

Last time: • For bounded operators $H: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, we have:

$$H \text{ symmetric} \Leftrightarrow H \text{ self-adjoint} \Leftrightarrow H \text{ generator of } U(t) = e^{-iHt}$$

We already saw earlier that there are unbounded operators $A: \mathcal{D}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ with dense domain $\mathcal{D}(A)$ that satisfy $\langle \varphi, A\psi \rangle = \langle A\varphi, \psi \rangle \forall \varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ (i.e., that are symmetric), but that cannot be generators. (The example was $-i\frac{d}{dx}: \mathcal{D}_{\min} \rightarrow L^2([0,1])$.)

Note: The term "unbounded operator" is usually used for a not necessarily bounded operator defined on some domain. More precisely:

Definition 3.49:

- a) An unbounded operator is a pair $(T, \mathcal{D}(T))$ of a subspace $\mathcal{D}(T) \subset \mathcal{H}$ (the domain of T) and a linear operator $T: \mathcal{D}(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. If $\mathcal{D}(T)$ is dense in \mathcal{H} (i.e., $\overline{\mathcal{D}(T)} = \mathcal{H}$), then T is called densely defined.
the closure of $\mathcal{D}(T)$, i.e., $\mathcal{D}(T)$ and all limit points
- b) $(S, \mathcal{D}(S))$ is called an extension of $(T, \mathcal{D}(T))$ if $\mathcal{D}(S) \supset \mathcal{D}(T)$ and $S|_{\mathcal{D}(T)} = T$. This is denoted $S \supset T$.
- c) $(T, \mathcal{D}(T))$ is called symmetric if $\langle \varphi, T\psi \rangle = \langle T\varphi, \psi \rangle \forall \varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{D}(T)$.

E.g., $(H_1, \mathcal{D}(H_1)) = (-\frac{\Delta}{2}, H^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is a symmetric densely defined unbounded operator.

$(H_0, \mathcal{D}(H_0)) = (-\frac{\Delta}{2}, C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ also, and $H_1 \supset H_0$ (H_1 extends H_0).

Now, recall the example of $-i\frac{d}{dx}$ on $[0,1]$. We need to choose $-i\frac{d}{dx}$ symmetric, but the domain must not be too small: e.g., the Schrödinger evolution leads initial conditions in \mathcal{D}_{min} out of \mathcal{D}_{min} (\mathcal{D}_{min} was not invariant under any T_0). So where exactly do they go?

Consider more generally some symmetric $(H_0, \mathcal{D}(H_0))$ and a symmetric extension $(H_1, \mathcal{D}(H_1))$.

Suppose the solution to $i\frac{d}{dt}\psi(t) = H_1\psi(t)$ for initial data $\psi(0) \in \mathcal{D}(H_0)$ stays in $\mathcal{D}(H_1)$, at least for some small time, but not necessarily in $\mathcal{D}(H_0)$. For $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(H_0)$ we have

$\langle H_1\psi(t), \varphi \rangle = \langle \psi(t), H_1\varphi \rangle = \langle \psi(t), H_0\varphi \rangle$. So this expression still makes sense even if

$\psi(t) \notin \mathcal{D}(H_0)$. Naturally we would use this expression to define the adjoint.

So our idea is that " e^{-iHt} " makes $\psi(0) \in \mathcal{D}(H_0)$ evolve into the domain of the (to be properly defined) adjoint. If the domain of the adjoint is the same as the domain of the operator the Schrödinger evolution leaves the domain invariant and all is good.

Therefore we define:

Definition 3.53:

Let $(T, \mathcal{D}(T))$ be a densely defined linear operator on \mathcal{H} . Then we define

always some Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{D}(T^*) := \{ \psi \in \mathcal{H} : \exists \eta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ s.t. } \langle \psi, T\varphi \rangle = \langle \eta, \varphi \rangle \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(T) \}.$$

Since $\mathcal{D}(T)$ is dense, η is determined uniquely and we define the **adjoint operator** as

$$T^*: \mathcal{D}(T^*) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}, \psi \mapsto T^*\psi = \eta \quad (\eta \text{ as in the def. of } \mathcal{D}(T^*)).$$

Note: • For bounded operator, this definition coincides with the adjoint as previously defined.

• Due to Riesz, the def. of $\mathcal{D}(T^*)$ is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{D}(T^*) = \{ \psi \in \mathcal{H} : \varphi \mapsto \langle \psi, T\varphi \rangle \text{ is continuous on } \mathcal{D}(T) \}.$$

• By this def., $(T^*, \mathcal{D}(T^*))$ is linear (but not necessarily densely defined) and of course $\langle \psi, T\varphi \rangle = \langle T^*\psi, \varphi \rangle \forall \psi \in \mathcal{D}(T^*), \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(T)$.

Definition 3.56:

Let $(T, \mathcal{D}(T))$ be a densely defined linear operator on \mathcal{H} . $(T, \mathcal{D}(T))$ is called **self-adjoint** if

$$\mathcal{D}(T^*) = \mathcal{D}(T) \text{ and } T^* = T \text{ on } \mathcal{D}(T).$$

Let us exemplify the definitions with $-i \frac{d}{dx}$ on $[0,1]$ again.

