

# Markov shift in non-commutative probability

Anilesh Mohari

S.N.Bose Center for Basic Sciences,  
JD Block, Sector-3, Calcutta-91  
E-mail:anilesh@boson.bose.res.in

## Abstract

We consider a class of quantum dissipative semigroup on a von-Neumann algebra which admits a normal invariant state. We investigate asymptotic behavior of the dissipative dynamics and their relation to that of the canonical Markov shift. In case the normal invariant state is also faithful, we also extend the notion of ‘quantum detailed balance’ introduced by Frigerio-Gorini and prove that forward weak Markov process and backward weak Markov process are equivalent by an anti-unitary operator.

# 1 Introduction:

Let  $\tau = (\tau_t, t \geq 0)$  be a semigroup of identity preserving completely positive maps on a von-Neumann algebra  $\mathcal{A}_0$  acting on a separable Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_0$  and  $\phi_0$  be an invariant normal state for  $\tau$ . We consider the unique minimal reversible system, constructed in [AcM2], i.e. a triplet  $(\mathcal{A}, \alpha_t, \phi)$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a von-Neumann algebra acting on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $(\alpha_t, t \in \mathbb{I} = \mathbb{R} \text{ or } \mathbb{Z})$  is a group of  $*$ -automorphism on  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\phi$  is an invariant state for  $(\alpha_t)$ , so that the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathcal{A}, \phi) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_t} & (\mathcal{A}, \phi) \\ j_0^f \uparrow & & \downarrow \mathbb{E}_0 \\ (\mathcal{A}_0, \phi_0) & \xrightarrow{\tau_t} & (\mathcal{A}_0, \phi_0) \end{array} \quad (1.1)$$

commutes for all  $t \geq 0$  where  $j_0^f$  is an injective  $*$ -homomorphism and  $\mathbb{E}_0$  is a completely positive map. Moreover there exists a group of unitary operators  $(S_t)$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  and a unit vector  $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$  so that  $S_t \Omega = \Omega$ ,  $\phi(X) = \langle \Omega, X \Omega \rangle$  and  $\alpha_t(X) = S_t^* X S_t$ ,  $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $X \in \mathcal{A}$ . Inspired by the classical notion  $(S_t)$  will be referred as **Markov shift**.

In case  $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$  is itself a reversible system i.e.  $\tau_t$  is also an endomorphism for each  $t \geq 0$ , then  $\mathcal{A}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{A}_0$  and  $(\alpha_t)$  is same as  $(\tau_t)$  up to an isomorphism. On the other hand, this dilation is indeed a generalization of Kolmogorov's construction of stationary Markov process in the non-commutative framework [Da2, PaB, AcM2], where *weak Markov forward process*  $(j_t^f : t \in \mathbb{R})$  is defined by  $j_t^f(x) = \alpha_t(j_0^f(x))$ ,  $\forall x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ . The family of increasing projections  $\{j_t^f(I) : t \in \mathbb{I}\}$  is the non-commutative counterpart of the filtration generated by the process  $(j_t^f : \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}, t \in \mathbb{I})$ . Furthermore in case  $\mathbb{I} = \mathbb{R}$  and the map  $t \rightarrow \tau_t(x)$  is weak\* continuous, then  $(S_t)$  is also strongly continuous.

In this exposition we analyze asymptotic behavior of the weak Markov process  $(j_t^f)$ . Since the minimal reversible process is uniquely determined by the dynamical semigroup, it is expected that asymptotic behavior of  $(j_t^f)$  will be related to that of  $(\tau_t)$ . At this point we remark very few general results are known which guarantees existence of a normal invariant state. For a discussion and results on this issue we refer to [Da2, FaR1, FaR2]. For this exposition we assume existence of a normal invariant state and explore how ergodicity, mixing (weak and strong) of  $(S_t)$  is related with that of  $(\tau_t)$ . We say the forward process is having **Kolmogorov shift** or **K-shift** property if the tail subspace is trivial, i.e.  $j_t^f(I) \rightarrow |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|$  strongly as  $t \rightarrow -\infty$ . In particular we prove that the process is having Kolmogorov property if and only if  $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . This notion was introduced in [AcM2] and explored its relation with the canonical commutation relation.

We investigate further the asymptotic behavior of the dynamical semigroup  $(\tau_t)$  and to that end we assume  $\phi_0$  to be also faithful. In a recent paper [FaR3] Fagnola and

Rebolledo found a useful criteria which guarantees faithful property of an invariant normal state in-terms of non existence of a non-trivial sub-harmonic projections.

We revisit Frigerio's original work [Fr1] and introduce von-Neumann sub-algebras  $\mathcal{F} = \{x \in \mathcal{A}_0 : \tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) = \tau_t(x^*x), \tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) = \tau_t(xx^*), t \geq 0\}$  and  $\mathcal{I} = \{x \in \mathcal{A}_0 : \tau_t(x) = x, t \geq 0\}$ . It is obvious  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{F}$ . We prove that the equality  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{I}$  is a sufficient condition for weak\* limit  $\tau_t(x) \rightarrow E(x)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , where  $E$  is the norm on projection on the von-Neumann sub-algebra  $\{x : \tau_t(x) = x, t \geq 0\}$ . This is a little improvement of Frigerio's work [Fr1] and in particular it removes the asymmetric feature of Frigerio's original condition for strong mixing. In this direction we added one important result which says how to get steady state which need not be faithful. In this regard we find the notion of sub-harmonic projection introduced in [FR3] plays an important role.

It is simple to note that any measure preserving strongly mixing flow does not satisfy this condition, thus this sufficient condition is not a necessary one for the shift  $(S_t)$  to be strong mixing. Since  $\{x \in \mathcal{A}_0 : \tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) = \tau_t(x^*x) : t \geq 0\} = \mathcal{I}$  is a necessary condition for Kolmogorov's property, in case strong mixing is equivalent to Kolmogorov's property, Frigerio's criteria is also necessary for strong mixing. In this exposition we will show such equivalence if  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is a type-I von-Neumann algebra with center completely atomic. In particular strong mixing and K-shift property are equivalent if  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  or  $\mathcal{A} = l^\infty(\mathcal{S})$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is a countable set.

In section 4, we explore further the faithful property of the invariant state and consider the backward weak Markov process  $j_t^b$  as in [AcM] associated with a canonical adjoint quantum dynamical semigroup  $(\tilde{\tau}_t)$ . We also consider the associated time reverse process  $(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{j}_t^f, \tilde{j}_t^b, \tilde{F}_t, \tilde{F}_{[t}, \tilde{\Omega})$ . There exists [AcM2] an anti-unitary operator  $U_0 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  which intertwines the forward weak Markov process associated with  $(\tau_t)$  to the backward weak Markov process associated with  $(\tilde{\tau}_t)$ . In particular we check that ergodicity, weak mixing and strong mixing properties are time reversible. However Kolmogorov's property seems to be delicate in the non-commutative case.

We also find that  $\{x \in \mathcal{A}_0 : \tilde{\tau}_t\tau_t(x) = x, \forall t \geq 0\} = \{x \in \mathcal{A}_0 : \tau_t(x) = x, \forall t \geq 0\}$  is a sufficient condition for weak\* limit of  $\tau_t(x) \rightarrow E(x), \forall x \in \mathcal{A}_0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Same is true if we interchange the role of  $(\tau_t)$  with that of  $(\tilde{\tau}_t)$ . This condition seems to be weaker than that of Frigerio's modified condition. In case modular automorphism group associated with  $\phi_0$  commutes with the dynamics  $(\tau_t)$  this sufficient condition is identical to that of the modified Frigerio's condition. We find this condition to be useful with the following implications:

(A) We prove that strong mixing and K-shift properties are equivalent when  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is a type-I von-Neumann algebra with center completely atomic. In such a case the following are equivalent:

$$(1) \{x \in \mathcal{A}_0 : \tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) = \tau_t(x^*x), \tau_t(x)\tau_t(x^*) = \tau_t(xx^*), \forall t \geq 0\} = \mathcal{I},$$

- (2)  $\{x \in \mathcal{A}_0 : \tilde{\tau}_t \tau_t(x) = x, \forall t \geq 0\} = \mathcal{C}$ ,  
(3)  $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ .

Thus improved Frigerio's sufficient condition is also necessary in this case for strong mixing, equivalently for Kolmogorov's property.

(B) Inspired by seminal work [FrG] we also introduce a notion of 'quantum detailed balance' and prove such an ergodic process is not only strongly mixing but also satisfies Kolmogorov's property. Thus once more we found a quantum counter part of a well known classical result which says ergodicity and detailed balance give rise to a mixing system. Moreover there exists an anti-unitary operator  $R_0$  so that  $R_0 j_t^f R_0^* = j_{-t}^b, \forall t \in \mathbb{I}$  and  $R_0 j_t^b R_0^* = \tilde{j}_{-t}^f, \forall t \in \mathbb{I}$ . Several model in quantum optics satisfies this detailed balance condition. However there are many interesting situation [Ma,MZ1,MZ2,MZ3] which suggests that the detailed balance condition for a Markov semigroup on quantum spin chain is far from being understood and thus needs a better understanding, where the Hamiltonian dynamics do not commute with the dissipative dynamics.

We end this exposition with a short introduction to quantum mechanical master equation and some implication of our results.

I wish to thank referee for his comments which not only make me aware of the related works but also helped me to revise the results and even include new results.

## 2 Stationary weak Markov process and shift:

A family  $(\tau_t, t \geq 0)$  of one parameter completely positive maps on  $\mathcal{A}_0$  with the properties  $\tau_0 = I, \tau_s \circ \tau_t = \tau_{s+t}, s, t \geq 0$  is called a *quantum dynamical semigroup*. If  $\tau_t(I) = I, t \geq 0$  it is called a *Markov* semigroup. We say a state  $\phi_0$  is *invariant* for  $(\tau_t)$  if  $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)) = \phi_0(x) \forall t \geq 0$ .

