

# SELF-ADJOINT INDEFINITE LAPLACIANS

CLAUDIO CACCIAPUOTI, KONSTANTIN PANKRASHKIN, AND ANDREA POSILICANO

ABSTRACT. Let  $\Omega_-$  and  $\Omega_+$  be two bounded smooth domains in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $n \geq 2$ , separated by a hypersurface  $\Sigma$ . For  $\mu > 0$ , consider the function  $h_\mu = 1_{\Omega_-} - \mu 1_{\Omega_+}$ . We discuss self-adjoint realizations of the operator  $L_\mu = -\nabla \cdot h_\mu \nabla$  in  $L^2(\Omega_- \cup \Omega_+)$  with the Dirichlet condition at the exterior boundary. We show that  $L_\mu$  is always essentially self-adjoint on the natural domain (corresponding to transmission-type boundary conditions at the interface  $\Sigma$ ) and study some properties of its unique self-adjoint extension  $\mathcal{L}_\mu := \overline{L_\mu}$ . If  $\mu \neq 1$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_\mu$  simply coincides with  $L_\mu$  and has compact resolvent. If  $n = 2$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_1$  has a non-empty essential spectrum,  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_1) = \{0\}$ . If  $n \geq 3$ , the spectral properties of  $\mathcal{L}_1$  depend on the geometry of  $\Sigma$ . In particular, it has compact resolvent if  $\Sigma$  is the union of disjoint strictly convex hypersurfaces, but can have a non-empty essential spectrum if a part of  $\Sigma$  is flat. Our construction features the method of boundary triplets, and the problem is reduced to finding the self-adjoint extensions of a pseudodifferential operator on  $\Sigma$ . We discuss some links between the resulting self-adjoint operator  $\mathcal{L}_\mu$  and some effects observed in negative-index materials.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be an open bounded set with a smooth boundary  $\partial\Omega$ . Let  $\Omega_-$  be a subset of  $\Omega$  having a smooth boundary  $\Sigma$  (called *interface*) and such that  $\overline{\Omega_-} \subset \Omega$ . In addition, we consider the open set  $\Omega_+ := \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_-}$ , whose boundary is  $\partial\Omega_+ = \Sigma \cup \partial\Omega$ , and denote by  $N_\pm$  the unit normal on  $\Sigma$  exterior with respect to  $\Omega_\pm$ . For  $\mu > 0$ , consider the function  $h : \Omega \setminus \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$h_\mu(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in \Omega_-, \\ -\mu, & x \in \Omega_+. \end{cases}$$

The aim of the present work is to construct self-adjoint operators in  $L^2(\Omega)$  corresponding to the formally symmetric differential expression  $L_\mu = -\nabla \cdot h_\mu \nabla$ . The operators of such a type appear e.g. in the study of negative-index metamaterials, and we refer to the recent paper [29] for a survey and an extensive bibliography; we remark that the parameter  $\mu$  is usually called *contrast*. A possible approach is to consider the sesquilinear form

$$\ell_\mu(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} h_\mu \overline{\nabla u} \cdot \nabla v \, dx, \quad u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega),$$

and then to define  $L_\mu$  as the operator generated by  $\ell_\mu$ , in particular, for all functions  $v$  from the domain of  $L_\mu$  one should then have

$$\int_{\Omega} \overline{u} L_\mu v \, dx = \ell_\mu(u, v), \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega). \quad (1)$$

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J05, 47A10, 47B25, 47G30.

*Key words and phrases.* Self-adjoint extension, sign-changing differential operator, negative-index material, Laplacian, boundary condition.

But the form  $\ell_\mu$  is not semibounded below, hence, the operator obtained in this way can have exotic properties, in particular, its self-adjointness is not guaranteed. We refer to [19, 35, 36] for some available results in this direction.

In [4] a self-adjoint operator for the above expression was constructed for a very particular geometry when  $\Omega_- = (-1, 0) \times (0, 1)$  and  $\Omega_+ = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$ , which enjoys a separation of variables and some symmetries. An interesting feature of the model is the possibility of a non-empty essential spectrum although the domain is bounded. Constructing self-adjoint operators realizations of  $L_\mu$  for the general case is an open problem, see [23]. In the present note, we give a solution in the case of a smooth interface.

One should remark that the study of various boundary value problems involving differential expressions  $\nabla \cdot h \nabla$  with sign-changing  $h$  has a long history, and the most classical form involves unbounded domains with a suitable radiation condition at infinity, cf. [12, 17, 31]. In particular, the geometric conditions appearing in the main results below are very close to those of [28, 31] for the well-posedness of a transmission problem. The case of a non-smooth interface  $\Sigma$ , which was partially studied in [7, 8, 9], is not covered by our approach.

In fact, the problem of self-adjoint realizations the non-critical case  $\mu \neq 1$  was essentially settled in [7], while for the critical case  $\mu = 1$  was only studied for the above-mentioned example of [4], in [36, Chapter 8] for another similar situation (symmetric  $\Omega_-$  and  $\Omega_+$  separated by a finite portion of a hyperplane), and in [20] for the one-dimensional case. In a sense, in the present work we recast some techniques of the transmission problems and the pseudodifferential operators into the setting of self-adjoint extensions. Using the machinery of boundary triplets we reduce the problem first to finding self-adjoint extensions of a symmetric differential operator and then to the analysis of the associated Weyl function acting on the interface  $\Sigma$ . Then one arrives at the study of the essential self-adjointness of a pseudodifferential operator on  $\Sigma$ , whose properties depend on the dimension. We hope that, in view of the recent progress in the theory of self-adjoint extensions of partial differential operators, see e.g. [5, 6, 15], such a direct reformulation could be a starting point for a further advance in the study of indefinite operators.

Similar to [4], our approach is based on the theory of self-adjoint extensions. Using the natural identification  $L^2(\Omega) \simeq L^2(\Omega_-) \oplus L^2(\Omega_+)$ ,  $u \simeq (u_-, u_+)$ , we introduce the sets

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu^s(\Omega \setminus \Sigma) := \left\{ u = (u_-, u_+) \in H^s(\Omega_-) \oplus H^s(\Omega_+) : \Delta u_\pm \in L^2(\Omega_\pm), \right. \\ \left. u_- = u_+ \text{ and } N_- \cdot \nabla u_- = \mu N_+ \cdot \nabla u_+ \text{ on } \Sigma, \quad u_+ = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \right\}, \quad s \geq 0.$$

Here and below, the values at the boundary are understood as suitable Sobolev traces; the exact definitions are given in Section 3. Let us recall that for  $\frac{1}{2} < s < \frac{3}{2}$  and  $u = (u_-, u_+) \in H^s(\Omega_-) \oplus H^s(\Omega_+)$  the conditions  $u_- = u_+$  on  $\Sigma$  and  $u_+ = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$  entail  $u \in H_0^s(\Omega)$ , see e.g. [1, Theorem 3.5.1]. In particular,

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu^2(\Omega \setminus \Sigma) \subseteq H_0^{\frac{3}{2}-\varepsilon}(\Omega) \text{ for } \varepsilon > 0, \quad \mathcal{D}_\mu^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma) \subseteq H_0^1(\Omega). \quad (2)$$

Consider the operator

$$L_\mu(u_-, u_+) = (-\Delta u_-, \mu \Delta u_+), \text{ with } \Delta = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1^2} + \cdots + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_n^2}, \quad (3)$$

acting on the domain

$$\text{dom } L_\mu = \mathcal{D}_\mu^2(\Omega \setminus \Sigma). \quad (4)$$

Remark that  $L_\mu$  satisfies (1) and it is a densely defined symmetric operator in  $L^2(\Omega)$ . Therefore, we use  $L_\mu$  as a starting point and seek its self-adjoint extensions. Even if the case  $\mu \neq 1$  was studied earlier, we include it into consideration as it does not imply any additional difficulties.

**Theorem 1** (Self-adjointness). *The operator  $L_\mu$  is essentially self-adjoint, and we denote*

$$\mathcal{L}_\mu := \overline{L_\mu}$$

*its closure and unique self-adjoint extension. Furthermore, if  $\mu \neq 1$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_\mu = L_\mu$ , i.e.  $L_\mu$  itself is self-adjoint, and has compact resolvent.*

Now we consider in greater detail the critical case  $\mu = 1$ . The properties of  $\mathcal{L}_1$  appear to depend on the dimension. In two dimensions, we have a complete result:

**Theorem 2** (Critical contrast in two dimensions). *Let  $\mu = 1$  and  $n = 2$ , then*

$$\text{dom } \mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{D}_1^0(\Omega \setminus \Sigma), \quad \mathcal{L}_1(u_-, u_+) = (-\Delta u_-, \Delta u_+), \quad (5)$$

*and the essential spectrum is non-empty,  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_1) = \{0\}$ .*

Remark (see Proposition 4 below) that 0 is not necessarily an eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}_1$ , contrary to the preceding examples given in [4] and [36, Chapter 8] for which the essential spectrum consisted of an infinitely degenerate zero eigenvalue.

In dimensions  $n \geq 3$  the result appears to depend on the geometric properties of  $\Sigma$ :

**Theorem 3** (Critical contrast in dimensions  $\geq 3$ ). *Let  $\mu = 1$  and  $n \geq 3$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_1$  acts as  $\mathcal{L}_1(u_-, u_+) = (-\Delta u_-, \Delta u_+)$ , and its domain satisfies*

$$\mathcal{D}_1^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma) \subseteq \text{dom } \mathcal{L}_1. \quad (6)$$

*Furthermore,*

- (a) *If on each connected component of  $\Sigma$  the principal curvatures are either all strictly positive or all strictly negative (in particular, if each maximal connected component of  $\Sigma$  is strictly convex), then*

$$\text{dom } \mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{D}_1^1(\Omega \setminus \Sigma) \quad (7)$$

*and  $\mathcal{L}_1$  has compact resolvent.*

- (b) *If a subset of  $\Sigma$  is isometric to a non-empty open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , then*

$$\text{dom } \mathcal{L}_1 \neq \mathcal{D}_1^s(\Omega \setminus \Sigma) \quad \text{for any } s > 0, \quad (8)$$

*the essential spectrum of  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is non-empty, and  $\{0\} \subseteq \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ .*

The proofs of the three theorems are given in Sections 2–4. In section 2 we recall the tools of the machinery of boundary triplets for self-adjoint extensions of symmetric operators. In section 3 we apply these tools to the operators  $L_\mu$  and reduce the initial problem to finding self-adjoint extensions of a pseudodifferential operator  $\Theta_\mu$  acting on  $\Sigma$ , which is essentially a linear combination of (suitably defined) Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps on  $\Omega_\pm$ . The self-adjoint extensions of  $\Theta_\mu$  are studied in Section 4 using a combination of some facts about Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps and pseudodifferential operators.

