also consider $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ as a closed submonoid of the locally compact topological group $(\mathbb{R}^d, +, \mathbf{0})$.

Example 1.7 As a non-discrete and non-commutative example, consider the Heisenberg group \mathcal{H}_d of order $2d + 1$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, which can be represented topologically as $\mathcal{H}_d = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ and algebraically via the operation^c

$$(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}, E)(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{p}', E') = \left(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}', E + E' + \frac{1}{2}(\langle \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle - \langle \mathbf{p}', \mathbf{x} \rangle) \right)$$

for $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}, E), (\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{p}', E') \in \mathcal{H}_d$. The identity element of \mathcal{H}_d is clearly $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, 0)$ and inverse of $g \in \mathcal{H}_d$ is given by $g^{-1} = -g$, if we view g as a vector in \mathbb{R}^{2d+1} . One can readily verify that

$$\mathcal{H}_d^+ := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}, E) \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d, E \in \mathbb{R}\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_d$$

is a closed submonoid. As a further non-commutative example, consider for some antisymmetric matrix $C \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$ the closed subgroup $\mathcal{H}_{d,C} := \{(\mathbf{x}, C\mathbf{x}, E) \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, E \in \mathbb{R}\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_d$ and the closed submonoid $\mathcal{H}_{d,C}^+ := \{(\mathbf{x}, C\mathbf{x}, E) \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d, E \in \mathbb{R}\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{d,C}$. Without loss of generality, we can replace the above representations of $\mathcal{H}_{d,C}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{d,C}^+$ by $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ respectively. Observe that the group operation satisfies

$$(\mathbf{x}, E)(\mathbf{x}', E) = \left(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}', E + E' + \frac{1}{2}(\langle C\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle - \langle C\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x} \rangle) \right) = \left(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}', E + E' + \langle C\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle \right)$$

for $(\mathbf{x}, E), (\mathbf{x}', E') \in \mathcal{H}_{d,C}$. One can thus think of the i^{th} and j^{th} x -co-ordinates of elements of $\mathcal{H}_{d,C}$ as being *correlated* with C_{ij} encoding this correlation.

Example 1.8 (Non-commuting families, Weyl Form of CCR). Continuing on from Example 1.7, let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, and $C \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$ be an antisymmetric matrix, *i.e.* $C = D - D^T$, where $D \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$ is a strictly upper triangular matrix. One use of classical dynamical systems defined over $\mathcal{H}_{d,C}^+$ is as follows: Consider an arbitrary SOT-continuous homomorphism, $T: \mathcal{H}_{d,C}^+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Set $T_i := (T(\mathbf{t}\mathbf{e}_i), 0)_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, and $U := (T(\mathbf{0}, E))_{E \in \mathbb{R}}$, whereby each $\mathbf{e}_i := (0, 0, \dots, \frac{1}{i}, \dots, 0)$ denotes the canonical i^{th} basis vector of \mathbb{R}^d . One can then readily verify that $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is a family of C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{H} and U is a (not necessarily unitary) SOT-continuous representation of $(\mathbb{R}, +, 0)$ on \mathcal{H} which commutes with each of the T_i . Furthermore the relations

$$T_j(t)T_i(s) = U(2stC_{ij})T_i(s)T_j(t) \tag{1.3}$$

hold for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, which is a slight generalisation of the semigroup version of the *canonical commutation relations* (CCR) in the Weyl form. Such systems are of interest in quantum mechanics (see *e.g.* [4, §5.2.1.2]). Conversely, one may consider an arbitrary family $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{H} and an arbitrary SOT-continuous representation U of $(\mathbb{R}, +, 0)$

^cThere are various different presentations of the Heisenberg group in the literature (*cf.* [10, §1], [14, §10.1], [21, §6.7.4]). We choose this particular form for convenience.

on \mathcal{H} , which commutes with each of the T_i , and such that the relations in (1.3) hold.^d Then, defining $T: \mathcal{H}_{d,C}^+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ via

$$T(\mathbf{x}, E) := U(E + \langle D\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle) \prod_{i=1}^d T_i(x_i)$$

for each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$, $E \in \mathbb{R}$, one can verify that T is an SOT-continuous homomorphism. These two constructions constitute a 1:1-correspondence (this is left as an exercise to the reader) between families satisfying (1.3) and SOT-continuous homomorphisms defined over $\mathcal{H}_{d,C}^+$.

For submonoids of topological groups, there are natural conditions which will aid us when investigating properties (*viz.* dilation) of classical dynamical systems defined over them. The following definition is due to Mueller [32, §2]:^e

Definition 1.9 Let G be a locally compact topological group and $M \subseteq G$ be a measurable submonoid. Fix a Haar-measure λ_G on G . Say that M is *e-joint* if $\lambda_G(U \cap M) > 0$ for all open neighbourhoods $U \subseteq G$ of the identity $e \in G$.^f

Example 1.10 Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \in \mathbb{P}$ be a prime number.

- (i) Consider $(G, M) = (\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d)$. For an open neighbourhood $U \subseteq G$ of $\mathbf{0}$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $U \supseteq (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)^d$. Thus $M \cap U \supseteq (0, \varepsilon)^d$, so $M \cap U$ is non-null. Hence M is an *e-joint* submonoid.
- (ii) Consider $(G, M) = (\mathcal{H}_d, \mathcal{H}_d^+) = (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d \times \mathbb{R})$. As in (i), for any open neighbourhood $U \subseteq G$ of $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, 0)$, one has $M \cap U \supseteq (0, \varepsilon)^d \times (0, \varepsilon)^d \times (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, so $M \cap U$ is non-null. Hence M is an *e-joint* submonoid.
- (iii) Let $C \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$ be an antisymmetric matrix. Similar to (ii) one can show that $\mathcal{H}_{d,C}^+$ is a (closed) *e-joint* submonoid of $\mathcal{H}_{d,C}$.
- (iv) The submonoid $\mathbb{Z}_p \setminus \{0\}$ of non-zero p -adic integers within the locally compact multiplicative group $(\mathbb{Q}_p \setminus \{0\}, \cdot, 1)$ of non-zero p -adic numbers is clearly *e-joint*, since it is a clopen subset.
- (v) Let G_i be a locally compact topological group and $M_i \subseteq G_i$ an *e-joint* measurable submonoid for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. By simple computations with product measures, one can readily verify that $\prod_{i=1}^d M_i$ is a measurable *e-joint* submonoid in $\prod_{i=1}^d G_i$ (*cf.* [11, Proposition A.7]).

Definition 1.11 Let (G, \cdot, e) be a (not necessarily locally compact!) topological group and $M \subseteq G$ a submonoid. If $\cdot^+: G \rightarrow M$ is a continuous function which satisfies

- (i) $e^+ = e$ for the identity element $e \in G$;
- (ii) $x^{++} = x^+$ for all $x \in G$, *i.e.* \cdot^+ is idempotent; and
- (iii) $(x^-)^{-1}x^+ = x$ for all $x \in G$, where $x^- := (x^{-1})^+$,

then we call (G, M, \cdot^+) a *positivity structure*.

Example 1.12 Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $C \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$ be an antisymmetric matrix. The pairs (G, M) of topological groups and submonoids: $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d)$, $(\mathcal{H}_d, \mathcal{H}_d^+)$, $(\mathcal{H}_{d,C}, \mathcal{H}_{d,C}^+)$ admit natural positivity structures. Furthermore, if (G_i, M_i, \cdot^{+i}) are positivity structures, then the product $(\prod_{i=1}^d G_i, \prod_{i=1}^d M_i)$ admits a positivity via the pointwise definition. The constructions are presented in Table 1 and left to the reader to verify.

^dFor example consider $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m)$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathbf{u}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$, and either $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, or $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Re \lambda < 0$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Set $U := (e^{\lambda t} \mathbf{1})_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ and $(T_i(t)f)(\mathbf{x}) := e^{\lambda t \langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(i)}, \mathbf{x} \rangle} f(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{u}^{(i)})$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m)$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Then (1.3) holds with $C := (\frac{1}{2}(\langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(i)}, \mathbf{u}^{(j)} \rangle - \langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(j)}, \mathbf{u}^{(i)} \rangle))_{i,j=1}^d \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$.

^e*cf.* also [11, Appendix A], where a similar, but stronger, property called *positivity in the identity* is defined.

^fNote that being a null-set is independent of the particular choice of Haar-measure.

Group G	Submonoid M	Description of $\cdot^+ : G \rightarrow M$
$\prod_{i=1}^d G_i$	$\prod_{i=1}^d M_i$	$\mathbf{x} \mapsto (x_i^+)_{i=1}^d$
$(\mathbb{R}, +, 0)$	$\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$	$t \mapsto \max\{t, 0\}$
$(\mathbb{R}^d, +, \mathbf{0})$	$\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$	$\mathbf{t} \mapsto (t_i^+)_{i=1}^d$
\mathcal{H}_d	\mathcal{H}_d^+	$(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}, E) \mapsto (\mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{p}^+, E^+)$
$\mathcal{H}_{d,C}$	$\mathcal{H}_{d,C}^+$	$(\mathbf{x}, E) \mapsto (\mathbf{x}^+, E^+)$

TABLE 1. Examples of positivity structures (G, M, \cdot^+) . Here $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $C \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$ is an antisymmetric matrix, and (G_i, M_i, \cdot^+) are positivity structures for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$.

Note that for the subset $G^+ := \{x^+ \mid g \in G\} \subseteq M$, it is neither required that $G^+ = M$ nor even that G^+ be closed under the group operation. In the case of \mathbb{R}^d , this happens to be the case, but in the case of the Heisenberg group, neither of these additional properties holds. We now state some basic facts about positivity structures.

Proposition 1.13 *Let (G, M, \cdot^+) be a positivity structure. Then $(G^-)^{-1} \cap G^+ = (G^+)^{-1} \cap G^+ = \{e\}$.*

Proof. First observe that $(G^-)^{-1} \cap G^+ = ((G^-)^+)^{-1} \cap G^+ = (G^+)^{-1} \cap G^+$. Thus it suffices to prove that $(G^+)^{-1} \cap G^+ = \{e\}$. Since $e^+ = e$, the \supseteq -inclusion holds. Towards the \subseteq -inclusion, let $x \in (G^+)^{-1} \cap G^+$ be arbitrary. Then $x = y^+ = (z^+)^{-1}$ for some $y, z \in G$. By the idempotence axiom, one has that $x^+ = y^{++} = y^+ = x$ and $x^- = (x^{-1})^+ = z^{++} = z^+ = x^{-1}$. By axiom (iii), it follows that $x = x^+ \stackrel{\text{(iii)}}{=} x^- x = x^{-1} x = e$. \blacksquare

Proposition 1.14 *Let (G, \cdot, e) be a topological group and $M \subseteq G$ a submonoid. Let $\cdot^+ : G \rightarrow M$ be an arbitrary map satisfying axiom (iii) of Definition 1.11. Then axiom (ii) is equivalent to the condition that $x^{+-} = e$ for all $x \in G$.*

Proof. Let $x \in G$ be arbitrary. Then by axiom (iii) one has $x^+ = (x^{+-})^{-1} x^{++}$. It follows that $x^{++} = x^+$ if and only if $x^{+-} = e$. \blacksquare

1.5 Characterisation of unitary approximations. Letting M be a topological monoid and \mathcal{H} a Hilbert space, a classical dynamical system modelled by a homomorphism,⁸ $T : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$, can be thought of as *reversible* if it is unitary valued. As this need not be the case, the question arises whether and in what sense one can *approximate* T via unitary systems.

In Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.5 a strong notion of convergence is used for the approximants. In the literature a similar weak notion of convergence for C_0 -semigroups is studied (cf. e.g. [29, 19, 18, 12, 11] and [17, §III.6] in the case of Hilbert spaces). These notions are defined as follows: Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{E} be a Banach space, $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a commuting family of C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{E} , and $(\{T_i^{(\alpha)}\}_{i=1}^d)_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ be a net of commuting families of C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{E} . We say that $(\{T_i^{(\alpha)}\}_{i=1}^d)_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ converges to $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ wrt. the SOT-topology (resp. wrt. the WOT-topology) uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$, if for all $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$ (resp. for all $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{E}'$) and all compact $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ it holds that $\sup_{\mathbf{t} \in L} \|(\prod_{i=1}^d T_i^{(\alpha)}(t_i) - \prod_{i=1}^d T_i(t_i)) \xi\| \xrightarrow{\alpha} 0$ (resp. $\sup_{\mathbf{t} \in L} |(\langle \prod_{i=1}^d T_i^{(\alpha)}(t_i) - \prod_{i=1}^d T_i(t_i) \xi, \eta \rangle)| \xrightarrow{\alpha} 0$). For classical systems on Hilbert spaces, using the concepts in §1.4 we may generalise the weak notion of convergence to classical dynamical systems in general in the following natural manner:

Definition 1.15 (Weak topologies). Let G be a topological group, $M \subseteq G$ a submonoid, \mathcal{H} a Hilbert space, $T : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ an SOT-continuous homomorphism and $(T^{(\alpha)} : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}))_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ a net of SOT-continuous homomorphisms. We say that $(T^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ converges to T

⁸i.e. $T(e) = \mathbf{I}$ and $T(xy) = T(x)T(y)$ for $x, y \in M$.

- (i) *exactly weakly*, if for each $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ there exists an index $\alpha_0 \in \Lambda$ such that for all $x \in M$ and $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$

$$\langle T^{(\alpha)}(x)\xi, \eta \rangle = \langle T(x)\xi, \eta \rangle;$$

- (ii) *uniformly weakly*, if for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ and compact $L \subseteq M$

$$\sup_{x \in L} |\langle T^{(\alpha)}(x)\xi, \eta \rangle - \langle T(x)\xi, \eta \rangle| \xrightarrow{\alpha} 0;$$

- (iii) *pointwise weakly*, if for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ and $x \in M$

$$|\langle T^{(\alpha)}(x)\xi, \eta \rangle - \langle T(x)\xi, \eta \rangle| \xrightarrow{\alpha} 0.$$

If each $T^{(\alpha)} = U^{(\alpha)}|_M$, where $U^{(\alpha)}: G \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is an SOT-continuous unitary representation of G on \mathcal{H} , we say that T has an *exact* (resp. *uniform* resp. *pointwise*) *weak unitary approximation*, if (i) (resp. (ii) resp. (iii)) holds.

Definition 1.16 (Regular weak topologies). Let (G, M, \cdot^+) be a positivity structure, \mathcal{H} a Hilbert space, $T: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ an SOT-continuous homomorphism and $(T^{(\alpha)}: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}))_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ a net of SOT-continuous homomorphisms. We say that $(T^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ converges to T

- (i) *exactly regularly weakly*, if for each $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ there exists an index $\alpha_0 \in \Lambda$ such that for all $x \in G$ and $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$

$$\langle T^{(\alpha)}(x^-)*T^{(\alpha)}(x^+)\xi, \eta \rangle = \langle T(x^-)*T(x^+)\xi, \eta \rangle;$$

- (ii) *uniformly regularly weakly*, if for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ and compact $L \subseteq G$

$$\sup_{x \in L} |\langle T^{(\alpha)}(x^-)*T^{(\alpha)}(x^+)\xi, \eta \rangle - \langle T(x^-)*T(x^+)\xi, \eta \rangle| \xrightarrow{\alpha} 0;$$

- (iii) *pointwise regularly weakly*, if for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ and $x \in G$

$$|\langle T^{(\alpha)}(x^-)*T^{(\alpha)}(x^+)\xi, \eta \rangle - \langle T(x^-)*T(x^+)\xi, \eta \rangle| \xrightarrow{\alpha} 0.$$

If each $T^{(\alpha)} = U^{(\alpha)}|_M$, where $U^{(\alpha)}: G \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is an SOT-continuous unitary representation of G on \mathcal{H} , we say that T has an *exact* (resp. *uniform* resp. *pointwise*) *regular weak unitary approximation*, if (i) (resp. (ii) resp. (iii)) holds.

Clearly, exact (regular) weak approximations are uniform (regular) weak approximations, which in turn are pointwise (regular) weak approximations. In the case of $(G, M) = (\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d)$, if $d = 1$, then each *regular*-notion of convergence clearly coincides with the corresponding notion without the *regular* prefix. In this special case, the following result is known:

Theorem 1.17 (Król, 2009). *Let T be a contractive C_0 -semigroup on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} .^h Then T has a uniform weak unitary approximation.*

For a proof see [29, Theorem 2.1 and Remark 2.3]. The following results add to this picture.

