

SCATTERING THEORY FOR SOME NON-SELF-ADJOINT OPERATORS

NICOLAS FRANTZ

ABSTRACT. We consider a non-self-adjoint H given as the perturbation of a self-adjoint operator H_0 . We suppose that H is of the form $H = H_0 + CWC$ where C is a bounded, positive definite and relatively compact with respect to H_0 , and W is bounded. We suppose that $C(H_0 - z)^{-1}C$ is uniformly bounded in $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. We define the regularized wave operators associated to H and H_0 by $W_{\pm}(H, H_0) := \text{s-}\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\pm itH} r_{\mp}(H) \Pi_{\text{p}}(H^*)^{\perp} e^{\mp itH_0}$ where $\Pi_{\text{p}}(H^*)$ is the projection onto the direct sum of all the generalized eigenspace associated to eigenvalue of H^* and r_{\mp} is a rational function that regularizes the ‘incoming/outgoing spectral singularities’ of H . We prove the existence and study the properties of the regularized wave operators. In particular we show that they are asymptotically complete if H does not have any spectral singularity.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Abstract setting	3
2.1. The model	3
2.2. Spectral subspaces, spectral projection	4
3. Assumptions and main results	6
3.1. Hypotheses	6
3.2. Main results	9
3.3. Applications to Schrödinger operators	10
3.4. Organization of the paper and main ingredients	11
4. The Wave operators	12
4.1. Preliminary results	12
4.2. The regularized wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ and $W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0)$	13
4.3. The regularized wave operators $W_{\pm}(H_0, H)$ and $W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*)$	20
4.4. The local regularized wave operators	22
5. Asymptotic completeness	28
5.1. Asymptotic completeness and spectral singularities	28
5.2. Completeness of the local wave operators	29
5.3. Remarks on the notion of asymptotic completeness	30
Appendix A. Proofs of Propositions 4.1 and 4.7	31
References	32

1. INTRODUCTION

We are interested in this paper in the scattering theory for non-self-adjoint operators. Non-self-adjoint ‘Hamiltonians’ in Quantum Mechanics are particularly relevant in various context, see e.g. [3, 27] and references therein for a detailed exposition.

In particular, non-conservative phenomena may be described by effective or phenomenological non-self-adjoint operators. A famous model involving non-self-adjoint operators is the *nuclear optical model* describing the interaction of a neutron (or a proton) and a nucleus in Nuclear Physics. It was introduced by Feshbach, Porter and Weisskopf in [14] as an empirical model taking into account the formation of a compound nucleus. In this model, if the neutron is initially (at time $t = 0$) in the normalized state φ_0 , then it evolves into the unnormalized state $\varphi_t = e^{-itH}\varphi_0$ at time t , where φ_t is the solution to the Schrödinger equation

$$i\partial_t\varphi_t = H\varphi_t. \quad (1.1)$$

Here $H = -\Delta + V(x)$ is a dissipative operator acting on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C})$, with $\text{Im}(V(x)) \leq 0$. Part of the energy of the neutron may be transferred to the nucleus, eventually leading to the capture of the neutron by the nucleus. The transfer of energy is mathematically illustrated by the dissipative nature of the ‘Hamiltonian’ H . In particular, given a normalized state φ_0 , the probability that the neutron escapes from the nucleus is given by

$$\rho_{\text{scatt}}(\varphi_0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{-itH}\varphi_0\|_{L^2}^2.$$

and $\rho_{\text{abs}}(\varphi_0)$, the probability of absorption of the neutron by the nucleus, is given by

$$\rho_{\text{abs}}(\varphi_0) = 1 - \rho_{\text{scatt}}(\varphi_0).$$

If the neutron is initially in a state whose probability of scattering is not zero, then it is expected that there exists a scattering state $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C})} = \rho_{\text{scatt}}(\varphi_0)$ and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{-itH}\varphi_0 - e^{-itH_0}\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C})} = 0.$$

This motivates the development of a scattering theory for non-self-adjoint operators. The nuclear optical model leads to predictions that correspond to experimental scattering data to a high precision. Theoretical justifications of the model have been given in [15, 16, 17] (see also [3, 18, 23]). We mention the works [12, 11, 10] for an abstract dissipative scattering theory and [30, 33] for dissipative Schrödinger operators. Moreover, scattering theory for non-self-adjoint operators on Hilbert spaces has been considered in other contexts, see for example [24] for the construction of local wave operators assuming that a limiting absorption principle holds, [34] for one-dimensional Schrödinger operators with a complex potential on the half-line, [35] for an abstract framework on scattering theory for non-self-adjoint operators under an assumption of Kato’s smoothness of the perturbation, and [25] in the case where the perturbation is not too large in Kato’s sense.

We consider here an abstract class of operators of the form $H = H_0 + V$ acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , where H_0 is self-adjoint with absolutely continuous spectrum and V is a bounded operator relatively compact with respect to H_0 . In particular, the essential spectrum of H and that of H_0 coincide. We suppose that V decomposes into the form $V = CWC$, with W bounded and C a bounded operator such that

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}} \|C(H_0 - z)^{-1}C\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty. \quad (1.2)$$

Such factorizations go back to the seminal work of Kato [25].

We aim at constructing and studying the wave operators associated to H and H_0 . As H is a perturbation of a self-adjoint operator by a bounded operator, $-iH$ is the generator of a strongly continuous group of evolution. We suppose in addition that H (and hence H^*) has a finite number

of eigenvalues with finite algebraic multiplicities. We can then define the *regularized wave operators* associated to H and H_0 by

$$W_{\pm}(H, H_0) = \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH} \Pi_p(H^*)^{\perp} r_{\mp}(H) e^{-itH_0}. \quad (1.3)$$

Here $\Pi_p(H^*)^{\perp}$ is the projection onto the orthogonal of the point spectral subspace of H^* , and $r_{\mp}(H)$ are rational functions of H regularizing the incoming/outgoing spectral singularities of H . See below for precise definitions. In our context, spectral singularities are defined as points of the essential spectrum of H where H does not satisfy a suitable limiting absorption principle (see Definition 3.1 below). For Schrödinger operators with a bounded, compactly supported potential, spectral singularities correspond to real resonances (see e.g. [8, chapter 3] for a definition of resonances and [12, section 5] for a discussion on spectral singularities and real resonances).

We are not aware of such a definition of regularized wave operators previously in the literature, even in context of Schrödinger operators. In this paper, we prove that, under suitable assumptions, the regularized wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ exist, are injective, and such that their ranges are dense in $\text{Ran}(\Pi_p(H^*)^{\perp})$. (We will recall from [13] that $\text{Ran}(\Pi_p(H^*)^{\perp})$ coincide with the ‘absolutely spectral subspace’ of H , see Subsection 3.4 for the definition of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$). These properties therefore extend the corresponding well-known properties that hold for wave operators in unitary scattering theory, which supports our definition of $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$.

Finally we show that if H has no spectral singularity, then wave operators are *asymptotically complete*, in the sense that they define bijections from \mathcal{H} to $\text{Ran}(\Pi_p(H^*)^{\perp})$. A consequence of Asymptotic Completeness is that the solutions of the Schrödinger equation (1.1) with initial conditions in $\text{Ran}(\Pi_p(H^*)^{\perp})$ are uniformly bounded in time.

Notation. In the following, if \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 are two Hilbert spaces, $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$ stands for the set of continuous linear operators from \mathcal{H}_1 to \mathcal{H}_2 . If $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_2$, we simplify the notation by setting $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_1)$. We let $\mathcal{R}_B(z) := (B - z)^{-1}$ the resolvent of an operator B . For H_0 , we denote $\mathcal{R}_0(z)$ its resolvent. Moreover $D(\lambda, \varepsilon)$ is the open disk centered at λ with radius ε and $\mathbb{C}^{\pm} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}, \pm \text{Im}(z) > 0\}$. Finally, the set of all integers between 1 and n is denoted $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ and A^{cl} is the closure of the set A .

2. ABSTRACT SETTING

2.1. The model. Consider $(\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}})$ a complex separable Hilbert space and an operator on \mathcal{H} of the form

$$H := H_0 + V, \quad (2.1)$$

where H_0 is self-adjoint and semi-bounded from below and $V \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a bounded operator. In particular, H is a closed operator with domain $\mathcal{D}(H) = \mathcal{D}(H_0)$ and its adjoint is given by

$$H^* = H_0 + V^*, \quad \mathcal{D}(H^*) = \mathcal{D}(H_0).$$

Without loss of generality, we suppose that $H_0 \geq 0$.

As H is a perturbation of the self-adjoint operator H_0 by the bounded operator V , $-iH$ generates a strongly continuous one-parameter group $\{e^{-itH}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ which satisfies

$$\|e^{-itH}\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \leq e^{|t|\|V\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})}}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

(see e.g [7] or [9]).

We assume that there exists an operator $C \in \mathcal{B}(H)$, relatively compact with respect to H_0 , such that V is of the form

$$V = CWC, \quad (2.2)$$




FIGURE 1. **Spectrum of H .** The essential spectrum of H , contained in $[0, \infty)$, is represented by thick lines and coincides with that of H_0 . The eigenvalues of H are represented by crosses. The discrete spectrum of H consists of isolated eigenvalues of finite algebraic multiplicities which may accumulate at any point of the essential spectrum. The point spectrum of H may also contain eigenvalues embedded in the essential spectrum.

with $W \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Finally, we require that C be a *metric operator*, which means that C is a positive and injective (see e.g. [2]).

2.2. Spectral subspaces, spectral projection. We let $\sigma(H)$ be the spectrum of H and $\rho(H) = \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(H)$ its resolvent set. We define the point spectrum of H as the set of all eigenvalues of H ,

$$\sigma_p(H) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}, \text{Ker}(H - \lambda) \neq \{0\}\}.$$

For each eigenvalue λ , we define its algebraic multiplicity $m_\lambda(H)$ as the dimension of the generalized eigenspace associated to λ

$$m_\lambda(H) := \dim \left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{Ker} \left((H - \lambda)^k \right) \right).$$

If λ is an isolated eigenvalue of H , we denote by

$$\Pi_\lambda(H) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma (z \text{Id} - H)^{-1} dz, \quad (2.3)$$

the usual Riesz projection, where γ is a circle oriented counterclockwise and centered at λ , of sufficiently small radius (so that λ is the only point of the spectrum of H contained in the interior of γ) is finite dimensional. The discrete spectrum of H , $\sigma_{\text{disc}}(H)$, is the set of all isolated eigenvalues λ such that the range of the associated Riesz projection is finite dimensional.

As V is a relatively compact perturbation of H_0 , the essential spectrum $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H) := \sigma(H) \setminus \sigma_{\text{disc}}(H)$ and the essential spectrum of H_0 coincide. Moreover, the discrete spectrum $\sigma_{\text{disc}}(H)$ is at most countable and can only accumulate at points of $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$. See Figure 1. We define in addition the set of eigenvalues embedded in the essential spectrum of H :

$$\sigma_{\text{emb}}(H) := \sigma_p(H) \cap \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H).$$

2.2.1. *Eigenspaces corresponding to isolated eigenvalues.* For $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{disc}}(H)$, since the restriction of H to $\text{Ran}(\Pi_\lambda(H))$ may have a nontrivial Jordan form, $\text{Ran}(\Pi_\lambda(H))$ is in general spanned by generalized eigenvectors of H associated to λ , i.e., by vectors $u \in \mathcal{D}(H^k)$ such that $(H - \lambda)^k u = 0$ for some $1 \leq k \leq m_\lambda(H)$. Moreover the dimension of the range of $\Pi_\lambda(H)$ satisfies $\dim \text{Ran}(\Pi_\lambda(H)) = m_\lambda(H)$. We set

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{disc}}(H) := \text{Span} \{u \in \text{Ran}(\Pi_\lambda(H)), \lambda \in \sigma_{\text{disc}}(H)\}^{\text{cl}},$$

where A^{cl} stands for the closure of a subset $A \subset \mathcal{H}$. We will sometimes assume that the discrete spectrum of H is finite. The spectral projection $\Pi_{\text{disc}}(H)$ onto $\mathcal{H}_{\text{disc}}(H)$ is then defined by

$$\Pi_{\text{disc}}(H) := \sum_{\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{disc}}(H)} \Pi_\lambda(H). \quad (2.4)$$

2.2.2. *Eigenspaces corresponding to embedded eigenvalues.* If λ is an eigenvalue of H embedded in its essential spectrum then the Riesz projection corresponding to λ is ill-defined. Under some additional conditions, however, one can define the spectral projection $\Pi_\lambda(H)$ as follows.

