

Contractions of product density operators of systems of identical fermions and bosons

Wiktor Radzki

*Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Nicolaus Copernicus University, ul. Chopina 12/18, 87-100 Toruń, Poland**

(Dated: September 2, 2008)

Recurrence and explicit formulae for contractions (partial traces) of antisymmetric and symmetric products of identical trace class operators are derived. Contractions of product density operators of systems of identical fermions and bosons are proved to be asymptotically equivalent to, respectively, antisymmetric and symmetric products of density operators of a single particle, multiplied by a normalization integer. The asymptotic equivalence relation is defined in terms of the thermodynamic limit of expectation values of observables in the states represented by given density operators. For some weaker relation of asymptotic equivalence, concerning the thermodynamic limit of expectation values of product observables, antisymmetric and symmetric products of density operators of a single particle are shown to be equivalent to tensor products of density operators of a single particle, multiplied by a normalization integer.

This paper presents the results of a part of the author's thesis [W. Radzki, *Kummer contractions of product density matrices of systems of n fermions and n bosons* (Polish), MS thesis, Institute of Physics, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, 1999].

PACS numbers: 02.30.Tb, 03.65.-w, 05.30.-d, 05.30.Fk, 05.30.Jp, 05.70.-a

Keywords: Density operator (matrix); Partial trace; Contraction of operator; Reduced density operator; Fermion; Boson; Thermodynamic limit

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper, presenting the results of a part of the author's MS thesis [10], deals with contractions (partial traces) of antisymmetric and symmetric product density operators representing mixed states of the systems of identical noninteracting fermions and bosons, respectively.

If \mathcal{H} is a separable Hilbert space of a single fermion (boson) then the space of the n -fermion (resp. n -boson) system is the antisymmetric (resp. symmetric) subspace $\mathcal{H}^{\wedge n} = A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)} \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ (resp. $\mathcal{H}^{\vee n} = S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)} \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$) of $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} = \mathcal{H} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}$, where $A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}$ (resp. $S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}$) is the antisymmetric (resp. symmetric) projector (see Section II A). Density operators (i.e. selfadjoint nonnegative operators with the trace equal to 1) of n -fermion (resp. n -boson) systems are identified with those defined on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ and concentrated on $\mathcal{H}^{\wedge n}$ (resp. $\mathcal{H}^{\vee n}$), i.e. satisfying the condition $K = A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)} K A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}$ (resp. $G = S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)} G S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}$), where K (resp. G) is given density operator on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$.

Recall that the expectation value of an observable represented by a bounded selfadjoint operator B on given Hilbert space in a state described by a density operator ρ equals $\text{Tr } B\rho$. If B is an unbounded selfadjoint operator on a dense subspace of given Hilbert space, instead of B one can consider its spectral measure $E_B(\Delta)$ (which is a bounded operator) of a Borel subset Δ of the spectrum of B . Then $\text{Tr } E_B(\Delta)\rho$ is the probability that the result of the measurement of the observable in question belongs to Δ [9].

k -particle observables of n -fermion and n -boson systems ($k < n$) are represented, respec-

*Electronic address: wiktorradzki@yahoo.com

tively, by operators of the form

$$\hat{\Gamma}_k^n B = A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)} \left(B \otimes I^{\otimes(n-k)} \right) A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}, \quad \check{\Gamma}_k^n B = S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)} \left(B \otimes I^{\otimes(n-k)} \right) S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}, \quad (1)$$

where I is the identity operator on \mathcal{H} and B is a selfadjoint operator on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}$. Operators (1) are called *antisymmetric* and *symmetric expansions of B* , respectively [4]. In view of the earlier remark it is assumed that B is bounded. The expectation values of observables represented by $\hat{\Gamma}_k^n B$ and $\check{\Gamma}_k^n B$ in states represented by n -fermion and n -boson density operators K and G , respectively, can be expressed as

$$\mathrm{Tr} K \hat{\Gamma}_k^n B = \mathrm{Tr} B L_n^k K, \quad \mathrm{Tr} G \check{\Gamma}_k^n B = \mathrm{Tr} B L_n^k G, \quad (2)$$

where k -particle density operators $L_n^k K$ and $L_n^k G$ are (n, k) -contractions of K and G (see Definition II.8), called also *reduced density operators*. Such operators were investigated by Coleman [1], Garrod and Percus [2], and Kummer [4].

In the present paper particular interest is taken in the case when K and G are *product density operators*, i.e. they are of the form

$$K = \frac{1}{\mathrm{Tr} \rho^{\wedge n}} \rho^{\wedge n}, \quad G = \frac{1}{\mathrm{Tr} \rho^{\vee n}} \rho^{\vee n}, \quad (3)$$

where $\rho^{\wedge n} = A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)} \rho^{\otimes n} A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}$, $\rho^{\vee n} = S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)} \rho^{\otimes n} S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}$, and ρ is a density operator of a single fermion or boson, respectively. The first objective of this paper is to find the recurrence and explicit formulae for $L_n^k K$ and $L_n^k G$ for K and G being, respectively, antisymmetric and symmetric products of identical trace class operators, including operators (3). The explicit form of the operators $L_n^k K$ and $L_n^k G$ proves to be quite complex. However, they can be replaced by operators with simpler structure if only the limiting values of expectations (2), in the sense of the thermodynamic limit, are of interest. The second objective of this paper is to find these simpler forms of contractions $L_n^k K$ and $L_n^k G$ for product density operators (3), equivalent to the complete expressions in the thermodynamic limit.

The problems described above have been solved for $k = 1, 2$ by Kossakowski and Maćkowiak [3], and Maćkowiak [6]. The formulae they derived were exploited in calculations of the free energy density of large interacting n -fermion and n -boson systems [3, 6], as well as in the perturbation expansion of the free energy density for the M -impurity Kondo Hamiltonian [8]. In the case of investigation of many-particle interactions of higher order [7, 13, 14, 15] or higher order perturbation expansion terms of the free energy density, the expressions for $(\mathrm{Tr} \rho^{\wedge n})^{-1} L_n^k \rho^{\wedge n}$ and $(\mathrm{Tr} \rho^{\vee n})^{-1} L_n^k \rho^{\vee n}$ with $k \geq 3$ prove to be necessary in the canonical and grand canonical ensemble approach.

The main results of this paper are Theorems III.1, III.4, IV.10, and IV.15.

II. PRELIMINARIES

This section concerns terminology, notation, and basic theorems used in this paper.

A. Basic notation

Let $(\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ be a separable Hilbert space over \mathbb{C} or \mathbb{R} . The following notation is used in the sequel.

I – the identity operator on \mathcal{H} ,

$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ – the Banach algebra of bounded linear operators on \mathcal{H} with the operator norm $\|\cdot\|$,

$\mathcal{HS}(\mathcal{H})$ – the space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators on \mathcal{H} ,

$\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ – the space of trace class operators on \mathcal{H} ,

$\mathcal{B}^*(\mathcal{H})$ – the space of bounded selfadjoint operators on \mathcal{H} ,
 $\mathcal{B}_{\geq 0}^*(\mathcal{H})$ – the set of nonnegative definite bounded selfadjoint operators on \mathcal{H} ,
 $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ – the set of density operators (matrices) on \mathcal{H} , i.e.

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}) = \{D \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}) \mid D = D^*, D \geq 0, \text{Tr } D = 1\}.$$

If $A \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq 0}^*(\mathcal{H})$ then the unique operator $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq 0}^*(\mathcal{H})$ such that $B^2 = A$ is denoted by $A^{\frac{1}{2}}$. If $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ then $A^*A \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq 0}^*(\mathcal{H})$, where A^* is the adjoint of A . Assume $|A| := (A^*A)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The real number $\|A\|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})} := \text{Tr } |A|$ is regarded as a norm for $A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$. The norm in $\mathcal{HS}(\mathcal{H})$ induced by the inner product defined by the formula $\langle A, B \rangle_{\mathcal{HS}(\mathcal{H})} = \text{Tr } A^*B$ is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{HS}(\mathcal{H})}$.

Let S_n be the group of permutations of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Since finite linear combinations of vectors of the type $\psi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_n$ form a dense subset of $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} = \underbrace{\mathcal{H} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}}_n$, there exist the

unique linear operators $A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}, S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ such that for every $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{H}$ one has

$$A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}(\psi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_n) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in S_n} \text{sgn } \pi \psi_{\pi(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_{\pi(n)},$$

$$S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}(\psi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_n) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in S_n} \psi_{\pi(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_{\pi(n)}.$$

The operators $A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}, S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}$ are projectors, i.e. they are idempotent and selfadjoint. The closed linear subspaces $\mathcal{H}^{\wedge n} = A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\vee n} = S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ of $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ are called the *antisymmetric* and *symmetric subspace*, respectively.

For every $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}), C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m})$ the *antisymmetric product* $B \wedge C = A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(k+m)}(B \otimes C)A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(k+m)}$ and the *symmetric product* $B \vee C = S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(k+m)}(B \otimes C)S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(k+m)}$ are operators on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes(k+m)}$ concentrated (in the sense of the orthogonal decomposition) on its antisymmetric and symmetric subspace, respectively.

For every $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}), C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m}), D \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ one has

$$(B \wedge C) \wedge D = B \wedge (C \wedge D) = A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(k+m+n)}(B \otimes C \otimes D)A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(k+m+n)},$$

$$(B \vee C) \vee D = B \vee (C \vee D) = S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(k+m+n)}(B \otimes C \otimes D)S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(k+m+n)},$$

which can be checked by direct calculation over the vectors of the form $\psi_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_{k+m+n}$. Thus one can omit the brackets in antisymmetric and symmetric products of three or more operators. For $n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 2$, the *n*th *antisymmetric* and *symmetric power* of $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is defined as $B^{\wedge n} = \underbrace{B \wedge \dots \wedge B}_n$ and $B^{\vee n} = \underbrace{B \vee \dots \vee B}_n$, respectively. It is also assumed

$B^{\wedge 1} = B^{\vee 1} = B$. Clearly, $B^{\wedge n} = A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}B^{\otimes n} = B^{\otimes n}A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}$ and $B^{\vee n} = S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}B^{\otimes n} = B^{\otimes n}S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}$. Notice that if $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq 0}^*(\mathcal{H})$ then $B^{\wedge n}, B^{\vee n} \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq 0}^*(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$.

The cardinality of a set X is denoted by $\#X$. The symbol $f|_Y$ stands for the restriction of a mapping $f: X \rightarrow Z$ to a subset $Y \subset X$, except the case when f is a measure (see Section II B). It is assumed $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, +\infty)$ and $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+ = \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$.

B. Integral kernels of trace class operators

Detailed proofs of all theorems concerning integral kernels of operators used in this paper have been contained in the author's MS thesis [10]. In this section the main theorems on integral kernels are formulated.

If (Y, μ) is a space with a measure $\mu: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ on a σ -algebra \mathcal{S} of subsets of a nonempty set Y , then for every $X \in \mathcal{S}$ the symbol $\mu|_X$ denotes the restriction of μ to the σ -algebra $\mathcal{S}|_X = \{A \cap X \mid A \in \mathcal{S}\}$. If $\mu_1: \mathcal{S}_1 \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ is another measure then $\mu \otimes \mu_1$ denotes the product of the measures μ and μ_1 . For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it is assumed $\mu^{\otimes n} = \underbrace{\mu \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu}_n$.

Fix the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_Y := L^2(Y, \mu)$ over the field $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ or \mathbb{R} , where the measure μ is separable and σ -finite. As well known, the elements of this space are equivalence classes of μ -a.e. equal square integrable functions. Usually such a class of functions is identified (and denoted by the same symbol) with its arbitrary representative, which can be defined μ -a.e. and identified with its trivial extension on Y . However, it should be noted that some operations in this paper are not admissible in L^2 spaces, since their results depend on the choice of representatives (see formula (6) in Lemma II.3 and Remark II.4).

Recall that if $\mathcal{K} \in L^2(Y \times Y, \mu \otimes \mu)$ then one can define the integral operator $K: L^2(Y, \mu) \rightarrow L^2(Y, \mu)$ by the formula

$$\forall \varphi \in L^2(Y, \mu): \quad (K\varphi)(x) = \int_Y \mathcal{K}(x, y)\varphi(y) d\mu(y). \quad (4)$$

Both \mathcal{K} regarded as an element of $L^2(Y, \mu)$ as well as its arbitrary representative is said to be an *integral kernel of K* . For any choice of representatives of \mathcal{K} and φ the integral on the r.h.s. of formula (4) exists for μ -a.a. $x \in Y$ and represents a μ -a.e. defined μ -measurable and square integrable function of x . The definition of K does not depend on the choice of these representatives. The kernel \mathcal{K} is unique as an element of $L^2(Y, \mu)$. However, a representative of \mathcal{K} of a special form, given in Lemma II.3 and Definition II.5, is useful in computations of the trace of K .

