

# ABOUT THE NOTION OF EIGENSTATES FOR $C^*$ -ALGEBRAS AND SOME APPLICATION IN QUANTUM MECHANICS

GIUSEPPE DE NITTIS AND DANILO POLO

**ABSTRACT.** This work is concerned with the notion of *eigenstates* for  $C^*$ -algebras. After reviewing some basic and structural results, we explore the possibility of reinterpreting certain typical concepts of quantum mechanics (e. g. dynamical equilibrium states, ground states, gapped states, Fermi surfaces) in terms of (algebraic) eigenstates.

**MSC 2010:** Primary: 46L30; Secondary: 47L80, 47L90, 82B10.

**Keywords:** *Eigenstates, ground states, gapped states, Fermi surfaces.*

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Eigenstates of $C^*$ -algebras	3
2.1. Basic definition	3
2.2. Eigenstates and spectrum	5
2.3. Eigenstates and representations	8
2.4. Relation between distinct eigenstates	8
2.5. Eigenstates of a projection	9
3. Eigenstates and dynamics	11
3.1. Stability under the dynamics	11
3.2. Ground state condition	12
3.3. Gapped ground states	14
4. Fermi surfaces and eigenstates	16
4.1. Standard notion of Fermi surface	16
4.2. Eigenstates for Fermi surfaces	17
4.3. A physical application: the graphene	20
4.4. Generalized notion of Fermi surface	22
Appendix A. Disintegration of measures	27
References	34

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Usually, the concept of *eigenstate* is formulated within the Hilbert space formulation of Quantum Mechanics (QM) [Dira, vNeu]: given a linear operator  $H$  (commonly called *observable*) acting on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  (the *state space*) and a number  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  (the *measure outcome*), then one says that  $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$  is an *eigenstate* of  $H$  with *eigenvalue*  $\lambda$  if the equation  $H\psi = \lambda\psi$  is satisfied. However, immediately after the birth of the Hilbert space formulation of QM, it was realized that the quantum theory can be rigorously reformulated in a purely algebraic language. The *algebraic foundation of QM* [MvN, Sega] turns out to be a more general and flexible theory compared with the original Hilbert space formulation. In this setting the observables are interpreted as elements of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  and the states are the continuous linear functional  $\omega : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . The connection with the standard formulation is given by the *GNS representation* (see Section 2.3) which provides a way to associate to a given state  $\omega$  a triple  $(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, \psi_\omega)$  where  $\pi_\omega$  is a representation of  $\mathfrak{A}$  over the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ , and  $\psi_\omega$  is a cyclic vector  $\psi_\omega$  which permits to reconstruct the statistic (or *expectation values*) of  $\omega$ . One of the main advantages of the algebraic approach is that it provides a framework suitable for dealing without ambiguity with systems with infinite degrees of freedom such as the statistical mechanics systems [BR1, BR2] and field theories [Haag].

In light of the above, it is worth asking whether there is an algebraic interpretation of the concept of eigenstate of an operator. In fact this is not so exotic or difficult. Given an observable  $H$  of a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  and a number  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  one says that a state  $\omega$  is an *eigenstate* of  $H$  if the eigenvalue equation  $\pi_\omega(H)\psi_\omega = \lambda\psi_\omega$  is satisfied in the related GNS representation (Theorem 2.15). Remarkably, this somehow natural definition of an eigenstate can be characterized in a purely algebraic way without resorting to the GNS representation (Definition 2.1). It is not clear to us where and when this definition was first introduced in the literature. However, it has been used by various authors for distinct reasons. For instance in [Ried1, Ried2] it is used for the study of spectral properties of the *almost Mathieu operator* and in [MP, Pash2] for the study of the simplicity of certain  $C^*$ -algebras. A recent review [Rine] is devoted to summarize the main properties of the eigenstates for self-adjoint operators.

This work is aimed to review and popularize the concept of eigenstates for elements of a  $C^*$ -algebra, and to provide a possible use of this notion to reinterpret certain ideas typical for (quantum) condensed matter systems. By following, and extending, the presentation in [Rine], we will explore the relation between the notion of eigenstate and the algebraic formulation of *dynamic equilibrium state*, *ground state*, *gapped state*, and *Fermi surface*. Along the way, we provide proofs that are missing or scattered in the literature.

In our opinion, one of the major contributions of this work is the connection between Fermi surfaces [AM, Call, Kitt, Kuch1] and eigenstates. In particular we can show (Theorem 4.5) that Fermi surface can be appropriately interpreted as eigenstates (of the related

of the C\*-algebra). This paves the way to extend the notion of Fermi surface beyond the usual setting of periodic operators. In fact in Section 4.4 we provide a generalized definition of Fermi surface which, in a certain sense, can be imagined as a “non-commutative version” of the usual notion of Fermi surface. This work provides only the first step in this direction, although the desired long-term goal is to have a complete characterization of the properties of an eigenstates are to be a “non-commutative Fermi surface”.

**Structure of the paper and main results.** In Section 2 we review some properties of eigenstates and generalize the results of [Rine] to normal elements. In particular, we show that if  $A$  is a normal element of a C\*-algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$ , then there is a correspondence between its spectrum and its set of eigenstates (cf. Corollary 2.10). It is also proved that for any normal element the set of eigenstates is closed under functional calculus (cf. Theorem 2.13). Other characterizations of eigenstates in terms of ideals and (left) invertibility are also presented. Section 3 is devoted to the relation between the notion of eigenstate of a self-adjoint element and the algebraic formulation of concepts like *equilibrium state*, *ground state* and *gapped state*. In more detail, we show that pure states invariant under the dynamic generated by a self-adjoint element  $H$  are exactly the eigenstates of  $H$  (Proposition 3.3), and we present an explicit characterization of the eigenstates in terms of ground states and gapped states (Propositions 3.7 and 3.9). In Section 4, we introduce a new algebraic definition of *Fermi surface* for elements of a C\*-algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Under mild technical conditions, the main result of this section states that one can build an eigenstate associated with each Fermi surface of a self-adjoint element in suitable C\*-algebras (Theorem 4.5). A physical example is considered in detail in Section 4.3. Supporting material concerning the *disintegration theorem* has been included in Appendix A.

**Acknowledgements** GD’s research is supported by the grant Fondecyt Regular - 1190204. DP’s research is supported by ANID-Subdirección de Capital Humano/ Doctorado Nacional/ 2022-21220144. GD would like to cordially thank J. Bellissard for several inspiring discussions on the algebraic notion of eigenstate and its relation with the notion of Fermi surface, and for suggesting references [Ried1, Ried2].

## 2. EIGENSTATES OF C\*-ALGEBRAS

**2.1. Basic definition.** In the following,  $\mathfrak{A}$  will always be a unital C\*-algebra with *unit*  $\mathbf{1}$ . In fact, there is no loss of generality in this assumption, since every non-unital C\*-algebra can be endowed with a unit in a standard way [BR1, Proposition 2.1.5]. The *state space* of  $\mathfrak{A}$ , *i. e.*, the set of the normalized positive linear functionals over  $\mathfrak{A}$  [BR1, Definition 2.3.14], will be denoted with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ .

**Definition 2.1** (Eigenstate). Let  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ . A state  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  is an *eigenstate* of  $A$  with *eigenvalue*  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  if and only if

$$\omega(BA) = \lambda \omega(B), \quad \forall B \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

The set of all eigenvalues of  $A$  will be denoted with  $\text{Eig}(A)$ .

By choosing  $B = \mathbf{1}$  in the definition above it turns out that

$$\lambda = \omega(A) ,$$

namely the value of the eigenvalue  $\lambda$  is determined by the evaluation of the eigenstate  $\omega$  on the operator  $A$ .

*Remark 2.2.* Let  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  be an eigenstate of  $A$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . Then  $\omega$  is also an eigenstate of  $A_0 := A - \lambda_0 \mathbf{1}$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda - \lambda_0$  for every  $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ . ◀

Given  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  let

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_{A,\lambda} := \overline{\{J = B(A - \lambda \mathbf{1}) \mid B \in \mathfrak{A}\}} \subseteq \mathfrak{A} . \quad (2.1)$$

be the associated closed left-ideal.

**Lemma 2.3.** *The state  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  is an eigenstate of  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  if and only if  $\omega|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_{A,\lambda}} \equiv 0$ .*

*Proof.* For the implication  $(\Rightarrow)$  let us start with the case  $J = B(A - \lambda \mathbf{1})$ . Then

$$\omega(J) = \omega(BA) - \lambda\omega(B) = 0 .$$

In the case  $J$  is the norm-limit of the sequence  $J_n := B_n(A - \lambda \mathbf{1})$  then one has by continuity that

$$|\omega(J)| = |\omega(J - J_n)| \leq \|J - J_n\|$$

and in turn  $\omega(J) = 0$ . The implication  $(\Leftarrow)$  follows by observing that the condition  $\omega|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_{A,\lambda}} \equiv 0$  implies Definition 2.1. ◻

**Proposition 2.4.** *The state  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  is an eigenstate of  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  if and only if*

$$\omega((A - \lambda \mathbf{1})^*(A - \lambda \mathbf{1})) = 0 .$$

*Proof.* The implication  $(\Rightarrow)$  is a consequence of Lemma 2.3. The implication  $(\Leftarrow)$  follows from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality for states [BR1, Lemma 2.3.10]

$$|\omega(B(A - \lambda \mathbf{1}))|^2 \leq \omega(B^*B) \omega((A - \lambda \mathbf{1})^*(A - \lambda \mathbf{1})) = 0 , \quad \forall B \in \mathfrak{A}$$

which implies that  $\omega(BA) = \lambda\omega(B)$  for every  $B \in \mathfrak{A}$ . ◻

Let us recall that  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  is *normal* if  $AA^* = A^*A$ .

**Corollary 2.5.** *Let  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  be a normal element and  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  an eigenstate of  $A$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . Then  $\omega$  is also an eigenstate of  $A^*$  with eigenvalue  $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}$ .*

*Proof.* In view of Proposition 2.4 and the normality of  $A$  it holds true that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \omega((A - \lambda \mathbf{1})^*(A - \lambda \mathbf{1})) = \omega((A - \lambda \mathbf{1})(A - \lambda \mathbf{1})^*) \\ &= \omega((A^* - \bar{\lambda} \mathbf{1})^*(A^* - \bar{\lambda} \mathbf{1})) . \end{aligned}$$

Then, by using again Proposition 2.4 one concludes the proof. ◻

**2.2. Eigenstates and spectrum.** Let us recall that the *spectrum* of  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  is defined as [BR1, Definition 2.2.1]

$$\text{Spec}(A) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid (A - \lambda \mathbf{1}) \text{ is not invertible in } \mathfrak{A}\}.$$

The next result shows that the eigenvalues are elements of the spectrum.

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ . Then,  $\text{Eig}(A) \subseteq \text{Spec}(A)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda \in \text{Eig}(A)$  and  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  be the associated eigenstate. By contradiction, let us suppose that  $B = (A - \lambda \mathbf{1})^{-1} \in \mathfrak{A}$ . Then, in view of Lemma 2.3, one would have that

$$\omega(\mathbf{1}) = \omega(B(A - \lambda \mathbf{1})) = 0$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore  $A - \lambda \mathbf{1}$  cannot be invertible. □

It is interesting to have a criterion that guarantees the equality

$$\text{Eig}(A) = \text{Spec}(A) \quad A \in \mathfrak{A}. \quad (2.2)$$

For that, we need the following preliminary result.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ . Then,  $\lambda \in \text{Eig}(A)$  if and only if  $\mathbf{1} \notin \mathfrak{J}_{A,\lambda}$ .*

*Proof.* The implication  $(\Rightarrow)$  is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.3. In fact, if  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  is an eigenstate of  $A$  associated to  $\lambda \in \text{Eig}(A)$ , then  $\omega(J) = 0$  for every  $J \in \mathfrak{J}_{A,\lambda}$ , and  $\omega(\mathbf{1}) = 1$  by definition of states. Consequently  $\mathbf{1} \notin \mathfrak{J}_{A,\lambda}$ . The implication  $(\Leftarrow)$  requires the use of [BR1, Proposition 2.3.24] which is a consequence of the Hahn-Banach theorem. Let  $\mathbf{1} \notin \mathfrak{J}_{A,\lambda}$  and consider the unital C\*-algebra

$$\mathfrak{B}_{A,\lambda} := \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1} + \mathfrak{J}_{A,\lambda} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$$

and the state  $\tilde{\omega} : \mathfrak{B}_{A,\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  defined by

$$\tilde{\omega}(\alpha \mathbf{1} + J) = \alpha, \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \forall J \in \mathfrak{J}_{A,\lambda}.$$

Then, there exists a state  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  which extends  $\tilde{\omega}$ . In particular, this means that  $\omega|_{\mathfrak{J}_{A,\lambda}} \equiv 0$  and in turn  $\lambda \in \text{Eig}(A)$  in view of Lemma 2.3. □

Following [Conw1, Chapter VII, Definition 3.1] let us introduce the *left spectrum* of  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  defined as

$$\text{Spec}_L(A) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid (A - \lambda \mathbf{1}) \text{ is not left-invertible in } \mathfrak{A}\}.$$

The *right spectrum*  $\text{Spec}_R(A)$  is defined similarly. From the definitions above, it holds true that

$$\text{Spec}(A) = \text{Spec}_L(A) \cup \text{Spec}_R(A).$$

Moreover one has that  $\text{Spec}_L(A) = \text{Spec}_R(A^*)$ .

