Projective quantum groups

Teo Banica

Department of Mathematics, University of Cergy-Pontoise, F-95000 Cergy-Pontoise, France. teo.banica@gmail.com

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 81R50

Key words and phrases. Projective group, Quantum group

Abstract. This is an introduction to the compact and discrete projective quantum groups, chosen undeformed. We first review the standard theory of the usual, affine compact and discrete quantum groups, following Woronowicz and others. Then we discuss what happens in the projective case, with some finer results here, and with a look into affine lifting questions too. We then go on a detailed study of projective easiness, again with results refining those in the affine case, and with a look into affine lifting questions too. Finally, we discuss a number of analytic aspects, notably with projective integration results, and with a study of the projective matrix models.

Preface

Quantum groups were introduced, and then systematically studied starting from the mid 1980s, with the idea in mind that they can help in relation with fundamental questions from quantum mechanics. However, as you surely know, in what regards advanced quantum mechanics, the central result there remains the Standard Model for particle physics, going back to the 1970s, and this model has not changed much since, despite numerous efforts with quantum groups, string theory, and many more.

In short, work in progress, things are hard and take it easy, and in waiting for a first truly impressive application of the quantum groups, job for us mathematicians to develop some more quantum group theory, and of course, fight about the axioms.

Speaking now quantum group axioms, tremendous fight going on there, for 40 years and counting. Shall these quantum groups be finite, or compact, which is normally equivalent to being discrete of dual, or locally compact? Shall these quantum groups be defined over $\mathbb{C}$, or over other fields, and which fields, or shall they perhaps be absolute objects, existing over any field? Also, what about the square of the antipode, shall that be the identity, as common sense suggests, or shall that be something non-trivial?

These are all non-trivial questions, and personally I think every evening, before going to sleep, of a sort of a wonderful world, there at very tiny scales, smaller than those of the Standard Model, where the mathematics is simple and free. And so, quantum groups have always been for me those which are the simplest, namely compact, or dual of discrete if you prefer, and this because finite is most likely not enough, defined over $\mathbb{C}$, and with the square of the antipode being the identity. And in the hope that this is right.

As an extra question, regarding the axiomatics, shall the quantum groups be affine, or projective? And here, at least if you adhere to the above-mentioned axiomatic choices, things tend to suggest that the quantum groups that we are interested in, those meant to be useful in quantum physics, should be rather projective. There is of course a long story here, subjective as they come, but for saying things shortly, the idea is that, from a quantum group perspective, the main operator algebra findings of Connes, Jones, Voiculescu are of rather projective nature. And so, our quantum groups should be projective.

This book is an introduction to the compact and discrete projective quantum groups, under the above-mentioned axioms. The book is organized in four parts, as follows:

(1) We first review the standard theory of the usual, affine compact and discrete quantum groups, following Woronowicz and others.

(2) Then we discuss what happens in the projective case, with some finer results here, and with a look into affine lifting questions too.

(3) We then go on a detailed study of projective easiness, again with results refining those in the affine case, and with a look into affine lifting questions too.

(4) Finally, we discuss a number of analytic aspects, notably with projective integration results, and with a study of the projective matrix models.

Many thanks to my colleagues and collaborators, for substantial joint work on all this. Thanks as well to my cats, for some help with the analytic aspects.

Cergy, March 2025
Teo Banica

Contents

Part I

Quantum groups

I got it one piece at a time
And it wouldn't cost me a dime
You'll know it's me
When I come through your town

CHAPTER 1

Quantum groups

1a. Quantum spaces

Welcome to quantum groups. In this first part of the present book we discuss the construction and basic properties of the main quantum permutation and rotation groups.

The story here involves the foundational papers of Woronowicz [**99**], [**100**], from the end of the 80s, then the key paper of Wang [**92**], from the mid 90s, then my own papers from the late 90s and early 00s, and finally some more specialized papers from the mid and late 00s, including [**9**], [**12**], [**17**], containing a few fundamentals too.

In short, cavern man mathematics from about 20 years ago, but lots of things to be learned. We will provide here 100 pages on the subject, with a decent presentation of what is known about the main quantum groups, of fundamental type, coming in the form of theorems accompanied by short proofs. For further details on all this, you have my graduate textbook on quantum groups [**5**], along with the original papers cited above.

Getting started now, at the beginning of everything, we have:

Question 1.1 (Connes). *What is a quantum permutation group?*

This question is more tricky than it might seem. For solving it you need a good formalism of quantum groups, and there is a bewildering number of choices here, with most of these formalisms leading nowhere, in connection with the above question. So, we are into philosophy, and for truly getting started, we have to go back in time, with:

Question 1.2 (Heisenberg). *What is a quantum space?*

Regarding this latter question, there are as many answers as quantum physicists, starting with Heisenberg himself in the early 1920s, then Schrödinger and Dirac short after, with each coming with his own answer to the question. Not to forget Einstein, who labeled all these solutions as "nice, but probably fundamentally wrong".

In short, we are now into controversy, and a look at more modern physics does not help much, with the controversy basically growing instead of diminishing, over the time. So, in the lack of a good answer, let us take as starting point something nice and mathematical, rather agreed upon in the 1930s, coming from Dirac's work, namely:

ANSWER 1.3 (von Neumann). *A quantum space is the dual of an operator algebra.*

Fast forward now to the 90s and to Connes' question, this remains something nontrivial, even when knowing what a quantum space is, and this for a myriad technical reasons. You have to work a bit on that question, try all sorts of things which do not work, until you hit the good answer. With this good answer being as follows:

ANSWER 1.4 (Wang). *The quantum permutation group S_N^+ is the biggest compact quantum group acting on $\{1,\ldots,N\}$, by leaving the counting measure invariant.*

To be more precise, the idea is that $\{1,\ldots,N\}$ has all sorts of quantum permutations, and even when restricting the attention to the "correct" ones, namely those leaving invariant the counting measure, there is still an infinity of such quantum permutations, and the quantum group formed by this infinity of quantum permutations is compact.

This was for the story of the subject, very simplified, and as a final ingredient, two answers to two natural questions that you might have:

(1) Isn't the conclusion $|S_N^+|=\infty$ a bit too speculatory, not to say crazy? Certainly not, I would say, because in quantum mechanics particles do not have clear positions and speeds, and once you're deep into this viewpoint, "think quantum", a bit fuzzy about everything, why the set $\{1,\ldots,N\}$ not being allowed to have an infinity of quantum permutations, after all. So, no contradiction, philosophically speaking.

(2) Why was the theory of S_N^+ developed so late? Good question, and in answer, looking retrospectively, quantum groups and permutations should have been developed by von Neumann and Weyl, sometimes in the 1940s, perhaps with some help from Gelfand. But that never happened. As for the story after WW2, with mathematics, physics, and mankind in general: that was sex, drugs and rock and roll, forget about it.

Getting started now for good, we have the whole remainder of this chapter for understanding what Question 1.1 is about, and what its Answer 1.4 says. But before that, Question 1.2 and Answer 1.3 coming first. Leaving aside physics, we must first talk about operator algebras, and the starting definition here is as follows:

DEFINITION 1.5. *A C^*-algebra is a complex algebra A, having a norm $||.||$ making it a Banach algebra, and an involution $*$, related to the norm by the formula*

$$||aa^*||=||a||^2$$

which must hold for any $a\in A$.

As a basic example, the algebra $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ of the complex $N\times N$ matrices is a C^*-algebra, with the usual matrix norm and involution of matrices, namely:

$$||M||=\sup_{||x||=1}||Mx|| \quad , \quad (M^*)_{ij}=\bar{M}_{ji}$$

More generally, any $*$-subalgebra $A \subset M_N(\mathbb{C})$ is automatically closed, and so is a C^*-algebra. In fact, in finite dimensions, the situation is as follows:

Proposition 1.6. *The finite dimensional C^*-algebras are exactly the algebras*

$$A = M_{n_1}(\mathbb{C}) \oplus \ldots \oplus M_{n_k}(\mathbb{C})$$

with norm $||(a_1, \ldots, a_k)|| = \sup_i ||a_i||$, and involution $(a_1, \ldots, a_k)^* = (a_1^*, \ldots, a_k^*)$.

Proof. In one sense this is clear. In the other sense, this comes by splitting the unit of our algebra A as a sum of central minimal projections, $1 = p_1 + \ldots + p_k$. Indeed, when doing so, each of the $*$-algebras $A_i = p_i A p_i$ follows to be a matrix algebra, $A_i \simeq M_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$, and this gives the direct sum decomposition in the statement. □

In general now, a main theoretical result about C^*-algebras, due to Gelfand, Naimark and Segal, and called GNS representation theorem, is as follows:

Theorem 1.7. *Given a complex Hilbert space H, finite dimensional or not, the algebra $B(H)$ of linear operators $T : H \to H$ which are bounded, in the sense that*

$$||T|| = \sup_{||x||=1} ||Tx||$$

is finite, is a C^*-algebra, with the above norm, and with involution given by:

$$< Tx, y > = < x, T^*y >$$

More generally, and norm closed $*$-subalgebra of this full operator algebra

$$A \subset B(H)$$

is a C^*-algebra. Any C^*-algebra appears in this way, for a certain Hilbert space H.

Proof. There are several statements here, with the first ones being standard operator theory, and with the last one being the GNS theorem, the idea being as follows:

(1) First of all, the full operator algebra $B(H)$ is a Banach algebra. Indeed, given a Cauchy sequence $\{T_n\}$ inside $B(H)$, we can set $Tx = \lim_{n\to\infty} T_n x$, for any $x \in H$. It is then routine to check that we have $T \in B(H)$, and that $T_n \to T$ in norm.

(2) Regarding the involution, the point is that we must have $< Tx, y > = < x, T^*y >$, for a certain vector $T^*y \in H$. But this can serve as a definition for T^*, and the fact that T^* is indeed linear, and bounded, with the bound $||T^*|| = ||T||$, is routine. As for the formula $||TT^*|| = ||T||^2$, this is elementary as well, coming by double inequality.

(3) Finally, the fact that any C^*-algebra appears as $A \subset B(H)$, for a certain Hilbert space H, is advanced. The idea is that each $a \in A$ acts on A by multiplication, $T_a(b) = ab$. Thus, we are more or less led to the result, provided that we are able to convert our algebra A, regarded as a complex vector space, into a Hilbert space $H = L^2(A)$. But this latter conversion can be done, by taking some inspiration from abstract measure theory. □

As a third and last basic result about C^*-algebras, which will be of particular interest for us, we have the following well-known theorem of Gelfand:

THEOREM 1.8. *Given a compact space X, the algebra $C(X)$ of continuous functions $f : X \to \mathbb{C}$ is a C^*-algebra, with norm and involution as follows:*

$$||f|| = \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)| \quad , \quad f^*(x) = \overline{f(x)}$$

This algebra is commutative, and any commutative C^*-algebra A is of this form, with $X = Spec(A)$ appearing as the space of Banach algebra characters $\chi : A \to \mathbb{C}$.

PROOF. Once again, there are several statements here, some of them being trivial, and some of them being advanced, the idea being as follows:

(1) First of all, the fact that $C(X)$ is indeed a Banach algebra is clear, because a uniform limit of continuous functions is continuous.

(2) Regarding now for the formula $||ff^*|| = ||f||^2$, this is something trivial for functions, because on both sides we obtain $\sup_{x \in X} |f(x)|^2$.

(3) Given a commutative C^*-algebra A, the character space $X = \{\chi : A \to \mathbb{C}\}$ is compact, and we have an evaluation morphism $ev : A \to C(X)$.

(4) The tricky point, which follows from basic spectral theory in Banach algebras, is to prove that ev is indeed isometric. This gives the last assertion. □

In what follows, we will be mainly using Definition 1.5 and Theorem 1.8, as general framework. To be more precise, in view of Theorem 1.8, let us formulate:

DEFINITION 1.9. *Given an arbitrary C^*-algebra A, we agree to write*

$$A = C(X)$$

and call the abstract space X a compact quantum space.

In other words, we can define the category of compact quantum spaces X as being the category of the C^*-algebras A, with the arrows reversed. A morphism $f : X \to Y$ corresponds by definition to a morphism $\Phi : C(Y) \to C(X)$, a product of spaces $X \times Y$ corresponds by definition to a product of algebras $C(X) \otimes C(Y)$, and so on.

All this is of course quite speculative, and as a first result regarding these compact quantum spaces, coming from Proposition 1.6, we have:

PROPOSITION 1.10. *The finite quantum spaces are exactly the disjoint unions of type*

$$X = M_{n_1} \sqcup \ldots \sqcup M_{n_k}$$

where M_n is the finite quantum space given by $C(M_n) = M_n(\mathbb{C})$.

PROOF. This is a reformulation of Proposition 1.6, by using the above philosophy. Indeed, for a compact quantum space X, coming from a C^*-algebra A via the formula $A = C(X)$, being finite can only mean that the following number is finite:

$$|X| = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} A < \infty$$

Thus, by using Proposition 1.6, we are led to the conclusion that we must have:

$$C(X) = M_{n_1}(\mathbb{C}) \oplus \ldots \oplus M_{n_k}(\mathbb{C})$$

But since direct sums of algebras A correspond to disjoint unions of quantum spaces X, via the correspondence $A = C(X)$, this leads to the conclusion in the statement. □

This was for the basic theory of C^*-algebras, the idea being that we have some basic operator theory results, that can be further learned from any standard book, such as Blackadar [**31**], and then we can talk about reformulations of these results in quantum space terms, by using Definition 1.9 and some basic common sense.

Finally, no discussion would be complete without a word about the von Neumann algebras. These are operator algebras of more advanced type, as follows:

THEOREM 1.11. *For a $*$-algebra $A \subset B(H)$ the following conditions are equivalent, and if they are satisfied, we say that A is a von Neumann algebra:*

1. *A is closed with respect to the weak topology, making each $T \to Tx$ continuous.*
2. *A is equal to its algebraic bicommutant, $A = A''$, computed inside $B(H)$.*

As basic examples, we have the algebras $A = L^\infty(X)$, acting on $H = L^2(X)$. Such algebras are commutative, any any commutative von Neumann algebra is of this form.

PROOF. There are several assertions here, the idea being as follows:

(1) The equivalence (1) $\iff$ (2) is the well-known bicommutant theorem of von Neumann, which can be proved by using an amplification trick, $H \to \mathbb{C}^N \otimes H$.

(2) Given a measured space X, we have indeed an emdedding $L^\infty(X) \subset B(L^2(X))$, with weakly closed image, given by $T_f : g \to fg$, as in the proof of the GNS theorem.

(3) Given a commutative von Neumann algebra $A \subset B(H)$ we can write $A =< T >$ with T being a normal operator, and the Spectral Theorem gives $A \simeq L^\infty(X)$. □

In the context of a C^*-algebra representation $A \subset B(H)$ we can consider the weak closure, or bicommutant $A'' \subset B(H)$, which is a von Neumann algebra. In the commutative case, $C(X) \subset B(L^2(X))$, the weak closure is $L^\infty(X)$. In general, we agree to write:

$$A'' = L^\infty(X)$$

For more on all this, basic theory of the C^*-algebras and von Neumann algebras, we refer to any standard operator algebra book, such as Blackadar [**31**].

1b. Quantum groups

We are ready now to introduce the compact quantum groups. The axioms here, due to Woronowicz [99], and slightly modified for our present purposes, are as follows:

Definition 1.12. *A Woronowicz algebra is a C^*-algebra A, given with a unitary matrix $u \in M_N(A)$ whose coefficients generate A, such that the formulae*

$$\Delta(u_{ij}) = \sum_k u_{ik} \otimes u_{kj} \quad , \quad \varepsilon(u_{ij}) = \delta_{ij} \quad , \quad S(u_{ij}) = u_{ji}^*$$

define morphisms of C^*-algebras $\Delta : A \to A \otimes A$, $\varepsilon : A \to \mathbb{C}$ and $S : A \to A^{opp}$, called comultiplication, counit and antipode.

In this definition the tensor product needed for Δ can be any C^*-algebra tensor product. In order to get rid of redundancies, coming from this and from amenability issues, we will divide everything by an equivalence relation, as follows:

Definition 1.13. *We agree to identify two Woronowicz algebras, $(A, u) = (B, v)$, when we have an isomorphism of $*$-algebras*

$$< u_{ij} > \simeq < v_{ij} >$$

mapping standard coordinates to standard coordinates, $u_{ij} \to v_{ij}$.

We say that A is cocommutative when $\Sigma\Delta = \Delta$, where $\Sigma(a \otimes b) = b \otimes a$ is the flip. We have then the following key result, from [99], providing us with examples:

Proposition 1.14. *The following are Woronowicz algebras, which are commutative, respectively cocommutative:*

1. *$C(G)$, with $G \subset U_N$ compact Lie group. Here the structural maps are:*
$$\Delta(\varphi) = \big[(g, h) \to \varphi(gh)\big] \quad , \quad \varepsilon(\varphi) = \varphi(1) \quad , \quad S(\varphi) = \big[g \to \varphi(g^{-1})\big]$$
2. *$C^*(\Gamma)$, with $F_N \to \Gamma$ finitely generated group. Here the structural maps are:*
$$\Delta(g) = g \otimes g \quad , \quad \varepsilon(g) = 1 \quad , \quad S(g) = g^{-1}$$

Moreover, we obtain in this way all the commutative/cocommutative algebras.

Proof. In both cases, we first have to exhibit a certain matrix u, and then prove that we have indeed a Woronowicz algebra. The constructions are as follows:

(1) For the first assertion, we can use the matrix $u = (u_{ij})$ formed by the standard matrix coordinates of G, which is by definition given by:

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} u_{11}(g) & \dots & u_{1N}(g) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ u_{N1}(g) & \dots & u_{NN}(g) \end{pmatrix}$$

(2) For the second assertion, we can use the diagonal matrix formed by generators:

$$u = \begin{pmatrix} g_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & g_N \end{pmatrix}$$

Finally, regarding the last assertion, in the commutative case this follows from the Gelfand theorem, and in the cocommutative case, we will be back to this. □

In order to get now to quantum groups, we will need as well:

PROPOSITION 1.15. *Assuming that $G \subset U_N$ is abelian, we have an identification of Woronowicz algebras $C(G) = C^*(\Gamma)$, with Γ being the Pontrjagin dual of G:*

$$\Gamma = \left\{ \chi : G \to \mathbb{T} \right\}$$

Conversely, assuming that $F_N \to \Gamma$ is abelian, we have an identification of Woronowicz algebras $C^*(\Gamma) = C(G)$, with G being the Pontrjagin dual of Γ:

$$G = \left\{ \chi : \Gamma \to \mathbb{T} \right\}$$

Thus, the Woronowicz algebras which are both commutative and cocommutative are exactly those of type $A = C(G) = C^*(\Gamma)$, with G, Γ being abelian, in Pontrjagin duality.

PROOF. This follows from the Gelfand theorem applied to $C^*(\Gamma)$, and from the fact that the characters of a group algebra come from the characters of the group. □

In view of this result, and of the findings from Proposition 1.14 too, we have the following definition, complementing Definition 1.12 and Definition 1.13:

DEFINITION 1.16. *Given a Woronowicz algebra, we write it as follows, and call G a compact quantum Lie group, and Γ a finitely generated discrete quantum group:*

$$A = C(G) = C^*(\Gamma)$$

Also, we say that G, Γ are dual to each other, and write $G = \widehat{\Gamma}, \Gamma = \widehat{G}$.

Let us discuss now some tools for studying the Woronowicz algebras, and the underlying quantum groups. First, we have the following result:

PROPOSITION 1.17. *Let (A, u) be a Woronowicz algebra.*

(1) *Δ, ε satisfy the usual axioms for a comultiplication and a counit, namely:*

$$(\Delta \otimes id)\Delta = (id \otimes \Delta)\Delta$$

$$(\varepsilon \otimes id)\Delta = (id \otimes \varepsilon)\Delta = id$$

(2) *S satisfies the antipode axiom, on the $*$-algebra generated by entries of u:*

$$m(S \otimes id)\Delta = m(id \otimes S)\Delta = \varepsilon(.)1$$

(3) *In addition, the square of the antipode is the identity, $S^2 = id$.*

PROOF. As a first observation, the result holds in the commutative case, $A = C(G)$ with $G \subset U_N$. Indeed, here we know from Proposition 1.14 that Δ, ε, S appear as functional analytic transposes of the multiplication, unit and inverse maps m, u, i:

$$\Delta = m^t \quad , \quad \varepsilon = u^t \quad , \quad S = i^t$$

Thus, in this case, the various conditions in the statement on Δ, ε, S simply come by transposition from the group axioms satisfied by m, u, i, namely:

$$m(m \times id) = m(id \times m)$$

$$m(u \times id) = m(id \times u) = id$$

$$m(i \times id)\delta = m(id \times i)\delta = 1$$

Here $\delta(g) = (g, g)$. Observe also that the result holds as well in the cocommutative case, $A = C^*(\Gamma)$ with $F_N \to \Gamma$, trivially. In general now, the first axiom follows from:

$$(\Delta \otimes id)\Delta(u_{ij}) = (id \otimes \Delta)\Delta(u_{ij}) = \sum_{kl} u_{ik} \otimes u_{kl} \otimes u_{lj}$$

As for the other axioms, the verifications here are similar. □

In order to reach to more advanced results, the idea will be that of doing representation theory. Following Woronowicz [99], let us start with the following definition:

DEFINITION 1.18. *Given (A, u), we call corepresentation of it any unitary matrix $v \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$, with $\mathcal{A} =< u_{ij} >$, satisfying the same conditions as u, namely:*

$$\Delta(v_{ij}) = \sum_k v_{ik} \otimes v_{kj} \quad , \quad \varepsilon(v_{ij}) = \delta_{ij} \quad , \quad S(v_{ij}) = v_{ji}^*$$

We also say that v is a representation of the underlying compact quantum group G.

In the commutative case, $A = C(G)$ with $G \subset U_N$, we obtain in this way the finite dimensional unitary smooth representations $v : G \to U_n$, via the following formula:

$$v(g) = \begin{pmatrix} v_{11}(g) & \dots & v_{1n}(g) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ v_{n1}(g) & \dots & v_{nn}(g) \end{pmatrix}$$

In the cocommutative case, $A = C^*(\Gamma)$ with $F_N \to \Gamma$, we will see in a moment that we obtain in this way the formal sums of elements of Γ, possibly rotated by a unitary. As a first result now regarding the corepresentations, we have:

PROPOSITION 1.19. *The corepresentations are subject to the following operations:*

1. *Making sums, $v + w = diag(v, w)$.*
2. *Making tensor products, $(v \otimes w)_{ia,jb} = v_{ij} w_{ab}$.*
3. *Taking conjugates, $(\bar{v})_{ij} = v_{ij}^*$.*
4. *Rotating by a unitary, $v \to UvU^*$.*

PROOF. We first check the fact that the matrices in the statement are unitaries:

(1) The fact that $v+w$ is unitary is clear.

(2) Regarding now $v\otimes w$, this can be written in standard leg-numbering notation as $v\otimes w=v_{13}w_{23}$, and with this interpretation in mind, the unitarity is clear.

(3) In order to check that $\bar{v}$ is unitary, we can use the antipode. Indeed, by regarding the antipode as an antimultiplicative map $S:A\to A$, we have:

$$(\bar{v}v^t)_{ij}=\sum_k v_{ik}^*v_{jk}=\sum_k S(v_{kj}^*v_{ki})=S((v^*v)_{ji})=\delta_{ij}$$

$$(v^t\bar{v})_{ij}=\sum_k v_{ki}v_{kj}^*=\sum_k S(v_{jk}v_{ik}^*)=S((vv^*)_{ji})=\delta_{ij}$$

(4) Finally, the fact that UvU^* is unitary is clear. As for the verification of the comultiplicativity axioms, involving Δ,ε,S, this is routine, in all cases. □

As a consequence of the above result, we can formulate:

DEFINITION 1.20. *We denote by $u^{\otimes k}$, with $k=\circ\bullet\bullet\circ\ldots$ being a colored integer, the various tensor products between $u,\bar{u}$, indexed according to the rules*

$$u^{\otimes\emptyset}=1\quad,\quad u^{\otimes\circ}=u\quad,\quad u^{\otimes\bullet}=\bar{u}$$

and multiplicativity, $u^{\otimes kl}=u^{\otimes k}\otimes u^{\otimes l}$, and call them Peter-Weyl corepresentations.

Here are a few examples of such corepresentations, namely those coming from the colored integers of length 2, to be often used in what follows:

$$u^{\otimes\circ\circ}=u\otimes u\quad,\quad u^{\otimes\circ\bullet}=u\otimes\bar{u}$$

$$u^{\otimes\bullet\circ}=\bar{u}\otimes u\quad,\quad u^{\otimes\bullet\bullet}=\bar{u}\otimes\bar{u}$$

In order to do representation theory, we first need to know how to integrate over G. And we have here the following key result, due to Woronowicz [99]:

THEOREM 1.21. *Any Woronowicz algebra $A=C(G)$ has a unique Haar integration,*

$$\left(\int_G\otimes id\right)\Delta=\left(id\otimes\int_G\right)\Delta=\int_G(.)1$$

which can be constructed by starting with any faithful positive form $\varphi\in A^*$, and setting

$$\int_G=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n\varphi^{*k}$$

where $\phi*\psi=(\phi\otimes\psi)\Delta$. Moreover, for any corepresentation $v\in M_n(\mathbb{C})\otimes A$ we have

$$\left(id\otimes\int_G\right)v=P$$

where P is the orthogonal projection onto $Fix(v)=\{\xi\in\mathbb{C}^n|v\xi=\xi\}$.

PROOF. Following [99], this can be done in 3 steps, as follows:

(1) Given $\varphi\in A^*$, our claim is that the following limit converges, for any $a\in A$:

$$\int_\varphi a=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n\varphi^{*k}(a)$$

Indeed, by linearity we can assume that a is the coefficient of certain corepresentation, $a=(\tau\otimes id)v$. But in this case, an elementary computation gives the following formula, with P_φ being the orthogonal projection onto the 1-eigenspace of $(id\otimes\varphi)v$:

$$\left(id\otimes\int_\varphi\right)v=P_\varphi$$

(2) Since $v\xi=\xi$ implies $[(id\otimes\varphi)v]\xi=\xi$, we have $P_\varphi\geq P$, where P is the orthogonal projection onto the following fixed point space:

$$Fix(v)=\left\{\xi\in\mathbb{C}^n\Big|v\xi=\xi\right\}$$

The point now is that when $\varphi\in A^*$ is faithful, by using a standard positivity trick, we can prove that we have $P_\varphi=P$. Assume indeed $P_\varphi\xi=\xi$, and let us set:

$$a=\sum_i\left(\sum_j v_{ij}\xi_j-\xi_i\right)\left(\sum_k v_{ik}\xi_k-\xi_i\right)^*$$

A straightforward computation shows then that $\varphi(a)=0$, and so $a=0$, as desired.

(3) With this in hand, the left and right invariance of $\int_G=\int_\varphi$ is clear on coefficients, and so in general, and this gives all the assertions. See [99]. □

We can now develop a Peter-Weyl type theory for the corepresentations, in analogy with the theory from the classical case. We will need:

DEFINITION 1.22. *Given two corepresentations $v\in M_n(A),w\in M_m(A)$, we set*

$$Hom(v,w)=\left\{T\in M_{m\times n}(\mathbb{C})\Big|Tv=wT\right\}$$

and we use the following conventions:

1. *We use the notations $Fix(v)=Hom(1,v)$, and $End(v)=Hom(v,v)$.*
2. *We write $v\sim w$ when $Hom(v,w)$ contains an invertible element.*
3. *We say that v is irreducible, and write $v\in Irr(G)$, when $End(v)=\mathbb{C}1$.*

In the classical case, where $A=C(G)$ with $G\subset U_N$ being a closed subgroup, we obtain in this way the usual notions regarding the representation intertwiners. Observe also that in the group dual case we have $g\sim h$ when $g=h$. Finally, observe that $v\sim w$ means that v,w are conjugated by an invertible matrix.

Here are now a few basic results, regarding the above linear spaces:

PROPOSITION 1.23. *We have the following results:*

(1) $T\in Hom(u,v),S\in Hom(v,w)\implies ST\in Hom(u,w)$.
(2) $S\in Hom(u,v),T\in Hom(w,z)\implies S\otimes T\in Hom(u\otimes w,v\otimes z)$.
(3) $T\in Hom(v,w)\implies T^*\in Hom(w,v)$.

In other words, the Hom spaces form a tensor $*$-category.

PROOF. The proofs are all elementary, as follows:

(1) Assume indeed that we have $Tu=vT$, $Sv=Ws$. We obtain, as desired:

$$STu=SvT=wST$$

(2) Assuming that we have $Su=vS$, $Tw=zT$, we obtain, as desired:

$$(S\otimes T)(u\otimes w)=(Su)_{13}(Tw)_{23}=(vS)_{13}(zT)_{23}=(v\otimes z)(S\otimes T)$$

(3) By conjugating, and then using the unitarity of v,w, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}Tv=wT&\implies v^*T^*=T^*w^*\\&\implies vv^*T^*w=vT^*w^*w\\&\implies T^*w=vT^*\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the last assertion follows from definitions, and from the obvious fact that, in addition to (1,2,3), the Hom spaces are linear spaces, and contain the units. □

Finally, in order to formulate the Peter-Weyl results, we will need as well:

PROPOSITION 1.24. *The characters of the corepresentations, given by*

$$\chi_v=\sum_iv_{ii}$$

behave as follows, in respect to the various operations:

$$\chi_{v+w}=\chi_v+\chi_w\quad,\quad\chi_{v\otimes w}=\chi_v\chi_w\quad,\quad\chi_{\bar{v}}=\chi_v^*$$

In addition, given two equivalent corepresentations, $v\sim w$, we have $\chi_v=\chi_w$.

PROOF. The three formulae in the statement are all clear from definitions. Regarding now the last assertion, assuming that we have $v=T^{-1}wT$, we obtain:

$$\chi_v=Tr(v)=Tr(T^{-1}wT)=Tr(w)=\chi_w$$

We conclude that $v\sim w$ implies $\chi_v=\chi_w$, as claimed. □

Consider the dense $*$-subalgebra $\mathcal{A}\subset A$ generated by the coefficients of the fundamental corepresentation u, and endow it with the following scalar product:

$$<a,b>=\int_Gab^*$$

With this convention, we have the following fundamental result, from [99]:

Theorem 1.25. *We have the following Peter-Weyl type results:*

1. *Any corepresentation decomposes as a sum of irreducible corepresentations.*
2. *Each irreducible corepresentation appears inside a certain $u^{\otimes k}$.*
3. $\mathcal{A}=\bigoplus_{v\in Irr(A)}M_{\dim(v)}(\mathbb{C})$*, the summands being pairwise orthogonal.*
4. *The characters of irreducible corepresentations form an orthonormal system.*

Proof. All these results are from Woronowicz [99], the idea being as follows:

(1) Given a corepresentation $v\in M_n(A)$, we know from Proposition 1.23 that $End(v)$ is a finite dimensional C^*-algebra, and by using Proposition 1.6, we obtain:

$$End(v)=M_{n_1}(\mathbb{C})\oplus\ldots\oplus M_{n_k}(\mathbb{C})$$

But this decomposition allows us to define subcorepresentations $v_i\subset v$, which are irreducible, so we obtain, as desired, a decomposition $v=v_1+\ldots+v_k$.