In the sequel use is made of the following theorem, the proof of which can be found in Schatten's book [12].

Theorem II.1. *An operator $K \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(Y, \mu))$ is of Hilbert-Schmidt type iff it is an integral operator with an integral kernel $\mathcal{K} \in L^2(Y \times Y, \mu \otimes \mu)$. Furthermore, $\|K\|_{\mathcal{HS}(L^2(Y, \mu))} = \|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^2(Y \times Y, \mu \otimes \mu)}$.*

Corollary II.2. *Let $K, G \in \mathcal{HS}(L^2(Y, \mu))$ and let $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{G} \in L^2(Y \times Y, \mu \otimes \mu)$ be integral kernels of the operators K, G , respectively. Then $\langle K, G \rangle_{\mathcal{HS}(L^2(Y, \mu))} = \langle \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{G} \rangle_{L^2(Y \times Y, \mu \otimes \mu)}$.*

Recall that $K \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(Y, \mu))$ is a trace class operator iff there exist operators $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{HS}(L^2(Y, \mu))$ such that $K = K_1 K_2$. Moreover, $\text{Tr } K = \langle K_1^*, K_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{HS}(L^2(Y, \mu))}$. This fact, Theorem II.1, and Corollary II.2 have been used by the present author [10] to prove the following lemma, in which elements of $L^2(Y, \mu)$ are distinguished from their representatives. The element of $L^2(Y, \mu)$ represented by a function f is denoted by $[f]$.

Lemma II.3. *Let $K \in \mathcal{T}(L^2(Y, \mu))$, $K = K_1 K_2$, where $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{HS}(L^2(Y, \mu))$. Let $[\mathcal{K}_1], [\mathcal{K}_2] \in L^2(Y, \mu)$ be integral kernels of K_1, K_2 . Then for any choice of representatives $\mathcal{K}_1 \in [\mathcal{K}_1], \mathcal{K}_2 \in [\mathcal{K}_2]$ the integral*

$$\mathcal{K}(x, y) = \int_Y \mathcal{K}_1(x, z)\mathcal{K}_2(z, y) d\mu(z) \quad (5)$$

exists and it is finite for $\mu \otimes \mu$ -a.a. $(x, y) \in Y \times Y$. The function $\mathcal{K}: Y \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ defined by formula (5) for $\mu \otimes \mu$ -a.a. $(x, y) \in Y \times Y$ (and constant at other points) is $\mu \otimes \mu$ -measurable, square integrable, and it is an integral kernel of K . The integral $\mathcal{K}(x, x)$ exists and it is finite for μ -a.a. $x \in Y$. The function $\mathcal{L}: Y \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ defined by the formula $\mathcal{L}(x) = \mathcal{K}(x, x)$ for μ -a.a. $x \in Y$ (and constant at other points) is μ -measurable and integrable. Moreover,

$$\text{Tr } K = \int_Y \mathcal{L}(x) d\mu(x) \equiv \int_Y \mathcal{K}(x, x) d\mu(x). \quad (6)$$

Remark II.4. Lemma II.3 states that the trace of a trace class operator on $L^2(Y, \mu)$ can be expressed as the integral of the function \mathcal{K} given by formula (5) over the diagonal set. The value of the integral on the r.h.s. of formula (6) does not depend on the choice of representatives $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2$ of the kernels $[\mathcal{K}_1], [\mathcal{K}_2] \in L^2(Y, \mu)$. However, there is no further arbitrariness in the choice of the representative of the integral kernel $[\mathcal{K}] \in L^2(Y, \mu)$ of K in formula (6), since the diagonal set $\{(x, y) \in Y \times Y \mid x = y\}$ can be of measure $\mu \otimes \mu$ zero (for example, if μ is the Lebesgue measure on an interval) and replacing the function \mathcal{K} given by formula (5) by other representative of $[\mathcal{K}]$ can change the value of integral (6).

This is the reason to introduce the following definition.

Definition II.5. Under the assumptions of Lemma II.3, the function \mathcal{K} given by formula (5) (for any choice of representatives $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2$ of integral kernels $[\mathcal{K}_1], [\mathcal{K}_2] \in L^2(Y, \mu)$) is called a *product integral kernel* of K .

Notice that for μ being the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ formula (6) is valid, for example, if \mathcal{K} is any continuous function.

In the following lemma [10], proved by using Lemma II.3, the function \mathcal{K}_0 need not be a product integral kernel of K_0 but the integral formula for the trace of K_0 still holds for \mathcal{K}_0 .

Lemma II.6. Let $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $k < n$, and let \mathcal{K} be a product integral kernel of $K \in \mathcal{T}(L^2(Y^n, \mu^{\otimes n}))$. Set $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$, $x'' = (x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n)$, $y' = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$. Then the integral

$$\mathcal{K}_0(x', y') = \int_{Y^{(n-k)}} \mathcal{K}(x', x'', y', x'') d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x'') \quad (7)$$

exists and it is finite for $\mu^{\otimes 2k}$ -a.a. $(x', y') \in Y^k \times Y^k$. The function $\mathcal{K}_0: Y^k \times Y^k \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ defined by formula (7) for $\mu^{\otimes 2k}$ -a.a. $(x', y') \in Y^k \times Y^k$ (and constant at other points) is $\mu^{\otimes 2k}$ -measurable, square integrable, and it is an integral kernel of an operator $K_0 \in \mathcal{T}(L^2(Y^k, \mu^{\otimes k}))$. For every $[\chi], [\varphi] \in L^2(Y^k, \mu^{\otimes k})$ and every orthonormal basis $\{[\psi_i]\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $L^2(Y^{n-k}, \mu^{\otimes(n-k)})$ one has

$$\langle [\chi], K_0[\varphi] \rangle_{L^2(Y^k, \mu^{\otimes k})} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle [\chi] \otimes [\psi_i], K([\varphi] \otimes [\psi_i]) \rangle_{L^2(Y^n, \mu^{\otimes n})}.$$

The integral $\mathcal{K}_0(x', x')$ exists and it is finite for $\mu^{\otimes k}$ -a.a. $x' \in Y^k$. The function $\mathcal{L}_0: Y^k \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ defined by the formula $\mathcal{L}_0(x') = \mathcal{K}_0(x', x')$ for $\mu^{\otimes k}$ -a.a. $x' \in Y^k$ (and constant at other points) is $\mu^{\otimes k}$ -measurable and integrable. Moreover,

$$\int_{Y^k} \mathcal{K}_0(x', x') d\mu^{\otimes k}(x') \equiv \int_{Y^k} \mathcal{L}_0(x') d\mu^{\otimes k}(x') = \text{Tr } K_0 = \text{Tr } K.$$

Corollary II.7. Under the assumptions of Lemma II.6, if $C \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(Y^k, \mu^{\otimes k}))$ then $\text{Tr } CK_0 = \text{Tr}(C \otimes I^{\otimes(n-k)})K$.

C. Contractions of operators

The definition and basic properties of contractions of operators are now recalled for the reader's convenience. A discussion of these properties was carried out by Kummer [4, 5].

Let \mathcal{H} be a separable Hilbert space over the field $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ or \mathbb{R} .

Definition II.8. Let $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $k < n$, and $K \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. Then the (n, k) -contraction of K is the operator $L_n^k K \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k})$ such that

$$\forall C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}): \quad \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}}(C \otimes I^{\otimes(n-k)})K = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}}CL_n^k K. \quad (8)$$

It is also assumed $L_n^n K = K$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes n})$.

Remark II.9. The operator $L_n^k K$ always exists and is defined uniquely by Eq. (8). $L_n^k K$ is a partial trace of K with respect to the component space $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes(n-k)}$ in $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} = \mathcal{H}^{\otimes k} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(n-k)}$. If $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_Y := L^2(Y, \mu)$ is the Hilbert space from Section II B and \mathcal{K} is a product integral kernel of K then $L_n^k K$ has an integral kernel \mathcal{K}_0 given by formula (7), according to Lemma II.6 and Corollary II.7.

Under the assumptions of Definition II.8 one has $\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}} L_n^k K = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}} K$, and if $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $k < p < n$, then $L_p^k (L_n^k K) = L_n^k K$. Moreover, if $K \in \mathcal{B}^*(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ then $L_n^k K \in \mathcal{B}^*(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k})$, and if $K \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq 0}^*(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ then $L_n^k K \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq 0}^*(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k})$.

Contractions of density operators are called *reduced density operators*. Contractions preserve the Fermi and Bose-Einstein statistics of the contracted density operator, i.e. for $K \in A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)} \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}) A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}$ and $G \in S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)} \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}) S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}$ one has $L_n^k K \in A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(k)} \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}) A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(k)}$ and $L_n^k G \in S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(k)} \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}) S_{\mathcal{H}}^{(k)}$, respectively. For such K and G Eqs. (2) hold.

The following theorem is a part of Coleman's theorem [1, 4].

Theorem II.10. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 2$. For every (n -fermion) density operator $D \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$, $D = A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)} D A_{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}$, one has $\|L_n^1 D\| \leq \frac{1}{n} \|D\|$.*

III. RECURRENCE AND EXPLICIT FORMULAE FOR CONTRACTIONS OF PRODUCTS OF TRACE CLASS OPERATORS

In this section recurrence formulae and next explicit formulae are derived for antisymmetric and symmetric powers of single particle operators.

In the whole section use is made of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_Y := L^2(Y, \mu)$ over the field $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ or \mathbb{R} , where the measure μ is separable and σ -finite.

The following theorem in the case of $k = 1, 2$ was proved by Kossakowski and Maćkowiak [3], and Maćkowiak [6].

Theorem III.1 (Recurrence formulae). *Let $B \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y)$. If $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 < k < n$, then*

$$\binom{n}{k} L_n^k B^{\wedge n} = \binom{n-1}{k-1} \left(L_{n-1}^{k-1} B^{\wedge(n-1)} \right) \wedge B - \binom{n-1}{k} \left(L_{n-1}^k B^{\wedge(n-1)} \right) \left(I^{\otimes(k-1)} \otimes B \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(k)}, \quad (9)$$

$$\binom{n}{k} L_n^k B^{\vee n} = \binom{n-1}{k-1} \left(L_{n-1}^{k-1} B^{\vee(n-1)} \right) \vee B + \binom{n-1}{k} \left(L_{n-1}^k B^{\vee(n-1)} \right) \left(I^{\otimes(k-1)} \otimes B \right) S_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(k)}, \quad (10)$$

and if $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 2$, then

$$n L_n^1 B^{\wedge n} = \left(\text{Tr} B^{\wedge(n-1)} \right) B - (n-1) \left(L_{n-1}^1 B^{\wedge(n-1)} \right) B, \quad (11)$$

$$n L_n^1 B^{\vee n} = \left(\text{Tr} B^{\vee(n-1)} \right) B + (n-1) \left(L_{n-1}^1 B^{\vee(n-1)} \right) B. \quad (12)$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{B}: Y \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be a product integral kernel of B . For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ define the mapping $\mathcal{B}^{\wedge m}: Y^m \times Y^m \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ by the formula

$$\mathcal{B}^{\wedge m} \left(\begin{matrix} x_1, \dots, x_m \\ y_1, \dots, y_m \end{matrix} \right) = \det \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}(x_1, y_1) & \cdots & \mathcal{B}(x_1, y_m) \\ \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{B}(x_m, y_1) & \cdots & \mathcal{B}(x_m, y_m) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then the mapping $\mathcal{K}: Y^n \times Y^n \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n) &= \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\tau \in S_n} \text{sgn } \tau \mathcal{B}(x_{\tau(1)}, y_1) \cdots \mathcal{B}(x_{\tau(n)}, y_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{n!} \mathcal{B}^{\wedge n} \left(\begin{matrix} x_1, \dots, x_n \\ y_1, \dots, y_n \end{matrix} \right) \end{aligned}$$

is a product integral kernel of $B^{\wedge n} = A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(n)} B^{\otimes n}$.