↳ First, consider $(D_{\min}, \mathcal{D}(D_{\min}))$, $D_{\min} = -i \frac{d}{dx}$, with $\mathcal{D}(D_{\min}) = \{\varphi \in H^1[0,1] : \varphi(0) = 0 = \varphi(1)\}$

Then $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\min})$:

$$\langle \varphi, D_{\min} \varphi \rangle = \int_0^1 \overline{\varphi(x)} \left(-i \frac{d}{dx} \varphi(x)\right) dx \stackrel{\substack{\text{integration by parts, boundary} \\ \text{terms vanish on } \mathcal{D}(D_{\min})}}{\downarrow} = \int_0^1 \overline{\left(-i \frac{d}{dx} \varphi(x)\right)} \varphi(x) dx = \underbrace{\langle -i \frac{d}{dx} \varphi, \varphi \rangle}_{=\gamma},$$

which works for all $\frac{d\varphi(x)}{dx} \in L^2$, i.e., $\varphi \in H^1([0,1])$.

So $\mathcal{D}(D_{\min}^*) = H^1([0,1]) \neq \mathcal{D}(D_{\min})$, and $(D_{\min}, \mathcal{D}(D_{\min}))$ is not self-adjoint.

↳ For $D_{\theta} = -i \frac{d}{dx}$ with $\mathcal{D}(D_{\theta}) = \{\varphi \in H^1([0,1]) : e^{i\theta} \varphi(1) = \varphi(0)\}$ we find $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(D_{\theta})$:

$$\langle \varphi, D_{\theta} \varphi \rangle = i(\overline{\varphi(0)} \varphi(0) - \overline{\varphi(1)} \varphi(1)) + \underbrace{\langle -i \frac{d}{dx} \varphi, \varphi \rangle}_{=\gamma}, \text{ so in order to get}$$

$\langle \varphi, D_{\theta} \varphi \rangle = \langle \gamma, \varphi \rangle$ we need $\varphi \in H^1([0,1])$ and $\overline{\varphi(0)} \varphi(0) = \overline{\varphi(1)} \varphi(1) \Leftrightarrow$

$$\frac{\overline{\varphi(0)}}{\varphi(1)} = \frac{\varphi(1)}{\varphi(0)} = e^{-i\theta} \text{ (by def.)}, \text{ i.e., } \varphi(0) = e^{i\theta} \varphi(1).$$

So $\mathcal{D}(D_{\theta}^*) = \mathcal{D}(D_{\theta})$ and $D_{\theta}^* = D_{\theta}$, so D_{θ} is self-adjoint.

A big result is that indeed the following holds:

Theorem 3.58: A densely defined operator $(H, \mathcal{D}(H))$ is generator of a strongly continuous unitary group $U(t)$ if and only if it is self-adjoint.

" \Leftarrow " follows from the spectral theorem; " \Rightarrow " is Stone's theorem

We skip the proofs here.

Finally, let us state Kato-Rellich. The idea is that we often consider operators $H = H_0 + V$, where we know that H_0 is self-adjoint with domain $\mathcal{D}(H_0)$ and we want to know whether also H is self-adjoint. Often the V 's are such that they do not disturb $\mathcal{D}(H_0)$ too much, i.e., they do not introduce new boundary points.

Definition: Let A, B be densely defined linear operators with $\mathcal{D}(A) \subset \mathcal{D}(B)$ and such that there are $a, b \geq 0$ s.t.

$$\|B\varphi\| \leq a \|A\varphi\| + b \|\varphi\| \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(A).$$

Then B is called relatively bounded by A (or A -bounded), and the infimum over all permissible a is called the relative bound.

If the relative bound = 0, B is called infinitesimally A -bounded.

Finally:

Theorem (Kato-Rellich): Let A be self-adjoint, B symmetric and A -bounded with relative bound $a < 1$. Then $A+B$ is self-adjoint on $\mathcal{D}(A+B) = \mathcal{D}(A)$.

Another approach to proving existence of self-adjoint extensions is via the Friedrichs extension. The advantage of this approach is that it is very easy to apply in practice. The disadvantage is that it only gives existence of a self-adjoint extension, and it does not provide information on its domain, nor uniqueness.

It uses the following definition:

Definition 3.114: An operator H is called **semibounded** if there is a $c \in \mathbb{R}$ s.t. for all $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(H)$, $\langle \psi, H\psi \rangle \geq c \|\psi\|^2$ (from below) or $\langle \psi, H\psi \rangle \leq c \|\psi\|^2$ (from above).

Then we have:

Theorem 3.115 (Friedrichs extension):

Any densely defined semibounded operator H has a self-adjoint extension, which satisfies the same upper/lower bound.

We skip the proof.

E.g., for $-\Delta$ on $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open, we find $\langle \varphi, (-\Delta)\varphi \rangle = \|\nabla \varphi\|^2 \geq 0 \cdot \|\varphi\|^2$,

so $(-\Delta, C_0^\infty(\Omega))$ has a self-adjoint extension. Same for $-\Delta + V$ with $V \geq 0$.

One can actually define one particular self-adjoint extension uniquely via quadratic forms.

This is then called the Friedrichs extension.

(E.g., for $H = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ on $C_0^\infty(0,1)$, the Friedrichs extension is the Dirichlet Laplacian. But there are other extensions with other boundary conditions, e.g., Neumann.)