

Tunnel effect and symmetries for Kramers Fokker-Planck type operators*

Dedicated to Louis Boutet de Monvel

Frédéric Hérau

Laboratoire de Mathématiques

Université de Reims

Moulin de la Housse B.P. 1039

51687 Reims cedex 2, France

and FRE 3111 CNRS

herau@univ-reims.fr

Michael Hitrik[†]

Department of Mathematics

University of California

Los Angeles

CA 90095-1555, USA

hitrik@math.ucla.edu

Johannes Sjöstrand[‡]

IMB, Université de Bourgogne

9, Av. A. Savary, BP 47870

FR-21078 Dijon Cédex

and UMR 5584, CNRS

johannes.sjostrand@u-bourgogne.fr

Abstract

We study operators of Kramers-Fokker-Planck type in the semiclassical limit, assuming that the exponent of the associated Maxwellian is a Morse function with a finite number n_0 of local minima. Under suitable additional assumptions, we show that the first n_0 eigenvalues are real and exponentially small, and establish the complete semiclassical asymptotics for these eigenvalues.

Résumé

Nous étudions des opérateurs de type Kramers-Fokker-Planck dans la limite semi-classique quand l'exposant du maxwellien associé est une fonction de Morse avec un nombre fini n_0 de minima locaux. Sous des hypothèses

*Ce travail a bénéficié d'une aide de l'Agence Nationale de la Recherche portant la référence ANR-08-BLAN-0228-01

[†]The partial support by the NSF under grant DMS-0653275 is gratefully acknowledged.

[‡]A part of this work was carried out at the Centre Interfacultaire Bernoulli (CIB), Lausanne, and we acknowledge support from CIB and NSF.

supplémentaires convenables, nous montrons que les premières n_0 valeurs propres sont réelles et exponentiellement petites et nous établissons leur asymptotique semi-classique complète.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Review of some results from [11]	5
2.1	The general case	6
2.2	The supersymmetric case	14
2.2.1	Generalities	14
2.2.2	The principal symbol of the Hodge Laplacian	16
2.2.3	The subprincipal symbol	17
2.2.4	A symmetry for adjoints	18
2.2.5	Quasimodes and spectral subspaces	19
3	Generalized PT symmetry and consequences	22
3.1	First remarks on the KFP case	22
3.2	Extra symmetry and self-adjointness in the general case	24
3.3	Positivity questions	25
4	Labelling and quasimodes for multiple wells	27
4.1	Separating saddle points and critical components	27
4.2	Cut-off functions and quasimodes	30
5	Multiple well analysis in the generic case	32
5.1	The critical points and quasimodes in the generic case	32
5.2	Estimates for the quasimodes	35
5.3	Singular values	37
5.4	Main result in the generic case	41
6	Explicit computation of the leading tunneling coefficient	42
6.1	Geometric preliminaries	42
6.2	A twisted Hodge operator	46
6.3	Expressions for the quasimodes $f_j^{(1)}$	48
6.4	Computation of the coefficient	54
7	Multiple well analysis in the general case	58
7.1	Statement of the main result and the matrix of $d_\phi : E^{(0)} \rightarrow E^{(1)}$. . .	59
7.2	Singular values	60
7.3	Proof of (7.4)	61
7.4	Full asymptotics for the smallest non-vanishing eigenvalue	63
7.5	An example with three minima and three saddle points	64

1 Introduction

In this article we shall continue the study that we started in [11] of the exponentially small eigenvalues of the Kramers-Fokker-Planck operator

$$P = y \cdot h\partial_x - V'(x) \cdot h\partial_y + \frac{\gamma}{2}(y - h\partial_y) \cdot (y + h\partial_y) \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^{2d} = \mathbb{R}_x^d \times \mathbb{R}_y^d, \quad \gamma > 0, \quad (1.1)$$

and similar operators. Suppose that the potential $V \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ is a Morse function on \mathbb{R}^d such that

$$\partial^\alpha V = \mathcal{O}(1), \quad |\alpha| \geq 2, \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla V| \geq 1/C, \quad \text{for} \quad |x| \geq C > 0. \quad (1.2)$$

Then (as we shall review) P is maximally accretive and has a unique closed extension from $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ to an unbounded operator: $L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ that we shall also denote by P . The spectrum $\sigma(P)$ is contained in the closed right half-plane. Assume for simplicity that

$$V(x) \rightarrow +\infty, \quad |x| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1.3)$$

Then the Maxwellian $e^{-(y^2/2+V(x))/h}$ belongs to the kernel of P , so $0 \in \sigma(P)$. In [10] the eigenvalues in any band $0 \leq \operatorname{Re} z \leq Ch$ were determined in the limit $h \rightarrow 0$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(h^\infty)$, for every fixed C . They are of the form $\mu h + o(h)$ where $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ are the eigenvalues of the quadratic approximations of P with $h = 1$ at the various critical points of V . These μ values are explicitly known and belong to a cone $|\operatorname{Im} \mu| \leq \mathcal{O}(\operatorname{Re} \mu)$. The $o(h)$ terms have complete asymptotic expansions in powers of h (and we need fractional powers when certain multiplicities are present).

Assume that V has n_0 local minima, $\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{n_0}$ and n_1 critical points of index 1 that we shall call saddle points. Then precisely n_0 of the above eigenvalues are $o(h)$ (i.e. with $\mu = 0$) and they are actually $\mathcal{O}(h^\infty)$ (as can be understood intuitively by using truncations of the Maxwellian near the local minima as exponentially accurate quasimodes).

As we shall review below, it follows from the analysis in [11] that these n_0 eigenvalues are actually exponentially small. In that paper we were able to establish the exponential decay rate and a full asymptotic expansion of the prefactor for the smallest non-vanishing eigenvalue when $n_0 = 2$.

In this paper we treat the case of general n_0 and our results are similar to those for the Witten Laplacian by Bovier, Eckhoff, Gayrard, Klein [3], [4], obtained with probabilistic methods and the ones by Helffer, Klein, Nier [6], with simplifications by Nier [15] and le Peutrec [14] with full asymptotic expansions, based on the WKB-analysis and Agmon estimates in [8].

In order to state one of our results completely we describe first a geometric framework slightly generalizing the procedure in [6], [15]: Let \mathbf{m}_1 be a global minimum of V and put $E_{\mathbf{m}_1} = \mathbb{R}^d$. For $\sigma \gg 1$, $V^{-1}(]-\infty, \sigma])$ is a connected relatively compact open subset of \mathbb{R}^d . When we decrease σ , $V^{-1}(]-\infty, \sigma])$ remains connected until we reach a critical value σ_2 where one of the following happens:

a) $\sigma_2 = \phi(\mathbf{m}_1)$ and $V(]-\infty, \sigma_2])$ is empty. The procedure then stops.

b) $V^{-1}(]-\infty, \sigma_2])$ is the finite union of several disjoint components, $E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \dots \cup E_N$, $N \geq 2$, where the labelling is chosen so that $\mathbf{m}_1 \in E_1$. For $k \geq 2$, let $\mathbf{m}_k \in E_k$ be a minimum of $V|_{E_k}$ and write $E_{\mathbf{m}_2} = E_2, \dots, E_{\mathbf{m}_N} = E_N$. Notice that none of the closures of the E_j can be disjoint from the union of the other closures, and that the intersections of their boundaries are finite unions of saddle points. σ_2 is the common value of V at those saddle points. For $2 \leq k \leq N$, we put $\sigma(E_{\mathbf{m}_k}) = \sigma_2$.

In case b) we pick (successively) each of E_j and consider $E_j \cap V^{-1}(]-\infty, \sigma])$ with σ decreasing from σ_2 until one of the scenarios a) or b) appears. In case a) we stop (with that component E_j) and in case b) (say for $\sigma = \sigma_3 < \sigma_2$) we get a finite union of connected components. Choose a global minimum for each of the new components except for the one which contains the already selected minimum \mathbf{m}_j . We continue in this way until all the local minima have been recovered. Then for each local minimum we have an associated connected component $E_{\mathbf{m}}$ of $V^{-1}(]-\infty, \sigma(\mathbf{m})])$. We put

$$S(\mathbf{m}) = \sigma(\mathbf{m}) - \phi(\mathbf{m}).$$

See Section 4 for a more detailed description of the procedure.

One of our main results is

Theorem 1.1 *Under the above assumptions, the n_0 exponentially small eigenvalues μ_1, \dots, μ_{n_0} are all real and can be labelled in such a way that*

$$\mu_k \asymp h e^{-S(\mathbf{m}_k)/h},$$

uniformly when $h \rightarrow 0$, and with the convention that $S(\mathbf{m}_1) = +\infty, \mu_1 = 0$.

This result is valid also for the Witten Laplacian $-\Delta_V = d_V^* d_V$, where $d_V := e^{-V/h} h d e^{V/h}$ and extends those of [4], [6], in the sense that no generic assumption is done on the separation of critical values.

Under a generic assumption in the spirit of [4], [6], we have full asymptotic expansions for each of the eigenvalues μ_k .

Theorem 1.2 *Suppose that V satisfies the same hypotheses as in the preceding theorem, and assume in addition the following :*

For every critical component E_k created in the above procedure,

- i) there is a unique point \mathbf{m}_k in E_k where $\inf_{E_k} V$ is attained, so $E_k = E_{\mathbf{m}_k}$*
- ii) except in the case when $E_k = \mathbb{R}^d$, there is a unique (saddle) point $s_j = s_{j(k)}$ in ∂E_k which is also on the boundary of another component of $V^{-1}(]-\infty, \sigma(E_k)])$. In particular we always have $N = 2$ in case b) of the above procedure.*

Then we have the following asymptotic expansion

$$\mu_k = h l_k(h) e^{-2S_k/h} \quad \text{with} \quad l_k(h) = l_{k,0} + l_{k,1}h + \dots, l_{k,0} > 0, \quad (1.4)$$

where

$$l_{k,0} = \frac{\widehat{\lambda}_1(\mathbf{s}_j)}{\pi} \left(\frac{\det V''(\mathbf{m}_k)}{-\det V''(\mathbf{s}_j)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Here $-\widehat{\lambda}_1(\mathbf{s}_j)$ is the unique negative eigenvalue of the block matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ V''(\mathbf{s}_j) & \gamma \end{pmatrix}$.

See Theorem 5.10 and Section 6. Under a weaker generic assumption (see Theorem 7.2) we get this for the lowest non-vanishing eigenvalue μ_2 . This last result is also valid for the ordinary Witten Laplacian and seems to be new in that degree of generality.

The proof is very much based on the analysis in the paper [11], where we were able to treat the case of one or two minima. As there we shall also use in an essential way the supersymmetric structure of the Kramers-Fokker-Planck operator, due to Bismut [1] and Tailleur, Tanase-Nicola, Kurchan [16], see also [13].

What made it possible to go beyond the case of two wells was the observation that we have an additional (generalized PT) symmetry, namely if we conjugate the Kramers-Fokker-Planck operator P by the unitary and self-adjoint operator $u(x, y) \mapsto u(x, -y)$, then we get the adjoint P^* . This extra symmetry makes it possible to introduce a Hermitian form on L^2 for which P is formally self-adjoint and the restriction of this form to the spectral subspace corresponding to the n_0 lowest eigenvalues is positive definite, hence an inner product. Consequently the restriction of P is self-adjoint and the n_0 lowest eigenvalues are real.

More generally, this extra symmetry entails that the supersymmetric approach followed in [11] reduces to a self-adjoint problem, very close to that of the Witten Laplacian, when we restrict the attention to the exponentially small eigenvalues. In particular, we can follow the work by Helffer-Klein-Nier [6], who adapted probabilistic ideas in the case of the Witten Laplacian. Le Peutrec [14] simplified some of the linear algebra in [6], and we simplify that even further.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we review some of the basic analysis of [11], including a description of the supersymmetric formalism. The generalized PT symmetry is then explored in Section 3, first in the original Kramers-Fokker-Planck case, and then in the general supersymmetric setting. In particular, we show here that the first n_0 eigenvalues are real. In Section 4 we prepare for the multiple well analysis, by introducing a suitable labelling of the minima and the associated saddle point values, as well as a system of quasimodes adapted to the minima. Sections 5 and 6 are devoted to the analysis of the exponentially small eigenvalues in the generic case. The general case is studied in Section 7. The main results of this work are Theorem 5.10, Proposition 6.7, Theorem 7.1 and Theorem 7.2.

It is natural here to acknowledge a contribution of L. Boutet de Monvel. One of us had the privilege to listen to his lectures at the Mittag Leffler institute in 1974 about complexes of pseudodifferential operators and related operators with double characteristics, cf [2]. This type of problems continues to be important, and the present paper deals once more with that situation.

2 Review of some results from [11]

The purpose of this section is to review some basic results from [11]. We refer to that paper for proofs and more details and we give proofs only for slightly new variants. As in [11] some of the analysis works also on compact manifolds but currently we

can go all the way only on \mathbb{R}^n and we restrict the attention to that case from the beginning.

2.1 The general case

On \mathbb{R}^n we consider a second order differential operator

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \sum_{j,k=1}^n hD_{x_j} \circ b_{j,k}(x) \circ hD_{x_k} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n (c_j(x)h\partial_{x_j} + h\partial_{x_j} \circ c_j(x)) + p_0(x) \\ &= P_2 + iP_1 + P_0, \quad D_{x_j} = \frac{1}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

where the coefficients $b_{j,k}$, c_j , p_0 are assumed to be smooth and real, with $b_{j,k} = b_{k,j}$. To P we associate the symbol in the semi-classical sense,

$$p(x, \xi) = p_2(x, \xi) + ip_1(x, \xi) + p_0(x), \quad (2.2)$$

$$p_2(x, \xi) = \sum_{j,k=1}^n b_{j,k}(x)\xi_j\xi_k, \quad p_1(x, \xi) = \sum_{j=1}^n c_j(x)\xi_j, \quad (2.3)$$

so that $p_j(x, \xi)$ is a real-valued polynomial in ξ , homogeneous of degree j . (It is well-defined on $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ and coincides with the Weyl symbol mod $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ locally uniformly.) We assume that

$$p_2(x, \xi) \geq 0, \quad p_0(x) \geq 0. \quad (2.4)$$

We impose the following growth conditions at infinity:

$$\partial_x^\alpha b_{j,k}(x) = \mathcal{O}(1), \quad |\alpha| \geq 0, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\partial_x^\alpha c_j(x) = \mathcal{O}(1), \quad |\alpha| \geq 1, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\partial_x^\alpha p_0(x) = \mathcal{O}(1), \quad |\alpha| \geq 2. \quad (2.7)$$

Put

$$\nu(x, \partial_x) = \sum_{j=1}^n c_j(x)\partial_{x_j}. \quad (2.8)$$

Let $f(t) \in C^\infty([0, \infty[; [0, 3/2])$ be an increasing function with $f(t) = t$ on $[0, 1]$, $f(t) = 3/2$ on $[2, \infty[$, $f(t) \leq t$. Put $f_\epsilon(t) = \epsilon f(t/\epsilon)$, and introduce the time T_0 average of $f_\epsilon \circ p_0$ along the integral curves of ν ,

$$\langle f_\epsilon \circ p_0 \rangle_{T_0} = \frac{1}{T_0} \int_{-T_0/2}^{T_0/2} f_\epsilon \circ p_0 \circ \exp(t\nu) dt. \quad (2.9)$$

By an averaging (realized by means of weak exponential weights) we showed in [11] the following result:

Proposition 2.1 *Let P be of the form (2.1), where $b_{j,k}, c_j, p_0$ are smooth and real and satisfy (2.2)–(2.7). Define $\langle f_\epsilon \circ p_0 \rangle_{T_0}$ as in (2.9). Let $C_0 > 0$ be sufficiently large. Then for every $C > 0$, put $\epsilon = Mh$ with $M > 0$ sufficiently large. Then there exists $\tilde{C} > 0$ such that*

$$\|(p_0 + h)^{\frac{1}{2}}u\| \leq \tilde{C}(\|(p_0 + h)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(P - z)u\| + h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|u\|_{\{\langle f_\epsilon \circ p_0 \rangle_{T_0} \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{C_0}\}}), \quad (2.10)$$

for $u \in \mathcal{S}$, $\operatorname{Re} z \leq Ch$.

Combining this with a very simple and direct a priori estimate, we also deduced that

$$\|B^{\frac{1}{2}}hDu\|^2 \leq \|(p_0 + h)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(P - z)u\| \|(p_0 + h)^{\frac{1}{2}}u\| + C\|h^{\frac{1}{2}}u\|^2. \quad (2.11)$$

Using elementary coercivity estimates and pseudodifferential machinery, we got in [11],

Proposition 2.2

$$\mathcal{R}(P - z) = L^2, \quad \operatorname{Re} z < 0.$$

Here $P : L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ denotes the graph closure of $P : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Corollary 2.3 *The maximal closed extension P_{\max} of P (with domain given by $\{u \in L^2; Pu \in L^2\}$) coincides with the graph closure (the minimal closed extension), already introduced.*

Thus P is maximally accretive. See [9], [7] for earlier and closely related results in this direction.

We shall now discuss some weighted estimates for $P - z$, leading to simplifications and improvements in Section 3 of [11]. These improvements will be used later on in this section.

Let $\lambda = \lambda(\rho) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n};]0, +\infty[)$ satisfy the bounds,

$$\lambda, \lambda^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(\langle \rho \rangle^{N_0}), \quad \langle \rho \rangle = (1 + |\rho|^2)^{1/2}, \quad (2.12)$$

for some fixed $N_0 \geq 0$ and assume that

$$\lambda = \mathcal{O}_1(\lambda), \quad (2.13)$$

in the sense that

$$\partial_\rho^\alpha \lambda = \mathcal{O}(\lambda \langle \rho \rangle^{-|\alpha|}), \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{2n}. \quad (2.14)$$

In the proof of Proposition 2.2, given in [11], we checked that

$$\lambda = \lambda_{\epsilon, N} = \langle \epsilon \rho \rangle^N$$

satisfies these assumptions uniformly for $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, when $N \in \mathbb{R}$ is fixed. The discussion there for such particular $\lambda = \lambda_{\epsilon, N}$ generalizes to λ in (2.12), (2.13) and we have with $\Lambda := \operatorname{Op}_h(\lambda)$ (when h is sufficiently small):

- The symbol of Λ^{-1} is equal to $\lambda^{-1} + \mathcal{O}_1(h^2\lambda^{-1}\langle\rho\rangle^{-2})$.
- The symbol of $[P, \Lambda]$ is of the form $\frac{h}{i}\{p, \lambda\} + \mathcal{O}_0(h^2\lambda)$, where we write $a = \mathcal{O}_0(m)$ if $\partial_\rho^\alpha a = \mathcal{O}(m)$ for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{2n}$.
- Here,

$$\{p, \lambda\} = \{p_2, \lambda\} + \mathcal{O}_0(\lambda) = -\partial_x p_2 \cdot \partial_\xi \lambda + \mathcal{O}_0(\lambda) = \mathcal{O}_0(\lambda\langle\rho\rangle),$$

where the term $\mathcal{O}_0(\lambda\langle\rho\rangle)$ is real-valued.

Combining these facts with h -pseudodifferential calculus, we see that

- The symbol of $[P, \Lambda]\Lambda^{-1}$ is equal to $\frac{h}{i}\frac{\{p, \lambda\}}{\lambda} + \mathcal{O}_0(h^2)$.

Before continuing the main discussion, we shall give a simplification of the main step of the proof of Proposition 2.2, which is to establish:

$$\begin{aligned} \exists z \in \mathbb{C}, \operatorname{Re} z < 0, \text{ such that if } u \in L^2 \\ \text{and } (P - z)u = 0, \text{ then } u = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

To see this, we choose $\lambda = \lambda_{\epsilon, N}$ with $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and with $N \leq -2$ fixed. Then,

$$0 = (\Lambda(P - z)u | \Lambda u) = (\Lambda(P - z)\Lambda^{-1}\Lambda u | \Lambda u) = ((P - z - [P, \Lambda]\Lambda^{-1})\Lambda u | \Lambda u).$$

Here we take the real part and use that $\operatorname{Op}_h(\frac{h}{i}\frac{\{p, \lambda\}}{\lambda})$ is formally skew-adjoint, to get

$$0 = ((P_2 + P_0 - \operatorname{Re} z + \operatorname{Op}_h(\mathcal{O}_0(h^2)))\Lambda u | \Lambda u) \geq (-\operatorname{Re} z + \mathcal{O}(h^2))\|\Lambda u\|^2.$$

Assuming that $-\operatorname{Re} z \gg h^2$, we conclude that $\Lambda u = 0$ and hence that $u = 0$. \square

The improvement in comparison with [11] is that we do not only consider $\operatorname{Re}((P - z)u | u)$ but modify this expression with weight factors, while the weight factors in [11] enter at a later stage.

If we let $u \in L^2$ and drop the assumption that $(P - z)u = 0$, the same calculations and Cauchy-Schwarz give

$$(-\operatorname{Re} z + \mathcal{O}(h^2))\|\Lambda u\| \leq \|\Lambda(P - z)u\|, \quad (2.16)$$

for $\Lambda = \Lambda_{\epsilon, N}$ with $N \leq -2$, and this remains true for more general $\Lambda = \operatorname{Op}_h(\lambda)$ as in (2.12), (2.13), provided that $\lambda = \mathcal{O}_1(\langle\rho\rangle^{-2})$.

Proposition 2.4 *Let $\Lambda = \operatorname{Op}(\lambda)$ with λ as in (2.12), (2.13). Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that if $\operatorname{Re} z \leq -Ch^2$, $(P - z)u = v$, $u, v \in L^2$, $\Lambda v \in L^2$, then $\Lambda u \in L^2$ and (2.16) holds.*

Proof. Choose $-N \geq N_0 + 2$. Then (2.16) holds with Λ replaced by $\Lambda_{\epsilon, N}\Lambda$:

$$(-\operatorname{Re} z + \mathcal{O}(h^2))\|\Lambda_{\epsilon, N}\Lambda u\| \leq \|\Lambda_{\epsilon, N}\Lambda(P - z)u\|, \quad (2.17)$$

uniformly with respect to ϵ . Letting ϵ tend to 0, we get $\|\Lambda u\| < +\infty$ together with (2.16). \square

The proposition can be generalized by letting $u, v \in \mathcal{S}'$, with $\Lambda_0 u, \Lambda_0 v \in L^2$, for some fixed $\Lambda_0 = \text{Op}_h(\lambda_0)$ with λ_0 as in (2.12), (2.13).

We shall next recall the dynamical assumptions introduced in [11]. Consider the non-negative symbol

$$\tilde{p}(x, \xi) = p_0(x) + \frac{p_2(x, \xi)}{\langle \xi \rangle^2}. \quad (2.18)$$

Hypothesis 2.5 Assume

$$\text{The set } \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; p_0(x) = 0, \nu(x, \partial_x) = 0\} \text{ is finite } = \{x^1, \dots, x^N\}. \quad (2.19)$$

Let $\rho_j = (x^j, 0)$ and introduce the critical set

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_N\}. \quad (2.20)$$

Notice that p_1, p_0, p_2, \tilde{p} vanish to second order at each ρ_j . For functions q on the cotangent space, we generalize the earlier definition of time T_0 average and put

$$\langle q \rangle_{T_0} = \frac{1}{T_0} \int_{-T_0/2}^{T_0/2} q \circ \exp(tH_{p_1}) dt.$$

We introduce the following dynamical conditions where $T_0 > 0$ is fixed:

Hypothesis 2.6

$$\text{Near each } \rho_j \text{ we have } \langle \tilde{p} \rangle_{T_0} \geq \frac{1}{C} |\rho - \rho_j|^2, \quad (2.21)$$

$$\text{In any set } |x| \leq C, \text{ dist}(\rho, \mathcal{C}) \geq \frac{1}{C}, \text{ we have } \langle \tilde{p} \rangle_{T_0}(\rho) \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{C}(C)}, \tilde{C}(C) > 0. \quad (2.22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall \text{ neighborhood } U \text{ of } \pi_x \mathcal{C}, \exists C > 0 \text{ such that } \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus U, \\ &\text{meas}(\{t \in [-\frac{T_0}{2}, \frac{T_0}{2}]; p_0(\exp t\nu(x)) \geq \frac{1}{C}\}) \geq \frac{1}{C}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

We know that P has no spectrum in the open left half-plane. By using an elaborate method of microlocal exponential (but bounded!) weights we showed in [11] the following result.

Proposition 2.7 *For every constant $B > 0$ there is a constant $D > 0$ such that P has no spectrum in*

$$\{z \in \mathbb{C}; \text{Re } z < Bh, |\text{Im } z| > Dh\} \quad (2.24)$$

when $h > 0$ is small enough. Moreover $\|(P - z)^{-1}\| = \mathcal{O}_B(h^{-1})$ for z in the set (2.24).

Let $\rho_j \in \mathcal{C}$ and let F_{ρ_j} be the matrix of the linearization of H_p at ρ_j (the so called fundamental matrix of p at the doubly characteristic point ρ_j). According to (2.21), the time average of the quadratic approximation of \tilde{p} at ρ_j along the Hamilton flow of the quadratic approximation of p_1 at ρ_j is elliptic and takes its values in a closed angle contained in the union of $\{0\}$ and the open right half plane. We could therefore apply a classical result to see that the eigenvalues of F_{ρ_j} are of the form $\pm\lambda_{j,k}$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, when repeated with their multiplicity, with $\text{Im } \lambda_{j,k} > 0$.

