

HAAR MEASURE ON A LOCALLY COMPACT QUANTUM GROUP

BYUNG-JAY KAHNG

ABSTRACT. We discuss the notion of Haar measure (Haar weight) for the Hopf C^* -algebra (A, Δ) we constructed earlier. By having the Haar weight rigorously defined, we can show that (A, Δ) is indeed a (non-compact) “ C^* -algebraic quantum group” in the sense of Kustermans and Vaes. We also discuss how the various quantum group structures obtained by our earlier construction are related with the ones predicted by the general theory.

INTRODUCTION. According to the widely accepted paradigm (which goes back to Gelfand and Naimark in the 1940’s and made more popular by Connes and his non-commutative geometry program [5]) that C^* -algebras are quantized/non-commutative locally compact spaces, the C^* -algebra framework is the most natural one on which to formulate a theory of *locally compact quantum groups*. There have been several examples of C^* -algebraic quantum groups constructed, beginning with Woronowicz’s (compact) quantum $SU(2)$ group [21]. The examples of non-compact C^* -algebraic quantum groups have been rather scarce, but significant progress has been made over the past decade.

Some time ago, growing out of the author’s Ph.D. thesis, we constructed in a Hopf C^* -algebra (A, Δ) by a method of deformation quantization [7], [8]. It could be regarded as a “quantum $C^*(H)$ ” or “quantum $C_0(G)$ ”, where H is a Heisenberg-type Lie group and G is a certain solvable Lie group. The groups G and H are mutually dual Poisson–Lie groups, and they are the classical counterparts to our “quantum group” (A, Δ) and its dual.

In constructing the quantum group structures on (A, Δ) , motivation for choosing its comultiplication, counit, antipode (coinverse), and Haar weight came from the structures at the level of Poisson–Lie groups. The proofs at the C^* -algebra level were given separately, for instance by introducing some useful tools like its multiplicative unitary operator. We could argue that (A, Δ) together with its additional structures should be an example of a *non-compact quantum group*, and any reasonable definition of a general locally compact quantum group should include it as an example.

We went on to find a certain “quantum universal R -matrix” type operator related with (A, Δ) and studied its representation theory, indicating that the $*$ -representations of A satisfy an interesting “quasi-triangular” type property. Refer [8] and [9] (More discussion on the representation theory will follow in a future paper [10].).

However, even with these strong indications suggested by our construction and the representation theoretic applications, we did not quite make it clear whether (A, Δ) is actually a locally compact quantum group. For instance, in [8], the discussion about the Haar weight on (A, Δ) was rather incomplete, since we more or less restricted our discussion to the level of a dense subalgebra of the C^* -algebra A . The problem of tying these loose ends and establishing (A, Δ) as a locally compact quantum group in a suitable sense has been postponed to a later occasion.

Part of the reason for the postponement was due to the fact that at the time of writing the paper, the correct definition of a locally compact quantum group had not yet been settled. It is known that simply requiring the existence of a counit and an antipode on the “locally compact quantum semigroup” (A, Δ) is not enough. Some of the proposals were being made, but they were in a rather primitive stage. Recently, the situation has improved: A new paper by Kustermans and Vaes [13] appeared, in which they give a relatively simple definition of a (reduced) C^* -algebraic quantum group.

In this new definition, the existence of a left invariant (Haar) weight and a right invariant weight plays the central role. In particular, they do not have to include the existence of the antipode and its polar decomposition in their axioms. Unlike the axiom sets of Masuda and Nakagami [14], or those for Kac algebras [6], which are either too complicated or too restrictive, these properties and others can be proved from the defining axioms.

It is still far from achieving the goal of formulating a set of axioms such that a general existence theorem for the Haar weight on a locally compact quantum group can be proved solely from the axioms. Considering this, it seems that the definition by Kustermans and Vaes is the most reasonable choice at this moment.

Now that we have an acceptable definition, we are going to return to our example (A, Δ) and verify that (A, Δ) is indeed a locally compact quantum group. Our discussion will begin (in section 1) by describing the definition of Kustermans and Vaes, making precise the notion of a “ C^* -algebraic locally compact quantum group”. After recalling (in section 2) a few results about our specific example (A, Δ) , we turn to the main part of this paper.

In section 3, we will define the Haar weight for (A, Δ) and make the notion rigorous in the C^* -algebra setting. Having the correct left/right invariant weights enables us to conclude that (A, Δ) is indeed a (non-compact) C^* -algebraic quantum group. It turns out that due to the rather simple nature of our example, it does not fully manifest some of the interesting properties a generic locally compact quantum group can have. The main reason is that the weights we consider are tracial. Still, many of the techniques being used here are not necessarily type-specific and therefore, will be also useful in more general cases.

In sections 4 and 5, we will discuss about its other quantum group structures and give a few additional perspectives on them, by comparing the ones we constructed in [8] with the ones suggested by the general theory. We will discuss the multiplicative unitary operator, the antipode, and the modular function, among others.

While we do believe in the advantage of the more constructive approach we took in [8] motivated by Poisson–Lie groups, the more theoretical approach presented here will certainly provide a nice complement as well as make it more rigorous. Having more solid understanding of the example will make it more accessible, thereby encouraging the development of its applications and generalizations.

1. DEFINITIONS, TERMINOLOGIES, AND CONVENTIONS

1.1. Weights on C^* -algebras. We will begin by briefly reviewing the theory of weights on C^* -algebras. The purpose is to make clear the notations used in the main definition of a C^* -algebraic quantum group (Definition 1.2) and in the proofs in later sections. For a more complete treatment and for standard terminologies on weights, refer to [3]. For instance, recall the standard notations like \mathfrak{N}_ϕ , \mathfrak{M}_ϕ , \mathfrak{M}_ϕ^+ , ... associated to a weight ϕ (on a C^* -algebra B). That is,

- $\mathfrak{N}_\phi = \{b \in B : \phi(b^*b) < \infty\}$
- $\mathfrak{M}_\phi^+ = \{b \in B^+ : \phi(b) < \infty\}$
- $\mathfrak{M}_\phi = \mathfrak{N}_\phi^* \mathfrak{N}_\phi$

The weights we will be considering are “proper weights”: A proper weight is a non-zero, densely defined weight on a C^* -algebra, which is lower semi-continuous [13].

If we are given a (proper) weight ϕ on a C^* -algebra, we can define the sets \mathcal{F}_ϕ and \mathcal{G}_ϕ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_\phi &= \{\omega \in B_+^* : \omega(x) \leq \phi(x), \forall x \in B^+\} \\ \mathcal{G}_\phi &= \{\alpha\omega : \omega \in \mathcal{F}_\phi, \alpha \in (0, 1)\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\phi. \end{aligned}$$

Here B^* denotes the norm dual of B .

These sets have been introduced by Combes, and they play a significant role in the theory of weights. Note that on \mathcal{F}_ϕ , one can give a natural order inherited from B_+^* . Meanwhile, \mathcal{G}_ϕ is a directed subset of \mathcal{F}_ϕ . That is, for every $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathcal{G}_\phi$, there exists an element $\omega \in \mathcal{G}_\phi$ such that $\omega_1, \omega_2 \leq \omega$. Because of this, \mathcal{G}_ϕ is often used as an index set (of a net). For a proper weight ϕ , we would have: $\phi(x) = \lim_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_\phi} (\omega(x))$, for $x \in B^+$.

By standard theory, for a weight ϕ on a C^* -algebra B , one can associate to it a “GNS-construction” $(\mathcal{H}_\phi, \pi_\phi, \Lambda_\phi)$. Here, \mathcal{H}_ϕ is a Hilbert space, $\Lambda_\phi : \mathfrak{N}_\phi \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\phi$ is a linear map such that $\Lambda_\phi(\mathfrak{N}_\phi)$ is dense in \mathcal{H}_ϕ and $\langle \Lambda_\phi(a), \Lambda_\phi(b) \rangle = \phi(b^*a)$ for $a, b \in \mathfrak{N}_\phi$, and π_ϕ is a representation of B on \mathcal{H}_ϕ defined by $\pi_\phi(a)\Lambda_\phi(b) = \Lambda_\phi(ab)$ for $a \in B, b \in \mathfrak{N}_\phi$. The GNS-construction is unique up to a unitary transformation.

