

Wick rotation in the lapse: admissible complex metrics and the associated heat kernel

RUDRAJIT BANERJEE¹ AND MAX NIEDERMAIER²

¹*Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University,
1919-1, Tancha, Onna, Kunigami District
Okinawa 904-0495, Japan*

²*Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Pittsburgh, 100 Allen Hall
Pittsburgh, PA 15260, USA*

Abstract

A Wick rotation in the lapse (not in time) is introduced that interpolates between Riemannian and Lorentzian metrics on real manifolds admitting a co-dimension one foliation. The definition refers to a fiducial foliation but covariance under foliation changing diffeomorphisms is ensured. In particular, the resulting complex metrics are admissible in the sense of Kontsevich-Segal in all (fiducial and non-fiducial) foliations. This setting is used to construct a Wick rotated heat semigroup, which remains well-defined into the near Lorentzian regime. Among the results established for the Wick rotated version are: (i) Existence as an analytic semigroup uniquely determined by its sectorial generator. (ii) Construction of an integral kernel that is jointly smooth in the semigroup time and both spacetime arguments. (iii) Existence of an asymptotic expansion for the kernel's diagonal in (shifted) powers of the semigroup time whose coefficients are the Seeley-deWitt coefficients evaluated on the complex metrics. (iv) Emergence of a Schrödinger evolution group in the strict Lorentzian limit. The toolbox includes local regularity results for admissible complex metrics.

¹email: rudrajit.banerjee@oist.jp

²email: mnieder@pitt.edu

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Wick rotated lapse and admissible complex metrics	4
2.1	Foliation changing diffeomorphisms	5
2.2	Admissibility criteria for scalar field theories.	11
3	Wick rotated heat semigroup from complexified Hessian	16
3.1	Background: analytic semigroups	17
3.2	Spectrum and sectoriality of the complexified Hessian	19
4	Semigroup action and the Wick rotated heat kernel	23
5	Asymptotic expansion of diagonal Wick rotated heat kernel	29
6	Schrödinger evolution group from the $\theta \rightarrow 0^+$ limit	45
7	Conclusions	49
A	Foliation geometry	51
B	Distributions and Sobolev spaces	55
C	Local regularity results	58

1. Introduction

For field theories on curved non-stationary backgrounds the notion of a Wick rotation is problematic. The proposed approaches include: rank one deformations [6, 45], complex analytic metrics [34, 20, 48], and Vielbein formulations [31, 43, 29, 46]. They have different range of applicability, limitations, and occasionally overlap. For example, a Wick rotation in time may be limited to purely electric metrics [25]; much of the Vielbein analysis is so far pointwise without change of chart. A recent survey [1] deems none of the existing proposals fully satisfactory.

Here we explore a notion of a Wick rotation on $1+d$ dimensional *real* smooth manifolds M that admit a codimension-one foliation $t \mapsto \Sigma_t$ into d dimensional leaves which are level surfaces $T = t$ of a scalar function T . Importantly, the atlas of charts of the manifold M are kept real and merely some of the metric components are complexified. The diffeomorphism group changing charts remains real throughout (and we take it to consist of smooth maps connected to the identity that are orientation- and boundary preserving). In adapted coordinates $y^\mu = (t, x^a)$ the Lorentzian and Euclidean metrics to be related may then be parameterized according to

$$ds_{\epsilon_g}^2 = g_{\mu\nu}^{\epsilon_g}(y)dy^\mu dy^\nu = \epsilon_g N^2 dt^2 + g_{ab}(dx^a + N^a dt)(dx^b + N^b dt), \quad (1.1)$$

where N is the lapse, N^a the shift, and g_{ab} the metric on Σ_t . We collect these fields into a triple $(N, N^a, g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g}$, where the subscript indicates the signature of the metric reconstructed from these data. The sign of the signature parameter $\epsilon_g = \pm 1$ cannot be flipped along a real path in $[-1, 1]$ without encountering degenerate metrics. Instead, we use in a fiducial foliation a Wick rotation in the lapse:

$$(N, N^a, g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g} \mapsto (i\epsilon_g^{-1/2} e^{-i\theta} N, N^a, g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g}, \quad \theta \in [0, \pi), \quad (1.2)$$

where $\sqrt{\epsilon_g} = +1, i$ for $\epsilon_g = 1, -1$. Crucially, the time coordinate remains real; it is the lapse field $N(t, x)$ in the reference foliation that is complexified. The conventions are such that starting from either initial signature the line element after (1.2) is $ds_\theta^2 = -e^{-2i\theta} N^2 dt^2 + g_{ab}(dx^a + N^a dt)(dx^b + N^b dt)$. Thus Lorentzian and Euclidean signature are recovered by the $\theta \rightarrow 0^+$ and $\theta \rightarrow \pi/2$ limits, respectively, irrespective of the initial signature.

In the first part of the article we argue that (1.2) gives rise to a fairly satisfactory notion of a Wick rotation. In particular, it can consistently be transferred to foliations other than the fiducial one. The resulting complex metric g^θ satisfies the admissibility criterion for complex metrics proposed in [31, 29], trivially in the reference foliation and nontrivially in all others.

In the second part we show that in this framework a Wick rotated heat semi-group exists that remains well-defined into the near Lorentzian regime. The generator of the semigroup Δ_θ can be written in terms of the Euclidean/Lorentzian signature Hessian

$\mathcal{D}_\pm = -\nabla_\pm^2 + V$ (for a nonnegative smooth potential V) as

$$\Delta_\theta = -\sin\theta \mathcal{D}_+ - i \cos\theta \mathcal{D}_-, \quad \theta \in (0, \pi), \quad (1.3)$$

where in general $[\mathcal{D}_+, \mathcal{D}_-] \neq 0$. For convenient orientation we summarize our main results here in a slightly cursory form. The precise definitions and conditions can be found in the corresponding theorems.

- (a) Δ_θ is an unbounded operator on a Sobolev domain dense in L^2 . The same holds for its adjoint Δ_θ^* , and $\Delta_\theta^* = \Delta_{\pi-\theta}$, including domains.
- (b) The spectrum of Δ_θ is contained in a wedge of the left half plane, $|\text{Arg}\lambda| \geq \pi/2 + \tilde{\theta}$, with $\tilde{\theta} := \min\{\theta, \pi - \theta\}$.
- (c) The resolvent $[z - \Delta_\theta]^{-1}$, $|\text{Arg}(z)| < \pi/2 + \tilde{\theta}$, obeys norm bounds that qualify Δ_θ as the generator of an analytic semigroup, $\zeta \mapsto e^{\zeta\Delta_\theta}$, with $|\text{Arg}\zeta| < \tilde{\theta}$.
- (d) $\zeta \mapsto e^{\zeta\Delta_\theta}$ is a bounded analytic semigroup on L^2 , which is uniquely determined by Δ_θ (including domain) and contractive, $\|e^{\zeta\Delta_\theta}\| \leq 1$, $|\text{Arg}(\zeta)| < \tilde{\theta}$ ($\zeta > 0$ in particular).
- (e) The operator $e^{\zeta\Delta_\theta}$, $|\text{Arg}(\zeta)| < \tilde{\theta}$, acts as an integral operator on L^2 functions with a kernel $K_\zeta^\theta(t, x; t', x')$ that is jointly smooth in (ζ, t, x, t', x') , and obeys $K_\zeta^\theta(t, x; t', x')^* = K_{\zeta^*}^{\pi-\theta}(t', x'; t, x)$.
- (f) The diagonal kernel admits an asymptotic expansion of the form

$$K_\zeta^\theta(t, x; t, x) \asymp \frac{(-ie^{i\theta})^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}{(4\pi\zeta)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \sum_{n \geq 0} A_n^\theta(t, x) (ie^{-i\theta}\zeta)^n,$$

where A_n^θ are the heat kernel coefficients evaluated on g^θ .

- (g) The $\theta \rightarrow 0^+$ limit gives rise to well-defined Schrödinger evolution group. Specifically, whenever $e^{-is\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-}$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, is generated by the unique self-adjoint closure of the Lorentzian Hessian \mathcal{D}_- defined on $C_c^\infty(M)$, one has $e^{s\Delta_\theta} \xrightarrow{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} e^{-is\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-}$ and $e^{s\Delta_{\pi-\theta}} \xrightarrow{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} e^{+is\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-}$ in the weak-star topology for all $s \geq 0$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2.1 we introduce the Wick rotation in the lapse and study its properties under foliation changing diffeomorphism. The admissibility of the resulting invariantly defined complex metrics is shown in Section 2.2. In Section 3.1 we collect some background material on analytic semigroups and their generators, after which Section 3.2 addresses items (a)–(d) in the above list. The existence of a smooth kernel is proven in Section 4, and Section 5 establishes its asymptotic expansion on the diagonal. Finally, the strict Lorentzian limit is studied in Section 6, with the result (g). We include three appendices: Appendix A on the (metric) geometry of the foliations and the $1 + d$ decomposition of diffeomorphisms. Appendix B on the functional analytical arena: test functions, distributions and Sobolev spaces. Appendix C provides a concise summary of a local regularity theory adapted to our complex metrics, as needed for Section 4.

2. Wick rotated lapse and admissible complex metrics

As outlined, we consider $1 + d$ dimensional real, smooth manifolds M that admit a co-dimension-one foliation, $I \ni t \mapsto \Sigma_t$, see Appendix A. In addition, M is assumed to be equipped with a metric of the form

$$ds_{\epsilon_g}^2 = g_{\mu\nu}^{\epsilon_g}(y)dy^\mu dy^\nu = \epsilon_g N^2 dt^2 + g_{ab}(dx^a + N^a dt)(dx^b + N^b dt), \quad (2.1)$$

for both values of $\epsilon_g = \pm 1$. For both signatures, the leaves Σ_t of the foliation are the level sets of a smooth submersion $T : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (referred to as a temporal function). When $\epsilon_g = -1$, dT is taken to be everywhere timelike and the (spacelike) leaves are assumed to be Cauchy surfaces; the resulting Lorentzian manifolds are globally hyperbolic. We are not aware of a concise established term for the analogous $\epsilon_g = +1$ (Riemannian) manifolds. For short, we shall refer to the metric components in (2.1) as the ADM (Arnowitt-Deser-Misner) fields. These comprise a positive lapse $N > 0$, the shift N^a , and the positive definite spatial metric g_{ab} . We collect these fields into a triple $(N, N^a, g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g}$, where the temporal function is tacit, and the subscript indicates the signature of the line element (2.1) reconstructed from it.

For any foliation $I \ni t \mapsto \Sigma_t$ with associated ADM triple $(N, N^a, g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g}$, our proposed notion of Wick rotation is

$$\mathfrak{w}_\theta : (N, N^a, g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g} \mapsto (i\epsilon_g^{-1/2}e^{-i\theta}N, N^a, g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g}, \quad \theta \in [0, \pi), \quad (2.2)$$

where $\sqrt{\epsilon_g} = +1, i$ for $\epsilon_g = 1, -1$. This is such that, starting from a fiducial foliation, one obtains a complexified line-element

$$ds_{\epsilon_g}^2 \mapsto ds_\theta^2 = -e^{-2i\theta}N^2 dt^2 + g_{ab}(dx^a + N^a dt)(dx^b + N^b dt). \quad (2.3)$$

The case $\epsilon_g = -1$ gives $N \mapsto e^{-i\theta}N$ and relates a Lorentzian signature ADM metric at $\theta = 0$ to a complexified one that becomes Euclidean for $\theta = \pi/2$. The case $\epsilon_g = +1$ gives $N \mapsto ie^{-i\theta}N$ and relates the original Euclidean ADM metric at $\theta = \pi/2$ to a complexified one that becomes Lorentzian for $\theta = 0$. The second half $(\pi/2, \pi)$ of the θ interval is carried along for later use.

We write $\text{Diff}(M)$ for the group of real diffeomorphisms $U \ni (t, x) \mapsto (\chi^0(t, x), \chi^a(t, x)) = (t', x'^a) \in U'$ (for open neighborhoods U, U') that are smooth, connected to the identity, as well as orientation preserving. An important subgroup $\text{Diff}(\{\Sigma\}) \subset \text{Diff}(M)$ are the foliation preserving diffeomorphisms of the form $t' = \chi^0(t), x'^a = \chi^a(t, x)$. They preserve the leaves Σ_t of the foliation, potentially changing their time labeling. The line elements (2.1) and (2.3) are manifestly invariant under foliation preserving diffeomorphisms. In particular, the lapse Wick rotation (2.2) does not depend on the choice of coordinates used to describe the given fiducial foliation. A relevant question is, what happens if the foliation is changed? To address this question we limit ourselves to foliations equivalent to the original one, that is, foliations that can be reached by an actively interpreted diffeomorphism in $\text{Diff}(M)$. An explicit formula for the action of

such foliation changing diffeomorphisms on the ADM data $(N, N^a, g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g}$ will guide the analysis.

Another desirable property of a Wick rotation is to result in damping integrands for a field theoretical functional integral. This leads to the admissibility criterion for complex metrics proposed in [31, 29]. Here we limit ourselves to a minimally coupled selfinteracting scalar field theory. The signs in (2.2) are chosen such the resulting complex metric is admissible in the chosen reference foliation. Again, the relevant issue is whether or not admissibility is preserved in other foliations.

2.1 Foliation changing diffeomorphisms

The Wick rotation (2.2), (2.3) inevitably refers to a fiducial foliation. The 1-forms entering, i.e. $Ndt, e^a := dx^a + N^a dt, a = 1, \dots, d$, comprise a frame on M which we dub the foliation frame. It is manifestly a coordinate independent notion and thus invariant under passively interpreted diffeomorphisms, as long as the foliation (i.e. the underlying temporal function T) is held fixed. Upon transition to a different temporal function T' whose level surfaces define a new (equivalent) foliation $t' \mapsto \Sigma_{t'}$ the foliation frame transforms in a nontrivial way. Writing $(t', x'^a) = (\chi^0(t, x), \chi^a(t, x))$ for the actively interpreted diffeomorphisms, the transformation law comes out as

$$\begin{aligned} N' dt' &= \frac{N}{D_{\epsilon_g}} \left[C dt + \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^a} e^a \right], \\ e'^a &= X_b^a \left[e^b - \epsilon_g g^{bc} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} \frac{N^2}{D_{\epsilon_g}^2} \left(C dt + \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^d} e^d \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\epsilon_g} &= \sqrt{C^2 + \epsilon_g N^2 \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^d} g^{cd}}, \quad C = \frac{\partial t'}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} N^c, \\ X_b^a &= \frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial x^b} - \frac{1}{C} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^b} \left(\frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial x^d} N^d \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

We refer to Appendix A for the block decomposition of diffeomorphisms; the combinations (2.5) will occur frequently and always refer to a generic underlying diffeomorphism that is suppressed in the notation. For the derivation of (2.4) Appendix A of [38] may be consulted. The mathematical equivalence between active and passive diffeomorphism transformations requires that

$$ds_{\epsilon_g}^2 = \epsilon_g N'^2 dt'^2 + g'_{ab} (dx'^a + N'^a dt') (dx'^b + N'^b dt'). \quad (2.6)$$

This fixes the transformation law for g'_{ab} and after stripping off the coordinate 1-forms from $N' dt'$ and e'^a one obtains the transformation law for the ADM triples $(N, N^a, g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g}$ themselves [38]

$$\text{transf}_{\epsilon_g} : (N, N^a, g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g} \longrightarrow (N', N'^a, g'_{ab})_{\epsilon_g}, \quad (2.7)$$

where

$$N' = \frac{N}{D_{\epsilon_g}} \quad (2.8a)$$

$$N'^a = -\frac{1}{D_{\epsilon_g}^2} \left(\left(\frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial x^d} N^d \right) C + \epsilon_g N^2 \frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial x^d} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} g^{cd} \right) \quad (2.8b)$$

$$g'_{ab} = \left(\frac{\partial x^c}{\partial x'^a} + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x'^a} N^c \right) \left(\frac{\partial x^d}{\partial x'^b} + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x'^b} N^d \right) g_{cd} + \epsilon_g N^2 \frac{\partial t}{\partial x'^a} \frac{\partial t}{\partial x'^b}. \quad (2.8c)$$

Remarks.

(i) Upon linearization $t' = t - \xi^0(t, x) + O((\xi^0)^2)$, $x'^a = x^a - \xi^a(t, x) + O((\xi^a)^2)$, $N' = N + \delta_\xi N$, etc, the transformations (2.8) read

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\xi N &= \xi^\mu N_\mu N + N \partial_t \xi^0 - N N^a \partial_a \xi^0, \\ \delta_\xi N^a &= \xi^\mu \partial_\mu N^a + \partial_t \xi^a + N \partial_t \xi^0 - N^b \partial_b \xi^a + \partial_b \xi^0 (\epsilon_g N^2 g^{ab} - N^a N^b), \\ \delta_\xi g_{ab} &= \xi^0 \partial_t g_{ab} + N^c (g_{cb} \partial_a \xi^0 + g_{ca} \partial_b \xi^0) + \mathcal{L}_{\vec{\xi}} g_{ab}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

These generate the ‘group’ of infinitesimal Lagrangian gauge transformations of a generally covariant system, c.f. [41]. Augmented by $\delta_\xi \phi = \xi^\mu \partial_\mu \phi$, they comprise in particular the gauge transformations of the scalar field action (2.26) below. Note that the ϵ_g dependence now only enters in the $\delta_\xi N^a$ gauge transformation. By analogy to (2.7) we shall write $\text{lintransf}_{\epsilon_g}(N, N^a, g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g} = (\delta_\xi N, \delta_\xi N^a, \delta_\xi g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g}$, with the understanding that the version of the matching signature is used. Conversely, one should interpret (2.8) as the finite gauge transformations characterizing a generally covariant system with metrics in ADM form.

(ii) On the right hand sides of (2.8a), (2.8b) the new coordinates associated to the temporal function $T' = t'$ occur as functions of the original ones. In order to interpret the last relation in the same way the inversion formulas (A.6) ought to be inserted. For readability’s sake we retain the given expression (2.8c) as a shorthand.

(iii) The maps (2.8) are invertible, and the formulas for the inverse transformations can be obtained simply by exchanging ‘primed’ with ‘unprimed’ quantities (fields and coordinate functions).

(iv) In addition to being highly nonlinear the transformation laws (2.4), (2.8) also depend on the signature parameter. As in (2.4) this reflects the fact that we take real, signature dependent metrics and the associated ADM triples as a starting point. On triples $(\sqrt{\epsilon_g} N, N^a, g_{ab})$ the foliation changing diffeomorphisms act in an ϵ_g independent way (formally given by the transf_+ formulas).

(v) In the lapse transformation law a consistent square root needs to be taken. This is possible since we restrict attention to separately time and space orientation preserving diffeomorphisms. As far as the ADM metrics are concerned one could work with triples $(N^2, N^a, g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g}$ where only the square of the lapse enters. Then $\text{transf}_{\epsilon_g}$ would act as in (2.8) just with $(N^2)'$ given by the square of the right hand side of (2.8a).

Using (2.4) one can deduce the transformation laws of covariant tensor components defined with respect to the foliation frame. For example, for a co-vector $V_\mu dy^\mu = v N dt + v_a e^a = v' N' dt' + v'_a e'^a$ one finds¹

$$v' = \frac{1}{D_{\epsilon_g}} \left(C v + \epsilon_g N \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} g^{cd} v_d \right), \quad v'_a = \left(\frac{\partial x^b}{\partial x'^a} + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x'^a} N^b \right) v_b + N \frac{\partial t}{\partial x'^a} v. \quad (2.10)$$

The frame dual to $(N dt, e^a)$ in the reference foliation consists of the vector fields $(N^{-1} e_0, \partial_a)$. There are analogous transformation formulas under a change of foliation, which can be found in Appendix A of [38]. We shall only need the induced transformation formulas for the components of a vector $V^\mu \partial / \partial y^\mu = \epsilon_g \check{v} N^{-1} e_0 + \check{v}^a \partial_a = \epsilon_g \check{v}' N'^{-1} e'_0 + \check{v}'^a \partial'_a$, which read

$$\check{v}' = \frac{1}{D_{\epsilon_g}} \left(C \check{v} + \epsilon_g N \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^a} \check{v}^a \right), \quad \check{v}'^a = X_b^a \left[\check{v}^b - g^{bc} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} \frac{N}{D_{\epsilon_g}^2} \left(C \check{v} + \epsilon_g N \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^d} \check{v}^d \right) \right]. \quad (2.11)$$

We now perform a Wick rotation (2.2) in the original foliation, resulting in the complex metric (2.3). As in (2.2) we combine the complexified ADM fields again into a triple $(N_\theta := e^{-i\theta} N, N^a, g_{ab})_-$, with the $-$ subscript indicating that the associated geometry arises through (2.3), i.e. $ds_\theta^2 = -N_\theta^2 dt^2 + \dots$. Next, we subject the fields $N_\theta := e^{-i\theta} N, N^a, g_{ab}$ to a foliation changing diffeomorphisms. The fields referring to the resulting equivalent foliation $I \ni t' \mapsto \Sigma'_{t'}$ are denoted by a prime. On account of the sign convention in (2.3) we use the transf_- transformations with its domain extended to allow for a complex lapse. This gives $(N'_\theta, N'^a_\theta, g'^\theta_{ab})_- = \text{transf}_-(N_\theta, N^a, g_{ab})_-$ with

$$N'_\theta = \frac{N_\theta}{\sqrt{C^2 - N_\theta^2 \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^d} g^{cd}}}, \quad (2.12a)$$

$$N'^a_\theta = - \frac{\left(\frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial x^d} N^d \right) C - N_\theta^2 \frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial x^d} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} g^{cd}}{C^2 - N_\theta^2 \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^d} g^{cd}}, \quad (2.12b)$$

$$g'^\theta_{ab} = \left(\frac{\partial x^c}{\partial x'^a} + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x'^a} N^c \right) \left(\frac{\partial x^d}{\partial x'^b} + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x'^b} N^d \right) g_{cd} - N_\theta^2 \frac{\partial t}{\partial x'^a} \frac{\partial t}{\partial x'^b}. \quad (2.12c)$$

The last relation should be interpreted in the same way as (2.8c).

The fact that also $N'^a_\theta, g'^\theta_{ab}$ are now complex in general highlights the sense in which the Wick rotation (2.2) is foliation dependent. However, specializing (2.12) to foliation preserving diffeomorphisms one sees that the N_θ dependence in N'^a_θ and g'^θ_{ab} drops out, while $N'_\theta = e^{-i\theta} N' = (\partial t' / \partial t)^{-1} N_\theta = (\partial t' / \partial t)^{-1} e^{-i\theta} N$ holds iff $N' = (\partial t' / \partial t)^{-1} N$. Hence, the definition (2.3) only depends on the foliation and not on the coordinatization of the hypersurfaces or their time labels.

¹The relations (2.10), (2.11) correct typos in the corresponding formulas (A.53), (A.52) of [38].

Proposition 2.1. *The lapse Wick rotated metric $g_{\mu\nu}^\theta dy^\mu dy^\nu = -N_\theta^2 dt^2 + g_{ab}(dx^a + N^a dt)(dx^b + N^b dt)$ in the fiducial foliation $t \mapsto \Sigma_t$ gives in a new (equivalent) foliation $t' \mapsto \Sigma_{t'}$ rise to $g'_{\mu\nu} dy'^\mu dy'^\nu = -N_\theta'^2 dt'^2 + g'_{ab}(dx'^a + N_\theta'^a dt')(dx'^b + N_\theta'^b dt')$. This is such that*

$$g_{\mu\nu}^\theta dy^\mu dy^\nu = g'_{\mu\nu} dy'^\mu dy'^\nu . \quad (2.13)$$

We shall refer to (2.13) as the complexified metric defined by lapse Wick rotation. It is invariantly defined with respect to passive and active diffeomorphisms but depends on the choice of fiducial foliation.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Viewing (2.12) as a definition only (2.13) needs to be shown. This can be established by a lengthy direct computation. \blacksquare

Wick rotation in non-fiducial foliations. So far the Wick rotation (2.2) only acted in the arbitrarily chosen but then fixed fiducial foliation. The result was then transplanted to other foliations by a foliation changing diffeomorphism. Formalizing this construction, one can define a Wick rotation in a non-fiducial foliation by the alternative expressions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{w}'_\theta &:= \text{transf}_- \circ \mathfrak{w}_\theta \circ (\text{transf}_-)^{-1} , \\ \mathfrak{w}'_\theta &:= \text{transf}_+ \circ \mathfrak{w}_\theta \circ (\text{transf}_+)^{-1} . \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Here, \mathfrak{w}'_θ acts on the real triples $(N', N'^a, g'_{ab})_-$ and $(N', N'^a, g'_{ab})_+$, respectively, of a matching signature metric in a non-fiducial foliation. In the second $\text{transf}_{\epsilon_g}$ map its action is extended to allow for a complex lapse. In the notation (2.12) the result is $\mathfrak{w}'_\theta(N', N'^a, g'_{ab})_- = (N'_\theta, N'^a_\theta, g'^\theta_{ab})_-$ and $\mathfrak{w}'_\theta(N', N'^a, g'_{ab})_+ = (iN'_\theta, N'^a_\theta, g'^\theta_{ab})_+$. Since $(iN', N'^a, g'_{ab})_+ = (N', N'^a, g'_{ab})_-$ and $(iN'_\theta, N'^a_\theta, g'^\theta_{ab})_+ = (N'_\theta, N'^a_\theta, g'^\theta_{ab})_-$, both variants of (2.14) are consistent; we keep both so as to be able to work with real (signature dependent) triples before Wick rotation.

The cases $\theta = \pi/2, 0$ are of particular interest and define a *Wick flip*. Specializing the defining relations in the fiducial foliation $\mathfrak{w}_\theta(N, N^a, g_{ab})_- = (e^{-i\theta}N, N^a, g_{ab})_-$, $\mathfrak{w}_\theta(N, N^a, g_{ab})_+ = (ie^{-i\theta}N, N^a, g_{ab})_+$, to these cases one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{w}_{\pi/2}(N, N^a, g_{ab})_- &= (-iN, N^a, g_{ab})_- = (N, N^a, g_{ab})_+ , \\ \mathfrak{w}_{\pi/2}(N, N^a, g_{ab})_+ &= (N, N^a, g_{ab})_+ , \\ \mathfrak{w}_0(N, N^a, g_{ab})_- &= (N, N^a, g_{ab})_- , \\ \mathfrak{w}_0(N, N^a, g_{ab})_+ &= (iN, N^a, g_{ab})_+ = (N, N^a, g_{ab})_- . \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

Note that $\mathfrak{w}_{\pi/2}^2 = \mathfrak{w}_{\pi/2}$, $\mathfrak{w}_0^2 = \mathfrak{w}_0$, and $\mathfrak{w}_0 \mathfrak{w}_{\pi/2} = \mathfrak{w}_0$, $\mathfrak{w}_{\pi/2} \mathfrak{w}_0 = \mathfrak{w}_{\pi/2}$. Clearly, the transf_+ version of (2.14) is trivial for $\mathfrak{w}_{\pi/2}$ while the transf_- version of (2.14) is trivial for \mathfrak{w}_0 . The other two relations are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{w}'_{\pi/2} &:= \text{transf}_- \circ \mathfrak{w}_{\pi/2} \circ (\text{transf}_-)^{-1} , \\ \mathfrak{w}'_0 &:= \text{transf}_+ \circ \mathfrak{w}_0 \circ (\text{transf}_+)^{-1} , \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

and extend the Wick flip to non-fiducial foliations. Explicitly, $\mathfrak{w}'_{\pi/2}(N', N'^a, g'_{ab})_- = (N', N'^a, g'_{ab})_+$, and $\mathfrak{w}'_0(N', N'^a, g'_{ab})_+ = (N', N'^a, g'_{ab})_-$.

Complexified metric as a rank one perturbation. In the fiducial foliation the complexified metric can trivially be interpreted as a rank one deformation of the original one. Writing, in adapted coordinates, $g_{\mu\nu}^{(\epsilon_g)} dy^\mu dy^\nu = \epsilon_g N^2 dt^2 + g_{ab} e^a e^b$ and $g_{\mu\nu}^\theta dy^\mu dy^\nu = -N_\theta^2 dt^2 + g_{ab} e^a e^b$ one has

$$g_{\mu\nu}^\theta dy^\mu dy^\nu = g_{\mu\nu}^{(\epsilon_g)} dy^\mu dy^\nu - (\epsilon_g + e^{-2i\theta}) N^2 dT dT, \quad (2.17)$$

with dT the differential of the temporal function of the foliation. In other (primed) coordinates associated with another temporal function T' , we seek to compare $g_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\theta} dy'^\mu dy'^\nu$ as in Proposition 2.1 with $g_{\mu\nu}^{(\epsilon_g)} dy'^\mu dy'^\nu$ from the right hand side of (2.6). One might guess that the deformation term in the new foliation arises simply by placing ‘appropriate primes’ on the original deformation, i.e. $N'^2 dT' dT'$. However, this is not the case, the correct assertion being

Proposition 2.2. *The lapse Wick rotated metric, defined with respect to a fiducial foliation in (2.2), is a rank one perturbation with a metric dependent covector field. In any foliation equivalent to the fiducial one,*

$$g_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\theta} = g_{\mu\nu}^{(\epsilon_g)} - (\epsilon_g + e^{-2i\theta}) (v' N' \partial'_\mu t' + v'_a e'^a_\mu) (v' N' \partial'_\nu t' + v'_a e'^a_\nu), \quad (2.18)$$

where with the notation from (2.5)

$$v' = \frac{C}{D_{\epsilon_g}}, \quad v'_a = N \frac{\partial t}{\partial x'^a}. \quad (2.19)$$

Here, the $\partial t / \partial x'^a$ term should again be interpreted in terms of t' via the inversion formula in (A.6).