Eq. (9) will be first proved for $n > k + 1$. In view of Remark II.9, an integral kernel $\mathcal{L}: Y^k \times Y^k \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ of $\binom{n}{k} L_n^k B^{\wedge n}$ can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k) \\ = \binom{n}{k} \int_{Y^{n-k}} \mathcal{K}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) \end{aligned}$$

for $\mu^{\otimes 2k}$ -a.a. $(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k) \in Y^{2k}$. Performing $k!$ permutations of the first k rows and $k!$ permutation of the first k columns of the determinant defining \mathcal{K} one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) \\ = \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\pi, \sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \pi \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \mathcal{K}(x_{\pi(1)}, \dots, x_{\pi(k)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n, y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n). \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the determinant in question with respect to the k th column gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k) \\ = \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\pi, \sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \pi \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k+j} \int_{Y^{n-k}} \mathcal{B}(x_{\pi(j)}, y_{\sigma(k)}) \\ \cdot \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_{\pi(1)}, \dots, x_{\pi(j-1)}, x_{\pi(j+1)}, \dots, x_{\pi(k)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) \\ d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) \\ + \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\pi, \sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \pi \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \sum_{j=k+1}^n (-1)^{k+j} \int_{Y^{n-k}} \mathcal{B}(x_j, y_{\sigma(k)}) \\ \cdot \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_{\pi(1)}, \dots, x_{\pi(k)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) \\ d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Consider the first term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (13). In all summands of $\sum_{j=1}^k$ except the last one the $(k-1)$ th row of the determinant (containing the variable $x_{\pi(k)}$) can be shifted into the j th position, changing thereby the sign of the determinant by $(-1)^{(k-2)-(j-1)} = (-1)^{-k-j+1}$. Then the first term of sum (13) assumes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\pi, \sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \pi \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (-1)^{k+j} (-1)^{-k-j+1} \int_{Y^{n-k}} \mathcal{B}(x_{\pi(j)}, y_{\sigma(k)}) \\ \cdot \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_{\pi(1)}, \dots, x_{\pi(j-1)}, x_{\pi(k)}, x_{\pi(j+1)}, \dots, x_{\pi(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) \\ d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) \\ + \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\pi, \sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \pi \operatorname{sgn} \sigma (-1)^{k+k} \int_{Y^{n-k}} \mathcal{B}(x_{\pi(k)}, y_{\sigma(k)}) \\ \cdot \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_{\pi(1)}, \dots, x_{\pi(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Let $T_{jk} \in S_k$ denote the transposition $j \leftrightarrow k$ for $j < k$ (then $(-1)^{k+j} (-1)^{-k-j+1} = (-1) = \operatorname{sgn} T_{jk}$) and the identity permutation for $j = k$ (with $\operatorname{sgn} T_{kk} = 1$). Expression (14) can be

then written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\pi, \sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \pi \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \operatorname{sgn} T_{jk} \int_{Y^{n-k}} \mathcal{B}(x_{(\pi \circ T_{jk})(k)}, y_{\sigma(k)}) \\
& \quad \cdot \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_{(\pi \circ T_{jk})(1)}, \dots, x_{(\pi \circ T_{jk})(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) \\
& + \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\pi, \sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \pi \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \operatorname{sgn} T_{kk} \int_{Y^{n-k}} \mathcal{B}(x_{(\pi \circ T_{kk})(k)}, y_{\sigma(k)}) \\
& \quad \cdot \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_{(\pi \circ T_{kk})(1)}, \dots, x_{(\pi \circ T_{kk})(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) \\
& = \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\pi, \sigma \in S_k} (\operatorname{sgn} \pi \operatorname{sgn} T_{jk}) \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \int_{Y^{n-k}} \mathcal{B}(x_{(\pi \circ T_{jk})(k)}, y_{\sigma(k)}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \cdot \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_{(\pi \circ T_{jk})(1)}, \dots, x_{(\pi \circ T_{jk})(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) \right) \\
& = \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\tau, \sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \tau \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \int_{Y^{n-k}} \mathcal{B}(x_{\tau(k)}, y_{\sigma(k)}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \cdot \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_{\tau(1)}, \dots, x_{\tau(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) \right) \\
& = k \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\tau, \sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \tau \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \int_{Y^{n-k}} \mathcal{B}(x_{\tau(k)}, y_{\sigma(k)}) \\
& \quad \cdot \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_{\tau(1)}, \dots, x_{\tau(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) \\
& = \binom{n-1}{k-1} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\tau, \sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \tau \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \mathcal{B}(x_{\tau(k)}, y_{\sigma(k)}) \int_{Y^{n-k}} \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \\
& \quad \cdot \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_{\tau(1)}, \dots, x_{\tau(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n), \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

if use is made of the identity $k \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{n!} = \binom{n-1}{k-1} \frac{1}{(n-1)!}$. The function $\mathcal{G}_1: Y^{k-1} \times Y^{k-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, given for fixed $\tau, \sigma \in S_k$ and $\mu^{\otimes 2(k-1)}$ -a.a. $(x_{\tau(1)}, \dots, x_{\tau(k-1)}, y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}) \in Y^{k-1} \times Y^{k-1}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{G}_1(x_{\tau(1)}, \dots, x_{\tau(k-1)}, y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}) \\
& = \int_{Y^{n-k}} \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_{\tau(1)}, \dots, x_{\tau(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n),
\end{aligned}$$

is an integral kernel of $L_{n-1}^{k-1} B^{\wedge(n-1)}$. Furthermore, the function $\mathcal{M}_1: Y^k \times Y^k \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, defined for fixed $\tau, \sigma \in S_k$ and $\mu^{\otimes 2k}$ -a.a. $(x_{\tau(1)}, \dots, x_{\tau(k)}, y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k)}) \in Y^k \times Y^k$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{M}_1(x_{\tau(1)}, \dots, x_{\tau(k)}, y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k)}) \\
& = \mathcal{G}_1(x_{\tau(1)}, \dots, x_{\tau(k-1)}, y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}) \mathcal{B}(x_{\tau(k)}, y_{\sigma(k)}),
\end{aligned}$$

is an integral kernel of $(\mathbf{L}_{n-1}^{k-1} B^{\wedge(n-1)}) \otimes B$. Consequently, the function $\mathcal{P}_1: Y^k \times Y^k \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, defined for $\mu^{\otimes 2k}$ -a.a. $(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k) \in Y^k \times Y^k$ by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_1(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k) &= \binom{n-1}{k-1} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\tau, \sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \tau \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \mathcal{M}_1(x_{\tau(1)}, \dots, x_{\tau(k)}, y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k)}), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

the r.h.s. of which equals expression (15), is an integral kernel of the operator

$$\binom{n-1}{k-1} \left(\mathbf{L}_{n-1}^{k-1} B^{\wedge(n-1)} \right) \wedge B,$$

which appears on the r.h.s. of Eq. (9).

Consider now the second term of the sum on the r.h.s. of Eq. (13). One can change the indices of the integral variables x_{k+1}, \dots, x_j in all summands of $\sum_{j=k+1}^n$ except the first one, according to the rule $x_j \rightarrow x_{k+1} \rightarrow x_{k+2} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_j$ for the j th summand, and simultaneously change the order of the columns of the determinant inversely (which changes the sign by $(-1)^{(j-1)-k} = (-1)^{(k+1)-j}$). The resulting sum $\sum_{j=k+1}^n$ then contains $n-k$ terms identical to the one with $j = k+1$. Since $(-1)^{k+(k+1)} = -1$, the second term of sum (13) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & - (n-k) \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \sum_{\pi, \sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \pi \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \int_{Y^{n-k}} \mathcal{B}(x_{k+1}, y_{\sigma(k)}) \\ & \cdot \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_{\pi(1)}, \dots, x_{\pi(k)}, x_{k+2}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) d\mu^{\otimes(n-k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Using the identity $\frac{n-k}{n!} \binom{n}{k} = \binom{n-1}{k} \frac{1}{(n-1)!}$ and performing the summation over $\pi \in S_k$ (there are $k!$ identical terms) one arrives at the following form of expression (17):

$$\begin{aligned} & - \binom{n-1}{k} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \int_Y \mathcal{B}(x_{k+1}, y_{\sigma(k)}) \left(\int_{Y^{n-1-k}} \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \right. \\ & \left. \cdot \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+2}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) d\mu^{\otimes(n-1-k)}(x_{k+2}, \dots, x_n) \right) d\mu(x_{k+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Observe that the function $\mathcal{G}_2: Y^k \times Y^k \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, defined for fixed $\sigma \in S_k$ and $\mu^{\otimes 2k}$ -a.a. $(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}) \in Y^k \times Y^k$ by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_2(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}) &= \int_{Y^{n-1-k}} \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \mathcal{B}^{\wedge(n-1)} \left(\begin{array}{c} x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+2}, \dots, x_n \\ y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n \end{array} \right) \\ & d\mu^{\otimes(n-1-k)}(x_{k+2}, \dots, x_n), \end{aligned}$$

is an integral kernel of $\mathbf{L}_{n-1}^k B^{\wedge(n-1)}$. Furthermore, the function $\mathcal{M}_2: Y^k \times Y^k \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, given for fixed $\sigma \in S_k$ and $\mu^{\otimes 2k}$ -a.a. $(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k)}) \in Y^k \times Y^k$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_2(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k)}) &= \int_Y \mathcal{G}_2(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k-1)}, x_{k+1}) \mathcal{B}(x_{k+1}, y_{\sigma(k)}) d\mu(x_{k+1}), \end{aligned}$$

is an integral kernel of $(\mathbf{L}_{n-1}^k B^{\wedge(n-1)}) (I^{\otimes(k-1)} \otimes B)$. Thus the function $\mathcal{P}_2: Y^k \times Y^k \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, defined for $\mu^{\otimes 2k}$ -a.a. $(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k) \in Y^k \times Y^k$ by

$$\mathcal{P}_2(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k) = - \binom{n-1}{k} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \operatorname{sgn} \sigma \mathcal{M}_2(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k)}), \quad (19)$$

the r.h.s. of which equals expression (18), is an integral kernel of the operator

$$-\binom{n-1}{k} \left(L_{n-1}^k B^{\wedge(n-1)} \right) \left(I^{\otimes(k-1)} \otimes B \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(k)},$$

which occurs on the r.h.s. of Eq. (9). One concludes that the kernel \mathcal{L} of the operator on the l.h.s. of Eq. (9) is $\mu^{\otimes 2k}$ -a.e. equal to the kernel $\mathcal{P}_1 + \mathcal{P}_2$ given by formulae (16) and (19), which, in turn, is an integral kernel of the operator on the r.h.s. of Eq. (9). The operators on both sides of Eq. (9) are therefore equal.

The proof of Eq. (9) for $n = k + 1$ and the proof of Eq. (11) proceeds analogously.

Similarly, the proof of Eqs. (10), (12) is accomplished by changing the product \wedge into \vee and replacing determinants in all formulae by pernaments, defined for every complex matrix $A = [a_{i,j}]_{i,j=1}^m$ as

$$\text{per} A = \sum_{\pi \in S_m} a_{\pi(1),1} \cdots a_{\pi(m),m}.$$

Notice that signs of permutations are omitted in this case, similarly as the multipliers ± 1 in the Laplace expansions. \square

Lemma III.2. *Let $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 < k < m$, $B \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y)$, $j_k \in \{k, \dots, m\}$, and*

$$R = \sum_{j_{k-1}=k-1}^{j_k-1} \sum_{j_{k-2}=k-2}^{j_{k-1}-1} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} B^{j_1} \otimes B^{j_2-j_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes B^{j_k-j_{k-1}}$$

(for $k = 2$ the only summation index is $j_{k-1} = j_1$). Then $A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(k)} R = R A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(k)}$ and $S_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(k)} R = R S_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(k)}$.

Proof. The proof consists in demonstrating invariance of R under permutation of factors in the tensor products. To this end it suffices to prove invariance of R under transpositions of neighbouring factors.

