

LOW ENERGY RESOLVENT EXPANSIONS IN DIMENSION TWO

T. J. CHRISTIANSEN AND K. DATCHEV

ABSTRACT. We prove resolvent expansions near zero energy for compactly supported perturbations of the Laplacian on \mathbb{R}^2 . We obtain precise results for general self-adjoint black box perturbations, in the sense of Sjöstrand and Zworski, and also for some non-self-adjoint ones. We compute the most singular terms, relating them to spaces of zero eigenvalues and resonances. Our methods include resolvent identity arguments following Vodev and boundary pairing arguments following Melrose.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $-\Delta = -\partial_{x_1}^2 - \partial_{x_2}^2$ be the Laplacian on \mathbb{R}^2 . For operators P which are compactly supported perturbations of $-\Delta$ on \mathbb{R}^2 we obtain expansions of the resolvent at zero. The leading terms of these expansions are determined by the $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ asymptotics of solutions to $Pu = 0$.

1.1. Motivation from wave evolution. One motivation for such results comes from their relevance to wave asymptotics. For example, for $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, let w be the solution to

$$(\partial_t^2 + P)w(x, t) = 0, \quad w(x, 0) = 0, \quad \partial_t w(x, 0) = f(x).$$

We consider two cases:

- The free case $P = -\Delta$. Then, by Kirchhoff's formula and the binomial theorem, we have

$$w(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi t} \int \left(1 - \frac{|x - x'|^2}{t^2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} f(x') dx' = \frac{1}{2\pi t} \int f + O(t^{-3}), \quad (1.1)$$

uniformly for large t , and for x varying in a fixed compact set.

- The perturbed case $P = -\Delta + V$, with $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ nonnegative and compactly supported. Then (1.1) is replaced by

$$w(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi t (\log t)^2} \left(\int U_{\log} f \right) U_{\log}(x) + O(t^{-1} (\log t)^{-3}), \quad (1.2)$$

where U_{\log} obeys $PU_{\log} = 0$ and $U_{\log}(x) \sim \log |x|$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$.

Observe that, in the free case, the only bounded solutions to $Pu = 0$ are constants. Further, the leading term of (1.1) decays like t^{-1} , with coefficient given by a sort of projection onto constants. By contrast, in the perturbed case, there are no bounded solutions to $Pu = 0$, and the leading term of (1.2) has the faster decay rate $t^{-1}(\log t)^{-2}$. It is given by a sort of projection onto U_{\log} .

We say that the free case $P = -\Delta$ has a resonance at zero, while for such V the perturbed case $P = -\Delta + V$ has no resonance at zero; see Definition 1 below. This accounts for the difference between (1.1) and (1.2).

The asymptotic (1.2) can be deduced from Theorem 2 using Stone's formula for the wave propagator in terms of the resolvent. This will be done in detail in [CDY], and see also Theorem 6 from Chapter X of [Vai89] for an abstract version of such a result.

1.2. Resolvent expansions. Our main resolvent expansions hold in the abstract framework of Section 2.2, which includes the black box setting of Sjöstrand and Zworski [SjZw91], as well as certain non-self-adjoint problems. The following examples are especially important:

- (1) Let $P = -\Delta + V$, where V is a bounded, compactly supported function. For Theorem 1 we will need $V \in L_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R})$. For Theorem 2 it is enough if $V \in L_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{C})$ and $\operatorname{Re} V \geq 0$.
- (2) Let P be the Dirichlet or Neumann Laplacian $-\Delta$ on $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{\mathcal{O}}$, where \mathcal{O} is a bounded open set with C^∞ boundary and $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{\mathcal{O}}$ is connected.

To describe the spaces of solutions to $Pu = 0$ needed for our main statements, we introduce the following definitions. Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$ in the first case and $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{\mathcal{O}}$ in the second case. Let $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\Omega)$, let \mathcal{D} be the domain of P , let \mathcal{H}_c be the set of functions in \mathcal{H} which have bounded support, and let \mathcal{D}_{loc} be the set of functions which are locally in \mathcal{D} . Recall that if a function u is harmonic and polynomially bounded outside of a disk, then it grows or decays like a power of $|x|$ or like $\log|x|$. We accordingly define:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_l &:= \{u \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}} : Pu = 0, u(x) = O(|x|^l) \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow \infty\}, \\ \mathcal{G}_{\log} &:= \{u \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}} : Pu = 0, u(x) = O(\log|x|) \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow \infty\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

Note that \mathcal{G}_{-2} is the zero eigenspace of P .

Definition 1. If $\mathcal{G}_0 \neq \mathcal{G}_{-2}$, we say P has a *zero resonance*. If $u \in \mathcal{G}_0 \setminus \mathcal{G}_{-1}$, we call u an *s-resonant state* and say P has an *s-resonance*. If $u \in \mathcal{G}_{-1} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{-2}$, we call u a *p-resonant state* and say P has a *p-resonance*.

For example, the free Laplacian and Neumann Laplacian always have a zero resonance with an *s-resonant state* (let u be a constant) while the Dirichlet Laplacian never does. But the Schrödinger operator $-\Delta + V$ may have various combinations of *s-resonance*, *p-resonance*, and zero eigenvalue. See Section 2.3 for more on these examples.

Dimensions of quotient spaces of the \mathcal{G}_l are especially relevant for the form of low-energy resolvent expansions. By standard harmonic function expansions, recalled in (2.5) below, the space of *s-resonances* (resp. *p-resonances*) has, modulo more rapidly decaying elements of the nullspace of P , dimension at most one (resp. two). In symbols,

$$\dim(\mathcal{G}_0/\mathcal{G}_{-1}) \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \dim(\mathcal{G}_{-1}/\mathcal{G}_{-2}) \leq 2. \tag{1.4}$$

Recall that the resolvent $(P - \lambda^2)^{-1}$ continues meromorphically from the upper half plane to Λ , the Riemann surface of $\log \lambda$, as an operator \mathcal{H}_c to \mathcal{D}_{loc} , i.e. from compactly supported functions in \mathcal{H} to functions which are locally in \mathcal{D} . We denote this meromorphic continuation by $R(\lambda)$. In other words, for any smooth and compactly supported χ , $\chi R(\lambda)\chi$ is meromorphic on Λ , with $\|\chi R(\lambda)\chi\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}}$ bounded away from poles. See Section 2.5 below for a review of this.

Although a number of our results are valid for non-self-adjoint operators, for our first result we restrict ourselves to the self-adjoint case.

Theorem 1. *Let P be a self-adjoint operator chosen from among the above examples, or a general self-adjoint black-box perturbation of the Laplacian as defined in Section 2.2. Then for any $\varphi_0 > 0$, we have the following expansion in the sense of operators $\mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}}$:*

$$R(\lambda) = \frac{-\mathcal{P}_e}{\lambda^2} + \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{U_{w_m} \otimes U_{w_m}}{\lambda^2(\log \lambda - s_m)} + B_{01} \log \lambda + O(1), \quad (1.5)$$

as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ with $|\arg \lambda| < \varphi_0$. Here:

- The operator \mathcal{P}_e is projection onto the zero eigenfunctions of P , i.e. onto \mathcal{G}_{-2} .
- The notation $U \otimes U$ means the operator mapping f to $U\langle f, U \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$, $M = \dim \mathcal{G}_{-1}/\mathcal{G}_{-2}$, the U_{w_m} are certain elements of \mathcal{G}_{-1} , and the s_m are certain constants: see Proposition 5.12.
- We have $B_{01} = \frac{-1}{2\pi} U_0 \otimes U_0 - (\rho^2/2) \mathcal{P}_e \mathbf{1}_{>\rho} \Pi_{-2} \mathbf{1}_{>\rho} \mathcal{P}_e$, where $U_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0$, $\mathbf{1}_{>\rho}$ is the characteristic function of the set $\{x: |x| > \rho\}$, Π_{-2} is projection onto the $l = -2$ modes in the Fourier expansion (2.5), and ρ is large enough that $P = -\Delta$ when $|x| \geq \rho$: see Proposition 5.8.

Remarks. 1. From the statement of Theorem 1, it is clear that certain leading terms of (1.5) vanish when certain types of zero resonance/eigenvalue are absent, i.e. when $\mathcal{G}_l = \{0\}$ for some $l \in \{-2, -1, 0\}$. Specifically, if $\mathcal{G}_{-2} = \{0\}$, then $\|\chi R(\lambda)\chi\| = O(\lambda^{-2}(\log \lambda)^{-1})$; if $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \{0\}$ then $\|\chi R(\lambda)\chi\| = O(\log \lambda)$; if $\mathcal{G}_0 = \{0\}$, then $\|\chi R(\lambda)\chi\| = O(1)$.

2. The expansion (1.5) can be continued: see (5.1) for a general result, Propositions 5.9 and 5.10 for simplifications when $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \mathcal{G}_{-2}$, and Theorem 2 for further simplifications when $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \{0\}$.

Our results in Section 4 show that if P is a (not necessarily self-adjoint) black-box perturbation of the Laplacian as defined in Section 2.2 and if $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \{0\}$, i.e. if P has neither eigenvalue 0 nor a p -resonant state, then the resolvent of P grows mildly in the sense of the bound $\|\chi R(\lambda)\chi\| = o(\lambda^{-2}(\log \lambda)^{-1})$: see (2.6) below. In some cases, including Dirichlet obstacle scattering, it is straightforward to prove this bound directly: see Section 2.3. In any case, with the resolvent bound $\|\chi R(\lambda)\chi\| = o(\lambda^{-2}(\log \lambda)^{-1})$ we are able to prove the following more refined resolvent expansion. Our proof of Theorem 2 is more direct than that of Theorem 1.

Definition 2. We say a series $\sum_n T_n(\lambda)$ of operators $T_n(\lambda): \mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}}$ converges absolutely, uniformly on sectors near zero if, for any $\varphi_0 > 0$ and any $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ which is identically 1 on the set where $P \neq -\Delta$, there is $\lambda_0 > 0$, such that the series $\sum_n \|\chi T_n(\lambda)\chi\|$ converges uniformly for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$ with $|\lambda| \leq \lambda_0$ and $|\arg \lambda| \leq \varphi_0$.

Theorem 2. *Let P be as in the above examples, or alternatively let P be a more general black-box perturbation of the Laplacian as defined in Section 2.2. Suppose the resolvent of P grows mildly at 0 in the sense of the bound $\|\chi R(\lambda)\chi\| = o(\lambda^{-2}(\log \lambda)^{-1})$.*

If $\mathcal{G}_0 \neq \{0\}$, i.e. if P has a zero resonance, then there are operators $B_{2j,k}: \mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}}$ such that

$$R(\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2j+1} B_{2j,k} \lambda^{2j} (\log \lambda)^k = B_{01} \log \lambda + B_{00} + B_{23} \lambda^2 (\log \lambda)^3 + \dots \quad (1.6)$$

If $k \neq 0$ then $B_{2j,k}$ has finite rank. Moreover, if P is self-adjoint, then

$$B_{01} = -\frac{1}{2\pi} U_0 \otimes U_0,$$

where $U_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ obeys $U_0(x) = 1 + O(|x|^{-1})$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ and is specified in Lemma 3.5.

If $\mathcal{G}_0 = \{0\}$, i.e. if P has no zero resonance, then there are operators $B_{2j,k}, \tilde{B}_{2j,-k}: \mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{loc}$ and a constant a such that

$$\begin{aligned} R(\lambda) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{k=0}^j B_{2j,k} (\log \lambda)^k + \sum_{k=1}^{j+1} \tilde{B}_{2j,-k} (\log \lambda - a)^{-k} \right) \lambda^{2j} \\ &= B_{00} + \tilde{B}_{0,-1} (\log \lambda - a)^{-1} + B_{21} \lambda^2 \log \lambda + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

If $k \neq 0$, then $B_{2j,k}$ and $\tilde{B}_{2j,-k}$ have finite rank. Moreover, if P is self-adjoint, then

$$\tilde{B}_{0,-1} = \frac{1}{2\pi} U_{\log} \otimes U_{\log}, \quad a = \log 2 - \gamma + \frac{\pi i}{2} + \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left(U_{\log}(x) - \log |x| \right), \quad \gamma = -\Gamma'(1) = 0.577\dots,$$

and U_{\log} is the unique element of \mathcal{G}_{\log} such that $U_{\log}(x) \sim \log |x|$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$.

The series (1.6) and (1.7) converge absolutely, uniformly on sectors near zero.

Remark. By Corollary 4.3, if $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \{0\}$ then the hypothesis $\|\chi R(\lambda)\chi\| = o(\lambda^{-2}(\log \lambda)^{-1})$ holds.

The expressions for $B_{0,1}$ in the first case and $\tilde{B}_{0,-1}$ in the second case are similar for non-self-adjoint P and can be found in Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6. Note that, by Theorem 1, if $P = P^*$ then (2.6) implies $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \{0\}$ and hence U_0 is determined uniquely by the conditions $U_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and $U_0(x) = 1 + O(|x|^{-1})$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$.

1.3. Background and context. Low frequency resolvent expansions have a long history in scattering theory, explicitly since the early results of MacCamy [Mac65] and implicitly even before. Because in dimension two there are several types of resonance and eigenvalue at zero, each playing a different role, this dimension is more challenging than any other – compare the papers [JeKa79, Jen80, Jen84, BGD88, JeNe01] which study this problem for Schrödinger operators with real-valued potentials decaying sufficiently fast at infinity in dimensions respectively three, at least five, four, two (with an additional restriction) and dimension no greater than two.

One of our contributions in Theorem 1 is to give a statement with explicit leading terms for general black-box operators. Such a unified and explicit result, without need for separate cases for presence of different kinds of resonance and eigenvalue at 0, seems to be new even just for Schrödinger operators, and we handle them together with obstacle problems and many other examples. In the absence of elements of the null space of P which decay at infinity, Theorem 2 refines these results, with a more direct proof, and generalizes them to certain non-self-adjoint operators.

By comparison, Vainberg [Vai89] has very general abstract results and many references, but the expansions there are not as explicit as ours. Explicit results corresponding to Theorem 2 were obtained using the framework of [Vai89, Chapter X] by Kleinman and Vainberg [KIVa94] in the setting of exterior differential operators. More recently, another abstract framework was developed by Müller and Strohmaier in [MüSt14], and our methods (in particular the proof of Proposition 4.1) have some commonality with it. It was applied to obtain explicit results, similar to but not as strong as our Theorem 2, for differential forms on manifolds by Strohmaier and Waters in [StWa20]. Some analogous results have been obtained for magnetic Pauli and Dirac operators in [Kov22, Theorem 6.5].

The structure of the resolvent expansion at zero has consequences for the low-energy behavior of the spectral measure, scattering matrix, and scattering phase – see e.g. [JeKa79, ChDa23, GMWZ].