In the following (see Hypothesis 4 below), we will suppose the existence of a *antiunitary operator* $J \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ verifying

$$J\mathcal{D}(H_0) \subset \mathcal{D}(H_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{D}(H_0), \quad JHu = H^*Ju. \quad (2.5)$$

In particular, J establishes a one-to-one correspondence between $\text{Ker}((H - \lambda)^k)$ and $\text{Ker}((H^* - \bar{\lambda})^k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and hence

$$m_\lambda(H) = m_{\bar{\lambda}}(H^*).$$

To shorten notation, let $m_\lambda = m_\lambda(H) = m_{\bar{\lambda}}(H^*)$. In order to define projections onto the generalized eigenspace associated to embedded eigenvalues, we will suppose that for each embedded eigenvalue $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$, m_λ is finite and the symmetric bilinear form

$$\text{Ker}((H - \lambda)^{m_\lambda}) \times \text{Ker}((H - \lambda)^{m_\lambda}) \ni (u, v) \mapsto \langle Ju, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \text{is non-degenerate.} \quad (2.6)$$

This implies that there exists a basis $(\varphi_k)_{1 \leq k \leq m_\lambda}$ of $\text{Ker}((H - \lambda)^{m_\lambda})$ such that

$$\langle J\varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \delta_{ij}, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq m_\lambda.$$

Thus we can define the spectral projection $\Pi_\lambda(H)$ onto the generalized eigenspace corresponding to λ as

$$\Pi_\lambda(H)u = \sum_{k=1}^{m_\lambda} \langle J\varphi_k, u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \varphi_k, \quad u \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (2.7)$$

It is not difficult to observe that $\Pi_\lambda(H)$ is a projection commuting with H , such that $\Pi_\lambda(H) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\Pi_\lambda(H)^* = \Pi_\lambda(H^*)$. For more detail about this projection, see [13].

2.2.3. *Projection onto the point spectrum.* In the following we will suppose that H has a finite number of eigenvalues with finite algebraic multiplicities, see Hypothesis 2. Thus the sum of all the projections associated to generalized eigenspaces of H , defined by

$$\Pi_{\text{p}}(H) := \sum_{\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{p}}(H)} \Pi_\lambda(H)$$

is well-defined. Next we define the point spectral subspace of H as the range of $\Pi_{\text{p}}(H)$,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}(H) := \text{Ran}(\Pi_{\text{p}}(H)).$$

Finally, we observe that

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}(H) = \sum_{\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{p}}(H)} \text{Ker}(H - \lambda)^{m_\lambda}.$$

3. ASSUMPTIONS AND MAIN RESULTS

3.1. Hypotheses. In this section we detail our main abstract assumptions. In Section 3.3 we will show that they are satisfied in the case of complex Schrödinger operators, with compactly supported potentials.

In our first hypothesis, we require that, at any point of its essential spectrum, H_0 satisfies a *limiting absorption principle* with weight C .

Hypothesis 1 (Limiting absorption principle for H_0). *We have*

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}^\pm} \|C\mathcal{R}_0(z)C\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty. \quad (3.1)$$

Note that (3.1) implies (see e.g. [5, Proposition 4.1]) that the spectrum of H_0 is purely absolutely continuous, i.e. that $\sigma_{\text{pp}}(H_0) = \emptyset$, $\sigma_{\text{ac}}(H_0) = \sigma(H_0)$, $\sigma_{\text{sc}}(H_0) = \emptyset$, where $\sigma_{\text{pp}}(H_0)$, $\sigma_{\text{ac}}(H_0)$, $\sigma_{\text{sc}}(H_0)$ stand for the usual pure point, absolutely continuous and singular continuous spectra of the self-adjoint operator H_0 .

Moreover, by Fatou's Theorem (see [32]), (3.1) implies that the limits $C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)C$ exist for almost every $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$, in the norm topology of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, and that the map $\mathbb{R} \ni \lambda \mapsto C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is bounded (observe that $C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)C = C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda)C$ if $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$).

Note also that Hypothesis 1 implies (see [25] or [31, Theorem XIII.25 and its corollary]) that C is *relatively smooth* with respect to H_0 in the sense of Kato, i.e. that there exists a constant c_0 such that

$$\forall u \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|Ce^{-itH_0}u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt \leq c_0^2 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \quad (3.2)$$

Recall that (3.2) is equivalent to

$$\forall u \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\|C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda - i0^+)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \|C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda + i0^+)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right) d\lambda \leq 2\pi c_0^2 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\lambda \mapsto C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)u$ denotes the limit of $\lambda \mapsto C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)u$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathcal{H})$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$.

Next we assume that the point spectral subspace of H is finite.

Hypothesis 2 (Eigenvalues of H). *H has only a finite number of eigenvalues with finite algebraic multiplicities.*

Hypothesis 2 prevents the essential spectrum of H from having an accumulation point of eigenvalues. It does not exclude, however, the presence of eigenvalues embedded in the essential spectrum of H .

Our next hypothesis concerns the spectral singularities of H . First we recall the definition of a regular spectral point. Note that this one is independent of the previous assumption.

Definition 3.1 (Regular spectral point and spectral singularity).

(1) Let $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$.

(i) We say that λ is an *outgoing/incoming regular spectral point* of H if λ is not an accumulation point of eigenvalues located in $\lambda \pm i(0, \infty)$ and if the limit

$$C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda \pm i0^+)CW := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)CW \quad (3.4)$$

exists in the norm topology of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. If λ is not an outgoing/incoming regular spectral point, we say that λ is an *outgoing/incoming spectral singularity* of H .

(ii) We say that λ is a *regular spectral point* of H if λ is both an outgoing and an incoming regular spectral point of H . If λ is not a regular spectral point, we say that λ is a *spectral singularity* of H .

- (2) We say that infinity is an outgoing/incoming regular spectral point of H if there exists $m > 0$ such that for all $\lambda > m$, λ is an outgoing/incoming regular spectral point and such that the map

$$[m, \infty) \ni \lambda \mapsto C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda \pm i0^+)CW \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$$

is bounded. If infinity is not outgoing/incoming regular spectral point of H , we say that H has an outgoing/incoming spectral singularity at infinity.

Next, we introduce the notion of *order* of a spectral singularity.

Definition 3.2 (Order of a spectral singularity).

- (1) Let $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ be an outgoing/incoming spectral singularity of H . We say that λ is a spectral singularity of finite order if there exist an integer n and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{z \in D(\lambda, \varepsilon) \cap \mathbb{C}^\pm} |\lambda - z|^n \|C\mathcal{R}_H(z)CW\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty. \quad (3.5)$$

Otherwise we say that λ is an outgoing/incoming spectral singularity of infinite order. If λ is an outgoing/incoming spectral singularity of finite order we define its order as the smallest integer satisfying (3.5).

- (2) If H has an outgoing/incoming spectral singularity at infinity, we say that infinity is an outgoing/incoming spectral singularity of finite order if there exists an integer n , $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $m > 0$ and $z_0 \in \rho(H) \setminus \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$\sup_{\substack{\text{Re}(z) > m \\ \pm \text{Im}(z) < \varepsilon_0}} |z - z_0|^{-n} \|C\mathcal{R}_H(z)CW\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty. \quad (3.6)$$

Otherwise we say that infinity is an outgoing/incoming spectral singularity of infinite order. If infinity is an outgoing/incoming spectral singularity of finite order we define its order as the smallest integer satisfying (3.6).

Remark that λ is a spectral singularity of finite order means that, in a neighborhood of λ , the map $z \mapsto C\mathcal{R}_H(z)CW$ blows up at most polynomially as z approaches λ . Moreover if the map $z \mapsto C\mathcal{R}_H(z)CW$ has a meromorphic continuation across $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$, then the spectral singularities of H correspond to poles of the meromorphic continuation of the weighted resolvent of H , and the order of the spectral singularity correspond to the order of the pole. This is in particular the case for Schrödinger operators (see 3.3).

In the following, we assume that H has a finite number of spectral singularities and that each spectral singularity has a finite order.

Hypothesis 3 (Spectral singularities for H). H only has a finite number of outgoing/incoming spectral singularities in $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H) \cup \{\infty\}$ and each spectral singularity has a finite order. Moreover, for all closed interval $I \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ not containing any spectral singularity, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\substack{\text{Re}(z) \in I \\ \pm \text{Im}(z) \in (0, \varepsilon_0)}} \|C\mathcal{R}_H(z)CW\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty.$$

This hypothesis has the following consequence. Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ be the spectral singularities of H belonging to $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$, of order $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n < \infty$, respectively, and let ν_∞ be the order of ∞ in the case where ∞ is a spectral singularity (otherwise, we use the convention that $\nu_\infty = 0$). Then there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\substack{\text{Re}(z) \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H) \\ \pm \text{Im}(z) \in (0, \varepsilon_0)}} \frac{1}{|z - z_0|^{\nu_\infty}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n \frac{|z - \lambda_j|^{\nu_j}}{|z - z_0|^{\nu_j}} \right) \|C\mathcal{R}_H(z)CW\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty, \quad (3.7)$$

where z_0 is an arbitrary complex number such that $z_0 \in \rho(H)$, $z_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. Note that the factors $|z - \lambda_j|^{\nu_j}$ ‘regularize’ the singularities of $z \mapsto C\mathcal{R}_H(z)CW$ as z approaches λ_j . Dividing them by $|z - z_0|^{\nu_j}$ produces bounded terms. The factor $|z - z_0|^{-\nu_\infty}$ regularizes a possible singularity at ∞ .

Observe that since $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ are the only spectral singularities of H , for all $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H) \setminus \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$, the limits $C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda \pm i0^+)CW$ exist in the norm topology of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. The condition (3.7) then implies that the maps

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H) \setminus \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\} \ni \lambda \mapsto \frac{1}{|\lambda - z_0|^{\nu_\infty}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n \frac{|\lambda - \lambda_j|^{\nu_j}}{|\lambda - z_0|^{\nu_j}} \right) C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda \pm i0^+)CW \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \quad (3.8)$$

are bounded. Since embedded eigenvalues are outgoing and incoming spectral singularities (see [13]), Hypothesis 3 also concern possible embedded eigenvalues. In the following we will denote by r_j the function that regularizes the spectral singularity λ_j , i.e.

$$r_j(z) := \frac{(z - \lambda_j)^{\nu_j}}{(z - z_0)^{\nu_j}}. \quad (3.9)$$

In the same way, r_∞ stands for the function that regularizes the spectral singularity at ∞ , i.e.

$$r_\infty(z) := (z - z_0)^{-\nu_\infty}. \quad (3.10)$$

Moreover we let r_+ be the product of all the functions r_j where λ_j is an outgoing spectral singularity, and r_- be the product of all the functions r_j where λ_j is an incoming spectral singularity.

We also mention the following ‘local version’ of (3.7) which will be useful in the sequel. Obviously, since H has a finite number n of spectral singularities, it also has a finite number of outgoing and incoming spectral singularities. Let J_1, \dots, J_n be compact intervals and J_∞ be an interval such that i) for each $j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$, the interior J_j^{int} of J_j contains the outgoing/incoming spectral singularity λ_j and no other outgoing/incoming spectral singularity, ii) $J_1^{\text{int}}, \dots, J_n^{\text{int}}, J_\infty^{\text{int}}$ are disjoint, and iii) $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H) = \bigcup_{j=1}^n J_j \cup J_\infty$. As, for $j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \cup \{\infty\}$, r_k is invertible in J_j for all $k \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \cup \{\infty\} \setminus \{j\}$, we deduce from (3.7) the following local limiting absorption principle:

$$\sup_{\substack{\text{Re}(z) \in J_j \\ \pm \text{Im}(z) \in (0, \varepsilon_0)}} |r_j(z)| \|C\mathcal{R}_H(z)CW\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty.$$

Finally, in order to define the spectral projections onto the generalized eigenspaces associated to embedded eigenvalues, we require the existence of a conjugation operator J satisfying, in particular, $JH = H^*J$.

Hypothesis 4 (Conjugation operator and embedded eigenvalues). *There exists an antiunitary operator $J : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that*

- (i) $J\mathcal{D}(H_0) \subset \mathcal{D}(H_0)$ and $\forall u \in \mathcal{D}(H_0)$, $JH_0u = H_0Ju$.
- (ii) $JC = CJ$ and $JW = W^*J$.

Moreover, for all embedded eigenvalues $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$, the symmetric bilinear form

$$\text{Ker}((H - \lambda)^{m_\lambda}) \times \text{Ker}((H - \lambda)^{m_\lambda}) \ni (u, v) \mapsto \langle Ju, v \rangle \quad \text{is non-degenerate.} \quad (3.11)$$

This condition ensures that the spectral projections (2.7) onto the generalized eigenspaces associated to embedded eigenvalues are well-defined. See the discussion in [13, section 2.2.2] for more details.

3.2. Main results. In this section we state our main results. Recall from (1.3) that the wave operators associated to H and H_0 are defined by

$$W_{\pm}(H, H_0) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH} \Pi_p(H^*)^{\perp} r_{\mp}(H) e^{-itH_0}$$

We recall that $\Pi_p(H^*)$ is the sum of all the spectral projections onto the generalized eigenspaces associated to the eigenvalues of H^* (either isolated or embedded into the essential spectrum), and that $\Pi_p(H^*)$ is well-defined thanks to Hypotheses 2 and 4. The projection $\Pi_p(H^*)^{\perp} = \text{Id} - \Pi_p(H^*)$ is needed to project out the generalized eigenspace associated to H , and the ‘regularizing operator’ $r_{\mp}(H)$ is needed to regularize the incoming/outgoing spectral singularities of H . See section 4.2.1 for more details about the justification of this definition. In the same way as for (1.3), this ‘non-stationary’ definition of wave operators taking into account possible spectral singularities seem to be new. See however e.g. [25] for general definitions of non necessarily unitary wave operators, under assumptions ensuring the absence of spectral singularities.

Our first main result is the existence of the wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ as well as properties about their ranges and kernels.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Then the wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ exist. Moreover they are injective and their ranges are dense in $\mathcal{H}_p(H^*)^{\perp}$.*

Once the existence of the wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ is proven, it is not difficult to show that they satisfy the usual intertwining properties (see Proposition 4.7).