Let $k \geq 3$. Consider the transposition of the p th factor with the $(p+1)$ th one, where $p \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$. Let the values j_1, \dots, j_{k-1} of the summation indices be fixed. Set $a := j_p - j_{p-1}$, $b := j_{p+1} - j_p$. Clearly, $a, b \geq 1$, since $j_{p-1} < j_p < j_{p+1}$. If $a = b$ then the transposition in question does not affect the expression $B^{j_1} \otimes B^{j_2-j_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes B^{j_k-j_{k-1}}$, whereas if $a \neq b$ then the value j_p of the p th summation index can be related to the unique value $j'_p \neq j_p$ of that index such that $b = j'_p - j_{p-1}$, $a = j_{p+1} - j'_p$. Then the expression

$$B^{j_1} \otimes B^{j_2-j_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes B^{j_k-j_{k-1}} + B^{j_1} \otimes B^{j_2-j_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes B^{j'_p-j_{p-1}} \otimes B^{j_{p+1}-j'_p} \otimes \cdots \otimes B^{j_k-j_{k-1}}$$

is invariant under the transposition in question. For $p = 1$, including the case of $k = 2$, the above reasoning can be repeated by setting $j_{p-1} = 0$. \square

Lemma III.3. *Let $B \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y)$, $\xi_s^\wedge := \text{Tr} B^{\wedge s}$, $\xi_s^\vee := \text{Tr} B^{\vee s}$ for $s \in \mathbb{N}$, $\xi_0^\wedge := 1$, $\xi_0^\vee := 1$, and*

$$\hat{\Pi}_m^p B^{\wedge m} := \sum_{j_p=p}^m \sum_{j_{p-1}=p-1}^{j_p-1} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{m-j_p}^\wedge (-1)^{p+j_p} B^{j_1} \wedge B^{j_2-j_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge B^{j_p-j_{p-1}},$$

$$\check{\Pi}_m^p B^{\vee m} := \sum_{j_p=p}^m \sum_{j_{p-1}=p-1}^{j_p-1} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{m-j_p}^\vee B^{j_1} \vee B^{j_2-j_1} \vee \cdots \vee B^{j_p-j_{p-1}}$$

for $p, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $p < m$. (For $p = 1$ the only summation index is j_1 and the summation runs over the operators B^{j_1} .) If $p \geq 2$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{\Pi}_m^p B^{\wedge m} \\
&= \left(\sum_{j_{p-1}=p-1}^{m-1} \sum_{j_{p-2}=p-2}^{j_{p-1}-1} \dots \right. \\
&\quad \left. \dots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{(m-1)-j_{p-1}}^{\wedge} (-1)^{(p-1)+j_{p-1}} B^{j_1} \wedge B^{j_2-j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{j_{p-1}-j_{p-2}} \right) \wedge B \\
&\quad - \left(\sum_{j_p=p}^{m-1} \sum_{j_{p-1}=p-1}^{j_p-1} \dots \right. \\
&\quad \left. \dots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{(m-1)-j_p}^{\wedge} (-1)^{p+j_p} B^{j_1} \wedge B^{j_2-j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{j_p-j_{p-1}} \right) (I^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes B) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(p)} \\
& \tag{20}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \check{\Pi}_m^p B^{\vee m} \\
&= \left(\sum_{j_{p-1}=p-1}^{m-1} \sum_{j_{p-2}=p-2}^{j_{p-1}-1} \dots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{(m-1)-j_{p-1}}^{\vee} B^{j_1} \vee B^{j_2-j_1} \vee \dots \vee B^{j_{p-1}-j_{p-2}} \right) \vee B \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{j_p=p}^{m-1} \sum_{j_{p-1}=p-1}^{j_p-1} \dots \right. \\
&\quad \left. \dots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{(m-1)-j_p}^{\vee} B^{j_1} \vee B^{j_2-j_1} \vee \dots \vee B^{j_p-j_{p-1}} \right) (I^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes B) S_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(p)}. \tag{21}
\end{aligned}$$

(For $p = 2$ the only summation index in the first terms on the r.h.s. of Eqs. (20), (21) is $j_{p-1} = j_1$, and the summation runs over the operators B^{j_1} .)

Proof. Eq. (20) will be first proved for $p > 2$. One has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{\Pi}_m^p B^{\wedge m} \\
&= \xi_{m-p}^{\wedge} B \wedge \dots \wedge B \\
&\quad + \sum_{j_p=p+1}^m \sum_{j_{p-1}=p-1}^{j_p-1} \sum_{j_{p-2}=p-2}^{j_{p-1}-1} \dots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{m-j_p}^{\wedge} (-1)^{p+j_p} B^{j_1} \wedge B^{j_2-j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{j_p-j_{p-1}} \\
&= \xi_{m-p}^{\wedge} B \wedge \dots \wedge B \\
&\quad + \sum_{l_p=p}^{m-1} \sum_{l_{p-1}=p-1}^{l_p} \sum_{l_{p-2}=p-2}^{l_{p-1}-1} \dots \\
&\quad \dots \sum_{l_1=1}^{l_2-1} \xi_{m-l_p-1}^{\wedge} (-1)^{p+l_p+1} B^{l_1} \wedge B^{l_2-l_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{l_{p-1}-l_{p-2}} \wedge B^{l_p-l_{p-1}+1}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \xi_{m-p}^\wedge B \wedge \dots \wedge B \\
&+ \sum_{l_p=p}^{m-1} \sum_{l_{p-1}=p-1}^{l_p-1} \sum_{l_{p-2}=p-2}^{l_{p-1}-1} \dots \\
&\quad \dots \sum_{l_1=1}^{l_2-1} \xi_{m-l_p-1}^\wedge (-1)^{p+l_p+1} B^{l_1} \wedge B^{l_2-l_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{l_{p-1}-l_{p-2}} \wedge B^{l_p-l_{p-1}+1} \\
&+ \sum_{l_p=p}^{m-1} \sum_{l_{p-2}=p-2}^{l_p-1} \sum_{l_{p-3}=p-3}^{l_{p-2}-1} \dots \\
&\quad \dots \sum_{l_1=1}^{l_2-1} \xi_{m-l_p-1}^\wedge (-1)^{p+l_p+1} B^{l_1} \wedge B^{l_2-l_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{l_{p-2}-l_{p-3}} \wedge B^{l_p-l_{p-2}} \wedge B. \quad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

The first and the third term after the last equality in Eq. (22) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{l_p=p-1}^{m-1} \sum_{l_{p-2}=p-2}^{l_p-1} \sum_{l_{p-3}=p-3}^{l_{p-2}-1} \dots \\
&\quad \dots \sum_{l_1=1}^{l_2-1} \xi_{m-l_p-1}^\wedge (-1)^{p+l_p+1} B^{l_1} \wedge B^{l_2-l_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{l_{p-2}-l_{p-3}} \wedge B^{l_p-l_{p-2}} \wedge B \\
&= \left(\sum_{j_{p-1}=p-1}^{m-1} \sum_{j_{p-2}=p-2}^{j_{p-1}-1} \dots \right. \\
&\quad \left. \dots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{(m-1)-j_{p-1}}^\wedge (-1)^{(p-1)+j_{p-1}} B^{j_1} \wedge B^{j_2-j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{j_{p-1}-j_{p-2}} \right) \wedge B \quad (23)
\end{aligned}$$

for $l_p = j_{p-1}$, $l_{p-2} = j_{p-2}$, \dots , $l_1 = j_1$. The second term after the last equality in Eq. (22) equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&- \left(\sum_{l_p=p}^{m-1} \sum_{l_{p-1}=p-1}^{l_p-1} \sum_{l_{p-2}=p-2}^{l_{p-1}-1} \dots \right. \\
&\quad \left. \dots \sum_{l_1=1}^{l_2-1} \xi_{m-l_p-1}^\wedge (-1)^{p+l_p} A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(p)} (B^{l_1} \otimes B^{l_2-l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes B^{l_p-l_{p-1}}) \right) (I^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes B) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(p)} \\
&= - \left(\sum_{j_p=p}^{m-1} \sum_{j_{p-1}=p-1}^{j_p-1} \dots \right. \\
&\quad \left. \dots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{(m-1)-j_p}^\wedge (-1)^{p+j_p} B^{j_1} \wedge B^{j_2-j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{j_p-j_{p-1}} \right) (I^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes B) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(p)}, \quad (24)
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma III.2, after replacing the indices l by j .

By adding expressions (23) and (24) one obtains Eq. (20) for $p > 2$. After obvious simplifications the proof also applies to the case of $p = 2$.

The proof of Eq. (21) is analogous to that of Eq. (20). \square

The next theorem provides the explicit form of (n, k) -contractions of product operators. The proof for $k = 1, 2$ was given in the papers of Kossakowski and Maćkowiak [3], and Maćkowiak [6]. The latter author [6] emphasized that formula (25) for $k = 2$ was derived by S. Pruski in 1978.

Theorem III.4 (Explicit formulae). *Let $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $k < n$, $B \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y)$, $\xi_s^\wedge := \text{Tr } B^{\wedge s}$, $\xi_s^\vee := \text{Tr } B^{\vee s}$ for $s \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\xi_0^\wedge := 1$, $\xi_0^\vee := 1$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \binom{n}{k} L_n^k B^{\wedge n} \\
&= \sum_{j_k=k}^n \sum_{j_{k-1}=k-1}^{j_k-1} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{n-j_k}^\wedge (-1)^{k+j_k} B^{j_1} \wedge B^{j_2-j_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge B^{j_k-j_{k-1}} \\
&= \sum_{i_1=1}^{n-(k-1)} \sum_{i_2=1}^{n-i_1-(k-2)} \cdots \\
&\quad \cdots \sum_{i_{k-1}=1}^{n-i_1-\cdots-i_{k-2}-1} \sum_{i_k=1}^{n-i_1-\cdots-i_{k-1}} \xi_{n-i_1-\cdots-i_k}^\wedge (-1)^{k+i_1+\cdots+i_k} B^{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge B^{i_k} \quad (25)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \binom{n}{k} L_n^k B^{\vee n} \\
&= \sum_{j_k=k}^n \sum_{j_{k-1}=k-1}^{j_k-1} \cdots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{n-j_k}^\vee B^{j_1} \vee B^{j_2-j_1} \vee \cdots \vee B^{j_k-j_{k-1}} \\
&= \sum_{i_1=1}^{n-(k-1)} \sum_{i_2=1}^{n-i_1-(k-2)} \cdots \sum_{i_{k-1}=1}^{n-i_1-\cdots-i_{k-2}-1} \sum_{i_k=1}^{n-i_1-\cdots-i_{k-1}} \xi_{n-i_1-\cdots-i_k}^\vee B^{i_1} \vee \cdots \vee B^{i_k}. \quad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

(For $k = 1$ the only summation indices are j_1 and i_1 and the summation runs over the operators B^{j_1} and B^{i_1} , respectively.)

Proof. For every $p, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $p < m$, let $\hat{\Pi}_m^p B^{\wedge m}$ be defined as in Lemma III.3. Then the first equality in Eq. (25) can be written as

$$\binom{n}{k} L_n^k B^{\wedge n} = \hat{\Pi}_n^k B^{\wedge n}. \quad (27)$$

The proof of Eq. (27) will be carried out by (double) induction with respect to k and, for fixed k , with respect to $n > k$.

1°. ($k = 1$) This part of the proof will be performed by induction with respect to $n > 1$.

a) ($n = 2$) According to Eq. (11) in Theorem III.1, $2L_2^1 B^{\wedge 2} = (\text{Tr } B) B - B^2$. On the other hand, $\hat{\Pi}_2^1 B^{\wedge 2} = \sum_{j_1=1}^2 \xi_{2-j_1}^\wedge (-1)^{1+j_1} B^{j_1} = (\text{Tr } B) B - B^2$, hence $2L_2^1 B^{\wedge 2} = \hat{\Pi}_2^1 B^{\wedge 2}$.

b) Assuming validity of formula (27) (with $k = 1$) for $n \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$, where $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m > 2$, its validity will be shown for $n = m$.

One has

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Pi}_m^1 B^{\wedge m} &= \sum_{j_1=1}^m \xi_{m-j_1}^\wedge (-1)^{1+j_1} B^{j_1} = \xi_{m-1}^\wedge B + \sum_{j_1=2}^m \xi_{m-j_1}^\wedge (-1)^{1+j_1} B^{j_1} \\
&= \xi_{m-1}^\wedge B - \left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{m-1} \xi_{m-1-j_1}^\wedge (-1)^{1+j_1} B^{j_1} \right) B.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, according to the induction assumption for $n \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$,

$$\hat{\Pi}_m^1 B^{\wedge m} = \xi_{m-1}^{\wedge} B - (m-1) \left(L_{m-1}^1 B^{\wedge(m-1)} \right) B,$$

which, in view of Eq. (11) from Theorem III.1, yields the equality $\binom{m}{1} L_m^1 B^{\wedge m} = \hat{\Pi}_m^1 B^{\wedge m}$.
2°. Assuming validity of formula (27) for $k \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$ (and every $n > k$), where $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $p > 1$, its validity will be shown for $k = p$. For arbitrarily fixed p the proof will be carried out by induction with respect to $n > p$.

a) ($n = p+1$) By the induction assumption with respect to k and Lemma III.3 one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Pi}_{p+1}^p B^{\wedge(p+1)} &= \binom{(p+1)-1}{p-1} \left(L_{(p+1)-1}^{p-1} B^{\wedge((p+1)-1)} \right) \wedge B \\ &\quad - \left(\sum_{j_p=p}^{(p+1)-1} \sum_{j_{p-1}=p-1}^{j_p-1} \dots \right. \\ &\quad \left. \dots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{((p+1)-1)-j_p}^{\wedge} (-1)^{p+j_p} B^{j_1} \wedge B^{j_2-j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{j_p-j_{p-1}} \right) (I^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes B) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(p)} \\ &= \binom{(p+1)-1}{p-1} \left(L_{(p+1)-1}^{p-1} B^{\wedge((p+1)-1)} \right) \wedge B - B^{\wedge p} (I^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes B) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(p)} \\ &= \binom{(p+1)-1}{p-1} \left(L_{(p+1)-1}^{p-1} B^{\wedge((p+1)-1)} \right) \wedge B \\ &\quad - \binom{(p+1)-1}{p} \left(L_{(p+1)-1}^p B^{\wedge((p+1)-1)} \right) (I^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes B) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(p)}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

By Theorem III.1, Eq. (28) gives $\binom{p+1}{p} L_{p+1}^p B^{\wedge(p+1)} = \hat{\Pi}_{p+1}^p B^{\wedge(p+1)}$.

b) Assuming validity of formula (27) for $n \in \{p+1, \dots, m-1\}$, where $k = p$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m > p+1$, its validity will be shown for $n = m$.

