

Low energy resolvent estimates for slowly decaying attractive potentials

Kenichi ITO* & Tomoya TAGAWA†

Abstract

We discuss the low energy resolvent estimates for the Schrödinger operator with slowly decaying attractive potential. The main results are Rellich's theorem, the limiting absorption principle and Sommerfeld's uniqueness theorem. For the proofs we employ an elementary commutator method due to Ito–Skibsted, for which neither of microlocal or functional-analytic techniques is required.

Keywords: Schrödinger operator, slowly decaying potentials, low-energy resolvent estimates, commutator method.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2020: Primary 81U05; Secondary 35J10.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Basic settings	3
1.1.1	Slowly decaying attractive potential	3
1.1.2	Agmon-Hörmander spaces	4
1.2	Main results	5
1.2.1	Rellich's theorem	5
1.2.2	LAP bounds	5
1.2.3	Radiation condition bounds and applications	6
2	Classical mechanics	8
2.1	Effective time	8

*Department of Mathematics, Graduate School of Science, Kobe University, 1-1, Rokkodai, Nada-ku, Kobe 657-8501, Japan. E-mail: ito-ken@math.kobe-u.ac.jp.

†Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan. E-mail: [tagawa-tomoya1212@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp](mailto>tagawa-tomoya1212@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp).

3 Rellich's theorem	10
3.1 Main propositions	10
3.2 A priori super-exponential decay estimate	11
3.3 Absence of super-exponentially decaying eigenfunction	16
4 LAP bounds	19
4.1 Main proposition	19
4.2 Proof of LAP bounds	23
5 Radiation condition bounds	25
5.1 Commutator estimate	25
5.2 Applications	28
5.2.1 Radiation condition bounds for complex spectral parameters.	28
5.2.2 Limiting absorption principle.	29
5.2.3 Radiation condition bounds for real spectral parameters. . .	30
5.2.4 Sommerfeld uniqueness result.	31
A LAP bounds in high energy regime	31
A.1 Settings and results	31
A.2 Outline of proof	32
A.2.1 Reduction	32
A.2.2 h -Resolvent estimates	33

1 Introduction

In the present paper we discuss the uniform low energy resolvent estimates for the Schrödinger operator on \mathbb{R}^d with $d \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$:

$$H = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta + V + q.$$

The operator Δ is the ordinary Laplacian, and we shall often write it as

$$-\Delta = p^2 = p_i p_i = p \cdot p, \quad p = -i\nabla = -i\partial.$$

Here and below the Einstein summation convention is adopted without tensorial superscripts. The potential V is *slowly decaying* and *attractive*, and q is a perturbation of short-range type for $-\frac{1}{2}\Delta + V$. Precise assumptions will be given soon below in Assumption 1.1.

The scattering theory for slowly decaying potentials, whether attractive or repulsive, was first studied by Yafaev [13], and was developed by Nakamura [10] and Fournais–Skibsted [4] in connection with the threshold resonances. These approaches were even further sophisticated by Skibsted [11], where the full stationary

scattering theory was carried out with sharp estimates involving long-range perturbations. Our goal is very similar to that of [11], but we would like to relax the smoothness assumption and simplify the proofs. In fact, almost all of these former results impose C^∞ smoothness on the potential, since they are dependent on the pseudodifferential techniques. Recently, Ito–Skibsted [6] developed simple commutator arguments to discuss the stationary scattering theory for strictly positive energies. We are going to follow their approach for the low energies including 0.

The setting of the paper is in part stronger than it should be, in that the principal part of the potential has spherical symmetry, and in that the perturbation is of short-range type, either of which were not assumed in [11]. However in the present paper we can relax smoothness to C^2 with a new technique from [6]. We expect that the paper could be extended to the setting of [11], if we employed a method of an even recent paper by Ito–Skibsted [7]. This would require much longer and more complicated preliminaries, and for this reason here we have decided to present only simple startup arguments for the subject. Hopefully, we could discuss such an extension elsewhere.

If the leading part of the potential is spherically symmetric, one can extract precise information on the scattering matrix, see e.g. [1]. In particular, Dereziński–Skibsted [2, 3] and Frank [5] computed its FIO expression at energy zero. The uniform resolvent estimates for slowly decaying potentials have an application to the Strichartz estimates, see [8] and [12] for the repulsive case. Mochizuki–Nakazawa [9] also investigated slowly decaying potential in an exterior domain.

1.1 Basic settings

1.1.1 Slowly decaying attractive potential

Throughout the paper we use notation $\langle x \rangle = (1 + x^2)^{1/2}$.

Assumption 1.1. Let $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be spherically symmetric, and there exist $\nu, \epsilon \in (0, 2)$ and $c, C > 0$ such that for any $|\alpha| \leq 2$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$|\partial^\alpha V(x)| \leq C\langle x \rangle^{-\nu-|\alpha|}, \quad V(x) \leq -c\langle x \rangle^{-\nu}, \quad x \cdot (\nabla V(x)) \leq -(2 - \epsilon)V(x).$$

In addition, let $q \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and there exist $\nu' \in (\nu, 2]$ and $C' > 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$|q(x)| \leq C'\langle x \rangle^{-1-\nu'/2}.$$

Remarks 1.2. 1. We shall often write simply

$$r = |x|, \quad \partial_r = r^{-1}x \cdot \nabla, \quad x \cdot \nabla V = r\partial_r V,$$

and also abuse notation as $V(x) = V(r)$.

2. Assumption 1.1 is not directly comparable with those in the previous works [13, 10, 4, 11], but we would like to emphasize that our V is only C^2 . Such a relaxation is possible since we avoid the microlocal techniques.
3. The spherical symmetry of V is more or less necessary if we finally aim at the stationary scattering theory, which we shall not discuss in the paper. In fact, it excludes logarithmic spirals in the classical orbits. See [13, 11] for the related results. [11] is much more general in this aspect, including long-range perturbations, although in the C^∞ settings. On the other hand, such symmetry was unnecessary in [10, 4] since their goals are different.
4. Under Assumption 1.1, H is self-adjoint on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The self-adjoint realization is denoted by the same notation H .

1.1.2 Agmon-Hörmander spaces

We define an *effective time*, or an *escape function*, as

$$\tau(\lambda, x) = \int_0^r a(\lambda, s)^{-1} ds; \quad a(\lambda, r) = (2 \max\{\lambda, 0\} - 2V(r))^{1/2} \quad (1.1)$$

for $(\lambda, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. See Proposition 2.2 for a motivation of these terminologies. Here we only remark that there exist $c, C > 0$ such that

$$c\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1/2}r\langle r\rangle^{\nu/2} \leq \tau(0, x) \leq C\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1/2}r\langle r\rangle^{\nu/2}, \quad (1.2)$$

and that for any $\lambda_0 > 0$ there exist $c', C' > 0$ such that

$$c'\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1/2}r \leq \tau(\lambda, x) \leq C'\langle\lambda\rangle^{-1/2}r \quad \text{uniformly in } \lambda \geq \lambda_0. \quad (1.3)$$

Using the function τ , we introduce the associated *Agmon-Hörmander spaces* as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(\lambda) &= \{\psi \in L^2_{\text{loc}}; \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)} < \infty\}, \quad \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{n/2} \|1_n(\lambda)\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \\ \mathcal{B}^*(\lambda) &= \{\psi \in L^2_{\text{loc}}; \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} < \infty\}, \quad \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{-n/2} \|1_n(\lambda)\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \\ \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda) &= \left\{ \psi \in \mathcal{B}^*(\lambda); \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2^{-n/2} \|1_n(\lambda)\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we let

$$\begin{aligned} 1_1(\lambda) &= 1(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; \tau(\lambda, x) < 2\}), \\ 1_n(\lambda) &= 1(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; 2^{n-1} \leq \tau(\lambda, x) < 2^n\}) \quad \text{for } n = 2, 3, \dots \end{aligned}$$

with $1(S)$ being the sharp characteristic function of a subset $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Note by (1.2) and (1.3) that, if we define the *weighted L^2 spaces* as

$$L_{s,\lambda}^2 = \langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \mathcal{H} \quad \text{for } s \in \mathbb{R},$$

then for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $s > 1/2$

$$L_{s,\lambda}^2 \subsetneq \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \subsetneq L_{1/2,\lambda}^2 \subsetneq \mathcal{H} \subsetneq L_{-1/2,\lambda}^2 \subsetneq \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda) \subsetneq \mathcal{B}^*(\lambda) \subsetneq L_{-s,\lambda}^2.$$

We also note, for any compact interval $I \subset (0, \infty)$, the spaces $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ are identical for all $\lambda \in I$ along with uniformly equivalent norms. The same is true for $\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)$ with $\lambda \in I$.

1.2 Main results

Now we present a series of the main results of the paper.

1.2.1 Rellich's theorem

We start with *Rellich's theorem*, or absence of generalized eigenfunctions in \mathcal{B}_0^* . It is a basis of our theory, and will be repeatedly referred to in the latter part of the paper.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose Assumption 1.1. If $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$ satisfy*

$$(H - \lambda)\phi = 0 \quad \text{in the distributional sense,}$$

then $\phi \equiv 0$. In particular, the self-adjoint realization of H on \mathcal{H} does not have non-negative eigenvalues: $\sigma_{\text{pp}}(H) \cap [0, \infty) = \emptyset$.

Remark 1.4. For a positive spectral parameter $\lambda > 0$ the result is already known under a more general assumption, see e.g. [6]. For $\lambda = 0$ a similar result can be deduced from [11], but the setting and the proof are different from ours.

1.2.2 LAP bounds

We next present the *LAP (Limiting Absorption Principle) bounds* for the resolvent

$$R(z) = (H - z)^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \quad \text{for } z \in \rho(H).$$

Let us introduce

$$A = i[H, \tau] = \text{Re}(a^{-1}p_r); \quad p_r = -i\partial_r, \tag{1.4}$$

and

$$L = p_i \ell_{ij} p_j; \quad \ell_{ij} = \delta_{ij} - r^{-2} x_i x_j = r(\nabla^2 r)_{ij}, \quad (1.5)$$

where δ is the Kronecker delta. Note that for $x \neq 0$ the matrix ℓ represents the orthogonal projection onto the spherical direction. Set for any $\rho > 0$ and $\omega \in (0, \pi)$

$$\Gamma_{\pm}(\rho, \omega) = \{z \in \mathbb{C}; 0 < |z| < \rho, 0 < \pm \arg z < \omega\},$$

respectively. In addition, for an operator T on \mathcal{H} we denote $\langle T \rangle_{\psi} = \langle \psi, T\psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$.

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose Assumption 1.1, and let $\rho > 0$ and $\omega \in (0, \pi)$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $\phi = R(z)\psi$ with $z = \lambda \pm i\mu \in \Gamma_{\pm}(\rho, \omega)$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{B}$*

$$\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} + \|a^{-1}p_r\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} + \langle \phi, a^{-2}\langle\tau\rangle^{-1}L\phi \rangle^{1/2} \leq C\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)},$$

respectively. In particular, the self-adjoint realization of H on \mathcal{H} does not have non-negative singular continuous spectrum: $\sigma_{\text{sc}}(H) \cap [0, \infty) = \emptyset$.

Remarks 1.6. 1. Theorem 1.5 provides a refinement of a part of the results from [10, 4], while [11] proved a similar result in a different setting with a different proof.

2. We can deduce uniform estimates in the high energy regime $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ by simple scaling arguments. We present it in Appendix A for completeness. See also [10].

1.2.3 Radiation condition bounds and applications

We next discuss the *radiation condition bounds*, and present their applications. We introduce an asymptotic complex phase b : For $z = \lambda \pm i\mu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$

$$b = b_z = \sqrt{2(z - V)} \mp i \frac{\partial_r V}{4(z - V)} \quad (1.6)$$

respectively. Here we choose the branch of square root as $\text{Re } \sqrt{w} > 0$ for $w \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$. We also set for any $\rho \geq 0$

$$\beta_{c,\rho} = \min \left\{ \frac{2-\nu}{2(2+\nu)}, \frac{\nu'-\nu}{2+\nu}, \frac{2+3\epsilon}{8} \inf_{\lambda \in [0, \rho]} \left(\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \tau a r^{-1} \right) \right\}.$$

We note that $\beta_{c,\rho} > 0$ for any $\rho > 0$ by Lemma 4.2.

