

Metodi Matematici della Meccanica Quantistica

Solutions for Assignment 1

Discussed on **Friday, October 6, 2023**.

In case of questions, contact sascha.lill@unimi.it.

Problem 1: Banach Spaces and Bounded Operators (2+2+3+3 points)

a. We have to verify the three axioms of a norm:

- *Homogeneity*: $\|\lambda[f]\|_p = (\int |\lambda f(x)|^p dx)^{1/p} = (|\lambda|^p \int |f(x)|^p dx)^{1/p} = |\lambda| (\int |f(x)|^p dx)^{1/p} = \lambda \|f\|_p$
- *Positive definiteness*: Since $|f(x)| \geq 0$, we also have $\int |f(x)|^p dx \geq 0$ and thus $\|f\|_p \geq 0$. The case $\|f\|_p = 0$ only occurs if¹

$$\int |f(x)|^p dx = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad |f(x)|^p = 0 \text{ a.e.} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad f(x) = 0 \text{ a.e.} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad [f] = 0$$

- *Triangle inequality*: This proof is a bit more tricky. It uses Hölder's inequality

$$\|[fg]\|_1 \leq \|f\|_p \|g\|_q, \tag{1}$$

which holds for any $[f] \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $[g] \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where $1 = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} \Leftrightarrow \frac{p}{q} = p - 1$ and $[fg](x) := f(x)g(x)$ (a.e.) is the pointwise product.

What we have to show is $\|[f] + [g]\|_p \leq \|f\|_p + \|g\|_p$. For $p > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|[f] + [g]\|_p^p &= \int |f(x) + g(x)|^p dx = \int |f(x) + g(x)| |f(x) + g(x)|^{p-1} dx \\ &\leq \int |f(x)| |f(x) + g(x)|^{p-1} dx + \int |g(x)| |f(x) + g(x)|^{p-1} dx \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \left(\int |f(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \left(\int |f(x) + g(x)|^{q(p-1)} dx \right)^{1/q} \\ &\quad + \left(\int |g(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \left(\int |f(x) + g(x)|^{q(p-1)} dx \right)^{1/q} \\ &= \|f\|_p \|f + g\|_p^{p/q} + \|g\|_p \|f + g\|_p^{p/q} \\ &= \left(\|f\|_p + \|g\|_p \right) \|f + g\|_p^{p/q}. \end{aligned}$$

¹Recall that "a.e." is the abbreviation for "almost everywhere", meaning "for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathcal{N}$ where \mathcal{N} is some set of Lebesgue measure zero". Also recall that if a function f is zero almost everywhere, then $[f] = [0] = 0$, i.e., it is in the same equivalence class as the zero function and this equivalence class is the zero element of the vector space $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

We conclude, using $p/q = p - 1$,

$$\|[f] + [g]\|_p^{p-p/q} \leq \|[f]\|_p + \|[g]\|_p \Leftrightarrow \|[f] + [g]\|_p \leq \|[f]\|_p + \|[g]\|_p,$$

which is what we wanted to show. In case $p = 1$, we simply have

$$\|[f] + [g]\|_1 = \int |f(x) + g(x)| dx \leq \int |f(x)| dx + \int |g(x)| dx = \|[f]\|_1 + \|[g]\|_1.$$

□

- b.** \tilde{X} being a Banach space means that every Cauchy sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \tilde{X}$ must converge to a limit $x \in \tilde{X}$.

Now, any Cauchy sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \tilde{X}$ is also a Cauchy sequence in $X \supset \tilde{X}$. Since X is a Banach space, this Cauchy sequence indeed has a limit $x \in X$. And since \tilde{X} is closed, this limit x must be an element of \tilde{X} , which establishes the proof. □

- c.** Suppose, $(A_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ is a Cauchy sequence, i.e., $\forall \varepsilon \exists N : \forall n, m \geq N : \|A_n - A_m\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)} < \varepsilon$. Our goal is to construct a limit operator $A \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ such that $A_n \rightarrow A$ in $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$. To do so, let us consider any $x \in X$. For $n, m \geq N$, we have

$$\|A_n x - A_m x\|_Y = \|(A_n - A_m)x\|_Y \leq \|A_n - A_m\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)} \|x\|_X \leq \varepsilon \|x\|_X,$$

which becomes arbitrarily small as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. So $(A_n x)_{n=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence in Y . Since Y is a Banach space, there exists a limit $A_n x \rightarrow y_x \in Y$. We now define the operator $A : X \rightarrow Y$ via $Ax := y_x$ for any $x \in X$ and claim that it is the desired limit of $(A_n)_{n=1}^\infty$.

