

ANNALES DE L'I. H. P., SECTION A

WATARU ICHINOSE

On essential self-adjointness of the relativistic hamiltonian of a spinless particle in a negative scalar potential

Annales de l'I. H. P., section A, tome 60, n° 2 (1994), p. 241-252

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIHPA_1994__60_2_241_0

© Gauthier-Villars, 1994, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales de l'I. H. P., section A » implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

On essential self-adjointness of the relativistic hamiltonian of a spinless particle in a negative scalar potential

by

Wataru ICHINOSE⁽¹⁾

Section of Applied Mathematics,
Department of Computer Science, Ehime University,
Matsuyama, 790 Japan

ABSTRACT. — The relativistic quantum hamiltonian H describing a spinless particle in an electromagnetic field is considered, where H is associated with the classical hamiltonian $c \{ m_0^2 c^2 + |p - A(x)|^2 \}^{1/2} + V(x)$ via the Weyl correspondence. We show that if $V(x)$ is bounded below by a polynomial, H is essentially self-adjoint on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This result is quite different from that on the non-relativistic hamiltonian, *i. e.* the Schrödinger operator, and is close to that on the Dirac equation. Our proof is done by using the commutator theorem in [6].

RÉSUMÉ. — L'hamiltonien relativiste quantique H décrivant une particule sans spin dans un champ électromagnétique est considéré, où H est associé à l'hamiltonien classique $c \{ m_0^2 c^2 + |p - A(x)|^2 \}^{1/2} + V(x)$ via la correspondance de Weyl. Nous démontrons que si $V(x)$ est borné inférieurement par un polynôme, H est essentiellement auto-adjoint sur $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Ce résultat est tout à fait différent de celui sur l'hamiltonien non-relativiste, c'est-à-dire l'opérateur de Schrödinger, et est voisin de celui sur l'opérateur de Dirac. La preuve est faite en utilisant le théorème du commutateur dans [6].

⁽¹⁾ Research supported in part by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research, Ministry of Education of Japan.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the present paper we study the problem of essential self-adjointness of the operator

$$\begin{aligned}
 H f(x) = H_A f(x) + V(x) f(x) \equiv & (2\pi)^{-n} \text{Os} - \iint e^{i(x-x') \cdot \xi} \\
 & \times h_A\left(\frac{x+x'}{2}, \xi\right) f(x') dx' d\xi + V(x) f(x) \quad (1.1)
 \end{aligned}$$

as an operator in the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
 h_A(x, \xi) = c \{ m_0^2 c^2 + |\xi - A(x)|^2 \}^{1/2}, \\
 A(x) = (a_1(x), \dots, a_n(x)), \quad (1.2)
 \end{aligned}$$

$V(x)$ is a real valued function and c, m_0 are positive constants.

$\text{Os} - \iint \dots dx' d\xi$ means the oscillatory integral (e.g. chapter 1 in [11]).

$L^2 = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the space of all square integrable functions on \mathbb{R}^n . H_A is called the Weyl quantized hamiltonian with a classical hamiltonian $h_A(x, \xi)$. When $n=3$, this operator H can be considered as the hamiltonian describing a relativistic spinless particle with charge one and rest mass m_0 in an electromagnetic field whose scalar and vector potentials are given by $V(x)$ and $A(x)$ respectively. There c denotes the velocity of light ([16], [7], [4], [8] and etc.).

Let $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the space of all infinitely differentiable functions with compact support. We denote H_A where $A(x) = (0, \dots, 0)$ by H_0 . Essential self-adjointness and spectral properties of $H_0 + V(x)$ where $V(x)$ is the Coulomb potential, a Yukawa-type potential and their sum have been studied in [16], [7] and [4]. On the other hand as for general H_A , essential self-adjointness of $H = H_A + V(x)$ has been studied in [12], [8] and [9] under the assumption that $V(x)$ is bounded from below. Recently the author proved self-adjointness of H with domain $\{f(x) \in L^2; Hf(x) \in L^2\}$ as one of results in [10] under the assumptions (1.3) and (1.4) below.

