

THE FERMIONIC ENTANGLEMENT ENTROPY AND AREA LAW FOR THE RELATIVISTIC DIRAC VACUUM STATE

FELIX FINSTER, MAGDALENA LOTTNER, AND ALEXANDER V. SOBOLEV
OCTOBER 2023 / JUNE 2024

ABSTRACT. We consider the fermionic entanglement entropy for the free Dirac field in a bounded spatial region of Minkowski spacetime. In order to make the system ultraviolet finite, a regularization is introduced. An area law is proven in the limiting cases where the volume tends to infinity and/or the regularization length tends to zero. The technical core of the paper is to generalize a theorem of Harold Widom to pseudo-differential operators whose principal symbols develop a specific discontinuity at a single point.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Physical preliminaries	7
2.1. The Dirac equation in Minkowski spacetime	7
2.2. The entanglement entropy of a quasi-free fermionic quantum state	10
3. Widom's formula and its generalizations	11
4. Schatten-von-Neumann bounds for pseudo-differential operators	14
4.1. Singular values and Schatten-von Neumann classes	14
4.2. Lattice norm bounds	15
4.3. Multi-scale symbols	15
4.4. Extension to non-smooth symbols	16
4.5. More estimates for the case $d = 1$	18
5. Estimates for the operator $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$ and approximation by smooth symbols	20
5.1. Two abstract results	20
5.2. Estimates for $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$	21
5.3. Trace class continuity of $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$	22
5.4. Approximation by smooth symbols	24
6. Proof of Widom's formula for smooth symbols and non-smooth test functions	26
7. Proof of Widom's formula for non-smooth symbols and non-smooth test functions	27
7.1. Continuity of the asymptotic coefficient $B(\mathcal{A}; f)$	28
7.2. Proof of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5	29
7.3. Proof of Proposition 3.6	29
8. Positivity of the coefficient $B(\mathcal{A}; f)$	29
8.1. An abstract result	30
8.2. Application to pseudo-differential operators	30
8.3. Proof of Theorem 8.3	32
8.4. Corollaries for the functions η_\varkappa	32
9. Proof of the main theorem	33

1. INTRODUCTION

Entropy is a measure for the disorder of a physical system. There are various notions of entropy, like the entropy in classical statistical mechanics as introduced by Boltzmann and Gibbs, the Shannon and Rényi entropies in information theory or the von Neumann entropy for quantum systems. In the past decade, there has been increasing interest in the *entanglement entropy*, which tells about non-classical correlations between subsystems of a composite quantum system [2, 17]. We here consider the *fermionic* case, where the many-particle system is composed of fermions satisfying the (Pauli-)Fermi-Dirac statistics. Moreover, for simplicity we consider the *quasi-free* case where the particles do not interact with each other. This makes it possible to express the entanglement entropy in terms of the reduced one-particle density operator [13] (for details see Section 2.2). This setting has been studied extensively for a free Fermi gas formed of non-relativistic spin-less particles [13, 21, 22] (for more details see the preliminaries in Section 2.2). In the present paper, we turn attention to a *relativistic* system formed of particles *with spin*. More precisely, we consider a free Dirac field in a bounded spatial subset of Minkowski spacetime. We compute the entanglement entropy for the quantum state describing the vacuum with an ultraviolet regularization on a length scale ε . The corresponding one-particle density operator turns out to be the regularized projection operator to all negative-frequency solutions of the Dirac equation. Making use of the explicit form of the Dirac propagator and employing the techniques developed in the mathematical section of this paper, it becomes possible to compute the entanglement entropy of bounded spatial subregions in Minkowski spacetime. We prove an area law in the limiting cases where the volume tends to infinity and/or the regularization length tends to zero. The technical core of the paper is to generalize the pseudo-differential methods for the one-particle density to principal symbols which develop a specific discontinuity at a single point.

We now give an overview of our methods and results. Let Π be the projection onto the negative frequency subspace of the Dirac operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{C}^4)$. As we recall in Section 2.1, in the momentum representation, this projection is simply the multiplication by the self-adjoint 4×4 -matrix-valued function

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{k}) := \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \frac{\sum_{\beta=1}^3 k_{\beta} \gamma^{\beta} \gamma^0 - m \gamma^0}{\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}} \right), \quad \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3. \quad (1.1)$$

In other words, the operator Π is a pseudo-differential operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{C}^4)$ with *symbol* $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{k})$,

$$(\Pi u)(\mathbf{x}) = (\text{Op}(\mathcal{P})u)(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \iint e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})} \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{k}) u(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mathbf{y} \, d\mathbf{k}, \quad (1.2)$$

where the parameter $m \geq 0$ is the rest mass of the Dirac particle. Given a parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ (the *regularization length*) and a function $\phi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ with $\phi(0) = 1$ (the *cutoff function*), in

this paper we shall be mainly concerned with the following *regularized* version of symbol (1.1):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^{(\varepsilon)}(\mathbf{k}) &:= \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{k}) \phi(\varepsilon \sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \frac{\sum_{\beta=1}^3 k_\beta \gamma^\beta \gamma^0 - m \gamma^0}{\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}} \right) \phi(\varepsilon \sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}), \quad \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

which gives rise to the *regularized* projection $\Pi^{(\varepsilon)} = \text{Op}(\mathcal{P}^{(\varepsilon)})$. Further requirements on the function ϕ will be given in Theorem 1.1.

Now, for each $\varkappa > 0$ we introduce the *Rényi entropy function*, which is defined as follows. If $t \notin (0, 1)$ then we set $\eta_\varkappa(t) = 0$. For $t \in (0, 1)$ we define

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_\varkappa(t) &= \frac{1}{1 - \varkappa} \log(t^\varkappa + (1 - t)^\varkappa) \quad \text{for } \varkappa \neq 1, \\ \eta_1(t) &:= \lim_{\varkappa \rightarrow 1} \eta_\varkappa(t) = -t \log t - (1 - t) \log(1 - t) \quad \text{for } \varkappa = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

Note that η_1 is the familiar von Neumann entropy function. Now, for any bounded (always assumed non-empty) set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ we can define the *Rényi entanglement entropy* associated with the bi-partition $\mathbb{R}^3 = \Lambda \cup (\mathbb{R} \setminus \Lambda)$ (see e.g. [20, Section 3]) by

$$S_\varkappa(\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}, \Lambda) := \text{tr}(\eta_\varkappa(\chi_\Lambda \Pi^{(\varepsilon)} \chi_\Lambda) - \chi_\Lambda \eta_\varkappa(\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}) \chi_\Lambda), \quad (1.5)$$

As we shall see later, since Λ is bounded and $\varepsilon > 0$, both operators on the right-hand side are trace class, so the entropy S_\varkappa is well-defined. Our main objective is to analyze the asymptotic behavior of the entropy $S_\varkappa(\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}, L\Lambda)$ as the regularization parameter ε tends to zero and/or the *scaling parameter* L tends to infinity.

The following theorem constitutes our main result – it provides the area law for the asymptotics of the entanglement entropy. From now on, as a rule we assume that Λ is a *region*, i.e. an open set with finitely many connected components such that their closures are disjoint.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a bounded spatial region with C^1 -boundary. Let the cut-off $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ be a function such that $\phi(0) = 1$ and*

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \phi(t) \right| \leq C_k (1 + t)^{-\rho}, \quad t > 0, \quad (1.6)$$

with some constants C_k for all $k = 0, 1, \dots$, where $\rho > 3$. Then, as $L\varepsilon^{-1} \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varepsilon \searrow 0$, the following asymptotics hold:

$$\lim L^{-2} \varepsilon^2 S_\varkappa(\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}, L\Lambda) = \mathfrak{M}_\varkappa \text{vol}_2(\partial\Lambda), \quad (1.7)$$

where \mathfrak{M}_\varkappa is some explicit constant.

If $L \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is fixed, then

$$\lim L^{-2} \varepsilon^2 S_\varkappa(\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}, L\Lambda) = \mathfrak{M}_\varkappa^{(\varepsilon)} \text{vol}_2(\partial\Lambda), \quad (1.8)$$

where $\mathfrak{M}_\varkappa^{(\varepsilon)}$ is some explicit constant such that $\mathfrak{M}_\varkappa^{(\varepsilon)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_\varkappa$ as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$.

If $0 < \varkappa < 2$, then both coefficients \mathfrak{M}_\varkappa and $\mathfrak{M}_\varkappa^{(\varepsilon)}$ are strictly positive.

The definitions of the coefficients $\mathfrak{M}_\varkappa, \mathfrak{M}_\varkappa^{(\varepsilon)}$ require more technical preliminaries and are given in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 9. We point out that these coefficients depend on the choice of the cutoff function ϕ . Note that the above theorem also applies to the limiting case where L is fixed and $\varepsilon \searrow 0$.

We now comment on the *role of the ultraviolet cutoff*. We first point out that, in the setting of relativistic quantum field theory, the ultraviolet regularization is needed in order for the entropy to be well-defined and finite. This well-known fact can be understood in various ways. One way is to note that a physically sensible state should satisfy a micro-local energy condition. This condition can be stated equivalently that the state should be a *Hadamard state* [25]. In our setting of a quasi-free state, this means that the two-point distribution $P(x, y)$ has a singularity structure of Hadamard form. Consequently, the corresponding reduced one-density operator Π defined by (1.2) is not trace class (because its kernel $\Pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is singular on the diagonal $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$). Moreover, corresponding entanglement entropies diverge. An alternative, more elementary way of understanding the divergence of the entropy is to note that the description of anti-particles in quantum field theory makes it necessary to take the negative-energy solutions of the Dirac equation into account. In fact, the operator Π in (1.2) is the projection operator onto all negative-frequency solutions. The fact that the total local density of these solutions is infinite at each spacetime point suggests that also the corresponding entanglement entropies diverge.