Theorem 1.18 (Characterisation of weak unitary approximations). *Let G be a locally compact topological group and $M \subseteq G$ be an e -joint closed submonoid. Further let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space and $T: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be an SOT-continuous homomorphism. If G contains a dense subset $D \subseteq G$ with $|D| \leq \dim(\mathcal{H})$,^h then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *The classical system T has a unitary dilation.*
- (b) *The classical system T has an exact weak unitary approximation.*
- (c) *The classical system T has a uniform weak unitary approximation.*

Without the above assumption on the dimension of \mathcal{H} , (b) \implies (c) \implies (a) hold.

Theorem 1.19 (Characterisation of regular weak unitary approximations). *Let (G, M, \cdot^+) be a positivity structure, where G is a topological group and $M \subseteq G$ is a submonoid.ⁱ Further let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space and $T: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be an SOT-continuous homomorphism. If \mathcal{H} is infinite dimensional and G contains a dense subset $D \subseteq G$ with $|D| \leq \dim(\mathcal{H})$,^h then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *The classical system T has a regular unitary dilation.*
- (b) *The classical system T has an exact regular weak unitary approximation.*
- (c) *The classical system T has a uniform regular weak unitary approximation.*
- (d) *The classical system T has a pointwise regular weak unitary approximation.*

Without the above assumption on the dimension of \mathcal{H} , (b) \implies (c) \implies (d) \implies (a) hold.

Now, to prove Theorem 1.17, Król constructs unitary approximants directly from a regular unitary dilation of T and further questions whether a proof is possible without reliance upon dilations (cf. [29, Remark 2.2]). Theorems 1.18 and 1.19 partially address this by showing that the existence of simultaneous (regular) dilations is necessary. Thus any dilation-free proof of Theorem 1.17 might necessarily involve some characterisation of (regular) unitary dilations.

Our results furthermore provide a sharp distinction between the two notions of dilation. By Examples 1.10 and 1.12 these results are immediately applicable to commuting families of C_0 -semigroups as well as non-commuting families satisfying the *canonical commutation relations* (CCR) in the Weyl form (see Example 1.8).

As an example, applying these characterisations to $(G, M) = (\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d)$ for any $d \geq 2$ and infinite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , we shall construct commuting families of d contractive C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{H} that admit no regular weak unitary approximations (see Corollary 5.1).

1.6 Notation. In this paper we fix the following notation and conventions:

- We write $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$, $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} = \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid r \geq 0\}$, $\mathbb{R}_{>0} = \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid r > 0\}$, and $\mathbb{T} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| = 1\}$ (unit circle in the complex plane). To distinguish from indices i we use \imath for the imaginary unit $\sqrt{-1}$.
- We write elements of product spaces in bold and denote their components in light face fonts with appropriate indices, e.g. the i^{th} components of $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \prod_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i$ are denoted t_i and α_i respectively.
- In some instances we shall work with concrete constructions of approximants of C_0 -semigroups or families thereof (e.g. the Hille- and Yosida-approximants). In such cases we use $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ to index the approximants. In others instances we work with the generalisation: *expectation-approximants* (defined below in Definition 2.3). To indicate the abstract setting, $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \prod_{i=1}^d \Lambda_i$ are used to index the approximants.
- For Banach spaces $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$, the set $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)$ denote the set of bounded linear operators on \mathcal{E} and the set of bounded linear operators from \mathcal{E}_1 to \mathcal{E}_2 respectively.
- For bounded operators S over a Banach space, S' denotes the adjoint (dual) operator. For bounded operators S over a Hilbert space, S^* denotes the Hermitian adjoint.
- For an (unbounded) linear operator $A: \text{dom}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ on a Banach space and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ in the resolvent set of A , $R(\lambda, A) = (\lambda \mathbf{I} - A)^{-1}$ denotes the resolvent operator.
- For a measure (or probability) space (X, Σ, μ) , a measurable space (Y, \mathcal{S}) , and a measurable function $f: X \rightarrow Y$, the push-forward measure $f_*\mu$, which we denote μ_f , is the measure (resp. probability measure) on (Y, \mathcal{S}) defined by $f_*\mu[B] = \mu[f^{-1}(B)]$ for all measurable $B \subseteq Y$.

^h In the case of separable topological groups, e.g. $G = \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, this holds as soon as \mathcal{H} is infinite dimensional.

ⁱ Note that we neither require G to be locally compact nor M to be a measurable subset in this theorem!

- For a probability distribution Γ over a set X we write $\theta \sim \Gamma$ to denote that θ is an X -valued random variable (r. v.) with distribution Γ .
- For $t \in \mathbb{R}$ the distribution δ_t denotes the point distribution concentrated in t .
- For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ we denote with $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$ the exponential distribution with *rate* λ . For $\theta \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ it holds that $\mathbb{P}_\theta[B] = \int_B \lambda e^{-\lambda s} ds$ for all measurable $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.
- For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ we denote with $\text{Poiss}(\lambda, c)$ the distribution of a Poisson distributed r. v. scaled by c . For $\theta \sim \text{Poiss}(\lambda, c)$ it holds that $\mathbb{P}[\theta = cn] = \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} e^{-\lambda}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with the convention that $0^0 := 1$. In particular, $\text{Poiss}(\lambda, c) = \delta_0$ if $\lambda = 0$.
- For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we denote with $\text{Poiss}_t^2(\lambda)$ an *auxiliary Poisson distribution* with *rate* λ over a *time duration* t (defined below in §2.1, see also [9, §4]).
- For a (unital) (C^*) -algebra \mathcal{A} , $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ denotes the (unital) matrix (C^*) -algebra of \mathcal{A} -valued $n \times n$ -matrices for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If \mathcal{A} is an algebra of operators over some Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , then the elements of $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ are viewed as operators acting on $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}$, and we have $\langle (a_{ij})_{ij} \bigoplus_{i=1}^d \xi_i, \bigoplus_{i=1}^d \eta_i \rangle = \sum_{ij} \langle a_{ij} \xi_j, \eta_i \rangle$ for ‘matrices’ $(a_{ij})_{ij} \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ and vectors $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \xi_i, \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \eta_i \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}$.
- A map $\Psi: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ between (subalgebras of) C^* -algebras is called *completely bounded* if $\|\Psi\|_{\text{cb}} := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\Psi \otimes id_{M_n}\| < \infty$, and *completely positive* if $\Psi \otimes id_{M_n}$ is positive for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Here $\Psi \otimes id_{M_n}: M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}))$ is defined by $(\Psi \otimes id_{M_n})((a_{ij})_{ij}) = (\Psi(a_{ij}))_{ij} \in M_n(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}))$ for each $(a_{ij})_{ij} \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (see [33, Chapter 1], [34, Chapter 3]).

For a Banach space \mathcal{E} , a measure space (X, Σ, μ) and an operator-valued function $T: X \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$, for which $T(\cdot)\xi: X \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is *strongly measurable* for each $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$, the integral $\text{SOT-}\int_X T d\mu$, when it exists, denotes the unique bounded operator $\tilde{T} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ that satisfies $\tilde{T}\xi = \int_X T(\cdot)\xi d\mu$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$, where $\int_X T(\cdot)\xi d\mu$ is computed as a Bochner-integral. This holds, for example, if X is a locally compact Polish space (e.g. $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$), and T is contractive and SOT-continuous (e.g. a product of contractive C_0 -semigroups). If $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$ is a probability space and $\tau: \Omega \rightarrow X$ is an X -valued r. v. (i.e. a measurable function), we refer to $\mathbb{E}[T(\theta)] = \text{SOT-}\int_{\omega \in \Omega} T(\theta(\omega)) \mathbb{P}(d\omega) = \text{SOT-}\int_{t \in X} T(t) \mathbb{P}_\theta(dt)$, when it exists, as the *expectation* (computed strongly via Bochner-integrals). If X is a locally compact Polish space and T is a contractive SOT-continuous function then the expectation exists.

The existence and properties of Bochner-integrals (including linearity, convexity and triangle inequalities, Fubini’s theorem for products, etc.) as well as the validity of various computations with Bochner-integrals and expectations used in the rest of this paper can be found in or readily derived from the literature. We refer the reader in particular to [24, §3.7, Theorems 3.7.4–6, and Theorems 3.7.12–13], [15, §II.2, Theorem 2, and Theorem 4], [20, §C.1–4], and [25, §1.1.c–§1.2.a]. For example, using Fubini’s theorem one can derive that $\prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[T_i(\theta_i)] = \mathbb{E}[\prod_{i=1}^n T_i(\theta_i)]$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, independent $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ -valued r. v.’s $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n$ and C_0 -semigroups T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n on a Banach space \mathcal{E} which are uniformly bounded on the essential ranges of $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n$ respectively (e.g. contractive semigroups). We shall take advantage of this computation throughout. Further fundamental applications of Bochner-integrals in the context of C_0 -semigroups can be found e.g. in [9, 16, 36].

2. STOCHASTIC PRESENTATION OF CLASSICAL APPROXIMANTS

In this section we provide standalone results for C_0 -semigroups over Banach spaces and then for (commuting) families. We assume basic knowledge of stochastic processes as well as Poisson and exponential distributions. We shall also rely on the theory of Bochner-integrals, in particular those that occur in the integral representations of powers of resolvents of unbounded generators of C_0 -semigroups.


2.1 Semigroups of distributions. A family $(\Gamma(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ of parameterised distributions of \mathbb{R} -valued random variables (r. v.'s) shall be called a *continuous semigroup of distributions* if

- (i) $\Gamma(0)$ is the point distribution concentrated in 0 (*i.e.* δ_0);
- (ii) $\theta_1 + \theta_2 \sim \Gamma(s + t)$ for $s, t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and any independent r. v.'s $\theta_1 \sim \Gamma(s)$ and $\theta_2 \sim \Gamma(t)$; and
- (iii) $\Gamma(t) \rightarrow \Gamma(0) = \delta_0$ weakly for $\mathbb{R}_{> 0} \ni t \rightarrow 0$, *i.e.* letting $\theta_t \sim \Gamma(t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, it holds that $\mathbb{E}[f(\theta_t)] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[f(\theta_0)] = f(0)$ for all bounded continuous functions $f \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$


(*cf.* [28, Definition 14.46 and Example 17.7] and [27, §17.E]). Simple examples of this include $(\delta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$, $(\text{Pois}(\lambda t, c))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ for $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, and $(\mathcal{N}(\mu t, \sigma^2 t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ (the normal distributions) for $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with the convention that $\mathcal{N}(0, 0)$ denotes the point distribution δ_0 (*cf.* [28, Corollary 15.13]).

We now construct a further family of parameterised distributions. For $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ we construct a random distribution via two independent homogeneous point Poisson processes (PPP) as follows (depicted in Figure 1):

1. Let $\tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\tau}_1, \tilde{\tau}_2, \dots, \tau_0, \tau_1, \tau_2, \dots \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ be independent identically distributed (i. i. d.) r. v.'s.
2. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ set $\tau_{<n} := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \tau_i$, with the convention that the empty sum is just the r. v. equal to 0 a. s. As a sum of n exponentially distributed r. v.'s, we have $\mathbb{P}[\tau_{<n} \in B] = \int_{s \in B} \lambda \frac{(\lambda s)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} e^{-\lambda s} ds$ for all measurable $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, provided $n \geq 1$ (see *e.g.* [28, Theorem 15.12 and Corollary 15.13 (ii)]).
3. For each $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, let $N_t := \sup_{[0, \infty)} \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \tilde{\tau}_i < t\}$. Then $N_t < \infty$ a. s. and $N_t \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda t, 1)$, including when $t = 0$, since $\text{Pois}(0, 1)$ is just the point distribution δ_0 . Moreover, by construction each N_t is independent of the τ_i .
4. Finally, set $\theta_t := \tau_{<N_t} = \sum_{i=0}^{N_t-1} \tau_i$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.



(a) 1st homogeneous PPP with rate λ , where N_t counts the number of ‘events’ in $[0, t)$.



(b) 2nd homogeneous PPP with rate λ , independent of 1st PPP, but with N_t determined by (a).

FIGURE 1. Visualisation of the construction of an auxiliary Poisson process, $\theta \sim \text{Pois}_t^2(\lambda)$.

For each $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ let $\text{Pois}_t^2(\lambda)$ denote the distribution of θ_t constructed as above. We refer to any r. v. distributed as $\text{Pois}_t^2(\lambda)$ as an *auxiliary Poisson process* with rate λ over a *time duration* t . We observe some basic properties of auxiliary Poisson processes.

Proposition 2.1 *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. The characteristic function of a $\text{Pois}_t^2(\lambda)$ -distributed r. v.^j is given by $\varphi_{t,\lambda}(\omega) = e^{\frac{i\omega}{\lambda-i\omega}\lambda t}$ for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, the mean and variance of $\text{Pois}_t^2(\lambda)$ -distributed r. v.'s are t and $\frac{2t}{\lambda}$ respectively.*

Proof. Let $\theta \sim \text{Pois}_t^2(\lambda)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that θ is given by the above construction, *i.e.* $\theta = \theta_t = \tau_{<N_t}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\mathbb{E}[e^{i\omega\tau_{<n}}] = (\frac{\lambda}{\lambda-i\omega})^n$ (see *e.g.* [28, Theorem 15.12]) and for $n = 0$ clearly $\mathbb{E}[e^{i\omega\tau_{<n}}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{i\omega\cdot 0}] = 1 =: (\frac{\lambda}{\lambda-i\omega})^0$. Since by construction, N_t is independent of the τ_i , one thus obtains

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{i\omega\theta}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[e^{i\omega\tau_{<N_t}} | N_t]]$$

^jFor an \mathbb{R} -valued r. v. X the characteristic function is defined as the map $\varphi: \mathbb{R} \ni \omega \mapsto \mathbb{E}[e^{i\omega X}]$ (*cf.* [28, Definition 15.7]).

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda-i\omega}\right)^{N_t} \mid N_t\right] \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} \frac{(\lambda t)^n}{n!} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda-i\omega}\right)^n \\
&= e^{-\lambda t} e^{\lambda t \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-i\omega}}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence the characteristic function is as claimed.

The mean can be computed as follows: For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ one has $\mathbb{E}[\tau_{<n}] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\tau_i] = \frac{n}{\lambda}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\tau_{<0}] = \mathbb{E}[0] = 0$, whence $\mathbb{E}[\theta] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\tau_{<N_t} \mid N_t]] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{N_t}{\lambda}\right] = \frac{\lambda t}{\lambda} = t$.^k To compute the variance, we first compute the 2nd moment of θ . Since the characteristic function $\varphi_{t,\lambda}$ of θ is 2-times (in fact ∞ -times) continuously differentiable, one may compute (cf. [28, Theorem 15.34])

$$\mathbb{E}[\theta^2] = \frac{1}{i^2} \varphi_{t,\lambda}''(0) = e^{-\lambda t} e^{\frac{\lambda^2 t}{\lambda-i\omega}} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda^2 t}{(\lambda-i\omega)^2} \right)^2 + 2 \frac{\lambda^2 t}{(\lambda-i\omega)^3} \right) \Big|_{\omega=0} = t^2 + \frac{2t}{\lambda},$$

from which $\text{Var}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[\theta^2] - \mathbb{E}[\theta]^2 = \frac{2t}{\lambda}$ follows. ■

Proposition 2.2 *For each $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, the family $(\text{Poiss}_t^2(\lambda))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ of distributions of auxiliary Poisson processes constitutes a continuous semigroup of distributions.*

Proof. If $\theta \sim \text{Poiss}_0^2(\lambda)$, then by the above construction, $\theta = \tau_{<N_0} = \tau_{<0} = 0$ a.s. We now show for independent r.v.'s $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $\theta_1 \sim \text{Poiss}_{t_1}^2(\lambda)$ and $\theta_2 \sim \text{Poiss}_{t_2}^2(\lambda)$, that $\theta_1 + \theta_2 \sim \text{Poiss}_{t_1+t_2}^2(\lambda)$. To this end let φ_{θ_1} , φ_{θ_2} , and $\varphi_{\theta_1+\theta_2}$ denote the characteristic functions of θ_1 , θ_2 , and $\theta_1 + \theta_2$ respectively. By Proposition 2.1, it holds that $\varphi_{\theta_1} = \varphi_{t_1,\lambda}$ and $\varphi_{\theta_2} = \varphi_{t_2,\lambda}$ and by independence (cf. e.g. [28, Lemma 15.11]) $\varphi_{\theta_1+\theta_2}(\omega) = \varphi_{\theta_1}(\omega) \cdot \varphi_{\theta_2}(\omega) = \varphi_{t_1,\lambda}(\omega) \cdot \varphi_{t_2,\lambda}(\omega) = e^{\frac{i\omega}{\lambda-i\omega} \lambda t_1} e^{\frac{i\omega}{\lambda-i\omega} \lambda t_2} = \varphi_{t_1+t_2,\lambda}(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Since the characteristic function uniquely determines the distribution of a r.v. (cf. [28, Theorem 15.8]), it follows by Proposition 2.1 that $\theta_1 + \theta_2 \sim \text{Poiss}_{t_1+t_2}^2(\lambda)$.

