

Two-parameter Asymptotics in Magnetic Weyl Calculus

Max Lein

October 7, 2022

Technische Universität München, Zentrum Mathematik, Boltzmannstraße 3, 85747 Garching, Germany
e-mail: lein@ma.tum.de

Abstract

This paper is concerned with small parameter asymptotics of magnetic quantum systems. In addition to a semiclassical parameter ε , the case of small coupling λ to the magnetic vector potential naturally occurs in this context. Magnetic Weyl calculus is adapted to incorporate both parameters, at least one of which needs to be small. Of particular interest is the expansion of the Weyl product which can be used to expand the product of operators in a small parameter, a technique which is prominent to obtain perturbation expansions. Three asymptotic expansions for the magnetic Weyl product of two Hörmander class symbols are proven: (i) $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $\lambda \ll 1$, (ii) $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $\lambda = 1$ as well as (iii) $\varepsilon = 1$ and $\lambda \ll 1$. Expansions (i) and (iii) are impossible to obtain with ordinary Weyl calculus. Furthermore, I relate results derived by ordinary Weyl calculus with those obtained with magnetic Weyl calculus by one- and two-parameter expansions. To show the power and versatility of magnetic Weyl calculus, I derive the semirelativistic Pauli equation as a scaling limit from the Dirac equation up to errors of 4th order in $1/c$.

Keywords and phrases: Magnetic field, quantization, pseudodifferential operator, Weyl calculus, Weyl product, asymptotic expansion, gauge invariance, small parameters, Dirac equation.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35S05, 47A60, 81Q05, 81Q10, 81Q15

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Main results	5
1.2	Extension to operator-valued symbols	9
1.3	Structure	9
1.4	Acknowledgements	9
2	Asymptotic expansion in λ and ε	9
2.1	Semiclassical symbols and precision	10
2.2	Magnetic Wigner transform	11
2.3	Equivalence of formulas for magnetic Weyl product	12
2.4	Asymptotic expansion of the product	14
2.5	Relation between magnetic and ordinary Weyl calculus	21

3 Application to the Dirac equation	24
3.1 Asymptotic expansion of \sharp_c^B	25
3.2 Semirelativistic limit as adiabatic limit	26
3.3 Effective hamiltonian	28
A Equivalence of Weyl systems in both scalings	30
B Formal expansion of the twister	32
C Properties of derivatives of γ_ε^B	34
D Existence of oscillatory integrals	34
E Details of calculations in example	40

1 Introduction

Quantum mechanical systems often contain small parameters that allow us to order terms by magnitude and importance. One prominent example are adiabatic systems where the fast degrees adjust ‘instantaneously’ to the configuration of the slow degrees of freedom. Here, the small parameter quantifies the separation of slow and fast scales. Under certain conditions, effective dynamics may be derived which contain corrections order-by-order in the small parameter and one can bound the error. This effective hamiltonian may be the starting point for a semiclassical analysis: so-called Egorov-type theorems compare the quantization of suitable classically evolved observables with the corresponding time-evolved quantum observables.

A quantization procedure is a systematic way to associate operators to functions on symplectic manifolds that has certain natural properties (e. g. linearity and compatibility with the involution, see [Wal08] for an overview). Mathematically speaking, we are interested in a functional calculus for non-commuting observables called position x and momentum ξ on phase space $T^*\mathbb{R}^d \cong \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ endowed with the *magnetic* symplectic form. This is by no means the only interesting case, other examples are spin systems [VGB89, VGBS90] or quantization procedures on generic Poisson manifolds [Kon03, Wal08]. Before we explain magnetic quantization in detail, we will briefly recall the non-magnetic case.

Usual Weyl quantization $\text{Op}_\varepsilon : f \mapsto \text{Op}_\varepsilon(f)$ maps suitable functions f on phase space $T^*\mathbb{R}^d$ onto linear operators acting on (subspaces of) $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (see [Hör79, Fol89], for example). The index ε indicates that the commutator of $\text{Op}_\varepsilon(\xi)$ and $\text{Op}_\varepsilon(x)$ is of order ε , $i[\text{Op}_\varepsilon(\xi_l), \text{Op}_\varepsilon(x_j)] = \varepsilon\delta_{lj}$. With this quantization procedure in hand, it turns out we can *define* a *non-commutative* product \star_ε on phase space which emulates the operator product.

$$\text{Op}_\varepsilon(f)\text{Op}_\varepsilon(g) = \text{Op}_\varepsilon(f \star_\varepsilon g)$$

If $\varepsilon \ll 1$, we can expand the Weyl product asymptotically in powers of ε which allows us to rewrite the operator product as an asymptotic series in ε as well [Fol89]. This idea has been used to derive corrections to perturbed operators, see, for instance, [LW93, PST03b, PST03a, Teu03]. Hence, from a computational point of view, an asymptotic expansion in a small parameter is a very desirable thing to have.

On the other hand, very often, the magnetic field is the perturbation of the hamiltonian and usual (i. e. non-magnetic) Weyl calculus is not well-adapted to this situation.

Let us introduce some notation first: assume we apply a magnetic field B with components that are smooth, bounded and have bounded derivatives to all orders, namely $B_{lj} \in \mathcal{BC}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $1 \leq l, j \leq d$. Then we will consider the quantization which takes the position and momentum vectors x and ξ into

the operators

$$\begin{aligned} Q &:= \hat{x} \\ P_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A &:= -i\varepsilon \nabla_x - \lambda A(Q) \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

A is a vector potential which represents B , i. e. $B_{lj} = \partial_{x_l} A_j - \partial_{x_j} A_l$, $1 \leq l, j \leq d$, whose components will always be chosen as smooth and polynomially bounded, $A_l \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $1 \leq l \leq d$. The first parameter ε formally takes the role of \hbar and quantifies the non-commutativity of position and momentum. There are many systems (e. g. Born-Oppenheimer-type systems) where ε is, physically speaking, *not* \hbar , but some other parameter that describes a separation of scales. The second parameter, λ , is often physically equal to e/c where e is the charge quantum and c the speed of light. If λ is taken to be small, this could either mean that we are interested in some non-relativistic limit, $c \gg 1$, or in the limit of small charge $e \ll 1$. (To be precise, small parameters must not have any units, so instead of $\lambda = 1/c$ we should really use $\lambda = v_0/c$ where v_0 is some characteristic velocity.)

The commutators of our basic building blocks are given by

$$i[Q_l, Q_j] = 0 \quad i[P_{\varepsilon, \lambda, j}^A, Q_l] = \varepsilon \delta_{lj} \quad i[P_{\varepsilon, \lambda, l}^A, P_{\varepsilon, \lambda, j}^A] = -\varepsilon \lambda B_{lj}(Q)$$

We note that the commutator of the kinetic momentum operator depends on the magnetic field B and *not* on the specific choice of vector potential. If we translate these commutation relations to the classical framework where x corresponds to Q and ξ to $P_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A$, we have to use the *magnetic* symplectic form

$$\omega^B = d\xi_l \wedge dx_l - B_{lj}(x) dx_l \wedge dx_j$$

on phase space $T^*\mathbb{R}^d$ which induces the *magnetic* Poisson bracket,

$$\{f, g\}_{\lambda B} = \partial_{\xi_l} f \partial_{x_l} g - \partial_{x_l} f \partial_{\xi_l} g - \lambda B_{lj}(x) \partial_{\xi_l} f \partial_{\xi_j} g.$$

Classically, this agrees with the recipe of minimal substitution: if we replace ξ with $\xi - \lambda A(x)$ and use the standard symplectic form, we recover the *magnetic* Poisson bracket.

$$\{f(x, \xi - \lambda A(x)), g(x, \xi - \lambda A(x))\} = \{f, g\}_{\lambda B}(x, \xi - \lambda A(x))$$

Quantum mechanically, these two points of view are *no longer equivalent*. Based on the *magnetic* symplectic form, Müller was the first to define covariant magnetic Weyl calculus in a non-rigorous fashion [Mül99] (M. L. thanks R. Littlejohn for this reference), although Luttinger has used it in prototype form as early as 1951 [Lut51]. The present paper relies upon earlier contributions which have put these ideas on a solid mathematical foundation [IMP07, MP04, MP05, KO01, KO04, KO05]. Some notable results include a Calderón-Vaillancourt-type theorem (L^2 continuity of $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^0$ symbols), selfadjointness of elliptic symbols on magnetic Sobolev spaces [IMP07] and a Beals-type criterion [IMP08]. One missing essential ingredient is an asymptotic expansion of the magnetic product with respect to a small parameter. This work fills this gap and, among other things, we will make Müller's expansion mathematically rigorous.

Before we continue, we would like to elaborate on possible choices of scalings. If we rescale space by ε via $(U_\varepsilon^{-1} \varphi)(x) := \varepsilon^{d/2} \varphi(\varepsilon x)$, $\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we can transform the observables (1.1) into

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\varepsilon &:= \varepsilon \hat{x} \\ \Pi_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A &:= -i \nabla_x - \lambda A(Q_\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

Mathematically, both scales are unitarily equivalent (see Appendix A). The decision which scale is deemed preferable is based on the physics of the problem. If we would like to emphasize the slow variation of the magnetic field (compared to other potentials), then the second choice is more natural. The single-particle Schrödinger equation with periodic potential V_Γ subjected to a slowly-varying electromagnetic field, a system which is described by the hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{1}{2} (-i \nabla_x - A(\varepsilon \hat{x}))^2 + V_\Gamma(\hat{x}) + \Phi(\varepsilon \hat{x}),$$

falls under this category. We emphasize that all of our results hold in *either scaling*. In particular, the asymptotic expansion of the product is the *same*, independent of the scaling (see Appendix A for details). As this paper was initially motivated by the problem above, we will use the *adiabatic* scaling given by equation (1.2).

The fundamental building block of magnetic pseudodifferential calculus is a *magnetic Weyl system* that encodes the *commutation relations* and the *gauge-covariance* of the theory,

$$W_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(X) := e^{-i\sigma(X,(Q_\varepsilon,\Pi_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A))}.$$

Here $(x, \xi) = X \in T^*\mathbb{R}^d$ is a point in phase space and $\sigma(X, Y) := \xi \cdot y - x \cdot \eta$, $Y = (y, \eta)$, is the (non-magnetic) symplectic form. In [MP04] it has been shown that this is a well-defined operator which acts on any $\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$(W_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(Y)\varphi)(x) = e^{-i\varepsilon(x+y/2)} e^{-i\lambda\Gamma_\varepsilon^A([x,x+y])} \varphi(x+y).$$

All proofs in [IMP07, MP04, MP05] carry over to the present case via a simple scaling argument ($W_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(x, \xi) = W^{\lambda/\varepsilon A(\varepsilon\cdot)}(x, \varepsilon\xi)$). The magnetic circulation Γ_ε^A is the scaled line integral along the line which connects x and y (see equation (2.1) for an explicit definition),

$$\lambda\Gamma_\varepsilon^A([x, y]) := \Gamma_\varepsilon^{\frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon}A(\varepsilon\cdot)}([x, y]) = \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon}\Gamma^A([\varepsilon x, \varepsilon y]). \quad (1.3)$$

The pseudodifferential operator associated to a Schwartz function $f \in \mathcal{S}(T^*\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined in terms of the symplectic Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}_\sigma f = \mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}f$ and the Weyl system:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(f) &:= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dX \int d\tilde{X} e^{i\sigma(X,\tilde{X})} f(\tilde{X}) W_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(X) \\ &=: \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int dX (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}f)(X) W_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(X) \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

All parameters are contained in the Weyl system $W_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(X) = e^{-i\sigma(X,(Q_\varepsilon,\Pi_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A))}$; if we had chosen the usual scaling, the formula would be the same, but Q_ε and $\Pi_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A$ would have to be replaced by Q and $P_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A$ from equation (1.1). This definition can be extended to observables of Hörmander symbol class m with weights ρ and δ [MP04, IMP07], $0 \leq \delta < \rho \leq 1$, among others:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^m := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(T^*\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \forall \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d \exists C_{\alpha\beta} \left| \partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_x^\beta f(X) \right| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle \xi \rangle^{m-|\alpha|\rho+|\beta|\delta} \right\}$$

If $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then for Hörmander-class symbols $(\text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(f)\varphi)(x)$ can be written as

$$(\text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(f)\varphi)(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int dy \int d\eta e^{-i(y-x)\cdot\eta} e^{-i\lambda\Gamma_\varepsilon^A([x,y])} f\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}(x+y), (y-z)\right) \varphi(y)$$

where the inner integral is interpreted as an oscillatory integral; by density, this extends to larger subspaces of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We refer to standard texts on that subject, e. g. [Hör72, DH73, Hör79, Hör85, Ste93]. If we choose a different gauge that gives the same magnetic field, i. e. $A'(x) = A(x) + \varepsilon\nabla_x \chi(x)$ for some $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then the magnetic Weyl quantization of f with respect to A' is related to that with respect to A by conjugating with $e^{-i\lambda\chi(Q_\varepsilon)}$, that is, magnetic quantization is *covariant*:

$$\text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^{A'}(f) = e^{+i\lambda\chi(Q_\varepsilon)} \text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(f) e^{-i\lambda\chi(Q_\varepsilon)}$$

Unless f is a polynomial of degree less or equal than 2 in momentum variables, regular Weyl quantization of minimally substituted symbols is *not gauge covariant* and does not coincide with magnetic

quantization. This includes physically relevant examples such as $\sqrt{m^2 + \xi^2}$ or band energy functions in solid state physics.

The second major component in magnetic Weyl calculus is a product $\star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B$. Its form is shaped by the commutation relations of the fundamental observables as expressed by the composition law of the Weyl system:

$$W_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(Y) W_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(Z) = e^{i \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sigma(Y, Z)} \Omega_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B(Q_\varepsilon, Q_\varepsilon + \varepsilon Y, Q_\varepsilon + \varepsilon Y + \varepsilon Z) W_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(Y + Z) \quad (1.5)$$

The magnetic contribution $\Omega_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B(x, x + \varepsilon y, x + \varepsilon y + \varepsilon z)$ depends only on the *magnetic field* (and *not* on the choice of gauge). It is the exponential of the magnetic flux through the triangle with corners x , $x + \varepsilon y$ and $x + \varepsilon y + \varepsilon z$ (see equation (2.2)),

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B(x, y, z) &:= \Omega_{\varepsilon}^{\frac{\lambda}{2} B}(x, y, z) \\ &= e^{-i \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon} \Gamma^B(x, y, z)} =: e^{-i \lambda \Gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z)}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

If $\varepsilon \ll 1$, then the components of the magnetic field remain almost constant and are approximately given by field at x . In the ‘usual scaling’ (equation (1.1)), the Weyl system would essentially obey the same composition law and lead to the *exact same* expansion of the magnetic product (see Theorem A.3 for details).

1.1 Main results

I hope to give a solid mathematical tools into the hands of mathematical physicists. One important piece that has been missing up until now is an asymptotic expansion of the magnetic Weyl product.

1.1.1 Asymptotic expansions

My main result is Theorem 1.1 which gives an asymptotic *two-parameter* expansion of the product of two Hörmander class symbols $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1}$ and $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_2}$. Furthermore, I have obtained two one-parameter expansions: for $\varepsilon \ll 1$, the expansion still has the same structure as the two-parameter expansion, i. e. the n th-order term in ε can be expressed as pointwise product of derivatives of the components of the magnetic field B_{l_j} , and of f and g . In case when ε is not necessarily small, one can expand with respect to $\lambda \ll 1$ only, although the formulas are in general less explicit.

Theorem 1.1 (Asymptotic expansion of the magnetic Moyal product) *Assume B is a magnetic field whose components are $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^\infty$ functions and $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1}$ as well as $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_2}$. Then the magnetic Moyal product can be expanded asymptotically in $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $\lambda \ll 1$: for every precision $\epsilon \ll 1$ (see Definition 2.4) we can choose $N \equiv N(\epsilon, \varepsilon, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that*

$$f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g = \sum_{n=0}^N \sum_{k=0}^n \varepsilon^n \lambda^k (f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(n, k)} + \tilde{R}_N \quad (f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(n, k)} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1 + m_2 - (n+k)(\rho - \delta)} \quad (1.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(n, k)}(X) &= \sum_{\substack{k_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n j k_j = n \\ \sum_{j=1}^n k_j = k}} \frac{i^{k+k_0}}{k_0! k_1! \cdots k_n!} \\ &\quad \cdot \mathcal{L}_0^{k_0}(\nabla_Y, \nabla_Z) \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{L}_j^{k_j}(x, -i \partial_\eta, -i \partial_\zeta) f(Y) g(Z) \Big|_{Y=X=Z} \end{aligned}$$

and the differential operators \mathcal{L}_j , $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, are given below:

$$\mathcal{L}_0(Y, Z) := \frac{1}{2}\sigma(Y, Z) = \frac{1}{2}(\eta \cdot z - y \cdot \zeta) \quad (1.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_j(x, y, z) &:= -\frac{1}{j!} \sum_{m_1, \dots, m_{j-1}=1}^d \partial_{x_{m_1}} \cdots \partial_{x_{m_{j-1}}} B_{kl}(x) y_k z_l \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{j+1} \frac{1}{(j+1)^2} \sum_{c=1}^j \binom{j+1}{c} \\ &\quad \cdot ((1 - (-1)^{j+1})^c - (1 - (-1)^c)(j+1)) y_{m_1} \cdots y_{m_{c-1}} z_{m_c} \cdots z_{m_{j-1}} \\ &=: - \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|=j-1} C_{j, \alpha, \beta} \partial_x^\alpha \partial_x^\beta B_{kl}(x) y_k z_l y^\alpha z^\beta \end{aligned} \quad (1.9)$$

We have explicit control over the remainder: \tilde{R}_N as given by equation (2.12) is numerically small (namely of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^+)$) and in the correct symbol class, $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-(N+1)(\rho-\delta)}$.

Here, we have glossed over the difficulty of agreeing up to which order we have to expand the product (ε and λ are independent), as we can no longer use well-known notation such as $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^n)$ or $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^k)$. We refer to Section 2.1 for details.

For each order in ε the sum in λ is finite, so that we immediately obtain the expansion with respect to ε only.

Corollary 1.2 Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, the one-parameter expansion of the product \star_ε^B in ε is obtained from the two-parameter expansion: the n th order term in ε then reads

$$(f \star_\varepsilon^B g)_{(n)} = \sum_{k=1}^n (f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(n, k)} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-n(\rho-\delta)}$$

where $(f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(n, k)}$ has been given in Theorem 1.1 with $\lambda = 1$.

Remark 1.3 Throughout this paper we will use *Einstein's summation convention*, i. e. **repeated indices in a product are implicitly summed over**. With that in mind, we can give the first terms of the expansion concisely as

$$\begin{aligned} (f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(0,0)} &= f g, \\ (f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(1,0)} &= -\frac{i}{2} (\partial_{\xi_i} f \partial_{x_i} g - \partial_{x_i} f \partial_{\xi_i} g), \\ (f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(1,1)} &= +\frac{i}{2} B_{lj} \partial_{\xi_l} f \partial_{\xi_j} g. \end{aligned}$$

The second-order corrections contain three derivatives with respect to momentum; if we group by powers of ε , then the decay properties are determined by $(f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(2,0)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} (f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(2,0)} &= +\frac{1}{4} (\partial_{\xi_l} \partial_{\xi_j} f \partial_{x_l} \partial_{x_j} g + \partial_{x_l} \partial_{x_j} f \partial_{\xi_l} \partial_{\xi_j} g + \\ &\quad - \partial_{\xi_l} \partial_{x_j} f \partial_{x_l} \partial_{\xi_j} g - \partial_{x_l} \partial_{\xi_j} f \partial_{\xi_l} \partial_{x_j} g), \\ (f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(2,1)} &= +\frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{3} \partial_{x_j} B_{lk} (\partial_{\xi_l} \partial_{\xi_j} f \partial_{\xi_k} g - \partial_{\xi_l} f \partial_{\xi_j} \partial_{\xi_k} g) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. - B_{lk} (\partial_{\xi_l} \partial_{\xi_j} f \partial_{\xi_k} \partial_{x_j} g - \partial_{\xi_l} \partial_{x_j} f \partial_{\xi_k} \partial_{\xi_j} g) \right), \\ (f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(2,2)} &= -\frac{1}{8} B_{l_1 j_1} B_{l_2 j_2} \partial_{\xi_{l_1}} \partial_{\xi_{l_2}} f \partial_{\xi_{j_1}} \partial_{\xi_{j_2}} g. \end{aligned}$$

If the magnetic field is constant, all terms containing derivatives of B vanish, only powers of the non-magnetic symplectic form and $B_{lj} \partial_{y_l} \partial_{z_j}$ survive.

