

Ergodic repeated interaction quantum systems: Steady states and reducibility theory

Owen Ekblad^{✉*1} and Jeffrey Schenker^{✉†2}

^{1,2}Department of Mathematics, Michigan State University.

June 18, 2024

Abstract

We consider the time evolution of an open quantum system subject to a sequence of random quantum channels with a stationary distribution. This incorporates disorder into the repeated interactions (or, quantum collision models) approach to understanding open quantum dynamics. In the literature, various specific models of disorder in repeated interaction models have been considered, including the cases where the sequence of quantum channels form either i.i.d. or Markovian stochastic processes. In the present paper we consider the general structure of such models without any specific assumptions on the probability distribution, aside from stationarity (i.e., time-translation invariance). In particular, arbitrarily strong correlations between time steps are allowed. In 2021, Movassagh and Schenker (MS) introduced a unified framework in which one may study such randomized quantum dynamics, and, under a key strong decoherence assumption proved an ergodic theorem for a large class of physically relevant examples. Here, we recognize the decoherence assumption of MS as a kind of *irreducibility* and develop a reducibility theory for general stationary random repeated interaction models without this condition. Within this framework, we establish ergodic theorems extending of those obtained by MS to the general stationary setting.

1 Introduction

The dissipative effect on a quantum system arising from environmental interaction is a subject of basic scientific interest, especially in the age of the quantum computer. Since the advent of the quantum theory, it has been understood that, in order to describe the evolution of a system without explicitly including the environment, one must consider density operator formulation of quantum mechanics [Neu27; Neu32]. Under this formalism, the dynamics of a quantum system interacting with its environment is described by a quantum channel, which is a completely positive trace-preserving superoperator acting on the space of density operators [Dav76; Kra+83]. In the situation of interest for many applications of quantum information science, the state space of our quantum system is described by a finite-, d -dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} [NC12], so the set of density operators is described by the set \mathbb{S}_d of positive semidefinite $d \times d$ -matrices of trace 1,

$$\mathbb{S}_d := \{\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : \rho \geq 0 \text{ and } \text{Tr}(\rho) = 1\},$$

and a quantum channel is a completely-positive, convex-linear superoperator $\phi : \mathbb{S}_d \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_d$.

The understanding of open quantum systems is paramount in the field of quantum information. Quantum computing was independently proposed by both Manin and Feynman in the 1980's [Yur80;

*ekbladow@msu.edu

†schenke6@msu.edu

Fey82], where it was recognized that a quantum computer may be more efficient in simulating quantum physics than a classical computer. Later, in the mid-1990's, Shor's factorization quantum algorithm [Sho94] demonstrated exponential speedups over the best known classical factorization algorithms, stimulating great interest in the field of quantum computing, quantum algorithms, and quantum technologies in general. The path to physically implementing a quantum computer making use of such speedups, however, is obstructed by decoherence owed to environmental interactions [AGP06]. One proposed solution to this problem is dissipative quantum computing [VWI09], which aims to engineer system-bath dynamics in such a way that the very dissipation arising from environmental coupling robustly drives the system to a desired steady state; see [HMM22] for a review of engineering dissipation in quantum applications, and, for a more complete discussion of the history of quantum computation and technologies, one may consult the various history and further reading sections at the ends of chapters in [NC12].

One model of open quantum system-bath interactions—the repeated interaction schemes (or quantum collision models) approach—imagines the continuous-time interaction of an open quantum system \mathcal{S} with a bath \mathcal{B} as a large, discrete sequence of rapid two-body unitary interactions U_n between subsystems \mathcal{E}_n of \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{S} [AP06; Gri+16; Cic+22]. Therefore, if ρ_n describes the state of \mathcal{S} at time n , then ρ_{n+1} is described by

$$\rho_{n+1} = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}_{n+1}} (U_{n+1}(\rho_n \otimes \eta_{n+1})U_{n+1}^*),$$

where η_n is the state of \mathcal{E}_n at time n . Thus, we may model the system-bath interaction by a sequence $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of quantum channels on \mathcal{S} , so that ρ_n may be mathematically expressed

$$\rho_n = \phi_n \circ \cdots \circ \phi_1(\rho),$$

where ρ is the initial state of \mathcal{S} .

Mathematically speaking, various models of sequences $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ have been considered. On the simplest end of the spectrum, the so-called basic collision model [Cic+22, Section 4] takes $\phi_n = \phi$ for some fixed quantum channel ϕ for all n . Other authors have considered various other, more elaborate situations; see [BJM08; PP09; BJM10; NP12; BJM14; MS21; MS22; BJP22] for a non-exhaustive list. A common theme throughout these works is the appearance of steady states in the asymptotics: for example, one often recovers convergence of the form

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_n \circ \cdots \circ \phi_1(\rho) = \rho_{\text{eq}} \quad \text{or} \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \phi_n \circ \cdots \circ \phi_1(\rho) = \rho_{\text{eq}},$$

where ρ_{eq} is a (sometimes unique) steady state of the process, and ρ can be an arbitrary state [BJM06]. To achieve results of this type, it is often expedient to make various *ad hoc* assumptions on the sequences $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, but it is often unclear the extent to which these assumptions are required to get the desired type of convergence, or to what degree these assumptions affect the uniqueness of the steady state ρ_{eq} . In this work, we investigate this question.

We focus on the situation where $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of random variables, and the randomness is modelled by a general ergodic dynamical system $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$. Various instances of this model have been previously considered in the literature—such as the i.i.d. [BJM08] or Markovian [BJP22] cases—but the full generality granted by the ergodic setting was first considered, to our knowledge, by Movassagh and Schenker in [MS21; MS22]. There, the authors studied the class of *eventually strictly positive* (ESP) repeated interaction schemes, and concluded, among other things, the following ergodic theorem for such repeated interactions.

Theorem ([MS22]). *Let $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an ESP ergodic repeated interaction scheme. There is an almost surely full rank random state $\rho_{\text{eq}} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_d$ such that*

$$\phi_1(\rho_{\text{eq}}) = \rho_{\text{eq}} \circ \theta \tag{1.1}$$

holds almost surely. Moreover, for any $\vartheta \in \mathbb{S}_d$,

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left| \phi_n \circ \cdots \circ \phi_1(\vartheta) - \rho_{\mathrm{eq}} \circ \theta^n \right| = O(\mu^n)$$

for some (possibly random) constant μ with $0 < \mu < 1$ almost surely.

We call a random state ρ_{eq} satisfying (1.1) a *stationary state* or *steady state* for $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and say that ρ_{eq} satisfies the *cocycle equation*. In the following, we make no probabilistic assumptions on $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ beyond stationarity of dynamical system driving the stochastic process, and develop a general methodology for investigating the structure of the steady states of the resulting general ergodic repeated interaction quantum systems (ERISs) we consider here.

To formulate our results, we emulate the strategy utilized in the celebrated theory of Perron-Frobenius for studying real-valued matrices with positive entries [Per07; Fro+12]. In this theory, one considers the ideal-theoretic decomposition of the space \mathbb{R}^d on which matrix acts and uses this decomposition to reduce to minimal components, on which one can make strong spectral-theoretic statements which ultimately may be reinterpreted in terms of the processes the positive matrices model. Here, the reducibility theory presents by way of random orthogonal projections $P : \Omega \rightarrow \{\text{projections}\}$, where we say that P reduces the ERIS $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ if there is a (possibly random) constant $C > 0$ such that, for all N ,

$$\phi_N \circ \cdots \circ \phi_1(P) \leq C(P \circ \theta^N)$$

holds almost surely. Owing to the fact that reducing projections are, in general, *random* objects, there are some subtleties involved with properly defining minimal reducing components for ERISs. Putting this issue aside, we show that, for any minimal reducing projection P , there is a unique stationary state ρ_{eq} supported on P . Furthermore, any random state ϑ with support on P converges in Cesàro mean to ρ_{eq} , in the sense that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M (\phi_N \circ \cdots \circ \phi_1(\vartheta)) \circ \theta^{-N} = \rho_{\mathrm{eq}}$$

holds almost surely. In fact, such Cesàro mean convergence characterizes the minimality of the reducing projection P , the extent to which is explicated in Theorem 1. In particular, there is a unique stationary state ρ_{eq} for an ERIS if and only if there is a unique (nonzero) minimal reducing projection, in which case one has the almost sure convergence

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \phi_N \circ \cdots \circ \phi_1(\vartheta) = \mathbb{E}[\rho_{\mathrm{eq}}]$$

for all random states ϑ , as shown in Theorem 2.

In keeping with the stochastic interpretation granted by the Perron-Frobenius methodology we employ, we define a random projection P_{r} , which is the unique *maximal* reducing projection, in the sense that, for all stationary states ρ_{eq} , the support of ρ_{eq} is contained in the range of P_{r} . We call P_{r} the *recurrent projection*, and we call its orthogonal complement P_{t} the *transient projection*. As this terminology suggests, the recurrent and transient projections have certain global stochastic interpretations, made formal by means of Theorem 3 below.

1.1 Main results

We now describe in mathematical detail the results of this work. Let (Ω, \mathbb{P}) be a standard probability space, and $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ a measure-preserving, invertible, and ergodic transformation. We let $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \{\text{quantum channels}\}$ be a random quantum channel, and, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let ϕ_n denote the random quantum channel defined by

$$\phi_{n;\omega} := \phi_{\theta^n(\omega)}.$$

We refer to the collection $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of random channel so defined as an ERIS, and use Ω as shorthand to denote such a collection. For any $N \in \mathbb{Z}$, let Φ_N denote the random quantum channel given by

$$\Phi_N = \begin{cases} \phi_N \circ \cdots \circ \phi_1 & \text{if } N > 0 \\ \phi_0 \circ \cdots \circ \phi_N & \text{if } N \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Given a random orthogonal projection P , we say that Ω is *reduced* by P if for all $N \geq 1$,

$$\Phi_N(P) \leq C(P \circ \theta^N) \quad (1.2)$$

holds almost surely, for some (possibly random) constant $C > 0$. By Lemma 3.6, it is clear the projections I and 0 always reduce Ω ; if these are the only reducing projections, we call Ω *irreducible*. Let \mathcal{P}_Ω be the set of all nonzero reducing projections for Ω . Then \mathcal{P}_Ω is partially ordered by \leq , i.e., for $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$,

$$P \leq Q \text{ if and only if } P_\omega \leq Q_\omega \text{ for almost every } \omega \in \Omega.$$

In Proposition 3.9, we show that \mathcal{P}_Ω has minimal elements with respect to this ordering. Accordingly, we call minimal elements of \mathcal{P}_Ω *minimal reducing projections* for Ω .

One technical fact ubiquitous in this work is the following ergodic property of any ERIS Ω : in Proposition 3.2, we show that, for all random matrices X such that $\text{Tr}(X) \in L^1(\Omega)$, the limit

$$\mathfrak{E}(X) := \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=0}^{M-1} \Phi_{-N}(X \circ \theta^{-N}) \quad (1.3)$$

exists almost surely and in the $L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{M}_d)$ sense, i.e., with respect to the norm $\mathbb{E} \text{Tr} |\cdot|$.

In the following, we write \mathfrak{A} to denote the von Neumann algebra $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{M}_d)$ of random matrices with essentially bounded operator norm, and we write \mathfrak{A}_* to denote the predual of this von Neumann algebra which consists of random matrices with integrable trace. Note that random orthogonal projections P are projections in the von Neumann algebra sense as elements of \mathfrak{A} . For any such P , we write \mathfrak{A}^P (resp. \mathfrak{A}_*^P) to denote the set of elements $X \in \mathfrak{A}$ (resp. $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*$) satisfying $PXP = X$ almost surely. For a random matrix X , we say X is nonzero if $X \neq 0$ with positive probability, and we write $\text{proj}(X)$ to denote the range projection of X . Lastly, for matrices A, B , let $\langle A, B \rangle = \text{Tr}(A^*B)$. We then have the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Let $\Omega = (\Phi_N)_{N \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an ergodic repeated interaction quantum system and let P be a random projection reducing for Ω . The following are equivalent.*

- (a) *The projection P is a minimal reducing projection for Ω .*
- (b) *For all nonzero positive $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$, we have $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{E}(X))_\omega = P_\omega$ for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.*
- (c) *There is a unique stationary state ρ_{eq} with $\text{proj}(\rho_{\text{eq}})_\omega = P_\omega$ for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.*
- (d) *For all random states ϑ in \mathfrak{A}_*^P and nonzero positive $X \in \mathfrak{A}^P$ satisfying $\mathbb{E} \langle \vartheta, X \rangle = 0$, there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), X \circ \theta^N \rangle > 0.$$

- (e) *For all random states ϑ in \mathfrak{A}_*^P and nonzero positive $X \in \mathfrak{A}^P$, the almost sure limit*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), X \circ \theta^N \rangle$$

exists and satisfies

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), X \circ \theta^N \rangle \in (0, \infty) \right) > 0.$$

In the case that any of these equivalent conditions hold, $\mathfrak{E}(X)_\omega = \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(X)]\rho_{\text{eq};\omega}$ for any $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ and almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.

Since \mathfrak{Q} being irreducible is equivalent to I being the unique minimal reducing projection, the above theorem implies various characterizations of irreducibility for \mathfrak{Q} . For example, the above implies that \mathfrak{Q} is irreducible if and only if there is a unique faithful stationary state ρ_{eq} for \mathfrak{Q} , or, more generally, \mathfrak{Q} has a unique stationary state if and only if there is a unique minimal reducing projection. We call \mathfrak{Q} with a unique stationary state *dynamically ergodic*. We then have the following result.

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathfrak{Q} = (\Phi_N)_{N \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an ergodic repeated interaction quantum system. Let P be a minimal reducing projection, and let ρ_{eq} be the unique stationary state satisfying $\text{proj}(\rho_{\text{eq}}) = P$. Then for all $X \in \mathfrak{A}^P$ and all random states ϑ in \mathfrak{A}_*^P , the limit*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), X \circ \theta^N \rangle = \mathbb{E} \langle \rho_{\text{eq}}, X \rangle \quad (1.4)$$

holds almost surely and in $L^1(\Omega)$. Moreover, for any $X \in \mathfrak{A}^P$,

$$P \left(\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \Phi_N^*(X \circ \theta^N) \right) P = [\mathbb{E} \langle \rho_{\text{eq}}, X \rangle] \cdot P$$

If there is a unique minimal reducing projection for \mathfrak{Q} , i.e., if \mathfrak{Q} is dynamically ergodic, then, letting ρ_{eq} be the unique stationary state of \mathfrak{Q} , (1.4) holds for all $X \in \mathfrak{A}$ (not just $X \in \mathfrak{A}^P$). In particular, for all random states ϑ , the limit

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \Phi_N(\vartheta) = \mathbb{E}[\rho_{\text{eq}}]$$

holds almost surely and in \mathfrak{A}_* .

The above concerns some of the ergodic properties of \mathfrak{Q} . We now discuss some of the reducibility theory proper of \mathfrak{Q} . For an ERIS \mathfrak{Q} , we let P_r denote the projection defined by

$$P_r = \text{proj}(\mathfrak{E}(I)), \quad (1.5)$$

and we call P_r the *recurrent projection* of \mathfrak{Q} . We let $P_t = I - P_r$ and call P_t the *transient projection* of \mathfrak{Q} . In Lemma 3.16, we show that, for any stationary state ρ of \mathfrak{Q} , it holds that $\text{proj}(\rho) \leq P_r$. Furthermore, we have the following decomposition theorem.

Theorem 3. *Let \mathfrak{Q} be an ergodic repeated interaction quantum system with recurrent projection P_r and transient projection $P_t = I - P_r$. There is a family of random projections $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^m$ such that each Q_i is a minimal reducing projection for \mathfrak{Q} , $Q_i Q_j = Q_j Q_i = 0$ almost surely for all $i \neq j$, and $\sum_i Q_i = P_r$.*

Moreover, for any $Y \in \mathfrak{A}^{P_t}$ and any random state $\vartheta \in \mathbb{S}_d(\Omega)$, we have that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=0}^{M-1} \mathbb{E} \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), Y \circ \theta^N \rangle = 0.$$

Remark 1.1. By applying the Ergodic Decomposition Theorem [VO15, Theorem 5.1.3], the above theory may be formulated for stationary but not necessarily ergodic $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$. Indeed, by means of the Ergodic Decomposition Theory, if $\mathbb{P} \circ \theta^{-1} = \mathbb{P}$, there is an almost sure partition \mathcal{D} of Ω into θ -invariant measurable subsets $D \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\Omega = \bigsqcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} D,$$

and, loosely speaking, each of the resulting conditional probabilities $\mathbb{P}(\cdot|D)$ defines a measure for which θ is ergodic. Thus, by conditioning on ergodic components, we may recover our theorems for general stationary dynamical systems $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$.

