

# BIMODULE QUANTUM MARKOV SEMIGROUPS

JINSONG WU AND ZISHUO ZHAO

**ABSTRACT.** We present a systematic investigation of bimodule quantum Markov semigroups within the framework of quantum Fourier analysis. Building on the structure of quantum symmetries, we introduce the concepts of bimodule equilibrium and bimodule detailed balance conditions, which not only generalize the classical notions of equilibrium and detailed balance but also expose interesting structures of quantum channels. We demonstrate that the evolution of densities governed by the bimodule quantum Markov semigroup is the bimodule gradient flow for the relative entropy with respect to quantum symmetries. Consequently, we obtain bimodule logarithmic Sobolev inequalities and bimodule Talagrand inequality with respect to a hidden density from higher dimensional structure. Furthermore, we establish a bimodule Poincaré inequality for irreducible inclusions and relative ergodic bimodule quantum semigroups.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Classical Markov semigroups, such as those governing heat flow, play a fundamental role in harmonic analysis. Several important inequalities, including Young’s inequality, the entropy power inequality, and the logarithmic Sobolev inequality, can be derived using the heat flow method.

In the quantum setting, a quantum system is represented by a Hilbert space, while observables correspond to self-adjoint operators. The system of observables is described by von Neumann algebras. A Markov semigroup acting on von Neumann algebras is commonly referred to as a quantum Markov semigroup. The quantum Markov semigroup [19, 6, 7] is a powerful tool in quantum statistical mechanics for modeling certain open quantum systems. It also plays a crucial role in noncommutative analysis, noncommutative probability and noncommutative geometry etc.

In quantum statistical mechanics, an open system interacts with a heat flow in thermal equilibrium, which mathematically corresponds to an equilibrium state. Due to the noncommutativity of the setting, the symmetries of the heat flow relative to the equilibrium state are more intricate than in the classical case. Two fundamental examples of such symmetries are Gelfand-Naimark-Segal (GNS) symmetry [31, 32] and Kubo-Martin-Schwinger (KMS) symmetry [3, 4, 5, 17, 30].

Modern subfactor theory was pioneered by Vaughan Jones [15, 16]. His work on subfactors revealed a wealth of unexpected symmetries beyond classical group symmetry, now known as quantum symmetries. The axiomatic characterization of subfactors includes Ocneanu’s paragroups [24], Popa’s  $\lambda$ -lattices [28], and Jones’ planar algebras [13]. Among these, Jones’ planar algebras provide a topological framework for studying quantum symmetries, consisting

of a sequence of  $n$ -box spaces. Quantum Markov semigroups, when encoded by quantum symmetries, exhibit highly intricate and fascinating structural properties.

In this paper, we investigate quantum Markov semigroups on a finite inclusion  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  of finite von Neumann algebras that preserve  $\mathcal{N}$ , referred to as bimodule quantum Markov semigroups. Assuming that the inclusion is a  $\lambda$ -extension, as introduced by Pimsner and Popa[26], we leverage the computational advantages of Jones' planar algebras. We explore equilibrium, GNS symmetry, and KMS symmetry in the bimodule setting. Inspired by the quantum Fourier analysis developed by Jaffe, Jiang, Liu, Ren, and Wu [10], we introduce the notions of bimodule equilibrium, bimodule GNS symmetry, and bimodule KMS symmetry within the framework of quantum Fourier analysis (See Theorems 4.5, 4.26, 4.40). Our findings reveal that while quantum channel equilibrium exists at a single state, bimodule equilibrium arises within a cone. Additionally, there exist quantum channels that are not GNS symmetric but exhibit bimodule GNS symmetry. These bimodule symmetries significantly broaden the study of symmetric quantum channels and quantum semigroups.

Bimodule quantum Markov semigroups can be fully characterized by  $\mathfrak{F}$ -positive elements, as introduced by Huang, Jaffe, Liu, and Wu[8], in the 2-box space, along with self-adjoint elements in the 1-box space (See Proposition 5.7 and Theorem 5.16). The derivation associated with a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup resides in the 3-box space. Utilizing this characterization of derivations, we establish the Poincaré inequality for irreducible subfactors (Theorem 5.48). For bimodule GNS-symmetric and relatively ergodic Markov semigroups, we analyze the limit of the semigroup and derive the equation of the gradient flow. Additionally, we introduce the concept of hidden density, obtained by projecting elements from the 2-box space into the 1-box space. This additional structure in the bimodule semigroup framework allows us to establish both the bimodule logarithmic Sobolev inequality (Theorem 6.41) under intertwining and the bimodule Talagrand inequality (Theorem 6.43). We shall investigate the bimodule KMS symmetric semigroups in the future.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 we recall the  $\lambda$ -extension of finite von Neumann algebras and examples for finite inclusions. This indicates that our work includes the matrix cases. Section 3 we study the bimodule quantum channels in terms of quantum Fourier analysis. Section 4 we introduce bimodule equilibrium, bimodule GNS symmetry, bimodule KMS symmetry from equilibrium GNS symmetry, KMS symmetry naturally. Section 5 we study the bimodule quantum Markov in the framework of quantum Fourier analysis and introduce the derivation in 3-box spaces. We also prove the Poincaré inequality for irreducible subfactors. Section 6 we study the gradient flow for bimodule GNS symmetric and relatively ergodic Markov semigroup and introduces the hidden density of the semigroup. Consequently, we obtain the logarithmic Sobolev inequality, Talagrand inequality with respect to the hidden density.

**Acknowledgement.** *J. W. were supported by grants from Beijing Institute of Mathematical Sciences and Applications. J. W. was supported by NSFC (Grant no. 12371124) and partially supported by NSFC (Grant no. 12031004).*

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Let  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  be an unital inclusion of finite von Neumann algebras and  $\tau$  the fixed normal faithful tracial state on  $\mathcal{M}$ . The inclusion  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible if  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M} = \mathbb{C}$ . Denote by  $L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$  the GNS representation Hilbert space of  $\tau$ , with cyclic separating vector  $\Omega$  and modular conjugation  $J$  given by  $Jx\Omega = x^*\Omega$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . Suppose that  $e_1$  is the Jones projection from  $L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$  onto  $L^2(\mathcal{N}, \tau)$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}$  the trace-preserving conditional expectation of  $\mathcal{M}$  onto  $\mathcal{N}$ . We have that  $e_1xe_1 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x)e_1$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . The basic construction  $\mathcal{M}_1 = \langle \mathcal{M}, e_1 \rangle$  is the von Neumann algebra generated by  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $e_1$ . The inclusion is finite if  $\mathcal{M}_1$  is a finite von Neumann algebra. In this case we have  $\mathcal{M}_1 = J\mathcal{N}'J$ , where  $\mathcal{N}'$  is the commutant of  $\mathcal{N}$  on  $L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ . We shall focus on the finite inclusions of finite von Neumann algebras in this paper.

Suppose  $\tau_1$  is a faithful normal trace on  $\mathcal{M}_1$  extending  $\tau$ , and let  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$  be the trace-preserving conditional expectation onto  $\mathcal{M}$ . The inclusion  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}_1$  is called a  $\lambda$ -extension of  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  if  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_1) = \lambda$  for some positive constant  $\lambda$ . The index of the extension is defined as  $[\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{N}] = \lambda^{-1}$ . We denote by  $\Omega_1$  the cyclic and separating vectors in  $L^2(\mathcal{M}_1, \tau_1)$ , and by  $e_2$  the Jones projection onto  $L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ . The  $\lambda$ -extension is called extremal if for all  $x \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\tau_1(x) = \tau_1(JxJ)$ . We assume all  $\lambda$ -extensions in the paper to be extremal. We define  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}$  to be the  $\tau_1$ -preserving conditional expectation from  $\mathcal{M}_1$  onto  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ .

Let  $\mathcal{M}_2 = \langle \mathcal{M}_1, e_2 \rangle$  be the basic construction of the inclusion  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}_1$ , with a normal faithful trace  $\tau_2$  extending  $\tau_1$ . We assume  $\mathcal{M}_1 \subset \mathcal{M}_2$  is a  $\lambda$ -extension of  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}_1$ , i.e.  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2) = \lambda$ , where  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}$  is the  $\tau_2$ -preserving conditional expectation onto  $\mathcal{M}_1$ . Define  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}$  to be the  $\tau_2$ -preserving conditional expectation from  $\mathcal{M}_2$  onto  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ .

A finite set  $\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^m$  of operators in  $\mathcal{M}$  is a Pimsner-Popa basis for  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$ , if  $x = \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x\eta_j^*)\eta_j$ , for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . Equivalently, this condition can be written as  $\sum_{j=1}^m \eta_j^*e_1\eta_j = 1$ .

This implies that any operator in  $\mathcal{M}_1$  is a finite sum of operators of the form  $ae_1b$  with  $a, b \in \mathcal{M}$ . As a consequence, for any  $y \in \mathcal{M}_1$ , there is a unique  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $ye_1 = xe_1$ .

This indicates that  $x = \lambda^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(ye_1)$ . That  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is a  $\lambda$ -extension implies  $\sum_{j=1}^m \eta_j^*\eta_j = \lambda^{-1}$ .

We shall assume that the basis is orthogonal, that is  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(\eta_k\eta_j^*) = 0$  for  $k \neq j$ . When  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is a  $\lambda$ -extension, the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}$  can be written as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(x) = \lambda \sum_{j=1}^m \eta_j^*x\eta_j, \quad x \in \mathcal{M}_2.$$

Note that this implies that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(e_1) = \lambda$ . We also have that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(yx) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(xy)$  for all  $y \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{M}_2$ .

The Pimsner-Popa inequality for the inclusion states that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x) \geq \lambda_{\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}}x$  for any  $0 \leq x \in \mathcal{M}$ , where  $\lambda_{\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}}$  is the Pimsner-Popa constant.

The basic construction from a  $\lambda$ -extension can be iterated to produce the Jones tower

$$\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}_1 \subset \mathcal{M}_2 \subset \cdots .$$

The higher relative commutants are known as the standard invariant of the inclusion. These standard invariants are axiomatized by planar algebras as in [13].

**2.1. Fourier Transform.** The Fourier transform  $\mathfrak{F} : \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  and the inverse Fourier transform  $\mathfrak{F}^{-1}$  are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}(x) &= \lambda^{-3/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(xe_2e_1), \quad x \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1. \\ \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(x) &= \lambda^{-3/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(xe_1e_2), \quad x \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2. \end{aligned}$$

We check that for any  $x \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\mathfrak{F}(x)) &= \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\lambda^{-3/2} \lambda \sum_{j=1}^m \eta_j^* x e_2 e_1 \eta_j) \\ &= \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\lambda^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \eta_j^* x e_2 e_1 \eta_j) \\ &= \lambda^{-3/2} \lambda^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\eta_j^* x e_2 e_1 \eta_j e_1 e_2) \\ &= \lambda^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\eta_j^* \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(\eta_j) x e_2 e_1 e_2) \\ &= \lambda^{-2} x \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\lambda e_2) = x. \end{aligned}$$

It is then readily checked that  $\mathfrak{F}$  satisfies the Plancherel identity:  $\tau_2(\mathfrak{F}(x)^* \mathfrak{F}(x)) = \tau_1(x^* x)$ , for all  $x \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{-3} \tau_2(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(e_1 e_2 x^*) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(x e_2 e_1)) &= \lambda^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^m \tau_2(e_1 e_2 x^* \eta_j^* x e_2 e_1 \eta_j) \\ &= \lambda^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^m \tau_2(e_2 x^* \eta_j^* x e_2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(\eta_j) e_1) \\ &= \lambda^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^m \tau_2(e_2 x^* \eta_j^* \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(\eta_j) x e_2 e_1) \\ &= \lambda^{-2} \tau_2(x^* x e_2 e_1 e_2) = \tau_1(x^* x). \end{aligned}$$

In the planar algebra of the inclusion, the Fourier transform from  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$  to  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  is described by a 90-degree rotation:

$$\mathfrak{F}(x) := \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram: A box labeled } x \text{ is rotated 90 degrees clockwise within a shaded region.} \end{array} \right].$$

There is a Fourier transform from  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  to  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$  and its inverse. We shall denote them also by  $\mathfrak{F}$  and  $\mathfrak{F}^{-1}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}(y) &= \lambda^{-3/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2 e_1 y), \quad y \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2. \\ \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y) &= \lambda^{-3/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(e_1 e_2 y), \quad y \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1. \end{aligned}$$

The planar tangle representing the Fourier transform from  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  to  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$  is the same as the above with a reversed shading.

On the relative commutant  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ , the 180-degree rotation is related to the modular conjugation  $J$  as follows:

$$\mathfrak{F}^2(x) = Jx^*J, \quad x \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1.$$

To see this, we first have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}^2(x) &= \lambda^{-3} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2 e_1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(x e_2 e_1)) \\ &= \lambda^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2 e_1 \eta_j^* x e_2 e_1 \eta_j) \\ &= \lambda^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2 e_1 \eta_j^* x e_2) e_1 \eta_j \end{aligned}$$

Next notice that the action of the operator  $J(ae_1b)^*J \in J\mathcal{M}_1J$  restricted to  $\mathcal{M}\Omega$  is given by  $J(ae_1b)^*Jz\Omega = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_1 z a e_1 b)\Omega$ . Therefore we have

$$\lambda^{-2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2 e_1 \eta_j^* x e_2) \Omega = \lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_1 \eta_j^* x) e_2) \Omega = Jx^*J\eta_j^*\Omega,$$

consequently

$$\lambda^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2 e_1 \eta_j^* x e_2) e_1 \eta_j = Jx^*J.$$

We call  $Jx^*J$  the modular conjugation of  $x$ , and denote it by  $\bar{x}$ . Since  $\bar{\bar{x}} = x$ , we see that  $\mathfrak{F}^4 = id$ . There is a similar relation between the modular conjugation and Fourier transform on  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ .

For irreducible inclusions, we have the Hausdorff-Young inequality which states  $\|\mathfrak{F}(x)\|_\infty \leq \lambda^{-1/2} \|x\|_1$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Suppose that  $a \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ . Then we have that for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ ,*

$$\mathfrak{F}(a)xe_1y\Omega_1 = \lambda^{1/2}xay\Omega_1.$$

Moreover, we have that  $\mathfrak{F}(a)e_1e_2 = \lambda^{1/2}ae_2$ .

*Proof.* We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}(a)xe_1y\Omega_1 &= \lambda^{-3/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(ae_2e_1)xe_1y\Omega_1 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda^{-1/2}x\eta_j^*ae_2e_1\eta_je_1y\Omega_1 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda^{-1/2}x\eta_j^*\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(\eta_j)ae_2e_1y\Omega_1 \\ &= \lambda^{-1/2}xae_2e_1e_2y\Omega_1 \\ &= \lambda^{1/2}xay\Omega_1. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $x = y = 1$ . We obtain that  $\mathfrak{F}(a)e_1\Omega_1 = \lambda^{1/2}a\Omega_1$ . This implies that  $\mathfrak{F}(a)e_1e_2\Omega_1 = \lambda^{1/2}ae_2\Omega_1$ . Hence  $\mathfrak{F}(a)e_1e_2 = \lambda^{1/2}ae_2$ . This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

The rotation  $\Theta : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1$  is defined as

$$\Theta(x) = \lambda^{-3}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2e_1\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(xe_2e_1)), \quad x \in \mathcal{M}_1.$$

Note that  $\Theta|_{\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1} = \mathfrak{F}^2$ .

We define the convolution between  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  as

$$\begin{aligned} x * y &= \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\mathfrak{F}(y)\mathfrak{F}(x)) \\ &= \lambda^{-9/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(e_1e_2\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2e_1y)\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2e_1x)). \end{aligned}$$

The convolution admits a simple graphical representation through planar algebra:

$$x * y = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{x} \quad \boxed{y} \\ \text{---} \end{array}.$$

The Schur product theorem states  $x * y \geq 0$  provided that  $x, y \geq 0$ . If the inclusion is irreducible, then we have Young's inequality:  $\|x * y\|_r \leq \lambda^{1/2}\|x\|_p\|y\|_q$ , for  $r^{-1} + 1 = p^{-1} + q^{-1}$ ,  $p, q, r \geq 1$ .

**2.2. The Inclusion  $\mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ .** Let  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{C}^n$ . Let  $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^n$  be  $n$  distinct minimal projections in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , we define the normalized trace  $\tau(E_k) = \frac{1}{n}$  for  $k = 1, \dots, n$ . The unit of  $\mathcal{N}$

is identified with that of  $\mathcal{M}$ , which is  $\sum_{k=1}^n E_k$ .



with  $\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$  under the unitary transformation

$$E_{j,k}\Omega_1 \mapsto \sqrt{n}E_j\Omega \otimes E_k\Omega,$$

the left/right action of  $\mathcal{M}$  are identified with the action on the first/second tensor factor.

The left action of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  on  $\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$  is given by  $E_{j,k} \otimes I$ . The action of  $e_2$  on  $\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$  is given by the projection  $\sum_{k=1}^n E_{k,k} \otimes E_{k,k}$ . From this we deduce  $\mathcal{M}_2 \cong M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ . The trace  $\tau_2$  on  $\mathcal{M}_2$  is given as  $\tau_2(E_{(j,l),(k,l)}) = \frac{1}{n^2}\delta_{j,k}$ . The inclusion  $\mathcal{M}_1 \subset \mathcal{M}_2$  is again a  $\frac{1}{n}$ -extension. We have

$$\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2 = \text{span}\{E_{j,j} \otimes E_{k,k} | 1 \leq j, k \leq n\}.$$

We remark that  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  is a commutative  $C^*$ -algebra.

A particular basis of  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  is obtained from Fourier transforming the system of matrix units of  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ . For  $1 \leq j, k \leq n$ , we have

$$\mathfrak{F}(E_{j,k}) = \sqrt{n}E_{j,j} \otimes E_{k,k}.$$

The multiplication of matrices is dual to the Schur product of matrices under the Fourier transform  $\mathfrak{F}$ .

To summarize, the Jones tower for the inclusion  $\mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  is  $\mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{C}^n \subset M_n(\mathbb{C}) \subset M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^n \subset \dots$ . We remark that the full standard invariant of the inclusion  $\mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  is described by spin planar algebra[13, Example 2.8]. The tensor network also describe the same inclusion. (See also [8]).

**2.3. The Inclusion  $\mathbb{C} \subset M_n(\mathbb{C})$ .** Denote  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathcal{M} = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Let  $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^n$  be a orthonormal basis of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , and  $\{E_{j,k}\}_{j,k=1}^n$  be a system of matrix units of  $M_n(\mathbb{C})$  that satisfies  $E_{j,k}|l\rangle = \delta_{k,l}|j\rangle$ . For  $1 \leq j, k, p, q \leq n$ , we define operators on  $L^2(\mathcal{M})$  by  $E_{(j,k),(p,q)}$  as  $E_{(j,k),(p,q)}E_{p',q'}\Omega = \delta_{(p,q),(p',q')}E_{j,k}\Omega$ . Then  $\{E_{(j,k),(p,q)}\}_{j,k,p,q=1}^n$  forms a system of matrix units of  $\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathcal{M}))$ . The left regular representation of  $E_{j,k} \in \mathcal{M}$  is  $\sum_{s=1}^n E_{(j,s),(k,s)}$ . The Jones projection is

$$e_1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j,k=1}^n E_{(j,j),(k,k)}.$$

The basic construction  $\mathcal{M}_1$  is generated by  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $e_1$ . We have  $\mathcal{M}_1 = J\mathcal{N}'J = \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathcal{M})) \cong M_{n^2}(\mathbb{C})$ . We have  $JX^*J = X^\top$ , where  $X \in \mathcal{M}_1$ . The trace  $\tau_1$  is the unique normalized trace, with respect to which we have  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_1) = \frac{1}{n^2}$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is a  $\frac{1}{n^2}$ -extension. A natural choice of Pimsner-Popa basis for  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is  $\{\sqrt{n}E_{j,k}\}_{j,k=1}^n$ .

We identify  $L^2(\mathcal{M}_1)$  with  $\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$  by the unitary transformation

$$E_{(j,k),(p,q)}\Omega_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{n}|j\rangle \otimes |k\rangle \otimes |p\rangle \otimes |q\rangle.$$

The left action of  $E_{(j,k),(p,q)} \in \mathcal{M}_1$  on  $L^2(\mathcal{M}_1)$  is given by  $E_{j,p} \otimes E_{k,q} \otimes I \otimes I$ . This implies the left action of  $E_{j,k} \in \mathcal{M}$  to be  $E_{j,k} \otimes I \otimes I \otimes I$ . The modular conjugation  $J_1$  on  $L^2(\mathcal{M}_1)$  acts as

$$J_1|j\rangle \otimes |k\rangle \otimes |p\rangle \otimes |q\rangle = |p\rangle \otimes |q\rangle \otimes |j\rangle \otimes |k\rangle.$$

The Jones projection  $e_2$  is given by


$$e_2 = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^n I \otimes E_{j,k} \otimes I \otimes E_{j,k}.$$

We thus have  $\mathcal{M}_2 = M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes I \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$ , and  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2 = I \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes I \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$ . The trace  $\tau_2$  is given as  $\tau_2(X \otimes Y \otimes I \otimes Z) = \frac{1}{n^3} \text{Tr}(X) \text{Tr}(Y) \text{Tr}(Z)$ . The inclusion  $\mathcal{M}_1 \subset \mathcal{M}_2$  is again a  $\frac{1}{n^2}$ -extension. The modular conjugation  $J_1$  acts on  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  as  $J_1(I \otimes X \otimes I \otimes Y)^* J_1 = I \otimes Y^\top \otimes I \otimes X^\top$ .


Finally the Fourier transform of the system of matrix units of  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$  is given by


$$\mathfrak{F}(E_{(j,k),(p,q)}) = nI \otimes E_{k,j} \otimes I \otimes E_{q,p}.$$

The element  $E_{(j,k),(p,q)} \in \mathcal{M}_1$  is depicted in the corresponding planar algebra as



Its Fourier transform in  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  is



Note that  is minimal projection for any  $X$  and

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram with } E_{j,k} \text{ and } E_{k,j} \\ \hline \text{Diagram with } E_{j,j} \text{ and } E_{k,k} \end{array}.$$

To summarize, the Jones tower for the inclusion  $\mathbb{C} \subset M_n(\mathbb{C})$  is  $\mathbb{C} \subset M_n(\mathbb{C}) \subset M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}) \subset M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}) \subset \dots$ .

**2.4. Finite index inclusions from unitary fusion categories.** In this section, we recall the canonical way to construct a finite index inclusion of type II<sub>1</sub> von Neumann algebras  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  from a Frobenius algebra in a unitary fusion category  $\mathcal{C}$ .

We denote the tensor unit of  $\mathcal{C}$  by 1. For an object  $X$ , denote by  $\overline{X}$  the dual of  $X$ . Let  $\text{ev}_X : \overline{X} \otimes X \rightarrow 1$  be the evaluation map and  $\text{coev}_X : 1 \rightarrow X \otimes \overline{X}$  the coevaluation map satisfying the zigzag relations. Suppose that  $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ . We denote by  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y)$  the space of morphisms from  $X$  to  $Y$ , and by  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X)$  the algebra of endomorphisms of  $X$ , with the identity morphism  $\text{id}_X$ . By the fact that  $\mathcal{C}$  is unitary fusion category,  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X)$  is a finite dimensional  $C^*$ -algebra. There is a faithful trace on  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X)$  given by the categorical trace as follows:

$$\text{Tr}(f) = \text{coev}_X^*(f \otimes \text{id}_{\overline{X}}) \circ \text{coev}_X, \quad f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X).$$

The quantum dimension of  $X$  is defined as  $d_X = \text{Tr}(\text{id}_X)$ . In what follows we shall consider the normalized categorical trace  $tr = \frac{1}{d_X} \text{Tr}$ .

