

BILINEAR EMBEDDING FOR PERTURBED DIVERGENCE-FORM OPERATOR WITH COMPLEX COEFFICIENTS ON IRREGULAR DOMAINS

ANDREA POGGIO

ABSTRACT. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be open, A a complex uniformly strictly accretive $d \times d$ matrix-valued function on Ω with L^∞ coefficients, b and c two d -dimensional vector-valued functions on Ω with L^∞ coefficients and V a locally integrable nonnegative function on Ω . Consider the operator $\mathcal{L}^{A,b,c,V} = -\operatorname{div}(A\nabla) + \langle \nabla, b \rangle - \operatorname{div}(c \cdot) + V$ with mixed boundary conditions on Ω . We extend the bilinear inequality that Carbonaro and Dragičević proved in [3] in the special cases when $b = c = 0$, previously proved in [6] when $V = 0$ as well. As a consequence, we obtain that the solution to the parabolic problem $u'(t) + \mathcal{L}^{A,b,c,V}u(t) = f(t)$, $u(0) = 0$, has maximal regularity in $L^p(\Omega)$, for all $p > 1$ such that A satisfies the p -ellipticity condition that Carbonaro and Dragičević introduced in [7] and b, c, V satisfy another condition that we introduce in this paper. Roughly speaking, V has to be “big” with respect to b and c . We do not impose any conditions on Ω , in particular, we do not assume any regularity of $\partial\Omega$, nor the existence of a Sobolev embedding.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a nonempty open set. Denote by $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ the class of all complex uniformly strictly elliptic $d \times d$ matrix-valued functions on Ω with L^∞ coefficients (in short, elliptic matrices). That is to say, $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ is the class of all measurable $A : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ for which there exist $\lambda, \Lambda > 0$ such that for almost all $x \in \Omega$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} \langle A(x)\xi, \xi \rangle &\geq \lambda |\xi|^2, & \forall \xi \in \mathbb{C}^d; \\ |\langle A(x)\xi, \sigma \rangle| &\leq \Lambda |\xi| |\sigma|, & \forall \xi, \sigma \in \mathbb{C}^d. \end{aligned}$$

We denote by $\lambda(A)$ and $\Lambda(A)$ the optimal λ and Λ , respectively.

Suppose that $A \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$. Let b, c be d -dimensional vector-valued functions on Ω with L^∞ coefficients and $V \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ a nonnegative function. Fix a closed subspace \mathcal{V} of the Sobolev space $H^1(\Omega)$ containing $H^1_0(\Omega)$. Consider the sesquilinear form $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_{A,b,c,V,\mathcal{V}}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{D}(\mathfrak{a}) &= \{u \in \mathcal{V} : \int_\Omega V|u|^2 < \infty\}, \\ \mathfrak{a}(u, v) &= \int_\Omega \langle A\nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + \langle \nabla u, b \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \bar{v} + u \langle c, \nabla v \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + Vu\bar{v}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Clearly, \mathfrak{a} is densely defined in $L^2(\Omega)$. Using the abbreviation $\mathfrak{a}(u) = \mathfrak{a}(u, u)$ and the *ad hoc* notation $\xi = \nabla u/u$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} \mathfrak{a}(u) &= \int_\Omega |u|^2 \left[\operatorname{Re} \langle A\xi, \xi \rangle + \operatorname{Re} \langle b + c, \xi \rangle + V \right], \\ \operatorname{Im} \mathfrak{a}(u) &= \int_\Omega |u|^2 \left[\operatorname{Im} \langle A\xi, \xi \rangle + \operatorname{Im} \langle b - c, \xi \rangle \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Date: June 4, 2024.

Consequently, if we suppose that for almost all $x \in \Omega$

$$\operatorname{Re} \langle A(x)\xi, \xi \rangle + \operatorname{Re} \langle b(x) + c(x), \xi \rangle + V(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{C}^d,$$

then \mathfrak{a} is accretive. Moreover, assume that there exist $\mu \in (0, 1]$ and $M > 0$ such that for almost all $x \in \Omega$

$$\operatorname{Re} \langle A(x)\xi, \xi \rangle + \operatorname{Re} \langle b(x) + c(x), \xi \rangle + V(x) \geq \mu(|\xi|^2 + V(x)), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{C}^d, \quad (2)$$

$$|b(x) - c(x)| \leq M \sqrt{V}. \quad (3)$$

Then, following Ouhabaz [22, the proof of Proposition 4.30], we get that \mathfrak{a} is also closed. We denote by $\mathcal{B}_{\mu, M}(\Omega)$ the class of all $(A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega) \times (L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d))^2 \times L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+)$ for which (2) and (3) hold for some fixed $\mu, M > 0$. Moreover, we set

$$\mathcal{B}(\Omega) = \bigcup_{\mu, M > 0} \mathcal{B}_{\mu, M}(\Omega).$$

For $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V)$, we denote by $\mu(\mathcal{A})$ and $M(\mathcal{A})$ the optimal μ and M , respectively.

Given $\phi \in (0, \pi)$ define the sector

$$\mathbf{S}_\phi = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} : |\arg(z)| < \phi\}.$$

Also set $\mathbf{S}_0 = (0, \infty)$. Boundedness of A , (2) and (3) imply that \mathfrak{a} is sectorial of some angle $\vartheta_0 = \vartheta_0(\mu, M, \Lambda) \in (0, \pi/2)$ in the sense of [18], meaning that its numerical range $\operatorname{Nr}(\mathfrak{a}) = \{\mathfrak{a}(u) : u \in \operatorname{D}(\mathfrak{a}), \|u\|_2 = 1\}$ satisfies

$$\operatorname{Nr}(\mathfrak{a}) \subseteq \overline{\mathbf{S}}_{\vartheta_0}. \quad (4)$$

Denote by $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_2^{A, b, c, V, \mathcal{V}}$ the unbounded operator on $L^2(\Omega)$ associated with the sesquilinear form \mathfrak{a} . That is,

$$\operatorname{D}(\mathcal{L}) := \left\{ u \in \operatorname{D}(\mathfrak{a}) : \exists w \in L^2(\Omega) : \mathfrak{a}(u, v) = \langle w, v \rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \operatorname{D}(\mathfrak{a}) \right\}$$

and

$$\langle \mathcal{L}u, v \rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} = \mathfrak{a}(u, v), \quad \forall u \in \operatorname{D}(\mathcal{L}), \quad \forall v \in \operatorname{D}(\mathfrak{a}). \quad (5)$$

Formally, \mathcal{L} is given by the expression

$$\mathcal{L}u = -\operatorname{div}(A\nabla u) + \langle \nabla u, b \rangle - \operatorname{div}(uc) + Vu.$$

It follows from (4) that $-\mathcal{L}$ is the generator of a strongly continuous semigroup on $L^2(\Omega)$

$$T_t = T_t^{A, b, c, V, \mathcal{V}}, \quad t > 0,$$

which is analytic and contractive in the cone $\mathbf{S}_{\pi/2 - \vartheta_0}$. Moreover, \mathcal{L} is sectorial of angle $\omega(\mathcal{L}) \leq \vartheta_0$. For details and proofs see [18, Chapter VI], [22, Chapters I and IV] and [17, Sections 2.1 and 3.4].

1.1. Mixed boundary conditions. Given a closed set $\Gamma \subseteq \partial\Omega$ we define $H^1_\Gamma(\Omega)$ to be the closure in $H^1(\Omega)$ of the set

$$\{u|_\Omega : u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Gamma)\}.$$

We shall always assume that \mathcal{V} is one of the following closed subspaces of $H^1(\Omega)$:

- (i) $\mathcal{V} = H^1(\Omega)$, corresponding to *Neumann boundary* conditions for \mathcal{L} , or
- (ii) $\mathcal{V} = H^1_\Gamma(\Omega)$, corresponding to *Dirichlet boundary* conditions in Γ and Neumann conditions in $\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma$ for \mathcal{L} .

The latter case includes Dirichlet boundary conditions ($\Gamma = \partial\Omega$) and good-Neumann boundary conditions ($\Gamma = \emptyset$); see [22, Section 4.1].

1.2. Standard assumptions. Unless otherwise specified, henceforth we assume that

- $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a nonempty open set;
- \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{W} are two closed subspaces of $H^1(\Omega)$ of the type described in Section 1.1;
- $A, B \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$;
- $b, c, \beta, \gamma \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$;
- $V, W \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+)$.

These assumptions shall be called the *standard assumptions*.

1.3. Notation. Given two quantities X and Y , we adopt the convention whereby $X \lesssim Y$ means that there exists an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that $X \leq CY$. If both $X \lesssim Y$ and $Y \lesssim X$, then we write $X \sim Y$. If $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ is a set of parameters, then $C(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ denotes a constant depending only on $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$. When $X \leq C(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)Y$, we will often write $X \lesssim_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n} Y$.

Unless specified otherwise, for every $p \in (1, \infty)$ we will denote by q its conjugate exponent, that is, $1/p + 1/q = 1$.

1.4. The p -ellipticity condition. We summarize the following notion, which Carbonaro and Dragičević introduced in [7].

Given $A \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$, we say that A is *p -elliptic* if there exists $C = C(A, p) > 0$ such that for a.e. $x \in \Omega$,

$$\operatorname{Re} \left\langle A(x)\xi, \xi + |1 - 2/p|\bar{\xi} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \geq C|\xi|^2, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{C}^d. \quad (6)$$

Equivalently, A is p -elliptic if $\Delta_p(A) > 0$, where

$$\Delta_p(A) := \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in \Omega} \min_{|\xi|=1} \operatorname{Re} \left\langle A(x)\xi, \xi + |1 - 2/p|\bar{\xi} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}.$$

Denote by $\mathcal{A}_p(\Omega)$ the class of all p -elliptic matrix functions on Ω . Clearly, $\mathcal{A}(\Omega) = \mathcal{A}_2(\Omega)$. A bounded matrix function A is real and elliptic if and only if it is p -elliptic for all $p > 1$ [7]. For further properties of the function $p \mapsto \Delta_p(A)$ we also refer the reader to [7].

Dindoš and Pipher in [11] found a sharp condition which permits proving reverse Hölder inequalities for weak solutions to $\operatorname{div}(A\nabla u) = 0$ with complex A . It turned out that this condition was precisely a reformulation of p -ellipticity (6).

A condition similar to (6), namely $\Delta_p(A) \geq 0$, was formulated in a different manner by Cialdea and Maz'ya in [9, (2.25)]. See [7, Remark 5.14].

1.5. The classes \mathcal{S}_p and \mathcal{B}_p . Let $p > 1$ and $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V)$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. For every $p \in [1, +\infty]$, we consider the operator

$$\mathcal{J}_p(\xi) = \frac{p}{2} \left(\xi + \left(1 - \frac{2}{p}\right)\bar{\xi} \right), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{C}^d. \quad (7)$$

Observe that $\mathcal{J}_p = (p/2)\mathcal{J}_p$, where \mathcal{J}_p is the operator introduced by Carbonaro and Dragičević in [7, (1.4)]. Moreover, we have:

- (a) \mathcal{J}_p is \mathbb{R} -linear;
- (b) $\mathcal{J}_p\xi = p \operatorname{Re} \xi - \bar{\xi}$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$;
- (c) $\operatorname{Re} \langle \mathcal{J}_p\xi, \sigma \rangle = \operatorname{Re} \langle \xi, \mathcal{J}_p\sigma \rangle$ for all $\xi, \sigma \in \mathbb{C}^d$;
- (d) $(p/2)\Delta_p(A) = \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in \Omega} \min_{|\xi|=1} \operatorname{Re} \langle A(x)\xi, \mathcal{J}_p\xi \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}$ [7, (1.6)].

If $1/p + 1/q = 1$, then also

- (e) $\mathcal{J}_p \mathcal{J}_q = I_{\mathbb{C}^d}$ [7, p. 3201];
- (f) $\mathcal{J}_p(i\xi) = i(p-1)\mathcal{J}_q \xi$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$;
- (g) $\|\mathcal{J}_p\| = p^* - 1$, where $p^* = \max\{p, q\}$.

We define the function $\Gamma_p^{\mathcal{A}} = \Gamma_p^{A,b,c,V} : \Omega \times \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Gamma_p^{\mathcal{A}}(x, \xi) = \operatorname{Re} \langle A(x)\xi, \mathcal{J}_p \xi \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + \operatorname{Re} \langle b(x) + (\mathcal{J}_p c)(x), \xi \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + V(x). \quad (8)$$

By using dilations $\xi \rightsquigarrow t\xi$, $t \rightarrow \infty$, we see that if for almost all $x \in \Omega$

$$\Gamma_p^{\mathcal{A}}(x, \xi) \geq 0, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{C}^d, \quad (9)$$

then $\Delta_p(A) \geq 0$. Moreover, when $b = c = 0$ the two conditions coincide. A condition slightly weaker than (9) was formulated in a different manner by Cialdea and Maz'ya in [9, (2.25)] (see Section 5.2).

We denote by $\mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$ the class of all $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega) \times (L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d))^2 \times L_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+)$ for which

- there exists $\mu > 0$ such that for a.e. $x \in \Omega$

$$\Gamma_p^{\mathcal{A}}(x, \xi) \geq \mu(|\xi|^2 + V(x)), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{C}^d, \quad (10)$$

- the condition (3) holds.

We denote by $\mu_p(\mathcal{A})$, or just μ_p , the largest admissible μ in (10). We list a few observations on \mathcal{S}_p and μ_p :

- By applying the dilation argument again, we get

$$\mu_p(\mathcal{A}) \leq \min \left\{ \frac{p}{2} \Delta_p(A), 1 \right\}; \quad (11)$$

- $(A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{S}_2(\Omega)$ if and only if (2) and (3) hold, that is, $\mathcal{S}_2(\Omega) = \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$;
- when $b = c = 0$, this new condition coincides with p -ellipticity, in the sense that $(A, 0, 0, V) \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$ if and only if $A \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega)$ [3, 7].

Finally, we define the class

$$\mathcal{B}_p(\Omega) = \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{S}_q(\Omega), \quad \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1,$$

which also coincides with $\mathcal{A}_p(\Omega)$ when $b = c = 0$, in the sense that $(A, 0, 0, V) \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$ if and only if $A \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega)$, by means of the invariance of p -ellipticity under conjugation [7, Corollary 5.16]. It also coincides with $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ when $p = 2$.

Our motivation for introducing \mathcal{B}_p on top of \mathcal{S}_p was to obtain a class which, other than generalising p -ellipticity, retains the following properties that the classes \mathcal{A}_p possess:

- (i) invariance under conjugation, in the sense that $\mathcal{A}_p(\Omega) = \mathcal{A}_q(\Omega)$ when $1/p + 1/q = 1$ [7, Proposition 5.8];
- (ii) a decrease with respect to p , in the sense that $\{\mathcal{A}_p(\Omega) : p \in [2, \infty)\}$ is a decreasing chain of matrix classes [7, Corollary 5.16].
- (iii) invariance under adjointness, in the sense that $A \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega) \iff A^* \in \mathcal{A}_q(\Omega)$, $1/p + 1/q = 1$ [7, Corollary 5.17].

We shall see that \mathcal{S}_p satisfies the analogue of (iii) (see Proposition 9(i)), but not (i) and (ii) (see Proposition 10). On the other hand, \mathcal{B}_p is invariant under conjugation by definition and it turns out that it is also decreasing with respect to p ; see Proposition 9(ii). Therefore, the class \mathcal{B}_p seems a more adequate generalisation of p -ellipticity.

1.6. Semigroup properties on L^p . As our first result, we want to generalise [3, Theorem 1.2] through Theorem 1. See also the implication (a) \Rightarrow (b) of [7, Theorem 1.3] and [6, Proposition 1], where $\phi = 0$, $b = c = 0$, $V = 0$. Carbonaro and Dragičević proved each result combining a theorem of Nittka [21, Theorem 4.1] either with [22, Theorem 4.7] for [7, Theorem 1.3] and [6, Proposition 1], or with [22, Theorem 4.31] for [3, Theorem 1.2]. The proof of Theorem 1 is a modification of that from [3, Theorem 1.2], the main difference being that we need a new condition which generalises that in [3, Theorem 1.2] (namely, $\Delta_p(e^{i\phi}A) \geq 0$) in order to get the L^p -dissipativity of the form. See Section 5.1 for the explanation of terminology and the proof.

Theorem 1. *Let $\Omega, \mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V), \mathcal{V}$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ and choose $p > 1$ and $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\phi| < \pi/2 - \vartheta_0$ and $\Gamma_p^{(e^{i\phi}A, e^{i\phi}b, e^{i\phi}c, (\cos \phi)V)}(x, \xi) \geq 0$ for almost all $x \in \Omega$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Then*

$$\left(e^{-te^{i\phi}\mathcal{L}} \right)_{t>0}$$

extends to a strongly continuous semigroup of contractions on $L^p(\Omega)$.

The next corollary, applied with r equal to the conjugate exponent of p , extends [3, Corollary 1.3].

Corollary 2. *Let $\Omega, \mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V), \mathcal{V}$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ and choose $r \leq 2 \leq p$ such that $\mathcal{A} \in (\mathcal{S}_r \cap \mathcal{S}_p)(\Omega)$. Then there exists $\vartheta = \vartheta(p, r, \mathcal{A}) > 0$ such that $\{T_z : z \in \mathcal{S}_\vartheta\}$ is analytic and contractive in $L^s(\Omega)$ for all $s \in [r, p]$.*

1.7. Bilinear embeddings for perturbed operators. In case when $b = c = 0$, in [3, Theorem 1.4] Carbonaro and Dragičević proved that there exists $C > 0$ independent of the dimension d such that

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \sqrt{\left| \nabla T_t^{A,V,\mathcal{V}} f \right|^2 + V \left| T_t^{A,V,\mathcal{V}} f \right|^2} \sqrt{\left| \nabla T_t^{B,W,\mathcal{W}} g \right|^2 + W \left| T_t^{B,W,\mathcal{W}} g \right|^2} \leq C \|f\|_p \|g\|_q, \quad (12)$$

for all $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega)$, $V, W \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+)$ and all $f, g \in (L^p \cap L^q)(\Omega)$, where \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{W} are two closed subspaces of $H^1(\Omega)$ of the type described in Section 1.1 and $q = p/(p-1)$ is the conjugate exponent of p .

Given $b, c, \beta, \gamma \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$, we extend the bilinear embedding in (12) to the semigroups $(T_t^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}})_{t>0}$ and $(T_t^{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{W}})_{t>0}$, where $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V)$, $\mathcal{B} = (B, \beta, \gamma, W) \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$. In accordance with [3, 6, 7], we need a stronger condition than the one which implies the L^p contractivity of such semigroups. Consistent with [3, 6, 7], it is convenient to introduce further notation:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(A, B) &= \min\{\lambda(A), \lambda(B)\} \\ \Lambda(A, B) &= \max\{\Lambda(A), \Lambda(B)\} \\ \mu(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) &= \min\{\mu(\mathcal{A}), \mu(\mathcal{B})\} \\ M(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) &= \max\{M(\mathcal{A}), M(\mathcal{B})\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mu_r(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \min\{\mu_r(\mathcal{A}), \mu_{r'}(\mathcal{A}), \mu_r(\mathcal{B}), \mu_{r'}(\mathcal{B})\},$$

whenever $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{B}_r(\Omega)$ for some $r \in (1, \infty)$, where $r' = r/(r-1)$ is its conjugate exponent. In Section 6 we shall prove the following result.

Theorem 3. *Let $\Omega, \mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V), \mathcal{B} = (B, \beta, \gamma, W), \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ and choose $p > 1, q = p/(p-1)$, such that $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$. Then there exists $C > 0$ independent of the dimension d such that*

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}} f|^2 + V |T_t^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}} f|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{W}} g|^2 + W |T_t^{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{W}} g|^2} \leq C \|f\|_p \|g\|_q, \quad (13)$$

for all $f, g \in (L^p \cap L^q)(\Omega)$. The constant $C > 0$ can be chosen so as to (continuously) depend only on $p, \lambda(A, B), \Lambda(A, B), \mu(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), M(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ and $\mu_p(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.

This result incorporates several earlier theorems as special cases, including:

- $b = c = 0, V = W, \Omega = \mathbb{R}^d, A, B$ equal and real [13, Theorem 1]
- $b = c = 0, V = W = 0, \Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$ [7, Theorem 1.1]
- $b = c = 0, V = W = 0$ [6, Theorem 2]
- $b = c = 0$ [3, Theorem 1.4].

1.8. Bilinear embeddings with complex potentials. Let $\Omega, A, b, c, V, \mathcal{V}$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Let $\varrho \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\operatorname{Re}(\varrho) > 0$. Let assume that $(A, b, c, \operatorname{Re}(\varrho)V) \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$. Then, it can be shown in the same way as above that the sesquilinear form \mathfrak{a} , defined by

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathfrak{a}) &= \left\{ u \in \mathcal{V} : \int_\Omega V |u|^2 < \infty \right\}, \\ \mathfrak{a}(u, v) &= \int_\Omega \langle A \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + \langle \nabla u, b \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \bar{v} + u \langle c, \nabla v \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + \varrho V u \bar{v}, \end{aligned}$$

is densely defined, closed and sectorial. Therefore, $-\mathcal{L}$, the operator on $L^2(\Omega)$ associated with \mathfrak{a} , generates an analytic and contractive semigroup $(T_t^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}})_{t>0}$ on $L^2(\Omega)$, where $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, \varrho V)$. More generally, all the results mentioned above hold also for these types of complex potentials and are proved as in the case where the potentials are real, provided that their real part belongs to the new class introduced before. For instance, Theorem 3 for complex potentials now reads as follows:

Theorem 4. *Let $\Omega, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, \varrho V)$ and $\mathcal{B} = (B, \beta, \gamma, \sigma W)$ be of the type described above. Choose $p > 1, q = p/(p-1)$, such that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = (A, b, c, \operatorname{Re}(\varrho)V), \tilde{\mathcal{B}} = (B, \beta, \gamma, \operatorname{Re}(\sigma)W) \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$. Then there exists $C > 0$ independent of the dimension d such that*

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}} f|^2 + \operatorname{Re}(\varrho)V |T_t^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}} f|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{W}} g|^2 + \operatorname{Re}(\sigma)W |T_t^{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{W}} g|^2} \leq C \|f\|_p \|g\|_q, \quad (14)$$

for all $f, g \in (L^p \cap L^q)(\Omega)$. The constant $C > 0$ can be chosen so as to (continuously) depend only on $p, \lambda(A, B), \Lambda(A, B), \mu(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}), M(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathcal{B}})$ and $\mu_p(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathcal{B}})$.