Let  $(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, t \geq 0, \phi_0)$  be a Markov semigroup and  $\phi_0$  be an  $(\tau_t)$ -invariant state on  $\mathcal{A}_0$ . We aim to recall from [AcM2] the quadruple  $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{A}, \alpha_t, \phi)$ , where  $\mathcal{H}$  is a Hilbert space,  $\mathcal{A}$  is a von-Neumann algebra acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $(\alpha_t, t \in \mathbb{R})$  is a group of automorphism on  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\phi$  is a normal state so that the diagram (1.1) commutes. The construction goes along the line of Kolmogorov's construction of stationary Markov processes or Markov shift with a modification [BhP] which takes care of the fact that  $\mathcal{A}_0$  need not be a commutative algebra. Here we review the construction given in [AcM2] in order to fix the notations and important properties.

We consider the class  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $\mathcal{A}_0$  valued functions  $\underline{x} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_0$  so that  $x_r \neq I$  for finitely many points and equip with the point-wise multiplication  $(\underline{x}\underline{y})_r = x_r y_r$ . We define the map  $L : (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  by

$$L(\underline{x}, \underline{y}) = \phi_0(x_{r_n}^* \tau_{r_{n-1}-r_n}(x_{r_{n-1}}^* (\dots x_{r_2}^* \tau_{r_1-r_2}(x_{r_1}^* y_{r_1}) y_{r_2}) \dots y_{r_{n-1}}) y_{r_n}) \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\underline{r} = (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n)$   $r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \dots \leq r_n$  is the collection of points in  $\mathbb{R}$  when either  $\underline{x}$  or  $\underline{y}$  are not equal to  $I$ . That this kernel is well defined follows from our hypothesis that  $\tau_t(I) = I$ ,  $t \geq 0$  and the invariance of the state  $\phi_0$  for  $(\tau_t)$ . The complete positiveness of  $(\tau_t)$  implies that the map  $L$  is a non-negative definite form on  $\mathcal{M}$ . Thus there exists a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and a map  $\lambda : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  such that

$$\langle \lambda(\underline{x}), \lambda(\underline{y}) \rangle = L(\underline{x}, \underline{y}).$$

Often we will omit the symbol  $\lambda$  to simplify our notations unless more than one such maps are involved.

We use the symbol  $\Omega$  for the unique element in  $\mathcal{H}$  associated with  $x = (x_r = I, r \in \mathbb{R})$  and the associated vector state  $\phi$  on  $B(\mathcal{H})$  defined by  $\phi(X) = \langle \Omega, X\Omega \rangle$ .

For each  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  we define shift operator  $S_t : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  by the following prescription:

$$(S_t \underline{x})_r = x_{r+t} \quad (2.2)$$

It is simple to note that  $S = ((S_t, t \in \mathbb{R}))$  is a unitary group of operators on  $\mathcal{H}$  with  $\Omega$  as an invariant element.

For any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  we set

$$\mathcal{M}_{[t]} = \{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{M}, x_r = I \forall r > t\}$$

and  $F_{[t]}$  for the projection onto  $\mathcal{H}_{[t]}$ , the closed linear span of  $\{\lambda(\mathcal{M}_{[t]})\}$ . For any  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  we also set elements  $i_t(x), \in \mathcal{M}$  defined by

$$i_t(x)_r = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } r = t \\ I, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

So the map  $V_+ : \mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  defined by

$$V_+ x = i_0(x)$$

is an isometry of the GNS space  $\{x : \langle x, y \rangle_{\phi_0} = \phi_0(x^*y)\}$  into  $\mathcal{H}$  and a simple computation shows that  $\langle y, V_+^* S_t V_+ x \rangle_{\phi_0} = \langle y, \tau_t(x) \rangle_{\phi_0}$ . Hence

$$P_t^0 = V_+^* S_t V_+, \quad t \geq 0$$

where  $P_t^0 x = \tau_t(x)$  is a contractive semigroup of operators on the GNS space associated with  $\phi_0$ .

We also note that  $i_t(x) \in \mathcal{M}_{[t]}$  and set  $\star$ -homomorphisms  $j_0^0 : \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{[0]})$  defined by

$$j_0^0(x)\underline{y} = i_0(x)\underline{y}$$

for all  $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{M}_{[0]}$ . That it is well defined follows from (2.1) once we verify that it preserves the inner product whenever  $x$  is an isometry. For any arbitrary element we extend by linearity. Now we define  $j_0^f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  by

$$j_0^f(x) = j_0^0(x)F_{[0]}. \quad (2.3)$$

Thus  $j_0^f(x)$  is a realization of  $\mathcal{A}_0$  at time  $t = 0$  with  $j_0^f(I) = F_{0j}$ . Now we use the shift  $(S_t)$  to obtain the process  $j^f = (j_t^f : \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), t \in \mathbb{R})$  and forward filtration  $F = (F_{tj}, t \in \mathbb{R})$  defined by the following prescription:

$$j_t^f(x) = S_t j_0^f(x) S_t^* \quad F_{tj} = S_t F_{0j} S_t^*, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.4)$$

So it follows by our construction that  $j_{r_1}^f(y_1) j_{r_2}^f(y_2) \dots j_{r_n}^f(y_n) \Omega = \underline{y}$  where  $y_r = y_{r_i}$ , if  $r = r_i$  otherwise  $I$ , ( $r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \dots \leq r_n$ ). Thus  $\Omega$  is a cyclic vector for the von-Neumann algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  generated by  $\{j_r^f(x), r \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \mathcal{A}_0\}$ . From (2.4) we also conclude that  $S_t X S_t^* \in \mathcal{A}$  whenever  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  and thus we can set a family of automorphism  $(\alpha_t)$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  defined by

$$\alpha_t(X) = S_t X S_t^*$$

Since  $\Omega$  is an invariant element for  $(S_t)$ ,  $\phi$  is an invariant state for  $(\alpha_t)$ . Now our aim is to show that the reversible system  $(\mathcal{A}, \alpha_t, \phi)$  satisfies (1.1) with  $j_0$  as defined in (2.4), for a suitable choice of  $\mathbb{E}_{0j}$ . To that end, for any element  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{M}$ , we verify by the relation  $\langle \underline{y}, F_{tj} \underline{x} \rangle = \langle \underline{y}, \underline{x} \rangle$  for all  $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{M}_{tj}$  that

$$(F_{tj} \underline{x})_r = \begin{cases} x_r, & \text{if } r < t; \\ \tau_{r_k-t}(\dots \tau_{r_{n-1}-r_{n-2}}(\tau_{r_n-r_{n-1}}(x_{r_n}) x_{r_{n-1}}) \dots x_t), & \text{if } r = t \\ I, & \text{if } r > t \end{cases}$$

where  $r_1 \leq \dots \leq r_k \leq t \leq \dots \leq r_n$  is the support of  $\underline{x}$ . We also claim that

$$F_{s[j]} j_t^f(x) F_{s[j]} = j_s^f(\tau_{t-s}(x)) \quad \forall s \leq t. \quad (2.5)$$

For that purpose we choose any two elements  $\underline{y}, \underline{y}' \in \lambda(\mathcal{M}_{s[j]})$  and check the following steps with the aid of (2.2):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \underline{y}, F_{s[j]} j_t^f(x) F_{s[j]} \underline{y}' \rangle &= \langle \underline{y}, i_t(x) \underline{y}' \rangle \\ &= \langle \underline{y}, i_s(\tau_{t-s}(x)) \underline{y}' \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\lambda(\mathcal{M}_{s[j]})$  spans  $\mathcal{H}_{s[j]}$  it complete the proof of our claim.

We also verify that  $\langle z, V_+^* j_t^f(x) V_+ y \rangle_{\phi_0} = \phi_0(z^* \tau_t(x) y)$ , hence

$$V_+^* j_t^f(x) V_+ = \tau_t(x), \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (2.6)$$

We summarize this construction in the following theorem.

**THEOREM 2.1:** There exists a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and a group of unitary operators  $(S_t)$  with an invariant vector  $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$  so that

$$F_t^0 = V_+^* S_t V_+, \quad t \geq 0$$

and a triplet  $(\mathcal{A}, \alpha_t, \phi)$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}$  so that the diagram (1.1) commutes with the injective  $*$  homomorphism  $j_0^f$  as described in (2.3) and the completely positive map  $\mathbb{E}_0(X) = V_+^* X V_+$ .

### 3 Asymptotic behavior of the stationary weak Markov process and the shift :

In this section we investigate how various properties ( ergodicity, weak mixing, strong mixing, etc ) of the system  $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$  is canonically related to that of the minimal Markov shift  $(\mathcal{H}, S_t, F_{tj})$ . To that end we first introduce the following definition.

An element  $y \in \mathcal{A}_0$  is said to be **invariant** for  $(\tau_t)$  if  $\tau_t(y) = y$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Thus any scaler multiple of the identity is an invariant element. We say  $(\tau_t)$  is **irreducible** if  $\tau_t(p) = p$ ,  $t \geq 0$  for a projection  $p \in \mathcal{A}_0$  implies that  $p = 0$  or  $I$ .

