ESI **The Erwin Schrödinger International Institute for Mathematical Physics**

Pasteurgasse 4/7
A-1090 Wien, Austria

Comparison of Dynamical Entropies for the Noncommutative Shifts

R. Alicki
H. Narnhofer

Vienna, Preprint ESI 106 (1994) June 20, 1994

Supported by Federal Ministry of Science and Research, Austria
Available via WWW.ESI.AC.AT

UWThPh-1994-21
ESI 106 (1994)
July 8, 1994

Comparison of Dynamical Entropies for the Noncommutative Shifts

R. Alicki*
Instituut voor Theoretische Fysica
Universiteit Leuven
B-3001 Leuven, Belgium

and

H. Narnhofer
Institut für Theoretische Physik
Universität Wien
A-1090 Wien, Austria

Abstract

It is shown that two definitions of dynamical entropy for noncommutative shifts give different results.

*) On leave of absence from the Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, University of Gdansk, PL-80-952 Gdansk, Poland.

The usefulness of the concept of dynamical entropy in classical ergodic theory was encouraging to look for a generalization of the definition to automorphisms on nonabelian algebras. There are several possibilities. In this note we want to concentrate on the one given in [CS] and its generalization in [CNT,ST] and compare it with that of [AF1]. Both can be calculated for the noncommutative shifts and give in some cases completely different answers, varying between zero and infinity. This supports the interpretation that the entropy proposed in [AF1] is related to how quickly by repeated measurements the information on the system grows, whereas the entropy proposed in [CS,CNT,ST] controls how quickly operators become independent from one another.

The Definitions

We first give the two definitions of dynamical entropies we want to compare. We start with a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$, Θ an automorphism acting on it and ω a Θ–invariant state over $\mathcal{M}$.

The definition offered in [AF1] which is related to some earlier ideas of [L] is the following:

Definition 1: Let $\mathcal{A}_0$ be a subalgebra in $\mathcal{M}$, $\Theta\ \mathcal{A}_0 \subset \mathcal{A}_0$. A finite operational partition of unity of size k is a set $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ consisting of elements of $\mathcal{A}_0$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} x_i^*\ x_i = 1. \tag{1}$$

A composition of two partitions X and Y is defined by

$$X \circ Y = \{x_i y_j | i = 1, \ldots, k, j = 1, \ldots, \ell\}. \tag{2}$$

To a given partition of size k we assign a state on the k–dimensional matrix algebra M_k

$$[\rho_X]_{ij} = \mathrm{Tr}\ \rho_X\ e_{ji} = \omega(x_j^*\ x_i) \qquad e_{ij} \text{ matrix unit in } M_k. \tag{3}$$

Consider the partition $\Theta^{m-1}X \circ \ldots \circ \Theta\ X \circ X$ which is of size km. Then the dynamical entropy h^I is given as

$$h^I \equiv h^I(\omega, \Theta, \mathcal{A}_0) = \sup_X \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\ S(\rho_{\Theta^{m-1}X\circ\ldots\circ X}). \tag{4}$$

Remark: It has not been shown that h^I might be independent on the chosen subalgebra $\mathcal{A}_0$. The restriction to $\mathcal{A}_0$ is so far necessary to have control on the convergence in explicit examples. For all known examples there exists a natural choice of $\mathcal{A}_0$.

Another definition for a dynamical entropy was proposed in [CS] for type II_1 algebras and generalized to arbitrary algebras in [CNT]. In [ST] an alternative definition was proposed and it was shown that for hyperfinite algebras the so obtained dynamical entropies coincide with the one proposed in [CNT]. We follow the definition in [ST].

Definition 2: Let $(\mathcal{M}, \Theta, \omega)$ be given. We call $(\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{B}, \Theta \otimes \sigma, \lambda)$ stationary couplings of $\mathcal{M}$ with abelian algebras $\mathcal{B}$ with automorphism σ where λ is a state on $\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ with $\lambda \circ \Theta \otimes \sigma = \lambda$ and $\lambda|_{\mathcal{M}} = \omega,\ \lambda|_{\mathcal{B}} = \mu$. Let P be a finite subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}$ and

$$h_\mu(\sigma, P) = \lim \frac{1}{n}\ H_\mu \left(\bigvee_{k=0}^{n-1} \sigma^k P \right)$$

the Kolmogorov–Sinai entropy of σ with respect to the partition P.

