

# Invariant positive forms on generalized ( $q$ -)Weyl algebras.

Daniil Klyuev

## Plan:

- 1 Generalized Weyl and  $q$ -Weyl algebras. Formulation of a problem.
- 2 Quantizations and short star-products (Some slides provided by Pavel Etingof from his talk.)
- 3 Positivity conditions.

## Definition

Let  $P$  be a polynomial of degree  $n$ . A **generalized Weyl algebra** is an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  with generators  $u, v, z$  and relations  $[z, u] = -u$ ,  $[z, v] = v$ ,  $vu = P(z - \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $uv = P(z + \frac{1}{2})$ .

## Definition

Let  $P$  be a polynomial of degree  $n$ . A **generalized Weyl algebra** is an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  with generators  $u, v, z$  and relations  $[z, u] = -u$ ,  $[z, v] = v$ ,  $vu = P(z - \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $uv = P(z + \frac{1}{2})$ .

- ① If  $n = 1$ ,  $P(x) = x$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  is generated by  $u, v$  with relation  $[u, v] = 1$  and  $z = uv - \frac{1}{2} = vu + \frac{1}{2}$ .

## Definition

Let  $P$  be a polynomial of degree  $n$ . A **generalized Weyl algebra** is an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  with generators  $u, v, z$  and relations  $[z, u] = -u$ ,  $[z, v] = v$ ,  $vu = P(z - \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $uv = P(z + \frac{1}{2})$ .

- 1 If  $n = 1$ ,  $P(x) = x$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  is generated by  $u, v$  with relation  $[u, v] = 1$  and  $z = uv - \frac{1}{2} = vu + \frac{1}{2}$ .
- 2 If  $n = 2$ ,  $P(x) = x^2 + C$ , this is central reduction of  $U(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  with  $e = v$ ,  $f = -u$ ,  $h = 2z$ . The Casimir element is  $ef + fe + \frac{h^2}{2} = \frac{h^2}{2} + h + 2fe$ .

## Definition

Let  $P$  be a Laurent polynomial. A **generalized  $q$ -Weyl algebra** is an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  with generators  $u, v, Z$  and relations  $ZuZ^{-1} = q^2u$ ,  $ZvZ^{-1} = q^{-2}v$ ,  $uv = P(q^{-1}Z)$ ,  $vu = P(qZ)$ .

## Definition

Let  $P$  be a Laurent polynomial. A **generalized  $q$ -Weyl algebra** is an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  with generators  $u, v, Z$  and relations  $ZuZ^{-1} = q^2u$ ,  $ZvZ^{-1} = q^{-2}v$ ,  $uv = P(q^{-1}Z)$ ,  $vu = P(qZ)$ .

- 1 If  $P(x) = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  is generated by  $u^{\pm 1}, Z^{\pm 1}$  with relation  $Zu = q^2uZ$ , a  $q$ -Weyl algebra.

## Definition

Let  $P$  be a Laurent polynomial. A **generalized  $q$ -Weyl algebra** is an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  with generators  $u, v, Z$  and relations  $ZuZ^{-1} = q^2u$ ,  $ZvZ^{-1} = q^{-2}v$ ,  $uv = P(q^{-1}Z)$ ,  $vu = P(qZ)$ .

- 1 If  $P(x) = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  is generated by  $u^{\pm 1}, Z^{\pm 1}$  with relation  $Zu = q^2uZ$ , a  $q$ -Weyl algebra.
- 2 If  $P(x) = \frac{x+x^{-1}}{(q-q^{-1})^2}$  this is central reduction of  $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ :  $u = E$ ,  $v = F$ ,  $Z = K$ , the Casimir element is  $\Lambda = (q - q^{-1})^2 FE + qK + q^{-1}K^{-1}$ .



# Positive traces

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra with an antilinear involution  $\rho$ .

## Definition

A linear map  $T: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a **trace** if  $T(ab) = T(ba)$ . The trace is **positive** if  $T(a\rho(a)) > 0$  for nonzero  $a \in A$ .

# Positive traces

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra with an antilinear involution  $\rho$ .

## Definition

A linear map  $T: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a **trace** if  $T(ab) = T(ba)$ . The trace is **positive** if  $T(a\rho(a)) > 0$  for nonzero  $a \in A$ .

- When  $T$  is positive  $(a, b) = T(a\rho(b))$  is positive definite and  $(ab, c) = T(ab\rho(c)) = T(b\rho(c)a) = (b, c\rho(a))$ .

# Positive traces

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra with an antilinear involution  $\rho$ .