Remark 1.4 We notice that all of the terms of the ε and ε - λ expansion (save for remainders of course) consist of products of derivatives of the components of the magnetic field B_{ij} and the two functions f and g , all evaluated at $X = (x, \xi)$. The separation of scales (quantified by ε) is responsible for this: in the proof, we will see that the expansion of the exponential of the twister $T_{\varepsilon, \lambda}$ (see equation (2.4)),

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\varepsilon, \lambda}(x, Y, Z) &= \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sigma(Y, Z) - \lambda \Gamma_{\varepsilon}^B(x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y+z), x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y-z), x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y+z)) \\ &=: \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sigma(Y, Z) - \lambda \gamma_{\varepsilon}^B(x, y, z), \end{aligned}$$

in powers of ε and λ determines the structure of the asymptotic expansion. The lengths of the sides of the magnetic flux triangles are typically of order ε and we can Taylor expand γ_{ε}^B in powers of ε around x . From explicit computation (see Appendix B), we have shown that the flux *itself* is of order ε and thus the total prefactor of magnetic contributions to the product is $\lambda \varepsilon^l$, $l \geq 1$. Even to lowest order, each factor of λ is accompanied by one factor of ε and thus the number of λ cannot exceed the number of ε .

If ε is *not* small, we cannot approximate the magnetic flux integral by a Taylor series, but have to accept it as-is. The k th order term of the expansion is given by an integral formula that cannot be simplified any further unless the symbols have a special structure (e. g. when they are polynomials in ξ).

Theorem 1.5 Assume B is a magnetic field whose components are $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^{\infty}$ functions. For $\lambda \ll 1$ and $\varepsilon \leq 1$, we can expand the λ Weyl product of $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1}$ and $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_2}$ asymptotically in λ such that

$$f \star_{\lambda}^B g - \sum_{k=0}^N \lambda^k (f \star_{\lambda}^B g)_{(k)} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-2(N+1)\rho}, \quad (f \star_{\lambda}^B g)_{(k)} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-2k(\rho-\delta)}. \quad (1.10)$$

The k th order term in λ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (f \star_{\lambda}^B g)_{(k)}(X) &= \frac{\varepsilon^k}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X, Y+Z)} e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)} \left(\frac{i^{3k}}{k!} \prod_{m=1}^k \tilde{B}_{l_m j_m}^{\varepsilon}(x, y, z) \right) \\ &\quad \cdot (\mathcal{F}_{\sigma}^{-1}(\partial_{\eta_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{\eta_{j_k}} f))(Y) (\mathcal{F}_{\sigma}^{-1}(\partial_{\zeta_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{\zeta_{j_k}} g))(Z) \end{aligned} \quad (1.11)$$

and $\tilde{B}_{ij}^{\varepsilon}$ is defined as

$$\tilde{B}_{ij}^{\varepsilon}(x, y, z) y_i z_j := -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \gamma_{\varepsilon}^B(x, y, z).$$

We have explicit control over the remainder (equation (2.14)): if we expand the product up to N th order in λ , the remainder is of order $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{N+1})$ and in symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-2(N+1)\rho}$.

Remark 1.6 The decay properties of the n th-order terms of the ε and λ expansions are genuinely different: in the ε expansion, the *non-magnetic symplectic form* dominates the decay as each power of $\sigma(Y, Z)$ contributes pairs of derivatives with respect to position (worsening decay by δ) and momentum (improving decay by ρ). In the λ expansion, the exponential of the non-magnetic symplectic form cannot be expanded (the prefactor ε is not assumed to be small) and the decay is determined by powers of the magnetic flux integral.

$$e^{iT_{\varepsilon, \lambda}(x, Y, Z)} = e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)} e^{-i\lambda \gamma_{\varepsilon}^B(x, y, z)} \asymp e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)} (1 - i\lambda \gamma_{\varepsilon}^B(x, y, z) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2))$$

The magnetic flux γ_{ε}^B is a *surface integral*, so each power of the flux contributes one derivative with respect to η_l and one with respect to ζ_j , improving decay by 2ρ . To make this more explicit, we have introduced $\tilde{B}_{ij}^{\varepsilon}$ which gives an average flux of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^0)$ per unit area.

The equivalence of the $\varepsilon \rightarrow \lambda$ expansion to the $\lambda \rightarrow \varepsilon$ expansion is obtained through explicit computation in Section 2.3. Agreeing on a remainder is somewhat tricky and necessitated the introduction of the concept of *precision* (see Definition 2.4), because the numerical values of ε and λ vary independently.

Theorem 1.7 Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, the magnetic Weyl product $\star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B$ of two symbols $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1}$, $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_2}$ can be simultaneously expanded in ε and λ , i. e. the expansion is the same, regardless of whether we expand with respect to ε first and then λ or the other way around.

1.1.2 Comparison with non-magnetic Weyl calculus

Regular Weyl quantization has seen many applications over the years, so one obvious question is how results would differ if magnetic Weyl calculus had been used instead (if at all possible). Let us spend a few more lines on this and give a more complete setting.

The usual recipe for the inclusion of a magnetic field is minimal substitution. We define $\vartheta_\lambda^A(x, \xi) := (x, \xi - \lambda A(x))$ and thus, the symbol to be quantized is really $g(x, \xi - \lambda A(x)) = g \circ \vartheta_\lambda^A(x, \xi)$ and not $g(x, \xi)$. It has already been mentioned that $\text{Op}_\varepsilon(g \circ \vartheta_\lambda^A)$ is in general not covariant, but this shall not concern us for the moment. The more important question is the following: if we have obtained an operator through minimal substitution and Weyl quantization, does there exist a symbol f , so that $\text{Op}_\varepsilon(g \circ \vartheta_\lambda^A) = \text{Op}_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(f)$? And if so, what are the properties of f ?

The answer is given by Theorem 2.25 which has been proven in [IMP07] for $\varepsilon = 1 = \lambda$ already. We have adapted the statement to the present case and ordered the corrections in powers of ε and λ . For simplicity, we will explain the one-parameter expansion in ε only and refer the interested reader to Section 2.5. If $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$, then also f is in Hörmander class of order m . Even more importantly, we can relate g and $f \asymp \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^n f_n$ by differential equations order-by-order in ε and find that both always agree up to errors of second order in ε . In general, we have shown that *only even powers in ε* contribute to the expansion of f , i. e. $f_{2n+1} = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, something which can be traced back to the antisymmetry of $\Gamma_\varepsilon^A([x, y]) = -\Gamma_\varepsilon^A([y, x])$.

The converse statement, Theorem 2.22, also holds: if we magnetically quantize $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$, then we can find a symbol $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ such that $\text{Op}_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(f) = \text{Op}_\varepsilon(g \circ \vartheta_\lambda^A)$.

One important application is the following: assume we are interested in the quantization of the a symbol $f = f_0 + \varepsilon f_1 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$. The subprincipal symbol may be a first-order correction in a perturbation expansion. Then we know that the usual quantization and the magnetic quantization coincide up to errors of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$ in the following sense:

$$\text{Op}_\varepsilon(f_0 \circ \vartheta_\lambda^A) + \varepsilon \text{Op}_\varepsilon(f_1 \circ \vartheta_\lambda^A) = \text{Op}_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(f_0) + \varepsilon \text{Op}_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(f_1) + \varepsilon^2 \hat{R}_2$$

Here, $\hat{R}_2 \in \Psi \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m-3\rho}$ is the quantization of a symbol of Hörmander class $m - 3\rho$ which we can calculate explicitly. In this sense, one can say that any effects that stem from the lack of covariance on the left-hand side are of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$.

Although the conclusion sounds like a ‘null effect’ statement, i. e. it is irrelevant which calculus you use unless you want to push beyond first-order precision, we would like to point out the following advantages of magnetic Weyl calculus:

- (i) Our whole formalism is gauge-covariant which may be important for some applications.
- (ii) The magnetic field appears as a purely geometrical object, the symbols are the same compared to the non-magnetic case (e. g. $H(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{2}\xi^2 + V(x)$ is the hamilton function for both, the magnetic and non-magnetic case).
- (iii) The formulas are more concise as symbols do not depend on x and $\xi - \lambda A(x)$ but on x and ξ . This is particularly true in case of semiclassical limits where calculations simplify if we use the correct symplectic form as the basis for our derivation [FL08].
- (iv) In the usual approach (Weyl quantization after minimal substitution), one has to impose conditions on the magnetic vector potential A – which is not physically observable. One common assumption, $A \in \mathcal{B} \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, excludes the physically relevant case of *constant* magnetic field. This condition is artificial (because even for very well-behaved magnetic fields, we may choose very ugly vector potentials) and unnecessary as the symplectic geometry depends on the properties of B . Magnetic Weyl calculus takes this into account and a broad range of results is available if the components of the magnetic field are $\mathcal{B} \mathcal{C}^\infty$ – which includes the case of constant field. Upon closer inspection, many results even hold for polynomially bounded fields.

- (v) The case of small coupling constant λ is difficult or impossible to treat if one uses regular Weyl calculus and minimal substitution. There is no easy way to obtain an expansion in the coupling constant λ , even if there is a separation of scales (λ does not appear in the Weyl product, only ε does). Our two-parameter expansion incorporates a λ expansion in a natural way.

1.2 Extension to operator-valued symbols

We will shortly mention a simple and mostly obvious (but potentially tedious) extension of symbol calculus to operator-valued symbols. This extension is well-known and has been used extensively in the literature, e. g. [Cor83, Cor04, Sor03, MS02, Teu03].

Assume our symbols are *operator-valued*, then our starting point is the Weyl system

$$W_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(X) := e^{-i\sigma(X, (Q_\varepsilon, \Pi_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A))} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}$$

where $\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is the identity operator on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . The objects to be quantized are suitable $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ -valued functions, extensions to unbounded operator-valued functions are commonly used as well. In other words, the quantization acts trivially on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and only concerns the functional dependence on x and ξ (spin systems and Dirac-type systems have this structure, for instance, here $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^N$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$). Other notions, e. g. that of involution or ellipticity, can be easily transcribed to the operator-valued context.

1.3 Structure

The derivation of our main results are found in Section 2: before we derive the main result, we need some prerequisites. First, the notions of two-parameter symbol classes and precision are introduced (Section 2.1). The properly adapted Wigner transform (Section 2.2) is necessary to show the equivalence of two product formulas found in the literature (Section 2.3). The one that is more amenable to an asymptotic expansion is used to derive the main result in Section 2.4. Lastly, we relate magnetic and non-magnetic quantization in Section 2.5 to be able to connect results derived via regular Weyl calculus to those where magnetic Weyl calculus has been used.

As a simple, but non-trivial application, the semirelativistic Pauli equation is derived from the Dirac equation (Section 3). It illustrates the versatility of the two-parameter expansion, gives insight into the origin of the corrections and emphasizes the mechanics of the computation. For the sake of brevity, the example is not presented in a mathematically rigorous manner, this is postponed to a future publication [FL08].

In an attempt to clean up the presentation, we have moved some auxiliary technical lemmas and details of various straightforward, but tedious calculations to an appendix.

1.4 Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a DAAD scholarship. I thank R. Littlejohn and R. Purice for their kind hospitality. I am very grateful for useful discussions, insights and references from M. Măntoiu, T. Miyao, G. Panati and H. Spohn.

2 Asymptotic expansion in λ and ε

This section will contain the proofs to my main results, namely the two-parameter expansion and some theorems which connect magnetic and non-magnetic Weyl calculus. Before we can attend to the asymptotic expansion, we need some preliminaries: apart from assumptions on the magnetic field and some comments on the notation, we need to introduce the concept of precision as well as adapt the definition of the Wigner-Weyl transform.

For simplicity, we will use Einstein's summation convention throughout this paper, i. e. **repeated indices in a product are always summed over from 1 to d** . We will always assume that the magnetic field satisfies the following assumptions unless explicitly stated otherwise.

Assumption 2.1 (Usual Assumptions on fields) *We will say that a magnetic field B and an associated vector potential A , $B = dA$, satisfy the Usual Assumptions if their components satisfy $B_{kl} \in \mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and $A_l \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $1 \leq k, l \leq d$.*

Remark 2.2 If a magnetic field B satisfies the usual assumptions, it is always possible to choose a polynomially bounded vector potential, e. g. we may use the transversal gauge (equation (B.3)). It is also clear that if B and A satisfy the usual assumptions, then so do $B^{\varepsilon, \lambda}(x) := dA^{\varepsilon, \lambda}(x) = \varepsilon \lambda B(\varepsilon x)$ and $A^{\varepsilon, \lambda}(x) := \lambda A(\varepsilon x)$.

In magnetic Weyl quantization, magnetic circulations and flux integrals play a very prominent role. We define the circulation of the one-form A along the line that connects x and y as

$$\Gamma^A([x, y]) := \int_{[x, y]} A = (y - x) \cdot \int_0^1 ds A(x + s(y - x)). \quad (2.1)$$

The magnetic flux through the triangle with corners x , y and z (which we denote by $\langle x, y, z \rangle$) is the (gauge-invariant) integral of the magnetic two-form,

$$\Gamma^B(x, y, z) := \int_{\langle x, y, z \rangle} B. \quad (2.2)$$

Either we parametrize the triangle as in [IMP07] or we can choose a vector potential for $B = dA$ and use the Stoke's Theorem to write $\Gamma^B(x, y, z) = \Gamma^A([x, y]) + \Gamma^A([y, z]) + \Gamma^A([z, x])$. We will use the latter to derive the asymptotic expansion of the scaled flux integral (equation (1.6)) in powers of ε . Most of the time, we will need the scaled circulation and flux integral which we have introduced before in equations (1.3) and (1.6).

2.1 Semiclassical symbols and precision

The Hörmander symbol classes $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ are Fréchet spaces whose topology can be defined by the usual family of seminorms

$$\|f\|_{m, k} := \sup_{|\alpha| + |\alpha'| \leq k} \sup_{(x, \xi) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \xi \rangle^{-m + |\alpha|\rho - |\alpha'|\delta} \left| \partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_x^{\alpha'} f(x, \xi) \right|.$$

One important notion is that of a *semiclassical symbol* [PST03b], i. e. it is a symbol which admits an expansion in ε and λ which is in some sense uniform.

Definition 2.3 (Semiclassical two-parameter symbol) *A map $f : [0, \varepsilon_0) \times [0, \lambda_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$, $(\varepsilon, \lambda) \mapsto f^{\varepsilon, \lambda}$ is called semiclassical two-parameter symbol of order m with weights ρ and δ , $0 \leq \delta < \rho \leq 1$, if there exists a sequence $\{f_{n, k}\}_{n, k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, $f_{n, k} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m - (n+k)(\rho - \delta)}$ for all $n, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, such that*

$$f^{\varepsilon, \lambda} - \sum_{l=0}^N \sum_{n+k=l} \varepsilon^n \lambda^k f_{n, k} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m - (N+1)(\rho - \delta)} \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N}_0$$

uniformly in the following sense: for each $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exists a constant $C_{N, m, j} > 0$ (independent of ε and λ) such that

$$\left\| f^{\varepsilon, \lambda} - \sum_{l=0}^N \sum_{n+k=l} \varepsilon^n \lambda^k f_{n, k} \right\|_{m, j} < C_{N, m, j} \max\{\varepsilon, \lambda\}^{N+1}.$$

holds for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0)$ and $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_0)$.

Since ε and λ vary independently, we also have to introduce a more sophisticated concept of precision. If there were only one small parameter, say ε , then $f - g = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^n)$ for symbols $f, g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ implies two things: (i) the difference between f and g is numerically small and (ii) we have associated a symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m-n(\rho-\delta)}$ to the ‘number’ ε^n . In case of two independent parameters, such a simple concept will not do and we have to introduce an association between a *third* number $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and a certain symbol class. Although it seems artificial at first to introduce yet another small parameter, in physical applications, this is quite natural: say, we are interested in the dynamics generated by a two-parameter symbol $H^{\varepsilon, \lambda}$ on times of order $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon)$, i. e. $e^{-it/\varepsilon H^{\varepsilon, \lambda}}$. Then we need to include all terms in our expansion for which $\varepsilon^n \lambda^k \leq \varepsilon$. Even if we choose $\varepsilon = \varepsilon$, for instance, we still cannot avoid this abstract definition as λ is independent of ε .

Definition 2.4 (Precision $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon+)$) Let $\varepsilon \ll 1$, $\lambda \ll 1$. For $\varepsilon \ll 1$, we define $n_c, k_c, N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that

$$\varepsilon^{n_c+1} < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^{n_c}, \quad \lambda^{k_c+1} < \varepsilon \leq \lambda^{k_c}$$

and $N \equiv N(\varepsilon, \lambda, \varepsilon) := \max\{n_c, k_c\}$. We say that a finite resummation $\sum_{n=0}^{N_\varepsilon} \sum_{k=0}^{N_\lambda} \varepsilon^n \lambda^k f_{n,k}$ of a semiclassical symbol $f^{\varepsilon, \lambda} \in \mathcal{AS}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ is $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon+)$ -close,

$$f^{\varepsilon, \lambda} - \sum_{n=0}^{N_\varepsilon} \sum_{k=0}^{N_\lambda} \varepsilon^n \lambda^k f_{n,k} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon+),$$

iff the diagonal resummation $\sum_{l=0}^N \sum_{n+k=l} \varepsilon^n \lambda^k f_{n,k}$ which differs from the semiclassical symbol by

$$f^{\varepsilon, \lambda} - \sum_{l=0}^N \sum_{n+k=l} \varepsilon^n \lambda^k f_{n,k} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m-(N+1)(\rho-\delta)}$$

is contained in the resummation (with $N = \max\{n_c, k_c\}$ from above).

Remark 2.5 From the definition of semiclassical symbol classes, we conclude immediately that difference between the semiclassical symbol $f^{\varepsilon, \lambda}$ and its resummation is in symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m-(N+1)(\rho-\delta)}$ as well. We use the ‘diagonal’ resummation, because all terms such that $n + k = l$ are in the same symbol class, namely $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m-l(\rho-\delta)}$. The definition ensures that the remainder is ‘numerically small’ compared to ε and in the symbol class with the best decay.

2.2 Magnetic Wigner transform

The Wigner transform plays a central role because it can be used to relate states (density operators) to pseudo-probability measures on phase space. We will need it to show the equivalence of two integral formulas for the magnetic Weyl product $\star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B$.

Definition 2.6 (Magnetic Wigner transform) Let $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The magnetic Wigner $\mathcal{W}^A(\varphi, \psi)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(\varphi, \psi)(X) := \varepsilon^d (\mathcal{F}_\sigma \langle \varphi, W_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(\cdot) \psi \rangle)(-X).$$

Lemma 2.7 The Wigner transform $\mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(\varphi, \psi)$ with respect to $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(\varphi, \psi)(X) = \int dy e^{-iy \cdot \xi} e^{-i\lambda \Gamma_\varepsilon^A([\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - \frac{y}{2}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} + \frac{y}{2}])} \varphi^*\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - \frac{y}{2}\right) \psi\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon} + \frac{y}{2}\right)$$

and maps $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ unitarily onto $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$.

Proof Formally, the result follows from direct calculation. The second claim, $\mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ follows from $e^{-i\lambda\Gamma_\varepsilon^A([x/\varepsilon-y/2, x/\varepsilon+y/2])} \varphi^*\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - \frac{y}{2}\right) \psi\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon} + \frac{y}{2}\right) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and the fact that the Fourier transformation is a unitary on \mathcal{S} . \square

Remark 2.8 The Wigner transform can be easily extended to a map from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ into $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) \cap \mathcal{C}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ where $\mathcal{C}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the space of continuous functions which decay at ∞ . For more details, see [Fol89, Proposition 1.92], for example.

Let $\mathcal{C}_{\text{polu}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ be the space of smooth functions with uniform polynomial growth at infinity, i. e. for each $f \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{polu}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ we can find $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $m \geq 0$, such that for all multiindices $\alpha, \alpha' \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ there is a $C_{\alpha\alpha'} > 0$ with

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_x^{\alpha'} f(x, \xi)| < C_{\alpha\alpha'} \langle \xi \rangle^m, \quad \forall (x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}.$$

Lemma 2.9 For $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{polu}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ we have

$$\langle \varphi, \text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(f)\psi \rangle = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int dX f(X) \mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(\varphi, \psi)(X).$$

Proof Since $f \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{polu}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, it is in the magnetic Moyal algebra \mathcal{M} defined in [MP04, Section VD.] and thus its quantization is a bounded operator on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The integral exists and we get the claim by direct computation. \square

The Wigner transform also leads to a ‘magnetic dequantization’ – once we know the operator kernel, we can reconstruct the distribution. We do not strive for full generality here. In particular, unless the operator has special properties, we cannot conclude that f is in any Hörmander class. More sophisticated techniques are needed, e. g. a Beals-type criterion [IMP08].