$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^\alpha a_j(x) \equiv \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\right)^{\alpha_1} \dots \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}\right)^{\alpha_n} a_j(x) (j=1, 2, \dots, n)$ are bounded on \mathbb{R}^n for all multi-indices $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ such that

$$|\alpha| \equiv \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n \neq 0. \quad (1.3)$$

There exists a constant $m \geq 0$ such that

$$\left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^\alpha V(x) \right| \leq C_\alpha (1 + |x|)^m \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n$$

are valid for all multi-indices α with constants C_α . (1.4)

Our aim in the present paper is to show that the above assumption (1.4) can be replaced by a much weaker one for essential self-adjointness of H with domain $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For example, we can obtain the following results. We denote by $L_{loc}^2 \equiv L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the space of all locally square integrable functions. Let $V(x)$ be a real valued function in L_{loc}^2 such that

$$-C(1+|x|)^m \leq V(x) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n \tag{1.5}$$

is valid for non-negative constants C and m . Let Z be a constant less than $(n-2)c/2$. Then both $H_A + V(x)$ and $H_0 - \frac{Z}{|x|} + V(x)$ with domain $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are essentially self-adjoint under a slightly weaker assumption than (1.3) (Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.4 in the present paper). $n \geq 3$ is assumed for the latter operator. The assumption (1.3) is not so limited, because we need such an assumption to define H_A by (1.1). But we must note that a more general definition of H_A is proposed in [8].

As for the Schrödinger operators $-\frac{1}{2m_0}\Delta + V_S(x)$, we know that we need for their essential self-adjointness the limitation on the decreasing rate at infinity of negative part of $V_S(x)$ (e.g. Theorem 2 in [5] and page 157 in [1]). On the other hand as for the Dirac operator, we know from Theorem 2.1 in [3] that such a limitation is not necessary at all for its essential self-adjointness. Hence our decreasing rate (1.5) for essential self-adjointness of H lies between those of the Schrödinger and the Dirac operators.

Our proof in the present paper is quite different from that in [10]. In [10] we studied the theory of pseudo-differential operators with basic weight functions and applied it. In the present paper we use the commutator theorem in [6].

The plan of the present paper is as follows. In section 2 we will state all results. Some of results will be proved there. Sections 3 and 4 will be devoted to the proofs of main results.

2. THEOREMS

Let $k(x, \xi)$ be a C^∞ -function on \mathbb{R}^{2n} . We suppose that for any multi-indices $\alpha \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ and β there exists a constant $C_{\alpha, \beta}$ satisfying

$$|k_{(\beta)}^{(\alpha)}(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} \langle x \rangle \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^{2n}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\langle x \rangle = \{1 + |x|^2\}^{1/2}$ and $k_{(\beta)}^{(\alpha)}(x, \xi) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi}\right)^\alpha \left(\frac{1}{i}\right)^{|\beta|} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^\beta k(x, \xi)$. It follows from the mean value theorem that

$$|k_{(\beta)}(x, \xi) - k_{(\beta)}(x, 0)| \leq C_\beta \langle x \rangle \langle \xi \rangle$$

are valid for all β with constants C_β . Hence by analogy with arguments in chapter 2 of [11] and chapter 4 of [15] we can define the pseudo-differential operator $K(X, D_x)$ with symbol $k(x, \xi)$ by

$$K(X, D_x) f(x) = (2\pi)^{-n} \int e^{ix \cdot \xi} k(x, \xi) \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi, \tag{2.2}$$

for $f(x) \in \mathcal{S}$. $\hat{f}(\xi)$ denotes the Fourier transformation $\int e^{-ix \cdot \xi} f(x) dx$ and \mathcal{S} the space of all rapidly decreasing functions on \mathbb{R}^n . It is easy to show that $K(X, D_x)$ makes a continuous operator from \mathcal{S} into \mathcal{S} .

THEOREM 2.1. — *Let $\Phi(x)$ be a real valued function in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Assume that $K(X, D_x)$ defined above is symmetric on $C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and that*

$$K(X, D_x) + \Phi(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{on } C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{2.3}$$

The quadratic form inequality (2.3) means that

$(\{K(X, D_x) + \Phi(x)\} f(x), f(x)) \geq 0$ for all $f(x) \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover we assume that for all $W(x)$ being in L^2_{loc} with $W(x) \geq 0$ almost everywhere (a. e.) $K(X, D_x) + \Phi(x) + W(x)$ with domain $C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is essentially self-adjoint. Then if $V(x) \in L^2_{loc}$ satisfies (1.5) for non-negative constants C and m , then $K(X, D_x) + \Phi(x) + V(x)$ with domain $C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is also essentially self-adjoint.

