Mikhail Shubin

Essential self-adjointness for magnetic Schrödinger operators on non-compact manifolds

Séminaire É. D. P. (1998-1999), Exposé n° XV, 22 p.

<http://sedp.cedram.org/item?id=SEDP_1998-1999____A15_0>

Essential self-adjointness for magnetic Schrödinger operators on non-compact manifolds

Mikhail Shubin

We give a condition of essential self-adjointness for magnetic Schrödinger operators on non-compact Riemannian manifolds with a given positive smooth measure which is fixed independently of the metric. This condition is related to the classical completeness of a related classical hamiltonian without magnetic field. The main result generalizes the result by I. Oleinik [29, 30, 31], a shorter and more transparent proof of which was provided by the author in [41]. The main idea, as in [41], consists in an explicit use of the Lipschitz analysis on the Riemannian manifold and also by additional geometrization arguments which include a use of a metric which is conformal to the original one with a factor depending on the minorant of the electric potential.

1. Introduction

Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold (i.e. M is a C^∞-manifold, (g_{jk}) is a Riemannian metric on M), $\dim M = n$. We will always assume that M is connected. We will also assume that we are given a *positive smooth measure* $d\mu$ i.e. a measure which has a C^∞ positive density $\rho(x)$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure $dx = dx^1 \dots dx^n$ in any local coordinates $x^1, \dots, x^n$, so we will write $d\mu = \rho(x)dx$. This measure may be completely independent of the Riemannian metric, but may of course coincide with the canonical measure $d\mu_g$ induced by the metric (in this case $\rho = \sqrt{g}$ where $g = \det(g_{jk})$, so locally $d\mu_g = \sqrt{g}dx$).

The main purpose of this paper is to study essential self-adjointness of magnetic Schrödinger operators in $L^2(M) = L^2(M, d\mu)$.

Denote $\Lambda^p_{(k)}(M)$ the set of all k-smooth (i.e. of the class C^k) complex-valued p-forms on M. We will write $\Lambda^p(M)$ instead of $\Lambda^p_{(\infty)}(M)$. A *magnetic potential* is a real-valued 1-form $A \in \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M)$. So in local coordinates $x^1, \dots, x^n$ it can be written as

$$A = A_j dx^j,$$

where $A_j = A_j(x)$ are real-valued C^1-functions of the local coordinates, and we use the standard Einstein summation convention.

The usual differential can be considered as a first order differential operator

$$d : C^\infty(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda^1(M).$$

We will also need a deformed differential

$$d_A : C^\infty(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M), \qquad u \mapsto du + iuA,$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$.

The Riemannian metric (g_{jk}) and the measure $d\mu$ induce an inner product in the spaces of smooth forms with compact support in a standard way. In particular, this inner product on functions has the form

$$(u, v) = \int_M u\bar{v}d\mu,$$

where the bar over v means the complex conjugation.

For smooth forms $\alpha = \alpha_j dx^j, \beta = \beta_k dx^k$ denote

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = g^{jk}\alpha_j\beta_k,$$

where (g^{jk}) is the inverse matrix to (g_{jk}). So the result $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle$ is a scalar function on M. Then for α, β with compact support we have

$$(\alpha, \beta) = \int_M \langle \alpha, \bar{\beta} \rangle d\mu,$$

where

$$\bar{\beta} = \bar{\beta}_k dx^k.$$

Using the inner products in spaces of smooth functions and forms with compact support we can define the completions of these spaces. They are Hilbert spaces which we will denote $L^2(M)$ for functions and $L^2\Lambda^1(M)$ for 1-forms. These spaces depend on the choice of the metric (g_{jk}) and the measure $d\mu$. However we will skip this dependence in the notations of the spaces for simplicity of notations. This will not lead to a confusion because both metric and measure will be fixed through the whole paper unless indicated otherwise.

The corresponding local spaces will be denoted $L^2_{loc}(M)$ and $L^2_{loc}\Lambda^1(M)$ respectively. These spaces do not depend on the metric or measure. For example $L^2_{loc}(M)$ consists of all functions $u : M \to \mathbb{C}$ such that for any local coordinates $x^1, \ldots, x^n$ defined in an open set $U \subset M$ we have $u \in L^2$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure $dx^1 \ldots dx^n$ on any compact subset in U.

Formally adjoint operators to the differential operators with sufficiently smooth coefficients are well defined through the inner products above. In particular, we have an operator

$$d_A^* : \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M) \longrightarrow C(M),$$

defined by the identity

$$(d_A u, \omega) = (u, d_A^* \omega), u \in C_c^\infty(M), \omega \in \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M).$$

(Here $C_c^\infty(M)$ is the set of all C^∞ functions with compact support on M.)

Therefore we can define the magnetic Laplacian Δ_A (with the potential A) by the formula

$$-\Delta_A = d_A^* d_A : C^\infty(M) \longrightarrow C(M).$$

Now the main object of our study will be the *magnetic Schrödinger operator*

$$H = H_{A,V} = -\Delta_A + V, \tag{1.1}$$

where $V \in L^\infty_{loc}(M)$ i.e. V is a locally bounded measurable function which is called *electric potential*. We will always assume V to be real-valued. Then H becomes a symmetric operator in $L^2(M)$ if we consider it on the domain $C_c^\infty(M)$. In this paper we will discuss conditions on V (at infinity) which guarantee that this operator is essentially self-adjoint in $L^2(M)$ (which means that its closure in $L^2(M)$ is a self-adjoint operator).

Note that for $A = 0$ the operator Δ_A becomes a generalized Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ on scalar functions on M and it can be locally written in the form

$$\Delta u = \frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}(\rho g^{jk}\frac{\partial u}{\partial x^k}). \tag{1.2}$$

The operator $H_{A,V}$ with $A = 0$ becomes a generalized Schrödinger operator

$$H_{0,V} = -\Delta + V. \tag{1.3}$$

Recent results by I. Oleinik [29, 30, 31] provided the most advanced essential self-adjointness condition for $H_{0,V}$ which is directly connected to the classical completeness of a related hamiltonian system. (I. Oleinik considered the case $d\mu = d\mu_g$ only but his arguments work for arbitrary $d\mu$ without any changes.) A simpler and more transparent proof of the I. Oleinik's result was given in [41]. In the present paper we extend the result of I. Oleinik to the case of magnetic Schrödinger operators $H_{A,V}$ using a modification of arguments given in [41]. The result is that the essential self-adjointness for $H_{A,V}$ holds under the same condition on (M, g) and V as was imposed in the I. Oleinik's theorem, and with no additional condition at infinity on the magnetic potential A.

The importance of the essential self-adjointness of H becomes clear if we turn to the quantum mechanics and try to use the differential expression (1.1) to produce a quantum observable (a Hamiltonian) associated with this expression: a self-adjoint operator in $L^2(M)$ which extends $H|_{C_c^\infty(M)}$. Essential self-adjointness means that such an extension exists and is unique. This in turn implies the existence and uniqueness of the solution of the following Cauchy problem for the evolutionary Schrödinger equation:

$$\frac{1}{i}\frac{\partial\psi(t)}{\partial t} = H\psi(t),\ \psi(0) = \psi_0 \in C_c^\infty(M),\ \psi(t) \in L^2(M) \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

(See e.g. [1], Ch.VI, Sect.1.7.) Here H is applied to ψ in the sense of distributions and the derivative in t is taken in the norm sense.

