### The Baum-Connes conjecture and quantum groups

Christian Voigt

University of Glasgow christian.voigt@glasgow.ac.uk http://www.maths.gla.ac.uk/~cvoigt/index.xhtml

KK-theory and homotopy theory January 9th, 2025

# The Baum-Connes conjecture

<□ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Let G be a second countable locally compact group. The *Baum-Connes* conjecture asserts that the assembly map

$$\mu: K^{top}_*(G) \to K_*(C^*_\mathsf{r}(G))$$

is an isomorphism.

Here

$$K^{top}_*(G) = K^G_*(\mathcal{E}G) = \varinjlim_{X \subset \mathcal{E}G, \overline{X} \text{ $G$-compact}} KK^G_*(C_0(X), \mathbb{C})$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三■ - のへぐ

is the equivariant K-homology of the universal proper G-space.

The conjecture is true in many cases - no counterexample is known.

Let G be a second countable locally compact group. The *Baum-Connes* conjecture asserts that the assembly map

$$\mu: K^{top}_*(G) \to K_*(C^*_\mathsf{r}(G))$$

is an isomorphism.

Here

$$K^{top}_*(G) = K^G_*(\mathcal{E}G) = \varinjlim_{X \subset \mathcal{E}G, \overline{X} \text{ $G$-compact}} KK^G_*(C_0(X), \mathbb{C})$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三■ - のへぐ

is the equivariant K-homology of the universal proper G-space.

The conjecture is true in many cases - no counterexample is known.

What happens if G is a locally compact *quantum* group?

# The framework

・ロト・4日・4日・4日・日・900

Meyer and Nest reformulated the Baum-Connes conjecture using the language of triangulated categories and derived functors (2004, 2006). This yields

- ▶ a better understanding of the (classical) conjecture
- ▶ a framework to define and study assembly maps in other situations

In fact, one of the motivations for their work was to extend the Baum-Connes machinery to the realm of quantum groups.

Based on their approach, Meyer and Nest formulated and proved an analogue of the Baum-Connes conjecture for duals of compact groups (2007).

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

# Equivariant Kasparov theory

▲ロト ▲御 ト ▲ 臣 ト ▲ 臣 ト ○ 包 へ ()

Let G be a locally compact group.

Equivariant Kasparov theory defines an additive category KK<sup>G</sup>, with

- objects all separable G- $C^*$ -algebras
- morphism sets the bivariant Kasparov K-groups  $KK^G(A, B)$
- the composition of morphisms

$$KK^{G}(A, B) \times KK^{G}(B, C) \to KK^{G}(A, C)$$

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆三 ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ◆ ●

given by Kasparov product.

▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶ □ のへで

The category  $KK^G$  is triangulated - this allows one to do homological algebra.

A triangulated category is an additive category togther with a translation functor and a class of exact triangles satisfying certain axioms.

In the case of  $KK^G$ , we have that

- the (inverse of the) suspension  $\Sigma A = C_0(\mathbb{R}) \otimes A$  yields the translation functor.
- the exact triangles are all diagrams in KK<sup>G</sup> isomorphic to mapping cone triangles

$$\Sigma B \to C_f \to A \to B$$

for equivariant \*-homomorphisms  $f : A \rightarrow B$ .

Every extension  $0 \rightarrow I \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow 0$  of G- $C^*$ -algebras with a G-equivariant completely positive contractive linear splitting defines an exact triangle.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □ ● ● ● ●

A G- $C^*$ -algebra is called *compactly induced* if it is of the form  $\operatorname{ind}_H^G(B)$  for an H- $C^*$ -algebra B and some compact subgroup  $H \subset G$ .

Here the induced G- $C^*$ -algebra is defined as

$$\operatorname{ind}_{H}^{G}(B) = \{ f \in C_{0}(G, B) \mid f(th) = h \cdot f(t) \text{ for all } h \in H \} \subset C_{0}(G, B),$$

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆三 ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ◆ ●

equipped with the G-action  $(g \cdot f)(t) = f(g^{-1}t)$ .