Theorem 2.1 will be proved in section 3. We will prove the following theorem from Theorem 2.1 by using the results obtained in [8].

THEOREM 2.2. — *Consider H defined by (1.1) with domain $C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$. We assume*

$$\left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right)^\alpha a_j(x) \right| \leq C_\alpha \log \{ \langle x \rangle \} \tag{2.4}$$

for all $\alpha \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ with constants C_α . Let $V(x)$ be the same function as in Theorem 2.1. Then H is essentially self-adjoint.

Remark 2.1. — As was stated in introduction, H defined by (1.1) with domain $\{f(x) \in L^2; H f(x) \in L^2\}$ is self-adjoint under the assumptions (1.3) and (1.4). We note that this H is also self-adjoint even if (1.3) is replaced by (2.4) there. This result follows from Theorem 1 in [10] at once.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. — We can easily have from the assumption

$$|h^{(\alpha)}_{A(\beta)}(x, \xi)| \leq C'_{\alpha, \beta} \{ \langle x \rangle^2 + \langle \xi \rangle \}$$

for all α and β with constants $C'_{\alpha, \beta}$. So it follows from the analogy with arguments in section 2 of chapter 2 in [11] that H_A makes a continuous operator from \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{S} and H_A is symmetric on \mathcal{S} . We note that the

assertion in Lemma 2.2 in [8] remains valid under our weaker assumption (2.4) than that in [8]. So Theorem 5.1 in [8] indicates $H_A \geq 0$ on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and essential self-adjointness of $H_A + W(x)$ with domain $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for any $W(x) \in L_{loc}^2$ such that $W(x) \geq 0$ a. e.

We set

$$p(x, \xi) = (2\pi)^{-n} \text{Os} - \iint e^{-iy \cdot \eta} h_A(x + y/2, \xi + \eta) dy d\eta.$$

Then

$$P(X, D_x) = H_A \quad \text{on } C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \tag{2.5}$$

follows from analogy of Theorem 2.5 in [11]. Let l be an even integer such that $l > n + 1$. Then taking the integration by parts, we have

$$p_{(\beta)}^{(\alpha)}(x, \xi) = (2\pi)^{-n} \text{Os} - \iint e^{-iy \cdot \eta} \langle y \rangle^{-l} (1 - \Delta_\eta)^{l/2} \times \{ \langle \eta \rangle^{-l} (1 - \Delta_y)^{l/2} h_{A(\beta)}^{(\alpha)}(x + y/2, \xi + \eta) \} dy d\eta$$

for any α and β . We note that $h_A(x, \xi)$ satisfies the same inequalities as (2.1) for all α and β such that $|\alpha + \beta| \neq 0$ with another constants $C_{\alpha, \beta}$ under the assumption (2.4). So using $\langle x + y \rangle^\sigma \leq \sqrt{2} \langle x \rangle^\sigma \langle y \rangle^\sigma$ ($\sigma = 1$ and -1 , $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$), we can see that

$$|p_{(\beta)}^{(\alpha)}(x, \xi)| \leq C''_{\alpha, \beta} \langle x \rangle \tag{2.6}$$

are valid for all α and β such that $|\alpha + \beta| \neq 0$ with constants $C''_{\alpha, \beta}$. Hence we can easily see from (2.5) and (2.6) that we can apply Theorem 2.1 to $H_A + V(x)$ as $K(X, D_x) = H_A = P(X, D_x)$ and $\Phi(x) = 0$. So Theorem 2.2 can be proved.

Q.E.D.

Remark 2.2. – As will be noted in Remark 3.1 in the present paper, the assumption in Theorem 2.1 that (2.1) must hold for all $\alpha \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ and β can be weakened. The assertion of Theorem 2.1 remains valid even if we replace this assumption by a weaker one that (2.1) holds for all $\alpha \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ and β satisfying $|\alpha| \leq J$ and $|\beta| \leq J$, where J is an integer determined from n and m . So the assumption on $\{a_j(x)\}_{j=1}^n$ in Theorem 2.2 can be similarly replaced by a weaker one that

$$\left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right)^\alpha a_j(x) \right| \leq C_\alpha \langle x \rangle^\varepsilon$$

are valid for all $0 < |\alpha| \leq J$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a sufficiently small constant and J is a sufficiently large integer. ε and J are determined from n and m .

