

# A NOTE ON HILBERT TRANSFORM OVER LATTICES OF $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$

JORGE PÉREZ GARCÍA

ABSTRACT. In a recent work by González-Pérez, Parcet and Xia, the boundedness over non-commutative  $L_p$ -spaces of an analogue of the Hilbert transform was studied. This analogue is defined as a Fourier multiplier with symbol  $m: \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  arising from the action by isometries of  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  on the 3-dimensional hyperbolic space  $\mathbb{H}^3$ . More concretely,  $m$  is a lifting of the function on  $\mathbb{H}^3$  that takes values  $\pm 1$  in the two regions formed by dividing the space by a hyperbolic plane. The boundedness of  $T_m$  on  $L_p(\mathcal{L}\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C}))$  for  $p \neq 2$  was disproved by Parcet, de la Salle and Tablate. Nevertheless, we will show that this Fourier multiplier is bounded when restricted to the arithmetic lattices  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-n}])$ , solving a question left open by González-Pérez, Parcet and Xia.

## Introduction

The boundedness problem for Fourier multipliers on  $L_p$ -spaces has always played a central role in harmonic analysis. One of the most studied examples is the Hilbert transform, defined as  $\widehat{Hf}(\xi) = i \operatorname{sign}(\xi) \widehat{f}(\xi)$  for  $f \in L_2(\mathbb{R})$ . Although  $H$  was already known to be bounded in  $L_p(\mathbb{R})$  for  $1 < p < \infty$ , in 1955 Cotlar [Cot55] gave a very simple proof of this fact using the following identity:

$$|Hf|^2 = 2H(f \cdot Hf) - H(H(|f|^2)). \quad (\text{Classical Cotlar})$$

This is known nowadays as the Cotlar identity. His proof uses that  $H$  is bounded in  $L_2(\mathbb{R})$  and that, by a recursive use of (Classical Cotlar), it also must be bounded in every  $p = 2^k$  for  $k \geq 1$ . Interpolation and the fact that  $H$  is self-adjoint complete the proof.

Mei and Ricard [MR17] introduced the Cotlar identity in the non-commutative setting in order to study Hilbert transforms over free groups and amalgamated free products of von Neumann algebras. In the recent work of González-Pérez, Parcet and Xia [GPPX22] the authors developed a systematic approach to study Cotlar identities for Fourier multipliers in non-Abelian groups. Let  $G$  be a unimodular group,  $\mathcal{L}G$  the von Neumann algebra of  $G$  and  $G_0 \subset G$  an open subgroup. Consider  $m: G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  a symbol on  $G$  and  $T_m$  the corresponding Fourier multiplier on  $\mathcal{L}G$ . Then the formula:

$$(m(g^{-1}) - m(h))(m(gh) - m(g)) = 0, \quad \text{for all } g \in G \setminus G_0, h \in G, \quad (\text{Cotlar})$$

is a translation of (Classical Cotlar) for  $T_m$  in terms of its symbol. The main result in [GPPX22] states that any  $m$  which is bounded, left  $G_0$ -invariant and verifies (Cotlar) defines a bounded multiplier in  $L_p(\mathcal{L}G)$  for all  $1 < p < \infty$ .

The subgroup  $G_0$  represents a set in which the Cotlar identity may fail. In the argument, this failure is balanced by the invariance of  $m$  respect  $G_0$ . Therefore this formulation of the theorem allows more flexibility in terms of the multiplier than the original one. However, the hypothesis of invariance can be relaxed even further. If  $\chi: G_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^1$  is a character, it is enough for the result to hold that  $m$  verifies:

$$m(gh) = \chi(g)m(h) \quad \text{for all } g \in G_0, h \in G.$$

We say in this case that  $m$  is *left  $(G_0, \chi)$ -invariant*, and of course the  $G_0$ -invariance is recovered when  $\chi$  is the trivial character.

---

The author was partially supported by pre-doctoral scholarship PRE2020-093245, the Severo Ochoa Grant CEX2023-001347-5(MICIU), PIE2023-50E106(CSIC), and PID2022-141354NB-I00(MICINN).

**Hilbert transform in  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ .** Recall that  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ , which is the quotient of the  $2 \times 2$  complex matrices with determinant 1 by its center, can be identified with the isometry group of the three dimensional hyperbolic space  $\mathbb{H}^3$ . This identification can be made explicit in various ways. Here we give one using the upper-space model of  $\mathbb{H}^3$  and quaternions. Let  $i, j, k$  denote the usual three quaternionic units, and let's define:

$$\mathbb{H}^3 = \{a + bi + cj : a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}, c > 0\}.$$

Doing so,  $\mathbb{H}^3$  is exactly the subspace  $\mathbb{C} + \mathbb{R}_{>0}j$  of the quaternions. Now, for a given  $\omega \in \mathbb{H}^3$  we set:

$$g \cdot \omega = (a\omega + b)(c\omega + d)^{-1}, \quad \text{for } g = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C}).$$

This is a well-defined action of  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  on  $\mathbb{H}^3$ , and it is an action by isometries when equipping  $\mathbb{H}^3$  with the usual Riemannian structure.

