

Infinite index subfactors and the GICAR categories

Vaughan F. R. Jones and David Penneys

October 6, 2014

Abstract

Given a II_1 -subfactor $A \subset B$ of arbitrary index, we show that the rectangular GICAR category, also called the rectangular planar rook category, faithfully embeds as $A - A$ bimodule maps among the bimodules $\otimes_A^n L^2(B)$. As a corollary, we get a lower bound on the dimension of the centralizer algebras $A'_0 \cap A_{2n}$ for infinite index subfactors, and we also get that $A'_0 \cap A_{2n}$ is nonabelian for $n \geq 2$, where $(A_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is the Jones tower for $A_0 = A \subset B = A_1$. We also show that the annular GICAR/planar rook category acts as maps amongst the A -central vectors in $\otimes_A^n L^2(B)$, although this action may be degenerate. We prove these results in more generality using bimodules.

The embedding of the GICAR category builds on work of Connes and Evans who originally found GICAR algebras inside Temperley-Lieb algebras with finite modulus.

1 Introduction

1.1 Finite vs. infinite index

In [Jon83], Jones pioneered the modern theory of subfactors. Starting with a finite index II_1 -subfactor $A_0 \subseteq A_1$, he used his basic construction to construct the Jones tower $(A_n)_{n \geq 0}$ iteratively by adding the Jones projections $(e_n)_{n \geq 1}$, which satisfy the Temperley-Lieb relations. Jones used these Temperley-Lieb algebras to show that the index lies in the range $\{4 \cos^2(\pi/n) | n \geq 3\} \cup [4, \infty)$, and he found a hyperfinite subfactor for each allowed index value.

A finite index subfactor is studied by analyzing its standard invariant, the two towers of finite dimensional centralizer algebras $(A'_i \cap A_j)_{i=0,1; j \geq 0}$. The standard invariant has been axiomatized in three different ways: Ocneanu's paragroups [Ocn88], Popa's λ -lattices [Pop95], and Jones' planar algebras [Jon99].

Some finite index results generalize to infinite index subfactors. Discrete, irreducible, "depth 2" subfactors correspond to outer (cocycle) actions of Kac algebras [HO89, EN96]. The classical Galois correspondence also holds for outer actions of infinite discrete groups and minimal actions of compact groups [ILP98].

Burns, in his Ph.D. thesis [Bur03], studied extremality and rotations for infinite index subfactors, as the key ingredient in proving isotopy invariance for Jones' planar algebras in [Jon99] is the rotation operator (also known to Ocneanu [Ocn94]). Essentially, Burns observed that for infinite index subfactors, the centralizer algebras $A'_0 \cap A_n$ and the central L^2 -vectors $A'_0 \cap L^2(A_n)$ do not coincide.

Using this observation, the second author generalized the work of Burns in [Pen13], where he gave a planar calculus for an arbitrary index II_1 -factor bimodule ${}_A H_A$. Setting $H^n = \bigotimes_A^n H$, he found two planar operads acting on the centralizer algebras $\mathcal{Q}_n = A' \cap (A^{\text{op}})' \cap B(H^n)$ and the central L^2 -vectors $\mathcal{P}_n = A' \cap H^n$ respectively whose actions are compatible. We recover the subfactor case when $A = A_0$ and $H = L^2(A_1)$. Interestingly, this planar structure was discovered without the use of Jones' basic construction and without the resulting Jones projections.

Hence we have one possible definition for the standard invariant of an infinite index subfactor, or a II_1 -factor bimodule: the centralizer algebras $\mathcal{Q}_\bullet = (\mathcal{Q}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ and the central L^2 -vectors $\mathcal{P}_\bullet = (\mathcal{P}_n)_{n \geq 0}$, together with their compatible planar calculi.

1.2 The simplest possible standard invariant

The Jones subfactors with index at most 4 discovered in [Jon83] have the simplest possible standard invariants; they consist entirely of the Temperley-Lieb algebras generated by the Jones projections. Since these projections are always contained in the centralizer algebras, the Temperley-Lieb standard invariant is always contained within the standard invariant of a finite index subfactor. Hence each subfactor planar algebra has a canonical Temperley-Lieb planar subalgebra.

In [Pop93], for every index greater than 4, Popa found a (non-hyperfinite) subfactor whose standard invariant is only Temperley-Lieb, and his methods led to his famous subfactor reconstruction theorem [Pop95]. An important open question is to determine for which indices greater than 4 there is a hyperfinite subfactor whose standard invariant is Temperley-Lieb.

The main motivation for this article is the following question.

Question 1.1. *For infinite index subfactors, what is the simplest possible standard invariant?*

When the index is infinite, one still has a Jones tower $(A_n)_{n \geq 0}$ of type II factors, but A_n is type II_∞ for $n \geq 2$ (see Section 5.2). In this case, Burns showed in [Bur03] that the odd canonical trace-preserving operator-valued weight $T_{2n+1} : A_{2n+1} \rightarrow A_{2n}$ is a conditional expectation, which results in an odd Jones projection $e_{2n+1} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n+1}$. We immediately see that $\dim(\mathcal{Q}_n) \geq n$, since the abelian algebra generated by the odd Jones projections is contained in \mathcal{Q}_n . However, the odd Jones projections actually give us non-abelian structure as well.

Theorem 1.2. *The odd Jones projections are equivalent in \mathcal{Q}_n . Hence \mathcal{Q}_n is not abelian for $n \geq 2$.*

We prove this result in more generality for the case of a II_1 -factor bimodule ${}_A H_A$ containing a distinguished central vector ζ , so $\mathcal{P}_n \neq (0)$. This is the natural analog of the bimodule $H = L^2(A_1)$ with distinguished A_0 -central vector $\hat{1}$. We give the odd Jones projections for such bimodules in Section 6.

1.3 GICAR and planar rook algebras and categories

The Temperley-Lieb algebras appear implicitly in Lieb's ice-type model in statistical mechanics [Lie67, TL71], [Jon11, Section 2.5]. The canonical algebra generated by the odd Jones projections together with the partial isometries witnessing the equivalences is actually another well-studied canonical operator algebra which arises in the study of fermions.

Theorem 1.3. *The gauge-invariant canonical anticommutation relations algebra $\text{GICAR}(\mathcal{H}_n)$ (also known as the fermion algebra) where $\dim(\mathcal{H}_n) = n$ is represented faithfully in \mathcal{Q}_n as the odd Jones projections and the partial isometries between them.*

For finite index subfactors, this map was constructed by Connes and Evans in their work on representations of the Virasoro algebra [CE89]. Our map is the bimodule analog, which is independent of von Neumann dimension.

In fact, there is a simple proof of the existence of such an injection, although further analysis is needed to show the image is correct. Our distinguished A -central vector $\zeta \in H$ yields an $A - A$ bimodule isomorphism $H \cong L^2(A) \oplus K$ where $L^2(A) \cong \overline{A\zeta}^{\|\cdot\|^2}$ and $K \cong \{\zeta\}^\perp$. By the binomial theorem,

$$\bigotimes_A^n H \cong (L^2(A) \oplus K)^{\otimes_{A^n}} \cong \bigoplus_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} K^j$$

where $K^0 = L^2(A)$, and $K^j = \bigotimes_A^j K$. The obvious intertwiners amongst the $\binom{n}{j}$ copies of K^j give a canonical inclusion


$$\bigoplus_{j=0}^n M_{\binom{n}{j}}(\mathbb{C}) \hookrightarrow \text{End}_{A-A} \left(\bigotimes_A^n H \right).$$

The left hand side above is isomorphic to $\text{GICAR}(\mathcal{H}_n)$.

We compute our map explicitly in Section 6.1, and we show it is compatible with the towers $\text{GICAR}(\mathcal{H}_\bullet) = (\text{GICAR}(\mathcal{H}_n))_{n \geq 0}$ and \mathcal{Q}_\bullet , along with their standard representations. The GICAR tower arises from choosing an orthonormal basis (ξ_n) of an infinite dimensional separable \mathcal{H} , and setting $\mathcal{H}_n = \text{span}\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n\}$. Again, we do so in more generality:


Theorem 1.4. *The tower $\text{GICAR}(\mathcal{H}_\bullet)$ fits naturally into a “rectangular” $*$, \otimes -category RG which acts faithfully as $A - A$ bimodule maps amongst the H^n 's. This action extends the faithful representation from Theorem 1.3.*

For a finite index subfactor, the image of Connes and Evans' map, which is also the map from Theorem 1.3, consists of the Kauffman diagrams in the Temperley-Lieb algebra with only shaded caps and cups [CE89, Lemma 4.2, Theorem 4.3]. Contracting shaded regions, we obtain a diagrammatic algebra which also appears in the literature as the planar rook algebra (see Section 2.2).



The representation theory of these diagrammatic algebras was studied in [FHH09], where they showed the Bratteli diagram for the tower of algebras resulting from the right inclusion is Pascal's Triangle. Of course this also follows from the isomorphism with the tower of GICAR algebras (see Sections 2.1, 3.1, and 4.1), and we get a diagrammatic representation of the infinite dimensional GICAR algebra in Section 4.1. We remark that Bigelow-Ramos-Yi showed that the Jones and Alexander polynomials can be recovered via traces on the planar rook algebras [BRY12].

Just as there is an annular version of the Temperley-Lieb category, there is an annular GICAR category \mathbf{AG} , which contains the rectangular GICAR category \mathbf{RG} .



Diagrams in \mathbf{AG} are obtained from diagrams in \mathbf{RG} by tensoring the morphisms with themselves around the outside, i.e., gluing the rectangles into annuli, and then allowing for rotation. This has two consequences:

- (1) \mathbf{AG} is no longer a tensor category, and
- (2) \mathbf{AG} must act on the spaces obtained from the H^n 's by tensoring themselves on the outside, i.e., the invariant vectors of the bimodules.

Using the Burns rotations studied in [Pen13], we get the following theorem:

Theorem 1.5. *There is an action of the annular GICAR category \mathbf{AG} as maps amongst the sequence of central L^2 -vectors \mathcal{P}_\bullet .*

However, this action is not necessarily faithful, and there are subfactor examples where it is completely degenerate. This is in stark contrast to the finite index case, where the action of the annular Temperley-Lieb category is never degenerate. In Section 4, we compute the representation theory of \mathbf{RG} and \mathbf{AG} in the spirit of Graham and Lehrer's cellular algebras [GL96], as was done for the affine and annular Temperley-Lieb categories in [GL98] and [Jon01] respectively.

1.4 Examples

By Theorem 1.3, we see that \mathcal{Q}_n must contain $\mathbf{GICAR}(\mathcal{H}_n)$. In Examples 6.5 and 6.29, we give an example of a II_1 -factor bimodule with a distinguished central vector such that \mathcal{Q}_n is exactly the image of $\mathbf{GICAR}(\mathcal{H}_n)$ and $\dim(\mathcal{P}_n) = 1$ for all $n \geq 0$. However, this example does not come from a subfactor, and at this point, we do not have such an example.

We note that in the subfactor case, $\mathcal{P}_{2n} \cong L^2(\mathcal{Q}_n, \text{Tr}_n)$ [Pen13, Remark 4.27], and the only Hilbert-Schmidt element in \mathcal{Q}_n in the image of $\mathbf{GICAR}(\mathcal{H}_n)$ is the product of all the odd Jones projections, which can be identified with the element $\widehat{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \widehat{1} \in H^n$ (see Example 6.28). In [Pen13] it was shown that when $H = L^2(A_1)$ for the subgroup-subfactor $A_0 = R \rtimes \text{Stab}(1) \subset R \rtimes S_\infty = A_1$, we have $\dim(\mathcal{Q}_n) < \infty$ and $\dim(\mathcal{P}_n) = 1$ for all $n \geq 0$.

1.5 Outline

In Section 2, we give a background on fermionic Fock space and the CAR and GICAR algebras along with planar rook algebras. In Section 3, we define the diagrammatic annular and rectangular planar rook categories and the abstract annular and rectangular GICAR categories, and we show they are respectively equivalent. We then give the classification of the finite dimensional Hilbert space representations of the annular and rectangular categories in Section 4. We give the background necessary for our II_1 -factor bimodule and subfactor representations of these categories in Section 5, and we construct these representations in Section 6.

1.6 Future research

We will continue to search for an example of an infinite index subfactor with the simplest possible standard invariant, or to attempt to show no such example exists.

In the recent article [BDH11], the authors clarify the connection between bifinite Hilbert bimodules and two-sided dualizability. Given an infinite index II_1 -subfactor $A \subset B$, the standard bimodule ${}_A L^2(B)_B$ is finite on only one side, so we have only one-sided duals. In future work, we will clarify the connection between one-sided finite Hilbert bimodules and one-sided dualizability. We will work with an operator-valued index for bimodules over finite von Neumann algebras which may be infinite in several distinct ways. It would be interesting if there were different types of one-sided duals associated to the different flavors of one-sided finite index bimodules.

1.7 Acknowledgements

This work was completed in three installments: while David Penneys visited Vanderbilt University in Spring 2011 (thanks to Dietmar Bisch and Jesse Peterson); while both authors visited Institut Henri Poincaré during the 2011 trimester on von Neumann algebras and ergodic theory of groups actions (thanks to the organizers Damien Gaboriau, Sorin Popa, and Stefaan Vaes); and during the Summer of 2013.

The second author would like to thank Michael Hartglass and James Tener for helpful conversations. David Penneys was supported in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada. Both authors were also supported by NSF DMS grant 0856316 and DOD-DARPA grants HR0011-11-1-0001 and HR0011-12-1-0009.

2 Fermions and planar rook algebras

In this section, we give the background material on fermionic Fock space, the CAR and GICAR algebras, and planar rook algebras.

2.1 Fermions, CAR, and GICAR

We take the following definitions from [Jon10, Chapter 18]. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space.

Definition 2.1. The n -th exterior power of \mathcal{H} is $\Lambda^n \mathcal{H} = p_n \otimes^n \mathcal{H}$, where p_n is the projection given by

$$p_n(\xi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \xi_n) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} (-1)^{\text{sign}(\sigma)} \xi_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \xi_{\sigma(n)}.$$

The fermionic Fock space $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ is given by $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \Lambda^n \mathcal{H}$. Given $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n \in \mathcal{H}$, we set

$$\xi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_n = \sqrt{n!} p_n(\xi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \xi_n).$$

The inner product on $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ is given by

$$\langle \eta_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \eta_n, \xi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_n \rangle = \det \left((\langle \eta_i, \xi_j \rangle)_{i,j} \right).$$

For $f \in \mathcal{H}$, the left creation operator $a(f)$ is given by the unique linear extension of

$$a(f)(\xi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_n) = f \wedge \xi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_n,$$

and its adjoint is given by

$$a(f)^*(\xi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i+1} \langle \xi_i, f \rangle (\xi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{\xi_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_n).$$

Remark 2.2. The wave function of several fermions is antisymmetric, so the exterior power $\Lambda^n(\mathcal{H})$ describes n identical fermions. The fermionic Fock space $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ is used to treat a countably infinite family of fermions.

Definition 2.3. If \mathcal{H} is a complex vector space, the canonical anticommutation relations algebra $\text{CAR}(\mathcal{H})$ is the unital $*$ -algebra with generators $a(f)$ for $f \in \mathcal{H}$ subject to the following relations:

$$\text{The map } f \mapsto a(f) \text{ is linear.} \quad (\text{CAR1})$$

$$a(f)a(g) + a(g)a(f) = 0 \text{ for all } f, g \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (\text{CAR2})$$

$$a(f)a(g)^* + a(g)^*a(f) = \langle f, g \rangle 1_{B(\mathcal{H})} \text{ for all } f, g \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (\text{CAR3})$$

Fact 2.4. There is a unique C^* norm and normalized trace on $\text{CAR}(\mathcal{H})$.

Definition 2.5. Given a $u \in U(\mathcal{H})$, the Bogoliubov automorphism α_u of $\text{CAR}(\mathcal{H})$ is given by $\alpha_u(a(f)) = a(uf)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{H}$.

Definition 2.6. The gauge-invariant canonical anticommutation relations algebra $\text{GICAR}(\mathcal{H})$ is $\text{CAR}(\mathcal{H})^{U(1)}$, where $U(1)$ is the scalars acting by Bogoliubov automorphisms on $\text{CAR}(\mathcal{H})$.