Towards continuity at 0, let $f \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ be an arbitrary bounded function. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and consider $\theta_t \sim \text{Poiss}_t^2(\lambda)$. Without loss of generality, assume that θ_t is constructed as above, i.e. $\theta_t = \tau_{<N_t}$. We need to show that $\mathbb{E}[f(\theta_t)] \rightarrow f(0)$ for $\mathbb{R}_{>0} \ni t \rightarrow 0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ one has $|\mathbb{E}[f(\tau_n)]| \leq \mathbb{E}[|f(\tau_n)|] \leq \|f\|_{\infty}$ and for $n = 0$ one has $\mathbb{E}[f(\tau_0)] = \mathbb{E}[f(0)] = f(0)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \mathbb{E}[f(\theta_t)] - f(0) \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[f(\theta_t) \mid N_t]] - f(0) \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[N_t = n] \mathbb{E}[f(\theta_t) \mid N_t = n] - f(0) \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[N_t = n] \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[f(\tau_n)]}_{=f(0) \text{ for } n=0} - f(0) \right| \\
&\leq (1 - \mathbb{P}[N_t = 0])|f(0)| + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[N_t = n] \|f\|_{\infty} \\
&= (1 - \mathbb{P}[N_t = 0]) (|f(0)| + \|f\|_{\infty}) \\
&= (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) (|f(0)| + \|f\|_{\infty}) \\
&\rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

for $\mathbb{R}_{>0} \ni t \rightarrow 0$. ■

^kUsing the characteristic function, one can alternatively compute $\mathbb{E}[\theta] = \frac{1}{i} \varphi_{t,\lambda}'(0) = e^{\frac{i\omega}{\lambda-i\omega} \lambda t} \cdot \frac{\lambda^2 t}{(\lambda-i\omega)^2} \Big|_{\omega=0} = t$.

2.2 Approximants as expectations. Our goal is to now associate continuous semigroups of distributions to C_0 -semigroups of operators via the machinery of expectations computed strongly via Bochner-integrals.

Definition 2.3 (Expectation-approximants). Let Λ be a directed index set and $\Gamma^{(\alpha)} := (\Gamma^{(\alpha)}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ be a continuous semigroup of distributions for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$. Further let T be a contractive C_0 -semigroup on a Banach space \mathcal{E} and define

$$T^{(\alpha)} := (\mathbb{E}[T(\theta_t^{(\alpha)})])_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$$

for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$, where $\theta_t^{(\alpha)} \sim \Gamma^{(\alpha)}(t)$. Furthermore, letting $\mu_t^{(\alpha)}$ and $(\sigma_t^{(\alpha)})^2$ denote the mean and variance of $\Gamma^{(\alpha)}(t)$ -distributed r. v.'s respectively, suppose that

$$\mu_t^{(\alpha)} \xrightarrow{\alpha} t \quad \text{and} \quad (\sigma_t^{(\alpha)})^2 \xrightarrow{\alpha} 0$$

uniformly in t on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. In this case, we say that $(T^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ is a net of *expectation-approximants* with *associated distribution semigroups* $(\Gamma^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$. We furthermore refer to T as the *original semigroup*.

Our motivation in using expectation-approximants is that they can be expressed in terms of the original C_0 -semigroup. Before we proceed with using this broad definition, we provide some concrete examples. In particular, we show that the Hille- and Yosida-approximants satisfy the above definition.

Lemma 2.4 (Hille- and Yosida-approximants as expectations, Chung 1962).

Let T be a contractive C_0 -semigroup on a Banach space \mathcal{E} with generator A . The Hille- and Yosida-approximants of T constitute expectation-approximants.

For our purposes, it will suffice to assume that T is contractive, although this result holds without this restriction. This result can be attributed to Chung (see [9, Theorem 1 and Theorem 4]). For completeness and the reader's convenience, we provide a proof.

Proof (of Lemma 2.4). Hille-approximants: The Hille-approximants are given by the net $(T^{(\lambda)})_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}}$, ordered by increasing values of λ , where $T^{(\lambda)} = (e^{tA^{(\lambda)}})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ and $A^{(\lambda)} = \lambda(T(\frac{1}{\lambda}) - \mathbf{I})$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ the parameterised distributions $\Gamma^{(\lambda)} := (\text{Poiss}(\lambda t, \frac{1}{\lambda}))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ form a continuous semigroup of distributions (see §2.1), with means $\mu_t^{(\lambda)} = \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \lambda t = t$ and variances $(\sigma_t^{(\lambda)})^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \cdot \lambda t = \frac{t}{\lambda} \xrightarrow{\lambda} 0$ for $\mathbb{R}_{> 0} \ni \lambda \rightarrow \infty$, and this convergence is clearly uniform in t on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. To satisfy the definition of a net of expectation-approximants, it thus suffices to show for $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, and $\theta \sim \text{Poiss}(\lambda t, \frac{1}{\lambda})$ that $T^{(\lambda)}(t) = \mathbb{E}[T(\theta)]$. Indeed $T^{(\lambda)}(t) = e^{tA^{(\lambda)}} = e^{\lambda t(T(\frac{1}{\lambda}) - \mathbf{I})} = e^{-\lambda t} e^{\lambda t T(\frac{1}{\lambda})}$ and

$$e^{-\lambda t} e^{\lambda t T(\frac{1}{\lambda})} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\lambda t} (\lambda t)^n}{n!} T(\frac{1}{\lambda})^n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[\theta = \frac{1}{\lambda} n] T(\frac{1}{\lambda} n) = \mathbb{E}[T(\theta)].$$

Hence the net of Hille-approximants for T forms a net of expectation-approximants for T .

Yosida-approximants: The Yosida-approximants are given by the net $(T^{(\lambda)})_{\lambda \in (\omega_0(T)^+, \infty)}$, ordered by increasing values of λ , where $T^{(\lambda)} = (e^{tA^{(\lambda)}})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ and $A^{(\lambda)} = \lambda \cdot (\lambda R(\lambda, A) - \mathbf{I})$ for each $\lambda \in (\omega_0(T)^+, \infty)$. For $\lambda \in (\omega_0(T)^+, \infty)$ the parameterised distributions $\Gamma^{(\lambda)} := (\text{Poiss}_t^2(\lambda))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ form a continuous semigroup of distributions (see Proposition 2.2), with means $\mu_t^{(\lambda)} = \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \lambda t = t$ and variances $(\sigma_t^{(\lambda)})^2 = \frac{2t}{\lambda} \xrightarrow{\lambda} 0$ for $(\omega_0(T)^+, \infty) \ni \lambda \rightarrow \infty$ (see Proposition 2.1), and this convergence is clearly uniform in t on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. To demonstrate that $(T^{(\lambda)})_{\lambda \in (\omega_0(T)^+, \infty)}$ forms a net of expectation-approximants for T , it thus suffices to show for $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\lambda \in (\omega_0(T)^+, \infty)$, and $\theta \sim \text{Poiss}_t^2(\lambda)$ that $T^{(\lambda)}(t) = \mathbb{E}[T(\theta)]$.

By the construction of auxiliary Poisson processes in §2.1, it suffices to prove the claim concretely for $\theta := \theta_t = \tau_{<N_t}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the *Phillips calculus* applied to A (see e.g. [16, Lemma VIII.1.12 [*]], [36, Proposition 3.3.5]) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{I} + \lambda^{-1}A^{(\lambda)})^n &= (\lambda R(\lambda, A))^n \\
&= \lambda^n \cdot \text{SOT-} \int_{s=0}^{\infty} \frac{s^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} e^{-\lambda s} T(s) \, ds \\
&= \text{SOT-} \int_{s=0}^{\infty} T(s) \underbrace{\lambda \frac{(\lambda s)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} e^{-\lambda s}}_{= \mathbb{P}_{\tau_{<n}}(ds)} \, ds, \\
&= \text{SOT-} \int_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} T(s) \mathbb{P}_{\tau_{<n}}(ds) \\
&\stackrel{\text{defn}}{=} \mathbb{E}[T(\tau_{<n})].
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $\tau_{<0} = 0$ a. s., one has $T(\tau_{<0}) = \mathbf{I}$ a. s. and thus $\mathbb{E}[T(\tau_{<0})] = \mathbf{I} = (\mathbf{I} + \lambda^{-1}A^{(\lambda)})^0$, using the convention of $S^0 := \mathbf{I}$ for $S \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{E})$. Thus

$$(\mathbf{I} + \lambda^{-1}A^{(\lambda)})^n = \mathbb{E}[T(\tau_{<n})] \tag{2.4}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (cf. [9, Lemma 2]). Let $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be arbitrary. By the boundedness of $A^{(\lambda)}$ one has $T^{(\lambda)}(t) = e^{tA^{(\lambda)}} = e^{\lambda t(-\mathbf{I} + (\mathbf{I} + \lambda^{-1}A^{(\lambda)}))} = e^{-\lambda t} e^{\lambda t(\mathbf{I} + \lambda^{-1}A^{(\lambda)})}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{-\lambda t} e^{\lambda t(\mathbf{I} + \lambda^{-1}A^{(\lambda)})} &= e^{-\lambda t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\lambda t)^n}{n!} \underbrace{(\mathbf{I} + \lambda^{-1}A^{(\lambda)})^n}_{:= \mathbf{I} \text{ for } n=0} \\
&\stackrel{(2.4)}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \underbrace{e^{-\lambda t} \frac{(\lambda t)^n}{n!}}_{= \mathbb{P}[N_t=n]} \mathbb{E}[T(\tau_{<n})] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[T(\tau_{<N_t})].
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $T^{(\lambda)}(t) = \mathbb{E}[T(\tau_{<N_t})] = \mathbb{E}[T(\theta)]$. ■

Remark 2.5 The setup of the auxiliary Poisson processes used to demonstrate that Yosida-approximants are expectation-approximants in Lemma 2.4 bears some resemblance to *expectation semigroups in random evolutions*. Note that a random evolution involves a *single Markov-process*: both for the number of events (referred to as ‘jumps’) that occur in a time interval $[0, t)$, as well as for the durations between each jump used with the semigroup(s), which accumulate to a total duration which necessarily lies in $[0, t)$ (cf. [22, §II.15.7]). By contrast, the construction in §2.1 involves two independent processes: N_t counts up the number of events that occur in $[0, t)$ for the first PPP, whereas the total duration, $\theta_t = \sum_{i=0}^{N_t} \tau_i$, used as inputs to the semigroup, is determined by a second independent PPP and may well lie outside $[0, t)$.

We now observe basic facts about expectation-approximants, which provide alternative unified proofs of facts we already knew about Hille- and Yosida-approximants (cf. §1.3). We first demonstrate that expectation-approximants are themselves bona fide C_0 -semigroups and that the nets approximate the original C_0 -semigroup. This result is likely well known (cf. e.g. [9, Lemma 1]). For the sake of completeness and the reader’s convenience we present the proofs.

Proposition 2.6 *Let T be a contractive C_0 -semigroup on a Banach space \mathcal{E} and $(T^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ a net of expectation-approximants for T . Then $T^{(\alpha)}$ is a contractive C_0 -semigroup for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$. Moreover, $T^{(\alpha)}(t) \xrightarrow{\alpha} T(t)$ wrt. the SOT-topology uniformly in t on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.*

Proof. Let $(\Gamma^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ be the distribution semigroups associated with the net of expectation-approximants. Further let $\theta_t^{(\alpha)} \sim \Gamma^{(\alpha)}(t)$ and let $\mu_t^{(\alpha)}$ and $(\sigma_t^{(\alpha)})^2$ be the mean and variance of $\theta_t^{(\alpha)}$ respectively for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

C_0 -semigroup: Let $\alpha \in \Lambda$ be arbitrary. First observe that $\|T^{(\alpha)}(t)\| = \|\mathbb{E}[T(\theta_t^{(\alpha)})]\| \leq \mathbb{E}[\|T(\theta_t^{(\alpha)})\|] \leq 1$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, whence each expectation-approximant is contractive. Towards the semigroup law, by definition of continuous semigroups of distributions, $T^{(\alpha)}(0) = \mathbb{E}[T(\theta_0^{(\alpha)})] = \mathbb{E}[T(0)] = \mathbf{I}$ since $\theta_0^{(\alpha)} \sim \delta_0$, and for each $s, t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, letting $\tau_1 \sim \theta_s^{(\alpha)} \sim \Gamma^{(\alpha)}(s)$ and $\tau_2 \sim \theta_t^{(\alpha)} \sim \Gamma^{(\alpha)}(t)$ be independent, one has $\tau_1 + \tau_2 \sim \theta_{s+t}^{(\alpha)} \sim \Gamma^{(\alpha)}(s+t)$, whence $T^{(\alpha)}(s)T^{(\alpha)}(t) = \mathbb{E}[T(\tau_1)]\mathbb{E}[T(\tau_2)] = \mathbb{E}[T(\tau_1)T(\tau_2)] = \mathbb{E}[T(\tau_1 + \tau_2)] = \mathbb{E}[T(\theta_{s+t}^{(\alpha)})] = T^{(\alpha)}(s+t)$. Towards SOT-continuity of $T^{(\alpha)}$, it suffices to prove continuity in 0. To this end, let $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Since T is SOT-continuous, $\sup_{s \in [0, \delta]} \|(T(s) - \mathbf{I})\xi\| < \varepsilon$ for some $\delta > 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|(T^{(\alpha)}(t) - T^{(\alpha)}(0))\xi\| &= \left\| \left(\mathbb{E}[T(\theta_t^{(\alpha)})] - \mathbf{I} \right) \xi \right\| \\ &= \left\| \int_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} (T(s) - \mathbf{I})\xi \mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}(ds) \right\| \\ &\leq \int_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \|(T(s) - \mathbf{I})\xi\| \mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}(ds) \\ &= \int_{s \in [0, \delta]} \underbrace{\|(T(s) - \mathbf{I})\xi\|}_{< \varepsilon} \mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}(ds) + \int_{s \in (\delta, \infty)} \underbrace{\|(T(s) - \mathbf{I})\xi\|}_{\leq 2\|\xi\|} \mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}(ds) \\ &\leq \varepsilon \mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}[[0, \delta]] + 2\|\xi\| \mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}[(\delta, \infty)] \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. By the Portmanteau theorem (see [27, Theorem 17.20 v]) and since by definition $\theta_t^{(\alpha)} \xrightarrow[t]{\alpha} \delta_0$ and $\delta_0((\delta, \infty) \setminus \text{int}((\delta, \infty))) = \delta_0(\{\delta\}) = 0$, one has $\mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}[(\delta, \infty)] \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\delta_0}[(\delta, \infty)] = 0$ for $\mathbb{R}_{>0} \ni t \rightarrow 0$. From the above inequality and since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrarily chosen, it follows that $T^{(\alpha)}(t)\xi \rightarrow T^{(\alpha)}(0)\xi$ for $\mathbb{R}_{>0} \ni t \rightarrow 0$. So $T^{(\alpha)}$ constitutes a contractive C_0 -semigroup.

