

A THEOREM ON "LOCALIZED" SELF-ADJOINTNESS OF SCHRÖDINGER OPERATORS WITH L^1_{LOC} -POTENTIALS

HANS L. CYCON

New York University
Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences
251 Mercer Street
New York, New York 10012

(Received December 31, 1981)

ABSTRACT. We prove a result which concludes the self-adjointness of a Schrödinger operator from the self-adjointness of the associated "localized" Schrödinger operators having L^1_{Loc} -Potentials.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES. *Schrödinger operators, self-adjointness.*

1980 SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODES. 35J10, 47B25, 47A55.

1. INTRODUCTION.

In 1978, Simader [1] proved a result which concludes the self-adjointness of a Schrödinger operator from the self-adjointness of the associated "localized" Schrödinger operators. A similar result was given by Brezis [2] in 1979 which seems to be slightly more general than [1]. Both papers deal with Schrödinger operators having L^2_{loc} -potentials.

In this paper, we give an analogous result to [2] for Schrödinger operators with L^1_{loc} -potentials and show the common structure of [1] and [2]. In the proof, we use arguments due to Kato [3] and Simader [2], which are based on quadratic form methods.

We first give some notations (compare [4]). If t is a semi-bounded quadratic form with lower bound α , we denote the inner product associated with t by $(u, v)_t := t[u, v] + (1 - \alpha)(u, v)$, for u, v in the form domain $Q(t)$ of t . The associated norm will be denoted by $\|\cdot\|_t$. t is closed if $Q(t)$ together with $(\cdot, \cdot)_t$ is a Hilbert

space. Recall the one-to-one correspondence between semibounded quadratic forms and semibounded self-adjoint operators. If T is a self-adjoint semibounded operator, the domain of the closed form associated with T will be denoted by $Q(T)$ and the form by $\langle u, v \rangle \mapsto (Tu/v)$ for $u, v \in Q(T)$. The associated norm will be called the form norm of T . We will always write $Q(T)$ for the Hilbert space of the associated form if the inner product is clear. A set which is dense in the Hilbert space $Q(T)$ will be called a form core of T .

Let q be a real-valued function on \mathbb{R}^n and assume

$$q \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n) \tag{C_1}$$

and

$$Lu := -\Delta u + qu \tag{1.1}$$

with $D(L) := \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) / qu \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)\}$

where the sum in (1.1) is taken in the distributional sense. Then we define a

"maximal" operator in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ associated with L such that

$$\left. \begin{aligned} T_{\max} u &:= Lu \\ D(T_{\max}) &:= \{u \in D(L) / Lu \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\}. \end{aligned} \right\} \tag{1.2}$$

Consider the quadratic form associated with L

$$t[w, v] := \int \bar{w} Lv, \quad w, v \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{1.3}$$

If we assume

t is bounded from below and closable (without loss of generality $t \geq 0$), (C_2)

then there exists a semibounded self-adjoint operator T_F associated with the closure

of t . Note that for $q \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, T_F coincides with the Friedrichs extension of

$T_{\min} := T_{\max} \upharpoonright C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$; see [3]. $Q(T_F)$ is then the closure of $C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in the sense

of the norm $\|\cdot\|_t$ associated with the inner product $(w, v)_t := t[w, v] + (w, v)$;

$w, v \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

From (C_2) , we know $T_F \geq 0$. (1.4)

Now consider $\phi \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ such that $\phi(x) = 1$ for $|x| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\phi(x) = 0$ for $|x| \geq 1$.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\phi_k(x) := \phi\left(\frac{x}{k}\right). \tag{1.5}$$

We now assume, for any k , there exists a "localized" operator associated with L ; i.e., for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist a $q_k \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and a L_k such that

$$(i) \quad L_k u := -\Delta u + q_k u \tag{C_3}$$

$$\text{with } D(L_k) := \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) / q_k u \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)\}$$

and

$$(ii) \quad q_k \phi_k u = q \phi_k u \text{ for } u \in D(L).$$

We define also a "maximal" operator in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ associated with L_k ; i.e., for $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} T_k u &:= L_k u \\ D(T_k) &:= \{u \in D(L_k) / L_k u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\}. \end{aligned} \right\} \tag{1.6}$$

Note, that (C_3) is not really a restriction; see Corollary 1 and Corollary 2.