There are various ways to avoid this divergence. One strategy is to restrict attention to the *relative entropy* which, being defined as the difference of two traces, can be finite even if the individual traces are not. The relative entropy has interesting connections to modular theory (see for example [15, 12, 34]). Another strategy is to compute the entanglement entropy not between a spatial region and its complement but instead the entanglement entropy between two separated regions in spacetime [14]. Here we take the point of view that, similar to the ultraviolet divergences in perturbative quantum field theory, the divergence of the entropy shows that quantum field theory should not hold on all scales, but only down to a microscopic length ε (typically thought of the Planck length) where it is to be replaced by another, more fundamental physical theory. We remark that the theory of causal fermion systems is a concise proposal for such a theory (for details see for example the textbooks [11, 9] or the website [1]). Here we do not need to be specific on how this microscopic physical theory should look like. Instead, we work with standard quantum field theory, but take into account its limitations by introducing a regularization on the length scale ε . Then the entropy becomes finite, and the smallness of the Planck length motivates to consider the asymptotics $\varepsilon \searrow 0$.

Clearly, this procedure raises the question how our results depend on the choice of the regularization. In order to address this question, with the ansatz (1.3) we consider a cutoff function ϕ which can be chosen in a general class of radially symmetric and smooth functions. The area laws in Theorem 1.1 hold irrespectively of the choice of the cutoff function. As we shall see later, only the numerical values of the coefficients \mathfrak{M}_\varkappa and $\mathfrak{M}_\varkappa^{(\varepsilon)}$ depend on this choice (see again the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 9). Considering non-smooth cutoff functions could lead to an asymptotic behavior different from our area law, which we want to avoid. For example, as explained in [7, Theorem 1.1], a sharp, step function cutoff at Fermi energy $\mu > 0$ entails the *enhanced area law* asymptotics (i.e. asymptotics with an extra logarithmic factor $\log L$). We should point out that in our paper, since Π is the projection on the negative spectral subspace, apart from the smooth cutoff we also have a sharp cutoff at energy zero.

This however does not lead to the enhanced area law since the associated singularity of the symbol is concentrated at the single point $\mathbf{k} = 0$, whereas the enhanced area law is produced when the singularity is supported on a surface of co-dimension one.

From the mathematical viewpoint, our analysis is based on the quasi-classical asymptotic theory for truncated pseudo-differential operators with matrix-valued symbols, see [31, 33]. We focus on pseudo-differential operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}^n)$, $d \geq 2, n \geq 1$, of the following form:

$$(\text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A})u)(\mathbf{x}) := \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\right)^d \iint e^{i\alpha\xi(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})} \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) u(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} d\boldsymbol{\xi} \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1.9)$$

where \mathcal{A} is the $(n \times n)$ -matrix-valued symbol, and $\alpha > 0$ is the scaling parameter. Introduce the truncated operator:

$$W_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda) := \chi_\Lambda \text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A})\chi_\Lambda, \quad (1.10)$$

where, as earlier, χ_Λ denotes the multiplication by the indicator of a set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. We are interested in the asymptotics of the trace of the operator

$$D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f) := \chi_\Lambda f(W_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda))\chi_\Lambda - W_\alpha(f \circ \mathcal{A}, \Lambda), \quad (1.11)$$

as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$. The function f , which we call *test function*, is continuous, but is not supposed to be smooth. Whenever it does not cause confusion we use the notation $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A})$ or $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; f)$.

One should note that the asymptotic regime $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ can be interpreted in two ways. First, the reciprocal value α^{-1} can be regarded as a quasi-classical parameter, i. e. *Planck's constant*, in which case the sought asymptotics is simply the quasi-classical asymptotics. At the same time, a straightforward change of spatial variable $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \alpha^{-1}\mathbf{x}$ shows that $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$ is unitarily equivalent to $D_1(\mathcal{A}, \alpha\Lambda; f)$, and hence $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ amounts to the spatial scaling limit. We should also observe that if $f(0) = 0$, Λ is bounded and \mathcal{A} decays at infinity sufficiently fast, then each of the operators on the right-hand side of (1.11) is trace class. In particular, the trace of the second operator equals

$$\left(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\right)^d \text{vol}_d(\Lambda) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \text{tr} f(\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi})) d\boldsymbol{\xi}.$$

If $f(0) \neq 0$ or Λ has infinite volume, then the two operators are no longer trace class individually, but under some mild conditions their difference, i.e. the operator D_α , is.

Using $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$ we can express the operator under the trace in the definition (1.5). Indeed, taking $d = 3$ and changing the variable $\mathbf{k} = \boldsymbol{\xi}\varepsilon^{-1}$ we can rewrite $\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}$ as

$$\Pi^{(\varepsilon)} = \text{Op}_{1/\varepsilon}(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}) \quad \text{with}$$

$$\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \mathcal{P}^{(\varepsilon)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}\varepsilon^{-1}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \frac{\sum_{\beta=1}^3 \xi_\beta \gamma^\beta - \varepsilon m}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\xi}^2 + \varepsilon^2 m^2}} \gamma^0 \right) \phi(\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\xi}^2 + (\varepsilon m)^2}),$$

and hence

$$S_\varkappa(\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}, \Lambda) = \text{tr} D_{1/\varepsilon}(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}, \Lambda; \eta_\varkappa).$$

Furthermore, due to the equivalence with the scaling limit, we can write

$$S_\varkappa(\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}, L\Lambda) = \text{tr} D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}, \Lambda; \eta_\varkappa) \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha = L\varepsilon^{-1}.$$

To study the trace we rely on the asymptotic formula obtained by H. Widom in [31], see Proposition 3.1. There are two significant complications however. The first one is that Widom's result was proved for analytic test functions f , whereas $\eta_\varkappa(t)$ is not even differentiable at $t = 0$ or $t = 1$ if $\varkappa \leq 1$. The second issue is that Widom's original formula holds for smooth symbols \mathcal{A} , but the symbol $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}$ becomes discontinuous in the limit $\varepsilon \searrow 0$:

$$\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \sum_{\beta=1}^3 \frac{\xi_\beta}{|\boldsymbol{\xi}|} \gamma^\beta \gamma^0 \right) \phi(|\boldsymbol{\xi}|). \quad (1.12)$$

Note that in the case $m = 0$, the symbol $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}$ coincides with the limit symbol (1.12) for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Thus our objective is to extend Widom's formula to non-smooth functions f and non-smooth symbols \mathcal{A} . More precisely, we focus on non-smooth test functions and non-smooth symbols that mimic the properties of η_\varkappa and the symbol (1.12) respectively. Note that we consider arbitrary dimensions $d \geq 2$ and not only $d = 3$. Moreover, instead of one discontinuity point (as in (1.12)), we allow for an arbitrary finite number of discontinuity points.

The asymptotic behavior of $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$ for non-smooth f has been explored for smooth *scalar* symbols \mathcal{A} in [20], [21], [22] and [28], [29], and some of these techniques are used in this paper. The mainstay of our work is an adaptation of the existing Schatten-von Neumann estimates for the operator (1.11) to non-smooth (matrix) symbols. Subsequently, these estimates allow us to approximate non-smooth symbols by smooth ones and hence enable us to use the original Widom's formula. Secondly, they allow us to generalize Widom's formula to non-smooth functions following the ideas of [21] and [29].

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we recall a few physical preliminaries on the Dirac equation in Minkowski spacetime and entanglement entropy. In Section 3 we provide some mathematical background of our analysis including the asymptotic formula by H. Widom, see Proposition 3.1. Our main mathematical results are contained in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5. Theorem 3.4 obtains the asymptotics in one parameter, as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, for a fixed symbol \mathcal{A} . The more general Theorem 3.5 considers a convergent (as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$) family of non-smooth symbols $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}$ and establishes a Widom type asymptotic formula in two parameters, $\varepsilon \searrow 0$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$. In Section 4 we collect the key technical bounds on Schatten-von Neumann (quasi-)norms of pseudo-differential operators, including the ones with non-smooth symbols. Section 5 focuses on the properties of the operator $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$ and prepares the grounds for approximations by smooth symbols. The conclusions of Section 5 are used in Section 6 to prove Theorem 3.4 for smooth symbols \mathcal{A} . The proofs of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 are completed in the short Section 7. In Section 8 we use the well-known result by Berezin from [3] for concave functions to examine the positivity of the asymptotic coefficient in the main theorems. And finally, in Section 9 the results of Sections 3 and 8 are applied to the entanglement entropy $S_\varkappa(\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}, L\Lambda)$ to complete the proof of our main result, Theorem 1.1.

Units and notational conventions. We work throughout in natural units $\hbar = c = 1$. Then the only remaining unit is that of a length (measured for example in meters). It is most convenient to work with dimensionless quantities. This can be achieved by choosing an arbitrary reference length ℓ and multiplying all dimensional quantities by suitable powers of ℓ .

For example, we work with the

$$\text{dimensionless quantities} \quad m\ell, \quad \xi\ell, \quad \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\varepsilon}{\ell}. \quad (1.13)$$

For ease in notation, in what follows we set $\ell = 1$, making it possible to leave out all powers of ℓ . The dimensionality can be recovered by rewriting all formulas using the dimensionless quantities in (1.13).

We conclude the introduction with some general notational conventions. For $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote $\langle \xi \rangle = \sqrt{1 + |\xi|^2}$. The symbol $\text{vol}_n(\Omega)$ with $n = 0, 1, \dots, d$ stands the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure of the (measurable) set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. We call $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ a *region* if it is a non-empty open set with finitely many connected components such that their closures are disjoint. We also use the standard notation $\mathbb{R}_+ = (0, \infty)$, $\mathbb{R}_- = (-\infty, 0)$.

For any matrix \mathcal{B} the notation $|\mathcal{B}|$ stands for its Hilbert-Schmidt norm. If $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\xi)$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, is a smooth matrix-valued function then we write

$$|\nabla_\xi^l \mathcal{B}(\xi)| = \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=l} |\partial_\xi^{\mathbf{m}} \mathcal{B}(\xi)|,$$

where $\partial_\xi^{\mathbf{m}}$ is the standard partial derivative of order $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$. The symbol $\mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ denotes the space of all $(n \times m)$ -matrices.

For any two bounded self-adjoint operators A and B on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} the inequality $A \leq B$ is understood in the standard quadratic form sense: $(Au, u) \leq (Bu, u)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$.

For two non-negative numbers (or functions) X and Y depending on some parameters, we write $X \lesssim Y$ (or $Y \gtrsim X$) if $X \leq CY$ for some positive constant C independent of those parameters. To avoid confusion we may comment on the nature of (implicit) constants in the bounds. If $X \lesssim Y \lesssim X$, then we write $X \asymp Y$.