To avoid burdening the notation, we will treat in detail only the case with real potentials.

1.9. Maximal regularity and functional calculus on domains. In case when $b = c = V = 0$, let $A \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega)$ and let $-\mathcal{L}_p^A$ be the generator of $(T_t^A)_{t>0}$ on $L^p(\Omega)$. Then \mathcal{L}_p^A admits a bounded holomorphic functional calculus of angle $\vartheta < \pi/2$ and has parabolic maximal regularity [6, Theorem 3].

Following the same argument of [6, Theorem 3], by means of

- elementary properties of the function $(p, A) \mapsto \Delta_p(A)$ (see [7, Corollary 5.17 and p. 3204])
- elementary properties of the classes $\mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$ (see Proposition 8 (iii), (iv))
- a well-known sufficient condition for bounded holomorphic functional calculus [10, Theorem 4.6 and Example 4.8]
- the Dore-Venni theorem [12, 23]
- Theorem 3 applied with $B = A^*$, $\beta = c$, $\gamma = b$, $W = V$ and $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{V}$

we can deduce the following result; see Section 7 for the explanation of terminology and the proof.

Theorem 5. *Let $\Omega, A, b, c, V, \mathcal{V}$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Suppose that $p > 1$ and $(A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$. Let $-\mathcal{L}_p$ be the generator of $(T_t)_{t>0}$ on $L^p(\Omega)$. Then \mathcal{L}_p admits a bounded holomorphic functional calculus of angle $\vartheta < \pi/2$. As a consequence, \mathcal{L}_p has parabolic maximal regularity.*

Recent results regarding the holomorphic functional calculus for the operator \mathcal{L}_p have been obtained by Egert [14]. He considered elliptic systems of second order in divergence form with bounded coefficients and subject to mixed boundary conditions on bounded and connected open sets Ω whose boundary is Lipschitz regular around the Neumann part $\overline{\partial\Omega} \setminus \Gamma$. We recall that Γ is a closed subset of $\partial\Omega$; see Section 1.1. In [14, Theorem 1.3] he provided the optimal interval of p 's for the bounded H^∞ -calculus on L^p . More precisely, after defining the interval $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}})$ by

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}) := \{p \in (1, \infty) : \sup_{t>0} \|T_t^{\mathcal{A}}\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^p)} < \infty\},$$

he proved that, given $p_0 \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})$, the operator \mathcal{L}_p admits a bounded H^∞ -calculus on L^p for all $p \in (p_0, 2) \cup (2, p_0)$. He used the regularity assumption on the domain Ω to prove that the semigroup satisfies specific off-diagonal estimates [14, Definition 1.6 and Proposition 4.4], which imply the boundedness of the H^∞ -calculus [14, Lemma 5.3]. For this last implication, he did not need the previous further assumptions on Ω . In particular, he exploited the existence of a bounded linear Sobolev extension operator that extends

$$\begin{aligned} H^1_\Gamma(\Omega) &\rightarrow H^1_\Gamma(\mathbb{R}^d), \\ L^p(\Omega) &\rightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^d), \end{aligned}$$

for every $p \in (1, \infty)$. Here, $H^1_\Gamma(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the closure in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of the set $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Gamma)$.

Since in generality that we consider, the domain Ω may be completely irregular and/or unbounded, we only deduce that our interval of p 's for the bounded H^∞ -calculus on L^p is contained in Egert's. In fact, Theorem 1 and Proposition 8(iii) imply that

$$\{p \in (1, \infty) : \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)\} \subseteq \text{int}(\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})).$$

See also [6, Section 1.5] for a similar discussion regarding unperturbed divergence-form operators.

1.10. Organization of the paper. Here is the summary of each section.

- In Section 2 we summarize some of the main notions needed in the paper, extending in particular the generalised convexity introduced by Carbonaro and Dragičević in [7].
- In Section 3 we summarize some properties of the classes \mathcal{S}_p and \mathcal{B}_p .
- In Section 4 we prove the desired convexity of the power functions in one complex variable and of the Bellman function.

- In Section 5 we prove the results on contractivity and analyticity of semigroups announced in Section 1.6.
- In Section 6 we prove the bilinear embedding.
- In Section 7 we prove Theorem 5.

2. HEAT-FLOW MONOTONICITY AND GENERALISED CONVEXITY

2.1. The Bellman function of Nazarov and Treil. Let Ω , $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V)$, $\mathcal{B} = (B, \beta, \gamma, W)$, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W} satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$. We want to study the monotonicity of the flow

$$\mathcal{E}(t) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{Q}(T_t^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}} f, T_t^{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{W}} g)$$

associated with a particular explicit *Bellman function* \mathcal{Q} invented by Nazarov and Treil [20]. Here we use a simplified variant introduced in [13] which comprises only two variables:

$$\mathcal{Q}(\zeta, \eta) = |\zeta|^p + |\eta|^q + \delta \begin{cases} |\zeta|^2 |\eta|^{2-q}, & |\zeta|^p \leq |\eta|^q; \\ (2/p) |\zeta|^p + (2/q - 1) |\eta|^q, & |\zeta|^p \geq |\eta|^q, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where $p > 2$, $q = p/(p-1)$, $\zeta, \eta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\delta > 0$ is a positive parameter that will be fixed later. It was noted in [7, p. 3195] that $\mathcal{Q} \in C^1(\mathbb{C}^2) \cap C^2(\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \Upsilon)$, where

$$\Upsilon = \{\eta = 0\} \cup \{|\zeta|^p = |\eta|^q\},$$

and that for $(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \mathcal{Q}(\zeta, \eta) \lesssim_{p, \delta} (|\zeta|^p + |\eta|^q), \\ |(\partial_{\zeta} \mathcal{Q})(\zeta, \eta)| &\lesssim_{p, \delta} \max\{|\zeta|^{p-1}, |\eta|\}, \\ |(\partial_{\eta} \mathcal{Q})(\zeta, \eta)| &\lesssim_{p, \delta} |\eta|^{q-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $\partial_{\zeta} = (\partial_{\zeta_1} - i\partial_{\zeta_2})/2$ and $\partial_{\eta} = (\partial_{\eta_1} - i\partial_{\eta_2})/2$.

2.2. Real form of complex operators. We explicitly identify \mathbb{C}^d with \mathbb{R}^{2d} as follows. For each $d \in \mathbb{N}_+$ consider the operator $\mathcal{V}_d : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, defined by

$$\mathcal{V}_d(\xi_1 + i\xi_2) = (\xi_1, \xi_2), \quad \xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

One has

$$\operatorname{Re} \langle \xi, \xi' \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} = \langle \mathcal{V}_d(\xi), \mathcal{V}_d(\xi') \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}, \quad \xi, \xi' \in \mathbb{C}^d. \quad (17)$$

If $A \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ we shall frequently use its real form:

$$\mathcal{M}(A) = \mathcal{V}_d A \mathcal{V}_d^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \operatorname{Re} A & -\operatorname{Im} A \\ \operatorname{Im} A & \operatorname{Re} A \end{bmatrix}.$$

For $\xi, \sigma \in \mathbb{C}^d$ we have the following extension of (17):

$$\operatorname{Re} \langle A\xi, \sigma \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} = \langle \mathcal{M}(A)\mathcal{V}_d(\xi), \mathcal{V}_d(\sigma) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}. \quad (18)$$

Let $k, d \in \mathbb{N}_+$. We define another identification operator

$$\mathcal{W}_{k,d} : \underbrace{\mathbb{C}^d \times \dots \times \mathbb{C}^d}_{k\text{-times}} \longrightarrow \underbrace{\mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}}_{k\text{-times}}$$

by the rule

$$\mathcal{W}_{k,d}(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^k) = (\mathcal{V}_d(\xi^1), \dots, \mathcal{V}_d(\xi^k)), \quad \xi^j \in \mathbb{C}^d, \quad j = 1, \dots, k.$$

2.3. Convexity with respect to complex matrices, complex vectors and real scalars. In [7], the authors introduced the notion of *generalised convexity of a function with respect to a matrix* (or a collection of matrices). Here we extend this notion to 4-tuples (A, b, c, V) . So the novelty is the presence of b, c and V . Our aim is to demonstrate the value of this extended notion by proving that it implies properties of \mathcal{L} as shown earlier for $b = c = 0$.

Due to the presence of the first- and zero-order terms, following [7] we only treat the one-dimensional and the two-dimensional case separately, in order to make the text more readable. One could provide a single definition for the k -dimensional case, as Carbonaro and Dragičević did in [6].

Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Take

$$\begin{aligned} A, B &\in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}, \\ b, \beta, c, \gamma &\in \mathbb{C}^d, \\ V, W &\in \mathbb{R}, \\ \omega = (\zeta, \eta) &\in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}, \\ \Xi = (X, Y) &\in \mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C}^d. \end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &= (A, b, c, V), \\ \mathcal{B} &= (B, \beta, \gamma, W). \end{aligned}$$

2.3.1. One-dimensional case. Let $\phi : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be of class C^2 . We associate the function ϕ with the following function on \mathbb{R}^2 :

$$\phi_{\mathcal{W}} := \phi \circ \mathcal{V}_1^{-1}.$$

Denote, respectively, by $D^2\phi(\zeta)$ and $\nabla\phi(\zeta)$ the Hessian matrix and the gradient of the function $\phi_{\mathcal{W}} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ calculated at the point $\mathcal{V}_1(\zeta) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. In accordance with [6, 7] we define

$$H_{\phi}^A[\zeta; X] = \left\langle \left[D^2\phi(\zeta) \otimes I_{\mathbb{R}^d} \right] \mathcal{V}_d(X), \mathcal{M}(A)\mathcal{V}_d(X) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}},$$

where \otimes denotes the Kronecker product of matrices (see, for example, [7]).

Moreover, we define

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\phi}^{(b,c)}[\zeta; X] &= \left\langle \left[D^2\phi(\zeta) \otimes I_{\mathbb{R}^d} \right] \mathcal{V}_d(X), \mathcal{V}_d(\zeta c) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \\ &\quad + \langle \nabla\phi(\zeta), \mathcal{V}_1(\langle X, b \rangle) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2}, \\ G_{\phi}^V[\zeta] &= \langle \nabla\phi(\zeta), \mathcal{V}_1(V\zeta) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Finally, we define

$$\mathbf{H}_{\phi}^{\mathcal{A}}[\zeta; X] = H_{\phi}^A[\zeta; X] + H_{\phi}^{(b,c)}[\zeta; X] + G_{\phi}^V[\zeta]. \tag{20}$$

Definition 6. We say that ϕ is \mathcal{A} -convex in \mathbb{C} if $\mathbf{H}_{\phi}^{\mathcal{A}}[\zeta; X]$ is nonnegative for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$, $X \in \mathbb{C}^d$.

In accordance with [6] we say that ϕ is A -convex if it is $(A, 0, 0, 0)$ -convex.

2.3.2. *Two-dimensional case.* Let $\Phi : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be of class C^2 . We associate the function Φ with the following function on \mathbb{R}^4 :

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{W}} := \Phi \circ \mathcal{W}_{2,1}^{-1}. \quad (21)$$

Denote, respectively, by $D^2\Phi(\omega)$ and $\nabla\Phi(\omega)$ the Hessian matrix and the gradient of the function $\Phi_{\mathcal{W}} : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ calculated at the point $\mathcal{W}_{2,1}(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^4$. In accordance with [6, 7] we define

$$H_{\Phi}^{(A,B)}[\omega; \Xi] = \left\langle \left[D^2\Phi(\omega) \otimes I_{\mathbb{R}^d} \right] \mathcal{W}_{2,d}(\Xi), [\mathcal{M}(A) \oplus \mathcal{M}(B)] \mathcal{W}_{2,d}(\Xi) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{4d}},$$

where $\mathcal{M}(A) \oplus \mathcal{M}(B)$ is the $4d \times 4d$ block diagonal real matrix with the $2d \times 2d$ blocks $\mathcal{M}(A), \mathcal{M}(B)$ along the main diagonal.

Moreover, we define

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\Phi}^{(b,\beta,c,\gamma)}[\omega; \Xi] &= \left\langle \left[D^2\Phi(\omega) \otimes I_{\mathbb{R}^d} \right] \mathcal{W}_{2,d}(\Xi), \mathcal{W}_{2,d}(\zeta c, \eta \gamma) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{4d}} \\ &\quad + \langle \nabla\Phi(\omega), \mathcal{W}_{2,1}(\langle X, b \rangle, \langle Y, \beta \rangle) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

$$G_{\Phi}^{(V,W)}[\omega] = \langle \nabla\Phi(\omega), \mathcal{W}_{2,1}(V\zeta, W\eta) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4}.$$

Finally, we define

$$\mathbf{H}_{\Phi}^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})}[\omega; \Xi] = H_{\Phi}^{(A,B)}[\omega; \Xi] + H_{\Phi}^{(b,\beta,c,\gamma)}[\omega; \Xi] + G_{\Phi}^{(V,W)}[\omega]. \quad (23)$$

Definition 7. We say that Φ is $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ -convex in \mathbb{C}^2 if $\mathbf{H}_{\Phi}^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})}[\omega; \Xi]$ is nonnegative for all $\omega \in \mathbb{C}^2, \Xi \in \mathbb{C}^{2d}$.

In accordance with [6] we say that Φ is (A, B) -convex if it is $(A, 0, 0, 0, B, 0, 0, 0)$ -convex.

We maintain the same notation when instead of matrices we consider matrix-valued functions $A, B \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{C}^{d \times d})$, vector-valued functions $b, \beta, c, \gamma \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$ and scalar functions $V, W \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+)$; in this case however we require that all the conditions are satisfied for a.e. $x \in \Omega$.

Given $f, g \in L^2(\Omega)$, define the function

$$\mathcal{E}(t) = \int_{\Omega} \Phi \left(T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f, T_t^{\mathcal{B}} g \right), \quad t > 0.$$

Definitions (22) and (23) are motivated by the fact that, formally,

$$-\mathcal{E}'(t) = \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{H}_{\Phi}^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})} \left[\left(T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f, T_t^{\mathcal{B}} g \right); \left(\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f, \nabla T_t^{\mathcal{B}} g \right) \right].$$

It follows that if Φ is $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ -convex on \mathbb{C}^2 then the function \mathcal{E} is nonincreasing on $(0, +\infty)$. When Φ is *strictly* $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ -convex and satisfies a suitable size estimate, this formal method can be used for proving bilinear inequalities in the spirit of [4, 5, 6, 7].

3. PROPERTIES OF THE CLASS $\mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$

In this section we shall prove some elementary properties of $\mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$ which we shall use in the rest of the paper.

In particular, we shall see that the strict positivity of Γ_p is preserved for exponents close enough to p and for small complex rotations of the coefficients (compare with [7, Corollary 5.17 and p. 3204]). Moreover, we shall see that the first order terms b, c are appropriately controlled by the potential V .

Proposition 8. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $q = p/(p-1)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$. Then the following assertions hold.*

(i) *For every $s \in (1, \infty)$ there exists $\tilde{C} > 0$ such that for a.e. $x \in \Omega$.*

$$|b(x) + (\mathcal{J}_s c)(x)| \leq \tilde{C} \sqrt{V(x)}.$$

The constant \tilde{C} can be chosen so as to (continuously) depend only on $p, s, \Lambda(A), M(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mu_p(\mathcal{A})$.

- (ii) *There exists $C > 0$ such that $|b(x)|, |c(x)| \leq C \sqrt{V(x)}$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. The constant C can be chosen so as to (continuously) depend only on $p, \Lambda(A), M(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mu_p(\mathcal{A})$.*
- (iii) *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $(A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{S}_s(\Omega)$ for all $s \in [p - \varepsilon, p + \varepsilon]$.*
- (iv) *There exists $\vartheta \in (0, \pi/2)$ such that $(e^{i\varphi} A, e^{i\varphi} b, e^{i\varphi} c, (\cos \varphi) V) \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$ for all $\varphi \in [-\vartheta, \vartheta]$.*

Proof. We will be using properties (a)-(g) of the operator \mathcal{J}_p , recalled on page 3.

(i) First consider the case $s = p$. Set $\xi_0 = b + \mathcal{J}_p c \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$. Clearly, the statement holds if $\xi_0 = 0$. Suppose that $\xi_0 \neq 0$. By (11) and by using dilations $\xi \rightsquigarrow \xi/t$, $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$, in (10), we see that $\mu_p < 1$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By ellipticity of A and by choosing $\xi = -\varepsilon \xi_0$ in (10), we obtain that

$$\varepsilon [1 - \varepsilon(\|\mathcal{J}_p\|\Lambda - \mu_p)] |\xi_0|^2 \leq (1 - \mu_p)V.$$

Observe that $\|\mathcal{J}_p\|\Lambda - \mu_p \geq 0$, since $\mu_p \leq (p/2)\Delta_p(A) \leq \|\mathcal{J}_p\|\Lambda$, by (11) and (d). Moreover, $\|\mathcal{J}_p\|\Lambda - \mu_p > 0$. Otherwise, by sending ε to ∞ , we would have that $\xi_0 = 0$. Therefore, by maximising the left-hand side with respect to $\varepsilon > 0$, we get

$$|\xi_0|^2 \leq 4(1 - \mu_p)(\|\mathcal{J}_p\|\Lambda - \mu_p)V.$$

If $s \neq p$, the assertion follows by the previous case, (ii) and the identity

$$b + \mathcal{J}_s c = b + \mathcal{J}_p c + (s - p) \operatorname{Re} c. \quad (24)$$

(ii) We shall prove that $|\operatorname{Re} c|, |\operatorname{Re} b|, |\operatorname{Im} b|, |\operatorname{Im} c| \lesssim \sqrt{V}$ in this order. The first estimate follows by applying (i) for $s = p$, (3) and the identity

$$p \operatorname{Re} c = \operatorname{Re}(b - c) - \operatorname{Re}(b + \mathcal{J}_p c).$$

Clearly, by (3) we have

$$|\operatorname{Re} b - \operatorname{Re} c| \lesssim \sqrt{V}, \quad (25)$$

$$|\operatorname{Im} b - \operatorname{Im} c| \lesssim \sqrt{V}. \quad (26)$$

Combining (25) with the estimate of $|\operatorname{Re} c|$, we get that $|\operatorname{Re} b| \lesssim \sqrt{V}$. On the other hand, by (i) and (24) we have

$$|\operatorname{Im} b + \operatorname{Im} c| = |\operatorname{Im}(b + \mathcal{J}_p c)| \lesssim \sqrt{V}. \quad (27)$$

Combining (26) and (27), we obtain that $|\operatorname{Im} b|, |\operatorname{Im} c| \lesssim \sqrt{V}$. All the constants which appear in the inequalities (continuously) depend only on $p, s, \Lambda, M, \mu_p(\mathcal{A})$.

(iii) By (24), $\mathcal{J}_{p+\delta}\xi = \mathcal{J}_p\xi + \delta \operatorname{Re} \xi$, hence (ii) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{p+\delta}^{\mathcal{A}}(\cdot, \xi) &= \Gamma_p^{\mathcal{A}}(\cdot, \xi) + \delta \operatorname{Re} [\langle A\xi, \operatorname{Re} \xi \rangle + \langle \xi, \operatorname{Re} c \rangle] \\ &\geq \mu_p(|\xi|^2 + V) - |\delta|(\Lambda|\xi|^2 + |\xi|\operatorname{Re} c) \\ &\geq (\mu_p - |\delta|\Lambda)|\xi|^2 - |\delta|C_p|\xi|\sqrt{V} + \mu_p V \\ &\geq (\mu_p - |\delta|\Lambda - |\delta|(C_p/2))|\xi|^2 + [\mu_p - |\delta|(C_p/2)]V \\ &\gtrsim |\xi|^2 + V, \end{aligned}$$

if $|\delta|$ is small enough.

(iv) From the properties (a), (c) of \mathcal{J}_p , we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} \langle e^{i\vartheta} A\xi, \mathcal{J}_p\xi \rangle + \operatorname{Re} \langle e^{i\vartheta} b + \mathcal{J}_p(e^{i\vartheta} c), \xi \rangle + (\cos \vartheta)V \\ = \cos \vartheta \operatorname{Re} [\langle A\xi, \mathcal{J}_p\xi \rangle + \langle b + \mathcal{J}_p c, \xi \rangle + V] \\ - \sin \vartheta \operatorname{Im} [\langle A\xi, \mathcal{J}_p\xi \rangle + \langle b + (p-1)\mathcal{J}_q c, \xi \rangle]. \end{aligned}$$

By (ii) we get $|b + (p-1)\mathcal{J}_q c| \leq C_q \sqrt{V}$. Therefore, we may proceed as

$$\geq (\mu_p \cos \vartheta - |\sin \vartheta| \|\mathcal{J}_p\| \Lambda) |\xi|^2 - C_q |\sin \vartheta| \sqrt{V} |\xi| + \mu_p (\cos \vartheta)V.$$

We conclude choosing ϑ small enough. \square

In [7, Corollary 5.17 (3)], the authors proved that \mathcal{A}_p is invariant under taking adjoints. The following proposition shows that this invariance still holds for \mathcal{S}_p . Moreover, in [7, Corollary 5.16] it was proved that $\{\mathcal{A}_p(\Omega) : p \in [2, \infty)\}$ is a decreasing chain of matrix classes. In Proposition 10 we shall show that $\{\mathcal{S}_p(\Omega) : p \in [2, \infty)\}$ is not. However, an interpolation property holds for \mathcal{S}_p which implies that $\{\mathcal{B}_p(\Omega) : p \in [2, \infty)\}$ is a decreasing chain.