Denote $q_k^+ := \max\{q_k, 0\}$, $q_k^- := \max\{-q_k, 0\}$, $q^+ := \max\{q, 0\}$, $q^- := \max\{-q, 0\}$.

2. MAIN RESULTS.

THEOREM. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume (C_1) , (C_2) , and (C_3) and define T_{max} and T_k as in (1.2) and (1.6). If we assume additionally,

$$T_k \text{ is self-adjoint; } \tag{C_4}$$

and

$$C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ is a form core of } T_k \text{ and there exists a } c_k > 0 \tag{C_5}$$

such that

$$(-\Delta w, w) + (q_k^+ w/w) \leq c_k [(T_k w/w) + \|w\|^2], \quad w \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{2.1}$$

then T_{max} is self-adjoint.

PROOF. First we note that, by (C_5) , T_k is bounded from below by -1 . Thus $Q(T_k)$ is well defined.

Now we proceed in 5 steps.

Step 1. We show that for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $u \in D(T_{max})$ implies $\phi_k u \in Q(T_k)$, and thus, by (C_5) , $\phi_k u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap Q(q_k^+)$ and $q_k u \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (making use of the semiboundedness of T_k).

By $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we denote the closure of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in the usual Sobolev norm

$$\|u\|_{H^1} := (\|\nabla u\|^2 + \|u\|^2)^{1/2}. \text{ We have the continuous inclusions (compare Kato [3]),}$$

$$D(T_k) \subset Q(T_k) \subset H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset Q(T)^*.$$

By $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $Q(T_k)^*$, we denote the antidual spaces of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $Q(T_k)$. $T_k + 2$ maps $D(T_k)$ onto $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and it is well known (see [4]) that this can be extended to a bicontinuous map $T'_k + 2$ from $Q(T_k)$ onto $Q(T_k)^*$. Actually, $T'_k + 2$ is a restriction of $L_k + 2$ to $Q(T_k)$ since, by (2.1) and the semiboundedness of T_k , $v \in Q(T_k)$ implies $q_k v \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Now let $u \in D(T_{max})$. Using (C_3) , we get in the distributional sense

$$L_k \phi_k u = \phi_k T_{max} u - 2 \nabla \phi_k \nabla u - (\Delta \phi_k) u. \tag{2.2}$$

Since $\nabla \phi_k u \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and all other terms on the right hand side of (2.2) are in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have

$$L_k \phi_k u \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset Q(T_k)^*.$$

Since $T'_k + 2$ is bijective, we conclude in the same way as Kato [3, Lemma 2] that $\phi_k u \in Q(T_k)$.

Step 2. We show that, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $u \in D(T_{max})$ implies $\phi_k u \in Q(T_F)$.

Let $u \in D(T_{max})$. From Step 1, we know $\phi_k u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap Q(q_k^+)$. Then, because of (C_3) , we also have

$$\phi_k u \in Q(q^+).$$

From a theorem due to Simon [5, Theorem 2.1] (see also [6] for generalizations), we know that $C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is dense in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap Q(q^+)$ in the sense of the norm

$$\| |w| \|_{t_+} := \{ \| |\nabla w| \|^2 + (q^+ w/w) + \| |w| \|^2 \}^{1/2}, \quad w \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap Q(q^+).$$

Therefore, we can find a sequence $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\| |v_n - \phi_k u| \|_{t_+} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (n \longrightarrow \infty). \tag{2.3}$$

Then, because of (1.4), we have

$$\phi_k u \in Q(q^-) \text{ and}$$

$$(q^- (v_n - \phi_k u) / (v_n - \phi_k u)) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (n \longrightarrow \infty). \tag{2.4}$$

(2.3) and (2.4) imply $\phi_k u \in Q(T_F)$.