2. PHYSICAL PRELIMINARIES

2.1. The Dirac equation in Minkowski spacetime. In special relativity, space and time are combined to a four-dimensional *spacetime*. Mathematically, this four-dimensional spacetime is described by Minkowski spacetime $(\mathcal{M}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$, a real four-dimensional vector space endowed with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ of signature $(+---)$. For \mathcal{M} one may always choose a basis $(e_i)_{i=0, \dots, 3}$ satisfying $\langle e_0, e_0 \rangle = 1$ and $\langle e_i, e_i \rangle = -1$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Such a basis is called *pseudo-orthonormal basis* or *reference frame*, since the corresponding coordinate system (x^i) describes time and space as observed by an observer in a system of inertia. We also refer to $t := x^0$ as time and denote spatial coordinates by $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, x^2, x^3)$. Representing two vectors $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ in such a basis as $x = \sum_{i=0}^3 x^i e_i$ and $y = \sum_{i=0}^3 y^i e_i$, the inner product takes the form

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{j,k=0}^3 g_{jk} x^j y^k,$$

where g_{ij} , the *Minkowski metric*, is the diagonal matrix $g = \text{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$.

The Dirac equation for a wave function $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{C}^4)$ of mass $m \geq 0$ in the Minkowski vacuum (i.e. without external potential) reads

$$(i\partial - m)\psi(x) = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

where we use the slash notation with the Feynman dagger $\not{\partial} := \gamma^j \partial_j$ (for more details on the Dirac equation see [30] or [11, Sections 1.2, 1.3]). We always work with the Dirac matrices in the Dirac representation

$$\gamma^0 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{C}^2} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{C}^2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \vec{\gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \vec{\sigma} \\ -\vec{\sigma} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and $\vec{\sigma}$ are the three Pauli matrices

$$\sigma^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The wave functions at a space-time point x take values in the *spinor space* S_x , a four-dimensional complex vector space endowed with an indefinite inner product of signature $(2, 2)$, which we call *spin inner product* and denote by

$$\langle \psi | \phi \rangle_x = \sum_{\alpha=1}^4 s_\alpha \psi^\alpha(x)^\dagger \phi^\alpha(x), \quad s_1 = s_2 = 1, \quad s_3 = s_4 = -1, \quad (2.2)$$

where ψ^\dagger is the complex conjugate wave function (in the physics literature, this inner product is often written as $\bar{\psi} \phi$ with the so-called adjoint spinor $\bar{\psi} = \psi^\dagger \gamma^0$). Since the Dirac equation is linear and hyperbolic (meaning that it can be rewritten as a symmetric hyperbolic system; for details see for example [11, Chapter 13]), its Cauchy problem for smooth initial data is well-posed, giving rise to global smooth solutions. Moreover, due to finite propagation speed, starting with compactly supported initial data, we obtain solutions which are spatially compact (meaning that their restriction to any Cauchy surface has compact support). For any two such solutions ψ, ϕ , the vector field $\langle \psi | \gamma^j \phi \rangle$ is divergence-free; this is referred to as *current conservation*. Applying Gauss' divergence theorem, this implies that the spatial integral

$$(\psi | \phi)|_t := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \langle \psi | \gamma^0 \phi \rangle|_{(t, \mathbf{x})} d^3 \mathbf{x} \quad (2.3)$$

is independent of the choice of the space-like hypersurface labelled by the time parameter t . This integral defines a scalar product on the space of smooth solutions of the Dirac equation with spatially compact support. Forming the completion, we obtain a Hilbert space, which we denote by $(\mathcal{H}, (\cdot | \cdot))$. The norm on \mathcal{H} is denoted by $\|\cdot\|$.

In what follows, we will work in a fixed coordinate system with a distinguished time function $t = x^0$. In this setting, it is most convenient to write the Dirac equation in an equivalent way which resembles the Schrödinger equation. To this end, we multiply the Dirac equation (2.1) by γ^0 and isolate the t -derivative on one side of the equation,

$$i \partial_t \psi = H \psi \quad \text{where} \quad H := -\gamma^0 (i \vec{\gamma} \vec{\nabla} - m) \quad (2.4)$$

(note here that $\sum_{j=0}^3 \gamma^j \partial_j = \gamma^0 \partial_0 + \vec{\gamma} \vec{\nabla}$). The operator H is referred to as the *Dirac Hamiltonian*, and (2.4) is the Dirac equation in the *Hamiltonian form*. By direct computation one verifies that the Hamiltonian is a symmetric operator on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Working at fixed time $t = 0$, in view of (2.3), the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} can be identified with the square-integrable spinors,

$$\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4).$$

In what follows, we shall always work with this identification.

Applying the (unitary) Fourier transform

$$(\mathcal{F}\phi)(\mathbf{k}) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3}} \int e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}, \quad \phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4),$$

the Hamiltonian H may be rewritten as

$$H = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{\beta=1}^3 k_{\beta} \gamma^{\beta} + m \right) \gamma^0 \mathcal{F}.$$

Using that the Hermitian 4×4 -matrix $(\sum_{\beta=1}^3 k_{\beta} \gamma^{\beta} + m) \gamma^0$ is trace-free and that its square can be computed with the help of the anti-commutation relations to be $\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2$ times the identity matrix, we conclude that that its eigenvalues are $\pm\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}$, both with multiplicity two. Hence, diagonalizing this matrix with a suitable unitary matrix S gives

$$\left(\sum_{\beta=1}^3 k_{\beta} \gamma^{\beta} + m \right) \gamma^0 = S^{-1} J S \quad \text{with} \quad J := \sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2} \operatorname{diag}(-1, -1, 1, 1).$$

Therefore, the projection onto the negative spectral subspace of H is given by

$$\Pi := (S \mathcal{F})^{-1} \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{C}^4} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}} J \right) S \mathcal{F}. \quad (2.5)$$

Inserting the regularizing factor $\phi(\varepsilon\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2})$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is the regularization length we obtain the *regularized projection operator*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^{(\varepsilon)} &:= (S \mathcal{F})^{-1} \frac{1}{2} \phi(\varepsilon\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{C}^4} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}} J \right) S \mathcal{F} \\ &= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \frac{1}{2} \phi(\varepsilon\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{C}^4} - \frac{(\sum_{\beta=1}^3 k_{\beta} \gamma^{\beta} + m) \gamma^0}{\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}} \right) \mathcal{F}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Remark 2.1. (Connection with the kernel of the fermionic projector) For simplicity, we here restrict attention to the Hamiltonian formulation and work exclusively with operators acting on the spatial Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}^4)$. Nevertheless, the operator $\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}$ is closely related to kernels in spacetime, as we now explain. The subspace of negative-energy solutions of the Dirac equation in Minkowski space can be described by the *regularized kernel of the fermionic projector* $P^{(\varepsilon)}(x, y)$ defined by

$$P^{(\varepsilon)}(x, y) = \int \frac{1}{(2\pi)^4} \left(\sum_{i=0}^3 k_i \gamma^i + m \right) \delta(\langle k, k \rangle - m^2) \Theta(-k^0) \phi(\varepsilon|k^0|) e^{-i\langle k, x-y \rangle} d^4 k,$$

where the cutoff function ϕ and the parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ again describes the regularization, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the Minkowski inner product, and Θ denotes the Heaviside function. This kernel plays a central role in the theory of causal fermion systems (for more details see [9, Chapter 1] or [11, Chapters 15 and 16]). In this context, the most common and simplest choice is an exponential cutoff

$$\phi(\tau) = e^{-\tau}, \quad \tau \geq 0$$

(for more details and some background see [9, Sections 1.2.2 and 2.4.1]). We emphasize however that in the current paper we allow rather arbitrary cut-offs ϕ satisfying the decay properties stated in Theorem 1.1.

If we choose both arguments on the Cauchy surface $\{t = 0\}$, i.e.

$$x = (0, \mathbf{x}), \quad y = (0, \mathbf{y}) \quad \text{with } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3$$

and carry out the integral over k^0 , we obtain

$$P^{(\varepsilon)}((0, \mathbf{x}), (0, \mathbf{y})) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^4} \int \frac{1}{2|\omega|} (k + m) \phi(\varepsilon|\omega|) \Big|_{\omega = -\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}} e^{i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})} d^3\mathbf{k}.$$

Comparing with (2.6), one sees that

$$\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = -2\pi P^{(\varepsilon)}((0, \mathbf{x}), (0, \mathbf{y})) \gamma^0.$$

Hence the integral kernel of the spatial operator $\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}$ is obtained from the regularized kernel of the fermionic projector simply by multiplying with a prefactor and with the matrix γ^0 from the right. This matrix γ^0 will appear frequently in our formulas; it can be understood as describing the transition from the setting in a Lorentzian spacetime to the purely spatial formulation on a given Cauchy surface.

2.2. The entanglement entropy of a quasi-free fermionic quantum state. Given a Hilbert space $(\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}})$ (the ‘‘one-particle Hilbert space’’), we let $(\mathcal{F}, \langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{F}})$ be the corresponding fermionic Fock space, i.e.

$$\mathcal{F} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} \underbrace{\mathcal{H} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathcal{H}}_{k \text{ factors}}$$

(where \wedge denotes the totally anti-symmetrized tensor product). We define the *creation operator* Ψ^\dagger by

$$\Psi^\dagger : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}), \quad \Psi^\dagger(\psi)(\psi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \psi_p) := \psi \wedge \psi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \psi_p,$$

(where $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F})$ denotes the linear mappings from \mathcal{F} to itself). Its adjoint is the annihilation operator denoted by $\Psi(\bar{\psi}) := (\Psi^\dagger(\psi))^*$. These operators satisfy the canonical anti-commutation relations

$$\{\Psi(\bar{\psi}), \Psi^\dagger(\phi)\} = (\psi|\phi) \quad \text{and} \quad \{\Psi(\bar{\psi}), \Psi(\bar{\phi})\} = 0 = \{\Psi^\dagger(\psi), \Psi^\dagger(\phi)\}.$$

Next, we let W be a *statistical operator* on \mathcal{F} , i.e. a positive semi-definite linear operator of trace one,

$$W : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}, \quad W \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tr}_{\mathcal{F}}(W) = 1.$$

Given an observable A (i.e. a symmetric operator on \mathcal{F}), the expectation value of the measurement is given by

$$\langle A \rangle := \text{tr}_{\mathcal{F}}(AW).$$

The corresponding *quantum state* ω is the linear functional which to every observable associates the expectation value, i.e.