A G- $C^*$ -algebra is called *compactly induced* if it is of the form  $\operatorname{ind}_H^G(B)$  for an H- $C^*$ -algebra B and some compact subgroup  $H \subset G$ .

Here the induced G- $C^*$ -algebra is defined as

$$\operatorname{ind}_{H}^{G}(B) = \{ f \in C_{0}(G, B) \mid f(th) = h \cdot f(t) \text{ for all } h \in H \} \subset C_{0}(G, B),$$

equipped with the *G*-action  $(g \cdot f)(t) = f(g^{-1}t)$ .

A G- $C^*$ -algebra A is called *compactly contractible* if  $\operatorname{res}_H^G(A) \cong 0 \in KK^H$  for every compact subgroup  $H \subset G$ .

We write  $\langle CI \rangle$  for the *localising subcategory* of  $KK^G$  generated by all compactly induced algebras and CC for the full subcategory of all compactly contractible algebras. The category CC is automatically localising.

<□ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Let G be a locally compact group.

- A morphism  $f : A \to B$  in  $KK^G$  is a weak equivalence if  $\operatorname{res}_H^G(f)$  is an isomorphism in  $KK^H(A, B)$  for all compact subgroups  $H \subset G$ .
- A  $\langle \mathcal{CI} \rangle$ -simplicial approximation of a G- $C^*$ -algebra A is a weak equivalence  $\tilde{A} \to A$  with  $\tilde{A} \in \langle \mathcal{CI} \rangle$ .

#### Theorem (Meyer-Nest 2006)

For every  $A \in KK^G$  there exists a  $\langle CI \rangle$ -simplicial approximation  $\tilde{A}$ , unique up to isomorphism. This fits into an exact triangle

$$\Sigma N \to \tilde{A} \to A \to N,$$

called Dirac triangle, with  $N \in CC$ .

### The Baum-Connes conjecture

#### Definition

Let A be a  $G\text{-}C^*\text{-}algebra.$  Then G satisfy the Baum-Connes conjecture with coefficients in A if the map

```
K_*(G \ltimes_{\mathsf{r}} \tilde{A}) \to K_*(G \ltimes_{\mathsf{r}} A)
```

is an isomorphism.

Theorem (Meyer-Nest 2006)

This is equivalent to the usual formulation of the Baum-Connes conjecture.

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆三 ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ◆ ●

### The Baum-Connes conjecture

### Definition

Let A be a  $G\text{-}C^*\text{-}\mathsf{algebra}.$  Then G satisfy the Baum-Connes conjecture with coefficients in A if the map

```
K_*(G \ltimes_{\mathsf{r}} \tilde{A}) \to K_*(G \ltimes_{\mathsf{r}} A)
```

is an isomorphism.

Theorem (Meyer-Nest 2006)

This is equivalent to the usual formulation of the Baum-Connes conjecture.

#### Definition

The group G satisfy the strong Baum-Connes conjecture if  $\langle CI \rangle = KK^G$ .

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆三 ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ◆ ●

### Definition

Let A be a  $G\text{-}C^*\text{-}algebra.$  Then G satisfy the Baum-Connes conjecture with coefficients in A if the map

```
K_*(G \ltimes_{\mathsf{r}} \tilde{A}) \to K_*(G \ltimes_{\mathsf{r}} A)
```

is an isomorphism.

Theorem (Meyer-Nest 2006)

This is equivalent to the usual formulation of the Baum-Connes conjecture.

#### Definition

The group G satisfy the strong Baum-Connes conjecture if  $\langle CI \rangle = KK^G$ .

Theorem (Higson-Kasparov 2001)

If G has the Haagerup property (is a-T-menable) then G satisfies the strong Baum-Connes conjecture.

# What is... a quantum group?

・ロト・日本・山下・ 山下・ 日・ うへの

Different people will give different answers...

Different people will give different answers...

