

ON ORDER ISOMORPHISMS INTERTWINING SEMIGROUPS FOR DIRICHLET FORMS

LIPING LI AND HANLAI LIN

ABSTRACT. This paper is devoted to characterizing the so-called order isomorphisms intertwining the L^2 -semigroups of two Dirichlet forms. We first show that every unitary order isomorphism intertwining semigroups is the composition of h -transformation and quasi-homeomorphism. In addition, under the absolute continuity condition on Dirichlet forms, every (not necessarily unitary) order isomorphism intertwining semigroups is the composition of h -transformation, quasi-homeomorphism, and multiplication by a certain step function.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	h -transformation, quasi-homeomorphisms and order isomorphisms	2
3.	Unitary order isomorphisms intertwining semigroups	6
4.	General order isomorphism intertwining semigroups	7
	References	12

1. INTRODUCTION

In a famous paper [7], Kac asked the following question: Let $\Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $i = 1, 2$, be bounded domains satisfying certain regularity condition, and Δ_i be the Laplacian with Dirichlet boundary condition on Ω_i . Does it follow that Ω_1 and Ω_2 are congruent if knowing that Δ_1 and Δ_2 have the same series of eigenvalues? This question can be formulated in terms of the L^2 -semigroups $(T_t^i)_{t \geq 0}$ generated by Δ_i . Take an orthogonal basis $\{e_n^i : n \geq 1\}$ of $L^2(\Omega_i)$ consisting of eigenfunctions of Δ_i and let $U : L^2(\Omega_1) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega_2)$ be the linear operator such that $Ue_n^1 = e_n^2$ for $n \geq 1$. Then the assumption the the spectra coincide is equivalent to that

$$UT_t^1 = T_t^2U, \quad t \geq 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Kac's problem amounts to asking that does it follow that Ω_1 and Ω_2 are congruent if (1.1) holds for a certain unitary operator $U : L^2(\Omega_1) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega_2)$? It has been shown in [6] that, in general, the answer is negative.

In [2], Arendt studied Kac's problem under an additional condition that U is a so-called *order isomorphism*: U is bijective, and for $f \in L^2(\Omega_1)$, $f \geq 0$ if and

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 31C25, 60J60.

Key words and phrases. Dirichlet forms, order isomorphisms intertwining semigroups, h -transformations, quasi-homeomorphisms.

The first named author is partially supported by NSFC (No. 11931004) and Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in Germany.

only if $Uf \geq 0$. The main result of [2] stated that if U is an order isomorphism satisfying (1.1), then Ω_1 and Ω_2 are congruent. In a recent paper [9], Lenz et al. investigated an analogical problem in terms of Dirichlet forms. The terminologies and notations concerning Dirichlet forms are referred to [3, 5]; see also §2.1. Let $(\mathcal{E}^i, \mathcal{F}^i)$ be two quasi-regular and irreducible Dirichlet forms on $L^2(E_i, m_i)$, whose L^2 -semigroups are denoted by $(T_t^i)_{t \geq 0}$, for $i = 1, 2$. Consider an order isomorphism $U : L^2(E_1, m_1) \rightarrow L^2(E_2, m_2)$, which is defined by the same way as the Laplacian case, and assume that U intertwines $(T_t^1)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(T_t^2)_{t \geq 0}$ in the sense of (1.1). Then Lenz et al. showed that the topologies of E_1 and E_2 coincide in the following sense: There exist \mathcal{E}^i -nests $\{F_n^i : n \geq 1\}$ and a map $j : E_1 \rightarrow E_2$ such that $j|_{F_n^1}$ is a homeomorphism from F_n^1 to F_n^2 for any $n \geq 1$. This problem is also considered in [4] for possibly reducible Dirichlet forms and unitary order isomorphisms intertwining their L^2 -semigroups by an argument involving the so-called ergodic decompositions of Dirichlet forms.

The main purpose of the current paper is to characterize the order isomorphisms intertwining the L^2 -semigroups of two Dirichlet forms by means of transformations of Dirichlet forms. We first note that two transformations of Dirichlet forms, i.e. *h-transformation* and *quasi-homeomorphism*, are corresponding to particular unitary order isomorphisms intertwining semigroups, as will be explained in §2.2 and §2.3. Then it turns out in Theorem 3.1 that every unitary order isomorphism intertwining semigroups is the composition of *h-transformation* and *quasi-homeomorphism*. Regarding general (not necessarily unitary) order isomorphisms intertwining semigroups, we assume the absolute continuity condition for the probability transition semigroup of the Markov process associated with $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$ and obtain an irreducible decomposition of E_1 for $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$ in the sense of Kuwae [8]. Then E_2 also admits an irreducible decomposition for $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$. Our main result, Theorem 4.6, concludes that every order isomorphism intertwining semigroups is the composition of three transformations: *h-transformation*, *quasi-homeomorphism*, and multiplication by a step function which is constant on each invariant set of $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$.

The paper is organized as follows. In §2 we prepare some terminologies and notations about Dirichlet forms and order isomorphisms. Particularly, Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 show that *h-transformation* and *quasi-homeomorphism* give special unitary order isomorphisms intertwining semigroups. The characterization of unitary order isomorphisms intertwining semigroups will be completed in §3. Then the general case will be studied in §4.

2. *h*-TRANSFORMATION, QUASI-HOMEOMORPHISMS AND ORDER ISOMORPHISMS

In this section we prepare some terminologies and notations about Dirichlet forms and order isomorphisms.

2.1. Dirichlet forms. Let $(E, \mathcal{B}(E))$ be a measurable space and m be a σ -finite measure on it. The completion of $\mathcal{B}(E)$ with respect to m is denoted by $\mathcal{B}^m(E)$. A Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a symmetric Markovian closed form on $L^2(E, m)$, for which we refer to the standard textbooks [3, 5]. Set $\mathcal{E}_1(f, g) := \mathcal{E}(f, g) + (f, g)_{L^2(E, m)}$ for any $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$.