In case when this existence and uniqueness holds, it is natural to say that we have *quantum completeness* for the corresponding quantum system. If for example the uniqueness does not hold, we need some extra data to construct a Hamiltonian, e.g. boundary conditions etc.

Let us also consider the classical system, which corresponds to the quantum Hamiltonian $H_{0,V}$, i.e. the Hamiltonian system with the Hamiltonian

$$h(p,x) = |p|^2 + V(x) \tag{1.4}$$

in the cotangent bundle T^*M (with the standard symplectic structure). Here p is considered as a cotangent vector at the point $x \in M$, $|p|$ means the length of p with respect to the metric induced by g on T^*M. In local coordinates $(x^1, \ldots, x^n)$ we have

$$|p|^2 = g^{ij}(x)p_i p_j, \text{ where } p = p_j dx^j \in T^*_x M.$$

In the coordinates $(x^1, \ldots, x^n, p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ the hamiltonian system has the form

$$\frac{dx^i}{dt} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial p_i}, \ \frac{dp_i}{dt} = -\frac{\partial h}{\partial x^i}, \ i = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{1.5}$$

Let us assume for a moment that $V \in C^2(M)$, so the local Hamiltonian flow associated with the classical Hamiltonian (1.4) is well defined. Let us say that the system is *classically complete* if all the hamiltonian trajectories, i.e. solutions of (1.5), with arbitrary initial conditions are defined for all values of t. Usually it is more natural to require that they are defined for almost all initial conditions (in the phase space T^*M), but this distinction will not play any role in our considerations, though it is relevant if we want to treat potentials with local singularities (e.g. Coulomb type potentials).

We refer to Reed and Simon [34] for a more detailed discussion about classical and quantum completeness.

In the future we will assume that

$$V(x) \geq -Q(x) \text{ for all } x \in M, \tag{1.6}$$

where Q is a real-valued function which is positive and somewhat more regular than V itself.

For any $x, y \in M$ denote by $d_g(x,y)$ the distance between x and y induced by the Riemannian metric g.

Now we can formulate the main result which generalizes the result of I. Oleinik [30] (see also [41]):

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $A \in \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M)$, V satisfies (1.6) where $Q(x) \geq 1$ for all $x \in M$ and the following conditions are satisfied:*

(a) The function $Q^{-1/2}$ is globally Lipschitz i.e.

$$|Q^{-1/2}(x) - Q^{-1/2}(y)| \leq C d_g(x,y), \ x, y \in M, \tag{1.7}$$

(*b*) $$\int^{\infty} Q^{-1/2} ds = \infty,$$
where the integral is taken along any parametrized curve (with a parameter $t \in [a, \infty)$*), such that it goes out to infinity (i.e. leaves any compact* $K \subset M$ *starting at some value of the parameter* t*),* ds *means the arc length element associated with the given metric* g*.*

Then the operator $H_{A,V}$ *given by (1.1) is essentially self-adjoint.*

Remark 1.2. The requirement (b) is related to the classical completeness of the system with the Hamiltonian $|p|^2 - Q(x)$ if we additionally assume that $Q \in C^2(M)$. To illustrate this assume for simplicity that $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ and the metric g is the standard flat metric on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Now assume that (b) is satisfied. Then along the classical trajectory of the Hamiltonian $|p|^2 - Q(x)$ we have

$$|p|^2 - Q(x) = E = const.$$

It follows that

$$dt = \frac{ds}{|\dot{x}|} = \frac{ds}{2|p|} = \frac{ds}{2\sqrt{E + Q(x)}},$$

hence the classical completeness for the Hamiltonian $|p^2| - Q(x)$ follows from the condition (b).

Remark 1.3. If we assume that $Q \in C^2(M)$ then the condition (b) is equivalent to the geodesic completeness of the Riemannian metric $\tilde{g}$ given by $\tilde{g}_{ij} = Q^{-1} g_{ij}$ (so $\tilde{g}$ is conformal to the original metric g).

Note also that (b) implies that the original metric g is also complete because $Q \geq 1$.

Remark 1.4. The requirement (a) in the theorem does not impose any serious restrictions on the growth of Q at infinity, but rather restricts oscillations of Q. Indeed, we can equivalently rewrite (a) in the form of the following estimate:

$$|dQ| \leq 2CQ^{3/2},$$

where $|dQ|$ means the length of the cotangent vector dQ as above. Arbitrary tower of exponents

$$e^r, e^{e^r}, e^{e^{e^r}} \ldots,$$

satisfies this estimate. (Here $r = r(x) = d_g(x, x_0)$ with a fixed $x_0 \in M$.)

Imposing appropriate conditions on V sometimes leads to the equivalence of the conditions of classical and quantum completeness (in case $A = 0$). An example of such situation was provided by A. Wintner [47] in case $n = 1$, with the restrictions which mean that the derivatives of V are small compared with V itself. However some conditions are indeed necessary even in case $n = 1$. This was shown by J. Rauch and M. Reed [33] who refer to unpublished lectures of E. Nelson. Examples given in [33] show that the classical and quantum completeness conditions are independent if no additional restrictions on V are imposed. (See also discussion on classical and quantum completeness in Appendix to Sect.X.1 in the M. Reed and B. Simon book [34].)

Remark 1.5. Theorem of I. Oleinik (i.e. Theorem 1.1 in case $A = 0$) was extended to the Laplacian on forms of arbitrary degree by M.Braverman [3]. The Braverman's result holds for the magnetic Schrödinger operator as well (which is well defined on forms of arbitrary degree), but we restrict ourselves to the case of the operator on functions for the simplicity of exposition.

2. Algebraic preliminaries

We will start by considering the operator d^*, which is formally adjoint to d, so $d^* : \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M) \to C(M)$. This operator is related with the divergence of vector fields. Let v be a smooth vector field on M. Denote by ω_v the 1-form corresponding to v i.e. locally $\omega_v = (\omega_v)_j dx^j$ where

$$(\omega_v)_j = g_{jk} v^k.$$

Vice versa, for any smooth 1-form ω we will denote by v_ω the corresponding vector field, so locally $v_\omega = v_\omega^k \partial/\partial x_k$ where

$$v_\omega^k = g^{kj}\omega_j.$$

Then we will define the divergence of v by the formula

$$\operatorname{div} v = -d^*\omega_v. \tag{2.1}$$

Equivalently we can write

$$d^*\omega = -\operatorname{div} v_\omega. \tag{2.2}$$

A straightforward calculation shows that in local coordinates

$$\operatorname{div} v = \frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}(\rho v^i), \quad v = v^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}. \tag{2.3}$$

It follows from (2.1) that $\operatorname{div} v$ (as given by (2.3)) does not depend on the choice of local coordinates but only on the metric and measure. On the other hand (2.3) implies that $\operatorname{div} v$ does not depend on the metric (even though it is not immediately seen from (2.1)).