## Definition

A linear map  $T: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a **trace** if  $T(ab) = T(ba)$ . The trace is **positive** if  $T(a\rho(a)) > 0$  for nonzero  $a \in A$ .

- When  $T$  is positive  $(a, b) = T(a\rho(b))$  is positive definite and
$$(ab, c) = T(ab\rho(c)) = T(b\rho(c)a) = (b, c\rho(a)).$$
- For central reduction of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  this corresponds to spherical unitary representations of  $G$ :  $\mathcal{A}$  is a complexification of the corresponding  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module.

# Involution $\rho$ for generalized Weyl algebras

- Recall that  $\mathcal{A}$  is generated by  $u, v, z$  with  $[z, u] = -u$ ,  $[z, v] = v$ ,  $vu = P(z - \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $uv = P(z + \frac{1}{2})$ . We define

$$\rho(u) = v, \quad \rho(v) = u, \quad \rho(z) = -z.$$

# Involution $\rho$ for generalized Weyl algebras

- Recall that  $\mathcal{A}$  is generated by  $u, v, z$  with  $[z, u] = -u$ ,  $[z, v] = v$ ,  $vu = P(z - \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $uv = P(z + \frac{1}{2})$ . We define

$$\rho(u) = v, \quad \rho(v) = u, \quad \rho(z) = -z.$$

- $\rho$  is well-defined when  $P(x) = \overline{P(-x)}$ , hence the roots are symmetric wrt  $i\mathbb{R}$ .

# Involution $\rho$ for generalized Weyl algebras

- Recall that  $\mathcal{A}$  is generated by  $u, v, z$  with  $[z, u] = -u$ ,  $[z, v] = v$ ,  $vu = P(z - \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $uv = P(z + \frac{1}{2})$ . We define

$$\rho(u) = v, \quad \rho(v) = u, \quad \rho(z) = -z.$$

- $\rho$  is well-defined when  $P(x) = \overline{P(-x)}$ , hence the roots are symmetric wrt  $i\mathbb{R}$ .
- The problem: classify traces  $T$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $T(a\rho(a)) > 0$  for all nonzero  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ .

# Short star-products

## Definition

A ( $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -equivariant) **star-product** on  $A$  is an associative multiplication  $*$  :  $A \otimes A \rightarrow A$  such that for  $a \in A_n$  and  $b \in A_m$ ,

$$a * b = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n+m}{2} \rfloor} C_k(a, b),$$

where  $C_k : A_n \otimes A_m \rightarrow A_{n+m-2k}$  are bilinear maps such that  $C_0(a, b) = ab$

# Short star-products

## Definition

A ( $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -equivariant) **star-product** on  $A$  is an associative multiplication  $*$  :  $A \otimes A \rightarrow A$  such that for  $a \in A_n$  and  $b \in A_m$ ,

$$a * b = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n+m}{2} \rfloor} C_k(a, b),$$

where  $C_k : A_n \otimes A_m \rightarrow A_{n+m-2k}$  are bilinear maps such that  $C_0(a, b) = ab$

## Definition (Beem, Peelaers, Rastelli, 2016)

A star-product  $*$  on  $A$  is **short** if for any  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and any  $a \in A_n, b \in A_m$  one has

$$C_k(a, b) = 0, k > \min(n, m).$$

In other words,  $a * b$  has **no terms in  $A_d$  for  $d < |n - m|$** .



# Filtered deformations

- Let  $A$  be a commutative graded algebra. Fix a **filtered associative algebra**  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{d \geq 0} F_d \mathcal{A}$  such that its associated graded algebra is identified with the graded algebra  $A$ ; namely,

$$\text{gr} \mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} F_d \mathcal{A} / F_{d-1} \mathcal{A}$$

and  $F_d \mathcal{A} / F_{d-1} \mathcal{A} \cong A_d$  for  $d \geq 0$  (compatibly with multiplication) with  $F_{-1} \mathcal{A} := 0$ .

# Filtered deformations

- Let  $A$  be a commutative graded algebra. Fix a **filtered associative algebra**  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{d \geq 0} F_d \mathcal{A}$  such that its associated graded algebra is identified with the graded algebra  $A$ ; namely,

$$\text{gr} \mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} F_d \mathcal{A} / F_{d-1} \mathcal{A}$$

and  $F_d \mathcal{A} / F_{d-1} \mathcal{A} \cong A_d$  for  $d \geq 0$  (compatibly with multiplication) with  $F_{-1} \mathcal{A} := 0$ .

- Such  $\mathcal{A}$  is called **filtered deformation (quantization)** of  $A$ .