Assume further that E is a Hausdorff topological space with the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(E)$ being assumed to be generated by the continuous functions on E and that m is fully supported on E . An ascending sequence $\{F_n : n \geq 1\}$ of closed subsets of E is called an \mathcal{E} -nest if $\cup_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{F}_{F_n}$ is \mathcal{E}_1 -dense in \mathcal{F} , where $\mathcal{F}_{F_n} := \{f \in \mathcal{F} : f =$

0, m -a.e. on F_n^c . A subset N of E is called \mathcal{E} -polar if there is an \mathcal{E} -nest $\{F_n : n \geq 1\}$ such that $N \subset \bigcap_{n \geq 1} (E \setminus F_n)$. A statement depending on $x \in A$ is said to hold \mathcal{E} -quasi-everywhere (\mathcal{E} -q.e. in abbreviation) on A if there is an \mathcal{E} -polar set $N \subset A$ such that the statement is true for every $x \in A \setminus N$. A function f on E is said to be \mathcal{E} -quasi-continuous (\mathcal{E} -q.c. in abbreviation) if there is an \mathcal{E} -nest $\{F_n : n \geq 1\}$ such that $f|_{F_n}$ is finite and continuous on F_n for each $n \geq 1$.

The Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is called *quasi-regular*, if

- (i) There exists an \mathcal{E} -nest $\{F_n : n \geq 1\}$ consisting of compact sets;
- (ii) There exists an \mathcal{E}_1 -dense subset of \mathcal{F} whose elements have \mathcal{E} -q.c. m -versions;
- (iii) There exists $\{f_n : n \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{F}$ having \mathcal{E} -quasi-continuous m -versions $\{\tilde{f}_n : n \geq 1\}$ and an \mathcal{E} -polar set $N \subset E$ such that $\{\tilde{f}_n : n \geq 1\}$ separates the points of $E \setminus N$.

It is called *regular*, if E is a locally compact separable metric space, m is a Radon measure on E with full support, and $\mathcal{F} \cap C_c(E)$ is \mathcal{E}_1 -dense in \mathcal{F} and uniformly dense in $C_c(E)$ respectively, where $C_c(E)$ is the family of all continuous functions with compact support on E . Note that a regular Dirichlet form is always quasi-regular.

2.2. h -transformation. Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ be a quasi-regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(E, m)$. Denote by $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ the L^2 -semigroup of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Note that $T_t|_{L^2_+(E, m)}$ can be extended to an operator, still denoted by T_t , on $L_+(E, m)$, where $L^2_+(E, m) = \{f \in L^2(E, m) : f \geq 0\}$ and $L_+(E, m)$ is the family of all m -equivalence classes of $\mathcal{B}^m(E)$ -measurable functions from E to $[0, \infty]$. More precisely, take a strictly positive function $\eta \in L^2(E, m)$ and define for any $f \in L_+(E, m)$,

$$T_t f := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_t(f \wedge n\eta).$$

Since $T_t g \geq 0$ for any $g \in L^2(E, m)$, it follows that $T_t(f \wedge n\eta) \uparrow T_t f$ and $T_t f \in L_+(E, m)$. This definition is independent of the choice of η . In fact, set $f_n := f \wedge n\eta$. For another sequence $g_n \in L^2_+(E, m) \uparrow f$, $\tilde{T}_t f := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_t g_n$ is also well defined and $\tilde{T}_t f = T_t f$ can be obtained as follows: For any $h \in L^2_+(E, m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E h \cdot T_t f dm &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_E h \cdot T_t f_n dm = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_E T_t h \cdot f_n dm \\ &= \int_E T_t h \cdot f dm = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_E T_t h \cdot g_n dm = \int_E h \cdot \tilde{T}_t f dm. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, $T_t f = \tilde{T}_t f$.

We introduce a family of excessive functions with respect to $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Exc}^+ &:= \{h \in L_+(E, m) : T_t h \leq h, \forall t \geq 0 \text{ and} \\ &\quad h \text{ admits an } \mathcal{E}\text{-q.c. } m\text{-version } \tilde{h} \text{ with } \tilde{h} > 0, \mathcal{E}\text{-q.e.}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

This family is not necessarily contained in $L^2(E, m)$ (cf., e.g., [3, 5]), and constant functions belong to \mathbf{Exc}^+ . For $h \in \mathbf{Exc}^+$,

$$E_h := \{x \in E : 0 < h(x) < \infty\} = E, \quad m\text{-a.e.},$$

and

$$T_t^h f(x) := \frac{1}{h(x)} T_t(hf)(x), \quad t \geq 0, f \in L^2(E, h^2 \cdot m) \quad (2.2)$$

is called the h -transformed semigroup on $L^2(E, h^2 \cdot m)$. Clearly $(T_t^h)_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous contraction Markovian semigroup on $L^2(E, h^2 \cdot m)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ be a quasi-regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(E, m)$ and $h \in \mathbf{Exc}^+$. Then the h -transformed semigroup $(T_t^h)_{t \geq 0}$ is associated with the quasi-regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(E, h^2 \cdot m)$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^h &= \{f \in L^2(E, h^2 \cdot m), fh \in \mathcal{F}\} \\ \mathcal{E}^h(f, g) &= \mathcal{E}(fh, gh), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{F}^h. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

Furthermore, the following hold:

- (1) An ascending sequence $\{F_n\}$ of closed subsets of E is an \mathcal{E}^h -nest, if and only if it is an \mathcal{E} -nest.
- (2) A set $N \subset E$ is \mathcal{E}^h -polar if and only if it is \mathcal{E} -polar.
- (3) f is \mathcal{E}^h -q.c. if and only if it is \mathcal{E} -q.c.

Proof. Clearly $h^2 \cdot m$ is σ -finite and has full support in E , and $(\mathcal{E}^h, \mathcal{F}^h)$ is a Dirichlet form on $L^2(E, h^2 \cdot m)$. It is easy to verify that $\cup_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{F}_{F_n}^h$ is \mathcal{E}_1^h -dense in \mathcal{F}^h , if and only if $\cup_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{F}_{F_n}$ is \mathcal{E}_1 -dense in \mathcal{F} . Hence $\{F_n\}$ is an \mathcal{E}^h -nest if and only if it is an \mathcal{E} -nest. Particularly, N is \mathcal{E}^h -polar if and only if it is \mathcal{E} -polar; every \mathcal{E} -q.c. function is \mathcal{E}^h -q.c. and vice versa. In addition, the first condition (i) in the definition of quasi-regularity holds true for $(\mathcal{E}^h, \mathcal{F}^h)$. For another two conditions (ii) and (iii), it suffices to note that for any \mathcal{E} -q.c. continuous $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\tilde{f} \cdot \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{F}^h$ is \mathcal{E}^h -q.c. That completes the proof. \square

The Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^h, \mathcal{F}^h)$ is called the h -transform of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Define an isometry

$$U_h : L^2(E, m) \rightarrow L^2(E, h^2 \cdot m), \quad f \mapsto \frac{f}{h} \quad (2.4)$$

for $h \in \mathbf{Exc}^+$. Then $(\mathcal{E}^h, \mathcal{F}^h)$ is the *image Dirichlet form* of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ under U_h in the sense that

$$\mathcal{F}^h = U_h \mathcal{F}, \quad \mathcal{E}^h(f, g) = \mathcal{E}(U_h^{-1} f, U_h^{-1} g), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{F}^h,$$

where U_h^{-1} is the inverse of U_h . Note that (2.2) yields the following.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $h \in \mathbf{Exc}^+$. Then $U_h T_t f = T_t^h U_h f$ for $t \geq 0$ and $f \in L^2(E, m)$.*

2.3. Quasi-homeomorphism of Dirichlet spaces. Given another Dirichlet form $(\hat{\mathcal{E}}, \hat{\mathcal{F}})$ on a second L^2 -space $L^2(\hat{E}, \hat{m})$, where \hat{E} is also a Hausdorff topological space and \hat{m} is fully supported on \hat{E} , $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is said to be quasi-homeomorphic to $(\hat{\mathcal{E}}, \hat{\mathcal{F}})$ if there is an \mathcal{E} -nest $\{F_n : n \geq 1\}$, an $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ -nest $\{\hat{F}_n : n \geq 1\}$ and a map $j : \cup_{n \geq 1} F_n \rightarrow \cup_{n \geq 1} \hat{F}_n$ such that

- (i) j is a topological homeomorphism from F_n onto \hat{F}_n for each $n \geq 1$.
- (ii) $\hat{m} = m \circ j^{-1}$.
- (iii) It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{F}} &= \{\hat{f} \in L^2(\hat{E}, \hat{m}) : \hat{f} \circ j \in \mathcal{F}\}, \\ \hat{\mathcal{E}}(\hat{f}, \hat{g}) &= \mathcal{E}(\hat{f} \circ j, \hat{g} \circ j), \quad \hat{f}, \hat{g} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}. \end{aligned}$$

The map j is called a *quasi-homeomorphism* from $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ to $(\hat{\mathcal{E}}, \hat{\mathcal{F}})$. Define an isometry

$$U_j : L^2(E, m) \rightarrow L^2(\hat{E}, \hat{m}), \quad f \mapsto f \circ j^{-1} \quad (2.5)$$

for a quasi-homeomorphism j . Then $(\hat{\mathcal{E}}, \hat{\mathcal{F}})$ is the image Dirichlet form of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ under U_j , i.e.

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}} = U_j \mathcal{F}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{E}}(f, g) = \mathcal{E}(U_j^{-1}f, U_j^{-1}g), \quad f, g \in \hat{\mathcal{F}},$$

where U_j^{-1} is the inverse of U_j . It is worth pointing out that a quasi-regular Dirichlet form is always quasi-homeomorphic to a certain regular Dirichlet form, and the quasi-homeomorphic image of a quasi-regular Dirichlet form is still quasi-regular.

Denote by $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(\hat{T}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ the L^2 -semigroup of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $(\hat{\mathcal{E}}, \hat{\mathcal{F}})$ respectively. The following lemma is obvious and the proof is omitted.

Lemma 2.3. *Let j be a quasi-homeomorphism from $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ to $(\hat{\mathcal{E}}, \hat{\mathcal{F}})$. Then $\hat{T}_t U_j f = U_j T_t f$ for any $t \geq 0$ and $f \in L^2(E, m)$.*

2.4. Order isomorphisms. Let $(E_i, \mathcal{B}(E_i))$ be a measurable space and m_i be a σ -finite measure on it for $i = 1, 2$. The following concepts play a central role in this paper. Note that we do not impose any topological structure on E_i for these concepts.

Definition 2.4. (1) A linear map $U : L^2(E_1, m_1) \rightarrow L^2(E_2, m_2)$ is called *positivity preserving* if $Uf \geq 0$, m_2 -a.e., for $f \in L^2_+(E_1, m_1)$.
(2) A positivity preserving map U is said to be an *order isomorphism* if U has a positivity preserving inverse.

Remark 2.5. A positivity preserving operator is always bounded; see, e.g., [1, Theorem 4.3]. An order isomorphism U is an invertible operator $U : L^2(E_1, m_1) \rightarrow L^2(E_2, m_2)$ such that for any $f \in L^2(E_1, m_1)$, $Uf \geq 0$ if and only if $f \geq 0$. Mimicking the argument concerning T_t in the beginning of §2.2, we can also extend $U|_{L^2_+(E_1, m_1)}$ to an operator from $L_+(E_1, m_1)$ to $L_+(E_2, m_2)$, which is still denoted by U .

The following proposition presents a representation for order isomorphisms, which is crucial to our treatment, and the proof is referred to [4, Proposition 3.2].

Proposition 2.6. *Assume that E_i is a standard Borel space, i.e. isomorphic to a Polish space with its Borel σ -algebra, for $i = 1, 2$. Let $U : L^2(E_1, m_1) \rightarrow L^2(E_2, m_2)$ be an order isomorphism. Then there exists a measurable map $s : (E_1, \mathcal{B}^{m_1}(E_1)) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and a measurable map $\tau : (E_1, \mathcal{B}^{m_1}(E_1)) \rightarrow (E_2, \mathcal{B}^{m_2}(E_2))$ with measurable a.e. inverse τ^{-1} such that*

$$Uf = \left(\frac{f}{s} \right) \circ \tau^{-1}, \quad \forall f \in L^2(E_1, m_1). \quad (2.6)$$

Here s and τ are unique up to equality almost everywhere.

Remark 2.7. The map τ is an *almost-isomorphism* from E_1 to E_2 in the sense that there exist m_i -negligible sets $N_i \in \mathcal{B}^{m_i}(E_i)$ such that $\tau : E_1 \setminus N_1 \rightarrow E_2 \setminus N_2$ is a strict isomorphism.

The s and τ are called *scaling* and *transformation* associated with the order isomorphism U respectively. Clearly, the inverse of U

$$U^{-1}g = s \cdot g \circ \tau, \quad g \in L^2(E_2, m_2)$$

is also an order isomorphism. The scaling and transformation associated with U^{-1} are $\frac{1}{s} \circ \tau^{-1}$ and τ^{-1} .

