

ON THE CAUCHY PROBLEM FOR PARABOLIC PSEUDO-DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

MICHIHIRO NAGASE

(Received September 26, 1973)

1. Introduction

In the recent paper [8] S. Kaplan has obtained an analogue of Gårding's inequality for parabolic differential operators and applied it to a Hilbert space treatment of the Cauchy problem. D. Ellis [3] has extended those results to higher order parabolic differential operators (see also [4]). On the other hand in [13] the author has studied a Hilbert space treatment of the Cauchy problem for parabolic pseudo-differential equations and generalized the results of S. Kaplan [8].

In the present paper we shall study the Cauchy problem for higher order parabolic pseudo-differential equations of the form

$$Lu = D_t^k u(t, x) + \sum_{j=1}^k p_j(t, X, D_x) D_t^{k-j} u(t, x) = f(t, x)$$

where $p_j(t, x, \xi)$ are symbols of the class $S_{\delta, \lambda}^{m, j}$ introduced in [11] and [12]. We need not assume that the basic weight function $\lambda(\xi)$ tends to infinity as $|\xi| \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore the theory can be applied to more general classes of operators (including difference operators) than the class of usual parabolic differential operators.

In section 2 we give definitions and lemmas for pseudo-differential operators. In section 3 the algebras and L^2 -theory are stated. The L^2 -continuity of pseudo-differential operators has been studied in many papers (see for example, Calderón and Vaillancourt [1], [2], Hörmander [7] and Kumano-go [10]). In the present paper the L^2 -continuity theorem by Calderón and Vaillancourt in [1] plays an essential role. In section 4 we define the space $H_{r,s}(\Omega)$ which is needed to study the Cauchy problem. In section 5 we derive energy inequalities for the parabolic system which is associated with a higher order parabolic pseudo-differential operator. These energy inequalities are very similar to those of D. Ellis [3] and [4]. To obtain the energy inequalities the idea of double symbols of pseudo-differential operators is very important. In section 6, using the results in section 4 and 5, we discuss a Hilbert space treatment of Cauchy problem for parabolic systems. In section 7 finally we state the main results for the Cauchy problem for higher order parabolic pseudo-differential equations.

The author would like to thank Professor H. Kumano-go for his advices and suggestions.

2. Definitions and lemmas

Let $\alpha=(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ be a multi-integer of $\alpha_j \geq 0, j=1, \dots, n$. We put $|\alpha|=\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n, \alpha! = \alpha_1! \dots \alpha_n!$ and $\partial_{\xi}^{\alpha}=(\partial/\partial \xi_1)^{\alpha_1} \dots (\partial/\partial \xi_n)^{\alpha_n}$.

DEFINITION 2.1. Let $\lambda(\xi)$ be a real valued C^{∞} function defined on the n -dimensional real space R^n_{ξ} . We say that $\lambda(\xi)$ is a basic weight function when $\lambda(\xi)$ satisfies that

$$(2.1) \quad \lambda(\xi) \geq 1,$$

$$(2.2) \quad |\partial_{\xi}^{\alpha} \lambda(\xi)| \leq C_{\alpha} \lambda(\xi)^{1-|\alpha|} \text{ for any } \alpha,$$

(see [9] and [13]).

We can see that the function $\langle \xi \rangle = (1 + |\xi|^2)^{1/2} = (1 + \xi_1^2 + \dots + \xi_n^2)^{1/2}$ is a basic weight function.

The following lemma was proved in [13].

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\lambda(\xi)$ be a basic weight function and δ and m be real numbers satisfying $0 \leq \delta < 1$. Then we have*

$$(2.3) \quad \lambda(\xi) \leq C_1 \langle \xi \rangle,$$

$$(2.4) \quad \lambda(\xi + \eta) \leq \lambda(\xi) + C_2 |\eta| \leq C_2 \lambda(\xi) \langle \eta \rangle,$$

$$(2.5) \quad C_{\delta}^{-1} \lambda(\xi) \leq \lambda(\xi + \lambda(\xi)^{\delta} \sigma) \leq C_{\delta} \lambda(\xi)$$

for any $\sigma \in R^n$ satisfying $|\sigma| \leq 1$,

$$(2.6) \quad \lambda(\xi + \eta)^m \leq C_m \lambda(\xi)^m \langle \eta \rangle^{m_1},$$

where C_1, C_2, C_{δ} and C_m are positive constants which are independent of ξ, η and σ .

Throughout this paper the letter C with or without indices will denote positive constants not necessarily the same at each occurrence.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\lambda_0(\xi)$ be a real valued C^1 function such that $\lambda_0(\xi) \geq c_0$ for some positive constant c_0 and $\partial_{\xi_j} \lambda_0(\xi) (j=1, \dots, n)$ are bounded. Then there exists a basic weight function $\lambda(\xi)$ which satisfies that*

$$(2.7) \quad c_1 \lambda_0(\xi) \leq \lambda(\xi) \leq c_2 \lambda_0(\xi)$$

for some positive constants c_1 and c_2 .

Proof. By assumptions for $\lambda_0(\xi)$ we have $|\lambda_0(\xi) - \lambda_0(\eta)| \leq C |\xi - \eta|$, so taking $\varepsilon_0 = \frac{1}{2C}$ it holds that $(1/2)\lambda_0(\xi) \leq \lambda_0(\eta) \leq 2\lambda_0(\xi)$ for $|\xi - \eta| \leq \varepsilon_0 \lambda_0(\eta)$.

Let $\varphi(\eta) \in C_0^\infty(R^n)$ satisfy that $\int_{R^n} \varphi(\eta) d\eta = 1$, $0 \leq \varphi(\eta) \leq C_1$, $\text{supp } \varphi \subset \{\eta; |\eta| \leq \varepsilon_0\}$ and $\varphi(\eta) \geq C_1^0 > 0$ for $|\eta| \leq \varepsilon_0/2$. Then the function $\lambda(\xi) = \int_{R^n} \varphi((\xi - \eta)/\lambda_0(\eta)) \lambda_0(\eta)^{-n+1} d\eta$ is a basic weight function and satisfies the inequality (2.7). In fact,

$$\partial_\xi^\alpha \lambda(\xi) = \int_{R^n} \varphi^{(\alpha)}((\xi - \eta)/\lambda_0(\eta)) \lambda_0(\eta)^{-n+1-|\alpha|} d\eta$$

where $\varphi^{(\alpha)}(\eta) = \partial_\eta^\alpha \varphi(\eta)$, so

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\xi^\alpha \lambda(\xi)| &\leq C_\alpha \int_{|\xi - \zeta| \leq \varepsilon_0 \lambda_0(\zeta)} \lambda_0(\zeta)^{-n+1-|\alpha|} d\zeta \\ &\leq C_\alpha \int_{|\xi - \zeta| \leq 2\varepsilon_0 \lambda_0(\xi)} \lambda_0(\zeta)^{-n+1-|\alpha|} d\zeta \leq C_\alpha \lambda_0(\xi)^{1-|\alpha|}, \\ \lambda_0(\xi) &= c_n \int_{|\xi - \zeta| \leq \varepsilon_0 \lambda_0(\xi)/4} \lambda_0(\zeta)^{-n+1} d\zeta \\ &\leq \left(\frac{c_n}{C_1^0}\right) C_1^0 \int_{|\xi - \zeta| \leq \varepsilon_0 \lambda_0(\zeta)/2} \lambda_0(\zeta)^{-n+1} d\zeta \\ &\leq C \int_{R^n} \varphi((\xi - \zeta)/\lambda_0(\zeta)) \lambda_0(\zeta)^{-n+1} d\zeta = C \lambda(\xi) \\ &\leq C' \int_{|\xi - \zeta| \leq \varepsilon_0 \lambda_0(\zeta)} \lambda_0(\zeta)^{-n+1} d\zeta \\ &\leq C' \int_{|\xi - \zeta| \leq 2\varepsilon_0 \lambda_0(\xi)} \lambda_0(\zeta)^{-n+1} d\zeta = C' \lambda_0(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

By these inequalities we obtain Lemma 2.3.

Q.E.D.

Let $B(R^n) = \{f(x) \in C^\infty(R^n); |\partial_x^\alpha f(x)| \leq C_\alpha \text{ for any } \alpha\}$, $S = S(R^n) = \{f(x) \in C^\infty(R^n); \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |x|^m |\partial_x^\alpha f(x)| = 0 \text{ for any } \alpha \text{ and real number } m\}$ and let S' denote the dual space of S .

DEFINITION 2.4. Let $\lambda(\xi)$ be a basic weight function.

- (i) We say that $p(x, \xi)$ belongs to $S_{0,\lambda}^m$ when $p(x, \xi) \lambda(\xi)^{-m} \in B(R^{2n})$.
- (ii) We say that $p(x, \xi, x')$ belongs to $S_{0,\lambda}^m$ when $p(x, \xi, x') \lambda(\xi)^{-m} \in B(R^{3n})$.
- (iii) We say that $p(x, \xi, x', \xi')$ belongs to $S_{0,\lambda}^{m,m'}$ when $p(x, \xi, x', \xi') \lambda(\xi)^{-m} \lambda(\xi')^{-m'} \in B(R^{4n})$.
- (iv) We set $S_{0,\lambda}^\infty = \bigcup_{-\infty < m < \infty} S_{0,\lambda}^m$ and $S_{0,\lambda}^{-\infty} = \bigcap_{-\infty < m < \infty} S_{0,\lambda}^m$.
- (v) Let $\lambda(\xi)$ and $\lambda'(\xi)$ be basic weight functions. Then we say that $p(x, \xi, x', \xi')$ belongs to $S_{0,\lambda,\lambda'}^{m,m'}$ when $p(x, \xi, x', \xi') \lambda(\xi)^{-m} \lambda'(\xi')^{-m'} \in B(R^{4n})$.

We use the notation: $D_x^\alpha = (-i)^{|\alpha|} (\partial/\partial x_1)^{\alpha_1} \dots (\partial/\partial x_n)^{\alpha_n}$ for any α . Then we set $p_{(\beta)}^{(\alpha)}(x, \xi) = D_x^\beta \partial_\xi^\alpha p(x, \xi)$, $p_{(\beta,\beta')}^{(\alpha)}(x, \xi, x') = D_x^\beta D_{x'}^{\beta'} \partial_\xi^\alpha p(x, \xi, x')$ and $p_{(\beta,\beta')}^{(\alpha,\alpha')}(x, \xi, x', \xi') = D_x^\beta D_{x'}^{\beta'} \partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_{\xi'}^{\alpha'} p(x, \xi, x', \xi')$ for any α, α', β and β' .

We can see that

- (i) $p(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m, \alpha}$ if and only if $|p_{(\beta)}^{(\alpha)}(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} \lambda(\xi)^m$ for any α and β ,
- (ii) $p(x, \xi, x') \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m, \alpha, \beta}$ if and only if $|p_{(\beta, \beta')}^{(\alpha, \alpha')}(x, \xi, x')| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta, \beta'} \lambda(\xi)^m$ for any α, β and β' ,
- (iii) $p(x, \xi, x', \xi') \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m, \alpha, \beta, \alpha'}$ if and only if $|p_{(\beta, \beta')}^{(\alpha, \alpha')}(x, \xi, x', \xi')| \leq C_{\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta'} \lambda(\xi)^m \lambda(\xi')$ for any α, α', β and β' ,
- (iv) when $m_1 \geq m_2$, it holds that $S_{0,\lambda}^{m_1} \supset S_{0,\lambda}^{m_2}$.

In this paper we write $\int f(x)dx$ for $\int_{R^n} f(x)dx$ and $d\xi$ for $(2\pi)^{-n} d\xi$.

DEFINITION 2.5. (i) For $p(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^\infty$, we define the pseudo-differential operator $p(X, D_x)$ by

$$(2.8) \quad p(X, D_x)u(x) = \int e^{ix \cdot \xi} p(x, \xi) \hat{u}(\xi) d\xi \quad \text{for } u \in S, \text{ where } \hat{u}(\xi) \text{ denote the Fourier transform } \int e^{-ix \cdot \xi} u(x) dx \text{ of } u(x) \text{ and } x \cdot \xi = x_1 \xi_1 + \dots + x_n \xi_n.$$

(ii) For $p(x, \xi, x') \in S_{0,\lambda}^\infty$, we define the operator $p(X, D_x, X')$ by

$$(2.9) \quad p(X, D_x, X')u(x) = \iint e^{i(x-x') \cdot \xi} p(x, \xi, x') u(x') dx' \cdot d\xi \quad \text{for } u \in S,$$

where $dx' \cdot d\xi$ means the integration in ξ follows the integration in x' .

