

On the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff Theorem: non-convergence and prolongation issues

Stefano Biagi, Andrea Bonfiglioli, Marco Matone

November 17, 2018

Abstract

In this paper we investigate two topics related to the celebrated Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff Theorem: a non-convergence and a prolongation result. Given a Banach algebra \mathcal{A} with identity I , and given $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$, we study the relationship of three different issues: the convergence of the BCH series $\sum_n Z_n(X, Y)$, the existence of a logarithm of $e^X e^Y$, and the convergence of the Mercator-type series $\sum_n \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} (e^X e^Y - I)^n$. We fix some general results, and by suitable counterexamples, we show that various pathologies can occur. This problem is also related to some recent results, of interest in physics, on closed formulas for the BCH series: while the sum of the BCH series presents several non-convergence issues, these closed formulas can provide a prolongation for the BCH series when it is not convergent. This leads us to the second topic of the paper: we study a prolongation problem for the BCH local-group operation generated by a family of smooth vector fields, showing that simple prolongation arguments for ODEs intervene to face this problem in a simple way.

1 Introduction and main results

The well-known theorem bearing the names of Baker, Campbell and Hausdorff (BCH, in the sequel) has pivotal applications both in mathematics and in physics: for instance, in the structure theory of Lie algebras and Lie groups (both finite- and infinite-dimensional), in group theory, in the analysis of linear PDEs, in the theory of ODEs, in control theory, in numerical analysis (particularly in geometric integration), in operator theory, in quantum and statistical mechanics, in physical chemistry. See [1] or the recent monograph [11] for a list of related references.

In recent years, particularly significant in physics has been the derivation of closed formulas for the BCH series $Z(x, y) := \sum_n Z_n(X, Y)$, when X and Y are operators satisfying specific commutator relations. Such a progress originated in the paper [43] and it was soon realized that closed BCH formulas admit relevant extensions by introducing a simple algorithm [26]. In [27] it has been shown that there are 13 types of commutator algebras admitting such closed forms for the BCH formula. Subsequently, closed BCH formulas for the generators of semisimple complex Lie algebras were derived in [28], where an iterative algorithm generalizing the one in [26] was also introduced.

The above results have been applied in covariantizing the generators of the conformal transformations, in providing explicit expressions of the unitary representations of the fundamental group of Riemann surfaces, in the context of conformal field theories, see [29]. Furthermore, the algorithm in [26] was applied in investigating the zero-energy states in conformal field theory with sine-square deformation, see [41]. Closed formulas have been found in the case of the BCH for the contact Heisenberg algebra, see [14]. Related investigations also concern the recent papers [21, 23] on the Zassenhaus formula.

Typically, closed BCH formulas can be derived by a formal manipulation of the BCH series $Z(x, y) = \sum_n Z_n(X, Y)$, often expressed as a logarithm $\ln(e^X e^Y)$, or via certain integral representations for the sum of the series. In general, $Z(X, Y)$ coincides with $\ln(e^X e^Y)$ only for small norms of X and Y (see Proposition 1.2). Since the power expansion of the exponential is everywhere convergent, it follows that a closed formula for $\ln(e^X e^Y)$, say $L(X, Y)$, which turns out to be meaningful (and

analytic) in a wider region than the set of convergence of the series $\sum_n \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} (e^X e^Y - I)^n$ expressing $\ln(e^X e^Y)$, will fulfill the identity $e^{L(X,Y)} = e^X e^Y$ by analytic continuation. The latter identity is very often what physicists look for. Equivalently put, closed formulas for the BCH series should be referred to as *prolongations* of the sum of the series $Z(X, Y)$, when the latter is not convergent.

There is a basic reason why the convergence issue of the above prolongations is a central question, not only by a purely technical point of view, but also of considerable mathematical and physical interest. It is well known that the BCH theorem, in its various forms, play a key role in quantum mechanics, quantum field theories, including their path integral formulation, and statistical physics. Two main examples concern the Trotter product formula [39]

$$\exp(A + B) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\exp(A/n) \exp(B/n))^n,$$

and the Magnus expansion and its generalizations [3]. To understand this, recall that, for example, the transition amplitude $\langle q', t' | q, t \rangle$ that leads to the Dirac-Feynman path integral has the form

$$\langle q', t' | q, t \rangle = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} H(t' - t)} \delta(q' - q), \quad (1.1)$$

where $H = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \Delta + V(q)$ is the Hamiltonian, Δ the Laplace-Beltrami operator and $V(q)$ the potential. A similar expression concerns the extension to quantum field theory, where now the Dirac tempered distribution is replaced by the functional Dirac distribution. In most theories, the path integral formulation is treated as a power expansion in the coupling constants. An outstanding problem is that such expansions yield divergent asymptotic series. In recent years a new approach, based on Écalle resurgence theory [19]¹, has been developed [4, 44]. The main idea is to use transseries expansions, which are faithful and unambiguous representations of observables. In such a construction, the analytic continuation plays the fundamental role. On the other hand, as illustrated by (1.1), it is clear that the problem of analytic continuation translates into a problem of analytic continuation of the BCH formula.

With all these physical motivations in mind, we now describe the two main topics of this paper. Our first result furnishes a *non-convergence* result for the BCH series, showing that its convergence is totally independent of the existence of $\ln(e^X e^Y)$, and even when both $Z(X, Y)$ and $\ln(e^X e^Y)$ exist, they can be actually different. The second result takes into account the problem of the *prolongation* of the local group that can be defined via the BCH series when dealing with finite-dimensional Lie algebras of smooth vector fields. We next describe these results with more details.

§1.1. A non-convergence result. First we review what can be positively said about the existence and equality of $Z(X, Y)$ and $\ln(e^X e^Y)$. In its most basic form, the BCH Theorem ensures that, in the associative algebra $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$ of the formal power series in two non-commuting indeterminates x and y over a field \mathbb{K} of characteristic zero, one has $e^x e^y = e^{Z(x,y)}$, where $Z(x, y)$ can be expressed as a series of Lie polynomials

$$Z(x, y) = x + y + \frac{1}{2}[x, y] + \frac{1}{12}([x, [y, y]] + [[y, x], x]) - \frac{1}{24}[x, [y, [x, y]]] + \dots$$

To be more precise, in the sequel we consider the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Z_n(x, y)$ that can be obtained from $Z(x, y)$ by grouping together the Lie polynomials of degree n in x and y , i.e.,

$$Z_1(x, y) := x + y, \quad Z_2(x, y) := \frac{1}{2}[x, y], \quad Z_3(x, y) := \frac{1}{12}([x, [y, y]] + [[y, x], x]), \quad \text{etc.}$$

More explicitly, once it is known that $Z(x, y)$ is a Lie series, the Z_n 's can be written, via the Dynkin-Specht-Wever Lemma (as in [11, Sec. 3.3.2]), under the following well-know (Dynkin) presentation

$$Z_n(x, y) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k} \sum_{\substack{(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_k, j_k) \neq (0, 0) \\ i_1 + j_1 + \dots + i_k + j_k = n}} \frac{(\text{ad } x)^{i_1} (\text{ad } y)^{j_1} \dots (\text{ad } x)^{i_k} (\text{ad } y)^{j_k - 1}(y)}{i_1! j_1! \dots i_k! j_k!}. \quad (1.2)$$

¹See [24] for a recent introduction to the related mould calculus applied to the BCH formula.

[When $j_k = 0$ (thus $i_k \neq 0$) the associated summand in (1.2) is understood to end with $(\text{ad } x)^{i_k-1}(x)$.] The convergence of the BCH series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Z_n(x, y)$ in the usual² metric topology of $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$ is a trivial consequence of the increasing degrees of the Z_n 's.