Proposition 9. *Let Ω, A, b, c, V satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Let $1 < r < p < \infty$, $q = p/(p-1)$. Then the following assertions hold.*

- (i) $(A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$ if and only if $(A^*, c, b, V) \in \mathcal{S}_q(\Omega)$.
- (ii) We have

$$\mathcal{S}_r(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{S}_s(\Omega)$$

for all $s \in [r, p]$.

In particular, $\{\mathcal{B}_p(\Omega) : p \in [2, \infty)\}$ is a decreasing chain.

Proof. (i) By (e) and (c), we obtain that for all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$

$$\operatorname{Re} \langle A^* \xi, \mathcal{J}_q \xi \rangle = \operatorname{Re} \langle A(\mathcal{J}_q \xi), \mathcal{J}_p(\mathcal{J}_q \xi) \rangle, \quad (28)$$

$$\operatorname{Re} \langle c + \mathcal{J}_q b, \xi \rangle = \operatorname{Re} \langle \mathcal{J}_q(b + \mathcal{J}_p c), \xi \rangle = \operatorname{Re} \langle b + \mathcal{J}_p c, \mathcal{J}_q \xi \rangle. \quad (29)$$

Since $|\mathcal{J}_s \xi| \sim_s |\xi|$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and all $s \in (1, \infty)$, we conclude combining (10), (28) and (29).

(ii) Let $t \in (0, 1)$ such that $tp + (1-t)r = s$. By assumptions we have for all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$

$$\begin{aligned} t(\operatorname{Re} \langle A\xi, \mathcal{J}_p \xi \rangle + \operatorname{Re} \langle b + \mathcal{J}_p c, \xi \rangle + V) &\gtrsim t(|\xi|^2 + V), \\ (1-t)(\operatorname{Re} \langle A\xi, \mathcal{J}_r \xi \rangle + \operatorname{Re} \langle b + \mathcal{J}_r c, \xi \rangle + V) &\gtrsim (1-t)(|\xi|^2 + V). \end{aligned}$$

Using the identity

$$t\mathcal{J}_p + (1-t)\mathcal{J}_r = \mathcal{J}_s$$

and summing the terms above we conclude. \square

We conclude this subsection underlining that $\{\mathcal{S}_p(\Omega) : p \in [2, \infty)\}$ is not a decreasing chain. Moreover, $\mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$ is not invariant under conjugation of p . This further justifies our introduction of another class (\mathcal{B}_p) .

Proposition 10. *For all $V \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+) \setminus \{0\}$, $p, r \in (1, \infty)$, $p \neq r$, $B \in \mathcal{A}_r(\Omega)$, there exist $b = b(p, r, B, V)$, $c = c(p, r, B, V) \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$ such that*

- $(A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega)$,
- $(B, b, c, V) \notin \mathcal{S}_r(\Omega)$.

In particular, for all $V \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+) \setminus \{0\}$, $p, r \in (1, \infty)$, $p \neq r$, $A \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}_r(\Omega)$, there exist $b, c \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$ such that $(A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega) \setminus \mathcal{S}_r(\Omega)$.

Proof. Fix $V \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+) \setminus \{0\}$, $p, r \in (1, \infty)$, with $p \neq r$ and $B \in \mathcal{A}_r(\Omega)$. Let $\varrho > 0$ and $v = v_\varrho \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$(r - p)^2 |v|^2 = \varrho V.$$

We define

$$b = b_\varrho = -(p - 1)v - i\frac{p}{2}v \quad \text{and} \quad c = c_\varrho = v + i\frac{p}{2}v.$$

Then

$$b + \mathcal{J}_p c = 0, \quad |b - c|^2 = \frac{2p^2}{(r - p)^2} \varrho V, \quad b + \mathcal{J}_r c = (r - p)v.$$

Therefore $(A, b_\varrho, c_\varrho, V) \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega)$ and $\varrho > 0$. Moreover, setting $\sigma := v/|v|$, we have for all $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \Omega$ such that $V(x) \neq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_r^{B, b, c, V}(x, -t\sigma) &= t^2 \operatorname{Re} \langle B(x)\sigma, \mathcal{J}_r \sigma \rangle - t(r - p)|v(x)| + V(x) \\ &= t^2 \operatorname{Re} \langle B(x)\sigma, \mathcal{J}_r \sigma \rangle - t\sqrt{\varrho} \sqrt{V(x)} + V(x) \xrightarrow{\varrho \rightarrow +\infty} -\infty. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

4. THE POWER FUNCTIONS

Recall the definition (15) of the Bellman function \mathcal{Q} . Owing to the tensor structure of \mathcal{Q} , the generalised convexity of \mathcal{Q} is related to that of its elementary building blocks: the power functions (see [7]).

Let $r > 0$. Define $F_r : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$F_r(\zeta) = |\zeta|^r, \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Let $\mathbf{1}$ denote the constant function of value 1 on \mathbb{C} , that is, $\mathbf{1} = F_0$.

A rapid calculation [3, 4, 6, 7] shows that

$$(\nabla F_r)(\zeta) = r|\zeta|^{r-2} \mathcal{V}_1(\zeta) \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, \quad (30)$$

$$(D^2 F_r)(\zeta) = r|\zeta|^{r-2} \left(I_{\mathbb{R}^2} + (r - 2) \frac{\mathcal{V}_1(\zeta)}{|\zeta|} \otimes \frac{\mathcal{V}_1(\zeta)}{|\zeta|} \right) \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (31)$$

Compare (31) with [7, (5.5)] and [3, (2.5)].

In [7], the authors proved that F_p is A -convex if and only if $\Delta_p(A) \geq 0$, and \mathcal{Q} is strictly (A, B) -convex provided that $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega)$.

In the next subsections we shall prove that F_p is \mathcal{A} -convex if and only if $\Gamma_p^{\mathcal{A}} \geq 0$, and \mathcal{Q} is strictly $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ -convex provided that $\mathcal{A} \in (\mathcal{S}_p \cap \mathcal{S}_2)(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{S}_q(\Omega)$, generalising the previous results.

4.1. Generalised convexity of power functions. Let $r > 0$. Before enunciating the next lemma, extend \mathcal{J}_r , Γ_r and \mathcal{S}_r to $r > 0$ by the same rules (7), (8) and (10). Recall the definitions (19) and (20). From (30) and (31) it follows that for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and all $X \in \mathbb{C}^d$

$$\mathbf{H}_{F_p}^{\mathcal{A}}[\zeta; X] = |\zeta|^{p-2} \left(H_{F_p}^A[\zeta/|\zeta|; X] + |\zeta| H_{F_p}^{(b,c)}[\zeta/|\zeta|; X] + |\zeta|^2 G_{F_p}^V[\zeta/|\zeta|] \right). \quad (32)$$

The next result is modelled after [7, Lemma 5.6]. We define

$$\sigma = e^{-i \arg(\zeta)} X \in \mathbb{C}^d.$$

By (17), (30), (31) and by adequately modifying the proof of [7, Lemma 5.6] we get the following result.

Lemma 11. *Let $r > 0$, $b, c \in \mathbb{C}^d$, $V \in \mathbb{R}$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $X \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Then, for $|\zeta| = 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} r^{-1} H_{F_r}^{(b,c)}[\zeta; X] &= \operatorname{Re} \langle b + \mathcal{J}_r c, \sigma \rangle, \\ r^{-1} G_{F_r}^V[\zeta] &= V |\zeta|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 12. *Let Ω and $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V)$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Let $r > 0$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $X \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Suppose that for a.e. $x \in \Omega$*

$$\Gamma_r^{\mathcal{A}}(x, \xi) \geq 0, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{C}^d.$$

Then

$$\mathbf{H}_{F_r}^{\mathcal{A}(x)}[\zeta; X] \geq 0.$$

Moreover, if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_r(\Omega)$, then for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ we have

$$\mathbf{H}_{F_r}^{\mathcal{A}(x)}[\zeta; X] \geq r \mu_r(A) |\zeta|^{r-2} (|X|^2 + V(x) |\zeta|^2).$$

Proof. By (32), Lemma 11 and [7, Lemma 5.6] we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_{F_r}^{\mathcal{A}}[\zeta; X] &= r |\zeta|^{r-2} \left(\operatorname{Re} \langle A \sigma, \mathcal{J}_r \sigma \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + |\zeta| \operatorname{Re} \langle b + \mathcal{J}_r c, \sigma \rangle + |\zeta|^2 V \right) \\ &= r |\zeta|^r \Gamma_r^{\mathcal{A}}(x, \sigma / |\zeta|). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude. \square

4.2. Generalised convexity of the Bellman function of Nazarov and Treil. Now we shall prove the $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ -convexity of the Bellman function provided that $\mathcal{A} \in (\mathcal{S}_p \cap \mathcal{S}_2)(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{S}_q(\Omega)$. This lemma is the analogue of [7, Lemma 5.11].

Lemma 13. *Let $1 < q < 2$ and $b, c, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Take $\omega = (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ such that $|\zeta| < |\eta|^{q-1}$ and $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} H_{F_2 \otimes F_{2-q}}^{(b,\beta,c,\gamma)}[\omega; (X, Y)] &= |\eta|^{2-q} H_{F_2}^{(b,c)}[\zeta, X] + |\zeta|^2 H_{F_{2-q}}^{(\beta,\gamma)}[\eta, Y] \\ &\quad + 2(2-q) |\zeta|^2 |\eta|^{1-q} \operatorname{Re} \langle c, \operatorname{Re} \sigma_2 \rangle \\ &\quad + 2(2-q) |\zeta| |\eta|^{2-q} \operatorname{Re} \langle \gamma, \operatorname{Re} \sigma_1 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. This follows from combining the definition of $H_{F_2 \otimes F_{2-q}}^{(b,\beta,c,\gamma)}[\omega; (X, Y)]$ (see (22)) and the identity

$$\partial_{\zeta_j \eta_k}^2 (F_2 \otimes F_{2-q})(\zeta, \eta) = 2(2-q) \zeta_j \eta_k |\eta|^{-q} \quad \text{for } j, k = 1, 2. \quad \square$$

Lemma 13 and [7, Corollary 5.10, Lemma 5.11] immediately give the following estimate.

Corollary 14. *Let $\Omega, \mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V), \mathcal{B} = (B, \beta, \gamma, W)$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Let $1 < q < 2$. Take $\omega = (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ such that $|\zeta| < |\eta|^{q-1}$ and $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Then, for almost everywhere $x \in \Omega$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{H}_{F_2 \otimes F_{2-q}}^{(\mathcal{A}(x), \mathcal{B}(x))}[\omega; (X, Y)] \\ & \geq |\eta|^{2-q} \mathbf{H}_{F_2}^{\mathcal{A}(x)}[\zeta; X] + \frac{(2-q)^2}{2} \Delta_{2-q}(B) |\eta|^{q-2} |Y|^2 \\ & \quad - (2-q) |\beta(x) + (\mathcal{J}_{2-q}\gamma)(x)| |\zeta|^2 |\eta|^{1-q} |Y| + (2-q) W(x) |\zeta|^2 |\eta|^{2-q} \\ & \quad - 4(2-q) \Lambda |X| |Y| - 2(2-q) |\operatorname{Re} c(x)| |\zeta|^2 |\eta|^{1-q} |Y| - 2(2-q) |\operatorname{Re} \gamma(x)| |\eta| |X|. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 15. *Let $\Omega, \mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V), \mathcal{B} = (B, \beta, \gamma, W)$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Let $p \geq 2$ such that $\mathcal{A} \in (\mathcal{S}_p \cap \mathcal{S}_2)(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{S}_q(\Omega)$. Then there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $C > 0$ such that for $\Omega = \Omega_{p,\delta}$ we have, for almost everywhere $x \in \Omega$,*

$$\mathbf{H}_{\Omega}^{(\mathcal{A}(x), \mathcal{B}(x))}[\omega; (X, Y)] \geq C \sqrt{|X|^2 + V(x)|\zeta|^2} \sqrt{|Y|^2 + W(x)|\eta|^2}$$

for any $\omega = (\zeta, \eta) \in (\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}) \setminus \Upsilon$ and $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^d$. The constant $C > 0$ can be chosen so as to (continuously) depend on $p, \lambda(A, B), \Lambda(A, B), M(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), \mu(\mathcal{A}), \mu_p(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mu_q(\mathcal{B})$, but not on the dimension d .

Proof. When $p = 2$ the Bellman function reads $\Omega(\zeta, \eta) = (1 + \delta)|\zeta|^2 + |\eta|^2$ for all $\zeta, \eta \in \mathbb{C}$, hence the theorem quickly follows from Proposition 12. Thus from now on assume that $p > 2$.

If $|\zeta|^p > |\eta|^q > 0$, then by the second assertion of Proposition 12 we have, for almost every $x \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_{\Omega}^{(\mathcal{A}(x), \mathcal{B}(x))}[\omega; (X, Y)] &= [1 + \delta(2/p)] \mathbf{H}_{F_p}^{\mathcal{A}(x)}[\zeta; X] + [1 + \delta(2/q - 1)] \mathbf{H}_{F_q}^{\mathcal{B}(x)}[\eta; Y] \\ &\geq p[1 + \delta(2/p)] \mu_p(A) |\zeta|^{p-2} (|X|^2 + V(x) |\zeta|^2) \\ &\quad + q[1 + \delta(2/q - 1)] \mu_q(B) |\eta|^{q-2} (|Y|^2 + W(x) |\eta|^2). \end{aligned}$$

By assumptions we have $2 - q > 0$. So whenever $\delta > 0$, we may continue as

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \min\{\mu_p(A), \mu_q(B)\} \left(p |\zeta|^{p-2} (|X|^2 + V(x) |\zeta|^2) + q |\eta|^{q-2} (|Y|^2 + W(x) |\eta|^2) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{p}{\sqrt{p-1}} \min\{\mu_p(A), \mu_q(B)\} \sqrt{|X|^2 + V(x) |\zeta|^2} \sqrt{|Y|^2 + W(x) |\eta|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step we have used the assumption $|\zeta|^p > |\eta|^q$ and the inequality between the arithmetic and geometric mean.

What remains is the case $|\zeta|^p < |\eta|^q$. Set $\Theta := \{p, \lambda, \Lambda, \mu, M, \mu_p(\mathcal{A}), \mu_q(\mathcal{B})\}$. By Proposition 8 (i), (ii) there exist $C_0 = C_0(\Theta) > 0$ such that for a.e. $x \in \Omega$

$$|\operatorname{Re} c(x)| \leq C_0 \sqrt{V(x)}, \quad |\operatorname{Re} \gamma(x)| \leq C_0 \sqrt{W(x)}, \quad |\beta(x) + (\mathcal{J}_{2-q}\gamma)(x)| \leq C_0 \sqrt{W(x)}.$$

Therefore, from Proposition 12 (applied with $r = q$ and $r = 2$) and Corollary 14 we get, for almost every $x \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{H}_Q^{(\mathcal{A}(x), \mathcal{B}(x))}[\omega; (X, Y)] \\
& \geq \mathbf{H}_{F_q}^{\mathcal{B}(x)}[\eta; Y] + \delta \mathbf{H}_{F_2 \otimes F_{2-q}}^{(\mathcal{A}(x), \mathcal{B}(x))}[\omega; (X, Y)] \\
& \geq 2\delta |\zeta|^2 |\eta|^{-q} \left(\frac{q\mu_q}{6\delta} |Y|^2 - (2-q)C_0 \sqrt{V(x)} |\eta| |Y| + \mu_2 V(x) |\eta|^2 \right) \\
& \quad + (2-q)\delta |\zeta|^2 |\eta|^{-q} \left(\frac{q\mu_q}{3(2-q)\delta} |Y|^2 - C_0 \sqrt{W(x)} |\eta| |Y| + W(x) |\eta|^2 \right) \\
& \quad + 2\delta \left(\mu_2 |\eta|^{2-q} |X|^2 - (2-q)C_0 \sqrt{W(x)} |\eta| |X| + \frac{q\mu_q}{2\delta} W(x) |\eta|^q \right) \\
& \quad + 2\delta \left(\Gamma |\eta|^{q-2} |Y|^2 - 2(2-q)\Lambda |X| |Y| \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Gamma = \frac{q\mu_q}{6\delta} + \frac{(2-q)^2}{4} \Delta_{2-q}(B).$$

Since $\mu_2, \mu_q > 0$, we have that $(\mu_2\mu_q)/\delta$ grows to infinity as $\delta \searrow 0$. Therefore, there exists $\delta = \delta(\Theta) > 0$ such that

$$\frac{2q\mu_2\mu_q}{3\delta} > C_0^2,$$

which, through [3, Corollary 3.4] and the facts that $q \in (1, 2)$ and $\mu_2 < 1$ (see (11)), implies the existence of $C_1 = C_1(\delta, \Theta), C_2 = C_2(\delta, \Theta) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{q\mu_q}{6\delta} |Y|^2 - (2-q)C_0 \sqrt{V(x)} |\eta| |Y| + \mu_2 V(x) |\eta|^2 \geq C_1 V(x) |\eta|^2, \\
& \frac{q\mu_q}{3(2-q)\delta} |Y|^2 - C_0 \sqrt{W(x)} |\eta| |Y| + W(x) |\eta|^2 \geq 0, \\
& \mu_2 |\eta|^{2-q} |X|^2 - (2-q)C_0 \sqrt{W(x)} |\eta| |X| + \frac{q\mu_q}{2\delta} W(x) |\eta|^q \geq C_2 (|\eta|^{2-q} |X|^2 + W(x) |\eta|^q),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_2 = C_2(\delta, \Theta) = \left(\sqrt{\frac{q\mu_2\mu_q}{2\delta}} - \frac{2-q}{2} C_0(\Theta) \right) \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{2\mu_2\delta}{q\mu_q}}, \sqrt{\frac{q\mu_q}{2\mu_2\delta}} \right\}.$$

Therefore, for almost every $x \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{H}_Q^{(\mathcal{A}(x), \mathcal{B}(x))}[\omega; (X, Y)] \\
& \geq 2\delta \left(C_2 |\eta|^{2-q} |X|^2 - 2(2-q)\Lambda |X| |Y| + \Gamma |\eta|^{q-2} |Y|^2 \right) \\
& \quad + 2\delta C_1 V(x) |\zeta|^2 |\eta|^{2-q} + 2\delta C_2 W(x) |\eta|^q.
\end{aligned}$$

Since C_2 tends to $\mu_2 > 0$ and Γ grows to infinity as $\delta \searrow 0$, we can choose $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small so that

$$C_2\Gamma > [(2-q)\Lambda]^2.$$

By [7, (5.23)], we may choose δ (continuously) depending only on Θ . Therefore, applying [3, Corollary 3.4] again, we obtain that, for almost every $x \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{H}_Q^{(\mathcal{A}(x), \mathcal{B}(x))}[\omega; (X, Y)] \\ & \gtrsim_{\Theta} |\eta|^{2-q} \left(|X|^2 + V(x)|\zeta|^2 \right) + |\eta|^{q-2} \left(|Y|^2 + W(x)|\eta|^2 \right) \\ & \gtrsim_{\Theta} \sqrt{|X|^2 + V(x)|\zeta|^2} \sqrt{|Y|^2 + W(x)|\eta|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used the inequality between the arithmetic and geometric mean. \square

Remark 16. When $b = c = 0$, in [3, Theorem 3.1] Carbonaro and Dragičević estimated $H_Q^{(A,B)}$ and $G_Q^{(V,W)}$ separately. However, this time, in order to use the nonnegativity of the function Γ_p , we cannot separate $H_Q^{(A,B)}$, $H_Q^{(b,c,\beta,\gamma)}$ and $G_Q^{(V,W)}$ into individual pieces and estimate them one by one.

We would like to have an analogue of [7, Corollary 5.5]. Fix a radial function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$ such that $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$, $\text{supp } \varphi \subset B_{\mathbb{R}^4}(0, 1)$ and $\int \varphi = 1$. For $\nu \in (0, 1]$ define $\varphi_\nu(\omega) = \nu^{-4} \varphi(\omega/\nu)$. Recall the notation (21). If $\Phi : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\Phi \star \varphi_\nu = (\Phi_W \star \varphi_\nu) \circ \mathcal{W}_{2,1} : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}. \quad (33)$$

Lemma 17. Let $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$, $b, \beta, c, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and $V, W \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Set $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V)$ and $\mathcal{B} = (B, \beta, \gamma, W)$. Then, for all $\omega = (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^d$, $\nu \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_{Q \star \varphi_\nu}^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})}[\omega; (X, Y)] &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \mathbf{H}_Q^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})}[\omega - \mathcal{W}_{2,1}^{-1}(\omega'); (X, Y)] \varphi_\nu(\omega') \, d\omega' \\ &+ R_\nu^{(c,\gamma)}[\omega; (X, Y)] + R_\nu^{(V,W)}(\omega), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_\nu^{(c,\gamma)} &= R_\nu^{(c,\gamma)}[\omega; (X, Y)] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left\langle \left[D^2 \mathcal{Q}(\omega - \mathcal{W}_{2,1}^{-1}(\omega')) \otimes I_{\mathbb{R}^d} \right] \mathcal{W}_{2,d}(X, Y), \mathcal{W}_{2,d} \left(\mathcal{V}_1^{-1}(\zeta')c, \mathcal{V}_1^{-1}(\eta')\gamma \right) \right\rangle \times \\ &\quad \times \varphi_\nu(\omega') \, d\omega', \\ R_\nu^{(V,W)} &= R_\nu^{(V,W)}(\omega) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \left\langle \nabla \mathcal{Q}(\omega - \mathcal{W}_{2,1}^{-1}(\omega')), (V\zeta', W\eta') \right\rangle \varphi_\nu(\omega') \, d\omega'. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Remark 18. We would like to use (34) in order to estimate $\mathbf{H}_{Q \star \varphi_\nu}^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})}$ from below. The integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \mathbf{H}_Q$ in (34) will be estimated by means of Theorem 15. Note that in the unperturbed case, Carbonaro and Dragičević [6, 7] proved that

$$H_{Q \star \varphi_\nu}^{(A,B)}[\omega; (X, Y)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} H_Q^{(A,B)}[\omega - \mathcal{W}_{2,1}^{-1}(\omega'); (X, Y)] \varphi_\nu(\omega') \, d\omega'.$$

This time, the presence of the terms $R_\nu^{(c,\gamma)}$ and $R_\nu^{(V,W)}$ in (34) is due to the fact that in the definition (22), the element $\omega = (\zeta, \eta)$ appears not only as a variable of the function \mathcal{Q} , but also in the components of $(\zeta c, \eta \gamma)$ and $(V\zeta, W\eta)$. For this reason we cannot proceed exactly as in [6]. The terms $R_\nu^{(c,\gamma)}$ and $R_\nu^{(V,W)}$ are remainders, in the sense that they are going to disappear as $\nu \rightarrow 0$. In order to prove that, we will need their upper estimates which will be established next; see Lemma 19.