Approximation: Fix an arbitrary $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$ and compact subset $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $L = [0, a]$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. By the SOT-continuity of T and compactness of $[0, a+1]$, there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\sup_{s \in U} \|(T(s) - T(t))\xi\| < \varepsilon \quad (2.5)$$

for all $t \in L$, where $U := \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cap (t - \delta, t + \delta)$. Since, by definition of expectation-approximants, $\mu_t^{(\alpha)} \xrightarrow[t]{\alpha} t$ uniformly for $t \in L$, by (2.5) it follows that $\sup_{t \in L} \|(T(\mu_t^{(\alpha)}) - T(t))\xi\| \leq \varepsilon$ for sufficiently large indices $\alpha \in \Lambda$. Furthermore, by the Chebyshev-inequality (see *e.g.* [28, Theorem 5.11]), one has that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}[\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \setminus U] \leq \delta^{-2} (\sigma_t^{(\alpha)})^2 \quad (2.6)$$

for each $t \in L$. Since, by definition of expectation-approximants, $(\sigma_t^{(\alpha)})^2 \xrightarrow[\alpha]{} 0$ uniformly for $t \in L$, by (2.6) one has $\sup_{t \in L} \mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}[\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \setminus U] \leq \varepsilon$ for sufficiently large indices $\alpha \in \Lambda$. For sufficiently large indices $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and all $t \in L$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(T^{(\alpha)}(t) - T(t))\xi\| &\leq \|(T(\mu_t^{(\alpha)}) - T(t))\xi\| + \|(T^{(\alpha)}(t) - T(\mu_t^{(\alpha)}))\xi\| \\ &= \underbrace{\|(T(\mu_t^{(\alpha)}) - T(t))\xi\|}_{\leq \varepsilon} + \left\| \left(\mathbb{E}[T(\theta_t^{(\alpha)})] - T(\mu_t^{(\alpha)}) \right) \xi \right\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon + \left\| \int_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} (T(s) - T(\mu_t^{(\alpha)}))\xi \mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}(ds) \right\| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \varepsilon + \int_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \|(T(s) - T(\mu_t^{(\alpha)}))\xi\| \mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}(ds) \\
&\leq \varepsilon + \int_{s \in U} \underbrace{\|(T(s) - T(t))\xi\| + \|(T(t) - T(\mu_t^{(\alpha)}))\xi\|}_{\leq 2\varepsilon} \mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}(ds) \\
&\quad + \int_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \setminus U} \underbrace{\|(T(s) - T(\mu_t^{(\alpha)}))\xi\|}_{\leq 2\|\xi\|} \mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}(ds) \\
&\leq \varepsilon + 2\varepsilon \mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}[U] + 2\|\xi\| \underbrace{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_t^{(\alpha)}}[\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \setminus U]}_{\leq \varepsilon} \leq 3\varepsilon + 2\|\xi\|\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Since ξ and ε were arbitrarily chosen, it follows that $T^{(\alpha)}(t) \rightarrow T(t)$ wrt. the SOT-topology uniformly in t on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. \blacksquare

Proposition 2.7 *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{E} be a Banach space, and $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a commuting family of contractive C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{E} . Furthermore, let $(T_i^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda_i}$ be expectation-approximants for T_i for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Then for each $\alpha \in \prod_{i=1}^d \Lambda_i$ the family of approximants $\{T_i^{(\alpha_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$ is a commuting family of contractive C_0 -semigroups. Moreover, $(\{T_i^{(\alpha_i)}\}_{i=1}^d)_{\alpha \in \prod_{i=1}^d \Lambda_i}$ converges to $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ wrt. the SOT-topology uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$.*

Proof. Commuting family: By Proposition 2.6, the approximants $T_i^{(\alpha_i)}$ are contractive C_0 -semigroups for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Let $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ be arbitrary. Per definition of expectation-approximants there exist $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ -valued r. v.'s $\theta_1, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_d$ satisfying $T_i^{(\alpha_i)}(t_i) = \mathbb{E}[T_i(\theta_i)]$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the θ_i are independent r. v.'s. By independence and commutativity $\mathbb{E}[T_i(\theta_i)]\mathbb{E}[T_j(\theta_j)] = \mathbb{E}[T_i(\theta_i)T_j(\theta_j)] = \mathbb{E}[T_j(\theta_j)T_i(\theta_i)] = \mathbb{E}[T_j(\theta_j)]\mathbb{E}[T_i(\theta_i)]$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ with $i \neq j$. Thus $\{T_i^{(\alpha_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$ is a commuting family of contractive C_0 -semigroups.

Approximation: Let $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ be an arbitrary compact subset. Without loss of generality, one may assume $L = \prod_{i=1}^d L_i$ for some compact subsets $L_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. We prove by induction over $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{t} \in \prod_{i=1}^k L_i} \left\| \left(\prod_{i=1}^k T_i^{(\alpha_i)}(t_i) - \prod_{i=1}^k T_i(t_i) \right) \xi \right\| \xrightarrow{\alpha} 0 \quad (2.7)$$

for all $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$. For $k = 1$, this holds by Proposition 2.6. Let $1 < k \leq d$ and assume that (2.7) holds for $k - 1$. Let $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Since T_k is SOT-continuous and L_k is compact, there is a finite subset $F \subseteq L_k$ such that $\min_{t' \in F} \|(T_k(t) - T_k(t'))\xi\| < \varepsilon$ for each $t \in L_k$. Let $\mathbf{t} \in L$ be arbitrary and let $t' \in F$ be such that $\|(T_k(t_k) - T_k(t'))\xi\| < \varepsilon$. Since the approximants are all contractive, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \left(\prod_{i=1}^k T_i^{(\alpha_i)}(t_i) - \prod_{i=1}^k T_i(t_i) \right) \xi \right\| &\leq \left\| \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} T_i^{(\alpha_i)}(t_i) - \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} T_i(t_i) \right) T_k(t') \xi \right\| \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\left\| \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} T_i^{(\alpha_i)}(t_i) - \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} T_i(t_i) \right\|}_{\leq 2} \underbrace{\left\| (T_k(t') - T_k(t_k)) \xi \right\|}_{< \varepsilon} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\left\| \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} T_i^{(\alpha_i)}(t_i) \right\|}_{\leq 1} \left\| (T_k^{(\alpha_k)}(t_k) - T_k(t_k)) \xi \right\| \\
&\leq \max_{t'' \in F} \left\| \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} T_i^{(\alpha_i)}(t_i) - \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} T_i(t_i) \right) T_k(t'') \xi \right\|
\end{aligned}$$

$$+2\varepsilon + \|(T_k^{(\alpha_k)}(t_k) - T_k(t_k))\xi\|$$

for each $\alpha \in \prod_{i=1}^k \Lambda_i$. By induction ((2.7) applied to $k-1$ and the finite set of vectors $\{T_k(t'')\xi \mid t'' \in F\}$) and Proposition 2.6 (applied to T_k), by taking lim sup over α , the right-hand expression is bounded by $0 + 2\varepsilon + 0$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrarily chosen, it follows that (2.7) holds. Hence the claim holds by induction. \blacksquare

We also obtain the following auxiliary results for simple modifications of C_0 -semigroups:

Proposition 2.8 *Let \mathcal{E} be a Banach space and T be a contractive C_0 -semigroup on \mathcal{E} . Furthermore, let $(T^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ be a net of expectation-approximants for T with associated distribution semigroups $(\Gamma^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$. Then for any (equivalently: for an arbitrary) r. v. $\theta \sim \Gamma^{(\alpha)}(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and $\alpha \in \Lambda$*

- (i) $(T^{(\alpha)}(t))' = \mathbb{E}[T(\theta)']$, provided \mathcal{E} is reflexive; and
- (ii) $(T^{(\alpha)}(t))^* = \mathbb{E}[T(\theta)^*]$, if \mathcal{E} is a Hilbert space.

Furthermore, in the case of Hille-(resp. Yosida-)approximants $(T^{(\lambda)})_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}}$ it holds that

- (iii) $T^{(\lambda)}(rt) = \mathbb{E}[T(r\theta)]$;

for $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and any (equivalently: for an arbitrary) r. v. $\theta \sim \text{Pois}(r\lambda t, \frac{1}{r\lambda})$ (resp. $\theta \sim \text{Pois}_t^2(r\lambda)$).

Proof. (i): First observe that $(T^{(\alpha)}(t)')_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ and $(T(t)')_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ are C_0 -semigroups (see e.g. [22, Theorem I.4.9]). Let $\xi \in \mathcal{E}'' \cong \mathcal{E}$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{E}'$ be arbitrary. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \xi, T^{(\alpha)}(t)' \eta \rangle &= \langle T^{(\alpha)}(t) \xi, \eta \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbb{E}[T(\theta)] \xi, \eta \rangle \\ &= \left\langle \left(\text{SOT-} \int_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} T(s) \mathbb{P}_\theta(ds) \right) \xi, \eta \right\rangle \\ &= \int_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \langle T(s) \xi, \eta \rangle \mathbb{P}_\theta(ds) \\ &= \int_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \langle \xi, T(s)' \eta \rangle \mathbb{P}_\theta(ds) \\ &= \left\langle \xi, \left(\text{SOT-} \int_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} T(s)' \mathbb{P}_\theta(ds) \right) \eta \right\rangle \\ &= \langle \xi, \mathbb{E}[T(\theta)'] \eta \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $T^{(\alpha)}(t)' = \mathbb{E}[T(\theta)']$. The expression in (ii) can be proved analogously.

(iii): First observe that $T_r := (T(rt'))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ is a C_0 -semigroup with generator $A_r = rA$. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. In the case of Hille-approximants, one has

$$A_r^{(r\lambda)} = (r\lambda) \cdot (T_r(\frac{1}{r\lambda}) - \mathbf{I}) = (r\lambda) \cdot (T(\frac{1}{\lambda}) - \mathbf{I}) = rA^{(\lambda)}$$

and in the case of Yosida-approximants

$$A_r^{(r\lambda)} = (r\lambda) \cdot ((r\lambda)R(r\lambda, A_r) - \mathbf{I}) = r\lambda \cdot ((r\lambda)R(r\lambda, rA) - \mathbf{I}) = rA^{(\lambda)}.$$

Thus in both cases $T_r^{(r\lambda)}(t) = e^{tA_r^{(r\lambda)}} = e^{trA^{(\lambda)}} = T^{(\lambda)}(rt)$ holds. Applying the properties of the $(r\lambda)$ th-Hille-approximant (resp. $(r\lambda)$ th-Yosida-approximant) of T_r thus yields

$$T^{(\lambda)}(rt) = T_r^{(r\lambda)}(t) = \mathbb{E}[T_r(\theta)] = \mathbb{E}[T(r\theta)]$$

for any (equivalently: for an arbitrary) r. v. $\theta \sim \text{Pois}(r\lambda t, \frac{1}{r\lambda})$ (resp. $\theta \sim \text{Pois}_t^2(r\lambda)$). \blacksquare

2.3 Families of approximants as expectations. In order to prove (c) \implies (d) of Theorem 1.5, we shall rely on results about the expectations of products.

Proposition 2.9 *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{E} be a Banach space, and $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a (not necessarily commuting) family of contractive C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{E} . Further let $(T_i^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda_i}$ be a net of expectation-approximants for T_i with associated distribution semigroups $(\Gamma_i^{(\alpha)}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \alpha \in \Lambda_i}$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Then for $\alpha \in \prod_{i=1}^d \Lambda_i$, and $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ it holds that*

$$\prod_{i=1}^d T_i^{(\alpha_i)}(t_i) = \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i=1}^d T_i(\theta_i) \right], \quad (2.8)$$

for any (equivalently: for an arbitrary) family of independent r.v.'s $\theta_i \sim \Gamma_i^{(\alpha_i)}(t)$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$.

Proof. By definition of expectation-approximants we have $T_i^{(\alpha_i)}(t_i) = \mathbb{E}[T_i(\theta_i)]$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and thus by independence $\prod_{i=1}^d T_i^{(\alpha_i)}(t_i) = \prod_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}[T_i(\theta_i)] = \mathbb{E}[\prod_{i=1}^d T_i(\theta_i)]$. \blacksquare

Restricting to the context of semigroups over Hilbert spaces yields a result, which can be utilised with regular polynomial evaluations. For $p \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, X_1^{-1}, X_2, X_2^{-1}, \dots, X_d, X_d^{-1}]$ let the *absolute degree of p* denote the largest $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, such that X_i^n or X_i^{-n} occurs in some monomial in p , or else 0 if $p = 0$. In particular, the absolute degree of p is at most 1 if and only if the only powers of the X_i that occur in monomials in p are ± 1 .

Proposition 2.10 *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, and $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a commuting family of contractive C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{H} . Further let $(T_i^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda_i}$ be a net of expectation-approximants for T_i with associated distribution semigroups $(\Gamma_i^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda_i}$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Then for $\alpha \in \prod_{i=1}^d \Lambda_i$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ and any regular polynomial $p \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, X_1^{-1}, X_2, X_2^{-1}, \dots, X_d, X_d^{-1}]$ with absolute degree at most 1*

$$p(T_1^{(\lambda_1)}(t_1), T_2^{(\lambda_2)}(t_2), \dots, T_d^{(\lambda_d)}(t_d)) = \mathbb{E}[p(T_1(\theta_1), T_2(\theta_2), \dots, T_d(\theta_d))] \quad (2.9)$$

for any (equivalently: for an arbitrary) family of independent r.v.'s $\theta_i \sim \Gamma_i^{(\alpha_i)}(t_i)$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$.

Proof. By linearity, it suffices to simply consider monomials of the form $p = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{n_i}$ where $\mathbf{n} \in \{0, \pm 1\}^d$. Let $C_1 := \text{supp}(\mathbf{n}^-)$, $C_2 := \text{supp}(\mathbf{n}^+)$, and $K := \text{supp}(\mathbf{n}) \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, where $\mathbf{n}^- := (n_i^-)_{i=1}^d$ and $\mathbf{n}^+ := (n_i^+)_{i=1}^d$. Then $(C_1, C_2) \in \text{Part}(K)$. By taking regular polynomial evaluations, we thus have to prove that

$$\prod_{i \in C_1} T_i^{(\lambda_i)}(t_i)^* \cdot \prod_{j \in C_2} T_j^{(\lambda_j)}(t_j) = \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i \in C_1} T_i(\theta_i)^* \cdot \prod_{j \in C_2} T_j(\theta_j) \right]$$

for any (equivalently: for an arbitrary) family of independent r.v.'s $\theta_i \sim \Gamma_i^{(\alpha_i)}(t)$, $i \in K$. This follows by applying Propositions 2.8 and 2.9. \blacksquare

Remark 2.11 For this paper we only need the statement in Proposition 2.10 to hold for regular polynomials of absolute degree at most 1. If we nonetheless sought to widen the scope of this result, observe that limitations arise for powers n of X_i with $|n| \geq 2$, since then the application of Proposition 2.8 (iii) leads to random variables with different parameterisations.

As an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.10, we obtain:

Lemma 2.12 (Transfer result). Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, and $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a commuting family of contractive C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{H} . Further for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ let $(T_i^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda_i}$ be a net of expectation-approximants for T_i . Then for any regular polynomial $p \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, X_1^{-1}, X_2, X_2^{-1}, \dots, X_d, X_d^{-1}]$ with absolute degree at most 1, if $p(T_1(t_1), T_1(t_2), \dots, T_d(t_d))$ is a positive operator for all $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$, then $p(T_1^{(\alpha_1)}(t_1), T_1^{(\alpha_1)}(t_2), \dots, T_d^{(\alpha_d)}(t_d))$ is positive for all $\alpha \in \prod_{i=1}^d \Lambda_i$ and $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$.

3. FIRST MAIN RESULT: EXPECTATION-APPROXIMANTS AND POLYNOMIAL BOUNDS

We can now prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof (of Theorem 1.5). First observe by Proposition 2.7 that the expectation-approximants constitute commuting families of C_0 -semigroups, which converge wrt. the SOT-topology uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ to the original family $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$. In particular, the implication (d) \implies (a) holds by Theorem 1.1. The implications (a) \implies (b) \implies (c) hold by Theorem 1.3, since these do not require the assumption of bounded generators. It remains to prove (c) \implies (d). We first prove this under the assumption that the expectation-approximants have bounded generators.