As this will be relevant throughout the paper, we review that (in the algebraic setting of $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$) the series $Z(x, y)$ is uniquely given by $\ln(e^x e^y)$, where

$$\ln(W) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k} (W - I)^k, \quad (1.3)$$

for any formal power series $W \in \mathbb{K}\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$ whose zero-degree term is equal to the identity I of \mathbb{K} . Since the power series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k} z^k$ is usually called the ‘Mercator series’, in order to avoid ambiguities in situations where other logarithms can be meaningful (as in \mathbb{C} or in matrix algebras), we introduce once and for all a selected notation for what we shall mean by $\ln(e^x e^y)$ in more general settings:

$$L(x, y) := \sum_n L_n(x, y), \quad \text{where } L_n(x, y) := \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} (e^x e^y - I)^n \text{ for any } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1.4)$$

With a little abuse, we say that $\sum_n L_n(x, y)$ is the *Mercator series* (a shorthand of ‘Mercator series for $\ln(e^x e^y)$ ’); we also say that its sum $L(x, y)$ is the Mercator logarithm of $e^x e^y$, and (when there is no risk of confusion), we may write $\ln(e^x e^y)$ in place of $L(x, y)$. The following identity

$$Z(x, y) = L(x, y) \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad Z(x, y) = \ln(e^x e^y) \quad (1.5)$$

is clearly equivalent to $e^{Z(x, y)} = e^x e^y$, another identity in the formal-power-series setting of $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$. Incidentally, as it will be important in the sequel, (1.5) justifies the associativity property of the map $(a, b) \mapsto Z(a, b)$, i.e.,

$$Z(a, Z(b, c)) = Z(Z(a, b), c), \quad (1.6)$$

holding true for any $a, b, c \in \mathbb{K}\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$ whose zero-degree terms are null.

All these facts are so well established in the BCH folklore that one may forget that the following four issues, though simple to solve in the formal-power-series setting, may be highly non-trivial if one is working outside $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$:

1. the convergence of the Mercator series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} (e^x e^y - I)^n$;
2. the convergence of the BCH series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Z_n(x, y)$;
3. the identity $e^{Z(x, y)} = e^x e^y$, or (more generally) the existence of a logarithm of $e^x e^y$;
4. the equality of the sums $L(x, y)$ and $Z(x, y)$ of the series in 1 and 2.

Apart from the algebraic framework of $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$, another kettle of fish is the study and validity of these four issues when x and y belong to more specific topological spaces, as in the case of matrix algebras. One of the aims of this paper is to study these problems in a wide framework: that of the *Banach algebras*; we fix some positive general results, and (with the use of selected counterexamples), we show that problems 1-to-4 can be very differently behaved. Indeed, we shall see that many pathological facts do occur even in the simple case of matrix algebras: for example, the BCH series may converge, whereas the Mercator series may not; or viceversa; or they can be both convergent but with different sums; or they can be both non-convergent, but $e^x e^y$ may yet admit a logarithm, i.e., some solution V of $e^V = e^x e^y$.

As a result, this will point out some inaccuracies, sometimes appearing in the literature, due to a formal application of the BCH Theorem. Indeed, any formal manipulation (resemblant to what is allowed in $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$ with its very simple topology) of the BCH series $Z(x, y)$ or of its companion series $\ln(e^x e^y)$ will invariably lose track of all the mentioned pathologies.

²See e.g., [11, Section 2.3.3].

Since the Z_n 's are well posed, *mutatis mutandis*, in any Lie algebra, the problem of the *convergence* of the BCH series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Z_n(x, y)$ is meaningful in any Lie algebra equipped with a metric, e.g., in finite-dimensional Lie algebras or in Banach-Lie algebras.³ The study of the convergence domain of the BCH series has a very long history, tracing back to Hausdorff [22, Section 4], and the determination of the optimal domain of convergence is still an open problem. See, e.g., [7, 9, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 30, 31, 35, 38, 40, 42, 45]. Related references to the convergence domain of the BCH series focused on its continuous counterpart (of great importance in the applications), the so-called Magnus series, can be found e.g., in [8, 32, 33, 34].

In the setting of infinite-dimensional Banach-Lie algebras, the convergence problem was recently investigated in [5], by extending to that setting the result on the convergence domain known in the finite-dimensional case (Mérigot [30]; Blanes, Casas [7]). The idea of using the (formal) ODE solved by $t \mapsto Z(tx, ty)$ has a crucial role in [5, 7, 30]; this ODE-approach traces back to Poincaré himself: see [36, equation (7), p. 248], where an ODE solved by $t \mapsto Z(x, ty)$ was first discovered. We shall use again an ODE technique in Section 3, while anticipating here that this versatile approach has already proved useful in other contexts related to BCH (see e.g., the Zassenhaus formula in [2], or the prolongation problem for the BCH series in [20]).

In view of the applications, the physics community has paid much attention to the convergence of the BCH series, as already described. However, as anticipated, some ambiguity occasionally arises from a formal manipulation of the BCH series. Indeed, when dealing with the BCH Theorem in physics applications, one often meets with the following identity

$$\ln(e^x e^y) = x + y + \frac{1}{2}[x, y] + \frac{1}{12}([x, y], y) + [[y, x], x] + \dots \quad (1.7)$$

(Under our naming, this is the equality of the sums of the Mercator and BCH series.) Unfortunately, while (1.7) is certainly true in the formal-series setting of $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$, and it is true in any Banach algebra provided that x and y are sufficiently close to zero, it can be dramatically false otherwise. Roughly put, this is due to the fact that (after an expansion of $\ln(e^x e^y)$ in its Mercator series), the terms on any of the two sides of (1.7) are obtained from the terms on the other side by reordering and associating, which are not harmless facts even in the case of real-valued series.

Another observable issue of (1.7) lies in the logarithm, in that, while it is uniquely given by (1.3) in $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$, in special Banach algebras (1.3) may not be the optimal choice: consider, for instance, the case of matrix algebras, where a more efficient \ln -function can be defined, for many classes of matrices, through the Jordan decomposition. Since we consider the general case of Banach algebras, we are compelled to unambiguously choose what we mean by the logarithm, which we now do.

In view of the fact that the BCH coefficients Z_n are constructed via the Mercator series (1.3) (as it is also visible from the factors $(-1)^{k+1}/k$ in (1.2)), it appears that (1.3) is the most natural choice if one wants to give a sufficiently comprehensive analysis of our problem, applicable to Banach algebras. Furthermore, (1.3) makes unambiguous sense in any Banach algebra \mathcal{A} , if we mean by I the identity element of \mathcal{A} . For this reason, as is frequently done for operator algebras, here and in the sequel we adopt the following definition.

Definition 1.1. Let \mathcal{A} be a Banach algebra, i.e., a triple $(\mathcal{A}, *, \|\cdot\|)$ where $(\mathcal{A}, *)$ is a unital associative algebra (with identity denoted by I), and $(\mathcal{A}, \|\cdot\|)$ is a (real or complex) Banach space, where the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is compatible with the multiplication, i.e., $\|x * y\| \leq \|x\| \|y\|$ for any $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$.

Given $W \in \mathcal{A}$, $\ln(W)$ will denote the sum of the Mercator series in (1.3), when this series converges in the metric space \mathcal{A} . The function $\exp : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is defined via the usual series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} W^k/k!$ (and denoted indifferently by $\exp(W)$ or e^W), this series being absolutely⁴ convergent for any $W \in \mathcal{A}$. In what follows, given $W \in \mathcal{A}$, we say that $V \in \mathcal{A}$ is a logarithm of W if $e^V = W$.

Finally, given any $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$, the notations in (1.4) will be applied for the Mercator series $\sum_n L_n(x, y)$ (be it convergent or not) and for its sum $L(x, y)$, occasionally also denoted by $\ln(e^x e^y)$.

³A Banach-Lie algebra is a Banach space \mathcal{A} (over \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C}) endowed with a Lie algebra structure such that $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \ni (x, y) \mapsto [x, y] \in \mathcal{A}$ is continuous.

⁴We say that a series $\sum_n a_n$ in \mathcal{A} is absolutely convergent if $\sum_n \|a_n\| < \infty$.

With these notations and definitions, we now state the first topic of our investigation: given a Banach algebra \mathcal{A} and given $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$, in dealing with identities like (1.7), it is relevant to face with the following different (albeit related) problems:

- (I) the Mercator series $\ln(e^x e^y) = \sum_n L_n(x, y)$ is convergent in \mathcal{A} ;
- (II) the BCH series $\sum_n^\infty Z_n(x, y)$ is convergent in \mathcal{A} ;
- (III) there exists a logarithm of $e^x e^y$, i.e., there exists $V \in \mathcal{A}$ fulfilling the identity $e^x e^y = e^V$;
- (IV) the sums of the Mercator and BCH series are equal.

