

# A stationary approach for the Kato-Rosenblum theorem in von Neumann algebras

Qihui Li and Rui Wang

ABSTRACT. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a countable decomposable properly infinite semifinite von Neumann algebra acting on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . An analogue of the Kato-Rosenblum theorem in  $\mathcal{M}$  has been proved in [9] by showing the existence of generalized wave operators. It is well-known that there are two typical approaches to show the existence of wave operators in the scattering theory. One is called time-dependent approach and another is called stationary approach. The main purpose of this article is to introduce a stationary approach in  $\mathcal{M}$  and then to obtain the Kato-Rosenblum theorem in  $\mathcal{M}$  by a stationary approach instead of a time-dependent approach in [9].

## 1. Introduction

This paper is a sequel to [9] and [10], in which we studied the diagonalizations of self-adjoint operators modulo norm ideal in semifinite von Neumann algebras. (see [4],[11]-[13] or [17] for more details about von Neumann algebras.) In particular, we give an analogue of Kato-Rosenblum theorem in a semifinite von Neumann algebra in [10].

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a complex separable infinite dimensional Hilbert space. Assume  $H$  and  $H_1$  are densely defined self-adjoint operators on  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfying that  $H_1 - H$  is in the trace class, then the Kato-Rosenblum theorem asserts that the wave operator  $W_{\pm}(H_1, H)$  of  $H$  and  $H_1$  exists and consequently the absolutely continuous parts of  $H$  and  $H_1$  are unitarily equivalent. Thus, if a self-adjoint operator  $H$  in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  has a nonzero absolutely continuous spectrum, then  $H$  can not be a sum of a diagonal operator and a trace class operator. In [10], we introduce the concept of generalized wave operator  $W_{\pm}$  based on the notion of norm absolutely continuous projections. An analogue of Kato-Rosenblum theorem in a semifinite von Neumann algebra  $\mathcal{M}$  is obtained by showing the existence of the generalized wave operator  $W_{\pm}$ . To be more precise, we proved that for self-adjoint operators  $H$  and  $H_1$  affiliated with  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfying  $H_1 - H \in \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ , the generalized wave operator  $W_{\pm}(H_1, H)$  exists and then the norm absolutely continuous part of  $H$  and  $H_1$  are unitarily equivalent. It implies that a self-adjoint operator  $H$  affiliated with

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 47C15; Secondary: 47A40, 47A55.

*Key words and phrases*. Stationary approach, Generalized wave operators, von Neumann algebras.

The author was partly supported by NSFC (Grant No.11671133, 11871021).

$\mathcal{M}$  can not be a sum of a diagonal operator in  $\mathcal{M}$  (see Definition 1.0.1 in [9]) and an operator in  $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$  if it has a non-zero norm absolutely continuous projection in  $\mathcal{M}$

The above statements illustrate that showing the existence of wave operators is the key step to prove two versions of Kato-Rosenblum theorem. In mathematical scattering theory, wave operator  $W_{\pm}$  is an elementary concept and the existence of  $W_{\pm}$  is one of the main research topics in this area. Actually, there are two typical approaches to show the existence of  $W_{\pm}$ . One is called time-dependent approach which has been used in [5] and [15] and another is called stationary approach (see [2], [3] or [18]). The methods which do not make explicit use of the time variable  $t$  are known as the stationary approaches. An important merit of a stationary approach is the advanced formula part. We notice that the method in [10] to show the Kato-Rosenblum theorem in  $\mathcal{M}$  is a so-called time-dependent approach. So it is natural to ask whether there is a stationary approach in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Thus to explore a stationary method in  $\mathcal{M}$  is our main purpose in the current article. We will also show the Kato-Rosenblum theorem in  $\mathcal{M}$  in [10] by a stationary approach.

The notion of the norm absolutely continuous support  $P_{ac}^{\infty}(H)$  of a self-adjoint operator  $H$  affiliated to  $\mathcal{M}$  plays a very important role in the Kato-Rosenblum theorem in  $\mathcal{M}$ . So in this article, we are going to characterize  $P_{ac}^{\infty}(H)$  by applying the Kato smoothness given in [6], we assert that

$$P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) = \vee \{R(G^*) : G \in \mathcal{M} \text{ is } H\text{-smooth}\}.$$

Therefore for a self-adjoint  $H$  affiliated with  $\mathcal{M}$ , if there is a  $H$ -smooth operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ , then  $H$  is not a sum of a diagonal operator in  $\mathcal{M}$  and an operator in  $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ .

The construction of this paper is as follows. In section 2, we prepare related notation, definitions and lemmas. We list the relation between the resolvent  $R_H(z) = (H - z)^{-1}$  and unitary  $U_H(t) = \exp(-itH)$  for a self-adjoint operator  $H$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ . We also recall the definitions of Kato smoothness and generalized wave operators. Some basic properties of generalized wave operators are discussed in this section too. Section 3 is focused on the main results of this paper. We first characterize the norm absolutely continuous support  $P_{ac}^{\infty}(H)$  of a self-adjoint operator  $H$  affiliated to  $\mathcal{M}$  by applying the Kato smoothness. After giving the concepts of generalized weak wave operators  $\widetilde{W}_{\pm}$ , generalized stationary wave operators  $\mathcal{U}_{\pm}$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , we give a stationary proof of the Kato-Rosenblum theorem in  $\mathcal{M}$ .

## 2. Preliminaries and Notation

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a complex Hilbert space and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  be the set of all bounded linear operators on  $\mathcal{H}$ . In this article, we assume that  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is a countable decomposable properly infinite semifinite von Neumann algebra with a faithful normal tracial weight  $\tau$  and  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  is the set of densely defined, closed operators affiliated with  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**2.1. The Unitary Group and Resolvent of a Self-adjoint Operator.** The resolvent  $R_H(z) = (H - z)^{-1}$  and unitary  $U_H(t) = \exp(-itH)$  for a self-adjoint operator  $H$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  will be frequently used in the current paper, so we recall their properties and relations below.

Let  $H$  be any self-adjoint operator with domain  $\mathcal{D}(H)$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\{(E_H(\lambda))\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}$  be the spectral resolution of the identity for  $H$ . For  $f, g$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ , the unitary group  $U_H(t) = \exp(-itH)$

has the sesquilinear form

$$\langle U_H(t)f, g \rangle = \langle \exp(-itH)f, g \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-i\lambda t) d\langle E_H(\lambda)f, g \rangle. \quad (2.1)$$

Similarly, its resolvent  $R_H(z) = (H - z)^{-1}$  has the sesquilinear form

$$\langle R_H(z)f, g \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (\lambda - z)^{-1} d\langle E_H(\lambda)f, g \rangle.$$

The connection between above two sesquilinear forms is given by the relation

$$R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) = \pm i \int_0^{\infty} \exp(-\varepsilon t \pm i\lambda t) \exp(\pm itH) dt. \quad (2.2)$$

The proof of equality (2.2) is based on Fubini's Theorem and given in Section 1.4 [18]. Set

$$\delta_H(\lambda, \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} [R_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) - R_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)] = \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} R_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) R_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon) \geq 0,$$

then

$$\varepsilon \pi^{-1} \|R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)f\|^2 = \langle \delta_H(\lambda, \varepsilon)f, f \rangle \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$\langle \delta_H(\lambda, \varepsilon)f, g \rangle = \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(s - \lambda - i\varepsilon)(s - \lambda + i\varepsilon)} d\langle E_H(s)f, g \rangle. \quad (2.4)$$