3. UNITARY ORDER ISOMORPHISMS INTERTWINING SEMIGROUPS

Let $(\mathcal{E}^i, \mathcal{F}^i)$ be a Dirichlet form on $L^2(E_i, m_i)$, where $L^2(E_i, m_i)$ is given in §2.4, for $i = 1, 2$. Denote by $(T_t^i)_{t \geq 0}$ the L^2 -semigroup of $(\mathcal{E}^i, \mathcal{F}^i)$. An order isomorphism $U : L^2(E_1, m_1) \rightarrow L^2(E_2, m_2)$ is said to *intertwine* $(T_t^1)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(T_t^2)_{t \geq 0}$, if

$$UT_t^1 f = T_t^2 U f, \quad \forall f \in L^2(E_1, m_1). \quad (3.1)$$

Denote by \mathcal{O} the family of all order isomorphisms intertwining $(T_t^1)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(T_t^2)_{t \geq 0}$. Set

$$\mathcal{U} := \{U \in \mathcal{O} : (Uf, Ug)_{L^2(E_2, m_2)} = (f, g)_{L^2(E_1, m_1)}, \forall f, g \in L^2(E_1, m_1)\},$$

i.e. the family of all unitary order isomorphisms intertwining $(T_t^1)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(T_t^2)_{t \geq 0}$. Any $U \in \mathcal{U}$ is an isometry between $L^2(E_1, m_1)$ and $L^2(E_2, m_2)$ and it is easy to verify that

$$\mathcal{F}^2 = U\mathcal{F}^1, \quad \mathcal{E}^2(f, g) = \mathcal{E}^1(U^{-1}f, U^{-1}g), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{F}^2; \quad (3.2)$$

in other words, $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$ is the image Dirichlet form of $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$ under U .

We endow E_i with a Polish topological structure, i.e. E_i is assumed to be a Polish space and $\mathcal{B}(E_i)$ is the Borel σ -algebra generated by the continuous functions on E_i , for $i = 1, 2$. Further assume that $(\mathcal{E}^i, \mathcal{F}^i)$ is quasi-regular. It is worth emphasising that these assumptions are not necessary for the set-up of $U \in \mathcal{O}$. Denote by \mathbf{Exc}_1^+ the family of excessive functions defined as (2.1) with respect to $(T_t^1)_{t \geq 0}$ and by $(\mathcal{E}^{1,h}, \mathcal{F}^{1,h})$ the h -transform of $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$ for $h \in \mathbf{Exc}_1^+$. The \mathcal{E}^1 -q.c. m_1 -version of $h \in \mathbf{Exc}_1^+$ is denoted by \tilde{h} . Note that both U_h and U_j corresponding to h -transformation and quasi-homeomorphism are unitary order isomorphisms intertwining semigroups; see Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3. In general we have the following characterization of unitary order isomorphisms intertwining $(T_t^1)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(T_t^2)_{t \geq 0}$.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that E_i is a Polish topological space with the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(E_i)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^i, \mathcal{F}^i)$ is a quasi-regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(E_i, m_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $U \in \mathcal{U}$, if and only if there exists $h \in \mathbf{Exc}_1^+$ and a quasi-homeomorphism j from $(\mathcal{E}^{1,h}, \mathcal{F}^{1,h})$ to $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$ such that $U = U_j U_h$. The pair (\tilde{h}, j) for $U \in \mathcal{U}$ is unique up to \mathcal{E}^1 -q.e. equality.*

Proof. Sufficiency. Let (h, j) be such a pair. Clearly $U_j U_h$ is invertible because so are U_j and U_h . In addition, $U_j U_h f \geq 0$ if and only if $f \geq 0$ for any $f \in L^2(E_1, m_1)$. Hence $U_j U_h$ is an order isomorphism. For the intertwining property, it follows from Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 that for any $t > 0$ and $f \in L^2(E_1, m_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} T_t^2 (U_j U_h) f &= (T_t^2 U_j) U_h f = (U_j T_t^{1,h}) U_h f \\ &= U_j (T_t^{1,h} U_h) f = U_j (U_h T_t^1) f = (U_j U_h) T_t^1 f. \end{aligned}$$

Finally $U_h U_j$ is unitary because so are U_h and U_j .

Necessity. The idea of this proof is due to [9] and we present some details for readers' convenience. In view of Proposition 2.6, let s and τ be the scaling and transformation associated with $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Recall that T_t^i and U also stand for the extended operators on $L_+(E_1, m_1)$ or $L_+(E_2, m_2)$. Particularly (2.6) and (3.1) also hold for $f \in L_+(E_1, m_1)$, and the Markovian property of $(\mathcal{E}^i, \mathcal{F}^i)$ implies that

$T_t^i 1 \leq 1$. Set $h := s$. It follows from

$$UT_t^1 h = T_t^2 U h = T_t^2 1 \leq 1$$

that $T_t^1 h \leq U^{-1} 1 = h$. Then [9, Lemma 3.4 and Proposition 3.7] indicate that h admits an \mathcal{E}^1 -q.c. m_1 -version \tilde{h} . Repeating the argument in the proof of [9, Lemma 3.9], we can obtain that $\{\tilde{h} = 0\}$ is \mathcal{E}^1 -polar, and thus $h \in \mathbf{Exc}_1^+$. In addition, the same argument as the proof of [9, Theorem 3.11] shows that τ admits an m_1 -version $\tilde{\tau}$ and there exist \mathcal{E}^i -nests $\{F_n^i\}$ such that $\tilde{\tau}|_{F_n^1} : F_n^1 \rightarrow F_n^2$ is a topological homeomorphism. Set $j := \tilde{\tau}$. We show that j is a quasi-homeomorphism from $(\mathcal{E}^{1,h}, \mathcal{F}^{1,h})$ to $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$. In fact, the condition (i) in the definition of quasi-homeomorphism has been obtained. To conclude (ii), it follows from (2.6) and the unitary property of U that for any $f, g \in L^2(E_1, h^2 \cdot m_1)$,

$$\int_{E_1} f g h^2 dm_1 = \int_{E_2} U(fh)U(gh) dm_2 = \int_{E_1} f g d(m_2 \circ j).$$

Hence $m_2 = (h^2 \cdot m_1) \circ j^{-1}$ and (ii) holds true. For (iii), (3.2) tells us that $f \in \mathcal{F}^2$ if and only if $U^{-1}f \in \mathcal{F}^1$. Note that $U^{-1}f = h \cdot f \circ j \in \mathcal{F}^1$, if and only if $f \circ j \in \mathcal{F}^{1,h}$. Consequently $f \in \mathcal{F}^2$ amounts to $f \circ j \in \mathcal{F}^{1,h}$. Meanwhile, (2.3) and (3.2) yield that for $f, g \in \mathcal{F}^2$,

$$\mathcal{E}^2(f, g) = \mathcal{E}^1(U^{-1}f, U^{-1}g) = \mathcal{E}^{1,h}(f \circ j, g \circ j).$$

As a result (iii) is obtained. Finally it suffices to note that, on account of (2.4), (2.5) and (2.6), $U = U_j U_h$ holds true.