In physics applications, (III) seems to be of the greatest relevance, and, in comparison to the other problems, it is much more frequently successful: this is the case of matrix algebras, where a logarithm of $e^x e^y$ can be defined in many⁵ interesting situations via the Jordan decomposition rather than via (1.3). In general Banach algebras, a logarithm of $e^x e^y$ can exist independently of the existence of $L(x, y)$ or of $Z(x, y)$, whose associated series may be divergent (see Example 1.3). Luckily, some positive results are available for identity (1.7) to hold, as the following result ensures.

Proposition 1.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be a Banach algebra, and let $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$. Then the following facts hold true:*

- (a) *If $\|x\| + \|y\| < \ln 2$, the Mercator series $\sum_n L_n(x, y)$ and the BCH series $\sum_n Z_n(x, y)$ are both absolutely convergent; moreover, the sums of their series are equal, and (1.7) holds true (with $\ln(e^x e^y)$ meaning the sum of the Mercator series).*
- (b) *If the Mercator series $\sum_n L_n(x, y)$ is convergent in \mathcal{A} for some $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ (without any knowledge on its absolute convergence), then its sum $L(x, y)$ is a logarithm of $e^x e^y$.*
- (c) *The same statement as in (b) is valid for the BCH series.*

Problems soon arise for non-small $\|x\| + \|y\|$, as shown in the following Example 1.3. For the sake of completeness, the proof of Proposition 1.2 (based on some re-arranging argument on absolutely convergent series, and on analytic-function theory in Banach algebras) is sketched in the Appendix.

Example 1.3. Let $\mathcal{M} = M_2(\mathbb{R})$ denote the usual normed algebra of the real 2×2 matrices, and let us consider (for $v \in \mathbb{R}$) the matrices

$$x = x(v) := \begin{pmatrix} -v & 0 \\ 0 & -2v \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad y := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.8)$$

In Section 2 we shall prove that:

- (i) the Mercator series expressing $\ln(e^{x(v)} e^y)$ converges in \mathcal{M} if and only if $v \geq -\ln \sqrt{2}$;
- (ii) the BCH series $\sum_n Z_n(x(v), y)$ converges in \mathcal{M} if and only if $|v| < 2\pi$;
- (iii) there exists a logarithm of $e^{x(v)} e^y$ for every $v \in \mathbb{R}$; this is given e.g., by

$$Z(v) := \begin{pmatrix} -v & \psi(v) \\ 0 & -2v \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\psi(v) := \frac{v}{1-e^{-v}}$ is the so-called Todd's function (it is understood that $\psi(0) = 1$).

Keeping in mind Proposition 1.2 and Example 1.3, we are in a position to analyze the mutual relationships of issues (I)-to-(IV), thus summarizing the contents of the first part of the paper:

- (II) *is sufficient to (III), but not necessary.* Sufficiency follows from statement (c) in Proposition 1.2. The lack of necessity is shown in Example 1.3, if one takes $|v| \geq 2\pi$.

⁵Actually, if one is working with complex matrices, since $e^x e^y$ is always invertible, it always admits a logarithm.

- (I) *is sufficient to (III), but not necessary.* Sufficiency follows from statement (b) in Proposition 1.2. The lack of necessity is shown in Example 1.3, if one takes $v < -\ln \sqrt{2}$. Another simpler example: if one chooses $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{R}$, $y = 0$ and $x > \ln 2$, then (III) holds with $V = x$, but $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n+1} (e^x - 1)^n / n$ is not convergent.
- (I) *and (II) are independent of each other.* On the one hand, it is simple to show that (II) may hold without (I): for instance, in \mathbb{R} , if we take $x > \ln 2$ and $y = 0$, then the BCH series boils down to $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Z_n(x, 0) = x$ (and is therefore trivially convergent), whereas the Mercator series for $\ln(e^x e^y)$ does not converge, as observed above. A less trivial example is again given by Example 1.3, by taking $v \in (-2\pi, -\ln \sqrt{2})$. Vice versa, the choice $v > 2\pi$ yields an example for which (I) holds true but (II) is false.
- (I), (II), (III) *may all be false.* For instance, taking the example by Wei [47] related to the Banach algebra $\mathcal{M} = M_2(\mathbb{R})$ and the pair of matrices

$$W := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -5\pi/4 \\ 5\pi/4 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad Y := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

it can be proved that there does not exist any logarithm of $e^W e^Y$ in \mathcal{M} . Thus, in view of statements (b) and (c) in Proposition 1.2, both the BCH series $\sum_n Z_n(W, Y)$ and the Mercator series $\sum_n L_n(W, Y)$ cannot converge, otherwise they would provide such a logarithm.

- (I) *and (II) may hold true, but (IV) can be false.* Indeed, it can be easily seen that, with the following choice

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} \ln 2 & -2\pi \\ 2\pi & \ln 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

then (as A, B commute) the BCH series boils down to $Z(A, B) = Z_1(A, B) = A + B = A$, whereas the Mercator series is given by

$$L(A, B) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^n = \begin{pmatrix} \ln 2 & 0 \\ 0 & \ln 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, $Z(A, B) \neq L(A, B)$ even if they are both convergent.

The non-convergence result of the BCH series contained in Example 1.3 is closely related to some recent classes of Lie algebras of interest in physics (see [25, 43]). In [43], Van-Brunt and Visser consider the case of two operators X and Y with the commutator relation (with scalar u, v, c)

$$[X, Y] = uX + vY + cI, \tag{1.9}$$

where I commutes with both X and Y . When $u = v = 0$, this comprises the Heisenberg case $[P, Q] = -i\hbar I$ and the creation-annihilation commutator $[a, a^\dagger] = I$. We observe that our Example 1.3 falls in this class: indeed, if X and Y are respectively given by the matrices x and y in (1.8), then (1.9) holds true with $u = c = 0$ (and any v).

Via some formal and tricky manipulation of the BCH series based on a (formal) integral representation for its sum (due to Richtmyer and Greenspan, [37]), in [43] it is shown that this integral representation, under the assumption (1.9), is equal to

$$X + Y + f(u, v)[X, Y], \quad \text{where } f(u, v) = \frac{ue^u(e^v - 1) - ve^v(e^u - 1)}{uv(e^u - e^v)}.$$

As the derivation of this object results from the BCH series, it seems to lead to a *closed formula for the BCH series*, as they are usually referred to in the physics literature. Unfortunately, in general $X + Y + f(u, v)[X, Y]$ cannot be claimed to be the sum of the BCH series: indeed, there are suitable choices of u, v, c and of X, Y which give sense to $X + Y + f(u, v)[X, Y]$ but for which the BCH series is non-convergent: namely, take $u = c = 0$, $|v| \geq 2\pi$ and $X = x(v), Y = y$ in Example 1.3.

Moreover, even the Mercator logarithm $\ln(e^X e^Y)$ may be different from $X + Y + f(u, v)[X, Y]$. Indeed, if we take $u = c = 0$, $v < -\ln \sqrt{2}$, $X = x(v)$ and $Y = y$ in Example 1.3, then the Mercator series for $\ln(e^X e^Y)$ is not convergent, whereas $X + Y + f(0, v)[X, Y]$ is perfectly meaningful.