With $S(\lambda|\lambda_i)_{\mathcal{M}}$ the relative entropy of λ, λ_i considered as states over $\mathcal{M}$ [OP] we define

$$H(P|\mathcal{M}) = \sup_{\sum \lambda_i = \lambda} \sum S(\lambda|\lambda_i)_P - S(\lambda|\lambda_i)_{\mathcal{M}} = S_\mu(P) - S(\omega \otimes \mu|\lambda)_{P \otimes \mathcal{M}}$$

(see [N]). Then

$$h^{II}(\Theta) = \sup_{\mathcal{B}, P, \lambda} [h_\mu(\sigma, P) - H(P|\mathcal{M})]$$

where the supremum has to be taken over all possible stationary couplings.

The entropies satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} h^I(\omega, \Theta^n, \mathcal{A}_0) &\geq n\ h^I(\omega, \Theta, \mathcal{A}_0) & \\ h^{II}(\Theta^n) &= n\ h^{II}(\Theta) & \mathcal{M} \text{ hyperfinite} \\ h^{II}(\Theta) &\leq h^{II}(\Theta^n) \leq n\ h^{II}(\Theta) & \mathcal{M} \text{ arbitrary.} \end{aligned}$$

Both entropies have been evaluated [AF1,CNT] for the shift on a lattice algebra $\mathcal{M} = \left\{ \bigotimes_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} M_d^{(n)} \right\}''$ with ω extremal translationally invariant state

$$h^I = s(\omega) + \ln d, \qquad h^{II} = s(\omega)$$

where $s(\omega)$ is the entropy density. A similar relation holds for CAR quasifree automorphisms [NT1,NT2,SV,AF2].

Now we want to compare them for the noncommutative Powers–Price shifts to demonstrate their different sensitivity on commutativity.

Example 1: We consider the algebra $\mathcal{A}_0$ introduced in [P,P]: It is generated by operators e_i, $i \in Z$, satisfying

(i) $e_i^* = e_i$, $e_i^2 = 1$,

(ii) $e_i\ e_j = e_j\ e_i (-1)^{g(|i-j|)}$, $g : N \to \{0, 1\}$.

On $\mathcal{A}_0$ the shift acts as $\Theta\ e_i = e_{i+1}$. The elements of $\mathcal{A}_0$ are linearly spanned by words $w_I = e_{i_1} \ldots e_{i_n}$ with $I = \{i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_n\}$. Again words either commute or anticommute. On $\mathcal{A}_0$ we define the state

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(1) &= 1 \\ \omega(w_I) &= 0 \qquad I \neq \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

This state is tracial and invariant under the shift.

Lemma: If $g \equiv 0$, then $\{\mathcal{A}_0'', \Theta, \omega\}$ corresponds to the baker transformation. If $g \not\equiv 0$, then $\mathcal{A}_0''$ is the hyperfinite II_1 factor.

Theorem 1:

$$h^I(\omega, \Theta, \mathcal{A}_0) = \ln 2 \qquad \text{independently of } g.$$

Proof: To get the lower bound we choose the partition

$$X = \left\{ \frac{1+e_1}{2}, \frac{1-e_1}{2} \right\} = \{p_{11}, p_{12}\}. \tag{5}$$

Define $\mathcal{A}_{[n,\ell]}$ to be the algebra generated by $\{e_i, n \le i \le \ell\}$. Then there exists a conditional expectation $E_{[n,\ell]}$ of $\mathcal{A}_0$ (and therefore $\mathcal{M}$) onto $\mathcal{A}_{[n,\ell]}$, preserving the state ω

$$E_{[n,\ell]}(w_I) \begin{array}{ll} = w_I & \qquad I \subset [n,\ell] \\ = 0 & \qquad I \cap [n,\ell]^c \ne \emptyset. \end{array}$$