*Remark 2.8.* Let  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$  be the C\*-algebra of bounded operators over some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ . Then, in view of [Conw1, Chapter XI, Proposition 1.1] one has that

$\text{Spec}_L(A)$  and  $\text{Spec}_R(A)$  coincide with the *approximate point spectrum* and the *surjective spectrum* of  $A$ , respectively .  $\blacktriangleleft$

**Proposition 2.9.** *Let  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ . Then,  $\text{Spec}_L(A) = \text{Eig}(A)$ .*

*Proof.* The inclusion  $\text{Eig}(A) \subseteq \text{Spec}_L(A)$  is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.7. To prove the opposite inclusion let  $\lambda \in \text{Spec}_L(A)$ . In order to show that  $\lambda \in \text{Eig}(A)$  it is enough to prove that  $\mathbf{1} \notin \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_{A,\lambda}$  in view of Lemma 2.7. Let  $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}'_{A,\lambda} := \mathfrak{A}(A - \lambda\mathbf{1})$  be the dense subideal of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_{A,\lambda}$  defined by elements of the form  $J = B(A - \lambda\mathbf{1})$  with  $B \in \mathfrak{A}$ . Since  $A - \lambda\mathbf{1}$  is not left-invertible by definition, it follows that  $\mathbf{1} \notin \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}'_{A,\lambda}$ . Therefore no element of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}'_{A,\lambda}$  can be invertible. Thus, for every  $J \in \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}'_{A,\lambda}$  it holds true that  $0 \in \text{Spec}(J)$ , or equivalently  $1 \in \text{Spec}(\mathbf{1} - J)$ . It follows that  $\|J - \mathbf{1}\| \geq 1$ , and consequently  $\mathbf{1} \notin \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_{A,\lambda}$  by a continuity argument.  $\square$

Putting together the content of Propositions 2.6 and 2.9 one gets

$$\text{Spec}_L(A) = \text{Eig}(A) \subseteq \text{Spec}(A) \quad A \in \mathfrak{A} . \quad (2.3)$$

In order to pass from (2.3) to (2.2) one needs some more condition that guarantees equality between the left spectrum and the spectrum.

**Corollary 2.10.** *For every normal element  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  the equality (2.2) holds true.*

*Proof.* For normal elements, the equality between the left spectrum and spectrum is proved in [Conw1, Chapter XI, Proposition 1.4]. Then the result follows from (2.3).  $\square$

Let  $\mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{H})$  be the (non-unital)  $C^*$ -algebra of compact operators on the separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . As usual, in order to have a unit let us consider the standard extension  $\mathfrak{K}^+(\mathcal{H}) := \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1} + \mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{H})$ . Since the structure of  $\mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{H})$  does not depend on the specific (separable) space  $\mathcal{H}$ , we will use the short notations  $\mathfrak{K}$  and  $\mathfrak{K}^+$ .

**Corollary 2.11.** *For every  $A \in \mathfrak{K}^+$  the equality (2.2) holds true.*

*Proof.* Let  $A = T + z\mathbf{1} \in \mathfrak{K}^+$  for some  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $T \in \mathfrak{K}$ . In view of Proposition 2.6 we only need to prove that  $\text{Spec}(A) \subseteq \text{Eig}(A)$ . Let  $\lambda \in \text{Spec}(A)$ . Then  $T - (\lambda - z)\mathbf{1}$  is not invertible, hence  $\lambda - z \in \text{Spec}(T)$ . If  $\lambda \neq z$ , then by the Riesz-Schauder theorem [RS1, Theorem VI.15] there exists a  $\psi \neq 0$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $T\psi = (\lambda - z)\psi$ . Therefore,  $A\psi = \lambda\psi$  and  $\lambda \in \text{Eig}(A)$  as we will see in Theorem 2.15. Now, let  $\lambda = z$  and assume that  $\lambda \notin \text{Eig}(A)$ . Then, from Proposition 2.9 one infers the existence of a bounded operator  $S$  such that

$$\mathbf{1} = S(A - \lambda\mathbf{1}) = ST .$$

The last equality would imply that the identity  $\mathbf{1}$  is compact since  $\mathfrak{K}$  is an ideal. However, this is a contradiction whenever  $\mathcal{H}$  is infinite-dimensional. This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Example 2.12* (Unilateral shift). It is not hard to check that there are operators for which the equality 2.2 does not hold. Let us consider the unilateral shift operator  $\mathfrak{s}$  on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$  defined by

$$\mathfrak{s} : (n_1, n_2, \dots) \longmapsto (0, n_1, n_2, \dots), \quad \forall n := (n_1, n_2, \dots) \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}).$$

Its adjoint is given by  $\mathfrak{s}^* : (n_1, n_2, \dots) \mapsto (n_2, n_3, \dots)$ . From [Conw1, Chapter VII, Proposition 6.5 & Corollary 6.6] one knows that  $\text{Spec}(\mathfrak{s}) = \mathbb{D}_1 = \text{Spec}(\mathfrak{s}^*)$  where  $\mathbb{D}_1 := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\lambda| \leq 1\}$  is the closed unit disk. On the other hand, by [Conw1, Chapter XI, Proposition 1.1] one gets that  $\text{Spec}_L(\mathfrak{s}) = \text{Spec}_{\text{a.p.}}(\mathfrak{s}) = \partial\mathbb{D}_1 \equiv \mathbb{S}^1$  where  $\mathbb{S}^1 := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\lambda| = 1\}$ . In view of Proposition 2.9 one finally obtains that  $\text{Eig}(\mathfrak{s}) \simeq \mathbb{S}^1$  showing that  $\text{Eig}(\mathfrak{s}) \neq \text{Spec}(\mathfrak{s})$ . It is worth to point out that the operator  $\mathfrak{s}^*$  meets equation (2.2) since it holds true that  $\text{Spec}_L(\mathfrak{s}^*) = \mathbb{D}_1$ . ◀

The next result uses the functional calculus for normal elements of  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{A}$ . In this case  $A$  and  $A^*$  generate a commutative sub-C\*-algebra of  $\mathfrak{A}$  which is isomorphic to the C\*-algebra  $C(\text{Spec}(A))$  of continuous functions over the compact set  $\text{Spec}(A) \subset \mathbb{C}$  in view of the Gelfand-Naimark theorem [Conw1, Section VII.2]. In particular, for every continuous function  $f \in C(\text{Spec}(A))$  there is an associated (normal) element  $f(A) \in \mathfrak{A}$  with spectrum  $f(\text{Spec}(A))$  (spectral mapping theorem). From Corollary 2.10 one gets that

$$\text{Eig}(f(A)) = f(\text{Spec}(A)). \quad (2.4)$$

The next result relates the eigenstates of  $A$  with the eigenstates of  $f(A)$  when  $A$  is a normal element.

**Theorem 2.13.** *Let  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  be a normal element and  $f \in C(\text{Spec}(A))$ . If  $\omega$  is an eigenstate of  $A$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  then  $\omega$  is also an eigenstate of  $f(A)$  with eigenvalue  $f(\lambda) \in \mathbb{C}$ .*

*Proof.* By using induction on  $n$  and  $m$  and Corollary 2.5 one obtains for any monomial  $p_{n,m}(x) := x^n \bar{x}^m$  that

$$\omega(\text{B}p_{n,m}(A)) = \omega(\text{B}A^n(A^*)^m) = \lambda^n \bar{\lambda}^m \omega(\text{B}) = p_{n,m}(\lambda) \omega(\text{B}).$$

Then, by linearity one gets that  $\omega$  is an eigenstate of  $p(A)$  with eigenvalue  $p(\lambda)$  for every polynomial  $p$ . The final result follows from the Stone-Weierstrass theorem and the continuity of  $\omega$ . ◻

**Corollary 2.14.** *Let  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  be a normal and  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  an eigenstate of  $A$  related to the eigenvalue  $\lambda \in \text{Spec}(A)$ . Let  $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a continuous function. Then,*

$$\omega([B, f(A)]) = \omega(\text{B}f(A)) - \omega(f(A)\text{B}) = 0$$

for every  $B \in \mathfrak{A}$ .

*Proof.* From Theorem 2.13 one has that

$$\omega(\mathbf{B}f(\mathbf{A})) = f(\lambda) \omega(\mathbf{B}) .$$

On the other hand, by Corollary 2.5 it is also true that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(f(\mathbf{A})\mathbf{B}) &= \overline{\omega(\mathbf{B}^*f(\mathbf{A})^*)} = \overline{f(\lambda)} \omega(\mathbf{B}^*) \\ &= f(\lambda) \overline{\omega(\mathbf{B}^*)} = f(\lambda) \omega(\mathbf{B}) . \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**2.3. Eigenstates and representations.** In this section, we will study the behavior of the notion of eigenstate under  $*$ -representations of the  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  in the algebra  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$  of bounded operators on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ .

**Theorem 2.15.** *Let  $\pi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$  be a  $*$ -representation of  $\mathfrak{A}$  and*

$$\omega_\psi(\mathbf{A}) := \langle \psi, \pi(\mathbf{A})\psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} , \quad \mathbf{A} \in \mathfrak{A}$$

*be the vector state associated with the normalized vector  $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ . Then,  $\omega_\psi$  is an eigenstate of  $\mathbf{A}$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  if and only if  $\pi(\mathbf{A})\psi = \lambda\psi$ .*

*Proof.* Let us start with the implication ( $\Rightarrow$ ). If  $\omega_\psi$  is an eigenstate then, in view of Lemma 2.3, one obtains

$$0 = \omega_\psi((\mathbf{A} - \lambda\mathbf{1})^*(\mathbf{A} - \lambda\mathbf{1})) = \|(\pi(\mathbf{A}) - \lambda\mathbf{1})\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$$

which implies  $\pi(\mathbf{A})\psi = \lambda\psi$ . The implication ( $\Leftarrow$ ) follows from the direct computation

$$\omega_\psi(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}) = \langle \psi, \pi(\mathbf{B})\pi(\mathbf{A})\psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \lambda \langle \psi, \pi(\mathbf{B})\psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \lambda \omega_\psi(\mathbf{B}) .$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Let us recall that every state  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  define the *GNS representation*  $(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, \psi_\omega)$  [Conw1, Chapter VIII, Theorem 5.14]. Here  $\psi_\omega$  is the cyclic vector of the representation, and it holds true that

$$\omega(\mathbf{A}) = \langle \psi_\omega, \pi_\omega(\mathbf{A})\psi_\omega \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} , \quad \mathbf{A} \in \mathfrak{A} .$$

The following result is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.15.

**Corollary 2.16.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathfrak{A}$  and  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  an eigenstate of  $\mathbf{A}$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . Let  $(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, \psi_\omega)$  be the GNS representation of  $\omega$ . Then*

$$\pi_\omega(\mathbf{A})\psi_\omega = \lambda\psi_\omega .$$

**2.4. Relation between distinct eigenstates.** In this section, we will investigate the relation between eigenstates of the element  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathfrak{A}$  related to distinct eigenvalues. Let us start with a definition. A collection of states  $\{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N\} \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  is called *linearly independent* if  $\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k \omega_k \equiv 0$  with  $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{C}$  implies  $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_N = 0$ .

**Theorem 2.17.** *Any collection  $\{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N\} \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  of eigenstates of  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathfrak{A}$  all having distinct eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N\} \subset \mathbb{C}$ , is linearly independent.*



*Proof.* The proof is by induction on  $N$ . The case  $N = 1$  is clear. Assume now that the conclusion holds for  $N - 1$ , and suppose that  $\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k \omega_k \equiv 0$ . By applying this sum to the element  $B(A - \lambda_N \mathbf{1})$  for some  $B \in \mathfrak{A}$  one gets

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k \omega_k(B(A - \lambda_N \mathbf{1})) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \alpha_k \omega_k(B(A - \lambda_N \mathbf{1})) = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \alpha_k (\lambda_k - \lambda_N) \omega_k(B). \end{aligned}$$

By the inductive hypothesis one has that  $\alpha_k (\lambda_k - \lambda_N) = 0$  for every  $k = 1, \dots, N - 1$ . Since all the eigenvalues are distinct it follows that  $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_{N-1} = 0$ . Finally  $\alpha_N = 0$  in view of the argument for  $N = 1$ .  $\square$

Following [Pede, Definition 3.2.3], let us recall that two linear functionals  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$  over  $\mathfrak{A}$  are said *orthogonal* if

$$\|\omega_1 - \omega_2\| = \|\omega_1\| + \|\omega_2\|.$$

**Theorem 2.18.** *Let  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  be normal. Then, any two eigenstates of  $A$  with different eigenvalues are orthogonal.*

*Proof.* Let  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$  be two eigenstates of  $A$  with eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ , respectively. As a consequence of the Urysohn's lemma, there exists a continuous function  $f \in C(\text{Spec}(A))$  such that  $f(\lambda_1) = 1$ ,  $f(\lambda_2) = -1$  and  $\|f\|_\infty = 1$ . From Theorem 2.13 one gets that

$$(\omega_1 - \omega_2)(f(A)) = f(\lambda_1) - f(\lambda_2) = 2.$$

Consequently,

$$2 \leq \|\omega_1 - \omega_2\| \leq \|\omega_1\| + \|\omega_2\| = 2$$

which implies the orthogonality between  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$ .  $\square$

**2.5. Eigenstates of a projection.** Let us recall that a self-adjoint projection is an element  $P \in \mathfrak{A}$  such that  $P^* = P = P^2$ .

**Theorem 2.19.** *Let  $P \in \mathfrak{A}$  be a self-adjoint projection and  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Let  $\omega_P \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  be the state defined by*

$$\omega_P(A) := \frac{\omega(PAP)}{\omega(P)}, \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

*The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\omega_P = \omega$ ;
- (ii)  $\omega$  is an eigenstate of  $P$  with eigenvalue 1;
- (iii)  $\omega(P) = 1$ .

*Proof.* (i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (ii). For all  $B \in \mathfrak{A}$  one has that

$$\omega(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{P}) = \omega_{\mathbf{P}}(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{P}) = \frac{\omega(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{P}^2)}{\omega(\mathbf{P})} = \frac{\omega(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{P})}{\omega(\mathbf{P})} = \omega_{\mathbf{P}}(\mathbf{B}) = \omega(\mathbf{B}),$$

then  $\omega$  is an eigenstate of  $\mathbf{P}$  with eigenvalue 1. On the other hand, if  $\omega$  is an eigenstate of  $\mathbf{P}$  with eigenvalue 1, then  $\omega(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{P}) = \omega(\mathbf{B})$  for every  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathfrak{A}$ , and in turn  $\omega(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{B}^*) = \omega(\mathbf{B}^*)$  by taking the adjoint. By replacing the generic element  $\mathbf{B}^*$  with  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{P}$  one gets  $\omega(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{P}) = \omega(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{P}) = \omega(\mathbf{B})$ . This fact along with  $\omega(\mathbf{P}) = 1$  provides  $\omega_{\mathbf{P}}(\mathbf{B}) = \omega(\mathbf{B})$  for every  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathfrak{A}$ .