(c) \implies (d), under boundedness assumption on approximants: Let $\alpha \in \prod_{i=1}^d \Lambda_i$ be arbitrary. Let $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ be arbitrary. By assumption,

$$p_K(T_1(t_1), T_2(t_2), \dots, T_d(t_d)) = \sum_{(C_1, C_2) \in \text{Part}(K)} \prod_{i \in C_1} T_i(t_i)^* \prod_{j \in C_2} T_j(t_j) \geq \mathbf{0}$$

for all $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$. By Lemma 2.12, this positivity can be transferred to the family of expectation-approximants, *i.e.* $p_K(T_1^{(\alpha_1)}(t_1), T_2^{(\alpha_2)}(t_2), \dots, T_d^{(\alpha_d)}(t_d)) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$. Since this holds for all $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and since by assumption the semigroups in $\{T_i^{(\alpha_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$ have bounded generators, by Theorem 1.3 $\{T_i^{(\alpha_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$ has a simultaneous regular unitary dilation.

We have thus established the equivalence of (a), (b), (c), (d) under the assumption that the expectation-approximants have bounded generators. Since by Lemma 2.4 one can always use the Hille- or Yosida-approximants (which by construction have bounded generators), the equivalences (a) \iff (b) \iff (c) hold in general. (†)

(c) \implies (d), without boundedness assumption on approximants: By the above, (d) \implies (a) \implies (b) \implies (c) continue to hold. Exactly as argued above, (c) implies that $p_K(T_1^{(\alpha_1)}(t_1), T_2^{(\alpha_2)}(t_2), \dots, T_d^{(\alpha_d)}(t_d)) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$, $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, and $\alpha \in \prod_{i=1}^d \Lambda_i$. Let $\alpha \in \prod_{i=1}^d \Lambda_i$ be arbitrary. By the general validity of (c) \implies (a) (see (†)) applied to $\{T_i^{(\alpha_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$, it follows that $\{T_i^{(\alpha_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$ has a simultaneous regular unitary dilation. Returning to the current context, this means that (d) holds. ■

Remark 3.1 In Theorem 1.5, since (a), (b), and (c) each imply that the T_i are contractive, for the equivalences (a) \iff (b) \iff (c) it is not necessary to explicitly demand that the T_i are contractive. To see that (b) implies that the T_i are contractive, consider polynomial bounds applied to the regular polynomials X_i for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. To see that (c) implies that the T_i are contractive, let $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ be arbitrary. By considering the polynomial $p_{\{i\}}$, we have that $(\mathbf{I} - T_i(t)^*) + (\mathbf{I} - T_i(t)) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. It readily follows that the generator A_i of T_i is dissipative and thus that T_i is contractive.

Remark 3.2 If we replace ‘simultaneous regular unitary dilations’ by ‘simultaneous unitary dilations’, classifications via bounds of algebraic expressions include [31, Theorem 2.2] in the continuous setting, and [34, Corollaries 4.9] in the discrete setting (*i.e.* for tuples of commuting contractions). In the discrete setting, the existence of a simultaneous *power dilation* is characterised by the *complete boundedness* of polynomials defined on the operators. In the

continuous setting, le Merdy characterised the existence of a simultaneous unitary dilation by the complete boundedness of a certain functional calculus map generated by the resolvents of the semigroups and defined on an algebra of holomorphic functions. Adding to this picture, our result in Theorem 1.5 (see also Remark 3.1) answers Question 1.4 positively and we now know in full generality that finite commuting families of C_0 -semigroups over Hilbert spaces have a simultaneous regular unitary dilation if and only if they satisfy regular polynomial bounds. (In §4 a further characterisation of regular unitary dilations via the complete positivity of a functional calculus shall be presented, which is more general than the regular polynomial bounds and further adds to this picture.)

Remark 3.3 Consider a neighbourhood $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ of $\mathbf{0}$ and let (c') be the assertion of the positivity of the operators in (c) for $\mathbf{t} \in U$ instead of for all $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$. We show that Theorem 1.5 holds with (c) replaced by (c'). For this it suffices to show that (c') implies (a) (i.e. that $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ has a simultaneous regular unitary dilation).

To this end, fix some $a \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ such that $U \supseteq [0, a]^d$ and consider the subnet of Hille-approximants: $(T_i^{(\lambda)})_{\lambda \in (a^{-1}, \infty)}$ for T_i for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Clearly, taking subnets does not affect the fact that these are expectation-approximants. Thus applying Theorem 1.5 yields that $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ has a simultaneous regular unitary dilation, if and only if $\{T_i^{(\lambda_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$ has a simultaneous regular unitary dilation for each $\lambda \in (a^{-1}, \infty)^d$. Since the Hille-approximants have bounded generators, by Theorem 1.3 this holds if and only if the generators $\{A_i^{(\lambda_i)}\}_{i=1}^d$ of the Hille-approximants are completely dissipative for each $\lambda \in (a^{-1}, \infty)^d$. By construction of the Hille-approximants, this holds if and only if

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{|K|} \sum_{(C_1, C_2) \in \text{Part}(K)} \left(\prod_{i \in C_1} \left(\lambda_i (T_i(\frac{1}{\lambda_i}) - \mathbf{I}) \right) \right)^* \prod_{j \in C_2} \left(\lambda_j (T_j(\frac{1}{\lambda_j}) - \mathbf{I}) \right) \geq \mathbf{0}$$

for all $\lambda \in (a^{-1}, \infty)^d$ and all $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. This holds if and only if $p_K(T_1(t_1), T_1(t_2), \dots, T_d(t_d)) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $\mathbf{t} \in (0, a)^d$ and all $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. This in turn is clearly implied by (c').

Remark 3.4 By (a) \iff (d) of Theorem 1.5 as well as Lemma 2.4, we have answered Question 1.2 positively for a large class of naturally definable examples: The simultaneous regular unitary dilatability of a commuting contractive family is characterised by the simultaneous regular unitary dilatability of families of semigroups in any given net of expectation-approximants, e.g. the nets of Hille- and Yosida-approximants. It would be interesting to know whether this characterisation holds for other classically defined approximants, such as the approximants that occur in Kendall's formula and the semigroup version of the Post-Widder theorem (cf. [24, Theorem 10.4.3 and 11.6.6], [9, Theorems 2–3]). In these cases, in place of the stochastic methods used in the present paper, other techniques such as product formulae used with path integrals, e.g. Chernoff approximations (see [7, 8, 5]), may be better suited.

Remark 3.5 Let $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be the generators of a commuting family $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of C_0 -semigroups on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Consider now the subset $D \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, of elements ξ which lie in the domain of $A_{k_n} \dots A_{k_2} \cdot A_{k_1}$ and such that the value of $(A_{k_n} \dots A_{k_2} \cdot A_{k_1})\xi$ does not depend on the order of the k_i for injective sequences $(k_i)_{i=1}^n \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, $n \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. It can be shown that D is a dense linear subspace of \mathcal{H} (see Proposition A.2). One may thus extend the notion of complete dissipativity to families of generators $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^d$ (without the boundedness assumption), by demanding that

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{|K|} \sum_{(C_1, C_2) \in \text{Part}(K)} \left\langle \left(\prod_{j \in C_2} A_j \right) \xi, \left(\prod_{i \in C_1} A_i \right) \xi \right\rangle \geq 0$$

for all $\xi \in D$ and $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$.

Appealing to condition (c) of Theorem 1.5, if $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ has a simultaneous regular unitary dilation, then by taking limits of the positive expressions $\frac{1}{2^K \prod_{i=1}^d t_i} \langle p_K(T_1(t_1), T_2(t_2), \dots, T_d(t_d))\xi, \xi \rangle$ for $\mathbb{R}_{> 0} \ni t_i \rightarrow 0$ successively for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and for each $\xi \in D$, we obtain that $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is completely dissipative by

the above definition. However, it is unclear whether the reverse implication holds. The approach used in [13, Theorem 1.1] to link complete dissipativity to a previously known condition¹ which characterises the existence of simultaneous regular unitary dilations in general, relies on asymptotic expressions, which in turn rely on the boundedness of the generators. Hence an alternative approach is needed for the unbounded setting. It would thus be of interest to know whether the above (or an alternative) definition of complete dissipativity can be shown to be equivalent to any (and thus all) of the conditions in Theorem 1.5.

4. FUNCTIONAL CALCULI ASSOCIATED WITH DILATIONS

We now leave the setting of commuting families and turn our attention to classical dynamical systems modelled by SOT-continuous homomorphisms between topological monoids and bounded operators over a Hilbert space. In this section we provide characterisations of unitary and regular unitary dilations via *functional calculi* defined on (subalgebras of) certain C^* -algebras related to topological groups. We thus begin in §4.1 by recalling the 1:1-correspondence between $*$ -representations of group C^* -algebras and unitary representations of topological groups. Then in §4.2 we shall use the Wittstock-Haagerup result, which involves extending and then dilating *completely bounded* maps. We build on this to generalise le Merdy’s approach to characterise unitary dilatability. Finally, in §4.3 we shall use Averson’s result and Stinespring’s theorem, which involves extending and then dilating *completely positive* maps. We build on this to obtain a characterisation of regular unitary dilations similar to that of Sz.-Nagy and Foias (see [43, Theorem I.7.1 b]).

Throughout this section, (G, \cdot, e) (or simply: G) shall denote a locally compact topological group^m and M shall denote a (closed) submonoid of G so that (M, \cdot, e) (or simply M), equipped with the relative topology, comprises a (locally compact) topological monoid. We furthermore let λ_G denote a left-invariant Haar-measure on G and express integrals of G via $\int_{x \in G} \cdot dx$.

4.1 Abstract harmonic analysis. In order to study dilations of classical dynamical systems on Hilbert spaces, we shall make use of a fundamental relationship between unitary representations and $*$ -representations of C^* -algebras. We recall these facts here. For a detailed exposition, see *e.g.* [21, §3.2 and §7.1], [14, §3.3]. Let G be a locally compact group (for which we can fix a left-invariant Haar measure) and let $\Delta(\cdot): G \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \cdot, 1)$ be the *modular function*, which is a continuous homomorphism. Then $L^1(G)$ forms a Banach $*$ -algebra under the convolution operation (viewed as ‘multiplication’) and involution defined by

$$(f_1 * f_2)(x) := \int_{y \in G} f_1(y) f_2(y^{-1}x) dy$$

and

$$f^*(x) := (f(x^{-1}))^* \Delta(x^{-1})$$

respectively, for $f, f_1, f_2 \in L^1(G)$, $x \in G$. It can then be shown, for any Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , that there is a natural 1:1-correspondence between non-degenerateⁿ $*$ -representations π of $(L^1(G), *, *)$ on \mathcal{H} and SOT-continuous unitary representations U of G on \mathcal{H} given by

$$U(x)\pi(f) = \pi(L_x f) = \pi(f(x^{-1}\cdot)) \quad (4.10)$$

and

$$\langle \pi(f)\xi, \eta \rangle = \int_{x \in G} f(x) \langle U(x)\xi, \eta \rangle dx \quad (4.11)$$

for $f \in L^1(G)$, $x \in G$, $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$.

¹*Bremer positivity*, see [35, Theorem 3.2].

^mSince we are only concerned with continuous maps between G and other Hausdorff topological groups (*e.g.* the group of unitaries on a Hilbert space under the SOT-topology), it is not important to assume that G be Hausdorff (*cf.* [14, §1.2]). Nonetheless, all of our examples (see Section 1.4) are Hausdorff.

ⁿ*i.e.* there is no $\xi \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\pi(f)\xi = 0$ for all $f \in L^1(G)$. This is the case, *e.g.* for irreducible representations.

Let \hat{G} denote the set of all irreducible $*$ -representations of $L^1(G)$ (equivalently: irreducible unitary representations of G), up to unitary equivalence. One can then equip $(L^1(G), *, *)$ with the norm

$$\|f\|_* := \sup_{[\pi] \in \hat{G}} \|\pi(f)\|$$

for $f \in L^1(G)$. This renders $(L^1(G), *, *)$ a dense $*$ -subalgebra of a C^* -algebra, which is referred to as the *group C^* -algebra* for G , and is denoted $C^*(G)$. Note also that $\|f\|_* \leq \|f\|$ holds for all $f \in L^1(G)$.

Convention 4.1 For simplicity we shall view $L^1(G)$ as a subset of $C^*(G)$. We shall interchangeably denote the group C^* -algebra for G as $C^*(G)$ and as $\overline{L^1(G)}$. Equipping G with the discrete topology yields a locally compact group with the counting measure as the Haar measure. In this case, the L^1 -space is simply $\ell^1(G)$. We shall thus denote the group C^* -algebra associated with the discretised G via $\overline{\ell^1(G)}$.

As a C^* -algebra, $C^*(G)$ has a unique unital extension. Note that $L^1(G)$ contains a unital element if and only if G is discrete, in which case, the unit is δ_e . For this reason, we shall denote the unital extension of $C^*(G)$ by

$$\mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_e + C^*(G)$$

in case G is continuous. If G is discrete, we have that $\mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_e + C^*(G) = C^*(G)$. Otherwise the above extension can be understood as $\mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_e \oplus C^*(G)$.

Relying on the density of $L^1(G)$ in $C^*(G)$, the above correspondence can be restated. The following is a slightly adapted version of the proofs in [21]:

Proposition 4.2 (Correspondence between $*$ - and unitary representations). *Let G be a locally compact topological group and \mathcal{H} a Hilbert space. Then for every SOT-continuous unitary representation U of G on \mathcal{H} there exists a non-degenerate $*$ -representation $\pi = \pi_U$ of $C^*(G)$ on \mathcal{H} , such that (4.10) and (4.11) hold. And for every non-degenerate $*$ -representation π of $C^*(G)$ on \mathcal{H} , there exists an SOT-continuous unitary representation $U = U_\pi$ of G on \mathcal{H} , such that (4.11) holds. The constructions $U \mapsto \pi_U$ and $\pi \mapsto U_\pi$ establish a 1:1-correspondence between SOT-continuous unitary representations of G on \mathcal{H} and non-degenerate $*$ -representations of $C^*(G)$ on \mathcal{H} .*

Proof. For the first claim, by [21, Theorem 3.9], there exists a non-degenerate $*$ -representation π of $L^1(G)$ on \mathcal{H} satisfying (4.10) and (4.11). Using Zorn's lemma, one can decompose \mathcal{H} into closed π -invariant subspaces with cyclic vectors $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_i \mathcal{H}_i$, thereby obtaining irreducible $*$ -representations π_i of $L^1(G)$ on each \mathcal{H}_i . By construction of the $\|\cdot\|_*$ -norm, each π_i and thus π itself are contractive. It follows that π can be extended to a bounded linear operator between $\overline{L^1(G)} = C^*(G)$ and $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$, which we may also call π . Since the algebraic operations in $C^*(G)$ are continuous, π remains a $*$ -representation.

Towards the second claim, by density, π is a non-degenerate $*$ -representation of $L^1(G)$ on \mathcal{H} , and thus by [21, Theorem 3.11], there exists an SOT-continuous unitary representation U of G on \mathcal{H} , satisfying (4.11).

Towards the final claim, we first show that $\pi_{U_\pi} = \pi$ for each $*$ -representation π of $C^*(G)$ on \mathcal{H} . Using (4.11) yields $\langle \pi_{U_\pi}(f)xi, \eta \rangle = \int_{x \in G} f(x) \langle U_\pi(x)\xi, \eta \rangle dx = \langle \pi(f)\xi, \eta \rangle$ for all $f \in L^1(G)$ and $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$. By the density of $L^1(G)$ in $C^*(G)$ and continuity of π , π_{U_π} , it follows that $\pi_{U_\pi} = \pi$. To show that $U_{\pi_U} = U$ for each SOT-continuous unitary representation U of G on \mathcal{H} , using (4.11) yields $\int_K \langle U_{\pi_U}(x)\xi, \eta \rangle dx = \langle \pi_U(\mathbf{1}_K)xi, \eta \rangle = \int_K \langle U(x)\xi, \eta \rangle dx$ for all compact $K \subseteq G$ and all $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$. By the WOT-continuity of U , U_{π_U} , it follows that $U_{\pi_U} = U$. ■

4.2 The Phillips–le Merdy functional calculus. For a locally compact topological group G and closed submonoid $M \subseteq G$, we consider

$$L_{c,M}^1(G) := \{f \in L^1(G) \mid \overline{\text{supp}}(f) \subseteq M, \text{ compact}\},$$

which is a subalgebra of the convolution algebra $(L^1(G), *)$ and thus of the unital C^* -algebra $\mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_e + C^*(G)$. For an SOT-continuous homomorphism $T: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ on \mathcal{H} , consider the map $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}: \mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_e + L_{c,M}^1(G) \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(c\delta_e + f) = c\mathbf{I} + \text{SOT-} \int_{x \in \overline{\text{supp}}(f)} f(x)T(x) \, dx \quad (4.12)$$

for $f \in L_{c,M}^1(G)$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$.^o It is easy to verify that $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}$ is a linear unital map which satisfies $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(f * g) = \Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(f)\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(g)$ for $f, g \in L_{c,M}^1(G)$. We shall refer to this unital homomorphism as the *Phillips–le Merdy calculus* associated with T .