As a consequence, the following identities contained in [43]

$$Z(X, Y) = \ln(e^X e^Y) = X + Y + f(u, v)[X, Y]$$

must be read, in terms of the BCH series and of the Mercator logarithm, as follows: the sum $V := X + Y + f(u, v)[X, Y]$ is *an extension* (for the values of u, v in the domain of f) both of the BCH series $Z(X, Y)$ and of the Mercator series (1.4) for $\ln(e^X e^Y)$ when these series are not convergent; moreover, V is a logarithm of $e^X e^Y$, i.e.,

$$\exp(X + Y + f(u, v)[X, Y]) = e^X e^Y. \quad (1.10)$$

In order to clarify the possible non-convergence of the BCH series repeatedly mentioned above, we now state the following result, proved in Section 2:

Theorem 1.4 (A non-convergence result for the BCH series). *Let \mathcal{A} be a Banach algebra (or, more generally, a Banach-Lie algebra) over \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} . Assume that there exist $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ and a scalar v such that*

$$[X, Y] = vY.$$

Then the BCH series $(X + Y) + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} Z_n(X, Y)$ coincides with the series

$$(X + Y) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-v)^n B_n}{n!} Y,$$

where the B_n 's are the Bernoulli numbers, i.e., the rational numbers uniquely determined by the generating function $\frac{z}{e^z - 1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_n}{n!} z^n$. Thus the BCH series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Z_n(X, Y)$ converges in \mathcal{A} if and only if $|v| < 2\pi$, and in this case the sum of the series is

$$X + \psi(v)Y, \quad \text{where } \psi(v) := \frac{v}{1 - e^{-v}} \text{ is Todd's function.} \quad (1.11)$$

In particular, if $|v| \geq 2\pi$ the BCH series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Z_n(X, Y)$ is not convergent.

It may be of interest to observe that, in proving Theorem 1.4, we shall not make use of the integral representation of the Z_n 's by Richtmyer and Greenspan, [37] (as is done in [43]).

§1.2. A prolongation result. Now we describe our second main result in this paper. First we provide the motivation: given a Hörmander partial differential operator $L = X_1 + \sum_{j=2}^m X_j^2$ in space \mathbb{R}^N , in the papers [6, 10, 12] it was considered the problem of equipping \mathbb{R}^N with the structure of a Lie group in such a way that L be left-invariant on that group. The great advantage of left-invariance in establishing an appropriate harmonic or potential analysis for L needs no further justification. In [6, 10, 12] the vector fields X_1, \dots, X_m were required to be of class C^ω . In [10] it was shown that this problem is intimately related to the *prolongation* of the local BCH operation that X_1, \dots, X_m determine on \mathbb{R}^N by means of their exponentiation, i.e., by the integral curves of the vector fields in \mathfrak{g} , the latter denoting the Lie algebra generated by X_1, \dots, X_m . In [6] it was proved that this prolongation is always achievable, under a minimal set of assumptions on \mathfrak{g} .

Our goal here is to remove the C^ω assumption, in favor of the less restrictive C^∞ assumption. We show that this is possible by using a very simple ODE argument, resembling to the techniques already mentioned in [2, 5, 7, 20, 30, 36] in BCH-prolongation issues.

Next we describe more closely the problem and our technique in solving it. To avoid technicalities with charts and coordinates, we take $M = \mathbb{R}^N$ as a smooth manifold, as in [6, 10, 12]. Let $\mathcal{X}(M)$ denote the vector space of the smooth vector fields on M . We think of any $X \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ as a (smooth) first order differential operator acting on $C^\infty(M)$. Let \mathfrak{g} be the Lie sub-algebra of $\mathcal{X}(M)$ Lie-generated by a family X_1, \dots, X_m of smooth vector fields on M . Following [6], we make the following assumptions:

(H): X_1, \dots, X_m satisfy Hörmander's bracket generating condition on M ;

(C): any $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ is complete, i.e., the maximal integral curves of X are defined on \mathbb{R} ;

(D): the dimension of \mathfrak{g} as a vector subspace of $\mathcal{X}(M)$ is N , the dimension of M .

We aim to prove via a purely ODE argument that, under conditions (H, C, D), M can be equipped with the structure of a Lie group $\mathbb{G} = (M, \cdot)$ such that \mathfrak{g} is the Lie algebra $\text{Lie}(\mathbb{G})$ of \mathbb{G} ; moreover, we give an explicit construction of \mathbb{G} (see Theorem 1.8 for the precise statement).

Remark 1.5. (H, C, D) are necessary for the solution of our problem, and they are mutually independent: see [6]. When we ask \mathfrak{g} to coincide with $\text{Lie}(\mathbb{G})$, we are thinking of $\text{Lie}(\mathbb{G})$ as a subset of $\mathcal{X}(M)$ (the elements of the latter being thought of as first order PDOs). We cannot be content with obtaining an isomorphism between \mathfrak{g} and $\text{Lie}(\mathbb{G})$, due to the motivation that we gave to our problem: this isomorphism would be of little use for the left-invariance of $L = X_1 + \sum_{j=2}^m X_j^2$ on M .

Thus, we shall avoid the application of Lie's Third Theorem, which works "modulo an isomorphism" and is not constructive. To the contrary, the main asset of our technique is that it gives an explicit construction of the group law via ODEs (a construction that can also be computer-implemented⁶ via *Mathematica*TM).

Given $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $x \in M$, thanks to assumption (C), the integral curve of X starting at x is defined on \mathbb{R} ; we denote this curve by $t \mapsto \exp(tX)(x)$; thus, the following map is well posed

$$\exp(X)(x) := \exp(tX)(x)|_{t=1}.$$

Next we choose any $x_0 \in M$ (which will serve as the identity element of the group): the choice is totally immaterial; since in our case $M = \mathbb{R}^N$, we take once and for all $x_0 = 0$. By obvious reasons, we denote the map $\mathfrak{g} \ni X \mapsto \exp(X)(0)$ by Exp . Since \mathfrak{g} is finite dimensional by (D), we can fix a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathfrak{g} (all norms being equivalent). Assumptions (H, D) imply that there exists an open neighborhood \mathfrak{U} of $0 \in \mathfrak{g}$ such that $\text{Exp}|_{\mathfrak{U}} : \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow V := \text{Exp}(\mathfrak{U})$ is a C^∞ diffeomorphism; we denote its inverse map by Log . Now, the BCH series naturally intervene if one makes the composition of two maps of the form $\exp(X)$ and $\exp(Y)$: indeed one has the following *BCH Theorem for ODEs*

Theorem 1.6 (A BCH Theorem for ODEs). *Let \mathfrak{g} be a Lie subalgebra of $\mathcal{X}(M)$ satisfying assumptions (C) and (D). Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the BCH series $Z(X, Y) = \sum_n Z_n(X, Y)$ is convergent for any $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ with $\|X\|, \|Y\| < \varepsilon$, and for any such X, Y one has*

$$\exp(Y)(\exp(X)(x)) = \exp(Z(X, Y))(x), \quad \forall x \in M. \quad (1.12)$$

In the C^ω case, this result is contained in [10]; for the C^∞ case, see Section 3. Next we define a partially-local multiplication by setting

$$m : M \times V \rightarrow M, \quad m(x, y) := \exp(\text{Log}(y))(x). \quad (1.13)$$

By using (1.12), one can easily prove the existence of a neighborhood $B \subseteq V$ of 0 such that

$$m(x, y) = \text{Exp}(Z(\text{Log}(x), \text{Log}(y))), \quad \text{whenever } x, y \in B. \quad (1.14)$$

This result and the associativity of the (local) operation $(X, Y) \mapsto Z(X, Y)$ (see e.g., (1.6)) show that m is "locally" associative, i.e.,

$$m(x, m(y, z)) = m(m(x, y), z), \quad \text{for every } x, y, z \in M \text{ such that } y, z \in B. \quad (1.15)$$

Thus, $(x, y) \mapsto m(x, y)$ defines a local Lie group (with identity 0 and local inversion $\text{Exp}(-\text{Log}(x))$), such that any $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ is "locally" left-invariant. By the last statement we mean, precisely, the following identity (where $\partial/\partial y$ denotes the differential with respect to y)

$$X(m(x, y)) = \frac{\partial m}{\partial y}(x, y)X(y), \quad \forall X \in \mathfrak{g}, x \in M, y \in B. \quad (1.16)$$

⁶A utility has been developed by the first- and second-named authors together with Giulia Spaletta (University of Bologna); available upon request to the authors.

It is not difficult to derive (1.16) as a consequence of the very definition of m in (1.13) and by differentiating (1.15) with respect to z at 0. Our main task is to show that *the local-Lie-group structure defined by m can be prolonged throughout M* . This is accomplished in Section 3 via a prolongation argument for ODEs which we now describe.

First we relate the prolongability of m and the existing results in the literature concerning the prolongability of the BCH series $Z(X, Y)$, since they appear to be linked by (1.14).