Moreover, as discussed in Section 1.1, it impacts the long-time asymptotics of solutions of the wave or time-dependent Schrödinger equation, see, e.g. [JeKa79, Vai89, Sch05, ErGr13, DyZw19, Hin22]. We explore some of these applications for the scattering matrix and scattering phase of the Dirichlet Laplacian in [ChDa23], for resonance and eigenvalue behavior near zero in [CDG], and for Aharonov–Bohm operators and wave evolution in [CDY].

Wave decay results, such as (1.1) and (1.2) and related results, have been much studied for decades. The field is too wide-ranging to survey here. Let us mention the seminal work of Morawetz [Mor61], and the surveys in [LaPh89, Epilogue], [Vai89, Chapter X], [DaRo13], [Tat13], [DyZw19], [Vas20], [Sch21], [Kla].

Another recent direction is discussed in the survey [ADH] on subwavelength resonator systems. These show strong scattering of waves by small objects, by analyzing at low energies a non-self-adjoint problem which does not fit the assumptions of Section 2.2, but is still amenable to our methods: see the Remark following Proposition 4.1 for a resolvent expansion in their setting.

1.4. Plan of the paper. In Section 2 we introduce our abstract framework, give examples, and prove some preliminary lemmas. In Section 3 we prove Theorem 2, establishing our best and most direct resolvent expansions under the mild growth assumption (2.6). The proof of Theorem 2 has significant overlap with the proof of [ChDa23, Theorem 1]; moreover, the latter is a special case of the former. We accordingly refer the reader to corresponding parts of [ChDa23] for certain details.

In Section 4 we prove our most general resolvent expansions. In Section 5, we refine the Section 4 expansions in the self-adjoint case: Theorem 1 follows from Propositions 5.1, 5.8, and 5.12. Further information about negative powers of $\log \lambda$ is contained in Propositions 5.9 and 5.10. Sections 4 and 5 do not use anything from Section 3.

1.5. Notation and conventions.

- The spaces $\mathcal{G}_l, \mathcal{G}_{\log}$ of polynomially bounded solutions to $Pu = 0$ are defined in (1.3).
- \mathcal{P}_e is projection onto the zero eigenfunctions of P , i.e. onto \mathcal{G}_{-2} .
- Λ is the Riemann surface of $\log \lambda$.
- $\mathbf{1}_{>\rho}$ is the characteristic function of the set $\{x: |x| > \rho\}$.
- The constant $\gamma_0 = \log 2 - \gamma + \frac{\pi i}{2}$ is defined in terms of Euler’s constant $\gamma = -\Gamma'(1) = 0.577\dots$
- The free resolvent notations $R_0(\lambda), \tilde{R}_0(\lambda)$ and $R_{2j,k}$ are introduced in Section 2.1.
- We use the complex inner product $a \cdot b = a^1 \bar{b}^1 + a^2 \bar{b}^2$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^2$.
- The black-box notations $P, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B}$, including the tensor product \otimes and involution $u \mapsto \bar{u}$, are introduced in Section 2.2.
- The Fourier coefficients v_l, c_0, c_{\log} are introduced in (2.5).
- The cutoff $\chi_1 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, which is 1 near \mathcal{B} and depends only on $|x|$, is introduced in the beginning of Section 2.4.
- The radius $r_1 > 0$ is always large enough that $\chi_1(x) = 0$ when $|x| > r_1 - 1$, and sometimes taken larger so as to satisfy additional requirements.
- The boundary pairing \mathbb{B} is defined in (2.9).
- The operators $K_1, K(\lambda), F(\lambda)$ used in Vodev’s identity are defined in the equations from (2.15) to (2.19).

- The operators $\tilde{F}(\lambda)$, $F_{2j,k}$, $A(\lambda)$, $D(\lambda)$, $D_{2j,k}$, the function w , and the complex numbers $\alpha(\lambda)$, $\alpha_{2j,k}$ are defined in (3.1) and Lemma 3.1.
- The notation U_w for $w \in \mathbb{C}^2$ denotes an element of \mathcal{G}_{-1} such that $U_w(x) = w \cdot (\cos \theta, \sin \theta) r^{-1} + O(r^{-2})$, where $x = r(\cos \theta, \sin \theta)$. Such a U_w does not necessarily exist for arbitrary $w \in \mathbb{C}^2$, and when it does exist it is not necessarily unique.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. The free resolvent. Let $-\Delta$ be the nonnegative Laplacian on \mathbb{R}^2 and $R_0(\lambda) = (-\Delta - \lambda^2)^{-1}$ its resolvent for λ in the upper half plane. We briefly review some standard facts about R_0 ; see Section 2A of [ChDa23] for references. The integral kernel of $R_0(\lambda)$ is given by

$$R_0(\lambda)(x, y) = \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(\lambda|x-y|), \quad \text{where } H_0^{(1)}(s) = \frac{2i}{\pi} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (\log s - \gamma_m) \frac{(-s^2/4)^m}{(m!)^2}, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\gamma_0 = \log 2 - \gamma + \frac{\pi i}{2}, \quad \gamma = -\Gamma'(1) = 0.577\dots, \quad \gamma_m = \gamma_{m-1} + \frac{1}{m} \text{ for } m \geq 1.$$

For any $f \in L_c^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and λ in the upper half plane,

$$R_0(\lambda)f(x) = O(e^{-|x|\text{Im}\lambda}), \quad \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.2)$$

It follows from (2.1) that $R_0(\lambda): L_c^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow H_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ continues holomorphically from the upper half plane to Λ , the Riemann surface of $\log \lambda$. For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ we write

$$R_0(\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^1 R_{2j,k} \lambda^{2j} (\log \lambda)^k = R_{01} \log \lambda + \tilde{R}_0(\lambda), \quad (2.3)$$

where $\tilde{R}_0(\lambda)$ is defined by the equation, the $R_{2j,k}$ are operators $L_c^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow H_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and the series converges absolutely, uniformly on sectors near zero. More explicitly, the integral kernels of the leading terms are as follows, with asymptotics valid for y in a fixed compact set and $|x| \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{01}(x, y) &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \\ R_{00}(x, y) &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} (\log|x-y| - \gamma_0) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} (\log|x| - \gamma_0) + \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m|x|^{2m}} (2x \cdot y - |y|^2)^m \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} (\log|x| - \gamma_0) + \frac{1}{4\pi|x|^2} (2x \cdot y - |y|^2) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\frac{x \cdot y}{|x|^2} \right)^2 + O(|x|^{-3}) \\ R_{21}(x, y) &= \frac{1}{8\pi} |x-y|^2 = \frac{1}{8\pi} (|x|^2 - 2x \cdot y + |y|^2) \\ R_{20}(x, y) &= \frac{1}{8\pi} (\log|x-y| - \gamma_0 - 1) |x-y|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{8\pi} \left(\log|x| - \gamma_0 - 1 - \frac{x \cdot y}{|x|^2} \right) |x-y|^2 + O(|x|^{-2}) |x-y|^2 \\ R_{41}(x, y) &= \frac{-1}{128\pi} |x-y|^4 = \frac{-1}{128\pi} (|x|^4 - 4|x|^2(x \cdot y) + 4(x \cdot y)^2 + 2|x|^2|y|^2 - 4(x \cdot y)|y|^2 + |y|^4). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

2.2. Black-box setup and notation. The operator P will either be a black-box perturbation of $-\Delta$ on \mathbb{R}^2 in the sense of [SjZw91]; see also [DyZw19, Chapter 4], or a variant of this that allows for certain non-self-adjoint operators as described below. We briefly review the basic definitions and results that we will need. Let \mathcal{H} be a complex Hilbert space with orthogonal decomposition

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 \oplus L^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B}),$$

where \mathcal{H}_0 is a separable Hilbert space and \mathcal{B} is a fixed ball in \mathbb{R}^2 . Define similarly

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} = \mathcal{H}_0 \oplus L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B}), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}_c = \mathcal{H}_0 \oplus L_c^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B}).$$

Let $u \mapsto u|_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $u \mapsto u|_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B}}$ denote the orthogonal projections $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B})$, and denote their natural extensions $\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}} \rightarrow L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B})$ in the same way. For χ a function on \mathbb{R}^2 which is equal to a constant c near \mathcal{B} , we define

$$\chi u = cu|_{\mathcal{B}} + \chi u|_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B}}.$$

We assume that at least one of (A1) or (A2) holds.

A1. For the ‘‘classic’’ black-box operator, let P be a self-adjoint operator on \mathcal{H} with dense domain \mathcal{D} . We assume that P is lower semi-bounded, that $u \mapsto ((P + z_0)^{-1}u)|_{\mathcal{B}}$ is compact for some z_0 with $\text{Im } z_0 > 0$.

A2. Alternatively, in order to allow certain non-self-adjoint operators P , we assume (as in equations (4.4.10) and (4.4.11) of [DyZw19]) that there is an involution defined on \mathcal{H} , $u \mapsto \bar{u}$, so that if $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B})$ is 0 near \mathcal{B} , then \bar{u} is the complex conjugate of u as usual. Moreover, we assume that if $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $u \in \mathcal{H}$, then $\overline{cu} = c\bar{u}$, and $\langle \bar{u}, \bar{v} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle v, u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$. An example to keep in mind is of course $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with the involution given by complex conjugation. We need also some hypotheses on the operator P : it has dense domain $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{H}$, if $u \in \mathcal{D}$ then \bar{u} is in the domain of P^* , with $\overline{P^*u} = Pu$. Moreover, we assume there is an $M > 0$ so that for all $u \in \mathcal{D}$, $\text{Re}\langle Pu, u \rangle > -M\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$, and $u \mapsto ((P + z_0)^{-1}u)|_{\mathcal{B}}$ is compact for some z_0 with $\text{Im } z_0 > 0$.

We also assume $\mathcal{D}|_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B}} \subset H^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B})$, that $(Pu)|_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B}} = (-\Delta u)|_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B}}$, and that if $f \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B})$ and $f = 0$ near \mathcal{B} then $f \in \mathcal{D}$. Put $\mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}} = \mathcal{D}|_{\mathcal{B}} \oplus H_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. We use a tensor product notation analogous to [DyZw19, (2.2.19)]:

$$(g \otimes h)f = g\langle f, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}},$$

and we use the same inner product notation for pairing vectors in \mathcal{H}_{loc} with vectors in \mathcal{H}_c . By statements like

$$u(x) = O(|x|^l), \quad \text{or} \quad u = O(|x|^l),$$

as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, as in (1.3), we mean $u|_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B}}(x) = O(|x|^l)$. If $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}}$, by Pu we mean $Pu = -\Delta(1 - \chi)u + P\chi u \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}}$, where $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is 1 in a neighborhood of \mathcal{B} .

We can now make sense of the spaces \mathcal{G}_l and \mathcal{G}_{log} of functions in \mathcal{D}_{loc} annihilated by P , defined in (1.3). Recall that such functions have a large $|x|$ expansion in polar coordinates: if $\phi \in \bigcup_l \mathcal{G}_l$, then there are coefficients $c_0(\phi), c_{\text{log}}(\phi) \in \mathbb{C}$, and $v_l(\phi) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, such that for r large enough we have

$$\phi(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) = c_0(\phi) + c_{\text{log}}(\phi) \log r + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} v_l(\phi) \cdot (\cos(|l|\theta), \sin(|l|\theta)) r^l. \quad (2.5)$$

Under the above assumptions, $R(\lambda) = (P - \lambda^2)^{-1} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is meromorphic for λ in the upper half plane, and $R(\lambda)$ continues meromorphically as an operator from $\mathcal{H}_{\text{comp}}$ to \mathcal{D}_{loc} to $\lambda \in \Lambda$; we review these facts in Section 2.5 below.

We record the following straightforward lemma for future reference.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose the black-box operator P and the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} satisfy (A2). Let $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and take $\text{Im } \lambda > 0$, away from any square roots of eigenvalues of P . Then $(R(\lambda))^* f = \overline{R(\lambda)f}$.*

Proof. Note that our assumptions (A2) imply that

$$(P^* - \bar{\lambda}^2)\overline{R(\lambda)f} = \overline{(P - \lambda^2)R(\lambda)f} = \bar{f}$$

so that $(P^* - \bar{\lambda}^2)\overline{R(\lambda)f} = f$. Comparing this to $(P^* - \bar{\lambda}^2)(R(\lambda))^* f = I$ gives $(R(\lambda))^* f = \overline{R(\lambda)f}$. \square

For our results in Section 3 we will need to assume that the resolvent grows mildly at 0 in the sense of the bound

$$\|\chi R(i\kappa)\chi\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}} = o(\kappa^{-2}(\log \kappa)^{-1}), \quad \text{as } \kappa \rightarrow 0 \text{ along the positive real axis,} \quad (2.6)$$

for any $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ which is 1 near \mathcal{B} . Corollary 4.3 shows that if P has neither eigenvalue 0 nor a p -resonance state (i.e. if $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \{0\}$), then the estimate (2.6) holds. Below we consider some examples in which one can rather easily check that there are no nontrivial elements of the null space of P which decay at infinity.

2.3. Examples. We now discuss further the basic examples we introduced earlier.

2.3.1. Schrödinger operators. Let $P = -\Delta + V$, with $V \in L_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{C})$. If either $\text{Re } V \geq 0$ or $\pm \text{Im } V \geq 0$ with $\text{Im } V \not\equiv 0$, then we can quickly show that $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \{0\}$, and thus by Corollary 4.3 the resolvent satisfies the estimate (2.6). Indeed, if $u \in \mathcal{G}_{-1}$, then

$$0 = \int_{|x| < \rho} Pu\bar{u}dx = \int_{|x| < \rho} (|\nabla u|^2 + V|u|^2)dx - \int_{|x|=\rho} \partial_r u \bar{u} dS_x.$$

By (2.5), $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|x|=\rho} \partial_r u \bar{u} dS_x = 0$. Hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|\nabla u|^2 + V|u|^2)dx = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

If $\text{Re } V \geq 0$, then taking the real part of (2.7) shows that $\nabla u \equiv 0$. Since $u(x) = O(|x|^{-1})$, we get $u \equiv 0$. If $\pm \text{Im } V \geq 0$, then taking the imaginary part of (2.7) shows that $\text{Im } V|u|^2 \equiv 0$. Using $\text{Im } V \not\equiv 0$ and unique continuation [Rob87, Corollary 2], we again get $u \equiv 0$.