In addition, we use the definition of the operators  $\mathcal{L}_\mu$  to revisit some results concerning the so-called cloaking by negative materials, see e.g [29, 30]. For  $\delta > 0$ , consider the operator

$T_{\mu,\delta}$  generated by the regularized sesquilinear form

$$t_{\mu,\delta}(u, v) := \int_{\Omega \setminus \Sigma} \overline{\nabla u} \cdot (h_\mu + i\delta) \nabla v \, dx, \quad u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

By the Lax-Milgram theorem, the operator  $T_{\mu,\delta} : L^2(\Omega) \supset H_0^1(\Omega) \supset \text{dom } T_{\mu,\delta} \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$  has a bounded inverse, hence, for  $g \in L^2(\Omega)$  one may define  $u_\delta := (T_{\mu,\delta})^{-1}g \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ . It was observed in [30] that the limit properties of  $u_\delta$  as  $\delta$  tends to 0 can be quite irregular, in particular, the norm  $\|u_\delta\|_{H^1(V)}$  may remain bounded for some subset  $V \subset \Omega$  while  $\|u_\delta\|_{H^1(\Omega \setminus V)}$  goes to infinity. The most prominent example is as follows: for  $0 < r < R$  we denote

$$B_r := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| < r\}, \quad B_{r,R} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : r < |x| < R\}, \quad S_r := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| = r\},$$

pick three constants  $0 < r_i < r_e < R$  and consider the above operator  $T_{\mu,\delta}$  corresponding to

$$\Omega := B_R, \quad \Omega_- := B_{r_i, r_e}, \tag{9}$$

and set  $u_\delta := (T_{\mu,\delta})^{-1}g$  with  $g$  supported in  $B_{r_e, R}$ . Then the norm  $\|u_\delta\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$  remains bounded for  $\delta$  approaching 0 provided  $\mu \neq 1$  or  $n \geq 3$ . For  $\mu = 1$  and  $n = 2$  the situation appears to be different: if  $g$  is supported outside the ball  $B_a$  with  $a = r_e^2/r_i$ , then  $\|u_\delta\|_{H^1(B_R)}$  remains bounded, otherwise, for a generic  $g$ , the norm  $\|u_\delta\|_{H^1(B_{r_e, R})}$  is bounded, while  $\|u_\delta\|_{H^1(B_{r_i, r_e})}$  becomes infinite, see [30]. Such a non-uniform blow-up the  $H^1$  norm is often referred to as an anomalously localized resonance, and we refer to [2, 3, 10, 22, 27] for a discussion of other similar models and generalizations.

It is interesting to understand whether similar observations can be made based on the direct study of the operator  $\mathcal{L}_\mu$ . In fact, instead of taking the limit of  $u_\delta$  one may study directly the solutions  $u$  of  $\mathcal{L}_\mu u = g$ . If  $\mu \neq 1$ , then  $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  by Theorem 1. Furthermore, due to Theorem 3(b) the same holds for  $\mu = 1$  and  $n \geq 3$  as the interface  $\Sigma$  consists of two strictly convex hypersurfaces (the spheres  $S_{r_i}$  and  $S_{r_e}$ ), which is quite close to the discussion of [21]; we remark that a separation of variables shows that  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is injective and thus surjective in this case. The study of the case  $\mu = 1$  and  $n = 2$  is more involved, and the link to the anomalously localized resonance appears as follows (we assume a special form of the function  $g$  to make the discussion more transparent):

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $\mu = 1$  and  $n = 2$ , then the operator  $\mathcal{L}_1$  associated with (9) is injective, and a function  $g \in L^2(B_R)$  of the form*

$$g(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) = 1_{(a,b)}(r)h(\theta), \quad h \in L^2(0, 2\pi), \quad r_e \leq a < b \leq R, \tag{10}$$

belongs to  $\text{ran } \mathcal{L}_1$  if and only if

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|h_m|^2}{|m|^5} \left(\frac{r_e^2}{r_i a}\right)^{2|m|} < \infty \quad \text{with } h_m := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} h(\theta) e^{-im\theta} d\theta. \tag{11}$$

In particular, the condition (11) is satisfied for any  $h$  if  $a \geq r_e^2/r_i$ , but fails generically for  $a < r_e^2/r_i$ .

**Acknowledgments.** C.C. acknowledges the support of the FIR 2013 project ‘‘Condensed Matter in Mathematical Physics’’, Ministry of University and Research of Italian Republic (code RBFR13WAET).

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Boundary triplets.** For a linear operator  $B$  we denote  $\text{dom } B$ ,  $\text{ker } B$ ,  $\text{ran } B$ ,  $\sigma(B)$  and  $\rho(B)$  its domain, kernel, range, spectrum and resolvent set respectively. For a self-adjoint operator  $B$ , by  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(B)$  and  $\sigma_{\text{p}}(B)$  we denote respectively its essential spectrum and point spectrum (i.e. the set of the eigenvalues). The scalar product in a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  will be denoted as  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$  or, if there is no ambiguity, simply as  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ , and it is assumed anti-linear with respect to the first argument. By  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{H})$  we mean the Banach space of the bounded linear operators from a Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{h}$  to a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , and we set  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H})$ .

Let us recall the key points of the method of boundary triplets for self-adjoint extensions [11, 13, 16]. Our presentation mostly follows the first chapters of [11]. Let  $S$  be a closed densely defined symmetric operator in a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . A triplet  $(\mathfrak{h}, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ , where  $\mathfrak{h}$  is an auxiliary Hilbert space and  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  are linear maps from the domain  $\text{dom } S^*$  of the adjoint operator  $S^*$  to  $\mathfrak{h}$ , is called a *boundary triplet* for  $S$  if the following three conditions are satisfied:

- (a) the Green's identity  $\langle u, S^*v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} - \langle S^*u, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle \Gamma_1 u, \Gamma_2 v \rangle_{\mathfrak{h}} - \langle \Gamma_2 u, \Gamma_1 v \rangle_{\mathfrak{h}}$  holds for all  $u, v \in \text{dom } S^*$ ,
- (b) the map  $\text{dom } S^* \ni u \mapsto (\Gamma_1 u, \Gamma_2 u) \in \mathfrak{h} \times \mathfrak{h}$  is surjective,
- (c)  $\text{ker } \Gamma_1 \cap \text{ker } \Gamma_2 = \text{dom } S$ .

It is known that a boundary triplet for  $S$  exists if and only if  $S$  admits self-adjoint extensions, i.e. if its deficiency indices are equal,  $\dim \text{ker}(S^* - i) = \dim \text{ker}(S^* + i) =: \mathfrak{n}(S)$ . A boundary triplet is not unique, but for any choice of a boundary triplet  $(\mathfrak{h}, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$  for  $S$  one has  $\dim \mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{n}(S)$ .

Let us assume from now on that the deficiency indices of  $S$  are equal and pick a boundary triplet  $(\mathfrak{h}, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ , then the self-adjoint extensions of  $S$  are in a one-to-one correspondence with the self-adjoint linear relations in  $\mathfrak{h}$  (multi-valued self-adjoint operators). In the present text we prefer to keep the operator language and reformulate this result as follows, cf. [33]: Let  $\Pi : \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \text{ran } \Pi \subseteq \mathfrak{h}$  be an orthogonal projector in  $\mathfrak{h}$  and  $\Theta$  be a linear operator in the Hilbert space  $\text{ran } \Pi$  with the induced scalar product. Denote by  $A_{\Pi, \Theta}$  the restriction of  $S^*$  to

$$\text{dom } A_{\Pi, \Theta} = \{u \in \text{dom } S^* : \Gamma_1 u \in \text{dom } \Theta \text{ and } \Pi \Gamma_2 u = \Theta \Gamma_1 u\},$$

then  $A_{\Pi, \Theta}$  is symmetric/closed/self-adjoint iff  $\Theta$  possesses the respective property as an operator in  $\text{ran } \Pi$ , and one has  $\overline{A_{\Pi, \Theta}} = A_{\Pi, \overline{\Theta}}$ , where as usual the bar means taking the closure. Furthermore, any self-adjoint extension of  $S$  is of the form  $A_{\Pi, \Theta}$ .

The spectral analysis of the self-adjoint extensions can be carried out using the associated Weyl functions. Namely, let  $A$  be the restriction of  $S^*$  to  $\text{ker } \Gamma_1$ , i.e. corresponds to  $(\Pi, \Theta) = (0, 0)$  in the above notation, which is a self-adjoint operator. For  $z \in \rho(A)$  the restriction  $\Gamma_1 : \text{ker}(S^* - z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}$  is a bijection, and we denote its inverse by  $G_z$ . The map  $z \mapsto G_z$ , called the associated  $\gamma$ -field, is then a holomorphic map from  $\rho(A)$  to  $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{H})$  with

$$G_z - G_w = (z - w)(A - z)^{-1}G_w, \quad z, w \in \rho(A). \quad (12)$$

The *Weyl function* associated with the boundary triplet is then the holomorphic map

$$\rho(A) \ni z \mapsto M_z := \Gamma_2 G_z \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h}).$$

To describe the spectral properties of the self-adjoint operators  $A_{\Pi, \Theta}$  let us consider first the case  $\Pi = 1$ , then  $\Theta$  is a self-adjoint operator in  $\mathcal{H}$ , and the following holds, see Theorems 1.29 and Theorem 3.3 in [11]:

**Proposition 5.** *For any  $z \in \rho(A) \cap \rho(A_{1,\Theta})$  one has  $0 \in \rho(\Theta - M_z)$  and the resolvent formula*

$$(A_{1,\Theta} - z)^{-1} = (A - z)^{-1} + G_z(\Theta - M_z)^{-1}G_z^* \quad (13)$$

*holds. In addition, for any  $z \in \rho(A)$  one has the equivalences:*

- (a)  $z \in \sigma(A_{1,\Theta})$  iff  $0 \in \sigma(\Theta - M_z)$ ,
- (b)  $z \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(A_{1,\Theta})$  iff  $0 \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\Theta - M_z)$ ,
- (c)  $z \in \sigma_p(A_{1,\Theta})$  iff  $0 \in \sigma_p(\Theta - M_z)$  with  $G_z$  being an isomorphism of the eigensubspaces.
- (d) If  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ , then  $f \in \text{ran}(A_{1,\Theta} - z)$  iff  $G_z^*f \in \text{ran}(\Theta - M_z)$ . If  $\Theta - M_z$  is injective, the resolvent formula (13) still holds for such  $f$ .