Denote by  $\mathcal{H}_{ac}(H)$  the set of all these vectors  $x \in \mathcal{H}$  such that the mapping  $\lambda \mapsto \langle E_H(\lambda)x, x \rangle$ , with  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , is a locally absolutely continuous function on  $\mathbb{R}$  (see [8] or [18] for more details). From the argument in Section 1.4 [18], we conclude that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle \delta_H(\lambda, \varepsilon)f, g \rangle = \frac{d\langle E_H(\lambda)f, g \rangle}{d\lambda}, \quad \text{a.e. } \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \quad (2.5)$$

for  $f$  or  $g$  in  $\mathcal{H}_{ac}(H)$ . We also have

$$\frac{d\langle E_H(\lambda)E_H(\Lambda)f, g \rangle}{d\lambda} = \mathcal{X}_{\Lambda}(\lambda) \frac{d\langle E_H(\lambda)f, g \rangle}{d\lambda}, \quad \text{a.e. } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.6)$$

where  $\mathcal{X}_{\Lambda}(\cdot)$  is the characteristic function of the Borel set  $\Lambda$ . The proof of equality (2.6) can be found in the proof of Theorem X.4.4 in [8] or Section 1.3 in [18].

**2.2. Kato Smoothness and generalized wave operators.** Kato smoothness play a very important role in the mathematical scattering theory. It can be equivalently formulated in terms of the corresponding unitary group. We recall it in this section.

For a self-adjoint operator  $H$ , an operator  $G : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is called  $H$ -bounded if  $\mathcal{D}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(G)$  and  $GR_H(z)$  is bounded for  $z$  in the resolvent set  $\rho = \rho(H)$ .

**THEOREM 2.2.1.** (Theorem 4.3.1 in [18] or Theorem 5.1 in [6]) *Let  $H$  be a densely defined self-adjoint operator in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Assume that  $G : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is  $H$ -bounded operator, then the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1)  $\gamma_1^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}(H), \|f\|=1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|Ge^{\pm itH}f\|^2 dt < \infty$ ;
- (2)  $\gamma_2^2 = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \sup_{\|f\|=1, \varepsilon > 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\|GR_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)f\|^2 + \|GR_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)f\|^2) d\lambda < \infty$ ;
- (3)  $\gamma_3^2 = \sup_{\|f\|=1, \varepsilon > 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|G\delta_H(\lambda, \varepsilon)f\|^2 d\lambda < \infty$ ;

$$(4) \quad \gamma_4^2 = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \varepsilon > 0} \|G\delta_H(\lambda, \varepsilon)G^*\| < \infty;$$

$$(5) \quad \gamma_5^2 = \sup_{\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}} \frac{\|GE_H(\Lambda)G^*\|}{|\Lambda|} < \infty.$$

All the constants  $\gamma_j = \gamma_j(G)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 5$ , are equal to one another.

DEFINITION 2.2.2. *Let  $H$  be a self-adjoint operator acting on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . If  $G$  is  $H$ -bounded and one of the inequalities (1)-(5) holds (and then all of them), then operator  $G$  is called Kato smooth relative to the operator  $H$  ( $H$ -smooth). The common value of the quantities  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_5$  is denoted by  $\gamma_H(G)$ .*

REMARK 2.2.3. *There are other expressions for the number  $\gamma_H(G)$  given in the Section 4.3 ([18]). In particular, for each the sign " $\pm$ "*

$$\gamma_H^2(G) = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^2 \sup_{\|f\|=1, \varepsilon > 0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|GR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)f\|^2 d\lambda \quad (2.7)$$

Before giving the definition of generalized wave operators in  $\mathcal{M}$ , we need to recall the following concepts which appear first in [10].

DEFINITION 2.2.4. ([10]) *Let  $H$  be a self-adjoint element in  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  and let  $\{E_H(\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}$  be the spectral resolution of the identity for  $H$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ . We define  $\mathcal{P}_{ac}^\infty(H)$  to be the collection of those projections  $P$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  such that:*

*the mapping  $\lambda \mapsto PE_H(\lambda)P$  from  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  into  $\mathcal{M}$  is locally absolutely continuous, i.e., for all  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $a < b$  and every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\sum_i \|PE_H(b_i)P - PE_H(a_i)P\| < \varepsilon$  for every finite collection  $\{(a_i, b_i)\}$  of disjoint intervals in  $[a, b]$  with  $\sum_i (b_i - a_i) < \delta$ .*

*A projection  $P \in \mathcal{P}_{ac}^\infty(H)$  is called a norm absolutely continuous projection with respect to  $H$ . Define*

$$P_{ac}^\infty(H) = \vee \{P : P \in \mathcal{P}_{ac}^\infty(H)\}.$$

*Such  $P_{ac}^\infty(H)$  is called the norm absolutely continuous support of  $H$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  and denote the range of  $P_{ac}^\infty(H)$  by  $\mathcal{H}_{ac}^\infty(H)$ .*

REMARK 2.2.5. *Let  $P_{ac}(H)$  be the projection from  $\mathcal{H}$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_{ac}(H)$ . In [10], it has been shown that  $P_{ac}^\infty(H) \leq P_{ac}(H)$  and  $P_{ac}^\infty(H) \in \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{A}'$  where  $\mathcal{A}$  is the von Neumann subalgebra generated by  $\{E_H(\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{A}'$  denotes the commutant of  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

Now, we are ready to recall the definition of generalized wave operators.

DEFINITION 2.2.6. ([10]) *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . The generalized wave operator for a pair of self-adjoint operators  $H, H_1$  and  $J$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  is the operator*

$$W_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \text{s.o.t-} \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH_1} J e^{-itH} P_{ac}^\infty(H)$$

*provided that s.o.t (strong operator topology) limit exists.*

We note that the relation containing the signs " $\pm$ " is understood as two independent equalities. After slightly modify the proof of Theorem 5.2.5 in [10], we can get the next result.

**THEOREM 2.2.7.** *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $W_{\pm}(H_1, H; J)$  exists for a pair of self-adjoint operators  $H, H_1$  and  $J$ , then for any Borel function  $\varphi$*

$$\varphi(H_1) W_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) = W_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) \varphi(H).$$

*In particular, for any Borel set  $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}$*

$$E_{H_1}(\Lambda) W_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) = W_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) E_H(\Lambda).$$

Different  $J$  might give us different  $W_{\pm}$ , we will give a condition about  $J$  such that  $W_{\pm}(H_1, H; J)$  is an isometry on  $P_{ac}^{\infty}(H)$  below. Its proof is similar to Proposition 2.1.3 in [18], so we omit it.

**THEOREM 2.2.8.** *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $W_{\pm}(H_1, H; J)$  exists, then  $W_{\pm}(H_1, H; J)$  is isometric on  $P_{ac}^{\infty}(H)$  if the strong operator limit*

$$s.o.t\text{-}\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} (J^*J - I) e^{-itH} P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) = 0$$

**LEMMA 2.2.9.** (Lemma 5.2.3 [10]) *Suppose  $H$  is a self-adjoint element in  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ . Let  $\{(E_H(\lambda))\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}$  be the spectral resolution of the identity for  $H$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $S \in \mathcal{M}$  satisfies that the mapping  $\lambda \mapsto S^* E_H(\lambda) S$  from  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $\mathcal{M}$  is locally absolutely continuous, then  $R(S)$ , the range projection of  $S$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , is a subprojection of  $P_{ac}^{\infty}(H)$ .*

Then we can get the following result.