If ϕ is proper, then \mathfrak{N}_ϕ is dense in B and $\Lambda_\phi : \mathfrak{N}_\phi \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\phi$ is a closed map. Also $\pi_\phi : B \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\phi)$ is a non-degenerate $*$ -homomorphism. It is not difficult to show that ϕ has a natural extension to a weight on $M(B)$, which we will still denote by ϕ . Meanwhile, since we can define for every $\omega \in \mathcal{G}_\phi$ a unique element $\tilde{\omega} \in \pi_\phi(B)''_*$ such that $\tilde{\omega} \circ \pi_\phi = \omega$, we can define a weight $\tilde{\phi}$ on the von Neumann algebra $\pi_\phi(B)''$ in the following way: $\tilde{\phi}(x) = \lim_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_\phi} (\tilde{\omega}(x))$, for $x \in (\pi_\phi(B)'')^+$. Then, by standard terminology [19], $\tilde{\phi}$ is a “normal”, “semi-finite” weight on the von Neumann algebra $\pi_\phi(B)''$.

Motivated by the properties of normal, semi-finite weights on von Neumann algebras, and to give somewhat of a control over the non-commutativity of B , one introduces the notion of “KMS weights” [11]. The notion as defined below is slightly different from (but equivalent to) the original one given by Combes in [4].

Definition 1.1. A proper weight ϕ is called a “KMS weight” if there exists a norm-continuous one-parameter group of automorphisms σ of B such that

- (1) $\phi \circ \sigma_t = \phi$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (2) $\phi(a^*a) = \phi(\sigma_{i/2}(a)\sigma_{i/2}(a)^*)$, for all $a \in D(\sigma_{i/2})$.

The one-parameter group σ is called the “modular automorphism group” for ϕ . It is uniquely determined when ϕ is faithful. Meanwhile, a proper weight ϕ is said to be “approximately KMS” if the associated (normal, semi-finite) weight $\tilde{\phi}$ is faithful. A KMS weight is approximately KMS. For more discussion on these classes of weights, including the relationship between the conditions above and the usual KMS condition, see [11]. Finally, note that in the special case when ϕ is a trace

(i.e. $\phi(a^*a) = \phi(aa^*)$, for $a \in \mathfrak{N}_\phi$), it is clear that ϕ is KMS. The modular automorphism group will be trivial ($\equiv \text{Id}$).

1.2. Definition of a locally compact quantum group. Let A be a C^* -algebra. Suppose $\Delta : A \rightarrow M(A \otimes A)$ is a non-degenerate $*$ -homomorphism (Later, Δ will be given certain conditions for it to become a comultiplication.). A proper weight ϕ on (A, Δ) will be called *left invariant*, if

$$\phi((\omega \otimes \text{id})(\Delta a)) = \omega(1)\phi(a), \quad (1.1)$$

for all $a \in \mathfrak{N}_\phi^+$ and $\omega \in A_+^*$. Similarly, ϕ is called *right invariant*, if

$$\phi((\text{id} \otimes \omega)(\Delta a)) = \omega(1)\phi(a). \quad (1.2)$$

By $\omega(1)$, we mean $\|\omega\|$. Note here that we used the extensions of ϕ to $M(A)$ in the equations, since we only know that $(\omega \otimes \text{id})(\Delta a) \in M(A)^+$. In the definition of locally compact quantum groups (to be given below), the “slices” of Δa will be assumed to belong in A .

In the definitions above, the left [respectively, right] invariance condition requires the formula (1.1) to hold only for $a \in \mathfrak{N}_\phi^+$. It is actually a very weak form of left invariance. In the case of locally compact quantum groups, the result can be extended and a much stronger left invariance condition can be proved from it. The proof is non-trivial. It was one of the important contributions made by Kustermans and Vaes.

Next, let us state the definition of a locally compact (C^* -algebraic) quantum group given by Kustermans and Vaes [13]. In the definition, $[X]$ denotes the closed linear span of X .

Definition 1.2. Consider a C^* -algebra A and a non-degenerate $*$ -homomorphism $\Delta : A \rightarrow M(A \otimes A)$ such that

- (1) $(\Delta \otimes \text{id})\Delta = (\text{id} \otimes \Delta)\Delta$
- (2) $[\{(\omega \otimes \text{id})(\Delta a) : \omega \in A^*, a \in A\}] = A$
- (3) $[\{(\text{id} \otimes \omega)(\Delta a) : \omega \in A^*, a \in A\}] = A$

Moreover, assume that there exist weights ϕ and ψ such that

- ϕ is a faithful, left invariant approximate KMS weight on (A, Δ) .
- ψ is a right invariant approximate KMS weight on (A, Δ) .

Then we say that (A, Δ) is a (*reduced*) C^* -algebraic quantum group.

First condition is the “coassociativity” condition for the “comultiplication” Δ . By the non-degeneracy, Δ can be naturally extended to $M(A)$, thereby making the expression valid. The two density conditions more or less correspond to the cancellation property in the case of ordinary groups. The last axiom corresponds to the existence of the

Haar measure (The weights ϕ and ψ actually turn out to be faithful KMS weights [13, §5]). For more on this definition (e.g. discussions on how one can build other quantum group structures), see [13].

2. THE HOPF C^* -ALGEBRA (A, Δ)

Our main object of study is the Hopf C^* -algebra (A, Δ) constructed in [8]. As a C^* -algebra, A is isomorphic to a twisted group C^* -algebra $C^*(H/Z, C_0(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q}), \sigma)$, where H is the $(2n+1)$ -dimensional Heisenberg Lie group and Z is the center of H . Whereas, $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h}^*$ is the dual space of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{h} of H and $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{z}^\perp$, for $\mathfrak{z} \subseteq \mathfrak{h}$ corresponding to Z . Since H is a nilpotent Lie group, $H \cong \mathfrak{h}$ and $Z \cong \mathfrak{z}$, as vector spaces. We denoted by σ (not to be confused with the modular automorphism group) the twisting cocycle for the group H/Z . As constructed in [8], σ is a continuous field of cocycles $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q} \ni r \mapsto \sigma^r$, where

$$\sigma^r((x, y), (x', y')) = \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r)\beta(x, y')]. \quad (2.1)$$

Following the notation of the previous paper, we used: $\bar{e}(t) = e^{(-2\pi i)t}$ and $\eta_\lambda(r) = \frac{e^{2\lambda r} - 1}{2\lambda}$, while $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the inner product. The elements $(x, y), (x', y')$ are group elements in H/Z .

In [8], we showed that the C^* -algebra A is a strict deformation quantization (in the sense of Rieffel [17], [18], [7]) of $C_0(G)$, where G is a certain solvable Lie group which is the dual Poisson–Lie group of H . See Definition 1.6 of [8] for the precise definition of G . For convenience, the deformation parameter \hbar has been fixed ($\hbar = 1$), which is the reason why we do not see it in the definition of A . When $\hbar = 0$ (i.e. classical limit), it turns out that $\sigma \equiv 1$. So $A_{\hbar=0} \cong C_0(G)$. Throughout this paper, we work with $A = A_{\hbar=1}$.

Let us be a little more specific and recall some of the notations and results obtained in [8], while referring the reader to that paper for more details on the construction of our main example (A, Δ) .

We first introduce the subspace \mathcal{A} , which is a dense subspace of A consisting of the functions in $S_{3c}(H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q})$, the space of Schwartz functions in the (x, y, r) variables having compact support in the $r(\in \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q})$ variable. On \mathcal{A} , we define the (twisted) multiplication and the (twisted) involution as follows:

$$(f \times g)(x, y, r) = \int f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r) g(x - \tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y}, r) \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r)\beta(\tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y})] d\tilde{x}d\tilde{y}, \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$f^*(x, y, r) = \overline{f(-x, -y, r)} \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r)\beta(x, y)]. \quad (2.3)$$

It is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{A} = S_{3c}(H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q})$ is closed under the multiplication (2.2) and the involution (2.3). Here, we observe the role being played by the twisting cocycle σ defined in (2.1).

