

# A $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -Topological Index as a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -State Index

N. J. B. Aza    L. C. P. A. M. Müssnich    A. F. Reyes-Lega

March 4, 2022

## Abstract

Within the setting of infinite dimensional self-dual CAR  $C^*$ -algebras describing fermions in the  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -lattice, we depart from the well-known Araki-Evans  $\sigma(P_1, P_2)$   $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -index for quasi-free fermion states and rewrite it in terms of states, rather than in terms of basis projections. Furthermore, we reformulate results which relate equivalences of Fock representations with the index parity into results which relate equivalences of GNS representations and the associated index parity.

**Keywords:** Operator Algebras, Lattice Fermion Systems,  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -index, ground states.

**AMS Subject Classification:** 46L30, 46N55, 82B20, 82B44

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Mathematical Framework</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Self-Dual CAR Algebra . . . . .	2
2.2	States, Fock Representation and Projection Index . . . . .	3
2.3	A Certain Space “ $\mathfrak{F}$ ” for Functionals . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Main results</b>	<b>7</b>

## 1 Introduction

This work is a preliminary result toward the stability of the *Araki-Evans*  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -Topological Index ( $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -TI) for *weakly interacting* fermions embedded on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -crystal lattices. The  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -TI was introduced in the quasi-free fermion setting, and can be used to study  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  topological components and their physical meaning in this context. It is well-known that it discriminates parity sectors among quasi-free ground states [EK98, BVF01]. Because of the strong connection between quasi-free ground states and *basis projections* in the *self-dual* framework, this  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -TI is written in terms of basis projections. Furthermore, the properties to which it is connected are stated in terms of the Fock representation for quasi-free states. For one recent work which discusses the use of the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -TI in the context of lattice fermions, see, for instance, [ARS22] and references therein.

Although we here present only a plain rewriting of the Araki-Evans  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -TI, this reformulation will allow for the further application of this index when sufficiently small (but not null) interactions are considered. Nonetheless, since no natural basis projections arise in the interacting case, this application first requires the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -TI to be written in terms of states, in such a way that its main properties are

retained, but that no references to basis projections are needed. Also, following recent ideas which use the *GNS representation* in the context of  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -indexes [Oga21b, Oga21a], we also reformulate in a simple way a result associated with the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -TI into the GNS representation setting. Our main result, Theorem 1, is then a restatement of Araki's [Ara87, Theorems 6.14 and 6.15].

On what regards further work, in [AMR], it will be taken that the spectral gap associated with a family of *free* fermion Hamiltonians in the same phase of matter will be uniform, in a way such that each of these has a unique gapped ground state. Then, we will consider properties of covariances of two-point correlation functions, as well as combine them with expansions of logarithms of generating functions associated with weakly interacting systems. Recall that time correlation functions appear in the perturbative expansion of (full) correlations for weakly interacting systems. Thus, under suitable assumptions we compare sets of quasi-free ground states of *free* fermions systems with a set of states associated with fermions under weak interactions. This will allow us to approximate both sets via local perturbations [NSY21]. We will then prove that the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -TI persists in the thermodynamic limit. Particularly we use the fermionic Renormalization Group equation, as well as efficient estimates associated with covariances of systems that are not necessarily translation invariant. For a full account of our approach to weakly interacting fermions in the lattice, see [ABPM21].

## 2 Mathematical Framework

### 2.1 Self-Dual CAR Algebra

We refer to [Ara87, ABPM21, ARS22] for an extensive treatment of self-dual CAR  $C^*$ -algebras in the context of lattice fermions. We briefly introduce and recall some notations.

Notation 1.

1. A norm on the generic vector space  $\mathcal{X}$  is denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}}$  and the identity map of  $\mathcal{X}$  by  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . The space of all bounded linear operators on  $(\mathcal{X}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}})$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ . The unit element of any algebra  $\mathcal{X}$  is always denoted by  $\mathbf{1}$ , provided it exists. The scalar product of any Hilbert space  $\mathcal{X}$  is denoted by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{X}}$  represents the usual trace on  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ .
2.  $(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$  is a *self-dual Hilbert space*, with  $\mathcal{H}$  a complex and separable Hilbert space, with either even and finite or infinite dimension.  $\{\psi_i : i \in \mathbb{I}\}$  is an orthonormal basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ .  $\Gamma : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is a *complex conjugation* over  $\mathcal{H}$ . Also, we let  $P = \Gamma P^\perp \Gamma$  be a basis projection over  $\mathcal{H}$ , with range denoted by  $\mathfrak{h}_P$ . The set of all basis projections over  $\mathcal{H}$  will be denoted by  $\mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ . We will also denote by  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$  the self-dual CAR algebra generated by a unit  $\mathbf{1}$  and by elements  $\{\text{B}(\varphi)\}_{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}}$ , indexed by  $\mathcal{H}$  and which satisfy the usual self-dual CAR generating conditions<sup>1</sup>. ♣

Recall that, for any unitary operator  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $U\Gamma = \Gamma U$ , the family of elements  $\{\mathbf{1}\} \cup \{\text{B}(U\varphi)\}_{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}}$  satisfies the self-dual CAR generating conditions, and hence by the same token generates  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ . Such unitary operators  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  are named *Bogoliubov transformations*. To each Bogoliubov transformation  $U$ , the unique  $*$ -automorphism  $\chi_U$  that satisfies

$$(2) \quad \chi_U(\text{B}(\varphi)) = \text{B}(U\varphi), \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{H},$$

is called the a *Bogoliubov  $*$ -automorphism* associated with  $U$ .  $U = -\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$ , allows us to define *odd* and *even* elements of  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ : *odd* elements satisfy  $\chi_{-\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}}}(A) = -A$ , whereas *even* elements

---

<sup>1</sup>Remember that these read, in the self-dual formalism, as  $\varphi \mapsto \text{B}(\varphi)^*$  being complex linear,  $\text{B}(\varphi)^*$  being equal to  $\text{B}(\Gamma\varphi)$ , and the canonical anticommutation relations being valid:

$$(1) \quad \text{B}(\varphi_1)\text{B}(\varphi_2)^* + \text{B}(\varphi_2)^*\text{B}(\varphi_1) = \langle \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{1}.$$

satisfy  $\chi_{-1_{\mathcal{H}}}(A) = A$ . Note that the subspace  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^+$  of even elements is a sub- $C^*$ -algebra of  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ . We shall denote the subset of odd elements by  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^-$ .