One of the ingredients to the properties of these operators is the studying of

$$W_{\pm}(H_0, H) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH_0} r_{\pm}(H) \Pi_p(H)^{\perp} e^{-itH}$$

in section 4.3. Because $\{e^{-itH_0}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is unitary, the existence of $W_{\pm}(H_0, H)$ implies that for all $u \in \text{Ran } W_{\pm}(H_0, H)$ there exists $v \in \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \left\| e^{-itH} \Pi_p(H^*)^{\perp} r_{\pm}(H) v - e^{-itH_0} u \right\| = 0. \quad (3.12)$$

And (3.12) leads to $u = W_{\pm}(H_0, H)v$ and

$$e^{-itH_0} u = \Pi_p(H^*)^{\perp} r_{\pm}(H) e^{-itH} v + o(1), \quad t \rightarrow \pm\infty.$$

Next we want to study the invertibility of the wave operator $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$. We say that $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ is asymptotically complete if its range is closed. In particular, if the wave operator $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ is asymptotically complete, then it is invertible in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_p(H^*)^{\perp})$. The next theorem give sufficient conditions for asymptotic completeness.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold and that H does not have any spectral singularity. Then the wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ are asymptotically complete.*

A similar result is proved in [12] for dissipative operators. In particular, the previous theorem implies that, if H does not have any spectral singularity, then H and H_0 are similar in the sense that

$$\forall u \in \mathcal{H}_p(H^*)^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{D}(H_0), \quad H_0 u = W_{\pm}(H, H_0)^{-1} H W_{\pm}(H, H_0) u.$$

Another consequence of Theorem 3.4 is the following result.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Suppose that H does not have any spectral singularities. Then there exist $m_1 > 0$, and $m_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{H}_p(H^*)^{\perp}, \quad m_1 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|e^{-itH} u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq m_2 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

The second inequality shows that solutions of the Schrödinger equation

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u_t = H u_t \\ u_0 \in \mathcal{H}_p(H^*)^\perp \end{cases}$$

cannot blow up as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$ and that the norm of u_t is controlled by the norm of the initial state u_0 . Related results have been established in [20] for non-self-adjoint Schrödinger operators and in [12] for abstract dissipative operators.

Finally, using the definition of spectral projection associated to H in an interval $I \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ without spectral singularities (see (3.16) below), we can define the local wave operators associated to H and H_0 on I by

$$W_\pm(H, H_0, I) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH} \mathbf{1}_I(H) e^{-itH_0}.$$

The next theorem then shows that $W_\pm(H, H_0, I)$ are asymptotically complete in the sense that the range of $W_\pm(H, H_0, I)$ is equal to the range of $\mathbf{1}_I(H)$.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-3 hold. Let $I \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ be a closed interval without any spectral singularity. Then $W_\pm(H, H_0, I)$ is invertible in $\mathcal{B}(\text{Ran}(\mathbf{1}_I(H_0)), \text{Ran}(\mathbf{1}_I(H)))$.*

Similar results have been obtained in [12] in abstract dissipative scattering theory, and in [24] for a class of non-self-adjoint Schrödinger operators.

3.3. Applications to Schrödinger operators. In this section we will show that our results apply to non-self-adjoint Schrödinger operators. We consider

$$\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}), \quad d \geq 3 \text{ odd}, \quad H_0 = -\Delta, \quad \mathcal{D}(H_0) = H^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}),$$

where $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C})$ is the usual Sobolev's space. It is well-known that $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H) = [0, \infty)$ and that

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}} \left\| \langle x \rangle^{-\delta} (-\Delta - z)^{-1} \langle x \rangle^{-\delta} \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty, \quad \delta > 1,$$

where $\langle x \rangle = (1 + x^2)^{1/2}$. Hence choosing $C(x) = \langle x \rangle^{-\delta}$ with $\delta > 1$, we see that Hypothesis 1 is satisfied.

We suppose that

$$V \in L_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}) = \{u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ compactly supported}\}. \quad (3.13)$$

It then follows from [19] that H has only a finite number of discrete eigenvalues with finite algebraic multiplicities. In particular, Hypothesis 2 is satisfied.

To verify that Hypothesis 3 holds, we rely on the theory of resonances. Resonances are defined as poles of the meromorphic extension of the weighted resolvent, see e.g [8]. More precisely, assuming (3.13), the map

$$\{z \in \mathbb{C}, \text{Im}(z) > 0\} \ni z \mapsto (H - z^2)^{-1} : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

is meromorphic and extends to a meromorphic map

$$\mathbb{C} \ni z \mapsto (H - z^2)^{-1} : L_c^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where $L_c^2(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), u \text{ is compactly supported}\}$ and $L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{u : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, u \in L^2(K) \text{ for all compact set } K \subset \mathbb{R}^d\}$. Poles of the extension of the resolvent of H are called resonances. To a real resonance $\pm\lambda_0$ with $\lambda_0 \geq 0$ corresponds an outgoing or/and an incoming spectral singularity λ_0^2 in the sense of Definition 3.1. The order of the pole of the resonance coincides with the order of the spectral singularity. Hence, if for example λ_0 is an outgoing spectral singularity,

there exists \mathcal{V}_{λ_0} a closed real neighborhood of λ_0 whose interior contains λ_0 and no other resonance, such that

$$\sup_{\substack{\text{Re}(z) \in \mathcal{V}_{\lambda_0} \\ \text{Im}(z) < \varepsilon_0}} |\lambda_0 - z|^{\nu_0} \|C\mathcal{R}_H(z)CW\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty$$

where ν_0 is the order of the pole of λ_0^2 and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ is small enough. Furthermore, under the assumption (3.13), H only has finitely many spectral singularities $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ of finite orders, and no spectral singularity at infinity. This shows that Hypothesis 3 is satisfied. We refer to [8] for more details about the theory of resonances and [12] for more details about the relation between resonances and spectral singularities.

Applying Theorems 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5, we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 3.7. *Suppose that $V \in L_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C})$ and that for each eigenvalue embedded in the essential spectrum of H , the symmetric bilinear form*

$$\text{Ker}((H - \lambda)^{m_\lambda}) \ni (u, v) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(x)v(x)dx \quad (3.14)$$

is non-degenerate. Then the wave operators $W_\pm(H, H_0)$ associated to $H = -\Delta + V$ and $H_0 = -\Delta$ exist, are injective and their ranges are dense in $\mathcal{H}_p(H)^\perp$.

Moreover if H does not have any real resonance, then $W_\pm(H, H_0)$ are asymptotically complete and there exist $m_1 > 0$ and $m_2 > 0$ such that, for all $u \in \mathcal{H}_p(H)^\perp$,

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad m_1 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|e^{itH}u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq m_2 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Note that if H has no embedded eigenvalue, then the condition (3.14) is not necessary. We mention that the condition (3.14) has been considered in [36] and [1], to study the long-time behavior of solutions to the Schrödinger equation with a complex potential.

Finally we apply Theorem 3.6.

Proposition 3.8. *Suppose that $V \in L_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C})$. Let $I \subset [0, \infty)$ be a closed interval without any resonance. Then the local wave operators $W_\pm(H, H_0, I)$ exist and are asymptotically complete.*

3.4. Organization of the paper and main ingredients. In this section we describe some of the main tools we will use in this paper.

To prove the existence of the wave operators $W_\pm(H, H_0)$, it is useful to characterize the spectral subspace $\mathcal{H}_p(H^*)^\perp$. We define the absolutely continuous spectral subspace of H , denoted $\mathcal{H}_{ac}(H)$, as the closure of $\mathcal{M}(H)$ in \mathcal{H} , where

$$\mathcal{M}(H) := \left\{ u \in \mathcal{H}, \forall v \in \mathcal{H}, \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\langle e^{itH}u, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}|^2 dt \leq c_u \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right\}. \quad (3.15)$$

It follows from [13] that, under our assumptions, $\mathcal{H}_{ac}(H)$ coincide with $\mathcal{H}_p(H^*)^\perp$. We will see that there exists $c > 0$ such that, for all $u \in \mathcal{H}_{ac}(H)$,

$$\int_0^\infty \|Cr_\pm(H)e^{\mp itH}u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt \leq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

The existence of the wave operators will then follows from this property, the equality $\mathcal{H}_{ac}(H) = \mathcal{H}_p(H^*)^\perp$ and Cook's method (see [31] or [38]).

The properties concerning the kernel and the range of the regularized wave operators mainly follow from the direct sum decomposition,

$$\mathcal{H}_{ac}(H) \oplus_J \mathcal{H}_p(H) = \mathcal{H},$$

proven in [13]. This is a generalization of the well-known spectral decomposition for self-adjoint operators without singular continuous spectrum. Here \oplus_J stand for the orthogonal direct sum for the bilinear form $\langle J, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$.

If $I \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ is a closed interval without any spectral singularity, we can define the spectral projection associated to H in I by setting

$$\mathbb{1}_I(H) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \text{w-lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_I (\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) - \mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)) d\lambda. \quad (3.16)$$

It follows from [13] that, under our assumptions, (3.16) exists and is a projection. Moreover (3.16) induces a bounded functional calculus in the sense that

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad e^{itH} \mathbb{1}_I(H) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \text{w-lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_I e^{it\lambda} (\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) - \mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)) d\lambda. \quad (3.17)$$

In particular, $\{e^{itH}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is uniformly bounded on the range of $\mathbb{1}_I(H)$. Such spectral projections for non self-adjoint operators have been considered by several authors, see [12] for dissipative operators, [21] and [22] for general non-self-adjoint operators, [24] for wave operators using a stationary approach and [29] and [28] for differential operators.

If $I \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ is a closed interval whose interior contains spectral singularities, then we define the ‘regularized spectral projection’ associated to H in I by setting

$$(h\mathbb{1}_I)(H) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \text{w-lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_I (h(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) - h(\lambda - i\varepsilon)\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)) d\lambda. \quad (3.18)$$

where h is a function that regularizes the singularity of the resolvent at the spectral singularity. More precisely, assuming in particular Hypothesis 3, h is chosen as

$$h(z) := \prod_{j \in \mathcal{S}_I} r_j(z), \quad \mathcal{S}_I := \{j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \cup \{\infty\}, \lambda_j \in I \text{ is a spectral singularity}\}, \quad (3.19)$$

where r_j are defined in (3.9)–(3.10). Similarly as above, under our assumptions, (3.18) exists and defines a Borel functional calculus in the sense that

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad e^{itH} (h\mathbb{1}_I)(H) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \text{w-lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_I e^{it\lambda} (h(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) - h(\lambda - i\varepsilon)\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)) d\lambda. \quad (3.20)$$

See [13]. In particular, $\{e^{itH}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is uniformly bounded on the range of $(h\mathbb{1}_I)(H)$.

Finally, we will use the following identity (proven in [13]) which generalizes the well-known resolution of identity for self-adjoint operators to our context:

$$r(H) = r(H)\Pi_{\text{disc}}(H) + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \text{w-lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)} (r(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) - r(\lambda - i\varepsilon)\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)) d\lambda, \quad (3.21)$$

where r is the regularizing function of Hypothesis 3.

4. THE WAVE OPERATORS

4.1. Preliminary results. We begin with preliminary results that will allow us to prove the existence and study the wave operators in the sequel.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that Hypothesis 1 holds. Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be such that there exists $c > 0$ satisfying*

$$\forall u \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \int_0^\infty \|Ce^{\pm itH^*} A^* u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt \leq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

Then the strong limits

$$\text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} A e^{itH} e^{-itH_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} A^* e^{itH_0} e^{-itH^*}$$

exist.

We can state a second version of the last proposition.

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose that Hypothesis 1 holds. Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be such that there exists $c > 0$ satisfying*

$$\forall u \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \int_0^\infty \|C e^{\pm itH} A u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt \leq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

Then the strong limits

$$\text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH_0} e^{-itH} A \quad \text{and} \quad \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} A e^{itH^*} e^{-itH_0}$$

exist.

The proofs of Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 are standard and based on Cook's method (see e.g. [31] or [38]). For the convenience of the reader, we give a proof of Proposition 4.1 in Appendix A.

4.2. The regularized wave operators $W_\pm(H, H_0)$ and $W_\pm(H^*, H_0)$. We recall the following definition. Note that $\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)$ is the projection onto the absolutely continuous spectral subspace of H defined in section 3.4.

Definition 4.3. *The regularized wave operators associated to H and H_0 (respectively to H^* and H_0) are defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} W_\pm(H, H_0) &:= \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) r_{\mp}(H) e^{-itH_0}, \\ W_\pm(H^*, H_0) &:= \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH^*} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) \bar{r}_{\mp}(H^*) e^{-itH_0}. \end{aligned}$$

In this section we prove the existence and study the properties of these wave operators. However, since Definition 4.3 is not standard, we begin with a few remarks justifying it.