(2) To any corepresentation $v\in M_n(A)$ we associate its space of coefficients, given by $C(v)=span(v_{ij})$. The construction $v\to C(v)$ is then functorial, in the sense that it maps subcorepresentations into subspaces. Observe also that we have:

$$\mathcal{A}=\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}*\mathbb{N}}C(u^{\otimes k})$$

Now given an arbitrary corepresentation $v\in M_n(A)$, the corresponding coefficient space is a finite dimensional subspace $C(v)\subset\mathcal{A}$, and so we must have, for certain positive integers $k_1,\ldots,k_p$, an inclusion of vector spaces, as follows:

$$C(v)\subset C(u^{\otimes k_1}\oplus\ldots\oplus u^{\otimes k_p})$$

Thus we have $v\subset u^{\otimes k_1}\oplus\ldots\oplus u^{\otimes k_p}$, and by (1) we obtain the result.

(3) As a first observation, which follows from an elementary computation, for any two corepresentations v,w we have a Frobenius type isomorphism, as follows:

$$Hom(v,w)\simeq Fix(\bar{v}\otimes w)$$

Now assume $v\not\sim w$, and let us set $P_{ia,jb}=\int_G v_{ij}w_{ab}^*$. According to Theorem 1.21, the matrix P is the orthogonal projection onto the following vector space:

$$Fix(v\otimes\bar{w})\simeq Hom(\bar{v},\bar{w})=\{0\}$$

Thus we have $P=0$, and so $C(v)\perp C(w)$, which gives the result.

(4) The fact that the characters form indeed an orthogonal system follows from (3). Regarding now the norm 1 assertion, consider the following integrals:

$$P_{ik,jl}=\int_G v_{ij}v_{kl}^*$$

We know from Theorem 1.21 that these integrals form the orthogonal projection onto $Fix(v \otimes \bar{v}) \simeq End(\bar{v}) = \mathbb{C}1$. By using this fact, we obtain the following formula:

$$\int_G \chi_v \chi_v^* = \sum_{ij} \int_G v_{ii} v_{jj}^* = \sum_i \frac{1}{N} = 1$$

Thus the characters have indeed norm 1, and we are done. □

Observe that in the cocommutative case, we obtain from (4) that our algebra must be of the form $A = C^*(\Gamma)$, for some discrete group Γ, as mentioned in Proposition 1.14. As another consequence of the above results, following Woronowicz [99], we have:

THEOREM 1.26. *Let A_{full} be the enveloping C^*-algebra of $\mathcal{A}$, and A_{red} be the quotient of A by the null ideal of the Haar integration. The following are then equivalent:*

1. *The Haar functional of A_{full} is faithful.*
2. *The projection map $A_{full} \to A_{red}$ is an isomorphism.*
3. *The counit map $\varepsilon : A_{full} \to \mathbb{C}$ factorizes through A_{red}.*
4. *We have $N \in \sigma(Re(\chi_u))$, the spectrum being taken inside A_{red}.*

If this is the case, we say that the underlying discrete quantum group Γ is amenable.

PROOF. This is well-known in the group dual case, $A = C^*(\Gamma)$, with Γ being a usual discrete group. In general, the result follows by adapting the group dual case proof:

(1) $\iff$ (2) This simply follows from the fact that the GNS construction for the algebra A_{full} with respect to the Haar functional produces the algebra A_{red}.

(2) $\iff$ (3) Here $\implies$ is trivial, and conversely, a counit $\varepsilon : A_{red} \to \mathbb{C}$ produces an isomorphism $\Phi : A_{red} \to A_{full}$, by slicing the map $\widetilde{\Delta} : A_{red} \to A_{red} \otimes A_{full}$.

(3) $\iff$ (4) Here $\implies$ is clear, coming from $\varepsilon(N - Re(\chi(u))) = 0$, and the converse can be proved by doing some functional analysis. See [99]. □

With these results in hand, we can formulate, as a refinement of Definition 1.16:

DEFINITION 1.27. *Given a Woronowicz algebra A, we formally write as before*

$$A = C(G) = C^*(\Gamma)$$

and by GNS construction with respect to the Haar functional, we write as well

$$A'' = L^\infty(G) = L(\Gamma)$$

with G being a compact quantum group, and Γ being a discrete quantum group.

Now back to Theorem 1.26, as in the discrete group case, the most interesting criterion for amenability, leading to some interesting mathematics and physics, is the Kesten one, (4) there. This leads us into computing character laws:

THEOREM 1.28. *Given a Woronowicz algebra (A,u), consider its main character:*

$$\chi=\sum_i u_{ii}$$

1. *The moments of χ are the numbers $M_k=\dim(Fix(u^{\otimes k}))$.*
2. *When $u\sim\bar{u}$ the law of χ is a real measure, supported by $\sigma(\chi)$.*
3. *The notion of coamenability of A depends only on $law(\chi)$.*

PROOF. All this follows from the above results, the idea being as follows:

(1) This follows indeed from Peter-Weyl theory.

(2) When $u\sim\bar{u}$ we have $\chi=\chi^*$, which gives the result.

(3) This follows from Theorem 1.26 (4), and from (2) applied to $u+\bar{u}$. □

This was for the basic theory of compact and discrete quantum groups. For more on all this, we refer to Woronowicz [**99**] and related papers, or to the book [**5**].

1c. Quantum rotations

We know so far that the compact quantum groups include the usual compact Lie groups, $G\subset U_N$, and the abstract duals $G=\widehat{\Gamma}$ of the finitely generated groups $F_N\to\Gamma$. We can combine these examples by performing basic operations, as follows:

PROPOSITION 1.29. *The class of Woronowicz algebras is stable under taking:*

1. *Tensor products, $A=A'\otimes A''$, with $u=u'+u''$. At the quantum group level we obtain usual products, $G=G'\times G''$ and $\Gamma=\Gamma'\times\Gamma''$.*
2. *Free products, $A=A'*A''$, with $u=u'+u''$. At the quantum group level we obtain dual free products $G=G'\,\hat{*}\,G''$ and free products $\Gamma=\Gamma'*\Gamma''$.*

PROOF. Everything here is clear from definitions. In addition to this, let us mention as well that we have $\int_{A'\otimes A''}=\int_{A'}\otimes\int_{A''}$ and $\int_{A'*A''}=\int_{A'}*\int_{A''}$. Also, the corepresentations of the products can be explicitely computed. See Wang [**92**]. □

Here are some further basic operations, once again from Wang [**92**]:

PROPOSITION 1.30. *The class of Woronowicz algebras is stable under taking:*

1. *Subalgebras $A'=<u'_{ij}>\subset A$, with u' being a corepresentation of A. At the quantum group level we obtain quotients $G\to G'$ and subgroups $\Gamma'\subset\Gamma$.*
2. *Quotients $A\to A'=A/I$, with I being a Hopf ideal, $\Delta(I)\subset A\otimes I+I\otimes A$. At the quantum group level we obtain subgroups $G'\subset G$ and quotients $\Gamma\to\Gamma'$.*

PROOF. Once again, everything is clear, and we have as well some straightforward supplementary results, regarding integration and corepresentations. See [**92**]. □

Finally, here are two more operations, which are of key importance:

PROPOSITION 1.31. *The class of Woronowicz algebras is stable under taking:*

(1) *Projective versions, $PA=<w_{ia,jb}>\subset A$, where $w=u\otimes\bar{u}$. At the quantum group level we obtain projective versions, $G\to PG$ and $P\Gamma\subset\Gamma$.*
(2) *Free complexifications, $\widetilde{A}=<zu_{ij}>\subset C(\mathbb{T})*A$. At the quantum group level we obtain free complexifications, denoted $\widetilde{G}$ and $\widetilde{\Gamma}$.*

PROOF. This is clear from the previous results. For details here, we refer to [92]. □

Once again following Wang [92] and related papers, let us discuss now a number of truly "new" quantum groups, obtained by liberating. We first have:

THEOREM 1.32. *The following universal algebras are Woronowicz algebras,*

$$C(O_N^+)=C^*\left((u_{ij})_{i,j=1,\ldots,N}\Big|u=\bar{u},u^t=u^{-1}\right)$$

$$C(U_N^+)=C^*\left((u_{ij})_{i,j=1,\ldots,N}\Big|u^*=u^{-1},u^t=\bar{u}^{-1}\right)$$

so the underlying quantum spaces O_N^+,U_N^+ are compact quantum groups.

PROOF. This comes from the elementary fact that if a matrix $u=(u_{ij})$ is orthogonal or biunitary, then so must be the following matrices:

$$(u^\Delta)_{ij}=\sum_k u_{ik}\otimes u_{kj}\quad,\quad(u^\varepsilon)_{ij}=\delta_{ij}\quad,\quad(u^S)_{ij}=u_{ji}^*$$

Thus we can define Δ,ε,S by using the universal property of $C(O_N^+)$, $C(U_N^+)$. □

Now with this done, we can look for various intermediate subgroups $O_N\subset O_N^\times\subset O_N^+$ and $U_N\subset U_N^\times\subset U_N^+$. Following [17], a basic construction here is as follows:

THEOREM 1.33. *The following quotient algebras are Woronowicz algebras,*

$$C(O_N^*)=C(O_N^+)\Big/\left\langle abc=cba\Big|\forall a,b,c\in\{u_{ij}\}\right\rangle$$

$$C(U_N^*)=C(U_N^+)\Big/\left\langle abc=cba\Big|\forall a,b,c\in\{u_{ij},u_{ij}^*\}\right\rangle$$

so the underlying quantum spaces O_N^*,U_N^* are compact quantum groups.

PROOF. This follows as in the proof of Theorem 1.32, because if the entries of u satisfy the half-commutation relations $abc=cba$, then so do the entries of $u^\Delta,u^\varepsilon,u^S$. □

Obviously, there are many more things that can be done here, with the above constructions being just the tip of the iceberg. But instead of discussing this, let us first verify that Theorem 1.32 and Theorem 1.33 provide us indeed with new quantum groups. For this purpose, we can use the notion of diagonal torus, which is as follows:

Proposition 1.34. *Given a closed subgroup $G \subset U_N^+$, consider its diagonal torus, which is the closed subgroup $T \subset G$ constructed as follows:*

$$C(T) = C(G) \Big/ \left\langle u_{ij} = 0 \Big| \forall i \neq j \right\rangle$$

This torus is then a group dual, $T = \widehat{\Lambda}$, where $\Lambda =< g_1, \ldots, g_N >$ is the discrete group generated by the elements $g_i = u_{ii}$, which are unitaries inside $C(T)$.

Proof. Since u is unitary, its diagonal entries $g_i = u_{ii}$ are unitaries inside $C(T)$. Moreover, from $\Delta(u_{ij}) = \sum_k u_{ik} \otimes u_{kj}$ we obtain, when passing inside the quotient:

$$\Delta(g_i) = g_i \otimes g_i$$

It follows that we have $C(T) = C^*(\Lambda)$, modulo identifying as usual the C^*-completions of the various group algebras, and so that we have $T = \widehat{\Lambda}$, as claimed. □

We can now distinguish between our various quantum groups, as follows:

Theorem 1.35. *The diagonal tori of the basic unitary quantum groups, namely*

$$\begin{matrix} U_N & \longrightarrow & U_N^* & \longrightarrow & U_N^+ \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ O_N & \longrightarrow & O_N^* & \longrightarrow & O_N^+ \end{matrix}$$

are the following discrete group duals,

$$\begin{matrix} \widehat{\mathbb{Z}^N} & \longrightarrow & \widehat{\mathbb{Z}^{\circ N}} & \longrightarrow & \widehat{F_N} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \widehat{\mathbb{Z}_2^N} & \longrightarrow & \widehat{\mathbb{Z}_2^{\circ N}} & \longrightarrow & \widehat{\mathbb{Z}_2^{*N}} \end{matrix}$$

with $\circ$ standing for the half-classical product operation for groups.

Proof. This is clear for U_N^+, where on the diagonal we obtain the biggest possible group dual, namely $\widehat{F_N}$. For the other quantum groups this follows by taking quotients, which correspond to taking quotients as well, at the level of the groups $\Lambda = \widehat{T}$. □

As a consequence of the above result, the quantum groups that we have are indeed distinct. There are many more things that can be said about these quantum groups, and about further versions of these quantum groups that can be constructed. More later.

1d. Quantum permutations

Eventually. Following Wang [92], let us discuss now the construction and basic properties of the quantum permutation group S_N^+. Let us first look at S_N. We have:

PROPOSITION 1.36. *Consider the symmetric group S_N, viewed as permutation group of the N coordinate axes of $\mathbb{R}^N$. The coordinate functions on $S_N\subset O_N$ are given by*

$$u_{ij}=\chi\left(\sigma\in G\Big|\sigma(j)=i\right)$$

and the matrix $u=(u_{ij})$ that these functions form is magic, in the sense that its entries are projections ($p^2=p^*=p$), summing up to 1 on each row and each column.

PROOF. The action of S_N on the standard basis $e_1,\ldots,e_N\in\mathbb{R}^N$ being given by $\sigma:e_j\to e_{\sigma(j)}$, this gives the formula of u_{ij} in the statement. As for the fact that the matrix $u=(u_{ij})$ that these functions form is magic, this is clear. □

With a bit more effort, we obtain the following nice characterization of S_N:

THEOREM 1.37. *The algebra of functions on S_N has the following presentation,*

$$C(S_N)=C^*_{comm}\left((u_{ij})_{i,j=1,\ldots,N}\Big|u=\text{magic}\right)$$

and the multiplication, unit and inversion map of S_N appear from the maps

$$\Delta(u_{ij})=\sum_k u_{ik}\otimes u_{kj}\quad,\quad\varepsilon(u_{ij})=\delta_{ij}\quad,\quad S(u_{ij})=u_{ji}$$

defined at the algebraic level, of functions on S_N, by transposing.

PROOF. The universal algebra A in the statement being commutative, by the Gelfand theorem it must be of the form $A=C(X)$, with X being a certain compact space. Now since we have coordinates $u_{ij}:X\to\mathbb{R}$, we have an embedding $X\subset M_N(\mathbb{R})$. Also, since we know that these coordinates form a magic matrix, the elements $g\in X$ must be 0-1 matrices, having exactly one 1 entry on each row and each column, and so $X=S_N$. Thus we have proved the first assertion, and the second assertion is clear as well. □

Following now Wang [92], we can liberate S_N, as follows:

THEOREM 1.38. *The following universal C^*-algebra, with magic meaning as usual formed by projections ($p^2=p^*=p$), summing up to 1 on each row and each column,*

$$C(S_N^+)=C^*\left((u_{ij})_{i,j=1,\ldots,N}\Big|u=\text{magic}\right)$$

is a Woronowicz algebra, with comultiplication, counit and antipode given by:

$$\Delta(u_{ij})=\sum_k u_{ik}\otimes u_{kj}\quad,\quad\varepsilon(u_{ij})=\delta_{ij}\quad,\quad S(u_{ij})=u_{ji}$$

Thus the space S_N^+ is a compact quantum group, called quantum permutation group.

PROOF. As a first observation, the universal C^*-algebra in the statement is indeed well-defined, because the conditions $p^2 = p^* = p$ satisfied by the coordinates give:

$$||u_{ij}|| \leq 1$$

In order to prove now that we have a Woronowicz algebra, we must construct maps Δ, ε, S given by the formulae in the statement. Consider the following matrices:

$$u^\Delta_{ij} = \sum_k u_{ik} \otimes u_{kj} \quad , \quad u^\varepsilon_{ij} = \delta_{ij} \quad , \quad u^S_{ij} = u_{ji}$$

Our claim is that, since u is magic, so are these three matrices. Indeed, regarding u^Δ, its entries are idempotents, as shown by the following computation:

$$(u^\Delta_{ij})^2 = \sum_{kl} u_{ik}u_{il} \otimes u_{kj}u_{lj} = \sum_{kl} \delta_{kl}u_{ik} \otimes \delta_{kl}u_{kj} = u^\Delta_{ij}$$

These elements are self-adjoint as well, as shown by the following computation:

$$(u^\Delta_{ij})^* = \sum_k u^*_{ik} \otimes u^*_{kj} = \sum_k u_{ik} \otimes u_{kj} = u^\Delta_{ij}$$

The row and column sums for the matrix u^Δ can be computed as follows:

$$\sum_j u^\Delta_{ij} = \sum_{jk} u_{ik} \otimes u_{kj} = \sum_k u_{ik} \otimes 1 = 1$$

$$\sum_i u^\Delta_{ij} = \sum_{ik} u_{ik} \otimes u_{kj} = \sum_k 1 \otimes u_{kj} = 1$$

Thus, u^Δ is magic. Regarding now u^ε, u^S, these matrices are magic too, and this for obvious reasons. Thus, all our three matrices $u^\Delta, u^\varepsilon, u^S$ are magic, so we can define Δ, ε, S by the formulae in the statement, by using the universality property of $C(S_N^+)$. □

Our first task now is to make sure that Theorem 1.38 produces indeed new quantum groups, which do not collapse to S_N. Following Wang [92], we have:

THEOREM 1.39. *We have an embedding $S_N \subset S_N^+$, given at the algebra level by:*

$$u_{ij} \to \chi\left(\sigma \in S_N \middle| \sigma(j) = i\right)$$

This is an isomorphism at $N \leq 3$, but not at $N \geq 4$, where S_N^+ is not classical, nor finite.

PROOF. The fact that we have indeed an embedding as above follows from Theorem 1.37. Observe that in fact more is true, because Theorems 1.37 and 1.38 give:

$$C(S_N) = C(S_N^+) \Big/ \Big\langle ab = ba \Big\rangle$$

Thus, the inclusion $S_N \subset S_N^+$ is a "liberation", in the sense that S_N is the classical version of S_N^+. We will often use this basic fact, in what follows. Regarding now the second assertion, we can prove this in four steps, as follows:

Case $N = 2$. The fact that S_2^+ is indeed classical, and hence collapses to S_2, is trivial, because the 2×2 magic matrices are as follows, with p being a projection:

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} p & 1-p \\ 1-p & p \end{pmatrix}$$

Indeed, this shows that the entries of U commute. Thus $C(S_2^+)$ is commutative, and so equals its biggest commutative quotient, which is $C(S_2)$. Thus, $S_2^+ = S_2$.

Case $N = 3$. By using the same argument as in the $N = 2$ case, and the symmetries of the problem, it is enough to check that u_{11}, u_{22} commute. But this follows from:

$$\begin{aligned} u_{11}u_{22} &= u_{11}u_{22}(u_{11} + u_{12} + u_{13}) \\ &= u_{11}u_{22}u_{11} + u_{11}u_{22}u_{13} \\ &= u_{11}u_{22}u_{11} + u_{11}(1 - u_{21} - u_{23})u_{13} \\ &= u_{11}u_{22}u_{11} \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, by applying the involution to this formula, we obtain that we have as well $u_{22}u_{11} = u_{11}u_{22}u_{11}$. Thus, we obtain $u_{11}u_{22} = u_{22}u_{11}$, as desired.

Case $N = 4$. Consider the following matrix, with p, q being projections:

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} p & 1-p & 0 & 0 \\ 1-p & p & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & q & 1-q \\ 0 & 0 & 1-q & q \end{pmatrix}$$

This matrix is magic, and we can choose $p, q \in B(H)$ as for the algebra $< p, q >$ to be noncommutative and infinite dimensional. We conclude that $C(S_4^+)$ is noncommutative and infinite dimensional as well, and so S_4^+ is non-classical and infinite, as claimed.

Case $N \geq 5$. Here we can use the standard embedding $S_4^+ \subset S_N^+$, obtained at the level of the corresponding magic matrices in the following way:

$$u \to \begin{pmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{N-4} \end{pmatrix}$$

Indeed, with this in hand, the fact that S_4^+ is a non-classical, infinite compact quantum group implies that S_N^+ with $N \geq 5$ has these two properties as well. □

The above result is quite surprising. How on Earth can the set $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ have an infinity of quantum permutations, and will us be able to fully understand this, one day. But do not worry, the remainder of the present book will be here for that.

As a first observation, as a matter of doublechecking our findings, we are not wrong with our formalism, because as explained once again in [92], we have as well:

THEOREM 1.40. *The quantum permutation group S_N^+ acts on the set $X=\{1,\ldots,N\}$, the corresponding coaction map $\Phi:C(X)\to C(X)\otimes C(S_N^+)$ being given by:*

$$\Phi(e_i)=\sum_j e_j\otimes u_{ji}$$

In fact, S_N^+ is the biggest compact quantum group acting on X, by leaving the counting measure invariant, in the sense that $(tr\otimes id)\Phi=tr(.)1$, where $tr(e_i)=\frac{1}{N},\forall i$.

PROOF. Our claim is that given a compact matrix quantum group G, the following formula defines a morphism of algebras, which is a coaction map, leaving the trace invariant, precisely when the matrix $u=(u_{ij})$ is a magic corepresentation of $C(G)$:

$$\Phi(e_i)=\sum_j e_j\otimes u_{ji}$$

Indeed, let us first determine when Φ is multiplicative. We have:

$$\Phi(e_i)\Phi(e_k)=\sum_{jl}e_je_l\otimes u_{ji}u_{lk}=\sum_j e_j\otimes u_{ji}u_{jk}$$

$$\Phi(e_ie_k)=\delta_{ik}\Phi(e_i)=\delta_{ik}\sum_j e_j\otimes u_{ji}$$

We conclude that the multiplicativity of Φ is equivalent to the following conditions:

$$u_{ji}u_{jk}=\delta_{ik}u_{ji}\quad,\quad\forall i,j,k$$

Similarly, Φ is unital when $\sum_i u_{ji}=1$, $\forall j$. Finally, the fact that Φ is a $*$-morphism translates into $u_{ij}=u_{ij}^*$, $\forall i,j$. Summing up, in order for $\Phi(e_i)=\sum_j e_j\otimes u_{ji}$ to be a morphism of C^*-algebras, the elements u_{ij} must be projections, summing up to 1 on each row of u. Regarding now the preservation of the trace, observe that we have:

$$(tr\otimes id)\Phi(e_i)=\frac{1}{N}\sum_j u_{ji}$$

Thus the trace is preserved precisely when the elements u_{ij} sum up to 1 on each of the columns of u. We conclude from this that $\Phi(e_i)=\sum_j e_j\otimes u_{ji}$ is a morphism of C^*-algebras preserving the trace precisely when u is magic, and since the coaction conditions on Φ are equivalent to the fact that u must be a corepresentation, this finishes the proof of our claim. But this claim proves all the assertions in the statement. □

As a technical comment here, the invariance of the counting measure is a key assumption in Theorem 1.40, in order to have an universal object S_N^+. That is, this condition is automatic for classical group actions, but not for quantum group actions, and when dropping it, there is no universal object of type S_N^+. This explains the main difficulty behind Question 1.1, and the credit for this discovery goes to Wang [**92**].

In order to study now S_N^+, we can use the technology that we have, which gives:

THEOREM 1.41. *The quantum groups S_N^+ have the following properties:*

1. *We have $S_N^+ \hat{*} S_M^+ \subset S_{N+M}^+$, for any N, M.*
2. *In particular, we have an embedding $\widehat{D_\infty} \subset S_4^+$.*
3. *$S_4 \subset S_4^+$ are distinguished by their spinned diagonal tori.*
4. *If $\mathbb{Z}_{N_1} * \ldots * \mathbb{Z}_{N_k} \to \Gamma$, with $N = \sum N_i$, then $\widehat{\Gamma} \subset S_N^+$.*
5. *The quantum groups S_N^+ with $N \geq 5$ are not coamenable.*
6. *The half-classical version $S_N^* = S_N^+ \cap O_N^*$ collapses to S_N.*

PROOF. These results follow from what we have, the proofs being as follows:

(1) If we denote by u, v the fundamental corepresentations of $C(S_N^+), C(S_M^+)$, the fundamental corepresentation of $C(S_N^+ \hat{*} S_M^+)$ is by definition:

$$w = \begin{pmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & v \end{pmatrix}$$

But this matrix is magic, because both u, v are magic, and this gives the result.

(2) This result, which refines our $N = 4$ trick from the proof of Theorem 1.39, follows from (1) with $N = M = 2$. Indeed, we have the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned} S_2^+ \hat{*} S_2^+ &= S_2 \hat{*} S_2 = \mathbb{Z}_2 \hat{*} \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ &\simeq \widehat{\mathbb{Z}_2} \hat{*} \widehat{\mathbb{Z}_2} = \widehat{\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2} \\ &= \widehat{D_\infty} \end{aligned}$$

(3) Observe first that $S_4 \subset S_4^+$ are not distinguished by their diagonal torus, which is $\{1\}$ for both of them. However, according to the Peter-Weyl theory applied to the group duals, the group dual $\widehat{D_\infty} \subset S_4^+$ from (2) must be a subgroup of the diagonal torus of (S_4^+, FuF^*), for a certain unitary $F \in U_4$, and this gives the result.

(4) This result, which generalizes (2), can be deduced as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Gamma} &\subset \mathbb{Z}_{N_1} \widehat{* \ldots *} \mathbb{Z}_{N_k} = \widehat{\mathbb{Z}_{N_1}} \hat{*} \ldots \hat{*} \widehat{\mathbb{Z}_{N_k}} \\ &\simeq \mathbb{Z}_{N_1} \hat{*} \ldots \hat{*} \mathbb{Z}_{N_k} \subset S_{N_1} \hat{*} \ldots \hat{*} S_{N_k} \\ &\subset S_{N_1}^+ \hat{*} \ldots \hat{*} S_{N_k}^+ \subset S_N^+ \end{aligned}$$

(5) This follows from (4), because at $N = 5$ the dual of the group $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_3$, which is well-known not to be amenable, embeds into S_5^+. As for the general case, that of S_N^+ with $N \geq 5$, here the result follows by using the embedding $S_5^+ \subset S_N^+$.

(6) We must prove that $S_N^* = S_N^+ \cap O_N^*$ is classical. But here, we can use the fact that for a magic matrix, the entries on each row sum up to 1. Indeed, by making c vary over a full row of u, we obtain $abc = cba \implies ab = ba$, as desired. $\square$

The above results are all quite interesting, notably with (2) providing us with a better understanding of why S_4^+ is infinite, and with (4) telling us that S_5^+ is not only infinite, but just huge. We have as well (6), suggesting that S_N^+ might be the only liberation of S_N. We will be back to these observations, with further results, in due time.

1e. Exercises

Exercises:

Exercise 1.42.

Exercise 1.43.

Exercise 1.44.

Exercise 1.45.

Exercise 1.46.

Exercise 1.47.

Exercise 1.48.

Exercise 1.49.

Bonus exercise.

CHAPTER 2

Diagrams, easiness

2a. Some philosophy

We have seen the definition and basic properties of S_N^+, and a number of more advanced results as well, such as the non-isomorphism of $S_N\subset S_N^+$ at $N\geq 4$, obtained by using suitable group duals $\widehat{\Gamma}\subset S_N^+$. It is possible to further build along these lines, but all this remains quite amateurish. For strong results, we must do representation theory.

So, let us first go back to the general closed subgroups $G\subset U_N^+$. We have seen in chapter 1 that such quantum groups have a Haar measure, and that by using this, a Peter-Weyl theory can be developed for them. However, all this is just a beginning, and many more things can be said, at the general level, which are all useful. We will present now this material, and go back afterwards to our problems regarding S_N^+.

Let us start with a claim, which is quite precise, and advanced, and which will stand as a guiding principle for this chapter, and in fact for the remainder of this book:

CLAIM 2.1. *Given a closed subgroup $G\subset_u U_N^+$, no matter what you want to do with it, of algebraic or analytic type, you must compute the following spaces:*

$$F_k=Fix(u^{\otimes k})$$

Moreover, for most questions, the computation of the dimensions $M_k=\dim F_k$, which are the moments of the main character $\chi=\sum_i u_{ii}$, will do.

This might look like a quite bold claim, so let us explain this. Assuming first that you are interested in doing representation theory for G, you will certainly run into the spaces F_k, via Peter-Weyl theory. In fact, Peter-Weyl tells you that the irreducible representations appear as $r\subset u^{\otimes k}$, so for finding them, you must compute the algebras $C_k=End(u^{\otimes k})$. But the knowledge of these algebras C_k is more or less the same thing as the knowledge of the spaces F_k, due to Frobenius duality, as follows:

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Given a closed subgroup $G\subset_u U_N^+$, consider the following spaces:*

$$F_k=Fix(u^{\otimes k})\quad,\quad C_k=End(u^{\otimes k})\quad,\quad C_{kl}=Hom(u^{\otimes k},u^{\otimes l})$$

Then knowing the sequence $\{F_k\}$ is the same as knowing the double sequence $\{C_{kl}\}$, and in the case $1\in u$, this is the same as knowing the sequence $\{C_k\}$.

