

The truncated multidimensional moment problem: canonical solutions.

S.M. Zagorodnyuk

Abstract. For the truncated multidimensional moment problem we introduce a notion of a canonical solution. Namely, canonical solutions are those solutions which are generated by commuting self-adjoint extensions inside the associated Hilbert space. It is constructed a 1-1 correspondence between canonical solutions and flat extensions of the given moments (both sets may be empty). In the case of the two-dimensional moment problem (with triangular truncations) a search for canonical solutions leads to an algebraic system of equations. A notion of the index i_s of nonself-adjointness for a set of prescribed moments is introduced. The case $i_s = 0$ corresponds to flatness. In the case $i_s = 1$ we get explicit necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of canonical solutions. These conditions are valid for arbitrary sizes of truncations. In the case $i_s = 2$ we get either explicit conditions for the existence of canonical solutions or a single quadratic equation with several unknowns. Numerical examples are provided.

MSC 2010: 44A60.

Keywords: moment problem, symmetric operator, operator extensions.

1 Introduction.

We shall need some notations in what follows. As usual, we denote by $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}_+$ the sets of real numbers, complex numbers, positive integers, integers and non-negative integers, respectively. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By \mathbb{Z}_+^n we mean $\mathbb{Z}_+ \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_+$, and $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}$, where the Cartesian products are taken with n copies. Let $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}}$ means the monomial $t_1^{k_1} \dots t_n^{k_n}$, and $|\mathbf{k}| = k_1 + \dots + k_n$. By $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we denote the set of all Borel subsets of \mathbb{R}^n .

Let \mathcal{K} be an arbitrary finite subset of \mathbb{Z}_+^n . Let $\mathcal{S} = (s_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}}$ be an arbitrary set of real numbers. *The truncated multidimensional moment problem* consists of finding a (non-negative) measure μ on $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\int \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}} d\mu(\mathbf{t}) = s_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad \forall \mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}. \quad (1)$$

The multidimensional moment problems were described in the books of Berezansky [1], Berg, Christensen and Ressel [2], Curto and Fialkow [4],

[5], Schmüdgen [9], Shohat and Tamarkin [10]. Besides the well investigated case $n = 1$, much success can be achieved in the case of (the full) K -moment problems, i.e. when the support of μ is restricted to a suitable (algebraic or semi-algebraic) prescribed set K . Here simple conditions for the solvability were obtained by Schmüdgen, see a detailed exposition of the corresponding results in [9]. In some special cases an analytical parametrization of all solutions is available, see [17] for the case of a strip. When there are no additional assumptions on the support of μ , multidimensional moment problems with $n \geq 2$ appeared to be very hard for investigation. In the cases of low numbers of prescribed moments and some restrictions on the measure support some satisfactory results for truncated multidimensional moment problems were obtained earlier, see, e.g., [6], [14], [18] and references therein. In the case of arbitrary sizes of truncations only flatness and few other special conditions can be mentioned, see [4], [5]. Some complicated conditions for the solvability of multidimensional moment problems were given in [10], [11], [8], [15], [3], [13]. Instead of restricting the measure support in (1) one can extend the support from \mathbb{R}^n to \mathbb{C}^n . In this case simple conditions for the solvability are available, see [20].

In this paper we shall focus on the truncated multidimensional moment problem. We shall use the operator approach to this moment problem, as it was described in [19]. Let us recall some related definitions and notations.

Consider the following operator W_j on \mathbf{Z}_+^n , which increases the j -th coordinate:

$$W_j(k_1, \dots, k_{j-1}, k_j, k_{j+1}, \dots, k_n) = (k_1, \dots, k_{j-1}, k_j + 1, k_{j+1}, \dots, k_n), \quad (2)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, n$. A finite subset $K \subset \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ is said to be *admissible*, if the following conditions hold:

$$1) \mathbf{0} = (0, \dots, 0) \in K;$$

$$2) \forall \mathbf{k} \in K \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\},$$

$$\mathbf{k} = W_{a_{|\mathbf{k}|}} W_{a_{|\mathbf{k}|-1}} \dots W_{a_1} \mathbf{0}, \quad (3)$$

for some $a_j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_r := W_{a_r} \dots W_{a_1} \mathbf{0} \in K, \quad \forall r = 1, 2, \dots, |\mathbf{k}|. \quad (4)$$

Such truncations appeared earlier in a paper by Laurent and Mourrain [7]. There are two important special cases. The first one is called *the case of triangular truncations*:

$$K = K_r = \{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n : |\mathbf{k}| \leq r\}, \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (5)$$

The second one is called *the case of rectangular truncations*:

$$K = K_{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n} = \{\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n : k_1 \leq d_1, \dots, k_n \leq d_n\},$$

$$d_1, \dots, d_n \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

For practical purposes, it is convenient to introduce some indexation in the set K by a unique index j :

$$K = \{\mathbf{k}_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, \rho\}. \quad (6)$$

Set $\vec{e}_r := (\delta_{r,m})_{m=1}^n \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, $r = 1, \dots, n$, and

$$\Omega_l = \{j \in \{0, \dots, \rho\} : \mathbf{k}_j + \vec{e}_l \in K\}, \quad l = 1, \dots, n. \quad (7)$$

We also denote

$$\Gamma = (s_{\mathbf{k}_j + \mathbf{k}_m})_{m,j=0}^\rho, \quad (8)$$

$$\Gamma_l = (s_{\mathbf{k}_j + \mathbf{k}_m})_{m,j \in \Omega_l}, \quad \widehat{\Gamma}_l = (s_{\mathbf{k}_j + \vec{e}_l + \mathbf{k}_m + \vec{e}_l})_{m,j \in \Omega_l}, \quad l = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (9)$$

where the indices from Ω_l are taken in the increasing order. Then we have the following necessary conditions of the solvability:

$$\Gamma \geq 0, \quad (10)$$

$$\text{Ker } \Gamma_l \subseteq \text{Ker } \widehat{\Gamma}_l, \quad l = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (11)$$

We do not know, if conditions (10),(11) are sufficient for the solvability of the moment problem (1). This is an open problem.

Now suppose that for an admissible finite set $K \subset \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ the moment problem (1), with $\mathcal{K} = K + K$ and some $\mathcal{S} = (s_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}}$, is given. Choose and fix some indexation (6). Assume that conditions (10),(11) hold. We may construct *the associated Hilbert space* H in the following way. A set \mathfrak{L} of all polynomials of the following form:

$$p(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\rho} \alpha_j \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}, \quad \alpha_j \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (12)$$

is a linear vector space. Consider the following functional:

$$\langle p, q \rangle = \sum_{j,m=0}^{\rho} \alpha_j \overline{\beta_m} s_{\mathbf{k}_j + \mathbf{k}_m},$$

where p is from (12), and q has the same form as p , but with $\beta_j (\in \mathbb{C})$ instead of α_j . Introducing the classes of the equivalence $[p] = [p]_{\mathfrak{L}}$ in \mathfrak{L} we obtain a finite-dimensional Hilbert space H . For $l = 1, \dots, n$ we consider the following operators:

$$M_l \sum_{j \in \Omega_l} \alpha_j [\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}]_{\mathfrak{L}} = \sum_{j \in \Omega_l} \alpha_j [\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j + \vec{e}_l}]_{\mathfrak{L}}, \quad \alpha_j \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (13)$$

with $D(M_l) = \text{Lin}\{[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}]_{\mathfrak{L}}\}_{j \in \Omega_l}$. In particular, we have

$$M_l [\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}]_{\mathfrak{L}} = [\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j + \vec{e}_l}]_{\mathfrak{L}}, \quad j \in \Omega_l; \quad l = 1, \dots, n. \quad (14)$$