Put

$$q(x, \xi) = -p(x, i\xi) = p_2 + p_1 - p_0.$$

Let F_q, F_p be the fundamental matrices of q, p at one of the critical points $\rho_j \in \mathcal{C}$. Since

$$H_q(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{i}(p'_\xi(x, \eta) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - p'_x(x, \eta) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta}), \text{ with } \eta = i\xi,$$

F_q and $\frac{1}{i}F_p$ have the same eigenvalues; $\pm\frac{1}{i}\lambda_k$, $k = 1, \dots, n$ (j being fixed) where $\text{Re}(\frac{1}{i}\lambda_k) > 0$. Now q is real-valued and we can apply the stable manifold theorem to see that the H_q -flow has a stable outgoing manifold Λ_+ passing through ρ_j such that $T_{\rho_j}\Lambda_+^{\mathbb{C}}$ is spanned by the generalized eigenvectors corresponding to $+\frac{1}{i}\lambda_k$, $k = 1, \dots, n$. We also know that Λ_+ is a Lagrangian manifold and that q vanishes on Λ_+ .

Let Λ_- be the stable incoming H_q -invariant manifold such that $T_{\rho_j}\Lambda_-^{\mathbb{C}}$ is spanned by the generalized eigenvectors of F_q corresponding to $-\frac{1}{i}\lambda_k$, $1 \leq k \leq n$. In [11], Section 8, we established a transversality lemma for Λ_{\pm} which together with a deformation argument led to the following result,

Proposition 2.8 *We have $\phi_+''(0) > 0$, $\phi_-''(0) < 0$.*

Here ϕ_{\pm} is the generating function for the Lagrangian manifold Λ_{\pm} .

Let

$$\tilde{\text{tr}}(p, \rho_j) = \frac{1}{i} \sum_k \lambda_{j,k}. \quad (2.25)$$

In [11] we also obtained the following two results.

Theorem 2.9 *We make the assumptions (2.1)–(2.7), (2.19), (2.21)–(2.23), and recall the definition of \mathcal{C} in (2.20). Let $B > 0$. Then there exists $h_0 > 0$ such that for $0 < h \leq h_0$, the spectrum of P in $D(0, Bh)$ is discrete and the eigenvalues are of the form*

$$\mu_{j,k}(h) \sim h(\mu_{j,k,0} + h^{1/N_{j,k}}\mu_{j,k,1} + h^{2/N_{j,k}}\mu_{j,k,2} + \dots), \quad (2.26)$$

where the $\mu_{j,k,0}$ are all the numbers in $D(0, B)$ of the form

$$\mu_{j,k,0} = \frac{1}{i} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \nu_{j,k,\ell} \lambda_{j,\ell} + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\text{tr}}(p, \rho_j), \text{ with } \nu_{j,k,\ell} \in \mathbf{N}, \quad (2.27)$$

for some $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $N = \#\mathcal{C}$. (Possibly after changing B , we may assume that $|\mu_{j,k,0}| \neq B$, $\forall j, k$.) Recall here that $\pm\lambda_{j,\ell}$ are the eigenvalues of F_p at ρ_j . This description also takes into account the multiplicities in the natural way. If the coefficients $\nu_{j,k,\ell}$ in (2.27) are unique, then $N_{j,k} = 1$ and we have only integer powers of h in the asymptotic expansion (2.26).

Theorem 2.10 *We make the same assumptions as in Theorem 2.9. For all $B, C > 0$ there is a constant $D > 0$ such that*

$$\|(z - P)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{D}{h}, \text{ for } z \in D(0, Bh) \text{ with } \text{dist}(z, \sigma(P)) \geq \frac{h}{C}. \quad (2.28)$$

Still with $j = j_0$ fixed, let

$$\mu_0 = \frac{1}{i} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \nu_\ell \lambda_\ell + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\text{tr}}(p, \rho_{j_0}), \quad \nu_\ell \in \mathbf{N} \quad (2.29)$$

be a value as in (2.27) and assume that μ_0 is simple in the sense that $(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \in \mathbf{N}^n$ is uniquely determined by μ_0 . In particular, every λ_ℓ for which $\nu_\ell \neq 0$ is a simple eigenvalue of F_p . Applying a classical construction we got

$$\mu(h) \sim h(\mu_0 + h\mu_1 + h^2\mu_2 + \dots) \quad (2.30)$$

with uniquely determined coefficients μ_1, μ_2, \dots and

$$a(x; h) \sim a_0(x) + ha_1(x) + \dots \text{ in } C^\infty(\text{neigh}(x^{j_0})), \quad (2.31)$$

where $a_j(x) = \mathcal{O}(|x - x^{j_0}|^{(m-2j)_+})$, $m = \sum \nu_\ell$ and a_0 has a non-vanishing Taylor polynomial of order m , such that

$$(P - \mu(h))(a(x; h)e^{-\phi_+(x)/h}) = \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)e^{-\phi_+(x)/h} \quad (2.32)$$

in a neighborhood of x^{j_0} . Actually any neighborhood $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^n$ will do, provided that

- 1) ϕ_+ is well-defined in a neighborhood of $\bar{\Omega}$.
- 2) $H_{q|_{\Lambda_+}} \neq 0$ on $\bar{\Omega} \setminus \{x^{j_0}\}$.
- 3) Ω is star-shaped with respect to the point x^{j_0} and the integral curves of the vector field $\nu_+ := (\pi_x)_*(H_{q|_{\Lambda_+}})$, where $\pi_x((x, \xi)) = x$.

We also know that $\mu(h)$ is equal mod $\mathcal{O}(h^\infty)$ to the corresponding value in (2.26).

If $\gamma \subset D(0, B)$ is a closed h -independent contour avoiding all the values $\mu_{j,k,0}$ in (2.27), and

$$\pi_{h\gamma} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{h\gamma} (z - P)^{-1} dz \quad (2.33)$$

the corresponding spectral projection, then,

$$\|\pi_{h\gamma}(\chi a e^{-\phi_+/h}) - \chi a e^{-\phi_+/h}\|_{L^2} = \mathcal{O}(h^\infty) \quad (2.34)$$

if $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ is equal to one near x^{j_0} . It follows that $\chi a e^{-\phi_+/h}$ is a linear combination of generalized eigenfunctions of P with eigenvalues inside $h\gamma$ up to an error $\mathcal{O}(h^\infty)$ in L^2 -norm.

We next review some exponential decay results from Section 9 in [11] and start with the case when \mathcal{C} is reduced to a single point:

$$\mathcal{C} = \{(0, 0)\}. \quad (2.35)$$

Let $\phi = \phi_+(x) \in C^\infty(\text{neigh}(0; \mathbb{R}))$ be the function introduced following Proposition 2.8 so that $\Lambda_+ = \Lambda_\phi$ is the stable outgoing manifold through $(0, 0)$ for the H_q -flow. Recall that by Proposition 2.8

$$\phi''(0) > 0. \quad (2.36)$$

Moreover, there exists $G \in C^\infty(\text{neigh}(0, \mathbb{R}^n); \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$(\partial_\xi q)(x, \phi'(x)) \cdot \partial_x G \asymp x^2, \quad G(x) \asymp x^2. \quad (2.37)$$

Let $\Omega_G(r) = \{x \in \text{neigh}(0); G(x) \leq r\}$ for $0 < r \ll 1$. Outside the set $\Omega_G(C_0\epsilon)$, we put

$$\widehat{\psi} = \phi - \epsilon g(G), \quad (2.38)$$

where $g = g(G) = \ln G$ for $G \geq C_0\epsilon$, so that $g'(G) = 1/G$. Then

$$q(x, \widehat{\psi}'(x)) \leq -\frac{\epsilon}{C_0}, \quad x \in \text{neigh}(0, M) \setminus \Omega_G(C_0\epsilon), \quad (2.39)$$

if $C_0 > 0$ is large enough.

We extend the definition of ψ to a full neighborhood of $x = 0$, by putting

$$g(G) = \ln(C_0\epsilon) + \frac{1}{C_0\epsilon}(G - C_0\epsilon), \quad \text{for } 0 \leq G \leq C_0\epsilon. \quad (2.40)$$

Outside a small fixed neighborhood of 0 we flatten out the weight. Let $f_\delta(t) = \delta f(\frac{t}{\delta})$ be the function introduced before (2.9). For some small and fixed $\delta_0 > 0$, we put

$$\psi = f_{\delta_0}(\widehat{\psi}) = f_{\delta_0}(\phi - \epsilon g(G)) \quad (2.41)$$

which is also well-defined as the constant $3\delta_0/2$ for large x . Finally, by the same averaging procedure as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, we can add a term $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ to ψ , supported away from a fixed neighborhood of 0, such that if ψ_ϵ denotes the corresponding modification of ψ , we have the apriori estimate,

$$h\|e^{\psi_\epsilon/h}v\| + h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|B^{\frac{1}{2}}hD(e^{\psi_\epsilon/h}v)\| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\|e^{\psi_\epsilon/h}(P - z)v\| + \mathcal{O}(h)\|e^{\psi_\epsilon/h}v\|_{\Omega_G(C_0\epsilon)}, \quad (2.42)$$

uniformly, for $|\text{Re } z| \leq Ch$ provided that $\epsilon = Ah$ for A large enough depending on C .

Now let $\mu(h) = \mu_{1,k}(h)$ be an eigenvalue of P as in (2.26), (2.30) and assume that μ_0 is given by (2.29) and is simple, as explained after that equation. Then $\mu(h)$ is a simple eigenvalue of P and is the only eigenvalue in some disc $D(\mu(h), h/C_0)$. Let $u_{\text{WKB}}(x; h)$ be the approximate solution given in (2.31), (2.32) and let $u = \pi_{h\gamma}(\chi u_{\text{BKW}})$ be the corresponding exact eigenfunction, where $\gamma = \partial D(\mu, \frac{1}{2C_0})$. Using (2.42) we established the following result in [11]:

Theorem 2.11 *a) Outside any h -independent neighborhood of 0, we have*

$$u, B^{\frac{1}{2}}hDu = \mathcal{O}(e^{-1/(Ch)})$$

in L^2 -norm.

b) There exists a neighborhood Ω of 0, where

$$\begin{aligned} u(x; h) &= (a + r)e^{-\phi_+(x)/h}, \\ \|r\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \|B^{\frac{1}{2}}hDr\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &= \mathcal{O}(h^\infty). \end{aligned} \quad (2.43)$$

Remark 2.12. If we drop the assumption (2.35) and allow $N - 1$ more points ρ_2, \dots, ρ_N in \mathcal{C} , then Theorem 2.11 is still valid, provided that all $\mu_{j,k,0}$ in 2.26 with $j \geq 2$ are different from the value μ_0 , associated to $\rho_1 = (0, 0)$.

We now drop the assumption (2.35) completely, so that $\mathcal{C} = \{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_N\}$, $\rho_j = (x^j, 0)$, $\rho_1 = (0, 0)$. We then have the following extension of Theorem 2.11.

Theorem 2.13 *We make the assumptions of Theorem 2.11, with the exception of (2.35). Let $u_{\text{WKB}}(x)$ be as in that theorem and as there, we put $u = \pi_{h\gamma}(u_{\text{WKB}})$, with C_0 large enough in the definition of γ above, so that $\mu(h)$ is the only asymptotic eigenvalue of P inside $h\gamma$ that we can associate with the critical point $\rho_1 = (0, 0)$. Then u is not necessarily an eigenfunction of P (due to possible eigenvalues of P inside a disc $D(\mu(h), o(h))$, associated to other points in \mathcal{C}), but the conclusions a) and b) of Theorem 2.11 remain valid.*

This result was not stated in [11], but follows fairly directly from Theorem 2.11 and the earlier results by some easy and standard arguments:

- Let us first “eliminate” $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, by introducing $\tilde{P} := P + \sum_2^N \alpha \chi(\frac{x-x^j}{\alpha})$ for some small and fixed $\alpha > 0$. Here χ is a standard cut-off function to a small neighborhood of 0.
- Then \tilde{P} fulfills the assumption (2.35), so the conclusions a) and b) of Theorem 2.11 apply to $\tilde{u} = \tilde{\pi}_{h\gamma}(\chi u_{\text{WKB}})$, where $\tilde{\pi}_{h\gamma}$ is the spectral projection associated to \tilde{P} , $h\gamma$.
- The resolvent identity $(z - P)^{-1} = (z - \tilde{P})^{-1} + (z - P)^{-1}(P - \tilde{P})(z - \tilde{P})^{-1}$ implies that

$$u = \tilde{u} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{h\gamma} (z - P)^{-1}(P - \tilde{P})(z - \tilde{P})^{-1} \chi u_{\text{WKB}} dz. \quad (2.44)$$

- Using the a priori estimate (2.42), with P replaced by \tilde{P} and $v = (z - \tilde{P})^{-1} \chi u_{\text{WKB}}$, together with Theorem 2.10 and Corollary 2.3, we first see that $(P - \tilde{P})(z - \tilde{P})^{-1} \chi u_{\text{WKB}}$ is exponentially decaying in L^2 , uniformly for $z \in h\gamma$. Using Theorem 2.10 and Corollary 2.3 once more, we next get that $\hat{u} := (z - P)^{-1}(P - \tilde{P})(z - \tilde{P})^{-1} \chi u_{\text{WKB}}$ is uniformly exponentially decreasing in $\mathcal{D}(P)$. In particular, $\|\hat{u}\| + \|B^{\frac{1}{2}}hD\hat{u}\| = \mathcal{O}(e^{-1/Ch})$ and we have the same estimate with \hat{u} replaced by the integral in (2.44).
- Theorem 2.13 now follows by combining the above facts for the two terms in (2.44).

2.2 The supersymmetric case

The Witten approach has been independently extended to the case of non-elliptic operators like the Kramers-Fokker-Planck operator in [16] (in supersymmetric language) and in [1] (in terms of differential forms). See also [13]. We here follow the presentation of Section 10 and 11 of [11] and refer to that work for more details and proofs.

We start by a quick review of that in the semiclassical case, then we establish some basic facts about the principal and subprincipal symbols, especially at the critical points of the given weight function. Finally we add some growth conditions and a dynamical condition, so that the results of Subsection 2.1 can be applied.

2.2.1 Generalities

Let

$$A : (\mathbb{R}^n)^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \quad (2.45)$$

be a linear and invertible map. Then we have the real nondegenerate bilinear form

$$(u|v)_A = \langle \wedge^k A(u)|v \rangle, \quad u, v \in \wedge^k(\mathbb{R}^n)^*. \quad (2.46)$$

If $a : \wedge^k(\mathbb{R}^n)^* \rightarrow \wedge^\ell(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ is a linear map, we define the "adjoint" $a^{A,*} : \wedge^\ell(\mathbb{R}^n)^* \rightarrow \wedge^k(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ by

$$(au|v)_A = (u|a^{A,*}v)_A. \quad (2.47)$$

(In the complexified case, we take the sesquilinear extension of $(u|v)_A$ and define $a^{A,*}$ the same way.)

If ω is a one form, we have

$$(\omega^\wedge)^{A,*} = (A\omega)^\lrcorner, \quad (2.48)$$

where \wedge and \lrcorner denote the usual operators of (left) exterior product and contraction.

If u, v are smooth k forms with $\text{supp } u \cap \text{supp } v$ compact, we define

$$(u|v)_A = \int (u(x)|v(x))_A dx$$

and denote by $a^{A,*}$ the formal adjoint of an operator $a : C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^n; \wedge^\ell T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$. We can consider

$$\partial_{x_j} : C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n),$$

acting coefficient-wise, and a straightforward computation shows that

$$(h\partial_{x_j})^{A,*} = -h\partial_{x_j}. \quad (2.49)$$

Let $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$ and introduce the Witten (de Rham) complex

$$d_\phi = e^{-\phi/h} \circ hd \circ e^{\phi/h} = hd + (d\phi)^\wedge : C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \wedge^{k+1} T^* \mathbb{R}^n), \quad (2.50)$$

with $d_\phi^2 = 0$. We have

$$d_\phi = \sum_1^n (h\partial_{x_j} + \partial_{x_j}\phi) \circ dx_j^\wedge, \quad (2.51)$$

where $h\partial_{x_j} + \partial_{x_j}\phi$ acts coefficient-wise and commutes with dx_j^\wedge , so

$$d_\phi^{A,*} = \sum_1^n (-h\partial_{x_k} + \partial_{x_k}\phi) \circ A(dx_k)^\lrcorner. \quad (2.52)$$

The corresponding Witten-Hodge Laplacian is given by

$$-\Delta_A = d_\phi^{A,*} d_\phi + d_\phi d_\phi^{A,*}, \quad (2.53)$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_A &= \sum_{j,k} (-h\partial_{x_k} + \partial_{x_k}\phi) A_{j,k} (h\partial_{x_j} + \partial_{x_j}\phi) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j,k} 2h\partial_{x_j}\partial_{x_k}\phi \circ dx_j^\wedge A(dx_k)^\lrcorner. \end{aligned} \quad (2.54)$$

Now write

$$A = B + C, \quad B^t = B, \quad C^t = -C. \quad (2.55)$$

Then (2.54) gives

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_A &= \sum_{j,k} (-h\partial_{x_k} + \partial_{x_k}\phi) B_{j,k} (h\partial_{x_j} + \partial_{x_j}\phi) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j,k} ((\partial_{x_k}\phi) C_{j,k} h\partial_{x_j} + h\partial_{x_j} \circ C_{j,k} \circ (\partial_{x_k}\phi)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j,k} 2h\partial_{x_j}\partial_{x_k}\phi \circ dx_j^\wedge A(dx_k)^\lrcorner. \end{aligned} \quad (2.56)$$

Note that the last term vanishes on 0-forms, i.e. on scalar functions. To recover the Kramers-Fokker-Planck operator (cf [16]), replace n by $2n$,

$$A = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & \gamma \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then (2.56) gives for 0-forms:

$$-\Delta_A^{(0)} = \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n (-h\partial_{y_j} + \partial_{y_j}\phi)(h\partial_{y_j} + \partial_{y_j}\phi) + hH_\phi, \quad (2.57)$$

where

$$H_\phi = \sum (\partial_{y_k}\phi \partial_{x_k} - \partial_{x_k}\phi \partial_{y_k})$$

is the Hamilton field of ϕ with respect to the standard symplectic form $\sum dy_j \wedge dx_j$.

If we choose

$$\phi(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}y^2 + V(x), \quad (2.58)$$

we get the Kramers-Fokker-Planck operator (1.1),

$$-\Delta_A^{(0)} = y \cdot h\partial_x - V'(x) \cdot h\partial_y + \frac{\gamma}{2}(-h\partial_y + y) \cdot (h\partial_y + y). \quad (2.59)$$

2.2.2 The principal symbol of the Hodge Laplacian

The principal symbol of $-\Delta_A$ in the sense of h -differential operators is scalar and given by

$$\begin{aligned} p(x, \xi) &= \sum_{j,k} A_{j,k}(-i\xi_k + \partial_{x_k}\phi)(i\xi_j + \partial_{x_j}\phi) \\ &= \sum_{j,k} B_{j,k}(\xi_j\xi_k + \partial_{x_j}\phi\partial_{x_k}\phi) + 2i \sum_{j,k} C_{j,k}\partial_{x_k}\phi\xi_j. \end{aligned} \quad (2.60)$$

The corresponding real symbol $q(x, \xi) = -p(x, i\xi)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} q(x, \xi) &= \sum_{j,k} A_{j,k}(\xi_k + \partial_{x_k}\phi)(\xi_j - \partial_{x_j}\phi) \\ &= \sum_{j,k} B_{j,k}(\xi_j\xi_k - \partial_{x_j}\phi\partial_{x_k}\phi) + 2 \sum_{j,k} C_{j,k}\partial_{x_k}\phi\xi_j. \end{aligned} \quad (2.61)$$

It vanishes on the two Lagrangian manifolds $\Lambda_{\pm\phi}$.

We define

$$\nu_{\pm} = H_{q|_{\Lambda_{\pm\phi}}}. \quad (2.62)$$

Using x_1, \dots, x_n as coordinates on $\Lambda_{\pm\phi}$, we get

$$\nu_+ = 2 \sum_{j,k} A_{j,k}\partial_{x_k}\phi\partial_{x_j} = 2A(\phi'(x)) \cdot \partial_x \quad (2.63)$$

$$\nu_- = -2 \sum_{j,k} A_{j,k}\partial_{x_j}\phi\partial_{x_k} = -2A^t(\phi'(x)) \cdot \partial_x. \quad (2.64)$$

Let x_0 be a nondegenerate critical point of ϕ , so that Λ_{ϕ} and $\Lambda_{-\phi}$ intersect transversally at $(x_0, 0)$. The spectrum of the linearization F_q of H_q at $(x_0, 0)$ is equal to the union of the spectra of the linearizations

$$\nu_+^0 = (2A\phi''(x_0)x) \cdot \partial_x \text{ and } \nu_-^0 = -(2A^t\phi''(x_0)x) \cdot \partial_x \quad (2.65)$$

of ν_+ and ν_- respectively at x_0 . Thus we are interested in the eigenvalues of the matrices $A\phi''$, $A^t\phi''$. Here, $A^t\phi'' = \phi''^{-1}(A\phi'')^t\phi''$ has the same eigenvalues as $A\phi''$, and similarly $\phi''A$, $\phi''A^t$ are isospectral to $A\phi''$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The eigenvalues of } F_q \text{ are given by } \pm 2\lambda_j, \\ \text{where } \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \text{ are the eigenvalues of } A\phi''. \end{aligned} \quad (2.66)$$

(Here the notation is different from the one used prior to Proposition 2.8.)

We assume from now on that

$$B \geq 0. \quad (2.67)$$

In [11] we established the following result:

Lemma 2.14 Let $\mu(x, \partial_x) = Mx \cdot \partial_x$ be a real linear vector field on \mathbb{R}^n . Let $n_{\pm} \in \mathbb{N}$, $n_+ + n_- = n$. Then the following two statements are equivalent:

- (A) M has n_+ eigenvalues with real part > 0 and n_- eigenvalues with real part < 0 .
(B) There exists a quadratic form $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of signature (n_+, n_-) and a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\mu(x, \partial_x)(G) \geq \frac{1}{C}|x|^2, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (2.68)$$

Using this lemma we got the following proposition at the nondegenerate critical point x_0 that we assume to be zero for notational reasons. Here p^0 is the quadratic approximation of p at $(0, 0)$.

Proposition 2.15 a) Assume that the matrix $A\phi''$ of ν_+^0 has m_{\pm} eigenvalues with \pm real part > 0 , $m_+ + m_- = n$. Then there exists a real quadratic form $\mathcal{G}(x, \xi)$ on \mathbb{R}^{2n} such that

$$\operatorname{Re} p^0((x, \xi) + i\epsilon H_{\mathcal{G}}(x, \xi)) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{C}|(x, \xi)|^2, \quad (x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}, \quad 0 < \epsilon \ll 1. \quad (2.69)$$

b) Conversely, assume that there exists a quadratic form \mathcal{G} such that (2.69) holds. Then $A\phi''$ has n_{\pm} eigenvalues with \pm real part > 0 , where (n_+, n_-) is the signature of $\phi''(0)$.

The condition (2.21) implies the existence of \mathcal{G} as in a) of the proposition.

2.2.3 The subprincipal symbol

We next look at the subprincipal term in (2.54), i.e. the last sum in that equation. As we saw in [11], it can be rewritten as

$$2h \sum_j (\phi'' \circ A^t)(dx_j) \wedge \partial_{x_j}^{\downarrow}. \quad (2.70)$$

Now we restrict the attention to a nondegenerate critical point x_0 of ϕ and we shall compute the subprincipal symbol of $-\Delta_A$ at the corresponding doubly characteristic point $(x_0, 0)$. At that point $\phi'' \circ A^t : T_{x_0}^* \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow T_{x_0}^* \mathbb{R}^n$ is invariantly defined and it is easy to check that (2.70) is also invariantly defined: we get the same quantity if we replace $dx_1, \dots, dx_n, \partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n}$, by $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n, \omega_1^*, \dots, \omega_n^*$, where $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$ is any basis in the complexified cotangent space and $\omega_1^*, \dots, \omega_n^*$ is the dual basis of tangent vectors for the natural bilinear pairing.

Assume that the equivalent conditions of Proposition 2.15 hold and denote the corresponding eigenvalues (that are also the eigenvalues of $\phi'' \circ A^t$) by $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ with $\operatorname{Re} \lambda_j > 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq n_+$ and with $\operatorname{Re} \lambda_j < 0$ for $n_+ + 1 \leq j \leq n = n_+ + n_-$. The eigenvalues of F_p are then $\pm 2i\lambda_j$ (in view of (2.66) and the isospectrality of F_p and iF_q reviewed prior to Proposition 2.8), so

$$\widetilde{\operatorname{tr}} F_p := \frac{1}{i} \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \sigma(F_p) \\ \operatorname{Im} \mu > 0}} \mu = \sum_1^{n_+} 2\lambda_j - \sum_{n_++1}^n 2\lambda_j. \quad (2.71)$$

The subprincipal symbol of the first term in (2.54) (at $(x_0, 0)$) is equal to

$$\sum_{j,k} A_{j,k} \frac{1}{2i} \{-i\xi_k + \partial_{x_k} \phi, i\xi_j + \partial_{x_j} \phi\} = -\sum_{j,k} A_{j,k} \phi''_{j,k} = -\text{tr}(A\phi'') = -\sum_1^n \lambda_j. \quad (2.72)$$

Simplifying the last term in (2.54), we get the full subprincipal symbol at $(x_0, 0)$:

$$S_P = -\sum_1^n \lambda_j + 2 \sum_j ((\phi'' A^t)(dx_j))^{\wedge} \partial_{x_j}^{\downarrow}$$

and hence

$$\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\text{tr}} F_p + S_P = -2 \sum_{n+1}^n \lambda_j + 2 \sum_j ((\phi'' A^t)(dx_j))^{\wedge} \partial_{x_j}^{\downarrow}$$

The eigenvalues of $\sum_j (\phi'' \circ A^t)(dx_j)^{\wedge} \partial_{x_j}^{\downarrow}$ on the space of m -forms are easily calculated, if we replace dx_1, \dots, dx_n by a basis of eigenvectors $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$ of $\phi'' \circ A^t$, so that

$$(\phi'' \circ A^t)(\omega_j) = \lambda_j \omega_j,$$

and ∂_{x_j} by the corresponding dual basis vectors ω_j^* . (Here we assume to start with that there are no Jordan blocks. This can be achieved by an arbitrarily small perturbation of A , and we can extend the end result of our calculation to the general case by continuity.) We get

$$\sum_j (\phi'' \circ A^t)(dx_j)^{\wedge} \partial_{x_j}^{\downarrow} = \sum_j \lambda_j \omega_j^{\wedge} \omega_j^{*\downarrow}. \quad (2.73)$$

A basis of eigenforms of this operator is given by $\omega_{j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_{j_m}$, $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_m \leq n$ and the corresponding eigenvalues are $\lambda_{j_1} + \dots + \lambda_{j_m}$.