If $\text{Re } V \geq 0$, one can prove the resolvent estimate (2.6) directly, without resorting to Corollary 4.3. One way is to argue as in Lemma 2.1 of [ChDa23]: if $u = R(i\kappa)\chi f$, then

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \kappa^2 \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \langle \chi f, u \rangle_{L^2} \leq \|\chi f\|_{L^{4/3}} \|u\|_{L^4} \leq \|\chi\|_{L^4} \|f\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|u\|_{L^2}^{1/2}, \quad (2.8)$$

which implies the stronger estimate $\|R(i\kappa)\chi\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}} = O(\kappa^{-3/2})$.

We remark that the paper [CDG] studies low-energy behavior of resonances and the scattering phase for Schrödinger operators, with explicit calculations for Schrödinger operators with circular well potentials.

2.3.2. *Obstacles.* Let $P = -\Delta$ be the Dirichlet or Neumann Laplacian $-\Delta$ on $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{\mathcal{O}}$, where \mathcal{O} is a bounded open set with C^∞ boundary and Ω is connected.

To determine whether P has a zero resonance or eigenvalue, we compute as in the proof of Theorem 4.19 of [DyZw19]. Let $u \in \mathcal{G}_0$, and take ρ large enough that $|x| < \rho$ for all $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}$. As in Section 2.3.1, we have

$$0 \leq \int_{\{x \in \Omega: |x| \leq \rho\}} |\nabla u|^2 = - \int_{|x|=\rho} (\partial_r u) \bar{u} = O(\rho^{-1}), \quad \text{as } \rho \rightarrow \infty,$$

and hence u is constant. Thus u can be nontrivial if and only if the boundary condition is Neumann. We conclude that P has an s -resonance in the Neumann case, but not in the Dirichlet case. In either case there is no p -resonance and no zero eigenvalue, so the estimate (2.6) holds by Corollary 4.3.

In the Dirichlet case (2.6) also follows directly from (2.8), and it holds moreover for any obstacle \mathcal{O} which is not polar: see [ChDa23, Section 2.2] for more details.

2.4. Boundary pairing. It is convenient to introduce a boundary pairing, similar to that from [Mel93, Section 6.1], whose notation we now adapt to our setting. Let $\chi_1 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; [0, 1])$ be such that χ_1 is 1 near \mathcal{B} and χ_1 depends only on $|x|$. For $r_1 > 0$ such that $\chi_1(x) = 0$ for $|x| > r_1 - 1$, and $u, v \in H^2(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : ||x| - r_1| < 1\})$, define

$$\mathbb{B}(u, v) = \mathbb{B}_{r_1}(u, v) = \int_{|x|=r_1} u \partial_r \bar{v} - (\partial_r u) \bar{v}. \quad (2.9)$$

The circle $|x| = r_1$ plays the role of the boundary of the interaction region.¹

Define for $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}}$,

$$\langle u_1, u_2 \rangle_{|x| < r_1} = \langle \chi_1^{1/2} u_1, \chi_1^{1/2} u_2 \rangle + \int_{|x| < r_1} (1 - \chi_1) u_1 \bar{u}_2 dx, \quad (2.10)$$

and define similarly $\langle u_1, u_2 \rangle_{|x| > r_1}$, $\langle u_1, u_2 \rangle_{r_1 < |x| < r_2}$. Note that this definition is independent of the choice of χ_1 .

Lemma 2.2. *Let $u_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}}$, $u_2 \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{loc}}$ and suppose for each $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ which is constant near \mathcal{B} , $u_2 \chi$ is in the domain of P^* . Then*

$$\mathbb{B}(u_1, u_2) = \langle P u_1, u_2 \rangle_{|x| < r_1} - \langle u_1, P^* u_2 \rangle_{|x| < r_1}.$$

Proof. This follows in a straightforward way from Green's formula. □

The next two results are closely related.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\chi_1 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be one in a neighborhood of \mathcal{B} , and such that $\chi_1(x) = 0$ for $|x| > r_1 - 1$. Let $u \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}}$, $v \in H_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then*

$$\langle [-\Delta, \chi_1] u, v \rangle = \langle (1 - \chi_1) u, \Delta v \rangle_{|x| < r_1} + \langle (1 - \chi_1) P u, v \rangle_{|x| < r_1} - \mathbb{B}(u, v).$$

¹In [Mel93, Section 6.1] the ‘boundary’ in ‘boundary pairing’ refers to a boundary at infinity. See also [DyZw19, Section 4.4.3] for another related usage.

Proof. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \langle [-\Delta, \chi_1]u, v \rangle &= \langle (\Delta(1 - \chi_1) + (1 - \chi_1)P)u, v \rangle_{|x| < r_1} \\ &= \langle (1 - \chi_1)u, \Delta v \rangle_{|x| < r_1} + \langle (1 - \chi_1)Pu, v \rangle_{|x| < r_1} + \int_{|x|=r_1} (\partial_r u \bar{v} - \phi \partial_r \bar{v}), \end{aligned}$$

by using Green's formula. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Fix $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$ and $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $|y_0| < r_1$. Then*

$$\langle \phi, \overline{R_0(\lambda)}(\bullet, y_0) \rangle_{|x| > r_1} = -\mathbb{B}_{r_1}(R(\lambda)\phi, \overline{R_0(\lambda)}(\bullet, y_0)).$$

Proof. By analytic continuation, it is enough to prove the equality for $\lambda = i|\lambda|$, $|\lambda| > 0$, and λ away from any poles of $R(\lambda)$. Recall that, by (2.2), $R_0(\lambda)(x, y_0)$ is exponentially decaying in $|x|$. Then, with $\psi_1 = R(\lambda)\phi$ and $\psi_2 = \overline{R_0(\lambda)}(\bullet, y_0)$, we have

$$\langle \phi, \psi_2 \rangle_{|x| > r_1} = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \langle (P - \lambda^2)\psi_1, \psi_2 \rangle_{\rho > |x| > r_1} = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{B}_\rho(\psi_1, \psi_2) - \mathbb{B}_{r_1}(\psi_1, \psi_2) = -\mathbb{B}_{r_1}(\psi_1, \psi_2),$$

where we used Green's formula in the annulus $\rho > |x| > r_1$ as in Lemma 2.2, the compact support of ϕ , and $(-\Delta - \lambda^2)R_0(\lambda)(x, y_0) = 0$ for $|x| > r_1$. \square

We shall frequently take boundary pairings of functions which are harmonic near infinity, and so we record the following lemma, whose proof is a straightforward calculation which we omit.

Lemma 2.5. *Let ϕ, ψ be harmonic and polynomially bounded for x such that $|x| > r_1 - 1$, some $\epsilon > 0$. Then, in terms of the Fourier series expansion, (2.5), we have*

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \mathbb{B}(\phi, \psi) = c_0(\phi) \bar{c}_{\log}(\psi) - c_{\log}(\phi) \bar{c}_0(\psi) + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} l v_{-l}(\phi) \cdot v_l(\psi).$$

We will often use the following special case:

Lemma 2.6. *If $\phi \in \mathcal{G}_{\log}$, then $c_{\log}(\phi) = \frac{-1}{2\pi} \langle [\Delta, \chi_1]\phi, 1 \rangle = R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1]\phi$.*

Proof. Use Lemma 2.3 with $v = 1$, Lemma 2.5, and the resolvent kernel formula (2.4). \square

We supplement the \mathcal{G}_l spaces with the following related spaces. For $l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, let

$$\mathcal{F}_l = \{u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}) : u(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) = (c_+ e^{i\theta} + c_- e^{-i\theta}) r^l, \text{ for some constants } c_\pm \in \mathbb{C}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \{u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}) : u(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) = c_0 + c_1 \log r, \text{ for some constants } c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{C}\}.$$

Note from Lemma 2.5 that \mathbb{B} is a nondegenerate pairing from $\mathcal{F}_l \times \mathcal{F}_{-l}$ to \mathbb{C} , and that $\mathbb{B}(u, v) = 0$ if $u \in \mathcal{F}_l, v \in \mathcal{F}_k$, with $l \neq -k$. Let

$$\mathcal{F}'_l = \{u \in \mathcal{F}_l : \text{there exists } u' \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}} \text{ with } Pu' = 0 \text{ and } u \sim u' \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty\}. \quad (2.11)$$

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose $u \in \mathcal{F}'_l$ and $v \in \mathcal{F}'_{-l}$. If $P = P^*$, then $\mathbb{B}(u, v) = 0$. If instead P and \mathcal{H} satisfy the hypotheses (A2), then $\mathbb{B}(u, \bar{v}) = 0$.*

Proof. First we note that if u' is as in (2.11) and v' is the analog for v , then $\mathbb{B}(u, v) = \mathbb{B}(u', v')$ and $\mathbb{B}(u, \bar{v}) = \mathbb{B}(u', \bar{v}')$. Then the lemma follows from an application of Lemma 2.2. \square

From Lemma 2.7 and the nondegeneracy of the mapping $\mathbb{B} : \mathcal{F}_l \times \mathcal{F}_{-l} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we deduce

Corollary 2.8. *If $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then $\dim \mathcal{F}'_l + \dim \mathcal{F}'_{-l} \leq 2$.*

Since $\dim(\mathcal{G}_{-1}/\mathcal{G}_{-2}) = \dim \mathcal{F}'_{-1}$ and $\dim(\mathcal{G}_0/\mathcal{G}_{-1}) \leq \dim \mathcal{F}'_0$, Corollary 2.8 generalizes and sharpens (1.4). In particular, we obtain

Corollary 2.9. *At most one of $\mathcal{G}_{\log} \setminus \mathcal{G}_0$ and $\mathcal{G}_0 \setminus \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ is nonempty.*

2.5. Vodev's identity. Let z and λ be in the upper half plane, away from any square roots of eigenvalues of P . To relate the resolvents of P and $-\Delta$, we start by using

$$R(\lambda)(1 - \chi_1)(-\Delta - \lambda^2)R_0(\lambda) = R(\lambda)\{(P - \lambda^2)(1 - \chi_1) + [\chi_1, \Delta]\}R_0(\lambda)$$

to write

$$R(\lambda)(1 - \chi_1) = \{1 - \chi_1 - R(\lambda)[\Delta, \chi_1]\}R_0(\lambda). \quad (2.12)$$

Similarly to (2.12) we have

$$(1 - \chi_1)R(z) = R_0(z)\{1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]R(z)\}. \quad (2.13)$$

We note for later use that this implies that for any $f \in \mathcal{H}_c$ and λ in the upper half plane,

$$R(\lambda)f|_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B}}(x) = O(e^{-|x|\operatorname{Im} \lambda}), \quad \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.14)$$

Inserting (2.12) and (2.13) into

$$R(\lambda) - R(z) = (\lambda^2 - z^2)R(\lambda)R(z) = (\lambda^2 - z^2)\left(R(\lambda)\chi_1(2 - \chi_1)R(z) + R(\lambda)(1 - \chi_1)^2R(z)\right),$$

gives

$$\begin{aligned} R(\lambda) - R(z) = & (\lambda^2 - z^2)\left(R(\lambda)\chi_1(2 - \chi_1)R(z) \right. \\ & \left. + \{(1 - \chi_1) - R(\lambda)[\Delta, \chi_1]\}R_0(\lambda)R_0(z)\{(1 - \chi_1) + [\Delta, \chi_1]R(z)\}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging in $(\lambda^2 - z^2)R_0(\lambda)R_0(z) = R_0(\lambda) - R_0(z)$, and introducing the notation

$$K_1 = 1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]R(z), \quad (2.15)$$

gives

$$R(\lambda) - R(z) = (\lambda^2 - z^2)R(\lambda)\chi_1(2 - \chi_1)R(z) + \{1 - \chi_1 - R(\lambda)[\Delta, \chi_1]\}(R_0(\lambda) - R_0(z))K_1. \quad (2.16)$$

We now bring the $R(\lambda)$ terms to the left, the remaining terms to the right, and factor, obtaining

$$R(\lambda)(I - K(\lambda)) = F(\lambda), \quad (2.17)$$

where

$$K(\lambda) = (\lambda^2 - z^2)\chi_1(2 - \chi_1)R(z) - [\Delta, \chi_1](R_0(\lambda) - R_0(z))K_1, \quad (2.18)$$

$$F(\lambda) = R(z) + (1 - \chi_1)(R_0(\lambda) - R_0(z))K_1. \quad (2.19)$$

Here and below we shorten formulas by using notation which displays λ -dependence but not z -dependence for operators other than resolvents. The identities (2.16) and (2.17) are versions of Vodev's resolvent identity [Vod14, (5.4)].

Our first use of Vodev's identity is to prove meromorphic continuation of the resolvent to z , using the technique of Section 2 of [ChDa22]. Take $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that χ is 1 near the support of χ_1 and multiply (2.17) on the left and right by χ . That gives $\chi R(\lambda)\chi(I - K(\lambda)\chi) = \chi F(\lambda)\chi$.

Observe now that $K(\lambda)\chi$ is compact $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, and $\|K(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}} \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow z$. Consequently, by the analytic Fredholm theorem, $\chi R(\lambda)\chi = \chi F(\lambda)\chi(I - K(\lambda)\chi)^{-1}$ continues meromorphically from the upper half plane to Λ , the Riemann surface of $\log \lambda$.

Thus (2.16) and (2.17) continue to hold for any z and λ in Λ , with $K(\lambda)$ and K_1 mapping \mathcal{H}_c to \mathcal{H}_c , and $R(\lambda)$ and $F(\lambda)$ mapping \mathcal{H}_c to \mathcal{D}_{loc} .

3. RESOLVENT EXPANSIONS WITH MILD GROWTH

The main result of this section is the proof of Theorem 2, an asymptotic expansion for the resolvent near the origin under the mild growth assumption (2.6).

We now begin to use the assumption (2.6) on the rate at which the cutoff resolvent norms may grow near zero energy. Parts of this proof are the same as that of [ChDa23, Theorem 1]. That result, for Dirichlet obstacle scattering, is a special case of (1.7).