The term "quantum group" is typically used for quantized universal enveloping algebras. These originate from the study of the quantum inverse scattering method developed in the 1980's (Faddev-Reshetikhin-Takhtajan, Drinfeld-Jimbo and others).

\*ロ \* \* @ \* \* ミ \* ミ \* ・ ミ \* の < @

In this context, quantum groups are certain (classes of) Hopf algebras.

Different people will give different answers...

The term "quantum group" is typically used for quantized universal enveloping algebras. These originate from the study of the quantum inverse scattering method developed in the 1980's (Faddev-Reshetikhin-Takhtajan, Drinfeld-Jimbo and others).

In this context, quantum groups are certain (classes of) Hopf algebras.

Independently, at around the same time, Woronowicz introduced the quantum group  $SU_q(2)$  and developed the theory of (what is now called) compact quantum groups.

The general definition of a *locally compact* quantum group was later given by Kustermans and Vaes.

▲□▶▲□▶▲目▶▲目▶ 目 のへで

If G is a locally compact *abelian* group, then the dual of G is the group  $\hat{G}$  of all continuous group homomorphisms  $\chi: G \to U(1) \subset \mathbb{C}$ .

## Pontrjagin duality

If G is a locally compact *abelian* group, then the dual of G is the group  $\hat{G}$  of all continuous group homomorphisms  $\chi: G \to U(1) \subset \mathbb{C}$ .

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆三 ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ◆ ●

Theorem (Pontrjagin duality)

The dual group of  $\hat{G}$  is canonically isomorphic to G.

## Pontrjagin duality

If G is a locally compact *abelian* group, then the dual of G is the group  $\hat{G}$  of all continuous group homomorphisms  $\chi: G \to U(1) \subset \mathbb{C}$ .

### Theorem (Pontrjagin duality)

The dual group of  $\hat{G}$  is canonically isomorphic to G.

#### Example

The compact group  $G = S^1$  is Pontrjagin dual to the discrete group  $\widehat{G} = \mathbb{Z}$ . Using  $C^*$ -algebras this can be expressed via the isomorphisms

$$C(S^1) = C^*(\mathbb{Z}), \qquad C^*(S^1) \cong C_0(\mathbb{Z}),$$

・ロト ・ 戸 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・ うへつ

given by Fourier transformation.

## Pontrjagin duality

If G is a locally compact *abelian* group, then the dual of G is the group  $\hat{G}$  of all continuous group homomorphisms  $\chi: G \to U(1) \subset \mathbb{C}$ .

### Theorem (Pontrjagin duality)

The dual group of  $\hat{G}$  is canonically isomorphic to G.

#### Example

The compact group  $G = S^1$  is Pontrjagin dual to the discrete group  $\widehat{G} = \mathbb{Z}$ . Using  $C^*$ -algebras this can be expressed via the isomorphisms

$$C(S^1) = C^*(\mathbb{Z}), \qquad C^*(S^1) \cong C_0(\mathbb{Z}),$$

given by Fourier transformation.

In the spirit of noncommutative topology, if G is a (possibly nonabelian) locally compact group, the correct replacement for the pair of Pontrjagin dual (quantum) groups should be  $C_0(G)$  and  $C^*(G)$ .

# Locally compact quantum groups

▲ロト ▲御 ト ▲ 臣 ト ▲ 臣 ト ○ 包 へ ()

- Duality for compact groups Tannaka (1938)
- ► Kac algebras Kac-Vainerman, Enock-Schwartz (1973)
- $SU_q(2)$  and compact quantum groups Woronowicz (1987)
- Examples of and constructions with locally compact quantum groups -Woronowicz and others (since 1990)

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆三 ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ◆ ●

Duality for compact groups - Tannaka (1938)

- ► Kac algebras Kac-Vainerman, Enock-Schwartz (1973)
- $SU_q(2)$  and compact quantum groups Woronowicz (1987)
- Examples of and constructions with locally compact quantum groups -Woronowicz and others (since 1990)

#### Definition (Kustermans-Vaes 1999)

A locally compact quantum group is a  $C^*$ -algebra H together with a comultiplication  $\Delta: H \to M(H \otimes H)$  and left and right Haar integrals.