Fact 2.7. Suppose \mathcal{H} is separable and infinite dimensional with a fixed choice of orthonormal basis $(\xi_i)_{i \geq 1}$. Let $\mathcal{H}_n = \text{span}\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n\}$, and define $A_n = \text{CAR}(\mathcal{H}_n)$ and $G_n = A_n^{U(1)} = \text{GICAR}(\mathcal{H}_n)$. We use the abbreviation $a_i = a(\xi_i)$ and $a_i^* = a(\xi_i)^*$ for all $i \geq 1$.

The inclusion $\mathcal{H}_n \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{n+1}$ induces inclusions of algebras $A_n \hookrightarrow A_{n+1}$ and $G_n \hookrightarrow G_{n+1}$. A straightforward calculation (e.g., see [Dav96, Examples III.5.4-5]) shows

$$A_n = C^*\{a_1, \dots, a_n, a_1^*, \dots, a_n^*\} \cong \bigotimes_{k=1}^n M_2(\mathbb{C}) \cong M_{2^n}(\mathbb{C}) \text{ and}$$

$$G_n = \text{span} \{a_{i_k} \cdots a_{i_1} a_{j_1}^* \cdots a_{j_k}^* \mid i_1 < \cdots < i_k, j_1 < \cdots < j_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\} \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^n M_{\binom{n}{k}}(\mathbb{C}),$$

where the inclusion $A_n \hookrightarrow A_{n+1}$ is given by $x \mapsto x \otimes 1$, and the Bratteli diagram for the tower $(G_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is Pascal's triangle.



The following facts are well known about the GICAR algebras. We provide a short proof for the convenience of the reader. Let \mathcal{H} , $(\xi_i)_{i \geq 1}$, \mathcal{H}_n , and G_n be as in Fact 2.7.

Theorem 2.8.

- (1) *The representation of G_n on $\Lambda^k \mathcal{H}_n$ is irreducible.*
- (2) *The left regular representation of G_n breaks up as*

$$G_n \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} \Lambda^k \mathcal{H}_n.$$

Thus the complete list of irreducible representations of G_n is $\{\Lambda^k \mathcal{H}_n \mid k = 0, \dots, n\}$.

- (3) *When restricted to the image of G_{n-1} in G_n ,*

$$\Lambda^k \mathcal{H}_n \cong \Lambda^{k-1} \mathcal{H}_{n-1} \oplus \Lambda^k \mathcal{H}_{n-1},$$

where $\Lambda^{k-1} \mathcal{H}_{n-1} = (0)$ if $k = 0$ and $\Lambda^{k+1} \mathcal{H}_n = (0)$ if $k = n$.

Proof.

- (1) This is straightforward. One can use that any vector of the form $\xi_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \xi_{i_k}$ with $i_1 < \dots < i_k$ and $k \leq n$ generates $\Lambda^k \mathcal{H}_n$ as a G_n -module.
- (2) By Relations (CAR2)-(CAR3), for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, the operators $a_i a_i^*$ are commuting projections. The words in $a_i a_i^*$ and $a_j^* a_j = 1 - a_j a_j^*$ for which all subscripts $1, \dots, n$ appear give the 2^n minimal projections in G_n . Thus there are exactly $\binom{n}{k}$ minimal projections in G_n with exactly k projections $a_j a_j^*$ appearing in the word. For each of these minimal projections p , the left G_n -module $G_n p$ is isomorphic to $\Lambda^k \mathcal{H}_n$ via the map

$$p = \prod_{\ell=1}^k a_{i_\ell} a_{i_\ell}^* \prod_{\ell=1}^{n-k} a_{j_\ell}^* a_{j_\ell} \longmapsto \xi_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \xi_{i_k}.$$

Since minimal projections in a multi-matrix algebra generate equivalent representations if and only if the projections are equivalent, the result follows from Fact 2.7. The last statement follows from the Artin-Wedderburn Theorem.

- (3) We have two invariant subspaces of $\Lambda^k \mathcal{H}_n$ under the action of G_{n-1} , namely

$$\text{span} \{ \xi_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \xi_{i_k} \mid i_1 < \dots < i_k < n \} \text{ and } \text{span} \{ \xi_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \xi_{i_k} \mid i_1 < \dots < i_k = n \}.$$

Both subspaces are irreducible under the action of G_{n-1} as in (1), the latter because G_{n-1} never moves ξ_n . The first is isomorphic to $\Lambda^k \mathcal{H}_n$ since ξ_n never appears, and the second is isomorphic to $\Lambda^{k-1} \mathcal{H}_n$ since we may ignore the ξ_n which never moves. If $k = n$, the first subspace is (0) , and if $k = 1$, G_{n-1} acts as the zero algebra on the second subspace. \square

Remarks 2.9.

- (1) Theorem 2.8 part (3) gives another proof that the Bratteli diagram for the tower $(G_n)_{n \geq 0}$ where $G_0 = \mathbb{C}$ is Pascal's Triangle.
- (2) Remark 4.9 gives a nice diagrammatic description of the representations in Theorem 2.8 part (2).

2.2 Rook monoids and planar rook algebras

Definition 2.10. Let R_n be the set of all $n \times n$ zero-one matrices with at most one entry equal to one in each row and column. Then R_n is a monoid under matrix multiplication. In [Sol02], the author named R_n the rook monoid, since the matrices are in one-to-one correspondence with placements of non-attacking rooks on an $n \times n$ chessboard.

Example 2.11. The rook monoid R_2 consists of the following matrices

$$R_2 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

In [FHH09], a diagrammatic description of the rook monoid was given as follows. Since each matrix in R_n has at most one 1 in each row and column, we can identify it with a bipartite graph on two rows of n vertices such that each node has degree 0 or 1. If the (i, j) -th entry of $x \in R_n$ is 1, then we connect the i -th node on the top row to the j -th node on the bottom row. For example, the matrices in R_2 are identified with the following diagrams:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \downarrow & \bullet \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \downarrow \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \downarrow \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \downarrow & \downarrow \end{pmatrix}$$

Multiplication then corresponds to vertical concatenation of diagrams up to isotopy, where we contract any edge which does not reach the other side, and we delete the middle nodes, e.g.,

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \end{pmatrix},$$

and the adjoint corresponds to vertical reflection

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \longleftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \downarrow \end{pmatrix}^* = \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \downarrow \end{pmatrix}.$$

Definition 2.12. The planar rook monoid [FHH09] P_n consists of the subset of R_n for which the corresponding graphs are planar. For example,

$$P_2 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \downarrow & \bullet \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \downarrow \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \downarrow \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \downarrow & \downarrow \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

The planar rook algebra $\mathbb{C}P_n$ is the complex $*$ -algebra spanned by P_n .

Fact 2.13. The representation theory of $\mathbb{C}P_n$ was classified in [FHH09]. Moreover, it was shown that $\mathbb{C}P_n \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^n M_{\binom{n}{k}}(\mathbb{C})$, and the Bratteli diagram for the tower of algebras $(\mathbb{C}P_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is Pascal's Triangle, where the unital inclusion $\mathbb{C}P_n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}P_{n+1}$ is given by adding a through string on the right:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet & \downarrow \end{pmatrix}$$

Hence the tower $(G_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is isomorphic to the tower $(\mathbb{C}P_n)_{n \geq 0}$.

We give an independently found short proof of the isomorphism of towers in Proposition 3.10 using a notational trick due to Bigelow. After we establish that the towers are isomorphic, we immediately get the representation theory of the $\mathbb{C}P_n$ from the well-known representation theory of the GICAR algebras given in Theorem 2.8. In Remark 4.9, we give a diagrammatic description of these representations in the spirit of Graham and Lehrer’s cellular algebras [GL96].

Remark 2.14. We discovered these diagrams in a completely different way. The Temperley-Lieb diagrams in $TL_{2n}(\delta)$ with only shaded caps and cups are in one-to-one correspondence with the diagrams in P_n . One sees this by contracting the cups and caps to nodes and contracting shaded regions to lines as in Figure 1. To make the multiplication agree on the nose, one must include a factor of δ for each maxima in the Temperley-Lieb diagram. (Note that the number of maxima must equal the number of minima).




Figure 1: TL diagrams with only shaded cups/caps and planar rook diagrams

Note that this is the same map $G_n \rightarrow TL_{2n}(\delta)$ found by Evans and Connes [CE89, Theorem 4.3] without the use of Kauffman diagrams [Kau87]. They showed this map is injective regardless of δ by verifying the minimal projections in G_n (see Proposition 3.10) map to nonzero orthogonal projections in $TL_{2n}(\delta)$. We will show a modification of this map works for infinite index subfactors (see Theorem 6.3).

3 Annular and rectangular GICAR categories

Just as the Temperley-Lieb algebras can be thought of as a category, so can the planar rook algebras. We discuss two realizations of this category, which we show are equivalent: a diagrammatic category, which we call the rectangular planar rook category, and an abstract category via generators and relations, which we call the rectangular GICAR category. We also have the notion of the annular planar rook and GICAR categories, which we show are equivalent.

Along the way, we will take a brief detour to discuss a diagrammatic representation of the GICAR algebra.

Notation 3.1. We denote categories using the sans-serif font $\mathbf{ABC} \dots$. Given a category \mathbf{C} , we write $X, Y \in \mathbf{C}$ to denote X, Y are objects in \mathbf{C} , and we write $\mathbf{C}(X, Y)$ for the space of morphisms from X to Y . If the objects in \mathbf{C} are symbols of the form $[n]$ for $n \geq 0$, we simply write $\mathbf{C}(m, n)$ for $\mathbf{C}([m], [n])$. We further simplify notation by writing \mathbf{C}_n for $\mathbf{C}(n, n)$.

3.1 Annular and rectangular planar rook categories

Definition 3.2. The annular planar rook category \mathbf{AP} is the following small involutive category:

Objects: $[n]$ for $n \geq 0$, and


Morphisms: $\mathbf{AP}(m, n)$ is all \mathbb{C} -linear combinations of isotopy classes of tangles on annuli with decoration as follows.

- There are m marked points on the inner boundary, called the inner points, and n marked points on the external boundary, called the outer points.
- Each marked point is connected to exactly one string. Each string is connected to at least one and at most two marked boundary points. Strings do not intersect. No string may connect two inner points or two outer points. Hence there are three possibilities for strings:
 - (1) A through string connects an inner and an outer boundary point.
 - (2) A cap is a string that only connects to an inner boundary point.
 - (3) A cup is a string that only connects to an outer boundary point.


We draw a dark circle on the end of a non-through string to denote that that end does not attach to another boundary point.

- There is a distinguished interval on each boundary disk, marked by a \star .

Composition: Composition is the \mathbb{C} -linear extension of insertion of annuli, making sure the boundary points line up, as do the distinguished intervals. When we get a floating string (a string connected to no boundary points), we just remove it.



Adjoint: The adjoint is the conjugate-linear extension of flipping the tangle inside out.



Remark 3.3. Unlike the annular Temperley-Lieb category, \mathbf{AP}_n is finite dimensional for all $n \geq 0$ due to the absence of non-contractible closed loops.

We now count the number of annular tangles in $\mathbf{AP}(m, n)$.

Definition 3.4. Let $N(m, n; k)$ be the number of annular tangles in \mathbf{AP}_n with m inner points, n outer points, and k through strings. Let $N(m, n) = \sum_{k=0}^{\min\{m, n\}} N(m, n; k)$.

Remark 3.5. Note that

- $N(m, n; k) = N(n, m; k)$ for all m, n, k , so we only need to count when $k \leq m \leq n$,

- $N(0, n) = 1$ for all $n \geq 0$, and
- $N(m, n; 0) = 1$ for all $m, n \geq 0$.

Lemma 3.6. *If $1 \leq k \leq m \leq n$, then $N(m, n; k) = m \binom{n}{k} \binom{m-1}{k-1}$.*

Proof. Draw an annulus with m inner points and n outer points. Fix the outer \star . There are exactly $\binom{n}{k}$ ways to connect k through strings to the n outer points. Equivalently, there are exactly $\binom{n}{k}$ choices for the cup positions.

Let us examine one of these choices more closely. Look at the first through string connected to an outer point counting clockwise from the outer \star . Follow the through string inward, and put the inner star on the interval to the left of this inner point, so that the region meeting the outer \star meets the inner \star . We now see there are exactly $\binom{m-1}{k-1}$ ways to connect the remaining through strings to the remaining inner points. Equivalently, there are exactly $\binom{m-1}{k-1}$ choices of the cap positions.

Fix such a choice of cap position, which we will call the tangle's initial cap position. Note that given an annular tangle in $\mathbf{AP}(m, n)$, the cup positions and the initial cap positions only depend on the outer \star . Hence we get m distinct tangles as we shift the inner \star clockwise.


In summary, for each of the $\binom{n}{k}$ cup positions and for each of the resulting $\binom{m-1}{k-1}$ initial cap positions, there are m distinct tangles. The formula follows. \square

Remark 3.5 and Lemma 3.6 now prove the following.

Proposition 3.7. *If $1 \leq m \leq n$, then $N(m, n) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^m m \binom{n}{k} \binom{m-1}{k-1}$.*


We will determine the algebra structure of \mathbf{AP}_n at the end of this subsection in Proposition 3.15. We first treat the rectangular planar rook category as a warmup.

Definition 3.8. The rectangular planar rook category \mathbf{RP} is the subcategory of \mathbf{AP} such that $\mathbf{RP}(m, n)$ is the \mathbb{C} -linear combinations of diagrams in $\mathbf{AP}(m, n)$ such that the region meeting the internal \star also meets the external \star . For example,



Each such morphism can be represented by a rectangular tangle rather than an annular tangle as follows. First, cut along a path from the internal \star to the external \star which does not meet any strings. Second, isotope the resulting diagram into a rectangle with lower and upper boundary points so that the inner boundary points of the annulus are now the lower boundary points of the rectangle, and the outer boundary points of the annulus are now the upper boundary points of the rectangle.

Composition of annuli then corresponds to stacking rectangles,






Figure 2: Cutting an annulus to get a rectangle

and the adjoint operation corresponds to vertical flipping of rectangles.

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}}^* = \boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}}$$

Viewing morphisms in \mathbf{RP} as rectangular tangles, we can endow \mathbf{RP} with a tensor structure. The tensor product of objects is $[m] \otimes [n] = [m+n]$, and the tensor product of morphisms is the \mathbb{C} -linear extension of horizontal join.

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}} \otimes \boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}} = \boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \bullet \\ \bullet \bullet \\ \bullet \bullet \end{array}}$$

Remark 3.9. Obviously $\mathbf{RP}_n \cong \mathbf{CP}_n$ by contracting cups and caps and trading the external boundary for nodes at the marked boundary points.

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}} \longleftrightarrow \left(\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \right)$$

We use different diagrams for morphisms in \mathbf{RP}_n than the usual diagrams for P_n to utilize a notational trick of Bigelow (see Definition 3.11).

Proposition 3.10. *As a complex $*$ -algebra, $\mathbf{RP}_n \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^n M_{\binom{n}{k}}(\mathbb{C})$. Moreover, the Bratteli diagram for the tower of finite dimensional algebras $(\mathbf{RP}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ under the right inclusion (adding a through string to the right) is given by Pascal's Triangle.*

Proof. Let $0 \leq k \leq n$. There are exactly $\binom{n}{k}$ diagrams with exactly k through strings in \mathbf{RP}_n . Hence $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbf{RP}_n) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} = 2^n$. However, it is important to note that diagrams with exactly k through strings are not orthogonal to diagrams with exactly j through strings for $j \neq k$. To fix this problem, we make the following definition.

Definition 3.11. As in [Big12, Section 3], we let the dotted strand denote the following morphism in \mathbf{RP}_1 :

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}} = \boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}} - \boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}}.$$

We then have the following relations in \mathbf{RP} :

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}} = 1 \tag{RP1}$$

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}} = \boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}} \tag{RP2}$$

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}} = 0. \tag{RP3}$$

Remark 3.12. Under the identification of these diagrams with those in the Temperley-Lieb category with only shaded cups and caps in Figure 1, the broken strand corresponds to the Jones projection e_1 , and the dotted strand corresponds to the Jones-Wenzl projection $f^{(2)} = 1 - e_1$.

With the use of the dotted strand, we find 2^n minimal orthogonal projections in $\mathbb{R}P_n$ given by the simple tensors composed entirely of

$$\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array} \text{ and } \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

The diagrams with exactly k through strings, all of which are dotted, span a full matrix algebra $M_{\binom{n}{k}}(\mathbb{C})$. Hence $\mathbb{R}P_n$ is isomorphic to the orthogonal direct sum $\bigoplus_{k=0}^n M_{\binom{n}{k}}(\mathbb{C})$.