## 2.2 States, Fock Representation and Projection Index

Likewise in the context of  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ , we first introduce and recall some notations.

Notation 2.

$\omega$  is any state<sup>2</sup> in  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*$ , the set of linear functionals over the self-dual CAR  $C^*$ -algebra. We denote by  $\mathfrak{E} \subset \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*$  the set of all states over  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ . We let  $(\mathcal{H}_\omega, \pi_\omega, \Omega_\omega)$  denote the GNS triple associated with  $\omega$ .  $\clubsuit$

States  $\omega \in \mathfrak{E}$  are said to be *quasi-free* when, if calculated over odd monomials on B operators, yield zero, *i.e.*, for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{2N} \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$(3) \quad \omega(B(\varphi_0) \cdots B(\varphi_{2N})) = 0,$$

and, if calculated over even monomials, are given by a Pfaffian over two-point correlations, *i.e.*, for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{2N} \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$(4) \quad \omega(B(\varphi_1) \cdots B(\varphi_{2N})) = \text{Pf} [\omega(\mathbb{O}_{k,l}(B(\varphi_k), B(\varphi_l)))]_{k,l=1}^{2N},$$

where

$$(5) \quad \mathbb{O}_{k,l}(A_1, A_2) \doteq \begin{cases} A_1 A_2 & \text{for } k < l, \\ -A_2 A_1 & \text{for } k > l, \\ 0 & \text{for } k = l. \end{cases}$$

In Equation (4), Pf is the usual Pfaffian defined by

$$(6) \quad \text{Pf} [M_{k,l}]_{k,l=1}^{2N} \doteq \frac{1}{2^N N!} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_{2N}} (-1)^\pi \prod_{j=1}^N M_{\pi(2j-1), \pi(2j)}$$

for any  $2N \times 2N$  skew-symmetric matrix  $M \in \text{Mat}(2N, \mathbb{C})$ . Note that (4) is equivalent to the definition given either in [Ara71, Definition 3.1] or in [EK98, Equation (6.6.9)]. Moreover, one can show that a quasi-free state  $\omega \in \mathfrak{E}$  is described (uniquely) by a *symbol*, that is, a positive operator  $S_\omega \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  such that

$$(7) \quad 0 \leq S_\omega \leq \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \text{and} \quad S_\omega + \Gamma S_\omega \Gamma = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$$

through the conditions

$$(8) \quad \langle \varphi_1, S_\omega \varphi_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \omega(B(\varphi_1)B(\varphi_2)^*), \quad \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Conversely, any self-adjoint operator  $P$  satisfying (7) uniquely defines a quasi-free state through Equation (8):

$$(9) \quad \omega_P(B(\varphi_1)B(\varphi_2)^*) = \langle \varphi_1, P \varphi_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Thus, any basis projection associated with  $(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$  can be seen as a symbol for a quasi-free state over  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ . Quasi-free states defined by basis projections are *pure* and it will be referred to as *Fock states* [Ara71, Lemma 4.3].

An example of a quasi-free state is provided by the tracial state:

---

<sup>2</sup> That is, a positive, normalized linear functional over  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ . In particular,  $\overline{\omega(A)} = \omega(A^*)$ , for any  $A \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ .

*Definition 1 (Tracial state).*

The tracial state  $\text{tr} \in \mathfrak{E}$  is the quasi-free state with symbol  $S_{\text{tr}} \doteq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}}$ . ▀

Take  $P \in \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ , with range  $\mathfrak{h}_P$ . For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \mathfrak{h}_P$ , we denote by  $\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_n$  the *completely antisymmetric  $n$ -linear form associated with*<sup>3</sup>  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ . Recall that

$$\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_n = \varepsilon_\pi \varphi_{\pi(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_{\pi(n)}, \quad \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \mathfrak{h}_P,$$

with  $\varepsilon_\pi$  equal to +1 or -1 if the permutation  $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n$  is even or odd, respectively. For  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , we define  $\wedge^0 \mathfrak{h}_P \doteq \mathbb{C}$ , and, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we define

$$\wedge^n \mathfrak{h}_P \doteq \text{lin}\{\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_n : \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \mathfrak{h}_P\}.$$

We introduce an inner product in  $\wedge^n \mathfrak{h}_P$  through

$$\langle \varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_n, \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n \rangle_{\wedge^n \mathfrak{h}_P} \doteq \det \left( \langle \varphi_i, \phi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right)_{i,j=1}^n.$$

Therefore, if we let

$$(10) \quad \wedge \mathfrak{h}_P \doteq \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \wedge^n \mathfrak{h}_P,$$

we might naturally endow it with a pre-Hilbert structure, the completion of which we call the *fermionic Fock space associated with  $\mathfrak{h}_P$* , denoted by  $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{h}_P)$ . We recall that “ $\wedge$ ” can be properly defined as a product over  $\wedge \mathfrak{h}_P$ , making it an associative algebra with unit. This product extends over to the fermionic Fock space.

We denote the *vacuum vector* by  $\Omega \in \wedge \mathfrak{h}_P$ , and it is such that  $[\Omega]_0 \doteq 1 \in \mathfrak{h}_P^0$  and  $[\Omega]_n \doteq 0 \in \mathfrak{h}_P^n$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Note that the vacuum vector is the unit of the algebra  $\wedge \mathfrak{h}_P$ . The maps  $a^* : \wedge \mathfrak{h}_P \rightarrow \wedge \mathfrak{h}_P$  and  $a : \wedge \mathfrak{h}_P \rightarrow \wedge \mathfrak{h}_P$  defined by, for all  $\xi, \zeta$  in  $\wedge \mathfrak{h}_P$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} a^*(\xi)\zeta &= \xi \wedge \zeta, \\ \forall \eta \in \wedge \mathfrak{h}_P, \langle a(\xi)\zeta, \eta \rangle_{\wedge \mathfrak{h}_P} &= \langle \zeta, \xi \wedge \eta \rangle_{\wedge \mathfrak{h}_P}, \end{aligned}$$

and extended over to the Fock space, are the so-called *creation* and *annihilation* operators, respectively. They are shown to be bounded operators. Among other properties, they satisfy  $a(\varphi)\Omega = 0$ , and  $a^*(\varphi)\Omega = \varphi$ , for all  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{h}_P$ . Here, for  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{h}_P$ , the involution of  $a(\varphi) \in \mathcal{B}(\wedge \mathfrak{h}_P)$ , namely,  $a(\varphi)^* \in \mathcal{B}(\wedge \mathfrak{h}_P)$ , is canonically identified with  $a^*(\varphi)$ , i. e.,  $a^*(\varphi) \equiv a(\varphi)^*$  [AJP06]. Additionally, the CAR hold:

$$a(\varphi_1)a^*(\varphi_2) + a^*(\varphi_2)a(\varphi_1) = \langle \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \rangle_{\mathfrak{h}_P} \mathbf{1}_{\wedge \mathfrak{h}_P}, \quad a(\varphi_1)a(\varphi_2) + a(\varphi_2)a(\varphi_1) = 0.$$