Especially $E_{2,\infty} p_{1i} = 1/2$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(p_{ki_k} \dots p_{1i_1} p_{1j_1} \dots p_{kj_k}) &= \omega(E_{[2,\infty)}\, p_{ki_k} \dots p_{1i_1} p_{1j_1} \dots p_{kj_k}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\, \delta_{i_1 j_1}\, \omega(p_{ki_k} \dots p_{2i_2} p_{2j_2} \dots p_{kj_k}) \\ &= 2^{-k}\, \delta_{i_1 j_1} \dots \delta_{i_k j_k} \\ &= [\rho_{\Theta^{k-1} X \circ \dots \circ X}]_{j_1 \dots j_k, i_1 \dots i_k} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

so that $S(\rho_{\Theta^{k-1} X \circ \dots \circ X}) = k \ln 2$ or $h^I \ge \ln 2$.

To estimate the upper bound we take a partition of unity $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ with $x_j \in \mathcal{A}_{[1,\ell]}$. Hence $X, \Theta X, \Theta^{m-1} X \in \mathcal{A}_{[1,\ell+m-1]}$. Generally any algebra $\mathcal{A}_{[1,r]}$ is isomorphic to a certain matrix algebra $\sum \bigoplus_\nu M_{n_\nu}$ where M_{n_ν} denotes a full $n_\nu \times n_\nu$ matrix algebra. Moreover

$$\sum_\nu n_\nu^2 = \dim \mathcal{A}_{[1,r]} = 2^r.$$

Using the above representation the faithful tracial state ω restricted to $\mathcal{A}_{[1,r]}$ can be written as

$$\omega|_{\mathcal{A}_{[1,r]}}(\cdot) = \sum_\nu \delta_\nu \frac{1}{n_\nu}\, \mathrm{tr}_{M_{n_\nu}}(\cdot)$$

where $\mathrm{tr}_{M_{n_\nu}}$ denotes the usual trace on M_{n_ν} and

$$\sum_\nu \delta_\nu = 1, \qquad \delta_\nu > 0.$$

Hence the relevant density matrix can be decomposed as follows

$$\rho_{\Theta^{m-1}(X) \circ \dots \circ X} = \sum_\nu \delta_\nu\, \rho^\nu_{(\Theta^{m-1} X)^\nu \circ \dots \circ X^\nu}$$

with

$$[\rho^{\nu}_{Y^{\nu}}]_{ij} = \frac{1}{n_{\nu}} \ \mathrm{tr}_{M_{n_\nu}}(y_j^{\nu *} y_i^{\nu}).$$

Here for any $x \in \mathcal{A}_{[1,r]}$, $x = \bigoplus x^{\nu}$, $x^{\nu} \in M_{n_\nu}$, $Y^{\nu} = \{y_1^{\nu}, \ldots, y_k^{\nu}\}$ is the partition of unity in M_{n_ν}. In order to estimate $S(\rho_{\Theta^{m-1}(X)\circ\ldots\circ X})$ we use first the inequality [W,OP]

$$S\left(\sum_{\nu} \lambda_i \ \rho_i\right) \leq \sum_{\nu} \lambda_i \ S(\rho_i) - \sum_{i} \lambda_i \ln \lambda_i$$

for $\lambda_i \geq 0$, $\sum \lambda_i = 1$ and ρ_i–density matrices, then the estimation in the proof of Theorem 4.1 [AF1], which in our case leads to

$$S(\rho^{\nu}_{(\Theta^{m-1}X)^{\nu}\circ\ldots\circ X^{\nu}}) \leq S\left(\omega|_{M_{n_\nu}}\right) + \ln n_{\nu} = 2 \ln n_{\nu},$$

and finally the convexity of the function $\ln x$. The result is

$$\begin{aligned} S(\rho_{\Theta^{m-1}(X)\circ\ldots\circ X}) &\leq \sum_{\nu} \delta_{\nu} \ 2 \ln n_{\nu} - \sum_{\nu} \delta_{\nu} \ln \delta_{\nu} \\ &= \sum_{\nu} \delta_{\nu} \ln \frac{n_{\nu}^2}{\delta_{\nu}} \leq \ln \sum_{\nu} n_{\nu}^2 = [\ell + m - 1] \ln 2. \end{aligned}$$

The upper bound $h^I \leq \ln 2$ follows and together with the lower bound we get equality.