Theorem 1.7. *Suppose Assumption 1.1, and let $\rho > 0$ and $\omega \in (0, \pi)$. Then for all $\beta \in [0, \beta_{c,\rho}]$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $\phi = R(z)\psi$ with $z = \lambda \pm i\mu \in \Gamma_{\pm}(\rho, \omega)$ and $\psi \in \langle\tau\rangle^{-\beta}\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$*

$$\|\tau^{\beta}a^{-1}(p_r \mp b_z)\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} + \langle \phi, \tau^{2\beta}a^{-2}\langle\tau\rangle^{-1}L\phi \rangle^{1/2} \leq C\|\langle\tau\rangle^{\beta}\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}.$$

Theorems 1.5 and 1.7 imply the *LAP*, or existence of the limiting resolvents $R(\lambda \pm i0)$ of the following form.

Corollary 1.8. *Suppose Assumption 1.1, and let $\rho > 0$ and $\omega \in (0, \pi)$. For any $s > 1/2$ and $\gamma \in (0, \min\{s - 1/2, \beta_{c,\rho}\})$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $z, z' \in \Gamma_+(\rho, \omega)$ or any $z, z' \in \Gamma_-(\rho, \omega)$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|R(z) - R(z')\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2_{s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}}, L^2_{-s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}})} &\leq C|z - z'|^\gamma, \\ \|a^{-1}p_r R(z) - a^{-1}p_r R(z')\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2_{s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}}, L^2_{-s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}})} &\leq C|z - z'|^\gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

In particular, the operators $R(z)$ and $a^{-1}p_r R(z)$ attain uniform limits as $z \in \Gamma_\pm(\rho, \omega) \rightarrow \lambda \in [0, \rho)$ in the norm topology of $\mathcal{B}(L^2_{s,\lambda}, L^2_{-s,\lambda})$, which are denoted by

$$\begin{aligned} R(\lambda \pm i0) &= \lim_{z \in \Gamma_\pm(\rho, \omega) \rightarrow \lambda} R(z), \\ a^{-1}p_r R(\lambda \pm i0) &= \lim_{z \in \Gamma_\pm(\rho, \omega) \rightarrow \lambda} a^{-1}p_r R(z), \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

respectively. These limits $R(\lambda \pm i0)$ and $a^{-1}p_r R(\lambda \pm i0)$ belong to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\lambda), \mathcal{B}^*(\lambda))$.

The radiation condition bounds extend to the limiting resolvents $R(\lambda \pm i0)$.

Corollary 1.9. *Suppose Assumption 1.1, and let $\rho > 0$ and $\omega \in (0, \pi)$. Then for all $\beta \in [0, \beta_{c,\rho})$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $\phi = R(\lambda \pm i0)\psi$ with $\lambda \in [0, \rho)$ and $\psi \in \langle\tau\rangle^{-\beta}\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$*

$$\|\tau^\beta a^{-1}(p_r \mp b_z)\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} + \langle\phi, \tau^{2\beta} a^{-2}\langle\tau\rangle^{-1}L\phi\rangle^{1/2} \leq C\|\langle\tau\rangle^\beta\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}.$$

Finally we present Sommerfeld's uniqueness theorem, which characterizes the limiting resolvents $R(\lambda \pm i0)$.

Corollary 1.10. *Suppose Assumption 1.1, and let $\lambda \geq 0$, $\phi \in L^2_{\text{loc}}$ and $\psi \in \langle\tau\rangle^{-\beta}\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ with $\beta \in [0, \beta_{c,\lambda})$. Then $\phi = R(\lambda \pm i0)\psi$ holds if and only if both of the following conditions hold:*

(i) $(H - \lambda)\phi = \psi$ in the distributional sense.

(ii) $\phi \in \langle\tau\rangle^\beta\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)$ and $a^{-1}(p_r \mp b_\lambda)\phi \in \langle\tau\rangle^{-\beta}\mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to the analysis of the corresponding classical mechanics, which motivates our proofs. We prove Theorem 1.3 in Section 3, Theorem 1.5 in Section 4, and Theorem 1.7 and Corollaries 1.8, 1.9 and 1.10 in Section 5. We discuss the uniform resolvent bounds for high energies in Appendix A.

2 Classical mechanics

In this section we study the classical mechanics for the classical Hamiltonian

$$H(x, p) = \frac{1}{2}p^2 + V(x). \quad (2.1)$$

We hope, even though we use the same notation as in the quantum mechanics, there would be no confusion. Here we try to understand rolls of the effective time from a classical viewpoint. The results of the section are in fact not necessary for our purpose, but would provide good motivations for the later arguments.

For the arguments of the section, we can slightly relax the conditions on V .

Assumption 2.1. Let $V \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be spherically symmetric, and there exist $\nu, \epsilon \in (0, 2)$ and $c > 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$V(x) \leq -c\langle x \rangle^{-\nu}, \quad x \cdot (\nabla V(x)) \leq -(2 - \epsilon)V(x).$$

Recall the Hamilton equations associated with (2.1) are given by

$$\dot{x} = p, \quad \dot{p} = -\nabla V.$$

A classical orbit $(x, p) = (x(t), p(t))$ is *forward/backward non-trapped* if

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} |x(t)| = \infty,$$

respectively.

2.1 Effective time

Here we discuss the order of scattering of the classical particles. Let us start with a rough estimation. Let $(x(t), p(t))$ be a forward/backward non-trapped classical orbit of energy $\lambda = 0$, and suppose as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$

$$x(t) \approx |t|^\alpha, \quad p(t) \approx |t|^{\alpha-1}.$$

Then by the law of conservation of energy

$$|t|^{2\alpha-2} \approx p(t)^2 = -2V(x(t)) \gtrsim |x(x)|^{-\nu} \approx |t|^{-\nu\alpha},$$

and this implies we should have $\alpha \geq 2/(2 + \nu)$. Hence

$$|x(x)|^{1+\nu/2} \gtrsim |t| \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \pm\infty,$$

and (the lower bound of) $x^{1+\nu/2}$ should play a roll of an *effective time* for energy $\lambda = 0$. We actually chose a more involved function τ from (1.1) for all the energy $\lambda \geq 0$, and we can verify the corresponding property as follows.

Proposition 2.2. *Suppose Assumption 2.1. If $(x(t), p(t))$ is a classical orbit of energy $\lambda \geq 0$ with*

$$\pm p_r(0) := \pm|x(0)|^{-1}x(0) \cdot p(0) > 0,$$

then for any $\pm t \geq 0$

$$\tau(\lambda, x(t)) \geq a(\lambda, x(0))^{-1}p_r(0)t + \tau(\lambda, x(0)),$$

respectively.

Proof. Since

$$\frac{d}{dt}\tau(\lambda, x(t)) = a(\lambda, x(t))^{-1}p_r(t); \quad p_r = (\nabla r) \cdot p = r^{-1}x \cdot p,$$

it suffices to show that

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\tau(\lambda, x(t)) \geq 0.$$

Below we would like to avoid explicit t -derivatives to motivate the later stationary approach to the quantum mechanics. For that we employ the Poisson brackets. Let

$$D = \frac{d}{dt} = \{H, \cdot\}, \quad (2.2)$$

and introduce a classical observable A as

$$A = D\tau = \{H, \tau\} = a^{-1}p_r,$$

see also (1.4). Then we compute

$$D^2\tau = \{H, A\} = a^{-3}(\partial_r V)p_r^2 + a^{-1}p \cdot (\nabla^2 r)p - a^{-1}(\partial_r V).$$

Using Assumption 1.1, the identity $\nabla r \otimes \nabla r + r(\nabla^2 r) = \delta$, the law of conservation of energy and the convexity $\nabla^2 r \geq 0$, we can proceed as

$$\begin{aligned} D^2\tau &\geq a^{-3}[(\partial_r V)p_r^2 + (\partial_r V)p \cdot (r\nabla^2 r)p + (2\lambda - \epsilon V)p \cdot (\nabla^2 r)p - a^2(\partial_r V)] \\ &= a^{-3}[(2\lambda - \epsilon V)p \cdot (\nabla^2 r)p + 2(\partial_r V)(H - \lambda)] \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we are done. \square

To prove Proposition 2.2, we show that the Poisson bracket between H and A is non-negative. In order to establish the main results, we analyze the quantization of the Poisson bracket between H and A .

3 Rellich's theorem

3.1 Main propositions

In this section we prove Rellich's theorem, or Theorem 1.3. The proof has two main steps, a priori super-exponential decay estimate and absence of super-exponentially decaying eigenfunctions. Their precise statements are the following. Throughout the section we assume Assumption 1.1.

Proposition 3.1. *If $\phi \in \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$ with $\lambda \geq 0$ satisfies*

$$(H - \lambda)\phi = 0 \text{ in the distributional sense,}$$

then $e^{\alpha S}\phi \in \mathcal{B}_0^(\lambda)$ for any $\alpha \geq 0$,*

Proposition 3.2. *If $\phi \in \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$ with $\lambda \geq 0$ satisfies*

1. $(H - \lambda)\phi = 0$ in the distributional sense,

2. $e^{\alpha S}\phi \in \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$ for any $\alpha \geq 0$,

then $\phi \equiv 0$.

Here, the function S is defined by

$$S(\lambda, x) = \int_0^r a(\lambda, s) \, ds, \quad (\lambda, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and solves the associated eikonal equation. Theorem 1.3 follows immediately from these propositions. We will prove them in Subsections 3.2 and 3.3, respectively, somehow following the scheme provided in the proof of Proposition 2.2. In fact, we are going to compute and bound a *distorted commutator*

$$\text{Im}(A\Theta(H - \lambda)). \quad (3.1)$$

Here the conjugate operator A is from (1.4), and the weight function Θ is of the form

$$\Theta = \chi_{m,n} e^{2\theta}, \quad \theta = \alpha S + \beta \int_0^S (1 + s/R)^{-1-\delta} \, ds \quad (3.2)$$

with parameters $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$, $\delta > 0$ and $R \geq 1$. The cut-off function $\chi_{m,n}$ is given as follows. Fix any $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\chi(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } t \leq 1, \\ 0 & \text{for } t \geq 2, \end{cases} \quad \chi' \leq 0, \quad (3.3)$$

and let $\chi_n, \bar{\chi}_n, \chi_{m,n} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be defined as

$$\chi_n = \chi(\tau/2^n), \quad \bar{\chi}_n = 1 - \chi_n, \quad \chi_{m,n} = \bar{\chi}_m \chi_n. \quad (3.4)$$

We note the integral from (3.2) is the so-called *Yosida approximation*, so that it is bounded for each $R \geq 1$, and converges pointwise to S as $R \rightarrow \infty$.

3.2 A priori super-exponential decay estimate

Here we prove Proposition 3.1. Before computations of (3.1) let us present some preliminaries.

It will be useful to decompose H into the radial and spherical parts with respect to (1.4) and (1.5).

Lemma 3.3. *One has a decomposition*

$$H - \lambda = \frac{1}{2}Aa^2A + \frac{1}{2}L - \frac{1}{2}a^2 + q_1 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\},$$

where $q_1 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies that there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$|q_1(x)| \leq C\langle x \rangle^{-1-\nu'/2}.$$

Proof. By definitions (1.4) and (1.5) of p_r and ℓ , respectively, we first rewrite

$$H - \lambda = \frac{1}{2}p_r^*p_r + \frac{1}{2}L - \frac{1}{2}a^2 + q. \quad (3.5)$$

Noting

$$\Delta r = (d-1)r^{-1}, \quad (3.6)$$

we can have

$$A = a^{-1}p_r - \frac{1}{2}\nabla \cdot (a^{-1}\nabla r) = a^{-1}p_r - \frac{1}{2}(a^{-3}(\partial_r V) + (d-1)r^{-1}a^{-1}), \quad (3.7)$$

so that

$$p_r = aA + \frac{1}{2}(a^{-2}(\partial_r V) + (d-1)r^{-1}). \quad (3.8)$$

Then by substituting (3.8) into (3.5) we can proceed as

$$\begin{aligned} H - \lambda &= \frac{1}{2}[Aa - \frac{1}{2}(a^{-2}(\partial_r V) + (d-1)r^{-1})] \\ &\quad \cdot [aA + \frac{1}{2}(a^{-2}(\partial_r V) + (d-1)r^{-1})] + \frac{1}{2}L - \frac{1}{2}a^2 + q \\ &= \frac{1}{2}Aa^2A + \frac{1}{2}L - \frac{1}{2}a^2 + q + \frac{1}{4}a^{-1}[\partial_r(a^{-1}(\partial_r V) + (d-1)r^{-1}a)] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8}(a^{-2}(\partial_r V) + (d-1)r^{-1})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we are done. \square

Lemma 3.4. *There exist $c, C > 0$ such that for any $(\lambda, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$cr(x)a(\lambda, x) \leq S(\lambda, x) \leq Cr(x)a(\lambda, x)$$

Proof. By Assumption 1.1 we have

$$c_1(\max\{\lambda, 0\} + \langle x \rangle^{-\nu})^{1/2} \leq a(\lambda, x) \leq C_1(\max\{\lambda, 0\} + \langle x \rangle^{-\nu})^{1/2}. \quad (3.9)$$

Hence the asserted bound for S from below is obvious. As for the one from above, we can compute it by using (3.9) as

$$\begin{aligned} S(\lambda, x) &\leq C_1 \int_0^r (\max\{\lambda^{1/2}, 0\} + \langle s \rangle^{-\nu/2}) \, ds \\ &\leq C_2 r (\max\{\lambda^{1/2}, 0\} + \langle r \rangle^{-\nu/2}) \\ &\leq 2C_2 r (\max\{\lambda, 0\} + \langle r \rangle^{-\nu})^{1/2} \\ &\leq C_3 r a(\lambda, x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the assertion follows. \square

For simplicity of notation we denote

$$\theta_0 = 1 + S/R.$$

We also denote by primes the derivatives of $\chi_{m,n}$ in τ , and of θ, θ_0 in S , such as

$$\begin{aligned} i[A, \theta] &= \theta' = \alpha + \beta \theta_0^{-1-\delta}, \\ i[A, \theta'] &= \theta'' = -\beta R^{-1}(1+\delta) \theta_0^{-2-\delta}, \\ i[A, \Theta] &= \chi'_{m,n} a^{-2} e^{2\theta} + 2\theta' \Theta. \end{aligned}$$

We shall repeatedly use the following estimates without a reference.

