

A SECOND ORDER APPROACH TO THE KATO SQUARE ROOT PROBLEM ON OPEN SETS

SEBASTIAN BECHTEL, CODY HUTCHESON, TIM SCHMATZLER, TOLGAHAN TASCI,
AND MATTES WITTIG

ABSTRACT. We give a proof for the Kato square root problem on suitable open sets and subject to pure Dirichlet boundary conditions. In contrast to earlier work, our proof uses only second-order techniques and is in the spirit of the proof given by Egert–Haller–Monniaux–Tolksdorf in the scope of the 27th international internet seminar for $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$. In contrast to the usual proofs based on the first-order framework by Axelsson–Keith–McIntosh, the proof becomes substantially shorter and technically less demanding.

1. INTRODUCTION

The current manuscript is the outgrowth of a student project in the scope of the “27th international internet seminar” supervised by the first-named author and carried out by the remaining authors. The lecture notes of the aforementioned course are [7] and we are going to build on results from that monograph in the present article.

We are going to investigate Kato’s square root problem on suitable open sets. For the moment, we just work with pure Dirichlet boundary conditions and in a homogeneous setting. Our main result then reads as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set satisfying Assumptions (Ω), (P) and $(-\Delta)$ and let $L = -\operatorname{div} A \nabla$ be an elliptic operator on Ω subject to pure Dirichlet boundary conditions. Then L has the Kato square root property $D(L^{\frac{1}{2}}) = H_0^1(\Omega)$ with the homogeneous estimate*

$$\|L^{\frac{1}{2}}u\|_2 \approx \|\nabla u\|_2, \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Implicit constants depend only on geometry, dimension and coefficient bounds of A .

The geometric assumptions will be introduced and discussed in detail in Section 2. The reader might have a bounded Lipschitz domain in mind. The elliptic operator $-\operatorname{div} A \nabla$ was discussed in all detail in [7, Sec. 3.5] and we are going to recap some properties in Section 4. In a follow up version of the manuscript, we will also consider mixed boundary conditions in an inhomogeneous setting (this is to say, when the elliptic operator has lower

Date: June 19, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 47A60, 35J47. Secondary: 26A33.

Key words and phrases. Kato square root problem, second order approach, Carleson measure estimate, Tb argument.

The first-named author is supported by the Alexander von Humboldt foundation by a Feodor Lynen grant. The third-named author gratefully acknowledges financial support by the grant no. 2022-03342 of the Swedish Research Council (VR)..

order terms) and under relaxed geometric requirements. For an outlook towards these possible extensions we refer the reader to Section 8.

In the literature, Kato's square root problem on open sets was investigated using the so-called "first order approach", see for instance [2, 4, 8]. One reason for this is that the first-order approach allows to capture Kato's square root problem in a rather operator-theoretic language, which allows to circumvent the usage of Fourier methods that appear regularly in proofs for the case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$. This was also the case for the proof given in [7]. It is the purpose of this project to give a proof for the Kato conjecture on domains using a second-order proof in the spirit of [7] but borrowing some ideas from the first-order world.

A central idea in our approach is the following: as is well known, the Kato square root problem can be reformulated to a quadratic estimate for ∇u , see also Section 5 and in particular (5). The traditional approach is to use (resolvents of) $-\Delta$ as a smoothing operator, applied component-wise when the argument is a gradient field like ∇u or even a more general vector field. Instead, we will be systematically replacing the operator $-\Delta = -\operatorname{div} \nabla$ by the operator $-\nabla \operatorname{div} =: M$ when the argument is a vector field. Consider the following beautiful identity, which is a consequence of Proposition 2.5:

$$(1) \quad (1 + t^2 M)^{-1} \nabla u = \nabla (1 - t^2 \Delta)^{-1} u, \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega), t > 0.$$

In more classical proofs like in [7], the Fourier transform has to be used to commute the gradient with a component-wise smoothing through resolvents of the Laplacian, see for instance [7, Rem. 13.8]. With (1) we can still commute the gradient with the smoothing operator, but this operation will translate the vector-valued operator M into the scalar-valued operator $-\Delta$ and vice versa.

Also, we mention here that the operator M has its place in the $T(b)$ -type argument that is key to the solution of Kato's conjecture. We are going to perturb the operator M by the elliptic coefficient function A to obtain the (still sectorial) operator MA . Its resolvents will be used to define the $T(b)$ -type test functions, see (14).

Notation. We try to stay in line with the notation from [7]. The integer n denotes the spacial dimension and $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is an open set for which we are going to collect geometric restrictions in the course of the article. For $x \in \Omega$ and $r > 0$ write $B(x; r)$ for the Euclidean ball centered in x and of radius r , and $Q(x; r)$ for the Euclidean cube centered in x and of sidelength $2r$. Moreover, write $B_\Omega(x; r) := B(x; r) \cap \Omega$ and $Q_\Omega(x; r) := Q(x; r) \cap \Omega$. The space $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$ consists of measurable functions on Ω that are integrable over subsets of finite measure in Ω (note that in the literature the notion L_{loc}^1 does not include integrability up to the boundary as is the case for our definition).

2. PRELIMINARIES AND ASSUMPTIONS

In this section we lay the ground for the sequel of this manuscript. Notable are the introduction of the operator $M = -\nabla_0 \operatorname{div}_0$ in Definition 2.3 and its relation to the Dirichlet Laplacian $-\Delta$ discussed in Proposition 2.5. Also, we introduce the Assumptions (Ω) , (P) and $(-\Delta)$ that appeared in the formulation of Theorem 1.1.

2.1. Function spaces and interpolation. Recall that the space $H_0^1(\Omega)$ is defined as the closure of the test functions $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in $H^1(\Omega)$. In the sequel we summarize basic notions and properties from interpolation theory; the reader can find further information in [14]. Since $H_0^1(\Omega) \subseteq L^2(\Omega)$, the pair of spaces $(L^2(\Omega), H_0^1(\Omega))$ forms an interpolation couple. Given $\theta \in (0, 1)$ write $[L^2(\Omega), H_0^1(\Omega)]_\theta$ for the θ -complex interpolation space between $L^2(\Omega)$ and $H_0^1(\Omega)$. It holds

$$H_0^1(\Omega) \subseteq [L^2(\Omega), H_0^1(\Omega)]_\theta \subseteq L^2(\Omega), \quad \theta \in (0, 1).$$

If $T: L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ is a bounded operator whose operator norm is given by M_0 and which restricts to a bounded operator $T: H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ with operator norm M_1 , then T also restricts to a bounded operator

$$T: [L^2(\Omega), H_0^1(\Omega)]_\theta \rightarrow L^2(\Omega), \quad \|T\| \leq M_0^{1-\theta} M_1^\theta, \quad \theta \in (0, 1).$$

This is a special case of the interpolation property, see [14, Thm. 1.9.3 (a) & Sec. 1.2.2]. The same is true for vector fields instead of scalar functions.

2.2. The operators $-\Delta$ and M .

Definition 2.1 (gradient and divergence). Denote by $\nabla_0: H_0^1(\Omega) \subseteq L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)^n$ the gradient with Dirichlet boundary conditions on $L^2(\Omega)$. This is a closed and densely defined operator, and we denote by $-\operatorname{div}_0 = \nabla_0^*: D(\operatorname{div}_0) \subseteq L^2(\Omega)^n \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ its (unbounded) adjoint operator, which is again closed and densely defined.

We also use the *very weak divergence operator* and denote it just by div . This is a bounded operator $-\operatorname{div}: L^2(\Omega)^n \rightarrow H_0^1(\Omega)^*$, which is defined via

$$\langle \operatorname{div} F, u \rangle_{(H_0^1)^* \times H_0^1} = - \int_{\Omega} F \cdot \overline{\nabla u}, \quad F \in L^2(\Omega)^n, u \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

The Dirichlet Laplacian $-\operatorname{div}$ on $L^2(\Omega)$ was defined using the form method in [7, Def. 3.26]. We give an alternative characterization.

Lemma 2.2. *The Laplace operator with Dirichlet boundary conditions $-\Delta$ coincides with the composition $-\operatorname{div}_0 \nabla_0: D(\operatorname{div}_0 \nabla_0) \subseteq L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ with maximal domain $D(\Delta) = \{u \in L^2(\Omega) : u \in D(\nabla_0) = H_0^1(\Omega), \nabla_0 u \in D(\operatorname{div}_0)\}$.*

The Laplacian acts on scalar functions. In [7] its resolvents were often applied componentwise to vector fields as smoothing operators. In our approach, we directly work with a differential operator that acts on vector fields. We introduce it in the next definition.

Definition 2.3 (the operator M). Define the operator $M: D(M) \subseteq L^2(\Omega)^n \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)^n$ as the composition $M = -\nabla_0 \operatorname{div}_0$ with maximal domain.

Using forms, we deduce the same desirable properties as for the Laplacian.

Proposition 2.4. *M is self-adjoint and m -accretive on $L^2(\Omega)^n$ with domain $D(M) = \{F \in L^2(\Omega)^n : F \in D(\operatorname{div}_0), \operatorname{div}_0 F \in H_0^1(\Omega)\}$. In particular, M is sectorial of angle zero, has a bounded H^∞ -calculus on its range and satisfies quadratic estimates as well as the Kato square root property*

$$\|\sqrt{M}F\|_2 = \|\operatorname{div}_0 F\|_2, \quad F \in D(\operatorname{div}_0) = D(\sqrt{M}).$$

Proof. Consider the sesquilinear form

$$\mathfrak{b}(F, G) = \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}_0 F \overline{\operatorname{div}_0 G}, \quad F, G \in D(\operatorname{div}_0) \subseteq L^2(\Omega)^n.$$

Note that $D(\mathfrak{b}) = D(\operatorname{div}_0)$ is a Hilbert space under the graph norm of div_0 (since $\operatorname{div}_0 = \nabla_0^*$ is closed), and the embedding $D(\mathfrak{b}) \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega)^n$ is dense. The form \mathfrak{b} is bounded, symmetric, accretive and elliptic, so there exists an associated m -accretive and self-adjoint (thus, sectorial of angle zero) operator B on some domain $D(B) \subseteq D(\mathfrak{b}) \subseteq L^2(\Omega)^n$. One easily verifies that the operator B corresponds to the composition $M = -\nabla_0 \operatorname{div}_0$ with the right domain. \square

The following intertwining property between M and $-\Delta$ is essential for our arguments in Section 6. In the proof we use that $-\Delta: H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow (H_0^1(\Omega))^*$ is invertible. This will be implied by Assumption (P), which we introduce properly only in the next subsection but already list here as an assumption.