Operators M_l are symmetric and they may be defined on proper subspaces of H . Denote

$$\Omega_0 = \{j \in \{0, \dots, \rho\} : \mathbf{k}_j + \vec{e}_1, \mathbf{k}_j + \vec{e}_2, \dots, \mathbf{k}_j + \vec{e}_n \in K\}, \quad (15)$$

and

$$H_0 = \text{Lin}\{[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}]_{\mathfrak{L}}\}_{j \in \Omega_0}. \quad (16)$$

The set of moments \mathcal{S} is said to be *dimensionally stable*, if $\dim H = \dim H_0$. The set of moments \mathcal{S} is said to be *completely self-adjoint*, if the operators M_l are self-adjoint and pairwise commute. Our first aim here will be to show that the dimensional stability implies the complete self-adjointness for general types of truncations (Theorem 1). In the case of triangular truncations it was proved by Vasilescu that flatness is equivalent to dimensional stability, see [12]. The dimensional stability can be checked numerically (see Theorem 5 in [19]) by solving linear algebraic systems of equations and then checking some equalities.

Definition 1 *A solution μ of the moment problem (1) is said to be **canonical** if it is generated by commuting self-adjoint operators $\widetilde{M}_j \supseteq M_j$ ($j = 1, \dots, n$) in the associated Hilbert space H , as it was described in the proof of Proposition 1 in [19].*

Our second aim here is to establish a bijection between all canonical solutions of the moment problem (1) with general truncations and all dimensionally stable close extensions of \mathcal{S} (Theorem 2). In particular, in the case of triangular truncations we get a 1-1 correspondence between all canonical solutions and all flat extensions of \mathcal{S} .

In Section 3 we search for canonical solutions of the two-dimensional truncated moment problem in the case of triangular truncations. This leads

to a system of algebraic equations. Precise answers on the existence of canonical solutions can be given for some special cases close to flatness. The number

$$i_s := \dim (H \ominus H_0), \quad (17)$$

is said to be **the index of nonself-adjointness of \mathcal{S}** . It is clear that the case $i_s = 0$ means the dimension stability or flatness of \mathcal{S} . In the case $i_s = 1$ we obtain explicit necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of canonical solutions. These conditions are valid for arbitrary sizes of truncations. In the case $i_s = 2$ we get either explicit conditions for the existence of canonical solutions or a single quadratic equation with several unknowns. Numerical examples for these cases are provided.

Notations. Besides the given above notations we shall use the following conventions. By $\mathbb{Z}_{k,l}$ we mean all integers r , which satisfy the following inequality: $k \leq r \leq l$. By $\text{Tr } M$ we denote the trace of a square complex matrix M . If H is a Hilbert space then $(\cdot, \cdot)_H$ and $\|\cdot\|_H$ mean the scalar product and the norm in H , respectively. Indices may be omitted in obvious cases. For a linear operator A in H , we denote by $D(A)$ its domain, by $R(A)$ its range, and A^* means the adjoint operator if it exists. If A is invertible then A^{-1} means its inverse. \overline{A} means the closure of the operator, if the operator is closable. If A is bounded then $\|A\|$ denotes its norm. For a set $M \subseteq H$ we denote by \overline{M} the closure of M in the norm of H . By $\text{Lin } M$ we mean the set of all linear combinations of elements from M , and $\text{span } M := \overline{\text{Lin } M}$. By E_H we denote the identity operator in H , i.e. $E_H x = x$, $x \in H$. In obvious cases we may omit the index H . If H_1 is a subspace of H , then $P_{H_1} = P_{H_1}^H$ is an operator of the orthogonal projection on H_1 in H .

2 Canonical solutions and flat extensions.

Suppose that for an admissible finite set $K \subset \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ the moment problem (1), with $\mathcal{K} = K + K$ and some $\mathcal{S} = (s_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}}$, is given. Choose and fix some indexation (6). Assume that conditions (10),(11) are satisfied. Construct the associated Hilbert space H and symmetric operators M_k , as it was described in the Introduction. In the case of arbitrary admissible truncations, a notion of flatness was introduced by Laurent and Mourrain [7]. It requires a use of a closure of a smaller set of monomials. However, two different sets of monomials may have the same closure, e.g., consider truncations K_3 and $K_3 \setminus \{(1, 1)\}$ for $n = 2$. These causes some difficulties. Here we shall

mainly use the notion of dimensional stability when dealing with general truncations.

Theorem 1 *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \subset \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ be an arbitrary admissible finite set, and $\mathcal{K} = K + K$. Let the moment problem (1) with some prescribed moments $\mathcal{S} = (s_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}}$ be given, and conditions (10), (11) be satisfied (with some indexation of K). If the set of moments \mathcal{S} is dimensionally stable then \mathcal{S} is completely self-adjoint. In the case of triangular truncations the converse implication is also true: if \mathcal{S} is completely self-adjoint then \mathcal{S} is dimensionally stable.*

Proof. Let us prove the first statement of the theorem. Here we shall use some ideas of Vasilescu from [12], but our proof is not the same. Suppose that \mathcal{S} is dimensionally stable. Since H has a finite dimension, then $H = H_0$. Thus, all multiplication operators M_k are defined on the whole space H . It remains to prove that they commute. Choose arbitrary $a, b \in 1, \dots, n$, $a \neq b$. For an arbitrary $[p(\mathbf{t})] \in H_0 (= H)$,

$$p(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{j \in \Omega_0} c_j \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}, \quad c_j \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (18)$$

we may write:

$$M_a p(\mathbf{t}) = [t_a p(\mathbf{t})] = [g(\mathbf{t})], \quad (19)$$

where $[g(\mathbf{t})] \in H_0$,

$$g(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{j \in \Omega_0} \xi_j \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}, \quad \xi_j \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (20)$$

The last equality in (19) follows from $H = H_0$ and the definition of H_0 . On the other hand, we have

$$M_b p(\mathbf{t}) = [t_b p(\mathbf{t})] = [h(\mathbf{t})], \quad (21)$$

where $[h(\mathbf{t})] \in H_0$,

$$h(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{j \in \Omega_0} \gamma_j \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}, \quad \gamma_j \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (22)$$

Then

$$M_b M_a [p(\mathbf{t})] = [t_b g(\mathbf{t})], \quad (23)$$

and

$$M_a M_b [p(\mathbf{t})] = [t_a h(\mathbf{t})]. \quad (24)$$

For an arbitrary $[u(\mathbf{t})] \in H_0 (= H)$,

$$u(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{m \in \Omega_0} d_m \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_m}, \quad d_m \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (25)$$

we may write:

$$\begin{aligned} (M_b M_a [p], [u])_H &= ([t_b g(\mathbf{t})], [u(\mathbf{t})])_H = ([g(\mathbf{t})], [t_b u(\mathbf{t})])_H = \\ &= ([t_a p(\mathbf{t})], [t_b u(\mathbf{t})])_H = \sum_{j, m \in \Omega_0} c_j \overline{d_m} ([\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j + \vec{e}_a}], [\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_m + \vec{e}_b}])_H = \\ &= \sum_{j, m \in \Omega_0} c_j \overline{d_m} s_{\mathbf{k}_j + \mathbf{k}_m + \vec{e}_a + \vec{e}_b}; \\ (M_a M_b [p], [u])_H &= ([t_a h(\mathbf{t})], [u(\mathbf{t})])_H = ([h(\mathbf{t})], [t_a u(\mathbf{t})])_H = \\ &= ([t_b p(\mathbf{t})], [t_a u(\mathbf{t})])_H = \sum_{j, m \in \Omega_0} c_j \overline{d_m} ([\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j + \vec{e}_b}], [\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_m + \vec{e}_a}])_H = \\ &= \sum_{j, m \in \Omega_0} c_j \overline{d_m} s_{\mathbf{k}_j + \mathbf{k}_m + \vec{e}_a + \vec{e}_b}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $M_b M_a [p] = M_a M_b [p]$. Thus, operators M_k are commuting self-adjoint operators.