Then the eigenvalues of

$$\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\text{tr}} F_p + S_P, \text{ acting on } m \text{ forms}$$

are

$$2(\lambda_{j_1} + \dots + \lambda_{j_m} - \sum_{n+1}^n \lambda_j), \quad 1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_m \leq n. \quad (2.74)$$

We conclude that if $m \neq n_-$, then all the eigenvalues have a real part > 0 . If $m = n_-$, then precisely one eigenvalue is equal to 0, while the others have positive real part and the corresponding one dimensional kernel is spanned by $\omega_{n_+} \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n$.

2.2.4 A symmetry for adjoints

In this subsection we are concerned with symmetry relations for the $A, *$ adjoints. If $D : L^2(\Omega; \wedge^k T^* \Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega; \wedge^j T^* \Omega)$, then a simple calculation shows that

$$D = (D^{A,*})^{A^t,*}.$$

This can be applied to $-\Delta_A$ and we get

$$(-\Delta_A)^{A^t,*} = -\Delta_{A^t}, \quad (-\Delta_{A^t})^{A,*} = -\Delta_A. \quad (2.75)$$

2.2.5 Quasimodes and spectral subspaces

So far, we only developed the formal aspects of the supersymmetric approach. Now assume,

Hypothesis 2.16 $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth and satisfies

$$\partial_x^\alpha \phi(x) = \mathcal{O}(1), \quad \partial_x^\alpha (\langle B \partial_x \phi, \partial_x \phi \rangle) = \mathcal{O}(1), \quad |\alpha| \geq 2. \quad (2.76)$$

Moreover, ϕ is a Morse function and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|\phi'(x)| \geq 1/C, \quad |x| \geq C. \quad (2.77)$$

We also assume from now on that A in (2.55) satisfies

$$B \geq 0. \quad (2.78)$$

Then $P = -\Delta_A^{(0)}$ satisfies the assumptions (2.4)–(2.7) and Hypothesis 2.5 is fulfilled with

$$\mathcal{C} = \{(x^1, 0), \dots, (x^N, 0)\},$$

where x^j denote the critical points of ϕ . Indeed, (2.60) can also be written

$$p(x, \xi) = \langle B \xi | \xi \rangle + 2i \langle C \phi'_x | \xi \rangle + \langle B \phi'_x | \phi'_x \rangle, \quad (2.79)$$

and the vector field ν becomes

$$\nu = 2C \phi'_x \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x}.$$

This means that Proposition 2.2 and Corollary 2.3 apply to $P = -\Delta_A^{(0)}$. Notice also that the principal part of $-\Delta_A^{(\ell)}$ is scalar so that this operator differs from the tensor product of $-\Delta_A^{(0)}$ with the identity in some \mathbb{C}^{N_ℓ} up a zero order term which is $\mathcal{O}(h)$ in C_b^∞ . Hence the above mentioned results apply to $-\Delta_A^{(\ell)}$ as well, provided that we strengthen the assumption on z in Proposition 2.2 to $\operatorname{Re} z < -Ch$, for $C \geq 0$ suitably chosen.

We now adopt the dynamical assumption, Hypothesis 2.6. Then Propositions 2.4, 2.7, 2.8, Theorem 2.9, 2.10, 2.13 apply also.

Proposition 2.17 For $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $\operatorname{Re} z \leq \mathcal{O}(h)$, $v \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta_A^{(\ell+1)} - z)^{-1} d_\phi v &= d_\phi (-\Delta_A^{(\ell)} - z)^{-1} v, \\ \text{when } z &\notin \sigma(-\Delta_A^{(\ell)}) \cup \sigma(-\Delta_A^{(\ell+1)}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.80)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta_A^{(\ell-1)} - z)^{-1} d_\phi^{A,*} v &= d_\phi^{A,*} (-\Delta_A^{(\ell)} - z)^{-1} v, \\ \text{when } z &\notin \sigma(-\Delta_A^{(\ell-1)}) \cup \sigma(-\Delta_A^{(\ell)}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.81)$$

Proof. By unique holomorphic continuation it suffices to establish these relations for $-\operatorname{Re} z \gg h^2$.

For such values of z , we can apply Proposition 2.4 to see that $\Lambda(-\Delta_A^{(\ell)} - z)^{-1}v \in L^2$ with $\Lambda = \operatorname{Op}_h(\langle \rho \rangle)$. In particular, $d_\phi(-\Delta_A^{(\ell)} - z)^{-1}v \in L^2$. Let $u = (-\Delta_A^{(\ell)} - z)^{-1}v$, so that $u, d_\phi u \in L^2$.

From $(-\Delta_A^{(\ell)} - z)u = v$ we get, using the intertwining relations;

$$d_\phi v = d_\phi(-\Delta_A^{(\ell)} - z)u = (-\Delta_A^{(\ell+1)} - z)d_\phi u.$$

By the equality of the minimal and maximal closed extensions (Corollary 2.3), and the fact that $d_\phi v, d_\phi u \in L^2$, we get

$$d_\phi u = (-\Delta_A^{(\ell+1)} - z)^{-1}d_\phi v,$$

and we get (2.80). The proof of (2.81) is similar. \square

We shall now discuss the action of d_ϕ and $d_\phi^{A,*}$ on generalized eigenspaces of $-\Delta_A^{(\ell)}$. Let $\gamma \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a simple closed contour such that no eigenvalues of the quadratic approximations of the operators $-\Delta_A^{(\ell)}$ at the critical points of ϕ for $h = 1$, $\ell = 0, \dots, n$, belong to γ .

Then $h\gamma \cap \sigma(-\Delta_A^{(\ell)}) = \emptyset$ for $0 < h \ll 1$, so we can introduce the spectral projections,

$$\Pi^{(\ell)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{h\gamma} (z + \Delta_A^{(\ell)})^{-1} dz,$$

and their finite dimensional ranges,

$$E^{(\ell)} = \Pi^{(\ell)}(L^2),$$

Since \mathcal{S} is dense in L^2 , we can replace L^2 by \mathcal{S} in the definition of $E^{(\ell)}$ and Proposition 2.17 tells us that $\Pi^{(\ell+1)}d_\phi = d_\phi\Pi^{(\ell)}$ on \mathcal{S} . Consequently,

$$d_\phi : E^{(\ell)} \rightarrow E^{(\ell+1)}. \quad (2.82)$$

In fact, if $u \in E^{(\ell)}$, we can write $u = \Pi^{(\ell)}(\tilde{u})$, $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{S}$, and then $d_\phi u = d_\phi\Pi^{(\ell)}(\tilde{u}) = \Pi^{(\ell+1)}d_\phi\tilde{u} \in E^{(\ell+1)}$.

Similarly,

$$d_\phi^{A,*} : E^{(\ell+1)} \rightarrow E^{(\ell)}. \quad (2.83)$$

In what follows, we shall mainly consider $-\Delta_A^{(0)}$ and $-\Delta_A^{(1)}$. Let n_0 be the number of local minima, m_1, \dots, m_{n_0} of ϕ . Then, if $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a standard cut-off to a small neighborhood of 0, the functions

$$f_k^{(0)} = h^{-n/4} \chi(x - m_k) e^{-(\phi - \phi(m_k))/h}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n_0, \quad (2.84)$$

are quasimodes of $-\Delta_A^{(0)}$ with eigenvalue 0 in the sense that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_k^{(0)}\| &\asymp 1, \quad (f_k^{(0)} | f_\ell^{(0)}) = 0 \text{ for } k \neq \ell, \\ -\Delta_A^{(0)} f_k^{(0)} &= \mathcal{O}(e^{-1/Ch}) \text{ in } L^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.85)$$

Using also the calculation for the subprincipal symbol above, we get, (as in [11])

Proposition 2.18 *If $C > 0$ is large enough, then $-\Delta_A^{(0)}$ has precisely n_0 eigenvalues in $D(0, h/C)$ (for h small enough) when counted with their multiplicity. These eigenvalues are actually $\mathcal{O}(h^\infty)$.*

Let $E^{(0)}$ be the spectral subspace corresponding to the eigenvalues in the proposition and let $\Pi^{(0)}$ denote the corresponding spectral projection. Then $e_k^{(0)} := \Pi^{(0)} f_k^{(0)}$ form a basis in $E^{(0)}$ such that

$$f_k^{(0)} - e_k^{(0)}, B^{1/2} h D(f_k^{(0)} - e_k^{(0)}) = \mathcal{O}(e^{-1/C h}) \text{ in } L^2. \quad (2.86)$$

This follows from Theorem 2.13 and its proof. Later we shall choose the quasimodes $f_k^{(0)}$ more carefully, using more refined cut-offs.

Let n_1 be the number of saddle points, i.e. critical points of index 1.

Proposition 2.19 *If $C > 0$ is large enough, then for $h > 0$ sufficiently small, $-\Delta_A^{(1)}$ has precisely n_1 eigenvalues in $D(0, h/C)$ (counted with their multiplicity). The corresponding eigenvalues are $\mathcal{O}(h^\infty)$. We denote by $E^{(1)} \subset L^2$ the corresponding spectral subspace.*

The first part follows from Theorem 2.13 and the calculation of the subprincipal symbol (see [11] for more details). That the corresponding eigenvalues are $\mathcal{O}(h^\infty)$ and not just $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ is also the consequence of a standard argument:

Let

$$f_j^{(1)} = h^{-n/4} a_j(x; h) e^{-\phi_+(x)/h}, \quad (2.87)$$

where

$$a_j(x; h) \sim a_{j,0}(x) + h a_{j,1} + \dots \text{ in } C^\infty(\text{neigh}(s_j, \mathbb{R}^n)), \quad a_{j,0}(s_j) \neq 0,$$

and $\phi_+ \asymp |x - s_j|^2$ solves the eiconal equation $q(x, \phi'_+) = 0$ in a neighborhood of s_j . We assume that $f_j^{(1)}$ is a quasimode so that in the sense of formal asymptotic expansions,

$$-\Delta_A^{(1)} f_j^{(1)} = \mu_j(h) f_j^{(1)}, \quad \mu_j(h) = \mathcal{O}(h^2).$$

Using the intertwining relations

$$\Delta_A^{(0)} d_\phi^{A,*} = d_\phi^{A,*} \Delta_A^{(1)}, \quad \Delta_A^{(2)} d_\phi = d_\phi \Delta_A^{(1)}, \quad (2.88)$$

we see that $d_\phi^{A,*} f_j^{(1)}$ and $d_\phi f_j^{(1)}$ are quasimodes to $-\Delta_A^{(0)}$ and $-\Delta_A^{(2)}$ respectively, with the same eigenvalue $\mu_j = o(h)$. However, from Theorem 2.13 and the calculations of the subprincipal symbol above, we know that these two operators cannot have any non-trivial quasimodes at s_j with an eigenvalue $o(h)$. Hence $d_\phi^{A,*} f_j^{(1)}$ and $d_\phi f_j^{(1)}$ vanish in the space of asymptotic WKB expressions, and using that $-\Delta_A^{(1)} = d_\phi^{A,*} d_\phi + d_\phi d_\phi^{A,*}$, we see that $\mu_j = \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)$, as claimed.

Recall that $\Lambda_{\phi_+, j}$ is the stable outgoing manifold through $(s_j, 0)$ for the H_q -flow and that $\phi''_{+, j}(s_j) > 0$ by Proposition 2.8. (Similarly we have a stable incoming manifold $\Lambda_{\phi_-, j}$.) Recall also (see Proposition 2.15) that the linearization of $H_q|_{\Lambda_\phi}$ at that point has $n - 1$ positive eigenvalues and 1 negative eigenvalue. Its matrix

is $2A\phi''(s_j)$, according to (2.63). We let $K_+, K_- \subset \Lambda_\phi$ be the corresponding stable outgoing and incoming submanifolds of dimension $k_+ = n-1$ and $k_- = 1$ respectively and recall that $K_+ \subset \Lambda_{\phi_+}$, $K_- \subset \Lambda_{\phi_-}$ and $\phi - \phi(s_j) - \phi_{\pm,j}$ vanishes to the second order on $\pi_x(K_\pm)$. It is also clear that $\Lambda_\phi, \Lambda_{\phi_\pm}$ intersect cleanly along K_\pm , so we get (cf [11, Section 11]):

$$\phi_+ - (\phi - \phi(s_j)) \asymp \text{dist}(x, \pi_x(K_+))^2, \quad \phi - \phi(s_j) - \phi_- \asymp \text{dist}(x, \pi_x(K_-))^2. \quad (2.89)$$

We also know from Proposition 2.15 and the isospectrality recalled prior to (2.66) that $\phi''(s_j)A^t$ (which is the linearization of $-\frac{1}{2}H_{q|_{\Lambda_{-\phi}}}$, where we also notice that q vanishes on $\Lambda_{\pm\phi}$) has precisely one negative eigenvalue, that the other eigenvalues have real parts > 0 , and that $a_{j,0}(s_j) \neq 0$ is an eigenvector corresponding to the negative eigenvalue. Here we recall that $\phi''(s_j)A$ and $\phi''(s_j)A^t$ are isospectral, since $(\phi''(s_j)A)^{A,*} = \phi''(s_j)A^t$. Also, if $a_{j,0}^* \neq 0$ is an eigenvector corresponding to the negative eigenvalue of $\phi''(s_j)A$, then by ([11, (11.27)]),

$$(a_{j,0}^*|a_{j,0}(s_j))_A \neq 0. \quad (2.90)$$

Here we point out that the construction of the quasimode in (2.87) starts by choosing $a_{j,0}(s_j)$ to be a non-vanishing eigenvector of $\phi''(s_j)A^t$, corresponding to the negative eigenvalue.

3 Generalized PT symmetry and consequences

3.1 First remarks on the KFP case

In this subsection, as a preliminary and pedagogical step, we show the reality of the small eigenvalues of the KFP operator (1.1), $n = 2d$. This corresponds to the general supersymmetric case with

$$\phi(x, y) = \frac{y^2}{2} + V(x), \quad A = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & \gamma \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.1)$$

Here, V is a smooth real-valued Morse function on \mathbb{R}_x^d with $V'' \in C_b^\infty$, $|V'(x)| \geq 1/C$ for $|x| \geq C$. Let $\mathbf{m}_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{n_0}$ be the (non-degenerate) local minima of V , so that $m_1 = (\mathbf{m}_1, 0), \dots, m_{n_0} = (\mathbf{m}_{n_0}, 0)$ are the local minima of ϕ . In this case the spectral subspace $E^{(0)}$ is spanned by the functions $e_k^{(0)}$, $k = 1, \dots, n_0$, where

$$e_k^{(0)} = h^{-\frac{n}{4}} e^{-\frac{1}{h}(\phi(x,y) - \phi(\mathbf{m}_j, 0))} \chi_k(x, y) + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty) \text{ in } L^2. \quad (3.2)$$

where $\chi_k \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ was defined before.

Let $\kappa : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be given by $\kappa(x, y) = (x, -y)$. Put $U_\kappa u = u \circ \kappa$, $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, so that U_κ is unitary on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and also self-adjoint and equal to its own inverse. We introduce the Hermitian form

$$(u|v)_\kappa = (U_\kappa u|v), \quad u, v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (3.3)$$

In the following our operators will be real so we can restrict the attention to real functions and differential forms. Notice that

$$P^* = U_\kappa^{-1} P U_\kappa. \quad (3.4)$$

Consequently,

$$(Pu|v)_\kappa = (U_\kappa Pu|v) = (P^* U_\kappa u|v) = (U_\kappa u|Pv) = (u|Pv)_\kappa,$$

so P is formally self-adjoint with respect to the Hermitian form $(u|v)_\kappa$.

Proposition 3.1 *The restriction of $(\cdot|\cdot)_\kappa$ to $E^{(0)} \times E^{(0)}$ is positive definite uniformly with respect to h , for h small enough.*

Proof. Since $\phi \circ \kappa = \phi$, we see that there exists $a_j > 0$ independent of h , such that

$$(e_k^{(0)}|e_k^{(0)})_\kappa = a_k + \mathcal{O}(h), \quad (e_k^{(0)}|e_{k'}^{(0)})_\kappa = \mathcal{O}(h^\infty) \text{ for } k \neq k'.$$

Hence for $u = \sum_1^{n_0} u_k e_k^{(0)}$, we get

$$(u|u)_\kappa = \sum_1^{n_0} (a_k + \mathcal{O}(h)) |u_k|^2 \geq \|u\|^2 / C,$$

and the proof is complete. □

In conclusion,

Proposition 3.2 *The restriction of $P : E^{(0)} \rightarrow E^{(0)}$ is self-adjoint with respect to the inner product $(\cdot|\cdot)_\kappa$.*

In particular, the n_0 eigenvalues of P with real part $< h/C$ are all real. Note that they also are $\mathcal{O}(h^\infty)$.

Remark 3.3. The Maxwellian $e^{-(V(x)+y^2/2)/h}$ is an even eigenfunction with respect to y , associated to the eigenvalue 0. Let us show that no other eigenfunction in $E^{(0)}$ than multiples of the Maxwellian can be even.

In fact, assume the contrary, $U_\kappa u = u \neq 0$, $Pu = \mu u$, and apply U_κ to the eigenvalue equation. Using that $U_\kappa P = P^* U_\kappa$, we get $P^* u = \mu u$. (Taking the differences of the two equations, we get $(P - P^*)u = 0$ so that the Hamilton field in P annihilates u). Taking the sum of the two equations, we get $\frac{1}{2}(P + P^*)u = \mu u$, i.e. $\frac{\gamma}{2}(y - h\partial_y) \cdot (y + h\partial_y)u = \mu u$ (for almost all x). Since μ is not among the eigenvalues of the harmonic oscillator part, we conclude that $u = 0$ and get a contradiction.

3.2 Extra symmetry and self-adjointness in the general case

Now we consider the general supersymmetric case and adopt the assumptions of Subsection 2.2. Let $\kappa : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be linear and satisfy

$$\kappa^2 = 1. \quad (3.5)$$

After a linear change of coordinates we may assume that $\kappa = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^{n-d}} \oplus (-\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^d})$, for some $d \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Also assume that

$$\phi \circ \kappa = \phi. \quad (3.6)$$

Then κ maps the critical set of ϕ into itself. We assume that

$$\kappa(x) = x \text{ for all critical points of } \phi \text{ of index 0 or 1.} \quad (3.7)$$

On differential k -forms we define $U_\kappa = \kappa^*$ as the pull-back in the usual sense. On 0-forms, we get

$$U_\kappa u = u \circ \kappa.$$

On differential 1-forms, we get $U_\kappa \omega = \kappa^t(\omega \circ \kappa)$, where $\omega \circ \kappa$ means the 1-form obtained from ω by composing the coefficients with κ . More generally, for k -forms, we get

$$U_\kappa \omega = \wedge^k(\kappa^t)(\omega \circ \kappa).$$

Using the fact that pullback and exterior differentiation commute, together with the invariance (3.6), we get

$$U_\kappa^{-1} d_\phi U_\kappa = d_\phi. \quad (3.8)$$

We next assume that

$$\kappa A = A^t \kappa^t, \quad (3.9)$$

which can also be written as $\kappa A^t = A \kappa^t$, since $\kappa^2 = 1$. Equivalently, κA (or $A \kappa^t$) is symmetric. In the case of KFP, we have

$$A = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & \gamma \end{pmatrix}, \quad \phi = \frac{y^2}{2} + V(x), \quad \kappa = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.10)$$

and we see that

$$\kappa A = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -\gamma \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proposition 3.4 *The bilinear form defined by*

$$(u|v)_{A,\kappa} := (U_\kappa u|v)_A$$

is a Hermitian form on the space of square integrable k -forms.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
(u|v)_{A,\kappa} &= \langle (\wedge^k A)(\wedge^k(\kappa^t))u \circ \kappa | v \rangle = \\
&\langle (\wedge^k(A\kappa^t))u | v \circ \kappa \rangle = \langle (\wedge^k(\kappa A^t))u | v \circ \kappa \rangle = \\
\langle (\wedge^k \kappa)(\wedge^k A^t)u | v \circ \kappa \rangle &= \langle (\wedge^k A^t)u | (\wedge^k \kappa^t)v \circ \kappa \rangle = \\
\langle u | (\wedge^k A)(\wedge^k \kappa^t)v \circ \kappa \rangle &= (v|u)_{A,\kappa},
\end{aligned}$$

where complex conjugate signs are absent since we restrict the attention to real forms. \square

The same type of calculation shows that

$$(u|U_\kappa v)_A = (U_\kappa u|v)_{A^t}.$$

Proposition 3.5 *We have*

$$U_\kappa d_\phi^{A^t,*} = d_\phi^{A,*} U_\kappa.$$

Proof. Let u be a k -form and v be a $(k+1)$ -form and consider

$$(u|U_\kappa d_\phi^{A^t,*} v)_A = (U_\kappa u|d_\phi^{A^t,*} v)_{A^t} = (d_\phi U_\kappa u|v)_{A^t}.$$

Similarly,

$$(u|d_\phi^{A,*} U_\kappa v)_A = (d_\phi u|U_\kappa v)_A = (U_\kappa d_\phi u|v)_{A^t},$$

and we get the proposition in view of (3.8). \square

It follows that

$$U_\kappa \Delta_{A^t} = \Delta_A U_\kappa, \tag{3.11}$$

which implies that Δ_A is formally self-adjoint for the Hermitian form $(\cdot|\cdot)_{A,\kappa}$. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Delta_A u|v)_{A,\kappa} &= (U_\kappa \Delta_A u|v)_A = (\Delta_{A^t} U_\kappa u|v)_A = \\
&(U_\kappa u|(\Delta_{A^t})^{A,*} v)_A = (U_\kappa u|\Delta_A v)_A = (u|\Delta_A v)_{A,\kappa},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (2.75).

We also have

$$(d_\phi u|v)_{A,\kappa} = (U_\kappa d_\phi u|v)_A = (d_\phi U_\kappa u|v)_A = (U_\kappa u|d_\phi^{A,*} v)_A = (u|d_\phi^{A,*} v)_{A,\kappa},$$

which shows that $d_\phi^{A,*}$ is the adjoint of d_ϕ for our Hermitian product $(\cdot|\cdot)_{A,\kappa}$.

3.3 Positivity questions

First we shall prove that the eigenvalues are real. We know from (2.56) that

$$\operatorname{Re} \left(-\Delta_A^{(0)} \right) \geq 0,$$

so all eigenvalues have real part ≥ 0 . Proposition 3.1 and its proof carry over without any changes, so we know that $-\Delta_A^{(0)} : E^{(0)} \rightarrow E^{(0)}$ is self-adjoint with respect to the

inner product $(\cdot|\cdot)_\kappa = (|\cdot)_{A,\kappa}$ on $E^{(0)}$. In particular, the eigenvalues of $-\Delta_A^{(0)}$ with real part in $[0, h/C]$ are all real and $= \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)$.

We next consider $-\Delta_A^{(1)}$ and a vector in $E^{(1)}$ of the form,

$$e_j^{(1)} = (h^{-n/4}a_j(x; h) + r_j)e^{-\phi_{+,j}(x)/h}\theta_j(x) + \tilde{r}_j e^{-S_0/h}, \quad (3.12)$$

where S_0 is a positive constant, $r_j, B^{1/2}hDr_j$ are $\mathcal{O}(h^\infty)$ in L^2 and similarly for $\tilde{r}_j, \theta_j \in C_0^\infty(\text{neigh}(s_j))$, $\theta_j = 1$ near s_j , and $a_j(x; h) \sim a_{j,0}(x) + ha_{j,1}(x) + \dots$ where $a_{j,0}(s_j) \neq 0$ is an eigenvector corresponding to the negative eigenvalue of $\phi''(s_j)A^\dagger$. The vector $e_j^{(1)}$ is obtained by the spectral projection of the truncation of a quasimode as in (2.87). As remarked at the end of Section 2, when constructing a quasimode for $-\Delta_{A^\dagger}^{(1)}$, we consider $a_{j,0}^* \neq 0$, which is an eigenvector corresponding to the negative eigenvalue of $\phi''(s_j)A$. Then

$$(a_{j,0}^*|a_{j,0}(s_j))_A \neq 0. \quad (3.13)$$

Notice that we can take $a_{j,0}^* = \kappa^\dagger a_{j,0}(s_j)$.

Now fix j for a while, suppress this subscript from the notation and write $a_0 = a_{j,0}(s_j)$. We shall study the sign of

$$(\kappa^\dagger a_0|a_0)_A, \quad (3.14)$$

which we already know is real and non-vanishing. Recall the relations

$$\kappa^\dagger \phi'' \kappa = \phi'', \quad \phi'' = \phi''(s_j), \quad (3.15)$$

$$\kappa A = A^\dagger \kappa^\dagger, \quad (3.16)$$

and that $A = B + C$ with $B = B^\dagger \geq 0$, $C = -C^\dagger$, A bijective. Write

$$\kappa = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} : E_+ \oplus E_- \rightarrow E_+ \oplus E_- \quad (3.17)$$

where $E_+ \simeq \mathbb{R}^{n-d}$ is the kernel of $\kappa - \text{Id}$ and $E_- \simeq \mathbb{R}^d$ is the kernel of $\kappa + \text{Id}$. Let $(\mathbb{R}^n)^* = E_+^* \oplus E_-^*$ be the dual decomposition, so that $E_+^* \simeq (\mathbb{R}^{n-d})^*$ is the kernel of $\kappa^\dagger - \text{Id}$ and $E_-^* \simeq (\mathbb{R}^d)^*$ is the kernel of $\kappa^\dagger + \text{Id}$.