**PROPOSITION 2.2.10.** *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $W_{\pm} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} W_{\pm}(H_1, H; J)$  exists and the strong operator limit*

$$s.o.t\text{-}\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} (J^*J - I) e^{-itH} P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) = 0,$$

*Then  $W_{\pm} W_{\pm}^* \leq P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1)$*

**PROOF.** If

$$s.o.t\text{-}\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} (J^*J - I) e^{-itH} P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) = 0,$$

then  $W_{\pm}^* W_{\pm} = P_{ac}^{\infty}(H)$  by Theorem 2.2.8. From Theorem 2.2.7, for any  $P \in \mathcal{P}_{ac}^{\infty}(H)$  and any Borel set  $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$(W_{\pm} P)^* E_{H_1}(\Lambda) (W_{\pm} P) = P W_{\pm}^* E_{H_1}(\Lambda) W_{\pm} P = P W_{\pm}^* W_{\pm} E_H(\Lambda) P = P E_H(\Lambda) P.$$

It implies that the mapping  $\lambda \rightarrow (W_{\pm} P)^* E_{H_1}(\lambda) (W_{\pm} P)$  from  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $\mathcal{M}$  is locally absolutely continuous. Hence the range projection  $R(W_{\pm} P) \leq P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1)$  by Lemma 2.2.9. Therefore  $R(W_{\pm}) \leq P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1)$  by the fact that  $W_{\pm} P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) = W_{\pm}$ . Hence  $W_{\pm} W_{\pm}^* \leq P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1)$ .  $\square$

### 3. Main Results

**3.1. Characterization of norm absolutely continuous projections in  $\mathcal{M}$ .** The cut off function  $\omega_n$  is given in [10]. We refer the reader to [10] for its definition. Here we only recall its useful property.

LEMMA 3.1.1. (Lemma 4.2.2 in [10]) Suppose  $H$  is a self-adjoint element in  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and cut-off function  $\omega_n$ , let

$$\omega_n(H) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \omega_n(t) dE_H(t).$$

Then  $\omega_n(H) \in \mathcal{M}$  and

$$\omega_n(H) \rightarrow I \text{ in strong operator topology, as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

REMARK 3.1.2. Let  $H$  be a self-adjoint element in  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  and  $P \in \mathcal{P}_{ac}^\infty(H)$ . From Lemma 4.2.3 (vi) in [10],

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|P\omega_n(H) e^{-itH} f\|^2 dt \leq \frac{n}{2\pi} \|f\| \quad (3.1)$$

for any  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then

$$\sup_{\|f\|=1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|P\omega_n(H) e^{-itH} f\|^2 dt \leq \frac{n}{2\pi}.$$

By Theorem 2.2.1 and Definition 2.2.2, we have  $G = P\omega_n(H)$  is  $H$ -smooth for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Next theorem is the main result in this subsection.

THEOREM 3.1.3. Suppose  $H$  is a self-adjoint element in  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ . Then

$$P_{ac}^\infty(H) = \vee \{R(G^*) : G \in \mathcal{M} \text{ is } H\text{-smooth}\}$$

where  $R(G^*)$  is the range projection of  $G^*$ .

PROOF. By Remark 3.1.2, we have  $G = P\omega_n(H)$  is  $H$ -smooth. Hence from Theorem 2.2.1,

$$\sup_{\|x\|=1} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|P\omega_n(H) e^{-itH} x\|^2 dt = \sup_{\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}} \frac{\|P\omega_n(H) E_H(\Lambda) \omega_n(H) P\|}{|\Lambda|} \leq \frac{n}{(2\pi)^2}.$$

Therefore  $\lambda \rightarrow P\omega_n(H) E_H(\lambda) \omega_n(H) P$  is locally absolutely continuous. Then by Lemma 2.2.9, we have  $R(\omega_n(H) P) \leq P_{ac}^\infty(H)$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $P \in \mathcal{P}_{ac}^\infty(H)$ . Hence

$$P = \vee_n R(\omega_n(H) P) = \vee_n \{R(G^*) : G = P\omega_n(H)\}$$

by Lemma 3.1.1, now we conclude that  $P_{ac}^\infty(H) \leq \vee \{R(G^*) : G \in \mathcal{M} \text{ is } H\text{-smooth}\}$ .

On the other hand, if  $G \in \mathcal{M}$  is  $H$ -smooth, then by Theorem 2.2.1 (5) we have  $\lambda \rightarrow GE_\lambda G^*$  is locally absolutely continuous. Therefore  $R(G^*) \leq P_{ac}^\infty(H)$  by Lemma 2.2.9. Hence

$$\vee \{R(G^*) : G \text{ is } H\text{-smooth in } \mathcal{M}\} \leq P_{ac}^\infty(H).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Let  $P_{ac}(H)$  be the projection from  $\mathcal{H}$  onto  $\mathcal{H}_{ac}(H)$ . In [10], it has been shown that  $P_{ac}(H) = P_{ac}^\infty(H)$  for a densely defined self-adjoint operator  $H$  (therefore  $H \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))$ ). Then we can get the following corollary.

COROLLARY 3.1.4. Let  $H$  be a densely defined self-adjoint operator on  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} P_{ac}(H) &= P_{ac}^\infty(H) \\ &= \vee \{R(G^*) : G \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \text{ is } H\text{-smooth}\}. \end{aligned}$$

**COROLLARY 3.1.5.** *Suppose  $H$  is a self-adjoint affiliated with  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then  $P_{ac}^\infty(H) \neq 0$  if and only if there is at least one  $H$ -smooth operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ .*

**PROOF.** If  $P_{ac}^\infty(H) \neq 0$ , then there is a projection  $P \in \mathcal{P}_{ac}^\infty(H)$ . By the argument in the proof of Theorem 3.1.3, we know that  $P\omega_n(H)$  is  $H$ -smooth operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . The other direction is clear by Theorem 3.1.3.  $\square$

**3.2. A Stationary approach in  $\mathcal{M}$ .** The stationary approach in a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  is based on several variations of wave operators, such as weak wave operators and stationary wave operators (see [18]). So we will also give the definitions of these variations in  $\mathcal{M}$ . For the reader who is familiar with the general scattering theory, the following definitions are natural extensions of the corresponding definitions in the general scattering theory. For the reader who is not familiar with this area, we refer the reader to the Appendix of this paper for the details.

**DEFINITION 3.2.1.** *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . The generalized weak wave operator for a pair of self-adjoint operators  $H, H_1$  and  $J$  is the operator*

$$\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = w.o.t\text{-}\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) e^{itH_1} J e^{-itH} P_{ac}^\infty(H)$$

provided that w.o.t (weak operator topology) limit exists.

Furthermore, we also have

$$\widetilde{W}_\pm(H, H_1; J^*) = \widetilde{W}_\pm^*(H_1, H; J) \quad (3.2)$$

if  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists.

**DEFINITION 3.2.2.** *Let  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ ,  $H, H_1$  be self-adjoint operators in  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ . If for any pair of elements  $f$  and  $f_1$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ ,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle$$

exists for a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , then the generalized stationary wave operator is defined as

$$\langle \mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f, f_1 \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle d\lambda.$$

From the definition of  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$ , it is clear that

$$P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) \mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) \quad (3.3)$$

if  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists.