Remark 4.3 Consider the case $(G, M) = (\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d)$. Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space and $T: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be an SOT-continuous contractive homomorphism on \mathcal{H} . Further let $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be the corresponding commuting family of contractive C_0 -semigroups. Then (4.12) can be naturally extended to $\mathcal{B} := \mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_0 \oplus \mathcal{B}_0$, where $\mathcal{B}_0 := \{f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \text{supp}(f) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d\}$. This extension of $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}$ to \mathcal{B} is essentially a restriction of the *Phillips calculus* (see e.g. [16, Lemma VIII.1.12 [*]], [36, Proposition 3.3.5]) applied to the generators $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$. Consider now arbitrary $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}^d$, and let $f \in \mathcal{B}_0$ be defined by $f(\mathbf{t}) := \prod_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \frac{(\lambda_i t_i)^{n_i-1}}{(n_i-1)!} e^{-\lambda_i t_i}$ for $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$. One has $(\mathcal{F}f)(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \prod_{i=1}^d \left(\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_i + \omega_i}\right)^{n_i}$ for $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $\mathcal{F}: L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the Fourier transform. Then $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(f) = \prod_{i=1}^d \text{SOT-} \int_{s=0}^{\infty} \lambda_i \frac{(\lambda_i s)^{n_i-1}}{(n_i-1)!} e^{-\lambda_i s} T_i(s) \, ds = \prod_{i=1}^d (\lambda_i R(\lambda_i, A_i))^{n_i}$. Thus, in the case of $(G, M) = (\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d)$, the Phillips calculus is a common extension of $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}$ and (upon application of the Fourier transform) the one defined by le Merdy in [31, Definition 2.1].

The main result in this subsection is thus inspired by le Merdy’s characterisation of simultaneous unitary dilations. By simplifying his approach and utilising results from abstract harmonic analysis we obtain a generalisation. Before presenting this, we need the following approximation.

Proposition 4.4 *Let G be a locally compact topological group and $M \subseteq G$ a closed submonoid. Further let $T: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be an SOT-continuous homomorphism. If M is e -joint, then there exists a net $(f_i)_i \subseteq L_{c,M}^1(G)$ such that $\|f_i\|_* \leq 1$ for all $i \in I$, $\|f_i * g - g\|_* \xrightarrow{i} 0$ for all $g \in L^1(G)$, and $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(f_i) \xrightarrow{i} \mathbf{I}$ wrt. the SOT-topology.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{N} be the filter of all compact neighbourhoods of the group identity $e \in G$. By compactness and e -jointness, $0 < \lambda_G(K \cap M) \leq \lambda_G(K) < \infty$ for all $K \in \mathcal{N}$. Thus $f_K := \frac{1}{\lambda_G(K \cap M)} \mathbf{1}_{K \cap M}$ is a well-defined element of $L^1(G)$ with $\overline{\text{supp}}(f) = K \cap M \subseteq M$ for each $K \in \mathcal{N}$, and moreover $\|f\|_* \leq \|f\|_1 = 1$. Hence it suffices to consider the net $(f_K)_{K \in \mathcal{N}}$ directly ordered by reverse inclusion.

Let $g \in L^1(G)$ be arbitrary. Then $\|f_K * g - g\|_* \leq \|f_K * g - g\|_1$ for each $h \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$. Since convolution is L^1 -continuous (see e.g. [21, Proposition 2.40a]) and $C_c(G)$ is dense in $L^1(G)$, it suffices to prove that $\|f_K * g - g\|_1 \xrightarrow{K} 0$ for each $g \in C_c(G)$. This is a straightforward matter that can be derived using uniform continuity arguments.

Towards the final claim, one has $\|\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(f_K)\xi - \xi\| = \left\| \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_G(K \cap M)} \text{SOT-} \int_{x \in K \cap M} T(x) \, dx \right) \xi - \xi \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_G(K \cap M)} \int_{x \in K \cap M} \|T(x)\xi - T(e)\xi\| \, dx \leq \sup_{x \in K \cap M} \|(T(x) - T(e))\xi\|$ for each $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$, whereby the latter expression converges to 0 since T is SOT-continuous. \blacksquare

^oNote that since T is SOT-continuous, one has that $T(\cdot)|_K \xi$ has a norm-compact and thus separable image for any compact subset $K \subseteq M$. Thus $\overline{\text{supp}}(f) \ni x \mapsto f(x)T(x)\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ is Bochner-integrable for each $f \in L_{c,M}^1(G)$. In particular, we do not need to demand the separability of \mathcal{H} .

Lemma 4.5 (Generalisation of le Merdy’s characterisation of dilations). *Let G be a locally compact topological group and $M \subseteq G$ an e -joint closed submonoid. Further let $T: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be an SOT-continuous homomorphism. Then T has a unitary dilation if and only if $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}$ is completely bounded with $\|\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}\|_{\text{cb}} \leq 1$.*

Proof. Via the GNS-construction, we may view the unital C^* -algebra, $\mathcal{A} := \mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_e + C^*(G)$ as a unital C^* -subalgebra of $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}_0)$ for some Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_0 .

Necessity: Suppose that (\mathcal{H}_1, U, r) is a unitary dilation of T . By the correspondence between unitary representations and non-degenerate $*$ -representations in abstract harmonic analysis (see Proposition 4.2), there exists a non-degenerate $*$ -representation $\pi: C^*(G) \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ such that (4.11) holds. Now, π can be extended to $\tilde{\pi}: \mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_e + C^*(G) \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ defined by $\tilde{\pi}(c\delta_e + f) := c\mathbf{I} + \pi(f)$ for $f \in C^*(G)$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}$. By non-degeneracy, $\tilde{\pi}$ is a well-defined^P unital $*$ -algebra representation. Using the unitary dilation and the $*$ -representation, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(c\delta_e + f)\xi, \eta \rangle &= \left\langle \left(c\mathbf{I} + \text{SOT-} \int_{x \in \overline{\text{supp}}(f)} f(x)T(x) \, dx \right) \xi, \eta \right\rangle \\
&= c\langle \xi, \eta \rangle + \int_{x \in \overline{\text{supp}}(f)} f(x) \underbrace{\langle T(x)\xi, \eta \rangle}_{=\langle r^*U(x)r\xi, \eta \rangle} \, dx \\
&= c\langle r\xi, r\eta \rangle + \int_{x \in \overline{\text{supp}}(f)} f(x)\langle U(x)r\xi, r\eta \rangle \, dx \\
&\stackrel{(4.11)}{=} \langle c\mathbf{I}r\xi, r\eta \rangle + \langle \pi(f)r\xi, r\eta \rangle \\
&= \langle r^*\tilde{\pi}(c \cdot \delta_e + f)r\xi, \eta \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

for all $f \in L^1_{c,M}(G) \subseteq L^1(G)$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$, $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$. Thus $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(a) = r^*\tilde{\pi}(a)r$ for all $a \in \mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_e + L^1_{c,M}(G)$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a_{ij})_{ij} \in M_n(\mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_e + L^1_{c,M}(G))$. Then $(\Psi_{\text{P-IM}} \otimes id_{M_n})(\mathbf{a}) = (\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(a_{ij}))_{ij} = (r^*\tilde{\pi}(a_{ij})r)_{ij} = (r \otimes \mathbf{I}_{M_n})^*(\tilde{\pi} \otimes id_{M_n})(\mathbf{a})(r \otimes \mathbf{I}_{M_n})$. Now, since $\tilde{\pi} \otimes id_{M_n}$ is a unital $*$ -algebra representation, it is necessarily contractive. It follows that $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}} \otimes id_{M_n}$ is contractive for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $\|\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}\|_{\text{cb}} \leq 1$.

Sufficiency: If $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}$ is completely bounded with $\|\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}\|_{\text{cb}} \leq 1$, then, since $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}$ is a (contractive!) unital homomorphism defined on the unital subalgebra $\mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_e + L^1_{c,M}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}_0)$, one may apply the dilation theorem in [34, Theorem 4.8]^Q and obtain a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_1 , an isometry $r \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_1)$, and a $*$ -algebra representation $\pi: \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}_0) \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ such that

$$\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(a) = r^* \pi(a) r \tag{4.13}$$

for all $a \in \mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_e + L^1_{c,M}(G)$. Since \mathcal{A} is unital, we can replace \mathcal{H}_1 with the π -invariant subspace $\overline{\pi(\mathcal{A})r\mathcal{H}}$, which contains $r\mathcal{H}$. In particular, one can assume that π is a unital (and thus non-degenerate) $*$ -representation of \mathcal{A} on \mathcal{H}_1 and that $\pi(\mathcal{A})r\mathcal{H}$ is dense in \mathcal{H}_1 . Since $L^1(G)$ is $\|\cdot\|_*$ -dense in $C^*(G)$, it follows that $(\mathbb{C} \cdot \mathbf{I} + \pi(L^1(G)))r\mathcal{H}$ is dense in \mathcal{H}_1 .

By the correspondence between unitary representations and non-degenerate $*$ -representations in abstract harmonic analysis (see Proposition 4.2), there exists a (unique) SOT-continuous unitary representation $U: G \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ such that

$$U(x)\pi(f) = \pi(L_x f) = \pi(f(x^{-1}\cdot)) \tag{4.14}$$

for all $x \in G$ and all $f \in L^1(G)$. Our goal is to show that (\mathcal{H}_1, U, r) is a unitary dilation of T .

Let $x \in M$ and $f \in L^1_{c,M}(G)$ be arbitrary. Then $L_x f = f(x^{-1}\cdot) \in L^1_{c,M}(G)$, since $\overline{\text{supp}}(f(x^{-1}\cdot)) = x \cdot \overline{\text{supp}}(f) \subseteq M$. Applying the construction of $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}$ yields

^PIn particular, if $C^*(G)$ already contains the δ_e , then by non-degeneracy $\pi(\delta_e) = \mathbf{I}$ must hold.

^QThis result is based on the factorisation of completely bounded maps (see [34, Theorem 4.8]), which builds on Stinespring’s theorem. Pisier attributes this to the independent work of Wittstock and Haagerup as well as Paulsen, and cites [44, 45] as well as an unpublished work from Haagerup (*cf.* the comments before Theorem 3.6 in [34]).

$$\begin{aligned}
r^* U(x) \pi(f) r &\stackrel{(4.14)}{=} r^* \pi(\mathcal{F}(f(x^{-1}\cdot))) r \\
&\stackrel{(4.13)}{=} \Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(f(x^{-1}\cdot)) \\
&= \text{SOT-} \int_{y \in \overline{\text{supp}}(f(x^{-1}\cdot))} f(x^{-1}y) T(y) \, dy \\
&= \text{SOT-} \int_{y \in \overline{\text{supp}}(f)} f(y) T(xy) \, dy \\
&= T(x) \cdot \text{SOT-} \int_{y \in \overline{\text{supp}}(f)} f(y) T(y) \, dy \\
&= T(x) \Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(f).
\end{aligned}$$

Consider now the net $(f_i)_{i \in I} \subseteq L_{c,M}^1(G)$ constructed in Proposition 4.4, for which it holds that $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(f_i) \xrightarrow{i} \mathbf{I}$ wrt. the SOT-topology. By construction, $\|f_i\|_* \leq 1$ for each $i \in I$, and since π is a $*$ -algebra representation, it follows that $\|\pi(f_i)\| \leq \|f_i\|_* \leq 1$ for all $i \in I$. We now claim that $\pi(f_i)r \xrightarrow{i} r$ wrt. the WOT-topology. Since $(\pi(f_i))_{i \in I}$ is uniformly bounded and $(\mathbb{C} \cdot \mathbf{I} + \pi(L^1(G)))r\mathcal{H}$ is dense in \mathcal{H}_1 , it suffices to show that $\langle \pi(f_i)r\xi, a\eta \rangle \xrightarrow{i} \langle r\xi, a\eta \rangle$ for $a \in \mathbb{C} \cdot \mathbf{I} + \pi(L^1(G))$ and $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$. To this end, consider an arbitrary $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$ and $a = c \cdot \mathbf{I} + \pi(g)$ for arbitrary $c \in \mathbb{C}$, $g \in L^1(G)$. By the properties of the construction in Proposition 4.4 one has $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(f_i) \xrightarrow{i} \mathbf{I}$ wrt. the SOT-topology as well as $\|g^* * f_i - g^*\|_* \xrightarrow{i} 0$ and thus $\pi(g^* * f_i) \xrightarrow{i} \pi(g^*) = \pi(g)^*$ in norm. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \pi(f_i)r\xi, a\eta \rangle &= c^* \langle \pi(f_i)r\xi, r\eta \rangle + \langle \pi(f_i)r\xi, \pi(g)r\eta \rangle \\
&= c^* \langle r^* \pi(f_i)r\xi, \eta \rangle + \langle \pi(g)^* \pi(f_i)r\xi, r\eta \rangle \\
&\stackrel{(4.13)}{=} c^* \langle \Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(f_i)\xi, \eta \rangle + \langle \pi(g^* * f_i)r\xi, r\eta \rangle \\
&\xrightarrow{i} c^* \langle \mathbf{I}\xi, \eta \rangle + \langle \pi(g)^* r\xi, r\eta \rangle = \langle r\xi, a\eta \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

from which the claim follows. Taking weak limits in the above computation applied to the f_i thus yields $r^* U(x) r = T(x) \cdot \mathbf{I}$ for all $x \in M$. Hence (\mathcal{H}_1, U, r) is a unitary dilation of T . \blacksquare

4.3 The discrete functional calculus. For a (not necessarily locally compact!) topological group G , we consider

$$c_{00}(G) = \{f \in \ell^1(G) \mid \text{supp}(f) \text{ finite}\},$$

which is a $*$ -subalgebra of the convolution algebra $(\ell^1(G), *)$ and thus of the unital C^* -algebra $\overline{\ell^1(G)}$. Let $M \subseteq$ be an arbitrary submonoid and suppose that (G, M, \cdot^+) is a positivity structure (see Definition 1.11). For a (not necessarily SOT-continuous) homomorphism $T: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ on \mathcal{H} , consider the map $\Psi_{\text{disc}}: c_{00}(G) \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$\Psi_{\text{disc}}(f) = \sum_{x \in \text{supp}(f)} f(x) T(x^-)^* T(x^+) \tag{4.15}$$

for $f \in c_{00}(G)$. One can readily check that Ψ_{disc} is a linear self-adjoint unital map which satisfies $\Psi_{\text{disc}}(f * g) = \Psi_{\text{disc}}(f) \Psi_{\text{disc}}(g)$ for $f, g \in c_{00}(G)$. We shall refer to this linear self-adjoint unital map as the *discrete functional calculus* associated with T .

Lemma 4.6 (Characterisation of regular dilations à la Sz.-Nagy). *Let (G, M, \cdot^+) be a positivity structure where G is a topological group and $M \subseteq G$ is a submonoid.[†] Further let $T: M \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be an SOT-continuous homomorphism. Then T has a regular unitary dilation if and only if Ψ_{disc} is completely positive.*

Parts of the proof of Lemma 4.6 are similar to [43, Theorem I.7.1 b)]. However, there are two main differences. Firstly, Sz.-Nagy works with extensions of T to all of G , without explicitly defining this (except in the special cases of $G = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $G = \mathbb{Z}^d$). Secondly, our approach relies on Stinespring's dilation theorem for C^* -algebras, whilst Sz.-Nagy's approach is more directly connected the theory of unitary representations.

Proof (of Lemma 4.6). Let $\mathcal{A} := \overline{\ell^1(G)}$ be the (unital) group C^* -algebra for the discretised version of G . Note that $c_{00}(G)$ is unital and self-adjoint, and thus constitutes an *operator system* (cf. [33, Chapter 2, p. 9]).