Then (3.15), (3.16) say that

$$\phi'' = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \Phi_2 \end{pmatrix} : E_+ \oplus E_- \rightarrow E_+^* \oplus E_-^*, \quad (3.18)$$

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} B_{11} & C_{12} \\ -C_{12}^\dagger & B_{22} \end{pmatrix} : E_+^* \oplus E_-^* \rightarrow E_+ \oplus E_-, \quad (3.19)$$

where $B_{11}, B_{22} \geq 0$. We now make a continuous deformation of A into the identity in such a way that the above properties of A are preserved, deform a_0 correspondingly so that it remains an eigenvector corresponding to the negative eigenvalue of $\phi'' A^\dagger$. (Notice here that the dynamical assumption (2.21) is automatically satisfied once we make B positive definite.) Then the quantity (3.14) remains non-vanishing and hence of constant sign, so we have reduced the problem to that of studying the sign of $(\kappa^\dagger a_0|a_0)$ when a_0 is a non-vanishing eigenvector of ϕ'' corresponding to its negative eigenvalue. This gives

Proposition 3.6 *There are only two possibilities:*

- i) If Φ_1 is the component in (3.18) that has a negative eigenvalue, then the quantity (3.14) is > 0 .*
- ii) If Φ_2 is the component in (3.18) that has a negative eigenvalue, then the quantity (3.14) is < 0 .*

A more invariant way of describing the two cases in the proposition, is to say that we are in the first case if ϕ'' is positive as a quadratic form on E_- and that we are in the second case when ϕ'' is positive on E_+ . In the case of KFP, we have

$$\phi'' = \begin{pmatrix} V'' & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \kappa = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.20)$$

so we are in the first case and the quantity (3.14) is positive.

Recall the final observation in Subsection 3.2. Combining it with Proposition 3.6 and the method of stationary phase as in the case of 0-forms, we get

Proposition 3.7 *Assume that at every saddle point, we are in the case 1 of Proposition 3.6. Then the restriction of $(\cdot|\cdot)_{A,\kappa}$ to $E^{(1)} \times E^{(1)}$ is uniformly positive definite and if we equip $E^{(0)}$, $E^{(1)}$ with the scalar products $(\cdot|\cdot)_\kappa$ and $(\cdot|\cdot)_{A,\kappa}$, then the adjoint of $d_\phi : E^{(0)} \rightarrow E^{(1)}$ is $d_\phi^{A,*}$.*

Remark 3.8. Let us finally mention that our discussion applies to the case of the usual Witten complex. In that case, we let $A = \iota : (\mathbb{R}^n)^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be the application whose matrix is the identity in Euclidean coordinates. Naturally much of our machinery is redundant in that case, but it may be of interest to point out that our Theorems 7.1, 7.2 seem to be new in that degree of generality for the standard Witten Laplacian.

4 Labelling and quasimodes for multiple wells

4.1 Separating saddle points and critical components

Let $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$ be a Morse function satisfying (2.76) and (2.77). Also assume that

$$\phi(x) \rightarrow +\infty, \quad x \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.1)$$

so that in view of (2.77), we have $\phi(x) \geq |x|/C$ for $|x| \geq C$, where $C > 0$. In particular, $e^{-\phi/h} \in L^2$. In [11] we also treated the case when (4.1) does not hold, and we hope to extend our present result to that case in the future.

The function ϕ has finitely many critical points. The critical points of index 1 will be called saddle points. In what follows, we shall be concerned with the saddle points and the local minima of ϕ .

Let s be a saddle point of ϕ and let $B(s, r) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; |x - s| < r\}$. Then for $r > 0$ small enough, the set

$$\{x \in B(s, r); \phi(x) < \phi(s)\}$$

has precisely 2 connected components, $C_j(s, r)$, $j = 1, 2$, with $C_j(s, \tilde{r}) \subset C_j(s, r)$, if $0 < \tilde{r} \leq r$.

Definition 4.1 *We say that $s \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a separating saddle point (ssp) if it is a saddle point and $C_1(s, r)$ and $C_2(s, r)$ are contained in different connected components of the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; \phi(x) < \phi(s)\}$. Let SSP denote the set of ssps.*

Notice that this definition depends on the global behavior of ϕ . It can be localized somewhat:

Proposition 4.2 *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a saddle point and let $\sigma \in]\phi(s), +\infty[$. Then s is a ssp if and only if $C_1(s, r)$ and $C_2(s, r)$ are contained in different components of $\{x \in F(s, \sigma); \phi(x) < \phi(s)\}$, where $F(s, \sigma)$ denotes the connected component of s in $\phi^{-1}(] - \infty, \sigma])$.*

Definition 4.3 *A connected component E of the sublevel set $\phi^{-1}(] - \infty, \sigma])$ will be called a critical component (cc) if $\partial E \cap \text{SSP} \neq \emptyset$ or if $E = \mathbb{R}^n$.*

We shall now describe a labelling system for the set LM of local minima of the function ϕ and a natural injective map from LM to the set CC of critical components, instrumental in constructing an appropriate system of quasimodes, adapted to the local minima. When doing so, it will turn out to be convenient to label the elements of both sets by 2-tuples of positive integers, \mathbb{N}^2 . Let therefore $m_{1,1}$ stand for a point of global minimum of ϕ , arbitrarily chosen, but kept fixed in the following discussion. Associated to $m_{1,1}$ we have the critical component $E_{1,1} = \mathbb{R}^n$ and we let the associated saddle point value be $\sigma_1 = \sigma(E_{1,1}) = +\infty$. Let next

$$\sigma_2 = \sup \phi(\text{SSP}).$$

Then the sublevel set $\mathcal{L}(\sigma_2) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \phi(x) < \sigma_2\}$ is the union of its finitely many connected components (all critical), of which there is precisely one containing the point $m_{1,1}$. The remaining connected components of the sublevel set $\mathcal{L}(\sigma_2)$ will be labelled as $E_{2,k}$, $1 \leq k \leq N_2$, $N_2 \geq 1$. Associated to each $E_{2,k}$, we let $m_{2,k}$ be a point of global minimum of the restriction of ϕ to $E_{2,k}$, $1 \leq k \leq N_2$.

Continuing the labelling procedure, we let σ_3 be the largest number of the form $\phi(s)$, $s \in \text{SSP}$, such that $\sigma_3 < \sigma_2$. Decompose the sublevel set $\mathcal{L}(\sigma_3)$ into its connected components and perform the labelling as follows: We omit all those components that contain the already labelled minima $m_{1,1}$ and $m_{2,k}$, $1 \leq k \leq N_2$. Some of these components may be non-critical. The remaining ones are critical and we label them as $E_{3,j}$, $1 \leq j \leq N_3$, $N_3 \geq 1$. We then let $m_{3,j}$ be a point of global minimum of the restriction of ϕ to $E_{3,j}$, $1 \leq j \leq N_3$.

We go on with this procedure, proceeding in the order dictated by the elements of the set $\phi(\text{SSP})$, arranged in the decreasing order, until all local minima have been




Figure 1: Labelling in the generic case

enumerated. In this way, we obtain the labelling of the set LM of local minima of ϕ by indices of the form $k = (k^\sigma, k^{cc}) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, where k^σ is the index corresponding to the separating saddle point values σ , arranged in the decreasing order, $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \sigma_3 > \dots > \sigma_{N_0}$. It is then also clear that we get an injection from LM to CC, associating to each local minimum m_k , the critical component E_k , containing m_k . We equip the set of indices k with the lexicographical order.




Figure 2: Labelling in the general case

Associated to the labelling procedure above is the connected graph, having a structure of a tree, or rather a root, obtained by letting σ vary from $+\infty$ to $-\infty$, and representing the various components of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma)$ as points that move vertically and

split at each separating saddle point level.




Figure 3: Tree corresponding to the general case

We also notice that our labelling procedure has the property that if $E_{k'}$ and E_k are two critical components with $E_{k'} \subset E_k$, with a proper inclusion, then $k' > k$, and E_k can be reached from $E_{k'}$ by following ascending links in the root. Given a critical component E_k , we let $\sigma(k) = \sigma(E_k)$ be the corresponding saddle point value. Here, as above, we adopt the convention that $E_{1,1} = \mathbb{R}^n$ is a critical component, and that $\sigma(1, 1) = +\infty$.

4.2 Cut-off functions and quasimodes

In this section, we shall build quasimodes adapted to the local minima of ϕ and the labelling of the set LM, described in the previous subsection. When doing so, we shall first construct suitable cut-off functions, in terms of the corresponding critical components.

Let $E = E(\sigma) \neq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a critical component and let σ be the corresponding saddle point value. Let $\chi_0 \in C_0^\infty(B(0, 1), [0, 1])$ be equal to 1 on $B(0, \frac{1}{2})$. For $\delta > 0$ small enough, put

$$\tilde{\phi}(x) = \phi(x) + \sum_{\substack{s \in \text{SSP}, \\ \phi(s) \geq \sigma}} \delta^2 \chi_0 \left(\frac{x-s}{\delta} \right). \quad (4.2)$$

For $0 \leq t \leq \frac{\delta^2}{C}$, with C large enough independent of δ , there is a unique connected component of $\tilde{\phi}^{-1}(]-\infty, \sigma + t])$ which is $C\delta$ -close to $E(\sigma)$ in the sense that any of the two sets is contained in the algebraic sum of the other and $B(0, C\delta)$. Let \tilde{E}_0 be this component when $t = \frac{\delta^2}{C}$. Let $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}; [0, 1])$ be equal to 1 on $]-\infty, \sigma + \frac{\delta^2}{2C}]$ and have its support in $]-\infty, \sigma + \frac{\delta^2}{C}[$. The cut-off function associated to the critical component $E = E(\sigma)$ is defined as follows,

$$\chi_E(x) = 1_{\tilde{E}_0}(x) f(\tilde{\phi}(x)). \quad (4.3)$$

Here $1_{\tilde{E}_0}$ is the characteristic function of the set \tilde{E}_0 .

Notice that outside the union of the balls $B(s, \delta)$, for $s \in \text{SSP}$, $\phi(s) \geq \sigma$, we have $\phi(x) \geq \sigma + \frac{\delta^2}{2C}$, in the cut-off region $\text{supp } \nabla \chi_E$. We also notice that if $B(s, \delta) \cap \text{supp } \nabla \chi_E \neq \emptyset$ for some $s \in \text{SSP}$, then $\text{dist}(s, E) \leq \mathcal{O}(\delta)$. In particular, s can be a boundary point only of critical components \tilde{E} which contain E .

We shall now describe the construction of quasimodes associated to the local minima m_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}^2$, of ϕ . Here we assume that the minima have been labelled as described in the previous subsection. Let E_k be the corresponding critical component containing m_k , as described there.

When $m_{1,1}$ is a point of global minimum of ϕ , let $E_1 = \mathbb{R}^n$, and set

$$f_{1,1}^{(0)}(x; h) = h^{-n/4} e^{-(\phi(x) - \phi(m_{1,1}))/h}.$$

When $k \neq (1, 1)$, we set, according to our labelling,

$$f_k^{(0)}(x; h) = f_{m_k}^{(0)}(x; h) = h^{-\frac{n}{4}} \chi_{E_k}(x) e^{-(\phi(x) - \phi(m_k))/h},$$

for each of the local minima m_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}^2$. Here χ_{E_k} has been defined as in (4.3). Notice that then the quasimode $f_{k_2}^{(0)}$ is exponentially small near m_{k_1} , as soon as $k_2 > k_1$.

From the properties of the cut-off functions χ_{E_k} , we infer that our system of quasi-modes has the following two important properties:

1) We have $-\Delta_A^{(0)}(f_{1,1}^{(0)}) = 0$, and for the other indices k , we obtain that

$$-\Delta_A^{(0)}(f_k^{(0)}) = [-\Delta_A^{(0)}, \chi_{E_k}](h^{-\frac{n}{4}} e^{-(\phi - \phi(m_k))/h}).$$

Let $\sigma(k)$ be the saddle point value associated to the critical component E_k and let $S_k = \sigma(k) - \phi(m_k)$. Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_A^{(0)}(f_k^{(0)}) &= \sum_{E_k \subset \tilde{E} \in \text{CC}} \sum_{s \in \text{SSP} \cap \partial \tilde{E}} 1_{B(s, \delta)} [-\Delta_A^{(0)}, \chi_{E_k}] h^{-\frac{n}{4}} e^{-(\phi - \phi(m_k))/h} \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_0}) e^{-(S_k + \frac{\delta^2}{2C})/h}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

for some $N_0 > 0$.

2) We next claim that the quasimodes $f_k^{(0)}$ enjoy the property of linear independence in L^2 , uniformly with respect to h . Indeed, notice first that $\|f_k^{(0)}\| \asymp 1$. Consider a linear combination

$$u = \sum u_k f_k^{(0)}, \quad u_k \in \mathbb{C},$$

where it is understood that the summation extends over all indices $k \in \mathbb{N}^2$, occurring in the labelling procedure of Subsection 4.1. For simplicity we now label them in lexicographical order, $f_{k_1}, f_{k_2}, \dots, f_{k_{n_0}}$, where $n_0 = \#\text{LM}$, so that $k_1 = (1, 1)$. As already noticed, if $k \neq (1, 1)$, then $f_k^{(0)}$ is exponentially small near $m_{1,1} = m_{k_1}$, while $f_{k_1}^{(0)}$ has a substantial part of its L^2 norm concentrated there: for every $r > 0$:

$$\int_{B(m_{k_1}, r)} |f_{k_1}^{(0)}|^2 dx \geq \frac{1}{C}, \quad C > 0.$$

Thus, if we multiply u by $1_{B(m_{k_1}, r)} \overline{f_{k_1}^{(0)}}$ and integrate (assuming also that $r > 0$ is sufficiently small), we get

$$|(u|1_{B(m_{k_1}, r)} f_{k_1}^{(0)})| \geq \frac{|u_{k_1}|}{C} - e^{-\frac{1}{C\hbar}} \left(\sum |u_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence

$$|u_{k_1}| \leq C(\|u\| + e^{-\frac{1}{C\hbar}} \|u_{\bullet}\|), \quad u_{\bullet} = (u_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{\#\text{LM}}.$$

Next consider the local minimum m_{k_2} . We have $\int_{B(m_{k_2}, r)} |f_{k_2}^{(0)}|^2 dx \geq 1/C$, while $\int_{B(m_{k_2}, r)} |f_{k_j}^{(0)}|^2 dx = \mathcal{O}(e^{-1/(Ch)})$ for $j > 2$. Taking the L^2 -product with $1_{B(m_{k_2}, r)} f_{k_2}^{(0)}$, we get

$$\frac{|u_{k_2}|}{C} + \mathcal{O}(|u_{k_1}|) \leq C(\|u\| + e^{-\frac{1}{C\hbar}} \|u_{\bullet}\|), \quad \text{so } |u_{k_2}| \leq \tilde{C}(\|u\| + e^{-\frac{1}{C\hbar}} \|u_{\bullet}\|).$$

Continuing this procedure, we get $\|u_{\bullet}\| \leq C(\|u\| + e^{-1/(Ch)} \|u_{\bullet}\|)$ and here the last term can be absorbed, so

$$\sum |u_k|^2 \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \left\| \sum u_k f_k^{(0)} \right\|^2,$$

which shows the uniform linear independence of the system of quasimodes $f_k^{(0)}$.

Let $e_k^{(0)} = \Pi^{(0)}(f_k^{(0)})$ where $\Pi^{(0)} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ is the spectral projection of $-\Delta_A^{(0)}$ onto $E^{(0)}$. Arguing as in Section 11 of [11] (or as in the proof of Theorem 2.13) and using (4.4), we first see that

$$e_k^{(0)} = f_k^{(0)} + \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_1} e^{-(S_k - \alpha)/h}) \quad \text{in } L^2,$$

for some small fixed $\alpha > 0$ and $N_1 > 0$, and it is then clear that also the system $(e_k^{(0)})$ is linearly independent in L^2 , uniformly with respect to h .

In what follows, we shall need the quasimodes for the operator $-\Delta_A^{(1)}$, associated to the saddle points of ϕ . The discussion here will be exactly the same as in the generic case, described in detail in the following section.

5 Multiple well analysis in the generic case

In this section we shall be concerned with the generic case and shall show that the analysis of the singular values of d_ϕ by Helffer, Klein and Nier in [6] in the Witten case can be applied here, thanks to the self-adjointness of $-\Delta^{(0)}$ in $(\cdot|\cdot)_{A, \kappa}$. We shall consider the case when $e^{-\phi/h} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and assume from now on that we are in the case 1 of Proposition 3.6 for every saddle point s_j .

5.1 The critical points and quasimodes in the generic case

Let ϕ be a Morse function satisfying the same assumptions as in the beginning of Section 4. The main hypothesis of this section is the following,

Hypothesis 5.1 For every critical component $E_k = E_{m_k}$ as in Subsection 4.1 we assume that

- $\phi|_{E_k}$ has a unique point of minimum (m_k),
- if $\text{SSP} \cap E_k \neq \emptyset$, there is a unique ssp $s \in \text{SSP} \cap E_k$, such that $\sup \phi(\text{SSP} \cap E_k) = \phi(s)$ and in particular $E_k \cap \phi^{-1}(]-\infty, \phi(s)[)$ is the union of two distinct ccps.

Combining this assumption with (3.7), we observe that $\kappa(m_k) = m_k$ and $\kappa(s_j) = \kappa(s_j)$, for all $1 \leq k \leq n_0$, $1 \leq j \leq n_1$.

In the following we let $s_0 = \infty$. The general labelling procedure described in the previous section simplifies in the generic case, since here $N_{k^\sigma} = 1$ for all k^σ , and hence the elements of the sets LM and CC can be labelled by positive integers. We get the following result.

Proposition 5.2 *There exists an injective function*

$$\{1, \dots, n_0\} \ni k \longmapsto j(k) \in \{0, \dots, n_1\} \quad \text{with } j(1) = 0, \{s_{j(2)}, \dots, s_{j(n_0)}\} = \text{SSP},$$

and a family of connected sets E_k , for $k \in \{1, \dots, n_0\}$, such that the following properties hold:

- i) We have $E_1 = \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\overline{E_k}$ is compact for $k > 1$. For every $k \geq 2$, E_k is the connected component containing m_k in

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; \phi(x) < \phi(s_{j(k)})\},$$

and $\phi(m_k) = \min_{E_k} \phi$.

- ii) If $s_j \in E_k$ and $j = j(k')$ for some $k, k' \in \{1, \dots, n_0\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$, then $k' > k$.

Following [6], we shall now introduce suitable quasimodes, adapted to the local minima of ϕ and the simplified labelling, described in Proposition 5.2. The construction can be viewed as a special case of the general quasimode construction described in Section 4. In what follows, we let \mathcal{U} stand for the set of the critical points of ϕ .

Let $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ be such that the distance between critical points is larger than $10\varepsilon_1$, and such that for every critical point c and $k \in \{1, \dots, n_0\}$ we have either $c \in \overline{E_k}$ or $\text{dist}(c, \overline{E_k}) \geq 10\varepsilon_1$.

When $0 < \varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon_1$ and $C_0 > 1$ are to be defined later, we build a family of C_0^∞ -cutoff functions $\chi_{k,\varepsilon}$, $k \in \{1, \dots, n_0\}$, $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, in the following way: first define $\chi_{1,\varepsilon} = 1$. For $k \geq 2$, we consider the open set $E_{k,\varepsilon} := E_k \setminus \overline{B(s_{j(k)}, \varepsilon)}$, and let $\chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ be a smooth function supported in $E_{k,\varepsilon} + B(0, \varepsilon/C_0)$ and equal to 1 in $E_{k,\varepsilon} + B(0, \varepsilon/(2C_0))$. Then for ε_0 small enough and C_0 large enough, there exists C such that for all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, we have the following properties,

- (a) $\chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ is supported in $E_k + B(0, \varepsilon)$ and $\text{supp } \chi_{k,\varepsilon} \cap \{\phi < \phi(s_{j(k)})\} \subset E_k$.

(b) The distance from any local minimum and a separating saddle point c other than $s_{j(k)}$ to $\text{supp } \nabla \chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ is bounded from below by $3\varepsilon_1$. In addition, if $c \in \text{supp } \chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ then $c \in E_k$.

(c) There exists $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $x \in \text{supp } \nabla(\chi_{k,\varepsilon}) \setminus B(s_{j(k)}, \varepsilon)$, we have

$$\phi(s_{j(k)}) + C_\varepsilon^{-1} \leq \phi(x) \leq \phi(s_{j(k)}) + C\varepsilon.$$

(d) for any $k' \in \{1, \dots, n_0\}$, if $m_{k'} \in \text{supp } \chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ then $k' \geq k$. In case $k' \neq k$ we have

$$\phi(m_{k'}) > \phi(m_k) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(s_{j(k')}) < \phi(s_{j(k)}).$$

(e) for any $j' \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$, if $s_{j'} \in \text{supp } \chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ then either j' does not belong to the image of the map j , or there exists $k' \geq k$ such that

$$m_{k'} \in \text{supp } \chi_{k,\varepsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad j' = j(k').$$

(f) Inside $B(s_{j(k)}, \varepsilon)$ we have:

i) The distance from $\text{supp } \chi_{k,\varepsilon} \cap B(s_{j(k)}, \varepsilon)$ to the projection $\pi_x(K_+)$ of the outgoing manifold K_+ is bounded from below by a constant $\delta_\varepsilon > 0$,

ii) for all $x \in B(s_{j(k)}, \varepsilon)$ we have $|\phi(x) - \phi(s_{j(k)})| \leq C\varepsilon^2$.

The quasimodes associated to the minima m_k are introduced as follows,

$$f_k^{(0)} = h^{-n/4} c_k(h) e^{-\frac{1}{h}(\phi(x) - \phi(m_k))} \chi_{k,\varepsilon}(x), \quad 1 \leq k \leq n_0, \quad (5.1)$$

where $c_k(h) > 0$ is a normalization constant such that $\|f_k^{(0)}\|_\kappa^2 = 1$. Notice that $c_k(h) \sim c_{k,0} + hc_{k,1} + \dots$, with $c_{k,0} \neq 0$. As before, to these quasimodes we associate their projections to $E^{(0)}$,

$$e_k^{(0)} = \Pi^{(0)}(f_k^{(0)}). \quad (5.2)$$

In the same spirit we also define the quasimodes associated to the saddle points. For this we suppose that for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$, the cutoff function θ_j is supported in $B(s_j, 2\varepsilon_1)$ and equal to 1 in $B(s_j, \varepsilon_1)$. The corresponding quasimodes and projections are defined as in (2.87), (3.12). We call

$$f_j^{(1)} = (h^{-n/4} a_j(x, h) + r_j) e^{-\phi_{+,j}(x)/h} \theta_j(x), \quad (5.3)$$

the quasimode, where $a_j(x, h)$ is the vector already introduced, so that $\|f_j^{(1)}\|_{A,\kappa} = 1$. Again we denote by $e_j^{(1)}$ the projection to $E^{(1)}$,

$$e_j^{(1)} = \Pi^{(1)}(f_j^{(1)}). \quad (5.4)$$

It is of the form (3.12) for a new tighter cut-off θ_j .

5.2 Estimates for the quasimodes

We shall first work in the space $E^{(0)}$. The following result says that, modulo exponentially small errors, the family $(e_k^{(0)})$ forms an orthonormal basis in this space.

Proposition 5.3 *The space $E^{(0)}$ is spanned by the family $(e_k^{(0)})_{k=1,\dots,n_0}$ defined in (5.1-5.2), and there exists $\alpha > 0$, independent of ε , such that for all $k, k' \in \{1, \dots, n_0\}$, and $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, we have*

$$(e_k^{(0)} | e_{k'}^{(0)})_\kappa = \delta_{k,k'} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha/h}). \quad (5.5)$$

Proof. We shall first repeat some arguments of Section 11 of [11], essentially the same as in the proof of Theorem 2.13. Consider $k \in \{1, \dots, n_0\}$. Since

$$f_k^{(0)} = h^{-n/4} c_k(h) e^{-\frac{1}{h}(\phi(x) - \phi(m_k))} \chi_{k,\varepsilon}(x) \quad (5.6)$$

where $\chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ is the cutoff function defined above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(f_k^{(0)}) &= [P, \chi_{k,\varepsilon}] \left(h^{-n/4} c_k(h) e^{-\frac{1}{h}(\phi(x) - \phi(m_k))} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_0} e^{-(S_k - C\varepsilon)/h}), \quad N_0 > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where $S_k = \phi(s_{j(k)}) - \phi(m_k)$. Here we used (d) and (f) of Subsection 5.1, where we gave estimates on the support of $\nabla \chi_{k,\varepsilon}$. Now we proved in Theorem 8.4 of [11], and recalled in Theorem 2.10 that

$$\Pi^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma (z - P)^{-1} dz = \mathcal{O}(1), \quad \|(z - P)^{-1}\| = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{h}\right), \quad z \in \gamma,$$

where γ is an oriented circle of center 0 and radius h/C with C large and fixed. This implies that

$$e_k^{(0)} = \Pi^{(0)} f_k^{(0)} = f_k^{(0)} + \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_1} e^{-(S_k - C\varepsilon)/h}) \quad \text{in } L^2, \quad (5.8)$$

thanks to the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} (z - P)f_k^{(0)} &= z f_k^{(0)} - r_k \\ (z - P)^{-1} f_k^{(0)} &= \frac{1}{z} f_k^{(0)} + (z - P)^{-1} z^{-1} r_k, \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

where r_k is defined by (5.7). Now since $f_k^{(0)}$ is normalized in L^2 in the sense that $(f_k^{(0)} | f_k^{(0)})_\kappa = 1$, we get

$$(e_k^{(0)} | e_k^{(0)})_\kappa = (f_k^{(0)} | f_k^{(0)})_\kappa + \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_2} e^{-(S_k - C\varepsilon)/h}) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_2} e^{-(S_k - C\varepsilon)/h})$$

and for all $k, k' \in \{1, n_0\}$, we can write

$$(e_k^{(0)} | e_{k'}^{(0)})_\kappa = (f_k^{(0)} | f_{k'}^{(0)})_\kappa + \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_3} e^{-(\min(S_k, S_{k'}) - C\varepsilon)/h}) \quad (5.10)$$

Let now $k' \neq k$, and suppose that $k' > k$ to fix the ideas. From Subsection 5.1, we see that there are only three possible cases:

- $m_{k'} \in \text{supp } \chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ (case (d) in Subsection 5.1). Then

$$(f_k^{(0)}|f_{k'}^{(0)})_\kappa = \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_4}e^{-(\phi(m_{k'})-\phi(m_k))/h}),$$

since the support of $\chi_{k',\varepsilon}$ is included in the support of $\chi_{k,\varepsilon}$. In that case we choose $0 < \alpha < \phi(m_{k'}) - \phi(m_k)$.

