

AN OPERATOR THEORY APPROACH TO THE EVANESCENT PART OF A TWO-PARAMETRIC WEAK-STATIONARY STOCHASTIC PROCESS

ZBIGNIEW BURDAK, MAREK KOSIEK, PATRYK PAGACZ, MAREK SŁOCIŃSKI

ABSTRACT. A new approach to the evanescent part of a two-dimensional weak-stationary stochastic process with the past given by a half-plane is proceed. The classical result due to Helson and Lowdenslager divides a two-parametric weak-stationary stochastic process into three parts. In this paper we describe the most untouchable one - the evanescent part. Moreover, we point out how this part depends on the shape of the past.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the remarkable work [38] Wold decomposed a stationary stochastic process between a deterministic process and the moving average of a white noise. A stochastic process has an interpretation as a Hilbert space isometry. Halmos gave an abstract version of Wold's result in [22] decomposing an arbitrary Hilbert space isometry between a unitary operator and a unilateral shift with a geometrical description of a unilateral shift. The similar decomposition of an isometry without the geometrical structure was pointed out earlier by von Neumann in [32].

Another direction of generalization of Wold's result are multi-dimensional stochastic processes called random fields. Random fields find their practical meaning, in the context presented in this paper, e.g in the problem of image texture modeling, filtering data and other applications, see [1, 15, 11, 18, 20, 19, 21]. The set of indices of a stochastic process is usually interpreted as time and is divided among a past, a present and a future. In the one-dimensional case negative indices naturally define the past.

In the two-dimensional case there are at least two concepts of the definition of the past: a quaternary past and a half-plane past. Moreover, a random field strongly depends on the definition of the past. Helson and Lowdenslager in [24] decomposed an arbitrary random field with a half-plane past among three summands, where a precise description of so called evanescent part is still missing. An abstract version of this result for commuting pairs of Hilbert space isometries is given in [35].

The paper is organized as follows. In Subsection 1.1 we recall the basic concepts of prediction theory introduced in [23, 24]. In Subsections 1.2 we present the operator theory approach to weak-stationary random fields as pairs of commuting Hilbert space isometries. In particular we include the recent results on decomposition of pairs of commuting Hilbert space isometries and models of summands in the decomposition. In Sections 2, 3 and 4 we show that the evanescent part of a random field with a half-plane past corresponds to exactly one pair of isometries (one summand) in the decomposition, where the corresponding summand is determined by a half-plane defining the past as follows: horizontal half-plane - a pair of a unitary operator and a unilateral shift, a half-plane with rational slope - a pair of generalized powers, and a half-plane with irrational slope - a continuously given pair.

Additionally, in the appendix, we give a formal proof of the form of a half-plane. Such result was mentioned in [17], but we were not able to find a strict proof in literature.

1.1. Prediction theory. A random field is a collection of random variables $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$ defined on the same probability space indexed in some topological space T usually interpreted as time. We consider a complex-valued variables indexed by $T = \mathbb{Z}^2$.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* MSC2020: 47B20, 47A13, 60G10, 60G25.

Key words and phrases. Keywords: evanescent part, stochastic process, weak-stationary, isometries, compatible isometries.

Definition 1. A random field $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ is weak-stationary if:

- $\mathbb{E}[|X_{(s,t)}|^2] < \infty$ for any $(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$,
- $\mathbb{E}[X_{(s,t)}]$ do not depend on $(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ (frequently assumed to vanish),
- the cross moments depend at most on the distance i.e. $\mathbb{E}[X_{(s,t)}\overline{X_{(s,t)+(p,q)}}] = \gamma(p,q)$, for some function γ .

By the first condition a weak-stationary random field can be considered in a Hilbert space of square integrable functions with an inner product $\langle X, Y \rangle = \mathbb{E}[X\overline{Y}]$.

Let $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ be a weak-stationary random field. The main goal of prediction theory is to investigate its dependence on the past. In other words, dependence of $X_{(s,t)}$ on $\{X_{(i,j)} : (i-s, j-t) \in S\}$ where the subset $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ define "the past". Let us recall precisely two concepts of a two-dimensional past:

$$(1) \quad Q = \{(i,j) : i \leq 0, j \leq 0\} \setminus \{(0,0)\}, \quad L = \{(i,j) : j \leq -1, i \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{(i,0) : i \leq -1\}$$

which correspond to the third-quadrant and the bottom half-plane, respectively. The set L is a special case of a half-plane as defined in [23].

Definition 2. S is a half-plane of lattice points if

- $(0,0) \notin S$,
- S is a semigroup,
- $(m,n) \in S$ if and only if $(-m,-n) \notin S$ unless $m = n = 0$.

There is one-to-one correspondence between half-planes and (preserving addition) total orders on \mathbb{Z}^2 . Indeed, a half-plane S define a total order as follows:

$$(s,t) \prec (i,j) \iff (s,t) \in (i,j) + S \cup \{(0,0)\}.$$

Conversely, a half-plane can be defined by a total order \prec as follows:

$$S := \{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : (i,j) \prec (0,0), (i,j) \neq (0,0)\}.$$

In [17] there was observed that a half-plane can be described by a vector \mathbf{v} , i.e. each half-plane is equal to

$$(2) \quad S_{\mathbf{v}} = \{(i,j) : \langle \mathbf{v}, (i,j) \rangle = iv_1 + jv_2 \geq 0 \text{ for } i < 0, \langle \mathbf{v}, (i,j) \rangle > 0 \text{ for } i \geq 0\},$$

or to

$$(3) \quad \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{v}} = \{(i,j) : \langle \mathbf{v}, (i,j) \rangle = iv_1 + jv_2 > 0 \text{ for } i \leq 0, \langle \mathbf{v}, (i,j) \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for } i > 0\}.$$

for some $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$. It can be showed that $\widehat{S}_{[x,y]} = \{(i,j) : (j,i) \in S_{[y,x]}\}$. The formal prove that any half-plane can be described as above is posted in Appendix. In particular, set L is equal to $S_{[0,-1]}$. Thus half-planes are rotations of L . The half-planes $S_{\mathbf{v}}$ were also called a *nonsymmetrical or augmented half-planes* f.e. in [14, 13, 18].

The general prediction theory based on weak-stationary random fields with a half-plane past was developed in the seminal papers by Helson and Lowdenslager (see [23, 24]). Let us recall some results following from their work.

The function γ on \mathbb{Z}^2 corresponding to a weak-stationary random field in Definition 1 is positive-definite. Hence, by Bochner's theorem, there is a unique distribution function F on the torus $\mathbb{T} = (-\pi, \pi]^2$ such that

$$\gamma(s,t) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp(-i(s\lambda_1 + t\lambda_2)) dF(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

Further, let $H := \text{span}\{X(s,t); (s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ where $\text{span}\{\dots\}$ denotes a closed linear manifold and $L^2(dF)$ be the space of square integrable functions on \mathbb{T} with respect to the measure $dF(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$. Both spaces $H, L^2(dF)$ are Hilbert spaces and the map $X_{(s,t)} \rightarrow \exp(-i(s\lambda_1 + t\lambda_2))$ extends to an isomorphism from H onto $L^2(dF)$.

Let

$$(4) \quad H^{(i,j)} := \text{span}\{X_{(s,t)} : (s-i, t-j) \in S\}$$

be the past of $X_{(i,j)}$. In the context of Helson and Lowdenslager paper [24] we give a standard and meaningful definition.

Definition 3. A random field $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ is said to be

- deterministic if $X_{(s,t)} \in \bigcap_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2} H^{(i,j)}$, for $(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$,
- evanescent if $\bigcap_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2} H^{(i,j)} = \{0\}$ and $X_{(s,t)} \in H^{(s,t)}$ for $(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$,
- purely nondeterministic if $X_{(s,t)} \in \text{span}\{I_{(i,j)} : (i,j) \in (s,t) + S \cup \{(0,0)\}\}$, for $(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, where $I_{(i,j)} := X_{(i,j)} - P_{H^{(i,j)}} X_{(i,j)}$ is called an innovation part of $X_{(i,j)}$, for $(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

The decomposition among the three parts above is given in [24]. The version we present follows from [24, Theorem 5] and [17, Theorems 3.1, 3.2] (in here for scalar valued process).

Theorem 4. Let $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ be a weak-stationary random field with a half-plane past S and a unique distribution function F with Lebesgue decomposition $F = f dm_2 + dF_s$. The process $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ has a nontrivial innovation part if and only if $\log(f) \in L^1(dm_2)$ and then:

•

$$(5) \quad A_{(s,t)} = \sum_{(k,l) \in S \cup \{(0,0)\}} a_{k,l} I_{s+k, t+l},$$

is a purely nondeterministic random field with distribution $dF_A = f dm_2$ where $I_{(s,t)}$ is an innovation part of $X_{(s,t)}$ and $a_{k,l} = \langle I_{0,0}, I_{0,0} \rangle^{-1} \langle X_{0,0}, I_{k,l} \rangle$, for $(k,l) \in S \cup \{(0,0)\}$,

- there are an evanescent random field $\{E_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ with distribution F_E and a deterministic random field $\{D_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ with distribution F_D such that $F_s = F_E + F_D$ and

$$X_{(s,t)} = A_{(s,t)} + E_{(s,t)} + D_{(s,t)}, \quad (s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2.$$

Moreover, there is a Borel set $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{T}$ of Lebesgue measure 0 such that

$$A_{(s,t)} = \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus \Gamma} \exp(is\lambda_1 + it\lambda_2) dF X_{(0,0)}.$$

The main difference between the above two-dimensional Wold-type decomposition and the classical Wold's one-dimensional version is the evanescent part. Let us point out that a purely nondeterministic part does not depend on the choice of S but evanescent and deterministic parts do. Recent spectral approaches to the evanescent part may be found in [15, 16, 17, 19, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31].

1.2. Two-dimensional Wold decomposition in operator theory. There is a natural interpretation of a random field $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ in the Hilbert space of square integrable functions with the inner product $\langle X, Y \rangle := \mathbb{E}(XY)$ as $H = \text{span}\{X_{(i,j)} : (i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$. Then operators defined by

$$(6) \quad U_1 X_{(s,t)} = X_{(s-1,t)}, \quad U_2 X_{(s,t)} = X_{(s,t-1)}, \quad (s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$$

are unitary on H and commute. Since without loss of generality we may assume that $\mathbb{Z}_-^2 \subset S$ subspaces $H^{(i,j)}$ defined in (4) are invariant under U_1, U_2 , so

$$(7) \quad V_1 = U_1|_{H^{(i,j)}}, \quad V_2 = U_2|_{H^{(i,j)}}$$

are commuting isometries, not necessarily unitary for any $(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Operators V_1, V_2 clearly depend on (i,j) but usually (i,j) is clear from the context and we skip it in notation.

As one can expect a decomposition of a random field provides a decomposition of (V_1, V_2) . It turns out that there is also the reverse connection. Precisely random fields may be investigated as pairs of commuting isometries. Let us describe this relations. The starting point is an operator version of Helson and Lowdenslager decomposition obtained by I. Suciú in [35].

Recall the operator theory notions corresponding to deterministic, evanescent and purely nondeterministic random fields. A pair of isometries (operators) is *completely non-unitary* if there is no non-trivial subspace reducing both operators to unitary operators. Further:

Definition 5. Let $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ be a semigroup such that $S \cap -S = \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{Z}_+^2 \subset S$ and (V_1, V_2) be a pair of commuting isometries on a Hilbert space H such that

$$V^{(m,n)} := \begin{cases} V_1^m V_2^n, & \text{if } m, n \geq 0, \\ V_1^{*|m|} V_2^n, & \text{if } m < 0 \leq n, \\ V_2^{*|n|} V_1^m, & \text{if } n < 0 \leq m, \end{cases}$$

is an isometry for any $(m, n) \in S$.