Elements of \mathcal{A} are viewed as operators on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q})$, via the “regular representation”, L , defined by

$$(L_f \xi)(x, y, r) = \int f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r) \xi(x - \tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y}, r) \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r) \beta(\tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y})] d\tilde{x} d\tilde{y}. \quad (2.4)$$

For $f \in \mathcal{A}$, define its norm by $\|f\| = \|L_f\|$. Then $(\mathcal{A}, \times, *, \|\cdot\|)$ as above is a pre- C^* -algebra, whose completion is the C^* -algebra $A \cong C^*(H/Z, C_0(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q}), \sigma)$.

Remark. To be more precise, the completion of \mathcal{A} with respect to the norm given by the regular representation, L , should be isomorphic to the “reduced” twisted group C^* -algebra $C_r^*(H/Z, C_0(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q}), \sigma)$. But by using a result of Packer and Raeburn [16], it is rather easy to see that the amenability condition holds in our case, thereby obtaining the isomorphism with the “full” C^* -algebra as above. Meanwhile, we should point out that our definition of \mathcal{A} is slightly different from that of [8]: There, \mathcal{A} is a subspace of $C_0(G)$, while at present we view it as functions contained in $C_0(H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q})$, in the (x, y, r) variables. Nevertheless, they can be regarded as the same since we consider the functions in \mathcal{A} as operators contained in our C^* -algebra A . The identification of the function spaces is given by the (partial) Fourier transform.

The C^* -algebra A becomes a Hopf C^* -algebra, together with its *comultiplication* Δ . In the following proposition, we chose to describe the comultiplication in terms of a certain “multiplicative unitary operator” $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$. See [8] for a discussion on the construction of U .

Proposition 2.1. (1) *Let U be the operator on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ defined by*

$$U\xi(x, y, r, x', y', r') = (e^{-\lambda r'})^n \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r') \beta(e^{-\lambda r'} x, y' - e^{-\lambda r'} y)] \xi(e^{-\lambda r'} x, e^{-\lambda r'} y, r + r', x' - e^{-\lambda r'} x, y' - e^{-\lambda r'} y, r').$$

Then U is a unitary operator, and it is multiplicative. That is, $U_{12}U_{13}U_{23} = U_{23}U_{12}$.

(2) *For $f \in \mathcal{A}$, define Δf by*

$$\Delta f = U(f \otimes 1)U^*,$$

where f and Δf are understood as operators L_f and $(L \otimes L)_{\Delta f}$. Then Δ can be extended to a non-degenerate C^ -homomorphism $\Delta : A \rightarrow M(A \otimes A)$ satisfying the coassociativity condition:*

$$(\Delta \otimes \text{id})\Delta f = (\text{id} \otimes \Delta)\Delta f.$$

Proof. See Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 of [8], together with the Remark 3.3 following them. \square

There is a useful characterization of the C^* -algebra A , via the multiplicative unitary operator U . The following proposition is suggested by the general theory on multiplicative unitaries [2].

Proposition 2.2. *Let U be as above. Consider the subspace $\mathcal{A}(U)$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ defined below:*

$$\mathcal{A}(U) = \{(\omega \otimes \text{id})(U) : \omega \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_*\}.$$

By standard theory, $\mathcal{A}(U)$ is a subalgebra of the operator algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, and the subspace $\mathcal{A}(U)\mathcal{H}$ forms a total set in \mathcal{H} .

We can show that the norm-closure in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of the algebra $\mathcal{A}(U)$ is exactly the C^ -algebra A we are studying. That is,*

$$A = \overline{\{(\omega \otimes \text{id})(U) : \omega \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_*\}}^{\|\cdot\|}.$$

Proof. The definition and the properties of $\mathcal{A}(U)$ can be found in [2]. We only need to verify the last statement. We will work with the standard notation $\omega_{\xi,\eta}$, where $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$. It is defined by $\omega_{\xi,\eta}(a) = \langle a\xi, \eta \rangle$, and it is well known that linear combinations of the $\omega_{\xi,\eta}$ are (norm) dense in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_*$.

So consider $(\omega_{\xi,\eta} \otimes \text{id})(U) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. We may further assume that ξ and η are continuous functions having compact support. Let $\zeta \in \mathcal{H}$. Then, by using change of variables, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\omega_{\xi,\eta} \otimes \text{id})(U)\zeta(x, y, r) \\ &= \int (U(\xi \otimes \zeta))(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{r}; x, y, r) \overline{\eta(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{r})} d\tilde{x}d\tilde{y}d\tilde{r} \\ &= \int f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r) \zeta(x - \tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y}, r) \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r)\beta(\tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y})] d\tilde{x}d\tilde{y}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r) = \int \xi(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{r} + r) (e^{\lambda r})^n \overline{\eta(e^{\lambda r}\tilde{x}, e^{\lambda r}\tilde{y}, \tilde{r})} d\tilde{r}.$$

Since ξ and η are L^2 functions, the integral (and thus f) is well defined. Actually, since f is essentially defined as a convolution product (in r) of two continuous functions having compact support, f will be also continuous with compact support. This means that

$$(\omega_{\xi,\eta} \otimes \text{id})(U) = L_f \in A.$$

Meanwhile, since the choice of ξ and η is arbitrary, we can see that the collection of the f will form a total set in the space of continuous

functions in the (x, y, r) variables having compact support. It follows from these two conclusions that

$$\overline{\{(\omega \otimes \text{id})(U) : \omega \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_*\}}^{\|\cdot\|} = A.$$

□

Meanwhile, from the proof of Theorem 3.2 of [8], we also have the following result. These are not same as the density conditions of Definition 1.2, but they can be used as alternative conditions (c.f. [13]).

Proposition 2.3. *We have:*

- (1) $\Delta(A)(1 \otimes A)$ is dense in $A \otimes A$.
- (2) $\Delta(A)(A \otimes 1)$ is dense in $A \otimes A$.

Proof. In the proof of the non-degeneracy of Δ in Theorem 3.2 and Remark 3.3 of [8], we showed that the $(\Delta f)(1 \otimes g)$'s ($f, g \in \mathcal{A}$) form a total set in the space $S_{3c}(H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q} \times H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q})$, which is in turn shown to be dense in $A \otimes A$: Under the natural injection from $S_{3c}(H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q} \times H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q})$ into $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$, the algebraic tensor product $\mathcal{A} \odot \mathcal{A}$ is sent into a dense subset of the algebraic tensor product $A \odot A$. Since elements in $S_{3c}(H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q} \times H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q})$ can be approximated (in the L^1 norm) by elements of $\mathcal{A} \odot \mathcal{A}$, we see that $S_{3c}(H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q} \times H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q})$ is mapped into a dense subset (in the C^* norm) of $A \otimes A$. Thus it follows that $\Delta(A)(1 \otimes A)$ is dense in $A \otimes A$. The second statement can be shown in exactly the same way. □

Turning our attention to the other structures on (A, Δ) , we point out that by viewing A as a “quantum $C_0(G)$ ”, we can construct its *counit*, ϵ , and *antipode*, S . These are described in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.4. (1) *For $f \in \mathcal{A}$, define $\epsilon : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by*

$$\epsilon(f) = \int f(x, y, 0) dx dy.$$

Then ϵ can be extended to a C^ -homomorphism from A to \mathbb{C} satisfying the condition: $(\text{id} \otimes \epsilon)\Delta = (\epsilon \otimes \text{id})\Delta = \text{id}$.*

- (2) *Consider a map $\kappa : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ defined by*

$$\kappa(f)(x, y, r) = (e^{2\lambda r})^n \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r)\beta(x, y)]f(-e^{\lambda r}x, -e^{\lambda r}y, -r).$$

There exists a map $S : A \rightarrow A$, which is an antiautomorphism extending κ . It satisfies the conditions:

$$S(S(a)^*)^* = a \quad \text{and} \quad (S \otimes S)(\Delta a) = \chi(\Delta(S(a))),$$

where χ denotes the flip.

Proof. See Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.3 of [8]. We had to use partial Fourier transform to convert these results into the level of functions in the (x, y, r) variables. We also mention here that S is defined by $S(a) = Ta^*T$, where T is an involutive operator on \mathcal{H} defined by

$$T\xi(x, y, r) = (e^{\lambda r})^n \overline{\xi(e^{\lambda r}x, e^{\lambda r}y, -r)}.$$

□

Remark. In [8], we used κ to denote the antipode, while we use S here. We do not necessarily think that the usage of κ is bad (in fact, it is the standard notation being used in Kac algebra theory). But we decided to use S here, so that we can match our notation with the preferred notation of Kustermans and Vaes [13].

