KMS states and Tomita-Takesaki Theory

Iván Mauricio Burbano Aldana

Advised by: Prof. Andrés Fernando Reyes Lega

Universidad de los Andes

May 17, 2018

Motivation

Can we obtain the equations of motion from the equilibrium state?

Motivation

Can we obtain the equations of motion from the equilibrium state?

Maybe in quantum thermal systems.

$$e^{-\beta H} \circlearrowleft e^{-iHt}$$

temperature $\iff i \times$ time

Outline

Elements of Classical and Quantum Theories

Classical theories

- Auxiliary space: locally compact Hausdorff space X;

Quantum theories

- Auxiliary space: separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$

Elements of Classical and Quantum Theories

Classical theories

- Auxiliary space: locally compact Hausdorff space X;
- Observables: continuous functions $C(X)$ on X;

Quantum theories

- Auxiliary space: separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$
- Observables: self-adjoint operators on $\mathcal{H}$

Elements of Classical and Quantum Theories

Classical theories

- Auxiliary space: locally compact Hausdorff space X;
- Observables: continuous functions $C(X)$ on X;
- States: probability measures P on X;

Quantum theories

- Auxiliary space: separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$
- Observables: self-adjoint operators on $\mathcal{H}$
- States: positive, self-adjoint, normalized and trace-class operators ρ on $\mathcal{H}$;

Elements of Classical and Quantum Theories

Classical theories

- Auxiliary space: locally compact Hausdorff space X;
- Observables: continuous functions $C(X)$ on X;
- States: probability measures P on X;
- Expected values: $\int f dP$.

Quantum theories

- Auxiliary space: separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$
- Observables: self-adjoint operators on $\mathcal{H}$
- States: positive, self-adjoint, normalized and trace-class operators ρ on $\mathcal{H}$;
- Expected values: $\operatorname{tr}(A\rho)$.

Difference between Classical and Quantum theories

EPR paradox [Einstein et al., 1935] $\longrightarrow$

Difference between Classical and Quantum theories

EPR paradox [Einstein et al., 1935] $\longrightarrow$ QM is incomplete

QM is complete

Entangled states ↯

Difference between Classical and Quantum theories

EPR paradox [Einstein et al., 1935] $\longrightarrow$ QM is incomplete

QM is complete

Search for complete theory:
Boolean propositions

Entangled states ⚡

Bell's inequalities [Bell, 1964]
[Reyes-Lega, 2013]

Lattice of projections [Wilce, 2012] $\longleftarrow$ Against experiment!

Algebraic Quantum Mechanics

- Observables: A C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$:
  - Complete normed vector space with product and involution;
  - C^* property: $\|A^*A\| = \|A\|^2$;
  - A C^*-algebra can always be realized as a uniformly closed subset of the bounded operators on a Hilbert space[Bratteli and Robinson, 1987]. It is called a von Neumann algebra or W^*-algebra if $\mathcal{A}'' = \mathcal{A}$ where the commutant $\mathfrak{A}'$ of a set $\mathfrak{A}$ of bounded operators on a Hilbert space is defined as the set of all bounded operatos which commute with every element of $\mathfrak{A}$.
  - We will assume that all the algebras we discuss are unital.
- States: Linear functionals $\omega : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{C}$ which are non-negative ($\omega(A^*A) \geq 0$ and normalized ($\omega(1) = 1$).

GNS Construction

Start with a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ and a state ω.

- $\mathcal{N}_\omega := \{A \in \mathcal{A} | \omega(A^*A) = 0\}$
- Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\omega := \overline{\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_\omega}$ with $\langle [A], [B] \rangle := \omega(A^*B)$
- Define the representation extending

$$\pi_\omega : \mathcal{A} \to \quad \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\omega)$$
$$A \mapsto \pi_\omega(A) : \mathcal{H}_\omega \to \mathcal{H}_\omega$$
$$[B] \mapsto [AB]$$

- Cyclic vector $\Omega_\omega := [1]$, that is, $\overline{\mathcal{A}\Omega_\omega} = \mathcal{H}_\omega$
- This is the unique $*$-representation of $\mathcal{A}$ with a cyclic vector Ω_ω such that $\omega(A) = \langle \Omega_\omega, \pi_\omega(A)\Omega_\omega \rangle = \mathrm{tr}(\pi_\omega(A)\rho_{\Omega_\omega})$.