Proof. The origin of the expressions for (v', v'_a) is simply as the image of $v N dt + v_a e^a = v' N' dt' + v'_a e'^a$ for $v = 1, v_a = 0$, using (2.10). The last identity reaffirms the mathematical equivalence between passive and active diffeomorphism transformations, for the perturbing covector field. Since the latter is already known to hold for the unperturbed metric via (2.6) and the Wick rotated one via Prop. 2.1 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & -N_\theta'^2 dt'^2 + g_{ab}^{\prime\theta} (dx'^a + N_\theta'^a dt') (dx'^b + N_\theta'^b dt') \\ & = \epsilon_g N'^2 dt'^2 + g_{ab}' e'^a e'^b - (\epsilon_g + e^{-2i\theta}) (v' N' dt' + v'_a e'^a)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Upon stripping off the coordinate differentials dy'^μ one obtains (2.18). ■

Remarks.

(i) The identity (2.20) can also be verified by a lengthy direct computation, using the formulae from Appendix A of [38]. Note that the phase $e^{-i\theta}$ enters the defining relations

(2.12) highly nonlinearly on the left hand side while appears only quadratically on the right hand side.

(ii) A notion of Wick rotation by a rank one deformation with a complex coefficient λ has first been proposed in [6]. Their perturbing covector field V_μ is, however, taken as a metric independent additional structure on the manifold. For non-extreme values of λ the perturbed metric and all concepts derived from it will depend on the choice of V_μ . In the present setting the perturbing covector is itself defined in terms of the metric data. Our complexified metric analogously depends on the choice of fiducial foliation.

(iii) In [43, 29, 46] the complexification is done in the internal metric of a Vielbein basis. That is, the Vielbein is kept real and merely the scalar diagonal coefficients are replaced by phases. In the present foliated setting the natural Vielbein for (2.1) is

$$\begin{aligned} E_I &= N^{-1}e_0 \epsilon_I + \epsilon_I^a \partial_a = E_I^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}, \\ E^I &= \epsilon_g N dt \epsilon^I + \epsilon_a^I e^a = E_\mu^I dy^\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

where $E_I^\mu E_\mu^J = \delta_I^J$, $E_I^\mu E_\nu^I = \delta_\nu^\mu$, $I, J = 0, \dots, d$, and $g_{\mu\nu}^{(\epsilon_g)} dy^\mu dy^\nu = \delta_{IJ}$ expresses the desired complete diagonalization. The defining relations for the component fields $(\epsilon_I, \epsilon_I^a)$ and $(\epsilon^I, \epsilon_a^I)$ can be read off upon inserting (A.14). Applying the lapse Wick rotation (2.2) to (2.21) would preserve the strict diagonalization at the expense of complexifying the Vielbeins. A better option is to retain the real Vielbeins (2.21) and use the rank one formula (2.17) to infer

$$g_{\mu\nu}^\theta E_I^\mu E_J^\nu = \delta_{IJ} - (\epsilon_g + e^{-2i\theta}) \epsilon_I \epsilon_J. \quad (2.22)$$

This is no longer fully diagonal but has eigenvalues $(-e^{-2i\theta}, 1, \dots, 1)$. The transformation formulas (2.4) can be used to deduce the induced behavior of the ϵ^I, ϵ_a^I under foliation changing diffeomorphisms, and similarly for ϵ_I, ϵ_I^a . This retains the covariance in a sense analogous to the rank one perturbations (2.18).

(iv) For later use we also prepare the counterpart of the rank one deformation formula (2.20), (2.18) for the inverse metric. In the fiducial foliation one has

$$g^{\mu\nu}(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu} = g_{\epsilon_g}^{\mu\nu}(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu} - (\epsilon_g + e^{+2i\theta}) N^{-2} e_0^2. \quad (2.23)$$

The image in a generic foliation can be found in parallel to (2.18), (2.19) using (2.11). for $\check{v} = 1, \check{v}^a = 0$.

$$g_\theta^{\mu\nu}(y') \frac{\partial}{\partial y'^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial y'^\nu} = g_{\epsilon_g}^{\mu\nu}(y') \frac{\partial}{\partial y'^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial y'^\nu} - (\epsilon_g + e^{+2i\theta}) (\epsilon_g \check{v}' N'^{-1} e'_0 + \check{v}'^a \partial'_a)^2, \quad (2.24)$$

where

$$\check{v}' = \frac{C}{D_{\epsilon_g}}, \quad \check{v}'^a = -\frac{NC}{D_{\epsilon_g}^2} X_b^a g^{bc} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c}. \quad (2.25)$$

2.2 Admissibility criteria for scalar field theories.

One reasonable “admissibility criterion” for a complex metric $g_{\mu\nu}^\theta dy^\mu dy^\nu$ on a real manifold is that the classically interpreted exponential of the action entering the functional integral is damping. This reasoning is tacit in numerous discussions of Wick rotations, recent explicit accounts are [31, 29, 46]. Taking Lorentzian signature as basic and writing $S_\theta = S_-|_{g \rightarrow g^\theta}$ for the complexified action, e^{iS_θ} should be damping. That is, $\text{Im}S_\theta > 0$, for some range of $\theta > 0$, if $S_{\theta=0} = S_-$ is the Lorentzian signature action. For short, we call a complex metric $g_{\mu\nu}^\theta dy^\mu dy^\nu$ on a real manifold *admissible* if this condition is met for the field theories under consideration. In a small θ expansion the linear response, $S_\theta = S_- + (\delta S_- / \delta g_{\mu\nu})(g^\theta - g)_{\mu\nu} + O(\theta^2)$, relates to the energy-momentum tensor $T_-^{\mu\nu} = -(2/\sqrt{g})\delta S_- / \delta g_{\mu\nu}$, of the Lorentzian theory. The condition $\text{Im}S_\theta > 0$ is then to $O(\theta)$ typically satisfied if the energy momentum tensor satisfies the weak energy condition (WEC). For short, we call a complex metric *WEC admissible* if $\text{Im}S_\theta > 0$ holds to $O(\theta)$ on account of the WEC condition.

On a foliated manifold both criteria are manifestly coordinate independent (invariant under passive diffeomorphisms) as long as the fiducial foliation is kept fixed. Below we limit ourselves to self-interacting scalar fields on a foliated background and address the admissibility of our lapse Wick rotated complexified metric in foliations other than the fiducial one in which the rotation is defined. Somewhat surprisingly, the analysis is conceptually different for the exact Wick rotation and the version linearized in θ .

We prepare the scalar field action for both signatures

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\epsilon_g}[\phi, g] &= \epsilon_g \int dy \sqrt{\epsilon_g g} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi + U(\phi) \right\} \\ &= \int dt \int_\Sigma d^d x \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{1}{2N} e_0(\phi)^2 + \frac{\epsilon_g}{2} N g^{ab} \partial_a \phi \partial_b \phi + \epsilon_g N U(\phi) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

In the second line we display the $1+d$ form of the action in some fiducial foliation with metric data $(N, N^a, g_{ab})_{\epsilon_g}$. Further, $U(\phi)$ is a metric independent potential which we assume to be non-negative. The bi-transversal component of the energy momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}^{\epsilon_g}$ is defined by projection with a real vector m^μ satisfying $dt_\mu m^\mu = 1$, $m^\mu m^\nu g_{\mu\nu}^{\epsilon_g} = \epsilon_g N^2$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mu\nu}^{\epsilon_g} &= \frac{2\epsilon_g}{\sqrt{g}} \frac{\delta S_{\epsilon_g}}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} = \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} g^{\rho\sigma} \partial_\rho \phi \partial_\sigma \phi - g_{\mu\nu} U(\phi), \\ N^{-2} m^\mu m^\nu T_{\mu\nu}^{\epsilon_g} &= \frac{1}{2N^2} e_0(\phi)^2 - \frac{\epsilon_g}{2} g^{ab} \partial_a \phi \partial_b \phi - \epsilon_g U(\phi), \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

where we momentarily omit the ϵ_g sub/superscripts on the metric for readability’s sake. One sees that $m^\mu m^\nu T_{\mu\nu}^- \geq 0$, so Lorentzian signature scalar field theories with a non-negative potential satisfy the WEC.

The action S_{ϵ_g} is manifestly invariant under foliation preserving diffeomorphisms. In fact, each of the terms $N^{-2} e_0(\phi)^2$, $g^{ab} \partial_a \phi \partial_b \phi$, $U(\phi)$ is separately a scalar under

$\text{Diff}(\{\Sigma\})$ and the Wick rotation (2.2) can unambiguously be applied. Explicitly, we define in the fiducial foliation the lapse Wick rotated action by

$$\begin{aligned} S_\theta[\phi, g] &:= S_-[\phi, g]\Big|_{N \rightarrow e^{-i\theta}N} = iS_+[\phi, g]\Big|_{N \rightarrow ie^{-i\theta}N} \\ &= \cos\theta S_-[\phi, g] + i\sin\theta S_+[\phi, g], \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

where S_\pm are given by the second line in (2.26). For $\theta \in (0, \pi)$ one has $\text{Im}[S_\theta] > 0$ and the generalized Boltzmann factor e^{+iS_θ} in a functional integral is damping. It is thus plain that the complexified action (2.28) is admissible in the above sense in the fiducial foliation. To linear order, $S_\theta = S_- + i\theta S_+ + O(\theta^2)$. Consistency with the WEC criterion requires that

$$\begin{aligned} S_+ &\stackrel{!}{=} \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{i\theta} \int dt d^d x \frac{\delta S_-}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}(g_-) (g^\theta - g_-)^{\mu\nu} \\ &= \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{e^{2i\theta} - 1}{2i\theta} \int dt d^d x \sqrt{-g_-} N^{-2} T_{\mu\nu}^- m^\mu m^\nu \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

where we used (2.23) and the variational definition of the energy momentum tensor. Inserting (2.27) this is indeed an identity.

WEC admissibility in non-fiducial foliations. The fiducial foliation can of course be chosen arbitrarily and in this sense (2.29) holds in any foliation with its associated temporal function T . One can, however, also ask if (2.29) continues to hold if the foliation is changed via the transformations (2.8). From the mathematical equivalence between active and passive diffeomorphism transformations one expects $T_{\mu\nu}^- m^\mu m^\nu$ not to be invariant (being the time-time component of a $\binom{0}{2}$ tensor) and the issue is whether it remains positive. By comparing the second lines of (2.26) and (2.27) one sees that both S_+ and $T_{\mu\nu}^- m^\mu m^\nu$ contain the *sum* of the temporal and the spatial gradient terms. By extension of Proposition 2.1 these sums are scalars under transf_+ in (2.8). However, $T_{\mu\nu}^-$, stemming from the Lorentzian action should really be subjected to the transf_- transformations, and will then not be a scalar.

It is instructive to compute explicitly the transformation law of the sum and difference of the temporal and the spatial gradient parts in the action S_{ϵ_g} based on the matching $\text{transf}_{\epsilon_g}$ version of the transition formulas. Using the results from Appendix A of [38] one finds

$$[N'^{-1}e'_0(\phi')]^2 + \epsilon_g g'^{ab} \partial'_a \phi' \partial'_b \phi' = [N^{-1}e_0(\phi)]^2 + \epsilon_g g^{ab} \partial_a \phi \partial_b \phi, \quad (2.30a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} [N'^{-1}e'_0(\phi')]^2 - \epsilon_g g'^{ab} \partial'_a \phi' \partial'_b \phi' &= \frac{1}{D_{\epsilon_g}^2} \left\{ \left[\frac{C}{N} e_0(\phi) + \epsilon_g N \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} g^{cd} \partial_d \phi \right]^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \epsilon_g g^{cd} \left[C \partial_c \phi - \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} e_0(\phi) \right] \left[C \partial_d \phi - \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^d} e_0(\phi) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.30b)$$

The first combination occurs in the Lagrangian of S_{ϵ_g} and (2.30a) confirms the expected scalar transformation law. The sign flipped version occurs in the bi-transversal

component of the energy momentum tensor (2.27) and, as expected, does not transform as a scalar under $\text{transf}_{\epsilon_g}$. Relevant in the present context is that the right hand side of (2.30b) can be written so that for $\epsilon_g = -1$ is manifestly non-negative. Hence, when subjecting the second line of (2.29) to an active foliation changing diffeomorphism of the inherited signature type, transf_- , its *value changes but it remains positive*.

Admissibility in non-fiducial foliations. The reason for slightly belaboring the above point is that the situation is conceptually different if the dependence on the phase $e^{\pm i\theta}$ is treated exactly and no reference to the energy momentum tensor of the original Lorentzian action is made. To frame the discussion it is convenient to define $L(\phi, A) := \frac{1}{2}A^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi + U(\phi)$, for any complex maximal rank matrix $A^{\mu\nu}$. Then, in a given fiducial foliation $L(\phi, g_+)$ is the Euclidean signature Lagrangian, $-L(\phi, g_-)$ is the Lorentzian signature Lagrangian, and $-L(\phi, g_\theta)$ is the Lagrangian of the complexified action (2.28), excluding the complexified measure term $\sqrt{-g_\theta}$. We interpret this measure term as $\sqrt{-g_\theta} = e^{-i\theta}\sqrt{\mp g_\mp} = e^{-i\theta}N\sqrt{g}$. Taking the extra phase into account the Lagrangian of the complexified action with the real $N\sqrt{g}$ measure is $L_\theta = -e^{-i\theta}L(\phi, g_\theta)$. In this notation the relation (2.28) reads

$$-e^{-i\theta}L(\phi, g_\theta)(y) = -\cos\theta L(\phi, g_-)(y) + i\sin\theta L(\phi, g_+)(y), \quad (2.31)$$

where $y^\mu = (t, x^a)$ are local coordinates adapted to the fiducial foliation. The interplay with non-fiducial foliations is described by

Proposition 2.3. *The Lagrangian $-e^{-i\theta}L(\phi, g_\theta)(y)$ of the complexified action is a scalar under the transformations (2.12), $-e^{-i\theta}L(\phi, g_\theta)(y) = -e^{-i\theta}L(\phi', g'_\theta)(y')$. Explicitly,*

$$\frac{1}{2N_\theta^2}e_0(\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2}g^{ab}\partial_a\phi\partial_b\phi - U(\phi) = \frac{1}{2N_\theta'^2}e'_0(\phi')^2 - \frac{1}{2}g'^{ab}\partial'_a\phi'\partial'_b\phi' - U(\phi'), \quad (2.32)$$

where $e'_0 = \partial'_t - N'^a\partial'_a$ and g'^{ab} is the inverse of g'^{θ}_{ab} in (2.12c). Further,

$$-e^{-i\theta}L(\phi', g'_\theta)(y') = -\cos\theta L(\phi', g'_-)(y') + i\sin\theta L(\phi', g'_+)(y'). \quad (2.33)$$

In particular, the real and imaginary parts of $-e^{-i\theta}L(\phi, g_\theta)$ are separately scalars under the transformations (2.12).

Proof. Since the inverse of the complexified metric enters the ‘covariant’ form of the action $S^\theta[\phi, g] = S_-[\phi, g^\theta]$ the assertion (2.32) does not quite follow from (2.13). However, defining the inverses $g^{\mu\nu}_\theta$ of $g_{\mu\nu}^\theta$ and $g'^{\mu\nu}_\theta$ of $g'^{\theta}_{\mu\nu}$ in the obvious way with respect to the real vector field bases $\partial/\partial y^\mu$ and $\partial/\partial y'^\mu$, respectively, it is clear that

$$g^{\mu\nu}_\theta \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu} = g'^{\mu\nu}_\theta \frac{\partial}{\partial y'^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial y'^\nu}, \quad (2.34)$$

will hold as well. This implies (2.32).

The phase $e^{-i\theta}$ occurs highly nonlinearly on the right hand side of (2.32). It is thus not immediate that the latter can be decomposed as claimed on the right hand side of (2.33). To see that this is the case, we return to (2.24) and insert it into the left hand side of (2.33). In a first step this gives

$$\begin{aligned} -e^{-i\theta} L(\phi', g'_\theta)(y') &= e^{-i\theta} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} g'_{\epsilon_g}{}^{\mu\nu} \partial'_\mu \phi' \partial'_\nu \phi' - U(\phi') \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} (\epsilon_g + e^{+2i\theta}) (\epsilon_g \check{v}' N'^{-1} e'_0(\phi') + \check{v}'^a \partial'_a \phi')^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

By construction, either sign $\epsilon_g = \pm 1$ can be chosen to evaluate the right hand side. Choosing $\epsilon_g = +1$ one finds

$$\begin{aligned} -e^{-i\theta} L(\phi', g'_\theta)(y') &= i \sin \theta \left\{ \frac{1}{2} g'_+{}^{\mu\nu} \partial'_\mu \phi' \partial'_\nu \phi' + U(\phi') \right\} \\ &\quad - \cos \theta \left\{ \frac{1}{2} g'_+{}^{\mu\nu} \partial'_\mu \phi' \partial'_\nu \phi' - (\epsilon_g \check{v}' N'^{-1} e'_0(\phi') + \check{v}'^a \partial'_a \phi')^2 - U(\phi') \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.36)$$

The first two terms in the second curly bracket can be simplified using the $\theta = 0$, $\epsilon_g = +1$ version of (2.24) in reverse. This yields (2.33). \blacksquare

In the context of our previous discussion of the WEC admissibility, the result (2.33) is somewhat surprising. While in (2.29) the imaginary part of the $O(\theta)$ perturbation is *not* a scalar under the inherited transf_- transformation, the real and the imaginary parts in (2.33) suddenly are. This is because the complex transformations (2.12) automatically apply the matching transformations transf_\pm to the definite signature parts of the quantities occurring on the right hand side of (2.24). As a consequence, after reexpressing $-e^{-i\theta} L(\phi', g'_\theta)(y')$ in terms of the definite signature $L(\phi', g'_-)$ and $L(\phi', g'_+)$ the latter coincide with the images of $L(\phi, g_-)$ and $L(\phi, g_+)$ under the matching transf_- and transf_+ transformations, respectively. There is no inherited transformation law that is kept fixed and results in a non-scalar transformation law.

Complexified Hessian. Next, we consider the Hessian defined by the quadratic part of the action S_θ . The appropriate background-fluctuation split is $\phi = \varphi + f$, for a background φ and some $f \in C_c^\infty(M)$. Expanding the action to quadratic order in f one has

$$S_\theta[\varphi + f, g] = S_\theta[\varphi, g] - \int dt \int_\Sigma d^d x N \sqrt{g} f i \Delta_\theta \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \int dt \int_\Sigma d^d x N \sqrt{g} f i \Delta_\theta f + O(f^3). \quad (2.37)$$

The Hessian $-i\Delta_\theta$ can be written in several alternatively useful ways

$$\begin{aligned} -i\Delta_\theta &= -e^{-i\theta} \left[-\nabla_-^2 \Big|_{N \mapsto e^{-i\theta} N} + V \right] = -e^{i\theta} \nabla_t^2 + e^{-i\theta} \nabla_s^2 - e^{-i\theta} V \\ &= -\cos \theta \mathcal{D}_- + i \sin \theta \mathcal{D}_+. \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

We do not require φ to be a solution of $\Delta_\theta \varphi = 0$ and treat the potential $V = U''(\varphi)$ as a given scalar function on M . Further, $\mathcal{D}_\pm := -\nabla_\pm^2 + V$ are the Euclidean/Lorentzian

signature Hessians, respectively. The corresponding scalar Laplacian is

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\epsilon_g}^2 &= (\epsilon_g g_{\epsilon_g})^{-1/2} \partial_\mu \left((\epsilon_g g_{\epsilon_g})^{1/2} g_{\epsilon_g}^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \right) \\ &= \epsilon_g g^{-1/2} N^{-1} e_0 \left(g^{1/2} N^{-1} e_0 \right) + g^{-1/2} N^{-1} \partial_a \left(N g^{1/2} g^{ab} \partial_b \right) =: \epsilon_g \nabla_t^2 + \nabla_s^2.\end{aligned}\quad (2.39)$$

Here $e_0 = \partial_t - \mathcal{L}_{\vec{N}}$ is the Lie derivative transversal to the leaves of the foliation. Note that the rightmost e_0 acts on spatial scalars as $e_0(f) = \partial_t f - N^a \partial_a f$, while the next e_0 acts on a +1 spatial density according to $e_0(\sqrt{g}f) = \partial_t(\sqrt{g}f) - \partial_a(N^a \sqrt{g}f)$. In $1+d$ form the diffeomorphism group acts nonlinearly according to the transformation formulas in (2.8) but for fixed signature parameter ϵ_g , – the same in (2.8) and (2.39)–, $\nabla_{\epsilon_g}^2$ will continue to map scalars to scalars. The temporal and spatial parts individually are of course only invariant under foliation preserving diffeomorphisms. The structure (2.39) carries over to non-fiducial foliations on account of Proposition 2.3.

Corollary 2.4. *The complexified Hessian (2.38) is invariant under the complex transformations (2.12), i.e. $\Delta'_\theta = \Delta_\theta$, in the respective local coordinates. Also in generic non-fiducial foliations it decomposes according to $-i\Delta'_\theta = -\cos\theta \mathcal{D}'_- + i\sin\theta \mathcal{D}'_+$, where \mathcal{D}'_\pm refer to $(N', N'^a, g'_{ab})_\pm$ and are separately invariant, $\mathcal{D}'_+ = \mathcal{D}_+$, $\mathcal{D}'_- = \mathcal{D}_-$, with respect to transf_+ , transf_- in (2.8).*

Remarks.

(i) We write $-i\Delta_\theta$ for the complexified Hessian as Δ_θ will generate a semigroup and in the mathematical literature semigroups arise schematically as $\zeta \mapsto e^{\zeta A}$ (without prefactors in the exponential) from their generator A .

(ii) The background φ is not assumed to be on-shell, $\Delta_\theta \varphi \neq 0$. It only indirectly enters the potential V , which is below directly assumed to be a non-negative $C^\infty(M)$ function. Imposing $\Delta_\theta \varphi = 0$ for any fixed θ is unproblematic; its extension to all θ requires $\mathcal{D}_+ \varphi = 0 = \mathcal{D}_- \varphi$ and thus would allow only simple (e.g. static) backgrounds. While on-shell backgrounds are commonly used for simplicity, they are not mandatory in the background field formalism of functional integrals. In particular, the Legendre effective action $\Gamma[\langle f \rangle, \varphi]$ can consistently be defined for off-shell backgrounds.

In summary, for field theories on real foliated manifolds satisfying the WEC the above notion of a Wick rotation is fairly satisfactory, if reliant on a fiducial foliation for its definition. For definiteness we considered only minimally coupled scalar matter, but the admissibility carries over to many other standard matter systems like Maxwell fields or perfect fluids. We are not aware of a *manifestly* foliation-independent Wick rotation for conventional field theories on real foliated manifolds.

3. Wick rotated heat semigroup from complexified Hessian

The goal of this section is to establish Δ_θ as the generator of an *analytic semigroup* via suitable resolvent estimates. In the introductory tabulation this corresponds to the results (a)–(d). Some background material is prepared in Section 3.1. Before turning to the proofs we add some comments on the relation to other approaches pursued in the literature to overcome the limitation of the heat kernel proper to a strictly Euclidean setting.

Often a formal pseudo-heat kernel is introduced by replacing $s > 0$ by $i\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{s} \in \mathbb{R}$, in the diffusion equation [39, 12]. This renders the formal exponential of an (indefinite, unbounded) Lorentzian signature Hessian \mathcal{D}_- more palatable, but does little in ensuring the existence of the operator semigroup $\mathbb{R} \ni \tilde{s} \mapsto e^{-i\tilde{s}\mathcal{D}_-}$. An $i\epsilon$ prescription, $\tilde{s} \mapsto \tilde{s} - i\epsilon$, alone does not help, unless the generator is again positive. For a non-elliptic \mathcal{D}_- the key step is to establish its essential self-adjointness under suitable conditions [49, 36, 37], after which the existence of a unique associated Schrödinger group is ensured.

For a wave operator \mathcal{D}_- , in the physics literature only a formal series realization of the putative Schrödinger kernel of $e^{-i\tilde{s}\mathcal{D}_-}$, $\tilde{s} \in \mathbb{R}$, is aimed at and invokes an ansatz in terms of the Synge function and its derivatives. The Synge function is locally well-defined on a Lorentzian manifold and the recursion relations for the coefficients in the ansatz are virtually the same as in the Riemannian case [12]. The solution formulas likewise have no explicit dependence on the signature parameter. These off-diagonal pseudo-heat kernel coefficients are moreover in one-to-one correspondence to those occurring in the (Lorentzian signature) Hadamard expansion [12], so there is little doubt that these coefficients correctly reflect the short distance behavior of the Hadamard parametrix. While the Hadamard parametrix can be defined independently of these series expansions, the use of the inverse Laplace transform to define the corresponding part of a pseudo-heat kernel is not immediate. The latter would require information about the resolvent set of \mathcal{D}_- , and for a Lorentzian signature Hessian essential self-adjointness is secondary [3], and may not always hold [27].

A rigorous result on a near Lorentzian Hadamard expansion is [17], where the $i\epsilon$ part of the Hadamard parametrix is kept finite and local. Starting from the original, $i\epsilon$ -independent wave equation the regularization terms are shown to be governed by recursive relations analogous to the standard ones and the existence of a deformed parametrix is shown. The relation to a Euclidean regime is not discussed.

One way to link the Euclidean heat kernel to the Lorentzian signature Hadamard parametrix is by subsuming both in a setting that invokes complex analytic metrics [34]. This allows for a local Wick rotation (in time), which is however potentially coordinate dependent. This framework can be used to prove the symmetry of the coefficients to all orders by transitioning between different real sections. It also leads to a natural notion of analytic Hadamard states [20] that extends beyond the stationary case [48]. On the other hand, a Wick rotation in time may be limited to purely electric metrics [25].

3.1 Background: analytic semigroups

For readability's sake we include a brief summary of the definitions and results needed, see e.g. [15] for a detailed account.

Definition 3.1 (Bounded analytic semigroup). *Let \mathcal{H} be a complex Hilbert space. Given $\alpha \in (0, \pi]$, the “sector” $\Sigma_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is defined by²*

$$\Sigma_\alpha := \left\{ \zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} \mid |\operatorname{Arg}(\zeta)| < \alpha \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$

Then, a family of bounded operators $(T(\zeta))_{\zeta \in \Sigma_\delta \cup \{0\}}$ in $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ (i.e. the space of bounded endomorphisms of \mathcal{H}) is called a bounded analytic semigroup of angle $\delta \in (0, \pi/2]$ if:

- (i) $T(0) = \mathbb{1}$ and $T(\zeta_1 + \zeta_2) = T(\zeta_1)T(\zeta_2)$ for all $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \Sigma_\delta$.
- (ii) The mapping $\zeta \mapsto T(\zeta)$ is analytic in Σ_δ , i.e. there is a powerseries expansion about every $\zeta \in \Sigma_\delta$ that converges in operator norm with nonzero radius of convergence.
- (iii) For all $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ and $0 < \delta' < \delta$ we have strong continuity, i.e. $\lim_{\Sigma_{\delta'} \ni \zeta \rightarrow 0} T(\zeta)\psi = \psi$.
- (iv) For every $0 < \delta' < \delta$, $\|T(\zeta)\|_{\text{op}}$ is uniformly bounded in $\Sigma_{\delta'}$.

Remarks.

(i) Restricting the domain of the bounded analytic semigroup to $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \subseteq \Sigma_\delta \cup \{0\}$ yields a strongly continuous semigroup $(T(s))_{s \geq 0}$.

(ii) A closed densely defined operator $A : D(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, $D(A) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, is the *generator* of the analytic semigroup $(T(\zeta))_{\zeta \in \Sigma_\delta \cup \{0\}}$ iff

$$\forall \psi \in D(A) : \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{s}(T(s)\psi - \psi) = A\psi, \quad (3.2)$$

i.e. the difference quotient converges in norm (as $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni s \rightarrow 0^+$) to $A\psi$ for all $\psi \in D(A)$. The defining property of an analytic semigroup's generator is its *sectoriality*.