Proposition 2.5 (intertwining between M and $-\Delta$). *Suppose Assumption (P). Let $f \in H^\infty(S_\varphi)$ for some $\varphi \in (0, \pi)$ and let $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Then, one has the intertwining relation $\nabla_0 f(-\Delta)u = f(M)\nabla_0 u$.*

Proof. Fix $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Let $0 < \psi < \varphi$ and $f \in H^\infty(S_\psi)$. Write γ for a parametrization of the boundary of S_ψ .

We comment first why the identity from the statement is well-defined. First of all, $f(-\Delta)$ is well-defined since the operator $-\Delta$ is sectorial of angle zero and injective. Next, write $u = (-\Delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}}v$ for a suitable $v \in L^2(\Omega)$, which uses the Kato square root property for $-\Delta$. Then the representation $f(-\Delta)u = (-\Delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}}f(-\Delta)v$ shows that $f(-\Delta)u$ is indeed an element of $H_0^1(\Omega) = D(\nabla_0)$, where we used a basic commutation property of the functional calculus and boundedness of the H^∞ -calculus for $-\Delta$. Therefore, the left-hand side of the claimed identity is well-defined. For the right-hand side, note that M is in general not injective. However, if we restrict M to $\overline{\operatorname{ran}(M)}$, then M becomes injective and $f(M)$ can be defined as an operator on $\overline{\operatorname{ran}(M)}$. See also [7, Exercise 7.5]. We are not going to distinguish M from its injective part notation-wise. We claim that $\nabla_0 u \in \operatorname{ran}(M)$, so that $f(M)$ is indeed defined on the gradient field $\nabla_0 u$ appearing in the statement. Indeed, since $-\Delta$ is invertible, there is in particular some $F = \nabla w \in L^2(\Omega)^n$ such that $-\operatorname{div} F = u$. Therefore, $\nabla_0 u = -\nabla_0 \operatorname{div} F = MF$.

We split the proof into 3 steps.

Step 1: Show $\nabla_0(z + \Delta)^{-1}u = (z - M)^{-1}\nabla_0 u$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$.

The operators $-\Delta$ and M are sectorial of angle zero, hence their resolvents for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ are well-defined. Put $v := (z + \Delta)^{-1}u$ for convenience. We can apply $(z + \Delta)$ to the definition of v to find $(z + \Delta)v = u$. Since $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, we can apply ∇_0 to the last identity. In conjunction with $\nabla_0 \Delta = -M\nabla_0$ and the associative law this gives

$$\nabla_0 u = \nabla_0(z + \Delta)v = (z - M)\nabla_0 v.$$

Finally, we apply $(z - M)^{-1}$ to the last identity and plug in the definition of v to conclude

$$(z - M)^{-1}\nabla_0 u = \nabla_0 v = \nabla_0(z + \Delta)^{-1}u.$$

Step 2: Show the intertwining relation for $f \in H_0^\infty(S_\varphi)$.

Since $f \in H_0^\infty(S_\varphi)$, we can write $f(M)$ and $f(-\Delta)$ via Cauchy integrals. Formally, with the identity from Step 1 we would obtain

$$(2) \quad \nabla_0 \int_\gamma f(z)(z + \Delta)^{-1}u \, dz = \int_\gamma f(z)\nabla_0(z + \Delta)^{-1}u \, dz = \int_\gamma f(z)(z - M)^{-1}\nabla_0 u \, dz.$$

The left-hand side coincides with $\nabla_0 f(-\Delta)u$ and the right-hand side with $f(M)\nabla_0 u$. Therefore, justifying (2) concludes this step.

To pull ∇_0 through the integral in the first step of (2), we appeal to Hille's theorem. For this, we have to argue that $f(z)(z + \Delta)^{-1}$ takes values in $D(\nabla_0) = H_0^1(\Omega)$, which is clear, and that the integral

$$(3) \quad \int_\gamma |f(z)| \|\nabla_0(z + \Delta)^{-1}u\| \, d|z|$$

converges absolutely. But $\|\nabla_0(z + \Delta)^{-1}u\| = \|(z - M)^{-1}\nabla_0 u\|$ is controlled by $|z|^{-1}$, again using Step 1 and sectoriality of M . Therefore, the integral in (3) is finite by the additional decay properties of f .

Step 3: The general case $f \in H^\infty(S_\varphi)$.

Recall from [7, Rem. 5.11] the standard regularizer $e(z) = z(1 + z)^{-2}$. By definition, $f(-\Delta)u = e(-\Delta)^{-1}(ef)(-\Delta)u$. As discussed at the start of the proof, $f(-\Delta)u$ is again in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Therefore, we can apply ∇_0 to the last identity to get $\nabla_0 f(-\Delta)u = \nabla_0 e(-\Delta)^{-1}(ef)(-\Delta)u$. By construction of the functional calculus, $v := (ef)(-\Delta)u$ is in the range of $e(-\Delta)$. Furthermore, $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Put $w := e(-\Delta)^{-1}v$. We claim that also $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Indeed, $w = f(-\Delta)u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ as observed above.

Next, we show $\nabla_0 e(-\Delta)^{-1}v = e(M)^{-1}\nabla_0 v$. To this end, write $\nabla_0 v = \nabla_0 e(-\Delta)w = e(M)\nabla_0 w$, where we use Step 2 for the last manipulation. Therefore, $\nabla_0 v \in \text{ran}(e(M))$ and we conclude $e(M)^{-1}\nabla_0 v = \nabla_0 w = \nabla_0 e(-\Delta)^{-1}v$ as desired.

In summary, we deduce with another application of Step 2 to $ef \in H_0^\infty(S_\varphi)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_0 f(-\Delta)u &= \nabla_0 e(-\Delta)^{-1}(ef)(-\Delta)u \\ &= e(M)^{-1}\nabla_0(ef)(-\Delta)u \\ &= e(M)^{-1}(ef)(M)\nabla_0 u \\ &= f(M)\nabla_0 u. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Remark 2.6. The last proposition is our substitute for the observation made in [3, Rem. 4.5].

2.3. (Geometric) Assumptions. We introduce next our geometric assumptions. The reader can keep a bounded Lipschitz domain as example in mind. Moreover, we are going to discuss far reaching generalizations later on in Section 8. These generalizations alter the underlying harmonic analysis only on a minor level and we are going to treat them in a subsequent version of the manuscript.

Definition 2.7 (Hausdorff measure). Let $\ell > 0$ and $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. For $\rho \in (0, \infty]$, define

$$\mathcal{H}_\ell^\rho(E) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} r_k^\ell : E \subseteq \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} B(x_k; r_k), x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n, 0 \leq r_k \leq \rho \right\},$$

where we consider all countable coverings of E by ρ -balls. Then the ℓ -dimensional *Hausdorff measure* is defined as the increasing limit

$$\mathcal{H}_\ell(E) := \lim_{\rho \searrow 0} \mathcal{H}_\ell^\rho(E)$$

Definition 2.8 (ℓ -regular set). Call a measurable set $\Xi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ an ℓ -regular set if there exist constants $A_0, A_1 > 0$ such that, for all $x \in \Xi$ and $r \in (0, 1]$, we have

$$A_0 r^\ell \leq \mathcal{H}_\ell(\Xi \cap B(x; r)) \leq A_1 r^\ell.$$

Remark 2.9. For $\Xi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, an equivalent and more convenient formulation of the above for n -regular sets is

$$\exists c > 0: \forall x \in \Xi: \forall r \in (0, 1]: \quad |Q(x; r) \cap \Xi| \geq c |Q(x; r)|$$

where $Q(x, r)$ is the cube centered at x with sidelength $\ell(Q(x, r)) = 2r$

Assumption (Ω). *The open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is n -regular, and $\partial\Omega$ is $(n - 1)$ -regular.*

Assumption (P). *The open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ admits a Poincaré inequality, that is to say, there exists $c > 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_2 \leq c \|\nabla u\|_2, \quad u \in \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega).$$

Example 2.10. If an open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is contained in a strip, then it satisfies Assumption (P). In particular, all bounded domains satisfy Assumption (P).

The following assumption resembles [9, Ass. (H7)]. In contrast to their hypothesis, we work with the operator $-\Delta$ instead of $1 - \Delta$. In virtue of Assumption (P), also $-\Delta$ is invertible, so that both conditions coincide. It could be interesting to study situations in which $-\Delta$ is merely injective, see Remark 2.12 below. For the inhomogeneous situation we refer again to Section 8.

Assumption ($-\Delta$). *There exists $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and a constant $c > 0$ such that for every function $v = \nabla w$ with $w \in \mathbf{D}(-\Delta)$ there holds the estimate*

$$\|v\|_{[\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega), \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega)]_\alpha} \leq c \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} w\|_2.$$

Example 2.11. (1) If $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$ then $\alpha = 1$ is admissible for a homogeneous version of Assumption ($-\Delta$), see Remark 2.12. Indeed, we would have to control $\partial_i \partial_j w$ by $-\Delta w$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, which is easily verified using Fourier multipliers.

- (2) If $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded Lipschitz domain, then Ω satisfies the three Assumptions (Ω) , (P) and $(-\Delta)$, see [8].

Remark 2.12. Without Assumption (P) it could be interesting to replace the interpolation couple $(L^2(\Omega), H_0^1(\Omega))$ by its homogeneous counterpart $(\dot{L}^2(\Omega), \dot{H}_0^1(\Omega))$. Here, $\dot{L}^2(\Omega)$ consists of the functions in $L^2(\Omega)$ that are mean-value free and $\dot{H}_0^1(\Omega)$ is the completion of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ with respect to the gradient norm $u \mapsto \|\nabla u\|_2$.

3. DYADIC STRUCTURES

The goal of this section is to introduce a replacement for the traditional dyadic cubes from [7, Def. 9.4]. They will be fundamental for the dyadic harmonic analysis presented in Sections 6 and 7.