Remark 1.7. Let \mathfrak{h} be a finite-dimensional real Lie algebra and let us fix any norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathfrak{h} ; arguing as in the proof of Proposition 1.2-(a), one can show that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the BCH series $\sum_n Z_n(a, b)$ is convergent whenever $\|a\|, \|b\| < \varepsilon$. By exploiting the algebraic companion (1.6) for associativity, one can prove that the local operation $(a, b) \mapsto \sum_n Z_n(a, b)$ defines a local Lie group.

In [20], Eggert studied the very interesting problem of the prolongation of this operation to the whole of $\mathfrak{h} \times \mathfrak{h}$. He proved that this prolongation is possible if and only if the connected and simply connected Lie group associated with \mathfrak{h} by Lie's Third Theorem is globally isomorphic to \mathfrak{h} via the exponential map. Unfortunately, we are not allowed to use this result here, since the extendibility of the BCH series on our vector-field Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is only sufficient, but not necessary, to the extendibility of m in (1.13), as shown by Example 4.2 in the Appendix.

Our prolongation argument reads as follows. Fixing $x, y \in M$, we consider the curve

$$\gamma_{x,y}(t) := m(x, ty), \quad (1.17)$$

defined at least for $|t|$ small. By using condition (H), it is not difficult to show that $z(t) := \gamma_{x,y}(t)$ satisfies the following non-autonomous Cauchy problem

$$\dot{z}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^N a_k(t, y) J_k(z(t)), \quad z(0) = x, \quad (1.18)$$

for suitable smooth functions a_k and vector fields J_k forming a basis of \mathfrak{g} (see Section 3). Since the J_k 's satisfy the invariant-type condition (1.16), we are entitled to apply the prolongability result for ODEs in [6, Th. 1.1], ensuring that $\gamma_{x,y}(t)$ exists for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We are then allowed to set

$$\Phi : M \times M \longrightarrow M, \quad \Phi(x, y) := \gamma_{x,y}(1). \quad (1.19)$$

It is clear that Φ is smooth and it prolongs m . All that remains to prove is that Φ defines on M a Lie group whose Lie algebra is \mathfrak{g} . We claim that both the associativity of $(x, y) \mapsto x \cdot y := \Phi(x, y)$ and the left invariance of any $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ derive from the following identity:

$$X(\Phi(x, y)) = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial y}(x, y) X(y), \quad \forall X \in \mathfrak{g}, x, y \in M, \quad (1.20)$$

which is a global version of (1.16). While the left invariance of $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ is clearly a restatement of (1.20), the associativity of \cdot follows from the fact that (1.20) also implies that the curve $t \mapsto x \cdot (y \cdot (tz))$ satisfies the same Cauchy problem solved by $\gamma_{x \cdot y, z}(t)$; thus, when $t = 1$ one gets $x \cdot (y \cdot z) = (x \cdot y) \cdot z$.

Hence (1.20) is the core of the argument: its proof can be found in Section 3, and it is obtained by showing that, replacing y with ty , both sides of (1.20) (as functions of t) satisfy the same Cauchy problem, another ODE argument. Summing up, we have proved the following result.

Theorem 1.8. *Let X_1, \dots, X_m be smooth vector fields on \mathbb{R}^N . Let \mathfrak{g} be the Lie algebra Lie-generated by X_1, \dots, X_m . Suppose that conditions (H, C, D) are fulfilled.*

Then \mathbb{R}^N can be equipped with a multiplication \cdot such that $\mathbb{G} = (\mathbb{R}^N, \cdot)$ is a Lie group whose Lie algebra (thought of as a set of vector fields on \mathbb{R}^N) is equal to \mathfrak{g} .

More precisely the group multiplication $x \cdot y$ is a smooth prolongation of the map $(x, y) \mapsto m(x, y)$ constructed in (1.13) through the integral curves of the vector fields of \mathfrak{g} . As a consequence, any Hörmander operator $L = X_1 + \sum_{j=2}^m X_j^2$ is left invariant on \mathbb{G} .

We observe that Theorem 1.8 is an improvement of both [12, Th. 1.1] (the latter assuming the existence of a C^ω prolongation of m , along with (H, C, D)), and an improvement of [6, Th. 1.4] (the latter assuming (H, C, D) under the C^ω regularity of X_1, \dots, X_m).

2 A non-convergence result for the BCH series

In this section we prove Theorem 1.4 and the results in Example 1.3.

Proof (of Theorem 1.4). Taking for granted the notation in the statement of the theorem, we explicitly compute the $Z_n(X, Y)$'s.

Since we know that $Z_1(X, Y) = X + Y$, we can suppose $n \geq 2$. With reference to the notation in Dynkin's presentation (1.2), from $[X, Y] = vY$, $[Y, X] = -vY$ and the trivial fact $[Y, Y] = 0$, one gets that the only possibly non-vanishing summands of (1.2) are related to the indices for which $j_1 + \dots + j_k = 1$. Thus, when $n \geq 2$, $Z_n(X, Y)$ coincides with the sum of the terms in formula (1.2) where Y appears precisely once.

At the formal-power-series level of $\mathbb{Q}\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$, we know from very classical results (see e.g., [11, eq. (4.173)]) that the sum of the terms in $\sum_{n \geq 1} Z_n(x, y)$ where y appears exactly once is equal to

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k B_k}{k!} (\text{ad } x)^k(y),$$

where the B_k 's are the Bernoulli numbers. Gathering these things together, by degree reasons,

$$Z_{n+1}(X, Y) = \frac{(-1)^n B_n}{n!} (\text{ad } X)^n(Y), \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

On the other hand, from $[X, Y] = vY$ one gets $(\text{ad } X)^n(Y) = v^n Y$ for every $n \geq 1$, so that

$$Z_{n+1}(X, Y) = \frac{(-1)^n B_n}{n!} v^n Y, \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

Summing up, the BCH series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Z_n(X, Y) = (X + Y) + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} Z_n(X, Y)$ coincides with

$$(X + Y) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n B_n}{n!} v^n Y = X + \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_n}{n!} (-v)^n \right) Y. \quad (2.1)$$

Since the B_n 's are defined by $\frac{z}{e^z - 1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_n}{n!} z^n$, the radius of convergence of the power series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_n}{n!} z^n$ is 2π . It can be proved that the power series does not converge when $|z| = 2\pi$ (for completeness reason, we furnish the proof of this fact in Remark 4.1).

This shows that the BCH series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Z_n(X, Y)$ converges if and only if $|v| < 2\pi$. As for its sum, if $|v| < 2\pi$ we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_n}{n!} (-v)^n = \frac{-v}{e^{-v} - 1} = \psi(v),$$

so that, on account of (2.1), we get the desired (1.11). This ends the proof of Theorem 1.4. \square

Next we prove the results in Example 1.3. For $v \in \mathbb{R}$, let $X = X(v)$ and Y be respectively the matrices $x = x(v)$ and y in (1.8). A direct computation shows that

$$[X, Y] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = vY,$$

so that (with $\mathcal{A} = M_2(\mathbb{R})$) we are entitled to apply Theorem 1.4. Hence assertion (ii) of Example 1.3 follows directly from that theorem. By a direct computation we have

$$e^X e^Y = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-v} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2v} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-v} & e^{-v} \\ 0 & e^{-2v} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, the Mercator series (1.4) boils down to the matrix series (be it convergent or not)

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-v} - 1 & e^{-v} \\ 0 & e^{-2v} - 1 \end{pmatrix}^n. \quad (2.2)$$

When $v = 0$ this series trivially converges, and its sum is equal to Y ; hence we can assume $v \neq 0$. By a direct diagonalization, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} e^{-v} - 1 & e^{-v} \\ 0 & e^{-2v} - 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & e^{-v} - 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} e^{-v} - 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2v} - 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{1-e^{-v}} \\ 0 & \frac{-1}{1-e^{-v}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

As a consequence, the series (2.2) is equal to

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & e^{-v} - 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} (e^{-v} - 1)^n & 0 \\ 0 & \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} (e^{-2v} - 1)^n \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{1-e^{-v}} \\ 0 & \frac{-1}{1-e^{-v}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now this series is convergent if and only if $e^{-v} - 1$ and $e^{-2v} - 1$ belong to $] -1, 1[$, and this is equivalent to $v \geq -\ln \sqrt{2}$. This proves assertion (i) of Example 1.3. Finally, assertion (iii), which is equivalent to

$$\exp \begin{pmatrix} -v & \frac{v}{1-e^{-v}} \\ 0 & -2v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-v} & e^{-v} \\ 0 & e^{-2v} \end{pmatrix} \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R},$$

can be proved by a direct diagonalization.