Definition 3.2. *A densely defined closed operator $A : D(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is called sectorial of angle $\delta \in (0, \pi/2]$ if:*

- (i) $\Sigma_{\pi/2+\delta} \subseteq \rho(A)$, where $\rho(A) := \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid \lambda - A \text{ is bijective and } (\lambda - A)^{-1} \text{ is bounded} \right\}$ is the resolvent set of A .
- (ii) The resolvents are uniformly bounded over sectors, i.e. for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)$ there exists $M_\varepsilon \geq 1$ such that

$$\|(\lambda - A)^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{M_\varepsilon}{|\lambda|}, \quad \lambda \in \overline{\Sigma_{\pi/2+\delta-\varepsilon}} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (3.3)$$

The exponentiation of a sectorial operator (which need not be normal, c.f. the operator Δ_θ in (3.10) for generic θ) may be defined via the holomorphic functional calculus.

²“Arg” is defined in $(-\pi, \pi)$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $(A, D(A))$ be a sectorial operator of angle $\delta \in (0, \pi/2]$ in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Consider the following family of operators in $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$,*

$$T(0) := \mathbb{1}, \quad T(\zeta) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} e^{\zeta\lambda} (\lambda - A)^{-1} d\lambda, \quad \zeta \in \Sigma_{\delta}, \quad (3.4)$$

where, given $\zeta \in \Sigma_{\delta}$, γ is any piecewise smooth curve in $\Sigma_{\pi/2+\delta}$ going from $\infty e^{-i(\pi/2+\delta')}$ to $\infty e^{i(\pi/2+\delta')}$ for some $|\operatorname{Arg}(\zeta)| < \delta' < \delta$.

Then the family $(T(\zeta))_{\zeta \in \Sigma_{\delta} \cup \{0\}}$ is a bounded analytic semigroup with generator $(A, D(A))$, and is furthermore uniquely determined the generator.

If, in addition, there is $\varphi \in (0, \delta)$ such that there is the uniform resolvent bound

$$\forall \lambda \in \Sigma_{\varphi} : \quad \left\| (\lambda - A)^{-1} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{|\lambda|}, \quad (3.5)$$

then $T(\zeta)$ is contractive in $\Sigma_{\varphi} \cup \{0\}$, i.e. $\forall \zeta \in \Sigma_{\varphi} \cup \{0\} : \|T(\zeta)\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$.

The existence of the analytic semigroup and the contractivity result is a straightforward combination of the Lumer-Phillips Theorem and the generation theorem for analytic semigroups (resp. Thms. 3.15 and 4.6 in Ch. II of [15]), while the uniqueness follows from the analyticity of the mapping $\Sigma_{\delta} \ni \zeta \rightarrow T(\zeta) \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$, together with the fact that the strongly continuous semigroup $(T(s))_{s \geq 0}$ obtained by restricting to $[0, \infty)$ is uniquely determined by its generator $(A, D(A))$ (c.f. Thm. 1.4 in Ch. II of [15]). We omit the proof, and instead note the following.

Remarks.

(i) The use of the Cauchy integral formula (3.4), and the fact the semigroup is uniquely determined by its generator, motivates the intuitive notation $e^{\zeta A} \equiv T(\zeta)$. For brevity we shall refer to the semigroup $T(\zeta)$ as the *analytic semigroup generated by A* and often write $e^{\zeta A}$ for it.

(ii) The map $\Sigma_{\delta} \ni \zeta \mapsto T(\zeta) \in \mathfrak{B}(H)$ is analytic, and the integral formula (3.4), together with the closedness of $(A, D(A))$, implies for all $\zeta \in \Sigma_{\delta}$

$$\frac{d^n}{d\zeta^n} T(\zeta) \psi = A^n T(\zeta) \psi, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \psi \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (3.6)$$

In particular, this entails boundedness of the $A^n T(\zeta)$, and that $\operatorname{ran}(T(\zeta)) \subseteq \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} D(A^n)$.

(iii) Moreover, a straightforward adaptation of the arguments in [15] shows that for all $\delta' \in (0, \delta)$ there is a $C_{\delta'} > 0$ such that

$$\forall \zeta \in \Sigma_{\delta'} : \quad \|AT(\zeta)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{C_{\delta'}}{|\zeta|}, \quad (3.7)$$

Observing that $A^n T(\zeta) = (AT(\zeta/n))^n$, it follows that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\forall \zeta \in \Sigma_{\delta'} : \quad \|A^n T(\zeta)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \left(\frac{n C_{\delta'}}{|\zeta|} \right)^n, \quad (3.8)$$

which will be needed later on. Finally, for any $\zeta_0 \in \Sigma_\delta$, the (convergent) Taylor expansion $T(\zeta) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\zeta - \zeta_0)^k}{k!} T^{(k)}(\zeta_0)$, together with (3.6) implies that for any $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$

$$A^n T(\zeta) \psi = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\zeta - \zeta_0)^k}{k!} A^{n+k} T(\zeta_0) \psi, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (3.9)$$

with the sum converging in norm within the disk of convergence.

3.2 Spectrum and sectoriality of the complexified Hessian

Returning now to the complexified Hessian $-i\Delta_\theta$ in (2.38), we show that Δ_θ (defined on an appropriate dense domain of $L^2(M)$) is a sectorial operator, and hence generates an analytic semigroup for every $\theta \in (0, \pi)$. In more detail, throughout this section, we focus on the family of operators

$$\Delta_\theta = -\sin \theta \mathcal{D}_+ - i \cos \theta \mathcal{D}_-, \quad \theta \in (0, \pi), \quad (3.10)$$

where $\mathcal{D}_\pm := -\nabla_\pm^2 + V$ are the Euclidean/Lorentzian signature Hessians and $V \in C^\infty(M)$ is non-negative and bounded (in particular, \mathcal{D}_+ defined on $C_c^\infty(M)$ is a positive operator). Concerning the dense domain $D(\Delta_\theta)$ in the Hilbert space $L^2(M)$, it is tempting to work with smooth functions and define the (classical) action of Δ_θ on $C_c^\infty(M)$, which is densely contained in $L^2(M)$. However, this domain is unsuitable for sectoriality as even $\mathbb{1} - \Delta_\theta$ fails to be surjective. Instead, we sacrifice classical differentiability and define the domain $D(\Delta_\theta)$ to be the following subset of the Sobolev space $\mathcal{W}_0^1(M)$ (see Appendix B)

$$\forall \theta \in (0, \pi) : D(\Delta_\theta) := \left\{ u \in \mathcal{W}_0^1(M) \mid \Delta_\theta u \in L^2(M) \right\}. \quad (3.11)$$

Remarks.

(i) First note that $u \in \mathcal{W}_0^1(M) \xrightarrow{\text{dense}} L^2(M)$ defines a distribution $\tilde{u} \in \mathfrak{D}'(M)$ on the space of test functions $\mathfrak{D}(M) \equiv C_c^\infty(M)$, and further the distributional action of the operator Δ_θ determines a distribution $\widetilde{\Delta_\theta u} \in \mathfrak{D}'(M)$, c.f. Appendix B. Then the condition $\Delta_\theta u \in L^2(M)$ in (3.11) means that there exists $h \in L^2(M)$ such that

$$\forall w \in C_c^\infty(M) : \int d\mu_g u \Delta_\theta w = \int d\mu_g h w, \quad (3.12)$$

with μ_g the measure on M defined by the real metric volume element $N\sqrt{g}$, c.f. Section 2.2; once (3.12) holds, one defines $\Delta_\theta u := h$.

(ii) Clearly $C_c^\infty(M) \subseteq D(\Delta_\theta) \subseteq L^2(M)$, so $D(\Delta_\theta)$ is dense in $L^2(M)$.

(iii) Finally, although $D(\Delta_\theta)$ contains non-classically differentiable functions, one may still integrate by parts: for all $u, v \in D(\Delta_\theta)$

$$\int d\mu_g u (\sin \theta \nabla_+^2 + i \cos \theta \nabla_-^2) v = - \int d\mu_g (\sin \theta g_+^{\alpha\beta} + i \cos \theta g_-^{\alpha\beta}) \partial_\alpha u \partial_\beta v. \quad (3.13)$$

This follows readily from approximation with $C_c^\infty(M)$ functions in \mathcal{W}^1 -norm, together with the definitions of the distributional gradient and the distributional action of $\sin \theta \nabla_+^2 + i \cos \theta \nabla_-^2$; we omit a detailed proof.

We now state and prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.2. *Let (M, g_-) be a globally hyperbolic manifold, $\theta \in (0, \pi)$, and $\tilde{\theta} := \min\{\theta, \pi - \theta\}$. Selecting a fiducial foliation on (M, g_-) with ADM triple $(N, N^a, g_{ab})_-$ and performing a lapse Wick rotation $(N, N^a, g_{ab})_- \mapsto (e^{-i\theta}N, N^a, g_{ab})_-$ to define a complexified metric tensor, consider the operator $(\Delta_\theta, D(\Delta_\theta))$ in $L^2(M)$ defined by*

$$\Delta_\theta := -\sin \theta \mathcal{D}_+ - i \cos \theta \mathcal{D}_-, \quad \mathcal{D}_\pm := -\nabla_\pm^2 + V, \quad (3.14)$$

with $V \in C^\infty(M)$ non-negative and bounded, and domain determined by its distributional action,

$$D(\Delta_\theta) := \{u \in \mathcal{W}_0^1(M) \mid \Delta_\theta u \in L^2(M)\}. \quad (3.15)$$

Then $(\Delta_\theta, D(\Delta_\theta))$ generates a unique bounded analytic semigroup $(e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta})_{\zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \cup \{0\}}$ that is contractive, i.e. $\|e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta}\|_{op} \leq 1$ for all $\zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \cup \{0\}$.

Further, the adjoint semigroup is given by

$$\forall \zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} : (e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta})^* = e^{\zeta^* \Delta_{\pi-\theta}}. \quad (3.16)$$

We prepare the following lemma, whose proof is postponed to the end of the section.

Lemma 3.3. *For $\theta \in (0, \pi)$, and $\tilde{\theta} := \min\{\theta, \pi - \theta\}$, the resolvent set $\rho(\Delta_\theta)$ contains the sector $\Sigma_{\pi/2+\tilde{\theta}}$, i.e. $\Sigma_{\pi/2+\tilde{\theta}} \subseteq \rho(\Delta_\theta)$. Equivalently, the spectrum $\sigma(\Delta_\theta)$ is contained in the (closed) set $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Sigma_{\pi/2+\tilde{\theta}}$. Moreover, for each $\tilde{\theta}' \in (0, \tilde{\theta})$ there is a constant $C_{\tilde{\theta}'} \geq 1$ such that*

$$\forall \lambda \in \Sigma_{\pi/2+\tilde{\theta}'} : \left\| (\lambda - \Delta_\theta)^{-1} \right\|_{op} \leq \frac{C_{\tilde{\theta}'}}{|\lambda|}, \quad (3.17)$$

and further

$$\forall \lambda \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} : \left\| (\lambda - \Delta_\theta)^{-1} \right\|_{op} \leq \frac{1}{|\lambda|}. \quad (3.18)$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Lemma 3.3 entails that $(\Delta_\theta, D(\Delta_\theta))$ is sectorial of angle $\tilde{\theta}$, and accordingly generates a unique bounded analytic semigroup $(e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta})_{\zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \cup \{0\}}$ by Theorem 3.1. Moreover, the resolvent bound (3.18) of Lemma 3.3 for all $\lambda \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$ implies $(e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta})_{\zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \cup \{0\}}$ is a family of contractive operators.

Next, the adjoint result (3.16) is an immediate corollary of the fact

$$\Delta_\theta^* = \Delta_{\pi-\theta}, \quad D(\Delta_\theta^*) = D(\Delta_{\pi-\theta}), \quad (3.19)$$

which we now prove. Since the all elements of $D(\Delta_\theta)$ and $D(\Delta_{\pi-\theta})$ are Sobolev \mathcal{W}_0^1 -functions, integration by parts (c.f. (3.13)) gives $\Delta_{\pi-\theta} \subseteq \Delta_\theta^*$ (i.e. $D(\Delta_{\pi-\theta}) \subseteq D(\Delta_\theta^*)$ and $\Delta_\theta^*|_{D(\Delta_{\pi-\theta})} = \Delta_{\pi-\theta}$). In order to show equality, let $\lambda > 0$ and define the operator $B_\theta := \lambda - \Delta_\theta$ with domain $D(B_\theta) := D(\Delta_\theta)$. By definition of the adjoint, $f \in D(B_\theta^*)$ iff there exists a unique $g \in L^2(M)$ such that for all $h \in D(B_\theta)$ we have $\langle f | B_\theta h \rangle_{L^2(M)} = \langle g | h \rangle_{L^2(M)}$, and by definition $B_\theta^* f := g$. On the other hand, Lemma 3.3 implies that $B_{\pi-\theta}^{-1} = (\lambda - \Delta_{\pi-\theta})^{-1} \in \mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))$, so there is $f' := (\Delta_{\pi-\theta} - \lambda)^{-1}g \in D(\Delta_{\pi-\theta})$. Hence, for any $h \in D(B_\theta)$

$$\langle B_\theta^* f | h \rangle_{L^2(M)} = \langle (\Delta_{\pi-\theta} - \lambda) f' | h \rangle_{L^2(M)} = \langle f' | (\Delta_\theta - \lambda) h \rangle_{L^2(M)}, \quad (3.20)$$

where the second equality arises from integrating by parts as $f', h \in \mathcal{W}_0^1(M)$ (c.f. (3.13)). Comparing f and f' , it follows that for all $h \in D(B_\theta)$ we have the result $\langle f - f' | (\Delta_\theta - \lambda) h \rangle_{L^2(M)} = 0$, or equivalently $f - f' \in \text{ran}(\lambda - \Delta_\theta)^\perp = L^2(M)^\perp$, and hence $f = f' \in D(\Delta_{\pi-\theta})$. So $B_\theta^* = (\lambda - \Delta_\theta)^* = \lambda - \Delta_{\pi-\theta}$ holds for all $\lambda > 0$, which implies $\Delta_\theta^* = \Delta_{\pi-\theta}$. \blacksquare

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Fixing an arbitrary $\theta \in (0, \pi)$, we begin by establishing $\Sigma_{\pi/2+\tilde{\theta}} \subseteq \rho(\Delta_\theta)$. Namely, given $\lambda \in \Sigma_{\pi/2+\tilde{\theta}}$, it is to be shown that $\lambda - \Delta_\theta : D(\Delta_\theta) \rightarrow L^2(M)$ has a bounded inverse.

Surjectivity: This follows through an application of the Lax-Milgram lemma (Ch. 6 Theorem 6 in [30]). Fixing $f \in L^2(M)$, one defines the antilinear bounded map $\Psi_f : \mathcal{W}_0^1(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\Psi_f(w) := \int d\mu_g f w^*, \quad (3.21)$$

and the sesquilinear form $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{W}_0^1(M) \times \mathcal{W}_0^1(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ mapping $u, w \in \mathcal{W}_0^1(M)$ to

$$\mathcal{E}(u, w) := \int d\mu_g \left[(\lambda + ie^{-i\theta} V) u w^* + (\sin \theta g_+^{\alpha\beta} + i \cos \theta g_-^{\alpha\beta}) \partial_\alpha u \partial_\beta w^* \right] \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (3.22)$$

Since the potential function V is bounded on M , an application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the identity³ $g_-^{\mu\sigma} g_{\sigma\rho}^+ g_-^{\rho\nu} = g_+^{\mu\nu}$ shows that \mathcal{E} is bounded, i.e., $\exists c > 0 : \forall u, w \in \mathcal{W}_0^1(M) : |\mathcal{E}(u, w)| \leq c \|u\|_{\mathcal{W}^1(M)} \|w\|_{\mathcal{W}^1(M)}$. Then, if \mathcal{E} is coercive, i.e., $\exists \alpha > 0 : \forall u \in \mathcal{W}_0^1(M) : |\mathcal{E}(u, u)| \geq \alpha \|u\|_{\mathcal{W}^1}$, the Lax-Milgram lemma implies the existence of a unique $v \in \mathcal{W}_0^1(M)$ such that

$$\forall w \in \mathcal{W}_0^1(M) : \mathcal{E}(v, w) = \Psi_f(w). \quad (3.23)$$

To establish the coercivity bound, consider the restriction of \mathcal{E} to the unit sphere $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{W}_0^1} := \{w \in \mathcal{W}_0^1(M) \mid \|w\|_{\mathcal{W}^1(M)} = 1\}$. Then, we may express

$$\mathcal{E}(w, w) = (1 - e(w))\lambda - \left[-\sin \theta e(w) - i \cos \theta \ell(w) - ie^{-i\theta} \int d\mu_g V |w|^2 \right], \quad (3.24)$$

³This follows by direct computation from $ds_{\epsilon_g}^2 = \epsilon_g N^2 dt^2 + g_{ab}(dx^a + N^a dt)(dx^b + N^b dt)$.

with

$$e(w) := \int d\mu_g g_+^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha w \partial_\beta w^*, \quad \ell(w) := \int d\mu_g g_-^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha w \partial_\beta w^*. \quad (3.25)$$

Clearly, $e(w) \geq 0$, $\ell(w) \in \mathbb{R}$ and the bound $|\ell(w)| \leq e(w)$ is easily seen; hence the two terms on the right hand side of (3.24) are elements of disjoint sets,

$$(1 - e(w))\lambda \in \Sigma_{\pi/2+\tilde{\theta}}, \\ -\sin\theta e(w) - i\cos\theta \ell(w) - ie^{-i\theta} \int d\mu_g V|w|^2 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Sigma_{\pi/2+\tilde{\theta}}. \quad (3.26)$$

It then follows that these terms are bounded away from each other uniformly over $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{W}_0^1}$, and so there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that for all $w \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{W}_0^1}$: $|E(w, w)| \geq \alpha$. Rescaling yields the requisite coercivity bound.

Having established coercivity, Ψ_f is uniquely realized by \mathcal{E} through the relation (3.23). In particular, for any $w \in C_c^\infty(M) \subseteq \mathcal{W}_0^1(M)$, integrating (3.23) by parts yields

$$\int d\mu_g f w^* = \int d\mu_g v(\lambda - \Delta_\theta) w^*. \quad (3.27)$$

In summary, given $f \in L^2(M)$, there exists a unique $v \in \mathcal{W}_0^1(M)$ such that $\Delta_\theta v = \lambda v - f \in L^2(M)$ and $(\lambda - \Delta_\theta)v = f$, establishing surjectivity.

Injectivity: For any element $w \in \mathcal{S}' := \{u \in D(\Delta_\theta) \mid \|u\|_{L^2} = 1\}$,

$$\|(\lambda - \Delta_\theta)w\|_{L^2(M)} \geq \left| \langle w \mid (\lambda - \Delta_\theta)w \rangle_{L^2(M)} \right|, \\ = \lambda - \left[-\sin\theta e(w) - i\cos\theta \ell(w) - ie^{-i\theta} \int d\mu_g V|w|^2 \right], \quad (3.28)$$

where the second line follows from an integration by parts, and $e(w)$, $\ell(w)$ are defined in (3.25). This is the difference of two terms, $\lambda \in \Sigma_{\pi/2+\tilde{\theta}}$, and the other an element of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Sigma_{\pi/2+\tilde{\theta}}$. Then, clearly for all $w \in \mathcal{S}'$

$$\left| \langle w \mid (\lambda - \Delta_\theta)w \rangle \right| \geq \text{dist}(\lambda, \mathbb{C} \setminus \Sigma_{\pi/2+\theta}) =: d_\lambda(\theta) > 0, \quad (3.29)$$

implying injectivity.

Resolvent bounds: For $\lambda \in \Sigma_{\pi/2+\tilde{\theta}}$, the bijection $\lambda - \Delta_\theta : D(\Delta_\theta) \rightarrow L^2(M)$ has inverse $(\lambda - \Delta_\theta)^{-1}$, and (3.29) implies the resolvent bound

$$\|(\lambda - \Delta_\theta)^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{d_\lambda(\theta)}. \quad (3.30)$$

When $\tilde{\theta}' \in (0, \tilde{\theta})$, for any $\lambda \in \Sigma_{\pi/2+\tilde{\theta}'}$ one has $d_\lambda(\theta) \geq \sin(\tilde{\theta} - \tilde{\theta}')|\lambda|$, yielding the uniform bound

$$\|(\lambda - \Delta_\theta)^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{\sin(\tilde{\theta} - \tilde{\theta}')} \frac{1}{|\lambda|}, \quad \forall \lambda \in \Sigma_{\pi/2+\tilde{\theta}'}, \quad (3.31)$$

Setting $C_{\tilde{\theta}'} := \sin(\tilde{\theta} - \tilde{\theta}')^{-1} \geq 1$ gives the result (3.17). On the other hand, restricting to $\lambda \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}'}$, it is easy to see that $d_\lambda(\theta) = |\lambda|$. Thus (3.30) yields the result (3.18), completing the proof of Lemma 3.3. \blacksquare

4. Semigroup action and the Wick rotated heat kernel

Two of the key features of the standard heat semigroup associated to the Dirichlet Laplacian on Riemannian manifolds are its smoothening property and its realizability as an integral operator with a smooth kernel. Having shown the existence of the Wick rotated heat semigroup for all $\theta \in (0, \pi)$ in the previous section, we collect a number of results on the semigroup's action in Theorem 4.1, in particular its smoothening behavior. The second main result of this section, Theorem 4.2, realizes the semigroup in terms of a unique, smooth integral kernel,

$$\begin{aligned} (e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi)(y) &= \int d\mu_g(y') K_\zeta^\theta(y, y') \psi(y'), \\ (\partial_\zeta - \Delta_{\theta, y}) K_\zeta^\theta(y, y') &= 0, \quad \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0} K_\zeta^\theta(y, y') = \delta(y, y'). \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Recall that μ_g is the θ -independent measure arising from the real metric volume form $dy N \sqrt{g}$, and the δ -distribution is normalized with respect to it.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\theta \in (0, \pi)$ and $\tilde{\theta} := \min\{\theta, \pi - \theta\}$.*

(i) *For any $\psi \in L^2(M)$ consider the map $\Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \ni \zeta \mapsto e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi \in L^2(M)$. Then, for each $\zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$, the image $e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi \in L^2(M)$ has a $C^\infty(M)$ -representative, denoted by $(e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi)(\cdot)$, and the mapping*

$$\Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \times M \ni (\zeta, y) \mapsto (e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi)(y) \in \mathbb{C} \quad (4.2)$$

is jointly smooth, and is analytic in $\zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$ for fixed $y \in M$. Moreover, the mapping (4.2) is a classical solution to the differential equation

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_\zeta - \Delta_\theta) f(\zeta, y) = 0, & \forall (\zeta, y) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \times M, \\ f(0, y) = \psi(y), & \text{for a.e. } y \in M. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

(ii) *Consider an arbitrary $\tilde{\theta}' \in (0, \tilde{\theta})$ and $\psi \in L^2(M)$. Then, for any chart U on M , and each open set $\Omega \Subset U$, there exist for every $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ constants $c_m > 0$ and $\sigma_m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that in local coordinates there are the uniform bounds⁴*

$$\forall \zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}'}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \quad \|e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi\|_{C^m(\Omega)} \leq c_m (1 + |\zeta|^{-\sigma_m}) \|\psi\|_{L^2(M)}. \quad (4.4)$$

The constant $c_m > 0$ depends on $\theta', \theta, \Omega, U$, but is independent of ψ and ζ , and $\sigma_m \in \mathbb{N}$ is defined as the smallest integer greater than $m/2 + (d+1)/4$.

(iii) *If $\psi \in C_c^\infty(M)$ and $\tilde{\theta}' \in (0, \tilde{\theta})$, then for any chart U on M , and each open set $\Omega \Subset U$, in local coordinates*

$$\forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \quad \|e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi - \psi\|_{C^m(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}'} \ni \zeta \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.5)$$

⁴The $\|\cdot\|_{C^m(\Omega)}$ -norm is defined in the local chart coordinates by $\|u\|_{C^m(\Omega)} := \sup_{|\alpha| \leq m} \sup_{\Omega_0} |\partial^\alpha u|$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1.

(i) Fix an open ball $B_S(\zeta_0) := \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\zeta - \zeta_0| < S\} \subseteq \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$, a chart U on M , and an open set $\Omega \Subset U$. Integrating in local coordinates in the chart U , we have the bound

$$\int_{\Omega} dy |\Delta_{\theta} f|^2 \leq C^2 \int_{\Omega} d\mu_g |\Delta_{\theta} f|^2 \leq C^2 \|\Delta_{\theta} f\|_{L^2(M)}^2, \quad (4.6)$$

where $C^2 := \sup_{\Omega} (N\sqrt{g})^{-1/2} < \infty$, since $\Omega \Subset U$.

Next, given $\psi \in L^2(M)$, Eq. (4.6) and the bound (3.8) imply that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \quad \Delta_{\theta}^n e^{\zeta_0 \Delta_{\theta}} \psi \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(U), \quad (4.7)$$

where U is regarded as an open subset of \mathbb{R}^{d+1} via the chart map, and $L_{\text{loc}}^2(U)$ is defined relative to the Lebesgue measure dy on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . Further, (3.9) entails the Taylor expansion

$$\Delta_{\theta}^n e^{\zeta \Delta_{\theta}} \psi = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\zeta - \zeta_0)^k}{k!} \Delta_{\theta}^{n+k} e^{\zeta_0 \Delta_{\theta}} \psi, \quad (4.8)$$

converging in $L^2(M)$ for all $\zeta \in B_S(\zeta_0)$ (with $S > 0$ sufficiently small), and hence converging in $L_{\text{loc}}^2(U)$ in local coordinates on the chart U . Since in local coordinates, Δ_{θ} is an operator in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} of the type (C.1b) considered in Appendix C, Theorem C.2 implies that for each $\zeta \in B_S(\zeta_0)$, there exists a $C^{\infty}(U)$ representative of $e^{\zeta \Delta_{\theta}} \psi$ in the chart, and moreover that the mapping

$$B_S(\zeta_0) \times U \ni (\zeta, y) \mapsto (e^{\zeta \Delta_{\theta}} \psi)(y) \in \mathbb{C} \quad (4.9)$$

is jointly smooth. Since both the open ball $B_S(\zeta_0) \subseteq \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$ and the chart U on M was arbitrary, this establishes that the mapping $\Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ given by $(e^{\zeta \Delta_{\theta}} \psi)(y)$ is smooth. Moreover, for each $y \in M$, the pointwise convergence of (4.8) implies analyticity in $\zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$. Finally, recall that when regarded as an element of $L^2(M)$, $e^{\zeta \Delta_{\theta}} \psi$ satisfies $(\partial_{\zeta} - \Delta_{\theta}) e^{\zeta \Delta_{\theta}} \psi = 0$ and $\lim_{\Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \ni \zeta \rightarrow 0} e^{\zeta \Delta_{\theta}} \psi = \psi$. The smoothness of $(\zeta, y) \mapsto e^{\zeta \Delta_{\theta}} \psi(y)$ then clearly entails it satisfies the differential equation (4.3).

(ii) Proceeding next to the local coordinate bound, fix arbitrary $\tilde{\theta}' \in (0, \tilde{\theta})$ and open sets $\Omega \Subset \Omega' \Subset U$ (since $\Omega \Subset U$, it is always possible to find such an open set Ω'). Then by Corollary C.1.1 we have for any $\zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}'}$ the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{\zeta \Delta_{\theta}} \psi\|_{C^m(\Omega)} &\leq B \sum_{j=0}^{\sigma_m} \left\| \Delta_{\theta}^j e^{\zeta \Delta_{\theta}} \psi \right\|_{L^2(\Omega', dy)} \leq B' \sum_{j=0}^{\sigma_m} \left\| \Delta_{\theta}^j e^{\zeta \Delta_{\theta}} \psi \right\|_{L^2(M)} \\ &\leq B'' \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\sigma_m} (j/|\zeta|)^j \right) \|\psi\|_{L^2(M)} \leq c_m \left(1 + |\zeta|^{-\sigma_m} \right) \|\psi\|_{L^2(M)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where (3.8) is used for the penultimate inequality, and $\sum_{j=1}^N (j/|\zeta|)^j \leq \sum_{j=1}^N j^j (1 + |\zeta|^{-N})$ for the final bound.