(ii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii). If  $\omega$  is an eigenstate of  $\mathbf{P}$  with eigenvalue 1 then

$$0 = \omega(0) = \omega((\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{P})\mathbf{P}) = \omega(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{P}).$$

Therefore

$$1 = \omega(\mathbf{1}) = \omega((\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{P}) + \mathbf{P}) = \omega(\mathbf{P}).$$

On the other hand from  $\omega(\mathbf{P}) = 1$  one gets  $\omega(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{P}) = 0$  and in turn  $\omega((\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{P})^*(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{P})) = \omega(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{P}) = 0$  which implies that  $\omega$  is an eigenstate of  $\mathbf{P}$  with eigenvalue 1 in view of Proposition 2.4.  $\square$

*Remark 2.20* (Eigenstates for gapped spectral projections). Let  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}^*$  be a selfadjoint element in  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\sigma_* \subset \text{Spec}(\mathbf{H}) \subset \mathbb{R}$  a closed (hence compact) subset of the spectrum of  $\mathbf{H}$ . Let us assume the *gap condition*  $\text{dist}(\sigma_*, \text{Spec}(\mathbf{H}) \setminus \sigma_*) > 0$  and denote with  $\mathbf{P}_*$  the spectral projection of  $\mathbf{H}$  on  $\sigma_*$ . Via functional calculus, and in view of the gap condition, we can choose a real continuous function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f$  coincides with the characteristic function of  $\sigma_*$  when restricted to  $\text{Spec}(\mathbf{H})$ , and  $f(\mathbf{H}) = \mathbf{P}_*$ . In particular, this ensures that  $\mathbf{P}_* \in \mathfrak{A}$ . We will refer to  $\mathbf{P}_*$  as a *gapped* spectral projection of  $\mathbf{H}$ . Our aim is to construct an eigenstate of  $\mathbf{P}_*$  (with eigenvalue 1). By invoking the disintegration theorem for measures (cf. Theorem A.2), one can obtain a real probability measure  $\mu_1$  with support in  $\sigma_*$ . In fact, let  $\nu := \mu \circ f^{-1}$  be the pushforward measure by  $f$  of the standard Lebesgue measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ . By Theorem A.2 there exists a  $\nu$ -almost everywhere uniquely determined disintegration  $\{\mu_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  of  $\mu$  over  $\nu$ . Since  $\mu_t$  lives on the fiber  $f^{-1}(\{t\})$  for  $\nu$ -almost all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , it follows that  $\mu_1$  is supported on  $f^{-1}(\{1\}) = \sigma_*$  as required. With  $\mu_1$  we can generate an eigenstate  $\omega$  of  $\mathbf{P}_*$ . Indeed, from Corollary 2.10, for each  $\lambda \in \sigma_*$  there exists at least an eigenstate  $\omega_\lambda$  of  $\mathbf{H}$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda$ . Let us assume that there is a point-wise continuous (or measurable) map  $\sigma_* \ni \lambda \mapsto \omega_\lambda$ . Then the functional

$$\omega(\mathbf{A}) = \int_{\sigma_*} d\mu_1(\lambda) \omega_\lambda(\mathbf{A}), \quad \mathbf{A} \in \mathfrak{A}$$

results well-defined. Moreover, one can check that  $\omega(\mathbf{1}) = \mu_1(\sigma_*) = 1$ , which implies that  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Finally, a direct computation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\mathbf{P}_*) &= \int_{\sigma_*} d\mu_1(\lambda) \omega_\lambda(\mathbf{P}_*) = \int_{\sigma_*} d\mu_1(\lambda) f(\lambda) = \int_{\sigma_*} d\mu_1(\lambda) \\ &= \mu_1(\sigma_*) = 1 \end{aligned}$$

and by Theorem 2.19,  $\omega$  is an eigenstate of  $P_*$  with eigenvalue 1.  $\blacktriangleleft$

The construction above will be taken up, and generalized in a larger context in Section 4.2.

### 3. EIGENSTATES AND DYNAMICS

In this section, we will relate the concept of eigenstates of a self-adjoint operator  $H$  with certain properties of the dynamics induced by  $H$ .

**3.1. Stability under the dynamics.** Let  $H = H^*$  be a self-adjoint element of the C\*-algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$ . By functional calculus, the unitaries  $e^{itH}$ , with  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , are contained in  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Then, one can define the *dynamics* associated with  $H$  as the one-parameter group of automorphisms  $t \mapsto \alpha_t^H \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A})$  defined by

$$\alpha_t^H(A) := e^{itH} A e^{-itH}, \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{A}. \quad (3.1)$$

The dynamics  $\alpha^H$  defined above is *strongly continuous* in the sense that the functions  $t \mapsto \|\alpha_t^H(A)\|$  are continuous for every  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ . This easily follows from the boundedness of  $H$  which guarantees the continuity of  $t \mapsto \|e^{itH}\|$ . It turns out that the dynamics are also strongly differentiable in the sense that the limit

$$\delta_H(A) := i[H, A] = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\alpha_t^H(A) - A}{t}$$

exists in norm for every  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ . The commutator  $\delta_H$  acts on  $\mathfrak{A}$  as a (bounded) derivation and it is called the *infinitesimal generator* of the dynamics  $\alpha^H$ .

A state  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  is *invariant* under the dynamics induced by  $H$  if and only if

$$\omega \circ \alpha_t^H = \omega, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

This is equivalent to  $\omega \circ \delta_H = 0$ . In view of Corollary 2.14 one has that:

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $H = H^*$  be a self-adjoint element of the C\*-algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  an eigenstate of  $H$  related to the eigenvalue  $\lambda \in \text{Spec}(H)$ . Then  $\omega$  is invariant under the dynamics induced by  $H$ .*

*Remark 3.2.* It is not hard to show that the converse of Proposition 3.1 is not true in general. In fact, there are invariant states which are not eigenstates. Consider the commutative C\*-algebra  $C([0, 1])$ , the state given by the integral

$$\omega(f) := \int_0^1 ds f(s), \quad f \in C([0, 1]),$$

and the element  $\xi(s) := s$  for all  $s \in [0, 1]$ . Since  $\omega(\xi^n) = (n+1)^{-1}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , one gets that  $\omega(\xi) = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\omega(\xi^2) \neq \frac{1}{2}\omega(\xi)$ . Therefore,  $\omega$  is not an eigenstate for  $\xi$  (associated to  $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ ). Nevertheless, in view of the commutativity of  $C([0, 1])$ ,  $\omega$  is trivially invariant under the dynamics induced by  $\xi$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

In order to obtain the converse of Proposition 3.1 we need to require some more conditions on the state  $\omega$ . Let us recall that a state  $\omega$  is *pure* if and only if the associated GNS representation  $(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, \psi_\omega)$  is irreducible [BR1, Theorem 2.3.19]. Recall that in the commutative case, the pure states coincide with the multiplicative functionals [BR1, Corollary 2.3.21], and therefore they are automatically eigenstates.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $H = H^*$  be a self-adjoint element of the  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$ ,  $t \mapsto \alpha_t^H$  the dynamics generated by  $H$  according to (3.1) and  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  a pure state. If  $\omega$  is invariant under the dynamics  $\alpha_t^H$  then it is an eigenstate of  $H$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, \psi_\omega)$  be the GNS representation associated with  $\omega$ . As a consequence of the uniqueness up to unitary equivalence of the GNS representation [BR1, Corollary 2.3.17] one has that it exists a unique strongly continuous one-parameter group of unitary operators  $U_\omega(t)$  on  $\mathcal{H}_\omega$  such that: (i)  $U_\omega(t)\pi_\omega(A)\psi_\omega = \pi_\omega(\alpha_t^H(A))\psi_\omega$ , and (ii)  $U_\omega(t)\psi_\omega = \psi_\omega$  for every  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . By the Stone's theorem there exists a self-adjoint operator  $K_\omega$  on  $\mathcal{H}_\omega$  such that  $U_\omega(t) = e^{itK_\omega}$  for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and in turn  $K_\omega\psi_\omega = 0$  in view of the property (ii). On the other hand, since  $\pi_\omega$  is a representation and  $H \in \mathfrak{A}$  one has that

$$\pi_\omega(\alpha_t^H(A)) := e^{it\pi_\omega(H)} \pi_\omega(A) e^{-it\pi_\omega(H)} .$$

Therefore  $K_\omega$  and  $\pi_\omega(H)$  generate the same dynamics on  $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ , and in turn the same commutator. In other words one has

$$[\pi_\omega(H) - K_\omega, \pi_\omega(A)] = 0, \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{A} .$$

By considering the irreducibility of the representation one gets  $\pi_\omega(H) - K_\omega = \lambda \mathbf{1}$  for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  in view of the Schur's lemma. It turns out that  $\pi_\omega(H)\psi_\omega = (K_\omega + \lambda \mathbf{1})\psi_\omega = \lambda\psi_\omega$  and this complete the proof in view of Corollary 2.16.  $\square$

**3.2. Ground state condition.** In this section, we will introduce the concept of ground state and we will study its relation with the dynamics.

**Definition 3.4** (Ground state). Let  $H = H^*$  be a self-adjoint element of the  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$ ,  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  a state and  $(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, \psi_\omega)$  the related GNS representation. Then,  $\omega$  is a *ground state* for  $H$  if and only if

$$\omega(H) = \lambda_* := \min \text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H)) .$$

The next result shows that a ground state is automatically an eigenstate.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $H = H^*$  be a self-adjoint element of the  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  a ground state for  $H$ . Then,  $\omega$  is an eigenstate of  $H$  related to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_*$ .*

*Proof.* In view of Theorem 2.15, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\pi_\omega(H)\psi_\omega = \lambda_*\psi_\omega \tag{3.2}$$

where  $(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, \psi_\omega)$  is the GNS representation associated to  $\omega$ . Let us assume that  $\text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H)) \setminus \{\lambda_*\} \neq \emptyset$  otherwise it is trivial. Let  $E^H$  be the PVM associated to  $\pi_\omega(H)$  and

$$\pi_\omega(H) = \int_{\text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H))} dE^H(\lambda) \lambda$$

its spectral decomposition. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \omega(H) - \lambda_* \\ &= \langle \psi_\omega, (\pi_\omega(H) - \lambda_* \mathbf{1}) \psi_\omega \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} \\ &= \int_{\text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H))} \langle \psi_\omega, dE^H(\lambda) \psi_\omega \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} (\lambda - \lambda_*) \\ &= \int_{\text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H)) \setminus \{\lambda_*\}} \langle \psi_\omega, dE^H(\lambda) \psi_\omega \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} (\lambda - \lambda_*) . \end{aligned}$$

Since the difference  $\lambda - \lambda_*$  is strictly positive on the set  $\text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H)) \setminus \{\lambda_*\}$ , it follows that

$$\langle \psi_\omega, E^H(\text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H)) \setminus \{\lambda_*\}) \psi_\omega \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} = 0$$

and in turn

$$\langle \psi_\omega, E^H(\{\lambda_*\}) \psi_\omega \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} = \langle \psi_\omega, E^H(\text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H))) \psi_\omega \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} = \langle \psi_\omega, \psi_\omega \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} = 1 .$$

Since  $E^H(\{\lambda_*\})$  is an orthogonal projection one gets that  $\|E^H(\{\lambda_*\}) \psi_\omega\|_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} = 1$ . Then the Pythagoras theorem implies that

$$E^H(\{\lambda_*\}) \psi_\omega = \psi_\omega .$$

The latter equality and the spectral decomposition of  $H$  imply the relation (3.2).  $\square$

*Remark 3.6* (Absolute ground state). The state  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  will be called an *absolute ground state* of  $H$  if

$$\omega(H) = \lambda_0 := \min \text{Spec}(H) .$$

Since  $\text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H)) \subseteq \text{Spec}(H)$  one gets that  $\lambda_0 \leq \min \text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H))$ . However, the same argument in the proof of Proposition 3.5 shows that  $\lambda_0$  is the eigenvalue of  $\pi_\omega(H)$  related to the cyclic vector  $\psi_\omega$ . Therefore, one gets that  $\lambda_0 = \min \text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H))$  meaning that an absolute ground state is a ground state according to Definition 3.4.  $\blacktriangleleft$

The concept of ground states can be expressed in terms of a certain dynamical condition as in [BR2, Definition 5.3.18]. The next characterization of ground states is an adaption of [BR2, Proposition 5.3.19].

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $H = H^*$  be a self-adjoint element of the C\*-algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$ . If  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  is a ground state for  $H$  then*

$$-i \omega(A^* \delta_H(A)) \geq 0, \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{A} . \quad (3.3)$$

*On the other hand, if  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  is a pure state which meets condition (3.3) then  $\omega$  is a ground state for  $H$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, \psi_\omega)$  be the GNS representation associated with the state  $\omega$ . For the first implication, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} -i \omega(A^* \delta_H(A)) &= \omega(A^*HA - A^*AH) = \omega(A^*HA) - \omega((A^*A)H) \\ &= \omega(A^*HA) - \lambda_* \omega(A^*A) = \omega(A^*(H - \lambda_* \mathbf{1})A) \\ &= \langle \psi_\omega, \pi_\omega(A)^*(\pi_\omega(H) - \lambda_* \mathbf{1})\pi_\omega(A)\psi_\omega \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi_A, (\pi_\omega(H) - \lambda_* \mathbf{1})\psi_A \rangle \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we used Proposition 3.5 which ensures that  $\omega$  is an eigenstate of  $H$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda_*$ . In the last line, we introduced  $\psi_A := \pi_\omega(A)\psi_\omega$ , and the last inequality is a consequence of the fact that  $\lambda_*$  is by assumption the minimum of the spectrum of  $\pi_\omega(H)$ . For the second implication, let us start by observing that [BR2, Lemma 5.3.16] implies  $\omega \circ \delta_H = 0$ , *i. e.*  $\omega$  is invariant under the dynamics induced by  $H$ . Assuming that  $\omega$  is pure one can use Proposition 3.3 which shows that  $\omega$  is an eigenstate of  $H$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda_* := \omega(H)$ . With this result inequality (3.3) reads  $\lambda_* \omega(A^*A) \leq \omega(A^*HA)$  for every  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ . The latter implies

$$\lambda_* \leq \inf_{\substack{A \in \mathfrak{A} \\ \omega(A^*A) > 0}} \frac{\omega(A^*HA)}{\omega(A^*A)} = \inf_{\substack{A \in \mathfrak{A} \\ \omega(A^*A) > 0}} \frac{\langle \psi_A, \pi_\omega(H)\psi_A \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega}}{\|\psi_A\|_{\mathcal{H}_\omega}^2}.$$

In view of the cyclicity of the vector  $\psi_\omega$  one finally gets

$$\lambda_* \leq \inf_{\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} = 1} \langle \phi, \pi_\omega(H)\phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} = \inf \text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H))$$

where the last inequality is justified by [Tesc, Theorem 2.19]. Since  $\lambda_*$  belongs to the spectrum of  $\pi_\omega(H)$  one concludes that  $\lambda_* = \min \text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H))$ .  $\square$

**3.3. Gapped ground states.** In many applications it is relevant to know when the ground state of a system is protected by a gap from the rest of the spectrum. Let us introduce the following precise definition.