Now assume that we have the case of triangular truncations and \mathcal{S} is completely self-adjoint. Then the associated multiplication operators M_k are self-adjoint. Thus they are defined on the whole H : $D(M_k) = H$, $k = 1, \dots, n$. Notice that for triangular truncations we have $D(M_k) = H_0$. Then $H = H_0$, and the dimensional stability follows. \square

It is not known for the case of rectangular truncations if complete self-adjointness implies dimensional stability. It is an interesting open problem. Of course, the general case of arbitrary admissible truncations is also interesting for further investigations.

We shall now study canonical solutions of the moment problem (1). As it was defined in the Introduction, a solution μ of the moment problem (1) is called canonical if it is generated by some commuting self-adjoint operators $\widetilde{M}_j \supseteq M_j$ ($j = 1, \dots, n$) in H .

Definition 2 Let $K \subset \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ be an arbitrary admissible finite set; $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The following set:

$$\text{Ext } K := K \cup \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n (K + \vec{e}_j) \right), \quad (26)$$

is said to be *the close extension of K* .

The latter notion is obviously related to the notion of the closure of a set of monomials in n variables from [7, p. 89]. We think that this is a natural way to define extensions of prescribed moments in the case of general truncations. Notice that the close extension of K is also admissible. Of course, in the case of triangular truncations we have

$$\text{Ext } K_r = K_{r+1}, \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

In contrast with Definition 2 the following notion is not directly related to the notion of a border of a set of monomials in [7, p. 89].

Definition 3 *Let $K \subset \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ be an arbitrary admissible finite set; $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The following set:*

$$\partial K := \{\mathbf{m} \in K : \exists j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ such that } \mathbf{m} + \vec{e}_j \notin K\}, \quad (27)$$

*is said to be **the border of K** .*

In the case of triangular truncations we have

$$\partial K_r = K_r \setminus K_{r-1}, \quad r \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Choose $n = 2$, $K = K_3 \setminus \{(1, 1)\}$. Then we have $\text{Ext } K = K_4$, and

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Ext } K) \setminus K &= \{(1, 1), (0, 4), (1, 3), (2, 2), (3, 1), (4, 0)\} \not\subseteq \partial(\text{Ext } K) = \\ &= \{(0, 4), (1, 3), (2, 2), (3, 1), (4, 0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for triangular truncations we have

$$(\text{Ext } K_r) \setminus K_r = \partial(\text{Ext } K_r), \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Theorem 2 *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \subset \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ be an arbitrary admissible finite set such that*

$$(\text{Ext } K) \setminus K \subseteq \partial(\text{Ext } K). \quad (28)$$

Set $\mathcal{K} = K + K$, and $\mathcal{K}' = \text{Ext } K + \text{Ext } K$. Let the moment problem (1) with some prescribed moments $\mathcal{S} = (s_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}}$ be given, and conditions (10),(11) be satisfied (with some indexation of K). Fix a continuation of the indexation of K to $\text{Ext } K$. There exists a one-to-one correspondence between a set of all canonical solutions to the moment problem (1) and a set of all dimensionally stable sets $\widehat{\mathcal{S}} = (\widehat{s}_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}'}$, where $\widehat{s}_{\mathbf{k}} \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\widehat{s}_{\mathbf{m}} = s_{\mathbf{m}}$, for $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{K}$. Here it is assumed that conditions (10),(11) are satisfied for each $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$, with the fixed indexation of $\text{Ext } K$.

Proof. Let K have an indexation of type (6). We extend this indexation to the whole set $\widehat{K} := \text{Ext } K$:

$$\widehat{K} = \{\mathbf{k}_j (\in \mathbb{Z}_+^n), \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, \widehat{\rho}\}. \quad (29)$$

The above indexation will be fixed throughout the whole proof.

Suppose that we have a dimensionally stable set $\widehat{\mathcal{S}} = (\widehat{s}_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}'}$, where $\widehat{s}_{\mathbf{m}} = s_{\mathbf{m}}$, for $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{K}$ (and conditions (10),(11) are satisfied with the fixed indexation of \widehat{K}). Denote by H and \widehat{H} the associated Hilbert spaces for \mathcal{S} and $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$, respectively. In a similar manner, denote $\mathfrak{L}, \Omega_0, H_0, M_k$ ($k = 1, \dots, n$) for \mathcal{S} as in the Introduction, and the corresponding objects for $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$ denote by $\widehat{\mathfrak{L}}, \widehat{\Omega}_0, \widehat{H}_0, \widehat{M}_k$. Since $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$ is dimensionally stable, we have $\widehat{H}_0 = \widehat{H}$. By Theorem 1 we conclude that operators $\widehat{M}_k, k = 1, \dots, n$, are commuting self-adjoint operators acting in $\widehat{H}(= \widehat{H}_0)$. Consider the following transformation W from H to \widehat{H} :

$$W \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\rho} \xi_j \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\mathfrak{L}} = \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\rho} \xi_j \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\widehat{\mathfrak{L}}}, \quad \xi_j \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (30)$$

The transformation W is well-defined and isometric. In fact, suppose that

$$h = \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\rho} \xi_j \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\mathfrak{L}} = \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\rho} \eta_j \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\mathfrak{L}}, \quad \xi_j, \eta_j \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\rho} \xi_j \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\widehat{\mathfrak{L}}} - \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\rho} \eta_j \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\widehat{\mathfrak{L}}} \right\|_{\widehat{H}}^2 = \\ & = \sum_{j,l=0}^{\rho} (\xi_j - \eta_j) \overline{(\xi_l - \eta_l)} \left(\left[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\widehat{\mathfrak{L}}}, \left[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_l} \right]_{\widehat{\mathfrak{L}}} \right)_{\widehat{H}} = \sum_{j,l=0}^{\rho} (\xi_j - \eta_j) \overline{(\xi_l - \eta_l)} s_{\mathbf{k}_j + \mathbf{k}_l} = \\ & = \sum_{j,l=0}^{\rho} (\xi_j - \eta_j) \overline{(\xi_l - \eta_l)} \left(\left[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\mathfrak{L}}, \left[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_l} \right]_{\mathfrak{L}} \right)_H = \|h - h\| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

If

$$g = \left[\sum_{l=0}^{\rho} \gamma_l \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_l} \right]_{\mathfrak{L}}, \quad \gamma_l \in \mathbb{C},$$

then

$$(Wh, Wg) = \sum_{j,l=0}^{\rho} \xi_j \overline{\gamma_l} \left(\left[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\widehat{\mathfrak{L}}}, \left[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_l} \right]_{\widehat{\mathfrak{L}}} \right)_{\widehat{H}} =$$

$$= \sum_{j,l=0}^{\rho} \xi_j \bar{\gamma}_l s_{\mathbf{k}_j + \mathbf{k}_l} = \sum_{j,l=0}^{\rho} \xi_j \bar{\gamma}_l \left([\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}]_{\mathcal{E}}, [\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_l}]_{\mathcal{E}} \right)_H = (h, g).$$

By the definition of the close extension of K we obtain that $\{0, 1, \dots, \rho\} \subseteq \widehat{\Omega}_0$. Therefore

$$WH \subseteq \widehat{H}_0.$$

Notice that the indices $\{\rho+1, \dots, \widehat{\rho}\}$ correspond to the elements of $(\text{Ext } K) \setminus K$. By condition (28) these elements belong to $\partial(\text{Ext } K)$. Therefore they do not belong to $\widehat{\Omega}_0$, by the definition of the border. Thus, we have $\{0, 1, \dots, \rho\} = \widehat{\Omega}_0$, and

$$WH = \widehat{H}_0. \quad (31)$$

The following operators are commuting self-adjoint operators in H :

$$C_k = W^{-1} \widehat{M}_k W, \quad k = 1, \dots, n. \quad (32)$$

They generate a solution μ of the moment problem as it was described in the proof of Proposition 1 in [19]. Of course, this solution is canonical.