First, A is bounded, so $A \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$, since for any $x \in X$,

$$\|Ax\|_Y = \left\| \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n x \right\|_Y \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A_n x\|_Y \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A_n\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)} \|x\|_X.$$

So $\|A\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A_n\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)}$ and the latter is bounded as $(A_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence.

Second, $(A_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ indeed converges to A , as for $n > N$,

$$\|(A - A_n)x\|_Y \leq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|(A_m - A_n)x\|_Y \leq \varepsilon \|x\|_X.$$

So $\|A - A_n\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)} \leq \varepsilon$, which can be achieved for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Thus, $A_n \rightarrow A$ in $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ and the latter space is closed and therefore a Banach space. □

- d.** Our goal is to extend A to any $x \in X \setminus D$. Since $D \subset X$ is dense, there exists a sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset D$ with $x_n \rightarrow x$. As $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converges, it is in particular a Cauchy sequence. Since (with $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)}$)

$$\|Ax_n - Ax_m\|_Y \leq \|A\| \|x_n - x_m\|_X,$$

the sequence $(Ax_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset Y$ is also a Cauchy sequence. And as Y is a Banach space, there exists a limit $Ax_n \rightarrow y_x \in Y$. We now define the extension $\bar{A} : X \rightarrow Y$ as

$$\bar{A}x := \begin{cases} Ax & \text{if } x \in D \\ y_x & \text{if } x \in X \setminus D \end{cases} .$$

It remains to prove that $\|\bar{A}\| = \|A\|$. First,

$$\|\bar{A}\| = \sup_{x \in X \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|\bar{A}x\|}{\|x\|} \geq \sup_{x \in D \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|Ax\|}{\|x\|} = \|A\| .$$

On the other hand, for $x \in X \setminus D$, we have

$$\|\bar{A}x\|_Y = \|\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ax_n\|_Y = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Ax_n\|_Y \leq \|A\| \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n\|_X = \|A\| \|x\|_X .$$

So $\|\bar{A}\| \leq \|A\|$, which finishes the proof. \square

Problem 2: Derivative Operator (5+5 points)

- a. To show that $2\pi i\mathbb{Z} \subset \sigma_p(A_3)$, we construct an explicit eigenfunction for every eigenvalue $\lambda_p := 2\pi ip, p \in \mathbb{Z}$. In fact, for $f_p(x) := e^{2\pi ipx}$, we have $f_p(0) = 1 = f_p(1)$ so $f_p \in D_3$, and

$$(A_3 f_p)(x) = f'_p(x) = 2\pi i p e^{2\pi ipx} = \lambda_p f_p(x) . \quad (2)$$

So f_p is indeed an eigenfunction for λ_p .

We may now finish the proof by showing that $z \in \rho(A_3)$ for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus 2\pi i\mathbb{Z}$, since then $2\pi i\mathbb{Z} \supset \sigma(A_3) \supset \sigma_p(A_3)$. To do so, we construct the resolvent $(A_3 - z)^{-1}$ explicitly: It is defined on $g \in C([0, 1])$ whenever there exists an $f \in D_3$, $f =: (A_3 - z)^{-1}g$ with

$$(A_3 - z)f = g \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad f'(x) - zf(x) = g(x) \quad \forall x \in [0, 1] . \quad (3)$$