It seems that the point (d) was not stated explicitly in earlier references, its proof is given in Appendix A.

Now let  $A_{\Pi,\Theta}$  be an arbitrary self-adjoint extension. Denote by  $S_{\Pi}$  the restriction of  $S^*$  to

$$\text{dom } S_{\Pi} = \{u \in \text{dom } S^* : \Gamma_1 u = \Pi \Gamma_2 u = 0\},$$

which is a closed densely defined symmetric operator whose adjoint  $S_{\Pi}^*$  is the restriction of  $S^*$  to

$$\text{dom } S_{\Pi}^* = \{u \in \text{dom } S^* : \Gamma_1 u \in \text{ran } \Pi\},$$

then  $(\text{ran } \Pi, \Gamma_1^{\Pi}, \Gamma_2^{\Pi})$ , with  $\Gamma_j^{\Pi} := \Pi \Gamma_j$ , is a boundary triplet for  $S_{\Pi}$ , and the restriction of  $S_{\Pi}^*$  to  $\ker \Gamma_1^{\Pi}$  is the same operator  $A$  as previously. The associated  $\gamma$ -field and Weyl function take the form

$$z \mapsto G_z^{\Pi} := G_z \Pi^*, \quad z \mapsto M_z^{\Pi} := \Pi M_z \Pi^*,$$

and  $\text{dom } A_{\Pi,\Theta} := \{u \in \text{dom } S_{\Pi}^* : \Gamma_2^{\Pi} u = \Theta \Gamma_1^{\Pi} u\}$ , see [11, Remark 1.30]. A direct application of Proposition 5 gives

**Corollary 6.** *For any  $z \in \rho(A) \cap \rho(A_{\Pi,\Theta})$  one has  $0 \in \rho(\Theta - M_z^{\Pi})$  and the resolvent formula*

$$(A_{\Pi,\Theta} - z)^{-1} = (A - z)^{-1} + G_z^{\Pi}(\Theta - M_z^{\Pi})^{-1}(G_z^{\Pi})^* \quad (14)$$

*holds, and, in addition, for any  $z \in \rho(A)$  one has*

- (a)  $z \in \sigma(A_{\Pi,\Theta})$  iff  $0 \in \sigma(\Theta - M_z^{\Pi})$ ,
- (b)  $z \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(A_{\Pi,\Theta})$  iff  $0 \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\Theta - M_z^{\Pi})$ ,
- (c)  $z \in \sigma_p(A_{\Pi,\Theta})$  iff  $0 \in \sigma_p(\Theta - M_z^{\Pi})$  with  $G_z^{\Pi}$  being an isomorphism of the eigensubspaces.
- (d) If  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ , then  $f \in \text{ran}(A_{\Pi,\Theta} - z)$  iff  $(G_z^{\Pi})^* f \in \text{ran}(\Theta - M_z^{\Pi})$ . If  $\Theta - M_z^{\Pi}$  is injective, the resolvent formula (14) still holds for such  $f$ .

**2.2. Singular perturbations.** In this section let us recall a special approach to the construction of boundary triplets as presented in [32] and [33] or in [11, Section 1.4.2]. Let  $A$  be a self-adjoint operator in a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , then we denote by  $\mathcal{H}_A$  the Hilbert space given by the linear space  $\text{dom } A$  endowed with the scalar product  $\langle u, v \rangle_A = \langle u, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle Au, Av \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{h}$  be an auxiliary Hilbert space and  $\tau : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}$  be a bounded linear map which is *surjective* and whose kernel  $\ker \tau$  is *dense in*  $\mathcal{H}$ , then the restriction  $S$  of  $A$  to  $\ker \tau$  is a closed densely defined symmetric operator in  $\mathcal{H}$ . To simplify the formulas we assume additionally that

$$0 \in \rho(A),$$

which always holds in the subsequent applications. For  $z \in \rho(A)$  consider the maps

$$G_z := (\tau(A - \bar{z})^{-1})^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{H}), \quad M_z := \tau(G_z - G_0) \equiv z\tau A^{-1}G_z \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{h}). \quad (15)$$

**Proposition 7.** *The adjoint  $S^*$  is given by*

$$\text{dom } S^* := \{u = u_0 + G_0 f_u : u_0 \in \text{dom } A \text{ and } f_u \in \mathfrak{h}\}, \quad S^* u = A u_0.$$

Furthermore, the triplet  $(\mathfrak{h}, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$  with  $\Gamma_1 u := f_u$  and  $\Gamma_2 u := \tau u_0$  is a boundary triplet for  $S$ , and the associated  $\gamma$ -field  $G_z$  and Weyl function  $M_z$  are given by (15).

**Example 8.** Let  $A_\pm$  be self-adjoint operators in Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}_\pm$  with  $0 \in \rho(A_\pm)$ , and let  $\mathfrak{h}_\pm, \tau_\pm, S_\pm, G_z^\pm, M_z^\pm, \Gamma_j^\pm$  be the spaces and maps defined as above and associated with  $A_\pm$ . For  $\nu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  consider the operator  $A := A_- \oplus \nu A_+$  acting in the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}_- \oplus \mathcal{H}_+$ . Set  $\tau = \tau_- \oplus \nu \tau_+$ , then the restriction  $S$  of  $A$  to  $\ker \tau$  has again the structure of a direct sum,  $S = S_- \oplus \nu S_+$ , with  $\gamma$ -field and Weyl function given by

$$G_z = G_z^- \oplus G_z^+, \quad M_z = M_z^- \oplus \nu M_z^+.$$

Thus, by the preceding considerations, the adjoint  $S^*$  acts on the domain

$$\text{dom } S^* = \{u = (u_-, u_+) : u_\pm = u_0^\pm + G_0^\pm \phi_\pm, \quad u_0^\pm \in \text{dom } A_\pm, \quad \phi_\pm \in \mathfrak{h}_\pm\} \quad (16)$$

by  $S^*(u_-, u_+) = A(u_0^-, u_0^+)$ , and one can take  $(\mathfrak{h}_- \oplus \mathfrak{h}_+, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$  as a boundary triplet for  $S$ ,

$$\Gamma_1 u = (\phi_-, \phi_+), \quad \Gamma_2 u = (\tau_- u_0^-, \nu \tau_+ u_0^+). \quad (17)$$

### 3. BOUNDARY TRIPLETS FOR INDEFINITE LAPLACIANS

We start with some constructions for the closed symmetric operator

$$S = (-\Delta_-^{\min}) \oplus \mu \Delta_+^{\min}, \quad \Delta_\pm^{\min} : L^2(\Omega_\pm) \supset H_0^2(\Omega_\pm) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega_\pm), \quad (18)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^2(\Omega_-) &:= \{u_- \in H^2(\Omega_-) : (\gamma_0^- u_-, \gamma_1^- u_-) = (0, 0)\}, \\ H_0^2(\Omega_+) &:= \{u_+ \in H^2(\Omega_+) : (\gamma_0^+ u_+, \gamma_1^+ u_+, \gamma_0^\partial u_+, \gamma_1^\partial u_+) = (0, 0, 0, 0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here and later on,  $H^m(\Omega_\pm)$  denotes the usual Sobolev-Hilbert space of the square-integrable functions on  $\Omega_\pm$  with square integrable partial (distributional) derivatives of any order  $k \leq m$ , and the linear operators

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0^\pm : H^2(\Omega_\pm) &\rightarrow H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma), & \gamma_1^\pm : H^2(\Omega_\pm) &\rightarrow H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma), \\ \gamma_0^\partial : H^2(\Omega_+) &\rightarrow H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega), & \gamma_1^\partial : H^2(\Omega_+) &\rightarrow H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega), \end{aligned}$$

are the usual trace maps first defined on  $u_\pm \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_\pm})$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0^\pm u_\pm(x) &:= u_\pm(x), & \gamma_1^\pm u_\pm(x) &:= N_\pm(x) \cdot \nabla u_\pm(x), & x \in \Sigma, \\ \gamma_0^\partial u_+(x) &:= u_+(x), & \gamma_1^\partial u_+(x) &:= N_\partial(x) \cdot \nabla u_+(x), & x \in \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

with  $N_\partial$  being the outer unit normal on  $\partial\Omega$ , and then extended by continuity. It is well known, see e.g. [26, Chapter 1, Section 8.2], that the maps

$$\begin{aligned} H^2(\Omega_-) \ni u_- &\mapsto (\gamma_0^- u_-, \gamma_1^- u_-) \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma) \oplus H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma), \\ H^2(\Omega_+) \ni u_+ &\mapsto (\gamma_0^+ u_+, \gamma_1^+ u_+, \gamma_0^\partial u_+, \gamma_1^\partial u_+) \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma) \oplus H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma) \oplus H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega) \oplus H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega) \end{aligned}$$

are bounded and surjective.