In general, the counit may as well be unbounded. So Proposition 2.4 implies that what we have is a more restrictive “bounded counit”. Having S bounded is also a bonus. Even so, the result of the proposition is not enough to legitimately call S an antipode. To give some support for our choice, we also showed the following, albeit only at the level of the function space \mathcal{A} . See section 4 of [8].

Proposition 2.5. *For $f \in \mathcal{A}$, we have:*

$$m((\text{id} \otimes S)\Delta f) = m((S \otimes \text{id})\Delta f) = \epsilon(f)1,$$

where $m : \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is the multiplication.

This is the required condition for the antipode in the purely algebraic setting of Hopf algebra theory [15]. In this sense, the proposition gives us a modest justification for our choice of S . However, in the operator algebra setting, this is not the correct way of approach. One of the serious obstacles is that the multiplication m is in general not continuous for the operator norm, thereby giving us trouble extending m to $A \otimes A$ or $M(A \otimes A)$.

Because of this and other reasons (including the obstacles due to possible unboundedness of ϵ and S), one has to develop a new approach. Motivated by the theory of Kac algebras [6], operator algebraists have been treating the antipode together with the notion of the Haar weight. This is also the approach chosen by Masuda, Nakagami [14] and Kustermans, Vaes [13]. As we mentioned earlier in this paper, any rigorous discussion about locally compact quantum groups should be built around the notion of Haar weights. In the next section, we will exclusively discuss the Haar weight for our (A, Δ) , and establish that (A, Δ) is indeed a “ C^* -algebraic locally compact quantum group”. We will come back to the discussion of the antipode in section 4.

3. HAAR MEASURE

We have been arguing that (A, Δ) is a “quantum $C_0(G)$ ”. This viewpoint has been helpful in our construction of its comultiplication Δ , counit ϵ , and antipode S .

To discuss the (left invariant) Haar weight on (A, Δ) , we pull this viewpoint once more. Recall that the group structure on G has been specifically chosen (Definition 1.6 of [8]) so that the Lebesgue measure on G becomes its left invariant Haar measure. This suggests us to build the Haar weight on (A, Δ) from the Lebesgue measure on G . At the level of functions, in \mathcal{A} , this suggestion takes the following form.

Definition 3.1. On \mathcal{A} , define a linear functional ϕ by

$$\phi(f) = \int f(0, 0, r) dr.$$

In section 5 of [8], we obtained some results (including certain “left invariance” property) indicating that our choice of ϕ is a correct one. However, the discussion was mostly limited to the level of functions in \mathcal{A} , and thus not very satisfactory.

Jumping up from the function level to the operator level can be quite technical, and this is not necessarily an easy task (For example, see [1], [20]). However, if one wants to rigorously formulate the construction of a locally compact quantum group in the operator algebra setting, this step of “jumping up” (extending ϕ to a weight) is very crucial.

Fortunately in our case, the discussion will be much simpler than some of the difficult examples, since we can show that ϕ is tracial. Note the following:

Proposition 3.2. *Let ϕ be defined on \mathcal{A} as in Definition 3.1. Then for $f \in \mathcal{A}$, we have:*

$$\phi(f^* \times f) = \phi(f \times f^*) = \|f\|_2^2,$$

where f^* is the C^* -involution of f , as given in (2.3).

Proof. By equations (2.2) and (2.3), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} f^* \times f(x, y, r) &= \int f^*(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r) f(x - \tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y}, r) \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r) \beta(\tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y})] d\tilde{x} d\tilde{y} \\ &= \int \overline{f(-\tilde{x}, -\tilde{y}, r)} \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r) \beta(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})] f(x - \tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y}, r) \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r) \beta(\tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y})] d\tilde{x} d\tilde{y} \\ &= \int \overline{f(-\tilde{x}, -\tilde{y}, r)} f(x - \tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y}, r) \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r) \beta(\tilde{x}, y)] d\tilde{x} d\tilde{y} \end{aligned}$$

It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(f^* \times f) &= \int f^* \times f(0, 0, r) dr = \int \overline{f(-\tilde{x}, -\tilde{y}, r)} f(-\tilde{x}, -\tilde{y}, r) d\tilde{x}d\tilde{y}dr \\ &= \int \overline{f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r)} f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r) d\tilde{x}d\tilde{y}dr = \|f\|_2^2\end{aligned}$$

The identity $\phi(f \times f^*) = \|f\|_2^2$ can be proved similarly. \square

Corollary. *By Proposition 3.2, we see that ϕ is a faithful, positive linear functional which is a trace.*

Now, let us begin the discussion of constructing a weight on (A, Δ) extending ϕ . As a first step, let us consider the associated GNS construction for ϕ . We can see easily that the “regular representation” L on \mathcal{H} we defined earlier is the GNS representation for ϕ .

Proposition 3.3. *Consider the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q})$, and let $\Lambda : \mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be the inclusion map. Then for $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$, we have:*

$$\langle \Lambda(f), \Lambda(g) \rangle = \phi(g^* \times f).$$

Here $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the inner product on \mathcal{H} , conjugate in the second place. Meanwhile, left multiplication gives a non-degenerate $*$ -representation, $\pi_\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, which coincides with the “regular representation” L .

By uniqueness (up to unitary equivalence), we conclude that $(\mathcal{H}, \Lambda, \pi_\phi)$ is the GNS construction associated with ϕ .

Proof. Since $\mathcal{A} = S_{3c}(H/Z \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{q})$, clearly \mathcal{A} is a dense subspace of \mathcal{H} . The inclusion map (i. e. $\Lambda(f) = f$) carries \mathcal{A} into \mathcal{H} . Now for $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(g^* \times f) &= \int g^*(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r) f(0 - \tilde{x}, 0 - \tilde{y}, r) \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r) \beta(\tilde{x}, 0 - \tilde{y})] d\tilde{x}d\tilde{y}dr \\ &= \int \overline{g(-\tilde{x}, -\tilde{y}, r)} \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r) \beta(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})] f(-\tilde{x}, -\tilde{y}, r) \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r) \beta(\tilde{x}, -\tilde{y})] d\tilde{x}d\tilde{y}dr \\ &= \int \overline{g(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r)} f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r) d\tilde{x}d\tilde{y}dr = \langle f, g \rangle = \langle \Lambda(f), \Lambda(g) \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Next, we consider the left-multiplication representation π_ϕ . Then for $f, \xi \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned}(\pi_\phi(f))(\Lambda(\xi))(x, y, r) &:= (\Lambda(f \times \xi))(x, y, r) = (f \times \xi)(x, y, r) \\ &= \int f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r) \xi(x - \tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y}, r) \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r) \beta(\tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y})] d\tilde{x}d\tilde{y} \\ &= L_f \xi(x, y, r).\end{aligned}$$

This shows that π_ϕ is just the $*$ -representation L of equation (2.4). Since $\mathcal{A} = \Lambda(\mathcal{A})$ is dense in \mathcal{H} , it is also clear that $\overline{\pi_\phi(\mathcal{A})\mathcal{H}}^{\|\cdot\|^2} = \mathcal{H}$, which means that $\pi_\phi(=L)$ is non-degenerate. \square

It follows from the proposition that $\mathcal{A}(\subseteq \mathcal{H})$ is a “left Hilbert algebra” (See definition below.).

Definition 3.4. ([4], [19]) By a *left Hilbert algebra*, we mean an involutive algebra \mathcal{U} equipped with a scalar product such that the involution is an antilinear preclosed mapping in the associated Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and such that the left-multiplication representation π of \mathcal{U} is non-degenerate, bounded, and involutive.