Note  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  is given in terms of the resolvents of operators  $H$  and  $H_1$  which obviously have nothing to do with time variable  $t$  apparently. So  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  is a key concept in the stationary approach in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Actually, to check the existence of  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  is one of the key steps to show the existence of  $W_\pm$  in a stationary method.

**COROLLARY 3.2.3.** *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists, then*

$$\mathcal{U}_\pm(H, H_1; J^*) = \mathcal{U}_\pm^*(H_1, H; J).$$

Next result give us the relation among  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$ ,  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  and  $W_\pm(H_1, H; J)$ , it is a natural extension of the similar result in the general scattering theory and the proof are similar too. If the reader are interested in its proof, you can find it in the Appendix of this paper.

**THEOREM 3.2.4.** *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H, H; J^*J)$ ,  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  and  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H, H; J^*J)$  exist as well as*

$$\mathcal{U}_\pm^*(H_1, H; J)\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \mathcal{U}_\pm(H, H; J^*J),$$

then  $W_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists and

$$\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = W_\pm(H_1, H; J).$$

Now based on the definition of  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$ , we can get the following property.

**COROLLARY 3.2.5.** *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists, then for any pair of elements  $f$  and  $f_1$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  and any Borel sets  $\Lambda, \Lambda_1 \subset \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) E_H(\Lambda) f, E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) f_1 \rangle \\ &= \int_{\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle J R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

**PROOF.** Set

$$\alpha_\pm(f, f_1; \lambda) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle J R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle.$$

Since

$$P_{ac}^\infty(H) E_H(\Lambda) = E_H(\Lambda) P_{ac}^\infty(H)$$

and

$$P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) = E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1)$$

by Remark 2.2.5, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\alpha_\pm(E_H(\Lambda) f, E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) f_1; \lambda)|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2} \|J\|^2 \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) E_H(\Lambda) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f\|^2 \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1\|^2 \\ & = \|J\|^2 \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle \delta_H(\lambda, \varepsilon) E_H(\Lambda) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, f \rangle \cdot \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1, f_1 \rangle \\ & = \|J\|^2 \mathcal{X}_{\Lambda \cap \Lambda_1} \frac{d \langle E_H(\lambda) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, f \rangle}{d\lambda} \frac{d \langle E_{H_1}(\lambda) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1, f_1 \rangle}{d\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

by (2.5) and (2.6) where  $\mathcal{X}_{\Lambda \cap \Lambda_1}$  is the characteristic function of  $\Lambda \cap \Lambda_1$ . Therefore

$$\mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \Lambda \cap \Lambda_1} \alpha_\pm(E_H(\Lambda) f, E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) f_1; \lambda) = 0.$$

where  $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \Lambda \cap \Lambda_1}$  is the characteristic function of  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \Lambda \cap \Lambda_1$ . It implies that

$$\mathcal{X}_{\Lambda \cap \Lambda_1} \alpha_\pm(E_H(\Lambda) f, E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) f_1; \lambda) = \alpha_\pm(E_H(\Lambda) f, E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) f_1; \lambda).$$



Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathcal{X}_{\Lambda \cap \Lambda_1} \alpha_{\pm}(f, f_1; \lambda) \\
 &= \mathcal{X}_{\Lambda \cap \Lambda_1} \alpha_{\pm}(E_H(\Lambda) f, E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) f_1; \lambda) + \mathcal{X}_{\Lambda \cap \Lambda_1} \alpha_{\pm}(E_H(\mathbb{R} \setminus (\Lambda)) f, E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) f_1; \lambda) \\
 &+ \mathcal{X}_{\Lambda \cap \Lambda_1} \alpha_{\pm}(f, E_{H_1}(\mathbb{R} \setminus (\Lambda_1)) f_1; \lambda) \\
 &= \alpha_{\pm}(E_H(\Lambda) f, E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) f_1; \lambda).
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \langle \mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) E_H(\Lambda) f, E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) f_1 \rangle \\
 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha_{\pm}(E_H(\Lambda) f, E_{H_1}(\Lambda_1) f_1; \lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{X}_{\Lambda \cap \Lambda_1} \alpha_{\pm}(f, f_1; \lambda) \\
 &= \int_{\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) f_1 \rangle d\lambda.
 \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed.  $\square$

REMARK 3.2.6. *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $J\mathcal{D}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(H_1)$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_1 J - JH &= (H_1 - z) J - J(H - z) \\
 &= (H_1 - z)(JR_H(z) - R_{H_1}(z) J)(H - z).
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Hence

$$JR_H(z) - R_{H_1}(z) J = R_{H_1}(z)(H_1 J - JH) R_H(z). \tag{3.5}$$

From (2.3) and (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) f_1 \rangle \\
 &= \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle (R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) J + R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)(H_1 J - JH) R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) f_1 \rangle \\
 &= \langle (J + (H_1 J - JH) R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) f_1 \rangle.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

LEMMA 3.2.7. *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $J\mathcal{D}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(H_1)$ . Suppose there are  $H$ -bounded operator  $G$  and  $H_1$ -bounded operator  $G_1$  in  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  satisfying  $H_1 J - JH = G_1^* G$ . If*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} GR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f$$

exist a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  for every  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle G_1 \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) f_1, g \rangle$$

exist a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  for any  $f_1$  and  $g \in \mathcal{H}$ , then  $\mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H_1, H; J)$  exists.

PROOF. Since  $H_1J - JH = G_1^*G$ , by (3.6)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle \\
&= \langle (J + (H_1J - JH) R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle \\
&= \langle (J + G_1^*GR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle \\
&= \langle JP_{ac}^\infty(H) f, \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle + \langle (GR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, G_1\delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Then from (2.5),

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle JP_{ac}^\infty(H) f, \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle \text{ exists a.e. } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Since

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} GR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f$$

and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle G_1\delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1, g \rangle$$

exist a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  for every  $f, f_1$  and  $g \in \mathcal{H}$ , we can easily check that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle (GR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, G_1\delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle$$

exists a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  is well-defined.  $\square$

LEMMA 3.2.8. *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $J\mathcal{D}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(H_1)$ . Suppose there are  $H$ -bounded operator  $G$  and  $H_1$ -bounded operator in  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  satisfying  $H_1J - JH = G_1^*G$ . If*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} GR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f \tag{3.8}$$

exist a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  for every  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle G_1\delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1, g \rangle \tag{3.9}$$

exist a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  for any  $f_1$  and  $g \in \mathcal{H}$ , then  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H, H; J^*J)$  exists and

$$\mathcal{U}_\pm^*(H_1, H; J)\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \mathcal{U}_\pm(H, H; J^*J).$$

PROOF. By Lemma 3.2.7,  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists. For any Borel set  $\Lambda$

$$\langle E_{H_1}(\Lambda) \cdot \mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f, f_1 \rangle = \int_\Lambda \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) \mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f, f_1 \rangle d\lambda \tag{3.10}$$

where

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) \mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f, f_1 \rangle \text{ exists}$$

by (2.5) and

$$P_{ac}^\infty(H_1)\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J).$$

By Corollary 3.2.5, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle E_{H_1}(\Lambda) \cdot \mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) f, f_1 \rangle \\ &= \int_{\Lambda} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) f_1 \rangle d\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Comparing two integrands of (3.10) and (3.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) \mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) f, f_1 \rangle \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) f_1 \rangle \text{ a.e. } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

So this equality holds only when

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) f_1 \rangle$$

exists a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . By (3.6) and the fact that  $H_1 J - J H = G_1^* G$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) f_1 \rangle \\ &= \langle JP_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) f_1 \rangle + \langle (GR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, G_1 \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) f_1 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then by (3.8), (3.9) and (2.5), we can conclude that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) f_1 \rangle \quad (3.13)$$

exists a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ .

In (3.13), replace  $f_1$  by  $\mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) g$ , so from (3.4), (3.6) and (3.12) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) \mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) g \rangle \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle (J + (H_1 J - J H) R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) \mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) g \rangle \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle (J + (H_1 J - J H) R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \mp i\varepsilon) JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) g \rangle \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle (J + (H_1 J - J H) R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, \delta_{H_1}(\lambda) R_{H_1}^{-1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) g \rangle \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) g \rangle \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle R_H(\lambda \mp i\varepsilon) J^* JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) g \rangle \text{ a.e. } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence applying the definition of  $\mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H_1, H; J)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) f, \mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) g \rangle \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) \mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) g \rangle \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle R_H(\lambda \mp i\varepsilon) J^* JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) g \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H, H; J^* J) f, g \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

It implies that

$$\mathcal{U}_\pm^*(H_1, H; J)\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \mathcal{U}_\pm(H, H; J^*J).$$

□

According to Theorem 3.2.4, for showing the existence of  $W_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  by a stationary method, we also need to prove the existence of  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  and  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H, H; J^*J)$  without using time variable  $t$  explicitly.

**3.3. The Kato-Rosenblum theorem in  $\mathcal{M}$  by a stationary approach.** The results below involve noncommutative  $\mathcal{L}^p$ -spaces associated to a semifinite von Neumann algebra  $\mathcal{M}$ , so we refer the reader to [14] for more details about it.

REMARK 3.3.1. For a separable Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , we denote by  $H_\pm^2(\mathcal{H})$  the class of functions with values in  $\mathcal{H}$ , holomorphic on upper (lower) half-plane and such that

$$\sup_{\varepsilon>0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|u(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)\|^2 d\lambda < +\infty.$$

Then by the result in Section 1 of Chapter V in [16], we know that the radial limit exists almost everywhere, i.e.,  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} u(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)$  exists a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ .

LEMMA 3.3.2. Let  $H \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a self-adjoint operator and  $A \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \cap \mathcal{M}$ . Then

$$s.o.t\text{-}\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} AR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)P_{ac}^\infty(H)$$

and

$$s.o.t\text{-}\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} A\delta_H(\lambda, \varepsilon)P_{ac}^\infty(H)$$

exist in the strong operator topology a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ .

PROOF. By Remark 3.1.2, and Theorem 2.2.1, we get

$$\sup_{\|f\|=1} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|P\omega_n(H)e^{-itH}f\|^2 dt = \sup_{\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}} \frac{\|P\omega_n(H)E_H(\Lambda)\omega_n(H)P\|}{|\Lambda|} \leq \frac{n}{(2\pi)^2}.$$

Hence by (2.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\|f\|=1} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|P\omega_n(H)e^{-itH}f\|^2 dt \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \sup_{\|f\|=1, \varepsilon>0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\|P\omega_n(H)R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)f\|^2) d\lambda \leq \frac{n}{(2\pi)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 2.1.1 in [10], there is a sequence  $\{x_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that

$$\|A\|_2^2 = \tau(A^*A) = \sum \langle A^*Ax_m, x_m \rangle$$

and

$$\vee \{A'x_m : A' \in \mathcal{M}' \text{ and } m \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

where  $\mathcal{M}'$  is the commutant of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then for these  $\{x_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ , we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (\|P\omega_n(H)R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)Ax_m\|^2) d\lambda \leq \frac{n}{(2\pi)^2} \|Ax_m\|^2 \leq \frac{n}{(2\pi)^2} \|A\|_2^2$$

for  $P \in \mathcal{P}_{a.c}^\infty(H)$ . We further note that for every  $A \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \cap \mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|P\omega_n(H) R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)A\|_2^2 d\lambda &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_m \|P\omega_n(H) R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)Ax_m\|_2^2 d\lambda \\ &= \sum_m \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|P\omega_n(H) R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)Ax_m\|_2^2 d\lambda \\ &\leq \frac{n}{2\pi} \sum \|Ax_m\|^2 \leq \frac{n}{2\pi} \|A\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combing it with the equality

$$\|X\|_2^2 = \tau(X^*X) = \tau(XX^*) = \|X^*\|_2^2 \text{ for very } X \in \mathcal{M},$$

we get the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|AR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)\omega_n(H)Px_m\|^2 d\lambda &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|AR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)\omega_n(H)P\|_2^2 d\lambda \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|P\omega_n(H)R_H(\lambda \mp i\varepsilon)A\|_2^2 d\lambda \\ &\leq \frac{n}{2\pi} \|A\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

It implies that the vector-valued function  $AR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)\omega_n(H)Px_m$  belongs to the Hardy classes  $H_{\pm}^2(\mathcal{H})$  in the upper and lower half planes. By Remark 3.3.1, the radial limit values of functions in  $H_{\pm}^2(\mathcal{H})$  exist a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , therefore

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} AR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)\omega_n(H)Px_m \text{ exists a.e. } \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \text{ for every } x_m.$$

Since the linear span of the set  $\{A'x_m : A' \in \mathcal{M}' \text{ and } m \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{H}$ , we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} AR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)\omega_n(H)PA'x_m = A' \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} AR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)\omega_n(H)Px_m \text{ exists}$$

and then this indicates that

$$\text{s.o.t.} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} AR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)\omega_n(H)P \text{ exists}$$

in strong operator topology. From the fact that  $\omega_n(H) \rightarrow I$  ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ ) in Lemma 3.1.1, we can conclude that

$$\text{s.o.t.} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} AR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)P \text{ exists for } A \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \cap \mathcal{M} \text{ and } P \in \mathcal{P}_{a.c}^\infty(H).$$

Since  $P_{a.c}^\infty(H) = \vee \{P : P \in \mathcal{P}_{a.c}^\infty(H)\}$ , we get

$$\text{s.o.t.} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} AR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)P_{a.c}^\infty(H) \text{ exists for } A \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \cap \mathcal{M}.$$

Note that  $\delta_H(\lambda, \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} [R_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) - R_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)]$ , so we can conclude that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} A\delta_H(\lambda, \varepsilon)P_{a.c}^\infty(H)x = \frac{1}{2\pi i} (\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} AR_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)P_{a.c}^\infty(H)x - \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} AR_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)P_{a.c}^\infty(H)x)$$

exists for  $A \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \cap \mathcal{M}$ . The proof is completed.  $\square$

**REMARK 3.3.3.** By Lemma 2.1.6 in [9], we knows that  $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \cap \mathcal{M}$  is a two-sided ideal of  $\mathcal{M}$  for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ .

REMARK 3.3.4. *If  $G \in \mathcal{M}$ , then by (2.5)*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle G_1 \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1, g \rangle = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle \delta_{H_1}(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1, G_1 g \rangle$$

exists a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  for any  $f_1$  and  $g \in \mathcal{H}$ .