For each fixed  $t \geq 0$ , following Evans [Ev], we define -conjugate linear maps  $D_t : \mathcal{A}_0 \times \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_0$  by  $D_t(y, y') = \tau_t(y^*y') - \tau_t(y^*)\tau_t(y')$ . Complete positiveness ( in fact 2-positive is enough ) of the map  $\tau_t$  and  $\tau_t(I) = I$  ensures that

$$\tau_t(y^*)\tau_t(y) \leq \tau_t(y^*y) \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{A}_0. \quad (3.1)$$

Thus (3.1) guarantees that  $D_t$  is a non-negative -conjugate linear form and a simple consequence of Cauchy-Schwartz inequality says that for all  $y' \in \mathcal{A}_0$ ,  $D_t(y, y') = 0$  whenever  $D_t(y, y) = 0$ . Now we conclude that  $\tau_t(y^*y) = y^*y$  and  $\tau_t(y) = y$  if and only if  $\tau_t(y'y) = \tau_t(y')y$  for all  $y' \in \mathcal{A}_0$ . The last statement in particular implies that

$$\mathcal{N} = \{y : \tau_t(y) = y, \tau_t(y^*y) = y^*y, \tau_t(yy^*) = yy^*, t \geq 0\} \quad (3.2)$$

is a \*-subalgebra and for any projection  $p \in \mathcal{N}$ ,  $\tau_t(px) = p\tau_t(x)$ . An element  $p \in \mathcal{N}$  is said to be irreducible if there is no projection  $q \in \mathcal{N}$  such that  $0 < q < p$ . The following proposition is a simplification of Evan's [Ev] original work.

**PROPOSITION 3.1** [Ev]:  $(\tau_t)$  is irreducible if and only if  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{I}$ .

**PROOF** : We show the non-trivial part of the proposition. Let  $y \in \mathcal{N}$ . Without loss of generality we assume that  $y^* = y$ . From the relation  $\tau_t(y'y) = \tau_t(y')y \quad \forall y' \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , we first note that  $\tau_t(y^n) = y^n$  for all  $n \geq 1$  (by induction). Since  $\tau_t$  is a contraction on  $\mathcal{A}_0$  we get  $\tau_t(\psi(y)) = \psi(y)$  for all bounded continuous real valued functions on  $\mathbb{R}$ . For a bounded Borel measurable function  $\psi$  we choose two family  $\psi_n, \psi'_n$  of bounded continuous functions so that  $\psi_n, \psi'_n \rightarrow \psi$  pointwise and  $\psi_n \leq \psi \leq \psi'_n$ . By positiveness of  $\tau_t$  we have  $\psi_n(y) \leq \tau_t(\psi(y)) \leq \psi'_n(y)$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Taking limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$  we conclude that  $\tau_t(\psi(y)) = \psi(y)$  for all Borel measurable functions  $\psi$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Since all invariant projections are either 0 or 1, we conclude that the spectral family of  $y$  are trivial. Hence  $y$  is a constant multiple of the identity. ■

$\tau_t$  is said to be *normal* if for each  $t \geq 0$  the map  $y \rightarrow \tau_t(y)$  is *normal* , i.e. for any increasing net  $y_\alpha$ ,  $\tau_t(\text{lub } y_\alpha) = \text{lub } \tau_t(y_\alpha)$ , where *lub* denotes the least upper bound. In such a case it is simple to check that  $\mathcal{N}$  is  $\sigma$ -strong closed and thus  $\mathcal{N}$  is a von-Neumann algebra. A normal Markov  $(\tau_t, t \geq 0)$  semigroup on  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is said to be *weak\** continuous if for each fixed  $y \in \mathcal{A}_0$  the map  $t \rightarrow \tau_t(y)$  is continuous

with respect to the  $\sigma$ -weak topology. In such a case there exists a unique contractive semigroup  $(\sigma_t)$  on the Banach space of equivalence class of the trace class operators such that  $\text{tr}(\sigma_t(\rho)x) = \text{tr}(\rho\tau_t(x)) \forall t \geq 0, x \in \mathcal{A}_0, \rho \in (\mathcal{A}_0)_*$ . Now onwards we always assume  $(\tau_t)$  is weak\* continuous. At this point we note that unlike strong continuity on a Banach space, weak\* continuity need not imply that the map  $(t, y) \rightarrow \tau_t(y)$  is jointly continuous, however the map is sequentially jointly continuous i.e.  $t_n \rightarrow t$  and  $y_n \rightarrow y$  in the weak\* topology then  $\tau_{t_n}(y_n) \rightarrow \tau_t(y)$  in the weak\* topology [AcM1], which serves our purpose for this exposition.

A normal state  $\phi_0$  is said to be *invariant* for  $(\tau_t)$  if  $\sigma_t(\phi_0) = \phi_0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . It is well known that any Markov semigroup on a finite dimensional  $\mathcal{A}_0$  admits an invariant normal state. However for an infinite dimensional algebra  $\mathcal{A}_0$ , a dynamical system may not admit an invariant normal state. Thus it remains an interesting open problem how to determine whether a given dynamical system admits a normal invariant state. In a series of papers, Fagnola and Rebolledo [FR1,FR2] addressed this problem when  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_0)$  and found a sufficient condition which guarantees existence of an invariant normal state. In the following we also propose a simple criteria for existence of an invariant normal state which seems to be another sufficient condition for existence of an invariant normal state.

**PROPOSITION 3.2 :** Let for a  $\lambda > 0$ , the resolvent  $(R_\lambda)(\rho) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} \sigma_t(\rho) dt$  be a compact operator on the Banach space  $\mathcal{A}_{0*}$ . Then  $(\tau_t)$  admits a normal invariant state.

**PROOF:** We fix any normal state  $\phi$  on  $\mathcal{A}_0$ . Note that the family  $\rho(t) = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \sigma_s(\rho) ds : t \geq 0$  is uniformly bounded. Thus by compactness of the resolvent we infer that for any sequence  $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ , there exists a subsequence  $t_{n_k}$  so that  $R_\lambda(\rho(t_{n_k}))$  converges in the Banach space norm topology. Now we use the fact that  $R_\lambda$  commutes with  $(\sigma_t)$  to conclude that the limiting state is an invariant state for  $(\sigma_t)$ . ■

If  $(\tau_t)$  admits an invariant faithful state, it follows from (3.1) that  $x^*x$  is an invariant element if  $x$  is so. Thus in such a case  $\mathcal{N} = \{x \in \mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t(x) = x, t \geq 0\}$  and there exists a norm one projection  $E$  on  $\mathcal{N}$  so that weak\* limit  $\lambda \rightarrow 0 \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} \tau_t(x) dt = E(x) \forall x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ . For more details we refer to Frigerio [Fr1]. In a recent paper Fagnola and Rebolledo [FR3], investigated when an invariant normal state is faithful. In the following we review their work and aim to prove an ergodic theorem for normal invariant state.

Following [FR3] we now say a positive  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$  is *sub-harmonic* for  $(\tau_t)$  if  $\tau_t(x) \geq x \forall t \geq 0$ . In such a case  $\tau_t(x)$  is an increasing positive operator with  $\tau_t(x) \leq \|x\|1$ , thus the strong limit  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tau_t(x)$  exists and the limit is an invariant element for  $(\tau_t)$ . In the following we list few crucial property of sub-harmonic projection.

**PROPOSITION 3.3:** Let  $p$  be a sub-harmonic projection for  $(\tau_t)$ . Then the following hold:



- (a) for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $p\tau_t(p) = \tau_t(p)p = p$ .  
 (b)  $\tau_t(x(1-p))p = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ ,  $t \geq 0$ .

**PROOF:** For a quick verification for (a) we note that  $p\tau_t(p)p \geq p$  and also  $p(1-\tau_t(p))p \geq 0$ . Thus we have  $p(1-\tau_t(p))p = p$ . Since  $1-\tau_t(p) \geq 0$  we have  $(1-\tau_t(p))p = 0$ . For (b) we consider the non-negative conjugate bilinear form  $\psi(x_1^*\tau_t(x_2^*y_2)y_1)$  for a positive normal state and use once more Cauchy-Schwartz in-equality to conclude that  $\psi(x_1^*\tau_t((x_2^*(1-p))p)) = 0$  for any  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{A}_0$  and  $t \geq 0$ . ■

For a projection  $p$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_0^p = p\mathcal{A}_0p$  is a von-Neumann acting on the Hilbert subspace  $p\mathcal{H}_0$ . Thus for a sub-harmonic projection  $p$  we verify by Proposition 3.3 that  $(\tau_t^p)$  defined by  $\tau_t^p(x) = p\tau_t(x)p$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0^p$  is a Markov semigroup. Let the strong limit  $\tau_t(p) \uparrow y$  as  $t \uparrow \infty$ . By Proposition 3.3. (a) we have  $py = yp = p$ ,  $p \leq y \leq 1$  and  $\tau_t(y) = y \forall t \geq 0$ . Thus  $p\tau_t(1-y^2)p = p\tau_t(p(1-y^2)p)p = 0$ . So we also have  $p\tau_t(y^2) = \tau_t(y^2)p = p$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Since  $\tau_t(p) \leq \tau_t(y^2) \leq \tau_t(y) = y$ , the strong limit of  $\tau_t(y^2)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  is also  $y$ . In case  $y^2$  is also an invariant element for  $(\tau_t)$ , we have  $y^2 = y$ . In general  $y^2$  need not be an invariant element even for an irreducible classical Markov semigroup  $(\tau_t)$ . In general  $y^2$  need not be an invariant element even for an irreducible  $(\tau_t)$ . We give a simple counter example in classical Markov chain in the following. Consider three state discrete time Markov chain where two of its states are absorbing and third state is a transient one with equal transition probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  to those two absorbing state. The chain is irreducible in the sense of [Ev]. Indicator function of an absorbing state is a sub-harmonic function for which  $y = (1, 0, \frac{1}{2})$  or  $y = (0, 1, \frac{1}{2})$  depending on which indicator function we have taken as  $p$ .