We now look at the right inclusion $\mathbb{R}P_n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}P_{n+1}$ given by adding a string to the right. Since

$$\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array} + \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array},$$

we see that the right inclusion maps each minimal projection in $\mathbb{R}P_n$ to the sum of exactly two minimal projections in $\mathbb{R}P_{n+1}$. More precisely, each minimal projection in the simple summand corresponding to $M_{\binom{n}{k}}(\mathbb{C})$ maps to the sum of two minimal projections, one in $M_{\binom{n+1}{k}}(\mathbb{C})$, and one in $M_{\binom{n+1}{k+1}}(\mathbb{C})$. Hence the Bratteli diagram is as claimed. \square

Remark 3.13. We give an explicit formula for the resulting isomorphism of towers $(G_n)_{n \geq 0} \cong (\mathbb{R}P_n)_{n \geq 0}$ in Theorem 4.4.

Corollary 3.14. $\dim(\mathbb{R}P_n) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k}^2$.

We now determine the algebra structure of $\mathbb{A}P_n$. The dotted strand will be of great use to us.

Proposition 3.15. *As a complex $*$ -algebra, $\mathbb{A}P_n \cong \mathbb{C} \oplus \bigoplus_{k=1}^n kM_{\binom{n}{k}}(\mathbb{C})$.*

Remark 3.16. Note that we have the identity

$$n \binom{n}{k} \binom{n-1}{k-1} = k \binom{n}{k}^2,$$

so the formula in Proposition 3.15 is consistent with Proposition 3.7.

Proof of Proposition 3.15. Using Bigelow's dotted strand, consider the annular tangles which give minimal projections in $\mathbb{R}P_n$ under the cutting operation in Figure 2. These annular tangles are orthogonal projections in $\mathbb{A}P_n$, but the only one that remains minimal is the one with only broken strings and no dotted through strings. Now given a projection p_k with k dotted through strings, the k powers of the 1-click rotation tangle ρ (see Figure 3) can be compressed by p_k to give k distinct tangles $p_k \rho^i p_k$ for $i = 1 \dots, k$.

Now if ω_k is a k -th root of unity, we get a projection

$$p_k^\omega = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \omega_k^{-i} p_k \rho^i p_k$$




Figure 3: The one click rotation $\rho \in \text{AP}_5$

which lives under p_k . Distinct ω give distinct projections, since $\rho(p_k^\omega) = \omega p_k^\omega$, so p_k splits into k non-zero orthogonal projections. Now using the usual partial isometries from RP_n in annular form, we see that splitting each projection with $k \geq 2$ dotted through strings into k orthogonal summands also splits the corresponding copy of $M_{\binom{n}{k}}(\mathbb{C})$ in RP_n into k copies of $M_{\binom{n}{k}}(\mathbb{C})$ in AP_n , which results in the claimed decomposition. By Remark 3.16, we must have all the minimal projections, since the dimension count agrees with Proposition 3.7. \square

3.2 Annular and rectangular GICAR categories

Definition 3.17. The annular GICAR category AG is the following small involutive category.

Objects: symbols $[n]$ for $n \geq 0$.

Morphisms: The morphisms of AG are \mathbb{C} -linear combinations of the words $*$ -generated by the maps

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i &: [n] \longrightarrow [n+1] \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n+1 \text{ and } n \geq 0 \\ \alpha_i^* &: [n] \longrightarrow [n-1] \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n \text{ and } n \geq 1 \\ \tau &: [n] \longrightarrow [n] \text{ for } n \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

subject to the relations

$$\alpha_i \alpha_{j-1} = \alpha_j \alpha_i \text{ and } \alpha_i^* \alpha_j^* = \alpha_{j-1}^* \alpha_i^* \text{ for all } i < j \quad (\text{AG1})$$

$$\alpha_i^* \alpha_j = \begin{cases} \alpha_{j+1} \alpha_i^* & \text{if } i < j \\ \text{id}_{[n]} & \text{if } i = j \\ \alpha_j \alpha_{i+1}^* & \text{if } i > j \end{cases} \quad (\text{AG2})$$

$$\tau^* = \tau^{-1} \text{ and } \tau^n = \text{id}_{[n]} \quad (\text{AG3})$$

$$\alpha_i \tau = \tau \alpha_{i-1} \text{ and } \alpha_i^* \tau = \tau \alpha_{i-1}^* \text{ for all } i = 2, \dots, n. \quad (\text{AG4})$$

Composition: The composition in AG is the concatenation of words.

Adjoint: The adjoint of a word $w = \ell_1 \dots \ell_n$ where the letters $\ell_k \in \{\alpha_i, \alpha_j^*, \tau\}$ is given by $w^* = \ell_n^* \dots \ell_1^*$.

Remark 3.18. AG is the full subcategory of $\mathbf{a}\Delta$ in [Pen12] generated by $\tau, \alpha_i, \alpha_j^*$, after replacing the α_i 's by the β_{2i} 's appearing there.

Proposition 3.19. *The additional relations*

$$\alpha_1 = \tau \alpha_n \text{ and } \alpha_1^* \tau = \alpha_n^* \quad (\text{AG5})$$

hold in AG.

Proof. By Relations (AG3) and (AG4), we have

$$\alpha_1 = \tau^{n+1}\alpha_1 = \tau^n\alpha_2\tau = \cdots = \tau\alpha_n\tau^n = \tau\alpha_n.$$

Now take adjoints. (Note there is a typo in the proof of this relation in [Pen12, Proposition 3.6.(1)]). \square

Remark 3.20. By the results of [Pen12], there is a $*$ -equivalence of categories $\text{AP} \cong \text{AG}$. We provide a short proof of this fact for the convenience of the reader along the same line of reasoning as [Pen12].

Proposition 3.21. *Suppose $w \in \text{AG}(m, n)$ is a word in the $\alpha_i, \tau, \alpha_j^*$. Then w can be written uniquely in the standard form*

$$w = \alpha_{i_k} \cdots \alpha_{i_1} \tau^r \alpha_{j_1}^* \cdots \alpha_{j_\ell}^*$$

where $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$, $0 \leq r < m - k$, and $j_1 < \cdots < j_\ell$.


In particular, the words in standard form give bases for $\text{G}(m, n)$, and thus $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\text{AG}(m, n)) < \infty$ for all m, n .

Proof. Using Relations (AG1)-(AG5), first push all the α_i 's all the way to the left and all the α_j^* 's all the way the right, leaving the τ 's in the middle. Then use Relation (AG1) to put the α_i 's in decreasing order and the α_j^* 's in increasing order. Finally, use Relation (AG3) to reduce the number of τ 's in the middle. \square


Theorem 3.22. *There is a $*$ -equivalence of categories $\text{AP} \cong \text{AG}$.*

Proof. We construct a $*$ -functor $\Psi : \text{AG} \rightarrow \text{AP}$. First, define $\Psi([n]) = [n]$. Next, we define Ψ on the morphisms $\alpha_i, \tau, \alpha_j^*$.


- $\alpha_i \in \text{AG}(n, n+1)$ maps to the tangle in RP with n inner points, $n+1$ outer points, a cap attached to outer boundary point i , and all other boundary points are connected by through strings so that the region meeting the internal \star also meets the external \star .



- $\alpha_j^* \in \text{AG}(n, n-1)$ maps to $\Psi(\alpha_j^*)^* \in \text{AP}(n-1, n)$.



- $\tau \in \text{AG}_n$ maps to the counter-clockwise one click rotation in AP_n , and $\tau^* = \tau^{-1}$ maps to the clockwise one click rotation.



One sees that these tangles satisfy the relations of AG by drawing the appropriate diagrams.

We define Ψ^{-1} by its \mathbb{C} -linear extension on tangles from AP . Given an annular tangle $T \in \text{AP}(m, n)$, there is a unique r satisfying

$$0 \leq r < \#(\text{through strings of } T)$$

which is the number of through strings to the left of the inner \star that one must cross to get to the region which meets the outer \star . We call this r the relative star position of T . Now, $\Psi^{-1}(T) \in \text{AG}(m, n)$ is the word in standard form

$$\Psi^{-1}(T) = \alpha_{i_k} \cdots \alpha_{i_1} \tau^r \alpha_{j_1}^* \cdots \alpha_{j_\ell}^*$$


where $j_1 < \cdots < j_\ell$ are the positions of the caps of T , r is the relative star position, and $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$ are the positions of the cups of T . That $\Psi^{-1} \circ \Psi = \text{id}_{\text{AG}}$ and $\Psi \circ \Psi^{-1} = \text{id}_{\text{AP}}$ follows immediately. \square

Definition 3.23. The rectangular GICAR category RG is the subcategory of AG such that $\text{RG}(m, n)$ consists of all \mathbb{C} -linear combinations of words w on $\alpha_i, \tau, \alpha_j^*$ such that in the standard form of w afforded by Proposition 3.21, no τ appears, i.e., $r = 0$.


Theorem 3.24. *There is a $*$ -equivalence of categories $\text{RP} \cong \text{RG}$.*

Proof. First, it is clear the functor Ψ constructed in Theorem 3.22 restricts to a $*$ -equivalence $\text{RP} \cong \text{RG}$. In fact,

- $\alpha_i \in \text{RG}(n, n+1)$ maps to the diagram with n lower boundary points, $n+1$ upper boundary points, a cup attached to lower boundary point i , and all other boundary points connected by undotted through strings.



- $\alpha_j^* \in \text{RG}(n, n-1)$ maps to $\Psi(\alpha_j)^* \in \text{RP}(n-1, n)$.



\square

Remark 3.25. We can now pull back the tensor structure on \mathbf{RP} to get a tensor structure on \mathbf{RG} . The tensor product of objects is $[m] \otimes [n] = [m + n]$, and the tensor product of morphisms in standard form

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi &= \alpha_{i_k} \cdots \alpha_{i_1} \alpha_{j_1}^* \cdots \alpha_{j_\ell}^* \in \mathbf{RG}(m_1, n_1) \text{ and} \\ \psi &= \alpha_{i'_k} \cdots \alpha_{i'_1} \alpha_{j'_1}^* \cdots \alpha_{j'_{\ell'}}^* \in \mathbf{RG}(m_2, n_2)\end{aligned}$$

is given by

$$\varphi \otimes \psi = \alpha_{i'_k+n_1} \cdots \alpha_{i'_1+n_1} \alpha_{i_k} \cdots \alpha_{i_1} \alpha_{j_1}^* \cdots \alpha_{j_\ell}^* \alpha_{j'_1+m_1}^* \cdots \alpha_{j'_{\ell'}+m_1}^* \in \mathbf{RG}(m_1 + m_2, n_1 + n_2).$$

With this tensor structure, the functor Ψ in Theorem 3.24 is a $*$, \otimes -functor.

4 Representation theory of the GICAR categories

We now compute the representation theory of the GICAR categories $\mathbf{RG} \cong \mathbf{RP}$ and $\mathbf{AG} \cong \mathbf{AP}$ in the spirit of Graham and Lehrer's theory of cellular algebras [GL96, GL98].

4.1 A diagrammatic representation of the GICAR algebra

We first give a diagrammatic description of the GICAR algebra acting on fermionic Fock space using the diagrams from \mathbf{RP} so that we may use Bigelow's dotted strand (Definition 3.11). These diagrams implicitly appear in [CE89], while our diagrams for fermionic Fock space arise from the cellular structure in the spirit of [GL96, GL98].

Our diagrammatic representation of $\mathbf{GICAR}(\mathcal{H})$ relies on choosing an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} . This should neither surprise nor worry the reader for the following reason. Recall from Fact 2.7 that we must choose an orthonormal basis to show that $\mathbf{CAR}(\mathcal{H}) \cong \bigotimes_{\infty} M_2(\mathbb{C})$ and to show that the Bratteli diagram for the tower of algebras $(G_n = A_n^{U(1)})_{n \geq 0}$ is given by Pascal's Triangle. Since our diagrams in \mathbf{RP} are equivalent to those for the \mathbf{CP}_n 's, we are relying on the AF structure of $\mathbf{GICAR}(\mathcal{H})$, which relies on the choice of basis.

Suppose \mathcal{H} is a separable, infinite dimensional Hilbert space with a fixed choice of orthonormal basis $(\xi_i)_{i \geq 1}$. Define $\mathcal{H}_n = \text{span}\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n\}$. We use the abbreviations $a_i = a(\xi_i)$ and $a_j^* = a(\xi_j)^*$. Recall the following facts about fermionic Fock space and the GICAR algebra.

Facts 4.1.

- (1) An orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ is given by symbols of the form $\xi_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_{i_n}$ for $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_n$ together with the vacuum vector Ω .
- (2) By [CE89, Lemma 2.2], $\mathbf{GICAR}(\mathcal{H}_n)$ has a presentation as a $*$ -algebra with generators f_i for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and u_i for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and relations:

$$f_i = f_i^* = f_i^2 \tag{G1}$$

$$[f_i, f_j] = 0 \text{ if } j \neq i \tag{G2}$$

$$[u_i, f_j] = 0 \text{ if } j \neq i, i+1 \tag{G3}$$

$$[u_i, u_j] = [u_i, u_j^*] = 0 \text{ if } |i - j| \geq 2 \tag{G4}$$

$$u_i^* u_i = f_{i+1}(1 - f_i) \text{ and } u_i u_i^* = f_i(1 - f_{i+1}) \tag{G5}$$

The isomorphism is given by $f_i \mapsto a_i^* a_i$ and $u_i \mapsto a_i^* a_{i+1}$.

We now construct a diagrammatic Hilbert space \mathcal{D}_n on which we represent RP_n . We then give a spatial isomorphism $\Theta_n : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_n$ and a $*$ -isomorphism of algebras $\theta_n : G_n \rightarrow \text{RP}_n$ which intertwines the actions, i.e., for all $\eta, \zeta \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_n)$ and all $x, y \in G_n$, we have

$$\langle \eta, \zeta \rangle_{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_n)} = \langle \Theta_n(\eta), \Theta_n(\zeta) \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_n}, \quad (\text{D1})$$

$$\theta_n(xy^*) = \theta_n(x)\theta_n(y)^*, \text{ and} \quad (\text{D2})$$

$$\Theta_n(x\eta) = \theta_n(x)\Theta_n(\eta) \quad (\text{D3})$$

Definition 4.2. For $n \geq 0$, let \mathcal{D}_n be the complex span of diagrams in RP with n top boundary points, at most n bottom boundary points, and no caps, such that all through strings are dotted. Define an inner product on \mathcal{D}_n by declaring the diagrammatic basis of RP to be orthonormal. Let RP_n act on \mathcal{D}_n by the usual composition of maps in RP .

Definition 4.3. We define $\Theta_n : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_n$ as follows. Let $\Theta_n(\xi_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_{i_k})$ where $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$ and $k \leq n$ be the diagram with n upper boundary points, $n - k$ lower boundary points, cups in the i_ℓ -th positions for all $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, and all other strings are dotted through strings. For example, when $k \leq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &\mapsto \boxed{\begin{array}{c} n \\ \dots \\ \bullet \end{array}}, \\ \xi_i &\mapsto \boxed{\begin{array}{c} i \quad n \\ \dots \bullet \dots \bullet \end{array}}, \text{ and} \\ \xi_i \wedge \xi_j &\mapsto \boxed{\begin{array}{c} i \quad j \quad n \\ \dots \bullet \dots \bullet \dots \bullet \end{array}} \text{ for } i < j. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.4. Define the map $\theta_n : G_n \rightarrow \text{RP}_n$ by

$$a_i^* a_i \mapsto \boxed{\begin{array}{c} i \quad n \\ \dots \bullet \dots \bullet \end{array}}, \text{ and } a_i^* a_{i+1} \mapsto \boxed{\begin{array}{c} i \quad n \\ \dots \bullet \bullet \dots \bullet \end{array}}.$$

Then Θ_n and θ_n satisfy Equations (D1)-(D3).

Proof. First, Equation (D1) holds since Θ_n is a spatial isomorphism which maps an orthonormal basis to an orthonormal basis. Second, by verifying that Relations (G1)-(G5) hold for $f_i = \theta_n(a_i^* a_i)$ and $u_i = \theta_n(a_i^* a_{i+1})$, we see that θ_n is an injective $*$ -algebra homomorphism, since $\dim(G_n) = \dim(\text{RP}_n)$ by Proposition 3.10.