THEOREM 2.3. – *Let H_0 be the operator defined in introduction with domain $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Suppose that $\Phi(x)$ is a real valued function in L_{loc}^2 and a H_0 -bounded multiplication operator with relative bound less than one. Let*

$V(x)$ be the same function as in Theorem 2.1. Then $H_0 + \Phi(x) + V(x)$ with domain $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is essentially self-adjoint.

Theorem 2.3 will be proved in section 4.

COROLLARY 2.4. — Let $n \geq 3$ and Z be a constant less than $(n-2)c/2$. Let $V(x)$ be the same function as in Theorem 2.1. Then $H_0 - \frac{Z}{|x|} + V(x)$ with domain $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is essentially self-adjoint.

Proof of Corollary 2.4. — When $Z \leq 0$, essential self-adjointness of $H_0 - \frac{Z}{|x|} + V(x)$ follows from Theorem 2.2 at once. Let $0 < Z < \left(\frac{n-2}{2}\right)c$. We denote L^2 -norm by $\| \cdot \|$. We know the Hardy inequality

$$\left(\frac{n-2}{2}\right)^2 \left\| \frac{\psi(x)}{|x|} \right\|^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \left\| \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_j}(x) \right\|^2$$

for $\psi(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (e. g. page 169 in [13] and (2.9) in [7]). So

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{n-2}{2}\right)^2 \left\| \frac{\psi(x)}{|x|} \right\|^2 &\leq (2\pi)^{-n} \int |\xi|^2 |\hat{\psi}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &\leq (2\pi)^{-n} \int \{m_0^2 c^2 + |\xi|^2\}^{1/2} |\hat{\psi}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &= c^{-2} \|H_0 \psi(x)\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

holds for $\psi(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Consequently $-\frac{Z}{|x|}$ is H_0 -bounded with relative bound less than one. Hence Corollary 2.4 follows from Theorem 2.3 at once.

Q.E.D.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

LEMMA 3.1. — Suppose that $k(x, \xi)$ satisfies (2.1) for all $\alpha \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ and β . Let ζ be a non-negative constant. Then there exists a positive constant $d = d(\zeta)$ such that

$$\| [K(X, D_x), \langle x \rangle^{\zeta/2}] f(x) \| \leq d \| \langle x \rangle^{\zeta/2} f(x) \| \tag{3.1}$$

are valid for all $f(x) \in \mathcal{S}$. $[K(X, D_x), \langle x \rangle^{\zeta/2}]$ denotes the commutator of operators $K(X, D_x)$ and $\langle x \rangle^{\zeta/2}$.

Proof. – We set

$$q(x, \xi) = (2\pi)^{-n} \text{Os} - \iint e^{-iy \cdot \eta} k(x, \xi + \eta) \langle x + y \rangle^{\xi/2} dy d\eta - \langle x \rangle^{\xi/2} k(x, \xi). \quad (3.2)$$

Then we get by analogy with arguments in chapter 2 of [11]

$$Q(X, D_x) = [K(X, D_x), \langle x \rangle^{\xi/2}] \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S}. \quad (3.3)$$

It is easy to see

$$q(x, \xi) = (2\pi)^{-n} \int_0^1 d\theta \sum_{|\alpha|=1} \text{Os} - \iint e^{-iy \cdot \eta} k^{(\alpha)}(x, \xi + \theta\eta) D_x^\alpha \langle x + y \rangle^{\xi/2} dy d\eta,$$

where $D_x^\alpha = \left(\frac{1}{i}\right)^{|\alpha|} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^\alpha$. Let l_1 and l_2 be integers such that $l_1 > n + \left\lfloor \frac{\xi}{2} - 1 \right\rfloor$ and $l_2 > n$. Then taking the integration by parts,

$$|q(x, \xi)| \leq (2\pi)^{-n} \int_0^1 d\theta \sum_{|\alpha|=1} \iint |\langle y \rangle^{-l_1} (1 - \Delta_\eta)^{l_1/2} \{ \langle \eta \rangle^{-l_2} (1 - \Delta_y)^{l_2/2} k^{(\alpha)}(x, \xi + \theta\eta) D_x^\alpha \langle x + y \rangle^{\xi/2} \}| dy d\eta$$

holds. So we get

$$|q(x, \xi)| \leq C_0 \langle x \rangle^{\xi/2}$$

with a constant C_0 from the assumption (2.1) in the same way to the proof of (2.6). Similarly we obtain

$$|q_{(\beta)}^{(\alpha)}(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} \langle x \rangle^{\xi/2} \quad (3.4)$$

for all α and β with constants $C_{\alpha, \beta}$.