On the other hand, a group  $G$  acting on a set  $X$  induces a multiplier on  $G$  as follows: first choose a point  $x_0 \in X$  and two disjoint subsets  $X^+, X^- \subset X$ . Let  $m$  be the map  $m : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  defined for each  $g \in G$  as:

$$m(g) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } g \cdot x_0 \in X^+, \\ -1 & \text{if } g \cdot x_0 \in X^-, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Even if the final multiplier depends on  $x_0$  and also on the partition given by  $X^+$  and  $X^-$ , the boundedness of the multiplier is preserved by changing  $x_0$  for any other point in the same  $G$ -orbit or using the sets  $\{g \cdot X^+, g \cdot X^-\}$ , with  $g \in G$ , instead of  $\{X^+, X^-\}$ . Back to the action of  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  on the hyperbolic space, we are choosing the base point in  $\mathbb{H}^3$  given by  $j$  in our quaternionic parametrization, and the following partition:

$$\mathbb{H}_+^3 = \{\omega \in \mathbb{H}^3 : \mathrm{Re}(\omega) > 0\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{H}_-^3 = \{\omega \in \mathbb{H}^3 : \mathrm{Re}(\omega) < 0\}.$$

This procedure induces a symbol  $m$  in  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  that is explicitly given by:

$$m(g) = \mathrm{sign}(\mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c} + b\bar{d})), \quad \text{with } g = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C}). \quad (1)$$

The dividing frontier  $\mathbb{H}^3 \setminus (\mathbb{H}_+^3 \cup \mathbb{H}_-^3) = \{\omega \in \mathbb{H}^3 : \mathrm{Re}(\omega) = 0\}$  is a hyperbolic plane, which determines the symbol  $m$  up to a sign. Since the action of  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  is transitive both on points and hyperbolic planes in  $\mathbb{H}^3$ , the boundedness of the multiplier defined by  $m$  on  $L_p(\mathcal{L}\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C}))$  will remain the same under any other choice of the kind. Also, it is worth noticing that  $m$  is easily shown invariant under the action of two groups:

- (1) The right action of the group  $\mathrm{PSU}(2)$ , which is the image of the unitary group  $\mathrm{U}(2)$  under the projection  $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ .
- (2) The left action of the group  $G_0 \leq \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  defined by:

$$G_0 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x & iy \\ iz & w \end{bmatrix} : x, y, z, w \in \mathbb{R}, xw + yz = 1 \right\}. \quad (2)$$

In [GPPX22] the authors proved that, when restricted to the lattices  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$  and  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z}[i])$ , this function defines an  $L_p$ -bounded Fourier multiplier for every  $1 < p < \infty$ . They posed three related questions, namely:

- (1) Is this multiplier bounded in  $L_p(\mathcal{L}\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C}))$ ?
- (2) Is its restriction bounded in  $L_p(\mathcal{L}\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R}))$ ?
- (3) Are there more lattices  $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  for which the restriction of  $m$  still defines a multiplier bounded in  $L_p(\mathcal{L}\Gamma)$ ?

The two first questions are negatively answered by the work of Parcet, de la Salle and Tablate. Concretely, by [PdIST23, Corollary B2] and the fact that the Lie algebra of  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  is simple (as a real Lie algebra) solves the problem.

In the present work we tackle the third question. Our main result concerns the family of groups  $\Gamma_n = \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-n}])$ , and it can be stated follows:

**Theorem A.** *For any integer  $n > 0$ , the symbol  $m$  restricted to the group  $\Gamma_n$  defines a bounded Fourier multiplier in  $L_p(\mathcal{L}\Gamma_n)$  for all  $1 < p < \infty$ , whose norm satisfies:*

$$\|T_m: L_p(\mathcal{L}\Gamma_n) \rightarrow L_p(\mathcal{L}\Gamma_n)\| \lesssim \left(\frac{p^2}{p-1}\right)^\beta, \quad \text{where } \beta = 1 + \log_2(1 + \sqrt{2}).$$

The proof consist in identifying a subgroup  $K_n \leq \Gamma_n$  and a suitable character  $\chi: K_n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^1$  for which  $m$  is left  $(K_n, \chi)$ -invariant, and then proving by hand that (Cotlar) holds. This is a refinement of the argument in [GPPX22] for the case  $n = 1$ , where the authors defined an auxiliary symbol  $\tilde{m}$  that is indeed  $K_1$ -invariant, and carried out the analogous computations that we present here in more generality.