It remains to show Equation (D3). Since Relations (D1)-(D2) hold, it suffices to verify Equation (D3) when x is one of $a_i^* a_i, a_i^* a_{i+1}$, and η is of the form $\xi_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_{i_k}$ where $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$. Clearly

$$\begin{aligned} a_i^* a_i(\xi_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_{i_k}) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \\ \xi_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_{i_k} & \text{otherwise, and} \end{cases} \\ a_i^* a_{i+1}(\xi_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_{i_k}) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \text{ and} \\ & i + 1 \in \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \\ \xi_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{\xi}_i \wedge \xi_{i+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_{i_k} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The rest is straightforward using Relations (RP1)-(RP3). \square

Remark 4.5. There is an easy graphical description of the inner product. If η, ζ are single diagrams in \mathcal{D}_n , we look at the composite $\zeta^*\eta$ in RP , which is well-defined since η, ζ both have n top boundary points. We then use Relations (RP1)-(RP3). If we get a non-zero composite, then $\zeta^*\eta$ consists of only dotted through strings. Thus it must be the case that $\eta = \zeta$, since the cap positions must agree, and $\langle \eta, \zeta \rangle = 1$. We leave it to the reader to extend this discussion to a formal definition of the graphical inner product.

Remark 4.6. The following diagram commutes where the maps $G_n \rightarrow G_{n+1}$ and $\mathcal{H}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{n+1}$ are the usual inclusions, the map $\text{RP}_n \rightarrow \text{RP}_{n+1}$ is the right inclusion, and the map $\mathcal{D}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{n+1}$ is adding a dotted through string on the right.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
G_n & \xrightarrow{\quad} & G_{n+1} & & \\
\downarrow \theta_n & \searrow & \downarrow \theta_{n+1} & \searrow & \\
& B(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_n)) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & B(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_{n+1})) & \\
& \downarrow \text{Ad}(\Theta_n) & & \downarrow \text{Ad}(\Theta_{n+1}) & \\
\text{RP}_n & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{RP}_{n+1} & & \\
& \downarrow & \downarrow & & \\
& B(\mathcal{D}_n) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & B(\mathcal{D}_{n+1}) &
\end{array}$$

Example 4.7. We have the following diagrammatic representation of G_3 on $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_3)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{RP}(3, 3) &= C^* \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array} \right\} \text{ and} \\
\mathcal{D}_3 &= \text{span} \left\{ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

However, note that we need a linear combination of diagrams to represent $a_1 a_3^*$ and $a_3 a_1^*$. Using Relations (CAR2)-(CAR3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1 a_3^* &= a_1 a_2^* a_2 a_3^* + a_1 a_2 a_2^* a_3^* = a_1 a_2^* a_2 a_3^* + a_2 a_1 a_3^* a_2^* = a_1 a_2^* a_2 a_3^* - a_2 a_3^* a_1 a_2^* \\
&\mapsto \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \\ \hline \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}.
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.8. At this point, we do not know if it is possible to use these diagrams or similar ones to represent $\text{CAR}(\mathcal{H})$ on $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$. One might be tempted to define a_1 by a cup in the first position on the top. In order for a_1 to kill ξ_1 , we must connect a dotted string to the first lower point. However, if this dotted string connected to upper point i , the image of a_1 would never contain an antisymmetric tensor containing a ξ_i , which is absurd.

Remark 4.9. We now get a nice diagrammatic description of the representations given in Theorem 2.8 part (2). There are exactly $\binom{n}{k}$ minimal projections in RP_n with exactly k through strings, all of

which are dotted. Each of these minimal projections p generates a copy of $\Lambda^{n-k}\mathcal{H}_n$ as $\mathbb{R}P_n p$, where we ignore the bottom of the broken strands. For example, if we have the minimal projection with k broken strings on the left and $n - k$ dotted through strings on the right,

$$\mathbb{R}P_n \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet \\ \hline \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet \\ \hline \end{array} \right) \cong \mathbb{R}P_n \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet \\ \hline \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet \\ \hline \end{array} \right) \cong G_n(\xi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_k) = \Lambda^k \mathcal{H}_n.$$

It would also be interesting to describe these representations using a unitary version of Graham and Lehrer's theory of cellular algebras [GL96, GL98].

4.2 Representations of small involutive categories

We now discuss the representation theory of small involutive categories, where for simplicity, we work with finite dimensional complex Hilbert spaces. Our treatment is along the lines of [Jon01, Sections 2-3]. We provide proofs for completeness.

Definition 4.10. Suppose \mathbf{C} is a small involutive category whose hom spaces are finite dimensional complex vector spaces. A Hilbert \mathbf{C} -module is a $*$ -functor $V : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Hilb}$, the category of finite dimensional Hilbert spaces and linear maps. We denote $V(n)$ by V_n for $n \in \mathbf{C}$, and we just use the notation c for $V(c) \in B(V_m, V_n)$ when $c \in \mathbf{C}(m, n)$. This means for all $\xi \in V_m$ and $\eta \in V_n$, we have

$$\langle c\xi, \eta \rangle_{V_n} = \langle \xi, c^*\eta \rangle_{V_m}.$$

Remark 4.11. Sometimes one defines a \mathbf{C} -module as a functor originating in \mathbf{C}^{op} , e.g., simplicial sets are functors $\Delta^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$. Since \mathbf{C} is involutive, $\mathbf{C} \cong \mathbf{C}^{\text{op}}$ via the involution, so we just use covariant functors.

Definition 4.12. We call a Hilbert \mathbf{C} -module

- indecomposable if it cannot be written as the direct sum of two non-trivial orthogonal submodules, or
- irreducible if it has no proper submodules, i.e., any non-zero element in V_m for any m generates all of V .

Lemma 4.13. *Suppose V is a Hilbert \mathbf{C} -module. Then V is irreducible if and only if V is indecomposable.*

Proof. Suppose V is indecomposable, and let $\xi \in V_n$ for some $n \in \mathbf{C}$. Define Hilbert \mathbf{C} -modules W, W^\perp by $W_m = \mathbf{C}(m, n)\xi$ and W_m^\perp is the usual orthogonal complement for all $m \geq 0$. Then $V = W \oplus W^\perp$, so W^\perp must be the zero module, i.e., $W_m = V_m$ for all m . Thus V is irreducible.

Suppose now that V is irreducible, and suppose $V = W \oplus X$ for orthogonal Hilbert \mathbf{C} -modules W and X . Suppose $\xi \in W_m$ is non-zero for some $m \in \mathbf{C}$. Let $\eta \in X_n$. Then for all $c \in \mathbf{C}(m, n)$, we have $\langle c\xi, \eta \rangle_{V_n} = 0$, but $\mathbf{C}(m, n)\xi = V_n$, so $\eta = 0$. Hence X is the zero module, and V is indecomposable. \square

Lemma 4.14. *Suppose V is a Hilbert \mathbf{C} -module. Suppose W_m and X_m are orthogonal $\mathbf{C}(m, m)$ -invariant subspaces of V_m . Then $\mathbf{C}(W)$ is orthogonal to $\mathbf{C}(X)$.*

Proof. If $\xi = c_1\xi_0$ for some $c_1 \in \mathbf{C}(m, n)$ and $\xi_0 \in W_m$, and $\eta = c_2\eta_0$ for some $c_2 \in \mathbf{C}(m, n)$ and $\eta_0 \in X_m$, then

$$\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_{V_n} = \langle c_1\xi_0, c_2\eta_0 \rangle_{V_n} = \langle c_2^*c_1\xi_0, \eta_0 \rangle_{V_m} = 0$$

since $c_2^*c_1 \in \mathbf{C}(m, m)$ and W_m is $\mathbf{C}(m, m)$ -invariant. \square

Lemma 4.15. *Suppose $W \subset V_m$ is an irreducible $\mathbf{C}(m, m)$ -module for some m . Then $W_n = \mathbf{C}(W)_n$ is irreducible for all n .*

Proof. Suppose $\xi \in W_n$ is nonzero, and let $\eta \in W_n$ be another vector. Write $\xi = c_1\xi_0$ and $\eta = c_2\eta_0$ for $\eta_0, \xi_0 \in W$ and $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbf{C}(m, n)$. Then $c_1^*\xi = c_1^*c_1\xi_0 \in W$ is non-zero, so there is a $c_3 \in \mathbf{C}(m, m)$ with $c_3c_1^*\xi = \eta_0$. Then $c_2c_3c_1^*\xi = \eta$, and W_n is irreducible. \square

Assumption 4.16. We now assume that our Hilbert \mathbf{C} -module V satisfies the following generating property:

- For any two objects $m, n \in \mathbf{C}$ such that $V_m, V_n \neq (0)$, the image of $\mathbf{C}(m, n)$ in $B(V_m, V_n)$ contains a non-zero map.

Lemma 4.17. *The following are equivalent.*

- (1) V_m is an irreducible $\mathbf{C}(m, m)$ -module for all m , and
- (2) V is irreducible.

Proof.

(1) \Rightarrow (2): Suppose $\xi \in V_m$ and $\eta \in V_n$ are nonzero. There is a nonzero map $c_2 \in \mathbf{C}(m, n)$ by Assumption 4.16, so there is an $\zeta \in V_m$ such that $c_2\zeta \in V_n \setminus \{0\}$. Since V_m is irreducible, there is a $c_1 \in \mathbf{C}(m, m)$ such that $c_1\xi = \zeta$. Since V_n is irreducible, there is a $c_3 \in \mathbf{C}(n, n)$ such that $\eta = c_3c_2\zeta = c_3c_2c_1\xi$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1): We prove the contrapositive. Suppose V_m has a non-zero proper $\mathbf{C}(m, m)$ -module W_m for some m . Since $\mathbf{C}(m, m)$ acts as a $*$ -algebra of bounded operators on V_m , W_m^\perp is also a non-zero proper submodule of V_m . Applying \mathbf{C} to W_m and W_m^\perp yields two proper \mathbf{C} -submodules of V which are orthogonal by Lemma 4.14. \square

Assumption 4.18. We now assume that the objects of \mathbf{C} are the symbols $[n]$ for $n \geq 0$, which come with the usual total order on $\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Moreover, we assume that for $m \leq n$, there is a monomorphism in $\mathbf{C}(m, n)$, so that Assumption 4.16 is satisfied.

Example 4.19. The (annular) Temperley-Lieb and the (annular) GICAR categories satisfy Assumption 4.18.

Definition 4.20. The weight $\text{wt}(V)$ of a \mathbf{C} -module V is the least number n such that V_n is non-zero. Elements of $V_{\text{wt}(V)}$ are called lowest weight vectors.

Proposition 4.21. *Every Hilbert \mathbf{C} -module has a canonical decomposition as an orthogonal direct sum of irreducible Hilbert \mathbf{C} -modules.*

Proof. First decompose $V_{\text{wt}(V)}$ into an orthogonal direct sum of irreducible $\mathbb{C}_{\text{wt}(V)}$ -modules. The direct summands generate irreducible \mathbb{C} -modules by Lemmas 4.15 and 4.17, all of which are mutually orthogonal by 4.14. The orthogonal complement of these \mathbb{C} -modules have higher weight, so we are finished by an induction argument. \square

Lemma 4.22. *If V, W are two Hilbert \mathbb{C} -modules with V irreducible, and $\theta : V_m \rightarrow W_m$ is a non-zero homomorphism of \mathbb{C}_m -modules, then θ extends uniquely to an injective homomorphism Θ of Hilbert \mathbb{C} -modules.*

Proof. Suppose $\xi \in V_n$. Then $\xi = a\eta$ for some $a \in \mathbb{C}(m, n)$ and $\eta \in V_m$ since V is irreducible. We claim $\Theta(\xi) = c\theta(\eta)$ gives a well-defined map of \mathbb{C} -modules. If $\xi = b\eta$ for another $b \in \mathbb{C}(m, n)$, then for any $c \in \mathbb{C}(m, n)$ and $\zeta \in V_m$, we have

$$\langle a\theta(\eta), c\zeta \rangle_{V_n} = \langle c^* a\theta(\eta), \zeta \rangle = \langle \theta(c^* b\eta), \zeta \rangle = \langle c^* b\theta(\eta), \zeta \rangle = \langle b\theta(\eta), c\zeta \rangle,$$

so $a\theta(\eta) = b\theta(\eta)$, so Θ is well-defined. By construction Θ is a \mathbb{C} -module map, and it is injective since V is irreducible. The uniqueness of the extension Θ of θ is obvious. \square

4.3 The representation theory of $\text{AG} \cong \text{AP}$

Since the annular GICAR category $\text{AG} \cong \text{AP}$ satisfies Assumption 4.16, the lemmas from the last subsection apply, and we easily obtain the complete classification of the representations of $\text{AG} \cong \text{AP}$. We work with AP so we can work modulo the ideal of diagrams without the maximal number of through strings. We give two equivalent constructions of the irreducible modules; the first follows the technique of [Jon01], and the second uses the algebra decomposition of AP_k given in Proposition 3.15.

Notation 4.23. We identify the maps $\alpha_i, \alpha_j^*, \tau \in \text{AG}$ with their images in AP under the equivalence Ψ given in Theorem 3.22.

Definition 4.24. Let $\text{Al}(k, m)$ be the space spanned by tangles in $\text{AP}(k, m)$ with fewer than k through strings, so $\text{Al}(k, m) = (0)$ if $m < k$. We will use the usual abbreviation $\text{Al}_k = \text{Al}(k, k)$. Note that Al_k has codimension k in AP_k , and $\text{AP}_k/\text{Al}_k \cong \mathbb{C}[\tau] \cong \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}/k]$.

Proposition 4.25. *Let V be a Hilbert AP -module, and let W_k be the AP_k -submodule of V_k generated by all the AP -submodules of V with weight less than k . Then*

$$W_k^\perp = \bigcap_{a \in \text{Al}_k} \ker(a).$$

Proof. Suppose $\xi \in W_k^\perp$, and let $a \in \text{Al}_k$. Then a is a linear combination of elements of the form b^*c where $b, c \in \text{AP}(k, m)$ with $m < k$. For any $\eta \in V_k$, we have $b\eta \in V_m$ with $m < k$, $c^*(b\eta) \in W_k$. Hence $\langle a\xi, \eta \rangle = \langle \xi, c^*b\eta \rangle = 0$, and thus $a\xi = 0$.

Suppose $\xi \in \ker(a)$ for all $a \in \text{Al}_k$, and let $\eta \in W_k$. Then η is a linear combination of elements of the form $b\zeta$ where $\zeta \in V_m$ and b a single diagram in $\text{AP}(m, k)$ with $m < k$.

Claim. *There is a diagram $c \in \text{Al}_k$ such that $b = cb$.*

Proof. Let c be the projection in \mathbf{AP}_k corresponding to a projection in \mathbf{RP}_k under the cutting operation in Figure 2 such that c has only non-dotted through strings in the same positions as the (dotted) through strings of b . Clearly $b = cb$, and since $b \in \mathbf{AP}(m, k)$, c has at most $m < k$ through strings, and thus $c \in \mathbf{AI}_k$. \square

By the claim, $\langle \xi, \eta \rangle = \langle \xi, cb\zeta \rangle = \langle c^*\xi, b\zeta \rangle = 0$, and $\xi \in W_k^\perp$. \square

Corollary 4.26. *If V is irreducible of weight k , then V_k descends to an irreducible $\mathbf{AP}_k/\mathbf{AI}_k \cong \mathbb{C}[\tau] \cong \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}/k]$ -module, all of which are one-dimensional.*

Definition 4.27. Since the action of $\mathbf{AP}(m, n)$ on $\mathbf{AP}(k, m)$ can only decrease the number of through strings, the action maps $\mathbf{AI}(k, m)$ to $\mathbf{AI}(k, n)$, and thus the action descends to an action of $\mathbf{AP}(m, n)$ on $\mathbf{AP}(k, m)/\mathbf{AI}(k, m)$. Note that the diagrams of $\mathbf{AP}(k, m)$ with exactly k through strings descend to a basis of $\mathbf{AP}(k, m)/\mathbf{AI}(k, m)$ under the canonical surjection. Hence we may think of the action of $\mathbf{AP}(m, n)$ on $\mathbf{AP}(k, m)/\mathbf{AI}(k, m)$ as the usual action in \mathbf{AP} , except with the rule that if a composite has fewer than k through strings, then we get zero.