To put things into a broader context, we note that an open set Ω satisfying Assumption (Ω) equipped with the restricted Euclidean metric and restricted Lebesgue measure is locally doubling, that is, there exists $C \geq 2$ such that for all $x \in \Omega$ and $r \in (0, 1]$ it holds

$$(4) \quad |B_\Omega(x; 2r)| \leq C |B_\Omega(x; r)|.$$

In [5, Thm 11], Christ has constructed a full dyadic structure in spaces that fulfill the doubling property (4) even for all $r \in (0, \infty)$. With the local doubling property from above, the same construction gives a dyadic structure on small scales, that is, we can decompose the space Ω into small ‘‘cubes’’ but not into large ‘‘cubes’’. For our formulation here, we combine [6, Thm 4.2.3, Lemma 4.2.5] with the rescaling argument from [12, Prop. 2.12].

Proposition 3.1 (existence of a dyadic structure). *Let Assumption (Ω) hold. Then there exists a collection $\{Q_\alpha^k : k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \alpha \in I_k\}$ of open sets, where I_k are countable index sets, and constants $a_0, a_1, \eta, C > 0$ such that the following hold:*

- (1) For each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ it holds $|\Omega \setminus \cup_{\alpha \in I_k} Q_\alpha^k| = 0$.
- (2) If $\ell \geq k$, then for each $\alpha \in I_k$ and each $\beta \in I_\ell$ either $Q_\beta^\ell \subseteq Q_\alpha^k$ or $Q_\beta^\ell \cap Q_\alpha^k = \emptyset$.
- (3) If $\ell \leq k$, then for each $\alpha \in I_k$ there is a unique $\beta \in I_\ell$ such that $Q_\alpha^k \subseteq Q_\beta^\ell$.
- (4) For each $Q_\alpha^k, k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \alpha \in I_k$, there exists z_α^k such that

$$Q(z_\alpha^k; a_0 2^{-k}) \cap \Omega \subseteq Q_\alpha^k \subseteq Q(z_\alpha^k; a_1 2^{-k}) \cap \Omega.$$

- (5) If $k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \alpha \in I_k$, and $t > 0$, then

$$|\{x \in Q_\alpha^k : d(x, \mathbb{R}^n \setminus Q_\alpha^k) \leq t 2^{-k}\}| \leq C t^\eta |Q_\alpha^k|.$$

Definition 3.2 (dyadic ‘‘cubes’’). In the setting of Proposition 3.1, put $\square_{2^{-k}} := \{Q_\alpha^k : \alpha \in I_k\}$. Members of this collection are called *dyadic ‘‘cubes’’* of *generation* 2^{-k} . For $t \in (2^{-(k+1)}, 2^{-k}]$, define also $\square_t := \square_{2^{-k}}$. In this case, the *sidelength* of $Q \in \square_t$ is $\ell(Q) := 2^{-k}$. Finally, the collection \square of all *dyadic ‘‘cubes’’* is given by $\bigcup_k \square_{2^{-k}}$.

Definition 3.3 (children and parents). Let $\ell \geq k$, $R \in \square_{2^{-\ell}}$ and $Q \in \square_{2^{-k}}$. If $R \subseteq Q$, then R is called a *child of R* , and Q is called the (*unique*) *parent cube of R* .

With R and Q as in the preceding definition, Proposition 3.1 (2) asserts that R is either a child of Q or disjoint to Q . Moreover, Proposition 3.1 (3) asserts the existence of a parent cube to R . In conjunction with (2), this parent cube has to be unique, which justifies our terminology of unique parent cubes in Definition 3.3.

Remark 3.4. (1) and (2) in Proposition 3.1 imply that, outside of a null set \mathfrak{N} , each $x \in \Omega \setminus \mathfrak{N}$ is uniquely contained in a cube $Q \in \square_t$ for each $t \in (0, 1]$.

Definition 3.5. For $t \in (0, 1]$, $x \in \Omega \setminus \mathfrak{N}$, and $u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ define the *dyadic averaging operator* by

$$\mathcal{A}_t u(x) := \int_{Q_{x,t}} u(y) \, dy,$$

where $Q_{x,t} \in \square_t$ is the unique cube containing x . For $F \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)^n$, via a minor abuse of notation, we define $\mathcal{A}_t F$ by componentwise action, that is

$$\mathcal{A}_t F(x) := (\mathcal{A}_t F_i(x))_{i=1}^n$$

where $F = (F_i(x))_{i=1}^n$.

We investigate some first properties.

Proposition 3.6. $\mathcal{A}_t^2 = \mathcal{A}_t$, and \mathcal{A}_t is a contraction on $L^2(\Omega)^n$ for all $t \in (0, 1]$.

Proof. Fix $t \in (0, 1]$. For the projection property, note that

$$\mathcal{A}_t^2 u(x) = \int_{Q_{x,t}} \left(\int_{Q_{x,t}} u(y) \, dy \right) dz = \int_{Q_{x,t}} (u)_{Q_{x,t}} \, dz = (u)_{Q_{x,t}} = \mathcal{A}_t u(x).$$

For the second property, decomposing $\Omega \setminus \mathfrak{N}$ into the dyadic cubes \square_t and applying Jensen's inequality, we see for $u \in L^2(\Omega)$ that

$$\|\mathcal{A}_t u\|_2^2 = \sum_{Q \in \square_t} \int_Q |\mathcal{A}_t u|^2 = \sum_{Q \in \square_t} |Q| \left| \int_Q u \right|^2 \leq \sum_{Q \in \square_t} |Q| \int_Q |u|^2 = \|u\|_2^2. \quad \square$$

The following is an important tool for later that can be found in [13, Thm 4.3]. It replaces [7, Thm. 9.19]. The notion of a *Carleson measure* was introduced in [7, Def. 9.17]. We will also review it at the beginning of Section 7.

Proposition 3.7 (Carleson's theorem). *If ν is a Carleson measure on $\Omega \times (0, 1]$, then*

$$\iint_{\Omega \times (0,1]} |\mathcal{A}_t u(x)|^2 \, d\nu(x, t) \lesssim \|\nu\|_{\mathcal{C}} \|u\|_2^2$$

4. ELLIPTIC OPERATOR

The main player in the Kato square root conjecture is the *elliptic operator in divergence form* $L = -\operatorname{div}_0 A \nabla_0$ on Ω and subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions. For precise definitions using forms and elementary properties of elliptic operators in divergence form with Dirichlet boundary conditions, we refer to [7] (in particular, Chapter 3.5 contains the relevant definitions). Equivalently, L can be understood as the composition $L = -\operatorname{div}_0 A \nabla_0$ with maximal domain in $L^2(\Omega)$. Note that L is the restriction to $L^2(\Omega)$ of the bounded operator $\mathcal{L} : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow H_0^1(\Omega)^*$ given by $\mathcal{L} = -\operatorname{div} A \nabla_0$.

The following lemma corresponds to Lemmata 11.7 and 11.10 in [7], the proof of which does not rely on the assumption $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 4.1. *The family $\{t \nabla (1 + t^2 L)^{-1}\}_{t>0}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega), L^2(\Omega)^n)$ and the adjoint operator family is given by $\{-t(1 + t^2 \mathcal{L})^{-1} \operatorname{div}\}_{t>0}$.*

We point out again that we restrict here our attention to the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions, but expect that the ideas presented work also in a more general setting with mixed boundary conditions, see Section 8.

One important property of elliptic operators in divergence form is their off-diagonal behaviour. In [7] this question was addressed for $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$, but they remain true on domains using a different proof, for instance by Davi's trick.

Proposition 4.2 (off-diagonal estimates). *The families $\{(1 + t^2 L)^{-1}\}_{t>0}$ and $\{t \nabla (1 + t^2 L)^{-1}\}_{t>0}$ satisfy L^2 off-diagonal estimates, that is, there exist constants $c, C > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$, all measurable subsets $E, F \subseteq \Omega$ and all $u \in L^2(\Omega)$ there holds*

$$\|\mathbf{1}_E (1 + t^2 L)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_F u\|_2 + \|\mathbf{1}_E t \nabla (1 + t^2 L)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_F u\|_2 \leq C e^{-c \frac{d(E,F)}{t}} \|\mathbf{1}_F u\|_2.$$

By duality, also the adjoint family $\{t(1 + t^2 \mathcal{L})^{-1} \operatorname{div}\}_{t>0}$ satisfies L^2 off-diagonal estimates.

4.1. Perturbations of M . We perturb the operator M by the elliptic coefficient function A . The resulting operator MA turns out to remain sectorial, which we are going to exploit in our construction of $T(b)$ -type test functions in Section 7.

Lemma 4.3. *If A is an elliptic matrix, then the operator MA is again sectorial. Moreover, the family $\{t \operatorname{div}_0 A (1 + t^2 MA)^{-1}\}_{t>0}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega)^n, L^2(\Omega))$.*

Proof. In order to prove the sectoriality of MA , it suffices to show that the operator $1 + t^2 MA$ is invertible for all $t > 1$ and that the family of inverses is uniformly bounded in t (see [11, Prop. 2.1.1]). We will use a perturbation argument similar to the one in [15, Prop. 14.14]: Let C be an elliptic coefficient function with upper and lower bounds $\lambda = \lambda(C)$ and $\Lambda = \Lambda(C)$, and put $\tau := \lambda^{-1} \Lambda^2$ and $b := 1 - \tau^{-1} C$. Then $\tau^{-1} C = 1 - b$ with $\|b\| < 1$. Indeed, for $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $\|x\| = 1$ we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \|bx\|^2 &= \left\langle (1 - \tau^{-1} C)x, (1 - \tau^{-1} C)x \right\rangle = \|x\|^2 - \tau^{-1} 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle Cx, x \rangle + \tau^{-2} \|Cx\|^2 \\ &\leq 1 - 2\lambda\tau^{-1} + \tau^{-2} \Lambda^2 = 1 - 2\lambda^2 \Lambda^{-2} + \lambda^2 \Lambda^{-2} = 1 - (\lambda \Lambda^{-1})^2, \end{aligned}$$

so that we find $\|b\| = \sqrt{1 - (\lambda\Lambda^{-1})^2} < 1$. Recall that since A is elliptic, it is in particular invertible and its inverse function A^{-1} is again elliptic. Therefore, we can apply the aforementioned fact to $C = A^{-1}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + t^2MA &= (\tau^{-1}A^{-1} + t^2\tau^{-1}M)\tau A \\ &= (1 + t^2\tau^{-1}M - b)\tau A \\ &= (1 + t^2\tau^{-1}M)(1 - (1 + t^2\tau^{-1}M)^{-1}b)\tau A. \end{aligned}$$

We have use in the last step that $(1 + t^2\tau^{-1}M)^{-1}$ is well defined since M is m-accretive. Moreover, $(1 - (1 + t^2\tau^{-1}M)^{-1}b)$ is invertible in virtue of the Neumann series because $(1 + t^2\tau^{-1}M)^{-1}$ is contractive and $\|b\| < 1$, with norm controlled by $\frac{1}{1 - \|b\|}$, which is independent of t . Finally, the matrix function τA is likewise invertible with norm independent of t .