We remark that both  $\Sigma$  and  $\partial\Omega$  can be made smooth compact Riemannian manifolds. For  $\Xi = \Sigma$  or  $\Xi = \partial\Omega$ , the fractional order Sobolev-Hilbert spaces  $H^s(\Xi)$  with  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , are defined in the standard way as the completions of  $C^\infty(\Xi)$  with respect to the scalar products

$$\langle \phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle_{H^s(\Xi)} := \langle \phi_1, (-\Delta_\Xi + 1)^s \phi_2 \rangle_{L^2(\Xi)},$$

where  $\Delta_\Xi$  is the (negative) Laplace-Beltrami operator in  $L^2(\Xi)$ , see e.g. [26, Remark 7.6, Chapter 1, Section 7.3], and then  $(-\Delta_\Xi + 1)^{\frac{s}{2}}$  extends to a unitary map from  $H^r(\Xi)$  to  $H^{r-s}(\Xi)$ . In what follows we denote for shortness

$$\Lambda := \sqrt{-\Delta_\Sigma + 1}, \quad \Lambda_\partial := \sqrt{-\Delta_{\partial\Omega} + 1}.$$

By Green's formula, the linear operators  $\gamma_0^\pm$ ,  $\gamma_1^\pm$ ,  $\gamma_0^\partial$  and  $\gamma_1^\partial$  can be then extended to continuous (with respect to the graph norm) maps

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0^\pm &: \text{dom } \Delta_\pm^{\max} \rightarrow H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma), & \gamma_1^\pm &: \text{dom } \Delta_\pm^{\max} \rightarrow H^{-\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma), \\ \gamma_0^\partial &: \text{dom } \Delta_+^{\max} \rightarrow H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega), & \gamma_1^\partial &: \text{dom } \Delta_+^{\max} \rightarrow H^{-\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where  $\Delta_\pm^{\max} := (\Delta_\pm^{\min})^*$  acts as the distributional Laplacian on the domain

$$\text{dom } \Delta_\pm^{\max} := \{u_\pm \in L^2(\Omega_\pm) : \Delta u_\pm \in L^2(\Omega_\pm)\},$$

see [26, Chapter 2, Section 6.5]. Now consider the operator

$$A = (-\Delta_-^D) \oplus \mu \Delta_+^D$$

acting in  $L^2(\Omega) \equiv L^2(\Omega_-) \oplus L^2(\Omega_+)$ , where  $\Delta_\pm^D$  are the Dirichlet Laplacians in  $L^2(\Omega_\pm)$ , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom } \Delta_-^D &= \{u_- \in H^2(\Omega_-) : \gamma_0^- u_- = 0\}, \\ \text{dom } \Delta_+^D &= \{u_+ \in H^2(\Omega_+) : (\gamma_0^+ u_+, \gamma_0^\partial u_+) = (0, 0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

As both  $\Delta_\pm^D$  are self-adjoint with compact resolvents, the same applies to  $A$ . The maps

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_- &: \text{dom } \Delta_-^D \rightarrow H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma), & \tau_- u_- &:= \gamma_1^- u_-, \\ \tau_+ &: \text{dom } \Delta_+^D \rightarrow H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma) \oplus H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega), & \tau_+ u_+ &:= (\gamma_1^+ u_+, \gamma_1^\partial u_+), \end{aligned}$$

are linear, continuous, surjective, and their kernels are dense in  $L^2(\Omega_\pm)$ . Moreover,  $\Delta_\pm^{\min}$  is exactly the restriction of  $\Delta_\pm^D$  to  $\ker \tau_\pm$ . Therefore, we may use the construction of Example 8 with  $\nu = -\mu$  to obtain a description of the self-adjoint extensions of  $S$  from (18). To this end, an expression for the associated operators  $G_z^\pm$  and  $M_z^\pm$  is needed. These were already obtained in [33, Example 5.5], and we recall the final result. The Poisson operators

$$P_z^- : H^s(\Sigma) \rightarrow \text{dom } \Delta_-^{\max}, \quad P_z^+ : H^s(\Sigma) \oplus H^s(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow \text{dom } \Delta_+^{\max}, \quad s \geq -\frac{1}{2},$$

are defined through the solutions of the respective boundary value problems,

$$P_z^- \phi = f \text{ iff } \begin{cases} -\Delta_-^{\max} f = z f, \\ \gamma_0^- f = \phi, \end{cases}, \quad z \in \rho(-\Delta_-^D),$$

$$P_z^+(\varphi, \psi) = g \text{ iff } \begin{cases} -\Delta_+^{\max} g = z g, \\ \gamma_0^+ g = \varphi, \\ \gamma_0^\partial g = \psi. \end{cases}, \quad z \in \rho(-\Delta_+^D),$$

and the associated (energy-dependent) Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators are given by

$$\begin{aligned} D_z^- &: H^s(\Sigma) \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\Sigma), \quad D_z^- := \gamma_1^- P_z^-, \quad s \geq -\frac{1}{2}, \\ D_z^+ &: H^s(\Sigma) \oplus H^s(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\Sigma) \oplus H^{s-1}(\partial\Omega), \quad s \geq -\frac{1}{2}, \\ D_z^+(\varphi, \psi) &:= \left( \gamma_1^+ P_z^+(\varphi, \psi), \gamma_1^\partial P_z^+(\varphi, \psi) \right), \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} G_z^- &= -P_z^- \Lambda, & M_z^- &= (D_0^- - D_z^-) \Lambda, \\ G_z^+ &= -P_z^+ (\Lambda \oplus \Lambda_\partial), & M_z^+ &= (D_0^+ - D_z^+) (\Lambda \oplus \Lambda_\partial). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Remark 8, the adjoint  $S^*$  acts as  $S^*u = (-\Delta_-^{\max} u_-, \mu \Delta_+^{\max} u_+)$  on the domain  $\text{dom}(\Delta_-^{\max} \oplus \Delta_+^{\max})$ , and using (16) and (17) one obtains the boundary triplet  $(\mathfrak{h}, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$  for  $S$  with  $\mathfrak{h} = H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma) \oplus H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma) \oplus H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$  and

$$\Gamma_1 u = - \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda^{-1} \gamma_0^- u_- \\ \Lambda^{-1} \gamma_0^+ u_+ \\ \Lambda_\partial^{-1} \gamma_0^\partial u_+ \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Gamma_2 u = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_1^-(u_- - P_0^- \gamma_0^- u_-) \\ -\mu \gamma_1^+(u_+ - P_0^+ (\gamma_0^+ u_+, \gamma_0^\partial u_+)) \\ -\mu \gamma_1^\partial(u_+ - P_0^+ (\gamma_0^+ u_+, \gamma_0^\partial u_+)) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The associated  $\gamma$ -field  $G_z$  and  $M_z$  are given by

$$G_z \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_- \\ \varphi_+ \\ \varphi_\partial \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} P_z^- \Lambda \varphi_- \\ P_{-\frac{z}{\mu}}^+ (\Lambda \varphi_+, \Lambda_\partial \varphi_\partial) \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_z \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_- \\ \varphi_+ \\ \varphi_\partial \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (D_0^- - D_z^-) \Lambda \varphi_- \\ -\mu (D_0^+ - D_{-\frac{z}{\mu}}^+) (\Lambda \varphi_+, \Lambda_\partial \varphi_\partial) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let us represent the operator  $L_\mu$  given by (3) and (4) in the form  $A_{\Pi, \Theta}$ . Remark first that, in view of the elliptic regularity, see e.g. [18, Proposition III.5.2], we have

$$\begin{aligned} H^2(\Omega_-) &= \{u_- \in L^2(\Omega_-) : \Delta_-^{\max} u_- \in L^2(\Omega_-), \gamma_0^+ u_- \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma)\} \\ H^2(\Omega_+) &= \{u_+ \in L^2(\Omega_+) : \Delta_+^{\max} u_+ \in L^2(\Omega_+), (\gamma_0^+ u_+, \gamma_0^\partial u_+) \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma) \oplus H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $L_\mu$  is exactly the restriction of  $S^*$  to the functions  $u = (u_-, u_+)$  with

$$\gamma_0^- u_- = \gamma_0^+ u_+ =: \gamma_0 u, \quad \gamma_0^\partial u_+ = 0, \quad \gamma_0 u \in H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma), \quad \gamma_1^- u_- = \mu \gamma_1^+ u_+. \quad (20)$$

The first two conditions can be rewritten as  $\Gamma_1 u \in \text{ran } \Pi$ , where  $\Pi$  is the orthogonal projector in  $\mathfrak{h}$  given by

$$\Pi(\varphi_-, \varphi_+, \varphi_\partial) = \frac{1}{2}(\varphi_- + \varphi_+, \varphi_- + \varphi_+, 0).$$

For the subsequent computations it is useful to introduce the unitary operator

$$U : \text{ran } \Pi \rightarrow H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma), \quad U(\varphi, \varphi, 0) = \sqrt{2} \varphi,$$

then

$$U \Pi \Gamma_2 u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ \gamma_1^-(u_- - P_0^- \gamma_0^- u_-) - \mu \gamma_1^+(u_+ - P_0^+ (\gamma_0^+ u_+, \gamma_0^\partial u_+)) \right],$$

and the third and the fourth conditions in (20) can be rewritten respectively as

$$\Gamma_1 u \in U^* \text{dom } \Theta_\mu, \quad U \Pi \Gamma_2 u = \Theta_\mu U \Gamma_1 u,$$

where  $\Theta_\mu$  is the symmetric operator in  $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$  given by

$$\Theta_\mu := \frac{1}{2}(D_0^- - \mu \tilde{D}_0^+) \Lambda, \quad \text{dom } \Theta_\mu = H^{\frac{5}{2}}(\Sigma),$$

with

$$\tilde{D}_z^+ := \gamma_1^+ \tilde{P}_z^+, \quad \tilde{P}_z^+ := P_z^+(\cdot, 0).$$

Therefore, one has the representation  $L_\mu = A_{\Pi, U^* \Theta_\mu U}$ , and, due to the unitarity of  $U$  and to the discussion of Section 2, the operator  $L_\mu$  is self-adjoint/essentially self-adjoint in  $L^2(\Omega)$  if and only if  $\Theta_\mu$  has the respective property as an operator in  $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$ . Remark that for the associated maps  $G_z^\Pi := G_z \Pi^*$  and  $M_z^\Pi := \Pi M_z \Pi^*$  (see Subsection 2.1) one has

$$G_z^\Pi U^* \varphi = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} P_z^- \Lambda \varphi \\ \tilde{P}_{-\frac{z}{\mu}}^+ \Lambda \varphi \end{pmatrix}, \quad U M_z^\Pi U^* = \frac{1}{2} \left( (D_0^- - D_z^-) - \mu (\tilde{D}_0^+ - \tilde{D}_{-\frac{z}{\mu}}^+) \right) \Lambda. \quad (21)$$

#### 4. PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

With the above preparations, the proofs will be based on an application of the theory of pseudodifferential operators, see e.g. [37] and [38]. At first we recall some known results adapted to our setting.