**PROPOSITION 3.4:** Let  $p$  be a sub-normal projection and  $y = \text{s.lim} \tau_t(p)$ . Then for any  $z \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_0)$  the following statements are equivalent:

- (a)  $yz = 0$   
 (b)  $\tau_t(p)z = 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

**PROOF:** That (b) implies (a) is obvious. For the converse, note that  $z^*\tau_t(p)z \leq zyz = 0$  by (a), hence (c) follows. ■

In case  $(\tau_t)$  is the semigroup associated with a quantum mechanical Fokker-Planck equation (see the last section), we will explore this explicit criteria further. In the following we will investigate its implication. In case  $y = 1$  by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality  $|\psi(\tau_t((1-p)x))|^2 \leq \psi(\tau_t(1-p)\tau_t(1-p))\psi(x^*x)$  for a normal state  $\psi$ , we conclude that  $\tau_t((1-p)x) \rightarrow 0$  in the weak\* topology as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ .

We recall an interesting result from Fagnola-Rebolledo [FR3] in the following proposition.

**PROPOSITION 3.5 :**[FR3] Let  $\phi_0$  be an invariant normal state on  $\mathcal{A}_0$ . Let  $p$  be the support of  $\phi_0$ . Then  $p$  is sub-harmonic.

**PROOF :** Since  $\phi_0(p(1-\tau_t(p))p) = 1 - 1 = 0$  and  $p$  is the minimal projection we

have  $p(1 - \tau_t(p))p = 0$ . Since  $1 - \tau_t(p) \geq 0$ , we conclude that  $(1 - \tau_t(p))p = 0$ . Hence  $\tau_t(p) = p + p^\perp \tau_t(p) p^\perp \geq p$ . ■

The following result shows that faithfulness of the normal invariant state can be removed for an von-Neumann-Frigerio type of ergodic theorem.

**THEOREM 3.6:** Let  $\phi_0$  be an invariant normal state for  $(\tau_t)$  which has support  $p$  so that the strong limit  $\uparrow \tau_t(p) = 1$  as  $t \uparrow \infty$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (a)  $\{pxp : p\tau_t(pxp)p = pxp\} = \{zp : z \in \mathcal{C}\}$
- (b) for all  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ ,  $\lambda \int e^{-\lambda t} p\tau_t(pxp)p \rightarrow \phi_0(x)p$  in the weak\* topology as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ .
- (c) for all  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ ,  $\lambda \int e^{-\lambda t} \tau_t(x) dt \rightarrow \phi_0(x)1$  in the weak\* topology as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ .

**PROOF:** Since  $\phi_0$  restricted to  $\mathcal{A}_0^p$  is faithful, equivalence of (a) and (b) follows by Theorem 2.1 in [Fr1]. That (c) implies (b) is trivial. We are left to show that (c) implies (b). Since  $\tau_t((1 - p)x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , we need to verify (c) for elements in  $\mathcal{A}_0^p$  only. To that end first note that  $\tau_{t+s}(pxp) = \tau_t(p\tau_s(pxp)p) + \tau_t(p\tau_s(pxp)p^\perp) + \tau_t(p^\perp\tau_s(pxp)p) + \tau_t(p^\perp\tau_s(pxp)p^\perp)$  and  $\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} |\psi(\lambda \int e^{-\lambda s} \tau_{t+s}(x) ds)|$  is independent of  $t$  that we choose. On the other hand  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} |\psi(\tau_t(z\lambda R_\lambda(pxp)p^\perp))| \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|x\| \|z\| |\psi(\tau_t(p^\perp))|$  is zero for any  $z \in \mathcal{A}_0$ . Hence (c) follows once we use (b) for  $pxp$  with  $\phi_0(x) = 0$ . The general result follows once we verify  $\lambda \int e^{-\lambda t} \tau_t(p) dt \rightarrow 1$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$  by our hypothesis  $\tau_t(p) \rightarrow 1$ . ■

One more important point we note that for a sub-normal projection  $p$  for  $(\tau_t)$ , if the reduced dynamical system admits a normal invariant state  $\phi_0$  on  $\mathcal{A}_0^p$ , then we can extend (need not be unique) the state to be an invariant normal state for the entire dynamics by  $\phi_0(x) = \phi_0(pxp)$ . However in case  $\text{s.lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tau_t(p) = 1$  and the reduced dynamics  $(\tau_t^p)$  admits a faithful normal ergodic state then the extension to  $\mathcal{A}$  is unique. The conditions  $\tau_t(p) \uparrow 1$  is also necessary for ergodicity for the entire system.

Now we fix a normal Markov semigroup  $(\tau_t)$  on  $\mathcal{A}_0$  which admits a normal invariant state and consider the Markov shift  $(S_t)$  constructed on the minimal Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  in Section 2.  $(S_t)$  is strongly continuous once  $(\tau_t)$  is continuous in the weak\* topology. Converse is also true provided  $\phi_0$  is faithful. For details we refer to [AcM2].

**PROPOSITION 3.7:** [AcM2] Let  $(\tau_t)$  be weak\* continuous with a normal invariant state  $\phi_0$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (a)  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int e^{-\lambda t} \phi_0(y\tau_t(x)) dt = \phi_0(x)1$  for all  $x$  and  $y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ ;
- (b)  $(S_t)$  is ergodic, i.e.  $\{f : S_t f = f \forall t \in \mathbb{R}\} = \mathcal{C}\Omega$ .

*PROOF:* We refer once more to [AcM2] for a proof.

We recall few more results from [AcM2] in the following proposition:

**PROPOSITION 3.8:** Let  $(\tau_t)$  be  $\sigma$ - weakly continuous dynamical semigroup with a normal invariant state  $\phi_0$  and  $(\mathcal{H}, S_t)$  is the minimal Markov shift.

(i) The following statements are equivalent:

(a) For all  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T | \langle h_1, S_t h_2 \rangle - \langle h_1, \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega, h_2 \rangle | dt = 0$ ;

(b) The spectrum of  $(S_t)$  in the orthocomplement of  $\mathcal{L}\Omega$  is continuous.

(c) For all  $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ ,  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T | \phi_0(x\tau_t(y)) - \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y) | dt = 0$ ;

(ii) The following statements are equivalent:

(d) For all  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle h_1, S_t h_2 \rangle = \langle h_1, \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega, h_2 \rangle$ ;

(e) For all  $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi_0(x\tau_t(y)) = \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y)$ .

(f) For any  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , weak\* limit of  $j_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

**PROOF:** For the proof once more we refer to [AcM2].

We say  $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$  is **weak mixing** if (a) holds and **strong mixing** if (d) holds. It is obvious that weak mixing implies ergodicity and strong mixing implies weak mixing. A simple consequence of the spectral theorem and Riemann-Lebesgue lemma implies strong mixing whenever the spectrum of  $(S_t)$  in the orthocomplement of  $\mathcal{L}\Omega$  is absolutely continuous. In general, it is rather hard to find a useful criteria for absolute continuity of the spectrum in the orthocomplement of  $\mathcal{L}\Omega$ . On the other hand, it is still not clear even in the classical case whether, this is also necessary [Pa]. At this point we also note that if  $\phi_0$  is also faithful, strong mixing guarantees that weak\* limit of  $\tau_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ . We postpone this issue now.

Since  $F_{[t]} = j_t(I)$ ,  $I - F_{[t]} \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $(I - F_{[t]})\Omega = 0$ , and thus  $\Omega$  is not a separating vector for  $\mathcal{A}$  even if  $\phi_0$  is so. So the support of the state  $\phi$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  is a proper projection  $P_\phi \in \mathcal{A}$  defined by

$$P_\phi = [\mathcal{A}'\Omega]$$

where  $\mathcal{A}'$  is the commutant of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since  $(\alpha_t)$  preserves  $\mathcal{A}$ , we check also that  $(\alpha_t)$  preserves  $\mathcal{A}'$  and thus  $P_\phi$  is an invariant element for  $\alpha_t$ . Since  $F_{[t]}\Omega = \Omega$  and  $F_{[t]} \in \mathcal{A}$ , we check also that  $P_\phi F_{[t]} X' \Omega = F_{[t]} P_\phi X' \Omega = X' \Omega$ . In other-words  $P_\phi F_{[t]} = F_{[t]} P_\phi = P_\phi$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Motivated by the well known notion, **Kolmogorov shift**, in ergodic theory, we introduce the following notion.

We say the minimal forward weak Markov process  $(\mathcal{H}, j_t, F_{[t]}, S_t, \Omega)$  associated with  $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$  is having **Kolmogorov's property** on  $\mathcal{H}$  if  $\bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} F_{[t]} = \mathcal{L}\Omega$ . It is obvious that Kolmogorov's property implies that  $P_\phi = |\Omega \rangle \langle \Omega|$ . In such a case  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ . The following important proposition gives a criteria for Kolmogorov's property.

**THEOREM 3.9:**  $F_{[t]} \rightarrow |\Omega \rangle \langle \Omega|$  as  $t \rightarrow -\infty$  if and only if

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi_0(\tau_t(x)\tau_t(y)) = \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y) \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0.$$

In such a case the following hold:

(a)  $j_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x) |\Omega \rangle \langle \Omega| \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{A}_0$  in the weak\* topology as  $t \rightarrow -\infty$ .

(b)  $\alpha_t(X) \rightarrow \phi(X)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  in the weak\* topology as  $t \rightarrow -\infty$  for all  $X \in \bigcup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{A}_s$ .