Theorem 2:

a) For $g \equiv 0$, $h^{II}(\Theta) = \ln 2$.

b) For $g \not\equiv 0$, $h^{II}(\Theta) \leq \ln 2$ (Conjecture $\leq \frac{1}{2} \ln 2$).

c) There are g (e.g. $g = (1, 0, 0, \ldots)$, $g = (1, 1, \ldots, 1, \ldots)$) with

$$h^{II}(\Theta) = \frac{1}{2} \ln 2.$$

d) For g sufficiently irregular (for all $w_I \exists$ a set $J(I)$ of infinite cardinality such that for all $n, m \in J(I)$ ($[\Theta^m w_I, \Theta^n w_I]_+ = 0$)

$$h^{II}(\Theta) = 0.$$

Proof:

a) $g \equiv 0$ is the classical baker transformation.

b) The dynamical entropy is bounded from above by the entropy density [CS], such that

$$h^{II}(\Theta) \leq \lim \frac{1}{n} \ S(\omega|_{\mathcal{A}_{[1,n]}}) \leq \ln 2.$$

Here we have used that the linear dimension of $\mathcal{A}_{[1,n]} = 2^n$. In fact this result can be improved by imbedding $\mathcal{A}_{[1,n]}$ into a matrix algebra which dimension will increase like $2^{k(n)}$. We conjecture that $k(n) \leq n/2 + k_0$, where k_0 is determined by the size of the center of $\mathcal{A}_{[1,n]}$ which is supposed to stay uniformly bounded (compare [NT3]).

c) $g = (1, 0, 0, \ldots)$. Here $s(\omega) = \frac{1}{2}\ln 2$ and $h^{II}(\Theta) \geq \frac{1}{2}h^{II}_{\mathcal{A}^0}(\Theta^2)$ with $\mathcal{A}^0$ generated by e_{2n} and thus abelian.

$g = (1, 1, \ldots)$. Again $s(\omega) = \frac{1}{2}\ln 2$ and $h^{II}(\Theta) \geq \frac{1}{2}h^{II}_{\mathcal{A}^0}(\Theta^2)$ with $\mathcal{A}^0$ now built by $e_{2n}\, e_{2n+1}$, again abelian.

d) Assume $\mathcal{B}$ is an abelian model. Consider words in $\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ of the form $w_I \otimes p$, where p varies over the projections in $\mathcal{B}$. According to our assumption on g to every I there exists a set $J(I)$ such that

$$[\Theta^n w_I \otimes \sigma^2 p, \Theta^k w_I \otimes \sigma^k p]_+ = 0 \quad \forall\, k, n \in J,\ k \neq n.$$

Then (compare [NT4]) for $\lambda = \lambda \circ \Theta \otimes \sigma$

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda(w_I)|^2 &= \left|\lambda\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1,k_i\in J}^{N} \Theta^{k_i} w_I \otimes \sigma^{k_i} p\right)\right|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2N^2}\sum_{i=1 k_i,k_j\in J}^{N} \lambda([\Theta^{k_i} w_I \otimes \sigma^{k_i} p, \Theta^{k_j} w_I \otimes \sigma^{k_j} p]_+) \\ &= \frac{1}{2N}\,\lambda(w_I^*\, w_I \otimes \cdot p^2) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore since by assumption N can be arbitrarily large, $\lambda(w_I \otimes p) = 0 = \lambda(w_I)$ for any word in $\mathcal{M}$ and any projection $p \in \mathcal{B}$. Therefore the coupling $\lambda = \omega \otimes \mu$ is trivial, $H(P|\mathcal{M}) = H(P)$ and $H(P) \geq h_\mu(\sigma, P)$.

Example 2: In [S] the following example was considered: Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the II_1 factor $L(F_\infty)$ obtained from the left regular representation of the free group F_∞ in infinite number of generators, in connection with the free shift as automorphism.