Lemma 2.10 Assume $T \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is an operator whose operator kernel K_T is a tempered distribution. Then we define the inverse magnetic quantization as

$$\text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A{}^{-1}(T)(X) := \mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A K_T(X) = \int dy e^{-iy \cdot \xi} e^{-i\lambda\Gamma_\varepsilon^A([x/\varepsilon-y/2, x/\varepsilon+y/2])} K_T\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - \frac{y}{2}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} + \frac{y}{2}\right). \quad (2.3)$$

Proof Let $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. By Lemma 2.7, the Wigner transform is a bijection on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ that can be extended to tempered distributions, because it is essentially the Fourier transform after a change of variables. We then connect the operator kernel with a function that is the preimage of T under magnetic Weyl quantization via Corollary 2.7,

$$\langle \varphi, T\psi \rangle = \int dx \int dy K_T(x, y) \varphi^*(x) \psi(y) \stackrel{!}{=} \int dX \mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(\varphi, \psi)(X) f(X).$$

If the kernel of T is a tempered distribution, then there is a dequantization $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ which is related to the kernel by $f = \mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A K_T$ (in the distributional sense). \square

2.3 Equivalence of formulas for magnetic Weyl product

It turns out that the integral formula for the product found in [MP04, IMP07] is not amenable to the derivation of an asymptotic expansion in ε and λ . Although an asymptotic expansion for $\varepsilon = 1 = \lambda$ has been derived in [IMP07], *calculating* each term has proven to be very tedious and it is not obvious how to collect terms of the same power in ε and λ . Hence, we will show that Măntoiu et al’s formula is equivalent to a form where the magnetic Weyl product is written as a *twisted convolution*. From this, we derive closed formulas for the (n, k) term by expanding the ‘twister’ of the convolution in the next section.

Theorem 2.11 ([Mül99, IMP07]) *Assume the magnetic field B satisfies Assumption 2.1. Then for two symbols $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1}$ and $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_2}$, the magnetic composition law is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} (f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g)(X) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ e^{+i\sigma(X,Y+Z)} e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y,Z)} \\ &\quad \cdot \Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B(x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y+z), x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y-z), x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y+z)) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}g)(Z) \quad (2.4) \\ &= \frac{1}{(\pi\varepsilon)^{2d}} \int d\tilde{Y} \int d\tilde{Z} e^{-i\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\sigma(\tilde{Y}-X, \tilde{Z}-X)} \Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B(x - \tilde{y} + \tilde{z}, -x + \tilde{y} + \tilde{z}, x + \tilde{y} + \tilde{z}) f(\tilde{Y}) g(\tilde{Z}) \end{aligned}$$

and the product $f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g$ is in symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2}$.

Proof The Weyl product is defined by

$$\text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(f) \text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(g) =: \text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g)$$

which, combined with Theorem 2.10 immediately yields

$$(f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g)(X) = \mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(K_{\text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(f) \text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(g)}})(X)$$

where $K_{\text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(f) \text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(g)}$ is the kernel of $\text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(f) \text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(g)$. Here, we have chosen a vector potential A which is associated to B that also satisfies Assumption 2.1. Although it is *a priori* not clear that there must exist a symbol $f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g$, we will start with formal calculations and then use Corollary D.4 to show that integral (2.4) exists and is in the correct symbol class.

Step 1: Rewrite in terms of Weyl system. Plugging in the definition of $\text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(f) \text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(g) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}g)(Z) W_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(Y) W_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(Z) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}g)(Z) e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y,Z)} \\ &\quad \cdot \Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B(Q_\varepsilon, Q_\varepsilon + \varepsilon Y, Q_\varepsilon + \varepsilon Y + \varepsilon Z) W_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(Y+Z) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dZ \left(\int dY (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}g)(Z-Y) e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y,Z)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B(Q_\varepsilon, Q_\varepsilon + \varepsilon Y, Q_\varepsilon + \varepsilon Z) \right) W_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(Z). \end{aligned}$$

In order to find the kernel of this operator, we need to find the kernel for $\hat{L}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(y, Z) := \Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B(Q_\varepsilon, Q_\varepsilon + \varepsilon y, Q_\varepsilon + \varepsilon Z) W_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(Z)$ which parametrically depends on y and $Z = (z, \zeta)$.

Step 2: Find the operator kernel for $\hat{L}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(y, Z)$. Let $\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{L}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(y, Z)\varphi)(v) &= \Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B(\varepsilon v, \varepsilon v + \varepsilon y, \varepsilon v + \varepsilon Z) e^{-i\varepsilon(v+z/2)\cdot\eta} e^{-i\lambda\Gamma_\varepsilon^A([v, v+z])} \varphi(v+z) \\ &= \int du e^{-i\varepsilon(u-z/2)\cdot\eta} e^{-i\lambda\Gamma_\varepsilon^A([u-z, u])} \Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B(\varepsilon u - \varepsilon z, \varepsilon u + \varepsilon y - \varepsilon z, \varepsilon u) \delta(u - (v+z)) \varphi(u) \\ &=: \int du K_{L,\varepsilon,\lambda}(y, Z; u, v) \varphi(u), \end{aligned}$$

and we need to find $\mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A K_{L,\varepsilon,\lambda}(y, Z; \cdot, \cdot)(X)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A K_{L,\varepsilon,\lambda}(y, Z; \cdot, \cdot)(X) &= \int du e^{-iu\cdot\xi} e^{-i\lambda\Gamma_\varepsilon^A([x/\varepsilon - u/2, x/\varepsilon + u/2])} K_{L,\varepsilon,\lambda}(y, Z; \frac{x}{\varepsilon} - \frac{u}{2}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} + \frac{u}{2}) \\ &= e^{i\sigma(X,Z)} \Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B(x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}z, x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}z + \varepsilon y, x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}z) =: L_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(y, Z; X). \end{aligned}$$

Step 3: Magnetic composition law. Now we plug $L_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(y, Z; X)$ back into the operator equation and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g)(X) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dZ \int dY (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z - Y) e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y,Z)} L_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(y, Z; X) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X,Y+Z)} e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y,Z)} \Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B \left(x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y+z), x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y-z), x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y+z) \right) \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

This formula is the starting point for Müller's and our derivation of the asymptotic expansion of the product. However, we can show the equivalence to the product formula obtained by two of the authors in [MP04] by writing out the symplectic Fourier transforms,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RHS of (2.5)} &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{4d}} \int dY \int d\tilde{Y} \int dZ \int d\tilde{Z} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Y},Y)} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Z},Z)} e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y,Z)} \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot \Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B \left(x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y+z), x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y-z), x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y+z) \right) f(\tilde{Y}) g(\tilde{Z}). \end{aligned}$$

If one writes out the exponential prefactors explicitly, sorts all terms containing ξ and η and then integrates over those variables, one obtains

$$\frac{1}{(\pi\varepsilon)^{2d}} \int d\tilde{Y} \int d\tilde{Z} e^{-i\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\sigma(X-\tilde{Y},X-\tilde{Z})} \Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B(\tilde{y} - \tilde{z} + x, \tilde{y} + \tilde{z} - x, -\tilde{y} + \tilde{z} + x) f(\tilde{Y}) g(\tilde{Z}).$$

Step 4: $f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2}$. The integral on the right-hand side of equation (2.5) satisfies the assumptions of Lemma D.4 with $\tau = 1$ (keeping in mind that $\Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B$ satisfies Lemma C.2). Thus, the integral in equation (2.5) exists and is in symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2}$. \square

2.4 Asymptotic expansion of the product

To obtain an asymptotic expansion of the product, we adapt an idea by Folland to the present case [Fol89, p 108 f.]: we expand the exponential of the *twister*

$$\begin{aligned} e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y,Z) - i\lambda\gamma_\varepsilon^B(x,y,z)} &= e^{iT_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(x,Y,Z)} \\ &\asymp \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^n \lambda^k \sum C_{n,k,\alpha,\alpha',\beta,\beta'}(x) y^\alpha \eta^{\alpha'} z^\beta \zeta^{\beta'} \end{aligned}$$

as a polynomial in y , η , z and ζ with coefficients $C_{n,k,\alpha,\alpha',\beta,\beta'} \in \mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ that are bounded functions with bounded derivatives to all orders. Then we can rewrite equation (2.4) as a convolution of derivatives of f and g . Furthermore, we can show that there are always sufficiently many derivatives with respect to momenta so that each of the terms has the correct decay properties.

The difficult part of the proof is to show the existence of certain oscillatory integrals. To clean up the presentation of the proof, we have moved these parts to Appendix D. For simplicity, we also introduce the following nomenclature:

Definition 2.12 (Number of q s and p s) Let $B \in \mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^d, \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_Y^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}_Z^{2d}))$ be a function which can be decomposed into a finite sum of the form

$$B(x, Y, Z) = \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta|=n \\ |\alpha'|+|\beta'|=k}} b_{\alpha\alpha'\beta\beta'}(x, Y, Z) y^\alpha \eta^{\alpha'} z^\beta \zeta^{\beta'}$$

where all $b_{\alpha\alpha'\beta\beta'}$ smooth bounded functions that depend on the multiindices $\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$. We then say that B has n qs (total number of factors in y and z) and k ps (total number of factors in η and ζ).

In the appendix we show how to convert qs into derivatives with respect to *momentum* and ps into derivatives with respect to *position*. Monomials of x and ξ multiplied with the symplectic Fourier transform of a Schwarz function $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ can be written as the symplectic Fourier transform of derivatives of φ in ξ and x :

$$x^\alpha \xi^{\alpha'} (\mathcal{F}_\sigma \varphi)(X) = \mathcal{F}_\sigma ((-i\partial_\xi)^\alpha (i\partial_x)^{\alpha'} \varphi)(X)$$

This manipulation can be made rigorous for symbols of Hörmander class m with weights ρ and δ . We see that derivatives with respect to momentum *improve* decay by ρ while those with respect to position *worsen* decay by δ . In this sense, the decay properties of the integrals are determined by the number of qs and ps .

Before we begin the proof of the main result, we will give the expansion of the magnetic flux integral γ_ε^B in ε . The proof is somewhat meticulous and its derivation can be found in Appendix B.

Lemma 2.13 *Assume B satisfies Assumption 2.1. Then we can expand γ_ε^B around x to arbitrary order N in powers of ε ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z) &= - \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\varepsilon^n}{n!} \partial_{x_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{x_{j_{n-1}}} B_{kl}(x) y_k z_l \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n+1} \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} \sum_{c=1}^n \binom{n+1}{c} \\ &\quad \cdot ((1 - (-1)^{n+1})c - (1 - (-1)^c)(n+1)) y_{j_1} \cdots y_{j_{c-1}} z_{j_c} \cdots z_{j_{n-1}} + R_N[\gamma_\varepsilon^B](x, y, z) \\ &=: - \sum_{n=1}^N \varepsilon^n \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|=n-1} C_{n,\alpha,\beta} \partial^\alpha \partial^\beta B_{kl}(x) y_k z_l y^\alpha z^\beta + R_N[\gamma_\varepsilon^B](x, y, z) \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

$$=: - \sum_{n=1}^N \varepsilon^n \mathcal{L}_n + R_N[\gamma_\varepsilon^B](x, y, z). \quad (2.7)$$

In particular, the n th-order term is a sum of monomials in position of degree $n+1$ and each of the terms is a $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^d, \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d))$ function. The remainder is a $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d))$ function that is $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{N+1})$ and can be explicitly written as a bounded function of x, y and z as well as $N+2$ factors of y and z .

Now we are in a position to state the main result of this article and prove it.

Theorem 2.14 (Asymptotic expansion of the magnetic Moyal product) *Assume B is a magnetic field whose components are $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^\infty$ functions and $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1}$ as well as $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_2}$. Then the magnetic Moyal product can be expanded asymptotically in $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $\lambda \ll 1$: for every precision $\epsilon \ll 1$ (see Definition 2.4) we can choose $N \equiv N(\epsilon, \varepsilon, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that*

$$f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g = \sum_{n=0}^N \sum_{k=0}^n \varepsilon^n \lambda^k (f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g)_{(n,k)} + \tilde{R}_N, \quad (f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g)_{(n,k)} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2-(n+k)(\rho-\delta)} \quad (2.8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g)_{(n,k)}(X) &= \sum_{\substack{k_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n jk_j = n \\ \sum_{j=1}^n k_j = k}} \frac{i^{k+k_0}}{k_0! k_1! \cdots k_n!} \\ &\quad \cdot \mathcal{L}_0^{k_0}(\nabla_Y, \nabla_Z) \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{L}_j^{k_j}(x, -i\partial_\eta, -i\partial_\zeta) f(Y) g(Z) \Big|_{Y=X=Z} \end{aligned}$$

and the differential operators \mathcal{L}_j , $j \in \mathbb{N}$, are given in Lemma 2.13, and $\mathcal{L}_0(Y, Z) := \frac{1}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)$. We have explicit control over the remainder: \tilde{R}_N as given by equation (2.12) is of order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^+)$ and in symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-(N+1)(\rho-\delta)}$.

Remark 2.15 Although we can show that the (n, k) term is in $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-(n-k)(\rho-\delta)-2k\rho}$, it is more convenient later on to show convergence in $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-(n+k)(\rho-\delta)} \supseteq \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-(n-k)(\rho-\delta)-2k\rho}$, because here magnetic and non-magnetic terms are treated more symmetrically. Otherwise we would need to modify our notions of precision (Definition 2.4) and semiclassical two-parameter symbol (Definition 2.3) which would then become very technical and cumbersome to work with. For the particularly relevant case $\delta = 0$, the two coincide.

Proof Step 1: Determine precision. For fixed $\epsilon \ll 1$ and $\lambda \ll 1$, take an arbitrary $\epsilon \ll 1$. Then if there is an asymptotic expansion of the product, by Definition 2.4 we can find an $N \equiv N(\epsilon, \epsilon, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that

$$f \star_{\epsilon, \lambda}^B g - \sum_{l=0}^N \sum_{n+k=l} \epsilon^n \lambda^k (f \star_{\epsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(n, k)} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-(N+1)(\rho-\delta)}.$$

Step 2: Formal expansion of the twister. We have already obtained a formal expansion of the exponent γ_ϵ^B (Lemma 2.13), now we will have to expand the exponential as well,

$$e^{\frac{i\epsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)} e^{-i\lambda\gamma_\epsilon^B(x, y, z)} = e^{iT_{\epsilon, \lambda}(x, Y, Z)}.$$

Let N be the integer from Step 1. We Taylor expand the exponential of the twister into a finite sum up to the N th term and a remainder,

$$e^{iT_{\epsilon, \lambda}(x, Y, Z)} = \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{i^n}{n!} (T_{\epsilon, \lambda}(x, Y, Z))^n + R_N(x, Y, Z).$$

The remainder

$$\begin{aligned} R_N(x, Y, Z) &= \frac{1}{N!} \int_0^1 d\tau (1-\tau)^N \partial_\tau^{N+1} e^{\tau u} \Big|_{u=iT_{\epsilon, \lambda}(x, Y, Z)} \\ &= \frac{i^{N+1}}{N!} (T_{\epsilon, \lambda}(x, Y, Z))^{N+1} \int_0^1 d\tau (1-\tau)^N e^{i\tau T_{\epsilon, \lambda}(x, Y, Z)} \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

is treated in Step 3, right now we are only concerned with the first term. It can be expanded up to N' th order using Lemma 2.13 with $N' \geq N$,

$$\begin{aligned} (T_{\epsilon, \lambda}(x, Y, Z))^n &= \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z) + \lambda \sum_{n'=1}^{N'} \epsilon^{n'} \mathcal{L}_{n'}(x, y, z) + \lambda R_{N'}[\gamma_\epsilon^B](x, y, z) \right)^n \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^n \binom{n}{l} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z) + \lambda \sum_{n'=1}^{N'} \epsilon^{n'} \mathcal{L}_{n'}(x, y, z) \right)^{n-l} (\lambda R_{N'}[\gamma_\epsilon^B](x, y, z))^l \\ &=: \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z) + \lambda \sum_{n'=1}^{N'} \epsilon^{n'} \mathcal{L}_{n'}(x, y, z) \right)^n + R_{N'}[T_{\epsilon, \lambda}](x, Y, Z). \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Again, we focus on the first term of the expansion and treat the remainder in Step 3,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z) + \lambda \sum_{n'=1}^{N'} \epsilon^{n'} \mathcal{L}_{n'}(x, y, z) \right)^n = \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ k_j=k}}^{N'} \epsilon^{(n-k)+\sum_{j=1}^{N'} jk_j} \lambda^k \frac{n!}{(n-k)! k_1! \cdots k_{N'}!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\sigma(Y, Z) \right)^{n-k} \prod_{j=1}^{N'} \mathcal{L}_j^{k_j}(x, y, z). \end{aligned}$$

Now we define $\mathcal{L}_0(Y, Z) := \frac{1}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)$ to clean up the presentation, include the sum over n again and sort by powers of ε and λ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{i^n}{n!} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z) + \lambda \sum_{n'=1}^{N'} \varepsilon^{n'} \mathcal{L}_{n'}(x, y, z) \right)^n = \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{i^n}{n!} \sum_{\sum_{j=0}^{N'} k_j = n} \varepsilon^{k_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{N'} j k_j} \lambda^{n-k_0} \frac{n!}{k_0! k_1! \cdots k_{N'}!} \prod_{j=0}^{N'} \mathcal{L}_j^{k_j}(x, Y, Z) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{NN'} \sum_{k=0}^n \varepsilon^n \lambda^k \sum_{\substack{k_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{N'} j k_j = n \\ \sum_{j=1}^{N'} k_j = k}} \frac{i^{k+k_0}}{k_0! k_1! \cdots k_{N'}!} \prod_{j=0}^{N'} \mathcal{L}_j^{k_j}(x, Y, Z). \end{aligned}$$

We are not missing any terms which contribute up to errors of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon+)$ as we have chosen $N' \geq N$. Also, we note that it is sufficient to sum n only up until N in the last line, all other terms will become $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon+)$ small after integration.

Step 3: Existence of the (n, k) term. The (n, k) term of the product is a sum of terms. We can show that it contains $n + k$ qs and at most k_0 ps . Each of these factors in y, z, η and ζ can be converted into derivatives: qs become derivatives with respect to momentum (and thus improve decay), ps become derivatives with respect to position (which worsen the decay),

$$(f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(n, k)}(X) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X, Y+Z)} \mathcal{T}_{n, k}(x, Y, Z) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z). \quad (2.11)$$

The decay is determined by the number of ps and qs of the (n, k) term of the expansion of the twister,

$$\mathcal{T}_{n, k}(x, Y, Z) = \sum_{\substack{k_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{N'} j k_j = n \\ \sum_{j=1}^{N'} k_j = k}} \frac{i^{k+k_0}}{k_0! k_1! \cdots k_{N'}!} \mathcal{L}_0^{k_0}(Y, Z) \prod_{j=1}^{N'} \mathcal{L}_j^{k_j}(x, y, z).$$

\mathcal{L}_0 is the non-magnetic symplectic form and contains 1 q and 1 p ; the k_0 th power of \mathcal{L}_0 contributes k_0 qs and an equal amount of ps . The magnetic terms $\mathcal{L}_j, j \geq 1$, contribute powers of q only and in this sense, magnetic fields *improve decay*. By Lemma 2.13, \mathcal{L}_j contributes $j + 1$ qs . Keep in mind that the \mathcal{L}_j are linear combinations of derivatives of the magnetic field evaluated at x and powers of y and z . In total, we have

$$k_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{N'} (j+1)k_j = k_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{N'} j k_j + \sum_{j=1}^{N'} k_j = n + k$$

qs and k_0 ps . As $0 \leq k_0 \leq n - k$, Lemma D.2 implies the existence of integral (2.11) and that it belongs to the correct symbol class, namely

$$(f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(n, k)} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1 + m_2 - (n+k)\rho + (n-k)\delta} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1 + m_2 - (n+k)(\rho - \delta)}.$$

Step 4: Existence of remainders. There are two remainders we need to control, equations (2.9) and (2.10): the first one stems from the Taylor expansion of the exponential, the second one has its origins in the expansion of the magnetic flux,

$$R_N^\Sigma(x, Y, Z) := R_N(x, Y, Z) + \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{i^n}{n!} R_{N'}[T_{\varepsilon, \lambda}](x, Y, Z).$$

The remainder of the product is obtained after integration:

$$\tilde{R}_N(X) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X,Y+Z)} R_N^\Sigma(x, Y, Z) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z) \quad (2.12)$$

We have to show that (i) the integral exists, (ii) it is in the correct symbol class and (iii) it is of the right order in ε and λ . Points (i) and (ii) are the content of Lemma D.4 once we can show that the prefactors (modulo $e^{i\tau \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sigma(Y,Z)}$) of R_N^Σ can be written as

$$\sum_{\substack{l \geq l_0 \\ m \geq m_0}} \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta|=l \\ |\alpha'|+|\beta'|=m}} G_{\alpha\alpha'\beta\beta'}(x, y, z) y^\alpha \eta^{\alpha'} z^\beta \zeta^{\beta'}$$

for suitable l_0, m_0 and bounded functions $G_{\alpha\alpha'\beta\beta'}$ which also may depend smoothly on τ .