Proof of Lemma 17. By definition (22) we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(b,\beta,c,\gamma)}[\omega; (X, Y)] &= \left\langle \left[D^2 \mathcal{Q}(\omega) \otimes I_{\mathbb{R}^d} \right] \mathcal{W}_{2,d}(X, Y), \mathcal{W}_{2,d}(\zeta c, \eta \gamma) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{4d}} \\ &\quad + \langle \nabla \mathcal{Q}(\omega), \mathcal{W}_{2,1}(\langle X, b \rangle, \langle Y, \beta \rangle) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} \\ &=: G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(b,\beta)}[\omega; (X, Y)] + H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(c,\gamma)}[\omega; (X, Y)], \end{aligned}$$

for all $\omega = (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \Upsilon$ and all $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Since $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{W}} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^4)$ and its second-order partial derivatives exist on $\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \mathcal{W}(\Upsilon)$ and are locally integrable in \mathbb{R}^4 , by the ACL characterisation of Sobolev spaces (see, for example, [24, Théorème V, p. 57] or [19, Theorem 11.45]) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{Q} \star \varphi_{\nu}}^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})}[\omega; (X, Y)] &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(A,B)}[\omega - \mathcal{W}_{2,1}^{-1}(\omega'); (X, Y)] \varphi_{\nu}(\omega') \, d\omega' \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(b,\beta)}[\omega - \mathcal{W}_{2,1}^{-1}(\omega'); (X, Y)] \varphi_{\nu}(\omega') \, d\omega' \\ &\quad + \left\langle \left[D^2(\mathcal{Q} \star \varphi)(\omega) \otimes I_{\mathbb{R}^d} \right] \mathcal{W}_{2,d}(X, Y), \mathcal{W}_{2,d}(\zeta c, \eta \gamma) \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \nabla(\mathcal{Q} \star \varphi)(\omega), \mathcal{W}_{2,1}(V\zeta, W\eta) \rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

for all $\omega \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and all $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Writing the third and the fourth terms of the right-hand side of (36) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \left[D^2(\mathcal{Q} \star \varphi)(\omega) \otimes I_{\mathbb{R}^d} \right] \mathcal{W}_{2,d}(X, Y), \mathcal{W}_{2,d}(\zeta c, \eta \gamma) \right\rangle \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(c,\gamma)}[\omega - \mathcal{W}_{2,1}^{-1}(\omega'); (X, Y)] \varphi_{\nu}(\omega') \, d\omega' + R_{\nu}^{(c,\gamma)}[\omega; (X, Y)], \\ &\langle \nabla(\mathcal{Q} \star \varphi)(\omega), \mathcal{W}_{2,1}(V\zeta, W\eta) \rangle \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{(V,W)}[\omega - \mathcal{W}_{2,1}^{-1}(\omega')] \varphi_{\nu}(\omega') \, d\omega' + R_{\nu}^{(V,W)}(\omega), \end{aligned}$$

we get (34). \square

Lemma 19. *Let $\nu \in (0, 1)$, $c, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and $V, W \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then*

(i) *for all $\omega = (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and all $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^d$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |R_{\nu}^{(c,\gamma)}[\omega; (X, Y)]| &\lesssim \nu^{q-1} \max\{|c|, |\gamma|\} \left(1 + |\zeta|^{p-2} + |\eta|^{2-q} \right) |(X, Y)|, \\ |R_{\nu}^{(V,W)}(\omega)| &\lesssim \nu \max\{V, W\} \left(1 + |\zeta|^{p-1} + |\eta|^{q-1} + |\eta| \right); \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *$R_{\nu}^{(c,\gamma)}[\omega; (X, Y)]$ and $R_{\nu}^{(V,W)}(\omega)$ converge to 0 as $\nu \rightarrow 0_+$ for all $\omega \in \mathbb{C}^2$, $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^d$.*

Proof. By using [6, Lemma 14(iii)], the second and the third estimates of [6, (29)] and the fact that the support of both the integrand of $R_{\nu}^{(c,\gamma)}$ and $R_{\nu}^{(V,W)}$ is contained in $B_{\mathbb{R}^4}(0, \nu)$, we get item (i). Sending ν to 0, we prove item (ii). \square

Corollary 20. *Let Ω , $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V)$, $\mathcal{B} = (B, \beta, \gamma, W)$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Let $p \geq 2$ such that $\mathcal{A} \in (\mathcal{S}_p \cap \mathcal{S}_2)(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{S}_q(\Omega)$. Then for every $\omega = (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$, $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and almost every $x \in \Omega$,*

$$\liminf_{\nu \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{Q} \star \varphi_{\nu}}^{(\mathcal{A}(x), \mathcal{B}(x))}[\omega; (X, Y)] \geq C \sqrt{|X|^2 + V(x)|\zeta|^2} \sqrt{|Y|^2 + W(x)|\eta|^2}.$$

The constant $C > 0$ can be chosen so as to (continuously) depend on $p, \lambda(A, B), \Lambda(A, B), M(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), \mu(\mathcal{A}), \mu_p(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mu_q(\mathcal{B})$, but not on the dimension d .

Proof. By combining Theorem 15 and Lemma 17, we infer that for almost every $x \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{Q}^* \varphi_\nu}^{(\mathcal{A}(x), \mathcal{B}(x))}[\omega; (X, Y)] \\ & \gtrsim \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \sqrt{|X|^2 + V(x)|\zeta - \mathcal{V}_1^{-1}(\zeta')|^2} \sqrt{|Y|^2 + W(x)|\eta - \mathcal{V}_1^{-1}(\eta')|^2} \varphi_\nu(\omega') \, d\omega' \quad (37) \\ & + R_\nu^{(c(x), \gamma(x))}[\omega; (X, Y)] + R_\nu^{(V(x), W(x))}(\omega), \end{aligned}$$

for all $\omega = (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^d$.

Since the function $\mathbb{C}^2 \ni (\zeta, \eta) \mapsto \sqrt{|X|^2 + V(x)|\zeta|^2} \sqrt{|Y|^2 + W(x)|\eta|^2}$ is continuous in \mathbb{C}^2 for all $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and for all $x \in \Omega$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\nu \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \sqrt{|X|^2 + V(x)|\zeta - \mathcal{V}_1^{-1}(\zeta')|^2} \sqrt{|Y|^2 + W(x)|\eta - \mathcal{V}_1^{-1}(\eta')|^2} \varphi_\nu(\omega') \, d\omega' \\ & = \sqrt{|X|^2 + V(x)|\zeta|^2} \sqrt{|Y|^2 + W(x)|\eta|^2} \quad (38) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\zeta, \eta \in \mathbb{C}$, $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and $x \in \Omega$. Combining Lemma 19(ii), (37) and (38), we conclude. \square

5. L^p CONTRACTIVITY AND ANALYTICITY OF $(T_t^{A,b,c,V,\mathcal{Y}})_{t>0}$

Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$. Let prove now Theorem 1 and Corollary 2.

5.1. Proof of Theorem 1. Let (Ω, μ) be a measure space, \mathfrak{b} a sesquilinear form defined on the domain $D(\mathfrak{b}) \subset L^2 = L^2(\Omega)$ and $1 < p < \infty$. Denote

$$D_p(\mathfrak{b}) := \{u \in D(\mathfrak{b}) : |u|^{p-2}u \in D(\mathfrak{b})\}.$$

We say that \mathfrak{b} is L^p -dissipative if

$$\operatorname{Re} \mathfrak{b}(u, |u|^{p-2}u) \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in D_p(\mathfrak{b}).$$

The notion of L^p -dissipativity of sesquilinear forms was introduced by Cialdea and Maz'ya in [9] for forms defined on $C_c^1(\Omega)$. Then it was extended by Carbonaro and Dragičević in [7, Definition 7.1].

In order to prove the L^p -contractivity of $(T_t^{A,b,c,V,\mathcal{Y}})_{t>0}$, we follow the proof of the implication (a) \Rightarrow (b) in [7, Theorem 1.3] for which the following theorem due to Nittka [21, Theorem 4.1] is essential. We reproduce it in the form it appeared in [3, Theorem 2.2].

Theorem 21 (Nittka). *Let (Ω, μ) be a measure space. Suppose that the sesquilinear form \mathfrak{a} on $L^2 = L^2(\Omega, \mu)$ is densely defined, accretive, continuous and closed. Let \mathcal{L} be the operator associated with \mathfrak{a} .*

Take $p \in (1, \infty)$ and define $B^p := \{u \in L^2 \cap L^p : \|u\|_p \leq 1\}$. Let \mathbf{P}_{B^p} be the orthogonal projection $L^2 \rightarrow B^p$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:

- $\|\exp(-t\mathcal{L})f\|_p \leq \|f\|_p$ for all $f \in L^2 \cap L^p$ and all $t \geq 0$;
- $D(\mathfrak{a})$ is invariant under \mathbf{P}_{B^p} and \mathfrak{a} is L^p -dissipative.

The L^p -dissipativity of the form (1) is closely related to our $\mathbf{H}_{F_p}^{\mathcal{A}}$, as we show next.

Proposition 22. *Suppose that $B \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$, $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and $W \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $p > 1$ and $f \in D_p(\mathfrak{a})$. Then, setting $\mathcal{B} = (B, \beta, \gamma, W)$,*

$$\mathbf{H}_{F_p}^{\mathcal{B}}[f; \nabla f] = p \operatorname{Re} \left(\left\langle B \nabla f, \nabla (|f|^{p-2} f) \right\rangle + \langle \nabla f, \beta \rangle |f|^{p-2} \bar{f} + f \langle \gamma, \nabla (|f|^{p-2} f) \rangle \right) + W |f|^p.$$

Proof. By [7, (5.5)], see also [3, Lemma 2.3],

$$\nabla \left(|f|^{p-2} f \right) = |f|^{p-2} \operatorname{sign} f \cdot \mathcal{J}_p \left(\operatorname{sign} \bar{f} \cdot \nabla f \right)$$

for all $f \in H^1(\Omega)$ such that $|f|^{p-2} f \in H^1(\Omega)$. In order to finish the proof it now suffices to recall [7, Lemma 5.6] and Lemma 11 applied with $k = 1$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. We will use Nittka's invariance criterion (Theorem 21). Under our assumptions on ϕ , the sesquilinear form $\mathfrak{b} := e^{i\phi} \mathfrak{a}$ is densely defined, closed and sectorial. It is well-known that a sectorial form is accretive and continuous; see for example [22, Proposition 1.8]. Therefore, it falls into the framework of Nittka's criterion. The operator associated with \mathfrak{b} is $e^{i\phi} \mathcal{L}^{A,b,c,V}$.

The invariance of $D(\mathfrak{b}) = D(\mathfrak{a})$ under \mathbf{P}_{B^p} was proved in [3, Theorem 1.2]. We have to prove just the L^p -dissipativity of \mathfrak{b} .

Let $u \in D_p(\mathfrak{b})$. By Proposition 22, applied with $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}_\phi := (e^{i\phi} A, e^{i\phi} b, e^{i\phi} c, (\cos \phi)V)$, we get

$$\operatorname{Re} \mathfrak{b}(u, |u|^{p-2} u) = p^{-1} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{H}_{F_p}^{\mathcal{A}_\phi} [u; \nabla u].$$

Hence the theorem follows from Proposition 12. \square

Without assumptions on the lower order terms, we obtain the L^p -quasi-contractivity of the semigroup $(T_t)_{t>0}$ generated by $-\mathcal{L}$ (i.e., the L^p -contractivity of the semigroup generated by $\mathcal{L} + \omega$, for some $\omega \geq 0$) provided that A is p -elliptic. Compare the next result with [9, Theorem 6]; see also [7, Proposition 5.18].

Corollary 23. *Let $\Omega, A, b, c, \mathcal{V}$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Let $V \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ be bounded from below and $p > 1$ such that $A \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega)$. Then $(T_t^{A,b,c,V,\mathcal{V}})_{t>0}$ extends to a quasi-contraction semigroup on $L^p(\Omega)$.*

Proof. We want to find $\omega > |\operatorname{ess\,inf} V|$ such that $(T_t^{A,b,c,V+\omega,\mathcal{V}})_{t>0}$ extends to a strongly continuous semigroup of contractions on $L^p(\Omega)$. To this end, in light of Theorem 1 applied with $\phi = 0$, it is sufficient to find $\omega, \mu > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_2^{A,b,c,V+\omega}(\xi) &\geq \mu \left(|\xi|^2 + V + \omega \right), \\ \Gamma_p^{A,b,c,V+\omega}(\xi) &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$. The first inequality would follow if we had $\mu < \min\{\lambda, 1\}$, where $\lambda = \lambda(A)$ is such that

$$(\lambda - \mu) |\xi|^2 + \operatorname{ess\,inf} \min_{|\sigma|=1} \operatorname{Re} \langle b + c, \sigma \rangle |\xi| + (1 - \mu) (\operatorname{ess\,inf} V + \omega) \geq 0.$$

This holds for ω large enough. In the same way, we are able to find ω such that the second inequality holds. \square

Proof of Corollary 2. By Proposition 9(ii) and Proposition 8(iv), there exists $\vartheta > 0$ such that $(e^{i\phi} A, e^{i\phi} b, e^{i\phi} c, (\cos \phi)V) \in \mathcal{S}_s(\Omega)$ for all $\phi \in [-\vartheta, \vartheta]$ and all $s \in [r, p]$. The contractivity part now follows from Theorem 1 and the relation

$$T_{te^{i\phi}} = \exp \left(-te^{i\phi} \mathcal{L} \right), \quad (39)$$

whereupon analyticity is a consequence of a standard argument [15, Chapter II, Theorem 4.6]. \square

5.2. Comparison between (9) and the Cialdea-Maz'ya condition [9, (2.25)]. Let $(C_c(\Omega, \mathbb{C}))^*$ denote the continuous dual of $C_c(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$ endowed with the uniform norm. In [9] Cialdea and Maz'ya studied the L^p -dissipativity of the sesquilinear form $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} D(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}) &= C_c^1(\Omega), \\ \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}(u, v) &= \int_{\Omega} \langle A \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle + \langle \nabla u, b \rangle \bar{v} + u \langle c, \nabla v \rangle + V u \bar{v}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Here A is a $d \times d$ matrix with entries $a_{hk} \in (C_c(\Omega, \mathbb{C}))^*$, $b = (b_1, \dots, b_d)$ and $c = (c_1, \dots, c_d)$ stand for vectors with $b_j, c_j \in (C_c(\Omega, \mathbb{C}))^*$ and V is a complex-valued scalar distribution in $(C_c^1(\Omega))^*$. By Riesz-Markov theorem every element of $(C_c(\Omega, \mathbb{C}))^*$ may be interpreted as a regular complex Borel measure on Ω . Therefore, for instance, the meaning of the first and the last terms in (40) is

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \langle A \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle &= \sum_{k,h=1}^d \int_{\Omega} \partial_k u \partial_h \bar{v} da_{hk}, \\ \int_{\Omega} V u \bar{v} &= \langle V, u \bar{v} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

They introduced the notion of L^p -dissipativity and, under the additional assumptions that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded domain with sufficiently regular boundary [9, p. 1087], the entries of A and b belong to $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$, c is zero and $V \in C(\bar{\Omega})$, they proved in [9, Theorem 6] that the semigroup $T_t^{\mathfrak{a}, H_0^1}$ is L^p -quasicontractive if and only if

$$|p - 2| |\langle \operatorname{Im} A(x) \xi, \xi \rangle| \leq 2 \sqrt{p - 1} |\langle \operatorname{Re} A(x) \xi, \xi \rangle|,$$

for any $x \in \Omega, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The above inequality is equivalent to saying that $\Delta_p(A_s) \geq 0$, where $A_s = (A + A^T)/2$ is the symmetric part of A ; see [7, Proposition 5.18].

Without these further assumptions on Ω and on the coefficients A, b, c and V , in [9, Corollary 4] they showed that $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$ is L^p -dissipative provided that there exist two real constants ϑ and ν such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{4}{pq} \langle \operatorname{Re} A \alpha, \alpha \rangle + \langle \operatorname{Re} A \beta, \beta \rangle + 2 \left\langle \left(p^{-1} \operatorname{Im} A + q^{-1} \operatorname{Im} A^* \right) \alpha, \beta \right\rangle \\ & + \langle \operatorname{Im} (b + c), \beta \rangle + 2 \left\langle \operatorname{Re} \left(\vartheta \frac{b}{p} + \nu \frac{c}{q} \right), \alpha \right\rangle + \\ & + \operatorname{Re} \left[V - \operatorname{div} \left((1 - \vartheta) \frac{b}{p} + (1 - \nu) \frac{c}{q} \right) \right] \geq 0 \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where q is the conjugate exponent of p . Condition (41) has to be understood in the sense of measures and distributions, that is, it means that, for every $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \left[\left(\frac{4}{pq} \langle \operatorname{Re} A \alpha, \alpha \rangle + \langle \operatorname{Re} A \beta, \beta \rangle + 2 \left\langle \left(p^{-1} \operatorname{Im} A + q^{-1} \operatorname{Im} A^* \right) \alpha, \beta \right\rangle \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \langle \operatorname{Im} (b + c), \beta \rangle + 2 \left\langle \operatorname{Re} \left(\vartheta \frac{b}{p} + \nu \frac{c}{q} \right), \alpha \right\rangle + \operatorname{Re} V \right) \varphi \right] \\ & - \left\langle \operatorname{div} \left((1 - \vartheta) \frac{\operatorname{Re} b}{p} + (1 - \nu) \frac{\operatorname{Re} c}{q} \right), \varphi \right\rangle \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

for any nonnegative $\varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$, where the last term of the left-hand side of the previous inequality stands for the action of the distribution $\operatorname{div} \left((1 - \vartheta) \frac{\operatorname{Re} b}{p} + (1 - \nu) \frac{\operatorname{Re} c}{q} \right)$ on φ .

The distributional divergence appears after two integrations by parts. In fact, let $p \geq 2$ and u be in $C_c^1(\Omega)$. Setting $v = |u|^{(p-2)/2}u$, which belongs to $C_c^1(\Omega)$, and noticing that $2 \operatorname{Re}(\bar{v}\nabla v) = \nabla(|v|^2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{Re} \left(\langle \nabla u, b \rangle |u|^{p-2}\bar{u} \right) &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{2}{p} \langle \operatorname{Re} b, \operatorname{Re}(\bar{v}\nabla v) \rangle + \langle \operatorname{Im} b, \operatorname{Im}(\bar{v}\nabla v) \rangle \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{2\vartheta}{p} \langle \operatorname{Re} b, \operatorname{Re}(\bar{v}\nabla v) \rangle + \langle \operatorname{Im} b, \operatorname{Im}(\bar{v}\nabla v) \rangle \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1-\vartheta}{p} \langle \operatorname{div}(\operatorname{Re} b), |v|^2 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we get the divergence of $(1-\nu)(\operatorname{Re} c/q)$; see [9, p. 1071 and p. 1078].

Our assumptions on the domain $D(\mathbf{a})$ of the form \mathbf{a} , defined in (1), are weaker than those on the domain of $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$, because the latter, which consists of all compactly supported functions on Ω of class C^1 , is a proper subspace of $D(\mathbf{a})$. Moreover, since in generality that we consider the domain Ω may be completely irregular, $D(\tilde{\mathbf{a}})$ might not even be dense in $D(\mathbf{a})$ with respect to the Sobolev norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$, for instance if $D(\mathbf{a}) = H^1(\Omega)$. In particular, for an arbitrary $u \in D_p(\mathbf{a})$, we are not able to justify the distributional integration by parts

$$\int_{\Omega} \langle \operatorname{Re} b, \nabla(|v|^2) \rangle = - \langle \operatorname{div}(\operatorname{Re} b), |v|^2 \rangle,$$

where $v = |u|^{(p-2)/2}u$ and $b \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$. Due to the weaker assumptions, our sufficient condition for the L^p -contractivity of the semigroup naturally turns out to imply (41).