Now $\langle \tau \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}/k$ acts on $\mathbf{AP}(k, m)/\mathbf{AI}(k, m)$ by internal rotation, freely permuting the diagrammatic basis, and the internal rotation action commutes with the external $\mathbf{AP}(m, n)$ action. This means $\mathbf{AP}(k, m)/\mathbf{AI}(k, m)$ splits into the eigenspaces of the rotation τ . Let $V_m^{k, \omega}$ be the eigenspace of $\mathbf{AP}(k, m)/\mathbf{AI}(k, m)$ associated to the rotational eigenvalue ω .

Proposition 4.28. $\dim(V_m^{k, \omega}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m < k \\ \binom{n}{k} & \text{if } m \geq k. \end{cases}$

Proof. For $k \leq m$, the action of \mathbb{Z}/k on $\mathbf{AP}(k, m)/\mathbf{AI}(k, m)$ is free, and

$$\dim(\mathbf{AP}(k, m)/\mathbf{AI}(k, m)) = N(k, m; k) = \begin{cases} k \binom{m}{k} \binom{k-1}{k-1} = k \binom{m}{k} & \text{if } k > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } k = 0 \end{cases}$$

by Remark 3.5 and Lemma 3.6. \square

Definition 4.29. Let

$$\xi_k^\omega = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{j=1}^k \omega^{-j} \tau^j \in \mathbf{AP}_k.$$

where Z is a normalization constant to be determined later. Note that $\tau \xi_k^\omega = \omega \xi_k^\omega$, and $\alpha_i^* \xi_k^\omega = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, since it is in $V_{k-1}^{k, \omega} = (0)$.

By Proposition 4.28, a basis for $V_m^{k, \omega}$ is given by $\{\alpha_{i_{m-k}} \cdots \alpha_{i_1} \xi_k^\omega \mid i_1 < \cdots < i_{m-k}\}$. For example, $V_4^{2, \omega}$ has the following diagrammatic basis:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \alpha_2 \alpha_1 \xi_2^\omega \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 2} \\ \alpha_3 \alpha_1 \xi_2^\omega \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 3} \\ \alpha_4 \alpha_1 \xi_2^\omega \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 4} \\ \alpha_3 \alpha_2 \xi_2^\omega \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 5} \\ \alpha_4 \alpha_2 \xi_2^\omega \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 6} \\ \alpha_4 \alpha_3 \xi_2^\omega \end{array} \right\}.$$

Definition 4.30. We define an inner product on $V^{k,\omega}$ as follows. Let tr be a faithful trace on $\text{AP}_k/\text{Al}_k \cong \mathbb{C}[\tau] \cong \mathbb{Z}/n$, and extend tr to AP_k via the quotient map. Given $a, b \in \text{AP}(k, m)$, $b^*a \in \text{AP}_k$, so we define an inner product on AP_m by $\langle a, b \rangle_m = \text{tr}(b^*a)$. It is clear that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ satisfies $\langle ab, c \rangle = \langle b, a^*c \rangle$, and the rotation τ is clearly unitary, so the decomposition into the $V^{k,\omega}$ is orthogonal.

We can now choose the Z in Definition 4.29 to be any scalar for which $\|\xi_k^\omega\|^2 = \langle \xi_k^\omega, \xi_k^\omega \rangle = 1$. We immediately get that the that basis of $V_m^{k,\omega}$ given in Definition 4.29 is orthonormal.

Proposition 4.31. *All inner products in $V^{k,\omega}$ are determined by:*

- (1) $\langle \xi_k^\omega, \xi_k^\omega \rangle = 1$,
- (2) $\alpha_i^* \xi_k^\omega = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, i.e., ξ_k^ω is uncappable, and
- (3) $\tau \xi_k^\omega = \omega \xi_k^\omega$.

Proof. $V_m^{k,\omega}$ is spanned by elements of the form $a\xi_k^\omega$ with a a single diagram in $\text{AP}(k, m)$. Since ξ_k^ω is uncappable, we see that $\langle a\xi_k^\omega, b\xi_k^\omega \rangle$ is zero unless all through strings connected to one ξ_k^ω attach to the other. When ξ_k^ω is not capped off, we use the rotational eigenvector property to end up with some power of ω times $\langle \xi_k^\omega, \xi_k^\omega \rangle$. \square

Proposition 4.32. *Under this inner product, $V^{k,\omega}$ is an irreducible Hilbert AP-module of weight k . Moreover, any irreducible Hilbert AP-module of weight k is isomorphic to some $V^{k,\omega}$.*

Proof. We know $V^{k,\omega}$ is a Hilbert AP-module, since we have exhibited an orthonormal basis. Irreducibility now follows by Lemmas 4.15 and 4.17 since $V^{k,\omega} = \text{AP}(\xi_k^\omega)$.

If W is another irreducible AP-module of weight k , then it is generated by a lowest weight rotational eigenvector vector $\eta \in W_k$ by Lemma 4.17 and Corollary 4.26. Let ω be the rotational eigenvalue, and without loss of generality, assume $\|\eta\|_{W_k} = 1$. Define $\theta : V_k^{k,\omega} \rightarrow W_k$ by $\theta(\xi_k^\omega) = \eta$, which is a non-zero homomorphism of AP_k -modules. By Lemma 4.22, θ extends uniquely to an injective homomorphism $\Theta : V^{k,\omega} \rightarrow W$ which preserves the inner product by Proposition 4.31. It is clear Θ is an isomorphism, as we can construct its inverse similarly. \square

Remark 4.33. We get the following equivalent characterization of $V^{k,\omega}$. Let $\dot{\tau}$ be the dotted rotation operator, e.g.,

Recall from Proposition 3.15 that

$$\text{AP}_k \cong \mathbb{C} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^k jM_{\binom{k}{j}}(\mathbb{C}),$$

where the j matrix algebras of size $\binom{k}{j}$ correspond to the annuli with j dotted through strings. This means that the k powers of $\dot{\tau}$ correspond to k copies of \mathbb{C} .

Define a non-faithful trace tr on AP_k by mapping the minimal projections

$$p_k^\omega = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \omega^{-j} \tau^j \in \text{AP}_k$$

to 1 and mapping all other minimal projections to zero. Then under the usual GNS sesquilinear form $\langle a, b \rangle = \text{tr}(b^*a)$, the minimal projections p_k^ω are orthonormal, and all other minimal projections have length zero. Note that $\tau p_k^\omega = \omega \xi_k^\omega$, and $\alpha_i^* p_k^\omega = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Now we can extend this sesquilinear form to $\text{AP}(k, m)$ as in Definition 4.30, since for any $a, b \in \text{AP}(k, m)$, $b^*a \in \text{AP}_k$. Let V_m^k be the quotient of $\text{AP}(k, m)$ by the radical of the sesquilinear form, so that V_m^k is a Hilbert space, which naturally carries an action of $\text{AP}(m, n)$.

The decomposition of $V_k^k = \text{span}\{p_k^\omega | \omega^k = 1\}$ into orthogonal eigenspaces for the rotation is easy. Set $V_k^{k, \omega} = \text{span}\{p_k^\omega\}$, and let $V^{k, \omega}$ be the irreducible Hilbert AP -submodule generated by p_k^ω . Proposition 4.32 implies this definition is equivalent to the previous definition via the isomorphism which maps p_k^ω to ξ_k^ω .

4.4 The representation theory of $\text{RG} \cong \text{RP}$

We now do the same for $\text{RG} \cong \text{RP}$. The proofs of the propositions in the subsection are similar to the proofs from the last subsection, and they will be omitted.

Notation 4.34. We now identify $\alpha_i, \alpha_j^* \in \text{RG}$ with their image in RP under the restriction of the equivalence Ψ as in Theorem 3.24.

Definition 4.35. Let $\text{RI}_n \subset \text{RP}_n$ denote the ideal generated by the diagrams with fewer than n through strings. Note that RI_n has codimension one in RP_n .

Proposition 4.36. *Let V be a Hilbert RP -module, and let W_k be the RP_k -submodule of V_k generated by all the RP -submodules of V with weight less than k . Then*

$$W_k^\perp = \bigcap_{a \in \text{RI}_k} \ker(a).$$

Corollary 4.37. *If V is irreducible of weight k , then V_k descends to an irreducible $\text{RP}_k/\text{RI}_k \cong \mathbb{C}$ -module, which is one dimensional.*

Definition 4.38. We define the irreducible Hilbert RP -modules V^k using the technique of Remark 4.33. For $k \geq 0$, let

$$p_k = \boxed{\begin{array}{c} k \\ \bullet \cdots \bullet \end{array}} \in \text{RP}_k,$$

and note that $\alpha_i^* p_k = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. Define a sesquilinear form on RP_k by declaring the minimal projection p_k to be a unit vector, and all other minimal projections have length zero. Extend the sesquilinear form to $\text{RP}(k, m)$ as before, and let V_m^k be the quotient of $\text{RP}(k, m)$ by the radical of the form. Then V^k is an irreducible Hilbert RP -module of weight k .

Proposition 4.39. $\dim(V_m^k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m < k \\ \binom{n}{k} & \text{if } m \geq k. \end{cases}$

Proposition 4.40. *All inner products in V^k are determined by:*

- (1) $\langle p_k, p_k \rangle = 1$, and
- (2) $\alpha_i^* p_k = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, i.e., p_k is uncappable.

Proposition 4.41. V^k is the the unique irreducible Hilbert RP-module of weight k up to isomorphism.

Remark 4.42. It would be interesting to fully compute the decomposition of the Temperley-Lieb algebras $TL_n(\delta)$ as irreducible AG and RG-modules. For example, while there is only one Temperley-Lieb module for Temperley-Lieb, there are many GICAR modules. It is well known that the n -th Catalan number counts the number of non-crossing partitions of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Using this fact, we expect to find for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a new low-weight generator corresponding to the partition which includes all $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and to use these elements to decompose the $TL_n(\delta)$ into irreducible modules by applying rotational symmetries. We leave this for another time.

5 Hilbert bimodules and II_1 -subfactors

We now have a brief interlude to introduce the background necessary to construct our II_1 -factor bimodule and subfactor representations of the annular and rectangular GICAR categories.

5.1 Hilbert bimodules

We refer to [Pen13, Section 2] for the background on Hilbert bimodules. We rapidly introduce our notation and conventions.

Notation 5.1.

- A is a II_1 -factor.
- H is an $A - A$ Hilbert bimodule.
- $D({}_A H)$ is the set of left A -bounded vectors.
 - For each $\eta \in D({}_A H)$ the right multiplication operator $R(\eta) : L^2(A) \rightarrow H$ is the unique extension of $\widehat{a} \mapsto a\eta$.
 - On $D({}_A H)$, the A -valued inner product ${}_A \langle \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle = JR(\eta_1)^* R(\eta_2)J \in A$ is A -linear on the left.
 - An ${}_A H$ basis (which exists by [Con80]) is a set of vectors $\{\alpha\} \subset D({}_A H)$ such that

$$\sum_{\alpha} R(\alpha)R(\alpha)^* = 1_H \iff \sum_{\alpha} {}_A \langle \eta, \alpha \rangle \alpha = \eta \text{ for all } \eta \in D({}_A H).$$

- The canonical normal, faithful, semifinite (n.f.s.) trace on $A' \cap B(H)$ is given by $\text{Tr}_{A' \cap B(H)}(x) = \sum_{\alpha} \langle x\alpha, \alpha \rangle$ where $\{\alpha\}$ is any ${}_A H$ basis.

- $D(H_A)$ is the set of right A -bounded vectors.

- For each $\xi \in D(H_A)$ the left multiplication operator $L(\xi) : L^2(A) \rightarrow H$ is the unique extension of $\widehat{a} \mapsto \xi a$.
- On $D(H_A)$, the A -valued inner product $\langle \xi_1 | \xi_2 \rangle_A = L(\xi_1)^* L(\xi_2) \in A$ is A -linear on the right.
- An H_A basis (which exists by [Con80]) is a set of vectors $\{\beta\} \subset D(H_A)$ such that

$$\sum_{\beta} L(\beta)L(\beta)^* = 1_H \iff \sum_{\beta} \beta \langle \beta | \xi \rangle_A = \xi \text{ for all } \xi \in D(H_A).$$

- The canonical n.f.s. trace on $(A^{\text{op}})' \cap B(H)$ is given by $\text{Tr}_{(A^{\text{op}})' \cap B(H)}(x) = \sum_{\beta} \langle x\beta, \beta \rangle$ where $\{\beta\}$ is any H_A basis.

- $H^n = \bigotimes_A^n H$, and we use the convention $H^0 = L^2(A)$.

- For $\eta \in D(H_A^k)$ and $\xi \in D({}_A H^n)$, we denote their relative tensor product in H^{k+n} by $\eta \otimes \xi$.
- For each $\eta \in D({}_A H)$, the right creation operator $R_{\eta} : H^n \rightarrow H^{n+1}$ is the unique extension of $\zeta \mapsto \zeta \otimes \eta$ for $\zeta \in D(H_A^n)$. Its adjoint is given by $R_{\eta}^*(\zeta \otimes \xi) = \zeta_A \langle \xi, \eta \rangle$ for ζ, ξ appropriate bounded vectors.
- For each $\xi_1 \in D(H_A)$, the right creation operator $L_{\xi_1} : H^n \rightarrow H^{n+1}$ is the unique extension of $\xi_2 \mapsto \xi_1 \otimes \xi_2$ for $\xi_w \in D({}_A H^n)$. Its adjoint is given by $L_{\xi_1}^*(\eta \otimes \zeta) = \langle \xi | \eta \rangle_A \zeta$ for η, ζ appropriate bounded vectors.
- If $x \in (A^{\text{op}})' \cap B(H^k)$ and $y \in A' \cap B(H^n)$, the operator $x \otimes_A y \in B(H^{k+n})$ given by the unique extension of $\xi \otimes \eta \mapsto (x\eta) \otimes (y\xi)$ where $\eta \in D(H_A^k)$ and $\xi \in D({}_A H^n)$ is well-defined and bounded, and $\|x \otimes_A y\|_{\infty} \leq \|x\|_{\infty} \|y\|_{\infty}$.

- $B^n = D({}_A H^n) \cap D(H_A^n)$, the simultaneously left and right-bounded vectors, which are dense in H^n [Pop86, Lemma 1.2.2]. Also, we use the convention that $B = B^1$, and we note $B^0 = A$.

Note: In the case that H is obtained from a II_1 -superfactor A_1 of $A = A_0$, B will have a different meaning. However, all statements we make about B will still hold for either definition of B . See Remark 5.5 in Subsection 5.2.

- Fix $\{\alpha\} \subset B$ an ${}_A H$ basis (see Lemma 5.2 below). We have

$$\{\alpha^n\} = \{\alpha_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \alpha_n | \alpha_i \in \{\alpha\} \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n\} \subset B^n$$

is the corresponding ${}_A H^n$ basis, since $R_{\alpha_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \alpha_n} = R_{\alpha_1} \cdots R_{\alpha_n}$. Similarly, we let $\{\beta\} \subset B$ be an H_A basis, and we have the corresponding H_A^n basis $\{\beta^n\} \subset B^n$.

- $C_n = (A^{\text{op}})' \cap B(H^n)$, the commutant of the right A -action on H^n , which has a canonical trace $\text{Tr}_n = \sum_{\beta^n} \langle \cdot \beta^n, \beta^n \rangle$.

- The inclusion $C_n \hookrightarrow C_{n+1}$ is given by $x \mapsto x \otimes_A \text{id}_H$.
- The unique trace preserving n.f.s. operator valued weight $T_{n+1} : (C_{n+1}^+, \text{Tr}_{n+1}) \rightarrow (\widehat{C_n^+}, \text{Tr}_n)$ is given by $x \mapsto \sum_{\beta} R_{\beta}^* x R_{\beta}$.
- $C_n^{\text{op}} = A' \cap B(H^n)$, which has a canonical trace $\text{Tr}_n^{\text{op}} = \sum_{\alpha^n} \langle \cdot, \alpha^n, \alpha^n \rangle$.
 - The inclusion $C_n^{\text{op}} \hookrightarrow C_{n+1}^{\text{op}}$ is given by $y \mapsto \text{id}_H \otimes_A y$.
 - The unique trace preserving n.f.s. operator valued weight $T_{n+1}^{\text{op}} : ((C_{n+1}^{\text{op}})^+, \text{Tr}_{n+1}^{\text{op}}) \rightarrow ((\widehat{C_n^{\text{op}}})^+, \text{Tr}_n^{\text{op}})$ is given by $y \mapsto \sum_{\alpha} L_{\alpha}^* y L_{\alpha}$.
- The standard invariant of H is the sequences of centralizer algebras $\mathcal{Q}_n = C_n \cap C_n^{\text{op}}$ and central L^2 -vectors $\mathcal{P}_n = A' \cap H^n = \{\zeta \in H^n \mid a\zeta = \zeta a \text{ for all } a \in A\}$.
 - The planar calculus of [Pen13] acts on the \mathcal{Q}_n and \mathcal{P}_n . Note that the \mathcal{Q}_n naturally act on the \mathcal{P}_n .
 - Note that $\mathcal{P}_0 = A' \cap L^2(A) = \mathbb{C}\widehat{1}$.