Step 3. We show that, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $v \in Q(T_k)$ implies $\phi_k v \in Q(T_k) \cap Q(T_F)$ and

$$u \in Q(T_F) \text{ implies } \phi_k u \in Q(T_k). \tag{2.5}$$

Let $v \in Q(T_k)$. Then, because of (C_5) , there exists a sequence $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\| |v_n - v| \|_{t_k} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (n \longrightarrow \infty), \tag{2.6}$$

where $\| |\cdot| \|_{t_k}$ denotes the form of T_k .

For $\alpha_k := 1 + \sup |\nabla\phi_k|$, we have

$$||\nabla\phi_k(v_n - v)|| \leq \alpha_k \{ ||\nabla(v_n - v)|| + ||v_n - v|| \} \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\int q_k^+ |\phi_k(v_n - v)|^2 \leq \int q_k^+ |(v_n - v)|^2; \tag{2.8}$$

because of the semiboundedness of T_k , we have

$$(q_k^- \phi_k(v_n - v) / \phi_k(v_n - v)) \leq ||\nabla\phi_k(v_n - v)||^2 + \int q_k^+ |\phi_k(v_n - v)|^2 + ||\phi_k(v_n - v)||^2. \tag{2.9}$$

(2.9), together with (2.6), (2.7) and (2.8), yields

$$\phi_k v \in Q(T_k) \tag{2.10}$$

and

$$||\phi_k v_n - \phi_k v||_{t_k} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (n \longrightarrow \infty).$$

Since, by (C_3) , we have

$$||\phi_k v_n||_{t_k}^2 = ||\phi_k v_n||_{t_k}^2 - ||\phi_k v_n||^2 \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

($||\cdot||_{t_k}$ denotes the form norm of T_k).

We can conclude

$$||\phi_k(v_n - v_m)||_{t_k} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (n, m \longrightarrow \infty)$$

and thus

$$\phi_k v \in Q(T_F). \tag{2.11}$$

(2.10) and (2.11) prove the first part of Step 3.

Now, let $u \in D(T_F)$ and $v \in Q(T_k)$. Then $\phi_k v \in Q(T_k) \cap Q(T_F)$ as proved above and there exist sequences $\{u_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{v_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$||u_j - u||_{t_k} \longrightarrow 0 \text{ and } ||v_m - v||_{t_k} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (j, m \longrightarrow \infty).$$

Thus,

$$(T_F u, \phi_k v) = \lim_{j, m \rightarrow \infty} (T_F u_j, \phi_k v_m) = \lim_{j, m \rightarrow \infty} (L u_j, \phi_k v_m). \tag{2.12}$$

Using (C_3) , we have

$$(L u_j, \phi_k v_m) = (L_k \phi_k u_j, v_m) - 2(u_j, \nabla\phi_k \nabla v_m) - (u_j, v_m \Delta\phi_k). \tag{2.13}$$

(2.12) and (2.13) yields, for a suitable constant $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (\phi_k u_j, v)_{t_k} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (T_k \phi_k u_j / v) = (T_F u, \phi_k v) + 2(u, \nabla\phi_k \nabla v) + \gamma(u, v).$$

Thus the limit of $\{\phi_k u_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ exists weakly in the Hilbert space $Q(T_k)$ and since

$$||\phi_k u_j - \phi_k u|| \longrightarrow 0 \quad (j \longrightarrow \infty),$$

we conclude

$$\phi_k u \in Q(T_k),$$

which proves the second part of Step 3.

Step 4. We show $T_F \subseteq T_{\max}$.