1.2 Background and relation to other work

What we call an ERIS here was called an ergodic quantum process when it was introduced by Movasagh & Schenker in [MS21; MS22]. As mentioned in the introduction, these others restricted their attention to the case of ESP ERISs. Other random repeated interaction schemes have also been considered in the literature, including the i.i.d. and Markovian cases [BJM08; Bru+09; BJM10; NP12; BJP22]. The general ergodic framework we put forth here unifies each of these under a single theory while also serving as a vast generalization of the i.i.d. and Markovian frameworks, encompassing many other common models of randomness, including periodic, quasi-periodic, and some sequences of random variables with long-range correlations. We showcase this with examples below (see §2).

Ergodic repeated interaction schemes may be viewed as encoding the expected behavior of an underlying quantum trajectory under random generalized measurements, which were studied in [Ekb+24]. A central limit theorem has been obtained for ESP ergodic repeated interaction schemes in [PS23], and a large deviation principle is obtained in [RS]. Ergodic quantum processes in the ESP regime on finite von Neumann algebras were studied in [NR24].

The theory of quantum collision models and repeated interaction schemes as an approach to understanding open quantum dynamics has received much attention in recent years. For a non-exhaustive list of relevant physics literature, one may consult [Cic+22; Cus22] and the references therein. On the mathematical physics side, one may consult the spread of interesting work done in [AP06; BJM08; PP09; BJM14; Han+17; BB20] and consult the references therein, outside of the already-mentioned random repeated interactions literature [BJM08; Bru+09; BJM10; NP12; BJP22; MS22].

The Perron-Frobenius theory of positive operators on Banach lattices and C^* -algebras has an extensive literature. The classic theorems of Perron and Frobenius may be found in [Per07; Fro+12], and are well-exposed in [Sch74, Chapter 1]. Perhaps the most well-known generalization of the Perron-Frobenius theory to the full generality of Banach spaces is the famous Krein-Rutman theorem [KR48]. In general, the theory of positive operators on Banach lattices and positive operators on C^* -algebras is markedly different, as indicated by [Kad51; She51]. Nevertheless, the general methodology used to understand the Perron-Frobenius theory of these two types of positive operators is similar. The reader may find an excellent exposition of the Perron-Frobenius theory of positive operators on Banach lattices in [Sch74], and other general discussions of positive operators on topological vector spaces in the latter half of [SW99]. For a list of literature related to the Perron-Frobenius theory of positive operators on C^* -algebras, see [Sto63; Cho74; EH78; Gro81; Gro83; Gro84a; Gro84b; Far96; Sch01] for a start.

Specializing to the case of interest in quantum information specifically, the study of steady states, asymptotics, and decomposition theories has received attention for various reasons; the interested reader may consult the list [AGG02; San+10; Li11b; Li11a; Bur+13; CP16; CJ20; CG21; SRD24] for some further reading on this topic. For general quantum information theory, one may consult the book [Wat18].

1.3 Organization

In §3, we give the bulk of our theory. This section is organized as follows: in §3.1, we establish notation and terminology. In §3.2, we introduce the main technical tools used to prove our theorems. In §3.3, we establish fundamental results for our reducibility theory. In §3.4, we give the technical argument at the heart of the proof of Theorem 1, and then we prove this theorem. In §3.5, we introduce P_Γ and study its properties. Also in this section, we prove Theorem 3. Lastly, in §3.6, we prove Theorem 2.

As an application of this theory, we prove Theorem 4 in §4.

2 Examples

We now illustrate the above theory with some examples.

2.1 I.I.D. repeated interaction quantum systems

Let (Ξ, \mathcal{G}, μ) be a probability space, and let $\psi : \Xi \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ be a random quantum channel. We let Ω be the probability space

$$\Omega = \prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \Xi$$

with the product σ -algebra and the product measure $\mathbb{P} = \bigotimes_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu$. Let $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be the left shift map, i.e., $\theta : (\omega_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mapsto (\omega_{i+1})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$. It is a standard fact that θ is an invertible ergodic m.p.t. We then let \mathfrak{J} be the ERIS corresponding to the random quantum channel

$$\begin{aligned} \phi : \Omega &\rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}_d) \\ (\omega_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} &\mapsto \psi_{\omega_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we see that the corresponding ERIS $\mathfrak{J} = (\Phi^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ models the quantum process described by the repeated independent application of a random quantum channel distributed according to ψ , i.e., \mathfrak{J} models an i.i.d. sequence of random channels. Accordingly, we refer to any ERIS arising from such a construction an i.i.d. RIS. For such processes, we have the following general fact.

Theorem 4. *Let \mathfrak{J} be an i.i.d. RIS. If the recurrent projection P_r is deterministic, then any minimal reducing projection for \mathfrak{J} is deterministic.*

For example, if ψ is unital almost surely, the above implies that minimal reducing projections for \mathfrak{J} are deterministic.

Example 1 (I.I.D. Haar processes). Suppose that in the above, (Ξ, \mathcal{G}, μ) is $(\mathbb{U}_d, \mathcal{B}, \nu)$ where \mathbb{U}_d is the set of $d \times d$ unitary matrices, \mathcal{B} is the Borel σ -algebra on \mathbb{U}_d , and ν is the normalized Haar measure on \mathbb{U}_d . Then $\Omega = \prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{U}_d$ and \mathbb{P} is the Haar measure on Ω viewed as a compact topological group. We denote elements $(U_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of Ω by ω .

Let $\phi : \prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{U}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ be the map given by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi : \Omega = \prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{U}_d &\rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}_d) \\ \omega = (U_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} &\mapsto U_0(-)U_0^* \end{aligned}$$

so that, for example, for any $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{\leq 0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_N : \Omega = \prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{U}_d &\rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}_d) \\ \omega = (U_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} &\mapsto U_0 \cdots U_N(-)U_N^* \cdots U_0^*. \end{aligned}$$

Denote the corresponding ERIS by \mathfrak{U} .

Now, the recurrent projection P_r for \mathfrak{U} is precisely I , because it is clear that I satisfies the cocycle equation for \mathfrak{U} hence $\mathfrak{E}(I) = I$ (recall that P_r was defined to be the range projection of $\mathfrak{E}(I)$). So, by Theorem 4, any minimal reducing projection P for \mathfrak{U} is necessarily deterministic; fix such a minimal reducing projection P . Later on, we establish Lemma 3.22, which implies that $\phi_\omega^*(P) = P$ for \mathbb{P} -almost every $\omega \in \Omega$. In particular,

$$U^*PU = P$$

holds for ν -almost every $U \in \mathbb{U}_d$. This immediately implies $P = I$ or $P = 0$: indeed, assuming $U^*PU = P$ ν -almost surely, then

$$F : (|\psi\rangle, |\varphi\rangle) \mapsto \langle \psi | P | \varphi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{U}_d} \langle \psi | U^* P U | \varphi \rangle d\nu(U)$$

defines a positive-semidefinite Hermitian form invariant under the unitary action of \mathbb{U}_d on \mathbb{C}^{2d} defined by $W(|\psi\rangle, |\varphi\rangle) = (W|\psi\rangle, W|\varphi\rangle)$. In particular, the value of $F(|\psi\rangle, |\psi\rangle)$ is independent of $|\psi\rangle$, and is equal to either 0 or 1. This implies that $P = I$ or $P = 0$. Thus, since we assumed $P \neq 0$, we have $P = I$, so that, since P was an arbitrary minimal reducing projection, we have demonstrated that \mathfrak{U} is an irreducible ERIS.

By means of Theorem 1, for any i.i.d. sequence $(\rho_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of random states distributed according to ρ and any sequence of Haar-distributed random unitaries $(U_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with U_n independent of ρ_n for all n , we have the convergence

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N U_n \rho_n U_n^* = d^{-1} I.$$

Indeed, if we let $\varrho : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_d$ be defined by $(\omega_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mapsto \rho_{\omega_0}$, then we see that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \Phi_n(\varrho \circ \theta^{-n}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N W_n \rho_n W_n^*$$

where $(W_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the i.i.d. sequence of Haar-distributed unitaries defined by

$$W_n = U_0 \cdots U_{1-n}$$

This recovers, in particular, the conclusion of [NP12, Proposition 6.2], without the additional requirement that the entire sequence $(\rho_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is independent of the entire sequence $(U_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Note, however, that we are making the additional assumption that $(\rho_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an i.i.d. sequence, which is not assumed in [NP12, Proposition 6.2].

Moreover, by Theorem 2, if we let $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_d$ be *any* random state—which may be arbitrarily correlated with the entire sequence $(U_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ —then we have that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N U_n \rho U_n^* = d^{-1} I$$

holds almost surely.

Example 2 (Random repeated interaction quantum systems [NP12; BJM08]). Consider an i.i.d. sequence $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of quantum channels distributed according to $\phi : \Xi \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}_d)$. Assume as in [NP12, Theorem 5.2] that

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{there is a unique invariant state for } \phi) > 0 \tag{2.1}$$

Let \mathfrak{J} be the corresponding i.i.d. RIS. If we assume further that P_r is a deterministic projection (for example, if ϕ is almost surely unital), then we have that P_r is the unique minimal reducing projection for \mathfrak{Q} . Indeed, if not, then by Theorem 4, there are two nonzero deterministic orthogonal projections $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{M}_d$ such that P_k reduces \mathfrak{J} almost surely for both k . That is, $\phi_x(P_k) \leq dP_k$ for almost every $x \in \Xi$, so that P_k reduces ϕ almost surely. In particular, for both k , almost surely there are states $\rho_k \in \mathbb{S}_d$ such that $\rho_k \leq P_k$, and $\phi(\rho_k) = \rho_k$, via [EH78]. Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{there is a unique invariant state for } \phi) = 0,$$

a contradiction to our assumption. So, P_r is a minimal reducing projection. Therefore, Theorems 1 and 2 imply there is a unique random state $\rho_{\text{eq}} \in \mathbb{S}_d(\Omega)$ such that for all random states $\vartheta \in \mathbb{S}_d(\Omega)$, we have the almost sure convergences

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \phi_1 \circ \cdots \circ \phi_N(\vartheta) = \rho_{\text{eq}}$$

and

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \phi_N \circ \cdots \circ \phi_1(\vartheta) = \mathbb{E}[\rho_{\text{eq}}],$$

which offers an extension of the convergence result in [NP12, Theorem 5.2], in the present situation where P_τ is deterministic. In particular, the convergence in [NP12, Theorem 5.2] holds for not just deterministic input states ϑ , but any random input states $\vartheta \in \mathbb{S}_d(\Omega)$, which may be arbitrarily correlated with $(\phi_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$.

2.2 Markovian repeated interaction quantum systems

Let Ξ be a finite set, $\Xi = \{\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{m-1}\}$, let $\vec{p} = (p_0, \dots, p_{m-1})$ be a probability vector with all nonzero entries, and let 2^Ξ denote the discrete σ -algebra on Ξ . Then $(\Xi, 2^\Xi, \vec{p})$ defines a probability space where ξ_i has probability p_i . Consider the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (\Xi, 2^\Xi, \vec{p})$ and let $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be the left shift,

$$\theta((\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}) = (\xi_{n+1})_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}.$$

Let $\psi : \Xi \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ be a random quantum channel, and let $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ be defined by

$$\phi_\omega = \psi_{\omega_0}.$$

We call RIS of the form $(\Phi_N)_{N \in \mathbb{Z}}$ *Markovian repeated interaction quantum systems (MRISs)*, and write \mathfrak{M} to denote them. Note that θ need not be ergodic, but is by construction stationary for \mathbb{P} . Thus, $(\Phi_N)_{N \in \mathbb{Z}}$ models a quantum process driven by a homogeneous Markov chain on a finite state space.

Example 3 (Irreducibility in [BJP22]). In [BJP22, Theorem 3.3], the authors prove that a particular class of MRISs, there is a unique full-rank stationary state ρ_{eq} for any \mathfrak{M} in this class. Thus, by Theorem 1, any such \mathfrak{M} is an example of an irreducible RIS.

2.3 Reducible ERISs from irreducible ones

We now give an example of a reducible ERIS where we can explicitly construct the minimal reducing projections of Theorem 3, and we give the stationary states corresponding to these minimal reducing projections of Theorem 1.

Example 4 (Reducible ERISs from deterministic irreducible channels). Let $\phi \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ be a fixed irreducible quantum channel with $\sigma(\phi) \cap \mathbb{T}$ equal to the finite cyclic group Γ_h of h th roots of unity for some $h \geq 2$. Make $\Omega = \mathbb{Z}/h\mathbb{Z}$ into a probability space via the uniform distribution and let $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be the map given by $\omega \mapsto \omega + 1 \pmod{h}$. It is then clear that θ is a measurably invertible measure-preserving ergodic transformation of Ω . So, we may consider the ERIS \mathfrak{Q}_h corresponding to the map $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ where $\phi_\omega = \phi$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. We show that \mathfrak{Q}_h is a recurrent and reducible ERIS, and we explicitly construct the partition of identity that exists as guaranteed by Theorem 1.

The reducibility of \mathfrak{Q}_h is not hard to see, for if we let $\alpha = e^{2\pi i/h}$ be the generator of Γ_h , there is deterministic $Z_\alpha \in \mathbb{M}_d$ such that $\phi(Z_\alpha) = \alpha Z_\alpha$. Therefore, if we let $f_\alpha : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the function defined by

$$f_\alpha(\omega) = e^{2\pi i \omega/h},$$

then it is clear that $f_\alpha \circ \theta^{-1}(\omega) = f_\alpha(\omega - 1 \pmod{h}) = \alpha^{-1} f_\alpha(\omega)$ holds for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Thus, we see that $X = f_\alpha Z_\alpha \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\phi(X_{\theta^{-1}(\omega)}) = f_\alpha \circ \theta^{-1}(\omega) \phi(Z_\alpha) = X_\omega$$

for all $\omega \in \Omega$. That is, X_α satisfies the cocycle equation. However, we know from the irreducibility of ϕ that there is a unique deterministic $Z \in \mathbb{S}_d$ such that $\phi(Z) = Z$ [EH78], therefore because X is

expressly *non*-deterministic, it is clear that $X \notin \mathbb{CZ}$. Thus, the set of random matrices satisfying the cocycle equation for \mathfrak{Q}_h has dimension strictly greater than 1, hence by Theorem 1, \mathfrak{Q}_h is reducible.

Because ϕ is irreducible as a deterministic quantum channel, there must, therefore, be some non-deterministic projection $P \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ such that P reduces \mathfrak{Q}_h . In fact, we can explicitly construct such a P : from [EH78, Theorem 4.2], there are (nonzero, nonidentity) deterministic projections P_k for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}/h\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\phi^*(P_k) = P_{k-1}$ for all k . Thus, if we define

$$P_\omega := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}/h\mathbb{Z}} 1_{\{k\}}(\omega) P_k,$$

then we see from construction that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^*(P_{\theta(\omega)}) &= \phi^* \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}/h\mathbb{Z}} 1_{\{k\}}(\omega + 1) P_k \right) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}/h\mathbb{Z}} 1_{\{k\}}(\omega + 1) \phi^*(P_k) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}/h\mathbb{Z}} 1_{\{k-1\}}(\omega) P_{k-1} \\ &= P_\omega \end{aligned}$$

for all $\omega \in \Omega$. In particular, Lemma 3.20 implies the random projection $I - P$ reduces \mathfrak{Q}_h . Because $P \neq I$ and $P \neq 0$, it holds that $I - P$ is a nontrivial reducing projection for \mathfrak{Q}_h .

Because $\phi^*(I) = I$, it is also the case that $\phi^*(I - P) = I - P$, hence Lemma 3.20 gives that \mathfrak{Q}_h is reduced by P as well. Now, ϕ is irreducible as a deterministic channel, so it holds that $\mathfrak{E}(I)$ is a deterministic, strictly positive matrix. In particular, \mathfrak{Q}_h is recurrent. We claim that both $I - P$ and P are minimal reducing projections for \mathfrak{Q}_h , so that these random projections, then, shall serve as an explicit example of the partition of identity in Theorem 3.