For each dimensionally stable set $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$ we put into correspondence a canonical solution μ , which is constructed in the above manner. We shall denote this map by τ :

$$\tau \widehat{\mathcal{S}} = \mu. \quad (33)$$

We are going to check that τ is a bijection between a set of all dimensionally stable close extensions of \mathcal{S} and a set of all canonical solutions of the moment problem. At first, let us check that τ is surjective.

Let μ_c be an arbitrary canonical solution of the moment problem (1). There exist commuting self-adjoint operators $A_k \supseteq M_k$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, in the associated Hilbert space H , and

$$\mu_c(\delta) = (E(\delta)[1]_{\mathcal{E}}, [1]_{\mathcal{E}})_H, \quad \delta \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad (34)$$

where $E(\delta)$ is the spectral measure of a commuting tuple A_1, \dots, A_n (see formula (24) in [19]). Consider a set $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}} := (\widetilde{s}_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}'}$, where

$$\widetilde{s}_{\mathbf{k}} = \int \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}} d\mu_c, \quad \mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}'. \quad (35)$$

Of course, $\widetilde{s}_{\mathbf{m}} = s_{\mathbf{m}}$, for $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{K}$. We claim that: (1) $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is dimensionally stable; (2) $\tau \widetilde{\mathcal{S}} = \mu_c$. At first we observe that conditions (10),(11) are satisfied for $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}$, with the fixed indexation of $\text{Ext } K$, since the extended moment problem (35) is solvable and the conditions are necessary for the solvability.

Let \tilde{H} be the associated Hilbert space for $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$. The corresponding objects from the Introduction for $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ we denote by $\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}, \tilde{\Omega}_0, \tilde{H}_0, \tilde{M}_k$. Notice that (see formula (22) in [19])

$$\text{Lin} \left\{ A_1^{k_1} A_2^{k_2} \dots A_n^{k_n} [1]_{\mathfrak{L}}, (k_1, \dots, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \right\} = H. \quad (36)$$

Denote by $L_{\mu_c}^2$ the space of all (classes of the equivalence) of all square integrable complex-valued $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ -measurable functions $f(\mathbf{t})$, $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The classes of the equivalence we shall denote by $[f] = [f]_{L_{\mu_c}^2}$. Set

$$L_{\mu_c,0}^2 = \text{Lin} \left\{ \left[t_1^{k_1} t_2^{k_2} \dots t_n^{k_n} \right]_{L_{\mu_c}^2}, (k_1, \dots, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \right\}. \quad (37)$$

Consider the following transformation V acting from H to $L_{\mu_c,0}^2$:

$$Vh = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \left[t_1^{k_1} t_2^{k_2} \dots t_n^{k_n} \right]_{L_{\mu_c}^2}, \quad h = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} A_1^{k_1} A_2^{k_2} \dots A_n^{k_n} [1]_{\mathfrak{L}}, \quad \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (38)$$

where all but finite number of $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}$ s are zero and this will be assumed in similar situations in what follows. Let us check that V is well-defined. Suppose that an element $h \in H$ has another representation:

$$h = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \beta_{\mathbf{k}} A_1^{k_1} A_2^{k_2} \dots A_n^{k_n} [1]_{\mathfrak{L}}, \quad \beta_{\mathbf{k}} \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (39)$$

Using relation (34) we may write:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\alpha_{\mathbf{k}} - \beta_{\mathbf{k}}) \left[t_1^{k_1} t_2^{k_2} \dots t_n^{k_n} \right]_{L_{\mu_c}^2} \right\|^2 = \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\alpha_{\mathbf{k}} - \beta_{\mathbf{k}}) \overline{(\alpha_{\mathbf{m}} - \beta_{\mathbf{m}})} \left(\left[t_1^{k_1} t_2^{k_2} \dots t_n^{k_n} \right]_{L_{\mu_c}^2}, \left[t_1^{m_1} t_2^{m_2} \dots t_n^{m_n} \right]_{L_{\mu_c}^2} \right) = \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\alpha_{\mathbf{k}} - \beta_{\mathbf{k}}) \overline{(\alpha_{\mathbf{m}} - \beta_{\mathbf{m}})} \int \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{m}} d\mu_c = \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\alpha_{\mathbf{k}} - \beta_{\mathbf{k}}) \overline{(\alpha_{\mathbf{m}} - \beta_{\mathbf{m}})} \left(A_1^{k_1} A_2^{k_2} \dots A_n^{k_n} [1]_{\mathfrak{L}}, A_1^{m_1} A_2^{m_2} \dots A_n^{m_n} [1]_{\mathfrak{L}} \right)_H = \\ &= \left\| \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\alpha_{\mathbf{k}} - \beta_{\mathbf{k}}) A_1^{k_1} A_2^{k_2} \dots A_n^{k_n} [1]_{\mathfrak{L}} \right\|^2 = \|h - h\|_H = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore V is well-defined. If

$$g = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \gamma_{\mathbf{m}} A_1^{m_1} A_2^{m_2} \dots A_n^{m_n} [1]_{\mathfrak{L}}, \quad \gamma_{\mathbf{m}} \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (40)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} (Vh, Vg) &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \overline{\gamma_{\mathbf{m}}} \left(\left[t_1^{k_1} t_2^{k_2} \dots t_n^{k_n} \right]_{L_{\mu_c}^2}, \left[t_1^{m_1} t_2^{m_2} \dots t_n^{m_n} \right]_{L_{\mu_c}^2} \right) = \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \overline{\gamma_{\mathbf{m}}} \int \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{m}} d\mu_c = \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \overline{\gamma_{\mathbf{m}}} \left(A_1^{k_1} A_2^{k_2} \dots A_n^{k_n} [1]_{\mathfrak{L}}, A_1^{m_1} A_2^{m_2} \dots A_n^{m_n} [1]_{\mathfrak{L}} \right) = (h, g). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, V is a linear isometric transformation which maps H onto $L_{\mu_c, 0}^2$. Then

$$\dim L_{\mu_c, 0}^2 = \dim H. \quad (41)$$

Consider the following transformation \widetilde{W} from H to \widetilde{H} :

$$\widetilde{W} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\rho} \xi_j \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\mathfrak{L}} = \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\rho} \xi_j \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{L}}}, \quad \xi_j \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (42)$$

The transformation \widetilde{W} is well-defined and isometric. This can be checked in the same manner, as it was done for the transformation W . Moreover, we also have an analogue of (31):

$$\widetilde{W}H = \widetilde{H}_0. \quad (43)$$

Then

$$\dim H = \dim \widetilde{W}H = \dim \widetilde{H}_0 \leq \dim \widetilde{H}. \quad (44)$$