In view of the induction assumption for $k \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$ and Lemma III.3 one has

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Pi}_m^p B^{\wedge m} &= \binom{m-1}{p-1} \left(L_{m-1}^{p-1} B^{\wedge(m-1)} \right) \wedge B \\ &\quad - \left(\sum_{j_p=p}^{m-1} \sum_{j_{p-1}=p-1}^{j_p-1} \sum_{j_{p-2}=p-2}^{j_{p-1}-1} \dots \right. \\ &\quad \left. \dots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{(m-1)-j_p}^{\wedge} (-1)^{p+j_p} B^{j_1} \wedge B^{j_2-j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{j_p-j_{p-1}} \right) (I^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes B) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(p)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, making use of the induction assumption for $n \in \{p+1, \dots, m-1\}$, one obtains

$$\hat{\Pi}_m^p B^{\wedge m} = \binom{m-1}{p-1} \left(L_{m-1}^{p-1} B^{\wedge(m-1)} \right) \wedge B - \binom{m-1}{p} \left(L_{m-1}^p B^{\wedge(m-1)} \right) (I^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes B) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(p)},$$

which, according to Eq. (9) from Theorem III.1, yields the equality $\binom{m}{p} L_m^p B^{\wedge m} = \hat{\Pi}_m^p B^{\wedge m}$. This completes the induction proof for Eq. (27) with respect to $n > p$ and simultaneously with respect to k .

Now the second equality in Eq. (25) will be proved. For $k = 1$ it is identity. Let $k \geq 2$. Setting $j_1 = i_1$, $j_2 = i_1 + i_2$, \dots , $j_k = i_1 + \dots + i_k$ or, equivalently, $i_1 = j_1$, $i_2 = j_2 - j_1$,

$i_3 = j_3 - j_2, \dots, i_k = j_k - j_{k-1}$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i_1=1}^{n-(k-1)} \sum_{i_2=1}^{n-i_1-(k-2)} \dots \\
& \dots \sum_{i_{k-1}=1}^{n-i_1-\dots-i_{k-2}-1} \sum_{i_k=1}^{n-i_1-\dots-i_{k-1}} \xi_{n-i_1-\dots-i_k}^\wedge (-1)^{k+i_1+\dots+i_k} B^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{i_k} \\
& = \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-(k-1)} \sum_{j_2=j_1+1}^{n-(k-2)} \dots \\
& \dots \sum_{j_{k-1}=j_{k-2}+1}^{n-1} \sum_{j_k=j_{k-1}+1}^n \xi_{n-j_k}^\wedge (-1)^{k+j_k} B^{j_1} \wedge B^{j_2-j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{j_k-j_{k-1}} \\
& = \sum_{j_k=k}^n \sum_{j_{k-1}=k-1}^{j_k-1} \dots \sum_{j_1=1}^{j_2-1} \xi_{n-j_k}^\wedge (-1)^{k+j_k} B^{j_1} \wedge B^{j_2-j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge B^{j_k-j_{k-1}},
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the second equality in formula (25) for $k \geq 2$.

The proof of Eq. (26) is analogous to that of Eq. (25). \square

IV. ASYMPTOTIC FORM FOR CONTRACTIONS OF PRODUCT STATES

The explicit forms of the contractions of product states given by Theorem III.4 are quite complex. In the present section they are replaced by simpler operators, equivalent in the thermodynamic limit. The main results in this section are Theorems IV.10 and IV.15.

In what follows use is made of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\Omega := L^2(\Omega, \mu)$ (over \mathbb{C} or \mathbb{R}), where the measure μ is separable, σ -finite, and satisfies the condition $\mu(\Omega) = +\infty$. For every μ -measurable subset $Y \subset \Omega$ such that $\mu(Y) > 0$ it is assumed $\mathcal{H}_Y := L^2(Y, \mu|_Y) \equiv L^2(Y, \mu)$.

Let $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ denote a fixed family of measurable subsets of Ω such that $0 < \mu(Y) < +\infty$ for every $Y \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ (it can be the family of all such subsets). Fix $d > 0$ and assume that there exists a sequence $\{Y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ such that $\frac{n}{\mu(Y_n)} \rightarrow d$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition IV.1. Let $\{b_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ be a family of complex numbers. A complex number b is said to be the *thermodynamic limit* of this family if for every sequence $\{Y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{\mu(Y_n)} = d$ the condition $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{Y_n,n} = b$ is fulfilled. In such a case b is denoted by $d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} b_{Y,n}$.

In this section special attention is given to the families of complex numbers of the form $\text{Tr}(L_n^k K_{Y,n}) C_Y$, where $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n > k$ (k is fixed), $K_{Y,n} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes n})$, and $C_Y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes k})$.

Definition IV.1 does not guarantee convergence of families $\{b_{Y,n}\}$ of interest in physics. To obtain such a convergence, additional conditions (such as conditions of uniform growth [11]) are usually imposed on the sequence $\{Y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in question. However, those additional conditions do not affect considerations in this paper.

As noted in Introduction, the mean value of an observable represented by a bounded selfadjoint operator C in a state represented by a density operator ρ is equal to $\text{Tr} C \rho$, and if C is unbounded then one can exploit the probabilistic interpretation of the quantity $\text{Tr} E_C(\Delta) \rho$, where E_C is the spectral measure of C and Δ is a Borel subset of the spectrum of C . This is the motivation for the following definition.

Definition IV.2. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$, $d > 0$. The families $\{A_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{B_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ of operators $A_{Y,n}, B_{Y,n} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes k})$ are said to be *asymptotically equivalent* (symbolically: $A_{Y,n} \approx B_{Y,n}$), if for every family $\{C_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ of operators $C_{Y,n} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes k})$ with uniformly bounded operator norms the following condition is fulfilled:

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} (A_{Y,n} - B_{Y,n})C_{Y,n} = 0. \quad (29)$$

Notice that condition (29) is required to hold also for families $\{C_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the equality $C_{Y,n} = C_{Y,m}$ for all $Y \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$, $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Such families appear in applications.

Remark IV.3. Kossakowski and Maćkowiak [3], and Maćkowiak [6] used some different definition of asymptotic equivalence of families of operators, closer to Definition IV.11 in this paper.

Remark IV.4. In the sequel it is assumed that the operators $A_{Y,n}, B_{Y,n}$ in Definition IV.2 are well defined for *almost all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (i.e. all but finitely many) and for *almost all sets* $Y \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ (i.e. all satisfying the condition $\mu(Y) > c$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$), which does not affect the existence and the value of the limit on the l.h.s. of Eq. (29).

Remark IV.5. Clearly, for fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$, $d > 0$, the relation \approx is an equivalence relation. If $A_{Y,n} \approx B_{Y,n}$ then for every family of operators $C_{Y,n}$ as in Definition IV.2 the limit $d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} A_{Y,n}C_{Y,n}$ exists iff the limit $d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} B_{Y,n}C_{Y,n}$ exists, in which case both limits are equal. Notice also that if $A_{Y,n} \approx B_{Y,n}$ then $A_{Y,n} + D_{Y,n} \approx B_{Y,n} + D_{Y,n}$ and $aA_{Y,n} \approx aB_{Y,n}$ for every family $\{D_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes k})$ and $a \in \mathbb{C}$. Furthermore, for every family $\{A_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes k})$ with uniformly bounded trace norms $\text{Tr} |A_{Y,n}|$ and for every sequence $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}$ convergent to $a \in \mathbb{C}$ one has $a_n A_{Y,n} \approx a A_{Y,n}$.

The following lemma provides an equivalent definition of the relation \approx for families of selfadjoint operators.

Lemma IV.6. Let $\{A_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{B_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ be as in Definition IV.2. Then the following implication holds true:

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} |A_{Y,n} - B_{Y,n}| = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad A_{Y,n} \approx B_{Y,n}. \quad (30)$$

Moreover, if the operators $A_{Y,n}, B_{Y,n}$ are selfadjoint then the inverse implication holds:

$$A_{Y,n} \approx B_{Y,n} \quad \Rightarrow \quad d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} |A_{Y,n} - B_{Y,n}| = 0. \quad (31)$$

Proof. Implication (30) follows from the estimate

$$|\text{Tr} (A_{Y,n} - B_{Y,n})C_{Y,n}| \leq \text{Tr} |(A_{Y,n} - B_{Y,n})C_{Y,n}| \leq \|C_{Y,n}\| \text{Tr} |A_{Y,n} - B_{Y,n}|,$$

which holds for every family of operators $\{C_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ such as in Definition IV.2.

Now assume that $A_{Y,n} \approx B_{Y,n}$, which, according to Remark IV.5, is equivalent to the condition

$$D_{Y,n} \approx 0, \quad (32)$$

where $D_{Y,n} := A_{Y,n} - B_{Y,n}$ for every $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$. The operators $D_{Y,n}$, being compact (they are trace class) and selfadjoint, have the spectral representations

$$D_{Y,n} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i(Y, n) P_{\varphi_i(Y, n)},$$

where $P_{\varphi_i(Y,n)}$ are the projectors onto orthogonal one dimensional subspaces of eigenvectors $\varphi_i(Y,n)$ of the operator $D_{Y,n}$, corresponding to the eigenvalues $\lambda_i(Y,n) \in \mathbb{R}$. One has $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i(Y,n)| = \text{Tr} |D_{Y,n}| < +\infty$, hence for every $(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$ there exists $m(Y,n) \in \mathbb{N}$

such that $\sum_{i=m(Y,n)+1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i(Y,n)| < \frac{1}{n}$. Thus the operators

$$F_{Y,n} = \sum_{i=1}^{m(Y,n)} \lambda_i(Y,n) P_{\varphi_i(Y,n)}$$

satisfy the condition

$$d - \lim_{n,\mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} |D_{Y,n} - F_{Y,n}| = d - \lim_{n,\mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=m(Y,n)+1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i(Y,n)| = 0, \quad (33)$$

which, in view of proved implication (30) and condition (32), gives $F_{Y,n} \approx D_{Y,n} \approx 0$, i.e. for every family $\{C_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ of operators $C_{Y,n} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes k})$ with uniformly bounded operator norms one has

$$d - \lim_{n,\mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} F_{Y,n} C_{Y,n} = 0. \quad (34)$$

In particular, the above equality holds for the operators

$$C_{Y,n} = \sum_{i=1}^{m(Y,n)} \text{sgn}(\lambda_i(Y,n)) P_{\varphi_i(Y,n)},$$

for which $\|C_{Y,n}\| = 1$. In this case,

$$\text{Tr} F_{Y,n} C_{Y,n} = \text{Tr} \sum_{i=1}^{m(Y,n)} |\lambda_i(Y,n)| P_{\varphi_i(Y,n)} = \text{Tr} |F_{Y,n}|,$$

hence condition (34) gives

$$d - \lim_{n,\mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} |F_{Y,n}| = 0. \quad (35)$$

On the other hand,

$$\text{Tr} |D_{Y,n}| = \text{Tr} |(D_{Y,n} - F_{Y,n}) + F_{Y,n}| \leq \text{Tr} |D_{Y,n} - F_{Y,n}| + \text{Tr} |F_{Y,n}|.$$

Thus conditions (33) and (35) yield

$$d - \lim_{n,\mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} |A_{Y,n} - B_{Y,n}| = d - \lim_{n,\mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} |D_{Y,n}| = 0,$$

which proves implication (31). \square

The following lemma [10] follows from Lemma IV.6.