Lemma 3.5. *Fix any $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\delta > 0$. Then there exists $c > 0$ such that uniformly in $R \geq 1$*

$$c \langle S \rangle^{-1} \leq \theta_0^{-1} \leq 1.$$

In addition, for any $k = 2, 3, \dots$ there exists $C > 0$ such that uniformly in $\beta \geq 0$ and $R \geq 1$

$$0 \leq (-1)^{k+1} \theta^{(k)} \leq C \beta \langle S \rangle^{1-k} \theta_0^{-1-\delta}.$$

Proof. These estimates are trivial. We omit the proof. \square

Now we compute and bound the distorted commutator (3.1). The following lemma is a key for the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Lemma 3.6. *Fix any $\lambda \geq 0$, $\alpha_0 \geq 0$ and $\delta \in (0, (\nu' - \nu)/(2 - \nu))$, and let $\beta > 0$ be sufficiently small. Then there exist $c, C > 0$, $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $R_0 \geq 1$ such that uniformly in $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_0]$, $n \geq m \geq N_0$ and $R \geq R_0$*

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im}(A\Theta(H - \lambda)) &\geq cr^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta}\Theta - C(\chi_{m-1,m+1} + \chi_{n-1,n+1})\tau^{-1}e^{2\theta} \\ &\quad + \operatorname{Re}(f(H - \lambda)), \end{aligned}$$

where f is a certain function satisfying $\operatorname{supp} f \subset \operatorname{supp} \chi_{m,n}$ and $|f| \leq C_{m,n}e^{2\theta}$.

Proof. Fix λ , α_0 and δ as in the assertion. We will for the moment discuss uniform estimates in $\beta \in (0, 1]$, $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_0]$, $n \geq m \geq 0$ and $R \geq 1$, and at the last step choose β , N_0 and R_0 so that the assertion holds. By Lemma 3.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im}(A\Theta(H - \lambda)) &= \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Im}(A\Theta Aa^2A) + \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Im}(A\Theta L) - \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Im}(A\Theta a^2) \\ &\quad + \operatorname{Im}(A\Theta q_1), \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

and in the following we further compute each term on the right-hand side of (3.10). There appear many terms that will turn out to be negligible at last. For short we shall gather them, and write simply

$$Q = r^{-1-\nu'/2}\Theta + Ar^{-1-\nu'/2}\Theta A + (|\chi'_{m,n}| + |\chi''_{m,n}|a^{-2})e^{2\theta} + p \cdot |\chi'_{m,n}|a^{-2}e^{2\theta}p.$$

In particular, once a derivative hits on $\chi_{m,n}$ in Θ , the corresponding term is absorbed into Q . The term Q will be computed and bounded later on.

Now the first term on the right-hand side of (3.10) is rewritten and bounded by using (3.7) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Im}(A\Theta Aa^2A) &= \frac{1}{4}Aa(\partial_r\Theta)A + \frac{1}{2}Aa^{-1}(\partial_rV)\Theta A \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}Aa^2\theta'\Theta A + \frac{1}{2}Aa^{-1}(\partial_rV)\Theta A - C_1Q. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Here and below $c_*, C_* > 0$ are uniform in $\beta \in (0, 1]$, $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_0]$, $n \geq m \geq 0$ and $R \geq 1$. We use the adjoint of (3.7), (1.5) and (3.6) to rewrite the second term of (3.10) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Im}(A\Theta L) &= \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Im}(p_r^*a^{-1}\Theta p_i\ell_{ij}p_j) + \frac{1}{4}(a^{-3}(\partial_rV) + (d-1)r^{-1}a^{-1})\Theta L \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Im}(p_ip_k(\nabla_kr)a^{-1}\Theta\ell_{ij}p_j) + \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Re}(p_k(\nabla^2r)_{ik}a^{-1}\Theta\ell_{ij}p_j) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4}(a^{-3}(\partial_rV) + (d-1)r^{-1}a^{-1})\Theta L \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{2}\theta'\Theta L + \frac{1}{2}r^{-1}a^{-1}\Theta L - C_2Q. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Here we have also used that

$$(\nabla_i r)\ell_{ij} = 0, \quad (\nabla_k r)(\partial_k \ell_{ij}) = -r^{-1}x_k(\partial_k r^{-2}x_i x_j) = 0. \tag{3.13}$$

The third and fourth terms of (3.10) are computed and bounded by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as

$$-\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}(A\Theta a^2) + \operatorname{Im}(A\Theta q_1) \geq \frac{1}{2} a^2 \theta' \Theta - \frac{1}{2} a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \Theta - C_3 Q.$$

Thus we have (3.10) bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im}(A\Theta(H - \lambda)) &\geq \frac{1}{2} A a^2 \theta' \Theta A + \frac{1}{2} A a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \Theta A - \frac{1}{2} \theta' \Theta L + \frac{1}{2} r^{-1} a^{-1} \Theta L \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} a^2 \theta' \Theta - \frac{1}{2} a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \Theta - C_4 Q. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

We continue to compute the right-hand side of (3.14). Using Lemma 3.3 and $S^{-1}a \leq C_5 r^{-1}$, we combine the third and fifth terms of (3.14) as

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} \theta' \Theta L + \frac{1}{2} a^2 \theta' \Theta &= \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re}(\theta' \Theta A a^2 A) + q_1 \theta' \Theta - \operatorname{Re}(\theta' \Theta (H - \lambda)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} A a^2 \theta' \Theta A - \frac{1}{4} a^{-1} (\partial_r a (\partial_r \theta' \Theta)) + q_1 \theta' \Theta - \operatorname{Re}(\theta' \Theta (H - \lambda)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} A a^2 \theta' \Theta A + a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \theta'^2 \Theta - a^2 \theta'^3 \Theta - \frac{3}{2} a^2 \theta' \theta'' \Theta \\ &\quad - C_6 Q - \operatorname{Re}(\theta' \Theta (H - \lambda)). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by Lemma 3.3, Assumption 2.1 and $S^{-1}a \leq C_5 r^{-1}$ the second, fourth and sixth terms of (3.14) are combined as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} A a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \Theta A + \frac{1}{2} r^{-1} a^{-1} \Theta L - \frac{1}{2} a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \Theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2} r^{-1} a^{-3} (a^2 - r \partial_r V) \Theta L + \frac{1}{4} a^{-1} (\partial_r a (\partial_r a^{-3} (\partial_r V) \Theta)) \\ &\quad - a^{-3} (\partial_r V) q_1 \Theta + \operatorname{Re}(a^{-3} (\partial_r V) \Theta (H - \lambda)) \\ &\geq c_1 r^{-1} a^{-1} \Theta L + a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \theta'^2 \Theta - C_7 Q + \operatorname{Re}(a^{-3} (\partial_r V) \Theta (H - \lambda)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im}(A\Theta(H - \lambda)) &\geq A a^2 \theta' \Theta A + c_1 r^{-1} a^{-1} \Theta L - a^2 \theta'^3 \Theta - \frac{3}{2} a^2 \theta' \theta'' \Theta \\ &\quad + 2 a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \theta'^2 \Theta - C_8 Q + \operatorname{Re}(f_1(H - \lambda)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Here and below f_* satisfy the same conditions as f in the assertion.

We can see the third term on the right-hand side of (3.15) is the worst negative contribution. To remove it we further exploit the first and second terms of (3.15) as follows. Let us split them as

$$\begin{aligned} A a^2 \theta' \Theta A + c_1 r^{-1} a^{-1} \Theta L &\geq A (a^2 \theta' - c_1 r^{-1} a \theta_0^{-\delta}) \Theta A \\ &\quad + c_1 A r^{-1} a \theta_0^{-\delta} \Theta A + c_1 r^{-1} a^{-1} \theta_0^{-\delta} \Theta L. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Then the first term of (3.16) is bounded by using $S^{-1}a \leq C_5 r^{-1}$ as

$$A (a^2 \theta' - c_1 r^{-1} a \theta_0^{-\delta}) \Theta A = (A + i\theta') (a^2 \theta' - c_1 r^{-1} a \theta_0^{-\delta}) \Theta (A - i\theta')$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + a^{-1}(\partial_r(a^2\theta' - c_1r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta})\theta'\Theta) \\
& - (a^2\theta' - c_1r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta})\theta'^2\Theta \\
& \geq (A + i\theta')(\beta a^2\theta_0^{-1-\delta} - c_1r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta})\Theta(A - i\theta') + a^2\theta'^3\Theta \\
& + 2a^2\theta'\theta''\Theta - 2a^{-1}(\partial_r V)\theta'^2\Theta - c_1r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta}\theta'^2\Theta - C_9Q.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.3 and $S^{-1}a \leq C_5r^{-1}$ the second and third terms of (3.16) are combined as

$$\begin{aligned}
& c_1Ar^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta}\Theta A + c_1r^{-1}a^{-1}\theta_0^{-\delta}\Theta L \\
& = \frac{c_1}{2}a^{-1}(\partial_r a(\partial_r r^{-1}a^{-1}\theta_0^{-\delta}\Theta)) + c_1r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta}\Theta \\
& - 2c_1r^{-1}a^{-1}\theta_0^{-\delta}q_1\Theta + 2c_1 \operatorname{Re}(r^{-1}a^{-1}\theta_0^{-\delta}\Theta(H - \lambda)) \\
& \geq c_1r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta}\Theta + 2c_1r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta}\theta'^2\Theta - C_{10}Q + 2c_1 \operatorname{Re}(r^{-1}\theta_0^{-\delta}a^{-1}\Theta(H - \lambda)).
\end{aligned}$$

At this stage we also bound Q , similarly to so far, as

$$\begin{aligned}
Q & \leq C_{11}r^{-1-\nu'/2}\Theta + C_{11}(\chi_{m-1,m+1} + \chi_{n-1,n+1})\tau^{-1}e^{2\theta} \\
& + 2 \operatorname{Re}(r^{-1-\nu'/2}a^{-2}\Theta(H - \lambda)) + 2 \operatorname{Re}(|\chi'_{m,n}|a^{-2}e^{2\theta}(H - \lambda)).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Im}(A\Theta(H - \lambda)) & \geq (A + i\theta')(\beta a^2\theta_0^{-1-\delta} - c_1r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta})\Theta(A - i\theta') \\
& + c_1r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta}\Theta + c_1r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta}\theta'^2\Theta + \frac{1}{2}a^2\theta'\theta''\Theta \\
& - C_{12}r^{-1-\nu'/2}\Theta - C_{12}(\chi_{m-1,m+1} + \chi_{n-1,n+1})\tau^{-1}e^{2\theta} \\
& + \operatorname{Re}(f_2(H - \lambda)) \\
& \geq (A + i\theta')(\beta ar - c_1R^{-1}S - c_1)r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-1-\delta}\Theta(A - i\theta') \tag{3.17} \\
& + c_2r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta}\Theta + (c_2 - C_{13}\beta)r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta}\Theta \\
& + (c_2r^{-1-\nu/2}S^{-\delta} - C_{12}r^{-1-\nu'/2})\Theta \\
& - C_{12}(\chi_{m-1,m+1} + \chi_{n-1,n+1})\tau^{-1}e^{2\theta} + \operatorname{Re}(f_2(H - \lambda)).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we choose and fix $\beta > 0$ small enough that the third term on the right-hand side of (3.17) is non-negative. Then we can choose $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R_0 \geq 1$ large so that the first and fourth terms are non-negative for any $n \geq m \geq N_0$ and $R \geq R_0$. Hence we are done. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$ and $\lambda \geq 0$ satisfy the assumption of the assertion, and set

$$\alpha_0 = \sup\{\alpha \geq 0 \mid e^{\alpha S}\phi \in \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)\}.$$