To show the minimality of P , we apply Theorem 1 (d). So let $S \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ be a random state, and let $X \in \mathfrak{A}^P$ be nonzero and positive such that

$$0 = \mathbb{E} \langle S, X \rangle = \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\omega=0}^{h-1} \langle S_\omega, X_\omega \rangle.$$

So, because each X_ω is positive, we know that $\langle S_\omega, X_\omega \rangle \geq 0$ for all k , hence the above equation implies that $\langle S_\omega, X_\omega \rangle = 0$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. We want to show that there is some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \langle \Phi_N(S), X \circ \theta^N \rangle = \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\omega=0}^{h-1} \langle \phi^N(S_\omega), X_{\theta^N(\omega)} \rangle \quad (2.2)$$

is strictly positive. To do this, it suffices to show that there are some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$ for which $\langle \phi^n(S_{\omega-n}), X_\omega \rangle$ is strictly positive. This, however, holds from the fact that $\phi^h|_{P_k}$ is irreducible with $\sigma(\phi^h|_{P_k}) \cap \mathbb{T} = \{1\}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}/h\mathbb{Z}$ via the proof of [EH78, Theorem 4.4]. Thus, because $X_{\theta^{hN}(\omega)} \in P_\omega \mathbb{M}_d P_\omega$ for all ω by assumption, [EH78, Proposition 2.2] implies that there is N large enough so that $\langle \phi^{Nh}(S_\omega), X_{\theta^{Nh}(\omega)} \rangle > 0$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$; any such N makes (2.2) strictly positive. Thus, P is a minimal reducing projection. Showing that $I - P$ is a similar computation, again applying Theorem 1 (d), and we omit it.

We conclude by explicitly demonstrating the (necessarily unique by Theorem 1) stationary states $\rho_{\text{eq}}^{(P)}$ and $\rho_{\text{eq}}^{(I-P)}$ corresponding to P and $I - P$, respectively. By [EH78, Theorem 4.4] that there are states ρ_k with $\text{proj}(\rho_k) = P_k$ and $\phi(\rho_k) = \rho_{k+1}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}/h\mathbb{Z}$. Thus, we see that $\rho_{\text{eq}}^{(P)} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_d$ defined by

$$\rho_{\text{eq};\omega}^{(P)} = \rho_\omega$$

and $\rho_{\text{eq}}^{(I-P)} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_d$ defined by

$$\rho_{\text{eq};\omega}^{(I-P)} = \frac{1}{h-1} \sum_{\tilde{\omega} \in \Omega \setminus \{\omega\}} \rho_{\tilde{\omega}},$$

then we see that $\rho_{\text{eq}}^{(P)}$ satisfies $\text{proj}(\rho_{\text{eq}}^{(P)}) = P$ and $\rho_{\text{eq}}^{(I-P)}$ satisfies $\text{proj}(\rho_{\text{eq}}^{(I-P)}) = I - P$. It is straightforward to check that both of these random states are stationary for \mathfrak{Q}_h .

3 Reducibility theory

In this section, we provide the bulk of the technical reducibility theory. First, we set notation and terminology. Then, we provide the results needed to prove Theorem 1. Next, we proceed to prove Theorem 2. Lastly, we explore the properties of the recurrent projection and a process who is adjoint to \mathfrak{Q} , and use this to prove Theorem 3.

3.1 Notation and terminology

Let \mathbb{M}_d denote the $d \times d$ matrices with entries in \mathbb{C} . For $A \in \mathbb{M}_d$, we A^* denotes its adjoint. We say X is *positive* if it is self-adjoint and $\sigma(X) \subset [0, \infty)$, where $\sigma(X)$ denotes the spectrum of X . To denote a matrix is positive, we write $X \geq 0$. For any matrix A , we let $|A|$ be the positive matrix defined by $\sqrt{A^*A}$. If $X \geq 0$ is invertible, we say that X is *strictly positive*, and we denote this by $X > 0$. We call $P \in \mathbb{M}_d$ a *projection* if $P = P^* = P^2$. For any matrix $A \in \mathbb{M}_d$, we write $\text{proj}(A)$ to denote the projection onto $\text{ran}(A)$. We write I to denote the identity matrix. We let $\text{Tr}(A)$ denote the sum of the eigenvalues of A . We let \mathbb{S}_d denote the set of *states* in \mathbb{M}_d , i.e.,

$$\mathbb{S}_d := \{\rho \in \mathbb{M}_d : \rho \geq 0 \text{ and } \text{Tr}(\rho) = 1\}.$$

We endow \mathbb{M}_d with the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product, defined by

$$\langle Y, X \rangle := \text{Tr}(Y^*X) \text{ for all } X, Y \in \mathbb{M}_d.$$

It is a standard fact of matrix analysis that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ gives \mathbb{M}_d the structure of a Hilbert space; see [Bha13]. When we are viewing \mathbb{M}_d as a Hilbert space with this inner product and we want to make it explicitly clear, we will write $\mathbb{M}_{d, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle}$ to denote this Hilbert space. For any $p \in [1, \infty)$, we let $\|\cdot\|_p$ be the norm on \mathbb{M}_d defined by

$$\|A\|_p := \text{Tr}(|A|^p)^{1/p}.$$

In particular, $\|A\|_2 = \langle A, A \rangle^{1/2}$. We define $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ to be the operator norm of A viewed as a bounded linear operator on \mathbb{C}^d . We write $\mathbb{M}_{d,p}$ to denote the Banach space whose underlying vector space is \mathbb{M}_d and the norm is $\|\cdot\|_p$; because the norm induced by the inner product on $\mathbb{M}_{d, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle}$ is precisely $\|\cdot\|_2$, we shall abuse notation slightly and write $\mathbb{M}_{d,2}$ to denote the Hilbert space $\mathbb{M}_{d, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle}$. It is a standard fact that the Banach space dual $\mathbb{M}_{d,p}^*$ of $\mathbb{M}_{d,p}$ is isometrically isomorphic to $\mathbb{M}_{d,p'}$, where $p, p' \in [1, \infty]$ satisfy $(p')^{-1} + p^{-1} = 1$; see [Bha13].

For a Banach space \mathcal{X} , let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ denote the space of bounded operators on \mathcal{X} . We say that $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ is *positive* if $X \geq 0$ implies $\psi(X) \geq 0$. For any $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}_d)$, its linearity automatically implies its continuity as an operator acting on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{M}_{d, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle}$. In particular, there is a unique map $\psi^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ satisfying

$$\langle \psi(Y), X \rangle = \langle Y, \psi^*(X) \rangle$$

for all $X, Y \in \mathbb{M}_d$. We call ψ the *adjoint* of ψ . Note that the adjoint ψ^* of a positive map $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ is itself positive. We call $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ *completely positive* if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $\psi \otimes \text{Id}_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}_d \otimes \mathbb{M}_n)$

is positive, where $\text{Id}_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}_n)$ is the identity map. The Choi-Kraus theorem [Kra71; Cho75] implies that this is equivalent to there being a finite set of matrices $\{V_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \subset \mathbb{M}_d$ such that

$$\psi(X) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} V_a X V_a^*.$$

From this, one can immediately see that the adjoint of a completely positive map is completely positive. We say that $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ is *trace-preserving* if for all $X \in \mathbb{M}_d$, one has that

$$\text{Tr}(\psi(X)) = \text{Tr}(X).$$

The Riesz-Representation theorem of Hilbert spaces $\mathbb{M}_{d, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle}^* = \mathbb{M}_{d, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle}$ shows that this is equivalent to ψ^* being *identity-preserving*, i.e.,

$$\psi^*(I) = I.$$

The various norms on \mathbb{M}_d induce various norms on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}_d)$; to discern between them, we write $\|\psi\|_p$ to denote the operator norm of ψ when viewed as an element of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}_{d,p})$. We denote the set of all completely-positive and trace-preserving maps $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ by $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}_d)$, and we call an element of $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ a *quantum channel*.

For $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ a standard probability space¹ and $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ a measurable map, we call φ a measure-preserving transformation (henceforth referred to as an m.p.t.) if $\mathbb{P}(\varphi^{-1}(E)) = \mathbb{P}(E)$ for all $E \in \mathcal{F}$. We call φ invertible only if its inverse is measurable, and, if φ is an m.p.t., we call φ invertible only if its inverse is also an m.p.t. We call φ ergodic if for all $E \in \mathcal{F}$, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(\varphi^{-1}(E)\Delta E) = 0 \text{ implies } \mathbb{P}(E) \in \{0, 1\}.$$

If \mathcal{Y} is a measurable space, we denote the linear mapping defined by

$$\left(\mathcal{X} \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{Y} \right) \mapsto \left(\mathcal{X} \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathcal{X} \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{Y} \right)$$

by writing $f \mapsto K_\varphi(f)$. It is clear that $K_\varphi \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(\Omega))$ is unitary whenever φ is an invertible m.p.t. It is a standard fact of ergodic theory that an m.p.t. $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is ergodic if and only if $K_\varphi \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathcal{X}))$ has a nondegenerate eigenvalue at 1, so that, in particular, invertible m.p.t.'s of a probability space \mathcal{X} are ergodic if and only if their inverses are ergodic [Eis+15, Chapter 7]. From here forward, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ will always be a probability space and $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ an invertible, ergodic m.p.t.

To denote the \mathbb{C} -vector space of random matrices modulo almost-sure equivalence, we write $\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$. We write \mathbb{M}_d to denote the subspace of $\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ consisting of deterministic matrices. For a matrix $X \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ and a property \mathfrak{P} of \mathbb{M}_d , we often say that X has property \mathfrak{P} to mean that

$$\mathbb{P}(X \text{ has property } \mathfrak{P}) = 1.$$

So, we say that $X \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ is positive, or write $X \geq 0$, to mean that $X \geq 0$ almost surely; we say that $P \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ is a projection if $P = P^2 = P^*$ almost surely. A notable exception to this rule is that we call a matrix $X \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ *nonzero* if $\mathbb{P}(X \neq 0) > 0$; i.e., if X is not *identically* zero.² We may be redundant, saying, e.g., $X \geq 0$ almost surely, when it is necessary to emphasize that X is a random matrix. We write $\mathbb{S}_d(\Omega)$ to denote the set of $S \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ with $S \in \mathbb{S}_d$ almost surely. For a map $\mathfrak{N} : \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$, we say that \mathfrak{N} is *positive* if $X \geq 0$ implies $\mathfrak{N}(X) \geq 0$, and we call \mathfrak{N} *trace-shifting* if

$$\text{Tr}(\mathfrak{N}(X)) = \text{Tr}(K_{\theta^{-1}}(X))$$

¹Throughout, we assume Ω is a standard probability space, mainly for the purposes of applying the Ergodic Decomposition Theorem [VO15, Theorem 5.1.3]

²We come to terms with this by understanding the phrase “ $X \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ is nonzero” as being the negation of the phrase “ $X \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ is zero”, which, according to our convention, means $\mathbb{P}(X = 0) = 1$. Thus, “ $X \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ is nonzero” is understood as the negation of $\mathbb{P}(X = 0) = 1$, which is $\mathbb{P}(X \neq 0) > 0$.

for all $X \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$.

There are various natural Banach subspaces of $\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ that we consider in this work. For any $p, q \in [1, \infty]$, we write $\mathbb{M}_{d,p}^q(\Omega)$ to denote the subspace of $\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ defined by

$$\mathbb{M}_{d,p}^q(\Omega) := \{X \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega) : \|X\|_p \in L^q(\Omega)\}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathbb{M}_{d,p}^q(\Omega)$ defines a Banach space with the norm given by $\|\cdot\|_{p,q} := \mathbb{E}[\|\cdot\|_p^q]^{1/q}$, and that there is a natural isometric isomorphism of Banach spaces

$$\mathbb{M}_{d,p}^q(\Omega) \cong L^q(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{M}_{d,p}.$$

In particular, $\mathbb{M}_{d,2}^2(\Omega)$ is a Hilbert space, $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{M}_d)$ is a tracial von Neumann algebra with (normalized) trace $d^{-1}\mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\cdot)]$, and $\mathbb{M}_{1,1}^1(\Omega)$ is the von Neumann algebraic predual of $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{M}_d)$; see [RR02] for tensor products of Banach spaces and [SZ20] for facts about von Neumann algebras. We use this structure freely in the following. Following the shorthand given in the introduction, we write \mathfrak{A}_* for $\mathbb{M}_{1,1}^1(\Omega)$ and \mathfrak{A} for $\mathbb{M}_{\infty,\infty}^\infty(\Omega)$.

Note that because $\|P\|_\infty \leq 1$ almost surely for any random projection, it follows that the set of random projections is contained in $\mathbb{M}_{d,p}^q(\Omega)$ for all $p, q \in [1, \infty]$. For any random projection $P \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ and any subset $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$, we write $P\mathcal{X}P$ to denote the set

$$P\mathcal{X}P := \{X \in \mathcal{X} : PXP = X \text{ almost surely}\}.$$

Thus, $\mathfrak{A}_*^P = P\mathfrak{A}_*P$ and $\mathfrak{A}^P = P\mathfrak{A}P$, for example.

3.2 Operator-theoretic reformulation

We begin by studying the properties of the linear operator $\mathfrak{L} : \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ defined by

$$\mathfrak{L}(X)_\omega = \phi_\omega(X_{\theta^{-1}(\omega)}).$$

Note that $\mathfrak{L} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}_*)$: indeed, for any $X \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$, the random matrix $\mathfrak{L}(X)$ satisfies

$$\|\mathfrak{L}(X)\|_1 = \|\phi(K_{\theta^{-1}}(X))\|_1 \leq \|\phi\|_1 \|K_{\theta^{-1}}(X)\|_1$$

almost surely. So, because ϕ is almost surely positive and trace-preserving, the Russo-Dye theorem [Wat18, Theorem 3.39] implies $\|\phi\|_1 = 1$ almost surely. Hence, $\|\mathfrak{L}(X)\|_1 \leq \|X\|_1$, and $\|\mathfrak{L}\| \leq 1$.

Notation 3.1. For any $X \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$, we write $\mathfrak{E}(X)$ to denote the *a priori* meaningless expression

$$\mathfrak{E}(X) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mathfrak{L}^n(X),$$

purposefully leaving some ambiguity as to what topology the limit exists in, if the limit exists at all. When there is ambiguity, we will specify in what sense the limit exists. For example, we write “ $\mathfrak{E}(X)$ exists almost surely” or “ $\mathfrak{E}(X)$ exists in \mathfrak{A}_* ”.

At this point, it is appropriate to recall the Theorem of Beck & Schwartz [BS57, Theorem 2].

Theorem (Beck & Schwartz, 1957 [BS57]). *Let \mathcal{X} be a Banach space and let (S, Σ, m) be a σ -finite measure space. Let $s \mapsto T_s$ be a strongly measurable function taking values in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$. Suppose that $\|T_s\| \leq 1$ for all $s \in S$. Let h be a measure-preserving transformation in (S, Σ, m) . Then for each $X \in L^1(S, \mathcal{X})$, there is $\bar{X} \in L^1(S, \mathcal{X})$ such that*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M T_s \cdots T_{h^{N-1}(s)}(X_{h^N(s)}) = \bar{X}_s$$

strongly in \mathcal{X} almost everywhere in S , and $\bar{X}_s = T_s(\bar{X}_{h(s)})$ almost everywhere in S . Moreover, if $m(S) < \infty$, then \bar{X} is also the limit in the mean of order 1.

Because $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ is a separable space, strong measurability of $\omega \mapsto \phi_\omega$ is assured by Pettis's theorem [Pet38, Theorem 1.1]. Therefore, taken with the Uniform Boundedness Principle [Con07, Theorem III.14.1], the theorem of Beck & Schwartz gives the following.

Proposition 3.2. *For all $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*$, the limit $\mathfrak{E}(X)$ exists in \mathfrak{A}_* and almost surely. Moreover, \mathfrak{E} defines a positive map in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}_*)$ with the property that $\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}\mathfrak{E} = \mathfrak{E} = \mathfrak{E}^2$.*

Now, let $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*$. By the tracial Hölder's inequality, we have that $|\mathrm{Tr}(X)| \leq \mathrm{Tr}|X|$, so $\mathrm{Tr}(X) \in L^1(\Omega)$. We know that $\mathfrak{E}_N(X)$ converges to $\mathfrak{E}(X)$ almost surely, so that $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathfrak{E}_N(X))$ converges to $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathfrak{E}(X))$ almost surely. So, the trace-shifting property of \mathfrak{L} gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}(\mathfrak{E}(X)) &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mathrm{Tr}(\mathfrak{L}^n(X)) \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mathrm{Tr}(\theta^{-n}X) = \mathbb{E} \mathrm{Tr}(X) \end{aligned}$$

almost surely, which follows from Birkhoff's ergodic theorem and the fact that $\mathrm{Tr}(X) \in L^1(\Omega)$. We record this fact as a lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *For all $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*$, $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathfrak{E}(X)) = \mathbb{E} \mathrm{Tr}(X)$.*

Remark 3.4. If $X \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ and the limit $\mathfrak{E}(X)$ exists *almost surely*, it is in general true that $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathfrak{E}(X))$ is almost surely constant and equal to $\mathbb{E} \mathrm{Tr}(X)$. Indeed, $\mathfrak{L}\mathfrak{E} = \mathfrak{E}$ on the domain where the almost sure limit \mathfrak{E} exists, so by the trace-shifting property of \mathfrak{L} , we find that $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathfrak{E}(X)) = \mathrm{Tr}(K_{\theta^{-1}}(\mathfrak{E}(X)))$, and by ergodicity we conclude $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathfrak{E}(X))$ is constant.