PROOF. In the particular case of the Peter-Weyl corepresentations, the Frobenius isomorphism $Hom(v,w)\simeq Fix(\bar{v}\otimes w)$, that we know from chapter 1, reads:

$$C_{kl}=Hom(u^{\otimes k},u^{\otimes l})=Fix(u^{\otimes\bar{k}l})=F_{\bar{k}l}$$

But this gives the equivalence in the statement. Regarding now the last assertion, assuming $1\in u$ we have $1\in u^{\otimes k}$ for any colored integer k, and so:

$$F_k=Hom(1,u^{\otimes k})\subset Hom(u^{\otimes k},u^{\otimes k})=C_k$$

Thus the spaces F_k can be identified inside the algebras C_k, and we are done. □

Summarizing, we have now good algebraic motivations for Claim 2.1. Before going further, however, let us point out that looking at Proposition 2.2 leads us a bit into a dillema, on which spaces are the best to use. And the traditional answer here is that the spaces C_{kl} are the best, due to Tannakian duality, which is as follows:

THEOREM 2.3. *The following operations are inverse to each other:*

(1) *The construction $G\to C$, which associates to a closed subgroup $G\subset_u U_N^+$ the tensor category formed by the intertwiner spaces $C_{kl}=Hom(u^{\otimes k},u^{\otimes l})$.*
(2) *The construction $C\to G$, associating to a tensor category C the closed subgroup $G\subset_u U_N^+$ coming from the relations $T\in Hom(u^{\otimes k},u^{\otimes l})$, with $T\in C_{kl}$.*

PROOF. This is something quite deep, going back to Woronowicz [100] in a slightly different form, and to Malacarne [71] in the simplified form above. The idea is that we have indeed a construction $G\to C_G$, whose output is a tensor C^*-subcategory with duals of the tensor C^*-category of finite dimensional Hilbert spaces, as follows:

$$(C_G)_{kl}=Hom(u^{\otimes k},u^{\otimes l})$$

We have as well a construction $C\to G_C$, obtained by setting:

$$C(G_C)=C(U_N^+)\Big/\left\langle T\in Hom(u^{\otimes k},u^{\otimes l})\Big|\forall k,l,\forall T\in C_{kl}\right\rangle$$

Regarding now the bijection claim, some elementary algebra shows that $C=C_{G_C}$ implies $G=G_{C_G}$, and that $C\subset C_{G_C}$ is automatic. Thus we are left with proving:

$$C_{G_C}\subset C$$

But this latter inclusion can be proved indeed, by doing some algebra, and using von Neumann's bicommutant theorem, in finite dimensions. See Malacarne [71]. □

The above result is something quite abstract, yet powerful. We will see applications of it in a moment, in the form of Brauer theorems for U_N,O_N,S_N and U_N^+,O_N^+,S_N^+.

All this is very good, providing us with strong motivations for Claim 2.1. However, algebra is of course not everything, and we must comment now on analysis as well. As an analyst you would like to know how to integrate over G, and here, we have:

Theorem 2.4. *The integration over $G \subset_u U_N^+$ is given by the Weingarten formula*

$$\int_G u_{i_1j_1}^{e_1}\ldots u_{i_kj_k}^{e_k}=\sum_{\pi,\sigma\in D_k}\delta_\pi(i)\delta_\sigma(j)W_k(\pi,\sigma)$$

for any colored integer $k=e_1\ldots e_k$ and indices i,j, where D_k is a linear basis of $Fix(u^{\otimes k})$,

$$\delta_\pi(i)=<\pi,e_{i_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes e_{i_k}>$$

and $W_k=G_k^{-1}$, with $G_k(\pi,\sigma)=<\pi,\sigma>$.

Proof. We know from chapter 1 that the integrals in the statement form altogether the orthogonal projection P^k onto the following space:

$$Fix(u^{\otimes k})=span(D_k)$$

Consider now the following linear map, with $D_k=\{\xi_k\}$ being as in the statement:

$$E(x)=\sum_{\pi\in D_k}<x,\xi_\pi>\xi_\pi$$

By a standard linear algebra computation, it follows that we have $P=WE$, where W is the inverse on $span(T_\pi|\pi\in D_k)$ of the restriction of E. But this restriction is the linear map given by G_k, and so W is the linear map given by W_k, and this gives the result. □

As a conclusion, regardless on whether you're an algebraist or an analyst, if you want to study $G\subset_u U_N$ you are led into the computation of the spaces $F_k=Fix(u^{\otimes k})$. However, the story is not over here, because you might say that you are a functional analyst, interested in the fine analytic properties of the dual $\Gamma=\widehat{G}$. But here, I would strike back with the following statement, based on the Kesten amenability criterion:

Proposition 2.5. *Given a closed subgroup $G\subset_u U_N^+$, consider its main character:*

$$\chi=\sum_i u_{ii}$$

1. *The moments of χ are the numbers $M_k=\dim(Fix(u^{\otimes k}))$.*
2. *When $u\sim\bar{u}$ the law of χ is a real measure, supported by $\sigma(\chi)$.*
3. *The notion of amenability of $\Gamma=\widehat{G}$ depends only on $law(\chi)$.*

Proof. This is something that we know from chapter 1, the idea being that (1) comes from Peter-Weyl theory, that (2) comes from $u\sim\bar{u}\implies\chi=\chi^*$, and that (3) comes from the Kesten amenability criterion, and from (2) applied to $u+\bar{u}$. □

Finally, you might argue that you are in fact a pure mathematician interested in the combinatorial beauty of the dual $\Gamma=\widehat{G}$. But I have an answer to this too, as follows, again urging you to look at the spaces $F_k=Fix(u^{\otimes k})$, before getting into Γ:

Proposition 2.6. *Consider a closed subgroup $G\subset_u U_N^+$, and assume, by enlarging if necessary u, that we have $1\in u=\bar{u}$. The formula*

$$d(v,w)=\min\left\{k\in\mathbb N\Big|1\subset\bar{v}\otimes w\otimes u^{\otimes k}\right\}$$

defines then a distance on $Irr(G)$, which coincides with the geodesic distance on the associated Cayley graph. Moreover, the moments of the main character,

$$\int_G\chi^k=\dim\left(Fix(u^{\otimes k})\right)$$

count the loops based at 1, having lenght k, on the corresponding Cayley graph.

Proof. Observe first the result holds indeed in the group dual case, where the Woronowicz algebra is $A=C^*(\Gamma)$, with $\Gamma=<S>$ being a finitely generated discrete group. In general, the fact that the lengths are finite follows from Peter-Weyl theory. The symmetry axiom is clear as well, and the triangle inequality is elementary to establish too. Finally, the last assertion, regarding the moments, is elementary too. □

As a conclusion, looks like I won the debate, with Claim 2.1 reigning over both the compact and discrete quantum group worlds, without opposition. Before getting further, let us record a result in relation with the second part of that claim, as follows:

Theorem 2.7. *Given a closed subgroup $G\subset_u U_N^+$, the law of its main character*

$$\chi=\sum_iu_{ii}$$

with respect to the Haar integration has the following properties:

1. *The moments of χ are the numbers $M_k=\dim(Fix(u^{\otimes k}))$.*
2. *M_k counts the lenght k loops at 1, on the Cayley graph of $\Gamma=\widehat{G}$.*
3. *$law(\chi)$ is the Kesten measure of the discrete quantum group $\Gamma=\widehat{G}$.*
4. *When $u\sim\bar{u}$ the law of χ is a usual measure, supported on $[-N,N]$.*
5. *$\Gamma=\widehat{G}$ is amenable precisely when $N\in supp(law(Re(\chi)))$.*
6. *Any inclusion $G\subset_u H\subset_v U_N^+$ must decrease the numbers M_k.*
7. *Such an inclusion is an isomorphism when $law(\chi_u)=law(\chi_v)$.*

Proof. All this is very standard, coming from the Peter-Weyl theory developed by Woronowicz in [99], and explained in chapter 1, the idea being as follows:

(1) This comes from the Peter-Weyl type theory, which tells us the number of fixed points of $v=u^{\otimes k}$ can be recovered by integrating the character $\chi_v=\chi_u^k$.

(2) This is something true, and well-known, for $G=\widehat{\Gamma}$ with $\Gamma=<g_1,\ldots,g_N>$ being a discrete group. In general, the proof is quite similar.

(3) This is actually the definition of the Kesten measure, in the case $G=\widehat{\Gamma}$, with $\Gamma=<g_1,\ldots,g_N>$ being a discrete group. In general, this follows from (2).

(4) The equivalence $u \sim \bar{u}$ translates into $\chi_u = \chi_u^*$, and this gives the first assertion. As for the support claim, this follows from $uu^* = 1 \implies ||u_{ii}|| \leq 1$, for any i.

(5) This is the Kesten amenability criterion, which can be established as in the group dual case, $G = \widehat{\Gamma}$, with $\Gamma =< g_1, \ldots, g_N >$ being a discrete group.

(6) This is something elementary, which follows from (1), and from the fact that the inclusions of closed subgroups of U_N^+ decrease the spaces of fixed points.

(7) This follows by using (6), and the Peter-Weyl type theory, the idea being that if $G \subset H$ is not injective, then it must strictly decrease one of the spaces $Fix(u^{\otimes k})$. □

As a conclusion to all this, somewhat improving Claim 2.1, given a closed subgroup $G \subset_u U_N^+$, regardless of our precise motivations, be that algebra, analysis or other, computing the law of $\chi = \sum_i u_{ii}$ is the "main problem" to be solved. Good to know.

2b. Diagrams, easiness

Let us discuss now the representation theory of S_N^+, and the computation of the law of the main character. Our main result here, which will be something quite conceptual, will be the fact that $S_N \subset S_N^+$ is a liberation of "easy quantum groups".

Looking at what has been said above, as a main tool, at the general level, we only have Tannakian duality. So, inspired by that, and following [**17**], let us formulate:

Definition 2.8. *Let $P(k,l)$ be the set of partitions between an upper row of k points, and a lower row of l points. A collection of sets*

$$D = \bigsqcup_{k,l} D(k,l)$$

with $D(k,l) \subset P(k,l)$ is called a category of partitions when it has the following properties:

1. *Stability under the horizontal concatenation, $(\pi, \sigma) \to [\pi\sigma]$.*
2. *Stability under the vertical concatenation, $(\pi, \sigma) \to [^\sigma_\pi]$.*
3. *Stability under the upside-down turning, $\pi \to \pi^*$.*
4. *Each set $P(k,k)$ contains the identity partition $|| \ldots ||$.*
5. *The sets $P(\emptyset, \circ\bullet)$ and $P(\emptyset, \bullet\circ)$ both contain the semicircle $\cap$.*

As a basic example, we have the category of all partitions P itself. Other basic examples are the category of pairings P_2, and the categories NC, NC_2 of noncrossing partitions, and pairings. We have as well the category $\mathcal{P}_2$ of pairings which are "matching", in the sense that they connect $\circ - \circ$, $\bullet - \bullet$ on the vertical, and $\circ - \bullet$ on the horizontal, and its subcategory $\mathcal{NC}_2 \subset \mathcal{P}_2$ consisting of the noncrossing matching pairings.

There are many other examples, and we will be back to this. Following [**17**], the relation with the Tannakian categories and duality comes from:

PROPOSITION 2.9. *Each partition $\pi\in P(k,l)$ produces a linear map*

$$T_\pi:(\mathbb C^N)^{\otimes k}\to(\mathbb C^N)^{\otimes l}$$

given by the following formula, with $e_1,\ldots,e_N$ being the standard basis of $\mathbb C^N$,

$$T_\pi(e_{i_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes e_{i_k})=\sum_{j_1\ldots j_l}\delta_\pi\begin{pmatrix}i_1&\ldots&i_k\\ j_1&\ldots&j_l\end{pmatrix}e_{j_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes e_{j_l}$$

and with the Kronecker type symbols $\delta_\pi\in\{0,1\}$ depending on whether the indices fit or not. The assignement $\pi\to T_\pi$ is categorical, in the sense that we have

$$T_\pi\otimes T_\sigma=T_{[\pi\sigma]}\quad,\quad T_\pi T_\sigma=N^{c(\pi,\sigma)}T_{[^\sigma_\pi]}\quad,\quad T_\pi^*=T_{\pi^*}$$

where $c(\pi,\sigma)$ are certain integers, coming from the erased components in the middle.

PROOF. The concatenation axiom follows from the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}&(T_\pi\otimes T_\sigma)(e_{i_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes e_{i_p}\otimes e_{k_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes e_{k_r})\\
=&\sum_{j_1\ldots j_q}\sum_{l_1\ldots l_s}\delta_\pi\begin{pmatrix}i_1&\ldots&i_p\\ j_1&\ldots&j_q\end{pmatrix}\delta_\sigma\begin{pmatrix}k_1&\ldots&k_r\\ l_1&\ldots&l_s\end{pmatrix}e_{j_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes e_{j_q}\otimes e_{l_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes e_{l_s}\\
=&\sum_{j_1\ldots j_q}\sum_{l_1\ldots l_s}\delta_{[\pi\sigma]}\begin{pmatrix}i_1&\ldots&i_p&k_1&\ldots&k_r\\ j_1&\ldots&j_q&l_1&\ldots&l_s\end{pmatrix}e_{j_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes e_{j_q}\otimes e_{l_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes e_{l_s}\\
=&T_{[\pi\sigma]}(e_{i_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes e_{i_p}\otimes e_{k_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes e_{k_r})\end{aligned}$$

As for the composition and involution axioms, their proof is similar. □

In relation with quantum groups, we have the following result, from [**17**]:

THEOREM 2.10. *Each category of partitions $D=(D(k,l))$ produces a family of compact quantum groups $G=(G_N)$, one for each $N\in\mathbb N$, via the formula*

$$Hom(u^{\otimes k},u^{\otimes l})=span\left(T_\pi\Big|\pi\in D(k,l)\right)$$

which produces a Tannakian category, and so a closed subgroup $G_N\subset_u U_N^+$.

PROOF. Let call C_{kl} the spaces on the right. By using the axioms in Definition 2.8, and the categorical properties of the operation $\pi\to T_\pi$, from Proposition 2.9, we see that $C=(C_{kl})$ is a Tannakian category. Thus Theorem 2.3 applies, and gives the result. □

We can now formulate a key definition, as follows:

DEFINITION 2.11. *A compact quantum group G_N is called easy when we have*

$$Hom(u^{\otimes k},u^{\otimes l})=span\left(T_\pi\Big|\pi\in D(k,l)\right)$$

for any colored integers k,l, for a certain category of partitions $D\subset P$.

In other words, a compact quantum group is called easy when its Tannakian category appears in the simplest possible way: from a category of partitions. The terminology is quite natural, because Tannakian duality is basically our only serious tool. In relation now with quantum permutation groups, and with the orthogonal and unitary quantum groups too, here is our main result, coming from [5], [17]:

THEOREM 2.12. *The basic quantum permutation and rotation groups,*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} S_N^+ & \longrightarrow & O_N^+ & \longrightarrow & U_N^+ \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ S_N & \longrightarrow & O_N & \longrightarrow & U_N \end{array}$$

are all easy, the corresponding categories of partitions being as follows,

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} NC & \longleftarrow & NC_2 & \longleftarrow & \mathcal{NC}_2 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ P & \longleftarrow & P_2 & \longleftarrow & \mathcal{P}_2 \end{array}$$

with 2 *standing for pairings, NC for noncrossing, and calligraphic for matching.*

PROOF. This is something quite fundamental, the proof being as follows:

(1) The quantum group U_N^+ is defined via the following relations:

$$u^* = u^{-1} \quad , \quad u^t = \bar{u}^{-1}$$

But, by doing some elementary computations, these relations tell us precisely that the following two operators must be in the associated Tannakian category C:

$$T_\pi \quad : \quad \pi = \overset{\cap}{\circ\bullet} \ , \ \overset{\cap}{\bullet\circ}$$

Thus, the associated Tannakian category is $C = span(T_\pi | \pi \in D)$, with:

$$D = < \overset{\cap}{\circ\bullet} \ , \ \overset{\cap}{\bullet\circ} > = \mathcal{N}C_2$$

(2) The subgroup $O_N^+ \subset U_N^+$ is defined by imposing the following relations:

$$u_{ij} = \bar{u}_{ij}$$

Thus, the following operators must be in the associated Tannakian category C:

$$T_\pi \quad : \quad \pi = \begin{smallmatrix}\circ\\|\\\bullet\end{smallmatrix} \ , \ \begin{smallmatrix}\bullet\\|\\\circ\end{smallmatrix}$$

We conclude that the Tannakian category is $C = span(T_\pi | \pi \in D)$, with:

$$D = < \mathcal{NC}_2, \begin{smallmatrix}\circ\\|\\\bullet\end{smallmatrix}, \begin{smallmatrix}\bullet\\|\\\circ\end{smallmatrix} > = NC_2$$

(3) The subgroup $U_N \subset U_N^+$ is defined via the following relations:

$$[u_{ij}, u_{kl}] = 0 \quad , \quad [u_{ij}, \bar{u}_{kl}] = 0$$

Thus, the following operators must be in the associated Tannakian category C:

$T_\pi \quad : \quad \pi =$  , 

Thus the associated Tannakian category is $C = span(T_\pi | \pi \in D)$, with:

$D =< \mathcal{NC}_2,$ ,  $>= \mathcal{P}_2$

(4) In order to deal now with O_N, we can simply use the following formula:

$$O_N = O_N^+ \cap U_N$$

At the categorical level, this tells us that O_N is indeed easy, coming from:

$$D =< NC_2, \mathcal{P}_2 >= P_2$$

(5) We know that the subgroup $S_N^+ \subset O_N^+$ appears as follows:

$$C(S_N^+) = C(O_N^+) \Big/ \Big\langle u = \text{magic} \Big\rangle$$

In order to interpret the magic condition, consider the fork partition:

$$Y \in P(2,1)$$

Given a corepresentation u, we have the following formulae:

$$(T_Y u^{\otimes 2})_{i,jk} = \sum_{lm} (T_Y)_{i,lm} (u^{\otimes 2})_{lm,jk} = u_{ij} u_{ik}$$

$$(u T_Y)_{i,jk} = \sum_l u_{il} (T_Y)_{l,jk} = \delta_{jk} u_{ij}$$

We conclude that we have the following equivalence:

$$T_Y \in Hom(u^{\otimes 2}, u) \iff u_{ij} u_{ik} = \delta_{jk} u_{ij}, \forall i, j, k$$

The condition on the right being equivalent to the magic condition, we obtain:

$$C(S_N^+) = C(O_N^+) \Big/ \Big\langle T_Y \in Hom(u^{\otimes 2}, u) \Big\rangle$$

Thus S_N^+ is indeed easy, the corresponding category of partitions being:

$$D =< Y >= NC$$

(6) Finally, in order to deal with S_N, we can use the following formula:

$$S_N = S_N^+ \cap O_N$$

At the categorical level, this tells us that S_N is indeed easy, coming from:

$$D =< NC, P_2 >= P$$

Thus, we are led to the conclusions in the statement. $\square$

The above result is something quite deep, and we will see in what follows countless applications of it. As a first such application, which is rather philosophical, we have:

THEOREM 2.13. *The constructions $G_N \to G_N^+$ with $G = U, O, S$ are easy quantum group liberations, in the sense that they come from the construction*

$$D \to D \cap NC$$

at the level of the associated categories of partitions.

PROOF. This is clear indeed from Theorem 2.12, and from the following trivial equalities, connecting the categories found there:

$$\mathcal{NC}_2 = \mathcal{P}_2 \cap NC \quad , \quad NC_2 = P_2 \cap NC \quad , \quad NC = P \cap NC$$

Thus, we are led to the conclusion in the statement. □

The above result is quite nice, because the various constructions $G_N \to G_N^+$ that we saw in chapter 1, although natural, were something quite ad-hoc. Now all this is no longer ad-hoc, and the next time that we will have to liberate a subgroup $G_N \subset U_N$, we know what the recipe is, namely check if G_N is easy, and if so, simply define $G_N^+ \subset U_N^+$ as being the easy quantum group coming from the category $D = D_G \cap NC$.

2c. Laws of characters

Let us discuss now some more advanced applications of Theorem 2.12, this time to the computation of the law of the main character, in the spirit of Claim 2.1. First, we have the following result, valid in the general easy quantum group setting:

PROPOSITION 2.14. *For an easy quantum group $G = (G_N)$, coming from a category of partitions $D = (D(k,l))$, the moments of the main character are given by*

$$\int_{G_N} \chi^k = \dim\left(span\left(\xi_\pi \Big| \pi \in D(k)\right)\right)$$

where $D(k) = D(\emptyset, k)$, and with the notation $\xi_\pi = T_\pi$, for partitions $\pi \in D(k)$.

PROOF. According to the Peter-Weyl theory, and to the definition of easiness, the moments of the main character are given by the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{G_N} \chi^k &= \int_{G_N} \chi_{u^{\otimes k}} \\ &= \dim\left(Fix(u^{\otimes k})\right) \\ &= \dim\left(span\left(\xi_\pi \Big| \pi \in D(k)\right)\right)\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain the formula in the statement. □

With the above result in hand, you would probably say very nice, so in practice, this is just a matter of counting the partitions appearing in Theorem 2.12, and then recovering the measures having these numbers as moments. However, this is wrong, because such a computation would lead to a law of χ which is independent on $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and for the classical groups at least, S_N, O_N, U_N, we obviously cannot have such a result.

The mistake comes from the fact that the vectors ξ_π are not necessarily linearly independent. Let us record this finding, which will be of key importance for us:

Conclusion 2.15. *The vectors associated to the partitions $\pi \in P(k)$, namely*

$$\xi_\pi = \sum_{i_1 \ldots i_k} \delta_\pi(i_1, \ldots, i_k)\, e_{i_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes e_{i_k}$$

are not linearly independent, with this making the main character moments for S_N,

$$\int_{S_N} \chi^k = \dim\left(span\left(\xi_\pi \Big| \pi \in P(k)\right)\right)$$

depend on $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, the same phenomenon happens for O_N, U_N.

All this suggests by doing some linear algebra for the vectors ξ_π, but this looks rather complicated, and let's keep that for later. What we can do right away, instead, is that of studying S_N with alternative, direct techniques. And here we have:

Theorem 2.16. *Consider the symmetric group S_N, regarded as a compact group of matrices, $S_N \subset O_N$, via the standard permutation matrices.*

1. *The main character $\chi \in C(S_N)$, defined as usual as $\chi = \sum_i u_{ii}$, counts the number of fixed points, $\chi(\sigma) = \#\{i|\sigma(i) = i\}$.*
2. *The probability for a permutation $\sigma \in S_N$ to be a derangement, meaning to have no fixed points at all, becomes, with $N \to \infty$, equal to $1/e$.*
3. *The law of the main character $\chi \in C(S_N)$ becomes with $N \to \infty$ the Poisson law $p_1 = \frac{1}{e}\sum_k \delta_k/k!$, with respect to the counting measure.*

Proof. This is something very classical, the proof being as follows:

(1) We have indeed the following computation, which gives the result:

$$\chi(\sigma) = \sum_i u_{ii}(\sigma) = \sum_i \delta_{\sigma(i)i} = \#\left\{i\Big|\sigma(i) = i\right\}$$

(2) We use the inclusion-exclusion principle. Consider the following sets:

$$S_N^i = \left\{\sigma \in S_N \Big| \sigma(i) = i\right\}$$

The probability that we are interested in is then given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\chi=0) &= \frac{1}{N!}\left(|S_N|-\sum_i|S_N^i|+\sum_{i<j}|S_N^i\cap S_N^j|-\sum_{i<j<k}|S_N^i\cap S_N^j\cap S_N^k|+\ldots\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{N!}\sum_{r=0}^N(-1)^r\sum_{i_1<\ldots<i_r}(N-r)!\\
&= \frac{1}{N!}\sum_{r=0}^N(-1)^r\binom{N}{r}(N-r)!\\
&= \sum_{r=0}^N\frac{(-1)^r}{r!}
\end{aligned}$$

Since we have here the expansion of $1/e$, this gives the result.

(3) This follows by generalizing the computation in (2). To be more precise, a similar application of the inclusion-exclusion principle gives the following formula:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}P(\chi=k)=\frac{1}{k!e}$$

Thus, we obtain in the limit a Poisson law of parameter 1, as stated. $\square$

The above result is quite interesting, and tells us what to do next. As a first goal, we can try to recover (3) there by using Proposition 2.14, and easiness. Then, once this understood, we can try to look at S_N^+, and then at O_N,U_N and O_N^+,U_N^+ too, with the same objective, namely finding $N\to\infty$ results for the law of χ, using easiness.

So, back to Proposition 2.14 and Conclusion 2.15, and we have now to courageously attack the main problem, namely the linear independence question for the vectors ξ_π. This will be quite technical. Let us begin with some standard combinatorics:

Definition 2.17. *Let $P(k)$ be the set of partitions of $\{1,\ldots,k\}$, and $\pi,\sigma\in P(k)$.*

1. *We write $\pi\leq\sigma$ if each block of π is contained in a block of σ.*
2. *We let $\pi\vee\sigma\in P(k)$ be the partition obtained by superposing π,σ.*

Also, we denote by $|.|$ the number of blocks of the partitions $\pi\in P(k)$.

As an illustration here, at $k=2$ we have $P(2)=\{||,\sqcap\}$, and we have:

$$||\leq\sqcap$$

Also, at $k=3$ we have $P(3)=\{|||,\sqcap|,\sqcap\hskip-3.2mm{\ }_|\,,|\sqcap,\sqcap\hskip-0.7mm\sqcap\}$, and the order relation is as follows:

$$|||\ \leq\ \sqcap|\ ,\ \sqcap\hskip-3.2mm{\ }_|\,,\ |\sqcap\ \leq\ \sqcap\hskip-0.7mm\sqcap$$

In relation with our linear independence questions, the idea will be that of using:

Proposition 2.18. *The Gram matrix of the vectors ξ_π is given by the formula*

$$<\xi_\pi,\xi_\sigma>=N^{|\pi\vee\sigma|}$$

where $\vee$ is the superposition operation, and $|.|$ is the number of blocks.

Proof. According to the formula of the vectors ξ_π, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}<\xi_\pi,\xi_\sigma> &= \sum_{i_1\ldots i_k}\delta_\pi(i_1,\ldots,i_k)\delta_\sigma(i_1,\ldots,i_k)\\ &= \sum_{i_1\ldots i_k}\delta_{\pi\vee\sigma}(i_1,\ldots,i_k)\\ &= N^{|\pi\vee\sigma|}\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have obtained the formula in the statement. □

In order to study the Gram matrix $G_k(\pi,\sigma)=N^{|\pi\vee\sigma|}$, and more specifically to compute its determinant, we will use several standard facts about the partitions. We have:

Definition 2.19. *The Möbius function of any lattice, and so of P, is given by*

$$\mu(\pi,\sigma)=\begin{cases}1 & \text{if } \pi=\sigma\\ -\sum_{\pi\leq\tau<\sigma}\mu(\pi,\tau) & \text{if } \pi<\sigma\\ 0 & \text{if } \pi\not\leq\sigma\end{cases}$$

with the construction being performed by recurrence.

As an illustration here, for $P(2)=\{||,\sqcap\}$, we have by definition:

$$\mu(||,||)=\mu(\sqcap,\sqcap)=1$$

Also, $||<\sqcap$, with no intermediate partition in between, so we obtain:

$$\mu(||,\sqcap)=-\mu(||,||)=-1$$

Finally, we have $\sqcap\not\leq||$, and so we have as well the following formula:

$$\mu(\sqcap,||)=0$$

Thus, as a conclusion, we have computed the Möbius matrix $M_2(\pi,\sigma)=\mu(\pi,\sigma)$ of the lattice $P(2)=\{||,\sqcap\}$, the formula being as follows:

$$M_2=\begin{pmatrix}1&-1\\0&1\end{pmatrix}$$

Back to the general case now, the main interest in the Möbius function comes from the Möbius inversion formula, which states that the following happens:

$$f(\sigma)=\sum_{\pi\leq\sigma}g(\pi)\quad\implies\quad g(\sigma)=\sum_{\pi\leq\sigma}\mu(\pi,\sigma)f(\pi)$$

In linear algebra terms, the statement and proof of this formula are as follows:

THEOREM 2.20. *The inverse of the adjacency matrix of $P(k)$, given by*

$$A_k(\pi,\sigma)=\begin{cases}1 & \text{if } \pi\leq\sigma\\ 0 & \text{if } \pi\not\leq\sigma\end{cases}$$

is the Möbius matrix of P, given by $M_k(\pi,\sigma)=\mu(\pi,\sigma)$.

PROOF. This is well-known, coming for instance from the fact that A_k is upper triangular. Indeed, when inverting, we are led into the recurrence from Definition 2.19. □

As an illustration, for $P(2)$ the formula $M_2=A_2^{-1}$ appears as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix}1&-1\\0&1\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}1&1\\0&1\end{pmatrix}^{-1}$$

Now back to our Gram matrix considerations, we have the following key result:

PROPOSITION 2.21. *The Gram matrix of the vectors ξ_π with $\pi\in P(k)$,*

$$G_{\pi\sigma}=N^{|\pi\vee\sigma|}$$

decomposes as a product of upper/lower triangular matrices, $G_k=A_kL_k$, where

$$L_k(\pi,\sigma)=\begin{cases}N(N-1)\ldots(N-|\pi|+1) & \text{if } \sigma\leq\pi\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}$$

and where A_k is the adjacency matrix of $P(k)$.

PROOF. We have the following computation, based on Proposition 2.18:

$$\begin{aligned}G_k(\pi,\sigma) &= N^{|\pi\vee\sigma|}\\ &= \#\left\{i_1,\ldots,i_k\in\{1,\ldots,N\}\Big|\ker i\geq\pi\vee\sigma\right\}\\ &= \sum_{\tau\geq\pi\vee\sigma}\#\left\{i_1,\ldots,i_k\in\{1,\ldots,N\}\Big|\ker i=\tau\right\}\\ &= \sum_{\tau\geq\pi\vee\sigma}N(N-1)\ldots(N-|\tau|+1)\end{aligned}$$

According now to the definition of A_k,L_k, this formula reads:

$$\begin{aligned}G_k(\pi,\sigma) &= \sum_{\tau\geq\pi}L_k(\tau,\sigma)\\ &= \sum_\tau A_k(\pi,\tau)L_k(\tau,\sigma)\\ &= (A_kL_k)(\pi,\sigma)\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we are led to the formula in the statement. □

As an illustration for the above result, at $k=2$ we have $P(2)=\{||,\sqcap\}$, and the above decomposition $G_2=A_2L_2$ appears as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix}N^2&N\\ N&N\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}1&1\\ 0&1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}N^2-N&0\\ N&N\end{pmatrix}$$

We are led in this way to the following formula, due to Lindstöm [68]:

THEOREM 2.22. *The determinant of the Gram matrix G_k is given by*

$$\det(G_k)=\prod_{\pi\in P(k)}\frac{N!}{(N-|\pi|)!}$$

with the convention that in the case $N<k$ we obtain 0.

PROOF. If we order $P(k)$ as usual, with respect to the number of blocks, and then lexicographically, A_k is upper triangular, and L_k is lower triangular. Thus, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\det(G_k)&=\det(A_k)\det(L_k)\\ &=\det(L_k)\\ &=\prod_\pi L_k(\pi,\pi)\\ &=\prod_\pi N(N-1)\ldots(N-|\pi|+1)\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we are led to the formula in the statement. □

Now back to easiness and laws of characters, we can formulate:

THEOREM 2.23. *For an easy quantum group $G=(G_N)$, coming from a category of partitions $D=(D(k,l))$, the asymptotic moments of the main character are given by*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\int_{G_N}\chi^k=|D(k)|$$

where $D(k)=D(\emptyset,k)$, with the limiting sequence on the left consisting of certain integers, and being stationary at least starting from the k-th term.