We have the following Leibniz rule for d^* (or, equivalently, for the divergence):

$$d^*(f\omega) = f d^*\omega - \langle df, \omega\rangle, \quad f \in C^1(M),\ \omega \in \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M). \tag{2.4}$$

For the Laplacian Δ (on functions) we have

$$\Delta u = d^* du = \operatorname{div}(\nabla u), \qquad u \in C^2(M), \tag{2.5}$$

where ∇u means the gradient of u associated with g, i.e. the vector field which corresponds to du and is given in local coordinates as

$$\nabla u = g^{jk} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^k}.$$

Let us identify the magnetic potential A with the multiplication operator

$$A : C^\infty(M) \longrightarrow \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M).$$

Then the formally adjoint operator A^* is a substitution operator of the vector field v_A into 1-forms, or in other words

$$A^*\omega = \langle A, \omega \rangle = g^{jk} A_j \omega_k. \tag{2.6}$$

This gives us a formula for d_A^*:

$$d_A^*\omega = (d^* - iA^*)\omega = -\operatorname{div} v_\omega - i\langle A, \omega \rangle. \tag{2.7}$$

It follows that

$$d_A^*(f\omega) = fd^*\omega - \langle df, \omega \rangle - if\langle A, \omega \rangle, \quad f \in C^1(M),\ \omega \in \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M). \tag{2.8}$$

The following Leibniz rules for d_A^* immediately follow:

$$\begin{aligned} d_A^*(f\omega) &= fd_A^*\omega - \langle df, \omega \rangle, \\ d_A^*(f\omega) &= fd^*\omega - \langle d_A f, \omega \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where f, ω are as in (2.8).

Using these formulas, we can write an explicit expression for the magnetic Laplacian Δ_A. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_A u &= d_A^* d_A u = (d^* - iA^*)(du + iAu) \\ &= d^*du - iA^*du + id^*(Au) + A^*Au \\ &= -\Delta u - i\langle A, du \rangle - i \operatorname{div}(uv_A) + \langle A, A \rangle u \\ &= -\Delta u - 2i\langle A, du \rangle + (id^*A + |A|^2)u. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain the following expression for the magnetic Schrödinger operator (1.1):

$$H_{A,V}u = -\Delta u - 2i\langle A, du \rangle + (id^*A + |A|^2)u + Vu. \tag{2.9}$$

On the other hand using the expressions (2.3) and (2.6) for the divergence and the operator A^* we easily obtain that in local coordinates

$$H_{A,V}u = -\frac{1}{\rho}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} + iA_j\right)\left[\rho g^{jk}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^k} + iA_k\right)u\right] + Vu, \tag{2.10}$$

or in slightly different notations

$$H_{A,V}u = \frac{1}{\rho}(D_j + A_j)[\rho g^{jk}(D_k + A_k)u] + Vu, \tag{2.11}$$

where $D_j = -i\partial/\partial x_j$.

Remark 2.1. A similar operator in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (with $\rho = 1$) was considered by T. Ikebe and T. Kato [19], K. Jörgens [21], M.S.P. Eastham, W.D. Evans and J.B. McLeod [11], A. Devinatz [10] in the space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, dx)$ where dx is the standard Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. The general operator of the form (2.10) on manifolds was studied by H.O.Cordes [8]. In this generality it includes some natural geometric situations (in particular the case $\rho = \sqrt{g}$).

3. Preliminaries on the Lipschitz analysis on a Riemannian manifold

Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold. A function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ is called *a Lipschitz function with a Lipschitz constant C* if

$$|f(x) - f(x')| \le C d_g(x, x'), \quad x, x' \in M. \tag{3.1}$$

It is well known that in this case f is differentiable almost everywhere and

$$|df| \le C \tag{3.2}$$

with the same constant C. Here $|df|$ means the length of the cotangent vector df in the metric associated with g. The corresponding differential df, as well as the partial derivatives of the first order, coincide with the distributional derivatives. Vice versa if $df \in L^\infty(M)$, for the distributional differential $df = (\partial f/\partial x^j)dx^j$, then f can be modified on a set of measure 0 so that it becomes a Lipschitz function.

The estimate (3.2) can be also rewritten in the form

$$|\nabla f| \le C \tag{3.3}$$

(again with the same constant C).

In local form (in open subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$) these facts are discussed e.g. in the book of V. Mazya [27], Sect.1.1. The correspondence between constants in (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3) is straightforward.

The Lipschitz vector fields, differential forms etc. are defined in an obvious way

The formulas (2.1), (2.2), (2.3), (2.4), (2.7) apply to Lipschitz vector fields and forms instead of smooth ones.

We will need the Stokes formula, or rather the divergence formula for Lipschitz vector fields v on M in the following simplest form:

Proposition 3.1. *Let $v = v(x)$ be a Lipschitz vector field with a compact support on M. Then*
$$\int_M \operatorname{div} v \, d\mu = 0.$$

The proof of the Proposition can be easily reduced to the case when v is supported in a domain of local coordinates. After that we can use mollification (regularization) of v to approximate v by smooth vector fields. A more general statement can be found in [27], Sect. 6.2.

4. Proof of the main theorem

In this section we will always write H instead of $H_{A,V}$ for simplicity of notations.

Let H_{min} and H_{max} be the minimal and maximal operators associated with the differential expression (1.1) for H in $L^2(M)$. Here H_{min} is the closure of H in $L^2(M)$ from the initial domain $C_c^\infty(M)$, $H_{max} = H_{min}^*$ (the adjoint operator to H_{min} in $L^2(M)$). Clearly
$$\operatorname{Dom}(H_{max}) = \{u \in L^2(M) |\, Hu \in L^2(M)\},$$
where Hu is understood in the sense of distributions.

It follows from the standard functional analysis arguments (see. e.g. [2], Appendix 1), that the essential self-adjointness of H is equivalent to the symmetry of H_{max} which means that

$$(H_{max}u, v) = (u, H_{max}v), \quad u, v \in \operatorname{Dom}(H_{max}). \tag{4.1}$$

To establish the symmetry of H_{max} we need some information about $\operatorname{Dom}(H_{max})$. We will start with a simple lemma establishing necessary local information.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume as before that $A \in \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M)$ and $V \in L^\infty_{loc}(M)$. Then $u \in \operatorname{Dom}(H_{max})$ implies that $u \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(M)$, where $W^{2,2}_{loc}(M)$ is the local Sobolev space consisting of all functions from $L^2_{loc}(M)$ such that their derivatives of the first and second order in local coordinates also belong to L^2_{loc} in these coordinates.*

Proof. We will repeat an argument given in [2], Appendix 2, proof of Theorem 2.1.

We will need general local Sobolev spaces $W^{m,2}_{loc}(M)$ for arbitrary integer m. If $m \geq 0$ then the space $W^{m,2}_{loc}(M)$ consists of functions $u \in L^2_{loc}(M)$ such that their derivatives of the order $\leq m$ in local coordinates also belong to L^2_{loc} in these coordinates. (The functions which coincide almost everywhere are identified.)