Our first lemma, from [ChDa23], is based on Vodev's identity (2.17) and on part of [Vod99, Proposition 3.1]. To state it, use the free resolvent series (2.3) and $F(\lambda)$ as in (2.19) to write

$$F(\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^1 F_{2j,k} \lambda^{2j} (\log \lambda)^k = F_{01} \log \lambda + \tilde{F}(\lambda), \quad (3.1)$$

where each $F_{2j,k}$ is bounded $\mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}}$. Moreover, if $k \neq 0$, then $F_{2j,k}$ has finite rank.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume (2.6). There is $z_0 > 0$ such that for every z on the positive imaginary axis obeying $0 < -iz \leq z_0$, we have*

$$R(\lambda) = \frac{\log \lambda}{1 - (\log \lambda - \log z)\alpha(\lambda)} \left(\left(\frac{-1}{2\pi} (1 - \chi_1) + \tilde{F}(\lambda) D(\lambda) w \right) \otimes 1 \right) K_1 D(\lambda) - \frac{\log z}{1 - (\log \lambda - \log z)\alpha(\lambda)} \tilde{F}(\lambda) D(\lambda) (w \otimes 1) K_1 D(\lambda) + \tilde{F}(\lambda) D(\lambda), \quad (3.2)$$

where $w = \frac{1}{2\pi} \Delta \chi_1$, and

$$D(\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^j D_{2j,k} \lambda^{2j} (\log \lambda)^k, \quad \alpha(\lambda) = \langle K_1 D(\lambda) w, 1 \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^j \alpha_{2j,k} \lambda^{2j} (\log \lambda)^k, \quad (3.3)$$

for some operators $D_{2j,k}: \mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_c$ and complex numbers $\alpha_{2j,k}$ which depend on z but not on λ . If $k \neq 0$ then $D_{2j,k}$ has finite rank. The series converge absolutely, uniformly on sectors near zero. We also have the following variant of Vodev's identity

$$R(\lambda)(I - A(\lambda)D(\lambda)) = F(\lambda)D(\lambda), \quad (3.4)$$

where $A(\lambda) = (\log \lambda - \log z)(w \otimes 1)K_1$.

Proof. The identity (3.2) generalizes identity (2.23) of [ChDa23], and the other assertions generalize Lemma 2.3 of the same paper. The same proofs work in our setting and we omit them. \square

We now derive the form of the resolvent expansions, in terms of two cases depending on α_{00} .

Lemma 3.2. *Let the notation and assumptions of Lemma 3.1 hold.*

1. *If $\alpha_{00} = 0$, then there are operators $B_{2j,k}: \mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{loc}$ such that*

$$R(\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2j+1} B_{2j,k} \lambda^{2j} (\log \lambda)^k = B_{01} \log \lambda + B_{00} + B_{23} \lambda^2 (\log \lambda)^3 + \dots \quad (3.5)$$

2. *If $\alpha_{00} \neq 0$, then there are operators $B_{2j,k}, \tilde{B}_{2j,-k}: \mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{loc}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} R(\lambda) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{k=0}^j B_{2j,k} (\log \lambda)^k + \sum_{k=1}^{j+1} \tilde{B}_{2j,-k} (\log \lambda - \log z - \alpha_{00}^{-1})^{-k} \right) \lambda^{2j} \\ &= B_{00} + \tilde{B}_{0,-1} (\log \lambda - \log z - \alpha_{00}^{-1})^{-1} + B_{11} \lambda^2 \log \lambda + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

The series converge absolutely, uniformly on sectors near zero. If $k \neq 0$, then $B_{2j,k}$ and $\tilde{B}_{2j,-k}$ have finite rank.

Proof. 1. If $\alpha_{00} = 0$, then $|(\log \lambda - \log z)\alpha(\lambda)| \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ and, using the series for α from (3.3), we have

$$\frac{1}{1 - (\log \lambda - \log z)\alpha(\lambda)} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (\log \lambda - \log z)^m \alpha(\lambda)^m = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2j} a_{2j,k} \lambda^{2j} (\log \lambda)^k.$$

Inserting this, and the series for D and \tilde{F} from (3.3) and (3.1), into (3.2) gives the resolvent series expansion (3.5), with B_{01} of rank at most 1. Moreover, $B_{2j,k}$ has finite rank for any $k \neq 0$.

2. If $\alpha_{00} \neq 0$, then $|(\log \lambda - \log z)\alpha(\lambda)| \rightarrow \infty$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. As in equation (2.30) of [ChDa23], we have

$$\frac{1}{1 - (\log \lambda - \log z)\alpha(\lambda)} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{j-1} b_{2j,k} (\log \lambda)^k + \sum_{k=1}^{j+1} b_{2j,-k} (\log \lambda - \log z - \alpha_{00}^{-1})^{-k} \right) \lambda^{2j}.$$

Inserting this series and the series (3.3) and (3.1) for D and \tilde{F} into (3.2) gives (3.6), with all the $B_{2j,k}, \tilde{B}_{2j,-k}$ having finite rank if $k \neq 0$, and $\tilde{B}_{0,-1}$ having rank at most 1. \square

We will use the following two lemmas for uniqueness statements when computing B_{01} and $\tilde{B}_{0,-1}$, and also to identify the cases $\alpha_{00} = 0$ and $\alpha_{00} \neq 0$ with the resonant $\mathcal{G}_0 \neq \{0\}$ and non-resonant $\mathcal{G}_0 = \{0\}$ cases respectively. We defer the proofs to the end of the section.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume (2.6). Then 0 is not an eigenvalue of P , i.e. $\mathcal{G}_{-2} = \{0\}$.*

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose $R(i\varepsilon)$ has a limit $\mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{loc}$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. Then $\mathcal{G}_0 = \{0\}$.*

To compute B_{01} and $\tilde{B}_{0,-1}$, we expand the equation $(P - \lambda^2)R(\lambda) = I$, for $\text{Im } \lambda > 0$, using (3.5) or (3.6), and compare powers of λ , $\log \lambda$, and $(\log \lambda - \log z - \alpha_{00}^{-1})^{-1}$. This gives the following identities in the sense of operators $\mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{loc}$:

$$\begin{aligned} PB_{2j,k} &= B_{2j-2,k}, & P\tilde{B}_{2j,k} &= \tilde{B}_{2j-2,k} \quad \text{if } (j,k) \neq (0,0), \\ PB_{00} &= I, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where we understand that $B_{2j,k} = 0$ and $\tilde{B}_{2j,k} = 0$ for the terms not appearing in (3.5) or (3.6).

Lemma 3.5. *Let the notation and assumptions of Lemma 3.2 hold, and suppose $\alpha_{00} = 0$. Then*

$$B_{01} = -\frac{1}{2\pi}U_0 \otimes U_0, \text{ in case (A1), or } B_{01} = -\frac{1}{2\pi}U_0 \otimes \overline{U_0} \text{ in case (A2)} \quad (3.8)$$

and U_0 is the unique element of \mathcal{G}_0 obeying

$$U_0(x) = 1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{x \cdot y}{|x|^2} (K_1 D_{00} w)(y) dy + O(|x|^{-2}), \quad \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.9)$$

Proof. From (3.2) we see that the range of B_{01} is spanned by a function U_0 given by

$$U_0 = 1 - \chi_1 - 2\pi F_{00} D_{00} w. \quad (3.10)$$

Furthermore, $PU_0 = 0$ follows from (3.7). Given the expansion (3.9), uniqueness of U_0 follows from $\mathcal{G}_{-2} = \{0\}$, by Lemma 3.3. Next we show that

$$F_{00} D_{00} w(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{x \cdot y}{|x|^2} (K_1 D_{00} w)(y) dy + O(|x|^{-2}). \quad (3.11)$$

By definition (2.19),

$$F_{00} = R(z)\chi + (1 - \chi_1)(R_{00} - R_0(z))K_1, \quad (3.12)$$

and, since the $R_0(z)$ and $R(z)$ terms are $O(e^{-|z||x|})$ by (2.2) and (2.14) because z is on the positive imaginary axis, (3.11) follows from the fact that for $|x|$ large enough we have

$$R_{00} K_1 D_{00} w(x) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m|x|^{2m}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (2x \cdot y - |y|^2)^m f(y) dy, \quad \text{with } f = K_1 D_{00} w, \quad (3.13)$$

where we used the R_{00} asymptotic (2.4) and the fact that $\alpha_{00} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f = 0$. This shows (3.9).

If P is self-adjoint, then writing

$$\langle R(i|\lambda)u, v \rangle - \langle u, R(i|\lambda)v \rangle = 0, \quad (3.14)$$

for arbitrary u and v in \mathcal{H}_c and $|\lambda| > 0$ small enough, substituting $R(i|\lambda) = B_{01} \log |\lambda| + O(1)$, and extracting the coefficient of $\log |\lambda|$, we see that $B_{01} = cU_0 \otimes U_0$, for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

If, instead P and \mathcal{H} satisfy the hypotheses (A2), then $B_{01} = cU_0 \otimes v$ for some $v \in \mathcal{H}_{loc}$ and some $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Expanding $R(\lambda)$ as in (3.5), from the coefficient of $\log \lambda$ in Lemma 2.1 we obtain $v = \overline{U_0}$.

Now we evaluate c . Let $\phi = [\Delta, \chi_1] \log |x|$. Since $\chi_1(x) = 0$ if $|x| \geq r_1$, the coefficient of $\log \lambda$ in Lemma 2.4 yields

$$\mathbb{B}(B_{01}\phi, \overline{R_{00}}(\bullet, 0)) + \mathbb{B}(B_{00}\phi, \overline{R_{01}}(\bullet, 0)) = 0. \quad (3.15)$$

Now we evaluate $B_{01}\phi$ and $B_{00}\phi$. If P is self-adjoint, then, by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.5, we obtain

$$\langle \phi, U_0 \rangle = \langle (P(1 - \chi_1) - (1 - \chi_1)P) \log |\bullet|, U_0 \rangle = \mathbb{B}(\log |\bullet|, U_0) = -2\pi.$$

Using this in $B_{01}\phi = c(U_0 \otimes U_0)\phi = c\langle \phi, U_0 \rangle U_0$ yields

$$B_{01}\phi = -2\pi c U_0. \quad (3.16)$$

A similar argument in case P satisfies hypotheses (A2) also yields (3.16).

To compute $B_{00}\phi$ we observe that, because $PB_{00}\phi = \phi = [\Delta, \chi_1] \log |x| = -\Delta(1 - \chi_1) \log |x|$, it follows that $\phi_1 := B_{00}\phi - (1 - \chi_1) \log |x|$ is in the nullspace of P . Next, by the definition of F (3.12), we have $F_{00}\psi = O(\log |x|)$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, for any $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_c$. Hence, by the resolvent expansion

(3.2), we get $B_{00}\phi = O(\log|x|)$ and thus also $\phi_1 = O(\log|x|)$ and so $\phi_1 \in \mathcal{G}_{\log}$. Since $U_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0 \setminus \mathcal{G}_{-1}$, by Corollary 2.9 it follows that $\phi_1 = O(1)$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. Hence

$$B_{00}\phi = \log|x| + O(1), \quad \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.17)$$

Using Lemma 2.5 to evaluate the boundary pairings in (3.15), and plugging in (3.16), (3.17) and the free resolvent asymptotics (2.4), gives $2\pi(-2\pi c)(\frac{-1}{2\pi}) - 2\pi(1)(\frac{-1}{2\pi}) = 0$, or $c = \frac{-1}{2\pi}$. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let the notation and assumptions of Lemma 3.2 hold, and suppose $\alpha_{00} \neq 0$. Then the operator $\tilde{B}_{0,-1}$ from (3.6) is given by*

$$\tilde{B}_{0,-1} = \frac{1}{2\pi}U_{\log} \otimes U_{\log} \text{ in case (A1), or } \tilde{B}_{0,-1} = \frac{1}{2\pi}U_{\log} \otimes \overline{U_{\log}} \text{ in case (A2)} \quad (3.18)$$

where U_{\log} is the unique element of \mathcal{G}_{\log} such that $c_{\log}(U_{\log}) = 1$. Moreover,

$$c_0(U_{\log}) = \alpha_{00}^{-1} + \log z - \gamma_0. \quad (3.19)$$

Proof. The proof in case (A1) is the same as that of Lemma 2.6 in [ChDa23], and we give just the following outline: first show that $B_{0,-1} = cU_{\log} \otimes U_{\log}$, then that $U_{\log} = 2\pi\tilde{B}_{0,-1}w$, and then that $\langle w, U_{\log} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$. Uniqueness of U_{\log} follows from Lemma 3.4

The proof in case (A2) is only slightly different. We have instead $\tilde{B}_{0,-1} = cU_{\log} \otimes \overline{U_{\log}}$ (just as in the proof of (3.8) above), while $U_{\log} = 2\pi\tilde{B}_{0,-1}w$ is unchanged, and finally we show $\langle w, \overline{U_{\log}} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$ by the same calculation that gives $\langle w, U_{\log} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$ in case (A1). \square

We are now ready to complete the proof of Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. If P has a zero resonance, then, by Lemma 3.4, $R(\lambda)$ cannot have a limit as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ along the positive imaginary axis. Hence by part 2 of Lemma 3.2 it follows that $\alpha_{00} = 0$. The conclusion then follows from part 1 of Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.5.

If P has no zero resonance, then there can be no solution $u_A \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}}$ to $Pu = 0$ with the asymptotic (3.9). Hence, by part 1 of Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.5, we must have $\alpha_{00} \neq 0$. The conclusion then follows from part 2 of Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.6. \square

It remains to prove Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4. We prove Lemma 3.3 using an intermediate step in the proof of Vodev's identity to reduce to a problem of bounding the free resolvent. See Lemma 5 of [Sch05] for a related calculation. If P is self-adjoint, then Lemma 3.3 can alternatively be deduced from Proposition 5.1 below.

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Let $\chi, \chi_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be 1 in a neighborhood of \mathcal{B} , with $\text{supp } \chi_0$ contained in the set on which χ_1 is 1. We use (2.12) with $\lambda = i\kappa$, $\kappa > 0$ to write

$$R(i\kappa) = R(i\kappa)\chi_1 + \{1 - \chi_1 - R(i\kappa)[\Delta, \chi_1]\}R_0(i\kappa)(1 - \chi_0). \quad (3.20)$$

Let $\phi \in \mathcal{G}_{-2}$. Then $R(i\kappa)\phi = \phi/\kappa^2$. Applying (3.20) to ϕ and multiplying on the left by χ yields

$$\kappa^{-2}\chi\phi = \chi R(i\kappa)\chi_1\phi + \chi\{1 - \chi_1 - R(i\kappa)[\Delta, \chi_1]\}R_0(i\kappa)(1 - \chi_0)\phi,$$

or, using our assumption (2.6),

$$\chi\phi = \kappa^2\chi\{1 - \chi_1 - R(i\kappa)[\Delta, \chi_1]\}R_0(i\kappa)(1 - \chi_0)\phi + o((\log \kappa)^{-1}). \quad (3.21)$$

It suffices to show that $\|\tilde{\chi}R_0(i\kappa)(1 - \chi_0)\phi\| = O(\log \kappa)$ as $\kappa \downarrow 0$, for any $\tilde{\chi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, since then by (3.21) and (2.6) we must have $\chi\phi = o(1)$, or $\phi = 0$, proving the lemma.