Uniqueness. Let (\tilde{h}_1, j_1) be another pair for U such that $U = U_{j_1} U_{h_1}$. Then $h = h_1$ and $j = j_1$, m_1 -a.e., due to the uniqueness stated in Proposition 2.6. The identity $j_1 = j$, \mathcal{E}^1 -q.e., is a result of [9, Lemma 3.10]. Another identity $\tilde{h} = \tilde{h}_1$, \mathcal{E}^1 -q.e., follows because both \tilde{h} and \tilde{h}_1 are \mathcal{E}^1 -q.c. That completes the proof. \square

This characterization particularly shows that the existence of unitary order isomorphism intertwining $(T_t^1)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(T_t^2)_{t \geq 0}$, which depends only on the measurable structures of E_1 and E_2 , leads to the coincidence of topological structures of E_1 and E_2 in a q.e. sense. That is the following.

Corollary 3.2. *Adopt the assumptions of Theorem 3.1. If $\mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset$, then there exist \mathcal{E}^i -nests $\{F_n^i : n \geq 1\}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and a map $j : \cup_{n \geq 1} F_n^1 \rightarrow \cup_{n \geq 1} F_n^2$ such that $j|_{F_n^1}$ is a homeomorphism from F_n^1 to F_n^2 for any $n \geq 1$.*

4. GENERAL ORDER ISOMORPHISM INTERTWINING SEMIGROUPS

4.1. Invariant sets. Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ be a Dirichlet form on $L^2(E, m)$ and $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be its L^2 -semigroup. A set $A \in \mathcal{B}^m(E)$ is called T_t -invariant if

$$1_A \cdot T_t f = T_t(1_A f), \quad f \in L^2(E, m).$$

Given a T_t -invariant set A , we can define the restriction of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ to A as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}^A := \{f|_A : f \in \mathcal{F}\}, \quad \mathcal{E}^A(f|_A, g|_A) := \mathcal{E}(1_A f, 1_A g), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Note that $(\mathcal{E}^A, \mathcal{F}^A)$ is a Dirichlet form on $L^2(A, m|_A)$ whose L^2 -semigroup is

$$T_t^A(f|_A) = T_t(f 1_A)|_A, \quad f \in L^2(E, m).$$

We would write m for $m|_A$ if no confusions caused. For $f \in L^2(A, m)$, denote its zero extension to E still by f if there is no risk of ambiguity. In view of [3,

Proposition 2.1.6], we may write $L^2(A, m) \subset L^2(E, m)$ and $\mathcal{F}^A \subset \mathcal{F}$ in abuse of notations.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that E is a Hausdorff topological space and let A be a T_t -invariant set. Endow A with the restricted topology of E . Then the following hold:*

- (1) *If $\{F_n : n \geq 1\}$ is an \mathcal{E} -nest, then $\{F_n \cap A : n \geq 1\}$ is an \mathcal{E}^A -nest.*
- (2) *$f|_A$ is \mathcal{E}^A -q.c. for any \mathcal{E} -q.c. function f .*
- (3) *If $N \subset E$ is \mathcal{E} -polar, then $N \cap A$ is \mathcal{E}^A -polar.*

Proof. We only need to prove the first assertion. Set $\hat{F}_n := F_n \cap A$. It suffices to show $\cup_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{F}_{\hat{F}_n}^A$ is \mathcal{E}_1^A -dense in \mathcal{F}^A . To accomplish this, take $f \in \mathcal{F}^A \subset \mathcal{F}$. Then there exists $\{g_n\} \subset \cup_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{F}_{F_n}$ such that $\|g_n - f\|_{\mathcal{E}_1} \rightarrow 0$. Without loss of generality assume that $g_n \in \mathcal{F}_{F_n}$. Set $f_n := g_n|_A \in \mathcal{F}^A$. Since $g_n = 0$, m -a.e. on $E \setminus F_n$, it follows that $f_n = 0$, m -a.e. on $A \setminus \hat{F}_n$. Hence $f_n \in \mathcal{F}_{\hat{F}_n}^A$. Applying [3, Proposition 2.1.6], we get that

$$\|f_n - f\|_{\mathcal{E}_1^A} \leq \|g_n - f\|_{\mathcal{E}_1} \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore the assertion can be concluded. \square

In addition, $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ or $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is called *irreducible*, if either $m(A) = 0$ or $m(E \setminus A) = 0$ for any T_t -invariant set A . It is worth pointing out that the definitions of invariant set and irreducibility depend only on the measurable structure of E .

4.2. Invariant sets under order isomorphism. From now on let E_i be a Polish topological space and $(\mathcal{E}^i, \mathcal{F}^i)$ be a quasi-regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(E_i, m_i)$ whose L^2 -semigroup is denoted by $(T_t^i)_{t \geq 0}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Further let $U \in \mathcal{O}$, whose scaling and transformation are s and τ respectively.

Lemma 4.2. *A is T_t^1 -invariant, if and only if $\tau(A)$ is T_t^2 -invariant. Particularly, $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$ is irreducible, if and only if so is $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$.*

Proof. Note that $U : L^2(E_1, m_1) \rightarrow L^2(E_2, m_2)$ is a bijective and write $g := Uf$ for $f \in L^2(E_1, m_1)$. Then $f = U^{-1}g$. We have

$$1_{\tau(A)} T_t^2 g = 1_{\tau(A)} U T_t^1 f = 1_{\tau(A)} \cdot \frac{T_t^1 f}{s} \circ \tau^{-1} = \frac{1_A T_t^1 f}{s} \circ \tau^{-1} = U(1_A T_t^1 f)$$

and

$$T_t^2(1_{\tau(A)} g) = T_t^2(1_{\tau(A)} U f) = T_t^2 \left(\frac{1_A f}{s} \circ \tau^{-1} \right) = T_t^2 U(1_A f) = U(T_t^1(1_A f)).$$

Hence $1_{\tau(A)} T_t^2 g = T_t^2(1_{\tau(A)} g)$ amounts to $1_A T_t^1 f = T_t^1(1_A f)$. In other words, A is T_t^1 -invariant, if and only if $\tau(A)$ is T_t^2 -invariant.