Necessity: Suppose that (\mathcal{H}_1, U, r) is a regular unitary dilation of T . By the correspondence between unitary representations and non-degenerate $*$ -representations in abstract harmonic analysis (see Proposition 4.2), there exists a non-degenerate $*$ -representation $\pi: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ such that (4.11) holds. Using the regular unitary dilation and the $*$ -representation, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi_{\text{disc}}(f)\xi, \eta \rangle &= \left\langle \left(\sum_{x \in \text{supp}(f)} f(x) \underbrace{T(x^-)^* T(x^+)}_{=r^* U(x) r} \right) \xi, \eta \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{x \in \text{supp}(f)} f(x) \langle U(x) r \xi, r \eta \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(4.11)}{=} \langle \pi(f) r \xi, r \eta \rangle \\ &= \langle r^* \pi(f) r \xi, \eta \rangle \end{aligned}$$

for all $f \in c_{00}(G)$, $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$. Thus $\Psi_{\text{disc}}(a) = r^* \pi(a) r$ for all $a \in c_{00}(G)$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and positive matrices $\mathbf{a} = (a_{ij})_{ij} \in M_n(c_{00}(G))$ it follows that $(\Psi_{\text{disc}} \otimes id_{M_n})(\mathbf{a}) = (\Psi_{\text{disc}}(a_{ij}))_{ij} = (r^* \pi(a_{ij}) r)_{ij} = (r \otimes \mathbf{I}_{M_n})^* (\pi \otimes id_{M_n})(\mathbf{a}) (r \otimes \mathbf{I}_{M_n})$, which is positive, since $\pi \otimes id_{M_n}$ is a $*$ -representation of the C^* -algebra $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ and thus positive. Thus Ψ_{disc} is completely positive.

Sufficiency: Since $c_{00}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is an operator system, Averson's extension theorem (see [33, Theorem 7.5]) yields an extension of Ψ_{disc} to a completely positive map between \mathcal{A} and $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Stinespring's dilation theorem (see [41, Theorem 1 and §3. Remarks]) applied to this yields a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_1 , an isometry $r \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_1)$, and a unital $*$ -representation $\pi: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}_1)$, such that

$$\Psi_{\text{disc}}(a) = r^* \pi(a) r \tag{4.16}$$

holds for all $a \in c_{00}(G)$. Since $c_{00}(G)$ is a dense, unital $*$ -subalgebra of \mathcal{A} , we can replace \mathcal{H}_1 by the π -invariant closed subspace $c_{00}(G)r\mathcal{H}$, which contains $r\mathcal{H}$.

Since for all $x, y \in G$ one has $\delta_x * \delta_y = \delta_{xy}$ and $\delta_x \in c_{00}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ are unitary,^s and since π is a unital $*$ -representation, it follows that $U: G \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ defined by $U(x) := \pi(\delta_x)$ is a unitary homomorphism of G on \mathcal{H} . Moreover by (4.16)

$$T(x^-)^* T(x^+) = \Psi_{\text{disc}}(\delta_x) = r^* \pi(\delta_x) r = r^* U(x) r \tag{4.17}$$

for all $x \in G$. To show that (\mathcal{H}_1, U, r) is a regular unitary dilation of T , it thus remains to show that U is SOT-continuous.

[†] Note that we neither require G to be locally compact nor M to be a measurable subset in this theorem!

^ssince $\delta_x^* * \delta_x = \delta_{x^{-1}x} = \delta_e$ and $\delta_x * \delta_x^* = \delta_{xx^{-1}} = \delta_e$.

To this end, first note that $(\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}), \text{SOT}) \times (\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}), \text{SOT}) \ni (R, S) \mapsto S^*R \in (\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}), \text{WOT})$ is continuous.^t So since $T: M \rightarrow (\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}), \text{SOT})$ and \cdot^+ (and thus \cdot^-) are continuous, it follows that $G \ni x \mapsto r^*U(x)r \stackrel{(4.17)}{=} T(x^-)^*T(x^+) \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is WOT-continuous. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} G \ni x \mapsto & \langle U(x)\pi(\delta_y)r\xi, \pi(\delta_z)r\eta \rangle \\ & = \langle U(x)U(y)r\xi, U(z)r\eta \rangle \\ & = \langle r^*U(z^{-1}xy)r\xi, r\eta \rangle \end{aligned}$$

is continuous for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$, $y, z \in G$, which in turn entails the continuity of $G \ni x \mapsto \langle U(x)\pi(f)r\xi, \pi(g)r\eta \rangle$ for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$, $f, g \in c_{00}(G)$. Since U is unitary-valued and $\pi(c_{00}(G))r\mathcal{H}$ is dense in \mathcal{H}_1 , it follows that U is a WOT- and thus indeed an SOT-continuous unitary representation of G on \mathcal{H}_1 . \blacksquare

Remark 4.7 The SOT-continuity of T was only used to prove the SOT-continuity of the unitary representation. Without this assumption, the above proof shows that T has a (not necessarily SOT-continuous) regular unitary dilation if and only if Ψ_{disc} is completely positive.

5. SECOND MAIN RESULTS: UNITARY APPROXIMANTS

The functional calculi presented in §4 to characterise unitary and regular unitary dilations respectively, provide us the means to study topological approximations of classical dynamical systems. We exploit these results to prove Theorems 1.18 and 1.19.

Proof (of Theorem 1.18). The implications (b) \implies (c) are clear irrespective of the assumptions on $\dim(\mathcal{H})$.

(c) \implies (a): Let $(U^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$, be a net of SOT-continuous unitary representations of G on \mathcal{H} . Suppose that $(U^{(\alpha)}|_M)_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ approximates T in the *uniform weak* sense. We make use of the *Phillips–le Merdy calculi* $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}, \Psi_{\text{P-IM}}^{(\alpha)}: L_{c,M}^1(G) \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ associated with T and each $U^{(\alpha)}|_M$ respectively (see §4.2). By the characterisation in Lemma 4.5, $\|\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}^{(\alpha)}\|_{\text{cb}} \leq 1$ for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$, and, in order to show that T has a unitary dilation, it suffices to show that $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}$ is completely bounded with $\|\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}\|_{\text{cb}} \leq 1$. To this end, first observe that for each $a = c \cdot \delta_e + f \in \mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_e + L_{c,M}^1(G) =: \mathcal{A}$, uniform weak convergence yields

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi_{\text{P-IM}}^{(\alpha)}(a)\xi, \eta \rangle & = \left\langle \left(c\mathbf{I} + \text{SOT-} \int_{x \in \overline{\text{supp}}(f)} f(x)U^{(\alpha)}(x) \, dx \right) \xi, \eta \right\rangle \\ & = c\langle \xi, \eta \rangle + \int_{x \in \overline{\text{supp}}(f)} f(x) \langle U^{(\alpha)}(x)\xi, \eta \rangle \, dx \\ & \xrightarrow{\alpha} c\langle \xi, \eta \rangle + \int_{x \in \overline{\text{supp}}(f)} f(x) \langle T(x)\xi, \eta \rangle \, dx \\ & = \langle \Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(a)\xi, \eta \rangle \end{aligned}$$

for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$. Thus $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}^{(\alpha)}(a) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \Psi_{\text{P-IM}}(a)$ wrt. the WOT-topology for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$. It follows that $(\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}^{(\alpha)} \otimes id_{M_n})(\mathbf{a}) \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\Psi_{\text{P-IM}} \otimes id_{M_n})(\mathbf{a})$ wrt. the WOT-topology for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and matrices $\mathbf{a} = (a_{ij})_{ij} \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$. Since $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}^{(\alpha)} \otimes id_{M_n}$ is a contraction for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}} \otimes id_{M_n}$ is a contraction for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}$ is completely bounded with $\|\Psi_{\text{P-IM}}\|_{\text{cb}} \leq 1$.

(a) \implies (b), **under cardinality assumption:** By assumption, G contains a dense subset $D \subseteq G$ and $\dim(\mathcal{H}) \geq \max\{\aleph_0, |D|\}$. Without loss of generality, one can replace D by a dense

^tThis follows directly from the observation that $(\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H}), \text{SOT})^2 \ni (R, S) \mapsto \langle S^*R\xi, \eta \rangle = \langle R\xi, S\eta \rangle \in \mathbb{C}$ is continuous for each $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$, which in turn holds, since the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle: (\mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|)^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is continuous (by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality). Note that we do not need to restrict the operators to bounded subsets of $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ (cf. [35, Lemma 3.1]).

subgroup of G . Let (\mathcal{H}_1, U, r) be a regular unitary dilation of T . Let $B \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ be an orthonormal basis (ONB) for \mathcal{H} and $\kappa := |B| = \dim(\mathcal{H}) \geq \max\{\aleph_0, |D|\}$ and consider

$$\mathcal{H}_0 := \overline{\text{lin}}\{U(x)r\xi \mid x \in D, \xi \in B\},$$

which is a U -invariant subspace. By the above cardinality assumptions and elementary computations with infinite cardinals (see *e.g.* [30, §I.10]), one has cardinality $|\mathcal{H}_0| = |B| = \kappa$. It follows that $(\mathcal{H}_0, U|_{\mathcal{H}_0}, r)$ is a regular unitary dilation of T . Furthermore, since r is isometric, we have $\kappa = \dim(\mathcal{H}) = \dim(\text{ran}(r)) \leq \dim(\mathcal{H}_0) = \kappa$. Thus $\dim(\mathcal{H}_0) = \kappa = \dim(\mathcal{H})$. So without loss of generality, one may assume that $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}$. It follows that there exists an isometry $r \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ and an SOT-continuous unitary representation U of G on \mathcal{H} such that

$$T(x) = r^* U(x) r \quad (5.18)$$

for all $x \in M$.

Now let $P \subseteq \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be the index set consisting of finite projections on \mathcal{H} , directly ordered by $p \geq q \Leftrightarrow \text{ran}(p) \supseteq \text{ran}(q)$. Let $p \in P$ be arbitrary and let $F_p \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ be a finite ONB for $\text{ran}(p)$. Since r is an isometry, $\tilde{F}_p := \{r e \mid e \in F_p\}$ is also a finite orthonormal family of vectors. Let $B_p, \tilde{B}'_p \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ be ONBs extending F_p, \tilde{F}_p respectively. Since \mathcal{H} is infinite dimensional and F_p, \tilde{F}_p are finite, one has $|B_p \setminus F_p| = \dim(\mathcal{H}) = |\tilde{B}'_p \setminus \tilde{F}_p|$. Thus there exists a bijection $f: B_p \setminus F_p \rightarrow \tilde{B}'_p \setminus \tilde{F}_p$. Thus $g := r|_{F_p} \cup f$ is a bijection between B_p and \tilde{B}'_p . This extends uniquely to a unitary operator $w_p \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$. By construction, $w_p|_{F_p} = r|_{F_p}$ and thus by linearity

$$w_p p = r p \quad (5.19)$$

for each $p \in P$. Finally, set

$$U^{(p)} := w_p^* U(\cdot) w_p$$

for each $p \in P$, which are clearly SOT-continuous unitary representations of G on \mathcal{H} . We demonstrate that the net $(U^{(p)}|_M)_{p \in P}$ of SOT-continuous homomorphisms, is an *exact weak approximation* of T . To this end, let $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ be arbitrary. Let $p_0 \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be the projection onto $\text{lin}\{\xi, \eta\}$. For each $p \in P$ with $p \geq p_0$ one has that $p\xi = \xi$ and $p\eta = \eta$. By (5.19), $w_p^* r \xi = w_p^* p \xi = w_p^* w_p p \xi = p \xi = \xi$ and similarly $w_p^* r \eta = \eta$. The dilation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T(x)\xi, \eta \rangle &\stackrel{(5.18)}{=} \langle r^* U(x) r \xi, \eta \rangle \\ &= \langle r^* w_p U^{(p)}(x) w_p^* r \xi, \eta \rangle \\ &= \langle U^{(p)}(x) w_p^* r \xi, w_p^* r \eta \rangle \\ &= \langle U^{(p)}(x) \xi, \eta \rangle \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in M$ and $p \geq p_0$. Hence $(U^{(p)}|_M)_{p \in P}$ is an exact weak approximation of T . \blacksquare

Proof (of Theorem 1.19). The implications (b) \implies (c) \implies (d) are clear irrespective of the assumptions on $\dim(\mathcal{H})$.

(d) \implies (a): Let $(U^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$, be a net of SOT-continuous unitary representations of G on \mathcal{H} . Suppose that $(U^{(\alpha)}|_M)_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ approximates T in the *pointwise regular weak* sense. We now make use of the *discrete functional calculi* $\Psi_{\text{disc}}, \Psi_{\text{disc}}^{(\alpha)}: c_{00}(G) \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ associated with T and each $U^{(\alpha)}|_M$ respectively (see §4.3). By the characterisation in Lemma 4.6, each $\Psi_{\text{disc}}^{(\alpha)}$ is completely positive and, in order to show that T has a regular unitary dilation, it suffices to show that Ψ_{disc} is completely positive. To this end, first observe for $f \in c_{00}(G)$, that pointwise regular weak convergence yields

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi_{\text{disc}}^{(\alpha)}(f)\xi, \eta \rangle &= \sum_{x \in \text{supp}(f)} f(x) \langle U^{(\alpha)}(x^-)^* U^{(\alpha)}(x^+) \xi, \eta \rangle \\ &\xrightarrow{\alpha} \sum_{x \in \text{supp}(f)} f(x) \langle T(x^-)^* T(x^+) \xi, \eta \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$= \langle \Psi_{\text{disc}}(f)\xi, \eta \rangle$$

for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$. Thus $\Psi_{\text{disc}}^{(\alpha)}(f) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \Psi_{\text{disc}}(f)$ wrt. the WOT-topology for each $f \in c_{00}(G)$. It follows that $(\Psi_{\text{disc}}^{(\alpha)} \otimes id_{M_n})(\mathbf{a}) \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\Psi_{\text{disc}} \otimes id_{M_n})(\mathbf{a})$ wrt. the WOT-topology for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and matrices $\mathbf{a} = (a_{ij})_{ij} \in M_n(c_{00}(G))$. Since $\Psi_{\text{disc}}^{(\alpha)} \otimes id_{M_n}$ is positive for each α and each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that $\Psi_{\text{disc}} \otimes id_{M_n}$ is positive for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus Ψ_{disc} is completely positive.

(a) \implies (b), under cardinality assumption: The proof is analogous to proof of (a) \implies (b) of Theorem 1.18. Relying on the cardinality assumptions, the same arguments as above yield a regular unitary dilation of T of the form (\mathcal{H}, U, r) , *i.e.*

$$T(x^-)*T(x^+) = r^* U(x) r \quad (5.20)$$

for all $x \in G$. The net $(w_p)_{p \in P}$ of unitary operators and the net $(U^{(p)} := w_p^* U(\cdot) w_p)_{p \in P}$ of SOT-continuous unitary representations of G on \mathcal{H} are constructed as above. For $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$, letting p_0 be the projection onto $\text{lin}\{\xi, \eta\}$, one has again $w_p^* r \xi = \xi$ and $w_p^* r \eta = \eta$ for $p \geq p_0$. The regular dilation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T(x^-)*T(x^+)\xi, \eta \rangle &\stackrel{(5.20)}{=} \langle r^* U(x) r \xi, \eta \rangle \\ &= \langle r^* w_p U^{(p)}(x) w_p^* r \xi, \eta \rangle \\ &= \langle U^{(p)}(x) w_p^* r \xi, w_p^* r \eta \rangle \\ &= \langle U^{(p)}(x) \xi, \eta \rangle \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in G$ and $p \geq p_0$. Hence $(U^{(p)}|_M)_{p \in P}$ is an *exact regular weak approximation* of T . \blacksquare

As an immediate application of Theorem 1.19, we demonstrate an infinite class of commuting systems which admit no regular weak unitary approximations. The following examples demonstrate in particular, that the problem of unitary approximability (in the *regular* case) of a commuting system cannot be reduced to the unitary approximability of strict subsystems.

Corollary 5.1 *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $d \geq 2$ and \mathcal{H} be an infinite dimensional Hilbert space. Then there exists an infinite class of commuting families $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of contractive C_0 -semigroups on \mathcal{H} whose generators have strictly negative spectral bounds,^u such that $\{T_i\}_{i \in C}$ has an exact regular weak unitary approximation for each $C \subsetneq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, whilst $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ has no pointwise regular weak unitary approximation.*

The class of semigroups can be constructed as in [13, Proposition 5.3]. For the reader's convenience, we sketch the construction. We apply the characterisation in Theorem 1.19 to $(G, M) = (\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d)$ (see Example 1.12) as well as the 1:1-correspondence between SOT-continuous homomorphisms defined over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ and commuting families of C_0 -semigroups discussed in §1.