A  $*$ -Frobenius algebra is a triple  $(\gamma, m, \eta)$  where  $\gamma$  is an object in  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $m : \gamma \otimes \gamma \rightarrow \gamma$  is the multiplication and  $\eta : 1 \rightarrow \gamma$  is the unit. (See [22, Definition 3.1] for the details.) By the universal construction of Müger, there exists a spherical Morita context  $\mathcal{E}$  with objects  $\{\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}\}$ , such that  $\mathcal{C} = \text{END}(\mathfrak{A})$  and  $\text{END}(\mathfrak{B})$  is a unitary fusion category. Moreover there is a distinguished 1-morphism  $J : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$  such that  $\gamma = \overline{J}J$ . Morita contexts can also be described in terms of module categories [25].

The construction of the inclusion from  $\gamma$  is as follows. Let  $\ell$  be a non-negative integer. For  $k = 2\ell$ , define a finite dimensional  $C^*$ -algebra  $M_k = \text{Hom}((\overline{J}J)^\ell \overline{J})$ ; for  $k = 2\ell + 1$ , define  $M_k = \text{Hom}(J(\overline{J}J)^\ell \overline{J})$ . There is a natural inclusion  $\iota_k : M_k \rightarrow M_{k+1}$  defined as  $\text{id}_J \otimes -$  for  $k$  even and  $\text{id}_{\overline{J}} \otimes -$  for  $k$  odd. These inclusions preserve the normalized categorical traces, so we obtain a faithful trace  $\tau$  on the  $*$ -algebra  $M = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} M_k$ . For  $k = 2\ell$ , define a  $C^*$ -subalgebra

$N_k \subset M_k$  as  $N_k = \text{Hom}((\overline{J}J)^\ell \otimes \text{id}_{\overline{J}})$ ; for  $k = 2\ell + 1$ , define  $N_k = \text{Hom}(J(\overline{J}J)^\ell \otimes \text{id}_{\overline{J}})$ . The inclusions  $\iota_k$  restricts to inclusions of  $N_k$  into  $N_{k+1}$ , so we obtain an inclusion of  $*$ -algebras

$$\bigcup_{k \geq 0} N_k \subset \bigcup_{k \geq 0} M_k = M.$$

Let  $L^2(M, \tau)$  be the GNS-construction of  $M$  with respect to  $\tau$ , we define  $\mathcal{M}$  to be the closure of the left regular representation of  $M$  in  $\mathcal{B}(L^2(M, \tau))$  with respect to the weak operator topology. It is a standard procedure to show that  $\tau$  extends to a normal faithful trace on  $\mathcal{M}$ . Define  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  to be the weak-closure of the  $*$ -subalgebra  $\bigcup_{k \geq 0} N_k$ . Thus  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is an

inclusion of (hyperfinte) type II von Neumann algebras.

It follows from the properties of commuting squares [14, Proposition 5.1.9] that  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is a  $\lambda$ -extension with  $\lambda = \frac{1}{d_\gamma}$ , where  $d_\gamma$  is the quantum dimension of  $\gamma$ . By Ocneanu's compactness argument [14, Theorem 5.7.1], the inclusion  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible if  $\gamma$  is simple,

namely  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(1, \gamma)$  is 1-dimensional. The higher relative commutants of  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  can also be computed by this theorem. We have for  $k = 2\ell$ ,  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_k = \text{Hom}(\overline{J}(J\overline{J})^\ell)$  and  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_k = \text{Hom}(J(\overline{J}J)^\ell)$ ; for  $k = 2\ell + 1$ ,  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_k = \text{Hom}((\overline{J}J)^{\ell+1})$  and  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_k = \text{Hom}((J\overline{J})^{\ell+1})$ . In particular, we have  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1 = \text{Hom}(\overline{J}J) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\gamma)$ , and  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2 = \text{Hom}(\gamma \otimes \gamma)$  where  $\gamma \otimes \gamma$  is treated as a  $\gamma$ -bimodule in  $\mathcal{C}$ . By a theorem of Popa [27, Corollary 3.7],  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is always extremal for there are only finitely many equivalent classes of simple objects in a fusion category. The dual inclusion  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}_1$  of  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  can be constructed in the same way with  $J$  and  $\overline{J}$  exchanged. For the dual inclusion, we have  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2 = \text{Hom}(\gamma \otimes \gamma)$  as  $\gamma$ -bimodules, and  $\mathcal{M}'_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_3 = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\gamma)$ .

We provide some examples of the above construction by specifying the unitary fusion category and the Frobenius algebra. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be unitary fusion, then so is  $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}$ . The object  $\gamma = \bigoplus_{X \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{C})} X \boxtimes X^{\text{op}}$  admits the structure of a simple Frobenius algebra, thus produces a irreducible subfactor  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$ . This is known as the quantum double construction[23]. The fusion ring of the underlying category  $\mathcal{C}$  is encoded in the triple  $(\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2, \mathfrak{F})$ , which is an instance of fusion bialgebras [20]. For a concrete example, consider  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{H}_3$  being the Haagerup fusion category [1] with simple objects  $\{1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \zeta, \alpha\zeta, \alpha^2\zeta\}$  and non-commutative fusion rules:

$$\alpha^3 = 1, \quad \zeta\alpha = \alpha^2\zeta, \quad \zeta\alpha^2 = \alpha\zeta, \quad \zeta^2 = 1 + \zeta + \alpha\zeta + \alpha^2\zeta.$$

It then follows from [20, Proposition 7.4] that the associated inclusion  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  has relative commutants  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1 \cong \mathbb{C}^6$  and  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2 \cong \mathbb{C}^2 \oplus M_2(\mathbb{C})$ . This is an instance of an irreducible inclusion with 1-side commutativity for 2-boxes. we have that  $\overline{\alpha} = \alpha^2$ , i.e. the modular conjugation acts non-trivially on  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ . The quantum dimensions  $d_\alpha = d_{\alpha^2} = 1$  and  $d_\zeta = d_{\alpha\zeta} = d_{\alpha^2\zeta} = \frac{3 + \sqrt{13}}{2}$ . The global dimension  $\lambda^{-1} = \frac{9(5 + \sqrt{13})}{4}$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{N}^h \subset \mathcal{M}^h$  the inclusion  $\mathcal{M}' \subset \mathcal{N}'$  on  $L^2(\mathcal{M})$ . Then  $\mathcal{M}_1^{h'} \cap \mathcal{M}_2^h = \mathbb{C}^6$ . Let  $p_\alpha, p_{\alpha^2}, p_\zeta, p_{\alpha\zeta}, p_{\alpha^2\zeta} \in \mathcal{M}^{h'} \cap \mathcal{M}_2^h$  the minimal projections corresponding to  $\alpha, \alpha^2, \zeta, \alpha\zeta, \alpha^2\zeta$ .

### 3. BIMODULE QUANTUM CHANNELS

Suppose that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a finite von Neumann algebra. A linear map  $\Phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is called positive if it preserves the positive cone  $\mathcal{M}_+$ . The map  $\Phi$  is called completely positive if  $\Phi \otimes id_n$  is positive on  $\mathcal{M} \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$  for all  $n \geq 1$ , and completely bounded if  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \|\Phi \otimes id_n\|$  is finite. The map  $\Phi$  is unital if  $\Phi(1) = 1$ . A quantum channel is a normal unital completely positive map on  $\mathcal{M}$ .

For a unital finite inclusion  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  of finite von Neumann algebras, a linear map  $\Phi$  is said to be  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule, if

$$\Phi(y_1xy_2) = y_1\Phi(x)y_2,$$

for all  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{N}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . The  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule map can be characterized by an element in the relative commutant  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ . Suppose  $\Phi$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule map on  $\mathcal{M}$ . The Fourier



**Proposition 3.1.** *Suppose  $\Phi$  is a bimodule bounded map. Then  $\sum_{j=1}^m \Phi(\eta_j^*)e_1\eta_j \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$*

and

$$\widehat{\Phi} = \mathfrak{F} \left( \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\eta_j^* e_1 \Phi(\eta_j)) \right) = \mathfrak{F}^{-1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi(\eta_j^*) e_1 \eta_j \right).$$

In particular,  $\Phi(x)\Omega = \mathfrak{F}(\widehat{\Phi})x\Omega$ , for  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .

*Proof.* This follows from Equation (1) and Lemma 2.1, here we provide a direct computation. For  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}^{-1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi(\eta_j^*) e_1 \eta_j \right) x e_1 y \Omega_1 &= \lambda^{-3/2} x \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'} \left( e_1 e_2 \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi(\eta_j^*) e_1 \eta_j \right) e_1 y \Omega_1 \\ &= \lambda^{-1/2} x \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^m \eta_{j_1}^* e_1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} (\Phi(\eta_{j_2}^*) e_1 \eta_{j_2} \eta_{j_1} e_1 y) \Omega_1 \\ &= \lambda^{1/2} x \sum_{j_1=1}^m \eta_{j_1}^* e_1 \Phi(\eta_{j_1}) y \Omega_1 \\ &= \widehat{\Phi} x e_1 y \Omega_1. \end{aligned}$$

This shows  $\widehat{\Phi} = \mathfrak{F}^{-1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi(\eta_j^*) e_1 \eta_j \right)$ . □

Suppose  $\Phi, \Psi$  are  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule maps on  $\mathcal{M}$ . The composition of bimodule maps is characterized by the convolution of the Fourier multipliers:

$$\widehat{\Phi\Psi} = \widehat{\Psi} * \widehat{\Phi}.$$

For a bounded  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule map  $\Phi$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ , we define the adjoint of  $\Phi$  (with respect to  $\tau$ ) by  $\tau(\Phi^*(y)x) = \tau(y\Phi(x))$ . Note that  $\Phi^*$  is a trace-preserving bimodule map if and only if  $\Phi$  is unital.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Suppose that  $\Phi$  is a bimodule bounded map. We have that*

$$\widehat{\Phi^*} = \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}^*.$$

In particular, for a completely positive map  $\Phi$ , we always have  $\widehat{\Phi^*} = \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}$ .

*Proof.* For any  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that

$$\tau(y^* \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\Phi} x e_1 e_2)) = \tau(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\Phi}^* y^* e_1 x e_2)).$$

By removing the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$ , we have that

$$\tau_2(y^* e_2 e_1 \widehat{\Phi} x e_1 e_2) = \tau_2(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\Phi}^* y^* e_1 x e_2),$$

i.e.

$$\tau_2(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\Phi} x e_1 y^*) = \tau_2(\widehat{\Phi}^* e_1 e_2 x e_1 y^*).$$

By Lemma 2.1, we see that

$$\tau_2(e_2 \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}) x e_1 y^*) = \tau_2(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^*) e_2 x e_1 y^*).$$

This implies that

$$\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}) = \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^*),$$

i.e.  $\widehat{\Phi}^* = \widehat{\Phi}$ . This completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

Suppose  $\Phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is a bimodule quantum channel. The fixed point space of  $\Phi$  is given by

$$\mathcal{M}(\Phi) = \{x \in \mathcal{M} \mid \Phi(x) = x\}.$$

The multiplicative domain of  $\Phi$  is

$$\mathcal{N}(\Phi) = \{x \in \mathcal{M} \mid \Phi(x^* x) = \Phi(x)^* \Phi(x), \Phi(x x^*) = \Phi(x) \Phi(x)^*\}.$$

The multiplicative domain of a quantum channel forms a von Neumann subalgebra of  $\mathcal{M}$ , while this is not true for fixed points in general. Notice that if  $\Phi$  is a  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule map, then  $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\Phi) \cap \mathcal{N}(\Phi)$ .

For a  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule quantum channel  $\Phi$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  with Fourier multiplier  $\widehat{\Phi} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ , we have  $\widehat{\Phi}^k = \widehat{\Phi}^{(*k)}$ . The limit  $\mathbb{E}_\Phi = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \Phi^k$  exists as a  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule quantum channel, with the property that  $\mathbb{E}_\Phi^2 = \mathbb{E}_\Phi$ . Moreover the image of  $\mathbb{E}_\Phi$  is  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi)$ . Taking Fourier multiplier gives:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \widehat{\Phi}^{(*k)},$$

with  $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi * \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi$ . Therefore  $\mathbb{E}_\Phi$  is an idempotent whose Fourier multiplier is positive.

Suppose that the image of  $\mathbb{E}_\Phi$  is a  $*$ -subalgebra  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}$ , then it is known that  $\mathbb{E}_\Phi$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -bimodule map that is a contraction with respect to the operator norm. This implies that  $\mathbb{E}_\Phi$  must be a conditional expectation onto  $\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $e_{\mathcal{P}}$  be the projection from  $L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$  onto  $L^2(\mathcal{P}, \tau)$ . Then we have that

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi) \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi)^*) = e_{\mathcal{P}}.$$

In particular, if  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi) = \mathcal{N}$ , we have that  $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi) \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi)^*) = e_1$ .

**Remark 3.3.** *Note that we can not conclude that  $\mathbb{E}_\Phi$  is trace-preserving conditional expectation, even if its image is a  $*$ -subalgebra. However this is true when the inclusion  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible [12, Proposition 3.2].*

This suggests us present the definition of convolutive support projection.

**Definition 3.4** (Convolutive Support Projection). *Suppose  $x \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ . The convolutive support projection  $\mathfrak{CS}(x)$  is defined to be*

$$\mathfrak{CS}(x) = \bigvee_{k \geq 1, \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k \in \{1, -\}} \mathcal{R}(x^{\epsilon_1} * \dots * x^{\epsilon_k}),$$

where  $x^\epsilon = x$  if  $\epsilon = 1$  and  $x^\epsilon = \bar{x}$  if  $\epsilon = -$ . We say  $x$  is connected if  $\mathfrak{CS}(x) = 1$ . We denote by  $\mathfrak{CS}_0(x) = \bigvee_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{R}(x^{*(k)})$ .

**Remark 3.5.** *We have that  $\mathcal{R}(x) \leq \mathfrak{CS}_0(x) \leq \mathfrak{CS}(x) \leq 1$  if  $x$  is positive. If  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible, then  $\mathfrak{CS}(x)$  is a biprojection by [12, Proposition 3.2].*

**Remark 3.6.** *Suppose  $G$  is an undirected graph and  $A_G$  is its adjacent matrix. By considering the inclusion  $\mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ , where  $n = |G|$ , the cardinality of  $G$ , we have that  $A_G \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{F}(A_G)$  is positive. Moreover,  $\mathfrak{CS}(\mathfrak{F}(A_G)) = 1$  if and only if  $G$  is connected.*

**Remark 3.7.** *Suppose  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel. We have that  $\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi) \leq \mathfrak{CS}_0(\widehat{\Phi})$ .*

We recall the relative irreducibility of a bimodule map introduced in [9].

**Definition 3.8** (Relative Irreducibility). *Suppose  $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  is a finite inclusion of von Neumann algebras and  $\Phi: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is bimodule positive map. We say  $\Phi$  is relatively irreducible if for any projection  $p \in \mathcal{M}$  and positive number  $c > 0$  satisfying  $\Phi(p) \leq cp$ , we have that  $p \in \mathcal{N}$ .*

**Remark 3.9.** *Theorem 5.8 in [9] shows that  $\mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi}) = 1$  implies that  $\Phi$  is relatively irreducible whenever  $\Phi$  is a completely positive bimodule map. Lemma 5.9 in [9] shows that if  $\Phi$  is relatively irreducible bimodule quantum channel and  $\mathcal{N}$  is a factor, then  $\Phi$  is equilibrium with respect to a normal faithful state  $\rho$ , i.e.  $\rho\Phi = \rho$ .*

We recall the following useful result for relatively irreducible bimodule quantum channels in [9].

**Proposition 3.10** (Proposition 5.12 in [9]). *Suppose that  $\Phi$  is a relatively irreducible bimodule quantum channel and  $\mathcal{N}$  is a factor. If there exists a non-zero positive element  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\Phi(x) \leq x$  or  $\Phi(x) \geq x$ , then  $\Phi(x) = x$ .*

Furthermore, Theorem 5.10 in [9] states that

**Proposition 3.11.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  is a finite inclusion of finite von Neumann algebras and  $\Phi$  is a relatively irreducible bimodule quantum channel. Suppose  $\mathcal{N}$  is a factor. Then the eigenvalues of  $\Phi$  with modulus 1 form a finite cyclic subgroup  $\Gamma$  of the unit circle  $U(1)$ . The fixed points space  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi) = \mathcal{N}$ . For each  $\alpha \in \Gamma$ , there exists a unitary  $u_\alpha \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha) = \{x \in \mathcal{M} : \Phi(x) = \alpha x\}$  such that  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha) = u_\alpha \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N} u_\alpha$ .*

**Lemma 3.12.** *Suppose  $\Phi$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule quantum channel. Suppose that there exists a faithful normal state  $\rho$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $\Phi$  is equilibrium with respect to  $\rho$ . Then  $x \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi)$  if and only if*

$$x\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2 = \widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2x.$$

Consequently,  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi)$  is a von Neumann subalgebra.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $x \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi)$ . By the Kadison-Schwarz inequality,  $\Phi(x^*x) \geq \Phi(x)^*\Phi(x) = x^*x$ . Since  $\rho(\Phi(x^*x) - x^*x) = 0$ , we have  $\Phi(x^*x) = x^*x$  as  $\rho$  is faithful. Let  $y = x\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2 - \widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2x$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(y^*y)) &= \tau\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}\left((x\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2 - \widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2x)^*(x\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2 - \widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2x)\right)\right) \\ &= \lambda^{3/2}\tau(\Phi(x^*x)) + \lambda^{3/2}\tau(xx^*\Phi(\mathbf{1})) - \lambda^{3/2}\tau(x^*\Phi(x)) - \lambda^{3/2}\tau(x\Phi(x^*)) \\ &\leq \lambda^{3/2}\tau(x^*x) + \lambda^{3/2}\tau(xx^*) - \lambda^{3/2}\tau(x^*x) - \lambda^{3/2}\tau(xx^*) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(y^*y) = 0$ . By the Pimsner-Popa inequality,  $y = 0$ . Note that  $x^* \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi)$ . We see that  $x^*\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2 = \widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2x^*$ . This implies that  $e_2e_1\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}x = xe_2e_1\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}$ .

Suppose that  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $x\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2 = \widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2x$ . We see that  $\Phi(x) = x$  by multiplying  $e_2e_1\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}$  from the left hand side and taking the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.13.** *It is known that when  $\Phi$  is equilibrium with respect to a normal faithful state  $\rho$ , we have  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\Phi)$ . In Theorem 4.18, the equilibrium of a bimodule quantum channel will be generalized to bimodule equilibrium.*

**Proposition 3.14.** *Suppose  $\Phi$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule quantum channel equilibrium with respect to a faithful normal state  $\rho$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then  $x \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi)$  if and only if*

$$\mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi})xe_1e_2 = \mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi})e_1xe_2.$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $x \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi)$ . We have that  $x^* \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi)$ . By Lemma 3.12, we have  $x\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2 = \widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2x$ , i.e.  $x\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}) = \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2})x$ . By considering the adjoint, we have that  $x\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2})^* = \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2})^*x$ . Multiplying  $\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2})$ ,  $\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2})^*$  multiple times, we obtain that

$$x\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2})^{\epsilon_1} \dots \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2})^{\epsilon_k} = \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2})^{\epsilon_1} \dots \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2})^{\epsilon_k}x, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k \in \{1, *\}.$$

By Lemma 2.1, we see that

$$(\widehat{\Phi}^{\epsilon_1/2} * \dots * \widehat{\Phi}^{\epsilon_k/2})xe_1e_2 = (\widehat{\Phi}^{\epsilon_1/2} * \dots * \widehat{\Phi}^{\epsilon_k/2})e_1xe_2, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k \in \{1, -\}.$$

Hence  $\mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2})xe_1e_2 = \mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2})e_1xe_2$ . Note that  $\mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}) = \mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi})$ . We have  $\mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi})xe_1e_2 = \mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi})e_1xe_2$ .

Suppose that  $\mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi})xe_1e_2 = \mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi})e_1xe_2$ . Then we obtain that  $\widehat{\Phi}xe_1e_2 = \widehat{\Phi}e_1xe_2$ . Multiplying  $e_2e_1$  from the left hand side and taking the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$ , we see that  $\Phi(x) = x$ , i.e.  $x \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.15.** *Suppose  $\Phi$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule quantum channel equilibrium with respect to a faithful normal state  $\rho$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi)$ . We have that  $\Phi^*(x) = \Phi^*(1)x$  and*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi} x e_1 e_2 = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi} e_1 x e_2.$$

**Corollary 3.16.** *Suppose  $\Phi$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule quantum channel equilibrium with respect to a faithful normal state  $\rho$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ . If one of the following holds:*

- (1)  $\mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi}) = 1$ ;
- (2)  $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi}$  is invertible,

then  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi) = \mathcal{N}$ .

*Proof.* If one of the above conditions holds, we have that  $x e_1 e_2 = e_1 x e_2$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi)$  by Proposition 3.14 and Remark 3.15. This implies that  $x \in \mathcal{N}$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi) = \mathcal{N}$ .  $\square$

#### 4. BIMODULE EQUILIBRIUM AND BIMODULE GNS SYMMETRY

In this section, we shall introduce bimodule equilibrium and bimodule GNS symmetris. Suppose  $\rho$  is a normal faithful state on  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\Omega_\rho$  be the separating and cyclic vector in the GNS representation Hilbert space  $L^2(\mathcal{M}, \rho)$ .

Let  $S_{\rho, \tau}$  be the relative modular operator defined by  $S_{\rho, \tau} x \Omega = x^* \Omega_\rho$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $S_{\rho, \tau} = J \Delta_\rho^{1/2}$ , where  $\Delta_\rho$  is affiliated to  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\sigma_t^\rho$  be the modular automorphism,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . If there is no confusion, we denote  $\sigma_t^\rho$  by  $\sigma_t$  for simplicity.

The state  $\rho$  is canonically lifted to  $\mathcal{M}_1$  by  $\rho \circ \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$ . The relative modular operator of  $\rho \circ \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$  with respect to  $\tau_1$  is just  $\Delta_\rho$ , which is viewed as an operator affiliated with  $\mathcal{M}_1$ .

The modular operator  $\Delta_\rho$  is an unbounded operator in general. In the bimodule case, we shall consider the operator  $\widehat{\Delta}_\rho$  defined as follows. We shall assume that the modular operator is compatible with basic construction, namely  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i}^\rho)$ . Under this assumption, define

$$\widehat{\Delta}_\rho = \lambda^{-1/2} \mathfrak{F}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\sigma_{-i}(e_1))).$$

We have that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\Delta_\rho e_1 \Delta_\rho^{-1}) \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$  is bounded. Hence  $\widehat{\Delta}_\rho \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  is bounded.