4.2.1. Remarks on Definition 4.3 of the regularized wave operators. To fix the ideas, we consider here the wave operator $W_-(H, H_0)$. In the usual setting, when H and H_0 are self-adjoint operators acting on the same Hilbert space and when H_0 has purely absolutely continuous spectrum, the common definition of the wave operators $W_-(H, H_0)$ is

$$W_-(H, H_0) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow -\infty} e^{itH} e^{-itH_0}. \quad (4.1)$$

Assuming for simplicity that H has finitely many eigenvalues with finite multiplicities and no singular continuous spectrum, we can write, for all $t \geq 0$ and $u \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$e^{itH} e^{-itH_0} u = e^{itH} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) e^{-itH_0} u + e^{itH} \Pi_{\text{p}}(H) e^{-itH_0} u,$$

and since $\Pi_{\text{p}}(H)$ is compact and H_0 has purely absolutely continuous spectrum, it is well-known that

$$\Pi_{\text{p}}(H) e^{-itH_0} u \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow -\infty]{} 0 \quad (4.2)$$

(see e.g [38, Lemma 1.4.1]). Hence proving the existence of (4.1) is equivalent to proving the existence of

$$\text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow -\infty} e^{itH} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) e^{-itH_0}.$$

In our context, however, the group $\{e^{itH}\}$ is not uniformly bounded ($\|e^{itH} \Pi_{\text{p}}(H)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})}$ may even blow up exponentially as $t \rightarrow -\infty$). Therefore (4.1) fails in general.

Still, a natural definition in our context might be

$$W_-(H, H_0) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow -\infty} e^{itH} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) e^{-itH_0}. \quad (4.3)$$

The next proposition however shows that if H has an outgoing spectral singularity, then C is not locally relatively smooth with respect to H , and hence the usual Cook criterion do not apply to prove the existence of (4.3). The purpose of adding a regularizing operator in the definition of $W_-(H, H_0)$ (see Definition 4.3) is precisely to overcome this issue.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that the assumptions 1-4 hold. Suppose there exists a compact interval of $J \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ without eigenvalue of H and $u \in \mathcal{H}$, such that*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_J \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)CWu\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda = \infty.$$

Then, C is not H -smooth in the interval J .

Proof. Let $v = CWu$. Parseval's theorem gives

$$\int_0^\infty \|Ce^{itH}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt = \frac{1}{2\pi} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)} \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda.$$

Fixing $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)} \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda &\geq \int_J \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_J \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \int_J \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{p}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

As J does not contain any eigenvalue of H ,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_J \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{p}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda$$

exists in \mathcal{H} . Moreover, by assumption

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_J \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda = \int_J \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)CWu\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda = \infty.$$

This prove that C is not H -smooth. \square

Based on the previous proposition, we believe that, in general, the limit (4.3) does not exist. Another argument supporting our Definition 4.3 come from the properties proven later in this section, namely that $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ exist, are injective and with ranges dense in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$.

To conclude this subsection, we underline that we could also have defined the wave operators by using the regularizing operator $r(H)$ instead of $r_{\pm}(H)$ in Definition 4.3. The advantage would have been to be able to rely on the functional calculus of [13] to prove the existence of the wave operators. See the discussion about local wave operators in Section 4.4 for related arguments proving the existence of wave operators using the functional calculus. The ‘inconvenience’ of using $r(H)$ instead of $r_{\pm}(H)$ in Definition 4.3 is that ‘a part of’ $r(H)$ is superfluous for the strong limit to exist, which may have the effect of somehow projecting out scattering states from the range of the wave operators.

We mention that such definitions of wave operators with an ‘identification’ operator appearing between the two evolution groups has been considered by Kato in [26], in a general setting where the evolution groups act on different Hilbert spaces. In the unitary case, various properties of the wave operators depending on the assumptions made on the identification operator are given in [38].

4.2.2. *Existence of $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ and $W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0)$.* Now we turn to the proof of the existence of the regularized wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ and $W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0)$. It suffices to apply Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 with $A = r_{\mp}(H)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)$. The following lemma shows that the conditions of Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 are indeed satisfied.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Then there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that, for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$,*

$$\int_0^{\infty} \|Cr_{\mp}(H)e^{\pm itH}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt \leq c_0 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$\int_0^{\infty} \|C\bar{r}_{\mp}(H^*)e^{\pm itH^*}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H^*)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt \leq c_0 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \quad (4.5)$$

Note that if H does not have any spectral singularity, then $r_{\pm}(H) = \text{Id}$ and this lemma shows that C is smooth with respect to H .

The proof of Lemma 4.5 is based on the following observation. If λ_j is a spectral singularity of order 1, then, for all $z \in \rho(H) \setminus \{z_0\}$, if $j \neq \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} r_j(H) - r_j(z) &= (H - \lambda_j)\mathcal{R}_H(z_0) - (z - \lambda_j)(z - z_0)^{-1} \\ &= (H - z)\mathcal{R}_H(z_0)(\lambda_j - z_0)(z - z_0)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, if $j = \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\infty}(H) - r_{\infty}(z) &= \mathcal{R}_H(z_0) - (z - z_0)^{-1} \\ &= (H - z)\mathcal{R}_H(z_0)(z - z_0)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, if λ_j is a spectral singularity of order μ_j , then, if $j \neq \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} r_j(H) - r_j(z) &= ((H - \lambda_j)\mathcal{R}_H(z_0))^{\nu_j} - ((\lambda_j - z)(\lambda_j - z_0)^{-1})^{\nu_j} \\ &= \left((H - z)\mathcal{R}_H(z_0) \left(\frac{\lambda_j - z_0}{z - z_0} \right) \right)^{\nu_j} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\nu_j-1} ((H - \lambda_j)\mathcal{R}_H(z_0))^k \left(\frac{z - \lambda_j}{z - z_0} \right)^{\nu_j-1-k} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

while if $j = \infty$,

$$r_{\infty}(H) - r_{\infty}(z) = \left((H - z)\mathcal{R}_H(z_0)(z - z_0)^{-1} \right)^{\nu_{\infty}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\nu_{\infty}-1} \mathcal{R}_H(z_0)^k (z - z_0)^{k+1-\nu_{\infty}} \right).$$

Now we are ready to prove Lemma 4.5.

Proof of Lemma 4.5. Let $u \in \mathcal{H}$. We will prove there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^{\infty} \|Cr_+e^{-itH}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt \leq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \quad (4.7)$$

The other inequalities can be obtained in the same way. Parseval's identity gives

$$\int_0^{\infty} \|Cr_+(H)e^{-itH}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt = \frac{1}{2\pi} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|Cr_+(H)\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda$$

Let n_+ denote the number of incoming spectral singularities. We partition $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ into a finite union of $n_+ + 2$ interval J_j 's such that i) J_0 is an interval of the form $(-\infty, a]$ with $a < 0$, $|a| \geq \|V\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} + 1$, ii) for all $j \in \llbracket 1, n_+ \rrbracket$, J_j is a compact interval whose interior contains the incoming spectral singularity λ_j and no other spectral singularities and iii) J_{n_++1} is an interval of the form

$[b, \infty)$, with b large enough, containing a possible singularity at infinity. We then obtain that, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|Cr_+(H)\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda = \sum_{j=0}^{n_++1} \int_{J_j} \|Cr_+(H)\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda.$$

Therefore, to prove (4.7), it suffices to prove that for all $j \in \llbracket 0, n_+ + 1 \rrbracket$, there exists $c_j > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{J_j} \|Cr_+(H)\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \leq c_j \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \quad (4.8)$$

First, we estimate the integral over J_0 . As H_0 is self-adjoint and $J_0 \subset (-\infty, 0)$, we remark that for all $\lambda \in J_0$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$\|\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\| \leq \frac{1}{\text{dist}(\lambda + i\varepsilon, \sigma(H_0))} \leq \frac{1}{|\lambda + i\varepsilon|}.$$

Next, using the resolvent identity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} &\leq \|\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} + \|\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda + i\varepsilon)V\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|\lambda + i\varepsilon|} + \|V\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \frac{1}{|\lambda + i\varepsilon|} \|\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|\lambda + i\varepsilon|} + \|V\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \frac{1}{|a| - |\varepsilon|} \|\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \end{aligned}$$

As $\|V\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} (|a| - |\varepsilon|)^{-1} < 1$ we have that for all $\lambda \in J_0$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$\|\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \leq \frac{b}{|\lambda + i\varepsilon|},$$

for some positive constant b . Therefore we deduce that there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{J_0} \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)r_+(H)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u\|^2 d\lambda \leq c_0 \int_{J_0} \frac{1}{|\lambda + i\varepsilon|^2} d\lambda \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

As J_0 is a closed interval not containing 0, Lebesgue's dominated theorem shows that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{J_0} \frac{1}{|\lambda + i\varepsilon|^2} d\lambda$$

exists. This proves (4.8) for $j = 0$.

Now let $j \in \llbracket 1, n_+ + 1 \rrbracket$. Writing

$$\tilde{r}_j(H) := \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^{n_++1} r_k(H) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}),$$

and setting $v = \tilde{r}_j(H)u$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{J_j} \|Cr_+(H)\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda &= \int_{J_j} \|Cr_j(H)\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \\ &\leq 2 \int_{J_j} \|C(r_j(H) - r_j(\lambda + i\varepsilon))\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

$$+ 2 \int_{J_j} |r_j(\lambda + i\varepsilon)|^2 \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda. \quad (4.10)$$

To estimate (4.9), we use (4.6): for all $j \in \llbracket 1, n_+ \rrbracket$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{J_j} \|C(r_j(H) - r_j(\lambda + i\varepsilon)) \mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \\ &= \int_{J_j} \left\| C \left(\mathcal{R}_H(z_0) \left(\frac{\lambda_j - z_0}{\lambda + i\varepsilon - z_0} \right) \right)^{\nu_j} A(\lambda + i\varepsilon) (H - (\lambda + i\varepsilon))^{\nu_j - 1} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A(\lambda + i\varepsilon) := \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\nu_j - 1} ((H - \lambda_j) \mathcal{R}_H(z_0))^k \left(\frac{\lambda + i\varepsilon - \lambda_j}{\lambda + i\varepsilon - z_0} \right)^{\nu_j - 1 - k} \right).$$

Clearly, for all $\lambda \in J_j$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} C \left(\mathcal{R}_H(z_0) \left(\frac{\lambda_j - z_0}{\lambda + i\varepsilon - z_0} \right) \right)^{\nu_j} A(\lambda + i\varepsilon) (H - (\lambda + i\varepsilon))^{\nu_j - 1} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v,$$

exists in \mathcal{H} . We claim that there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\lambda \in J_j, \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0} \left\| C \left(\mathcal{R}_H(z_0) \left(\frac{\lambda_j - z_0}{\lambda + i\varepsilon - z_0} \right) \right)^{\nu_j} A(\lambda + i\varepsilon) (H - (\lambda + i\varepsilon))^{\nu_j - 1} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty. \quad (4.11)$$

Indeed, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough it's clear that there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\lambda \in J_j, 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1} \|A(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty.$$

A direct computation shows that $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{R}_H(z_0)(H - \lambda + i\varepsilon)$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ on J_j with a bound independent of ε , thus there exists $b_j > 0$ and $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\lambda \in J_j, 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_2} \left| \frac{\lambda_j - z_0}{\lambda + i\varepsilon - z_0} \right|^{\nu_j} \|C \mathcal{R}_H(z_0)^{\nu_j} (H - (\lambda + i\varepsilon))^{\nu_j - 1} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}} < b_j \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

So we get (4.11). Finally, using dominated convergence theorem, the map

$$J_j \ni \lambda \mapsto C \left(\mathcal{R}_H(z_0) \left(\frac{\lambda_j - z_0}{\lambda - z_0} \right) \right)^{\nu_j} A(\lambda) (H - \lambda)^{\nu_j - 1} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v$$

is in $L^2(J_j, \mathcal{H})$ and there exists $a_j > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{J_j} \left\| C \left(\mathcal{R}_H(z_0) \left(\frac{\lambda_j - z_0}{\lambda - z_0} \right) \right)^{\nu_j} A(\lambda) (H - \lambda)^{\nu_j - 1} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{J_j} \left\| C \left(\mathcal{R}_H(z_0) \left(\frac{\lambda_j - z_0}{\lambda + i\varepsilon - z_0} \right) \right)^{\nu_j} A(\lambda + i\varepsilon) (H - (\lambda + i\varepsilon))^{\nu_j - 1} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \\ &\leq a_j \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where in the last inequality we used that $v = \tilde{r}_j(H)u$ and that $r_j(H)$ is bounded.