**Definition 3.8** (Gap condition). Let  $H = H^*$  be a self-adjoint element of the  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_\mathfrak{A}$  a ground state of  $H$  according to Definition 3.4. Then, we will say that the ground state is *gapped* if

$$\text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H)) \cap (\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \Delta) = \emptyset. \quad (3.4)$$

for some  $\Delta > 0$ . Moreover, if

$$\text{Ker}(\pi_\omega(H) - \lambda_* \mathbf{1}) = \{\psi_\omega\}$$

we will say that the gapped ground state is *non-degenerate*.

Let us denote with  $\mathcal{K}_\omega := \text{Ker}(\pi_\omega(H) - \lambda_* \mathbf{1})^\perp$  the orthogonal complement in  $\mathcal{H}_\omega$  to the eigenspace associated with the ground state  $\lambda_*$ . By observing that the infimum of  $\text{Spec}(\pi_\omega(H)) \setminus \{\lambda_*\}$  can be estimated with the help of [Tesc, Theorem 2.19] applied to

the subspace  $\mathcal{K}_\omega$ , one can reformulate the gap condition by

$$\inf_{\substack{\phi \in \mathcal{K}_\omega \\ \|\phi\|_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} = 1}} \langle \phi, \pi_\omega(H)\phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} \geq \lambda_* + \Delta. \quad (3.5)$$

The next result shows that also the gap condition can be characterized by a dynamical property [FNW, Section 6].

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let  $H = H^*$  be a self-adjoint element of the C\*-algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\omega \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  a ground state of  $H$ . Then,  $\omega$  is a non-degenerated gapped ground state if and only there exists a  $\Delta > 0$  such that*

$$-i \omega(A^* \delta_H(A)) \geq \Delta (\omega(A^*A) - |\omega(A)|^2), \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{A}. \quad (3.6)$$

*Proof.* Let us start with the implication ( $\Rightarrow$ ). Since the ground state is assumed to be non-degenerated one has that  $\mathcal{K}_\omega \subset \mathcal{H}_\omega$  be the orthogonal complement of the one-dimensional subspace generated by  $\psi_\omega$ . Let  $\psi_A := \pi_\omega(A)\psi_\omega$  and  $\psi_A^\perp := \psi_A - \langle \psi_\omega, \psi_A \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} \psi_\omega$  its orthogonal projection on  $\mathcal{K}_\omega$ . In view of (3.5) one has that

$$\langle \psi_A^\perp, (\pi_\omega(H) - (\lambda_* + \Delta)\mathbf{1})\psi_A^\perp \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} \geq 0 \quad (3.7)$$

for every  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ . However, a direct computation shows that

$$\langle \psi_A^\perp, \psi_A^\perp \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} = \omega(A^*A) - |\omega(A)|^2 \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_A^\perp, (\pi_\omega(H) - \lambda_*\mathbf{1})\psi_A^\perp \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} &= \langle \psi_A, (\pi_\omega(H) - \lambda_*\mathbf{1})\psi_A \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} \\ &= \omega(A^*(HA - AH)) \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

where in the last equality we used that  $\lambda_*\omega(A^*A) = \omega(A^*AH)$  in view of Proposition 3.5. By putting together inequality (3.7) with (3.8) and (3.9) one finally gets (3.6). For the implication ( $\Leftarrow$ ) let us observe that in view of (3.8) and (3.9) one has that condition (3.6) is equivalent to condition (3.7). Now, in view of the cyclicity of  $\psi_\omega$ , for any  $\phi \in \mathcal{K}_\omega$  there is a sequence  $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathfrak{A}$  such that  $\psi_{A_n} \rightarrow \phi$ . This immediately implies that  $\psi_{A_n}^\perp \rightarrow \phi$ . Therefore, one has that

$$\langle \phi, (\pi_\omega(H) - (\lambda_* + \Delta)\mathbf{1})\phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \psi_{A_n}^\perp, (\pi_\omega(H) - (\lambda_* + \Delta)\mathbf{1})\psi_{A_n}^\perp \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\omega} \geq 0$$

in view of (3.7). The positivity of the quantity on the left-hand side for every  $\phi \in \mathcal{K}_\omega$  implies (3.5) which is equivalent to the gap condition.  $\square$

*Remark 3.10.* The condition of non-degeneracy of the ground state in Proposition 3.9 is necessary for the implication ( $\Rightarrow$ ). In fact, if  $\dim \text{Ker}(\pi_\omega(H) - \lambda_*\mathbf{1}) > 1$  there is a non-zero  $\psi' \in \text{Ker}(\pi_\omega(H) - \lambda_*\mathbf{1})$  which is orthogonal to  $\psi_\omega$ . For simplicity let us assume that there exists a  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  such that  $\psi' := \psi_A$ . In this case, the same computation in (3.9) provides  $\omega(A^* \delta_H(A)) = 0$  and the orthogonality between  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_\omega$  reads  $\omega(A) = 0$ . In summary, one obtains

$$|\omega(A)|^2 - i \Delta^{-1} \omega(A^* \delta_H(A)) = 0 < \|\psi_A\|_{\mathcal{H}_\omega}^2 = \omega(A^*A)$$

which contradicts (3.6). The general case just follows by a density argument similar to that used in the second part of the proof of Proposition 3.9. ◀

#### 4. FERMI SURFACES AND EIGENSTATES

In this section, we introduce the notion of *generalized (or noncommutative) Fermi surface* for an abstract  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$ . We prove that under suitable conditions on  $\mathfrak{A}$ , we can construct an eigenstate associated with a Fermi surface. Classical references in the physical literature about the notion of Fermi surfaces are [AM, Call, Kitt]. From the mathematical point of view, we will refer to the review [Kuch1].

**4.1. Standard notion of Fermi surface.** Let us start by introducing the concept of Fermi surface in a fairly standard framework. Let  $X$  be a compact metric space and consider the  $C^*$ -algebra

$$\mathfrak{A} := C(X) \otimes \mathfrak{K} \simeq C(X, \mathfrak{K}) . \quad (4.1)$$

The isomorphism above [Murp, Theorem 6.4.17] allows us to think of  $\mathfrak{A}$  as the  $C^*$ -algebra of continuous functions on  $X$  with values on the compact operators  $\mathfrak{K}$  (on some separable Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ ). Since we will need to consider the spectrum of the elements in  $\mathfrak{A}$  and the states of  $\mathfrak{A}$ , we will consider  $\mathfrak{A}$  as a subalgebra of its standard unitization  $\mathfrak{A}^+$  [BR1, Proposition 2.1.5] made by continuous functions of the type  $X \ni x \mapsto A(x) + \lambda \mathbf{1}$  with  $A(x) \in \mathfrak{K}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . These technicalities become irrelevant if one replaces  $\mathfrak{K}$  with the matrix algebra  $\text{Mat}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . For every  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  the following spectral equality holds true

$$\text{Spec}(A) = \bigcup_{x \in X} \text{Spec}(A(x)) . \quad (4.2)$$

Equation (4.2) can be deduced from a very general claim about the spectra of direct integrals of operators [RS2, Theorem XIII.85]. However, it can also be justified directly. First of all, since  $A \mapsto A(x)$  is a  $*$ -homomorphism for every fixed  $x \in X$ , one has that  $\text{Spec}(A(x)) \subset \text{Spec}(A)$  and in turn  $\bigcup_{x \in X} \text{Spec}(A(x)) \subseteq \text{Spec}(A)$ . The reverse inclusion follows from [Kuch2, Theorem 1.4.6] which claims that if  $\lambda \notin \text{Spec}(A(x))$  for all  $x \in X$ , namely if  $A(x) - \lambda \mathbf{1}$  is invertible for all  $x \in X$ , then  $A - \lambda \mathbf{1}$  is invertible, and in turn  $\lambda \notin \text{Spec}(A)$ . Therefore, one gets  $\bigcup_{x \in X} \text{Spec}(A(x)) \supseteq \text{Spec}(A)$ . Given the equality (4.2) we can introduce the *Fermi surface* (or *variety*) of  $A$  at the spectral point  $\lambda \in \text{Spec}(A)$  as the subset of  $X$  defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_\lambda^A := \{x \in X \mid \lambda \in \text{Spec}(A(x))\} \subseteq X . \quad (4.3)$$

The concept of Fermi surface originates initially in the study of electrical conduction in metals and is a central concept in solid state physics [AM, Kitt]. In fact, the Hamiltonians describing the dynamics of an electron in  $d$ -dimensional crystals are linear elliptic partial differential operators with  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -periodic coefficients. The Bloch-Floquet transform maps (the resolvent of) such operators in elements of the algebra  $\mathfrak{A} = C(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathfrak{K})$



[Kuch1, Kuch2]. The  $d$ -dimensional torus  $\mathbb{T}^d$ , which appears in this context as the Pontryagin dual of the symmetry group  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , is known as the *Brillouin zone*. Therefore, in condensed matter physics the Fermi surfaces are the *isoenergy* level sets contained in the Brillouin zone of a given periodic Hamiltonian. A toy model of this type is described in Section 4.3.

**4.2. Eigenstates for Fermi surfaces.** Our next task is to show that under certain circumstances it is possible to associate an eigenstate to a Fermi surface defined by a self-adjoint operator.

As in the previous section let us focus on the C\*-algebra  $\mathfrak{A} = C(X, \mathfrak{K})$  with  $X$  a compact metric space. Let  $\mathcal{B}_X$  be the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $X$  and assume that  $X$  is endowed with a probability Borel measure  $\mu$ . Let  $H = H^*$  be a self-adjoint element in  $\mathfrak{A}$ ,  $\lambda \in \text{Spec}(H)$  a spectral point and  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H$  the associated Fermi surface according to (4.3). Since  $H(x)$  is a compact operator for every  $x \in X$ , one has that  $\text{Spec}(H(x))$  is made by an increasing sequence of real eigenvalues

$$\varepsilon_{\min} \leq \varepsilon_0(x) \leq \varepsilon_1(x) \leq \dots \leq \varepsilon_n(x) \leq \dots \leq \varepsilon_{\max},$$

that are repeated according to their multiplicity, and  $\varepsilon_{\min}$  and  $\varepsilon_{\max}$  are the minimum and the maximum of  $\text{Spec}(H)$ , respectively. We will refer to every  $\varepsilon_n : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as the  $n$ -th *energy function*. Standard perturbation theory provides that the energy functions  $\varepsilon_n$  are continuous [Kato, Kuch2]. Therefore  $\varepsilon_n^{-1}(\{\lambda\})$  is a closed (hence Borelian) subset of  $X$  for every  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , and evidently  $\varepsilon_n^{-1}(\{\lambda\}) = \emptyset$  whenever  $\lambda \notin \text{Spec}(H)$ . In view of the equality (4.2) and the definition (4.3) one gets that

$$\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H = \bigcup_{n=0}^{+\infty} \varepsilon_n^{-1}(\{\lambda\}),$$

and as a consequence one concludes that every Fermi surface is an element of the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_X$ .

**Assumption 4.1** (Finite band contribution). There is only a finite number  $M$  of energy functions  $\{\varepsilon_{n_1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{n_M}\}$  such that  $\varepsilon_{n_j}^{-1}(\{\lambda\}) \neq \emptyset$ .

The consequence of the assumption above is that  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H$  is a closed, hence compact subset of  $X$ .

Consider now the function  $f_{H,\lambda} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$f_{H,\lambda}(x) := \prod_{j=1}^M (\varepsilon_{n_j}(x) - \lambda).$$

This is evidently a continuous function (product of continuous functions), hence measurable, such that  $f_{H,\lambda}^{-1}(\{0\}) = \mathcal{F}_\lambda^H$ . Theorem A.2 assures that there exists a disintegration  $\{\mu_t^H\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  of  $\mu$  subordinated to  $f_{H,\lambda} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mu_t^H$  is supported in  $f_{H,\lambda}^{-1}(\{t - \lambda\})$

(the shift in the variable is for notation purposes only). In particular,  $\mu_\lambda^H$  turns out to be a probability measure supported on  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H$ .

**Definition 4.2** (Fermi measure). The probability measure  $\mu_\lambda^H$  on  $X$  defined above will be called the Fermi measure associated with the Fermi surface  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H$ .

In order to go further we need to assume a gap condition subordinated to the Fermi surface.

**Assumption 4.3** (Local gap condition). There is a positive constant  $g > 0$  such that

$$\inf_{x \in \mathcal{F}_\lambda^H} \{ \text{dist}(\{\lambda\}, \text{Spec}(H(x)) \setminus \{\lambda\}) \} = g > 0.$$

Equivalently, on each point of the Fermi surface the eigenvalue  $\lambda$  is separated by a finite gap of size at least  $2g$  from the rest of the spectrum of  $H(x)$ .

Let  $Q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous function such that

$$Q(t) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \in \left[ \lambda - \frac{g}{3}, \lambda + \frac{g}{3} \right], \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in \left( -\infty, \lambda - \frac{2}{3}g \right] \cup \left[ \lambda + \frac{2}{3}g, +\infty \right). \end{cases}$$

By functional calculus, one gets that  $Q(H) \in \mathfrak{A}$ . Moreover, since the evaluation at  $x$  is a homomorphism of  $C^*$ -algebras, and homomorphisms commute with the functional calculus, one obtains that  $Q(H)(x) = Q(H(x))$ . Taking into account Assumption 4.3 one infers that

$$Q(H)(x) = P_\lambda^H(x), \quad x \in \mathcal{F}_\lambda^H,$$

where  $P_\lambda^H(x)$  denotes the spectral projection of  $H(x)$  for the eigenvalue  $\lambda$ . In particular, in view of the compactness of  $H(x)$  the projection  $P_\lambda^H(x)$  is finite-dimensional, hence trace class, whenever  $\lambda \neq 0$ .

Let us introduce the density matrix

$$\rho_\lambda^H(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{P_\lambda^H(x)}{\text{Tr}(P_\lambda^H(x))} & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{F}_\lambda^H, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let Assumptions 4.1 and 4.3 be valid. Then, for every  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  the map*

$$X \ni x \longmapsto \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda^H(x)A(x)) \in \mathbb{C} \quad (4.5)$$

*is a measurable function.*

*Proof.* Since by Assumption 4.1 the Fermi surface  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H \subset X$  is compact, there is a restriction map  $\iota : C(X, \mathfrak{K}) \rightarrow C(\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H, \mathfrak{K})$  which is a homomorphism of  $C^*$ -algebras. Said differently  $\iota(Q) = Q|_{\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H}$  is a continuous map and  $\iota(Q(H))(x) = P_\lambda^H(x)$  is trace class.