The first contribution to \tilde{R}_N stems from the Taylor expansion of the exponential,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X,Y+Z)} \frac{1}{N!} \int_0^1 d\tau (1-\tau)^N \partial_\tau^{N+1} e^{\tau u} \Big|_{u=iT_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(x,Y,Z)} (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z) = \\ & = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int_0^1 d\tau (1-\tau)^N \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X,Y+Z)} \frac{i^{N+1}}{N!} (T_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(x, Y, Z))^{N+1} e^{-i\tau \lambda \gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z)} \\ & \quad \cdot e^{i\tau \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sigma(Y, Z)} (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z). \end{aligned}$$

The first factor, $(T_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(x, Y, Z))^{N+1}$, can be expanded in powers of $\sigma(Y, Z)$ and $\gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z)$:

$$(T_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(x, Y, Z))^{N+1} = \varepsilon^{N+1} \sum_{l=0}^{N+1} \binom{N+1}{l} \lambda^l \left(\frac{1}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)\right)^{N+1-l} \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z)\right)^l}_{=\theta(1)}$$

From Lemma 2.13, we know that γ_ε^B is of order ε and contributes 2 qs and no ps ; Lemma C.1 gives polynomial bounds of derivatives of γ_ε^B :

$$\left| \partial_x^\alpha \gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z) \right| \leq C_\alpha (\langle y \rangle + \langle z \rangle)$$

A similar bound holds for the exponential of the flux (Corollary C.2):

$$\left| \partial_x^\alpha \Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B(x, y, z) \right| \leq C_\alpha (\langle y \rangle + \langle z \rangle)^{|\alpha|} \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$$

The decay properties are determined by $(\sigma(Y, Z))^{N+1}$ with $N+1$ ps and $N+1$ qs , all other terms contribute less ps (which worsen decay) and more qs . Altogether, $(T_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(x, Y, Z))^{N+1} e^{-i\tau \lambda \gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z)}$ satisfies the conditions on G_τ in Lemma D.4 which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int_0^1 d\tau (1-\tau)^N \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X,Y+Z)} \frac{i^{N+1}}{N!} (T_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(x, Y, Z))^{N+1} e^{-i\tau \lambda \gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z)} \\ & \quad \cdot e^{i\tau \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sigma(Y, Z)} (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z) \end{aligned}$$

exists as an oscillatory integral and belongs to symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2-(N+1)(\rho-\delta)}$.

The second contribution can be estimated more easily. It is essentially a sum of

$$R_{N'n}[T_{\varepsilon,\lambda}](x, Y, Z) = \sum_{l=1}^n \binom{n}{l} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sigma(Y, Z) + \lambda \sum_{n'=1}^{N'} \varepsilon^{n'} \mathcal{L}_{n'}(x, y, z) \right)^{n-l} (\lambda R_{N'}[\gamma_\varepsilon^B](x, y, z))^l$$

By Lemma 2.13, $R_{N'}[\gamma_\varepsilon^B]$ is of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon+)$ (the largest prefactor is $\varepsilon^{N'+1} < \varepsilon$) and contains $N' + 2$ qs. So the sum over these terms have at least $N' + 2 \geq N + 2$ qs and even if there are ps, they are always accompanied by an equal number of qs. Another application of Lemma D.4 (with $\tau = 0$) implies that the second contribution to \tilde{R}_N exists as an oscillator integral and is of symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2-(N'+2)\rho} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2-(N+2)\rho} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2-(N+2)(\rho-\delta)}$.

Altogether, we conclude that \tilde{R}_N exists pointwise and is of symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2-(N+1)(\rho-\delta)}$ as long as $N' \geq N$. This concludes the proof. \square

If we do not have a separation of spatial scales, i. e. $\varepsilon = 1$, but weak coupling to the magnetic field, we can still expand the product $\star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B$ as a power series in λ . This is also the starting point of the λ - ε expansion which coincides with the ε - λ expansion.

Definition 2.16 (λ Weyl product \star_λ^B) Let $\lambda \ll 1$, $\varepsilon \leq 1$, $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1}$ and $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_2}$. Then we define the λ Moyal product by equation (2.4).

Theorem 2.17 Assume the magnetic field B satisfies Assumption 2.1; then for $\lambda \ll 1$ and $\varepsilon \leq 1$, we can expand the λ Weyl product of $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1}$ and $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_2}$ asymptotically in λ such that

$$f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g - \sum_{k=0}^N \lambda^k (f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g)_{(k)} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2-2(N+1)\rho}, \quad (f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g)_{(k)} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2-2k\rho}. \quad (2.13)$$

In particular, the zeroth-order term reduces to the non-magnetic Weyl product, $(f \star_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B g)_{(0)} = f \star_\varepsilon g$. We have explicit control over the remainder (equation (2.14)): if we expand the product up to N th order in λ , the remainder is of order $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{N+1})$ and in symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2-2(N+1)\rho}$.

Remark 2.18 We could have equally assumed that the k th term of the expansion is in Hörmander class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2-2k(\rho-\delta)} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2-2k\rho}$.

Proof Step 1: Precision of expansion. Assume we want an expansion up to $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{N+1})$ (i. e. the remainder should be of Hörmander class $m_1 + m_2 - 2(N+1)\rho$).

Step 2: Expansion of exponential flux. If ε is not necessarily small, we cannot expand the magnetic flux integral γ_ε^B anymore, its exponential does not contain a small parameter anymore. However, we will keep ε as a *bookkeeping device*.

$$\begin{aligned} e^{iT_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(x,Y,Z)} &= e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y,Z)} e^{-i\lambda\gamma_\varepsilon^B(x,y,z)} \\ &= e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y,Z)} \left(\sum_{k=0}^N \lambda^k \frac{(-i)^k}{k!} (\gamma_\varepsilon^B(x,y,z))^k + R_N(x,y,z) \right) \end{aligned}$$

The remainder is of order λ^{N+1} and has $2(N+1)$ qs,

$$R_N(x,y,z) = \frac{1}{N!} (-i\lambda\gamma_\varepsilon^B(x,y,z))^{N+1} \int_0^1 d\tau (1-\tau)^N e^{-i\lambda\tau\gamma_\varepsilon^B(x,y,z)}.$$

This can be seen more readily once we define $-\varepsilon\tilde{B}_{l_j}^\varepsilon(x,y,z)y_l z_j := \gamma_\varepsilon^B(x,y,z)$ to emphasize that γ_ε^B contains ε as a prefactor and 2 qs. Using the antisymmetry of B_{l_j} , there is a simple explicit expression for $\tilde{B}_{l_j}^\varepsilon$ (see proof of Lemma B.1):

$$\tilde{B}_{l_j}^\varepsilon(x,y,z) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1/2}^{+1/2} dt \int_0^1 ds s [B_{l_j}(x + \varepsilon s(ty - \frac{z}{2})) + B_{l_j}(x + \varepsilon s(\frac{y}{2} + tz))] = \mathcal{O}(1)$$

Step 3: Existence of k th-order term. Then the expansion can be rewritten so that we can separate off factors of y , z and ε . The k th order term contains $2k$ qs and no ps,

$$\frac{(-i)^k}{k!} (\gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z))^k = \varepsilon^k \frac{i^k}{k!} \prod_{m=1}^k \tilde{B}_{l_m j_m}^\varepsilon(x, y, z) y_{l_m} z_{j_m}.$$

By Lemma D.4 (with $\tau = 1$) the k th order term

$$\begin{aligned} (f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g)_{(k)}(X) &= \frac{\varepsilon^k}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X, Y+Z)} e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)} \left(\frac{i^k}{k!} \prod_{m=1}^k \tilde{B}_{l_m j_m}^\varepsilon(x, y, z) y_{l_m} z_{j_m} \right) \\ &\quad \cdot (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z) \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon^k}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X, Y+Z)} e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)} \left(\frac{i^{3k}}{k!} \prod_{m=1}^k \tilde{B}_{l_m j_m}^\varepsilon(x, y, z) \right) \\ &\quad \cdot (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}(\partial_{\tilde{\eta}_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{\tilde{\eta}_{j_k}} f))(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}(\partial_{\tilde{z}_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{\tilde{z}_{j_k}} g))(Z) \end{aligned}$$

exists and is of symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-2k\rho}$.

Step 4: Existence of remainder. The remainder is of order λ^{N+1} and has $2(N+1)$ qs. (It contains ε^{N+1} as a prefactor as well which will be of importance in the proof of the next theorem.) By Lemma C.1 and Corollary C.2, the integral in R_N over the exponential of the magnetic flux is bounded and its derivatives can be bounded by polynomially in y and z ,

$$R_N(x, y, z) = \lambda^{N+1} \frac{\varepsilon^{N+1}}{N!} (\tilde{B}_{l_j}^\varepsilon(x, y, z) y_l z_j)^{N+1} \int_0^1 d\tau (1-\tau)^N e^{-i\lambda\tau\gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z)}.$$

This means R_N satisfies the conditions on G in Lemma D.4 (with $\tau = 1$) and we conclude that

$$\tilde{R}_N(X) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X, Y+Z)} e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)} R_N(x, y, z) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z) \quad (2.14)$$

exists and is in symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-2(N+1)\rho}$. \square

The next statement is central to this paper, because it tells us we can speak of *the* two-parameter expansion of the product.

Theorem 2.19 *Assume that the magnetic field B satisfies Assumption 2.1 and $\varepsilon \ll 1$ in addition to $\lambda \ll 1$. Then we can expand each term of the λ expansion of $f \star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B g$ in ε , $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1}$, $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_2}$, and obtain the same as in Theorem 1.1. Hence we can speak of the two-parameter expansion of the product $\star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B$.*

Proof Step 1: Precision of expansion. Assume we have expanded the magnetic product \star_λ^B up to N_0 th power in λ . We choose $\varepsilon := \lambda^{N_0}$ as precision and Definition 2.4 yields an $N \equiv N(\varepsilon, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ up to which we need to expand. By definition, $N \geq N_0$.

Step 2: Equality of (n, k) terms of expansion. Now to the expansion itself. The two terms we need to expand are the non-magnetic twister $e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)}$ and the k th power of the magnetic flux integral γ_ε^B in $\varepsilon \ll 1$: we choose $N', N'' \geq N$ and write the k th order of the λ expansion as

$$\begin{aligned} (f \star_\lambda^B g)_{(k)}(X) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X, Y+Z)} e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)} \frac{(-i)^k}{k!} (\gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z))^k (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X, Y+Z)} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{N'} \varepsilon^n \frac{i^n}{n!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\sigma(Y, Z) \right)^n + R_{N'}[\sigma](Y, Z) \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \frac{(-i)^k}{k!} \left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N''} \varepsilon^j \mathcal{L}_j(x, y, z) \right)^k + R_{N''k}[\mathcal{L}R](x, y, z) \right) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z). \end{aligned}$$

The remainders are given explicitly in Step 3, equations 2.15 and 2.16. The (n, k) terms of the expansion originate from the first of these terms, i. e. we need to look at

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{N'} \varepsilon^n \frac{i^n}{n!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)\right)^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N''} \varepsilon^j \mathcal{L}_j(x, y, z)\right)^k = \\ & = \sum_{n=0}^{N'} \sum_{\substack{\sum_{j=1}^{N''} k_j = k}} \varepsilon^{n+\sum_{j=1}^{N''} j k_j} \frac{i^{n+k}}{n! k_1! \cdots k_{N''}!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)\right)^n \prod_{j=1}^{N''} \mathcal{L}_j^{k_j}(x, y, z) \end{aligned}$$

to obtain the (n, k) term of this expansion. The remaining three terms define the remainder which will be treated in the last step. We define $\mathcal{L}_0(Y, Z) := \frac{1}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)$, $k_0 := n$ and recognize the result from Theorem 1.1, the terms match:

$$\sum_{n=k}^{N'N''} \sum_{\substack{k_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{N''} j k_j = n \\ \sum_{j=1}^{N''} k_j = k}} \varepsilon^n \frac{i^{k+k_0}}{k_0! k_1! \cdots k_{N''}!} \mathcal{L}_0^{k_0}(Y, Z) \prod_{j=1}^{N''} \mathcal{L}_j^{k_j}(x, y, z)$$

Obviously, the arguments made in the proof of Theorem 1.1 can be applied here as well, and we conclude that the (n, k) term exists and is in the correct symbol class, $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-(n+k)(\rho-\delta)}$.

Step 3: Existence of remainders. The remainders of the expansions of $e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)}$ and $(\gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z))^k$,

$$R_{N'}[\sigma](Y, Z) = \varepsilon^{N'+1} \frac{i^{N'+1}}{N'!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)\right)^{N'+1} \int_0^1 d\tau (1-\tau)^{N'} e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\tau\sigma(Y, Z)} \quad (2.15)$$

and

$$R_{N''k}[\mathcal{L}R](x, y, z) = \sum_{l=1}^k \binom{k}{l} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N''} \varepsilon^j \mathcal{L}_j(x, y, z)\right)^{k-l} (R_{N''k}[\gamma_\varepsilon^B](x, y, z))^l \quad (2.16)$$

with $R_{N''k}[\gamma_\varepsilon^B](x, y, z)$ as in Lemma 2.13, lead to three terms of total remainder:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{NN'N''k}^\Sigma(x, Y, Z) &= R_{N'}[\sigma](Y, Z) \left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N''} \varepsilon^j \mathcal{L}_j(x, y, z)\right)^k + R_{N''k}[\mathcal{L}R](x, y, z) \right) + \\ &+ \left(\sum_{n=0}^{N'} \varepsilon^n \frac{i^n}{n!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)\right)^n \right) R_{N''k}[\mathcal{L}R](x, y, z) \end{aligned}$$

Going through the motions of the proof to Theorem 1.1, we count ps and qs , and then apply Lemma D.4. The first remainder, $R_{N'}[\sigma](Y, Z)$, is of order $\varepsilon^{N'+1} < \varepsilon$ in ε and contributes $N' + 1$ ps and qs . By Lemma 2.13, $R_{N''k}[\gamma_\varepsilon^B]$ contributes $N'' + 2$ qs and all prefactors are less than or equal to $\varepsilon^{N''+1} < \varepsilon$. Thus $R_{N''k}[\mathcal{L}R]$ contains at least $N'' + 2$ qs (for all $k \leq N$) and prefactors that are at most $\varepsilon^{N''+1} < \varepsilon$. Hence, the total remainder exists as an oscillatory integral, is $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon+)$ small and in symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-(N+1)(\rho-\delta)}$. \square

Remark 2.20 The asymptotic expansion of $\star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B$ can be immediately extended to an expansion of products of *semiclassical two-parameter symbols* (see Definition 2.3).

2.5 Relation between magnetic and ordinary Weyl calculus

In a previous work [IMP07], Iftimie et al have investigated the relation between magnetic Weyl quantization and regular Weyl quantization combined with minimal substitution, the ‘usual’ recipe to couple a

quantum system to a magnetic field. However, since there were no small parameters ε and λ , we have to revisit their statements and adapt them to the present case.

Let us define $\vartheta_\lambda^A(X) := \xi - \lambda A(x)$ as coordinate transformation which relates momentum and kinetic momentum. With a little abuse of notation, we will also use $f \circ \vartheta_\lambda^A(X) := f(x, \vartheta_\lambda^A(X))$ to transform functions. In general, $\text{Op}_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(f) \neq \text{Op}_\varepsilon(f \circ \vartheta_\lambda^A)$ since the latter is *not* manifestly covariant. However, we would like to be able to compare results obtained with magnetic Weyl calculus to those obtained with usual Weyl calculus and minimal substitution. To show how the two calculi are connected, we need to make slightly stronger assumptions on the magnetic *vector potential*. This may appear contrary to the spirit of the rest of the paper where it has been emphasized that restrictions should be placed on the magnetic *field*. The necessity arises, because usual, non-magnetic Weyl calculus is used in this section.

Assumption 2.21 *We assume that the magnetic field is such that we can find a vector potential A whose components satisfy*

$$|\partial_x^\alpha A_l(x)| \leq C_\alpha \quad \forall 1 \leq l \leq d, |\alpha| \geq 1, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$$

In particular, this implies that the magnetic field $B = dA$ satisfies Assumption 2.1, i. e. its components are $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^\infty$ functions.

It is conceptually useful to introduce the line integral

$$\Gamma^A(x, y) := \int_0^1 ds A(x + s(y - x)) \quad (2.17)$$

which is related to $\Gamma^A([x, y]) = (y - x) \cdot \Gamma^A(x, y)$; similarly, $\Gamma_\varepsilon^A([x, y]) =: (y - x) \cdot \Gamma_\varepsilon^A(x, y)$ defines the scaled line integral. This allows us to rewrite the integral kernel of a magnetic pseudodifferential operator $\text{Op}_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(f)$ for $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ as

$$K_{f, \varepsilon, \lambda}(x, y) = \int d\eta e^{-iy \cdot \eta} f\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}(x + y), \eta - \lambda \Gamma_\varepsilon^A(x, y)\right). \quad (2.18)$$

If we had used minimal substitution instead, then we would have to replace the line integral $\Gamma_\varepsilon^A(x, y)$ by its mid-point value $A(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}(x + y))$.

Theorem 2.22 ([IMP07]) *Assume the magnetic field satisfies Assumption 2.21. Then for any $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ there exists a unique $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ such that $\text{Op}_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A(f) = \text{Op}_\varepsilon(g \circ \vartheta_\lambda^A)$. g can be expressed as an asymptotic series $g \asymp \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^n \varepsilon^n \lambda^k g_{n,k}$, where $g_{n,k} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m-(n+k)\rho}$ for all $n \geq 1$, and*

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^k g_{n,k}(x, \xi) = \varepsilon^{-n} \sum_{|\alpha|=n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} (i\partial_y)^\alpha \left(\partial_\xi^\alpha f\left(x, \xi - \lambda \Gamma^A\left(x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y, x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y\right) + \lambda A(x)\right) \right) \Big|_{y=0}. \quad (2.19)$$

Only terms with even powers of ε contribute, i. e. $g_{n,k} = 0$ for all $n \in 2\mathbb{N}_0 + 1$, $1 \leq k \leq n$. In particular we have $g_{0,0} = f$, $g_{1,0} = 0$, $g_{1,1} = 0$ and $f - g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m-3\rho}$.

Remark 2.23 The reason that only even powers of ε contribute can be traced back to the symmetry of $\Gamma_\varepsilon^A(x, y) = +\Gamma_\varepsilon^A(y, x)$. Note that this is consistent with what was said in the introduction, $\Gamma_\varepsilon^A([x, y]) = (y - x) \cdot \Gamma_\varepsilon^A([x, y])$ is indeed odd.

Proof The proof is virtually identical to the proof of Proposition 6.7 in [IMP07]; we will only specialize the formal part to the present case, the rigorous justification found in the reference applies also to this case as well.