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆三 ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ◆ ●

# Compact quantum groups

▲□▶▲□▶▲目▶▲目▶ 目 のへで

### Definition (Woronowicz)

A compact quantum group is given by a unital  $C^*\text{-algebra}\ S$  together with a unital \*-homomorphism  $\Delta:S\to S\otimes S$  such that

$$S \xrightarrow{\Delta} S \otimes S$$

$$\downarrow_{\Delta} \qquad \qquad \downarrow_{\operatorname{id} \otimes \Delta}$$

$$S \otimes S \xrightarrow{\Delta \otimes \operatorname{id}} S \otimes S \otimes S$$

is commutative and

$$\Delta(S)(1\otimes S), \qquad (S\otimes 1)\Delta(S)$$

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆三 ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ◆ ●

are dense subspaces of  $S \otimes S$ .

#### Definition (Woronowicz)

A compact quantum group is given by a unital  $C^*\text{-algebra}\ S$  together with a unital \*-homomorphism  $\Delta:S\to S\otimes S$  such that

$$S \xrightarrow{\Delta} S \otimes S$$

$$\downarrow_{\Delta} \qquad \qquad \downarrow_{\operatorname{id} \otimes \Delta}$$

$$S \otimes S \xrightarrow{\Delta \otimes \operatorname{id}} S \otimes S \otimes S$$

is commutative and

$$\Delta(S)(1\otimes S), \qquad (S\otimes 1)\Delta(S)$$

are dense subspaces of  $S \otimes S$ .

Every compact quantum group has a unique state  $\phi$ , called *Haar integral*, satisfying

$$(\phi \otimes \mathrm{id})\Delta(x) = \phi(x)\mathbf{1} = (\mathrm{id} \otimes \phi)\Delta(x).$$

\*ロ \* \* @ \* \* ミ \* ミ \* ・ ミ \* の < @

# Example: Compact groups

▲□▶▲□▶▲目▶▲目▶ 目 のへで

• If G is a compact group then S = C(G) is a compact quantum group.

The comultiplication  $\Delta: C(G) \to C(G) \otimes C(G) = C(G \times G)$  is given by  $\Delta(f)(s,t) = f(st).$ 

The Haar integral is given by integration with respect to (normalised) Haar measure.

\*ロ \* \* @ \* \* ミ \* ミ \* ・ ミ \* の < @

• Every compact quantum group for which S is a commutative  $C^*$ -algebra is of this form.

# Example: Discrete groups

▲ロト ▲御 ト ▲ 臣 ト ▲ 臣 ト ○ 包 へ ()
# Example: Discrete groups

• If G is a discrete group then  $S = C_r^*(G)$  is a compact quantum group.

The comultiplication  $\Delta: C^*_{\mathsf{r}}(G) \to C^*_{\mathsf{r}}(G) \otimes C^*_{\mathsf{r}}(G)$  is given by

$$\Delta(s) = s \otimes s$$

for  $s \in G \subset \mathbb{C}G \subset C^*_r(G)$ .

The Haar integral is given by

$$\phi(x) = \langle \delta_e, x \delta_e \rangle$$

for  $x \in C^*_{\mathsf{r}}(G) \subset B^2(L^2(G))$ .

- ▶ In a similar way  $S = C_f^*(G)$  is a compact quantum group.
- Every compact quantum group which is *cocommutative* is (essentially) of this form.

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▶ = ● ●

# Example: The quantum group $SU_q(2)$

<ロ> < 団> < 団> < 三> < 三> < 三</p>

Fix  $q \in [-1,1] \setminus \{0\}$ .

#### Definition (Woronowicz 1987)

The  $C^*\text{-algebra}\ C(SU_q(2))$  is the universal  $C^*\text{-algebra}$  generated by elements  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  satisfying the relations

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha\gamma = q\gamma\alpha, \quad \alpha\gamma^* = q\gamma^*\alpha, \quad \gamma\gamma^* = \gamma^*\gamma, \\ &\alpha^*\alpha + \gamma^*\gamma = 1, \quad \alpha\alpha^* + q^2\gamma\gamma^* = 1. \end{aligned}$$

These relations are equivalent to saying that the fundamental matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} lpha & -q\gamma^* \ \gamma & lpha^* \end{pmatrix}$$

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▶ = ● ●

is unitary.

The comultiplication  $\Delta: C(SU_q(2)) \rightarrow C(SU_q(2)) \otimes C(SU_q(2))$  is defined by

$$\Delta \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -q\gamma^* \\ \gamma & \alpha^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -q\gamma^* \\ \gamma & \alpha^* \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -q\gamma^* \\ \gamma & \alpha^* \end{pmatrix},$$

using "matrix multiplication", that is,

$$\Delta(\alpha) = \alpha \otimes \alpha - q\gamma^* \otimes \gamma$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲臣▶ ▲臣▶ 三臣 - のへで

and similarly for the other generators.

The comultiplication  $\Delta: C(SU_q(2)) \rightarrow C(SU_q(2)) \otimes C(SU_q(2))$  is defined by

$$\Delta \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -q\gamma^* \\ \gamma & \alpha^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -q\gamma^* \\ \gamma & \alpha^* \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -q\gamma^* \\ \gamma & \alpha^* \end{pmatrix},$$

using "matrix multiplication", that is,

$$\Delta(\alpha) = \alpha \otimes \alpha - q\gamma^* \otimes \gamma$$

and similarly for the other generators.

For q = 1 one (re-)obtains in this way the  $C^*$ -algebra C(SU(2)) of functions on SU(2) together with the group structure of SU(2).

・ロト ・ 日 ・ モ ト ・ 日 ・ ・ つ へ ()

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □ ● ● ● ●

#### Definition (Van Daele-Wang 1995)

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . The  $C^*$ -algebra  $C^*_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbb{F}O(n)) = A_o(n)$  of the free orthogonal quantum group  $\mathbb{F}O(n)$  is the universal  $C^*$ -algebra with self-adjoint generators  $u_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j \leq n$  and relations

$$\sum_{k=1}^n u_{ik} u_{jk} = \delta_{ij}, \qquad \sum_{k=1}^n u_{ki} u_{kj} = \delta_{ij}.$$

• These relations are equivalent to saying that  $u = (u_{ij})$  is an orthogonal matrix.

▶ The *abelianisation* of  $C_{\mathbf{f}}^*(\mathbb{F}O(n))$  is isomorphic to the algebra C(O(n)) of functions on the orthogonal group O(n).

・ロト ・ 戸 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・ うへつ

The comultiplication  $\Delta: C^*_{\rm f}(\mathbb{F}O(n)) \to C^*_{\rm f}(\mathbb{F}O(n)) \otimes C^*_{\rm f}(\mathbb{F}O(n))$  is defined by

$$\Delta \begin{pmatrix} u_{11} & \cdots & u_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ u_{n1} & \cdots & u_{nn} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_{11} & \cdots & u_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ u_{n1} & \cdots & u_{nn} \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} u_{11} & \cdots & u_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ u_{n1} & \cdots & u_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$$

Explicitly,

$$\Delta(u_{ij}) = \sum_{k=1}^n u_{ik} \otimes u_{kj}.$$

<ロト < 個 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 の < で</p>

The reduced  $C^*$ -algebra  $C^*_r(\mathbb{F}O(n))$  is the image of  $C^*_f(\mathbb{F}O(n))$  in the GNS-representation of the Haar integral.

For n>2 the free orthogonal quantum group  $\mathbb{F}O(n)$  is not amenable, that is, the canonical map

$$\lambda: C_{\mathsf{f}}^*(\mathbb{F}O(n)) \to C_{\mathsf{r}}^*(\mathbb{F}O(n))$$

is *not* an isomorphism.

From non-amenability it follows that  $C^*_{\rm f}(\mathbb{F}O(n))$  and  $C^*_{\rm r}(\mathbb{F}O(n))$  are not nuclear.

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▶ = ● ●

## Definition

Let G be a compact quantum group and S = C(G). A unitary representation of G on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  is a unitary  $U \in B(S \otimes \mathcal{H})$  such that

 $(\Delta \otimes \mathrm{id})(U) = U_{13}U_{23}.$ 

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆三 ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ◆ ●

#### Definition

Let G be a compact quantum group and S = C(G). A unitary representation of G on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  is a unitary  $U \in B(S \otimes \mathcal{H})$  such that

 $(\Delta \otimes \mathrm{id})(U) = U_{13}U_{23}.$ 

- There is an obvious way to define the *direct sum* and the *tensor product* of representations.
- A representation is irreducible if it cannot be written as the direct sum of two representations.
- Every irreducible representation of a compact quantum group is finite dimensional.
- The finite dimensional representations of the compact quantum group G form a C\*-tensor category Rep(G).

# Meyer-Nest for quantum groups

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▶ ≡ のへで

Let G be a locally compact quantum group.

*Equivariant Kasparov theory* defines a triangulated category  $KK^G$ , in a very similar way to the group case.

Let G be a locally compact quantum group.

*Equivariant Kasparov theory* defines a triangulated category  $KK^G$ , in a very similar way to the group case.

In order to formulate an analogue of the Baum-Connes conjecture one also needs a suitable choice of localising subcategories  $\langle \mathcal{CI} \rangle$  and  $\mathcal{CC}$ .

The notion of a compact quantum subgroup, together with restriction and induction, makes sense - but basic examples show that this is not quite the right thing to look at in general...

For discrete quantum groups, a "good" choice of  $\langle {\cal CI}\rangle$  and  ${\cal CC}$  have been proposed by Arano-Skalski (2021).

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆三 ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ◆ ●

Let G be a locally compact quantum group.

*Equivariant Kasparov theory* defines a triangulated category  $KK^G$ , in a very similar way to the group case.

In order to formulate an analogue of the Baum-Connes conjecture one also needs a suitable choice of localising subcategories  $\langle \mathcal{CI} \rangle$  and  $\mathcal{CC}$ .

The notion of a compact quantum subgroup, together with restriction and induction, makes sense - but basic examples show that this is not quite the right thing to look at in general...

For discrete quantum groups, a "good" choice of  $\langle {\cal CI}\rangle$  and  ${\cal CC}$  have been proposed by Arano-Skalski (2021).

For given (discrete) G one can also just *try* choices of CC and  $\langle CI \rangle$  and see what the corresponding assembly map gives!

If G is torsion-free then a natural choice of compactly induced G- $C^*$ -algebras are those of the form  $C_0(G) \otimes A$  where A is any  $C^*$ -algebra.

In this case a G- $C^*$ -algebra A is compactly contractible if  $A \cong 0$  in KK.

・ロト・4日ト・4日ト・日・900

# Baum-Connes for free orthogonal quantum groups

For free orthogonal quantum groups the above choice of  $\mathcal{CC}$  and  $\langle \mathcal{CI} \rangle$  works.

Theorem (V. 2009)

The free orthogonal quantum group  $\mathbb{F}O(n)$  satisfies the strong Baum-Connes conjecture.

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆三 ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ◆ ●

# Baum-Connes for free orthogonal quantum groups

For free orthogonal quantum groups the above choice of  $\mathcal{CC}$  and  $\langle \mathcal{CI} \rangle$  works.

Theorem (V. 2009)

The free orthogonal quantum group  $\mathbb{F}O(n)$  satisfies the strong Baum-Connes conjecture.

#### Corollary

- The free orthogonal quantum group  $\mathbb{F}O(n)$  is K-amenable.
- In particular, the natural map

$$K_*(C^*_{\mathsf{f}}(\mathbb{F}O(n))) \to K_*(C^*_{\mathsf{r}}(\mathbb{F}O(n)))$$

is an isomorphism.

• The K-theory of  $\mathbb{F}O(n)$  is given by

 $K_0(C^*(\mathbb{F}O(n))) = \mathbb{Z}$  $K_1(C^*(\mathbb{F}O(n))) = \mathbb{Z}.$ 

▲ロト ▲周ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト - ヨ - の々ぐ

for all n > 2.

▲ロト ▲御 ト ▲ 臣 ト ▲ 臣 ト ○ 包 へ ()

▶ Write  $G = \mathbb{F}O(n)$  and consider the Dirac element  $D \in KK^G(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}, \mathbb{C})$ .

<ロト < 回 ト < 三 ト < 三 ト 三 の < で</p>

- ▶ Write  $G = \mathbb{F}O(n)$  and consider the Dirac element  $D \in KK^G(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}, \mathbb{C})$ .
- Applying maximal resp. reduced crossed products to D yields a commutative diagram

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

in KK.

- Write  $G = \mathbb{F}O(n)$  and consider the Dirac element  $D \in KK^G(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}, \mathbb{C})$ .
- Applying maximal resp. reduced crossed products to D yields a commutative diagram

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

in KK.

▶ The left vertical arrow is *always* an isomorphism.

- ▶ Write  $G = \mathbb{F}O(n)$  and consider the Dirac element  $D \in KK^G(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}, \mathbb{C})$ .
- Applying maximal resp. reduced crossed products to D yields a commutative diagram

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▶ = ● ●

in KK.

- The left vertical arrow is *always* an isomorphism.
- Strong BC implies that D is an isomorphism.

- ▶ Write  $G = \mathbb{F}O(n)$  and consider the Dirac element  $D \in KK^G(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}, \mathbb{C})$ .
- Applying maximal resp. reduced crossed products to D yields a commutative diagram

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▶ = ● ●

in KK.

- The left vertical arrow is *always* an isomorphism.
- Strong BC implies that D is an isomorphism.
- Hence the horizontal arrows are isomorphisms.

- ▶ Write  $G = \mathbb{F}O(n)$  and consider the Dirac element  $D \in KK^G(\tilde{\mathbb{C}}, \mathbb{C})$ .
- Applying maximal resp. reduced crossed products to D yields a commutative diagram

in KK.

- The left vertical arrow is *always* an isomorphism.
- Strong BC implies that D is an isomorphism.
- Hence the horizontal arrows are isomorphisms.
- So the right arrow is an isomorphism in KK as well, and and hence induces an isomorphism in K-theory.

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▶ = ● ●

▲ロト ▲御 ト ▲ 臣 ト ▲ 臣 ト ○ 包 へ ()

• The crossed product  $G \ltimes C_0(G)$  is isomorphic to the compact operators  $\mathbb{K}$ .

• The crossed product  $G \ltimes C_0(G)$  is isomorphic to the compact operators  $\mathbb{K}$ .

Using a Koszul resolution argument one obtains an exact triangle

$$C_0(G) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{C}} \longrightarrow \Sigma C_0(G) \longrightarrow \Sigma C_0(G)$$

which, after taking crossed products, induces an exact sequence

The crossed product  $G \ltimes C_0(G)$  is isomorphic to the compact operators  $\mathbb{K}$ .

Using a Koszul resolution argument one obtains an exact triangle

$$C_0(G) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{C}} \longrightarrow \Sigma C_0(G) \longrightarrow \Sigma C_0(G)$$

which, after taking crossed products, induces an exact sequence

▶ Using the counit  $\epsilon : C_{f}^{*}(G) \to \mathbb{C}$  we see that  $K_{0}(G \ltimes \tilde{\mathbb{C}}) \cong K_{0}(C_{f}^{*}(G))$  contains a direct summand  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

The crossed product  $G \ltimes C_0(G)$  is isomorphic to the compact operators  $\mathbb{K}$ .