(iii) Strong continuity of $(e^{\zeta\Delta_\theta})_{\zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \cup \{0\}}$ (c.f. Definition 3.1(iii)) entails that for any $\tilde{\theta}' \in (0, \tilde{\theta})$ and $\psi \in L^2(M)$, $\|e^{\zeta\Delta_\theta}\psi - \psi\|_{L^2(M)} \rightarrow 0$ as $\Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \ni \zeta \rightarrow 0$. In particular, if $\psi \in C_c^\infty(M)$, then for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$: $\Delta_\theta^k \psi \in C_c^\infty(M)$, and hence $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$\left\| \Delta_\theta^k (e^{\zeta\Delta_\theta}\psi - \psi) \right\|_{L^2(M)} = \left\| e^{\zeta\Delta_\theta} (\Delta_\theta^k \psi) - \Delta_\theta^k \psi \right\|_{L^2(M)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \ni \zeta \rightarrow 0, \quad (4.11)$$

where the equality follows from the semigroup commuting with its generator. Corollary C.1.1 then implies the result (4.5). \blacksquare

We proceed to the kernel theorem.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\theta \in (0, \pi)$ and $\tilde{\theta} := \min\{\theta, \pi - \theta\}$. Then for all $\zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$ there is a unique integral kernel $K_\zeta^\theta \in C^\infty(M \times M)$ such that for all $\psi \in L^2(M)$*

$$(e^{\zeta\Delta_\theta}\psi)(y) = \int d\mu_g(y') K_\zeta^\theta(y, y') \psi(y'), \quad \forall y \in M. \quad (4.12)$$

This integral kernel has the following properties:

- (i) (Hermiticity) For all $(\zeta, y, y') \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \times M \times M$: $K_\zeta^\theta(y, y') = K_{\zeta^*}^{\pi-\theta}(y', y)^*$.
- (ii) (Regularity) The mapping

$$\Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \times M \times M \ni (\zeta, y, y') \mapsto K_\zeta^\theta(y, y') \in \mathbb{C} \quad (4.13)$$

is jointly C^∞ -smooth. Moreover for fixed $(y, y') \in M \times M$, $K_\zeta^\theta(y, y')$ is analytic in $\zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$.

- (iii) (Uniqueness) *If for any $\zeta \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$ there exists another integral kernel $J_\zeta^\theta \in C^\infty(M \times M)$ realizing the semigroup action via (4.12), then $K_\zeta^\theta = J_\zeta^\theta$.*
- (iv) (Semigroup property) *For all $y, y' \in M$ and $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$*

$$K_{\zeta_1 + \zeta_2}^\theta(y, y') = \int d\mu_g(y'') K_{\zeta_1}^\theta(y, y'') K_{\zeta_2}^\theta(y'', y'). \quad (4.14)$$

- (v) (Wick rotated heat equation) *For any fixed $y' \in M$,*

$$(\partial_\zeta - \Delta_{\theta, y}) K_\zeta^\theta(y, y') = 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \times M. \quad (4.15)$$

Furthermore if $\psi \in C_c^\infty(M)$ and $\tilde{\theta}' \in (0, \tilde{\theta})$, then for any chart U on M , and each open set $\Omega \Subset U$, in local coordinates we have

$$\int d\mu_g(y) K_\zeta^\theta(\cdot, y) \psi(y) \longrightarrow \psi(\cdot) \quad (4.16)$$

in $C^m(\Omega)$ as $\Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}'} \ni \zeta \rightarrow 0$.

Remark. These properties mirror closely those of the heat kernel $K_s(y, y')$ on a Riemannian manifold (M, g^+) . Additionally, the latter often satisfies $\int d\mu_g(y') K_s(y', y) = 1$, for all $y \in M$, referred to as stochastic completeness of (M, g^+) . Since this primarily reflects features of the underlying manifold [23] (not of the Wick rotation) we leave this unexplored here.

The proof of this theorem uses the following lemmas.

Lemma 4.3. *For all $(\zeta, y) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \times M$ there exists a unique $\kappa_{\zeta, y}^\theta \in L^2(M)$ such that for every $\psi \in L^2(M)$*

$$(e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi)(y) = \langle \kappa_{\zeta, y}^\theta | \psi \rangle_{L^2(M)}, \quad \forall (\zeta, y) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \times M. \quad (4.17)$$

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Fixing an arbitrary $(\zeta, y) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \times M$, consider the mapping $L^2(M) \ni \psi \mapsto (e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi)(y) \in \mathbb{C}$, which is well-defined by Theorem 4.1 and clearly linear. Moreover, Theorem 4.1(ii) implies there is a constant $B > 0$ (depending on y, ζ, θ , but independent of $\psi \in L^2(M)$) such that

$$|(e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi)(y)| \leq B \|\psi\|_{L^2(M)}, \quad \forall \psi \in L^2(M). \quad (4.18)$$

Thus, this mapping is continuous, and by the Riesz Representation Theorem is realized by a unique $\kappa_{\zeta, y}^\theta \in L^2(M)$ via $(e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi)(y) = \langle \kappa_{\zeta, y}^\theta | \psi \rangle_{L^2(M)}$, for each $\psi \in L^2(M)$. ■

Next, as a tool to prove the regularity statement Theorem 4.2(ii), we recall the notions of weak and strong differentiability of Hilbert space valued maps. Let $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set and $h : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow L^2(M)$.

- h is said to be *weakly C^k* , $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, if $\forall \varphi \in L^2(M) : \langle \varphi | h(\cdot) \rangle_{L^2(M)}$ is in $C^k(\mathcal{O})$.
- The Gâteaux derivative of h along direction \hat{e}_i in Ω is

$$\partial_i h(z) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{h(z + \varepsilon \hat{e}_i) - h(z)}{\varepsilon}, \quad (4.19)$$

with the limit taken in $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(M)}$. Then h is said to be *strongly C^k* , $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, if for all multi-indices α with $|\alpha| \leq k$ the Gâteaux derivatives $\partial^\alpha h$ exist throughout Ω and are strongly continuous.

Then we have the result

Lemma 4.4. *$h : \Omega \rightarrow L^2(M)$ is strongly C^∞ iff it is weakly C^∞ .*

We omit the proof, referring to Corollary 1.42 of [9].

We now proceed to the proof of Theorem 4.2.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. We begin with the existence of the pointwise defined integral kernel. Fixing arbitrary $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$, $y \in M$ and $\psi \in L^2(M)$, consider

$$(e^{(\zeta_1 + \zeta_2) \Delta_\theta} \psi)(y) = (e^{\zeta_1 \Delta_\theta} (e^{\zeta_2 \Delta_\theta} \psi))(y) = \langle \kappa_{\zeta_1, y}^\theta | e^{\zeta_2 \Delta_\theta} \psi \rangle_{L^2(M)} = \langle e^{\zeta_2^* \Delta_{\pi - \theta}} \kappa_{\zeta_1, y}^\theta | \psi \rangle_{L^2(M)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int d\mu_g(y') (e^{\zeta_2^* \Delta_{\pi-\theta}} \kappa_{\zeta_1, y}^\theta)^*(y') \psi(y') \\
&= \int d\mu_g(y') \left\langle \kappa_{\zeta_1, y}^\theta \mid \kappa_{\zeta_2^*, y'}^{\pi-\theta} \right\rangle_{L^2(M)} \psi(y'), \tag{4.20}
\end{aligned}$$

where we use $e^{\zeta_2^* \Delta_{\pi-\theta}} = (e^{\zeta_2 \Delta_\theta})^*$ for the third equality on the first line, and Lemma 4.3 for the last step. In particular, for $\zeta \in \Sigma_{\bar{\theta}}$ we have

$$(e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi)(y) = \int d\mu_g(y') \left\langle \kappa_{\zeta/2, y}^\theta \mid \kappa_{\zeta^*/2, y'}^{\pi-\theta} \right\rangle_{L^2(M)} \psi(y'), \tag{4.21}$$

so the semigroup has a pointwise defined integral kernel

$$K_\zeta^\theta(y, y') := \left\langle \kappa_{\zeta/2, y}^\theta \mid \kappa_{\zeta^*/2, y'}^{\pi-\theta} \right\rangle_{L^2(M)}, \quad \forall (\zeta, y, y') \in \Sigma_{\bar{\theta}} \times M \times M. \tag{4.22}$$

(i) The hermiticity property of the kernel follows immediately from the definition (4.22).

(ii) We now turn to its regularity. Let \mathcal{O} be a chart of $\Sigma_{\bar{\theta}} \times M$ with coordinates (ζ, y) , and consider the map $(\zeta, y) \mapsto \kappa_{\zeta, y}^\theta \in L^2(M)$. Since $\langle \kappa_{\zeta, y}^\theta \mid \psi \rangle_{L^2(M)} = (e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi)(y)$ is smooth in $(\zeta, y) \in \mathcal{O}$ for every $\psi \in L^2(M)$, the map is weakly C^∞ , and hence strongly C^∞ by the Lemma 4.4. Similarly, choosing another chart \mathcal{O}' of $\Sigma_{\bar{\theta}} \times M$ with coordinates (ξ, y') , define the map

$$\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{O}' \ni (\zeta, y; \xi, y') \mapsto \left\langle \kappa_{\zeta, y}^\theta \mid \kappa_{\xi^*, y'}^{\pi-\theta} \right\rangle_{L^2(M)} \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{4.23}$$

This is jointly smooth in $(\zeta, y; \xi, y')$ since the maps $(\zeta, y) \mapsto \kappa_{\zeta, y}^\theta$ and $(\xi, y') \mapsto \kappa_{\xi^*, y'}^{\pi-\theta}$ are strongly C^∞ . Since the charts were arbitrary, $(\Sigma_{\bar{\theta}} \times M)^2 \ni (\zeta, y; \xi, y') \mapsto \langle \kappa_{\zeta, y}^\theta \mid \kappa_{\xi^*, y'}^{\pi-\theta} \rangle_{L^2(M)}$ is smooth. Restricting to the diagonal in kernel time yields joint C^∞ -smoothness of

$$\Sigma_{\bar{\theta}} \times M \times M \ni (\zeta, y, y') \mapsto \left\langle \kappa_{\zeta/2, y}^\theta \mid \kappa_{\zeta^*/2, y'}^{\pi-\theta} \right\rangle_{L^2(M)} = K_\zeta^\theta(y, y') \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{4.24}$$

Finally, the analyticity in ζ is a by-product of Theorem 4.1(i) and equation (4.26) below.

(iii) Next, fixing $\zeta \in \Sigma_{\bar{\theta}}$, the uniqueness of the kernel $K_\zeta^\theta \in C^\infty(M \times M)$ is implied by the uniqueness (for each $y \in M$) of $\kappa_{\zeta, y}^\theta \in L^2(M)$ from Lemma 4.3. In more detail, fixing $y \in M$, and comparing the realizations of $(e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \psi)(y)$ in terms of $\kappa_{\zeta, y}^\theta$ via Lemma 4.3 and the kernel K_ζ^θ in (4.12), yields $\kappa_{\zeta, y}^\theta(y')^* = K_\zeta^\theta(y, y')$ for a.e. $y' \in M$. The same must be true of any other kernel $J_\zeta^\theta \in C^\infty(M \times M)$ satisfying (4.12), i.e. for each $y \in M$, they coincide a.e. $y' \in M$. Then smoothness implies they coincide everywhere, i.e. $J_\zeta^\theta = K_\zeta^\theta$.

(iv) To prove the semigroup identity, fix arbitrary $\zeta \in \Sigma_{\bar{\theta}}$ and $y, y' \in M$. As discussed in (iii) above, for any $z \in M : \kappa_{\zeta, z}^\theta(z')^* = K_\zeta^\theta(z, z')$ for a.e. $z' \in M$. Then, it is sufficient to prove that for $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \Sigma_{\bar{\theta}}$

$$\forall y, y' \in M : K_{\zeta_1 + \zeta_2}^\theta(y, y') = \left\langle \kappa_{\zeta_1, y}^\theta \mid \kappa_{\zeta_2^*, y'}^{\pi-\theta} \right\rangle_{L^2(M)}. \tag{4.25}$$

Indeed, from the definition of the kernel (4.21) and the computation (4.20), it is immediate that for each $y \in M$: $K_{\zeta_1+\zeta_2}^\theta(y, y') = \langle \kappa_{\zeta_1, y}^\theta | \kappa_{\zeta_2, y'}^{\pi-\theta} \rangle_{L^2(M)}$ a.e. $y' \in M$. However, both sides are smooth in $y' \in M$ by the above regularity results (4.23), (4.24), and hence are equal for all $y' \in M$. This proves (4.25), and hence the semigroup property.

(v) To see that for each $y' \in M$, $(\partial_\zeta - \Delta_{\theta, y})K_\zeta^\theta(y, y') = 0$ in $\Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}} \times M$, fix an arbitrary $\xi \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$ such that $\zeta - \xi \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$ and consider $f(\zeta, y) := \langle \kappa_{\zeta, y}^\theta | \kappa_{\xi, y'}^{\pi-\theta} \rangle_{L^2(M)} = (e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta} \kappa_{\xi, y'}^{\pi-\theta})(y)$. Then Theorem 4.1(i) implies $(\partial_\zeta - \Delta_\theta)f(\zeta, y) = 0$, and hence the same holds for $f(\zeta - \xi, y)$ since $\zeta - \xi \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\theta}}$. The semigroup identity (4.25) entails that

$$f(\zeta - \xi, y) = \langle \kappa_{\zeta - \xi, y}^\theta | \kappa_{\xi, y'}^{\pi-\theta} \rangle_{L^2(M)} = K_\zeta^\theta(y, y'), \quad (4.26)$$

yielding (4.15). Finally, the limit statement (4.16) is an immediate corollary of Theorem 4.1(iii), completing the proof. \blacksquare

5. Asymptotic expansion of diagonal Wick rotated heat kernel

Much of the computational uses of the heat kernel rest on it's asymptotic expansion for small diffusion time. The tabulated low order coefficients provide a shortcut to many otherwise difficult quantum field theoretical computations on curved backgrounds. The goal in the following is to establish Theorem 5.6, a generalization of this expansion for the Wick rotated heat kernel.

For the heat kernel proper the off-diagonal expansion is usually formulated in terms of the Synge function (one-half of the square of the geodesic distance). While the Synge function is a natural geometric quantity it is itself nontrivial to construct, both mathematically [7, 35] and computationally. In our Wick rotated setting the standard local existence proofs carry over straightforwardly only if the metric is assumed to be locally analytic. This is somewhat at odds with our framework and presumably also not a necessary assumption. We therefore postpone a detailed investigation of the Wick rotated Synge function to another occasion and proceed here along different lines. We begin by noting the correctly Wick rotated form of the Eikonal equation

$$\sigma_\theta(y, y') = \frac{ie^{-i\theta}}{2} g_\theta^{\mu\nu}(y) \partial_\mu \sigma_\theta \partial_\nu \sigma_\theta, \quad (5.1)$$

which characterizes the Synge function σ_θ subject to suitable boundary conditions. We omit a derivation as (5.1) will occur later as a byproduct of the ansatz for $K_\zeta^\theta(y, y')$ used. Note that (5.1) is not symmetric in y, y' while the solution aimed at is. The relevant boundary conditions are $\sigma_\theta(y, y) = 0$, $\nabla_\mu^\theta \nabla_\nu^\theta \sigma_\theta|_{y=y'} = -ie^{i\theta} g_{\mu\nu}^\theta$, where ∇_μ^θ is the metric connection build from g^θ . The usual construction reduces (for $\theta = 0, \pi/2$) the solution of (5.1) to the solution of the geodesic equation. In the present context this would require evaluation of the metric at complex arguments, which is ambiguous without local analyticity. In the following we instead use an explicitly constructable asymptotic solution.

Proposition 5.1. *Let g^θ be a Wick rotated smooth metric on M and fix a local chart $U \subset M$, which in local coordinates can be identified with an open subset of \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . For $y, y' \in U$ set $\mathcal{E}_\theta[\sigma](y, y') := \sigma(y, y') - \frac{i}{2} e^{-i\theta} g_\theta^{\mu\nu}(y) \partial_\mu \sigma \partial_\nu \sigma$, as well as $\Delta y^\mu := (y - y')^\mu$ and $|\Delta y| := (\delta_{\mu\nu} \Delta y^\mu \Delta y^\nu)^{1/2}$.*

(a) *Inserting the formal series*

$$\sigma_\theta(y, y') = -ie^{i\theta} \sum_{n \geq 2} \frac{1}{n!} s_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}(y) \Delta y^{\mu_1} \dots \Delta y^{\mu_n}, \quad (5.2)$$

into $\mathcal{E}_\theta[\sigma] \equiv 0$, the completely symmetric coefficients $s(y)$ are uniquely determined differential polynomials in $g_{\mu\nu}^\theta$ contracted with $g_\theta^{\rho\sigma}$ at y .

(b) *There exists a (possibly non-unique) smooth function $\tilde{\sigma}_\theta(y, y')$, which in a Δy expansion has Taylor coefficients $-ie^{i\theta} s_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}(y)$, such for all $N \geq 1$*

$$|\mathcal{E}_\theta[\tilde{\sigma}_\theta](y, y')| \leq C_N |\Delta y|^N, \quad (5.3)$$

for some constants $C_N > 0$ and all y, y' in an open neighborhood $V \subset U$.

(c) There exists θ dependent constants $0 < c_- \leq c_+ < \infty$ and an open neighborhood $V \subset U$ such that for all $y, y' \in V$

$$c_- |\Delta y|^2 \leq \operatorname{Re} \tilde{\sigma}_\theta(y, y') \leq c_+ |\Delta y|^2. \quad (5.4)$$

Proof. (a) Technically, it is convenient to insert an ansatz akin to (5.2) but with coefficients evaluated at y' into $\mathcal{E}[\sigma] = 0$. By comparing powers of Δy then only algebraic recursion relations arise. Moreover, these coefficients at y' are differential polynomials in $g_{\mu\nu}^\theta$ with at most $n - 2$ differentiations at order n , contracted with $g_\theta^{\rho\sigma}$. By Taylor expanding the coefficients at $y' = y - \Delta y$ around y the expansion (5.2) arises, where each $s(y)$ coefficient is a finite linear combination of the algebraically determined coefficients at y' .

(b) By the assumed smoothness of the metric there exist a precompact $V_1 \subset U$ such that $g_{\mu\nu}^\theta, g_\theta^{\mu\nu}$, and all its derivatives are bounded on V_1 . By (a) the coefficients $s(y)$ can be bounded in terms of the Taylor coefficients of the metric at y . For arbitrary $N \geq 2$, the remainders of the partial sums, $n \leq N - 1$, can thus be bounded by a constant times a $O(\Delta y^N)$ contraction. For some open $V \subset V_1$ this gives a bound $C_N |\Delta y|^N$, for all $y, y' \in V$. Borel's lemma then provides the existence of $\tilde{\sigma}_\theta$ satisfying (5.3).

(c) We fix again some precompact set $V_1 \subset U$ in which the components of $g_{\mu\nu}^\theta, g_\theta^{\mu\nu}$, and all derivatives thereof are bounded. Defining

$$\begin{aligned} c_- &:= \frac{1}{2} \inf_{y \in V_1} \inf_{\Delta y \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}, |\Delta y|=1} \operatorname{Re} \left(-ie^{i\theta} g_{\mu\nu}^\theta(y) \Delta y^\mu \Delta y^\nu \right), \\ c_+ &:= \frac{1}{2} \sup_{y \in V_1} \sup_{\Delta y \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}, |\Delta y|=1} \operatorname{Re} \left(-ie^{i\theta} g_{\mu\nu}^\theta(y) \Delta y^\mu \Delta y^\nu \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

one has $0 < c_- < c_+ < \infty$. The function $V_1 \times V_1 \ni (y, y') \mapsto \tilde{\sigma}_\theta(y, y') - c_- |\Delta y|^2$ is smooth and vanishes on the diagonal. By (a), (b) one also has $2\operatorname{Re} \tilde{\sigma}_\theta(y, y') = \operatorname{Re}(-ie^{i\theta} g_{\mu\nu}^\theta \Delta y^\mu \Delta y^\nu) + O(|\Delta y|^3)$ near the diagonal. It follows that $\operatorname{Re} \tilde{\sigma}_\theta(y, y') - c_- |\Delta y|^2 > 0$ in some open neighborhood of the diagonal in $V_1 \times V_1$. This implies that there is an open neighborhood $V \subset V_1$ such that $\operatorname{Re} \tilde{\sigma}_\theta(y, y') > c_- |\Delta y|^2$, for all $y, y' \in V$. The upper bound in the first equation of (5.4) is obtained analogously. \blacksquare

To low orders the coefficients read

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\mu_1 \mu_2} &= g_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^\theta, \quad s_{\mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3} = -\frac{3}{2} \partial_{\mu_1} g_{\mu_2 \mu_3}^\theta, \\ s_{\mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3 \mu_4} &= 2 \partial_{\mu_1} \partial_{\mu_2} g_{\mu_3 \mu_4}^\theta - \frac{1}{4} g_\theta^{\rho\sigma} \partial_\rho g_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^\theta \partial_\sigma g_{\mu_3 \mu_4}^\theta \\ &\quad + g_\theta^{\rho\sigma} \partial_\rho g_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^\theta \partial_{\mu_3} g_{\sigma \mu_4}^\theta - g_\theta^{\rho\sigma} \partial_{\mu_1} g_{\rho \mu_2}^\theta \partial_{\mu_3} g_{\sigma \mu_4}^\theta, \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

where symmetrization in all indices is understood. An analogous expansion exists with coefficients $\mathfrak{s}_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}$ evaluated at y' rather than y . A-posteriori one then finds $\mathfrak{s}_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n} = (-)^n s_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}$, $n \geq 2$, indicating that the directly computed coefficients are

compatible with the symmetry of the solution, $\sigma_\theta(y, y') = \sigma_\theta(y', y)$. For the present purposes symmetry of the truncated series (5.2) will not be needed. The following proposition summarizes a Wick rotated version of the usual starting point to establish the existence of an asymptotic expansion.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\sigma_\theta(y, y')$ be an exact, symmetric solution of the Eikonal equation (5.1). Then*

$$K_\zeta^\theta(y; y') = \frac{(-ie^{i\theta})^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}{(4\pi\zeta)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} e^{-\frac{1}{2\zeta}\sigma_\theta(y, y')} \sum_{n \geq 0} A_n^\theta(y, y') (ie^{-i\theta}\zeta)^n, \quad (5.7)$$

provides a formal solution to the heat equation $(\partial_\zeta - \Delta_\theta)K_\zeta^\theta = 0$, iff the coefficients A_n^θ satisfy

$$2g_\theta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\sigma_\theta\partial_\nu A_0^\theta + [\nabla_\theta^2\sigma_\theta + ie^{i\theta}(d+1)]A_0^\theta = 0, \quad (5.8)$$

$$2g_\theta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\sigma_\theta\partial_\nu A_{n+1}^\theta + \left[\nabla_\theta^2\sigma_\theta - \frac{ie^{i\theta}}{2}(2n+1-d)\right]A_{n+1}^\theta = -e^{2i\theta}\Delta_\theta A_n^\theta, \quad n \geq 0.$$

The overall normalization is fixed by $A_0(y, y) = 1$. Further, ∇_μ^θ is the metric connection associated with g^θ , and $\nabla_\theta^2 = g_\theta^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\mu^\theta\nabla_\nu^\theta$.

Proof. Direct substitution and comparing powers of ζ . ■

The recursion (5.8) generalizes the well-known one for the off-diagonal heat kernel coefficients A_n (see e.g. [18], Eq. 9.9a), and specializes to them for $\theta = \pi/2$. For Euclidean signature A_0 is expressible in terms of the Van Vleck-Morette determinant and the recursion can be solved via the method of characteristics. The construction masks the symmetry of the coefficients, which has to be established independently [34].

Even with the symmetry of the coefficients ensured, the Euclidean signature series in (5.7) may not be properly asymptotic to the exact heat kernel [34]. A complete and direct proof for the existence of a small time asymptotic expansion for the off-diagonal heat kernel has only been given recently in [32], building on [28]. The methodology in [32, 28] does not make use of the transport equations (5.8) and is therefore somewhat decoupled from the way the (Euclidean signature version of the) ansatz (5.7) enters computations. It is also not immediate that the methodology would carry over to the Wick rotated situation. Since in applications mostly the diagonal expansion is needed, we aim in the following only at a small ζ asymptotic expansion for the diagonal of our kernel $K_\zeta^\theta(y, y')$. By modifying a proof strategy proposed by Wald [47], and approximating the solutions of the transport equations via Proposition 5.1 a fairly elementary proof for the existence of the diagonal expansion can be given that retains contact to (5.7), (5.8). This is possible because we have independently established the existence of our kernel $K_\zeta^\theta(y, y')$ with the requisite properties. In contrast, the approaches [32, 28, 22, 47] aim at establishing the kernel's existence through a sequence of approximants that are asymptotic a-posteriori.

Local parametrix. For simplicity, we take the heat kernel time ζ in the following to be real (and positive) and comment on the extension of Theorem 5.6 below to $|\text{Arg}\zeta| < \tilde{\theta}$

at the end. Given an arbitrary $y_0 \in M$, an open chart neighborhood $U \ni y_0$, and a truncation order $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we initially consider a *local* parametrix defined in $U \times U$ of the form

$$F_\zeta(y, y') := \frac{(-ie^{i\theta})^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}{(4\pi\zeta)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} e^{-\frac{1}{2\zeta}s_\theta(y, y')} \sum_{n=0}^N A_n^\theta(y, y') (ie^{-i\theta}\zeta)^n. \quad (5.9)$$

Later on s_θ will be identified with the function $\tilde{\sigma}_\theta(y, y')$ from Proposition 5.1; for now we only need $s_\theta(y, y')$ to be jointly smooth in ζ, y, y' , for $y, y' \in U$ and such that $\text{Re } s_\theta > 0$ in a neighborhood of $y = y'$. Importantly, s_θ is neither necessarily symmetric nor a solution of the Eikonal equation (5.1). Similarly, the A_n^θ are initially only assumed to be smooth in $y, y' \in U$ and nonzero in a neighborhood of $y = y'$. To unclutter the notation we suppress the N and θ dependence in the notation.

To proceed, we act with the heat operator $\partial_\zeta - \Delta_\theta$ on (5.9). For convenience we recall the definitions, $\Delta_\theta = ie^{-i\theta}(\nabla_\theta^2 - V)$, $\nabla_\theta^2 = g_\theta^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\mu^\theta\nabla_\nu^\theta$. A straightforward computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} [\partial_\zeta - \Delta_{\theta, y}]F_\zeta(y, y') &= \frac{(-ie^{i\theta})^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}{(4\pi\zeta)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} e^{-\frac{1}{2\zeta}s_\theta(y, y')} \\ &\times \sum_{n=0}^N (ie^{-i\theta}\zeta)^n \left[\frac{X_n}{(ie^{-i\theta}\zeta)^2} + \frac{Y_n}{ie^{-i\theta}\zeta} + Z_n \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} X_n &= \frac{1}{2}(ie^{-i\theta})^2 \left(s_\theta - \frac{1}{2}ie^{-i\theta}g_\theta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu s_\theta\partial_\nu s_\theta \right) A_n^\theta, \\ Y_n &= \frac{1}{2}ie^{-i\theta} \left[(2n - (d+1))\mathbb{1} + \mathcal{L}(s_\theta) \right] A_n^\theta, \quad Z_n = -\Delta_\theta A_n^\theta, \\ \mathcal{L}(s_\theta) &= ie^{-i\theta}\nabla_\theta^2 s_\theta + 2ie^{-i\theta}g_\theta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu s_\theta\partial_\nu s_\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

The structure of the X_n term elucidates the origin of the Eikonal equation (5.1). Clearly, $X_n = 0$ for all $n \geq 0$ iff (for at least one nonzero $A_{n_0}^\theta$) $s_\theta = \sigma_\theta$ solves (5.1). Further, for $X_n = 0$, $n \geq 0$, the remaining terms in the second line reduce to $(ie^{-i\theta}\zeta)^N Z_N$ iff $Y_0 = 0$ and $Y_{n+1} + Z_n = 0$, $n = 0, \dots, N-1$. These vanishing conditions are precisely the $n = 0, \dots, N-1$ transport equations in (5.8).