$$\omega : A \mapsto \text{tr}_{\mathcal{F}}(AW).$$

The *von Neumann entropy* of the state ω is defined by

$$S := -\text{tr}_{\mathcal{F}}(W \log W).$$

In this paper, we restrict our attention to the subclass of so-called *quasifree* states, fully determined by their two-point distributions

$$\omega_2(\bar{\psi}, \phi) := \omega(\Psi^\dagger(\phi) \Psi(\bar{\psi})) .$$

Definition 2.2. The **reduced one-particle density operator** D is the positive linear operator on the Hilbert space $(\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}})$ defined by

$$\omega_2(\bar{\psi}, \phi) = \langle \psi | D\phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} .$$

The von Neumann entropy $S_1(\omega)$ of the quasi-free fermionic quantum state can be expressed in terms of the reduced one-particle density operator by

$$S_1(\omega) = \text{tr} \eta(D) , \tag{2.7}$$

where $\eta = \eta_1$ is the von Neumann entropy function defined in (1.4). This formula appears commonly in the literature (see for example [24, Equation 6.3], [18, 8, 23] and [13, eq. (34)]). A detailed derivation can be found in [10, Appendix A]. Similar to (2.7) also other entropies can be expressed in terms of the reduced one-particle density operator. Namely, the Rényi entropy and the corresponding entanglement entropy can be written as $S_\varkappa(\omega) = \text{tr} \eta_\varkappa(D)$ and (1.5), respectively. These formulas are also derived in [10, Appendix A].

We here consider a quasi-free state formed of solutions of the Dirac equation in Minkowski space. Thus we choose the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} as the solution space of the Dirac equation with scalar product $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle = (\cdot | \cdot)$. Moreover, we consider the *regularized vacuum state*, in which case the reduced two-particle density operator is equal to the regularized projection operator onto all negative-frequency solutions of the Dirac equation, i.e.

$$D = \Pi^{(\varepsilon)}$$

with $\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}$ as in (2.6). We point out that, in the limiting case $\varepsilon \searrow 0$, the operator D goes over to the projection operator to all negative-frequency solutions (2.5). The corresponding quantum state ω is the vacuum state in Minkowski space.

Remark 2.3. We point out that our definition of entanglement entropy differs from the conventions in [13, 20] in that we do not add the entropic difference operator of the complement of Λ . This is justified as follows. On the technical level, our procedure is easier, because it suffices to consider compact spatial regions. Conceptually, restricting attention to the entropic difference operator of Λ can be understood from the fact that occupied one-particle states which are supported either inside or outside Λ do not contribute to the entanglement entropy. Thus it suffices to consider the one-particle states which are non-zero both inside and outside. These “boundary states” are taken into account already in our definition of the entanglement entropy (1.5).

3. WIDOM’S FORMULA AND ITS GENERALIZATIONS

As explained in the Introduction, our approach is based on the asymptotic analysis of truncated pseudo-differential operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{C}^n)$, $d \geq 2, n \geq 1$, with matrix-valued symbols $\mathcal{A}(\xi)$, that are defined by (1.9), (1.10). In the scalar case, i.e. for $n = 1$, we often use for symbols the lower case letters and write $a(\xi)$ instead of $\mathcal{A}(\xi)$. In this and the next few sections the objective is to study the asymptotics of the trace of the operator $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$ defined in (1.11), as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, for non-smooth symbols \mathcal{A} and suitable test functions f . Sometimes, one

or more arguments will be omitted if it does not cause confusion, and we simply write $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; f)$ or $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A})$. In order to state our results, we need to describe first the asymptotic coefficient. For a vector $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we represent $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as

$$\boldsymbol{\xi} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} + t\mathbf{e} \quad \text{with } t \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \in \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{e} := \{\boldsymbol{\xi} \mid \boldsymbol{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{e} = 0\}.$$

Instead of $\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ we sometimes write

$$\mathcal{A}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}; t) := \mathcal{A}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} + t\mathbf{e}).$$

Fixing the value $\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ and considering $\mathcal{A}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}, t)$ as a function of one real variable t , we introduce the operator $W_1(\mathcal{A}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}; \cdot); \mathbb{R}_+)$ acting on $L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^n)$. For a function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}; \mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f) &:= \text{tr} [\chi_{\mathbb{R}_+} f(W_1(\mathcal{A}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}; \cdot); \mathbb{R}_+)) \chi_{\mathbb{R}_+} - W_1(f(\mathcal{A}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}; \cdot)); \mathbb{R}_+)] \\ &= \text{tr} D_1(\mathcal{A}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}; \cdot); \mathbb{R}_+; f), \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \in \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{e}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{R}_+ = (0, \infty)$, and introduce

$$\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{e}} \mathcal{M}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}; \mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f) d\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}. \quad (3.1)$$

Finally, denoting the outer unit normal to $\partial\Lambda$ at $\mathbf{x} \in \partial\Lambda$ by $\mathbf{n}_\mathbf{x}$, we can define the main asymptotic coefficient:

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f) := \int_{\partial\Lambda} \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{n}_\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{A}; f) dS_\mathbf{x}. \quad (3.2)$$

As Lemma 5.5 later on shows, under the conditions of the main Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 the coefficients (3.1) and (3.2) are well-defined. In particular, they are finite for C^∞ symbols \mathcal{A} and polynomial f . Our analysis stems from the following result for smooth symbols \mathcal{A} due to H. Widom [31]. Let $\mathcal{A} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{C}^{n \times n})$, $d \geq 2$, be a matrix-valued symbol (not necessarily Hermitian) such that

$$|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^k \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi})| \lesssim \langle \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle^{-\rho} \quad \text{with } k = 0, 1, \dots \text{ and } \rho > d. \quad (3.3)$$

The following is Widom's result stated in the form adapted for our needs.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $d \geq 2$, and let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded C^1 -region. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{C}^{n \times n})$ is a matrix-valued symbol satisfying (3.3). Let f be a polynomial with $f(0) = 0$. Then*

$$\text{tr} f(W_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; \Lambda)) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\right)^d \text{vol}_d(\Lambda) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \text{tr} f(\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi})) d\boldsymbol{\xi} + \alpha^{d-1} \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f) + o(\alpha^{d-1}). \quad (3.4)$$

Remark. (1) Under the conditions of Proposition 3.1 both operators in definition (1.11) of $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$ are trace class, and the first term on the right-hand side of (3.4) is exactly the trace $\text{tr} W_\alpha(f \circ \mathcal{A}, \Lambda)$. In this case we also have the equality $\chi_\Lambda f(W_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda)) \chi_\Lambda = f(W_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda))$, and therefore the formula (3.4) can be rewritten as

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \alpha^{1-d} \text{tr} D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f) = \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f). \quad (3.5)$$

On the other hand, if f is a polynomial such that $f(0) \neq 0$, then (3.4) does not make sense, but (3.5) still holds.

- (2) One should mention that in contrast with the matrix case, for scalar symbols $\mathcal{A} = a$ the coefficient $B(a; f)$ can be found explicitly, see [32] and [33].

The main mathematical contribution of our work is the extension of the above result to non-smooth symbols \mathcal{A} and non-smooth functions f . Remembering the relation $\Pi^{(\varepsilon)} = \text{Op}_1(\mathcal{P}^{(\varepsilon)})$, we study symbols that model the symbol $\mathcal{P}^{(\varepsilon)}$ and its limit as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$. Namely, we consider symbols \mathcal{A} that are C^∞ outside of a fixed finite set $\Xi = \{\xi^{(1)}, \xi^{(2)}, \dots, \xi^{(N)}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and satisfy the bound

$$|\nabla_\xi^k \mathcal{A}(\xi)| \lesssim \langle \xi \rangle^{-\rho} d(\xi)^{-k}, \quad d(\xi) := \min(\text{dist}(\xi, \Xi), 1), \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \quad (3.6)$$

where $\rho > d$ and $\langle \xi \rangle := \sqrt{1 + |\xi|^2}$. We are also interested in families of symbols that converge in the following sense.

Condition 3.2. *Let $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a finite set. We assume that the family of Hermitian symbols $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Xi; \mathbb{C}^{n \times n})$, $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, satisfies the bounds*

$$|\nabla_\xi^k \mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}(\xi)| \lesssim \langle \xi \rangle^{-\rho} d(\xi)^{-k}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots,$$

for some $\rho > d$, uniformly in ε . Away from Ξ the symbols $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}$ converge to $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}^{(0)}$ uniformly, i.e. for each $h > 0$ we have

$$\sup_{\xi: d(\xi) > h} |\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}(\xi) - \mathcal{A}(\xi)| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \searrow 0.$$

In our analysis we can include functions f that are more general than the entropy functions (1.4):

Condition 3.3. *Assume that there is a finite collection of points $\mathbb{T} = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_K\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and a number $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ such that the function $f \in C(\mathbb{R}) \cap C^2(\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{T})$ satisfies the bounds*

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{dt^k} f(t) \right| \lesssim \sum_{l=1}^K \quad \text{for } |t - t_l|^{\gamma-k} \text{ and } k = 1, 2, t \notin \mathbb{T}.$$

Using these conditions we can now state the main technical results of this paper. The first of them deals with fixed non-smooth symbols \mathcal{A} .

Theorem 3.4. *Let $d \geq 2$, and let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded C^1 -region. Assume that the function f satisfies Condition 3.3 for some $\gamma \in (0, 1]$. Suppose that a Hermitian matrix-valued symbol $\mathcal{A} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Xi; \mathbb{C}^{n \times n})$ satisfies (3.6) for a finite set $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\rho > 0$ with $\rho\gamma > d$. Then the formula*

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \alpha^{1-d} \text{tr } D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f) = B(\mathcal{A}; f) \quad (3.7)$$

holds.