Proof (of Corollary 5.1). By assumption, one can find orthonormal closed subspaces $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \dim(\mathcal{H}_2) \leq \dim(\mathcal{H}_1)$ such that $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$. Working wrt. this partition, and letting $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{d-1}})$ be arbitrary, we consider for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ bounded operators of the form

$$A_i = -\mathbf{I} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2\alpha V_i \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where the $V_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1)$ can be chosen to be any isometries. One can show that $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is a commuting family of dissipative operators whose spectra are each given by $\{-1\}$. Thus, $\{T_i := (e^{tA_i})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}\}_{i=1}^d$ is a commuting family of contractive C_0 -semigroups, whose (bounded) generators have strictly negative spectral bounds. As in [13, Proposition 5.3], it can be shown

^uThe *spectral bound* of a linear operator $A: \text{dom}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is given by $\sup\{\Re \lambda \mid \lambda \in \sigma(A)\}$ (cf. [20, Definition 1.12]).

that $\{A_i\}_{i \in C}$ is completely dissipative for each $C \subsetneq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, whilst $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is not completely dissipative. By the characterisation for semigroups with bounded generators (Theorem 1.1), it follows that $\{T_i\}_{i \in C}$ has a simultaneous regular unitary dilation for each $C \subsetneq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, whilst $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ does not. By Theorem 1.19, the claim follows. ■

Remark 5.2 It is well known that commuting systems of $d = 2$ contractive C_0 -semigroups have simultaneous unitary dilations (see [39], [40, Theorem 2], and [35, Theorem 2.3]). Hence by Theorems 1.18 and 1.19 and Corollary 5.1, the topologies defined by exact weak (resp. uniform weak) convergence are in general^v strictly weaker than their *regular* counterparts. In particular, the characterisations in Theorems 1.18 and 1.19 now provide a sharp topological distinction between *unitary dilations* and *regular unitary dilations*.

At the start of this paper we mentioned two different ways to treat irreversible systems: via embeddings into or approximations by reversible systems. The characterisations in Theorems 1.18 and 1.19, demonstrate that, under modest conditions, these are in fact equivalent for respective choices of dilations and approximations. This holds for the commutative setting and for a large class of classical dynamical systems, including dynamical systems consisting of families of C_0 -semigroups on Hilbert spaces satisfying a semigroup version of the CCR in Weyl-form (see Example 1.8, Example 1.10, and Example 1.12).

APPENDIX A. ELEMENTS IN THE DOMAINS OF GENERATORS

In this appendix we construct elements in the domains of generators of C_0 -semigroups, and then extend this to the situation of commuting families of C_0 -semigroups. For the main ideas here, we refer the reader to [26, Proposition G.2.5], [20, Theorem I.5.8], [11, Theorem A.8].

Let u_t denote a r. v. concentrated and uniformly distributed on $[0, t]$, or shorter: $u_t \sim U([0, t])$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Consider a C_0 -semigroup T over a Banach space. By SOT-continuity and the uniform boundedness principle, we have that $\{T(t) \mid t \in V\}$ is uniformly norm-bounded for compact subsets $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ of 0. It follows that the expectation $\mathbb{E}[T(u_t)]$ exists and satisfies the bounds $\|\mathbb{E}[T(u_t)]\| \leq \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|T(s)\| < \infty$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$. Hence we also have that $\{\mathbb{E}[T(u_t)] \mid t \in V\}$ is uniformly norm-bounded for bounded subsets $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

Proposition A.1 *Let T be a C_0 -semigroup on a Banach space \mathcal{E} with generator A . Further let $S \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{E})$ commute with $T(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Then $S \mathbb{E}[T(u_t)] \xi \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ with $A S \mathbb{E}[T(u_t)] \xi = S \frac{1}{t}(T(t) - \mathbf{I}) \xi$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$.*

Proof. Relying on basic properties of Bochner-integrals, one can show for $h \in (0, t)$ that

$$T(h) \mathbb{E}[T(u_t)] = \mathbb{E}[T(u_t)] + \frac{1}{t}(T(t) - \mathbf{I}) \cdot h \mathbb{E}[T(u_h)]$$

(see also the proof of [6, Proposition 1.1.4]). Thus by commutativity

$$\frac{1}{h}(T(h) - \mathbf{I}) \cdot S \mathbb{E}[T(u_t)] = S \frac{1}{h}(T(h) \mathbb{E}[T(u_t)] - \mathbb{E}[T(u_t)]) = S \frac{1}{t}(T(t) - \mathbf{I}) \mathbb{E}[T(u_h)]$$

for sufficiently small $h \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$. Now, since T is SOT-continuous and $T(0) = \mathbf{I}$, one has $\mathbb{E}[T(u_h)] \xrightarrow{\text{SOT}} \mathbf{I}$ for $\mathbb{R}_{> 0} \ni h \rightarrow 0$ (cf. the subsequent paragraph below (1.1.7) in [6]). It follows that $\frac{1}{h}(T(h) - \mathbf{I}) S \mathbb{E}[T(u_t)] \xrightarrow{\text{SOT}} S \frac{1}{t}(T(t) - \mathbf{I})$ for $\mathbb{R}_{> 0} \ni h \rightarrow 0$. This proves the claim. ■

Proposition A.2 *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a commuting family of C_0 -semigroups over a Banach space \mathcal{E} with generators $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^d$. For each $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}^d$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$ define*

$$\tilde{\xi}_{\mathbf{t}} := \mathbb{E}[T_1(u_{t_1})] \mathbb{E}[T_2(u_{t_2})] \dots \mathbb{E}[T_d(u_{t_d})] \xi.$$

^v viz. for commuting families of $d \geq 2$ semigroups over infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces.

Then $D_0 := \{\tilde{\xi}_{\mathbf{t}} \mid \xi \in \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d\}$ spans a dense linear subspace D of \mathcal{E} . Furthermore, for injective sequences $(k_i)_{i=1}^n \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, $n \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ one has $D \subseteq \mathcal{D}(A_{k_n} \cdots A_{k_2} \cdot A_{k_1})$. And for each $\xi \in D$, the value of $(A_{k_n} \cdots A_{k_2} \cdot A_{k_1})\xi$ does not depend on the order of the k_i .

Proof. As explained in the proof of Proposition A.1, one has for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ that $\mathbb{E}[T_i(u_t)] = \frac{1}{t} \cdot \text{SOT-}\int_{s \in [0, t]} T(s) \, ds \xrightarrow{\text{SOT}} \mathbf{I}$ for $\mathbb{R}_{>0} \ni t \rightarrow 0$. As explained above, $\{\mathbb{E}[T_i(u_t)] \mid t \in (0, h)\}$ is uniformly bounded for all $h \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Since multiplication is SOT-continuous on bounded subsets of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$, it follows that $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathbf{t}} = \mathbb{E}[T_1(u_{t_1})]\mathbb{E}[T_2(u_{t_2})] \cdots \mathbb{E}[T_d(u_{t_d})]\xi \rightarrow \xi$ in norm for $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^d \ni \mathbf{t} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$. Thus D_0 is dense in \mathcal{E} .

Towards the final claim, it suffices to consider elements of D_0 . So consider $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathbf{t}} \in D_0$ for some $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{E}$ and let $(k_i)_{i=1}^n \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ be an injective sequence for some $n \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Letting $\tau_i \sim U([0, t_i])$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ be independent r.v.'s, one has $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathbf{t}} = \mathbb{E}[T_1(\tau_1)]\mathbb{E}[T_2(\tau_2)] \cdots \mathbb{E}[T_d(\tau_d)]\xi$. Also, by independence and commutativity one obtains $\mathbb{E}[T_i(\tau_i)]\mathbb{E}[T_j(\tau_j)] = \mathbb{E}[T_i(\tau_i)T_j(\tau_j)] = \mathbb{E}[T_j(\tau_j)T_i(\tau_i)] = \mathbb{E}[T_j(\tau_j)]\mathbb{E}[T_i(\tau_i)]$ as well as $\mathbb{E}[T_i(\tau_i)]\frac{1}{t_j}(T(t_j) - \mathbf{I}) = \mathbb{E}[T_i(\tau_i)]\frac{1}{t_j}(T(t_j) - \mathbf{I}) = \mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{t_j}(T(t_j) - \mathbf{I})T_i(\tau_i)] = \frac{1}{t_j}(T(t_j) - \mathbf{I})\mathbb{E}[T_i(\tau_i)]$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ with $i \neq j$. Since these operators commute, one may apply Proposition A.1 and obtain by induction over n that $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathbf{t}} = \mathbb{E}[T_1(\tau_1)]\mathbb{E}[T_2(\tau_2)] \cdots \mathbb{E}[T_d(\tau_d)]\xi \in \mathcal{D}(A_{k_n} \cdots A_{k_2} \cdot A_{k_1})$ with

$$(A_{k_n} \cdots A_{k_2} \cdot A_{k_1})\tilde{\xi}_{\mathbf{t}} = \left(\prod_{i=1}^d \begin{cases} \frac{1}{t_i}(T(t_i) - \mathbf{I}) & : i \in \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n\} \\ \mathbb{E}[T_i(u_i)] & : \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \right) \xi. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

In particular, by (A.21) the value is independent of the order of the k_i . ■

Acknowledgement. The author is grateful to Tanja Eisner for her patient and detailed feedback, to Markus Haase for pointing out useful literature on Bochner-integrals, to Ulrich Groh for discussions about positive operators, and to the referee for their constructive feedback.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. H. ABDELAZIZ, *On the product of class A-semigroups of linear operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 88 (1983), pp. 517–522.
- [2] T. ANDŌ, *On a pair of commutative contractions*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged), 24 (1963), pp. 88–90.
- [3] W. ARVESON, *Dilation theory yesterday and today*, in A glimpse at Hilbert space operators, vol. 207 of Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2010, pp. 99–123.
- [4] O. BRATELI AND D. W. ROBINSON, *Operator algebras and quantum statistical mechanics. 2*, Texts and Monographs in Physics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second ed., 1997. Equilibrium states. Models in quantum statistical mechanics.
- [5] Y. A. BUTKO, *The method of Chernoff approximation*, in Semigroups of operators—theory and applications, vol. 325 of Springer Proc. Math. Stat., Springer, Cham, 2020, pp. 19–46.
- [6] P. L. BUTZER AND H. BERENS, *Semi-groups of operators and approximation*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 145, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1967.
- [7] P. R. CHERNOFF, *Note on product formulas for operator semigroups*, J. Functional Analysis, 2 (1968), pp. 238–242.
- [8] ———, *Product formulas, nonlinear semigroups, and addition of unbounded operators*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, No. 140, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1974.
- [9] K. L. CHUNG, *On the exponential formulas of semi-group theory*, Math. Scand., 10 (1962), pp. 153–162.
- [10] L. A. COBURN, *The measure algebra of the Heisenberg group*, J. Funct. Anal., 161 (1999), pp. 509–525.
- [11] R. DAHYA, *On the complete metrisability of spaces of contractive semigroups*, Arch. Math. (Basel), 118 (2022), pp. 509–528.
- [12] ———, *The space of contractive C_0 -semigroups is a Baire space*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 508 (2022). Paper No. 125881, 12.
- [13] ———, *Dilations of commuting C_0 -semigroups with bounded generators and the von Neumann polynomial inequality*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 523 (2023). Paper No. 127021.
- [14] A. DEITMAR AND S. ECHTERHOFF, *Principles of harmonic analysis*, Universitext, Springer, Cham, second ed., 2014.
- [15] J. DIESTEL AND J. J. UHL, JR., *Vector measures*, Mathematical Surveys, No. 15, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1977. With a foreword by B. J. Pettis.

- [16] N. DUNFORD AND J. T. SCHWARTZ, *Linear operators. Part I*, Wiley Classics Library, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1988. General theory, With the assistance of William G. Bade and Robert G. Bartle, Reprint of the 1958 original, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [17] T. EISNER, *Stability of operators and operator semigroups*, vol. 209 of Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2010.
- [18] T. EISNER AND A. SERÉNY, *Category theorems for stable semigroups*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, 29 (2009), pp. 487–494.
- [19] ———, *On the weak analogue of the Trotter-Kato theorem*, Taiwanese J. Math., 14 (2010), pp. 1411–1416.
- [20] K.-J. ENGEL AND R. NAGEL, *One-parameter semigroups for linear evolution equations*, vol. 194 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [21] G. B. FOLLAND, *A course in abstract harmonic analysis*, no. 29 in Textbooks in mathematics, CRC Press, 2 ed., 2015.
- [22] J. A. GOLDSTEIN, *Semigroups of linear operators & applications*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1985.
- [23] P. R. HALMOS, *Normal dilations and extensions of operators*, Summa Brasil. Math., 2 (1950), pp. 125–134.
- [24] E. HILLE AND R. S. PHILLIPS, *Functional analysis and semi-groups*, vol. 31 of American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., rev. ed., 1957.
- [25] T. HYTÖNEN, J. VAN NEERVEN, M. VERAAR, AND L. WEIS, *Analysis in Banach spaces. Vol. I. Martingales and Littlewood-Paley theory*, vol. 63 of Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics, Springer, Cham, 2016.
- [26] ———, *Analysis in Banach spaces. Vol. II. Probabilistic Methods and Operator Theory*, vol. 67 of Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics, Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [27] A. S. KECHRIS, *Classical descriptive set theory*, vol. 156 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [28] A. KLENKE, *Probability theory*, (2008), pp. xii+616. Translated from the 2006 German original.
- [29] S. KRÓL, *A note on approximation of semigroups of contractions on Hilbert spaces*, Semigroup Forum, 79 (2009), pp. 369–376.
- [30] K. KUNEN, *Set theory*, vol. 34 of Studies in Logic (London), College Publications, London, 2011.
- [31] C. LE MERDY, *On dilation theory for c_0 -semigroups on Hilbert space*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 45 (1996), pp. 945–959.
- [32] B. J. MUELLER, *Three results for locally compact groups connected with Haar measure density theorem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 16 (1965), pp. 1414–1416.
- [33] V. I. PAULSEN, *Completely bounded maps and dilations*, vol. 146 of Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow; John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1986.
- [34] G. PISIER, *Similarity problems and completely bounded maps*, vol. 1618 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, expanded ed., 2001.
- [35] M. PTAK, *Unitary dilations of multi-parameter semi-groups of operators*, Annales Polonici Mathematici, XLV (1985), pp. 237–243.
- [36] M. REISSIG AND B.-W. SCHULZE, eds., *New trends in the theory of hyperbolic equations*, vol. 159 of Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2005.
- [37] O. M. SHALIT, *Dilation theory: a guided tour*, in Operator theory, functional analysis and applications, vol. 282 of Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2021, pp. 551–623.
- [38] E. SHAMOVICH AND V. VINNIKOV, *Dilations of semigroups of contractions through vessels*, Integral Equations Operator Theory, 87 (2017), pp. 45–80.
- [39] M. ŚLOCIŃSKI, *Unitary dilation of two-parameter semi-groups of contractions*, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys., 22 (1974), pp. 1011–1014.
- [40] ———, *Unitary dilation of two-parameter semi-groups of contractions II*, Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 23 (1982), pp. 191–194.
- [41] W. F. STINESPRING, *Positive functions on C^* -algebras*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 6 (1955), pp. 211–216.
- [42] B. SZ.-NAGY, *Sur les contractions de l'espace de Hilbert*, vol. 15, 1953.
- [43] B. SZ.-NAGY AND C. FOIAŞ, *Harmonic analysis of operators on Hilbert space*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-London; American Elsevier Publishing Co., Inc., New York; Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1970. Translated from the French and revised.
- [44] G. WITTSTOCK, *Ein operatorwertiger Hahn-Banach Satz*, J. Functional Analysis, 40 (1981), pp. 127–150.
- [45] ———, *On matrix order and convexity*, in Functional analysis: surveys and recent results, III (Paderborn, 1983), vol. 90 of North-Holland Math. Stud., North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 175–188.

Email address: raj.dahya@web.de

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK UND INFORMATIK
UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG, AUGUSTUSPLATZ 10, D-04109 LEIPZIG, GERMANY