Hence, the family of operators  $\{a(\varphi)\}_{\varphi \in \mathfrak{h}_P}$  and  $\mathbf{1}_{\wedge \mathfrak{h}_P}$  generate a CAR  $C^*$ -algebra. By [Ara68, Lemma 3.3], there is a  $*$ -isomorphism from the self-dual CAR algebra onto the CAR generated by the creation and annihilation operators acting on the Fock space. This allows us to implement the so-called (*fermionic*) *Fock representation* of the sCAR( $\mathcal{H}, \Gamma$ ) algebra. Explicitly, for any  $P \in \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ , we write

$$(11) \quad \pi_P(B(\varphi)) \doteq a(P\varphi) + a^*(\Gamma P^\perp \varphi), \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{H},$$

---

<sup>3</sup>One can implement it, for instance, through

$$\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_n (\phi_1^*, \dots, \phi_n^*) = \det(\phi_i^*(\varphi_j))_{i,j=1}^n,$$

for all  $\phi_1^*, \dots, \phi_n^*$  elements of the dual  $\mathcal{H}^*$ .

and require that  $\pi_P$  is extended by linearity, in that it preserves products and adjoints. When considering the representation  $(\wedge_{\mathfrak{h}_P}, \pi_P)$ , it can be shown, then, that the above *Fock states*  $\omega_P$  can be written as

$$(12) \quad \omega_P(A) = \langle \Omega, \pi_P(A)\Omega \rangle_{\wedge_{\mathfrak{h}_P}}, \quad A \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma).$$

Before defining the *projection index* we introduce one further notation. Take the even and odd parts  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^\pm \subset \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$  (see expression (2)). Let  $\pi_P$  be the fermionic Fock representation associated to  $P$  given by (11). As shown by [Ara87],  $\pi_P$  can be decomposed as two disjoint irreducible representations :  $\pi_P = \pi_P^+ \oplus \pi_P^-$ . These are defined in the following way: let

$$\mathcal{H}_P^\pm \doteq \overline{\pi_P(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^\pm)\Omega_P}.$$

Then,  $\pi_P^+$  is the representation obtained by the restriction of  $\pi_P(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^+)$  to  $\mathcal{H}_P^+$ , and  $\pi_P^-$  is the representation obtained by the restriction of  $\pi_P(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^+)$  to  $\mathcal{H}_P^-$ .

We then define the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -*projection index* ( $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -PI) as follows:  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -PI is the function  $\sigma: \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma) \times \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$  defined by, for each  $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ ,

$$(13) \quad \sigma(P_1, P_2) \doteq (-1)^{\dim(P_1 \wedge P_2^\perp)},$$

where  $P_1 \wedge P_2^\perp$  denotes  $P_1\mathcal{H} \cap P_2^\perp\mathcal{H}$ . It is a fact that  $\sigma(P_1, P_2)$  gives an equivalence criterion for the quasi-free states  $\omega_{P_1}$  and  $\omega_{P_2}$ , when restricted to the even part  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^+$  of the self-dual  $C^*$ -algebra  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ . More generally, the Shale–Stinespring Theorem states that two Fock representations  $\pi_{P_1}$  and  $\pi_{P_2}$  associated with  $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$  are unitarily equivalent if, and only if,  $P_1 - P_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is a *Hilbert–Schmidt class* operator [BVF01]. Moreover, the representations  $\pi_{P_1}^\pm$  and  $\pi_{P_2}^\pm$  are (unitarily) equivalent if, and only if,  $P_1 - P_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is a Hilbert–Schmidt operator *and*  $\sigma(P_1, P_2)$  equals  $+1$ . On the other hand, the representations  $\pi_{P_1}^\pm$  and  $\pi_{P_2}^\mp$  are (unitarily) equivalent if, and only if,  $P_1 - P_2$  is a Hilbert–Schmidt operator *and*  $\sigma(P_1, P_2)$  is  $-1$ . See [Ara87, Theorem 6.15].

## 2.3 A Certain Space “ $\mathfrak{F}$ ” for Functionals

For our purposes, the following constructions are convenient<sup>4</sup>. Firstly, we introduce for,  $f, g \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*$ , a sesquilinear form on  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*$ :

$$(14) \quad \langle f, g \rangle_{\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*} \doteq \sum_{i, j \in \mathbb{I}} \overline{f(\mathbb{B}(\psi_i)\mathbb{B}(\psi_j)^*)} g(\mathbb{B}(\psi_i)\mathbb{B}(\psi_j)^*),$$

where  $\{\psi_i: i \in \mathbb{I}\}$  is an orthogonal basis of  $\mathcal{H}$ . For it to be meaningful, it should be restricted to elements  $f$  and  $g$  for which  $\langle f, g \rangle_{\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*} < \infty$ . Note that, if  $\mathcal{H}$  has infinite dimension, and  $P \in \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ , the quasi-free state  $\omega_P \in \mathfrak{E}$  *not* satisfies  $\langle \omega_P, \omega_P \rangle_{\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*} < \infty$ . See (9). It will be useful, nonetheless, to introduce the following quantity, for any  $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathfrak{E}$ :

$$(15) \quad \mathcal{N}(\omega_1, \omega_2) \doteq \langle \omega_1, 2\text{tr} - \omega_2 \rangle_{\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*},$$

where  $\text{tr} \in \mathfrak{E}$  is the tracial state of Definition 1. It has the following properties:

LEMMA 1.