The next theorem considers families of convergent symbols.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $d \geq 2$, and let the region $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and the function f be as in Theorem 3.4. Suppose that the family of Hermitian matrix-valued symbols $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}$ satisfies Condition 3.2 for some $\rho > 0$ with $\rho\gamma > d$. Then, as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varepsilon \searrow 0$, we have*

$$\lim \alpha^{1-d} \text{tr } D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}, \Lambda; f) = B(\mathcal{A}; f). \quad (3.8)$$

As the next Proposition shows, if the symbol \mathcal{A} is “radially symmetric”, then the integral (3.1) is independent of the unit vector \mathbf{e} , which simplifies the expression for the coefficient $B(\mathcal{A}; f)$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $d \geq 2$. Suppose that f satisfies Condition 3.3 with some $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, and that $\partial\Lambda$ is a union of finitely many bounded piece-wise C^1 -surfaces. Suppose that a Hermitian matrix-valued symbol $\mathcal{A} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Xi; \mathbb{C}^{n \times n})$ satisfies (3.6) with some $\rho > 0$ such that $\rho\gamma > d$. Suppose also that for each $\mathbf{R} \in \text{SO}(d)$ there exists a matrix $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{R}} \in \text{SU}(n)$ such that*

$$\mathcal{A}(\xi) = \mathbf{Q} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{R}\xi) \mathbf{Q}^* \quad \text{for a.e. } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.9)$$

Then $\Xi = \{0\}$, and the integral (3.1) does not depend on the vector $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and

$$B(\mathcal{A}; f) = \mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}; f) \text{vol}_{d-1}(\partial\Lambda), \quad (3.10)$$

where we have denoted $\mathfrak{M}(\mathcal{A}; f) = \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f)$ for an arbitrary \mathbf{e} .

The identity $\Xi = \{0\}$ is an immediate consequence of the symmetry (3.9). Indeed if Ξ contained a singular point $\xi_0 \neq 0$, then by (3.9) the symbol \mathcal{A} would have a singularity on the sphere $|\xi| = |\xi_0|$, which is not a finite set.

Note that in Proposition 3.6, the region Λ is not supposed to be bounded. In fact, any Λ satisfying the following condition, would be suitable:

Condition 3.7. *The set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d, d \geq 2$, is a region with piece-wise C^1 -smooth boundary, and either Λ or $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda$ is bounded.*

We note that Λ and $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{\Lambda}$ satisfy Condition 3.7 simultaneously. The boundedness of Λ in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 is assumed only because both of them are derived from Proposition 3.1 where Λ is supposed to be bounded. Most of the intermediate results in the forthcoming sections hold for the regions satisfying Condition 3.7.

Throughout the paper the implicit constants in the bounds involving the region Λ , will of course depend on the region Λ , but we will not point this out every time.

4. SCHATTEN-VON-NEUMANN BOUNDS FOR PSEUDO-DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS

4.1. Singular values and Schatten-von Neumann classes. In this section we state some definitions and results on singular values and Schatten-von Neumann classes. We refer to [6, Ch. 11] for more details on this topic.

For a compact operator A in a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} we denote by $s_k(A), k = 1, 2, \dots$, its singular values i.e. eigenvalues of the self-adjoint compact operator $\sqrt{A^*A}$ labeled in non-increasing order counting multiplicities. For the sum $A + B$ the following inequality holds:

$$s_{2k}(A + B) \leq s_{2k-1}(A + B) \leq s_k(A) + s_k(B). \quad (4.1)$$

We say that A belongs to the Schatten-von Neumann class $\mathbf{S}_p, p > 0$, if

$$\|A\|_p := \left(\text{tr}(A^*A)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

is finite. The functional $\|A\|_p$ defines a norm if $p \geq 1$ and a quasi-norm if $0 < p < 1$. With this (quasi-)norm the class \mathbf{S}_p is a complete space. For $0 < p \leq 1$ the quasi-norm is actually a p -norm, that is, it satisfies the following “triangle inequality” for all $A, B \in \mathbf{S}_p$:

$$\|A + B\|_p^p \leq \|A\|_p^p + \|B\|_p^p. \quad (4.2)$$

This inequality is used systematically in what follows. We point out a useful estimate for individual eigenvalues for operators in \mathbf{S}_p :

$$s_k(A) \leq k^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|A\|_p, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (4.3)$$

Moreover, note that for block operators A with entries A_{jk} , $1 \leq j, k \leq n$, where $A_{jk} \in \mathbf{S}_p$, $0 < p \leq 1$, by (4.2) we have

$$\|A\|_p^p \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^n \|A_{ij}\|_p^p, \quad 0 < p \leq 1, \quad (4.4)$$

i.e. in order to obtain \mathbf{S}_p -bounds for A it suffices to obtain them for its entries.

4.2. Lattice norm bounds. Here we obtain bounds for suitable \mathbf{S}_q (quasi-)norms for the operators $h \text{Op}_1(a)$, $h = h(\mathbf{x})$, $a = a(\boldsymbol{\xi})$, which have been studied quite extensively.

To this end we first introduce the following notation. Let $\mathcal{C} = [0, 1)^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}} = \mathcal{C} + \mathbf{u}$ with $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For a function $h \in \mathbf{L}_{\text{loc}}^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $r \in (0, \infty)$, denote

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{||}h\mathbf{||}_{r,\delta} = \left[\sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left(\int_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{n}}} |h(\mathbf{x})|^r d\mathbf{x} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{r}} \right]^{\frac{1}{\delta}}, & 0 < \delta < \infty, \\ \mathbf{||}h\mathbf{||}_{r,\infty} = \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left(\int_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}} |h(\mathbf{x})|^r d\mathbf{x} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}, & \delta = \infty. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

These functionals are sometimes called *lattice quasi-norms* (norms for $r, \delta \geq 1$). If $\mathbf{||}h\mathbf{||}_{r,\delta} < \infty$ we say that $h \in \mathbf{l}^\delta(\mathbf{L}^r)(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

We need the following estimate from [5, Theorem 11.1] (see also [4], Section 5.8), and quoted in [27, Theorem 4.5] for $q \in [1, 2]$.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that $f \in \mathbf{l}^q(\mathbf{L}^2)(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g \in \mathbf{l}^q(\mathbf{L}^2)(\mathbb{R}^d)$, with some $q \in (0, 2]$. Let $K : \mathbf{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the operator with the kernel*

$$f(\mathbf{x})e^{i\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}}g(\mathbf{y}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then

$$\|K\|_q \lesssim \mathbf{||}f\mathbf{||}_{2,q} \mathbf{||}g\mathbf{||}_{2,q}$$

with a constant independent of f and g .

4.3. Multi-scale symbols. Consider $a \in \mathbf{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for which there exist positive continuous functions v and τ such that v is bounded and

$$|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^k a(\boldsymbol{\xi})| \lesssim \tau(\boldsymbol{\xi})^{-k} v(\boldsymbol{\xi}), \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \quad \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (4.6)$$

with constants independent of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. It is natural to call τ the *scale (function)*. The scale τ is assumed to be globally Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant $\nu < 1$, that is,

$$|\tau(\boldsymbol{\xi}) - \tau(\boldsymbol{\eta})| \leq \nu |\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\eta}|, \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.7)$$

The function v is assumed to satisfy the bounds

$$v(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \asymp v(\boldsymbol{\xi}), \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\eta} \in B(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \tau(\boldsymbol{\xi})), \quad (4.8)$$

with implicit constants independent of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$. For example, for smooth scalar symbols a the bound (3.3) translates into (4.6) with $v(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \langle \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle^{-\beta}$ and $\tau(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = 1$. In general, it is useful to

think of v and τ as (functional) parameters. They, in turn, can depend on other parameters, e.g. numerical parameters like $r \geq 0$ in (4.10) in the next section.

We need only one result involving multi-scale symbols.

Proposition 4.2. [21, Lemma 3.4] *Suppose that the region Λ satisfies Condition 3.7, and let the functions τ and v be as described above. Suppose that the symbol a satisfies (4.6), and that the conditions*

$$\alpha\tau_{\text{inf}} \gtrsim 1, \quad \tau_{\text{inf}} := \inf_{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \tau(\boldsymbol{\xi}) > 0, \quad (4.9)$$

hold. Then for any $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ we have

$$\|[\text{Op}_\alpha(a), \chi_\Lambda]\|_\sigma^\sigma \lesssim \alpha^{d-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{v(\boldsymbol{\xi})^\sigma}{\tau(\boldsymbol{\xi})} d\boldsymbol{\xi}.$$

This bound is uniform in the symbols a satisfying (4.6) with the same implicit constants.

4.4. Extension to non-smooth symbols. For the symbols satisfying (3.6) one is tempted to apply Proposition 4.2 with $\tau(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = d(\boldsymbol{\xi})$. However, this scale function vanishes at the points of the set Ξ and hence does not satisfy (4.9). Nevertheless, as we see below, Proposition 4.2 is still applicable. In order to state the precise result, for methodological purposes instead of the condition (3.6) we impose a more general condition on \mathcal{A} . Assume that for some finite set $\Xi = \{\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(2)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(N)}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and some $r \geq 0$ the Hermitian symbol $\mathcal{A} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Xi; \mathbb{C}^{n \times n})$ satisfies the bounds

$$|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^k \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi})| \lesssim \langle |\boldsymbol{\xi}| + r \rangle^{-\rho} d(\boldsymbol{\xi})^{-k}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \quad (4.10)$$

where, as in (3.6), $\rho > d$ and $d(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := \min(\text{dist}(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \Xi), 1)$.

In what follows we need a partition of unity associated with the set Ξ . For $h \in (0, 1/4]$ introduce the spatial scale function $\tau_h(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \frac{1}{2}(d(\boldsymbol{\xi}) + h)$. It is clearly Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant $1/2$. Therefore, using [16, Theorem 1.4.10] we can now construct two functions $\zeta_h^{(1)}, \zeta_h^{(2)} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with the properties

$$\zeta_h^{(1)} + \zeta_h^{(2)} = 1, \quad \zeta_h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = 1 \text{ for } d(\boldsymbol{\xi}) > 4h; \quad \zeta_h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = 1 \text{ for } d(\boldsymbol{\xi}) < 2h,$$

and such that

$$|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^k \zeta_h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\xi})| + |\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^k \zeta_h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\xi})| \lesssim (d(\boldsymbol{\xi}) + h)^{-k}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \quad (4.11)$$

where the implicit constants depend only on dimension d and exponent k .

Remark 4.3. Most of the bounds in this section will be uniform in the symbol \mathcal{A} and the point set Ξ in the following sense. We say that a bound is uniform in \mathcal{A} if it is uniform in all symbols \mathcal{A} satisfying (3.6) or (4.10) with the same implicit constants. Similarly, uniformity in Ξ means that the result is uniform in all point sets Ξ such that their cardinality $N = \text{card } \Xi$ is bounded above by the same constant.