Bianchi groups are another natural family of lattices in  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  to consider. Indeed, for every square-free positive integer  $n > 0$ , we define the  $n$ -th Bianchi group as  $\Gamma'_n = \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathcal{O}_{-n})$ , where  $\mathcal{O}_{-n}$  denotes the ring of integers of the quadratic extension  $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-n})$ . The explicit definition of  $\Gamma'_n$  depends on the class of  $n$  modulus 4, since:

$$\mathcal{O}_{-n} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-n}] & \text{if } n \not\equiv -1 \pmod{4}, \\ \mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1+\sqrt{-n}}{2}\right] & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore this family extends the one featuring in Theorem A. The problem is that the set where (Cotlar) fails is bigger in  $\Gamma'_n$  than in  $\Gamma_n$ . This set cannot be contained in a subgroup respect of which  $m$  has some kind of invariance, which was a key step in our previous argument, and this is why the question of whether  $m$  defines a bounded multiplier on  $L_p(\mathcal{L}\Gamma'_n)$  is left open.

**Acknowledgments.** The author would like to thank his advisor, Adrián González-Pérez, for pointing him out the problem, as well as for his support and insightful conversations.

## 1. Background

**Group von Neumann algebras.** Let  $G$  be a discrete group and let  $\lambda: G \rightarrow B(\ell_2(G))$  denote the left regular representation of  $G$ , that is, the unitary representation of  $G$  assigning to every  $g \in G$  the operator  $\lambda_g \in B(\ell_2(G))$  given by  $\lambda_g f(h) = f(g^{-1}h)$ , for every  $f \in \ell_2(G)$  and  $h \in G$ . The group von Neumann algebra of  $G$ , denoted here by  $\mathcal{L}G$ , is the operator algebra given by:

$$\mathcal{L}G = \overline{\mathrm{span}\{\lambda_g: g \in G\}}^{\mathrm{WOT}},$$

where closure is taken in the weak operator topology of  $B(\ell_2(G))$ . Notice that an arbitrary element  $x \in \mathcal{L}G$  can be represented by a sum  $x = \sum_{g \in G} x_g \lambda_g$ , with  $x_g \in \mathbb{C}$ , converging in this topology.

The group von Neumann algebra  $\mathcal{L}G$  comes equipped with a finite trace:

$$\tau: \mathcal{L}G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad x \mapsto \tau\left(\sum_{g \in G} x_g \lambda_g\right) = x_e.$$

If  $G$  is Abelian then  $\mathcal{L}G$  is isomorphic (as von Neumann algebra) to  $L_\infty(\widehat{G})$ , where  $\widehat{G}$  represents the dual group, and  $\tau$  is the functional induced on  $L_\infty(\widehat{G})$  by the Haar measure of  $\widehat{G}$ . In the non-commutative case, the trace  $\tau$  above defined helps us to define  $L_p$ -spaces associated to  $\mathcal{L}G$  without needing an underlying measure space. For a given  $x \in \mathcal{L}G$  and  $p \in [1, \infty]$  we define the norms:

$$\|x\|_p = \tau(|x|^p)^{1/p} \text{ if } 1 \leq p < \infty, \text{ and } \|x\|_\infty = \|x\|_{\mathcal{L}G}.$$

The space  $L_p(\mathcal{L}G)$  is defined as the closure of  $B(\ell_2(G))$  respect to this norm. All of this can be done in more generality for non-discrete groups, using the Haar measure of  $G$  and defining a weight  $\tau$  instead of a trace, see [Ped79]. The  $L_p$ -spaces over von Neumann algebras can also be defined in more generality, see for example [PX03].

**Non-commutative Fourier multipliers.** A Fourier multiplier  $T_m$  with symbol  $m: G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is an operator defined as:

$$T_m \left( \sum_{g \in G} x_g \lambda_g \right) = \sum_{g \in G} m(g) x_g \lambda_g, \quad \text{for } x = \sum_{g \in G} x_g \lambda_g \in \mathbb{C}G.$$

Here  $\mathbb{C}G$  denotes the space of elements with finite Fourier expansion. Notice that it is a dense subspace of every  $L_p(\mathcal{L}G)$ . If  $T_m$  extends to a bounded operator  $T_m: L_p(\mathcal{L}G) \rightarrow L_p(\mathcal{L}G)$ , we say that  $T_m$  is a bounded  $L_p$ -multiplier.

The study of general conditions for the symbol  $m$  that ensure the  $L_p$ -boundedness of  $T_m$  has been an active area of research both in the classical and the non-commutative case. As discussed in the Introduction, the key result we are going to use concerns the following version of Cotlar identity for non-commutative Fourier multipliers:

**Theorem 1.1.** [GPPX22, Theorem A] *Let  $G$  be a locally compact unimodular group,  $G_0 \leq G$  an open subgroup and  $\chi: G_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^1$  some character. Let  $T_m$  be a Fourier multiplier whose symbol  $m: G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is bounded and left  $(G_0, \chi)$ -invariant. If  $m$  satisfies the identity:*

$$(m(g^{-1}) - m(h))(m(gh) - m(g)) = 0, \quad \text{for all } g \in G \setminus G_0 \text{ and } h \in G_0$$

*the  $T_m$  is bounded in  $L_p$  for all  $1 < p < \infty$ . Moreover, its norm satisfies:*

$$\|T_m: L_p(\mathcal{L}G) \rightarrow L_p(\mathcal{L}G)\| \lesssim \left( \frac{p^2}{p-1} \right)^\beta, \quad \text{with } \beta = \log_2(1 + \sqrt{2}).$$

Notice that if  $G$  is discrete then any subgroup  $G_0 \leq G$  is open. The subgroup  $G_0$  gives a range of flexibility to this result respect to the original one of Cotlar: taking a big subgroup  $G_0$  increases the chances for the formula to hold, but makes it harder for  $m$  to satisfy the invariance hypothesis. Also, the theorem holds even if we take  $G_0$  an empty set, which allows us to recover the classical statement when  $G = \mathbb{R}$ .