Example: $M_{2 \times 2}(\mathbb{C})$

Consider the most general state on this algebra

$$\omega_\lambda(A) = \lambda A_{11} + (1 - \lambda) A_{22} = \text{tr}(\rho_\lambda A), \quad \rho = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 1 - \lambda \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Let E_{ij} be the matrix units so that $A = A_{ij} E_{ij}$

$$\omega_\lambda(A^* A) = \omega_\lambda(A_{ki}^* A_{kj} E_{ij}) = \lambda(|A_{11}|^2 + |A_{21}|^2) + (1 - \lambda)(|A_{12}|^2 + |A_{22}|^2).$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{N}_\lambda = \begin{cases} \text{span}\{E_{11}, E_{21}\} & \lambda = 0 \\ \text{span}\{E_{12}, E_{22}\} & \lambda = 1 \\ \{0\} & \lambda \in (0, 1) \end{cases} \qquad \mathcal{H}_\lambda = \begin{cases} \text{span}\{E_{12}, E_{22}\} & \lambda = 0 \\ \text{span}\{E_{11}, E_{21}\} & \lambda = 1 \\ M_{2 \times 2}(\mathbb{C}) & \lambda \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

Inner product

Consider $\lambda \in (0,1)$. We have for $e_{ij} = [E_{ij}]$, $\lambda_1 := \lambda$, and $\lambda_2 := 1 - \lambda$

$$\langle e_{ij}, e_{kl}\rangle = \omega(E_{ij}^* E_{kl}) = \omega(E_{ji} E_{kl}) = \omega(\delta_{ik} E_{jl}) = \delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}\lambda_l \tag{2}$$

Therefore the basis $\{e_i^{(\alpha)} := [E_{i\alpha}]/\sqrt{\lambda_\alpha} | i, \alpha \in \{1, 2\}\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$. Moreover, the representation splits as

$$\mathcal{H}_\lambda = \mathcal{H}_\lambda^{(1)} \oplus \mathcal{H}_\lambda^{(2)} \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{H}_\lambda^{(\alpha)} := \operatorname{span}\{e_i^{(\alpha)} | i \in \{1, 2\}\}$. We have the corresponding orthogonal projections $P^{(\alpha)}$ onto $\mathcal{H}_\lambda^{(\alpha)}$. Another useful inner product to compute is

$$\langle \Omega_\lambda, e_i^{(\alpha)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\alpha}}\langle [I_2], [E_{i\alpha}]\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\alpha}}\omega(E_{i\alpha}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\alpha}}\delta_{i\alpha}\lambda_\alpha. \tag{4}$$

Constructing a Density Operator from Decompositions

$$
\begin{aligned}
\omega_\lambda(A) =& \langle \Omega_\lambda, \pi_\omega(A)\Omega_\omega \rangle = \langle \Omega_\omega, \sum_{\alpha \in I} P^{(\alpha)} \pi_\omega(A)\Omega_\omega \rangle \\
=& \langle \Omega_\omega, \sum_{\alpha \in I} P^{(\alpha)} \pi_\omega(A) P^{(\alpha)} \Omega_\omega \rangle \\
=& \langle \Omega_\omega, \sum_{n \in J} \langle e_n, \sum_{\alpha \in I} P^{(\alpha)} \pi_\omega(A) P^{(\alpha)} \Omega_\omega \rangle e_n \rangle \\
=& \sum_{n \in J} \langle e_n, \sum_{\alpha \in I} P^{(\alpha)} \pi_\omega(A) P^{(\alpha)} \langle \Omega_\omega, e_n \rangle \Omega_\omega \rangle \\
=& \sum_{n \in J} \langle e_n, \sum_{\alpha \in I} P^{(\alpha)} \pi_\omega(A) P^{(\alpha)} \rho_{\Omega_\omega} e_n \rangle \\
=& \operatorname{tr} \left(\pi_\omega(A) \sum_{\alpha \in I} P^{(\alpha)} \rho_{\Omega_\omega} P^{(\alpha)} \right) = \operatorname{tr}(\pi_\omega(A)\rho_\omega)
\end{aligned}
\tag{5}
$$

The Density Operator of Our Decomposition

$$\rho_\lambda e_i^\alpha = \sum_{\beta \in I} P^{(\beta)} \rho_{\Omega_\omega} P^{(\beta)} e_i^{(\alpha)} = \sum_{\beta \in I} P^{(\beta)} \rho_{\Omega_\omega} \delta_{\alpha\beta} e_i^{(\alpha)} = P^{(\alpha)} \rho_{\Omega_\omega} e_i^{(\alpha)}$$

$$= P^{(\alpha)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\alpha}} \delta_{i\alpha} \lambda_\alpha \Omega_\omega = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\alpha}} \delta_{i\alpha} \lambda_\alpha \sum_{j=1}^{2} \langle e_j^\alpha, \Omega_\omega \rangle e_j^{(\alpha)} \qquad (6)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\alpha}} \delta_{i\alpha} \lambda_\alpha \sum_{j=1}^{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\alpha}} \delta_{j\alpha} \lambda_\alpha e_j^{(\alpha)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\alpha}} \delta_{i\alpha} \lambda_\alpha \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\alpha}} \lambda_\alpha e_\alpha^{(\alpha)}$$

$$= \delta_{i\alpha} \lambda_\alpha e_\alpha^{(\alpha)}.$$

Therefore, in the ordered basis $\mathcal{B} = \{e_1^{(1)}, e_2^{(1)}, e_1^{(2)}, e_2^{(2)}\}$ we have

$$[\rho_\lambda]_\mathcal{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{1-\lambda} \end{bmatrix} \qquad (7)$$

The representation

Finally we explicitly need the GNS representatives. Using the same approach

$$\pi_\lambda(A)e_i^{(\alpha)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\alpha}}[AE_{i\alpha}] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\alpha}}[A_{jk}\delta_{ki}\delta_{\beta\alpha}E_{j\beta}] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_\alpha}}A_{ji}[E_{j\alpha}] = A_{ji}e_j^{(\alpha)}.$$

Therefore

$$[\pi_\lambda(A)]_\mathcal{B} = \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix} \tag{8}$$

and we explicitly check that neither ρ_{Ω_λ} or ρ_λ have an interpretation as observables.

Ambiguity in functions of states

Consider the von Neumann entropy $S(\rho) = -\operatorname{tr}(\rho \log(\rho))$ of a density matrix ρ. In our example the entropy of our initial density matrix describing the state is $-\lambda \log(\lambda) - (1 - \lambda)\log(1 - \lambda) = S(\rho) = \omega(\log(\rho))$. This is in particular the expected value of an observable! However, in the GNS representation we have encountered two density matrices which also do the job ρ_{Ω_λ} and ρ_λ but are not observables. The first has a null entropy since it is a vector state $S(\rho_{\Omega_\lambda}) = 0$. On the other hand $S(\rho_\lambda) = S(\rho)$. What is going on here? In reality, the ambiguity is much more dramatic. Redefining the orthonormal basis by $e_i^\alpha(U) = \sum_\beta = 1^2 e_i^{(\beta)} U_{\beta\alpha}$ for U unitary yields a new decomposition and thus a new density operator $\rho_\lambda(U)$. More about this will be discussed in Souad's lecture right after this!

Cyclic representations of W^*-algebras

Theorem ($\bigstar$)

If $\mathfrak{M}$ is a W^*-algebra and ω is a faithful ($\omega(A^*A) = 0 \to A = 0$) normal ($\omega(A) = \mathrm{tr}(\rho A)$) state then its cyclic representation $(\mathcal{H}_\omega, \pi_\omega, \Omega_\omega)$ satisfies

- *π_ω is faithful (injective);*
- *$\pi_\omega(\mathfrak{M})$ is a von Neumann algebra;*
- *Ω_ω is separating for $\pi_\omega(\mathfrak{M})$ ($\pi_\omega(A)\Omega_\omega = 0 \to \pi_\omega(A) = 0$).*

Dynamical Systems

Time evolution is represented by a one-parameter group of automorphisms

$$\tau : \mathbb{R} \to \text{Aut}(\mathcal{A})$$
$$t \mapsto \tau_t.$$

Dynamical systems consist of an $C(W)^*$-algebra with a time evolution which satisfies certain continuity properties.

Example

Given a Hamiltonian H on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ the Schrödinger time evolution s is given by

$$s_t(O) = e^{iHt} O e^{-iHt} \tag{9}$$

and $(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), s)$ is a dynamical system.

KMS States

Definition

Let $(\mathcal{A}, \alpha)$ be a dynamical system. ϕ is said to be a KMS state if for all $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists an analytic F on the strip which satisfies


$$F(t + i \hbar \beta) = \varphi(\alpha_t(B)A)$$

$$F(t) = \varphi(A \, \alpha_t(B))$$

Figure: Taken from [Connes, 1994].

KMS states as Equilibrium states

KMS states are a candidate for a general definition of thermodynamic equilibrium in quantum systems[Haag et al., 1967]:

- KMS states are invariant under the dynamics $\omega(\tau_t(A)) = \omega(A)$;
- In finite dimensional Hilbert spaces with Schrödinger's time evolution τ, the only possible (τ, β)-KMS states are the β-Gibbs states

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) &\to \mathbb{C} \\
A &\mapsto \frac{\operatorname{tr}(Ae^{-\beta H})}{\operatorname{tr}(e^{-\beta H})}.
\end{aligned}
$$

- It is clear that the Gibbs prescription cannot be the characterization of equilibrium in the thermodynamic limit since coexistence of different phases demands that there cannot be a general unique correspondence between the Hamiltonian (evolution group) and states[Connes, 1994].

Tomita-Takesaki Theory

For a W^*-algebra $\mathfrak{M}$ equipped with a cyclic and separating vector Ω Tomita-Takesaki theory yields:

- a one-parameter unitary group $t \mapsto \Delta^{it}$;
- a modular conjugation J.

Theorem (Tomita-Takesaki)

- $J\mathfrak{M}J = \mathfrak{M}'$;
- $\Delta^{it}\mathfrak{M}\Delta^{-it} = \mathfrak{M}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof.

[Bratteli and Robinson, 1987] $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

Modular Automorphism Group

Definition

Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be a von Neumann algebra and ω be a faithful normal state. Due to ★ we can perform the modular constructions on the cyclic representation $(\pi_\omega(\mathfrak{M}), \pi_\omega, \Omega_\omega)$. We define the modular automorphism group of $(\mathfrak{M}, \omega)$ by

$$\alpha_t = \pi_\omega^{-1}(\Delta^{it}\pi_\omega(A)\Delta^{-it}). \tag{10}$$

Theorem (★★)

$(\mathfrak{M}, \alpha)$ is a W^*-dynamical system

Proof.

[Duvenhage, 1999] □

The Canonical Time Evolution

Theorem (★★★)

Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be a von Neumann algebra and ω be a faithful normal state. Then $(\mathfrak{M}, \tau)$ with $\tau_t(A) = \alpha_{-t/\beta}(A)$ and α the modular group of $(\mathfrak{M}, \omega)$ is the unique W^*-dynamical system such that ω is a (τ, β)-KMS state.

Proof.

[Duvenhage, 1999] □

On von Neumann Algebras as Dynamical Objects

- Through the modular group, states induce dynamics on the algebra of operators.
- The physical relevance of such prescription for evolution is guaranteed by the fact that it is the unique dynamical law which makes the state an equilibrium state.
- One can use an analog of the Radon-Nikodym theorem to connect the modular groups induced by different states. Such a connection brings forward a canonical homomorphism from $\mathbb{R}$ into the automorphism group of $\mathfrak{M}$ modulus inner automorphisms. This suggests that the emergence of the dynamical law might have a deeper origin.

References I

📄 Bell, J. S. (1964).
The Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox.
Physics, 1(3):195–200.

📄 Bratteli, O. and Robinson, D. W. (1987).
Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics 1.
Springer, 2nd edition.

📄 Connes, A. (1994).
Noncommutative Geometry.

📄 Duvenhage, R. D. V. (1999).
Quantum statistical mechanics , KMS states and Tomita-Takesaki theory.
Msc, University of Pretoria.

References II

Einstein, A., Podolsky, B., and Rosen, N. (1935).
Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Reality Be Considered
Complete?
Physical Review, 47.

Haag, R., Hugenholtz, N. M., and Winnink, M. (1967).
On the Equilibrium States in Quantum Statistical Mechanics.
Commun. math. Phys, (5):215–236.

Reyes-Lega, A. F. (2013).
Some Aspects of Operator Algebras in Quantum Physics.
In Cano, L., Cardona, A., Ocampo, H., and Reyes-Lega, A. F., editors,
*Geometric, Algebraic and Topological Methods for Quantum Field
Theory*, pages 1–74. World Scientific.

References III

Wilce, A. (2012).
Quantum Logic and Probability Theory.
Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.