The strategy used later on will be to impose *approximate* vanishing conditions for the X_n , $n \geq 0$, and $Y_{n+1} + Z_n$, $n = 0, \dots, N-1$, in an expansion in powers of Δy . This needs to be done in a way that is coordinated with the order of the expansion in ζ . To do so, we interpret (and eventually construct) the functions $s_\theta(y, y')$, $A_n^\theta(y, y')$, $F_\zeta(y, y')$ as truncated series in Δy with coefficients evaluated at y . Our convention throughout this section will be that the first argument indicates the base point at which the coefficients are evaluated, $f(y, y') = f(y) + f_\mu(y)\Delta y^\mu + O(|\Delta y|^2)$, etc.. The remainders in these expansions will be of $O(|\Delta y|^L)$, for suitable powers L . For the next steps, we assume

only that s_θ has a leading term given by the one fixed by Proposition 5.1, i.e.

$$s_\theta(y, y') = -\frac{i}{2}e^{i\theta}g_{\mu\nu}^\theta(y)\Delta y^\mu\Delta y^\nu + O(|\Delta y|^3), \quad (5.12)$$

that $A_n^\theta(y, y')$ is regular and nonzero as $|\Delta y| \rightarrow 0$, and in particular $A_0^\theta(y, y) = 1$. Before turning to the Δy expansion, we prepare a key property of the local parametrix. All function spaces occurring in the following are subspaces of $L^2(M)$ and $\|\cdot\|$ will always refer to the $L^2(M)$ norm.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $F_\zeta(y, y)$, $\zeta > 0$, be the local parametrix (5.9) defined in an open chart neighborhood U of the point $y_0 \in M$. Then there is a precompact open neighborhood $V \Subset U$ of y_0 such that :*

(a) *As a distribution on $C_c^\infty(V)$ test functions,*

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} F_\zeta(y, y') = |g|^{-1/2}(y) \delta(y - y'). \quad (5.13)$$

(b) *Let \mathbb{F}_ζ , $\zeta > 0$, be the integral operator on $L^2(V)$ defined by the kernel F_ζ . Then*

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} \|\mathbb{F}_\zeta \psi\| = \|\psi\|, \quad \psi \in L^2(V). \quad (5.14)$$

Proof. (a) It follows from (5.12) that y_0 has a precompact open neighborhood $V \Subset U$ where $|2s_\theta(y, y') + ie^{i\theta}g_{\mu\nu}^\theta(y)\Delta y^\mu\Delta y^\nu| < c_-|\Delta y|^2$, for all $y, y' \in V$. As in the proof of Proposition 5.1(c) this implies

$$\frac{c_-}{4}|\Delta y|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\zeta} \operatorname{Re} \left[s_\theta(y, y - \sqrt{\zeta}\Delta y) \right], \quad (5.15)$$

for all $y, y' \in V$, as needed shortly. We express (5.13) in terms of the integral operator \mathbb{F}_ζ with kernel $F_\zeta(y, y')$. Changing integration variables from y' to Δy , its action on a $C_c^\infty(V)$ function ψ can be written as

$$(\mathbb{F}_\zeta \psi)(y) = \frac{(-ie^{i\theta})^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}{(4\pi\zeta)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \sum_{n=0}^N (ie^{-i\theta}\zeta)^n \int d^{d+1}(\Delta y) f_{\zeta,n}(y, \Delta y), \quad (5.16)$$

$$f_{\zeta,n}(y, \Delta y) = |g|^{1/2}(y - \Delta y) e^{-\frac{1}{2\zeta}s_\theta(y, y - \Delta y)} A_n^\theta(y, y - \Delta y) \psi(y - \Delta y).$$

Next, we rescale the integration variable $\Delta y \mapsto \zeta^{1/2}\Delta y$. In the prefactor before the sum this cancels the $\zeta^{-\frac{d+1}{2}}$, leaving only non-negative ζ powers in front of the $d^{d+1}\Delta y$ measure. The precompactness of V entails that the integration ranges over a bounded domain, say $|\Delta y| \leq \delta$. After the rescaling one has $|\Delta y| \leq \delta/\sqrt{\zeta}$, so for $\zeta \rightarrow 0^+$ the integration will effectively extend over all of \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . Since the A_n^θ are smooth on $U \times U$, each may be bounded by its supremum over the precompact $V \times V$. Then (5.15) can be used to bound for each n the integrand by a constant times $\exp\{-c_-|\Delta y|^2/4\}$, which is

of course integrable. Applying dominated convergence the $\zeta \rightarrow 0^+$ limit can be brought inside the integral. Pointwise in Δy the n -th integrand converges to

$$|g|^{1/2}(y)A_n(y, y)\psi(y) \exp\left\{\frac{i}{4}e^{i\theta}g_{\mu\nu}^\theta(y)\Delta y^\mu\Delta y^\nu\right\}. \quad (5.17)$$

The $d^{d+1}\Delta y$ integral is a well-defined Gaussian, as $\theta \in (0, \pi)$. Performing it cancels the prefactors of the $\sum_{n=0}^N (ie^{-i\theta}\zeta)^n$ sum. When taking the $\zeta \rightarrow 0^+$ limit in (5.16) only the $n = 0$ term in the sum contributes and one arrives at $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} (\mathbb{F}_\zeta \psi)(y) = \psi(y)$, using $A_0^\theta(y, y) = 1$. This gives (5.13) as a distribution on $C_c^\infty(V)$ test functions.

(b) Using (5.16) and rescaling both difference integration variables gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int dy |g|^{1/2}(y) |\mathbb{F}_\zeta \psi|(y)^2 &= \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{d+1}} \sum_{m,n=0}^N \zeta^{n+m} \int d^{d+1}y |g|^{1/2}(y) \int d^{d+1}\Delta y \int d^{d+1}\Delta z \\ &\times f_{\zeta,m}(y, \sqrt{\zeta}\Delta z)^* f_{\zeta,n}(y, \sqrt{\zeta}\Delta y). \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

The integration in y extends over a bounded domain V , while after the rescaling the integration domain over the difference variables $\Delta y, \Delta z$ will tend to \mathbb{R}^{d+1} , as $\zeta \rightarrow 0^+$. Pointwise in $\Delta y, \Delta z$, the integrand converges for $\zeta \rightarrow 0^+$ to the product of (5.17) and a complex conjugate copy with $n \mapsto m, \Delta y \mapsto \Delta z$. By an argument analogous to that in the proof of part (a) above, the integrand is bounded for each n, m by a constant times

$$|g|^{1/2}(y)|\psi(y)|^2 \exp\{-c_-|\Delta y|^2/4\} \exp\{-c_-|\Delta z|^2/4\}. \quad (5.19)$$

This is because ψ has compact support, so for fixed y the $\psi(y - \sqrt{\zeta}\Delta y)$ term can be bounded by its finite supremum over $\Delta y \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, and similarly for $\psi(y - \sqrt{\zeta}\Delta z)^*$. Since the y integration domain is bounded the expression (5.19) is integrable with respect to the measure in (5.18). This allows one to bring the $\zeta \rightarrow 0^+$ limit inside the triple integral. Taking the $\zeta \rightarrow 0^+$ limit in (5.18) only the $n = m = 0$ term is nonzero and results in

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} \|\mathbb{F}_\zeta \psi\| = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{d+1}} \int d^{d+1}y |g|^{3/2}(y) |\psi(y)|^2 \left| \int d^{d+1}\Delta y e^{\frac{ie^{i\theta}}{4}g_{\mu\nu}^\theta(y)\Delta y^\mu\Delta y^\nu} \right|^2 \quad (5.20)$$

The modulus-square of the Gaussian integral evaluates to $(4\pi)^{d+1}/|g|(y)$, which yields (5.14). ■

Global parametrix. Later on we seek to compare the parametrix F_ζ to our globally defined kernel K_ζ . To this end an extension of the local parametrix (5.9) to all of $M \times M$ is needed; in particular, we want a parametrix that does not just vanish along the diagonal outside a compact region.

The extension is done using a partition of unity subordinate to a suitable open cover of $M \times M$. We have already shown through Lemma 5.3 that every point in M has an open chart neighborhood on which a local parametrix with properties (5.13), (5.14) can

be defined. Since M is assumed to have a countable topological base, it can be covered by countably many such open chart neighborhoods $(V_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$, where we may assume that no V_l is contained in any $V_{l'}$ for $l \neq l'$. In fact, we can assume that each point in M is contained in at most $d+2$ of the V_l 's. This is because on a (smooth, second countable) manifold the Lebesgue covering dimension coincides with the topological dimension. By construction, the charts are such that the local parametrices $F_\zeta^{(l)}(y, y')$, $y, y' \in V_l$, satisfy Lemma 5.3. Finally, since for fixed $\zeta > 0$ the $F_\zeta^{(l)}$ are smooth we may also assume the neighborhoods to be sufficiently small such that

$$\int_{V_l} d\mu(y') |F_\zeta^{(l)}(y, y')| \leq \frac{C}{(4\pi\zeta)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}}, \quad \int_{V_l} d\mu(y) |F_\zeta^{(l)}(y, y')| \leq \frac{C}{(4\pi\zeta)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}}, \quad (5.21)$$

for all $y \in V_l$, with a y and l independent constant $C > 0$.

The rectangular open neighborhoods $(V_l \times V_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ then cover the diagonal of $M \times M$. To get an open cover of $M \times M$ we augment this by $W := (M \times M) \setminus \text{diag}(M \times M)$. Since $\text{diag}(M \times M) \subset M \times M$ is closed, W is indeed open, and

$$\{W\} \cup \{V_l \times V_l\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}, \quad (5.22)$$

furnishes an open cover of $M \times M$. Then, there exists a locally finite partition of unity $(\chi_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ that is subordinate to this cover. Explicitly,

- (i) $\chi_l \in C^\infty(M \times M, [0, 1])$, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$.
- (ii) $\text{supp } \chi_0 \subset W$, and $\text{supp } \chi_l \subset V_l \times V_l$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (iii) Every point in $M \times M$ has an open neighborhood that intersects only finitely many of the $(\text{supp } \chi_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0}$. In particular, $\text{supp } \chi_l(y, \cdot)$ with $y \in M$ fixed is nonempty for at most $d+2$ of the $l \geq 1$.
- (iv) $\sum_{l=0}^\infty \chi_l = 1$ at every point in $M \times M$.

Using this partition of unity we define the global parametrix by

$$F_\zeta(y, y') = \sum_{l \geq 1} \chi_l(y, y') F_\zeta^{(l)}(y, y'), \quad y, y' \in M, \quad \zeta > 0, \quad (5.23)$$

where the $l=0$ term does not appear, as the parametrix ought to be localized around the diagonal. For simplicity we identify points $p, p' \in V_l$ with their coordinates $y = \varphi_l(p)$, $y' = \varphi_l(p')$, in the respective chart map φ_l . By a slight abuse of notation we extend this to all $p, p' \in M$, with the relevant chart maps and their consistent coordinatizations implicit. Note that for each (y, y') the sum over l is finite by property (iii) of the partition. For simplicity, we continue to write F_ζ for the resulting bi-scalar parametrix on $M \times M$. It is then jointly smooth in ζ, y, y' and nonzero in a neighborhood of the diagonal of $M \times M$. The diagonal $F_\zeta(y, y)$ is governed by the glued diagonal coefficients

$$A_n^\theta(y) := \sum_{l \geq 1} \chi_l(\varphi_l(p), \varphi_l(p)) (A_n^\theta)^{(l)}(\varphi_l(p), \varphi_l(p)), \quad (5.24)$$

where on the right hand side we indicated the chart maps. By the smoothness assumption these $A_n^\theta : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are globally defined. The main result needed is the global counterpart of Lemma 5.3.

Proposition 5.4. *The global parametrix (5.23) has the property (a) from Lemma 5.3 but now for $C_c^\infty(M)$ test functions. Likewise, property (b) from Lemma 5.3 holds, but now for all $\psi \in L^2(M)$.*

Proof. (a) Let $\psi \in C_c^\infty(M)$. Then $\text{supp } \psi$ intersects the support of only finitely many $\chi_l(y, \cdot) \in C^\infty(M, [0, 1])$. To see this, consider $\{y\} \times \text{supp } \psi \subset M \times M$, which can be covered by open neighborhoods that intersect only finitely many of the $\text{supp } \chi_l$ (by property (iii) of the partition). Since $\{y\} \times \text{supp } \psi \subset M \times M$, is compact, there exist a finite subcover of it by such neighborhoods. Hence $\text{supp } \psi$ only intersects finitely many $\chi_l(y, \cdot)$, as claimed, say $\chi_{l_1}(y, \cdot), \dots, \chi_{l_K}(y, \cdot)$.

To proceed, let \mathbb{F}_ζ be the integral operator whose kernel is the global parametrix (5.23). Its action on $\psi \in C_c^\infty(M)$ is given by

$$(\mathbb{F}_\zeta \psi)(y) = \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{V_{l_k}} d\mu_g(y') F_\zeta^{(l_k)}(y, y') \chi_{l_k}(y, y') \psi(y'), \quad (5.25)$$

using $\text{supp } \chi_{l_k}(y, \cdot) \subset V_{l_k}$. Note in particular, that the image has compact support as well: $\mathbb{F}_\zeta \psi \in C_c^\infty(M)$ for $\psi \in C_c^\infty(M)$. Since each $\chi_l(y, \cdot) \in C_c^\infty(V_l)$, Lemma 5.3(a) is applicable to each term in the sum (5.25), giving

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} (\mathbb{F}_\zeta \psi)(y) = \sum_{k=1}^K \chi_{l_k}(y, y) \psi(y). \quad (5.26)$$

By property (iv) of the partition of unity, the sum over all χ_l is 1, pointwise in $M \times M$. However, as seen above, among all χ_l 's only the $\chi_{l_1}, \dots, \chi_{l_K}$, are potentially supported at (y, y) with $y \in \text{supp } \psi$. Further, $\chi_0(y, y) = 0$ as $(y, y) \in \text{diag}(M \times M)$. Thus, $1 = \sum_{l=0}^\infty \chi_l(y, y) = \sum_{k=1}^K \chi_{l_k}(y, y)$, which gives the assertion (a).

(b) We first use Holmgren's criterion ([30], p.176) to show that (5.23) defines a bounded integral operator $\mathbb{F}_\zeta : L^2(M) \rightarrow L^2(M)$. According to the criterion, a sufficient condition for this to be the case is that

$$\sup_{y \in M} \int d\mu_g(y') |F_\zeta(y, y')| < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{y' \in M} \int d\mu_g(y) |F_\zeta(y, y')| < \infty, \quad (5.27)$$

where F_ζ is the global parametrix (5.23). We start with the first condition and insert (5.23) to find

$$\int d\mu_g(y') |F_\zeta(y, y')| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{d+2} \int_{V_{l_k}} d\mu_g(y') \chi_{l_k}(y, y') |F_\zeta^{(l_k)}(y, y')|. \quad (5.28)$$

Initially, the sum extends over all $l \geq 1$. However, for any fixed y the second part of property (iii) ensures that at most $d+2$ open sets $V_{l_k}, k = 1, \dots, d+2$, contribute. By

definition of the χ_l , $l \neq 0$, the support of $\chi_{l_k}(y, y')$ is contained in $V_{l_k} \times V_{l_k}$, even as y' varies. This gives (5.28). Finally, using property (5.21) the right hand side of (5.28) can be bounded by $C(d+2)(4\pi\zeta)^{-\frac{d+1}{2}}$, for a y and l_k independent constant C . This gives the first bound in (5.27) for each fixed $\zeta > 0$. The flipped version is obtained similarly. This shows that $\mathbb{F}_\zeta : L^2(M) \rightarrow L^2(M)$ is a bounded operator, for all $\zeta > 0$.

Next, consider the explicit form of $\|\mathbb{F}_\zeta\psi\|^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int d\mu_g(y) |(\mathbb{F}_\zeta\psi)(y)|^2 &= \int d\mu_g(y) \int d\mu_g(y_1) \int d\mu_g(y_2) \\ &\times \sum_{l,m \geq 1} \chi_l(y, y_1) \chi_m(y, y_2) F_\zeta^{(l)}(y, y_1) F_\zeta^{(m)}(y, y_2)^* \psi(y_1) \psi(y_2)^*. \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

Anticipating that it is legitimate to take the $\zeta \rightarrow 0^+$ limit inside the integral one has

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} \int d\mu_g(y) |(\mathbb{F}_\zeta\psi)(y)|^2 = \int d\mu_g(y) \left(\sum_{l \geq 1} \chi_l(y, y) \right)^2 |\psi(y)|^2 = \|\psi\|^2. \quad (5.30)$$

In the penultimate step we used that the $l = 0$ term does not contribute to the partition of unity on the diagonal.

It remains to justify that the limit can be taken inside the integrals. To this end we initially take $\psi \in C_c^\infty(M)$. By the reasoning before (5.25) then a variant of (5.29) arises with finite sums and integrals over compact domains. Specifically, the integrand reads

$$I(y, y_1, y_2) = \sum_{k,m=1}^K \chi_{l_k}(y, y_1) \chi_{l_m}(y, y_2) F_\zeta^{(l_k)}(y, y_1) F_\zeta^{(l_m)}(y, y_2) \psi(y_1) \psi(y_2)^*. \quad (5.31)$$

Here, χ_{l_k} has support in $V_{l_k} \times V_{l_k}$ and χ_{l_m} has support in $V_{l_m} \times V_{l_m}$, which forces y in the (k, l) -th term to lie in the intersection $V_{l_k} \cap V_{l_m}$. In order to take the limit $\zeta \rightarrow 0^+$ inside the triple integral $d\mu(y)d\mu(y_1)d\mu(y_2)$ with integrand (5.31) we show that I can be bounded by an integrable function. As in the proof of Lemma 5.3a we use $|F_\zeta^{(l_k)}(y, y')| \leq C_y^{(l_k)} \exp\{-\frac{c_-}{4}|y-y'|^2\}$, for some constants $C_y^{(l_k)}$. We can bound the χ_{l_k} by 1 to obtain

$$|I(y, y_1, y_2)| \leq C_y \left(e^{-\frac{c_-}{4}|y-y_1|^2} \psi(y_1) \right) \left(e^{-\frac{c_-}{4}|y-y_2|^2} \psi(y_2) \right)^*. \quad (5.32)$$

Since the domain of the y integration is also compact (given by the union of the $V_{l_k} \cap V_{l_m}$) the right hand side is integrable with respect to $d\mu(y)d\mu(y_1)d\mu(y_2)$ with integrand (5.31). This justifies the step leading to (5.30) for all $\psi \in C_c^\infty(M)$.

Finally, we use the fact that $C_c^\infty(M)$ is dense in $L^2(M)$. That is, for a given $\psi \in L^2(M)$ there exists a sequence ψ_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$ of $C_c^\infty(M)$ functions such that $\|\psi_n - \psi\| \rightarrow 0$, $n \rightarrow \infty$. We know that $\mathbb{F}_\zeta\psi_n \in C_c^\infty(M)$ for all n and $\mathbb{F}_\zeta\psi \in L^2(M)$. Since by the first part \mathbb{F}_ζ is a bounded operator on $L^2(M)$ also $\|\mathbb{F}_\zeta\psi_n - \mathbb{F}_\zeta\psi\| \rightarrow 0$, $n \rightarrow \infty$ holds. \blacksquare

Bounding the difference kernel. We now use the global parametrix $F_\zeta(y, y')$ to define a global remainder function $R_\zeta(y, y') := (\partial_\zeta - \Delta_{\theta, y})F_\zeta(y, y')$, that is jointly smooth in ζ, y, y' . Adapting the strategy in [47] we define in terms of it

$$Q_\zeta(y, y') := \int_0^\zeta d\zeta' \int d\mu_g(z) K_{\zeta-\zeta'}^\theta(y, z) R_{\zeta'}(z, y'). \quad (5.33)$$

By ∂_ζ differentiation of (5.33) one finds

$$\partial_\zeta(F_\zeta - Q_\zeta)(y, y') = \Delta_{\theta, y}(F_\zeta - Q_\zeta)(y, y'), \quad (5.34)$$

using the heat equation for $\partial_\zeta K_{\zeta-\zeta'}^\theta$ and the definition of R_ζ . The difference kernel $(F_\zeta - Q_\zeta)(y, y')$ therefore satisfies the same heat equation as $K_\zeta^\theta(y, y')$. Since Q_ζ manifestly vanishes for $\zeta \rightarrow 0^+$ and F_ζ obeys (5.13) by Proposition 5.4, the difference is also a fundamental solution to the heat equation.

We wish to conclude that $F_\zeta - Q_\zeta$ therefore coincides with K_ζ . Note, however, that on a noncompact manifold a fundamental solution even to the standard heat equation is not necessarily unique. In order to utilize the results from Section 4 we associate an integral operator to the difference kernel, defining for $\psi \in L^2(M)$

$$((\mathbb{F}_\zeta - \mathbb{Q}_\zeta)\psi)(y) := \int d\mu_g(y') (F_\zeta - Q_\zeta)(y, y') \psi(y'), \quad \zeta > 0. \quad (5.35)$$

As seen above, the image solves the heat equation $(\partial_\zeta - \Delta_\theta)(\mathbb{F}_\zeta - \mathbb{Q}_\zeta)\psi = 0$ for all $\psi \in L^2(M)$. Further,

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} \|(\mathbb{F}_\zeta - \mathbb{Q}_\zeta)\psi\| = \|\psi\|, \quad \psi \in L^2(M). \quad (5.36)$$

To see this, we first note that $\mathbb{F}_\zeta\psi$ and $\mathbb{Q}_\zeta\psi$ are separately in $L^2(M)$. For $\mathbb{F}_\zeta\psi$ this was established before; for $\mathbb{Q}_\zeta\psi$ we use the definition and Cauchy-Schwarz to write

$$\int d\mu(y) |(\mathbb{Q}_\zeta\psi)(y)|^2 \leq \left(\int_0^\zeta d\zeta' \|e^{(\zeta-\zeta')\Delta_\theta} \psi_{\zeta'}\| \right)^2, \quad (5.37)$$

where $\psi_\zeta(z) := \int d\mu_g(y') R_\zeta(z, y') \psi(y')$. Clearly, $\mathbb{Q}_\zeta\psi \in L^2(M)$ if $\psi_\zeta \in L^2(M)$, where the latter is easily seen. To proceed, we anticipate the (much stronger and independently established) Lemma 5.5 and the ensued bounds on R_ζ . Based on this, it can be shown that $[0, \zeta] \ni \zeta' \mapsto \|e^{(\zeta-\zeta')\Delta_\theta} \psi_{\zeta'}\|$ is bounded as $\zeta \rightarrow 0^+$. This implies $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} \|\mathbb{Q}_\zeta\psi\| = 0$. The triangle inequality $\|(\mathbb{F}_\zeta - \mathbb{Q}_\zeta)\psi\| - \|\mathbb{F}_\zeta\psi\| \leq \|\mathbb{Q}_\zeta\psi\|$ and (5.30) then give the assertion (5.36).

On the other hand, we know that $(\Delta_\theta, D(\Delta_\theta))$ generates a strongly continuous semigroup, $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni \zeta \mapsto e^{\zeta\Delta_\theta}$, on $L^2(M)$. As such the solution of the initial value problem

$\partial_\zeta \psi(\zeta) - \Delta_\theta \psi(\zeta) = 0$ with $\psi(0) = \psi \in L^2(M)$, is unique; see, Ch. II, Prop. 6.4 of [15]. Hence, the semigroups $\mathbb{F}_\zeta - \mathbb{Q}_\zeta$ and $e^{\zeta \Delta_\theta}$ coincide. By Theorem 4.2(iii) this implies that their kernels coincide as well, i.e.

$$K_\zeta^\theta(y, y') - F_\zeta(y, y') = Q_\zeta(y, y'). \quad (5.38)$$

To complete the proof we now seek to bound Q_ζ appropriately. Since Q_ζ is defined in terms of R_ζ this amounts to rendering R_ζ ‘small’. So far, mostly the very broad properties for s_θ and A_n^θ mentioned after (5.12) entered, and R_ζ will just be given by the expression (5.10). We now identify s_θ with $\tilde{\sigma}_\theta$ from Proposition 5.1 and make for $A_n^\theta(y, y')$ an ansatz in powers of Δy to an appropriate order and adjust the coefficients so as to render all but the term proportional to $(ie^{-i\theta}\zeta)^N Z_N$ on the right hand side of (5.10) ‘small’. The appropriate requirement is

$$\begin{aligned} X_n &= O(|\Delta y|^{2N+8}), \quad n \geq 0, \quad Y_0 = O(|\Delta y|^{2N+6}), \\ Y_{n+1} + Z_n &= O(|\Delta y|^{2N+4}), \quad n = 0, \dots, N-1, \end{aligned} \quad (5.39)$$

where N is the expansion order in ζ .

We formulate the instrumental fact as a Lemma but postpone its proof.

Lemma 5.5. *For $(y, y') \in V \times V$, some open chart neighborhood of the diagonal in $M \times M$, let $s_\theta(y, y') = \tilde{\sigma}_\theta(y, y')$ be given by Proposition 5.1 and consider its suitably truncated Taylor expansion. Then, in a polynomial ansatz for $A_n^\theta(y, y')$, $n = 0, \dots, N$, to a suitable N -dependent order in Δy , the coefficients can be adjusted such that the conditions (5.39) hold, for any given $N \geq (d+1)/2$. The adjustment only requires the solution of decoupled linear equations. In particular, the resulting diagonal coefficients $A_n^\theta(y, y)$ are scalar differential polynomials in $g_{\mu\nu}^\theta$ that are smooth in y .*

Based on this Lemma we can bound the failure of F_ζ to furnish a solution of the heat equation. Recall the global remainder function $R_\zeta(y, y') = (\partial_\zeta - \Delta_{\theta, y})F_\zeta(y, y')$, which may be expressed in terms of local remainders $R_\zeta^{(l)}(y, y')$ through the partition of unity analogously to (5.23). Both are clearly jointly smooth in ζ, y, y' for all $\zeta > 0$. From (5.10) and Lemma 5.5 one has

$$R_\zeta^{(l)}(y, y') = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2\zeta}\tilde{\sigma}_\theta(y, y')}}{\zeta^{\frac{d+1}{2}+2}} \left[\Delta y^{2N+4} A(y, \zeta) + \zeta^{N+2} B(y, y') \right]. \quad (5.40)$$

Here the first term arises from the approximate vanishing of the $n = 0, \dots, N-1$ terms in (5.10), and the second term is the $n = N$ contribution proportional to Z_N .

Next, it is convenient to reexpress (5.33) in the form

$$Q_\zeta(y, y') = \int_0^\zeta d\zeta' \left(e^{(\zeta-\zeta')\Delta_\theta} \psi_{\zeta', y'} \right)(y), \quad (5.41)$$

where $\psi_{\zeta', y'}(z) = R_{\zeta'}(z, y')$ is for fixed ζ', y' smooth and of compact support in z , and also the dependence on ζ', y' is smooth. The integrand may be given a pointwise bound (in y, y') as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |(e^{(\zeta-\zeta')\Delta_\theta}\psi_{\zeta', y'})(y)| &\leq B_y \sum_{j=0}^{\sigma_0} \|\Delta_\theta^j e^{(\zeta-\zeta')\Delta_\theta}\psi_{\zeta', y'}\| = B_y \sum_{j=0}^{\sigma_0} \|e^{(\zeta-\zeta')\Delta_\theta}\Delta_\theta^j\psi_{\zeta', y'}\| \\ &\leq B_y \sum_{j=0}^{\sigma_0} \|\Delta_\theta^j\psi_{\zeta', y'}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.42)$$

Here, the first inequality follows from the Sobolev embedding theorem along the lines of the computation in (4.10), and σ_0 is the smallest integer greater than $(d+1)/4$. In the second step we commute the operator Δ_θ through the semigroup, and in the final inequality we use the contractivity of the semigroup.