# Filtered deformations

- Let  $A$  be a commutative graded algebra. Fix a **filtered associative algebra**  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{d \geq 0} F_d \mathcal{A}$  such that its associated graded algebra is identified with the graded algebra  $A$ ; namely,

$$\text{gr} \mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} F_d \mathcal{A} / F_{d-1} \mathcal{A}$$

and  $F_d \mathcal{A} / F_{d-1} \mathcal{A} \cong A_d$  for  $d \geq 0$  (compatibly with multiplication) with  $F_{-1} \mathcal{A} := 0$ .

- Such  $\mathcal{A}$  is called **filtered deformation (quantization)** of  $A$ .
- For example, when  $\mathcal{A}$  is a generalized Weyl algebra,  $\text{gr} \mathcal{A}$  is isomorphic to  $A = \mathbb{C}[u, v, z] / (uv - z^n)$ , **Kleinian singularity of type A**. Each deformation of  $A$  is isomorphic to a GWA with parameter  $P$  of degree  $n$ .

# Bijection between star-products and quantization maps

Given a quantization map  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ , we can define the star-product on  $A$  by

$$a * b := \phi^{-1}(\phi(a)\phi(b)).$$

# Bijection between star-products and quantization maps

Given a quantization map  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ , we can define the star-product on  $A$  by

$$a * b := \phi^{-1}(\phi(a)\phi(b)).$$

Conversely, given a star-product on  $A$ , we can set  $\mathcal{A} := (A, *)$  with the filtration induced by the grading, and  $\phi := \text{Id}$ .

# Bijection between star-products and quantization maps

Given a quantization map  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ , we can define the star-product on  $A$  by

$$a * b := \phi^{-1}(\phi(a)\phi(b)).$$

Conversely, given a star-product on  $A$ , we can set  $\mathcal{A} := (A, *)$  with the filtration induced by the grading, and  $\phi := \text{Id}$ .

## Lemma

*This defines a pair of mutually inverse bijections between star-products on  $A$  and ( $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -equivariant) quantizations of  $A$  equipped with a quantization map.*

# Positivity condition.

- A short star-product is **positive** if  $C_k(a, \rho(a)) > 0$  for all nonzero  $a$  of degree  $k$ .

# Positivity condition.

- A short star-product is **positive** if  $C_k(a, \rho(a)) > 0$  for all nonzero  $a$  of degree  $k$ .
- It follows from the results in Etingof-Stryker that there is a bijection between positive short star-products and pairs  $(\mathcal{A}, T)$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a filtered deformation of  $A$  and  $T$  is a positive trace.



# Positivity condition.

- A short star-product is **positive** if  $C_k(a, \rho(a)) > 0$  for all nonzero  $a$  of degree  $k$ .
- It follows from the results in Etingof-Stryker that there is a bijection between positive short star-products and pairs  $(\mathcal{A}, T)$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a filtered deformation of  $A$  and  $T$  is a positive trace.
- This is a physical motivation for considering positive traces. Beem, Peelaers and Rastelli tried to compute positive short star-products on Kleinian singularities of type  $A$ .

# The answer

- Let  $\alpha$  be a root of  $P(x)$ . We say that  $\alpha$  is **good** if  $|\operatorname{Re} \alpha| < \frac{1}{2}$ .

# The answer

- Let  $\alpha$  be a root of  $P(x)$ . We say that  $\alpha$  is **good** if  $|\operatorname{Re} \alpha| < \frac{1}{2}$ .
- Assume for simplicity that there are no roots of  $P$  with  $\operatorname{Re} \alpha = \pm \frac{1}{2}$ . Then

## Proposition

*Let  $k$  be the number of good roots. Then the dimension of the cone of positive traces modulo scaling is  $k - 4$  if  $n$  is divisible by 4 and  $k - 2$  otherwise.*

# The answer

- Let  $\alpha$  be a root of  $P(x)$ . We say that  $\alpha$  is **good** if  $|\operatorname{Re} \alpha| < \frac{1}{2}$ .
- Assume for simplicity that there are no roots of  $P$  with  $\operatorname{Re} \alpha = \pm \frac{1}{2}$ . Then

## Proposition

*Let  $k$  be the number of good roots. Then the dimension of the cone of positive traces modulo scaling is  $k - 4$  if  $n$  is divisible by 4 and  $k - 2$  otherwise.*

- For example, for  $n = 2$  a positive trace is unique and exists when  $P(x) = x^2 + C$  satisfies  $C > -\frac{1}{4}$ . If  $C \geq 0$  we get spherical principal series representations, if  $-\frac{1}{2} < C < 0$  we get complementary series representations.

# Case of $q$ -Weyl algebras

- Suppose that  $\mathcal{A}$  is generalized  $q$ -Weyl algebra. Then  $\rho(u) = v$ ,  $\rho(v) = u$ ,  $\rho(Z) = Z^{-1}$  and  $P(x)$  is real on unit circle.

# Case of $q$ -Weyl algebras

- Suppose that  $\mathcal{A}$  is generalized  $q$ -Weyl algebra. Then  $\rho(u) = v$ ,  $\rho(v) = u$ ,  $\rho(Z) = Z^{-1}$  and  $P(x)$  is real on unit circle.
- There is a similar notion of good roots ( $q < |\alpha| < q^{-1}$ ), but the answer is always  $k - 1$ .

- Let  $M$  be an  $\mathcal{A} - \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ -bimodule. For any  $P$  we can define  $\rho$  in the same way:  $\rho(u) = v$ ,  $\rho(v) = u$ ,  $\rho(z) = -z$ .





- Let  $M$  be an  $\mathcal{A} - \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ -bimodule. For any  $P$  we can define  $\rho$  in the same way:  $\rho(u) = v, \rho(v) = u, \rho(z) = -z$ .
- Such  $M$  exists when for each root  $\alpha_i$  of  $P$  have  $2 \operatorname{Re} \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  or  $\alpha_i + \overline{\alpha_j} \in \mathbb{Z}$ .



- Let  $M$  be an  $\mathcal{A} - \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ -bimodule. For any  $P$  we can define  $\rho$  in the same way:  $\rho(u) = v$ ,  $\rho(v) = u$ ,  $\rho(z) = -z$ .
- Such  $M$  exists when for each root  $\alpha_i$  of  $P$  have  $2 \operatorname{Re} \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  or  $\alpha_i + \overline{\alpha_j} \in \mathbb{Z}$ .
- Let us rewrite the definition of good root: instead of  $|\operatorname{Re} \alpha_i| < \frac{1}{2}$  write  $-1 < \alpha_i - \alpha_j < 1$ . Then it works in this case.

- Let  $M$  be an  $\mathcal{A} - \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ -bimodule. For any  $P$  we can define  $\rho$  in the same way:  $\rho(u) = v$ ,  $\rho(v) = u$ ,  $\rho(z) = -z$ .
- Such  $M$  exists when for each root  $\alpha_i$  of  $P$  have  $2 \operatorname{Re} \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  or  $\alpha_i + \overline{\alpha_j} \in \mathbb{Z}$ .
- Let us rewrite the definition of good root: instead of  $|\operatorname{Re} \alpha_i| < \frac{1}{2}$  write  $-1 < \alpha_i - \alpha_j < 1$ . Then it works in this case.
- The answer is the same: number of good roots minus a constant from 1 to 4.

- Let  $M$  be an  $\mathcal{A} - \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ -bimodule. For any  $P$  we can define  $\rho$  in the same way:  $\rho(u) = v$ ,  $\rho(v) = u$ ,  $\rho(z) = -z$ .
- Such  $M$  exists when for each root  $\alpha_i$  of  $P$  have  $2 \operatorname{Re} \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  or  $\alpha_i + \overline{\alpha_j} \in \mathbb{Z}$ .
- Let us rewrite the definition of good root: instead of  $|\operatorname{Re} \alpha_i| < \frac{1}{2}$  write  $-1 < \alpha_i - \alpha_j < 1$ . Then it works in this case.
- The answer is the same: number of good roots minus a constant from 1 to 4.
- The story when  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $q$ -deformation is similar.

-  C. Beem, W. Peelaers, L. Rastelli, Deformation quantization and superconformal symmetry in three dimensions, arXiv:1601.05378.
-  P. Etingof, D. Stryker, Short Star-Products for Filtered Quantizations, I, SIGMA 16 (2020), 014.
-  D. Klyuev, On Unitarizable Harish-Chandra Bimodules for Deformations of Type-A Kleinian Singularities, IMRN 2023, 3
-  P. Etingof, D. Klyuev, E. Rains, D. Stryker, Twisted Traces and Positive Forms on Quantized Kleinian Singularities of Type A, SIGMA 17 (2021), 029
-  D. Klyuev. Twisted traces and positive forms on generalized  $q$ -Weyl algebras. SIGMA 18 (2022), 009
-  D. Klyuev. Unitarizability of Harish-Chandra bimodules over generalized Weyl and  $q$ -Weyl algebras, in preparation

Thank you!

- Thank you!

# Computation of traces

We will restrict our attention to the case of even  $n$  for convenience. In this case  $s = \text{id}$ . An easy computation shows that the space of traces on  $\mathcal{A}$  is isomorphic to  $V^*$ , where

$$V = \mathbb{C}[x]/\{P(x+1)S(x+1) - P(x-1)S(x-1) \mid S \in \mathbb{C}[x]\}$$

# Computation of traces

We will restrict our attention to the case of even  $n$  for convenience. In this case  $s = \text{id}$ . An easy computation shows that the space of traces on  $\mathcal{A}$  is isomorphic to  $V^*$ , where

$$V = \mathbb{C}[x]/\{P(x+1)S(x+1) - P(x-1)S(x-1) \mid S \in \mathbb{C}[x]\}$$

Suppose that  $\phi \in V^*$ . We have  $\mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{A}_m$  — an eigenspace of  $\text{ad } z$  decomposition. The corresponding trace  $T$  acts as follows: if  $a \in \mathcal{A}_m$ ,  $m \neq 0$ , then  $T(a) = 0$ . If  $a \in \mathcal{A}_0 = \mathbb{C}[h]$  then  $a = R(h)$  and  $T(a) = \phi(R)$ .

# Analytic formula.

Suppose that all roots of  $P(x)$  belong to **the open strip  $|\operatorname{Re} x| < 1$** .  
Then there is the following formula:

$$T(R) = \int_{i\mathbb{R}} R(x)w(x)dx,$$

where  $w(x) = \frac{Q(e^{i\pi x})}{P(e^{i\pi x})}$ ,  $P(x) = \prod_{P(\alpha)=0} (x + e^{i\pi\alpha})$ .



# Analytic formula.

Suppose that all roots of  $P(x)$  belong to **the open strip  $|\operatorname{Re} x| < 1$** .  
Then there is the following formula:

$$T(R) = \int_{i\mathbb{R}} R(x)w(x)dx,$$

where  $w(x) = \frac{Q(e^{i\pi x})}{\mathcal{P}(e^{i\pi x})}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}(x) = \prod_{P(\alpha)=0} (x + e^{i\pi\alpha})$ . Recall that a trace  $T$  is positive if and only if

$$T(S(x)\overline{S(-x)}) > 0$$

and

$$T(\pm S(1-x)\overline{S(x-1)}P(x-1)) < 0$$

# Analytic formula.

Suppose that all roots of  $P(x)$  belong to **the open strip  $|\operatorname{Re} x| < 1$** .  
Then there is the following formula:

$$T(R) = \int_{i\mathbb{R}} R(x)w(x)dx,$$

where  $w(x) = \frac{Q(e^{i\pi x})}{\mathcal{P}(e^{i\pi x})}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}(x) = \prod_{P(\alpha)=0} (x + e^{i\pi\alpha})$ . Recall that a trace  $T$  is positive if and only if

$$T(S(x)\overline{S(-x)}) > 0$$

and

$$T(\pm S(1-x)\overline{S(x-1)}P(x-1)) < 0$$

Condition  $T(S(x)\overline{S(-x)}) > 0$  translates to  $w(x) \geq 0$  on  $i\mathbb{R}$ ,  
similarly for the second condition we get  $\pm w(x+1)P(x) \leq 0$  on  $i\mathbb{R}$ .

It follows shortly that the cone of positive forms is **isomorphic to the cone of nonnegative polynomials** of degree  $d \leq d_0$  for certain  $d_0$ .

# Analytic formula, ctd.

It follows shortly that the cone of positive forms is **isomorphic to the cone of nonnegative polynomials** of degree  $d \leq d_0$  for certain  $d_0$ .

In the case when not all roots of  $P(x)$  belong to  $|\operatorname{Re} x| < 1$  analytic formulas for traces become harder: instead of  $i\mathbb{R}$  we should take slightly **different contour**.

# Analytic formula, ctd.

It follows shortly that the cone of positive forms is **isomorphic to the cone of nonnegative polynomials** of degree  $d \leq d_0$  for certain  $d_0$ .

In the case when not all roots of  $P(x)$  belong to  $|\operatorname{Re} x| < 1$  analytic formulas for traces become harder: instead of  $i\mathbb{R}$  we should take slightly **different contour**.

It can be proved that roots  $x$  with  $|\operatorname{Re} x| > 1$  **do not change the cone of positive forms**, and each pair of roots  $x \pm 1$  with  $\operatorname{Re} x = 0$  **multiplies the cone by  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$** : there exists trace  $R \mapsto R(x)$ .