Lemma IV.7. Fix $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\{A_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{B_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ be families of selfadjoint operators $A_{Y,n}, B_{Y,n} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes k})$ such that $A_{Y,n} \approx B_{Y,n}$, and let $\{D_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ be a family of operators $D_{Y,n} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes m})$ with uniformly bounded trace norms $\text{Tr} |D_{Y,n}|$. Then

$$A_{Y,n} \otimes D_{Y,n} \approx B_{Y,n} \otimes D_{Y,n}, \quad D_{Y,n} \otimes A_{Y,n} \approx D_{Y,n} \otimes B_{Y,n},$$

$$A_{Y,n} \wedge D_{Y,n} \approx B_{Y,n} \wedge D_{Y,n}, \quad D_{Y,n} \wedge A_{Y,n} \approx D_{Y,n} \wedge B_{Y,n},$$

$$A_{Y,n} \vee D_{Y,n} \approx B_{Y,n} \vee D_{Y,n}, \quad D_{Y,n} \vee A_{Y,n} \approx D_{Y,n} \vee B_{Y,n}.$$

In the sequel the symbol $\{\rho_Y\}_{Y \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)}$ denotes a family of nonnegative definite selfadjoint operators $\rho_Y \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y)$, and it is assumed that

$$\xi_{Y,0}^\wedge := 1, \quad \xi_{Y,0}^\vee := 1, \quad \rho_Y^{\wedge 1} := \rho_Y, \quad \rho_Y^{\vee 1} := \rho_Y,$$

$$\xi_{Y,n}^\wedge := \text{Tr } \rho_Y^{\wedge n} > 0, \quad \xi_{Y,n}^\vee := \text{Tr } \rho_Y^{\vee n} > 0,$$

$$s_{Y,n}^\wedge := \frac{\xi_{Y,n-1}^\wedge}{\xi_{Y,n}^\wedge}, \quad s_{Y,n}^\vee := \frac{\xi_{Y,n-1}^\vee}{\xi_{Y,n}^\vee}$$

for every $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$.

Density operators of the form $\frac{1}{\xi_{Y,n}^\wedge} \rho_Y^{\wedge n}$, $\frac{1}{\xi_{Y,n}^\vee} \rho_Y^{\vee n}$ are called, respectively, *n-fermion* and *n-boson product density operators*. Physical motivation for the investigation of such operators and their contractions can be found in the paper of Maćkowiak [6]. The objective of this section is to find density operators of the most simple form which are asymptotically equivalent to the density operators

$$\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(k)} := \mathbb{L}_n^k \left(\frac{1}{\xi_{Y,n}^\wedge} \rho_Y^{\wedge n} \right), \quad \check{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(k)} := \mathbb{L}_n^k \left(\frac{1}{\xi_{Y,n}^\vee} \rho_Y^{\vee n} \right),$$

defined for fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$, $n > k$.

Remark IV.8. For every $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$ the operator $I + s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y$ is invertible and $\|(I + s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y)^{-1}\| = 1$. Furthermore, if $s_{Y,n+1}^\vee \|\rho_Y\| < 1$, then $I - s_{Y,n+1}^\vee \rho_Y$ is invertible and $\|(I - s_{Y,n+1}^\vee \rho_Y)^{-1}\| = (1 - s_{Y,n+1}^\vee \|\rho_Y\|)^{-1}$.

The next theorem is a version of a theorem studied by Kossakowski and Maćkowiak [3], and Maćkowiak [6] (see Remark IV.3).

Theorem IV.9. If $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \approx \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n+1}^{(1)}$ and the reals $s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \|\rho_Y\|$ are uniformly bounded for a.a. $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$ (see Remark IV.4) then

$$\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I + s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) \approx (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y, \quad (36)$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \approx (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y (I + s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y)^{-1}. \quad (37)$$

If $\check{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \approx \check{\sigma}_{Y,n+1}^{(1)}$ and the reals $s_{Y,n}^\vee \|\rho_Y\|$ are uniformly bounded for a.a. $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$ then

$$\check{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I - s_{Y,n+1}^\vee \rho_Y) \approx (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^\vee \rho_Y. \quad (38)$$

If additionally the inequality $s_{Y,n}^\vee \|\rho_Y\| \leq \epsilon$ holds for some $\epsilon < 1$ and a.a. $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$ then

$$\check{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \approx (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^\vee \rho_Y (I - s_{Y,n+1}^\vee \rho_Y)^{-1}. \quad (39)$$

Proof. By Eq. (11) in Theorem III.1 one has

$$\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n+1}^{(1)} = (n+1)^{-1} \left(s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y - n \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) \right)$$

for $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$. Thus the assumption $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \approx \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n+1}^{(1)}$ implies

$$\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} - (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y \approx - (n+1)^{-1} n \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y). \quad (40)$$

Since $\frac{n}{n+1} \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\left| \text{Tr} \left[\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right] \right| \leq s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \|\rho_Y\| \text{Tr} \left[\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right] = s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \|\rho_Y\|$$

for a.a. $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$, relation (40) yields equivalence (36), in view of Remark IV.5.

Now turn to the proof of relation (37). According to Remark IV.8,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \text{Tr} \left[\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} - (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)^{-1} \right] \right| \\ &= \text{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) - (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y \right) (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)^{-1} \right| \\ &\leq \left\| (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)^{-1} \right\| \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) - (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y \right| \\ &= \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) - (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

The explicit form of $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)}$ given by Theorem III.4 shows that $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)}$ commutes with $I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y$, and since both operators are selfadjoint, $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)$ is also selfadjoint. Therefore, by condition (36) and implication (31) from Lemma IV.6,

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) - (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y \right| = 0.$$

Thus estimate (41) yields

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} - (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)^{-1} \right| = 0,$$

which proves equivalence (37), in view of implication (30) from Lemma IV.6.

The proof of relation (38) runs parallel to that of relation (36).

In order to prove equivalence (39) one can write relation (38) in the form

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y) - (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y \right) C_{Y,n} = 0,$$

and next, equivalently, as

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} - (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y (I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y)^{-1} \right) (I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y) C_{Y,n} = 0 \quad (42)$$

for every family $\{C_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ of operators $C_{Y,n} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_Y)$ with uniformly bounded operator norms. According to the assumption $s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \|\rho_Y\| \leq \epsilon < 1$ the operators $I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y$ are uniformly bounded for a.a. $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, by Remark IV.8, the operators $I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y$ are invertible and the operators $(I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y)^{-1}$ are uniformly bounded for a.a. $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$. Therefore arbitrariness of the choice of the family $\{C_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ admits the representation of a.a. elements of every family

$\{D_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ of operators $D_{Y,n} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_Y)$ with uniformly bounded operator norms in the form $D_{Y,n} = (I - s_{Y,n+1}^\vee \rho_Y) C_{Y,n}$. From Eq. (42) one then obtains

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left(\overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} - (n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^\vee \rho_Y (I - s_{Y,n+1}^\vee \rho_Y)^{-1} \right) D_{Y,n} = 0,$$

which completes the proof of equivalence (39).

Relation (39) can be also proved analogously to relation (37). Notice that in this case the expression $\|(I + s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y)^{-1}\| = 1$ from estimate (41) is replaced by $\|(I - s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y)^{-1}\| = (1 - s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \|\rho_Y\|)^{-1} \leq (1 - \epsilon)^{-1}$ (see Remark IV.8). \square

The following theorem for $k = 2$ (with the reservation of Remark IV.3) was obtained by Kossakowski and Maćkowiak [3], and Maćkowiak [6]. The latter author [6] gave also arguments that can be used to check the assumptions of this theorem.

Theorem IV.10 (Asymptotic formulae I). *If $\overset{\wedge(k)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \approx \overset{\wedge(k)}{\sigma}_{Y,n+1}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and*

$$s_{Y,n}^\wedge \|\rho_Y\| \leq 2 \quad \text{for a.a. } (Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N} \quad (43)$$

then, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$,

$$\overset{\wedge(k)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \approx k! \underbrace{\overset{\wedge(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \wedge \dots \wedge \overset{\wedge(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n}}_k. \quad (44)$$

If $\overset{\vee(k)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \approx \overset{\vee(k)}{\sigma}_{Y,n+1}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$s_{Y,n}^\vee \|\rho_Y\| \leq \epsilon \quad \text{for some } \epsilon < 1 \text{ and a.a. } (Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N} \quad (45)$$

then, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$,

$$\overset{\vee(k)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \approx k! \underbrace{\overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \vee \dots \vee \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n}}_k. \quad (46)$$

Proof. (Induction with respect to $k \geq 2$). First equivalence (44) will be proved.

1°. ($k = 2$) By Eq. (9) from Theorem III.1 for $n \geq 2$ one has

$$\binom{n+1}{2} \overset{\wedge(2)}{\sigma}_{Y,n+1} = \binom{n}{1} \overset{\wedge(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \wedge (s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) - \binom{n}{2} \overset{\wedge(2)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} (I \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)}.$$

Equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} \binom{n+1}{2} \overset{\wedge(2)}{\sigma}_{Y,n+1} &= \frac{n}{n+1} \overset{\wedge(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \wedge ((n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} \binom{n}{2} \overset{\wedge(2)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} (I \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Notice that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} \binom{n+1}{2} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} \binom{n}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$, $\text{Tr} \left| \overset{\wedge(2)}{\sigma}_{Y,n+1} \right| = 1$, and assumption (43) implies

$$\text{Tr} \left| \overset{\wedge(2)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} (I \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \right| \leq s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \|\rho_Y\| \text{Tr} \left| \overset{\wedge(2)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \right| \leq 2$$

for a.a. $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$. Thus, by Eq. (47) and Remark IV.5, one obtains

$$\frac{1}{2} \overset{\wedge(2)}{\sigma}_{Y,n+1} \approx \frac{n}{n+1} \overset{\wedge(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \wedge ((n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) - \frac{1}{2} \overset{\wedge(2)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} (I \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)}.$$

The assumption $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} \approx \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n+1}^{(2)}$ allows to write the above condition in the form

$$\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} + \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} (I \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \approx 2 \frac{n}{n+1} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge ((n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y).$$

Thus, by virtue of equivalence (36) from Theorem IV.9, the inequality $\text{Tr} \left| 2 \frac{n}{n+1} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right| \leq 2$, and Lemma IV.7, one has

$$\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} + \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} (I \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \approx 2 \frac{n}{n+1} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right). \quad (48)$$

Furthermore, $\frac{n}{n+1} \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and assumption (43) gives

$$\text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) \right| \leq \|I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y\| \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right| \leq 3$$

for a.a. $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, by condition (48) and Remark IV.5,

$$\left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) (I \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \approx 0. \quad (49)$$

The explicit form of the operators $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)}$, $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)}$ given by Theorem III.4 implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) (I \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \\ &= A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} (I \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)) \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

proving selfadjointness of the operator on the l.h.s. According to Lemma IV.6, relation (49) therefore amounts to

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) (I \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \right| = 0. \quad (50)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right| &= \text{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) (I \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) (I \otimes (I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \right| \\ &\leq \text{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) (I \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \right| \\ &\quad + \|I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y\| \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} & (2 - \|I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y\|) \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right| \\ &\leq \text{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) (I \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \right|. \quad (51) \end{aligned}$$

Since the operators ρ_Y are trace class, $\inf_{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_Y; \|\varphi\|=1} \langle \varphi, \rho_Y \varphi \rangle = 0$. Thus, taking into account selfadjointness of the operators $I - s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y$ and assumption (43), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \|I - s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y\| &= \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_Y \\ \|\varphi\|=1}} |\langle \varphi, (I - s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) \varphi \rangle| = \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_Y \\ \|\varphi\|=1}} |1 - s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \langle \varphi, \rho_Y \varphi \rangle| \\ &= \max \left\{ \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_Y \\ \|\varphi\|=1}} (1 - s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \langle \varphi, \rho_Y \varphi \rangle), \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_Y \\ \|\varphi\|=1}} (s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \langle \varphi, \rho_Y \varphi \rangle - 1) \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ 1 - s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \inf_{\substack{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_Y \\ \|\varphi\|=1}} \langle \varphi, \rho_Y \varphi \rangle, s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_Y \\ \|\varphi\|=1}} \langle \varphi, \rho_Y \varphi \rangle - 1 \right\} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Inequality (51) therefore assumes the form

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right| \leq \mathrm{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) (I \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y)) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \right|,$$

which, according to Eq. (50), yields $d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \mathrm{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right| = 0$, proving relation (44) for $k = 2$, in view of Lemma IV.6.