The uniformity in Ξ will be especially important in the proof of Lemma 5.5 further on.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that the region Λ satisfies Condition 3.7 and the Hermitian symbol \mathcal{A} satisfies (4.10) with some $\rho > d$. Let $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ be a number such that $\rho\sigma > d$. Then for*

all $\alpha \gtrsim 1$ we have

$$\begin{cases} \|[\text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A}), \chi_\Lambda]\|_\sigma^\sigma \lesssim \alpha^{d-1} \langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+d} & \text{if } d \geq 2, \\ \|[\text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A}), \chi_\Lambda]\|_\sigma^\sigma \lesssim \langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+1} \log(\alpha+2) & \text{if } d = 1. \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

The constants in (4.12) are uniform in \mathcal{A} satisfying (4.10), and in Ξ , in the sense of Remark 4.3.

Proof. In view of (4.4) it is clear that it suffices to prove the bound (4.12) for scalar symbols only. As in Proposition 4.2 we use for such symbols the notation $a = a(\boldsymbol{\xi})$. Using the partition of unity introduced before the lemma we split $a(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ into two symbols depending on h :

$$\begin{aligned} a &= a_h^{(1)} + a_h^{(2)}, \\ a_h^{(1)} &= a\zeta_h^{(1)}, \quad a_h^{(2)} = a\zeta_h^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider first the symbol $a_h^{(1)}$. Due to (4.10) and (4.11), $a_h^{(1)}$ satisfies the bound

$$|\nabla^k a_h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\xi})| \lesssim \langle |\boldsymbol{\xi}| + r \rangle^{-\rho} (d(\boldsymbol{\xi}) + h)^{-k}.$$

Therefore, the function $a_h^{(1)}$ satisfies the bound (4.6) with $v(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \langle |\boldsymbol{\xi}| + r \rangle^{-\rho}$ and the scale function $\tau_h(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \frac{1}{2}(d(\boldsymbol{\xi}) + h)$. It is straightforward that for these functions the conditions (4.7) and (4.8) are fulfilled. Moreover, fixing $h = \alpha^{-1}$, we guarantee that τ_h satisfies (4.9):

$$\alpha\tau_h(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \geq \alpha h = 1, \quad \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Thus Proposition 4.2 is applicable, and it gives the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\text{Op}_\alpha(a_h^{(1)}), \chi_\Lambda]\|_\sigma^\sigma &\lesssim \alpha^{d-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v(\boldsymbol{\xi})^\sigma (\tau_h(\boldsymbol{\xi}))^{-1} d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &\lesssim \alpha^{d-1} \langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma} \int_{\text{dist}(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \Xi) \leq 1} (d(\boldsymbol{\xi}) + h)^{-1} d\boldsymbol{\xi} + \alpha^{d-1} \int_{\text{dist}(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \Xi) > 1} \langle |\boldsymbol{\xi}| + r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma} d\boldsymbol{\xi}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Since

$$(\text{dist}(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \Xi) + h)^{-1} \leq \sum_{j=1}^N (h + |\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)}|)^{-1}$$

in the first integral, the right-hand side of (4.13) does not exceed $\alpha^{d-1} \langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+d}$ if $d \geq 2$ and

$$\langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma} \log(\alpha+2) + \langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+1}, \quad \text{if } d = 1.$$

To estimate the commutator $[\text{Op}_\alpha(a_h^{(2)}), \chi_\Lambda]$ we assume without loss of generality that Λ is bounded (if not, consider the commutator with $\mathbb{1} - \chi_\Lambda$), and estimate separately its components $\text{Op}_\alpha(a_h^{(2)})\chi_\Lambda$ and $\chi_\Lambda \text{Op}_\alpha(a_h^{(2)})$. By the definition of the function $\zeta_h^{(2)}$, its support can be

covered by balls of radius $4h$ centered at the points $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)} \in \Xi$. Denote by $\phi(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ the indicator of the ball $|\boldsymbol{\xi}| \leq 4$, and observe that

$$|a_h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\xi})| \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^N b_h^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}), \quad b_h^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \langle r \rangle^{-\rho} \phi((\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)})h^{-1}).$$

Thus it suffices to estimate each pair $\text{Op}_\alpha(b_h^{(j)})\chi_\Lambda$ and $\chi_\Lambda \text{Op}_\alpha(b_h^{(j)})$ individually. Fix the index j and assume without loss of generality that $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)} = 0$. Then, by rescaling $\boldsymbol{\xi} \rightarrow h\boldsymbol{\xi}$, the operator $\text{Op}_\alpha(b_h^{(j)})$ coincides with $\langle r \rangle^{-\rho} \text{Op}_1(\phi)$ and therefore

$$\|\text{Op}_\alpha(b_h^{(j)})\chi_\Lambda\|_\sigma^\sigma + \|\chi_\Lambda \text{Op}_\alpha(b_h^{(j)})\|_\sigma^\sigma \lesssim \langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma} \|\chi_\Lambda \text{Op}_1(\phi)\|_\sigma^\sigma.$$

As both functions χ_Λ and ϕ are compactly supported, their lattice quasi-norms $\|\chi_\Lambda\|_{2,\sigma}$ and $\|\phi\|_{2,\sigma}$ (see (4.5)) are finite for any $\sigma \in (0, 1]$. Thus by Proposition 4.1, the \mathbf{S}_σ -quasi-norm is bounded by a constant that depends only on dimension d and region Λ . As a consequence,

$$\|[\text{Op}_\alpha(a_h^{(2)}), \chi_\Lambda]\|_\sigma^\sigma \lesssim \langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma}.$$

Together with the previously derived bound for $a_h^{(1)}$ this leads to (4.12). \square

4.5. More estimates for the case $d = 1$. We also need bounds for pseudo-differential operators in $\mathbf{L}^2(\mathbb{R})$ given by

$$(\text{Op}_\alpha^a(p)u)(x) = \frac{\alpha}{2\pi} \int e^{i\alpha(x-y)\xi} p(x, y, \xi) u(y) dy d\xi,$$

where the scalar function $p = p(x, y, \xi)$ is called *the amplitude*. Let

$$P_l(x, y, \xi; p) := \sum_{l_1, l_2=0}^l |\partial_x^{l_1} \partial_y^{l_2} p(x, y, \xi)|.$$

The following proposition is adapted from [28, Theorem 2.5] and is stated in the form convenient for our purposes.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbf{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, and let p be such that $P_l \in \mathbf{l}^\sigma(\mathbf{L}^1)(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with some $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ and $l = \lfloor \sigma^{-1} \rfloor + 1$. Then*

$$\|h_1 \text{Op}_1^a(p)h_2\|_\sigma \lesssim \|h_1\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty} \|h_2\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty} \|P_l(p)\|_{1,\sigma}, \quad (4.14)$$

with a constant independent of p and h_1, h_2 .

A similar result holds also for operators in $\mathbf{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with arbitrary $d \geq 1$ but we do not need it here.

At this stage, for the one-dimensional estimates we need an assumption somewhat different from (4.10). For $r \geq 0$ and $r_1 > 0$ we assume that

$$|\partial_\xi^k \mathcal{A}(\xi)| \lesssim \langle |\xi| + r \rangle^{-\rho} (d(\xi) + r_1)^{-k}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \quad (4.15)$$

where $\rho > 1$ and $d(\xi) = \min\{1, \text{dist}(\xi, \Xi)\}$ for some finite set $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}$. Let χ_\pm be the indicator function of \mathbb{R}_\pm .

Lemma 4.6. *Let $d = 1$. Suppose that \mathcal{A} satisfies (4.15). Let $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ be some number such that $\rho\sigma > 1$. Then for all $r > 0$ and all $r_1 > 0$ we have*

$$\|\chi_{\pm} \text{Op}_1(\mathcal{A})\chi_{\mp}\|_{\sigma}^{\sigma} \lesssim \langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+1} \log\left(\frac{1}{r_1} + 2\right), \quad (4.16)$$

where the implicit constant is uniform in \mathcal{A} and in the set Ξ .

Proof. Again, it suffices to study scalar symbols a . We first estimate the quasi-norm of $\chi_{(0,\alpha)} \text{Op}_1(a)\chi_{-}$, where $\alpha \gtrsim 1$ will be chosen later. This operator is easily checked to be unitarily equivalent to

$$\chi_{(0,1)} \text{Op}_{\alpha}(a)\chi_{-} = [\chi_{(0,1)}, \text{Op}_{\alpha}(a)]\chi_{-},$$

and hence it satisfies the bound (4.12):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_{(0,\alpha)} \text{Op}_1(a)\chi_{-}\|_{\sigma}^{\sigma} &\leq \|[\chi_{(0,1)}, \text{Op}_{\alpha}(a)]\|_{\sigma}^{\sigma} \\ &\lesssim \langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+1} \log(\alpha + 2). \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

To estimate $\chi_{(\alpha,\infty)} \text{Op}_1(a)\chi_{-}$ we use Proposition 4.5. Let $\zeta \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ be a function such that $\zeta(x) = 0$ for $x \leq 1/2$ and $\zeta(x) = 1$ for $x \geq 1$. Then we can write

$$\chi_{(\alpha,\infty)} \text{Op}_1(a)\chi_{-} = \chi_{(\alpha,\infty)} \text{Op}_1^a(g)\chi_{-}, \quad g(x, y, \xi) = \zeta((x-y)/\alpha) a(\xi).$$