PROOF. We know from Proposition 2.14 that we have the following formula:

$$\int_{G_N}\chi^k=\dim\left(span\left(\xi_\pi\Big|\pi\in D(k)\right)\right)$$

Now since by Theorem 2.22 the vectors ξ_π are linearly independent with $N\geq k$, and in particular with $N\to\infty$, we obtain the formula in the statement. □

This is very nice, and as a first application, we can recover as promised the Poisson law result from Theorem 2.16, this time by using easiness, as follows:

THEOREM 2.24. *For the symmetric group S_N, the main character becomes Poisson*

$$\chi \sim p_1$$

in the $N \to \infty$ limit.

PROOF. As already mentioned, this is something that we already know, from Theorem 2.16. Alternatively, according to Theorem 2.23, we have the following formula:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\int_{S_N}\chi^k = |P(k)|$$

Now since a partition of $\{1,\ldots,k+1\}$ appears by choosing s neighbors for 1, among the k numbers available, and then partitioning the $k-s$ elements left, the numbers on the right $B_k = |P(k)|$, called Bell numbers, satisfy the following recurrence:

$$B_{k+1} = \sum_s \binom{k}{s} B_{k-s}$$

On the other hand, the moments M_k of the Poisson law $p_1 = \frac{1}{e}\sum_r \delta_r/r!$ are subject to the same recurrence formula, as shown by the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{k+1} &= \frac{1}{e}\sum_r \frac{(r+1)^k}{r!}\\
&= \frac{1}{e}\sum_r \frac{r^k}{r!}\left(1+\frac{1}{r}\right)^k\\
&= \frac{1}{e}\sum_r \frac{r^k}{r!}\sum_s \binom{k}{s} r^{-s}\\
&= \sum_s \binom{k}{s}\cdot\frac{1}{e}\sum_r \frac{r^{k-s}}{r!}\\
&= \sum_s \binom{k}{s} M_{k-s}
\end{aligned}$$

As for the initial values, at $k=1,2$, these are $1,2$, for both the Bell numbers B_k, and the Poisson moments M_k. Thus we have $B_k = M_k$, which gives the result. □

2d. Free probability

Moving ahead, we have now to work out free analogues of Theorem 2.24 for the other easy quantum groups that we know. A bit of thinking at traces of unitary matrices suggests that for the groups O_N, U_N we should get the real and complex normal laws. As for O_N^+, U_N^+, S_N^+, we are a bit in the dark here, and we can only say that we can expect to have "free versions" of the real and complex normal laws, and of the Poisson law.

Long story short, the combinatorics ahead looks quite complicated, and we are in need of a crash course on probability. So, let us start with that, classical and free probability, and we will come back later to combinatorics and quantum groups. We first have:

DEFINITION 2.25. *Let A be a C^*-algebra, given with a trace $tr: A \to \mathbb{C}$.*
(1) *The elements $a \in A$ are called random variables.*
(2) *The moments of such a variable are the numbers $M_k(a) = tr(a^k)$.*
(3) *The law of such a variable is the functional $\mu: P \to tr(P(a))$.*

Here $k = \circ\bullet\bullet\circ\ldots$ is by definition a colored integer, and the corresponding powers a^k are defined by the following formulae, and multiplicativity:

$$a^\emptyset = 1 \quad , \quad a^\circ = a \quad , \quad a^\bullet = a^*$$

As for the polynomial P, this is a noncommuting $*$-polynomial in one variable:

$$P \in \mathbb{C} < X, X^* >$$

Observe that the law is uniquely determined by the moments, because we have:

$$P(X) = \sum_k \lambda_k X^k \implies \mu(P) = \sum_k \lambda_k M_k(a)$$

Generally speaking, the above definition is something quite abstract, but there is no other way of doing things, at least at this level of generality. However, in certain special cases, the formalism simplifies, and we recover more familiar objects, as follows:

PROPOSITION 2.26. *Assuming that $a \in A$ is normal, $aa^* = a^*a$, its law corresponds to a probability measure on its spectrum $\sigma(a) \subset \mathbb{C}$, according to the following formula:*

$$tr(P(a)) = \int_{\sigma(a)} P(x) d\mu(x)$$

When the trace is faithful we have $supp(\mu) = \sigma(a)$. Also, in the particular case where the variable is self-adjoint, $a = a^*$, this law is a real probability measure.

PROOF. This is something very standard, coming from the Gelfand theorem, applied to the algebra $< a >$, which is commutative, and then the Riesz theorem. □

Following Voiculescu [90], we have the following two notions of independence:

DEFINITION 2.27. *Two subalgebras $A, B \subset C$ are called independent when*

$$tr(a) = tr(b) = 0 \implies tr(ab) = 0$$

holds for any $a \in A$ and $b \in B$, and free when

$$tr(a_i) = tr(b_i) = 0 \implies tr(a_1 b_1 a_2 b_2 \ldots) = 0$$

holds for any $a_i \in A$ and $b_i \in B$.

In short, we have here a straightforward extension of the usual notion of independence, in the framework of Definition 2.25, along with a quite natural free analogue of it. In order to understand what is going on, let us first discuss some basic models for independence and freeness. We have the following result, from [90], which clarifies things:

PROPOSITION 2.28. *Given two algebras (A,tr) and (B,tr), the following hold:*

(1) *A,B are independent inside their tensor product $A\otimes B$.*
(2) *A,B are free inside their free product $A*B$.*

PROOF. Both the assertions are clear from definitions, after some standard discussion regarding the tensor product and free product trace. See Voiculescu [90]. □

In relation with groups, we have the following result:

PROPOSITION 2.29. *We have the following results, valid for group algebras:*

(1) *$C^*(\Gamma),C^*(\Lambda)$ are independent inside $C^*(\Gamma\times\Lambda)$.*
(2) *$C^*(\Gamma),C^*(\Lambda)$ are free inside $C^*(\Gamma*\Lambda)$.*

PROOF. This follows from the general results in Proposition 2.28, along with the following two isomorphisms, which are both standard:

$$C^*(\Gamma\times\Lambda)=C^*(\Lambda)\otimes C^*(\Gamma)\quad,\quad C^*(\Gamma*\Lambda)=C^*(\Lambda)*C^*(\Gamma)$$

Alternatively, we can prove this directly, by using the fact that each algebra is spanned by the corresponding group elements, and checking the result on group elements. □

In order to study independence and freeness, our main tool will be:

THEOREM 2.30. *The convolution is linearized by the log of the Fourier transform,*

$$F_f(x)=E(e^{ixf})$$

and the free convolution is linearized by the R-transform, given by:

$$G_\mu(\xi)=\int_\mathbb{R}\frac{d\mu(t)}{\xi-t}\implies G_\mu\left(R_\mu(\xi)+\frac{1}{\xi}\right)=\xi$$

PROOF. In what regards the first assertion, if f,g are independent, we have indeed:

$$\begin{aligned}F_{f+g}(x)&=\int_\mathbb{R}e^{ixz}d(\mu_f*\mu_g)(z)\\&=\int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}}e^{ix(z+t)}d\mu_f(z)d\mu_g(t)\\&=\int_\mathbb{R}e^{ixz}d\mu_f(z)\int_\mathbb{R}e^{ixt}d\mu_g(t)\\&=F_f(x)F_g(x)\end{aligned}$$

As for the second assertion, here we need a good model for free convolution, and the best is to use the semigroup algebra of the free semigroup on two generators:

$$A = C^*(\mathbb{N} * \mathbb{N})$$

Indeed, we have some freeness in the semigroup setting, a bit in the same way as for the group algebras $C^*(\Gamma * \Lambda)$, from Proposition 2.29, and in addition to this fact, and to what happens in the group algebra case, the following two key things happen:

(1) The variables of type $S^* + f(S)$, with $S \in C^*(\mathbb{N})$ being the shift, and with $f \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ being a polynomial, model in moments all the distributions $\mu : \mathbb{C}[X] \to \mathbb{C}$. This is indeed something elementary, which can be checked via a direct algebraic computation.

(2) Given $f, g \in \mathbb{C}[X]$, the variables $S^* + f(S)$ and $T^* + g(T)$, where $S, T \in C^*(\mathbb{N} * \mathbb{N})$ are the shifts corresponding to the generators of $\mathbb{N} * \mathbb{N}$, are free, and their sum has the same law as $S^* + (f + g)(S)$. This follows indeed by using a 45° argument.

With this in hand, we can see that the operation $\mu \to f$ linearizes the free convolution. We are therefore left with a computation inside $C^*(\mathbb{N})$, whose conclusion is that $R_\mu = f$ can be recaptured from μ via the Cauchy transform G_μ, as stated. See [90]. □

As a first result now, which is central and classical and free probability, we have:

Theorem 2.31 (CLT). *Given self-adjoint variables $x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots$ which are i.i.d./f.i.d., centered, with variance $t > 0$, we have, with $n \to \infty$, in moments,*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \sim g_t / \gamma_t$$

where g_t/γ_t are the normal and Wigner semicircle law of parameter t, given by:

$$g_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t}} e^{-x^2/2t} dx \quad , \quad \gamma_t = \frac{1}{2\pi t} \sqrt{4t^2 - x^2} dx$$

Proof. This is routine, by using the Fourier transform and the R-transform. □

Next, we have the following complex version of the CLT:

Theorem 2.32 (CCLT). *Given variables $x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots$ which are i.i.d./f.i.d., centered, with variance $t > 0$, we have, with $n \to \infty$, in moments,*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \sim G_t / \Gamma_t$$

where G_t/Γ_t are the complex normal and Voiculescu circular law of parameter t, given by:

$$G_t = law\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a + ib)\right) \quad , \quad \Gamma_t = law\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\alpha + i\beta)\right)$$

where $a, b/\alpha, \beta$ are independent/free, each following the law g_t/γ_t.

PROOF. This follows indeed from the CLT, by taking real and imaginary parts. □

Finally, we have the following discrete version of the CLT:

THEOREM 2.33 (PLT). *The following Poisson limits converge, for any $t > 0$,*

$$p_t = \lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\left(1-\frac{t}{n}\right)\delta_0+\frac{t}{n}\delta_1\right)^{*n} \quad , \quad \pi_t = \lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\left(1-\frac{t}{n}\right)\delta_0+\frac{t}{n}\delta_1\right)^{\boxplus n}$$

the limiting measures being the Poisson law p_t, and the Marchenko-Pastur law π_t,

$$p_t = \frac{1}{e^t}\sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{t^k\delta_k}{k!} \quad , \quad \pi_t = \max(1-t,0)\delta_0 + \frac{\sqrt{4t-(x-1-t)^2}}{2\pi x}\,dx$$

with at $t = 1$, the Marchenko-Pastur law being $\pi_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sqrt{4x^{-1}-1}\,dx$.

PROOF. This is again routine, by using the Fourier and R-transform. □

This was for the basic classical and free probability. In relation now with combinatorics, we have the following result, which reminds easiness, and is of interest for us:

THEOREM 2.34. *The moments of the various central limiting measures, namely*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \pi_t & - & \gamma_t & - & \Gamma_t \\ | & & | & & | \\ p_t & - & g_t & - & G_t \end{array}$$

are always given by the same formula, involving partitions, namely

$$M_k = \sum_{\pi\in D(k)} t^{|\pi|}$$

with the sets of partitions $D(k)$ in question being respectively

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} NC & \leftarrow & NC_2 & \leftarrow & \mathcal{NC}_2 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ P & \leftarrow & P_2 & \leftarrow & \mathcal{P}_2 \end{array}$$

and with $|.|$ being the number of blocks.

PROOF. This follows indeed from the various computations leading to Theorems 2.31, 2.32, 2.33, and details can be found in any free probability book. See [90]. □

It is possible to say more on this, following Rota in the classical case, Speicher in the free case, and Bercovici-Pata for the classical/free correspondence. We first have:

Definition 2.35. *The cumulants of a self-adjoint variable $a\in A$ are given by*

$$\log F_a(\xi)=\sum_{n=1}^\infty k_n(a)\,\frac{(i\xi)^n}{n!}$$

and the free cumulants of the same variable $a\in A$ are given by:

$$R_a(\xi)=\sum_{n=1}^\infty\kappa_n(a)\xi^{n-1}$$

Moreover, we have extensions of these notions to the non-self-adjoint case.

In what follows we will only discuss the self-adjoint case, which is simpler, and illustrating. Since the classical and free cumulants are by definition certain linear combinations of the moments, we should have conversion formulae. The result here is as follows:

Theorem 2.36. *The moments can be recaptured out of cumulants via*

$$M_n(a)=\sum_{\pi\in P(n)}k_\pi(a)\quad,\quad M_n(a)=\sum_{\pi\in NC(n)}\kappa_\pi(a)$$

with the convention that k_π,κ_π are defined by multiplicativity over blocks. Also,

$$k_n(a)=\sum_{\nu\in P(n)}\mu_P(\nu,1_n)M_\nu(a)\quad,\quad \kappa_n(a)=\sum_{\nu\in NC(n)}\mu_{NC}(\nu,1_n)M_\nu(a)$$

where μ_P,μ_{NC} are the Möbius functions of $P(n),NC(n)$.

Proof. Here the first formulae follow from Definition 2.35, by doing some combinatorics, and the second formulae follow from them, via Möbius inversion. □

In relation with the various laws that we are interested in, we have:

Proposition 2.37. *The classical and free cumulants are as follows:*

(1) *For $\mu=\delta_c$ both the classical and free cumulants are $c,0,0,\ldots$*
(2) *For $\mu=g_t/\gamma_t$ the classical/free cumulants are $0,t,0,0,\ldots$*
(3) *For $\mu=p_t/\pi_t$ the classical/free cumulants are $t,t,t,\ldots$*

Proof. Here (1) is something trivial, and (2,3) can be deduced either directly, starting from the definition of the various laws involved, or by using Theorem 2.34. □

Following now Bercovici-Pata [18], let us formulate the following definition:

Definition 2.38. *If the classical cumulants of η equal the free cumulants of μ,*

$$k_n(\eta)=\kappa_n(\mu)$$

we say that η is the classical version of μ, and that μ is the free version of η.

All this is quite interesting, and we have now a better understanding of Theorem 2.34, the point there being that on the vertical, we have measures in Bercovici-Pata bijection. Now back to quantum groups, we first have the following result, from [5]:

THEOREM 2.39. *The asymptotic laws of characters for the basic quantum groups,*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} S_N^+ & \longrightarrow & O_N^+ & \longrightarrow & U_N^+ \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ S_N & \longrightarrow & O_N & \longrightarrow & U_N \end{array}$$

are precisely the main laws in classical and free probability at $t = 1$.

PROOF. This follows indeed from our various easiness considerations before, and from Theorem 2.34 applied at $t = 1$, which gives $M_k = |D(k)|$ in this case. □

More generally, again following [5], let us discuss now the computation for the truncated characters. These are variables constructed as follows:

DEFINITION 2.40. *Associated to any Woronowicz algebra (A, u) are the variables*

$$\chi_t = \sum_{i=1}^{[tN]} u_{ii}$$

depending on a parameter $t \in (0, 1]$, called truncations of the main character.

In order to understand what these variables χ_t are about, let us first investigate the symmetric group S_N. We have here the following result:

THEOREM 2.41. *For the symmetric group $S_N \subset O_N$, the truncated character*

$$\chi_t(g) = \sum_{i=1}^{[tN]} u_{ii}$$

becomes, with $N \to \infty$, a Poisson variable of parameter t.

PROOF. This can be deduced via inclusion-exclusion, as in the proof of Theorem 2.16, but let us prove this via an alternative method, which is instructive as well. Our first claim is that the integrals over S_N are given by the following formula:

$$\int_{S_N} u_{i_1j_1} \ldots u_{i_kj_k} = \begin{cases} \frac{(N-|\ker i|)!}{N!} & \text{if } \ker i = \ker j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Indeed, according to the definition of u_{ij}, the above integrals are given by:

$$\int_{S_N} u_{i_1j_1} \ldots u_{i_kj_k} = \frac{1}{N!} \# \left\{ \sigma \in S_N \Big| \sigma(j_1) = i_1, \ldots, \sigma(j_k) = i_k \right\}$$

But this proves our claim. Now with the above formula in hand, with S_{kb} being the Stirling numbers, counting the partitions in $P(k)$ having b blocks, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{S_N}\chi_t^k &= \sum_{i_1\ldots i_k=1}^{[tN]}\int_{S_N}u_{i_1i_1}\ldots u_{i_ki_k}\\ &= \sum_{\pi\in P(k)}\frac{[tN]!}{([tN]-|\pi|!)}\cdot\frac{(N-|\pi|!)}{N!}\\ &= \sum_{b=1}^{[tN]}\frac{[tN]!}{([tN]-b)!}\cdot\frac{(N-b)!}{N!}\cdot S_{kb}\end{aligned}$$

Thus with $N\to\infty$ the moments are $M_k\simeq\sum_{b=1}^kS_{kb}t^b$, which gives the result. □

Summarizing, we have nice results about S_N. In general, however, and in particular for O_N,U_N and S_N^+,O_N^+,U_N^+, there is no simple trick as for S_N, and we must use general integration methods, from [5], [36]. We have here the following formula:

Theorem 2.42. *For an easy quantum group $G\subset_u U_N^+$, coming from a category of partitions $D=(D(k,l))$, we have the Weingarten integration formula*

$$\int_Gu_{i_1j_1}\ldots u_{i_kj_k}=\sum_{\pi,\sigma\in D(k)}\delta_\pi(i)\delta_\sigma(j)W_{kN}(\pi,\sigma)$$

where $D(k)=D(\emptyset,k)$, δ are usual Kronecker symbols, and $W_{kN}=G_{kN}^{-1}$, with

$$G_{kN}(\pi,\sigma)=N^{|\pi\vee\sigma|}$$

where $|.|$ is the number of blocks.

Proof. This follows from the general Weingarten formula from Theorem 2.4. Indeed, in the easy case we can take $D_k=D(k,k)$, and the Kronecker symbols are given by:

$$\delta_{\xi_\pi}(i)=<\xi_\pi,e_{i_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes e_{i_k}>=\delta_\pi(i_1,\ldots,i_k)$$

The Gram matrix being as well the correct one, we obtain the result. See [5]. □

With the above formula in hand, we can go back to the question of computing the laws of truncated characters. First, we have the following moment formula, from [5]:

Proposition 2.43. *The moments of truncated characters are given by the formula*

$$\int_G(u_{11}+\ldots+u_{ss})^k=Tr(W_{kN}G_{ks})$$

where G_{kN} and $W_{kN}=G_{kN}^{-1}$ are the associated Gram and Weingarten matrices.

PROOF. We have indeed the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_G(u_{11}+\ldots+u_{ss})^k&=\sum_{i_1=1}^s\ldots\sum_{i_k=1}^s\int u_{i_1i_1}\ldots u_{i_ki_k}\\&=\sum_{\pi,\sigma\in D(k)}W_{kN}(\pi,\sigma)\sum_{i_1=1}^s\ldots\sum_{i_k=1}^s\delta_\pi(i)\delta_\sigma(i)\\&=\sum_{\pi,\sigma\in D(k)}W_{kN}(\pi,\sigma)G_{ks}(\sigma,\pi)\\&=Tr(W_{kN}G_{ks})\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have obtained the formula in the statement. □

In order to process now the above formula, things are quite technical, and won't work well in general. We must impose here a uniformity condition, as follows:

THEOREM 2.44. *For an easy quantum group $G=(G_N)$, coming from a category of partitions $D\subset P$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *$G_{N-1}=G_N\cap U_{N-1}^+$, via the embedding $U_{N-1}^+\subset U_N^+$ given by $u\to diag(u,1)$.*
2. *$G_{N-1}=G_N\cap U_{N-1}^+$, via the N possible diagonal embeddings $U_{N-1}^+\subset U_N^+$.*
3. *D is stable under the operation which consists in removing blocks.*

If these conditions are satisfied, we say that $G=(G_N)$ is uniform.

PROOF. This is something very standard, the idea being as follows:

(1) $\iff$ (2) This equivalence is elementary, coming from the inclusion $S_N\subset G_N$, which makes everything S_N-invariant.

(1) $\iff$ (3) Given a closed subgroup $K\subset U_{N-1}^+$, with fundamental corepresentation u, consider the following $N\times N$ matrix:

$$v=\begin{pmatrix}u&0\\0&1\end{pmatrix}$$

Then for any $\pi\in P(k)$ a standard computation shows that we have:

$$\xi_\pi\in Fix(v^{\otimes k})\iff\xi_{\pi'}\in Fix(v^{\otimes k'}),\forall\pi'\in P(k'),\pi'\subset\pi$$

Now with this in hand, the result follows from Tannakian duality. □

By getting back now to the truncated characters, we have the following result:

THEOREM 2.45. *For a uniform easy quantum group $G=(G_N)$, we have the formula*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\int_{G_N}\chi_t^k=\sum_{\pi\in D(k)}t^{|\pi|}$$

with $D\subset P$ being the associated category of partitions.

PROOF. In the uniform case the Gram matrix, and so the Weingarten matrix too, are asymptotically diagonal, so the asymptotic moments are given by:

$$\int_{G_N}\chi_t^k=Tr(W_{kN}G_{k[tN]})\simeq\sum_{\pi\in D(k)}N^{-|\pi|}[tN]^{|\pi|}\simeq\sum_{\pi\in D(k)}t^{|\pi|}$$

Thus, we are led to the conclusion in the statement. See [5], [17]. □

We can now improve our quantum group results, as follows:

THEOREM 2.46. *The asymptotic laws of truncated characters for the quantum groups*

$$\begin{matrix}S_N^+&\to&O_N^+&\to&U_N^+\\ \uparrow&&\uparrow&&\uparrow\\ S_N&\to&O_N&\to&U_N\end{matrix}$$

are precisely the main limiting laws in classical and free probability, namely:

$$\begin{matrix}\pi_t&-&\gamma_t&-&\Gamma_t\\ |&&|&&|\\ p_t&-&g_t&-&G_t\end{matrix}$$

PROOF. This follows indeed from easiness, Theorem 2.34 and Theorem 2.45. □

2e. Exercises

Exercises:

EXERCISE 2.47.

EXERCISE 2.48.

EXERCISE 2.49.

EXERCISE 2.50.

EXERCISE 2.51.

EXERCISE 2.52.

EXERCISE 2.53.

EXERCISE 2.54.

Bonus exercise.

CHAPTER 3

Algebraic invariants

3a. Rotation groups

We have seen that the inclusion $S_N \subset S_N^+$, and its companion inclusions $O_N \subset O_N^+$ and $U_N \subset U_N^+$, are all liberations in the sense of easy quantum group theory, and that some representation theory consequences, in the $N \to \infty$ limit, can be derived from this. We discuss here the case where $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is fixed, which is more technical.

Let us first study the representations of O_N^+. We know that in the $N \to \infty$ limit we have $\chi \sim \gamma_1$, and as a first question, we would like to know how the irreducible representations of a "formal quantum group" should look like, when subject to the condition $\chi \sim \gamma_1$. And fortunately, the answer here is very simple, coming from SU_2:

Theorem 3.1. *The group SU_2 is as follows:*

(1) *The main character is real, its odd moments vanish, and its even moments are the Catalan numbers:*

$$\int_{SU_2} \chi^{2k} = C_k$$

(2) *This main character follows the Wigner semicircle law, $\chi \sim \gamma_1$.*

(3) *The irreducible representations can be labelled by positive integers, r_k with $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and the fusion rules for these representations are:*

$$r_k \otimes r_l = r_{|k-l|} + r_{|k-l|+2} + \ldots + r_{k+l}$$

(4) *The dimensions of these representations are* $\dim r_k = k + 1$.

Proof. There are many possible proofs here, the idea being as follows:

(1,2) These statements are equivalent, and in order to prove them, a simple argument is by using the well-known isomorphism $SU_2 \simeq S^3_{\mathbb{R}}$, coming from:

$$SU_2 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x+iy & z+it \\ -z+it & x-iy \end{pmatrix} \Big| x^2+y^2+z^2+t^2 = 1 \right\}$$

Indeed, in this picture the moments of $\chi = 2x$ can be computed via spherical coordinates and some calculus, and follow to be the Catalan numbers:

$$C_k = \frac{1}{k+1}\binom{2k}{k}$$

As for the formula $\chi \sim \gamma_1$, this follows from this, and is geometrically clear as well.

(3,4) Our claim is that we can construct, by recurrence on $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a sequence r_k of irreducible, self-adjoint and distinct representations of SU_2, satisfying:

$$r_0 = 1 \quad , \quad r_1 = u \quad , \quad r_{k-1} \otimes r_1 = r_{k-2} + r_k$$

Indeed, assume that $r_0, \ldots, r_{k-1}$ are constructed, and let us construct r_k. We have:

$$r_{k-2} \otimes r_1 = r_{k-3} + r_{k-1}$$

Thus $r_{k-1} \subset r_{k-2} \otimes r_1$, and since r_{k-2} is irreducible, by Frobenius we have:

$$r_{k-2} \subset r_{k-1} \otimes r_1$$

We conclude there exists a certain representation r_k such that:

$$r_{k-1} \otimes r_1 = r_{k-2} + r_k$$

By recurrence, r_k is self-adjoint. Now observe that according to our recurrence formula, we can split $u^{\otimes k}$ as a sum of the following type, with positive coefficients:

$$u^{\otimes k} = c_k r_k + c_{k-2} r_{k-2} + c_{k-4} r_{k-4} + \ldots$$

We conclude by Peter-Weyl that we have an inequality as follows, with equality precisely when r_k is irreducible, and non-equivalent to the other summands r_i:

$$\sum_i c_i^2 \leq \dim(End(u^{\otimes k}))$$

But by (1) the number on the right is C_k, and some straightforward combinatorics, based on the fusion rules, shows that the number on the left is C_k as well. Thus:

$$C_k = \sum_i c_i^2 \leq \dim(End(u^{\otimes k})) = \int_{SU_2} \chi^{2k} = C_k$$

We conclude that we have equality in our estimate, so our representation r_k is irreducible, and non-equivalent to $r_{k-2}, r_{k-4}, \ldots$ Moreover, this representation r_k is not equivalent to $r_{k-1}, r_{k-3}, \ldots$ either, with this coming from $r_p \subset u^{\otimes p}$, and from:

$$\dim(Fix(u^{\otimes 2s+1})) = \int_{SU_2} \chi^{2s+1} = 0$$

Thus, we have proved our claim. Now since each irreducible representation of SU_2 must appear in some tensor power $u^{\otimes k}$, and we know how to decompose each $u^{\otimes k}$ into sums of representations r_k, these representations r_k are all the irreducible representations of SU_2, and we are done with (3). As for the formula in (4), this is clear. □

There are of course many other proofs for the above result, which are all instructive, and we recommend here any good book on geometry and physics. In what concerns us, the above will do, and we will be back to this later, with some further comments.

Getting back now to O_N^+, we know that in the $N\to\infty$ limit we have $\chi\sim\gamma_1$, so by the above when formally setting $N=\infty$, the fusion rules are the same as for SU_2. Miraculously, however, this happens in fact at any $N\geq 2$, the result being as follows:

THEOREM 3.2. *The quantum groups O_N^+ with $N\geq 2$ are as follows:*

(1) *The odd moments of the main character vanish, and the even moments are:*

$$\int_{O_N^+}\chi^{2k}=C_k$$

(2) *This main character follows the Wigner semicircle law, $\chi\sim\gamma_1$.*
(3) *The fusion rules for irreducible representations are as for SU_2, namely:*

$$r_k\otimes r_l=r_{|k-l|}+r_{|k-l|+2}+\ldots+r_{k+l}$$

(4) *We have* $\dim r_k=(q^{k+1}-q^{-k-1})/(q-q^{-1})$, *with $q+q^{-1}=N$.*

PROOF. The idea is to skilfully recycle the proof of Theorem 3.1, as follows:

(1,2) These assertions are equivalent, and since we cannot prove them directly, we will simply say that these follow from the combinatorics in (3) below.

(3,4) As before, our claim is that we can construct, by recurrence on $k\in\mathbb N$, a sequence $r_0,r_1,r_2,\ldots$ of irreducible, self-adjoint and distinct representations of O_N^+, satisfying:

$$r_0=1\quad,\quad r_1=u\quad,\quad r_{k-1}\otimes r_1=r_{k-2}+r_k$$

In order to do so, we can use as before $r_{k-2}\otimes r_1=r_{k-3}+r_{k-1}$ and Frobenius, and we conclude there exists a certain representation r_k such that:

$$r_{k-1}\otimes r_1=r_{k-2}+r_k$$

As a first observation, r_k is self-adjoint, because its character is a certain polynomial with integer coefficients in χ, which is self-adjoint. In order to prove now that r_k is irreducible, and non-equivalent to $r_0,\ldots,r_{k-1}$, let us split as before $u^{\otimes k}$, as follows:

$$u^{\otimes k}=c_kr_k+c_{k-2}r_{k-2}+c_{k-4}r_{k-4}+\ldots$$

The point now is that we have the following equalities and inequalities:

$$C_k=\sum_ic_i^2\leq\dim(End(u^{\otimes k}))\leq|NC_2(k,k)|=C_k$$

Indeed, the equality at left is clear as before, then comes a standard inequality, then an inequality coming from easiness, then a standard equality. Thus, we have equality, so r_k is irreducible, and non-equivalent to $r_{k-2},r_{k-4},\ldots$ Moreover, r_k is not equivalent to $r_{k-1},r_{k-3},\ldots$ either, by using the same argument as for SU_2, and the end of the proof of (3) is exactly as for SU_2. As for (4), by recurrence we obtain, with $q+q^{-1}=N$:

$$\dim r_k=q^k+q^{k-2}+\ldots+q^{-k+2}+q^{-k}$$

But this gives the dimension formula in the statement, and we are done. $\square$

The above result raises several interesting questions. For instance we would like to know if Theorem 3.1 can be unified with Theorem 3.2. Also, combinatorially speaking, we would like to have a better understanding of the "miracle" making Theorem 3.2 hold at any $N\geq 2$, instead of $N=\infty$ only. These questions will be answered in due time.

Regarding now the quantum group U_N^+, a similar result holds here, which is also elementary, using only algebraic techniques, based on easiness. Let us start with:

THEOREM 3.3. *We have isomorphisms as follows,*

$$U_N^+=\widetilde{O_N^+}\quad,\quad PO_N^+=PU_N^+$$

modulo the usual equivalence relation for compact quantum groups.