(iii) For $p(x, \xi, x', \xi') \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m, \alpha, \beta, \alpha'}$ or $S_{0,\lambda}^{m, \alpha, \beta, \alpha'}$, we define the operator $p(X, D_x, X', D_{x'})$ by

$$(2.10) \quad p(X, D_x, X', D_{x'})u(x) = \iiint e^{i(x-x') \cdot \xi + ix' \cdot \xi'} p(x, \xi, x', \xi') \hat{u}(\xi') d\xi' \cdot dx' \cdot d\xi \quad \text{for } u \in S.$$

We can see that the above operators $p(X, D_x)$ and $p(X, D_x, X')$ are continuous linear operators from $S(R^n)$ to $S(R^n)$. We say that the functions $p(x, \xi)$, $p(x, \xi, x')$ and $p(x, \xi, x', \xi')$ are symbols of the pseudo-differential operators $p(X, D_x)$, $p(X, D_x, X')$ and $p(X, D_x, X', D_{x'})$ respectively and in particular $p(x, \xi, x', \xi')$ is often called a double symbol.

DEFINITION 2.6. Let $\lambda(\xi)$ be a basic weight function and s be a real number. We define a Sobolev space H_s by

$$H_s = H_{s,\lambda} = \{u \in S'; \hat{u}(\xi) \in L^1_{loc}(R^n), \lambda(\xi)^s \hat{u}(\xi) \in L^2(R^n)\}.$$

We can see that $H_{s,\lambda}$ is a Hilbert space with inner product

$$(2.11) \quad (u, v)_s = (u, v)_{s,\lambda} = \int \lambda(\xi)^{2s} \hat{u}(\xi) \overline{\hat{v}(\xi)} d\xi$$

and the set $S = S(R^n)$ is a dense subset of $H_{s,\lambda}$

For $s=0$, $H_{0,\lambda} = L^2(R^n)$. When $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq s_3$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a constant $C = C_{s_1, s_2, s_3, \varepsilon}$ such that

$$(2.12) \quad \|u\|_{s_2}^2 \leq \varepsilon \|u\|_{s_3}^2 + C \|u\|_{s_1}^2 \quad \text{for any } u \in S,$$

where $\|u\|_s = \sqrt{(u, u)_{s,\lambda}}$ (see [13]).

When $P(x, \xi) = (p_{i,j}(x, \xi))$ is a $k \times k$ matrix function, we say that $P(x, \xi)$ belongs to $S_{0,\lambda}^m$ if all the elements $p_{i,j}(x, \xi)$ belong to $S_{0,\lambda}^m$ in the sense of Definition 2.4 (i). By the same way we define $P(x, \xi, x') \in S_{0,\lambda}^m$ and $P(x, \xi, x', \xi') \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m,m'}$ or $S_{0,\lambda,\lambda'}^{m,m'}$. For $P(x, \xi) = (p_{i,j}(x, \xi)) \in S_{0,\lambda}^m$, we define the pseudo-differential operator $P(X, D_x)$ by $P(X, D_x)U(x) = \int e^{ix \cdot \xi} P(x, \xi) \widehat{U}(\xi) d\xi$, where $U(x) = {}^t(u_1(x),$

$$\dots, u_k(x)) \in \{S\}^k \quad \text{and} \quad P(x, \xi) \widehat{U}(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^k p_{1,j}(x, \xi) \hat{u}_j(\xi) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^k p_{k,j}(x, \xi) \hat{u}_j(\xi) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By the same way we can define the operators $P(X, D_x, X')$ and $P(X, D_x, X', D_x')$.

REMARK 2.7. With the aid of Lemma 2.3, we can see that

(i) for any basic weight functions $\lambda_1(\xi)$ and $\lambda_2(\xi)$, there exists a basic weight function $\lambda(\xi)$ such that $c_1 \lambda(\xi) \leq \lambda_1(\xi) + \lambda_2(\xi) \leq c_2 \lambda(\xi)$,

(ii) for any basic weight function $\lambda(\xi)$ in R^n and real number $m \geq 1$, there exists a basic weight function $\lambda_1(\tau, \xi)$ in R^{n+1} such that $c_1 \lambda_1(\tau, \xi) \leq (\tau^2 + \lambda(\xi)^{2m})^{1/2m} \leq c_2 \lambda_1(\tau, \xi)$ (see [12] and [13]).

The fact of Remark 2.7 (ii) is important to define the spaces which are necessary to study the Cauchy problem for parabolic pseudo-differential equations.

REMARK 2.8. From the definition of basic weight functions, if $\lambda(\xi)$ is a basic weight function in R^n , $\lambda(\xi)$ is also a basic weight function in $R_{\tau,\xi}^{n+1}$.

3. Properties of pseudo-differential operators

All the theorems and corollaries of this section are stated in [12] and [13], so we omit the proofs.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\lambda(\xi)$ and $\lambda'(\xi)$ be basic weight functions and let $p(x, \xi, x', \xi') \in S_{0,\lambda,\lambda'}^{m,m'}$. Then there exists a function $p_L(x, \xi)$ such that*

$$(3.1) \quad p_L(x, \xi) \lambda(\xi)^{-m} \lambda'(\xi)^{-m'} \in B(R^{2n})$$

and

$$(3.2) \quad p_L(X, D_x)u = p(X, D_x, X', D_x')u \quad \text{for any } u \in S.$$

Corollary 3.2. (i) *Let $p_1(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^m$ and $p_2(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda'}^{m'}$. Then there exists a function $p_L(x, \xi)$ such that*

$$(3.3) \quad p_L(x, \xi) \lambda(\xi)^{-m} \lambda'(\xi)^{-m'} \in B(R^{2n})$$

and

$$(3.4) \quad p_L(X, D_x)u = p_1(X, D_x) \cdot p_2(X, D_x)u \quad \text{for any } u \in S.$$

(ii) *For $p(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^m$, there exists a symbol $p^*(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^m$ such that*

$(p(X, D_x)u, v)_0 = (u, p^*(X, D_x)v)_0$ for any $u, v \in S$.

When $\lambda(\xi) = \lambda'(\xi)$, the assertions in Corollary 3.2 mean that the class of pseudo-differential operators defined by the symbols in $S_{0,\lambda}^\infty$ forms an algebra.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $0 < \delta \leq 1$ and $p(x, \xi, x', \xi') \in S_{0,\lambda,\lambda'}^{m,m'}$. We assume that $\partial_{\xi_j} p(x, \xi, x', \xi') \in S_{0,\lambda,\lambda'}^{m-\delta, m'}$. Then for $p_L(x, \xi)$ in Theorem 3.1 and $p_0(x, \xi) = p(x, \xi, x, \xi)$, it holds that*

$$(3.5) \quad \{p_L(x, \xi) - p_0(x, \xi)\} \lambda(\xi)^{-m+\delta} \lambda'(\xi)^{-m'} \in B(R^{2n}).$$

Corollary 3.4. (i) *Let $p_1(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^m$ and $p_2(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m'}$. Assume that $\partial_{\xi_j} p_1(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m-\delta}$ ($j=1, \dots, n$) for some $\delta \in (0, 1]$. Then*

$$(3.6) \quad \{p_L(x, \xi) - p_1(x, \xi) p_2(x, \xi)\} \lambda(\xi)^{-m+\delta} \lambda'(\xi)^{-m'} \in B(R^{2n}),$$

where $p_L(x, \xi)$ is the function defined in Corollary 3.2.

(ii) *Assume that $p(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^m$ and $\partial_{\xi_j} p(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m-\delta}$. Then for $p^*(x, \xi)$ in Corollary 3.2 (ii) we have*

$$(3.7) \quad \{p^*(x, \xi) - \overline{p(x, \xi)}\} \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m-\delta}.$$

Corollary 3.5. *For $p(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^m$, there exists a symbol $p_{L,m'}(x, \xi)$ such that*

$$(3.8) \quad \{p_{L,m'}(x, \xi) - p(x, \xi) \lambda'(\xi)^{m'}\} \lambda'(\xi)^{-m'+1} \lambda(\xi)^{-m} \in B(R^{2n}),$$

$$(3.9) \quad p_{L,m'}(X, D_x)u = \lambda'(D_x)^{m'} \cdot p(X, D_x)u \quad \text{for any } u \in S.$$

Corollary 3.6. *Let $p_1(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^m$ and $p_2(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m'}$. Assume that $\partial_{\xi_j} p_1(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m-\delta}$ and $\partial_{\xi_j} p_2(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m'-\delta}$ ($j=1, \dots, n$). Then there exists a symbol $p(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m+m'-\delta}$ such that*

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} p(X, D_x)u &= [p_1(X, D_x), p_2(X, D_x)]u \\ &= \{p_1(X, D_x) \cdot p_2(X, D_x) - p_2(X, D_x) \cdot p_1(X, D_x)\}u \end{aligned}$$

for any $u \in S$.

The following L^2 -estimate was proved in [1].

Lemma 3.7. *Let $p(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^0$. Then it holds that*

$$(3.11) \quad \|p(X, D_x)u\|_0 \leq C \|u\|_0 \quad \text{for any } u \in S,$$

where $C = C_p = c \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq N} \sup_{(x, \xi)} |p_{(\alpha, \beta)}^{(\infty)}(x, \xi)|$ for some positive integer N .

Using Corollary 3.2 (i) and Lemma 3.7 we have

Theorem 3.8. *Let s be an arbitrary real number and $p(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^m$. Then it holds that*

$$(3.12) \quad \|p(X, D_x)u\|_{s,\lambda} \leq C \|u\|_{s+m,\lambda} \quad \text{for any } u \in S.$$

Corollary 3.9. *When $p(x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^m$, we have*

$$(3.13) \quad |(p(X, D_x)u, u)_0| \leq C \|u\|_{m/2, \lambda}^2 \text{ for any } u \in S.$$

For any $p(x, \xi) \in S_{0, \lambda}^m$ we denote $|p|_m = \sup_{(x, \xi)} |p(x, \xi) \lambda(\xi)^{-m}|$.

Using the Friedrichs approximation (see [5], [10] and [13]) we have,

Theorem 3.10. *Assume that $0 < \delta \leq 1$ and $p^{(\alpha)}(x, \xi) \in S_{0, \lambda}^{m-\delta|\alpha|}$ for $|\alpha| \leq 1$. Then we have*

$$(3.14) \quad |Re(p(X, D_x)u, u)_0| \leq |Re p|_m \|u\|_{m/2, \lambda}^2 + C \|u\|_{(m-\delta/2)/2}^2, \text{ for any } u \in S.$$

Corollary 3.11. *Assume that $p^{(\alpha)}(x, \xi) \in S_{0, \lambda}^{m-|\alpha|}$ for $|\alpha| \leq 1$, then we have*

$$(3.15) \quad \|p(X, D_x)u\|_{s, \lambda}^2 \leq |p|_m^2 \|u\|_{m+s, \lambda}^2 + C \|u\|_{m+s-\delta/4, \lambda}^2 \text{ for any } u \in S.$$

We note that all the theorems and corollaries of this section except for Corollary 3.6 remain valid when the symbols of operators are $k \times k$ matrix functions. But in the case of matrix symbols we must replace $|Re p|_m$ in (3.14) and $|p|_m^2$ in (3.15) by $k|Re p|_m$ and $k|p|_m^2$ respectively, where we mean that for $p(x, \xi) = (p_{i,j}(x, \xi)) \in S_{0, \lambda}^m$, $Re p = \frac{1}{2} \{p(x, \xi) + p(x, \xi)^*\}$ and $|p|_m = \{ \sum_{i,j=1}^k \sup_{(x, \xi)} |p_{i,j}(x, \xi) \lambda(\xi)^{-m}|^2 \}^{1/2}$.

In the case of matrix symbols, Corollary 3.6 holds if matrix $p_1(x, \xi)$ commutes with $p_2(x, \xi)$.

By virtue of Corollary 3.2 (ii), we can define the pseudo-differential operators on the space S' by $\langle p(X, D_x)u, v \rangle = \langle u, \overline{p^*(X, D_x)v} \rangle$ for $u \in S'$ and $v \in S$. Then inequalities (3.11), (3.12), (3.13), (3.14) and (3.15) hold for functions in $H_{s, \lambda}$ spaces.