Let  $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathfrak{E}$  be states over  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ . Then, the quantity  $\mathcal{N}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ , given by (15), is basis independent and  $\mathcal{N}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \mathcal{N}(\omega_2, \omega_1)$ . Moreover, if  $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$  are basis projections such that  $P_1 - P_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is a Hilbert–Schmidt operator, and  $\omega_{P_1}, \omega_{P_2} \in \mathfrak{E}$  are their associated quasi-free states, we have

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{N}(\omega_{P_1}, \omega_{P_2}) = \dim(P_1 \wedge P_2^\perp) \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad \blacklozenge$$

<sup>4</sup>We note that the notation “ $\mathfrak{F}$ ” carries no further meaning, apart from being an abbreviating symbol.

*Proof.* Let  $\{\psi_i: i \in I\}$  be an orthogonal basis of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Basis–independence for  $\mathcal{N}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$  derives from the fact that the summand is antilinear in  $\psi_i$  for  $\omega_1$  and linear in  $\psi_i$  for  $\omega_2$ , and likewise for  $\psi_j$ . In order to prove the symmetry, *i.e.*,  $\mathcal{N}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \mathcal{N}(\omega_2, \omega_1)$ , note that one can choose for  $\mathcal{H}$  the basis

$$(17) \quad \{\psi_j: j \in J\} \cup \{\Gamma\psi_j: j \in J\},$$

which splits it into the direct sum  $\mathfrak{h}_{P_1} \oplus \mathfrak{h}_{P_1^\perp}$ , with  $\{\psi_j: j \in J\}$  being the basis for  $\mathfrak{h}_{P_1}$ . Then note that, by (1) and footnote 2, we are able to write  $\mathcal{N}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(\omega_1, \omega_2) &= \sum_{i,j \in I} \overline{\omega_1 \left( \mathbf{B}(\psi_i) \mathbf{B}(\psi_j)^* \right)} \left( \delta_{i,j} - \omega_2 \left( \mathbf{B}(\psi_i) \mathbf{B}(\psi_j)^* \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,j \in I} \omega_1 \left( \mathbf{B}(\psi_j) \mathbf{B}(\psi_i)^* \right) \omega_2 \left( \mathbf{B}(\psi_j)^* \mathbf{B}(\psi_i) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,j \in I} \omega_1 \left( \mathbf{B}(\Gamma\psi_j)^* \mathbf{B}(\Gamma\psi_i) \right) \omega_2 \left( \mathbf{B}(\Gamma\psi_j) \mathbf{B}(\Gamma\psi_i)^* \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,j \in I} \omega_{P_1} \left( \mathbf{B}(\tilde{\psi}_j)^* \mathbf{B}(\tilde{\psi}_i) \right) \omega_2 \left( \mathbf{B}(\tilde{\psi}_j) \mathbf{B}(\tilde{\psi}_i)^* \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,j \in I} \omega_2 \left( \mathbf{B}(\tilde{\psi}_j) \mathbf{B}(\tilde{\psi}_i)^* \right) \omega_1 \left( \mathbf{B}(\tilde{\psi}_j)^* \mathbf{B}(\tilde{\psi}_i) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{N}(\omega_2, \omega_1), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\{\tilde{\psi}_i\}$  is just the previous basis, only reordered as  $\{\Gamma\psi_j\} \cup \{\psi_j\}$ .

Finally, if  $P_1 - P_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is a Hilbert–Schmidt operator, then  $P_1 \wedge P_2^\perp$  is a vector subspace of  $\mathcal{H}$  with finite dimension [Ara87, Page 95]. Hence, in order to perform a calculation for  $\mathcal{N}(\omega_{P_1}, \omega_{P_2})$ , we may choose, as orthonormal basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ , the following basis

$$\{\psi_i: i \in I\} = \{\tilde{\psi}_k: k \in K\} \cup \{\check{\psi}_{k'}: k' \in K'\},$$

where  $\{\tilde{\psi}_k: k \in K\}$  is an orthonormal basis for  $P_1 \mathcal{H} \cap P_2^\perp \mathcal{H}$ , while  $\{\check{\psi}_{k'}: k' \in K'\}$  is an orthonormal basis for its orthogonal complement, with  $K, K'$  appropriate index sets. In this case, from expressions (1), (9) and footnote 2, one obtains that expression (15) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(\omega_{P_1}, \omega_{P_2}) &= \sum_{i,j \in I} \omega_{P_1} \left( \mathbf{B}(\psi_j) \mathbf{B}(\psi_i)^* \right) \omega_{P_2} \left( \mathbf{B}(\psi_j)^* \mathbf{B}(\psi_i) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,j \in I} \left\langle \psi_j, P_1 \psi_i \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \left\langle \psi_i, (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - P_2) \psi_j \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \sum_{i,j \in K} \left\langle \tilde{\psi}_j, P_1 \tilde{\psi}_i \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \left\langle \tilde{\psi}_i, (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - P_2) \tilde{\psi}_j \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \sum_{i \in K} \left\langle \tilde{\psi}_i, \tilde{\psi}_i \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \dim(P_1 \wedge P_2^\perp). \end{aligned}$$

◻

Observe that in order to avoid degeneracy of the sesquilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*}$ , we can apply a standard procedure, like that performed in [Lan12, Page 532], and turn it non–degenerate. For any  $f \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*$  we define left and right kernels, respectively, by

$$\mathcal{K}_L \doteq \left\{ f: \forall g, \langle f, g \rangle_{\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*} = 0 \right\}, \quad \mathcal{K}_R \doteq \left\{ f: \forall g, \langle g, f \rangle_{\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*} = 0 \right\},$$

which, by the construction of  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*}$ , are equal – whence we call them both  $\mathcal{K}$ . The set  $\mathcal{K}$  is a subspace of  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*$ , and we can define, for each  $f \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*$ , cosets of  $\mathcal{K}$ :

$$[f] \doteq f + \mathcal{K}.$$

We may then create the union of all cosets thus defined,

$$\mathfrak{F} \doteq \bigcup_{f \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*} \{[f]\},$$

and introduce in such a union a vector space structure. The sesquilinear form of equation (14) yields, then, a non-degenerate form in  $\mathfrak{F}$ , unambiguously given by

$$\langle [f], [g] \rangle_{\mathfrak{F}} \doteq \langle f, g \rangle_{\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*}, \quad \text{for any } f, g \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^*,$$

and, hence,  $\mathfrak{F}$  is a pre-Hilbert space, the completion of which – through the norm induced by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{F}}$ , that is,

$$\|[f]\|_{\mathfrak{F}} \doteq \left( \sum_{i, j \in \mathbb{I}} |f(\text{B}(\psi_i)\text{B}(\psi_j)^*)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

– will be denoted by  $\widehat{\mathfrak{F}}$ . We shall write, without confusion,  $\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathfrak{F}}$  and  $\|f\|_{\mathfrak{F}}$ .