- $m_k \in \text{supp } \chi_{k',\varepsilon}$. This case is the same as above.
- The distance from $m_{k'}$ to $\text{supp } \chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ is larger than $3\varepsilon_1$ (case (b) in Subsection 5.1). Then by construction, the supports of $\chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ and $\chi_{k',\varepsilon}$ are disjoint and hence $(f_k^{(0)}|f_{k'}^{(0)})_\kappa = 0$.

In all cases we can find $\alpha > 0$ independent of ε and h such that

$$(f_k^{(0)}|f_{k'}^{(0)})_\kappa = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha/h}).$$

Inserting this estimate in (5.10), and possibly shrinking ε_0 and α so that $0 < \alpha < (\min(S_k, S_{k'}) - C\varepsilon_0)$, we get,

$$(e_k^{(0)}|e_{k'}^{(0)})_\kappa = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha/h}), \quad k' \neq k. \quad (5.11)$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 5.4 *The space $E^{(1)}$ is spanned by the family $(e_j^{(1)})_{j=1,\dots,n_1}$ defined in (5.3), (5.4), and there exists $\alpha' > 0$ (independent of ε) such that for all $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$,*

$$(e_j^{(1)}|e_{j'}^{(1)})_{A,\kappa} = \delta_{j,j'} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha'/h}). \quad (5.12)$$

and $a_j(h) = a_{j,0} + ha_{j,1} + \dots$

Proof. The proof of this result is simpler than that of Proposition 5.3, thanks to the localization properties of the cut-off functions θ_j . Recall that in (5.3) we defined the functions

$$f_j^{(1)} = (h^{-n/4}a_j(x;h) + r_j(x))e^{-\phi_{+,j}(x)/h}\theta_j(x), \quad (5.13)$$

where $a_j(x, h) = a_{j,0} + ha_{j,1} + \dots$ and $\|f_j^{(1)}\|_{A,\kappa} = 1$. Again we denote by $e_j^{(1)}$ its projection onto $E^{(1)}$. Being in the case i) of Proposition 3.6, we can choose the coefficient $a_{j,0}$ such that

$$(\kappa^t a_{j,0}(s_j)|a_{j,0}(s_j))_A = 1. \quad (5.14)$$

It follows from [11] that

$$P^{(1)}(f_j^{(1)}) = \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_1}e^{-\alpha'/h}), \quad \alpha' > 0, N_1 > 0.$$

Here we may also recall that $\phi_{+,j}(x) \asymp |x - s_j|^2$ near s_j . Now using again Theorem 8.4 of [11] in the matrix case, or Theorem 2.13, we have

$$\Pi^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma (z - P^{(1)})^{-1} dz = \mathcal{O}(1),$$

where we recall that γ is an oriented circle of center 0 and radius h/C with C large and fixed. This implies that for some $N_2 > 0$,

$$e_j^{(1)} = \Pi^{(1)} f_j^{(1)} = f_j^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_2} e^{-\alpha'/h}) \quad \text{in } L^2, \quad (5.15)$$

Since the functions $f_j^{(1)}$ are L^2 -normalized (for the A, κ -inner product), we get for all $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$,

$$(e_j^{(1)} | e_{j'}^{(1)})_{A, \kappa} = (f_j^{(1)} | f_{j'}^{(1)})_{A, \kappa} + \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_3} e^{-\alpha'/h}) = \delta_{j, j'} + \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_3} e^{-\alpha'/h}),$$

where we also used that the supports of the functions θ_j are disjoint, since the distance between different critical points is larger than $10\varepsilon_1$. Replacing α' by $\alpha'/2$ completes the proof. \square

5.3 Singular values

Recall that in Section 2, as a consequence of Proposition 2.17, we showed that $d_\phi : E^{(0)} \rightarrow E^{(1)}$. Following [6], we shall now estimate the singular values of this map. The first step is the following proposition.

Proposition 5.5 *For all $k \in \{1, \dots, n_0\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} (f_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A, \kappa} &= 0 \quad \text{if } j \neq j(k), \\ (f_{j(k)}^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A, \kappa} &= h^{1/2} b_k(h) e^{-S_k/h}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

where $b_k(h) \sim b_{k,0} + h b_{k,1} + \dots$. Here $b_{k,0}$ is $\neq 0$ and will be determined in Proposition 6.7.

Proof. For the first result we notice that for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n_0\}$,

$$d_\phi f_k^{(0)} = (h d^{(0)} \chi_{k, \varepsilon}(x)) \left(h^{-n/4} c_k(h) e^{-\frac{1}{h}(\phi(x) - \phi(m_k))} \right) \quad (5.17)$$

is supported in $\text{supp } \nabla \chi_{k, \varepsilon}$ which is disjoint from the support of θ_j for all $j \neq j(k)$ according to point (c) in Subsection 5.1. As a consequence, the forms $f_j^{(1)}$ and $d_\phi f_k^{(0)}$ also have disjoint support, and we get the first result, $(f_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A, \kappa} = 0$.

Now we consider the case when $j = j(k)$. We shall use Gaussian type integrals in transversal directions, as in Section 11 of [11]. We first notice that the domain of integration in the inner product can be reduced to $B(s_j, \varepsilon)$: from (5.17) and (5.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (f_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A, \kappa} &= h^{1-n/2} c_k(h) \int_{B(s_j, 2\varepsilon_1)} \left((\kappa^\dagger(a_j(\kappa(x), h)) | d^{(0)} \chi_{k, \varepsilon}(x))_A + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty) \right) \\ &\quad \times \theta_j \circ \kappa(x) e^{-(\phi_{+, j} \circ \kappa(x) + \phi(x) - \phi(m_k))/h} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

Now we observe that for any $x \in B(s_j, 2\varepsilon_1) \setminus B(s_j, \varepsilon)$ we have by (c) of Subsection 5.1 that if $x \in \text{supp } \nabla \chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ then

$$\phi(s_{j(k)}) + C_\varepsilon^{-1} \leq \phi(x) \leq \phi(s_{j(k)}) + C\varepsilon.$$

which implies

$$\phi_{+,j} \circ \kappa(x) + \phi(x) - \phi(m_k) \geq \phi(x) - \phi(m_k) = S_k + \phi(x) - \phi(s_{j(k)}) \geq S_k + C_\varepsilon^{-1}.$$

We can therefore restrict the domain of integration to the smaller ball $B(s_j, \varepsilon)$, modulo an error term as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} (f_j^{(1)} |d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} &= h^{1-n/2} c_k(h) \int_{B(s_j, \varepsilon)} \left((\kappa^\dagger(a_j)(\kappa(x), h) |d^{(0)} \chi_{k,\varepsilon}(x))_A + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty) \right) \\ &\quad \times \theta_j \circ \kappa(x) e^{-(\phi_{+,j} \circ \kappa(x) + \phi(x) - \phi(m_k))/h} dx \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(h^{-N} e^{-(S_k + C_\varepsilon^{-1})/h}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

We shall need the following result.

Lemma 5.6 *In $B(s_{j(k)}, \varepsilon)$, we have $\phi_{+,j} \circ \kappa(x) + (\phi(x) - \phi(s_j)) \asymp \text{dist}(x, \pi_x(K_-))^2$.*

Proof. Referring to the end of Section 2 and especially (2.89), we first recall that

$$\phi_+(x) - (\phi(x) - \phi(s_j)) \asymp \text{dist}(x, \pi_x(K_+))^2, \tag{5.20}$$

and

$$-\phi_-(x) + (\phi(x) - \phi(s_j)) \asymp \text{dist}(x, \pi_x(K_-))^2, \tag{5.21}$$

Now recall the definition of the adjoint operator $-\Delta_{A^\dagger} = (-\Delta_A)^{A^\dagger, *}$, from (2.75). Its principal symbol is $p_2 - ip_1 + p_0 = p(x, -\xi) =: \check{p}(x, \xi)$, the corresponding real "q"-symbol is $\check{q}(x, \xi) = q(x, -\xi)$, and since this is the same type of operator, the geometric discussion above applies (notice in particular that Proposition 3.7 applies). We also notice for future reference that the hypotheses 2.5, 2.6 remain valid for $-\Delta_{A^\dagger}$. Moreover, if we are in the case 1 of Proposition 3.6 for $-\Delta_A$, then we are so also for $-\Delta_{A^\dagger}$. In particular we can introduce $\Lambda_{\phi_\pm^*}$, $\Lambda_{\phi_\mp^*}$ as the stable outgoing and incoming $H_{\check{q}}$ -invariant Lagrangian manifolds through s_j and $K_\pm^* \subset \Lambda_\phi$ as the stable outgoing and incoming manifolds for $H_{\check{q}|_{\Lambda_\phi}}$ (noting that $\check{q} = 0$ on Λ_ϕ). Again we have $\dim K_+^* = n - 1$, $\dim K_-^* = 1$ and

$$\phi_+^* - (\phi - \phi(s_j)) \asymp \text{dist}(x, \pi_x(K_+^*))^2,$$

and

$$-\phi_-^* + (\phi - \phi(s_j)) \asymp \text{dist}(x, \pi_x(K_-^*))^2. \tag{5.22}$$

In view of the general relation

$$J_*(H_q) = -H_{\check{q}}, \text{ where } J : (x, \xi) \mapsto (x, -\xi), \tag{5.23}$$

we see that $\Lambda_{\phi_-^*} = J(\Lambda_{\phi_+})$, $\Lambda_{\phi_+^*} = J(\Lambda_{\phi_-})$, or simply

$$\phi_-^* = -\phi_+, \quad \phi_+^* = -\phi_-. \quad (5.24)$$

From the relation (3.11),

$$-\Delta_A \circ U_\kappa = U_\kappa \circ (-\Delta_{A^t}),$$

and Egorov's theorem, we see that $\check{p} = p \circ \mathcal{K}$ and hence $\check{q} = q \circ \mathcal{K}$, where $\mathcal{K} : (y, \eta) \mapsto (\kappa(y), (\kappa^t)^{-1}\eta)$ is the natural canonical transformation which lifts κ to the cotangent space. Since ϕ is invariant under composition with κ , we have $\mathcal{K} : \Lambda_\phi \rightarrow \Lambda_\phi$ and it follows that $K_\pm^* = \mathcal{K}(K_\pm)$ and in particular $\pi_x(K_\pm^*) = \kappa(\pi_x(K_\pm))$. Combining (5.22), (5.24), we get

$$\phi_+(x) + (\phi(x) - \phi(s_j)) \asymp \text{dist}(x, \pi_x(K_-^*))^2 \asymp \text{dist}(x, \kappa(\pi_x(K_-)))^2,$$

and replacing x by $\kappa(x)$, we get the lemma. \square

We summarize for further use some of the microlocal results obtained during the proof of the preceding lemma:

Lemma 5.7 *Let $\mathcal{K} : (y, \eta) \mapsto (\kappa(y), (\kappa^t)^{-1}\eta)$ be the lifting of κ and $J : (x, \xi) \mapsto (x, -\xi)$. We have*

$$\Lambda_{\phi_-^*} = J(\Lambda_{\phi_+}), \quad \Lambda_{\phi_+^*} = J(\Lambda_{\phi_-}) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_\mp^* = -\phi_\pm, \quad (5.25)$$

and also

$$\Lambda_{\phi_\pm^*} = \mathcal{K}(\Lambda_{\phi_\pm}), \quad \pi_x(K_\pm^*) = \kappa(\pi_x(K_\pm)), \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_\pm^* = \phi_\pm \circ \kappa \quad (5.26)$$

End of the proof of Proposition 5.5. Now we are able to continue the computation in (5.19). Using Lemma 5.6, we get that the exponential term in the integral satisfies

$$\phi_{+,j} \circ \kappa(x) + (\phi(x) - \phi(m_k)) - S_k \asymp \text{dist}(x, \pi_x(K_-))^2,$$

on $B(s_j, \varepsilon) \cap \text{supp } \nabla \chi_{k,\varepsilon}$. By evaluating the Gaussian integral in the directions transversal to $\pi_x(K_-)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (f_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} &= h^{1/2} \tilde{b}_k(h) e^{-S_k/h} + \mathcal{O}(h^{-N} e^{-(S_k + C_\varepsilon^{-1})}) \\ &= h^{1/2} b_k(h) e^{-S_k/h}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

It is also quite clear that b_k is elliptic and a more detailed computation of $b_{k,0}$ will be given in Section 6. \square

We are now able to compute the matrix of d_ϕ from $E^{(0)}$ to $E^{(1)}$ with respect to the bases $(e_k^{(0)})$ and $(e_j^{(1)})$. This result is contained in the following proposition.

Proposition 5.8 *There exists $\alpha'' > 0$ such that if ε_0 is small enough then for all $k \in \{2, \dots, n_0\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} (e_j^{(1)} | d_\phi e_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} &= \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-(S_k + \alpha'')/h}\right) \quad \text{if } j \neq j(k), \\ \text{and } (e_{j(k)}^{(1)} | d_\phi e_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} &= h^{1/2} b_k(h) e^{-S_k/h}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

where $b_k(h) \sim b_{k,0} + h b_{k,1} + \dots$ is elliptic for $k \neq 1$, and $(e_j^{(1)} | d_\phi e_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} = 0$ when $k = 1$.

Proof. Let k and j be integers as above. The case $k = 1$ is clear since $d_\phi e_1^{(0)} = 0$. Consider now the case when $k \geq 2$: using the self-adjointness and intertwining properties of the projectors $\Pi^{(l)}$, $l = 0, 1$, which follow from Proposition 2.17, we check that

$$\begin{aligned} (e_j^{(1)} | d_\phi e_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} &= (e_j^{(1)} | d_\phi \Pi^{(0)} f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} = (e_j^{(1)} | \Pi^{(1)} d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} \\ &= (\Pi^{(1)} e_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} = (e_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} \\ &= (f_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} + (e_j^{(1)} - f_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

According to Proposition 5.5, the result of the proposition will follow if we show that for any k and j , we have

$$(e_j^{(1)} - f_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} = \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-(S_k + \alpha'')/h}\right). \quad (5.30)$$

Let us therefore prove (5.30). By Cauchy–Schwarz,

$$\left| (e_j^{(1)} - f_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} \right| \leq C(A) \|e_j^{(1)} - f_j^{(1)}\|_{L^2} \|d_\phi f_k^{(0)}\|_{L^2}. \quad (5.31)$$

Now a computation very similar to the one made in the proof of (5.7) and based on the support of $\nabla \chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ gives that

$$d_\phi f_k^{(0)} = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-N_0} e^{-(S_k - C\varepsilon)/h}\right)$$

where C is the constant appearing in (c) and (f) of Subsection 5.1. On the other hand we have from (5.15) that

$$e_j^{(1)} - f_j^{(1)} = \mathcal{O}(h^{-N_2} e^{-\alpha'/h}) \text{ in } L^2,$$

where $\alpha' > 0$ is independent of ε . Consequently, we can write that

$$\left| (e_j^{(1)} - f_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} \right| = \mathcal{O}\left(h^{-(N_0 - N_2)} e^{-(S_k - C\varepsilon + \alpha')/h}\right).$$

Taking ε_1 small enough (e.g. such that $C\varepsilon_1 \leq \alpha'/3$) first and then posing $\alpha'' = \alpha'/2$, gives the estimate (5.30) and the proof of Proposition 5.8 is complete. \square

5.4 Main result in the generic case

We can now give the complete asymptotics for the exponentially small eigenvalues in the generic case. Let us first prove the following result.

Lemma 5.9 *Consider the $n_1 \times n_0$ matrix*

$$R = (r_{j,k}) := ((e_j^{(1)} | d_\phi e_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa})_{j \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}, k \in \{1, \dots, n_0\}},$$

where we recall that there exists $\alpha'' > 0$ such that for all $k \in \{2, \dots, n_0\}$, and $j \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$,

$$r_{j(k),k} = h^{1/2} b_k(h) e^{-S_k/h}, \quad r_{j,k} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-(S_k + \alpha'')/h}), \quad \text{when } j \neq j(k),$$

while $r_{j,1} = 0$ for all j . Set also $r_{j(1),1} = 0$. Then there exists $\eta > 0$ such that the singular values $\nu_k(R)$ of R , enumerated in a suitable order, satisfy

$$\nu_k(R) = |r_{j(k),k}| (1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\eta/h})), \quad 1 \leq k \leq n_0.$$

Proof. Since the first column of R consists of zeros, we know that $\nu_1 = 0$ is a singular value of R and we can study the reduced matrix R' with entries $r'_{j,k} = r_{j,k+1}$, where $k \geq 1$. We shall use that there is only one dominant term in each column of R' . Define the $(n_0 - 1) \times (n_0 - 1)$ diagonal matrix D as follows,

$$D = \text{diag}(h^{1/2} b_{k+1}(h) e^{-S_{k+1}/h}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n_0 - 1).$$

Notice that D is invertible, thanks to the ellipticity of b_k , and that $\nu_k(D) = |r_{j(k),k}|$. Define the characteristic matrix of R' to have the entry 1 at each dominant term (columnwise), and 0 elsewhere:

$$U = (\delta_{j,j(k+1)}),$$

where δ is the Kronecker symbol. Then there is a constant $\eta > 0$ such that $R'D^{-1} = U + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\eta/h})$,

$$R' = (U + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\eta/h}))D. \quad (5.32)$$

The Ky Fan inequalities therefore give

$$\nu_k(R') \leq (1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\eta/h}))\nu_k(D). \quad (5.33)$$

To get the opposite estimate, notice that U is isometric, $U^*U = 1$, and write

$$U^*R' = (1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\eta/h}))D,$$

$$D = (1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\eta/h}))U^*R',$$

to get

$$\nu_k(D) \leq (1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\eta/h}))\nu_k(R').$$

□

One of the main results of this paper is the following theorem.

Theorem 5.10 *In addition to the general assumptions, we adopt the Hypothesis 5.1 and assume that we are in case i) of Proposition 3.6 at every separating saddle point. The exponentially small eigenvalues of P are real and given by*

$$\mu_k = (h|b_k(h)|^2 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty))e^{-2S_k/h}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n_0,$$

where $S_1 = +\infty$ (and $\mu_1 = 0$), by convention. Here $b_k(h) \sim b_{k,0} + hb_{k,1} + \dots$, where $b_{k,0} \neq 0$ will be studied in more detail in Section 6.

Proof. According to the propositions 5.3 and 5.4 the bases $(e_k^{(0)})$ and $(e_j^{(1)})$ are orthonormal up to exponentially small errors in $E^{(0)}$ and $E^{(1)}$ respectively, for the A, κ scalar products. Let $(\tilde{e}_k^{(0)})$ and $(\tilde{e}_j^{(1)})$ be the corresponding orthonormalizations (obtained by taking square roots of the Gramians), which differ from the original bases by exponentially small recombinations. Then with respect to the new bases, the matrix of d_ϕ is $\tilde{R} = (1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha/h}))R(1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha/h}))$ and from Lemma 5.9 and the Ky Fan inequalities (which will be used in a more essential way in the proof of Theorem 7.1) we see that the conclusion of that lemma is also valid for \tilde{R} . The matrix of the restriction of P to $E^{(0)}$ with respect to the basis $(\tilde{e}_k^{(0)})$ is $\tilde{R}^* \tilde{R}$ and the theorem follows. \square

6 Explicit computation of the leading tunneling coefficient

The aim of this section to compute the dominant term in the amplitude of the exponentially small eigenvalues. For this we shall estimate the coefficient b_k appearing in Theorem 5.10. We follow essentially the proof given in [8], but point out that here we are in a non-selfadjoint situation. The main result is given in Proposition 6.7 at the end of the section.

6.1 Geometric preliminaries

We recall some points concerning the study of the operator $-\Delta_A^{(l)}$. The principal symbol $p(x, \xi)$ of $-\Delta_A^{(l)}$ does not depend on l and if $q(x, \xi) = -p(x, i\xi)$ then from Subsection 2.2.2 we have

$$q(x, \xi) = \langle A(\xi + d\phi(x)) | (\xi - d\phi(x)) \rangle = ((\xi + d\phi(x)) | (\xi - d\phi(x)))_A,$$

where we recall that $A : (\mathbb{R}^n)^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, and where $(\cdot | \cdot)_A$ was introduced in (2.46). Near a critical point $(s_j, 0)$ of index 1, we also defined the two Lagrangian manifolds $\Lambda_\pm = \{(x, \xi), \xi = d\phi_\pm(x)\}$, on which q is equal zero. This gives the following two eikonal equations in a neighborhood of s_j :

$$0 = q(x, d\phi_{\pm,j}(x)) = (d\phi_{\pm,j}(x) + d\phi(x) | d\phi_{\pm,j}(x) - d\phi(x))_A. \quad (6.1)$$

We omit the index j when no confusion is possible, and define in a neighborhood of the saddle point s_j ,

$$\begin{cases} g_+ = \phi_+ - (\phi - \phi(s_j)) \\ g_- = -\phi_- + (\phi - \phi(s_j)) \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

Notice that g_- is the phase appearing in the Laplace integral defining b_k in formula 5.19 up to a constant; indeed in a neighborhood of s_j we have according to Lemma 5.7

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_+ \circ \kappa + (\phi - \phi(m_k)) &= \phi_+^* + (\phi - \phi(s_j)) + (\phi(s_j) - \phi(m_k)) \\ &= -\phi_- + (\phi - \phi(s_j)) + (\phi(s_j) - \phi(m_k)) = g_- + (\phi(s_j) - \phi(m_k)). \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

Using again Lemma 5.7 we also define

$$\begin{cases} g_+^* = \phi_+^* - (\phi - \phi(s_j)) \\ g_-^* = -\phi_-^* + (\phi - \phi(s_j)) = \phi_+ + (\phi - \phi(s_j)) \end{cases} \quad (6.4)$$

and with these notations the eikonal equation for ϕ_- can be written near s_j in the following form :

$$(dg_+^*(x)|dg_-(x))_A = 0, \quad (6.5)$$

according to the following direct computation and (6.1)

$$\begin{aligned} (dg_+^*(x)|dg_-(x))_A &= (d\phi_+^*(x) - d\phi(x) | -d\phi_-(x) + d\phi(x))_A \\ &= (d\phi_-(x) + d\phi(x) | d\phi_-(x) - d\phi(x))_A = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

Similarly using ϕ_+ , we get

$$(dg_-^*(x)|dg_+(x))_A = 0. \quad (6.7)$$

We now recall other properties of the functions g_\pm and g_\pm^* , which are essentially reformulations of (2.89): In a neighborhood of s_j , we have

$$g_\pm(x) \asymp d(x, \pi_x(K_\pm))^2 \quad \text{and} \quad g_\pm^*(x) \asymp d(x, \pi_x(K_\pm^*))^2 \quad (6.8)$$

Recall some properties of the Hamilton fields $\nu_\pm = H_q|_{\Lambda_{\pm\phi}}$ near s_j that we identify with their x -space projections. We already used the fact that

$$\forall x \in \pi_x(K_\pm), \quad \nu_+(x) = 2Ad\phi(x) \in T_x(\pi_x(K_\pm)),$$

and that it vanishes at s_j . Similarly,

$$\nu_-(x) = -2A^t d\phi(x)$$

so that $\nu_-(x) = -\nu_+^*(x)$ and

$$\forall x \in \pi_x(K_\pm^*), \quad \nu_-(x) = -2A^t d\phi(x) \in T_x(\pi_x(K_\pm^*)), \quad (6.9)$$

where the K_\pm^* are associated to the operator $-\Delta_{A^t}$ (see the end of Section 2).

When looking for an accurate expression of the eigenmodes of $P = -\Delta_A$ on l forms we need to know precisely the conjugate operator

$$P_+ = e^{\phi_+/h} P e^{-\phi_+/h},$$

in a neighborhood of a saddle point s_j (recall that we omit the index j when no confusion is possible).

Lemma 6.1 *In a neighborhood of s_j we have on l -forms*

$$P_+ = hd(hd)^{A,*} + (hd)^{A,*}hd - \overbrace{(dg_-^*(x)|dg_+(x))_A}^{=0} + h\mathcal{L}_{Ad(\phi+\phi_+)} + h\mathcal{L}_{A^t d(\phi-\phi_+)}^{A,*}, \quad (6.10)$$

where \mathcal{L}_ν denotes the Lie derivative in the ν direction.