Next we set

$$r(x, \xi) = (2\pi)^{-n} \text{Os} - \iint e^{-iy \cdot \eta} q(x, \xi + \eta) \langle x + y \rangle^{-\xi/2} dy d\eta. \quad (3.5)$$

Then we have

$$R(X, D_x) = Q(X, D_x) \circ \langle x \rangle^{-\xi/2}. \quad (3.6)$$

$\circ \circ \circ$ denotes the product of operators. Then we obtain from (3.4)

$$|r_{(\beta)}^{(\alpha)}(x, \xi)| \leq C'_{\alpha, \beta} \quad (3.7)$$

for all α and β with constants $C'_{\alpha, \beta}$ in the same way to the proof of (3.4).

We note that

$$[K(X, D_x), \langle x \rangle^{\xi/2}] = R(X, D_x) \circ \langle x \rangle^{\xi/2} \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S}$$

holds from (3.3) and (3.6). So applying the Calderón-Vaillancourt theorem in [2] to $R(X, D_x)$, we get Lemma 3.1.

Q.E.D.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. — For the sake of simplicity we denote $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by \mathcal{E} . Let $d=d(m)$ be the constant determined in Lemma 3.1. We can choose a constant $M>0$ satisfying

$$M \geq 2 d(m) \quad \text{and} \quad V(x) + M \langle x \rangle^m \geq 0 \quad \text{a.e.} \quad (3.8)$$

because of the assumption (1.5). We fix this M . Set

$$T = K(X, D_x) + \Phi(x) + V(x) \quad (3.9)$$

with domain \mathcal{E} . It follows from the assumptions in Theorem 2.1 and (3.8) that $T + 3 M \langle x \rangle^m \geq 2 M \langle x \rangle^m$ on \mathcal{E} holds and $T + 3 M \langle x \rangle^m$ with domain \mathcal{E} is essentially self-adjoint. Let N be the self-adjoint operator defined by the closure of $T + 3 M \langle x \rangle^m$. Then

$$N \geq 2 M \langle x \rangle^m > 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{E} \quad (3.10)$$

is valid and \mathcal{E} is a core for N .

We will prove

$$\|Tf(x)\| \leq \|Nf(x)\| \quad [f(x) \in \mathcal{E}] \quad (3.11)$$

and

$$\pm i \{ (Tf, Nf) - (Nf, Tf) \} \leq 3 d(Nf, f) \quad [f(x) \in \mathcal{E}]. \quad (3.12)$$

(. . .) implies the inner product in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then Corollary 1.1 in [6] shows that T is essentially self-adjoint, which completes the proof.

We will first prove (3.11). Let $f(x) \in \mathcal{E}$. Since each $\Phi(x)$ and $V(x)$ is in L_{loc}^2 , we can easily have

$$(Tf, \langle x \rangle^m f) = (T \circ \langle x \rangle^{m/2} f, \langle x \rangle^{m/2} f) - ([K(X, D_x), \langle x \rangle^{m/2}] f, \langle x \rangle^{m/2} f). \quad (3.13)$$

We denote by $\text{Re}(\cdot)$ and $\text{Im}(\cdot)$ the real part and the imaginary part of complex number respectively. Then noting $Nf = Tf + 3 M \langle x \rangle^m f$, we get by (3.13)

$$\begin{aligned} \|Nf\|^2 &= \|Tf\|^2 + 6 M \text{Re}(Tf, \langle x \rangle^m f) + 9 M^2 \|\langle x \rangle^m f\|^2 \\ &= \|Tf\|^2 + 6 M \text{Re}(\{T + M \langle x \rangle^m\} \circ \langle x \rangle^{m/2} f, \langle x \rangle^{m/2} f) \\ &\quad + 3 M^2 \|\langle x \rangle^m f\|^2 - 6 M \text{Re}([K(X, D_x), \langle x \rangle^{m/2}] f, \langle x \rangle^{m/2} f). \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

It is easy to see from the assumption (2.3) and (3.8)

$$T + M \langle x \rangle^m \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{E}. \quad (3.15)$$

Hence applying Lemma 3.1 to (3.14), we obtain by (3.8)

$$\begin{aligned} & \|Nf\|^2 \\ & \geq \|Tf\|^2 + 3M^2 \|\langle x \rangle^m f\|^2 - 6Md \|\langle x \rangle^{m/2} f\|^2 \\ & \geq \|Tf\|^2 + 3M(M-2d) \|\langle x \rangle^m f\|^2 \\ & \geq \|Tf\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which shows (3.11).