PROOF. The above isomorphisms both come from easiness, as follows:

(1) We have embeddings as follows, with the first one coming by using the counit, and with the second one coming from the universality property of U_N^+:

$$O_N^+\subset\widetilde{O_N^+}\subset U_N^+$$

We must prove that the embedding on the right is an isomorphism. In order to do so, let us denote by v,zv,u the fundamental representations of the above quantum groups. At the level of the associated Hom spaces we obtain reverse inclusions, as follows:

$$Hom(v^{\otimes k},v^{\otimes l})\supset Hom((zv)^{\otimes k},(zv)^{\otimes l})\supset Hom(u^{\otimes k},u^{\otimes l})$$

But the spaces on the left and on the right are known from chapter 2, the easiness result there stating that these are as follows:

$$span\left(T_\pi\Big|\pi\in NC_2(k,l)\right)\supset span\left(T_\pi\Big|\pi\in\mathcal{NC}_2(k,l)\right)$$

Regarding the spaces in the middle, these are obtained from those on the left by coloring, and we obtain the same spaces as those on the right. Thus, by Tannakian duality, our embedding $\widetilde{O_N^+}\subset U_N^+$ is an isomorphism, modulo the usual equivalence relation.

(2) Regarding now the projective versions, the result here follows from:

$$PU_N^+=P\widetilde{O_N^+}=PO_N^+$$

Alternatively, with the notations in the proof of (1), we have:

$$Hom\left((v\otimes v)^k,(v\otimes v)^l\right)=span\left(T_\pi\Big|\pi\in NC_2((\circ\bullet)^k,(\circ\bullet)^l)\right)$$

$$Hom\left((u\otimes\bar{u})^k,(u\otimes\bar{u})^l\right)=span\left(T_\pi\Big|\pi\in\mathcal{NC}_2((\circ\bullet)^k,(\circ\bullet)^l)\right)$$

The sets on the right being equal, we conclude that the inclusion $PO_N^+\subset PU_N^+$ preserves the corresponding Tannakian categories, and so must be an isomorphism. □

Getting now to the representations of U_N^+, the result here is as follows:

THEOREM 3.4. *The quantum groups U_N^+ with $N\geq 2$ are as follows:*

(1) *The moments of the main character count the matching pairings:*

$$\int_{U_N^+}\chi^k=|\mathcal{NC}_2(k)|$$

(2) *The main character follows the Voiculescu circular law of parameter 1:*

$$\chi\sim\Gamma_1$$

(3) *The irreducible representations are indexed by $\mathbb N*\mathbb N$, with as fusion rules:*

$$r_k\otimes r_l=\sum_{k=xy,l=\bar{y}z}r_{xz}$$

(4) *The corresponding dimensions $\dim r_k$ can be computed by recurrence.*

PROOF. There are several proofs here, the idea being as follows:

(1) The original proof, explained for instance in [5], is by construcing the representations r_k by recurrence, exactly as in the proof of Theorem 3.2, and then arguing, also as there, that the combinatorics found proves the first two assertions as well. In short, what we have is a "complex remake" of Theorem 3.2, which can be proved in a similar way.

(2) An alternative argument, discussed as well in [5], is by using Theorem 3.3. Indeed, the fusion rules for $U_N^+=\widetilde{O_N^+}$ can be computed by using those of O_N^+, and we end up with the above "free complexification" of the Clebsch-Gordan rules. As for the first two assertions, these follow too from $U_N^+=\widetilde{O_N^+}$, via standard free probability. □

As a conclusion, our results regarding O_N^+,U_N^+ show that the $N\to\infty$ convergence of the law of the main character to γ_1,Γ_1, known since chapter 2, is in fact stationary, starting with $N=2$. And this is quite a miracle, for instance because for O_N,U_N, some elementary computations show that the same $N\to\infty$ convergence, this time to the normal laws g_1,G_1, is far from being stationary. Thus, it is tempting to formulate:

CONCLUSION 3.5. *The free world is simpler than the classical world.*

And please don't get me wrong, especially if you're new to the subject, having struggled with the free material explained so far in this book. What I'm saying here is that, once you're reasonably advanced, and familiar with freeness, and so you will be soon, a second look at what has been said so far in this book can only lead to the above conclusion.

More on this later, in connection with permutations and quantum permutations too. Finally, as an extra piece of evidence, we have the isomorphism $PO_N^+=PU_N^+$ from Theorem 3.3, which is something quite intruiguing too, suggesting that the "free projective geometry is scalarless". We will be back to this later, with the answer that yes, free projective geometry is indeed scalarless, simpler than classical projective geometry.

3b. Clebsch-Gordan rules

We discuss now the representation theory of S_N^+ at $N\geq 4$. Let us begin our study exactly as for O_N^+. We know that in the $N\to\infty$ limit we have $\chi\sim\pi_1$, and as a first question, we would like to know how the irreducible representations of a "formal quantum group" should look like, when subject to the condition $\chi\sim\pi_1$. And fortunately, the answer here is very simple, involving this time the group SO_3:

THEOREM 3.6. *The group SO_3 is as follows:*

(1) *The moments of the main character are the Catalan numbers:*

$$\int_{SO_3}\chi^k=C_k$$

(2) *The main character follows the Marchenko-Pastur law of parameter 1:*

$$\chi\sim\pi_1$$

(3) *The fusion rules for irreducible representations are as follows:*

$$r_k\otimes r_l=r_{|k-l|}+r_{|k-l|+1}+\ldots+r_{k+l}$$

(4) *The dimensions of these representations are* $\dim r_k=2k-1$.

PROOF. As before with SU_2, there are many possible proofs here, which are all instructive. Here is our take on the subject, in the spirit of our proof for SU_2:

(1,2) These statements are equivalent, and in order to prove them, a simple argument is by using the SU_2 result, and the double cover map $SU_2\to SO_3$. Indeed, let us recall from the proof for SU_2 that we have an isomorphism $SU_2\simeq S^3_\mathbb R$, coming from:

$$SU_2=\left\{\begin{pmatrix}x+iy&z+it\\-z+it&x-iy\end{pmatrix}\Big|x^2+y^2+z^2+t^2=1\right\}$$

The point now is that we have a double cover map $SU_2\to SO_3$, which gives the following formula for the generic elements of SO_3, called Euler-Rodrigues formula:

$$U=\begin{pmatrix}x^2+y^2-z^2-t^2&2(yz-xt)&2(xz+yt)\\2(xt+yz)&x^2+z^2-y^2-t^2&2(zt-xy)\\2(yt-xz)&2(xy+zt)&x^2+t^2-y^2-z^2\end{pmatrix}$$

It follows that the main character of SO_3 is given by the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(U)&=Tr(U)+1\\&=3x^2-y^2-z^2-t^2+1\\&=4x^2\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we know from Theorem 3.1 and its proof that $2x\sim\gamma_1$. Now since we have $f\sim\gamma_1\implies f^2\sim\pi_1$, we obtain $\chi\sim\pi_1$, as desired.

(3,4) Our claim is that we can construct, by recurrence on $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a sequence r_k of irreducible, self-adjoint and distinct representations of SO_3, satisfying:

$$r_0 = 1 \quad , \quad r_1 = u - 1 \quad , \quad r_{k-1} \otimes r_1 = r_{k-2} + r_{k-1} + r_k$$

Indeed, assume that $r_0, \ldots, r_{k-1}$ are constructed, and let us construct r_k. The Frobenius trick from the proof for SU_2 will no longer work, as you can verify yourself, so we have to invoke (1). To be more precise, by integrating characters we obtain:

$$r_{k-1}, r_{k-2} \subset r_{k-1} \otimes r_1$$

Thus, there exists a representation r_k such that:

$$r_{k-1} \otimes r_1 = r_{k-2} + r_{k-1} + r_k$$

Once again by integrating characters, we conclude that r_k is irreducible, and non-equivalent to $r_1, \ldots, r_{k-1}$, and this proves our claim. Also, since any irreducible representation of SO_3 must appear in some tensor power of u, and we can decompose each $u^{\otimes k}$ into sums of representations r_p, we conclude that these representations r_p are all the irreducible representations of SO_3. Finally, the dimension formula is clear. □

Based on the above result, and on what we know about the relation between SU_2 and the quantum groups O_N^+ at $N \geq 2$, we can safely conjecture that the fusion rules for S_N^+ at $N \geq 4$ should be the same as for SO_3. However, a careful inspection of the proof of Theorem 3.6 shows that, when trying to extend it to S_4^+, a bit in the same way as the proof of Theorem 3.1 was extended to O_N^+, we run into a serious problem, namely:

Problem 3.7. *Regarding S_N^+ with $N \geq 4$, we can't get away with the estimate*

$$\int_{S_N^+} \chi^k \leq C_k$$

because the Frobenius trick won't work. We need equality in this estimate.

To be more precise, the above estimate comes from easiness, and we have seen that for O_N^+ with $N \geq 2$, a similar easiness estimate, when coupled with the Frobenius trick, does the job. However, the proof of Theorem 3.6 makes it clear that no Frobenius trick is available, and so we need equality in the above estimate, as indicated.

So, how to prove the equality? The original argument, from [5], is something quick and advanced, saying that modulo some standard identifications, we are in need of the fact that the trace on the Temperley-Lieb algebra $TL_N(k) = span(NC_2(k,k))$ is faithful at index values $N \geq 4$, and with this being true by the results of Jones in [58]. However, while very quick, this remains something advanced, because the paper [58] itself is based on a good deal of von Neumann algebra theory, covering a whole book or so. And so, we don't want to get into this, at least at this stage of our presentation.

In short, we are a bit in trouble. But no worries, there should be a pedestrian way of solving our problem, because that is how reasonable mathematics is made, always available to pedestrians. Here is an idea for a solution, which is a no-brainer:

Solution 3.8. *We can get the needed equality at $N \geq 4$, namely*

$$\int_{S_N^+} \chi^k = C_k$$

by proving that the vectors $\{\xi_\pi | \pi \in NC(k)\}$ are linearly independent.

Indeed, this is something coming from easiness, and since this problem does not look that scary, let us try to solve it. As a starting point for our study, we have:

Proposition 3.9. *The following are linearly independent, at any $N \geq 2$:*

(1) *The linear maps $\left\{T_\pi \middle| \pi \in NC_2(k,l)\right\}$, with $k + l \in 2\mathbb{N}$.*
(2) *The vectors $\left\{\xi_\pi \middle| \pi \in NC_2(2k)\right\}$, with $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*
(3) *The linear maps $\left\{T_\pi \middle| \pi \in NC_2(k,k)\right\}$, with $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. All this follows from the dimension equalities established in the proof of Theorem 3.2, because in all cases, the number of partitions is a Catalan number. □

In order to pass now to quantum permutations, we can use the following trick:

Proposition 3.10. *We have a bijection $NC(k) \simeq NC_2(2k)$, constructed by fattening and shrinking, as follows:*

(1) *The application $NC(k) \to NC_2(2k)$ is the "fattening" one, obtained by doubling all the legs, and doubling all the strings too.*
(2) *Its inverse $NC_2(2k) \to NC(k)$ is the "shrinking" application, obtained by collapsing pairs of consecutive neighbors.*

Proof. The fact that the above two operations are indeed inverse to each other is clear, by drawing pictures, and computing the corresponding compositions. □

At the level of the associated Gram matrices, the result is as follows:

Proposition 3.11. *The Gram matrices of $NC_2(2k) \simeq NC(k)$ are related by*

$$G_{2k,n}(\pi, \sigma) = n^k (\Delta_{kn}^{-1} G_{k,n^2} \Delta_{kn}^{-1})(\pi', \sigma')$$

where $\pi \to \pi'$ is the shrinking operation, and Δ_{kn} is the diagonal of G_{kn}.

Proof. In the context of the bijection from Proposition 3.10, we have:

$$|\pi \vee \sigma| = k + 2|\pi' \vee \sigma'| - |\pi'| - |\sigma'|$$

We therefore have the following formula, valid for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$n^{|\pi \vee \sigma|} = n^{k+2|\pi' \vee \sigma'| - |\pi'| - |\sigma'|}$$

Thus, we are led to the formula in the statement. □

We can now formulate a "projective" version of Proposition 3.9, as follows:

PROPOSITION 3.12. *The following are linearly independent, for $N=n^2$ with $n\geq 2$:*
(1) *The linear maps $\left\{T_\pi\middle|\pi\in NC(k,l)\right\}$, with $k,l\in 2\mathbb N$.*
(2) *The vectors $\left\{\xi_\pi\middle|\pi\in NC(k)\right\}$, with $k\in\mathbb N$.*
(3) *The linear maps $\left\{T_\pi\middle|\pi\in NC(k,k)\right\}$, with $k\in\mathbb N$.*

PROOF. This follows from the various linear independence results from Proposition 3.9, by using the Gram matrix formula from Proposition 3.11, along with the well-known fact that vectors are linearly independent when their Gram matrix is invertible. □

Good news, we can now discuss S_N^+ with $N=n^2$, $n\geq 2$, as follows:

THEOREM 3.13. *The quantum groups S_N^+ with $N=n^2$, $n\geq 2$ are as follows:*
(1) *The moments of the main character are the Catalan numbers:*

$$\int_{S_N^+}\chi^k=C_k$$

(2) *The main character follows the Marchenko-Pastur law, $\chi\sim\pi_1$.*
(3) *The fusion rules for irreducible representations are as for SO_3, namely:*

$$r_k\otimes r_l=r_{|k-l|}+r_{|k-l|+1}+\ldots+r_{k+l}$$

(4) *We have $\dim r_k=(q^{k+1}-q^{-k})/(q-1)$, with $q+q^{-1}=N-2$.*

PROOF. This is quite similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2, by using the linear independence result from Proposition 3.12 as main ingredient, as follows:

(1) We have the following computation, using Peter-Weyl, then the easiness property of S_N^+, then Proposition 3.12 (2), then Proposition 3.10, and the definition of C_k:

$$\int_{S_N^+}\chi^k=|NC(k)|=|NC_2(2k)|=C_k$$

(2) This is a reformulation of (1), using standard free probability theory.

(3) This is identical to the proof of Theorem 3.6 (3), based on (1).

(4) Finally, the dimension formula is clear by recurrence. □

All this is very nice, and although there is still some work, in order to reach to results for S_N^+ at any $N\geq 4$, let us just enjoy what we have. As a consequence, we have:

THEOREM 3.14. *The free quantum groups are as follows:*
(1) *U_N^+ is not coamenable at $N\geq 2$.*
(2) *O_N^+ is coamenable at $N=2$, and not coamenable at $N\geq 3$.*
(3) *S_N^+ is coamenable at $N\leq 4$, and not coamenable at $N\geq 5$.*

PROOF. The various non-coamenability assertions are all clear, due to various examples of non-coamenable group dual subgroups $\widehat{\Gamma}\subset G$, coming from the theory in chapter 1. As for the amenability assertions, regarding O_2^+ and S_4^+, these come from Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.13, which show that the support of the spectral measure of χ is:

$$supp(\gamma_1)=[-2,2]\quad,\quad supp(\pi_1)=[0,4]$$

Thus the Kesten criterion from chapter 1, telling us that $G\subset O_N^+$ is coamenable precisely when $N\in supp(law(\chi))$, applies in both cases, and gives the result. □

3c. Meander determinants

Let us discuss now the extension of Theorem 3.13, to all the quantum groups S_N^+ with $N\geq 4$. For this purpose we need an extension of the linear independence results from Proposition 3.12. This is something non-trivial, and the first thought goes to:

SPECULATION 3.15. *There should be a theory of deformed compact quantum groups, alowing us to talk about O_n^+ with $n\in[2,\infty)$, having the same fusion rules as SU_2, and therefore solving via partition shrinking our S_N^+ problems at any $N\geq 4$.*

This speculation is legit, and in what concerns the first part, generalities, that theory is indeed available, from the Woronowicz papers [**99**], [**100**]. Is it also possible to talk about deformations of O_N^+ in this setting, as explained in Wang's paper [**92**], with the new parameter $n\in[2,\infty)$ being of course not the dimension of the fundamental representation, but rather its "quantum dimension". And with this understood, all the rest is quite standard, and worked out in the quantum group literature. We refer to [**5**] for more about this, but we will not follow this path, which is too complicated.

As a second speculation now, which is something complicated too, but is far more conceptual, we have the idea, already mentioned before, of getting what we want via the trace on the Temperley-Lieb algebra $TL_N(k)=span(NC_2(k,k))$. We will not follow this path either, which is quite complicated too, but here is how this method works:

THEOREM 3.16. *Consider the Temperley-Lieb algebra of index $N\geq 4$, defined as*

$$TL_N(k)=span(NC_2(k,k))$$

with product given by the rule $\bigcirc=N$, when concatenating.

1. *We have a representation $i:TL_N(k)\to B((\mathbb{C}^N)^{\otimes k})$, given by $\pi\to T_\pi$.*
2. *$Tr(T_\pi)=N^{loops(<\pi>)}$, where $\pi\to<\pi>$ is the closing operation.*
3. *The linear form $\tau=Tr\circ i:TL_N(k)\to\mathbb{C}$ is a faithful positive trace.*
4. *The representation $i:TL_N(k)\to B((\mathbb{C}^N)^{\otimes k})$ is faithful.*

In particular, the vectors $\{\xi_\pi|\pi\in NC(k)\}\subset(\mathbb{C}^N)^{\otimes k}$ are linearly independent.

PROOF. All this is quite standard, but advanced, the idea being as follows:

(1) This is clear from the categorical properties of $\pi \to T_\pi$.

(2) This follows indeed from the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned} Tr(T_\pi) &= \sum_{i_1\ldots i_k} \delta_\pi \begin{pmatrix} i_1 \ldots i_k \\ i_1 \ldots i_k \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \# \left\{ i_1, \ldots, i_k \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \Big| \ker \begin{pmatrix} i_1 \ldots i_k \\ i_1 \ldots i_k \end{pmatrix} \geq \pi \right\} \\ &= N^{loops(<\pi>)} \end{aligned}$$

(3) The traciality of τ is clear from definitions. Regarding now the faithfulness, this is something well-known, and we refer here to Jones' paper [58].

(4) This follows from (3) above, via a standard positivity argument. As for the last assertion, this follows from (4), by fattening the partitions. □

We will be back to this later, when talking subfactors and planar algebras, with a closer look into Jones' paper [58]. In the meantime, however, Speculation 3.15 and Theorem 3.16 will not do, being too advanced, so we have to come up with something else, more pedestrian. And this can only be the computation of the Gram determinant.

We already know, from chapter 2, that for the group S_N the formula of the corresponding Gram matrix determinant, due to Lindstöm [68], is as follows:

THEOREM 3.17. *The determinant of the Gram matrix of S_N is given by*

$$\det(G_{kN}) = \prod_{\pi \in P(k)} \frac{N!}{(N - |\pi|)!}$$

with the convention that in the case $N < k$ we obtain 0.

PROOF. This is something that we know from chapter 2, the idea being that G_{kN} decomposes as a product of an upper triangular and lower triangular matrix. □

Although we will not need this here, let us discuss as well, for the sake of completness, the case of the orthogonal group O_N. Here the combinatorics is that of the Young diagrams. We denote by $|.|$ the number of boxes, and we use quantity f^λ, which gives the number of standard Young tableaux of shape λ. The result is then as follows:

THEOREM 3.18. *The determinant of the Gram matrix of O_N is given by*

$$\det(G_{kN}) = \prod_{|\lambda|=k/2} f_N(\lambda)^{f^{2\lambda}}$$

where the quantities on the right are $f_N(\lambda) = \prod_{(i,j)\in\lambda}(N + 2j - i - 1)$.

Proof. This follows from the results of Zinn-Justin on the subject. Indeed, it is known from there that the Gram matrix is diagonalizable, as follows:

$$G_{kN}=\sum_{|\lambda|=k/2} f_N(\lambda)P_{2\lambda}$$

Here $1=\sum P_{2\lambda}$ is the standard partition of unity associated to the Young diagrams having $k/2$ boxes, and the coefficients $f_N(\lambda)$ are those in the statement. Now since we have $Tr(P_{2\lambda})=f^{2\lambda}$, this gives the result. See [5]. $\square$

For the free orthogonal and symmetric groups, the results, by Di Francesco [41], are substantially more complicated. Let us begin with some examples. We first have:

Proposition 3.19. *The first Gram matrices and determinants for O_N^+ are*

$$\det\begin{pmatrix}N^2&N\\N&N^2\end{pmatrix}=N^2(N^2-1)$$

$$\det\begin{pmatrix}N^3&N^2&N^2&N^2&N\\N^2&N^3&N&N&N^2\\N^2&N&N^3&N&N^2\\N^2&N&N&N^3&N^2\\N&N^2&N^2&N^2&N^3\end{pmatrix}=N^5(N^2-1)^4(N^2-2)$$

with the matrices being written by using the lexicographic order on $NC_2(2k)$.

Proof. The formula at $k=2$, where $NC_2(4)=\{\sqcap\sqcap,\bigcap\!\!\!\!\!\cap\}$, is clear. At $k=3$ however, things are tricky. We have $NC(3)=\{|||,\sqcap|,\sqcap\!\!\!|\,,|\sqcap,\sqcap\!\sqcap\}$, and the corresponding Gram matrix and its determinant are, according to Theorem 3.17:

$$\det\begin{pmatrix}N^3&N^2&N^2&N^2&N\\N^2&N^2&N&N&N\\N^2&N&N^2&N&N\\N^2&N&N&N^2&N\\N&N&N&N&N\end{pmatrix}=N^5(N-1)^4(N-2)$$

By using Proposition 3.11, the Gram determinant of $NC_2(6)$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\det(G_{6N})&=\frac{1}{N^2\sqrt{N}}\times N^{10}(N^2-1)^4(N^2-2)\times\frac{1}{N^2\sqrt{N}}\\&=N^5(N^2-1)^4(N^2-2)\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have obtained the formula in the statement. $\square$

In general, such tricks won't work, because $NC(k)$ is strictly smaller than $P(k)$ at $k\geq 4$. However, following Di Francesco [41], we have the following result:

THEOREM 3.20. *The determinant of the Gram matrix for O_N^+ is given by*

$$\det(G_{kN})=\prod_{r=1}^{[k/2]}P_r(N)^{d_{k/2,r}}$$

where P_r are the Chebycheff polynomials, given by

$$P_0=1\quad,\quad P_1=X\quad,\quad P_{r+1}=XP_r-P_{r-1}$$

and $d_{kr}=f_{kr}-f_{k,r+1}$, with f_{kr} being the following numbers, depending on $k,r\in\mathbb{Z}$,

$$f_{kr}=\binom{2k}{k-r}-\binom{2k}{k-r-1}$$

with the convention $f_{kr}=0$ for $k\notin\mathbb{Z}$.

PROOF. This is something quite technical, obtained by using a decomposition as follows of the Gram matrix G_{kN}, with the matrix T_{kN} being lower triangular:

$$G_{kN}=T_{kN}T_{kN}^t$$

Thus, a bit as in the proof of the Lindstöm formula, we obtain the result, but the problem lies however in the construction of T_{kN}, which is non-trivial. See [41]. □

We refer to [5] for further details regarding the above result, including a short proof, based on the bipartite planar algebra combinatorics developed by Jones in [61]. Let us also mention that the Chebycheff polynomials have something to do with all this due to the fact that these are the orthogonal polynomials for the Wigner law. See [5].

Moving ahead now, regarding S_N^+, we have here the following formula, which is quite similar, obtained via shrinking, also from Di Francesco [41]:

THEOREM 3.21. *The determinant of the Gram matrix for S_N^+ is given by*

$$\det(G_{kN})=(\sqrt{N})^{a_k}\prod_{r=1}^{k}P_r(\sqrt{N})^{d_{kr}}$$

where P_r are the Chebycheff polynomials, given by

$$P_0=1\quad,\quad P_1=X\quad,\quad P_{r+1}=XP_r-P_{r-1}$$

and $d_{kr}=f_{kr}-f_{k,r+1}$, with f_{kr} being the following numbers, depending on $k,r\in\mathbb{Z}$,

$$f_{kr}=\binom{2k}{k-r}-\binom{2k}{k-r-1}$$

with the convention $f_{kr}=0$ for $k\notin\mathbb{Z}$, and where $a_k=\sum_{\pi\in\mathcal{P}(k)}(2|\pi|-k)$.

PROOF. This follows indeed from Theorem 3.20, by using Proposition 3.11. □

Getting back now to our quantum permutation group questions, by using the above results we can produce a key technical ingredient, as follows:

PROPOSITION 3.22. *The following are linearly independent, for any $N \geq 4$:*

(1) *The linear maps $\left\{T_\pi\middle|\pi \in NC(k,l)\right\}$, with $k,l \in 2\mathbb{N}$.*
(2) *The vectors $\left\{\xi_\pi\middle|\pi \in NC(k)\right\}$, with $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*
(3) *The linear maps $\left\{T_\pi\middle|\pi \in NC(k,k)\right\}$, with $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

PROOF. The statement is identical to Proposition 3.12, with the assumption $N = n^2$ lifted. As for the proof, this comes from the formula in Theorem 3.21. □

With this in hand, we have the following extension of Theorem 3.13:

THEOREM 3.23. *The quantum groups S_N^+ with $N \geq 4$ are as follows:*

(1) *The moments of the main character are the Catalan numbers:*
$$\int_{S_N^+} \chi^k = C_k$$
(2) *The main character follows the Marchenko-Pastur law, $\chi \sim \pi_1$.*
(3) *The fusion rules for irreducible representations are as for SO_3, namely:*
$$r_k \otimes r_l = r_{|k-l|} + r_{|k-l|+1} + \ldots + r_{k+l}$$
(4) *We have $\dim r_k = (q^{k+1} - q^{-k})/(q-1)$, with $q + q^{-1} = N - 2$.*

PROOF. This is identical to the proof of Theorem 3.13, by using this time the linear independence result from Proposition 3.22 as technical ingredient. □

So long for representations of S_N^+. All the above might seem quite complicated, but we repeat, up to some standard algebra, everything comes down to Proposition 3.22. And with some solid modern mathematical knowledge, be that operator algebras a la Jones, or deformed quantum groups a la Woronowicz, or meander determinants a la Di Francesco, the result there is in fact trivial. You can check here [5], [5], both short papers.

In what concerns us, we will be back to the similarity between S_N^+ and SO_3 on several occasions, with a number of further results on the subject, refining Theorem 3.23.

3d. Planar algebras

In the remainder of this chapter we keep developing some useful theory for U_N^+, O_N^+, S_N^+. We will present among others a result from [7], refining the Tannakian duality for the quantum permutation groups $G \subset S_N^+$, stating that these quantum groups are in correspondence with the subalgebras of Jones' spin planar algebra $P \subset \mathcal{S}_N$.

In order to get started, we need a lot of preliminaries, the lineup being von Neumann algebras, II_1 factors, subfactors, and finally planar algebras. We already met von Neumann algebras, in chapter 1. The advanced general theory regarding them is as follows:

THEOREM 3.24. *The von Neumann algebras $A \subset B(H)$ are as follows:*

(1) *Any such algebra decomposes as $A = \int_X A_x dx$, with X being the spectrum of the center, $Z(A) = L^\infty(X)$, and with the fibers A_x being factors, $Z(A_x) = \mathbb{C}$.*
(2) *The factors can be fully classified in terms of II_1 factors, which are those factors satisfying $\dim A = \infty$, and having a faithful trace $tr : A \to \mathbb{C}$.*
(3) *The II_1 factors enjoy the "continuous dimension geometry" property, in the sense that the traces of their projections can take any values in $[0, 1]$.*
(4) *Among the II_1 factors, the smallest one is the Murray-von Neumann hyperfinite factor R, obtained as an inductive limit of matrix algebras.*

PROOF. This is something heavy, the idea being as follows:

(1) This is von Neumann's reduction theory theorem, which follows in finite dimensions from $A = M_{n_1}(\mathbb{C}) \oplus \ldots \oplus M_{n_k}(\mathbb{C})$, and whose proof in general is quite technical.

(2) This comes from results of Murray-von Neumann and Connes, the idea being that the other factors can be basically obtained via crossed product constructions.

(3) This is subtle functional analysis, with the rational traces being relatively easy to obtain, and with the irrational ones coming from limiting arguments.

(4) Once again, heavy results, by Murray-von Neumann and Connes, the idea being that any finite dimensional construction always leads to the same factor, called R. □

Let us discuss now subfactor theory, following Jones' fundamental paper [58]. Jones looked at the inclusions of II_1 factors $A \subset B$, called subfactors, which are quite natural objects in physics. Given such an inclusion, we can talk about its index:

DEFINITION 3.25. *The index of an inclusion of II_1 factors $A \subset B$ is the quantity*

$$[B : A] = \dim_A B \in [1, \infty]$$

constructed by using the Murray-von Neumann continuous dimension theory.

In order to explain Jones' result in [58], it is better to relabel our subfactor as $A_0 \subset A_1$. We can construct the orthogonal projection $e_1 : A_1 \to A_0$, and set:

$$A_2 = < A_1, e_1 >$$

This remarkable procedure, called "basic construction", can be iterated, and we obtain in this way a whole tower of II_1 factors, as follows:

$$A_0 \subset_{e_1} A_1 \subset_{e_2} A_2 \subset_{e_3} A_3 \subset \ldots\ldots$$

Quite surprisingly, this construction leads to a link with the Temperley-Lieb algebra $TL_N = span(NC_2)$. The results can be summarized as follows:

THEOREM 3.26. *Let $A_0\subset A_1$ be an inclusion of II_1 factors.*

(1) *The sequence of projections $e_1,e_2,e_3,\ldots\in B(H)$ produces a representation of the Temperley-Lieb algebra of index $N=[A_1,A_0]$, as follows:*

$$TL_N\subset B(H)$$

(2) *The index $N=[A_1,A_0]$, which is a Murray-von Neumann continuous quantity $N\in[1,\infty]$, must satisfy the following condition:*

$$N\in\left\{4\cos^2\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)\Big|n\in\mathbb{N}\right\}\cup[4,\infty]$$

PROOF. This result, from [58], is something tricky, the idea being as follows:

(1) The idea here is that the functional analytic study of the basic construction leads to the conclusion that the sequence of projections $e_1,e_2,e_3,\ldots\in B(H)$ behaves algebrically, when rescaled, exactly as the sequence of diagrams $\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_2,\varepsilon_3,\ldots\in TL_N$ given by:

$$\varepsilon_1={}^{\cup}_{\cap}\quad,\quad\varepsilon_2=|{}^{\cup}_{\cap}\quad,\quad\varepsilon_3=||{}^{\cup}_{\cap}\quad,\quad\ldots$$

But these diagrams generate TL_N, and so we have an embedding $TL_N\subset B(H)$, where H is the Hilbert space where our subfactor $A_0\subset A_1$ lives, as claimed.