Assume $\alpha_0 < \infty$, and we deduce a contradiction. Fix δ, β, N_0 and R_0 as in the assertion of Lemma 3.6, and take any $\alpha \in \{0\} \cup [0, \alpha_0)$ such that $\alpha + \beta > \alpha_0$. With such parameters evaluate the inequality from Lemma 3.6 for the state $\chi_{m-2, n+2}\phi$, and then we obtain for any $n \geq m \geq N_0$ and $R \geq R_0$

$$\|(r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta}\Theta)^{1/2}\phi\|^2 \leq C_m \|\chi_{m-1, m+1}^{1/2}\phi\|^2 + C_R 2^{-n/2} \|\chi_{n-1, n+1}^{1/2} e^{\alpha S}\phi\|^2. \quad (3.18)$$

The second term on the right-hand side of (3.18) vanishes in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ by the assumption, and hence by Lebesgue's monotone convergence theorem

$$\|(r^{-1}a\theta_0^{-\delta}\Theta)^{1/2}\phi\|^2 \leq C_m \|\chi_{m-1, m+1}^{1/2}\phi\|^2. \quad (3.19)$$

Next we let $R \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.19) invoking again Lebesgue's monotone convergence theorem, and then it follows that

$$\bar{\chi}_m^{1/2} r^{-1/2} a^{1/2} e^{(\alpha+\beta)S} \phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

This implies $e^{\kappa S} \phi \in \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$ for any $\kappa \in (0, \alpha + \beta)$, contradicting $\alpha + \beta > \alpha_0$. Thus we are done. \square

3.3 Absence of super-exponentially decaying eigenfunction

Here we prove Propositions 3.2. The proof is very similar to that of Propositions 3.1, but we focus on different parameters. In fact, we let $\beta = 0$, so that

$$\theta = 2\alpha S, \quad \Theta = \chi_{m, n} e^{\alpha S},$$

and we deduce uniform estimates in $\alpha \geq 0$ as follows. Note here δ and R are irrelevant.

Lemma 3.7. *Fix any $\lambda \geq 0$, and let $\beta = 0$. Then there exist $c, C > 0$ and $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that uniformly in $\alpha \geq 1$ and $n \geq m \geq N_0$*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}(A\Theta(H - \lambda)) &\geq c\alpha^2 r^{-1} a\Theta - C\alpha^2 (\chi_{m-1, m+1} + \chi_{n-1, n+1}) \tau^{-1} e^{2\theta} \\ &\quad + \text{Re}(f(H - \lambda)), \end{aligned}$$

where f is a certain function satisfying $\text{supp } f \subset \text{supp } \chi_{m, n}$ and $|f| \leq C\alpha e^{2\theta}$ uniformly in $\alpha \geq 1$ and $n \geq m \geq N_0$.

Proof. We repeat computations similar to the proof of Lemma 3.6, however focusing on different parameters. Fix λ and β as in the assertion. We will again for the moment discuss uniform estimates in $\alpha \geq 1$ and $n \geq m \geq 0$, and then finally fix appropriate N_0 so that the assertion holds. By Lemma 3.3 we write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}(A\Theta(H - \lambda)) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Im}(A\Theta A a^2 A) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Im}(A\Theta L) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Im}(A\Theta a^2) \\ &\quad + \text{Im}(A\Theta q_1), \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

and further compute the right-hand side below. The terms to be negligible are gathered and denoted by

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \alpha r^{-1-\nu'/2} \Theta + \alpha^{-1} A r^{-1-\nu'/2} \Theta A \\ &\quad + (\alpha^2 |\chi'_{m,n}| + \alpha |\chi''_{m,n}| a^{-2}) e^{2\theta} + p \cdot |\chi'_{m,n}| a^{-2} e^{2\theta} p, \end{aligned}$$

and it will be estimated later on.

The first term on the right-hand side of (3.20) is rewritten and bounded by using (3.7) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}(A \Theta A a^2 A) &= \frac{1}{4} A a (\partial_r \Theta) A + \frac{1}{2} A a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \Theta A \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha}{2} A a^2 \Theta A + \frac{1}{2} A a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \Theta A - C_1 Q. \end{aligned}$$

Here and below $c_*, C_* > 0$ are uniform in $\alpha \geq 1$ and $n \geq m \geq 0$. By the adjoint of (3.7), (1.5), (3.6) and (3.13) we compute the second term of (3.20) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}(A \Theta L) &= \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}(p_r^* a^{-1} \Theta p_i \ell_{ij} p_j) + \frac{1}{4} (a^{-3} (\partial_r V) + (d-1) r^{-1} a^{-1}) \Theta L \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}(p_i p_k (\nabla_k r) a^{-1} \Theta \ell_{ij} p_j) + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re}(p_k (\nabla^2 r)_{ik} a^{-1} \Theta \ell_{ij} p_j) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} (a^{-3} (\partial_r V) + (d-1) r^{-1} a^{-1}) \Theta L \\ &\geq -\frac{\alpha}{2} \Theta L + \frac{1}{2} r^{-1} a^{-1} \Theta L - C_2 Q. \end{aligned}$$

The third and fourth terms of (3.20) are computed and bounded by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as

$$-\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}(A \Theta a^2) + \operatorname{Im}(A \Theta q_1) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} a^2 \Theta - \frac{1}{2} a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \Theta - C_3 Q.$$

Thus (3.20) is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im}(A \Theta (H - \lambda)) &\geq \frac{\alpha}{2} A a^2 \Theta A + \frac{1}{2} A a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \Theta A - \frac{\alpha}{2} \Theta L + \frac{1}{2} r^{-1} a^{-1} \Theta L \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha}{2} a^2 \Theta - \frac{1}{2} a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \Theta - C_4 Q. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

We continue to compute the right-hand side of (3.21). Using Lemma 3.3, we combine the third and fifth terms of (3.21) as

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\alpha}{2} \Theta L + \frac{\alpha}{2} a^2 \Theta &= \frac{\alpha}{2} \operatorname{Re}(\Theta A a^2 A) + \alpha q_1 \Theta - \alpha \operatorname{Re}(\Theta (H - \lambda)) \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{2} A a^2 \Theta A - \frac{\alpha}{4} a^{-1} (\partial_r a (\partial_r \Theta)) + \alpha q_1 \Theta - \alpha \operatorname{Re}(\Theta (H - \lambda)) \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha}{2} A a^2 \Theta A + \alpha^2 a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \Theta - \alpha^3 a^2 \Theta - C_5 Q - \alpha \operatorname{Re}(\Theta (H - \lambda)). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by Lemma 3.3 and Assumption 2.1 the second, fourth and sixth terms of (3.21) are combined as

$$\frac{1}{2} A a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \Theta A + \frac{1}{2} r^{-1} a^{-1} \Theta L - \frac{1}{2} a^{-1} (\partial_r V) \Theta$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2}r^{-1}a^{-3}(a^2 - r\partial_r V)\Theta L + \frac{1}{4}a^{-1}(\partial_r a(\partial_r a^{-3}(\partial_r V)\Theta)) \\
&\quad - a^{-3}(\partial_r V)q_1\Theta + \operatorname{Re}(a^{-3}(\partial_r V)\Theta(H - \lambda)) \\
&\geq c_1r^{-1}a^{-1}\Theta L + \alpha^2a^{-1}(\partial_r V)\Theta - C_6Q + \operatorname{Re}(a^{-3}(\partial_r V)\Theta(H - \lambda)).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Im}(A\Theta(H - \lambda)) &\geq \alpha Aa^2\Theta A + c_1r^{-1}a^{-1}\Theta L - \alpha^3a^2\Theta \\
&\quad + 2\alpha^2a^{-1}(\partial_r V)\Theta - C_7Q + \operatorname{Re}(f_1(H - \lambda)).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Here and below f_* satisfy the same conditions as f in the assertion.

The first to fourth terms of (3.22) are further bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha Aa^2\Theta A + c_1r^{-1}a^{-1}\Theta L - \alpha^3a^2\Theta + 2\alpha^2a^{-1}(\partial_r V)\Theta \\
&\geq \alpha(A + i\alpha)a^2\Theta(A - i\alpha) + c_1r^{-1}a^{-1}\Theta L - C_8Q \\
&\geq c_2(A + i\alpha)r^{-1}a\Theta(A - i\alpha) + c_2r^{-1}\Theta L - C_8Q \\
&\geq c_2Ar^{-1}a\Theta A + c_2r^{-1}\Theta L - c_2\alpha^2r^{-1}a\Theta + c_2\alpha r^{-2}\Theta - C_9Q \\
&\geq \frac{c_2}{2}a^{-1}(\partial_r a(\partial_r r^{-1}a^{-1}\Theta)) + c_2r^{-1}a\Theta - 2c_2r^{-1}a^{-1}q_1\Theta - c_2\alpha^2r^{-1}a\Theta \\
&\quad + c_2\alpha r^{-2}\Theta - C_9Q + 2c_2\operatorname{Re}(r^{-1}a^{-1}\Theta(H - \lambda)) \\
&\geq c_2(\alpha^2 + 1)r^{-1}a\Theta - C_{10}Q + 2c_2\operatorname{Re}(r^{-1}a^{-1}\Theta(H - \lambda)).
\end{aligned}$$

We also bound Q , similarly to so far, as

$$\begin{aligned}
Q &\leq C_{11}\alpha r^{-1-\nu'/2}\Theta + C_{11}\alpha^2(\chi_{m-1,m+1} + \chi_{n-1,n+1})\tau^{-1}e^{2\theta} \\
&\quad + 2\alpha^{-1}\operatorname{Re}(r^{-1-\nu'/2}a^{-2}\Theta(H - \lambda)) + 2\operatorname{Re}(|\chi'_{m,n}|a^{-2}(H - \lambda))..
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Im}(A\Theta(H - \lambda)) &\geq c_2(\alpha^2 + 1)r^{-1}a\Theta - C_{12}\alpha r^{-1-\nu'/2}\Theta \\
&\quad - C_{12}\alpha^2(\chi_{m-1,m+1} + \chi_{n-1,n+1})\tau^{-1}e^{2\theta} + \operatorname{Re}(f_2(H - \lambda)).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence by letting $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be large enough, we obtain the assertion. \square

Proof of Propositions 3.2. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$ and $\lambda \geq 0$ satisfy the assumption of the assertion. Choose $N_0 \geq 0$ as in Lemma 3.7, and we evaluate the inequality from Lemma 3.7 for the state $\chi_{m-2,n+2}\phi$. Then $\alpha \geq 1$ and $n \geq m \geq N_0$

$$\|(r^{-1}a\chi_{m,n})^{1/2}e^{\alpha S}\phi\|^2 \leq C_1\|\chi_{m-1,m+1}^{1/2}e^{\alpha S}\phi\|^2 + C_12^{-n/2}\|\chi_{n-1,n+1}^{1/2}e^{\alpha S}\phi\|^2. \tag{3.23}$$

Since $e^{\alpha S}\phi \in \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$ for any $\alpha \geq 0$, the second term on the right-hand side of (3.23) vanishes in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence by the Lebesgue monotone convergence theorem we obtain

$$\|(r^{-1}a\bar{\chi}_m)^{1/2}e^{\alpha S}\phi\|^2 \leq C_1\|\chi_{m-1,m+1}e^{\alpha S}\phi\|^2, \tag{3.24}$$

Now assume $\bar{\chi}_{m+2}\phi \neq 0$, and then we can deduce a contradiction from (3.24) as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$. Thus $\bar{\chi}_{m+2}\phi = 0$, and we obtain $\phi \equiv 0$ by the unique continuation property. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The assertion is obvious by Propositions 3.1 and 3.2. \square

4 LAP bounds

4.1 Main proposition

In this section we prove the LAP bounds, or Theorem 1.5. The proof depends on a commutator argument as in the previous section, but we use a different weight function of the form

$$\Theta = \Theta_R^\delta = \bar{\chi}_0 \theta,$$

where $\bar{\chi}_0$ is from (3.4) with $n = 0$, and

$$\theta = \int_0^{\tau/R} (1+s)^{-1-\delta} ds = \delta^{-1} [1 - (1+\tau/R)^{-\delta}]; \quad \delta > 0, \quad R \geq 1. \quad (4.1)$$

Note we put $\bar{\chi}_0$ to remove a singularity of A at the origin. In this section we denote derivatives of functions in τ by primes, such as

$$\theta' = R^{-1}(1+\tau/R)^{-1-\delta}, \quad \theta'' = -R^{-2}(1+\delta)(1+\tau/R)^{-2-\delta}. \quad (4.2)$$

We quote the following estimates from [6].