4. Spaces $H_{r,s}(\Omega)$

In what follows we fix a basic weight function $\lambda(\xi)$ in R^n and a real number $m \geq 1$. By Remark 2.7 (ii), there exists a basic weight function $\lambda_1(\tau, \xi)$ in R^{n+1} such that $c_1 \lambda_1(\tau, \xi) \leq (\tau^2 + \lambda(\xi)^{2m})^{1/2m} \leq c_2 \lambda_1(\tau, \xi)$.

DEFINITION 4.1. For any real numbers r and s , we define the space $H_{r,s}$ by $H_{r,s} = \{u \in S'(R^{n+1}); \tilde{u}(\tau, \xi) \in L^1_{loc}(R^{n+1}), \lambda_1(\tau, \xi)^r \lambda(\xi)^s \tilde{u}(\tau, \xi) \in L^2(R^{n+1})\}$ where $\tilde{u}(\tau, \xi)$ is the Fourier transform $\int e^{-i(t\tau + x \cdot \xi)} u(t, x) dt dx$ of $u(t, x)$.

The space $H_{r,s}$ is a Hilbert space with inner product

$$(4.1) \quad (u, v)_{r,s} = \int \lambda_1(\tau, \xi)^{2r} \lambda(\xi)^{2s} \tilde{u}(\tau, \xi) \overline{\tilde{v}(\tau, \xi)} d\tau d\xi.$$

We can see that $S(R^{n+1})$ is a dense subset of $H_{r,s}$.

For $-\infty \leq a < b \leq +\infty$, we set $\Omega = \Omega_{a,b} = \{(t, x) \in R^{n+1}; a < t < b, x \in R^n\}$.

DEFINITION 4.2. (i) $H_{r,s}(\Omega) = \{u \in D'(\Omega); v|_{\Omega} = u \text{ for some } v \in H_{r,s}\}$, where $v|_{\Omega} = u$ means that the restriction of v to Ω coincides with u and $D'(\Omega)$

denote the space of distributions on Ω .

(ii) For any closed set K in R^{n+1} , we set $H_{0,r,s}(K) = \{u \in H_{r,s}; \text{supp } u \subset K\}$.

(iii) For any open set G in R^{n+1} , we set $C_{00}^\infty(G) = \{\varphi|_G; \varphi \in C_0^\infty(R^{n+1})\}$.

For $u \in H_{r,s}(\Omega)$ we define the norm of u by $\|u\|_{r,s,\Omega} = \inf \{\|v\|_{r,s}; v \in H_{r,s}, v|_\Omega = u\}$ where $\|v\|_{r,s} = \sqrt{(v,v)_{r,s}}$. The space $H_{r,s}(\Omega)$ is a Banach space with norm $\|v\|_{r,s,\Omega}$. We can see that $H_{0,r,s}(K)$ is a closed subspace of $H_{r,s}$.

Using a similar method in [6], [8] and [11], we can see that for any r and s , the set $C_{00}^\infty(\Omega)$ is dense in $H_{r,s}(\Omega)$, $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ is dense in $H_{0,r,s}(\bar{\Omega})$ and $C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega}^c)$ is dense in $H_{0,r,s}(\Omega^c)$, where Ω^c means the complement of Ω .

The following lemmas are stated in [13] and can be proved by the similar methods to those in [8] and [11].

Lemma 4.3. Assume that $u \in H_{r,s+m}(\Omega)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u \in H_{r,s}(\Omega)$, Then $u \in H_{r+m,s}(\Omega)$ and

$$(4.2) \quad \|u\|_{r+m,s,\Omega} \leq C \left\{ \|u\|_{r,s+m,\Omega} + \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u \right\|_{r,s,\Omega} \right\}.$$

Lemma 4.4. Assume that $2r > m$ and $-\infty < a < b \leq \infty$.

(i) We can define the trace operator $\gamma_a: H_{r,s}(\Omega) \rightarrow H_{r+s-m/2,\lambda}$ such that $(\gamma_a u)(x) = u(a, x)$ for $u(t, x) \in S(R^{n+1})$ and

$$(4.3) \quad \|\gamma_a u\|_{r+s-m/2,\lambda} \leq C \|u\|_{r,s,\Omega}.$$

(ii) There exists a bounded linear operator $\gamma^a: H_{r+s-m/2,\lambda} \rightarrow H_{r,s}(\Omega)$ such that $\gamma_a \cdot \gamma^a u = u$ for $u \in H_{r+s-m/2,\lambda}$.

Lemma 4.5. Assume that $|r| < m/2$. We put

$$H_a \varphi(t, x) = \begin{cases} \varphi(t, x) & \text{for } t \geq a, \\ 0 & \text{for } t < a, \end{cases}$$

for $\varphi(t, x) \in S(R^{n+1})$, then it holds that $\|H_a \varphi\|_{r,s} \leq C \|\varphi\|_{r,s}$. That is, the operator H_a can be extended to a bounded linear operator on $H_{r,s}$ and the range of H_a is $H_{0,r,s}(\bar{\Omega}_a, \infty)$.

When a function $p(t, x, \xi)$ satisfies that $|\partial_t^j \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta p(t, x, \xi)| \leq C_{j,\alpha,\beta,\lambda}(\xi)^\lambda$ for any j, α and β , we write $p(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^l$, by the same notation as in Definition 2.4. For $u(t, x) \in S(R^{n+1})$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} p(t, X, D_x)u(t, x) &= \int e^{i(\tau t + x \cdot \xi)} p(t, x, \xi) \hat{u}(\tau, \xi) d\tau d\xi \\ &= \int e^{ix \cdot \xi} p(t, x, \xi) \hat{u}(t, \xi) d\xi \text{ where } \hat{u}(t, \xi) = \int e^{-ix \cdot \xi} u(t, x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.6. Let r and s be arbitrary real numbers. For $p(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^l$, it holds that

$$(4.4) \quad \|p(t, X, D_x)u\|_{r,s} \leq C \|u\|_{r,s+l} \text{ for } u \in S(R^{n+1}).$$

Proof. By the definitions,

$$\|p(t, X, D_x)u\|_{r,s} = \|\lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r \cdot \lambda(D_x)^s \cdot p(t, X, D_x)u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})},$$

where $\lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r v = \int e^{i(\sigma\tau + x \cdot \xi)} \lambda_1(\tau, \xi)^r \hat{v}(\tau, \xi) d\tau d\xi$.

Using Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2 (i) we can write

$$\lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r \cdot \lambda(D_x)^s \cdot p(t, X, D_x)u(t, x) = \hat{p}_{r,s}(t, X, D_t, D_x)u(t, x)$$

where $\hat{p}_{r,s}(t, x, \tau, \xi) \lambda_1(\tau, \xi)^{-r} \lambda(\xi)^{-s-l} \in B(R^{2(n+1)})$.

From Lemma 3.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|p(t, X, D_x)u\|_{r,s} &= \|\hat{p}_{r,s}(t, X, D_t, D_x) \cdot \lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^{-r} \cdot \lambda(D_x)^{-s-l} \\ &\quad \cdot \lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r \cdot \lambda(D_x)^{s+l} u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C \|\lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r \cdot \lambda(D_x)^{s+l} u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \\ &= C \|u\|_{r,s+l}. \end{aligned} \quad \text{Q.E.D.}$$

By Proposition 4.6, the pseudo-differential operator $p(t, X, D_x)$ with symbol $p(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^l$ can be extended to a bounded linear operator from $H_{r,s+l}$ to $H_{r,s}$. In the above proof we used the fact that when $\lambda(\xi)$ is a basic weight function in R^n , $\lambda(\xi)$ is also a basic weight function in R^{n+1} .

For any $u \in H_{0,r,s}(\Omega)$, we take a sequence $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ in $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $u_j \rightarrow u$ in $H_{r,s}$. Then by Proposition 4.6, $p(t, X, D_x)u_j \rightarrow p(t, X, D_x)u$ in $H_{r,s-l}$. Therefore we have $p(t, X, D_x)u \in H_{0,r,s-l}(\Omega)$ for $u \in H_{0,r,s}(\Omega)$. This fact permits us to extend the operator $p(t, X, D_x)$ from $H_{r,s}(\Omega)$ to $H_{r,s-l}(\Omega)$. Indeed, let $u \in H_{r,s}(\Omega)$, $v_1|_\Omega = v_2|_\Omega = u$ and $v_1, v_2 \in H_{r,s}$. Since $v_1 - v_2 \in H_{0,r,s}(\Omega^c)$, we have $p(t, X, D_x)(v_1 - v_2) \in H_{0,r,s-l}(\Omega^c)$. So we define $p(t, X, D_x)u$ by $p(t, X, D_x)u = p(t, X, D_x)v|_\Omega$ for $v \in H_{r,s}$ such that $v|_\Omega = u$. Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|p(t, X, D_x)u\|_{r,s-l,\Omega} &= \inf \{ \|v\|_{r,s-l}; v|_\Omega = p(t, X, D_x)u, \\ &\quad v \in H_{r,s-l} \} \leq \inf \{ \|p(t, X, D_x)v\|_{r,s-l}; v|_\Omega = u, v \in H_{r,s} \} \\ &\leq \inf \{ C \|v\|_{r,s}; v|_\Omega = u, v \in H_{r,s} \} = C \|u\|_{r,s,\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can extend the operator $p(t, X, D_x)$ to a bounded linear operator from $H_{r,s}(\Omega)$ to $H_{r,s-l}(\Omega)$.

For $\varphi(t, x), \psi(t, x) \in C_0^\infty(R^{n+1})$, we write $[\varphi, \psi] = \int_{R^{n+1}} \varphi(t, x) \overline{\psi(t, x)} dt dx$.

Then we can see that $\|\varphi\|_{r,s} = \sup \left\{ \frac{|[\varphi, \psi]|}{\|\psi\|_{-r,-s}}; \psi \neq 0, \psi \in C_0^\infty(R^{n+1}) \right\}$.

Thus, $H_{r,s}$ and $H_{-r,-s}$ are dual Hilbert spaces and the form $[\cdot, \cdot]$ can be extended to a sesqui-linear form defined on $H_{r,s} \times H_{-r,-s}$.

Let $\{\zeta_i(t, x)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of $C_0^\infty(R^{n+1})$ and $\{\psi_j(\xi)\}_{j=1}^\infty$ a sequence of $C_0^\infty(R^n)$ functions satisfying the following conditions:

- (i) $\sum \zeta_i(t, x)^2 = 1, \sum \psi_j(\xi)^2 = 1,$
- (ii) $\sum |\partial_x^l \partial_x^\alpha \zeta_i(t, x)| \leq C_{l,\alpha}, \sum |\partial_\xi^\alpha \psi_j(\xi)| \leq C_\alpha$ for any l and $\alpha,$
- (iii) there exists a positive integer N such that for any $(t, x) \in R^{n+1}$, the

number of $\text{supp } \zeta_i$ containing (t, x) is at most N and for any $\xi \in R^n$, the number of $\text{supp } \psi_j$ containing ξ is at most N .

Let $\{c_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^\infty$ be a bounded sequence of complex numbers.

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j} [c_{ij} \zeta_i(t, x) \psi_j(D_x) \varphi(t, x), c_{ij} \zeta_i(t, x) \psi_j(D_x) \psi(t, x)] \\ &= \sum [\psi_j(D_x) |c_{ij}|^2 \zeta_i(t, x)^2 \psi_j(D_x) \varphi(t, x), \psi(t, x)] \\ &= [\sum \psi_j(D_x) |c_{ij}|^2 \zeta_i(t, x)^2 \psi_j(D_x) \varphi(t, x), \psi(t, x)]. \end{aligned}$$

By assumptions of $\{c_{ij}\}$, $\{\zeta_i(t, x)\}$ and $\{\psi_j(\xi)\}$, we can consider the operator $\sum \psi_j(D_x) |c_{ij}|^2 \zeta_i(t, x)^2 \psi_j(D_x)$ as a pseudo-differential operator with a double symbol $\sum \psi_j(\xi) |c_{ij}|^2 \zeta_i(t, x)^2 \psi_j(\xi') \in S_{0,\lambda}^{0,0}$.