So, by a truncation argument applied to $X \geq 0$ whenever $\mathfrak{E}(X)$ exists almost surely, Lemma 3.3 implies that $\mathbb{E} \mathrm{Tr}(X) = \mathrm{Tr}(\mathfrak{E}(X)) < \infty$ almost surely, and $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*$.

We denote the set of fixed points of the linear map $\mathfrak{L} : \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ by $\mathrm{Fix}(\mathfrak{L})$. That is, $\mathrm{Fix}(\mathfrak{L})$ is the set of random matrices X such that $\mathfrak{L}(X) = X$. For such a random matrix, it is clear that the almost sure limit $\mathfrak{E}(X)$ exists and is equal to X . In particular, by the above remark, $\mathrm{Fix}(\mathfrak{L}) \subseteq \mathfrak{A}_*$. Thus, $\mathrm{Fix}(\mathfrak{L})$ is precisely the eigenspace of $\mathfrak{L} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}_*)$ corresponding to the eigenvalue 1.

By Proposition 3.2, $\mathfrak{L}\mathfrak{E} = \mathfrak{E}$ and \mathfrak{E} is positive. Moreover, Lemma 3.3 implies that

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathfrak{E}(I)) = \mathbb{E} \mathrm{Tr}(I) = d \tag{3.1}$$

almost surely. Because $\mathfrak{E}(I) \geq 0$, this implies that $\mathfrak{E}(I)$ is nonzero almost surely. Thus, the \mathfrak{A}_* -limit $\mathfrak{E}(I)$ is a nonzero fixed point of \mathfrak{L} . Moreover, $\mathfrak{E}(I) \geq 0$ implies $\|\mathfrak{E}(I)\|_\infty \leq \mathrm{Tr}(\mathfrak{E}(I))$ almost surely, so (3.1) tells us that $\mathfrak{E}(I) \in \mathfrak{A}$. We have then proved the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *There is $Z \geq 0$ in $\mathrm{Fix}(\mathfrak{L}) \cap \mathfrak{A}$ with $\mathbb{P}(Z \neq 0) = 1$.*

3.3 Reducibility

Recall the definition of reducibility: we say that a random projection $P \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ reduces \mathfrak{Q} if $\Phi_N(P) \leq CK_{\theta^N}(P)$ almost surely for all N for some (possibly random) constant $C > 0$. A moment's thought reveals that this is equivalent to asking that

$$\mathfrak{L}(P) \leq CP$$

almost surely. The following lemmas are of a standard sort.

Lemma 3.6. *Let P be a random projection. The following are equivalent.*

- (a) $\mathfrak{L}(P) \leq dP$.

(b) $\mathfrak{L}(P) \in P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$.

(c) The subspace $P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$ of $\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ is invariant under \mathfrak{L} .

(d) There is random $C > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{L}(P) \leq CP$ almost surely, i.e., P reduces \mathfrak{L} .

Proof. We first show that (a) implies (b). Assume $\mathfrak{L}(P) \leq dP$. Then $P_\omega\mathbb{M}_dP_\omega$ is a hereditary C^* -subalgebra of \mathbb{M}_d and $\mathfrak{L}(P)_\omega \geq 0$, it holds that $\mathfrak{L}(P)_\omega \in P_\omega\mathbb{M}_dP_\omega$. In particular, $P\mathfrak{L}(P)P = \mathfrak{L}(P)$ almost surely, so $\mathfrak{L}(P) \in P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$.

We now show that (b) implies (c). Let $X \in P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$. Then $PXP = X$ and $PX^*P = X^*$ almost surely, so $X^* \in P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$. Thus, $2^{-1}(X + X^*)$ and $(2i)^{-1}(X - X^*)$ are in $P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$, and so to show that $P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$ is invariant under \mathfrak{L} , it suffices to show the set of self-adjoint elements of $P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$ is invariant under \mathfrak{L} . Now, for X self-adjoint, it holds that

$$-\|X\|_\infty \text{proj}(X) \leq X \leq \|X\|_\infty \text{proj}(X)$$

almost surely. Because $X \in P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$, we have that $\text{proj}(X) \leq P$ almost surely, so the above implies that $-\|X\|_\infty P \leq X \leq \|X\|_\infty P$. Because \mathfrak{L} is a positive map and ϕ is linear, this gives that

$$-K_{\theta^{-1}}(\|X\|_\infty)\mathfrak{L}(P) \leq \mathfrak{L}(X) \leq K_{\theta^{-1}}(\|X\|_\infty)\mathfrak{L}(P).$$

Because $\mathfrak{L}(P) \in P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$ and $\mathfrak{L}(X)$ is self-adjoint (by the assumed self-adjointness of X and the positivity of \mathfrak{L}), this immediately implies that $\mathfrak{L}(X) \in P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$, which implies the desired invariance.

That (c) implies (d) follows because if $\mathfrak{L}(P) \in P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$, then we have that $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{L}(P)) \leq P$, hence by the fact that $\|P\|_1 \leq d$ almost surely (since P is a projection), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{L}(P) &\leq \|\mathfrak{L}(P)\|_\infty P \leq \|\mathfrak{L}(P)\|_1 P \\ &\leq \|\phi\|_1 K_{\theta^{-1}} P \|P\|_1 P \leq dP \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

since $\|\phi\|_1 = 1$ almost surely by trace-preservation and Russo-Dye.

Lastly, to see that (d) implies (a), note that hypothesis (d) implies that $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{L}(P)) \leq P$ almost surely. Thus, we may apply (3.2) to conclude that \mathfrak{L} is reduced by P . \blacksquare

Because condition (d) is implied by the definition of reducibility, the above implies that the constant C taken in the definition of reducibility may be chosen to be d , the dimension in \mathbb{M}_d .

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose Z is a positive random matrix with $\mathfrak{L}(Z) = Z$. Then $\text{proj}(Z)$ reduces \mathfrak{L} .*

Proof. Note that by $\mathfrak{L}(Z) = Z$ and the trace-shifting property of \mathfrak{L} ,

$$0 = \mathbf{1}_{\{\text{Tr}(Z)=0\}} \text{Tr}(Z) = \mathbf{1}_{\{\text{Tr}(Z)=0\}} \text{Tr}(\mathfrak{L}(Z)) = \mathbf{1}_{\{\text{Tr}(Z)=0\}} \text{Tr}(\theta^{-1}Z)$$

almost surely. So, we have the almost sure inclusion $\{\text{Tr}(Z) = 0\} \supseteq \theta^{-1}\{\text{Tr}(Z) = 0\}$. Measure-preservation and ergodicity of θ^{-1} implies that $\mathbb{P}(\text{Tr}(Z) = 0) \in \{0, 1\}$. Because $Z \geq 0$ almost surely, this implies that $\mathbb{P}(Z = 0) \in \{0, 1\}$. If $Z = 0$ almost surely, then it is clear that $\text{proj}(Z) = 0$ reduces \mathfrak{L} , so suppose $\mathbb{P}(Z = 0) = 0$.

Let $\lambda_{\min} = \min(\sigma(Z) \cap \mathbb{R}^{>0})$ and $\lambda_{\max} = \max \sigma(Z)$. Because $\mathbb{P}(Z = 0) = 0$ and $Z \geq 0$, it holds that λ_{\min} is well-defined and also that $\lambda_{\min}, \lambda_{\max} > 0$ almost surely. By the equation

$$0 \leq \lambda_{\min} \text{proj}(Z) \leq Z \leq \lambda_{\max} \text{proj}(Z)$$

holding almost surely, the positivity of \mathfrak{L} gives

$$0 \leq (K_{\theta^{-1}}(\lambda_{\min}))\mathfrak{L}(\text{proj}(Z)) = \mathfrak{L}(\lambda_{\min} \text{proj}(Z)) \leq \mathfrak{L}(Z) = Z$$

almost surely. So, since $\lambda_{\min} > 0$ almost surely, we have that

$$\mathfrak{L}(\text{proj}(Z)) \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{K_{\theta^{-1}}(\lambda_{\min})} \text{proj}(Z)$$

almost surely, so that, by Lemma 3.6, $\text{proj}(Z)$ reduces \mathfrak{L} . \blacksquare

In the proof of the above lemma, we saw that, for any *nonzero* positive random matrix Z with $\mathfrak{L}(Z) = Z$, it is necessarily true that $\mathbb{P}(Z = 0) = 0$. We also have a similarly useful fact about reducing projections. Note that $\text{Tr}(P) = \text{rank}(P)$ for any projection P .

Lemma 3.8. *Let P be a nonzero random projection. If P reduces \mathfrak{Q} , then $\text{Tr}(P) > 0$ almost surely, that is, $\text{rank}(P) \geq 1$ almost surely.*

Proof. For P reducing \mathfrak{Q} , we know that $\mathfrak{L}(P) \leq dP$. So, positivity and the trace-shifting property of \mathfrak{L} implies

$$0 \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{\text{Tr}(\theta^{-1}P)=0\}} \text{Tr}(P) \leq d \mathbb{1}_{\{\text{Tr}(\theta^{-1}P)=0\}} \text{Tr}(\mathfrak{L}(P)) = d \mathbb{1}_{\{\text{Tr}(\theta^{-1}P)=0\}} \text{Tr}(\theta^{-1}P) = 0$$

almost surely. So, the almost sure inclusion $\{\text{Tr}(P) = 0\} \supseteq \theta\{\text{Tr}(P) = 0\}$ holds. Measure-preservation and ergodicity of θ implies that $\mathbb{P}(\text{Tr}(P) = 0) \in \{0, 1\}$. Since P is nonzero, this implies that $\text{Tr}(P) > 0$ almost surely, as desired. ■

Now, note that the set of random projections is partially ordered by \leq . Consider the set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{Q}}$ of nonzero reducing projections for \mathfrak{Q} . Then $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{Q}}$ inherits the partial ordering \leq . The last fundamental fact about reducing projections is that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{Q}}$ contains minimal elements.

Proposition 3.9. *The set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{Q}}$ of nonzero reducing projections for \mathfrak{Q} contains minimal elements.*

Proof. We apply Zorn's lemma. So, let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a totally ordered decreasing set in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{Q}}$, i.e., $i \geq j$ implies $P_i \leq P_j$. For all $i \in I$ and $r = 1, \dots, d$, let

$$E_i^{(r)} := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \text{Tr}(P_{i;\omega}) \geq r \right\} \in \mathcal{F}.$$

For any $i, j \in I$, that \mathcal{P} is totally ordered implies that $P_i \leq P_j$ if and only if $\text{Tr}(P_i) \leq \text{Tr}(P_j)$ almost surely. So, $P_i \leq P_j$ if and only if $E_i^{(r)} \subseteq E_j^{(r)}$ almost surely for all $r = 1, \dots, d$: indeed, $E_i^{(r)} \subseteq E_j^{(r)}$ almost surely means $\text{Tr}(P_i) \geq r$ implies $\text{Tr}(P_j) \geq r$ almost surely for all $r = 1, \dots, d$. So, for any r , $\text{Tr}(P_i) = r$ implies $\text{Tr}(P_j) \geq r$ almost surely, hence $\text{Tr}(P_j) \geq \text{Tr}(P_i)$, so $P_i \leq P_j$. The converse of this is clear.

For each r , let $m_r := \inf_i \mathbb{P}(E_i^{(r)})$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $i_n \in I$ recursively by $i_{n+1} > i_n$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{i_{n+1}}^{(r)}) \leq m_r + \frac{1}{n+1}$$

for all $r \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Let $S^{(r)} = \bigcap_n E_{i_n}^{(r)}$. Then it is clear that

$$\mathbb{P}(S^{(r)}) = \lim_n \mathbb{P}(E_{i_n}^{(r)}) = m_r,$$

since $E_{i_{n+1}}^{(r)} \subseteq E_{i_n}^{(r)}$ almost surely for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let now $P = \inf_n P_{i_n}$. We claim that $P \leq P_i$ almost surely for all $i \in I$. To see this, fix $i \in I$, and suppose there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $i_N \geq i$. Then it holds that $E_{i_N}^{(r)} \subseteq E_i^{(r)}$ almost surely for all r , hence $P_{i_N} \leq P_i$ almost surely. Because $P \leq P_{i_N}$, it holds that $P \leq P_i$. On the other hand, if i is such that $i > i_n$ for all n , then $P_i \leq P_{i_n}$ for all n hence $P_i \leq P$. Also, $E_i^{(r)} \subseteq S^{(r)}$ almost surely for all $r \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. By the definition of m_r and the construction of $S^{(r)}$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}(S^{(r)}) \geq \mathbb{P}(E_i^{(r)}) \geq m_r = \mathbb{P}(S^{(r)}).$$

Thus, $\mathbb{P}(S^{(r)} \Delta E_i^{(r)}) = 0$ for all r . So, $E_i^{(r)} = S^{(r)}$ almost surely for all r , hence $\text{Tr}(P_i) \leq \text{Tr}(P)$ almost surely, whereby we conclude $P \leq P_i$ so that $P = P_i$ almost surely. So P is a lower bound on \mathcal{P} .

To see that $P \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$, recall by Lemma 3.6 that $\mathfrak{L}(P_i) \leq dP_i$ for all i , as $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$. Because $P \leq P_i$ for all i , positivity of \mathfrak{L} implies

$$0 \leq \mathfrak{L}(P) \leq \mathfrak{L}(P_{i_n}) \leq dP_{i_n}$$

for all n . So, $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{L}(P)) \leq P_{i_n}$ almost surely for all n . The infimum property of P implies that $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{L}(P)) \leq P$ almost surely, so that $\mathfrak{L}(P) \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$. Thus, P reduces Ω . To see that P is actually nonzero, note that each P_i is nonzero, so that, by Lemma 3.8, $\text{tr}(P_i) \geq 1$ almost surely. In particular, $\text{tr}(P) = \inf_n \text{Tr}(P_{i_n}) \geq 1$ almost surely, so P is nonzero almost surely. So, $P \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$. Zorn's lemma gives the result. \blacksquare

3.3.1 Schaefer irreducibility

Now, we discuss the relationship between the above notion of reducibility and another previously-introduced notion of irreducibility for general positive operators on real ordered Banach spaces.

In [SW99, Appendix, §3], the following definition of irreducibility is given. Let \mathcal{X} be an ordered real Banach space \mathcal{X} with positive cone $\mathcal{C} \neq \{0\}$. We call $X \in \mathcal{C}$ *quasi-interior* if $\overline{\text{span}}([0, X]) = \mathcal{X}$, where $[0, X]$ denotes the order interval

$$[0, X] = \{Y \in \mathcal{C} : 0 \leq Y \leq X\}.$$

For an operator $\mathfrak{J} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$, let $r(\mathfrak{J})$ denote the spectral radius, and for $\lambda \notin \sigma(\mathfrak{J})$, let $R_{\mathfrak{J}}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ denote the resolvent of \mathfrak{J} at λ , i.e.,

$$R_{\mathfrak{J}}(\lambda) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda^n} \mathfrak{J}^{n-1}$$

We call a positive operator $\mathfrak{J} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ *Schaefer-irreducible* if there is $\lambda > r(\mathfrak{J})$ such that for all nonzero $X \in \mathcal{C}$, the element

$$\mathfrak{J}R_{\mathfrak{J}}(\lambda)(X) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda^n} \mathfrak{J}^n(X)$$

is quasi-interior.

Lemma 3.10. *Let P be a random projection with $\text{Tr}(P) > 0$ almost surely. The set of quasi-interior points of \mathfrak{A}_*^P is precisely the set of positive $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ with $\text{proj}(X) = P$.*

Proof. Let $X \geq 0$ be a fixed element of \mathfrak{A}_*^P throughout. Suppose first that X satisfies $\text{proj}(X) = P$. Let $Q \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ be a projection. Let $\lambda : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{>0}$ be the minimal nonzero eigenvalue of X . We begin with the trivial chain of inequalities

$$0 \leq \lambda Q \leq \lambda P \leq X. \quad (3.3)$$

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, if we write $\tilde{A}_n = (2^{-n-1}, 2^{-n}]$ and $A_n = \{\lambda \in \tilde{A}_n\}$, then from $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$, we have that

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} A_n. \quad (3.4)$$

Because $0 \leq 2^{-n-1}1_{A_n}Q \leq \lambda Q$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the inequality (3.3) gives that

$$0 \leq 2^{-n-1}1_{A_n}Q \leq X$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. In particular, $1_{A_n}Q \in \text{span}[0, X]$. Because the union (3.4) is a disjoint one, we have

$$Q = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 1_{A_n}Q \in \overline{\text{span}}[0, X],$$

where the sum is understood to be an \mathfrak{A}_* -limit. Because \mathfrak{A}_* is the closed span of its projections, we have demonstrated that X is quasi-interior.