Proposition 24. *Let $A : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{d,d}$, $b, c : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$, $V : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $p > 1$. Suppose that $\Gamma_p^{A,b,c,V}(x, \xi) \geq 0$ for almost all $x \in \Omega$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Then (41) holds with $\vartheta = \nu = 1$.*

Proof. Recalling (18), replacing α with $\alpha p/2$ and using the identity

$$b + \mathcal{J}_p c = \operatorname{Re}(b + (p-1)c) + i \operatorname{Im}(b + c),$$

the condition (41) with $\vartheta = \nu = 1$ can be expressed as: for a.e. $x \in \Omega$

$$\operatorname{Re} \langle A(x)(\alpha + i\beta), \mathcal{J}_p(\alpha + i\beta) \rangle + \operatorname{Re} \langle b + \mathcal{J}_p c, \alpha + i\beta \rangle + V(x) \geq 0 \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad \square$$

6. PROOF OF THE BILINEAR EMBEDDING

We modify the heat-flow method of [6] and [3]. Observe that we cannot estimate $\mathbf{H}^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}$ splitting it into the three terms of the definition (23), as Carbonaro and Dragičević implicitly did in [3] when the first-order terms were zero. This is because our condition (10) involves the matrix (A) , as well as the first- and zero-order terms $(b, c$ and V , respectively) at the same time, without “decoupling”. On the other hand, in [6] the authors strongly exploited that the sequences appearing in the limit argument in the heat-flow method were (A, B) -convex, so that they could use Fatou’s lemma. The crucial point there was that the (A, B) -convexity is invariant under convolution, while, as already observed in Remark 18, the $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ -convexity might be not. Therefore, we would like to justify the passage of the limits through the integrals by means of the Lebesgue’s dominated convergence theorem. However, under the general assumptions on the coefficients, it is not straightforward to uniformly dominate the integrands by integrable functions. Therefore, we will initially prove the bilinear embedding under further assumptions on the coefficients and then we will deduce the arbitrary case by a limit argument.

Without loss of generality we assume $p \geq 2$. Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V)$, $\mathcal{B} = (B, \beta, \gamma, W)$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$. Fix two closed subspaces \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{W} of $H^1(\Omega)$ of the type discussed in Section 1.1. In the spirit of [7], we will for the moment also

$$\text{assume that } A, B \in C^\infty(\Omega), b, c, \beta, \gamma, V, W \in C_c^\infty(\Omega).$$

The smoothness of the coefficients implies that $T_t^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}} f, T_t^{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{W}} g \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ for all $f, g \in L^2(\Omega)$; see Lemma B.6. In particular, they and their respective gradients are locally bounded on Ω . This fact, combined with the assumption on the supports of the first- and zero-order terms, will allow us to uniformly dominate certain intergrands by integrable functions and then apply the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. Once the proof with these further assumptions is over, we will apply the regularisation argument from the Appendix to pass to the case of arbitrary coefficients.

Now, we will prove that

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}} f|^2 + V |T_t^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}} f|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{W}} g|^2 + W |T_t^{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{W}} g|^2} \lesssim (\|f\|_p^p + \|g\|_q^q), \quad (42)$$

for all $f, g \in (L^p \cap L^q)(\Omega)$. Once (42) is proved, (13) follows by replacing f and g in (42) with sf and $s^{-1}g$ and minimising the right-hand side with respect to $s > 0$.

We now start the heat-flow method, but for simplicity we omit the subscript W . Moreover, we simply denote

$$\begin{aligned} T_t^{\mathcal{A}} &= T_t^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}}, & T_t^{\mathcal{B}} &= T_t^{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{W}}, & \forall t > 0, \\ \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}} &= \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}}, & \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{B}} &= \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{W}}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the boundedness of the potentials V, W implies that

$$D(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}}) = \mathcal{V}, \quad D(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{W}}) = \mathcal{W}. \quad (43)$$

We also recall that for $r \in (1, \infty)$ the operator $-\mathcal{L}_r^{\mathcal{A}}$ stands for the generator of $(T_t^{\mathcal{A}})$ on $L^r(\Omega)$, whenever the semigroup extends on $L^r(\Omega)$.

Let $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_\delta$ as in (15). Fix $\delta > 0$ such that Theorem 15 holds. Let us start with a reduction in the spirit of [6, Section 6.1]; see also [8, Proposition 7.2].

Proposition 25. *Let $p \geq 2$, $q = p/(p-1)$. Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V)$, $\mathcal{B} = (B, \beta, \gamma, W)$, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W} as above. Assume that*

$$\int_\Omega \sqrt{|\nabla u|^2 + V|u|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla v|^2 + W|v|^2} \lesssim 2 \operatorname{Re} \int_\Omega \left((\partial_\zeta \mathcal{Q})(u, v) \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}} u + (\partial_\eta \mathcal{Q})(u, v) \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{B}} v \right) \quad (44)$$

for $u \in D(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}})$, $v \in D(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{B}})$ such that $u, v \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ and $u, v, \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}} u, \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{B}} v \in (L^p \cap L^q)(\Omega)$. Then the bilinear estimate (42) holds for all $f, g \in (L^p \cap L^q)(\Omega)$.

Proof. Fix $f, g \in (L^p \cap L^q)(\Omega)$. Define

$$\mathcal{E}(t) = \int_\Omega \mathcal{Q} \left(T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f, T_t^{\mathcal{B}} g \right), \quad t > 0.$$

The estimates (16), the analyticity and the contractivity of $(T_t^{\mathcal{A}})_{t>0}$ and $(T_t^{\mathcal{B}})_{t>0}$ both in L^p and in L^q (see Theorem 1 and Corollary 2) and [6, Proposition C.1] imply that \mathcal{E} is well defined, continuous on $[0, \infty)$, differentiable on $(0, \infty)$ with a continuous derivative and

$$-\mathcal{E}'(t) = 2 \operatorname{Re} \int_\Omega \left(\partial_\zeta \mathcal{Q} \left(T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f, T_t^{\mathcal{B}} g \right) \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}} T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f + \partial_\eta \mathcal{Q} \left(T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f, T_t^{\mathcal{B}} g \right) \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{B}} T_t^{\mathcal{B}} g \right). \quad (45)$$

The upper pointwise estimates on Ω (see, for example, [7, Proposition 5.1]) yield

$$-\int_0^\infty \mathcal{E}'(t) dt \leq \mathcal{E}(0) \lesssim \|f\|_p^p + \|g\|_q^q. \quad (46)$$

Analyticity of the semigroups gives $T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f \in D(\mathcal{L}_p^{\mathcal{A}}) \cap D(\mathcal{L}_q^{\mathcal{A}})$ and $T_t^{\mathcal{B}} g \in D(\mathcal{L}_p^{\mathcal{B}}) \cap D(\mathcal{L}_q^{\mathcal{B}})$. By the consistency of the semigroups and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$D(\mathcal{L}_p^{\mathcal{A}}) \cap D(\mathcal{L}_q^{\mathcal{A}}) \subset D(\mathcal{L}_2^{\mathcal{A}}) \subset \mathcal{V}$$

and

$$D(\mathcal{L}_p^{\mathcal{B}}) \cap D(\mathcal{L}_q^{\mathcal{B}}) \subset D(\mathcal{L}_2^{\mathcal{B}}) \subset \mathcal{W}.$$

Moreover, the smoothness of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} together with Lemma B.6 implies that $T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f, T_t^{\mathcal{B}} g \in C^\infty(\Omega)$. Therefore, (44) applied with the couple $(u, v) = (T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f, T_t^{\mathcal{B}} g)$, combined with (45) and (46), gives the desired estimate (42). \square

When the first- and zero-order terms are zero, in order to establish an analogue of (44), that is [6, (36)], Carbonaro and Dragičević approximated the Bellman function \mathcal{Q} by a sequence $(\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\nu \in (0, 1)$, of smooth (A, B) -convex functions proving that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \operatorname{Re} \int_{\Omega} \left((\partial_{\zeta} \mathcal{Q})(u, v) \mathcal{L}^A u + (\partial_{\eta} \mathcal{Q})(u, v) \mathcal{L}^B v \right) \\ = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} H_{\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}}^{(A,B)}[(u, v); (\nabla u, \nabla v)] \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

and

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} H_{\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}}^{(A,B)}[(u, v); (\nabla u, \nabla v)] \gtrsim \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u| |\nabla v|; \quad (48)$$

see [6, Section 6.1]. While the identity (47) is easily adapted to our case since it follows from properties of the sequence $(\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu})_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ which do not depend on the matrices A and B ((49), (50), (51) below), the estimate (48) is not. In fact, it was proved by strongly exploiting the (A, B) -convexity of $\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $\nu \in (0, 1)$. The crucial point there was that the (A, B) -convexity is invariant under convolution, while, as already observed in Remark 18, the $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ -convexity might be not. Therefore, in this case we do not know if $\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}$ are $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ -convex for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $\nu \in (0, 1)$.

6.1. The approximation sequence $(\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu})_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ of [6]. For $\nu \in (0, 1)$, consider the sequence $(\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu})_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ of smooth (A, B) -convex functions defined in [6]. In [6] the authors proved that

•

$$\begin{aligned} D\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu} &\rightarrow D(\mathcal{Q} \star \varphi_{\nu}), \\ D^2\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu} &\rightarrow D^2(\mathcal{Q} \star \varphi_{\nu}) \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

pointwise in \mathbb{C}^2 as $n \rightarrow \infty$;

• there exists $C = C(\nu) > 0$ that does not depend on n such that

$$|(D\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu})(\omega)| \leq C(\nu) \left(|\omega|^{p-1} + |\omega|^{q-1} \right), \quad (50)$$

for all $\omega \in \mathbb{C}^2$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $\nu \in (0, 1)$;

• for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $\nu > 0$, $u \in \mathcal{V}$ and $v \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$(\partial_{\zeta} \mathcal{R}_{n,\nu})(u, v) \in \mathcal{V} \quad \text{and} \quad (\partial_{\eta} \mathcal{R}_{n,\nu})(u, v) \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (51)$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that there exists $C = C(\nu) > 0$ that does not depend on n such that

$$|D^2 R_{n,\nu}(\omega)| \leq C(\nu)(|\omega|^{p-2} + 1), \quad (52)$$

for all $\omega \in \mathbb{C}^2$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $\nu \in (0, 1)$.

6.2. Proof of (44). Let u, v as in the assumptions of Proposition 25.

As in [6], by using (49), (50), [6, Lemma 4(ii)], the facts that $\mathcal{Q} \in C^1(\mathbb{C}^2)$, $u, v, \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}} u, \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{B}} v \in (L^p \cap L^q)(\Omega)$ and the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem twice, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \operatorname{Re} \int_{\Omega} \left((\partial_{\zeta} \mathcal{Q})(u, v) \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}} u + (\partial_{\eta} \mathcal{Q})(u, v) \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{B}} v \right) \\ &= \lim_{\nu \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} 2 \operatorname{Re} \int_{\Omega} \left((\partial_{\zeta} \mathcal{R}_{n,\nu})(u, v) \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}} u + (\partial_{\eta} \mathcal{R}_{n,\nu})(u, v) \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{B}} v \right). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

By (51) and (43) we can integrate by parts the integral on the right-hand side of (53) and, by means of the chain-rule for the composition of smooth functions with vector-valued Sobolev functions, deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \operatorname{Re} \int_{\Omega} \left((\partial_{\zeta} \mathcal{R}_{n,\nu})(u, v) \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}} u + (\partial_{\eta} \mathcal{R}_{n,\nu})(u, v) \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{B}} v \right) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}}^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})}[(u, v); (\nabla u, \nabla v)]. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

So far we have repeated the same steps of [6, Section 6.1], adapting them to our case, establishing an analogue of (47). Now if we knew, as in [6], that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}}^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})}[(u, v); (\nabla u, \nabla v)] \geq \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{Q} \star \varphi_{\nu}}^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})}[(u, v); (\nabla u, \nabla v)] \quad (55)$$

and

$$\liminf_{\nu \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{Q} \star \varphi_{\nu}}^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})}[(u, v); (\nabla u, \nabla v)] \gtrsim \int_{\Omega} \sqrt{|\nabla u|^2 + V|u|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla v|^2 + W|v|^2}, \quad (56)$$

we could prove (44) by combining these two estimates with (53) and (54).

Notice that, by (49) and Corollary 20, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}}^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})}[(u, v); (\nabla u, \nabla v)] = \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{Q} \star \varphi_{\nu}}^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})}[(u, v); (\nabla u, \nabla v)], \\ & \liminf_{\nu \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{Q} \star \varphi_{\nu}}^{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})}[(u, v); (\nabla u, \nabla v)] \gtrsim \sqrt{|\nabla u|^2 + V|u|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla v|^2 + W|v|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, proving (55) and (56) reduces to justifying the passage of the limits through the integrals. While in [6] it was sufficient applying Fatou's lemma since both $\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}$ and $\mathcal{Q} \star \varphi_{\nu}$ are (A, B) -convex, now we will also need the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. We will strongly exploit that $u, v \in C^{\infty}(\Omega)$.

6.2.1. Proof of (55). We should proceed in a slightly different way than [6], since we do not know that $\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}$ are $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ -convex in \mathbb{C}^2 for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $\nu \in (0, 1)$; see Remark 18. However, by [6, Theorem 16] $\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}$ are (A, B) -convex for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $\nu \in (0, 1)$. Therefore, it is convenient to split the integrand of the right-hand side of

(54) according to the definition (23), obtaining that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}}^{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})}[(u,v);(\nabla u,\nabla v)] \\ &= \int_{\Omega} H_{\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}}^{(A,B)}[(u,v);(\nabla u,\nabla v)] + \int_{\Omega} \left(H_{\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}}^{(b,\beta,c,\gamma)}[(u,v);(\nabla u,\nabla v)] + G_{\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}}^{(V,W)}[(u,v)] \right) \\ &=: I_1^n + I_2^n. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

By using (49), [6, Theorem 16] and Fatou's lemma we deduce that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} I_1^n \geq \int_{\Omega} H_{\mathcal{Q}^{\star}\varphi}^{(A,B)}[(u,v);(\nabla u,\nabla v)]. \quad (58)$$

Recall that $u, v \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ and $b, \beta, c, \gamma, V, W$ are compactly supported. Hence by using (50) and (52) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| H_{\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}}^{(b,\beta,c,\gamma)}[(u,v);(\nabla u,\nabla v)] \right| &\lesssim C(\nu) \left(|(u,v)|^{p-1} + |(u,v)|^{q-1} \right) |(\nabla u,\nabla v)| \mathbf{1}_K \in L^1(\Omega), \\ \left| G_{\mathcal{R}_{n,\nu}}^{(V,W)}[(u,v)] \right| &\lesssim C(\nu) \left(|(u,v)|^p + |(u,v)|^q \right) \mathbf{1}_K \in L^1(\Omega), \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where K is a compact in Ω containing the supports of $b, \beta, c, \gamma, V, W$. Therefore, by applying (49), (59) and the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem we deduce that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} I_2^n = \int_{\Omega} \left(H_{\mathcal{Q}^{\star}\varphi}^{(b,\beta,c,\gamma)}[(u,v);(\nabla u,\nabla v)] + G_{\mathcal{Q}^{\star}\varphi}^{(V,W)}[(u,v)] \right). \quad (60)$$

Hence we obtain (55) by combining (57), (58) and (60).

6.2.2. *Proof of (56).* By Corollary 20, for almost $x \in \Omega$,

$$\liminf_{\nu \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{Q}^{\star}\varphi_\nu}^{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})}[(u,v);(\nabla u,\nabla v)] \gtrsim \sqrt{|\nabla u|^2 + V|u|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla v|^2 + W|v|^2}. \quad (61)$$

If we knew that

$$\liminf_{\nu \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} H_{\mathcal{Q}^{\star}\varphi_\nu}^{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})} \geq \int_{\Omega} \liminf_{\nu \rightarrow 0} H_{\mathcal{Q}^{\star}\varphi_\nu}^{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})}, \quad (62)$$

we could get (56) as in [6]. But we cannot proceed as in [6] to justify (62): in fact, we cannot use Fatou's Lemma, not knowing that $\mathcal{Q}^{\star}\varphi_\nu$ are $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ -convex in \mathbb{C}^2 . However, the identity (34) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{Q}^{\star}\varphi_\nu}^{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})}[(u,v);(\nabla u,\nabla v)] &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})}[(u,v) - \mathcal{W}_{2,1}^{-1}(\omega');(\nabla u,\nabla v)] \varphi_\nu(\omega') \, d\omega' \\ &\quad + R_\nu^{(c,\gamma)}[(u,v);(\nabla u,\nabla v)] + R_\nu^{(V,W)}(u,v) \\ &=: J_\nu + R_\nu^{(c,\gamma)} + R_\nu^{(V,W)}, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

for all $\nu \in (0, 1)$. The integral J_ν is nonnegative for all $\nu \in (0, 1)$. Therefore, by using Fatou's lemma, Lemma 19(ii) and (63), we get

$$\liminf_{\nu \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} J_\nu \geq \int_{\Omega} \liminf_{\nu \rightarrow 0} J_\nu = \int_{\Omega} \liminf_{\nu \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{Q}^{\star}\varphi_\nu}^{(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})}[(u,v);(\nabla u,\nabla v)] \quad (64)$$

On the other hand, sending $\nu \rightarrow 1$ on the right-hand side of Lemma 19(i) implies that there exists a constant $C > 0$, that does not depend on ν , such that

$$\begin{aligned} |R_\nu^{(c,\gamma)}| &\leq C \left(1 + |u|^{p-2} + |v|^{2-q} \right) |(\nabla u,\nabla v)| \mathbf{1}_K \in L^1(\Omega), \\ |R_\nu^{(V,W)}| &\leq C \left(1 + |u|^{p-1} + |v|^{q-1} + |v| \right) \mathbf{1}_K \in L^1(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

All the right-hand terms of these estimates are integrable functions, since $u, v \in C^\infty(\Omega)$. Therefore, by using Lemma 19(ii) and the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\nu \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} R_{\nu}^{(c, \gamma)}[(u, v); (\nabla u, \nabla v)] &= 0, \\ \lim_{\nu \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} R_{\nu}^{(V, W)}(u, v) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Then, by combining (63), (64) and (65), we get (62) and thus (56), as explained above.

7. MAXIMAL REGULARITY AND FUNCTIONAL CALCULUS: PROOF OF THEOREM 5

The following result is modelled after [6, Proposition 20]. See [6, Sections 7.1 and 7.2] for the necessary terminology and references.

Proposition 26. *Let $\Omega, \mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V), \mathcal{V}$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Suppose that $p > 1$ and $\mathcal{A} \in (\mathcal{S}_p \cap \mathcal{S}_2)(\Omega)$. Let $-\mathcal{L}_p$ be the generator of $(T_t)_{t>0}$ on $L^p(\Omega)$. If $\omega_{H^\infty}(\mathcal{L}_p) < \pi/2$, then \mathcal{L}_p has parabolic maximal regularity.*

7.1. Proof of Theorem 5. We prove Theorem 5 as Carbonaro and Dragičević proved [6, Theorem 3] in [6, Section 7.3] when $b = c = V = 0$. Without loss of generality we suppose $p \geq 2$. Let A, b, c, V satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. In light of Proposition 26 it suffices to show that

$$(A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega) \implies \omega_{H^\infty}(\mathcal{L}_p) < \pi/2.$$

Observe that $\mathcal{L}_2^{A^*, c, v, V} = (\mathcal{L}^{A, b, c, V})_2^*$, so $T_t^{A^*, c, b, V} = (T_t^{A, b, c, V})^*$ for all $t > 0$. Set $T_t = T_t^{A, b, c, V}$ and $T_t^* = T_t^{A^*, c, b, V}$ for all $t > 0$.

By Proposition 8(iv) and Proposition 9(i), there exists $\vartheta \in (0, \pi/2)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (e^{\pm i\vartheta} A, e^{\pm i\vartheta} b, e^{\pm i\vartheta} c, (\cos \vartheta) V) &\in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega), \\ (e^{\mp i\vartheta} A^*, e^{\mp i\vartheta} c, e^{\mp i\vartheta} b, (\cos \vartheta) V) &\in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for every $r \in [q, p]$ both $(T_t)_{t>0}$ and $(T_t^*)_{t>0}$ are analytic (and contractive) in $L^r(\Omega)$ in the cone \mathbf{S}_ϑ ; see Corollary 2.

By Theorem 4 and (39) there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \int_{\Omega} \sqrt{|\nabla T_{te^{\pm i\vartheta}} f|^2 + (\cos \vartheta) V |T_{te^{\pm i\vartheta}} f|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla T_{te^{\mp i\vartheta}}^* g|^2 + (\cos \vartheta) W |T_{te^{\mp i\vartheta}}^* g|^2} dx dt \\ \leq C \|f\|_p \|g\|_q, \end{aligned}$$

for all $f, g \in (L^p \cap L^q)(\Omega)$. Therefore,

$$\int_0^\infty \int_{\Omega} \sqrt{|\nabla T_{te^{\pm i\vartheta}} f|^2 + V |T_{te^{\pm i\vartheta}} f|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla T_{te^{\mp i\vartheta}}^* g|^2 + W |T_{te^{\mp i\vartheta}}^* g|^2} dx dt \leq \frac{C}{\cos \vartheta} \|f\|_p \|g\|_q, \tag{66}$$

for all $f, g \in (L^p \cap L^q)(\Omega)$.

On the other hand, the integration by parts (5) and Proposition 8(ii) give

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{L}_2 T_{te^{\pm i\vartheta}} f \overline{T_{te^{\mp i\vartheta}}^* g} dx \right| \\ \lesssim \int_{\Omega} \sqrt{|\nabla T_{te^{\pm i\vartheta}} f|^2 + V |T_{te^{\pm i\vartheta}} f|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla T_{te^{\mp i\vartheta}}^* g|^2 + W |T_{te^{\mp i\vartheta}}^* g|^2} dx, \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

By combining (66) and (67), we deduce that

$$\int_0^\infty \left| \int_\Omega \mathcal{L}_p T_{2te^{\pm i\vartheta}} f \bar{g} dx \right| dt \lesssim \|f\|_p \|g\|_q,$$

for all $f, g \in (L^p \cap L^q)(\Omega)$. Analyticity of $(T_t)_{t>0}$ in $L^p(\Omega)$, Fatou's lemma and a density argument show that

$$\int_0^\infty \left| \int_\Omega \mathcal{L}_p T_{te^{\pm i\vartheta}} f \bar{g} dx \right| dt \lesssim \|f\|_p \|g\|_q, \quad (68)$$

for all $f \in L^p(\Omega)$ and all $g \in L^q(\Omega)$.