Therefore the map

$$\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H \ni x \longmapsto \operatorname{Tr}(\iota(Q(H)A)(x)) = \operatorname{Tr}(P_\lambda^H(x)\iota(A)(x)) \in \mathbb{C}$$

is continuous, hence measurable on  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H$ . The same is true for the map

$$\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H \ni x \longmapsto \operatorname{Tr}(\iota(Q(H))(x)) = \operatorname{Tr}(P_\lambda^H(x)) \neq 0.$$

As a result

$$\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H \ni x \longmapsto \frac{\operatorname{Tr}(P_\lambda^H(x)\iota(A)(x))}{\operatorname{Tr}(P_\lambda^H(x))} \in \mathbb{C} \quad (4.6)$$

is a measurable function. The proof is concluded by observing that the map (4.5) is obtained by multiplying the map (4.6) by the characteristic function  $\chi_{\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H}$  of the Fermi surface  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H$ , the latter being a measurable function on  $X$ .  $\square$

We are now in a position to prove that Fermi surfaces are related to the existence of specific eigenstates.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Assume that  $X$  is a compact metric space endowed with a Borel probability measure  $\mu$ . Let  $H = H^*$  be a self-adjoint element of the C\*-algebra  $\mathfrak{A} := C(X, \mathfrak{K})$ ,  $\lambda \in \operatorname{Spec}(H) \setminus \{0\}$  a spectral point,  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H$  the associated Fermi surface defined by (4.3) and  $\mu_\lambda^H$  the Fermi measure described in Definition 4.2. If Assumptions 4.1 and 4.3 are satisfied then the functional*

$$\omega_\lambda(A) := \int_X d\mu_\lambda^H(x) \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_\lambda^H(x)A(x)), \quad A \in \mathfrak{A}, \quad (4.7)$$

with  $\rho_\lambda^H$  defined by (4.4), provides an eigenstate of  $H$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda$ .

*Proof.* First of all the map  $\omega_\lambda : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  in (4.2) is well defined in view of Lemma 4.4 and the fact that the Fermi measure is supported exactly on  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H$ . It is evidently linear and normalized since

$$\omega_\lambda(\mathbf{1}) = \int_X d\mu_\lambda^H(x) = \mu_\lambda^H(X) = 1.$$

In the last equation we have tacitly identified  $\omega_\lambda$  with its canonical extension on  $\mathfrak{A}^+$  [BR1, Corollary 2.3.13]. It is also positive since  $\operatorname{Tr}(\rho_\lambda^H(x)A(x)) \geq 0$  for every  $x \in X$  if  $A$  is a positive element. Summing up, it turns out that  $\omega_\lambda$  is a state of  $\mathfrak{A}^+$ . It remains to prove that  $\omega_\lambda$  is an eigenstate of  $H$ . Observe that when  $x \in \mathcal{F}_\lambda^H$  one has that  $P_\lambda^H(x)$  is the spectral projection of  $H(x)$  at the eigenvalue  $\lambda$  and therefore

$$\operatorname{Tr}(\rho_\lambda^H(x)A(x)H(x)) = \operatorname{Tr}(H(x)\rho_\lambda^H(x)A(x)) = \lambda \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_\lambda^H(x)A(x)).$$

On the other hand, the Fermi measure is supported exactly on  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H$ . As a result, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_\lambda(AH) &= \int_X d\mu_\lambda^H \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_\lambda^H(x)A(x)H(x)) = \int_{\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H} d\mu_\lambda^H \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_\lambda^H(x)A(x)H(x)) \\ &= \lambda \int_{\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H} d\mu_\lambda^H \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_\lambda^H(x)A(x)) = \lambda \int_X d\mu_\lambda^H \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_\lambda^H(x)A(x)) = \lambda \omega_\lambda(A) \end{aligned}$$

for every  $A \in \mathbb{R}$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Definition 4.6** (Fermi eigenstate). The eigenstate  $\omega_\lambda$  defined by (4.2) will be called the *Fermi eigenstate* of  $H$  at the spectral value  $\lambda \in \text{Spec}(H) \setminus \{0\}$ .

*Remark 4.7.* The crucial point of the proof of Theorem 4.5 is to prove that the map

$$\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H \ni x \longmapsto \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda^H(x)A(x)) \in \mathbb{C}$$

is measurable. Assumptions 4.1 and 4.3 are sufficient to ensure this fact but are not necessary in principle.  $\blacktriangleleft$

**4.3. A physical application: the graphene.** Let  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  be the shift operators defined on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  by  $(s_j\psi)(n) := \psi(n - e_j)$  with  $j = 1, 2$ ,  $\psi \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  and  $e_1 := (1, 0)$  and  $e_2 := (0, 1)$  the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . We will denote by  $C^*(s_1, s_2)$  the unital  $C^*$ -algebra generated by the shift operators. Elements of  $C^*(s_1, s_2)$  are usually called *periodic operators*. In order to provide a mathematical model for the graphene we need to extend the algebra of periodic operators to allow for the isospin degree of freedom. As explained in detail in [DL] this is accomplished by considering the algebra  $\mathfrak{A} := C^*(s_1, s_2) \otimes \text{Mat}_2(\mathbb{C})$ . The *isotropic nearest-neighbor model* perturbed by a *stagger potential*  $\gamma > 0$  is described by the self-adjoint operator

$$H := \begin{pmatrix} +\gamma\mathbf{1} & s_1 + s_2 \\ s_1^* + s_2^* & -\gamma\mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.8)$$

The Hamiltonian (4.8) can also be understood as a two dimensional version of the Su-Schrieffer-Heeger (SSH) model [SSH].

Consider the (inverse) Fourier transform  $\mathcal{F} : \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^2) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$  where  $\mathbb{T}^2 \simeq [0, 2\pi]^2$  is the two-dimensional torus, parameterized by the coordinates  $k = (k_1, k_2)$ , and endowed with the normalized Haar measure  $d\mu(k) := (2\pi)^{-2} dk$ . Under this transform one has that the shift operators are mapped to the multiplication by the phases  $e^{-ik_1}$  and  $e^{-ik_2}$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{F}s_j\mathcal{F}^* = e^{-ik_j}$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . As a consequence one gets the isomorphism  $\mathfrak{A} \simeq C(\mathbb{T}^2) \otimes \text{Mat}_2(\mathbb{C})$  and the operator (4.8) is mapped to the function  $k \mapsto H(k)$  with

$$H(k) := \begin{pmatrix} +\gamma\mathbf{1} & e^{-ik_1} + e^{-ik_2} \\ e^{+ik_1} + e^{+ik_2} & -\gamma\mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.9)$$

Since we are in the precise scenario of Section 4.2 we can compute the Fermi surfaces and the related measures for the operator (4.9). First of all it is easy to verify that  $H(k)$  has two energy bands  $\varepsilon_-(k) < \varepsilon_+(k)$  given by

$$\varepsilon_\pm(k) := \pm \sqrt{\gamma^2 + 4 \cos^2\left(\frac{k_1 - k_2}{2}\right)} \quad (4.10)$$

and the related spectral projections are

$$P_\pm(k) := \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}_2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon_\pm(k)}H(k). \quad (4.11)$$

The energy band  $\varepsilon_{\pm}$  takes all the values between the limit values  $\pm\gamma$  and  $\pm\sqrt{\gamma^2 + 4}$ . Therefore the spectrum of  $H$  is given by

$$\sigma(H) := \left[-\sqrt{\gamma^2 + 4}, -\gamma\right] \cup \left[\gamma, \sqrt{\gamma^2 + 4}\right]$$

and shows a central gap of size  $2\gamma$ .

Let us construct the Fermi surfaces for the upper band  $\varepsilon_+$ . The construction for the lower band  $\varepsilon_-$  is totally similar. For every  $\lambda \in Y := [\gamma, \sqrt{\gamma^2 + 4}]$ , the Fermi surface  $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda}^H$  is the null-set of the function  $f_{H,\lambda}(k) := \varepsilon_+(k) - \lambda$ , namely it is described by the solutions of the equations

$$\cos\left(\frac{k_1 - k_2}{2}\right) = \pm \frac{\sqrt{\lambda^2 - \gamma^2}}{2}.$$

Let us fix  $\theta \equiv \theta(\lambda)$  as

$$\theta := \arccos\left(\frac{\sqrt{\lambda^2 - \gamma^2}}{2}\right) \in \left[0, \frac{\pi}{2}\right]$$

and consider the linear subsets

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\pm} &:= \{k \in \mathbb{T}^2 \mid k_2 = k_1 \pm 2\theta\}, \\ G_{\pm} &:= \{k \in \mathbb{T}^2 \mid k_2 = k_1 \pm 2(\pi - \theta)\} \end{aligned}$$

that depend on  $\lambda$  through  $\theta$ . Then, one gets that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\lambda}^H = L_+ \cup L_- \cup G_+ \cup G_-.$$

The two extreme cases are given by  $\lambda_{\min} := \gamma$  which corresponds to  $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ , and  $\lambda_{\max} := \sqrt{\gamma^2 + 4}$  which provides  $\theta = 0$ . In the first case, one obtains that the lines  $L_{\pm}$  coincide with the lines  $G_{\pm}$  and as a result one gets  $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{\min}}^H = L_+^{\min} \cup L_-^{\min}$  where

$$L_{\pm}^{\min} := \{k \in \mathbb{T}^2 \mid k_2 = k_1 \pm \pi\}.$$

In the second case, the four lines collapse into the single line

$$L^{\max} := \{k \in \mathbb{T}^2 \mid k_2 = k_1\}$$

which coincides with  $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_{\max}}^H$ .

The next task is to compute the Fermi measures induced by the upper energy band. For simplicity let us exclude the extreme cases by assuming  $\lambda \neq \lambda_{\min}, \lambda_{\max}$ . First, let us compute the expectation operator  $E$  induced by  $\varepsilon_+$ . Observe that  $\varepsilon_+ = f \circ g$ , where  $g(k_1, k_2) = k_1 - k_2$  and  $f(y) = \sqrt{\gamma^2 + 4 \cos^2\left(\frac{y}{2}\right)}$ . Therefore, by invoking Proposition A.3, one gets  $E = E^f E^g$ . The expectation operators  $E^g$  and  $E^f$  are computed in Examples A.6 and A.5, respectively. By using these results one obtains that

$$E_{\psi}(\lambda) = E_{E_{\psi}^g}^f(\lambda) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{y \in P_{\lambda}} E_{\psi}^g(y) \quad (4.12)$$

with  $\psi \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mu)$ ,  $\lambda \in Y$  a given spectral value and

$$P_\lambda := f^{-1}(\{\lambda\}) = \{ \pm 2\theta, \pm 2(\pi - \theta) \} .$$

On the other hand, from the computation in Example A.6, and some manipulation, one obtains

$$E_\psi^g(\pm 2\theta) = \int_0^1 d\tau \psi(s_{L_\pm}(\tau))$$

where  $[0, 1] \ni \tau \mapsto s_{L_\pm}(\tau) \in \mathbb{T}^2$  is a linear parametrization of  $L_\pm$ . More precisely one has that

$$\begin{aligned} s_{L_+}(\tau) &:= (\tau(2\pi - 2\theta), \tau(2\pi - 2\theta) + 2\theta) , \\ s_{L_-}(\tau) &:= (\tau(2\pi - 2\theta) + 2\theta, \tau(2\pi - 2\theta)) . \end{aligned}$$

Similarly one has that

$$E_\psi^g(\pm 2(\pi - \theta)) = \int_0^1 d\tau \psi(s_{G_\pm}(\tau))$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} s_{G_+}(\tau) &:= (\tau 2\theta, \tau 2\theta + (2\pi - 2\theta)) , \\ s_{G_-}(\tau) &:= (\tau 2\theta + (2\pi - 2\theta), \tau 2\theta) . \end{aligned}$$

Putting the ingredients all together one obtains

$$E_\psi(\lambda) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\#=\pm} \int_0^1 d\tau [\psi(s_{L_\#}(\tau)) + \psi(s_{G_\#}(\tau))] \quad (4.13)$$

and the disintegration  $\mu_\lambda^H$  of the Haar measure induced by the energy band  $\varepsilon_+$  takes the form

$$\mu_\lambda^H(k_1, k_2) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\#=\pm} \int_0^1 d\tau [\delta_{s_{L_\#}(\tau)}(k_1, k_2) + \delta_{s_{G_\#}(\tau)}(k_1, k_2)]$$

where  $\delta_k$  denotes the Dirac measure concentrated at the point  $k \in \mathbb{T}^2$ . Evidently,  $\mu_\lambda^H$  is concentrated on the Fermi surface  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H$ .

With these ingredients, the associated Fermi eigenstate  $\omega_\lambda$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_\lambda(A) &:= \int_{\mathcal{F}_\lambda^H} d\mu_\lambda^H(k_1, k_2) \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^2}(P_+(k_1, k_2)A(k_1, k_2)) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\#=\pm} \int_0^1 d\tau \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^2}(P_+A(s_{L_\#}(\tau)) + P_+A(s_{G_\#}(\tau))) \end{aligned}$$

for any  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ .

**4.4. Generalized notion of Fermi surface.** We are now in a position to provide a generalized, algebraic definition of Fermi surface.

For a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  let us denote by  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$  to the spectrum of  $\mathfrak{A}$ , *i. e.*, the set of unitary equivalence classes of non-zero irreducible  $*$ -representations of  $\mathfrak{A}$  [Murp, Section 5.4].