THEOREM 3.3.5. *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $J\mathcal{D}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(H_1)$ . Assume  $H_1 J - JH \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \cap \mathcal{M}$ , then  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  and  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H, H; J^* J)$  both exist and*

$$\mathcal{U}_\pm^*(H_1, H; J) \mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \mathcal{U}_\pm(H, H; J^* J).$$

PROOF. Let  $G = |H_1 J - JH|^{1/2} \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \cap \mathcal{M}$  and  $G_1^* = V |H_1 J - JH|^{1/2} \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \cap \mathcal{M}$  for some partial isometry  $V$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then the proof is completed by Remark 3.3.4, Lemma 3.3.2, Lemma 3.2.7 and Lemma 3.2.8.  $\square$

According Theorem 3.2.4, for showing the existence of  $W_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  by the stationary approach, we first need to show the existence of  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  without depending on time variable  $t$  explicitly. For doing this, we need several lemmas.

LEMMA 3.3.6. *(Lemma 2.5.1 in [10]) Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators,  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $J\mathcal{D}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(H_1)$  and  $H_1 J - JH \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $W_J(t) = e^{itH_1} J e^{-itH}$ , for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, for all  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $s, w \in \mathbb{R}$ , the mapping  $t \mapsto e^{itH_1} (H_1 J - JH) e^{-itH} f$  from  $[s, w]$  into  $\mathcal{H}$  is Bochner integrable with*

$$(W_J(w) - W_J(s)) f = i \int_s^w e^{itH_1} (H_1 J - JH) e^{-itH} f dt.$$

LEMMA 3.3.7. *Let  $H \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a self-adjoint operator and  $G$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then there is a linear manifold  $\mathcal{D}$  in  $\mathcal{H}_{ac}^\infty(H)$  with  $\overline{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{H}_{ac}^\infty(H)$  such that*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|G e^{-itH} g\|^2 dt < \infty, \quad g \in \mathcal{D}.$$

PROOF. For any  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{ac}^\infty(H)$ , by (2.5), we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle G \delta(\lambda, \varepsilon) f, h \rangle = \frac{d \langle G E_H(\lambda) f, g \rangle}{d\lambda} \quad \text{a.e. } \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \text{ for any } h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Let  $F_f(\lambda) \in \mathcal{H}$  be the weak limit of  $G \delta(\lambda, \varepsilon) f$ , i.e.  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle G \delta(\lambda, \varepsilon) f, h \rangle = \langle F_f(\lambda), h \rangle$  a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  for every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ . We set

$$X_{N,n}(f) = \{\lambda : |\lambda| \leq n, \|F_f(\lambda)\| \leq N\}$$

and  $\mathcal{D}$  to be the set of linear combination of all elements of the form  $g = E(X_{N,n}) f$  for  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{ac}^\infty(H)$  and  $n, N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since for  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{ac}^\infty(H)$  and  $n, N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$E(X_{N,n}) f = E(X_{N,n}) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f = P_{ac}^\infty(H) E(X_{N,n}) f$$

by Remark 2.2.5, we have  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{H}_{ac}^\infty(H)$ . Note

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} |(-n, n) \setminus X_{N,n}| = 0,$$

then  $f$  can be approximated by the elements  $E(X_{N,n}) f$  for  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{ac}^\infty(H)$ . Hence  $\overline{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{H}_{ac}^\infty(H)$ .

Let  $\{e_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be an orthonormal basis in  $\mathcal{H}$ . By 2.1, for  $g = E(X_{N,n})f$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Ge^{-itH}g, e_i \rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\lambda t} d \langle GE_H(\lambda)g, e_i \rangle \\ &= \int_{X_{N,n}(g)} e^{-i\lambda t} \frac{d \langle GE_H(\lambda)g, e_i \rangle}{d\lambda} d\lambda \\ &= \int_{X_{N,n}(g)} e^{-i\lambda t} \langle F_g(\lambda), e_i \rangle d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the Parseval equality, for each  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\langle Ge^{-itH}g, e_i \rangle|^2 dt = 2\pi \int_{X_{N,n}(g)} |\langle F_g(\lambda), e_i \rangle|^2 d\lambda$$

Hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|Ge^{-itH}g\|^2 dt = 2\pi \int_{X_{N,n}(g)} \|F_g(\lambda)\|^2 d\lambda \leq 4\pi N^2 n.$$

Therefore we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|Ge^{-itH}g\|^2 dt < \infty, \quad g \in \mathcal{D}.$$

□

**THEOREM 3.3.8.** *Let the operators  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $J\mathcal{D}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(H_1)$ . Let  $W_J(t) = e^{itH_1} J e^{-itH}$ , for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . If  $H_1 J - JH = G_1^* G$  for  $G_1$  and  $G$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , then the generalized weak wave operator  $\widetilde{W}_{\pm}(H_1, H; J)$  exists.*

**PROOF.** By Lemma 3.3.7, there are linear space  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{ac}^{\infty}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{D}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1)$  with  $\overline{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{H}_{ac}^{\infty}(H)$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{D}_1} = \mathcal{H}_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1)$ . Then for  $f \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $g \in \mathcal{D}_1$

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle W_J(w) - W_J(s)f, g \rangle| &= \left| \int_s^w \langle e^{itH_1} (H_1 J - JH) e^{-itH} f, g \rangle dt \right| \\ &\leq \int_s^w |\langle Ge^{-itH} f, G_1 e^{-itH_1} g \rangle| d\lambda \\ &\leq \left( \int_s^w \|Ge^{-itH} f\|^2 dt \cdot \int_s^t \|G_1 e^{-itH_1} g\|^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_s^w \|Ge^{-itH} f\|^2 dt \rightarrow 0, \quad \int_s^w \|G_1 e^{-itH_1} g\|^2 dt \rightarrow 0$$

as  $s, w \rightarrow \pm\infty$ . Hence

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \langle W_J(t)f, g \rangle = \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \langle W_J(t) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) g \rangle$$

exists for  $f \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $g \in \mathcal{D}_1$ . Since

$$\overline{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{H}_{ac}^{\infty}(H) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\mathcal{D}_1} = \mathcal{H}_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1),$$

we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \langle P_{ac}^{\infty}(H_1) W_J(t) P_{ac}^{\infty}(H) f, g \rangle$$

exist for any  $f, g \in \mathcal{H}$ . Therefore  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists.  $\square$

**COROLLARY 3.3.9.** *Let the operators  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $J\mathcal{D}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(H_1)$ . If  $H_1J - JH \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \cap \mathcal{M}$ , then the generalized weak wave operator  $\widetilde{W}_\pm = \widetilde{W}_\pm(H, H; J^*J)$  exists.*

**PROOF.** Since

$$HJ^*J - J^*JH = J^*(H_1J - JH) - (J^*H_1 - HJ^*)J \in \mathcal{M},$$

we have  $\widetilde{W}_\pm = \widetilde{W}_\pm(H, H; J^*J)$  exists by Theorem 3.3.8.  $\square$

Next result is the analogue of Kato-Rosenblum Theorem in a semifinite von Neumann algebra  $\mathcal{M}$  which is first proved in [10] by a time-dependent approach. One of our main purpose of this article is to obtain this result by a stationary approach. Now we are ready to show it here.

**THEOREM 3.3.10.** *(Theorem 5.2.5 in [10]) Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $J\mathcal{D}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(H_1)$ . Assume  $H_1 - H \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \cap \mathcal{M}$ , then*

$$W_\pm \triangleq W_\pm(H_1, H) \text{ exists in } \mathcal{M}.$$

Moreover,  $W_\pm^*W_\pm = P_{ac}^\infty(H)$ ,  $W_\pm W_\pm^* = P_{ac}^\infty(H_1)$  and  $W_\pm HW_\pm^* = H_1 P_{ac}^\infty(H_1)$ .