(2) This is something quite surprising, which follows from (1), via some clever positivity considerations, involving the Perron-Frobenius theorem. In fact, the subfactors having index $N\in[1,4]$ can be classified by ADE diagrams, and the obstruction $N=4\cos^2(\frac{\pi}{n})$ comes from the fact that N must be the squared norm of such a graph. □

Quite remarkably, Theorem 3.26 is just the tip of the iceberg. One can prove indeed that the planar algebra structure of TL_N, taken in an intuitive sense, extends to a planar algebra structure on the sequence of relative commutants $P_k=A_0'\cap A_k$. In order to discuss this key result, due as well to Jones, from [60], and that we will need too, in connection with our quantum group problems, let us start with:

DEFINITION 3.27. *The planar algebras are defined as follows:*

(1) *A k-tangle, or k-box, is a rectangle in the plane, with $2k$ marked points on its boundary, containing r small boxes, each having $2k_i$ marked points, and with the $2k+\sum 2k_i$ marked points being connected by noncrossing strings.*
(2) *A planar algebra is a sequence of finite dimensional vector spaces $P=(P_k)$, together with linear maps $P_{k_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes P_{k_r}\to P_k$, one for each k-box, such that the gluing of boxes corresponds to the composition of linear maps.*

As basic example of a planar algebra, we have the Temperley-Lieb algebra TL_N. Indeed, putting $TL_N(k_i)$ diagrams into the small r boxes of a k-box clearly produces a $TL_N(k)$ diagram, so we have indeed a planar algebra, of somewhat "trivial" type.

In general, the planar algebras are more complicated than this, and we will be back later with some explicit examples. However, the idea is very simple, namely that "the elements of a planar algebra are not necessarily diagrams, but they behave like diagrams". In relation now with subfactors, the result, which extends Theorem 3.26 (1), and which was found by Jones in [60], almost 20 years after [58], is as follows:

THEOREM 3.28. *Given a subfactor $A_0 \subset A_1$, the collection $P = (P_k)$ of linear spaces*

$$P_k = A_0' \cap A_k$$

has a planar algebra structure, extending the planar algebra structure of TL_N.

PROOF. As a first observation, since $e_1 : A_1 \to A_0$ commutes with A_0 we have $e_1 \in P_2'$. By translation we obtain $e_1, \ldots, e_{k-1} \in P_k$ for any k, and so:

$$TL_N \subset P$$

The point now is that the planar algebra structure of TL_N, obtained by composing diagrams, can be shown to extend into an abstract planar algebra structure of P. This is something quite technical, and we will not get into details here. See [60]. □

Getting back to quantum groups, all this machinery is interesting for us. We will need the construction of the tensor and spin planar algebras $\mathcal{T}_N, \mathcal{S}_N$. Let us start with:

DEFINITION 3.29. *The tensor planar algebra $\mathcal{T}_N$ is the sequence of vector spaces*

$$P_k = M_N(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes k}$$

with the multilinear maps $T_\pi : P_{k_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes P_{k_r} \to P_k$ being given by the formula

$$T_\pi(e_{i_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes e_{i_r}) = \sum_j \delta_\pi(i_1, \ldots, i_r : j) e_j$$

with the Kronecker symbols δ_π being 1 if the indices fit, and being 0 otherwise.

In other words, we are using here a construction which is very similar to the construction $\pi \to T_\pi$ that we used for easy quantum groups. We put the indices of the basic tensors on the marked points of the small boxes, in the obvious way, and the coefficients of the output tensor are then given by Kronecker symbols, exactly as in the easy case.

The fact that we have indeed a planar algebra, in the sense that the gluing of tangles corresponds to the composition of linear maps, as required by Definition 3.27, is something elementary, in the same spirit as the verification of the functoriality properties of the correspondence $\pi \to T_\pi$, discussed in chapter 2, and we refer here to Jones [60].

Let us discuss now a second planar algebra of the same type, which is important as well for various reasons, namely the spin planar algebra $\mathcal{S}_N$. This planar algebra appears somehow as the "square root" of the tensor planar algebra $\mathcal{T}_N$. Let us start with:

Definition 3.30. *We write the standard basis of* $(\mathbb{C}^N)^{\otimes k}$ *in* $2\times k$ *matrix form,*

$$e_{i_1\ldots i_k}=\begin{pmatrix}i_1&i_1&i_2&i_2&i_3&\ldots&\ldots\\ i_k&i_k&i_{k-1}&\ldots&\ldots&\ldots&\ldots\end{pmatrix}$$

by duplicating the indices, and then writing them clockwise, starting from top left.

Now with this convention in hand for the tensors, we can formulate the construction of the spin planar algebra $\mathcal{S}_N$, also from [60], as follows:

Definition 3.31. *The spin planar algebra* $\mathcal{S}_N$ *is the sequence of vector spaces*

$$P_k=(\mathbb{C}^N)^{\otimes k}$$

written as above, with the multiplinear maps $T_\pi:P_{k_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes P_{k_r}\to P_k$ *being given by*

$$T_\pi(e_{i_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes e_{i_r})=\sum_j\delta_\pi(i_1,\ldots,i_r:j)e_j$$

with the Kronecker symbols δ_π *being* 1 *if the indices fit, and being* 0 *otherwise.*

Here are some illustrating examples for the spin planar algebra calculus:

(1) The identity 1_k is the (k,k)-tangle having vertical strings only. The solutions of $\delta_{1_k}(x,y)=1$ being the pairs of the form (x,x), this tangle 1_k acts by the identity:

$$1_k\begin{pmatrix}j_1&\ldots&j_k\\ i_1&\ldots&i_k\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}j_1&\ldots&j_k\\ i_1&\ldots&i_k\end{pmatrix}$$

(2) The multiplication M_k is the (k,k,k)-tangle having 2 input boxes, one on top of the other, and vertical strings only. It acts in the following way:

$$M_k\left(\begin{pmatrix}j_1&\ldots&j_k\\ i_1&\ldots&i_k\end{pmatrix}\otimes\begin{pmatrix}l_1&\ldots&l_k\\ m_1&\ldots&m_k\end{pmatrix}\right)=\delta_{j_1m_1}\ldots\delta_{j_km_k}\begin{pmatrix}l_1&\ldots&l_k\\ i_1&\ldots&i_k\end{pmatrix}$$

(3) The inclusion I_k is the $(k,k+1)$-tangle which looks like 1_k, but has one more vertical string, at right of the input box. Given x, the solutions of $\delta_{I_k}(x,y)=1$ are the elements y obtained from x by adding to the right a vector of the form $\binom{l}{l}$, and so:

$$I_k\begin{pmatrix}j_1&\ldots&j_k\\ i_1&\ldots&i_k\end{pmatrix}=\sum_l\begin{pmatrix}j_1&\ldots&j_k&l\\ i_1&\ldots&i_k&l\end{pmatrix}$$

(4) The expectation U_k is the $(k+1,k)$-tangle which looks like 1_k, but has one more string, connecting the extra 2 input points, both at right of the input box:

$$U_k\begin{pmatrix}j_1&\ldots&j_k&j_{k+1}\\ i_1&\ldots&i_k&i_{k+1}\end{pmatrix}=\delta_{i_{k+1}j_{k+1}}\begin{pmatrix}j_1&\ldots&j_k\\ i_1&\ldots&i_k\end{pmatrix}$$

(5) The Jones projection E_k is a $(0,k+2)$-tangle, having no input box. There are k vertical strings joining the first k upper points to the first k lower points, counting

from left to right. The remaining upper 2 points are connected by a semicircle, and the remaining lower 2 points are also connected by a semicircle. We have:

$$E_k(1)=\sum_{ijl}\begin{pmatrix}i_1&\ldots&i_k&j&j\\ i_1&\ldots&i_k&l&l\end{pmatrix}$$

The elements $e_k=N^{-1}E_k(1)$ are then projections, and define a representation of the infinite Temperley-Lieb algebra of index N inside the inductive limit algebra $\mathcal{S}_N$.

(6) The rotation R_k is the (k,k)-tangle which looks like 1_k, but the first 2 input points are connected to the last 2 output points, and the same happens at right:

$$R_k=\begin{matrix}\Cap\,|\,|\,|\,\|\\ \|\qquad\ \ \|\\ \|\,|\,|\,|\,\Cup\end{matrix}$$

The action of R_k on the standard basis is by rotation of the indices, as follows:

$$R_k(e_{i_1i_2\ldots i_k})=e_{i_2\ldots i_ki_1}$$

There are many other interesting examples of k-tangles, but in view of our present purposes, we can actually stop here, due to the following fact:

Theorem 3.32. *The multiplications, inclusions, expectations, Jones projections and rotations generate the set of all tangles, via the gluing operation.*

Proof. This is something well-known and elementary, obtained by “chopping” the various planar tangles into small pieces, as in the above list. See [60]. □

Finally, in order for our discussion to be complete, we must talk as well about the $*$-structure of the spin planar algebra. Once again this is constructed as in the easy quantum group calculus, by turning upside-down the diagrams, as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix}j_1&\ldots&j_k\\ i_1&\ldots&i_k\end{pmatrix}^*=\begin{pmatrix}i_1&\ldots&i_k\\ j_1&\ldots&j_k\end{pmatrix}$$

Getting back now to quantum groups, following [7], we have the following result:

Theorem 3.33. *Given $G\subset S_N^+$, consider the tensor powers of the associated coaction map on $C(X)$, where $X=\{1,\ldots,N\}$, which are the folowing linear maps:*

$$\Phi^k:C(X^k)\to C(X^k)\otimes C(G)$$

$$e_{i_1\ldots i_k}\to\sum_{j_1\ldots j_k}e_{j_1\ldots j_k}\otimes u_{j_1i_1}\ldots u_{j_ki_k}$$

The fixed point spaces of these coactions, which are by definition the spaces

$$P_k=\left\{x\in C(X^k)\Big|\Phi^k(x)=1\otimes x\right\}$$

are given by $P_k=Fix(u^{\otimes k})$, and form a subalgebra of the spin planar algebra $\mathcal{S}_N$.

PROOF. Since the map Φ is a coaction, its tensor powers Φ^k are coactions too, and at the level of fixed point algebras we have the following formula:

$$P_k = Fix(u^{\otimes k})$$

In order to prove now the planar algebra assertion, we will use Theorem 3.32. Consider the rotation R_k. Rotating, then applying Φ^k, and rotating backwards by R_k^{-1} is the same as applying Φ^k, then rotating each k-fold product of coefficients of Φ. Thus the elements obtained by rotating, then applying Φ^k, or by applying Φ^k, then rotating, differ by a sum of Dirac masses tensored with commutators in $A = C(G)$:

$$\Phi^k R_k(x) - (R_k \otimes id)\Phi^k(x) \in C(X^k) \otimes [A, A]$$

Now let $\int_A$ be the Haar functional of A, and consider the conditional expectation onto the fixed point algebra P_k, which is given by the following formula:

$$\phi_k = \left(id \otimes \int_A\right)\Phi^k$$

Since $\int_A$ is a trace, it vanishes on commutators. Thus R_k commutes with ϕ_k:

$$\phi_k R_k = R_k \phi_k$$

The commutation relation $\phi_k T = T\phi_l$ holds in fact for any (l, k)-tangle T. These tangles are called annular, and the proof is by verification on generators of the annular category. In particular we obtain, for any annular tangle T:

$$\phi_k T \phi_l = T\phi_l$$

We conclude from this that the annular category is contained in the suboperad $\mathcal{P}' \subset \mathcal{P}$ of the planar operad consisting of tangles T satisfying the following condition, where $\phi = (\phi_k)$, and where $i(.)$ is the number of input boxes:

$$\phi T \phi^{\otimes i(T)} = T\phi^{\otimes i(T)}$$

On the other hand the multiplicativity of Φ^k gives $M_k \in \mathcal{P}'$. Now since the planar operad $\mathcal{P}$ is generated by multiplications and annular tangles, it follows that we have $\mathcal{P}' = P$. Thus for any tangle T the corresponding multilinear map between spaces $P_k(X)$ restricts to a multilinear map between spaces P_k. In other words, the action of the planar operad $\mathcal{P}$ restricts to P, and makes it a subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}_N$, as claimed. □

As a second result now, also from [7], completing our study, we have:

THEOREM 3.34. *We have a bijection between quantum permutation groups and subalgebras of the spin planar algebra,*

$$(G \subset S_N^+) \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad (Q \subset \mathcal{S}_N)$$

given in one sense by the construction in Theorem 3.33, and in the other sense by a suitable modification of Tannakian duality.

Proof. The idea is that this will follow by applying Tannakian duality to the annular category over Q. Let n, m be positive integers. To any element $T_{n+m} \in Q_{n+m}$ we associate a linear map $L_{nm}(T_{n+m}) : P_n(X) \to P_m(X)$ in the following way:

$$L_{nm}\begin{pmatrix} |\,|\,| \\ T_{n+m} \\ |\,|\,| \end{pmatrix} : \begin{pmatrix} | \\ a_n \\ | \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} |\ \ |\ \ \cap \\ \ \ T_{n+m}| \\ |\,|\ \ |\ \ | \\ a_n|\ \ |\ \ | \\ \cup\ \ |\ \ | \end{pmatrix}$$

That is, we consider the planar $(n, n+m, m)$-tangle having an small input n-box, a big input $n+m$-box and an output m-box, with strings as on the picture of the right. This defines a certain multilinear map, as follows:

$$P_n(X) \otimes P_{n+m}(X) \to P_m(X)$$

If we put the element T_{n+m} in the big input box, we obtain in this way a certain linear map $P_n(X) \to P_m(X)$, that we call L_{nm}. With this convention, let us set:

$$Q_{nm} = \left\{ L_{nm}(T_{n+m}) : P_n(X) \to P_m(X) \Big| T_{n+m} \in Q_{n+m} \right\}$$

These spaces form a Tannakian category, so by [100] we obtain a Woronowicz algebra (A, u), such that the following equalities hold, for any m, n:

$$Hom(u^{\otimes m}, u^{\otimes n}) = Q_{mn}$$

We prove now that u is a magic unitary. We have $Hom(1, u^{\otimes 2}) = Q_{02} = Q_2$, so the unit of Q_2 must be a fixed vector of $u^{\otimes 2}$. But $u^{\otimes 2}$ acts on the unit of Q_2 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} u^{\otimes 2}(1) &= u^{\otimes 2}\left(\sum_i \begin{pmatrix} i & i \\ i & i \end{pmatrix}\right) \\ &= \sum_{ikl} \begin{pmatrix} k & k \\ l & l \end{pmatrix} \otimes u_{ki}u_{li} \\ &= \sum_{kl} \begin{pmatrix} k & k \\ l & l \end{pmatrix} \otimes (uu^t)_{kl} \end{aligned}$$

From $u^{\otimes 2}(1) = 1 \otimes 1$ ve get that uu^t is the identity matrix. Together with the unitarity of u, this gives the following formulae:

$$u^t = u^* = u^{-1}$$

Consider the Jones projection $E_1 \in Q_3$. After isotoping, $L_{21}(E_1)$ looks as follows:

$$L_{21}\begin{pmatrix} |\cup \\ |\cap \end{pmatrix} : \begin{pmatrix} |\ | \\ {\scriptstyle i\ i} \\ {\scriptstyle j\ j} \\ |\ | \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} | & \\ {\scriptstyle i\ i} & \\ {\scriptstyle j\ j} & \supset \\ | & \end{pmatrix} = \delta_{ij}\begin{pmatrix} | \\ {\scriptstyle i} \\ {\scriptstyle i} \\ | \end{pmatrix}$$

In other words, the linear map $M = L_{21}(E_1)$ is the multiplication $\delta_i \otimes \delta_j \to \delta_{ij}\delta_i$:

$$M\begin{pmatrix} i & i \\ j & j \end{pmatrix} = \delta_{ij}\begin{pmatrix} i \\ i \end{pmatrix}$$

In order to finish, consider the following element of $C(X) \otimes A$:

$$(M \otimes id)u^{\otimes 2}\left(\begin{pmatrix} i & i \\ j & j \end{pmatrix} \otimes 1\right) = \sum_k \begin{pmatrix} k \\ k \end{pmatrix} \delta_k \otimes u_{ki}u_{kj}$$

Since $M \in Q_{21} = Hom(u^{\otimes 2}, u)$, this equals the following element of $C(X) \otimes A$:

$$u(M \otimes id)\left(\begin{pmatrix} i & i \\ j & j \end{pmatrix} \otimes 1\right) = \sum_k \begin{pmatrix} k \\ k \end{pmatrix} \delta_k \otimes \delta_{ij}u_{ki}$$

Thus we have $u_{ki}u_{kj} = \delta_{ij}u_{ki}$ for any i, j, k, which shows that u is a magic unitary. Now if P is the planar algebra associated to u, we have $Hom(1, v^{\otimes n}) = P_n = Q_n$, as desired. As for the uniqueness, this is clear from the Peter-Weyl theory. □

All the above might seem a bit technical, but is worth learning, and for good reason, because it is extremely powerful. As an example of immediate application, if you agree with the bijection $G \leftrightarrow Q$ in Theorem 3.34, then $G = S_N^+$ itself, which is the biggest object on the left, must correspond to the smallest object on the right, namely $Q = TL_N$. Thus, more or less everything that we learned so far in this book is trivial.

Welcome to planar algebras. Try to master this technology. And once this understood, get to know some analysis too, which comes after. But it will be among our main purposes here to do so, getting you familiar with algebra, and with some analysis as well.

Back now to work, the results established above, regarding the subgroups $G \subset S_N^+$, have several generalizations, to the subgroups $G \subset O_N^+$ and $G \subset U_N^+$, as well as subfactor versions, going beyond the combinatorial level. At the algebraic level, we have:

THEOREM 3.35. *The following happen:*

(1) *The closed subgroups $G \subset O_N^+$ produce planar algebras $P \subset \mathcal{T}_N$, via the following formula, and any subalgebra $P \subset \mathcal{T}_N$ appears in this way:*

$$P_k = End(u^{\otimes k})$$

(2) *The closed subgroups $G \subset U_N^+$ produce planar algebras $P \subset \mathcal{T}_N$, via the following formula, and any subalgebra $P \subset \mathcal{T}_N$ appears in this way:*

$$P_k = End(\underbrace{u \otimes \bar{u} \otimes u \otimes \ldots}_{k\ terms})$$

(3) *In fact, the closed subgroups $G \subset PO_N^+ \simeq PU_N^+$ are in correspondence with the subalgebras $P \subset \mathcal{T}_N$, with $G \to P$ being given by $P_k = Fix(u^{\otimes k})$.*

PROOF. There is a long story with this result, whose origins go back to papers of mine written before the 1999 papers [5], [60], using Popa's standard lattice formalism, instead of the planar algebra one, and then to a number of papers written in the early 2000s, proving results which are more general. For the whole story, and a modern treatment of the subject, we refer to Tarrago-Wahl [87]. As in what regards the proof:

(1) This is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.33 and Theorem 3.34, ultimately coming from Woronowicz's Tannakian duality in [100]. Note however that the correspondence is not bijective, because the spaces P_k determine $PG\subset PO_N^+$, but not $G\subset O_N^+$ itself.

(2) This is an extension of (1), and the same comments apply. With the extra comment that the fact that the subgroups $PG\subset PO_N^+$ produce the same planar algebras as the subgroups $PG\subset PU_N^+$ should not be surprising, due to $PO_N^+=PU_N^+$.

(3) This is an extension of (2), and a further extension of (1), and is in fact the best result on the subject, due to the fact that we have there a true, bijective correspondence. As before, this ultimately comes from Woronowicz's Tannakian duality in [100].

(4) As a final comment, you might say that, now that we have (3) as ultimate result on the subject, why not saying a few words about the proof. In answer, (3) is in fact just the tip of the iceberg, so we prefer to discuss this later, once we'll see the whole iceberg. □

Finally, in relation with subfactors, the result here is as follows:

THEOREM 3.36. *The planar algebras coming the subgroups $G\subset S_N^+$ appear from fixed point subfactors, of the following type,*

$$A^G\subset(\mathbb C^N\otimes A)^G$$

and the planar algebras coming from the subgroups $G\subset PO_N^+=PU_N^+$ appear as well from fixed point subfactors, of the following type,

$$A^G\subset(M_N(\mathbb C)\otimes A)^G$$

with the action $G\curvearrowright A$ being assumed to be minimal, $(A^G)'\cap A=\mathbb C$.

PROOF. Again, there is a long story with this result, and besides needing some explanations, regarding the proof, all this is in need of some unification. We will be back to this in chapter 4, and in the meantime we refer to [5], [87] and related papers. □

Finally, let us mention that an important question, which is still open, is that of understanding whether the above subfactors can be taken to be hyperfinite, $A^G\simeq R$. This is related to the axiomatization of hyperfinite subfactors, another open question, which is of central importance in von Neumann algebras. We will be back to this.

3e. Exercises

Exercises:

Exercise 3.37.

Exercise 3.38.

Exercise 3.39.

Exercise 3.40.

Exercise 3.41.

Exercise 3.42.

Exercise 3.43.

Exercise 3.44.

Bonus exercise.

CHAPTER 4

Analytic aspects

4a. Matrix models

One potentially interesting method for the study of the closed subgroups $G \subset S_N^+$, that we have not tried yet, consists in modeling the standard coordinates $u_{ij} \in C(G)$ by concrete variables over some familiar C^*-algebra, $U_{ij} \in B$. Indeed, assuming that the model is faithful in some suitable sense, and that the variables U_{ij} are not too complicated, all questions about G would correspond in this way to routine questions inside B. We will discuss here such questions, which are quite interesting, first for the arbitrary closed subgroups $G \subset U_N^+$, and then for the quantum permutation groups $G \subset S_N^+$.

All this sounds good, mathematically speaking, and we will soon see that there are some potentially interesting connections with physics as well. Getting started now, we have a good idea, but we must first solve the following philosophical question:

QUESTION 4.1. *What type of target algebras B shall we use for our matrix models $\pi : C(G) \to B$? We would like these to be simple enough, as for the computations inside them to be doable, but also general enough, as to model well our quantum groups.*

In answer, a good idea would be probably that of using random matrix algebras, $B = M_K(C(T))$, with $K \geq 1$ being an integer, and T being a compact space. Indeed, these algebras generalize the most familiar algebras that we know, namely the matrix ones $M_K(\mathbb{C})$, and the commutative ones $C(T)$, so they are definitely simple enough. As for their potential modeling power, my cat who knows some physics says okay.

In short, time to start our study, with the following definition:

DEFINITION 4.2. *A matrix model for $G \subset U_N^+$ is a morphism of C^*-algebras*

$$\pi : C(G) \to M_K(C(T))$$

where $K \geq 1$ is an integer, and T is a compact space.

As a first comment, focusing on such models might look a bit restrictive, but we will soon discover that, with some know-how, we can do many things with such models. For the moment, let us develop some general theory. The main question to be solved is that of understanding the suitable faithfulness assumptions needed on π, as for the model to "remind" the quantum group. As we will see, this is something quite tricky.

The simplest situation is when π is faithful in the usual sense. Here π obviously reminds G. However, this is something quite restrictive, because in this case the algebra $C(G)$ must be quite small, admitting an embedding as follows:

$$\pi : C(G) \subset M_K(C(T))$$

Technically, this means that $C(G)$ must be of type I, as an operator algebra, and we will discuss this in a moment, with the comment that this is indeed something quite restrictive. However, there are many interesting examples here, and all this is worth a detailed look. First, we have the following result, providing us with basic examples:

PROPOSITION 4.3. *The following closed subgroups $G \subset U_N^+$ have faithful models:*
(1) *The compact Lie groups $G \subset U_N$.*
(2) *The finite quantum groups $G \subset U_N^+$.*

In both cases, we can arrange for $\int_G$ to be restriction of the random matrix trace.

PROOF. These assertions are all elementary, the proofs being as follows:

(1) This is clear, because we can simply use here the identity map:

$$id : C(G) \to M_1(C(G))$$

(2) Here we can use the left regular representation $\lambda : C(G) \to M_{|G|}(\mathbb{C})$. Indeed, let us endow the linear space $H = C(G)$ with the scalar product $< a, b >= \int_G ab^*$. We have then a representation of $*$-algebras, as follows:

$$\lambda : C(G) \to B(H) \quad , \quad a \to [b \to ab]$$

Now since we have $H \simeq \mathbb{C}^{|G|}$, we can view λ as a matrix model map, as above.

(3) Finally, our claim is that we can choose our model as for the following formula to hold, where $\int_T$ is the integration with respect to a given probability measure on T:

$$\int_G = \left(tr \otimes \int_T \right) \pi$$

But this is clear for the model in (1), by definition, and is clear as well for the model in (2), by using the basic properties of the left regular representation. □

In the above result, the last assertion is quite interesting, and suggests formulating the following definition, somewhat independently on the notion of faithfulness:

DEFINITION 4.4. *A matrix model $\pi : C(G) \to M_K(C(T))$ is called stationary when*

$$\int_G = \left(tr \otimes \int_T \right) \pi$$

where $\int_T$ is the integration with respect to a given probability measure on T.

Here the term "stationary" comes from a functional analytic interpretation of all this, with a certain Cesàro limit needed to be stationary, and this will be explained later. Yet another explanation comes from a certain relation with the lattice models, but this is something rather folklore, not axiomatized yet. We will be back to this.

We will see in a moment that stationarity implies faithfulness, so that stationarity can be regarded as being a useful, pragmatic version of faithfulness. But let us first discuss the examples. Besides those in Proposition 4.3, we can look at group duals. So, consider a discrete group Γ, and a model for the corresponding group algebra, as follows:

$$\pi : C^*(\Gamma) \to M_K(C(T))$$

Since a representation of a group algebra must come from a unitary representation of the group, such a matrix model must come from a representation as follows:

$$\rho : \Gamma \to C(T, U_K)$$

With this identification made, we have the following result:

PROPOSITION 4.5. *An matrix model $\rho : \Gamma \subset C(T, U_K)$ is stationary when:*

$$\int_T tr(g^x)dx = 0, \forall g \neq 1$$

Moreover, the examples include all abelian groups, and all finite groups.

PROOF. Consider indeed a group embedding $\rho : \Gamma \subset C(T, U_K)$, which produces by linearity a matrix model, as follows:

$$\pi : C^*(\Gamma) \to M_K(C(T))$$

It is enough to formulate the stationarity condition on the group elements $g \in C^*(\Gamma)$. Let us set $\rho(g) = (x \to g^x)$. With this notation, the stationarity condition reads:

$$\int_T tr(g^x)dx = \delta_{g,1}$$

Since this equality is trivially satisfied at $g = 1$, where by unitality of our representation we must have $g^x = 1$ for any $x \in T$, we are led to the condition in the statement. Regarding now the examples, these are both clear. More precisely:

(1) When Γ is abelian we can use the following trivial embedding:

$$\Gamma \subset C(\widehat{\Gamma}, U_1) \quad , \quad g \to [\chi \to \chi(g)]$$

(2) When Γ is finite we can use the left regular representation:

$$\Gamma \subset \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}\Gamma) \quad , \quad g \to [h \to gh]$$

Indeed, in both cases, the stationarity condition is trivially satisfied. □

In order to discuss now certain analytic aspects of the matrix models, let us go back to the von Neumann algebras, discussed in chapter 1, and in chapter 3. We recall from there that we have the following result, due to Murray-von Neumann and Connes:

THEOREM 4.6. *Given a von Neumann algebra $A\subset B(H)$, if we write its center as*

$$Z(A)=L^\infty(X)$$

then we have a decomposition as follows, with the fibers A_x having trivial center:

$$A=\int_X A_x\,dx$$

Moreover, the factors, $Z(A)=\mathbb C$, can be basically classified in terms of the II_1 *factors, which are those satisfying* $\dim A=\infty$, *and having a faithful trace $tr:A\to\mathbb C$.*

PROOF. This is something which is clear in finite dimensions, and in the commutative case too. In general, this is something heavy, the idea being as follows:

(1) The first assertion, regarding the decomposition into factors, is von Neumann's reduction theory main result, which is actually one of the heaviest results in fundamental mathematics, and whose proof uses advanced functional analysis techniques.

(2) The classification of factors, due to Murray-von Neumann and Connes, is again something heavy, the idea being that the II_1 factors are the "building blocks", with the other factors basically appearing from them via crossed product type constructions. □

Back now to matrix models, as a first general result, which is something which is not exactly trivial, and whose proof requires some functional analysis, we have:

THEOREM 4.7. *Assuming that a closed subgroup $G\subset U_N^+$ has a stationary model*

$$\pi:C(G)\to M_K(C(T))$$

it follows that G must be coamenable, and that the model is faithful. Moreover, π extends into an embedding of von Neumann algebras, as follows,

$$L^\infty(G)\subset M_K(L^\infty(T))$$

which commutes with the canonical integration functionals.

PROOF. Assume that we have a stationary model, as in the statement. By performing the GNS construction with respect to $\int_G$, we obtain a factorization as follows, which commutes with the respective canonical integration functionals:

$$\pi:C(G)\to C(G)_{red}\subset M_K(C(T))$$

Thus, in what regards the coamenability question, we can assume that π is faithful. With this assumption made, we have an embedding as follows:

$$C(G)\subset M_K(C(T))$$

By performing the GNS construction we obtain a better embedding, as follows:

$$L^\infty(G)\subset M_K(L^\infty(T))$$

Now since the von Neumann algebra on the right is of type I, so must be its subalgebra $A=L^\infty(G)$. But this means that, when writing the center of this latter algebra as $Z(A)=L^\infty(X)$, the whole algebra decomposes over X, as an integral of type I factors:

$$L^\infty(G)=\int_X M_{K_x}(\mathbb C)\,dx$$

In particular, we can see from this that $C(G)\subset L^\infty(G)$ has a unique C^*-norm, and so G is coamenable. Thus we have proved our first assertion, and the second assertion follows as well, because our factorization of π consists of the identity, and of an inclusion. □

In relation with the above, we have the following well-known result of Thoma:

Theorem 4.8. *For a discrete group Γ, the following are equivalent:*

1. *$C^*(\Gamma)$ is of type I, so that we have an embedding $\pi:C^*(\Gamma)\subset M_K(C(X))$, with X being a compact space.*
2. *$C^*(\Gamma)$ has a stationary model of type $\pi:C^*(\Gamma)\to M_F(C(L))$, with F being a finite group, and L being a compact abelian group.*
3. *Γ is virtually abelian, in the sense that we have an abelian subgroup $\Lambda\lhd\Gamma$ such that the quotient group $F=\Gamma/\Lambda$ is finite.*
4. *Γ has an abelian subgroup $\Lambda\subset\Gamma$ whose index $K=[\Gamma:\Lambda]$ is finite.*

Proof. There are several proofs for this fact, the idea being as follows:

(1) $\implies$ (4) This is the non-trivial implication, that we will not prove here. We refer instead to the literature, either Thoma's orignal paper, or books like those of Dixmier, mixing advanced group theory and advanced operator algebra theory.