Lemma 4.1. *For any $\delta > 0$ there exist $c, C, C_k > 0$, $k = 2, 3, \dots$, such that for any $k = 2, 3, \dots$ and uniformly in $R \geq 1$*

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{c, c\tau/R\} &\leq \theta \leq \min\{C, \tau/R\}, \\ c(\min\{R, \tau\})^\delta \tau^{-1-\delta} \theta &\leq \theta' \leq \tau^{-1} \theta, \\ 0 &\leq (-1)^{k-1} \theta^{(k)} \leq C_k \tau^{-k} \theta. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We omit the proof, see e.g. [6, Lemma 4.2]. \square

Lemma 4.2. *There exist $c, C > 0$ such that for any $(\lambda, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$cr(x)a(\lambda, x)^{-1} \leq \tau(\lambda, x) \leq Cr(x)a(\lambda, x)^{-1}$$

Proof. By (3.9) the bound from above is easy. As for the bound from below, we estimate it by using (3.9) as

$$\begin{aligned}\tau(\lambda, x) &\geq c_1 \int_{r/2}^r (\max\{\lambda, 0\} + \langle s \rangle^{-\nu})^{-1/2} ds \\ &\geq \frac{c_1}{2} r (\max\{\lambda, 0\} + \langle \frac{1}{2}r \rangle^{-\nu})^{-1/2} \\ &\geq c_2 r a(\lambda, x)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we are done. \square

We now present a key estimate for the proof of LAP bounds. It is essentially a consequence of commutator computations.

Proposition 4.3. *Fix any $\rho > 0$, $\omega \in (0, \pi)$ and $\delta \in (0, (\nu' - \nu)/(2 + \nu))$. Then there exist $C > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for any $R \geq 1$, $z = \lambda \pm i\mu \in \Gamma_{\pm}(\rho, \omega)$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ the state $\phi = R(z)\psi$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\theta'^{1/2}\phi\|^2 + \|a^{-1}\theta'^{1/2}p_r\phi\|^2 + \langle \phi, a^{-2}\langle\tau\rangle^{-1}\theta L\phi \rangle \\ \leq C (\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}^2 + \|\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)}\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)} + \|a^{-1}p_r\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)}\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)} + R^{-1}\|\chi_n^{1/2}\phi\|^2).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Fix ρ , ω and δ as in the assertion. Clearly it suffices to show there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $c_1, C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Im}(A\Theta(H - z)) &\geq c_1\theta' + c_1p_r^*a^{-2}\theta'p_r + c_1a^{-2}\langle\tau\rangle^{-1}\theta L \\ &\quad - C_1R^{-1}\chi_n + \text{Re}(\gamma(H - z)) - C_1(H - \bar{z})\tau(H - z),\end{aligned}\tag{4.3}$$

uniformly in $R \geq 1$ and $z = \lambda \pm i\mu \in \Gamma_{\pm}(\rho, \omega)$, where $\gamma = \gamma_{z,R}$ is a certain uniformly bounded function: $|\gamma| \leq C_2$. In the below we compute and bound the quantity on the left-hand side of (4.3). As in the proof of Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 we gather *admissible error terms*, and write them for short as

$$Q = r^{-1-\nu'/2}\Theta + Ar^{-1-\nu'/2}\Theta A + R^{-1}p_i\chi_1p_i.$$

For the moment the following estimates are all uniform in $R \geq 1$, $z = \lambda \pm i\mu \in \Gamma_{\pm}(\rho, \omega)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and we will fix n only at the last step of the proof.

Similarly to (3.10), we first rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Im}(A\Theta(H - z)) &= \frac{1}{2}\text{Im}(A\Theta Aa^2 A) + \frac{1}{2}\text{Im}(A\Theta L) - \frac{1}{2}\text{Im}(A\Theta a^2) \\ &\quad + \text{Im}(A\Theta q_1) - \text{Im}(A\Theta z).\end{aligned}\tag{4.4}$$

Partially similarly to (3.11), the first term of (4.4) is computed as

$$\frac{1}{2}\text{Im}(A\Theta Aa^2 A) = \frac{1}{4}Aa(\partial_r\Theta)A - \frac{1}{4}Aa^{-1}(\partial_r a^2)\Theta A$$

$$= \frac{1}{4}A\Theta'A + \frac{1}{2}Aa^{-1}(\partial_r V)\Theta A.$$

We can also use a part of (3.12) to compute the second term of (4.4) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Im}(A\Theta L) &= \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Im}(p_ip_k(\nabla_k r)a^{-1}\Theta\ell_{ij}p_j) + \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Re}(p_k(\nabla^2 r)_{ik}a^{-1}\Theta\ell_{ij}p_j) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4}(a^{-3}(\partial_r V) + (d-1)r^{-1}a^{-1})\Theta L \\ &= -\frac{1}{4}a^{-2}\Theta'L + \frac{1}{2}r^{-1}a^{-1}\Theta L. \end{aligned}$$

We can directly compute and bound the third to fifth terms of (4.4) by using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Im}(A\Theta a^2) + \operatorname{Im}(A\Theta q_1) - \operatorname{Im}(A\Theta z) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}a^{-1}(\partial_r\Theta a^2) + \operatorname{Im}(A\Theta q_1) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda a^{-1}(\partial_r\Theta) \mp \mu \operatorname{Re}(A\Theta) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4}\Theta' - \frac{1}{2}a^{-1}(\partial_r V)\Theta + \frac{1}{2}\lambda a^{-2}\Theta' \mp \mu \operatorname{Re}(A\Theta) - C_3Q. \end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im}(A\Theta(H-z)) &\geq \frac{1}{4}A\Theta'A + \frac{1}{2}Aa^{-1}(\partial_r V)\Theta A - \frac{1}{4}a^{-2}\Theta'L + \frac{1}{2}r^{-1}a^{-1}\Theta L \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4}\Theta' - \frac{1}{2}a^{-1}(\partial_r V)\Theta + \frac{1}{2}\lambda a^{-2}\Theta' \mp \mu \operatorname{Re}(A\Theta) - C_3Q. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

We continue to compute the right-hand side of (4.5). We can combine the third, fifth and seventh terms of (4.5) as

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{4}a^{-2}\Theta'L + \frac{1}{4}\Theta' + \frac{1}{2}\lambda a^{-2}\Theta' &= \frac{1}{4}\operatorname{Re}(a^{-2}\Theta'Aa^2A) + \frac{1}{2}a^{-2}q_1\Theta' \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Re}(a^{-2}\Theta'(H-z)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4}A\Theta'A - C_4Q - C_4R^{-1}\chi_1 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Re}(a^{-2}\Theta'(H-z)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

The second and sixth terms of (4.5) are rewritten and bounded by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}Aa^{-1}(\partial_r V)\Theta A - \frac{1}{2}a^{-1}(\partial_r V)\Theta &= \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Im}(a(\partial_r a^{-3}(\partial_r V)\Theta)A) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}a^{-3}(\partial_r V)\Theta L - a^{-3}(\partial_r V)q_1\Theta \\ &\quad + \operatorname{Re}(a^{-3}(\partial_r V)\Theta(H-z)) \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{2}a^{-3}(\partial_r V)\Theta L - C_5Q - C_5R^{-1}\chi_1 \\ &\quad + \operatorname{Re}(a^{-3}(\partial_r V)\Theta(H-z)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

The eighth term of (4.5) requires a technical treatment as follows. We first use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma 4.1 as

$$\begin{aligned} \mp\mu \operatorname{Re}(A\Theta) &\geq -C_6\mu - C_6\mu p_i\bar{\chi}_0 a^{-2}p_i \\ &\geq -C_7\mu - 2C_6\mu \operatorname{Re}(\bar{\chi}_0 a^{-2}\theta(H-z)) \\ &\geq \mp C_7 \operatorname{Re}(i(H-z)) - C_8\mu^2\bar{\chi}_0 r^{\nu/2-1}a^{-2}\theta \\ &\quad - C_8(H-\bar{z})\tau(H-z). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

The first and third terms on the right-hand side of (4.8) are negligible, see the last two terms of (4.3). The second term of (4.8) is bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
-C_8\mu^2\bar{\chi}_0r^{\nu/2-1}a^{-2}\theta &= \pm\frac{1}{2}C_8\mu\operatorname{Re}((\partial_r\bar{\chi}_0r^{\nu/2-1}a^{-2}\theta)p_r) \\
&\quad \pm C_8\mu\operatorname{Im}(\bar{\chi}_0r^{\nu/2-1}a^{-2}\theta(H-z)) \\
&\geq -C_9\mu - C_9\mu p_i\bar{\chi}_0r^{2\nu-4}a^{-2}\theta p_i - C_9Q - C_9R^{-1}\chi_1 \\
&\quad - C_9\mu^2\bar{\chi}_0r^{\nu-2}a^{-2}\theta - C_9(H-\bar{z})\tau(H-z) \\
&\geq -C_{10}\mu - 2C_9\mu\operatorname{Re}(\bar{\chi}_0r^{2\nu-4}a^{-2}\theta(H-z)) \tag{4.9} \\
&\quad - C_{10}Q - C_{10}R^{-1}\chi_1 \\
&\quad - C_9\mu^2\bar{\chi}_0r^{\nu-2}a^{-2}\theta - C_9(H-\bar{z})\tau(H-z) \\
&\geq \mp C_{10}\operatorname{Re}(i(H-z)) - C_{10}Q - C_{10}R^{-1}\chi_1 \\
&\quad - C_{11}\mu^2\bar{\chi}_0r^{\nu-2}a^{-2}\theta - C_{11}(H-\bar{z})\tau(H-z).
\end{aligned}$$

Note the fourth term on the right-hand side of (4.9) has a better decay rate than on the left-hand side, or the second term on the right-hand side of (4.8), and all the other terms of (4.9) are negligible. Thus, by repeating this procedure, the second term of (4.8) can get any extra decay rates up to negligible errors, so that we obtain

$$\mp\mu\operatorname{Re}(A\Theta) \geq C_{12}\operatorname{Re}(i(H-z)) - C_{13}Q \tag{4.10} \\
- C_{13}R^{-1}\chi_1 - C_{13}(H-\bar{z})\tau(H-z).$$

Hence by (4.5), (4.6), (4.7) and (4.10)

$$\operatorname{Im}(A\Theta(H-z)) \geq \frac{1}{2}A\Theta'A + \frac{1}{2}r^{-1}a^{-1}\Theta L - \frac{1}{2}a^{-3}(\partial_r V)\Theta L - C_{14}Q \tag{4.11} \\
- C_{14}R^{-1}\chi_1 + \operatorname{Re}(\gamma_1(H-z)) - C_{14}(H-\bar{z})\tau(H-z),$$

where γ_1 is a bounded function uniformly in z and R .

Now we deduce the main positive contributions from the first to third terms of (4.11). By using Assumption 2.1 we bound them below as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}A\Theta'A + \frac{1}{2}r^{-1}a^{-1}\Theta L - \frac{1}{2}a^{-3}(\partial_r V)\Theta L \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}A\Theta'A + \frac{1}{2}r^{-1}a^{-3}(2\lambda - \epsilon V)\Theta L \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}A\Theta'A + \frac{\epsilon}{4}r^{-1}a^{-1}\Theta L \\
&\geq 2c_2A\Theta'A + c_2a^{-2}\Theta'L + c_2\tau^{-1}a^{-2}\Theta L - C_{15}Q \\
&\geq c_2\Theta' + c_2A\Theta'A + c_2a^{-2}\tau^{-1}\Theta L - C_{16}Q \\
&\quad - C_{16}R^{-1}\chi_1 - C_{16}\mu + 2c_2\operatorname{Re}(a^{-2}\Theta'(H-z)) \\
&\geq c_2\theta' + c_2p_r^*a^{-2}\theta'p_r + c_2a^{-2}\langle\tau\rangle^{-1}\theta L - C_{17}Q \\
&\quad - C_{17}R^{-1}\chi_1 \mp C_{16}\operatorname{Re}(i(H-z)) + 2c_2\operatorname{Re}(a^{-2}\Theta'(H-z)).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we also bound Q as

$$\begin{aligned} Q &\leq C_{18}r^{-1-\nu'/2}\Theta + C_{18}R^{-1}\chi_2 + 2\operatorname{Re}(a^{-2}r^{-1-\nu'/2}\Theta(H-z)) \\ &\quad + 2R^{-1}\operatorname{Re}(\chi_1(H-z)) \\ &\leq C_{18}r^{-1-\nu'/2}\bar{\chi}_n\theta + C_{19}R^{-1}\chi_n + 2\operatorname{Re}(a^{-2}r^{-1-\nu'/2}\Theta(H-z)) \\ &\quad + 2R^{-1}\operatorname{Re}(\chi_1(H-z)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (4.11) and the above estimates imply

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im}(A\Theta(H-z)) &\geq c_2\theta' - C_{18}r^{-1-\nu'/2}\bar{\chi}_n\theta + c_2p_r^*a^{-2}\theta'p_r + c_2a^{-2}\langle\tau\rangle^{-1}\theta L \\ &\quad - C_{20}R^{-1}\chi_n + \operatorname{Re}(\gamma_2(H-z)) - C_{20}(H-\bar{z})\tau(H-z). \end{aligned}$$

By letting $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be sufficiently large we obtain (4.3), hence the assertion. \square

4.2 Proof of LAP bounds

Now we prove Theorem 1.5. We combine Proposition 4.3 and contradiction.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Fix any $\rho > 0$ and $\omega \in (0, \pi)$ as in the assertion.