For the integral over $J_{n_+ + 1}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{J_{n_+ + 1}} \|C(r_\infty(H) - r_\infty(\lambda + i\varepsilon)) \mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \\ &= \int_{J_{n_+ + 1}} \left\| CA(\lambda + i\varepsilon) \left(\mathcal{R}_H(z_0) (\lambda + i\varepsilon - z_0)^{-1} \right)^{\nu_\infty} (H - (\lambda + i\varepsilon))^{\nu_\infty - 1} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A(\lambda + i\varepsilon) := \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\nu_\infty - 1} \mathcal{R}_H(z_0)^k (\lambda + i\varepsilon - z_0)^{k+1-\nu_\infty} \right).$$

It is clear that for all $j \in J_{n_++1}$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} CA(\lambda + i\varepsilon) \left(\mathcal{R}_H(z_0) (\lambda + i\varepsilon - z_0)^{-1} \right)^{\nu_\infty} (H - (\lambda + i\varepsilon))^{\nu_\infty - 1} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v$$

exists in \mathcal{H} . Moreover, there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in J_{n_++1}$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ smaller than ε_1 ,

$$\|CA(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \leq \left(\nu_\infty \sup_{k \in \llbracket 0, \nu_\infty - 1 \rrbracket} \left(|\lambda + i\varepsilon_1 - z_0|^{k+1-\nu_\infty} \|C\mathcal{R}_H(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})}^k \right) \right) < \infty,$$

and a direct computation shows that

$$\mathcal{R}_H(z_0)(H - (\lambda + i\varepsilon)) = \text{Id} + \mathcal{R}_H(z_0)(z_0 - (\lambda + i\varepsilon)).$$

So for all ε smaller than ε_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left(\mathcal{R}_H(z_0) (\lambda + i\varepsilon - z_0)^{-1} \right)^{\nu_\infty} (H - (\lambda + i\varepsilon))^{\nu_\infty - 1} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ & \leq |(\lambda + i\varepsilon_1 - z_0)|^{-\nu_\infty} \|\mathcal{R}_H(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \left(1 + \|\mathcal{R}_H(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} |z_0 - (\lambda + i\varepsilon_1)| \right)^{\nu_\infty - 1} \|\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ & = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}), \quad (\lambda \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the map

$$J_{n_++1} \ni \lambda \mapsto |(\lambda + i\varepsilon_1 - z_0)|^{-\nu_\infty} \|\mathcal{R}_H(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \left(1 + \|\mathcal{R}_H(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} |z_0 - (\lambda + i\varepsilon_1)| \right)^{\nu_\infty - 1} \|\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

is in $L^2(J_{n_++1}, \mathcal{H})$. Finally with Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{J_{n_++1}} \|C(r_\infty(H) - r_\infty(\lambda + i\varepsilon)) \mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda$$

exists and there exists $a_\infty > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{J_{n_++1}} \left\| CA(\lambda) \left(\mathcal{R}_H(z_0) (\lambda - z_0)^{-1} \right)^{\nu_\infty} (H - \lambda)^{\nu_\infty - 1} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \\ & = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{J_{n_++1}} \left\| CA(\lambda + i\varepsilon) \left(\mathcal{R}_H(z_0) (\lambda + i\varepsilon - z_0)^{-1} \right)^{\nu_\infty} (H - (\lambda + i\varepsilon))^{\nu_\infty - 1} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \\ & \leq a_\infty \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

It remains to estimate (4.10). We use again the resolvent identity. For all $j \in \llbracket 1, n_+ + 1 \rrbracket$, and for all $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{J_j} |r_j(\lambda + i\varepsilon)|^2 \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \\ & = \int_{J_j} |r_j(\lambda + i\varepsilon)|^2 \|C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda + i\varepsilon) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \\ & \quad + \int_{J_j} |r_j(\lambda + i\varepsilon)|^2 \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) CW C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda + i\varepsilon) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

As for all $j \in \llbracket 1, n_+ + 1 \rrbracket$,

$$\sup_{\substack{\lambda \in J_j \\ 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0}} |r_j(\lambda + i\varepsilon)| \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)CW\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty$$

by Hypothesis 3, and since C is relatively smooth with respect to H_0 , there exists $b_j > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{J_j} |r_j(\lambda + i\varepsilon)|^2 \|C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \\ & + \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{J_j} |r_j(\lambda + i\varepsilon)|^2 \|C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon)CW C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda + i\varepsilon)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\lambda \\ & \leq b_j \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Combining (4.12), (4.13) and (4.14), we obtain (4.7), which concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

Applying Propositions 4.1 and 4.2, the existence of the wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ then follows:

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Then the wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ and $W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0)$ exist.*

Proof. It suffices to remark that $\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)r_{\pm}(H)$ commute with H and then apply Lemma 4.5 together with Propositions 4.1 and 4.2. \square

4.2.3. *Properties of the wave operators.* We derive in this section the main properties of the regularized wave operators. First we have that they satisfy the usual intertwining properties.

Proposition 4.7. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Then for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$,*

$$e^{itH}W_{\pm}(H, H_0)u = W_{\pm}(H, H_0)e^{itH_0}u \quad \text{and} \quad e^{itH^*}W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0)u = W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0)e^{itH_0}u. \quad (4.15)$$

In particular, $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)\mathcal{D}(H_0) \subset \mathcal{D}(H_0)$, $W_{\pm}(H^, H_0)\mathcal{D}(H_0) \subset \mathcal{D}(H_0)$ and for all $u \in \mathcal{D}(H_0)$,*

$$HW_{\pm}(H, H_0)u = W_{\pm}(H, H_0)H_0u \quad \text{and} \quad H^*W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0)u = W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0)H_0u. \quad (4.16)$$

The proof is standard. We will recall it in Appendix A.

In the following proposition we show that the regularized wave operators are injective and that their ranges are dense in the absolutely continuous spectral subspace.

Proposition 4.8. *Suppose Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Then $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ and $W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0)$ are injective and we have*

$$\text{Ran}(W_{\pm}(H, H_0))^{\text{cl}} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ran}(W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0))^{\text{cl}} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H^*).$$

Proof. We show that $W_+(H, H_0)$ is injective. The proof for the other wave operators is similar. To show that $W_+(H, H_0)$ is injective, we compute its kernel. Let $u \in \text{Ker}(W_+(H, H_0))$ then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{itH}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)r_-(H)e^{-itH_0}u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

Since $r(H) = r_-(H)\tilde{r}(H)$ for some bounded operator $\tilde{r}(H)$, we also have that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{itH}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)r(H)e^{-itH_0}u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

Next we claim that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, for all $v \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\|e^{itH}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)r(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq \|\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)r(H)^2v\|_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (4.17)$$

Indeed, combining (3.20) and (3.21) (see also [13]) that, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|e^{itH}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)r(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Hence, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)r(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \|e^{-itH}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)r(H)e^{itH}v\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|e^{itH}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (4.18)$$

Applying the last inequality to $r(H)u$, we obtain (4.17).

Next, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, applying (4.17) to $v = e^{-itH_0}u$, we have

$$\|e^{itH}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)r(H)e^{-itH_0}u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq \|\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)r(H)^2e^{-itH_0}u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Then we write

$$r(H)^2 = (r(H) - r(H_0))r(H) + r(H_0)(r(H) - r(H_0)) + r(H_0)^2$$

Proceeding by double induction over the number of spectral singularities and the order of each spectral singularity, it is not difficult to see that $r(H) - r(H_0)$ is a compact operator since C is relatively compact with respect to H_0 . Hence $r(H)^2 - r(H_0)^2$ is also compact. Using the triangular inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{itH}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)r(H)e^{-itH_0}u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq \|\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)r(H_0)^2e^{-itH_0}u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ & - \|(\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)(r(H)^2 - r(H_0)^2))e^{-itH_0}u\|_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

As $r(H)^2 - r(H_0)^2$ is compact, the second term in the right hand side of the last inequality vanishes when t goes to ∞ . Moreover, since u is in the kernel of the wave operators, we have

$$0 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)e^{-itH_0}r(H_0)^2u\|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

and since $\Pi_{\text{p}}(H)$ is a compact operator,

$$0 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\Pi_{\text{p}}(H)e^{-itH_0}r(H_0)^2u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Using $\Pi_{\text{p}}(H) + \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) = \text{Id}$, we then deduce from the previous estimates that

$$0 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{-itH_0}r(H_0)^2u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

As the evolution group associated to H_0 is unitary and $r(H_0)^2$ is injective (since H_0 has no eigenvalue), we conclude that $u = 0$, which proves that the wave operators are injective.

To show that $\text{Ran}(W_+(H, H_0))^{\text{cl}} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$, it suffices to use that $\text{Ker}((W_+(H, H_0))^*) = \mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}(H^*)$ by Propositions 4.12 and 4.13 proven below. \square

Clearly, the last proposition shows that the regularized wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ are invertible from \mathcal{H} to their range. In Section 5, we will give conditions in order to have that $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ are invertible in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H))$.

4.3. The regularized wave operators $W_{\pm}(H_0, H)$ and $W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*)$. As shown by the proof of Proposition 4.8, an important ingredient to study the regularized wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ is to study their adjoint, in order to use the duality property between the kernel of an operator and the orthogonal of its range. Formally, the adjoint of $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ are given by $W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*)$ where $W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*)$ are defined as follows.

Definition 4.9. *The wave operators associated to H_0 and H (respectively H_0 and H^*) are defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\pm}(H_0, H) & := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH_0}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)r_{\pm}(H)e^{-itH}, \\ W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*) & := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH_0}\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H^*)\bar{r}_{\pm}(H^*)e^{-itH^*}. \end{aligned}$$

In the remainder of this section we state the existence and study the properties of these wave operators.

4.3.1. *Existence of $W_{\pm}(H_0, H)$ and $W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*)$.* The existence of $W_{\pm}(H_0, H)$ and $W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*)$ follows in the same way as in the previous section.

Proposition 4.10. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Then the wave operators $W_{\pm}(H_0, H)$ and $W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*)$ exist.*

Proof. It suffices to apply Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 together with Lemma 4.5. \square

We mention the following interesting consequence of Proposition 4.10. Together with the Banach-Steinhaus Theorem, the last proposition shows that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|e^{-itH} r_+(H) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \|e^{itH} r_-(H) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty, \quad (4.19)$$

and

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|e^{-itH^*} \bar{r}_+(H^*) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H^*)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \|e^{itH^*} \bar{r}_-(H^*) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H^*)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} < \infty. \quad (4.20)$$

In other words, when restricted to $\text{Ran}(r_{\mp}(H) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H))$, the semigroups generated by $\pm iH$ are uniformly bounded (roughly speaking $\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)$ projects out the generalized eigenstates of H , while $r_{\mp}(H)$ ‘projects out’ the outgoing/incoming states corresponding to spectral singularities). This should be compared to the result that can be obtained using the functional calculus of [13], which only gives that the groups generated by $\pm iH$ are uniformly bounded when restricted to the range of $r(H) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)$.

4.3.2. *Properties of $W_{\pm}(H_0, H)$ and $W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*)$.* The following intertwining properties follow in the same way as in the proof of Proposition 4.7 (see Appendix A).

Proposition 4.11. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Then for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$,*

$$e^{itH_0} W_{\pm}(H_0, H) = W_{\pm}(H_0, H) e^{itH} \quad \text{and} \quad e^{itH_0} W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*) = W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*) e^{itH} u.$$

In particular, $W_{\pm}(H_0, H) \mathcal{D}(H_0) \subset \mathcal{D}(H)$, $W_{\pm}(H_0, H^) \mathcal{D}(H_0) \subset \mathcal{D}(H)$ and for all $u \in \mathcal{D}(H_0)$,*

$$H_0 W_{\pm}(H_0, H) u = W_{\pm}(H_0, H) H u \quad \text{and} \quad H_0 W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*) u = W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*) H^* u.$$

The next proposition relates the wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ to the adjoints of $W_{\mp}(H_0, H^*)$.

Proposition 4.12. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Then*

$$(W_{\pm}(H, H_0))^* = W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*) \quad \text{and} \quad (W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0))^* = W_{\pm}(H_0, H)$$

Proof. We prove that $(W_{\pm}(H, H_0))^* = W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*)$ the second equality is obtained in the same way. For $u, v \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle W_{\pm}(H, H_0) u, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \langle e^{itH} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) r_{\mp}(H) e^{-itH_0} u, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \langle u, e^{itH_0} \bar{r}_{\pm}(H^*) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H^*) e^{-itH^*} v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \langle u, W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*) v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the result. \square

It should be noted that Proposition 4.12 and Hypothesis 4 yield

$$\|W_{\pm}(H, H_0)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} = \|W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} = \|W_{\mp}(H^*, H_0)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} = \|W_{\mp}(H_0, H)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})}.$$

In the next proposition we characterize the ranges and kernels of $W_{\pm}(H_0, H)$ and $W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*)$. Its proof relies on the characterization of the set of asymptotically disappearing states of H , defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{ads}}^{\pm}(H) := \left\{ u \in \mathcal{H}, \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|e^{-itH}u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0 \right\}^{\text{cl}}. \quad (4.21)$$

It has been proved in [13] that, under our assumptions, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ads}}^{\pm}(H)$ coincide with the direct sum of the generalized eigenspaces associated to eigenvalues with negative/positive imaginary part, that is

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{ads}}^{\pm}(H) = \mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}^{\pm}(H) := \{u \in \text{Ker}(H - \lambda)^{m_{\lambda}}, \lambda \in \sigma_{\text{p}}(H), \mp \text{Im}(\lambda) > 0\}, \quad (4.22)$$

where we recall that m_{λ} is the algebraic multiplicity of the eigenvalue λ .

Proposition 4.13. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Then*

$$\text{Ker}(W_{\pm}(H_0, H)) = \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H^*)^{\perp} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}(H), \quad \text{Ker}(W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*)) = \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)^{\perp} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}(H^*),$$

and

$$\text{Ran}(W_{\pm}(H_0, H))^{\text{cl}} = \mathcal{H} = \text{Ran}(W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*))^{\text{cl}}.$$

Proof. It follows from [13] that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H^*)^{\perp} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}(H)$ and likewise for $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)^{\perp}$. We prove that $\text{Ker}(W_{+}(H_0, H)) = \mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}(H)$, the equalities $\text{Ker}(W_{-}(H_0, H)) = \mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}(H)$ and $\text{Ker}(W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*)) = \mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}(H^*)$ are proven in the same way. It follows from the definition of $W_{+}(H_0, H)$ that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}(H) \subset \text{Ker}(W_{+}(H_0, H))$. Hence we only need to prove the reverse inclusion.