Let $u \in D(T_F)$. Then, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ from Step 3, we know $\phi_k u \in Q(T_k)$ and therefore, by (C_5) ,

$$\phi_k u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap Q(q_k^+).$$

As in Step 1, we conclude that

$$qu \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Thus $u \in D(L)$ and, from

$$T_F u = Lu \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

we have

$$u \in D(T_{\max}) \text{ and } T_F u = T_{\max} u.$$

Step 5. We show $T_F = T_{\max}$.

In view of Step 4, we have to show

$$D(T_{\max}) \subseteq D(T_F).$$

Let $v \in D(T_{\max})$ and

$$v' := (T_F + 1)^{-1} (T_{\max} + 1)v.$$

Thus, $v' \in D(T_{\max})$ by Step 4 and

$$(T_{\max} + 1)v = (T_F + 1)v' = (T_{\max} + 1)v'.$$

With

$$u := v - v' \in D(T_{\max}),$$

we conclude $(T_{\max} + 1)u = 0$ and therefore

$$((T_{\max} + 1)u, w) = 0 \text{ for } w \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (2.14)$$

We will show that (2.14) implies $u = 0$; then, Step 5 will be proven.

We argue in the following as Simander does in [1]. Since T_{\max} is a real operator, we may assume u to be real-valued. From Step 1, we know that $\phi_k u \in Q(T_k)$ and thus, by (C_3) and the semiboundedness of T_k ,

$$\phi_k u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap Q(q^+) \cap Q(q^-).$$

If we replace w in (2.14) by $\phi_k^2 w$, we get, after some partial integrations,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\nabla\phi_k u, \nabla\phi_k w) + (q_k^+ \phi_k u / \phi_k w) - (q_k^- \phi_k u / \phi_k w) + (\phi_k u, \phi_k w) = \\
 ((\nabla\phi_k)^2 u, w) - ((u\nabla w - w\nabla u, \phi_k \nabla\phi_k)). \quad (2.15)
 \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$u \in H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ and } q_k^\pm |\phi_k u| \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

we can, by using an approximation, replace w in (2.15) by $u^{(m)} \in H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, defined by

$$u^{(m)} := \begin{cases} u(x) & \text{for } |u(x)| \leq m \\ m \operatorname{sign}(u(x)) & \text{for } |u(x)| > m \end{cases}$$

for $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Then, the limits of both sides of (2.15) exist and we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\nabla\phi_k u, \nabla\phi_k u) + (q_k^+ \phi_k u / \phi_k u) - (q_k^- \phi_k u / \phi_k u) + (\phi_k u, \phi_k u) = \\
 ((\nabla\phi_k)^2 u, \phi_k u) + ((u\nabla\phi_k - \phi_k \nabla u, \phi_k \nabla\phi_k). \quad (2.16)
 \end{aligned}$$

Since, from Step 2, we know $\phi_k u \in Q(T_F)$, we conclude from (2.16) and from $T_F + 1 \geq 1$ that

$$\|\phi_k u\|^2 \leq ((T_F + 1)\phi_k u / \phi_k u) = \text{RHS of (2.16)} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (k \longrightarrow \infty).$$

Thus $u = 0$, which proves Step 5.

Since T_F is self-adjoint by Step 5, the theorem is proven.

COROLLARY 1. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume (C_1) and (C_2) . Set $q_k^+ := q^+$;

$$q_k^-(x) := \begin{cases} q^-(x) & \text{if } |x| \leq k \\ 0 & \text{if } |x| > k \end{cases}$$

$$q_k := q_k^+ - q_k^-;$$

and define T_k and T_{\max} as in (1.6) and (1.2). Assume additionally

$$T_k \text{ is self-adjoint} \quad (C_4)$$

and

$$\text{there exist } 0 \leq a_k < 1 \text{ and } b_k \geq 0 \text{ such that} \quad (C_5)$$

$$|(q_k^- w / w)| \leq a_k (-\Delta w, w) + b_k \|w\|^2, \quad w \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (2.17)$$

Then T_{\max} is self-adjoint.