Denote also by $W^{m,2}_{comp}(M)$ the space of functions which belong to $W^{m,2}_{loc}(M)$ and have a compact support.

If $m < 0$ then $W^{m,2}_{loc}(M)$ is a dual space to $W^{-m,2}_{comp}(M)$ and it consists of all distributions which can be locally represented as sums of derivatives of order $\leq -m$ of functions from L^2_{loc}.

Assume that $u \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(H_{max})$. Due to (2.9) this means that $u \in L^2(M)$ and

$$-\Delta u - 2i\langle A, du\rangle + (id^*A + |A|^2)u + Vu = f \in L^2(M),$$

where Δu and $\langle A, du\rangle$ are understood in the sense of distributions, so a priori $\Delta u \in W^{-2,2}_{loc}(M)$, $\langle A, du\rangle \in W^{-1,2}_{loc}(M)$. Note also that $(id^*A + |A|^2)u + Vu \in L^2_{loc}(M)$. It follows from the local elliptic regularity theorem applied to $-\Delta$ that $u \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(M)$.

This already implies that $\langle A, du\rangle \in L^2_{loc}(M)$. Applying the local elliptic regularity theorem again we see that $u \in W^{2,2}_{loc}(M)$. $\square$

Remark 4.2. Lemma 4.1 is certainly not new, though I had difficulty to find a statement which would exactly imply it. More general equations are considered e.g. by D. Gilbarg and N.S. Trudinger ([14], Theorem 8.10), but with a stronger a priori requirement $u \in W^{1,2}$.

The following key lemma provides necessary global information:

Lemma 4.3. *If $u \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(H_{max})$, then*

$$\int_M Q^{-1}|d_A u|^2 d\mu \leq 2[(8C^2+1)\|u\|^2 + \|u\|\cdot\|Hu\|] < \infty. \tag{4.2}$$

Here $\|\cdot\|$ means the norm in $L^2(M)$, and C is the Lipschitz constant for $Q^{-1/2}$ from (1.7).

Proof. Let us choose a Lipschitz function $\phi : M \to \mathbb{R}$, such that ϕ has a compact support and

$$0 \leq \phi \leq Q^{-1/2}. \tag{4.3}$$

Note that this implies that $\phi \leq 1$.

Let us estimate the quantity $I \geq 0$ where

$$I^2 = \int_M \phi^2 |d_A u|^2 d\mu.$$

To this end let us calculate first $d^*(\phi^2\bar{u}d_A u))$ using (2.2), (2.7) and the Leibniz rules from Sect.3:

$$d^*(\phi^2\bar{u}\,d_A u) \quad = \phi^2\bar{u}\,d^*d_A u - \langle d(\phi^2\bar{u}), d_A u\rangle$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \phi^2 \bar u\, d^* d_A u - \phi^2 \langle d\bar u, d_A u\rangle - 2\phi \bar u \langle d\phi, d_A u\rangle \\
&= \phi^2 \bar u\, d_A^* d_A u + \phi^2 \bar u i\, A^*(d_A u) - \phi^2 \langle d\bar u, d_A u\rangle - 2\phi \bar u \langle d\phi, d_A u\rangle \\
&= \phi^2 \bar u\, d_A^* d_A u - \phi^2 \langle d\bar u - i\bar u A, d_A u\rangle - 2\phi \bar u \langle d\phi, d_A u\rangle \\
&= \phi^2 \bar u\, d_A^* d_A u - \phi^2 |d_A u|^2 - 2\phi \bar u \langle d\phi, d_A u\rangle .
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that

$$
\phi^2 |d_A u|^2 = -d^*(\phi^2 \bar u d_A u) + \phi^2 \bar u (d_A^* d_A u) - 2\phi \bar u \langle d\phi, d_A u\rangle . \tag{4.4}
$$

Replacing $d_A^* d_A u$ by $(H - V)u$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi^2 |d_A u|^2 &= -d^*(\phi^2 \bar u d_A u) - 2\phi \bar u \langle d\phi, d_A u\rangle + \phi^2 \bar u \cdot Hu - \phi^2 V |u|^2 \\
&\le -d^*(\phi^2 \bar u d_A u) - 2\phi \bar u \langle d\phi, d_A u\rangle + \phi^2 \bar u \cdot Hu + \phi^2 Q |u|^2 .
\end{aligned}
$$

(Note that the right hand side of the last equality is real because the left hand side is.)

Let us integrate the inequality over M. Due to (2.2) and the Stokes formula (Proposition 3.1) the integral of the first term in the right hand side vanishes. Taking into account that $0 \le \phi \le 1$ and $\phi^2 Q \le 1$ due to (4.3), we can estimate the integral of the last two terms by $\|u\|(\|u\| + \|Hu\|)$. Now denote by $\tilde C$ the Lipschitz constant of ϕ, so that $|d\phi| \le \tilde C$. Then we obtain by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
&2\left| \int_M \phi \bar u \langle d\phi, d_A u\rangle d\mu \right| = \\
&2\left| \int_M \langle \bar u d\phi, \phi d_A u\rangle d\mu \right| \le 2\tilde C I \|u\| .
\end{aligned}
$$

Overall we obtain the inequality

$$
I^2 \le 2\tilde C I \|u\| + \|u\|(\|u\| + \|Hu\|).
$$

Estimating

$$
2\tilde C I \|u\| \le \frac{1}{2} I^2 + 8\tilde C^2 \|u\|^2 ,
$$

we arrive at the estimate

$$
I^2 \le 2[(8\tilde C^2 + 1)\|u\|^2 + \|u\| \cdot \|Hu\|]. \tag{4.5}
$$

Now it is easy to construct a sequence of Lipschitz functions ϕ_k, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, such that ϕ_k satisfies

$$
0 \le \phi_k \le Q^{-1/2}, \quad |d\phi_k| \le C + 1/k,
$$

(4.3) for any k, $\phi_1 \le \phi_2 \le \ldots$, and

$$
\lim_{k\to\infty} \phi_k(x) = Q^{-1/2}(x), \quad x \in M.
$$

Indeed, take a function $\chi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, such that $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $0 \le \chi \le 1$, $\chi(t) = 1$ if $t \le 1$, $\chi(t) = 0$ if $t \ge 3$, and $|\chi'| \le 1$. Then we can take

$$\phi_k(x) = \chi(k^{-1} d_g(x, x_0)) Q^{-1/2}(x),$$

where $x_0 \in M$ is an arbitrary fixed point. The estimate (4.5) holds for ϕ_k with $\tilde{C} = C + 1/k$. Taking the limit as $k \to \infty$, we obtain (4.2). □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We want to prove that the operator H_{max} is symmetric.