Now consider the following transformation U , acting from \widetilde{H} into $L_{\mu, 0}^2$:

$$Uh = \sum_{j=0}^{\widehat{\rho}} \alpha_j \left[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{L_{\mu_c}^2}, \quad h = \sum_{j=0}^{\widehat{\rho}} \alpha_j \left[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{L}}}, \quad \alpha_j \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (45)$$

If h has another representation:

$$h = \sum_{j=0}^{\widehat{\rho}} \beta_j \left[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{L}}}, \quad \beta_j \in \mathbb{C},$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{\hat{\rho}} (\alpha_j - \beta_j) [\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}]_{L^2_{\mu_c}} \right\|^2 = \sum_{j,m=0}^{\hat{\rho}} (\alpha_j - \beta_j) \overline{(\alpha_m - \beta_m)} \left([\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}]_{L^2_{\mu_c}}, [\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_m}]_{L^2_{\mu_c}} \right) = \\
& = \sum_{j,m=0}^{\hat{\rho}} (\alpha_j - \beta_j) \overline{(\alpha_m - \beta_m)} \int \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j + \mathbf{k}_m} d\mu_c = \sum_{j,m=0}^{\hat{\rho}} (\alpha_j - \beta_j) \overline{(\alpha_m - \beta_m)} \tilde{s}_{\mathbf{k}_j + \mathbf{k}_m} = \\
& = \sum_{j,m=0}^{\hat{\rho}} (\alpha_j - \beta_j) \overline{(\alpha_m - \beta_m)} \left([\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}]_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}, [\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_m}]_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \right)_{\tilde{H}} = \|h - h\|^2 = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, U is well-defined. If

$$g = \sum_{j=0}^{\hat{\rho}} \gamma_j [\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}]_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}, \quad \gamma_j \in \mathbb{C},$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
(Uh, Ug) & = \sum_{j,m=0}^{\hat{\rho}} \alpha_j \overline{\gamma_m} \left([\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}]_{L^2_{\mu_c}}, [\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_m}]_{L^2_{\mu_c}} \right) = \\
& = \sum_{j,m=0}^{\hat{\rho}} \alpha_j \overline{\gamma_m} \tilde{s}_{\mathbf{k}_j + \mathbf{k}_m} = \sum_{j,m=0}^{\hat{\rho}} \alpha_j \overline{\gamma_m} \left([\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}]_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}, [\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_m}]_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \right)_{\tilde{H}} = (h, g).
\end{aligned}$$

So, U is a linear isometric transformation which maps \tilde{H} onto a subspace of $L^2_{\mu_c,0}$. It follows that

$$\dim \tilde{H} \leq \dim L^2_{\mu_c,0}. \quad (46)$$

By (41),(44),(46) we obtain that

$$\dim \tilde{H} = \dim \tilde{H}_0 = \dim L^2_{\mu_c,0} = \dim H. \quad (47)$$

So, $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is dimensionally stable and the first claim is proved. Notice that relation (47) also shows that U is a unitary transformation which maps \tilde{H} onto $L^2_{\mu_c,0}$.

Now we are going to check the second claim. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is dimensionally stable, we can construct a canonical solution $\tilde{\mu} := \tau \tilde{\mathcal{S}}$. Using the same notations as at the beginning of the proof, we can repeat all the constructions for the concrete choice of moments $\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}$. The use of the same notations will cause no confusion, since we shall not use these constructions elsewhere. So, we

now have double notations for the same objects: $\widehat{\Omega}_0 = \widetilde{\Omega}_0$, $\widehat{M}_k = \widetilde{M}_k$, etc. We have

$$\widetilde{\mu}(\delta) = (E_C(\delta)[1]_{\mathfrak{L}}, [1]_{\mathfrak{L}})_H, \quad \delta \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad (48)$$

where $E_C(\delta)$ is the spectral measure of the commuting tuple C_1, \dots, C_n ($C_k = W^{-1}\widetilde{M}_k W$). In order to prove the second claim we need to check that $\widetilde{\mu} = \mu_c$. Choose an arbitrary element $h \in H$ of the form (39). We may write

$$\begin{aligned} V A_l h &= V \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \beta_{\mathbf{k}} A_1^{k_1} \dots A_l^{k_l+1} \dots A_n^{k_n} [1]_{\mathfrak{L}} = \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \beta_{\mathbf{k}} \left[t_1^{k_1} \dots t_l^{k_l+1} \dots t_n^{k_n} \right]_{L_{\mu_c}^2} = \Lambda_l V h, \end{aligned}$$

where we denote by Λ_l the operator of multiplication by t_l in $L_{\mu_c}^2$, restricted to $L_{\mu_c,0}^2$. Therefore

$$V A_l V^{-1} = \Lambda_l, \quad l = 1, \dots, n. \quad (49)$$

Choose an arbitrary element $g \in \widetilde{H}_0 (= \widetilde{H})$,

$$g = \sum_{j \in \widetilde{\Omega}_0} \alpha_j \left[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}^j} \right]_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{L}}}, \quad \alpha_j \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Then

$$U \widetilde{M}_l g = U \sum_{j \in \widetilde{\Omega}_0} \alpha_j \left[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}^j + \vec{e}_l} \right]_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{L}}} = \sum_{j \in \widetilde{\Omega}_0} \alpha_j \left[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}^j + \vec{e}_l} \right]_{L_{\mu_c}^2} = \Lambda_l U g.$$

Therefore

$$U \widetilde{M}_l U^{-1} = \Lambda_l, \quad l = 1, \dots, n. \quad (50)$$

By (49),(50) we obtain that A_l and \widetilde{M}_l are unitary equivalent:

$$T A_l T^{-1} = \widetilde{M}_l, \quad l = 1, \dots, n, \quad (51)$$

where $T := U^{-1}V$. Therefore operators A_l and C_l are also unitarily equivalent:

$$F A_l F^{-1} = C_l, \quad l = 1, \dots, n, \quad (52)$$

where $F := W^{-1}T$. Operators A_l and C_l have the same eigenvalues which we denote by

$$\{\lambda_{l;j}\}_{j=1}^{n_l}, \quad \text{where } \lambda_{l;m} \neq \lambda_{l;k}, \text{ if } m \neq k.$$

For $\lambda_{l;j}$ we denote by $H_{l;j}$ and $\tilde{H}_{l;j}$ the eigen subspaces of A_l and C_l , respectively. We also denote $P_{l,j} := P_{H_{l;j}}^H$ and $\tilde{P}_{l,j} := P_{\tilde{H}_{l;j}}^H$. Then

$$\tilde{P}_{l,j} = FP_{l,j}F^{-1}, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}_{1,n_l}, \quad l \in \mathbb{Z}_{1,n}. \quad (53)$$

The measures μ_c and $\tilde{\mu}$ are atomic and they can have atoms at the following points only:

$$\mathbf{a}_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n} := (\lambda_{1;j_1}, \lambda_{2;j_2}, \dots, \lambda_{n;j_n}), \quad j_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{1,n_k}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_{1,n}. \quad (54)$$

The corresponding masses have the following values:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_c(\{\mathbf{a}_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n}\}) &= (E_1(\{\lambda_{1;j_1}\}) \cdots E_n(\{\lambda_{n;j_n}\})[1]_{\mathcal{E}}, [1]_{\mathcal{E}})_H = \\ &= (P_{1,j_1} \cdots P_{n,j_n}[1]_{\mathcal{E}}, [1]_{\mathcal{E}})_H, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}(\{\mathbf{a}_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n}\}) &= (E_{C_1}(\{\lambda_{1;j_1}\}) \cdots E_{C_n}(\{\lambda_{n;j_n}\})[1]_{\mathcal{E}}, [1]_{\mathcal{E}})_H = \\ &= (\tilde{P}_{1,j_1} \cdots \tilde{P}_{n,j_n}[1]_{\mathcal{E}}, [1]_{\mathcal{E}})_H, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where E_j and E_{C_j} are the spectral measures of A_j and C_j , respectively. By (53) we conclude that $\mu_c = \tilde{\mu}$. Thus, the second claim is proved. We conclude that the map τ is surjective. Our considerations also show that the set of canonical solutions is empty if and only if the set of dimensionally stable extensions is empty.