Let

$$L_u = -iu^{-1}\partial_{\xi}, \quad u \neq 0.$$

Since $L_u e^{iu\xi} = e^{iu\xi}$, we can integrate by parts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \int e^{i(x-y)\xi} g(\xi) d\xi &= i^k \int e^{i(x-y)\xi} g^{(k)}(x, y, \xi) d\xi, \\ g^{(k)}(x, y, \xi) &= \zeta((x-y)/\alpha) (x-y)^{-k} \partial_{\xi}^k a(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $k = 0, 1, \dots$, we have $\chi_{(\alpha,\infty)} \text{Op}_1(a)\chi_{-} = \chi_{(\alpha,\infty)} \text{Op}_1^a(g^{(k)})\chi_{-}$. According to (4.14), the \mathbf{S}_{σ} -quasi-norm of $\chi_{(\alpha,\infty)} \text{Op}_1(a)\chi_{-}$ then estimates as

$$\|\chi_{(\alpha,\infty)} \text{Op}_1(a)\chi_{-}\|_{\sigma}^{\sigma} \lesssim \mathbf{I}P_l(g^{(k)})\mathbf{I}_{1,\sigma}, \quad (4.18)$$

for $l = \lfloor \sigma^{-1} \rfloor + 1$. Let us estimate the right-hand side remembering that $|x| + |y| = |x-y| \geq \alpha$ for $x \in (\alpha, \infty)$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^{-}$:

$$P_l(x, y, \xi; g^{(k)}) \lesssim \frac{|\partial_{\xi}^k a(\xi)|}{|x|^k + |y|^k + \alpha^k},$$

with an implicit constant depending on l . By (4.15),

$$P_l(x, y, \xi; g^{(k)}) \lesssim (|x|^k + |y|^k + \alpha^k)^{-1} \langle |\xi| + r \rangle^{-\rho} (d(\xi) + r_1)^{-k}.$$

In order to estimate the $(1, \sigma)$ -quasi-norm write

$$\mathbf{I}P_l(g^{(k)})\mathbf{I}_{1,\sigma}^{\sigma} \lesssim \mathbf{I}(|x|^k + |y|^k + \alpha^k)^{-1}\mathbf{I}_{1,\sigma}^{\sigma} \mathbf{I}\langle |\xi| + r \rangle^{-\rho} (d(\xi) + r_1)^{-k}\mathbf{I}_{1,\sigma}^{\sigma},$$

where the first quasi-norm is taken in $l^\sigma(\mathbf{L}^1)(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and the second one in $l^\sigma(\mathbf{L}^1)(\mathbb{R})$. Consider the factors individually assuming that $k\sigma > 2$:

$$\mathbf{I}(|x|^k + |y|^k + \alpha^k)^{-1} \mathbf{I}_{1,\sigma}^\sigma \lesssim \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^2} (\alpha^k + |\mathbf{m}|^k)^{-\sigma} \lesssim \alpha^{-k\sigma+2}.$$

Now,

$$\mathbf{I}\langle |\xi| + r \rangle^{-\rho} (d(\xi) + r_1)^{-k} \mathbf{I}_{1,\sigma}^\sigma \lesssim r_1^{-k\sigma} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle |m| + r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma} \lesssim \langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+1} r_1^{-k\sigma}.$$

Therefore

$$\mathbf{I}P_l(g^{(k)}) \mathbf{I}_{1,\sigma}^\sigma \lesssim \alpha^{-k\sigma+2} \langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+1} r_1^{-k\sigma}.$$

Together with (4.18) and (4.17) this yields the bound

$$\|\chi_+ \text{Op}_1(a)\chi_-\|_\sigma^\sigma \lesssim \langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+1} \log(\alpha + 2) + \alpha^{-k\sigma+2} \langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+1} r_1^{-k\sigma}. \quad (4.19)$$

Take $\alpha = \max(r_1^{-s}, 1)$, where $s = k\sigma(k\sigma - 2)^{-1} > 0$, so that the right-hand side of (4.19) does not exceed $\langle r \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+1} \log(r_1^{-1} + 2)$. Now (4.19) leads to (4.16). \square

5. ESTIMATES FOR THE OPERATOR $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$ AND APPROXIMATION BY SMOOTH SYMBOLS

5.1. Two abstract results. We begin with two results for compact operators in an arbitrary separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Let A be a bounded operator and let P be an orthogonal projection on \mathcal{H} . For a function f define the operator

$$\mathcal{D}(A, P; f) := Pf(PAP)P - Pf(A)P. \quad (5.1)$$

In the next few statements, instead Condition 3.3 it will be more convenient to assume the following condition.

Condition 5.1. *The function $f \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{t_0\}) \cap \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies the bound*

$$\mathbf{I}f \mathbf{I}_2 := \max_{0 \leq k \leq 2} \sup_{t \neq t_0} |f^{(k)}(t)| |t - t_0|^{-\gamma+k} < \infty \quad (5.2)$$

for some $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, and it is supported on the interval $(t_0 - R, t_0 + R)$ with some finite $R > 0$.

Condition 5.1 is clearly less general than Condition 3.3, but it allows to control the dependence of the quantities with which we work, on the size of the support of f .

The next proposition follows from a more general fact proved in [29], see also [21, Proposition 2.2].

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose that f satisfies Condition 5.1 with some $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ and some $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $R > 0$. Let $q \in (1/2, 1]$ and assume that $\sigma < \min(2 - q^{-1}, \gamma)$. Let A be a bounded self-adjoint operator and let P be an orthogonal projection such that $PA(\mathbf{1} - P) \in \mathbf{S}_{\sigma q}$. Then*

$$\|\mathcal{D}(A, P; f)\|_q \lesssim \mathbf{I}f \mathbf{I}_2 R^{\gamma-\sigma} \|PA(\mathbf{1} - P)\|_{\sigma q}^\sigma,$$

with a positive implicit constant independent of the operators A and P , the function f , and the parameters R, t_0 .

Next, we give a result comparing the operators $\mathcal{D}(A, P; f)$ and $\mathcal{D}(B, P; f)$. For this result we do not need the explicit dependence of the coefficients on the function f .

Proposition 5.3. [22, Corollary 4.3] *Let the function f satisfy Condition 5.1 with some $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, and let $\sigma < \gamma$. Let A, B be bounded self-adjoint operators and let J be a bounded operator such that*

$$[A, J] = [B, J] = 0, \quad (A - B)J = 0.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{D}(A, P; f) - \mathcal{D}(B, P; f)\|_1 &\lesssim \|[(\mathbb{1} - J)A, P]\|_\sigma^\sigma \\ &\quad + \|[(\mathbb{1} - J)B, P]\|_\sigma^\sigma + \|[J, P]\|_\sigma^\sigma + \|[J, P]\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

The implicit constants in the above bound depend on $\|f\|_2$ and on the norms $\|A\|, \|B\|$, and $\|J\|$, and hence they are uniform in the operators A, B, J whose norms are bounded by the same constants.

In the next subsection we apply the above propositions to pseudo-differential operators.

5.2. Estimates for $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$. We apply this proposition to the operator $A = \text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A})$ and projection $P = \chi_\Lambda$. As before, we suppose that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ is a Hermitian matrix-valued symbol such that (3.6) holds. The bounds in this section are uniform in \mathcal{A} and Ξ in the sense of Remark 4.3.

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose that f satisfies Condition 5.1 with some $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, and Λ satisfies Condition 3.7. Let $q \in (1/2, 1]$ and $0 < \sigma < \min(2 - q^{-1}, \gamma)$. Assume that $\rho\sigma q > d$. If $d \geq 2$, then*

$$\|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)\|_q^q \lesssim \|f\|_2^q R^{q(\gamma-\sigma)} \alpha^{d-1},$$

and if $d = 1$, then

$$\|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)\|_q^q \lesssim \|f\|_2^q R^{q(\gamma-\sigma)} \log(\alpha + 2),$$

uniformly in \mathcal{A} and Ξ .

Proof. By Proposition 5.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)\|_q &\lesssim \|f\|_2 R^{\gamma-\sigma} \|\chi_\Lambda \text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A})(\mathbb{1} - \chi_\Lambda)\|_{\sigma q}^\sigma \\ &\leq \|f\|_2 R^{\gamma-\sigma} \|[\text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A}), \chi_\Lambda]\|_{\sigma q}^\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

The required bounds follow now from Lemma 4.4. \square

Lemma 5.5. *Let $d \geq 2$. Suppose that f satisfies Condition 5.1 with some $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, and Λ satisfies Condition 3.7. Suppose that \mathcal{A} satisfies (3.6) with some $\rho > 0$ such that $\rho\gamma > d$. Then for any $\sigma \in (d\rho^{-1}, \gamma)$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{M}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}; \mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f)| &\lesssim \|f\|_2 R^{\gamma-\sigma} \langle \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+1} \log(r(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}})^{-1} + 2), \\ &\text{for } \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \in \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{e}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \notin \hat{\Xi}_\mathbf{e}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

where $\hat{\Xi} = \hat{\Xi}_\mathbf{e}$ denotes the projection of the set Ξ onto the hyperplane $\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{e} = \{\boldsymbol{\xi} : \boldsymbol{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{e} = 0\}$, and $r(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) = \min(\text{dist}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}, \hat{\Xi}_\mathbf{e}), 1)$. The bound is uniform in \mathcal{A}, Ξ and $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$.

Furthermore,

$$|\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f)| \lesssim \|f\|_2 R^{\gamma-\sigma}, \quad (5.5)$$

uniformly in \mathcal{A} and $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, and

$$|\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f)| \lesssim \|f\|_2 R^{\gamma-\sigma}, \quad (5.6)$$

uniformly in \mathcal{A} and Ξ .

Proof. Suppose now that $d \geq 2$ and that \mathcal{A} satisfies (3.6). Let $\widehat{\Xi}_{\mathbf{e}}$ be the projection of Ξ onto the hyperplane $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{e}}$, and let $\widehat{\Xi}_{\mathbf{e}}^\perp$ be its projection onto the one-dimensional subspace spanned by \mathbf{e} . Then it follows from (3.6) that $\mathcal{A}(\hat{\xi}, t)$ satisfies the bound

$$|\partial_t^k \mathcal{A}(\hat{\xi}; t)| \lesssim \langle |\hat{\xi}| + |t| \rangle^{-\rho} (r(\hat{\xi}) + d(t))^{-k}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \quad (5.7)$$

where $r = r(\hat{\xi}) = \min(\text{dist}(\hat{\xi}, \widehat{\Xi}_{\mathbf{e}}), 1)$ and $d(t) = \min(\text{dist}(t, \widehat{\Xi}_{\mathbf{e}}^\perp), 1)$. Using Proposition 5.2 with $q = 1$, and Lemma 4.6, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{M}(\hat{\xi}; \mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f)| &\leq \|D_1(\mathcal{A}(\hat{\xi}; \cdot); \mathbb{R}_+; f)\|_1 \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_2 R^{\gamma-\sigma} \|\chi_+ \text{Op}_1(\mathcal{A}(\hat{\xi}; \cdot))(\mathbf{1} - \chi_+)\|_\sigma^\sigma \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_2 R^{\gamma-\sigma} \langle \hat{\xi} \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+1} \log(r(\hat{\xi})^{-1} + 2), \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

which is exactly the bound (5.4).