Proof. We first recall that $P = d_\phi d_\phi^{A,*} + d_\phi^{A,*} d_\phi$ on forms (of arbitrary order) and we get

$$\begin{aligned} P_+ &= e^{\phi_+/h} (d_\phi d_\phi^{A,*} + d_\phi^{A,*} d_\phi) e^{-\phi_+/h} \\ &= (e^{\phi_+/h} d_\phi e^{-\phi_+/h}) \left(e^{\phi_+/h} d_\phi^{A,*} e^{-\phi_+/h} \right) + \left(e^{\phi_+/h} d_\phi^{A,*} e^{-\phi_+/h} \right) (e^{\phi_+/h} d_\phi e^{-\phi_+/h}) \\ &= (e^{\phi_+/h} d_\phi e^{-\phi_+/h}) (e^{-\phi_+/h} d_\phi e^{\phi_+/h})^{A,*} + (e^{-\phi_+/h} d_\phi e^{\phi_+/h})^{A,*} (e^{\phi_+/h} d_\phi e^{-\phi_+/h}) \\ &= (hd + d(\phi - \phi_+)^{\wedge}) (hd + d(\phi + \phi_+)^{\wedge})^{A,*} \\ &\quad + (hd + d(\phi + \phi_+)^{\wedge})^{A,*} (hd + d(\phi - \phi_+)^{\wedge}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

For a one form ω we have $(\omega^{\wedge})^{A,*} = (A\omega)^{\lrcorner}$ so

$$\begin{aligned} P_+ &= hd(hd)^{A,*} + (hd)^{A,*}hd \\ &\quad + d(\phi - \phi_+)^{\wedge} (Ad(\phi + \phi_+))^{\lrcorner} + (Ad(\phi + \phi_+))^{\lrcorner} d(\phi - \phi_+)^{\wedge} \\ &\quad + hd(Ad(\phi + \phi_+))^{\lrcorner} + (Ad(\phi + \phi_+))^{\lrcorner} hd \\ &\quad + d(\phi - \phi_+)^{\wedge} (hd)^{A,*} + (hd)^{A,*} d(\phi - \phi_+)^{\wedge}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

Using the formula $\langle \omega, \nu \rangle = \nu^{\lrcorner} \omega^{\wedge} + \omega^{\wedge} \nu^{\lrcorner}$ for a vector field ν and a one-form ω , we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(\phi - \phi_+)^{\wedge} (Ad(\phi + \phi_+))^{\lrcorner} + (Ad(\phi + \phi_+))^{\lrcorner} d(\phi - \phi_+)^{\wedge} \\ = (d(\phi + \phi_+)|d(\phi - \phi_+))_A = -(dg_-^*(x)|dg_+(x))_A = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

Using also Cartan's formula $\mathcal{L}_\nu \omega = d(\nu^{\lrcorner} \omega) + \nu^{\lrcorner} d\omega$ with $\nu = Ad(\phi + \phi_+)$ we can write

$$h\mathcal{L}_{Ad(\phi+\phi_+)} = hd(Ad(\phi + \phi_+))^{\lrcorner} + (Ad(\phi + \phi_+))^{\lrcorner} hd \quad (6.14)$$

and using also

$$(\nu^{\lrcorner})^{A,*} = (A^{t-1}\nu)^{\wedge},$$

for a vector ν , we get

$$\begin{aligned} h\mathcal{L}_{A^t d(\phi-\phi_+)}^{A,*} &= (hd(A^t d(\phi - \phi_+))^{\lrcorner})^{A,*} + ((A^t d(\phi - \phi_+))^{\lrcorner} hd)^{A,*} \\ &= ((A^t d(\phi - \phi_+))^{\lrcorner})^{A,*} (hd)^{A,*} + (hd)^{A,*} ((A^t d(\phi - \phi_+))^{\lrcorner})^{A,*} \\ &= d(\phi - \phi_+)^{\wedge} (hd)^{A,*} + (hd)^{A,*} d(\phi - \phi_+)^{\wedge}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.15)$$

Putting together (6.13-6.14-6.15) in (6.12), and using the fact that the eikonal equation is satisfied by ϕ_+ , we get the lemma. \square

It is convenient to introduce adapted coordinates in a neighborhood of the saddle point s_j . We begin with defining a C^∞ function y_1 by

$$y_1 = \pm \sqrt{g_+(x)}$$

with the sign \pm depending on a choice of a side of the (local) hypersurface $\pi_x(K_+) = \{g_+(x) = 0\}$. We impose for example the sign $+$ on the side containing m_k for $j = j(k)$ defined according to the injection defined in the preceding section. Of course we have

$$y_1^2 = g_+ = \phi_+ - (\phi - \phi(s_j)). \quad (6.16)$$

We also introduce $y_1^* = y_1 \circ \kappa$, so that according to Lemma (5.7)

$$(y_1^*)^2 = (y_1 \circ \kappa)^2 = \phi_+^* - (\phi - \phi(s_j)) = g_+^*,$$

and we notice that

$$Ady_1^* \in T\pi_x(K_-) \quad \text{on } \pi_x(K_-).$$

Now we consider the restriction of g_- to $\pi_x(K_+)$. Since

$$g_-(\cdot) \asymp d(\cdot, \pi_x(K_-))^2 \text{ near } s_j,$$

we can apply the Morse lemma to g_- on $\pi_x(K_+)$ and get smooth functions z_2, \dots, z_n on $\pi_x(K_+)$ such that,

$$g_- = z_2^2 + \dots + z_n^2 \text{ on } \pi_x(K_+).$$

Extend the functions z_k to a whole neighborhood of s_j using the Hamilton Jacobi equation

$$\nabla_{Ady_1^*} z_k = 0,$$

or equivalently

$$\langle dy_1^*, dz_k \rangle_A = 0.$$

Since $\langle dy_1^*, dg_- \rangle_A = 0$ by (6.5), the function g_- does not depend on the y_1 coordinate and we have

$$g_- = z_2^2 + \dots + z_n^2 \text{ in a whole neighborhood of } s_j.$$

We introduce the variables $z_k^* = z_k \circ \kappa$, and we also have

$$g_-^* = (z_2^*)^2 + \dots + (z_n^*)^2 \text{ in a neighborhood of } s_j.$$

Note that according to (6.2) and (6.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_+ &= \frac{1}{2}(g_+ + g_-^*) = \frac{1}{2}(y_1^2 + (z_2^*)^2 + \dots + (z_n^*)^2), \\ \phi - \phi(s_j) &= \frac{1}{2}(-g_+ + g_-^*) = \frac{1}{2}(-y_1^2 + (z_2^*)^2 + \dots + (z_n^*)^2) \end{aligned} \quad (6.17)$$

Note that $\phi \circ \kappa = \phi$ gives

$$-y_1^2 + (z_2^*)^2 + \dots + (z_n^*)^2 = -(y_1^*)^2 + z_2^2 + \dots + z_n^2,$$

so that

$$y_1^2 + z_2^2 + \dots + z_n^2 = (y_1^*)^2 + (z_2^*)^2 + \dots + (z_n^*)^2. \quad (6.18)$$

6.2 A twisted Hodge operator

We introduce now a special Hodge operator. We use the notation of [8]. We recall first the definition of the usual Hodge $*$ operator, denoted $*$ or \mathcal{I} (and $*$ or \mathcal{I}_l when restricted on l -forms): For any real l -forms ω and μ ,

$$(\omega|\mu)dx = \omega \wedge (*\mu) = \omega \wedge (\mathcal{I}_l\mu), \quad dx = dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_n,$$

where $(\cdot|\cdot)$ denotes the scalar product on l -forms inherited from the identification of $T\mathbb{R}^n$ and $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ via the standard euclidian metric. We denote by

$$\iota : T^*\mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow T\mathbb{R}^n$$

the corresponding application whose matrix is the identity in euclidian coordinates. This corresponds to a choice of an additional structure in our problem.

In fact the right object is the following Hodge operator denoted $*^A$ or \mathcal{I}^A , and whose restriction on l forms will be denoted again by $*^A$ or \mathcal{I}_l^A : For any real l -forms ω and μ , it is defined by

$$(\omega|\mu)_A dx = \omega \wedge (*^A\mu) = \omega \wedge (\mathcal{I}_l^A\mu).$$

We give now some properties of the twisted Hodge operators $*^A$ and $*^{A^t}$.

Lemma 6.2 *We have on l -forms*

$$i) \quad *^A = * \circ \wedge^l(\iota^{-1}A^t), \quad ii) \quad (*^A)^{-1} = (-1)^{l(n-l)} \wedge^l(\iota^{-1}A^t)^{-1}*,$$

where $*$ denotes \mathcal{I}_l in the first equality and \mathcal{I}_{n-l} in the second one. In addition if ω is an l -form and μ an $(n-l)$ -form we have

$$iii) \quad (*^A\omega) \wedge (*^A\mu) = (\det(\iota^{-1}A^t))\omega \wedge \mu.$$

Proof. Let ω and μ be two l -forms. Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \wedge *^A\mu &= (\omega|\mu)_A dx = \langle \wedge^l A\omega | \mu \rangle dx = \langle \omega | \wedge^l A^t\mu \rangle dx \\ &= (\omega | \wedge^l(\iota^{-1}A^t)\mu) dx = \omega \wedge (* \wedge^l(\iota^{-1}A^t)\mu) \end{aligned} \quad (6.19)$$

This proves i).

The invertibility of $*^A$ and formula ii) are direct consequences of i) and the fact that $\mathcal{I}_l \circ \mathcal{I}_{n-l} = (-1)^{l(n-l)}$ for the usual Hodge operator. In order to prove iii) we recall first that

$$\begin{aligned} (*\omega) \wedge (*\mu) &= (*\omega|\mu)dx = (\mu|*\omega)dx \\ &= \mu \wedge (* * \omega) = (-1)^{l(n-l)}\mu \wedge \omega = \omega \wedge \mu. \end{aligned}$$

Using property i) yields the result since

$$((\wedge^l(\iota^{-1}A)) \wedge (\wedge^{n-l}(\iota^{-1}A))) = \wedge^n(\iota^{-1}A) = \det(\iota^{-1}A) \text{Id}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

The second lemma is devoted to the commutation properties of $*^A$ with the Lie derivatives.

Lemma 6.3 *Let ν be a smooth vector field. We have*

$$*^A \mathcal{L}_\nu^{A,*} = -\mathcal{L}_\nu *^A \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_\nu^{A,*} *^{A^t} = -*^{A^t} \mathcal{L}_\nu,$$

Proof. Consider the identity

$$\mathcal{L}_\nu((u(x)|v(x))_A dx) = \mathcal{L}_\nu(u \wedge (*^A v)).$$

If u, v have compact support, then the left hand side is the Lie derivative of a compactly supported differential form and has therefore the integral zero. On the other hand it takes the form $(\mathcal{L}_\nu u|v)_A dx - (u|Mv)_A dx$ for some first order differential operator M , so by integration, we recognize that M is the A^* adjoint of \mathcal{L}_ν and the left hand side becomes

$$(\mathcal{L}_\nu u|v)_A dx - (u|\mathcal{L}_\nu^{A,*} v)_A dx.$$

The right hand side is equal to

$$(\mathcal{L}_\nu u) \wedge (*^A v) + u \wedge (\mathcal{L}_\nu *^A v).$$

The first terms in the two expressions coincide and hence the second terms also. This leads to

$$-u \wedge (*^A \mathcal{L}_\nu^{A,*} v) = u \wedge (\mathcal{L}_\nu *^A v)$$

and the first identity in the lemma follows.

In order to prove the second identity we shall first prove the general identity of independent interest:

$$*^A *^{A^t} = *^{A^t} *^A = (-1)^{l(n-l)} \det(i^{-1} A^t) \text{Id}. \quad (6.20)$$

This follows from the computation

$$\begin{aligned} \det(i^{-1} A^t) \omega \wedge \mu &= (*^A \omega) \wedge (*^A \mu) = (*^A \omega | \mu)_A dx \\ &= (\mu | *^A \omega)_{A^t} dx = \mu \wedge (*^{A^t} *^A \omega) = (-1)^{(n-l)l} (*^{A^t} *^A \omega) \wedge \mu. \end{aligned}$$

The second identity in the lemma now follows by applying $*^{A^t}$ to the right and to the left in the first one and using (6.20). \square

We also need a relation between $*^A$ and κ :

Lemma 6.4 *We have $\kappa^* *^{A^t} = \det \kappa *^A \kappa^*$.*

Proof. The statement in the lemma is equivalent to the statement that

$$\kappa^* \omega \wedge \kappa^* *^{A^t} \mu = (\det \kappa) \kappa^* \omega \wedge *^A \kappa^* \mu$$

for all $n-l$ -forms μ and all l forms ω . Here the left hand side is equal to

$$\kappa^*(\omega \wedge *^{A^t} \mu) = \kappa^*((\omega | \mu)_{A^t} dx) = (\wedge^l A^t \omega \circ \kappa | \mu \circ \kappa) (\det \kappa) dx.$$

The right hand side is equal to $(\det \kappa) (\kappa^* \omega | \kappa^* \mu)_A dx$ so we only have to identify the scalar products in the two expressions:

$$(\kappa^* \omega | \kappa^* \mu)_A = (\wedge^l A \wedge^l \kappa^t \omega \circ \kappa | \wedge^l \kappa^t \mu \circ \kappa) = (\wedge^l (\kappa A \kappa^t) \omega \circ \kappa | \mu \circ \kappa).$$

Here $\kappa A \kappa^t = A^t (\kappa^t)^2 = A^t$, so the two scalar products are equal. \square

6.3 Expressions for the quasimodes $f_j^{(1)}$

In this subsection we compute the leading amplitude of the quasimode $f_j^{(1)}$ in (5.3) on the manifolds $\pi_x(K_+)$ and $\pi_x(K_-^*)$, associated to the saddle point s_j .

As a warm up, we shall first show that

$$*^{A^\dagger} (dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*) = f dy_1 \quad (6.21)$$

in a neighborhood of s_j , where f is smooth and non-vanishing. In fact, composing the orthogonality relation $(dy_1^* | dz_k^*)_A = 0$ with κ , it is not difficult to see that we also have

$$(dy_1 | dz_k^*)_{A^\dagger} = 0. \quad (6.22)$$

If ω is an $n - 1$ form, we have

$$(\omega | dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*)_{A^\dagger} dx = \omega \wedge *^{A^\dagger} (dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*).$$

From (6.22) it follows that the left hand side vanishes as soon as ω can be written as the exterior product of dy_1 and an $n - 2$ form, and then it is easy to see that (6.21) holds. $f(s_j)$ will be computed below.

With these notations we have the following result:

Proposition 6.5 *In a neighborhood of s_j we have*

$$f_j^{(1)}(x) = (h^{-n/4} a_j(x, h) + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)) e^{-\phi_{j,+}(x)/h},$$

where we recall that $\phi_{j,+} = (y_1^2 + (z_2^*)^2 + \dots + (z_n^*)^2)/2$ and where

$$a_j(x, h) = a_{j,0}(x) + h a_{j,1}(x) + \dots,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{with } \forall x \in \pi_x(K_+), \quad a_{j,0}(x) &= \tilde{\alpha}_j dy_1 \\ \text{and } \forall x \in \pi_x(K_-^*), \quad a_{j,0}(x) &= \hat{\alpha}_j *^{A^\dagger} (dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*). \end{aligned} \quad (6.23)$$

Here $\hat{\alpha}_{j,0}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_{j,0}$ are non-vanishing constants.

Proof. We already know that $a_{j,0}(s_j)$ has to belong to the kernel of $\frac{1}{2} \widetilde{\text{tr}} F_p + S_P$ at $(s_j, 0)$ and it follows from the discussion at the end of Subsubsection 2.2.3 (or from [11]) that $a_{j,0}(s_j)$ is an eigenvector in the negative eigenspace of $\phi''(s_j) A^\dagger$. (See also (2.90).) However, $dy_1(s_j)$ is such a vector since it is orthogonal to $T_{s_j}(\pi_x K_+)$, the spectral subspace corresponding to the eigenvalues with real part > 0 of $A \phi''(s_j) = (\phi''(s_j) A^\dagger)^\dagger$. (Cf (2.66).) Thus we know from the start that $a_{j,0}(s_j)$ is given by any of the two equivalent expressions in (6.23).

Mimicking the proof given in [8], we use the expression of the conjugate operator P_+ in Lemma 6.1 and have to solve

$$P_+ a_j = 0, \quad (6.24)$$

in the sense of formal asymptotic expansions. We get the first transport equation $T a_{j,0} = 0$, where

$$T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}_{Ad(\phi+\phi_+)} + \mathcal{L}_{A^\dagger d(\phi-\phi_+)}^{A,*} = \mathcal{L}_{Adg_-^*} - \mathcal{L}_{A^\dagger dg_+}^{A,*}$$

where we used the definitions of g_-^* and g_+ in (6.4), (6.2). The transport equation for $a_{j,0}$ reads

$$\left(\mathcal{L}_{Adg_-^*} - \mathcal{L}_{A^\dagger dg_+}^{A,*} \right) a_{j,0} = 0. \quad (6.25)$$

In order to prove the first identity in (6.23) we try to solve (6.25) along $\pi_x(K_+)$ with

$$a_{j,0}(x) = \tilde{\alpha}_j(z_2, \dots, z_n) dy_1 + \mathcal{O}(y_1). \quad (6.26)$$

For general reasons, we already know that the vector field part of the transport operator is tangent to $\pi_x(K_+)$. Using (6.15), we get

$$\mathcal{L}_{A^\dagger g_+}^{A,*} a_{j,0} = (dg_+)^{\wedge} d^{A,*} a_{j,0} + d^{A,*} (dg_+)^{\wedge} a_{j,0}.$$

Here $dg_+ = 0$ on $\pi_x(K_+)$ so the first term vanishes there. Using the form of $a_{j,0}$ above and the fact that $dg_+ = 2y_1 dy_1$, we get $(dg_+)^{\wedge} a_{j,0} = \mathcal{O}(y_1^2)$ and the second term also vanishes on $\pi_x(K_+)$.

Thus we only have to solve along $\pi_x(K_+)$ the equation

$$\mathcal{L}_{Adg_-^*} a_{j,0}(x) = 0, \quad (6.27)$$

still with $a_{j,0}$ of the form (6.26) and we have to check that $\tilde{\alpha}_j$ is in fact constant on $\pi_x(K_+)$. From Cartan's formula for Lie derivatives, (6.27) reads

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= d(\tilde{\alpha}_j(z)(Adg_-^*)^{\lrcorner} dy_1) + ((Adg_-^*)^{\lrcorner} d\tilde{\alpha}_j) dy_1 - d\tilde{\alpha}_j \underbrace{\langle Adg_-^* | dy_1 \rangle}_{=0} \\ &= d(\tilde{\alpha}_j \underbrace{(dg_-^* | dy_1)_A}_{=0}) + (dg_-^* | d\tilde{\alpha}_j)_A dy_1 \\ &= (dg_-^* | d\tilde{\alpha}_j)_A dy_1 = 2(d\phi | d\tilde{\alpha}_j)_A dy_1, \end{aligned} \quad (6.28)$$

where we used that $dg_-^* = 2d\phi$ on $\pi_x(K_+)$, and also the eikonal equation. Recalling that $2Ad\phi = \nu_+ \in T(\pi_x(K_+))$ we get that on $\pi_x(K_+)$

$$(6.27) \iff \nabla_{Ad\phi} \tilde{\alpha}_j = 0 \iff \tilde{\alpha}_j = \text{Cte},$$

from the standard properties of non-degenerate vector fields. This proves the first assertion in (6.23).

For the second one the tools are essentially the same. On $\pi_x(K_-^*)$ we look for a solution of the type

$$a_{j,0}(x) = \hat{\alpha}_j(y_1^*) *^{A^\dagger} (dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*) + \mathcal{O}(z^*).$$

and we have to check that $\hat{\alpha}_j$ is in fact constant on $\pi_x(K_-^*)$.

Let us check that the first term in (6.25) vanishes on $\pi_x(K_-^*)$. dg_-^* vanishes on $\pi_x(K_-^*)$, so

$$\mathcal{L}_{Adg_-^*} a_{j,0} = d \circ (Adg_-^*)^{\lrcorner} a_{j,0} \text{ on } \pi_x(K_-^*),$$

and it suffices to check that

$$d\left((\text{Ad}g_-^*)^{\downarrow} *^{A^t} (dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*)\right) = 0,$$

i.e. that

$$0 = d((\text{Ad}g_-^*)^{\downarrow} f dy_1) = d(f(dg_-^*|dy_1)_A),$$

and this is zero, since $(dg_-^*|dy_1)_A = 0$ as we have already observed and used.

Thus the transport equation on $\pi_*(K_-^*)$ becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_{A^t dg_+}^{A,*} *^{A^t} (\widehat{\alpha}_j(y_1^*) dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*) = 0. \quad (6.29)$$

Lemma 6.3 shows that the preceding equality is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{L}_{A^t dg_+} \widehat{\alpha}_j(y_1^*) (dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*) = 0. \quad (6.30)$$

Exactly as in the preceding case and using again the eikonal equation, it reduces on $\pi_x(K_-^*)$ to

$$2 \langle d\phi, d\widehat{\alpha}_j \rangle_{A^t} dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^* = 0$$

and again this is satisfied if $\widehat{\alpha}_j = \text{Cte}$: Indeed it also reads

$$\nabla_{A^t d\phi}(\widehat{\alpha}_j(y_1^*)) = 0,$$

and $2A^t d\phi = -\nu_- \in T(\pi_x(K_-^*))$ from (6.9). Again we used the standard properties of non-degenerate vector fields. The proof of Proposition 6.5 is complete. \square

Now we evaluate the coefficients $\widetilde{\alpha}_j$ and $\widehat{\alpha}_j$. For this we simply write that $f_j^{(1)}$ is (κ, A) -normalized:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \|f_j^{(1)}\|_{\kappa, A}^2 = \left(\kappa^* f_j^{(1)} | f_j^{(1)} \right)_A \\ &= h^{-n/2} \int \theta_j \circ \kappa(x) \theta_j(x) \langle \kappa^* a_j(x) | a_j(x) \rangle_A e^{-\phi_+ \circ \kappa(x)/h} e^{-\phi_+(x)/h} dx \end{aligned}$$

where θ_j is the truncation function introduced in the preceding section.

Using (6.17) we check that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_+ \circ \kappa + \phi_+ &= \frac{1}{2} (y_1^2 + (z_2^*)^2 + \dots + (z_n^*)^2) + \frac{1}{2} ((y_1^*)^2 + z_2^2 + \dots + z_n^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (y_1^2 + z_2^2 + \dots + z_n^2) + \frac{1}{2} ((y_1^*)^2 + (z_2^*)^2 + \dots + (z_n^*)^2) \\ &= (y_1^*)^2 + (z_2^*)^2 + \dots + (z_n^*)^2 \\ &= y_1^2 + z_2^2 + \dots + z_n^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6.31)$$

where we used (6.18) for the last two equalities.