**PROOF:** We need to show that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} F_{[t]} = |\Omega \rangle \langle \Omega|$  if and only if  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi_0(\tau_t(x)\tau_t(y)) = \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y) \forall x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ . Since the family  $F_{[t]}$  is uniformly norm bounded,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} F_{[t]} = |\Omega \rangle \langle \Omega|$  if and only if

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \langle \underline{x}, F_{[t]} \underline{y} \rangle = \langle \underline{x}, \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega, \underline{y} \rangle .$$

The result follows once we note that for any fix  $\underline{x}, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{H}$  if  $t \leq r_1, r'_1$ , where  $r_1, r'_1$  are the lowest support of  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$  respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \underline{x}, F_{[t]} \underline{y} \rangle &= \langle F_{[t]} \underline{x}, F_{[t]} \underline{y} \rangle \\ &= \phi_0[(\tau_{r_1-t}(\dots \tau_{r_{n-1}-r_{n-2}}(\tau_{r_n-r_{n-1}}(x_{r_n})x_{r_{n-1}})\dots x_{r_1}))^* \\ &\quad \tau_{r'_1-t}(\dots \tau_{r'_{m-1}-r'_{m-2}}(\tau_{r'_m-r'_{m-1}}(y_{r'_m})y_{r'_{m-1}})\dots y_{r'_1})] \end{aligned}$$

For (a) we also note that  $\langle \underline{x}, j_t(z) \underline{y} \rangle$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \phi_0[(\tau_{r_1-t}(\dots \tau_{r_{n-1}-r_{n-2}}(\tau_{r_n-r_{n-1}}(x_{r_n})x_{r_{n-1}})\dots x_{r_1}))^* \\ &\quad z \tau_{r'_1-t}(\dots \tau_{r'_{m-1}-r'_{m-2}}(\tau_{r'_m-r'_{m-1}}(y_{r'_m})y_{r'_{m-1}})\dots y_{r'_1})] \end{aligned}$$

and for any  $x, y, z \in \mathcal{A}_0$   $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)z\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(z)\phi_0(y)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . For (b) we claim that  $\bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{A}_{[s]}$  is von-Neumann algebra generated by  $|\Omega \rangle \langle \Omega|$ . Our claim follows since for any such  $X$  we have  $F_{[t]} X F_{[t]} = X$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Thus by taking limit  $t \rightarrow -\infty$  we have  $X = \phi(X) |\Omega \rangle \langle \Omega|$ . We recall that for any  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$   $\alpha_t(\mathcal{A}_{[s]}) = \mathcal{A}_{[s+t]}$ . Hence once we fix any  $X \in \mathcal{A}_s$  by weak\* compactness of the unit ball in  $\mathcal{A}$  we conclude that the limit points as  $t$  diverges to  $\infty$  is equal to  $\phi(X) |\Omega \rangle \langle \Omega|$ . Since the limit point is uniquely determined, the result follows. This complete the proof  $\blacksquare$

One interesting feature appears in Theorem 3.8 that the two point correlation  $\phi(\alpha_t(X)Y) \rightarrow \phi(X)\phi(Y)$  as long as  $Y$  is an element in one of the local von-Neumann algebras. This asymptotic abelianess holds good to the  $C^*$  algebra completion of the  $*$  algebra  $\bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{A}_{[t]}$ . Since  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  and spectrum of  $H$  contains  $\mathbb{R}$  we conclude that the  $C^*$  algebra is strictly contained in  $\mathcal{A}$  and asymptotic abelianess do not hold for  $\mathcal{A}$ .

By polarization identity, we check that  $(\tau_t)$  is a K-shift if and only if  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|P_t^0 x\| = \phi_0(\tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x)) \rightarrow 0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$  such that  $\phi_0(x) = 0$ . Before we start investigating this criteria further we note once more by Cauchy-Schwartz in-equality that  $(\tau_t)$  is strong mixing and  $\{x \in \mathcal{A}_0 : \tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) = \tau_t(x^*x), \forall t \geq 0\}$  is trivial i.e.  $\{\lambda 1, \lambda \in \mathcal{C}\}$  whenever  $(\mathcal{H}, F_{[t]}, S_t)$  is a K-shift.

The following result shows why we need infinite dimensional Hilbert space in order to construct a strong mixing dynamical system which is not a K-shift.

**COROLLARY 3.10:** Let the resolvent  $R_\lambda = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} P_t dt, \lambda > 0$ , be a compact operator for some  $\lambda > 0$ . Then strong mixing Markov shift is also a K-shift.

Now inspired by Frigerio's seminal paper [Fr1], we revisit his work and find a sufficient condition for strong mixing. We set

$$\mathcal{F} = \{x : \tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) = \tau_t(x^*x); \tau_t(x)\tau_t(x^*) = \tau_t(xx^*), \forall t \geq 0\} \quad (3.3)$$

We claim that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a von-Neumann sub-algebra. To that end first we note by 2-positive  $((\tau_t(x_i^*x_j))) \geq ((\tau_t(x_i^*)\tau_t(x_j)))$  where  $x_i : i = 1, 2$  are any elements in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Thus for any  $t \geq 0$ , by choosing  $x_1 = x$  and  $x_2 = y$  we conclude that

$$\tau_t(x^*y) = \tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(y) \text{ whenever } \tau_t(x^*x) = \tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) \quad (3.4)$$

Now it is a routine work to check that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a linear space and a  $*$ -algebra. That it is a von-Neumann algebra follows by the normality of  $(\tau_t)$  and (3.4).

**PROPOSITION 3.11:** [Fr1] Let  $\phi_0$  be a faithful normal invariant state for  $(\tau_t)$ . If  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{F}$  then  $\text{weak}^* - \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tau_t(x) = E(x) \forall x \in \mathcal{A}$ , where  $E$  is the unique norm one projection on  $\mathcal{N}$ .

**PROOF :** For any  $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi_0(D_t(x, y)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle x\omega, (I - P_t^*P_t)y\omega \rangle = \langle x\omega, Qy\omega \rangle$ , where  $Q = s - \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} I - P_t^*P_t$ . Thus  $\phi_0(D_t(\tau_s(x), \tau_s(y)) = \phi_0(D_s(x, y)) - \phi_0(D_{s+t}(x, y)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ . By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we conclude that  $|\phi_0(D_t(\tau_s(x), y))|^2 \leq \phi_0(D_t(\tau_s(x), \tau_s(x)))\phi_0(D_t(y, y)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus for any weak\* limit point  $x_\infty$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$  of the norm bounded net  $\{\tau_s(x)\}_s$ , we have  $D_t(x_\infty, x_\infty) = 0$ . Since  $x_\infty^*$  is also a limit point of the norm bounded net  $\{\tau_s(x^*)\}_s$ , we conclude that  $D_t(x_\infty^*, x_\infty^*) = 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Thus  $x_\infty \in \mathcal{F}$ . Since  $E$  is a norm one projection on  $\mathcal{N}$ , we have  $\tau_s(x) = E(x) + (I - E)(\tau_s(x)) \forall s \geq 0$ . Thus any limiting point  $x_\infty$  satisfies  $x_\infty = E(x) + (I - E)(x_\infty)$ . If  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{F}$ ,  $(I - E)(x_\infty) = 0$ , so  $x_\infty = E(x)$ , which is uniquely determined. Since this holds for any weak\* limit point, the result follows by weak\* compactness of the unit ball of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

The following theorem suggest that we can have steady state which need not be faithful.

**THEOREM 3.12:** Let  $\phi_0$  be a normal invariant state for  $(\tau_t)$  and  $p$  be the support projection for  $\phi_0$  so that the strong limit of  $\tau_t(p) \uparrow 1$  as  $t \uparrow \infty$ . Then the following are equivalent:

- (a)  $\{pxp : p\tau_t(px^*p)p\tau_t(pxp)p = p\tau_t(px^*pxp)p, t \geq 0\} = \{\lambda p : \lambda \in \mathcal{C}\}$
- (b) for all  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ ,  $\tau_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)1$  in the weak\* topology.

**PROOF:** Since  $\tau_t((1 - p)x) \rightarrow 0$  in the weak\* topology, it is good enough if we verify that (a) is equivalent to  $\tau_t(pxp) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)1$  in the weak\* topology as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . To that end we first note that  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \psi(\tau_{s+t}(x))$  is independent of  $s \geq 0$  we choose. On the other hand we write  $\tau_{s+t}(pxp) = \tau_s(p\tau_t(pxp)p) + \tau_s(p\tau_t(pxp)p^\perp) + \tau_t(p^\perp\tau_s(pxp)p) + \tau_s(p^\perp\tau_t(pxp)p^\perp)$  and use the fact for any normal state  $\psi$  we have  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} |\psi(\tau_s(z\tau_t(pxp)p))| \leq \|x\| \|z\| |\psi(\tau_s(p))|$  for all  $z, x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ . Thus by our hypothesis on the support and Proposition 3.11 we conclude that

$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} |\psi(\tau_t(pxp))| = 0$  for all  $x$  for which  $\phi_0(x) = 0$ . For the general case, we use the identity  $\psi(\tau_t(pxp)) = \psi(\tau_t(p(x - \phi_0(x))p) + \phi_0(x)\psi(\tau_t(p))$  and our hypothesis  $\tau_t(p) \uparrow 1$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . ■

## 4 Time reverse weak Markov process and Quantum detailed balance :

Following [AcM], we will consider the time reverse process associated with the KMS-adjoint ( Or Petz adjoint ) quantum dynamical semigroup  $(\mathcal{A}, \tilde{\tau}_t, \phi_0)$ . We aim to investigate how far various properties of the dynamical semigroup are time reversible. First we recall from [AcM] time reverse process associated with the KMS-adjoint (Petz-adjoint ) semigroup in the following paragraph.

Let  $\phi_0$  be a faithful state and without loss of generality let also  $(\mathcal{A}_0, \phi_0)$  be in the standard form  $(\mathcal{A}_0, J, \mathcal{P}, \omega_0)$  [BrR] where  $\omega_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0$ , a cyclic and separating vector for  $\mathcal{A}_0$ , so that  $\phi_0(x) = \langle \omega_0, x\omega_0 \rangle$  and the closer of the close-able operator  $S_0 : x\omega_0 \rightarrow x^*\omega_0$ ,  $S$  possesses a polar decomposition  $S = J\Delta^{1/2}$  with the self-dual positive cone  $\mathcal{P}$  as the closure of  $\{JxJx\omega_0 : x \in \mathcal{A}_0\}$  in  $\mathcal{H}_0$ . Tomita's [BrR] theorem says that  $\Delta^{it}\mathcal{A}_0\Delta^{-it} = \mathcal{A}_0$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $J\mathcal{A}_0J = \mathcal{A}'_0$ , where  $\mathcal{A}'_0$  is the commutant of  $\mathcal{A}_0$ . We define the modular automorphism group  $\sigma = (\sigma_t, t \in \mathbb{R})$  on  $\mathcal{A}_0$  by

$$\sigma_t(x) = \Delta^{it}x\Delta^{-it}.$$

Furthermore for any normal state  $\psi$  on  $\mathcal{A}_0$  there exists a unique vector  $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}$  so that  $\psi(x) = \langle \zeta, x\zeta \rangle$ .