3 A prolongation result for the BCH operation

What remains to prove from §1.2 of the introduction is Theorem 1.6 and the global left-invariance property (1.20), which is what we demonstrate in this section.

Proof (of Theorem 1.6). The existence of ε can be obtained as in the proof of Proposition 1.2-(c), since \mathfrak{g} is finite-dimensional by (D) (hence equipped with some norm). Let now $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ satisfy $\|X\|, \|Y\| < \varepsilon$; we also fix any $x \in M$. For $t \in [0, 1]$ we consider the functions

$$F(t) := \exp(tY)(\exp(X)(x)), \quad G(t) := \exp(Z(X, tY))(x).$$

They are well-posed due to assumption (C) (as $Z(X, tY) \in \mathfrak{g}$); moreover they are smooth. We claim that $F \equiv G$ on $[0, 1]$; the identity $F(1) = G(1)$ gives the desired (1.12). Hence we prove the claim: since $F(0) = G(0) = \exp(X)(x)$, by uniqueness results for Cauchy problems, all that remains to prove is that F and G satisfy the same ODE. By the very definition of an integral curve, one has $F'(t) = Y(F(t))$, for any $t \in [0, 1]$. Thus we aim to prove that

$$G'(t) = Y(G(t)), \quad t \in [0, 1]. \quad (3.1)$$

This is less trivial to prove. We argue as follows. Let us use the alternative flow-notation $\Psi_t^X(x)$ for the flow of the vector field X at time t starting from the point x . Let us fix any linear basis J_1, \dots, J_N of \mathfrak{g} ; for $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we use the notation $\xi \cdot J$ for $\sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j J_j$. Then there exists a smooth \mathbb{R}^N -valued map $\xi(t)$ such that $Z(X, tY) = \xi(t) \cdot J$ on $[0, 1]$. Since \mathfrak{g} is finite dimensional, it is simple to calculate the differential of the function $\xi \mapsto \Psi_t^{\xi \cdot J}(x)$. Thus we get the following computation

$$G'(t) = d_x(\Psi_1^{\xi(t) \cdot J}) \frac{e^{\text{ad}(\xi(t) \cdot J)} - 1}{\text{ad}(\xi(t) \cdot J)} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \xi'_j(t) J_j(x) \right). \quad (3.2)$$

On the other hand, by the results in [5, Th. 3.1] we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \xi'_j(t) J_j(x) = \frac{d}{dt} Z(X, tY) = \frac{-\text{ad} Z(X, tY)}{e^{-\text{ad}(Z(X, tY))} - 1} Y.$$

Inserting this in (3.2), and since $Z(X, tY) = \xi(t) \cdot J$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} G'(t) &= d_x(\Psi_1^{\xi(t) \cdot J}) e^{\text{ad}(\xi(t) \cdot J)} Y = d_x \Psi_1^{\xi(t) \cdot J} \left(d\Psi_{-1}^{\xi(t) \cdot J} Y \right) \\ &= Y \left(\Psi_1^{\xi(t) \cdot J} \circ \Psi_{-1}^{\xi(t) \cdot J} \right) (\Psi_1^{\xi(t) \cdot J}(x)) = Y(\Psi_1^{\xi(t) \cdot J}(x)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

In the second equality we used the identity $d\Psi_{-t}^X Y = e^{\text{ad}(tX)}(Y)$ (valid for any t and any $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$), another simple consequence of assumptions (C, D). Since $\xi(t) \cdot J = Z(X, tY)$, we have $\Psi_1^{\xi(t) \cdot J}(x) = G(t)$, so that (3.3) gives $G'(t) = Y(G(t))$ and the proof of (3.1) is complete. \square

Finally we give the following proof.

Proof (of identity (1.20)). By conditions (H) and (D), there exists a linear basis $\{J_1, \dots, J_N\}$ of \mathfrak{g} such that, denoting by $J(x)$ the matrix whose j -th column is the $N \times 1$ vector whose entries are the coefficients of the vector field $J_j(x)$ w.r.t. the coordinate partial derivatives, one has

$$J(0) = \text{identity matrix, and } \det(J(x)) \neq 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

With these notations, it is not difficult to check that $z(t) := \gamma_{x,y}(t)$ in (1.17) solves the Cauchy problem (1.18), written compactly as

$$\dot{z}(t) = J(z(t))J(ty)^{-1}y, \quad z(0) = x.$$

By the prolongability result for ODEs in [6, Th. 1.1], we know that $z(t)$ exists for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$; hence the map Φ in (1.19) is well posed and smooth. As the two curves $s \mapsto \gamma_{x,ty}(s), \gamma_{x,y}(ts)$ solve the same Cauchy problem, we have $\gamma_{x,y}(t) = \Phi(x, ty)$ for any t . From the latter, we easily get

$$\frac{d}{dt}\{\Phi(x, ty)\} = J(\Phi(x, ty))J(ty)^{-1}y \quad (\text{for any } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N). \quad (3.4)$$

After a differentiation of both sides of (3.4) with respect to y , we get the matrix ODE

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left\{t \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial y}(x, ty)\right\} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left\{J(\Phi(x, ty))J(ty)^{-1}y\right\}. \quad (3.5)$$

Next, we have the following very technical fact: let us consider the structure constants of \mathfrak{g} with respect to the basis $\{J_1, \dots, J_N\}$, that is $\{C_{i,j}^k\}_{i,j,k \leq N}$ such that

$$[J_i, J_j] = \sum_{k=1}^N C_{i,j}^k J_k, \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}; \quad (3.6)$$

then, for any fixed $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, setting $C(j) := (C_{i,j}^k)_{k,i \leq N}$ one has (for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$)

$$C(j)J(z)^{-1}z = J(z)^{-1} \frac{\partial J_j}{\partial z}(z)z - J(z)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial J_1}{\partial z}(z)J_j(z) \dots \frac{\partial J_N}{\partial z}(z)J_j(z) \right) J(z)^{-1}z. \quad (3.7)$$

Indeed (3.7) follows by re-writing (3.6) under the obvious matrix form (then by multiplication times $J(z)^{-1}$ on the left, and times $J(z)^{-1}z$ on the right). We claim that

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial y}(x, y) = J(\Phi(x, y))J(y)^{-1}, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (3.8)$$

By right multiplication of (3.8) times $J(y)$, we get the desired (1.20) with X replaced by J_1, \dots, J_N ; then (1.20) will follow by linearity. So all that we have to prove is (3.8).

To this end, we fix $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and we prove that

$$t \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial y}(x, ty) = tJ(\Phi(x, ty))J(ty)^{-1}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.9)$$

We denote by $A(t)$ and $B(t)$, respectively, the left-hand and the right-hand sides of (3.9). If we show that $A(t) = B(t)$ for any t , then (3.8) will follow by taking $t = 1$. Provided that $A(0) = 0 = B(0)$, we show that A and B solve the same (matrix linear) ODE. By (3.5), we see that A solves

$$A'(t) = J(\Phi(x, ty)) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(J(ty)^{-1} y \right) + \sum_{k=1}^N (J(ty)^{-1} y)_k \frac{\partial J_k}{\partial y} (\Phi(x, ty)) A(t). \quad (3.10)$$

We finally claim that $B(t)$ solves the same ODE (3.10): indeed, if one inserts $B(t)$ in place of $A(t)$ in (3.10), after a tedious computation, one discovers that the claimed needed identity is equivalent to the technical identity in (3.7). This ends the proof. \square

4 Appendix

For the sake of completeness, we give the following:

Proof of Proposition 1.2. We split the proof according to the statement of the proposition.