### 3 Main results

LEMMA 2 ( $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -PI AS A  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -STATE INDEX).

Let  $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ , and let  $\omega_{P_1}, \omega_{P_2} \in \mathfrak{E}$  be their respective quasi-free states. Then:

1.  $P_1 - P_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator if, and only if,

$$\|\omega_{P_1} - \omega_{P_2}\|_{\mathfrak{F}} < \infty.$$

2. The  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -PI given by (13) can be rewritten in terms of the quantity (16) as

$$\sigma(P_1, P_2) = (-1)^{\mathcal{N}(\omega_{P_1}, \omega_{P_2})} \doteq \sigma(\omega_{P_1}, \omega_{P_2}). \quad \blacklozenge$$

*Proof.* We begin by proving 1. It is a simple result. First, recall that, for  $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ , the Hilbert-Schmidt norm is given by

$$\|T\|_{\text{HS}} \doteq \left( \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \|T\psi_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Explicitly, for  $P_1 - P_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  we are able to write

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_1 - P_2\|_{\text{HS}}^2 &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \|(P_1 - P_2)\psi_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} (\langle \psi_i, P_1\psi_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle \psi_i, P_2\psi_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} - \langle \psi_i, P_1P_2\psi_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} - \langle \psi_i, P_2P_1\psi_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose, then, that  $P_1 - P_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is Hilbert-Schmidt, i.e.,  $\|P_1 - P_2\|_{\text{HS}}^2 < \infty$ . Notice that under some calculations one can rewrite  $\|P_1 - P_2\|_{\text{HS}}^2$  as

$$\|P_1 - P_2\|_{\text{HS}}^2 = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} (\langle (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - P_2)\psi_i, P_1\psi_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - P_1)\psi_i, P_2\psi_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}).$$

Since the Hilbert–Schmidt norm is basis independent, one can choose for  $\mathcal{H}$  the basis as in Expression (17), which splits it into the direct sum  $\mathfrak{h}_{P_1} \oplus \mathfrak{h}_{P_1^\perp}$ , with  $\{\tilde{\psi}_j: j \in J\}$  being the basis for  $\mathfrak{h}_{P_1}$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_1 - P_2\|_{\text{HS}}^2 &= \sum_{j \in J} \langle (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - P_2)\tilde{\psi}_j, \tilde{\psi}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{j \in J} \langle \Gamma\tilde{\psi}_j, P_2\Gamma\tilde{\psi}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= 2 \sum_{j \in J} \langle \tilde{\psi}_j, (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - P_2)\tilde{\psi}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \end{aligned}$$

and one hence concludes that  $P_1 - P_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is Hilbert–Schmidt if, and only if

$$\sum_{j \in J} \langle \tilde{\psi}_j, (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - P_2)\tilde{\psi}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty.$$

Now, consider the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \|\omega_{P_1} - \omega_{P_2}\|_{\mathfrak{F}}^2 &= \sum_{i,j \in I} \overline{(\omega_{P_1}(\text{B}(\psi_i)\text{B}(\psi_j)^*) - \omega_{P_2}(\text{B}(\psi_i)\text{B}(\psi_j)^*))} \\ &\quad (\omega_{P_1}(\text{B}(\psi_i)\text{B}(\psi_j)^*) - \omega_{P_2}(\text{B}(\psi_i)\text{B}(\psi_j)^*)), \end{aligned}$$

which, in face of Expression (9), is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \|\omega_{P_1} - \omega_{P_2}\|_{\mathfrak{F}}^2 &= \sum_{i,j \in I} \left( \overline{\langle \psi_i, P_1\psi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}} - \overline{\langle \psi_i, P_2\psi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}} \right) \left( \langle \psi_i, P_1\psi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} - \langle \psi_i, P_2\psi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,j \in I} \left( \left| \langle \psi_i, P_1\psi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right|^2 + \left| \langle \psi_i, P_2\psi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \langle \psi_i, P_2\psi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \psi_j, P_1\psi_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} - \langle \psi_i, P_1\psi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \psi_j, P_2\psi_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This quantity is basis independent, with the basis choices for the sums over  $i$  and  $j$  not being necessarily equal. Then, let, for the sum over  $j$ , the basis be given by Equation (17). Similarly, let the basis for sum over  $i$  be that which splits  $\mathcal{H}$  into the direct sum  $\mathfrak{h}_{P_2} \oplus \mathfrak{h}_{P_2^\perp}$  be denoted by

$$\{\check{\psi}_j: j \in J\} \cup \{\Gamma\check{\psi}_j: j \in J\},$$

with  $\{\check{\psi}_j: j \in J\}$  being the basis for  $\mathfrak{h}_{P_2}$ , c.f., (17). We note that, since  $\mathfrak{h}_{P_1}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}_{P_2}$  have the same dimension, we can choose the same index set  $J$  for both their basis. Straightforward calculations then show that

$$\|\omega_{P_1} - \omega_{P_2}\|_{\mathfrak{F}}^2 = 2 \sum_{i,j \in J} \left| \langle \check{\psi}_i, \Gamma\check{\psi}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right|^2.$$

Therefore,  $\|\omega_{P_1} - \omega_{P_2}\|_{\mathfrak{F}}^2$  is finite if, and only if,

$$\sum_{i,j \in J} \left| \langle \check{\psi}_i, \Gamma\check{\psi}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right|^2 < \infty.$$

We nonetheless observe that the projection of  $\Gamma\check{\psi}_j$  onto  $\mathfrak{h}_{P_2}$  is given by

$$P_2\Gamma\check{\psi}_j = \sum_{i \in J} \langle \check{\psi}_i, \Gamma\check{\psi}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \check{\psi}_i,$$



so that

$$\langle P_2 \Gamma \tilde{\psi}_j, P_2 \Gamma \tilde{\psi}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \sum_{i \in J} \left| \langle \check{\psi}_i, \Gamma \tilde{\psi}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right|^2.$$