**PROOF.** Let  $J = I$ . Combing Theorem 3.3.8, Theorem 3.3.5 and Theorem 3.2.4, we know that  $W_\pm(H_1, H)$  and  $W_\pm(H, H_1)$  both exist. By Theorem 2.2.8, we also have

$$W_\pm^*W_\pm = W_\pm^*(H_1, H)W_\pm(H_1, H) = P_{ac}^\infty(H)$$

and

$$W_\pm^*(H, H_1)W_\pm(H, H_1) = P_{ac}^\infty(H_1).$$

Since  $H_1 - H \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \cap \mathcal{M}$ , we have  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H)$  and  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H, H_1)$  both exist and

$$\begin{aligned} W_\pm^* &= W_\pm^*(H_1, H) = \widetilde{W}_\pm^*(H_1, H) = \widetilde{W}_\pm^*(H, H_1) = W_\pm^*(H, H_1); \\ W_\pm^*(H, H_1) &= \widetilde{W}_\pm^*(H, H_1) = \widetilde{W}_\pm^*(H_1, H) = W_\pm^*(H_1, H) = W_\pm^* \end{aligned}$$

by equality (3.2). Thus

$$W_\pm^*W_\pm = P_{ac}^\infty(H), \quad W_\pm W_\pm^* = P_{ac}^\infty(H_1).$$

Meanwhile, by Theorem 2.2.7,

$$W_\pm HW_\pm^* = HW_\pm W_\pm^* = P_{ac}^\infty(H_1).$$

So the proof is completed.  $\square$

**REMARK 3.3.11.** *For a self-adjoint  $H \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ , if there is a  $H$ -smooth operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ , then  $H$  is not a sum of a diagonal operator in  $\mathcal{M}$  and an operator in  $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$  by Theorem 3.3.10 and Theorem 3.1.3.*



### References

- [1] Arendt, Wolfgang; Batty, Charles J. K. Hieber Matthias, Neubrander Frank. Vector-valued Laplace Transforms and Cauchy Problems (Second Edition), (Monographs in Mathematics 96), Birkhuser Basel (2011).
- [2] M. Sh. Birman and S.B. Entina, The stationary approach in abstract scattering theory, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.* 31 (1967), no. 2, 401-430.
- [3] V. G. Deich, The stationary local method in scattering theory for a pair of spaces, *Problemy Math Fiz.* 6.(1973), 76-90.
- [4] R. Kadison and J. Ringrose. Fundamentals of the theory of operator algebras. Vol I. Elementary Theory and Vol. II. Advanced theory. Corrected reprint of the 1986 original. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 15 and 16. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.
- [5] T. Kato. Perturbation of continuous spectra by trace class operators. *Proc. Japan Acad.* 33 (1957), 260–264.
- [6] T. Kato. Wave operators and similarity for some non-selfadjoint operators. *Math. Ann.* 162 (1966), 258–279.
- [7] T. Kato. Smooth operators and commutators. *Studia Mathematica.* T.XXXI. (1968), 535–546.
- [8] T. Kato. Perturbation theory for linear operators. Springer: Classics in mathematics series, 2ed, 1995 edition.
- [9] Q. Li, J. Shen and R. Shi, A generalization of Voiculescu’s theorem for normal operators to semifinite von Neumann algebras. *Adv. Math.* 375 (2020), 107347, 55 pp.
- [10] Q. Li, J. Shen and R. Shi, L. Wang, Perturbations of self-adjoint operators in semifinite von Neumann algebras: Kato-Rosenblum theorem. *J. Funct. Anal.* 275 (2018), no. 2, 259–287.
- [11] F.J. Murray and J. von Neumann, On rings of operators, *Ann. of Math.* 37 (1936), 116-229.
- [12] F.J. Murray and J. von Neumann, On rings of operators, II, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 41 (1937), 208-248.
- [13] F.J. Murray and J. von Neumann, On rings of operators, IV, *Ann. of Math.* 44 (1943), 716-808.
- [14] G. Pisier and Q. Xu. Non-commutative  $L^p$ -spaces, *Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2 (2003), 1459–1517.
- [15] M. Rosenblum. Perturbation of the continuous spectrum and unitary equivalence. *Pacific J. Math.* 7 (1957), 997–1010.
- [16] B. Sz.-Nagy and C. Foias, Harmonic analysis of operators on Hilbert space, North-Holland Amsterdam, 1971.
- [17] J. von Neumann, On rings of operators, III, *Ann. of Math.* 41 (1940), 94-161
- [18] D. R. Yafaev, Mathematical scattering theory. General theory. Translated from the Russian by J. R. Schulenberger. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 105. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1992. x+341 pp. ISBN: 0-8218-4558-6.
- [19] D. R. Yafaev, Mathematical scattering theory. Analytic theory. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 158. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. xiv+444 pp. ISBN: 978-0-8218-0331-8

## 4. Appendix

### 4.1. Relation between $\widetilde{W}_\pm$ and $W_\pm$ .

LEMMA 4.1.1. *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If*

$$\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J), \widetilde{W}_\pm(H, H; J^*J)$$

*exist and the equality*

$$\widetilde{W}_\pm^*(H_1, H; J)\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \widetilde{W}_\pm(H, H; J^*J)$$

*holds, then  $W_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists and*

$$W_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J).$$

PROOF. Suppose  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists. For  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| e^{itH_1} J e^{-itH} P_{ac}^\infty(H) f - \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f \right\|^2 \\ &= \langle P_{ac}^\infty(H) e^{itH} J^* J e^{-itH} P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, f \rangle \\ & \quad - 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle e^{itH_1} J e^{-itH} P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f \rangle + \left\| \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f \right\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

By the fact that  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$ , we conclude that

$$\operatorname{Re} \langle e^{itH_1} J e^{-itH} P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f \rangle \rightarrow \left\| \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f \right\|^2$$

as  $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$ . Therefore by the assumption that  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H, H; J^*J)$  exists and

$$\widetilde{W}_\pm^*(H_1, H; J)\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \widetilde{W}_\pm(H, H; J^*J),$$

we conclude that the right side of the equality (4.1) is zero, therefore

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \left\| e^{itH_1} J e^{-itH} P_{ac}^\infty(H) f - \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f \right\| = 0,$$

it implies that

$$W_\pm(H_1, H; J) f = \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH_1} J e^{-itH} P_{ac}^\infty(H) f = \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f.$$

The proof is completed. □

**4.2. Relation among  $\mathcal{U}_\pm, \widetilde{\mathcal{U}}_\pm, \widetilde{W}_\pm$  and  $W_\pm$ .** The idea of giving the definition of generalized stationary wave operators in  $\mathcal{M}$  is same as the idea given in Section 2.2 of [18]. So we summarize it here briefly.

Suppose that a nonnegative function  $\omega(t)$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , is normalized by the condition

$$\int_0^\infty \omega(t) dt = 1.$$

We introduce the averaging kernel  $\omega_\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon\omega(\varepsilon t)$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ . *Generalized weak abelian wave operator*  $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}_\pm$  is defined by the equality

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = w.o.t\text{-}\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\infty \omega_\varepsilon(t) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) W_J(\pm t) P_{ac}^\infty(H) dt$$

where *w.o.t.* stands for the weak operator topology. So similarly to the argument in [18], we conclude that  $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  if  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists. If we set  $\omega_\varepsilon(t) = 2\varepsilon \exp(-2\varepsilon t)$ , then for a pair of elements  $f$  and  $f_1$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\left\langle \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f, f_1 \right\rangle = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 2\varepsilon \int_0^\infty e^{-2\varepsilon t} \langle W_J(t) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle dt$$

if  $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists.