As for the amplitude in the integral, we use that at s_j we have two expressions for a_j . To leading order w.r.t. h , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \kappa^* a_{j,0} | a_{j,0} \rangle_A dx &= \widetilde{\alpha}_j \widehat{\alpha}_j (dy_1^* | *^{A^t} (dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*))_A dx \\ &= \widetilde{\alpha}_j \widehat{\alpha}_j (*^{A^t} (dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*) | dy_1^*)_{A^t} dx \\ &= \widetilde{\alpha}_j \widehat{\alpha}_j *^{A^t} (dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*) \wedge *^{A^t} dy_1^* \\ &= \pm (\det \iota^{-1} A) \widetilde{\alpha}_j \widehat{\alpha}_j (dy_1^* \wedge dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*) \end{aligned} \quad (6.32)$$

where we used Lemma 6.2 and stopped trying to follow up the signs for simplicity. Putting (6.31) and (6.32) in the integral, using the change of variable κ and applying the Laplace method, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \|f_j^{(1)}\|_{\kappa,A}^2 \\ &= \pm h^{-n/2} (\det \iota^{-1} A) \tilde{\alpha}_j \hat{\alpha}_j \int \theta_j \circ \kappa \theta_j e^{-(y_1^2 + z_2^2 + \dots + z_n^2)/h} dy_1 dz_2 \dots dz_n + \mathcal{O}(h) \\ &= \pm \pi^{n/2} (\det \iota^{-1} A) \tilde{\alpha}_j \hat{\alpha}_j + \mathcal{O}(h). \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\pm 1 = \pi^{n/2} (\det \iota^{-1} A) \tilde{\alpha}_j \hat{\alpha}_j. \quad (6.33)$$

We shall next compute $f(s_j)$ in (6.21). Equivalently, we shall compute $g = g(s_j)$ in the relation

$$*^A dy_1 = g dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*. \quad (6.34)$$

Indeed, if we apply $*^{A^t}$ to this and use (6.20), we get

$$\det(\iota^{-1} A^t) dy_1 = g *^{A^t} dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*, \quad (6.35)$$

which is (6.21) with

$$f = \pm \frac{\det(\iota^{-1} A^t)}{g}. \quad (6.36)$$

(6.34) means that

$$(\omega|dy_1)_A dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_n = \pm g \omega \wedge dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*,$$

for all 1 forms ω (and with a sign independent of ω). With $\omega = dy_1^*$, we get

$$(dy_1^*|dy_1)_A dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_n = \pm g dy_1^* \wedge dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*. \quad (6.37)$$

Now use (6.17)

$$\phi - \phi(s_j) = \frac{1}{2} (-y_1^2 + (z_2^*)^2 + \dots + (z_n^*)^2) = \frac{1}{2} (-(y_1^*)^2 + z_2^2 + \dots + z_n^2), \quad (6.38)$$

where the last equality follows from $\phi \circ \kappa = \phi$. On $\pi_x(K_-)$ we have $z_2 = \dots = z_n = 0$ and hence

$$\nu_+ = 2Ad\phi = -2A(y_1^* dy_1^*) = -2y_1^* Ady_1^*.$$

Since ν_+ is tangent to $\pi_x(K_-)$, we conclude that

$$Ady_1^* = b \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1}, \quad (6.39)$$

so

$$\nu_+ = -2by_1^* \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} \text{ on } \pi_x(K_-). \quad (6.40)$$

For notational reasons, we sometimes write z_1, z_1^* instead of y_1, y_1^* . Recall that

$$z_j^*(x) = z_j(\kappa(x)) = \sum_{k=1}^{\nu} \kappa_{j,k} z_k,$$

where $(\kappa_{j,k})$ is the matrix of κ with respect to the coordinates z_1, \dots, z_n . On $\pi_x(K_-)$ we get $y_1^* = \kappa_{1,1} y_1$ and (6.40) becomes

$$\nu_+ = -2b\kappa_{1,1} y_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} \text{ on } \pi_x(K_-). \quad (6.41)$$

On the other hand, we know that $\pi_x(K_-)$ is an eigenspace of the linearization of ν_+ with associated eigenvalue $-2\widehat{\lambda}_1 < 0$, writing $\widehat{\lambda}_1 = -\lambda_1$ where λ_1 is the negative eigenvalue in (2.66), and a comparison with (6.41) shows that $-2b\kappa_{1,1} = -2\widehat{\lambda}_1$, so

$$b = \frac{\widehat{\lambda}_1}{\kappa_{1,1}}. \quad (6.42)$$

Combining this with (6.39), we get

$$(dy_1^*|dy_1)_A = \langle Ady_1^*|dy_1 \rangle = b \underbrace{\left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} | dy_1 \right\rangle}_{=1} = \frac{\lambda_1}{\kappa_{1,1}}. \quad (6.43)$$

In Remark 6.6 we will give practically computable formulas for $\kappa_{1,1}$. Also recall that the quantity (6.43) is > 0 since we assume that we are in case i) of Proposition 3.6. Hence $\kappa_{1,1} > 0$. From the last equality in (6.31) we also know that the matrix $(\kappa_{j,k})$ is orthogonal and in particular that $\kappa_{1,1} \leq 1$:

$$0 < \kappa_{1,1} \leq 1. \quad (6.44)$$

Inserting (6.43) in (6.37), we get

$$g = \pm \frac{\widehat{\lambda}_1}{\kappa_{1,1}} \frac{1}{\det \frac{\partial z^*}{\partial x}}, \quad (6.45)$$

where we recall that we write z_1^* for y_1^* whenever convenient. From (6.31), we get

$$\frac{1}{2}(\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)''_{xx} = \left(\frac{\partial z^*}{\partial x} \right)^t \frac{\partial z^*}{\partial x},$$

so

$$\det \frac{\partial z^*}{\partial x} = \pm (\det \frac{1}{2}(\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)''_{xx})^{1/2},$$

and (6.45) gives

$$g = \pm \frac{\widehat{\lambda}_1}{\kappa_{1,1} (\det \frac{1}{2}(\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)''_{xx})^{1/2}}. \quad (6.46)$$

From (6.36) we now get at s_j :

$$f = \pm \frac{\kappa_{1,1}}{\widehat{\lambda}_1} (\det \frac{1}{2} (\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)''_{xx})^{1/2} \det(\iota^{-1} A^t). \quad (6.47)$$

Remark 6.6. Here is a direct way of getting $\kappa_{1,1}$: Recall that $\kappa_{1,1}$ is equal to y_1^*/y_1 on $\pi_x(K_-)$, so

$$\kappa_{1,1}^2 = \frac{(y_1^*)^2}{y_1^2} \text{ on } \pi_x(K_-).$$

Using (6.38), we get $(y_1^*)^2 = -2(\phi - \phi(s_j))$ on $\pi_x(K_-)$. Similarly, by (6.31), we have $y_1^2 = \phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa$ on $\pi_x(K_-)$, so

$$\kappa_{1,1}^2 = \frac{-(\phi - \phi(s_j))}{\frac{1}{2}(\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)} \text{ on } \pi_x(K_-). \quad (6.48)$$

It follows from the discussion that the right hand side of (6.48) is constant on $\pi_x(K_-)$. Thus, in order to compute $\kappa_{1,1}$ up to the sign, it suffices to compute the eigendirection $\pi_x(K_-)$ and the Hessian of the positive definite solution ϕ_+ of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation.

Combining (6.21) and (6.23), we get

$$\widehat{\alpha}_j f(s_j) = \widetilde{\alpha}_j, \quad (6.49)$$

where f is given above, and using this and (6.47) in (6.33), we get

$$1 = \pm \pi^{n/2} \det(\iota^{-1} A) \det(\iota^{-1} A^t) \frac{\kappa_{1,1}}{\widehat{\lambda}_1} (\det \frac{1}{2} (\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)''_{xx})^{1/2} \widehat{\alpha}_j^2. \quad (6.50)$$

Here we notice that $\iota : (\mathbb{R}^n)^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is symmetric by its definition: $\langle \iota\omega | \mu \rangle = \langle \omega | \mu \rangle$, $\omega, \mu \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^*$, so

$$\det \iota^{-1} A^t = \det(\iota^{-1} A^t)^t = \det A(\iota^{-1})^t = \det A \iota^{-1} = \det \iota^{-1} A.$$

Thus we get from (6.50)

$$\pm 1 = \pi^{n/2} (\det \iota^{-1} A)^2 (\det \frac{1}{2} (\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)''_{xx})^{1/2} \frac{\kappa_{1,1}}{\widehat{\lambda}_1} \widehat{\alpha}_j^2, \quad (6.51)$$

where the sign to the left is the one that allows $\widehat{\alpha}_j$ to be real. Assuming that $\kappa_{1,1} > 0$ (which can be arranged by the choice of sign of y_1^*), we get,

$$\widehat{\alpha}_j = \pm \pi^{-\frac{n}{4}} (\det \iota^{-1} A)^{-1} (\det \frac{1}{2} (\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)''_{xx})^{-\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{\widehat{\lambda}_1}{\kappa_{1,1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (6.52)$$

where we are free to choose the sign (implying a choice of sign for $\widetilde{\alpha}_j$).

6.4 Computation of the coefficient

Now we can compute the coefficient of the singular matrix defined in (5.27) according to (5.19) in the preceding section. First recall the expressions for the quasimodes $f_j^{(1)}$ and $f_k^{(0)}$ in a neighborhood of the saddle point s_j :

As for $f_j^{(1)}$ we have the following definition from Proposition 6.5 in a neighborhood of s_j

$$f_j^{(1)}(x) = (h^{-n/4}a_j(x, h) + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)) \theta_j(x) e^{-\phi_{j,+}(x)/h},$$

where we recall that $\phi_{j,+} = (y_1^2 + (z_2^*)^2 + \dots + (z_n^*)^2)/2$. and that

$$\forall x \in \pi_x(K_-^*), \quad a_{j,0}(x) = \widehat{\alpha}_j *^{At} (dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*). \quad (6.53)$$

Now we deal with the quasimode $f_k^{(0)}$ where $k = k(j)$ according to the injection defined in the preceding section. We have

$$f_k^{(0)} = h^{-n/4} c_k(h) e^{-\frac{1}{h}(\phi(x) - \phi(m_k))} \chi_{k,\varepsilon}(x)$$

where $\chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ is the cutoff function defined in the generic case and $c_k(h) > 0$ a normalization constant. In the following it is convenient to pose

$$X_k = \sqrt{\det(\phi''(m_k))}$$

and a direct application of the Laplace method gives

$$c_k = (1 + \mathcal{O}(h)) \frac{\sqrt{X_k}}{\pi^{n/4}}, \quad (6.54)$$

so that

$$f_k^{(0)} = \frac{\sqrt{X_k}}{(\pi h)^{n/4}} (1 + \mathcal{O}(h)) e^{-(\phi(x) - \phi(m_k))/h} \chi_{k,\varepsilon}(x).$$


We now choose the behavior of the cut-off $\chi_{k,\varepsilon}$ function near s_j . In addition to all the properties recalled in Subsection 5.1, we impose that in a small neighborhood \mathcal{V} of $\pi_x(K_-) \cap \{y_1 > 0\}$,

$$\chi_{k,\varepsilon}(x) = \widetilde{\chi}_{k,\varepsilon}(y_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp } \chi_{k,\varepsilon} \cap \{y_1 \leq 0\} = \emptyset.$$

As in Subsection 5.1 we impose that the function θ_j is equal to 1 in a far larger ball of radius $\simeq \varepsilon_1 \gg \varepsilon$.

We can compute the tunneling coefficient defined in (5.19):

$$\begin{aligned} & (f_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} \\ &= h^{1-n/2} c_k(h) \int \theta_j \circ \kappa(x) ((\kappa^* a_j)(x, h) | d\chi_{k,\varepsilon}(x))_A e^{-(\phi_{+,j} \circ \kappa(x) + \phi(x) - \phi(m_k))/h} dx \\ & \quad + \mathcal{O}(h^{-N} e^{-(S_k + C_\varepsilon^{-1})/h}) \quad (6.55) \end{aligned}$$



We use the adapted coordinates. As already noticed the phase is up to a division by h equal to

$$\begin{aligned} -(\phi_{+,j} \circ \kappa(x) + \phi(x) - \phi(m_k)) &= -(\phi_{+,j} \circ \kappa(x) + \phi(x) - \phi(s_j)) - S_k \\ &= -g_-(x) - S_k \\ &= -(z_2^2 + \dots + z_n^2) - S_k. \end{aligned}$$

We therefore get

$$\begin{aligned} (f_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} \\ = h^{1-n/2} e^{-S_k/h} c_k(h) \left(\int \theta_j \circ \kappa(x) ((\kappa^* a_j)(x, h) | d\chi_{k,\epsilon}(x))_A e^{-(z_2^2 + \dots + z_n^2)/h} dx \right) \\ + \mathcal{O}(h^{-N} e^{-(S_k + C_\epsilon^{-1})/h}) \quad (6.56) \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that $j = j(k)$. On $\pi_x(K_-^*)$ we have by Proposition 6.5

$$a_j(x, h) = \widehat{\alpha}_j *^{A^\dagger} (dz_2^* \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n^*) + \mathcal{O}(h).$$

Since $z_l^* = z_l \circ \kappa$ we can use Lemma 6.4 to get on $\pi_x(K_-)$

$$\forall x \in \pi_x(K_-), \quad a_{j,0}^*(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \kappa^* a_{j,0} = (\det \kappa) \widehat{\alpha}_j *^A (dz_2 \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n).$$

From the expression of $\chi_{k,\epsilon}$ near s_j we also have in a neighborhood of $\pi_x(K_-)$,

$$d\chi_{k,\epsilon}(x) = \widetilde{\chi}'_{k,\epsilon}(y_1) dy_1,$$

and putting these two expressions together with iii) of Lemma 6.2, we get on $\pi_x(K_-)$

$$\begin{aligned} ((\kappa^* a_j)(x, h), d\chi_{k,\epsilon}(x))_A dx \\ = \pm \widehat{\alpha}_j \widetilde{\chi}'_{k,\epsilon}(y_1) (*^A (dz_2 \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n) | dy_1)_A dx + \mathcal{O}(h) \\ = \pm \widehat{\alpha}_j \widetilde{\chi}'_{k,\epsilon}(y_1) *^A (dz_2 \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n) \wedge *^A dy_1 + \mathcal{O}(h) \\ = \pm \widehat{\alpha}_j (\det i^{-1} A) \widetilde{\chi}'_{k,\epsilon}(y_1) dy_1 \wedge dz_2 \wedge \dots \wedge dz_n + \mathcal{O}(h) \quad (6.57) \end{aligned}$$

Using the Laplace method in the z coordinates we therefore get from (6.56) and (6.57)

$$\begin{aligned}
& (f_j^{(1)}|d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} \\
& \equiv \pm(\det \iota^{-1}A)h^{1-n/2}e^{-S_k/h}c_k(h)(\pi h)^{(n-1)/2}\widehat{\alpha}_j \int_{\pi_x K_- \cap \mathcal{V}} \widetilde{\chi}'_{k,\varepsilon}(y_1)dy_1 \quad (6.58) \\
& \equiv \pm(\det \iota^{-1}A)\pi^{(n-1)/2}h^{1/2}e^{-S_k/h}c_k(h)\widehat{\alpha}_j.
\end{aligned}$$

modulo $\mathcal{O}(h^{3/2}e^{-S_k/h})$. Combining this with (6.54), (6.52), we finally get

Proposition 6.7 *Let s_j be a saddle point corresponding to a minimum m_k , with $j = j(k)$. Then we have*

$$(f_j^{(1)}|d_\phi f_k^{(0)})_{A,\kappa} = \pm \left(\frac{h}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\widehat{\lambda}_1}{\kappa_{1,1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{(\det \phi''(m_k))^{\frac{1}{4}}}{(\det \frac{1}{2}(\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)''(s_j))^{\frac{1}{4}}} e^{-S_k/h} + \mathcal{O}(h^{3/2}e^{-S_k/h}),$$

where we recall that $-\widehat{\lambda}_1$ is the negative eigenvalue of $A\phi''(s_j)$ and that $\kappa_{1,1}$ is the restriction of

$$\left(\frac{-2(\phi - \phi(s_j))}{\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

to $\pi_x(K_-)$ (whose tangent space at s_j is the corresponding eigenspace). As a consequence the exponentially small eigenvalues of $P = -\Delta_A^{(0)}$ are real and asymptotically given by

$$\mu_k = h \left(\frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\widehat{\lambda}_1}{\kappa_{1,1}} \frac{(\det \phi''(m_k))^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(\det \frac{1}{2}(\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)''(s_j))^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \mathcal{O}(h) \right) e^{-2S_k/h}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n_0$$

where $S_1 = \infty$ (and $\mu_1 = 0$) by convention.

To finish this section we shall make Proposition 6.7 even more explicit in the case of the Kramers-Fokker-Planck operator (1.1). Assume for simplicity that the saddle point s_j is placed at the origin $x = 0, y = 0$. Our calculations only concern the quadratic approximation, so we may assume most of the time that V is quadratic. After an orthogonal change of variables, we may assume that

$$V(x) = -\frac{v}{2}x_1^2 + \sum_{j=2}^d \frac{v_j}{2}x_j^2, \quad (6.59)$$

where v, v_j are > 0 . The variables can be completely separated and only the x_1, y_1 variables are of interest, so in most of the following discussion we will assume that $d = 1$ with some remarks about the formulation of the corresponding results when $d > 1$. Thus we consider the one dimensional potential,

$$V(x) = -\frac{v}{2}x^2 \quad (6.60)$$

where $v > 0$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} p &= i(y\xi + vx\eta) + \frac{\gamma}{2}(y^2 + \eta^2), \\ q &= -p(x, y; i\xi, i\eta) = y\xi + vx\eta + \frac{\gamma}{2}(\eta^2 - y^2), \\ \phi(x, y) &= \frac{1}{2}(y^2 - vx^2). \end{aligned} \tag{6.61}$$

Let $\phi_+(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(ax^2 + 2bxy + cy^2)$ be the unique positive definite quadratic form which solves the eiconal equation

$$q(x, y; \partial_x \phi_+, \partial_y \phi_+) = 0. \tag{6.62}$$

Expanding the left hand side as a quadratic form and equating the coefficients to zero, we get

$$\frac{\gamma}{2}b^2 + vb = 0, \quad a + vc + \gamma bc = 0, \quad b + \frac{\gamma}{2}c^2 = \frac{\gamma}{2}. \tag{6.63}$$

Choosing $b = 0$ as the solution of the first equation, leads to the two solutions $\pm\phi(x, y)$, neither of which is positive definite. Thus we have to choose the other solution, $b = -2v/\gamma$. Then the last equation in (6.63) leads to $c = \pm\sqrt{1 + \frac{4v}{\gamma^2}}$ and the condition that ϕ_+ is positive definite imposes the choice of the plus sign. Finally we determine a from the middle equation and get $a = v\sqrt{1 + \frac{4v}{\gamma^2}}$. Thus the unique solution to our problem is

$$\phi_+ = \frac{v}{2}\sqrt{1 + \frac{4v}{\gamma^2}}x^2 - \frac{2v}{\gamma}xy + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1 + \frac{4v}{\gamma^2}}y^2, \tag{6.64}$$

which can be seen directly to be positive definite. (In higher dimensions, we get

$$\phi_+^{(d)}(x, y) = \phi_+^{(1)}(x_1, y_1) + \sum_2^d \frac{1}{2}(y_j^2 + v_j x_j^2),$$

differing from the expression for $\phi^{(d)}(x, y)$ only in the variables x_1, y_1 , where we used the superscripts 1 and d to indicate the functions ϕ_+ and ϕ in dimension 1 and d respectively. In this case, $\kappa : (x, y) \mapsto (x, -y)$, so

$$\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa = v\sqrt{1 + \frac{4v}{\gamma^2}}x^2 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{4v}{\gamma^2}}y^2. \tag{6.65}$$

Next we compute the negative eigenvalue $-2\widehat{\lambda}_1$ of $2A\phi''(s_j)$ and the corresponding eigenspace $\pi_x(K_-)$. Since

$$2A\phi''(s_j) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & \gamma \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -v & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ v & \gamma \end{pmatrix},$$

the eigenvalues are $\frac{\gamma}{2} \pm \sqrt{(\gamma/2)^2 + v}$, so

$$\widehat{\lambda}_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{(\gamma/2)^2 + v} - \gamma/2). \tag{6.66}$$

the corresponding eigenspace $\pi_x(K_-)$ is generated by the vector $(1, \sqrt{(\gamma/2)^2 + v - \frac{\gamma}{2}})$ (In d dimensions, $\pi_x(K_-)$ is generated by a vector (x, y) with (x_1, y_1) equal to the vector above and with the other components equal to 0.)

$\kappa_{1,1}^2$ is the restriction of $(-2\phi)/(\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)$ to $\pi_x(K_-)$ (where by our normalization, we have $\phi(s_j) = 0$, $s_j = (0, 0)$), so after some straight forward calculations, we get

$$\kappa_{1,1} = \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{\gamma^2 + 4v}}. \quad (6.67)$$

The formulae (6.66) and (6.67) remain valid in d dimensions, with $-v$ denoting the negative eigenvalue of $V''(s_j) = V''(0)$.

In the first formula in Proposition 6.7, we write

$$\frac{\det \phi''(m_k)}{\det \frac{1}{2}(\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)''(s_j)} = \frac{\det \phi''(m_k)}{-\det \phi''(s_j)} \times \frac{-\det \phi''(s_j)}{\det \frac{1}{2}(\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)''(s_j)}. \quad (6.68)$$

With V as in (6.59), the last factor reduces to the one-dimensional case and we get

$$\frac{-\det \phi''(s_j)}{\det \frac{1}{2}(\phi_+ + \phi_+ \circ \kappa)''(s_j)} = \frac{-\det \begin{pmatrix} -v & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}{\det \begin{pmatrix} v\sqrt{1 + \frac{4v}{\gamma^2}} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{1 + \frac{4v}{\gamma^2}} \end{pmatrix}} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{4v}{\gamma^2}}. \quad (6.69)$$

Combining (6.66)–(6.69) with Proposition 6.7, we get after some straight forward reductions,

$$(f_j^{(1)} | d_\phi f_k^{(0)}) = \pm \left(\frac{h}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\det V''(\mathbf{m}_k)}{-\det V''(\mathbf{s}_j)}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \widehat{\lambda}_1^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{S_k}{h}} + \mathcal{O}(h^{\frac{3}{2}}) e^{-\frac{S_k}{h}}, \quad (6.70)$$

so that the exponentially small eigenvalues are given by

$$\mu_k = \frac{h}{\pi} \left(\frac{\det V''(\mathbf{m}_k)}{-\det V''(\mathbf{s}_j)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \widehat{\lambda}_1 e^{-\frac{S_k}{h}} + \mathcal{O}(h^2) e^{-\frac{S_k}{h}}.$$

7 Multiple well analysis in the general case

In this section we return to the general case and show how the analysis of Sections 4 and 5 may be combined to obtain the other main result of this work, Theorem 7.1. In Theorem 7.2 we also give the full asymptotic expansion for the smallest non-vanishing eigenvalue under a generic assumptions which is weaker than the one in Theorem 5.10. The section is concluded by a brief discussion of an explicit example of a system with three minima and three saddle points, where the values of ϕ at the different minima and the saddle points may coincide, illustrating the transition from a degenerate case to a generic one.

7.1 Statement of the main result and the matrix of $d_\phi : E^{(0)} \rightarrow E^{(1)}$

In Section 4 we have constructed an injection from the set LM of local minima of ϕ to the set CC of critical components: $m_k \mapsto E_k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}^2$. Let $\sigma(k) = \sigma(E_k)$ be the corresponding saddle point value of E_k , with the convention that \mathbb{R}^n is a critical component and that $\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n) = +\infty$. It is of the form $E_{1,1}$ where $m_{1,1}$ is a point of global minimum of ϕ . For $m_k \in \text{LM}$, we put

$$S_k = \sigma(k) - \phi(m_k) > 0, \quad (S_1 = +\infty). \quad (7.1)$$

For simplicity, let us arrange the indices $k \in \mathbb{N}^2$ in a suitable order, to be chosen below, and write them as k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{n_0} , with $k_1 = (1, 1)$.

Theorem 7.1 *We label the local minima as above, so that $E_{1,1} = \mathbb{R}^n$, and let μ_2, \dots, μ_{n_0} denote the $n_0 - 1$ non-vanishing eigenvalues of $-\Delta_A^{(0)}$, which are $o(h)$. For h small enough they are real and exponentially small. More precisely, with a suitable labelling of the eigenvalues, we have*

$$\mu_\ell \asymp h e^{-2S_{k_\ell}/h}, \quad 2 \leq \ell \leq n_0. \quad (7.2)$$

Next, we recall that in Section 4 we have constructed a basis for the subspace $E^{(0)}$, given by $e_k^{(0)} = \Pi^{(0)}(f_k^{(0)})$, $k \in \mathbb{N}^2$, and checked that the system $(e_k^{(0)})$ is uniformly linearly independent in L^2 . Also, in Section 5, we have introduced a basis of one-forms $(e_j^{(1)})$, $1 \leq j \leq n_1$, for the subspace $E^{(1)}$, associated to the saddle points, and this construction is applicable here as well. In particular, Proposition 5.4 remains valid.

Similarly to the generic case, we can analyze the matrix of $d_\phi : E^{(0)} \rightarrow E^{(1)}$ with respect to the bases $(e_k^{(0)})$ and $(e_j^{(1)})$, and verify the following properties,

$$d_\phi e_{k_1}^{(0)} = 0, \quad k_1 = (1, 1),$$

while for $\ell \geq 2$, we have

$$d_\phi e_{k_\ell}^{(0)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} r_{j,\ell} e_j^{(1)},$$

where for some fixed $\alpha > 0$,

- 1) $r_{j,\ell} = h^{\frac{1}{2}} b_{j,\ell}(h) e^{-S_{k_\ell}/h}$, when $s_j \in \text{SSP} \cap \partial E_{k_\ell}$. Here $b_{j,\ell}(h) \sim \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} b_{j,\ell}^\nu h^\nu$, $b_{j,\ell}^0 \neq 0$.
- 2) $r_{j,\ell} = h^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathcal{O}(e^{-(\phi(s_j) - \phi(m_{k_\ell}))/h}) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-(S_{k_\ell} + \alpha)/h}))$, when $s_j \in \text{SSP} \cap \partial \tilde{E}$ and $\tilde{E} \neq E_{k_\ell}$ is a critical component containing E_{k_ℓ} .
- 3) $r_{j,\ell} = \mathcal{O}(h^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-(S_{k_\ell} + \alpha)/h})$ otherwise, i.e. when s_j is a saddle point that is not on the boundary of a critical component containing E_{k_ℓ} .

The matrix of $d_\phi : E^{(0)} \rightarrow E^{(1)}$ is of the form $(0 R') = R = (r_{j,\ell})$, where $(j, \ell) \in \{1, \dots, n_1\} \times \{1, \dots, n_0\}$ and 0 indicates the first vanishing column. Let D be the $(n_0 - 1) \times (n_0 - 1)$ matrix $\text{diag}(e^{-S_{k_\ell}/h})_{\ell=2, \dots, n_0}$, and write

$$R' = h^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{R} D, \quad \tilde{R} = (\tilde{r}_{j,\ell}), \quad (7.3)$$

so that $\tilde{r}_{j,\ell}$ is equal to $b_{j,\ell}$, $\mathcal{O}(e^{-(\phi(s_j) - \phi(m_{k_\ell}) - S_{k_\ell})/h}) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha/h})$, $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha/h})$ respectively, in the three different cases above. Notice that in the second case, $\phi(s_j) - \phi(m_{k_\ell}) - S_{k_\ell} > 0$ but if we want to allow ϕ to vary nicely with parameters, we have no uniform bound from below by a positive constant.