Step 1. Here we assume

$$\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} \leq C_1\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}; \quad \phi = R(z)\psi, \quad z \in \Gamma_{\pm}(\rho, \omega), \quad \psi \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda), \quad (4.12)$$

and deduce the assertion by using (4.12). Note all the following estimates are uniform in $z \in \Gamma_{\pm}(\rho, \omega)$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$. By Proposition 4.3 with any $\delta \in (0, (\nu' - \nu)/(2 + \nu))$ and (4.12) we can find $C_2 > 0$ such that uniformly in $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $R \geq 1$

$$\|a^{-1}\theta^{1/2}p_r\phi\|^2 + \langle\phi, a^{-2}\langle\tau\rangle^{-1}\theta L\phi\rangle \leq \epsilon\|a^{-1}p_r\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)}^2 + \epsilon^{-1}C_2\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}^2.$$

Noting the expressions (4.1) and (4.2) from θ and θ' , respectively, take the supremum of each term on the above left-hand side in $R \geq 1$, and we obtain

$$\|a^{-1}p_r\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)}^2 + \langle\phi, a^{-2}\langle\tau\rangle^{-1}L\phi\rangle \leq \epsilon C_3\|a^{-1}p_r\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)}^2 + \epsilon^{-1}C_3\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}^2.$$

Therefore by letting $\epsilon \in (0, C_3^{-1})$ it follows that

$$\|a^{-1}p_r\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)}^2 + \langle\phi, a^{-2}\langle\tau\rangle^{-1}L\phi\rangle \leq C_4\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}^2.$$

Hence the assertion reduces to the single bound (4.12).

Step 2. Next we prove (4.12) by contradiction. Let us discuss only the upper sign. Assume there exist $z_k \in \Gamma_+(\rho, \omega)$ and $\psi_k \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\psi_k\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)} = 0, \quad \|\phi_k\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} = 1; \quad \phi_k = R(z_k)\psi_k. \quad (4.13)$$

By choosing a subsequence we may let z_k converge to some $z \in \overline{\Gamma_+(\rho, \omega)}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. If $\text{Im } z > 0$, then (4.13) contradicts the bounds

$$\|\phi_k\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} \leq C_5 \|R(z_k)\psi_k\| \leq \|R(z_k)\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})} \|\psi_k\| \leq C_6 \|R(z_k)\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})} \|\psi_k\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}$$

and the norm continuity of $R(z) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ in $z \in \rho(H)$. Thus we have a real limit

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} z_k = z = \lambda \in [0, \rho]. \quad (4.14)$$

Fix any $s \in (1/2, (2 + \nu')/(2(2 + \nu)))$. By choosing a subsequence again we may further let $\langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \phi_k \in \mathcal{H}$ converge weakly to some $\langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \phi \in \mathcal{H}$. Then, in fact, $\langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \phi_k$ converges strongly to $\langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \phi$ in \mathcal{H} . To see this take any $t \in (1/2, s)$ and $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $f = 1$ on a neighborhood of $[0, \rho]$, and decompose $\langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \phi_k$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \phi_k &= (\langle \tau \rangle^{-s} f(H))(\chi_m \langle \tau \rangle^s)(\langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \phi_k) \\ &\quad + (\langle \tau \rangle^{-s} f(H) \langle \tau \rangle^s)(\bar{\chi}_m \langle \tau \rangle^{t-s})(\langle \tau \rangle^{-t} \phi_k) \\ &\quad + \langle \tau \rangle^{-s} (1 - f(H))R(z_k)\psi_k. \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

By (4.13) the last term on the right-hand side of (4.15) converges to 0 in \mathcal{H} . Since $\langle \tau \rangle^{-s} f(H) \langle \tau \rangle^s$ is a bounded operator on \mathcal{H} , by choosing $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ sufficiently large the second term of (4.15) can be arbitrarily small in \mathcal{H} . Lastly, since $\langle \tau \rangle^{-s} f(H)$ is a compact operator on \mathcal{H} , for any fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the first term of (4.15) converges strongly in \mathcal{H} . Therefore $\langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \phi_k$ is a Cauchy sequence in \mathcal{H} , and converges there to $\langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \phi$:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \phi_k = \langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \phi \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}. \quad (4.16)$$

By (4.13), (4.14) and (4.16) it follows that

$$(H - \lambda)\phi = 0 \quad \text{in the distributional sense.} \quad (4.17)$$

In addition, we can verify $\phi \in \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$. In fact, letting $\delta \in (2s - 1, (\nu' - \nu)/(2 + \nu))$, we apply Proposition 4.3 to ϕ_k and let $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then by Lemma 4.1, (4.16) and (4.13) we obtain for all $R \geq 1$

$$\|\theta'^{1/2} \phi\| \leq C_7 R^{-1} \|\chi_n^{1/2} \phi\|. \quad (4.18)$$

By letting $R \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.18) we obtain $\phi \in \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$. Therefore by (4.17) and Theorem 1.3 it follows that $\phi = 0$

Now we have a contradiction. In fact, as in Step 1, we can show

$$1 = \|\phi_k\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)}^2 \leq C_8 (\|\psi_k\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}^2 + \|\chi_n^{1/2} \phi_k\|^2),$$

but the right-hand side can be made smaller than 1 by taking k large enough. \square

5 Radiation condition bounds

In this section we discuss the radiation condition bounds and their relevant consequences. Throughout the section we prove the statements only for the upper sign for simplicity.

5.1 Commutator estimate

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\rho > 0$ and $\omega \in (0, \pi)$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that uniformly in $z \in \overline{\Gamma_{\pm}(\rho, \omega)}$*

$$|b| \leq C, \quad \operatorname{Im} b \geq -C\langle x \rangle^{-1-\nu}a^{-2}, \quad |p_r b + b^2 - 2(z - V)| \leq C\langle x \rangle^{-2}.$$

Proof. It is clear from the definition (1.6) that the first and second inequalities hold. Since we can write,

$$p_r b + b^2 - 2(z - V) = -\frac{\partial_r^2 V}{4(z-V)} - \frac{5(\partial_r V)^2}{16(z-V)^2},$$

Hence the last bound is also clear. \square

To simplify a commutator computation in Lemma 5.3, we introduce B as

$$B = \operatorname{Re} p_r = p_r - \frac{i}{2}\Delta r,$$

and decompose $H - z$ into a sum of radial and spherical components.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\rho > 0$ and $\omega \in (0, \pi)$. Then there exists a complex-valued function q_2 and a constant $C > 0$ such that uniformly in $z \in \overline{\Gamma_{\pm}(\rho, \omega)}$*

$$H - z = \frac{1}{2}(B + b)(B - b) + \frac{1}{2}L + q_2 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$$

where $q_2 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies that there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$|q_2(x)| \leq C\langle x \rangle^{-1-\nu'/2}.$$

Proof. Using the expression (3.5) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} H - z &= \frac{1}{2}(B - b)(B + b) + \frac{1}{2}L + q \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(p_r b + b^2 - 2(z - V)) + \frac{1}{4}\partial_r(\Delta r) + \frac{1}{8}(\Delta r)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we are done. \square

Let us introduce the weight

$$\Theta = \Theta_{R,l}^\delta = \bar{\chi}_l \theta; \quad \delta > 0, \quad R \geq 1, \quad l = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

where $\bar{\chi}_l$ is a function defined in (3.4) and θ is

$$\theta = \int_0^{\tau/R} (1+s)^{-1-\delta} ds = \delta^{-1} [1 - (1+\tau/R)^{-\delta}].$$

Next we state and prove the key commutator estimate of the section that is needed for our proof of the radiation condition bounds.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\rho > 0$, $\omega \in (0, \pi)$ and fix any $\delta \in \left(0, \min\left\{\frac{2-\nu}{2(2+\nu)}, \frac{\nu'-\nu}{2+\nu}\right\}\right)$ and $\beta \in (0, \beta_{c,\rho})$. Then there exists $C > 0, l \geq 1$ such that for any $R \geq 1$, $z = \lambda + i\mu \in \Gamma_+(\rho, \omega)$ and $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the state $\phi = R(z)\psi$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\bar{\chi}_l \theta')^{1/2} \Theta^{\beta-1/2} a^{-1} (p_r - b_z) \phi\|^2 + \langle \phi, \tau^{2\beta} a^{-2} \langle \tau \rangle^{-1} L \phi \rangle \\ & \leq C(\|\Theta^\beta a^{-1} (p_r - b_z) \phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} \|\theta^\beta \psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)} + \|\langle \tau \rangle^{-1/2 - \min\left\{\frac{2-\nu}{2(2+\nu)}, \frac{\nu'-\nu}{2+\nu}\right\} + \delta} \theta^\beta \phi\|^2 \\ & \quad + \|\langle \tau \rangle^{1/2 - \min\left\{\frac{2-\nu}{2(2+\nu)}, \frac{\nu'-\nu}{2+\nu}\right\} + \delta} \theta^\beta \psi\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Fix $\rho, \omega, \delta, \beta_{c,\rho}$ in the assertion. Clearly it suffices to show there exist $l \geq 1$ and $c, C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}((a^{-1}(B-b))^* \Theta^{2\beta} (H-z)) & \geq c(a^{-1}(p_r - b))^* \theta' \bar{\chi}_l \Theta^{2\beta-1} (a^{-1}(p_r - b)) \\ & \quad + c p_i a^{-2} \langle \tau \rangle^{-1} \ell_{i,j} \Theta^{2\beta} p_j \\ & \quad - C \langle \tau \rangle^{-1-2 \min\{(2-\nu)/2(2+\nu), (\nu'-\nu)/(2+\nu)\} + 2\delta} \theta^{2\beta} \\ & \quad - \text{Re}(\gamma \theta^{2\beta} (H-z)), \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

uniformly $R \geq 1$, $z = \lambda + i\mu \in \Gamma_+(\rho, \omega)$, where γ is a complex-valued function satisfying $|\gamma| \leq C \langle \tau \rangle^{-1-2 \min\{(2-\nu)/2(2+\nu), (\nu'-\nu)/(2+\nu)\} + 2\delta}$. In the below we compute and bound the quantity on the left-hand side of (5.1). We gather admissible error terms, and write them for short as

$$\begin{aligned} Q & = \langle \tau \rangle^{-1-2 \min\{(2-\nu)/2(2+\nu), (\nu'-\nu)/(2+\nu)\} + 2\delta} \theta^{2\beta} \\ & \quad + p_i \langle \tau \rangle^{-1-2 \min\{(2-\nu)/2(2+\nu), (\nu'-\nu)/(2+\nu)\} + 2\delta} \ell_{i,j} \theta^{2\beta} p_j. \end{aligned}$$

For the moment the following estimates are all uniform in $R \geq 1$, $z \in \Gamma_+(\rho, \omega)$, and $l \geq 1$. By the Lemma 5.2 we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}((a^{-1}(B-b))^* \Theta^{2\beta} (H-z)) & = \frac{1}{2} \text{Im}((a^{-1}(B-b))^* \Theta^{2\beta} (B+b)(B-b)) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{Im}(B a^{-1} \Theta^{2\beta} L) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Im}((a^{-1}b)^* \Theta^{2\beta} L) \quad (5.2) \\ & \quad + \text{Im}((a^{-1}(B-b))^* \Theta^{2\beta} q_2). \end{aligned}$$