REMARK 4.2.1. *Let  $\theta(t) = 1$  as  $t \geq 0$  and  $\theta(t) = 0$  for  $t < 0$ . We apply Placherel's Theorem for Fourier transformation on Hilbert space (see Theorem 1.8.1 in [1]) to the functions*

$$\theta e^{-\varepsilon t} J U_H(\pm t) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, \quad \theta e^{-\varepsilon t} J U_{H_1}(\pm t) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1.$$

Considering the expression in (2.2) for the resolvents of  $H$  and  $H_1$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\varepsilon \int_0^\infty e^{-2\varepsilon t} \langle J U_H(\pm t) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, U_{H_1}(\pm t) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle dt \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \langle J R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

From the above argument, we can get the following result.

LEMMA 4.2.2. *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . The existence of  $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  is equivalent to the existence of the following limit*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \langle J R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle d\lambda$$

for any  $f$  and  $f_1$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f, f_1 \right\rangle \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \langle J R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

The generalized stationary wave operator of  $H$  and  $H_1$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  is given below.

LEMMA 4.2.3. (Theorem 1.1.3, [18]) *Suppose for functions  $f_\varepsilon \in L_1(\mathbb{R})$  the integrals*

$$\int_X f_\varepsilon(\lambda) d\lambda$$

tend to zero uniformly with respect to  $\varepsilon$  as  $|X| \rightarrow 0$ . Suppose also the same for  $X = (-\infty, -N) \cup (N, \infty)$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} f_\varepsilon(\lambda) = f(\lambda) \quad a.e. \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R},$$

then  $f \in L_1(\mathbb{R})$  and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_\varepsilon(\lambda) d\lambda = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\lambda) d\lambda.$$

**THEOREM 4.2.4.** *Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle$$

*exists for any pair of  $f$  and  $f_1$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  is well-defined and bounded with  $\|\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)\| \leq \|J\|$ . Meanwhile  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  also exists under this condition and*

$$\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_\pm(H_1, H; J).$$

Furthermore,

$$\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \tilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$$

if  $\tilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists.

**PROOF.** Since  $P_{ac}^\infty(H) \leq P_{ac}(H)$ ,  $P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) \leq P_{ac}(H_1)$  and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle$$

exists for any pair of  $f$  and  $f_1$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  a.e.  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , then by the definition of  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle \mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f, f_1 \rangle| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle d\lambda \right| \\ &\leq \|J\| \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \|R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f\|^2 \right) d\lambda \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \|R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1\|^2 \right) d\lambda \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \|J\| \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d(E_H(\lambda) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, f)}{d\lambda} d\lambda \cdot \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d(E_{H_1}(\lambda) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1, f_1)}{d\lambda} d\lambda \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \|J\| \|P_{ac}^\infty(H) f\| \|P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1\| \leq \|J\| \|f\| \|f_1\| \end{aligned}$$

by Definition 3.2.2, equalities (2.3) and (2.5). Hence  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists and is bounded with

$$\|\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)\| \leq \|J\|.$$

For a fixed positive number  $\varepsilon_0$  and any Borel set  $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , from Fubini's Theorem and equality (2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_Y \langle \delta_H(\lambda, \varepsilon) f, g \rangle d\lambda \right| &= \left| \int_Y \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(s - \lambda - i\varepsilon)(s - \lambda + i\varepsilon)} d\langle E_H(s) f, g \rangle \right) d\lambda \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \left( \int_Y \frac{1}{(s - \lambda)^2 + \varepsilon^2} d\lambda \right) d\langle E_H(s) f, g \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \left( \int_Y \frac{1}{(s - \lambda)^2 + \varepsilon_0^2} d\lambda \right) d\langle E_H(s) f, g \rangle \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

uniformly with respect to  $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_0$  as  $|Y| \rightarrow 0$  or  $Y = (-\infty, -N) \cup (N, +\infty)$  with  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore by equality (2.3)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{\pi} \int_Y \varepsilon \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle d\lambda \right| \\ & \leq \|J\| \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \|R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1\|^2 d\lambda \int_Y \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} \|R_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f\|^2 d\lambda \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \|J\| \|f\| \left( \int_Y \langle \delta_H(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, f \rangle d\lambda \right)^{1/2} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

uniformly with respect to  $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_0$  as  $|Y| \rightarrow 0$  or  $Y = (-\infty, -N) \cup (N, +\infty)$  with  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

For  $P_{ac}^\infty(H) f \in \mathcal{H}_{ac}(H)$ , we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle \delta_H(\lambda, \varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, f \rangle = \frac{d(E_H(\lambda) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, f)}{d\lambda} \in L_1(\mathbb{R})$$

by equality (2.5). Then now from Lemma 4.2.3 and the assumption of the existence of  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varepsilon \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle d\lambda \\ & = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \langle JR_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H) f, R_{H_1}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon) P_{ac}^\infty(H_1) f_1 \rangle d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

It implies that  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_\pm(H, H_1; J)$  exists and

$$\langle \mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f, f_1 \rangle = \langle \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_\pm(H_1, H; J) f, f_1 \rangle$$

for any pair of  $f$  and  $f_1$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Since the equality  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  holds if  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists, we can quickly get

$$\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$$

if  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists.  $\square$

Next result give us the relation among  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$ ,  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  and  $W_\pm(H_1, H; J)$ .

**Theorem 3.2.4** Let  $H, H_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$  be a pair of self-adjoint operators and  $J$  be an operator in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_\pm(H, H; J^*J)$ ,  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  and  $\widetilde{W}_\pm(H, H; J^*J)$  exist and

$$\mathcal{U}_\pm^*(H_1, H; J) \mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \mathcal{U}_\pm(H, H; J^*J),$$

then  $W_\pm(H_1, H; J)$  exists and

$$\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = W_\pm(H_1, H; J).$$

PROOF. By Theorem 4.2.4, if

$$\mathcal{U}_\pm(H, H_1; J), \mathcal{U}_\pm(H, H; J^*J), \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J) \text{ and } \widetilde{W}_\pm(H, H; J^*J)$$

exist, then

$$\mathcal{U}_\pm(H_1, H; J) = \widetilde{W}_\pm(H_1, H; J),$$

$$\mathcal{U}_{\pm}^*(H_1, H; J) = \widetilde{W}_{\pm}^*(H_1, H; J)$$

and

$$\mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H, H; J^*J) = \widetilde{W}_{\pm}(H, H; J^*J).$$

So by Lemmar 4.1.1 and equality

$$\mathcal{U}_{\pm}^*(H_1, H; J)\mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H_1, H; J) = \mathcal{U}_{\pm}(H, H; J^*J),$$

we know  $W_{\pm}(H_1, H; J)$  exists. The proof is completed.  $\square$

*Current address:* School of Mathematics, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai, 200237, P. R. China

*Email address:* qihui\_li@126.com

*Current address:* Shanghai Aerospace Control Technology Institute, Shanghai, 200237, P. R. China

*Email address:* 18121142030@163.com