## 2. Description of the set where Cotlar identity fails

Let  $m$  be the function defined in (1) and set  $\Gamma_n = \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-n}])$ . As we shall prove later, our function  $m|_{\Gamma_n}$  is invariant (through a suitable character) respect to:

$$K_n = \{g \in \Gamma_n : m(g) = 0\}, \tag{2.1}$$

which turns out to be a subgroup of  $\Gamma_n$ . The goal of this section is to give an explicit description of this set. Along our proof, we will also give a description of the analogous set

$$K'_n = \{g \in \Gamma'_n : m(g) = 0\} \tag{2.2}$$

for  $\Gamma'_n$  the Bianchi group of discriminant  $-n$ . These subsets  $K'_n$  are defined only for square-free integers, and moreover  $K'_n = K_n$  whenever  $n \not\equiv -1 \pmod{4}$ .

The main theorem of this section (namely, Theorem B) allows us to decompose  $K_n$  and  $K'_n$  as a combination of the four following disjoint sets:

$$\begin{aligned} K_n^+ &= \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x & y\sqrt{-n} \\ z\sqrt{-n} & w \end{bmatrix} : x, y, z, w \in \mathbb{Z}, xw + nyz = 1 \right\}, \\ K_n^- &= \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x\sqrt{-n} & y \\ z & w\sqrt{-n} \end{bmatrix} : x, y, z, w \in \mathbb{Z}, nxw + yz = 1 \right\}, \\ L_n^+ &= \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & -\bar{a} \\ c & \bar{c} \end{bmatrix} : a, c \in \mathcal{O}_{-n}, \mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c}) = \frac{1}{2} \right\}, \quad \text{and} \\ L_n^- &= \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & \bar{a} \\ c & -\bar{c} \end{bmatrix} : a, c \in \mathcal{O}_{-n}, \mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c}) = -\frac{1}{2} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

**Theorem B.** *Let  $n \geq 0$  be an integer, and  $K_n, K'_n$  the sets defined in (2.1) and (2.2), respectively. Then, it holds that:*

- (1)  $K_n = K_n^+ \cup K_n^-$ .
- (2) If  $n \equiv -1 \pmod{4}$  is a square-free integer with  $n \neq 3$ , then  $K'_n = K_n^+ \cup K_n^- \cup L_n^+ \cup L_n^-$ .

We will divide the proof of the theorem in several lemmas. Concretely, Lemmas 2.4 and 2.6 combined prove the theorem for  $K_n$ , whereas Lemma 2.5 gives the extra information needed for  $K'_n$ . Prior to that, we are going to make two remarks about the classification.

**Remark 2.1.** The set  $K_n$  is always a subgroup of  $\Gamma_n$ , but  $K'_n \subset \Gamma'_n$  is not. This is because  $K'_n$  is not closed under products neither taking inverses. Let  $l \in L_n^+$  and  $g \in \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ , then:

$$m(lg) = \mathrm{sign}(|r_1(g)| - |r_2(g)|)$$

where  $r_1(g)$  and  $r_2(g)$  denotes the first and second rows of  $g$  as complex vectors in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Therefore  $m(lg) \neq 0$  for many  $g \in K'_n$ . On the other hand, notice that:

$$(L_n^+)^{-1} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} c & a \\ -\bar{c} & \bar{a} \end{bmatrix} : \mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c}) = 1/2 \right\},$$

which is not contained in  $K'_n$  because of the classification we provided in Theorem B.

**Remark 2.2.** The theorem does not apply for  $K'_3$ . Notice that  $\mathcal{O}_{-3} = \mathbb{Z}[\xi_3]$  where  $\xi_3$  denotes a primitive 3-root of the unit. A matrix as simple as:

$$u = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_3 & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{\xi}_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

will be in  $K'_3$  but not in  $K_3 \cup L_3$ . Also, since  $m$  is right  $\mathrm{PSU}(2)$ -invariant, if we pick any  $g \in K_3$  then  $gu \in K'_3$ , but this product will not be in  $K_3 \cup L_3$  in general.