Thus, it remains to bound the $\|\Delta_\theta^j\psi_{\zeta', y'}\|$ in (5.42). To this end we make use of the fact that (by the Lebesgue covering dimension) for each y' only $d+2$ local parametrices contribute to the right hand side of (5.42). It is therefore sufficient to find a bound for only a single local parametrix. To obtain $\Delta_\theta^j\psi_{\zeta', y'}$ we need to operate with Δ_θ^j (acting on y) on (5.40). The structure of Δ_θ^j can be inferred from (5.57) below, it contains between $2j$ and j partial derivatives. Each derivative acting on the exponential prefactor in (5.40) brings down a power of ζ^{-1} . Each derivative acting on the term in square brackets produces a term where the order of Δy is reduced and others. After rescaling of the difference variable $\Delta y = \sqrt{\zeta}z$ this results in a structure of the following form

$$\Delta_{\theta, y}^j R_\zeta(y, y') \Big|_{\Delta y \rightarrow \sqrt{\zeta}z} = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2\zeta}\tilde{\sigma}_\theta(y, y - \sqrt{\zeta}z)}}{\zeta^{\frac{d+1}{2}+2}} \zeta^{N+2-2j} P_\zeta^{(j)}(y, z), \quad (5.43)$$

where $P_\zeta^{(j)}(y, z)$ is a polynomial in z of degree $2N+4$ and also a polynomial in ζ . This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_\theta^j\psi_{\zeta, y'}\|^2 &= \int d^{d+1}y |g|^{1/2}(y) |\Delta_\theta^j R_\zeta(y, y')|^2 \\ &= \zeta^{2N-4j-(d+1)} \int d^{d+1}y e^{-\frac{1}{\zeta}\tilde{\sigma}_\theta(y, y - \Delta y)} |g|^{1/2}(y) |P_\zeta^{(j)}(y, \Delta y/\sqrt{\zeta})|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.44)$$

The cutoff functions in the partition of unity entail that this integral is over a compact domain, for which we may take $|y - y'| < \delta$. We can bound the y -dependence in the non-exponential factors by its supremum in this ball and write $\tilde{P}^{(j)}(\Delta y/\sqrt{\zeta})$ for the resulting function of the difference variable. The exponential can be bounded by $\exp\{-c_-|\Delta y|^2/(2\zeta)\}$, using (5.15). The integrand is then a function of Δy only and one can change integration variables to $z = \Delta y/\sqrt{\zeta}$. This yields

$$\|\Delta_\theta^j\psi_{\zeta, y'}\|^2 \leq \zeta^{2N-4j-\frac{d+1}{2}} \int d^{d+1}z e^{-\frac{c_-}{2}|z|^2} \tilde{P}_\zeta^{(j)}(z). \quad (5.45)$$

After the rescaling the integral is effectively over the ball $0 < \sqrt{\zeta}|z| < \delta$. For small ζ this forces $|z|$ to be large and we can obtain an upper bound by extending the integration domain to \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . This gives a sum of (polynomially modified) Gaussians in z with a polynomial ζ dependence. Performing them results in a polynomial in ζ (with non-vanishing constant term), which for $0 < \zeta < 1$ can be bounded by a constant. The upshot is that there exist a $C(\delta) > 0$ such that

$$\|\Delta_\theta^j \psi_{\zeta, y'}\| \leq C(\delta) \zeta^{N-2j-\frac{d+1}{4}}. \quad (5.46)$$

Finally, with (5.42) one obtains upon performing the $d\zeta'$ integral in the bound obtained from (5.41)

$$|Q_\zeta(y, y')| \leq C_y \zeta^{N+1-2\sigma_0-\frac{d+1}{4}}. \quad (5.47)$$

Used in (5.38), we arrive at the following result: *for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y \in M$, for $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ there is a constant $C_{y, N}$ such that*

$$|K_\zeta^\theta(y, y) - F_\zeta^N(y, y)| \leq C_{y, N} \zeta^{N+1-c} \quad (5.48)$$

for $c = 2\sigma_0 + (d+1)/2 > 0$. Here, we specialized to the diagonal $y = y'$, and denote the the truncation order of the parametrix by a superscript N .

For an asymptotic expansion proper, one seeks to have the remainder of the same order as the first term omitted in the parametrix ansatz. This can be achieved by the following adjustment. Pick an integer $N_0 < N$ and note

$$F_\zeta^N(y, y) = F_\zeta^{N_0}(y, y) + \frac{1}{(4\pi\zeta)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \left\{ A_{N_0+1}^\theta(y) \zeta^{N_0+1} + \dots + A_N^\theta(y) \zeta^N \right\}. \quad (5.49)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |K_\zeta^\theta(y, y) - F_\zeta^{N_0}(y, y)| &\leq |K_\zeta^\theta(y, y) - F_\zeta^N(y, y)| + |F_\zeta^N(y, y) - F_\zeta^{N_0}(y, y)| \\ &\leq C_{y, N} \zeta^{N_0+1-(c-(N-N_0))} + D_y \zeta^{N_0+1-\frac{d+1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.50)$$

The second term dominates when $(N - N_0) + (d+1)/2 > c$; with $c = 2\sigma_0 + (d+1)/2 > 0$ and σ_0 the smallest integer greater than $(d+1)/4$, this can clearly be realized for any given d by adjusting $N - N_0$. This establishes:

Theorem 5.6. *The diagonal of the kernel K_ζ^θ from Theorem 4.2 admits an asymptotic expansion of the form*

$$K_\zeta^\theta(y, y) \asymp \frac{(-ie^{i\theta})^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}{(4\pi\zeta)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \sum_{n \geq 0} A_n^\theta(y) (ie^{-i\theta}\zeta)^n, \quad (5.51)$$

i.e. for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y \in M$

$$(4\pi\zeta)^{\frac{d+1}{2}} K_\zeta^\theta(y, y) - (-ie^{i\theta})^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \sum_{n=0}^N A_n^\theta(y) (ie^{-i\theta}\zeta)^n = O(\zeta^{N+1}) \quad (5.52)$$

as $\zeta \rightarrow 0^+$. Here the coefficients $A_n^\theta(y)$ from (5.24) are in each chart map related to the standard heat kernel coefficients by a lapse Wick rotation.

Remarks.

(i) The assertion about the coefficients is a by-product of the proof of Lemma 5.5. Indeed, the proof will show in particular that in each local chart the $A_{n,0}$ terms in the polynomial ansatz for $A_n^{c_n}$ below in (5.53) are uniquely determined differential polynomials in the metric g^θ and its inverse. Since the X_n, Y_n, Z_n coefficients (5.11) determining them are $N \mapsto ie^{-i\theta}N$ Wick rotations of their Euclidean signature counterparts and only algebraic manipulations are invoked, the solutions $A_{n,0}$ likewise must be the $N \mapsto ie^{-i\theta}N$ Wick rotations of the standard diagonal heat kernel coefficients. In the special case when for given p the $(A_n^\theta)^{(l)}(\varphi_l(p), \varphi_l(p))$ are l -independent, i.e. a single chart suffices, the expression (5.24) reduces to the expected $A_n^\theta(y, y)$ in that chart.

(ii) The result remains valid for complex ζ in the wedge $|\text{Arg}(\zeta)| < \tilde{\theta}$, where the left hand side is defined by Theorem 4.2. The right hand side is up to a $ie^{-i\theta}$ prefactor only a function of $|\zeta|$ and $\theta - \text{Arg}(\zeta)$, while the asymptoticity refers to $|\zeta|$. With some additional work one can also trace the validity of the individual steps in the proof.

Proof of Lemma 5.5. We use power series ansätze of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
 s^L(y', y) &= -ie^{i\theta} \sum_{l=2}^{L-1} \frac{1}{l!} s_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_l}(y') \Delta y^{\mu_1} \dots \Delta y^{\mu_l}, \\
 A_n^{c_n}(y', y) &= \sum_{k=0}^{c_n-1} \frac{1}{k!} A_{n, \nu_1 \dots \nu_k}(y') \Delta y^{\nu_1} \dots \Delta y^{\nu_k}, \tag{5.53}
 \end{aligned}$$

where the orders L and c_n will be functions of N (the truncation order in ζ) to be determined. The correction terms in (5.53) are understood to be of order Δy^L and Δy^{c_n} , respectively. The base point y' is chosen so that the partial derivatives $\partial_\mu = \partial/\partial y^\mu$ only act on the Δy products. To unclutter the notation we indicate the order in Δy directly by the number of indices, writing $A_{n, \nu_1 \dots \nu_k}(y')$ for $A_{n, \nu_1 \dots \nu_k}^{(k)}(y')$ and $A_{n,0}(y')$ for $A_n^{(0)}(y')$.

Starting with the X_0 condition in (5.39) it is plain that if the coefficients s_{μ_1, \dots, μ_l} , $l = 2, \dots, L-1$ are adjusted as in Proposition 5.1 the remainder in the Eikonal equation will be of order $|\Delta y|^L$. For this to be of order $|\Delta y|^{2N+8}$ we take

$$L = 2N + 8, \tag{5.54}$$

from here on. Note that this does not constrain $A_0^{c_0}$. Moreover, the same $L = 2N+8$ Sygne function approximant s^L will render all X_n , $n \geq 1$, also $O(|\Delta y|^{2N+4+d_0})$ without constraining the $A_n^{c_n}$ ansatz. Since this is one or two orders higher than the requirement in the other two conditions in (5.39) the latter reduce to

$$Y_0 = O(|\Delta y|^{2N+6}), \quad Y_{n+1} + Z_n = O(|\Delta y|^{2N+4}), \quad n = 0, \dots, N-1. \tag{5.55}$$

In the following we regard s^L with $L = 2N + 8$ as a known function and seek to determine the coefficients in the $A_n^{c_n}$ ansätze such that (5.55) holds. Irrespective of the details, both conditions will have an expansion in powers of Δy . Consistency with $L = 2N + 8$ requires that the order $c_n - 1$ of the polynomials used must not exceed $2N + 6$, see (5.59).

For Y_0 one needs to take into account that $A_{0,0} = 1$; so the ansatz for $A_0^{c_0}$ only contains $c_0 - 1$ free parameter functions. On the other hand, an explicit computation (detailed below) shows that the constant term in Y_0 vanishes, so that only positive powers of Δy occur, $Y_0 = \sum_{p=1}^{c_0-1} (\Delta y)^p Y_{0,p} + O(|\Delta y|^{c_0})$. In the absence of any coincidental cancellations the coefficients $Y_{0,p}$, $p = 1, \dots, 2N + 5$, will have to be made to vanish so as to render the result of order $|\Delta y|^{2N+6}$. Taking $c_0 = 2N + 6$ the ansatz for $A_0^{c_0}$ contains $2N + 5$ free parameter functions for $2N + 5$ linear conditions to be met. A closer inspection shows that only linear, decoupled relations arise, which fix the coefficients uniquely.

For $n \geq 1$, the Z_{n-1} term in (5.55) is determined by $A_{n-1}^{c_{n-1}}$ and thus constitutes an inhomogeneity known from the preceding order. The condition $Y_n + Z_{n-1} = O(|\Delta y|^{2N+4})$ thus should determine the c_n parameters in $A_n^{c_n}$. Assuming $c_n \leq c_{n-1}$ the expansion will produce a series of the form $\sum_{p=0}^{c_n-1} (\Delta y)^p (Y_{n,p} - Z_{n-1,p})$, so that the coefficients $p = 0, \dots, 2N + 3$ have to vanish in order to meet the condition. Taking $c_n = 2N + 4$ matches the number of parameters to the number of conditions. Again, the conditions turn out to be linear and decoupled so that the parameters are uniquely fixed.

In summary, the choice

$$c_0 = 2N + 6, \quad c_n = 2N + 4, \quad n \geq 1, \quad (5.56)$$

will uniquely determine the parameters in the ansätze, provided the expansion of the Y_n , $n \geq 0$, terms has an appropriate structure.

We prepare

$$\nabla_\theta^2 = g_\theta^{\mu\nu}(y) \nabla_\mu^\theta \nabla_\nu^\theta = g_\theta^{\mu\nu}(y) \partial_\mu \partial_\nu + \gamma_\theta^\mu(y) \partial_\mu, \quad \gamma_\theta^\mu := |g|^{-1/2} \partial_\nu (|g|^{1/2} g_\theta^{\nu\mu}), \quad (5.57)$$

where again the θ -independent density $|g|^{1/2}$ enters. For $\mathcal{L}(s^L)$ from (5.11) this gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(s^L) &= g_\theta^{\mu\nu}(y) g_{\mu\nu}^\theta(y') + \sum_{l=1}^{L-3} \frac{1}{l!} \Delta y^{\mu_1} \dots \Delta y^{\mu_l} \left[g_\theta^{\mu\nu}(y) s_{\mu\nu\mu_1 \dots \mu_l}(y') \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \gamma_\theta^\mu(y) s_{\mu\mu_1 \dots \mu_l}(y') + 2g_\theta^{\mu\nu}(y) s_{\mu\mu_1 \dots \mu_l}(y') \partial_\nu \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(L-2)!} \Delta y^{\mu_1} \dots \Delta y^{\mu_{L-2}} \left[\gamma_\theta^\mu(y) s_{\mu\mu_1 \dots \mu_{L-2}}(y') + 2g_\theta^{\mu\nu}(y) s_{\mu\nu\mu_1 \dots \mu_{L-2}}(y') \partial_\nu \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.58)$$

One could now expand the coefficient functions evaluated at $y' = y - \Delta y$ around y to obtain a local first order linear differential operator. For our purposes it is better to expand the coefficients at $y = y' + \Delta y$ around y' . This gives an expression of the form

$$\mathcal{L}(s^L) = d+1 + \sum_{l=1}^{L-2} \Delta y^{\mu_1} \dots \Delta y^{\mu_l} \left[d_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_l}(y') + e_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_l}^\nu(y') \partial_\nu \right] + O(\Delta y^{L-1}), \quad (5.59)$$

where the explicit form of the coefficients is readily inferred from (5.58). From here the structure of the Y_n terms follows. Collecting terms of the same order in Δy one finds

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta y^0 &: 2nA_{n,0} \\
\Delta y^1 &: [2n\delta_{\mu_1}^\nu + e_{\mu_1}^\nu]A_{n,\nu} + d_{\mu_1}A_{n,0}, \\
\Delta y^p &: \vartheta(c_n - 1 - p) \left\{ \left[\frac{2n}{p!} \delta_{\mu_1}^\nu + \frac{1}{(p-1)!} e_{\mu_1}^\nu \right] A_{n,\nu\mu_2\dots\mu_p} + \right. \\
&+ \frac{1}{(p-2)!} e_{\mu_1\mu_2}^\nu A_{n,\nu\mu_3\dots\mu_p} + \dots + \frac{1}{1!} e_{\mu_1\dots\mu_{p-1}}^\nu A_{n,\nu\mu_p} \vartheta(L-p) \\
&+ \left. \frac{1}{(p-1)!} d_{\mu_1} A_{n,\mu_2\dots\mu_p} + \frac{1}{(p-2)!} d_{\mu_1\mu_2} A_{n,\mu_3\dots\mu_p} + \dots + \frac{1}{1!} d_{\mu_1\dots\mu_{p-1}} A_{n,\mu_p} \vartheta(L-1-p) \right\} \\
&+ d_{\mu_1\dots\mu_p} A_{n,0} \vartheta(L-2-p) + e_{\mu_1\dots\mu_p}^\nu A_{n,\nu} \vartheta(L-1-p).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.60}$$

In the last relation $p \geq 2$ and we use $\vartheta(x) = 1, x \geq 0, \vartheta(x) = 0, x < 0$, to transcribe the range of the original sums. Each order in Δy will give rise to one condition constraining the coefficients in $A_n^{c_n}$. For $n=0$ there are $2N+5$ free coefficients in $A_0^{c_0}$, with $c_0 = 2N+6$. The vanishing of the $p = 1, \dots, p_{\max}$, relations will match the number of parameters for $p_{\max} = 2N + 5$. The overall step function in the Δy^p condition will then always be unity. With $L = 2N + 6$ also the L -dependent step function is just 1. The same happens for $n \geq 1$. By (5.56) there are $2N + 4$ coefficients and the step functions limit the validity of the given expression to $p \leq p_{\max} = 2N + 3$. Hence, the $2N + 4$ coefficients in the ansatz for A_n^{2N} are subjected to as many equations. Further, for $L = 2N + 6$ the L dependent step function is always unity. In summary, with the choices (5.54), (5.56) the relations (5.60) have all step functions evaluate to 1.

The expressions (5.60) clearly have a triangular structure, the $A_{n,\nu\mu_2\dots\mu_p}$ coefficient with p indices occurs only once and is contracted with a matrix indicated in square brackets. This matrix is always non-singular and is in fact a multiple of the unit matrix. Indeed, returning to (5.58) one reads off $e_{\mu_1}^\nu = 2g_{\theta}^{\nu\mu}(y')s_{\mu\mu_1}(y') = 2\delta_{\mu_1}^\nu$. The other terms in the Δy^p expression have $A_{n,\#}$ coefficients with a smaller number of indices, which suggests an iterative procedure to impose the conditions (5.55).

For $n = 0$ the vanishing of the $\Delta y^p, p = 1, \dots, 2N + 5$, expressions in (5.60) indeed determines the coefficients $A_{0,\nu}, A_{0,\nu\mu_2}, \dots, A_{0,\nu,\mu_2\dots\mu_{2N+1}}$, iteratively. For $n \geq 1$, we solve the relations $Y_n = -Z_{n-1} + O(|\Delta y|^{2N})$, inductively in n . Since $-Z_{n-1}$ is determined by the $A_{n-1}^{c_{n-1}}$ coefficients, the right hand side is known as a polynomial in Δy from the preceding order. Equating its coefficients to the ones on (5.60) again leads to a system triangular in p , which determines the coefficients $A_{n,\nu}, A_{n,\nu\mu_2}, \dots, A_{n,\nu\mu_2\dots\mu_{2N-1}}$, uniquely. ■

6. Schrödinger evolution group from the $\theta \rightarrow 0^+$ limit

The Wick rotated heat semigroup is well-defined in the near Lorentzian regime, as long as $\theta > 0$. In this section, we study the strict Lorentzian limit $\theta \rightarrow 0^+$, where the properties change qualitatively. Based on the form (3.14) of the generator Δ_θ , one might hope that in some sense a unitary Schrödinger group will arise in the limit. The following theorem specifies a sense in which this indeed holds.

Theorem 6.1. *Let (M, g_-) be a globally hyperbolic manifold and assume that the operator $\mathcal{D}_- = -\nabla_-^2 + V$ is essentially self-adjoint on $C_c^\infty(M)$, i.e., its closure $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-$ is self-adjoint. Then for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ there is the limiting behavior*

$$e^{s\Delta_\theta} \xrightarrow{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} e^{-is\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-}, \quad e^{s\Delta_{\pi-\theta}} \xrightarrow{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} e^{+is\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-}, \quad (6.1)$$

converging with respect to the ultra-weak (or weak-star) topology on $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))$. Here $e^{-is\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-}$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, is the one-parameter unitary group generated by $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-$.

We recall that $(\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M)), \|\cdot\|_{\text{op}})$ is the Banach space of continuous endomorphisms on $L^2(M)$, while the ultra-weak topology on $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))$ is the weak-star topology arising from its pre-dual, the Banach space of trace-class operators $\mathfrak{B}_1(L^2(M))$ equipped with the trace norm. We shall also need the product topological space $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$, where each component $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))$ is endowed with the ultra-weak topology. The product topology for an uncountable product is defined as follows. Starting with a family $(X_s)_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ of topological spaces, the product space $\prod_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} X_s$ (also denoted $X^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ when all $X_s \equiv X$, as is the case here) is the set of all functions $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \bigcup_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} X_s$ such that $\forall s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : f(s) \in X_s$. Then, the canonical base for the product topology consists of sets of the form $\prod_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \mathcal{V}_s$, with each $\mathcal{V}_s \subseteq X_s$ open, and $\mathcal{V}_s = X_s$ for all but *finitely many* $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

Throughout this section, we use the notation

$$\forall s \geq 0, \theta \in (0, \pi) : \quad T(s, \theta) := e^{s\Delta_\theta}. \quad (6.2)$$

Clearly, for each $\theta \in (0, \pi)$, $T(\cdot, \theta) \in \mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$.

We begin by preparing the following lemmas.⁵

Lemma 6.2. *Let (M, g_-) be a globally hyperbolic manifold and $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ as above. Regarding $((0, \pi), \preceq)$ as a directed set with ordering*

$$\theta_1 \preceq \theta_2 \iff \theta_1 \geq \theta_2, \quad \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in (0, \pi), \quad (6.3)$$

the family $(T(\cdot, \theta))_{\theta \in (0, \pi)}$ is a net in $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$. Then:

- (i) *There exists a subnet $(T(\cdot, \theta_\alpha))_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$, and a strongly continuous family of contractive operators $T(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ such that $T(0) = \mathbb{1}$, and $T(\cdot, \theta_\alpha) \xrightarrow{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} T(\cdot)$ wrt.*

⁵We are grateful to K. Taira for discussions related to Lemma 6.3 below.

the product topology on $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$. In particular, this implies component-wise convergence,

$$\forall s \geq 0 : \quad T(s, \theta_\alpha) \xrightarrow{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} T(s) \quad (6.4)$$

in the ultra-weak topology on $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))$.

(ii) Consider for each $u \in C_c^\infty(M)$ the mapping

$$\forall s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : \quad \mathbf{u}(s) := T(s)u. \quad (6.5)$$

Then $\mathbf{u} \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, L^2(M)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}_{> 0}, L^2(M))$, and is a distributional solution to the Schrödinger equation for each $w \in C_c^\infty(M)$, i.e.

$$\langle w | d_s \mathbf{u}(s) \rangle_{L^2(M)} + \langle i\mathcal{D}_- w | \mathbf{u}(s) \rangle_{L^2(M)} = 0, \quad s > 0, \quad (6.6)$$

with initial condition $\mathbf{u}(0) = u$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let (M, g_-) be a globally hyperbolic manifold and assume that the operator $\mathcal{D}_- = -\nabla_-^2 + V$ is essentially self-adjoint on $C_c^\infty(M)$. Then the distributional solution $\mathfrak{f} \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, L^2(M)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}_{> 0}, L^2(M))$ to the Schrödinger equation*

$$d_s \mathfrak{f}(s) + i\mathcal{D}_-^* \mathfrak{f}(s) = 0, \quad s > 0, \quad (6.7)$$

with initial condition $\mathfrak{f}(0) = f \in C_c^\infty(M)$ has a unique solution, namely $\mathfrak{f}(s) = e^{-is\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-} f$, where $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-$ is the (unique, self-adjoint) closure of $(\mathcal{D}_-, C_c^\infty(M))$.

The proof of Lemma 6.3 is omitted, referring to Ch.VI Theorem 1.7 of [4].

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Consider from Lemma 6.2 the subnet $(T(\cdot, \theta_\alpha))_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ and its limit $T(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$. For every $u \in C_c^\infty(M)$, it follows from (6.5), (6.6) that $\mathbf{u}(s) := T(s)u$ is a solution to (6.7) with initial condition $\mathbf{u}(0) = u$. This solution is unique by Lemma 6.3, and hence $\forall s \geq 0 : T(s)u = e^{-is\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-} u$. Thus, the action of the families $(T(s))_{s \geq 0}$ and $(e^{-is\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-})_{s \geq 0}$ coincide on $C_c^\infty(M)$. Since $C_c^\infty(M)$ is dense in $L^2(M)$, it follows immediately that the families are identical, and so

$$\forall s \geq 0 : \quad T(s, \theta_\alpha) \xrightarrow{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} e^{-is\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-}, \quad (6.8)$$

in the ultra-weak topology on $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))$.

Next, consider an arbitrary subnet $(T(\cdot, \theta_\beta))_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}}$ of the net $(T(\cdot, \theta))_{\theta \in (0, \pi)}$ in $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$. By the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 6.2 below, it follows that there is a sub-subnet $(T(\cdot, \theta_{\beta(\kappa)}))_{\kappa \in \mathcal{K}}$ converging to a $\tilde{T}(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ in the product topology. This limit $\tilde{T}(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ has the same properties as the $T(\cdot)$ from Lemma 6.2; in particular $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(s) := \tilde{T}(s)u$, for $u \in C_c^\infty(M)$, solves the differential equation (6.7) with initial condition u . As above, this implies that $\forall s \geq 0 : \tilde{T}(s) = e^{-is\overline{\mathcal{D}}_-}$.

Having shown that every subnet of $(T(\cdot, \theta))_{\theta \in (0, \pi)}$ has a further sub-subnet that converges to $(e^{-is\overline{\mathcal{D}}^-})_{s \geq 0}$, it follows⁶ that the original net converges to the same, i.e. $T(\cdot, \theta) \xrightarrow{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} e^{-is\overline{\mathcal{D}}^-}$ in the product topology. This entails component-wise convergence, i.e.,

$$\forall s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : T(s, \theta) = e^{s\Delta_\theta} \xrightarrow{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} e^{-is\overline{\mathcal{D}}^-}, \quad (6.9)$$

in the ultra-weak topology of $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))$, completing the proof. \blacksquare

It remains to prove Lemma 6.2.

Proof of Lemma 6.2.

(i) Since for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\theta \in (0, \pi)$: $\|T(s, \theta)\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$, it follows that $(T(\cdot, \theta))_{\theta \in (0, \pi)}$ is a net in the product topological space $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$, with \mathcal{B} the norm-closed unit ball of $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))$ equipped with the (relative) ultra-weak topology inherited from $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))$. Since $\mathfrak{B}(L^2(M))$ is the dual of the space of trace-class operators $\mathfrak{B}_1(L^2(M))$, \mathcal{B} is compact in the ultra-weak topology by the Banach-Alaoglu theorem, and hence $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ is compact in the product topology (Tychonoff's theorem). Compactness then entails that there is a subnet $(T(\cdot, \theta_\alpha))_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ converging to $T(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ in the product topology, which in particular implies the component-wise convergence

$$\forall s \geq 0 : T(s, \theta_\alpha) \xrightarrow{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} T(s), \quad (6.10)$$

in the ultra-weak topology on \mathcal{B} , from which (6.4) follows immediately.

(ii) To proceed, fix arbitrary $S > 0$ and $u \in C_c^\infty(M)$, and consider the family $(\mathbf{u}(s, \theta))_{\substack{s \in [0, S] \\ \theta \in (0, \pi)}}$ in $L^2(M)$, defined by

$$\mathbf{u}(s, \theta) := T(s, \theta)u. \quad (6.11)$$

It is clear that for any fixed $\theta \in (0, \pi)$, $\mathbf{u}(\cdot, \theta) \in C([0, S], L^2(M)) \cap C^\infty((0, S), L^2(M))$, and in particular for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$d_s^k(\mathbf{u}(s, \theta)) = (\Delta_\theta)^k T(s, \theta)u = T(s, \theta)(\Delta_\theta)^k u, \quad (6.12)$$

leading to the bound

$$\left\| d_s^k(\mathbf{u}(s, \theta)) \right\|_{L^2(M)} = \left\| T(s, \theta)(\Delta_\theta)^k u \right\|_{L^2(M)} \leq \left\| (\Delta_\theta)^k u \right\|_{L^2(M)} \leq c_k(u). \quad (6.13)$$

Here $c_k(u) > 0$ is a constant depending on $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u \in C_c^\infty(M)$, but independent of $\theta \in (0, \pi)$, and the final bound in (6.13) follows since Δ_θ acts classically on $u \in C_c^\infty(M)$.

⁶The proof of this statement for nets is essentially the same as the proof of the corresponding result for sequences. Indeed, if the original net did not converge, then there would be an open neighborhood V of the (sub-subnet) limit point and a subnet that lives in the complement of V . Then, this subnet cannot have a further sub-subnet that converges to the limit point, a contradiction.

It then follows that for each $\theta \in (0, \pi)$, $\mathbf{u}(\cdot, \theta) \in H^2([0, S], L^2(M))$, the Bochner-space of $L^2(M)$ valued Sobolev functions on $[0, S]$, which is in particular a Hilbert space.⁷ Moreover, the result (6.13) implies that there is a constant $C_2(u) > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\theta \in (0, \pi)} \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot, \theta)\|_{H^2([0, S], L^2(M))} \leq C_2(u), \quad (6.14)$$

where the H^2 -norm is defined by

$$\|\mathfrak{h}\|_{H^2([0, S], L^2(M))}^2 := \sum_{j=0}^2 \int_0^S ds \left\| d_s^j \mathfrak{h}(s) \right\|_{L^2(M)}^2. \quad (6.15)$$

Returning now to the subnet $(T(\cdot, \theta_\alpha))_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ from earlier in the proof, it follows from (6.14) that $(\mathbf{u}(\cdot, \theta_\alpha))_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ is a net contained in the H^2 -norm-closed ball of radius $C_2(u)$. Since $H^2([0, S], L^2(M))$ is a Hilbert space, this ball is weakly compact, and hence $(\mathbf{u}(\cdot, \theta_\alpha))_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ has a subnet $(\mathbf{u}(\cdot, \theta_{\alpha(\beta)}))_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}}$ converging weakly to $\mathbf{u}(\cdot) \in H^2([0, S], L^2(M))$. By Sobolev embedding (Theorem 2 of Chapter 5.9.2 of [16]), $\mathbf{u}(\cdot)$ has a $C([0, S], L^2(M)) \cap C^1((0, S), L^2(M))$ representative, which we continue to denote by $\mathbf{u}(\cdot)$. A further consequence of Sobolev embedding is that for any $w \in L^2(M)$ and $s \in [0, S]$, the mapping

$$H^2([0, S], L^2(M)) \ni \mathfrak{h} \mapsto \langle w | \mathfrak{h}(s) \rangle_{L^2(M)} \in \mathbb{C} \quad (6.16)$$

is an element of the dual space $H^2([0, S], L^2(M))^*$. Then, the weak convergence of the subnet $(\mathbf{u}(\cdot, \theta_{\alpha(\beta)}))_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}}$ above entails that for each $s \in [0, S]$ and $w \in L^2(M)$,

$$\left\langle w \mid \mathbf{u}(s, \theta_{\alpha(\beta)}) \right\rangle_{L^2(M)} = \left\langle w \mid T(s, \theta_{\alpha(\beta)})u \right\rangle_{L^2(M)} \xrightarrow{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \langle w | \mathbf{u}(s) \rangle_{L^2(M)}. \quad (6.17)$$

However, the ultra-weak convergence (6.10) of the subnet $(T(\cdot, \theta_\alpha))_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ when restricted to the above sub-subnet $(T(\cdot, \theta_{\alpha(\beta)}))_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}}$ implies

$$\left\langle w \mid T(s, \theta_{\alpha(\beta)})u \right\rangle_{L^2(M)} \xrightarrow{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \langle w | T(s)u \rangle_{L^2(M)}. \quad (6.18)$$

Since $w \in L^2(M)$ is arbitrary, comparing (6.17) and (6.18) yields

$$\forall s \in [0, S]: \quad \mathbf{u}(s) = T(s)u, \quad (6.19)$$

and hence $T(\cdot)u \in C([0, S], L^2(M)) \cap C^1((0, S), L^2(M))$. Finally, it follows from the density of $C_c^\infty(M) \subseteq L^2(M)$ (and since $S > 0$ is arbitrary) that the family of operators $(T(s))_{s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ is strongly continuous.