The next lemma was used without proof in [Pen13]; due to its importance, we provide a proof for the convenience of the reader. The proof uses ideas similar to [Pop86, Lemma 1.2.2] and [Bur03, Proposition 3.2.19]. The latter proves this result in the subfactor case (but B has a different meaning - see Remark 5.5).

Lemma 5.2. *There exist ${}_A H$ and H_A -bases which are subsets of B .*

Proof. We show there is a H_A -basis $\{\gamma\} \subset B$, and the other case is similar.

First, let $\{\beta_i\}$ be an orthogonal H_A -basis, so the $L(\beta_i)L(\beta_i)^*$ are projections which sum to 1_H , and $L(\beta_i)^*L(\beta_j) = \langle \beta_i | \beta_j \rangle_A = 0$ if $i \neq j$. This exists by [EN96, Proposition 2.2]. Moreover, $C_1 = \{L(\eta)L(\xi)^* \mid \eta, \xi \in D(H_A)\}''$ by [Con80].

For each i , $T_1(L(\beta_i)L(\beta_i)^*)$ has finite trace, and thus has a spectral resolution

$$T_1(L(\beta_i)L(\beta_i)^*) = \int_0^{\infty} \lambda de_{\lambda}^i.$$

Mimicking [Bur03, Proposition 3.2.19], set $\gamma_{i,1} = e_1^i \beta$ and $\gamma_{i,n} = (e_n^i - e_{n-1}^i) \beta$ for $n \geq 2$. Thus $T_1(L(\gamma_{i,n})L(\gamma_{i,n})^*)$ has norm at most n , and $L(\beta_i)L^2(A) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} L(\gamma_{i,n})L^2(A)$. Moreover, the $\gamma_{i,n}$ are orthogonal, since $L(\gamma_{i,m})^*L(\gamma_{j,n}) = L(\beta_i)^*e_m e_n L(\beta_j)$, which is zero unless $i = j$ and $m = n$. Thus $\{\gamma_{i,n}\}$ is an H_A -basis.

Finally, to show each $\gamma_{i,n} \in D({}_A H)$, for each $a \in A$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|a\gamma_{i,n}\|_H^2 &= \|aL(\gamma_{i,n})\widehat{1}\|_H^2 = \text{tr}_A(L(\gamma_{i,n})^*a^*aL(\gamma_{i,n})) = \text{Tr}_1(aL(\gamma_{i,n})L(\gamma_{i,n})^*a^*) \\ &= \text{tr}_A(aT_1(L(\gamma_{i,n})L(\gamma_{i,n})^*)a^*) \leq n \text{tr}_A(aa^*) = n\|\widehat{a}\|_{L^2(A)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Definition 5.3. H is called symmetric if there is a conjugate-linear isomorphism $J : H \rightarrow H$ such that $J(a\xi b) = b^*(J\xi)a^*$ for all $a, b \in A$ and $\xi \in H$ and $J^2 = \text{id}_H$.

Remark 5.4. If H is symmetric, then for $n \geq 1$, H^n is symmetric with conjugate-linear isomorphism $J_n : H^n \rightarrow H^n$ given by the extension of

$$J_n(\xi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \xi_n) = (J\xi_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes (J\xi_n).$$

for $\xi_i \in B$ for all i . Note that $J_n A J_n = A^{\text{op}}$, $J_n C_n J_n = C_n^{\text{op}}$, and $J_n B^n = B^n$. On $B(H^n)$, we define j_n by $j_n(x) = J_n x^* J_n$. Note that $j_n^2 = \text{id}$ and $\text{Tr}_n = \text{Tr}_n^{\text{op}} \circ j_n$.

If H is not symmetric, then in general, C_n^{op} is not the opposite algebra of C_n , e.g. ${}_{R \otimes 1} L^2(R \otimes R)_{R \otimes R}$ where R is the hyperfinite II₁-factor.

5.2 Arbitrary index II₁-subfactors

Suppose $A = A_0$ is contained in a II₁-factor A_1 . The $A - A$ bimodule $H = L^2(A_1)$ is the motivating example for this paper.

Remark 5.5. In the case that $H = L^2(A_1)$, we no longer use the notation B for $D({}_A L^2(A_1)) \cap D(L^2(A_1)_A)$. Rather, we set $B = A_1$, which is obviously still dense in $L^2(A_1)$. Note that the bi-bounded vectors $D({}_A L^2(A_1)) \cap D(L^2(A_1)_A)$ do not agree with the image of B in $L^2(B)$ when $[B : A] = \infty$. However, all statements we made concerning the B in the previous subsection still apply for $B = A_1$.

We can perform the Jones basic construction to get another type II factor $\langle B, e_A \rangle$, which is type II₁ if and only if $[B : A] < \infty$ [Jon83]. When $[B : A] < \infty$, we can form the Jones tower, and the higher relative commutants form a planar algebra [Jon99], which always includes a Temperley-Lieb planar subalgebra.

When $[B : A] = \infty$, $\langle B, e_A \rangle$ is a II_∞-factor, and we must be more careful. Detailed analysis of this situation was started in [EN96, Bur03], and planar structure was given for the centralizer algebras and central L^2 -vectors in [Pen13]. We rapidly recall the necessary background from [EN96, Bur03].

Definition 5.6. Suppose M is a semifinite von Neumann algebra with n.f.s. trace Tr_M . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{n}_{\text{Tr}_M} &= \{x \in M \mid \text{Tr}_M(x^*x) < \infty\} \text{ and} \\ \mathfrak{m}_{\text{Tr}_M} &= \mathfrak{n}_{\text{Tr}_M}^* \mathfrak{n}_{\text{Tr}_M} = \text{span} \{x^*y \mid x, y \in \mathfrak{n}_{\text{Tr}_M}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose N is a von Neumann subalgebra of M with n.f.s. trace Tr_N . Then by [Haa79], there is a unique trace-preserving n.f.s. operator valued weight $T : M^+ \rightarrow \widehat{N^+}$, the extended positive cone of N . We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{n}_T &= \{x \in M \mid T(x^*x) \in N^+\} \text{ and} \\ \mathfrak{m}_T &= \mathfrak{n}_T^* \mathfrak{n}_T = \text{span} \{x^*y \mid x, y \in \mathfrak{n}_T\}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $A_0 = A \subset B = A_1$ is an infinite index II₁-subfactor. First, recall that A_0, A_1 have normal, faithful, finite normalized traces tr_0, tr_1 respectively, and $\text{tr}_1|_{A_0} = \text{tr}_0$. We have $T_1 = E_1 : A_1 \rightarrow A_0$ is the normal, faithful conditional expectation, which is implemented by the Jones projection $e_1 \in A'_0 \cap B(L^2(A_1, \text{tr}_1))$.

The basic construction of $A_0 \subset A_1$ is A_2 , a type II_∞-factor, and the canonical n.f.s. trace Tr_2 on A_2 satisfies

$$\text{Tr}_2(xe_1y^*) = \text{Tr}_2(L(\widehat{x})L(\widehat{y})^*) = \text{tr}_1(xy^*)$$

for all $x, y \in A_1$. (Note that in the notation of the previous subsection, $A_2 = C_1$, and $\text{Tr}_2 = \text{Tr}_1$.) We form the L^2 -space in the usual way as the closure of $\mathfrak{n}_{\text{Tr}_2}$.

Now the unique trace-preserving operator valued weight $T_2 : A_2^+ \rightarrow \widehat{A}_1^+$ is not a conditional expectation. For $x \in \mathfrak{n}_{T_2} \subset A_2$, we define left creation operators $\Lambda_{T_2}(x) : L^2(A_1) \rightarrow L^2(A_2)$ which commute with the right A_1 -action by $\widehat{y} \mapsto \widehat{xy}$ for $y \in \mathfrak{n}_{\text{tr}_1} = A_1$ which is well-defined and bounded since $xy \in \mathfrak{n}_{T_2} \cap \mathfrak{n}_{\text{Tr}_2}$:

$$\|xy\|_2^2 = \text{Tr}_2((yy^*)^{1/2}x^*x(yy^*)^{1/2}) = \text{tr}_1((yy^*)^{1/2}T(x^*x)(yy^*)^{1/2}) \leq \|T(x^*x)\|_\infty \|y\|_2^2.$$

Moreover, the maps $\Lambda_{T_2}(x)$ satisfy

- $\Lambda_{T_2}(x)^*\widehat{y} = \widehat{T_2(x^*y)}$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{n}_{T_2}$ and $y \in \mathfrak{n}_{\text{Tr}_2}$, and
- $\Lambda_{T_2}(x)^*\Lambda_{T_2}(y) = E_1(x^*y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathfrak{n}_{T_2}$.

To iterate the basic construction, note that the modular conjugation J_2 on $\mathfrak{n}_{\text{Tr}_2}$ extends to an anti-linear unitary. Hence we may define the basic construction by $A_3 = J_2(A'_1 \cap B(L^2(A_2, \text{Tr}_2)))J_2$. It follows from [EN96] that

$$A_3 = \{\Lambda_{T_2}(x)\Lambda_{T_2}(y)^* | x, y \in \mathfrak{n}_{T_2}\}''.$$

The canonical n.f.s. trace Tr_3 on A_3 is given by

$$\text{Tr}_3(\Lambda_{T_2}(x)\Lambda_{T_2}(y)^*) = \text{tr}_1(\Lambda_{T_2}(y)^*\Lambda_{T_2}(x)) = \text{tr}_1(y^*x),$$

and the unique trace-preserving n.f.s. operator valued weight satisfies

$$T_3(\Lambda_{T_2}(x)\Lambda_{T_2}(x)^*) = xx^*.$$

By [Bur03, Section 3.2.1], $\text{Tr}_3|_{A_2^+} = \text{Tr}_2$, so $T_3 = E_3$ is a conditional expectation, which is implemented by a Jones projection $e_3 \in A'_2 \cap B(L^2(A_3, \text{Tr}_3))$.

One continues this process as in [EN96, Bur03] to get a tower of type II factors $(A_n, \text{Tr}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ together with

- the conjugate-linear unitary J_n on $L^2(A_n, \text{Tr}_n)$ extending the adjoint on $\mathfrak{n}_{\text{Tr}_n}$,
- the basic construction

$$A_{n+1} = J_n(A'_{n-1} \cap B(L^2(A_n, \text{Tr}_n)))J_n = \{\Lambda_{T_2}(x)\Lambda_{T_2}(y)^* | x, y \in \mathfrak{n}_{T_n}\}'' ,$$

- the operator valued weights $T_{n+1} : A_{n+1}^+ \rightarrow \widehat{A}_n^+$,
- the left creation operators $\Lambda_{T_n}(x) : L^2(A_{n-1}, \text{Tr}_{n-1}) \rightarrow L^2(A_n, \text{Tr}_n)$ for $x \in \mathfrak{n}_{T_n}$ which commute with the right A_{n-1} action,
- the n.f.s. traces Tr_{n+1} satisfying

$$\text{Tr}_{n+1}(\Lambda_{T_n}(x)\Lambda_{T_n}(y)^*) = \text{Tr}_{n-1}(\Lambda_{T_n}(y)^*\Lambda_{T_n}(x)) = \text{Tr}_{n-1}(y^*x) \text{ for all } x, y \in \mathfrak{n}_{T_n},$$

We have the following facts due to [EN96, Bur03].

Facts 5.7.

- (1) $L^2(A_n) \cong \bigotimes_A^n L^2(B)$ via isomorphisms θ_n (see Subsection 5.3).
- (2) Writing $B^n = \bigotimes_A^n \widehat{B}$ (again, this notation differs from Subsection 5.1), B^n is dense in $\bigotimes_A^n L^2(B)$.
- (3) (Multistep basic construction [EN96]) For $0 \leq k \leq n$, the inclusions $A_{n-k} \subseteq A_n \subseteq A_{n+k}$ are standard, i.e.

$$(\text{id}_k \otimes_A J_{n-k} A_{n-k} J_{n-k})' = J_n (A_{n-k} \otimes_A \text{id}_k)' J_n \cong A_{n+k}.$$

- (4) (Shifts [EN96]) For $0 \leq k \leq n$, we let $j_n(x) = J_n x^* J_n$ for $x \in B(L^2(A_n, \text{Tr}_n))$. Then j_n is an anti-isomorphism of A_{n-k} onto A'_{n+k} . Hence if we compose j_n and j_{n+1} , we get an isomorphism:

$$j_{n+1} j_n (A'_{n-k} \cap A_n) \underset{\text{anti}}{\cong} j_{n+1} (A'_n \cap A_{n+k}) \underset{\text{anti}}{\cong} A'_{n-k+2} \cap A_{n+2}.$$

- (5) (Odd Jones projections [Bur03, Section 3.2.1]) For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{Tr}_{2n} |_{A_{2n-1}^+} = \infty$ and $\text{Tr}_{2n+1} |_{A_{2n}^+} = \text{Tr}_{2n}$. Therefore, $T_{2n+1} : A_{2n+1} \rightarrow A_{2n}$ is a conditional expectation, which gives rise to the odd Jones projection e_{2n+1} .

When we realize A_{2n} acting on $L^2(A_n, \text{Tr}_n)$ from the multistep basic construction, $e_{2n-1} = J_n e_1 J_n$.

Remark 5.8. For $x_1, \dots, x_n \in B$, we write $\widehat{x}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \widehat{x}_n \in B^n$ omitting the subscript A to distinguish between operators and vectors, such as $x \otimes_A \text{id}_1$ and $\widehat{x} \otimes \widehat{1}$ for $x \in B$. One is left multiplication by $x \in B$ on $L^2(B) \otimes_A L^2(B)$, and the other is $\theta_2^{-1}(\widehat{x} \widehat{e}_1)$.

5.3 Identifying the Jones projections

We now identify the Jones projections acting on $\bigotimes_A^n L^2(B)$ via θ_n . We recall Burns' definition of the isomorphisms $\theta_n : \bigotimes_A^n L^2(B) \rightarrow L^2(A_n)$ [Bur03, Section 3.2.2]. Note that our numbering differs from Burns' numbering in that we start with $A_0 \subset A_1$. Also, Burns' definition is more general in that he works with arbitrary type II factors, and he defines a more general set of isomorphisms. We provide a simplified definition for the reader's convenience.

Definition 5.9. The isomorphisms $\theta_n : \bigotimes_A^n L^2(B) \rightarrow L^2(A_n)$ are composites of other known isomorphisms. We define:

- $v_{k+1} : L^2(A_k) \otimes_{A_{k-1}} L^2(A_k) \rightarrow L^2(A_{k+1})$ by $\eta \otimes J_k \xi \mapsto L(\eta) L(\xi)^*$ for $\eta, \xi \in D(L^2(A_k)_{A_{k-1}})$,
- $\iota_k : L^2(A_k) \otimes_{A_k} L^2(A_k) \rightarrow L^2(A_k)$ by $\widehat{x} \otimes \widehat{y} \mapsto \widehat{xy}$ for $x, y \in \mathfrak{n}_{\text{Tr}_n}$,

- $\psi_{k,n} = \left(\bigotimes_{A_k}^{n-1} v_{k+1} \right) \circ \left(\text{id}_k \otimes_{A_{k-1}} \left(\bigotimes_{A_{k-1}}^{n-2} \iota_k^* \right) \otimes_{A_{k-1}} \text{id}_k \right)$ which doubles, regroups, and contracts,

i.e., $\psi_{k,n}$ is the composite map

$$\bigotimes_{A_{k-1}}^n L^2(A_k) \rightarrow \bigotimes_{A_{k-1}}^n \left(L^2(A_k) \otimes_{A_k} L^2(A_k) \right) \cong \bigotimes_{A_k}^{n-1} \left(L^2(A_k) \otimes_{A_{k-1}} L^2(A_k) \right) \rightarrow \bigotimes_{A_k}^{n-1} L^2(A_{k+1}),$$

and

- for $n \geq 2$, $\theta_n : \bigotimes_A^n L^2(B) \rightarrow L^2(A_n)$ by $\psi_{n-1,2} \circ \psi_{n-3,3} \circ \cdots \circ \psi_{2,n-1} \circ \psi_{1,n}$.