**Lemma 2.3.** *For any  $g = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ , it holds that  $\mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c}) \mathrm{Re}(b\bar{d}) \geq -\frac{1}{4}$ . Moreover, if  $g \in \Gamma_n$ , the right-hand side of the inequality can be improved to 0.*

**Proof.** Suppose that  $\mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c}) \mathrm{Re}(b\bar{d}) < 0$ . Then, by multiplying the equation  $ad - bc = 1$  by  $\overline{cd}$  and taking real part we get that:

$$|\mathrm{Re}(b\bar{d})||c|^2 + |\mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c})||d|^2 = |\mathrm{Re}(c\bar{d})| \leq |c||d|.$$

Now we claim that any positive numbers  $x, y, \alpha, \beta > 0$  satisfying

$$\alpha x^2 + \beta y^2 \leq xy \tag{2.4}$$

must verify  $\alpha\beta \leq \frac{1}{4}$ . To prove the claim, just notice that (2.4) is equivalent to  $\alpha u^2 - u + \beta \leq 0$  with  $u = x/y$ , and this can only happen if the discriminant  $1 - 4\alpha\beta$  is greater than or equal to 0.

If  $g \in \Gamma_n$ , then both  $\mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c})$  and  $\mathrm{Re}(b\bar{d})$  are integers, so  $\mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c}) \mathrm{Re}(b\bar{d})$  must be indeed non-negative.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** *For any  $n \geq 0$ , let  $K_n$  and  $K'_n$  be the sets defined in (2.1) and (2.2) respectively. It holds that:*

- (1)  $K_n = \{g \in \Gamma_n : \operatorname{Re}(a\bar{c}) = \operatorname{Re}(b\bar{d}) = 0\}$ .
- (2) *If  $n \equiv -1 \pmod{4}$ , then  $K'_n = \{g \in \Gamma_n : \operatorname{Re}(a\bar{c}) = \operatorname{Re}(b\bar{d}) = 0 \text{ or } \operatorname{Re}(a\bar{c}) = -\operatorname{Re}(b\bar{d}) = \pm\frac{1}{2}\}$ .*

**Proof.** For any  $g \in \operatorname{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-n}])$ , Lemma 2.3 says that  $\operatorname{Re}(a\bar{c})\operatorname{Re}(b\bar{d}) \geq 0$ . Recall that  $m(g) = \operatorname{Re}(a\bar{c}) + \operatorname{Re}(b\bar{d})$ , so  $m(g) = 0$  if and only if  $\operatorname{Re}(a\bar{c}) = \operatorname{Re}(b\bar{d}) = 0$ . This proves the first point of the lemma. The second one follows from the same argument, but in this case  $\operatorname{Re}(a\bar{c})$  and  $\operatorname{Re}(b\bar{d})$  are demi-integers instead of integers since  $\Gamma'_n = \operatorname{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{-n}}{2}])$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $g = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix}$  be an element of  $\operatorname{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ .*

- (1)  $\operatorname{Re}(a\bar{c}) = -\operatorname{Re}(b\bar{d}) = \frac{1}{2}$  if and only if  $c = \bar{d}$ ,  $a = -\bar{b}$  and  $\operatorname{Re}(a\bar{c}) = \frac{1}{2}$ .
- (2)  $\operatorname{Re}(a\bar{c}) = -\operatorname{Re}(b\bar{d}) = -\frac{1}{2}$  if and only if  $c = -\bar{d}$ ,  $a = \bar{b}$  and  $\operatorname{Re}(a\bar{c}) = -\frac{1}{2}$ .

**Proof.** In order to prove (1), first multiply the equation  $ad - bc = 1$  by  $\bar{c}\bar{d}$  and then take real part, resulting:

$$|d|^2 + |c|^2 = 2\operatorname{Re}(\bar{c}\bar{d}).$$

A basic algebraic computation shows that this equality is equivalent to:

$$|c - \bar{d}|^2 = 0,$$

This implies that  $c = \bar{d}$ . To obtain  $a = -\bar{b}$ , begin with the equation  $\bar{a}\bar{d} - \bar{b}\bar{c} = 0$ , multiply it by  $ab$  and take real part again, concluding the argument in the same fashion as before.

Now, (2) follows from (1) just by considering  $\tilde{g} = \begin{bmatrix} a & -b \\ -c & d \end{bmatrix}$  instead of  $g$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $n \geq 0$  be an integer.*

- (1) *Let  $g = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_n$  verifying  $\operatorname{Re}(a\bar{c}) = \operatorname{Re}(b\bar{d}) = 0$ . Then either  $a, d \in i\mathbb{R}$  and  $b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ , or  $a, d \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $b, c \in i\mathbb{R}$ .*
- (2) *Same holds if  $g \in \Gamma'_n$  for  $n \equiv -1 \pmod{4}$ ,  $n \neq 3$ .*

**Proof.** We'll divide the argument in four cases, but first some notation: throughout this proof, for any given  $x \in \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-n}]$  we will denote by  $x_1, x_2$  the integers satisfying  $x = x_1 + x_2\sqrt{-n}$ . On the other hand, if  $x \in \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{-n}}{2}]$ , then  $x_1, x_2$  will denote the integers satisfying  $x = \frac{x_1 + x_2\sqrt{-n}}{2}$ .