Then (V_1, V_2) is called

- quasi-unitary if

$$\text{cl} \left\{ \bigcup_{(m,n)-(k,l) \in S} V^{(k,l)*} V^{(m,n)} H \right\} = H,$$

- totally non-unitary if there is no non-trivial subspace reducing (V_1, V_2) to a quasi-unitary pair,
- strange if it is quasi-unitary and completely non-unitary.

Note that $\{V^{(m,n)}\}_{(m,n) \in S}$ is a semi-group since $V^{(m,n)}$ is assumed to be an isometry for any $(m, n) \in S$.

Theorem 6. [35, Theorem 3] Let $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ be a semigroup such that $S \cap -S = \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{Z}_+^2 \subset S$. Let a pair of isometries (V_1, V_2) on a Hilbert space H be such that $V^{(m,n)}$ is an isometry for any $(m, n) \in S$. Then there is a unique decomposition

$$H = H_u \oplus H_e \oplus H_t,$$

where H_u, H_e, H_t are (V_1, V_2) reducing subspaces, $(V_1|_{H_u}, V_2|_{H_u})$ is a pair of unitary operators, $(V_1|_{H_e}, V_2|_{H_e})$ is strange and $(V_1|_{H_t}, V_2|_{H_t})$ is totally non-unitary.

Theorem 6 implies Theorem 4 by Remark 8 below. First we remark some property used in the proof of Remark 8 and further in the paper.

Remark 7. Let (V_1, V_2) be a pair of isometries on H and (U_1, U_2) be its minimal unitary extension on K . If $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$ is a decomposition between (V_1, V_2) reducing subspaces, then $K = K_1 \oplus K_2$ where K_i are the spaces of the minimal unitary extensions of $(V_1|_{H_i}, V_2|_{H_i})$ for $i = 1, 2$. It follows a decomposition $K = H_1 \oplus (K_1 \ominus H_1) \oplus H_2 \oplus (K_2 \ominus H_2)$ which is equivalent to $P_{H_i} = P_H P_{K_i} = P_{K_i} P_H$ for $i = 1, 2$ as operators on K . In other words $H_i = K_i \cap H$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Clearly the similar result is correct for decomposition among more reducing subspaces.

Remark 8. Let us consider decompositions

$$H^{(i,j)} = H_u^{(i,j)} \oplus H_e^{(i,j)} \oplus H_t^{(i,j)}$$

of subspaces (4) given by Theorem 6 for (V_1, V_2) as in (7) for $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. A minimal unitary extension of (V_1, V_2) for each (i, j) is an extension to the whole H and by Remark 7 we get $H = H_u \oplus H_e \oplus H_t$ where H_u, H_e, H_t are minimal unitary extensions of $H_u^{(i,j)}, H_s^{(i,j)}, H_t^{(i,j)}$ respectively. Clearly $H_u = H_u^{(i,j)}$ so it does not depend on (i, j) . Moreover, since by Remark 7 $P_{H_t^{(i,j)}} = P_{H_t} P_{H^{(i,j)}}$ and $P_{H^{(i,j)}} \xrightarrow{SOT} I$ for $(i, j) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$ we get $H_t = \text{span}\{H_t^{(i,j)} : (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ and similarly $H_e = \text{span}\{H_e^{(i,j)} : (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$.

Moreover, if

$$X_{(s,t)} = A_{(s,t)} + E_{(s,t)} + D_{(s,t)}$$

is a decomposition like in Theorem 4, then $D_{(s,t)} \in H_u$, $A_{(s,t)} \in H_t$, $E_{(s,t)} \in H_e$. Hence Theorem 6 implies Theorem 4 by

$$X_{(s,t)} = P_{H_t} X_{(s,t)} + P_{H_e} X_{(s,t)} + P_{H_u} X_{(s,t)}.$$

The Wold(-type) decompositions of Hilbert space isometries are originated as generalization of the results for stochastic processes/random fields. Hence the result as in Remark 8 is not surprising. However, operator theory approach to the problem developed independently. In this paper we apply some recent result in operator theory concerning pairs of commuting, compatible isometries, to get a precise description of the evanescent part in the case of *rational nonsymmetrical half-plane* (RNHP) i.e. $S = S_{\mathbf{v}}$, where $\mathbf{v} = (k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and also some result describing the evanescent part for irrational nonsymmetrical half-plane past i.e. $S = S_{\mathbf{v}}$, where $\mathbf{v} = (q, r) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\frac{q}{r} \notin \mathbb{Q}$. The problem of describing the evanescent part under above assumption on the past was investigated by many authors (i.e. [1, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 28, 29]).

The pair of isometries (V_1, V_2) on \mathcal{H} is compatible if $P_{V_1^m(\mathcal{H})}P_{V_2^n(\mathcal{H})} = P_{V_2^n(\mathcal{H})}P_{V_1^m(\mathcal{H})}$ for any non negative m, n ([30]). Let (V_1, V_2) be as in (7) for any $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Note that $V_1^m(H^{(i,j)}) = U_1^m(H^{(i,j)}) = H^{(i-m,j)}$ and $V_2^n(H^{(i,j)}) = U_2^n(H^{(i,j)}) = H^{(i,j-n)}$. On the other hand, a half-plane past define a total order which implies a total inclusion order among subspaces $H^{(i,j)}$ and in turn a total order among $P_{H^{(i,j)}}$. It clearly implies compatibility of (V_1, V_2) . Let us remark that a pair of isometries corresponding to random field with Q past (1) does not have to be compatible.

The commuting, compatible pairs are described in [7, 9]. More precisely, from [9, Theorem 3] we get a decomposition among pairs of isometries of certain types. First we formulate a decomposition theorem. Then we recall definitions of the types of compatible pairs that appears in the decomposition and its relation with the random fields.

Theorem 9. *For any pair of commuting, compatible isometries (V_1, V_2) on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} there is a decomposition:*

$$H = H_{uu} \oplus H_{us} \oplus H_{su} \oplus H_{gp} \oplus H_d \oplus H_c$$

where $H_{uu}, H_{us}, H_{su}, H_{gp}, H_d, H_c$ reduce (V_1, V_2) such that:

- $V_1|_{H_{uu}}, V_2|_{H_{uu}}, V_1|_{H_{us}}, V_2|_{H_{su}}$ are unitary and $V_1|_{H_{su}}, V_2|_{H_{us}}$ are unilateral shifts,
- $(V_1|_{H_{gp}}, V_2|_{H_{gp}})$ decomposes among pairs of generalized powers,
- $(V_1|_{H_d}, V_2|_{H_d})$ decomposes among pairs given by diagrams,
- $(V_1|_{H_c}, V_2|_{H_c})$ is a continuously given pair.

The deterministic part is described by Theorem 6 as a pair of unitary operators.

The purely nondeterministic part is described as a pair defined by a diagram by Theorem 12. A *diagram* is a set $J \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $J + \mathbb{Z}_+^2 \subset J$. The concept of pairs of isometries defined by diagrams was introduced by Müller in [30] and developed in [8].

Definition 10. *Let J be a diagram and \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space. Define*

$$H_J := \{f \in L^2_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{T}) : \hat{f}_{i,j} = 0 \text{ for } (i, j) \notin J\} = \text{span}\{z_1^i z_2^j h : (i, j) \in J, h \in \mathcal{H}\}$$

where $L^2_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{T})$ denotes a space of \mathcal{H} valued, square integrable functions and $\hat{f}_{i,j}$ denotes the respective Fourier coefficient. Note that H_J is invariant under operators of multiplication by independent variables M_{z_1}, M_{z_2} .

A pair of isometries defined by the diagram J and the space \mathcal{H} is a pair unitarily equivalent to $M_{z_1}|_{H_J}, M_{z_2}|_{H_J}$.

For the one who prefers purely geometrical description let us recall an equivalent definition as in [7].

Remark 11. *Let J be a diagram and \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space.*

Define a Hilbert space $H := \{\mathbf{v} = \{v_{(i,j)}\}_{(i,j) \in J} : v_{i,j} \in \mathcal{H}\}$ and operators

$$V_1 \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{x} \text{ where } x_{(i,j)} = \begin{cases} v_{(i-1,j)}, & \text{if } (i-1, j) \in J; \\ 0, & \text{if } (i-1, j) \notin J. \end{cases}$$

$$V_2 \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{y} \text{ where } y_{(i,j)} = \begin{cases} v_{(i,j-1)}, & \text{if } (i, j-1) \in J; \\ 0, & \text{if } (i, j-1) \notin J. \end{cases}$$

Operators V_1, V_2 are commuting isometries defined by the diagram J and the space \mathcal{H} .

In particular for $J = (\mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{0\})^2$ the subspace H_J is a (vector valued) Hardy space and $M_{z_1}|_{H_J}, M_{z_2}|_{H_J}$ is a pair of doubly commuting unilateral shifts. Let us note that the set $(i, j) + J$,

called a *translation* of the diagram J , is a diagram which generate the same pair of isometries as J (assuming the same space \mathcal{H}), where $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Hence, it is more precise to view a pair of isometries as defined by a translation equivalence class of a diagram than a single diagram.

Since S in Definition 5 is a semigroup containing \mathbb{Z}_+^2 it is a diagram. Hence, directly from [35, Theorem 4] follows.


Theorem 12. *Any totally non-unitary pair of isometries is a pair given by a diagram.*

Note that Theorem 12 implies (5).

The evanescent part of the random field with the past L (1) is described by a pair of a unitary operator and a unilateral shift by Theorem 16. The evanescent part of the random field with the rational nonsymmetrical half-plane past $S_{(k,l)}$ for $(k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ is described by a pair of generalized powers by Theorem 21. Generalized powers are generalization of a pair (V^m, V^n) where V is a unilateral shift and m, n are positive integers. Hence a random field corresponding to (V^m, V^n) is defined by a one-dimensional white noise. The model of a pair of generalized powers and its definition require the concept of a periodic diagram.

Definition 13. *The diagram J is periodic if there exist m, n such that for $J_0 := (\{0, 1, \dots, m-1\} \times \mathbb{Z}) \cap J$ and $J_k := (km, -kn) + J_0 = \{(i + km, j - kn) : (i, j) \in J_0\}$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $J = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} J_k$, and J_k are disjoint for different k . Then the set J_0 is called a period of the diagram.*

The idea of a periodic diagram and its period is explained in the following picture:



The definition of a pair of generalized powers was originally given in [7, Definition 7.3], but in [8, Definition 4.7] it uses a more convenient notation. For reader convenience we give a definition with notation similar to Remark 11.

Definition 14. *Let there be given a periodic diagram J with period J_0 and integers (m, n) and a unitary $\mathcal{U} \in B(\mathcal{H})$. Define $H := \{\mathbf{v} = \{v_{(i,j)}\}_{(i,j) \in J_0} : v_{i,j} \in \mathcal{H}\}$ and*

$$V_1 \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{x} \text{ where } x_{(i,j)} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } i = 0 \text{ and } (m-1, j-n) \notin J_0, \\ \mathcal{U}v_{(m-1, j-n)}, & \text{if } i = 0 \text{ and } (m-1, j-n) \in J_0, \\ v_{(i-1, j)}, & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, m-1. \end{cases}$$

$$V_2 \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{y} \text{ where } y_{(i,j)} = \begin{cases} v_{(i, j-1)}, & \text{if } (i, j-1) \in J_0, \\ 0, & \text{if } (i, j-1) \notin J. \end{cases}$$

We call (V_1, V_2) a pair of generalized powers given by a periodic diagram J and a unitary \mathcal{U} .