Proposition 3.5. *The algebra \mathcal{A} , together with its inner product inherited from that of \mathcal{H} , is a left Hilbert algebra.*

Proof. We view $\mathcal{A} = \Lambda(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. It is an involutive algebra equipped with the inner product inherited from that of \mathcal{H} . Now for every $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$, we have:

$$\langle f^*, g \rangle = \phi(g^* \times f^*) = \phi(f^* \times g^*) = \langle g^*, f \rangle,$$

where we used the property that ϕ is a trace. Since \mathcal{A} is dense in \mathcal{H} , it follows easily from this equation that the map $f \mapsto f^*$ is closable. The remaining conditions for \mathcal{A} being a left Hilbert algebra are immediate consequences of the previous proposition. \square

Let us denote by T the closure of the involution on \mathcal{A} . Usually, the next step is to study T and its polar decomposition. In our case, since ϕ is a trace, this step is rather trivial. For the sake of completeness, let us mention about this briefly: The map T is a closed, antilinear map on \mathcal{H} . The proposition implies that \mathcal{A} is a core for T , and $Tf = f^*$ for $f \in \mathcal{A}$. From the proof of the proposition, we can see also that \mathcal{A} is contained in the domain, $D(T^*)$, of T^* and that $T^*g = g^*$ for $g \in \mathcal{A}$.

Define $\nabla = T^*T$. Clearly, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq D(\nabla)$ and $\nabla(f) = f$ for $f \in \mathcal{A}$. In other words, $\nabla = \text{Id}$. The polar decomposition of T is given by $T = J\nabla^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where ∇ is as above and J is an anti-unitary operator. Obviously in our case, $T = J$. The “modular operator” ∇ plays an important role in the formulation of the KMS property. But we can see here that we can ignore ∇ from now on, all due to the property that ϕ is a trace.

Since we have a left Hilbert algebra structure on \mathcal{A} , we can apply the result of Combes ([4], [19]) to obtain a weight extending ϕ . Although it is true that we do not necessarily have to rely too much on the theory of weights on C^* -algebras (Since ϕ is a trace in our case, we

could use even earlier results by Dixmier), we nevertheless choose here the more general approach. The advantage is that the process will remain essentially the same even in more difficult examples where we may encounter non-tracial weights.

Theorem 3.6. *There is a faithful, lower semi-continuous weight on the C^* -algebra A extending the linear functional ϕ . We will use the notation ϕ_A to denote this weight.*

Proof. The representation $\pi_\phi(= L)$ generates a von Neumann algebra $L(\mathcal{A})''$ on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . On this von Neumann algebra, we can define a faithful, semi-finite, normal weight $\tilde{\phi}$ (See Theorem 2.11 of [4].):

For $p \in L(\mathcal{A})''$ and $p \geq 0$, define $\tilde{\phi}(p)$ by

$$\tilde{\phi}(p) = \begin{cases} \|\xi\|^2 = \langle \xi, \xi \rangle & \text{if } \exists \xi \in \mathcal{A}'' \text{ such that } p^{1/2} = \pi_\phi(\xi) \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Here \mathcal{A}'' denotes the set of “left bounded elements” [4, §2].

We restrict this normal weight to the C^* -algebra $\overline{L(\mathcal{A})}^{\|\cdot\|}$ (norm-closure). Then the restriction is a faithful, lower semi-continuous weight. Since $\pi_\phi(= L)$ extends from \mathcal{A} to an isomorphism $A \cong \overline{L(\mathcal{A})}^{\|\cdot\|}$, we can use this isomorphism to obtain the faithful, lower semi-continuous weight (to be denoted by ϕ_A) on A .

It is clear from the construction that ϕ_A extends the linear functional ϕ on \mathcal{A} . To see this explicitly, suppose $f \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $\pi_\phi(f)^* \pi_\phi(f) \in L(\mathcal{A})''$. According to the theory of left Hilbert algebras, we then have $\pi_\phi(f)^* \pi_\phi(f) \in \mathfrak{M}_{\tilde{\phi}}^+$ and

$$\tilde{\phi}(\pi_\phi(f)^* \pi_\phi(f)) = \langle \Lambda(f), \Lambda(f) \rangle = \langle f, f \rangle = \phi(f^* f).$$

But $\pi_\phi(f)^* \pi_\phi(f) = \pi_\phi(f^* f) \in \overline{L(\mathcal{A})}^{\|\cdot\|} \cong A$, and since ϕ_A is the restriction of $\tilde{\phi}$ to A , it follows that $\pi_\phi(f^* f) \in \mathfrak{M}_{\phi_A}$, and $\phi_A(\pi_\phi(f^* f)) = \phi(f^* f)$. By using polarization, we conclude that in general, $L(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{\phi_A}$ and

$$\phi_A(\pi_\phi(f)) = \phi(f), \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{A}.$$

□

Remark. From the proof of the proposition, we can see that ϕ_A is densely defined (note that we have $L(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_{\phi_A}$). It is a faithful weight since the linear functional ϕ is faithful on \mathcal{A} . Since ϕ_A is obtained by restricting the normal weight $\tilde{\phi}$ on the von Neumann algebra level, it follows that it is also KMS (We will not give proof of this here, since ϕ being a trace makes this last statement redundant: See comment

after Definition 1.1.). In the terminology of the first section, ϕ_A is a “proper” weight, which is “faithful” and “KMS” (actually a trace).

From now on, let us turn our attention to the weight ϕ_A . Consider the GNS triple associated with ϕ_A , given by the following ingredients:

- $\mathcal{H}_{\phi_A} = \mathcal{H}$
- $\Lambda_{\phi_A} : \mathfrak{N}_{\phi_A} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. The proof of the previous theorem suggests that for $a \in \mathfrak{N}_{\phi_A}$, there exists a unique “left bounded” element $v \in \mathcal{H}$. We define $\Lambda_{\phi_A}(a) = v$.
- $\pi_{\phi_A} : A \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is the inclusion map.

Note that for $f \in \mathcal{A}$, we have: $\Lambda_{\phi_A}(\pi_{\phi}(f)) = \Lambda(f)$. So we know that Λ_{ϕ_A} has a dense range in \mathcal{H} .

Define Λ_0 as the closure of the mapping $L(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H} : \pi_{\phi}(f) \mapsto \Lambda(f)$. Let us denote by \mathcal{A}_0 the domain of Λ_0 . Clearly, Λ_0 is a restriction of Λ_{ϕ_A} . By using the properties of ϕ_A , including its lower semi-continuity and the “left invariance” at the level of the $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} , one can improve the left invariance up to the level of \mathcal{A}_0 . One can also show that $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathfrak{N}_{\phi_A}$ and that $L(\mathcal{A})$ is a core for Λ_{ϕ_A} (We can more or less follow the discussion in section 6 of [12].). From these results, the left invariance of ϕ_A can be proved at the C^* -algebra level (See Corollary 6.14 of [12].).

However, we plan to give a somewhat different proof here, which is in the spirit of Van Daele’s recently developed method [20]. We first need a lemma on the $\omega_{\xi, \eta}$.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ and consider $\omega_{\xi, \eta}$, as defined earlier. If $\{\xi_k\}$ forms an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} , we have:*

$$\omega_{\xi, \eta}(ab) = \sum_k \omega_{\xi_k, \eta}(a) \omega_{\xi, \xi_k}(b), \quad a, b \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}).$$

Proof. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{\xi, \eta}(ab) &= \langle ab\xi, \eta \rangle = \langle b\xi, a^*\eta \rangle \\ &= \sum_k \langle b\xi, \xi_k \rangle \langle \xi_k, a^*\eta \rangle = \sum_k \langle b\xi, \xi_k \rangle \langle a\xi_k, \eta \rangle \\ &= \sum_k \omega_{\xi, \xi_k}(b) \omega_{\xi_k, \eta}(a). \end{aligned}$$

□

The following theorem shows the left invariance of ϕ_A , as defined by equation (1.1).

Theorem 3.8. *For any positive element $a \in A$ such that $\phi_A(a) < \infty$, and for $\omega \in A_+^*$, we have:*

$$\phi_A((\omega \otimes \text{id})(\Delta a)) = \omega(1)\phi_A(a).$$

Proof. As stated above, let $a \in \mathfrak{M}_{\phi_A}^+$ and let $\omega \in A_+^*$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that ω is a (positive) vector state. That is, we can assume that there is a vector $\zeta \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\omega = \omega_{\zeta, \zeta}$.