Note that θ_n is compatible with $J : \bigotimes_A^n L^2(B) \rightarrow \bigotimes_A^n L^2(B)$ by $\xi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \xi_n \mapsto J_B \xi_n \otimes \cdots \otimes J_B \xi_1$ since the v_{k+1} , ι_k , and $\psi_{k,j}$ are also.

Lemma 5.10. *When we use θ_n to transport the action of A_{2n} to $\bigotimes_A^n L^2(B)$, the Jones projection e_1 maps to $e_1 \otimes_A \text{id}_{n-1}$ and the Jones projection e_{2n-1} maps to $\text{id}_{n-1} \otimes_A e_1$.*

Proof. The result follows from [Bur03, Lemma 3.3.20] and the compatibility of θ_n and J . \square

Proposition 5.11. *When we use θ_n to transport the action of A_{2n} to $\bigotimes_A^n L^2(B)$, then for $1 \leq i \leq n$, we may identify the Jones projection e_{2i-1} with $\text{id}_{i-1} \otimes_A e_1 \otimes_A \text{id}_{n-i}$.*

Proof. We use strong induction on n . The case $n = 1$ is trivial. Suppose the result holds for all $0 \leq i \leq n$. Now use θ_{n+1} to realize the action of A_{2n+2} on $\bigotimes_A^{n+1} L^2(B)$. In the notation of Subsection 5.1, the inclusion $A_{2n} \hookrightarrow A_{2n+2}$ transports to the inclusion $C_n \hookrightarrow C_{n+1}$ which is given by $x \mapsto x \otimes_A \text{id}_1$, so the result is true for all $1 \leq i < n+1$ by the associativity of the relative tensor product of $A - A$ bilinear operators. The result for $i = n+1$ now follows by Lemma 5.10. \square

6 Representations via subfactors and bimodules

The rectangular GICAR category RG acts on tensor powers of a II_1 -factor bimodule which contains a copy of the trivial bimodule. The action of the tensor category RG is compatible with the tensor structure of the tensor category of bimodules. One can imagine that the annular GICAR category AG is obtained from RG by tensoring the morphisms with themselves around the outside, i.e., gluing the rectangles into annuli (the opposite of Figure 2). This no longer leaves us with a tensor category, and thus AG must act on the spaces obtained from the bimodules by tensoring themselves on the outside, i.e., the invariant vectors of the bimodules.

6.1 Rectangular GICAR representations

Let A be a II_1 -factor and let H be a Hilbert $A - A$ bimodule. We assume the following.

Assumption 6.1. Suppose H is not the trivial bimodule, but H contains a distinguished copy of the trivial bimodule, i.e., $H \cong L^2(A) \oplus K$ for a non-zero $A - A$ Hilbert bimodule K .

Remark 6.2. Containing a distinguished copy of the trivial bimodule is equivalent to the existence of a distinguished central L^2 -vector $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_1$ with $\langle \zeta | \zeta \rangle_A = 1_A$. Note that all central L^2 -vectors are automatically $A - A$ bounded. See [Pen13, Sections 3.3-3.4] for more details. For all $A - A$ bounded $\kappa \in K \neq (0)$, we have $\langle \kappa | \zeta \rangle_A = 0$.

Below is the main theorem of this subsection, which is implied by Theorem 6.18.

Theorem 6.3. *There is a faithful $*, \otimes$ -representation of the rectangular GICAR category RG as $A - A$ bimodule maps between the H^n , which is independent of the left and right von Neumann dimension of H .*

Of particular importance is the following corollary, which tells us some basic structure of the centralizer algebras \mathcal{Q}_n .

Corollary 6.4. *The G_n embed faithfully in the centralizer algebras \mathcal{Q}_n , so \mathcal{Q}_n is nonabelian for $n \geq 2$.*

Using the binomial theorem, it is easy to see how the algebras G_n should arise as intertwiners among the H^n . For $n \geq 0$, let $K^n = \bigotimes_A^n K$, where as usual, $K^0 = L^2(A)$. Then we have

$$H^n \cong (L^2(A) \oplus K)^{\otimes n} \cong \bigoplus_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} K^j,$$

and we get a canonical inclusion $G_n \hookrightarrow \text{End}_{A-A}(H^n)$. If K^j is irreducible and distinct for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, then $G_n \cong \text{End}_{A-A}(H^n)$ for all $n \geq 0$.

Example 6.5. Let $\sigma : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \text{Out}(R)$ be an outer action, where R is the hyperfinite II_1 -factor. We denote $\sigma(n)$ by σ^n . Let $K = L^2(A)_\sigma$, where the action is given by $a \cdot \widehat{b} \cdot c = (ab\sigma(c))^\widehat{\cdot}$. Recall that $K^j \cong L^2(A)_{\sigma^j}$ for all $j \geq 0$. Hence each K^j is irreducible and distinct, and $\text{End}_{R-R}(\bigotimes_R^n (L^2(R) \oplus K)) \cong G_n$ for all $n \geq 0$.

Questions 6.6. *Is there such a K ...*

- *which is symmetric?*
- *which is of the form $L^2(B) \ominus L^2(A)$ for a (necessarily infinite index) II_1 -subfactor $A \subset B$?*

With more care, we obtain a faithful representation of the entire rectangular GICAR category RG as $A - A$ bimodule maps among the H^n 's.

Remark 6.7. Recall that $H \cong L^2(A) \oplus K$, where the copy of $L^2(A)$ corresponds to the distinguished central L^2 -vector $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_1$. Note that $L(\zeta) : L^2(A) \rightarrow H$ can be viewed as the inclusion, and $L(\zeta)^* : H \rightarrow L^2(A)$ behaves like the Jones projection for a II_1 -subfactor. More precisely, if $\xi \in B = D({}_A H) \cap D(H_A)$, then $L(\zeta)^* \xi = \langle \zeta | \xi \rangle_A$ defines an element of A .

Notation 6.8. We write $e_A = L(\zeta)^*$ and $e_A^* = L(\zeta)$. Note that e_A, e_A^* are $A - A$ bilinear since $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_1$.

Definition 6.9. Given an $A - A$ bimodule H , we define the rectangular bimodule category $\mathbf{R}(H)$ as the following small involutive tensor category:

Objects: H^n for $n \geq 0$.

Tensoring objects: Connes relative tensor product. Note that $H^m \otimes_A H^n \cong H^{m+n}$. The associators are the unique extensions of the obvious associators on the subspaces of bounded vectors B^n .

Morphisms: For $1 \leq i \leq n$, define the maps $\mathbf{a}_i^* : H^n \rightarrow H^{n-1}$ by the following commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^n & \xleftarrow{\cong} & H^{i-1} \otimes_A H \otimes_A H^{n-i} \\ \mathbf{a}_i^* \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{id}_{i-1} \otimes_A e_A \otimes_A \text{id}_{n-i} \\ H^{n-1} & \xleftarrow{\cong} & H^{i-1} \otimes_A L^2(A) \otimes_A H^{n-i}. \end{array}$$

The horizontal arrows are the associator isomorphisms. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, we define the maps $\mathbf{a}_j : H^n \rightarrow H^{n-1}$ similarly, but replacing e_A with e_A^* . The morphisms of $\mathbf{R}(H)$ are \mathbb{C} -linear combinations of all composites of the $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j^*$. Note that these morphisms are all $A - A$ bimodule maps.

Composition: composition of operators.

Adjoint: adjoint of operators.

We have the following explicit characterization of the maps $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_i^*$.

Proposition 6.10. *The maps a_i, a_i^* are given by the unique extensions of*

$$\mathbf{a}_i(\xi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \xi_n) = \xi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \xi_{i-1} \otimes \zeta \otimes \xi_i \otimes \cdots \otimes \xi_n \quad (\text{creation})$$

$$\mathbf{a}_i^*(\xi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \xi_n) = \xi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \xi_{i-1} \otimes e_A(\xi_i)\xi_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \xi_n \quad (\text{annihilation})$$

where $\xi_j \in B$ for all j .

Proof. Since $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_1$, the right hand side of the first formula is well-defined. Since ξ_j is A -bounded, $e_A(\xi_j) = \langle \zeta | \xi_j \rangle_A$ defines an element of A . Since $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_1$ is A -central, e_A is $A - A$ bilinear, and the right hand side of the second formula is well-defined. The rest is a straightforward calculation. \square

Compare Relations (AG1)-(AG2) and Proposition 3.21 with Proposition 6.11.

Proposition 6.11.

(1) *The words on $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j^*$ satisfy the following relations:*

(i) $\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_{j-1} = \mathbf{a}_j \mathbf{a}_i$ and $\mathbf{a}_i^* \mathbf{a}_j^* = \mathbf{a}_{j-1}^* \mathbf{a}_i^*$ for all $i < j$,

$$(ii) \mathbf{a}_i^* \mathbf{a}_j = \begin{cases} \mathbf{a}_{j+1} \mathbf{a}_i^* & \text{if } i < j \\ \text{id}_n & \text{if } i = j \\ \mathbf{a}_j \mathbf{a}_{i+1}^* & \text{if } i > j \end{cases} \quad \text{and}$$

(iii) $\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_i^* = \text{id}_{i-1} \otimes_A e_A^* e_A \otimes_A \text{id}_{n-i}$ for all $i \leq n$.

(2) *Each word in the a_i, a_j^* has a unique standard form*

$$\mathbf{a}_{i_k} \cdots \mathbf{a}_{i_1} \mathbf{a}_{j_1}^* \cdots \mathbf{a}_{j_\ell}^*$$

where $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$ and $j_1 < \cdots < j_\ell$.

Proof. Straightforward from Proposition 6.10. \square

Comparing (1.iii) in Proposition 6.11 with Proposition 5.11, we make the following definition.

Definition 6.12 (Odd Jones projections). For $1 \leq i \leq n$, define $e_{2i-1} = \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_i^*$.

Corollary 6.13. *For $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, the $\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_j^* \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ witness the von Neumann equivalence of the projections $e_{2i-1}, e_{2j-1} \in \mathcal{Q}_n$. Thus once we know $e_{2i-1} \neq e_{2j-1}$ (which follows from Corollary 6.17), \mathcal{Q}_n is not abelian for $n \geq 2$.*

Proof. By Proposition 6.11,

$$(\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_j^*)(\mathbf{a}_j \mathbf{a}_i^*) = \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_i^* = e_{i-1} \otimes_A e_1 \otimes_A \text{id}_{n-i} = e_{2i-1} \quad \text{and}$$

$$(\mathbf{a}_j \mathbf{a}_i^*)(\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_j^*) = \mathbf{a}_j \mathbf{a}_j^* = e_{j-1} \otimes_A e_1 \otimes_A \text{id}_{n-j} = e_{2j-1}.$$

\square

Remark 6.14. Suppose $H = L^2(B)$ where $A \subset B$ is a II_1 -subfactor. In this case, since $H^n \cong L^2(A_n)$, we have $\mathcal{Q}_n \cong A'_0 \cap A_{2n}$, and the odd Jones projections in Definition 6.12 agree with Burns' odd Jones projections via Proposition 5.11. Thus $A'_0 \cap A_{2n}$ is not abelian for $n \geq 2$.

Lemma 6.15. *There is a $\kappa \in K$ with $\|\kappa\|_K = 1$ such that*

- (1) $\kappa \in D(H_A)$ and $\langle \kappa | \kappa \rangle_A = 1_A$, or
- (2) $\kappa \in D({}_A K)$ and ${}_A \langle \kappa, \kappa \rangle = 1_A$.

Hence the simple relative tensors consisting of only κ 's and ζ 's are well-defined vectors in H^n .

Proof. Since K is a non-zero $A - A$ bimodule, $\dim_{A-}({}_A K) \dim_{-A}(K_A) \geq 1$. Suppose $\dim_{-A}(K_A) \geq 1$, and choose a submodule $M_A \subset K_A$ such that $\dim_{-A}(M_A) = 1$. Then there is a spatial isomorphism $\phi : L^2(A) \rightarrow M$ which intertwines the right A -actions. Let $\kappa = \phi(\widehat{1})$. Then $\kappa \in D(M_A) \subset D(K_A)$, $\phi = L(\kappa)$, and $L(\kappa)^* L(\kappa) = \langle \kappa | \kappa \rangle_A = 1_A$. If $\dim_{A-}({}_A K) \geq 1$, then a similar argument finds a κ such that ${}_A \langle \kappa, \kappa \rangle = 1_A$.

The last assertion follows from the fact that for $n \geq 2$, H^n is the completion of the algebraic tensor product $D(H_A) \odot_A H^{n-1}$ with the inner product $\langle \eta_1 \odot \xi_1, \eta_2 \odot \xi_2 \rangle = \langle \langle \eta_2 | \eta_1 \rangle_A \xi_1, \xi_2 \rangle_{H^{n-1}}$, and similarly for left modules. \square

Proposition 6.16. *Suppose*

$$x = \mathbf{a}_{i_k} \cdots \mathbf{a}_{i_1} \mathbf{a}_{j_1}^* \cdots \mathbf{a}_{j_\ell}^* \in \mathbf{R}(H)(n, n - \ell + k)$$

is in the standard form of Proposition 6.11. Then there are $\xi \in B^n$ and $\eta \in B^{n-\ell+k}$ such that $\langle x\xi, \eta \rangle = 1$ and $\langle y\xi, \eta \rangle = 0$ for all words $y \in \mathbf{R}(H)(n, n - \ell + k)$ on the $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j^$ whose standard form has length at least $\ell + k$.*

Proof. Choose κ as in Lemma 6.15. Let

- $\xi \in B^n$ be the simple relative tensor with ζ 's in positions $j_1 < \cdots < j_\ell$ and κ 's in the other positions, and
- $\eta \in B^{n-\ell+k}$ be the simple relative tensor with ζ 's in positions $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$ and κ 's in the other positions.

Then by Lemma 6.15,

$$\langle x\xi, \eta \rangle = \underbrace{\|\kappa \otimes \cdots \otimes \kappa\|_{H^{n-\ell}}^2}_{n-\ell \text{ vectors}} = 1.$$

Suppose $y \in \mathbf{R}(H)(n, n - \ell + k)$ is a word on the $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j^*$ with $\langle y\xi, \eta \rangle \neq 0$, and write y in standard form

$$y = \mathbf{a}_{i'_{k'}} \cdots \mathbf{a}_{i'_1} \mathbf{a}_{j'_1}^* \cdots \mathbf{a}_{j'_{\ell'}}^*.$$

Since $e_A(\kappa) = 0$, we must have $i'_1, \dots, i'_{k'} \in \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ and $j'_1, \dots, j'_{\ell'} \in \{j_1, \dots, j_\ell\}$, so $k' \leq k$ and $\ell' \leq \ell$. Moreover, if $k' = k$ and $\ell' = \ell$, then $y = x$. \square

Corollary 6.17. *The words on $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j^*$ in standard form in $\mathbf{R}(H)(m, n)$ are a basis.*

Proof. We already know such words span by Proposition 6.11. Suppose

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i w_i \in \mathbf{R}(H)(m, n)$$

where $w_i \in \mathbf{R}(H)(m, n)$ are distinct words on the $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j^*$ in standard form, ordered by increasing word length. We show by induction on k that all the λ_i 's are zero. If $k = 1$, this is trivial, since $w \neq 0$ for all words w by Proposition 6.16 (there is a linear functional which separates w from 0). Suppose now that $k > 1$. Since the standard form word length of w_1 is minimal, by Proposition 6.16, there are $\xi \in B^m$ and $\eta \in B^n$ such that $\langle w_i \xi, \eta \rangle = \delta_{1,i}$. This means

$$\lambda_1 = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \langle w_i \xi, \eta \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i w_i \xi, \eta \right\rangle = 0.$$

We are finished by the induction hypothesis. \square

Theorem 6.18. *The $*$, \otimes -functor $\Phi : \mathbf{RG} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}(H)$ given by $[n] \mapsto H^n$ for $n \geq 0$ and*

$$\mathbf{RG}(n, n+1) \ni \alpha_i \mapsto \mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbf{R}(H)(n, n+1) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n+1$$

defines an equivalence of involutive tensor categories.