By [7, Theorem 7.2] generalized powers (V_1, V_2) are compatible and $V_2^{*n} V_1^m$ is unitary - equal to the extension of \mathcal{U} onto H given by $V_2^{*n} V_1^m \mathbf{v} = \{\mathcal{U}v_{(i,j)}\}_{(i,j) \in J_0}$, for $\mathbf{v} = \{v_{(i,j)}\}_{(i,j) \in J_0}$. Conversely,

if (V_1, V_2) is a commuting, compatible pair of isometries, such that $V_2^{*n}V_1^m$ is unitary for some (m, n) then the pair may be decomposed among pairs of unitary operators and pairs of generalized powers.

Let us emphasize that the subspace H_d in Theorem 9 is not the maximal one, where a pair may be decomposed among pairs given by diagrams. To be precise, some special cases of pairs in other parts may be also considered as pairs given by a diagram. The simplest example is M_{z_1}, M_{z_2} on $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ which is a pair of unitary operators but also a pair given by the diagram \mathbb{Z}^2 . It turns out that some generalized powers may be also described as pairs given by diagrams. It is explained in [8, p.176, Remark 4.9] - a pair of generalized powers given by a (periodic) diagram J and a bilateral shift \mathcal{U} with the wandering subspace \mathcal{H}_w may be also described as a pair of isometries given by the same diagram J and the space \mathcal{H}_w . The reverse also holds. That is, if V_1, V_2 is a pair given by a periodic diagram and the space \mathcal{H} then $V_2^{*n}V_1^m$ is a bilateral shift, for which \mathcal{H} is wandering where m, n are integers corresponding to the periodicity of the diagram. Such the pair may be also described as a pair of generalized powers given by the same diagram and a unitary $\mathcal{U} = V_2^{*n}V_1^m|_{\bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (V_2^{*n}V_1^m)^i \mathcal{H}}$.

The evanescent part of a random field with irrational half-plane past is described by a continuously given pair by Theorem 25. The original definition of a continuously given pair [9, Definition 1] uses the concept of the shape of the diagram. To avoid recalling some technical construction we have formulated equivalent definition.

Definition 15. *A pair of compatible isometries $(V_1, V_2) \in B(H)$ is continuously given if the minimal (V_1, V_2) reducing subspace containing $\ker V_1^* \cap \ker V_2^*$ is the whole H and there is no nontrivial subspace reducing (V_1, V_2) to a pair of generalized powers or a pair given by a diagram.*

2. THE EVANESCENT PART FOR THE PAST GIVEN BY L

In this section we consider the random field $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ with no deterministic part and the past given by the half-plane L (1). Our aim is to decompose such a random field between a purely non-deterministic field and an evanescent field and show that the latter one consists of a one-dimensional deterministic and a one-dimensional completely non-deterministic processes. Such a result is not new, however we use operator theory approach, which applied in the next section will describe evanescent part of a random field with a rational half-plane past in the new way.

Let

$$-L = \{(k, l) : (-k, -l) \in L\} = \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \mathbb{Z}_+ \times \{0\}$$

and $V^{(k,l)}$ be as in Definition 5 which in the case of $(k, l) \in -L$, so $l \geq 0$ simplifies to

$$V^{(k,l)} = \begin{cases} V_1^k V_2^l & \text{for } k \geq 0, \\ V_1^{*-k} V_2^l & \text{for } k < 0. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 16. *Let $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ be a random field with no deterministic part and the half-plane past L (1). Further, let U_1, U_2 be unitaries corresponding to the random field as in (6) and $V_1 = U_1|_{H^{(0,0)}}, V_2 = U_2|_{H^{(0,0)}}$ be isometries defined on $H^{(0,0)}$ - the past of $X_{(0,0)}$.*

There is a decomposition $H^{(0,0)} = H_t^{(0,0)} \oplus H_e^{(0,0)}$ such that:

- $H_t^{(0,0)}, H_e^{(0,0)}$ reduce V_1, V_2 ,
- $V_1|_{H_t^{(0,0)}}, V_2|_{H_t^{(0,0)}}$ is a totally non unitary pair,
- $V_1|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}$ is unitary, $V_2|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}$ is a unilateral shift.

Moreover,

- there is a vector $v \in \ker V_2^* \cap H_e$ cyclic for $V_1|_{\ker V_2^* \cap H_e}$ and

$$H_e = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \text{span}\{V_2^n V_1^m v : m = 0, \dots, K - 1\}$$

where $K = \dim \ker V_2^* \leq \infty$,

- $V_1|_{H_t^{(0,0)}}, V_2|_{H_t^{(0,0)}}$ is given by the diagram $-L \cup \{(0,0)\}$ and

$$H_t^{(0,0)} = \bigoplus_{(k,l) \in -L \cup \{(0,0)\}} V^{(k,l)} \ker V_1^*.$$

Proof. Since the random field $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ has no deterministic part, V_1, V_2 is completely non-unitary, so $V_1 V_2$ is a unilateral shift, and we have $H^{(0,0)} = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} (V_1 V_2)^n \mathcal{E}$ where $\mathcal{E} = \ker(V_1 V_2)^*$. For the matrix representation of V_1, V_2 let it be given $l^2(\mathcal{E}) = \{(h_0, h_1, \dots) : h_n \in \mathcal{E}, \sum_{n \geq 0} \|h_n\|^2 < \infty\}$ and a unitary operator

$$\Psi : H^{(0,0)} \ni h = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (V_1 V_2)^n h_n \mapsto (h_0, h_1, \dots) \in l^2(\mathcal{E}).$$

We show the decomposition $l^2(\mathcal{E}) = H_t^W \oplus H_e^W$ satisfying conditions analogous to those in the statement for the pair $W_1 = \Psi V_1 \Psi^*, W_2 = \Psi V_2 \Psi^* \in B(l^2(\mathcal{E}))$. Then $H_t^{(0,0)} = \Psi^* H_t^W, H_e^{(0,0)} = \Psi^* H_e^W$ satisfy the statement for V_1, V_2 .

Berger, Coburn, Lebow model [3] via [34, (3-6)] provides a matrix representation

$$W_1 = \begin{bmatrix} U(I-P) & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ UP & U(I-P) & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & UP & U(I-P) & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & UP & U(I-P) & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & UP & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$W_2 = \begin{bmatrix} PU^* & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ (I-P)U^* & PU^* & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & (I-P)U^* & PU^* & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & (I-P)U^* & PU^* & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & (I-P)U^* & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

where $U, P \in B(\mathcal{E})$

$$(8) \quad U = (W_1(I - W_2 W_2^*) + (I - W_1 W_1^*)W_2^*)|_{\mathcal{E}} = (W_1(I - W_2 W_2^*) + W_2^*)|_{\mathcal{E}}$$

is unitary and

$$P = W_2(I - W_1 W_1^*)W_2^*|_{\mathcal{E}}$$

is an orthogonal projection. The middle term in (8) is more convenient to calculate U^* as follows

$$(9) \quad U^* = P_{\mathcal{E}}((I - W_2 W_2^*)W_1^* + W_2(I - W_1 W_1^*))|_{\mathcal{E}} = (W_1^* + W_2(I - W_1 W_1^*))|_{\mathcal{E}}.$$

Let us define

$$H_t^W := \bigoplus_{(k,l) \in L \cup \{(0,0)\}} W^{(k,l)} \ker W_1^*.$$

To see that H_t^W is well defined we have to show that $W^{(k,l)} \ker W_1^*$ are pairwise orthogonal. We do it by proving that:

- $\ker W_1^* = EUP\mathcal{E}$, where E is a natural embedding of \mathcal{E} into $l^2(\mathcal{E})$,
- $UP\mathcal{E}$ is wandering for U ,
- there is a one-to-one correspondence between $\{W^{(k,l)} \ker W_1^* : (k,l) \in -L \cup \{(0,0)\}\}$ and $\{(W_1 W_2)^i E U^n P \mathcal{E} : i \geq 0, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

To see (a) let us calculate that

$$(10) \quad W_1 W_1^* = \begin{bmatrix} I - UPU^* & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & I & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \quad W_2 W_2^* = \begin{bmatrix} P & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & I & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

and so $P_{\ker W_1^*} = I - W_1 W_1^* = \begin{bmatrix} UPU^* & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} = EUPU^*P_{\mathcal{E}}$. Hence

$$\ker W_1^* = EUPU^*P_{\mathcal{E}}l^2(\mathcal{E}) = EUPU^*\mathcal{E} = EUP_{\mathcal{E}}.$$

Next let us see (b). The total order given by the past L implies $W_2(l^2(\mathcal{E})) = \Psi V_2(H^{(0,0)}) = \Psi H^{(0,-1)} \subset \Psi H^{(-n,0)} = \Psi V_1^n(H^{(0,0)}) = W_1^n(l^2(\mathcal{E}))$ and in turn

$$(11) \quad W_2 W_2^* \leq W_1^n W_1^{*n} \text{ for } n \geq 1.$$

Now, let us prove that $PU^n P = 0$ for $n \neq 0$.

The proof is done by induction, it requires to prove simultaneously formulae on $W_1^n W_1^{*n}$. More precisely, we show that

$$W_1^n W_1^{*n} = \begin{bmatrix} I - \sum_{i=1}^n U^i P U^{*i} & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & I & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad P U^n P = 0.$$

Base step, $n = 1$ is the result of (10) and (11) by which

$$P(I - UPU^*) = P \Rightarrow PUPU^* = 0 \Rightarrow PUP = 0.$$

Inductive step: assume that

$$W_1^n W_1^{*n} = \begin{bmatrix} I - \sum_{i=1}^n U^i P U^{*i} & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & I & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad P U^i P = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Taking advantage of $PU^i P = 0$ and $PU^{*i} P = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ one can directly calculate

$$W_1^{n+1} W_1^{*(n+1)} = W_1(W_1^n W_1^{*n})W_1^* = \begin{bmatrix} I - \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} U^i P U^{*i} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & I & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence by (11) we get

$$P\left(I - \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} U^i P U^{*i}\right) = P \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} P U^i P U^{*i} = 0 \Rightarrow P U^{n+1} P U^{*(n+1)} = 0 \Rightarrow P U^{n+1} P = 0$$

where the last but one implication is by inductive assumption $PU^i P = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Therefore, $PU^n P = 0$, for $n > 0$ (so for $n \neq 0$) yields that $UP_{\mathcal{E}}$ is wandering for U .