**Remark 4.1.** *We say the normal faithful state  $\rho$  is a hypertrace on  $\mathcal{M}$  over  $\mathcal{N}$  if  $\rho|_{\mathcal{N}}$  is a tracial state. For such  $\rho$ , we have  $\Delta_\rho$  affiliated with  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}$ . Note that being a hypertrace does not imply that  $\Delta_\rho$  is bounded. If the modular automorphism group of  $\rho$  keeps  $\mathcal{N}$  fixed globally and the center of  $\mathcal{N}$  is finite dimensional, then  $\Delta_\rho$  is bounded. For such  $\rho$ , we have*

$$\widehat{\Delta}_\rho = \lambda^{-1/2} \mathfrak{F}(\Delta_\rho e_1 \Delta_\rho^{-1}).$$

*If  $\rho|_{\mathcal{N}} = \tau$ , we have that  $\Delta_\rho e_1 = e_1 \Delta_\rho$ . This implies that  $\widehat{\Delta}_\rho = 1$ . If  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$  and  $\rho$  is a normal faithful state on  $\mathcal{M}$ , then  $\rho$  is a hyper-trace on  $\mathcal{M}$  over  $\mathcal{N}$ . In this case,*

$$\widehat{\Delta}_\rho = \lambda^{-2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(\Delta_\rho e_1 \Delta_\rho^{-1} e_2 e_1),$$

depicted as

$$\left| \begin{array}{c} \square_{\Delta_\rho} \square_{\Delta_\rho^{-1}} \\ \hline \end{array} \right.$$

The contragredient  $\widehat{\Delta}_\rho = \lambda^{-2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(\Delta_\rho^{-1} e_1 \Delta_\rho e_2 e_1)$  is depicted as

$$\left| \begin{array}{c} \square_{\Delta_\rho^{-1}} \square_{\Delta_\rho} \\ \hline \end{array} \right.$$

**Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose  $\rho$  is a normal faithful state on  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ . Then  $x \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $y \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ , we have that

$$y \sigma_{-i}(e_1) \Omega_1 = y \Delta_\rho e_1 \Delta_\rho^{-1} \Omega_1 = y \Delta_\rho e_1 \Delta_\rho^{-1} e_2 \Omega_1 = \Delta_\rho \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y) \Delta_\rho^{-1} \Omega_1.$$

This implies that  $\Delta_\rho \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y) \Delta_\rho^{-1}$  is bounded and  $\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y) \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ . Note that  $\mathfrak{F}$  is a unitary transform from  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$  onto  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ . We see that  $x \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.3.** *We have that*

$$\widehat{\Delta}_\rho = \lambda^{-2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(\Delta_\rho^{1/2} e_1 e_2 \Delta_\rho^{-1} e_2 e_1 \Delta_\rho^{1/2}) \geq e_2.$$

in  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ . Moreover  $e_2 \widehat{\Delta}_\rho = \widehat{\Delta}_\rho e_2 = e_2$ .

*Proof.* We denote  $\sigma_{-i}^\rho(e_1)$  by  $\Delta_\rho e_1 \Delta_\rho^{-1}$ . Note that since  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\Delta_\rho)$ , it is also in  $\text{Dom}(\Delta_\rho^{1/2})$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Delta}_\rho &= \lambda^{-2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\Delta_\rho e_1 \Delta_\rho^{-1}) e_2 e_1) \\ &= \lambda^{-2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(\Delta_\rho e_1 \Delta_\rho^{-1} e_2 e_1) \\ &= \lambda^{-2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(\Delta_\rho^{1/2} e_1 e_2 \Delta_\rho^{-1} e_2 e_1 \Delta_\rho^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\lambda^2 e_2 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(\Delta_\rho^{1/2} e_1 e_2 \Delta_\rho^{-1/2}) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(\Delta_\rho^{-1/2} e_2 e_1 \Delta_\rho^{1/2}) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(\Delta_\rho^{1/2} e_1 e_2 \Delta_\rho^{-1} e_2 e_1 \Delta_\rho^{1/2}).$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(\Delta_\rho^{1/2} e_1 e_2 \Delta_\rho^{-1} e_2 e_1 \Delta_\rho^{1/2}) e_2 &= \lambda \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(\Delta_\rho^{1/2} e_1 e_2 \Delta_\rho^{-1} e_2 \Delta_\rho^{1/2}) \\ &= \lambda \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(e_1 e_2) \\ &= \lambda^2 e_2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *We have that  $\widehat{\Delta}_\rho$  is invertible.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $p$  is a projection in  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  such that  $p\widehat{\Delta}_\rho = 0$ . Then we have that  $p\Delta_\rho^{1/2}e_1e_2\Delta_\rho^{-1}e_2e_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}p = 0$ . This implies that  $p\Delta_\rho^{1/2}e_1e_2\Delta_\rho^{-1/2} = 0$  and  $p\Delta_\rho^{1/2}e_1e_2 = 0$ . Multiplying  $e_1$ , we obtain that  $p\Delta_\rho^{1/2}e_1 = 0$ . By taking the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}$ , we see that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(p)\Delta_\rho^{1/2}e_1 = 0$ . Note that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(p) \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\Delta_\rho^{1/2}$  is invertible. We see that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(p)e_1 = 0$ . Applying the Pimsner-Popa basis  $\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^m$ , we see that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(p) = 0$ . Finally, we see that  $p = 0$ . Hence  $\widehat{\Delta}_\rho$  is invertible.  $\square$

**4.1. Bimodule Equilibrium.** In this section, we shall study the equilibrium in the bimodule case.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Suppose that  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel and  $\rho$  is a faithful normal state on  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ . Then  $\Phi$  is equilibrium with respect to  $\rho$  if and only if  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\Delta}_\rho\overline{\Phi}e_1e_2) = \lambda^{5/2}$  and*

$$e_2e_1\overline{\Phi}\Delta_\rho e_1\Delta_\rho^{-1}\Omega_1 = e_2e_1\overline{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho e_1\Omega_1.$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . We have that

$$\langle \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\Phi}xe_1e_2)\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle = \lambda^{5/2}\langle x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle.$$

Note that  $e_2\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 = \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1$ . We see that

$$\lambda\langle e_2e_1\widehat{\Phi}xe_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle = \lambda^{5/2}\langle x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle.$$

By taking Fourier transform, we have that

$$\langle \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{\Phi})xe_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle = \lambda\langle x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle.$$

Now we have that

$$\int \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{\Phi})xe_1\Delta_\rho d\tau'_1 = \lambda \int x\Delta_\rho d\tau'_1,$$

where  $\tau'_1 = J_1\tau J_1$  and  $\int \cdot d\tau_1$  is the trace-like functional on the Banach space  $L^1(\mathcal{M}_1)$ . By the fact that  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ , we have that

$$\int \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{\Phi})x\Delta_\rho\sigma_i(e_1)d\tau'_1 = \lambda \int x\Delta_\rho d\tau'_1.$$

Hence for any  $\tilde{x} \in L^1(\mathcal{M})$ , we have that

$$\int \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{\Phi})\tilde{x}\sigma_i(e_1)d\tau'_1 = \lambda \int \tilde{x}d\tau'_1.$$

Now we have that

$$\int \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{\Phi})\tilde{x}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\sigma_i(e_1))d\tau'_1 = \lambda \int \tilde{x}d\tau'_1.$$

By taking conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$ , we have that

$$\int \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\sigma_i(e_1)))\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})\tilde{x}d\tau'_1 = \lambda \int \tilde{x}d\tau'_1.$$

This implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\sigma_i(e_1)))\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}) = \lambda. \quad (4)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\sigma_i(e_1)\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\sigma_i(e_1))\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})). \quad (5)$$

By the computation, we have that the Equations (4) and (5) imply that  $\Phi$  is equilibrium with respect to  $\rho$ .

Note that Equation (4) is equivalent to

$$e_2e_1\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\sigma_i(e_1)))\widehat{\Phi}e_1e_2 = \lambda^2e_2,$$

i.e.  $e_2e_1\widehat{\Delta}_\rho\widehat{\Phi}e_1e_2 = \lambda^{3/2}e_2$  and this is equivalent to the first condition. By taking Fourier transform, we see that Equation (5) is equivalent to the second condition. This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

**Remark 4.6.** *In Theorem 4.5, the first condition  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\Delta}_\rho\widehat{\Phi}e_1e_2) = \lambda^{3/2}$  is more attractive to us. It is equivalent to the following statements:*

- (1)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho e_1e_2) = \lambda^{5/2};$
- (2)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\sigma_i(e_1)))\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}) = \lambda^{1/2};$
- (3)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\sigma_{-i}(e_1))) = \lambda^{1/2};$
- (4)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\Delta}_\rho\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})) = \lambda;$
- (5)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho) = \lambda^{1/2}.$

The last statement is obtained from the condition by taking  $180^\circ$  rotation.

**Corollary 4.7.** *Suppose that  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel and  $\rho$  is a hyper-trace on  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ . Then  $\Phi$  is equilibrium with respect to  $\rho$  if and only if  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\Delta}_\rho\widehat{\Phi}e_1e_2) = \lambda^{5/2}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\rho$  is a hyper-trace, then  $\Delta_\rho \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}$ . By Theorem 4.5, we see that  $\Phi$  is equilibrium with respect to  $\rho$  if and only if  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\Delta}_\rho\widehat{\Phi}e_1e_2) = \lambda^{5/2}$ .  $\square$

By Theorem 4.5, we shall generalize the equilibrium of a quantum channel to bimodule equilibrium as follows.

**Definition 4.8** (Bimodule Equilibrium). *Suppose  $\Phi$  is a contractive bimodule completely positive map and  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  is positive such that  $\widehat{\Delta}e_2 = e_2$ . We say  $\Phi$  is bimodule equilibrium to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  if*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\Delta}\widehat{\Phi}e_1e_2) = \lambda^{5/2}.$$

**Remark 4.9.** *The bimodule equilibrium is weaker than the equilibrium for a bimodule quantum channel in general. Suppose  $\Phi$  is equilibrium with respect to a faithful normal state  $\rho$  and  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ . By Theorem 4.5, we see that  $\Phi$  is bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}_\rho$ .*

**Remark 4.10.** *A possible definition for bimodule equilibrium is that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2} \widehat{\Phi} \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2} e_1 e_2) = \lambda^{5/2}$ . However, this assumption does not imply that the fixed point space of  $\Phi$  is a von Neumann algebra.*

**Remark 4.11.** *The condition for the bimodule equilibrium is also equivalent to the one of the following statements:*

- (1)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\Phi} \widehat{\Delta} e_1 e_2) = \lambda^{5/2}$ ;
- (2)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\mathfrak{F}}^{-1}(\widehat{\Delta}) \widehat{\mathfrak{F}}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})) = \lambda^{1/2}$ ;
- (3)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\mathfrak{F}}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}) \widehat{\mathfrak{F}}^{-1}(\widehat{\Delta})) = \lambda^{1/2}$ ;
- (4)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\Delta} \widehat{\mathfrak{F}}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})) = \lambda$ ;
- (5)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Phi} \widehat{\Delta}) = \lambda^{1/2}$ .

**Remark 4.12.** *The pictorial interpretation of the bimodule equilibrium is the following:*

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} \widehat{\Phi} \\ \widehat{\Delta} \end{array} \right] = 1.$$

*If  $\rho$  is a hyper-trace, then by Corollary 4.7, we see that  $\Phi$  is equilibrium with respect to a faithful normal state  $\rho$  if and only if*

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} \widehat{\Delta}_\rho \quad \widehat{\Delta}_\rho^{-1} \\ \widehat{\Phi} \end{array} \right] = 1.$$

Let  $\mathcal{BE}(\Phi)$  be the set given by

$$\mathcal{BE}(\Phi) = \left\{ 0 \leq \widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2 : \widehat{\Delta} e_2 = e_2, \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\Delta} \widehat{\Phi} e_1 e_2) = \lambda^{5/2} \right\}.$$

It is clear that  $\mathcal{BE}(\Phi)$  is a convex set.

**Example 4.13.** *Consider the inclusion  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{C}^3$ . We define a quantum channel  $\Phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  by  $\Phi(E_k) = E_{k+1}$ , where  $k = 1, 2, 3 \pmod{3}$ . We determine the convex set  $\mathcal{BE}(\Phi)$*

*and the extreme points of its closure. The Fourier multiplier of  $\Phi$  is  $\widehat{\Phi} = \sqrt{3} \sum_{j=1}^3 E_{j+1, j+1} \otimes$*

*$E_{j, j}$ . The coefficient matrix of  $\widehat{\Phi}$  is  $\sqrt{3} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ . Now let  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  be an element*

with coefficient matrix  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & d_{12} & d_{13} \\ d_{21} & 1 & d_{23} \\ d_{31} & d_{32} & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ . Then  $\widehat{\Delta}e_2 = e_2$  and it is positive if the off-diagonal

elements in the coefficient matrix are positive. The coefficient matrix of  $\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \widehat{\Phi} \\ \hline \widehat{\Delta} \\ \hline \end{array}$  is given by the

diagonal part of  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & d_{12} & d_{13} \\ d_{21} & 1 & d_{23} \\ d_{31} & d_{32} & 1 \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} d_{21} & d_{31} & 1 \\ 1 & d_{32} & d_{12} \\ d_{23} & 1 & d_{13} \end{bmatrix}$ . Thus  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{BE}(\Phi)$  if and only if  $d_{21} = d_{32} = d_{13} = 1$  and all other  $d_{ij}$  are positive. We thus obtain

$$\mathcal{BE}(\Phi) = \left\{ \left[ \begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & d_{12} & 1 & \\ 1 & 1 & d_{23} & \\ d_{31} & 1 & 1 & \end{array} \right] \middle| d_{12}, d_{23}, d_{31} \geq 0 \right\}.$$

The only extreme point of the closure  $\overline{\mathcal{BE}(\Phi)}$  is  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\widehat{\Phi} + e_2$ . Notice this set is convex but non-compact.

In fact, we can make the set  $\overline{\mathcal{BE}}$  compact by symmetrizing  $\Phi$ . That is, we now consider  $\Psi$  with  $\widehat{\Psi} = \widehat{\Phi} + \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}$ . The coefficient matrix of  $\widehat{\Psi}$  is  $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , and the coefficient of  $\widehat{\Delta}$  that satisfies the bimodule equilibrium condition for  $\Psi$  must satisfies

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & d_{12} & d_{13} \\ d_{21} & 1 & d_{23} \\ d_{31} & d_{32} & 1 \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & * & * \\ * & 1 & * \\ * & * & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

which amounts to  $d_{21} + d_{31} = d_{12} + d_{32} = d_{13} + d_{23} = 1$ . Thus we obtain:

$$\mathcal{BE}(\Psi) = \left\{ \left[ \begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & d_{12} & 1 - d_{23} & \\ 1 - d_{31} & 1 & d_{23} & \\ d_{31} & 1 - d_{12} & 1 & \end{array} \right] \middle| 1 \geq d_{12}, d_{23}, d_{31} \geq 0 \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that  $\mathcal{BE}(\Psi)$  is compact and has 8 extreme points.

**Remark 4.14.** We have the following questions regarding the bimodule equilibrium:

- (1) When is  $\mathcal{BE}(\Phi)$  compact or equivalently bounded?
- (2) If  $\mathcal{BE}(\Phi)$  is compact, can we characterize its extreme points?
- (3) Suppose  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi)$  is a von Neumann algebra. Is  $\mathcal{BE}(\Phi) = \emptyset$  true?
- (4) Does there exist an  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule quantum channel  $\Phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  such that there is no faithful normal states on  $\mathcal{M}$  invariant under  $\Phi$ , but we still have  $\mathcal{BE}(\Phi) \neq \emptyset$ ?

**Remark 4.15.** For a bimodule quantum channel  $\Phi$  with  $\widehat{\Phi}e_2 = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\widehat{\Phi}e_1e_2) = \lambda^{5/2}$ , take  $\widehat{\Delta} = \overline{\widehat{\Phi}} + e_2$  we find that  $\widehat{\Delta}e_2 = e_2$  and  $\widehat{\Delta}\widehat{\Phi} = \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\widehat{\Phi}$ . Thus  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \overline{\mathcal{BE}(\Phi)}$ .

**Remark 4.16.** Suppose  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible. Then  $\Phi$  is bimodule equilibrium with respect to any positive  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  with  $\tau_2(\widehat{\Delta}\widehat{\Phi}) = \lambda^{1/2}$  and  $\widehat{\Delta}e_2 = e_2$ .

**Example 4.17.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible and  $p \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  is a minimal projection such that  $p \neq \overline{p}$ . This implies that  $p \neq e_2$ . Let  $\widehat{\Phi} = \kappa p + \kappa^{-1}\overline{p}$  such that  $\kappa + \kappa^{-1} = \frac{\lambda^{1/2}}{\tau_2(p)}$ . This implies that  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel. By taking  $\widehat{\Delta} = e_2 + \kappa^2 p + \kappa^{-2}\overline{p}$ , we have that

$$\lambda^{-5/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\Delta}\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}e_1e_2) = \lambda^{-5/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\Phi}e_1e_2) = 1.$$

We see that  $\Phi$  is bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  comes from the Haagerup fusion category described in Section 2.4. Then  $\widehat{\Phi}$  can be taken as  $\kappa p_\alpha + \kappa^{-1}p_{\alpha^2}$ .

**Theorem 4.18.** Suppose  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . Then  $x \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi)$  if and only if

$$x\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2 = \widehat{\Phi}^{1/2}e_1e_2x.$$

Consequently,  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi)$  is a von Neumann subalgebra.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $x \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi)$ . By Kadison-Schwarz inequality,  $\Phi(x^*x) \geq \Phi(x)^*\Phi(x) = x^*x$ . We shall consider the item  $\langle (\Phi(x^*x) - x^*x)\Omega_1, \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}e_1\Omega_1 \rangle$  and show it is equal to 0. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi(x^*x)\Omega_1, \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}e_1\Omega_1 \rangle &= \lambda^{-3/2} \langle e_2e_1x^*x\widehat{\Phi}e_1e_2\Omega_1, \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}e_1\Omega_1 \rangle \\ &= \lambda^{-1} \langle e_1x^*x\Omega_1, e_2\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{\widehat{\Delta}})\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}e_1e_2\Omega_1 \rangle \\ &= \lambda^{-1} \langle e_1x^*x\Omega_1, e_2e_1\widehat{\Delta}\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}e_1e_2\Omega_1 \rangle \\ &= \langle e_1x^*x\Omega_1, \Omega_1 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$\langle x^*x\Omega_1, \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}e_1\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle x^*x\Omega_1, e_1\Omega_1 \rangle$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\Phi(x^*x) - x^*x)\Omega_1, \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}e_1\Omega_1 \rangle &= \langle (\Phi(x^*x) - x^*x)\Omega_1, e_1\Omega_1 \rangle \\ &= \lambda \langle (\Phi(x^*x) - x^*x)\Omega_1, \Omega_1 \rangle \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

by using the fact that  $\widehat{\Delta}e_2 = e_2$ . Combining the equalities, we have that

$$\langle (\Phi(x^*x) - x^*x)\Omega_1, \Omega_1 \rangle = 0.$$

We now have  $\Phi(x^*x) = x^*x$ . The rest follows from the argument in Lemma 3.12.  $\square$

**Remark 4.19.** *Theorem 4.18 gives a weaker condition to see that the fixed point space  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi)$  of a bimodule quantum channel is a von Neumann algebra.*

**Proposition 4.20.** *Suppose  $\Phi$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -bimodule quantum channel bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ . Then  $x \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi)$  if and only if*

$$\mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi})xe_1e_2 = \mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi})e_1xe_2.$$

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 3.14. □

**Remark 4.21.** *Suppose  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ . If one of the following holds:*

- (1)  $\mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\Phi}) = 1$ ;
  - (2)  $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi}$  is invertible,
- then  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi) = \mathcal{N}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha) = \{x \in \mathcal{M} : \Phi(x) = \alpha x\}$ . By using bimodule equilibrium, Theorem 5.7 in [9] will have the following form.

**Theorem 4.22.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  is a finite inclusion of finite von Neumann algebra and  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel bimodule equilibrium to  $0 \leq \widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  with  $\widehat{\Delta}e_2 = e_2$ . Then the following statements hold.*

- (i)  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha)^* = \mathcal{M}(\Phi, \bar{\alpha})$  for any  $\alpha \in \sigma(\Phi) \cap U(1)$ , where  $U(1)$  is the unit circle;
- (ii)  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha_1)\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha_2) \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha_1\alpha_2)$  for any  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \sigma(\Phi) \cap U(1)$ ;  
In particular,  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha)\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \bar{\alpha})$  is a \*-subalgebra of  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, 1)$ ;  
We further assume  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi)$  is a factor.
- (iii) The set  $\Gamma := \sigma(\Phi) \cap U(1)$  is a finite cyclic group;
- (iv) Then there exists a unitary  $u_{\alpha} \in \mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha)$ ,  $\alpha \in \Gamma$ , such that

$$\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha) = u_{\alpha}\mathcal{M}(\Phi, 1) = \mathcal{M}(\Phi, 1)u_{\alpha}.$$

Moreover,  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha)^n = \mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha^n)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha)^{|\Gamma|} = \mathcal{M}(\Phi, 1)$ , where  $|\Gamma|$  is the order of the finite cyclic group  $\Gamma$ . This implies that  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi, \alpha)$  is invertible  $\mathcal{M}(\Phi)$ - $\mathcal{M}(\Phi)$ -bimodule, and the eigenspaces form a bimodule category which is a unitary fusion category.

Suppose that  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel equilibrium with respect to a faithful normal state  $\rho$ . Then  $\Phi^2$  is also equilibrium with respect to  $\rho$ . However if  $\Phi$  is bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ , we do not have  $\Phi^2$  bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  in general. Rotating the condition for bimodule equilibrium, we have that

This suggests following a stronger version of bimodule equilibrium.

**Definition 4.23** (Strong Bimodule Equilibrium). *Suppose that  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel and  $0 \leq \widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  with  $\widehat{\Delta}e_2 = e_2$ . We say  $\Phi$  is strong bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  if*

$$\widehat{\Phi} * \widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}.$$

**Remark 4.24.** *Suppose  $\Phi$  is a quantum bimodule channel strong bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . Then  $\Phi$  is bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  and  $\Phi^2$  is bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ .*

**4.2. Bimodule GNS Symmetry.** In the following, we shall investigate the GNS symmetry of a bimodule quantum channel. Suppose  $\rho$  is a faithful normal state on  $\mathcal{M}$ . A quantum channel  $\Phi$  satisfies  $\rho$ -detailed balance condition if

$$\rho(y^*\Phi(x)) = \rho(\Phi(y)^*x), \quad x, y \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (6)$$

In this case, we also say that the quantum channel  $\Phi$  is GNS-symmetry with respect to  $\rho$ .

**Lemma 4.25.** *Suppose that  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel GNS-symmetry with respect to a normal faithful state  $\rho$ . Then for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that*

$$\Phi(\sigma_t(x)) = \sigma_t(\Phi(x)), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $x \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ . By Equation (6), we have that for any  $\mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\langle S_{\rho,\tau}\Phi(x)^*\Omega, S_{\rho,\tau}y^*\Omega \rangle = \langle S_{\rho,\tau}x^*\Omega, S_{\rho,\tau}\Phi(y)^*\Omega \rangle.$$

and

$$\langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Phi(x)^*\Omega, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}y^*\Omega \rangle = \langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}x^*\Omega, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Phi(y)^*\Omega \rangle.$$

Replacing  $x$  by  $\sigma_{-i}(x)$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\Phi(\sigma_{-i}(x))^*y) &= \langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Phi(\Delta_\rho x \Delta_\rho^{-1})^*\Omega, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}y^*\Omega \rangle \\ &= \langle \Delta_\rho^{-1/2}x^*\Delta_\rho\Omega, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Phi(y)^*\Omega \rangle \\ &= \overline{\langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Phi_t(y)\Omega, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}x\Omega \rangle} \\ &= \overline{\langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}y\Omega, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Phi_t(x)\Omega \rangle} \\ &= \langle \Phi(x)^*\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega, y^*\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega \rangle \\ &= \rho(y\Phi(x)^*). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $\Phi_t(x) \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$  and  $\Phi(\sigma_{-i}(x)) = \sigma_{-i}\Phi(x)$ . Suppose that  $x$  is analytic with respect to  $\sigma$ . We have that  $\Phi(\sigma_{-im}(x)) = \sigma_{-im}\Phi(x)$  for any  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , where  $\mathbb{Z}$  is the set of all integers. Therefore,  $\Phi(\sigma_t(x)) = \sigma_t\Phi(x)$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Note that the set of analytic elements is weakly dense in  $\mathcal{M}$ . We have that  $\Phi(\sigma_t(x)) = \sigma_t\Phi(x)$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . This completes the computation.  $\square$

In the following, we shall characterize the detailed balance condition in terms of Fourier multiplier.