Moreover, we can replace $(1 - \chi_0)$ with $\mathbf{1}_{>\rho}$ for any fixed $\rho > 0$, since by the R_0 expansion (2.3) we have $\|\tilde{\chi}R_0(i\kappa)(1 - \chi_0 - \mathbf{1}_{>\rho})\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = O(\log \kappa)$. Thus, by the resolvent kernel formula (2.1), taking ρ large enough that $\tilde{\chi}$ is supported in $\{x: |x| < \rho/2\}$, we see that it is enough to show

$$\int_{\{y: |y| > \rho\}} H_0^{(1)}(i\kappa|x - y|)\phi(y) dy = O(\log \kappa),$$

uniformly for $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $|x| < \rho/2$. Now write $|x - y| = |y|(1 + \varepsilon)$, where $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(x, y)$ obeys $|\varepsilon| \leq |x|/|y| < 1/2$. Using the fact that

$$\int_{\{y: |y| > \rho\}} H_0^{(1)}(i\kappa|y|)\phi(y) dy = 0$$

since the zero Fourier component of ϕ is 0 for $|y| > \rho$, we see that it is enough to show that

$$\int_{\{y: |y| > \rho\}} \left(H_0^{(1)}(i\kappa|y|(1 + \varepsilon)) - H_0^{(1)}(i\kappa|y|) \right) \phi(y) dy = O(\log \kappa).$$

Using $\phi(y) = O(|y|^{-2})$, and passing to polar coordinates, observe that it is enough to prove

$$\int_{\rho}^{\infty} \left| H_0^{(1)}(i\kappa r(1 + \varepsilon_1)) - H_0^{(1)}(i\kappa r) \right| r^{-1} dr = \int_{\rho\kappa}^{\infty} \left| H_0^{(1)}(is(1 + \varepsilon_1)) - H_0^{(1)}(is) \right| s^{-1} ds = O(\log \kappa),$$

provided $|\varepsilon_1| < 1/2$. By the same large argument Bessel function asymptotics as in the proof of (2.2), we have $H_0^{(1)}(is) \lesssim e^{-s}$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$, so it is enough to show that there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\rho\kappa}^{\delta} \left| H_0^{(1)}(is(1 + \varepsilon_1)) - H_0^{(1)}(is) \right| s^{-1} ds = O(\log \kappa).$$

For that use the fact that, by (2.1), $H_0^{(1)}(is) \sim (2i/\pi) \log s$ as $s \rightarrow 0$ to write

$$\left| H_0^{(1)}(is(1 + \varepsilon_1)) - H_0^{(1)}(is) \right| \sim \frac{2}{\pi} |\log(1 + \varepsilon_1)| < \frac{2}{\pi} \log 2.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 3.4. We first give the proof for P self-adjoint. Let $U \in \mathcal{G}_0$. Take $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$, and take r_1 such that $\phi(x) = 0$ when $|x| \geq r_1$. Let $R(0) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} R(i\varepsilon)$. Then, by Lemma 2.2,

$$0 = \langle R(0)\phi, PU \rangle = \langle \phi, U \rangle - \mathbb{B}(R(0)\phi, U) \quad (3.22)$$

Now observe that, by (2.13) with χ_1 such that $\chi_1 = 1$ near the support of ϕ , with $z \rightarrow 0$ along the positive imaginary axis, and substituting the free resolvent series (2.3), we have

$$(1 - \chi_1)R(0)\phi = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \log(i\varepsilon)R_{01}\{1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]R(i\varepsilon)\}\phi + R_{00}\{1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]R(0)\}\phi.$$

But the fact that the limit on the right exists implies that

$$\int ((1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]R(0))\phi)(x) dx = 0, \quad (3.23)$$

and also that the limit $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \log(i\varepsilon)R_{01}\left(1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1](R(i\varepsilon) - R(0))\right)\phi$ exists, yielding

$$(1 - \chi_1)R(0)\phi = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \log(i\varepsilon)R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1](R(i\varepsilon) - R(0))\phi + R_{00}(1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]R(0))\phi. \quad (3.24)$$

Now we use (3.23) and insert the R_{00} series (2.4) into (3.24) to get

$$(1 - \chi_1)R(0)\phi(x) = c_\phi + \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m|x|^{2m}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (2x \cdot y - |y|^2)^m f(y) dy,$$

with $f = (1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]R(0))\phi$ and

$$c_\phi = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int \left(\log(i\varepsilon)[\Delta, \chi_1](R(i\varepsilon) - R(0)) \right) \phi dx.$$

In particular, $R(0)\phi$ is harmonic and bounded for large $|x|$. By Lemma 2.5, $\mathbb{B}(R(0)\phi, U) = 0$, and hence (3.22) yields $\langle \phi, U \rangle = 0$. Since this is true for any $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$, it follows that $U = 0$.

If P is not self-adjoint but satisfies the alternate conditions (A2), then instead of (3.22) we write

$$0 = \langle R(0)\phi, \overline{P\bar{U}} \rangle = \langle R(0)\phi, P^*\bar{U} \rangle = \langle \phi, \bar{U} \rangle - \mathbb{B}(R(0)\phi, \bar{U}).$$

The rest of the proof is essentially identical, giving $\langle \phi, \bar{U} \rangle = 0$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$, and hence $U = 0$. \square

4. GENERAL RESOLVENT EXPANSIONS

Here we begin our study of resolvent expansions without the mild growth hypothesis (2.6). Corollary 4.3 to these initial results gives us a sufficient condition for (2.6) in terms of the nullspace of P : if $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \{0\}$, i.e. if P has no p -resonance or eigenvalue at 0, then (2.6) holds. In the self-adjoint case, the converse is also true by Theorem 1, or more specifically by Lemma 5.5.

We emphasize that the results of this section do not require that P be self-adjoint, only that it satisfies our general black-box hypotheses, including either (A1) or (A2).

Proposition 4.1. *There are $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $k_0(j) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $B_{2j,k} : \mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}}$ such that*

$$R(\lambda) = \sum_{j=-j_0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0(j)} B_{2j,k} (\log \lambda)^k \lambda^{2j}. \quad (4.1)$$

The series (4.1) converges absolutely, uniformly on sectors near zero. Moreover, if $k \neq 0$, then $B_{2j,k}$ has finite rank.

Proof. We use Vodev's identity $R(\lambda)(I - K(\lambda)) = F(\lambda)$ from (2.17). First note that if we choose $\chi_2 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ to be 1 on the support of χ_1 , then $(I - K(\lambda)(1 - \chi_2))^{-1} = I + K(\lambda)(1 - \chi_2)$, since $(1 - \chi_2)K(\lambda) = 0$. Using $I - K(\lambda) = (I - K(\lambda)(1 - \chi_2))(I - K(\lambda)\chi_2)$ yields

$$R(\lambda) = F(\lambda)(I - K(\lambda)\chi_2)^{-1}(I + K(\lambda)(1 - \chi_2)),$$

so that it remains to understand the inverse of $I - K(\lambda)\chi_2$. Note that, by Section 2.1, the free resolvent $R_0(\lambda)$ can be written in the form

$$(\log \lambda)H_1(\lambda) + H_2(\lambda), \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{with } H_1, H_2, \text{ holomorphic and even in } \lambda \text{ near } \lambda = 0, \\ \text{and } \partial_\lambda^m H_1(0) \text{ finite rank for all } m. \end{array} \quad (4.2)$$

Hence each of $K(\lambda)$ and $F(\lambda)$ can be written in the form (4.2) as well. Since $K(\lambda)\chi_2$ is a compact operator and $K(z) = 0$, (4.1) follows from the Hahn-holomorphic Fredholm theorem [MüSt14, Theorem 4.1].

For the reader's convenience we give the argument, which is very similar to that used in the proof of the usual analytic Fredholm theorem, e.g. [ReSi80, Theorem VI.14]. Set

$$A_1(\lambda) := (1/2\pi)(\log \lambda - \log z)(\Delta \chi_1 \otimes 1)K_1 \chi_2.$$

Since $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} K(\lambda) \chi_2 - A_1(\lambda)$ is compact, we can find $\lambda_0 > 0$ small enough, a finite rank operator A_2 , and a compact operator $K_2(\lambda)$, such that

$$K(\lambda) \chi_2 = A_1(\lambda) + A_2 + K_2(\lambda), \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \Lambda, |\arg \lambda| < \varphi_0, |\lambda| < \lambda_0,$$

and $\|K_2(\lambda)\| \leq 1/2$ in this region. Moreover, $K_2(\lambda)$ can be written in the form (4.2). Then $I - K_2(\lambda)$ is invertible with bounded inverse in this region, and the inverse can be written

$$(I - K_2(\lambda))^{-1} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (K_2(\lambda))^m = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq k \leq j} D_{2j,k} (\log \lambda)^k \lambda^{2j}$$

for some operators $D_{2j,k} : \mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{loc}$. Moreover, if $k > 0$, $D_{2j,k}$ has finite rank.

Then $I - K(\lambda) \chi_2 = (I - A_3(\lambda))(I - K_2(\lambda))$ where $A_3(\lambda) = (A_1(\lambda) + A_2)(I - K_2(\lambda))^{-1}$. Since $A_1(\lambda)$ and A_2 are each finite rank, $A_3(\lambda)$ is of finite rank and $I - A_3(\lambda)$ can be inverted essentially by Cramer's rule, resulting in an operator of the form $I + G(\lambda)$, where $G(\lambda)$ is of finite rank and has an expansion of the type on the right hand side of (4.1). The claim about the finite rank of $B_{2j,k}$ for $k \neq 0$ follows from how a nonzero power of $\log \lambda$ can arise during the construction: as a coefficient of $\log \lambda \lambda^{2j'}$ in the expansions of F , K , or K_2 , each of which is of finite rank, or in inverting $I - A_3(\lambda)$, which differs from the identity by a finite rank operator. \square

Remark. The main ingredients of the proof of this proposition are Vodev's identity and a variant of the analytic Fredholm theorem. This means that the proof of Proposition 4.1 does not need the full strength of assumptions (A1) or (A2). It does, however, require that $K(\lambda)$ is a compact operator for some λ with $0 < \arg \lambda < \pi$. For this, it suffices if $u \mapsto ((P + z_0)^{-1}u)|_{\mathcal{B}}$ is compact for some z_0 with $\text{Im } z_0 \neq 0$. Hence the results of Proposition 4.1 hold for a larger class of non-selfadjoint operators, including the case of a finite set of subwavelength resonators as in [ADH].

Lemma 4.2. *With the assumptions and notation of Proposition 4.1, if $j_0 > 0$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$, then $B_{-2j_0,k} \phi \in \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $k \leq k_0(-j_0)$.*

Proof. To simplify notation, let $k^\sharp = k_0(-j_0)$, and for each $k \leq k^\sharp$ let $\psi_k = B_{-2j_0,k} \phi$. Since $P\psi_k = 0$ follows from the coefficient of $\lambda^{-2j_0} (\log \lambda)^{-k}$ in $(P - \lambda^2)R(\lambda)\phi = \phi$, it is enough to show that, for all $k \leq k^\sharp$, we have

$$\psi_k(x) = O(|x|^{-1}), \quad \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.3)$$

From the coefficient of $z^{-2j_0} (\log z)^{k^\sharp+1}$ in (2.13), and using $R_{01} = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1}$, we obtain

$$\langle [\Delta, \chi_1] \psi_{k^\sharp}, \mathbf{1} \rangle = 0, \quad (4.4)$$

and from the coefficient of $z^{-2j_0} (\log z)^k$ with $k \leq k^\sharp$ we obtain

$$\psi_k = R_{00}[\Delta, \chi_1] \psi_k + R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1] \psi_{k-1} + O(|x|^{-N}) = O(\log |x|). \quad (4.5)$$

Plugging the formula (2.4) for R_{00} and (4.4) into (4.5) with $k = k^\sharp$, and applying Lemma 2.6, yields

$$\psi_{k^\sharp}(x) = c_{\log}(\psi_{k^\sharp-1}) + O(|x|^{-1}). \quad (4.6)$$

By Corollary 2.9, we cannot have both $\psi_{k^\sharp} \in \mathcal{G}_0 \setminus \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ and $\psi_{k^\sharp-1} \in \mathcal{G}_{\log} \setminus \mathcal{G}_0$. Hence $c_{\log}(\psi_{k^\sharp-1}) = 0$, and we obtain $\psi_{k^\sharp}(x) = O(|x|^{-1})$ and $\psi_{k^\sharp-1}(x) = O(1)$.

An inductive argument which repeats the steps above proves (4.3) for all $k \leq k^\sharp$. \square

Lemma 4.2 has as an immediate corollary:

Corollary 4.3. *Suppose P satisfies the black-box hypotheses, including either (A1) or (A2). If $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \{0\}$, then the resolvent estimate (2.6) holds.*

5. RESOLVENT EXPANSIONS WITHOUT MILD GROWTH

In this section we study the more challenging problem of understanding the expansion of $R(z)$ near 0 without the mild growth assumption (2.6). In order to make this more manageable, we shall assume throughout this section that P satisfies hypothesis (A1); in particular, P is self-adjoint.

Proposition 5.1. *When P is self-adjoint, (4.1) can be refined to*

$$R(\lambda) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^0 B_{-2,k}(\log \lambda)^k \lambda^{-2} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0(j)} B_{2j,k}(\log \lambda)^k \lambda^{2j}, \quad B_{-2,0} = -\mathcal{P}_e. \quad (5.1)$$

Proof. By self-adjointness, $\text{Im}(\langle (P \mp ir^2)\phi, \phi \rangle) = \mp r^2 \|\phi\|^2$ if $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$, $r > 0$. Hence $\|R(e^{i\pi/4}r)\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}} \leq r^{-2}$. Combining with Proposition 4.1 gives (5.1), except for $B_{-2,0} = -\mathcal{P}_e$.

It remains to prove $B_{-2,0} = -\mathcal{P}_e$. First observe that $\|B_{-2,0}\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}} \leq 1$, because if $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}_c$, then $|\langle B_{-2,0}\phi, \psi \rangle| = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} |\langle r^2 R(e^{i\pi/4}r)\phi, \psi \rangle| \leq \|\phi\| \|\psi\|$, by (5.1) and $\|R(e^{i\pi/4}r)\| \leq r^{-2}$. Next, the coefficient of λ^{-2} in $(P - \lambda^2)R(\lambda) = I$ gives $PB_{-2,0} = 0$ and thus $\mathcal{P}_e B_{-2,0} = B_{-2,0}$.

The coefficient of $\lambda^0(\log \lambda)^0$ in $(P - \lambda^2)R(\lambda) = I$ gives $PB_{00} - B_{-2,0} = I$, and applying \mathcal{P}_e to both sides gives $\mathcal{P}_e B_{-2,0} = -\mathcal{P}_e$ once we show that $\mathcal{P}_e PB_{00} = 0$.