**Case 1.** Suppose that some entry is 0. We'll make the proof for  $a = 0$  since all the cases are proven the same way. From  $bc = -1$  it follows that  $b = -c = \pm 1$ , since these are the only units in the rings  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-n}]$ ,  $\mathcal{O}_{-n}$ , and therefore  $d$  is purely imaginary.

**Case 2.** Suppose that  $g$  has non-zero entries and some entry is purely real or imaginary. From  $\operatorname{Re}(a\bar{c}) = \operatorname{Re}(b\bar{d}) = 0$  we know that there exist rational numbers  $r, q \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that

$$c = r\sqrt{-na} \quad \text{and} \quad d = q\sqrt{-nb}. \tag{2.5}$$

This also implies that:

$$ad - bc = (q - r)\sqrt{-nab} = 1, \tag{2.6}$$

and the statement follows from a simple checking.

**Case 3.** Now we are proving by reductio ad absurdum that  $g \in \Gamma_n$  have a purely real or purely imaginary entry. Suppose this is not the case, and also that  $\gcd(a_1, a_2) = \gcd(b_1, b_2) = 1$ , since the

general case follows in an analogous manner dividing first by the g.c.d. Let  $r$  and  $q$  be as in (2.5), and notice that (2.6) can be split into two real equations by taking real and imaginary part:

$$a_1 b_1 - n a_2 b_2 = 0, \tag{2.7a}$$

$$(r - q)n(a_1 b_2 + b_2 a_1) = 1. \tag{2.7b}$$

The definition of  $r$  implies that its denominator, denoted by  $\mathrm{den}(r)$ , divides both  $a_1$  and  $n a_2$ . Therefore  $\mathrm{den}(r)$  divides  $n$ . For the same reasons,  $\mathrm{den}(q)$  also must divide  $n$ , so  $(r - q)n$  is an integer.

Because of (2.7b) we have that  $a_1 b_2 + b_2 a_1 = \pm 1$ . On the other hand, Equation (2.7a) implies that  $a_2$  divides  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  divides  $a_1$ , so there exist integers  $x, y$  such that  $a_1 = x b_2$ ,  $b_1 = y a_2$  and  $xy = n$ . All of this is summarized in the following two equations:

$$xy = n, \tag{2.8a}$$

$$y a_2^2 + x b_2^2 = \pm 1. \tag{2.8b}$$

First equation says that  $x$  and  $y$  are non-zero and that they have the same sign, so  $|y a_2^2 + x b_2^2| \geq |a|^2 + |b|^2$ . However, both  $|a|^2$  and  $|b|^2$  are positive integers, so  $|y a_2^2 + x b_2^2| \geq 2$ , which is a contradiction with the last equation.

This proves (1). Now consider  $g \in \Gamma'_n$ . The same argument as in Case 3 can be carried out, with the difference that now (2.8a) and (2.8b) have the form:

$$xy = n,$$

$$|y a_2^2 + x b_2^2| \leq 4.$$

Again the integers  $x$  and  $y$  have the same sign, so  $4 \geq |x b_2^2 + y a_2^2| \geq |x| + |y|$ . But any two integers  $x, y$  satisfying this inequality verify  $|xy| \leq 3$ . Since  $n > 3$ , we have a contradiction with the first equation, proving (2).  $\square$

### 3. Proof of the Cotlar Identity

The sets  $K_n^+$  and  $K_n^-$  defined in (2.3) verify certain relations related to the invariance of  $m$ . Throughout this section, we set:

$$\omega = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C}).$$

It holds that  $\omega K_n^+ = K_n^+ \omega = K_n^-$ . These identities, together with the fact that  $K_n^+$  is a subgroup of  $\Gamma_n$ , implies easily that:

$$K_n^+ K_n^-, K_n^- K_n^+ \subset K_n^- \quad \text{and} \quad K_n^- K_n^- \subset K_n^+.$$

We claim now that, because of these contentions, the function  $\chi: K_n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^1$  defined as:

$$\chi(g) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } g \in K_n^+, \\ -1 & \text{if } g \in K_n^-, \end{cases}$$

is a character. The following three lemmas prove that  $m|_{\Gamma_n}$  is left  $(K_n, \chi)$ -invariant.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $g \in \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  and let  $r_1(g)$  and  $r_2(g)$  denote the first and second rows of  $g$ , respectively. There exist an unitary matrix  $u \in \mathrm{PSU}(2)$  such that:*

$$g = \begin{bmatrix} s^{-1} & s^{-1}t \\ 0 & s \end{bmatrix} u,$$

with  $s = |r_2(g)|$  and  $t = \langle r_1(g), r_2(g) \rangle$ , where the bracket represents the scalar product in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ .

**Proof.** This is just an explicit statement of the ANK decomposition for  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ . It can be proven directly as follows. Let  $u$  be the (only) unitary matrix such that  $r_2(g)u^* = (0, s)$  with  $s > 0$ . Thus,  $s = |r_2(g)|$ . On the other hand, using that  $\det(gu^*) = 1$ , we get that  $r_1(g)u^* = (s^{-1}, \omega)$  for some  $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$ . This  $\omega$  can be computed using that  $\omega = s^{-1} \langle r_1(gu^*), r_2(gu^*) \rangle = s^{-1} \langle r_1(g), r_2(g) \rangle$ , which is the definition of  $s^{-1}t$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** For any  $g = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ , it holds that:

$$\mathrm{Im}(b\bar{c} - a\bar{d})^2 - 4 \mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c}) \mathrm{Re}(b\bar{d}) \leq 1.$$

Moreover, if  $g \in \Gamma_n$ , then the right-hand side of the above inequality can be improved to 0.

**Proof.** Same computations as in the proof of [GPPX22, Lemma 5.3] shows that the left-hand side of the above expression can be written as  $p(X) = -4X(1+X)$ , where  $X = na_2d_2 + b_1c_1$ . This proves the statement for  $g \in \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ . If  $g \in \Gamma_n$ , then  $X$  is an integer and therefore  $p(X) \in 4\mathbb{Z}$ , which proves the second part of the statement.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** The symbol  $m|_{\Gamma_n}$  is right  $K_n$ -invariant and left  $(K_n, \chi)$ -invariant.

**Proof.** It is immediate to check that  $m(\omega g) = -m(g)$ . On the other hand,  $K_n^+$  and  $K_n^-$  are contained respectively in  $G_0$  and  $\omega G_0$ , where  $G_0$  is the group defined in the Introduction by (2). Since  $m$  is invariant by the left action of  $G_0$ , it follows that  $m|_{\Gamma_n}$  is left  $(K_n, \chi)$ -invariant.

For the right invariance, let's take  $g \in \Gamma_n$  and  $h \in K_n$ . If  $g \in K_n$ , it is immediate that  $m(gh) = m(g) = 0$ , so we rule out this case. Let's write  $g$  and  $h$  as

$$g = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad h = \begin{bmatrix} s^{-1} & s^{-1}t \\ 0 & s \end{bmatrix} u,$$

where we used Lemma 3.1 to decompose  $h$  in a product of two matrices, such that  $u \in \mathrm{PSU}(2)$ ,  $s > 0$  and  $t = \langle r_1(h), r_2(h) \rangle$ . Recall that  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  represent the first and second rows of our matrices, and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is the scalar product in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Since  $h \in K_n$ ,  $t$  is purely imaginary, which allows us to write:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Re}\langle r_1(gh), r_2(gh) \rangle &= \mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c})(1 + (\mathrm{Im} t)^2)s^{-2} + \mathrm{Re}(b\bar{d})s^2 + \mathrm{Im}(b\bar{c} - a\bar{d}) \mathrm{Im} t \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} s^{-1} \mathrm{Im} t & s \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2 \mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c}) & \mathrm{Im}(b\bar{c} - a\bar{d}) \\ \mathrm{Im}(b\bar{c} - a\bar{d}) & 2 \mathrm{Re}(b\bar{d}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} s^{-1} \mathrm{Im} t \\ s \end{bmatrix} + s^{-2} \mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

The Lemma 3.2 says that the determinant of the matrix in (3.1) is always non-negative. Therefore, this matrix will be semidefinite positive if  $\mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c}) \geq 0$  and  $\mathrm{Re}(b\bar{d}) \geq 0$  and semidefinite negative otherwise. In both cases, it implies that  $m(gh)m(g) \geq 0$ . Since  $gh \notin K_n$ , it follows that  $m(gh) = m(g)$ , proving the statement.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** Let  $g = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_n$ . Then

$$m(g)m(g^t) \mathrm{Re}(a\bar{d} + b\bar{c}) \geq 0,$$

where  $g^t$  denotes the transpose of  $g$ .

**Proof.** If  $g$  or  $g^t$  are in  $K_n$ , the result is immediate. If they are not, we know  $m(g)$  has the same sign as  $\mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c})$  or  $\mathrm{Re}(b\bar{d})$ , depending on which one is non-zero. We'll suppose that both  $\mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c})$  and  $\mathrm{Re}(b\bar{d})$  are non-zero, since the rest of the cases comes from applying this one to  $\omega g$ ,  $g\omega$  or  $\omega g\omega$ .