Let us introduce a new metric $\tilde{g}_{ij} = Q^{-1} g_{ij}$ and denote the corresponding distance function by $\tilde{d}$. This means that for any $x, y \in M$

$$\tilde{d}(x, y) = \inf \left\{ \int_\gamma Q^{-1/2} ds | \ \gamma : [0,1] \to M, \ \gamma(0) = x, \gamma(1) = y \right\},$$

where $\gamma \in C^\infty$ and ds means the element of the arc length of γ associated with g. Denote also

$$P(x) = \tilde{d}(x, x_0),$$

where $x_0 \in M$ is fixed. The completeness condition (b) means exactly that

$$P(x) \to \infty \text{ as } x \to \infty,$$

or, equivalently, that the set $\{x | \ P(x) \le t\} \subset M$ is compact for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Clearly, $|dP|_{\tilde{g}} \le 1$, which can be rewritten as

$$|dP|^2 \le Q^{-1}.$$

(Here, as above, $|dP|$ means the length of the cotangent vector dP with respect to the original metric g.)

Now for two functions $u, v \in \operatorname{Dom}(H_{max})$ consider the following integral:

$$I_t = \int_{\{x| \ P(x) \le t\}} \left(1 - \frac{P(x)}{t}\right) (u \cdot \overline{Hv} - \bar{v} \cdot Hu) d\mu.$$

By the dominated convergence theorem we obviously have

$$I_t \to \int_M (u \cdot \overline{Hv} - \bar{v} \cdot Hu) d\mu = (u, Hv) - (Hu, v) \quad \text{as } t \to \infty. \tag{4.6}$$

(Here $(\cdot, \cdot)$ means the scalar product in $L^2(M)$.) Hence the desired symmetry of H_{max} is equivalent to the fact that $I_t \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$ for any $u, v \in \operatorname{Dom}(H_{max})$.

Now note that

$$u \cdot \overline{Hv} - \bar{v} \cdot Hu = \bar{v} \cdot \Delta_A u - u \cdot \overline{\Delta_A v} = u \cdot \overline{d_A^* d_A v} - \bar{v} \cdot d_A^* d_A u. \tag{4.7}$$

Here both terms are locally integrable due to Lemma 4.1.

We claim that the right hand side of (4.7) can be presented as a divergence in the following way:

$$u \cdot \overline{d_A^* d_A v} - \bar{v} \cdot d_A^* d_A u = d^*(u \cdot \overline{d_A v} - \bar{v} \cdot d_A u). \tag{4.8}$$

Indeed, calculating the right hand side by use of the Leibniz rule (2.4) for d^* and formulas for d_A, d_A^* from Sect.3, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& d^*(u \cdot \overline{d_A v} - \bar{v} \cdot d_A u) \\
= \; & (u \cdot \overline{d^* d_A v} - \bar{v} \cdot d^* d_A u) - (\langle du, \overline{d_A v}\rangle - \langle d\bar{v}, d_A u\rangle) \\
= \; & (u \cdot \overline{d^* d_A v} - \bar{v} \cdot d^* d_A u) - (\langle du, \overline{iAv}\rangle - \langle d\bar{v}, iAu\rangle) \\
= \; & (u \cdot \overline{d^* d_A v} - \bar{v} \cdot d^* d_A u) - (\langle d_A u, \overline{iAv}\rangle - \langle \overline{d_A v}, iAu\rangle) \\
= \; & (u \cdot \overline{(d^* d_A v - i\langle A, d_A v\rangle)} - \bar{v} \cdot (d^* d_A u - i\langle A, d_A u\rangle)) \\
= \; & u \cdot \overline{d_A^* d_A v} - \bar{v} \cdot d_A^* d_A u,
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

Using (4.8) and the Leibniz rules, we can rewrite the integrand of I_t as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(1 - \frac{P(x)}{t}\right)(u \cdot \overline{Hv} - \bar{v} \cdot Hu) \\
= \; & \left(1 - \frac{P(x)}{t}\right) d^*(u \cdot \overline{d_A v} - \bar{v} \cdot d_A u) \\
= \; & d^* \left[\left(1 - \frac{P(x)}{t}\right)(u \cdot \overline{d_A v} - \bar{v} \cdot d_A u)\right] + \frac{1}{t}\left(u\langle dP, \overline{d_A v}\rangle - \bar{v}\langle d_A u, dP\rangle\right).
\end{aligned}$$

The integral of the first term in the right hand side (with respect to $d\mu$) vanishes due to Proposition 3.1. Therefore using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_t| & = \left| \frac{1}{t} \int_{\{x \mid P(x) \le t\}} \left(u\langle dP, \overline{d_A v}\rangle - \bar{v}\langle d_A u, dP\rangle\right) d\mu \right| \\
& = \left| \frac{1}{t} \int_{\{x \mid P(x) \le t\}} \left(u\langle Q^{1/2} dP, Q^{-1/2}\overline{d_A v}\rangle - \bar{v}\langle Q^{-1/2} d_A u, Q^{1/2} dP\rangle\right) d\mu \right| \\
& \le \frac{1}{t}(\|v\| \|Q^{-1/2} d_A u\| + \|u\| \|Q^{-1/2} d_A v\|).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.3 the right hand side is $O(1/t)$, so $I_t \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. Due to (4.6) this proves that H_{max} is symmetric i.e. (4.1) holds. This ends the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

5. Examples and further comments

In this section we will provide several examples, further results and relevant bibliographical comments (by necessity incomplete).

We will start with some particular cases of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 5.1. *Let (M, g) be a complete Riemannian manifold. Then the magnetic Laplacian $\Delta_A = -d_A^* d_A$ is essentially self-adjoint in $L^2(M, d\mu)$ for any magnetic potential $A \in \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M)$ and any positive smooth measure $d\mu$.*

PROOF. Take $Q(x) \equiv 1$ and use Theorem 1.1. □

Theorem 5.1 generalizes the classical theorem by M. Gaffney [13] which corresponds to the case when $A = 0$ and $d\mu = d\mu_g$.

Note however that in fact the proof of Theorem 1.1 uses some elements of the Gaffney's proof.

N.N. Ural'ceva [45] and S.A. Laptev [25] provided examples of elliptic operators in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, dx)$ of the form

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\left(g^{jk}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x^k}\right)$$

(with smooth positive definite matrices (g^{jk})) which are not essentially self-adjoint due to the fact that the coefficients g^{jk} are "rapidly growing". In these examples the inverse matrix (g_{jk}) is vice versa "rapidly decaying", which implies that $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the metric (g_{jk}) is not complete.