We now apply [10, Theorem 4.6 and Example 4.8] to the dual subpair $\langle \overline{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{L}_p), \overline{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{L}_q^*) \rangle$ and the dual operators $(\mathcal{L}_p)_\parallel, (\mathcal{L}_q^*)_\parallel$ [10, p. 64], and deduce from (68) that $\omega_{H^\infty}(\mathcal{L}_p) \leq \pi/2 - \vartheta$.

APPENDIX A. APPROXIMATION WITH REGULAR-COEFFICIENT OPERATORS

We learnt the following regularisation method by Carbonaro and Dragičević in [7, Appendix].

For any $\phi \in (0, \pi/2)$ denote $\phi^* := \pi/2 - \phi$. Write $I = [0, 1]$. Consider a one-parameter family $\{A_s : s \in I\}$ of $d \times d$ complex matrix functions on Ω , two one-parameter families $\{b_s : s \in I\}, \{c_s : s \in I\}$ of d -dimensional complex vector-valued functions on Ω and a one parameter family $\{V_s : s \in I\}$ of nonnegative functions on Ω . Suppose that there exist $\mu, M, C > 0$ such that

- (H1) $\mathcal{A}_s := (A_s, b_s, c_s, V_s) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu, M}(\Omega)$ for all $s \in I$;
- (H2) $\max\{\|A_s\|_\infty, \|b_s\|_\infty, \|c_s\|_\infty, \|V_s\|_\infty\} \leq C$ for all $s \in I$.
- (H3) For a.e. $x \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \|A_s(x) - A_0(x)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)} &= 0, \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \|b_s(x) - b_0(x)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d, \mathbb{C})} &= 0, \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \|c_s(x) - c_0(x)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}^d)} &= 0, \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \|V_s(x) - V_0(x)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C})} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Denote by \mathfrak{a}_s the sesquilinear form associated with \mathcal{A}_s and by $\mathcal{L}_s = \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}_s}$ the operator on $L^2(\Omega)$ associated with \mathfrak{a}_s . Recall from Section 1 that each \mathcal{L}_s is sectorial with sectoriality angle $\omega(\mathcal{L}_s) \leq \vartheta_0$, where $\vartheta_0 = \vartheta_0(\mu, M, \Lambda)$ is a positive angle smaller than $\pi/2$. In particular,

$$\sup_{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbf{S}_{\vartheta_0}} \|\zeta(\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < \infty, \quad \forall \vartheta \in (\vartheta_0, \pi/2). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Set $\mathcal{H}_0 = L^2(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{H}_1 = L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$. For $\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbf{S}_{\vartheta_0}$ define the operators $G_{\mathcal{L}_s}(\zeta) : \mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1$ and $S_{\mathcal{L}_s}(\zeta) : C_c^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$ by

$$G_{\mathcal{L}_s}(\zeta) := \nabla(\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1}, \quad S_{\mathcal{L}_s}(\zeta) := (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} \text{div}.$$

Lemma A.1. *Assume (H1) holds. Then for every $\vartheta \in (\vartheta_0, \pi/2)$ there exists $C = C(\mu, M, \Lambda, \vartheta) > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} |\zeta|^{1/2} \|G_{\mathcal{L}_s}(\zeta) f\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} &\leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_0}, \\ |\zeta|^{1/2} \|S_{\mathcal{L}_s}(\zeta) F\|_{\mathcal{H}_0} &\leq C \|F\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}, \\ \|\nabla S_{\mathcal{L}_s}(\zeta) F\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} &\leq C \|F\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $s \in I$, $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, $F \in C_c^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{C}^d)$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbf{S}_\vartheta$. Moreover, the very same estimates hold with \mathcal{L}_s replaced by \mathcal{L}_s^* .

Proof. Since the proof is basically the same as that of [7, Lemma A.1] for unperturbed divergence-form operators, let us prove only the first inequality. The condition (H1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \|\nabla(\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} f\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2 &\leq \operatorname{Re} \mathbf{a}_s \left((\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} f, (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} f \right) \\ &= \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_s (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} f, (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} f \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0} \\ &= \operatorname{Re} \left\langle \zeta (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} f, (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} f \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0} - \operatorname{Re} \left\langle f, (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} f \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0}. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality of the lemma now follows from (A.1). Since $\mathcal{L}_s^* = \mathcal{L}^{A_s^*, c_s, b_s, V_s}$ and $(A_s^*, c_s, b_s, V_s) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu, M}(\Omega)$ by Proposition 9(i), the same estimate clearly holds with \mathcal{L}_s replaced by \mathcal{L}_s^* . \square

Remark A.2. The preceding lemma implies that for $\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbf{S}_{\vartheta_0}$ the operators $S_{\mathcal{L}_s}(\zeta)$ and $\nabla S_{\mathcal{L}_s}(\zeta)$ admit unique extensions to bounded operators $\mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1$, respectively. Moreover, $S_{\mathcal{L}_s}^*(\zeta) = G_{\mathcal{L}_s^*}(\bar{\zeta})$.

Lemma A.3. For every $s \in I$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbf{S}_{\vartheta_0}$ and $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f - (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} f &= S_{\mathcal{L}_s}(\zeta) \circ M_{A_0 - A_s} \circ G_{\mathcal{L}_0}(\zeta) f \\ &\quad + (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} \circ M_{b_0 - b_s} \circ G_{\mathcal{L}_0}(\zeta) f \\ &\quad + S_{\mathcal{L}_s}(\zeta) \circ M_{c_0 - c_s} \circ (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f \\ &\quad + (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} \circ M_{V_0 - V_s} \circ (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f \end{aligned}$$

where we denote

$$\begin{aligned} M_{A_0 - A_s} &: \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1 \text{ the operator of multiplication by } A_0 - A_s, \\ M_{b_0 - b_s} &: \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0 \text{ the operator } \langle \cdot, b_0 - b_s \rangle, \\ M_{c_0 - c_s} &: \mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1 \text{ the operator of multiplication by } c_0 - c_s, \\ M_{V_0 - V_s} &: \mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0 \text{ the operator of multiplication by } V_0 - V_s. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbf{S}_{\vartheta_0}$. The identity

$$(\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} - (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} = (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} \mathcal{L}_0 (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} - \mathcal{L}_s (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1}$$

implies that, for all $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $g \in D(\mathcal{L}_s^*)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f - (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} f, g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0} \\ &= \left\langle \mathcal{L}_0 (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f, (\bar{\zeta} - \mathcal{L}_s^*)^{-1} g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0} - \overline{\left\langle \mathcal{L}_s^* (\bar{\zeta} - \mathcal{L}_s^*)^{-1} g, (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0}} \\ &= \mathbf{a}_0 \left((\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f, (\bar{\zeta} - \mathcal{L}_s^*)^{-1} g \right) - \mathbf{a}_s \left((\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f, (\bar{\zeta} - \mathcal{L}_s^*)^{-1} g \right) \\ &= \left\langle M_{A_0 - A_s} G_{\mathcal{L}_0}(\zeta) f, G_{\mathcal{L}_s^*}(\bar{\zeta}) g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} + \left\langle M_{b_0 - b_s} G_{\mathcal{L}_0}(\zeta) f, (\bar{\zeta} - \mathcal{L}_s^*)^{-1} g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0} \\ &\quad + \left\langle M_{c_0 - c_s} (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f, G_{\mathcal{L}_s^*}(\bar{\zeta}) g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} + \left\langle M_{V_0 - V_s} (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f, (\bar{\zeta} - \mathcal{L}_s^*)^{-1} g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude by invoking Remark A.2. \square

Lemma A.4. Fix $f \in L^2(\Omega)$. Assuming (H1), (H2) and (H3), for every $z \in \mathbf{S}_{\vartheta_0^*}$ we have

$$V_s^{1/2} T_z^{\mathcal{A}_s} f \rightarrow V_0^{1/2} T_z^{\mathcal{A}_0} f \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\nabla T_z^{\mathcal{A}_s} f \rightarrow \nabla T_z^{\mathcal{A}_0} f \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{C}^d), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

as $s \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. In order to prove (A.2), by (H2) and (H3) it suffices to prove that

$$T_z^{\mathcal{A}_s} f \rightarrow T_z^{\mathcal{A}_0} f \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

as $s \rightarrow 0$. Let $\vartheta^* \in (0, \pi/2)$ be such that $|\arg z| < \vartheta^* < \vartheta_0^*$. Fix $\delta > 0$ and denote by γ the positively oriented boundary of $\mathbf{S}_{\vartheta} \cup \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} : |\zeta| < \delta\}$. For $s \in I$ and $\zeta \in \gamma$ define

$$\begin{aligned} U(s, \zeta) &= S_{\mathcal{L}_s}(\zeta) \circ M_{A_0 - A_s} \circ G_{\mathcal{L}_0}(\zeta) + (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} \circ M_{b_0 - b_s} \circ G_{\mathcal{L}_0}(\zeta) \\ &\quad + S_{\mathcal{L}_s}(\zeta) \circ M_{c_0 - c_s} \circ (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} + (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_s)^{-1} \circ M_{V_0 - V_s} \circ (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by [17, Lemma 2.3.2] and Lemma A.3,

$$T_z^{\mathcal{A}_0} f - T_z^{\mathcal{A}_s} f = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} e^{-z\zeta} U(s, \zeta) f \, d\zeta.$$

Therefore, by Minkowsky's integral inequality, (A.1) and the second estimate of Lemma A.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_z^{\mathcal{A}_0} f - T_z^{\mathcal{A}_s} f\|_2 &\lesssim \int_{\gamma} |e^{-z\zeta}| \cdot \|U(s, \zeta) f\|_2 \, d|\zeta| \\ &\lesssim \int_{\gamma} e^{-\operatorname{Re}(z\zeta)} |\zeta|^{-1/2} \|M_{A_0 - A_s} G_{\mathcal{L}_0}(\zeta) f\|_2 \, d|\zeta| \\ &\quad + \int_{\gamma} e^{-\operatorname{Re}(z\zeta)} |\zeta|^{-1} \|M_{b_0 - b_s} G_{\mathcal{L}_0}(\zeta) f\|_2 \, d|\zeta| \\ &\quad + \int_{\gamma} e^{-\operatorname{Re}(z\zeta)} |\zeta|^{-1/2} \|M_{c_0 - c_s} (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f\|_2 \, d|\zeta| \\ &\quad + \int_{\gamma} e^{-\operatorname{Re}(z\zeta)} |\zeta|^{-1} \|M_{V_0 - V_s} (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f\|_2 \, d|\zeta|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

By (H2), (H3), Lemma A.1 and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \|M_{A_0 - A_s} G_{\mathcal{L}_0}(\zeta) f\|_2 &= 0, \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \|M_{b_0 - b_s} G_{\mathcal{L}_0}(\zeta) f\|_2 &= 0, \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \|M_{c_0 - c_s} (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f\|_2 &= 0, \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \|M_{V_0 - V_s} (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f\|_2 &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\zeta \in \gamma$. Moreover, by Lemma A.1 again and by (A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_{A_0 - A_s} G_{\mathcal{L}_0}(\zeta) f\|_2 &\lesssim |\zeta|^{-1/2} \|f\|_2, \\ \|M_{b_0 - b_s} G_{\mathcal{L}_0}(\zeta) f\|_2 &\lesssim |\zeta|^{-1/2} \|f\|_2, \\ \|M_{c_0 - c_s} (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f\|_2 &\lesssim |\zeta|^{-1} \|f\|_2, \\ \|M_{V_0 - V_s} (\zeta - \mathcal{L}_0)^{-1} f\|_2 &\lesssim |\zeta|^{-1} \|f\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\zeta \in \gamma$. Now (A.4) follows from the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem.

Similarly one can prove (A.3), using in this case the first and the third estimate of Lemma A.1 to get the analogue of (A.5). \square

A.1. Convolution with approximate identity. Let $k \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a radial function such that $0 \leq k \leq 1$, $\text{supp } k \subset B_{\mathbb{R}^d}(0, 1)$ and $\int k = 1$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ define $k_\varepsilon(x) := \varepsilon^{-d} k(x/\varepsilon)$. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$, $b, c \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$ and $V \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+)$. Suppose that b, c, V are compactly supported and that

$$\text{supp } b, \text{supp } c \subset \text{supp } V. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

If $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} A_\varepsilon &:= (\tilde{A} * k_\varepsilon)|_\Omega, \\ b_\varepsilon &:= (b * k_\varepsilon)|_\Omega, \\ c_\varepsilon &:= (c * k_\varepsilon)|_\Omega, \\ V_\varepsilon &:= (V * k_\varepsilon)|_\Omega, \\ \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon &:= (A_\varepsilon, b_\varepsilon, c_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{A}(x) := \begin{cases} A(x), & \text{if } x \in \Omega; \\ (p^*/p)I_{\mathbb{R}^d}, & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Here, $p^* = \max\{p, p/(p-1)\}$. The constant p^*/p is a normalisation factor.

Lemma A.5. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu, M}(\Omega)$ and \mathcal{A}_ε are as above and $p \in (1, \infty)$. Then*

(i) *For a.e. $x \in \Omega$*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|A_\varepsilon(x) - A(x)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)} &= 0, \\ \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|b_\varepsilon(x) - b(x)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d, \mathbb{C})} &= 0, \\ \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|c_\varepsilon(x) - c(x)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}^d)} &= 0, \\ \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|V_\varepsilon(x) - V(x)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C})} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *There exists $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1]$ such that $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu, M}(\Omega)$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$;*

(iii) *If $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$, then for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon &\in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega), \\ \mu_p(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon) &\geq \mu_p(\mathcal{A}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\mu_p(\mathcal{A}) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mu_p(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon)$.

In particular, if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$ then $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$;

(iv) *There exists $C > 0$ such that $\max\{\|A_\varepsilon\|_\infty, \|b_\varepsilon\|_\infty, \|c_\varepsilon\|_\infty, \|V_\varepsilon\|_\infty\} \leq C$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Proof. Let prove only the first limit in (i). The others are proved in the same way. As in the proof of [7, Lemma A.5(i)], it is enough to show that for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ we have $A_\varepsilon(x)\xi \rightarrow A(x)\xi$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$. This is true because each $a_{ij} \in L^\infty(\Omega) \subset L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ so that $(\tilde{a}_{ij} * k_\varepsilon)(x)$ tends to $\tilde{a}_{ij}(x) = a_{ij}(x)$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Let $r \in (1, \infty)$ and $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_r(\Omega)$. Then, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that $\int k = 1$, we get for all $x \in \Omega$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |b_\varepsilon(x) - c_\varepsilon(x)| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |b(x-y) - c(x-y)| k_\varepsilon^{1/2}(y) \cdot k_\varepsilon^{1/2}(y) dy \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |b(x-y) - c(x-y)|^2 k_\varepsilon(y) dy \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq M \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x-y) k_\varepsilon(y) dy \right)^{1/2} \\ &= M \sqrt{V_\varepsilon(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to estimate $\Gamma_r^{\mathcal{A}\varepsilon}$ from below. Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\text{supp}V + \overline{B(0, \varepsilon)} \subseteq \Omega, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Let $x \in \Omega$. Then, by combining (A.6), (A.7) and the fact that $\text{supp}k_\varepsilon \subset B_{\mathbb{R}^d}(0, \varepsilon)$, we obtain that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_r^{\mathcal{A}\varepsilon}(x, \xi) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma_r^{\tilde{A}, b, c, V}(x-y, \xi) k_\varepsilon(y) dy \\ &= \int_{\{y \in B(0, \varepsilon) : x-y \in \text{supp}V\}} \Gamma_r^{\mathcal{A}}(x-y, \xi) k_\varepsilon(y) dy \\ &\quad + \int_{\{y \in B(0, \varepsilon) : x-y \notin \text{supp}V\}} \text{Re} \left\langle \tilde{A}(x-y)\xi, \partial_r \xi \right\rangle k_\varepsilon(y) dy \\ &=: I_1 + I_2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Since $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_r(\Omega)$, we estimate I_1 by

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\geq \mu_r(\mathcal{A}) \int_{\{y \in B(0, \varepsilon) : x-y \in \text{supp}V\}} (|\xi|^2 + V(x-y)) k_\varepsilon(y) dy \\ &= \mu_r(\mathcal{A}) |\xi|^2 \int_{\{y \in B(0, \varepsilon) : x-y \in \text{supp}V\}} k_\varepsilon(y) dy + \mu_r(\mathcal{A}) V_\varepsilon(x). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

On the other hand, since $A \in \mathcal{A}_r(\Omega)$ and $\Delta_r(I_{\mathbb{R}^d}) = 2/r^*$, we estimate I_2 by

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\geq \min \left\{ \frac{r}{2} \Delta_r(A), \frac{rp^*}{pr^*} \right\} |\xi|^2 \int_{\{y \in B(0, \varepsilon) : x-y \notin \text{supp}V\}} k_\varepsilon(y) dy \\ &\geq \min \left\{ \mu_r(\mathcal{A}), \frac{rp^*}{pr^*} \right\} |\xi|^2 \int_{\{y \in B(0, \varepsilon) : x-y \notin \text{supp}V\}} k_\varepsilon(y) dy, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where in the last inequality we used (11). Hence, by combining (A.8), (A.9) and (A.10) we get

$$\Gamma_r^{\mathcal{A}\varepsilon}(x, \xi) \geq \min \left\{ \mu_r(\mathcal{A}), \frac{rp^*}{pr^*} \right\} (|\xi|^2 + V_\varepsilon(x)).$$

for all $x \in \Omega$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Note that $p^*/p \geq 1$ for all $p \in (1, \infty)$. On the other hand, $\mu_2(\mathcal{A}) \leq 1$ by (11). Therefore, by taking $r = 2$, we prove (ii).

By taking $r = p$ and by (11) again, we prove that $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$ and that

$$\mu_p(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon) \geq \mu_p(\mathcal{A}), \quad (\text{A.11})$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Moreover, by definition of μ_p and the continuity of $x \mapsto (A_\varepsilon(x), b_\varepsilon(x), c_\varepsilon(x), V_\varepsilon(x))$, we get $\Gamma_p^{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon}(x, \xi) \geq \mu_p(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon)(|\xi|^2 + V_\varepsilon(x))$ for all $x \in \Omega$, $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. The limit in (iii) now follows from (i) and (A.11).

Item (iv) follows by the definition of convolution and by the boundedness of A, b, c, V . \square

A.2. Truncations of first- and zero-order terms by cut-off functions. Let $\{K_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ be a family of compact subsets in Ω such that $K_n \subset \text{int}(K_{n+1})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{int}(K_n) = \Omega$. Let $\{\psi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ a family of compactly supported C^∞ functions in Ω such that $0 \leq \psi_n \leq 1$, $\psi_n = 1$ on a neighbourhood of K_n and $\text{supp } \psi_n \subset \text{int}(K_{n+1})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$. If $A \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$, $b, c \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$ and $V \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} b_n &:= \psi_n b, \\ c_n &:= \psi_n c, \\ V_n &:= \psi_n V, \\ \mathcal{A}_n &:= (A, b_n, c_n, V_n). \end{aligned} \tag{A.12}$$

Lemma A.6. *For every $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu, M}(\Omega)$ and \mathcal{A}_n as above and $p \in (1, \infty)$ we have*

(i) *For a.e. $x \in \Omega$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|b_n(x) - b(x)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^d, \mathbb{C})} &= 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|c_n(x) - c(x)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}^d)} &= 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|V_n(x) - V(x)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C})} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) $\mathcal{A}_n \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu, M}(\Omega)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$;

(iii) If $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$, then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_n &\in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega), \\ \mu_p(\mathcal{A}_n) &\geq \mu_p(\mathcal{A}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_p(\mathcal{A}_n) = \mu_p(\mathcal{A})$.

In particular, if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$ then $\mathcal{A}_n \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$;

(iv) $\text{supp } b_n, \text{supp } c_n \subset \text{supp } V_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$;

(v) There exists $C > 0$ such that $\max\{\|b_n\|_\infty, \|c_n\|_\infty, \|V_n\|_\infty\} \leq C$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$.

Proof. Items (i) and (v) follow by the definition (A.12).

Clearly, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and all $r \in (1, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_r^{\mathcal{A}_n}(\cdot, \xi) &= (1 - \psi_n) \text{Re} \langle A\xi, \mathcal{J}_r \xi \rangle + \psi_n \Gamma_r^{\mathcal{A}}(\cdot, \xi), \\ |b_n - c_n|^2 &\leq \psi_n M^2 V_n. \end{aligned}$$

By taking $r = 2$ and by combining (11) with the fact that $0 \leq \psi_n \leq 1$, we get (ii).

Similarly, by taking $r = p$ and by definition of μ_p , we obtain that $\mathcal{A}_n \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$ and that $\mu_p(\mathcal{A}_n) \geq \mu_p(\mathcal{A})$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Since $\mathcal{A}_n \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$, we have $\Gamma_p^{\mathcal{A}_n}(x, \xi) \geq \mu_p(\mathcal{A}_n)(|\xi|^2 + V_n(x))$ for almost everywhere $x \in \Omega$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$. The limit in (iii) now follows by (i).

Item (iv) follows by the definition (A.12) and Proposition 8(ii). \square

A.3. Bilinear embedding with bounded potentials. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open, $p > 1$, $q = p/(p-1)$ and \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{W} be two closed subspaces of $H^1(\Omega)$ of the type described in Section 1.1. We prove now the bilinear embedding for arbitrary $A, B \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$, $b, c, \beta, \gamma \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$ and $V, W \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that $(A, b, c, V), (B, \beta, \gamma, W) \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$. We will do it in two steps.