Under this hypothesis, the statement is equivalent to

$$\mathrm{Re}(a\bar{c}) \mathrm{Re}(a\bar{d}) \mathrm{Re}(a\bar{d} + b\bar{c}) \geq 0.$$

From the proof of [GPPX22, Proposition 5.8] we know that the left-hand side of the inequality equals  $p(X) = (AX+B)(2X+1)$  with  $A = n(a_1^2 + a_2^2)$ ,  $B = na_2^2$  and  $X = b_1c_1 + na_2d_2$ . Since  $X$  is an integer and the roots of the polynomial  $p$  have modulus lesser or equal than 1, we conclude the statement.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem A.** We are going to prove that the symbol  $m|_{\Gamma_n}$  satisfies (Cotlar) relative to  $K_n$ , that is:

$$(m(g^{-1}) - m(h))(m(gh) - m(g)) = 0, \quad \text{for all } g \in \Gamma_n \setminus K_n \text{ and } h \in \Gamma_n.$$



If  $h \in K_n$ , the equality follows from the right  $K_n$ -invariance of  $m$  proven in Lemma 3.3. Now, suppose that  $h \notin K_n$  and  $m(g^{-1}) \neq m(h)$ . We have to prove that  $m(gh) = m(g)$ . Since the hypothesis  $m(g^{-1}) \neq m(h)$  implies that  $gh \notin K_n$ , it suffices to prove that  $m(gh)m(g) \geq 0$ . We write:

$$g = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad h = \begin{bmatrix} s^{-1} & s^{-1}t \\ 0 & s \end{bmatrix} u,$$

using Lemma 3.1 to decompose  $h$  into an upper-triangular matrix and an unitary one. Now, a computation shows that:

$$\begin{aligned} m(gh)m(g) &= \text{sign} \left( \text{Re}(a\bar{c} + b\bar{d}) \text{Re}(a\bar{c})s^{-2}(1 + (\text{Re } t)^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \text{Re}(a\bar{c} + b\bar{d}) \text{Re}(a\bar{d} + b\bar{c}) \text{Re } t \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \text{Re}(a\bar{c} + b\bar{d}) [\text{Re}(a\bar{c})s^{-2}(\text{Im } t)^2 + \text{Re}(b\bar{d})s^2 + \text{Im}(b\bar{c} - a\bar{d}) \text{Im } t] \right) \\ &= \text{sign} \left( \text{(I)} + \text{(II)} + \text{(III)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now notice that (I) is non-negative because of Lemma 2.3 and the fact that  $s > 0$ . Also, (II) is non-negative because  $\text{Re } t$  has the same sign as  $m(h) = -m(g^{-1}) = m(g^t)$ , so we can apply Lemma 3.4. Finally, (III) is non-negative because of Lemma 3.2, which implies that each factor of the product has the same sign as  $m(g)$  or is zero.  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** We still don't know if the Fourier multiplier given by  $m|_{\Gamma'_n}$  is bounded or not in  $L_p(\mathcal{L}\Gamma'_n)$ , but what can be proven is that this symbol do not verify a Cotlar identity as in Theorem 1.1 respect to any possible subgroup of  $\Gamma'_n$ . To see this, suppose that  $m|_{\Gamma'_n}$  is  $(G_0, \chi)$ -invariant for some subgroup  $G_0 \leq \Gamma'_n$  and some character  $\chi$  on  $G_0$ . We claim that  $G_0 \cap L_n^+ = \emptyset$ . Firstly, let  $a: \Gamma'_n \rightarrow \Gamma'_n$  the map that permutes the two rows of a matrix and multiplies the first column by  $-1$ . If  $G_0 \cap L_n^+ \neq \emptyset$ , by the formula featuring in Remark 2.1 it would hold that for any  $h \in \Gamma'_n$  and any  $l \in G_0 \cap L_n^+$ :

$$m(lh) = \chi(l)m(h) = \chi(l)m(a(h)) = m(la(h)) = -m(lh),$$

which is of course impossible. On the other hand, fix an  $l \in L_n^+$  whose inverse is not in  $K'_n$ . Then in order to Cotlar identity to hold, one needs that:

$$m(l^{-1}) = m(h), \quad \text{for any } h \in \Gamma'_n \text{ such that } m(lh) \neq 0.$$

Pick  $h \in \Gamma'_n$  any element which verifies this equation. Let  $h'$  be given by  $h' = \omega h \omega$ , where  $\omega$  is the matrix defined at the beginning of this section. Notice that  $m(lh') = -m(lh) \neq 0$ , but  $m(h') = -m(h)$ . Therefore Cotlar identity must fail when applied to  $l$  and  $h'$ .

## References

- [Cot55] M. Cotlar. A unified theory of Hilbert transforms and ergodic theorems. *Rev. Mat. Cuyana*, 1(2):105–167, 1955.
- [GPPX22] A. Gonzalez-Perez, J. Parcet, and R. Xia. Noncommutative cotlar identities for groups acting on tree-like structures, 2022.
- [MR17] T. Mei and É. Ricard. Free Hilbert transforms. *Duke Math. J.*, 166(11):2153–2182, 2017.
- [PdIST23] J. Parcet, M. de la Salle, and E. Tablate. The local geometry of idempotent schur multipliers, 2023.
- [Ped79] G. K. Pedersen. *C\*-algebras and their automorphism groups*, volume 14 of *London Mathematical Society Monographs*. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London-New York, 1979.
- [PX03] G. Pisier and Q. Xu. Non-commutative  $L^p$ -spaces. In *Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces, Vol. 2*, pages 1459–1517. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2003.