To prove uniform boundedness of $t \operatorname{div}_0 A(1 + t^2MA)^{-1}$, we can still use the form method presented in [7, Prop. 11.7] (but now with the form \mathfrak{b} associated to M), even though MA is not associated with a form itself. Notice however that $A(1 + t^2MA)^{-1}$ maps into the domain of M , since $(1 + t^2MA)^{-1}$ maps into the domain of MA , which we are going to exploit below. Concretely, for $F \in L^2(\Omega)^n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| t \operatorname{div}_0 A(1 + t^2MA)^{-1}F \right\|^2 &= \mathfrak{b}(t^2A(1 + t^2MA)^{-1}F, A(1 + t^2MA)^{-1}F) \\ &= \left\langle t^2MA(1 + t^2MA)^{-1}F, A(1 + t^2MA)^{-1}F \right\rangle \\ &\leq \Lambda \left\| (1 - (1 + t^2MA)^{-1})F \right\| \left\| (1 + t^2MA)^{-1}F \right\| \lesssim \|F\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the last two steps we used the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, estimated the bounded coefficient matrix A and exploited uniform boundedness of the resolvents $(1 + t^2MA)^{-1}$ in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega))^n$ as shown in the first part of the proof. \square

5. REDUCTION TO A QUADRATIC ESTIMATE

It was shown in the 13th Lecture of [7] that Theorem 1.1 is equivalent to a quadratic estimate. For the readers convenience, we recall that result here.

Proposition 5.1 (reduction to a quadratic estimate). *In the situation of Theorem 1.1, the validity of Kato’s square root property is equivalent to the quadratic estimate*

$$(QE) \quad \int_0^\infty \|tL(1 + t^2L)^{-1}u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|\nabla_0 u\|_2^2, \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$$

for every elliptic operator in divergence form L on Ω subject to pure Dirichlet boundary conditions.

Hence, instead of showing Theorem 1.1 right away we are going to establish (QE) in the following two sections.

As in [7], the quadratic estimate (QE) can be reformulated in terms of the bounded operator $\mathcal{L} : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow (H_0^1(\Omega))^*$. More precisely, writing

$$\Theta_t = -t(1 + t^2\mathcal{L})^{-1} \operatorname{div} A$$

with the very weak divergence operator div , (QE) takes the form

$$(5) \quad \int_0^\infty \|\Theta_t \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|\nabla_0 u\|_2^2, \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Lemma 5.2. *The family $\{\Theta_t\}_{t>0}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega)^n, L^2(\Omega))$ and satisfies L^2 off-diagonal estimates.*

Proof. Since the coefficient matrix A acts as a bounded operator on $L^2(\Omega)$ and preserves the support, the claim is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.2. \square

6. PRINCIPAL PART APPROXIMATION

6.1. Introduction of the relevant operators. Recall that owing to the off-diagonal estimates from Lemma 5.2, Θ_t extends to a bounded operator $L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)$ for all t . We exploit this fact in the subsequent definition of the principal part.

Definition 6.1 (principal part). Identifying the standard unit vectors $e_1, \dots, e_n \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with their respective constant functions on Ω , for $t \in (0, 1]$ we define the *principal part* of Θ_t by

$$\gamma_t := (\Theta_t(e_i))_{i=1}^n \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\Omega)^n$$

Definition 6.2 (smoothing operators). For $t > 0$ we define the smoothing operators

$$P_t = (1 + t^2 M)^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega)^n), \quad Q_t = -t \operatorname{div}_0(1 + t^2 M)^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega)^n, L^2(\Omega)).$$

This choice of P_t and Q_t operators should be compared to Definition 13.7 in [7]. There, smoothing is done via resolvents of $-\Delta$ (applied componentwise to vector fields) instead of resolvents of M . We will see below (for instance, in the proof of Proposition 6.5) that our choice makes algebraic manipulations much nicer: in particular, we do not rely on the Fourier transform to justify commutation of (resolvents) of differential operators, which does not work when they are endowed with boundary conditions. Furthermore, we draw attention to the fact that, in our setting, the roles of Q_t and Q_t^* are swapped in comparison with [7]. Finally, a direct consequence of the intertwining property from Proposition 2.5 with the H^∞ -function $f : z \mapsto (1 + t^2 z)^{-1}$ is the commuting relation

$$(6) \quad P_t \nabla_0 u = \nabla_0(1 - t^2 \Delta)^{-1} u, \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Lemma 6.3. *The families $\{P_t\}$ and $\{Q_t\}$ are uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega)^n)$ and $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega)^n, L^2(\Omega))$, respectively. Thus also the adjoint family $\{Q_t^*\}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega), L^2(\Omega)^n)$, and the operators Q_t^* are given by the bounded extension to $L^2(\Omega)$ of $t(1 + t^2 M)^{-1} \nabla_0$.*

Proof. Uniform boundedness of $\{P_t\}$ is by m -accretivity of M , and for $\{Q_t\}$ one can use the sesquilinear form \mathfrak{b} , see the proof of Lemma 4.3 or [7, Lem. 11.7]. If $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $F \in L^2(\Omega)^n$, then using the definition of $-\operatorname{div}$ and self-adjointness of P_t deduce

$$\langle Q_t^* u, F \rangle = -\langle u, t \operatorname{div}_0 P_t F \rangle = \langle t P_t \nabla_0 u, F \rangle.$$

Hence, Q_t^* is indeed an extension of the operator $t(1+t^2M)^{-1}\nabla_0 = tP_t\nabla_0$ endowed with its maximal domain. \square

Lemma 6.4. *For $F \in L^2(\Omega)^n$ there holds the square function estimate*

$$\int_0^\infty \|Q_t F\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|F\|_2^2,$$

and the reproducing formula

$$2 \int_0^\infty Q_t^* Q_t F \frac{dt}{t} = F.$$

Proof. Note that M is self-adjoint so that the Kato square root property gives

$$\|Q_t F\|_2^2 = \|t \operatorname{div}_0(1+t^2M)^{-1}F\|_2^2 = \|\sqrt{t^2M}(1+t^2M)^{-1}F\|_2^2.$$

The result follows by quadratic estimates for M .

For the reproducing formula, note that Q_t maps into $D(\nabla_0)$, so we can compute

$$Q_t^* Q_t = -t^2(1+t^2M)^{-1}\nabla_0 \operatorname{div}_0(1+t^2M)^{-1} = t^2M(1+t^2M)^{-2} = f(t^2M).$$

Then the Calderón reproducing formula [7, Thm. 6.16] with $f(z) = \frac{z}{(1+z)^2}$ yields the assertion. \square

With these operators we first split the left-hand side of (QE) as

$$(7) \quad \int_0^\infty \|\Theta_t \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \int_0^\infty \|\Theta_t P_t \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} + \int_0^\infty \|\Theta_t(1-P_t)\nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t}.$$

With our choice of smoothing operators, the estimate for the second term becomes easy.

Proposition 6.5. *For $F \in L^2(\Omega)^n$ there holds the quadratic estimate*

$$\int_0^\infty \|\Theta_t(1-P_t)F\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|F\|_2^2.$$

Proof. Note that $1-P_t = t^2MP_t$ and $\operatorname{div} AM = -\operatorname{div} A\nabla_0 \operatorname{div}_0 \subset \mathcal{L} \operatorname{div}_0$. Thus for $F \in L^2(\Omega)^n$ we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_t(1-P_t)F &= -t(1+t^2\mathcal{L})^{-1} \operatorname{div} At^2MP_tF \\ &= t^2(1+t^2\mathcal{L})^{-1} \mathcal{L}t \operatorname{div}_0 P_tF \\ &= t^2L(1+t^2L)^{-1}Q_tF = (1-(1+t^2L)^{-1})Q_tF. \end{aligned}$$

By m -accretivity the resolvents $(1+t^2L)^{-1}$ are uniformly bounded, so we arrive at

$$\int_0^\infty \|\Theta_t(1-P_t)F\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \int_0^\infty \|Q_tF\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|F\|_2^2,$$

where the last step follows from the quadratic estimate for Q_t from Lemma 6.4. \square

6.2. Reduction to finite time. The first term in (7) we want to approximate by the principal part. However, since the dyadic structure on Ω and hence the principal part do only exist on small scales, the integral for $t \geq 1$ has to be treated separately.

Proposition 6.6. *It holds*

$$\int_1^\infty \|\Theta_t P_t \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|\nabla_0 u\|_2^2, \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Proof. Denote by H_α the complex interpolation space $[L^2(\Omega), H_0^1(\Omega)]_\alpha$. Since Θ_t is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega)^n, L^2(\Omega))$ and $H_\alpha(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega)$, we have

$$\|\Theta_t P_t \nabla_0 u\|_2 \lesssim \|P_t \nabla_0 u\|_2 \lesssim \|P_t \nabla_0 u\|_{H_\alpha}.$$

The intertwining property with the H^∞ -function $z \mapsto (1 + t^2 z)^{-1}$ gives $P_t \nabla_0 u = \nabla_0 (1 - t^2 \Delta)^{-1} u$. Since the resolvent $(1 - t^2 \Delta)^{-1}$ maps into $D(-\Delta)$, Assumption $(-\Delta)$, the square root property of $-\Delta$ and the intertwining property from Proposition 2.5 for the H^∞ -function $f(z) = \frac{z^\alpha}{1+t^2z}$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_t \nabla_0 u\|_{H_\alpha} &= \|\nabla_0 (1 - t^2 \Delta)^{-1} u\|_{H_\alpha} \lesssim \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} (1 - t^2 \Delta)^{-1} u\|_2 \\ &= \|\nabla_0 (-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (1 - t^2 \Delta)^{-1} u\|_2 = \|M^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} P_t \nabla_0 u\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

We can then estimate $1 \leq t^{2\alpha}$ to obtain a square function estimate for M with $f(z) = z^{\alpha/2}(1+z)^{-1}$, which reads

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^\infty \|\Theta_t P_t \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} &\lesssim \int_1^\infty t^{2\alpha} \|M^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (1 + t^2 M)^{-1} \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= \int_1^\infty \|f(t^2 M) \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|\nabla_0 u\|_2^2. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

6.3. Smoothed principal part approximation. Keep in mind that the operator $\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t$ acts on $F \in L^2(\Omega)^n$ by $(\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t F)(x) = \gamma_t(x)(\mathcal{A}_t F)(x)$ for almost every x and all $t \in (0, 1]$.