Suppose that we have two different dimensionally stable sets $\mathcal{S}' = (s'_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}'}$, and $\mathcal{S}'' = (s''_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}'}$, where $s'_{\mathbf{m}} = s''_{\mathbf{m}} = s_{\mathbf{m}}$, for $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{K}$. Denote

$$\mu_1 := \tau\mathcal{S}', \quad \mu_2 := \tau\mathcal{S}''.$$

Since $\mathcal{S}' \neq \mathcal{S}''$, then there exists $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}'$ such that $s'_{\mathbf{k}} \neq s''_{\mathbf{k}}$. Then

$$\int \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}} d\mu_1 \neq \int \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}} d\mu_2.$$

Therefore $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$. Thus, τ is injective. It follows that τ is a bijection and this completes the proof of the theorem. \square

3 The two-dimensional case with triangular truncations. Indices of nonself-adjointness.

Fix an arbitrary number $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider $K = K_r$, where K_r is given by (5) with $n = 2$. Assume that the moment problem (1) with $\mathcal{K} = K + K$

and some $\mathcal{S} = (s_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}}$ is given and $s_{(0,0)} > 0$ (this condition excludes the trivial case). Choose and fix an indexation (6) such that the elements of K_{r-1} are indexed at first. Assume that conditions (10),(11) are satisfied. Construct the associated Hilbert space H , symmetric operators M_1, M_2 , and other related objects from the Introduction. Notice that the operators M_1, M_2 are now defined on the same subspace H_0 . As it was already mentioned in the Introduction, the number

$$i_s := \dim (H \ominus H_0), \quad (57)$$

is said to be *the index of nonself-adjointness of \mathcal{S}* . The case $i_s = 0$ leads to the dimension stability or flatness of \mathcal{S} . From the definitions of $K = K_r$ and Ω_0 it is clear that i_s can take values $0, 1, \dots, r + 1$.

In what follows we shall assume that $i_s > 0$. Apply the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure to the sequence $[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j}]_{\mathcal{G}}, j = 0, 1, \dots, \rho$. We shall obtain an orthonormal basis $\mathcal{G} = \{g_j\}_{j=0}^{d+i_s}$ in H , with some $d \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Of course, $\dim H_0 = d + 1$, $\dim H = d + i_s + 1$, and $\{g_j\}_{j=0}^d$ is an orthonormal basis in H_0 . Operators M_1 and M_2 are defined on H_0 , which is a *proper subspace of H* . The existence of self-adjoint extensions of such symmetric operators was investigated by Krasnoselskii, for details see, e.g., a survey in [16] and references therein. Of course, the existence of self-adjoint extensions in a finite-dimensional case is quite clear from the matrix representations of the corresponding operators.

Let R_1 and $R_2, D(R_1) = D(R_2) = H$, be arbitrary self-adjoint extensions of M_1 and M_2 , respectively. For the basis \mathcal{G} we denote by \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 the matrices of R_1 and R_2 , respectively. We have

$$\mathcal{R}_k = ((R_k g_l, g_j)_H)_{j,l=0}^{d+i_s} = \begin{pmatrix} A_k & B_k^* \\ B_k & C_k \end{pmatrix}, \quad k = 1, 2, \quad (58)$$

where

$$A_k = ((R_k g_l, g_j)_H)_{j,l=0}^d = ((M_k g_l, g_j)_H)_{j,l=0}^d, \quad (59)$$

$$B_k = ((R_k g_l, g_j)_H)_{j=d+1, \dots, d+i_s; l=0, \dots, d} = ((M_k g_l, g_j)_H)_{j=d+1, \dots, d+i_s; l=0, \dots, d}, \quad (60)$$

$$C_k = ((R_k g_l, g_j)_H)_{j,l=d+1}^{d+i_s}. \quad (61)$$

Thus, matrices A_k and B_k are calculated by the given moments. A direct block multiplication of the corresponding matrices shows that the operators R_1 and R_2 commute if and only if the following conditions hold:

$$A_1 A_2 + B_1^* B_2 = A_2 A_1 + B_2^* B_1, \quad (62)$$

$$B_2^*C_1 - B_1^*C_2 = A_1B_2^* - A_2B_1^*, \quad (63)$$

$$C_1C_2 - C_2C_1 = B_2B_1^* - B_1B_2^*. \quad (64)$$

Observe that relation (62) is a necessary condition for the existence of canonical solutions. By (64) we see that the following condition:

$$\text{Tr}(B_2B_1^* - B_1B_2^*) = 0, \quad (65)$$

is necessary for the existence of canonical solutions as well.

Proposition 1 *Let $n = 2$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $K = K_r$, with K_r as in (5). Assume that the moment problem (1) with $\mathcal{K} = K + K$ and some $\mathcal{S} = (s_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}}$ is given with $s_{(0,0)} > 0$. Choose and fix an indexation (6) such that the elements of K_{r-1} are indexed at first, and then the rest of K_r . Assume that conditions (10),(11) are satisfied. Construct the associated Hilbert space H , the symmetric operators M_1, M_2 , and define other related objects as in the Introduction. Suppose that $i_s > 0$ and conditions (62),(65) hold with A_k, B_k , $k = 1, 2$, defined by (59),(60). The moment problem (1) has a canonical solution if and only if conditions (63),(64) hold for some Hermitian matrices C_1, C_2 of size $i_s \times i_s$.*

Proof. *Necessity.* Suppose that there exists a canonical solution $\tilde{\mu}$ of the moment problem (1). It is generated by commuting self-adjoint extensions $\tilde{R}_j \supseteq M_j$, $j = 1, 2$. Applying the considerations before the statement of the theorem for $R_j = \tilde{R}_j$, we obtain that conditions (63),(64) hold for the corresponding Hermitian matrices C_1, C_2 .

Sufficiency. Assume that there exist Hermitian matrices C_1, C_2 of size $i_s \times i_s$ which satisfy (63),(64). Define operators R_k , $k = 1, 2$, by the matrices \mathcal{R}_k , as in (58) with

$$A_k = ((M_k g_l, g_j)_H)_{j,l=0}^d, \quad B_k = ((M_k g_l, g_j)_H)_{j=d+1, \dots, d+i_s; l=0, \dots, d}.$$

Operators R_1, R_2 are commuting self-adjoint operators, extending M_1 and M_2 , respectively. Operators R_k generate a canonical solution μ of the moment problem. The proof is complete. \square

Suppose that assumptions of Proposition 1 hold. Now we shall study equations (63),(64) for unknown Hermitian matrices C_1, C_2 of size $i_s \times i_s$. Let

$$C_k = (c_{k;j,l})_{j,l=1}^{i_s}, \quad c_{k;j,l} \in \mathbb{C}, \quad k = 1, 2. \quad (66)$$

For $j, l \in \mathbb{Z}_{1, i_s} : j > l$, we may write

$$c_{k;j,l} = \alpha_{k;j,l} + i\beta_{k;j,l}, \quad \alpha_{k;j,l}, \beta_{k;j,l} \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (67)$$

Thus, Hermitian matrices C_1 and C_2 are determined by real numbers

$$\alpha_{k;j,l}, \beta_{k;j,l}, \quad j, l \in \mathbb{Z}_{1,i_s} : j > l, \quad (68)$$

and

$$c_{k;m,m}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}_{1,i_s}; \quad k = 1, 2. \quad (69)$$

In the case $i_s = 1$ relation (64) takes the following form:

$$B_2 B_1^* - B_1 B_2^* = 0, \quad (70)$$

and it can be verified directly. In this case, taking the real and the imaginary parts of both sides of relation (63) we obtain a system of linear algebraic equations with real coefficients, with respect to unknown real numbers $\alpha_{k;j,l}, \beta_{k;j,l}$, and $c_{k;m,m}$. Thus, in the case $i_s = 1$ the existence of canonical solutions can be easily checked.