Now, let us focus on (c). By a direct calculation on matrix form of W_1, W_2 taking advantage of $PU^n P = 0$, for $n \neq 0$ one can check that

$$(12) \quad EU^n|_{UP_{\mathcal{E}}} = W_1^n|_{EUP_{\mathcal{E}}} = W_1^n|_{\ker W_1^*},$$

and

$$(13) \quad EU^{*n}|_{UP_{\mathcal{E}}} = EU^{*n}UPU^*|_{UP_{\mathcal{E}}} = EU^{*(n-1)}PU^*|_{UP_{\mathcal{E}}} = W_1^{*n-1}W_2|_{EUP_{\mathcal{E}}} = W_1^{*n-1}W_2|_{\ker W_1^*},$$

for $n \geq 1$. Hence it follows the one-to-one correspondence:

$$(W_1 W_2)^l EU^{k-l}(UP_{\mathcal{E}}) = W_1^l W_2^l W_1^{k-l}(\ker W_1^*) = W_1^k W_2^l(\ker W_1^*) = W^{(k,l)}(\ker W_1^*)$$

for $k \geq l \geq 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
(W_1 W_2)^{l-1} E U^{*l-k} (U P \mathcal{E}) &= W_2^{l-1} W_1^{l-1} W_1^{*l-k-1} W_2 (\ker W_1^*) \\
&= \begin{cases} W_2^{l-1} W_1^{l-1} W_1^{*l-1} W_1^k W_2 (\ker W_1^*) & \text{for } k \geq 0, \\ W_2^{l-1} W_1^{l-1} W_1^{*l-1} W_1^{*-k} W_2 (\ker W_1^*) & \text{for } k < 0 \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} W_2^{l-1} W_1^k W_2 (\ker W_1^*) & \text{for } k \geq 0, \\ W_2^{l-1} W_1^{*-k} W_2 (\ker W_1^*) & \text{for } k < 0 \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} W_1^k W_2^l (\ker W_1^*) & \text{for } k \geq 0, \\ W_1^{*-k} W_2^l (\ker W_1^*) & \text{for } k < 0 \end{cases} = W^{(k,l)} (\ker W_1^*)
\end{aligned}$$

for $k < l, l > 0$ where $W_1^{l-1} W_1^{*l-l}$ can be reduced, as it is a projection and factor in the product of contractions factorizing the initial isometry. For similar reason $W_2^{l-1} W_1^{*-k} W_2 = W_1^{*-k} W_1^{-k} W_2^{l-1} W_1^{*-k} W_2 = W_1^{*-k} W_2^{l-1} W_1^{-k} W_1^{*-k} W_2 = W_1^{*-k} W_2^l$ holds on $\ker W_1^*$.

Using analogous arguments one can check that

$$\begin{aligned}
W_1 W^{(k,l)} (\ker W_1^*) &= W^{(k+1,l)} (\ker W_1^*), \quad W_2 W^{(k,l)} (\ker W_1^*) = W^{(k,l+1)} (\ker W_1^*), \\
W_1^* W^{(k,l)} (\ker W_1^*) &= \begin{cases} W^{(k-1,l)} (\ker W_1^*) & \text{if } (k-1, l) \in -L, \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\
W_2^* W^{(k,l)} (\ker W_1^*) &= \begin{cases} W^{(k,l-1)} (\ker W_1^*) & \text{if } (k, l-1) \in -L, \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

by which $H_t^W = \bigoplus_{(k,l) \in -L \cup \{(0,0)\}} W^{(k,l)} \ker W_1^*$ reduces W_1, W_2 to a pair given by the diagram $-L$, so to a totally non-unitary pair.

Since $\ker W_1^* \subset H_e^W$ we get $H_e^W = l^2(\mathcal{E}) \ominus H_t^W$ reduces W_1 to a unitary operator. Hence, since the product is a unilateral shift $W_2|_{H_e^W}$ has to be a unilateral shift. Denote for convenience $W_{ie} = W_i|_{H_e^W}$ for $i = 1, 2$. It is well known that since W_{1e} is unitary it doubly commute with W_{2e} and $\ker W_{2e}^*$ reduces W_{1e} . Let us calculate $\ker W_{2e}^*$. Note that

$$\ker W_{2e}^* = \text{span}\{(I - W_2 W_2^*) P_{H_e^W} \Psi X_{(n,0)} : n < 0, (I - W_2 W_2^*) P_{H_e^W} \Psi X_{(n,-1)} : n \geq 0\}.$$

However,

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{H_e^W} \Psi X_{(n,-1)} &= P_{H_e^W} W_1^{*(n+1)} W_1^{n+1} \Psi X_{(n,-1)} = P_{H_e^W} W_1^{*(n+1)} \Psi V_1^{n+1} X_{(n,-1)} = \\
W_1^{*(n+1)} P_{H_e^W} \Psi X_{(-1,-1)} &= W_1^{*(n+1)} P_{H_e^W} \Psi V_2 X_{(-1,0)} = W_1^{*(n+1)} P_{H_e^W} W_2 \Psi X_{(-1,0)} = \\
W_1^{*(n+1)} W_2 P_{H_e^W} \Psi X_{(-1,0)} &= W_{1e}^{*(n+1)} W_{2e} P_{H_e^W} \Psi X_{(-1,0)} = \\
W_{2e} W_{1e}^{*(n+1)} P_{H_e^W} \Psi X_{(-1,0)} &= W_2 W_1^{*(n+1)} P_{H_e^W} \Psi X_{(-1,0)}
\end{aligned}$$

and so $P_{H_e^W} \Psi X_{(n,-1)} \in W_2(H_e^W)$ for $n \geq 0$. Hence

$$\ker W_{2e}^* = \text{span}\{(I - W_2 W_2^*) P_{H_e^W} \Psi X_{(n,0)} : n < 0\}.$$

Since $W_1(I - W_2 W_2^*) P_{H_e^W} \Psi X_{(n,0)} = (I - W_2 W_2^*) P_{H_e^W} \Psi X_{(n-1,0)}$ the vector $(I - W_2 W_2^*) P_{H_e^W} \Psi X_{(-1,0)}$ is cyclic for $W_{1e}|_{\ker W_{2e}^*}$. The formulae on H_e^W is immediate consequence. \square

From the proof above we get the remark to be used in the next section.

Remark 17. Under assumptions of Theorem 16 and notations from its proof one can see that

$$(14) \quad W^{(i,j)} W^{(k,l)} (U P \mathcal{E}) = W^{(k+i, l+j)} (U P \mathcal{E}), \text{ for } (i, j), (k, l) \in -L,$$

and for $(k, l), (i, j) \in -L$ such that $(k - i, l - j) \in -L$

$$(15) \quad W^{(i,j)*} W^{(k,l)} (U P \mathcal{E}) = W^{(k-i, l-j)} (U P \mathcal{E}).$$

Assume notation of Theorem 16, however it will be more convenient to consider operators on $H^{(1,0)}$ where $X_{(0,0)}$ belongs instead on $H^{(0,0)}$, in other words $V_1 = U_1|_{H^{(1,0)}}$ and $V_2 = U_2|_{H^{(1,0)}}$. Since $H^{(0,0)} = U_1 H^{(1,0)} = V_1 H^{(1,0)}$ we get $\ker V_1^* \subset H^{(1,0)} \ominus H^{(0,0)}$. Since $H^{(1,0)} = H^{(0,0)} \vee \{X_{(0,0)}\}$ we get $\ker V_1^* = \mathbb{C} e_{(0,0)}$ where $e_{(0,0)} = \frac{P_{\ker V_1^*} X_{(0,0)}}{\|P_{\ker V_1^*} X_{(0,0)}\|}$. Hence $\ker V_1^*$ is at most one-dimensional and

$H_t^{(1,0)} \neq \{0\}$ if and only if $X_{(0,0)} \notin H^{(0,0)}$. Moreover, $e_{(k,l)} = V^{(k,l)}e_{(0,0)}$, for $(k,l) \in -L \cup \{(0,0)\}$, form orthonormal basis of $H_t^{(1,0)}$.

Let us denote for short $P_{H_t^{(1,0)}} = P_t^{(1,0)}$. Then $P_t^{(1,0)}X_{(0,0)} = \sum_{(k,l) \in -L \cup \{(0,0)\}} \alpha_{(k,l)}e_{(k,l)}$. Let us consider $(-s, -t) \in L$ and calculate $I_{(-s,-t)}$ an innovation part of the vector $P_t^{(1,0)}X_{(-s,-t)}$. We get

$$P_t^{(1,0)}X_{(-s,-t)} = P_t^{(1,0)}U_1^s U_2^t X_{(0,0)} = P_t^{(1,0)}V_1^s V_2^t X_{(0,0)} = V_1^s V_2^t P_t^{(1,0)}X_{(0,0)} = \sum_{(l,k) \in -L \cup \{(0,0)\}} \alpha_{(k,l)}e_{(k+s,l+t)}.$$

Hence $P_t^{(1,0)}H^{(-s,-t)} = \text{span}\{e_{(k+s,l+t)} : (k,l) \in -L\}$ and

$$I_{(-s,-t)} = P_t^{(1,0)}X_{(-s,-t)} - P_{H^{(-s,-t)}}P_t^{(1,0)}X_{(-s,-t)} = \alpha_{(s,t)}e_{(s,t)}.$$

In other words $H_t^{(1,0)}$ is a subspace which reduces the random field $X_{(i,j)}$ to purely non-deterministic random field, where the innovation part $I_{(i,j)}$ is equal $\alpha_{(i,j)}e_{(-i,-j)}$, for $(i,j) \in L \cup \{(0,0)\}$.

Theorem 18. *The evanescent part $E_{(m,n)}$ of a weak-stationary random field with a half-plane past L is deterministic along the first coordinate of the index and stochastic along the second coordinate that is, there is a random field $\{F_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ such that:*

$$E_{(m,n)} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{s=0}^{K-1} \beta_{(s,t)} F_{s+m,t+n},$$

and $\{F_{s,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a one-dimensional white noise for any sequence $\{s_t\}$, and $\{F_{s,t}\}_{s=0}^{K-1}$ is deterministic process for any t , where $K = \dim\{F_{s,0} : s = 0, 1, \dots\} \leq \infty$.

Proof. The statement follows directly from Theorem 16. Indeed, let $F_{(0,0)}$ be the cyclic vector and $F_{(s,t)} = U_1^{-s}U_2^{-t}F_{(0,0)}$ for $(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Properties of $\{F_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ follows directly from types of V_1, V_2 . \square

Example 19. *Let $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of orthogonal (i.e. $\mathbb{E}\alpha_n \overline{\alpha_m} = 0$ for $m \neq n$) random variables. Let $X_{(s,t)} := \alpha_t$. Then $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{s,t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a weak-stationary random field.*

For the past given by L we have $H^{(s,t)} = \bigvee\{X_{(i,j)} : (i,j) \in L + \{(s,t)\}\} = \bigvee\{\alpha_i : i \leq t\}$. Thus $X_{(s,t)} \in H^{(s,t)}$ and $\bigcap_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2} H^{(s,t)} = \{0\}$. Hence the random field $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{s,t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is evanescent.

Moreover, $H_X^{(s,t)}$ reduces (U_1, U_2) to the pair: an identity, a unilateral shift of multiplicity 1.

3. THE RATIONAL NONSYMMETRICAL HALF-PLANE

The half-plane $S_{\mathbf{v}}$ defined in (2), in the case $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ is called the rational nonsymmetrical half-plane (see e.g. [17, 19]). In other words, rational nonsymmetrical half-plane $S_{\mathbf{v}}$ is a half-plane with a rational slope. Note that L (1) is a half-plane with a slope 0, so the special case of the rational slope. It turns out that an arbitrary rational nonsymmetrical half-plane is a rotation of L and via such rotation the result of previous section for the past given by L can be applied to a random field with the past given by an arbitrary rational nonsymmetrical half-plane.

Remark 20. *For $\mathbf{v} = (k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}_-^2$ where k, l are relatively prime, there are $(p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $pk + ql = -1$ and $-l > p > 0 \geq q > k$ and*

$$\psi : L \ni (m, n) \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} -l & p \\ k & q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} m \\ n \end{bmatrix} = (pn - lm, qn + km) \in S_{(k,l)}$$

is a bijection.