Theorem 5.2. *Let (M, g) be a complete Riemannian manifold with a positive smooth measure $d\mu$, $A \in \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M)$, $V \in L^\infty_{loc}(M)$, and $V(x) \geq -C$, $x \in M$, with a constant C. Then the magnetic Schrödinger operator $H = -\Delta_A + V(x)$ is essentially self-adjoint.*

In case when $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ (with the standard metric and measure) and $A = 0$ this result is due to T. Carleman [5], and the Carleman proof is reproduced in the book of I.M. Glazman [16], Theorem 34 in Sect.3. In this case the requirement $V \in L^\infty_{loc}$ can be completely removed, i.e. replaced by $V \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, as was shown by T. Kato [23] (see also [34], Sect. X.4). This can be done with the help of the Kato inequality

$$\Delta|u| \geq \mathrm{Re}[(\mathrm{sgn}\, u)\Delta u],$$

for any $u \in L^1_{loc}$ such that $\Delta u \in L^1_{loc}$. Some non-positive perturbations can be allowed as well. For example, it is sufficient to require that $V = V_1 + V_2$ where $V_1 \in L^2_{loc}$, $V_1 \geq 0$, and V_2 is bounded with respect to $-\Delta$ with the $-\Delta$-bound $a < 1$. In particular, it is sufficient to assume that

$$V_+ = \max(V, 0) \in L^2_{loc}, \quad V_- = \min(V, 0) \in L^p + L^\infty,$$

where $p = 2$ if $n \le 3$; $p > 2$ if $n = 4$, and $p = n/2$ if $n \ge 5$. The work by T. Kato was partially motivated by the paper of B. Simon [42] who proved the essential self-adjointness under an additional restriction compared with [23]. The reader may consult Chapters X.4, X.5 in M. Reed and B. Simon [34] for more references, motivations and a review.

It is actually sufficient to require only that the operator H_{min} is semi-bounded below, as was suggested by I.M. Glazman and proved by A.Ya. Povzner [32]. Another proof was suggested by E. Wienholtz [46] and also reproduced in [16].

Though the completeness requirement looks natural in case of semi-bounded operators, sometimes it can be relaxed and incompletness may be compensated by a specific behavior of the potential (see e.g. A.G. Brusentsev [4] and also the references there).

The following theorem in case $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ with the standard metric and measure and with $A = 0$ is due to D.B. Sears (see e.g. [39, 44, 2]), who followed an idea of an earlier paper by E.C. Titchmarsh.

Theorem 5.3. *Let us fix $x_0 \in M$ and denote $r = r(x) = d_g(x, x_0)$. Assume that $A \in \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M)$ and $V(x) \ge -Q(r)$ where $Q(r) \ge 1$ for all $r \ge 0$,*

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{dr}{\sqrt{Q(r)}} = \infty, \tag{5.1}$$

and one of the following two conditions is satisfied:

(a) $Q^{-1/2}$ is globally Lipschitz, i.e.

$$|Q^{-1/2}(r) - Q^{-1/2}(r')| \le C|r - r'|, \quad r, r' \in [0, \infty); \tag{5.2}$$

(b) Q is monotone increasing.

Then the operator (1.1) is essentially self-adjoint.

Proof. Under condition (a) this theorem clearly follows from Theorem 1.1.

Now assume that (b) is satisfied. Then we can follow F.S. Rofe-Beketov [35] to reduce this to the case when in fact (a) is satisfied. It is enough to construct a new function $\tilde{Q}$, such that $\tilde{Q}(r) \ge Q(r)$ for all $r \ge 0$ and $\tilde{Q}$ satisfies both (5.1) and (a). To this end we can define $\tilde{Q}(n) = Q(n+1)$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, and then extend $\tilde{Q}^{-1/2}$ to the semi-axis $[0, \infty)$ by linear interpolation, i.e. take

$$\tilde{Q}^{-1/2}(\alpha n + (1-\alpha)(n+1)) = \alpha \tilde{Q}^{-1/2}(n) + (1-\alpha)\tilde{Q}^{-1/2}(n+1),$$

where $0 \le \alpha \le 1$, $n = 0, 1, \ldots$. It is easy to see that $\tilde{Q}$ satisfies the desired conditions. □

Remark 5.4. F.S. Rofe-Beketov [36] proved in case $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ (with the standard metric and measure0 and $A = 0$ that the local inequality $V(x) \ge -Q(x)$ can be replaced by an operator inequality

$$H \geq -\varepsilon\Delta - Q(x)$$

with a constant $\varepsilon > 0$. This allows in particular some potentials which are unbounded below. I. Oleinik [31] noticed that this result can be carried over to the case of manifolds as well.

Remark 5.5. F.S. Rofe-Beketov [35] noticed that if in Theorem 5.3 we have $Q(r) < \infty$ for all $r \geq 0$ and Q satisfies (5.2), then we can always replace Q by another function $Q_1 \in C^\infty$ such that Q_1 also satisfies all the conditions (including (a) with a possibly bigger Lipschitz constant).

Indeed, it suffices to construct a globally Lipschitz C^∞ function $Q_1 : [0, \infty) \to [1, \infty)$ so that $Q(r)/2 \leq Q_1(r) \leq 2Q(r)$ for all $r \geq 0$. To this end we can first mollify $Q^{-1/2}$ on each of the overlapping intervals $[0, 4], [2, 6], [6, 10], \ldots$, by convolution with a positive smooth probability measure supported in a small neighborood of 0. This neighborhood should depend on the chosen interval to insure the desired inequalities. Note that the convolution does not change the Lipschitz constant. Then we can use a partition of unity on $[0, \infty)$ such that it is subordinated to the covering of $[0, \infty)$ by the intervals above and consists of functions which have uniformly bounded derivatives of any fixed order (e.g. translations of an appropriately fixed C^∞ function). Using such partition of unity to glue locally mollified function $Q^{-1/2}$ we arrive to the desired approximation $Q_1^{-1/2}$.

Remark 5.6. Another Sears-type result was obtained by T. Ikebe and T. Kato [19] where magnetic Schrödinger operators in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (with the standard metric and measure) with possibly locally singular potentials were considered. The allowed local singularities are most naturally described by the Stummel type conditions first introduced by F. Stummel [43]; see also E. Wienholtz [46], E. Nelson [28], K. Jörgens [21], G. Hellwig [18], T. Kato [23], B. Simon [42], H. Kalf and F.S. Rofe-Beketov [22] and references there for other results on operators with singular potentials. In particular a recent paper by H. Kalf and F.S. Rofe-Beketov [22] contains most general results which provide the essential self-adjointness of a Schrödinger operator in $\mathbb{R}^n$ under the condition that the operator is locally self-adjoint and appropriate Sears type conditions at infinity are imposed.

Remark 5.7. B.M. Levitan [26] gave a new proof of Theorem 5.3 (in case $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ with the standard metric and measure and with $A = 0$). His proof uses the wave equation and the finite propagation speed argument. Similar arguments were later used by A.A. Chumak [7], P. Chernoff [6] and T. Kato [24] to prove essential self-adjointness in a somewhat different context. A.A. Chumak considered semi-bounded Schrödinger operators on complete Riemannian manifolds. P. Chernoff proves in particular the essential self-adjointness for the powers of such operators as well as Dirac operators, whereas T. Kato extends the arguments and results to the powers H^m, $m = 1, 2, \dots$, (in $\mathbb{R}^n$) under the condition that $H \geq -a - b|x|^2$ with some constants a, b.

Note however that the self-adjointness of the powers of the Laplacian on a complete Riemannian manifold was first established by H.O. Cordes [8] without finite propagation speed argument. (See also the book [9] for a variety of results on essential self-adjointness of semi-bounded Schrödinger-type operators on manifolds and their powers.)

There are many results on self-adjointness of more general higher order operators – see e.g. M. Schechter [38] for operators in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (and also for similar L^p results in $\mathbb{R}^n$) and also M. Shubin [40] for operators on manifolds of bounded geometry, as well as F.S. Rofe-Beketov [37] and references there.