It remains to prove $\mathcal{P}_e PB_{00} = 0$. We deduce this from $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c, \psi \in \mathcal{G}_{-2} \implies \langle PB_{00}\phi, \psi \rangle = \langle B_{00}\phi, P\psi \rangle = 0$ and to check the first equals sign we use Lemma 2.2 to reduce the problem to proving $\lim_{r_1 \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{B}_{r_1}(B_{00}\phi, \psi) = 0$. Now, by the coefficient of $z^0(\log z)^0$ in (2.13) we have

$$(1 - \chi_1)B_{00} = R_{00}(1 - \chi_1) + \sum_{j=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^1 R_{2j,k}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{-2j,-k}. \quad (5.2)$$

Using the $R_{2j,k}$ formulas in (2.4), the lack of $l \geq 0$ modes in the expansion (2.5) of $B_{-2,-1}\phi$ (from Lemma 4.2), and the lack of $l \geq -1$ modes in the expansion of $B_{-2,0}\phi$ (from $\mathcal{P}_e B_{-2,0} = B_{-2,0}$), we see that $B_{00}\phi = O(|x|)$ and $\partial_r B_{00}\phi = O(1)$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, and hence from the formula (2.9) for \mathbb{B}_{r_1} we have $\mathbb{B}_{r_1}(B_{00}\phi, \psi) = O(r_1^{-1})$, as desired. \square

Like $B_{-2,0}$, all terms $B_{2j,k}$ we compute below have the form

$$B_{2j,k} = \sum_{m=1}^M c_m U_m \otimes U_m, \quad \text{for some } M \in \mathbb{N}, c_m \in \mathbb{R}, U_m \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{loc}}. \quad (5.3)$$

Note that if $k = -1$ or $k_0(j)$, then the $\kappa^{2j}(\log \kappa)^k$ coefficient of $\langle R(i\kappa)\phi, \psi \rangle = \langle \phi, R(i\kappa)\psi \rangle$ for $\kappa > 0$ gives $\langle B_{2j,k}\phi, \psi \rangle = \langle \phi, B_{2j,k}\psi \rangle$, and hence (5.3) follows provided we have additionally $k \neq 0$.

In Section 5.1 we show that $B_{-2,k}$ with $k \leq -1$ is nonzero if and only if $\mathcal{G}_{-1} \neq \mathcal{G}_{-2}$, and describe such $B_{-2,k}$ in terms of elements of $\mathcal{G}_{-1} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{-2}$ (i.e. p -resonant states). In Section 5.2, we show

that $B_{0,1}$ is nonzero if and only if $\mathcal{G}_0 \neq \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ or $\mathcal{G}_{-2} \neq \mathcal{G}_{-3}$, and describe it in terms of elements of $(\mathcal{G}_0 \setminus \mathcal{G}_1) \cup (\mathcal{G}_{-2} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{-3})$ (i.e. s -resonant states and eigenfunctions of slowest decay). We also show that $B_{0,k} = 0$ for $k \geq 2$ always. In Section 5.3 we simplify the leading negative powers of $\log \lambda$.

5.1. Contributions of p -resonances. The main result of this section is the following proposition, which computes $B_{-2,-1}$. We use the Fourier series notation of (2.5).

Proposition 5.2. *Let $M = \dim(\mathcal{G}_{-1}/\mathcal{G}_{-2})$. If $M = 0$ then $B_{-2,-k} = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$. Otherwise, $M \leq 2$ and there exist $\{w_m\}_{m=1}^M$ an orthonormal set in \mathbb{C}^2 and corresponding $U_{w_m} \in \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ with $v_{-1}(U_{w_m}) = w_m$ such that*

$$B_{-2,-1} = \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{m=1}^M U_{w_m} \otimes U_{w_m}.$$

Before proving Proposition 5.2, we prove several lemmas and identities. We begin by using Vodev's identity (2.16) with $\lambda = ze^{in\pi}$, followed by $R_0(ze^{in\pi}) - R_0(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} in\pi R_{2j,1} z^{2j}$, to get

$$R(ze^{in\pi}) - R(z) = in\pi \left(1 - \chi_1 - R(ze^{in\pi})[\Delta, \chi_1]\right) \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} R_{2j,1} z^{2j}\right) \left(1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]R(z)\right). \quad (5.4)$$

In the next lemma we extract coefficients corresponding to negative powers of $\log z$ from (5.4).

Lemma 5.3. *Let $-1 \leq j$ and $1 \leq k' \leq k$. Then*

$$B_{2j,-k} = \sum_{j_1+j_2+j_3=j} B_{2j_1,-k'}[\Delta, \chi_1] R_{2j_2,1}[\Delta, \chi_1] B_{2j_3,k'-k-1} \quad (5.5)$$

For $j = -1$, (5.5) simplifies to

$$B_{-2,-k} = B_{-2,-k'}[\Delta, \chi_1] R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1] B_{-2,k'-k-1}, \quad (5.6)$$

In particular, $B_{-2,-k}\mathcal{H}_c \subset B_{-2,-k'}\mathcal{H}_c$.

Proof. To prove (5.5), use $a^{-k} - b^{-k} = (b-a)(a^{-k}b^{-1} + \dots + a^{-1}b^{-k})$ to extract the coefficient of $z^{2j}(\log z + in\pi)^{-k'}(\log z)^{k'-k-1}$ from (5.4).

To get (5.6), it is enough to show that if $j = -1$, then all terms in (5.5) with $j_2 = 0$ vanish. Such terms have either $j_3 = -1$ or $j_1 = -1$. If $j_3 = -1$, we have $R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{-2,k-k'-1} = 0$, by Lemma 2.6 and the fact that $B_{-2,k-k'-1}$ maps $\mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ by Lemma 4.2. If $j_1 = -1$, we have similarly $B_{-2,-k'}[\Delta, \chi_1]R_{01} = 0$, because $B_{-2,-k}^*$ maps $\mathcal{H}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ since P is self-adjoint. \square

We shall also need to compute $R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]U_w$. Since $(1 - \chi_1)U_w$ has no 0 Fourier modes,

$$\langle (1 - \chi_1)U_w, \Delta R_{21}(x, \bullet) \rangle_{|x| < r_1} = \langle (1 - \chi_1)U_w, \frac{1}{2\pi} \rangle_{|x| < r_1} = 0$$

so that by Lemma 2.3 $\langle [\Delta, \chi_1]U_w, R_{21}(x, \bullet) \rangle = \mathbb{B}(U_w, R_{21}(x, \bullet))$. Then

$$(R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]U_w)(x) = \langle [\Delta, \chi_1]U_w, R_{21}(x, \bullet) \rangle = \mathbb{B}(U_w, R_{21}(x, \bullet)) = -\mathbb{B}(U_w, \frac{x \cdot \bullet}{4\pi}) = -\frac{1}{2}w \cdot x, \quad (5.7)$$

where we used the formula (2.4) for R_{21} , Lemma 2.5 to compute the boundary pairing, and again the fact that U_w has no 0 Fourier modes for $|x|$ big enough.

Lemma 5.4. *If $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$ and $B_{-2,-1}\phi \neq 0$, then $B_{-2,-1}\phi \in \mathcal{G}_{-1} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{-2}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.2, $B_{-2,-1}\phi \in \mathcal{G}_{-1}$, so we must show that $B_{-2,-1}\phi \in \mathcal{G}_{-2}$ implies $B_{-2,-1}\phi = 0$.

By (5.6), we have

$$B_{-2,-1} = B_{-2,-1}[\Delta, \chi_1]R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{-2,-1}. \quad (5.8)$$

But if $B_{-2,-1}\phi \in \mathcal{G}_{-2}$ then $R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{-2,-1}\phi = 0$ by (5.7), and so (5.8) implies $B_{-2,-1}\phi = 0$. \square

Now we show that if $\mathcal{G}_{-1} \neq \mathcal{G}_{-2}$, then there is a nontrivial term $B_{-2,-1}$ in the expansion (5.1).

Lemma 5.5. *We have $\text{rank } B_{-2,-1} = \dim(\mathcal{G}_{-1}/\mathcal{G}_{-2})$.*

Proof. Observe first that Lemma 5.4 implies that $\text{rank } B_{-2,-1} \leq \dim(\mathcal{G}_{-1}/\mathcal{G}_{-2})$.

To prove that $\dim(\mathcal{G}_{-1}/\mathcal{G}_{-2}) \leq \text{rank } B_{-2,-1}$, we will construct a linear map $L: \mathcal{G}_{-1} \rightarrow B_{-2,-1}\mathcal{H}_c$ with $\ker L \subset \mathcal{G}_{-2}$. Let $U_{w_0} \in \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$ with $\mathcal{P}_e\phi = 0$. Applying Lemma 2.2 with r_1 large enough that $\phi(x) = 0$ when $|x| \geq r_1$, and using $PB_{00} = I - \mathcal{P}_e$ (from the λ^0 coefficient of $(P - \lambda^2)R(\lambda) = I$), gives

$$0 = \langle PU_{w_0}, B_{00}\phi \rangle = \mathbb{B}(U_{w_0}, B_{00}\phi) + \langle U_{w_0}, \phi \rangle. \quad (5.9)$$

To compute $\mathbb{B}(U_{w_0}, B_{00}\phi)$, note the $R_{2j,k}$ formulas (2.4) imply that $R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{0,-1}\phi = O(1)$ and $R_{00}(1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]B_{00})\phi = O(\log|x|)$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, and furthermore $B_{-2,0}\phi = -\mathcal{P}_e\phi = 0$ by our choice of ϕ . Thus the formula (5.2) for B_{00} and (5.7) yield

$$B_{00}\phi = R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{-2,-1}\phi + O(\log|x|) = -\frac{1}{2}w_1 \cdot x + O(\log|x|), \quad \text{where } U_{w_1} = B_{-2,-1}\phi.$$

Hence, by Lemma 2.5, $\mathbb{B}(U_{w_0}, B_{00}\phi) = -\pi w_0 \cdot w_1$. Plugging into (5.9) gives

$$w_0 \cdot w_1 = \frac{1}{\pi} \langle U_{w_0}, \phi \rangle. \quad (5.10)$$

Now given $U_{w_0} \in \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ with $w_0 \neq 0$, applying (5.10) with $\phi_{w_0} = \chi w_0 \cdot x$, for some $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{B})$, $\chi \geq 0$, $\chi \neq 0$, yields $w_0 \cdot w_1 > 0$. Thus, defining $LU_{w_0} = B_{-2,-1}\phi_{w_0}$ gives $\ker L \subset \mathcal{G}_{-2}$ as desired. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.2. By Lemma 5.4, if $M = 0$, then $B_{-2,-k} = 0$ for any $k \geq 1$.

It remains to compute $B_{-2,-1}$ when $M \geq 1$. By (5.3) and Lemma 5.5,

$$B_{-2,-1} = \sum_{m,m'=1}^M c_{m,m'} U_{w_m} \otimes U_{w'_m},$$

for some constants $c_{m,m'}$. Further, by linearity, we may take the w_m orthonormal. Using (5.7) and its consequence $\langle [\Delta, \chi_1]w \cdot \bullet, U_{w'} \rangle = \mathbb{B}(w \cdot \bullet, U_{w'}) = -2\pi w \cdot w'$ in (5.8) gives

$$\sum_{m,m'=1}^M c_{m,m'} U_{w_m} \otimes U_{w'_m} = \pi \sum_{m,m',m''=1}^M c_{mm'} c_{m'm''} U_{w_m} \otimes U_{w_{m''}}.$$

Thus if we denote by C the $M \times M$ matrix whose entries are the $c_{mm'}$, we have $\pi C^2 = C$. Since C must have rank M by Lemma 5.5, this means $\pi C = I$. \square

5.2. Contributions of s -resonances. We next compute the B_{0k} . The main results of this section are Lemma 5.7, which shows that $B_{0k} = 0$ for $k \geq 2$, and Proposition 5.8, which computes B_{01} and shows that it is nontrivial if and only if P has an s -resonant state or a zero eigenfunction which decays more slowly than $|x|^{-3}$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. if and only if $\mathcal{G}_0 \neq \mathcal{G}_1$ or $\mathcal{G}_{-2} \neq \mathcal{G}_{-3}$.

Lemma 5.6. *We have $B_{0k}\mathcal{H}_c \subset \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ for $k \geq 2$ and $B_{01}\mathcal{H}_c \subset \mathcal{G}_0$.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of Lemma 4.2. Let $k^\sharp = k_0(0)$, and assume $k^\sharp \geq 1$ as otherwise there is nothing to prove. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$ and $\psi_k = B_{0k}\phi$ for $k = 1, \dots, k^\sharp$. From the coefficient of $(\log \lambda)^k$ in $(P - \lambda^2)R(\lambda) = I$, $P\psi_k = 0$. The coefficient of $(\log z)^k$ in (2.13) yields $\psi_k \in \mathcal{G}_{\log}$,

$$\psi_k = R_{00}[\Delta, \chi_1]\psi_k + c_{\log}(\psi_{k-1}) + \delta_{1k}R_{01}(1 - \chi_1)\phi + O(|x|^{-N}), \quad (5.11)$$

where we used $R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{-2,0} = 0$ from (5.7), Lemma 2.6, and δ_{1k} is the Kronecker delta.

By (5.11) with $k = k^\sharp + 1$, we obtain $c_{\log}(\psi_{k^\sharp}) = 0$ and hence $\psi_{k^\sharp} \in \mathcal{G}_0$. If $k^\sharp = 1$ we are done.

Suppose now $k^\sharp \geq 2$. By (5.11) with $k = k^\sharp$, and using $\psi_{k^\sharp} \in \mathcal{G}_0$, Lemma 2.6, and the formula (2.4) for R_{00} , we obtain $\psi_{k^\sharp} = c_{\log}(\psi_{k^\sharp-1}) + O(|x|^{-1})$. By Corollary 2.9, we cannot have both $\psi_{k^\sharp} \in \mathcal{G}_0 \setminus \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ and $\psi_{k^\sharp-1} \in \mathcal{G}_{\log} \setminus \mathcal{G}_0$. Hence $c_{\log}(\psi_{k^\sharp-1}) = 0$, giving $\psi_{k^\sharp} \in \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ and $\psi_{k^\sharp-1} \in \mathcal{G}_0$.

An inductive argument which repeats the steps above completes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.7. *If $k \geq 2$, then $B_{0k} = 0$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 5.3, the coefficient of $(\log z + in\pi)^{k-2} \log z$ in (5.4) gives

$$B_{0k} = \begin{cases} -B_{0,k-2}[\Delta, \chi_1]R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{01}, & k \geq 3, \\ \mathcal{P}_e[\Delta, \chi_1]R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{01} + \{1 - \chi_1 - B_{00}[\Delta, \chi_1]\}R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{01}, & k = 2. \end{cases}$$

But $R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{01} = 0$ by Lemmas 2.6 and 5.6, and $\mathcal{P}_e[\Delta, \chi_1]R_{21} = 0$ by (5.7). \square

Now that we know B_{01} is the only possible nontrivial B_{0k} with $k \geq 1$, it remains to compute it.