For a symbol $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^m$, the integral kernel of its magnetic quantization is given by equation (2.18). On the other hand, it is clear how to invert $\text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A$ for $\lambda = 0, A \equiv 0$: we apply the non-magnetic Wigner transform $\mathcal{W}_\varepsilon := \mathcal{W}_{\varepsilon,\lambda=0}^{A=0}$ to the magnetic integral kernel:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon K_{f,\varepsilon,\lambda}(X) &= \int dy e^{-iy \cdot \xi} K_{f,\varepsilon,\lambda}\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon} + \frac{y}{2}, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} - \frac{y}{2}\right) \\ &= \int dy \int d\eta e^{iy \cdot \eta} f\left(x, \eta + \xi - \lambda \Gamma^A\left(x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y, x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

Since we have a separation of scales, we can expand $\Gamma^A(x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y, x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y)$ in powers of ε up to some even N . We will find that only even powers of ε survive – which immediately explains the absence of the first-order correction,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^A\left(x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y, x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y\right) &= \int_{-1/2}^{+1/2} ds \left(\sum_{n=0}^N \varepsilon^n s^n \sum_{|\alpha|=n} \partial_x^\alpha A(x) y^\alpha + R_N(s, x, y) \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{N/2} \varepsilon^{2n} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2n} \frac{1}{2n+1} \sum_{|\alpha|=2n} \partial_x^\alpha A(x) y^\alpha + \int_{-1/2}^{+1/2} ds R_N(s, x, y). \end{aligned}$$

The remainder is bounded since it is the integral of a $\mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty$ function over the compact set $[-1/2, +1/2] \times [0, 1]$. In any event, The exact value will not matter if we choose N large enough as we set $y = 0$ in the end.

A Taylor expansion of $f\left(x, \eta + \xi - \lambda \Gamma^A\left(x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y, x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y\right)\right)$ around $\eta - \lambda \Gamma^A$ and some elementary integral manipulations formally yield for the n th term of the expansion

$$\varepsilon^n \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^k g_{n,k}(x, \xi - \lambda A(x)) = \sum_{|\alpha|=n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} (i\partial_y)^\alpha \left(\partial_\xi^\alpha f\left(x, \xi - \lambda \Gamma^A\left(x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y, x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y\right)\right) \right) \Big|_{y=0} \quad (2.20)$$

where we substitute the expansion above for Γ^A . Each derivative in y will give one factor of ε , i. e. we will have n altogether. On the other hand, we have at least 1 and at most n factors of λ . Only even powers in ε contribute, because the expansion of $\Gamma^A(x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y, x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y)$ contains only even powers of y . Furthermore, all terms in this sum are bounded functions in x , because derivatives of A are bounded by assumption.

To show that $g_{n,k}$ is in symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m-(n+k)\rho}$, we need to have a closer look at equation 2.20: the only possibility to get k factors of λ is to derive $\partial_\xi^\alpha f\left(x, \xi - \lambda \Gamma^A\left(x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y, x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y\right)\right)$ k times with respect to y . Each of these y derivatives becomes an additional derivative of $\partial_\xi^\alpha f$ with respect to momentum. Hence, there is a total of $|\alpha| + k = n + k$ derivatives with respect to ξ .

The rigorous justification that these integrals exist can be found in [IMP07, Proposition 6.7]. \square

Remark 2.24 If we are interested in a one-parameter expansion in ε only, then

$$g_n(X) := \varepsilon^{-n} \sum_{|\alpha|=n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} (i\partial_y)^\alpha \left(\partial_\xi^\alpha f\left(x, \xi - \lambda \Gamma^A\left(x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y, x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y\right) + \lambda A(x)\right) \right) \Big|_{y=0}$$

gives the n th order correction in ε .

Proposition 2.25 ([IMP07]) *The converse statement also holds: if the magnetic field satisfies Assumption 2.21, then for each $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^m$ there exists a unique $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^m$ such that $\text{Op}_\varepsilon(g \circ \vartheta_\lambda^A) = \text{Op}_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^A(f)$.*

$f \asymp \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^n \varepsilon^n \lambda^k f_{n,k}$, $f_{n,k} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m-(n+k)\rho}$, can be expressed as a formal power series in ε where the n th term is given by

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^k f_{n,k}(x, \xi) = \varepsilon^{-n} \sum_{|\alpha|=n} \frac{1}{\alpha!} (i\partial_y)^\alpha (\partial_\xi^\alpha f)(x, \xi + \lambda \Gamma_\varepsilon^A(x - y/2, x + y/2) - \lambda A(x)) \Big|_{y=0} \quad (2.21)$$

In particular we have $f_{0,0} = g$, $f_{1,0} = 0$, $f_{1,1} = 0$ and $g - f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m-3\rho}$.

Proof This proof works along the same lines: one magnetically Wigner-transforms the kernel of the operator $\text{Op}_\varepsilon(f \circ \vartheta_\lambda^A)$. Again, for the rigorous justification see [IMP07, Proposition 6.9]. \square

3 Application to the Dirac equation

To demonstrate the advantages of *magnetic* Weyl calculus, we will apply it to a simple, yet interesting problem: the semirelativistic limit of the Dirac equation. This is a well-studied problem [FW50, Tha92, Ynd96, Cor83, Cor04], but we believe our derivation sheds a new light on origin of corrections. To keep this section readable and put emphasis on the computational aspects, we will dispense with mathematical rigor. Making these statements exact and putting them into context with previous works will be postponed to a future publication [FL08].

The dynamics of a relativistic spin-1/2 particle with mass m subjected to an electromagnetic field is described by the Dirac hamiltonian.

$$i\partial_t \Psi = \left(c^2 m \beta + c(-i\nabla_x) \cdot \alpha - eA(\hat{x}) \cdot \alpha + eV(\hat{x}) \right) \Psi, \quad \Psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4)$$

The hamiltonian consists of *operator-valued matrices*; α_j , $j = 1, 2, 3$, has the j th Pauli matrix as entries in the offdiagonal, β is the diagonal matrix with entries 1, 1, -1 and -1 , namely,

$$\alpha_j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma_j \\ \sigma_j & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \beta = \begin{pmatrix} \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^2} & 0 \\ 0 & -\text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

As is customary, we have used shorthand notation for $\sum_{j=1}^3 \xi_j \alpha_j =: \xi \cdot \alpha$. We will assume that the components of the magnetic field B satisfy the following assumption: there exists a $\mu > 0$ such that for any multiindex $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ there exists a constant $C_\alpha > 0$ for which

$$\left| \partial_x^\alpha B_{lj}(x) \right| \leq C_\alpha \langle x \rangle^{-1-\mu} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, 1 \leq l, j \leq d.$$

Lemma 7.2 in [IMP07] shows that we can then choose an associated vector potential A whose components satisfy

$$\left| \partial_x^\alpha A_l(x) \right| \leq C_\alpha \langle x \rangle^{-\mu}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d, 1 \leq l \leq d.$$

Furthermore, we assume that the electrostatic potential is a $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^\infty$ function. This ensures that the Dirac Hamiltonian defines a self-adjoint operator on the magnetic Sobolev space $H_A^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4)$ and its essential spectrum is not altered by the electromagnetic field, $\text{spec}_{\text{ess}}(\widehat{H}_D) = (-\infty, -m] \cup [m, +\infty)$ (by the limiting absorption principle derived in [IMP07, Theorem 7.3]).

If we rescale the energy by $1/c^2$ for convenience and absorb the charge in the definition of the potentials, we see that there are two *natural* ways to write the Dirac hamiltonian, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{H}_D &= m\beta + \frac{1}{c}(-i\nabla_x - \frac{1}{c}A(Q)) \cdot \alpha + \frac{1}{c^2}V(Q) \\ &= m\beta + (-i\frac{1}{c}\nabla_x - \frac{1}{c^2}A(Q)) \cdot \alpha + \frac{1}{c^2}V(Q) \end{aligned}$$

where $Q := \hat{x}$ is the position operator. The first way of writing suggests to use

$$p_c^A := -i\nabla_x - \frac{1}{c}A(Q)$$

as kinetic momentum operator, the second definition,

$$P_c^A := -i\frac{1}{c}\nabla_x - \frac{1}{c^2}A(Q) = \frac{1}{c}p_c^A, \quad (3.1)$$

absorbs an additional factor of $1/c$. This seems nothing more than an algebraic trivialty, but this choice of operators contains the physics. The first corresponds to the non-relativistic scaling where momenta are small and the $1/c \rightarrow 0$ limit leads to the non-relativistic limit. In [FL08] we derive the Pauli equation including fourth-order corrections in this scaling. As this case is computationally more involved, we use the second, the *semirelativistic scaling* in this example. The rescaled Dirac hamiltonian can be written as

$$\widehat{H}_D = H_0(P_c^A) + \frac{1}{c^2}H_2(Q) \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_0(\xi) &:= m\beta + \xi \cdot \alpha \\ H_2(x) &:= V(x). \end{aligned}$$

Or to put another way, we can write $\widehat{H}_D = \text{Op}_c^A(H_D)$ as the *magnetic* quantization of the symbol $H_D := H_0 + \frac{1}{c^2}H_2$ with respect to the pair of observables (Q, P_c^A) . The attentive reader will notice that we have defined the magnetic quantization of *matrix-valued* symbols; to account for this, we simply have to tensor the Weyl system with the identity matrix $\text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4}$.

$$\text{Op}_c^A(H_D) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int dX \mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}(H_D) e^{i\sigma(X, (Q, P_c^A))} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4}$$

Associated to this quantization, there is a magnetic Weyl product \sharp_c^B with an asymptotic expansion in $1/c$.

3.1 Asymptotic expansion of \sharp_c^B

If we compare equation (1.1) with the definition of P_c^A , equation (3.1), we see that $\varepsilon = 1/c$ and $\lambda = 1/c^2$. According the Theorem A.3, we can write the expansion of \sharp_c^B in terms of the two-parameter expansion of $\star_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B$. The first few terms of $f \sharp_c^B g$ (with f and g suitable matrix-valued functions, e. g. matrix-valued Hörmander class symbols) are

$$\begin{aligned} (f \sharp_c^B g)_{(0)} &= f g, \\ (f \sharp_c^B g)_{(1)} &= -\frac{i}{2}\{f, g\}, \\ (f \sharp_c^B g)_{(2)} &= -\frac{1}{4}(\sigma(\nabla_Y, \nabla_Z))^2 f(Y) g(Z) \Big|_{Y=X=Z}, \\ (f \sharp_c^B g)_{(3)} &= \frac{i}{8}(\sigma(\nabla_Y, \nabla_Z))^3 f(Y) g(Z) \Big|_{Y=X=Z} + \frac{i}{2}B_{lj}(x) \partial_{\xi_l} f(X) \partial_{\xi_j} g(X). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

While this seems very complicated, we will often need the product of two symbols which are functions of momentum only, $f \equiv f(\xi)$, $g \equiv g(\xi)$. In that case, only *purely magnetic terms* (i. e. $k_0 = 0$ in Theorem 1.1) contribute,

$$f \sharp_c^B g = f g + \frac{1}{c^3} \frac{i}{2} B_{lj} \partial_{\xi_l} f \partial_{\xi_j} g + \mathcal{O}(1/c^4). \quad (3.4)$$

3.2 Semirelativistic limit as adiabatic limit

The technique of choice, a modified version of *space-adiabatic perturbation theory* [PST03b, PST03a, Teu03] that uses *magnetic* Weyl calculus, rests on the interpretation of the semirelativistic limit $1/c \rightarrow 0$ as an *adiabatic limit*. This means, the Dirac hamiltonian has three characteristic features all adiabatic systems share, the so-called *adiabatic trinity*:

- (i) A distinction between *slow and fast degrees of freedom*, i. e. a decomposition of the original Hilbert space the hamiltonian acts on into $\mathcal{H} \cong \mathcal{H}_{\text{slow}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{fast}}$. Here, the fast Hilbert space is spanned by the electronic and the positronic state, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{fast}} \cong \mathbb{C}^2$. The slow Hilbert space is that of a *non-relativistic* spin-1/2 particle, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{slow}} \cong L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)$.
- (ii) A *small, dimensionless parameter* that quantifies the separation of scales. If v_0 is a typical velocity of the particle, we expect that no electron-positron pairs are created as long as $v_0/c \ll 1$. However, for notational simplicity, we use $1/c$ as small parameter.
- (iii) A *relevant part of the spectrum* of the *unperturbed* operator, separated by a *gap* from the remainder. If we consider the field-free case, then $H_0(-i/c \nabla_x)$ fibers via the Fourier transform and the spectrum of each fiber hamiltonian is given by $\text{spec}(H_0(\xi)) = \{\pm \sqrt{m^2 + \xi^2}\}$. We are interested in the electronic subspace – which is separated by a gap (of size $2\sqrt{m^2 + \xi^2} \geq 2m$) from the positronic subspace. This ensures that even in the perturbed case, transitions from one band to the other are exponentially suppressed.

In a commutative diagram, the unperturbed situation looks as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{c} \overset{e^{-itH_0(-i/c \nabla_x)}}{\curvearrowright} \\ L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4) \end{array} & \xrightarrow{u_0(-i/c \nabla_x)} & \begin{array}{c} \overset{e^{-itE(-i/c \nabla_x)\beta}}{\curvearrowright} \\ L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2) \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \end{array} \\
 \downarrow \pi_0(-i/c \nabla_x) & & \downarrow \Pi_{\text{ref}} \\
 \pi_0(-i/c \nabla_x)(L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4)) & \dashrightarrow & L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2) \\
 & & \uparrow \overset{e^{-itE(-i/c \nabla_x)}}{\curvearrowright}
 \end{array} \tag{3.5}$$

With a little abuse of notation, we will interpret all of these spaces as (subspaces of) $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4) \cong L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes \mathbb{C}^4$ when convenient; operators acting on this space can be thought of as (operator-valued) 4×4 matrices or, if we are on the right-hand side of the diagram, as 2×2 matrices whose entries are itself (operator-valued) 2×2 matrices. The former identification is used during calculations, but the latter is conceptually useful.

The objects in this diagram can be found in every text book on relativistic quantum mechanics (e. g. [Tha92, Ynd96]): π_0 is the projection onto the electronic subspace,

$$\pi_0(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \frac{1}{E(\xi)} H_0(\xi) \right). \tag{3.6}$$

u_0 is the matrix-valued function that diagonalizes H_0 ,

$$h_0 := u_0 H_0 u_0^* = \sqrt{m^2 + \xi^2} \beta =: E \beta, \tag{3.7}$$

and ‘intertwines’ π_0 with the *reference projection*,

$$u_0 \pi_0 u_0^* = \pi_{\text{ref}} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$u_0(\xi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E(E+m)}} ((E+m)\text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} - (\xi \cdot \alpha)\beta). \quad (3.9)$$

The ‘quantization’ of π_{ref} is $\Pi_{\text{ref}} = \text{id}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2)} \otimes \pi_{\text{ref}}$ projects out the positronic degrees of freedom in Diagram (3.5). If we are interested in the electron’s dynamics only, we can describe it by an *effective hamiltonian*, the quantization of

$$h_{\text{eff}0} := \pi_{\text{ref}} h_0 \pi_{\text{ref}} = E \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^2} = \sqrt{m^2 + \xi^2} \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^2}, \quad (3.10)$$

in the following sense:

$$\left(e^{-itH_0(-i/c \nabla_x)} - u_0^*(-i/c \nabla_x) e^{-itE(-i/c \nabla_x)} u_0(-i/c \nabla_x) \right) \pi_0(-i/c \nabla_x) = 0$$

Hence, we are able to relate the dynamics in the upper-left corner of diagram (3.5) with the reduced, effective dynamics in the lower-right corner. This reduction is made possible, because $H_0(-i/c \nabla_x)$ and $\pi_0(-i/c \nabla_x)$ commute, $[H_0(-i/c \nabla_x), \pi_0(-i/c \nabla_x)] = 0$, the electronic subspace is invariant under the unperturbed dynamics.

If we switch on the electromagnetic perturbation, this is not true anymore, the commutator of \widehat{H}_D and $\text{Op}_c^A(\pi_0) = \pi_0(\text{P}_c^A)$ is of order $\mathcal{O}(1/c^3)$. The immediate question is whether we can generalize diagram (3.5) through some generalized projection Π^c and generalized unitary U^c such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \textcircled{e^{-it\widehat{H}_D}} \\ L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4) \end{array} & \xrightarrow{U^c} & \begin{array}{c} \textcircled{e^{-it\text{Op}_c^A(h)}} \\ L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2) \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \end{array} \\ \downarrow \Pi^c & & \downarrow \Pi_{\text{ref}} \\ \Pi^c(L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4)) & \dashrightarrow & L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2) \\ & & \textcircled{e^{-it\text{Op}_c^A(h_{\text{eff}})}} \end{array} \quad (3.11)$$

If these objects exist, we require them to be an *orthogonal projection* and a *unitary* which commute with the full, perturbed Hamiltonian \widehat{H}_D and block-diagonalize it, i. e.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^{c2} &= \Pi^c, \quad \Pi^{c*} = \Pi^c & [\text{Op}_c^A(H_D), \Pi^c] &= 0 \\ U^{c*} U^c &= \text{id}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4)}, \quad U^c U^{c*} = \text{id}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^2) \otimes \mathbb{C}^2} & U^c \Pi^c U^{c*} &= \Pi_{\text{ref}} = \text{id}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \otimes \pi_{\text{ref}}. \end{aligned}$$

Because of the last property U^c , is called *intertwiner*. For suitable potentials V , we can *translate* these equations (up to $\mathcal{S}^{-\infty}$) into equations of *semiclassical symbols*. So if there exist $\pi^c \in \mathcal{A}\mathcal{S}_{1,0}^0$ and $u^c \in \mathcal{A}\mathcal{S}_{1,0}^0$ such that $\Pi^c = \text{Op}_c^A(\pi^c) + \mathcal{O}_0(1/c^\infty)^1$ and $U^c = \text{Op}_c^A(u^c) + \mathcal{O}_0(1/c^\infty)$, then the corresponding symbols must satisfy

$$\pi^c \sharp_c^B \pi^c = \pi^c + \mathcal{O}(1/c^\infty), \quad \pi^{c*} = \pi^c \quad [H_D, \pi^c] \sharp_c^B = \mathcal{O}(1/c^\infty) \quad (3.12)$$

$$u^{c*} \sharp_c^B u^c = \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \mathcal{O}(1/c^\infty), \quad u^c \sharp_c^B u^{c*} = \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \mathcal{O}(1/c^\infty) \quad u^c \sharp_c^B \pi^c \sharp_c^B u^{c*} = \pi_{\text{ref}} \quad (3.13)$$

where the Moyal commutator is defined by $[H_D, \pi^c] \sharp_c^B := H_D \sharp_c^B \pi^c - \pi^c \sharp_c^B H_D$.

¹We say that two c -dependent bounded operators A and B on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} satisfy $A = B + \mathcal{O}_0(1/c^\infty)$ if for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exists a constant C_n such that $\|A - B\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \leq C_n \frac{1}{c^n}$

A modified version of space-adiabatic perturbation theory [PST03b, Teu03] gives an *explicit resummation* for these symbols as well as formulas to correct $\text{Op}_c^A(\pi^c)$ and $\text{Op}_c^A(u^c)$ on the order $\mathcal{O}_0(1/c^\infty)$ to get a projection and a unitary in the operator sense. Since we want to consider *perturbed* systems only, we assume that the addition of the perturbation (in this case: the electromagnetic field) *does not appreciably alter the spectrum*. This assumption can be translated to conditions on the admissible magnetic fields (not vector potentials) via a limiting absorption principle for magnetic Weyl calculus (Theorem 7.3 in [IMP07]). Then it is natural to assume that the principal symbols (the zeroth-order term) of the expansion of π^c and u^c have to be π_0 and u_0 – the symbols of unitary and projection associated to the unperturbed hamiltonian. Starting from the unperturbed objects, Panati, Spohn and Teufel have found recursion relations which give corrections to u_0 and π_0 order-by-order in $1/c$ which turn out to be *independent* of the specific Weyl calculus used.