Now assume that $i_s = 2$. By (65) we may write:

$$B_2 B_1^* - B_1 B_2^* = U \begin{pmatrix} ir & 0 \\ 0 & -ir \end{pmatrix} U^{-1}, \quad r \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (71)$$

where U is a suitable unitary matrix. Relation (64) may be written in the following form:

$$\mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}_2 - \mathbf{C}_2 \mathbf{C}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} ir & 0 \\ 0 & -ir \end{pmatrix}, \quad (72)$$

where

$$\mathbf{C}_1 = U^{-1} C_1 U, \quad \mathbf{C}_2 = U^{-1} C_2 U. \quad (73)$$

Relation (63) takes the following form:

$$\mathcal{B}_2 \mathbf{C}_1 - \mathcal{B}_1 \mathbf{C}_2 = \mathcal{D}, \quad (74)$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}_2 = B_2^* U, \quad \mathcal{B}_1 = B_1^* U, \quad \mathcal{D} = (A_1 B_2^* - A_2 B_1^*) U. \quad (75)$$

Thus, the moment problem (1) has a canonical solution if and only if conditions (72),(74) hold for some Hermitian matrices $\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_2$ of size 2×2 . Let

$$\mathbf{C}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} a & c \\ \bar{c} & b \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{C}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} d & g \\ \bar{g} & f \end{pmatrix}, \quad (76)$$

where $a, b, d, f \in \mathbb{R}$, $c = c' + ic''$, $g = g' + ig''$, $c', c'', g', g'' \in \mathbb{R}$. If we take the real and imaginary parts of relation (74), we shall obtain a system of linear algebraic equations with real coefficients and real unknowns

$a, b, d, f, c', c'', g', g''$. As for relation (72), it is equivalent to the following two equations:

$$c\bar{g} - \bar{c}g = ir, \quad (77)$$

$$c(f - d) + g(a - b) = 0. \quad (78)$$

Relations (77),(78) are equivalent to the following three equations:

$$c''g' - c'g'' = \frac{r}{2}, \quad (79)$$

$$c'(f - d) + g'(a - b) = 0, \quad (80)$$

$$c''(f - d) + g''(a - b) = 0. \quad (81)$$

Case 1: $r \neq 0$. In this case relations (80),(81) imply $f = d$, $a = b$. In fact, these relations form a real linear algebraic system of equations with respect to $f - d, a - b$, having a non-zero determinant. Thus we have a non-linear equation (79) and a linear system of equations including $f = d$, $a = b$, and those equations obtained from relation (74). Solvability of this system is necessary for the the existence of canonical solutions.

Suppose that the latter linear system of equations has solutions. We substitute its solution into relation (79). If the solution of the linear system was unique, we shall obtain a necessary condition for the existence of canonical solutions. Otherwise, we obtain a single quadratic equation with several unknowns. It can be effectively solved for the cases of one or two unknowns. The case of three or more unknowns for a quadratic equation seems to be not investigated.

Case 2: $r = 0$. In this case relations (77),(78) take the following form:

$$c\bar{g} - \bar{c}g = 0, \quad (82)$$

$$c(f - d) + g(a - b) = 0. \quad (83)$$

Let us look for solutions of these equations with $g = 0$. Then $c(f - d) = 0$. Thus, in this special case equations (82),(83) will be satisfied if $c = 0$ or $f = d$. It remains to solve the linear system corresponding to the real and imaginary parts of relation (74).

In a similar way we may look for solutions of equations (82),(83) with $c = 0$. In this special case equations (82),(83) will be fulfilled if $g = 0$ or $a = b$. Then we also come to a linear system of remaining equations.

Let us search for solutions of equations (82),(83) with $g \neq 0$ and $c \neq 0$. Rewrite equations (82),(83) in the following form:

$$\frac{c}{g} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (84)$$

$$\frac{c}{g}(f - d) + a - b = 0. \quad (85)$$

These equations have a solution if and only if the following system with an additional real unknown β is solvable:

$$c' = \beta g', \quad c'' = \beta g'', \quad (86)$$

$$\beta(f - d) + a - b = 0. \quad (87)$$

Together with the linear system, corresponding to the real and imaginary parts of relation (74), we get a linear system with coefficients depending on a real parameter β . In this case one can apply the Gauss elimination method. In fact, the choice of a leading element may lead to a search of real roots of a polynomial in β . This roots can be localized with any desired precision. If one gets some equations without unknowns, they also lead to a search of real roots of a polynomial in β .

Corollary 1 *Suppose that assumptions of Proposition 1 hold. If $i_s = 1$ then the existence of canonical solutions can be checked explicitly. If $i_s = 2$ then the existence of canonical solutions either can be checked explicitly, or one gets a single quadratic equation with several real unknowns.*

Proof. The proof follows from considerations before the statement of the corollary. \square

Let us show that the cases $i_s = 1$ and $i_s = 2$ can really happen.

Example 1 ($i_s = 1$). Let $n = 2$, $K = K_2$ (see (5)), and $\mathcal{K} = K + K = K_4$. Consider the moment problem (1) with the moments $\mathcal{S} = (s_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}}$:

$$s_{(0,0)} = 9, \quad s_{(1,0)} = -1, \quad s_{(0,1)} = 0, \quad s_{(2,0)} = 1, \quad s_{(1,1)} = 0, \quad s_{(0,2)} = 2,$$

$$s_{(3,0)} = -1, \quad s_{(2,1)} = s_{(1,2)} = s_{(0,3)} = 0,$$

$$s_{(4,0)} = 1, \quad s_{(3,1)} = s_{(2,2)} = s_{(1,3)} = 0, \quad s_{(0,4)} = 2.$$

We shall use the following indexation for K :

$$\mathbf{k}_0 = (0, 0), \quad \mathbf{k}_1 = (1, 0), \quad \mathbf{k}_2 = (0, 1), \quad \mathbf{k}_3 = (2, 0), \quad \mathbf{k}_4 = (1, 1), \quad \mathbf{k}_5 = (0, 2). \quad (88)$$

Consider the associated Hilbert space H (see Introduction), and denote

$$x_j = \left[\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}_j} \right]_{\mathcal{L}}, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}_{0,5}. \quad (89)$$

The matrix Γ from (8) now has the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &= (s_{\mathbf{k}_j+\mathbf{k}_m})_{m,j=0}^5 = ((x_j, x_m)_H)_{m,j=0}^5 = \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 9 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

We have $\Omega_l = \Omega_0 = \{0, 1, 2\}$, and

$$\Gamma_l = \begin{pmatrix} 9 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad l = 1, 2, \quad (91)$$

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \widehat{\Gamma}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (92)$$

Conditions $\Gamma \geq 0$, and

$$\text{Ker } \Gamma_1 \subseteq \text{Ker } \widehat{\Gamma}_1, \quad \text{Ker } \Gamma_2 \subseteq \text{Ker } \widehat{\Gamma}_2,$$

can be verified directly. Apply the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure to x_0, x_1, \dots, x_5 . Using (90) we get an orthonormal basis $\mathcal{G} = \{g_j\}_{j=0}^3$ in H :

$$\begin{aligned} g_0 &= \frac{1}{3}x_0, \quad g_1 = \frac{3}{2\sqrt{2}} \left(x_1 + \frac{1}{9}x_0 \right), \quad g_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x_2, \\ g_3 &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \left(x_5 - \frac{1}{4}x_0 - \frac{1}{4}x_1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\{g_j\}_{j=0}^2$ is an orthonormal basis in $H_0 = D(M_1) = D(M_2)$. Consequently, we have $i_s = 1$.