**Theorem 4.26.** *Suppose  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel and  $\rho$  is a normal faithful state on  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ . Then  $\Phi$  satisfies the  $\rho$ -detailed balance condition if and only if  $\overline{\widehat{\Phi}} = \widehat{\Phi} \overline{\Delta_\rho}$  and*

$$\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\Delta_\rho^{-1}e_1\Delta_\rho\Omega_1 = \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\overline{\Delta_\rho}e_1\Omega_1. \quad (7)$$

*Proof.* The  $\rho$ -detailed balance condition (6) implies that

$$\langle S_{\rho,\tau}\Phi(x)^*\Omega, S_{\rho,\tau}y^*\Omega \rangle = \langle S_{\rho,\tau}x^*\Omega, S_{\rho,\tau}\Phi(y)^*\Omega \rangle.$$

Reformulating it, we obtain that

$$\langle \Phi(x)\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega, y\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega \rangle = \langle x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega, \Phi(y)\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega \rangle.$$

In terms of the Fourier multiplier of  $\Phi_t$ , we see that

$$\langle \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\Phi}xe_1e_2)\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega, y\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega \rangle = \langle x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega, \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\Phi}ye_1e_2)\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega \rangle.$$

Now by removing the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$ , we have that

$$\langle e_2e_1\widehat{\Phi}xe_1e_2\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, y\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, e_2e_1\widehat{\Phi}ye_1e_2\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle.$$

Note that  $e_2\Omega_1 = \Omega_1$ . We have that

$$\langle e_1\widehat{\Phi}xe_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, y\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, x^*e_1y\widehat{\Phi}e_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle.$$

Rewriting it in  $\mathcal{M}_1$ , we obtain that

$$\langle \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})^*xe_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, y\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, x^*e_1y\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle.$$

By shifting  $e_1$ , we have that

$$\langle \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})^*x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, y\sigma_{-i}(e_1)\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, x^*e_1y\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle.$$

By the fact that  $\widehat{\Phi}e_1e_2 = \lambda^{1/2}\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})e_2$ , i.e. Lemma 2.1, we see that

$$\langle \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}e_1x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, y\sigma_{-i}(e_1)\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, x^*e_1y\widehat{\Phi}e_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle. \quad (8)$$

By taking the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}$ , we have that

$$\langle \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}y^*e_1x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\sigma_{-i}(e_1))\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, x^*e_1y\widehat{\Phi}e_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle. \quad (9)$$

Combining Equations (8) and (9), we see that

$$\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\sigma_{-i}(e_1)\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 = \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\sigma_{-i}(e_1))\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 = \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho e_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 = \widehat{\Phi}e_1\Omega_1.$$

This implies that

$$\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\sigma_{-i}(e_1)e_2 = \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\sigma_{-i}(e_1))e_2 = \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho e_1e_2 = \widehat{\Phi}e_1e_2.$$

This indicates that the condition (7) holds. Note that  $\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho e_1 e_2 = \widehat{\Phi} e_1 e_2$  implies that  $\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho e_1 = \widehat{\Phi} e_1$ . Applying the Pimsner-Popa basis, we see that  $\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho = \widehat{\Phi}$ . By taking contragredient, we obtain that

$$\overline{\widehat{\Phi}} = \widehat{\Phi}\overline{\widehat{\Delta}_\rho}.$$

Suppose  $\overline{\widehat{\Phi}} = \widehat{\Phi}\overline{\widehat{\Delta}_\rho}$ . By the previous computation, we see that

$$\langle \overline{\widehat{\Phi}} y^* e_1 x \Delta_\rho^{1/2} \Omega_1, \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\sigma_{-i}(e_1)) \Delta_\rho^{1/2} \Omega_1 \rangle = \langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2} \Omega_1, x^* e_1 y \widehat{\Phi} e_1 \Delta_\rho^{1/2} \Omega_1 \rangle.$$

By the fact that Equation (7) holds, we see that  $\Phi$  satisfies  $\rho$ -detailed balance condition.  $\square$

**Remark 4.27.** Suppose that  $\Phi$  is GNS symmetry with respect to a normal faithful normal state  $\rho$  with  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ . If  $\widehat{\Phi}$  is invertible, by Theorem 4.26, we have that  $\sigma_i(e_1) = \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Delta}_\rho)^*$ .

**Proposition 4.28.** Suppose  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel and  $\rho$  is a hyper-trace on  $\mathcal{M}$  over  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ . Then  $\Phi$  satisfies  $\rho$ -detailed balance condition if and only if  $\overline{\widehat{\Phi}} = \widehat{\Phi}\overline{\widehat{\Delta}_\rho}$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $\rho$  is hyper-trace. We have that  $\Delta_\rho e_1 \Delta_\rho^{-1} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\Delta_\rho e_1 \Delta_\rho^{-1})$ . By Theorem 4.26, we see that the proposition holds.  $\square$

**Remark 4.29.** Suppose  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel and  $\rho$  is a hyper-trace on  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ . Then the  $\rho$ -detailed balance condition  $\overline{\widehat{\Phi}} = \widehat{\Phi}\overline{\widehat{\Delta}_\rho}$ , which is depicted as

**Proposition 4.30.** Suppose  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel and  $\rho$  is a normal faithful state on  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ . Then  $\Phi$  satisfies the  $\rho$ -detailed balance condition if and only if  $\overline{\widehat{\Phi}} = \widehat{\Phi}\overline{\widehat{\Delta}_\rho}$  and

$$\Delta_\rho^{-1} \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}) \Delta_\rho \Omega_1 = \overline{\widehat{\Delta}_\rho} \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}) \Omega_1. \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $\Phi$  satisfies the  $\rho$ -detailed balance condition. Then

$$\widehat{\Phi} \Delta_\rho^{-1} e_1 \Delta_\rho \Omega_1 = \widehat{\Phi} \overline{\widehat{\Delta}_\rho} e_1 \Omega_1.$$

Applying Lemma 2.1, we see that Equation (10) holds.

Suppose that Equation (10) holds. We see that  $\Phi$  satisfies the  $\rho$ -detailed balance condition.  $\square$

**Remark 4.31.** By Proposition 4.30, we see that  $\sigma_i(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})) \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ . Note that we do not know if  $\sigma_{-i}(e_1) \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ .

**Corollary 4.32.** *Suppose  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel satisfying the  $\rho$ -detailed balance condition, where  $\rho$  is a normal faithful state on  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ . Then*

$$\widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho = \widehat{\Delta}_\rho\widehat{\Phi}, \quad \widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho = \widehat{\Delta}_\rho\widehat{\Phi}.$$

*Proof.* By the fact that  $\overline{\Phi} = \widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho$ , we see that  $\widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho = \widehat{\Delta}_\rho\widehat{\Phi}$  and  $\overline{\Phi} = \widehat{\Delta}_\rho^{-1}\widehat{\Phi}$ . This implies that  $\widehat{\Delta}_\rho^{-1}\widehat{\Phi} = \widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho^{-1}$ . Hence  $\widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}_\rho = \widehat{\Delta}_\rho\widehat{\Phi}$ . This completes the proof of the corollary.  $\square$

Now we suggest the following definition of detailed balanced condition for bimodule quantum channels.

**Definition 4.33** (Bimodule Detailed Balance Condition). *Suppose  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel,  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  is strictly positive and  $\widehat{\Delta}e_2 = e_2$ . We say  $\Phi$  satisfies the bimodule detailed balance condition with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  if*

$$\overline{\Phi} = \widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}.$$

*We also say that  $\Phi$  satisfies the bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ .*

**Remark 4.34.** *Suppose  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ , which is strictly positive and  $\widehat{\Delta}e_2 = e_2$ . Then  $\Phi$  is bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ .*

**Remark 4.35.** *If  $\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi}) \neq \mathcal{R}(\overline{\Phi})$ , we see that  $\Phi$  is not bimodule GNS symmetry to any strictly positive  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  with  $\widehat{\Delta}e_2 = e_2$ .*

**Remark 4.36.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible and  $\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi}) = \mathcal{R}(\overline{\Phi})$ . By taking  $\widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Phi}\overline{\Phi}^{-1} + 1 - \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})$ , we see that  $\Phi$  is bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . In Example 4.17, we have that  $\Phi$  is bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta} = e_2 + \kappa^2 p + \kappa^{-2} \bar{p} + s(1 - e_2 - p - \bar{p})$ ,  $s > 0$ , where  $\widehat{\Phi} = \kappa p + \kappa^{-1} \bar{p}$ ,  $p \neq \bar{p}$  and  $\kappa + \kappa^{-1} = \frac{\lambda^{1/2}}{\tau_2(p)}$ . Note that  $\widehat{\Delta}$  is not in the ideal  $z_{e_2} \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ . There is no faithful normal state  $\rho$  with  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_i)$  such that  $\widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}_\rho$ .*

**Proposition 4.37.** *Suppose  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ , which is strictly positive and  $\widehat{\Delta}e_2 = e_2$ . Then we have that*

- (1)  $\widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}\widehat{\Phi}$ .
- (2)  $\widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}\widehat{\Phi}$ .
- (3)  $\widehat{\Phi}\overline{\Phi} = \overline{\Phi}\widehat{\Phi}$ .
- (4)  $\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\widehat{\Delta}\widehat{\Delta} = \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\overline{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta} = \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})$ .

*Proof.* (1) follows from  $\overline{\widehat{\Delta}\widehat{\Phi}} = \overline{\Phi} = \overline{\Phi}^* = \overline{\Phi} = \widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}$ . (2) follows the same argument applied to  $\widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}^{-1} = \overline{\Phi}$ . (3) follows from  $\widehat{\Phi}\overline{\Phi} = \widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}\widehat{\Phi} = \overline{\Phi}\widehat{\Phi}$ . For (4), note that we have

$$\widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta}\widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}\widehat{\Phi}\widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}\overline{\Phi} = \widehat{\Phi}.$$

Also,  $\widehat{\Phi}\overline{\widehat{\Delta}}\widehat{\Delta} = \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Phi}$ . Thus the conclusion follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.38.** *Suppose that  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel and  $\rho$  is a normal faithful state on  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i})$ . Then we have that  $\Phi$  is bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}_\rho$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Theorem 4.26.  $\square$

**Remark 4.39.** *Suppose that  $\widehat{\Delta} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{\Delta} \\ \boxed{\Delta^{-1}} \end{array}$ , for some strictly positive  $\Delta \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}$ . Then*

By taking convolution with  $\widehat{\Phi}$ , we have that

$$(\widehat{\Phi} * \widehat{\Phi})\widehat{\Delta} = \overline{\widehat{\Phi}} * \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}.$$

This implies that  $\Phi^2$  is bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . However, this is not true in general.

**4.3. Bimodule KMS Symmetry.** Suppose that  $\rho$  is a faithful normal state on  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel. The bimodule quantum channel  $\Phi$  is KMS symmetry with respect to  $\rho$  if

$$\langle J\Phi(x)^* J\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega, y\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega \rangle = \langle Jx^* J\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega, \Phi(y)\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega \rangle,$$

whenever  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ . In this section, we shall introduce bimodule KMS symmetry for bimodule quantum channels. Let

$$\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2} = \lambda^{-1/2} \mathfrak{F}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}(\Delta_\rho^{1/2} e_1 \Delta_\rho^{-1/2})).$$

By a similar argument in Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4, we have that

- (1)  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  is positive and  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2} e_2 = e_2$ .
- (2)  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}$  is invertible.

**Theorem 4.40.** *Suppose that  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel and  $\rho$  is a normal faithful state on  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i/2})$ . Then  $\Phi$  is KMS-symmetric with respect to  $\rho$  if and only if  $\widehat{\Phi}\overline{\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}} = \widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}$ ,  $\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}^{-1} = \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\overline{\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}}$  and*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\Delta_\rho^{-1/2} e_1 \Delta_\rho^{1/2} \Omega_1 &= \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\overline{\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}} e_1 \Omega_1, \\ \overline{\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\Delta_\rho^{1/2} e_1 \Delta_\rho^{-1/2} \Omega_1} &= \overline{\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}} e_1 \Omega_1. \end{aligned}$$

*Equivalently*

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_\rho^{-1/2}\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 &= \overline{\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}}\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})^*\Omega_1, \\ \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})^*\Delta_\rho^{-1/2}\Omega_1 &= \widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})\Omega_1.\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We will follow a similar argument in Theorem 4.26. For any  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have

$$\langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Phi(x)\Omega_1, y\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}x\Omega_1, \Phi(y)\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle, \quad (11)$$

Reformulating it in terms of the Fourier multiplier, we obtain that

$$\langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}e_1\widehat{\Phi}xe_1\Omega_1, y\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle \Delta_\rho^{1/2}x\Omega_1, e_1\widehat{\Phi}ye_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle.$$

Assuming that  $x \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i/2})$ , we obtain that

$$\langle y^*\sigma_{-i/2}(e_1)\sigma_{-i/2}(x)\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi})^*\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle y^*e_1\sigma_{-i/2}(x)\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \widehat{\Phi}e_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle.$$

Hence

$$\langle y^*\sigma_{-i/2}(e_1)x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}e_1\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle y^*e_1x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \widehat{\Phi}e_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle.$$

By taking the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}'}$  and the Fourier transform, we have that

$$\langle y^*\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}e_1x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \Delta_\rho^{1/2}\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}e_1\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle y^*e_1x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \widehat{\Phi}e_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle. \quad (12)$$

Meanwhile, we have that

$$\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\sigma_{-i/2}(e_1)e_2 = \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}e_1e_2. \quad (13)$$

Similarly, we have that

$$\langle y^*\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}e_1x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}e_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle y^*e_1x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \widehat{\Phi}e_1\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1 \rangle.$$

By removing the inner product, we see that

$$\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}e_1e_2 = \widehat{\Phi}e_1e_2.$$

By removing  $e_1, e_2$ , we obtain that

$$\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}\overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2} = \widehat{\Phi}. \quad (14)$$

Reformulating Equation (12), we see that

$$\langle y^*\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}e_1x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \overline{\widehat{\Phi}}\Delta_\rho^{1/2}e_1\Omega_1 \rangle = \langle y^*e_1x\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\Omega_1, \widehat{\Phi}\Delta_\rho^{1/2}\overline{\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}e_1\Omega_1} \rangle.$$

This implies that

$$\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}\overline{\widehat{\Phi}} = \widehat{\Phi}\overline{\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}}. \quad (15)$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\widehat{\Phi}\sigma_{i/2}(e_1)e_2 = \widehat{\Phi}\overline{\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}e_1e_2}. \quad (16)$$

Combining Equations (14) and (15), we obtain that

$$\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}^{-1} = \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\overline{\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}}. \quad (17)$$

If Equations (13), (14), (15), (17) hold, we see that Equation (11) holds. This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

Theorem 4.40 inspires us to introduce bimodule KMS symmetry as follows.

**Definition 4.41** (Bimodule KMS-Symmetry). *Suppose  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel and  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  is strictly positive such that  $\widehat{\Delta}e_2 = e_2$ ,  $\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\overline{\widehat{\Delta}} = \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi})\widehat{\Delta}^{-1}$ . We say  $\Phi$  is bimodule KMS-symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  if*

$$\overline{\widehat{\Phi}} = \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}\widehat{\Phi}\overline{\widehat{\Delta}}.$$

**Proposition 4.42.** *Suppose that  $\Phi$  is a bimodule quantum channel and  $\rho$  is a normal faithful state on  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i/2})$ . Then we have that  $\Phi$  is bimodule KMS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho,1/2}$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Theorem 4.40.  $\square$

**Remark 4.43.** *Note that bimodule KMS-symmetry does not imply that bimodule equilibrium. Hence the fixed point space of a bimodule quantum channel bimodule KMS equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  might not be a von Neumann algebra. If  $\widehat{\Delta} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{\overline{\Delta}} \quad \boxed{\Delta^{-1}} \\ \hline \end{array}$ , then the bimodule KMS symmetry implies the bimodule equilibrium. The bimodule GNS symmetry implies bimodule KMS symmetry.*

## 5. BIMODULE QUANTUM MARKOV SEMIGROUPS

In this section, we shall discuss the bimodule quantum Markov semigroup.

### 5.1. Bimodule Quantum Markov Semigroup.

**Definition 5.1** (Bimodule Quantum Markov Semigroup). *Suppose  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is a finite inclusion of finite von Neumann algebras and  $\{\Phi_t : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a quantum Markov semigroup. We say  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup if  $\Phi_t$  is a bimodule quantum channel for  $t \geq 0$ .*

**Proposition 5.2.** *Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup for a finite inclusion  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  of finite von Neumann algebras. Then  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is uniformly continuous.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\tau$  is a normal faithful tracial state on  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\Omega$  is the cyclic and separating vector in the GNS Hilbert space  $L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ . We define  $y(t)$  on  $L^2(\mathcal{M})$  as follows

$$y(t)x\Omega = \Phi_t(x)\Omega, \quad x \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (18)$$

Then we see that  $y(t) \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ . Note that  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is a finite inclusion. We find that  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$  is finite dimensional. Hence  $\{y(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a uniformly continuous one-parameter

semigroup. We denote by  $h$  the generator of this semigroup. Then  $h \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$  and  $y(t) = e^{ht}$ . We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Phi_t(x) - x\| &= \sup_{\tau(a^*a)=1} \|(\Phi_t(x) - x)a\Omega\| \\
&= \sup_{\tau(a^*a)=1} \|Ja^*(\Phi_t(x^*) - x^*)\Omega\| \\
&= \sup_{\tau(a^*a)=1} \|Ja^*(y(t) - 1)x^*\Omega\| \\
&= \lambda^{-1} \sup_{\tau(a^*a)=1} \|Ja^*\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}((y(t) - 1)x^*e_1)\Omega\| \\
&= \lambda^{-1} \sup_{\tau(a^*a)=1} \|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_1x(y(t) - 1)^*)a\Omega\| \\
&\leq \lambda^{-1} \|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_1x(y(t) - 1)^*)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $\Phi_t$  is uniformly continuous.  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the generator of a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  such that  $e^{-t\mathcal{L}} = \Phi_t$ , which is also called Lindbladian.

By Proposition 5.2, we see that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is uniformly continuous. Then the generator  $\mathcal{L}$  is a bounded map on  $\mathcal{M}$ . The Fourier multiplier of  $\mathcal{L}$  is defined as follows

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}xe_1y\Omega_1 = \lambda^{1/2} \sum_{j=1}^m x\eta_j^*e_1\mathcal{L}(\eta_j)y\Omega_1, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathcal{M}.$$

We have that  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}e_2 - \widehat{\Phi}_t}{t}$ .

**Proposition 5.3.** *Suppose that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup for a finite extremal inclusion  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{L}$  is its generator. Then*

- (1)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\mathcal{L}}e_1e_2) = 0$ . Pictorially,  $\boxed{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} = 0$ .
- (2)  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^* = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ .
- (3)  $-(1 - e_2)\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(1 - e_2) \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* (1): Let  $h$  be the generator of  $\{y(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  defined in Equation (18). We see that  $h \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}$  and  $y(t) = e^{th}$ ,  $t \geq 0$ . Note that  $\Phi_t = e^{-t\mathcal{L}}$ . We have that  $hx\Omega = -\mathcal{L}(x)\Omega$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . By the fact that  $\Phi_t(1) = 1$ , we have that  $e^{-t\mathcal{L}(1)} = 1$ . This implies that  $\mathcal{L}(1) = 0$  and  $h\Omega = 0$ . Hence  $he_1 = 0$ . Reformulating it in terms of the Fourier multiplier, we obtain that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\mathcal{L}}e_1e_2) = 0$ .

(2): By the fact that  $\Phi_t(x)^* = \Phi_t(x^*)$ , we have that  $\mathcal{L}(x)^* = \mathcal{L}(x^*)$ . This implies that  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^* = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ .

(3): Suppose that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x_j, y_k \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\sum_{j=1}^n x_j y_j = 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} - \sum_{j,k=1}^n y_j^* \mathcal{L}(x_j^* x_k) y_k &= \sum_{j,k=1}^n \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{y_j^* \Phi_t(x_j^* x_k) y_k - y_j^* x_j^* x_k y_k}{t} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{j,k=1}^n \frac{y_j^* \Phi_t(x_j^* x_k) y_k}{t} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Reformulating it in terms of the Fourier multiplier, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq - \sum_{j,k=1}^n y_j^* \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 x_j^* \widehat{\mathcal{L}} x_k e_1 e_2) y_k \\ &= - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( e_2 \sum_{j=1}^n y_j^* e_1 x_j^* \widehat{\mathcal{L}} \sum_{k=1}^n x_k e_1 y_k e_2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that for any  $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{M}_1$  with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\tilde{x}) = 0$ , we have that

$$- \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 \tilde{x}^* \widehat{\mathcal{L}} \tilde{x} e_2) \geq 0. \quad (19)$$

Note that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\tilde{x}) = 0$  is equivalent to  $e_2 \tilde{x} e_2 = 0$ . Equation (19) can be reformulated to

$$- \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 \tilde{x}^* (1 - e_2) \widehat{\mathcal{L}} (1 - e_2) \tilde{x} e_2) \geq 0. \quad (20)$$

For any  $\tilde{y} \in \mathcal{M}_1$ , we have that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\tilde{y} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\tilde{y})) = 0$ . Replacing  $\tilde{x}$  by  $\tilde{y} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\tilde{y})$  in Equation (20), we have that

$$- \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 \tilde{y}^* (1 - e_2) \widehat{\mathcal{L}} (1 - e_2) \tilde{y} e_2) \geq 0. \quad (21)$$

Then

$$0 \leq - \langle \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 \tilde{y}^* (1 - e_2) \widehat{\mathcal{L}} (1 - e_2) \tilde{y} e_2) \Omega_1, \Omega_1 \rangle.$$

This implies that

$$- \tau_2(\tilde{y}^* e_2 \tilde{y} (1 - e_2) \widehat{\mathcal{L}} (1 - e_2)) \geq 0. \quad (22)$$

Suppose  $\tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_m$  is the Pimsner-Popa basis for  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}_1$ . Then for any  $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{M}_2$ , we have

$$\tilde{x} = \sum_{k=1}^m x_k e_2 \tilde{\eta}_k, \quad x_k \in \mathcal{M}_1.$$

This implies that

$$\tilde{x} \tilde{x}^* = \sum_{k=1}^m x_k e_2 \tilde{\eta}_k \tilde{\eta}_k^* e_2 x_k^*.$$

Finally, we see that Equation (22) implies that  $-(1 - e_2) \widehat{\mathcal{L}} (1 - e_2) \geq 0$ .  $\square$

Suppose  $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is bounded bimodule map. We say  $\mathcal{L}$  is conditional negative if  $-\sum_{j,k=1}^n y_j^* \mathcal{L}(x_j^* x_k) y_k \geq 0$  for any  $\sum_{j=1}^n x_j y_j = 0$ , where  $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n \in \mathcal{M}$ . This is equivalent to the following condition:

$$-y^* \mathcal{L}_n(x^* x) y \geq 0, \quad x, y \in \mathcal{M} \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}) \text{ with } xy = 0.$$

The gradient form  $\Gamma$  of  $\{\Phi_t = e^{-t\mathcal{L}}\}_{t \geq 0}$  is defined as

$$\Gamma(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(y^* \mathcal{L}(x) + \mathcal{L}(y)^* x - \mathcal{L}(y^* x)), \quad x, y \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{L}_n = \mathcal{L} \otimes I_n$  on  $\mathcal{M} \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and

$$\Gamma_n(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(y^* \mathcal{L}_n(x) + \mathcal{L}_n(y)^* x - \mathcal{L}_n(y^* x)), \quad x, y \in \mathcal{M} \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}).$$

We say  $\mathcal{L}$  is completely dissipative if for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{M} \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$ ,  $\Gamma_n(x, x) \geq 0$ , i.e.

$$x^* \mathcal{L}_n(x) + \mathcal{L}_n(x)^* x - \mathcal{L}_n(x^* x) \geq 0.$$

**Proposition 5.4.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is a bounded bimodule map with  $\mathcal{L}(1) = 0$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^* = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\Phi_t = e^{-t\mathcal{L}}$  is completely positive for  $t \geq 0$  and  $\Phi_t(1) = 1$ ;
- (2)  $\mathcal{L}$  is completely dissipative;
- (3)  $\mathcal{L}$  is conditionally negative;
- (4)  $-(1 - e_2)\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(1 - e_2) \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 5.3, we see that (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) is true.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Suppose that  $x \in \mathcal{M} \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Let  $\tilde{x} = \begin{pmatrix} x & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\tilde{y} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ x & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ . Then we have that  $\tilde{y}^* \mathcal{L}_{2n}(\tilde{x}^* \tilde{x}) \tilde{y} \geq 0$ . This implies that  $\tilde{y}^* \mathcal{L}_n(\tilde{x}) + \mathcal{L}_n(\tilde{y})^* \tilde{x} - \mathcal{L}_n(\tilde{y}^* \tilde{x}) \geq 0$ . Hence we see that  $\mathcal{L}$  is completely dissipative.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Suppose  $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\sum_{j=1}^n x_j y_j = 0$ . Let  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  and  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ . Then  $x^* \mathcal{L}_n(x) + \mathcal{L}_n(x)^* x - \mathcal{L}_n(x^* x) \geq 0$  and  $y^* x^* \mathcal{L}_n(x) y + y^* \mathcal{L}_n(x)^* x y - y^* \mathcal{L}_n(x^* x) x \geq 0$ . This implies that  $\mathcal{L}$  is conditional negative.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Note that  $\|I + t\mathcal{L}\| = \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{M})} \|u + t\mathcal{L}(u)\|$ , where  $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{M})$  is the set of all unitaries in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then by the fact that  $\mathcal{L}$  is completely dissipative, we have that  $\|I + t\mathcal{L}\| \leq 1 + t^2 \|\mathcal{L}\|^2$ . This implies that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|I + t\mathcal{L}\| - 1}{t} \leq 0$ . Hence  $\Phi_t$  is contractive. By the fact that  $\mathcal{L}(1) = 0$ , we see that  $\Phi_t(1) = 1$ . This implies that  $\Phi_t$  is positive.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (3): The assumption implies that Equation (20) is true. The Equation (19) is true. Hence  $\mathcal{L}$  is conditionally negative.  $\square$

**Remark 5.5.** *The equivalence of (1), (2) is discussed in [19].*

**Theorem 5.6.** *Suppose  $u = u^* \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  satisfies the following conditions:*

- (1)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 u e_1 e_2) = 0$ .
- (2)  $-(1 - e_2)u(1 - e_2) \geq 0$ .

*Then there exists a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  with generator  $\mathcal{L}$  such that  $u = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ .*

*Proof.* We define a map  $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  such that

$$\mathcal{L}(x) = \lambda^{-5/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 u x e_1 e_2), \quad x \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Then  $\Phi_t = e^{-t\mathcal{L}}$  is a bimodule semigroup. By Proposition 5.4, we see that  $\Phi_t$  is completely positive. Then  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup.  $\square$

We define the two components of  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 &= -(1 - e_2)\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(1 - e_2). \\ \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 &= e_2\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(1 - e_2). \end{aligned}$$

By the fact that  $\lambda^{-3/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}} e_1 e_2) = \lambda \boxed{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} = 0$ , we have that

$$\lambda^2 \boxed{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} + \lambda \boxed{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1} + \lambda \boxed{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1^*} - \boxed{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0} = 0,$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \boxed{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0} &= \lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 \widehat{\mathcal{L}} e_2) + \lambda^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1^*) + \lambda^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 e_1 e_2), \\ &= \lambda^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 \widehat{\mathcal{L}} e_2) + \lambda \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1)) + \lambda \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1^*)). \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 e_1 e_2) \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}$ .

In what follows we shall impose that  $Z(\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C}$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{M}$  is a factor. In this case  $e_2$  is a minimal projection in  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ . Let  $\mathcal{S} = z_{e_2} \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ , where  $z_{e_2}$  is the central carrier of the Jones projection  $e_2$ . We have that  $\mathcal{S}$  is isomorphic to a multi-matrix algebra. When  $e_2 \widehat{\mathcal{L}} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}} e_2$ , we have that  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 = 0$ . In particular, when  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible, i.e.  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M} = \mathbb{C}$ , we have that  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 = 0$ . In general, we have that  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 = e_2 \widehat{\mathcal{L}} z_{e_2}$ .

The spectral decomposition of  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0$  is given as follows

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0 \cup \mathcal{S}_1} \omega_j p_j,$$

where  $\{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0}$  is an orthogonal family of minimal projections in  $(1 - e_2)z_{e_2} \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  and  $\{p_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{S}_1}$  is an orthogonal family of minimal projections in  $(1 - z_{e_2}) \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_0 \cup \mathcal{S}_1$  for convenience. For each minimal projection  $p_j$ , there exists  $v_j \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}$

such that

where the algebraic expression of the right hand side is

$$\lambda^{-1/2}\Theta(v_j^*)e_2\Theta(v_j) = \lambda^{-13/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2e_1\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(v_j^*e_2e_1))e_2\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2e_1\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}'}(v_je_2e_1)).$$

Note that we also denote  $\Theta(v_j)$  by  $\bar{v}_j \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ . Then by the fact that  $p_je_2 = 0$  and  $p_jp_{j'} = \delta_{j,j'}p_j$ , we have that

$$\tau(v_j) = 0, \quad \tau(v_jv_{j'}^*) = \lambda^{1/2}\delta_{j,j'}.$$

Moreover, each  $p_j$  implements a completely positive bimodule map on  $\mathcal{M}$  as  $x * p_j = v_j^*xv_j$  for  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .

**Proposition 5.7.** *Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup. Then for  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ ,*

$$\mathcal{L}(x) = \lambda^{-1/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2\widehat{\mathcal{L}}e_2)x + \lambda^{-3/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1^*)x + \lambda^{-3/2}x\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1e_1e_2) - x * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0.$$

*Proof.* We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(x) &= \lambda^{-5/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\mathcal{L}}xe_1e_2) \\ &= \lambda^{-5/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1e_2\widehat{\mathcal{L}}e_2xe_1e_2) + \lambda^{-5/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1e_2\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(1-e_2)xe_1e_2) + \\ &\quad + \lambda^{-5/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1(1-e_2)\widehat{\mathcal{L}}xe_2e_1e_2) + \lambda^{-5/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1(1-e_2)\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(1-e_2)xe_1e_2) \\ &= \lambda^{-1/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2\widehat{\mathcal{L}}e_2)x + \lambda^{-3/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1e_1e_2)x + \lambda^{-3/2}x\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1^*) - x * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the computation. □

**Remark 5.8.** *Suppose that  $e_2\widehat{\mathcal{L}} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}e_2$ . We have that  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 = 0$  and*

$$\mathcal{L}(x) = \lambda^{-1/2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2\widehat{\mathcal{L}}e_2)x - x * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 = (1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)x - x * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0.$$

*If the inclusion  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible, we see that  $e_2\widehat{\mathcal{L}} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}e_2$ .*

**Remark 5.9.** *This is a bimodule version of Proposition 5 in [19].*

**Definition 5.10** (Laplacian). *Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup. The bimodule map  $\mathcal{L}_a$  defined by*

$$\mathcal{L}_a(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)x + \frac{1}{2}x(1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) - x * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0, \quad x \in \mathcal{M},$$

*is called the Laplacian of  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ .*

**Remark 5.11.** *We have that*

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_a + \mathcal{L}_w,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_w(x) &= i[x, \Im \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1))], \\ \Im \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1)) &= \frac{i}{2} \left( \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1))^* - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_a = \begin{array}{c} \text{U} \\ \text{U} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{U} \text{ } \boxed{\mathbf{y}} \\ \text{U} \end{array} - \boxed{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0},$$

where  $\mathbf{y} = \frac{1}{2}(1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)$  and

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_w = i \begin{array}{c} \text{U} \\ \text{U} \end{array} - i \begin{array}{c} \text{U} \text{ } \boxed{\mathbf{x}} \\ \text{U} \end{array},$$

where  $\mathbf{x} = \Im \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1))$ . In particular,  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0$  as follows:

$$(1 - e_2)\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_a(1 - e_2) = (1 - e_2)\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(1 - e_2) = -\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0.$$

**Proposition 5.12.** *Suppose that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1))^* = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1))$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_w = 0$ . If  $\mathcal{M}$  is a factor, then we have that  $\mathcal{L}_w = 0$  if and only if  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1))^* = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1))$ .*

*Proof.* It is clear that if  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1))^* = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1))$  then  $\mathcal{L}_w = 0$ . Note that  $\mathcal{L}_w = 0$  if and only if  $\Im \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1))$  is in the center of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Note that  $\Im \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1)) \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}$ . Note that  $\tau(\Im \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1))) = 0$ . If  $\mathcal{M}$  is a factor, then  $\mathcal{L}_w = 0$  if and only if  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1))^* = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1))$ .  $\square$

**Definition 5.13** (Pure Generator). *We say the generator  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$  is pure if  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0$  is a multiple of projection.*

**Corollary 5.14.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathcal{M} = M_n(\mathbb{C})$  and  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a quantum Markov semigroup on  $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Then there exist  $v_j, w$  in  $M_n(\mathbb{C})$  with hermitian  $w$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(x) &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \frac{1}{2} \omega_j \{v_j^* v_j, x\} - \omega_j v_j^* x v_j + i[w, x] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \omega_j v_j^* [x, v_j] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \omega_j [v_j^*, x] v_j + i[w, x], \end{aligned}$$

subject to  $\tau(v_j v_k^*) = \lambda^{1/2} \delta_{j,k}$ ,  $\tau(v_j) = 0$ , and  $\omega_j \geq 0$ .



and the conjugation  $\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1$  as follows

$$\bar{\partial}x = [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})^*], \quad x \in \mathcal{M}.$$

**Remark 5.17.** *The Fourier multiplier of  $\partial$  is in the 3-box space of the corresponding planar algebra and depicted as follows*

We see that the adjoint  $\partial^* : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  of  $\partial$  is

$$\partial^*x = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})^*]), \quad x \in \mathcal{M}_1.$$

and the adjoint  $\bar{\partial}^* : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  of  $\bar{\partial}$  is

$$\bar{\partial}^*x = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})]), \quad x \in \mathcal{M}_1.$$

We have that for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $y \in \mathcal{M}_1$ ,

$$\tau_1(y^* \partial x) = \tau((\partial^* y)^* x),$$

$$\tau_1(y^* \bar{\partial} x) = \tau((\bar{\partial}^* y)^* x).$$

In particular, we have that  $\tau_1(y^* \partial^* \partial x) = \tau_1((\partial y)^* (\partial x))$  for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ . Now we define the directional derivation  $\partial_j$  as follows

$$\partial_j x = \omega_j^{1/2} [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)], \quad j \in \mathcal{J}.$$

We then have that

$$\bar{\partial}_j x = \omega_j^{1/2} [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)^*] = \omega_j^{1/2} [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\bar{p}_j)], \quad j \in \mathcal{J}.$$

By considering the adjoint, we obtain that

$$\partial_j^* x = \omega_j^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)^*]) = \omega_j^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\bar{p}_j)]), \quad j \in \mathcal{J}.$$

and

$$\bar{\partial}_j^* x = \omega_j^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)]), \quad j \in \mathcal{J}.$$

We have that

$$\partial = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1} \partial_j.$$

**Remark 5.18.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathcal{M} = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ . We have that*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial x &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0} \omega_j^{1/2} [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)] = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0} \omega_j^{1/2} [x, v_j] \otimes \bar{v}_j^*, \\ \bar{\partial} x &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0} \omega_j^{1/2} [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)^*] = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0} \omega_j^{1/2} [x, v_j^*] \otimes \bar{v}_j. \end{aligned}$$

This indicates  $\overline{\partial}$  can be characterized by  $\partial_j^*$  completely.

**Lemma 5.19.** *We have that*

$$\begin{aligned}(\partial x)e_2 &= \lambda^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} [x, e_1] e_2, \\ e_2(\partial x) &= \lambda^{-1/2} e_2 [x, e_1] \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}}.\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.1, we have that

$$(\partial x)e_2 = \lambda^{-1/2} x \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} e_1 e_2 - \lambda^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} e_1 e_2 x = \lambda^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} [x, e_1] e_2.$$

This completes the computation. □

**Remark 5.20.** *We have that  $\mathcal{M} \subset \text{Ker} \partial_j^*$ . In fact, for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , we see that*

$$(\partial_j^* x)e_2 = e_2 [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)^*] e_2 = \lambda^{-1/2} e_2 \overline{p_j} [x, e_1] e_2 = 0,$$

by the fact that  $p_j e_2 = 0$ .

**Lemma 5.21.** *We have that for  $j \neq k$ ,*

$$\partial_j^* \partial_k = 0, \quad \overline{\partial_j^* \partial_k} = 0.$$

and

$$\partial_j^* \partial_j x = \lambda^{1/2} \omega_j (1 * p_j) x + \lambda^{1/2} \omega_j x (1 * \overline{p_j}) - \lambda^{1/2} \omega_j x * (\overline{p_j} + p_j).$$

*Proof.* For any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned}e_2 \partial_k^* \partial_j(x) &= e_2 \omega_k^{1/2} \omega_j^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)], \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{p_k})) \\ &= e_2 \omega_k^{1/2} \omega_j^{1/2} [[x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)], \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{p_k})] e_2 \\ &= \lambda^{-1} \omega_k^{1/2} \omega_j^{1/2} (x e_2 e_1 \overline{p_j} \overline{p_k} e_1 e_2 - e_2 e_1 \overline{p_j} x \overline{p_k} e_1 e_2 \\ &\quad - e_2 e_1 p_k x p_j e_1 e_2 + e_2 e_1 p_k p_j e_1 e_2 x) \\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $\partial_j^* \partial_k = 0$ . Similarly, we have that  $\overline{\partial_j^* \partial_k} = 0$ . Moreover, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}e_2 \partial_j^* \partial_j(x) &= \lambda^{-1} \omega_j (x e_2 e_1 \overline{p_j} e_1 e_2 - e_2 e_1 \overline{p_j} x e_1 e_2 \\ &\quad - e_2 e_1 x p_j e_1 e_2 + e_2 e_1 p_j e_1 e_2 x).\end{aligned}$$

Applying  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_j^* \partial_j(x) &= \lambda^{-2} \omega_j (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(x e_2 e_1 \overline{p_j} e_1 e_2) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 x \overline{p_j} e_1 e_2) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 x p_j e_1 e_2) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 p_j e_1 e_2 x)) \\ &= \lambda^{1/2} \omega_j (x(1 * \overline{p_j}) - x * \overline{p_j} - x * p_j + (1 * p_j)x).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the Lemma. □

**Remark 5.22.** *We have that*

$$\partial^* \partial x = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} \partial_j^* \partial_j x = \lambda^{1/2} ((1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)x + x(1 * \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0}) - x * (\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0})).$$

**Lemma 5.23.** *We have that for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ ,*

$$\mathcal{L}_a(x) = -\frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}})(\partial x)) + \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}((\overline{\partial x})\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})).$$

*Proof.* We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_a(x) &= \frac{1}{2}(1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)x + \frac{1}{2}x(1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) - x * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \\ &= \frac{\lambda^{-5/2}}{2} \left( \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 e_1 e_2 x) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 x e_1 e_2) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda^{-5/2}}{2} \left( \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(x e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 e_1 e_2) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 x e_1 e_2) \right) \\ &= -\frac{\lambda^{-5/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 [x, e_1] e_2) + \frac{\lambda^{-5/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 [x, e_1] \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 e_1 e_2) \\ &= -\frac{\lambda^{-2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}(\partial x) e_2) + \frac{\lambda^{-2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2(\overline{\partial x}) \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} e_1 e_2) \\ &= -\frac{\lambda^{-3/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}})(\partial x) e_2) + \frac{\lambda^{-3/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2(\overline{\partial x}) \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}) e_2) \\ &= -\frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}})(\partial x)) + \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}((\overline{\partial x}) \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the computation. □

**Remark 5.24.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathcal{M} = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ . We have that*

$$\mathcal{L}_a(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \omega_j [x, v_j^*] v_j - \omega_j v_j^* [x, v_j],$$

*subject to  $\tau(v_j v_k^*) = \lambda^{1/2} \delta_{j,k}$ ,  $\tau(v_j) = 0$ , and  $\omega_j \geq 0$ .*

**Lemma 5.25.** *We have that for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ ,*

$$\mathcal{L}_a^*(x) = -\frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( [\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})y, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})^*] \right) + \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( [y \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}}), \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})] \right).$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ . We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau(\mathcal{L}_a^*(y)^*x) &= \tau(y^*\mathcal{L}_a(x)) \\
&= -\frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2}\tau(y^*\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})(\partial x)) + \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2}\tau(y^*\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}((\overline{\partial}x)\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}))) \\
&= -\frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2}\tau_1(y^*\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})(\partial x)) + \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2}\tau_1(y^*(\overline{\partial}x)\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})) \\
&= -\frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2}\tau_1((\partial^*\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})y)^*x) + \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2}\tau_1((\overline{\partial}^*y\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}))^*x).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_a^*(y) &= -\frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2}\partial^*\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})y + \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2}\overline{\partial}^*y\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}) \\
&= -\frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}\left([\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})y, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})^*]\right) + \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}\left([y\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}), \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})]\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the computation.  $\square$

**Remark 5.26.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathcal{M} = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ . For any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that

$$\mathcal{L}_a^*(x) = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \omega_j[v_j x, v_j^*] + \omega_j[x v_j^*, v_j],$$

subject to  $\tau(v_j v_k^*) = \lambda^{1/2}\delta_{j,k}$ ,  $\tau(v_j) = 0$ , and  $\omega_j \geq 0$ .

We define the completely bounded map  $\mathcal{L}_{\overline{a}}$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\overline{a}}(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1 * \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0})x + \frac{1}{2}x(1 * \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0}) - x * \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0}.$$

By Lemma 5.23, we have that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\overline{a}}(x) = -\frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})(\overline{\partial}x)) + \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}((\partial x)\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})).$$

If  $\tau(y^*\mathcal{L}(x)) = \tau(\mathcal{L}(y)^*x)$  for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{L}$  is symmetric with respect to  $\tau$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_{\overline{a}} = \mathcal{L}_a^*$ .

**Proposition 5.27.** We have that for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2}\left(\partial^*\partial + \overline{\partial}^*\overline{\partial}\right) = \mathcal{L}_a + \mathcal{L}_{\overline{a}}.$$

*Proof.* For any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{a}}(x) + \mathcal{L}_a(x) &= \frac{1}{2}(1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)x + \frac{1}{2}x(1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) - x * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(1 * \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0})x + \frac{1}{2}x(1 * \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0}) - x * \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0} \\ &= \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} \overline{\partial_j^* \partial_j} x + \partial_j^* \partial_j x \\ &= \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \overline{\partial^* \partial} x + \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \partial^* \partial x. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the computation.  $\square$

**Remark 5.28.** We have that  $\text{Ker}(\mathcal{L}_a + \mathcal{L}_{\bar{a}})$  is a von Neumann subalgebra.

**Proposition 5.29.** For any  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\Gamma(x, y) &= y^*(1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)x - y^*(x * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) - (y^* * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)x + (y^*x) * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \\ &= \lambda^{-5/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([y, \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} e_1 e_2]^* [x, \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} e_1 e_2]) \\ &= \lambda^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([y, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})]^* [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})]) \\ &= \lambda^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}((\partial y)^*(\partial x)) \\ &= \lambda^{-1/2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}((\partial_j y)^*(\partial_j x)). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 5.7, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\Gamma(x, y) &= y^* \mathcal{L}(x) + \mathcal{L}(y)^* x - \mathcal{L}(y^* x) \\ &= \lambda^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 \widehat{\mathcal{L}} e_2) y^* x + \lambda^{-3/2} y^* \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1^*) x + \lambda^{-3/2} y^* \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 e_1 e_2) x \\ &\quad - y^*(x * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) - (y^* * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)x + (y^*x) * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \\ &= y^*(1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)x - y^*(x * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) - (y^* * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)x + (y^*x) * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([y, \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} e_1 e_2]^* [x, \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} e_1 e_2]) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 y^* \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 x e_1 e_2) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(y^* e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 x e_1 e_2) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 y^* \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 e_1 e_2 x) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(y^* e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 e_1 e_2 x) \\ &= \lambda^{5/2} (y^*(1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)x - y^*(x * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) - (y^* * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)x + (y^*x) * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} e_1 e_2 = \lambda^{1/2} \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}) e_2$ . We obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([y, \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} e_1 e_2]^* [x, \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} e_1 e_2]) &= \lambda \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 [y, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})]^* [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})] e_2) \\ &= \lambda^2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([y, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})]^* [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})]) \\ &= \lambda^2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}((\partial y)^*(\partial x)). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the computation.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.30.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible,  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $y \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  is positive. Then we have*

$$(x^*x) * y + x^*(1 * y)x - x^*(x * y) - (x^* * y)x \geq \lambda^{1/2} |[x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y^{1/2})]|^2.$$

In particular, if  $x * y = 0$ , then

$$(x^*x) * y + x^*(1 * y)x \geq \lambda^{1/2} |[x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y^{1/2})]|^2.$$

and

$$\|[x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y^{1/2})]\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2} \|y\|^{1/2} \|x\|_2.$$

*Proof.* Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & (x^*x) * y + x^*(1 * y)x - x^*(x * y) - (x^* * y)x \\ &= \lambda^{-5/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([x, y^{1/2} e_1 e_2]^* [x, y^{1/2} e_1 e_2]) \\ &= \lambda^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y^{1/2})]^* [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y^{1/2})]) \\ &\geq \lambda^{1/2} [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y^{1/2})]^* [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y^{1/2})] = \lambda^{1/2} |[x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y^{1/2})]|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that  $x * y = 0$ . We see that  $(x^*x) * y + x^*(1 * y)x \geq \lambda^{1/2} |[x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y^{1/2})]|^2$ . By taking trace, we obtain that

$$\tau((x^*x) * y) + \tau(x^*(1 * y)x) \geq \lambda^{1/2} \|[x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y^{1/2})]\|_2^2.$$

Note that

$$\tau((x^*x) * y) \leq \lambda^{1/2} \|x\|_2^2 \|y\|, \quad 1 * y \leq \lambda^{1/2} \|y\|.$$

We see that  $\|[x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(y^{1/2})]\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2} \|y\|^{1/2} \|x\|_2$ . If  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible, then

$$\tau((x^*x) * y) = \lambda^{1/2} \|x\|_2^2 \|y\|_1, \quad 1 * y = \lambda^{1/2} \|y\|_1.$$

This completes the computation.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.31.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible and  $\Phi$  is bimodule completely positive map. Then for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that*

$$\Phi(x^*x) + x^*\Phi(1)x - x^*\Phi(x) - \Phi(x^*)x \geq \lambda^{1/2} |[x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2})]|^2$$

In particular, for  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\Phi(x) = 0$ , we have that

$$\Phi(x^*x) + x^*\Phi(1)x \geq \lambda^{1/2} |[x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}^{1/2})]|^2$$

*Proof.* It follows from the same argument as Corollary 5.30.  $\square$

**5.3. Invariant Subalgebras.** In this section, we shall investigate the invariant subspace of a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ .

**Proposition 5.32.** *Suppose that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ker}\Gamma &:= \{x \in \mathcal{M} : \Gamma(x, x) = 0\}, \\ &= \{x \in \mathcal{M} : [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})] = 0\}, \\ &= \{x \in \mathcal{M} : \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 x e_1 e_2 = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 e_1 x e_2\}, \\ &= \{x \in \mathcal{M} : \mathfrak{CS}_0(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) x e_1 e_2 = \mathfrak{CS}_0(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) e_1 x e_2\}, \\ &= \{x \in \mathcal{M} : \partial_j x = 0, j \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 5.29. □

**Definition 5.33.** *Suppose that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup. The fixed point subspace  $\mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0})$  is defined to be*

$$\mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}) = \{x \in \mathcal{M} : \Phi_t(x) = x, t \geq 0\}$$

*The multiplicative domain  $\mathcal{N}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0})$  of  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is defined to be*

$$\mathcal{N}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}) = \{x \in \mathcal{M} : \Phi_t(x^*)\Phi_t(x) = \Phi_t(x^*x), \Phi_t(x)\Phi_t(x^*) = \Phi_t(xx^*), t \geq 0\}.$$

**Remark 5.34.** *By the definition of Lindbladian, we see that  $\mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}) = \text{Ker}(\mathcal{L})$ .*

**Remark 5.35.** *By differentiating  $\Phi_t(x^*)\Phi_t(x) = \Phi_t(x^*x)$  with respect to  $t$  at  $t = 0$ , we have that  $\mathcal{L}(x^*x) = \mathcal{L}(x^*)x + x^*\mathcal{L}(x)$ . This implies that  $\mathcal{N}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}) \subset \text{Ker}\Gamma$ .*

**Proposition 5.36.** *Suppose that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup such that  $\Phi_t$  is bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}_t \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ . Then  $\mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0})$  is a von Neumann algebra.*

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 4.20. □

**Remark 5.37.** *Suppose that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup such that  $\Phi_t$  is bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}_t \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ . We have that  $\mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}) \subset \mathcal{N}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0})$ .*

**Remark 5.38.** *Suppose that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup such that  $\Phi_t$  is bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  for  $t \geq 0$ . We have that  $\mathbb{E}_\Phi$  is bimodule equilibrium to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  by the fact that  $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \widehat{\Phi}_s ds$ . Furthermore, we have that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\Delta} \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} e_1 e_2) = 0.$$

**Theorem 5.39.** *Suppose that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup and  $\Phi_t$  is bimodule equilibrium with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}_t$ . Then  $\mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}) = \mathcal{N}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0})$  if and only if*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\Phi}_t = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \widehat{\Phi}_s ds.$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \Phi_s(x) ds$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . Note that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \Phi_s(x) ds$  exists. We define  $\mathbb{E}_\Phi$  to be

$$\mathbb{E}_\Phi(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \Phi_s(x) ds, \quad x \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Then  $\mathbb{E}_\Phi^2 = \mathbb{E}_\Phi$  is a conditional expectation onto the fixed point space of  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ , which is a von Neumann subalgebra. By the assumption, we see that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t(x) = \mathbb{E}_\Phi(x)$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Suppose  $x \in \mathcal{N}(\Phi)$ . Then  $\Phi_t(x^*x) = \Phi_t(x^*)\Phi_t(x)$ . By taking limit as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain that  $\mathbb{E}_\Phi(x^*x) = \mathbb{E}_\Phi(x^*)\mathbb{E}_\Phi(x)$ . Hence

$$\mathbb{E}_\Phi((x - \mathbb{E}_\Phi(x))^*(x - \mathbb{E}_\Phi(x))) = \mathbb{E}_\Phi(x^*x) - \mathbb{E}_\Phi(x^*)\mathbb{E}_\Phi(x) = 0.$$

This implies that  $x = \mathbb{E}_\Phi(x)$ , i.e.  $x \in \mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0})$ .

Suppose that  $\mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}) = \mathcal{N}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0})$ . Let  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\|x\| = 1$ . Then  $\{\Phi_t(x)\}_{t \geq 0}$  is bounded. By Banach-Alaoglu theorem, there exists a subnet  $\mathcal{I}$  such that  $w^* - \lim_{s \in \mathcal{I}} \Phi_s(x) = x_0$ .

Note that

$$\langle (\Phi_t(y_1^*y_2) - \Phi_t(y_1)^*\Phi_t(y_2))\Omega_1, \overline{\widehat{\Delta}_t}e_1\Omega_1 \rangle = \lambda \langle y_2\Omega_1, (1 - \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}_t)^*\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}_t))y_1\Omega_1 \rangle.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle (\Phi_t(\Phi_s(x)^*\Phi_s(x)) - \Phi_t(\Phi_s(x))^*\Phi_t(\Phi_s(x)))\Omega_1, \overline{\widehat{\Delta}_t}e_1\Omega_1 \rangle \\ &= \lambda \langle x\Omega_1, (\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}_s)^*\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}_s) - \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}_{t+s})^*\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\Phi}_{t+s}))x\Omega_1 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By taking limit as  $s \in \mathcal{I}$ , we have that

$$\langle (\Phi_t(x_0^*x_0) - \Phi_t(x_0)^*\Phi_t(x_0))\Omega_1, \overline{\widehat{\Delta}_t}e_1\Omega_1 \rangle = 0.$$

Hence  $x_0 \in \mathcal{N}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0})$ . Note that  $\mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}) = \mathcal{N}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0})$ . We see that  $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0})$ . Applying the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_\Phi$ , we obtain that  $x_0 = \mathbb{E}_\Phi(x)$ . Therefore  $w^* - \lim_{s \in \mathcal{I}} \Phi_s(x) = \mathbb{E}_\Phi(x)$ , which is independent of the choice of the subnet, i.e.  $w^* - \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t(x) = \mathbb{E}_\Phi(x)$ . By the fact that the inclusion is finite, we see that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t(x) = \mathbb{E}_\Phi(x)$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.40.** *Theorem 5.39 generalizes Theorem 3.1 in [6] and is a bimodule version of Theorem 3.4 in [7].*

**Definition 5.41** (Relative Irreducibility). *Suppose that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup. We say  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is relatively irreducible if for any projection  $p \in \mathcal{M}$  satisfying  $\Phi_t(p) \leq c_t p$  for some  $c_t > 0$  and for all  $t \geq 0$ , we have that  $p \in \mathcal{N}$ .*

**Remark 5.42.** *By the fact that  $\Phi_t = e^{-t\mathcal{L}}$ , we see that  $\Phi_{t_0}$  is relatively irreducible for some  $t_0 \neq 0$  if and only if  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is relatively irreducible.*

**Definition 5.43** (Relative Ergodicity). *Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup. We say  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is relatively ergodic if  $\text{Ker} \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{N}$  or equivalently  $\mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}) = \mathcal{N}$ .*

**Proposition 5.44.** *Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup. Then  $x \in \text{Ker} \mathcal{L}$  if and only if  $\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}})x^*\Omega = 0$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $x \in \text{Ker} \mathcal{L}$ , we have that  $\mathcal{L}(x) = 0$ . This implies that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}} x e_1 e_2) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_1 x \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}})) = 0$ . Removing  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$ , we have that  $e_2 x \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}) \Omega_1 = 0$ . Multiplying  $e_1$  from the left hand side, we obtain that  $e_1 x \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}) \Omega_1 = 0$ . Note that  $\Omega_1$  is a separating vector. We see that  $e_1 x \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$ .

$$\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}})x^*e_1\Omega = \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}})x^*\Omega = 0.$$

If  $\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}})x^*\Omega = 0$ , we see that  $x \in \text{Ker} \mathcal{L}$ . □

**Proposition 5.45.** *Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup. Then  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is relatively ergodic if and only if  $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}})) = 1 - e_1$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 5.44. □

**Proposition 5.46.** *Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup and  $\mathcal{L}_w = 0$ . If  $\mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) = 1$ , then  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is relatively ergodic.*

*Proof.* It follows from Remark 4.21. □

**5.4. Poincaré Inequality.** In this section, we shall obtain the Poincaré inequalities for bimodule quantum Markov semigroups.

**Theorem 5.47** (Poincaré Inequality). *Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup,  $\mathcal{N}$  is a factor and  $\mathfrak{CS}_0(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) = 1$ . Let  $2\beta$  be the second maximal eigenvalue of  $\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0})$ . Then for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x) = 0$ ,*

$$\tau(\Gamma(x, x)) \geq (\widehat{\beta} - \beta)\tau(x^*x),$$

where  $0 \neq \widehat{\beta}$  is the minimal eigenvalue of  $\lambda^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(|\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})|^2)$ .

*Proof.* We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\Gamma(x, x)) &= \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \tau_1((\partial x)^*(\partial x)) \\ &= \frac{\lambda^{-3/2}}{2} \tau_2(e_2([x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})])^*([x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})]e_2)) \\ &= \frac{\lambda^{-5/2}}{2} \tau_2(e_2[x, e_1]^* \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0[x, e_1]e_2)) \\ &= \lambda^{-5/2} \tau_2(x^*x \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 e_1 e_2)) \\ &= \frac{\lambda^{-1}}{2} \tau_2(x e_1 x^* \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0})). \end{aligned}$$

Now by the fact that  $\mathcal{N}$  is factor, we see that  $e_1$  is a rank-one projection in  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ . By the fact that  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0$  is connected and the Perron-Frobenius theorem for  $\mathfrak{F}$ -positive elements, there is a unique positive eigenvector for  $\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0})$  and

$$\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0}) \leq 2\|\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)\|e_1 + 2\beta(1 - e_1).$$

This implies that for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x) = 0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2}\tau_2(xe_1x^*\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0})) \leq \beta\tau_2(xe_1x^*(1 - e_1)) \leq \lambda\beta\tau(x^*x).$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$\lambda^{-5/2}\tau_2(x^*x\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0e_1e_2)) = \lambda^{-1/2}\tau_2(x^*x\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(|\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})|^2)) \geq \widehat{\beta}\tau_2(x^*x).$$

Now we shall show that  $\widehat{\beta} > 0$ . Suppose that  $p$  is a projection in  $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}$  such that  $p\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0e_1e_2) = 0$ . Then we have that

$$p(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)p \leq \lambda^{-5/2}p\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0e_1e_2)p = 0$$

by the Schur product theorem. Repeating the process, we see that  $p\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{(k)} = 0$  for any  $k \geq 2$ . Moreover, we have that  $p\mathfrak{CS}_0(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) = 0$ , i.e.  $p = 0$ .  $\square$

If the inclusion is irreducible, we have much better estimation for  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0e_1e_2)$ .

**Theorem 5.48** (Poincaré Inequality). *Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup. Assume that  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible. Let  $B$  be spectral projection of  $\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0})$  corresponding to its maximal eigenvalue and  $2\beta$  is the second maximal eigenvalue. Then for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $Bxe_1 = 0$ ,*

$$\tau(\Gamma(x, x)) \geq (\lambda^{-1/2}\tau_2(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) - \beta)\tau(x^*x),$$

*Proof.* By Corollary 6.12 in [11] and the Hausdorff-Young inequality, we have that  $B$  is a biprojection and

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau_2(xe_1x^*\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0})) \\ & \leq \tau_2(xe_1x^*(2\lambda^{-1/2}\tau_2(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)B + 2\beta(1 - B))) \\ & = 2\beta\tau_2(xe_1x^*) = 2\lambda\beta\tau(x^*x). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\Gamma(x, x)) & \geq \lambda^{-1/2}\tau_2(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)\tau(x^*x) - \beta\tau(x^*x) \\ & = (\lambda^{-1/2}\tau_2(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) - \beta)\tau(x^*x). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$2\beta < \|\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0})\| = \lambda^{-1/2}\|\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0}\|_1 = 2\lambda^{-1/2}\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0).$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

**5.5. Divergence and Gradients.** In this section, we shall recall the divergence and gradients for a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ . For any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , we define the noncommutative gradients  $\nabla : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \bigoplus_j \mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\overline{\nabla} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \bigoplus_j \mathcal{M}_1$  as follows

$$\nabla x = (\partial_j x)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1}, \quad \overline{\nabla} x = (\overline{\partial}_j x)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1}.$$

For any  $(x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1} \in \bigoplus_j \mathcal{M}_1$ , we define the divergences  $\text{Div} : \bigoplus_j \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  and  $\overline{\text{Div}} : \bigoplus_j \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  as follows

$\bigoplus_j \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  as follows

$$\text{Div}(x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1} \partial_j^* x_j, \quad \overline{\text{Div}}(x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1} \overline{\partial}_j^* x_j.$$

This implies that

$$\mathcal{L}_a + \mathcal{L}_{\overline{a}} = \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \overline{\text{Div}} \overline{\nabla} + \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \text{Div} \nabla.$$

**Remark 5.49.** Suppose  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathcal{M} = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ . We have that

$$\mathcal{L}_a(x) + \mathcal{L}_{\overline{a}}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0} \omega_j [[x, v_j^*], v_j] + \omega_j [[x, v_j], v_j^*]$$

subject to  $\tau(v_j v_k^*) = \lambda^{1/2} \delta_{j,k}$ ,  $\tau(v_j) = 0$ , and  $\omega_j \geq 0$ .

## 6. GRADIENT FLOW

In this section, we shall study bimodule quantum Markov semigroups satisfying bimodule detailed balance condition.

**Definition 6.1** (Bimodule GNS Symmetric Semigroups). Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a quantum bimodule Markov semigroup and  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  is strictly positive and  $\widehat{\Delta} e_2 = e_2$ . We say  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is GNS-symmetric with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  if  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}} \widehat{\Delta}$ .

**Remark 6.2.** By Theorem 4.26, we have that if  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  satisfies  $\rho$ -detailed balance condition for some normal faithful state  $\rho$ , then  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is GNS-symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}_\rho$ .

**Remark 6.3.** Suppose that  $\widehat{\Delta} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{\Delta} \\ \hline \boxed{\Delta^{-1}} \end{array}$ , for some strictly positive  $\Delta \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}$ . By Remark 4.39, we have that  $\Phi_t$  is bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Proposition 6.4.** Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is bimodule GNS symmetric with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . Then  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}} \widehat{\Delta}$ . and

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}} \widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}, \quad \widehat{\mathcal{L}} \widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}, \quad \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}) \widehat{\Delta} \widehat{\Delta} = \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Moreover,

$$\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \overline{\widehat{\Delta}} = \overline{\widehat{\Delta}} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0, \quad \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}^{1/2}} = \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}^{-1/2}} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}^{1/2}$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 4.37, we have that  $\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}} \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}$ ,  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}} \widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ ,  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}} \overline{\widehat{\Delta}} = \overline{\widehat{\Delta}} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ . Furthermore, we have that  $\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}) \overline{\widehat{\Delta}} \widehat{\Delta} = \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}})$ .

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0} &= -(1 - e_2) \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}(1 - e_2) = -(1 - e_2) \widehat{\mathcal{L}} \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}(1 - e_2) \\ &= -(1 - e_2) \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(1 - e_2) \overline{\widehat{\Delta}} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}. \end{aligned}$$

The rest equalities are true by similar arguments.  $\square$

**Remark 6.5.** Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a quantum bimodule Markov semigroup and  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  is strictly positive and  $\widehat{\Delta} e_2 = e_2$ . We say  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is KMS-symmetric with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  if  $\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} = \overline{\widehat{\Delta}} \widehat{\mathcal{L}} \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}$ .

By Theorem 4.26, we have that if  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is KMS symmetry with respect to a normal faithful state  $\rho$  with  $e_1 \in \text{Dom}(\sigma_{-i/2})$ , then  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is KMS-symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}_{\rho, 1/2}$ .

Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is bimodule KMS symmetric with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . Then by differentiating with respect to  $t$ , we have that

$$\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} = \overline{\widehat{\Delta}} \widehat{\mathcal{L}} \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}, \quad \widehat{\Delta} \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}} \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}.$$

By multiplying  $(1 - e_2)$ , we have that

$$\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0} = \overline{\widehat{\Delta}} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}, \quad \overline{\widehat{\Delta}^{1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}^{1/2}} = \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2} \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0} \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2} = \overline{\widehat{\Delta}^{1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}^{1/2}}.$$

We see that  $\overline{\widehat{\Delta}^{1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}^{1/2}}$  will produce a GNS symmetry bimodule quantum Markov semigroup.

**Proposition 6.6.** Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is bimodule GNS symmetric with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_w = 0$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 6.4, we have that  $e_2 \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}(1 - e_2) = e_2 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(1 - e_2)$ , i.e.  $\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_1^* = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1$ . This implies that  $\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1)^* = \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1)$ . Hence  $\mathcal{L}_w = 0$  and  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_a$ .  $\square$

**Remark 6.7.** Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is bimodule KMS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . Note that

$e_2 \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}(1 - e_2) = e_2 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(1 - e_2) \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}$ . This implies that  $\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_1^* = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_1 \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}$ . In general,  $\mathcal{L}_w \neq 0$ . If  $\widehat{\Delta} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{\Delta} \quad \boxed{\Delta^{-1}} \\ | \quad | \\ \hline \end{array}$ ,

then the bimodule KMS symmetry implies that  $\mathcal{L}_w = 0$ .

**Proposition 6.8.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible and  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup. Suppose that there exists a strictly positive element  $\widehat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  with  $\widehat{\Delta} e_2 = e_2$  such that  $\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0} = \overline{\widehat{\Delta}} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0$ . Then  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  and  $\Phi_t$  is bimodule GNS symmetry.

*Proof.* By the fact that  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible, we have that  $\mathcal{L}_w = 0$ . Then we have that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}} = \tau_2(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)e_2 - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0.$$

It is clear that  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}\widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{L}$  is bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . Hence  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}) = \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}})$ . We obtain that for  $t \neq 0$ ,

$$\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi}_t) = \bigvee_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(*k)}) = \bigvee_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(*k)}) = \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi}_t).$$

This implies that  $\Phi_t$  is bimodule GNS symmetry.  $\square$

**Remark 6.9.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible and  $p \neq \bar{p}$  are minimal projections in  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ . Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 = \kappa p + \kappa^{-1}\bar{p}$ . Then  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}} = (\kappa + \kappa^{-1})\tau_2(p)e_2 - \kappa p - \kappa^{-1}\bar{p}$ . Then the corresponding bimodule quantum Markov semigroup is bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ , where  $\widehat{\Delta} = e_2 + \kappa^2 p + \kappa^{-2}\bar{p} + (1 - e_2 - p + \bar{p})$ . If  $\mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) = \mathfrak{CS}_0(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) = 1$ , then the semigroup is relatively ergodic.*

**Lemma 6.10.** *Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is bimodule GNS symmetric with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . Then*

$$\text{Ker}\Gamma = \text{Ker}\mathcal{L} = \text{Ker}\mathcal{L}_a = \mathcal{N}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}) = \mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}).$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 6.6, we have that  $\text{Ker}\mathcal{L}_a = \text{Ker}\mathcal{L}$ . For any  $x \in \text{Ker}\Gamma$ , we have that  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} x e_1 e_2 = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} e_1 x e_2$  by Proposition 5.32. By Proposition 6.4, we have that  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{-1/2} x e_1 e_2 = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{-1/2} e_1 x e_2$ . This implies that  $x e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} = e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} x$ . Now we have that

$$\mathcal{L}(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)x + \frac{1}{2}x(1 * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) - x * \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 = 0,$$

i.e.  $x \in \text{Ker}\mathcal{L}$ .

Suppose that  $x \in \text{Ker}\mathcal{L}$ . Then we have that  $x \in \mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0})$ . By Theorem 4.18, we have that  $x \widehat{\Phi}_t e_1 e_2 = \widehat{\Phi}_t e_1 x e_2$ . This implies that  $x \widehat{\mathcal{L}} e_1 e_2 = \widehat{\mathcal{L}} e_1 x e_2$ . Hence  $x \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 e_1 e_2 = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 e_1 x e_2$ . By Proposition 5.32, we see that  $x \in \text{Ker}\Gamma$ .

Note that  $\mathcal{M}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}) \subset \mathcal{N}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}) \subset \text{Ker}\Gamma$ . We see the lemma is true.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.11.** *Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is bimodule GNS symmetric with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\Phi}_t$  exists. If moreover  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is relatively ergodic, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\Phi}_t = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1} \left( \widehat{\Delta} \right)^{-1}.$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 6.6, we see that  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_a$ . By Lemma 6.10, we have that  $\text{Ker}\Gamma = \text{Ker}\mathcal{L}_a = \text{Ker}\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{N}(\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0})$ . By Theorem 5.39, we obtain that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\Phi}_t = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi$ . When  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is relatively ergodic, we have  $\text{Ker}\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{N}$ . Note that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}} \Phi_t(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t(x)$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ . We see that  $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi * \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\mathcal{N}} = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi$ . This implies that  $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi)$ , so  $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\Phi \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ .

Since  $\Phi_t$  is bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ , then we have  $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi} = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi} \widehat{\Delta}$ . Pictorially, we have

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi} \widehat{\Delta} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{\widehat{\Delta}} \\ \boxed{\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi}} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \boxed{\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi}} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi}.$$

Hence  $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi} \widehat{\Delta}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi}) = 1$ , and  $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{\Phi} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta})^{-1}$ .  $\square$

**Notation 6.1.** We denote  $F_{\Phi} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\Phi}_t$ . We have  $F_{\Phi}^2 = F_{\Phi}$  when it exists. If  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is relatively ergodic, we have that  $F_{\Phi} \in \mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ .

**Corollary 6.12.** Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is bimodule GNS symmetric with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  and relatively ergodic. Then for any  $D \in \mathcal{M}_+$ , we have that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t^*(D) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D) \overline{F_{\Phi}},$$

If  $\Phi_t$  is bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then for any  $D \in \mathcal{M}_+$ , we have that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t^*(D) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D) \overline{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta})^{-1}},$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta})^{-1}$  is viewed as an element in  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$  and the contragredient is taken in the space  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_1$ .