Next we will prove (3.12). Let $f(x) \in \mathcal{E}$. Using $Nf = Tf + 3M \langle x \rangle^m f$ and $\Phi(x), V(x) \in L^2_{loc}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (Tf, Nf) - (Nf, Tf) \\ & = (Tf, 3M \langle x \rangle^m f) - (3M \langle x \rangle^m f, Tf) \\ & = 3M \{ (K(X, D_x) f, \langle x \rangle^m f) - (\langle x \rangle^m f, K(X, D_x) f) \} \\ & = 6Mi \operatorname{Im}(K(X, D_x) f, \langle x \rangle^m f). \end{aligned}$$

Apply the equality

$$\begin{aligned} (K(X, D_x) f, \langle x \rangle^m f) & = (K(X, D_x) \circ \langle x \rangle^{m/2} f, \langle x \rangle^{m/2} f) \\ & \quad - ([K(X, D_x), \langle x \rangle^{m/2}] f, \langle x \rangle^{m/2} f) \end{aligned}$$

to the above. Then since $K(X, D_x)$ is assumed to be symmetric on \mathcal{E} ,

$$\begin{aligned} (Tf, Nf) - (Nf, Tf) & \\ & = -6Mi \operatorname{Im}([K(X, D_x), \langle x \rangle^{m/2}] f, \langle x \rangle^{m/2} f) \quad (3.16) \end{aligned}$$

is valid. Hence we obtain by Lemma 3.1

$$\begin{aligned} & \pm i \{ (Tf, Nf) - (Nf, Tf) \} \\ & \leq 6Md \|\langle x \rangle^{m/2} f\|^2 \\ & = 6Md (\langle x \rangle^m f, f) \\ & \leq 3d(Nf, f). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used (3.10) for the last inequality. Thus (3.12) could be proved. This completes the proof.

Q.E.D.

Remark 3.1. – We can easily see in the proof of Theorem 2.1 from the Calderón-Vaillancourt theorem that if (3.7) holds for $|\alpha| \leq 3n$ and $|\beta| \leq 3n$, (3.1) is valid. Hence as was stated in Remark 2.2, we can weaken the assumption in Theorem 2.1 that (2.1) hold for all $\alpha \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ and β . This can be easily verified by following the proof of Theorem 2.1.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3

We denote $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by \mathcal{E} as in section 3. It is easy to see $H_0 \geq m_0 c^2 > 0$ on \mathcal{S} . $\Phi(x)$ was assumed to be H_0 -bounded with relative bound less than one. So it follows from Theorem X.18 in [13] that $\Phi(x)$ is form-bounded with the same relative bound with respect to H_0 . That is, there exists a constant $b \geq 0$ such that

$$|(\Phi(x)f, f)| < (H_0 f, f) + b(f, f)$$

are valid for all $f(x) \in \mathcal{E}$. Hence we see

$$\{H_0 + \Phi(x) + b\} \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{E}. \tag{4.1}$$

We will show that $H_0 + \Phi(x) + b + W(x)$ with domain \mathcal{E} are essentially self-adjoint for all $W(x)$ being in L^2_{loc} with $W(x) \geq 0$ a. e. Then the proof of Theorem 2.3 can be completed by Theorem 2.1. We will prove essential self-adjointness of $H_0 + \Phi(x) + b + W(x)$ by analogy with arguments in the proof of Theorem X.29 in [13] where Schrödinger operators are studied. There we will use the Kato-type inequality obtained in [8].

Let $W(x) \geq 0$ a. e. be in L^2_{loc} . Noting (4.1), it follows from Theorem X.26 in [13] that iff $H_0 + \Phi(x) + b + W(x)$ with domain \mathcal{E} is essentially self-adjoint, the range of $\lambda + H_0 + \Phi(x) + b + W(x)$ is dense in L^2 for a constant $\lambda > 0$.