But, since  $\langle P_2 \Gamma \tilde{\psi}_j, P_2 \Gamma \tilde{\psi}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle \tilde{\psi}_j, (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - P_2) \tilde{\psi}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ , we have

$$\sum_{j \in J} \langle \tilde{\psi}_j, (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - P_2) \tilde{\psi}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \sum_{i, j \in J} \left| \langle \check{\psi}_i, \Gamma \tilde{\psi}_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right|^2,$$

in which case statement 1 is proven. Part 2 is clear from Lemma 1–quantity (16) and Definition of the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ –PI, given by (13). End

In order to state our main Theorem, as well as its proof, some considerations are in order. Firstly, for a basis projection  $P \in \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ , we explicitly construct the GNS representation associated with its quasi-free state  $\omega_P$ . This is a well-known result and we write it for completeness. See, for instance, [EK98, Chap. 6]. As was discussed for equation (9) and comments around it,  $\omega_P$  is completely defined by two-point correlations, satisfying (3)–(6). If we choose for  $\mathcal{H}$  the basis given by (17), namely,

$$\{\tilde{\psi}_j : j \in J\} \cup \{\Gamma \tilde{\psi}_j : j \in J\},$$

with  $P$  instead of  $P_1$ , this yields a useful form for computations of the type  $\omega_P(A)$ , for  $A \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ . Let  $A \equiv B(\psi_1) \cdots B(\psi_{2N})$ , where, for  $i \in \{1, \dots, 2N\}$ ,  $\psi_i$  is a basis element of  $\mathcal{H}$ , with  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Observe that  $\omega_P(A)$  is given by

$$\omega_P(B(\psi_1) \cdots B(\psi_{2N})) = \text{Pf}[\omega_P(\mathbb{O}_{k,l}(B(\psi_k), B(\psi_l)))]_{k,l=1}^{2N},$$

where, for  $k, l \in \{1, \dots, 2N\}$ ,  $\mathbb{O}_{k,l}$  is defined by (5). Note that for  $P \in \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ , the  $2N \times 2N$  matrix

$$\mathbf{M}_{k,l}^{2N} \doteq [\mathbb{O}_{k,l}(\langle \psi_k, P \Gamma \psi_l \rangle_{\mathcal{H}})]_{k,l=1}^{2N}$$

is skew-symmetric and satisfies

$$\langle \psi_k, P \Gamma \psi_l \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle \psi_l, (\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}} - P) \Gamma \psi_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad k, l \in \{1, \dots, 2N\}.$$

Explicitly, the matrix is given by

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \langle \psi_1, P \Gamma \psi_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} & \cdots & \langle \psi_1, P \Gamma \psi_{2N-1} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} & \langle \psi_1, P \Gamma \psi_{2N} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ -\langle \psi_1, P \Gamma \psi_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 & \cdots & \langle \psi_2, P \Gamma \psi_{2N-1} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} & \langle \psi_2, P \Gamma \psi_{2N} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ -\langle \psi_1, P \Gamma \psi_{2N-1} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} & -\langle \psi_2, P \Gamma \psi_{2N-1} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} & \cdots & 0 & \langle \psi_{2N-1}, P \Gamma \psi_{2N} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ -\langle \psi_1, P \Gamma \psi_{2N} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} & -\langle \psi_2, P \Gamma \psi_{2N} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} & \cdots & -\langle \psi_{2N-1}, P \Gamma \psi_{2N} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

One notices, for example, that, whenever  $\psi_{2N}$  belongs to  $\mathfrak{h}_P$ , the Pfaffian under consideration is zero. It is likewise zero whenever  $\psi_1$  belongs to  $\mathfrak{h}_{P^\perp}$ . This implies that, whenever  $B(\psi_i)$  is present in  $A$ , a non-zero result requires  $B(\psi_i)^*$  present to its right, and reciprocally. Moreover, Definition 6 for the Pfaffian relies on sums of products of  $N$  factors. Therefore, there must be at least  $N$  non-zero entries in  $\mathbf{M}$ . This only happens if, apart from anticommutation,  $A$  is of the form  $\prod_{i=1}^N B(\psi_i) B(\psi_i)^*$ , with each  $\psi_i$  an element of the chosen basis for  $\mathfrak{h}_P$ .

All of the considerations of the previous paragraph allow us to conclude, for any basis projection  $P \in \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$  with associated quasi-free state  $\omega_P \in \mathfrak{E}$ , that the ideal  $\mathfrak{I}_{\omega_P}$  of the GNS construction<sup>5</sup> associated with  $\omega_P$ , to wit,

$$\mathfrak{I}_{\omega_P} \doteq \{A: A \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma), \omega_P(A^*A) = 0\}$$

is the set of all elements of the  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$  which are *not* of the form<sup>6</sup>

$$B(\psi_1)^* \cdots B(\psi_N)^*, \quad \psi_1, \dots, \psi_N \in \mathfrak{h}_P,$$

for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . For all  $A \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ , we can then construct its GNS class by

$$\Psi_A \doteq A + \mathfrak{I}_{\omega_P},$$

so that  $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_P}$  is the completion of the vector space  $\{\Psi_A: A \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)\}$ , seen as a pre-Hilbert space with inner product given by  $\langle A, B \rangle_{\omega_P} \doteq \omega_P(A^*B)$ , for any  $A, B \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ .

The above explicit construction allows us to therefore show that  $\pi_{\omega_P}$  and  $\pi_P$  are unitarily equivalent. In fact, consider the fermionic Fock space and its associated vacuum vector, given by (10) and discussed in comments around it. For all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , and all elements  $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_N$  of  $\mathfrak{h}_P$ , consider the function given by

$$\Psi_{B(\psi_1)^* \cdots B(\psi_N)^*} \mapsto \psi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \psi_N, \quad \Psi_{\mathbf{1}} (\doteq \Omega_{\omega_P}) \mapsto \Omega,$$

which is extended by linearity for all  $\Psi_A$ , with  $A \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ . It is clear that this function is bounded and defined over a dense subset of  $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_P}$ . It therefore has a bounded extension  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\omega_P}; \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{h}_P))$ . Note that  $U$  is unitary and that, for all  $A \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ ,

$$(18) \quad \pi_{\omega_P}(A) = U^* \pi_P(A) U,$$

whence the equivalence. This equivalence allows us to go a bit further, and establish two other equivalences. When we consider the spaces

$$\pi_{\omega_P}(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^\pm) \Omega_{\omega_P},$$

we note that<sup>7</sup>

$$U \left( \pi_{\omega_P}(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^\pm) \Omega_{\omega_P} \right) = \pi_P(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^\pm) \Omega,$$

from what we may assert that

$$U(\mathcal{H}_{\omega_P}^\pm) = \mathcal{H}_P^\pm,$$

<sup>5</sup>We use here Bratteli–Robinson notation. See [BR03, Pages 54–56].