We can think of this algebra constructed in a similar way as in the previous case, only now $e_i^2 = 1$ but $w_I = e_i e_j e_i e_j \ldots$, i.e. words with finitely many alternating letters, are linearly independent operators. The state ω again reads $\omega(1) = 1$, $\omega(w_I) = 0$ for $I \neq \emptyset$. The shift Θ is defined by $\Theta\; e_i = e_{i+1}$. In [S] it was shown that in spite that the algebra increases enormously under the shift the noncommutativity is so strong that conditional expectations are essentially always trivial so that a decomposition can only be felt in a finite area which implies that $h^{II}(\Theta) = 0$, as well as $h^{II}(\Theta^k)$. But

Theorem 3: Let $\mathcal{A}_0$ be spanned by finite words. Then

$$h^I(\omega, \Theta^2, \mathcal{A}_0) = \infty.$$

Proof: Consider $\mathcal{B}_0 = \{e_1, e_2\}''$. This algebra is infinite and therefore $S(\omega|_{\mathcal{B}_0})$ is infinite. To every n we can therefore find a partition $X \subset \mathcal{B}_0$ such that $S(\rho_X) > n$. Let the partition be written as $x_i = \sum_j \alpha_{ij} w_{I_j}$. Then $\Theta^2 x_i = \sum_j \alpha_{ij} w_{I_j+2}$, so that $(I_j + 2) \cap I_j = \emptyset$. Therefore

$$\omega(x_{i_1}^* \Theta^2 x_{i_2}^* \Theta^2 x_{j_2} x_{j_1}) = \omega(x_{i_1}^*\ x_{j_1})\omega(x_{i_2}^*\ x_{j_2})$$

so that

$$S(\rho_{\Theta^2 X \circ X}) = 2S(\rho_X)$$
$$S(\rho_{\Theta^{2m} X \circ \ldots \circ X}) = (m+1)S(\rho_X)$$

and $h^I(\omega, \Theta^2, \mathcal{A}_0) \geq n$ for arbitrary n.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank M. Fannes for useful comments on the manuscript. R.A. gratefully acknowledges the hospitality of the Erwin Schrödinger Institute in Vienna where this work was done. He also acknowledges financial support from KBN (project PB 1436/2/91) and KUL project O.T. 92/9.

References

[AF1] Alicki, R. and Fannes, M., to be publ. in: Lett. Math. Phys. (1994)

[AF2] Alicki, R. and Fannes, M., "Quantum Dynamical Entropy of a Quasi–Free Fermion Automorphism" (preprint, KUL 1994)

[CNT] Connes, A., Narnhofer, H., and Thirring, W., Commun. Math. Phys. *112* (1987) 691

[CS] Connes, A., and Størmer, E., Acta Math. *134* (1975) 289

[L] Lindblad, G., Commun. Math. Phys. *65* (1979) 281

[N] Narnhofer, H., Lett. Math. Phys. *28* (1993) 85

[NT1] Narnhofer, H., and Thirring, W., Lett. Math. Phys. *14* (1987) 89

[NT2] Narnhofer, H., and Thirring, W., *Dynamical Entropy of Quantum Systems and Their Abelian Counterpart*, to be publ. in G.G. Emch and G.C. Hegerfeldt eds.

[NT3] Narnhofer, H., and Thirring, W., in: *From Phase Transition to Chaos*, G. Györgyi, I. Kondor, S. Sasvári, T. Tèl, eds., World Scientific (Singapore 1993), 530.

[NT4] Narnhofer, H., and Thirring, W., Lett. Math. Phys. *30* (1994) 307

[OP] Ohya, M., and Petz, D., *Quantum Entropy and Its Use*, Springer, (Berlin 1993)

[P,P] Price, G.L., Canad. J. Math. *39* (1987) 492;
Powers, R.T., Canad. J. Math. *40* (1988) 86

[S] Størmer, E., Invent. Math. *110* (1992) 63

[ST] Sauvageot, J–L., and Thouvenot, J–P., Commun. Math. Phys. *145* (1992) 411

[SV] Størmer, E., and Voiculescu, D., Commun. Math. Phys. *133* (1990) 521

[W] Wehrl, A., Rev. Mod. Phys. *50* (1978) 221