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum [c_{ij} \zeta_i(t, x) \psi_j(D_x) \varphi(t, x), c_{ij} \zeta_i(t, x) \psi_j(D_x) \psi(t, x)] \\ & \leq C \|\varphi\|_{r,s} \|\psi\|_{-r,-s}. \end{aligned}$$

From this inequality we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 4.7. *The form $\sum [c_{ij} \zeta_i(t, x) \psi_j(D_x) \varphi(t, x), c_{ij} \zeta_i(t, x) \psi_j(D_x) \psi(t, x)]$ for $\varphi, \psi \in C_0^\infty(R^{n+1})$ can be extended uniquely to a continuous sesquilinear form defined on $H_{r,s} \times H_{-r,-s}$.*

Using Lemma 4.5 and Proposition 4.7, we obtain the similar proposition to Proposition 7 in [3].

Proposition 4.8. *Let $\{c_{ij}\}$, $\{\zeta_i(t, x)\}$ and $\{\psi_j(\xi)\}$ satisfy the above conditions. Let s_1, s_2, r_1 and r_2 be real numbers satisfying that $r_1 + r_2 \geq 0$, $r_1 + r_2 + s_1 + s_2 \geq 0$, $\min(r_1, r_2) > -m/2$ and let $-\infty \leq a < b \leq +\infty$.*

Then the form

$$\sum_a^b (c_{ij} \zeta_i(t) \psi_j(D_x) \varphi(t), c_{ij} \zeta_i(t) \psi_j(D_x) \psi(t))_0 dt$$

for $\varphi(t, x), \psi(t, x) \in C_{(0)}^\infty(\Omega)$ can be extended uniquely to a continuous sesquilinear form on $H_{r_1,s_1}(\Omega) \times H_{r_2,s_2}(\Omega)$.

5. Parabolic operators and energy inequalities

Consider the operator $L = D_t^k + \sum_{j=1}^k p_j(t, X, D_x) D_t^{k-j}$ where $D_t = (-i)\partial/\partial t$.

We assume that the operator L satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) we can write $L = L_0 + L_1$ where $L_0 = D_t^k + \sum_{j=1}^k p_j^0(t, X, D_x) D_t^{k-j}$ and $L_1 = \sum_{j=1}^k q_j(t, X, D_x) D_t^{k-j}$,
- (ii) $p_j^0(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m,j}$ ($j=1, \dots, k$),
- (iii) for some $0 < \delta_1 \leq 1$, $\partial_{\xi_i} p_j^0(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m,j-\delta_1}$ ($i=1, \dots, n, j=1, \dots, k$) and $q_j(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m,j-\delta_1}$,

(iv) roots $\tilde{p}_1(t, x, \xi), \dots, \tilde{p}_k(t, x, \xi)$ of the equation $\sigma(L_0) = \tau^k + \sum_{j=1}^k p_j^0(t, x, \xi) \tau^{k-j} = 0$ satisfy the inequalities $\text{Im } \tilde{p}_j(t, x, \xi) \geq c_0 \lambda(\xi)^m$ ($j=1, \dots, k$) where c_0 is a positive constant.

We can consider the operator L as an extended form for higher order parabolic differential operators.

For any $u \in S(R^{n+1})$, we put $u_j = \lambda(D_x)^{m(k-j)} D_t^{j-1} u$ for $j=1, \dots, k$, and $U = {}^t(u_1, \dots, u_k)$. Then we have $D_t u_j = \lambda(D_x)^m u_{j+1}$ for $j=1, \dots, k-1$ and $D_t u_k = D_t^k u = Lu - \sum_{j=1}^k p_j^0(t, X, D_x) D_t^{k-j} u - \sum_{j=1}^k q_j(t, X, D_x) D_t^{k-j} u = Lu - \sum_{j=1}^k p_{k-j+1}^1(t, X, D_x) \lambda(D_x)^m u_j - \sum_{j=1}^k q_{k-j+1}^1(t, X, D_x) u_j$ where $p_{k-j+1}^1(t, x, \xi) = p_{k-j+1}^0(t, x, \xi) \lambda(\xi)^{-m(k-j+1)} \in S_{0,\lambda}^{0, \delta_1}$ and $q_{k-j+1}^1(t, x, \xi) = q_{k-j+1}(t, x, \xi) \lambda(\xi)^{-m(k-j)} \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m-\delta_1}$.

Hence we can write

$$D_t U = h(t, X, D_x) \cdot \lambda(D_x)^m U + \frac{1}{i} J(t, X, D_x) U + (Lu) e_k$$

where $e_k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $h(t, x, \xi) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & 1 & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \\ 0 & 0 & \vdots & \vdots & 0 & 1 \\ -p_k^1 - p_{k-1}^1 & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & -p_1^1 \end{pmatrix}$

and $J(t, x, \xi) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -iq_k^1 \dots -iq_1^1 \end{pmatrix}$

Thus, $\partial/\partial t U = H \cdot \lambda(D_x)^m U + JU + i(Lu) e_k$ and $H = ih(t, X, D_x)$. We put $R = \partial/\partial t - H \cdot \lambda(D_x)^m - J$.

From the assumptions of operator L , we have

(i) $\sigma(H) = ih(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^0$, $\partial_{\xi_j} \sigma(H) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{-\delta_1}$ ($j=1, \dots, n$) and $\sigma(J) = J(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m-\delta_1}$,

(ii) the eigenvalues of $\sigma(H)$ are contained in a fixed compact subset of the set $\{z \in \mathbf{C}; \text{Re } z \leq -c_0\}$.

For a matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ we denote $|A| = \{\sum |a_{ij}|^2\}^{1/2}$.

The following lemma is shown in [3].

Lemma 5.1. *For any (t, x, ξ) , there exists a $k \times k$ matrix $N(t, x, \xi)$ such that*

(i) $|N(t, x, \xi)| + |N(t, x, \xi)^{-1}| \leq C$,

(ii) $\text{Re } (N(t, x, \xi)^{-1} H(t, x, \xi) N(t, x, \xi) \zeta, \zeta) \leq -\frac{c_0}{4} |\zeta|^2$ for any $\zeta = {}^t(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k) \in \mathbf{C}^k$,

where the constant C is independent of (t, x, ξ) .

Lemma 5.2. *We fix an arbitrary point (t_0, x_0, ξ_0) and put $N_0 = N(t_0, x_0, \xi_0)$, $H_0 = H(t_0, x_0, \xi_0)$ and $R_0 = \partial/\partial t - H_0 \lambda(D_x)^m - J$. Then we have*

$$(5.1) \quad c_1 \|U(b)\|_0^2 - c_2 \|U(a)\|_0^2 + \mu_1 \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 dt$$

$$-\mu_2 \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_0^2 dt \leq \operatorname{Re} \int_a^b (N_0^{-1} R_0 U, N_0^{-1} U)_0 dt$$

for any $U \in \{S(R^{n+1})\}^k$, where c_1, c_2, μ_1 and μ_2 are constants which are independent of (t_0, x_0, ξ_0) and

$$\|U(t)\|_0^2 = \int \lambda(\xi)^{2s} |\hat{U}(t, \xi)|^2 d\xi.$$

Proof. Since H_0 and N_0 are constant matrices, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re}(N_0^{-1} R_0 U, N_0^{-1} U)_0 &= \operatorname{Re} \left(N_0^{-1} \frac{\partial U}{\partial t}, N_0^{-1} U \right)_0 - \operatorname{Re}(N_0^{-1} H_0 \lambda(D_x)^m U, N_0^{-1} U)_0 \\ - \operatorname{Re}(N_0^{-1} J U, N_0^{-1} U)_0 &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \|N_0^{-1} U(t)\|_0^2 \\ - \operatorname{Re}(N_0^{-1} H_0 \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U, N_0^{-1} \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U)_0 &- \operatorname{Re}(N_0^{-1} J U, N_0^{-1} U)_0. \end{aligned}$$

Putting $N_0^{-1} \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U = V$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} \int_a^b (N_0^{-1} R_0 U, N_0^{-1} U)_0 dt &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|N_0^{-1} U(b)\|_0^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|N_0^{-1} U(a)\|_0^2 \\ - \operatorname{Re} \int_a^b (N_0^{-1} H_0 N_0 V, V)_0 dt &- C \int_a^b \|J U\|_{-(m-\delta_1)/2} \|U\|_{(m-\delta_1)/2} dt. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 3.8, it holds that

$$\|J U\|_{-(m-\delta_1)/2} \leq C \|U\|_{(m-\delta_1)/2}.$$

Using Lemma 5.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re}(N_0^{-1} H_0 N_0 V, V)_0 &= \operatorname{Re} \int N_0^{-1} H_0 N_0 \hat{V}(t, \xi) \cdot \overline{\hat{V}(t, \xi)} d\xi \\ &\leq -\frac{c_0}{4} \int |\hat{V}(t, \xi)|^2 d\xi \leq -\mu_1' \int \lambda(\xi)^m |\hat{U}(t, \xi)|^2 d\xi = -\mu_1' \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} \int_a^b (N_0^{-1} R_0 U, N_0^{-1} U)_0 dt &\geq c_1 \|U(b)\|_0^2 - c_2 \|U(a)\|_0^2 \\ + (\mu_1' - \varepsilon) \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 dt &- C_\varepsilon \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_0^2 dt \end{aligned}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Taking $\varepsilon = \mu_1'/2$, we obtain (5.1).

Q.E.D.

To obtain the similar energy inequalities to those of [3] or [4], we use the partition of unity of the space $R_{(t,x)}^{n+1}$ and R_x^n . Let ε be a sufficiently small positive number which will be determined later.

Let $\zeta(t, x) \in C_0^\infty(R^{n+1})$ satisfy $0 \leq \zeta(t, x) \leq 1$, $\operatorname{supp} \zeta \subset \{(t, x); |t| < 1, |x_j| < 1, j=1, \dots, n\}$ and $\zeta(t, x) = 1$ for $|t| \leq 1/2$ and $|x_j| \leq 1/2, j=1, \dots, n$.

Let $g = (g_0, g') = (g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n)$ and $h = (h_0, h')$ denote $(n+1)$ -tuples of integers.

$$\text{We put } \zeta_g(t, x) = \frac{\zeta\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} t - g_0, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} x - g'\right)}{\left\{ \sum_h \zeta\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} t - h_0, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} x - h'\right)^2 \right\}^{1/2}}.$$

Enumerating the points $\{\varepsilon g\}$ and the corresponding functions $\{\zeta_g\}$ in some order, we denote them by $(t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2), \dots$ and ζ_1, ζ_2, \dots .

Then we have,

(i) $\sum_i \zeta_i(t, x)^2 \equiv 1,$

(ii) $\sum_i |\partial_t^l \partial_x^\alpha \zeta_i(t, x)| \leq C_{l, \alpha, \varepsilon}$ for any l and $\alpha,$

(iii) the supp ζ_i overlap in such a way that each fixed point in R^{n+1} is contained in at most 2^{n+1} distinct ones of them,

(iv) $|\mathbf{H}(t, x, \xi) - \mathbf{H}(t_i, x_i, \xi)| \leq C\{|t - t_i| + |x - x_i|\} \leq C_\varepsilon$ for any $(t, x) \in \text{supp } \zeta_i$ and $\xi \in R^n.$

We take the set $\{\tilde{g}_{1,j}\}_{j=0}^\infty$ of points in R^n as follows:

(i) $\tilde{g}_{1,0} = 0,$

(ii) $\tilde{g}_{1,i} \neq \tilde{g}_{1,j}$ for $i \neq j,$

(iii) when $1 + l(3^n - 1) \leq j \leq (l + 1)(3^n - 1), l = 0, 1, \dots,$ writing $\tilde{g}_{1,j} = (a_1, \dots, a_n), a_i = 2 \cdot 3^l$ or $a_i = 0$ or $a_i = -2 \cdot 3^l \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$ We put $\tilde{a}_{1,0} = 2$ and $\tilde{a}_{1,j} = 2 \cdot 3^l$ for $1 + l(3^n - 1) \leq j \leq (l + 1)(3^n - 1), l = 0, 1, \dots.$ We put $\tilde{\Delta}_{1,j} = \left\{ \xi \in R^n; |\xi_i - a_i| \leq \frac{1}{2} \tilde{a}_{1,j}, i = 1, \dots, n \right\}$ for $\tilde{g}_{1,j} = (a_1, \dots, a_n).$

Then it holds that $R^n = \bigcup_{j=0}^\infty \tilde{\Delta}_{1,j}, \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty \partial \tilde{\Delta}_{1,j}$ is a set of measure zero and for almost everywhere $\xi \in R^n,$ there is a number j uniquely such that $\xi \in \tilde{\Delta}_{1,j}.$

Enumerating the cubes which satisfy $\tilde{a}_{1,j} \leq \varepsilon \lambda(\tilde{g}_{1,j})^{\delta_1},$ we denote them by $\Delta_{1,1}, \Delta_{1,2}, \dots$ and their centers and the lengths of sides by $g_{1,1}, g_{1,2}, \dots$ and $a_{1,1}, a_{1,2}, \dots$ respectively.