<sup>6</sup>We disregard counting elements like  $B(\varphi_1)B(\varphi_1)^*B(\varphi_2)^*$ , etc, with a  $B(\varphi_i)$  element to left of a  $B(\varphi_i)^*$ , and which are not in  $\mathfrak{I}_\omega$ , since, for instance,

$$(B(\varphi_1)B(\varphi_1)^*B(\varphi_2)^*)^*B(\varphi_1)B(\varphi_1)^*B(\varphi_2)^* = B(\varphi_2)B(\varphi_1)B(\varphi_1)^*B(\varphi_1)B(\varphi_1)^*B(\varphi_2)^*,$$

and, because of the CAR,

$$B(\varphi_1)B(\varphi_1)^*B(\varphi_1)B(\varphi_1)^* = B(\varphi_1)B(\varphi_1)^*.$$

<sup>7</sup> One sees that zero belongs to  $\pi_{\omega_P}(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^+) \Omega_{\omega_P}$ , and that its non-zero vectors are of the form  $\Psi_{B(\psi_1)^* \cdots B(\psi_N)^*}$ , with  $N$  even, or  $\psi_1$ . On the other hand, one sees that zero belongs to  $\pi_P(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^+) \Omega_P$ , and that its non-zero vectors are of the form  $\psi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \psi_N$ , with  $N$  even, or  $\Omega$ . Analogous reasoning goes for the spaces with the “−” sign.

where  $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_P}^+$  is the closure of the space  $\pi_{\omega_P}(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^+)\Omega_{\omega_P}$ , and  $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_P}^-$  is the closure of the space  $\pi_{\omega_P}(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^-)\Omega_{\omega_P}$ . Moreover, it is of notice that  $\mathcal{H}_P^+$  and  $\mathcal{H}_P^-$  consist, respectively, of the vector subsets of even and odd elements of the Fock space, which share only in common the null vector. Therefore, the fermionic Fock space splits into the direct sum:  $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{h}_P) = \mathcal{H}_P^+ \oplus \mathcal{H}_P^-$ . Similarly, we can write  $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_P} = \mathcal{H}_{\omega_P}^+ \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\omega_P}^-$ , in such a way that

$$U = U_+ \oplus U_-,$$

with  $U_{\pm} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\omega_P}^{\pm}; \mathcal{H}_P^{\pm})$  being a unitary operator. This allows to conclude that, if  $\pi_{\omega_P}$  is the restriction of  $\pi_{\omega_P}(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^+)$  to  $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_P}^+$ , and  $\pi_{\omega_P}^-$  is the restriction  $\pi_{\omega_P}(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^+)$  to  $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_P}^-$ , then<sup>8</sup>

$$\pi_{\omega_P}^+ = U_+^* \pi_P^+ U_+, \quad \pi_{\omega_P}^- = U_-^* \pi_P^- U_-,$$

from what we conclude that  $\pi_P^{\pm}$  and  $\pi_{\omega_P}^{\pm}$  are unitarily equivalent. With all the foregoing considerations, the following Theorem is easily proven:

**Theorem 1:**

*Let  $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$  be two basis projections, and let  $\omega_{P_1}, \omega_{P_2} \in \mathfrak{E}$  be the quasi-free states associated with  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , respectively. Let  $\pi_{\omega_{P_1}}$  and  $\pi_{\omega_{P_2}}$  be the GNS representations on the  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$  algebra associated with the states  $\omega_{P_1}$  and  $\omega_{P_2}$ . Then:*

1. *Shale–Stinespring:  $\pi_{\omega_{P_1}}$  and  $\pi_{\omega_{P_2}}$  are unitarily equivalent if, and only if,  $\|\omega_{P_1} - \omega_{P_2}\|_{\mathfrak{F}} < \infty$ ;*
2. *For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $\pi_{\omega_{P_i}}^{\pm}$  be representations defined above and consider the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -state index,  $\sigma(\omega_{P_1}, \omega_{P_2})$ , given in Lemma 2. Then:*
  - (a) *The representations  $\pi_{\omega_{P_1}}^{\pm}$  and  $\pi_{\omega_{P_2}}^{\pm}$  are irreducible;*
  - (b) *The representations  $\pi_{\omega_{P_1}}^{\pm}$  and  $\pi_{\omega_{P_2}}^{\pm}$  are unitarily equivalent if, and only if,  $\sigma(\omega_{P_1}, \omega_{P_2}) = 1$  and  $\|\omega_{P_1} - \omega_{P_2}\|_{\mathfrak{F}} < \infty$ ;*
  - (c) *The representations  $\pi_{\omega_{P_1}}^{\pm}$  and  $\pi_{\omega_{P_2}}^{\mp}$  are unitarily equivalent if, and only if,  $\sigma(\omega_{P_1}, \omega_{P_2}) = -1$  and  $\|\omega_{P_1} - \omega_{P_2}\|_{\mathfrak{F}} < \infty$ .  $\blacklozenge$*

*Proof.* 1. For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $U_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\omega_{P_i}}; \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{h}_{P_i}))$  satisfying relation (18), suppose  $\pi_{\omega_{P_1}}$  and  $\pi_{\omega_{P_2}}$  are unitarily equivalent, namely, there is  $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\omega_{P_1}}; \mathcal{H}_{\omega_{P_2}})$  such that for any  $A$  in  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ ,

$$(19) \quad \pi_{\omega_{P_1}}(A) = U^* \pi_{\omega_{P_2}}(A) U.$$

Let  $\tilde{U} \doteq U_2 U U_1^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{h}_{P_1}); \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{h}_{P_2}))$ . Then, for all  $A \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U}^* \pi_{P_2}(A) \tilde{U} &= U_1 U^* U_2^* \pi_{P_2}(A) U_2 U U_1^* \\ &= U_1 U^* \pi_{\omega_{P_2}}(A) U U_1^* \\ &= U_1 \pi_{\omega_{P_1}}(A) U_1^* \\ &= \pi_{P_1}(A), \end{aligned}$$


so that  $\pi_{P_1}$  and  $\pi_{P_2}$  are equivalent. It follows by [Ara87, Theo. 6.14] that  $P_1 - P_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is a Hilbert–Schmidt operator, and, from Lemma 1, it follows that  $\|\omega_{P_1} - \omega_{P_2}\|_{\mathfrak{F}} < \infty$ .