Proof. Since $-k, -l$ are positive, relatively prime, remainders of $\frac{-k}{-l}, \frac{-2k}{-l}, \dots, \frac{-(-l-1)k}{-l}$ are positive and pairwise different. Hence the set of such remainders is the whole $\{1, \dots, -l-1\}$, so there is $p \in \{1, \dots, -l-1\}$ such that the remainder of $\frac{-pk}{-l}$ is 1. Let q' be the corresponding quotient, so $0 \leq q' < -k$. Consequently $-pk = -q'l + 1$ and in turn $pk - q'l = -1$. Taking $q = -q'$ we get

$pk + ql = -1$ and $-l > p > 0 \geq q > k$. Hence ψ may be defined on the whole \mathbb{Z}^2 , where it is linear and invertible. Consequently, it is enough to check that $\psi(L) \subset S_{(k,l)}$ and $\psi^{-1}(S_{(k,l)}) \subset L$.

For $n = 0, m < 0$ we get $\langle (-lm, km), (k, l) \rangle = 0$, while for $n < 0, m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \langle (pn - lm, qn + km), (k, l) \rangle = (pk + ql)n = -n > 0$. Hence $\psi(L) \subset S_{(k,l)}$. Note that

$$\psi^{-1}(a, b) = \begin{bmatrix} -l & p \\ k & q \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} = (qa - pb, -ka - lb).$$

For $(a, b) \in S_{(k,l)}$ either $-ka - lb < 0$ and a is arbitrary or $-ka - lb = 0$ and $a < 0$. For the first case clearly $(qa - pb, -ka - lb) \in L$. For the second case, since $b = \frac{-ka}{l}$ we get $qa - pb = qa - \frac{-pka}{l} = \frac{a}{l}(ql + pk) = -\frac{a}{l}$ which by $a < 0$ is less than 0. Hence $(qa - pb, -ka - lb) \in \mathbb{Z}_- \times \{0\} \subset L$, so $\psi^{-1}(S_{(k,l)}) \subset L$. \square

As we mentioned earlier, version of Theorem 16 for any rational nonsymmetrical half-plane follows from Remark 20.

Theorem 21. *Let $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ be a random field with no deterministic part and the past given by the rational nonsymmetrical half-plane past $S_{\mathbf{v}}$ (2) for $\mathbf{v} = (k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Further, let U_1, U_2 be unitaries corresponding to the random field as in (6) and $V_1 = U_1|_{H^{(0,0)}}, V_2 = U_2|_{H^{(0,0)}}$ be isometries defined on $H^{(0,0)}$ - the past of $X_{(0,0)}$.*

There is a decomposition $H^{(0,0)} = H_t^{(0,0)} \oplus H_e^{(0,0)}$ such that:

- $H_t^{(0,0)}, H_e^{(0,0)}$ reduce V_1, V_2 ,
- $V_1|_{H_t^{(0,0)}}, V_2|_{H_t^{(0,0)}}$ is a totally non unitary pair,
- $V_1|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}, V_2|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}$ is a pair of generalized powers given by a cyclic unitary.

Moreover, if $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_-$ and are relatively prime we get

- $(V_1|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}, V_2|_{H_e^{(0,0)}})$ is a pair of generalized powers given by a diagram with period $J_0 = \{(i, j) \in -S_{(k,l)} : 0 \leq i \leq -l - 1\} \cup \{(0, 0)\}$, integers $(-l, -k)$, the space $\mathcal{H} = \ker V_1^{*p} V_2^{-q} \cap H_e^{(0,0)}$ where p, q are as in Remark 20 and a unitary $\mathcal{U} = V_2^{*-k} V_1^{-l}|_{\ker V_1^{*p} V_2^{-q}}$, and

$$H_e^{(0,0)} = \bigoplus_{(i,j) \in J_0} \bigvee \{(V_2^{*-k} V_1^{-l})^\kappa V^{(i,j)} w : \kappa \geq 0\},$$

where w is the cyclic vector for \mathcal{U} (see Definition 14),

- $(V_1|_{H_t^{(0,0)}}, V_2|_{H_t^{(0,0)}})$ is given by the diagram $-S_{\mathbf{v}} \cup \{(0, 0)\}$ and

$$H_t^{(0,0)} = \bigoplus_{(i,j) \in -S_{(k,l)} \cup \{(0,0)\}} V^{(i,j)} \ker V_1^{*-l} V_2^{-k}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume since the beginning that $\mathbf{v} = (k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}_-^2$ where k, l are relatively prime as in Remark 20 and use ψ defined there. By linearity of ψ there is a natural extension of ψ on \mathbb{Z}^2 given by $\psi(i, j) = -\psi(-i, -j)$ for $(i, j) \in -L$ and $\psi(0, 0) = (0, 0)$. We use this extension if needed. Let us define a random field $\{Y_{(m,n)}\}_{(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ by

$$Y_{(m,n)} := X_{\psi(m,n)} = X_{(pn-lm, qn+km)}.$$

Since formulae in ψ are linear, the cross moments of $\{Y_{(m,n)}\}_{(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ inherit dependence only on the distance and so $\{Y_{(m,n)}\}_{(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ is weak-stationary. Note that definition of ψ implies that for any $(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ the past spaces $H^{(m,n)}$ given by (4) are spanned by the same random variables when calculated for the random field $\{Y_{(m,n)}\}_{(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ with the past L as well as for the random field $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ with the past $S_{\mathbf{v}}$. In other words the past of $X_{(m,n)}$ and the past of $Y_{(m,n)}$ is the same space $H^{(m,n)}$. On the other hand, operators U_1^Y, U_2^Y defined by (6) for the random field $\{Y_{(m,n)}\}_{(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ are different from U_1, U_2 . However, there is a connection between (U_1^Y, U_2^Y) and (U_1, U_2) :

$$\begin{aligned} U_1^Y Y_{(m,n)} &= Y_{(m-1,n)} = X_{(pn-lm+l, qn+km-k)} = U_2^{*-k} U_1^{-l} X_{(pn-lm, qn+km)} = U_2^{*-k} U_1^{-l} Y_{(m,n)}, \\ U_2^Y Y_{(m,n)} &= Y_{(m,n-1)} = X_{(pn-lm-p, qn+km-q)} = U_2^{*-q} U_1^p X_{(pn-lm, qn+km)} = U_2^{*-q} U_1^p Y_{(m,n)} \end{aligned}$$

and by similar calculation $U_1 = U_1^{Y*} U_2^{Y-k}, U_2 = U_1^{Y*} U_2^{Y-l}$. Consequently (U_1, U_2) and (U_1^Y, U_2^Y) have the same reducing subspaces and the same subspaces reduce them to unitary pairs. Thus $\{Y_{(i,j)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ has no deterministic part, as it was assumed for $\{X_{(i,j)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ and we may apply Theorem 16 to $V_1^Y = U_1^Y|_{H^{(0,0)}}, V_2^Y = U_2^Y|_{H^{(0,0)}}$.

Let $H^{(0,0)} = H_t^{Y(0,0)} \oplus H_e^{Y(0,0)}$ be the decomposition given by Theorem 16 for (V_1^Y, V_2^Y) . Let us check that $H_t^{Y(0,0)}, H_e^{Y(0,0)}$ reduce (V_1, V_2) . Since the subspaces complements each other to $H^{(0,0)}$ and $V_1, V_2 \in B(H^{(0,0)})$ it is enough to show that $H_t^{Y(0,0)}, H_e^{Y(0,0)}$ are (V_1, V_2) invariant. Let H_t, H_e be the minimal (U_1^Y, U_2^Y) reducing subspaces containing $H_t^{Y(0,0)}, H_e^{Y(0,0)}$ respectively. Hence they are (U_1, U_2) reducing. On the other hand, by Remark 7 $H_t^{Y(0,0)} = H_t \cap H^{(0,0)}, H_e^{Y(0,0)} = H_e \cap H^{(0,0)}$ which clearly are U_1, U_2 invariant subspaces of $H^{(0,0)}$, so they are V_1, V_2 invariant.

Next we show that $H_t^{Y(0,0)} = H_t^{(0,0)}$ and so $H_e^{Y(0,0)} = H_e^{(0,0)}$ and that restrictions of (V_1, V_2) are as described in the statement.

Let us first show that $H_t^{Y(0,0)}$ and $H_t^{(0,0)}$ are sums of the same subspaces, but differently indexed and so they are equal. Note that $V_1^Y = U_1^Y|_{H^{(0,0)}} = U_2^{*-k} U_1^{-l}|_{H^{(0,0)}} = P_{H^{(0,0)}} U_2^{*-k} U_1^{-l}|_{H^{(0,0)}} = V_2^{*-k} V_1^{-l}$ and similarly $V_2^Y = V_2^{*-l} V_1^p$. Hence $\ker V_1^{Y*} = \ker V_1^{*-l} V_2^{-k}$ and $(V^Y)^{(i,j)} = V^{\psi(i,j)}$.

$$\begin{aligned} H_t^{Y(0,0)} &= \bigoplus_{(i,j) \in -L \cup \{(0,0)\}} V^{Y(i,j)} \ker V_1^{Y*} = \bigoplus_{(i,j) \in -L \cup \{(0,0)\}} V^{\psi(i,j)} \ker V_1^{*-l} V_2^{-k} \\ &= \bigoplus_{(i,j) \in -S_v \cup \{(0,0)\}} V^{(i,j)} \ker V_1^{*-l} V_2^{-k} = H_t^{(0,0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we may identify $V_1|_{H_t^{(0,0)}}, V_2|_{H_t^{(0,0)}}$ as a pair given by a diagram $-S_v \cup \{(0,0)\}$ and $\mathcal{H} = \ker V_1^{*-l} V_2^{-k}$ as in Remark 11.