We may assume $b=0$ without the loss of generality. Let $\lambda > 0$ be a constant and $u(x)$ be in L^2 such that

$$(u(x), \{\lambda + H_0 + \Phi(x) + W(x)\} f(x)) = 0 \tag{4.2}$$

hold for all $f(x) \in \mathcal{E}$. (4.2) indicates that

$$(\lambda + H_0 + \Phi + W) u(x) = 0 \tag{4.2}'$$

holds in a distribution sense. Since $u(x)$ is in L^2 and $\Phi(x) + W(x)$ is in L^2_{loc} , $H_0 u(x)$ is in L^1_{loc} . Hence we get from Theorem 4.1 in [8] the distribution inequality

$$\text{Re}[(\text{sgn } u(x)) H_0 u(x)] \geq H_0 |u(x)| \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}', \tag{4.3}$$

where $\text{sgn } u(x)$ is a bounded measurable function defined by $\overline{u(x)}/|u(x)|$ for a point x such that $u(x) \neq 0$ and zero for a point x such that $u(x) = 0$. $\overline{u(x)}$ is the complex conjugate of $u(x)$. (4.3) means that

$$(\text{Re}[(\text{sgn } u(x)) H_0 u(x)], f(x)) \geq (H_0 |u(x)|, f(x))$$

hold for all $f(x) \in \mathcal{E}$ with $f(x) \geq 0$. Inserting $H_0 u(x) = -(\lambda + \Phi + W) u(x)$ into (4.3),

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda + H_0) |u(x)| &\leq -(\Phi + W) |u(x)| \\ &\leq -\Phi(x) |u(x)| \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}' \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

is obtained. Here we used $W(x) \in L^2_{loc}$ and $W(x) \geq 0$ a.e. for the last inequality.

Now

$$\begin{aligned} |(\Phi(x)|u(x)|, f(x))| &\leq \|u(x)\| \|\Phi(x)f(x)\| \\ &\leq C_1 \|u(x)\| \|(\mathbf{H}_0 + 1)f(x)\| \end{aligned}$$

follow from H_0 -boundedness of $\Phi(x)$ for all $f(x) \in \mathcal{E}$, where C_1 is a constant. It is easy to see that the same inequalities remain valid for all $f(x) \in \mathcal{S}$. So $\Phi(x)|u(x)|$ belongs to \mathcal{S}' . \mathcal{S}' is the dual space of \mathcal{S} . It is also easy to see $(\lambda + H_0)|u(x)| \in \mathcal{S}'$. Hence we obtain by (4.4)

$$-(\Phi(x)|u(x)|, f(x)) \geq ((\lambda + H_0)|u(x)|, f(x)) \tag{4.5}$$

for all $f(x) \in \mathcal{S}$ with $f(x) \geq 0$. Let $\psi(x) \geq 0$ on \mathbb{R}^n be an arbitrary function in \mathcal{S} and set $\varphi(x) = (\lambda + H_0)^{-1} \psi(x)$. Then $\varphi(x)$ belongs to \mathcal{S} . $\varphi(x) \geq 0$ on \mathbb{R}^{2n} follows from (3.3) and (3.4) in [8] or Theorems XIII.52, 54 and the example on page 220 in [14]. So inserting this $\varphi(x)$ into (4.5) as $f(x)$, we get

$$-(\Phi(x)|u(x)|, (\lambda + H_0)^{-1} \psi(x)) \geq (|u(x)|, \psi(x)). \tag{4.6}$$

Now $\Phi(x)$ is assumed to be H_0 -bounded with relative bound less than one. So there exist constants $0 \leq a' < 1$ and $0 \leq b'$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(x)f(x)\| &< a' \|H_0 f(x)\| + b' \|f(x)\| \\ &< a' \|(\lambda + H_0)f(x)\| + b' \|f(x)\| \end{aligned}$$

are valid for all $f(x) \in \mathcal{E}$. We can easily see that these inequalities remain valid for all $f(x) \in \mathcal{S}$. Consequently we get for all $g(x) \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(x)(\lambda + H_0)^{-1} g(x)\| &< a' \|g(x)\| + b' \|(\lambda + H_0)^{-1} g(x)\| \\ &< \left(a' + \frac{b'}{\lambda}\right) \|g(x)\|, \end{aligned}$$