If  $\Psi \in \mathcal{B}(H^s(\Sigma), H^{s-k}(\Sigma))$  is a symmetric pseudodifferential operator of order  $k$ , we set  $k_0 := \max(k, 0)$  and denote by  $\Psi^{\min}$  and  $\Psi^0$  the symmetric operators in  $L^2(\Sigma)$  given by the restriction of  $\Psi$  to  $\text{dom } \Psi^{\min} = C^\infty(\Sigma)$  and  $\text{dom } \Psi^0 = H^{k_0}(\Sigma)$  respectively, then  $\Psi^0 \subseteq \overline{\Psi^{\min}} \subseteq \overline{\Psi^0}$ . Furthermore, if  $\Psi$  is elliptic, then  $\Psi^0$  is closed and, hence,  $\overline{\Psi^{\min}} = \Psi^0$ . Since  $\text{dom}(\overline{\Psi^{\min}})^* = \{f \in L^2(\Sigma) : \Psi f \in L^2(\Sigma)\}$ , for elliptic  $\Psi$  one has  $\text{dom}(\overline{\Psi^{\min}})^* \subseteq H^{k_0}(\Sigma) = \text{dom } \overline{\Psi^{\min}}$ , and so  $\Psi^{\min}$  is essentially self-adjoint and  $\Psi^0$  is self-adjoint. It is important to recall that for  $k = 1$  one does not need the ellipticity:

**Lemma 9.** *If  $\Psi$  is a symmetric first order pseudodifferential operator, then  $\Psi^{\min}$ , and then also  $\Psi^0$ , is essentially self-adjoint in  $L^2(\Sigma)$ .*

*Proof.* By [37, Proposition 7.4], for any  $f \in L^2(\Sigma)$  with  $\Psi f \in L^2(\Sigma)$  there exist  $(f_j) \subset C^\infty(\Sigma)$  such that  $f_j \rightarrow f$  and  $\Psi^{\min} f_j \rightarrow \Psi f$  in  $L^2(\Sigma)$ , which literally means that  $\text{dom}(\overline{\Psi^{\min}})^* \subseteq \text{dom } \overline{\Psi^{\min}}$ .  $\square$

In what follows, instead of studying  $\Theta_\mu$  in  $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$  we prefer to deal with the unitarily equivalent operator  $\Phi_\mu := \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta_\mu \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  acting in  $L^2(\Sigma)$ . Set

$$\Psi_\mu := \frac{1}{2} \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} (D_0^- - \mu \tilde{D}_0^+) \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

then  $\Phi_\mu$  is the restriction of  $\Psi_\mu$  to  $\text{dom } \Phi_\mu = H^2(\Sigma)$ . Furthermore, denote by  $\Psi_\mu^{\min}$  and  $\Psi_\mu^0$  the symmetric operators in  $L^2(\Sigma)$  given respectively by the restrictions of  $\Psi_\mu$  to  $\text{dom } \Psi_\mu^{\min} = C^\infty(\Sigma)$  and to  $\text{dom } \Psi_\mu^0 = H^{k_0}(\Sigma)$ , where  $k$  is the order of  $\Psi_\mu$  and  $k_0 = \max(k, 0)$ . Remark that we always have  $k \leq 2$ , hence,  $\Psi_\mu^{\min} \subseteq \Phi_\mu \subseteq \Psi_\mu^0$ .

**Proof of Theorem 1.** Assume first that  $\mu \neq 1$ . Let us show that the operator  $\Theta_\mu$  is self-adjoint in  $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$ , then this will imply the self-adjointness of  $L_\mu$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ . It is a classical result that  $D_0^\pm$  are first order pseudodifferential operators with the principal symbol  $|\xi|$ , see e.g. [38, Chapter 7, Section 11], and, in view of the definition, the same applies then to  $\tilde{D}_0^+$ . Then  $\Psi_\mu$  is a pseudodifferential operator with principal symbol  $\frac{1-\mu}{2} |\xi|^2$ . As such a principal symbol is non-vanishing,  $\Psi_\mu$  is a second order elliptic pseudodifferential operator and, by the results recalled at the beginning of the section,  $\Phi_\mu \equiv \Psi_\mu^0$  is self-adjoint on the domain  $H^2(\Sigma)$ . Hence, since  $\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} : H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma) \rightarrow L^2(\Sigma)$  is unitary, the operator  $\Theta_\mu = \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi_\mu \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}$  is self-adjoint

on the initial domain  $H^{\frac{5}{2}}(\Sigma)$ , which implies the self-adjointness of  $L_\mu$  on the initial domain  $\mathcal{D}_\mu^2(\Omega \setminus \Sigma)$ . Due to (2) we have  $\text{dom } L_\mu \subseteq H_0^1(\Omega)$ , and the compact embedding of  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  into  $L^2(\Omega)$  proves that the resolvent of  $L_\mu$  is a compact operator.

Let  $\mu = 1$ , then  $\Psi_1$  is a first order pseudodifferential operator, and  $\Psi_1^{\min}$  is essentially self-adjoint due to Lemma 9. Then  $\Phi_1$  is also essentially self-adjoint being a symmetric extension of  $\Psi_1^{\min}$ . The unitarity of  $\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} : H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma) \rightarrow L^2(\Sigma)$  implies the essential self-adjointness of  $\Theta_1$  in  $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$  and, in turn, that of  $L_1$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ .  $\square$

Recall that in what follows we denote by  $\mathcal{L}_1$  the unique self-adjoint extension of  $L_1$ . In view of the discussion of Section 3 one has  $\mathcal{L}_1 = A_{\Pi, U^* \Theta U}$  with  $\Theta = \overline{\Theta_1}$  being the closure (and the unique self-adjoint extension) of  $\Theta_1$  in  $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$ .

**Proof of Theorem 2.** Assume that  $n = 2$  and  $\mu = 1$ , then  $\Psi_1 = \frac{1}{2} \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} (D_0^- - \widetilde{D}_0^+) \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . It is well known that the *full* symbol of the classical Dirichlet-to-Neumann map (at  $z = 0$ ) on a smooth bounded two-dimensional domain with respect to the arclength is equal to  $|\xi|$ , see [14, Proposition 1] for a direct proof or [25, Section 1] for an iterative computation. It follows that  $\Psi_1$  is a symmetric pseudodifferential operator of order  $(-\infty)$ , hence  $\Psi_1^0 : L^2(\Sigma) \rightarrow L^2(\Sigma)$  is bounded, self-adjoint and compact. As  $\Phi_1$  is densely defined, it follows that  $\overline{\Phi_1} = \Psi_1^0$ . Since  $\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} : H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma) \rightarrow L^2(\Sigma)$  is unitary, the closure of  $\Theta_1$  is given by  $\Theta = \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \overline{\Phi_1} \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} : H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma) \rightarrow H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$ , and it is a compact self-adjoint operator in  $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$ . As  $\text{dom } \Theta = H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$ , the boundary condition  $\Gamma_1 u \in U^* \text{dom } \Theta$  takes the form  $\gamma_0^- u_- = \gamma_0^+ u_+ \in H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$ ,  $\gamma_0^+ u_+ = 0$ , and, in view of (19), the domain of  $\mathcal{L}_1 = A_{\Pi, U^* \Theta U}$  is given by (5).

Let us study the spectral properties of  $\mathcal{L}_1$  using Corollary 6. As  $U^* \Theta U - M_0^\Pi \equiv U^* \Theta U$  is compact, one has  $0 \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(U^* \Theta U - M_0^\Pi)$  implying  $0 \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ . To prove the reverse inclusion  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_1) \subseteq \{0\}$  we note first that the operators  $U^* \Theta U - M_z^\Pi$  are unitarily equivalent to  $\Theta - U M_z^\Pi U^*$  and, hence, have the same spectra. Furthermore, the principal symbol of  $D_0^\pm - D_\lambda^\pm$  is  $\frac{\lambda}{2|\xi|}$  for any  $\lambda \in \rho(-\Delta_\pm^D)$ , see [24, Lemma 1.1]. As the principal symbol of  $\Lambda$  is  $|\xi|$ , it follows that, for any  $z \in \rho(A)$ , the operators  $(D_0^- - D_z^-) \Lambda$  and  $(\widetilde{D}_0^+ - \widetilde{D}_{-\frac{z}{\mu}}^+) \Lambda$  are bounded in  $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$  being pseudodifferential operators of order zero, and their principal symbols are  $\frac{z}{2}$  and  $(-\frac{z}{2\mu})$  respectively. By Eq. (21) it follows that the principal symbol of  $\Theta - U M_z^\Pi U^*$  is simply  $\frac{z}{2}$ , and one can represent  $\Theta - U M_z^\Pi U^* = \frac{z}{2} + K_z$ , where  $K_z$  are compact operators depending holomorphically on  $z \in \rho(A)$ . As the operator  $A$  has compact resolvent, it follows by (12) that the only possible singularities of  $z \mapsto K_z$  at the points of  $\sigma(A)$  are simple poles with finite-dimensional residues. Therefore, the operator function  $z \mapsto U^* \Theta U - M_z^\Pi := U^*(\Theta - U M_z^\Pi U^*)U$  satisfies the assumptions of the meromorphic Fredholm alternative on  $\mathbb{C}_0 := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , see [34, Theorem XIII.13], and either (a)  $0 \in \sigma(U^* \Theta U - M_z^\Pi)$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}_0 \setminus \rho(A)$ , or (b) there exists a subset  $B \subset \mathbb{C}_0$ , without accumulation points in  $\mathbb{C}_0$ , such that the inverse  $(U^* \Theta U - M_z^\Pi)^{-1}$  exists and is bounded for  $z \in \mathbb{C}_0 \setminus (B \cup \sigma(A))$  and extends to a meromorphic function in  $\mathbb{C}_0 \setminus B$  such that the coefficients in the Laurent series at the points of  $B$  are finite-dimensional operators. The case (a) can be excluded: By Corollary 6 this would imply the presence of a non-empty non-real spectrum for  $\mathcal{L}_1$ , which is not possible due to the self-adjointness. Therefore, we are in the case (b), and the resolvent formula (14) for  $\mathcal{L}_1 \equiv A_{\Pi, U^* \Theta U}$  implies that the set  $\mathbb{C}_0 \cap \sigma(\mathcal{L}_1) \cap \rho(A) \subseteq B$  has no accumulation points in  $\mathbb{C}_0$ , and each point of this set is a discrete eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}_1$ . Furthermore, by (12) the maps  $z \mapsto G_z^\Pi$  can have at most simple poles with finite-dimensional residues at the points of  $\sigma(A)$ , and it is seen again from the resolvent formula (14) that the