Let $u \in \text{Ker}(W_{+}(H_0, H))$. Using the unitarity of the group associated to H_0 , we have that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{-itH}r_{+}(H)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{itH_0}r_{+}(H)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)e^{-itH}u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

Thus $r_{+}(H)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ads}}^{+}(H)$. By the remark above, this implies that $r_{+}(H)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}^{+}(H) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}(H)$. Together with the fact that $r_{-}(H)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$, this yields

$$r_{-}(H)\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u = 0. \quad (4.23)$$

Finally as $r_{-}(H)$ is injective on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$ (because the restriction of H to $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$ has no point spectrum), we obtain that $\Pi_{\text{ac}}(H)u = 0$. This proves that $u \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{p}}(H)$.

The fact that $\text{Ran}(W_{\pm}(H_0, H))^{\text{cl}} = \mathcal{H}$ follows from the facts that $W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0)$ are injective by Proposition 4.8 and that $(W_{\pm}(H_0, H))^* = W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0)$ by Proposition 4.12. \square

4.4. The local regularized wave operators. It can be useful to define local wave operators on an interval I of the essential spectrum. In this section we define the local regularized wave operators and we give their properties.

We recall that given a closed interval $I \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_0)$, h stands for the function defined in (3.19) which regularizes the spectral singularities of H in I . It allows one to consider a regularized spectral projection $(h\mathbb{1}_I)(H)$ as in (3.18) which in turn induces a functional calculus (3.20).

Definition 4.14. *Let $I \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ be a closed interval. We define the local regularized wave operators on the interval I by*

$$W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH}(h\mathbb{1}_I)(H)e^{-itH_0} \quad W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0, I) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH^*}(\bar{h}\mathbb{1}_I)(H^*)e^{-itH_0}.$$

Note that in the particular case where H does not have any spectral singularity in I , then the local wave operators associated to H and H_0 reduce to

$$W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH}\mathbb{1}_I(H)e^{-itH_0} \quad W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0, I) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH^*}\mathbb{1}_I(H^*)e^{-itH_0}.$$

Since $\mathbb{1}_I(H)$ is a projection, this implies that in this case, $\text{Ran}(W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)) \subset \text{Ran}(\mathbb{1}_I(H))$.

4.4.1. *Existence of the local regularized wave operator.* As in Section 4.2 for the regularized wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$, the proof of the existence of the local regularized wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)$, is based on Proposition 4.1. In order to apply this proposition, we need to prove that $C(h\mathbf{1}_I)(H)$ is H_0 -smooth, which is the purpose on the following lemma. Note that the proof, based on the functional calculus (3.20), follows a different route from that of Lemma 4.5. The disadvantage of functional calculus is that we need to regularize both outgoing and incoming spectral singularities.

Lemma 4.15. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Let $I \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ be a closed interval. Then $C(h\mathbf{1}_I)(H)$ is relatively smooth with respect to H in the sense of Kato and $C(h\mathbf{1}_{H^*})(I)$ is relatively smooth with respect to H^* .*

Proof. It suffices to show that there exists $c > 0$ such that, for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\int_0^{\infty} \|Ce^{itH}(h\mathbf{1}_I)(H)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt \leq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \quad (4.24)$$

the proof of

$$\int_0^{\infty} \|Ce^{-itH}(h\mathbf{1}_I)(H)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt \leq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$$

being similar. Let $u, v \in \mathcal{H}$. Using the integral representation (3.18) of $(h\mathbf{1}_I)(H)$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, Ce^{itH}(h\mathbf{1}_I)(H)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \langle v, Ce^{itH_0}h(H_0)\mathbf{1}_I(H_0)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &- \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_I e^{it\lambda} h(\lambda) \langle C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \mp i0^+)Cv, W C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} d\lambda \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_I e^{it\lambda} h(\lambda) \langle C\mathcal{R}_{H^*}(\lambda \mp i0^+)CW^*C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \mp i0^+)Cv, W C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} d\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

Let g_1^{\pm} and g_2^{\pm} be the functions defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R} \ni \lambda \mapsto g_1^{\pm}(\lambda) &:= h(\lambda) \langle W^*C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \mp i0^+)Cv, C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{1}_I(\lambda) \\ &= h(\lambda) \langle v, C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)CW C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{1}_I(\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R} \ni \lambda \mapsto g_2^{\pm}(\lambda) &:= h(\lambda) \langle W^*C\mathcal{R}_{H^*}(\lambda \mp i0^+)CW^*C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \mp i0^+)Cv, C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \mp i0^+)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{1}_I(\lambda) \\ &= h(\lambda) \langle v, C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)CW C\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda \pm i0^+)CW C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \mp i0^+)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{1}_I(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that g_1^{\pm} and g_2^{\pm} are in $L^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C})$. Indeed for all $\lambda \in I$, by Hypotheses 1 and 3 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$|g_1^{\pm}(\lambda)|^2 \leq \|h\|_{\infty}^2 \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}^{\pm}} \|C\mathcal{R}_0(z)C\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})}^2 \|W^*\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \|C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \quad (4.26)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |g_2^{\pm}(\lambda)|^2 &\leq \left(\sup_{\substack{\text{Re}(z) \in I \\ |\text{Im}(z)| \leq \varepsilon_0}} (|h(z)| \|C\mathcal{R}_H(z)CW^*\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})})^2 \right) \left(\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}^{\pm}} \|C\mathcal{R}_0(z)C\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})}^2 \right) \\ &\times \|W\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})}^2 \|C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

Since C is relatively smooth with respect to H_0 , the function $\lambda \mapsto C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)u$ is square integrable on I . Moreover, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |g_1^\pm(\lambda)| \, d\lambda &\leq \left(\int_I |h(z)| \|W^*C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \mp i0^+)Cu\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \, d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_I \|C\mathcal{R}_0(\lambda \pm i0^+)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \, d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq c_1 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |g_2(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \leq c_2 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Using (4.25), we deduce that there exists $c_3 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty |\langle v, Ce^{itH}(h\mathbf{1}_I)(H)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}|^2 \, dt &\leq c_3 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\langle v, Ce^{itH_0}\mathbf{1}_I(H_0)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}|^2 \, dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\check{g}_1^\pm(t)|^2 \, dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\check{g}_2^\pm(t)|^2 \, dt \right), \end{aligned}$$

where for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, \check{g}_i^\pm is the inverse Fourier transform of g_i^\pm , i.e.

$$\check{g}_i^\pm(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{it\lambda} g_i^\pm(\lambda) \, d\lambda$$

As g_1^\pm and g_2^\pm are in $L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C})$, Plancherel's equality implies that there exists $c_4 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty |\langle v, Ce^{itH}(h\mathbf{1}_I)(H)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}|^2 \, dt &\leq c_4 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\langle v, Ce^{itH_0}h(H_0)\mathbf{1}_I(H_0)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}|^2 \, dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\check{g}_1^\pm(\lambda)|^2 \, d\lambda + \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\check{g}_2^\pm(\lambda)|^2 \, d\lambda \right). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting (4.26)–(4.27) into the last inequality and using that C is relatively smooth with respect to H_0 , we obtain

$$\int_0^\infty |\langle v, Ce^{itH}(h\mathbf{1}_I)(H)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}|^2 \, dt \leq c_5 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

Using $\|Ce^{itH}(h\mathbf{1}_I)(H)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle v_n, Ce^{itH}(h\mathbf{1}_I)(H)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ for some normalized sequence $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ together with Fatou's lemma, this leads to (4.24). \square

Using this lemma we obtain the existence of the local regularized wave operators.

Proposition 4.16. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1–4 hold. Let $I \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ be a closed interval. Then $W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)$ and $W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0, I)$ exist.*

Proof. It suffices to apply Lemma 4.15 together with Propositions 4.1 and 4.2. \square

Similarly as before, the adjoints of $W_{\mp}(H^*, H_0, I)$ and $W_{\mp}(H, H_0, I)$ are formally given by

$$W_{\pm}(H_0, H, I) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH_0}(h\mathbf{1}_I)(H)e^{-itH} \quad W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*, I) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH_0}(\bar{h}\mathbf{1}_I)(H^*)e^{-itH^*}.$$

We then have the following existence result.

Proposition 4.17. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1–4 hold. Let $I \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ be a closed interval. Then the wave operators $W_{\pm}(H_0, H, I)$ and $W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*, I)$ exist and satisfy*

$$W_{\pm}(H_0, H, I)^* = W_{\mp}(H^*, H_0, I), \quad W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*, I)^* = W_{\mp}(H, H_0, I).$$

Proof. Again, it suffices to apply Lemma 4.15 together with Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 to obtain the existence. The adjoint properties follow from a direct computation. \square

4.4.2. *Properties of the local regularized wave operators.* In this section we reformulate the properties of regularized wave operators stated in Section 4.2 for the local regularized wave operators. First we have the following intertwining properties whose proofs, left to the reader, rely on the same arguments as those used in the proof of Proposition 4.7.

Proposition 4.18. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Then for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$,*

$$e^{itH}W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)u = W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)e^{itH_0}u \quad \text{and} \quad e^{itH^*}W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0, I)u = W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0, I)e^{itH_0}u.$$

In particular, $W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)\mathcal{D}(H_0) \subset \mathcal{D}(H_0)$, $W_{\pm}(H^, H_0, I)\mathcal{D}(H_0) \subset \mathcal{D}(H_0)$ and for all $u \in \mathcal{D}(H_0)$,*

$$HW_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)u = W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)H_0u \quad \text{and} \quad H^*W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0, I)u = W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0, I)H_0u.$$

Moreover,

$$(h\mathbb{1}_I)(H)W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)u = W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)h(H_0)\mathbb{1}_I(H_0)u \quad (4.28)$$

$$(h\mathbb{1}_I)(H^*)W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0, I)u = W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0, I)h(H_0)\mathbb{1}_I(H_0)u \quad (4.29)$$

Note that (4.28) relies on the existence of the spectral projection and the intertwining property for the resolvent of H and H_0 , where the intertwining property for the resolvent of H and H_0 is proved by using the Laplace transform of the resolvent.

The next two propositions characterize the kernels and ranges of $W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)$ and $W_{\pm}(H_0, H, I)$. The proof of Proposition 4.19 relies on the same idea as that of Proposition 4.8, up to some technicalities due to the use of the regularized functional calculus (3.20). Recall that h stands for the function defined in (3.19) which regularizes the spectral singularities of H in I .

Proposition 4.19. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Let $I \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ be a closed interval. Then*

$$\text{Ker}(W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)) = \text{Ker}(\mathbb{1}_I(H_0)) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ker}(W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0, I)) = \text{Ker}(\mathbb{1}_I(H_0)).$$

Moreover,

$$\text{Ran}(W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I))^{\text{cl}} = \text{Ran}((r\mathbb{1}_I)(H))^{\text{cl}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ran}(W_{\pm}(H, H_0^*, I))^{\text{cl}} = \text{Ran}((r\mathbb{1}_I)(H^*))^{\text{cl}}.$$

Proof. We show that $\text{Ker}(W_+(H, H_0, I)) = \text{Ker}(\mathbb{1}_I(H_0))$, the proof the other equalities characterizing the kernels are similar. Let $u \in \text{Ker}(W_+(H, H_0, I))$, then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{itH}(h\mathbb{1}_I)(H)e^{-itH_0}u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

Composing by $(r\mathbb{1}_I)(H)$ and using the intertwining properties of Proposition 4.18, we obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{itH}(h\mathbb{1}_I)(H)e^{-itH_0}\mathbb{1}_I(H_0)r(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

Next since $r = h\tilde{r}$ for some rational function \tilde{r} , we also have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{itH}(r\mathbb{1}_I)(H)e^{-itH_0}\mathbb{1}_I(H_0)r(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

We claim that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, for all $v \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\|e^{itH}(h\mathbb{1}_I)(H)e^{-itH_0}v\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq \|(r\mathbb{1}_I)(H)^2e^{-itH_0}v\|_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (4.30)$$

Indeed, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, by the functional calculus (3.20) $\{e^{itH}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is uniformly bounded on the range of $h(H)$. Thus we have

$$\|e^{-itH}(r\mathbb{1}_I)(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Thus for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|(r\mathbb{1}_I)(H)v\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \|e^{-itH}(r\mathbb{1}_I)(H)e^{itH}v\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|e^{itH}v\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Applying the last inequality to $(r\mathbf{1}_I)(H)e^{itH_0}v$, we obtain (4.30). Now (4.30) yields

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|(r\mathbf{1}_I)(H)^2 e^{-itH_0} \mathbf{1}_I(H_0)r(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

and hence

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|(r\mathbf{1}_I)(H)^3 e^{-itH_0} \mathbf{1}_I(H_0)r(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0. \quad (4.31)$$

Now let $I^c := (\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H) \setminus I)^{\text{cl}}$. We claim that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|(r\mathbf{1}_{I^c})(H)^3 e^{-itH_0} \mathbf{1}_I(H_0)r(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0. \quad (4.32)$$

Indeed, it follows again from the functional calculus (3.20) that there exists $c > 0$ such that, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|(r\mathbf{1}_{I^c})(H)^3 e^{-itH_0} \mathbf{1}_I(H_0)r(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq c \|(r\mathbf{1}_{I^c})(H)e^{-itH}(r\mathbf{1}_{I^c})(H)e^{-itH_0} \mathbf{1}_I(H_0)r(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Letting t go to ∞ yields