Lemma 6.7. *The family $\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega)^n)$ for $t \in (0, 1]$. Moreover, for $F \in H_0^1(\Omega)^n$ there holds*

$$\|(\Theta_t - \gamma_t \mathcal{A}_t) F\|_2 \lesssim t \|F\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)^n}, \quad t \in (0, 1].$$

Proof. Fix $t \in (0, 1]$ and the natural number k for which $t \in (2^{-(k+1)}, 2^{-k}]$. First, we work on a fixed $Q \in \square_t$. By utilizing Proposition 3.1 (4), there exist constants $a_0, a_1 > 0$ and $z \in \Omega$ such that

$$Q(z; a_0 2^{-k}) \cap \Omega \subseteq Q \subseteq Q(z; a_1 2^{-k}) \cap \Omega.$$

Let $Q_* := Q(z; a_0 2^{-k})$ and $Q^* := Q(z; a_1 2^{-k})$, then the left-hand side becomes $Q_* \cap \Omega$ and the right-hand side $Q^* \cap \Omega$. By Assumption (Ω) there exists $c_\Omega > 0$ such that

$$c_\Omega |Q_*| \leq |Q|.$$

Adapting [7, Prop. 11.12], for compact $K \subset \Omega$, we get the existence of the limit $\Theta_t b := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Theta_t(\mathbf{1}_{2^k Q} b)$ in $L^2(K)$, for $b \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Now, we define *annuli* of a “cube” Q by

$$C_1(Q) := 4Q^* \cap \Omega, \quad C_\ell(Q) := \left(2^{\ell+1}Q^* \setminus 2^\ell Q^*\right) \cap \Omega.$$

and see that, using our adaptation of [7, Prop. 11.12], we arrive at the conclusion of (13.6) in the same notes for $F \in L^2(Q)^n$, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t F &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Theta_t(\mathbf{1}_{2^k Q^* \cap \Omega}(F)_Q) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \Theta_t(\mathbf{1}_{C_\ell(Q)}(F)_Q) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \Theta_t(\mathbf{1}_{C_\ell(Q)}(F)_Q). \end{aligned}$$

Now, note that

$$\frac{d(C_\ell(Q), Q)}{t} \geq \frac{d(C_\ell(Q), Q^*)}{t} = \frac{(2^\ell - 2) \frac{a_1 t}{2}}{t} = \frac{a_1(2^\ell - 2)}{2}.$$

Both of the above, in conjunction with Lemma 5.2, allow us to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{1}_Q(\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t)F\|_2 &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \left\| \mathbf{1}_Q \Theta_t(\mathbf{1}_{C_\ell(Q)}(F)_Q) \right\|_2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} e^{-ca_1 2^\ell} \left\| \mathbf{1}_{C_\ell(Q)}(F)_Q \right\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder’s inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbf{1}_{C_\ell(Q)}(F)_Q \right\|_2 &= \frac{|C_\ell(Q)|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|} \left| \int_Q F(y) \, dy \right| \\ &\leq \left(\frac{|C_\ell(Q)|}{|Q|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{1}_Q F\|_2 \\ &\leq \left(\frac{|2^{\ell+1}Q^*|}{c_\Omega |Q^*|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{1}_Q F\|_2 \\ &= \left(\frac{a_1^n}{c_\Omega a_0^n} 2^{(\ell+1)n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{1}_Q F\|_2 \\ &\approx 2^{\frac{(\ell+1)n}{2}} \|\mathbf{1}_Q F\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

which gives us

$$\|\mathbf{1}_Q(\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t)F\|_2 \lesssim \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} 2^{\frac{(\ell+1)n}{2}} e^{-ca_1 2^\ell} \right) \|\mathbf{1}_Q F\|_2 := C \|\mathbf{1}_Q F\|_2$$

Since the above C is independent of Q and t , squaring and summing both sides yields the first assertion. Now, we can proceed with the second assertion. Since Θ_t is bounded on

$L^2(\Omega)^n$, we have

$$\Theta_t F = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \Theta_t(\mathbf{1}_{C_\ell(Q)} F).$$

Taking the difference with $\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t F$ and again applying Lemma 5.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{1}_Q(\Theta_t - \gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t)F\|_2 &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \left\| \mathbf{1}_Q \Theta_t(\mathbf{1}_{C_\ell(Q)}(F - (F)_Q)) \right\|_2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} e^{-ca_1 2^\ell} \left\| \mathbf{1}_{2^{\ell+1}Q^* \cap \Omega}(F - (F)_Q) \right\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

Now, let E_0 represent extension by zero. Note that $(F)_Q = (E_0 F)_Q$ and $2^{\ell+1}Q^*$ is convex and contains Q . We can apply the local Sobolev-Poincaré inequality [7, Prop. 10.17] to see that there exists a dimensional constant C such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbf{1}_{2^{\ell+1}Q^* \cap \Omega}(F - (F)_Q) \right\|_2 &= \|E_0 F - (E_0 F)_Q\|_{L^2(2^{\ell+1}Q^*)} \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{\text{diam}(2^{\ell+1}Q^*)^n}{|Q|} |2^{\ell+1}Q^*|^{\frac{1}{n}} \right) \|E_0 \nabla F\|_{L^2(2^{\ell+1}Q^*)} \\ &= C \left(\frac{\text{diam}(2^{\ell+1}Q^*)^n}{|Q|} |2^{\ell+1}Q^*|^{\frac{1}{n}} \right) \|\nabla F\|_{L^2(2^{\ell+1}Q^* \cap \Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

The constant we compare to

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\text{diam}(2^{\ell+1}Q^*)^n}{|Q|} |2^{\ell+1}Q^*|^{\frac{1}{n}} \right) &\leq \frac{1}{c_\Omega} \left(\frac{\text{diam}(2^{\ell+1}Q^*)^n}{|Q_*|} |2^{\ell+1}Q^*|^{\frac{1}{n}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{a_0^n c_\Omega} \left((2^{\ell+1} a_1 \sqrt{n})^n 2^{\ell+2} t \right) \\ &= \frac{(a_1 \sqrt{n})^n 2^{n+2}}{a_0^n c_\Omega} 2^{\ell(n+1)} t \\ &\approx 2^{\ell(n+1)} t. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\|\mathbf{1}_Q(\Theta_t - \gamma_t \mathcal{A}_t)F\|_2 \lesssim t \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} 2^{\ell(n+1)} e^{-a_1 c 2^\ell} \left\| \mathbf{1}_{2^{\ell+1}Q^* \cap \Omega} \nabla F \right\|_2$$

From here, the proof follows the lines of [7, Lemma 13.6], with the final observation that $\|\nabla F\|_2 \leq \|F\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}$. \square

Proposition 6.8. *There holds the quadratic estimate*

$$\int_0^1 \|(\Theta_t - \gamma_t \mathcal{A}_t) P_t \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|\nabla_0 u\|_2^2, \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Proof. As in Proposition 6.6, put $H^\alpha = [L^2(\Omega), H_0^1(\Omega)]_\alpha$. On the one hand, $\Theta_t - \gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega)^n, L^2(\Omega))$ since this is the case for both Θ_t and $\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t$, see Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 6.7. On the other hand, the $\mathcal{L}(H_0^1(\Omega)^n, L^2(\Omega))$ -norm of $\Theta_t - \gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t$

is controlled by t in virtue of Lemma 6.7. Therefore, interpolation (see Section 2.1) yields boundedness

$$\Theta_t - \gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t : (\mathbb{H}^\alpha)^n \rightarrow L^2(\Omega), \quad \|\Theta_t - \gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t\| \lesssim t^\alpha.$$

Therefore, we obtain with Assumption $(-\Delta)$ that

$$\|(\Theta_t - \gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t)P_t \nabla_0 u\|_2 \lesssim t^\alpha \|P_t \nabla_0 u\|_{\mathbb{H}^\alpha} \lesssim t^\alpha \|M^{\alpha/2} P_t \nabla_0 u\|_2,$$

where the second bound is obtained similarly to the proof of Proposition 6.6. With the H_0^∞ -function $f : z \mapsto z^{\alpha/2}(1+z)^{-1}$, quadratic estimates for M give

$$\int_0^1 \|(\Theta_t - \gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t)P_t \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \int_0^1 \|f(t^2 M) \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|\nabla_0 u\|_2^2. \quad \square$$

6.4. Reduction to a Carleson measure estimate. So far we have reduced (QE) to the quadratic estimate

$$\int_0^1 \|\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t P_t \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|\nabla_0 u\|_2^2, \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

To eliminate the smoothing via the resolvents P_t and to reduce this to a Carleson measure estimate, we split again

$$(8) \quad \int_0^1 \|\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t P_t \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \int_0^1 \|\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t (P_t - 1) \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} + \int_0^1 \|\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality on \mathbb{C}^n , the second term is bounded as

$$\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\gamma_t(x) \cdot \mathcal{A}_t \nabla_0 u(x)|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t} \leq \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |(\mathcal{A}_t \nabla_0 u)(x)|^2 |\gamma_t(x)|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t}.$$

By Proposition 3.7 this part is controlled by $\|\nabla_0 u\|_2^2$ provided $d\nu = |\gamma_t|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t}$ is a Carleson measure, which we are going to prove in Section 7. To treat the first term on the right-hand side, we need the following lemma. The following lemma will be important soon as well as in the future.