For the equivalence of irreducibility of $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$, it suffices to prove that $m_1 \circ \tau^{-1}$ and m_2 are mutually absolutely continuous. In fact, take $A \in \mathcal{B}^{m_2}(E_2)$ with $m_2(A_2) = 0$. Then $1_A = 0$ in $L^2(E_2, m_2)$ and hence $U^{-1}1_A = 0$ in $L^2(E_1, m_1)$. It follows from

$$m_1 \circ \tau^{-1}(A) = \int_{E_1} 1_A \circ \tau dm_1 = \int_{E_1} \frac{U^{-1}1_A}{s} dm_1 = 0$$

that $m_1 \circ \tau^{-1} \ll m_2$. The contrary can be obtained analogically. That completes the proof. \square

Denote by $\|U\|$ the operator norm of $U \in \mathcal{O}$. The following result characterizes all order isomorphisms intertwining semigroups for irreducible case; see also [9].

Proposition 4.3. *Adopt the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 and assume further that $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$ is irreducible. Then $U \in \mathcal{O}$, if and only if there exists $h \in \mathbf{Exc}_1^+$ and a quasi-homeomorphism j from $(\mathcal{E}^{1,h}, \mathcal{F}^{1,h})$ to $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$ such that $U = c \cdot U_j U_h$ for some constant $c > 0$. The pair (\tilde{h}, j) for $U \in \mathcal{O}$ is unique up to \mathcal{E}^1 -q.e. equality.*

Proof. The sufficiency is clear because

$$U_c : L^2(E_2, m_2) \rightarrow L^2(E_2, m_2), \quad f \mapsto c \cdot f$$

is an order isomorphism such that $U_c T_t^2 = T_t^2 U_c$. For the necessity, on account of Lemma 4.2, $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$ is irreducible. Then [9, Corollary 2.4] leads to that $U/\|U\|$ is unitary for $U \in \mathcal{O}$. In other words, $U/\|U\| \in \mathcal{U}$. As a result, the representation of U with $c = \|U\|$ as well as the uniqueness of (\tilde{h}, j) is a consequence of Theorem 3.1. That completes the proof. \square

Obviously the analogical result of Corollary 3.2 holds.

Corollary 4.4. *Adopt the same assumptions of Proposition 4.3. If $\mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$, then there exist \mathcal{E}^i -nests $\{F_n^i : n \geq 1\}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and a map $j : \cup_{n \geq 1} F_n^1 \rightarrow \cup_{n \geq 1} F_n^2$ such that $j|_{F_n^1}$ is a homeomorphism from F_n^1 to F_n^2 for any $n \geq 1$.*

4.3. General characterization. Take a T_t^1 -invariant set A . Denote by $T_t^{1,A}$ and $T_t^{2,\tau(A)}$ the restrictions of T_t^1 to A and T_t^2 to $\tau(A)$ respectively. Clearly (2.6) yields that $(A, \tau(A))$ is U -invariant in the sense that

$$U(f1_A) = 1_{\tau(A)} Uf, \quad f \in L^2(E_1, m_1).$$

As a consequence,

$$U^A(f|_A) := U(f1_A)|_{\tau(A)} \in L^2(\tau(A), m_2), \quad f \in L^2(E_1, m_1) \quad (4.1)$$

is well defined.

Lemma 4.5. *Adopt the same assumptions of Lemma 4.2 and let A be a T_t^1 -invariant set. Then (4.1) gives an order isomorphism*

$$U^A : L^2(A, m_1) \rightarrow L^2(\tau(A), m_2)$$

intertwining $T_t^{1,A}$ and $T_t^{2,\tau(A)}$.

Proof. Clearly U^A is linear and injective. For $g \in L^2(\tau(A), m_2) \subset L^2(E_2, m_2)$, set $f := (U^{-1}g)|_A \in L^2(A, m_1)$. Then

$$U^A f = U(U^{-1}g \cdot 1_A)|_{\tau(A)} = U(U^{-1}g)|_{\tau(A)} = g.$$

Hence U^A is surjective. Note that $f \geq 0$ if and only if $U^A f \geq 0$ for any $f \in L^2(A, m_1)$. Thus U^A is an order isomorphism. Since $\tau(A)$ is T_t^2 -invariant, it follows that for any $f \in L^2(A, m_1) \subset L^2(E_1, m_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} U^A T_t^{1,A} f &= U^A (T_t^1 f|_A) = U(T_t^1 f)|_{\tau(A)} = T_t^2(Uf)|_{\tau(A)} \\ &= T_t^2(Uf \cdot 1_{\tau(A)})|_{\tau(A)} = T_t^{2,\tau(A)}(Uf|_{\tau(A)}) = T_t^{2,\tau(A)}(Uf|_{\tau(A)}) = T_t^{2,\tau(A)} U^A f. \end{aligned}$$

That completes the proof. \square

Denote by $X^1 = (X_t^1)_{t \geq 0}$ the Markov process associated with $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$ and by $(P_t^1(x, dy))_{t \geq 0}$ the probability transition semigroup of X^1 . We impose the following assumption:

(AC): $(P_t^1)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the absolute continuity condition with respect to m_1 , i.e. $P_t^1(x, dy) \ll m_1(dy)$ for any $t \geq 0$ and $x \in E_1$.

Under **(AC)**, Kuwae [8] shows that E_1 admits a unique irreducible decomposition for $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$:

$$E_1 = \cup_{1 \leq n \leq N} A_n^1, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\{A_n^1 \in \mathcal{B}^{m_1}(E_1) : 1 \leq n \leq N\}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ or ∞ , forms a disjoint union, and each A_n^1 is T_t^1 -invariant and contains no proper T_t^1 -invariant subsets. Particularly the restriction of $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$ to A_n^1 is irreducible. Set $A_n^2 := \tau(A_n^1)$. On account of Lemma 4.2,

$$E_2 = \cup_{1 \leq n \leq N} A_n^2, \quad m_2\text{-a.e.} \quad (4.3)$$

forms an irreducible decomposition for $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$. Define a family of step functions on E_2 as follows:

$$\mathcal{S} := \left\{ \varphi = \sum_{n=1}^N c_n \cdot 1_{A_n^2} : \exists c > 1, \text{ s.t. } 1/c \leq c_n \leq c, 1 \leq n \leq N \right\}. \quad (4.4)$$

For any $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}$, define

$$U_\varphi : L^2(E_2, m_2) \rightarrow L^2(E_2, m_2), \quad f \mapsto \varphi \cdot f. \quad (4.5)$$

Clearly U_φ is bijective and $f \geq 0$ if and only if $U_\varphi f \geq 0$. Consequently, U_φ is an order isomorphism. The main result is the following.