Now consider $(\omega \otimes \text{id})(\Delta a) = (\omega_{\zeta, \zeta} \otimes \text{id})(\Delta a)$. From Proposition 2.1, we know that $\Delta a = U(a \otimes 1)U^*$. If we let (ξ_k) be an orthonormal basis in \mathcal{H} , we would then have:

$$\begin{aligned} (\omega \otimes \text{id})(\Delta a) &= (\omega_{\zeta, \zeta} \otimes \text{id})(U(a \otimes 1)U^*) \\ &= (\omega_{\zeta, \zeta} \otimes \text{id})(U(a^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes 1)(a^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes 1)U^*) \quad a: \text{ positive} \\ &= \sum_k [(\omega_{\xi_k, \zeta} \otimes \text{id})(U(a^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes 1))] [(\omega_{\zeta, \xi_k} \otimes \text{id})(a^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes 1)U^*] \\ &= \sum_k v_k^* v_k. \end{aligned}$$

The sum is convergent in the σ -weak topology on the von Neumann algebra $L(\mathcal{A})''$ (We use Lemma 3.7 here.). For convenience, we let $v_k = (\omega_{\zeta, \xi_k} \otimes \text{id})(a^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes 1)U^*$.

We can write: $v_k = \sum_i \omega_{\xi_i, \xi_k}(a^{\frac{1}{2}})(\omega_{\zeta, \xi_i} \otimes \text{id})(U^*)$, by Lemma 3.7. But note that $(\omega_{\xi_i, \zeta} \otimes \text{id})(U) \in \mathcal{A}(U) (\subseteq A)$ (See Proposition 2.2 for the definition of $\mathcal{A}(U)$.) and that $(\omega_{\zeta, \xi_i} \otimes \text{id})(U^*) = ((\omega_{\xi_i, \zeta} \otimes \text{id})(U))^*$. Thus it is not difficult to see that $(\omega_{\zeta, \xi_k} \otimes \text{id})(U^*)$ is a “left bounded” element and so is v_k . Therefore, it follows that $\sum_k v_k^* v_k \in \mathfrak{N}_{\phi_A}$.

Remembering that ϕ_A is a restriction of $\tilde{\phi}$, we thus have:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_A((\omega_{\zeta, \zeta} \otimes \text{id})(\Delta a)) &= \phi_A\left(\sum_k v_k^* v_k\right) = \sum_k \phi_A(v_k^* v_k) \\ &= \sum_{k, l} \langle v_k \xi_l, v_k \xi_l \rangle \quad (\xi_l): \text{ orthonormal basis of } \mathcal{H} \\ &= \sum_{k, l, i} \omega_{\xi_i, \xi_k}(a^{\frac{1}{2}}) \overline{\omega_{\xi_i, \xi_k}(a^{\frac{1}{2}})} \langle ((\omega_{\zeta, \xi_i} \otimes \text{id})(U^*)) \xi_l, ((\omega_{\zeta, \xi_i} \otimes \text{id})(U^*)) \xi_l \rangle \\ &= \sum_{l, i} \langle a^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi_i, a^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi_i \rangle \|((\omega_{\zeta, \xi_i} \otimes \text{id})(U^*)) \xi_l\|_2^2 = \sum_l \phi_A(a) \|U^*(\zeta \otimes \xi_l)\|_2^2 \\ &= \phi_A(a) \|\zeta\|_2^2 \quad U^* \text{ is unitary} \\ &= \phi_A(a) \langle \zeta, \zeta \rangle = \phi_A(a) \omega(1). \end{aligned}$$

□

As we remarked earlier, proving this “weak” version of the left invariance is enough. In this way, we have shown that ϕ_A is a proper, faithful, KMS (tracial) weight on (A, Δ) , which is left invariant. This satisfies the requirement of Definition 1.2.

We now need to talk about the right invariant weight on (A, Δ) . Again by viewing (A, Δ) as a “quantum $C_0(G)$ ”, we try to build the weight from the right Haar measure of G (The group structure of G as defined in Definition 1.6 of [8] immediately gives us the natural choice for its right Haar measure.). Just as we did at the beginning of this section, this suggestion lets us to consider the linear functional ψ on \mathcal{A} , as described below.

Definition 3.9. On \mathcal{A} , define a linear functional ψ by

$$\psi(f) = \int f(0, 0, r)(e^{-2\lambda r})^n dr.$$

It is helpful to realize that at the level of the $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} , we have: $\psi = \phi \circ \kappa$, where κ is the antipodal map we defined in Proposition 2.4. Indeed, for $f \in \mathcal{A}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\kappa(f)) &= \int \kappa(f)(0, 0, r) dr = \int (e^{2\lambda r})^n \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r)\beta(0, 0)] f(0, 0, -r) dr \\ &= \int f(0, 0, r)(e^{-2\lambda r})^n dr = \psi(f). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, to extend ψ to the C^* -algebra level, we may consider $\psi_A = \phi_A \circ S$, where $S : A \rightarrow A$ is the antiautomorphism extending κ , as defined in Proposition 2.4.

Remark. Defining $\psi_A = \phi_A \circ S$ is not entirely correct: In general, the “antipode” S may not be defined everywhere and can be unbounded. However, even in the general case, the antipode can be always written in the form $S = R\tau_{-\frac{i}{2}}$ (“polar decomposition” of S), where τ is the so-called “scaling group” and R is the “unitary antipode”. In our case, $\tau \equiv 1$ and $R = S$ (See section 4.). The correct way of defining ψ_A would be: $\psi_A = \phi_A \circ R$, which is true in general.

Since R is an (anti-)automorphism on A , it follows that $\psi_A = \phi_A \circ R$ is clearly a faithful, lower semi-continuous, densely defined KMS weight on A , extending ψ . Checking the “right invariance” is straightforward, if we use the property of R .

Theorem 3.10. *Let $\psi_A = \phi_A \circ R$. It is a proper, faithful, KMS (and tracial) weight on A . It is also “right invariant”. That is, for $a \in \mathfrak{M}_{\psi_A}^+$ and for $\omega \in A_+^*$, we have:*

$$\psi_A((\text{id} \otimes \omega)(\Delta a)) = \omega(1)\psi_A(a).$$

Proof. Recall from Proposition 2.4 that $R(=S)$ satisfies $(R \otimes R)(\Delta a) = \chi(\Delta(R(a)))$, where χ denotes the flip. We thus have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \psi_A((\text{id} \otimes \omega)(\Delta a)) &= \phi_A(R((\text{id} \otimes \omega)(\Delta a))) \\
 &= \phi_A((\text{id} \otimes \omega)((R \otimes R)(\Delta a))) \\
 &= \phi_A((\text{id} \otimes \omega)(\chi(\Delta(R(a)))) = \phi_A((\omega \otimes \text{id})(\Delta(R(a)))) \\
 &= \omega(1)\phi_A(R(a)) \quad \phi_A: \text{left invariant} \\
 &= \omega(1)\psi_A(a).
 \end{aligned}$$

□

We thus have the weight ψ_A on (A, Δ) , satisfying the requirement of Definition 1.2. For another characterization of the right invariant weight, see section 5.

Finally, we are now able to say that (A, Δ) is indeed a *(C^* -algebraic) locally compact quantum group*, in the sense of [13].

Theorem 3.11. *The pair (A, Δ) , together with the weights ϕ_A and ψ_A on it, is a C^* -algebraic quantum group.*

Proof. Combine the results of Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.3 on the comultiplication Δ . Theorem 3.6 and Theorem 3.8 gives the left invariant weight ϕ_A , while Theorem 3.10 gives the right invariant weight ψ_A . By Definition 1.2, we conclude that (A, Δ) is a *(reduced) C^* -algebraic quantum group*. □

4. OTHER QUANTUM GROUP STRUCTURES ON (A, Δ)

According to the general theory (by Kustermans and Vaes [13]), the result of Theorem 3.11 is enough to establish our main goal of showing that (A, Δ) is indeed a C^* -algebraic locally compact quantum group (satisfying Definition 1.2).

Assuming both the left invariant and the right invariant weights in the definition may look somewhat peculiar, while there is no mention on the antipode. However, using these rather simple set of axioms, Kustermans and Vaes could prove additional properties for (A, Δ) , so that it can be legitimately called a locally compact quantum group. They construct a manageable multiplicative unitary operator (in the sense of [2] and [23]) associated with (A, Δ) , and more significantly, the antipode and its polar decomposition. The uniqueness (up to scalar multiplication) of the Haar weight is also obtained.