We consider the unique Markov semigroup  $(\tau'_t)$  on the commutant  $\mathcal{A}'_0$  of  $\mathcal{A}_0$  so that  $\phi(\tau_t(x)y) = \phi(x\tau'_t(y))$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$  and  $y \in \mathcal{A}'_0$ . We define weak\* continuous Markov semigroup  $(\tilde{\tau}_t)$  on  $\mathcal{A}_0$  by  $\tilde{\tau}_t(x) = J\tau'_t(JxJ)J$ . Thus we have the following adjoint relation

$$\phi_0(\sigma_{1/2}(x)\tau_t(y)) = \phi_0(\tilde{\tau}_t(x)\sigma_{-1/2}(y)) \quad (4.1)$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , analytic elements for  $(\sigma_t)$ . One can as well describe the adjoint semigroup as Hilbert space adjoint of a one parameter contractive semigroup  $(P_t)$  on a Hilbert space defined by  $P_t : \Delta^{1/4}x\omega_0 = \Delta^{1/4}\tau_t(x)\omega_0$ . For more details we refer to [Ci].

Once  $\phi_0$  is also faithful, there exists also a unique backward weak Markov process  $(j_t^b)$  which generalizes Tomita's representation and a family of projections  $F_t : t \in \mathbb{R}$  so that

$$F_{[s}j_t^b(x)F_{[s} = j_s^b(\tilde{\tau}_{s-t}(x))$$

for  $-\infty < t \leq s < \infty$ . For more details and the following result we refer to [AcM].

**THEOREM 4.1:** [AcM] We consider the weak Markov processes  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{H}, F_t, F_t, S_t, j_t^f, j_t^b, t \in \mathbb{R}, \Omega)$  associated with  $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, t \geq 0, \phi_0)$

and the weak Markov processes  $(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}, \tilde{F}_{[t]}, \tilde{F}_{[t]}, \tilde{S}_t, \tilde{j}_t^f, \tilde{j}_t^b, t \in \mathbb{R}, \tilde{\Omega})$  associated with  $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tilde{\tau}_t, t \geq 0, \phi_0)$ . There exists a unique anti-unitary operator  $U_0 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  so that

- (a)  $U_0\Omega = \tilde{\Omega}$ ;
- (b)  $U_0S_tU_0^* = \tilde{S}_{-t}$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ;
- (c)  $U_0j_t^f(x)U_0 = \tilde{j}_{-t}^b(x)$ ,  $U_0J_t^b(x)U_0 = \tilde{j}_{-t}^f(x)$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ;
- (d)  $U_0F_{[t]}U_0^* = \tilde{F}_{[-t]}$ ,  $U_0F_{[t]}U_0^* = \tilde{F}_{[-t]}$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ;

A simple corollary of Theorem 4.1 is the following result.

**COROLLARY 4.2:**  $(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}, \tilde{S}_t, \tilde{F}_{[t]})$  is a K-shift if and only if  $\phi_0(\tilde{\tau}_t(x)\tilde{\tau}_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . In other words  $\cap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} F_{[t]} = |\Omega \rangle \langle \Omega|$  if and only if  $\phi_0(\tilde{\tau}_t(x)\tilde{\tau}_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

So it is now simple to verify directly by Theorem 4.1 that ergodicity, weak-mixing, strong mixing are time reversible. It is not very transparent whether the same fact holds also for K-shift property. In the classical case [Pa] this property is well known to be equivalent to strictly positive *dynamical entropy*  $h(\theta, \zeta)$  of the shift  $\theta$  for any non-trivial partition  $\zeta$  of the measure space. Since  $h(\theta, \zeta) = h(\theta^{-1}, \zeta)$  we conclude that K-shift property is also time reversible. However such a notion and result in the general case is still missing [OhP]. We conjecture the following.

**CONJECTURE 4.3:**  $\cap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} F_{[t]} = |\Omega \rangle \langle \Omega|$  if and only if  $\cap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} F_{[t]} = |\Omega \rangle \langle \Omega|$ .

We will verify this conjecture with an affirmative answer when  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_0)$ , algebra of all bounded operators, more general case will include type-I von-Neumann algebra with center completely atomic.

Before we proceed we find an alternative criteria for strong mixing in the following theorem. To that end we introduce  $\mathcal{G} = \{x \in \mathcal{A}_0 : \tilde{\tau}_t\tau_t(x) = x, t \geq 0\}$ .

**THEOREM 4.4:** Let  $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$  is a quantum dynamical system with  $\phi_0$ , a faithful normal invariant state for  $(\tau_t)$ . If  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{G}$  then weak\* limit  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tau_t(x) = E(x)$ .

**PROOF :** In spirit proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.8. We consider the bi-linear form  $d_t(x, y) = \phi_0(x^*JyJ) - \phi_0(\tau_t(x^*)J\tau_t(y)J)$   $t \geq 0$ . That  $d_t(x, x) \geq 0$  follows from the unital positive property of  $\tau_t$ . Also note that  $d_t(\tau_s(x), \tau_s(y)) = d_s(x, y) - d_{s+t}(x, y)$ . Thus  $d_t(x, x)$  is monotonically increasing and bounded above by  $\phi_0(Jx^*Jx)$ . So along the line of Proposition 3.8 we conclude that any weak\* limit point of the net  $\{\tau_t(x)\}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  will be an element say  $x_\infty$  satisfying  $d_t(x_\infty, x_\infty) = 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality  $d_t(x, x) = 0$  if and only if  $d_t(x, y) = 0$  for all  $y \in \mathcal{A}$  i.e.  $\phi_0(\tilde{\tau}_t\tau_t(x)JyJ) = \phi_0(xJyJ)$  for all  $y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ . Thus  $x_\infty \in \mathcal{G}$  which is same as  $\mathcal{N}$  by our hypothesis. Since  $\tau_t(x) = E(\tau_t(x)) + (I - E)(\tau_t(x))$  and  $E(\tau_t(x)) = \tau_t(E(x)) = E(x)$  we conclude that  $x_\infty = E(x)$ . Thus the result follows from weak\* compactness of the unit ball. ■

One natural question whether the sufficient condition in Theorem 4.4 is really different from Frigerio's criteria. By (3.1) we note that  $\|\tilde{\tau}_t\tau_t(x)\omega_0\| \leq \|\tau_t(x)\omega_0\|$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , thus  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ . Since  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{G}$  we conclude that Frigerio's condition  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{N}$  also guarantees that  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{N}$ . It is not clear whether the reverse inclusion is true. However, in case modular automorphism commutes with the Markov semigroup then [Fr2]  $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)\tau_t(y)) = \phi_0(x\tilde{\tau}_t\tau_t(y))$  for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , hence  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$ . Since strong mixing property is time reversible, we also get sufficient conditions  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{N}$  or  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = \mathcal{N}$  (note that  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}} = \mathcal{N}$ ) associated with the adjoint Markov semigroup  $(\tilde{\tau}_t)$  for strong mixing. Once more it is not resolved whether  $\mathcal{F} = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  or  $\mathcal{G} = \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ . However the following proposition indicates that they are essentially same. To that end we introduce  $\mathcal{G}_s = \{x : \tilde{\tau}_t(\tau_t(x)) = x, s \geq t \geq 0\}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_s = \{x : \tau_t(x^*)\tau_t(x) = \tau_t(x^*x), \tau_t(x)\tau_t(x^*) = \tau_t(xx^*), 0 \leq t \leq s\}$  for each  $s > 0$ .

**PROPOSITION 4.5:** For each  $0 < s$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_s = \mathcal{N}$  if and only if for each  $0 < s$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_s = \mathcal{N}$ . Same hold for  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**PROOF:** Since  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{G}_s$ , we only need to show  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_s \subset \mathcal{N}$  if  $\mathcal{G}_s = \mathcal{N}$  for each  $s > 0$ . So we fix  $s > 0$  and let  $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_s$ . So  $\tilde{\tau}_t\tau_t(x) = x$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq s$ . Hence  $\tau_t\tilde{\tau}_t(y) = y$  where  $y = \tau_t(x)$ . Since  $\phi_0(\tilde{\tau}_t(z)J\tilde{\tau}_t(z)J)$  is a monotonically decreasing function for any  $z \in \mathcal{A}_0$  we conclude that  $\phi_0(\tilde{\tau}_r(y)J\tilde{\tau}_r(y)) = \phi_0(yJyJ)$  for  $0 \leq r \leq t$ , thus we have  $\tau_t(x) \in \mathcal{G}_t$ . Thus we have  $\tau_t(x) \in \mathcal{N}$  for all  $t > 0$ . Now taking limit  $t \rightarrow 0$ , we conclude the required result. We omit the proof for  $\mathcal{F}$ . ■

**PROPOSITION 4.6:** Let  $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$  be a quantum dynamical semigroup with a faithful normal state  $\phi_0$ . Then  $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y) \forall x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  if and only if  $\phi_0(J\tau_t(x)J\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y) \forall x, y \in \mathcal{A}_0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

**PROOF:** Since  $J$  is an anti-unitary operator, in particular contraction, thus 'if part' is obvious. For the converse statement, first note that  $\Delta^{1/4}|\tau_t(x)\omega \rangle \rightarrow \phi_0(x)|\omega \rangle$  strongly as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Now we use the fact that  $\Delta$  is a closed operator to conclude that  $J\Delta^{1/2}|\tau_t(x)\omega \rangle \rightarrow \overline{\phi_0(x)}|\omega \rangle$  strongly as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . But  $J\Delta^{1/2}|x\omega \rangle = |x^*\omega \rangle$ , so the proof of the corollary is now completed. ■

**THEOREM 4.7:** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a von-Neumann algebra of type-I with center completely atomic. Then strong mixing and K-shift properties are equivalent. In such a case (in particular  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ ) the following statements are equivalent:

- (a) For any normal state  $\psi$ ,  $\psi\tau_t \rightarrow \phi_0$  strongly as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,
- (b)  $\mathcal{F}$  is trivial,
- (c)  $\{x \in \mathcal{A}_0 : \tilde{\tau}_t\tau_t(x) = x, t \geq 0\}$  is trivial.