2°. Assuming validity of equivalence (44) for $k \in \{2, \dots, q-1\}$, where $q \in \mathbb{N}$, $q > 2$, its validity will be proved for $k = q$.

By Eq. (9) in Theorem III.1 for $n \geq q$ one has

$$\binom{n+1}{q} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n+1}^{(q)} = \binom{n}{q-1} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q-1)} \wedge (s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) - \binom{n}{q} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)},$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(n+1)^q} \binom{n+1}{q} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n+1}^{(q)} &= \frac{1}{(n+1)^{q-1}} \binom{n}{q-1} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q-1)} \wedge ((n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{(n+1)^q} \binom{n}{q} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)}. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Notice that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(n+1)^q} \binom{n+1}{q} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(n+1)^q} \binom{n}{q} = \frac{1}{q!}$, $\mathrm{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n+1}^{(q)} \right| = 1$, and assumption (43) implies

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \right| \leq s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \|\rho_Y\| \mathrm{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} \right| \leq 2$$

for a.a. $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, by Eq. (53) and Remark IV.5,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{q!} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n+1}^{(q)} &\approx \frac{1}{(n+1)^{q-1}} \binom{n}{q-1} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q-1)} \wedge ((n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{q!} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of the assumption $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} \approx \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n+1}^{(q)}$, one can write the above condition in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} + \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \\ \approx \frac{q!}{(n+1)^{q-1}} \binom{n}{q-1} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q-1)} \wedge ((n+1)^{-1} s_{Y,n+1}^\wedge \rho_Y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by equivalence (36) from Theorem IV.9, the inequality $\text{Tr} \left| \frac{q!}{(n+1)^{q-1}} \binom{n}{q-1} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q-1)} \right| \leq \frac{q!}{(q-1)!}$, and Lemma IV.7, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} + \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \\ \approx \frac{q!}{(n+1)^{q-1}} \binom{n}{q-1} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q-1)} \wedge \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Furthermore, one has $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q!}{(n+1)^{q-1}} \binom{n}{q-1} = \frac{q!}{(q-1)!}$, and assumption (43) implies

$$\text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q-1)} \wedge \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) \right| \leq \|I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y\| \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q-1)} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right| \leq 3$$

for a.a. $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$. Condition (54) and Remark IV.5 thus yield

$$\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} + \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \approx \frac{q!}{(q-1)!} \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q-1)} \wedge \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right).$$

By assumption (43) the operators $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y)$ have uniformly bounded trace norms for a.a. $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, in view of Lemma IV.7 and the induction assumption $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q-1)} \approx (q-1)! \underbrace{\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)}}_{q-1}$, one has

$$\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} + \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \approx q! \underbrace{\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)}}_{q-1} \wedge \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right),$$

hence

$$\left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \underbrace{\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)}}_q \right) \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \approx 0. \quad (55)$$

From the explicit form of the operators $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)}$, $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)}$ given by Theorem III.4 one finds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \\ = A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which proves selfadjointness of the operator on the l.h.s. Thus, according to Lemma IV.6, relation (55) means that

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \right| = 0. \quad (56)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right| \\ = \text{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \right. \\ \left. + \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \text{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \right| \\ &\quad + \|I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y\| \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} &(2 - \|I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y\|) \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right| \\ &\leq \text{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \right|. \quad (57) \end{aligned}$$

By Eq. (52), inequality (57) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right| \\ &\leq \text{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\wedge} \rho_Y) \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \right|, \quad (58) \end{aligned}$$

which, by virtue of Eq. (56), yields $d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} - q! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right| = 0$, meaning that $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(q)} \approx q! \underbrace{\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)}}_q$, in view of Lemma IV.6. Validity of formula (44) has been proved.

Now equivalence (46) will be proved.

1°. ($k = 2$) Using formula (10) from Theorem III.1 for $n \geq 2$ and proceeding in the same manner as in the proof of relation (44) one obtains

$$\left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \right) (I \otimes (I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y)) S_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \approx 0,$$

hence

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \right) (I \otimes (I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y)) S_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \right| = 0. \quad (59)$$

Furthermore, one obtains the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &(2 - \|I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y\|) \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \right| \\ &\leq \text{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \right) (I \otimes (I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y)) S_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \right|. \quad (60) \end{aligned}$$

According to assumption (45), for a.a. $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$ one has

$$2 - \|I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y\| \geq 2 - (1 + s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \|\rho_Y\|) \geq 1 - \epsilon > 0. \quad (61)$$

Therefore estimate (60) gives

$$\text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \right| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon} \text{Tr} \left| \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(2)} - 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \right) (I \otimes (I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y)) S_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \right| \quad (62)$$

for a.a. $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$. Thus, by virtue of Eq. (59), $d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left| \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(2)} - 2 \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \right| =$

0, which implies $\sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(2)} \approx 2 \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)}$, in view of Lemma IV.6.

2°. Assuming validity of equivalence (46) for $k \in \{2, \dots, q-1\}$, where $q \in \mathbb{N}$, $q > 2$, its validity will be demonstrated for $k = q$.

Using formula (10) from Theorem III.1 for $n \geq q$ and proceeding in the same way as in the proof of relation (44) one obtains

$$\left(\sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(q)} - q! \underbrace{\sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \dots \vee \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)}}_q \right) \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y) \right) S_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \approx 0,$$

whence

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left| \left(\sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(q)} - q! \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \dots \vee \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \right) \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y) \right) S_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \right| = 0. \quad (63)$$

One obtains also the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & (2 - \|I + s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y\|) \text{Tr} \left| \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(q)} - q! \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \dots \vee \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \right| \\ & \leq \text{Tr} \left| \left(\sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(q)} - q! \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \dots \vee \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \right) \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y) \right) S_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

which, in view of estimate (61), yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr} \left| \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(q)} - q! \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \dots \vee \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon} \text{Tr} \left| \left(\sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(q)} - q! \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \dots \vee \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \right) \left(I^{\otimes(q-1)} \otimes (I - s_{Y,n+1}^{\vee} \rho_Y) \right) S_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(q)} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by virtue of condition (63), the equality $d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left| \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(q)} - q! \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \dots \vee \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \right| = 0$ holds, implying, according to Lemma IV.6, the relation $\sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(q)} \approx q! \underbrace{\sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)} \vee \dots \vee \sigma_{Y,n}^{\vee(1)}}_q$ and completing the proof of equivalence (46). \square

Theorem IV.10 allows to replace (n, k) -contractions of antisymmetric and symmetric product density operators by antisymmetric and symmetric products of 1-particle contractions, respectively, if the number n of particles in the system is large. Further simplification, consisting in replacement of antisymmetric and symmetric products by tensor products, will be now proved possible. To this end weaker conditions on the asymptotic equivalence relation will be imposed. Namely, it will be assumed that the operators $C_{Y,n}$ from Definition IV.2 are tensor products of 1-particle operators. (The new relation will be denoted by \sim .)

Definition IV.11. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$, $d > 0$. The families $\{A_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$, $\{B_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ of operators $A_{Y,n}, B_{Y,n} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes k})$ are said to be *weakly asymptotically equivalent* (symbolically: $A_{Y,n} \sim B_{Y,n}$), if the condition $d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} (A_{Y,n} - B_{Y,n}) C_{Y,n} = 0$

is satisfied for every family $\{C_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ of operators of the form $C_{Y,n} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^k C_{Y,n}^{(i)}$,

where $C_{Y,n}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_Y)$ ($i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $(Y, n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}$) are operators with uniformly bounded operator norms.

Remark IV.4 concerns also the above definition. The relation \sim has the properties analogous to the properties of the relation \approx from Remark IV.5.

Definition IV.12. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$. Fix $\pi \in S_k$. A set $X \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ is called a *cyclic set of the permutation* π , if $X = \{l_1, \dots, l_q\}$ for some $l_1, \dots, l_q \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $q \in \{2, \dots, k\}$, such that $\pi(l_s) = l_{s+1}$ for every $s \in \{1, \dots, q-1\}$, and $\pi(l_q) = l_1$. A singleton $\{l\} \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $\pi(l) = l$ is also called a cyclic set of the permutation π .

Note that the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$ from the above definition can be represented as the union of disjoint cyclic sets of π . Two limiting cases occur: in the first one all single element subsets of $\{1, \dots, k\}$ are cyclic sets of π , in which case $\pi = \text{Id}$, whereas in the second case the only cyclic set of π is the whole set $\{1, \dots, k\}$. If $\pi \neq \text{Id}$ then (for $k \geq 2$) there exists at least one cyclic set of π containing at least two elements.

Lemma IV.13. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$. If $\pi \in S_k$, $B^{(1)}, \dots, B^{(k)} \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_Y)$, and $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H}_Y then

$$\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \varphi_{i_1}, B^{(1)} \varphi_{i_{\pi(1)}} \right\rangle \cdots \left\langle \varphi_{i_k}, B^{(k)} \varphi_{i_{\pi(k)}} \right\rangle = \prod_{j=1}^{p(\pi)} \text{Tr} \prod_{s=1}^{q_j} B^{(l_{j,s})}, \quad (64)$$

where $p(\pi) \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ is the number of disjoint cyclic sets of π , indexed by j , and q_j denotes the number of elements in the j th cyclic set, which is

$$\bigcup_{s=1}^{q_j} \{l_{j,s}\} = \{l_{j,1}, \dots, l_{j,q_j}\}$$

for $l_{j,1}, \dots, l_{j,q_j} \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that

$$\pi(l_{j,q_j}) = l_{j,1} \quad \text{and, for } q_j \geq 2, \quad \pi(l_{j,s}) = l_{j,s+1}, \quad s = 1, \dots, q_j - 1. \quad (65)$$

Clearly,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p(\pi)} q_j = k, \quad \bigcup_{j=1}^{p(\pi)} \bigcup_{s=1}^{q_j} \{l_{j,s}\} = \{1, \dots, k\}.$$

Proof. One has

$$\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \varphi_{i_1}, B^{(1)} \varphi_{i_{\pi(1)}} \right\rangle \cdots \left\langle \varphi_{i_k}, B^{(k)} \varphi_{i_{\pi(k)}} \right\rangle = \text{Tr} \left(\bigotimes_{r=1}^k B^{(r)} \right) U_{\pi},$$

where $U_{\pi} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes k})$ is the unique operator such that $U_{\pi}(\psi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_k) = \psi_{\pi(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_{\pi(k)}$ for every $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k \in \mathcal{H}_Y$. The sum of the series on the l.h.s. of Eq. (64) therefore exists and, by virtue of absolute convergence, does not depend on the order of summation. Thus

$$\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \varphi_{i_1}, B^{(1)} \varphi_{i_{\pi(1)}} \right\rangle \cdots \left\langle \varphi_{i_k}, B^{(k)} \varphi_{i_{\pi(k)}} \right\rangle = \prod_{j=1}^{p(\pi)} M_j, \quad (66)$$

where

$$M_j := \sum_{i_{j,1}=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{i_{j,q_j}=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \varphi_{i_{j,1}}, B^{(l_{j,1})} \varphi_{i_{\pi(l_{j,1})}} \right\rangle \cdots \left\langle \varphi_{i_{j,q_j}}, B^{(l_{j,q_j})} \varphi_{i_{\pi(l_{j,q_j})}} \right\rangle.$$

If $q_j = 1$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, p(\pi)\}$ then

$$M_j \equiv \sum_{i_{j,1}=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \varphi_{i_{j,1}}, B^{(l_{j,1})} \varphi_{i_{j,1}} \right\rangle = \text{Tr} B^{(l_{j,1})}.$$