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|(r\mathbf{1}_{I^c})(H)^3 e^{-itH_0} \mathbf{1}_I(H_0)r(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq c \|(r\mathbf{1}_{I^c})(H)W_+(H, H_0, I^c)\mathbf{1}_I(H_0)r(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Finally using the intertwining properties of Proposition 4.18 together with the facts that $\mathbf{1}_{I \cap I^c}(H_0) = 0$ since H_0 has purely absolutely continuous spectrum, we obtain (4.32). Proceeding in the same way, we have that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|(r\mathbf{1}_I)(H)(r\mathbf{1}_{I^c})(H)^2 e^{-itH_0} \mathbf{1}_I(H_0)r(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

and

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|(r\mathbf{1}_{I^c})(H)(r\mathbf{1}_I)(H)^2 e^{-itH_0} \mathbf{1}_I(H_0)r(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

Summing the last two previous limits with (4.31) and (4.32) gives

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|(r\mathbf{1}_{\text{ess}})(H)^3 e^{-itH_0} r(H_0)\mathbf{1}_I(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0. \quad (4.33)$$

Now $r(H)^3 \Pi_p(H)$ is compact under our assumptions and therefore

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|r(H)^3 \Pi_p(H) e^{-itH_0} \mathbf{1}_I(H_0)r(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0. \quad (4.34)$$

Summing (4.33) and (4.34), it follows from the spectral resolution formula (3.21) and the triangular inequality that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|r(H)^3 e^{-itH_0} r(H_0)\mathbf{1}_I(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

Writing

$$r(H)^3 = (r(H)^2(r(H) - r(H_0)) + r(H)(r(H) - r(H_0))r(H_0) + (r(H) - r(H_0))r(H_0)^2 + r(H_0)^3),$$

and using that $r(H) - r(H_0)$ is compact, we obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|(r(H)^3 - r(H_0)^3) e^{-itH_0} \mathbf{1}_I(H_0)r(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

and hence

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{-itH_0} \mathbf{1}_I(H_0)r^4(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

Since $r(H_0)^4$ is injective (because H_0 has no eigenvalue) and $\{e^{-itH_0}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is unitary, we conclude that $u \in \text{Ker}(\mathbf{1}_I(H_0))$.

Conversely, let $u \in \text{Ker}(\mathbf{1}_I(H_0))$. Then

$$W_+(H, H_0, I)(r\mathbf{1}_I)(H_0)u = 0$$

and using the intertwining properties of Proposition 4.18, we also have

$$(r\mathbb{1}_I)(H)W_+(H, H_0, I)u = 0. \quad (4.35)$$

Moreover, using that

$$(r\mathbb{1}_{I^c})(H)(r\mathbb{1}_I)(H) = 0,$$

as follows from the functional calculus (3.20), where $I^c := (\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H) \setminus I)^{\text{cl}}$, we obtain

$$(r\mathbb{1}_{I^c})(H)W_+(H, H_0, I)u = 0. \quad (4.36)$$

Now, we claim that

$$r(H)\Pi_p(H)W_+(H, H_0, I)u = 0. \quad (4.37)$$

Indeed, it suffices to prove that $W_+(H, H_0, I)u \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$, where we recall that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$ is defined as the closure of $\mathcal{M}(H)$, see (3.15). Since H_0 has purely absolutely continuous spectrum, there exists a sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{M}(H_0)$ such that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to u when $n \rightarrow \infty$. Using the intertwining properties of Proposition 4.18, we deduce that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\langle e^{itH}W_+(H, H_0, I)u_n, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}|^2 dt &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\langle e^{itH_0}u_n, W_+(H, H_0, I)^*v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}|^2 dt \\ &\leq c_{u_n} \|W_+(H, H_0, I)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(W_+(H, H_0, I)u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{M}(H)$, which implies (4.37). Finally, using the spectral resolution formula (3.21) together with (4.35), (4.36) and (4.37) we obtain

$$r(H)W_+(H, H_0, I)u = 0.$$

Since the restriction $r(H)$ to $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$ is injective, it follows that $u \in \text{Ker}(W_+(H, H_0, I))$.

The characterizations of the ranges follow from Propositions 4.17 and 4.20. \square

Now we turn to the study of the kernels and ranges of $W_{\pm}(H_0, H, I)$.

Proposition 4.20. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Let $I \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ be a closed interval. Then*

$$\text{Ker}((h\mathbb{1}_I)(H)) = \text{Ker}(W_{\pm}(H_0, H, I)) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ker}((\bar{h}\mathbb{1}_I)(H^*)) = \text{Ker}((W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*, I)).$$

Moreover we have

$$\text{Ran}(W_{\pm}(H_0, H, I))^{\text{cl}} = \text{Ran}(\mathbb{1}_I(H_0)) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ran}(W_{\pm}(H_0, H^*, I))^{\text{cl}} = \text{Ran}(\mathbb{1}_I(H_0)).$$

Proof. We show that $\text{Ker}(W_+(H_0, H, I)) = \text{Ker}((h\mathbb{1}_I)(H))$, the proof the other equalities characterizing the kernels are similar. Let $u \in \text{Ker}(W_+(H_0, H, I))$. Then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{itH_0}e^{-itH}(h\mathbb{1}_I)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0$$

and therefore, by unitarity of e^{itH_0} ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{-itH}(h\mathbb{1}_I)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

Hence $(h\mathbb{1}_I)u \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ads}}(H)^+$ (see (4.21)) which in turn yields $(h\mathbb{1}_I)u \in \mathcal{H}_p^+(H)$ by (4.22). Thus we have

$$(h\mathbb{1}_I)(H)u = \Pi_p^+(H)(h\mathbb{1}_I)(H)u.$$

Using (3.18) it is not difficult to verify that, for all $v \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\langle \Pi_p^+(H)(h\mathbb{1}_I)(H)u, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

Therefore $\Pi_p^+(H)(h\mathbb{1}_I)(H)u = 0$ and hence $u \in \text{Ker}((h\mathbb{1}_I)(H))$.

Conversely, if $u \in \text{Ker}((h\mathbb{1}_I)(H))$, then by definition of $W_+(H_0, H, I)$, $u \in \text{Ker}(W_+(H_0, H, I))$.

The characterizations of the ranges follow from Propositions 4.17 and 4.19. \square

5. ASYMPTOTIC COMPLETENESS

In this section, we study a notion of asymptotic completeness for the wave operator $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$.

Definition 5.1. *We say that the wave operator $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ or $W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0)$ is asymptotically complete if its range is closed.*

This definition is motivated by Proposition 4.8. Indeed, we already know that, under our assumptions, the wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ are injective and that their ranges are dense in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$. Hence if the wave operators are asymptotically complete, they are bijective. In the following we give conditions ensuring that asymptotic completeness holds. Note that $W_{-}(H, H_0)$ may be asymptotically complete while $W_{+}(H, H_0)$ is not.

5.1. Asymptotic completeness and spectral singularities. Our first result shows that if H does not have any spectral singularity, then the wave operators are asymptotically complete. A similar result has been proved in [12] for dissipative operators.

We recall that if H has no incoming/outgoing spectral singularity, then $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ and $W_{\pm}(H_0, H)$ reduce to

$$W_{\pm}(H, H_0) = \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) e^{-itH_0}, \quad W_{\pm}(H_0, H) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH_0} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) e^{-itH}.$$

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Suppose that H does not have any spectral singularities. Then $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ and $W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0)$ are asymptotically complete.*

Proof. We prove that $W_{+}(H, H_0)$ is asymptotically complete. By proposition 4.8, we already know that $\text{Ran}(W_{+}(H, H_0)) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$. Hence, to prove that the range of $W_{+}(H, H_0)$ is closed, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H) \subset \text{Ran}(W_{+}(H, H_0))$. Let $u \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$. Then

$$u = \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) u = \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) e^{itH} e^{-itH_0} e^{itH_0} e^{-itH} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) u.$$

As e^{itH} is uniformly bounded in $t \in \mathbb{R}$ by (4.19), letting $t \rightarrow \infty$, we easily obtain

$$u = W_{+}(H, H_0) W_{+}(H_0, H) u.$$

Thus $u \in \text{Ran}(W_{+}(H, H_0))$, which concludes the proof. \square

Under the conditions of Theorem 5.2, we see in particular that $W_{+}(H, H_0)$ is a left inverse of $W_{+}(H_0, H)$ and, as $W_{+}(H, H_0)$ is invertible in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H))$, we have

$$W_{+}(H, H_0)^{-1} = W_{+}(H_0, H).$$

Note also that the intertwining properties show that

$$Hu = W_{+}(H, H_0) H_0 W_{+}(H_0, H) u, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{D}(H_0) \cap \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H),$$

and

$$e^{itH} u = W_{+}(H, H_0) e^{itH_0} W_{+}(H_0, H) u, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In other words, the restriction of H to $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$ is similar to H_0 .

The next result is a reformulation of Theorem 3.5.

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Suppose that H does not have spectral singularities. Then there exist $m_1 > 0$, and $m_2 > 0$ such that*

$$m_1 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|e^{itH} u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq m_2 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$. Using the functional calculus (3.17), we deduce that there exists $m_2 > 0$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, for all $v \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$|\langle v, e^{itH}u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}| = \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)} \langle v, e^{it\lambda} (\mathcal{R}_H(\lambda + i\varepsilon) - \mathcal{R}_H(\lambda - i\varepsilon)) u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} d\lambda \right| \leq m_2 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Thus

$$\|e^{itH}u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq m_2 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

For the other inequality, we use that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|e^{itH}u\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \|W_+(H, H_0)e^{itH_0}W_+(H_0, H)u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

By the remarks above, $W_+(H, H_0)$ and $W_+(H_0, H)$ are invertible in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H))$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H), \mathcal{H})$, respectively, and the evolution group generated by H_0 is unitary. Hence there exists $m_1 > 0$ such that

$$\|e^{itH}u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq m_1 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Note that the proof of the second inequality of the theorem above does not involve scattering theory but only functional calculus.

5.2. Completeness of the local wave operators. We recall that if I is a closed interval contained in $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ such that H does not have any spectral singularity in I , the the local wave operators associated to H and H_0 reduce to

$$W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH} \mathbf{1}_I(H) e^{-itH_0}$$

The next theorem shows that in this case $W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)$ are asymptotically complete in a natural sense.

Theorem 5.4. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Let $I \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ be a closed interval not containing any spectral singularity of H . Then $W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)$ and $W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0, I)$ are asymptotically complete in the sense that*

$$\text{Ran}(W_+(H, H_0, I)) = \text{Ran}(\mathbf{1}_I(H)), \quad \text{Ran}(W_+(H^*, H_0, I)) = \text{Ran}(\mathbf{1}_I(H^*)).$$

Proof. We prove the equality for $W_+(H, H_0, I)$. The proof of the equalities for $W_-(H, H_0, I)$ and $W_{\pm}(H^*, H_0, I)$ are similar. If I does not have any spectral singularity, then with the intertwining property,

$$W_+(H, H_0, I) = \mathbf{1}_I(H)W_+(H, H_0, I) = W_+(H, H_0, I)\mathbf{1}_I(H_0). \quad (5.1)$$

So by proposition 4.19 and with 5.1 the restriction of $W_+(H, H_0, I)$ to $\text{Ran}(\mathbf{1}_I(H_0))$ is injective and $\text{Ran}(W_+(H, H_0, I)) \subset \text{Ran}(\mathbf{1}_I(H))$. We will show the reverse inclusion. Let $u \in \text{Ran}(\mathbf{1}_I(H))$, then

$$u = \mathbf{1}_I(H)u = e^{itH} \mathbf{1}_I(H) e^{-itH_0} e^{itH_0} e^{-itH} \mathbf{1}_I(H).$$

As $t \mapsto e^{itH} \mathbf{1}_I(H) e^{-itH_0}$, is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} u &= e^{itH} \mathbf{1}_I(H) e^{-itH_0} W_+(H_0, H, I)u + o(1), \quad (t \rightarrow \infty) \\ &= W_+(H, H_0, I)W_+(H_0, H, I)u \end{aligned}$$

This prove the reverse inclusion. \square

The previous result shows that if H does not have any spectral singularity in I , then the inverses of $W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)$ are $W_{\pm}(H_0, H, I)$. It should be noted that in order to construct the local wave operators on an interval I not containing any spectral singularity, it suffices to have the existence of the spectral projection in I . Next it follows from Theorem 3.6 that they are invertible, and hence in particular injective with closed range. In the general case where I contains spectral singularities, on the other hand, we relied on the whole spectral structure of H in order to prove that $W_{\pm}(H, H_0, I)$ are injective (see Proposition 4.19).

5.3. Remarks on the notion of asymptotic completeness. Theorem 5.2 shows that if H does not have any spectral singularities then the wave operators $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ are asymptotically complete. We conjecture that if H has a spectral singularity, then the regularized wave operators are *not* asymptotically complete. We give in this section partial results supporting this conjecture.