Proposition 5.8. *There exists $U_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ such that*

$$B_{01} = -\frac{1}{2\pi}U_0 \otimes U_0 - \frac{\rho^2}{2}\mathcal{P}_e\mathbf{1}_{>\rho}\Pi_{-2}\mathbf{1}_{>\rho}\mathcal{P}_e, \quad (5.12)$$

where Π_{-2} denotes projection onto the $l = -2$ modes in (2.5), $\mathbf{1}_{>\rho}$ is the characteristic function of $\{x: |x| > \rho\}$ with $\mathcal{B} \subset \{x: |x| > \rho\}$. Moreover, $U_0 = 0$ if $\mathcal{G}_0 \setminus \mathcal{G}_{-1} = \emptyset$, and $c_0(U_0) = 1$ otherwise.

Proof. 1. From the coefficient of $(\log z + in\pi)^0(\log z)^0 z^0$ in (5.4), we get

$$B_{01} = B_{01,0} + B_{01,-2}, \quad \text{where}$$

$$B_{01,0} = (1 - \chi_1 - B_{00}[\Delta, \chi_1])R_{01}(1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]B_{00}), \quad B_{01,-2} = -\mathcal{P}_e[\Delta, \chi_1]R_{41}[\Delta, \chi_1]\mathcal{P}_e,$$

and we used $\mathcal{P}_e[\Delta, \chi_1]R_{21} = R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]\mathcal{P}_e = 0$, from (5.7). It remains to show that

$$B_{01,0} = -\frac{1}{2\pi}U_0 \otimes U_0, \quad B_{01,-2} = -\frac{\rho^2}{2}\mathcal{P}_e\mathbf{1}_{>\rho}\Pi_{-2}\mathbf{1}_{>\rho}\mathcal{P}_e. \quad (5.13)$$

2. Now we turn to showing the first of (5.13). For $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$, by Lemma 5.6 $B_{01}\phi \in \mathcal{G}_0$, so that by Lemmas 2.3 and 2.5 we find $\langle 1, [\Delta, \chi_1]B_{01}\phi \rangle = 0$. Since P is self-adjoint, $B_{00}^* = B_{00} + cB_{01}$ for some constant c . We use these and the formula (2.4) for R_{01} to write, for $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}_c$,

$$-2\pi\langle B_{01,0}\phi, \psi \rangle = \langle (1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]B_{00})\phi, 1 \rangle \langle 1, (1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]B_{00})\psi \rangle, \quad (5.14)$$

By Lemma 2.3,

$$\langle [\Delta, \chi_1]B_{00}\phi, 1 \rangle = -\langle (1 - \chi_1)PB_{00}\phi, 1 \rangle_{|x| < r_1} + \mathbb{B}_{r_1}(B_{00}\phi, 1).$$

Plugging in $PB_{00} = I - \mathcal{P}_e$, and taking r_1 large enough that $\phi(x) = 0$ when $|x| \geq r_1$, gives

$$\langle (1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]B_{00})\phi, 1 \rangle = \langle (1 - \chi_1)\mathcal{P}_e\phi, 1 \rangle + \mathbb{B}_{r_1}(B_{00}\phi, 1) = \mathbb{B}_{r_1}(B_{00}\phi, 1),$$

since $\mathcal{P}_e\phi$ contains no $l = 0$ modes in (2.5). But, from the coefficient of $\log \lambda$ in Lemma 2.4,

$$\mathbb{B}_{r_1}(B_{01}\phi, \overline{R}_{00}(\bullet, y_0)) + \mathbb{B}_{r_1}(B_{00}\phi, \overline{R}_{01}(\bullet, y_0)) = 0, \quad (5.15)$$

where we used (by (5.7)) $\mathbb{B}_{r_1}(B_{-20}\phi, \overline{R}_{21}(\bullet, y_0)) = 0$. Using also the formulas (2.4) for R_{00} and R_{01} , the fact (from Lemma 5.6) that $B_{01}\phi \in \mathcal{G}_0$, and Lemma 2.5 for boundary pairing, gives

$$\mathbb{B}_{r_1}(B_{00}\phi, 1) = -2\pi\mathbb{B}_{r_1}(B_{00}\phi, \overline{R}_{01}(\bullet, y_0)) = 2\pi\mathbb{B}_{r_1}(B_{01}\phi, \overline{R}_{00}(\bullet, y_0)) = -2\pi c_0(B_{01}\phi),$$

and hence

$$\langle B_{01,0}\phi, \psi \rangle = -2\pi c_0(B_{01}\phi)\overline{c}_0(B_{01}\psi). \quad (5.16)$$

Since $B_{01}\phi \in \mathcal{G}_0$, (5.16) shows $B_{01,0} = 0$ when $\mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ because in that case $c_0(B_{01}\phi) = 0$ for all ϕ . If, on the other hand, $\mathcal{G}_0 \neq \mathcal{G}_{-1}$, then (5.14) shows that there is $U_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ with $c_0(U_0) = 1$ such that $B_{01,0} = \beta U_0 \otimes U_0$ for some constant β . Plugging $B_{01,0}\phi = \beta\langle \phi, U_0 \rangle U_0$, $c_0(B_{01,-2}\phi) = 0$ into (5.16), and similarly for ψ , gives $\beta = -2\pi\beta^2$, so it remains to show $\beta \neq 0$.

To show $\beta \neq 0$, follow the corresponding computation from our proof in the corresponding case covered in Section 3, equations (3.15) to (3.17). More specifically, we will show that $B_{01}\phi \neq 0$ for $\phi = [\Delta, \chi_1] \log |x|$. By (5.15), it is enough to show that $B_{00}\phi = \log |x| + O(1)$, and this can be shown by using (5.2) to show that $B_{00}\phi = O(\log |x|)$, followed by the fact that $\phi_1 := B_{00}\phi - (1 - \chi_1) \log |x|$ is in the nullspace of P and hence by Corollary 2.9 we have $\phi_1 = O(1)$.

3. To show the second of (5.13), for $\phi_j \in \mathcal{H}_c$ let $\psi_j = [\Delta, \chi_1]\mathcal{P}_e\phi_j$, and write

$$\langle \mathcal{P}_e[\Delta, \chi_1]R_{41}[\Delta, \chi_1]\mathcal{P}_e\phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle = -\langle R_{41}\psi_1, \psi_2 \rangle = \frac{1}{32\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} (x \cdot y)^2 \psi_1(x) \overline{\psi_2(y)} dx dy,$$

where we used the formula (2.4) for R_{41} and the fact that the expansion of ψ_j as in (2.5) has no terms with $l \geq 1$. Next, using polar coordinates and taking a_j, b_j , such that $\mathcal{P}_e\phi_j = r^{-2}(a_j \cos 2\theta + b_j \sin 2\theta) + O(r^{-3})$, we write this as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{32\pi} \left(\int_0^\infty r^3 [\partial_r^2 + \frac{1}{r}\partial_r, \chi_1] r^{-2} dr \right)^2 \times \\ & \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \cos^2(\theta_1 - \theta_2) (a_1 \cos 2\theta_1 + b_1 \sin 2\theta_1) (\overline{a_2} \cos 2\theta_2 + \overline{b_2} \sin 2\theta_2) d\theta_1 d\theta_2 = \frac{\pi}{4} (a_1 \overline{a_2} + b_1 \overline{b_2}). \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{P}_e \mathbf{1}_{>\rho} \Pi_{-2} \mathbf{1}_{>\rho} \mathcal{P}_e \phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle &= \int_\rho^\infty r^{-3} dr \int_0^{2\pi} (a_1 \cos 2\theta + b_1 \sin 2\theta) (\overline{a_2} \cos 2\theta + \overline{b_2} \sin 2\theta) d\theta \\ &= \frac{\pi}{2\rho^2} (a_1 \overline{a_2} + b_1 \overline{b_2}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\langle \mathcal{P}_e[\Delta, \chi_1]R_{41}[\Delta, \chi_1]\mathcal{P}_e\phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle = \frac{\rho^2}{2} \langle \mathcal{P}_e \mathbf{1}_{>\rho} \Pi_{-2} \mathbf{1}_{>\rho} \mathcal{P}_e \phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle$, as desired. \square

5.3. Simplification of negative logarithmic powers. In this section we simplify some of the negative powers of $\log \lambda$ in the resolvent expansion. Our first result shows, similarly to the first part of Theorem 2 but without requiring $\mathcal{G}_{-2} = \{0\}$, that these negative powers vanish when P has an s -resonance but no p -resonance, i.e. when $\mathcal{G}_0 \neq \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ but $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \mathcal{G}_{-2}$.

Proposition 5.9. *If $\mathcal{G}_0 \neq \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \mathcal{G}_{-2}$, then (5.1) can be improved to*

$$R(\lambda) = -\mathcal{P}_e \lambda^{-2} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{k_0(j)} B_{2j,k} \lambda^{2j} (\log \lambda)^k.$$

Proof. We begin by showing that $B_{0,-1} = 0$. By (5.5) and Proposition 5.2, we have

$$B_{0,-1} = B_{0,-1}[\Delta, \chi_1] R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1] B_{0,-1}. \quad (5.17)$$

But from the coefficient of $(\log z)^{-1}$ in (2.13),

$$(1 - \chi_1) B_{0,-1} = R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1] B_{0,-2} + R_{00}[\Delta, \chi_1] B_{0,-1}. \quad (5.18)$$

Hence, by the formulas (2.4) for R_{01} and R_{00} , $B_{0,-1} \mathcal{H}_c \subset \mathcal{G}_{\log}$. Since $\mathcal{G}_0 \neq \mathcal{G}_{-1}$, by Corollary 2.9 this implies $B_{0,-1} \mathcal{H}_c \subset \mathcal{G}_0$. However, by Lemma 2.6, $R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1] \mathcal{G}_0 = \{0\}$, and putting that into (5.17) gives $B_{0,-1} = 0$.

From $B_{0,-1} = 0$ and (5.5), we get $B_{0,-k} = 0$ for all $k \geq 2$. Finally, if there is $J \geq 0$ such that $B_{2j,-k} = 0$ for all $j \leq J$ and for all $k \geq 1$, then (5.5) with $j = J + 1$ shows that $B_{2(J+1),-k} = 0$. Hence, by induction, $B_{2j,-k} = 0$ for all j and for all $k \geq 1$. \square

We next simplify the leading negative powers of $\log \lambda$ in the cases $\mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ or $\mathcal{G}_{-1} \neq \mathcal{G}_{-2}$. Since $\mathcal{G}_{-1} \neq \mathcal{G}_{-2}$ is the more complicated case, we begin with the simpler case $\mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}_{-1} = \mathcal{G}_{-2}$, i.e. the case of no resonance at zero. This result is analogous to the second part of Theorem 2 but without the assumption $\mathcal{G}_{-2} = \{0\}$, just as Proposition 5.9 is analogous to the first part of Theorem 2.

Proposition 5.10. *Suppose P has no resonance at zero, i.e. $\mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}_{-2}$. There exists $U_{\log} \in \mathcal{G}_{\log}$ with $c_{\log}(U_{\log}) = 1$, such that, if $a = \gamma_0 + c_0(U_{\log})$, then*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} B_{0,-k} (\log \lambda)^{-k} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\log \lambda)^{-k} a^{k-1} B_{0,-1} = \frac{1}{2\pi(\log \lambda - a)} U_{\log} \otimes U_{\log}.$$

Proof. 1. We will show that there exist $U_{\log} \in \mathcal{G}_{\log}$ and constants β_k such that if $k \geq 1$ then

$$B_{0,-k} = \beta_k U_{\log} \otimes U_{\log}. \quad (5.19)$$

To show (5.19), by (5.5) applied twice, first with $j = 0$ and $k' = 1$, and second with $j = 0$ and $k' = k$, if $k \geq 1$ then

$$B_{0,-k} = B_{0,-1}[\Delta, \chi_1] R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1] B_{0,-k} = B_{0,-k}[\Delta, \chi_1] R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1] B_{0,-1}. \quad (5.20)$$

Hence (5.19) for general k follows from (5.19) for $k = 1$, and by (5.3) and $R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1] \mathcal{P}_e = 0$ it is enough to show that $B_{0,-1} \mathcal{H}_c \subset \mathcal{G}_{\log}$. To get $B_{0,-1} \mathcal{H}_c \subset \mathcal{G}_{\log}$, observe that the coefficient of $(\log z)^{-k}$ in (2.13) gives

$$(1 - \chi_1) B_{0,-k} \phi = R_{00}[\Delta, \chi_1] B_{0,-k} \phi + R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1] B_{0,-k-1} \phi, \quad (5.21)$$

and hence $B_{0,-1} \mathcal{H}_c \subset \mathcal{G}_{\log}$ follows from the formulas (2.4) for R_{00} and R_{01} together with $P B_{0,-1} = 0$ from the coefficient of $(\log \lambda)^{-1}$ in $(P - \lambda^2) R(\lambda) = I$.