The generalized generator of the dynamics in the lower-right corner of diagram (3.11) is the upper-left 2×2 submatrix of the diagonalized hamiltonian

$$h := u^c \sharp_c^B H_D \sharp_c^B u^{c*}, \quad (3.14)$$

i. e. the *effective hamiltonian*

$$h_{\text{eff}} := \pi_{\text{ref}} h \pi_{\text{ref}} = \pi_{\text{ref}} u^c \sharp_c^B H_D \sharp_c^B u^{c*} \pi_{\text{ref}}. \quad (3.15)$$

There are technical and conceptual reasons for this specific choice that go beyond the scope of this text, we refer the interested reader to [Teu03, Section 3.3] for details. The magnetic quantization of h_{eff} generates effective dynamics which approximate the full dynamics for electronic states,

$$\left(e^{-it\text{Op}_c^A(H_D)} - \text{Op}_c^A(u^c)^* e^{-it\text{Op}_c^A(h_{\text{eff}})} \text{Op}_c^A(u^c) \right) \text{Op}_c^A(\pi^c) = \mathcal{O}_0(|t| 1/c^\infty).$$

3.3 Effective hamiltonian

In the present case, equation (3.4) implies that the first correction to π_0 and u_0 is of *third* order in $1/c$:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0 \sharp_c^B \pi_0 - \pi_0 &= \mathcal{O}(1/c^3) & [H_D, \pi_0] \sharp_c^B &= \mathcal{O}(1/c^3) \\ u_0^* \sharp_c^B u_0 = \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \mathcal{O}(1/c^3), \quad u_0 \sharp_c^B u_0^* &= \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \mathcal{O}(1/c^3) & u_0 \sharp_c^B \pi_0 \sharp_c^B u_0^* &= \pi_{\text{ref}} + \mathcal{O}(1/c^3) \end{aligned}$$

From these equations, we conclude that π_0 and u_0 are an approximate Moyal projection and Moyal unitary, respectively, and $\pi^c = \pi_0 + \mathcal{O}(1/c^3)$ and $u^c = u_0 + \mathcal{O}(1/c^3)$. The latter implies that within our framework, there are no corrections to the usual Foldy-Wouthuysen transform up to second order in $1/c$ even in the case of electric *and* magnetic fields. Now we calculate the terms in the expansion of h_{eff} up to *third* order in $1/c$.

Let us compute the diagonalized hamiltonian symbol $h := u^c \sharp_c^B H_D \sharp_c^B u^{c*}$ up to second order first. As expected, the zeroth order is given by

$$h_0 = (u_0 \sharp_c^B H_D \sharp_c^B u_0^*)_{(0)} = u_0 H_0 u_0^* = E \beta.$$

If $h \asymp \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{c^n} h_n$ is the asymptotic expansion of the diagonalized hamiltonian, then we can determine h_n recursively from $h \sharp_c^B u^c = u^c \sharp_c^B H_D + \mathcal{O}(1/c^\infty)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{c^n} (h_n \sharp_c^B u^c)_{(0)} &= \frac{1}{c^n} h_n u_0 + \mathcal{O}(1/c^{n+1}) \\ &= u^c \sharp_c^B H - \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{c^k} h_k \right) \sharp_c^B u^c + \mathcal{O}(1/c^{n+1}) \end{aligned}$$

This simplifies calculations considerably. Starting from this equation, we arrive at the following formulas

for h_1 and h_2 :

$$\begin{aligned} h_1 &= \left(u_0 H_1 + u_1 H_0 - h_0 u_1 + (u_0 \#_c^B H_0)_{(1)} - (h_0 \#_c^B u_0)_{(1)} \right) u_0^* = 0 \\ h_2 &= \left(u_0 H_2 + u_1 H_1 + u_2 H_0 - h_0 u_2 + (u_0 \#_c^B H_1)_{(1)} + (u_1 \#_c^B H_0)_{(1)} - (h_0 \#_c^B u_1)_{(1)} - (h_1 \#_c^B u_0)_{(1)} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (u_0 \#_c^B H_0)_{(2)} - (h_0 \#_c^B u_0)_{(2)} \right) u_0^* \\ &= u_0 H_2 u_0^* = V(x) \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} \end{aligned}$$

h_1 vanishes as expected and h_2 simplifies to V , because u_1, u_2 and H_1 vanish identically, and the product of two momentum-dependent functions contains no first- and second-order terms in $1/c$. So far, we did not need to calculate one line explicitly to arrive at this result! The first three terms of the effective hamiltonian are obtained by sandwiching h_0 to h_2 with π_{ref} .

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\text{eff}0} &= \pi_{\text{ref}} h_0 \pi_{\text{ref}} = E \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^2} = \sqrt{m^2 + \xi^2} \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^2} \\ h_{\text{eff}1} &= \pi_{\text{ref}} h_1 \pi_{\text{ref}} = 0 \\ h_{\text{eff}2} &= \pi_{\text{ref}} h_2 \pi_{\text{ref}} = V \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^2} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for $h_{\text{eff}3}$, we need to make some explicit computations and the first magnetic correction (third order in $1/c$). There are three groups of surviving terms:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\text{eff}3} &= \pi_{\text{ref}} h_3 \pi_{\text{ref}} = \pi_{\text{ref}} \left(u_3 H_0 - h_0 u_3 + (u_0 \#_c^B H_2)_{(1)} - (h_2 \#_c^B u_0)_{(1)} + (u_0 \#_c^B H_0)_{(3)} - (h_0 \#_c^B u_0)_{(3)} \right) u_0^* \pi_{\text{ref}} \\ &=: h_{\text{eff}30} + h_{\text{eff}31} + h_{\text{eff}33} \end{aligned}$$

The first two vanish when we project with π_{ref} from left and right, because $h_{\text{eff}0} = E \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^2}$ is a scalar symbol,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\text{eff}30} &= \pi_{\text{ref}} (u_3 H_0 - h_0 u_3) u_0^* \pi_{\text{ref}} = \pi_{\text{ref}} u_3 u_0^* u_0 H_0 u_0^* \pi_{\text{ref}} - \pi_{\text{ref}} h_0 u_3 u_0^* \pi_{\text{ref}} \\ &= \pi_{\text{ref}} u_3 u_0^* h_0 \pi_{\text{ref}} - \pi_{\text{ref}} h_0 u_3 u_0^* \pi_{\text{ref}} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The second and third group of terms need to be calculated explicitly; since the details are arithmetically intricate, we have moved them to Appendix E. $(u_0 \#_c^B H_2)_{(1)} - (h_2 \#_c^B u_0)_{(1)}$ gives a gradient coupling to the potential, the last one gives the coupling to the magnetic field:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\text{eff}31} &= \pi_{\text{ref}} \left((u_0 \#_c^B H_2)_{(1)} - (h_2 \#_c^B u_0)_{(1)} \right) \pi_{\text{ref}} = -i \pi_{\text{ref}} \{u_0, V\} \pi_{\text{ref}} \\ &= -i \partial_{x_i} V \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E(E+m)}} \pi_{\text{ref}} \left[-\frac{m \xi_i}{2\sqrt{2}E^{5/2}(E+m)^{1/2}} \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} (E+m) \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\xi_i(2E+m)}{2\sqrt{2}E^{5/2}(E+m)^{3/2}} (\xi \cdot \alpha) \beta (\xi \cdot \alpha) \beta - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E(E+m)}} \alpha_i \beta (\xi \cdot \alpha) \beta \right] \pi_{\text{ref}} \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have only kept *blockdiagonal terms*, because blockoffdiagonal terms do not contribute once we sandwich with π_{ref} . A short, but simple computation leads to

$$h_{\text{eff}31} = \frac{1}{2E(E+m)} (\nabla_x V \wedge \xi) \cdot \sigma$$

where we have used the definition of $E = \sqrt{m^2 + \xi^2}$ and

$$(\nabla_x V \cdot \alpha) (\xi \cdot \alpha) = (\nabla_x V \cdot \xi) \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + i(\nabla_x V \wedge \xi) \cdot \rho$$

with ρ_j , $j = 1, 2, 3$, defined as

$$\rho_j = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_j & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_j \end{pmatrix}.$$

The last term, $h_{\text{eff}33}$, contains the spin-orbit coupling:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\text{eff}33} &= \pi_{\text{ref}} \left((u_0 \#^B H_0)_{(3)} - (h_0 \#^B u_0)_{(3)} \right) u_0^* \pi_{\text{ref}} = \frac{i}{2} B_{lj}(x) \pi_{\text{ref}} \left(\partial_{\xi_l} u_0 \partial_{\xi_j} H_0 - \partial_{\xi_l} h_0 \partial_{\xi_j} u_0 \right) u_0^* \pi_{\text{ref}} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2E} B \cdot \sigma \end{aligned}$$

Altogether, the effective dynamics up to errors of fourth order in $1/c$ are given by

$$h_{\text{eff}} = E \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^2} + \frac{1}{c^2} V \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^2} + \frac{1}{c^3} \left(\frac{1}{2E(E+m)} (\nabla_x V \wedge \xi) \cdot \sigma - \frac{1}{2E} B \cdot \sigma \right) + \mathcal{O}(1/c^4). \quad (3.16)$$

The third-order correction is responsible for the spin dynamics and leads to the so-called T-BMT equation. This result has been previously derived by Cordes [Cor83] and Teufel [Teu03, Section 4.1], although their results differ from ours.

Cordes did not order his corrections in powers of a small parameter, but in terms of decay properties. Physically, this is not satisfactory, because the prefactor decides which effects are and are not measurable. Furthermore, it is not clear how to extend his ideas to allow for a non-relativistic limit.

Teufel's derivation rests on the assumptions that the electromagnetic potentials vary slowly. No such assumption has been made here, we have assumed that $1/c \ll 1$. Hence, the decoupling mechanism of these two approaches is different, even though the methods are the same. Physically, we argue that it is more natural to think of the semirelativistic limit as a limit that is concerned with the typical energy of the particle (which then determines $1/c$).

If we want to make this result rigorous, we will have to explicitly show that the construction of space-adiabatic perturbation theory still works when one replaces usual Weyl calculus with magnetic Weyl calculus. This has been the motivation for making the two-parameter expansion rigorous in the first place, but deserves a publication in its own right [FL08].

A Equivalence of Weyl systems in both scalings

Lemma A.1 *The adiabatic scaling and the usual scaling are related by the unitary U_ε , $(U_\varepsilon \varphi)(x) := \varepsilon^{-d/2} \varphi(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})$, $\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, i. e. we have*

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= U_\varepsilon Q_\varepsilon U_\varepsilon^{-1} \\ P_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A &= U_\varepsilon \Pi_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A U_\varepsilon^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof Let $\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then we have for Q_ε

$$\begin{aligned} (U_\varepsilon Q_\varepsilon U_\varepsilon^{-1} U_\varepsilon \varphi)(x) &= (U_\varepsilon Q_\varepsilon \varphi)(x) = \varepsilon^{-d/2} (Q_\varepsilon \varphi)\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &= \varepsilon^{-d/2} \varepsilon \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \varphi\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) = Q(U_\varepsilon \varphi)(x). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we get for the momentum operators

$$\begin{aligned} (U_\varepsilon \Pi_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A U_\varepsilon^{-1} U_\varepsilon \varphi)(x) &= (U_\varepsilon \Pi_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A \varphi)(x) = \varepsilon^{-d/2} (\Pi_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^A \varphi)\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &= \varepsilon^{-d/2} (-i(\nabla_x \varphi)\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) - \lambda A\left(\varepsilon \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \varphi\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)) = (-i\varepsilon \nabla_x - \lambda A(Q))(U_\varepsilon \varphi)(x). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the two scalings are unitarily equivalent. □

Corrolary A.2 *The Weyl systems associated to the two scalings given by equations (1.1) and (1.2) are unitarily equivalent.*

Theorem A.3 *The asymptotic two-parameter expansions of the magnetic Weyl products with respect to either scaling are given by the same terms order-by-order in ε and λ .*

Proof To show that the asymptotic expansion of the product is the same, we have to revisit Theorem 2.11 (proof of equivalence of the two non-asymptotic product formulas product formulas) and translate the relevant formulas to the usual scaling. It suffices to show that the twister in both cases is the same function and thus the expansion has to be identical, too. We denote magnetic Weyl quantization with respect to the Weyl system in usual scaling, W_u^A , with Op_u^A . For convenience of the reader, we will follow the notation in the proof of Theorem 1.1 as closely as possible.

With a simple scaling argument, we get the composition rule for the Weyl system $W_u^A(X)$:

$$\begin{aligned} W_u^A(Y)W_u^A(Z) &= W^{\lambda/\varepsilon A}(\varepsilon y, \eta)W^{\lambda/\varepsilon A}(\varepsilon z, \zeta) \\ &= e^{\frac{i}{2}\sigma((\varepsilon y, \eta), (\varepsilon z, \zeta))}\Omega^{\lambda/\varepsilon B}(Q, Q + \varepsilon y, Q + \varepsilon y + \varepsilon z)W^{\lambda/\varepsilon A}(\varepsilon y + \varepsilon z, \eta + \zeta) \\ &= e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)}\Omega_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B(Q, Q + \varepsilon y, Q + \varepsilon y + \varepsilon z)W_u^A(Y + Z) \end{aligned}$$

In Step 1 of the proof, we conclude from the composition law of the Weyl system (reformulated in the usual scaling),

$$\text{Op}_u^A(f)\text{Op}_u^A(g) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dZ \left(\int dY (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}f)(Y) (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1}g)(Z - Y) e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(Y, Z)} \cdot \Omega_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B(Q, Q + \varepsilon y, Q + \varepsilon z) \right) W_u^A(Z),$$

that we need to find the operator kernel for

$$\Omega_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B(Q, Q + \varepsilon y, Q + \varepsilon z)W_u^A(Z).$$

If we apply this operator to a function $\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\Omega_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B(Q, Q + \varepsilon y, Q + \varepsilon z)W_u^A(Z)\varphi)(v) &= \Omega_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B(v, v + \varepsilon y, v + \varepsilon z) e^{-i(v+\varepsilon/2z)\cdot\zeta} e^{-i\lambda/\varepsilon\Gamma^A([v, v+\varepsilon z])} \varphi(v + \varepsilon z) \\ &= \int du e^{-i(u-\varepsilon/2z)\cdot\zeta} e^{-i\lambda/\varepsilon\Gamma^A([u-\varepsilon z, u])} \Omega_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B(u - \varepsilon z, u + \varepsilon y, u) \delta(u - (v + \varepsilon z)) \varphi(u) \\ &=: \int du \tilde{K}(y, Z; u, v) \varphi(u). \end{aligned}$$

To find the symbol associated to this object, we employ the Wigner transform adapted to observables in the usual scaling defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{W}}^A(\varphi, \psi)(X) &:= \varepsilon^d (\mathcal{F}_\sigma \langle \varphi, W_u^A(\cdot)\psi \rangle)(-X) \\ &= \int dy e^{-iy\cdot\xi} e^{-i\lambda/\varepsilon\Gamma^A([x-\varepsilon/2y, x+\varepsilon/2y])} \varphi^*(x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y) \psi(x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y). \end{aligned}$$

If we apply this to the integral kernel above, we get by the essentially the same calculation as before,

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\mathcal{W}}^A \tilde{K}(y, Z; \cdot, \cdot))(X) &= \varepsilon^d \int du e^{-iu\cdot\xi} e^{-i\lambda/\varepsilon\Gamma^A([x-\varepsilon/2u, x+\varepsilon/2u])} \tilde{K}(y, Z; x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}u, x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}u) \\ &= \varepsilon^d \varepsilon^{-d} \int du e^{-iu\cdot\xi} e^{-i\lambda/\varepsilon\Gamma^A([x-\varepsilon/2u, x+\varepsilon/2u])} e^{-i(x-\varepsilon/2u-\varepsilon/2z)\cdot\eta} e^{-i\lambda/\varepsilon\Gamma^A([x-\varepsilon/2u-\varepsilon z, x-\varepsilon/2u])} \\ &\quad \cdot \Omega_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B(x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}u - \varepsilon z, x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}u + \varepsilon y, x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}u) \delta(z + u) \\ &= e^{i\sigma(X, Z)} \Omega_{\varepsilon, \lambda}^B(x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}z, x + \varepsilon(y - \frac{z}{2}), x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}z). \end{aligned}$$

If we plug this into the remainder of the proof, we see that the twister term (after replacing z with $y + z$ just as in Step 3) obtained here is identical to the one obtained in the adiabatic scaling,

$$e^{i\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sigma(x,y)}\Omega_{\varepsilon,\lambda}^B(x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y+z), x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y-z), x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(y+z)).$$

Hence the two expansions need to agree. \square

B Formal expansion of the twister

Lemma B.1 *Assume B satisfies Assumption 2.1. Then we can expand γ_ε^B around x to arbitrary order N in powers of ε :*

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z) &= -\sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\varepsilon^n}{n!} \partial_{x_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{x_{j_{n-1}}} B_{kl}(x) y_k z_l \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n+1} \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} \sum_{c=1}^n \binom{n+1}{c} \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot \left((1 - (-1)^{n+1})c - (1 - (-1)^c)(n+1) \right) y_{j_1} \cdots y_{j_{c-1}} z_{j_c} \cdots z_{j_{n-1}} + R_N[\gamma_\varepsilon^B](x, y, z) \\ &=: -\sum_{n=1}^N \varepsilon^n \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|=n-1} C_{n,\alpha,\beta} \partial_x^\alpha \partial_x^\beta B_{kl}(x) y_k z_l y^\alpha z^\beta + R_N[\gamma_\varepsilon^B](x, y, z) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$=: -\sum_{n=1}^N \varepsilon^n \mathcal{L}_n + R_N[\gamma_\varepsilon^B](x, y, z) \quad (\text{B.2})$$

In particular, the flux is of order ε and the n th-order term is a sum of monomials in position of degree $n+1$ and each of the terms is a $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^d, \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_z^d))$ function. The remainder is a $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d))$ function that is $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{N+1})$ and can be explicitly written as a bounded function of x , y and z as well as $N+2$ factors of y and z .

Proof We choose the transversal gauge to represent B , i. e.

$$A_l(x+a) = -\int_0^1 ds B_{lj}(x+sa) sa_j \quad (\text{B.3})$$

and rewrite the flux integral into three line integrals over the edges of the triangle.

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z) &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^1 dt \left[\varepsilon (y_l + z_l) A_l(x + \varepsilon(t-1/2)(y+z)) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \varepsilon y_l A_l(x + \varepsilon(t-1/2)y - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}z) - \varepsilon z_l A_l(x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}y + \varepsilon(t-1/2)z) \right] \\ &= \varepsilon \int_{-1/2}^{+1/2} dt \int_0^1 ds s \left[-B_{lj}(x + \varepsilon st(y+z)) (y_l + z_l) t(y_j + z_j) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + B_{lj}(x + \varepsilon s(ty - \frac{z}{2})) y_l (ty_j - \frac{z_j}{2}) + B_{lj}(x + \varepsilon s(\frac{y}{2} + tz)) z_l (\frac{y_j}{2} + tz_j) \right] \end{aligned}$$

All these terms have a prefactor of ε which stems from the explicit expression of transversal gauge. We will now Taylor expand each of the three terms up to $N-1$ th order around x (so that it is of N th order in ε).