Lemma 6.9. *Letting η be as in Proposition 3.1, we have*

$$\left| \int_Q \nabla_0 u \right|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{t^\eta} \left(\int_Q |u|^2 \right)^{\frac{\eta}{2}} \left(\int_Q |\nabla_0 u|^2 \right)^{1-\frac{\eta}{2}}$$

for all $t \in (0, 1]$, $Q \in \square_t$, and $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Proof. Fix $t \in (0, 1]$, $Q \in \square_t$, and $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Write the estimate above as

$$X \lesssim t^{-\eta} Y^{\eta/2} Z^{1-\eta/2}.$$

First, observe that $X \leq Z$ by Jensen's inequality and that $Y = 0$ implies $Z = 0$. Thus, we can now safely assume $Y, Z > 0$. Put $\tau := Y^{1/2} Z^{-1/2} > 0$ and note that, for $\tau \geq t$, we have

$$X \leq Z \leq \tau^\eta t^{-\eta} Z = t^{-\eta} Y^{\eta/2} Z^{1-\eta/2}.$$

Now, suppose $t < \tau$. Let $Q_r = \{x \in Q : d(x, \mathbb{R}^n \setminus Q) \leq r\}$ for $r > 0$ and note that by Proposition 3.1 (5) we have the estimate

$$(9) \quad |Q_r| \leq Cr^\eta \ell(Q)^{-\eta} |Q| \leq Cr^\eta t^{-\eta} |Q|.$$

Convolve $\mathbf{1}_{Q \setminus Q_{\tau/2}}$ by a suitable kernel to obtain $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(Q)$ with range in $[0, 1]$, equal to 1 on $Q \setminus Q_\tau$ and satisfying $\|\nabla_0 \varphi\| \leq \frac{c}{\tau}$ for $c > 0$ depending only on n . Now, write

$$\nabla_0 u = \varphi \nabla_0 u + (1 - \varphi) \nabla_0 u,$$

and apply integration by parts to see that

$$\int_Q \nabla_0 u = - \int_Q u \nabla_0 \varphi + \int_Q (1 - \varphi) \nabla_0 u.$$

From here, applying the inequality $(x + y)^2 \leq 2(x^2 + y^2)$ as well as Hölder's inequality, noting that both $\nabla_0 \varphi$ and $1 - \varphi$ are 0 on $Q \setminus Q_\tau$ and using (9), we achieve

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_Q \nabla_0 u \right|^2 &\leq 2 \left(\int_Q \mathbf{1}_{Q_\tau} |\nabla_0 \varphi|^2 \right) \left(\int_Q |u|^2 \right) + 2 \left(\int_Q \mathbf{1}_{Q_\tau} |1 - \varphi|^2 \right) \left(\int_Q |\nabla_0 u|^2 \right) \\ &\lesssim |Q_\tau| \left(\tau^{-2} \int_Q |u|^2 + \int_Q |\nabla_0 u|^2 \right) \\ &\lesssim \tau^\eta t^{-\eta} |Q| \left(\tau^{-2} \int_Q |u|^2 + \int_Q |\nabla_0 u|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Translating back in terms of X, Y , and Z , the above says

$$\begin{aligned} |Q|^2 X &\lesssim \tau^{\eta-2} t^{-\eta} |Q|^2 Y + \tau^\eta t^{-\eta} |Q|^2 Z \\ &= 2 |Q|^2 t^{-\eta} Y^{\eta/2} Z^{1-\eta/2}, \end{aligned}$$

from which the claim follows after dividing by $|Q|^2$. \square

Now, the first term on the right-hand side of (8) is controlled by the next proposition.

Proposition 6.10. *There holds the square function estimate*

$$\int_0^1 \|\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t (1 - P_t) \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|\nabla_0 u\|_2^2, \quad u \in \mathbb{H}_0^1(\Omega).$$

Proof. Recall from Proposition 3.6 that the averaging operator \mathcal{A}_t is a projection, that is, $\mathcal{A}_t^2 = \mathcal{A}_t$. By the uniform boundedness of $\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t$ from Lemma 6.7, we have

$$\|\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t (1 - P_t) \nabla_0 u\| = \|(\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t) \mathcal{A}_t (1 - P_t) \nabla_0 u\| \lesssim \|\mathcal{A}_t (1 - P_t) \nabla_0 u\|.$$

Therefore, we can reduce to the quadratic estimate

$$\int_0^1 \|\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t (1 - P_t) \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \int_0^1 \|\mathcal{A}_t (1 - P_t) \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t},$$

which we want to control by $\|\nabla_0 u\|_2^2$. This is done by a Schur-type estimate, which we will perform next. Let us assume for the moment that we have the bound

$$(10) \quad \|\mathcal{A}_s (1 - P_s) Q_t^* v\|_2 \lesssim \zeta(s/t) \|v\|_2, \quad v = \operatorname{div}_0 F \text{ for some } F \in \mathcal{D}(M),$$

for all $s \in (0, 1]$ and $t > 0$ with some function $\zeta \in L^1((0, \infty); d\tau/\tau)$. We prove this estimate below. Using (10), we show how to derive the assertion via a Schur-type estimate.

Since $\mathcal{A}_s(1 - P_s)$ is a bounded operator on $L^2(\Omega)^n$, the Calderón reproducing formula in Lemma 6.4 with $F = \nabla_0 u$ gives

$$\mathcal{A}_s(1 - P_s)\nabla u = 2 \int_0^\infty \mathcal{A}_s(1 - P_s)Q_t^*Q_t\nabla u \frac{dt}{t}.$$

Hence, as $v := Q_t\nabla_0 u = t \operatorname{div}_0(1 + t^2M)^{-1}\nabla_0 u$ is admissible for (10), Young's convolution inequality with indices $1 + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{2}$ on the multiplicative group $(0, \infty)$ with measure $\frac{dt}{t}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \|\mathcal{A}_s(1 - P_s)\nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{ds}{s} &\lesssim \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^\infty \|\mathcal{A}_s(1 - P_s)Q_t^*Q_t\nabla_0 u\|_2 \frac{dt}{t} \right)^2 \frac{ds}{s} \\ &\lesssim \int_0^\infty \left(\int_0^\infty \zeta(s/t) \|Q_t\nabla_0 u\|_2 \frac{dt}{t} \right)^2 \frac{ds}{s} \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_0^\infty \zeta(\tau) \frac{d\tau}{\tau} \right)^2 \int_0^\infty \|Q_t\nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|\nabla_0 u\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last step above follows via the quadratic estimate from Lemma 6.4.

We turn our attention to proving (10). By Definition 6.2, one readily checks the relations

$$P_s Q_t^* = \frac{t}{s} P_t Q_s^*, \quad (1 - P_s) Q_t^* = \frac{s}{t} (1 - P_t) Q_s^*.$$

This is proved by commuting resolvents of M : on the dense subset $H_0^1(\Omega)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - P_s) Q_t^* &= s^2 M (1 + s^2 M)^{-1} t (1 + t^2 M)^{-1} \nabla_0 \\ &= \frac{s}{t} t^2 (1 + t^2 M)^{-1} s (1 + s^2 M)^{-1} \nabla_0 \\ &= \frac{s}{t} (1 - P_t) Q_s^*. \end{aligned}$$

Let now $F \in D(M)$ and $v = \operatorname{div}_0 F$. For $s \leq t$, uniform L^2 -bounds (see Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 6.3) give

$$\|\mathcal{A}_s(1 - P_s)Q_t^*v\|_2 = \frac{s}{t} \|\mathcal{A}_s(1 - P_t)Q_s^*v\|_2 \lesssim \frac{s}{t} \|v\|_2.$$

For $t \leq s$, we have

$$\|\mathcal{A}_s(1 - P_s)Q_t^*v\|_2 \lesssim \|\mathcal{A}_s Q_t^*v\|_2 + \|P_s Q_t^*v\|_2 \lesssim \|\mathcal{A}_s Q_t^*v\|_2 + \frac{t}{s} \|v\|_2.$$

So we are left with estimating the first term. Since $F \in D(M)$, we have $v = \operatorname{div}_0 F \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, so that $Q_t^*v = -t(1 + t^2M)^{-1}\nabla_0 v$. Writing out the averaging operator at scale s , we have

$$(11) \quad \|\mathcal{A}_s Q_t^*v\|_2^2 = \sum_{R \in \square_s} |R| \left(\int_R t P_t \nabla_0 \operatorname{div}_0 F \right)^2.$$

Now the divergence and gradient combine and we can commute $P_t M \subset M P_t$, which reads

$$\left(\int_R t P_t \nabla_0 \operatorname{div}_0 F \right)^2 = \left(\int_R t M P_t F \right)^2 = \left(\int_R t \nabla_0 \operatorname{div}_0 P_t F \right)^2$$

Using Lemma 6.9 and Hölder's inequality (in the sequence space ℓ^2), we can thus estimate the right-hand side of (11) by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{s^\eta} \sum_{R \in \square_s} |R| \left(\int_R |t \operatorname{div}_0 P_t F|^2 \right)^{\eta/2} \left(\int_R |t \nabla_0 \operatorname{div}_0 P_t F|^2 \right)^{1-\eta/2} \\ & \leq \frac{t^\eta}{s^\eta} \left(\sum_{R \in \square_s} \int_R |\operatorname{div}_0 P_t F|^2 \right)^{\eta/2} \left(\sum_{R \in \square_s} \int_R |t \nabla_0 \operatorname{div}_0 P_t F|^2 \right)^{1-\eta/2} \\ & = \frac{t^\eta}{s^\eta} \|\operatorname{div}_0 P_t F\|_2^\eta \|t M P_t F\|_2^{2-\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we have $t M P_t F = t P_t M F = Q_t^* \operatorname{div}_0 F = Q_t^* v$, and we can discard Q_t^* by the uniform bounds from Lemma 6.3. Similarly, the square root property for M applied twice, the fact that $F \in D(M) \subseteq D(\sqrt{M})$ and uniform boundedness of $\{P_t\}_{t>0}$ give

$$\|\operatorname{div}_0 P_t F\|_2 = \|\sqrt{M} P_t F\|_2 = \|P_t \sqrt{M} F\|_2 \lesssim \|\sqrt{M} F\|_2 = \|\operatorname{div}_0 F\|_2 = \|v\|_2.$$

Putting things together, we arrive at (10) with $\zeta(\tau) = \min\{\tau^{-1}, \tau + \tau^\eta\}$, which lies in $L^1((0, \infty), d\tau/\tau)$. \square

Remark 6.11. At least in our homogeneous setting with Assumption (P), the condition on v in (10) is equivalent to $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. In the proof above, instead of combining $-\nabla_0 \operatorname{div}_0 = M$ to commute P_t with ∇_0 , we could make use of the intertwining relation (6), which requires precisely $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

6.5. Full principal part approximation. Let us summarize the different estimates of the previous sections in a single result for future reference.