**PROOF:** By Proposition 4.6 we only need to show that  $\phi_0(J\tau_t(x)J\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)\phi_0(y)$  for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  whenever it is mixing i.e.  $\tau_t(x) \rightarrow \phi_0(x)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  in the weak\* topology. Since any element can be expressed as linear combination of four non-negative elements, we assume without loss of generality that  $x \geq 0$  and  $\phi_0(x) = 1$ . For such a choice we note that  $\phi_t(y) = \phi_0(J\tau_t(x)Jy)$   $y \in \mathcal{A}$  is a normal



state on  $\mathcal{A}_0$  for each  $t \geq 0$ . By strong mixing  $\phi_t \rightarrow \phi_0$  weakly. Now we use our hypothesis that  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is type-I with center completely atomic to conclude by a theorem [De] that  $\|\phi_t - \phi_0\|_1 \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . The result follows from  $|(\phi_t - \phi_0)(\tau_t(y))| \leq \|\phi_t - \phi_0\|_1 \|y\|$ . The last part is now a simple consequence of Theorem 3.10 and Theorem 4.4 and Corollary 3.9.  $\blacksquare$

In the proof of Theorem 4.4 we checked that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi_0(JyJ\tilde{\tau}_t(\tau_t(x)))$  exists, in fact the limiting value for any  $x \geq 0$  is less than  $\|x\|\phi_0(JyJ)$  for any  $y \geq 0$ . Thus there exists an element  $\mathcal{E}(x) \in \mathcal{A}$  so that  $\text{weak}^* \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\tau}_t \tau_t(x) = \mathcal{E}(x) \forall x \in \mathcal{A}$ . It is clear that  $\mathcal{E}$  is a completely positive unital map so that  $\phi_0(J\mathcal{E}(y)Jx) = \phi_0(JyJ\mathcal{E}(x))$  and  $\tilde{\tau}_t \mathcal{E} \tau_t(x) = \mathcal{E}$ . However it is not clear whether  $\mathcal{E}^2 = \mathcal{E}$ , i.e. a projection in general. In case  $(\tau_t)$  commutes with  $(\tilde{\tau}_t)$  then  $\mathcal{E}$  commutes with  $(\tau_t)$  and as well with  $(\tilde{\tau}_t)$ , thus by taking limit as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  in second identity we get  $\mathcal{E}^2 = \mathcal{E}$ . Thus in such a case if  $\mathcal{N} = \{x : \tilde{\tau}_t \tau_t(x) = x : t \geq 0\}$  we conclude that  $\mathcal{E} = E$ . So we have completed the proof of the following Corollary.

**COROLLARY 4.8:** Let  $(\tau_t)$  commutes with  $(\tilde{\tau}_t)$ . If  $\mathcal{N} = \{x : \tilde{\tau}_t \tau_t(x) = x, t \geq 0\}$  then  $\phi_0(\tau_t(x)\tau_t(y)) \rightarrow \phi_0(xE(y))$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

We say the system  $(\mathcal{A}_0, \tau_t, \phi_0)$  is *normal* if  $(\tau_t)$  commutes with  $(\tilde{\tau}_t)$  and is in *detailed balance* if further  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(x) - \mathcal{L}(x) = 2i[H, x]$  on a weak\* dense subalgebra of  $\mathcal{A}_0$ , where  $H$  is a self-adjoint operator so that  $\alpha_t(x) = e^{itH} x e^{-itH}$  is an automorphism on  $\mathcal{A}_0$  and  $\mathcal{L}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}$  are the generators for  $(\tau_t), (\tilde{\tau}_t)$  respectively. In such a case  $(\tau_t)$  commutes with  $(\alpha_t)$ . In the following we investigate results in Theorem 4.1 further.

**THEOREM 4.9:** Let  $(\tau_t)$  be in detailed balance with respect to a faithful normal state  $\phi_0$ . Then there exists a unique unitary operator  $V_0 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  so that

- (a)  $V_0 : \Omega = \tilde{\Omega}$ ,
- (b)  $V_0 F_t V_0^* = \tilde{F}_t, V_0 F_t V_0^* = \tilde{F}_t$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,
- (c)  $V_0 S_t V_0 = \tilde{S}_t t \in \mathbb{R}$
- (d)  $V_0 j_t(\alpha_t(x)) V_0^* = \tilde{j}_t(\alpha_{-t}(x))$ .
- (e)  $R_0 F_t R_0^* = F_{[-t]}$  and  $R_0 F_t R_0^* = F_{[-t]}$  where  $R_0 = U_0^* V_0$ .

**PROOF :** Since  $\tau_t \alpha_t = \tilde{\tau}_t \alpha_{-t}$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $(\alpha_t)$  commutes with both the semigroup  $(\tau_t)$  and  $(\tilde{\tau}_t)$  by (2.2) we check that

$$V_0 : j_{t_1}(\alpha_{t_1}(x_1)) \dots j_{t_n}(\alpha_{t_n}(x_n)) \omega = \tilde{j}_{t_1}(\alpha_{-t_1}(x_1)) \tilde{j}_{t_2} \dots \tilde{j}_{t_n}(\alpha_{-t_n}(x_n)) \tilde{\Omega},$$

is indeed an isometry on total sets generated by the cyclic vectors. Hence  $V_0$  has a unique extension to  $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ . That  $V_0$  satisfies (a) -(e) are now routine work. Uniqueness follows by the cyclic property of the vectors  $\Omega$  for  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}$  for  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ .  $\blacksquare$

## 5 Quantum mechanical master equation:

We say a normal Markov semigroup  $(\tau_t)$  on  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is norm continuous if  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|\tau_t - I\| = 0$ . In such a case the generator  $\mathcal{L}$  is a bounded operator on  $\mathcal{A}$  and can be described [GoKoSu, Lin, CrE] by

$$\mathcal{L}(x) = Y^*x + xY + \sum_{k \geq 1} L_k^*xL_k \quad (5.1)$$

where  $Y \in \mathcal{A}_0$  is the generator of a norm continuous contractive semigroup on  $\mathcal{H}_0$  and  $L_k$ ,  $k \geq 1$  is a family of bounded operators so that  $\sum_k L_k^*xL_k \in \mathcal{A}_0$  whenever  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ . However this choice  $(Y, L_k, k \geq 1)$  is not unique. Conversely, for any such a family  $(Y, L_k)$  with  $Y \in \mathcal{A}_0$  and  $L_kxL_k^* \in \mathcal{A}_0$ ,  $\forall x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , there exists a unique Markov semigroup  $(\tau_t)$  with  $\mathcal{L}$  as its generator. There are many methods to show the existence of a Markov semigroup  $(\tau_t)$  with  $\mathcal{L}$  as its generator [Da3, MoS, ChF]. Here we describe one such a method [ChF].

We consider the following iterated equation :

$$\tau_t^0(x) = e^{tY^*} x e^{tY} \quad (5.2)$$

$$\tau_t^{(n)}(x) = e^{tY^*} x e^{tY} + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)Y^*} \Phi(\tau_s^{(n-1)}(x)) e^{(t-s)Y} ds, \quad n \geq 1 \quad (5.3)$$

where  $\Phi(x) = \sum_k L_k^*xL_k$ . It is simple to check for  $x \geq 0$  that

$$0 \leq \tau_t^{n-1}(x) \leq \tau_t^n(x) \leq \|x\| I, \quad \forall t \geq 0$$

Thus we set for  $x \geq 0$ ,  $\tau_t(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_t^{(n)}(x)$  in the weak\* topology. For an arbitrary element we extend it by linearity. Thus we have

$$\tau_t(x) = e^{tY^*} x e^{tY} + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)Y^*} \Phi(\tau_s(x)) e^{(t-s)Y} ds \quad (5.4)$$

for any  $x \in \mathcal{A}_0$ .

In such a case [Ev], it is simple to check that  $\mathcal{N}$  is trivial if and only if  $\{x \in \mathcal{A}_0 : [x, H] = 0, [x, L_k] = 0 \forall k \geq 1\}$  is trivial.

The following simple but important result due to Fagnola-Rebolledo [FR3].

**THEOREM 5.1:** A projection  $p$  is sub-normal if and only if  $(1-p)Yp = 0$  and  $(1-p)L_kp = 0$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq \infty$ .

**PROOF:** For a proof and a more general result we refer to [FR3]. ■

**THEOREM 5.2:** Let  $p$  be a sub-normal projection and  $y = s.\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tau_t(p)$ . For any  $z \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_0)$  following are equivalent:

- (a)  $yz = 0$   
 (b)  $pz = 0$ ,  $pL_{i_1}L_{i_2}\dots L_{i_n}z = 0$  for all  $0 \leq i_m \leq \infty$ ,  $1 \leq m \leq n$  and  $n \geq 1$ , where  $L_0 = Y$ .