(4) $\implies$ (3) We choose coset representatives $g_i\in\Gamma$, and we set:

$$\Lambda'=\bigcap_i g_i\Gamma g_i^{-1}$$

Then $\Lambda'\subset\Lambda$ has finite index, and we have $\Lambda'\lhd\Gamma$, as desired.

(3) $\implies$ (2) This follows by using the theory of induced representations. We can define a model $\pi:C^*(\Gamma)\to M_F(C(\widehat{\Lambda}))$ by setting:

$$\pi(g)(\chi)=Ind_\Lambda^\Gamma(\chi)(g)$$

Indeed, any character $\chi\in\widehat{\Lambda}$ is a 1-dimensional representation of Λ, and we can therefore consider the induced representation $Ind_\Lambda^\Gamma(\chi)$ of the group Γ. This representation is $|F|$-dimensional, and so maps the group elements $g\in\Gamma$ into order $|F|$ matrices $Ind_\Lambda^\Gamma(\chi)(g)$. Thus the above map π is well-defined, and the fact that it is a representation is clear as well. In order to check now the stationarity property of this representation, we can use the following well-known character formula, due to Frobenius:

$$Tr\left(Ind_\Lambda^\Gamma(\chi)(g)\right)=\sum_{x\in F}\delta_{x^{-1}gx\in\Lambda}\chi(x^{-1}gx)$$

By integrating with respect to $\chi\in\widehat{\Lambda}$, we deduce from this that we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\left(Tr\otimes\int_{\widehat{\Lambda}}\right)\pi(g) &= \sum_{x\in F}\delta_{x^{-1}gx\in\Lambda}\int_{\widehat{\Lambda}}\chi(x^{-1}gx)d\chi\\ &= \sum_{x\in F}\delta_{x^{-1}gx\in\Lambda}\delta_{g,1}\\ &= |F|\cdot\delta_{g,1}\end{aligned}$$

Now by dividing by $|F|$ we conclude that the model is stationary, as claimed.

(2) $\implies$ (1) This is the trivial implication, with the faithfulness of π following from the abstract functional analysis arguments from the proof of Theorem 4.7. □

We refer to [5] and related papers for more on all this, including for some partial extensions of Thoma's theorem, to the case of the discrete quantum groups.

Getting back now to Definition 4.2, more generally, we can model in that way the standard coordinates $x_i\in C(X)$ of various algebraic manifolds $X\subset S^{N-1}_{\mathbb{C},+}$. Indeed, these manifolds generalize the compact matrix quantum groups, which appear as:

$$G\subset U_N^+\subset S^{N^2-1}_{\mathbb{C},+}$$

Thus, we have many other interesting examples of such manifolds, such as the homogeneous spaces over our quantum groups. However, at this level of generality, not much general theory is available. It is elementary to show that, under the technical assumption $X^{class}\neq\emptyset$, there exists a universal $K\times K$ model for the algebra $C(X)$, which factorizes as follows, with $X^{(K)}\subset X$ being a certain algebraic submanifold:

$$\pi_K:C(X)\to C(X^{(K)})\subset M_K(C(T_K))$$

To be more precise, the universal $K\times K$ model space T_K appears by imposing to the complex $K\times K$ matrices the relations defining X, and the algebra $C(X^{(K)})$ is then by definition the image of π_K. In relation with this, we can set as well:

$$X^{(\infty)}=\bigcup_{K\in\mathbb{N}}X^{(K)}$$

We are led in this way to a filtration of X, as follows:

$$X^{class}=X^{(1)}\subset X^{(2)}\subset X^{(3)}\subset\ldots\ldots\subset X^{(\infty)}\subset X$$

It is possible to say a few non-trivial things about these manifolds $X^{(K)}$. In the compact quantum group case, however, that we are mainly interested in here, the matrix truncations $G^{(K)} \subset G$ are generically not quantum subgroups at $K \geq 2$, and so this theory is a priori not very useful, at least in its basic form presented above.

4b. Inner faithfulness

Let us discuss now the general, non-coamenable case, with the aim of finding a weaker notion of faithfulness, which still does the job, namely that of "reminding" the quantum group. The idea comes by looking at the group duals $G = \widehat{\Gamma}$. Consider indeed a general model for the associated group algebra, which can be written as follows:

$$\pi : C^*(\Gamma) \to M_K(C(T))$$

The point is that such a representation of the group algebra must come by linearization from a unitary group representation, as follows:

$$\rho : \Gamma \to C(T, U_K)$$

Now observe that when this group representation ρ is faithful, the representation π is in general not faithful, for instance because when $T = \{.\}$ its target algebra is finite dimensional. On the other hand, this representation "reminds" Γ, so can be used in order to fully understand Γ. Thus, we have an idea here, basically saying that, for practical purposes, the faithfuless property can be replaced with something much weaker.

This weaker notion, which will be of great interest for us, is called "inner faithfulness". The general theory here, from [10], starts with the following definition:

DEFINITION 4.9. *Let $\pi : C(G) \to M_K(C(T))$ be a matrix model.*

(1) *The Hopf image of π is the smallest quotient Hopf C^*-algebra $C(G) \to C(H)$ producing a factorization as follows:*
$$\pi : C(G) \to C(H) \to M_K(C(T))$$
(2) *When the inclusion $H \subset G$ is an isomorphism, i.e. when there is no non-trivial factorization as above, we say that π is inner faithful.*

The above notions are quite tricky, and having them well understood will take us some time. As a first example, motivated by the above discussion, in the case where $G = \widehat{\Gamma}$ is a group dual, π must come from a group representation, as follows:

$$\rho : \Gamma \to C(T, U_K)$$

Thus the minimal factorization in (1) is obtained by taking the image:

$$\rho : \Gamma \to \Lambda \subset C(T, U_K)$$

Thus, as a conclusion, in this case π is inner faithful precisely when we have:

$$\Gamma \subset C(T, U_K)$$

Dually now, given a compact Lie group G, and elements $g_1,\ldots,g_K\in G$, we have a diagonal representation $\pi:C(G)\to M_K(\mathbb C)$, appearing as follows:

$$f\to\begin{pmatrix}f(g_1)&&\\&\ddots&\\&&f(g_K)\end{pmatrix}$$

The minimal factorization of this representation π, as in Definition 4.9 (1), is then via the algebra $C(H)$, with H being the following closed subgroup of G:

$$H=\overline{<g_1,\ldots,g_K>}$$

Thus, as a conclusion, π is inner faithful precisely when we have:

$$G=H$$

There are many other examples of inner faithful representations, which are however substantially more technically advanced, and we will discuss them later.

Back to general theory now, in the framework of Definition 4.9, the existence and uniqueness of the Hopf image come by dividing $C(G)$ by a suitable ideal, with this being something standard. Alternatively, in Tannakian terms, as explained in [10], we have:

Theorem 4.10. *Assuming $G\subset U_N^+$, with fundamental corepresentation $u=(u_{ij})$, the Hopf image of a model $\pi:C(G)\to M_K(C(T))$ comes from the Tannakian category*

$$C_{kl}=Hom(U^{\otimes k},U^{\otimes l})$$

where $U_{ij}=\pi(u_{ij})$, and where the spaces on the right are taken in a formal sense.

Proof. Since the morphisms increase the intertwining spaces, when defined either in a representation theory sense, or just formally, we have inclusions as follows:

$$Hom(u^{\otimes k},u^{\otimes l})\subset Hom(U^{\otimes k},U^{\otimes l})$$

More generally, we have such inclusions when replacing (G,u) with any pair producing a factorization of π. Thus, by Tannakian duality, the Hopf image must be given by the fact that the intertwining spaces must be the biggest, subject to the above inclusions. On the other hand, since u is biunitary, so is U, and it follows that the spaces on the right form a Tannakian category. Thus, we have a quantum group (H,v) given by:

$$Hom(v^{\otimes k},v^{\otimes l})=Hom(U^{\otimes k},U^{\otimes l})$$

By the above discussion, $C(H)$ follows to be the Hopf image of π, as claimed. □

Regarding now the study of the inner faithful models, a key problem is that of computing the Haar integration functional. The result here, from [5], is as follows:

THEOREM 4.11. *Given an inner faithful model $\pi : C(G) \to M_K(C(T))$, we have*

$$\int_G = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{r=1}^k \int_G^r$$

with the truncations of the integration on the right being given by

$$\int_G^r = (\varphi \circ \pi)^{*r}$$

with $\phi * \psi = (\phi \otimes \psi)\Delta$, and with $\varphi = tr \otimes \int_T$ being the random matrix trace.

PROOF. This is something quite tricky, the idea being as follows:

(1) As a first observation, there is an obvious similarity here with the Woronowicz construction of the Haar measure, explained in chapter 1. In fact, the above result holds more generally for any model $\pi : C(G) \to B$, with $\varphi \in B^*$ being a faithful trace.

(2) In order to prove now the result, we can proceed as in chapter 1. If we denote by $\int_G'$ the limit in the statement, we must prove that this limit converges, and that:

$$\int_G' = \int_G$$

It is enough to check this on the coefficients of the Peter-Weyl corepresentations, and if we let $v = u^{\otimes k}$ be one of these corepresentations, we must prove that we have:

$$\left(id \otimes \int_G'\right) v = \left(id \otimes \int_G\right) v$$

(3) In order to prove this, we already know, from the Haar measure theory from chapter 1, that the matrix on the right is the orthogonal projection onto $Fix(v)$:

$$\left(id \otimes \int_G\right) v = Proj\Big[Fix(v)\Big]$$

Regarding now the matrix on the left, the trick in [99] applied to the linear form $\varphi\pi$ tells us that this is the orthogonal projection onto the 1-eigenspace of $(id \otimes \varphi\pi)v$:

$$\left(id \otimes \int_G'\right) v = Proj\Big[1 \in (id \otimes \varphi\pi)v\Big]$$

(4) Now observe that, if we set $V_{ij} = \pi(v_{ij})$, we have the following formula:

$$(id \otimes \varphi\pi)v = (id \otimes \varphi)V$$

Thus, we can apply the trick in [99], and we conclude that the 1-eigenspace that we are interested in equals $Fix(V)$. But, according to Theorem 4.10, we have:

$$Fix(V) = Fix(v)$$

Thus, we have proved that we have $\int_G' = \int_G$, as desired. □

In practice, Theorem 4.11 is something quite powerful. As an illustration, regarding the law of the main character, we obtain here the following result:

PROPOSITION 4.12. *Assume that $\pi : C(G) \to M_K(C(T))$ is inner faithful, let*

$$\mu = law(\chi)$$

and let μ^r be the law of χ with respect to $\int_G^r = (\varphi \circ \pi)^{*r}$, where $\varphi = tr \otimes \int_T$.

(1) *We have the following convergence formula, in moments:*

$$\mu = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{r=0}^{k} \mu^r$$

(2) *The moments of μ^r are the numbers $c_\varepsilon^r = Tr(T_\varepsilon^r)$, where:*

$$(T_\varepsilon)_{i_1 \ldots i_p, j_1 \ldots j_p} = \left(tr \otimes \int_T \right) (U_{i_1 j_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \ldots U_{i_p j_p}^{\varepsilon_p})$$

PROOF. These formulae are both elementary, by using the convergence result established in Theorem 4.11, the proof being as follows:

(1) This follows from the limiting formula in Theorem 4.11, by applying the linear forms there to the main character χ.

(2) This follows from the definitions of the measure μ^r and of the matrix T_e, by summing the entries of T_e over equal indices, $i_r = j_r$. □

Interestingly, the above results regarding inner faithfulness have applications as well to the notion of stationarity introduced before, clarifying among others the use of the word "stationary". To be more precise, in order to detect the stationary models, we have the following useful criterion, mixing linear algebra and analysis, from [10]:

THEOREM 4.13. *For a model $\pi : C(G) \to M_K(C(T))$, the following are equivalent:*

(1) *$Im(\pi)$ is a Hopf algebra, and the Haar integration on it is:*

$$\psi = \left(tr \otimes \int_T \right) \pi$$

(2) *The linear form $\psi = (tr \otimes \int_T)\pi$ satisfies the idempotent state property:*

$$\psi * \psi = \psi$$

(3) *We have $T_e^2 = T_e$, $\forall p \in \mathbb{N}$, $\forall e \in \{1, *\}^p$, where:*

$$(T_e)_{i_1 \ldots i_p, j_1 \ldots j_p} = \left(tr \otimes \int_T \right) (U_{i_1 j_1}^{e_1} \ldots U_{i_p j_p}^{e_p})$$

If these conditions are satisfied, we say that π is stationary on its image.

PROOF. Given a matrix model $\pi : C(G) \to M_K(C(T))$ as in the statement, we can factorize it via its Hopf image, as in Definition 4.9:

$$\pi : C(G) \to C(H) \to M_K(C(T))$$

Now observe that (1,2,3) above depend only on the factorized representation:

$$\nu : C(H) \to M_K(C(T))$$

Thus, we can assume in practice that we have $G = H$, which means that we can assume that π is inner faithful. With this assumption made, the formula in Theorem 4.11 applies to our situation, and the proof of the equivalences goes as follows:

(1) $\implies$ (2) This is clear from definitions, because the Haar integration on any compact quantum group satisfies the idempotent state equation:

$$\psi * \psi = \psi$$

(2) $\implies$ (1) Assuming $\psi * \psi = \psi$, we have $\psi^{*r} = \psi$ for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, and Theorem 4.11 gives $\int_G = \psi$. By using now Theorem 4.7, we obtain the result.

In order to establish now (2) $\iff$ (3), we use the following elementary formula, which comes from the definition of the convolution operation:

$$\psi^{*r}(u_{i_1j_1}^{e_1} \ldots u_{i_pj_p}^{e_p}) = (T_e^r)_{i_1\ldots i_p,j_1\ldots j_p}$$

(2) $\implies$ (3) Assuming $\psi * \psi = \psi$, by using the above formula at $r = 1, 2$ we obtain that the matrices T_e and T_e^2 have the same coefficients, and so they are equal.

(3) $\implies$ (2) Assuming $T_e^2 = T_e$, by using the above formula at $r = 1, 2$ we obtain that the linear forms ψ and $\psi * \psi$ coincide on any product of coefficients $u_{i_1j_1}^{e_1} \ldots u_{i_pj_p}^{e_p}$. Now since these coefficients span a dense subalgebra of $C(G)$, this gives the result. □

4c. Half-liberation

As a first illustration, we can apply the above criterion to certain models for O_N^*, U_N^*. We first have the following result, coming from the work in [5], [10]:

PROPOSITION 4.14. *We have a matrix model as follows,*

$$C(O_N^*) \to M_2(C(U_N)) \quad , \quad u_{ij} \to \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v_{ij} \\ \bar{v}_{ij} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where v is the fundamental corepresentation of $C(U_N)$, as well as a model as follows,

$$C(U_N^*) \to M_2(C(U_N \times U_N)) \quad , \quad u_{ij} \to \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v_{ij} \\ w_{ij} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where v, w are the fundamental corepresentations of the two copies of $C(U_N)$.

PROOF. It is routine to check that the matrices on the right are indeed biunitaries, and since the first matrix is also self-adjoint, we obtain in this way models as follows:

$$C(O_N^+)\to M_2(C(U_N))\quad,\quad C(U_N^+)\to M_2(C(U_N\times U_N))$$

Regarding now the half-commutation relations, this comes from something general, regarding the antidiagonal 2×2 matrices. Consider indeed matrices as follows:

$$X_i=\begin{pmatrix}0&x_i\\ y_i&0\end{pmatrix}$$

We have then the following computation:

$$X_iX_jX_k=\begin{pmatrix}0&x_i\\ y_i&0\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}0&x_j\\ y_j&0\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}0&x_k\\ y_k&0\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}0&x_iy_jx_k\\ y_ix_jy_k&0\end{pmatrix}$$

Since this quantity is symmetric in i,k, we obtain from this:

$$X_iX_jX_k=X_kX_jX_i$$

Thus, the antidiagonal 2×2 matrices half-commute, and we conclude that our models for $C(O_N^+)$ and $C(U_N^+)$ constructed above factorize as in the statement. □

We can now formulate our first concrete modeling theorem, as follows:

THEOREM 4.15. *The above antidiagonal models, namely*

$$C(O_N^*)\to M_2(C(U_N))\quad,\quad C(U_N^*)\to M_2(C(U_N\times U_N))$$

are both stationary, and in particular they are faithful.

PROOF. Let us first discuss the case of O_N^*. We will use Theorem 4.13 (3). Since the fundamental representation is self-adjoint, the various matrices T_e with $e\in\{1,*\}^p$ are all equal. We denote this common matrix by T_p. We have, by definition:

$$(T_p)_{i_1\ldots i_p,j_1\ldots j_p}=\left(tr\otimes\int_H\right)\left[\begin{pmatrix}0&v_{i_1j_1}\\ \bar{v}_{i_1j_1}&0\end{pmatrix}\ldots\ldots\begin{pmatrix}0&v_{i_pj_p}\\ \bar{v}_{i_pj_p}&0\end{pmatrix}\right]$$

Since when multipliying an odd number of antidiagonal matrices we obtain an atidiagonal matrix, we have $T_p=0$ for p odd. Also, when p is even, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}(T_p)_{i_1\ldots i_p,j_1\ldots j_p}&=\left(tr\otimes\int_H\right)\begin{pmatrix}v_{i_1j_1}\ldots\bar{v}_{i_pj_p}&0\\ 0&\bar{v}_{i_1j_1}\ldots v_{i_pj_p}\end{pmatrix}\\ &=\frac{1}{2}\left(\int_H v_{i_1j_1}\ldots\bar{v}_{i_pj_p}+\int_H\bar{v}_{i_1j_1}\ldots v_{i_pj_p}\right)\\ &=\int_H Re(v_{i_1j_1}\ldots\bar{v}_{i_pj_p})\end{aligned}$$

We have $T_p^2 = T_p = 0$ when p is odd, so we are left with proving that for p even we have $T_p^2 = T_p$. For this purpose, we use the following formula:

$$Re(x)Re(y) = \frac{1}{2}\left(Re(xy) + Re(x\bar{y})\right)$$

By using this identity for each of the terms which appear in the product, and multi-index notations in order to simplify the writing, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
(T_p^2)_{ij} &= \sum_{k_1\ldots k_p}(T_p)_{i_1\ldots i_p,k_1\ldots k_p}(T_p)_{k_1\ldots k_p,j_1\ldots j_p}\\
&= \int_H\int_H\sum_{k_1\ldots k_p}Re(v_{i_1k_1}\ldots\bar{v}_{i_pk_p})Re(w_{k_1j_1}\ldots\bar{w}_{k_pj_p})dvdw\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\int_H\int_H\sum_{k_1\ldots k_p}Re(v_{i_1k_1}w_{k_1j_1}\ldots\bar{v}_{i_pk_p}\bar{w}_{k_pj_p})+Re(v_{i_1k_1}\bar{w}_{k_1j_1}\ldots\bar{v}_{i_pk_p}w_{k_pj_p})dvdw\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\int_H\int_H Re((vw)_{i_1j_1}\ldots(\bar{v}\bar{w})_{i_pj_p})+Re((v\bar{w})_{i_1j_1}\ldots(\bar{v}w)_{i_pj_p})dvdw
\end{aligned}$$

Now since $vw\in H$ is uniformly distributed when $v,w\in H$ are uniformly distributed, the quantity on the left integrates up to $(T_p)_{ij}$. Also, since H is conjugation-stable, $\bar{w}\in H$ is uniformly distributed when $w\in H$ is uniformly distributed, so the quantity on the right integrates up to the same quantity, namely $(T_p)_{ij}$. Thus, we have:

$$(T_p^2)_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\Big((T_p)_{ij} + (T_p)_{ij}\Big) = (T_p)_{ij}$$

Summarizing, we have obtained that for any p, we have $T_p^2 = T_p$. Thus Theorem 4.13 applies, and shows that our model is stationary, as claimed. As for the proof of the stationarity for the model for U_N^*, this is similar. See [**16**]. □

As a second illustration, regarding H_N^*, K_N^*, we have:

Theorem 4.16. *We have a stationary matrix model as follows,*

$$C(H_N^*)\to M_2(C(K_N))\quad,\quad u_{ij}\to\begin{pmatrix}0&v_{ij}\\ \bar{v}_{ij}&0\end{pmatrix}$$

where v is the fundamental corepresentation of $C(K_N)$, as well as a stationary model

$$C(K_N^*)\to M_2(C(K_N\times K_N))\quad,\quad u_{ij}\to\begin{pmatrix}0&v_{ij}\\ w_{ij}&0\end{pmatrix}$$

where v,w are the fundamental corepresentations of the two copies of $C(K_N)$.

Proof. This follows by adapting the proof of Proposition 4.14 and Theorem 4.15, by adding there the H_N^+, K_N^+ relations. All this is in fact part of a more general phenomenon, concerning half-liberation in general, and we refer here to [**5**], [**10**]. □

As a consequence of this, we can now work out the discrete group case:

PROPOSITION 4.17. *Any reflection group $\Gamma =< g_1, \ldots, g_N >$ which is half-abelian, in the sense that its standard generators half-commute,*

$$g_i g_j g_k = g_k g_j g_i$$

has an algebraic stationary model, with $K = 2$.

PROOF. This follows from Theorem 4.15. To be more precise, in the non-abelian case, the results in [5] show that $\widehat{\Gamma} \subset O_N^*$ must come from a group dual $\widehat{\Lambda} \subset U_N$, via the construction there, and with $\Lambda =< h_1, \ldots, h_N >$, the corresponding model is:

$$\Gamma \subset C(\widehat{\Lambda}, U_2) \quad , \quad g_i \to \left[\chi \to \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \chi(h_i) \\ \bar{\chi}(h_i) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right]$$

As for the abelian case, the result here follows from Proposition 4.5. □

More generally now, we have the following result, from [5]:

PROPOSITION 4.18. *If L is a compact group, having a N-dimensional unitary corepresentation v, and an order K automorphism $\sigma : L \to L$, we have a matrix model*

$$\pi : C(U_N^*) \to M_K(C(L)) \quad , \quad u_{ij} \to \tau[v_{ij}^{(1)}, \ldots, v_{ij}^{(K)}]$$

where $v^{(i)}(g) = v(\sigma^i(g))$, and where $\tau[x_1, \ldots, x_K]$ is obtained by filling the standard K-cycle $\tau \in M_K(0,1)$ with the elements $x_1, \ldots, x_K$. We call such models "cyclic".

PROOF. The matrices $U_{ij} = \tau[v_{ij}^{(1)}, \ldots, v_{ij}^{(K)}]$ in the statement appear by definition as follows, with the convention that all the blank spaces denote 0 entries:

$$U_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} & & & v_{ij}^{(1)} \\ v_{ij}^{(2)} & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & v_{ij}^{(K)} & \end{pmatrix}$$

The matrix $U = (U_{ij})$ is then unitary, and so is $\bar{U} = (U_{ij}^*)$. Thus, if we denote by $w = (w_{ij})$ the fundamental corepresentation of $C(U_N^+)$, we have a model as follows:

$$\rho : C(U_N^+) \to M_K(C(L)) \quad , \quad w_{ij} \to U_{ij}$$

Now observe that the matrices $U_{ij}U_{kl}^*, U_{ij}^*U_{kl}$ are all diagonal, so in particular, they commute. Thus the above morphism ρ factorizes through $C(U_N^*)$, as claimed. □

In relation with the above models, we have the following result, also from [5]:

THEOREM 4.19. *Any cyclic model in the above sense,*

$$\pi : C(U_N^*) \to M_K(C(L))$$

is stationary on its image, with the corresponding closed subgroup $[L] \subset U_N^*$*, given by*

$$Im(\pi) = C([L])$$

being the quotient $L \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_K \to [L]$ *having as coordinates the variables* $u_{ij} = v_{ij} \otimes \tau$*.*

PROOF. Assuming that (L, σ) are as in Proposition 4.18, we have an action $\mathbb{Z}_K \curvearrowright L$, and we can therefore consider the following short exact sequence:

$$1 \to \mathbb{Z}_K \to L \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_K \to L \to 1$$

By performing a Thoma type construction we obtain a model as follows, where $x^{(i)} = \tilde{\sigma}^i(x)$, with $\tilde{\sigma} : C(L) \to C(L)$ being the automorphism induced by $\sigma : L \to L$:

$$\rho : C(L \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_K) \subset M_K(C(L)) \quad , \quad x \otimes \tau^i \to \tau^i[x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(K)}]$$

Consider now the quotient quantum group $L \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_K \to [L]$ having as coordinates the variables $u_{ij} = v_{ij} \otimes \tau$. We have then a injective morphism, as follows:

$$\nu : C([L]) \subset C(L \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_K) \quad , \quad u_{ij} \to v_{ij} \otimes \tau$$

By composing the above two embeddings, we obtain an embedding as follows:

$$\rho\nu : C([L]) \subset M_K(C(L)) \quad , \quad u_{ij} \to \tau[v_{ij}^{(1)}, \ldots, v_{ij}^{(K)}]$$

Now since ρ is stationary, and since ν commutes with the Haar funtionals as well, it follows that this morphism $\rho\nu$ is stationary, and this finishes the proof. □

As an illustration, we can now recover the following result, from [5]:

PROPOSITION 4.20. *For any non-classical* $G \subset O_N^*$ *we have a stationary model*

$$\pi : C(G) \to M_2(C(L)) \quad , \quad u_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v_{ij} \\ \bar{v}_{ij} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $L \subset U_N$*, with coordinates denoted* v_{ij}*, is the lift of* $PG \subset PO_N^* = PU_N$*.*

PROOF. Assume first that $L \subset U_N$ is self-conjugate, in the sense that $g \in L \implies \bar{g} \in L$. If we consider the order 2 automorphism of $C(L)$ induced by $g_{ij} \to \bar{g}_{ij}$, we can apply Theorem 4.19, and we obtain a stationary model, as follows:

$$\pi : C([L]) \subset M_2(C(L)) \quad , \quad u_{ij} \otimes 1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v_{ij} \\ \bar{v}_{ij} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

The point now is that, as explained in [5], any non-classical subgroup $G \subset O_N^*$ must appear as $G = [L]$, for a certain self-conjugate subgroup $L \subset U_N$. Moreover, since we have $PG = P[L]$, it follows that $L \subset U_N$ is the lift of $PG \subset PO_N^* = PU_N$, as claimed. □

In the unitary case now, and with the matrix size $K\in\mathbb N$ being arbitrary, we recall from [5], [10] and related papers that U_N^* has a certain "arithmetic version" $U_{N,K}^*\subset U_N^*$, obtained by imposing some natural length $2K$ relations on the standard coordinates. As basic examples, at $K=1$ we have $U_{N,1}^*=U_N$, the defining relations being $ab=ba$ with $a,b\in\{u_{ij},u_{ij}^*\}$, and at $K=2$ we have $U_{N,2}^*=U_N^{**}$, with the latter quantum group appearing via the relations $ab\cdot cd=cd\cdot ab$, for any $a,b,c,d\in\{u_{ij},u_{ij}^*\}$.

With this convention, we have the following result, also from [5]:

Theorem 4.21. *For any subgroup $G\subset U_{N,K}^*$ which is K-symmetric, in the sense that $u_{ij}\to e^{2\pi i/K}u_{ij}$ defines an automorphism of $C(G)$, we have a stationary model*

$$\pi:C(G)\to M_K(C(L))\quad,\quad u_{ij}\to\tau[v_{ij}^{(1)},\ldots,v_{ij}^{(K)}]$$

with $L\subset U_N^K$ being a closed subgroup which is symmetric, in the sense that it is stable under the cyclic action $\mathbb Z_K\curvearrowright U_N^K$.

Proof. This follows from what we have, as follows:

(1) Assuming that $L\subset U_N^K$ is symmetric in the above sense, we have representations $v^{(i)}:L\subset U_N^K\to U_N^{(i)}$ for any i, and the cyclic action $\mathbb Z_K\curvearrowright U_N^K$ restricts into an order K automorphism $\sigma:L\to L$. Thus we can apply Theorem 4.19, and we obtain a certain closed subgroup $[L]\subset U_{N,K}^*$, having a stationary model as in the statement.

(2) Conversely now, assuming that $G\subset U_{N,K}^*$ is K-symmetric, the main result in [10] applies, and shows that we must have $C(G)\subset C(L)\rtimes\mathbb Z_K$, for a certain closed subgroup $L\subset U_N^K$ which is symmetric. But this shows that we have $G=[L]$, and we are done. $\square$

We refer to [5], [10] and related papers for more on the above.

4d. Group duals

Let us discuss now the group dual case, where we have a closed subgroup $\widehat\Gamma\subset S_N^+$, with Γ being a discrete group. Following [5], we use the following construction:

Proposition 4.22. *The following happen:*

1. *Given integers $K_1,\ldots,K_M$ satisfying $K_1+\ldots+K_M=N$, the dual of any quotient group $\mathbb Z_{K_1}*\ldots*\mathbb Z_{K_M}\to\Gamma$ appears as a closed subgroup $\widehat\Gamma\subset S_N^+$.*
2. *By refining if necessary the partition $N=K_1+\ldots+K_M$, we can always assume that the M morphisms $\mathbb Z_{K_i}\to\Gamma$ are all injective.*
3. *Assuming that the partition $N=K_1+\ldots+K_M$ is refined, as above, this partition is precisely the one describing the orbit structure of $\widehat\Gamma\subset S_N^+$.*

PROOF. The idea for (1) is that we have embeddings $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}_{K_i} \simeq \mathbb{Z}_{K_i} \subset S_{K_i} \subset S_{K_i}^+$, and by performing a free product construction, we obtain an embedding as follows:

$$\widehat{\Gamma} \subset \widehat{\mathbb{Z}_{K_1} * \ldots * \mathbb{Z}_{K_M}} \subset S_N^+$$

To be more precise, the magic unitary that we get is as follows, where $F_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K_i}}(w_i^{ab})_{ab}$ with $w_i = e^{2\pi i/K_i}$, and $V_i = (g_i^a)_a$, with g_i being the standard generator of $\mathbb{Z}_{K_i}$:

$$u = diag(u_i) \quad , \quad u_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K_i}} \begin{pmatrix} (F_iV_i)_0 & \ldots & (F_iV_i)_{K_i-1} \\ (F_iV_i)_{K_i-1} & \ldots & (F_iV_i)_{K_i-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ (F_iV_i)_1 & \ldots & (F_iV_i)_0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Regarding (2,3), the idea here is that the orbit structure of any $\widehat{\Gamma} \subset S_N^+$ produces a partition $N = K_1 + \ldots + K_M$, and then a quotient map $\mathbb{Z}_{K_1} * \ldots * \mathbb{Z}_{K_M} \to \Gamma$. □

Following the material from the previous chapters, we will be mainly interested in what follows in the quasi-transitive case. Let us start with the following definition:

DEFINITION 4.23. *Given a subgroup $G \subset S_N^+$, a random matrix model of type*

$$\pi : C(G) \to M_K(C(T))$$

is called quasi-flat when the fibers $P_{ij}^x = \pi(u_{ij})(x)$ all have rank ≤ 1.

We will explore more in detail this notion later. Now with this convention made, and getting back to the group duals, we have the following result, from [5]:

PROPOSITION 4.24. *The quasi-transitive group duals $\widehat{\Gamma} \subset S_N^+$, with orbits having K elements, appearing as above, have the following properties:*

1. *These come from the quotients $\mathbb{Z}_K^{*M} \to \Gamma$, having the property that the corresponding M morphisms $\mathbb{Z}_K^{(i)} \subset \mathbb{Z}_K^{*M} \to \Gamma$ are all injective.*
2. *For such a quotient, a matrix model $\pi : C^*(\Gamma) \to M_K(\mathbb{C})$ is quasi-flat if and only if it is stationary on each subalgebra $C^*(\mathbb{Z}_K^{(i)}) \subset C^*(\Gamma)$.*

PROOF. The first assertion follows from Proposition 4.23. Regarding the second assertion, consider a matrix model $\pi : C^*(\Gamma) \to M_K(\mathbb{C})$, mapping $g_i \to U_i$, where g_i is the standard generator of $\mathbb{Z}_K^{(i)}$. With notations from the proof of Proposition 4.23, the images of the nonzero standard coordinates on $\widehat{\Gamma} \subset S_N^+$ are mapped as follows:

$$\pi : \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}(FV_i)_c \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}(FW_i)_c$$

Here $V_i = (g_i^a)_a$, $W_i = (U_i^a)_a$, and $F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}(w^{ab})_{ab}$ with $w = e^{2\pi i/K}$. With this formula in hand, the flatness condition on π simply states that we must have:

$$Tr((FW_i)_c) = \sqrt{K} \quad , \quad \forall i, \forall c$$

In terms of the trace vectors $T_i = (Tr(U_i^a))_a$ this condition becomes $FT_i = \sqrt{K}\xi$, where $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^K$ is the all-one vector. Thus we must have $T_i = \sqrt{K}F^*\xi$, which reads:

$$\begin{pmatrix} Tr(1) \\ Tr(U_i) \\ \vdots \\ Tr(U_i^{K-1}) \end{pmatrix} = \sqrt{K}F^* \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} K \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad \forall i$$

In other words, we have reached to the conclusion that π is flat precisely when its restrictions to each subalgebra $C^*(\mathbb{Z}_K^{(i)}) \subset C^*(\Gamma)$ are stationary, as claimed. □

We would like to end our study with a purely group-theoretical formulation of these results, and of some related questions, that we believe of interest. Let us start with:

Definition 4.25. *A discrete group Γ is called uniform when:*

(1) *Γ is finitely generated, $\Gamma =< g_1, \ldots, g_M >$.*
(2) *The generators $g_1, \ldots, g_M$ have common order $K < \infty$.*
(3) *Γ appears as an intermediate quotient $\mathbb{Z}_K^{*M} \to \Gamma \to \mathbb{Z}_K^M$.*
(4) *We have an action $S_M \curvearrowright \Gamma$, given by $\sigma(g_i) = g_{\sigma(i)}$.*

Here the conditions (1-3) basically come from [22], via Proposition 4.24 (1), and together with some extra considerations from [5], which prevent us from using groups of type $\Gamma = (\mathbb{Z}_K * \mathbb{Z}_K) \times \mathbb{Z}_K$, we are led to the condition (4) as well.

Observe that some of the above conditions are technically redundant, with (4) implying that the generators $g_1, \ldots, g_M$ have common order, as stated in (2), and also with (3) implying that the group is finitely generated, with the generators having finite order. We have as well the following notion, which is once again group-theoretical:

Definition 4.26. *If a discrete group Γ is uniform, as above, a unitary representation $\rho : \Gamma \to U_K$ is called quasi-flat when the eigenvalues of each*

$$U_i = \rho(g_i) \in U_K$$

are uniformly distributed.

To be more precise, assuming that $\Gamma =< g_1, \ldots, g_M >$ with $ord(g_i) = K$ is as in Definition 4.25, any unitary representation $\rho : \Gamma \to U_K$ is uniquely determined by the images $U_i = \rho(g_i) \in U_K$ of the standard generators. Now since each of these unitaries satisfies $U_i^K = 1$, its eigenvalues must be among the K-th roots of unity, and our quasi-flatness assumption states that each eigenvalue must appear with multiplicity 1.

With these notions in hand, we have the following result:

THEOREM 4.27. *If $\Gamma =< g_1, \ldots, g_M >$ is uniform, with $ord(g_i) = K$, a model*

$$\pi : C^*(\Gamma) \to M_K(C(X))$$

is quasi-flat precisely when the associated unitary representation

$$\rho : \Gamma \to C(X, U_K)$$

has quasi-flat fibers, in the sense of Definition 4.26.

PROOF. According to Proposition 4.24 (2), the model is quasi-flat precisely when the following compositions are all stationary:

$$\pi_i : C^*(\mathbb{Z}_K^{(i)}) \subset C^*(\Gamma) \to M_K(C(X))$$

On the other hand, as already observed in the proof of Proposition 4.24, a matrix model $\rho : C^*(\mathbb{Z}_K) \to M_K(C(X))$ is stationary precisely when the unitary $U = \rho(g)$, where g is the standard generator of $\mathbb{Z}_K$, satisfies the following condition:

$$\begin{pmatrix} tr(1) \\ tr(U) \\ \vdots \\ tr(U^{K-1}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus, such a model is stationary precisely when the eigenvalues of U are uniformly distributed, over the K-th roots of unity. We conclude that π is quasi-flat precisely when the eigenvalues of each $U_i = \rho(g_i)$ are uniformly distributed, as in Definition 4.26. □

We are interested now in the matrix models for the discrete group algebras, which are stationary. We use a lift of the quasi-flat models, in the following sense:

PROPOSITION 4.28. *The affine lift of the universal quasi-flat model for $C^*(\mathbb{Z}_K^{*M})$,*

$$\pi : C^*(\mathbb{Z}_K^{*M}) \to M_K(C(U_K^M))$$

is given on the canonical generator g_i of the i-th factor by

$$\pi(g_i)(U^1, \ldots, U^M) = \sum_j w^j P_{U^i_j}$$

where U^i_j is the j-th column of U^i and P_ξ denotes the orthogonal projection onto $\mathbb{C}\xi$.

PROOF. There is indeed a canonical quotient map $U_K \to E_K$, obtained by parametrizing the orthonormal bases of $\mathbb{C}^K$ by the unitary group U_K, and this gives the result. □

We know that the maximal group dual subgroups $\widehat{\Gamma} \subset S_N^+$ are the free products of type $\mathbb{Z}_{K_1} * \ldots * \mathbb{Z}_{K_M}$ with $K_1 + \ldots + K_M = N$. In the quasi-transitive case, where by definition $K_1 = \ldots = K_M = K$ with $K|N$, we have the following result, from [5]:

THEOREM 4.29. *The universal quasi-flat model for the group*

$$\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_K^{*M}$$

is inner faithful.

PROOF. It is enough to prove that the affine lift of the universal model in the statement is inner faithful. For this purpose, let us consider a reduced word $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_K^{*M}$, and write it as follows, with indices $i_t \neq i_{t+1}$, and with exponents $1 \leq k_t \leq K-1$:

$$\gamma = g_{i_1}^{k_1} \ldots g_{i_n}^{k_n}$$

With this convention, we have then the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\gamma)(U^1, \ldots, U^M) &= \sum_{j_1 \ldots j_n = 1}^{K} w^{k_1 j_1} P_{U^{i_1}_{j_1}} \ldots w^{k_n j_n} P_{U^{i_n}_{j_n}} \\ &= \sum_{j_1 \ldots j_n = 1}^{K} w^{<k,j>} P_{U^{i_1}_{j_1}} \ldots P_{U^{i_n}_{j_n}}\end{aligned}$$

Our aim is to prove that there is at least one sequence $(U^1, \ldots, U^M)$ for which the above matrix is not the identity. For this purpose, we use the following formula:

$$P_{\xi_1} \ldots P_{\xi_l}(x) = < x, \xi_l >< \xi_l, \xi_{l-1} > \ldots \ldots < \xi_2, \xi_1 > \xi_1$$

To compute the trace of this operator, we can consider any orthonormal basis containing ξ_l, yielding $< \xi_1, \xi_l >< \xi_l, \xi_{l-1} > \ldots \ldots < \xi_2, \xi_1 >$. Applying this to $\pi(\gamma)$ and using the equality $< U_i, V_j >= \sum_l U_{ki} \bar{V}_{kj} = (V^* U)_{ji}$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}tr \circ \pi(\gamma) &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j_1 \ldots j_n = 1}^{K} w^{<k,j>} < U^{i_1}_{j_1}, U^{i_n}_{j_n} >< U^{i_n}_{j_n}, U^{i_{n-1}}_{j_{n-1}} > \ldots < U^{i_2}_{j_2}, U^{i_1}_{j_1} > \\ &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j_1 \ldots j_n = 1}^{K} w^{<k,j>} (U^{i_n *} U^{i_1})_{j_n j_1} (U^{i_{n-1} *} U^{i_n})_{j_{n-1} j_n} \ldots (U^{i_1 *} U^{i_2})_{j_1 j_2}\end{aligned}$$

Denoting by W the diagonal matrix given by $W_{ij} = \delta_{ij} w^i$, we have:

$$\sum_{j_1} w^{k_1 j_1} U_{j_n j_1} U^*_{j_1 j_2} = \sum_{j_1 l} U_{j_n j_1} W^{k_1}_{j_1 l} U^*_{l j_2} = (U W^{k_1} U^*)_{j_n j_2}$$

Applying this n times in the above formula for $tr \circ \pi(\gamma)$ yields:

$$\begin{aligned}tr \circ \pi(\gamma) &= tr \left(U^{i_n *} U^{i_1} W^{k_1} U^{i_1 *} U^{i_2} W^{k_2} \ldots W^{k_{n-1}} U^{i_{n-1} *} U^{i_n} W^{k_n} \right) \\ &= tr \left(U^{i_1} W^{k_1} U^{i_1 *} \ldots U^{i_n} W^{k_n} U^{i_n *} \right)\end{aligned}$$

Assume now that $\pi(\gamma)(U^1,\ldots,U^M)=Id$ for all sequences of unitary matrices. The trace of a unitary matrix can only be equal to 1 if it is the identity, hence:

$$\prod_{p=1}^n U^{i_p}W^{k_p}U^{i_p*}=Id$$

In other words, the following noncommutative polynomial vanishes on U_K^M:

$$P=\prod_{p=1}^n X^{i_p}W^{k_p}X^{i_p*}-1$$

But this is clearly impossible if $k_t\neq 0(K)$ for all t, hence $\pi(\gamma)$ is not always the identity, and so our representation π is inner faithful, as desired. □

More generally now, we have the following result, also from [5]:

Theorem 4.30. *The universal quasi-flat model for the group*

$$\Gamma=\mathbb{Z}_K^{M_1}*\ldots*\mathbb{Z}_K^{M_n}$$

is inner faithful.

Proof. We can consider the space $U_K\times S_K^M$ as the affine lift of our model. If $g_1,\ldots,g_M$ are the canonical generators of the direct product, their action is then given by:

$$\pi(g_i)(U,\sigma_1,\ldots,\sigma_M)=\sum_{j=1}^K w^jP_{U_{\sigma_i^{-1}(j)}}=\sum_{j=1}^K w^{\sigma_i(j)}P_{U_j}$$

This gives the following formula for a general element:

$$\pi(g_1^{k_1}\ldots g_M^{k_M})(U,\sigma_1,\ldots,\sigma_M)=\sum_{j=1}^K w^{k_1\sigma_1(j)+\ldots+k_M\sigma_M(j)}P_{U_j}$$

Let $g_1(i),\ldots,g_{M_i}(i)$ be the generators of $\mathbb{Z}_K^{M_i}$, and let consider a reduced word:

$$\gamma=\left(g_1(i_1)^{k_1(1)}\ldots g_{M_{i_1}}(i_1)^{k_{M_{i_1}}(1)}\right)\ldots\left(g_1(i_n)^{k_1(n)}\ldots g_{M_{i_n}}(i_n)^{k_{M_{i_n}}(n)}\right)$$

The computation of $tr\circ\pi(\gamma)$ is then similar to the one in the proof of Theorem 4.29, until the introduction of the matrices W. Here we have to replace W^{k_t} by $\prod_{s=1}^{M_t}W_{\sigma_s^t}^{k_s(t)}$, where $(U^t,\sigma_1^t,\ldots,\sigma_{M_t}^t)_{1\leq t\leq n}$ is the element to which we are applying $\pi(\gamma)$, and:

$$(W_\sigma)_{ij}=\delta_{ij}w^{\sigma(i)}$$

Assuming that $\pi(\gamma)=1$, we can apply the same strategy as before. Indeed, we have a polynomial which must vanish on all sequences of unitary matrices, and this is impossible unless all the matrices appearing in the polynomial are the identity. Thus, we have:

$$\prod_{s=1}^{M_t} W_{\sigma_s^t}^{k_s(t)} = Id \quad , \quad \forall t$$

But this condition translates into the following condition:

$$\prod_{s=1}^{M_t} w^{\sigma_s^t(i) k_s(t)} = 1$$

We can sum the above equation over all permutations, and we obtain:

$$\frac{1}{(K!)^M} \sum_{\sigma_1,\ldots,\sigma_{M_i} \in S_K} w^{k_1(t)\sigma_1(i)+\ldots+k_{M_t}(t)\sigma_{M_t}(i)} = \frac{1}{(K!)^M} \prod_{s=1}^{M_t} \left(\sum_{\sigma_s \in S_K} w^{k_s(t)\sigma_s(i)} \right)$$

For any i', there are $(K-1)!$ permutations σ such that $\sigma_s(i) = i'$. This leads to:

$$\sum_{\sigma_s \in S_K} w^{k_s(t)\sigma_s(i)} = \sum_{i'=1}^{K} (K-1)! w^{k_s(t)i'} = K! \delta_{k_s(t),0}$$

Now by putting everything together, we obtain the following formula:

$$\prod_{s=1}^{M_i} \delta_{k_s(t),0} = 1$$

Thus $k_s(t) = 0$ for all t and all s, which is a contradiction, as desired. □

4e. Exercises

Exercises:

Exercise 4.31.

Exercise 4.32.

Exercise 4.33.

Exercise 4.34.

Exercise 4.35.

Exercise 4.36.

Exercise 4.37.

Exercise 4.38.

Bonus exercise.

Part II

Projective groups

I'm going to Jackson
I'm gonna mess around
Yeah, I'm going to Jackson
Look out Jackson town

CHAPTER 5

5a.

5b.

5c.

5d.

5e. Exercises

Exercises:

EXERCISE 5.1.

EXERCISE 5.2.

EXERCISE 5.3.

EXERCISE 5.4.

EXERCISE 5.5.

EXERCISE 5.6.

EXERCISE 5.7.

EXERCISE 5.8.

Bonus exercise.

CHAPTER 6

6a.

6b.

6c.

6d.

6e. Exercises

Exercises:

Exercise 6.1.

Exercise 6.2.

Exercise 6.3.

Exercise 6.4.

Exercise 6.5.

Exercise 6.6.

Exercise 6.7.

Exercise 6.8.

Bonus exercise.

CHAPTER 7

7a.

7b.

7c.

7d.

7e. Exercises

Exercises:

EXERCISE 7.1.

EXERCISE 7.2.

EXERCISE 7.3.

EXERCISE 7.4.

EXERCISE 7.5.

EXERCISE 7.6.

EXERCISE 7.7.

EXERCISE 7.8.

Bonus exercise.

CHAPTER 8

8a.

8b.

8c.

8d.

8e. Exercises

Exercises:

Exercise 8.1.

Exercise 8.2.

Exercise 8.3.

Exercise 8.4.

Exercise 8.5.

Exercise 8.6.

Exercise 8.7.

Exercise 8.8.

Bonus exercise.

Part III

Projective easiness

If it hadn't been for Cotton-Eye Joe
I'd been married long time ago
Where did you come from, where did you go
Where did you come from, Cotton-Eye Joe

CHAPTER 9

9a.

9b.

9c.

9d.

9e. Exercises

Exercises:

Exercise 9.1.

Exercise 9.2.

Exercise 9.3.

Exercise 9.4.

Exercise 9.5.

Exercise 9.6.

Exercise 9.7.

Exercise 9.8.

Bonus exercise.

CHAPTER 10

10a.

10b.

10c.

10d.

10e. Exercises

Exercises:

EXERCISE 10.1.

EXERCISE 10.2.

EXERCISE 10.3.

EXERCISE 10.4.

EXERCISE 10.5.

EXERCISE 10.6.

EXERCISE 10.7.

EXERCISE 10.8.

Bonus exercise.

CHAPTER 11

11a.

11b.

11c.

11d.

11e. Exercises

Exercises:

Exercise 11.1.

Exercise 11.2.

Exercise 11.3.

Exercise 11.4.

Exercise 11.5.

Exercise 11.6.

Exercise 11.7.

Exercise 11.8.

Bonus exercise.

CHAPTER 12

12a.

12b.

12c.

12d.

12e. Exercises

Exercises:

Exercise 12.1.

Exercise 12.2.

Exercise 12.3.

Exercise 12.4.

Exercise 12.5.

Exercise 12.6.

Exercise 12.7.

Exercise 12.8.

Bonus exercise.

Part IV

Analytic aspects

Come on let's twist again
Like we did last Summer
Yeah, let's twist again
Like we did last year

CHAPTER 13

13a.

13b.

13c.

13d.

13e. Exercises

Exercises:

Exercise 13.1.

Exercise 13.2.

Exercise 13.3.

Exercise 13.4.

Exercise 13.5.

Exercise 13.6.

Exercise 13.7.

Exercise 13.8.

Bonus exercise.

CHAPTER 14

14a.

14b.

14c.

14d.

14e. Exercises

Exercises:

Exercise 14.1.

Exercise 14.2.

Exercise 14.3.

Exercise 14.4.

Exercise 14.5.

Exercise 14.6.

Exercise 14.7.

Exercise 14.8.

Bonus exercise.

CHAPTER 15

15a.

15b.

15c.

15d.

15e. Exercises

Exercises:

EXERCISE 15.1.

EXERCISE 15.2.

EXERCISE 15.3.

EXERCISE 15.4.

EXERCISE 15.5.

EXERCISE 15.6.

EXERCISE 15.7.

EXERCISE 15.8.

Bonus exercise.

CHAPTER 16

16a.

16b.

16c.

16d.

16e. Exercises

Congratulations for having read this book, and no exercises for this final chapter.

Bibliography

[1] E. Abe, Hopf algebras, Cambridge Univ. Press (1980).

[2] N. Andruskiewitsch and J. Bichon, Examples of inner linear Hopf algebras, *Rev. Un. Mat. Argentina* **51** (2010), 7–18.

[3] N. Andruskiewitsch and H.J. Schneider, On the classification of finite-dimensional pointed Hopf algebras, *Ann. Math.* **171** (2010), 375–417.

[4] M.F. Atiyah, The geometry and physics of knots, Cambridge Univ. Press (1990).

[5] T. Banica, Introduction to quantum groups, Springer (2023).

[6] T. Banica, Principles of operator algebras (2025).

[7] T. Banica, Basic projective geometry (2025).

[8] T. Banica and J. Bichon, Quantum groups acting on 4 points, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **626** (2009), 74–114.

[9] T. Banica and J. Bichon, Hopf images and inner faithful representations, *Glasg. Math. J.* **52** (2010), 677–703.

[10] T. Banica and J. Bichon, Matrix models for noncommutative algebraic manifolds, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **95** (2017), 519–540.

[11] T. Banica, J. Bichon and B. Collins, The hyperoctahedral quantum group, *J. Ramanujan Math. Soc.* **22** (2007), 345–384.

[12] T. Banica, J. Bichon and S. Curran, Quantum automorphisms of twisted group algebras and free hypergeometric laws, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **139** (2011), 3961–3971.

[13] T. Banica, J. Bichon and S. Natale, Finite quantum groups and quantum permutation groups, *Adv. Math.* **229** (2012), 3320–3338.

[14] T. Banica and B. Collins, Integration over compact quantum groups, *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **43** (2007), 277–302.

[15] T. Banica and D. Goswami, Quantum isometries and noncommutative spheres, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **298** (2010), 343–356.

[16] T. Banica and I. Nechita, Flat matrix models for quantum permutation groups, *Adv. Appl. Math.* **83** (2017), 24–46.

[17] T. Banica and R. Speicher, Liberation of orthogonal Lie groups, *Adv. Math.* **222** (2009), 1461–1501.

[18] H. Bercovici and V. Pata, Stable laws and domains of attraction in free probability theory, *Ann. of Math.* **149** (1999), 1023–1060.

[19] J. Bhowmick, F. D'Andrea and L. Dabrowski, Quantum isometries of the finite noncommutative geometry of the standard model, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **307** (2011), 101–131.

[20] J. Bichon, The representation category of the quantum group of a non-degenerate bilinear form, *Comm. Algebra* **31** (2003), 4831–4851.

[21] J. Bichon, Free wreath product by the quantum permutation group, *Alg. Rep. Theory* **7** (2004), 343–362.

[22] J. Bichon, Corepresentation theory of universal cosovereign Hopf algebras, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **75** (2007), 83–98.

[23] J. Bichon, Algebraic quantum permutation groups, *Asian-Eur. J. Math.* **1** (2008), 1–13.

[24] J. Bichon, Half-liberated real spheres and their subspaces, *Colloq. Math.* **144** (2016), 273–287.

[25] J. Bichon, A. De Rijdt and S. Vaes, Ergodic coactions with large multiplicity and monoidal equivalence of quantum groups, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **262** (2006), 703–728.

[26] J. Bichon and M. Dubois-Violette, Half-commutative orthogonal Hopf algebras, *Pacific J. Math.* **263** (2013), 13–28.

[27] J. Bichon and M. Dubois-Violette, The quantum group of a preregular multilinear form, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **113** (2013), 455–468.

[28] J. Bichon and S. Natale, Hopf algebra deformations of binary polyhedral groups, *Transform. Groups* **16** (2011), 339–374.

[29] J. Bichon, S. Neshveyev and M. Yamashita, Graded twisting of comodule algebras and module categories, *J. Noncommut. Geom.* **12** (2018), 331–368.

[30] D. Bisch and V.F.R. Jones, Algebras associated to intermediate subfactors, *Invent. Math.* **128** (1997), 89–157.

[31] B. Blackadar, K-theory for operator algebras, Cambridge Univ. Press (1986).

[32] A.H. Chamseddine and A. Connes, The spectral action principle, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **186** (1997), 731–750.

[33] V. Chari and A. Pressley, A guide to quantum groups, Cambridge Univ. Press (1994).

[34] A. Chirvasitu, C. Walton and X. Wang, Gelfand-Kirillov dimension of cosemisimple Hopf algebras, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **147** (2019), 4665–4672.

[35] L.S. Cirio, A. D'Andrea, C. Pinzari and S. Rossi, Connected components of compact matrix quantum groups and finiteness conditions, *J. Funct. Anal.* **267** (2014), 3154–3204.

[36] B. Collins and P. Śniady, Integration with respect to the Haar measure on the unitary, orthogonal and symplectic group, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **264** (2006), 773–795.

[37] A. Connes, Noncommutative geometry, Academic Press (1994).

[38] A. Connes and M. Marcolli, Noncommutative geometry, quantum fields and motives, AMS (2008).

[39] A. D'Andrea, C. Pinzari and S. Rossi, Polynomial growth for compact quantum groups, topological dimension and *-regularity of the Fourier algebra, *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **67** (2017), 2003–2027.

[40] P. Deligne, Catégories tannakiennes, in "The Grothendieck Festschrift" (2007), 111–195.

[41] P. Di Francesco, Meander determinants, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **191** (1998), 543–583.

[42] S. Doplicher and J.E. Roberts, A new duality theory for compact groups, *Invent. Math.* **98** (1989), 157–218.

[43] V.G. Drinfeld, Quantum groups, Proc. ICM Berkeley (1986), 798–820.

[44] M. Enock and J.M. Schwartz, Kac algebras and duality of locally compact groups, Springer (1992).

[45] P. Etingof, S. Gelaki, D. Nikshych and V. Ostrik, Tensor categories, AMS (2016).

[46] L. Faddeev, Instructive history of the quantum inverse scattering method, *Acta Appl. Math.* **39** (1995), 69–84.

[47] L. Faddeev, N. Reshetikhin and L. Takhtadzhyan, Quantization of Lie groups and Lie algebras, *Leningrad Math. J.* **1** (1990), 193–225.

[48] R.P. Feynman, R.B. Leighton and M. Sands, The Feynman lectures on physics, Caltech (1963).

[49] P. Fima and L. Pittau, The free wreath product of a compact quantum group by a quantum automorphism group, *J. Funct. Anal.* **271** (2016), 1996–2043.

[50] W. Fulton and J. Harris, Representation theory, Springer (1991).

[51] D. Goswami, Quantum group of isometries in classical and noncommutative geometry, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **285** (2009), 141–160.

[52] J.M. Gracia-Bondía, J.C. Várilly and H. Figueroa, Elements of noncommutative geometry, Birkhäuser (2001).

[53] D.J. Griffiths and D.F. Schroeter, Introduction to quantum mechanics, Cambridge Univ. Press (2018).

[54] L.C. Grove, Classical groups and geometric algebra, AMS (2002).

[55] T. Halverson and A. Ram, Partition algebras, *European J. Combin.* **26** (2005), 869–921.

[56] J. Harris, Algebraic geometry, Springer (1992).

[57] M. Jimbo, A q-difference analog of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ and the Yang-Baxter equation, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **10** (1985), 63–69.

[58] V.F.R. Jones, Index for subfactors, *Invent. Math.* **72** (1983), 1–25.

[59] V.F.R. Jones, On knot invariants related to some statistical mechanical models, *Pacific J. Math.* **137** (1989), 311–334.

[60] V.F.R. Jones, Planar algebras I (1999).

[61] V.F.R. Jones, The annular structure of subfactors, *Monogr. Enseign. Math.* **38** (2001), 401–463.

[62] A. Joyal and R. Street, An introduction to Tannaka duality and quantum groups, in "Category theory, Como 1990", Springer (2006), 413–492.

[63] C. Kassel, Quantum groups, Springer (1995).

[64] A. Kirillov Jr., On an inner product in modular tensor categories, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **9** (1996), 1135–1169.

[65] J. Kustermans and S. Vaes, Locally compact quantum groups, *Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup.* **33** (2000), 837–934.

[66] G. Landi, An introduction to noncommutative spaces and their geometry, Springer (1997).

[67] S. Lang, Algebra, Addison-Wesley (1993).

[68] B. Lindstöm, Determinants on semilattices, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **20** (1969), 207–208.

[69] F. Lusztig, Introduction to quantum groups, Birkhäuser (1993).

[70] S. Majid, Foundations of quantum group theory, Cambridge Univ. Press (1995).

[71] S. Malacarne, Woronowicz's Tannaka-Krein duality and free orthogonal quantum groups, *Math. Scand.* **122** (2018), 151–160.

[72] Y.I. Manin, Quantum groups and noncommutative geometry, Springer (2018).

[73] V.A. Marchenko and L.A. Pastur, Distribution of eigenvalues in certain sets of random matrices, *Mat. Sb.* **72** (1967), 507–536.

[74] M.L. Mehta, Random matrices, Elsevier (1967).

[75] S. Montgomery, Hopf algebras and their actions on rings, AMS (1993).

[76] C. Mrozinski, Quantum groups of $GL(2)$ representation type, *J. Noncommut. Geom.* **8** (2014), 107–140.

[77] J. Nash, The imbedding problem for Riemannian manifolds, *Ann. of Math.* **63** (1956), 20–63.

[78] D.E. Radford, Hopf algebras, World Scientific (2011).

[79] S. Raum and M. Weber, The full classification of orthogonal easy quantum groups, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **341** (2016), 751–779.

[80] M. Rosso, Finite dimensional representations of the quantum analog of the enveloping algebra of a complex simple Lie algebra, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **117** (1988), 581–593.

[81] M. Rosso, Algèbres enveloppantes quantifiées, groupes quantiques compacts de matrices et calcul différentiel non commutatif, *Duke Math. J.* **61** (1990), 11–40.

[82] S. Schmidt, On the quantum symmetry groups of distance-transitive graphs, *Adv. Math.* **368** (2020), 1–43.

[83] J.P. Serre, Linear representations of finite groups, Springer (1977).

[84] I.R. Shafarevich, Basic algebraic geometry, Springer (1974).

[85] G.C. Shephard and J.A. Todd, Finite unitary reflection groups, *Canad. J. Math.* **6** (1954), 274–304.

[86] M.E. Sweedler, Hopf algebras, W.A. Benjamin (1969).

[87] P. Tarrago and J. Wahl, Free wreath product quantum groups and standard invariants of subfactors, *Adv. Math.* **331** (2018), 1–57.

[88] P. Tarrago and M. Weber, Unitary easy quantum groups: the free case and the group case, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **18** (2017), 5710–5750.

[89] S. Vaes and R. Vergnioux, The boundary of universal discrete quantum groups, exactness and factoriality, *Duke Math. J.* **140** (2007), 35–84.

[90] D.V. Voiculescu, K.J. Dykema and A. Nica, Free random variables, AMS (1992).

[91] J. von Neumann, Mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics, Princeton Univ. Press (1955).

[92] S. Wang, Quantum symmetry groups of finite spaces, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **195** (1998), 195–211.

[93] A. Wassermann, Coactions and Yang-Baxter equations for ergodic actions and subfactors, *London Math. Soc. Lect. Notes* **136** (1988), 203–236.

[94] S. Weinberg, Lectures on quantum mechanics, Cambridge Univ. Press (2012).

[95] H. Wenzl, C^*-tensor categories from quantum groups, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **11** (1998), 261–282.

[96] H. Weyl, The theory of groups and quantum mechanics, Princeton Univ. Press (1931).

[97] E. Wigner, Characteristic vectors of bordered matrices with infinite dimensions, *Ann. of Math.* **62** (1955), 548–564.

[98] E. Witten, Quantum field theory and the Jones polynomial, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **121** (1989), 351–399.

[99] S.L. Woronowicz, Compact matrix pseudogroups, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **111** (1987), 613–665.

[100] S.L. Woronowicz, Tannaka-Krein duality for compact matrix pseudogroups. Twisted SU(N) groups, *Invent. Math.* **93** (1988), 35–76.

Index