Proposition 6.12. *There holds the quadratic estimate for the principal part approximation*

$$\int_0^1 \|(\Theta_t - \gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t) \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|\nabla_0 u\|_2^2, \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Proof. Write

$$\Theta_t - \gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t = (\Theta_t - \gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t) P_t + \Theta_t(1 - P_t) - \gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t(1 - P_t).$$

Each term has been treated separately in Proposition 6.8, 6.5 and 6.10, respectively. \square

7. CARLESON MEASURE ESTIMATE AND CONCLUSION

In Section 6, we have reduced the proof of the quadratic estimate (QE) (and hence of the Kato square root conjecture) to proving that the measure $|\gamma_t(x)|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t}$ is a Carleson measure on $(0, 1] \times \Omega$, that is

$$(12) \quad \iint_{R(Q)} |\gamma_t(x)|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t} \lesssim |Q|, \quad Q \in \square.$$

Here, we follow [7] and denote Carleson boxes as $R(Q) = (0, \ell(Q)] \times Q \subseteq (0, 1] \times \Omega$. In Chapter 14 of [7], the Carleson measure estimate (12) is reduced to a bound on sectors in \mathbb{C}^n .

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for each sector*

$$\Gamma_\xi^\varepsilon = \left\{ w \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\} : \left| \frac{w}{|w|} - \xi \right| \leq \varepsilon \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{C}^n, |\xi| = 1,$$

there holds the estimate

$$(13) \quad \iint_{R(Q)} \left| \gamma_t(x) \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_\xi^\varepsilon}(\gamma_t(x)) \right|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t} \lesssim |Q|, \quad Q \in \square.$$

Then $|\gamma_t(x)|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t}$ is a Carleson measure.

It remains to establish the bound (13).

7.1. Construction of Tb-type test functions. The proof of the key estimate (13) relies on a $T(b)$ argument and the construction of adapted test functions. We follow closely the ideas presented in Chapter 14 of [7] but with a different choice of test functions, which is motivated by the first order proof via perturbed Dirac operators in [9].

Proposition 7.2. *There is a constant $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, all unit vectors $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and each dyadic “cube” $Q \in \square$ we can find a “ $T(b)$ -type test function” $b = b^{\varepsilon, \xi, Q} \in L^2(\Omega)$ with the following properties*

- (a) $\|b^{\varepsilon, \xi, Q}\|^2 \lesssim |Q|$.
- (b) $\operatorname{Re}(\xi \cdot f_Q b^{\varepsilon, \xi, Q}) \geq 1$.
- (c) $\iint_{R(Q)} |\gamma_t(x) \cdot \mathcal{A}_t b^{\varepsilon, \xi, Q}(x)|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t} \lesssim |Q|/\varepsilon^2$.

Proof. Fix a unit vector $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $Q \in \square$, and denote by $\ell = \ell(Q)$ the “sidelength” of Q . Define

$$(14) \quad b := b^{\varepsilon, Q, \xi} := 2(1 + \varepsilon^2 \ell^2 MA)^{-1}(\mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}).$$

Recall from Lemma 4.3 that MA is sectorial so that b is indeed well-defined. We are going to verify that, upon choosing $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ sufficiently small, b satisfies the three properties listed above. Write $\tau = \varepsilon \ell$ for brevity.

Proof of (a): Since MA is sectorial, the resolvents $(1 + \tau^2 MA)^{-1}$ are uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega)^n)$, so we have

$$\|b\| = \|2(1 + \tau^2 MA)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}\| \lesssim \|\mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}\| \lesssim |Q|^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof of (b) The underlying heuristic of (b) is that the average of b over Q points roughly in the direction $\bar{\xi}$. Therefore, we estimate the difference

$$(15) \quad \frac{1}{2}b - \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi} = \tau^2 MA(1 + \tau^2 MA)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi} = \tau^2 \nabla_0 v$$

with $v := -\operatorname{div}_0 A(1 + \tau^2 MA)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}$, with the hope that this difference becomes small in the end. Since this difference is a gradient field, Lemma 6.9 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_Q \nabla_0 v \right)^2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{\ell^\eta} \left(\int_Q |v|^2 \right)^{\frac{\eta}{2}} \left(\int_Q |\nabla_0 v|^2 \right)^{1-\frac{\eta}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\ell^\eta} \frac{1}{|Q|} \|v\|_2^\eta \|\nabla_0 v\|_2^{2-\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

By (15) and (a) we have

$$\|\nabla_0 v\|_2 = \tau^{-2} \left\| \frac{1}{2}b - \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi} \right\|_2 \lesssim \tau^{-2} |Q|^{1/2}.$$

Similarly, by the uniform boundedness from Lemma 4.3 and the doubling property for dyadic ‘‘cubes’’ we can control

$$\|v\|_2 = \|\operatorname{div}_0 A(1 + \tau^2 MA)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}\|_2 \lesssim \tau^{-1} \|\mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}\|_2 \approx \tau^{-1} |Q|^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Collecting the powers we arrive at

$$\left(\int_Q \frac{1}{2}b - \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi} \right)^2 = \tau^4 \left(\int_Q \nabla_0 v \right)^2 \lesssim \frac{\tau^{4-\eta-4+2\eta}}{\ell^\eta} = \varepsilon^\eta.$$

Now, assertion (b) follows from

$$\operatorname{Re} \left(\xi \cdot \int_Q b \right) = 2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left(\xi \cdot \int_Q \frac{1}{2}b - \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi} \right) \geq 2 - 2C\varepsilon^\eta$$

if we choose ε small enough so that $2C\varepsilon^\eta \leq 1$.

Proof of (c) Our choice of $T(b)$ -function b is itself not a gradient field (or to be more precise, it is not in the range of ∇_0), so we cannot apply the principal part approximation estimate from Proposition 6.12 to it. However, recalling (15) we can apply the principal part approximation to the difference $\frac{1}{2}b - \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}$. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{R(Q)} |\gamma_t(x) \cdot \mathcal{A}_t b(x)|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t} &\lesssim \iint_{R(Q)} |(\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t - \Theta_t)b|^2 + |\Theta_t b|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t} \\ &\lesssim \iint_{R(Q)} |(\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t - \Theta_t)(\frac{1}{2}b - \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi})|^2 + |(\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t - \Theta_t)\mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}|^2 + |\Theta_t b|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t} \\ &=: I + II + III. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{1}{2}b - \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}$ is in the range of ∇_0 , the first term is controlled using the principal part approximation (Proposition 6.12) and (a), and we get

$$I \lesssim \int_0^1 \|(\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t - \Theta_t)(b - \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi})\|^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \|b\|^2 + \|\mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}\|^2 \lesssim |Q|.$$

The second term can be estimated via off-diagonal estimates and the definition of the principal part approximation, similarly to the proof of Lemma 6.7. Recall that we seek to control

$$\int_0^\ell \|\mathbf{1}_Q(\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t - \Theta_t)\mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t}.$$

On the ‘‘cube’’ Q , $\mathbf{1}_{2Q}$ is constant, so we have $\mathcal{A}_t \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}(x) = \bar{\xi}$ for $x \in Q$. This yields $\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi} = \Theta_t \bar{\xi}$ on Q . With the notation of the proof of Lemma 6.7, this leads to

$$(16) \quad \mathbf{1}_Q (\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t - \Theta_t) \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi} = \mathbf{1}_Q \Theta_t (\bar{\xi} - \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_Q \Theta_t (\mathbf{1}_{(C_j \cap \Omega) \setminus 2Q} \bar{\xi}),$$

where we split Ω into truncated annuli $C_j \cap \Omega$. Recall that for $j \geq 1$ and $t \leq 1$ we have

$$e^{-c \frac{2^j}{t}} = e^{-c \frac{2^{j-1}}{t}} e^{-c \frac{2^{j-1}}{t}} \leq e^{-c 2^{j-1}} e^{-\frac{c}{t}}.$$

Then L^2 off-diagonal estimates (see Proposition 4.2) control the $L^2(\Omega)$ -norm of (16) by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} e^{-c \frac{d((C_j \cap \Omega) \setminus 2Q, Q)}{t}} \|\mathbf{1}_{(C_j \cap \Omega) \setminus 2Q} \bar{\xi}\|_2 &\lesssim \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} e^{-c 2^j / t} 2^{j/2} |Q|^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} e^{-c 2^{j-1}} 2^{j/2} \right) e^{-c/t} |Q|^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim t |Q|^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The last step follows from convergence of the series and estimating $e^{-s} \lesssim \frac{1}{s}$ for $s \geq 0$. It follows

$$\int_0^\ell \|\mathbf{1}_Q (\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t - \Theta_t) \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \int_0^1 t^2 |Q| \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim |Q|.$$

For the last term *III*, observe that resolvents of MA map into $D(MA) \subset D(\operatorname{div}_0 A)$, so that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_t b &= -2t(1 + t^2 \mathcal{L})^{-1} \operatorname{div} A (1 + \tau^2 MA)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi} \\ &= -2t(1 + t^2 L)^{-1} \operatorname{div}_0 A (1 + \tau^2 MA)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.3, we have $\|\operatorname{div}_0 A b\|_2 \lesssim \tau^{-1} \|\mathbf{1}_{2Q} \bar{\xi}\|_2 \lesssim \tau^{-1} |Q|^{1/2}$. Uniform boundedness of the resolvents $(1 + t^2 L)^{-1}$ in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega))$ gives

$$III \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2} \ell^{-2} \int_0^\ell t^2 |Q| \frac{dt}{t} = \frac{|Q|}{\varepsilon^2}. \quad \square$$

7.2. Stopping time argument. We can now exploit the dyadic structure on Ω and the properties of the $T(b)$ -functions constructed in Proposition 7.2 to derive the key estimate (13). The main point is to deduce from property (b) in Proposition 7.2 that $\mathcal{A}_t b^{\varepsilon, \xi, Q}(x)$ points roughly in direction $\bar{\xi}$ for x in a substantial subset of $Q \in \square$. This (and the subsequent reasoning) follows verbatim as in [7, Sec. 14.4]. The reader might recall the notions of parents and childrens of ‘‘cubes’’ from Definition 3.3.