The first term of (5.2) is computed as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}((a^{-1}(B-b))^* \Theta^{2\beta} (B+b)(B-b)) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} (a^{-1}(B-b))^* \beta \Theta^{2\beta-1} \bar{\chi}_l \theta'(a^{-1}(B-b)) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{4} (a^{-1}(B-b))^* a^{-1} \partial_r V \Theta^{2\beta} (a^{-1}(B-b)) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} (a^{-1}(B-b))^* (\operatorname{Im} b) a \Theta^{2\beta} (a^{-1}(B-b)) \\
& \quad - C_1 Q.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the following inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{1}{4} a^{-1} \partial_r V + \frac{1}{2} (\operatorname{Im} b) a \right) \Theta^{2\beta} \\
& = \left(\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}(\sqrt{2(z-V)}) - \frac{\mu^2 \partial_r V}{4a^2((\lambda-V)^2+\mu^2)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + (\lambda - \max\{\lambda, 0\}) \frac{\partial_r V(\lambda-V)}{4a^2((\lambda-V)^2+\mu^2)} \right) a \Theta^{2\beta} \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\mu} (1 - C_2 r^{-1+\nu/2}) a \Theta^{2\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we take l large enough, we obtain the following estimate:

$$\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}((a^{-1}(B-b))^* \Theta^{2\beta} (B+b)(B-b)) \geq \frac{1}{2} (a^{-1}(B-b))^* \beta \Theta^{2\beta-1} \bar{\chi}_l \theta'(a^{-1}(B-b)).$$

Next we can compute the second and third term of (5.2) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}(B a^{-1} \Theta^{2\beta} L) - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}((a^{-1} b)^* \Theta^{2\beta} L) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} p_i r^{-1} a^{-1} (1 - \beta r a^{-1} \tau^{-1} - \frac{1}{2} a^{-2} r \partial_r V + \frac{1}{2} r \operatorname{Im} b) \ell_{i,j} \Theta^{2\beta} p_j \\
& \quad - C_3 Q \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} p_i r^{-1} a^{-1} (1 - \beta r a^{-1} \tau^{-1} + \frac{1}{2} (2 - \epsilon) a^{-2} V - \frac{1}{4} (r \partial_r V) / (\lambda - V)) \ell_{i,j} \Theta^{2\beta} p_j \\
& \quad - C_3 Q \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} p_i r^{-1} a^{-1} (1 - \beta r a^{-1} \tau^{-1} - \frac{1}{4} (2 - \epsilon) - \frac{1}{8} (2 - \epsilon)) \ell_{i,j} \Theta^{2\beta} p_j \\
& \quad - C_3 Q.
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $\beta_{c,\rho}$ and Lemma 4.2, if we take l large enough, we obtain the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}(B a^{-1} \Theta^{2\beta} L) - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}((a^{-1} b)^* \Theta^{2\beta} L) \\
& \geq c_1 p_i a^{-2} \langle \tau \rangle^{-1} \ell_{i,j} \Theta^{2\beta} p_j - C_3 Q.
\end{aligned}$$

We can directly compute the fourth term of (5.2) by using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Im}((a^{-1}(B-b))^* \Theta^{2\beta} q_2) \\
& \geq -C_4 (a^{-1}(B-b))^* \langle \tau \rangle^{-1-2\delta} (a^{-1}(B-b)) - C_4 Q.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Im}((a^{-1}(B-b))^* \Theta^{2\beta}(H-z)) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2}(a^{-1}(B-b))^*(\beta \bar{\chi}_l \theta' - C_5 \langle \tau \rangle^{-1-2\delta} \Theta) \Theta^{2\beta-1}(a^{-1}(B-b)) \\ & \quad + c_1 p_i a^{-2} \langle \tau \rangle^{-1} \ell_{i,j} \Theta^{2\beta} p_j - C_5 Q. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}(a^{-1}(B-b))^*(\beta \bar{\chi}_l \theta' - C_5 \langle \tau \rangle^{-1-2\delta} \Theta) \Theta^{2\beta-1}(a^{-1}(B-b)) \\ & \geq c_2(a^{-1}(B-b))^* \bar{\chi}_l \theta' \Theta^{2\beta-1}(a^{-1}(B-b)) - C_6 Q \\ & \geq c_3(a^{-1}(p_r - b))^* \bar{\chi}_l \theta' \Theta^{2\beta-1}(a^{-1}(p_r - b)) - C_7 Q. \end{aligned}$$

Finally we can bound $-Q$ as

$$\begin{aligned} -Q & \geq -C_8 \langle \tau \rangle^{-1-2 \min\{(2-\nu)/2(2+\nu), (\nu'-\nu)/(2+\nu)\}+2\delta} \theta^{2\beta} \\ & \quad - C_8 \operatorname{Re}(\langle \tau \rangle^{-1-2 \min\{(2-\nu)/2(2+\nu), (\nu'-\nu)/(2+\nu)\}+2\delta} (H-z)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we are done. \square

5.2 Applications

Now we are going to prove Theorem 1.7 and Corollary 1.8–1.10 in this order.

5.2.1 Radiation condition bounds for complex spectral parameters.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Let ρ, ω be the assertion. For $\beta = 0$ the assertion is obvious by Theorem 1.5, and hence we may let $\beta \in (0, \beta_{c,\rho})$. We take any

$$\delta \in \left(0, \min \left\{0, \min \left\{\frac{2-\nu}{2(2+\nu)}, \frac{\nu'-\nu}{2+\nu}\right\} - \beta_{c,\rho}\right\}\right).$$

By Lemma 5.3, There exists $C_1 > 0$ such that for any state $\phi = R(z)\psi$ with $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $z \in \Gamma_+(\rho, \omega)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\bar{\chi}_l \theta')^{1/2} \Theta^{\beta-1/2} a^{-1}(p_r - b_z) \phi\|^2 + \langle \phi, \tau^{2\beta} a^{-2} \langle \tau \rangle^{-1} L \phi \rangle \\ & \leq C(\|\Theta^\beta a^{-1}(p_r - b_z) \phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} \|\theta^\beta \psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)} + \|\langle \tau \rangle^{-1/2-\min\{\frac{2-\nu}{2(2+\nu)}, \frac{\nu'-\nu}{2+\nu}\}+\delta} \theta^\beta \phi\|^2 \\ & \quad + \|\langle \tau \rangle^{1/2-\min\{\frac{2-\nu}{2(2+\nu)}, \frac{\nu'-\nu}{2+\nu}\}+\delta} \theta^\beta \psi\|^2) \\ & \leq C_1 R^{-2\beta} (\|\bar{\chi}_l^{1/2} \tau^\beta a^{-1}(p_r - b) \phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} \|\langle \tau \rangle^\beta \psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)} + \|\langle \tau \rangle^\beta \psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}^2). \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Here we note that $\langle \tau \rangle^\beta a^{-1}(p_r - b) \phi \in \mathcal{B}^*$ for each $z \in \Gamma_+(\rho, \omega)$ and hence the quantity on the right-hand side of (5.3) is finite. In fact, this can be verified by

commuting $R(z)$ and powers of $\langle \tau \rangle$ sufficiently many times and using the fact that $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then by (5.3), it follows

$$\begin{aligned} & R^{2\beta} \|(\bar{\chi}_l \theta')^{1/2} \Theta^{\beta-1/2} a^{-1} (p_r - b_z) \phi\|^2 + R^{2\beta} \langle \phi, \tau^{2\beta} a^{-2} \langle \tau \rangle^{-1} L \phi \rangle \\ & \leq C_1 (\| \bar{\chi}_l^{1/2} \tau^\beta a^{-1} (p_r - b) \phi \|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} \| \langle \tau \rangle^\beta \psi \|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)} + \| \langle \tau \rangle^\beta \psi \|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

In the first term on the left-hand side of (5.4) Let R be 2^m and take the supremum in $m \geq 0$ noting (4.2), and then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & c_1 \|(\bar{\chi}_l)^{1/2} \tau^\beta a^{-1} (p_r - b_z) \phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)}^2 \\ & \leq C_1 (\| \bar{\chi}_l^{1/2} \tau^\beta a^{-1} (p_r - b) \phi \|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} \| \langle \tau \rangle^\beta \psi \|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)} + \| \langle \tau \rangle^\beta \psi \|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}^2). \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\| \bar{\chi}_l^{1/2} \tau^\beta a^{-1} (p_r - b) \phi \|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)} \leq C_2 \| \langle \tau \rangle^\beta \psi \|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}. \quad (5.5)$$

As for the second term on the left-hand side of (5.4) we use (5.5), the concavity of Θ and Lebesgue's monotone convergence theorem and then obtain by letting $R \rightarrow \infty$

$$\langle p_i \bar{\chi}_l^{1/2} \tau^{2\beta} a^{-2} \langle \tau \rangle^{-1} \ell_{i,j} p_j \rangle_\phi \leq C_3 \| \langle \tau \rangle^\beta \psi \|_{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)}. \quad (5.6)$$

From (5.5) and (5.6) we can remove the cut off $\bar{\chi}_l^{1/2}$ by using Theorem 1.5. Hence we are done. \square

5.2.2 Limiting absorption principle.

Proof of corollary 1.8. Let $s > 1/2$ and $\gamma \in (0, \min\{s - 1/2, \beta_{c,\rho}\})$ be in the assertion. Let $s' = s - \gamma$. We decompose for $n \geq 0$ and $z, z' \in \Gamma_+(\rho, \omega)$

$$\begin{aligned} R(z) - R(z') &= \chi_n R(z) \chi_n - \chi_n R(z') \chi_n \\ &+ (R(z) - \chi_n R(z) \chi_n) - (R(z') - \chi_n R(z') \chi_n). \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

By Theorem 1.5 we can estimate the third term of (5.7) uniformly in $n \geq 0$ and $z, z' \in \Gamma_+(\rho, \omega)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & \|R(z) - \chi_n R(z) \chi_n\|_{\mathcal{B}(L_{s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}}^2, L_{-s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}}^2)} \\ & \leq \| \langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \bar{\chi}_n R(z) \bar{\chi}_n \langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} + \| \langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \chi_n R(z) \bar{\chi}_n \langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \\ & \quad + \| \langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \bar{\chi}_n R(z) \chi_n \langle \tau \rangle^{-s} \|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \\ & \leq C_1 2^{n(s'-s)} = C_1 2^{-n\gamma}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$\|R(z') - \chi_n R(z') \chi_n\|_{\mathcal{B}(L_{s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}}^2, L_{-s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}}^2)} \leq C_2 2^{-n\gamma}.$$

As for the first and second term on the right-hand side of (5.7), using the equation

$$i[H, \chi_{n+1}] = \operatorname{Re}(\chi'_{n+1} a^{-1} p_r) \quad (5.9)$$

and noting the identity $\bar{b}_{\bar{z}} = b_z$, we can write for $n \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \chi_n R(z) \chi_n - \chi_n R(z') \chi_n \\ &= \chi_n R(z) \chi_{n+1} (H - z') - (H - z) \chi_{n+1} R(z') \chi_n \\ &= \chi_n R(z) \{ (z - z') \chi_{n+1} + i \operatorname{Re}(\chi'_{n+1} a^{-1} p_r) \} R(z') \chi_n \\ &= \frac{i}{2} \chi_n R(z) \chi'_{n+1} a^{-1} (p_r - b_{z'}) R(z') \chi_n + \frac{i}{2} \chi_n R(z) (a^{-1} (p_r + b_{\bar{z}}))^* \chi'_{n+1} R(z') \chi_n \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{2} \chi_n R(z) (a^{-1} (b_z - b_{z'})) \chi'_{n+1} R(z') \chi_n - (z - z') \chi_n R(z) \chi_m R(z') \chi_n \\ &\quad - (z - z') \chi_n R(z) \chi_{m,n+1} (a(b_z + b'_{z'})^{-1}) (a^{-1} (p_r - b_{z'})) R(z') \chi_n \\ &\quad + (z - z') \chi_n R(z) (a^{-1} (p_r + b_{\bar{z}}))^* \chi_{m,n+1} a(b_z + b_{z'})^{-1} R(z') \chi_n \\ &\quad - (z - z') \chi_n R(z) [a^{-1} p_r, \chi_{m,n+1} a(b_z + b_{z'})^{-1}] R(z') \chi_n. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

Here $m \geq 0$ is fixed so that $(b_z + b_{z'})^{-1}$ is non-singular on $\operatorname{supp} \bar{\chi}_m$. Then by Theorem 1.5 and 1.7 we have uniformly in $n \geq 0$ and $z, z' \in \Gamma_+(\rho, \omega)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\chi_n R(z) \chi_n - \chi_n R(z') \chi_n\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2_{s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}}, L^2_{-s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}})} \\ & \leq C_3 2^{-n\gamma} + C_4 2^{n(1-\gamma)} |z - z'|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Summing up (5.7)-(5.11), we obtain uniformly in $n \geq 0$ and $z, z' \in \Gamma_+(\rho, \omega)$

$$\|R(z) - R(z')\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2_{s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}}, L^2_{-s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}})} \leq C_5 2^{-n\gamma} + C_5 2^{n(1-\gamma)} |z - z'|.$$