An aspect of note through all this is that in this new definition, the “left (or right) invariance” of a weight has been formulated without invoking the antipode, while a characterization of the antipode is given

without explicitly referring to any invariant weights. This is much simpler and is a fundamental improvement over earlier frameworks, where one usually requires certain conditions of the type:

$$(\text{id} \otimes \phi)((1 \otimes a)(\Delta b)) = S((\text{id} \otimes \phi)((\Delta a)(1 \otimes g))).$$

It is also more natural. Note that in the cases of ordinary locally compact groups or Hopf algebras in the purely algebraic setting, the axioms of the antipode do not have to require any relationships to invariant measures.

Furthermore, using the multiplicative unitary operator, one can construct the “(reduced) dual” $(\hat{A}, \hat{\Delta})$. The method is similar to the case of Kac algebras [6], although some technical work is necessary [14], [23], [13]. Together with the “dual weights” on it, $(\hat{A}, \hat{\Delta})$ becomes also a reduced C^* -algebraic quantum group. One then obtains the generalized version of the Pontryagin duality theorem. That is, $(\hat{\hat{A}}, \hat{\hat{\Delta}}) \cong (A, \Delta)$.

For details on the general theory, we will refer the reader to [13]. What we plan to do in this section is to match the general theory with our specific example. In regards to the fact that the multiplicative unitary operator and the antipode play the central roles in the study of any locally compact quantum group, we will see if we can re-construct U and S from (A, Δ) .

4.1. Multiplicative unitary operator. Given a locally compact quantum group (A, Δ) together with its left and right invariant weights ϕ and ψ , one can construct the *multiplicative unitary operator* for (A, Δ) in the following way:

Fix the GNS triple $(\mathcal{H}_\phi, \Lambda_\phi, \pi_\phi)$ for ϕ . Then we define the unitary operator $W \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\phi \otimes \mathcal{H}_\phi)$ such that

$$W^*(\Lambda_\phi(a) \otimes \Lambda_\phi(b)) = (\Lambda_\phi \otimes \Lambda_\phi)((\Delta b)(a \otimes 1)), \quad (4.1)$$

for all $a, b \in \mathfrak{N}_\phi$. This formula is essentially the one used in Kac algebra theory [6]. For the definition to work, one needs to show that W^* is isometry, and moreover unitary. This is done separately in steps. The operator W defined in this way is multiplicative, and it is the one associated with (A, Δ) .

To compare W constructed in this way with our own U , let us first fix $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. By the result obtained in the previous paper (See proof of Theorem 3.2 of [8]), we know that

$$\begin{aligned} ((\Delta b)(a \otimes 1))(x, y, r; x', y', r') &= (e^{-\lambda r'}) \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r') \beta(e^{-\lambda r'} x, y' - e^{-\lambda r'} y)] \\ &\quad b(e^{-\lambda r'} x, e^{-\lambda r'} y, r + r') a(x' - e^{-\lambda r'} x, y' - e^{-\lambda r'} y, r'). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, equation (4.1) takes the form:

$$W^* \xi(x, y, r; x', y', r') = (e^{-\lambda r'}) \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r') \beta(e^{-\lambda r'} x, y' - e^{-\lambda r'} y)] \\ \xi(x' - e^{-\lambda r'} x, y' - e^{-\lambda r'} y, r'; e^{-\lambda r'} x, e^{-\lambda r'} y, r + r').$$

Comparing with the expression for our own U (given in Proposition 2.1), we see that $W^* = \Sigma U \Sigma$ and thus $W = \Sigma U^* \Sigma$, where Σ is the flip on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$. This means that W suggested by the general theory and our own U are “opposite” multiplicative unitaries. This is perfectly satisfactory, since we have:

$$\Delta a = U(a \otimes 1)U^* = W^*(1 \otimes a)W,$$

which exactly agrees with the formulation of [13].

4.2. Antipode. By general theory ([23], [13]), the antipode, S , can be characterized such that $\{(\omega \otimes \text{id})U : \omega \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_*\}$ is a core for S and

$$S((\omega \otimes \text{id})U) = (\omega \otimes \text{id})(U^*), \quad \omega \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_*. \quad (4.2)$$

It is a closed linear operator on A . The domain $D(S)$ is a subalgebra of A and S is antimultiplicative: i.e. $S(ab) = S(b)S(a)$, for any $a, b \in D(S)$. The image $S(D(S))$ coincides with $D(S)^*$ and $S(S(a)^*)^* = a$ for any $a \in D(S)$. The operator S admits the (unique) “polar decomposition”: $S = R\tau_{-\frac{i}{2}}$, where R is the “unitary antipode” and $\tau_{-\frac{i}{2}}$ is the analytic generator of a certain one parameter group $(\tau_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ of $*$ -automorphisms of A (called the “scaling group”).

Remark. In [13], the scaling group and the unitary antipode are constructed first (using only the multiplicative unitary operator and the invariant weights), from which they define the antipode via $S = R\tau_{-\frac{i}{2}}$. The characterization given above is due to Woronowicz [23].

To compare S given by equation (4.2) with our own S defined in Proposition 2.4, let us again consider $\omega_{\xi, \eta}$. From the proof of Proposition 2.2, we know that

$$(\omega_{\xi, \eta} \otimes \text{id})(U) = L_f,$$

where

$$f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r) = \int \xi(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{r} + r) (e^{\lambda r})^n \overline{\eta(e^{\lambda r} \tilde{x}, e^{\lambda r} \tilde{y}, \tilde{r})} d\tilde{r}.$$

We can carry out a similar computation for $(\omega_{\xi,\eta} \otimes \text{id})(U^*)$. For $\zeta \in \mathcal{H}$, we would have (again using change of variables):

$$\begin{aligned} S(L_f)\zeta(x, y, r) &= S((\omega_{\xi,\eta} \otimes \text{id})(U))\zeta(x, y, r) \\ &= (\omega_{\xi,\eta} \otimes \text{id})(U^*)\zeta(x, y, r) \\ &= \int (U^*(\xi \otimes \zeta))(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{r}; x, y, r) \overline{\eta(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{r})} d\tilde{x}d\tilde{y}d\tilde{r} \\ &= \int g(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r)\zeta(x - \tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y}, r)\bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r)\beta(\tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y})] d\tilde{x}d\tilde{y} \\ &= L_g\zeta(x, y, r), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$g(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r) = \int (e^{\lambda r})^n \xi(-e^{\lambda r}\tilde{x}, -e^{\lambda r}\tilde{y}, \tilde{r}-r) \overline{\eta(-\tilde{x}, -\tilde{y}, \tilde{r})} \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r)\beta(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})] d\tilde{r}.$$

This means that $S(f) = g$. Comparing with f , we see that

$$S(f)(x, y, r) = g(x, y, r) = (e^{2\lambda r})^n f(-e^{\lambda r}\tilde{x}, -e^{\lambda r}\tilde{y}, -r)\bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r)\beta(x, y)].$$

This is exactly the expression we gave in Proposition 2.4, verifying that our situation agrees perfectly with the general theory.

Since we have already seen that $S : A \rightarrow A$ is an antiautomorphism (defined everywhere on A), the uniqueness of the polar decomposition implies that $R = S$ and $\tau \equiv 1$.

As a final comment on the general theory, we point out that after one defines the antipode as $S = R\tau_{-\frac{1}{2}}$, one proves that for $a, b \in \mathfrak{N}_{\psi_A}$,

$$S((\psi_A \otimes \text{id})((a^* \otimes 1)(\Delta b))) = (\psi_A \otimes \text{id})(\Delta(a^*)(b \otimes 1)).$$

In this way, one can “define” S , as well as give a stronger version of the invariance of ψ_A . The fact that this result could be obtained from the defining axioms (as opposed to being one of the axioms itself) was the significant achievement of [13].