**PROOF:**  $yz = 0$  if and only if  $z^*\tau_t(p)z = 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Now by (5.2) we have  $z^*\tau_t(p)z = 0$  if and only if  $z^*e^{tY^*}pe^{tY}z = 0$  and  $z^*\Phi(\tau_t(p))z = 0$  for  $t \geq 0$ . Thus we have  $pe^{tY}z = 0$  and also  $z^*\Phi(\tau_t(p))z = 0$  for all  $t$ . Thus in particular we have  $z^*\Phi(p)z = 0$ , hence  $pL_kz = 0$  for all  $k \geq 0$ . We go now by induction on  $n$ , we check if  $z' = pL_{i_1}L_{i_2}\dots L_{i_n}z$  then  $yz' = z'$  thus (a) implies (b). For the converse statement, we check that derivative of any order at  $t = 0$  of  $z^*\tau_t(p)z$  vanishes, thus constant which is zero. ■

Thus the zero operator is the only element  $z$  that satisfies (b) if and only if the closure of the range of  $y$  is the entire Hilbert space. Thus  $p$  together with  $L_{i_1}^*L_{i_2}^*\dots L_{i_n}^*p$  where  $0 \leq i_m \leq \infty$ ,  $1 \leq m \leq n$  and  $n \geq 1$  will generate the Hilbert space if and only if  $y$  is one to one. In particular we find this property is a necessary condition for  $y$  to be 1. In general the condition is not a sufficient one. Once more one can construct a counter example in birth and death processes where no population is an absorbing state and birth and death rates are such that the population will extinct with positive probability but need not be 1. We omit the details. However it seems reasonable to ask whether this condition is sufficient for finite dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_0$ .

Now onwards we assume that  $\phi_0$  is faithful. Many important class of example [Fr1,FR1,AcM2,Ma,MZ1,MZ2,MZ3] do admit a faithful normal invariant state. We check that  $\mathcal{F}_s \subset \{x : [L_k, x] = [L_k, x^*] = 0, k \geq 1\}$  and moreover equality hold if  $\{x : [L_k, x] = [L_k, x] = 0\}$  is invariant by  $(\tau_t)$ .

In case  $(\tau_t)$  is only weak\* continuous, the problem in it's complete generality is open. For an application to diffusion processes we refer to [Mo]. However a suitable modification of the method outlined above or a perturbation method can be employed for  $(Y, L_k)$  unbounded when  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_0)$ . To that end we assume [Da 3,ChF,MoS] the following:

- (a)  $(Y, \mathcal{D}(Y))$  is the generator of a strongly continuous semigroup with domain  $\mathcal{D}(Y)$ ;  
 (b)  $L_k$  are closed operator with domains  $\mathcal{D}(L_k) \subset \mathcal{D}(Y)$  so that for  $f, g \in \mathcal{D}(Y)$

$$\langle f, Yg \rangle + \langle Yf, g \rangle + \sum_k \langle L_k f, L_k g \rangle = 0;$$

- (c)  $\mathcal{L} = \{x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_0) : \langle f, xYg \rangle + \langle Yf, xg \rangle + \sum_k \langle L_k f, xL_k g \rangle = \langle f, xg \rangle\}$

**THEOREM 5.3:** There exists a unique weak\* continuous Markov semigroup  $(\tau_t)$  on  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_0)$  with the generator  $\mathcal{L}$  given by  $\langle f, \mathcal{L}(x)g \rangle = \langle f, xYg \rangle + \langle Yf, xg \rangle + \sum_k \langle L_k f, xL_k g \rangle$  for all  $f, g \in \mathcal{D}(Y)$ . Moreover the domain of  $\mathcal{L}$  contains the dense \*-algebra  $\{(\lambda - Y^*)^{-1}x(\mu - Y)^{-1} : x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_0), \lambda, \mu > 0\}$ . In such a case  $\mathcal{F} \subset \{x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : [L_k, R_\lambda(x)] = 0, \lambda > 0, 1 \leq k < \infty\}$ .

**PROOF:** Let  $x \in \mathcal{F}$ . We first check that  $\tau_t(x) \in \mathcal{F}$ , thus  $R_\lambda(x) \in \mathcal{F}$ . So  $R_\lambda(x) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$ , the domain of  $\mathcal{L}$  and as well an element in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{L}(R_\lambda(x))y + x\mathcal{L}(R_\lambda(y)) = \mathcal{L}(R_\lambda(x)R_\lambda(y))$  for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{F}$ . From the explicit relation we find that  $\langle f, [R_\lambda(x), L_k]^*[R_\lambda(x), L_k]g \rangle = 0$  for  $f, g \in \mathcal{D}(Y)$  and  $k \geq 1$ . In other words  $[R_\lambda(x), L_k] = 0$  has a bounded extension and its value is zero for each  $\lambda > 0$ . ■

## REFERENCES

- [AcM1] L. Accardi, Anilesh Mohari: On the structure of classical and quantum flows Preprint Volterra, N.167 Febbraio 1994, Journ. Funct. Anal. 135 (1996) 421–455
- [AcM2] Accardi, L., Mohari, A.: Time reflected Markov processes. Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top., vol-2 ,no-3, 397-425 (1999).
- [Ar] Arveson, W.: Pure  $E_0$ -semigroups and absorbing states. Comm.Math.Phys 187 , n0.1, 19-43, (1997)
- [BhP] Bhat, R., Parthasarathy, K.R.: Kolmogorov's existence theorem for Markov processes on  $C^*$ -algebras, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. 104,1994, p-253-262.
- [BrR] Bratelli, O., Robinson, D.W. : Operator algebras and quantum statistical mechanics, I,II, Springer 1981.
- [ChF] Chebotarev, A.M., Fagnola, F. Sufficient conditions for conservativity of minimal quantum dynamical semigroups, J. Funct. Anal. 153 (1998) no-2, 382-404.
- [CrE] Christensen, E., Evans, D. E.: Cohomology of operator algebras and quantum dynamical semigroups, J.Lon. Maths Soc. 20(1970) 358-368.
- [Ci] Cipriani, F.: Dirichlet form and Markovian semigroups on standard forms of von Neumann algebras, J. funct. Anal. 147 (1997) n0-2, 259-300.
- [Da1] Davies, E.B.: One parameter semigroups, Academic Press, 1980.
- [Da2] Davies, E.B.: Quantum theory of open systems, Academic press, 1976.
- [Da3] Davies, E.B.: Quantum dynamical semigroups and the neutron diffusion equation. Rep. Math. Phys. 11 (1977), no-2, 169-188.
- [De] Dell'Antonio, G.F. : On the limit of sequences of normal states, Comm. Pure Appl Math 20 (1967) 413-429.
- [Ev] Evans, D.E.: Irreducible quantum dynamical semigroups, Commun. Math. Phys. 54, 293-297 (1977).

- [EL] Evans, D.E., Lewis, J.T.: Dilations of irreversible evolution in algebraic quantum theory, Dublin institute of advance studies, (1977).
- [FR1] F. Fagnola, R. Rebolledo. The approach to equilibrium of a class of quantum dynamical semigroups *Inf. Dim. Anal. Q. Prob. and Rel. Topics*, 1(4):1–12, 1998
- [FR2] F. Fagnola and R. Rebolledo. On the existence of invariant states for quantum dynamical semigroups *J.Math.Phys.*, 42, 296-1308, 2001.
- [FR3] F. Fagnola, R. Rebolledo. Subharmonic projections for a Quantum Markov Semigroup. Preprint PUC/FM-04/2000, Santiago.
- [MZ1] Majewski A.W. and Zegarlinski B., *On quantum stochastic dynamics* , *Markov Proc. and Rel. Fields* **2** (1996) 87–116
- [MZ2] Majewski A.W. and Zegarlinski B., *Quantum Stochastic Dynamics II*, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **8** (1996) 689–713
- [MOZ1] A. Majewski, Olkiewicz R. and Zegarlinski B., *Dissipative Dynamics for Quantum Spin Systems on a Lattice*, *J. Phys. A.: Math. Gen.* **31** (1998) 2045–2056
- [MOZ2] A. Majewski, Olkiewicz R. and Zegarlinski B., *Construction and Ergodicity of Dissipative Dynamics for Quantum Spin Systems on a Lattice*, pp.112 - 126 in "Frontiers in Quantum Physics" Eds. S.C. Lim, R. Abd-Shukur, K.H. Kwek , Springer-Verlag 1998
- [MOZ3] A. Majewski, Olkiewicz R. and Zegarlinski B., *Stochastic Dynamics of Quantum Spin Systems*, pp. 285–295 *Banach Center Publications*, Vol. **43**, 1998, *Quantum Probability 97*, Eds R. Alicki, M. Bozejko and W. A. Majewski
- [FKGV] A. Frigerio, A. Kossakowski, V. Gorini, M. Verri: "Quantum detailed balance and KMS condition." *Commun. Math. Phys.* 57 (1977) 97-110. Erratum: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 60 (1978) 96.
- [Fr1] Frigerio, A.: Stationary states of quantum dynamical semigroups. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 63, 269-276 (1978).
- [Fr2] Frigerio, A., Gorini, V. : Markov dilations and quantum detailed balance. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 93 , 517-532 (1984).
- [GoKoSu] Gorini, V., Kossakowski, A., Sudarshan, E.C.G. : Completely positive dynamical semigroups of n-level systems, *J. Math. Phys.* 17, 821-825 (1976).
- [Lin] Lindblad, G. : On the generators of quantum dynamical semigroups, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 48, 119-130 (1976).

- [Mo] Mohari, A.: Ergodicity of Homogeneous Brownian flows. Preprint.
- [MoS] Mohari, A., Sinha, K.B.: Stochastic dilation of minimal quantum dynamical semigroup. Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math Sci. vol-102 (1992), no-2, 159-173.
- [OhP] Ohya, M., Petz, D.: Quantum entropy and its use, Text and monograph in physics, Springer-Verlag.
- [Par] Parry, W. : Topics in ergodic theory, Cambridge University press, 1981.