Theorem 4.6. *Adopt the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 and assume that **(AC)** holds. Then $U \in \mathcal{O}$, if and only if*

- (i) E_2 admits an irreducible decomposition (4.3) for $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$;
- (ii) There exists $h \in \mathbf{Exc}_1^+$, a quasi-homeomorphism j from $(\mathcal{E}^{1,h}, \mathcal{F}^{1,h})$ to $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$U = U_\varphi U_j U_h. \quad (4.6)$$

The triple (h, j, φ) for $U \in \mathcal{O}$ is unique in the sense that if (h_1, j_1, φ_1) is another triple such that $U = U_{\varphi_1} U_{j_1} U_{h_1}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi &= \varphi_1, \quad m_2\text{-a.e.}, \\ j &= j_1, \quad \tilde{h} = \tilde{h}_1, \quad \mathcal{E}^1\text{-q.e.} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Sufficiency. Applying Theorem 3.1, we only need to show $U_\varphi T_t^2 = T_t^2 U_\varphi$. In fact, let $\varphi = \sum_{n=1}^N c_n \cdot 1_{A_n^2}$ as in (4.4). Since (4.3) forms an irreducible decomposition for $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$, it follows that for any $g \in L^2(E_2, m_2)$,

$$1_{A_n^2} \cdot T_t^2 g = T_t^2 (g \cdot 1_{A_n^2}).$$

Hence

$$U_\varphi T_t^2 g = \sum_{n=1}^N c_n 1_{A_n^2} \cdot T_t^2 g = \sum_{n=1}^N T_t^2 (c_n g 1_{A_n^2}) = T_t^2 \left(\sum_{n=1}^N c_n g 1_{A_n^2} \right) = T_t^2 U_\varphi g, \quad (4.7)$$

where the third identity is due to the convergence of $\sum_{n=1}^N c_n g 1_{A_n^2}$ in $L^2(E_2, m_2)$.

Necessity. Let (4.2) be the irreducible decomposition for $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$. Set $A_n^2 := \tau(A_n^1)$. Then (4.3) is an irreducible decomposition for $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$, i.e. the first assertion holds true. In view of Lemma 4.5,

$$U_n := U^{A_n^1} : L^2(A_n^1, m_1) \rightarrow L^2(A_n^2, m_2)$$

is an order isomorphism intertwining $T_t^{1,n} := T_t^{1,A_n^1}$ and $T_t^{2,n} := T_t^{2,A_n^2}$. Denote by $c_n := \|U_n\|$ the operator norm of U_n , and set

$$\varphi := \sum_{n=1}^N c_n \cdot 1_{A_n^2}.$$

We first prove that $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}$. In fact, for any $f \in L^2(A_1, m_1) \subset L^2(E_1, m_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_n f\|_{L^2(A_n^2, m_2)} &= \|(Uf)|_{A_n^2}\|_{L^2(A_n^2, m_2)} \leq \|Uf\|_{L^2(E_2, m_2)} \\ &\leq \|U\| \cdot \|f\|_{L^2(E_2, m_2)} = \|U\| \cdot \|f\|_{L^2(A_n^2, m_2)}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\|U_n\| \leq \|U\|$. Analogously we have $\|U_n^{-1}\| \leq \|U^{-1}\|$. In addition, it follows from $\mathbf{Id}_n^1 = U_n^{-1}U_n$, where \mathbf{Id}_n^1 is the identity operator on $L^2(A_n^1, m_1)$, that

$$c_n = \|U_n\| \geq 1/\|U_n^{-1}\| \geq 1/\|U^{-1}\|.$$

As a result, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}$ can be concluded. Secondly we assert that $U_n/\|U_n\|$ is unitary. Denote by U_n^* the adjoint operator of U_n . Set $s_n := s|_{A_n^1}$ and $\tau_n := \tau|_{A_n^1}$. For any $f, g \in L^2(A_n^1, m_1)$, we have

$$(U_n^* U_n f, g)_{L^2(A_n^1, m_1)} = (U_n f, U_n g)_{L^2(A_n^2, m_2)} = \int_{A_n^1} \frac{fg}{s_n^2} dm_2 \circ \tau_n. \quad (4.8)$$

In view of the proof of Lemma 4.2, we have $m_2 \circ \tau_n \ll m_1$. Set $\rho_n := dm_2 \circ \tau_n / dm_1$. It follows from (4.8) that $U_n^* U_n f = \phi_n f$ where $\phi_n := \rho_n / s_n^2$. On the other hand, $U_n T_t^{1,n} = T_t^{2,n} U_n$ implies $T_t^{1,n} U_n^* = U_n^* T_t^{2,n}$. Thus

$$\phi_n T_t^{1,n} f = U_n^* U_n T_t^{1,n} f = T_t^{1,n} U_n^* U_n f = T_t^{1,n} (\phi_n f).$$

Mimicking the proof of [9, Lemma 2.2], we can obtain that ϕ_n is constant, m_1 -a.e. on A_n^1 . Then (4.8) leads to

$$(U_n f, U_n g)_{L^2(A_n^2, m_2)} = c^2 \cdot (f, g)_{L^2(A_n^1, m_1)}$$

for some constant $c > 0$. Therefore $c = \|U_n\|$ and $U_n/\|U_n\|$ is unitary. Finally, let U_φ^{-1} be the inverse of (4.5), and set $\tilde{U} := U_\varphi^{-1}U$. We show $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{U}$, so that Theorem 3.1 yields the representation (4.6). To accomplish this, note that \tilde{U} is clearly bijective and for $f \in L^2(E_1, m_1)$, $f \geq 0$ if and only if $\tilde{U}f \geq 0$. Thus \tilde{U} is an order isomorphism. Mimicking (4.7), we get that

$$U_\varphi^{-1} T_t^2 g = T_t^2 U_\varphi^{-1} g, \quad g \in L^2(E_2, m_2).$$

It follows from $U \in \mathcal{O}$ that for any $f \in L^2(E_1, m_1)$,

$$\tilde{U} T_t^1 f = U_\varphi^{-1} T_t^2 (Uf) = T_t^2 U_\varphi^{-1} (Uf) = T_t^2 \tilde{U} f.$$