only possible singularities of  $z \mapsto (\mathcal{L}_1 - z)^{-1}$  at the points of  $\sigma(A)$  are poles with finite-dimensional residues. It follows that each point of  $\sigma(A)$  is either not in the spectrum of  $\mathcal{L}_1$  or is its discrete eigenvalue. Therefore,  $\mathcal{L}_1$  has no essential spectrum in  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , and the only possible accumulation points for the discrete eigenvalues are 0 and  $\infty$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 3.** Assume  $n \geq 3$  and  $\mu = 1$ , then again  $\Psi_1 = \frac{1}{2}\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(D_0^- - \widetilde{D}_0^+)\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . By [38, Chapter 12, Proposition C.1], there holds

$$D_0^- = (-\Delta_\Sigma)^{\frac{1}{2}} + B^- + C^-, \quad \widetilde{D}_0^+ = (-\Delta_\Sigma)^{\frac{1}{2}} + B^+ + C^+,$$

where  $C^\pm$  are pseudodifferential operators of order  $(-1)$  and  $B^\pm$  are pseudodifferential operator of order 0 whose principal symbols are  $\pm b_0(x, \xi)$ , with

$$b_0(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \operatorname{tr} W_x - \frac{\langle \xi, W_x^* \xi \rangle_{T_x^* \Sigma}}{\langle \xi, \xi \rangle_{T_x^* \Sigma}} \right)$$

and  $W_x := dN_-(x) : T_x \Sigma \rightarrow T_x \Sigma$  being the Weingarten map and  $W_x^*$  its adjoint. Therefore,  $\Psi_1$  is a pseudodifferential operator of order 1 whose principal symbol is  $\frac{1}{2}b_0(x, \xi)|\xi|$ . As already seen,  $\Psi_1^{\min}$  is then essentially self-adjoint by Lemma 9, and, as before,  $L_1$  is essentially self-adjoint and its self-adjoint closure is  $A_{\Pi, U^* \Theta U}$ , where  $\Theta := \overline{\Theta}_1$ . As  $\Theta_1$  is a first order operator, one has  $H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma) \subseteq \operatorname{dom} \Theta$ . In particular, the boundary condition  $\Gamma_1 u \in U^* H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma)$  entails  $\gamma_0^- u_- = \gamma_0^+ u_+ \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$  and  $\gamma_0^\partial u_+ = 0$ . Due to the elliptic regularity, see e.g. [26, Chapter 2, Section 7.3], this can be rewritten as  $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  and gives the inclusion (6).

(a) Recall that the principal curvatures  $k_1(x), \dots, k_{n-1}(x)$  of  $\Sigma$  at a point  $x$  are the eigenvalues of  $W_x$ , hence,

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( k_1(x) + \dots + k_{n-1}(x) - \max_j k_j(x) \right) \leq b_0(x, \xi) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( k_1(x) + \dots + k_{n-1}(x) - \min_j k_j(x) \right).$$

Let  $\Sigma'$  be a maximal connected component of  $\Sigma$ . If all  $k_j$  are either all strictly positive or all strictly negative on  $\Sigma'$ , one can estimate  $a_1 \leq |b_0(x, \xi)| \leq a_2$  for all  $x \in \Sigma'$  with some  $a_1 > 0$  and  $a_2 > 0$ . Therefore, in this case  $\Psi_1$  is a first order elliptic pseudodifferential operator and so, by the results recalled at the beginning of this section,  $\Psi_1^0$  is self-adjoint. This implies that  $\operatorname{dom} \Theta \equiv \operatorname{dom} \overline{\Theta}_1 = H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma)$ . As before, the boundary condition  $\Gamma_1 u \in U^* \operatorname{dom} \Theta$  for  $u \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{L}_1$  entails  $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ , and one arrives at the equality (7). The inclusion  $\operatorname{dom} \mathcal{L}_1 \subseteq H_0^1(\Omega)$  and the compact embedding of  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  into  $L^2(\Omega)$  imply that  $\mathcal{L}_1$  has compact resolvent.

(b) As  $M_0^\Pi = 0$ , by Corollary 6(b) and by the unitarity of  $U$ , to get  $0 \in \sigma_{\operatorname{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_1)$  it suffices to show that  $0 \in \sigma_{\operatorname{ess}}(\Theta)$ . As  $\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} : H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma) \rightarrow L^2(\Sigma)$  is a unitary operator, it is sufficient to show  $0 \in \sigma_{\operatorname{ess}}(\overline{\Phi}_1)$  for the unitarily equivalent operator  $\overline{\Phi}_1 \equiv \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  in  $L^2(\Sigma)$ , which will be done by constructing a singular Weyl sequence, i.e. a sequence of non-zero functions  $(u_j) \subset \operatorname{dom} \overline{\Phi}_1$  weakly converging to 0 in  $L^2(\Sigma)$  and such that the ratio  $\|\Psi_1 u_j\|_{L^2(\Sigma)} / \|u_j\|_{L^2(\Sigma)}$  tends to 0. While the domain of  $\overline{\Phi}_1$  is not known explicitly, we know already that it contains  $H^1(\Sigma)$ .

Without loss of generality we assume that  $\Sigma_\varepsilon := \{(x', 0) : x' \in B_\varepsilon\} \subset \Sigma$ , where  $B_\varepsilon$  is the ball in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  centered at the origin and of radius  $\varepsilon > 0$ . The iterative procedure of [25, Section 1] shows that the full symbols of  $D_-^0$  and  $\widetilde{D}_0^+$  on  $\Sigma_\varepsilon$  in the local coordinates  $x'$  are equal to  $|\xi|$ , and it follows that the full symbol of  $\Psi_1$  vanishes on  $\Sigma_\varepsilon$ . Hence, there exists a smoothing operator  $K$  and  $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$  such that  $\Psi_1 \tilde{u} = K \tilde{u}$  for all  $u \in C_c^\infty(B_\delta)$ , where  $\tilde{u}$  is the extension of  $u$  by zero to the whole of  $\Sigma$ . Take an orthonormal sequence  $(u_j) \subset L^2(B_\delta)$

with  $u_j \in C_c^\infty(B_\delta)$ , then the sequence  $(\tilde{u}_j) \subset H^1(\Sigma)$  is orthonormal and weakly converging to 0 in  $L^2(\Sigma)$ . Due to the compactness of  $K$  in  $L^2(\Sigma)$  there exists a subsequence  $(\Psi_1 \tilde{u}_{j_k})$  strongly converging to zero in  $L^2(\Sigma)$ . Therefore, the sequence  $v_k := \tilde{u}_{j_k}$  is a sought singular Weyl sequence for  $\overline{\Phi_1}$ , which gives the result.

Suppose now  $\text{dom } \mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{D}_1^s(\Omega \setminus \Sigma) \subseteq H^s(\Omega_-) \oplus H^s(\Omega_+)$  for some  $s > 0$ . As the set on the right-hand side is compactly embedded in  $L^2(\Omega)$ , see e.g. [1, Theorem 14.3.1], this implies the compactness of the resolvent of  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and the equality  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_1) = \emptyset$ , which contradicts the previously proved relation  $0 \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 10.** After some simple cancellations, the resolvent formula of Corollary 6 for  $\mathcal{L}_\mu$  takes the following form:

$$(\mathcal{L}_\mu - z)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} u_- \\ u_+ \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (-\Delta_-^D - z)^{-1} u_- \\ (\mu \Delta_+^D - z)^{-1} u_+ \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} R_z^-(u_-, u_+) \\ R_z^+(u_-, u_+) \end{pmatrix},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} R_z^-(u_-, u_+) &= P_z^- \left( D_z^- - \mu \tilde{D}_{-\frac{z}{\mu}}^+ \right)^{-1} \left( \gamma_1^- (-\Delta_-^D - z)^{-1} u_- - \mu \gamma_1^+ (\mu \Delta_+^D - z)^{-1} u_+ \right), \\ R_z^+(u_-, u_+) &= P_{-\frac{z}{\mu}}^+ \left( \begin{pmatrix} \left( D_z^- - \mu \tilde{D}_{-\frac{z}{\mu}}^+ \right)^{-1} \left( \gamma_1^- (-\Delta_-^D - z)^{-1} u_- - \mu \gamma_1^+ (\mu \Delta_+^D - z)^{-1} u_+ \right) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right). \end{aligned}$$

## 5. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4

We continue using the conventions and notation introduced just before Theorem 4. In addition to (9) we have

$$\Omega_+ = B_{r_i} \cup B_{r_e, R}, \quad \Sigma = S_{r_i} \cup S_{r_e}, \quad \partial\Omega = S_R,$$

and for the subsequent computations we use the identification  $L^2(S_\rho) \simeq L^2((0, 2\pi), \rho d\theta)$ , then  $L^2(\Sigma) \simeq L^2((0, 2\pi), r_i d\theta) \oplus L^2((0, 2\pi), r_e d\theta)$ , and similar identifications hold for the Sobolev spaces.

In view of Corollary 6 and of the expressions (21), the injectivity of  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is equivalent to the injectivity of the map

$$\mathcal{D} := D_0^- - \tilde{D}_0^+ : H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma) \rightarrow H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma),$$

and then the condition  $g = (0, g_+) \in \text{ran } \mathcal{L}_1$  is equivalent to  $(G_0^{\text{II}})^* g \equiv -\gamma_1^+ (-\Delta_+^D)^{-1} g_+ \in \text{ran } \mathcal{D}$ , or, as  $(\Delta_+^D)^{-1} : L^2(\Omega_+) \rightarrow H^2(\Omega)$  and  $\gamma_1^+ : H^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$ , to

$$\mathcal{D}^{-1} \gamma_1^+ (-\Delta_+^D)^{-1} g_+ \in H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma). \quad (22)$$

The condition will be checked using an explicit computation of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps  $D_0^\pm$  and of the inverse of  $\Delta_+^D$ .