Conversely, suppose that X satisfies $\text{proj}(X) \neq P$. Then, letting Q denote $\text{proj}(X)$, we have that $Q \leq P$, so that $P - Q$ is a nonzero positive element of \mathfrak{A}_*^P . Because $\text{Tr}((P - Q)Y) = 0$ for all $Y \in [0, X]$ and trace is linear and continuous, we have that $\text{Tr}((P - Q)Z) = 0$ for all $Z \in \overline{\text{span}}[0, X]$. Consequently, $P - Q \notin \overline{\text{span}}[0, X]$, so X is not quasi-interior. \blacksquare

To denote the operator $\mathfrak{L}|_{PM_{d,q}^p(\Omega)P} \in \mathcal{B}(PM_{d,q}^p(\Omega)P)$, we write $\mathfrak{L}|_P$, indicating on which Banach space it is acting as necessary. The following proposition may be understood as one justification that, for minimal $P \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$, the map $\mathfrak{L}|_P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}_*^P)$ is irreducible.

Proposition 3.11. *A random projection $P \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$ is minimal if and only if $\mathfrak{L}|_P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}_*^P)$ is Schaefer-irreducible.*

Proof. First, suppose that $P \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$ is not minimal. Then there is $Q \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$ with $Q \leq P$ and $Q \neq P$. So, $0 \leq P - Q$ is nonzero and has the property that, for all positive $X \in Q\mathfrak{A}_*Q$, $\langle X, P - Q \rangle = 0$ almost surely. In particular, because Q reduces Ω , for all $X \geq 0$ in $Q\mathfrak{A}_*Q$, $0 \leq \mathfrak{L}R_\Omega(2)(X) \in Q\mathfrak{A}_*Q$. Hence,

$$\text{Tr}(\mathfrak{L}R_\Omega(2)(X)(P - Q)) = 0$$

almost surely. Because $P - Q \leq P$ is positive and nonzero, this implies that $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{L}R_\Omega(2)(X)) \neq P$. Thus, $\mathfrak{L}|_P$ is not Schaefer-irreducible.

Conversely, suppose that $P \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$ is minimal. Then fix $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ positive and nonzero. Let Z denote the element

$$Z := \mathfrak{L}R_\Omega(2)(X) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \mathfrak{L}^n(X).$$

We want to show that $\text{proj}(Z) = P$, which by Lemma 3.10 is equivalent to $0 \leq Z$ being quasi-interior. This will then imply that $\mathfrak{L}|_P$ is Schaefer-irreducible. To do this, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \text{Tr}(Z) &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \text{Tr}(\mathfrak{L}^n(X)) \right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \mathbb{E} \text{Tr}(\theta^{-n}X) && \text{by monotone convergence} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \mathbb{E} \text{Tr}(X) && \text{by measure-preservation of } \theta \\ &= \mathbb{E} \text{Tr}(X) \in (0, \infty) \end{aligned}$$

since $X \geq 0$ is nonzero and in \mathfrak{A}_* . So, since $Z \geq 0$, it is necessarily true that Z is nonzero. In particular, $\text{proj}(Z) \neq 0$. So, to show that $\text{proj}(Z) = P$, by minimality of $P \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$ it suffices to show that $\text{proj}(Z)$ reduces Ω . To see this, define

$$\lambda_{\max} = 1_{\{Z=0\}} + 1_{\{Z \neq 0\}} \max \sigma(Z) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\min} = 1_{\{Z=0\}} + 1_{\{Z \neq 0\}} \min \sigma(Z).$$

Note that $\lambda_{\max}, \lambda_{\min} > 0$ almost surely. Also, it is clear that $\lambda_{\min} \text{proj}(Z) \leq Z \leq \lambda_{\max} \text{proj}(Z)$ almost surely, as $Z \geq 0$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{L}(\text{proj}(Z)) &\leq \frac{1}{K_{\theta^{-1}}(\lambda_{\min})} \mathfrak{L}(Z) = \frac{1}{K_{\theta^{-1}}(\lambda_{\min})} \mathfrak{L} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \mathfrak{L}^n(X) \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{K_{\theta^{-1}}(\lambda_{\min})} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \mathfrak{L}^{n+1}(X) \leq \frac{2}{K_{\theta^{-1}}(\lambda_{\min})} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \mathfrak{L}^n(X) \\ &= \frac{2}{K_{\theta^{-1}}(\lambda_{\min})} Z \\ &\leq \frac{2\lambda_{\max}}{K_{\theta^{-1}}(\lambda_{\min})} \text{proj}(Z). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.6, we have that $\text{proj}(Z)$ reduces Ω , which concludes the proof. \blacksquare

3.4 Fixed points

We now state one of the main technical results of the paper. Recall \mathcal{P}_Ω denotes the set of (random) nonzero reducing projections for Ω and that $\text{Fix}(\mathfrak{L})$ is the set of random matrices X with $\mathfrak{L}(X) = X$ almost surely.

Proposition 3.12. *Let $P \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$ be minimal, and let $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ be self-adjoint with $\mathfrak{L}(X) = X$. Then either $\mathbb{P}(X \geq 0) = 1$ or $\mathbb{P}(-X \geq 0) = 1$.*

We prove this proposition in steps. First, note that if $X = X^*$ almost surely and $\mathfrak{L}(X) = X$, the positivity of ϕ implies that

$$0 \leq 1_{\{K_{\theta^{-1}}(X) \geq 0\}} \phi(K_{\theta^{-1}}(X)) = 1_{\{K_{\theta^{-1}}(X) \geq 0\}} \mathfrak{L}(X) = 1_{\{K_{\theta^{-1}}(X) \geq 0\}} X$$

almost surely. Thus, $\theta \{X \geq 0\} \subseteq \{X \geq 0\}$ almost surely, and so measure-preservation and ergodicity of θ implies that $\mathbb{P}(X \geq 0) \in \{0, 1\}$. We record this fact as a lemma.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $X \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ be self-adjoint with $\mathfrak{L}(X) = X$. Then either $\mathbb{P}(X \geq 0) = 0$ or $\mathbb{P}(X \geq 0) = 1$.*

By replacing X by $-X$, this lemma immediately implies $\mathbb{P}(-X \geq 0) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all self-adjoint $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ satisfying $\mathfrak{L}(X) = X$. So, to show that either $\mathbb{P}(X \geq 0) = 1$ or $\mathbb{P}(-X \geq 0) = 1$, it suffices to show that it is impossible that $\mathbb{P}(X \geq 0) = \mathbb{P}(-X \geq 0) = 0$. Because $X = X^*$ almost surely, $\sigma(X) \subset \mathbb{R}$, and so $\mathbb{P}(X \geq 0) = \mathbb{P}(-X \geq 0) = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{P}(\min \sigma(X) < 0 < \max \sigma(X)) = 1. \quad (3.5)$$

We show that this leads to a contradiction. A first step in this direction is the following routine generalization of Lemma 3.5.

Lemma 3.14. *Let $P \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$ be minimal. Then there is nonzero positive Z in $\mathfrak{A}^P \cap \text{Fix}(\mathfrak{L})$ with $\text{proj}(Z) = P$ almost surely.*

Proof. Because P reduces Ω , $Z := \mathfrak{E}(P) \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$, as \mathfrak{A}_*^P is closed. Clearly, $Z \geq 0$ and $\mathfrak{L}(Z) = Z$. Moreover, since $P \geq 0$ is nonzero, $0 < \mathbb{E} \text{Tr}(P) = \text{Tr}(\mathfrak{E}(P))$ by Lemma 3.3. Also, $Z \geq 0$ and P being a projection implies $\|Z\|_\infty \leq \text{Tr}(Z) = \mathbb{E} \text{Tr}(P) \leq d$, so $Z \in \mathfrak{A}$. Lastly, since Z is a nonzero fixed point, $\text{proj}(Z) \neq 0$, and Lemma 3.7 implies that $\text{proj}(Z)$ reduces Ω . However, $Z \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$, so $\text{proj}(Z) \leq P$ almost surely. The minimality of P then implies that $\text{proj}(Z) = P$ almost surely. ■

Now fix $P \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$ minimal and fix $Z \in \mathfrak{A}^P \cap \text{Fix}(\mathfrak{L})$ as in the lemma above. Suppose $X = X^* \in \text{Fix}(\mathfrak{L}) \cap \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ satisfies (3.5). Let $Z(\cdot)$ denote the function defined by

$$\begin{aligned} Z(\cdot) : [0, \infty) &\rightarrow \text{Fix}(\mathfrak{L}) \cap \mathfrak{A}_*^P \\ Z(a) &:= aX + Z. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

It is clear that $Z(a) \in \text{Fix}(\mathfrak{L}) \cap \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ for all $a \geq 0$. Moreover, it is clear that $Z(a)$ is self-adjoint for all a , so that by Lemma 3.13 we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(-Z(a) \geq 0), \mathbb{P}(Z(a) \geq 0) \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (3.7)$$

Note that $Z(0) = Z \geq 0$. Also, as (3.5) implies X is nonzero, there must be $a_0 > 0$ large enough such that $a \geq a_0$ yields

$$\mathbb{P}(Z(a) \geq 0) = \mathbb{P}(-Z(a) \geq 0) = 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Indeed, if for $Y \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ self-adjoint we define

$$\lambda_P^{\min}(Y) := \min \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \text{proj}(PYP - \lambda P) \neq P \}$$

and define $\lambda_P^{\max}(Y)$ similarly, then Weyl's perturbation theorem for self-adjoint matrices (see Lemma A.1) yields

$$\max(|\lambda_P^{\min}(Y) - \lambda_P^{\min}(Y')|, |\lambda_P^{\max}(Y) - \lambda_P^{\max}(Y')|) \leq \|Y - Y'\|_\infty \quad (3.9)$$

almost surely for all Y, Y' self-adjoint random matrices. In particular, noting that $Z \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{d, \|\cdot\|_\infty})$ and

$$\lambda_P^{\min}(aX) = \min \sigma(aX) < 0 < \max \sigma(aX) = \lambda_P^{\max}(aX)$$

almost surely for all $a > 0$ since $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$, if we let $r > 0$ be such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\min \sigma(X) \leq -r < 0 < r \leq \max \sigma(X)) > 0,$$

then for all $a \geq a_0$ with $a_0 = r^{-1} \left(1 + \|Z\|_{L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{M}_{d, \|\cdot\|_\infty})}\right)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 0 < \mathbb{P}(\min \sigma(X) \leq -r < 0 < r \leq \max \sigma(X)) \\ &= \Pr \left(\begin{array}{c} \min \sigma(X) \leq -r < 0 < r \leq \max \sigma(X) \quad \text{and} \\ \max(|\min \sigma(aX) - \lambda_P^{\min}(Z(a))|, |\max \sigma(aX) - \lambda_P^{\max}(Z(a))|) \leq \|Z\|_\infty \end{array} \right) \quad \text{by (3.9)} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\lambda_P^{\min}(Z(a)) < 0 < \lambda_P^{\max}(Z(a))) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\min \sigma(Z(a)) < 0 < \max \sigma(Z(a))) \end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality follows by choice of a_0 , and the last equality follows since $Z(a) \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$. In particular, (3.7) implies that (3.8) holds for all $a \geq a_0 > 0$, as asserted.

So, let $a_* \geq 0$ be the infimum of all $a_0 > 0$ such that $a \geq a_0$ implies (3.8). Then for all $0 \leq a < a_*$, it holds that $Z(a) \geq 0$ or $-Z(a) \geq 0$. In fact, we claim that $Z(a_*) \geq 0$ or $-Z(a_*) \geq 0$. Certainly, if $a_* = 0$, this is true. Else, $a_* > 0$, and suppose for a contradiction that there is $r > 0$ with

$$\mathbb{P}(\min \sigma(Z(a_*)) \leq -r < 0 < r \leq \max \sigma(Z(a_*))) > 0.$$

Then there is some $M > 0$ large enough for which

$$\mathbb{P}(\min \sigma(Z(a_*)) \leq -r < 0 < r \leq \max \sigma(Z(a_*)) \text{ and } \|X\|_\infty \leq M) > 0.$$

So, by Weyl's perturbation theorem, there must be some small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ with $a_* - \varepsilon > 0$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(\min \sigma(Z(a_* - \varepsilon)) < 0 < \max \sigma(Z(a_* - \varepsilon))) > 0.$$

This, however, is a contradiction, because $0 < a_* - \varepsilon < a_*$, and a_* was chosen to be an infimum. So, $Z(a_*) \geq 0$ or $-Z(a_*) \geq 0$.

Now then, Lemma 3.7 implies that $\text{proj}(\pm Z(a)) \leq P$ reduces Ω for all $0 \leq a \leq a_*$. The minimality of P implies that $\text{proj}(\pm Z(a)) \in \{0, P\}$. If $\text{proj}(\pm Z(a)) = 0$, then $Z(a) = 0$, hence $Z = -aX$. If $a = 0$, this is an immediate contradiction, because Z is nonzero. Also, for $a > 0$, this leads to the contradiction that $\min \sigma(Z) = -a \max \sigma(X) < 0$ almost surely, as $Z \geq 0$ almost surely. Thus, it must be that $\text{proj}(\pm Z(a)) = P$.

In fact, $Z(a) \geq 0$ for all $0 \leq a \leq a_*$. To see this, suppose there is some $0 < a \leq a_*$ for which $-Z(a) \geq 0$, and let $a_- \geq 0$ be the infimum of all such a . Arguing as above with Weyl's perturbation theorem, it holds that $Z(a_-) \geq 0$. Also, there is a sequence $\varepsilon_n > 0$ converging to zero with $\lambda_P^{\max}(Z(a_- + \varepsilon_n)) < 0$. Letting $r > 0$ be such that $\max \sigma(Z(a_-)) \geq r$ with some positive probability and letting $M > 0$ be large enough so that

$$\mathbb{P}(\max \sigma(Z(a_-)) > r \text{ and } \|X\|_\infty \leq M) > 0,$$

if $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is large enough so that $\varepsilon_n M < r/2$, Weyl's perturbation theorem implies

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \mathbb{P}\left(\max \sigma(Z(a_-)) > r \text{ and } \|X\|_\infty \leq M\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\max \sigma(Z(a_-)) > r \text{ and } \|X\|_\infty \leq M \text{ and } |\max \sigma(Z(a_-)) - \lambda_P^{\max}(Z(a_- + \varepsilon_n))| \leq \varepsilon_n \|X\|_\infty\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max \sigma(Z(a_-)) > r \text{ and } \|X\|_\infty \leq M \text{ and } |\max \sigma(Z(a_-)) - \lambda_P^{\max}(Z(a_- + \varepsilon_n))| \leq r/2\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_P^{\max}(Z(a_- + \varepsilon_n)) > 0\right), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Thus, $Z(a) \geq 0$ for all $0 \leq a \leq a_*$.

Now let $r > 0$ be such that $\mathbb{P}(\lambda_P^{\min}(Z(a_*)) > r) > 0$, which is guaranteed by $Z(a_*) \geq 0$ being nonzero and $\text{proj}(Z(a_*)) = P$. Then there is $M > 0$ large enough so that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_P^{\min}(Z(a_*)) > r > 0 \text{ and } \|X\|_\infty \leq M\right) > 0.$$

Let now $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough so that $M/n \leq r/2$. Weyl's perturbation theorem implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_P^{\min}(Z(a_*)) > r \text{ and } \|X\|_\infty \leq M\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_P^{\min}(Z(a_*)) > r \text{ and } \|X\|_\infty \leq M \text{ and } |\lambda_P^{\min}(Z(a_*)) - \lambda_P^{\min}(Z(a_* + n^{-1}))| \leq n^{-1} \|X\|_\infty\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_P^{\min}(Z(a_*)) > r \text{ and } \|X\|_\infty \leq M \text{ and } |\lambda_P^{\min}(Z(a_*)) - \lambda_P^{\min}(Z(a_* + n^{-1}))| \leq r/2\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_P^{\min}(Z(a_* + n^{-1})) > 0\right), \end{aligned}$$

This, however, is a contradiction, since $\lambda_P^{\min}(Z(a_* + \varepsilon)) < 0$ almost surely for all $\varepsilon > 0$ by construction of a_* . Thus, it must be that $\mathbb{P}(X \geq 0) = 1$ or $\mathbb{P}(-X \geq 0) = 1$, and Proposition 3.12 is proved.