Similarly we write $\Delta'_{1,1}, \Delta'_{1,2}, \dots, g'_{1,1}, g'_{1,2}, \dots$ and $a'_{1,1}, a'_{1,2}, \dots$ for the cubes satisfying $\tilde{a}_{1,j} > \varepsilon \lambda(\tilde{g}_{1,j})^{\delta_1}.$

We divide each $\Delta'_{1,j}$ into 2^n congruent cubes and enumerate such cubes in some order: $\tilde{\Delta}_{2,1}, \tilde{\Delta}_{2,2}, \dots.$ We denote the center and length of side of each cube $\tilde{\Delta}_{2,j}$ by $\tilde{g}_{2,j}$ and $\tilde{a}_{2,j}$ respectively.

By the same way as above we write $\{\tilde{\Delta}_{2,j}\}_j = \{\Delta_{2,j}\}_j, \{\tilde{g}_{2,j}\}_j = \{g_{2,j}\}_j$ and $\{\tilde{a}_{2,j}\}_j = \{a_{2,j}\}_j$ if $\tilde{a}_{2,j} \leq \varepsilon \lambda(\tilde{g}_{2,j})^{\delta_1}$ and $\{\tilde{\Delta}_{2,j}\}_j = \{\Delta'_{2,j}\}_j$ if $\tilde{a}_{2,j} > \varepsilon \lambda(\tilde{g}_{2,j})^{\delta_1}.$

Repeating this process, we obtain cubes $\{\Delta_{l,j}\}_{l,j}$ with centers $\{g_{l,j}\}_{l,j}$ and lengths of sides $\{a_{l,j}\}_{l,j}.$

Lemma 5.3. (i) $R^n = \bigcup_{l,j} \Delta_{l,j}$

(ii) for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0, \{\tilde{\Delta}_{1,j}\} = \{\Delta'_{1,j}\},$

(iii) for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0,$ we have $c_0 \varepsilon \lambda(g_{l,j})^{\delta_1} \leq a_{l,j} \leq \varepsilon \lambda(g_{l,j})^{\delta_1}$ ($0 < c_0 < 1$).

Proof of (i). We note that $R^n = \bigcup_{j=0}^\infty \tilde{\Delta}_{1,j}.$ Assume that there exists a point $\xi \in R^n$ such that for any $l, \xi \in \Delta'_{l,j_l}$ for some $j_l.$ Then by the definition of

$\Delta'_{l,j_l}, |\xi_i - a'_i| \leq \frac{1}{2} a'_{l,j_l} (i=1, \dots, n), a'_{l,j_l} > \varepsilon \lambda(g'_{l,j_l})^{\delta_1} \geq \varepsilon$ and $a'_{l,j_l} = \frac{1}{2^{l-1}} a'_{1,j_1}$ for some j_1 , here $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ and $g'_{l,j_l} = (a'_1, \dots, a'_n)$.

Taking sufficiently large l , we have a contradiction. Hence for any $\xi \in R^n$, there exists l and j_l such that $\xi \in \Delta_{l,j_l}$.

Proof of (ii). Taking $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we have $\varepsilon \lambda(0)^{\delta_1} < 2 = \tilde{a}_{1,0}$, hence $\tilde{\Delta}_{1,0} \in \{\Delta'_{1,j}\}$. For any $j_1 \geq 1$, by definitions, $2 \leq \tilde{a}_{1,j_1} \leq |\tilde{g}_{1,j_1}| \leq \sqrt{n} \tilde{a}_{1,j_1}$. By Lemma 2.2 (2.3), $\lambda(\tilde{g}_{1,j_1})^{\delta_1} \leq C_1 \langle \tilde{g}_{1,j_1} \rangle^{\delta_1} \leq C_1 |\tilde{g}_{1,j_1}| \leq 2C_1 |\tilde{g}_{1,j_1}| \leq (2C_1 \sqrt{n}) \tilde{a}_{1,j_1}$.

Hence, taking $0 < \varepsilon < (2C_1 \sqrt{n})^{-1}$, we have $\varepsilon \lambda(\tilde{g}_{1,j_1})^{\delta_1} < \tilde{a}_{1,j_1}$. This means $\tilde{\Delta}_{1,j_1} \in \{\Delta'_{1,j}\}$.

Proof of (iii). By definitions we have $a_{l,j} \leq \varepsilon \lambda(g_{l,j})^{\delta_1}$. By virtue of Lemma 2.2, we can take $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small such that

$$(5.2) \quad \frac{3}{4} \lambda(\xi) \leq \lambda(\eta) \leq \frac{4}{3} \lambda(\xi) \quad \text{for } |\xi - \eta| \leq 2\sqrt{n} \varepsilon \lambda(\xi)^{\delta_1}.$$

By definitions and (ii), $\Delta_{l,j} \subset \Delta'_{l-1,j_l}$. Then we have $a_{l,j} = \frac{1}{2} a'_{l-1,j_l} > \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon \lambda(g'_{l-1,j_l})^{\delta_1}$.

Since $g'_{l-1,j_l} \in \Delta_{l,j}$, $|g'_{l-1,j_l} - g_{l,j}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{n} a_{l,j} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{n} \varepsilon \lambda(g_{l,j})^{\delta_1} \leq 2\sqrt{n} \varepsilon \lambda(g_{l,j})^{\delta_1}$. Hence, we have $a_{l,j} > \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{\delta_1} \lambda(g_{l,j})^{\delta_1}$. Q.E.D.

We put $\Delta^*_{l,j} = \{\xi; |\xi_i - a_i| \leq \frac{5}{9} a_{l,j}, i=1, \dots, n\}$ where $g_{l,j} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$.

It is clear that $\Delta_{l,j} \subset \Delta^*_{l,j}$.

Lemma 5.4. *We take $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small so that Lemma 5.3 (ii) and the inequality (5.2) hold. Then if $\Delta^*_{l,j} \cap \Delta'_{l',j'} \neq \emptyset$, it holds that $\frac{1}{3} a_{l,j} \leq a_{l',j'} \leq 3a_{l,j}$.*

Proof. Assume that $\Delta^*_{l,j} \cap \Delta'_{l',j'} \neq \emptyset$ and $a_{l',j'} < \frac{1}{3} a_{l,j}$. By definitions and Lemma 5.3 (ii), $\Delta'_{l',j'} \subset \Delta'_{l'-1,j''}$ for some $\Delta'_{l'-1,j''}$. Taking $\xi \in \Delta^*_{l,j} \cap \Delta'_{l',j'}$ we have

$$|g_{l,j} - g'_{l'-1,j''}| \leq |g_{l,j} - \xi| + |\xi - g'_{l'-1,j''}| \leq \frac{5}{9} \sqrt{n} a_{l,j} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{n} a'_{l'-1,j''} \\ = \frac{5}{9} \sqrt{n} a_{l,j} + \sqrt{n} a_{l',j'} \leq \frac{8}{9} \sqrt{n} a_{l,j} \leq 2\sqrt{n} \varepsilon \lambda(g_{l,j})^{\delta_1}.$$

From (5.2) we have $a'_{l'-1,j''} = 2 a_{l',j'} < \frac{2}{3} a_{l,j} \leq \frac{2}{3} \varepsilon \lambda(g_{l,j})^{\delta_1} \leq \frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\delta_1}$

$$\varepsilon \lambda(g'_{l'-1,j''})^{\delta_1} \leq \varepsilon \lambda(g'_{l'-1,j''})^{\delta_1}.$$

This contradicts to the definition of $\Delta'_{l'-1,j''}$.

Hence we have $a_{l',j'} \geq \frac{1}{3} a_{l,j}$.

By the same way we can prove that $a_{l',j'} \leq 3 a_{l,j}$. Q.E.D.

We denote the volume of cube Δ by $|\Delta|$.

Lemma 5.5. *There is a positive integer M such that for any l, j , the number of cubes $\Delta^*_{l',j'}$ which satisfy $\Delta_{l,j} \cap \Delta^*_{l',j'} \neq \phi$ is at most M .*

Proof. By Lemma 5.4, we have, $\cup_{l',j'} \Delta_{l',j'} \subset \{\xi; |\xi_i - a_i| \leq 4 a_{l,j}\}$ where $g_{l,j} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and the union is taken for the cubes satisfying $\Delta^*_{l',j'} \cap \Delta_{l,j} \neq \phi$.

We write the number of such cubes by M_0 .

Consider the number M_1 of cubes which satisfy that $|\Delta| \geq \left(\frac{1}{3} a_{l,j}\right)^n$ and $\Delta \subset \{\xi; |\xi_i - a_i| \leq 4 a_{l,j}, i=1, \dots, n\}$.

Then we have,

$$M_1 \left(\frac{1}{3} a_{l,j}\right)^n \leq (8 a_{l,j})^n,$$

hence, $M_1 \leq 24^n$.

Using Lemma 5.4, we obtain $M_0 \leq M_1 \leq 24^n$. Q.E.D.

Rearranging $\{\Delta_{l,j}\}$, $\{g_{l,j}\}$ and $\{a_{l,j}\}$, we denote them by $\{\Delta_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, $\{g_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ and $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$.

Let $\psi(\xi) \in C_0^\infty(R^n)$ satisfy that $\psi(\xi) = 1$ for $|\xi_i| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ ($i=1, \dots, n$) $0 \leq \psi(\xi) \leq 1$ and $\text{supp } \psi(\xi) \subset \{\xi; |\xi_i| \leq \frac{5}{9}, i=1, \dots, n\}$.

We put $\psi_j(\xi) = \psi\left(\frac{\xi - g_j}{a_j}\right)$, $\tilde{\psi}(\xi) = \left\{ \sum_j \psi_j(\xi)^2 \right\}^{1/2}$ and $\varphi_j(\xi) = \psi_j(\xi) / \tilde{\psi}(\xi)$.

Theorem 5.6. *For sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we have,*

- (i) $\varphi_j(\xi) \in C_0^\infty(R^n)$, $0 \leq \varphi_j(\xi) \leq 1$,
- (ii) $\sum_j \varphi_j(\xi)^2 \equiv 1$,
- (iii) $\sum_j |\partial_\xi^\alpha \varphi_j(\xi)| \leq C_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \lambda(\xi)^{-|\alpha|}$ for any α ,
- (iv) *there exists a positive integer M such that each $\xi \in R^n$ is contained in the supports of at most M of $\{\varphi_j\}$.*

Proof. We put $\Delta_j^* = \left\{ \xi; |\xi_i - b_i| \leq \frac{5}{9} a_j (i=1, \dots, n) \right\}$ here $g_j = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$. Then by definitions $\text{supp } \varphi_j \subset \Delta_j^*$ and $\psi_j(\xi) = 1$ for $\xi \in \Delta_j$.

Using Lemma 5.3 (i) and Lemma 5.5, $\tilde{\psi}(\xi)$ is well-defined and $1 \leq \tilde{\psi}(\xi) \leq M$. Therefore from the definitions of $\varphi_j(\xi)$, we obtain (i), (ii) and (iv).

Since $\partial_\xi^\alpha \psi_j(\xi) = \psi^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{\xi - g_j}{a_j}\right) a_j^{-|\alpha|}$, using Lemma 5.3 (iii) and (5.2) we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\partial_{\xi}^{\alpha} \psi_j(\xi)| &\leq |\psi^{(\alpha)}\left(\frac{\xi-g_j}{a_j}\right)| a_j^{-|\alpha|} \leq C_{\alpha}(\varepsilon c_0)^{-|\alpha|} \lambda(g_j)^{-\delta_1|\alpha|} \\
 &\leq C_{\varepsilon, \alpha}^1 \lambda(\xi)^{-\delta_1|\alpha|}, \text{ for any } \alpha.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence $|\partial_{\xi}^{\alpha} \tilde{\psi}_j(\xi)| \leq C_{\varepsilon, \alpha}^1 M \lambda(\xi)^{-\delta_1|\alpha|}$ for any α .