*Proof.* By Theorem 6.11, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t^*(D) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^{-5/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\Phi}_t D e_1 e_2) \\ &= \lambda^{-5/2} \overline{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta})^{-1} D e_1 e_2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta})^{-1}$  is viewed as an element in  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$  and the contragredient is taken in  $\mathcal{M}' \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ . Continuing the computation, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t^*(D) &= \lambda^{-5/2} \overline{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta})^{-1} e_1 D e_1 e_2)} \\ &= \lambda^{-5/2} \overline{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta})^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D) e_1 e_2)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D) \lambda^{-5/2} \overline{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta})^{-1} e_1 e_2)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D) \overline{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta})^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the computation.  $\square$

**Remark 6.13.** In Corollary 6.12, the pictorial representation of  $\overline{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta})^{-1}}$  is the following:

$$\lambda^{-1/2} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{\widehat{\Delta}} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right]^{-1}.$$

If  $\widehat{\Delta} = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{\Delta} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{\Delta^{-1}} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right]$ , then  $\overline{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta})^{-1}} = \Delta$ . This indicates that if  $\widehat{\Delta}$  comes from a faithful normal state  $\rho$ , then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t^*(D) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\Delta_\rho$ . If  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$ , then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t^*(D) = \tau(D)\Delta_\rho$ .

**Remark 6.14.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$  is irreducible and  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\Phi}_t$  is a multiple of biprojection. If  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is relatively ergodic, then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\Phi}_t = \lambda^{1/2}$ .

**6.1. Derivation.** In the following, we shall consider  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2}$  and study its spectral decomposition. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the  $C^*$ -algebra generated by  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0, \widehat{\Delta} \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi}_t), \overline{\widehat{\Delta}} \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi}_t)$  with identity  $\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi}_t)$ . By Proposition 6.4,  $\mathcal{A}$  is commutative. Therefore we can find a complete set of orthogonal minimal projections  $p_j$ ,  $j \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1$  and non-negative reals  $\omega_j, \mu_j$ , that has the following properties:

- (1)  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} \omega_j p_j$ ;
- (2)  $\widehat{\Delta} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} \mu_j p_j$ ;
- (3) for each  $j$  there exists  $j^* \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1$  such that  $\overline{p_j} = p_{j^*}$ .

Note that (3) follows from  $\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2}} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2}$  and that  $\mathcal{A}$  is invariant under the contragradient. These properties entails Therefore

$$\omega_j = \omega_{j^*}, \quad j \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1.$$

**Remark 6.15.** We have that for any  $j$  with  $\omega_j \neq 0$ ,  $\mu_j \mu_{j^*} = 1$  which follows from  $\mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi}_t) \overline{\widehat{\Delta}} \widehat{\Delta} = \mathcal{R}(\widehat{\Phi}_t)$ .

**Example 6.16.** Suppose  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathcal{M} = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ . We have that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \omega_j \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{p_j} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right] = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \omega_j \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{v_j} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{v_j^*} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right], \quad \widehat{\Delta} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \mu_j \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{v_j} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{v_j^*} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right].$$

Now we see that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \mu_j^{1/2} \omega_j p_j.$$

Define the balanced derivation  $\partial^\Delta : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1$  with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  as follows:

$$\partial^\Delta x = [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4})].$$

We have that  $\overline{\partial^\Delta} = \partial^\Delta$  and

$$(\partial^\Delta x)e_2 = \lambda^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4} [x, e_1] e_2, \quad x \in \mathcal{M}.$$

The  $j$ -th directional derivation  $\partial_j^\Delta$  of  $\partial^\Delta$  is defined as follows:

$$\partial_j^\Delta x = \omega_j^{1/2} [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)], \quad j \in \mathcal{J}.$$

We now obtain that  $\overline{\partial_j^\Delta(x)} = -\partial_{j^*}^\Delta(\bar{x})$  for  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  and

$$\partial_j = \mu_j^{1/4} \partial_j^\Delta, \quad j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1.$$

Let  $\Gamma^\Delta = \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} (\partial^\Delta)^* \partial^\Delta = \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \mu_j^{-1/2} \partial_j^* \partial_j$  be the modified gradient form.

**Theorem 6.17.** *Suppose  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is bimodule GNS symmetric with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  and  $\mathfrak{CS}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0) = 1$ . Let  $\beta$  be the second maximal eigenvalue of  $\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2})$ . Then for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x) = 0$ ,*

$$\tau(\Gamma^\Delta(x, x)) \geq (\widehat{\beta} - \beta) \tau(x^* x),$$

where  $0 \neq \widehat{\beta}$  is the minimal eigenvalue of  $\lambda^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \left| \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4}) \right|^2 \right)$ .

*Proof.* We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau((\Gamma^\Delta(x, x))) &= \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \tau_1((\partial^\Delta x)^* (\partial^\Delta x)) \\ &= \frac{\lambda^{-3/2}}{2} \tau_2(e_2([x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4})])^* ([x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4})] e_2)) \\ &= \frac{\lambda^{-5/2}}{2} \tau_2(e_2[x, e_1]^* \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2} [x, e_1] e_2)) \\ &= \lambda^{-5/2} \tau_2(x^* x \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2 e_1 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2} e_1 e_2)) \\ &= \frac{\lambda^{-1}}{2} \tau_2(x e_1 x^* \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2})). \end{aligned}$$

Now by the fact  $\text{Ker } \mathcal{L} = \text{Ker } \mathcal{L}_a = \mathcal{N}$  and the Perron-Frobenius theorem for  $\mathfrak{F}$ -positive elements [8, Theorem 3.10], there is a unique positive eigenvector for  $\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2})$  and

$$\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0 \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2}) \leq \|\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0)\| e_1 + \beta(1 - e_1).$$

This implies that for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x) = 0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2}\tau_2(xe_1x^*\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0\widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2})) \leq \beta\tau_2(xe_1x^*(1-e_1)) \leq \lambda\beta\tau(x^*x).$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda^{-5/2}\tau_2(x^*x\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(e_2e_1\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0\widehat{\Delta}^{-1/2}e_1e_2)) \\ &= \lambda^{-1/2}\tau_2(x^*x\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\left|\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}\widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4})\right|^2\right)) \geq \widehat{\beta}\tau_2(x^*x). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two inequalities above, we see the theorem is true.  $\square$

In the following, we shall extend the domain of  $\partial_j^\Delta$  to  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .

**Lemma 6.18.** *For any  $j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1$  and  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Delta}^{1/4}(\partial_j^\Delta x)e_2 &= (\partial_j x)e_2, \\ \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2}(\partial_j^\Delta x\widehat{\Delta}^{-1})e_2 &= \omega_j^{1/2}(\mu_j^{-1/2}x\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) - \mu_j^{1/2}\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)x)e_2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,  $\lambda^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta}^{1/4}(\partial_j^\Delta x)e_2) = \partial_j x$ , and

$$\lambda^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta}^{1/2}(\partial_j^\Delta x\widehat{\Delta}^{-1})e_2) = \omega_j^{1/2}(\mu_j^{-1/2}x\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) - \mu_j^{1/2}\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)x). \quad (23)$$

Furthermore,  $\partial x = \lambda^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta}^{1/4}(\partial^\Delta x)e_2)$  and

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1} \omega_j^{1/2}(\mu_j^{-1/2}x\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) - \mu_j^{1/2}\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)x) = \lambda^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta}^{1/2}(\partial^\Delta x\widehat{\Delta}^{-1})e_2).$$

*Proof.* The first equality is true by a routine computation. For any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2}(\partial_j^\Delta x\widehat{\Delta}^{-1})e_2 &= \lambda^{-1/2}\widehat{\Delta}^{1/2}(\omega_j^{1/2}p_j[x\widehat{\Delta}^{-1}, e_1])e_2 \\ &= \lambda^{-1/2}\mu_j^{1/2}(\omega_j^{1/2}p_j(\mu_j^{-1}xe_1 - e_1x))e_2 \\ &= \lambda^{-1/2}(\omega_j^{1/2}p_j(\mu_j^{-1/2}xe_1 - \mu_j^{1/2}e_1x))e_2 \\ &= \omega_j^{1/2}(\mu_j^{-1/2}x\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)e_2 - \mu_j^{1/2}\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)xe_2). \end{aligned}$$

This implies the second equality. By taking the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}$ , we have Equation (23). By taking the sum, we see the last equality is true.  $\square$

**Remark 6.19.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathcal{M} = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ . We have that*

$$\widehat{\Delta}^{1/2}(\partial_j^\Delta x\widehat{\Delta}^{-1})e_2 = \omega_j^{1/2}(\mu_j^{-1/2}xv_j - \mu_j^{1/2}v_jx) \otimes \overline{v_j^*}e_2.$$

There are alternative formulae for the derivations.

**Lemma 6.20.** *For any  $j \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1$  and  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} e_2(\partial_j^\Delta x) \widehat{\Delta}^{1/4} &= e_2(\partial_j x), \\ e_2(\partial_j^\Delta x \widehat{\Delta}^{-1}) \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2} &= \omega_j^{1/2} e_2(\mu_j^{-1/2} x \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) - \mu_j^{1/2} \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) x). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,  $\lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2(\partial_j^\Delta x) \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4}) = \partial_j x$ , and

$$\lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2(\partial_j^\Delta x \widehat{\Delta}^{-1}) \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2}) = \omega_j^{1/2} (\mu_j^{-1/2} x \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{p_j}) - \mu_j^{1/2} \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{p_j}) x). \quad (24)$$

Furthermore,  $\partial x = \lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2(\partial^\Delta x) \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4})$  and

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} \omega_j^{1/2} (\mu_j^{-1/2} x \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) - \mu_j^{1/2} \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) x) = \lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2(\partial^\Delta x \widehat{\Delta}^{-1}) \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2}).$$

*Proof.* For any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} e_2(\partial_j^\Delta x \widehat{\Delta}^{-1}) \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2} &= \lambda^{-1/2} \omega_j^{1/2} e_2[x \widehat{\Delta}^{-1}, e_1] \overline{p_j} \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2} \\ &= \lambda^{-1/2} \mu_j^{-1/2} \omega_j^{1/2} e_2(x e_1 - \mu_j e_1 x) \overline{p_j} \\ &= \lambda^{-1/2} \omega_j^{1/2} e_2(\mu_j^{-1/2} x e_1 - \mu_j^{1/2} e_1 x) \overline{p_j} \\ &= \omega_j^{1/2} e_2(\mu_j^{-1/2} x \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{p_j}) - \mu_j^{1/2} \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{p_j}) x). \end{aligned}$$

The rest equalities follows directly.  $\square$

**Remark 6.21.** *We have that  $\overline{\partial} x = \lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4}(\partial^\Delta x) e_2)$  and  $\overline{\partial} x = \lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(e_2(\partial^\Delta x) \widehat{\Delta}^{1/4})$ .*

**Proposition 6.22.** *We have that*

$$\mathcal{L}(x) = \frac{\lambda^{-2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4}(\partial^\Delta x) e_2 e_1 \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}}) - \frac{\lambda^{-2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}} e_1 e_2(\partial^\Delta x) \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4}).$$

*Proof.* Now by Lemmas 5.23 and 6.20, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_a(x) &= -\frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}})(\partial x)) + \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}((\overline{\partial} x) \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})) \\ &= -\frac{\lambda^{-3/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}}) e_2(\partial^\Delta x) \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4}) + \frac{\lambda^{-3/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4}(\partial^\Delta x) e_2 \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2})) \\ &= -\frac{\lambda^{-2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}} e_1 e_2(\partial^\Delta x) \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4}) + \frac{\lambda^{-2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4}(\partial^\Delta x) e_2 e_1 \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}}). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the computation.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.23.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathcal{M} = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ . We have that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \omega_j \mu_j^{-1/2} [x, v_j] v_j^* - \omega_j \mu_j^{1/2} v_j^* [x, v_j], \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \omega_j \mu_j^{1/2} ([x, v_j^*] v_j - v_j^* [x, v_j]), \end{aligned}$$

subject to  $\tau(v_j v_k^*) = \lambda^{1/2} \delta_{j,k}$ ,  $\tau(v_j) = 0$ , and  $\omega_j \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda^{-1}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4}(\partial^\Delta x) e_2 e_1 \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}}) &= \frac{\lambda^{-1}}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \mu_j^{-1/4} \omega_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{-1/4} \omega_j^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(p_j[x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)] e_2 e_1 p_j) \\ &= \frac{\lambda^{-1/2}}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \mu_j^{-1/2} \omega_j \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}([x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)] e_2 \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)^*) \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \mu_j^{-1/2} \omega_j [x, v_j] v_j^*, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda^{-1}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}} e_1 e_2 (\partial^\Delta x) \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4}) &= \frac{\lambda^{-1}}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \mu_j^{1/4} \omega_j^{1/2} \mu_j^{1/4} \omega_j^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{p_j} e_1 e_2 [x, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)] \overline{p_j}) \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \mu_j^{1/2} \omega_j v_j^* [x, v_j]. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \omega_j \mu_j^{-1/2} [x, v_j] v_j^* - \omega_j \mu_j^{1/2} v_j^* [x, v_j], \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} \omega_j \mu_j^{1/2} ([x, v_j^*] v_j - v_j^* [x, v_j]). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the computation. □

**Proposition 6.24.** *We have that for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^*(x) &= \frac{\lambda^{-2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \partial^\Delta \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1} (e_2 (\partial^\Delta x \widehat{\Delta}^{-1}) \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2}) \right), \\ &= \frac{\lambda^{-1}}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} \omega_j^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \partial^\Delta \left( \mu_j^{-1/2} x \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) - \mu_j^{1/2} \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) x \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* For any  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda^2 \tau(\mathcal{L}^*(y)^* x) &= \lambda^2 \tau(y^* \mathcal{L}(x)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \tau_2 \left( y^* \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4} (\partial^\Delta x) e_2 e_1 \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \tau_2 \left( y^* \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}} e_1 e_2 (\partial^\Delta x) \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \tau_2 \left( (\partial^\Delta x) e_2 e_1 \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}} \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4} y^* \right) - \frac{1}{2} \tau_2 \left( (\partial^\Delta x) y^* \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4} \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}} e_1 e_2 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{1/2} \tau_2 \left( (\partial^\Delta x) e_2 \mathfrak{F}^{-1} (\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}^{-1/4}) y^* \right) - \frac{1}{2} \tau_2 \left( (\partial^\Delta x) y^* \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4} \overline{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2}} e_1 e_2 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \tau_2 \left( (\partial^\Delta x) \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} \overline{\widehat{\Delta}}^{-1/4} e_1 e_2 y^* \right) - \frac{1}{2} \tau_2 \left( (\partial^\Delta x) y^* \widehat{\Delta}^{-3/4} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} e_1 e_2 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \tau_2 \left( (\partial^\Delta x) \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} \widehat{\Delta}^{1/4} (e_1 y^* - \widehat{\Delta}^{-1} y^* e_1) e_2 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \tau_2 \left( (\partial^\Delta x) \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_0^{1/2} \widehat{\Delta}^{-1/4} (e_1 y^* \widehat{\Delta}^{-1} - y^* \widehat{\Delta}^{-1} e_1) e_2 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \tau_2 \left( (\partial^\Delta x) \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2} (\partial^\Delta y \widehat{\Delta}^{-1})^* e_2 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \tau_1 \left( (\partial^\Delta x) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1} (\widehat{\Delta}^{1/2} (\partial^\Delta y \widehat{\Delta}^{-1})^* e_2) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \tau_1 \left( x (\partial^\Delta \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1} (e_2 (\partial^\Delta y \widehat{\Delta}^{-1}) \widehat{\Delta}^{1/2})^*) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The rest follows from Lemma 6.20. This completes the computation.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.25.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathcal{M} = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ . We have that*

$$\mathcal{L}^*(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0} \omega_j [(\mu_j^{-1/2} x v_j - \mu_j^{1/2} v_j x), v_j^*],$$

subject to  $\tau(v_j v_k^*) = \lambda^{1/2} \delta_{j,k}$ ,  $\tau(v_j) = 0$ , and  $\omega_j \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}^*(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0} \omega_j^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \partial^\Delta \left( \mu_j^{-1/2} x \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) - \mu_j^{1/2} \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) x \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0} \omega_j [(\mu_j^{-1/2} x v_j - \mu_j^{1/2} v_j x), v_j^*].
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the computation.  $\square$

**6.2. Divergence.** Suppose that  $D \in \mathcal{M}$  is strictly positive and  $\mu > 0$ . We define the linear map  $\mathbf{K}_{D,\mu} : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1$  as follows:

$$\mathbf{K}_{D,\mu}(x) = \int_0^1 \mu^{1-2s} D^s x D^{1-s} ds, \quad x \in \mathcal{M}_1.$$

Let  $f(s) = \mu^{1-2s} D^s v D^{1-s}$  for  $v \in \mathcal{M}_1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} f'(s) &= (\mu^{-1} D)^s ((\log \mu^{-1} D)v - v \log \mu D) (\mu D)^{1-s} \\ &= (\mu^{-1} D)^s ((\log D)v - v \log D) (\mu D)^{1-s} - 2(\log \mu) (\mu^{-1} D)^s v (\mu D)^{1-s}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\mathbf{K}_{D,\mu}((\log \mu^{-1} D)v - v \log \mu D) = \mu^{-1} Dv - \mu v D, \quad v \in \mathcal{M}_1.$$

The inverse of  $\mathbf{K}_{D,\mu}$  is known to be

$$\mathbf{K}_{D,\mu}^{-1}(x) = \int_0^\infty (s + \mu D)^{-1} x (s + \mu^{-1} D)^{-1} ds, \quad x \in \mathcal{M}_1.$$

For any  $j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1$ , we let  $\mathbf{K}_{D,j} = \mathbf{K}_{D,\mu_j^{-1/2}}$  and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_{D,j}(x) = \mathbf{K}_{D,j}(x - \lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}((\partial_j^\Delta \log \hat{\Delta})e_2)), \quad x \in \mathcal{M}_1.$$

**Remark 6.26.** Suppose that  $\hat{\Delta} = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \Delta \\ \hline \Delta^{-1} \\ \hline \end{array}$ , for some strictly positive  $\Delta \in \mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M}$ . Then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}((\partial_j^\Delta \log \hat{\Delta})e_2) = \omega_j^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}([\log \hat{\Delta}, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)]e_2) = \lambda \omega_j^{1/2} [\log \Delta, \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)].$$

This indicates that the item  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}((\partial_j^\Delta \log \hat{\Delta})e_2)$  contains more information.

**Theorem 6.27.** Suppose that  $D \in \mathcal{M}$  is strictly positive. We have that

$$\mathcal{L}^*(D) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \partial^\Delta \tilde{\mathbf{K}}_{D,j} \left( \partial_j^\Delta (\log D) \right) \right).$$

*Proof.* Note that  $(\log \hat{\Delta})e_2 = 0$ . We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^*(D) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1} \omega_j^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \partial^\Delta \left( \mu_j^{-1/2} D \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) - \mu_j^{1/2} \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) D \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1} \omega_j^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \partial^\Delta \mathbf{K}_{D,\mu_j^{1/2}} \left( (\log \mu_j^{-1/2} D) \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) - \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) (\log \mu_j^{1/2} D) \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1} \omega_j^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \partial^\Delta \mathbf{K}_{D,\mu_j^{1/2}} \left( (\log D) \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) - \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) (\log D) - \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) \log \mu_j \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{\lambda^{-1}}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1} \omega_j^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \partial^\Delta \mathbf{K}_{D,j} \left( \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}((\log D \hat{\Delta}^{-1}) \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) e_2 - \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j) (\log D \hat{\Delta}^{-1}) e_2) \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0 \cup \mathcal{J}_1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \partial^\Delta \tilde{\mathbf{K}}_{D,j} \left( \partial_j^\Delta (\log D) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the computation. □

**Remark 6.28.** Theorem 6.27 generalizes Theorem 5.10 in [2]

We shall modify the divergence and gradients for bimodule GNS symmetric semigroups. The divergence  $\text{Div} : \mathcal{M}_1^{|\mathcal{J}|} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is defined as

$$\text{Div}(x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\partial_j^{\Delta*} x_j),$$

and the gradient  $\nabla : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1^{|\mathcal{J}|}$  is defined as

$$\nabla x = (\partial_j^{\Delta} x)_{j \in \mathcal{J}},$$

where  $x_j \in \mathcal{M}_1$ ,  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .

**Lemma 6.29.** *Suppose the bimodule quantum Markov semigroup  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is relatively ergodic. Then the range of  $\text{Div}$  is*

$$\text{Ran}(\text{Div}) = \{x \in \mathcal{M} : \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x) = 0\}.$$

*Proof.* Note that  $\text{Ker} \nabla = \mathcal{N}$ . We have that

$$\text{Ran}(\text{Div}) = (\text{Ker} \nabla)^{\perp} = \mathcal{N}^{\perp} = \{x \in \mathcal{M} : \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x) = 0\}.$$

This completes the proof of the Lemma. □

**Remark 6.30.** *Note that  $\mathcal{M} \subset \text{Ker} \partial_j^{\Delta*}$ . We have that  $\mathcal{M}^{|\mathcal{J}|} \subset \text{Ker} \text{Div}$ .*

We extend  $\mathbf{K}_{D,j}$  to the linear map  $\mathbf{K}_D : \mathcal{M}_1^{|\mathcal{J}|} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1^{|\mathcal{J}|}$  as

$$\mathbf{K}_D(x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}} = (\mathbf{K}_{D,j} x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}},$$

where  $(x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \in \mathcal{M}^{|\mathcal{J}|}$ . The inverse of  $\mathbf{K}_D$  is  $\mathbf{K}_D^{-1} = (\mathbf{K}_{D,j}^{-1})_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ .

**Definition 6.31.** *Suppose  $X = (x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$  and  $Y = (y_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ , where  $x_j, y_j \in \mathcal{M}_1$ . We define  $\langle X, Y \rangle_{D, \hat{\Delta}}$  as follows:*

$$\langle X, Y \rangle_{D, \hat{\Delta}} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \tau_1((\mathbf{K}_{D,j} y_j)^* x_j).$$

*The sesquilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{D, \hat{\Delta}}$  is an inner product on  $\mathcal{M}_1^{|\mathcal{J}|}$ . The induced norm is denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_{D, \hat{\Delta}}$ .*

Suppose  $X, Y \in \mathcal{M}_1^{|\mathcal{J}|}$ . We denote by  $X \perp_{D, \hat{\Delta}} Y$  if  $\langle X, Y \rangle_{D, \hat{\Delta}} = 0$ . We denote by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  the usual inner product, i.e.  $\langle X, Y \rangle = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \tau_1(y_j^* x_j)$ . Hence we have that

$$\langle X, Y \rangle_{D, \hat{\Delta}} = \langle \mathbf{K}_D X, Y \rangle = \langle X, \mathbf{K}_D Y \rangle.$$

Suppose that  $\Psi : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1$  is a trace-preserving completely positive map. Denote by  $\Psi^{|\mathcal{J}|} : \mathcal{M}_1^{|\mathcal{J}|} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1^{|\mathcal{J}|}$  the map  $(x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \mapsto (\Psi(x_j))_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ . Then

$$\left\langle \Psi^{|\mathcal{J}|}(X), \mathbf{K}_{\Psi(D)}^{-1} \Psi^{|\mathcal{J}|}(X) \right\rangle \leq \langle X, \mathbf{K}_D^{-1}(X) \rangle, \quad (25)$$

which follows from the Lieb's concavity theorem [18] for the following map:

$$(x, D) \mapsto \int_0^\infty \tau_1((s + \mu D)^{-1}x(s + \mu D)^{-1}x^*)ds.$$

**Theorem 6.32.** *Suppose the bimodule quantum Markov semigroup  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is relatively ergodic,  $\{D_s\}_{s \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]}$  is a continuous family of density operators in  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D_s)$  independent of  $s$ . Then there exists  $X = (x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \in \mathcal{M}_1^{|\mathcal{J}|}$  such that*

$$\dot{D}_0 = \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D(X).$$

If  $X$  is minimal subject to  $\|\cdot\|_{D, \hat{\Delta}}$ , then there exists a unique self-adjoint element  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $X = \nabla x$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x) = 0$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(\dot{D}_0) = 0$ . By relative ergodicity and Lemma 6.29, there exists  $X \in \mathcal{M}_1^{|\mathcal{J}|}$  such that  $\dot{D}_0 = \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D(X)$ .