which also remain valid for all $g(x) \in L^2$. Hence $\Phi(x)(\lambda + H_0)^{-1}$ is a bounded operator from L^2 to L^2 and its operator norm is bounded by a less constant than $\left(a' + \frac{b'}{\lambda}\right)$. Therefore we see that $\{\Phi(x)(\lambda + H_0)^{-1}\}^* |u(x)|$ belongs to L^2 and

$$\|\{\Phi(x)(\lambda + H_0)^{-1}\}^* |u(x)|\| < \left(a' + \frac{b'}{\lambda}\right) \|u(x)\| \tag{4.7}$$

is valid, because $u(x)$ belongs to L^2 . Moreover (4.6) indicates

$$-\{\Phi(x)(\lambda + H_0)^{-1}\}^* |u(x)| \geq |u(x)| \quad \text{a.e.} \tag{4.8}$$

as the inequality between functions, because $\psi(x) \geq 0$ is arbitrary. Hence we get by (4.7) and (4.8)

$$\|u(x)\| < \left(a' + \frac{b'}{\lambda}\right) \|u(x)\|. \quad (4.9)$$

This shows $u(x) = 0$ a.e. when $\lambda > 0$ is large. Thus we see that if $\lambda > 0$ is large, the range of $\lambda + H_0 + \Phi(x) + W(x)$ is dense in L^2 . This completes the proof of Theorem 2.3.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. A. BEREZIN and M. A. SHUBIN, *The Schrödinger Equation*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston and London, 1991.
- [2] A. P. CALDERÓN and R. VAILLANCOURT, On the Boundedness of Pseudo-Differential Operators, *J. Math. Soc.*, Japan, Vol. **23**, 1971, pp. 374-378.
- [3] P. R. CHERNOFF, Schrödinger and Dirac Operators with Singular Potentials and Hyperbolic Equations, *Pacific J. Math.*, Vol. **72**, 1977, pp. 361-382.
- [4] I. DAUBECHIES, One Electron Molecules with Relativistic Kinetic Energy: Properties of the Discrete Spectrum, *Commun. Math. Phys.*, Vol. **94**, 1984, pp. 523-535.
- [5] M. S. P. EASTHAM, W. D. EVANS and J. B. MCLEOD, The Essential Self-Adjointness of Schrödinger-Type Operators, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, Vol. **60**, 1976, pp. 185-204.
- [6] W. G. FARIS and R. B. LAVINE, Commutators and Self-Adjointness of Hamiltonian Operators, *Commun. Math. Phys.*, Vol. **35**, 1974, pp. 39-48.
- [7] I. W. HERBST, *Spectral theory of the operator $(p^2 + m^2)^{1/2} - Ze^2/r$* , *Ibid.*, Vol. **53**, 1977, pp. 285-294.
- [8] T. ICHINOSE, Essential Selfadjointness of the Weyl Quantized Relativistic Hamiltonian, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré*, Phys. Théor., Vol. **51**, 1989, pp. 265-298.
- [9] T. ICHINOSE and T. TSUCHIDA, On Kato's Inequality for the Weyl Quantized Relativistic Hamiltonian, *Manuscripta Math.*, Vol. **76**, 1992, pp. 269-280.
- [10] W. ICHINOSE, *Remarks on Self-Adjointness of Operators in Quantum Mechanics and \hbar -dependency of Solutions for Their Cauchy Problem*, Preprint.
- [11] H. KUMANO-GO, *Pseudo-Differential Operators*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, 1981.
- [12] M. NAGASE and T. UMEDA, On the Essential Self-Adjointness of Pseudo-Differential Operators, *Proc. Japan Acad. Série A*, Vol. **64**, 1988, pp. 94-97.
- [13] M. REED and B. SIMON, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics II, Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness*, Academic Press, New York and London, 1975.
- [14] M. REED and B. SIMON, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics IV, Analysis of Operators*, Academic Press, New York and London, 1978.
- [15] M. A. SHUBIN, *Pseudodifferential Operators and Spectral Theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and Heidelberg, 1987.
- [16] R. A. WEDER, Spectral Analysis of Pseudodifferential Operators, *J. Functional Anal.*, Vol. **20**, 1975, pp. 319-337.

(Manuscript received July 12, 1993;
Revised version received September 2, 1993.)