Let us check that the pair $(V_1|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}, V_2|_{H_e^{(0,0)}})$ is a pair of generalized powers. By Theorem 16 we have $V_1^Y|_{H_e^{(0,0)}} = V_2^{*-k} V_1^{-l}|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}$ a unitary, and v a cyclic vector for $V_2^{*-k} V_1^{-l}|_{\ker V_2^{Y*} \cap H_e^{(0,0)}}$. Denote $\mathcal{H}_{(i,j)} = \bigvee \{(V_2^{*-k} V_1^{-l})^\kappa V^{(i,j)} v : \kappa > 0\}$ for $(i,j) \in J_0$, so in particular $\mathcal{H}_{(0,0)} = \ker V_2^{Y*} \cap H_e^{(0,0)}$ and it reduces $V_2^{*-k} V_1^{-l}$. Moreover, $V_2^{*-k} V_1^{-l}|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}$ as a unitary doubly commutes with $V_1|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}, V_2|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}$ and in turn it commutes with each $V^{(i,j)}|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}$. Hence $\mathcal{H}_{(i,j)} = V^{(i,j)}(\ker V_2^{Y*} \cap H_e^{(0,0)}) = V^{Y\psi^{-1}(i,j)}(\ker V_2^{Y*} \cap H_e^{(0,0)}) = V_2^{Y\psi^{-1}(i,j)2} V_1^{Y\psi^{-1}(i,j)1}(\ker V_2^{Y*} \cap H_e^{(0,0)}) = V_2^{Y\psi^{-1}(i,j)2}(\ker V_2^{Y*} \cap H_e^{(0,0)})$ where $\psi^{-1}(i,j) = (\psi^{-1}(i,j)_1, \psi^{-1}(i,j)_2)$. One can check that $J_0 \ni (i,j) \mapsto \psi^{-1}(i,j)_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{0\}$ is injective (even bijective) and so $\mathcal{H}_{(i,j)}$ are pairwise orthogonal. Moreover, since each $V^{(i,j)}$ is an isometry for $(i,j) \in -S_v$ we get $V_1 \mathcal{H}_{(i,j)} = \mathcal{H}_{(i+1,j)}$ for $i \leq -l-1$ and $V_1 \mathcal{H}_{(-l-1,j)} = V_1^{-l} \mathcal{H}_{(0,j)} = V_1^{-l} V_2^{-k} V_1^{*-l} \mathcal{H}_{(0,j)} = \mathcal{H}_{(0,j-k)}$ and $V_2 \mathcal{H}_{(i,j)} = \mathcal{H}_{(i,j+1)}$, so $\bigoplus_{(i,j) \in J_0} \mathcal{H}_{(i,j)}$ reduces (V_1, V_2) . Hence, in particular $\bigoplus_{(i,j) \in J_0} \mathcal{H}_{(i,j)}$ reduces a unilateral shift V_2^Y and as it contains $\ker V_2^{Y*} \cap H_e^{(0,0)}$ we get $H_e^{(0,0)} = \bigoplus_{(i,j) \in J_0} \mathcal{H}_{(i,j)}$. Consequently we may identify $V_1|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}, V_2|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}$ as a pair of generalized powers given by J_0 , integers $(-l, -k)$, the space $\mathcal{H} = \ker V_2^{Y*} \cap H_e^{(0,0)}$ and the unitary $\mathcal{U} = V_2^{*-k} V_1^{-l}|_{\ker V_2^{Y*} \cap H_e^{(0,0)}}$ as in Definition 14. \square

As a corollary we get a nice description of an evanescent part for the considered past.

Theorem 22. *Let $\{E_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ be an evanescent part of a weak-stationary random field with a half-plane past S_v , where $v = (k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}_-^2$ for k, l relatively prime. Then there is a random field $\{F_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ such that:*

$$E_{(m,n)} = \sum_{(s,t) \in J_0, \dots, K-1} \beta_{(s,t)} F_{s+m, t+n},$$

where $\{F_{m-li, n-ki}\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is deterministic stochastic process for any (m, n) and $\{F_{m_i, n_i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a one-dimensional white noise whenever $(m_i - m_j, n_i - n_j)$ is not a multiplicity of $(-l, -k)$ for any $i \neq j$ where $J_0, \dots, K-1 = \{(s, t) \in -S_v \cup \{(0, 0)\} : 0 \leq s \leq -lK-1\}$ and $K = \dim\{F_{-li, -ki} : i = 0, 1, \dots\}$.

Proof. The result is a consequence of Theorem 21 on the space $H^{(1,0)}$. Indeed, take $F_{(0,0)}$ as the cyclic vector and define $F_{(s,t)} = U_1^s U_2^t F_{(0,0)}$. Moreover, we get $\{(V_2^{*-k} V_1^{-l})^\kappa V^{(i,j)} F_{(0,0)} : \kappa \geq 0\} = \{(V_2^{*-k} V_1^{-l})^\kappa V^{(i,j)} F_{(0,0)} : \kappa = 0, \dots, K-1\}$. Hence $E_{(0,0)} \in H_e^{(1,0)}$ is a linear combination of $(V_2^{*-k} V_1^{-l})^\kappa V^{(i,j)} F_{(0,0)} = V^{(i-\kappa l, j+\kappa k)} F_{(0,0)}$ for $\kappa = 0, \dots, K-1$ and $(i,j) \in J_0$. One can check that $\{(i-\kappa l, j+\kappa k) : (i,j) \in J_0, \kappa = 0, \dots, K-1\} = \bigcup_{\kappa=0}^{K-1} J_0 + \kappa(-l, k) = J_{0, \dots, K-1}$. Hence $E_{(0,0)} = \sum_{(s,t) \in J_{0, \dots, K-1}} \beta_{(s,t)} F_{s,t}$ for some coefficients $\beta_{(s,t)}$. Since $E_{(m,n)} = U_1^m U_2^n E_{(0,0)}$ we get the result by the definition of $F_{(s,t)}$. \square

Example 23. Let $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=-\infty}^\infty$ be a sequence of orthogonal (i.e. $\mathbb{E}\alpha_n \overline{\alpha_m} = 0$ for $m \neq n$) random variables. Let $X_{(s,t)} := \alpha_{s+t}$. Then $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{s,t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a weak-stationary random field. Let the past be the half-plane $S_{[-1,-1]}$. We have $H^{(s,t)} = \bigvee \{X_{(i,j)} : (i,j) \in S_v + \{(s,t)\}\} = \bigvee \{\alpha_i : i \leq s+t\}$. Thus $X_{(s,t)} \in H^{(s,t)}$ and $\bigcap_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2} H^{(s,t)} = \{0\}$. Hence the random field $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{s,t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is evanescent.

Moreover, we have $V_1|_{H^{(s,t)}} = V_2|_{H^{(s,t)}}$. So, in particular $(V_1|_{H^{(s,t)}}, V_2|_{H^{(s,t)}})$ is a pair of generalized powers.

The following example shows the dependence of the type of random field on the past.

Example 24. Let us consider the same weak-stationary random field as in Example 23 but with the past given by L .

Then we have $H^{(s,t)} = \bigvee \{X_{(i,j)} : (i,j) \in L + \{(s,t)\}\} = \bigvee \{\alpha_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and so $\bigcap_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2} H^{(s,t)} = H$.

Hence the random field $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{s,t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is deterministic.

4. THE IRRATIONAL NONSYMMETRICAL HALF-PLANE

In this section we consider the random field $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ with no deterministic part and the past given by the half-plane past S_v where $v = (q, r)$ with $\frac{q}{r} \notin \mathbb{Q}$ that is the half-plane with irrational slope. Clearly, there can be constructed a bijection between L and S_v but not as a rotation as in Remark 20. Indeed, the rotation would have the angle corresponding to irrational slope, so it would not lead to \mathbb{Z}^2 . In fact a bijection from L to irrational half-plane would not preserve dependence on distance and in turn a random field $\{Y_{(i,j)}\}_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}}$ as defined in the proof of Theorem 21 would not be weak-stationary.

Theorem 25. Let $\{X_{(s,t)}\}_{(s,t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ be a random field with no deterministic part and the past given by S_v (2) where $v = (q, r)$ with $\frac{q}{r} \notin \mathbb{Q}$, that is the irrational nonsymmetrical half-plane past. Further, let U_1, U_2 be unitary operators corresponding to the random field as in (6) and $V_1 = U_1|_{H^{(0,0)}}, V_2 = U_2|_{H^{(0,0)}}$ be isometries defined on $H^{(0,0)}$ - the past of $X_{(0,0)}$.

There is a decomposition $H^{(0,0)} = H_t^{(0,0)} \oplus H_e^{(0,0)}$ such that:

- $H_t^{(0,0)}, H_e^{(0,0)}$ reduce V_1, V_2 ,
- $V_1|_{H_t^{(0,0)}}, V_2|_{H_t^{(0,0)}}$ is a totally non unitary pair,
- $V_1|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}, V_2|_{H_e^{(0,0)}}$ is a continuously given pair.

Proof. Since $\frac{q}{r} \notin \mathbb{Q}$ for any pair of integers m, n we get $\langle (m, -n), \mathbf{v} \rangle \neq 0$. Hence either $\langle (m, -n), \mathbf{v} \rangle < 0$ or $\langle (-m, n), \mathbf{v} \rangle < 0$ and one can show that

$$(16) \quad \{(i + \kappa m + k, j - \kappa n + l) : (i, j) \in S_v, \kappa \in \mathbb{Z}, k, l \geq 0\} = \mathbb{Z}^2.$$

Assume $\mathcal{H} \subset H^{(0,0)}$ is a subspace that reduces (V_1, V_2) such that $V_2^{*n} V_1^m|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is unitary for some nonnegative integers m, n . Then $\mathcal{H} = \text{span}\{P_{\mathcal{H}} X_{(i,j)} : (i,j) \in S_v\}$ and by (16) all $P_{\mathcal{H}} X_{(i,j)}$ have the same norm. Indeed, since $V_2^{*n} V_1^m|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is unitary we have $\|V_2^l V_1^k (V_2^{*n} V_1^m)^\kappa P_{\mathcal{H}} X_{(i,j)}\| = \|P_{\mathcal{H}} V_2^l V_1^k (V_2^{*n} V_1^m)^\kappa X_{(i,j)}\| = \|P_{\mathcal{H}} X_{(i+\kappa m+k, j-\kappa n+l)}\|$ and $P_{\mathcal{H}} X_{(i+\kappa m+k, j-\kappa n+l)} \in \mathcal{H}$ for $\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}$ and k, l nonnegative integers. By (16) we get $\mathcal{H} = \text{span}\{P_{\mathcal{H}} X_{(i,j)} : (i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$. Hence \mathcal{H} reduces V_1, V_2 to a unitary pair. Since the process is completely non deterministic we get $\mathcal{H} = \{0\}$. In other words we have shown that $V_2^{*n} V_1^m$ is not unitary in restriction to any non-trivial reducing subspace.

Let us decompose (V_1, V_2) by Theorem 9. Since $V_2^{*n}V_1^m$ is not unitary on subspaces reducing (V_1, V_2) for m, n non-negative integers, so also $m = 0$ or $n = 0$ we get $H_{uu} = H_{su} = H_{us} = H_{gp} = \{0\}$. Hence (V_1, V_2) decomposes between pairs given by diagrams and continuously given pairs. \square

The continuously given pair do not have such a nice model like pairs given by diagrams or pairs of generalized powers. Hence we do not formulate the result precisely describing the evanescent part for irrational past like we did in previous sections. However, Theorems 16, 21, 25 shows that evanescent part of the random field is significantly different in all the three considered pasts.

In our opinion it may be difficult to describe the evanescent part with irrational slope using geometrical construction. It requires rather measure theory approach. It follows from the description of the generator of a continuously given pair. To explain the notion of the generator we need to recall the general idea of the construction of the model of compatible pairs given in [7, 9]. At first, there were described all the pairs where $\ker V_1^* \cap \ker V_2^* = \{0\}$, which were not the case of a continuously given pair. Then $\ker V_1^* \cap \ker V_2^*$ was decomposed among subspaces generating certain pairs of compatible isometries (including a continuously given pair), where the pair generated by $L \subset \ker V_1^* \cap \ker V_2^*$ is $(V_1|_{H_L}, V_2|_{H_L})$ for H_L the minimal V_1, V_2 reducing subspace containing L . The generator of a continuously given pair is the respective subspace $L_0 \subset \ker V_1^* \cap \ker V_2^*$. The decomposition of $\ker V_1^* \cap \ker V_2^*$ is obtained by a certain sequence of decompositions of $\ker V_1^* \cap \ker V_2^*$ such that each summand in a given decomposition is a subspace of some summand (precisely one summand) in the previous decomposition. In other words, we build the succeeding decomposition by decomposing some or all summands in previous decomposition. Hence, properly taking one (nontrivial) summand in each decomposition we obtain a decreasing sequence of nontrivial subspaces. Since decompositions are orthogonal, limits of such sequences are pairwise orthogonal as well and only countably many of them may be nontrivial (in separable Hilbert space). The target decomposition of $\ker V_1^* \cap \ker V_2^*$ is the decomposition among nontrivial limits of the described sequences (generating pairs given by diagrams or pairs of generalized powers) and the remaining L_0 generating a continuously given pair. The main point is that if there were only countably many decreasing nontrivial sequences we could consider the decomposition among all the limits and then $L_0 = \{0\}$. Hence $L_0 \neq \{0\}$ yields an uncountable number of the nontrivial sequences vanishing to $\{0\}$. It reflects the nature of a non-atomic measure. Indeed, if we set a correspondence (possibly constructing some spectral measure) between L_0 and some measurable set A , such that the sequence of decompositions of L_0 corresponds to the sequence of decompositions of A among countably many disjoint (up to measure 0) measurable sets (such that each set in a given decomposition is a subset of precisely one set in the previous decomposition), then the fact that each sequence of subspaces vanish to $\{0\}$ corresponds to the fact that each sequence of subsets vanish to a set of measure 0.