5. MODULAR FUNCTION

To motivate the modular function of (A, Δ) , let us re-visit our right invariant weight ψ_A . We will keep the notation of section 3. Recall that at the level of a dense $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} , the right invariant weight is given by the linear functional ψ :

$$\psi(f) = \int f(0, 0, r)(e^{-2\lambda r})^n dr.$$

Let us consider the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_R , which will be the GNS Hilbert space for ψ . It is defined such that $\mathcal{H}_R = \mathcal{H}$ as a space and the inner

product on it is defined by

$$\langle f, g \rangle_R = \int f(x, y, r) \overline{g(x, y, r)} (e^{-2\lambda r})^n dr.$$

Let Λ_R be the inclusion map $\Lambda_R : \mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_R$. We can see easily that for $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\langle \Lambda_R(f), \Lambda_R(g) \rangle_R = \langle \Lambda(f), \Lambda(\delta g) \rangle.$$

Here $\delta g \in \mathcal{A}$ defined by $\delta g(x, y, r) = (e^{-2\lambda r})^n g(x, y, r)$.

For motivational purposes, let us be less rigorous for the time being. Observe that working purely formally, we can regard δg as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta g(x, y, r) &= (e^{-2\lambda r})^n g(x, y, r) \\ &= \int \delta(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, r) g(x - \tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y}, r) \bar{e}[\eta_\lambda(r) \beta(\tilde{x}, y - \tilde{y})] d\tilde{x} d\tilde{y} \\ &= (\delta \times g)(x, y, r), \end{aligned}$$

where δ is considered as a (Dirac delta type) “function” in the (x, y, r) variables such that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(x, y, r) &= 0, & (\text{if } x \neq 0 \text{ or } y \neq 0) \\ \int \delta(x, y, r) dx dy &= (e^{-2\lambda r})^n. \end{aligned}$$

At the level of the functions in the (x, y, z) variables, δ corresponds to the following “function” (we may use partial Fourier transform, again purely formally):

$$h(x, y, z) = \int e[(-e^{-\lambda r} p) \cdot x + (-e^{-\lambda r} q) \cdot y + (-r)z] dp dq dr.$$

In this formulation, we see an indication of the inverse operation on G (Note that in G , we have $(p, q, r)^{-1} = (-e^{-\lambda r} p, -e^{-\lambda r} q, -r)$).

These remarks modestly justifies our intention to call δ a “modular function”. Certainly, we see that δ plays an important role relating $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_R$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, or in other words, relating ψ and ϕ . A word of caution is that δ is not bounded and not exactly a function. What we plan to do here is to make this notion precise in the C^* -algebra setting.

Note that since \mathcal{A} is a dense subspace of \mathcal{H} , we may already regard the map $\tilde{\delta} : \mathcal{A} \ni g \mapsto \delta g \in \mathcal{A}$ as an operator on \mathcal{H} . It would be an (unbounded) operator affiliated with the von Neumann algebra $L(A)''$, since for an arbitrary element $b \in L(A)'$ and $g \in \mathcal{A}(\subseteq A)$, we would have:

$$b\tilde{\delta}g = \tilde{\delta}gb = \tilde{\delta}bg.$$

By viewing \mathcal{A} again as a dense subspace of \mathcal{H} , we conclude that $\tilde{\delta}$ commutes with $b \in L(A)'$, proving our claim that $\tilde{\delta}$ is affiliated with $L(A)''$.

We may pull down the operator $\tilde{\delta}$ to the C^* -algebra level, and obtain an operator affiliated with A , in the C^* -algebra setting (c. f. in the sense of Woronowicz [22]). Let us be more precise. Define first a closed linear (unbounded) operator, N , from \mathcal{H} into \mathcal{H}_R such that $\Lambda(\mathcal{A})$ is a core for N and

$$N\Lambda(f) := \Lambda_R(f), \quad f \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Then N is a densely defined, injective operator with dense range. Note also that $\langle N\Lambda(f), \Lambda_R(g) \rangle_R = \langle \Lambda(f), \Lambda(\delta g) \rangle$. So we have $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq D(N^*)$, and

$$N^*\Lambda_R(g) = \Lambda(\delta g), \quad g \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Consider the following operator (which will be the “modular function”). Clearly, $\Lambda(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq D(\delta_A)$ and $\delta_A\Lambda(f) = \Lambda(\delta f)$.

Definition 5.1. Define $\delta_A = N^*N$. It is an injective, positive (unbounded) operator on \mathcal{H} .

By general theory, we can say that δ_A is the appropriate definition of the “modular function” in the C^* -algebra setting.

Theorem 5.2. *Let δ_A be defined as above. Then the following properties hold.*

- (1) δ_A is an operator affiliated with the C^* -algebra A .
- (2) $\Delta(\delta_A) = \delta_A \otimes \delta_A$.
- (3) $\tau_t(\delta_A) = \delta_A$ and $R(\delta_A) = \delta_A^{-1}$.
- (4) $\psi(a) = \phi(\delta_A^{\frac{1}{2}} a \delta_A^{\frac{1}{2}})$, for $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

Proof. It is not difficult to see that δ_A is cut down from the operator $\tilde{\delta}$. For proof of the statements, see [13, §7] or see [12, §8]. There are also important relations relating the modular automorphism groups corresponding to ϕ_A and ψ_A , but in our case they become trivial. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Baaĵ, *Représentation régulière du groupe quantique des déplacements de Woronowicz*, Recent Advances in Operator Algebras (Orléans 1992), Astérisque, no. 232, Soc. Math. France, 1995, pp. 11–48 (French).
- [2] S. Baaĵ and G. Skandalis, *Unitaires multiplicatifs et dualité pour les produits croisés de C^* -algèbres*, Ann. Scient. Éc. Norm. Sup., 4^e série **t. 26** (1993), 425–488 (French).
- [3] F. Combes, *Poids sur une C^* -algèbre*, J. Math. Pures et Appl. **47** (1968), 57–100 (French).

- [4] ———, *Poids associé à une algèbre hilbertienne à gauche*, Compos. Math. **23** (1971), 49–77 (French).
- [5] A. Connes, *Noncommutative Geometry*, Academic Press, 1994.
- [6] M. Enock and J. M. Schwartz, *Kac Algebras and Duality of Locally Compact Groups*, Springer-Verlag, 1992.
- [7] B. J. Kahng, *Deformation quantization of certain non-linear Poisson structures*, Int. J. Math. **9** (1998), 599–621.
- [8] ———, *Non-compact quantum groups arising from Heisenberg type Lie bialgebras*, J. Operator Theory **44** (2000), 303–334.
- [9] ———, **-representations of a quantum Heisenberg group algebra*, 2001, preprint (to appear in Houston J. Math).
- [10] ———, *Dressing orbits and a quantum Heisenberg group algebra*, 2001, preprint.
- [11] J. Kustermans, *KMS-weights on C^* -algebras*, 1997, preprint, Odense Universitet.
- [12] J. Kustermans and A. Van Daele, *C^* -algebraic quantum groups arising from algebraic quantum groups*, Int. J. Math. **8** (1997), no. 8, 1067–1139.
- [13] J. Kustermans and S. Vaes, *Locally compact quantum groups*, Ann. Scient. Éc. Norm. Sup., 4^e série **t. 33** (2000), 837–934.
- [14] T. Masuda and Y. Nakagami, *A von Neumann algebra framework for the duality of the quantum groups*, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **30** (1994), no. 5, 799–850.
- [15] S. Montgomery, *Hopf Algebras and Their Actions on Rings*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, no. 82, American Mathematical Society, 1993.
- [16] J. Packer and I. Raeburn, *Twisted crossed products of C^* -algebras*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **106** (1989), 293–311.
- [17] M. A. Rieffel, *Deformation quantization of Heisenberg manifolds*, Comm. Math. Phys. **122** (1989), 531–562.
- [18] ———, *Deformation quantization for actions of R^d* , Memoirs of the AMS, no. 506, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1993.
- [19] S. Stratila, *Modular Theory in Operator Algebras*, Abacus Press, 1981.
- [20] A. Van Daele, *The Haar measure on some locally compact quantum groups*, 2001, preprint.
- [21] S. L. Woronowicz, *Twisted $SU(2)$ group. an example of noncommutative differential calculus*, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **23** (1987), 117–181.
- [22] ———, *Unbounded elements affiliated with C^* -algebras and non-compact quantum groups*, Comm. Math. Phys. **136** (1991), 399–432.
- [23] ———, *From multiplicative unitaries to quantum groups*, Int. J. Math. **7** (1996), no. 1, 127–149.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, LAWRENCE, KS 66045

E-mail address: bjkahng@math.ukans.edu