Using these inequalities we obtain (iii).

Q.E.D.

We can see that for any $(t, x) \in R^n$ and $\xi \in \text{supp } \varphi_j$,

$$(5.3) \quad |\mathbf{H}(t, x, \xi) - \mathbf{H}(t, x, g_j)| \leq C |\xi - g_j| \sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \lambda(g_j + s(\xi - g_j))^{-\delta_1} \leq C_2 \varepsilon.$$

Taking $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we have the following Theorem.

Theorem 5.7. *We put $N_{i,j} = N(t_i, x_i, g_j)$. There exist positive constants c_1, c_2, μ_1 and μ_2 such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.4) \quad &c_1 \|U(b)\|_0^2 - c_2 \|U(a)\|_0^2 + \mu_1 \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 dt \\
 &- \mu_2 \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_0^2 dt \\
 &\leq \text{Re} \int_a^b \sum_{i,j} (N_{i,j}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \mathbf{R}U, N_{i,j}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j U)_0 dt
 \end{aligned}$$

for any $U \in \{S(R^{n+1})\}^k$ where $\Phi_j = \varphi_j(D_x)$.

Proof. We put $\mathbf{H}_{i,j} = \mathbf{H}(t_i, x_i, \xi_j)$ and $\mathbf{R}_{i,j} = \partial/\partial t - \mathbf{H}_{i,j} \lambda(D_x)^m$. By Lemma 5.2, there exist positive constants c_1, c_2, μ_1 and μ_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 &c_1 \|U(b)\|_0^2 - c_2 \|U(a)\|_0^2 + \mu_1 \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 dt \\
 &- \mu_2 \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_0^2 dt \leq \text{Re} \int_a^b (N_{i,j}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_{i,j} U, N_{i,j}^{-1} U)_0 dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &c_1 \|\zeta_i(b) \Phi_j U(b)\|_0^2 - c_2 \|\zeta_i(a) \Phi_j U(a)\|_0^2 \\
 &+ \mu_1 \int_a^b \|\zeta_i(t) \Phi_j U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 dt - \mu_2 \int_a^b \|\zeta_i(t) \Phi_j U(t)\|_0^2 dt \\
 &\leq \text{Re} \int_a^b (N_{i,j}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_{i,j} \zeta_i \Phi_j U, N_{i,j}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j U)_0 dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

We can see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j U(t)\|_s^2 = \sum_{i,j} \text{Re}(\zeta_i \lambda(D_x)^{2s} \zeta_i \Phi_j U, \Phi_j U)_0 \\
 &= \text{Re} \sum_j (\sum_i \zeta_i(t, X) \cdot \lambda(D_x)^{2s} \cdot \zeta_i(t, X') \Phi_j U, \Phi_j U)_0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_i \zeta_i(t, x) \lambda(\xi)^{2s} \zeta_i(t, x') \in S_{0,\lambda}^{2s}$, from Theorem 3.3, we can write $\sum_i \zeta_i(t, X) \cdot \lambda(D_x)^{2s} \cdot \zeta_i(t, X') = \lambda(D_x)^{2s} \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{p}^1(t, X, D_x)$ where $\mathbf{p}^1(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{2s-1}$.

Hence we obtain

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j U(t)\|_s^2 \leq \|U(t)\|_s^2 + C \|U(t)\|_{s-1/2}^2 \\ \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j U(t)\|_s^2 \geq \|U(t)\|_s^2 - C \|U(t)\|_{s-1/2}^2, \end{cases}$$

in particular,

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j U(t)\|_0^2 &= \|U(t)\|_0^2. \\ &|\sum_{i,j} (N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \mathbf{J}U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j U)_0| \\ &\leq C \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j \mathbf{J}U(t)\|_{-(m-\delta_1)/2} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j U(t)\|_{(m-\delta_1)/2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{i,j} \{ \|\zeta_i \Phi_j \mathbf{J}U(t)\|_{-(m-\delta_1)/2}^2 + \|\zeta_i \Phi_j U(t)\|_{(m-\delta_1)/2}^2 \} \\ &\leq C \{ \|\mathbf{J}U\|_{-(m-\delta_1)/2}^2 + \|U(t)\|_{(m-\delta_1)/2}^2 \} \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon \|U(t)\|_{(m-\delta_1)/2}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\mu_1}{N_0} \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 + C_{N_0, \varepsilon} \|U(t)\|_0^2, \end{aligned}$$

for any positive number N_0 .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{By (5.5), } \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 & \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{N_0}\right) \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 - C_{N_0} \|U(t)\|_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we get the inequality

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} c_1 \|U(b)\|_0^2 - c_2 \|U(a)\|_0^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2}{N_0}\right) \mu_1 \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 dt \\ - C_{N_0, \varepsilon} \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_0^2 dt \\ \leq \text{Re} \int_a^b \sum_{i,j} (N_{ij}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_{ij} \zeta_i \Phi_j U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j U)_0 dt \\ - \text{Re} \int_a^b \sum_{i,j} (N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \mathbf{J}U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j U)_0 dt. \end{aligned}$$

The right hand side of this inequality can be written in the form:

$$\text{Re} \int_a^b \sum_{i,j} \{ (N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \mathbf{R}U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j U)_0 + A_{ij} \} dt$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ij} &= \left(N_{ij}^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \zeta_i \right) \Phi_j U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j U \right)_0 \\ &+ (N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i [\Phi_j, \mathbf{H}] \lambda(D_x)^m U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j U)_0 \\ &- (N_{ij}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{ij} [\lambda(D_x)^m, \zeta_i] \Phi_j U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j U)_0 \\ &+ (N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \{ \mathbf{H} - \mathbf{H}_{ij} \} \lambda(D_x)^m \Phi_j U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j U)_0 \\ &= I_{ij} + II_{ij} + III_{ij} + IV_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

We can see that

$$(5.8) \quad \left| \sum_{i,j} I_{ij} \right| \leq C \sum_{i,j} \left\{ \left\| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \zeta_i \right) \Phi_j U \right\|_0^2 + \|\zeta_i \Phi_j U\|_0^2 \right\} \leq C_\varepsilon \|U(t)\|_0^2.$$

$$\left| \sum_{i,j} II_{ij} \right| \leq \left| \sum_j \left(\sum_i (N^*_{ij})^{-1} N^{-1}_{ij} \zeta_i^2 \right) [\Phi_j, H] \lambda(D_x)^m U, \Phi_j U \right|.$$

By Theorem 5.3, we get $[\Phi_j, H] = p_j^2(t, X, D_x)$ where $p_j^2(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{-\delta_1}$. Thus,

$$\left| \sum_{i,j} II_{ij} \right| \leq \left| \left(\sum_j \Phi_j \zeta_j^{(1)} p_j^2(t, X, D_x) \lambda(D_x)^m U, U \right) \right|$$

where $\zeta_j^{(1)} = \sum_i (N^*_{ij})^{-1} N^{-1}_{ij} \zeta_i(t, x)^2$. Since

$$\sum_j \varphi_j(\xi) \zeta_j^{(1)}(t, x') p_j^2(t, x', \xi') \lambda(\xi')^m \in S_{0,\lambda}^{0,m-\delta_1},$$

$$(5.9) \quad \left| \sum_{i,j} II_{ij} \right| \leq \left| (p^3(t, X, D_x) U, U) \right|$$

$$\leq \|p^3(t, X, D_x) U\|_{-(m-\delta_1)/2} \|U\|_{(m-\delta_1)/2}$$

$$\leq C_\varepsilon \|U\|_{(m-\delta_1)/2}^2 \leq \frac{\mu_1}{N_0} \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 + C_{N_0,\varepsilon} \|U(t)\|_0^2$$

where $p^3(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m-\delta_1}$.

By the similar way, we can obtain

$$\sum_{i,j} III_{ij} = (p^4(t, X, D_x) U, U)_0$$

where $p^4(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m-1}$. Hence we get

$$(5.10) \quad \left| \sum_{i,j} III_{ij} \right| \leq C_\varepsilon \|U\|_{(m-1)/2}^2 \leq \frac{\mu_1}{N_0} \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 + C_{N_0,\varepsilon} \|U(t)\|_0^2.$$

To estimate the term $\sum_{i,j} IV_{ij}$, we write

$$IV_{ij} = (N^{-1}_{ij} \zeta_i \{H - H_{ij}\} \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U, N^{-1}_{ij} \zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U)_0$$

$$+ (N^{-1}_{ij} \zeta_i \{H - H_{ij}\} \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U, N^{-1}_{ij} [\lambda(D_x)^{m/2}, \zeta_i] \Phi_j U)_0$$

$$+ (N^{-1}_{ij} [\zeta_i, \lambda(D_x)^{m/2}] \{H - H_{ij}\} \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U, N^{-1}_{ij} \zeta_i \Phi_j U)_0$$

$$+ (N^{-1}_{ij} \zeta_i [H, \lambda(D_x)^{m/2}] \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U, N^{-1}_{ij} \zeta_i \Phi_j U)_0$$

$$= B_{ij} + C_{ij} + D_{ij} + E_{ij}.$$

By the similar way to above estimates (5.9) and (5.10), we can obtain

$$(5.11) \quad \left| \sum_{i,j} (C_{ij} + D_{ij}) \right| = \left| (p^5(t, X, D_x) U, U) \right| \leq C_\varepsilon \|U\|_{(m-1)/2}^2$$

$$\leq \frac{\mu_1}{N_0} \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 + C_{N_0,\varepsilon} \|U(t)\|_0^2,$$

where $p^5(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m-1}$, and

$$(5.12) \quad \left| \sum_{i,j} E_{ij} \right| = \left| (p^6(t, X, D_x) U, U) \right| \leq C_\varepsilon \|U\|_{(m-\delta_1)/2}^2$$

$$\leq \frac{\mu_1}{N_0} \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 + C_{N_0,\varepsilon} \|U(t)\|_0^2,$$

where $p^6(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m-\delta_1}$. Furthermore we have

$$\left| \sum_{i,j} B_{ij} \right| \leq C_0 \left\{ \sum_{i,j} N_0 \|\zeta_i \{H - H_{ij}\} \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U\|_0^2 \right.$$

$$\left. + \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U\|_0^2 \right\}$$

where the constant C_0 is independent of N_0 and ε .

Using Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.4 (i), (ii), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \{H - H_{ij}\} \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U\|_0^2 \\ &= (\mathbf{p}^7(t, X, D_x) \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U, \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U)_0 \\ &+ (\mathbf{p}^8(t, X, D_x) \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U, \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U)_0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{p}^7(t, x, \xi) = \sum_{i,j} \zeta_i(t, x)^2 \{H(t, x, \xi) - H_{ij}\}^*$
 $\times \{H(t, x, \xi) - H_{ij}\} \varphi_j(\xi)^2$

and $\mathbf{p}^8(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0, \lambda^1}$.

By the assumptions of H, ζ_i, φ_j and H_{ij} ,

$$|\mathbf{p}^7(t, x, \xi)| \leq \sum_{i,j} |\zeta_i(t, x)|^2 |\varphi_j(\xi)|^2 \{C_1 + C_2\}^2 \varepsilon^2 \leq C_3 \varepsilon,$$

where C_1 is the constant in (iv) of the definition of $\{\zeta_i\}$ and C_2 is the one in (5.3), and $\partial_{\xi_i} \mathbf{p}^7(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0, \lambda^1} \quad i=1, \dots, n$.

Hence by Theorem 3.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\mathbf{p}^7(t, X, D_x) \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U, \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U)_0| \\ & \leq C_4 \varepsilon \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|U(t)\|_{(m-\delta_1/2)/2}^2. \quad \text{Therefore,} \\ & \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \{H - H_{ij}\} \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^{m/2} U\|_0^2 \\ & \leq C_4 \varepsilon \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|U(t)\|_{(m-\delta_1/2)/2}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|U(t)\|_{m-\delta_1/2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (5.13) \quad & \left| \sum_{i,j} B_{ij} \right| \leq \{C_0 C_4 N_0\} \varepsilon \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 + \frac{C_0}{N_0} \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 \\ & + C_{N_0, \varepsilon} \|U(t)\|_{(m-\delta_1/2)/2}^2 \\ & \leq \left(C_0 C_4 N_0 \varepsilon + \frac{C_0}{N_0} \right) \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 + \frac{\mu_1}{N_0} \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 + C_{N_0, \varepsilon} \|U(t)\|_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

By virtue of the inequalities (5.7)~(5.13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (5.14) \quad & c_1 \|U(b)\|_0^2 - c_2 \|U(a)\|_0^2 + \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{6}{N_0}\right) \mu_1 - C_0 C_4 N_0 \varepsilon - \frac{C_0}{N_0} \right\} \\ & \times \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{m/2}^2 dt - C_{N_0, \varepsilon} \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_0^2 dt \\ & \leq \text{Re} \int_a^b \sum_{i,j} (N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j R U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j U)_0 dt \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\varepsilon \leq \frac{\mu_1}{N_0^2 C_0 C_4}$ and N_0 sufficiently large so that $\mu_1 - \frac{7\mu_1 + C_0}{N_0} \geq \frac{\mu_1}{2}$,

we complete the proof.