The evanescent part of the random field with irrational nonsymmetrical half-plane past was investigated by measures in [24, 17]. More precisely, in [24] there are characterized purely evanescent processes for irrational nonsymmetrical half-plane past under assumption that the distribution is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. In [17] there is given an example under similar assumptions, however for the distribution singular to the Lebesgue measure.

APPENDIX


Characterization of half-planes. In this section we characterize general half-planes. The general idea of a half-plane is to divide points in \mathbb{Z}^2 in two parts, by a line. Points on one side of the line are suppose to be in S , while points on the other side in $-S$. Since $(0, 0)$ is neither in S nor in $-S$ it should belong to the line. Moreover, we need the line to pass through $(0, 0)$ to get $S \cap -S = \emptyset$. However, there may be also points belonging to the line different from $(0, 0)$ which have to be assigned either to S or to $-S$. Let the line be $\kappa : py - qx = 0$. If p, q are relatively irrational ($p = rq, r \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$), then $\kappa \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 = \{(0, 0)\}$, so it is not the case. However, if p, q are relatively rational, assuming p, q to be relatively prime integers, we get $\kappa \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 = \{(kp, kq) : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. If we assign $(p, q) \in S$, then S as a semi-group contains $\kappa_+ = \{(kp, kq) : k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ and in turn $-S$ contains $\kappa_- = \{(kp, kq) : k \in \mathbb{Z}_-\}$. If we assign $(p, q) \in -S$ then κ_+, κ_- are included another way around. Hence, we get two half-planes defined by the same line (the same vector) $S_{\mathbf{v}}$ and $\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{v}}$ as in

(2) and (3). It is clear that $S_{\mathbf{v}}$ and $\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{v}}$ are half-planes and they are different if and only if p, q are relatively rational. Moreover, one can check that $-S_{[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}]} = \widehat{S}_{[-\mathbf{p}, -\mathbf{q}]}$ and $-\widehat{S}_{[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}]} = S_{[-\mathbf{p}, -\mathbf{q}]}$ and for $S^X = \{(i, j) : (i, -j) \in S\}$ we get $S_{[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}]}^X = S_{[\mathbf{p}, -\mathbf{q}]}$. In other words S is equal to one of $S_{[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}]}$ or $\widehat{S}_{[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}]}$ if and only if $-S$ is equal to one of such half-planes if and only if S^X is equal to one of such half-planes.

Next we show that any half-plane is of the form $S_{[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}]}$ or $\widehat{S}_{[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}]}$. The last condition in Definition 2 yields that S contains precisely one of sets: $\{(-1, 0), (0, -1)\}$, $\{(1, 0), (0, -1)\}$, $\{(-1, 0), (0, 1)\}$, $\{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$. We may assume without loss of generality that $(-1, 0), (0, -1) \in S$. Indeed, for the other cases $(-1, 0), (0, -1)$ is either in $-S$ or S^X or $-S^X$. The result for any of such half-planes implies the result for S . Since $(-1, 0), (0, -1) \in S$, for any $(i, j) \in S$ we get $(i, j) + (\mathbb{Z}_- \cup \{0\})^2 \subset S$. Consequently, there are sequences $\{M_i\}, \{N_j\} \subset \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ such that

$$(17) \quad S = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \{(i, j) : i \leq M_j\} = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \{(i, j) : j \leq N_i\}$$

as in the picture:



The main idea of the sequences $\{M_i\}, \{N_j\}$ is to describe "corner points" of S as points $(M_j, j) = (i, N_i)$ for some i, j .

We can see in the picture some regularity. Precisely, both sequences are decreasing and $M_j - M_{j+1} \in \{3, 4\}, N_i - N_{i+1} \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$. In fact, for any half-plane not being L nor $L' = \{(i, j) : (j, i) \in L\}$ there are non-negative integers m, n such that $M_j - M_{j+1} \in \{m, m+1\}$ and $N_i - N_{i+1} \in \{n, n+1\}$ and at least one of m, n is zero. Let us show this fact.

Since $(i, j) + (\mathbb{Z}_- \cup \{0\})^2 \subset S$ for any $(i, j) \in S$ we get that $\{M_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}, \{N_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are decreasing. Since $(0, 0) \notin S$ and $(-1, 0), (0, -1) \in S$ we get $M_0 = N_0 = -1$. Moreover,

$$-S = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \{(-i, -j) : i \leq M_j\} = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \{(i, j) : -i \leq M_{-j}\} = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \{(i, j) : i \geq -M_{-j}\}$$

and

$$-S \cup \{(0, 0)\} = \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus S = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \{(i, j) : i > M_j\}.$$

and similar arguments for $\{N_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ imply

$$(18) \quad \begin{aligned} M_j &= -M_{-j} - 1 & \text{for } j \neq 0 \\ N_i &= -N_{-i} - 1 & \text{for } i \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $p \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $(M_{-p}, -p), (M_p, p) \in S$ and $M_{-p} = -M_p - 1$ by (18), we get

$$(M_{j+p}, j+p) + (M_{-p}, -p) = (M_{j+p} - M_p - 1, j) \in S \text{ yields } M_{j+p} - M_p - 1 \leq M_j$$

and

$$(M_j, j) + (M_p, p) = (M_j + M_p, j+p) \in S, \text{ yields } M_j + M_p \leq M_{j+p}$$

for an arbitrary j . Summing up

$$(19) \quad M_p \leq M_{j+p} - M_j \leq M_p + 1.$$

In particular for $p = 1$ we get $-M_1 \geq M_j - M_{j+1} \geq -M_1 - 1$. Since $M_1 \leq M_0 = -1$ we get $m = -M_1 - 1$ a non-negative integer and

$$(20) \quad M_j - M_{j+1} \in \{m, m + 1\}.$$

We may get similarly as above that $N_i - N_{i+1} \in \{n, n + 1\}$ for some non-negative integer n .

For the further characterization note that one (and only one) of elements $(-1, 1), (1, -1)$ belongs to S . If we assume $(1, -1) \in S$ then $(i, N_i) + (1, -1) = (i + 1, N_i - 1) \in S$ yields $N_i - 1 \leq N_{i+1}$. Since $\{N_i\}$ is decreasing

$$N_i - 1 \leq N_{i+1} \leq N_i.$$

In other words, from $(1, -1) \in S$ follows $N_i - N_{i+1} \in \{0, 1\}$. As one can expect the other case $(-1, 1) \in S$ yields $M_j - M_{j+1} \in \{0, 1\}$.

Proposition 26. *For a given $\mathbf{M} = \{M_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of integers satisfying (18) and (19) for any positive j, p with $M_0 = -1$ the set*

$$S_{\mathbf{M}} = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : i \leq M_j\}$$

is a half-plane.

Proof. Let us first check that $S_{\mathbf{M}}$ satisfies conditions of Definition 2.

- Since $M_0 = -1$ clearly $(0, 0) \notin S_{\mathbf{M}}$.
- Since by (19) $M_j + M_p \leq M_{j+p}$ for any $(x, j), (y, p) \in S_{\mathbf{M}}$ we get $x + y \leq M_j + M_p \leq M_{j+p}$ so $(x, j) + (y, p) = (x + y, j + p) \in S_{\mathbf{M}}$. Hence $S_{\mathbf{M}}$ is semi-group.
- Note that $(i, j) \notin S_{\mathbf{M}}$ if and only if $i > M_j$ which by (18) is equivalent to $-i \leq -1 - M_j = M_{-j}$, so to $(-i, -j) \in S_{\mathbf{M}}$.

It finishes the proof. □

Proposition 27. *Any half-plane S containing $(-1, 0), (0, -1)$ is either L (see (1)) or $L' = \{(i, j) : (j, i) \in L\}$ or*

$$(21) \quad S_{\mathbf{M}} = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : i \leq M_j\},$$

where $M_0 = -1$ and $\{M_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ satisfy (18) and (19).

Proof. Since $(-1, 0), (0, -1) \in S$ by (17) we get a sequence $\{M_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ such that $S = S_{\mathbf{M}}$ and a sequence $\{N_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$. If $M_1 = -\infty$ or $N_1 = -\infty$ then $S = L$ or $S = L'$ respectively, otherwise $\{M_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}, \{N_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ has only finite values by (20) and similar result for $\{N_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$. □

The propositions above describes all half-planes as half-planes of the form $S_{\mathbf{M}}$.

Theorem 28. *For any half-plane S there is a vector \mathbf{v} such that $S = S_{\mathbf{v}}$ or $S = \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{v}}$ (see (2), (3)).*

Proof. At the beginning of the paragraph we explained that without lost of generality we may assume $(-1, 0), (0, -1) \in S$. Then by Proposition 27 it is enough to show the result for $S = S_{\mathbf{M}}$ where $\mathbf{M} = \{M_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \subset \mathbb{Z}$. If we denote $\delta_j := \frac{1}{j}(M_0 - M_j) = \frac{1}{j}(-1 - M_j)$ for $j > 0$, then $M_j = -j\delta_j - 1$ for $j > 0$ and by (18) $M_j = -j\delta_{-j}$ for $j < 0$. We are going to show that δ_j is convergent and then the statement for $\mathbf{v} = [-1, -\delta]$ where $\delta = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \delta_j$.

From (20) we get $\delta_j = \frac{1}{j} \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} (M_k - M_{k+1}) \in [m, m + 1]$. Hence $\delta_{sup} := \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \delta_j, \delta_{inf} := \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \delta_j$ are in $[m, m + 1]$, so in particular are positive, finite. Denote $\epsilon = \frac{1}{3}(\delta_{sup} - \delta_{inf})$. Clearly δ_j is convergent if and only if $\epsilon = 0$.

By (19) we get $-1 - j\delta_j = M_j \leq M_{kj} - M_{(k-1)j} \leq M_j + 1 = -j\delta_j$ which is equivalent to $0 \leq M_{(k-1)j} - M_{kj} - j\delta_j \leq 1$. Hence $sj\delta_{sj} - sj\delta_j = \sum_{k=1}^s (M_{(k-1)j} - M_{kj} - j\delta_j) \in [0, s]$ and so $0 \leq j\delta_{sj} - j\delta_j \leq 1$, in particular $j\delta_j \leq j\delta_{sj}$.