(a). Let $\|x\| + \|y\| < \ln 2$. Then, by the compatibility of the norm of \mathcal{A} with the product, we have (see (1.4))

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|L_n(x, y)\| &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_n, j_n) \neq (0,0)} \frac{\|x\|^{i_1} \|y\|^{j_1} \dots \|x\|^{i_n} \|y\|^{j_n}}{i_1! j_1! \dots i_n! j_n!} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \left(e^{\|x\| + \|y\|} - 1 \right)^n = -\ln(2 - e^{\|x\| + \|y\|}) < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

The last equality is a consequence of $\|x\| + \|y\| < \ln 2$ and the trivial fact $\sum_n w^n/n = -\ln(1-w)$, valid for $w \in [-1, 1)$. This proves the absolute convergence of the Mercator series $L(x, y)$ when $\|x\| + \|y\| < \ln 2$. The above computation shows that we can rearrange the sums over n and over $(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_n, j_n)$ as we please. We group homogeneous terms of the same degree as follows:

$$L_n(x, y) = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} L_{n,k}(x, y) \quad \text{where} \quad L_{n,k}(x, y) := \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} \sum_{\substack{(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_n, j_n) \neq (0,0) \\ i_1 + j_1 + \dots + i_n + j_n = k}} \frac{x^{i_1} y^{j_1} \dots x^{i_n} y^{j_n}}{i_1! j_1! \dots i_n! j_n!}.$$

This gives the following computation (the sums can be interchanged due to absolute convergence)

$$L(x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} L_n(x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} L_{n,k}(x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^k L_{n,k}(x, y).$$

We claim that the last member is equal to the BCH series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} Z_k(x, y)$. This will give the equality $L(x, y) = Z(x, y)$ when $\|x\| + \|y\| < \ln 2$. The claim is a consequence of the following fact:

$$\sum_{n=1}^k L_{n,k}(x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^k \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} \sum_{\substack{(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_n, j_n) \neq (0,0) \\ i_1 + j_1 + \dots + i_n + j_n = k}} \frac{x^{i_1} y^{j_1} \dots x^{i_n} y^{j_n}}{i_1! j_1! \dots i_n! j_n!} = Z_k(x, y). \quad (4.2)$$

Indeed, the last equality holds true since the middle term is precisely the associative presentation of $Z_k(x, y)$ in $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle x, y \rangle\rangle$ (the one leading to Dynkin's presentation (1.2) after an application of the Dynkin-Specht-Wever map), see e.g., [11, Sec. 3.1.3]. We are left to prove the absolute convergence

of the BCH series when $\|x\| + \|y\| < \ln 2$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|Z_k(x, y)\| &\stackrel{(4.2)}{\leq} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\substack{(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_n, j_n) \neq (0, 0) \\ i_1 + j_1 + \dots + i_n + j_n = k}} \frac{\|x\|^{i_1 + \dots + i_n} \|y\|^{j_1 + \dots + j_n}}{i_1! j_1! \cdots i_n! j_n!} \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\substack{(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_n, j_n) \neq (0, 0) \\ i_1 + j_1 + \dots + i_n + j_n = k}} \frac{\|x\|^{i_1 + \dots + i_n} \|y\|^{j_1 + \dots + j_n}}{i_1! j_1! \cdots i_n! j_n!} \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_n, j_n) \neq (0, 0)} \frac{\|x\|^{i_1 + \dots + i_n} \|y\|^{j_1 + \dots + j_n}}{i_1! j_1! \cdots i_n! j_n!} \stackrel{(4.1)}{=} -\ln(2 - e^{\|x\| + \|y\|}).
\end{aligned}$$

(b). Suppose that $\sum_n L_n(x, y)$ converges in \mathcal{A} . Then, by Abel's Lemma in Banach spaces (see e.g., [11, Lemma 5.68]), we know that the power series $F(t) := \sum_n L_n(x, y)t^n$ is uniformly convergent (hence continuous) for t in $[0, 1]$, and is an \mathcal{A} -valued analytic function on $(0, 1)$. Now it is a standard fact to show that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\exp\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} w^n\right) = I + w, \quad \text{for every } w \in \mathcal{A} \text{ such that } \|w\| < \epsilon. \quad (4.3)$$

As a consequence, if t is suitably small (so that $\|t(e^x e^y - I)\| < \epsilon$) we have the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp(F(t)) &= \exp\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} L_n(x, y)t^n\right) \stackrel{(1.4)}{=} \exp\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} (t(e^x e^y - I))^n\right) \\
&\stackrel{(4.3)}{=} I + t(e^x e^y - I) =: G(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\exp \circ F$ and G are two \mathcal{A} -valued analytic functions on $(0, 1)$, coinciding on some small interval $(0, \epsilon')$, with $\epsilon' > 0$. By Unique Continuation we infer that $\exp \circ F = G$ on $(0, 1)$, and by continuity we get $\exp(F(1)) = G(1)$. The latter identity is precisely $\exp(L(x, y)) = e^x e^y$.

(c). We set $F(t) := \sum_n Z_n(tx, ty)$. Since Z_n is a homogeneous polynomial of degree n , we have $F(t) = \sum_n Z_n(x, y)t^n$. Arguing as above we know that the power series $F(t)$ is uniformly convergent (hence continuous) for t in $[0, 1]$, and an \mathcal{A} -valued analytic function on $(0, 1)$. When t is small (say $t \in [0, \epsilon]$ with $\epsilon = \epsilon(x, y) > 0$), we have $\|tx\| + \|ty\| < \ln 2$, hence (by part (a) of the proof) $F(t)$ is a logarithm of $e^{tx} e^{ty}$:

$$\exp(F(t)) = e^{tx} e^{ty} \quad \forall t \in [0, \epsilon].$$

Now, both sides of this identity are analytic functions of t on $(0, 1)$, hence this identity is valid throughout $(0, 1)$ by Unique Continuation. By continuity, the identity remains true for $t = 1$:

$$\exp(F(1)) = e^x e^y, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \exp\left(\sum_n Z_n(x, y)\right) = e^x e^y.$$

This is exactly what we wanted to prove. \square

Next, we review some special function facts for the non-convergence of the series associated with the Bernoulli numbers on the boundary of the disc of convergence.

Remark 4.1. Let the B_n 's be as in Theorem 1.4. We show that the power series $S(z) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_n}{n!} z^n$ is not convergent on the boundary $\{|z| = 2\pi\}$ of its convergence disc; since $B_{2n+1} = 0$ for every $n \geq 1$, $S(z)$ converges if and only if the series $\tilde{S}(z) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{B_{2n}}{(2n)!} z^{2n}$ converges. We use a formula relating the B_n 's to Riemann's ζ function (see [46, §3.16, p. 117]):

$$\zeta(2n) = \frac{(2\pi)^{2n} (-1)^{n-1} B_{2n}}{2 \cdot (2n)!}, \quad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $\zeta(2n) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get $\frac{|B_{2n}|}{(2n)!} \sim \frac{2}{(2\pi)^{2n}}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, if $|z| = 2\pi$, then $\tilde{S}(z)$ cannot converge, since $\frac{|B_{2n}|}{(2n)!} |z|^{2n} \rightarrow 2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Finally, the following example shows that Eggert's condition (see [20]) on the extendibility for the BCH series may not be satisfied when our extendibility assumptions (H,C,D) hold true.

Example 4.2. Let us consider on \mathbb{R}^3 the vector fields

$$X_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \quad X_2 = \cos x_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} + \sin x_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathfrak{g} := \text{Lie}\{X_1, X_2\}$ is 3-dimensional (whence (D) is fulfilled) and it also satisfies hypotheses (C) (any $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ has bounded coefficients) and (H). The associated Exp map is given by

$$\text{Exp}(\xi_1 X_1 + \xi_2 X_2 + \xi_3 [X_1, X_2]) = \left(\xi_1, \xi_2 \frac{\sin \xi_1}{\xi_1} + \xi_3 \frac{\cos \xi_1 - 1}{\xi_1}, -\xi_2 \frac{\cos \xi_1 - 1}{\xi_1} + \xi_3 \frac{\sin \xi_1}{\xi_1} \right).$$

We observe that Exp is not injective nor surjective, hence Eggert's extendibility condition for the BCH series is not fulfilled. However, after some computation, it can be checked that our local map m in (1.13) is equal to

$$m(x, y) = \left(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2 \cos x_1 - y_3 \sin x_1, x_3 + y_2 \sin x_1 + y_3 \cos x_1 \right),$$

which is clearly extendible to $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$.