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{-1/2}^{+1/2} dt \int_0^1 ds B_{lj}(x + \varepsilon st(y+z)) \varepsilon s(y_j + z_j) = \\ &= \int_0^1 ds \int_{-1/2}^{+1/2} dt \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{\varepsilon^{n+1}}{n!} s^{n+1} s^{-n} \partial_{x_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{x_{j_n}} B_{lj_{n+1}}(x) t^{n+1} \prod_{m=1}^{n+1} (y_{j_m} + z_{j_m}) + R_{1Nl}(x, y, z) \end{aligned}$$

The remainder R_{1Nl} is of order $N + 1$ in ε , bounded in x and polynomially bounded in y and z . It is a sum of monomials in y and z of degree $N + 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} R_{1Nl}(x, y, z) &= \int_0^1 d\tau \int_0^1 ds \int_{-1/2}^{+1/2} dt \frac{1}{(N-1)!} (1-\tau)^{N-1} \partial_\tau^N B_{lj}(x + \varepsilon\tau st(y+z)) \varepsilon st(y+z) \\ &= \varepsilon^{N+1} \sum_{|\alpha|=N} \frac{N}{\alpha!} \int_0^1 ds \int_{-1/2}^{+1/2} dt s t^{N+1} (y+z)^\alpha (y_j + z_j) \int_0^1 d\tau (1-\tau)^{N-1} \partial_x^\alpha B_{lj}(x + \varepsilon\tau st(y+z)) \end{aligned}$$

The n th order term in ε (the $n - 1$ th term of the Taylor expansion) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon^n}{(n-1)!} \int_0^1 ds s \int_{-1/2}^{+1/2} dt t^n \partial_{x_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{x_{j_{n-1}}} B_{lj_n}(x) \prod_{m=1}^n (y_{j_m} + z_{j_m}) &= \\ = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\varepsilon^n}{n!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n+1} \frac{1 + (-1)^n}{n+1} \partial_{x_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{x_{j_n}} B_{lj_n}(x) \sum_{m=0}^n \binom{n}{m} y_{j_1} \cdots y_{j_m} z_{j_{m+1}} \cdots z_{j_n}. \end{aligned}$$

The other factors can be calculated in the same fashion:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon^n}{(n-1)!} \int_{-1/2}^{+1/2} dt \int_0^1 ds s^n s^{-(n-1)} \partial_{x_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{x_{j_{n-1}}} B_{lj_n}(x) \prod_{m=1}^n (ty_{j_m} - \frac{1}{2}z_{j_m}) &= \\ = \frac{\varepsilon^n}{n!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n+2} \partial_{x_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{x_{j_{n-1}}} B_{lj_n}(x) \sum_{m=0}^n \binom{n}{m} \frac{(-1)^{n-m} + (-1)^n}{m+1} y_{j_1} \cdots y_{j_m} z_{j_{m+1}} \cdots z_{j_n} \end{aligned}$$

The remainder is also of the correct order in ε , contains $N + 2$ qs and a $\mathcal{B} \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d))$ function as prefactor:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{2Nl}(x, y, z) &= \varepsilon^{N+1} \sum_{|\alpha|=N} \frac{N}{\alpha!} \int_0^1 ds \int_{-1/2}^{+1/2} dt s (ty - \frac{z}{2})^\alpha (ty_j - \frac{z_j}{2}) \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot \int_0^1 d\tau (1-\tau)^{N-1} \partial_x^\alpha B_{lj}(x + \varepsilon\tau(sty - \frac{z}{2})) \end{aligned}$$

The last term satisfies the same properties as R_{1Nl} :

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-1/2}^{+1/2} dt \int_0^1 ds \frac{\varepsilon^n}{(n-1)!} s^n s^{-(n-1)} \partial_{x_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{x_{j_{n-1}}} B_{lj_n}(x) \prod_{m=1}^n (\frac{1}{2}y_{j_m} + tz_{j_m}) &= \\ = \frac{\varepsilon^n}{n!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n+2} \partial_{x_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{x_{j_{n-1}}} B_{lj_n}(x) \sum_{m=0}^n \binom{n}{m} \frac{1 + (-1)^{n-m}}{n+1-m} y_{j_1} \cdots y_{j_m} z_{j_{m+1}} \cdots z_{j_n} \end{aligned}$$

R_{3Nl} satisfies the same properties as R_{1Nl} and R_{2Nl} ,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{3Nl}(x, y, z) &= \varepsilon^{N+1} \sum_{|\alpha|=N} \frac{N}{\alpha!} \int_0^1 ds \int_{-1/2}^{+1/2} dt s (\frac{y}{2} + tz)^\alpha (\frac{y_j}{2} + tz_j) \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot \int_0^1 d\tau (1-\tau)^{N-1} \partial_x^\alpha B_{lj}(x + \varepsilon\tau s(\frac{y}{2} + tz)). \end{aligned}$$

Put together, we obtain for the n th order term:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \frac{\varepsilon^n}{n!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n+1} \partial_{x_{j_1}} \cdots \partial_{x_{j_{n-1}}} B_{l_{j_n}}(x) \sum_{m=0}^n \binom{n}{m} \cdot \\
& \cdot \left[\frac{1 + (-1)^n}{n+1} (y_l + z_l) - \frac{(-1)^{n-m} + (-1)^n}{m+1} y_l - \frac{1 + (-1)^{n-m}}{n+1-m} z_l \right] y_{j_1} \cdots y_{j_m} z_{j_{m+1}} \cdots z_{j_n} \\
& = \frac{\varepsilon^n}{n!} \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n+1} \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|=n-1} \partial_x^\alpha \partial_x^\beta B_{lk}(x) y_l z_k \cdot \\
& \cdot \binom{n+1}{|\alpha|+1} ((1 - (-1)^{|\alpha|+1})(n+1) - (1 - (-1)^{n+1})(|\alpha|+1)) y^\alpha z^\beta
\end{aligned}$$

The total remainder of the expansion reads

$$R_N[\gamma_\varepsilon^B] = y_l (R_{1Nl} - R_{2Nl}) + z_l (R_{1Nl} - R_{3Nl}) \in \mathcal{B} \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)).$$

In total, the remainder is a sum of monomials with bounded coefficients of degree $N + 2$ while it is of $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{N+1})$. \square

C Properties of derivatives of γ_ε^B

For convenience, we give two theorems found in [IMP07] on the magnetic flux and its exponential which are needed to make the expansion rigorous:

Lemma C.1 *If the magnetic field B_{lj} , $1 \leq l, j \leq n$, satisfies the usual conditions, then*

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{x_j} \gamma_\varepsilon^B &= D_{jk}(x, y, z) y_k + E_{jk}(x, y, z) z_k \\
\partial_{y_j} \gamma_\varepsilon^B &= D'_{jk}(x, y, z) y_k + E'_{jk}(x, y, z) z_k \\
\partial_{z_j} \gamma_\varepsilon^B &= D''_{jk}(x, y, z) y_k + E''_{jk}(x, y, z) z_k
\end{aligned}$$

where the coefficients $D_{jk}, \dots, E''_{jk} \in \mathcal{B} \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, $1 \leq j, k \leq d$.

Proof The corners of the flux triangles of F_B found in [IMP07] differ from those of γ_ε^B , but the proof carries over with trivial modifications. \square

A direct consequence of this is the following simple corollary:

Corrolary C.2 *If the magnetic field satisfies the usual conditions, then*

$$\left| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta \partial_z^\gamma e^{-i\lambda \gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z)} \right| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} (\langle y \rangle + \langle z \rangle)^{|\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma|} \quad \forall \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^d,$$

i. e. derivatives of $e^{-i\lambda \gamma_\varepsilon^B(x, y, z)}$ are $\mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty$ functions in y and z .

D Existence of oscillatory integrals

To derive the adiabatic expansion, we have to ensure the existence of two types of oscillatory integrals, one is relevant for the (n, k) term of the two-parameter expansion, the other is necessary to show existence of remainders the and k th term of the λ expansion.

Lemma D.1 Let $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$. Then for all multiindices $\alpha, \alpha' \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$

$$G(X) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int dY e^{i\sigma(X, Y)} y^\alpha \eta^{\alpha'} (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) = ((-i\partial_\xi)^\alpha (+i\partial_x)^{\alpha'} f)(X) \quad (\text{D.1})$$

exists as an oscillatory integral and is in symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m-|\alpha|+|\alpha'|}$.

Proof Formally, we can rewrite the polynomial in y and η as derivatives with respect to ξ and x , respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int dY e^{i\sigma(X, Y)} y^\alpha \eta^{\alpha'} (\mathcal{F}_\sigma f)(Y) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int d\tilde{Y} e^{i\sigma(X, Y)} y^\alpha \eta^{\alpha'} e^{i\sigma(Y, \tilde{Y})} f(\tilde{Y}) = \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int d\tilde{Y} (-i\partial_\xi)^\alpha (+i\partial_x)^{\alpha'} \left(e^{i\sigma(X - \tilde{Y}, Y)} f(\tilde{Y}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

As $\sigma(X - \tilde{Y}, Y)$ and f are smooth functions of X (f depends trivially on X), we can interchange integration and differentiation with respect to x and ξ (for details, see [Hör72, p. 90 f]):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int d\tilde{Y} (-i\partial_\xi)^\alpha (+i\partial_x)^{\alpha'} \left(e^{i\sigma(X - \tilde{Y}, Y)} f(\tilde{Y}) \right) &= \\ &= (-i\partial_\xi)^\alpha (+i\partial_x)^{\alpha'} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int d\tilde{Y} e^{i\sigma(X - \tilde{Y}, Y)} f(\tilde{Y}) \\ &= ((-i\partial_\xi)^\alpha (+i\partial_x)^{\alpha'} f)(X) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the integral exists as an oscillatory integral. G is also in the correct symbol class and the lemma has been proven. \square

The next corollary contains the relevant result for the term-by-term expansion of the magnetic product.

Corrolary D.2 Let $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1}$, $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_2}$ and $\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ be arbitrary multiindices. Then for all functions $B \in \mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the oscillatory integral

$$G(X) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X, Y+Z)} B(x) y^\alpha \eta^{\alpha'} (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) z^\beta \zeta^{\beta'} (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z) \quad (\text{D.2})$$

exists, is in symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-(|\alpha|+|\beta|)\rho+(|\alpha'|+|\beta'|)\delta}$ and yields

$$B(x) ((-i\partial_\xi)^\alpha (+i\partial_x)^{\alpha'} f)(X) ((-i\partial_\xi)^\beta (+i\partial_x)^{\beta'} g)(X). \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Proof We decompose the integrals into two independent factors and then apply Lemma D.1 to each:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int dY \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X, Y+Z)} B(x) y^\alpha \eta^{\alpha'} (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) z^\beta \zeta^{\beta'} (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z) &= \\ &= B(x) \left(\frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int dY e^{i\sigma(X, Y)} y^\alpha \eta^{\alpha'} (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} f)(Y) \right) \left(\frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int dZ e^{i\sigma(X, Z)} z^\beta \zeta^{\beta'} (\mathcal{F}_\sigma^{-1} g)(Z) \right) \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that G is in the correct symbol class. $\partial_\xi^\mu \partial_x^{\mu'} G(X)$ is a linear combination of terms of the type

$$\partial_x^{\nu'} B(x) ((-i\partial_\xi)^{\alpha+\kappa} (+i\partial_x)^{\alpha'+\kappa'} f)(X) ((-i\partial_\xi)^{\beta+\tau} (+i\partial_x)^{\beta'+\tau'} g)(X)$$

where $\mu = \kappa + \tau$ and $\mu' = \nu' + \kappa' + \tau'$. Derivatives of B remain bounded and thus do not alter the decay properties. All of these terms can be bounded by

$$C \langle \xi \rangle^{m_1+m_2-(|\alpha|+|\beta|+|\kappa|+|\tau|)\rho+(|\alpha'|+|\beta'|+|\kappa'|+|\tau'|)\delta} \leq C \langle \xi \rangle^{m_1+m_2-(|\alpha|+|\beta|+|\mu|)\rho+(|\alpha'|+|\beta'|+|\mu'|)\delta}.$$

Hence $G \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^{m_1+m_2-(|\alpha|+|\beta|)\rho+(|\alpha'|+|\beta'|)\delta}$. \square

In the proof of Corollary D.2 we have used that we could write the integrals as a *product* of two independent integrals. There is, however, a second relevant type of oscillatory integral that cannot be ‘untangled.’ Fortunately, we only need to ensure their existence and not evaluate them explicitly. Again, we will start with a simpler integral over only one phase space variable and then extend the ideas to the full integral in a corollary.

Lemma D.3 Assume $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^m$, $B \in \mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^d, \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_y^d))$ and to each multiindex $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, there exists a bounded function $C_{\alpha\beta}$ such that

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta B(x, y)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta}(x) \langle y \rangle^{|\alpha|+|\beta|}.$$

Then the following integral exists as an oscillatory integral

$$F(X) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int dY \int d\tilde{Y} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Y}, Y)} B(x, y) f(\tilde{Y}) \quad (\text{D.4})$$

and F of symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^m$.

Proof We start by rewriting the oscillatory integral as a convolution over the Fourier transform of B in y and the $f(x, \cdot)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int dY \int d\tilde{Y} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Y}, Y)} B(x, y) f(\tilde{Y}) &= \int dY \int d\tilde{Y} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta})\cdot y} e^{-i(x-\tilde{y})\cdot \eta} B(x, y) f(\tilde{y}, \tilde{\eta}) \\ &= \int dy \int d\tilde{y} \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta})\cdot y} (2\pi)^d \delta(x-\tilde{y}) B(x, y) f(\tilde{y}, \tilde{\eta}) \\ &= (2\pi)^d \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta})\cdot y} B(x, y) f(x, \tilde{\eta}) =: (2\pi)^d F(x, \xi) \end{aligned}$$

We will split the integral in two parts: one integral around the origin and an integral over the remainder. So let $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, [0, 1])$ be a smooth function such that $\chi(y) \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of the origin and 0 outside of some compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d . We can decompose B into a part with compact support in y and a remainder,

$$B(x, y) = \chi(y)B(x, y) + (1 - \chi(y))B(x, y) =: B_1(x, y) + B_2(x, y).$$

The integral is then also split in two:

$$\begin{aligned} \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta})\cdot y} B(x, y) f(x, \tilde{\eta}) &= \\ &= \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta})\cdot y} B_1(x, y) f(x, \tilde{\eta}) + \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta})\cdot y} B_2(x, y) f(x, \tilde{\eta}) \\ &=: F_1(x, \xi) + F_2(x, \xi) \end{aligned}$$

Let us start with the integral which involves B_1 . First of all, we note that $B_1(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and thus its Fourier transform exists and decays rapidly as well. Certainly $(\mathcal{F}_2 B_1)(x, \cdot)$ is integrable.

The symbol f may be replaced by a bounded function $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^0$ and $\langle \tilde{\eta} \rangle^m$. The factor $\langle \tilde{\eta} \rangle^m$ is then converted into powers of $L_y := \sqrt{1 - \Delta_y}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi - \tilde{\eta}) \cdot y} B_1(x, y) f(x, \tilde{\eta}) &= \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi - \tilde{\eta}) \cdot y} B_1(x, y) \tilde{f}(x, \tilde{\eta}) \langle \tilde{\eta} \rangle^m \\ &= \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} (L_y^m e^{-i\tilde{\eta} \cdot y}) (e^{i\xi \cdot y} B_1(x, y)) \tilde{f}(x, \tilde{\eta}) \end{aligned}$$

By partial integration, we get linear combinations of terms of the type

$$\int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{-i\tilde{\eta} \cdot y} (L_y^{k_1} e^{i\xi \cdot y}) (L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, y)) \tilde{f}(x, \tilde{\eta}) = \langle \xi \rangle^{k_1} \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi - \tilde{\eta}) \cdot y} L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, y) \tilde{f}(x, \tilde{\eta})$$

where $k_1 + k_2 = m$. As $L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, its Fourier transform exists and is rapidly decaying, hence integrable. On the other hand, \tilde{f} is bounded by assumption, and Hölder's inequality yields a bound on the growth in momentum,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \xi \rangle^{k_1} \left\| \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi - \tilde{\eta}) \cdot y} L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, y) \tilde{f}(x, \tilde{\eta}) \right\|_\infty &\leq \\ &\leq (2\pi)^{d/2} \left\| \mathcal{F}_2(L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, \cdot)) \right\|_1 \left\| \tilde{f}(x, \cdot) \right\|_\infty \langle \xi \rangle^{k_1} \leq C(x) \langle \xi \rangle^{k_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.5})$$

The last norm, $\|\tilde{f}(x, \cdot)\|_\infty$, can be uniformly bounded in x by definition of $\mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^0$. Estimating the L^1 norm is slightly more involved: we split

$$L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, \cdot) = [L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, \cdot)]_+ - [L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, \cdot)]_-$$

into positive and negative part (whose support is also compact and independent of x), and use the triangle inequality, $\|\mathcal{F}_2 L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, \cdot)\|_1 \leq \|\mathcal{F}_2 [L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, \cdot)]_+\|_1 + \|\mathcal{F}_2 [L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, \cdot)]_-\|_1$. Thus we can bound $[L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, \cdot)]_\pm \geq 0$ separately: by assumption, both are positive and for fixed x , $[L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, \cdot)]_\pm \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ which implies that $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ norm of the Fourier transform is *equal* to the L^1 norm of the original function [LL01, p. 124],

$$\left\| [L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, \cdot)]_\pm \right\|_\infty = \left\| \mathcal{F}_2^{-1} \mathcal{F}_2 [L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, \cdot)]_\pm \right\|_\infty = \left\| \mathcal{F}_2 [L_y^{k_2} B_1(x, \cdot)]_\pm \right\|_1 < C_\pm,$$

where we have used that \mathcal{F}_2 is unitary on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Therefore, the right-hand side of (D.5) can be uniformly bounded by $(C_+ + C_-) \langle \xi \rangle^{k_1} \leq (C_+ + C_-) \langle \xi \rangle^m$ for all $k_1 + k_2 = m$.

To prove that F_1 is really in the correct symbol class, i. e. $|\partial_x^{\alpha'} \partial_\xi^\alpha F_1(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha, \alpha'} \langle \xi \rangle^{m - |\alpha| \rho + |\alpha'| \delta}$ for all $\alpha, \alpha' \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, we write $\partial_x^{\alpha'} \partial_\xi^\alpha F_1(x, \xi)$ as linear combinations of the type

$$\int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} (\partial_\xi^\alpha e^{i(\xi - \tilde{\eta}) \cdot y}) (\partial_x^{\beta'} B_1(x, y)) \partial_x^{\mu'} f(x, \tilde{\eta})$$

where $\beta' + \mu' = \alpha'$. $\partial_\xi^\alpha e^{i(\xi - \tilde{\eta}) \cdot y}$ yields powers of y which can be converted into derivatives of f with respect to $\tilde{\eta}$ (by either partial integration or the distribution of derivatives property of convolutions). By assumption, $\partial_x^{\beta'} B_1(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and we can bound the above integral,

$$\left| \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi - \tilde{\eta}) \cdot y} \partial_x^{\beta'} B_1(x, y) \partial_\eta^\alpha \partial_x^{\mu'} f(x, \tilde{\eta}) \right| \leq C \langle \xi \rangle^{m - |\alpha| \rho + |\mu'| \delta} \leq C \langle \xi \rangle^{m - |\alpha| \rho + |\alpha'| \delta}.$$

Hence, we conclude $F_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^m$ whenever $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho,\delta}^m$.

Writing F_2 as a convolution of a Fourier transform of an L^2 function and another L^2 function allows us to use the Cauchy Schwarz inequality: this gives a bound in terms of the L^2 norms of the two functions and ensures the existence of F_2 . As B_2 vanishes in a neighborhood of $y = 0$, i. e. the singular support of the distribution, F_2 is much better behaved than F_1 and does not contribute to the growth of F in ξ .

For all $y \in \text{supp} B_2(x, \cdot)$, by assumption on B , we can bound $B_2(x, \cdot)$ by even powers of $\|y\|^{2N} = (\sum_{j=1}^d y_j^2)^N =: \sum_{|\alpha|=2N} c_\alpha y^\alpha$. We can choose any $N \geq N_{\min}$ larger than a certain minimum $N_{\min} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $b_2(x, \cdot)$ is bounded (as $B_2(x, \cdot)$ vanishes in a neighborhood of $y = 0$, there will be no singularity),

$$B_2(x, y) = b_2(x, y) \|y\|^{2N} = b_2(x, y) \sum_{|\alpha|=2N} c_\alpha y^\alpha.$$

In particular, we may choose $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ so that (i) $2(N - N_{\min}) > d/2$ and (ii) $m - 2N\rho < -d/2$. The first condition means we have chosen N such that the bounded prefactor $b_2(x, \cdot)$ is square-integrable in y for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. By converting $\|y\|^{2N}$ into derivatives of f with respect to $\tilde{\eta}$,

$$\begin{aligned} F_2(x, \xi) &= \sum_{|\alpha|=2N} (2\pi)^d c_\alpha \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} (+i\partial_{\tilde{\eta}})^\alpha \left(e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta})\cdot y} \right) b_2(x, y) f(x, \tilde{\eta}) \\ &= \sum_{|\alpha|=2N} (2\pi)^d c_\alpha \int d\tilde{\eta} \left(\int dy e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta})\cdot y} b_2(x, y) \right) ((-i\partial_{\tilde{\eta}})^\alpha f)(x, \tilde{\eta}) \\ &= \sum_{|\alpha|=2N} (2\pi)^d c_\alpha (\hat{b}_2(x, \cdot) * (\partial_{\tilde{\eta}}^\alpha f(x, \cdot))), \end{aligned}$$

F_2 has been rewritten as a sum of derivatives of a convolution of the Fourier transform of $b_2(x, \cdot)$ in the second argument (denoted by $\hat{b}_2(x, \cdot)$) and $f(x, \cdot)$. As $b_2(x, \cdot) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, its Fourier transform is also square-integrable. With our choice of $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\partial_{\tilde{\eta}}^\alpha f(x, \cdot)$ is square-integrable as well for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, $|\alpha| = 2N$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|\partial_{\tilde{\eta}}^\alpha f(x, \xi)| \leq C_\alpha \langle \xi \rangle^{m-2N\rho} < C_\alpha \langle \xi \rangle^{-d/2}.$$

The convolution of two square-integrable functions exists *pointwise*, is *continuous* in ξ and can be uniformly bounded in ξ [LL01, Lemma 2.20]:

$$\|\hat{b}_2(x, \cdot) * (\partial_{\tilde{\eta}}^\alpha f(x, \cdot))\|_\infty \leq \|\hat{b}_2(x, \cdot)\|_2 \|\partial_{\tilde{\eta}}^\alpha f(x, \cdot)\|_2$$

Now we need to show that we can uniformly bound each of the factors in x : $\{\hat{b}_2(x, \cdot)\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ can be interpreted as a family of functionals on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ indexed by x . For any $\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the application of the functional $\hat{b}_2(x, \cdot)$ to φ ,

$$|(\hat{b}_2(x, \cdot), \varphi)| = \left| \iint dy \hat{b}_2(x, y) \varphi(y) \right| < \infty,$$

is finite and the *Principle of Uniform Boundedness* yields a uniform upper bound for $\|\hat{b}_2(x, \cdot)\|_2$. The bound on the L^2 norm of $\partial_{\tilde{\eta}}^\alpha f(x, \cdot)$ follows from the same argument.