Consequently $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{O}$. In addition, (4.1) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{U}f, \tilde{U}f)_{L^2(E_2, m_2)} &= \sum_{n=1}^N c_n^2 \cdot (Uf|_{A_n^2}, Uf|_{A_n^2})_{L^2(E_2, m_2)} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N c_n^2 \cdot (U_n(f|_{A_n^1}), U_n(f|_{A_n^1}))_{L^2(A_n^2, m_2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Since $U_n/\|U_n\|$ is unitary, it follows that

$$(\tilde{U}f, \tilde{U}f)_{L^2(E_2, m_2)} = \sum_{n=1}^N (f|_{A_n^1}, f|_{A_n^1})_{L^2(A_n^1, m_1)} = (f, f)_{L^2(E_1, m_1)}.$$

Therefore $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{U}$.

Uniqueness. Note that $U_{\varphi_1}^{-1}U = U_{j_1}U_{h_1}$ is unitary. Mimicking (4.9), we can obtain that $\varphi_1 = \varphi$, m_2 -a.e. Particularly, $U_\varphi = U_{\varphi_1}$ and

$$U_{j_1}U_{h_1} = U_{\varphi_1}^{-1}U = U_\varphi^{-1}U = U_jU_h.$$

The second identity is a consequence of the uniqueness obtained in Theorem 3.1. That completes the proof. \square

We end this section with two corollaries of Theorem 4.6. The first one is the analogue of Corollary 3.2, and the proof is trivial.

Corollary 4.7. *Adopt the same assumptions of Theorem 4.6. If $\mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$, then there exist \mathcal{E}^i -nests $\{F_n^i : n \geq 1\}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and a map $j : \cup_{n \geq 1} F_n^1 \rightarrow \cup_{n \geq 1} F_n^2$ such that $j|_{F_n^1}$ is a homeomorphism from F_n^1 to F_n^2 for any $n \geq 1$.*

Let $U = U_\varphi U_j U_h$ be in Theorem 4.6, and denote by $U_n := U^{A_n^1}$ the restriction of U to the T_t^1 -invariant set A_n^1 . Although we cannot apply Proposition 4.3 directly to U_n because A_n^1 is not necessarily Polish, the analogical representation holds true for U_n . To accomplish this, denote by $\mathbf{Exc}_{1,n}^+$ the family of excessive functions defined as (2.3) with respect to T_t^{1,A_n^1} . The h -transform of $(\mathcal{E}^{1,A_n^1}, \mathcal{F}^{1,A_n^1})$ for $h_n \in \mathbf{Exc}_{1,n}^+$ is denoted by $(\mathcal{E}^{1,A_n^1,h_n}, \mathcal{F}^{1,A_n^1,h_n})$. Set

$$\tilde{A}_n^2 := j(A_n^1), \quad 1 \leq n \leq N.$$

Then $\tilde{A}_n^2 = A_n^2$, m_2 -a.e. and

$$E_2 = \cup_{n=1}^N \tilde{A}_n^2, \quad m_2\text{-a.e.}$$

also forms an irreducible decomposition for $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$. The restriction of $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$ to \tilde{A}_n^2 is denoted by $(\mathcal{E}^{2,\tilde{A}_n^2}, \mathcal{F}^{2,\tilde{A}_n^2})$

Corollary 4.8. *Adopt the same assumptions of Theorem 4.6 and let $U = U_\varphi U_j U_h \in \mathcal{O}$. For any $1 \leq n \leq N$, there exists $h_n \in \mathbf{Exc}_{1,n}^+$ and a quasi-homeomorphism j_n from $(\mathcal{E}^{1,A_n^1,h_n}, \mathcal{F}^{1,A_n^1,h_n})$ to $(\mathcal{E}^{2,\tilde{A}_n^2}, \mathcal{F}^{2,\tilde{A}_n^2})$ such that $U_n = \|U_n\| U_{j_n} U_{h_n}$.*

Proof. Set $h_n := h|_{A_n^1}$ and $j_n := j|_{A_n^1}$. It suffices to note that $h_n \in \mathbf{Exc}_{1,n}^+$ and j_n is a quasi-homeomorphism from $(\mathcal{E}^{1,A_n^1,h_n}, \mathcal{F}^{1,A_n^1,h_n})$ to $(\mathcal{E}^{2,\tilde{A}_n^2}, \mathcal{F}^{2,\tilde{A}_n^2})$ by virtue of Lemma 4.1. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] C. D. ALIPRANTIS AND O. BURKINSHAW, *Positive operators*, Springer, Dordrecht, 2006.
- [2] W. ARENDT, *Does diffusion determine the body?*, J. Reine Angew. Math., 550 (2002), pp. 97–123.
- [3] Z.-Q. CHEN AND M. FUKUSHIMA, *Symmetric Markov processes, time change, and boundary theory*, vol. 35 of London Mathematical Society Monographs Series, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.
- [4] L. DELLO SCHIAVO AND M. WIRTH, *Ergodic decompositions of Dirichlet forms under order isomorphisms*, arXiv: 2109.00615, (2021).
- [5] M. FUKUSHIMA, Y. OSHIMA, AND M. TAKEDA, *Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes*, vol. 19 of de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, extended ed., 2011.
- [6] C. GORDON, D. WEBB, AND S. WOLPERT, *Isospectral plane domains and surfaces via Riemannian orbifolds*, Invent. Math., 110 (1992), pp. 1–22.
- [7] M. KAC, *Can one hear the shape of a drum?*, Amer. Math. Monthly, 73 (1966), pp. 1–23.

- [8] K. KUWAE, *Irreducible decomposition for Markov processes*, Stochastic Process. Appl., 140 (2021), pp. 339–356.
- [9] D. LENZ, M. SCHMIDT, AND M. WIRTH, *Geometric properties of Dirichlet forms under order isomorphisms*, arXiv: 1801.08326, (2018).

FUDAN UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, CHINA.

BIELEFELD UNIVERSITY, BIELEFELD, GERMANY.

Email address: liliping@amss.ac.cn

FUDAN UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, CHINA.