2. We construct U_{\log} such that $c_{\log}(U_{\log}) = 1$, and show that then $\beta_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi}$. By Proposition 5.2, $B_{-2,-k} = 0$ for $k \geq 1$, and by Proposition 5.8, $B_{01} = -\mathcal{P}_e B_{01} \mathcal{P}_e$. Then the coefficient of $\log z$ in (2.13), and the formulas (2.4) for R_{01} and R_{00} , show that for any $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$,

$$0 = R_{01}(1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]B_{00})\phi + O(|x|^{-1}).$$

Hence, if $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$, then $\langle (1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]B_{00})\phi, 1 \rangle = 0$ and so

$$R_{00}(1 - \chi_1 + [\Delta, \chi_1]B_{00})\phi = O(|x|^{-1}). \quad (5.22)$$

Now let $\phi_0 = \Delta\chi_1$ and $U_{\log} = B_{0,-1}\phi_0$. From (5.2), and using (5.22) and Lemma 2.6, we have

$$B_{00}\phi_0 = R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{0,-1}\phi_0 + O(|x|^{-1}) = c_{\log}(B_{0,-1}\phi_0) + O(|x|^{-1}),$$

so with $\phi_1 = 1 - \chi_1 - B_{00}\phi_0$, we have $\phi_1 \in \mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}_{-2}$, and hence $c_{\log}(U_{\log}) = 1$. To show that $\beta_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi}$, use Lemma 2.3 to calculate

$$U_{\log} = B_{0,-1}\phi_0 = \beta_1 \langle \phi_0, U_{\log} \rangle U_{\log} = \beta_1 \langle [\Delta, \chi_1]1, U_{\log} \rangle U_{\log} = \beta_1 \mathbb{B}(1, U_{\log})U_{\log} = 2\pi\beta_1 U_{\log}.$$

3. It remains to show that $\beta_{k+1} = a\beta_k$ for all $k \geq 1$. We replace ϕ by $\phi_0 = \Delta\chi_1$ in (5.21) and then take the boundary pairing of both sides of (5.21) with U_{\log} to get, since $B_{0,-k}\phi_0 = \beta_k U_{\log} = \beta_k(\phi_0)U_{\log}$,

$$\beta_k \mathbb{B}(U_{\log}, U_{\log}) = \beta_k \mathbb{B}(R_{00}[\Delta, \chi_1]U_{\log}, U_{\log}) + \beta_{k+1} \mathbb{B}(R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1]U_{\log}, U_{\log}). \quad (5.23)$$

By the definition (2.9) of \mathbb{B} , we have $\mathbb{B}(U_{\log}, U_{\log}) = 0$. By Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6, we have $\mathbb{B}(R_{01}[\Delta, \chi_1]U_{\log}, U_{\log}) = 2\pi$. Using Lemma 2.5 and writing $R_{00}[\Delta, \chi_1]U_{\log} = \log|x| - \gamma_0 + O(|x|^{-1})$ yields $\mathbb{B}(R_{00}[\Delta, \chi_1]U_{\log}, U_{\log}) = -2\pi a$. Using these three in (5.23) shows $\beta_{k+1} = a\beta_k$, as desired. \square

For the p -resonance case $\mathcal{G}_{-1} \neq \mathcal{G}_{-2}$ we need the following boundary pairing calculations.

Lemma 5.11. *Let $v, w \in \mathbb{C}^2$ be such that there are corresponding $U_v, U_w \in \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ satisfying $v_{-1}(U_v) = v, v_{-1}(U_w) = w$. If $\chi_1(x) = 0$ for $|x| > r_1 - 1$, then*

$$\mathbb{B}_{r_1}(R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]U_w, U_v) = \pi w \cdot v, \quad (5.24)$$

$$\mathbb{B}_{r_1}(R_{20}[\Delta, \chi_1]U_w, U_v) = \pi(\log r_1 - \gamma_0)w \cdot v + O(r_1^{-1}). \quad (5.25)$$

Proof. Equation (5.24) follows from (5.7). To prove (5.25), first note that from the resolvent kernel formulas (2.4), putting $\tilde{R}_{21}(x, y) = (\log|x| - \gamma_0 - 1)R_{21}(x, y)$, we have

$$R_{20}(x, y) = \tilde{R}_{21}(x, y) - \frac{1}{8\pi}x \cdot y + O(1), \quad \partial_r R_{20}(x, y) = \partial_r \left(\tilde{R}_{21}(x, y) - \frac{1}{8\pi}x \cdot y \right) + O(|x|^{-1}).$$

Next, from (5.24) and the definition (2.9) of \mathbb{B}_{r_1} ,

$$\mathbb{B}_{r_1}(\tilde{R}_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]U_w, U_v) = \pi(\log r_1 - \gamma_0 - 1)w \cdot v - r_1^{-1} \int_{|x|=r_1} (R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]U_w)\overline{U_v},$$

while using (5.7) again gives

$$\int_{|x|=r_1} (R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]U_w)\overline{U_v} = -\frac{1}{2r_1^2} \int_{|x|=r_1} (w \cdot x)(x \cdot v) = -\frac{\pi}{2}r_1 w \cdot v.$$

By Lemma 2.3 and (5.7) again,

$$\langle [\Delta, \chi_1]U_w, x \cdot \bullet \rangle = \mathbb{B}_{r_1}(U_w, x \cdot \bullet) = 2\pi w \cdot x,$$

so that

$$\mathbb{B}_{r_1}(-\frac{1}{8\pi}\langle[\Delta, \chi_1]U_w, x \cdot \bullet\rangle, U_v) = \frac{\pi}{2}w \cdot v,$$

which implies (5.25). \square

Proposition 5.12. *If $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \mathcal{G}_{-2}$, then $B_{-2,-k} = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$. If $\mathcal{G}_{-1} \neq \mathcal{G}_{-2}$, use the functions U_{w_m} of Proposition 5.2 to define*

$$\alpha_m = \lim_{r_1 \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{\pi} \langle U_{w_m}, U_{w_m} \rangle_{|x| < r_1} - \log r_1 \right).$$

Then, with $M = \dim(\mathcal{G}_{-1}/\mathcal{G}_{-2})$, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\log \lambda)^{-k} B_{-2,-k} = \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{m=1}^M (\log \lambda - \gamma_0 - \alpha_m)^{-1} U_{w_m} \otimes U_{w_m},$$

provided if $M = 2$ that U_{w_1} and U_{w_2} are chosen such that

$$\langle U_{w_1}, U_{w_2} \rangle_{|x| < r_1} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } r_1 \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.26)$$

Proof. 1. Proposition 5.2 already proves the first statement of the proposition.

Next we show that if $M = 2$ it is possible to choose U_{w_1}, U_{w_2} so that (5.26) holds. We begin with U_{w_1}, U_{w_2} from Proposition 5.2, recalling $\{w_1, w_2\}$ is an orthonormal set. Define a map $\mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_{-1}$ by $v \mapsto U_v$, where if $v = c_1 w_1 + c_2 w_2$, $U_v = c_1 U_{w_1} + c_2 U_{w_2}$. Define a quadratic form on \mathbb{C}^2 by

$$q(v, v') = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (\langle U_v, U_{v'} \rangle_{|x| < r} - \pi v \cdot v' \log r).$$

That the limit exists follows from our expansions of U_{w_1}, U_{w_2} at infinity. There is a self-adjoint operator Q so that $q(v, v') = (Qv) \cdot v'$ for all $v, v' \in \mathbb{C}^2$. Let \tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2 be a basis of eigenvectors for Q so that $\tilde{w}_n \cdot \tilde{w}_m = \delta_{nm}$, and then let \tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2 be the new w_1, w_2 .

The remainder of the proof is similar to Step 3 of Proposition 5.10.

2. Given $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_c$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there are constants $\beta_{m,-k} = \beta_{m,-k}(\phi)$ such that $B_{-2,-k}\phi = \sum_{m=1}^M \beta_{m,-k} U_{w_m}$, and we shall show that $\beta_{m,-k-1} = (\gamma_0 + \alpha_m)\beta_{m,-k}$.

First, using Lemma 5.11 and $w_m \cdot w_n = \delta_{mn}$,

$$\mathbb{B}(R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{-2,-k-1}\phi, U_{w_m}) = \pi\beta_{m,-k-1}. \quad (5.27)$$

To compute the left hand side of (5.27), note that if $\phi_1 \in L_c^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\phi_1(x) = 0$ if $|x| > r_1 - 1$, then $\mathbb{B}(R_{01}\phi_1, U_{w_m}) = 0 = \mathbb{B}(R_{00}\phi_1, U_{w_m})$ by Lemma 2.5 and the resolvent formulas (2.4). Using this and the coefficient of $(\log z)^{-k}$ from (2.13) yields

$$\mathbb{B}(B_{0,-k}\phi, U_{w_m}) = \mathbb{B}(R_{21}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{-2,-k-1}\phi, U_{w_m}) + \mathbb{B}(R_{20}[\Delta, \chi_1]B_{-2,-k}\phi, U_{w_m}). \quad (5.28)$$

By Lemma 2.2,

$$\mathbb{B}(B_{0,-k}\phi, U_{w_m}) = \langle B_{-2,-k}\phi, U_{w_m} \rangle_{|x| < r_1} = \sum_{n=1}^M \beta_{n,-k} \langle U_{w_n}, U_{w_m} \rangle_{|x| < r_1},$$

and combining with the results of Lemma 5.11 gives

$$\pi\beta_{m,-k-1} = \pi(\gamma_0 - \log r_1)\beta_{m,-k} + \sum_{n=1}^M \beta_{n,-k} \langle U_{w_n}, U_{w_m} \rangle_{|x| < r_1} + O(r_1^{-1}) \rightarrow \pi(\gamma_0 + \alpha_m)\beta_{m,-k}.$$

3. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\log \lambda)^{-k} B_{-2,-k} \phi &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^M (\log \lambda)^{-k} \beta_{m,-k} U_{w_m} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^M (\log \lambda)^{-k} (\gamma_0 + \alpha_m)^{k-1} \beta_{m,-1} U_{w_m} \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^M (\log \lambda - \gamma_0 - \alpha_m)^{-1} \beta_{m,-1} U_{w_m}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed by using the explicit expression for $B_{-2,-1}$ from Proposition 5.2. \square

Acknowledgments. The authors are grateful to Maciej Zworski for his encouragement and helpful conversations over the course of this project. The BIRS conference “Mathematical aspects of the physics with non-self-adjoint operators” provided motivation for considering resolvent expansions for non-self-adjoint operators, and Maciej Zworski pointed out the connection with [ADH]. We also gratefully acknowledge partial support from Simons Collaboration Grants for Mathematicians. KD was, in addition, partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1708511.

REFERENCES

- [ADH] H. Ammari, B. Davies, E.O Hiltunen, *Functional analytic methods for discrete approximations of subwavelength resonator systems*. Preprint, arXiv:2106.123012.
- [BGD88] D. Bollé, F. Gesztesy, C. Danneels, *Threshold scattering in two dimensions*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor. 48:2 (1988), 175–204.
- [ChDa22] T. J. Christiansen and K. Datchev, *Wave asymptotics for waveguides and manifolds with infinite cylindrical ends*. Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2022:4 (2022), 19431–19500.
- [ChDa23] T. J. Christiansen and K. Datchev, *Low energy scattering asymptotics for planar obstacles*. Pure and Applied Analysis 5 (2023), no. 3, 767–794.
- [CDG] T. J. Christiansen, K. Datchev, and C. Griffin, *Persistence and disappearance of negative eigenvalues in dimension two*. Preprint.
- [CDY] T. J. Christiansen, K. Datchev, and M. Yang. In preparation.
- [DaRo13] M. Dafermos and I. Rodnianski, *Lectures on Black Holes and Linear Waves*. Clay Mathematics Proceedings 17 (2013) 105–205.
- [DyZw19] S. Dyatlov and M. Zworski, *Mathematical Theory of Scattering Resonances*. Grad. Stud. Math. 200. Amer. Math. Soc., 2019.
- [ErGr13] M. B. Erdoğan and W. R. Green, *Dispersive estimates for Schrödinger operators in dimension two with obstructions at zero energy*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 365:12 (2013) 6403–6440.
- [GMWZ] J. Galkowski, P. Marchand, J. Wang, and M. Zworski, *The scattering phase: seen at last*. Preprint, arXiv:2210.09908. To appear in SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics.
- [Hin22] P. Hintz, *A Sharp Version of Price’s Law for Wave Decay on Asymptotically Flat Spacetimes*. Commun. Math. Phys. 389 (2022), 491–542.
- [Jen80] A. Jensen, *Spectral properties of Schrödinger operators and time-delay of the wave functions: results in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$, $m \geq 5$* . Duke Math. J. 47:1 (1980), 57–80.
- [Jen84] A. Jensen, *Spectral properties of Schrödinger operators and time-decay of the wave functions. Results in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$* . J. Math. Anal. Appl. 101:2 (1984), 397–422.
- [JeKa79] A. Jensen and T. Kato, *Spectral properties of Schrödinger operators and time-decay of the wave functions*. Duke Math. J. 46:3 (1979), 583–611.
- [JeNe01] A. Jensen and G. Nenciu, *A unified approach to resolvent expansions at thresholds*. Rev. Math. Phys. 13:6 (2001), 727–754. Erratum 16:5 (2004), 675–677.
- [Kla] S. Klainerman. *Columbia lectures on the stability of Kerr*. Preprint <https://www.math.columbia.edu/~staff/columbia2023.pdf>, 2023.
- [KlVa94] R. Kleinman and B. Vainberg. *Full low-frequency asymptotic expansion for second-order elliptic equations in two dimensions*. Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences 17 (1994), 989–1004.

- [Kov22] H. Kovařík. *Spectral properties and time decay of the wave functions of Pauli and Dirac operators in dimension two*. Advances in Mathematics 398 (2022), 108244.
- [LaPh89] P. D. Lax and R. S. Phillips. *Scattering Theory: Revised Edition*. Academic Press, Inc. 1989.
- [Mac65] R. C. MacCamy. *Low frequency acoustic oscillations*. Quarterly of Applied Mathematics 23:3 (1965) 247–255.
- [Mel93] R. B. Melrose, *The Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem*. Research Notes in Mathematics, 4. A K Peters, Ltd., Wellesley, MA, 1993.
- [Mor61] C. S. Morawetz, *The decay of solutions of the exterior initial-boundary value problem for the wave equation*. Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, 14 (1961) , 561–568.
- [MüSt14] J. Müller and A. Strohmaier. *The theory of Hahn-meromorphic functions, a holomorphic Fredholm theorem, and its applications*. Anal. PDE 7:3, pp.745–770, 2014.
- [ReSi80] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of modern mathematical physics. I. Functional analysis*. Second edition. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York, 1980.
- [Rob87] L. Robbiano, *Sur les zéros de solutions d'inégalités différentielles elliptiques*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 12:8 (1987), 903–919.
- [Sch05] W. Schlag, *Dispersive estimates for Schrödinger operators in dimension two*. Comm. Math. Phys. 257:1 (2005), 87–117.
- [Sch21] W. Schlag, *On pointwise decay of waves*. J. Math. Phys. 62 (2021) 061509.
- [SjZw91] J. Sjöstrand and M. Zworski, *Complex scaling and the distribution of scattering poles*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. 4:4 (1991), 729–769.
- [StWa20] A. Strohmaier and A. Waters, *Geometric and obstacle scattering at low energy*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 45:11 (2020), 1451–1511.
- [Tat13] D. Tataru, *Local decay of waves on asymptotically flat stationary space-times* Amer. J. Math. 135:2 (2013) 361–401.
- [Vai89] B. R. Vainberg. *Asymptotic methods in equations of mathematical physics*. Gordon and Breach, 1989.
- [Vas20] A. Vasy *The black hole stability problem*. Current Developments in Mathematics 2020 (2020), 105–155.
- [Vod99] G. Vodev, *On the uniform decay of the local energy*. Serdica Math. J. 25 (1999), 191–206.
- [Vod14] G. Vodev, *Semi-classical resolvent estimates and regions free of resonances*. Math. Nachr. 287:7 (2014), 825–835.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, COLUMBIA, MO 65211 USA

Email address: christiansent@missouri.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47907 USA

Email address: kdatchev@purdue.edu