There is a privileged topology, called *hull-kernel* (or *Jacobson*) *topology* which makes  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$  a topological space. Let  $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A})$  be the set of primitive ideals of  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Then  $\mathfrak{J} \in \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A})$  if and only if there is a non-zero irreducible representation  $\pi$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$  on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_\pi$  such that  $\mathfrak{J} = \text{Ker}(\pi)$  [Murp, Theorem 5.4.2]. The latter characterization will be used here as the “handy definition” of primitive ideal. Notice that primitive ideals are automatically closed and proper. Since any two unitary equivalent representations have the same kernel, it makes sense to use the notation  $\text{Ker}([\pi])$  where  $[\pi]$  is the equivalence class of  $\pi$ . This fact provides a canonical surjection  $\theta : \widehat{\mathfrak{A}} \rightarrow \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A})$  defined by  $\theta : [\pi] \mapsto \text{Ker}([\pi])$ . The set  $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A})$  can be endowed with a unique topology that satisfies the following property: for each subset  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A})$  the closure of  $\mathcal{R}$  is given by the set of primitive ideals of  $\mathfrak{A}$  which contain the intersection of the ideals in  $\mathcal{R}$  [Murp, Theorem 5.4.6], that is

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}} := \left\{ \mathfrak{P} \in \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A}) \mid \bigcap_{\mathfrak{J} \in \mathcal{R}} \mathfrak{J} \subseteq \mathfrak{P} \right\}. \quad (4.14)$$

The (induced) hull-kernel topology on  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$  is the weakest topology making the canonical surjection  $\theta$  continuous. The topological space  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$  can be quite bizarre. However, one has that  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$  is a  $T_0$  space if and only if the canonical surjection  $\theta$  is a homeomorphism, namely if and only if  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}} \simeq \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A})$  as topological spaces [Murp, Theorem 5.4.9]. In particular, this is the case when  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$  is a Hausdorff space. Let us also mention that when  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a unital C\*-algebra then  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$  turns out to be compact (this follows from [Murp, Theorem 5.4.8]).

For every  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  and  $[\pi] \in \widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$  let us denote with  $A([\pi])$  the image of  $A$  in the quotient  $\mathfrak{A}_{[\pi]} := \mathfrak{A}/\text{Ker}([\pi])$ . Given any representative  $\pi$  of the class  $[\pi]$ , it is immediate to check that  $\pi$  provides an isomorphism of C\*-algebras between  $\mathfrak{A}_{[\pi]}$  and  $\pi(\mathfrak{A})$ . Therefore, for any  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  one has that

$$\text{Spec}(A([\pi])) = \text{Spec}(\pi(A)) \subseteq \text{Spec}(A)$$

independently of the choice of the representative  $\pi$ . The following result provides a generalization of (4.2).

**Lemma 4.8.** *For every  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  it holds true that*

$$\text{Spec}(A) = \bigcup_{[\pi] \in \widehat{\mathfrak{A}}} \text{Spec}(A([\pi])).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  be the set of pure states of  $\mathfrak{A}$ , and for a given  $\omega \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  consider the associated irreducible GNS representation  $(\mathcal{H}_\omega, \pi_\omega, \psi_\omega)$ . As in the proof of [BR1, Theorem 2.1.10] let us consider the direct sum representation  $(\mathcal{H}, \pi)$  given by

$$\mathcal{H} := \bigoplus_{\omega \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{A}}} \mathcal{H}_\omega, \quad \rho := \bigoplus_{\omega \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{A}}} \pi_\omega.$$

By repeating verbatim the proof of [BR1, Theorem 2.1.10], and observing that the state  $\omega_A$  in this proof can be chosen pure in view of [BR1, Lemma 2.1.23], one gets that  $\rho$  is

a  $*$ -isomorphism. It follows that

$$\mathrm{Spec}(A) = \mathrm{Spec}(\rho(A)) = \bigcup_{\omega \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{A}}} \mathrm{Spec}(\pi_{\omega}(A)).$$

Since the representations  $(\mathcal{H}_{\omega}, \pi_{\omega}, \psi_{\omega})$  are irreducible one gets that  $\mathrm{Spec}(A)$  is contained in the union of  $\mathrm{Spec}(\pi(A))$  when  $\pi$  runs over all the irreducible representations. Since the spectrum only depend on the equivalence class of the representation one obtains

$$\mathrm{Spec}(A) \subseteq \bigcup_{[\pi] \in \hat{\mathfrak{A}}} \mathrm{Spec}(A([\pi])).$$

The other inclusion is trivial in view of the fact that  $\mathrm{Spec}(\pi(A)) \subseteq \mathrm{Spec}(A)$  for every (not necessarily irreducible) representation  $\pi$ .  $\square$

The proof above can be shortened using [RW, Theorem A.38].

We are now in a position to generalize the concept of Fermi surfaces.

**Definition 4.9** (Generalized Fermi surface). Let  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ . The Fermi surface  $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda}^A$  defined by  $A$  at the spectral point  $\lambda$  is the subset of  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$  defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_{\lambda}^A := \left\{ [\pi] \in \hat{\mathfrak{A}} \mid \lambda \in \mathrm{Spec}(A([\pi])) \right\} \subseteq \hat{\mathfrak{A}}. \quad (4.15)$$

*Example 4.10* (Relation with the standard case). To justify Definition 4.9 it is needed to show that (4.15) is equivalent to (4.3) when  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra of the form (4.1). Let us start from the simpler case of the abelian  $C^*$  algebra  $C(X)$  with  $X$  a compact Hausdorff space. Then it is known that  $\widehat{C(X)} = \{e_x \mid x \in X\}$  where  $e_x : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is the *evaluation* at  $x$  defined by  $e_x(f) := f(x)$  for every  $f \in C(X)$  [RW, Example A.16]. Therefore the map  $x \mapsto e_x$  provides a bijection between  $X$  and  $\widehat{C(X)}$  which turns out to be a homeomorphism of topological spaces [RW, p. 213-214]. This allows us to write  $\widehat{C(X)} \simeq X$  and this is an incarnation of the Gelfand isomorphism [BR1, Theorem 2.1.11A]. The more general case in which  $\mathfrak{A}$  is of the form  $C(X, \mathrm{Mat}_n(\mathbb{C}))$  or  $C(X, \mathfrak{K})$  is discussed in [RW, Examples A.23 & A.24]. Also in this case one has that the irreducible representations of  $\mathfrak{A}$  are evaluations of the type  $e_x(A) = A(x)$  for every  $x \in X$ , up to unitary equivalences. Therefore, there is a homeomorphism  $X \simeq \hat{\mathfrak{A}}$  provided by  $x \mapsto [e_x]$ . Putting all this information together one can see that (4.3) can be indeed rewritten in the generalized form (4.15).  $\blacktriangleleft$

*Example 4.11* (Compact operators). Let us consider the compact operators  $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$  (for some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ ) and its standard unitization  $\mathfrak{K}^+ = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1} + \mathfrak{K}$ . The argument of [RW, Example A.15] shows that the identity representation  $\mathrm{id} : \mathfrak{K} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is irreducible and every irreducible representation is unitarily equivalent to  $\mathrm{id}$ . Consequently  $\hat{\mathfrak{K}} = \{[\mathrm{id}]\}$  and  $\mathrm{Prim}(\mathfrak{K}) = \{\mathcal{I}_0\}$  are (homeomorphic) singletons with  $\mathcal{I}_0 := \{0\}$  the trivial ideal. To compute  $\mathrm{Prim}(\mathfrak{K}^+)$  let us observe that  $\mathfrak{K}$  is an ideal in  $\mathfrak{K}^+$ . Then by virtue of [RW,



Proposition A.26 (a)] one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{K}^+) &= \{\mathfrak{P} \in \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{K}^+) \mid \mathfrak{K} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}\} \cup \{\mathfrak{P} \in \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{K}^+) \mid \mathfrak{K} \not\subseteq \mathfrak{P}\} \\ &= \{\mathfrak{P} \in \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{K}^+) \mid \mathfrak{K} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}\} \cup \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{K}) \\ &= \{\mathfrak{K}, \mathfrak{I}_0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The irreducible representation with kernel  $\mathfrak{K}$  is the one-dimensional representation  $\pi_0(K + \alpha \mathbf{1}) = \alpha$  for every  $K \in \mathfrak{K}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ . By using (4.14) one gets that

$$\overline{\mathfrak{I}_0} = \{\mathfrak{P} \in \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{K}^+) \mid \mathfrak{I}_0 \subseteq \mathfrak{P}\} = \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{K}^+)$$

which shows that  $\mathfrak{I}_0$  is dense in  $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{K}^+)$ . Therefore  $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{K}^+)$  is not Hausdorff. However, it is  $T_0$  and this provides the homeomorphism  $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{K}^+) \simeq \widehat{\mathfrak{K}^+} = \{[\text{id}], [\pi_0]\}$ . It is interesting to notice that  $\widehat{\mathfrak{K}^+}$  provides an easy example of a non Hausdorff spectrum. Now let  $A \in \mathfrak{K}^+$  and  $\lambda \in \text{Spec}(A)$ . Then, by applying the definition (4.15) one obtains that the Fermi surface  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^A$  defined by  $A$  at the spectral point  $\lambda$  is given by

$$\mathcal{F}_\lambda^A = \begin{cases} \{[\text{id}]\} & \text{if } \pi_0(A) \neq \lambda, \\ \widehat{\mathfrak{K}^+} & \text{if } \pi_0(A) = \lambda. \end{cases}$$

The presence of the dense point  $[\text{id}]$  independently of  $\lambda$  follows from the fact that it corresponds to the identity representation which preserves the spectrum. ◀

*Example 4.12* (The Toeplitz C\*-algebra). Let  $\mathfrak{T}$  be the *Toeplitz C\*-algebra*, namely the C\*-subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{B}(\ell^2(\mathbb{N}))$  generated by the unilateral shift operator  $\mathfrak{s}$  described in Example 2.12. There is a well-known (not-split) exact sequence, called Toeplitz extension, given by

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathfrak{K} \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathfrak{T} \xrightarrow{\varphi} C(\mathbb{S}^1) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (4.16)$$

where  $\mathfrak{K}$  is the algebra of compact operators on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ ,  $\iota$  is the inclusion (indeed  $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathfrak{T}$ ) and  $\varphi$  is called the *symbol map* [Davi, Theorem V.1.5] and [RW, Proposition A.26]. As a consequence one has that  $\mathfrak{T}/\mathfrak{K} \simeq C(\mathbb{S}^1)$ . Moreover,  $\mathfrak{T}$  acts irreducibly on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$  (it is a primitive C\*-algebra) meaning that  $\mathfrak{I}_0 \in \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{T})$ . As in the example above one has that the trivial ideal is dense, i.e.  $\overline{\mathfrak{I}_0} = \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{T})$ . Since  $\mathfrak{T}$  contains  $\mathfrak{K}$  as its unique minimal (non-trivial) ideal, it follows that any other primitive ideal of  $\mathfrak{T}$  must contain  $\mathfrak{K}$ . This means that the associate irreducible representation must vanish on  $\mathfrak{K}$ . Therefore the other irreducible representations of  $\mathfrak{T}$  can be obtained by the combination of  $\varphi$  with the evaluation at the points of  $\mathbb{S}^1$ . More precisely one gets that  $\pi_\theta := \epsilon_\theta \circ \varphi : \mathfrak{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  are irreducible representations of  $\mathfrak{T}$  for every  $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ . Consequently one obtains that

$$\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{T}) = \{\mathfrak{I}_0\} \cup \{\mathfrak{I}_\theta \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^1\}$$

where  $\mathfrak{I}_\theta = \mathfrak{K} + \mathfrak{L}_\theta$  and  $\mathfrak{L}_\theta$  satisfies  $\varphi(\mathfrak{L}_\theta) = \{f \in C(\mathbb{S}^1) \mid f(\theta) = 0\}$ . One can check that  $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{T}) \simeq \{\mathfrak{I}_0\} \cup \mathbb{S}^1$  with the usual topology on  $\mathbb{S}^1$  but with the property that the singleton  $\{\mathfrak{I}_0\}$  is dense. Therefore  $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{T})$  is not Hausdorff. However, it is  $T_0$  and this provides the homeomorphism  $\widehat{\mathfrak{T}} \simeq \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{T})$ . Now let  $A \in \mathfrak{T}$  and  $\lambda \in \text{Spec}(A)$ . Then

the Fermi surface  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^A$  defined by  $A$  at the spectral point  $\lambda$  is given by

$$\mathcal{F}_\lambda^A = \{\mathcal{I}_0\} \cup \{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1 \mid \varphi(A)(\theta) = \lambda\}$$

in view of the definition (4.15). ◀

The generalization of the notion of Fermi surface as given in Definition 4.15 paves the possibility of extending the construction of the Fermi eigenstates in Theorem 4.5 to more general  $C^*$ -algebras. This problem remains outside the scope of this work and provides material for new future investigations. However, it is worth anticipating that there is at least a class of  $C^*$ -algebras for which the extension of Theorem 4.5 seems to be directly accessible, even if not entirely trivial. Following [RW, Proposition 5.15] let us introduce the following definition:

**Definition 4.13** (Continuous-trace  $C^*$ -algebra). A  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  is called *continuous trace* if and only if: (i) its spectrum  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$  is a Hausdorff space; (ii)  $\mathfrak{A}$  is locally Morita equivalent to  $C_0(\mathfrak{A})$ .

Let us clarify the meaning of condition (ii) in the definition above. First of all notice that the open sets  $\mathcal{U} \subset \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A})$  are in one-to-one correspondence with the ideals

$$\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{U}} := \bigcap \{\mathfrak{P} \in \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A}) \mid \mathfrak{P} \notin \mathcal{U}\}.$$

In other words, the topology on  $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A})$  always determines the ideal structure of  $\mathfrak{A}$ . There are natural homeomorphisms  $\mathcal{U} \simeq \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{U}})$  and  $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A}) \setminus \mathcal{U} \simeq \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A}/\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{U}})$  [RW, Proposition A.27]. When  $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A})$  is a (locally compact) Hausdorff space (and in this case  $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A}) \simeq \hat{\mathfrak{A}}$ ) one can *localize* at a given point  $\mathcal{I} \in \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A})$  considering a compact neighborhood  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $\mathcal{I}$  and considering the quotient  $\mathfrak{A}^{\mathcal{F}} := \mathfrak{A}/\mathfrak{A}_{\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A}) \setminus \mathcal{F}}$ . In fact, by the Hausdorff condition  $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A}) \setminus \mathcal{F}$  is open in  $\text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A})$ . Condition (ii) in Definition 4.13 means that for every  $\mathcal{I} \in \text{Prim}(\mathfrak{A})$  there is a compact neighborhood  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $\mathcal{I}$  such that

$$\mathfrak{A}^{\mathcal{F}} \simeq C(\mathcal{F}) \otimes \mathfrak{K} \simeq C(\mathcal{F}, \mathfrak{K}).$$

We need a final observation. For a separable  $C^*$ -algebra its spectrum is a second-countable space [Dixm, Proposition 3.3.4]. Then for a continuous trace  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{A}$  its spectrum  $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$  is Hausdorff and second-countable. If  $\mathcal{F} \subset \hat{\mathfrak{A}}$  is a compact subset then  $\mathcal{F}$  is compact, Hausdorff and second-countable, hence metrizable (Urysohn metrization Theorem). Then, separable continuous-trace  $C^*$ -algebras are at least locally of the form of the  $C^*$ -algebras considered in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 and the  $C^*$ -algebras of the type (4.1) are special examples of (separable) continuous-trace  $C^*$ -algebras [RW, Example 5.18]. Under these conditions Theorem 4.5 applies at least locally and one would expect to cook up a global version by some technical gluing procedure.