To complete the proof of Lemma 6.2, it only remains to be shown that $\mathbf{u}(s) = T(s)u$ solves the distributional Schrödinger equation (6.6). To that end, we return to the weakly converging subnet $(\mathbf{u}(\cdot, \theta_{\alpha(\beta)}))_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}}$ in $H^2([0, S], L^2(M))$. Fixing an arbitrary $w \in C_c^\infty(M)$, clearly

$$\left\langle w \mid \left(\partial_s - \Delta_{\theta_{\alpha(\beta)}} \right) \mathbf{u}(s, \theta_{\alpha(\beta)}) \right\rangle_{L^2(M)} = 0, \quad s \in (0, S). \quad (6.20)$$

⁷We refer to [50, 26] for textbook accounts of Bochner integration, and to [16] for a discussion of the associated Sobolev spaces.

On the other-hand, by Sobolev embedding and weak convergence in $H^2([0, S], L^2(M))$,

$$\langle w \mid \partial_s \mathbf{u}(s, \theta_{\alpha(\beta)}) \rangle_{L^2(M)} = \langle w \mid d_s \mathbf{u}(s, \theta_{\alpha(\beta)}) \rangle_{L^2(M)} \xrightarrow{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \langle w \mid d_s \mathbf{u}(s) \rangle_{L^2(M)} , \quad (6.21)$$

$$\langle w \mid \Delta_{\theta_{\alpha(\beta)}} \mathbf{u}(s, \theta_{\alpha(\beta)}) \rangle_{L^2(M)} = \langle \Delta_{\pi - \theta_{\alpha(\beta)}} w \mid \mathbf{u}(s, \theta_{\alpha(\beta)}) \rangle_{L^2(M)} \xrightarrow{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \langle i\mathcal{D}_- w \mid \mathbf{u}(s) \rangle_{L^2(M)} ,$$

and hence

$$\langle w \mid d_s \mathbf{u}(s) \rangle_{L^2(M)} + \langle i\mathcal{D}_- w \mid \mathbf{u}(s) \rangle_{L^2(M)} = 0 , \quad s \in (0, S) , \quad (6.22)$$

with initial condition $\mathbf{u}(0) = u$. Since $S > 0$ is arbitrary, it follows that $\mathbf{u}(s) = T(s)u$ indeed solves the distributional Schrödinger equation (6.6) with initial condition $\mathbf{u}(0) = u$. \blacksquare

7. Conclusions

A Wick rotation in the lapse, rather than in time, has been introduced for real manifolds admitting a co-dimension one foliation. The definition refers to a fiducial foliation, but covariance under foliation changing diffeomorphisms is ensured. Further, the interpolating complex metrics are admissible in the sense of [29] in a foliation independent sense. In this setting a Wick rotated heat semi-group was constructed and studied in some detail. The main results obtained are summarized in the introductory tabulation. Here we mention some further directions.

The most immediate extension is to non-scalar Laplacians, in particular of Lichnerowicz type. For Euclidean signature the associated heat semigroups are widely used to investigate the quantum theory of gauge fields and gravity, often in combination with the non-perturbative Functional Renormalization Group [39, 40, 42]. We see no principle obstruction to such a generalization, which would allow one to explore the near Lorentzian regime of such computations in an apples-to-apples comparison. The widely used de Sitter background may serve as a test case.

In practice, such computations utilize mainly the coefficients appearing in a small semigroup time asymptotic expansion of the kernel's diagonal, as developed here. Nevertheless, the existence of an asymptotic expansion for the off-diagonal Wick rotated heat kernel would be of considerable interest. Although the existence of an off-diagonal expansion can presumably be established along the lines of [28, 22, 32] without reference to the Synge function, the formulas for the coefficients are normally expressed in terms of it. It would therefore be desirable to establish existence results for the lapse-Wick rotated Synge function under weak assumptions on the metric. A related issue left unexplored here are generalizations of the known exact heat kernel bounds [10, 23], usually formulated in terms of the Synge function.

The generalized Laplace transform of the Wick rotated heat kernel's off-diagonal expansion relates to a Wick rotated Hadamard parametrix, and the difference to the exact

induced Wick rotated Green's function may be expected to code 'state dependent' aspects. Here the strict Lorentzian limit warrants further investigation, particularly the relation to boundary values of the Lorentzian Hessian's resolvent and associated Feynman propagator [13, 14]. One of the relevant questions then being whether or not the $\theta \rightarrow 0^+$ limit of the Wick-rotated Hessian's resolvent singles out a Green's function, and if this is associated to a positive quantum state [2, 8].

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank N. Viet Dang, J. Dereziński, I. Khavkine, A. Strohmaier, R. Verch, A. Vasy, and M. Wrochna for their interest and helpful discussions at various stages of this work. Additionally, we are grateful to K. Taira and C. J. Lennard for suggestions on the proof strategy in Section 6. R.B. thanks the Erwin Schrödinger Institute in Vienna for hospitality during the 'Spectral Theory and Mathematical Relativity' thematic program, and the Institute Henri Poincaré for hospitality during the 'Quantum and classical fields interacting with geometry' thematic program, where parts of this work were completed and many stimulating discussions took place. The authors acknowledge support of the Institute Henri Poincaré (UAR 839 CNRS-Sorbonne Université), and LabEx CARMIN (ANR-10-LABX-59-01).

A. Foliation geometry

In this appendix we set our notation and collect a few basic notions of foliation geometry in relation to foliation changing diffeomorphisms, as needed in the main text. Throughout M is a $1+d$ dimensional topological manifold (locally Euclidean and Hausdorff) that is: smooth, connected, orientable, 2^{nd} countable, and without boundary. We allow it to be noncompact.

Equivalent foliations. No metric structure is assumed in this part. A *co-dimension-one foliation* of M is a collection $\{\Sigma_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ of connected disjoint subsets of M such that: (i) $M = \cup_{\alpha \in A} \Sigma_\alpha$, and (ii) every point in M has a neighborhood U and a system of local coordinates $y = (y^0, y^1, \dots, y^d) : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{1+d}$, such that for each leaf Σ_α , if $\Sigma_\alpha \cap U \neq \emptyset$, then its local coordinate image is a $y^0 = \text{const.}$ slice of the chart range. Such a (non-unique) coordinate system is said to be *adapted to the foliation*. Criteria for a manifold to admit such a structure can be found in [44] and the references therein. Here we assume that M admits a co-dimension-one foliation given by the level sets of a smooth submersion $T : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (in particular $dT \neq 0$ everywhere).⁸ The foliation can then be parameterized as $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t \in I}$, $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is the range of T , and $\Sigma_t := T^{-1}(\{t\})$; by slight abuse of notation we sometimes denote such a foliation as $I \ni t \mapsto \Sigma_t$. Every leaf is a d -dimensional embedded hypersurface, and we further assume that all leaves Σ_t arise from embeddings of a single d -dimensional manifold Σ . It follows readily from the implicit function theorem and the non-vanishing of the differential dT that each $p \in M$ has a chart neighborhood U such that in local coordinates $\Sigma_t \cap U$ (if non-empty) consists of the points (t, y^1, \dots, y^d) in the chart range. Such adapted coordinates are not unique. If y and y' are two such coordinate systems defined on an open set $U \subset M$, then both are related by a diffeomorphism of the form $y'^0 = \chi^0(y^0), y'^a = \chi^a(y) = \chi^a(t, x)$, $a = 1, \dots, d$. By the implicit function theorem we also view $x^\alpha(y)$ to be locally known and such that $\tilde{y}^\alpha = y^\alpha(t(\tilde{y}), x(\tilde{y}))$, for all \tilde{y}^α . Here and below we often write $y^\alpha, \alpha = 0, 1, \dots, d$, for $y = (y^0, y^a)$.

Two foliations $I \ni t \mapsto \Sigma_t$, and $I' \ni t' \mapsto \Sigma'_{t'}$, defined on M are called *equivalent* if there is a diffeomorphism sending the leaves of one into the leaves of the other. For simplicity we consider only smooth, orientation preserving diffeomorphisms $\chi : M \rightarrow M$ in the component of the identity, that reduce to the identity outside a compact set. They form a group with respect to composition. Sequences of diffeomorphisms and the concomitant topological considerations will not enter. For short, we just write $\text{Diff}(M)$ for the resulting group of diffeomorphisms.

In local charts, we identify points with their coordinates, and write alternatively $\chi(y)$ and y' for the image point of $y \in U$. The differential $T_y \chi$ maps the tangent space at y into the one at y' and is written as $\partial y'^\alpha / \partial y^\gamma$. Similarly, for the inverse $\chi^{-1} : U' \rightarrow U$, the image of $y' \in U'$ is written alternatively as $\chi^{-1}(y')$ and y . For the differentials one has $T_{y'} \chi^{-1} = [T_y \chi]^{-1}$. In the $1+d$ decomposition we write χ^0, χ^a and $(\chi^{-1})^0, (\chi^{-1})^a$ for the projections of χ and χ^{-1} onto an adapted coordinate basis, and whenever

⁸In metric geometry T corresponds to a temporal function and the associated foliations are vorticity-free, see Section A.2.

unambiguous we abbreviate those as t' , x'^a and t , x^a , respectively. In this notation a generic $\chi \in \text{Diff}(M)$ changes both the leaves of the foliation and the coordinatization of the hypersurfaces:

$$t \mapsto \Sigma_t \text{ is mapped into } t' \mapsto \Sigma'_{t'} \text{ by } t' = \chi^0(t, x), x'^a = \chi^a(t, x). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

By the above definition two such foliations are equivalent. However, the adapted coordinates of one are not adapted to the other. This is to be contrasted with the subgroup $\text{Diff}(\{\Sigma\}) \subset \text{Diff}(M)$ of *foliation preserving diffeomorphisms*

$$\chi \in \text{Diff}(\{\Sigma\}) \text{ iff } t' = \chi^0(t), x'^a = \chi^a(t, x), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

with $\chi^0(t_i) = t_i$, $\chi^0(t_f) = t_f$. As noted before, this is the maximal subgroup that maps adapted coordinates of a given foliation into each other; merely the labeling of the leaves and their coordinatization changes. The Jacobian matrix in the $1+d$ decomposition is then upper triangular. We reserve the notation $\text{Diff}(\Sigma)$ for the subgroup of t independent diffeomorphisms $x'^a = \chi^a(x)$ of Σ .

Block decomposition of $1+d$ diffeomorphisms. The diffeomorphisms in $1+d$ form of course still form a group under concatenation. Concatenating $(t', x'^a) = (\chi^0(t, x), \chi^a(t, x))$ with $(t'', x''^a) = (\chi'^0(t', x'), \chi'^a(t', x'))$ gives $(t'', x''^a) = ((\chi' \circ \chi)^0(t, x), (\chi' \circ \chi)^a(t, x))$, where $(\chi' \circ \chi)^0(t, x) = \chi'^0(\chi^0(t, x), \chi^a(t, x))$ and $(\chi' \circ \chi)^a(t, x) = \chi'^a(\chi^0(t, x), \chi^a(t, x))$. The defining relations for the inverse χ^{-1} of χ therefore are $(\chi^{-1})^0(\chi^0(t, x), \chi^a(t, x)) = t$, $(\chi^{-1})^a(\chi^0(t, x), \chi^a(t, x)) = x^a$. In general, the temporal or spatial component of χ^{-1} also depends on the spatial or temporal component of χ . An exception are diffeomorphisms trivial in one component, $(t, x^a) \mapsto (\chi^0(t, x), x^a)$ or $(t, x^a) \mapsto (t, \chi^a(t, x))$, where the inverses depend only parametrically on x^a or t , respectively.

Next, consider the composition of the differentials. Written in $1+d$ block form one has

$$\frac{\partial y^\gamma}{\partial y'^\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial t}{\partial t'} & \frac{\partial x^c}{\partial t'} \\ \frac{\partial t}{\partial x'^a} & \frac{\partial x^c}{\partial x'^a} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \frac{\partial y'^\alpha}{\partial y^\gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial t} & \frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial t} \\ \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} & \frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial x^c} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The chain rule $(\partial y'^\gamma / \partial y^\beta)(\partial y''^\alpha / \partial y'^\gamma) = (\partial y''^\alpha / \partial y^\beta)$ decomposes into blocks according to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial t''}{\partial t} &= \frac{\partial t''}{\partial t'} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial t''}{\partial x'^c} \frac{\partial x'^c}{\partial t}, \\ \frac{\partial x''^a}{\partial t} &= \frac{\partial x''^a}{\partial t'} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial x''^a}{\partial x'^c} \frac{\partial x'^c}{\partial t}, \\ \frac{\partial t''}{\partial x^b} &= \frac{\partial t''}{\partial t'} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^b} + \frac{\partial t''}{\partial x'^c} \frac{\partial x'^c}{\partial x^b}, \\ \frac{\partial x''^a}{\partial x^b} &= \frac{\partial x''^a}{\partial t'} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^b} + \frac{\partial x''^a}{\partial x'^c} \frac{\partial x'^c}{\partial x^b}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

As a consequence the familiar inversion formula for the full Jacobian matrices (A.3) does not project to the blocks. Systematically one would want to express the components of $\partial y^\alpha/\partial y'^\beta$ in terms of the components of $\partial y'^\alpha/\partial y^\beta$. To do so we specialize (A.4) to coinciding initial and final variables and swap the role of the primed and the unprimed fields. Combining the resulting equations pairwise gives

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial x^c}{\partial x'^b} \left(\frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial x^c} - \left(\frac{\partial t'}{\partial t} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial t} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} \right) &= \delta_b^a, \\ \frac{\partial x^c}{\partial t'} \left(\frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial x^c} - \left(\frac{\partial t'}{\partial t} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial t} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c} \right) &= - \left(\frac{\partial t'}{\partial t} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial x'^a}{\partial t}.\end{aligned}\tag{A.5}$$

The inverse of the matrix in brackets can be expressed in terms of the matrix inverse of $\partial x'^a/\partial x^b$ via the formula for rank one perturbations (Sherman-Morrison). Writing Y_b^a for the result the desired inversion formulas read

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial x^a}{\partial x'^b} &= Y_b^a, \\ \frac{\partial x^a}{\partial t'} &= - \left(\frac{\partial t'}{\partial t} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial x'^b}{\partial t} Y_b^a, \\ \frac{\partial t}{\partial t'} &= \left(\frac{\partial t'}{\partial t} \right)^{-1} + \left(\frac{\partial t'}{\partial t} \right)^{-2} \frac{\partial x'^d}{\partial t} Y_d^c \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c}, \\ \frac{\partial t}{\partial x'^a} &= - \left(\frac{\partial t'}{\partial t} \right)^{-1} Y_a^c \frac{\partial t'}{\partial x^c}.\end{aligned}\tag{A.6}$$

In general all components mix under inversion. Upper or lower block diagonal Jacobian matrices remain so, as required. Only for direct product diffeomorphism $t' = \chi^0(t)$, $x'^a = \chi^a(x)$ does (A.6) reduce to the simple variants $\partial x^a/\partial x'^b = [(\partial x'/\partial x)^{-1}]_b^a$, $\partial t/\partial t' = (\partial t'/\partial t)^{-1}$, directly entailed by the implicit function theorem.

In summary, the differentials $T_y\chi$ and $T_{y'}\chi^{-1} = [T_y\chi]^{-1}$ of a generic diffeomorphisms $\chi \in \text{Diff}(M)$, admit a block decomposition whose composition and inverse is governed by the relations (A.4) and (A.6). The advantage of this crude decomposition is that no metric structure is required.

Metric geometry of the foliations. We now assume that the manifold M is in addition equipped with both a Lorentzian and a Riemannian metric g , which we take to be smooth and similar to $(\epsilon_g, +, \dots, +)$, $\epsilon_g = \mp 1$. For Lorentzian signature global hyperbolicity of (M, g) is the instrumental condition. It ensures the existence of smooth time functions, the attainability of the $N^a = 0$ gauge, and that the leaves of the foliation are Cauchy surfaces [5]. Systematic expositions of the Lorentzian $1 + d$ projection formalism in metric geometry can be found in many textbooks, see e.g. [21]. A *temporal function* in this context is a smooth function $T : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with a timelike past pointing gradient dT , interpreted as a one-form $dT = (\partial T/\partial y^\alpha) dy^\alpha$. Importantly, any globally hyperbolic spacetime admits a temporal function such that any level surface $\Sigma_t = \{y \in M \mid T(y) = t\}$ is a Cauchy surface [5]. For Riemannian metrics we shall

continue to use the term ‘temporal function’ for a smooth function T with a nowhere vanishing gradient. To fix the notation and to highlight the dependence on the signature parameter $\epsilon_g \in \{\mp 1\}$, we display the main relations of the (Arnowitt-Deser-Misner) ADM formalism.

For a fixed temporal function T and the associated foliation $I \ni t \mapsto \Sigma_t$, one may identify T with t and write $\partial_\alpha t$ for the components of dT . In terms of them we set

$$g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha t \partial_\beta t =: \epsilon_g N^{-2}, \quad m^\alpha := \epsilon_g N^2 g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta t. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

The first equation defines the lapse N , the second defines a vector conjugate to the temporal gradient, $m^\alpha \partial_\alpha t = 1$. Note that N is scalar and m^α a vector as long as T is held fixed. Further $m^\alpha \partial_\alpha$ has unit coefficient along ∂_t and

$$m^\alpha \partial_\alpha = \partial_t - N^a \partial_a, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

defines the shift N^a . In terms of $m^\alpha, \partial_\alpha t$ projectors tangential and transversal to the leaves of the foliation are defined by

$$\Sigma_\alpha^\beta := \delta_\alpha^\beta - \partial_\alpha t m^\beta, \quad T_\alpha^\beta := \partial_\alpha t m^\beta. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

We write $g_{\alpha\beta} := \Sigma_\alpha^\delta \Sigma_\beta^\gamma g_{\delta\gamma}$ for the induced metric on Σ_t . Since $m^\alpha \Sigma_\alpha^\beta = 0$, the natural derivative transversal to the leaves of the foliation is $e_0 := \mathcal{L}_m = \partial_t - \mathcal{L}_{\vec{N}}$, where $\mathcal{L}_{\vec{N}}$ is the d -dimensional Lie derivative in the direction of N^a . When acting on scalars we write $e_0 = e_0^\alpha \partial_\alpha$, so that $e_0^\alpha = m^\alpha$. The tangential derivatives acting on scalars are

$$e_a^\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial x^a} = \Sigma_\alpha^\beta \partial_\beta = \partial_\alpha - \partial_\alpha t e_0, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x^a} = e_a^\alpha \partial_\alpha. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

which defines the coefficient matrices e_a^α and e_α^a . They are such that

$$\begin{aligned} e_a^\alpha e_\alpha^b &= \delta_a^b, & \Sigma_\alpha^\beta &= e_\alpha^a e_a^\beta, \\ e_a^\alpha &:= g^{\alpha\beta} g_{ab} e_\beta^b, & g_{\alpha\beta} e_\alpha^a m^\beta &= 0 = g^{\alpha\beta} e_\alpha^a \partial_\beta t, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

which express the orthogonality and completeness of the component fields. By (A.7), (A.9), (A.11) the metric and its inverse take the block diagonal form

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\alpha\beta} &= \epsilon_g N^2 \partial_\alpha t \partial_\beta t + g_{ab} e_\alpha^a e_\beta^b, \\ g^{\alpha\beta} &= \epsilon_g N^{-2} m^\alpha m^\beta + g^{ab} e_a^\alpha e_b^\beta, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where $g^{ac} g_{cb} = \delta_b^a$. Further $\det g = \epsilon_g N^2 \det g$. For a fixed temporal function in addition to N, N^a also g_{ab} is a scalar.

The description in terms of the embedding relations $\tilde{y}^\alpha = y^\alpha(t(\tilde{y}), x(\tilde{y}))$ is now secondary, but still carries over

$$\partial_\alpha t = \frac{\partial t}{\partial y^\alpha}, \quad m^\alpha = \frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial t} - N^a e_a^\alpha, \quad (\text{A.13a})$$

$$e_a^\alpha = \frac{\partial y^\alpha}{\partial x^a}, \quad e_\alpha^a = \frac{\partial x^a}{\partial y^\alpha} + N^a \partial_\alpha t, \quad (\text{A.13b})$$

where $t(y)$ is the given temporal function and $x^a(y)$ is defined by the implicit function theorem. The left pair of relations holds by definition. Further $\partial y^\alpha / \partial t - m^\alpha$ is orthogonal to $\partial_\alpha t$ and thus tangent to Σ_t . As such it can be written in the form $N^a e_a^\alpha$, which gives the second relation in (A.13a). The orthogonality (A.11) then provides the second relation in (A.13b). The 1-forms $e^a = dx^a + N^a dt$ span the cotangent space of Σ , while $\partial_a = e_a^\alpha \partial_\alpha$ span the tangent space. The full coordinate 1-forms and associated differentials are given by

$$\begin{aligned} dy^\alpha &= m^\alpha dt + e_a^\alpha e^a, & e^a &= dx^a + N^a dt, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\alpha} &= \partial_\alpha t e_0 + e_a^\alpha \partial_a, & e_0 &= \partial_0 - N^a \partial_a. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

The one forms (Ndt, e^a) and dual vector fields $(N^{-1}e_0, \partial_a)$ form a moving frame which we refer to as the *foliation frame*. As long as the coordinate functions $t : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $x^a : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ are kept fixed the description is independent of the choice of embedding coordinates y^α .

B. Distributions and Sobolev spaces

We introduce and summarize the main properties of the function and distribution spaces used in this paper.

Test functions, distributions and distributional derivatives. As a *set*, the test functions on the manifold M is simply $\mathfrak{D}(M) = C_c^\infty(M)$, the compactly supported smooth complex-valued functions on M (all functions discussed will be complex valued, and this specification will be henceforth omitted). $\mathfrak{D}(M)$ is equipped with a topology arising from a family of seminorms, rendering it a locally convex topological vector space; we refer to [3, 19] for further details. It can be shown that, in order to define distributions, it is sufficient to specify the mode of convergence in $\mathfrak{D}(M)$.

Definition B.1. *A sequence $(u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathfrak{D}(M)$ is said to converge to $u \in \mathfrak{D}(M)$ iff the following holds.*

- (i) *There is a compact set $K \subseteq M$ containing the supports of u and all the u_j .*
- (ii) *There is a covering of K by finitely many charts $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_k$ such that for each chart in local coordinates, for all multi-indices α , $\partial^\alpha u_j \rightarrow \partial^\alpha u$ uniformly on the chart.*

In order to define distributional gradients and Laplacians we introduce the *test vector fields* $\overline{\mathfrak{D}}(M)$ and *test covector fields* $\underline{\mathfrak{D}}(M)$. As *sets* these are respectively the compactly supported smooth vector and covector fields on M , and the mode of convergence is defined as the straightforward generalization of Definition B.1.

Next, the distribution space $\mathfrak{D}'(M)$ comprises the continuous linear functionals over $\mathfrak{D}(M)$, where continuity means that for any $\varphi \in \mathfrak{D}'(M)$ and any sequence $(u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to zero in $\mathfrak{D}(M)$ we have $(\varphi, u_j) \xrightarrow{j} 0$ (here (φ, u_j) denotes the action of the distribution φ). It is clear that $\mathfrak{D}'(M)$ is a vector space, and convergence therein is defined as usual: $\varphi_j \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{D}'} \varphi$ iff $(\varphi_j, u) \xrightarrow{j} (\varphi, u)$ for all test functions $u \in \mathfrak{D}(M)$. Similarly, the spaces of *distributional vector fields* $\overrightarrow{\mathfrak{D}}'(M)$ and *distributional covector fields* $\overleftarrow{\mathfrak{D}}'(M)$ are respectively the duals of $\overrightarrow{\mathfrak{D}}(M)$ and $\overleftarrow{\mathfrak{D}}(M)$, and are linear spaces with convergence defined analogously to the scalar case.

The above test function and distribution spaces are well-defined on any smooth manifold, without reference to a metric structure. We now assume that M carries in addition a smooth metric g of Riemannian or Lorentzian signature, and associated volume form $d\mu_g = dy\sqrt{|g|}$. Recall that $f \in C^\infty(M)$ canonically defines a distribution $(\tilde{f}, u) := \int d\mu_g f u$. Then the one-form ∇f defines an distributional vector field $\overleftarrow{\nabla} f \in \overleftarrow{\mathfrak{D}}'(M)$ by an integration by parts, $(\overleftarrow{\nabla} f, v) := -(\tilde{f}, \nabla_\alpha v^\alpha)$ for $v \in \overrightarrow{\mathfrak{D}}(M)$, where $\nabla_\alpha v^\alpha = |g|^{-1/2} \partial_\alpha (|g|^{1/2} v^\alpha)$ is the divergence. Generalizing, the *distributional gradient* maps $\overrightarrow{\mathfrak{D}}'(M) \rightarrow \overrightarrow{\mathfrak{D}}'(M)$, where for each $\varphi \in \mathfrak{D}'(M)$, the *distribution* $\nabla \varphi$ is defined by

$$(\nabla \varphi, v) := -(\varphi, \nabla_\alpha v^\alpha), \quad \forall v \in \overrightarrow{\mathfrak{D}}(M). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The distributional Laplacian ∇^2 is defined analogously: for $\varphi \in \mathfrak{D}'(M)$, $\nabla^2 \varphi \in \mathfrak{D}'(M)$ is defined by

$$(\nabla^2 \varphi, u) := (\varphi, \nabla^2 u), \quad \forall u \in \mathfrak{D}(M). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

L^2 - and Sobolev spaces. The σ -algebra $\mathfrak{M}(M)$ of measurable sets on the manifold M consists of those $E \subseteq M$ such that for any chart U on M , the image of $E \cap U$ under the chart map is a Lebesgue measurable subset of \mathbb{R}^{1+d} ; in particular, $\mathfrak{M}(M)$ contains all Borel sets. Then, measurable functions, vector fields, and covector fields can be defined on M in the standard way. Next, the volume form associated to the Lorentzian metric g_- induces a complete, regular measure μ_g on $\mathfrak{M}(M)$; we refer to [23] for details. Then, as usual, $L^2(M)$ consists of (equivalence classes of) measurable functions $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ for which the 2-norm $\|f\|_{L^2(M)} := (\int d\mu_g |f|^2)^{1/2} < \infty$. This is a Hilbert space with inner product

$$\langle f_1 | f_2 \rangle_{L^2(M)} := \int d\mu_g f_1^* f_2, \quad f_1, f_2 \in L^2(M). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

To discuss L^2 -spaces of (co)-vector functions, a Riemannian metric g_+ is introduced. The space of square-integrable covector fields $\overleftarrow{L}^2(M)$ consists of (equivalence classes of) measurable sections $\omega : M \rightarrow T^*M$ for which $(g_+^{\alpha\beta} \omega_\alpha^* \omega_\beta)^{1/2} \in L^2(M)$. The definition of the space of square-integrable vector fields $\overrightarrow{L}^2(M)$ is analogous, and moreover the metric g_+ defines a canonical isometry $\omega_\alpha := g_{\alpha\beta}^+ v^\beta$ between $\overrightarrow{L}^2(M)$ and $\overleftarrow{L}^2(M)$. Further, as in the scalar case, these are Hilbert spaces with inner products

$$\langle \omega | \eta \rangle_{\overleftarrow{L}^2(M)} := \int d\mu_g g_+^{\alpha\beta} \omega_\alpha^* \eta_\beta, \quad \langle v | w \rangle_{\overrightarrow{L}^2(M)} := \int d\mu_g g_+^{\alpha\beta} v_\alpha^* w_\beta. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

The locally integrable versions of the above spaces consist of measurable sections that are square-integrable over every open set $\Omega \Subset M$, and are denoted e.g. $L^2_{\text{loc}}(M)$ in the scalar case; moreover, clearly $L^2(M) \subseteq L^2_{\text{loc}}(M)$.

Next, we recall the following characterization of a distribution $F \in \mathfrak{D}'(M)$ having an $L^2(M)$ realization. In particular, the right hand side of (B.7) below defines a (possibly infinite) L^2 -“norm” of a distribution $F \in \mathfrak{D}'(M)$, without the L^2 -realization being a-priori well defined.