Now, if $|z - z'| \leq 1$, then we choose $2^n \leq |z - z'|^{-1} < 2^{n+1}$, and then obtain

$$\|R(z) - R(z')\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2_{s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}}, L^2_{-s, \min\{\operatorname{Re} z, \operatorname{Re} z'\}})} \leq C_6 |z - z'|^\gamma. \quad (5.12)$$

The same bound is trivial for $|z - z'| \geq 1$, and hence the Hölder continuity (1.7) for $R(z)$ follows from (5.12). The Hölder continuity for $a^{-1} p_r R(z)$ follows by using the first Resolvent equation. The existence of the limits (1.8) is an immediate consequence of (1.7). By Theorem 1.5 the limits $R(z)$ and $a^{-1} p_r R(z)$ actually map into \mathcal{B}^* , and moreover they extend continuously to map $\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^*$ by density argument. Hence we are done. \square

5.2.3 Radiation condition bounds for real spectral parameters.

Proof of Corollary 1.9. The corollary follows from Theorem 1.7, Corollary 1.8 and approximation arguments. Note the elementary property

$$\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)} = \sup_{n \geq 0} \|\chi_n \psi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)}; \quad \psi \in \mathcal{B}^*(\lambda).$$

Hence we are done. \square

5.2.4 Sommerfeld uniqueness result.

Proof of Corollary 1.10. Let $\lambda \geq 0$, $\phi \in L^2_{\text{loc}}$ and $\psi \in \langle \tau \rangle^{-\beta} \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ with $\beta \in [0, \beta_{c,\lambda}]$. We first assume $\phi = R(\lambda + i0)\psi$. Then (i) and (ii) of the corollary hold by Corollaries 1.8 and 1.9. Conversely, assume (i) and (ii) of the corollary, and let

$$\phi' = \phi - R(\lambda + i0)\psi.$$

Then by Corollaries 1.8 and 1.9 it follows that ϕ' satisfies of the corollary with $\psi = 0$. In addition, we can verify $\phi' \in \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$ by the virial-type argument. In fact noting the identity

$$2 \operatorname{Im}(\chi_m(H - \lambda)) = \operatorname{Re}(a^{-1}b)\chi'_m + \operatorname{Re}(\chi'_m a^{-1}(p_r - b)),$$

we conclude that

$$0 \leq \langle \operatorname{Re}(a^{-1}b)\chi'_m \rangle_{\phi'} = \operatorname{Re}\langle \chi'_m a^{-1}(p_r - b) \rangle_{\phi'}. \quad (5.13)$$

Taking the limit $m \rightarrow \infty$ and using $\phi' \in \langle \tau \rangle^\beta \mathcal{B}^*(\lambda)$ and $a^{-1}(p_r - b)\phi' \in \langle \tau \rangle^{-\beta} \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$ in (5.13), we obtain $\phi' \in \mathcal{B}_0^*(\lambda)$. By Theorem 1.3 it follows that $\phi' = 0$. Hence we have $\phi = R(\lambda + i0)\psi$. \square

A LAP bounds in high energy regime

A.1 Settings and results

In this appendix we discuss the LAP bounds in the high energy regime. The settings here are slightly more general than in the previous sections, being rather independent of them. For there do not appear the difficulties due to the energy 0.

Consider the Schrödinger operator of the form

$$H = \frac{1}{2}p^2 + V$$

with the following assumption on V :

Assumption A.1. Let $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$, and there exists a splitting

$$V = V_1 + V_2; \quad V_1 \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}), \quad V_2 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}),$$

such that for some $C > 0$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$

$$\partial_r V_1 \leq C\langle x \rangle^{-1-\epsilon}, \quad |V_2| \leq C\langle x \rangle^{-1-\epsilon}.$$

Remark A.2. Clearly, this is weaker than Assumption 1.1.

We also slightly refine the Agmon-Hörmander spaces as, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\mathcal{B}(m) = \{\psi \in L^2_{\text{loc}}; \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(m)} < \infty\}, \quad \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(m)} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{(n-m)/2} \|1_n(m)\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

$$\mathcal{B}^*(m) = \{\psi \in L^2_{\text{loc}}; \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(m)} < \infty\}, \quad \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(m)} = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{-(n-m)/2} \|1_n(m)\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

with

$$1_1(m) = 1(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; |x| < 2^{1-m}\}),$$

$$1_n(m) = 1(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; 2^{n-m-1} \leq |x| < 2^{n-m}\}) \quad \text{for } n = 2, 3, \dots$$

Note $\mathcal{B}(m)$ coincide for all $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ as sets, and so do $\mathcal{B}^*(m)$, however we have

$$\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}(m)} \geq \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}(m+1)}, \quad \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(m)} \leq \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(m+1)}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

For any $a, b > 0$ we set

$$\Gamma'_{\pm}(a, b) = \{z = \lambda \pm i\mu \in \mathbb{C}; \lambda > a, 0 < \mu < b\lambda^{1/2}\},$$

respectively.

Theorem A.3. *Suppose Assumption A.1. Let $a > 0$ be sufficiently large, and let $b > 0$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $z = \lambda \pm i\mu \in \Gamma'_{\pm}(a, b)$, $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $2^{2m} < \lambda \leq 2^{2m-2}$*

$$\|R(z)\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(m)} \leq C2^{-m}\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(m)}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\|p_r R(z)\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(m)} \leq C\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(m)},$$

$$\langle R(z)\psi, \langle 2^m x \rangle^{-1} L R(z)\psi \rangle \leq C2^{-m}\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(m)}^2.$$

respectively.

Remark A.4. According to (A.1), this refines the ordinary $\mathcal{B}(0)$ - $\mathcal{B}^*(0)$ estimates in the high energy regime, where the Agmon-Hörmander spaces approach those with homogeneous weights.

A.2 Outline of proof

A.2.1 Reduction

The proof of Theorem A.3 depends on a simple scaling argument combined with the following local resolvent estimates for an h -dependent Schrödinger operator

$$H_h = \frac{1}{2}p^2 + V_h; \quad V_h(x) = h^2 V(hx), \quad h \in (0, 1].$$

Let $R_h(w) = (H_h - w)^{-1}$ for $w \in \rho(H_h)$, and also set for any $b > 0$

$$\Gamma''_{\pm}(b) = \{z = \lambda \pm i\mu \in \mathbb{C}; 1 < \lambda \leq 4, 0 < \mu < b\},$$

respectively.

Proposition A.5. *Suppose Assumption A.1. Let $h_0 > 0$ be sufficiently small, and let $b > 0$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $h \in (0, h_0]$, $w \in \Gamma''_{\pm}(b)$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(0)$*

$$\|R_h(w)\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(0)} + \|p_r R_h(w)\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(0)} + \langle R_h(w)\psi, \langle x \rangle^{-1} L R_h(w)\psi \rangle^{1/2} \leq C \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(0)}.$$

The proof of Proposition A.5 is essentially the same as [6, Proposition 4.1], hence is very similar to Theorem 1.5. We will only present key steps later on. Here let us verify Theorem A.3 by using Proposition A.5 and scaling.

Deduction of Theorem A.3 from Proposition A.5. We shall prove only (A.2) since the others are treated similarly. For any $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\psi \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we set

$$(U_m \psi)(x) = \psi(2^{-m}x).$$

Then by definition of the norms in $\mathcal{B}(m)$ and $\mathcal{B}^*(m)$ and change of variables it is straightforward to see that

$$\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(m)} = \|U_m \phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(0)}, \quad \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(m)} = 2^{-m} \|U_m \psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(0)},$$

so that

$$\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(m)} \leq 2^m \|U_m R(z) U_m^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}(0), \mathcal{B}^*(0))} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(m)}.$$

Hence it suffices to examine $U_m R(z) U_m^{-1}: \mathcal{B}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^*(0)$. Let us rewrite

$$U_m R(z) U_m^{-1} = 2^{-2m} R_h(w) \quad \text{with } h = 2^{-m}, \quad w = 2^{-2m} z.$$

If we choose $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $2^{2m} < \text{Re } z \leq 2^{2m+2}$, then Proposition A.5 indeed applies, and the assertion follows. We are done. \square

A.2.2 h -Resolvent estimates

In order to prove Proposition A.5 we employ the following estimates with

$$\theta = \int_0^{r/R} (1+s)^{-1-\delta} ds = \delta^{-1} [1 - (1+r/R)^{-\delta}]; \quad \delta > 0, \quad R \geq 1,$$

cf. (4.1).

Lemma A.6. *Let $h_0 > 0$ be sufficiently small, and let $b > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$. Then there exist $C > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for any $R \geq 1$, $h \in (0, 1]$, $w \in \Gamma''_{\pm}(b)$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{B}(0)$ the state $\phi = R_h(w)\psi$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\theta'^{1/2} \phi\|^2 + \|\theta'^{1/2} p_r \phi\|^2 + \langle \phi, \langle x \rangle^{-1} \theta L \phi \rangle \\ & \leq C (\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(0)} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(0)} + \|p_r \phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^*(0)} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}(0)} + R^{-1} \|\chi_n^{1/2} \phi\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Similarly to the proof of [6, Proposition 4.1] or Theorem 1.5, it suffices to compute and bound from below a distorted commutator

$$\text{Im}(A\Theta(H_h - w)); \quad A = \text{Re } p_r, \quad \Theta = (1 - \chi(r))\theta,$$

where χ is from (3.3). This can be done in almost the same manner as for [6, Proposition 4.1], which is indeed much simpler than Theorem 1.5. The only differences from [6, Proposition 4.1] are that our r is singular at the origin, and that we have an h -dependence. However, the former is handled by the cut-off $1 - \chi(r)$. As for the latter, note that V_h satisfies Assumption A.1, see also [6, Condition 1.3], uniformly in $h \in (0, 1]$, and moreover that the corresponding coefficient C vanishes as $h \rightarrow +0$. Hence the assertion can be verified for any small $h \in (0, 1]$. Let us omit the further details. \square

Proof of Proposition A.5. Once we obtain Lemma A.6, Proposition A.5 follows from it by the same manner as for Theorem 1.5, or [6, Theorem 1.7]. Here we have an h -dependence, but a modification is straightforward. We omit the details. \square

Acknowledgements

KI thanks Erik Skibsted for valuable discussions and comments on the draft.

Funding

KI was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP23K03163.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Data Availability

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

References

- [1] S. Agmon, M. Klein, *Analyticity properties in scattering and spectral theory for Schrödinger operators with long-range radial potentials*, Duke Math. J. **68** (1992), no. 2, 337–399.
- [2] J. Dereziński, E. Skibsted, *Scattering at zero energy for attractive homogeneous potentials*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **10** (2009), no. 3, 549–571.

- [3] J. Dereziński, E. Skibsted, *Quantum scattering at low energies*, J. Funct. Anal. **257** (2009), no. 6, 1828–1920.
- [4] S. Fournais, E. Skibsted, *Zero energy asymptotics of the resolvent for a class of slowly decaying potentials*, Math. Z. **248** (2004), no. 3, 593–633.
- [5] R. Frank, *A note on low energy scattering for homogeneous long-range potentials*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **10** (2009), no. 3, 573–575.
- [6] K. Ito, E. Skibsted, *Radiation condition bounds on manifolds with ends*, J. Funct. Anal. **278** (2020), no. 9, 108449 47 pp.
- [7] K. Ito, E. Skibsted, *Scattering theory for C^2 long-range potentials*, J. Spectr. Theory. **15**, (2025), no. 1, 353–439.
- [8] H. Mizutani, *Strichartz estimates for Schrödinger equations with slowly decaying potentials*, J. Funct. Anal. **279** (2020), no. 12, 108789, 57 pp.
- [9] K. Mochizuki, H. Nakazawa, *The principle of limiting amplitude for perturbed wave equations in an exterior domain*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **60** (2024), no. 3, 583–606.
- [10] S. Nakamura, *Low energy asymptotics for Schrödinger operators with slowly decreasing potentials*, Comm. Math. Phys. **161** (1994), no. 1, 63–76.
- [11] E. Skibsted, *Renormalized two-body low-energy scattering*, J. Anal. Math. **122** (2014), 25–68.
- [12] K. Taira, *A remark on Strichartz estimates for Schrödinger equations with slowly decaying potentials*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **150** (2022), no. 9, 3953–3958.
- [13] D. R. Yafaev, *The low energy scattering for slowly decreasing potentials*, Comm. Math. Phys. **85** (1982), no. 2, 177–196.
- [14] D. R. Yafaev, Mathematical scattering theory, Analytic theory, Math. Surveys Monogr., **158** American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. xiv+444 pp.