## APPENDIX A. DISINTEGRATION OF MEASURES

In this appendix, we briefly review the theory of disintegration of measures between compact metric (or metrizable) spaces. The results of this section are adapted from [Conw2, Section VII.2].

Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu)$  be a Borel measure space, with  $X$  a compact metric space<sup>1</sup> endowed with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_X$  and  $\mu : \mathcal{B}_X \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  a positive regular measure. We will denote with  $\mathfrak{M}(X)$  the space of regular Borel measures on  $X$ . We say that  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu)$  is a probability space when  $\mu(X) = 1$ . Let  $(Y, \mathcal{B}_Y)$  be a second compact metric space endowed with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra and  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  a Borel function. The *pushforward* of the measure  $\mu$  by  $f$  is the measure  $\nu : \mathcal{B}_Y \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  defined by  $\nu(\Sigma) := \mu(f^{-1}(\Sigma))$  for every Borel set  $\Sigma \in \mathcal{B}_Y$ . In the following, we will use the short notation  $\nu = \mu \circ f^{-1}$ . Let us denote with  $\mathcal{L}^p(X, \mu)$  the space of  $p$ -integrable functions and by  $L^p(X, \mu)$  the corresponding Lebesgue space of equivalence classes of these functions. For each  $\psi \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mu)$  the map

$$L^\infty(Y, \nu) \ni \phi \mapsto \int_X d\mu(x) \psi(x) (\phi \circ f)(x) \in \mathbb{C}$$

defines a bounded linear functional on  $L^\infty(Y, \nu)$ . Let  $\chi_\Sigma \in L^\infty(Y, \nu)$  be the characteristic function of  $\Sigma$ . Then the mapping

$$\mathcal{B}_Y \ni \Sigma \mapsto \int_X d\mu(x) \psi(x) (\chi_\Sigma \circ f)(x) = \int_{f^{-1}(\Sigma)} d\mu(x) \psi(x) \in \mathbb{C}$$

is a countably additive (complex-valued) measure on  $Y$  that is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\nu$ . Therefore, there is a unique element  $E_\psi \in L^1(Y, \nu)$ , the so-called Radon–Nikodym derivative, such that

$$\int_X d\mu(x) \psi(x) (\phi \circ f)(x) = \int_Y d\nu(y) E_\psi(y) \phi(y), \quad \forall \phi \in L^\infty(Y, \nu). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

This construction provides a well defined map  $E : L^1(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^1(Y, \nu)$  called the *expectation operator*. As proved in [Conw2, Section VII.2, Proposition 2.8] this is a contraction, *i. e.*  $\|E_\psi\|_{L^1} \leq \|\psi\|_{L^1}$  for every  $\psi \in L^1(X, \mu)$ .

**Definition A.1.** A disintegration of the measure  $\mu$  with respect to  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is a function  $Y \ni y \mapsto \mu_y \in \mathfrak{M}(X)$  such that: (i) for each  $y \in Y$ ,  $\mu_y$  is a positive probability measure on  $X$ ; (ii) if  $\psi \in L^1(X, \mu)$  then

$$E_\psi(y) = \int_X d\mu_y(x) \psi(x) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where the equality is meant  $\nu$ -almost everywhere.

Let  $\{\mu_y\}_{y \in Y}$  be a disintegration  $\mu$  with respect to  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  and  $\Delta \in \mathcal{B}_X$  with characteristic function  $\chi_\Delta$ . Starting from (A.1) and setting  $\phi \equiv 1$ , a direct computation

<sup>1</sup>With a little more generality we can require that  $X$  is a Radon space.

shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(\Delta) &= \int_X d\mu(x) \chi_\Delta(x) = \int_Y d\nu(y) E_{\chi_\Delta}(y) \\ &= \int_Y d\nu(y) \left( \int_X d\mu_y(x) \chi_\Delta(x) \right) = \int_Y d\nu(y) \mu_y(\Delta).\end{aligned}$$

So the disintegration  $\{\mu_y\}_{y \in Y}$  does indeed *disintegrate* the measure  $\mu$  into the pieces  $\mu_y$ . Moreover, for every  $\psi \in L^1(X, \mu)$  a similar computation provides

$$\int_X d\mu(x) \psi(x) = \int_Y d\nu(y) E_\psi(y) = \int_Y d\nu(y) \left( \int_X d\mu_y(x) \psi(x) \right). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

From its very definition it also follows that each measure  $\mu_y$  of a disintegration is carried by the level set  $f^{-1}(\{y\}) \subseteq X$  for  $\nu$ -almost every  $y \in Y$  [Conw2, Section VII.2, Proposition 2.8]. More precisely one has that

$$\mu_y(X \setminus f^{-1}(\{y\})) = 0$$

for  $\nu$ -almost every  $y \in Y$ . This implies that  $\mu_y(\Delta) = \mu_y(\Delta \cap f^{-1}(\{y\}))$  for every  $\Delta \in \mathcal{B}_X$ . Combining the latter fact with (A.3) one gets

$$\int_X d\mu(x) \psi(x) = \int_Y \int_{f^{-1}(y)} d\nu(y) d\mu_y(x) \psi(x) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

for every  $\psi \in L^1(X, \mu)$ , or more in general for every Borel-measurable function such that  $|\psi| : X \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ .

The next result guarantees the existence and the uniqueness of the disintegration of a measure [Conw2, Section VII.2, Proposition 2.8].

**Theorem A.2.** (*Disintegration Theorem*) *Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu)$  be a Borel measure space, given by a compact metric space  $X$  endowed with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_X$  and a positive regular probability measure  $\mu : \mathcal{B}_X \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ . Let  $(Y, \mathcal{B}_Y)$  be a second compact metric space endowed with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra and  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  a Borel function. Then, there exists a disintegration  $\{\mu_y\}_{y \in Y}$  of  $\mu$  with respect to  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ . Moreover, if there is a second disintegration  $\{\mu'_y\}_{y \in Y}$  of  $\mu$  with respect to the same  $f$  then  $\mu_y = \mu'_y$  for  $\nu$ -almost every  $y \in Y$ .*

It is useful in applications to know the behavior of the disintegration under the composition of measurable maps.

**Proposition A.3.** *Let  $(X_i, \mu^i)$  be Borel probability spaces for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Let  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  and  $g : X_2 \rightarrow X_3$  be two measurable maps so that  $\mu^2$  and  $\mu^3$  are the pushforward measures induced by  $f$  and  $g$ , respectively. If  $h := g \circ f$ , then the expectation operator  $E^h$  with respect to  $h$  fulfills the composition rule  $E^h = E^g E^f$ , where  $E^g$  and  $E^f$  are the expectation operators associated with  $f$  and  $g$ , respectively. Furthermore, the disintegration*

$\{\mu_z^{1,h}\}_{z \in X_3}$  of  $\mu^1$  with respect to  $\mu^3$  related to  $h$  meets the equality

$$\mu_z^{1,h}(\Sigma) = \int_{X_2} d\mu_z^{2,g}(y) \mu_y^{1,f}(\Sigma),$$

for  $\mu^3$ -almost all  $z \in X_3$ , and any measurable sets  $\Sigma \subset X_1$ . Here  $\{\mu_z^{2,g}\}_{z \in X_3}$  and  $\{\mu_y^{1,f}\}_{y \in X_2}$  denote the disintegrations of  $\mu^2$  and  $\mu^1$  related to  $g$  and  $f$ , respectively.

*Proof.* First of all, observe that  $\mu^3$  coincides with the pushforward measure of  $\mu^1$  induced by  $h$ . Thus, one has that

$$\int_{X_1} d\mu^1(x) \phi(h(x))\psi(x) = \int_{X_3} d\mu^3(z) \phi(z)(E_\psi^h)(z) \quad (\text{A.5})$$

for all  $\phi \in L^\infty(X_3, \mu^3)$  and  $\psi \in L^1(X_1, \mu^1)$ . On the other hand, let us note that the left-hand side of [A.5](#) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X_1} d\mu^1(x) \phi(h(x))\psi(x) &= \int_{X_1} d\mu^1(x) (\phi \circ g)(f(x))\psi(x) \\ &= \int_{X_2} d\mu^2(y) (\phi \circ g)(y)(E_\psi^f)(y) \\ &= \int_{X_2} d\mu^2(y) \phi(g(y))(E_\psi^f)(y) \\ &= \int_{X_3} d\mu^3(z) \phi(z)(E_{E_\psi^f}^g)(z). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

With the identification  $E_{E_\psi^f}^g := (E^g E^f)_\psi$ , and in light of [A.5](#) and [A.6](#), it holds that  $E^h = E^g E^f$  as composition of linear maps between the related  $L^1(X^i, \mu^i)$  spaces. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_z^{1,h}(\Sigma) &= (E_{X_\Sigma}^h)(z) = ((E^g E^f)_{X_\Sigma})(z) = \int_{X_2} d\mu_z^{2,g}(y) (E_{X_\Sigma}^f)(y) \\ &= \int_{X_2} d\mu_z^{2,g}(y) \mu_y^{1,f}(\Sigma) \end{aligned}$$

for every measurable set  $\Sigma \subseteq X^1$ . □

Let us end this section with some simple but useful examples.

*Example A.4* (Disintegration along a product space). Let  $(X_1, \mu_1)$  and  $(X_2, \mu_2)$  be two compact metric spaces endowed with regular probability measures. Let us consider the product space  $(X \times Y, \mu)$  with the corresponding product measure  $\mu := \mu_1 \times \mu_2$  and the projection on the first component  $\pi : X_1 \times X_2 \rightarrow X_1$  defined by  $\pi(x_1, x_2) = x_1$  for every  $x_j \in X_j$  and  $j = 1, 2$ . Let  $\nu$  be the pushforward of the measure  $\mu$  by  $\pi$ . From its very definition it follows that for every measurable set  $\Sigma \subseteq X_1$  one gets

$$\nu(\Sigma) = \mu(\pi^{-1}(\Sigma)) = \mu(\Sigma \times X_2) = \mu_1(\Sigma)\mu_2(X_2) = \mu_1(\Sigma).$$

Therefore one has that  $\nu = \mu_1$ . The next task is to calculate the expectation operator. For that, consider a  $\psi \in L^1(X_1 \times X_2, \mu)$ . Then, in view of (A.1) and for all  $\phi \in L^\infty(X_1, \mu_1)$  it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X_1} d\mu_1(x_1) E_\psi(x_1)\phi(x_1) &= \int_{X_1 \times X_2} d\mu(x_1, x_2) \psi(x_1, x_2)\phi(\pi(x_1, x_2)) \\ &= \int_{X_1 \times X_2} d\mu(x_1, x_2) \psi(x_1, x_2)\phi(x_1) \\ &= \int_{X_1} d\mu_1(x_1) \phi(x_1) \left( \int_{X_2} d\mu_2(x_2)\psi(x_1, x_2) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line is a consequence of Fubini's theorem. Since

$$\int_{X_1} d\mu_1(x_1) \phi(x_1) \left[ E_\psi(x_1) - \int_{X_2} d\mu_2(x_2)\psi(x_1, x_2) \right] = 0$$

for every  $\phi \in L^\infty(X_1, \mu_1)$ , it follows that

$$E_\psi(x_1) = \int_{X_2} d\mu_2(x_2)\psi(x_1, x_2)$$

as elements of  $L^1(X_2, \mu_2)$ . To compute the disintegration  $\{\mu_{x_1}\}_{x_1 \in X_1}$  of  $\mu$  let us use (A.2). Let  $\Sigma \subseteq X_1$  and  $\Gamma \subseteq X_2$  be two measurable sets and  $\chi_{\Sigma \times \Gamma}$  the characteristic function of the product  $\Sigma \times \Gamma$ . Then, one has that

$$\mu_{x_1}(\Sigma \times \Gamma) = E_{\chi_{\Sigma \times \Gamma}}(x_1) = \int_{X_2} d\mu_2(x_2) \chi_{\Sigma \times \Gamma}(x_1, x_2) = \mu_2(\Gamma)\chi_\Sigma(x_1), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where in the last equality it has been used that  $\chi_{\Sigma \times \Gamma} = \chi_\Sigma \chi_\Gamma$ . Therefore, one gets that

$$\mu_{x_1} = \delta_{x_1} \times \mu_2$$

is a product measure where  $\delta_{x_1}$  denotes the Dirac measure on  $X_1$  concentrated on the point  $x_1$ . ◀

*Example A.5 (Disintegration on the real line).* Let  $X := [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$  endowed with the normalized Lebesgue measure  $\mu$ , and  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a  $C^1$ -function. Let  $a < x_1 < \dots < x_N < b$  be the set of points in which  $f'(x_k) = 0$  (it is not necessary to assume that  $f'$  vanishes on the extremes  $a$  and  $b$ ). The set of intervals  $I_k := [x_k, x_{k+1}]$  with  $k = 0, \dots, N$ ,  $x_0 := a$  and  $x_{N+1} := b$ , provides a partition of  $X$  such that  $f$  is strictly monotone inside each  $I_k$ . The set  $Y := f(X) = [f_{\min}, f_{\max}] \subset \mathbb{R}$  is again an interval delimited by the maximum and minimum values of  $f$  over  $X$ . In particular the values  $f_{\min}$  and  $f_{\max}$  are attained by evaluating  $f$  over some of the points  $x_k$ . It is also true that for every  $y \in Y$  the preimage  $P_y := f^{-1}(\{y\})$  is a finite, hence discrete, set of  $X$ . Let  $\nu$  be the pushforward of the measure  $\mu$  by  $f$ . From its very definition it follows that for every measurable set  $\Sigma \subseteq Y$  one

gets

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\Sigma) &= \mu(f^{-1}(\Sigma)) = \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b dx \chi_{f^{-1}(\Sigma)}(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{b-a} \sum_{k=0}^N \int_{I_k} dx \chi_{f^{-1}(\Sigma)}(x) \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $f$  is invertible in each  $I_k$ . Therefore, by setting  $f_k := f|_{I_k}$  one can use the change of variable  $y = f(x)$  in every integral by obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I_k} dx \chi_{f^{-1}(\Sigma)}(x) &= \int_{f(x_k)}^{f(x_{k+1})} dy (f_k^{-1})'(y) \chi_{f^{-1}(\Sigma)}(f_k^{-1}(y)) \\ &= \int_Y dy \frac{\chi_{f(I_k)}(y)}{|f'(f_k^{-1}(y))|} \chi_{\Sigma}(y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, one obtains that  $\nu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $Y$  and can be written in the form  $d\nu(y) = \rho(y) dy$  with

$$\rho(y) := \frac{1}{(b-a)} \sum_{k=0}^N \frac{\chi_{f(I_k)}(y)}{|f'(f_k^{-1}(y))|}.$$