References

- [1] R. Achilles, A. Bonfiglioli: *The early proofs of the Theorem of Campbell, Baker, Hausdorff and Dynkin*, Arch. Hist. Exact Sci., **66**, 295–358 (2012).
- [2] A. Arnal, F. Casas, C. Chiralt: *On the structure and convergence of the symmetric Zassenhaus formula*, Computer Physics Communications **217**, 58–65 (2017).
- [3] M. Bauer, R. Chetrite, K. Ebrahimi-Fard, F. Patras: *Time-ordering and generalized Magnus expansion*, Lett. Math. Phys. **103**, 331–350 (2013).
- [4] G. Basar, G.V. Dunne and M. Unsal: *Quantum geometry of resurgent perturbative/nonperturbative relations*, JHEP **1705**, 087 (2017).
- [5] S. Biagi, A. Bonfiglioli: *On the convergence of the Campbell-Baker-Hausdorff-Dynkin series in infinite-dimensional Banach-Lie algebras*, Linear Multilin. Algebra **62**, 1591–1615 (2014).
- [6] S. Biagi, A. Bonfiglioli: *A completeness result for time-dependent vector fields and applications*, Commun. Contemp. Math. **17**, 1–26 (2015).
- [7] S. Blanes, F. Casas: *On the convergence and optimization of the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula*, Linear Algebra Appl. **378**, 135–58 (2004).
- [8] S. Blanes, F. Casas, J.A. Oteo, J. Ros: *Magnus and Fer expansions for matrix differential equations: The convergence problem*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **22**, 259–268 (1998).
- [9] S. Blanes, F. Casas, J.A. Oteo, J. Ros: *The Magnus expansion and some of its applications*, Phys. Rep. **470**, 151–238 (2009).
- [10] A. Bonfiglioli: *An ODE's version of the formula of Baker, Campbell, Dynkin and Hausdorff and the construction of Lie groups with prescribed Lie algebra*, Mediterr. J. Math. **7**, 387–414 (2010).
- [11] A. Bonfiglioli, R. Fulci: *Topics in Noncommutative Algebra. The Theorem of Campbell, Baker, Hausdorff and Dynkin*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **2034**, Springer-Verlag: Heidelberg, 2012. ISBN: 978-3-642-22596-3.
- [12] A. Bonfiglioli, E. Lanconelli: *Lie groups related to Hörmander operators and Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck equations* Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. **11**, 1587–1614 (2012).
Lie groups related to Hörmander operators and Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck equations. Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.2012;11(5):1587–614.
- [13] N. Bourbaki: *Éléments de Mathématique. Groupes et Algèbres de Lie*. Chap. I-III, Actualités scientifiques et industrielles. Paris: Hermann, 1972.
- [14] A. Bravetti, A. A. Garcia-Chung and D. Tapias: *Exact Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula for the contact Heisenberg algebra*, J. Phys. A **50** no.10, 105203 (2017).
- [15] F. Casas: *Sufficient conditions for the convergence of the Magnus expansion*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40**, 15001–15017 (2007).
- [16] F. Casas, A. Murua: *An efficient algorithm for computing the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff series and some of its applications*, J. Math. Phys. **50**, 033513-1–033513-23 (2009).

- [17] J. Day, W. So, W., R.C. Thompson: *Some properties of the Campbell-Baker-Hausdorff series*, Linear and Multilinear Algebra **29**, 207–224 (1991).
- [18] E. B. Dynkin: *Normed Lie algebras and analytic groups*, Uspehi Matem. Nauk (N.S.) **5**, n.1 (35), 135–186 (1950).
- [19] J. Écalle: *Les fonctions resurgentes*, vol. I - III Publ. Math. Orsay, 1981.
- [20] A. Eggert: *Extending the Campbell-Hausdorff multiplication*, Geom. Dedicata **46**, 35–45 (1993).
- [21] D. L. Foulis: *The algebra of complex 2×2 matrices and a general closed Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula*, J. Phys. A **50** no.30, 305204 (2017).
- [22] F. Hausdorff: *Die symbolische Exponentialformel in der Gruppentheorie*, Leipz. Ber. **58**, 19–48 (1906).
- [23] T. Kimura: *Explicit description of the Zassenhaus formula*, PTEP **2017** no.4, 041A03 (2017).
- [24] Y. Li, D. Sauzin, S. Sun: *The Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula via mould calculus*, arXiv:1805.00766 [math.RA].
- [25] C. F. Lo: *Comment on ‘Special-case closed form of the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula’*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **49**, 218001 (2016).
- [26] M. Matone: *An algorithm for the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula*, JHEP **1505**, 113 (2015).
- [27] M. Matone: *Classification of commutator algebras leading to the new type of closed Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formulas*, J. Geom. Phys. **97**, 34–43 (2015).
- [28] M. Matone: *Closed form of the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula for the generators of semisimple complex Lie algebras*, Eur. Phys. J. C **76** no.11, 610 (2016).
- [29] M. Matone, P. Pasti: *Wilson loops on Riemann surfaces, Liouville theory and covariantization of the conformal group*, JHEP **1506**, 010 (2015).
- [30] M. Mérigot: *Domaine de convergence de la série de Campbell-Hausdorff*, multigraphie interne, Nice University (1974).
- [31] J. Michel: *Bases des algèbres de Lie et série de Hausdorff*, Séminaire Dubreil. Algèbre **27** n.1 (1973-1974), exp. n.6, 1–9 (1974).
- [32] P. C. Moan: *Efficient approximation of Sturm-Liouville problems using Lie-group methods*, Technical Report 1998/NA11, Dep. of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, University of Cambridge, England, 1998.
- [33] P. C. Moan, J. Niesen: *Convergence of the Magnus series*, Found. Comput. Math. **8**, 291–301 (2008).
- [34] P. C. Moan, J. A. Oteo: *Convergence of the exponential Lie series*, J. Math. Phys. **42**, 501–508 (2001).
- [35] M. Newman, W. So, R. C. Thompson: *Convergence domains for the Campbell-Baker-Hausdorff formula*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **24**, 301–310 (1989).
- [36] H. Poincaré: *Sur les groupes continus*, Cambr. Trans. **18**, 220–255 (1900).
- [37] R. D. Richtmyer, S. Greenspan: *Expansion of the Campbell-Baker-Hausdorff formula by computer*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **18**, 107–108 (1965).
- [38] R. S. Strichartz: *The Campbell-Baker-Hausdorff-Dynkin formula and solutions of differential equations*, J. Funct. Anal. **72**, 320–345 (1987).
- [39] F. Strocchi: *An introduction to the mathematical structure to quantum mechanics*. Advanced Series in Mathematical Physics, Vol. 28. World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc.: Singapore, 2008.
- [40] M. Suzuki: *On the convergence of exponential operators—the Zassenhaus formula, BCH formula and systematic approximants*, Commun. Math. Phys. **57**, 193–200 (1977).
- [41] S. Tamura, H. Katsura: *Zero-energy states in conformal field theory with sine-square deformation*, PTEP **2017**, 113 (2017).
- [42] R. C. Thompson: *Convergence proof for Goldberg’s exponential series*, Linear Algebra Appl. **121**, 3–7 (1989).
- [43] A. Van-Brunt, M. Visser: *Special-case closed form of the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **48**, 225207 (2015).
- [44] M. Serone, G. Spada, G. Villadoro: *The power of perturbation theory*, JHEP **1705**, 056 (2017).
- [45] V. A. Vinokurov: *The logarithm of the solution of a linear differential equation, Hausdorff’s formula, and conservation laws*, Soviet Math. Dokl., **44**, 200–205 (1992). Translated from **319**, no.5 (1991).
- [46] Z. X. Wang, D. R. Guo: *Special Functions*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc.: Singapore, 1989.
- [47] J. Wei: *Note on the global validity of the Baker-Hausdorff and Magnus theorems*, J. Mathematical Phys. **4**, 1337–1341 (1963).