Corollary 3.15. *For minimal $P \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$, there is a random state $\rho_{\text{eq}} \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ with $\text{proj}(\rho_{\text{eq}}) = P$ such that $P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P \cap \text{Fix}(\mathfrak{L}) = \mathbb{C}\rho_{\text{eq}}$.*

Proof. Let $Z \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P \cap \text{Fix}(\mathfrak{L})$ a nonzero positive fixed point with $\text{proj}(Z) = P$ as guaranteed by Lemma 3.14. Because $Z \geq 0$ and $\text{proj}(Z) = P$ is nonzero, we have that $\text{Tr}(Z) > 0$ almost surely. Moreover, since $Z \in \text{Fix}(\mathfrak{L})$, $\text{Tr}(Z) = \mathbb{E} \text{Tr}(Z)$ almost surely, so we may replace Z by $Z/\mathbb{E} \text{Tr}(Z)$ to assume that Z is in fact a random state.

Let $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ satisfy $\mathfrak{L}(X) = X$. Because \mathfrak{L} is a positive map, both $2^{-1}(X + X^*)$ and $(2i)^{-1}(X - X^*)$ are fixed points of \mathfrak{L} . So, to show that $\{X \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P : \mathfrak{L}(X) = X\} = \mathbb{C}Z$, it suffices to show that any self-adjoint fixed point of \mathfrak{L} is a multiple of Z .

So let $X = X^* \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ be a fixed point of \mathfrak{L} . We may assume X is nonzero, and by Proposition 3.12, we may further assume without loss of generality that $X \geq 0$. Also, because $\text{proj}(X)$ reduces \mathfrak{L} and $\text{proj}(X) \leq P$, we have that $P = \text{proj}(X)$. Lastly, $\text{Tr}(X) = \mathbb{E} \text{Tr}(X) > 0$ almost surely, and so we may replace X by $X/\mathbb{E} \text{Tr}(X)$ to assume that X is a random state.

Because \mathfrak{A}_*^P is a closed subspace of \mathfrak{A}_* , it is itself a Banach space. Moreover, Z and X are both strictly positive as elements of this Banach space, since $\text{proj}(Z) = \text{proj}(X) = P$. So, if $X \neq Z$, there is a positive linear functional φ on \mathfrak{A}_*^P such that

$$0 < \varphi(X) < \varphi(Z).$$

In particular, $0 < \varphi(X)/\varphi(Z) < 1$, so there is $\varphi(X)/\varphi(Z) < a < 1$. Fix such an a . If $X - aZ = 0$, then we are done by $a^{-1}X = Z$. Otherwise, $X - aZ$ is a nonzero self-adjoint element of $\text{Fix}(\mathfrak{L})$, so Proposition 3.12 gives that either $X - aZ \geq 0$ or $aZ - X \geq 0$, hence $\text{proj}(\pm(X - aZ)) = P$. That is, $X - aZ$ is either a strictly positive or strictly negative element of \mathfrak{A}_*^P . Because $Y \mapsto \mathbb{E} \text{Tr}(Y)$ is a positive linear functional,

$$\mathbb{E} \text{Tr}(X - aZ) = 1 - a > 0$$

implies that $X - aZ$ is not strictly negative. On the other hand, φ is also a positive linear functional, so

$$\varphi(X - aZ) = \varphi(X) - a\varphi(Z) < 0$$

by choice of a . This implies that $X - aZ$ is not strictly positive, which is, of course, a contradiction. So, it must be that either $X - aZ = 0$ or $X = Z$, which concludes the proof. \blacksquare

3.4.1 Proof of Theorem 1

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1. Recall the statement of the theorem.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathfrak{Q} = (\Phi_N)_{N \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an ergodic repeated interaction quantum system and let P be a random projection reducing for \mathfrak{Q} . The following are equivalent.*

- (a) *The projection P is a minimal reducing projection for \mathfrak{Q} .*
- (b) *For all nonzero positive $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$, we have $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{E}(X))_\omega = P_\omega$ for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.*
- (c) *There is a unique stationary state ρ_{eq} with $\text{proj}(\rho_{\text{eq}})_\omega = P_\omega$ for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.*
- (d) *For all random states ϑ in \mathfrak{A}_*^P and nonzero positive $X \in \mathfrak{A}^P$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}\langle \vartheta, X \rangle = 0$, there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), X \circ \theta^N \rangle > 0.$$

- (e) *For all random states ϑ in \mathfrak{A}_*^P and nonzero positive $X \in \mathfrak{A}^P$, the almost sure limit*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), X \circ \theta^N \rangle$$

exists and satisfies

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), X \circ \theta^N \rangle \in (0, \infty) \right) > 0.$$

In the case that any of these equivalent conditions hold, $\mathfrak{E}(X)_\omega = \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(X)]\rho_{\text{eq};\omega}$ for any $X \in \mathfrak{A}_^P$ and almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.*

Proof. We first establish the equivalence of (a), (b), and (c). The implication (a) implies (c) is given by Corollary 3.15. That (c) implies (b) follows because for any nonzero positive $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$, we have that $\mathfrak{E}(X)$ is a nonzero fixed point (via $\text{Tr}(\mathfrak{E}(X)) = \mathbb{E}\text{Tr}(X) > 0$), hence by (c) $\mathfrak{E}(X) = a\rho_{\text{eq}}$ for some $a > 0$ and random state ρ_{eq} with $\text{proj}(\rho_{\text{eq}}) = P$. So, $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{E}(X)) = \text{proj}(\rho_{\text{eq}}) = P$. That (b) implies (a) follows by the contrapositive: if $Q \leq P$ is a nonzero reducing projection with $Q \neq P$, then $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{E}(Q)) \leq Q$, hence $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{E}(Q)) \neq P$. Thus, (a), (b), and (c) are equivalent.

Now, in §3.6, using only the equivalence of (a), (b), and (c), we show that, if P is a minimal reducing projection, then for all random states $\vartheta \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ and all (not necessarily positive) $X \in \mathfrak{A}^P$, the almost sure limit

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), X \circ \theta^N \rangle$$

exists and is equal to $\mathbb{E}\langle \rho_{\text{eq}}, X \rangle$, where ρ_{eq} is the unique stationary state with $\text{proj}(\rho_{\text{eq}}) = P$ guaranteed by the equivalence of (a) and (c). Thus, assuming (a) - (c), because for X positive and nonzero the above limit is necessarily non-negative, the condition

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), X \circ \theta^N \rangle \in (0, \infty) \right) > 0$$

is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E} \langle \rho_{\text{eq}}, X \rangle = \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), X \circ \theta^N \rangle \right] \in (0, \infty).$$

From this, it is clear that (a) - (c) implies (e), since $\text{proj}(\rho_{\text{eq}}) = P$ almost surely and X is nonzero and positive.

Now, assuming (e) holds, we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), X \circ \theta^N \rangle \right] = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \mathbb{E} \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), X \circ \theta^N \rangle \in (0, \infty).$$

From this, it is clear that (d) holds. So, it remains to show that (d) implies (a), which we show via contrapositive. So suppose that (a) is false, i.e., that P is a non-minimal but still reducing projection for \mathfrak{Q} . Then there exists a minimal reducing projection Q of \mathfrak{Q} such that $Q \leq P$ and $Q \neq P$. In particular, $P - Q$ is a nonzero positive element of \mathfrak{A}^P such that, if we let $\vartheta = \text{Tr}(Q)^{-1} Q$ (by minimality of Q , we know $\text{Tr}(Q) > 0$ almost surely), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \langle \vartheta, P - Q \rangle = 0$$

and yet, because Q reduces \mathfrak{Q} , we have that $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{L}^n(Q)) \leq Q$ for all n . Hence,

$$\mathbb{E} \langle \mathfrak{L}^n(\vartheta), P - Q \rangle = 0$$

for all n . In particular, (d) is not true.

The supplementary assertion at the end of the statement of the theorem is immediate from the above, and this concludes the proof. \blacksquare

3.5 Recurrence and transience

We saw in Lemma 3.5 that there is always a nonzero positive fixed point Z of \mathfrak{L} by simply letting $Z = \mathfrak{E}(I)$. It turns out that the range projection of this canonical fixed point is of particular importance to the ergodic quantum process \mathfrak{Q} . Following the convention of [EH78], we call it the *recurrent projection*, and call its orthogonal complement the *transient projection*.

Definition 1 (Recurrent and transient projections). *Let \mathfrak{Q} be an ergodic quantum process. We define the recurrent projection P_r to be $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{E}(I))$. We call $I - P_r$ the transient projection and denote it P_t . We say that \mathfrak{Q} is recurrent if $P_r = I$, and we call \mathfrak{Q} dynamically ergodic if P_r is a minimal reducing projection.*

Note that Lemma 3.7 implies P_r reduces \mathfrak{Q} .

Lemma 3.16. *For any positive random matrix $Z \geq 0$ with $\mathfrak{L}(Z) = Z$, we have $\text{proj}(Z) \leq P_r$.*

Proof. Because $\mathfrak{L}(Z) = Z$, $\text{Tr}(Z) = \|Z\|_1$ is constant. Moreover, $\mathfrak{E}(Z)$ is defined and equal to Z . Since \mathfrak{E} is a positive map and $Z \leq \text{Tr}(Z)I$ almost surely, it holds that

$$0 \leq Z = \mathfrak{E}(Z) \leq \text{Tr}(Z) \mathfrak{E}(I)$$

almost surely. Because $\text{Tr}(Z) \geq 0$ is a constant, this implies $\text{proj}(Z) \leq \text{proj}(\mathfrak{E}(I)) = P_r$, as asserted. \blacksquare

Remark 3.17. Because P_r was defined to be $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{E}(I))$, and $\mathfrak{E}(I)$ is a positive fixed point of \mathfrak{L} , if P is any random projection such that $\text{proj}(Z) \leq P$ for all positive fixed points Z of \mathfrak{L} , it is clearly true that $P_r \leq P$. In particular, in the setting of [EH78], P_r is precisely the projection onto the recurrent subspace. \blacksquare

Recall that $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger : \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ was defined by $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(X) = K_\theta(\phi^*(X))$, and that

$$\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{M}_d)) \subseteq L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{M}_d)$$

so that $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger \in \mathcal{B}(L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{M}_d))$. The main property of \mathfrak{L}^\dagger that we use is the following. If $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*$ and $Y \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{M}_d)$, then we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \langle \mathfrak{L}(X), Y \rangle = \mathbb{E} \langle X, \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(Y) \rangle,$$

which follows because θ is invertible and measure-preserving. Phrased differently, \mathfrak{L}^\dagger is the Banach space dual \mathfrak{L}^* of $\mathfrak{L} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}_*)$.

Similar to before, for a projection $P \in \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$, we say \mathfrak{L}^\dagger is reduced by P if $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) \leq P$.³ Keeping in mind that $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(\cdot) = K_\theta(\phi^*(\cdot))$, Lemmas 3.18 and 3.19 may be proved in the same manner as Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7, respectively.

Lemma 3.18. *Let P be a random projection. The following are equivalent.*

- (a) P reduces \mathfrak{L}^\dagger .
- (b) $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) \in P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$.
- (c) The subspace $P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$ of $\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)$ is invariant under \mathfrak{L}^\dagger .
- (d) There is random $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) \leq \lambda P$ almost surely.

Lemma 3.19. *Suppose Z is a positive random matrix with $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(Z) = Z$. Then $\text{proj}(Z)$ reduces \mathfrak{L}^\dagger .*

The next lemma is useful for discussion of the recurrence of the ergodic quantum process \mathfrak{Q} and is also of a standard sort.

Lemma 3.20. *Let P be a random projection. Then \mathfrak{L} is reduced by P if and only if \mathfrak{L}^\dagger is reduced by $I - P$.*

Proof. Suppose that \mathfrak{Q} is reduced by P . Then we note that

$$0 \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\text{Tr} (P\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(I - P)P) \right) = \mathbb{E} \langle \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(I - P), P \rangle = \mathbb{E} \langle I - P, \mathfrak{L}(P) \rangle = 0$$

because $\mathfrak{L}(P) \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$. In particular, $P\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(I - P)P = 0$.

Now, note that $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(I - P) \geq 0$ since \mathfrak{L}^\dagger is positive. So, if we write X for $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(I - P)$, we may express X as the 2×2 block matrix

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} (I - P)X(I - P) & PX(I - P) \\ (I - P)XP & PXP \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (I - P)X(I - P) & PX(I - P) \\ (I - P)XP & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Because $X \geq 0$ hence $(I - P)X(I - P) \geq 0$, [Bha09, Proposition 1.3.2] implies that $PX(I - P)$ and $(I - P)XP$ are zero. That is,

$$X = \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(I - P) = (I - P)\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(I - P)(I - P) \in (I - P)\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)(I - P),$$

so $I - P$ reduces \mathfrak{L}^\dagger .

As the converse argument proceeds the same way, the proof is concluded. ■

Corollary 3.21. *The operator \mathfrak{L} is irreducible if and only if \mathfrak{L}^\dagger is irreducible.*

Lemma 3.22. *Let $P \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$ be a nonzero minimal reducing projection for \mathfrak{Q} . Then $P_r\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P)P_r = P$.*

³We note here that the dominating constant in $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) \leq cP$ may be chosen to be $c = 1$, whereas for \mathfrak{L} it was $c = d$. The reason for this is because the infinity norm of projections is equal to 1.

Proof. Because $P \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$ is minimal, $P = \text{proj}(Z)$ where Z is the positive fixed point $\mathfrak{E}(P)$. So, by Lemma 3.16, we have that $P \leq P_r$. Also, $I - P$ reduces \mathfrak{L}^\dagger , so $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(I - P) \leq I - P$. Because $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(I) = I$, this implies

$$\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) \geq P.$$

That is, $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) - P \geq 0$, so, since $P \leq P_r$, we have $P_r \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) P_r - P \geq 0$. Moreover, $P_r \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) P_r - P$ is in $P_r \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega) P_r$, so because $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{E}(I)) = P_r$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \langle P_r \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) P_r - P, \mathfrak{E}(I) \rangle &= \mathbb{E} \langle P_r \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) P_r, \mathfrak{E}(I) \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle P, \mathfrak{E}(I) \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \langle P, \mathfrak{L} \mathfrak{E}(I) \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle P, \mathfrak{E}(I) \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \langle P, \mathfrak{E}(I) \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle P, \mathfrak{E}(I) \rangle \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Because $\mathfrak{E}(I) \geq 0$ is such that $\text{proj}(\mathfrak{E}(I)) = P_r$ and $P_r \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) P_r - P \in P_r \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega) P_r$, we have $P_r \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) P_r - P = 0$ almost surely, i.e., $P_r \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) P_r = P$. \blacksquare

Corollary 3.23. *Let $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^k \subset \mathcal{P}_\Omega$ be a collection of orthogonal nonzero minimal reducing projections for Ω . Then $P_r - \sum_{i=1}^k Q_i$ is a reducing projection for Ω .*

Proof. Let P denote the sum $\sum_{i=1}^k Q_i$. Because $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^k$ is an orthogonal set, we have that P is a projection. Also, each $Q_i \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega$ is minimal, so we have that $Q_i = \text{proj}(Z_i)$ where Z_i is the positive fixed point $\mathfrak{E}(Q_i)$. By Lemma 3.16, this implies $Q_i \leq P_r$. Thus, $P \leq P_r$. From this, it is clear that $P_r - P$ is a projection. In fact, $P = P_r P P_r$, so we have that $P_r - P = P_r(I - P)P_r$. Lastly, by the previous lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} P_r \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) P_r &= P_r \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(Q_i) \right) P_r \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k P_r \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(Q_i) P_r \\ &= P. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \text{Tr}(P \mathfrak{L}(P_r - P) P) &= \mathbb{E} \langle \mathfrak{L}(P_r - P), P \rangle = \mathbb{E} \langle P_r - P, \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \langle I - P, P_r \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) P_r \rangle = \mathbb{E} \langle I - P, P \rangle = 0, \end{aligned}$$

so that $P \mathfrak{L}(P_r - P) P = 0$, as $P \mathfrak{L}(P_r - P) P \geq 0$. So, writing $X = \mathfrak{L}(P_r - P)$, we see that $X \geq 0$ hence $(I - P)X(I - P) \geq 0$, so by [Bha09, Proposition 1.3.2], we have that $(I - P)XP$ and $PX(I - P)$ are zero. That is, $\mathfrak{L}(P_r - P) = (I - P)\mathfrak{L}(P_r - P)(I - P)$. Because $P_r - P \leq P_r$ and P_r reduces Ω , we have that $\mathfrak{L}(P_r - P) \in P_r \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega) P_r$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{L}(P_r - P) &= (I - P)\mathfrak{L}(P_r - P)(I - P) \\ &= (I - P)P_r \mathfrak{L}(P_r - P) P_r (I - P) \\ &= (P_r - P)\mathfrak{L}(P_r - P)(P_r - P) \in (P_r - P)\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)(P_r - P) \end{aligned}$$

so that $P_r - P$ reduces Ω . \blacksquare

3.5.1 Proof of Theorem 3

Proving Theorem 3 is now just a matter of consolidating the above results. Recall the statement of the theorem under consideration.