It remains to show that F_2 is in the correct symbol class, i. e.

$$|\partial_x^{\alpha'} \partial_{\tilde{\eta}}^\alpha F_2(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\alpha'} \langle \xi \rangle^{m-|\alpha|\rho+|\alpha'|\delta} \quad (\text{D.6})$$

for all $\alpha, \alpha' \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$. Derivatives with respect to momentum can be directly pushed over to f and thus improve decay in ξ by $|\alpha|\rho$. Derivatives with respect to x will distribute and we have to consider terms of the type

$$\int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta})\cdot y} \partial_x^{\beta'} b_2(x, y) \|y\|^{2N} \partial_x^{\mu'} \partial_{\tilde{\eta}}^\alpha f(x, \tilde{\eta})$$

where $\beta' + \mu' = \alpha'$. By assumption on B , we can bound $|\partial_x^{\beta'} b_2(x, y)|$ by $C_{\beta'}(x) \|y\|^{|\beta'|}$ and thus define $b_{2\beta'}(x, y) \|y\|^{|\beta'|} := \partial_x^{\beta'} b_2(x, y)$. The factor $\|y\|^{2N+|\beta'|}$ can be converted into derivatives of f with respect to $\tilde{\eta}$ as shown above and thus improves decay in momentum by an *additional* $|\beta'| \rho$. Hence, we can bound the above integral by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta}) \cdot y} \partial_x^{\beta'} b_2(x, y) \|y\|^{2N} \partial_x^{\mu'} \partial_{\xi}^{\alpha'} f(x, \tilde{\eta}) \right| = \\ & = \left| \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta}) \cdot y} b_{2\beta'}(x, y) \|y\|^{2N+|\beta'|} \partial_x^{\mu'} \partial_{\tilde{\eta}}^{\alpha'} f(x, \tilde{\eta}) \right| \leq C_{\alpha\beta'\mu'} \langle \xi \rangle^{m-(|\alpha|+|\beta'|)\rho+|\mu'|\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

The worst case is clearly $\beta' = 0 \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ and $\mu' = \alpha'$, and $C_{\alpha\alpha'} \langle \xi \rangle^{m-|\alpha|\rho+|\alpha'|\delta}$ is an upper bound for (D.6). Thus, we conclude that $F_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ as well and we have proven the Lemma. \square

Lemma D.4 Assume $f \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1}$, $g \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_2}$ and the τ -dependent function $G_{\tau} \in \mathcal{B} \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_x^d, \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_Y^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}_Z^{2d}))$ is of the form

$$G_{\tau}(x, Y, Z) = \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta|=l \\ |\alpha'|+|\beta'|=m}} G_{\tau \alpha \alpha' \beta \beta'}(x, y, z) y^{\alpha} \eta^{\alpha'} z^{\beta} \zeta^{\beta'}$$

where all $G_{\tau \alpha \alpha' \beta \beta'}$ that occur in the sum are smooth in τ , $\tau \in [0, 1]$, and satisfy the following condition: for all multiindices $\gamma, \mu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ there exists a bounded function $C_{\gamma\mu\nu}$ such that

$$|\partial_x^{\gamma} \partial_y^{\mu} \partial_z^{\nu} G_{\tau \alpha \alpha' \beta \beta'}(x, y, z)| \leq C_{\gamma\mu\nu}(x) (\langle y \rangle + \langle z \rangle)^{|\gamma|+|\mu|+|\nu|}. \quad (\text{D.7})$$

Then for all $\tau \in [0, 1]$

$$I_{\tau}(X) := \int dY \int d\tilde{Y} \int dZ \int d\tilde{Z} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Y}, Y)} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Z}, Z)} G_{\tau}(x, Y, Z) e^{i\tau \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sigma(Y, Z)} f(\tilde{Y}) g(\tilde{Z}) \quad (\text{D.8})$$

exists as an oscillatory integral and is in symbol class $\mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2-l\rho+m\delta}$. The map $\tau \mapsto I_{\tau}(X)$ is smooth for all $X \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$.

Proof We convert each of power of y , η , z and ζ into derivatives with respect to $\tilde{\eta}$, \tilde{y} , $\tilde{\zeta}$ and \tilde{z} , and use partial integration (in the sense of oscillatory integrals) to move the derivatives to f and g ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int dY \int d\tilde{Y} \int dZ \int d\tilde{Z} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Y}, Y)} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Z}, Z)} G_{\tau}(x, y, z) e^{i\tau \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sigma(Y, Z)} f(\tilde{Y}) g(\tilde{Z}) = \\ & = \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta|=l \\ |\alpha'|+|\beta'|=m}} \int dY \int d\tilde{Y} \int dZ \int d\tilde{Z} (y^{\alpha} \eta^{\alpha'} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Y}, Y)}) (z^{\beta} \zeta^{\beta'} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Z}, Z)}) \cdot \\ & \quad \cdot G_{\tau \alpha \alpha' \beta \beta'}(x, y, z) e^{i\tau \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sigma(Y, Z)} f(\tilde{Y}) g(\tilde{Z}) \\ & = \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta|=l \\ |\alpha'|+|\beta'|=m}} \int dY \int d\tilde{Y} \int dZ \int d\tilde{Z} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Y}, Y)} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Z}, Z)} G_{\tau \alpha \alpha' \beta \beta'}(x, y, z) e^{i\tau \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sigma(Y, Z)} \cdot \\ & \quad \cdot ((+i\partial_{\tilde{\eta}})^{\alpha} (-i\partial_{\tilde{y}})^{\alpha'} f)(\tilde{Y}) ((+i\partial_{\tilde{\zeta}})^{\beta} (-i\partial_{\tilde{z}})^{\beta'} g)(\tilde{Z}). \quad (\text{D.9}) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it suffices to prove the statement for $l = 0 = m$,

$$I_{\tau}(X) = \int dY \int d\tilde{Y} \int dZ \int d\tilde{Z} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Y}, Y)} e^{i\sigma(X-\tilde{Z}, Z)} G_{\tau}(x, y, z) e^{i\tau \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sigma(Y, Z)} f(\tilde{Y}) g(\tilde{Z}),$$

where G_τ depends only on position variables (and possibly τ), and satisfies condition (D.7). The general case follows immediately from equation (D.9).

After collecting terms in the exponential containing η and ζ and then integrating out those variables, we rewrite the integral as

$$\begin{aligned} I_\tau(X) &= (2\pi)^{2d} \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} \int dz \int d\tilde{\zeta} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta})\cdot y} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\zeta})\cdot z} G_\tau(x, y, z) f\left(x - \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}z, \tilde{\eta}\right) g\left(x + \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}y, \tilde{\zeta}\right) \\ &=: (2\pi)^d \int dz \int d\tilde{\zeta} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\zeta})\cdot z} F_\tau\left(x - \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}z, \xi, z, \tilde{\zeta}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The existence of

$$\begin{aligned} F_\tau\left(x - \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}z, \xi, z, \tilde{\zeta}\right) &= \int dy \int d\tilde{\eta} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta})\cdot y} G_\tau(x, y, z) f\left(x - \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}z, \tilde{\eta}\right) g\left(x + \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}y, \tilde{\zeta}\right) \\ &= \int d\tilde{\eta} \left(\int dy e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\eta})\cdot y} G_\tau(x, y, z) g\left(x + \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}y, \tilde{\zeta}\right) \right) f\left(x - \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}z, \tilde{\eta}\right) \end{aligned}$$

follows from arguments analogous to those in the proof of the previous Lemma: for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\tilde{\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ $g\left(x + \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}y, \tilde{\zeta}\right)$ can be uniformly bounded in y and τ , and $G_\tau(x, y, z) g\left(x + \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}y, \tilde{\zeta}\right)$ plays the same role as $B(x, y)$ (the extra variables are regarded as parameters). Hence, we conclude that $F_\tau(x, \xi, z, \tilde{\zeta})$ exists and $F_\tau(\cdot, \cdot, z, \tilde{\zeta}) \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1}$. In fact, we can bound $|F_\tau(x - \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}z, \xi, z, \tilde{\zeta})|$ uniformly in x, z and $\tau \in [0, 1]$:

$$|F_\tau\left(x - \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}z, \xi, z, \tilde{\zeta}\right)| \leq C \langle \xi \rangle^{m_1} \langle \tilde{\zeta} \rangle^{m_2}$$

The uniformity in τ follows from Proposition 1.2.2 in [Hör72]: $\tau \mapsto F_\tau\left(x - \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}z, \xi, z, \tilde{\zeta}\right)$ is smooth, and the fact that the interval $[0, 1]$ is compact. Then repeating the same arguments for

$$I_\tau(X) = (2\pi)^{2d} \int dz \int d\tilde{\zeta} e^{i(\xi-\tilde{\zeta})\cdot z} F_\tau\left(x - \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2}z, \xi, z, \tilde{\zeta}\right)$$

yields $I_\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^{m_1+m_2}$ for all $\tau \in [0, 1]$. Again, the smoothness in τ follows from Proposition 1.2.2 in [Hör72]. \square

E Details of calculations in example

For convenience of the reader, we have added some more details in the computation of $h_{\text{eff}31}$ and $h_{\text{eff}33}$. We use that α_j and β anticommute, $\beta^2 = \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4}$ and $(\xi \cdot \alpha)(\xi \cdot \alpha) = \xi^2 \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4}$, the fact that only blockdiagonal terms contribute, and $E = \sqrt{m^2 + \xi^2}$:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\text{eff}31} &= -i \partial_{x_l} V \pi_{\text{ref}} \left[-\frac{m\xi_l}{4E^3} \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} - \frac{\xi_l(2E+m)}{4E^3(E+m)^2} \xi^2 \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \frac{1}{2E(E+m)} \alpha_l(\xi \cdot \alpha) \right] \pi_{\text{ref}} \\ &= \frac{im}{4E^3} (\nabla_x V \cdot \xi) \pi_{\text{ref}} + \frac{i(2E+m)\xi^2}{4E^3(E+m)^2} (\nabla_x V \cdot \xi) \pi_{\text{ref}} - \frac{i}{2E(E+m)} \pi_{\text{ref}} (\nabla_x V \cdot \alpha)(\xi \cdot \alpha) \pi_{\text{ref}} \\ &= \frac{i(\nabla_x V \cdot \xi)}{4E^3(E+m)^2} (m(E+m)^2 + (2E+m)\xi^2) \pi_{\text{ref}} - \frac{i}{2E(E+m)} ((\nabla_x V \cdot \xi) \pi_{\text{ref}} + i(\nabla_x V \wedge \xi) \cdot \rho) \\ &= \frac{i(\nabla_x V \cdot \xi)}{4E^3(E+m)^2} (2mE^2 + 2E(m^2 + \xi^2) - 2E^2(E+m)) \pi_{\text{ref}} - \frac{i^2}{2E(E+m)} \pi_{\text{ref}} (\nabla_x V \wedge \xi) \cdot \rho \pi_{\text{ref}} \\ &= + \frac{1}{2E(E+m)} (\nabla_x V \wedge \xi) \cdot \sigma \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can compute $h_{\text{eff}33}$,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\text{eff}33} &= \pi_{\text{ref}} \left((u_0 \#_c^B H_0)_{(3)} - (h_0 \#_c^B u_0)_{(3)} \right) u_0^* \pi_{\text{ref}} = \frac{i}{2} B_{lj} \pi_{\text{ref}} \left(\partial_{\xi_l} u_0 \partial_{\xi_j} H_0 - \partial_{\xi_l} h_0 \partial_{\xi_j} u_0 \right) u_0^* \pi_{\text{ref}} \\ &= \frac{i}{2} B_{lj} \pi_{\text{ref}} \left[\left(-\frac{m \xi_l}{2\sqrt{2}E^{5/2}(E+m)^{1/2}} \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \frac{\xi_l(2E+m)}{2\sqrt{2}E^{5/2}(E+m)^{3/2}} (\xi \cdot \alpha) \beta - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E(E+m)}} \alpha_l \beta \right) \alpha_j + \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\xi_l}{E} \beta \left(-\frac{m \xi_j}{2\sqrt{2}E^{5/2}(E+m)^{1/2}} \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \frac{\xi_j(2E+m)}{2\sqrt{2}E^{5/2}(E+m)^{3/2}} (\xi \cdot \alpha) \beta - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E(E+m)}} \alpha_j \beta \right) \right] u_0^* \pi_{\text{ref}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now use $B_{lj} \xi_l \xi_j = 0$ to eliminate two terms:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\text{eff}33} &= \frac{i}{2} B_{lj} \pi_{\text{ref}} \left[-\frac{m \xi_l}{2\sqrt{2}E^{5/2}(E+m)^{1/2}} \alpha_j + \frac{\xi_l(2E+m)}{2\sqrt{2}E^{5/2}(E+m)^{3/2}} (\xi \cdot \alpha) \beta \alpha_j + \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E(E+m)}} \alpha_l \beta \alpha_j + \frac{\xi_l}{\sqrt{2E^{3/2}(E+m)^{1/2}}} \beta \alpha_j \beta \right] u_0^* \pi_{\text{ref}} \\ &= \frac{i}{2} B_{lj} \pi_{\text{ref}} \left[-\frac{\xi_l(2E+m)}{2\sqrt{2}E^{5/2}(E+m)^{1/2}} \alpha_j - \frac{\xi_l(2E+m)}{2\sqrt{2}E^{5/2}(E+m)^{3/2}} (\xi \cdot \alpha) \alpha_j \beta + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E(E+m)}} \alpha_l \alpha_j \beta \right] u_0^* \pi_{\text{ref}}. \end{aligned}$$

Once we plug u_0^* back in, we get the claim,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\text{eff}33} &= \frac{i B_{lj}}{2\sqrt{2E(E+m)}} \pi_{\text{ref}} \left[-\frac{\xi_l(2E+m)}{2\sqrt{2}E^{5/2}(E+m)^{1/2}} \alpha_j - \frac{\xi_l(2E+m)}{2\sqrt{2}E^{5/2}(E+m)^{3/2}} (\xi \cdot \alpha) \alpha_j \beta \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E(E+m)}} \alpha_l \alpha_j \beta \right] ((E+m) \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + (\xi \cdot \alpha) \beta) \pi_{\text{ref}} \\ &= \frac{i B_{lj}}{8E^3(E+m)} \pi_{\text{ref}} \left(-\xi_l(2E+m) \alpha_j (\xi \cdot \alpha) - \xi_l(2E+m) (\xi \cdot \alpha) \alpha_j + 2E^2(E+m) \alpha_l \alpha_j \right) \beta \pi_{\text{ref}} \\ &= -\frac{i 2B_{lj} \xi_l \xi_j (2E+m)}{8E^3(E+m)} \pi_{\text{ref}} - \frac{1}{2E} \pi_{\text{ref}} B \cdot \rho \pi_{\text{ref}} = -\frac{1}{2E} B \cdot \sigma. \end{aligned}$$

References

- [Cor83] H. O. Cordes. A pseudodifferential Foldy-Wouthuysen transform. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 8(13):1475–1485, 1983.
- [Cor04] H. O. Cordes. A precise pseudodifferential Foldy-Wouthuysen transform for the Dirac equation. *Journal of Evolution Equations*, 4(1):128–138, March 2004.
- [DH73] J. J. Duistermaat and Lars Hörmander. Fourier Integral Operators 2. *Acta Mathematica*, 128(1):183–269, 1973.
- [FL08] Martin Fürst and Max Lein. Scaling Limits of the Dirac Equation with Slowly-varying Electromagnetic Fields: an Adiabatic Approach. *to be published*, 2008.
- [Fol89] Gerald B. Folland. *Harmonic Analysis on Phase Space*. Princeton University Press, 1989.
- [FW50] Leslie L. Foldy and Siegfried A. Wouthuysen. On the dirac theory of spin 1/2 particles and its non-relativistic limit. *Phys. Rev.*, 78(1):29–36, Apr 1950.

- [Hör72] Lars Hörmander. Fourier Integral Operators I. *Acta Mathematica*, 127(1):79–183, 1972.
- [Hör79] Lars Hörmander. The Weyl Calculus of Pseudo-Differential Operators. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, XXXII:359–443, 1979.
- [Hör85] Lars Hörmander. *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators 3*. Springer Verlag, 1985.
- [IMP07] Viorel Iftimie, Marius Mantoiu, and Radu Purice. Magnetic Pseudodifferential Operators. *Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences*, 44(3), 2007.
- [IMP08] Viorel Iftimie, Marius Mantoiu, and Radu Purice. Commutator Criteria for Magnetic Pseudodifferential Operators. *to be published*, 2008.
- [KO01] M. V. Karasev and T. A. Osborn. Symplectic areas, quantization, and dynamics in electromagnetic fields. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 43(2):756–788, 2001.
- [KO04] M. V. Karasev and T. A. Osborn. Quantum magnetic algebra and magnetic curvature. *Journal of Physics A: Math. Gen.*, 37:2345–2363, 2004.
- [KO05] M. V. Karasev and T. A. Osborn. Cotangent bundle quantization: entangling of metric and magnetic field. *Journal of Physics A: Math. Gen.*, 38:8549–8578, 2005.
- [Kon03] Maxim Kontsevich. Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds, I. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 66:157, 2003.
- [LL01] Elliot Lieb and Michael Loss. *Analysis*. American Mathematical Society, 2001.
- [Lut51] J. M. Luttinger. The effect of a magnetic field on electrons in a periodic potential. *Physical Review*, 84(4):814–817, 1951.
- [LW93] Robert G. Littlejohn and Stefan Weigert. Diagonalization of multicomponent wave equations with a Born-Oppenheimer example. *Physical Review A*, 47(5):3506–3512, 1993.
- [MP04] Marius Mantoiu and Radu Purice. The Magnetic Weyl Calculus. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 45(4), January 2004.
- [MP05] Marius Mantoiu and Radu Purice. Strict deformation quantization for a particle in a magnetic field. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 46:052105, April 2005.
- [MS02] André Martinez and Vania Sordoni. A general reduction scheme for the time-dependent Born-Oppenheimer approximation. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 334(3):185–188, 2002.
- [Mül99] M. Müller. Product rule for gauge invariant Weyl symbols and its application to the semiclassical description of guiding centre motion. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 32:1035–1052, 1999.
- [PST03a] Gianluca Panati, Herbert Spohn, and Stefan Teufel. Effective dynamics for Bloch electrons: Peierls substitution. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 242:547–578, October 2003.
- [PST03b] Gianluca Panati, Herbert Spohn, and Stefan Teufel. Space Adiabatic Perturbation Theory. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 7:145–204, 2003.
- [Sor03] Vania Sordoni. Reduction scheme for semiclassical operator-valued schrödinger type equation and application to scattering. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 28(7 & 8):1221–1236, 2003.
- [Ste93] Elias Stein. *Harmonic Analysis: Real-variable Methods, Orthogonality and Oscillatory Integrals*. Princeton University Press, 1993.
- [Teu03] Stefan Teufel. *Adiabatic Perturbation Theory in Quantum Dynamics*. Springer Verlag, 2003.

- [Tha92] Bernd Thaller. *The Dirac Equation*. Springer Verlag, 1992.
- [VGB89] Joseph C. Várilly and José Gracia-Bondía. Moyal Representation of Spin. *Annals of Physics*, 190:107–148, 1989.
- [VGBS90] Joseph C. Várilly, José Gracia-Bondía, and Walter Schempp. The Moyal Representation of Quantum Mechanics and Special Function Theory. *Acta Applicandae Mathematica*, 11:225–250, 1990.
- [Wal08] Stefan Waldmann. *Poisson-Geometrie und Deformationsquantisierung. Eine Einführung*. Springer Verlag, 2008.
- [Ynd96] Francisco Yndurain. *Relativistic Quantum Mechanics and Introduction to Field Theory*. Springer Verlag, 1996.