- First, we will prove the bilinear embedding for all $\mathcal{C} = (C, d, e, U)$, $\mathcal{D} = (D, l, m, Z) \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$ satisfying the assumptions of Section A.1, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{supp} d, \operatorname{supp} e &\subset \operatorname{supp} U, \\ \operatorname{supp} l, \operatorname{supp} m &\subset \operatorname{supp} Z, \end{aligned}$$

and d, e, l, m, U, Z are compactly supported. Fix $f, g \in (L^p \cap L^q)(\Omega)$. Let $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon$ be the smooth approximations introduced in Section A.1. By Lemma A.4, Lemma A.5 and a standard theorem in measure theory, there exists a sequence $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon_n}} f \rightarrow \nabla T_t^{\mathcal{C}} f$ and $U_{\varepsilon_n}^{1/2} T_t^{\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon_n}} f \rightarrow U^{1/2} T_t^{\mathcal{C}} f$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ almost everywhere on Ω and for all $t > 0$; the same for (\mathcal{D}, g) . Recall that we have already established in Section 6 the bilinear embedding for smooth matrices and smooth and compactly supported first- and zero-order coefficients. Consequently, Fatou's lemma and Lemma A.5(ii), (iii) give

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{C}} f|^2 + U |T_t^{\mathcal{C}} f|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{D}} g|^2 + Z |T_t^{\mathcal{D}} g|^2} \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon_n}} f|^2 + U_{\varepsilon_n} |T_t^{\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon_n}} f|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon_n}} g|^2 + Z_{\varepsilon_n} |T_t^{\mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon_n}} g|^2} \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_n \|f\|_p \|g\|_q, \end{aligned}$$

where C_n continuously depends on $p, \Lambda, \mu, M, \mu_p(\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon_n}), \mu_q(\mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon_n})$. Therefore, Lemma A.5(iii) implies that

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{C}} f|^2 + U |T_t^{\mathcal{C}} f|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{D}} g|^2 + Z |T_t^{\mathcal{D}} g|^2} \leq C \|f\|_p \|g\|_q, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where C continuously depends on $p, \Lambda, \mu, M, \mu_p(\mathcal{C}), \mu_q(\mathcal{D})$.

- Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V)$, $\mathcal{B} = (B, \beta, \gamma, W)$ as above. Fix $f, g \in (L^p \cap L^q)(\Omega)$. Let $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_n$ as in (A.12). By arguing just as in the previous case, only replacing Lemma A.5 by Lemma A.6, we deduce that there exists a sequence $(n_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}_{n_j}} f \rightarrow \nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f$ and $V_{n_j}^{1/2} T_t^{\mathcal{A}_{n_j}} f \rightarrow V^{1/2} T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ almost everywhere on Ω and for all $t > 0$; the same for (\mathcal{B}, g) . Consequently, Fatou's lemma, (A.13) applied with $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}_{n_j}$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{B}_{n_j}$, and Lemma A.6 give

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f|^2 + V |T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{B}} g|^2 + W |T_t^{\mathcal{B}} g|^2} \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}_{n_j}} f|^2 + V_{n_j} |T_t^{\mathcal{A}_{n_j}} f|^2} \sqrt{|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{B}_{n_j}} g|^2 + W_{n_j} |T_t^{\mathcal{B}_{n_j}} g|^2} \\ &\leq C \|f\|_p \|g\|_q. \end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX B. INTERIOR ELLIPTIC REGULARITY

In Section 1 we showed that we can associate a contractive and analytic semigroup $(T_t)_{t>0}$ on $L^2(\Omega)$ with the sesquilinear form defined in (1), provided that its coefficients satisfy conditions (2) and (3). In this section we will see that if we assume that the coefficients are also smooth, then $T_t f$ is also smooth for all $t > 0$ and $f \in L^2(\Omega)$.

For every function f on \mathbb{R}^d and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we introduce the functions $\tau_y f$, $\delta_y f$ on \mathbb{R}^d by the following rule:

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_y f(x) &= f(x - y), \\ \delta_y f(x) &= \frac{\tau_{-y} f(x) - f(x)}{|y|},\end{aligned}$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

We will use the following lemmas to prove Lemma B.4. See, for example, [16, Proposition 4.8] for their proofs.

Lemma B.1. *Let $f \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, $R > 0$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then*

$$\int_{B(x_0, R)} |\delta_{h\nu} f|^2 \leq \int_{B(x_0, R+h)} |\partial_\nu f|^2, \quad \forall h > 0.$$

Lemma B.2. *Let $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then $f \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if and only if*

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \|\delta_{h\nu} f\|_{L_{\text{loc}}^2} < \infty, \quad \forall \nu \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}.$$

In this case,

$$\|\partial_\nu f\|_{L^2(B)} \leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \|\delta_{h\nu} f\|_{L^2(B)},$$

for every compact set $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ open, A a complex $d \times d$ matrix-valued function on Ω , b, c two complex d -dimensional vector-valued functions on Ω and V a nonnegative function on Ω . Set $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V)$. We will write that

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}}(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} [\langle A \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + \langle \nabla u, b \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \bar{v} + u \langle c, \nabla v \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + V u \bar{v}]$$

for every $u, v \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$ for which the integral on the right-hand side is finite. Note that now we are not assuming that the domain of the form is of the type described in Section 1.1.

Lemma B.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open, $A \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^{d \times d})$, $b, c \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$ and $V \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$. Take $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$. Suppose that there exists $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}}(u, \varphi) = \int_{\Omega} f \bar{\varphi}, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Then

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}}(u, \varphi) = \int_{\Omega} f \bar{\varphi}, \quad \forall \varphi \in H_c^1(\Omega),$$

where $H_c^1(\Omega)$ consists of all functions in $H^1(\Omega)$ having compact support in Ω .

Proof. Let $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$ and $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ for which (B.1) holds. Let $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$ with compact support in Ω and $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$ such that $\text{supp } \varphi \Subset \Omega'$. By [1, Lemma 2.18(b) and Lemma 3.15] there exists a sequence $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $C_c^\infty(\Omega')$ such that

$$\varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi \text{ in } H^1(\Omega'). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Therefore, by using also the assumption on u and the boundedness of A, b, c and V (thanks to which we have, for instance, that $Vu \in L^2(\Omega')$), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}}(u, \varphi) &= \int_{\Omega'} [\langle A\nabla u, \nabla \varphi \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + \langle \nabla u, b \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \bar{\varphi} + u \langle c, \nabla \varphi \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + Vu\bar{\varphi}] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega'} [\langle A\nabla u, \nabla \varphi_n \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + \langle \nabla u, b \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \bar{\varphi}_n + u \langle c, \nabla \varphi_n \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + Vu\bar{\varphi}_n] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}}(u, \varphi_n). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Since $\varphi_n \in C_c^\infty(\Omega')$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$, by (B.1) we have

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}}(u, \varphi_n) = \int_{\Omega} f \bar{\varphi}_n = \int_{\Omega'} f \bar{\varphi}_n,$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand, $f \in L^2(\Omega')$. Hence by (B.2) we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}}(u, \varphi_n) = \int_{\Omega} f \bar{\varphi} = \int_{\Omega'} f \bar{\varphi}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

We conclude by combining (B.3) and (B.4). \square

The following lemma was proved in [16, Theorem 4.9] when $b, c, V = 0$. We adapt its proof to the general case when b, c and V are not null.

Lemma B.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open, $A \in (\text{Lip}_{\text{loc}} \cap L^\infty)(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^{d \times d})$, $b, c \in (\text{Lip}_{\text{loc}} \cap L^\infty)(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$ and $V \in (\text{Lip}_{\text{loc}} \cap L^\infty)(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$ such that $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, \text{Re } V) \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$. Take $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$. Suppose that there exists $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}}(u, \varphi) = \int_{\Omega} f \bar{\varphi}, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega). \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Then $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$.

Proof. Fix $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and set

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_h &= \tau_{he_j}, \\ \delta_h &= \delta_{he_j}, \\ \mathcal{A}_h &= (\tau_{-h}A, \tau_{-h}b, \tau_{-h}c, \tau_{-h}V) = \tau_{-h}\mathcal{A}, \\ \delta_h(\mathcal{A}) &= (\delta_hA, \delta_hb, \delta_hc, \delta_hV), \end{aligned}$$

where $e_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the unit vector $(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ with 1 in the j -th position.

Let $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$ and $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ for which (B.5) holds. Let $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$ with compact support in Ω . If h is small enough, $\tau_h\varphi$ also belongs to $H^1(\Omega)$ and has compact support in Ω . Therefore, Lemma B.3 implies that

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}}(u, \tau_h\varphi) = \int_{\Omega} f \tau_h\bar{\varphi}, \quad (\text{B.6})$$

for $|h| \ll 1$.

On the other hand, by $\nabla\tau_h = \tau_h\nabla$, a change of variable and (B.6), we find that

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}_h}(\tau_{-h}u, \varphi) = \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}}(u, \tau_h\varphi) = \int_{\Omega} f \tau_h\bar{\varphi}. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Subtracting (B.5) from equation (B.7), we get

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}_h}(\tau_{-h}u, \varphi) - \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}}(u, \varphi) = \int_{\Omega} f(\tau_h\bar{\varphi} - \bar{\varphi}).$$

Observe that $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}_h}(\tau_{-h}u, \varphi)$ is well-defined for small $|h|$, even though \mathcal{A} is defined on Ω . This is due to the fact that φ has compact support.

By writing $\tau_{-h}u = \tau_{-h}u - u + u$ and by dividing by h both terms of the previous identity, we have

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}_h}(\delta_h u, \varphi) = -\mathbf{a}_{\delta_h(\mathcal{A})}(u, \varphi) + \int_{\Omega} f \overline{\delta_{-h}\varphi}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Now we will choose an adequate φ . Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $R > 0$ such that $\overline{B_{2R}} := \overline{B(x_0, 2R)} \subset \Omega$. Fix $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\text{supp } \eta \subseteq B_R$ and $\eta = 1$ on $B_{R/2}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} v &:= \delta_h u, \\ \varphi &:= \eta^2 v \end{aligned}$$

for $|h| \ll 1$. By plugging this particular φ in (B.8), we obtain

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}_h}(v, \eta^2 v) = -\mathbf{a}_{\delta_h(\mathcal{A})}(u, \eta^2 v) + \int_{\Omega} f \overline{\delta_{-h}(\eta^2 v)}. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

By writing $\nabla(\eta^2 v) = \eta^2 \nabla v + 2\eta v \nabla \eta$ in the definition of $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}_h}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{\delta_h(\mathcal{A})}$, (B.9) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_R} \eta^2 \left[\langle \tau_{-h} A \nabla v, \nabla v \rangle + \langle \nabla v, \tau_{-h} b \rangle \bar{v} + v \langle \tau_{-h} c, \nabla v \rangle + \tau_{-h} V |v|^2 \right] \\ &= -2 \int_{B_R} \eta \left[\langle \tau_{-h} A \nabla v, \nabla \eta \rangle \bar{v} + |v|^2 \langle \tau_{-h} c, \nabla \eta \rangle \right] \\ & \quad - \int_{B_R} \eta^2 \left[\langle \delta_h(A) \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle + \langle \nabla u, \delta_h(b) \rangle \bar{v} + u \langle \delta_h(c), \nabla v \rangle + \delta_h(V) u \bar{v} \right] \\ & \quad - 2 \int_{B_R} \eta \bar{v} \left[\langle \delta_h(A) \nabla u, \nabla \eta \rangle + u \langle \delta_h(c), \nabla \eta \rangle \right] \\ & \quad + \int_{B_{R+h}} f \overline{\delta_{-h}(\eta^2 v)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we also used that $\text{supp } \eta \subseteq B_R$. Therefore, since $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$, there exists $\mu \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \int_{B_R} \eta^2 |\nabla v|^2 &\leq -2 \operatorname{Re} \int_{B_R} \eta \left[\langle \tau_{-h} A \nabla v, \nabla \eta \rangle \bar{v} + |v|^2 \langle \tau_{-h} c, \nabla \eta \rangle \right] \\ & \quad - \operatorname{Re} \int_{B_R} \eta^2 \left[\langle \delta_h(A) \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle + \langle \nabla u, \delta_h(b) \rangle \bar{v} + u \langle \delta_h(c), \nabla v \rangle + \delta_h(V) u \bar{v} \right] \\ & \quad - 2 \operatorname{Re} \int_{B_R} \eta \bar{v} \left[\langle \delta_h(A) \nabla u, \nabla \eta \rangle + u \langle \delta_h(c), \nabla \eta \rangle \right] \\ & \quad + \operatorname{Re} \int_{B_{R+h}} f \overline{\delta_{-h}(\eta^2 v)}. \end{aligned}$$

The boundedness of A and c implies that $\tau_{-h}A$ and $\tau_{-h}c$ are bounded on B_R uniformly in $|h| \ll 1$. Moreover, as A is locally Lipschitz, $\delta_h(A)$ is also bounded on B_R uniformly in $|h| \ll 1$. The same for $\delta_h(b)$, $\delta_h(c)$ and $\delta_h(V)$. Therefore, by using also that $\|\nabla \eta\|_\infty \lesssim R^{-1}$

and $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_R} \eta^2 |\nabla v|^2 &\lesssim_{\mu, R} \int_{B_R} \left(\eta |\nabla v| |v| + \eta |v|^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \int_{B_R} \eta^2 (|\nabla u| + |u|) |\nabla v| \\
&\quad + \int_{B_R} \eta (|\nabla u| + |u|) |v| \\
&\quad + \int_{B_{R+h}} |f| |\delta_{-h}(\eta^2 v)| \\
&=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.10}$$

By repeatedly applying the inequality $2ab \leq \varepsilon a + \varepsilon^{-1}b$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and the fact that $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, we obtain the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\lesssim \varepsilon \int_{B_R} \eta^2 |\nabla v|^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B_R} |v|^2 + \int_{B_R} |v|^2, \\
I_2 &\lesssim \varepsilon \int_{B_R} \eta^2 |\nabla v|^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B_R} (|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2), \\
I_3 &\lesssim \int_{B_R} (|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2 + |v|^2), \\
I_4 &\lesssim \varepsilon \int_{B_{R+h}} |\delta_{-h}(\eta^2 v)|^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B_{R+h}} |f|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$. These estimates combined with (B.10) give

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_R} \eta^2 |\nabla v|^2 &\lesssim \varepsilon \int_{B_R} \eta^2 |\nabla v|^2 \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B_R} (|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2 + |v|^2) \\
&\quad + \int_{B_R} (|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2 + |v|^2) \\
&\quad + \varepsilon \int_{B_{R+h}} |\delta_{-h}(\eta^2 v)|^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B_{R+h}} |f|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{B.11}$$

where the constant depends on μ and R , but not on h . On the other hand, by Lemma B.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_{R+h}} |\delta_{-h}(\eta^2 v)|^2 &\leq \int_{B_{R+2h}} |\nabla(\eta^2 v)|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_{R+2h}} \eta^4 |\nabla v|^2 + \eta^2 |v|^2 |\nabla \eta|^2 \\
&\lesssim \int_{B_R} \eta^2 |\nabla v|^2 + \int_{B_R} |v|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{B.12}$$

where in the last inequality we used that $\eta \leq 1$ and $\text{supp } \eta \subseteq B_R$. Hence (B.11) and (B.12) give

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_R} \eta^2 |\nabla v|^2 &\lesssim \varepsilon \int_{B_R} \eta^2 |\nabla v|^2 \\
&\quad + (\varepsilon^{-1} + 1) \int_{B_R} (|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2 + |v|^2) \\
&\quad + \varepsilon \int_{B_R} |v|^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} \int_{B_{R+h}} |f|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant depends on μ and R , but not on h . Therefore, we may choose ε independent of h small enough such that the term with $\|\eta \nabla v\|_{L^2(B_R)}^2$ can be absorbed in the left-hand side of the inequality, obtaining

$$\int_{B_R} \eta^2 |\nabla v|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 + \int_{B_R} |u|^2 + \int_{B_R} |v|^2 + \int_{B_{R+h}} |f|^2,$$

which implies that

$$\int_{B_{R/2}} |\nabla v|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 + \int_{B_R} |u|^2 + \int_{B_R} |v|^2 + \int_{B_{R+h}} |f|^2. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

By Lemma B.1 again,

$$\int_{B_R} |v|^2 = \int_{B_R} |\delta_h u|^2 \leq \int_{B_{R+h}} |\nabla u|^2.$$

Hence (B.13) yields

$$\int_{B_{R/2}} |\delta_h \nabla u|^2 = \int_{B_{R/2}} |\nabla v|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_{R+h}} |\nabla u|^2 + \int_{B_R} |u|^2 + \int_{B_{R+h}} |f|^2.$$

Since the constant in the previous estimate does not depend on h , we get

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_{R/2}} |\delta_h \nabla u|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 + \int_{B_R} |u|^2 + \int_{B_R} |f|^2.$$

From Lemma B.2 we infer that $u \in H^2(B_{R/2})$ and that

$$\int_{B_{R/2}} |D^2 u|^2 \lesssim \int_{B_R} |\nabla u|^2 + \int_{B_R} |u|^2 + \int_{B_R} |f|^2. \quad \square$$

Lemma B.5. *Let $\Omega, A, b, c, V, \mathcal{V}$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Suppose that $A \in C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^{d \times d})$, $b, c \in C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$, $V \in C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+) \cap L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+)$ and that $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$. Let $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}}$ be the operator on $L^2(\Omega)$ associated with the sesquilinear form $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}}$ defined in (1). Then*

$$D\left((\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}})^k\right) \subseteq H_{\text{loc}}^{2k}(\Omega) \quad (\text{B.14})$$

for all $k \geq 1$. In particular,

$$\bigcap_{k \geq 1} D\left((\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}})^k\right) \subseteq C^\infty(\Omega). \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Proof. When $k = 1$, (B.14) holds by Lemma B.4.

Assume that (B.14) holds for $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Then, for all $u \in D\left((\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}})^{k+1}\right)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} u &\in D\left((\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}})^k\right) \subseteq H_{\text{loc}}^{2k}(\Omega), \\ \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}} u &\in D\left((\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}})^k\right) \subseteq H_{\text{loc}}^{2k}(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

We will first prove that $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{2k+1}(\Omega)$ and then that $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{2k+2}(\Omega)$, thus establishing (B.14) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $|\alpha| \leq 2k - 1$. For all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial^\alpha \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}} u, \varphi \rangle &= (-1)^{|\alpha|} \langle \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}} u, \partial^\alpha \varphi \rangle \\ &= (-1)^{|\alpha|} \int_{\Omega} \left[\langle A \nabla u, \partial^\alpha \nabla \varphi \rangle + \langle \nabla u, b \rangle \overline{\partial^\alpha \varphi} + u \langle c, \partial^\alpha \nabla \varphi \rangle + V u \overline{\partial^\alpha \varphi} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By assumptions A, b, c, V are smooth. So, by integrating by parts and by applying the product rule, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \partial^\alpha \mathcal{L}^\mathcal{A} u, \varphi \rangle &= \int_\Omega \langle A \nabla \partial^\alpha u, \nabla \varphi \rangle - \sum_{i,j=1}^d \int_\Omega \partial_i \left(\sum_{0 \leq \beta < \alpha} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} (\partial^{\alpha-\beta} a_{ij}) (\partial^\beta \partial_j u) \right) \bar{\varphi} \\
&+ \int_\Omega \langle \nabla \partial^\alpha u, b \rangle \bar{\varphi} + \sum_{i=1}^d \int_\Omega \left(\sum_{0 \leq \beta < \alpha} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} (\partial^{\alpha-\beta} \bar{b}_i) (\partial^\beta \partial_i u) \right) \bar{\varphi} \\
&+ \int_\Omega \partial^\alpha u \langle c, \nabla \varphi \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^d \int_\Omega \partial_i \left(\sum_{0 \leq \beta < \alpha} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} (\partial^{\alpha-\beta} c_i) (\partial^\beta u) \right) \bar{\varphi} \\
&+ \int_\Omega V \partial^\alpha u \bar{\varphi} + \int_\Omega \left(\sum_{0 \leq \beta < \alpha} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} (\partial^{\alpha-\beta} V) (\partial^\beta u) \right) \bar{\varphi} \\
&= \int_\Omega \left[\langle A \nabla \partial^\alpha u, \nabla \varphi \rangle + \int_\Omega \langle \nabla \partial^\alpha u, b \rangle \bar{\varphi} + \int_\Omega \partial^\alpha u \langle c, \nabla \varphi \rangle + \int_\Omega V \partial^\alpha u \bar{\varphi} \right] \\
&+ \int_\Omega P(\partial) u \bar{\varphi},
\end{aligned}$$

where P is a polynomial with smooth coefficients and $\deg P \leq 2k$. Therefore, by using that $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{2k}(\Omega)$, we obtain that $P(\partial)u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ and $\partial^\alpha u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$. Hence we may write

$$\mathfrak{a}_\mathcal{A}(\partial^\alpha u, \varphi) = \int_\Omega \left(\partial^\alpha \mathcal{L}^\mathcal{A} u - P(\partial)u \right) \bar{\varphi}.$$

On the other hand, $\partial^\alpha \mathcal{L}^\mathcal{A} u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$, since $\mathcal{L}^\mathcal{A} u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{2k}(\Omega)$. This shows that $\partial^\alpha \mathcal{L}^\mathcal{A} u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ and thus $\partial^\alpha \mathcal{L}^\mathcal{A} u - P(\partial)u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$. Now we may apply Lemma B.4 which gives $\partial^\alpha u \in H_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ for all $|\alpha| \leq 2k - 1$. Thus we proved $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{2k+1}(\Omega)$.

Let now $|\beta| \leq 2k$. As before, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \langle A \nabla \partial^\beta u, \nabla \varphi \rangle + \int_\Omega \langle \nabla \partial^\beta u, b \rangle \bar{\varphi} + \int_\Omega \partial^\beta u \langle c, \nabla \varphi \rangle + \int_\Omega V \partial^\beta u \bar{\varphi} \\
&= \int_\Omega \left(\partial^\beta \mathcal{L}^\mathcal{A} u - Q(\partial)u \right) \bar{\varphi}, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega),
\end{aligned}$$

where Q is a polynomial with smooth coefficients and $\deg Q \leq 2k + 1$. We proved before that $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{2k+1}(\Omega)$, hence we have $\partial^\beta u \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$ and $Q(\partial)u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$. Therefore, repeating the same procedure as before, we obtain that $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{2k+2}(\Omega)$. By induction we conclude the proof of (B.14).

Prove now (B.15). Consider $R > 0$ and $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that $\overline{B_R} = \overline{B(x_0, R)} \subseteq \Omega$. Fix $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\text{supp } \eta \subseteq B_R$ and $\eta = 1$ on $B_{R/2}$. Let $u \in \bigcap_{k \geq 1} D((\mathcal{L}^\mathcal{A})^k)$. By (B.14), $u \in H_{\text{loc}}^{2k}(\Omega)$, for all $k \geq 1$. Therefore, $\eta u \in H^{2k}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, for all $k \geq 1$. By the Sobolev embedding theorem, for example see [1, Theorem 4.12, Part I, Case A], $\eta u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, hence $u \in C^\infty(B(x_0, R/2))$. Since $x_0 \in \Omega$ was arbitrary, we conclude that $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)$. \square

Lemma B.6. *Let $\Omega, A, b, c, V, \mathcal{V}$ satisfy the standard assumptions of Section 1.2. Suppose that $A \in C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^{d \times d})$, $b, c \in C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d)$, $V \in C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+) \cap L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+)$ and that $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$. Let $(T_t^\mathcal{A})_{t>0}$ be the semigroup on $L^2(\Omega)$ associated with the sesquilinear form $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}}$. Then $T_t^\mathcal{A} f \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ for all $t > 0$ and all $f \in L^2(\Omega)$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$, we know that $(T_t^{\mathcal{A}})_{t>0}$ is analytic and is generated by $-\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}}$, the operator on $L^2(\Omega)$ associated with the sesquilinear form $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{A},\gamma}$; see Section 1.

Set $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}}$ and $T_t = T_t^{\mathcal{A}}$ for all $t > 0$. By induction we deduce that

$$T_t f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}^k), \quad \forall t > 0, \quad \forall f \in L^2(\Omega) \quad (\text{B.16})$$

for all $k \geq 1$. In fact, for $k = 1$ this follows from the analyticity of $(T_t)_{t>0}$ and [15, Chapter II, Theorem 4.6(c)]. Assume that (B.16) holds for $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$. We want to prove that $\mathcal{L}^k T_t f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$ for all $t > 0$ and all $f \in L^2(\Omega)$. Fix $t > 0$, $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and choose $\varepsilon \in (0, t)$. By using the fact the generator \mathcal{L} commutes with the semigroup $(T_t)_{t>0}$ on $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$ [15, Chapter II, Lemma 1.3(ii)], the inductive hypothesis on T_ε and (B.16) applied for $T_{t-\varepsilon}$ with $k = 1$, we get

$$\mathcal{L}^k T_t f = \mathcal{L}^k T_{t-\varepsilon} T_\varepsilon f = T_{t-\varepsilon} \mathcal{L}^k T_\varepsilon f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}).$$

We conclude by invoking (B.15). \square

APPENDIX C. UNBOUNDED POTENTIALS

In order to treat the general case with unbounded potentials, we will follow the argument used by Carbonaro and Dragičević in [3, Section 3.4] when they proved [3, Theorem 1.4]. Like in their case, Theorem 3 will follow from the special case of bounded potentials already proved in Section A.3, once we prove the following approximation result.

Let $V \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ be a nonnegative unbounded function. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$ define

$$V_m := \min\{V, m\}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

We also set $V_\infty = V$.

Lemma C.1. *For every $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu, M}(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{A}_m = (A, b, c, V_m)$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$ we have*

- (i) *For every $\varepsilon \in (0, \mu)$ there exists $m_\varepsilon \geq 0$ such that $\mathcal{A}_m \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu-\varepsilon, M}$ for all $m \geq m_\varepsilon$;*
- (ii) *If $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$, then for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \mu_p(\mathcal{A}))$ there exists $m_{\varepsilon, p} \geq 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_m &\in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega), \\ \mu_p(\mathcal{A}_m) &\geq \mu_p(\mathcal{A}) - \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

for all $m \geq m_{\varepsilon, p}$. Moreover, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu_p(\mathcal{A}_m) = \mu_p(\mathcal{A})$.

In particular, if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$ then $\mathcal{A}_m \in \mathcal{B}_p(\Omega)$ for all $m \geq \max\{m_{\varepsilon, p}, m_{\varepsilon, q}\}$, where $q = p/(p-1)$.

Proof. Let $r \in (1, \infty)$ and $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_r(\Omega)$. Clearly, for almost all $x \in \Omega$,

$$|b(x) - c(x)| \leq M \sqrt{m}, \quad \forall m \geq \|b - c\|_\infty^2 / M^2.$$

On the other hand, note that for almost $x \in \Omega$,

$$\Gamma_r^{A, b, c, m}(x, \xi) \geq \frac{r}{2} \Delta_r(A) |\xi|^2 + \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in \Omega} \min_{|\sigma|=1} \operatorname{Re} \langle b(x) + \mathcal{J}_r c(x), \sigma \rangle |\xi| + m,$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, it suffices to show that for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \mu_r(\mathcal{A}))$ there exists $\tilde{m}_{\varepsilon, r}$ such that

$$\frac{r}{2} \Delta_r(A) |\xi|^2 + \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in \Omega} \min_{|\sigma|=1} \operatorname{Re} \langle b(x) + \mathcal{J}_r c(x), \sigma \rangle |\xi| + m \geq (\mu_r(\mathcal{A}) - \varepsilon) (|\xi|^2 + m),$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and all $m \geq \tilde{m}_{\varepsilon, r}$. This property holds by taking

$$\tilde{m}_{\varepsilon, r} := \frac{\left(\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in \Omega} \min_{|\sigma|=1} \operatorname{Re}^2 \langle b(x) + \mathcal{J}_r c(x), \sigma \rangle \right)^2}{4((r/2)\Delta_r(A) - \mu_r(\mathcal{A}) + \varepsilon) \cdot (1 - \mu_r(\mathcal{A}) + \varepsilon)},$$

which is a nonnegative finite constant by the boundedness of b, c and (11). Therefore, by taking $r = 2$, we prove (ii) with $m_\varepsilon := \max\{\tilde{m}_{\varepsilon, 2}, \|b - c\|_\infty^2/M^2\}$. By taking $r = p$, we prove that $\mathcal{A}_m \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$ and that

$$\mu_p(\mathcal{A}_m) \geq \mu_p(\mathcal{A}) - \varepsilon, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \mu_p(\mathcal{A}))$ and all $m \geq m_{\varepsilon, p} := \max\{\tilde{m}_{\varepsilon, p}, \|b - c\|_\infty^2/M^2\}$. Since $\mathcal{A}_m \in \mathcal{S}_p(\Omega)$, we have $\Gamma_p^{\mathcal{A}_m}(x, \xi) \geq \mu_p(\mathcal{A}_m)(|\xi|^2 + V_m(x))$ for almost everywhere $x \in \Omega$, all $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^d$, all $\varepsilon \in (0, \mu_p(\mathcal{A}))$ and all $m \geq m_{\varepsilon, p}$. Therefore, since $V_m(x) \rightarrow V(x)$ for almost all $x \in \Omega$, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\mu_p(A) \geq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu_p(\mathcal{A}_m),$$

which, combined with (C.2), implies that

$$\varepsilon + \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu_p(\mathcal{A}_m) \geq \mu_p(\mathcal{A}) \geq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu_p(\mathcal{A}_m),$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \mu_p(\mathcal{A}))$. By sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we conclude. \square

Lemma C.2. *For all $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, $(A, b, c, V) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu, M}(\Omega)$ and all $t > 0$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}_m} f &\rightarrow \nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f && \text{in } L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d), \\ V_m^{1/2} T_t^{\mathcal{A}_m} f &\rightarrow V^{1/2} T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f && \text{in } L^2(\Omega) \end{aligned}$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Fix $f \in L^2(\Omega)$. Denote by $\mathcal{L}_m = \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}_m}$ the operator associated with $\mathcal{A}_m = (A, b, c, V_m)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$. By Lemma C.1(i), there exists $\tilde{\mu} \in (0, \mu)$ and $\tilde{m} \geq 0$ such that each $(A, b, c, V_m) \in \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{\mu}, M}(\Omega)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ such that $m \geq \tilde{m}$. Therefore, each \mathcal{L}_m is sectorial with sectoriality angle $\omega(\mathcal{L}_m) \leq \tilde{\vartheta}_0 = \vartheta_0(\tilde{\mu}, M, \Lambda)$, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ such that $m \geq \tilde{m}$; see Section 1. Using the standard representation of the analytic semigroup $(T_t^{\mathcal{A}_m})_{t>0}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$, $m \geq \tilde{m}$, by means of a Cauchy integral, earlier applied in the proof of Lemma A.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}_m} f - \nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f\| &\lesssim \int_\gamma e^{-t \operatorname{Re} \zeta} \|\nabla(\zeta - \mathcal{L}_m)^{-1} f - \nabla(\zeta - \mathcal{L})^{-1} f\|_2 |d\zeta|, \\ \|V_m^{1/2} T_t^{\mathcal{A}_m} f - V^{1/2} T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f\| &\lesssim \int_\gamma e^{-t \operatorname{Re} \zeta} \|V_m^{1/2}(\zeta - \mathcal{L}_m)^{-1} f - V^{1/2}(\zeta - \mathcal{L})^{-1} f\|_2 |d\zeta|, \end{aligned}$$

where γ is the positively oriented boundary of $\mathbf{S}_\vartheta \cup \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} : |\zeta| < \delta\}$, with $\vartheta > \tilde{\vartheta}_0$ and $\delta > 0$. Therefore it suffices to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla(\zeta - \mathcal{L}_m)^{-1} f &\rightarrow \nabla(\zeta - \mathcal{L})^{-1} f && \text{in } L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d), \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbf{S}_{\tilde{\vartheta}_0}^{\sim}, \\ V_m^{1/2}(\zeta - \mathcal{L}_m)^{-1} f &\rightarrow V^{1/2}(\zeta - \mathcal{L})^{-1} f && \text{in } L^2(\Omega), \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbf{S}_{\tilde{\vartheta}_0}^{\sim}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$, and that for all $t > 0$ there exist $C = C(t) > 0$, not depend on m , and $F(t, \cdot) \in L^1(\gamma)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-t \operatorname{Re} \zeta} \|\nabla(\zeta - \mathcal{L}_m)^{-1} f\|_2 &\leq CF(t, \zeta), \\ e^{-t \operatorname{Re} \zeta} \|V_m^{1/2}(\zeta - \mathcal{L}_m)^{-1} f\|_2 &\leq CF(t, \zeta), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$, $m \geq \tilde{m}$, and all $\zeta \in \gamma$. In fact, we would complete the proof by applying the dominated convergence theorem in the two integrals above.

In order to prove (C.3) and (C.4) one can proceed as in the proof of [3, Proposition 3.9], where b and c are zero. We leave it to the reader to fill in the details. \square

By combining Lemma C.1 and Lemma C.2 and by applying the same limit argument of Section A.3, we obtain the bilinear embedding (13) for unbounded potentials.

C.1. Unbounded complex potentials. In Section 1.8 a bilinear embedding theorem was stated for particular complex potentials of the type ϱV , with $V \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ nonnegative and $\varrho \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\text{Re } \varrho > 0$.

If V is bounded, then the approximation argument of Section A can be applied exactly in the same way.

Otherwise, let suppose that V is unbounded. We can assume that $\varrho \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, otherwise ϱV would be real. For every $m \in \mathbb{N}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$, let V_m be defined as in (C.1) with the notation $V_\infty = V$. Set $\mathcal{A} = (A, b, c, \varrho V)$ and $\mathcal{A}_m = (A, b, c, \varrho V_m)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Fix $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $t > 0$. We would like to get the analogue of Lemma C.2, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}_m} f &\rightarrow \nabla T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f && \text{in } L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{C}^d), \\ V_m^{1/2} T_t^{\mathcal{A}_m} f &\rightarrow V^{1/2} T_t^{\mathcal{A}} f && \text{in } L^2(\Omega), \end{aligned}$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$, provided that $(A, b, c, \text{Re } (\varrho)V) \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$. Again, we would like to proceed like in [3, Section 3.4] where the potentials are real. For the kind of potentials we are considering now, it is straightforward to adapt their method to our case. The main step where the differences come out lies in proving the analogue of [3, Lemma 3.8]. For real potentials, they did that by combining a monotone convergence theorem for sequences of symmetric sesquilinear forms [18, Theorem 3.13a, p. 461] and a vector-valued version of Vitali's theorem [2, Theorem A.5]. We will do the same following the sketch of its proof and highlighting what we need to change in our case, that is, for complex potentials. More precisely, we would like to prove that, for all $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and all $s > 0$,

$$(s + \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}_m})^{-1} f \rightarrow (s + \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}})^{-1} f \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega), \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Since $(A, b, c, \text{Re } (\varrho)V) \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$, by arguing as in Lemma C.1, it can be shown that there exist $\mu \in (0, 1)$, $M > 0$ and $\tilde{m} \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (A, b, c, \text{Re } (\varrho)V) &\in \mathcal{B}_{\mu, M}(\Omega), \\ (A, b, c, \text{Re } (\varrho)V_m) &\in \mathcal{B}_{\mu, M}(\Omega), \quad \forall m \geq \tilde{m}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists $\vartheta_0 \in (0, \pi/2)$ such that the sesquilinear forms $\mathbf{a} := \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathbf{a}_m := \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}_m}$ are both sectorial of angle ϑ_0 , for all $m \geq \tilde{m}$. In particular, each operator $\mathcal{L}_m = \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}_m}$ is sectorial of angle $\omega(\mathcal{L}_m) \leq \vartheta_0$, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ such that $m \geq \tilde{m}$; see Section 1 and Section 1.8. It can be shown that the sesquilinear forms \mathbf{a}_z and $\mathbf{a}_{m,z}$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_z &:= \text{Re } \mathbf{a} + z \text{Im } \mathbf{a}, \\ \mathbf{a}_{m,z} &:= \text{Re } \mathbf{a}_m + z \text{Im } \mathbf{a}_m, \end{aligned}$$

are closed and sectorial for all $z \in \mathcal{O} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |\text{Re } z| < \delta\}$ and all $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $m \geq \tilde{m}$, where $\delta = \cot \vartheta_0$. The real and the imaginary part of a sesquilinear form are defined as in [18, Chapter VI, §1.1]. They are both symmetric sesquilinear forms. Note that $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}_i$.

Let \mathcal{L}_z and $\mathcal{L}_{m,z}$ be the operators associated with \mathbf{a}_z and $\mathbf{a}_{m,z}$, respectively. As explained in the sketch of the proof of [3, Lemma 3.8], the maps $z \mapsto (s + \mathcal{L}_z)^{-1}$ and

$z \mapsto (s + \mathcal{L}_{m,z})^{-1}$ are both holomorphic from \mathcal{O} to the space of bounded linear operators on $L^2(\Omega)$, for every $s > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \geq \tilde{m}$.

Now, we need to slightly change their proof due to the presence of complex potentials. We need to distinguish two cases. First, let suppose that $\text{Im}(\varrho) > 0$. Hence $\mathfrak{a}_{\tilde{m},z} \leq \mathfrak{a}_{\tilde{m}+1,z} \leq \dots$ is a monotone nondecreasing sequence of closed and sectorial symmetric forms, for all $z \in [0, \delta)$. Therefore, [18, Theorem 3.13a, p. 461] gives that for every $s > 0$, $z \in [0, \delta)$ and $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ we have

$$(s + \mathcal{L}_{m,z})^{-1}f \rightarrow (s + \mathcal{L}_z)^{-1}f \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega), \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

As in [3], we conclude by using a vector-valued version of Vitali's theorem [2, Theorem A.5], which implies that $(s + \mathcal{L}_{m,z})^{-1}f \rightarrow (s + \mathcal{L}_z)^{-1}f$ for all $z \in \mathcal{O}$. In particular, by taking $z = i$ we get (C.5).

The case $\text{Im}(\varrho) < 0$ is treated similarly. In this case, (C.6) holds for all $z \in (-\delta, 0]$.

In [3], since the potential is real, the analogue of (C.6), that is, [3, (3.19)], holds for all $z \in (-\delta, \delta)$.

Acknowledgements. I was partially supported by the ‘‘National Group for Mathematical Analysis, Probability and their Applications’’ (GNAMPA-INdAM).

I would like to thank Andrea Carbonaro and Oliver Dragičević for their support and guidance during the writing of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. Adams and J. J. F. Fournier, *Sobolev spaces*, Second edition, Pure and Applied Mathematics (Amsterdam), vol. 140, Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, 2003. [↑35, 40](#)
- [2] W. Arendt, C. J. K. Batty, M. Hieber, and F. Neubrander, *Vector-valued Laplace Transforms and Cauchy Problems*, Second Edition, Monographs in Mathematics, vol. 96, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel, 2011. [↑43, 44](#)
- [3] A. Carbonaro and O. Dragičević, *Bilinear embedding for Schrödinger-type operators with complex coefficients*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.00143>. [↑1, 4, 5, 6, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 41, 43, 44](#)
- [4] A. Carbonaro and O. Dragičević, *Functional calculus for generators of symmetric contraction semigroups*, *Duke Math. J.* **166** (2017), no. 5, 937–974. [↑10, 13](#)
- [5] A. Carbonaro and O. Dragičević, *Bounded holomorphic functional calculus for nonsymmetric Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operators*, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **4** (2019), 1497–1533. [↑10](#)
- [6] A. Carbonaro and O. Dragičević, *Bilinear embedding for divergence-form operators with complex coefficients on irregular domains*, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **59** (2020), no. 3, 36 pp. Paper No. 104. [↑1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27](#)
- [7] A. Carbonaro and O. Dragičević, *Convexity of power functions and bilinear embedding for divergence-form operators with complex coefficients*, *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* **22** (2020), no. 10, 3175–3221. [↑1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 28, 29, 31](#)
- [8] A. Carbonaro, O. Dragičević, V. Kovač, and K. A. Škreb, *Trilinear embedding for divergence-form operators with complex coefficients*, *Advances in Mathematics* **431** (2023), 109239. [↑23](#)
- [9] A. Cialdea and V. Maz'ya, *Criterion for the L^p -dissipativity of second order differential operators with complex coefficients*, *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)* **84** (2005), no. 8, 1067–1100. [↑3, 4, 19, 20, 21, 22](#)
- [10] M. Cowling, I. Doust, A. McIntosh, and A. Yagi, *Banach space operators with a bounded H^∞ functional calculus*, *Austral. Math. Soc.* **60** (1996), 51–89. [↑7, 28](#)
- [11] M. Dindoš and J. Pipher, *Regularity theory for solutions to second order elliptic operators with complex coefficients and the L^p Dirichlet problem*, *Adv. Math.* **341** (2019), 255–298. [↑3](#)
- [12] G. Dore and A. Venni, *On the closedness of the sum of two closed operators*, *Math. Z.* **196** (1987), no. 2, 189–201. [↑7](#)
- [13] O. Dragičević and A. Volberg, *Bilinear embedding for real elliptic differential operators in divergence form with potentials*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **261** (2011), no. 10, 2816–2828. [↑6, 8](#)
- [14] M. Egert, *L^p -estimates for the square root of elliptic systems with mixed boundary conditions*, *J. Differential Equations* **265** (2018), no. 4, 1279–1323. [↑7](#)

- [15] K.-J. Engel and R. Nagel, *One-parameter semigroups for linear evolution equations*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 194, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000. ↑[20](#), [41](#)
- [16] M. Giaquinta and L. Martinazzi, *An introduction to the regularity theory for elliptic systems, harmonic maps and minimal graphs*, Second edition, Publications of the Scuola Normale Superiore, Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, 2012. ↑[35](#), [36](#)
- [17] M. Haase, *The functional calculus for sectorial operators*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, vol. 169, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2006. ↑[2](#), [30](#)
- [18] T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Second edition, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1980. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 132. ↑[2](#), [43](#), [44](#)
- [19] G. Leoni, *A first course in Sobolev spaces*, Second edition, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 181, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017. ↑[18](#)
- [20] F. L. Nazarov and S. R. Treil', *The hunt for a Bellman function: applications to estimates for singular integral operators and to other classical problems of harmonic analysis*, Algebra i Analiz **8** (1996), no. 5, 32–162. ↑[8](#)
- [21] R. Nittka, *Projections onto convex sets and L^p -quasi-contractivity of semigroups*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **98** (2012), no. 4, 341–353. ↑[5](#), [19](#)
- [22] E. M. Ouhabaz, *Analysis of heat equations on domains*, London Mathematical Society Monographs Series, vol. 31, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2005. ↑[2](#), [5](#), [20](#)
- [23] J. Prüss and H. Sohr, *On operators with bounded imaginary powers in Banach spaces*, Math. Z. **203** (1990), no. 3, 429–452. MR1038710 ↑[7](#)
- [24] L. Schwartz, *Théorie des distributions*, Publications de l'Institut de Mathématique de l'Université de Strasbourg, No. IX-X., Hermann, Paris, 1966. ↑[18](#)

ANDREA POGGIO, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI GENOVA, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, VIA DODECANESO, 35 16146 GENOVA, ITALY
Email address: poggio@dima.unige.it