First we consider regularized wave operators with an ‘over-regularizing’ operator in the following sense. For the sake of simplicity, suppose that H has only one incoming spectral singularity λ_0 of finite order ν_0 . Consider the regularized wave operator

$$\widetilde{W}_+(H, H_0) := \text{s-lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{itH} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) (H - \lambda_0)^{\nu_0+1} \mathcal{R}_H(z_0)^{\nu_0+1} e^{-itH_0}.$$

This definition should be compared to the Definition 4.3 where the regularizing operator is $(H - \lambda_0)^{\nu_0} \mathcal{R}_H(z_0)^{\nu_0}$ instead of $(H - \lambda_0)^{\nu_0+1} \mathcal{R}_H(z_0)^{\nu_0+1}$. In particular we have that

$$\widetilde{W}_+(H, H_0) = (H - \lambda_0) \mathcal{R}_H(z_0) W_+(H, H_0),$$

where $W_+(H, H_0)$ is the regularized wave operator associated to H and H_0 from Definition 4.3. Under our assumptions, it follows from Proposition 4.6 that $\widetilde{W}_+(H, H_0)$ exists, is injective and its range is dense in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{ac}}(H)$. The next proposition shows that $\widetilde{W}(H, H_0)$ is not surjective.

Proposition 5.5. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. Then $\widetilde{W}(H, H_0)$ is not asymptotically complete.*

Proof. Suppose that $\widetilde{W}(H, H_0)$ is asymptotically complete. Then its range is closed and hence there exists $c > 0$ such that, for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\left\| \widetilde{W}(H, H_0) u \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

It then follows from (4.19) that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$c_1 \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\| (H - \lambda_0) \mathcal{R}_H(z_0) e^{-itH_0} u \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

As $(H - \lambda_0) \mathcal{R}_H(z_0) - (H_0 - \lambda_0) \mathcal{R}_{H_0}(z_0)$ is compact, we deduce that

$$c_1 \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\| (H_0 - \lambda_0) \mathcal{R}_{H_0}(z_0) e^{-itH_0} u \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Finally, using that $\{e^{-itH_0}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is unitary and that $\mathcal{R}_{H_0}(z_0)$ is bounded, this implies that there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$c_2 \left\| (H_0 - \lambda_0) u \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

This is a contradiction because this would imply that $H_0 - \lambda_0$ is bijective (since it is self-adjoint and injective with closed range), which is impossible since λ_0 is in the essential spectrum of H_0 . \square

Our last result shows that if H has a incoming spectral singularity and if $-iH$ is the generator of a strongly continuous one parameter semigroup which is uniformly bounded for positive times, then $W_+(H, H_0)$ is not asymptotically complete. It’s especially the case if $\text{Im}(V) \leq 0$ because in this case $-iH$ become dissipative and thus generates a contraction group.

Proposition 5.6. *Suppose that Hypotheses 1-4 hold. If $\{e^{itH}\}_{\pm t \geq 0}$ is uniformly bounded and H has a incoming/outgoing spectral singularity then $W_{\pm}(H, H_0)$ are not asymptotically complete.*

Proof. We prove the proposition for $W_+(H, H_0)$. The proof for $W_-(H, H_0)$ is very similar. Suppose that $W_+(H, H_0)$ is asymptotically complete. Then there exists $c > 0$ such that for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\|W_+(H, H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Using that $\{e^{itH}\}_{t \geq 0}$ is uniformly bounded and arguing as in the proof of Proposition 5.5, we have that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that, for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\|r_-(H_0)u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq c_1 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Since $r_-(H_0)$ is self-adjoint and injective, this would imply that it is bijective. However $r_-(H_0)$ is not bijective by definition, because spectral singularities of H are points of the essential spectrum of H_0 . \square

APPENDIX A. PROOFS OF PROPOSITIONS 4.1 AND 4.7

In this appendix, for completeness, we recall the proofs of some standard results about wave operators.

proof of Proposition 4.1. We suppose that there exist $c > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^{\infty} \|Ce^{-itH^*}A^*u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt \leq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and we prove that the strong limit $s\text{-}\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Ae^{itH}e^{-itH_0}$ exist. The existence of the other strong limits are similar. Because of the uniform boundedness principle, it suffices to show that for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Ae^{itH}e^{-itH_0}u$$

exists in \mathcal{H} . We claim that for all $t > 0$, for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$Ae^{itH}e^{-itH_0}u = Au + i \int_0^t Ae^{isH}CWCe^{-isH_0}uds. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Indeed, let $u \in \mathcal{D}(H_0)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then as $\{e^{itH}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ preserves $\mathcal{D}(H_0)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} Ae^{itH}e^{-itH_0}u &= Au - \int_0^t \partial_s (Ae^{isH}e^{-isH_0}u) ds \\ &= Au - \int_0^t Ae^{isH}(iH - iH_0)e^{-isH_0}uds \\ &= Au - i \int_0^t Ae^{isH}Ve^{-isH_0}uds. \end{aligned}$$

As the equality

$$Ae^{itH}e^{-itH_0}u = Au - i \int_0^t Ae^{isH}Ve^{-isH_0}uds$$

makes sense if $u \in \mathcal{H}$, using that $\mathcal{D}(H_0)$ is dense in \mathcal{H} together with Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we deduce that (A.2) holds.

To prove that the limit in the left hand side of (A.2) exists when $t \rightarrow \infty$, we show that the integral in the right hand side of (A.2) converges when $t \rightarrow \infty$. To do this, we show that the integral satisfies

a Cauchy criterion. As C is relatively smooth with respect to H_0 , it follows from (4.5) that there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \int_x^y A e^{isH} C W C e^{-isH_0} u ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&= \sup_{\substack{v \in \mathcal{H} \\ \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}=1}} \left| \int_x^y \left\langle C e^{-isH^*} A^* v, W C e^{-isH_0} u \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} ds \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{\substack{v \in \mathcal{H} \\ \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}=1}} \int_x^y \left| \left\langle C e^{-isH^*} A v, W C e^{-isH_0} u \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| ds \\
&\leq \sup_{\substack{v \in \mathcal{H} \\ \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}=1}} \left(\int_x^y \|C e^{-isH^*} A v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_x^y \|W C e^{-isH_0} u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq c_0 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (A.1) and (3.2) in the last inequality. Since \mathcal{H} is complete the map $s \mapsto A e^{isH} V e^{-isH_0} u$ belongs to $L^1([0, \infty), \mathcal{H})$ and hence the limit of (A.2) exists when $t \rightarrow \infty$. \square

proof of Proposition 4.7. We show the proposition for $W_+(H, H_0)$, the proof is similar for the other wave operators. Let $u \in \mathcal{H}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{itH} W_+(H, H_0) u &= e^{itH} e^{isH} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) r_-(H) e^{-isH_0} u + o(1), \quad (s \rightarrow \infty) \\
&= e^{i(t+s)H} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) r_-(H) e^{-i(t+s)H_0} e^{itH_0} u + o(1), \quad (s \rightarrow \infty) \\
&= e^{irH} \Pi_{\text{ac}}(H) r_-(H) e^{-irH_0} e^{itH_0} u + o(1), \quad (r \rightarrow \infty) \\
&= W_+(H, H_0) e^{itH_0} u.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows (4.15). To prove that $W_+(H, H_0)$ preserves $\mathcal{D}(H_0)$, it suffices to use that

$$\mathcal{D}(H_0) = \left\{ u \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{-it} (e^{-itH} - \text{Id}) u \text{ exists in } \mathcal{H} \right\}.$$

together with 4.15. To prove (4.16), we use that

$$Hu = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{-it} (e^{-itH} - \text{Id}) u$$

and (4.15) again. \square

Acknowledgements: I would like to warmly thank Jérémy Faupin for his advice, useful discussions and his encouragements.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Aafarani, *Large time behavior of solutions to Schrödinger equation with complex-valued potential*, J. Math. Pures Appl., 150, (2021), 64–111.
- [2] J-P. Antoine and C. Trapani, *Partial inner product spaces, metric operators and generalized hermicity*, J.Phys. A: Math Theor., 46, (2013), 21p.
- [3] F. Bagarello, J.-P. Gazeau, H.F Szafraniec, M. Znojil, *Non-Selfadjoint Operators in Quantum Physics. Mathematical Aspects*, Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, Hoboken, NJ, 2015.
- [4] N. Bohr. *Neutron capture and nuclear constitution*, Nature, 137, (1936), 344–348.
- [5] H.L. Cycon, R.G. Froese, W. Kirsch, B. Simon, *Schrödinger operators, with application to quantum mechanics and global geometry*, Springer Study edition, Texts and Monographs in Physics, 1987.

- [6] E. B. Davies. *Two-channel Hamiltonians and the optical model of nuclear scattering*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Sect. A (N.S.), 29, (1978), 395–413.
- [7] E. B. Davies. *Linear operators and their spectra*, volume 106 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [8] S. Dyatlov and M. Zworski. *Mathematical theory of scattering resonances*, AMS studies in Mathematics 200, 2019.
- [9] K.-J. Engel and R. Nagel, *One-parameter semigroups for linear evolution equations*, volume 194 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [10] J. Faupin, *Generic nature of asymptotic completeness in dissipative scattering theory*, Rev. Math. Phys., 33, No. 1, (2021), 23 p.
- [11] J. Faupin and F. Nicoleau, *Scattering matrices for dissipative quantum systems*, J. Funct. Anal., 9, (2019), 3062–3097.
- [12] J. Faupin and J. Fröhlich, *Asymptotic completeness in dissipative scattering theory*, Adv. Math., 340, (2018), 300–362.
- [13] J. Faupin and N. Frantz *Spectral decomposition of some non self-adjoint operators* preprint on ArXiv 2203.12406 (2022) *accepted by Annales Henri Lebesgue*
- [14] H. Feshbach, C. Porter and V. Weisskopf. *Model for nuclear reactions with neutrons*, Phys. Rev., 96, (1954), 448–464.
- [15] H. Feshbach, *Unified theory of nuclear reactions*, Ann. Phys. (NY), (1958), 357–390.
- [16] H. Feshbach, *The optical model and its justification*, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci., 8, (1958).
- [17] H. Feshbach, *A unified theory of nuclear reactions II*. Ann. Phys. (NY), (1962), 287–313.
- [18] H. Feshbach, *Theoretical Nuclear Physics, Nuclear Reactions*, Wiley, New York, 1992.
- [19] R. L. Frank, A. Laptev, and O. Safronov, *On the number of eigenvalues of Schrödinger operators with complex potentials*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., (2) 94, (2016), 377–390.
- [20] M. Goldberg, *A dispersive bound for three-dimensional Schrödinger operators with zero energy eigenvalues*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 35, (2010), 1610–1634.
- [21] C. Goldstein. *Perturbation of non-self-adjoint operators. I*. Arch. Rational Mech., 37, (1970), 268–296.
- [22] C. Goldstein. *Perturbation of non-self-adjoint operators. II*. Arch. Rational Mech., 42, (1971), 380–402.
- [23] P. E. Hodgson, *The nuclear optical model*, Rep. Prog. Phys., 34, (1971), 765–819.
- [24] T. Kako and K. Yajima, *Spectral and Scattering Theory for a Class of Non-Selfadjoint Operator* Sci. Papers College Gen. Ed. Univ. Tokyo, 26, (1976).
- [25] T. Kato, *Wave operators and similarity for some non-selfadjoint operators*, Math. Ann., 162, (1965/1966), 258–279.
- [26] T. Kato *Scattering theory with two Hilbert spaces* J. Funct. Anal. 1 (1967) 342–369
- [27] D. Krejcirik, *Mathematical aspects of quantum mechanics with non-self-adjoint operators*, Habilitation Thesis, Universitas Carolina Pragensis, 2017.
- [28] K. Mochizuki. *Eigenfunction expansions associated with the Schrödinger operator with a complex potential and the scattering inverse problem*, Proceedings of the Japan Academy, Proc. Japan Acad. 43(7), (1967), 638–643.
- [29] K. Mochizuki. *On the large perturbation by a class on non-self-adjoint operators*, J. Math. Soc. Japan., 19(2), (1967), 123–158.
- [30] K. Mochizuki. *Scattering theory for wave equations with dissipative terms*, J. Operator Theory, 14(1):57–66, 1985.
- [31] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Methods of modern mathematical physics. I–IV*. Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1975–1980.
- [32] W. Rudin, *Function theory in the Unit Ball of \mathbb{C}^n* , New York, NY: Springer New York, 1980.
- [33] B. Simon. *Phase space analysis of simple scattering systems : extensions of some work of Enss*. Duke Math. J., 46(1):119–168, 1979.
- [34] S.A. Stepin. *Complex Potentials : Bound States, Quantum Dynamics and Wave Operators*, Semigroups of Operators - Theory and Application (Bedlewo Poland October 2013), Springer-Verlag (2015), 287–297.
- [35] S.A. Stepin, *Complete Wave operators in non-self-adjoint Kato model of smooth perturbation theory*, Russian Journal of Mathematical Physics 26, 94–108 (2019).
- [36] X.P. Wang, *Gevrey estimates of the resolvent and sub-exponential time-decay for the heat and Schrödinger semigroups*, J. Math. Pures Appl., 135, (2020), 284–338.
- [37] X. P. Wang. *Time-decay of semigroups generated by dissipative Schrödinger operators* J. Differential Equations, 253, (2012), 3523–3542.
- [38] D.R. Yafaev, *Mathematical Scattering Theory: General Theory*, American Mathematical Society, (1998).

(N. Frantz) LABORATOIRE ANALYSE GÉOMÉTRIE MODÉLISATION, CY CERGY PARIS UNIVERSITÉ 95302 CERGY
PONTOISE, FRANCE
Email address: `nicolas.frantz@cyu.fr`