Proof. By Proposition 6.11, the relations of \mathbf{RG} are satisfied in $\mathbf{R}(H)$, so Φ is well-defined. By definition Φ preserves the adjoint, and it is easy to check that Φ preserves \otimes . Since the words on α_i, α_j^* in $\mathbf{RG}(m, n)$ in standard form are a basis for $\mathbf{RG}(m, n)$ by Proposition 3.21, Corollary 6.17 shows that Φ is fully faithful and essentially surjective. \square

Remark 6.19. The involutive tensor category $\mathbf{RG} \cong \mathbf{RP}$ is positive, i.e., if $x \in \mathbf{RG}(m, n)$ and $x^*x = 0 \in \mathbf{RG}(m, m)$, then $x = 0$. This can be shown using the standard form in Proposition 3.21, or using positivity of $\mathbf{R}(H)$ which comes for free. If $x \in \mathbf{RG}(m, n)$ with $x^*x = 0$, then $\Phi(x^*x) = 0$, so $\Phi(x) = 0$ as $\mathbf{R}(H)$ is positive. Hence $x = 0$ as Φ is injective on hom spaces.

Remark 6.20. The planar calculus of [Pen13] is compatible with diagrams in \mathbf{RP} . The value of a free-floating strand is

$$\boxed{\bullet} = \begin{cases} \boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \downarrow \\ \bullet \end{array}} = \text{Tr}_1(e_1) = \dim_{-A}(L^2(A)) = 1 \\ \boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \uparrow \\ \bullet \end{array}} = \text{Tr}_1^{\text{op}}(e_1) = \dim_{A-}(L^2(A)) = 1, \end{cases}$$

and the value of the dotted closed oriented loops are

$$\begin{aligned} \boxed{\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \circlearrowright \end{array}} &= \text{Tr}_1(1 - e_1) = \dim_{-A}(K) \text{ and} \\ \boxed{\begin{array}{c} \circlearrowleft \\ \bullet \end{array}} &= \text{Tr}_1^{\text{op}}(1 - e_1) = \dim_{A-}(K). \end{aligned}$$

Thus if $0 \leq k \leq n$ and $q \in \mathcal{RP}_n$ is a minimal projection with exactly j dotted through strings, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}_n(\Phi \circ \Psi^{-1}(q)) &= \dim_{-A}(K)^j \\ \mathrm{Tr}_n^{\mathrm{op}}(\Phi \circ \Psi^{-1}(q)) &= \dim_{A-}(K)^j.\end{aligned}$$

6.2 Annular GICAR representations

Let H be as in Assumption 6.1. Then $\mathcal{P}_n \neq (0)$ for all $n \geq 0$, since it contains the vector $\zeta \otimes \cdots \otimes \zeta$.

Definition 6.21 ([Pen13, Section 4]). A Hilbert $A - A$ bimodule H is called extremal if $\mathrm{Tr}_1 = \mathrm{Tr}_1^{\mathrm{op}}$ on \mathcal{Q}_1 .

A Burns rotation is an operator $\rho : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_n$ such that for all $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $b_1, \dots, b_n \in B$, we have

$$\langle \rho(\zeta), b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_n \rangle = \langle \zeta, b_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_n \otimes b_1 \rangle.$$

An opposite Burns rotation is defined similarly:

$$\langle \rho^{\mathrm{op}}(\zeta), b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_n \rangle = \langle \zeta, b_n \otimes b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{n-1} \rangle.$$

Note that if such a ρ exists, then it is unique, and $\rho^n = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{P}_n}$. In this case, $\rho^{-1} = \rho^{\mathrm{op}}$.

Recall the following theorems.

Theorem 6.22 ([Pen13, Theorem 4.7]). *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) H is extremal.
- (2) H^n is extremal for all $n \geq 1$.
- (3) H^n is extremal for some $n \geq 1$.

Theorem 6.23 ([Pen13, Theorems 4.11, 4.20, and 4.28]). *If H is extremal, then the Burns rotation $\rho = \sum_{\beta} L_{\beta} R_{\beta}^*$ converges strongly on \mathcal{P}_n for all $n \geq 2$. Moreover, $\rho^{-1} = \rho^*$ is given by the strongly convergent sum $\sum_{\alpha} R_{\alpha} L_{\alpha}^*$.*

Conversely, if a unitary Burns rotation ρ exists on \mathcal{P}_{2n} and H is symmetric, then H^n is extremal.

We now impose the following assumption.

Assumption 6.24. Suppose H is extremal, so that the Burns rotation $\rho = \sum_{\beta} L_{\beta} R_{\beta}^*$ converges strongly on \mathcal{P}_n for all $n \geq 2$.

Definition 6.25. Given an $A - A$ bimodule H , we define the annular bimodule category $\mathbf{A}(H)$ as the following small involutive category:

Objects: \mathcal{P}_n for $n \geq 0$.

Morphisms: For $1 \leq i \leq n + 1$, the maps $\mathbf{a}_i : H^n \rightarrow H^{n+1}$ descend to maps $\mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{n+1}$ since they are $A - A$ bilinear, i.e., for all $x \in A$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{P}_n$,

$$x(\mathbf{a}_i(\xi)) = \mathbf{a}_i(x\xi) = \mathbf{a}_i(\xi x) = (\mathbf{a}_i(\xi))x.$$

A similar statement holds for the \mathbf{a}_j^* . For $n = 0$, let $\rho = \mathrm{id}_{L^2(A)}$, and for $n \geq 1$, let ρ be the Burns rotation, which preserves \mathcal{P}_n . The morphisms of $\mathbf{A}(H)$ are \mathbb{C} -linear combinations of all composites of the $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j^*, \rho$.

Composition: composition of operators.

Adjoint: adjoint of operators.

The main theorem of this subsection is as follows.

Theorem 6.26. *The $*$ -functor $\Phi_A : \text{AG} \rightarrow \text{A}(H)$ given by $\alpha_i \mapsto \mathbf{a}_i$ and $\tau \mapsto \rho$ defines a $*$ -representation.*

Proof. Note that Relations (AG1) and (AG2) automatically hold in $\text{A}(H)$ by Proposition 6.11. It remains to show Relations (AG3) and (AG4) hold. Since ρ is periodic and unitary, Relation (AG3) follows for $\Phi_A(\tau) = \rho$ immediately. Suppose $2 \leq i \leq n$. Then for all $\xi \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $b_1, \dots, b_{n-1} \in B$, by the definition of the Burns rotation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \Phi_A(\alpha_i^* \tau)(\xi), b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{n-1} \rangle &= \langle \Phi_A(\alpha_i)^* \Phi_A(\tau)(\xi), b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{n-1} \rangle \\
&= \langle \rho(\xi), \mathbf{a}_i(b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{n-1}) \rangle \\
&= \langle \rho(\xi), b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{i-1} \otimes \zeta \otimes b_i \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{n-1} \rangle \\
&= \langle \xi, b_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{i-1} \otimes \zeta \otimes b_i \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{n-1} \otimes b_1 \rangle \\
&= \langle \xi, \mathbf{a}_{i-1}(b_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{n-1} \otimes b_1) \rangle \\
&= \langle \Phi_A(\alpha_{i-1})^*(\xi), b_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{n-1} \otimes b_1 \rangle \\
&= \langle \rho(\Phi_A(\alpha_{i-1}^*)(\xi)), b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{n-1} \rangle \\
&= \langle \Phi_A(\tau \alpha_{i-1}^*)(\xi), b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{n-1} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

The relation $\alpha_i \tau = \tau \alpha_{i-1}$ is similar, and Relation (AG4) holds. \square

Remark 6.27. The representation of Theorem 6.26 is not necessarily faithful as we will see in Examples 6.28 and 6.29.

Just as every subfactor planar algebra decomposes as an orthogonal direct sum of irreducible annular Temperley-Lieb modules, so does the sequence of central L^2 -vectors $(\mathcal{P}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ under our AG-action afforded by Theorem 6.26.

Just as the empty diagram generates an annular Temperley-Lieb module for a subfactor planar algebra [Jon01], the vector $\hat{1} \in \mathcal{P}_0 = A' \cap L^2(A)$ always generates an annular GICAR module. However, this AG-module is trivial, since the only AG-consequence of $\hat{1} \in \mathcal{P}_0$ in \mathcal{P}_n is the n -fold tensor product of ζ . In stark comparison with finite index subfactors, it may be the case that $(\mathcal{P}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ only consists of the trivial AG-module when $A_0 \subset A_1$ is a non-trivial subfactor!

Example 6.28 ([Pen13, Section 5]). Consider $A_0 = R \rtimes \text{Stab}(1) \subset R \rtimes S_\infty = A_1$ where $\text{Stab}(1)$ is the stabilizer of 1 under the action of S_∞ on \mathbb{N} . Then $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{P}_n) = 1$ for all $n \geq 0$. More precisely, for $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{P}_n = A'_0 \cap \bigotimes_{A_0}^n L^2(A_1) = \text{span} \left\{ \underbrace{\hat{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{1}}_{n \text{ vectors}} \right\} \cong \mathbb{C} \left[\begin{array}{c} \boxed{\bullet \cdots \bullet} \\ n \end{array} \right].$$

However, note that although $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{Q}_n) < \infty$ for all n , the dimension grows superfactorially, which is much faster than $\dim(G_n) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k}^2$. Thus $A_0 \subset A_1$ does not have trivial standard invariant, i.e., it is not the infinite index analog of the Temperley-Lieb subfactors.

Example 6.29. Recall Example 6.5, i.e. $H = L^2(R) \oplus L^2(R)_\sigma$ for an outer action $\sigma : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \text{Out}(R)$, where we denote $\sigma^n = \sigma(n)$. In this case, when $n \geq 1$, $K^n = L^2(R)_{\sigma^n}$ has no central vectors, so

$$\mathcal{P}_n = A' \cap H^n = \text{span} \left\{ \underbrace{\zeta \otimes \cdots \otimes \zeta}_{n \text{ vectors}} \right\} \cong \mathbb{C} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bullet \cdots \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}^n,$$

where ζ is the image of $\widehat{1} \in L^2(R)$ inside H . This bimodule has trivial standard invariant by Example 6.5, but it does not come from a II_1 -subfactor.

References

- [BDH11] Arthur Bartels, Christopher L. Douglas, and André Henriques, *Dualizability and index of subfactors*, 2011, [arXiv:1110.5671](#).
- [Big12] Stephen Bigelow, *A diagrammatic Alexander invariant of tangles*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications **21** (2012), no. 8, 1250081, 9, [MR2925434](#), [arXiv:1203.5457](#), [DOI:10.1142/S0218216512500812](#).
- [BRY12] Stephen Bigelow, Eric Ramos, and Ren Yi, *The Alexander and Jones polynomials through representations of rook algebras*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications **21** (2012), no. 12, 1250114, 18, [MR2978881](#), [arXiv:1110.0538](#), [DOI:10.1142/S0218216512501143](#).
- [Bur03] Michael Burns, *Subfactors, planar algebras, and rotations*, Ph.D. thesis at the University of California, Berkeley, 2003, [arXiv:1111.1362](#).
- [CE89] Alain Connes and David E. Evans, *Embedding of $U(1)$ -current algebras in noncommutative algebras of classical statistical mechanics*, Comm. Math. Phys. **121** (1989), no. 3, 507–525, [MR990778](#).
- [Con80] Alain Connes, *On the spatial theory of von Neumann algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **35** (1980), no. 2, 153–164, [MR561983](#).
- [Dav96] Kenneth R. Davidson, *C^* -algebras by example*, Fields Institute Monographs, vol. 6, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996, [MR1402012](#).
- [EN96] Michel Enock and Ryszard Nest, *Irreducible inclusions of factors, multiplicative unitaries, and Kac algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **137** (1996), no. 2, 466–543, [MR1387518](#).
- [FHH09] Daniel Flath, Tom Halverson, and Kathryn Herbig, *The planar rook algebra and Pascal’s triangle*, Enseign. Math. (2) **55** (2009), no. 1-2, 77–92.
- [GL96] John J. Graham and Gus I. Lehrer, *Cellular algebras*, Invent. Math. **123** (1996), 1–34, [MR1376244](#).
- [GL98] ———, *The representation theory of affine Temperley-Lieb algebras*, Enseign. Math. (2) **44** (1998), no. 3-4, 173–218, [MR1659204](#).
- [Haa79] Uffe Haagerup, *Operator-valued weights in von Neumann algebras. I*, J. Funct. Anal. **32** (1979), no. 2, 175–206, [MR534673](#).
- [HO89] Richard H. Herman and Adrian Ocneanu, *Index theory and Galois theory for infinite index inclusions of factors*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **309** (1989), no. 17, 923–927, [MR1055223](#).
- [ILP98] Masaki Izumi, Roberto Longo, and Sorin Popa, *A Galois correspondence for compact groups of automorphisms of von Neumann algebras with a generalization to Kac algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **155** (1998), no. 1, 25–63, [MR1622812](#).
- [Jon83] Vaughan F. R. Jones, *Index for subfactors*, Invent. Math. **72** (1983), no. 1, 1–25, [MR696688](#), [DOI:10.1007/BF01389127](#).
- [Jon99] ———, *Planar algebras I*, 1999, [arXiv:math/9909027](#).

- [Jon01] ———, *The annular structure of subfactors*, Essays on geometry and related topics, Vol. 1, 2, Monogr. Enseign. Math., vol. 38, Enseignement Math., Geneva, 2001, [MR1929335](#), pp. 401–463.
- [Jon10] ———, *Von neumann algebras*, 2010, <http://math.berkeley.edu/~vfr/MATH20909/VonNeumann2009.pdf>.
- [Jon11] ———, *Jones' notes on planar algebras*, <http://math.berkeley.edu/~vfr/VANDERBILT/p121.pdf>, 2011.
- [Kau87] Louis H. Kauffman, *State models and the Jones polynomial*, Topology **26** (1987), no. 3, 395–407, [MR899057](#), [DOI:10.1016/0040-9383\(87\)90009-7](#).
- [Lie67] Elliott H. Lieb, *Residual entropy of square ice*, Physical Review **162** (1967), no. 1, 162–172.
- [Ocn88] Adrian Ocneanu, *Quantized groups, string algebras and Galois theory for algebras*, Operator algebras and applications, Vol. 2, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 136, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1988, [MR996454](#), pp. 119–172.
- [Ocn94] Adrian Ocneanu, *Chirality for operator algebras*, Subfactors (Kyuzeso, 1993), World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1994, [MR1317353](#), pp. 39–63.
- [Pen12] David Penneys, *A cyclic approach to the annular Temperley-Lieb category*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications **21** (2012), no. 6, 1250049, 40, [MR2903179](#) [arXiv:0912.1320](#) [DOI:10.1142/S0218216511010012](#).
- [Pen13] ———, *A Planar Calculus for Infinite Index Subfactors*, Comm. Math. Phys. **319** (2013), no. 3, 595–648, [MR3040370](#) [arXiv:1110.3504](#) [DOI:10.1007/s00220-012-1627-4](#).
- [Pop86] Sorin Popa, *Correspondences*, INCREST Preprint, 1986.
- [Pop93] ———, *Markov traces on universal Jones algebras and subfactors of finite index*, Invent. Math. **111** (1993), no. 2, 375–405, [MR1198815](#) [DOI:10.1007/BF01231293](#).
- [Pop95] ———, *An axiomatization of the lattice of higher relative commutants of a subfactor*, Invent. Math. **120** (1995), no. 3, 427–445, [MR1334479](#) [DOI:10.1007/BF01241137](#).
- [Sol02] Louis Solomon, *Representations of the rook monoid*, J. Algebra **256** (2002), no. 2, 309–342, [MR1939108](#) [DOI:10.1016/S0021-8693\(02\)00004-2](#).
- [TL71] Harold N. V. Temperley and Elliott H. Lieb, *Relations between the “percolation” and “colouring” problem and other graph-theoretical problems associated with regular planar lattices: some exact results for the “percolation” problem*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **322** (1971), no. 1549, 251–280, [MR0498284](#).