Now we will formulate a result generalizing a theorem of I. Oleinik [31] (who considered the case $d\mu = d\mu_g$ and $A = 0$) which shows that in fact it is sufficient to restrict the behavior of the potential V only on some sequence of layers or shells which eventually surround all the points in M. The motivation of this result is obvious from the classical point of view this is obvious because the classical completeness can be guaranteed if the classical particle escaping to infinity spends infinite time already inside the layers. The first result of this kind in case $n = 1$ is due to P. Hartman [17], and further generalizations were obtained in one-dimensional case by R. Ismagilov [20] (higher order operators), and in case $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ by M.G. Gimadislamov [15], F.S. Rofe-Beketov [36], M.S.P. Eastham, W.D. Evans, J.B. McLeod [11] and A. Devinatz [10] (the last two references also include magnetic field terms).

Theorem 5.8. *Let $\{\Omega_k | \, k = 0, 1, \dots, \}$ be a sequence of open relatively compact subsets with smooth boundaries in M, $\overline{\Omega_k} \subset \Omega_{k+1}$, $\cup_k \Omega_k = M$. Denote $T_k = \Omega_{2k+1} \setminus \overline{\Omega_{2k}}$, and let h_k be the minimal thickness of the layer T_k, i.e. $h_k = \operatorname{dist}_g(\Omega_{2k}, M \setminus \Omega_{2k+1})$. Assume that $A \in \Lambda^1_{(1)}(M)$ and*

$$V(x) \geq -C\gamma_k, \ x \in T_k, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \tag{5.3}$$

where $C > 0$, $\gamma_k \geq 1$, and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \min\{h_k^2, h_k \gamma_k^{-1/2}\} = \infty. \tag{5.4}$$

Then the operator (1.1) is essentially self-adjoint.

Proof. Following F.S. Rofe-Beketov [36] and I. Oleinik [31] we will construct a minorant Q for the potential V, so that the conditions (a) and (b) in Theorem 1.1 are satisfied.

We will start by constructing for any $k = 0, 1, \dots$, a function $Q_k \geq 0$ on M such that $Q_k = +\infty$ on $M \setminus T_k$, then assemble $Q^{-1/2}$ as a linear combination of the functions $Q_k^{-1/2}$.

Denote for any $x \in M$

$$\delta_{2k}(x) = \mathrm{dist}_g(x, \Omega_{2k}), \quad \delta_{2k+1}(x) = \mathrm{dist}_g(x, M \setminus \Omega_{2k+1}), \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots.$$

For $p = 2k, 2k+1$ introduce sets

$$\Omega'_p = \{x | \, \delta_p(x) \leq h_k/4\}$$

and functions $\delta'_p : M \to [0, \infty)$,

$$\delta'_p(x) = \mathrm{dist}_g(x, M \setminus \Omega'_p).$$

Now define

$$Q_k^{-1/2}(x) = h_k^{-1}, \quad x \in M \setminus (\Omega'_{2k} \cup \Omega'_{2k+1}),$$

and

$$Q_k^{-1/2}(x) = h_k^{-1} \delta_p(x)(\delta_p(x) + \delta'_p(x))^{-1}, \quad x \in \Omega'_p,$$

where $p = 2k$ or $2k+1$. Clearly $0 \leq Q_k^{-1/2}(x) \leq h_k^{-1}$ on M and $Q_k^{-1/2}(x) = 0$ if $x \notin T_k$.

Let us evaluate the Lipschitz constant for $Q_k^{-1/2}$. To this end denote $f(s,t) = s/(s+t)$, and observe that the absolute values of both partial derivatives of f in s and t are bounded by $(s+t)^{-1}$ if $s, t \geq 0$, $s + t > 0$. Also both δ_p and δ'_p are Lipschitz with the Lipschitz constant 1. Now note that it is easily follows from the triangle inequality that

$$\delta_p(x) + \delta'_p(x) \geq h_k/4, \quad x \in M.$$

Hence by the chain rule we see that

$$|\nabla(Q_k^{-1/2})| \leq 2h_k^{-1} \cdot 4h_k^{-1} = 8h_k^{-2}.$$

Hence the Lipschitz constant of $Q_k^{-1/2}$ does not exceed $8h_k^{-2}$.

Now let us define

$$Q^{-1/2}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k Q_k^{-1/2},$$

where we will adjust the coefficients $a_k \geq 0$ so that all the conditions are satisfied. Let us list these conditions turn by turn.

(a) We need the condition $V \geq -Q$ to be satisfied which will be guaranteed if $-C\gamma_k \geq -Q(x)$, $x \in T_k$. This is equivalent to $Q_k^{-1/2} \leq (C\gamma_k)^{-1/2}$, $k = 0, 1, \ldots$, and will be guaranteed if $a_k h_k^{-1} \leq (C\gamma_k)^{-1/2}$ or

$$a_k \leq C^{-1/2} h_k \gamma_k^{-1/2}. \tag{5.5}$$

(b) The Lipschitz constant of $Q^{-1/2}$ is evaluated by $8 \sup_k (a_k h_k^{-2})$, so for $Q^{-1/2}$ to be Lipschitz it is sufficient to have

$$a_k \leq C_1 h_k^2 \tag{5.6}$$

with some constant $C_1 > 0$.

(c) At last we need the condition (b) of Theorem 1.1 to be satisfied. Note that the minimal thickness of the internal layer $T'_k = M \setminus (\Omega'_{2k} \cup \Omega'_{2k+1})$ is at least $h_k/2$, and $Q^{-1/2} = a_k h_k^{-1}$ in T'_k. It follows that the condition (b) in Theorem 1.1 will be satisfied if we require

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k = \infty. \tag{5.7}$$

Now taking $C_1 = C^{-1/2}$ we can choose

$$a_k = C^{-1/2} \min\{h_k^2, h_k \gamma_k^{-1/2}\},$$

so the conditions (5.5), (5.6) will be automatically satisfied. The condition (5.7) will be satisfied if we require the condition (5.4) to hold. □

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-9706038. I am also very grateful to Yu. Netrusov and F.S. Rofe-Beketov for useful discussions.