This is an ODE, whose most general solution, e.g., obtained by the method of Green's functions (also called "variation of the constant" or "Duhamel's formula"), reads

$$f(x) = \int_0^x e^{z(x-t)} g(t) dt + f_0 e^{zx} =: (Sg)(x) , \quad (4)$$

with an arbitrary $f_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. Indeed, one can check that

$$f'(x) = \int_0^x z e^{z(x-t)} g(t) dt + (e^{z(x-x)} g(x)) + z f_0 e^{zx} = z f(x) + g(x) , \quad (5)$$

so $f'(x) = z f(x) + g(x)$ is continuous, whence $f \in C([0, 1])$. Further, we can attain

$$f(0) = f(1) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad f_0 = \int_0^1 e^{z(1-t)} g(t) dt + f_0 e^z$$

by choosing $f_0 := (1 - e^z)^{-1} \int_0^1 e^{z(1-t)} g(t) dt$. Note that $(1 - e^z)^{-1}$ only exists because $z \notin 2\pi i\mathbb{Z}$ (otherwise, the resolvent would be ill-defined). With this choice of f_0 we indeed have $f \in D_3$ and f satisfies (3), which is $(A_3 - z)Sg = g$. The operator S is also bounded, as

$$\begin{aligned} |(Sg)(x)| &\leq \int_0^1 |e^z| \max_{t \in [0,1]} |g(t)| dt \leq |e^z| \|g\|_{C([0,1])} , \\ |(Sg)'(x)| &= |z(Sg)(x) + g(x)| \leq (|z||e^z| + 1) \|g\|_{C([0,1])} . \end{aligned}$$

Further, integration by parts yields

$$S(A_3 - z)f = \int_0^x e^{z(x-t)} (f'(t) - zf(t)) dt = [e^{z(x-t)} f(t)]_{t=0}^x = f(x) .$$

So S is indeed the desired resolvent $(A_3 - z)^{-1}$. □

- b.** First we show $\sigma_p(A_4) = \emptyset$, that is, there are no eigenfunctions. Suppose that $f \in D_4$ was an eigenfunction of some eigenvalue $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Then, f solves the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} f'(x) &= \lambda f(x) & \text{for } x \in [0, 1] \\ f(0) &= 0 \end{cases} ,$$

which, by the Picard-Lindelöf theorem, has the unique solution $f(0) = 0$. So f is the zero function, which can never be an eigenfunction.

To prove $\sigma(A_4) = \mathbb{C}$, we show that for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$, there is no bounded resolvent $(A_4 - z)^{-1}$. In analogy to (3), such a resolvent would only exist if for any $g \in C([0, 1])$, there is some $f \in D_4$ with $f' - zf = g$. Recall (4) that the most general solution to this ODE reads

$$f(x) = \int_0^x e^{z(x-t)} g(t) dt + f_0 e^{zx} .$$

Now $f \in D_4$ entails the two conditions $f(0) = 0 \Rightarrow f_0 = 0$ and

$$f(1) = \int_0^1 e^{z(1-t)} g(t) dt = 0 .$$

It is easy to see that the latter condition is violated for some $g \in C([0, 1])$, for instance, say

$$g(t) := e^{-z(1-t)} \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(1) = \int_0^1 1 dt = 1 \neq 0 .$$

So a resolvent can for no $z \in \mathbb{C}$ be defined on every $g \in C([0, 1])$. □

Problem 3: Operator-valued analytic functions (10 points)

The assumption that $L : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(X)$ is an operator-valued analytic function means that for any $y \in X^*, x \in X$, the function $f_{y,x} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, f_{y,x}(z) := \langle y, L(z)x \rangle$ is analytic. By $\|L(z)\| \leq M$ (which holds uniformly in $z \in \mathbb{C}$) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we conclude

$$|f_{y,x}(z)| = |\langle y, L(z)x \rangle| \leq \|y\|_{X^*} \|L(z)x\|_X \leq M \|y\|_{X^*} \|x\|_X, \quad (6)$$

so $f_{y,x}$ is bounded. Thus, Liouville's theorem applies and $f_{y,x}$ is constant for any fixed $y \in X^*, x \in X$.

From this we now conclude that $L(z)$ is constant, that is, $L(z)x = L(z')x$ for any $z, z' \in \mathbb{C}$ and $x \in X$: We know that for any $y \in X^*$,

$$f_{y,x}(z) = f_{y,x}(z') \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \langle y, (L(z)x - L(z')x) \rangle = 0,$$

so $L(z)x - L(z')x = 0$. □