Let R_1 and R_2 be arbitrary self-adjoint extensions of M_1 and M_2 , respectively. We denote by \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 the matrices of R_1 and R_2 , respectively. Using relations (58),(59),(60) and the definition of the associated operators M_1, M_2 we may calculate the corresponding matrices A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 :

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{9} & \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{9} & 0 \\ \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{9} & -\frac{8}{9} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{6} \\ \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} & \frac{1}{6} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (93)$$

$$B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (94)$$

Conditions (62),(65) are satisfied. Since

$$A_1 B_2^* = A_2 B_1^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_2 B_1^* = B_1 B_2^* = 0,$$

then conditions (63),(64) are satisfied with $C_1 = C_2 = 0$. By Proposition 1 we conclude that the moment problem is solvable.

Example 2 ($i_s = 2$). Let $n = 2$, $K = K_2$, and $\mathcal{K} = K + K = K_4$. Consider the moment problem (1) with the following moments $\mathcal{S} = (s_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}}$:

$$s_{(0,0)} = 8, \quad s_{(1,0)} = s_{(0,1)} = 0, \quad s_{(2,0)} = 2, \quad s_{(1,1)} = 0, \quad s_{(0,2)} = 2,$$

$$s_{(3,0)} = s_{(2,1)} = s_{(1,2)} = s_{(0,3)} = 0,$$

$$s_{(4,0)} = 2, \quad s_{(3,1)} = s_{(2,2)} = s_{(1,3)} = 0, \quad s_{(0,4)} = 2.$$

We shall use the indexation (88) for K . Consider the associated Hilbert space H , and denote x_j as in (89). The matrix Γ from (8) has the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &= (s_{\mathbf{k}_j + \mathbf{k}_m})_{m,j=0}^5 = ((x_j, x_m)_H)_{m,j=0}^5 = \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 8 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

We have $\Omega_l = \Omega_0 = \{0, 1, 2\}$, and

$$\Gamma_l = \begin{pmatrix} 8 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad l = 1, 2, \quad (96)$$

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \widehat{\Gamma}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (97)$$

Conditions $\Gamma \geq 0$, and

$$\text{Ker } \Gamma_1 \subseteq \text{Ker } \widehat{\Gamma}_1, \quad \text{Ker } \Gamma_2 \subseteq \text{Ker } \widehat{\Gamma}_2,$$

can be checked directly. Apply the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure to x_0, x_1, \dots, x_5 . We get an orthonormal basis $\mathcal{G} = \{g_j\}_{j=0}^4$ in H :

$$g_0 = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}x_0, \quad g_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x_1, \quad g_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x_2, \quad g_3 = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \left(x_3 - \frac{1}{4}x_0 \right),$$

$$g_4 = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left(x_5 + \frac{1}{3}x_3 - \frac{1}{3}x_0 \right).$$

Observe that $\{g_j\}_{j=0}^2$ is an orthonormal basis in $H_0 = D(M_1) = D(M_2)$. Therefore $i_s = 2$.

Let R_1 and R_2 be arbitrary self-adjoint extensions of M_1 and M_2 , respectively. Denote by \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 the matrices of R_1 and R_2 , respectively. By relations (58),(59),(60) we may calculate the corresponding matrices A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 :

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (98)$$

$$B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{-1}{2\sqrt{3}} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (99)$$

Conditions (62),(65) are fulfilled. Since

$$A_1 B_2^* = A_2 B_1^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_2 B_1^* = B_1 B_2^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

then conditions (63),(64) are satisfied with

$$C_1 = C_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Proposition 1 we obtain that this moment problem is solvable.

References

- [1] Yu. M. Berezansky, *Expansions in Eigenfunctions of Selfadjoint Operators*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1968. (Russian edition: Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1965).
- [2] C. Berg, J. P. R. Christensen, P. Ressel, *Harmonic Analysis on Semigroups*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984.
- [3] D. Cichoń, J. Stochel, F. H. Szafraniec, Extending positive definiteness.— *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **363**, No. 1 (2011), 545-577.
- [4] R. Curto, L. Fialkow, Solution of the truncated complex moment problem for flat data, *Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc.* 119, no. 568 (1996), x+52 pp.
- [5] R. Curto, L. Fialkow, Flat extensions of positive moment matrices: Recursively generated relations, *Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc.* 136, no. 648 (1998), x+56 pp.
- [6] L. A. Fialkow, Solution of the truncated moment problem with variety $y = x^3$.— *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **363**, No. 6 (2011), 3133-3165.
- [7] M. Laurent, B. Mourrain, A generalized flat extension theorem for moment matrices, *Arch. Math.*, 93 (2009), 87–98.
- [8] M. Putinar, F.-H. Vasilescu, Solving moment problems by dimensional extension, *Annals of Math.*, **149** (1999), 1087-1107.
- [9] K. Schmüdgen, *The moment problem*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 277. Springer, Cham, 2017. xii+535 pp.
- [10] J. A. Shohat, J. D. Tamarkin, *The problem of moments*, Amer. Math. Soc., 531 West 116th Street, New York City, 1943.
- [11] J. Stochel, F. H. Szafraniec, The complex moment problem and subnormality: a polar decomposition approach, *J. Funct. Anal.* 159 (1998), 432–491.
- [12] F.-H. Vasilescu, Dimensional stability in truncated moment problems, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **388** (2012), 219–230.
- [13] F.-H. Vasilescu, An idempotent approach to truncated moment problems.— *Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory*, **79** Issue 3 (2014), 301-335.

- [14] S. Yoo, Sextic moment problems on 3 parallel lines.— *Bull. Korean. Math. Soc.*, **54**, No. 1 (2017), 299-318.
- [15] S. M. Zagorodnyuk, On the two-dimensional moment problem.—*Ann. Funct. Anal.* , **1**, no. 1 (2010), 80-104.
- [16] S.M. Zagorodnyuk, Generalized resolvents of symmetric and isometric operators: the Shtraus approach. —*Annals of Functional Analysis*, **4**, No. 1 (2013), 175–285.
- [17] S. M. Zagorodnyuk, The two-dimensional moment problem in a strip. —*Methods Funct. Anal. Topology*, **19**, no. 1 (2013), 40–54.
- [18] S. Zagorodnyuk, On the truncated two-dimensional moment problem.—*Adv. Oper. Theory*, **3**, no. 2 (2018), 63-74.
- [19] S. M. Zagorodnyuk, The operator approach to the truncated multidimensional moment problem.—*Concr. Oper.*, **6** (2019), no. 1, 1–19.
- [20] S. ZAGORODNYUK, *On the truncated multidimensional moment problems in \mathbb{C}^n* , *Axioms* **11**, no. 1 (2022), 20.

Address:

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University
 School of Mathematics and Computer Sciences
 Department of Higher Mathematics and Informatics
 Svobody Square 4, 61022, Kharkiv, Ukraine
 Sergey.M.Zagorodnyuk@gmail.com; zagorodnyuk@karazin.ua