Using a Koszul resolution argument one obtains an exact triangle

$$C_0(G) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{C}} \longrightarrow \Sigma C_0(G) \longrightarrow \Sigma C_0(G)$$

which, after taking crossed products, induces an exact sequence

▶ Using the counit  $\epsilon : C_{f}^{*}(G) \to \mathbb{C}$  we see that  $K_{0}(G \ltimes \tilde{\mathbb{C}}) \cong K_{0}(C_{f}^{*}(G))$  contains a direct summand  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

The crossed product  $G \ltimes C_0(G)$  is isomorphic to the compact operators  $\mathbb{K}$ .

Using a Koszul resolution argument one obtains an exact triangle

$$C_0(G) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{C}} \longrightarrow \Sigma C_0(G) \longrightarrow \Sigma C_0(G)$$

which, after taking crossed products, induces an exact sequence

▶ Using the counit  $\epsilon : C_{f}^{*}(G) \to \mathbb{C}$  we see that  $K_{0}(G \ltimes \tilde{\mathbb{C}}) \cong K_{0}(C_{f}^{*}(G))$  contains a direct summand  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

The crossed product  $G \ltimes C_0(G)$  is isomorphic to the compact operators  $\mathbb{K}$ .

Using a Koszul resolution argument one obtains an exact triangle

$$C_0(G) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{C}} \longrightarrow \Sigma C_0(G) \longrightarrow \Sigma C_0(G)$$

which, after taking crossed products, induces an exact sequence

▶ Using the counit  $\epsilon : C_{f}^{*}(G) \to \mathbb{C}$  we see that  $K_{0}(G \ltimes \tilde{\mathbb{C}}) \cong K_{0}(C_{f}^{*}(G))$  contains a direct summand  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

The crossed product  $G \ltimes C_0(G)$  is isomorphic to the compact operators  $\mathbb{K}$ .

Using a Koszul resolution argument one obtains an exact triangle

$$C_0(G) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{C}} \longrightarrow \Sigma C_0(G) \longrightarrow \Sigma C_0(G)$$

which, after taking crossed products, induces an exact sequence

▶ Using the counit  $\epsilon : C_{f}^{*}(G) \to \mathbb{C}$  we see that  $K_{0}(G \ltimes \tilde{\mathbb{C}}) \cong K_{0}(C_{f}^{*}(G))$  contains a direct summand  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

...this yields the claim.

# Proof of the main result

We want to show that  $\mathbb{F}O(n)$  satisfies strong BC.
We want to show that  $\mathbb{F}O(n)$  satisfies strong BC.

Theorem (V. 2009, Arano-Kitamura-Kubota 2022)

The strong Baum-Connes property does not depend on  $G = \mathbb{F}O(n)$  but only on the tensor category  $\operatorname{Rep}(G)$ .

In fact, Arano-Kitamura-Kubota develop equivariant  $K\!K\text{-theory}$  for actions of  $C^*\text{-tensor}$  categories on  $C^*\text{-algebras}.$ 

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆三 ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ◆ ●

We want to show that  $\mathbb{F}O(n)$  satisfies strong BC.

Theorem (V. 2009, Arano-Kitamura-Kubota 2022)

The strong Baum-Connes property does not depend on  $G = \mathbb{F}O(n)$  but only on the tensor category  $\operatorname{Rep}(G)$ .

In fact, Arano-Kitamura-Kubota develop equivariant  $K\!K\text{-theory}$  for actions of  $C^*\text{-tensor}$  categories on  $C^*\text{-algebras}.$ 

Since  $\operatorname{Rep}(\mathbb{F}O(n)) \cong \operatorname{Rep}(SU_q(2))$  for  $n = -q - q^{-1}$  it suffices to show

## Theorem (V. 2009)

The dual of  $SU_q(2)$  satisfies the strong Baum-Connes conjecture.

The proof strategy for this is similar to the proof of Baum-Connes for the classical group  $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ .

・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・