References

[1] Yu.M. Berezanski, *Expansions in eigenfunctions of self-adjoint operators,* Amer. Math. Soc. Translation of Math. Monographs, Providence, RI, 1968

[2] F.A. Berezin, M.A. Shubin, *The Schrödinger equation,* Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht e.a., 1991

[3] M. Braverman, *On self-adjointness of a Schrödinger operator on differential forms,* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **126** (1998), 617–624

[4] A.G. Brusentsev, *On essential self-adjointness of semi-bounded second order elliptic operators without completeness of the Riemannian manifold,* Math. Physics, Analysis, Geometry (Kharkov), **2** (1995), no. 2, 152–167 (in Russian)

[5] T. Carleman, *Sur la théorie mathématique de l'équation de Schrödinger,* Ark. Mat. Astr. Fys., **24B**, no. 11 (1934), 1–7

[6] P. Chernoff, *Essential self-adjointness of powers of generators of hyperbolic equations,* J. Funct. Analysis, **12** (1973), 401–414

[7] A.A. Chumak, *Self-adjointness of the Beltrami-Laplace operator on a complete paracompact manifold without boundary,* Ukrainian Math. Journal, **25** (1973), no. 6, 784-791 (in Russian)

[8] H.O. Cordes, *Self-adjointness of powers of elliptic operators on non-compact manifolds,* Math. Annalen, **195** (1972), 257-272

[9] H.O. Cordes, *Spectral theory of linear differential operators and comparison algebras,* London Math. Soc., Lecture Notes Series, **76**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1987

[10] A. Devinatz, *Essential self-adjointnessof Schrödinger-type operators,* J. Funct. Analysis, **25** (1977), 58–69

[11] M.S.P. Eastham, W.D. Evans, J.B. McLeod, *The essential self-adjointness of Schrödinger type operators,* Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., **60** (1975/76), no. 2, 185–204

[12] W. Faris, R. Lavine, *Commutators and self-adjointness of Hamiltonian operators,* Commun. Math. Phys., **35** (1974), 39–48

[13] M. Gaffney, *A special Stokes's theorem for complete Riemannian manifolds,* Ann. of Math., **60** (1954). 140–145

[14] D. Gilbarg, N.S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order.* Second Edition. Springer-Verlag, Berlin e.a., 1983

[15] M.G. Gimadislamov, *Sufficient conditions of coincidence of minimal and maximal partial differential operators and discreteness of their spectrum,* Math. Notes, **4**, no. 3 (1968), 301–317 (in Russian)

[16] I.M. Glazman, *Direct methods of qualitative spectral analysis of singular differential operators,* Israel Program for Scientific Translation, Jerusalem, 1965

[17] P. Hartman, *The number of L^2-solutions of $x'' + q(t)x = 0$,* Amer. J. Math., **73** (1951), 635–645

[18] G. Hellwig, *Differential operators of mathematical physics. An introduction.* Addison-Wesley, 1964

[19] T. Ikebe, T. Kato, *Uniqueness of the self-adjoint extension of singular elliptic differential operators,* Arch. for Rat. Mech. and Anal., **9** (1962), 77–92

[20] R.S. Ismagilov, *Conditions for self-adjointness of differential operators of higher order,* Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **142** (1962), 1239–1242. English translation: Soviet Math. Doklady, **3** (1962), 279–283

[21] K. Jörgens, *Wesentliche Selbstadjungiertheit singulärer elliptischer Differentialoperatoren zweiter Ordnung in $C_0^\infty(G)$*, Math. Scand., **15** (1964), 5–17

[22] H. Kalf, F.S. Rofe-Beketov, *On the essential self-adjointness of Schrödinger operators with locally integrable potentials*, Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh, **128A** (1998), 95–106

[23] T. Kato, *Schrödinger operators with singular potentials,* Israel J. Math., **13** (1972), 135–148

[24] T. Kato, *A remark to the preceding paper by Chernoff,* J. Funct. Analysis, **12** (1973), 415–417

[25] S.A. Laptev, *Closure in the metric of a generalized Dirichlet integral,* Differential Equations, **7** (1971), 557–564

[26] B.M. Levitan, *On a theorem by Titchmarsh and Sears,* Uspekhi Matem. Nauk, **16**, no.4 (1961), 175–178 (in Russian)

[27] V.G. Mazya, *Sobolev spaces,* Springer-Verlag, Berlin e.a., 1985

[28] E. Nelson, *Feynman integrals and the Schrödinger operators,* J. Math. Phys., **5** (1964), 332–343

[29] I.M. Oleinik, *On the essential self-adjointness of the Schrödinger operator on a complete Riemannian manifold,* Mathematical Notes, **54** (1993), 934–939

[30] I.M. Oleinik, *On the connection of the classical and quantum mechanical completeness of a potential at infinity on complete Riemannian manifolds,* Mathematical Notes, **55** (1994), 380–386

[31] I.M. Oleinik, *On the essential self-adjointness of the Schrödinger-type operators on complete Riemannian manifolds,* PhD thesis, Northeastern University, May 1997

[32] A.Ya. Povzner, *On expansions of arbitrary functions in eigenfunctions of the operator* $\Delta u + cu$, Matem. Sbornik, **32** (74), no. 1 (1953), 109–156 (in Russian)

[33] J. Rauch, M. Reed, *Two examples illustrating the differences between classical and quantum mechanics,* Commun. Math. Phys., **29** (1973), 105–111

[34] M. Reed, B. Simon, *Methods of modern mathematical physics. II: Fourier analysis, self-adjointness.* Academic Press, New York e.a., 1975

[35] F.S. Rofe-Beketov, *On non-semibounded differential operators,* Theory of Functions, Functional Analysis and Applications (Teoriya funktsii, funkts. analyz i ikh prilozh.), no. 2, Kharkov (1966), 178–184 (in Russian)

[36] F.S. Rofe-Beketov, *Conditions for the self-adjointness of the Schrödinger operator,* Mathematical Notes, **8** (1970), 888–894

[37] F.S. Rofe-Beketov, *Self-adjointness of elliptic operators of higher order and energy estimates in* $\mathbb{R}^n$, Theory of Functions, Functional Analysis and Applications (Teoriya funktsii, funkts. analyz i ikh prilozh.), no. 56, Kharkov (1991), 35–46 (in Russian)

[38] M. Schechter, *Spectra of partial differential operators,* North-Holland, 1971

[39] D.B. Sears, *Note on the uniqueness of Green's functions associated with certain differential equations,* Canad. J. Math., **2** (1950), 314–325

[40] M.A. Shubin, *Spectral theory of elliptic operators on non-compact manifolds,* Astérisque, **207** (1992), 35–108

[41] M.A. Shubin, *Classical and quantum completeness for the Schrödinger operators on non-compact manifolds,* Preprint no. 349, SFB 288, Differentialgeometry and Quantenphysik, Berlin, October 1998

[42] B. Simon, *Essential self-adjointness of Schrödinger operators with positive potentials,* Math. Annalen, **201** (1973), 211–220

[43] F. Stummel, *Singuläre elliptische Differentialoperatoren in Hilbertschen Räumen,* Math. Annalen, **132** (1956), 150–176

[44] E.C. Titchmarsh, *Eigenfunction expansions associated with second-order differential equations,* Part II, Clarendon Press, Oxford,1958

[45] N.N. Ural'ceva, *The nonselfadjointness in* $L_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *of an elliptic operator with rapidly increasing coefficients,* Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI), **14** (1969), 288–294 (in Russian)

[46] E. Wienholtz, *Halbbeschränkte partielle Differentialoperatoren zweiter ordnung vom elliptischen Typus,* Math. Ann., **135** (1958), 50–80

[47] A. Wintner, *On the normalization of characteristic differentials in continuous spectra,* Phys. Rev., **72** (1947), 516–517

Department of Mathematics, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115, USA

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 35P05, 58G25; Secondary 47B25, 81Q10