Proposition B.1 (Lemma 2.15 of [23]). *Let $F \in \mathfrak{D}'(M)$. Then*

$$\sup_{\substack{u \in C_c^\infty(M) \\ \|u\|_{L^2} = 1}} |(F, u)| < \infty \quad (\text{B.5})$$

iff there exists a unique $f \in L^2(M)$ such that for all $u \in C_c^\infty(M) = \mathfrak{D}(M)$

$$(F, u) = \int d\mu_g(y) f(y)u(y). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Moreover,

$$\|f\|_{L^2} = \sup_{\substack{u \in C_c^\infty(M) \\ \|u\|_{L^2} = 1}} |(F, u)|. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Proceeding now to Sobolev spaces, every $f \in L^2(M)$ defines a distribution $(\tilde{f}, u) := \int d\mu_g f u$, and hence has a well-defined *distributional gradient* $\widetilde{\nabla} f \in \overrightarrow{\mathfrak{D}}'(M)$,

$$(\widetilde{\nabla} f, v) = - \int d\mu_g f \nabla_\alpha v^\alpha, \quad \forall v \in \overrightarrow{\mathfrak{D}}(M). \quad (\text{B.8})$$

The Sobolev space $\mathcal{W}^1(M)$ consists of those elements $f \in L^2(M)$ for which the *distributional gradient* $\widetilde{\nabla} f \in \overrightarrow{\mathfrak{D}}'(M)$ has an $\underline{L}^2(M)$ realization, denoted by ∇f and called the *weak derivative of $f \in L^2(M)$* . Clearly for every test vector field $v \in \overrightarrow{\mathfrak{D}}(M)$ one has

$$\int d\mu_g \nabla_\alpha f v^\alpha = - \int d\mu_g f \nabla_\alpha v^\alpha. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Clearly, $C_c^\infty(M) \subseteq \mathcal{W}^1(M)$, and moreover $\mathcal{W}^1(M)$ is a Hilbert space with inner product

$$\langle f_1 | f_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{W}^1(M)} := \langle f_1 | f_2 \rangle_{L^2(M)} + \langle \nabla f_1 | \nabla f_2 \rangle_{\underline{L}^2(M)}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Finally, the main Sobolev space used in this paper, $\mathcal{W}_0^1(M)$, is defined as the closed subspace of $\mathcal{W}^1(M)$ obtained by taking the closure of $C_c^\infty(M)$ in the \mathcal{W}^1 -norm. In particular, $\mathcal{W}_0^1(M)$ is a Hilbert space with inner product (B.10), and embeds densely into $L^2(M)$.

C. Local regularity results

In this appendix we summarize the salient aspects of the local regularity theory of the following elliptic operators with complex valued smooth coefficients, defined on a connected open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$L(\cdot) = \partial_\mu(a^{\mu\nu}(x)\partial_\nu(\cdot)), \quad (\text{C.1a})$$

$$\bar{L}(\cdot) = b(x)\partial_\mu(a^{\mu\nu}(x)\partial_\nu(\cdot)). \quad (\text{C.1b})$$

Here $b \in C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ and $a \in C^\infty(\Omega, M_{n \times n}(\mathbb{C}))$ satisfy:

- (i) For all $x \in \Omega$: $b(x) > 0$.
- (ii) For each $x \in \Omega$: $a \in M_{n \times n}(\mathbb{C})$ is symmetric. Further, there exists a continuous map $\ell : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that

$$\text{Re}(a^{\mu\nu}(x)\xi_\mu^*\xi_\nu) \geq \ell(x)\delta^{\mu\nu}\xi_\mu^*\xi_\nu, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{C}^n. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

We shall make copious use of Sobolev embedding:⁹

Sobolev embedding theorem (Theorem 6.1 of [23]). *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and $k, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $k > m + \frac{n}{2}$. Then each $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^k(\Omega)$ has a $C^m(\Omega)$ -representative (also denoted by u). Moreover, for any relatively compact open sets Ω_0, Ω_1 such that $\Omega_0 \Subset \Omega_1 \Subset \Omega$ there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{C^m(\Omega_0)} \leq C\|u\|_{W^k(\Omega_1)}, \quad (\text{C.3})$$

and C depends on $\Omega_0, \Omega_1, k, m, n$.

The first result of this appendix is that when $u, \bar{L}u, \dots, \bar{L}^k u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ for sufficiently high $k \in \mathbb{N}$, u is classically differentiable. This is the content of Theorem C.1, and its Corollary C.1.1.

Theorem C.1. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, and assume that for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$u, \bar{L}u, \dots, \bar{L}^k u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega), \quad (\text{C.4})$$

where the operator \bar{L} is defined in (C.1b). Then $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2k}(\Omega)$, and for any open sets $\Omega_0 \Subset \Omega_1 \Subset \Omega$, there exists $M_k > 0$ (depending on $\bar{L}, \Omega_0, \Omega_1$) such that

$$\|u\|_{W^{2k}(\Omega_0)} \leq M_k \sum_{j=0}^k \|\bar{L}^j u\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)}. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Applying the Sobolev embedding theorem then yields

⁹Here, and throughout this appendix, all $L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ and Sobolev spaces $W_{\text{loc}}^l(\Omega)$ are defined wrt. the Lebesgue measure on Ω . We refer to [23] for detailed definitions.

Corollary C.1.1. *Given the hypotheses of Theorem C.1, if there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $k > m/2 + n/4$, then $u \in C^m(\Omega)$ (or more precisely $u \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ has a C^m -representative). Moreover, for open sets $\Omega_0 \Subset \Omega_1 \Subset \Omega$ there is a $B > 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{C^m(\Omega_0)} \leq B \sum_{j=0}^k \|\bar{L}^j u\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)}, \quad (\text{C.6})$$

with $\|u\|_{C^m(\Omega_0)} := \sup_{|\alpha| \leq m} \sup_{\Omega_0} |\partial^\alpha u|$.

The second main result of this appendix concerns analytic maps from the open ball $B_S(0) := \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\zeta| < S\}$ to $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ defined by power series of the form

$$F(s) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{s^j}{j!} f_j, \quad (\text{C.7})$$

and joint regularity in $(s, x) \in B_S(0) \times \Omega$. Indeed, since for each s , $F(s) \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ is determined only up to sets of Lebesgue measure zero, joint regularity is not a well-defined notion for such maps in general. However, with the additional hypotheses that under the action of \bar{L} , the $F(s)$, f_j satisfy local integrability conditions of the form (C.4) for sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, *classical joint differentiability* is enforced.

Theorem C.2. *Let there exist a sequence $(f_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ in $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ so that*

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{N}_0 : f_j, \bar{L}f_j, \dots, \bar{L}^k f_j \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega). \quad (\text{C.8})$$

Suppose there exists an analytic function $F : B_S(0) \rightarrow L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$, with the following properties for each $\zeta \in B_S(0)$.

- (i) *The power series $F(\zeta) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta^j}{j!} f_j$ converges in $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$.*
- (ii) *$F(\zeta), \bar{L}F(\zeta), \dots, \bar{L}^k F(\zeta) \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$.*
- (iii) *For each $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ $\bar{L}^l F(\zeta) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta^j}{j!} \bar{L}^l f_j$, with the sum converging in $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$.*

If there is $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $k > m/2 + n/4$, then for each $\zeta \in B_S(0)$ there exists a $C^m(\Omega)$ representative of $F(\zeta)$, denoted by $F(\zeta, \cdot)$, and the mapping

$$B_S(0) \times \Omega \ni (\zeta, x) \mapsto F(\zeta, x) \in \mathbb{C} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

is jointly C^m .

The technical input required for the proofs of these results are the following lemmas.

Lemma C.3. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, if $u \in W^k(\Omega)$ with compact support in Ω ,¹⁰ and $Lu \in W^{k-1}(\Omega)$, then*

$$L(u * \varphi_\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{W^{k-1}} Lu. \quad (\text{C.10})$$

¹⁰ $u \in W^k(\Omega)$ compactly supported in Ω means there exists $K \subseteq \Omega$ such that K is compact and $u = 0$ a.e. on $\Omega \setminus K$. It follows that all weak derivatives up to order k are compactly supported and are zero a.e. on $\Omega \setminus K$.

Here $u * \varphi_\varepsilon$ is the convolution with the mollifier φ_ε .¹¹

Note: since $u \in W^k(\Omega)$ is compactly supported in Ω , it may be extended to an element of $W^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting it to zero outside Ω , thereby rendering the convolution $u * \varphi_\varepsilon$ well defined.

Lemma C.4. *Let $\Omega, \Omega' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$. Then for every $k \in \mathbb{N} : \exists C_k > 0$ (depending on L and Ω') such that*

$$\|u\|_{W^k(\Omega')} \leq C_k \|Lu\|_{W^{k-2}(\Omega')}, \quad u \in C_c^\infty(\Omega'). \quad (\text{C.11})$$

These results are (respectively) generalizations to all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ of Lemmas 6.6 and 6.7 of [23], suitably adapted to the complex coefficient operator (C.1a). The proofs are by induction, with the base case following the same lines as in [23], and the inductive step straightforward; we omit the details.

We now proceed to the proof of Theorems C.1 and C.2.

Proof of Theorem C.1. This is by induction on $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Base case $k = 1$: Assume that $u, \bar{L}u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$, which implies that $Lu = b^{-1}\bar{L}u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$. Fixing arbitrary open sets $\Omega_1 \Subset \Omega_2 \Subset \Omega$, there is a further open set Ω' such that $\Omega_1 \Subset \Omega' \Subset \Omega_2$. Next, let $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega')$ be a cutoff function for Ω_0 , i.e. $\psi : \Omega' \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\psi|_{\Omega_0} \equiv 1$, and define $v := \psi u$. Then clearly $v \in L^2(\Omega)$, with compact support contained in Ω' .

Next, consider

$$Lv = \psi Lu + L\psi u + 2a^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \psi \partial_\nu u. \quad (\text{C.12})$$

Since both $u, Lu \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$, the first two terms are in $L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ as well. The final term, with a single derivative acting on u is *a priori* only in $W_{\text{loc}}^{-1}(\Omega)$. Thus, $Lv \in W_{\text{loc}}^{-1}(\Omega)$.

Since v is compactly supported in Ω' , there is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ we have under mollification $v * \varphi_\varepsilon \in C_c^\infty(\Omega')$. Thus, Lemma C.4 implies that there is $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\|v * \varphi_\varepsilon\|_{W^1(\Omega')} \leq C_1 \|L(v * \varphi_\varepsilon)\|_{W^{-1}(\Omega')}, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0). \quad (\text{C.13})$$

Furthermore, $L(v * \varphi_\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{W^{-1}} Lv$ by Lemma C.3, so

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \|v * \varphi_\varepsilon\|_{W^1(\Omega')} \leq C_1 \|Lv\|_{W^{-1}(\Omega')}, \quad (\text{C.14})$$

and hence $\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \|v * \varphi_\varepsilon\|_{W^1(\Omega')} < \infty$. This implies $v \in W^1(\Omega')$ with $\|v\|_{W^1(\Omega')} \leq C_1 \|Lv\|_{W^{-1}(\Omega')}$ (c.f. [23] Theorem 2.13). Since $u \equiv v$ on $\Omega_0 \Subset \Omega'$, together with the expression for Lv in (C.12), it follows that $u \in W^1(\Omega_0)$ and

$$\|u\|_{W^1(\Omega_0)} \leq C_1' (\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega')} + \|Lu\|_{L^2(\Omega')}), \quad (\text{C.15})$$

¹¹Mollifiers are defined by first specifying a non-negative $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ supported in the unit ball $B_1(0) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} d^n x \varphi = 1$. Then for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ one sets $\varphi_\varepsilon(x) := \varepsilon^{-n} \varphi(x/\varepsilon)$, which is supported in $B_\varepsilon(0)$.

with $C'_1 > 0$ independent of u . Moreover, since $\Omega_1 \Subset \Omega' \Subset \Omega$ were arbitrary, $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$.

To go from W^1 to W^2 , note that (the now established) $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega) \implies Lv \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ above. Then Lemmas C.4 and C.3 in combination yield

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \|v * \varphi_\varepsilon\|_{W^2(\Omega')} \leq C_2 \|Lv\|_{L^2(\Omega')}, \quad (\text{C.16})$$

and hence $v \in W^2(\Omega')$ with the bound $\|v\|_{W^2(\Omega')} \leq C_2 \|Lv\|_{L^2(\Omega')}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{W^2(\Omega_0)} &\leq C_2 \|Lv\|_{L^2(\Omega')} \leq C'_2 \left(\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega')} + \|Lu\|_{L^2(\Omega')} + \|u\|_{W^1(\Omega')} \right) \\ &\leq C''_2 \left(\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega')} + \|Lu\|_{L^2(\Omega')} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.17})$$

with the final inequality from the bound (C.15) applied to $\|u\|_{W^1(\Omega')}$. Thus we conclude that $u, \bar{L}u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ implies $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$. Moreover, since $\bar{L} = bL$, there is $M_1 > 0$ (depending on \bar{L} and the open sets Ω_0, Ω_1 , but independent of u) such that

$$\|u\|_{W^2(\Omega_0)} \leq M_k \sum_{j=0}^1 \|\bar{L}^j u\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)}, \quad (\text{C.18})$$

establishing the base case.

The inductive step k to $k+1$: Fixing an arbitrary $k \geq 1$, assume that the result holds for k . Next, assume that

$$u, \bar{L}u, \dots, \bar{L}^k u, \bar{L}^{k+1} u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega). \quad (\text{C.19})$$

Then $u, \bar{L}u, \dots, \bar{L}^k u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ and $\bar{L}u, \dots, \bar{L}^k(\bar{L}u) \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$, which together with the inductive hypothesis implies $u, \bar{L}u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2k}(\Omega)$ along with the requisite norm bounds (c.f. (C.5)).

It then follows that, upon fixing an arbitrary multi-index α with $|\alpha| = 2k$, we have $\partial^\alpha u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ and using $\bar{L} = bL$,¹²

$$L(\partial^\alpha u) = b^{-1} \partial^\alpha(\bar{L}u) - \sum_{\substack{|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| = |\alpha| \\ |\beta_1| > 0}} b^{-1} \partial^{\beta_1} b \partial^{\beta_2} Lu \in W_{\text{loc}}^{-1}(\Omega). \quad (\text{C.20})$$

Applying the argument in the proof of the base case above to $\partial^\alpha u$, one concludes that $\partial^\alpha u \in W_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$. Moreover, since α is an arbitrary multi-index with $|\alpha| = 2k$, it follows that $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2k+2}(\Omega)$.

Turning now to the bound, having chosen open sets $\Omega_0 \Subset \Omega_1 \Subset \Omega$, choose two further open sets Ω', Ω'' satisfying $\Omega_0 \Subset \Omega' \Subset \Omega'' \Subset \Omega_1$. The $k=1$ bound (C.18) applied to $\partial^\alpha u$ on $\Omega_0 \Subset \Omega' \Subset \Omega$ is

$$\|\partial^\alpha u\|_{W^2(\Omega_0)} \leq M_1 \left(\|\partial^\alpha u\|_{L^2(\Omega')} + \|\bar{L}(\partial^\alpha u)\|_{L^2(\Omega')} \right). \quad (\text{C.21})$$

¹²Clearly the first term is in $L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$, and since $|\beta_2| \leq 2k-1$, $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2k}(\Omega)$, the second term is an element of $W_{\text{loc}}^{-1}(\Omega)$.

Next, it follows from (C.20) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{L}(\partial^\alpha u)\|_{L^2(\Omega')} &\leq C_1' \left(\|\bar{L}u\|_{W^{2k}(\Omega')} + \sum_{|\beta| \leq 2k} \|\partial^\beta u\|_{W^1(\Omega')} \right) \\ &\leq C_1'' \left(\|u\|_{W^{2k}(\Omega'')} + \|\bar{L}u\|_{W^{2k}(\Omega'')} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.22})$$

where to arrive at the second inequality one applies the W^1 -bound (C.15) to $\partial^\beta u$ on $\Omega' \Subset \Omega'' \Subset \Omega$.

Finally, applying the inductive hypothesis to u , $\bar{L}u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2k}(\Omega)$ on $\Omega'' \Subset \Omega_1 \Subset \Omega$ yields

$$\|u\|_{W^{2k}(\Omega'')} \leq \tilde{C} \sum_{j=0}^k \|\bar{L}^j u\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)}, \quad \|Lu\|_{W^{2k}(\Omega'')} \leq \tilde{C} \sum_{j=0}^k \|\bar{L}^{j+1} u\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} \quad (\text{C.23})$$

with $\tilde{C} > 0$ independent of u . This, in combination with (C.21) and (C.22) implies the existence of $M_{k+1} > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{W^{2k+2}(\Omega_0)} \leq M_{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{k+1} \|\bar{L}^j u\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)}, \quad (\text{C.24})$$

completing the inductive step, and hence the proof of the theorem. \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem C.2. Assume that there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k > m/2 + n/4$. It follows straightforwardly from Corollary C.1.1 that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\zeta \in B_S(0)$, f_j , $F(s)$ have $C^m(\Omega)$ -representatives, to be denoted $f_j(\cdot)$ and $F(\zeta, \cdot)$ respectively. Moreover, it follows from the convergence of the series in Theorem C.2 that for each $\zeta \in B_S(0)$ the power series

$$F(\zeta, \cdot) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta^j}{j!} f_j(\cdot) \quad (\text{C.25})$$

converges in $C^m(\Omega_0)$ for every open set $\Omega_0 \Subset \Omega$.¹³ The uniformity of this convergence for each $\zeta \in B_S(0)$, together with the basic properties of the convergence of power series, implies that $F(\cdot, \cdot)$ is jointly C^m in (ζ, x) . The detailed argument is by induction.

Base case (jointly C^1): Fix an arbitrary open set $\Omega_0 \Subset \Omega$ and let $\zeta \in B_S(0)$ and $\delta\zeta \in B_r(\zeta) \subseteq B_S(0)$. Since the $C^m(\Omega_0)$ convergence of the power series (C.25) holds for any $\zeta \in B_S(0)$, the sum $\sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{|\zeta + \delta\zeta|^j}{j!} \|f_j\|_{C^1(\Omega_0)}$ is uniformly bounded from above for $\delta\zeta \in B_r(\zeta)$. Then

$$\lim_{\delta\zeta \rightarrow 0} F(\zeta + \delta\zeta, \cdot) = \lim_{\delta\zeta \rightarrow 0} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\zeta + \delta\zeta)^j}{j!} f_j(\cdot) = F(\zeta, \cdot), \quad (\text{C.26})$$

¹³Recall that the $\|\cdot\|_{C^m(\Omega_0)}$ -norm is defined by $\|h\|_{C^m(\Omega_0)} := \sup_{\alpha \leq m} \sup_{\Omega_0} |\partial^\alpha h|$.

with the limit taken with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{C^m(\Omega_0)}$, and the above uniform upper bound allows the limit to be taken inside the sum. This continuity in ζ , uniformly over $x \in \Omega$, implies joint continuity in ζ and x .

Having established joint continuity, consider the following series bounding the difference quotient,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j!} \left| \frac{(\zeta + \delta\zeta)^j - \zeta^j}{\delta\zeta} \right| \|f\|_{C^m(\Omega_0)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{r^{j-1}}{(j-1)!} \|f\|_{C^m(\Omega_0)} < \infty \quad (\text{C.27})$$

with finiteness following from the $C^m(\Omega_0)$ convergence of (C.25) over $B_S(0)$. Analogous to the argument for continuity, this implies that the difference quotient power series converges to $\partial_\zeta F(\zeta, \cdot)$ in $C^m(\Omega_0)$ as $\delta\zeta \rightarrow 0$. In particular, it yields the power series

$$\partial_\zeta F(\zeta, \cdot) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta^j}{j!} f_{j+1}(\cdot), \quad (\text{C.28})$$

converging in $C^m(\Omega_0)$ for $\zeta \in B_S(0)$. Applying the above continuity arguments to this power series implies that $F(\cdot, \cdot)$ is jointly C^1 , and for indices $i + |\alpha| = 1$,

$$\partial_\zeta^i \partial_x^\alpha F(\zeta, \cdot) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta^j}{j!} \partial_x^\alpha f_{j+1}(\cdot), \quad \zeta \in B_S(0), \quad (\text{C.29})$$

converging in $C^{m-|\alpha|}(\Omega_0)$.

The inductive step: For $1 \leq l < m$, assume that $F(\cdot, \cdot)$ is jointly C^l on $B_S(0) \times \Omega$, and that for indices $i + |\alpha| \leq l$ the series (C.29) converges in $C^{m-|\alpha|}(\Omega_0)$ for any open set $\Omega_0 \Subset \Omega$. To proceed, fix such an open set Ω_0 . It is to be shown that for indices $i + |\alpha| = l + 1$, the power series expansion in (C.29) converges in $C^{m-|\alpha|}(\Omega_0)$. When $i \leq l$, this holds as a direct consequence of the induction hypothesis. Thus, w.l.o.g. assume that $i = l + 1$, and consider

$$\partial_\zeta^l F(\zeta, \cdot) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta^j}{j!} f_{j+l}(\cdot). \quad (\text{C.30})$$

By the inductive hypothesis, this converges in $C^m(\Omega_0)$ for each $\zeta \in B_S(0)$. Applying the arguments of the base case above to (C.30) then implies $\partial_\zeta^l F(\cdot, \cdot)$ is jointly C^1 , and in particular

$$\partial_\zeta^{l+1} F(\zeta, \cdot) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta^j}{j!} f_{j+l+1}(\cdot), \quad \zeta \in B_S(0), \quad (\text{C.31})$$

converging in $C^m(\Omega_0)$ as desired. Thus, $F(\cdot, \cdot)$ is jointly C^{l+1} in $(\zeta, x) \in B_S(0) \times \Omega$, completing the inductive step, and thereby the proof. \blacksquare

References

- [1] A. Baldazzi, R. Percacci, and V. Skrinjar, Wicked metrics, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36** (2019) 105008.
- [2] R. Banerjee and M. Niedermaier, The spatial Functional Renormalization Group and Hadamard states on cosmological spacetimes, *Nucl. Phys.* **B980** (2022) 115814.
- [3] C. Bär, N. Ginoux, and F. Pfäffle, *Wave equations on Lorentzian manifolds and Quantization*, Europ. Math. Soc. 2007.
- [4] J. M. Berezanskii, *Expansions in Eigenfunctions of Selfadjoint Operators*, AMS, 1968.
- [5] A. Bernal and M. Sanchez, Smoothness of time functions and the metric splitting of globally hyperbolic spacetimes, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **257** (2005) 43.
- [6] P. Candelas and D. Raine, Feynman propagator in curved spacetime, *Phys. Rev.* **D15** (1977) 1494.
- [7] F. Cardin and A. Marigonda, Global World functions, *J. Geom. Physics* **2** (2004) 1.
- [8] E. D'Angelo, N. Drago, N. Pinamonti, and K. Rejzner, An algebraic QFT approach to the Wetterich equation on Lorentzian manifolds, *Ann. H. Poincaré*, (2023) 01348-4.
- [9] E. B. Davies, *One-Parameter Semigroups*, Academic Press, 1980.
- [10] E. B. Davies, *Heat kernels and spectral theory*, Cambridge UP, 1989.
- [11] E. B. Davies, *Linear Operators and their Spectra*, Cambridge UP, 2007.
- [12] Y. Decanini and A. Folacci, Off-diagonal coefficients of the DeWitt-Schwinger and Hadamard representations of the Feynman propagator, *Phys. Rev.* **D73** (2006) 044027.
- [13] J. Dereziński and D. Siemssen, Feynman Propagators on Static Spacetimes, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **30** (2018).
- [14] J. Dereziński and D. Siemssen, An evolution operator approach to the Klein-Gordon equation on curved spacetime, *Pure Appl. Analysis* **1** (2019) 215.
- [15] K. Engel and R. Nagel, *A short course on operator semigroups*, Springer, 2010,
- [16] L. C. Evans, *Partial Differential Equations*, Second Edition, AMS, 2010.
- [17] F. Finster and M. Kraus, The regularized Hadamard expansion, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **491** (2020) 124340.
- [18] S. Fulling, *Aspects of Quantum Field Theory in curved space-time*, Cambridge UP, 1989.
- [19] F. G. Friedlander, *The wave equation on a curved space-time*, Cambridge UP, 1975.

- [20] C. Gerard and M. Wrochna, Analytic Hadamard states, Calderón projectors and Wick rotation near analytic Cauchy surfaces, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **366** (2019) 29-65.
- [21] E.ourgoulhon, *3 + 1 formalism in general relativity*, Springer, 2012.
- [22] D. Grieser, Notes on heat kernel asymptotics, 2004;
<https://api.Semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:73665205>
- [23] A. Grigor'yan, *Heat kernel and Analysis on Manifolds*, AMS 2009.
- [24] A. Grigor'yan, E. Hu, J. Hu, The pointwise existence and properties of the heat kernel, in: *Analysis and partial differential equations on manifolds, fractals, and graphs*, de Gruyter, 2021.
- [25] C. Helleland and S. Hervik, A Wick rotatable metric is purely electric, *J. Geom. Phys.* **123** (201) 424.
- [26] T. Hytönen, J. van Neerven, M. Veraar, L. Weis, *Analysis in Banach Spaces. Volume I: Martingales and Littlewood-Paley Theory*, Springer, 2016.
- [27] W. Kaminski, Non-selfadjointness of the Klein-Gordon operator on a globally hyperbolic and geodesically complete manifold: an example, *Ann. H. Poincaré*, **23** (2022) 4409.
- [28] Y. Kannai, Off-diagonal heat kernel asymptotics for fundamental solution of diffusion equation, *Commun. Partial Differ. Equ.* **2**(8) (1977) 781.
- [29] M. Konsevich and G. Segal, Wick rotation and the positivity of energy in Quantum Field Theory, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.* **72** (2021) 673.
- [30] P. Lax, *Functional Analysis*, Wiley, 2002.
- [31] J. Louka and R. Sorkin, Complex actions in two-dimensional topology change, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **14** (1997) 179.
- [32] M. Ludewig, Strong short-time asymptotics and convolution approximation of heat kernel, *Ann. Glob. Anal.* **55** (2019) 371.
- [33] V. Moretti, One-loop stress-tensor renormalization in curved background: the relation between ζ -function and point-splitting approaches, and an improved point-splitting procedure, *J. Math. Phys.* **40** (1999) 3843.
- [34] V. Moretti, Proof of the symmetry of the off-diagonal Hadamard/Seeley-DeWitt's coefficients in C^∞ Lorentzian manifolds by a 'local Wick rotation', *Commun. Math. Phys.* **212** (2000) 165.
- [35] V. Moretti, On the global Hadamard parametrix in QFT and the signed squared geodesic distance defined in domains larger than convex normal neighborhoods, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **111** (2021) 130.
- [36] S. Nakamura and K. Taira, Essential self-adjointness of real principal type operators, *Ann. H. Lebesgue*, **4** (2021), 1035.

- [37] S. Nakamura and K. Taira, A remark on the essential self-adjointness for Klein-Gordon type operators, *Ann. H. Poincaré*, **24** (2023) 2587.
- [38] M. Niedermaier, Nonstandard action of diffeomorphisms and gravity's Anti-Newtonian limit, *Symmetry* **12** (2020) 752.
- [39] L. Parker and D. Toms, *Quantum Field Theory in curved spacetime*, Cambridge UP, 2009.
- [40] R. Percacci, *An Introduction to Covariant Quantum Gravity and Asymptotic Safety*, World Scientific, 2017.
- [41] J. Pons, D. Salisbury, and L. Shepley, Gauge transformations in the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms of generally covariant theories, *Phys. Rev.* **D55** (1997) 658.
- [42] M. Reuter and F. Saueressig, *Quantum Gravity and the Functional Renormalization Group*, Cambridge UP, 2019.
- [43] J. Samuel, Wick rotation in the tangent space, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **33** (2016) 015006.
- [44] W. Thurston, Existence of co-dimension one foliations, *Ann. Math.* **104** (1976) 249.
- [45] M. Visser, "How to Wick rotate generic curved spacetime", GRF essay 1991, arXiv: 1702.05572.
- [46] M. Visser, Feynman's $i\epsilon$ prescription, almost real spacetimes, and acceptable complex spacetimes, *JHEP* **08** (2022) 129.
- [47] R. Wald, On the Euclidean approach to Quantum Field Theory in curved spacetime, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **70** (1979) 221.
- [48] M. Wrochna, Wick rotation of the time variable for two-point functions on analytic backgrounds, *Lett. Math. Phys.*, **110** (2019) 585.
- [49] A. Vasy, Essential self-adjointness of the wave operator and the limiting absorption principle on Lorentzian scattering spaces, *J. Spectr. Theory.* **10** (2020) 439.
- [50] K. Yosida, *Functional Analysis, Sixth Edition*, Springer-Verlag, 1980.