If $q_j = 2$ then by Parseval's formula and the equalities $\pi(l_{j,1}) = l_{j,2}$, $\pi(l_{j,2}) = l_{j,1}$ one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
M_j &\equiv \sum_{i_{j,1}=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i_{j,2}=1}^{\infty} \langle \varphi_{i_{j,1}}, B^{(l_{j,1})} \varphi_{i_{j,2}} \rangle \langle \varphi_{i_{j,2}}, B^{(l_{j,2})} \varphi_{i_{j,1}} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{i_{j,1}=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i_{j,2}=1}^{\infty} \langle (B^{(l_{j,1})})^* \varphi_{i_{j,1}}, \varphi_{i_{j,2}} \rangle \langle \varphi_{i_{j,2}}, B^{(l_{j,2})} \varphi_{i_{j,1}} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{i_{j,1}=1}^{\infty} \langle (B^{(l_{j,1})})^* \varphi_{i_{j,1}}, B^{(l_{j,2})} \varphi_{i_{j,1}} \rangle = \sum_{i_{j,1}=1}^{\infty} \langle \varphi_{i_{j,1}}, B^{(l_{j,1})} B^{(l_{j,2})} \varphi_{i_{j,1}} \rangle \\
&= \text{Tr } B^{(l_{j,1})} B^{(l_{j,2})}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $q_j(\pi) > 2$ then by condition (65) and Parseval's formula one has

$$\begin{aligned}
M_j &= \sum_{i_{j,1}=1}^{\infty} \dots \sum_{i_{j,q_j}=1}^{\infty} \langle \varphi_{i_{j,1}}, B^{(l_{j,1})} \varphi_{i_{j,2}} \rangle \langle \varphi_{i_{j,2}}, B^{(l_{j,2})} \varphi_{i_{j,3}} \rangle \dots \\
&\quad \dots \langle \varphi_{i_{j,q_j}}, B^{(l_{j,q_j})} \varphi_{i_{j,1}} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{i_{j,1}=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i_{j,3}=1}^{\infty} \dots \sum_{i_{j,q_j}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_{j,2}=1}^{\infty} \langle (B^{(l_{j,1})})^* \varphi_{i_{j,1}}, \varphi_{i_{j,2}} \rangle \langle \varphi_{i_{j,2}}, B^{(l_{j,2})} \varphi_{i_{j,3}} \rangle \right) \dots \\
&\quad \dots \langle \varphi_{i_{j,q_j}}, B^{(l_{j,q_j})} \varphi_{i_{j,1}} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{i_{j,1}=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i_{j,3}=1}^{\infty} \dots \sum_{i_{j,q_j}=1}^{\infty} \langle (B^{(l_{j,1})})^* \varphi_{i_{j,1}}, B^{(l_{j,2})} \varphi_{i_{j,3}} \rangle \dots \langle \varphi_{i_{j,q_j}}, B^{(l_{j,q_j})} \varphi_{i_{j,1}} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{i_{j,1}=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i_{j,3}=1}^{\infty} \dots \sum_{i_{j,q_j}=1}^{\infty} \langle \varphi_{i_{j,1}}, B^{(l_{j,1})} B^{(l_{j,2})} \varphi_{i_{j,3}} \rangle \dots \langle \varphi_{i_{j,q_j}}, B^{(l_{j,q_j})} \varphi_{i_{j,1}} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Performing successive summations one obtains

$$M_j = \sum_{i_{j,1}=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \varphi_{i_{j,1}}, \left(\prod_{s=1}^{q_j} B^{(l_{j,s})} \right) \varphi_{i_{j,1}} \right\rangle = \text{Tr} \prod_{s=1}^{q_j} B^{(l_{j,s})},$$

proving validity of formula (64), in view of Eq. (66). \square

Lemma IV.14. *One has*

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right\| = 0, \quad (67)$$

and if $\check{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} \approx 2 \check{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \vee \check{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)}$ (see Theorem IV.10) then

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \check{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right\| = 0. \quad (68)$$

Proof. To prove Eq. (67) it suffices to observe that, according to Theorem II.10, one has

$$\left\| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right\| = \left\| L_n^1 \left(\frac{1}{\xi_{Y,n}^\wedge} \rho_{Y,n}^\wedge \right) \right\| \leq \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{\xi_{Y,n}^\wedge} \|\rho_{Y,n}^\wedge\| \leq \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{\xi_{Y,n}^\wedge} \text{Tr} \rho_{Y,n}^\wedge = \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{\xi_{Y,n}^\wedge} \xi_{Y,n}^\wedge = \frac{1}{n}.$$

Now Eq. (68) will be proved. Let $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H}_Y for fixed $Y \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$. Then, according to Lemma IV.13, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} 2 \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \vee \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} &= 2 \text{Tr} \left(\overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \otimes \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \right) S_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(2)} \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in S_2} \sum_{i_1, i_2=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \varphi_{i_1}, \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \varphi_{i_{\pi(1)}} \right\rangle \left\langle \varphi_{i_2}, \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \varphi_{i_{\pi(2)}} \right\rangle = \left(\text{Tr} \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \right)^2 + \text{Tr} \left(\overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

On the other hand, the relation $\overset{\vee(2)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \approx 2 \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \vee \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n}$ states that

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left(2 \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \vee \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} - \overset{\vee(2)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \right) C_{Y,n} = 0 \quad (70)$$

for every family $\{C_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$ of operators appearing in Definition IV.2. Thus, taking into account Eq. (69), Eq (70) for $C_{Y,n} = I^{\otimes 2}$, and the equality $\text{Tr} \overset{\vee(2)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} = \text{Tr} \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} = 1$, one obtains

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left(\overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \right) = 0. \quad (71)$$

Powers of a selfadjoint nonnegative operator are selfadjoint and nonnegative, therefore for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_Y$ such that $\|\varphi\| = 1$ the inequality

$$\left\| \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \varphi \right\|^2 = \left\langle \varphi, \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \varphi \right\rangle \leq \text{Tr} \left(\overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \right)$$

holds, and due to Eq. (71) yields Eq. (68). \square

Notice that Eq. (67) can be also proved analogously to Eq. (68) under the additional assumption $\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(2)} \approx 2 \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)}$.

The proof of the next theorem for $k = 2$ was given by Kossakowski and Maćkowiak [3], and Maćkowiak [6].

Theorem IV.15 (Asymptotic formulae II). *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$. One has*

$$k! \underbrace{\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)}}_k \sim \underbrace{\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)}}_k, \quad (72)$$

and if $d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \right\| = 0$ (see Lemma IV.14) then

$$k! \underbrace{\overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \vee \dots \vee \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n}}_k \sim \underbrace{\overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n} \otimes \dots \otimes \overset{\vee(1)}{\sigma}_{Y,n}}_k. \quad (73)$$

Proof. First Eq. (72) will be proved. Fix a family

$$\{C_{Y,n}\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}} = \left\{ C_{Y,n}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes C_{Y,n}^{(k)} \right\}_{(Y,n) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \times \mathbb{N}}$$

of operators such as in Definition IV.11 and set

$$B_{Y,n}^{(r)} := \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} C_{Y,n}^{(r)}, \quad r = 1, \dots, k.$$

Furthermore, let $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an orthonormal basis in \mathcal{H}_Y for fixed $Y \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$. Then by Lemma IV.13 one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr } k! \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) \left(C_{Y,n}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes C_{Y,n}^{(k)} \right) \\ &= k! \text{Tr } A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(k)} \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) \left(C_{Y,n}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes C_{Y,n}^{(k)} \right) \\ &= k! \text{Tr} \left(B_{Y,n}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes B_{Y,n}^{(k)} \right) A_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^{(k)} \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \text{sgn } \pi \left(\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k=1}^{\infty} \langle \varphi_{i_1}, B_{Y,n}^{(1)} \varphi_{i_{\pi(1)}} \rangle \cdots \langle \varphi_{i_k}, B_{Y,n}^{(k)} \varphi_{i_{\pi(k)}} \rangle \right) \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \text{sgn } \pi \left(\prod_{j=1}^{p(\pi)} \text{Tr} \prod_{s=1}^{q_j} B_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,s})} \right) \\ &= \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) \left(C_{Y,n}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes C_{Y,n}^{(k)} \right) + \sum_{\substack{\pi \in S_k \\ \pi \neq \text{Id}}} \text{sgn } \pi \left(\prod_{j=1}^{p(\pi)} \text{Tr} \prod_{s=1}^{q_j} B_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,s})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr} \left(k! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} - \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) \left(C_{Y,n}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes C_{Y,n}^{(k)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\pi \in S_k \\ \pi \neq \text{Id}}} \text{sgn } \pi \left(\prod_{j=1}^{p(\pi)} \text{Tr} \prod_{s=1}^{q_j} B_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,s})} \right). \quad (74) \end{aligned}$$

Now let $\pi \in S_k$, $\pi \neq \text{Id}$, be fixed. If $q_j = 1$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, p(\pi)\}$ then

$$\left| \text{Tr} \prod_{s=1}^{q_j} B_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,s})} \right| \equiv \left| \text{Tr } B_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,1})} \right| \leq \text{Tr} \left| B_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,1})} \right| \leq \left\| C_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,1})} \right\| \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right| = \left\| C_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,1})} \right\|,$$

whereas if $q_j \geq 2$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \text{Tr} \prod_{s=1}^{q_j} B_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,s})} \right| \leq \text{Tr} \left| \prod_{s=1}^{q_j} B_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,s})} \right| \leq \left\| \prod_{s=1}^{q_j-1} B_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,s})} \right\| \text{Tr} \left| B_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,q_j})} \right| \\ & \leq \left\| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right\|^{q_j-1} \left(\prod_{s=1}^{q_j-1} \left\| C_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,s})} \right\| \right) \left\| C_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,q_j})} \right\| \text{Tr} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right| \leq \left\| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right\|^{q_j-1} \prod_{s=1}^{q_j} \left\| C_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,s})} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

However, since $\pi \neq \text{Id}$, there exists at least one $j \in \{1, \dots, p(\pi)\}$ such that $q_j \geq 2$, therefore

$$\left| \prod_{j=1}^{p(\pi)} \text{Tr} \prod_{s=1}^{q_j} B_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,s})} \right| \leq \left(\prod_{j=1}^{p(\pi)} \left\| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right\|^{q_j-1} \right) \prod_{j=1}^{p(\pi)} \prod_{s=1}^{q_j} \left\| C_{Y,n}^{(l_{j,s})} \right\| = \|C_{Y,n}\| \prod_{j=1}^{p(\pi)} \left\| \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right\|^{q_j-1}$$

and at least one exponent $q_j - 1$ is nonzero. Thus, by the uniform boundedness of the norms $\|C_{Y,n}\|$, Lemma IV.14, and Eq. (74), one obtains

$$d - \lim_{n, \mu(Y) \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left(k! \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} - \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{Y,n}^{(1)} \right) \left(C_{Y,n}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes C_{Y,n}^{(k)} \right) = 0,$$

which proves validity of formula (72).

The proof of formula (73), after discarding the permutation signs and replacing \wedge by \vee , proceeds analogously. \square

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article presents the results of the author's MS thesis [10] written in Institute of Physics, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, under the supervision of Professor Jan Maćkowiak. The author wishes to express his gratitude to Professor Maćkowiak for the helpful suggestions and remarks. Professor Maćkowiak prepared also, on his own initiative, the English translation of appropriate parts of the author's thesis, which was useful for the author in editing of the present paper.

-
- [1] A. J. Coleman, "Structure of fermion density matrices," Rev. Mod. Phys. **35** (3), 668-687 (1963).
 - [2] C. Garrod and J. K. Percus, "Reduction of the N -particle variational problem," J. Math. Phys. **5** (12), 1756-1776 (1964).
 - [3] A. Kossakowski, J. Maćkowiak, "Minimization of the free energy of large continuous quantum systems over product states," Rep. Math. Phys. **24** (3), 365-376 (1986).
 - [4] H. Kummer, " n -representability problem for reduced density matrices," J. Math. Phys. **8** (10), 2063-2081 (1967).
 - [5] H. Kummer, "Mathematical description of a system consisting of identical quantum-mechanical particles," J. Math. Phys. **11** (2), 449-474 (1970).
 - [6] J. Maćkowiak, "Infinite-volume limit of continuous n -particle quantum systems," Phys. Rep. **308** (4), 235-331 (1999).
 - [7] J. Maćkowiak, P. Tarasewicz, "An extension of the Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer model of superconductivity," Physica C **331**, 25-37 (2000).
 - [8] J. Maćkowiak, M. Wiśniewski, "A perturbation expansion for the free energy of the s-d exchange Hamiltonian," Physica A **242**, 482-500 (1997).
 - [9] J. von Neumann, *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1932).
 - [10] W. Radzki, *Kummer contractions of product density matrices of systems of n fermions and n bosons* (Polish), MS thesis, Institute of Physics, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, 1999.
 - [11] D. Ruelle, *Statistical Mechanics* (Benjamin, New York, 1969).
 - [12] R. Schatten, *Norm ideals of completely continuous operators* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg, 1960).
 - [13] C. W. Schneider, G. Hammerl, G. Logvenov, T. Kopp, J. R. Kirtley, P. J. Hirschfeld, J. Mannhart, "Half- $h/2e$ critical current - Oscillations of SQUIDs," Europhys. Lett. **68**, 86-92 (2004).
 - [14] P. Tarasewicz, J. Maćkowiak, "Thermodynamic functions of Fermi gas with quadruple BCS-type binding potential," Physica C **329**, 130-148 (2000).
 - [15] G. E. Volovik, *Exotic Properties of Superfluid ^3He* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992).