7.2 Singular values

Clearly $\|\tilde{R}\| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)$ and we shall prove that \tilde{R} is injective with a uniformly bounded left inverse satisfying

$$\|\tilde{R}^{-1}\| \leq \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (7.4)$$

Accepting this in this subsection, we shall now estimate the singular values of R . Using the standard notation, we let $s_1(\tilde{R}) \geq \dots \geq s_{n_0-1}(\tilde{R})$ be the singular values of \tilde{R} , i.e. the eigenvalues of $(\tilde{R}^* \tilde{R})^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then in view of (7.4), we have

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq s_j(\tilde{R}) \leq C. \quad (7.5)$$

The Ky Fan inequalities and (7.3) tell us that

$$s_\nu(R') \leq h^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\tilde{R}\| s_\nu(D),$$

where we recall that $\|R\| = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $S_{k_2} \geq S_{k_3} \geq \dots \geq S_{k_{n_0}}$. Then $s_\nu(D) = e^{-S_{k_{n_0+1-\nu}}/h}$, and we get the upper bound,

$$s_\nu(R') \leq \mathcal{O}(1) h^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-S_{k_{n_0+1-\nu}}/h}. \quad (7.6)$$

To get a lower bound we shall use (7.5) and write

$$\tilde{R} = h^{-\frac{1}{2}} R' D^{-1}$$

so that the Ky Fan inequalities give,

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{O}(1)} \leq s_{n_0-1}(\tilde{R}) \leq h^{-\frac{1}{2}} s_\nu(R') s_{n_0-\nu}(D^{-1}).$$

Here $s_{n_0-\nu}(D^{-1}) = e^{S_{k_{n_0+1-\nu}}/h}$ and we get

$$s_\nu(R') \geq \frac{h^{1/2}}{\mathcal{O}(1)} e^{-S_{k_{n_0+1-\nu}}/h}, \quad 1 \leq \nu \leq n_0 - 1.$$

In conclusion,

$$s_\nu(R') \asymp h^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-S_{k_{n_0+1-\nu}}/h}. \quad (7.7)$$

We can now end the **proof of Theorem 7.1.** We may assume that $e_1^{(1)}, \dots, e_{n_1}^{(1)}$ is an orthonormal basis in $E^{(1)}$ for the scalar product $(\cdot|\cdot)_{A,\kappa}$. Let $g_1^{(0)}, \dots, g_{n_0}^{(0)}$ be an orthonormal basis in $E^{(0)}$ for the scalar product $(\cdot|\cdot)_{A,\kappa}$ on functions. Then, as we have seen, the eigenvalues μ_ℓ are the squares of the singular values of the matrix \widehat{R} of $d_\phi : E^{(0)} \rightarrow E^{(1)}$ with respect to the two orthonormal bases. However the uniform linear independence of the basis $e_{k_1}^{(0)}, \dots, e_{k_{n_0}}^{(0)}$ means that $\widehat{R} = RU$ where U and U^{-1} are uniformly bounded. By the Ky Fan inequalities we then know that the singular values of R and those of \widehat{R} are pairwise of the same order of magnitude. The theorem therefore follows from (7.7). \square

7.3 Proof of (7.4)

We define the indicator matrix \widetilde{R}_0 of \widetilde{R} by replacing $\widetilde{r}_{j,\ell}$ by 0 in the third case in the description of \widetilde{R} above (after (7.3)). Then,

$$\widetilde{R}_0 = (\widehat{r}_{j,\ell})_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq n_1 \\ 2 \leq \ell \leq n_0}},$$

where

- 1) $\widehat{r}_{j,\ell} = \widetilde{r}_{j,\ell} = b_{j,\ell}$ when $s_j \in \text{SSP} \cap \partial E_{k_\ell}$,
- 2) $\widehat{r}_{j,\ell} = \widetilde{r}_{j,\ell} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-(\phi(s_j) - \phi(m_{k_\ell}) - S_{k_\ell})/h} + e^{-\alpha/h})$ when $s_j \in \text{SSP} \cap \partial \widetilde{E}$ and $E_{k_\ell} \subset \widetilde{E} \in \text{CC}$, $E_{k_\ell} \neq \widetilde{E}$,
- 3) $\widehat{r}_{j,\ell} = 0$ otherwise.

Then $\widetilde{R} = \widetilde{R}_0 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha/h})$ and in order to prove (7.4) it suffices to prove an a priori estimate

$$\|u\| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \|\widetilde{R}_0 u\|, \quad u \in \mathbb{C}^{n_0-1}, \quad (7.8)$$

since we then get an analogous estimate for \widetilde{R} .

We shall prove (7.8) by estimating the components of u one after the other in a suitable order and thus eliminating them successively.

If SSP is empty or equivalently, if $m_{1,1}$ is the only local minimum of ϕ , then there is nothing to prove.

If $\text{SSP} \neq \emptyset$, let σ_2 be the *smallest* value in $\phi(\text{SSP})$. Here we are not using the labelling introduced in Section 4. The components of $\phi^{-1}(] - \infty, \sigma_2])$ can be split into the critical components, labelled as E_k , with $k = (k^{\sigma_2}, k^{cc})$, $1 \leq k^{cc} \leq N_{k^{\sigma_2}}$, and the others, say, F_1, \dots, F_M . For notational convenience, we shall relabel the critical components E_k as $\widetilde{E}_1, \dots, \widetilde{E}_N$. Here each \widetilde{E}_j intersects at least one other, \widetilde{E}_k , while each \widetilde{F}_ℓ is disjoint from the closure of the other components. Thus the union of the \widetilde{E}_j can be grouped into say, $\widetilde{E}_1 \cup \dots \cup \widetilde{E}_{\ell_1}$, $\widetilde{E}_{\ell_1+1} \cup \dots \cup \widetilde{E}_{\ell_1+\ell_2}, \dots$ such that the corresponding unions of the closures are connected and mutually disjoint. Here ℓ_1, ℓ_2, \dots are all ≥ 2 .

In what follows, it will be useful to change the labelling of the local minima whenever we find it convenient and here even the global minimum $m_{1,1}$ may have

to change its notation. Consider one of the groups introduced above, say $\widetilde{E}_1, \dots, \widetilde{E}_{\ell_1}$ and write ℓ instead of ℓ_1 for simplicity. Let m_k be the unique local minimum of $\phi|_{\widetilde{E}_k}$ (recalling that $\sigma_2 = \inf \phi(\text{SSP})$). Recall that in the construction of the quasimodes, we have assigned a critical component E_k to each local minimum and since σ_2 is minimal, we have $E_k \supset \widetilde{E}_k$. The same construction also shows that $E_k \neq \widetilde{E}_k$ for precisely one value of k , say for $k = 1$. Notice that the corresponding local minimum m_1 is also a global minimum of the restriction of ϕ to $\widetilde{E}_1 \cup \dots \cup \widetilde{E}_\ell$.

Since $\widetilde{E}_1 \cup \dots \cup \widetilde{E}_\ell$ is connected, we know that $\widetilde{E}_1 \cap \widetilde{E}_k \neq \emptyset$ for at least one value of $k \neq 1$, say $k = 2$. This intersection is a finite set of ssp's. Choose one of them and denote it by s_2 . We shall now estimate u_2 . Notice that $\widehat{r}_{2,2} = b_{2,2}$ is elliptic, while $\widehat{r}_{2,1} = 0$. Since s_2 cannot be in the boundary of \widetilde{E}_k for any $k \geq 3$, we know (using also the minimality of σ_2) that $\widehat{r}_{2,k} = 0$ for all other k associated to any other local minimum different from m_1 and m_2 . It follows that

$$(\widetilde{R}_0 u)(2) = b_{2,2} u(2),$$

and by the ellipticity of $b_{2,2}$, we deduce the a priori estimate

$$|u(2)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \|\widetilde{R}_0 u\|.$$

If $\ell \geq 3$, we may assume, after relabelling of m_3, \dots, m_ℓ , that $\widetilde{E}_2 \cap \widetilde{E}_3 \neq \emptyset$. Let s_3 be a ssp in this intersection. Then (using again the minimality of σ_2) we have

$$(\widetilde{R}_0 u)(3) = b_{3,2} u(2) + b_{3,3} u(3),$$

so, using the ellipticity of $b_{3,3}$, we get

$$|u(3)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)(\|\widetilde{R}_0 u\| + |u(2)|) \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \|\widetilde{R}_0 u\|.$$

Continuing this way, we get

$$|u(2)| + \dots + |u(\ell)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \|\widetilde{R}_0 u\|.$$

Thus, in order to prove (7.4), it suffices to do so when $u(2) = \dots = u(\ell) = 0$. Indeed, for a general $u \in \mathbb{C}^{n_0-1}$, write

$$u = u' + \sum_{k=2}^{\ell} u(k) e_k, \quad u'(k) = 0, \quad \text{for } 2 \leq k \leq \ell,$$

where e_k is the canonical basis vector of index k , and if we assume that (7.4) holds when $u(2) = \dots = u(\ell) = 0$, then

$$\|u'\| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \|\widetilde{R}_0 u'\| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)(\|\widetilde{R}_0 u\| + \mathcal{O}(1)(|u(2)| + \dots + |u(\ell)|)) \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \|\widetilde{R}_0 u\|.$$

In other words, we have eliminated the minima m_2, \dots, m_ℓ from the discussion and only m_1 survives among the m_1, m_2, \dots, m_ℓ . We do the same for the other groups $\widetilde{E}_{\ell_1+1} \cup \dots \cup \widetilde{E}_{\ell_1+\ell_2}, \dots$, (if there are more than one) so that for each group,

we eliminate all the local minima except one which is also a global minimum in the corresponding union.

If σ_2 is the only element of $\phi(\text{SSP})$, then we only have one group as above and no F_j . We have then eliminated all the $u(k)$ and the proof is complete.

If $\phi(\text{SSP})$ contains more elements, let $\sigma_3 > \sigma_2$ be the smallest one. Again (after a change of notation and forgetting about the earlier \tilde{E}_k and F_ν) we have

$$\phi^{-1}(] - \infty, \sigma_3]) = \tilde{E}_1 \cup \dots \cup \tilde{E}_N \bigcup F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_M,$$

where \tilde{E}_ν are the ccs and F_μ are the other components. Each of the components may have several local minima but we have already eliminated all but one, say m which is also a global minimum for that component, and $\tilde{E}_\nu \subset E_m$ and $F_\mu \subset E_m$ respectively. This implies that we can repeat the procedure of elimination precisely as we did at the level σ_2 . After finitely many steps all the local minima are eliminated and we get (7.4).

7.4 Full asymptotics for the smallest non-vanishing eigenvalue

We return to the general situation in Subsection 7.1 and label the minima $m_{k_1}, m_{k_2}, \dots, m_{k_{n_0}}$ so that $m_{k_1} = m_{1,1}$ and S_{k_2} is maximal among all the S_{k_j} , $j = 2, 3, \dots, n_0$. We assume that there is a gap between S_{k_2} and the other S_{k_j} :

$$S_{k_2} > \max_{j \geq 3} S_{k_j} =: S'. \quad (7.9)$$

Also assume that

$$\partial E_{k_2} \text{ contains precisely one ssp.} \quad (7.10)$$

Theorem 7.2 *We assume (7.9), (7.10), in addition to the general assumption of Theorem 7.1. Then the smallest non-vanishing eigenvalue μ_2 is given by*

$$\mu_2 = (h|b_2(h)|^2 + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty))e^{-2S_2/h},$$

where we write S_2 instead of S_{k_2} for short. Here b_2 is as in Theorem 5.10.

As before, we may assume that the basis $(e_j^{(1)})$ in $E^{(1)}$ is orthonormal, while we have uniform linear independence for the basis $(e_k^{(0)})$ in $E^{(0)}$. We may assume however that

$$\|e_{k_2}^{(0)}\|_\kappa = 1. \quad (7.11)$$

Define R, R', \tilde{R}, D as in and around (7.3). Then

$$\tilde{R}D = \begin{pmatrix} b_2(h) & \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha/h}) \\ \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha/h}) & W \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-S_2/h} & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{D} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7.12)$$

where $\hat{D} = \text{diag}(e^{-S_j/h})_{3 \leq j \leq n_0}$ and we write S_j instead of S_{k_j} for simplicity.

Here, we know that b_2 is elliptic of order 0 and that $\begin{pmatrix} b_2 & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{pmatrix}$ has a uniformly bounded left inverse. Consequently,

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{O}(1)} \leq W^*W \leq \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (7.13)$$

Theorem 7.2 follows from:

Proposition 7.3 *The smallest singular value of $\tilde{R}D : \mathbb{R}^{n_0-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ is equal to $|b_2|e^{-S_2/h} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-(S_2+\alpha)/h})$ for some $\alpha > 0$, independent of h , when \mathbb{R}^{n_1} is equipped with the standard Hilbert norm and \mathbb{R}^{n_0-1} is equipped with the norm $[\cdot]$, defined by*

$$[x]^2 = \sum_{2 \leq j, k \leq n_0} x_j x_k (e_j^{(0)} | e_k^{(k)})_\kappa.$$

We know that $[\cdot]$ is uniformly equivalent to the standard norm and that $[e_2] = 1$, where $e_2 = (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0-1}$. The square of the singular value is equal to

$$\inf_{[x]=1} \|\tilde{R}Dx\|^2. \quad (7.14)$$

Eliminating the terms $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha/h})$ in (7.12) will modify the quantity (7.14) by a factor $1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha/h})$ and if we do that elimination, then (7.14) becomes

$$\inf_{[x]=1} |b_2|^2 e^{-2S_2/h} x_2^2 + \|W\hat{D}x'\|^2, \quad x = (x_2, x'). \quad (7.15)$$

Taking $x_2 = 1$, $x' = 0$, we see that this infimum is $\leq |b_2|^2 e^{-2S_2/h}$, and we shall see that it is very close to this value. Let x be a point (with $[x] = 1$) where the infimum is attained. Then $\|W\hat{D}x'\| = \mathcal{O}(e^{-S_2/h})$ and from (7.13) and the fact that $\hat{D}^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(e^{S'/h})$, we conclude that $\|x'\| = \mathcal{O}(e^{-(S_2-S')/h})$. It is then clear that $x_2 = \pm 1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-(S_2-S')/h})$ and the infimum in (7.15) is

$$\geq |b_2|^2 e^{-2S_2/h} (1 - \mathcal{O}(e^{-(S_2-S')/h})) \geq |b_2|^2 e^{-2S_2/h} - \mathcal{O}(e^{-(S'+S_2)/h}).$$

This gives Proposition 7.3 and Theorem 7.2.

7.5 An example with three minima and three saddle points

We shall finally briefly discuss an example illustrating the generic and general cases, for which computations can be made by hand. We study the case of three saddle points and three local minima as illustrated by Figure 4. It is natural to denote simply by m_k , $k = 1, 2, 3$ the local minima and s_j , $j = 1, 2, 3$ the saddle points. The *generic case* corresponds to the case when Hypothesis 5.1 is satisfied. An interesting situation, entering in the previous *general case*, appears when ϕ depends smoothly on some parameter such that we may have

$$\phi(m_1) = \phi(m_2) = \phi(m_3), \text{ and } \phi(s_1) = \phi(s_2) = \phi(s_3). \quad (7.16)$$




Figure 4: Case of 3 saddle points at the same level

We will restrict the attention to a small neighborhood of a parameter value for which (7.16) holds.

In this situation we can describe in some detail some facts about the restriction of the twisted Laplacian $-\Delta_A^{(0)}$ to the space $E^{(0)}$ corresponding to the exponentially small eigenvalues. We know from the previous sections that this space is of dimension 3, since this is the number of local minima. The question is to study the eigenvalues in more detail, and we already know that one of them is 0 and that they are all real.

It will be convenient to use a different system of critical components and define $E(m_k)$ to be the connected component of $\phi^{-1}(-\infty, \min_{j \neq k} \phi(s_j)]$ that contains m_k and to define χ_k correspondingly as in Section 4. The eigenspace $E^{(0)}$ is generated by 0-forms of the form

$$e_k^{(0)} = h^{-n/4} c_k(h) \chi_k(x) e^{-(\phi - \phi(m_k))/h} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-1/Ch}),$$

where $c_k(h) \sim c_{k,0} + hc_{k,1} + \dots$ is a normalization constant with $c_{k,0} > 0$. Similarly we know that 1-forms generating the 3-dimensional eigenspace $E^{(1)}$ of $-\Delta_A^{(1)}$ associated with exponentially small eigenvalues can be chosen of the following form:

$$e_j^{(1)} = (h^{-n/4} a_j(x; h) + r_j(x)) \theta_j(x) e^{-\phi_+(x)/h} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-1/Ch}),$$

where $a_j(x; h) \sim a_{j,0}(x) + ha_{j,1} + \dots$ in $C^\infty(\text{neigh}(s_j, \mathbb{R}^n))$ and r_j are as in (3.12). Both families $(e_k^{(0)})$ and $(e_j^{(1)})$ are bases that we can assume to be orthonormal for the A, κ scalar products.

The matrix R of $d_\phi : E^{(0)} \rightarrow E^{(1)}$ with respect to the bases $(e_k^{(0)})$ and $(e_j^{(1)})$ takes the form

$$R = h^{1/2} (\rho_{j,k} e^{-\phi(s_j)/h} e^{\phi(m_k)/h}),$$

where $|\rho_{j,k}| \asymp 1$ for $j \neq k$, and $= \mathcal{O}(1) e^{-\frac{1}{Ch}}$ when $j = k$, uniformly for the parameter in a small neighborhood of the value where (7.16) holds. The Maxwellian $e^{-\phi/h}$ can

be written

$$e^{-\phi/h} = h^{\frac{n}{4}} \sum_k \frac{(1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\frac{1}{c_k h}}))}{c_k(h)} e^{-\frac{\phi(m_k)}{h}} e_k^{(0)},$$

and is annihilated by d_ϕ , so we know that the coefficient vector belongs to the kernel of R . It follows that

$$\sum_{k; k \neq j} \rho_{j,k} \frac{1}{c_k} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\frac{1}{c_k h}}),$$

so

$$\rho_{j,k} = \rho_{j,k}^0 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\frac{1}{c_k h}}),$$

where

$$\rho_{j,k}^0 = \begin{cases} 0, & k = j, \\ d_j c_k, & k = j + 1, \\ -d_j c_k, & k = j + 2 \end{cases}, \quad d_j \asymp 1, \quad c_k \asymp 1$$

with the cyclic convention for the indices. Introducing

$$\mu_k = c_k e^{\phi(m_k)/h}, \quad \sigma_j = d_j e^{-\phi(s_j)/h},$$

we get

$$R = h^{1/2} R_0 + e^{-\frac{1}{c_k h}} (\mathcal{O}(1) e^{-(\phi(s_j) - \phi(m_k))/h})_{j,k},$$

where

$$R_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_2 & -b_3 \\ -b_1 & 0 & a_3 \\ a_1 & -b_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$a_1 = \sigma_3 \mu_1, \quad a_2 = \sigma_1 \mu_2, \quad a_3 = \sigma_2 \mu_3,$$

$$b_1 = \sigma_2 \mu_1, \quad b_2 = \sigma_3 \mu_2, \quad b_3 = \sigma_1 \mu_3.$$

We see that $R_0 \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1^{-1} \\ \mu_2^{-1} \\ \mu_3^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = 0$ reflecting the fact that $d_\phi(e^{-\phi/h}) = 0$. This implies that $\det R_0 = 0$. We have

$$R_0^* R_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -b_1 & a_1 \\ a_2 & 0 & -b_2 \\ -b_3 & a_3 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_2 & -b_3 \\ -b_1 & 0 & a_3 \\ a_1 & -b_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1^2 + b_1^2 & -a_1 b_2 & -b_1 a_3 \\ -b_2 a_1 & a_2^2 + b_2^2 & -a_2 b_3 \\ -a_3 b_1 & -b_3 a_2 & a_3^2 + b_3^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\det(R_0^* R_0) = 0$ we get that for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\lambda - R_0^* R_0) &= \lambda^3 - (a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 + b_1^2 + b_2^2 + b_3^2) \lambda^2 \\ &\quad + \underbrace{[(a_2^2 a_3^2 + b_2^2 b_3^2 + b_2^2 a_3^2) + (a_3^2 a_1^2 + b_3^2 b_1^2 + b_3^2 a_1^2) + (a_1^2 a_2^2 + b_1^2 b_2^2 + b_1^2 a_2^2)]}_{\stackrel{\text{def}}{D}} \lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{7.17}$$

To shorten the notation we let $\alpha_j = a_j^2$, $\beta_j = b_j^2$ and $\gamma_j = \alpha_j + \beta_j$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. Then one of the eigenvalues of $R_0^*R_0$ is 0 and the other two are positive and given by

$$\lambda_{\pm} = \frac{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3}{2} \pm \left(\left(\frac{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3}{2} \right)^2 - D \right)^{1/2}.$$

Notice that we already know that the eigenvalues are real nonnegative thanks to Section 3.2. In particular we have

$$0 < D \leq \left(\frac{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3}{2} \right)^2. \quad (7.18)$$

We can localize the eigenvalues a little more: we get for example that

$$0 < \lambda_- \leq \frac{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3}{2} \leq \lambda_+ < \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3$$

and also from the fact that $\lambda_+\lambda_- = D$, we get

$$\frac{D}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3} < \lambda_- \leq \frac{2D}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3}.$$

Now we can study the case when (7.16) occurs, as illustrated by Figure 4. This case is included in the general situation and no longer in the generic one, since in particular 3 critical connected components appear when we are at the critical level (see Figure 4). If we assume in addition that $b_1 = b_2 = b_3$ and $a_1 = a_2 = a_3$, which corresponds roughly to the rotation invariant case, then we get $\alpha_j = \beta_j =: \alpha$, $\gamma_j = 2\alpha$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$, and $D = 9\alpha^2 = \left(\frac{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3}{2} \right)^2$, so that the eigenvalues λ_+ and λ_- of R_0 are equal.

$$\lambda_+ = \lambda_- = 3\alpha \approx he^{-2(\phi(s) - \phi(m))/h},$$

where s (respectively m) is any of the saddle points (respectively minima).

Remark 7.4. The right-hand side inequality in (7.18) also reads

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3)^2 - 4D \\ &= (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3)^2 \\ &\quad - 4(\alpha_2\alpha_3 + \beta_2\beta_3 + \beta_2\alpha_3) - 4(\alpha_3\alpha_1 + \beta_3\beta_1 + \beta_3\alpha_1) - 4(\alpha_1\alpha_2 + \beta_1\beta_2 + \beta_1\alpha_2) \\ &= (\alpha_1 - \beta_3)^2 + (\alpha_2 - \beta_1)^2 + (\alpha_3 - \beta_2)^2 \\ &\quad - 2(\alpha_1 - \beta_3)(\alpha_2 - \beta_1) - 2(\alpha_1 - \beta_3)(\alpha_3 - \beta_2) - 2(\alpha_2 - \beta_1)(\alpha_3 - \beta_2) \end{aligned}$$

Let us denote by \mathcal{D} this last expression. From the general study we know that 0 is an eigenvalue and this implies

$$\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3 = \beta_1\beta_2\beta_3 \quad (7.19)$$

since $\alpha_j = a_j^2$, $\beta_j = b_j^2$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\lambda - R_0^*R_0) &= \lambda^3 - (a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 + b_1^2 + b_2^2 + b_3^2)\lambda^2 \\ &\quad + [(a_2^2a_3^2 + b_2^2b_3^2 + b_2^2a_3^2) + (a_3^2a_1^2 + b_3^2b_1^2 + b_3^2a_1^2) + (a_1^2a_2^2 + b_1^2b_2^2 + b_1^2a_2^2)]\lambda \\ &\quad - (a_1a_2a_3 - b_1b_2b_3)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (7.20)$$

Just notice that without the assumption (7.19), \mathcal{D} may be negative: this can happen for example if we suppose $\alpha_1 - \beta_3 = \alpha_2 - \beta_1 = \alpha_3 - \beta_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta > 0$ since we get then

$$\mathcal{D} = -3\delta^2 < 0.$$

Note that in this case $\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3 > \beta_1\beta_2\beta_3$ by direct computation so that of course (7.19) is not satisfied.

References

- [1] J.M. Bismut, *The hypoelliptic Laplacian on the cotangent bundle*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 18(2005), 379-476.
- [2] L. Boutet de Monvel, *Hypoelliptic operators with double characteristics and related pseudo-differential operators*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 27 (1974), 585–639.
- [3] A. Bovier, M. Eckhoff, V. Gayrard, M. Klein, *Metastability in reversible diffusion processes. I. Sharp asymptotics for capacities and exit times*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 6(4)(2004), 399–424.
- [4] A. Bovier, V. Gayrard, M. Klein, *Metastability in reversible diffusion processes. II. Precise asymptotics for small eigenvalues*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 7(1)(2005), 69–99.
- [5] S. Graffi, E. Calicetti, J.Sjöstrand, *Spectra of PT-symmetric operators and perturbation theory*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 38(1)(2005), 185-193.
PT symmetric non-selfadjoint operators, diagonalizable and non-diagonalizable, with real discrete spectrum, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 40(33)(2007), 10155-10170.
- [6] B. Helffer, M. Klein, F. Nier, *Quantitative analysis of metastability in reversible diffusion processes via a Witten complex approach*, Mat. Contemp. 26 (2004), 41–85.
- [7] B. Helffer, F. Nier, *Hypoelliptic estimates and spectral theory for Fokker-Planck operators and Witten Laplacians*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1862. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.
- [8] B. Helffer, J. Sjöstrand, *Puits multiples en mécanique semi-classique IV, étude du complexe de Witten*, Comm. PDE 10(3)(1985), 245–340.
- [9] F. Hérau, F. Nier, *Isotropic hypoellipticity and trend to equilibrium for the Fokker-Planck equation with a high-degree potential*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 171 (2004), no. 2, 151–218.
- [10] F. Hérau, J. Sjöstrand, C. Stolk, *Semiclassical analysis for the Kramers-Fokker-Planck equation*, Comm. PDE 30(5–6)(2005), 689–760.

- [11] F. Hérau, M. Hitrik, J. Sjöstrand, *Tunnel effect for Fokker-Planck type operators*, Annales Henri Poincaré, 9(2)(2008), 209–274.
- [12] F. Hérau, M. Hitrik, J. Sjöstrand, *Tunnel effect for Kramers-Fokker-Planck type operators: return to equilibrium and applications*, International Math Res Notices, Vol. 2008, Article ID rnn057, 48p.
- [13] G. Lebeau, *Le bismutien*, Sémin. é.d.p., École Pol. 2004–05, I.1–15.
- [14] D. Le Peutrec, *Small singular values of an extracted matrix of a Witten complex*, Cubo 11(4)(2009), 49–57.
- [15] F. Nier, *Quantitative analysis of metastability in reversible diffusion processes via a Witten complex approach*, Journées “Équations aux Dérivées Partielles”, Exp. No. VIII, 17 pp., École Polytech., Palaiseau, 2004.
- [16] J. Tailleur, S. Tanase-Nicola, J. Kurchan, *Kramers equation and supersymmetry*, J. Stat. Phys. 122(4)(2006), 557–595.