Q.E.D.

Let r and s be real numbers satisfying $r > m/2$ and let $-\infty \leq a < b \leq +\infty$.

Theorem 5.8. For sufficiently small ε there exist positive constants c_1, c_2, μ_1 and μ_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.15) \quad & c_1 \|U(b)\|_\rho^2 - c_2 \|U(a)\|_\rho^2 + \mu_1 \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{\rho+m/2}^2 dt \\
 & - \mu_2 \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_\rho^2 dt \\
 & \leq \operatorname{Re} \int_a^b \sum_{i,j} (N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^\rho \mathbf{R}U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^\rho U)_0 dt
 \end{aligned}$$

for any $U \in \{H_{r,s}(\Omega)\}^k$, where $\rho=r+s-m/2$ and $U(t)=\gamma_t U$, and γ_t is the trace operator defined in Lemma 4.4.

Proof. At first we assume $r+s-m/2=\rho=0$, then by Theorem 5.7, the inequality (5.14) holds for $U \in \{S(R^{n+1})\}^k$. Since $R: \{H_{r,s}(\Omega)\}^k \rightarrow \{H_{r-m,s}(\Omega)\}^k$ is a continuous linear operator, the form

$$\int_a^b \sum_{i,j} (N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \mathbf{R}U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j V)_0 dt$$

is a continuous sesquilinear form defined on $\{H_{r,s}(\Omega)\}^k \times \{H_{r,s}(\Omega)\}^k$, because of Proposition 4.8. Using the continuity of the trace operator γ_t , we obtain the theorem for $\rho=0$.

Let $r+s-m/2=\rho$. We have that $\mathbf{R}\lambda(D_x)^\rho = \lambda(D_x)^\rho \mathbf{R} + \{\mathbf{R}\lambda(D_x)^\rho - \lambda(D_x)^\rho \mathbf{R}\} = \lambda(D_x)^\rho \mathbf{R} + [\lambda(D_x)^\rho, \mathbf{H}]\lambda(D_x)^m + [\lambda(D_x)^\rho, \mathbf{J}]$. By assumptions of \mathbf{H} and \mathbf{J} , we have $[\lambda(D_x)^\rho, \mathbf{H}]\lambda(D_x)^m = \mathbf{p}^1(t, X, D_x)$ and $[\lambda(D_x)^\rho, \mathbf{J}] = \mathbf{p}^2(t, X, D_x)$ where $\mathbf{p}^1(t, x, \xi)$ and $\mathbf{p}^2(t, x, \xi)$ belong to $S_{0,\lambda}^{m+\rho-\delta_1}$.

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \operatorname{Re} \int_a^b \sum_{i,j} (N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j [\lambda(D_x)^\rho, \mathbf{H}]\lambda(D_x)^m U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^\rho U)_0 dt \right| \\
 & \leq C \int_a^b \sum_{i,j} \{ \|\zeta_i \Phi_j \mathbf{p}^1(t, X, D_x) U\|_{-(m-\delta_1)/2}^2 + \|\zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^\rho U\|_{(m-\delta_1)/2}^2 \} dt \\
 & \leq C_\varepsilon \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{\rho+m/2-\delta_1/2}^2 dt \\
 & \leq \frac{1}{N_0} \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{\rho+m/2}^2 dt + C_{N_0,\varepsilon} \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_\rho^2 dt
 \end{aligned}$$

for any $U \in \{H_{r,s}(\Omega)\}^k$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \operatorname{Re} \int_a^b \sum_{i,j} (N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j [\lambda(D_x)^\rho, \mathbf{J}]U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^\rho U)_0 dt \right| \\
 & \leq \frac{1}{N_0} \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{\rho+m/2}^2 dt + C_{N_0,\varepsilon} \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_\rho^2 dt
 \end{aligned}$$

for any $U \in \{H_{r,s}(\Omega)\}^k$.

Taking N_0 sufficiently large and using (5.4) for $\lambda(D_x)^\rho U$ in place of U we obtain the theorem. Q.E.D.

6. The Cauchy problem for the operator R

In the proof of Lemma 4 in [3] (p. 193) replacing $|\xi|^{2k}$ by $\lambda(\xi)^m$, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *We fix an arbitrary point (t_0, x_0, ξ_0) , and put $H_0 = H(t_0, x_0, \xi_0)$ and $R_0 = \partial/\partial t - H_0 \lambda(D_x)^m$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$(6.1) \quad \int_{R^{n+1}} (\tau^2 + \lambda(\xi)^{2m} + \eta^2) |\tilde{U}(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi \leq C \|(\mathbf{R}_0 + \eta \mathbf{I})U\|_{0,0}^2$$

for any $\eta > 0$ and $U \in \{S(R^{n+1})\}^k$, where \mathbf{I} is the $k \times k$ identity matrix and C is a constant independent of (t_0, x_0, ξ_0) .

Theorem 6.2. *There exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$(6.2) \quad \int_{R^{n+1}} (\tau^2 + \lambda(\xi)^{2m} + \eta^2) |\tilde{U}(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi \leq C_1 \|(\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I})U\|_{0,0}^2 + C_2 \|U\|_{0,0}^2$$

for any $U \in \{S(R^{n+1})\}^k$.

Proof. For sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we take $\{\zeta_i\}_i, \{\varphi_j\}_j$ as in Section 5 and put $H_{i,j} = H(t_i, x_i, \xi_j)$. By Lemma 6.1, we have

$$\int (\tau^2 + \lambda(\xi)^{2m} + \eta^2) |\tilde{U}(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi \leq C \|(\mathbf{R}_{i,j} + \eta \mathbf{I})U\|_{0,0}^2$$

for any $U \in \{S(R^{n+1})\}^k$, where $\mathbf{R}_{i,j} = \partial/\partial t - H(t_i, x_i, \xi_j) \lambda(D_x)^m$

Taking $\zeta_i(t, x) \varphi_j(D_x) U(t, x)$ in place of $U(t, x)$, we have

$$\int (\tau^2 + \lambda(\xi)^{2m} + \eta^2) |\widetilde{\zeta_i \Phi_j U}(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi \leq C \|(\mathbf{R}_{i,j} + \eta \mathbf{I})\zeta_i \Phi_j U\|_{0,0}^2.$$

Now we shall estimate various error terms to obtain (6.2). At first,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j} \int \tau^2 |\widetilde{\zeta_i \Phi_j U}(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \int \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \{\zeta_i \Phi_j U(t, x)\} \right|^2 dt dx \\ &\geq \int \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} U(t, x) \right|^2 dt dx - C \int |U(t, x)|^2 dt dx \\ &= \int \tau^2 |\tilde{U}(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi - C \|U\|_{0,0}^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the same way as in Section 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j} \int \lambda(\xi)^{2m} |\widetilde{\zeta_i \Phi_j U}(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \| \lambda(D_x)^m \{\zeta_i \Phi_j U\} \|_{0,0}^2 \\ &= \text{Re}(\sum_{i,j} \Phi_j \zeta_i \lambda(D_x)^{2m} \zeta_i \Phi_j U, U) \\ &= \text{Re}(\mathbf{p}^1(t, X, D_x)U, U), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{p}^1(t, x, \xi) = \lambda(\xi)^{2m} \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{p}^2(t, x, \xi)$ and $\mathbf{p}^2(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{2m-\delta_1}$.

So we get,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j} \int \lambda(\xi)^{2m} |\zeta_i \widetilde{\Phi_j} U(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi \\ & \geq \int \lambda(\xi)^{2m} |\widetilde{U}(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi - C \|U\|_{0, m-\delta_1/2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We can see easily that

$$\sum_{i,j} \int \eta^2 |\zeta_i \widetilde{\Phi_j} U(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi = \eta^2 \int |\widetilde{U}(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi.$$

Now we can write,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j} \|(\mathbf{R}_{ij} + \eta \mathbf{I}) \zeta_i \Phi_j U\|_{0,0}^2 \\ & \leq 2^2 \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j (\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I}) U\|_{0,0}^2 + C \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j (\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{R}_{ij}) U\|_{0,0}^2 \\ & + C \sum_{i,j} \|[\mathbf{R}_{ij}, \zeta_i \Phi_j] U\|_{0,0}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the method as in the proof of Theorem 5.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j (\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{R}_{ij}) U\|_{0,0}^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j (\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{H}_{ij}) \lambda(D_x)^m U\|_{0,0}^2 \\ & + 2 \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j \mathbf{J} U\|_{0,0}^2 \\ & \leq 2^2 \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i (\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{H}_{ij}) \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^m U\|_{0,0}^2 \\ & + 2^2 \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i [\Phi_j, \mathbf{H}] \lambda(D_x)^m U\|_{0,0}^2 + 2 \|\mathbf{J} U\|_{0,0}^2 \\ & \leq 2^2 \varepsilon C \|U\|_{0,m}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|U\|_{0, m-\delta_1/2}^2 \\ & + C_\varepsilon \|U\|_{0, m-\delta_1/2}^2 + C \|U\|_{0, m-\delta_1/2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j} \|[\mathbf{R}_{ij}, \zeta_i \Phi_j] U\|_{0,0}^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i,j} \left\| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \zeta_i \right) \Phi_j U \right\|_{0,0}^2 \\ & + 2 \sum_{i,j} \|\mathbf{H}_{ij} [\lambda(D_x)^m, \zeta_i] \Phi_j U\|_{0,0}^2 \\ & \leq C \|U\|_{0,0}^2 + C \|U\|_{0, m-1/2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summarizing these inequalities, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \{\tau^2 + \lambda(\xi)^{2m} + \eta^2\} |\widetilde{U}(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi \\ & \leq C \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j (\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I}) U\|_{0,0}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|U\|_{0, m-\delta_1/2}^2 + C_3 \varepsilon \|U\|_{0,m}^2 \\ & \leq C \|(\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I}) U\|_{0,0}^2 + C_3 \varepsilon \|U\|_{0,m}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|U\|_{0, m-\delta_1/2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, taking ε sufficiently small, we get,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int (\tau^2 + \lambda(\xi)^{2m} + \eta^2) |\widetilde{U}(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi \\ & \leq C \|(\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I}) U\|_{0,0}^2 + C_\varepsilon \|U\|_{0, m-\delta_1/2}^2 \\ & \leq C \|(\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I}) U\|_{0,0}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|U\|_{0,m}^2 + C \|U\|_{0,0}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain (6.2) for some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$. Q.E.D.

Theorem 6.3. *For any real numbers r and s , there exist positive constants η_0 and c_0 such that for any $\eta > \eta_0$, it holds that*

(6.3) $c_0 \|U\|_{r+m,s} \leq \|(\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I})U\|_{r,s} \leq C_\eta \|U\|_{r+m,s}$ for any $U \in \{H_{r+m,s}\}^k$, for some positive constant C_η .

Proof. The inequality $\|(\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I})U\|_{r,s} \leq C_\eta \|U\|_{r+m,s}$ is clear. Because $\sigma(\mathbf{R}) = i\tau \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}(t, x, \xi)\lambda(\xi)^m - \mathbf{J}(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0, \lambda_1(\tau, \xi)}^m$, so

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I})U\|_{r,s} \leq \eta \|U\|_{r,s} + \|\mathbf{R}U\|_{r,s} \\ & \leq \eta \|U\|_{r+m,s} + \|\lambda(D_x)^s \lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r \mathbf{R}U\|_{0,0}, \end{aligned}$$

and by Corollary 3.2 (i), we can write $\lambda(D_x)^s \lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{p}^1(t, X, D_t, D_x)$ where $\mathbf{p}^1(t, x, \tau, \xi)\lambda(\xi)^{-s} \lambda_1(\tau, \xi)^{-r-m} \in B(R^{2n+2})$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hence, } & \|\lambda(D_x)^s \lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r \mathbf{R}U\|_{0,0} = \|\mathbf{p}^1(t, X, D_t, D_x)U\| \\ & \leq C \|\lambda(D_x)^s \lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^{r+m} U\|_{0,0} = C \|U\|_{r+m,s}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get $\|(\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I})U\|_{r,s} \leq (C + \eta) \|U\|_{r+m,s}$, for any $U \in \{S(R^{n+1})\}^k$.