Theorem 3. *Let Ω be an ergodic repeated interaction quantum system with recurrent projection P_r and transient projection $P_t = I - P_r$. There is a family of random projections $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^m$ such that each Q_i is a minimal reducing projection for Ω , $Q_i Q_j = Q_j Q_i = 0$ almost surely for all $i \neq j$, and $\sum_i Q_i = P_r$.*

Moreover, for any $Y \in \mathfrak{A}^{P_t}$ and any random state $\vartheta \in \mathbb{S}_d(\Omega)$, we have that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=0}^{M-1} \mathbb{E} \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), Y \circ \theta^N \rangle = 0.$$

Proof. Let P_1 be any nonzero minimal reducing projection for Ω . Then by Lemma 3.8 we have $\text{Tr}(P_1) > 0$. Also, by Corollary 3.23, $P_r - P_1$ reduces Ω . If $P_r - P_1$ is nonzero, then we may proceed inductively using Corollary 3.23 to produce a collection $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^m$ with $m \leq d$ of orthogonal minimal reducing projections for Ω . By their construction, it is clear that $\sum_{i=1}^m Q_i = P_r$, as desired.

For the last part, let $Y \in \mathfrak{A}^{P_t}$ and $\vartheta \in \mathbb{S}_d(\Omega)$ be arbitrary. Then $\mathfrak{E}(\vartheta)$ is a positive fixed point of \mathfrak{L} , so by Lemma 3.16 it holds that $\mathfrak{E}(\vartheta) \in P_r \mathbb{M}_d(\Omega) P_r$. Thus, $\mathbb{E} \langle \mathfrak{E}(\vartheta), Y \rangle = 0$. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1, this may be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathbb{E} \langle \mathfrak{E}(\vartheta), Y \rangle \\ &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=0}^{M-1} \mathbb{E} \langle \mathfrak{L}^N(\vartheta), Y \rangle \\ &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=0}^{M-1} \mathbb{E} \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), K_{\theta^N}(Y) \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which is what we wanted. ■

3.6 Dynamical ergodicity

Here, we direct our attention to the setting where P_r is the unique minimal reducing projection, which, by Theorem 1 is equivalent to there being a unique stationary state ρ_{eq} for Ω . We recall from the introduction that we call this notion *dynamical ergodicity*.

To get our main result in this arena (Theorem 2), we investigate general properties of the adjoint \mathfrak{L}^\dagger and apply this analysis to prove our theorem. Along these lines, we apply the theorem of Beck & Schwartz to get the following technical fact.

Proposition 3.24. *For all $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*$, the limit*

$$\bar{X} := \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \Phi_N^*(K_{\theta^{N+1}}(X)) \tag{3.10}$$

exists almost surely and in \mathfrak{A}_ . Moreover, $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(\bar{X}) = \bar{X}$ almost surely.*

Proof. Note that, because ϕ is a quantum channel almost surely, ϕ^* is almost surely unital, hence almost surely a contraction. So, by applying the theorem of Beck & Schwartz to the random map $\omega \mapsto \phi_{1;\omega}^*$, we get the result. ■

We now record a lemma that follows immediately from [KN79, Proposition 1.1], owed to the fact that the Cesàro mean limit \mathfrak{E} exists (in the language of [KN79], \mathfrak{L} is mean ergodic).

Lemma 3.25. *The vector spaces $\ker(I - \mathfrak{L}) \subseteq \mathfrak{A}_*$ and $\ker(I - \mathfrak{L}^\dagger) \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ are isomorphic.*

From here, we may prove the latter half of Theorem 2. Indeed, by the above lemma, in the case that Ω is dynamically ergodic, we know that the unique (\mathfrak{A} -norm 1) fixed point of \mathfrak{L}^\dagger is precisely I . Thus, for any $X \in \mathfrak{A}$, Proposition 3.24 implies that there is a deterministic constant C_X depending only on X such that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \overline{\Phi_N^*}(K_{\theta^{N+1}}(X)) = C_X I.$$

Therefore, for any random state $\vartheta \in \mathbb{S}_d(\Omega)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} C_X &= \left\langle \vartheta, \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \overline{\Phi_N^*}(K_{\theta^{N+1}}(X)) \right\rangle \\ &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \vartheta, \Phi_N^*(K_{\theta^{N+1}}(X)) \rangle \\ &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), K_{\theta^{N+1}}(X) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

almost surely. In particular, by applying the above computation when X is deterministic, we discover that $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \Phi_N(\vartheta)$ almost surely exists and is deterministic. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \Phi_N(\vartheta) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \Phi_N(\vartheta) \right] = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \mathbb{E}[\Phi_N(\vartheta)] \\ &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{L}^N(\vartheta)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \mathfrak{L}^N(\vartheta) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\rho_{\text{eq}}], \end{aligned}$$

where ρ_{eq} is the unique stationary state of \mathfrak{L} , by Theorem 1. On the other hand, C_X is deterministic, so (3.11) gives

$$\begin{aligned} C_X &= \mathbb{E}[C_X] = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \mathbb{E} \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), K_{\theta^{N+1}}(X) \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\langle \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \mathfrak{L}^N(\vartheta), K_\theta(X) \right\rangle = \mathbb{E} \langle \rho_{\text{eq}}, K_\theta(X) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By replacing X by $K_{\theta^{-1}}(X)$ in the above, we recover the following proposition.

Proposition 3.26. *If Ω is dynamically ergodic with unique stationary state $\rho_{\text{eq}} \in \mathbb{S}_d(\Omega)$, for all $X \in \mathfrak{A}$ and random states $\vartheta \in \mathbb{S}_d(\Omega)$, we have that*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), K_{\theta^N}(X) \rangle = \mathbb{E} \langle \rho_{\text{eq}}, X \rangle$$

and

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \Phi_N(\vartheta) = \mathbb{E}[\rho_{\text{eq}}]$$

The above constitutes the second half of Theorem 2. We now concern ourselves with the first half. To do this, we introduce an operator $\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger$ defined on \mathfrak{A} . Specifically, let $\phi_{\text{rec}}^* : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{M}_d)$ be the random positive operator defined by

$$\phi_{\text{rec};\omega}^*(\cdot) := P_{\text{rec};\omega} \phi_{1;\omega}^*(\cdot) P_{\text{rec};\omega}.$$

We then let $\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger$ be the operator on \mathfrak{A} defined by

$$\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger(X)_\omega = \phi_{\text{rec};\omega}^*(X_{\theta(\omega)}).$$

Noting that $\phi_{\text{rec};\omega}^*$ is almost surely a contraction, we may apply the theorem of Beck & Schwartz to conclude the following.

Proposition 3.27. *For all $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*$, the limit*

$$\bar{X}_{\text{rec}} := \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M (\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger)^N(K_\theta(X))$$

exists almost surely and in \mathfrak{A}_ . Moreover, $\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger(\bar{X}_{\text{rec}}) = \bar{X}_{\text{rec}}$ almost surely. In particular, $\bar{X}_{\text{rec}} \in \mathfrak{A}_*^{P_r}$.*

On a different note, by Lemma 3.22, it holds that $\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger(P) = P$ for any minimal reducing projection P of \mathfrak{Q} . By standard argumentation, this implies that $\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger$ leaves $P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$ invariant; we write $\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger|_P$ to denote the restriction of $\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger$ to $P\mathbb{M}_d(\Omega)P$. We then have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.28. *Let P be a minimal reducing projection. Then the Banach space dual of the map $\mathfrak{L}|_P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}_*^P)$ is precisely $\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger|_P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}^P)$.*

Proof. Let $X \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ and $Y \in \mathfrak{A}^P$ be arbitrary. Then we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \langle \mathfrak{L}(X), Y \rangle &= \mathbb{E} \langle X, \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(Y) \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \langle P_r X P_r, \mathfrak{L}^\dagger(Y) \rangle && \text{since } X \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P \\ &= \mathbb{E} \langle X, \mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger|_P(Y) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

■

As before, we may now apply [KN79, Proposition 1.1] to conclude the following.

Lemma 3.29. *Let P be a minimal reducing projection. Then the vector spaces $\ker(P - \mathfrak{L}|_P) \subseteq \mathfrak{A}_*^P$ and $\ker(P - \mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger|_P) \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^P$ are isomorphic.*

Therefore, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 3.26, we find that, whenever P is a minimal reducing projection and $X \in \mathfrak{A}^P$, there is a deterministic constant C_X depending only on X with

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M (\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger)^N(X) = C_X P.$$

Note that the Cesàro mean of Proposition 3.27 has been applied to $K_{\theta^{-1}}(X)$ in order to ensure that

the resulting random matrix is an element $PM_d(\Omega)P$. Thus, for all states $\vartheta \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
C_X = \mathbb{E}[C_X] &= \mathbb{E} \left\langle \vartheta, \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M (\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger)^N(X) \right\rangle \\
&= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left\langle \vartheta, (\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger)^N(X) \right\rangle \\
&= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \mathbb{E} \langle \mathfrak{L}^N(\vartheta), X \rangle && \text{by Proposition 3.28} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\langle \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \mathfrak{L}^N(\vartheta), X \right\rangle \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\langle \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \mathfrak{L}^N(\vartheta), X \right\rangle \\
&= \mathbb{E} \langle \rho_{\text{eq}}, X \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

where ρ_{eq} is the unique stationary state with $\text{proj}(\rho_{\text{eq}}) = P$. On the other hand, C_X may be expressed

$$\begin{aligned}
C_X &= \left\langle \vartheta, \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M (\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger)^N(X) \right\rangle \\
&= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \left\langle \vartheta, (\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger)^N(X) \right\rangle \\
&= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \left\langle \phi_1(P_r \vartheta P_r), (\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger)^{N-1}(K_\theta(X)) \right\rangle \\
&= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \left\langle \phi_1(\vartheta), (\mathfrak{L}_{\text{rec}}^\dagger)^{N-1}(K_\theta(X)) \right\rangle && \text{since } \text{proj}(\vartheta) \leq P \leq P_r \\
&= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), K_{\theta^N}(X) \rangle && \text{by induction.}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \langle \Phi_N(\vartheta), K_{\theta^N}(X) \rangle = C_X = \mathbb{E} \langle \rho_{\text{eq}}, X \rangle$$

almost surely. Lastly, it is not hard to conclude from the above that for all $X \in \mathfrak{A}^P$ and states $\vartheta \in \mathfrak{A}_*^P$, we have that

$$[\mathbb{E} \langle \rho_{\text{eq}}, X \rangle] \langle \vartheta, P \rangle = \left\langle \vartheta, \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \Phi_N^*(K_{\theta^N}(X)) \right\rangle = \left\langle \vartheta, P \left(\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \Phi_N^*(K_{\theta^N}(X)) \right) P \right\rangle,$$

since $\vartheta = P\vartheta P$. By the duality $(\mathfrak{A}_*^P)^* = \mathfrak{A}^P$, this implies that

$$P \left(\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \Phi_N^*(K_{\theta^N}(X)) \right) P = [\mathbb{E} \langle \rho_{\text{eq}}, X \rangle] \cdot P$$

almost surely. Gathering the above results, we find that Theorem 2 is proved.

4 Proof of Theorem 4

As an application of the above theory, we prove Theorem 4. Recall the statement of the theorem.

Theorem 4. *Let \mathfrak{J} be an i.i.d. RIS. If the recurrent projection $P_{\mathfrak{r}}$ is deterministic, then any minimal reducing projection for \mathfrak{J} is deterministic.*

Proof. Let P be a minimal reducing projection for an i.i.d. RIS \mathfrak{J} . We prove the theorem in the case that $P_{\mathfrak{r}} = I$; the case that $P_{\mathfrak{r}}$ is arbitrary (but still deterministic) is similar.

For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\pi_N : \Omega \rightarrow \Xi$ be the measurable map $(\omega_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mapsto \omega_N$, and let Σ_N be the σ -algebra generated by this map. Let $\Sigma_{[-N, N]}$ be the σ -algebra generated by the maps π_{-N}, \dots, π_N . Let $\Sigma_{\leq 0}$ be the σ -algebra generated by π_N for all $N \leq 0$, and let $\Sigma_{> 0}$ be defined similarly. Note that $\phi_N \in \Sigma_N$ for all N .

Let P be a minimal reducing projection for \mathfrak{J} . Then there is a stationary state ρ_{eq} with $\text{proj}(\rho_{\text{eq}}) = P$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{eq}; \omega} &= \mathfrak{L}^n(\rho_{\text{eq}})_\omega \\ &= \phi_{0; \omega} \circ \dots \circ \phi_{1-n; \omega}(\rho_{\text{eq}; \theta^{-n}(\omega)}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

almost surely. Now, because ρ_{eq} is measurable with respect to the product σ -algebra on $\Omega = \prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \Xi$, for all ε , there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\rho_N \in \Sigma_{[-N, N]}$ such that

$$\text{Tr} |\rho_{\text{eq}} - \rho_N| < \varepsilon \quad (4.2)$$

So, (4.1) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{eq}; \omega} &= \phi_{0; \omega} \circ \dots \circ \phi_{1-N; \omega}(\rho_{\text{eq}; \theta^{-N}(\omega)}) \\ &= \phi_{0; \omega} \circ \dots \circ \phi_{1-N; \omega}(\rho_{N; \theta^{-N}(\omega)}) + \phi_{0; \omega} \circ \dots \circ \phi_{1-N; \omega}(\rho_{\text{eq}; \theta^{-N}(\omega)} - \rho_{N; \theta^{-N}(\omega)}). \end{aligned}$$

Because $\rho_N \in \Sigma_{\pm N}$, it holds that $\rho_N \circ \theta^{-N} \in \Sigma_{\leq 0}$. So, because $\phi_n \in \Sigma_n$ for all n , the fact that ϕ is almost surely a contraction together with (4.2) gives that

$$\text{Tr} \left| \rho_{\text{eq}; \omega} - \phi_{0; \omega} \circ \dots \circ \phi_{1-N; \omega}(\rho_{N; \theta^{-N}(\omega)}) \right| = O(\varepsilon).$$

In particular, because ε was arbitrary, $\rho_{\text{eq}} \in \Sigma_{\leq 0}$. Because $\text{proj}(\rho_{\text{eq}}) \in \sigma(\rho_{\text{eq}})$, this implies that $P \in \Sigma_{\leq 0}$.

On the other hand, Lemma 3.22 gives that $\mathfrak{L}^\dagger(P) = P$ almost surely. So, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$P_\omega = \phi_{\theta(\omega)}^* \circ \dots \circ \phi_{\theta^n(\omega)}^*(P_{\theta^n(\omega)}).$$

Arguing as above, we conclude that P may be approximated arbitrarily well by elements of $\Sigma_{> 0}$, so that $P \in \Sigma_{> 0}$.

Because $\Sigma_{\leq 0}$ and $\Sigma_{> 0}$ are independent σ -algebras, we conclude that P is independent of itself, hence must be deterministic. \blacksquare

Acknowledgements

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 2153946.

A Eigenvalue perturbation

For $P \in \mathbb{M}_d$ an orthogonal projection and $A \in \mathbb{M}_d$, let $\sigma_P(A)$ denote the set

$$\sigma_P(A) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \text{proj}(PAP - \lambda P) \neq P\}.$$

If $\text{rank}(P) = \ell$, there is an obvious identification of $P\mathbb{M}_dP$ with \mathbb{M}_ℓ via

$$\mathbb{M}_d = \begin{bmatrix} P\mathbb{M}_dP & P\mathbb{M}_d(I-P) \\ (I-P)\mathbb{M}_dP & (I-P)\mathbb{M}_d(I-P) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{M}_\ell & \mathbb{M}_{\ell, d-\ell} \\ \mathbb{M}_{d-\ell, \ell} & \mathbb{M}_{d-\ell} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Under this identification, for any $A \in \mathbb{M}_r = P\mathbb{M}_dP$, it is clear that $\sigma_{\mathbb{M}_r}(A) = \sigma_P(A)$. Thus, the usual results about the spectrum of an operator hold for $\sigma_P(A)$. In particular, if A is self-adjoint, then $\sigma_P(A) \subset \mathbb{R}$, and $\#\sigma_P(A) = \text{rank}(P)$ counted with multiplicity.