The next task is to calculate the expectation operator. For that, consider a  $\psi \in L^1(X, \mu)$  and a  $\phi \in L^\infty(Y, \nu)$ . Then, in view of (A.1) one gets

$$\int_Y dy \rho(y) E_\psi(y) \phi(y) = \int_X d\mu(x) \psi(x) (\phi \circ f)(x).$$

By decomposing the integral on the right-hand side over the intervals  $I_k$ , and applying again the change of variables  $y = f(x)$ , one gets

$$\int_Y dy \rho(y) E_\psi(y) \phi(y) = \int_Y dy \left( \frac{1}{(b-a)} \sum_{k=0}^N \frac{\chi_{f(I_k)}(y) \psi(f_k^{-1}(y))}{|f'(f_k^{-1}(y))|} \right) \phi(y).$$

Since the equality above must hold independently of  $\phi$  it turns out that

$$\sum_{k=0}^N \frac{\chi_{f(I_k)}(y) [E_\psi(y) - \psi(f_k^{-1}(y))]}{|f'(f_k^{-1}(y))|} = 0$$

for almost every  $y$  in  $Y$ . Therefore, one has that

$$E_\psi(y) = \sum_{x \in P_y} c_x(f) \psi(x), \quad c_k(f) := \left( \sum_{x \in P_y} \frac{1}{|f'(x)|} \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{|f'(x)|}.$$

Finally, the disintegration  $\{\mu_y\}_{y \in Y}$  of  $\mu$  is obtained by using (A.2) which provides

$$\int_X d\mu_y(x) \psi(x) = \sum_{x \in P_y} c_x \psi(x)$$

showing that

$$\mu_y = \sum_{x \in P_y} c_x \delta_x$$

coincides with a convex combination of Dirac measures supported on the points of  $P_y$ . As a special application of this result let us consider the trigonometric expression

$$f(x) := \sqrt{\gamma^2 + 4 \cos^2 \left( \frac{x}{2} \right)}, \quad x \in [-2\pi, 2\pi]$$

with  $\gamma > 0$ . In this case, the critical points are  $x_k := (k-2)\pi$  for  $k = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$  and one can define the associated partition  $I_k$ . For every  $y \in Y := (\gamma, \sqrt{\gamma^2 + 4})$  the set of points  $P_y := f^{-1}(\{y\})$  is given by four points of the type  $\{\pm x_*, \pm 2\pi \mp x_*\}$  where the reference point  $x_* = x_*(y)$  is chosen as  $x_* := f^{-1}(\{y\}) \cap [0, \pi]$ . To compute the coefficients  $c_x(f)$ , let us observe that

$$f'(x) := -\frac{\sin(x)}{f(x)}.$$

By observing that  $|f'(x)| = |\sin(x_*)|f(x_*)^{-1}$  for every  $x \in P_y$  it follows that  $c_x(f) = \frac{1}{4}$ . As a result one gets

$$\mu_y = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\# = \pm} \delta_{\#x_*} + \delta_{\#(2\pi - x_*)}$$

for the associated disintegration of the normalized Lebesgue measure  $\mu$  on  $[-2\pi, 2\pi]$ . ◀

*Example A.6 (Disintegration by a linear function).* Given  $\ell > 0$ , let us consider the square  $X := [0, \ell] \times [0, \ell] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  endowed with its normalized (product) Lebesgue measure  $d\mu := \ell^{-2} dx_1 dx_2$ . Consider the linear function on  $X$  given by  $f(x_1, x_2) := x_2 - x_1$ . It is not hard to see that the range  $f(X)$  coincides with the interval  $Y := [-\ell, \ell]$ . Therefore, one can see  $f$  as a map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ . Since  $f$  is continuous, hence measurable, we can compute the pushforward measure  $\nu$  on  $Y$  induced by the measure  $\mu$  through  $f$ . Let  $\Sigma \subseteq Y$  be any measurable set and  $\chi_\Sigma$  its characteristic function. Then, by definition

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\Sigma) &:= \mu(f^{-1}(\Sigma)) = \int_X d\mu(x_1, x_2) \chi_{f^{-1}(\Sigma)}(x_1, x_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{\ell^2} \int_0^\ell dx_1 \int_0^\ell dx_2 \chi_\Sigma(x_2 - x_1) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is a consequence of Fubini's theorem. Let us assume for the moment that  $\chi_\Sigma$  is Riemann integrable and consider the change of variables  $(s, y) \mapsto (x_1, x_2)$  given by  $x_1(s, y) := s$  and  $x_2(s, y) := s + y$ . The Jacobian determinant of the transformation is 1, and after some manipulation one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\Sigma) &= \frac{1}{\ell^2} \int_0^\ell ds \left( \int_{-s}^{\ell-s} dy \chi_\Sigma(y) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\ell} \int_0^\ell ds g_\Sigma(s) \end{aligned} \tag{A.8}$$



where

$$g_{\Sigma}(s) := \frac{1}{\ell} \int_{-s}^{\ell-s} dy \chi_{\Sigma}(y) = \frac{|[-s, \ell-s] \cap \Sigma|}{\ell}$$

and  $|\cdot|$  in the numerator denotes the usual Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Evidently, it holds true that  $g_{\Sigma} : [0, \ell] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . The formula above and the Lebesgue's criterion for integrability imply that  $g_{\Sigma} = 0$  whenever  $\Sigma$  is any measurable set of zero Lebesgue measure. Therefore from (A.8) one infers that  $\nu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure  $dy$  on  $Y$ . Therefore, in view of the Radon–Nikodym theorem, there exists a measurable function  $\rho : Y \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that  $d\nu(y) = \rho(y) dy$ . Let us observe that the integral (A.8) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\Sigma) &= \frac{1}{\ell^2} \int_0^{\ell} ds \left( \int_{-s}^{\ell-s} dy \chi_{[-s, \ell-s]}(y) \chi_{\Sigma}(y) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\ell^2} \int_Y dy \chi_{\Sigma}(y) \left( \int_0^{\ell} ds \chi_{[-s, \ell-s]}(y) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality the order of integration has been exchanged. Therefore one gets that

$$\rho(y) := \frac{1}{\ell^2} \int_0^{\ell} ds \chi_{[-s, \ell-s]}(y) = \frac{\ell - |y|}{\ell^2}$$

which provides the expression for the Radon–Nikodym derivative. The next task is to calculate the expectation operator. For that, consider a  $\psi \in L^1(X, \mu)$ . Then, in view of (A.1) and for all  $\phi \in L^{\infty}(Y, \nu)$  it holds that

$$\int_Y dy \rho(y) \phi(y) E_{\psi}(y) = \frac{1}{\ell^2} \int_0^{\ell} \int_0^{\ell} dx_1 dx_2 \psi(x_1, x_2) \phi(x_2 - x_1) .$$

To massage the right-hand side of this equation let us assume for the moment that the function  $\psi$  and  $\phi$  are Riemann integrable so that change of variable  $(s, y) \mapsto (x_1, x_2)$  can be used again. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Y dy \rho(y) \phi(y) E_{\psi}(y) &= \frac{1}{\ell^2} \int_0^{\ell} ds \int_{-s}^{\ell-s} dy \psi(s, s+y) \phi(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{\ell^2} \int_0^{\ell} ds \int_Y dy \chi_{[-s, \ell-s]}(y) \psi(s, s+y) \phi(y) \\ &= \int_Y dy \phi(y) \left( \frac{1}{\ell^2} \int_0^{\ell} ds \chi_{[-s, \ell-s]}(y) \psi(s, s+y) \right) . \end{aligned}$$

The equality between the first and the last member holds for very bounded Riemann measurable function  $\phi$ , and in view of the Lebesgue's criterion for every  $\phi \in L^{\infty}(Y, \nu)$ . This implies that

$$\rho(y) E_{\psi}(y) = \frac{1}{\ell^2} \int_0^{\ell} ds \chi_{[-s, \ell-s]}(y) \psi(s, s+y)$$

for almost all  $y$  in  $Y$ . With a final manipulation one gets

$$E_\psi(y) = \frac{1}{\ell - |y|} \begin{cases} \int_0^{\ell-y} ds \psi(s, s+y) & 0 \leq y \leq \ell \\ \int_{|y|}^{\ell} ds \psi(s, s+y) & -\ell \leq y \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Let us compare the last equation with the (A.2), here rewritten as

$$E_\psi(y) = \int_X d\mu_y(x_1, x_2) \psi(x_1, x_2),$$

where  $\{\mu_y\}_{y \in Y}$  is the disintegration of  $\mu$  with respect to  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ . Then one gets that  $\mu_y$  is concentrated on the segment

$$L_y := f^{-1}(\{y\}) = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_2 - x_1 = y\} \cap [0, \ell]^2$$

and over  $L_y$  it agrees with the normalized one-dimensional Lebesgue measure. Let  $[0, 1] \ni \tau \mapsto s(\tau) \in L_y$  be the linear reparametrization of  $L_y$ , given by  $s(\tau) = (\alpha + \beta\tau, \alpha + \beta\tau + y)$  and  $\alpha, \beta$  depending on  $y$ . Then, with an innocent misuse of notation, and by using the Dirac measure  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , one can write

$$\mu_y(x_1, x_2) = \int_0^1 d\tau \delta_{s(\tau)}(x_1, x_2)$$

for the disintegration of the measure  $\mu$  along  $f$ . ◀

## REFERENCES

- [AM] Ashcroft, N.; Mermin, N.: *Solid state physics*. Saunders College Publishing, 1976
- [BR1] Bratteli, O.; Robinson, D. W.: *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics 1*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1987
- [BR2] Bratteli, O.; Robinson, D. W.: *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics 2*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1997
- [Call] Callaway, J.: *Energy Band Theory*. Academic Press, New York, 1964
- [Conw1] Conway, J. B.: *A Course in Functional Analysis*. Springer, Berlin, 1990
- [Conw2] Conway, J. B.: *The Theory of Subnormal Operators*, AMS, 1991
- [Davi] Davidson, K. R.: *C\*-Algebras by Example*. AMS, 1996
- [Dira] Dirac, P. A. M.: *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics*,. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1930
- [Dixm] Dixmier, J.: *C\*-Algebras*. North-Holland Publishing Co., 1977
- [DL] De Nittis, G.; Lein, M.: *Topological polarization in graphene-like systems*. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **46**, 385001 (2013)
- [FNW] Fannes, M.; Nachtergaele, B.; Werner, R. F.: *Finitely correlated states on quantum spin chains*. Commun. Math. Phys. **144**, 443-490 (1992)
- [Haag] Haag, R.: *Local Quantum Physics. Fields, Particles, Algebras*. Springer, 1996
- [Kato] Kato, T.: *Perturbation theory for linear operators*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980
- [Kitt] Kittel, C.: *Introduction to Solid State Physics*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1976
- [Kuch1] Kuchment, P.: *An overview on elliptic operators*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **53**, 343-41 (2016)
- [Kuch2] Kuchment, P.: *Floquet Theory for Partial Differential Equations*. Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, vol. 60, Birkhauser Verlag, Basel, 1993

- [MP] Mitchel, L.; Paschke, W.: *Simplicity of  $C^*$ -algebras using unique eigenstates*. J. Operator Theory **64**, 321-347 (2010)
- [Murp] Murphy, G.:  *$C^*$ -Algebras and Operator Theory*. Academic Press, Inc., 1990
- [MvN] Murray, F. J.; von Neumann, J.: *On Rings of Operators*. Ann. of Math. **37**, 116-229 (1936)
- [Nils] Nilsen, M.: *The Stone-Čech compactification of Prim* A. Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. **52**, 377-383 (1995)
- [Pash2] Paschke, W.: *Pure eigenstates for the sum of generators of the free group*. Pacific J. Math. **197**, 151-171 (2001)
- [Pede] Pedersen, G. K.:  *$C^*$ -algebras and their automorphism groups*. Academic Press, London-New York, 1979
- [Ried1] Riedel, N.: *Almost Mathieu Operators and Rotation  $C^*$ -Algebras*. Proc. London Math. Soc. **56**, 281-302 (1988)
- [Ried2] Riedel, N.: *On spectral properties of almost Mathieu operators and connections with irrational rotation  $C^*$  algebras*. Rocky Mountain J. Math. **20**, 541-550 (1990)
- [Rine] Rinehart, L.: *Eigenstates of  $C^*$ -Algebras*. E-print <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.07049>, (2021)
- [RS1] Reed, M.; Simon, B.: *Functional Analysis (Methods of modern mathematical physics I)*. Academic Press, New York-London, 1972
- [RS2] Reed, M.; Simon, B.: *Analysis of Operators (Methods of modern mathematical physics IV)*. Academic Press, New York-London, 1978
- [RW] Raeburn, P.; Williams, D.: *Morita equivalence and continuous-trace  $C^*$ -algebras*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs Vol 60. AMS, 1998
- [Sega] Segal I. E.: *Postulates for General Quantum Mechanics*. Ann. Math. **48**, 930-948 (1947)
- [SSH] Su, W. P.; Schrieffer, J. R.; Heeger, A. J.: *Postulates for General Quantum Mechanics*. Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 1698 (1979)
- [Tesc] Tesch, G.: *Mathematical Methods in Quantum Mechanics With Applications to Schrodinger Operators*. AMS, 2009
- [vNeu] von Neumann, J.: *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. Princeton University Press, 1932

(G. De Nittis) FACULTAD DE MATEMÁTICAS & INSTITUTO DE FÍSICA, PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DE CHILE, SANTIAGO, CHILE.

*Email address:* gidenittis@mat.uc.cl

(D. Polo) FACULTAD DE MATEMÁTICAS, PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DE CHILE, SANTIAGO, CHILE.

*Email address:* djpolo@mat.uc.cl