Proposition 7.3. *There is some $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and some $\eta > 0$ such that for all unit vectors $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and all $Q \in \square$ there exist pairwise disjoint dyadic children $Q_j \subseteq Q$ such that the sets*

$$(17) \quad E(Q) = Q \setminus \bigcup_j Q_j \subseteq Q, \quad E^*(Q) = R(Q) \setminus \bigcup_j R(Q_j),$$

there hold the properties

$$(a) \quad |E(Q)| \geq \eta |Q|.$$

$$(b) \left| w \cdot \mathcal{A}_t b^{\varepsilon, \xi, Q}(x) \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{ for all } (x, t) \in E^*(Q) \text{ and } w \in \Gamma_\xi^\varepsilon.$$

To conclude the proof of Lemma 7.1 we cite the following result about Carleson measures, see [7, Lem. 14.10] for a statement and proof in the case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$. It applies verbatim to our situation when replacing traditional dyadic cubes with our ‘‘cubes’’ from Definition 3.2.

Lemma 7.4 (John-Nirenberg lemma for Carleson measures). *Let ν be a Borel measure on $\Omega \times (0, 1]$ such that there are $\eta, \kappa > 0$ with the following property. Each dyadic ‘‘cube’’ $Q \in \square$ has pairwise disjoint dyadic children $Q_j \in \square$ such that the sets $E(Q) \subseteq Q$ and $E^*(Q)$ defined in (17) satisfy*

$$(a) |E(Q)| \geq \eta |Q|.$$

$$(b) \nu(E^*(Q)) \leq \kappa |Q|.$$

Then ν is a Carleson measure with norm at most κ/η .

Proof of the key estimate (13). By part (b) from Proposition 7.3 and property (c) from Proposition 7.2, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{E^*(Q)} \left| \gamma_t(x) \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_\xi^\varepsilon}(\gamma_t(x)) \right|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t} &\leq 4 \iint_{E^*(Q)} \left| \gamma_t(x) \cdot \mathcal{A}_t b^{\varepsilon, Q, \xi}(x) \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_\xi^\varepsilon}(\gamma_t(x)) \right|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t} \\ &\leq 4 \iint_{R(Q)} \left| \gamma_t(x) \cdot \mathcal{A}_t b^{\varepsilon, Q, \xi}(x) \right|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t} \lesssim \frac{|Q|}{\varepsilon^2}. \end{aligned}$$

This and part (a) from Proposition 7.3 ensure by Lemma 7.4 that $\nu = |\gamma_t(x) \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_\xi^\varepsilon}(\gamma_t(x))|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t}$ is a Carleson measure, which yields the asserted estimate (13). \square

We are now done with the proof of the quadratic estimate (QE) and hence of Theorem 1.1. To convince the reader, we give below a short proof summarizing with references the different reduction steps of our proof.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. In Proposition 5.1 we have seen that the Kato square root conjecture is equivalent to (QE). The integral on the left hand side can be split as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \|\Theta_t \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} &\lesssim \int_1^\infty \|\Theta_t (1 - P_t) \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} + \int_1^\infty \|\Theta_t P_t \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \|(\Theta_t - \gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t) \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t} + \int_0^1 \|\gamma_t \cdot \mathcal{A}_t \nabla_0 u\|_2^2 \frac{dt}{t}. \end{aligned}$$

The first and second terms are controlled by Proposition 6.5 resp. 6.6 and the third one is estimated in Proposition 6.12. Via the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in \mathbb{C}^n the last integral is bounded by

$$\int_0^1 \int_\Omega |\mathcal{A}_t \nabla_0 u(x)|^2 |\gamma_t(x)|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t}.$$

By Proposition 3.7, it then suffices to prove that $\nu = |\gamma_t(x)|^2 \frac{dx dt}{t}$ is a Carleson measure on $\Omega \times (0, 1]$, i.e., we want to prove (12). Splitting over angular sectors Γ_ξ^ε in \mathbb{C}^n reduces

this to finding an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that (13) holds true for all directions $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^n$, which we have done above via $T(b)$ -functions and the stopping time argument. \square

8. GENERALIZATION

In [4], the first-named author of this manuscript together with Egert and Haller-Dintelmann establish the state of the art result for Kato’s square root problem subject to mixed boundary conditions. Here, mixed boundary conditions means that the operator L is subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions only on a boundary part $D \subseteq \partial\Omega$ and subject to natural boundary conditions on the remaining boundary part $N := \partial\Omega \setminus D$.

Their geometric framework is as follows. The underlying set Ω is open but might be disconnected and unbounded. The Dirichlet boundary part is supposed to satisfy the Ahlfors–David regularity condition, which means that D is $n-1$ -dimensional on all scales. This is essentially the boundary part of our Assumption (Ω), but we have to consider $r \in (0, \text{diam}(\Omega)]$. For the Neumann boundary part N , a so-called “local uniformity” condition is imposed, which goes back to fundamental work of Jones. More precise definitions for the above hypotheses can be found in the article [4]. We would like to point out that n -regularity condition is not an assumption in [4] and can in fact be removed by an a-posteriori argument from the corresponding result with n -regularity condition.

Besides the geometric assumptions, they also include lower order terms for L , which means that they consider the operator

$$L = -\text{div}(A\nabla + b) + c \cdot \nabla + d.$$

The operators ∇ and $-\text{div}$ are subject to mixed boundary conditions in the sense of Definition 2.1 but where the space $H_0^1(\Omega)$ is replaced by a Sobolev space $H_D^1(\Omega)$ that incorporates the mixed boundary conditions in a suitable way, see again [4] for more details.

In a subsequent version of this manuscript we will recover the full result of [4] using our second order approach.

With the geometric tools developed in [4] it is straightforward to push the geometric assumptions substantially, for instance when it comes to verifying Assumption $(-\Delta)$. Moreover, the lower order terms allow us to get rid of the Assumption (P). The price for this is that we only get the inhomogeneous estimate

$$\|L^{\frac{1}{2}}u\|_2^2 \approx \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|u\|_2^2, \quad u \in H_D^1(\Omega),$$

in Theorem 1.1. In the presence of Assumption (P) we can still recover the homogeneous estimate, compare with [6].

A crucial change for our argument is that the smoothing operator M has to be replaced by the invertible operator $M + 1$. This will lead to more quadratic estimates, some for u instead of ∇u , in the proofs of Proposition 6.6 and Proposition 6.8.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. AUSCHER, S. HOFMANN, M. LACEY, A. MCINTOSH, and P. TCHAMITCHIAN. *The solution of the Kato square root problem for second order elliptic operators on \mathbb{R}^n* . Ann. of Math. (2) **156** (2002), no. 2, 633–654.

- [2] A. AXELSSON, S. KEITH, and A. MCINTOSH. *The Kato square root problem for mixed boundary value problems*. J. London Math. Soc. (2) **74** (2006), no. 1, 113–130.
- [3] A. AXELSSON, S. KEITH, and A. MCINTOSH. *Quadratic estimates and functional calculi of perturbed Dirac operators*. Invent. Math. **163** (2006), no. 3, 455–497.
- [4] S. BECHTEL, M. EGERT, and R. HALLER-DINTELMANN. *The Kato square root problem on locally uniform domains*. Adv. Math. **375** (2020)
- [5] M. CHRIST. *A $T(b)$ theorem with remarks on analytic capacity and the Cauchy integral*. Colloq. Math. **60/61** (1990), no. 2, 601–628.
- [6] M. EGERT. *On Kato’s conjecture and mixed boundary conditions*. PhD Thesis, Sierke Verlag, Göttingen, 2015. Available online <https://www.math.u-psud.fr/~egert/Thesis.pdf>.
- [7] M. EGERT, R. HALLER, S. MONNIAUX, and P. TOLKSDORF. *Harmonic Analysis Techniques for Elliptic Operators*. Lecture notes. Available online https://www.mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de/media/analysis/lehrmaterial_anapde/ISem_complete_lecture_notes.pdf.
- [8] M. EGERT, R. HALLER-DINTELMANN, and P. TOLKSDORF. *The Kato Square Root Problem for mixed boundary conditions*. J. Funct. Anal. **267** (2014), no. 5, 1419–1461.
- [9] M. EGERT, R. HALLER-DINTELMANN, and P. TOLKSDORF. *The Kato Square Root Problem follows from an extrapolation property of the Laplacian*. Publ. Math. **61** (2016), no. 2, 451–483.
- [10] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Springer, Berlin, 2001.
- [11] M. HAASE. *The Functional Calculus for Sectorial Operators*. Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, vol. 169, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2006.
- [12] S. HOFMANN, D. MITREA, M. MITREA, and A. MORRIS. *L^p -Square Function Estimates on Spaces of Homogeneous Type and on Uniformly Rectifiable Sets* Available online <https://arxiv.org/abs/1301.4943>
- [13] A. MORRIS. *The Kato Square Root Problem on submanifolds*. J. Lond. Math. Soc. **86** (2011), no. 3, 879–910.
- [14] H. TRIEBEL. *Interpolation Theory, Function Spaces, Differential Operators*. North-Holland Mathematical Library, vol. 18, North-Holland Publishing, Amsterdam, 1978.
- [15] P. AUSCHER and M. EGERT. *Boundary Value Problems and Hardy Spaces for Elliptic Systems with Block Structure*. Progress in Mathematics, vol. 346, Birkhäuser, Cham, 2023.

DELFT INSTITUTE OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, DELFT UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, P.O. Box 5031,
2600 GA DELFT, THE NETHERLANDS

Email address: s.bechtel@tudelft.nl

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, TUSCALOOSA, AL, 35487, USA

Email address: cmhutcheson@crimson.ua.edu

MATEMATISKA INSTITUTIONEN, STOCKHOLMS UNIVERSITET, 106 91 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

Email address: timotheus.schmatzler@math.su.se

IMACM, BERGISCHE UNIVERSITÄT WUPPERTAL, GAUSSSTRASSE 20, WUPPERTAL, D-42119, GERMANY

Email address: tolgahan.tasci@uni-wuppertal.de

MATHS INSTITUTE, TU HAMBURG (TUHH), D-21073 HAMBURG, GERMANY

Email address: mattes.wittig@tuhh.de