<sup>8</sup>Following footnote 7, notice that the even elements from  $\pi_{\omega_P}(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^+)$  (or  $\pi_P(\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)^+)$ ) leave  $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_P}^{\pm}$  (respectively  $\mathcal{H}_P^{\pm}$ ) invariant, for even elements of  $\text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$  do not alter parity.

For the converse, if  $\|\omega_{P_1} - \omega_{P_2}\|_{\mathfrak{F}} < \infty$ , then, by Lemma 1,  $P_1 - P_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is Hilbert–Schmidt, and, by [Ara87, Theo. 6.14],  $\pi_{P_1}$  and  $\pi_{P_2}$  are unitarily equivalent. Let  $\tilde{U}$  be the unitary which implements this equivalence, that is, for all  $A \in \text{sCAR}(\mathcal{H}, \Gamma)$ ,

$$\pi_{P_1}(A) = \tilde{U}^* \pi_{P_2}(A) \tilde{U}.$$

Then, for  $U = U_2^* \tilde{U} U_1$ , calculations similar to the foregone show that  $\tilde{U}$  establishes the equivalence between  $\pi_{\omega_{P_1}}$  and  $\pi_{\omega_{P_2}}$ , like that given by (19). Item 1 is thus proven.

2 (a) By the above discussion, for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $\pi_{\omega_{P_i}}^\pm$ , is unitarily equivalent to  $\pi_{P_i}^\pm$ , and each of the latter is, by [Ara87, Theo. 6.15], an irreducible representation. 2 (b) Follows from an argument similar to that used for Item 1. In case  $\pi_{\omega_{P_1}}^+$  and  $\pi_{\omega_{P_2}}^+$  are unitarily equivalent, we can show, by an appropriate choice of unitary operator, that  $\pi_{P_1}^+$  and  $\pi_{P_2}^+$  are unitarily equivalent. This uses the fact that  $\pi_{\omega_{P_1}}^+$  and  $\pi_{P_1}^+$  are unitarily equivalent, and so are  $\pi_{\omega_{P_2}}^+$  and  $\pi_{P_2}^+$ . From this, it follows, by [Ara87, Theo. 6.15 (2)], that  $P_1 - P_2$  is Hilbert–Schmidt, and that  $\sigma(P_1, P_2) = 1$ . By Lemma 1, this implies that  $\|\omega_{P_1} - \omega_{P_2}\|_{\mathfrak{F}} < \infty$ , and that  $\sigma(\omega_{P_1}, \omega_{P_2}) = 1$ . For the converse, if  $\|\omega_{P_1} - \omega_{P_2}\|_{\mathfrak{F}} < \infty$  and  $\sigma(\omega_{P_1}, \omega_{P_2}) = 1$ , Lemma 1 and [Ara87, Theo. 6.15 (2)] allow us to conclude that  $\pi_{P_1}^+$  and  $\pi_{P_2}^+$  are equivalent, from what follows, by an appropriate choice of unitary transformation, that  $\pi_{\omega_{P_1}}^+$  and  $\pi_{\omega_{P_2}}^+$  are unitarily equivalent. 2 (c) is proven in the exact same way as 2 (b). 

## References

- [ABPM21] N. J. B. Aza, J.-B. Bru, de Siqueira W. Pedra, and L. C. P. A. M. Müssnich, *Large Deviations in Weakly Interacting Fermions – Generating Functions as Gaussian Berezin Integrals and Bounds on Large Pfaffians.*, Reviews in Mathematical Physics (2021).
- [AJP06] S. Attal, A. Joye, and C.A. Pillet, *Open Quantum Systems I: The Hamiltonian Approach*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer, 2006.
- [AMR] N. J. B. Aza, L. C. P. A. M. Müssnich, and A. F. Reyes-Lega, *A  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  Topological Index for Interacting Fermions Systems*, To appear.
- [Ara68] H. Araki, *On the diagonalization of a bilinear Hamiltonian by a Bogoliubov transformation*, Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University. Ser. A **4** (1968), no. 2, 387–412.
- [Ara71] \_\_\_\_\_, *On quasifree states of CAR and Bogoliubov automorphisms*, Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences **6** (1971), no. 3, 385–442.
- [Ara87] \_\_\_\_\_, *Bogoliubov Automorphisms and Fock Representations of Canonical Anticommutation Relations*, Contemp. Math **62** (1987), 23–141.
- [ARS22] N. J. B. Aza, A. F. Reyes-Lega, and L. A. Sequera M, *A  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -Topological Index for Quasifree fermions*, To be published in Mathematical Physics, Analysis and Geometry (2022).
- [BR03] O. Bratteli and D.W. Robinson, *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics I:  $C^*$ - and  $W^*$ -Algebras. Symmetry Groups. Decomposition of States*, 2 ed., Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics, Springer, 2003.
- [BVF01] J.G. Bondía, J.C. Várilly, and H. Figueroa, *Elements of Noncommutative Geometry*, Birkhäuser advanced texts. Basler Lehrbücher, Birkhäuser, 2001.

- [EK98] D.E. Evans and Y. Kawahigashi, *Quantum symmetries on operator algebras*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, ISSN 0964-9174, Clarendon Press, 1998.
- [Lan12] S. Lang, *Algebra*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer New York, 2012.
- [NSY21] B. Nachtergaele, R. Sims, and A. Young, *Quasi-locality bounds for quantum lattice systems. Part II. Perturbations of frustration-free spin models with gapped ground states*, Annales Henri Poincaré, Springer, 2021, p. 1–119.
- [Oga21a] Y. Ogata, *Classification of gapped ground state phases in quantum spin systems*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04675 (2021).
- [Oga21b] ———, *Classification of symmetry protected topological phases in quantum spin chains*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04671 (2021).