For a function  $f$  defined in  $\Omega_\pm$ , define its Fourier coefficients with respect to the polar angle by

$$f_m(r) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) e^{-im\theta} d\theta, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z},$$

then  $f$  is reconstructed by  $f(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} f_m(r) e^{im\theta}$ . Furthermore, the separation of variables shows that a function  $f$  is harmonic iff  $f_m$  satisfy the Euler equations

$$f_m''(r) + r^{-1} f_m'(r) - m^2 r^{-2} f_m(r) = 0,$$

whose linearly independent solutions are 1 and  $\ln r$  for  $m = 0$  and  $r^{\pm m}$  for  $m \neq 0$ . This shows that for

$$(\phi_i, \phi_e) \in H^s(\Sigma), \quad \phi_{i/e}(\theta) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \phi_{i/e,m} e^{im\theta}, \quad \phi_{i/e,m} := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \phi_{i/e}(\theta) e^{-im\theta} d\theta,$$

one has the following expressions for the Poisson operators:

$$\begin{aligned} P_0^- \begin{pmatrix} \phi_i \\ \phi_e \end{pmatrix} (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) &= \frac{\ln \frac{r_e}{r}}{\ln \frac{r_e}{r_i}} \phi_{i,0} + \frac{\ln \frac{r}{r_i}}{\ln \frac{r_e}{r_i}} \phi_{e,0} \\ &+ \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\left[ \left( \frac{r_e}{r} \right)^{|m|} - \left( \frac{r}{r_e} \right)^{|m|} \right] \phi_{i,m} + \left[ \left( \frac{r}{r_i} \right)^{|m|} - \left( \frac{r_i}{r} \right)^{|m|} \right] \phi_{e,m}}{\left( \frac{r_e}{r_i} \right)^{|m|} - \left( \frac{r_i}{r_e} \right)^{|m|}} e^{im\theta}, \end{aligned} \quad (r, \theta) \in (r_i, r_e) \times (0, 2\pi), \quad (23)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_0^+ \begin{pmatrix} \phi_i \\ \phi_e \end{pmatrix} (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) &= \begin{cases} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( \frac{r}{r_i} \right)^{|m|} \phi_{i,m} e^{im\theta}, & (r, \theta) \in (0, r_i) \times (0, 2\pi), \\ \frac{\ln \frac{R}{r}}{\ln \frac{R}{r_e}} \phi_{e,0} + \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\left( \frac{R}{r} \right)^{|m|} - \left( \frac{r}{R} \right)^{|m|}}{\left( \frac{R}{r_e} \right)^{|m|} - \left( \frac{r_e}{R} \right)^{|m|}} \phi_{e,m} e^{im\theta}, & (r, \theta) \in (r_e, R) \times (0, 2\pi). \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} D_0^- \begin{pmatrix} \phi_i \\ \phi_e \end{pmatrix} &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} B_m \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{i,m} \\ \phi_{e,m} \end{pmatrix} e^{im\theta}, \quad \tilde{D}_0^+ \begin{pmatrix} \phi_i \\ \phi_e \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} C_m \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{i,m} \\ \phi_{e,m} \end{pmatrix} e^{im\theta}, \\ \mathcal{D} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_i \\ \phi_e \end{pmatrix} &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} D_m \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{i,m} \\ \phi_{e,m} \end{pmatrix} e^{im\theta}, \quad D_m := B_m - C_m, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$B_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{r_i} \frac{1}{\ln \frac{r_e}{r_i}} & -\frac{1}{r_i} \frac{1}{\ln \frac{r_e}{r_i}} \\ \frac{1}{r_e} \frac{1}{\ln \frac{r_e}{r_i}} & \frac{1}{r_e} \frac{1}{\ln \frac{r_e}{r_i}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{r_e} \frac{1}{\ln \frac{R}{r_e}} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$B_m = |m| \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{r_i} \frac{\left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{|m|} + \left(\frac{r_i}{r_e}\right)^{|m|}}{\left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{|m|} - \left(\frac{r_i}{r_e}\right)^{|m|}} & -\frac{2}{r_i} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{|m|} - \left(\frac{r_i}{r_e}\right)^{|m|}} \\ -\frac{2}{r_e} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{|m|} - \left(\frac{r_i}{r_e}\right)^{|m|}} & \frac{1}{r_e} \frac{\left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{|m|} + \left(\frac{r_i}{r_e}\right)^{|m|}}{\left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{|m|} - \left(\frac{r_i}{r_e}\right)^{|m|}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad m \neq 0,$$

$$C_m = |m| \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{r_i} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{r_e} \frac{\left(\frac{R}{r_e}\right)^{|m|} + \left(\frac{r_e}{R}\right)^{|m|}}{\left(\frac{R}{r_e}\right)^{|m|} - \left(\frac{r_e}{R}\right)^{|m|}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad m \neq 0.$$

Therefore,

$$D_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{r_i} \frac{1}{\ln \frac{r_e}{r_i}} & -\frac{1}{r_i} \frac{1}{\ln \frac{r_e}{r_i}} \\ -\frac{1}{r_e} \frac{1}{\ln \frac{r_e}{r_i}} & \frac{1}{r_e} \left( \frac{1}{\ln \frac{r_e}{r_i}} - \frac{1}{\ln \frac{R}{r_e}} \right) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$D_m = 2|m| \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{r_i} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{2|m|} - 1} & -\frac{1}{r_i} \frac{\left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{|m|}}{\left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{2|m|} - 1} \\ -\frac{1}{r_e} \frac{\left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{|m|}}{\left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{2|m|} - 1} & \frac{1}{r_e} \left( \frac{1}{\left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{2|m|} - 1} - \frac{1}{\left(\frac{R}{r_e}\right)^{2|m|} - 1} \right) \end{pmatrix}, \quad m \neq 0,$$

hence, all  $D_m$  are invertible, and then  $\mathcal{D}$  is injective with the inverse

$$\mathcal{D}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_i \\ \phi_e \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} D_m^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{i,m} \\ \phi_{e,m} \end{pmatrix} e^{im\theta}, \quad (25)$$

which shows the injectivity of  $\mathcal{L}_1$ . Furthermore, for  $m \neq 0$  we have

$$D_m^{-1} = -\frac{1}{2|m|} \begin{pmatrix} r_i \left(1 - \left(\frac{r_e^2}{r_i R}\right)^{2|m|}\right) & r_e \left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{|m|} \left(1 - \left(\frac{r_e}{R}\right)^{2|m|}\right) \\ r_i \left(\frac{r_e}{r_i}\right)^{|m|} \left(1 - \left(\frac{r_e}{R}\right)^{2|m|}\right) & r_e \left(1 - \left(\frac{r_e}{R}\right)^{2|m|}\right) \end{pmatrix},$$

and we conclude that a function  $(\phi_i, \phi_e) \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$  belongs to  $\text{ran } \mathcal{D}$  iff  $\mathcal{D}^{-1}(\phi_i, \phi_e) \in H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$ , i.e. iff

$$\sum_{m \neq 0} \frac{1}{|m|} \left\| D_m^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{i,m} \\ \phi_{e,m} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 < \infty. \quad (26)$$

Therefore, the condition (22) is equivalent to (26) for

$$(\phi_i, \phi_e) := \gamma_1^+ f, \quad f := (\Delta_+^D)^{-1} g_+. \quad (27)$$

Remark first that  $f$  vanishes in  $B_{r_i}$ , hence,  $\phi_i = 0$  and  $f_m(r) = 0$  for  $r < r_i$  and  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ . To study the problem in  $B_{r_e, R}$ , let us pass to the Fourier coefficients, then we arrive to the system of equations

$$f_m''(r) + r^{-1} f_m'(r) - m^2 r^{-2} f_m(r) = h_m 1_{(a,b)}(r), \quad r_e < r < R, \quad f_m(r_e) = f_m(R) = 0, \quad (28)$$

and we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi_i \\ \phi_e \end{pmatrix} = - \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ f_m'(r_e) \end{pmatrix} e^{im\theta}. \quad (29)$$

One solves (28) using the variation of constants, and for  $m \neq 0$  the solutions are

$$f_m(r) = \alpha_m r^m + \beta_m r^{-m} + \frac{h_m r^m}{2m} \int_{r_e}^r s^{1-m} 1_{(a,b)}(s) ds - \frac{h_m r^{-m}}{2m} \int_{r_e}^r s^{1+m} 1_{(a,b)}(s) ds,$$

$$\alpha_m = -\frac{h_m}{2m r_e^m} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{R}{r_e}\right)^m - \left(\frac{r_e}{R}\right)^m} \int_a^b \left( \left(\frac{R}{s}\right)^m - \left(\frac{s}{R}\right)^m \right) s ds, \quad \beta_m = -r_e^{2m} \alpha_m,$$

and

$$f_m'(r_e) = \frac{m h_m}{r_e} (\alpha_m r_e^m - \beta_m r_e^{-m}) = -\frac{1}{r_e} \frac{\int_a^b \left( \left(\frac{R}{s}\right)^{|m|} - \left(\frac{s}{R}\right)^{|m|} \right) s ds}{\left(\frac{R}{r_e}\right)^{|m|} - \left(\frac{r_e}{R}\right)^{|m|}}.$$

Then for large  $m$  one has

$$f_m'(r_e) = -\frac{(a^2 + o(1)) h_m}{r_e |m|} \left(\frac{r_e}{a}\right)^{|m|}, \quad D_m^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -f_m'(r_e) \end{pmatrix} = h_m \begin{pmatrix} \frac{a^2 + o(1)}{2m^2} \left(\frac{r_e^2}{r_i a}\right)^{|m|} \\ \frac{a^2 + o(1)}{2m^2} \left(\frac{r_e}{a}\right)^{|m|} \end{pmatrix},$$

and the condition (26) for the function (27) takes the form (11), which finishes the proof.

One should remark that the condition (11) can still hold for  $a < r_e^2/r_i$  if the Fourier coefficients  $h_m$  of  $h$  are very fast decaying for large  $m$ , i.e. if  $h$  extends to an analytic function in a suitable complex neighborhood of the unit circle.

**Remark 11.** At last we note that, in view of the injectivity of  $\mathcal{L}_1$ , the expression for its inverse given in Remark 10 can be extended naturally to a linear map  $\mathcal{L}^{-1} : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ . As  $\text{ran}(\Delta_{\pm}^D)^{-1} = H^2(\Omega_{\pm}) \cap H_0^1(\Omega_{\pm})$ , the finiteness of the norms  $\|\mathcal{L}_1^{-1} g\|_{H^s(V)}$ ,  $V \subseteq \Omega$ ,  $0 \leq s \leq 1$ , is equivalent to the finiteness of  $\|v\|_{H^s(V)}$  for  $v := (R_0^- g, R_0^+ g)$ . The direct substitution of the values of (25) and (29) into (23) and (24) shows that one always has  $v \in H^1(B_{r_e, R})$ , while the condition  $v \in L^2(B_{r_i, r_e})$  appears to be equivalent to (11), so it holds for any  $h$  for  $a \geq r_e^2/r_i$  as before, otherwise a very strong regularity of  $h$  is required.