Let $l > 0$ be such that $\delta_l \geq \delta_{sup} - \epsilon$. Decompose any positive integer $t = sl + t_0$ where $0 \leq t_0 \leq l - 1$. Recall that M_j is decreasing, by which $j\delta_j$ is increasing. Consequently we get

$$t\delta_t \geq sl\delta_{sl} \geq sl\delta_l \geq (t - t_0)(\delta_{sup} - \epsilon).$$

On the other hand, t may be chosen arbitrary large and such that $\delta_t \leq \delta_{inf} + \epsilon$. Consequently

$$(t - t_0)(\delta_{sup} - \epsilon) \leq t\delta_t \leq t(\delta_{inf} + \epsilon) = t(\delta_{sup} - 2\epsilon),$$

which yields

$$t\epsilon \leq t_0(\delta_{sup} - \epsilon) \leq (l - 1)\delta_{sup}.$$

Since t may be chosen arbitrary large, ϵ is non negative and the right hand side is constant (for the fixed l) we get $\epsilon = 0$.

Let us show that $S_{\mathbf{M}} = S_{[-1, -\delta]}$ or $S_{\mathbf{M}} = \widehat{S}_{[-1, -\delta]}$. Since a half-plane may not contain another half-plane unless they are equal it is enough to show $S_{[-1, -\delta]} \subset S_{\mathbf{M}}$ or $\widehat{S}_{[-1, -\delta]} \subset S_{\mathbf{M}}$. Recall

$$S_{\mathbf{M}} = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : i \leq M_j\},$$

$$S_{[-1, -\delta]} = \{(i, j) : i \leq -j\delta \text{ for } i < 0, i < -j\delta \text{ for } i \geq 0\}.$$

Note that $0 \leq j\delta_{sj} - j\delta_j \leq 1$, showed earlier yields (taking $s \rightarrow \infty$) $j\delta_j \leq j\delta \leq j\delta_j + 1$.

Assume $(i, j) \in S_{[-1, -\delta]}$.

- if $i \geq 0$, inequality $i < -j\delta$ may be satisfied only for $j < 0$ and we get $i < -j\delta \leq -j\delta_{-j} + 1 = M_j + 1$ which yields $i \leq M_j$ so $(i, j) \in S_{\mathbf{M}}$.
- if $i < 0$, then $i \leq -j\delta \leq \begin{cases} -j\delta_{-j} + 1 = M_j + 1, & \text{for } j < 0; \\ -j\delta_j = M_j + 1, & \text{for } j \geq 0. \end{cases}$ For $j \leq 0$ we get $i < -j\delta \leq M_j + 1$ which yields $i \leq M_j$, so $(i, j) \in S_{\mathbf{M}}$. For $j > 0$ either $i < M_j + 1$ or $i = -j\delta = -j\delta_j = M_j + 1$. In the first case $(i, j) \in S_{\mathbf{M}}$. In the second case, since i, j are integers $i = -j\delta$ yields $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}$. Let $\delta = \frac{p}{q}$ for p, q relatively prime integers. Then $i = -j\delta$ yields $(i, j) \in \{(-kp, kq) : k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$. In other words, $S_{[-1, -\delta]} \setminus S_{\mathbf{M}} = S_{[-1, -\delta]} \cap -S_{\mathbf{M}} \subset \{(-kp, kq) : k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$. On the other hand $(-p, q)$ is either in $S_{[-1, -\delta]}$ or in $-S_{[-1, -\delta]}$ and either in $S_{\mathbf{M}}$ or in $-S_{\mathbf{M}}$. Since all of them are semi-groups the whole $\{(-kp, kq) : k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is a subset of those semi-groups where $(-p, q)$ belongs. Hence, either $S_{[-1, -\delta]} \cap -S_{\mathbf{M}} = \emptyset$, so $S_{[-1, -\delta]} \subset S_{\mathbf{M}}$ or $\{(-kp, kq) : k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\} \subset S_{[-1, -\delta]} \cap -S_{\mathbf{M}}$.

Summing up, either we get $S_{[-1, -\delta]} = S_{\mathbf{M}}$, so the statement, or $\delta = \frac{p}{q}$ for p, q relatively prime integers and $\{(-kp, kq) : k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\} \subset S_{[-1, -\delta]} \cap -S_{\mathbf{M}}$. The latter case implies $\{(kp, -kq) : k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\} \subset S_{\mathbf{M}}$. The proof will be done if we show that the last inclusion implies $\widehat{S}_{[-1, -\delta]} \subset S_{\mathbf{M}}$. Recall that

$$\widehat{S}_{[-1, -\delta]} = \{(i, j) : i < -j\delta \text{ for } i \leq 0, i \leq -j\delta \text{ for } i > 0\}.$$

For $(i, j) \in \widehat{S}_{[-1, -\delta]}$:

- if $i \leq 0$, then $i < -j\delta \leq \begin{cases} -j\delta_{-j} + 1 = M_j + 1, & \text{for } j < 0; \\ -j\delta_j = M_j + 1, & \text{for } j \geq 0, \end{cases}$ which yields $i \leq M_j$, so $(i, j) \in S_{\mathbf{M}}$.
- if $i > 0$, then $i \leq -j\delta$ is possible only for $j < 0$ and $i \leq -j\delta \leq -j\delta_{-j} + 1 = M_j + 1$ for $j < 0$. Hence $i \leq M_j + 1$. However, if $i = M_j + 1$, then $i = -j\delta$ and in turn $(i, j) \in \{(kp, -kq) : k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\} \subset S_{\mathbf{M}}$ so $i \leq M_j$ - a contradiction. Consequently, $i \leq M_j$, so $(i, j) \in S_{\mathbf{M}}$.

□

DATA AVAILABILITY

Our manuscript has no associated data.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Ramananjara, O. Alata and M. Najim, 2-D Wold decomposition: New parameter estimation approach to evanescent field spectral supports, *European Signal Processing Conference*, 2015.
- [2] H. Bercovici, R. G. Douglas and C. Foias, Canonical Models for Bi-isometries, in: *Oper. Theory Adv. Appl.*, 218 (2012) 177-205.
- [3] C.A. Berger, L.A. Coburn and A. Lebow, Representation and index theory for C^* -algebras generated by commuting isometries, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 27 (1978), 51-99.
- [4] B. Sz-Nagy, C. Foias, H. Bercovici, L. Kérchy, *Harmonic Analysis of Operators on Hilbert Space*, Springer Science & Business Media, volume 5, 2012.
- [5] M.Sh. Birman and M.Z. Solomjak, *Spectral theory of self-adjoint operators in Hilbert space*, Springer, 2010.
- [6] S. Bochner, Boundary values of analytic functions in several variables and of almost periodic functions, *Ann. Math.* 45 (1944), 708-722.
- [7] Z. Burdak, M. Kosiek and M. Słociński, Compatible pairs of commuting isometries, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 479 (2015), 216-259.
- [8] Z. Burdak, M. Kosiek, P. Pagacz and M. Słociński, On the commuting isometries, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 516 (2017), 167-185.
- [9] Z. Burdak, M. Kosiek, P. Pagacz and M. Słociński, Corrigendum to “Compatible pairs of commuting isometries” [*Linear Algebra Appl.* 479 (2015) 216–259], *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 675 (2023), 106-117.
- [10] Z. Burdak, M. Kosiek, P. Pagacz and M. Słociński, Invariant subspaces of $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$ and $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$ preserving compatibility, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 455 (2017), 1706-1719.
- [11] P. Campisi, G. Iacovitti and A. Neri, Optimised Wold-Like Decomposition of 2D Random Fields, *9th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO 1998)*, 1998.
- [12] R. Cheng, Prediction of stationary Gaussian random fields with incomplete quarterplane past, *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 139 (2015) 245-258.
- [13] T.-P. Chiang, The prediction theory of stationary random fields (II): Nonsymmetrical half-plane prediction, *Acta Math. Appl. Sinica (English series)*, 5 (1989), 176-192.
- [14] T.-P. Chiang, The Prediction Theory of Stationary Random Fields (III): Fourfold Wold Decompositions, *J. Multivariate Anal.* 37 (1991), 46-65.
- [15] A. Cohen, Scanning and Sequential Decision Making for Multidimensional Data—Part II: The Noisy Case, *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 54(2008), 5609-5631.
- [16] G. Cohen and J.M. Francos, Spectral representation and asymptotic properties of certain deterministic fields with innovation components, *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 127 (2003) 277-304.
- [17] C. Cuny, On the prediction of vector-valued random fields and the spectral distribution of their evanescent component, *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 97 (2006) 1842-1869.
- [18] J.M. Francos, 7 Orthogonal Decompositions of 2D Random Fields and their Applications for 2D Spectral Estimation, *Handbook of Statistics*, 10 (1993), 207-227.
- [19] J.M. Francos, A.Z. Meiri and B. Porat, A Wold-Like Decomposition of Two-Dimensional Discrete Homogeneous Random Fields, *The Annals of Applied Probability* 5 (1995), 248-260.
- [20] J.M. Francos, A. Nehorai, Interference Mitigation in STAP Using the Two-Dimensional Wold Decomposition Model, *IEEE Trans. Image Process.* 51 (2003), 2461-2470.
- [21] J.M. Francos, A. Narasimhan and J. W. Woods, Maximum likelihood parameter estimation of textures using Wold decomposition model, *IEEE Trans. Image Process.* 4 (1995), 1655-1666.
- [22] P. R. Halmos, Shifts on Hilbert spaces, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 208 (1961), 102-112.
- [23] H. Helson, D. Lowdenslager, Prediction theory and Fourier series in several variables, *Acta Math.* 99 (1958), 165-202.
- [24] H. Helson, D. Lowdenslager, Prediction theory and Fourier series in several variables II, *Acta Math.* 106 (1961), 175-213.
- [25] G. Kallianpur, A. G. Miamee and H.Niemi, On the prediction theory of two-parameter stationary random fields, *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 32 (1990), 120-149.
- [26] M. Kliger, J. M. Francos, The rank of the covariance matrix of an evanescent field, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 101(2010) 692-705.
- [27] P. Kohlia, M. Pourahmadib, Some prediction problems for stationary random fields with quarter-plane past, *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 127 (2014), 112-125.
- [28] H. Korezlioglu and P. Loubaton, Spectral factorization of wide sense stationary processes on \mathbb{Z}^2 , *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 19(1986), 24-47.
- [29] P. Loubaton, A regularity criterion for lexicographical prediction of multivariate wide-sense stationary processes on \mathbb{Z}^2 with non-full-rank spectral densities, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 104(1992), 198-228.
- [30] Karel Horák, Vladimír Müller, Functional model for commuting isometries, *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 39(1989), No. 2, 370-379.
- [31] Z. Mafakheri, A.R. Soltani, Z. Shishebor, Interpolation for Second Order Stationary Random Fields: Time Domain Recipe, *Rocky Mountain J. Math.*, preprint 2018.
- [32] J. von Neumann, Allgemeine eigenwerttheorie hermitescher funktional operatoren, *Math. Ann.* 102 (1929) 49-131.

- [33] Marek Słociński *On the Wold-type decomposition of a pair of commuting isometries* Annales Polonici Mathematici XXXVII(1980), 255-262.
- [34] D. Popovici, *On the structure of c.n.u. bi-isometries*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) 66(2000), 719–729.
- [35] I. Suciu, *On the semi-groups of isometries*, Stud. Math., 30(1968), 101-110.
- [36] K. Urbanik, *Lectures on Prediction Theory*, Lect. Notes Math., 44(1967), pp.50.
- [37] P. Whittle, *On stationary processes in the plane*, Biometrika, 41(1954), 434-449.
- [38] H. Wold, *A study in the analysis of stationary time series*, Almkvist and Wiksell, Stockholm, 1938.