PROOF. (C_3) holds trivially. From (2.17), we deduce

$$(-\Delta w, w) + (q_k^+ w / w) \leq \frac{1}{1 - a_k} \{ (T_k w / w) + (b_k + 1) \|w\|^2 \}$$

which implies (2.1). Since $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is dense in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap Q(q^+)$ in the sense of the

norm $\|\cdot\|_{t_+}$ (as we know from [5], see Step 2 above), (2.17) implies that $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a form core of T_k . Therefore, (C_5) holds and, by the theorem, self-adjointness of T_{\max} follows.

Note that, for $q \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, Corollary 1 implies the result of Simader [1] since then $T_{\min}^* = T_{\max}$ where

$$T_{\min} := T_{\max}|_{C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

COROLLARY 2. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume (C_1) and (C_2) . Set

$$q_k(x) := \begin{cases} q(x) & \text{if } |x| \leq k \\ 0 & \text{if } |x| > k \end{cases}$$

and define T_k and T_{\max} as in (1.6) and (1.2). Assume additionally (C_4) and (C_5) . Then T_{\max} is self-adjoint. The proof follows immediately from the theorem.

In the case $q \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, Corollary 2 implies the result of Brézis [2] by the same arguments as above. We also should note that, if $q_k^+ = q^+$ and $q_k^- = q^-$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) and if q^- is form-bounded relative to the form of $(-\Delta + q^+)$ with bound < 1 , our theorem is Kato's [3] result for the semibounded case. In fact, our proof is a variant of Kato's proof of his main theorem in [3].

Note: On leave from: Technische Universität Berlin, Fachbereich Mathematik
StraBe des 17 Juni 135, 1 Berlin 12, Germany

REFERENCES

1. SIMADER, C.G. Essential self-adjointness of Schrödinger operators bounded from below, Math. Z. 159 (1978), 47-50.
2. BRÉZIS, H. "Localized" self-adjointness of Schrödinger operators, J. Operator Theory 1 (1979), 287-290.
3. KATO, T. A second look at the essential self-adjointness of Schrödinger operators, in: Physical reality and mathematical description, C.P. Enz, J. Mehra eds., D. Reichel Dordrecht (1974).
4. FARIS, W.G. Self-adjoint operators, Lect. Notes in Math. 433, Springer (1975).
5. SIMON, B. Maximal and minimal Schrödinger operators and forms, J. Operator Theory Appl. 1 (1979), 37-47.
6. CYCON, H.L. On the form sum and the Friedrichs extension of Schrödinger operators with singular potentials, J. Operator Theory 6 (1981), 75-86.

Special Issue on Singular Boundary Value Problems for Ordinary Differential Equations

Call for Papers

The purpose of this special issue is to study singular boundary value problems arising in differential equations and dynamical systems. Survey articles dealing with interactions between different fields, applications, and approaches of boundary value problems and singular problems are welcome.

This Special Issue will focus on any type of singularities that appear in the study of boundary value problems. It includes:

- Theory and methods
- Mathematical Models
- Engineering applications
- Biological applications
- Medical Applications
- Finance applications
- Numerical and simulation applications

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/bvp/guidelines.html>. Authors should follow the Boundary Value Problems manuscript format described at the journal site <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/bvp/>. Articles published in this Special Issue shall be subject to a reduced Article Processing Charge of €200 per article. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/> according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	May 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	August 1, 2009
Publication Date	November 1, 2009

Lead Guest Editor

Juan J. Nieto, Departamento de Análisis Matemático, Facultad de Matemáticas, Universidad de Santiago de

Compostela, Santiago de Compostela 15782, Spain;
juanjose.nieto.roig@usc.es

Guest Editor

Donal O'Regan, Department of Mathematics, National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland;
donal.oregan@nuigalway.ie