#### APPENDIX A. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5(D)

Let  $f \in \text{ran}(A_{1,\Theta} - z)$ , then there is  $g \in \text{dom } A_{1,\Theta}$  with  $f = (A_{1,\Theta} - z)g$ . By [11, Theorem 1.23(a)], one can uniquely represent

$$g = g_z + G_z h \quad (30)$$

with  $g_z \in \text{dom } A$  and  $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ , and  $f = (S^* - z)g = (A - z)g_z$ . As  $g_z \in \text{dom } A = \ker \Gamma_1$ , we have  $\Gamma_1 g = \Gamma_1 G_z h = h$  and  $\Gamma_2 g = \Gamma_2 g_z + \Gamma_2 G_z h$ . By [11, Theorem 1.23(2d)] there holds  $\Gamma_2 g_z = \Gamma_2 (A - z)^{-1} f = G_z^* f$ , and by definition we have  $\Gamma_2 G_z h = M_z h$ . Therefore, the boundary condition  $\Gamma_2 g = \Theta \Gamma_1 g$  writes as  $G_z^* f = (\Theta - M_z)h$  implying  $G_z^* f \in \text{ran}(\Theta - M_z)$ . If  $\Theta - M_z$  is injective, then  $A_{1,\Theta}$  is also injective by Proposition 5(c),  $h = (\Theta - M_z)^{-1} G_z^* f$ , and the substitution into (30) gives the relation

$$(A_{1,\Theta} - z)^{-1} f = g = g_z + G_z h = (A - z)^{-1} f + G_z (\Theta - M_z)^{-1} G_z^* f.$$

Now let  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $G_z^* f \in \text{ran}(\Theta - M_z)$ . Take  $h \in \mathfrak{h}$  with  $G_z^* f = (\Theta - M_z)h$  and consider the function  $g = g_z + G_z h$  with  $g_z = (A - z)^{-1} f \in \text{dom } A$ . By [11, Theorem 1.23(2d)] we have  $g \in \text{dom } S^*$ . As previously,  $\Gamma_1 g = h$  and  $\Gamma_2 g = G_z^* f + M_z h = (\Theta - M_z)h + M_z h = \Theta h = \Theta \Gamma_1 g$ , i.e.  $g \in \text{dom } A_{1,\Theta}$ , and we have  $(A_{1,\Theta} - z)g = (S^* - z)g = (S^* - z)(A - z)^{-1} f = f$ , i.e.  $f \in \text{ran}(A_{1,\Theta} - z)$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. S. Agranovich: *Sobolev spaces, their generalizations and elliptic problems in smooth and Lipschitz domains*. Springer, Berlin, 2015.
- [2] H. Ammari, G. Ciraolo, H. Kang, H. Lee, G. W. Milton: *Spectral theory of a Neumann-Poincaré-type operator and analysis of cloaking due to anomalous localized resonance*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **208** (2013) 667–692.
- [3] H. Ammari, G. Ciraolo, H. Kang, H. Lee, G. W. Milton: *Spectral theory of a Neumann-Poincaré-type operator and analysis of anomalous localized resonance II*. Contemporary Math. **615** (2014) 1–14.
- [4] J. Behrndt, D. Krejčířík: *An indefinite Laplacian on a rectangle*. J. Anal. Math. (to appear). Preprint arXiv:1407.7802.
- [5] J. Behrndt, J. Rohleder: *Spectral analysis of selfadjoint elliptic differential operators, Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps, and abstract Weyl functions*. Adv. Math. **285** (2015) 1301–1338.
- [6] J. Behrndt, T. ter Elst: *Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps on bounded Lipschitz domains*. J. Differential Equ. **259** (2015) 5903–5926.
- [7] A.-S. Bonnet-Ben Dhia, M. Dauge, K. Ramdani: *Analyse spectrale et singularités d'un problème de transmission non-coercive*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **328** (1999) 717–720.
- [8] A.-S. Bonnet-Ben Dhia, L. Chesnel, P. Ciarlet Jr.: *T-coercivity for scalar interface problems between dielectrics and metamaterials*. Math. Mod. Num. Anal. **46** (2012) 1363–1387.
- [9] A.-S. Bonnet-Ben Dhia, L. Chesnel, X. Claeys: *Radiation condition for a non-smooth interface between a dielectric and a metamaterial*. Math. Models Meth. App. Sci. **3** (2013) 1629.
- [10] G. Bouchitté, B. Schweizer: *Cloaking of small objects by anomalous localized resonance*. Quart. J. Mech. Appl. Math. **63** (2010) 438–463.
- [11] J. Brüning, V. Geyler, K. Pankrashkin: *Spectra of self-adjoint extensions and applications to solvable Schrödinger operators*. Rev. Math. Phys. **20** (2008) 1–70.
- [12] M. Costabel, E. Stephan: *A direct boundary integral equation method for transmission problems*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **106** (1985) 367–413.
- [13] V. A. Derkach, M. M. Malamud: *Generalized resolvents and the boundary value problems for Hermitian operators with gaps*. J. Funct. Anal. **95** (1991) 1–95.
- [14] J. Edward: *An inverse spectral result for the Neumann operator on planar domains*. J. Funct. Anal. **111** (1993) 312–322.
- [15] F. Gesztesy, M. Mitrea: *A description of all self-adjoint extensions of the Laplacian and Kreĭn-type resolvent formulas on non-smooth domains*. J. Anal. Math. **113** (2011) 53–172.
- [16] V. I. Gorbachuk, M. L. Gorbachuk: *Boundary value problems for operator differential equations* Mathematics and its Applications: Soviet Series. Vol. 48. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1991.
- [17] D. Grieser: *The plasmonic eigenvalue problem*. Rev. Math. Phys. **26** (2014) 1450005.
- [18] G. Grubb: *A characterization of the non-local boundary value problems associated with an elliptic operator*. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa **22** (1968) 425–513.

- [19] L. Grubišić, V. Kostrykin, K. A. Makarov, K. Veselić: *Representation theorems for indefinite quadratic forms revisited*. *Mathematika* **59** (2013) 169–189.
- [20] A. Hussein: *Sign-indefinite second-order differential operators on finite metric graphs*. *Rev. Math. Phys.* **26** (2014) 1430003.
- [21] H. Kettunen, M. Lassas, P. Ola: *On absence and existence of the anomalous localized resonance without the quasi-static approximation*. Preprint arXiv:1406.6224.
- [22] R. V. Kohn, J. Lu, B. Schweizer, M. I. Weinstein: *A variational perspective on cloaking by anomalous localized resonance*. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **328** (2014) 1–27.
- [23] D. Krejčířík: *Problem 21.2. The cloaking effect in metamaterials: beyond ellipticity*. In *List of open problems. AIM workshop: Mathematical aspects of physics with non-self-adjoint operators*. Available at <http://aimath.org/pastworkshops/nonseladjointproblems.pdf>.
- [24] E. Lakshmanov, B. Vainberg: *Applications of elliptic operator theory to the isotropic interior transmission eigenvalue problem*. *Inverse Problems* **29** (2013) 104003.
- [25] J. M. Lee, G. Uhlmann: *Determining anisotropic real-analytic conductivities by boundary measurements*. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math* **42** (1989) 1097–1112.
- [26] J. L. Lions, E. Magenes: *Non-homogeneous boundary value problems and applications. Volume 1*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Vol. 181. Springer, 1972.
- [27] H.-M. Nguyen: *Asymptotic behavior of solutions to the Helmholtz equations with sign changing coefficients*. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **367** (2015) 6581–6595.
- [28] H.-M. Nguyen: *Limiting absorption principle and well-posedness for the Helmholtz equation with sign changing coefficients*. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **106** (2016) 342–374.
- [29] H.-M. Nguyen: *Negative index materials and their applications: recent mathematics progress*. *Chin. Ann. Math.* (to appear), Preprint available at <http://cama.epfl.ch/files/content/sites/cama/files/documents/Survey.pdf>.
- [30] N. A. Nicorovici, R. C. McPhedran, G. W. Milton: *Optical and dielectric properties of partially resonant composites*. *Phys. Rev. B* **49** (1994) 8479–8482.
- [31] P. Ola: *Remarks on a transmission problem*. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **196** (1995) 639–658.
- [32] A. Posilicano: *Boundary triples and Weyl functions for singular perturbations of self-adjoint operators*. *Meth. Funct. Anal. Topol.* **10** (2004) 57–63
- [33] A. Posilicano: *Self-adjoint extensions of restrictions*. *Oper. Matr.* **2** (2008) 483–506
- [34] M. Reed, B. Simon: *Methods of modern mathematical physics. IV: Analysis of operators*. Academic Press, 1978.
- [35] S. Schmitz: *Representation theorems for indefinite quadratic forms without spectral gap*. *Integr. Equ. Oper. Th.* **83** (2015) 73–94.
- [36] S. Schmitz: *Representation theorems for indefinite quadratic forms and applications*. Dissertation, Mainz, 2014. Available at <http://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:hebis:77-37267>.
- [37] M. E. Taylor: *Pseudodifferential operators*. Princeton University Press, 1981
- [38] M. E. Taylor: *Partial differential equations II. Qualitative studies of linear equations*. Applied Mathematical Sciences. Vol. 116. Springer, 1996.

DiSAT, SEZIONE DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DELL'INSUBRIA, VIA VALLEGGIO 11, 22100 COMO, ITALY

*E-mail address:* [claudio.cacciapuoti@uninsubria.it](mailto:claudio.cacciapuoti@uninsubria.it)

LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES D'ORSAY, UNIV. PARIS-SUD, CNRS, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-SACLAY, 91405 ORSAY, FRANCE

*E-mail address:* [konstantin.pankrashkin@math.u-psud.fr](mailto:konstantin.pankrashkin@math.u-psud.fr)

*URL:* <http://www.math.u-psud.fr/~pankrash/>

DiSAT, SEZIONE DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DELL'INSUBRIA, VIA VALLEGGIO 11, 22100 COMO, ITALY

*E-mail address:* [andrea.posilicano@uninsubria.it](mailto:andrea.posilicano@uninsubria.it)