Suppose  $X \in \mathcal{M}_1^{|\mathcal{J}|}$  is minimal subject to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{D, \hat{\Delta}}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{M}_1^{|\mathcal{J}|}$  with  $\text{Div} A = 0$ . Let  $Y = X + r \mathbf{K}_D^{-1} A$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{C}$ . Then  $\dot{D}_0 = \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D(Y)$  and  $\langle X, X \rangle_{D, \hat{\Delta}} \leq \langle Y, Y \rangle_{D, \hat{\Delta}}$ . This implies that

$$\langle X, \mathbf{K}_D^{-1} A \rangle_{D, \hat{\Delta}} = 0 = \langle X, A \rangle.$$

Hence  $X \perp \text{Ker} \text{Div}$ , i.e.  $X \in \text{Ran}(\nabla)$ . Therefore there exists  $x_1 \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\nabla x_1 = X$ . Note that the adjoint  $x_1^*$  also satisfies  $\dot{D}_0 = \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D(\nabla x_1^*)$ . Then  $x_2 = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_1^*)$  is also a solution. Let  $x = x_2 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x_2)$ . We see that  $x$  is a solution.

Suppose that  $y$  is a solution such that  $y = y^*$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(y) = 0$ . We have that  $\nabla(x - y) = 0$ . This implies that  $x - y \in \mathcal{N}$ , i.e.  $x = y$ . We see that  $x$  is unique subject to  $x = x^*$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x) = 0$ .  $\square$

Let  $X_\Delta \in \mathcal{M}$  such that

$$\left( \lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}((\partial_j^\Delta \log \hat{\Delta}) e_2) \right)_{j \in \mathcal{J}} = \nabla X_\Delta + (x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}},$$

where  $(x_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \perp_{D, \hat{\Delta}} \text{Ran}(\nabla)$ . Note that

$$\lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}((\partial_j^\Delta \log \hat{\Delta}) e_2) = (\log \mu_j) \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j).$$

By the fact that  $(\log \mu_j) \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_j)^* = -\log \mu_{j^*} \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(p_{j^*})$ . We have that  $X_\Delta$  can be chosen as a self-adjoint element and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(X_\Delta) = 0$ . Let  $D_\Delta = e^{X_\Delta}$ . We shall call the element  $D_\Delta$  as a hidden density.

**Remark 6.33.** *Suppose that  $\hat{\Delta} = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \overline{\Delta} \\ \hline \Delta^{-1} \\ \hline \end{array}$ . Then by Remark 6.26, we see that  $X_\Delta$  can be*

*taken as  $\log \Delta$  and  $D_\Delta = \Delta$ . By Remark 6.13, we have that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\overline{\hat{\Delta}})^{-1} = \Delta$ . However,  $D_\Delta$  might not be taken as  $\overline{F_\Phi}$  in general.*

**Proposition 6.34.** *Suppose that  $D$  is a strictly positive element in  $\mathcal{M}$ . We have that*

$$\mathcal{L}^*(D) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D (\nabla \log D - \nabla \log D_\Delta).$$

*Proof.* We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^*(D) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left( \partial^\Delta \tilde{\mathbf{K}}_{D,j} (\partial_j^\Delta (\log D)) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \left( \tilde{\mathbf{K}}_{D,j} (\partial_j^\Delta (\log D)) \right)_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D \left( (\partial_j^\Delta (\log D))_{j \in \mathcal{I}} - \left( \lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}_1} ((\partial_j^\Delta \log \hat{\Delta}) e_2) \right)_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D (\nabla \log D - \nabla \log D_\Delta). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the computation.  $\square$

**6.3. Relative Entropy.** In this section, we shall study the relative entropy with respect to the hidden density.

**Definition 6.35** (Riemannian Metric). *Suppose  $\{D_s\}_{s \in [a,b]}$  is continuous path in  $\mathcal{M}_+$  with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D_s)$  independent of  $s$ . The Riemannian metric  $g_{\mathcal{L}}$  on  $\mathcal{M}_+$  with respect to  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is defined as*

$$\|\dot{D}_0\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}} = \min \left\{ \|X\|_{D, \hat{\Delta}} : \dot{D}_0 = \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D(X) \right\}$$

Suppose  $f : \mathcal{M}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a differentiable function. For any self-adjoint  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\tau(x) = 0$ , there exists  $\frac{df}{dD} \in \mathcal{M}$  such that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(D + sx) - f(D)}{s} = \tau \left( \frac{df}{dD} x \right).$$

**Definition 6.36** (Gradient Vector Field). *Suppose  $f$  is a differentiable function. The gradient vector field  $\text{grad}_{g,D} f \in \{\nabla x : x = x^* \in \mathcal{M}, \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x) = 0\}$  is defined as*

$$\left. \frac{d}{ds} f(D_s) \right|_{s=0} = \frac{1}{2} \langle \text{grad}_{g,D} f, \nabla x \rangle_{D, \hat{\Delta}},$$

where  $\dot{D}_0 = \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D(\nabla x)$  and  $D_0 = D$ . Note that the gradient vector field is unique.

**Lemma 6.37.** *Suppose  $f$  is a differentiable function. Then*

$$\text{grad}_{g,D} f = \nabla \frac{df}{dD}.$$

and

$$\|\text{grad}_{g,D} f\|_{D,\widehat{\Delta}}^2 = \left\langle \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D \nabla \frac{df}{dD}, \frac{df}{dD} \right\rangle.$$

*Proof.* For any differentiable path  $\{D_s\}_s$  of density operators, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d}{ds} f(D_s) \right|_{s=0} &= \left\langle \frac{df}{dD}, \dot{D}_0 \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \frac{df}{dD}, \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D(\nabla x) \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \nabla \frac{df}{dD}, \mathbf{K}_D(\nabla x) \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \nabla \frac{df}{dD}, \nabla x \right\rangle_{D,\widehat{\Delta}} \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $\text{grad}_{g,D} f = \nabla \frac{df}{dD}$ . □

Let  $f(D) = H(D\|D_\Delta)$  be the relative entropy. A differentiable path  $\{D_s\}_s$  is a gradient flow (See [21]) for  $f$  if  $\dot{D}_s = \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D \left( \nabla \frac{df}{dD_s} \right)$ . Then we have the following theorem:

**Theorem 6.38.** *Suppose that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup bimodule GNS symmetric with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$ . Suppose  $\{D_s\}_{s \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)}$  is a differentiable path of density operators such that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D_s)$  is independent of  $s$  satisfying*

$$\dot{D}_s = \mathcal{L}^*(D_s).$$

*Then it is the gradient flow for the relative entropy  $H(D\|D_\Delta)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $f(D) = H(D\|D_\Delta) = \tau(D \log D - D \log D_\Delta)$ . Then for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(x) = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d}{ds} f(D + tx) \right|_{s=0} &= \tau(x(\log D - \log D_\Delta)) + \int_0^\infty \tau \left( \frac{D}{(D+r)^2} x \right) dr \\ &= \tau(x(\log D - \log D_\Delta)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\frac{df}{dD} = \log D - \log D_\Delta$ . On the other hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^*(D_s) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D (\nabla \log D_s - \nabla \log D_\Delta) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D \left( \nabla \frac{df}{dD_s} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

**Corollary 6.39.** *Suppose that  $\{D_s\}_{s \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)}$  is a differentiable path of density operators such that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D_s)$  is independent of  $s$ . Then*

$$\left\| \frac{d}{ds} D_s \right\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}} = \|\text{grad}_{g,D} f\|_{D, \hat{\Delta}}^2,$$

where  $f(D) = H(D \| D_{\Delta})$ .

*Proof.* We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{d}{ds} D_s \right\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}} &= \min \left\{ \|X\|_{D_s, \hat{\Delta}} : \frac{d}{ds} D_s = \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_{D_s}(X) \right\} \\ &= \left\| \nabla \frac{df}{dD_s} \right\|_{D, \hat{\Delta}} \\ &= \|\text{grad}_{g,D} f\|_{D, \hat{\Delta}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the computation. □

Now we shall show the bimodule version of the logarithm Sobolev inequality and Talagrand inequality under the intertwining property.

**Definition 6.40** (Intertwining Property). *Suppose that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup bimodule GNS symmetric with respect to  $\hat{\Delta}$ . We say that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  satisfies the intertwining property if there exists  $\beta > 0$  such that*

$$\Phi_t^* \text{Div} = e^{-\beta t} \text{Div} \widetilde{\Phi}_t^*, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where  $\widetilde{\Phi}_t = \Phi_t \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1$ .

**Theorem 6.41** (Bimodule Logarithmic Sobolev Inequality). *Suppose that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup bimodule GNS symmetric with respect to  $\hat{\Delta}$  and satisfies the intertwining property. Then for any density operator  $D \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} &H(\Phi_t^*(D) \| D_{\Delta}) - H(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D) \overline{F_{\Phi}} \| D_{\Delta}) \\ &\leq e^{-2\beta t} (H(D \| D_{\Delta}) - H(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D) \overline{F_{\Phi}} \| D_{\Delta})) \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Furthermore, we have that

$$H(D \| D_{\Delta}) - H(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D) \overline{F_{\Phi}} \| D_{\Delta}) \leq \frac{1}{2\beta} \tau(\mathcal{L}^*(D)(\log D - \log D_{\Delta})). \tag{27}$$

This is called the generalized logarithmic Sobolev inequality.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $X(s)$  is the solution of  $\frac{d}{ds} D_s = \frac{1}{2} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D X(s)$  minimizing  $\|X(s)\|_{D, \hat{\Delta}}$ , where  $\{D_s\}_s$  is a differentiable path in  $\mathcal{M}_+$  such that  $D_0 = D$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D_s)$  is independent of

s. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} \Phi_t^*(D_s) &= \frac{1}{2} \Phi_t^* \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D X(s) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-\beta t} \text{Div} \widetilde{\Phi}_t^*(X(s)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} e^{-\beta t} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_{\Phi_t^*(D)} \left( \mathbf{K}_{\Phi_t^*(D)}^{-1} \widetilde{\Phi}_t^*(X(s)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{d}{ds} \Phi_t^*(D_s) \right\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}}^2 &\leq e^{-2\beta t} \left\| \mathbf{K}_{\Phi_t^*(D)}^{-1} \widetilde{\Phi}_t^*(X(s)) \right\|_{\Phi_t^*(D), \widehat{\Delta}}^2 \\ &\leq e^{-2\beta t} \left\langle \mathbf{K}_{\Phi_t^*(D)}^{-1} \widetilde{\Phi}_t^*(X(s)), \widetilde{\Phi}_t^*(X(s)) \right\rangle \\ &\leq e^{-2\beta t} \left\langle \mathbf{K}_D^{-1} X(s), X(s) \right\rangle \\ &= e^{-2\beta t} \left\| \frac{d}{ds} D_s \right\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{d}{ds} \Phi_t^*(D_s) \right\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}} = 0$  and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left\| \frac{d}{ds} \Phi_t^*(D_s) \right\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}}^2 \leq -2\beta \left\| \frac{d}{ds} \Phi_t^*(D_s) \right\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}}^2.$$

By Corollary 6.39, we have that

$$\left\| \text{grad}_{g, \Phi_t^*(D_s)} f \right\|_{\Phi_t^*(D_s), \widehat{\Delta}}^2 \leq e^{-2\beta t} \left\| \text{grad}_{g, D_s} f \right\|_{D_s, \widehat{\Delta}}^2.$$

Hence

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \left\| \text{grad}_{g, \Phi_t^*(D_s)} f \right\|_{D, \widehat{\Delta}}^2 \right|_{t=0^+} \leq -2\beta \left\| \text{grad}_{g, D_s} f \right\|_{D, \widehat{\Delta}}^2.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d}{dt} f(\Phi_t^*(D)) \right|_{t=0} &= -\tau \left( \frac{df}{dD} \mathcal{L}^*(D) \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \tau \left( \frac{df}{dD} \text{Div} \mathbf{K}_D \left( \nabla \frac{df}{dD} \right) \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \mathbf{K}_D \left( \nabla \frac{df}{dD} \right), \nabla \frac{df}{dD} \right\rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \left\| \text{grad}_{g, D} f \right\|_{D, \widehat{\Delta}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We see that

$$2 \frac{d}{dt} H(\Phi_t^*(D_s) \| D_{\Delta}) = - \left\| \text{grad}_{g, \Phi_t^*(D_s)} f \right\|_{\Phi_t^*(D_s), \widehat{\Delta}}^2. \quad (28)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
2\frac{d}{dt}H(\Phi_t^*(D_s)\|D_\Delta) &= -\left\|\frac{d}{ds}\Phi_t^*(D_s)\right\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}}^2 \\
&= \int_t^\infty \frac{d}{dr}\left\|\frac{d}{ds}\Phi_r^*(D_s)\right\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}}^2 dr \\
&\leq -2\beta \int_t^\infty \|\text{grad}_{g,\Phi_r^*(D_s)}f\|_{\Phi_r^*(D_s),\widehat{\Delta}}^2 dr \\
&= 4\beta H(\mathbb{E}_\Phi^*(D_s)\|D_\Delta) - 4\beta H(\Phi_t^*(D_s)\|D_\Delta),
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\frac{d}{dt}H(\Phi_t^*(D_s)\|D_\Delta) \leq 2\beta H(\mathbb{E}_\Phi^*(D_s)\|D_\Delta) - 2\beta H(\Phi_t^*(D_s)\|D_\Delta). \quad (29)$$

By integrating Equation (29) with respect to  $t$ , we obtain that

$$H(\Phi_t^*(D_s)\|D_\Delta) - H(\mathbb{E}_\Phi^*(D_s)\|D_\Delta) \leq e^{-2\beta t}(H(D_s\|D_\Delta) - H(\mathbb{E}_\Phi^*(D_s)\|D_\Delta)).$$

By Equation (28), we obtain that

$$H(D_s\|D_\Delta) - H(\mathbb{E}_\Phi^*(D_s)\|D_\Delta) \leq \frac{1}{4\beta}\|\text{grad}_{g,D}f\|_{D,\widehat{\Delta}}^2.$$

Note that

$$H(\mathbb{E}_\Phi^*(D_s)\|D_\Delta) = H(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D_s)\overline{F_\Phi}\|D_\Delta),$$

We see the first equality of the theorem is true. By Lemma 6.37, we have that

$$\|\text{grad}_{g,D}f\|_{D,\widehat{\Delta}}^2 = 2\tau(\mathcal{L}^*(D)(\log D - \log D_\Delta)).$$

We see that the second inequality of the theorem is true. □

**Remark 6.42.** If  $\widehat{\Delta} = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \Delta \\ \hline \Delta^{-1} \\ \hline \end{array}$ , then by Remarks 6.13 and 6.26, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
H(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\overline{F_\Phi}\|D_\Delta) &= H(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\Delta\|\Delta) \\
&= \tau(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\Delta \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\Delta - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\Delta \log \Delta) \\
&= \tau(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\Delta \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)).
\end{aligned}$$

If  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{C}$ , we see that  $H(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\overline{F_\Phi}\|D_\Delta) = 0$  for density operator  $D \in \mathcal{M}$ .

In [2], Talagrand inequality [29] was obtained for quantum Markov semigroups. In the following, we obtain a bimodule version of Talagrand inequality.

**Theorem 6.43** (Talagrand Inequality). *Suppose that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a bimodule quantum Markov semigroup bimodule GNS symmetry with respect to  $\widehat{\Delta}$  and relatively ergodic. Suppose that Equation (27) holds. We have that*

$$d(D, D_\Delta) \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{H(D\|D_\Delta) - H(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\overline{F_\Phi}\|D_\Delta)}{\beta}}.$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $D \in \mathcal{M}$  is a density operator. Let  $\Delta_D = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\overline{F_\Phi}$ . Then the distance between  $D$  and  $\Delta_D$  is described by the following equation:

$$d(D, \Delta_D) = \int_0^\infty \left\| \frac{d}{dt} \Phi_t^*(D) \right\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}} dt.$$

Note that  $\left\| \frac{d}{dt} \Phi_t^*(D) \right\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}}^2 = -2\frac{d}{dt} H(\Phi_t^*(D)\|D_\Delta)$ . By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for any  $0 < t_1 < t_2 < \infty$ , we have that

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \left\| \frac{d}{dt} \Phi_t^*(D) \right\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}} dt \leq \sqrt{2}\sqrt{t_2 - t_1} \sqrt{H(\Phi_{t_1}^*(D)\|D_\Delta) - H(\Phi_{t_2}^*(D)\|D_\Delta)}$$

Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ , for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we take  $t_k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & H(\Phi_{t_k}^*(D)\|D_\Delta) - H(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\overline{F_\Phi}\|D_\Delta) \\ &= e^{-k\epsilon} (H(D\|D_\Delta) - H(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\overline{F_\Phi}\|D_\Delta)). \end{aligned}$$

By Equation (26), we have that  $t_k - t_{k-1} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2\beta}$ . By Equation (26) again, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \left\| \frac{d}{dt} \Phi_t^*(D) \right\|_{g_{\mathcal{L}}} dt \\ & \leq \sqrt{2}\sqrt{t_k - t_{k-1}} \sqrt{H(\Phi_{t_{k-1}}^*(D)\|D_\Delta) - H(\Phi_{t_k}^*(D)\|D_\Delta)} \\ & \leq \sqrt{2}\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2\beta} (e^{-(k-1)\epsilon} - e^{-k\epsilon}) (H(D\|D_\Delta) - H(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\overline{F_\Phi}\|D_\Delta))} \\ & = \sqrt{2}e^{-k\epsilon/2} \sqrt{\epsilon(e^\epsilon - 1)} \sqrt{\frac{H(D\|D_\Delta) - H(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}}(D)\overline{F_\Phi}\|D_\Delta)}{2\beta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-k\epsilon/2} \sqrt{\epsilon(e^\epsilon - 1)} &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{e^{-\epsilon/2} \sqrt{\epsilon(e^\epsilon - 1)}}{1 - e^{-\epsilon/2}} \\
&= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon(e^\epsilon - 1)}}{e^{\epsilon/2} - 1} \\
&= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon(e^{\epsilon/2} + 1)}{e^{\epsilon/2} - 1}} \\
&= \sqrt{2} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{e^{\epsilon/2} - 1}} = 2.
\end{aligned}$$

By taking summation of Equation (30) with respect to  $k$ , we see that the theorem is true.  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. Asaeda and U. Haagerup. Exotic subfactors of finite depth with jones indices and. *Comm Math Phys*, 202:1–63, 1999.
- [2] E. A. Carlen and J. Maas. Gradient flow and entropy inequalities for quantum Markov semigroups with detailed balance. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 273:1810–1869, 2017.
- [3] F. Fagnola and R. Reboledo. Entropy production and detailed balance for a class of quantum markov semigroups. *Open Syst. Inf. Dyn.*, 22:1550013, 2015.
- [4] F. Fagnola and V. Umanitá. Detailed balance, time reversal, and generators of quantum markov semigroups. *Math Notes*, 84:108–115, 2008.
- [5] F. Fagnola and V. Umanitá. Generators of kms symmetric markov semigroups on  $b(\mathfrak{h})$ : Symmetry and quantum detailed balance. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 298:523–547, 2010.
- [6] A. Frigerio. Stationary states of quantum dynamical semigroups. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 63:269 – 276, 1978.
- [7] A. Frigerio and M. Verri. Long-time asymptotic properties of dynamical semigroups on  $W^*$ -algebras. *Math. Zeit.*, 180:275 – 286, 1982.
- [8] L. Huang, A. Jaffe, Z. Liu, and J. Wu. The quantum Perron-Frobenius space. *arXiv:2305.18971*, 2023.
- [9] L. Huang, C. Jiang, Z. Liu, and J. Wu. Phase group category of bimodule quantum channels. *arXiv:2411.02707*, 2024.
- [10] A. Jaffe, C. Jiang, Z. Liu, Y. Ren, and J. Wu. Quantum Fourier analysis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 117(10):10715–10720, 2020.
- [11] C. Jiang, Z. Liu, and J. Wu. Noncommutative uncertainty principles. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 270:264–311, 2016.
- [12] C. Jiang, Z. Liu, and J. Wu. Block Maps and Fourier Analysis. *Science China Mathematics*, 62:1585–1614, 2019.
- [13] V. Jones. Planar Algebras. *New Zealand Journal of Mathematics*, 52:1–107, Sep. 2021.
- [14] V. Jones and V. Sunder. *Introduction to Subfactors*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [15] V. F. R. Jones. Index for subfactors. *Invent. Math.*, 72:1–25, 1983.
- [16] V. F. R. Jones. A polynomial invariant for knots via von Neumann algebras. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 12(1):103–111, 1985.
- [17] A. Kossakowski, A. Frigerio, V. Gorini, and M. Verri. Quantum detailed balance and kms conditions. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 57:97–110, 1977.

- [18] E. H. Lieb. Convex trace functions and the wigner-yanase-dyson conjecture. *Advances in Mathematics*, 11:267–288, 1973.
- [19] G. Lindblad. On the Generators of Quantum Dynamical Semigroups. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 48:119–130, 1976.
- [20] Z. Liu, S. Palcoux, and J. Wu. Fusion bialgebras and fourier analysis: Analytic obstructions for unitary categorification. *Advances in Mathematics*, 390:107905, 2021.
- [21] J. Maas. Gradient flows of the entropy for finite markov chains. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 261:2250–2292, 2011.
- [22] M. Müger. From subfactors to categories and topology i: Frobenius algebras in and morita equivalence of tensor categories. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 180(1):81–157, 2003.
- [23] M. Müger. From subfactors to categories and topology ii: The quantum double of tensor categories and subfactors. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 180(1):159–219, 2003.
- [24] A. Ocneanu. Quantized groups, string algebras and galois theory for algebras, operator algebras and applications. *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol.136, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge,*, pages 119 – 172, 1988.
- [25] V. Ostrik. Module categories, weak hopf algebras and modular invariants. *Transformation Groups*, 8:177–206, 2003.
- [26] M. Pimsner and S. Popa. Entropy and index for subfactors. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, 19:57–106, 1986.
- [27] S. Popa. Classification of subfactors: the reduction to commuting squares. *Invent. Math.*, 101:19–43, 1990.
- [28] S. Popa. An axiomatization of the lattice of higher relative commutants. *Invent. Math.*, 120:237–252, 1995.
- [29] M. Talagrand. Transportation cost for gaussian and other product measures. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 6:587–600, 1996.
- [30] M. Vernooij and M. Wirth. Derivations and kms-symmetric quantum markov semigroups. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 403:381—416, 2023.
- [31] M. Wirth. Christensen-Evans theorem and extensions of GNS-symmetric quantum Markov semigroups. arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.00341, 2022.
- [32] M. Wirth. The differential structure of generators of GNS-symmetric quantum markov semigroups. arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.09247, 2022.

JINSONG WU, BEIJING INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND APPLICATIONS, BEIJING, 101408, CHINA

*Email address:* wjs@bimsa.cn

ZISHUO ZHAO, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100084, CHINA

*Email address:* zzs21@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn