

Singular half-sided modular inclusions and deformation quantization

Gandalf Lechner

joint work with Charley Scotford



IWOTA Lancaster, 18 August 2021

Overview of the talk

- ▶ **Main topic:** Certain (half-sided modular, HSM) inclusions $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$ (subfactors of type III₁) of von Neumann algebras (equivalently formulated as **Borchers triples**)
- ▶ Closely related to chiral conformal quantum field theories on the real line \mathbb{R} (or the circle $S^1 \cong \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$)
- ▶ This relation will guide us to the question whether a HSM $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$ is **singular** (trivial relative commutant, $\mathcal{N}' \cap \mathcal{M} = \mathbb{C}$) or not.
- ▶ Will construct examples of singular half-sided inclusions by a **deformation procedure** (warped convolution, Rieffel deformation).

Geometric preliminaries

- ▶ Symmetries of real line \mathbb{R} :
 - translations $x \mapsto x + a$, dilations $x \mapsto e^t \cdot x$, reflection $x \mapsto -x$
 - generate affine group **Aff** of \mathbb{R}
- ▶ In *conformal* theories, have also conformal (Möbius) transformations

$$x \mapsto \frac{ax + b}{cx + d}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\} \cong S^1$$

generate Möbius group **Möb** = $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$



Conformal nets

Idea: Consider unitary rep U of Möb on Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and model quantum fields localized in interval I by an algebra of operators $\mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

Definition (or wishlist:)

- ▶ For every $I \in \mathcal{I}$, there is a (von Neumann) algebra $\mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$
- ▶ $I_1 \subset I_2 \implies \mathcal{A}(I_1) \subset \mathcal{A}(I_2)$
- ▶ Locality: If I_1 and I_2 are disjoint, then $\mathcal{A}(I_1)$ and $\mathcal{A}(I_2)$ commute.
- ▶ Covariance: $U(g)\mathcal{A}(I)U(g)^{-1} = \mathcal{A}(gI)$
- ▶ Positivity: The translations $U(x) = e^{iPx}$ have positive generator $P > 0$
- ▶ Vacuum I: There is a unique (up to a scalar) vector $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$ that is invariant under U .
- ▶ Vacuum II: Ω is cyclic for all $\mathcal{A}(I)$

Such a structure is called a **conformal net**.

▶ **Although well motivated, it is a complicated definition. For a classification, one would like to connect it to simpler data.**

Borchers triples and half-sided inclusions

Let us start from a simpler situation (on the real line):

- only **one** algebra, the one corresponding to the half line \mathbb{R}_+
- only **translation** symmetry

Borchers triples and half-sided inclusions

Let us start from a simpler situation (on the real line):

- only **one** algebra, the one corresponding to the half line \mathbb{R}_+
- only **translation** symmetry

Definition

A (one-dimensional) **Borchers triple** (\mathcal{M}, T, Ω) consists of a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and a unitary representation T of \mathbb{R} on \mathcal{H} s.t.

- T has positive generator. The subspace of T -invariant vectors is $\mathbb{C}\Omega$.
- $T(x)\mathcal{M}T(-x) \subset \mathcal{M}$ for $x \geq 0$.
- Ω is cyclic and separating for \mathcal{M} .

Borchers triples and half-sided inclusions

Let us start from a simpler situation (on the real line):

- only **one** algebra, the one corresponding to the half line \mathbb{R}_+
- only **translation** symmetry

Definition

A (one-dimensional) **Borchers triple** (\mathcal{M}, T, Ω) consists of a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and a unitary representation T of \mathbb{R} on \mathcal{H} s.t.

- T has positive generator. The subspace of T -invariant vectors is $\mathbb{C}\Omega$.
 - $T(x)\mathcal{M}T(-x) \subset \mathcal{M}$ for $x \geq 0$.
 - Ω is cyclic and separating for \mathcal{M} .
- Gives rise to **half-sided modular inclusion** (Borchers, Wiesbrock)

$$\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}, \quad \mathcal{N} := T(1)\mathcal{M}T(-1),$$
$$\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}^{it}\mathcal{N}\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}^{-it} \subset \mathcal{N} \quad t \leq 0$$

- To construct a map (Borchers triples) \rightarrow (conformal nets), one needs modular theory.

The modular symmetry machine

With modular theory, we can extend a Borchers triple to a conformal net
[Borchers, Wiesbrock, Longo/Guido/Wiesbrock]

The modular symmetry machine

With modular theory, we can extend a Borchers triple to a conformal net
[Borchers, Wiesbrock, Longo/Guido/Wiesbrock]

- Define dilation symmetry by modular unitaries $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}^{it}$ of (\mathcal{M}, Ω) .
- Define interval algebras by

$$\mathcal{A}(a, b) := T(a)\mathcal{M}T(-a) \cap T(b)\mathcal{M}'T(-b).$$



- **If Ω is cyclic for the interval algebras $\mathcal{A}(a, b)$ (“standard” situation),** use modular unitaries $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}(a,b)}^{it}$ to generate representation of Möbius group.

The modular symmetry machine

With modular theory, we can extend a Borchers triple to a conformal net
[Borchers, Wiesbrock, Longo/Guido/Wiesbrock]

- Define dilation symmetry by modular unitaries $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}^{it}$ of (\mathcal{M}, Ω) .
- Define interval algebras by

$$\mathcal{A}(a, b) := T(a)\mathcal{M}T(-a) \cap T(b)\mathcal{M}'T(-b).$$



- **If Ω is cyclic for the interval algebras $\mathcal{A}(a, b)$ (“standard” situation),** use modular unitaries $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}(a,b)}^{it}$ to generate representation of Möbius group.

Theorem ([Longo, Guido, Wiesbrock 98])

- *In the standard situation, this construction yields a conformal net on S^1 .*
- *There exists a bijection between (strongly additive) conformal nets and standard Borchers triples.*

The modular symmetry machine

With modular theory, we can extend a Borchers triple to a conformal net
[Borchers, Wiesbrock, Longo/Guido/Wiesbrock]

- Define dilation symmetry by modular unitaries $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}^{it}$ of (\mathcal{M}, Ω) .
- Define interval algebras by

$$\mathcal{A}(a, b) := T(a)\mathcal{M}T(-a) \cap T(b)\mathcal{M}'T(-b).$$



- **If Ω is cyclic for the interval algebras $\mathcal{A}(a, b)$ (“standard” situation),** use modular unitaries $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}(a,b)}^{it}$ to generate representation of Möbius group.

Theorem ([Longo, Guido, Wiesbrock 98])

- *In the standard situation, this construction yields a conformal net on S^1 .*
- *There exists a bijection between (strongly additive) conformal nets and standard Borchers triples.*

Unfortunately, the “standard” situation is not really standard ..

The local subspace

Define the **local subspace**:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} := \overline{\mathcal{A}(I)\Omega} \subset \mathcal{H}, \quad I \subset \mathbb{R} \text{ bounded interval}$$

The local subspace

Define the **local subspace**:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} := \overline{\mathcal{A}(I)\Omega} \subset \mathcal{H}, \quad I \subset \mathbb{R} \text{ bounded interval}$$

Theorem ([Bostelmann, GL, Morsella 11])

This space is independent of I and invariant under the net \mathcal{A} .

Three cases:

- 1 $\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathcal{H}$. (**standard situation**)
 - Here we can construct a conformal net directly on \mathcal{H} .

The local subspace

Define the **local subspace**:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} := \overline{\mathcal{A}(I)\Omega} \subset \mathcal{H}, \quad I \subset \mathbb{R} \text{ bounded interval}$$

Theorem ([Bostelmann, GL, Morsella 11])

This space is independent of I and invariant under the net \mathcal{A} .

Three cases:

- 1 $\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathcal{H}$. (**standard situation**)
 - Here we can construct a conformal net directly on \mathcal{H} .
- 2 $\mathbb{C}\Omega \subsetneq \mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} \subsetneq \mathcal{H}$.
 - Here the construction works as in (1) after restriction to \mathcal{H}_{loc} .
- 3 $\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathbb{C}\Omega$.
 - This is the case of a **singular Borchers triple**.
 - Here all data are trivial – this is the situation that we want to **avoid**.

The local subspace

Define the **local subspace**:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} := \overline{\mathcal{A}(I)\Omega} \subset \mathcal{H}, \quad I \subset \mathbb{R} \text{ bounded interval}$$

Theorem ([Bostelmann, GL, Morsella 11])

This space is independent of I and invariant under the net \mathcal{A} .

Three cases:

- 1 $\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathcal{H}$. (**standard situation**)
 - Here we can construct a conformal net directly on \mathcal{H} .
- 2 $\mathbb{C}\Omega \subsetneq \mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} \subsetneq \mathcal{H}$.
 - Here the construction works as in (1) after restriction to \mathcal{H}_{loc} .
- 3 $\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathbb{C}\Omega$.
 - This is the case of a **singular Borchers triple**.
 - Here all data are trivial – this is the situation that we want to **avoid**.

(1) and (2) are known to occur frequently, many examples. Charley Scotford has lots of examples arising from scaling limits.

The local subspace

Define the **local subspace**:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} := \overline{\mathcal{A}(I)\Omega} \subset \mathcal{H}, \quad I \subset \mathbb{R} \text{ bounded interval}$$

Theorem ([Bostelmann, GL, Morsella 11])

This space is independent of I and invariant under the net \mathcal{A} .

Three cases:

- 1 $\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathcal{H}$. (**standard situation**)
 - Here we can construct a conformal net directly on \mathcal{H} .
- 2 $\mathbb{C}\Omega \subsetneq \mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} \subsetneq \mathcal{H}$.
 - Here the construction works as in (1) after restriction to \mathcal{H}_{loc} .
- 3 $\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathbb{C}\Omega$.
 - This is the case of a **singular Borchers triple**.
 - Here all data are trivial – this is the situation that we want to **avoid**.

(1) and (2) are known to occur frequently, many examples. Charley Scotford has lots of examples arising from scaling limits.

Does case (3) occur?

The local subspace

Define the **local subspace**:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} := \overline{\mathcal{A}(I)\Omega} \subset \mathcal{H}, \quad I \subset \mathbb{R} \text{ bounded interval}$$

Theorem ([Bostelmann, GL, Morsella 11])

This space is independent of I and invariant under the net \mathcal{A} .

Three cases:

- 1 $\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathcal{H}$. (**standard situation**)
 - Here we can construct a conformal net directly on \mathcal{H} .
- 2 $\mathbb{C}\Omega \subsetneq \mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} \subsetneq \mathcal{H}$.
 - Here the construction works as in (1) after restriction to \mathcal{H}_{loc} .
- 3 $\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathbb{C}\Omega$.
 - This is the case of a **singular Borchers triple**.
 - Here all data are trivial – this is the situation that we want to **avoid**.

(1) and (2) are known to occur frequently, many examples. **Charley Scotford** has lots of examples arising from scaling limits.

Does case (3) occur? Answer from 2019: Yes. [**Longo, Tanimoto, Ueda 19**] have free probability construction to get an example of (3).

The algebra at infinity

Let (\mathcal{M}, T, Ω) be a BT, write $\alpha_x = \text{Ad}T(x)$, $\sigma_t = \text{Ad}\Delta^{it}$, $\mathcal{N} = \alpha_1(\mathcal{M})$.

The algebra at infinity:

$$\mathcal{X} := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \sigma_t(\mathcal{N} \vee J\mathcal{N}J) = \bigcap_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}(I)'$$



Remarks/Lemmas:

- The larger \mathcal{X} , the smaller \mathcal{H}_{loc} .
- $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{C}1 \iff \mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathcal{H}$ (standard case).
- $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \iff \mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathbb{C}\Omega$ (singular case)

The algebra at infinity

Let (\mathcal{M}, T, Ω) be a BT, write $\alpha_x = \text{Ad}T(x)$, $\sigma_t = \text{Ad}\Delta^{it}$, $\mathcal{N} = \alpha_1(\mathcal{M})$.

The algebra at infinity:

$$\mathcal{X} := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \sigma_t(\mathcal{N} \vee J\mathcal{N}J) = \bigcap_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}(I)'$$



Remarks/Lemmas:

- The larger \mathcal{X} , the smaller \mathcal{H}_{loc} .
- $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{C}1 \iff \mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathcal{H}$ (standard case).
- $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \iff \mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathbb{C}\Omega$ (singular case) $\iff P_\Omega = |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega| \in \mathcal{X}$

How to construct elements in \mathcal{X}

Let $A \in \mathcal{M}$, $B' \in \mathcal{M}'$, and let L be a weak limit point of $\sigma_t(\alpha_1(A)\alpha_{-1}(B'))$ as $t \rightarrow -\infty$. Then $L \in \mathcal{X}$.

Warping

Plan: Find a BT such that $\sigma_t(\alpha_1(A)\alpha_{-1}(B')) \rightarrow P_\Omega$ weakly as $t \rightarrow -\infty$.

- This construction relies on a representation $T(x, y)$ of **two-dimensional** translation symmetry (view net \mathcal{A} as chiral half of a 2d theory)



Warping

Plan: Find a BT such that $\sigma_t(\alpha_1(A)\alpha_{-1}(B')) \rightarrow P_\Omega$ weakly as $t \rightarrow -\infty$.

- This construction relies on a representation $T(x, y)$ of **two-dimensional** translation symmetry (view net \mathcal{A} as chiral half of a 2d theory)



- Fix a deformation parameter Q , an antisymmetric (2×2) -matrix.
- Deform smooth operators $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ on smooth vects $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}$ according to

$$A_Q \Psi := (2\pi)^{-2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} e^{-ipx} T(Qp) A T(-Qp) \cdot T(x) \Psi dp dx,$$

reminiscent of Weyl-Moyal product.

Warping

Plan: Find a BT such that $\sigma_t(\alpha_1(A)\alpha_{-1}(B')) \rightarrow P_\Omega$ weakly as $t \rightarrow -\infty$.

- This construction relies on a representation $T(x, y)$ of **two-dimensional** translation symmetry (view net \mathcal{A} as chiral half of a 2d theory)



- Fix a deformation parameter Q , an antisymmetric (2×2) -matrix.
- Deform smooth operators $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ on smooth vects $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}$ according to

$$A_Q \Psi := (2\pi)^{-2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} e^{-ipx} T(Qp) A T(-Qp) \cdot T(x) \Psi dp dx,$$

reminiscent of Weyl-Moyal product.

Facts [Buchholz, GL, Summers 2011]:

- A_Q extends to a bounded operator. $A \mapsto A_Q$ is a faithful representation of the Rieffel-deformed C^* -algebra $(\mathcal{C}_Q, \times_Q, \|\cdot\|_Q)$.
- Let $\mathcal{M}_Q := \{A_Q : A \in \mathcal{M} \text{ smooth}\}''$. If $\kappa \geq 0$, then also $(\mathcal{M}_Q, T, \Omega)$ is a Borchers triple.

Theorem ([GL/Scotford 2021] Deforming the free field leads to singular BTs)

Consider the free field triple (\mathcal{M}, T, Ω) . Then there exist operators A affiliated to \mathcal{M} and B' affiliated to \mathcal{M}' such that for $\kappa > 0$

$$\text{w-}\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \Delta^{it} \alpha_1(A_Q) \alpha_{-1}(B'_{-Q}) \Delta^{-it} = P_\Omega.$$

Hence $(\mathcal{H}_{loc})_Q = \mathbb{C}\Omega$; this gives singular BTs.

Theorem ([GL/Scotford 2021] Deforming the free field leads to singular BTs)

Consider the free field triple (\mathcal{M}, T, Ω) . Then there exist operators A affiliated to \mathcal{M} and B' affiliated to \mathcal{M}' such that for $\kappa > 0$

$$\text{w-}\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \Delta^{it} \alpha_1(A_Q) \alpha_{-1}(B'_{-Q}) \Delta^{-it} = P_\Omega.$$

Hence $(\mathcal{H}_{loc})_Q = \mathbb{C}\Omega$; this gives singular BTs.

- Here A, B can be chosen as free quantum field operators.
- The proof relies on a Riemann-Lebesgue type argument

$$\int dp_1 \cdots dp_n dq' \overline{\Phi_n(p)} \Psi_n(p) f^+(q') \overline{g^+(q')} \prod_{l=1}^n e^{i(p_l, Q \Lambda_t q')} \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow -\infty$$

Theorem ([GL/Scotford 2021] Deforming the free field leads to singular BTs)

Consider the free field triple (\mathcal{M}, T, Ω) . Then there exist operators A affiliated to \mathcal{M} and B' affiliated to \mathcal{M}' such that for $\kappa > 0$

$$\text{w-}\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \Delta^{it} \alpha_1(A_Q) \alpha_{-1}(B'_{-Q}) \Delta^{-it} = P_\Omega.$$

Hence $(\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}})_Q = \mathbb{C}\Omega$; this gives singular BTs.

- Here A, B can be chosen as free quantum field operators.
- The proof relies on a Riemann-Lebesgue type argument

$$\int dp_1 \cdots dp_n dq' \overline{\Phi_n(p)} \Psi_n(p) f^+(q') \overline{g^+(q')} \prod_{l=1}^n e^{i(p_l, Q \Lambda_t q')} \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow -\infty$$

Conjecture

Take any 2d Borchers triple with $\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathcal{H}$, then deform it with deformation parameter $\kappa > 0$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}})_Q = \mathbb{C}\Omega$ (singular case).

Outlook/Open Questions:

- This result hints at \mathcal{H}_{loc} being unstable under deformations.
- What are the intrinsic properties of this example that distinguish it from case (1) and (2)?
- Are further deformation results possible? (\rightarrow quantum group symmetry)