The following lemma is achieved by applying Weyl's perturbation theorem [Bha13, Theorem VI.2.1] to $P\mathbb{M}_dP$.

Lemma A.1. *Let $P \in \mathbb{M}_d$ be an orthogonal projection of rank ℓ and let $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_d$ be self-adjoint. Order the elements of $\sigma_P(A)$ as $\lambda_{P,1}^\downarrow(A) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{P,\ell}^\downarrow(A)$ and of $\sigma_P(B)$ as $\lambda_{P,1}^\downarrow(B) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{P,\ell}^\downarrow(B)$. Then*

$$\max_j \left| \lambda_{P,j}^\downarrow(A) - \lambda_{P,j}^\downarrow(B) \right| \leq \|A - B\|_\infty.$$

Proof. By viewing PAP and PBP as self-adjoint elements of $P\mathbb{M}_dP = \mathbb{M}_r$,

$$\max_j \left| \lambda_{P,j}^\downarrow(A) - \lambda_{P,j}^\downarrow(B) \right| \leq \|P(A - B)P\|_\infty$$

follows immediately from the usual formulation Weyl's perturbation theorem. Since $\|P\|_\infty \leq 1$, the result as stated in the lemma follows. ■

References

- [AGG02] A. Arias, A. Gheondea, and S. Gudder. “Fixed points of quantum operations”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 43.12 (Dec. 2002), pp. 5872–5881. ISSN: 0022-2488. DOI: [10.1063/1.1519669](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1519669).
- [AGP06] P. Aliferis, D. Gottesman, and J. Preskill. “Quantum accuracy threshold for concatenated distance-3 codes”. In: *Quantum Info. Comput.* 6.2 (Mar. 2006), pp. 97–165. ISSN: 1533-7146.
- [AP06] S. Attal and Y. Pautrat. “From Repeated to Continuous Quantum Interactions”. In: *Annales Henri Poincaré* 7.1 (2006), pp. 59–104. ISSN: 1424-0661. DOI: [10.1007/s00023-005-0242-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00023-005-0242-8).
- [BB20] J.-F. Bougnon and L. Bruneau. “Linear Response Theory and Entropic Fluctuations in Repeated Interaction Quantum Systems”. In: *Journal of Statistical Physics* 181.5 (2020), pp. 1636–1677. ISSN: 1572-9613. DOI: [10.1007/s10955-020-02640-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10955-020-02640-x).
- [Bha09] R. Bhatia. *Positive definite matrices*. Princeton university press, 2009. ISBN: 9780691168258. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400827787>.
- [Bha13] R. Bhatia. *Matrix analysis*. Vol. 169. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013. ISBN: 978-1-4612-6857-4. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0653-8>.
- [BJM06] L. Bruneau, A. Joye, and M. Merkli. “Asymptotics of repeated interaction quantum systems”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 239.1 (2006), pp. 310–344. ISSN: 0022-1236. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2006.02.006>.

- [BJM08] L. Bruneau, A. Joye, and M. Merkli. “Random Repeated Interaction Quantum Systems”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 284.2 (2008), pp. 553–581. ISSN: 1432-0916. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-008-0580-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-008-0580-8).
- [BJM10] L. Bruneau, A. Joye, and M. Merkli. “Infinite products of random matrices and repeated interaction dynamics”. en. In: *Annales de l’I.H.P. Probabilités et statistiques* 46.2 (2010), pp. 442–464. DOI: [10.1214/09-AIHP211](https://doi.org/10.1214/09-AIHP211).
- [BJM14] L. Bruneau, A. Joye, and M. Merkli. “Repeated interactions in open quantum systems”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 55.7 (June 2014), p. 075204. ISSN: 0022-2488. DOI: [10.1063/1.4879240](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4879240).
- [BJP22] J.-F. Bougron, A. Joye, and C.-A. Pillet. “Markovian repeated interaction quantum systems”. In: *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* 34.09 (July 2022). ISSN: 1793-6659. DOI: [10.1142/s0129055x22500283](https://doi.org/10.1142/s0129055x22500283).
- [Bru+09] W. Bruzda et al. “Random quantum operations”. In: *Physics Letters A* 373.3 (2009), pp. 320–324. ISSN: 0375-9601. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physleta.2008.11.043>.
- [BS57] A. Beck and J. T. Schwartz. “A Vector-Valued Random Ergodic Theorem”. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 8.6 (1957), pp. 1049–1059. ISSN: 00029939, 10886826. DOI: [10.2307/2032681](https://doi.org/10.2307/2032681).
- [Bur+13] D. Burgarth et al. “Ergodic and mixing quantum channels in finite dimensions”. In: *New Journal of Physics* 15.7 (July 2013), p. 073045. ISSN: 1367-2630. DOI: [10.1088/1367-2630/15/7/073045](https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/15/7/073045).
- [CG21] R. Carbone and F. Girotti. “Absorption in Invariant Domains for Semigroups of Quantum Channels”. In: *Annales Henri Poincaré* 22.8 (2021), pp. 2497–2530. ISSN: 1424-0661. DOI: [10.1007/s00023-021-01016-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00023-021-01016-5).
- [Cho74] M.-D. Choi. “A Schwarz Inequality for Positive Linear Maps on C*-Algebras”. In: *Illinois J. Math.* 18.4 (1974), pp. 565–574. DOI: [10.1215/ijm/1256051007](https://doi.org/10.1215/ijm/1256051007).
- [Cho75] M.-D. Choi. “Completely positive linear maps on complex matrices”. In: *Linear algebra and its applications* 10.3 (1975), pp. 285–290. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3795\(75\)90075-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3795(75)90075-0).
- [Cic+22] F. Ciccarello et al. “Quantum collision models: Open system dynamics from repeated interactions”. In: *Physics Reports* 954 (2022), pp. 1–70. ISSN: 0370-1573. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2022.01.001>.
- [CJ20] R. Carbone and A. Jenčová. “On Period, Cycles and Fixed Points of a Quantum Channel”. In: *Annales Henri Poincaré* 21.1 (2020), pp. 155–188. ISSN: 1424-0661. DOI: [10.1007/s00023-019-00861-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00023-019-00861-9).
- [Con07] J. B. Conway. *A Course in Functional Analysis*. second. Springer New York, 2007. ISBN: 978-1-4419-3092-7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-3092-7>.
- [CP16] R. Carbone and Y. Pautrat. “Open Quantum Random Walks: Reducibility, Period, Ergodic Properties”. In: *Annales Henri Poincaré* 17.1 (2016), pp. 99–135. ISSN: 1424-0661. DOI: [10.1007/s00023-015-0396-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00023-015-0396-y).
- [Cus22] S. Cusumano. “Quantum Collision Models: A Beginner Guide”. In: *Entropy* 24.9 (Sept. 2022), p. 1258. ISSN: 1099-4300. DOI: [10.3390/e24091258](https://doi.org/10.3390/e24091258).
- [Dav76] E. B. Davies. *Quantum theory of open systems*. 1st ed. Academic Press, 1976. ISBN: 0122061500.
- [EH78] D. E. Evans and R. Høegh-Krohn. “Spectral Properties of Positive Maps on C*-Algebras”. In: *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* s2-17.2 (1978), pp. 345–355. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms/s2-17.2.345>.

- [Eis+15] T. Eisner et al. *Operator theoretic aspects of ergodic theory*. Vol. 272. Springer, 2015. ISBN: 978-3-319-37105-4. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16898-2>.
- [Ekb+24] O. Ekblad et al. *Asymptotic Purification of Quantum Trajectories under Random Generalized Measurements*. 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.03168>.
- [Far96] D. R. Farenick. “Irreducible Positive Linear Maps on Operator Algebras”. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 124.11 (1996), pp. 3381–3390. ISSN: 00029939, 10886826.
- [Fey82] R. P. Feynman. “Simulating physics with computers”. In: *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 21.6 (1982), pp. 467–488. ISSN: 1572-9575. DOI: [10.1007/BF02650179](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02650179).
- [Fro+12] G. Frobenius et al. “Über Matrizen aus nicht negativen Elementen”. In: (1912).
- [Gri+16] D. Grimmer et al. “Open dynamics under rapid repeated interaction”. In: *Physical Review A* 94.3 (Sept. 2016), p. 032126. ISSN: 2469-9926. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.94.032126](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.94.032126).
- [Gro81] U. Groh. “The Peripheral Point Spectrum of Schwarz Operators on C*-Algebras”. In: *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 176.3 (1981), pp. 311–318. ISSN: 1432-1823. DOI: [10.1007/BF01214608](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01214608).
- [Gro83] U. Groh. “On the Peripheral Spectrum of Uniformly Ergodic Positive Operators on C*-Algebras”. In: *Journal of Operator Theory* 10.1 (1983), pp. 31–37. ISSN: 03794024, 18417744.
- [Gro84a] U. Groh. “Uniform Ergodic Theorems for Identity Preserving Schwarz Maps on W*-Algebras”. In: *Journal of Operator Theory* 11.2 (1984), pp. 395–404. ISSN: 03794024, 18417744.
- [Gro84b] U. Groh. “Uniformly ergodic maps on C*-algebras”. In: *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 47.2 (1984), pp. 227–235. ISSN: 1565-8511. DOI: [10.1007/BF02760517](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02760517).
- [Han+17] E. P. Hanson et al. “Landauer’s Principle in Repeated Interaction Systems”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 349.1 (2017), pp. 285–327. ISSN: 1432-0916. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-016-2751-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-016-2751-3).
- [HMM22] P. M. Harrington, E. J. Mueller, and K. W. Murch. “Engineered dissipation for quantum information science”. In: *Nature Reviews Physics* 4.10 (2022), pp. 660–671. ISSN: 2522-5820. DOI: [10.1038/s42254-022-00494-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s42254-022-00494-8).
- [Kad51] R. V. Kadison. “Order Properties of Bounded Self-Adjoint Operators”. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 2.3 (1951), pp. 505–510. ISSN: 00029939, 10886826.
- [KN79] B. Kümmerer and R. Nagel. “Mean ergodic semigroups on W*-algebras”. In: *Acta. Sci. Math.* 41 (1979), pp. 151–159.
- [KR48] M. G. Kreĭn and M. A. Rutman. “Linear operators leaving invariant a cone in a Banach space”. In: *Uspehi Matem. Nauk (N.S.)* 3.1(23) (1948), pp. 3–95.
- [Kra+83] K. Kraus et al. *States, Effects, and Operations Fundamental Notions of Quantum Theory*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1983. ISBN: 9783540387251. DOI: [10.1007/3-540-12732-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-12732-1).
- [Kra71] K. Kraus. “General state changes in quantum theory”. In: *Annals of Physics* 64.2 (1971), pp. 311–335. ISSN: 0003-4916. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-4916\(71\)90108-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-4916(71)90108-4).
- [Li11a] Y. Li. “Characterizations of fixed points of quantum operations”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 52.5 (May 2011), p. 052103. ISSN: 0022-2488. DOI: [10.1063/1.3583541](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3583541).
- [Li11b] Y. Li. “Fixed points of dual quantum operations”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 382.1 (2011), pp. 172–179. ISSN: 0022-247X. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2011.04.047>.
- [MS21] R. Movassagh and J. Schenker. “Theory of Ergodic Quantum Processes”. In: *Physical Review X* 11.4 (Oct. 2021). ISSN: 2160-3308. DOI: [10.1103/physrevx.11.041001](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevx.11.041001).

- [MS22] R. Movassagh and J. Schenker. “An Ergodic Theorem for Quantum Processes with Applications to Matrix Product States”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 395 (2022), pp. 1175–1196. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-022-04448-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-022-04448-0).
- [NC12] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, June 2012. ISBN: 9781107002173. DOI: [10.1017/CB09780511976667](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511976667).
- [Neu27] J. v. Neumann. “Wahrscheinlichkeitstheoretischer Aufbau der Quantenmechanik”. In: *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse* 1927 (1927), pp. 245–272.
- [Neu32] J. v. Neumann. *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik*. Berlin: Springer, 1932.
- [NP12] I. Nechita and C. Pellegrini. “Random repeated quantum interactions and random invariant states”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 152.1 (2012), pp. 299–320. ISSN: 1432-2064. DOI: [10.1007/s00440-010-0323-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-010-0323-6).
- [NR24] B. Nelson and E. B. Roon. “Ergodic quantum processes on finite von Neumann algebras”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 287.4 (2024), p. 110485. ISSN: 0022-1236. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2024.110485>.
- [Per07] O. Perron. “Zur Theorie der Matrices”. In: *Mathematische Annalen* 64 (1907), pp. 248–263.
- [Pet38] B. J. Pettis. “On Integration in Vector Spaces”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math.* 44 (1938), pp. 277–304.
- [PP09] C. Pellegrini and F. Petruccione. “Non-Markovian quantum repeated interactions and measurements”. In: *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 42.42 (Oct. 2009), p. 425304. ISSN: 1751-8113. DOI: [10.1088/1751-8113/42/42/425304](https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/42/42/425304).
- [PS23] L. Pathirana and J. Schenker. “Law of large numbers and central limit theorem for ergodic quantum processes”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 64.8 (Aug. 2023). ISSN: 1089-7658. DOI: [10.1063/5.0153483](https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0153483).
- [RR02] R. A. Ryan and R. a Ryan. *Introduction to tensor products of Banach spaces*. Vol. 73. Springer, 2002. ISBN: 1852334371.
- [RS] R. Raquépas and J. Schenker. “Large Deviation for Disorderd, Repeated Quantum Measurements”.
- [San+10] M. Sanz et al. “A Quantum Version of Wielandt’s Inequality”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 56.9 (Sept. 2010), pp. 4668–4673. ISSN: 0018-9448. DOI: [10.1109/TIT.2010.2054552](https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2010.2054552).
- [Sch01] R. Schrader. “Perron-Frobenius Theory for Positive Maps on Trace Ideals”. In: *Mathematical Physics in Mathematics and Physics: Quantum and Operator Algebraic Aspects*. Ed. by R. Longo. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Soc., 2001, pp. 361–378. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.math-ph/0007020>.
- [Sch74] H. H. Schaefer. *Banach Lattices and Positive Operators*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1974. ISBN: 978-3-642-65972-0. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-65970-6>.
- [She51] S. Sherman. “Order in Operator Algebras”. In: *American Journal of Mathematics* 73.1 (1951), pp. 227–232. ISSN: 00029327, 10806377.
- [Sho94] P. W. Shor. “Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring”. In: *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. SFCS ’94. USA: IEEE Computer Society, 1994, pp. 124–134. ISBN: 0818665807. DOI: [10.1109/SFCS.1994.365700](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1994.365700).
- [SRD24] S. Singh, M. Rahaman, and N. Datta. “Zero-error communication, scrambling, and ergodicity”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18703* (2024). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.18703>.

- [Sto63] E. Stormer. “Positive linear maps of operator algebras”. In: *Acta Mathematica* 110 (Jan. 1963), pp. 233–278. DOI: [10.1007/BF02391860](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02391860).
- [SW99] H. H. Schaefer and M. P. Wolff. *Topological vector spaces*. second. Springer New York, NY, 1999. ISBN: 978-1-4612-7155-0. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1468-7>.
- [SZ20] S.-V. Stratila and L. Zsido. *Lectures on von Neumann Algebras*. Cambridge University Press, Oct. 2020. ISBN: 9781108496841. DOI: [10.1017/9781108654975](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108654975).
- [VO15] M. Viana and K. Oliveira. *Foundations of Ergodic Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Nov. 2015. ISBN: 9781107126961. DOI: [10.1017/CB09781316422601](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09781316422601).
- [VWI09] F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. Ignacio Cirac. “Quantum computation and quantum-state engineering driven by dissipation”. In: *Nature Physics* 5.9 (Sept. 2009), pp. 633–636. ISSN: 1745-2473. DOI: [10.1038/nphys1342](https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys1342).
- [Wat18] J. Watrous. *The Theory of Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, Apr. 2018. ISBN: 9781107180567. DOI: [10.1017/9781316848142](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316848142).
- [Yur80] Yuri Manin. *Vychislimoe i nevychislimoe*. Sov. Radio, 1980, pp. 13–15.