For any $U \in \{S(R^{n+1})\}^k$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I})U\|_{r,s}^2 = \|\lambda(D_x)^s \lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r (\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I})U\|_{0,0}^2 \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \|(\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I})\lambda(D_x)^s \lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r U\|_{0,0}^2 \\ & \quad - 2\|[\mathbf{R}, \lambda(D_x)^s \lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r]U\|_{0,0}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now from Theorem 6.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I}) \cdot \lambda(D_x)^s \cdot \lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r U\|_{0,0}^2 \\ & \geq c \int (\tau^2 + \lambda(\xi)^{2m} + \eta^2) \lambda(\xi)^{2s} \lambda_1(\tau, \xi)^{2r} |\tilde{U}(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau d\xi - C \|U\|_{r,s}^2 \\ & \geq c \|U\|_{r+m,s}^2 + (\eta^2 - C) \|U\|_{r,s}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using Corollary 3.4 (i), we get

$$\|[\mathbf{R}, \lambda(D_x)^s \lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r]U\|_{0,0}^2 = \|\mathbf{p}^2(t, X, D_t, D_x)U\|_{0,0}^2$$

where $\mathbf{p}^2(t, x, \tau, \xi)\lambda(\xi)^{-s+\delta_1-m} \lambda_1(\tau, \xi)^{-r} \in B(R^{2(n+1)})$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{So, } & \|[\mathbf{R}, \lambda(D_x)^s \lambda_1(D_t, D_x)^r]U\|_{0,0}^2 \leq C \|U\|_{r,s+m-\delta_1}^2 \\ & \leq \varepsilon_0 \|U\|_{r,s+m}^2 + C_{\varepsilon_0} \|U\|_{r,s}^2 \leq \varepsilon_0 \|U\|_{r+m,s}^2 + C_{\varepsilon_0} \|U\|_{r,s}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for any $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. Thus, we obtain,

$$\|(\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I})U\|_{r,s}^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} C - 2\varepsilon_0\right) \|U\|_{r+m,s}^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2} \eta^2 - C - C_{\varepsilon_0}\right) \|U\|_{r,s}^2.$$

Taking ε_0 sufficiently small and η_0 such that $\frac{1}{2}\eta_0^2 - C - C_{\varepsilon_0} = 0$, we have (6.3) for any $U \in \{S(R^{n+1})\}^k$. Hence we have the theorem. Q.E.D.

Let R^* be the formal adjoint operator of R , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} R^* &= -\partial/\partial t - \{H \cdot \lambda(D_x)^m\}^* - J^* \\ &= -\partial/\partial t - H^* \cdot \lambda(D_x)^m - J_1 \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma(J_1) = J_1(t, x, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m-\delta_1}$ and $\sigma(H^*) = H(t, x, \xi)^* = \overline{{}^t H(t, x, \xi)}$.

In fact, by Corollary 3.2 (ii) and Corollary 3.4 (ii), we have that

$$\sigma(\{H \cdot \lambda(D_x)^m\}^*) - H(t, x, \xi)^* \lambda(\xi)^m \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m-\delta_1}$$

and $\sigma(J^*) = J^*(t, X, \xi) \in S_{0,\lambda}^{m-\delta_1}$.

Hence we can write,

$$R^* = -\partial/\partial t - H^* \cdot \lambda(D_x)^m - J_1.$$

Using the same way as the proof of Theorem 6.2 and Theorem 6.3, we have that for any real r and s , there exist constant η_0 and c_0 such that for any $\eta > \eta_0$ it holds that

$$(6.4) \quad c_0 \|U\|_{r+m,s} \leq \|(\mathbf{R}^* + \eta \mathbf{I})U\|_{r,s} \leq C_\eta \|U\|_{r+m,s} \text{ for any } U \in \{H_{r+m,s}\}^k.$$

Using (6.3) and (6.4), we have,

Corollary 6.4. *For any real numbers r and s , there exists positive constant η_0 such that for any $\eta > \eta_0$, $\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I}$ is a topological isomorphism of $\{H_{r,s}\}^k$ onto $\{H_{r-m,s}\}^k$ (See Theorem 2 in [8]).*

Using Theorem 5.8 and Corollary 6.4, we have

Theorem 6.5. *For any real numbers r, s and a , there exists η_0 such that for any $\eta > \eta_0$, $\mathbf{R} + \eta \mathbf{I}$ is an isomorphism of $\{H_{0,r,s}(\overline{\Omega}_{a,\infty})\}^k$ onto $\{H_{0,r-m,s}(\overline{\Omega}_{a,\infty})\}^k$.*

Theorem 6.6. *Let real numbers r, s, a and b satisfy $r > \frac{m}{2}$ and $-\infty < a < b < \infty$. Then the mapping $U \rightsquigarrow \langle \mathbf{R}U, \gamma_a U \rangle$ is a topological isomorphism of $\{H_{r,s}(\Omega_{a,b})\}^k$ onto $\{H_{r-m,s}(\Omega_{a,b})\}^k \oplus \{H_{r+s-m/2}\}^k$.*

This theorem can be shown by using Lemma, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and Theorem 6.5 (See [8] and [13]).

7. Cauchy problem for operator L

Let real numbers r, s, a and b satisfy $r > (k-1/2)m$ and $-\infty < a < b < +\infty$, and let $\Omega = \Omega_{a,b}$.

Then we have the following main theorems.

Theorem 7.1. *The mapping $u \rightsquigarrow \langle Lu, \gamma_a u, \gamma_a \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u, \dots, \gamma_a \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right)^{k-1} u \rangle$*

is a one to one mapping from $H_{r,s}(\Omega)$ into $H_{r-mk,s}(\Omega) \oplus H_{r+s-m/2} \oplus H_{r+s-3m/2} \oplus \dots \oplus H_{r+s-(k-1/2)m}$.

Proof. We can see that

$$(7.1) \quad \sum_{i,j} \int_a^b (N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^\rho U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^\rho U) dt \\ \geq C \int_a^b \sum_{i,j} \|\zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^\rho U\|_\rho^2 dt = C \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_\rho^2 dt.$$

By Theorem 5.8 and (7.1), it holds that for any $\eta > 0$,

$$c_1 \|U(b)\|_\rho^2 - c_2 \|U(a)\|_\rho^2 + \mu_1 \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{\rho+m/2}^2 dt \\ + c(\eta - \mu_2) \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_\rho^2 dt \\ \leq \sum_{i,j} \operatorname{Re} \int_a^b (N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^\rho \cdot (R + \eta I)U, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^\rho U) dt$$

for any $U \in \{H_{r-m(k-1),s}(\Omega)\}^k$, where $\rho = r + s - (k - 1/2)m$.

Since $-\infty < a < b < +\infty$, $e^{-\eta t} U \in \{H_{r,s}(\Omega)\}^k$ for any $U \in \{H_{r,s}(\Omega)\}^k$.

For each $u \in H_{r,s}(\Omega)$, let $U = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ \vdots \\ u_k \end{pmatrix}$ where $u_j = \lambda(D_x)^{m(k-j)} D_i^{j-1} u$. Then $U \in \{H_{r-m(k-1),s}(\Omega)\}^k$ and $RU \in \{H_{r-mk,s}(\Omega)\}^k$. In the above inequality, replacing U by $e^{-\eta t} U$ and putting $Lu = f \in H_{r-mk,s}(\Omega)$, we have

$$(7.2) \quad c_1 e^{-\eta b} \|U(b)\|_\rho^2 - c_2 e^{-\eta a} \|U(a)\|_\rho^2 \\ + \mu_1 e^{-\eta b} \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{\rho+m/2}^2 dt + c(\eta - \mu_2) e^{-\eta b} \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_\rho^2 dt \\ \leq \sum_{i,j} \operatorname{Re} \int_a^b e^{-2\eta t} (N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^\rho \{i Lu\} e_k, N_{ij}^{-1} \zeta_i \Phi_j \lambda(D_x)^\rho U) dt$$

for $\eta > \mu_2$. Assume that $Lu = f = 0$. Then,

$$c_1 e^{-\eta b} \|U(b)\|_\rho^2 - c_2 e^{-\eta a} \|U(a)\|_\rho^2 \\ + \mu_1 e^{-\eta b} \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{\rho+m/2}^2 dt + c(\eta - \mu_2) e^{-\eta b} \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_\rho^2 dt \\ \leq 0.$$

If $\gamma_a u = 0, \gamma_a \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u = 0, \dots, \gamma_a \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right)^{k-1} u = 0$, we can see that $U(a) = 0$.

Thus we have

$$c_1 e^{-\eta b} \|U(b)\|_\rho^2 + \mu_1 e^{-\eta b} \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_{\rho+m/2}^2 dt \\ + c(\eta - \mu_2) e^{-\eta b} \int_a^b \|U(t)\|_\rho^2 dt \leq 0.$$

This inequality means $U = 0$ and therefore $u = 0$.

Q.E.D.

Theorem 7.2. Under the same assumptions as Theorem 7.1, the mapping

$u \rightsquigarrow \langle Lu, \gamma_a u, \gamma_a \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u, \dots, \gamma_a \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right)^{k-1} u \rangle$ is a topological isomorphism from $H_{r,s}(\Omega)$ onto $H_{r-mk,s}(\Omega) \oplus H_{r+s-m/2} \oplus H_{r+s-3m/2} \oplus \dots \oplus H_{r+s-(k-1/2)m}$.

Proof. We denote $\mathcal{L}u = \langle Lu, \gamma_a u, \gamma_a \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u, \dots, \gamma_a \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right)^{k-1} u \rangle$. By Theorem 7.1, the operator \mathcal{L} is a one to one mapping from $H_{r,s}(\Omega)$ to $H_{r-mk,s}(\Omega) \oplus H_{r+s-m/2} \oplus \dots \oplus H_{r+s-(k-1/2)m}$.

So we have only to show that \mathcal{L} is an onto mapping, due to the open mapping theorem. But the fact that \mathcal{L} is onto can be shown by the same way as the proof of Theorem 8 in [3]. In this case we use the argument on Theorem 4.16 in [13], in place of Theorem 9 of [8]. Q.E.D.

YAMAGUCHI UNIVERSITY

References

- [1] A. Calderón and R. Vaillancourt: *On the boundedness of pseudo-differential operators*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **23** (1971), 374–378.
- [2] A. Calderón and R. Vaillancourt: *A class of bounded pseudo-differential operators*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **69** (1972), 1185–1187.
- [3] D. Ellis: *An energy inequality for higher order linear parabolic operators and its applications*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **165** (1972), 167–206.
- [4] D. Ellis: *Pseudo-differential estimates for linear parabolic operators*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **184** (1973), 355–371.
- [5] K. O. Friedrichs: *Pseudo-differential Operators*, Lecture note, Courant Inst. Math. Sci. New York Univ., 1968.
- [6] L. Hörmander: *Linear Partial Differential Operators*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1964.
- [7] L. Hörmander: *Pseudo-differential operators and hypoelliptic equations*, Singular Integrals, Proc. Symposia in Pure Math. **10** (1968), 138–183.
- [8] S. Kaplan: *An analogue of Gårding's inequality for parabolic operators and its applications*, J. Math. Mech. **19** (1969), 171–188.
- [9] H. Kumano-go: *Pseudo-differential operators and the uniqueness of the Cauchy problem*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **22** (1969), 73–129.
- [10] H. Kumano-go: *Algebras of pseudo-differential operators*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo **17** (1970), 31–50.
- [11] H. Kumano-go: *Pseudo-differential operators and its applications*, Funkcial. Ekvac. (1970), (In Japanese).
- [12] M. Nagase: *A sharp form of Gårding's inequality for a class of pseudo-differential operators*, Proc. Japan Acad. **47** (1971), 815–820.
- [13] M. Nagase: *On the algebra of a class of pseudo-differential operators and the Cauchy problem for parabolic pseudo-differential equations*, Math. Japon. **17** (1972), 147–172.