Since $\rho\sigma > d$ and

$$r(\hat{\xi})^{-1} \lesssim 1 + \sum_{\hat{\xi}^{(j)} \in \widehat{\Xi}} \frac{1}{|\hat{\xi} - \hat{\xi}^{(j)}|},$$

the right-hand side of (5.8) is integrable in $\hat{\xi}$ and, by definition (3.1),

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f)| &\lesssim \|f\|_2 R^{\gamma-\sigma} \int_{\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{e}}} \langle \hat{\xi} \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+1} \log(r(\hat{\xi})^{-1} + 2) d\hat{\xi} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_2 R^{\gamma-\sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in \mathcal{A} , Ξ and $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. This proves (5.5) which entails (5.6) due to the definition (3.2). \square

5.3. Trace class continuity of $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$. We begin with an elementary standard observation:

Lemma 5.6. *Let $B^{(\varepsilon)}$, $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ be a family of uniformly bounded self-adjoint operators such that $\|B^{(\varepsilon)} - B^{(0)}\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$. Then for any function $g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$ we have*

$$\|g(B^{(\varepsilon)}) - g(B^{(0)})\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \searrow 0.$$

Proof. Since $\{B^{(\varepsilon)}\}$ are uniformly bounded, we can assume that g is compactly supported on some compact interval I . Thus it would suffice to prove the required convergence for polynomials. By virtue of the representation

$$(B^{(\varepsilon)})^l - (B^{(0)})^l = \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} (B^{(\varepsilon)})^{l-1-k} [B^{(\varepsilon)} - B^{(0)}] (B^{(0)})^k, \quad l = 1, 2, \dots,$$

we have

$$\|(B^{(\varepsilon)})^l - (B^{(0)})^l\| \lesssim \|B^{(\varepsilon)} - B^{(0)}\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \varepsilon \searrow 0,$$

as required. \square

Consider a family of *continuous* symbols $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Xi; \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{C}^{n \times n})$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, that satisfy (3.6) with $\rho > d$, uniformly in ε . Suppose that

$$\sup_{\xi} |\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}(\xi) - \mathcal{A}(\xi)| \rightarrow 0, \quad \varepsilon \searrow 0. \quad (5.9)$$

In the next lemma we use the notation $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}) = D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $d \geq 2$. Suppose that f satisfies Condition 5.1 with some $\gamma \in (0, 1]$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}$ are continuous and satisfy (3.6) with some ρ such that $\rho\gamma > d$, uniformly in $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$. Then under the condition (5.9) we have*

$$\sup_{\alpha \gtrsim 1} \alpha^{1-d} \|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A})\|_1 \rightarrow 0, \quad \varepsilon \searrow 0.$$

Proof. Split the sum

$$\|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A})\|_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} s_k(D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}))$$

into two parts:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1(\varepsilon, \ell) &= \sum_{k=1}^{2\ell} s_k(D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A})), \\ Z_2(\varepsilon, \ell) &= \sum_{k=2\ell+1}^{\infty} s_k(D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A})), \end{aligned}$$

where ℓ is an integer to be specified later. Estimate the first sum:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1(\varepsilon, \ell) &\leq 2\ell \|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A})\| \\ &\leq 2\ell \left[\|f(W_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)})) - f(W_\alpha(\mathcal{A}))\| + \|W_\alpha(f(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)})) - W_\alpha(f(\mathcal{A}))\| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

In view of (5.9),

$$\|\text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}) - \text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A})\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \varepsilon \searrow 0,$$

and hence

$$\|W_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}) - W_\alpha(\mathcal{A})\| \rightarrow 0$$

as well, so that by Lemma 5.6,

$$\|f(W_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)})) - f(W_\alpha(\mathcal{A}))\| \rightarrow 0.$$

In the same way the second term in (5.10) also tends to zero. Thus for an arbitrary $\delta > 0$ and sufficiently small ε we have

$$Z_1(\varepsilon, \ell) < 2\ell\delta.$$

Now we estimate Z_2 . In view of the bound (4.1) the sum $Z_2(\varepsilon, \ell)$ can be estimated as follows:

$$Z_2(\varepsilon, \ell) \leq 2 \sum_{k=\ell}^{\infty} s_k(D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)})) + 2 \sum_{k=\ell}^{\infty} s_k(D_\alpha(\mathcal{A})).$$

To estimate the right-hand side we use Lemma 5.4. Let $q \in (1/2, 1)$ and $\sigma < \min(2 - q^{-1}, \gamma)$ be such that $\rho\sigma q > d - 1$. Then, by Lemma 5.4, $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}) \in \mathbf{S}_q$ and

$$\|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)})\|_q^q \lesssim \alpha^{d-1},$$

uniformly in ε . By (4.3), this allows us to write the following bound for the singular values:

$$s_k(D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)})) \lesssim k^{-\frac{1}{q}} \alpha^{\frac{d-1}{q}}.$$

Consequently,

$$\sum_{k=\ell}^{\infty} s_k(D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)})) \lesssim \alpha^{\frac{d-1}{q}} \sum_{k=\ell}^{\infty} k^{-\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim \alpha^{\frac{d-1}{q}} \ell^{1-\frac{1}{q}},$$

$$\text{and hence } Z_2(\varepsilon, \ell) \lesssim \alpha^{\frac{d-1}{q}} \ell^{1-\frac{1}{q}},$$

uniformly in ε . Thus, together with the bound for $Z_1(\varepsilon, \ell)$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{1-d} \|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A})\|_1 &\lesssim \alpha^{1-d} \ell \delta + \alpha^{(d-1)(\frac{1}{q}-1)} \ell^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \\ &= \alpha^{1-d} \ell \delta + (\alpha^{1-d} \ell)^{1-\frac{1}{q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Take $\ell = M\alpha^{d-1}$ with some $M > 0$. Then

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \sup_{\alpha \gtrsim 1} \alpha^{1-d} \|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A})\|_1 \lesssim M\delta + M^{1-\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Since $\delta > 0$ and $M > 0$ are arbitrary, the left-hand side equals zero as required. \square

5.4. Approximation by smooth symbols. Here we assume as before that \mathcal{A} is a Hermitian matrix-valued symbol satisfying (3.6). To approximate \mathcal{A} by a family of smooth symbols we use the following partition of unity.

For a parameter $h \in (0, 1/4]$, let the functions $\theta_h^{(j)} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, N = \text{card } \Xi$, and $\zeta_h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_h^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) &= 1, \quad \text{for } |\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)}| \leq h; \\ \theta_h^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) &= 0, \quad \text{for } |\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)}| \geq 2h, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \theta_h^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) + \zeta_h(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = 1, \quad \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

In particular, $\zeta_h(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = 1$ if $d(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = d(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \Xi) := \min\{1, \text{dist}(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \Xi)\} \geq 2h$. A standard argument easily shows that one can construct such cut-off functions that for every $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$, the following bounds hold:

$$|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^k \theta_h^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi})| + |\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^k \zeta_h(\boldsymbol{\xi})| \lesssim h^{-k}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \quad (5.11)$$

We compare the operators $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; f)$ and $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}_h; f)$, where

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi})\zeta_h(\boldsymbol{\xi}), \quad (5.12)$$

so that

$$\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) - \mathcal{A}_h(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \sum_{k=1}^N \theta_h^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}). \quad (5.13)$$

Below we use again the shorthand notation $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A})$ instead of $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \Lambda; f)$.

Lemma 5.8. *Let $d \geq 2$. Suppose that f satisfies Condition 5.1 and Λ satisfies Condition 3.7. Let \mathcal{A} satisfy (3.6). Assume that $h \in (0, 1]$ and $\alpha h \gtrsim 1$. Then we have*

$$\|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}_h)\|_1 \lesssim (\alpha h)^{d-1}, \quad (5.14)$$

with an implicit constant uniform in \mathcal{A} and the set Ξ .

Proof. First we use Proposition 5.3 with

$$P := \chi_\Lambda, \quad J = J_{2h} := \text{Op}_\alpha(\zeta_{2h}), \quad A = \text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A}), \quad B = \text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A}_h).$$

The norms of these operators P and J are bounded uniformly in h and, since $\zeta_h \zeta_{2h} = \zeta_{2h}$, we have $(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}_h)\zeta_{2h} = 0$. Let us estimate the right-hand side of (5.3) by starting with a bound for

$$\|[(\mathbf{1} - J_{2h}) \text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A}_h), P]\|_\sigma^\sigma$$

with an arbitrary $\sigma \in (0, 1]$. In view of (5.13), we have

$$(1 - \zeta_{2h}(\boldsymbol{\xi})) \mathcal{A}_h(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{B}_h^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}), \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{B}_h^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \zeta_h(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \theta_{2h}^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}).$$

Consider each commutator $[\text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{B}_h^{(j)}), P]$ individually. First we rescale and shift the symbol $\mathcal{B}_h^{(j)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_h^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) &:= \mathcal{B}_h^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)} + h\boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ &= \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)} + h\boldsymbol{\xi}) \zeta_h(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)} + h\boldsymbol{\xi}) \theta_{2h}^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)} + h\boldsymbol{\xi}). \end{aligned}$$

The following unitary equivalence is easily checked:

$$\text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{B}_h^{(j)}) = e^{i\alpha\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \text{Op}_{\alpha h}(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_h^{(j)}) e^{-i\alpha\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)} \cdot \mathbf{y}}, \quad (5.15)$$

By the definition of the cut-offs $\theta^{(j)}$ and ζ_h we have

$$|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^k \zeta_h(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)} + h\boldsymbol{\xi}) \theta_{2h}^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)} + h\boldsymbol{\xi})| \lesssim 1, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots$$

Furthermore, since

$$\frac{1}{d(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)} + h\boldsymbol{\xi}, \Xi)} \lesssim \frac{1}{h d(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \tilde{\Xi}_h^{(j)})}, \quad \tilde{\Xi}_h^{(j)} = \frac{1}{h}(\Xi - \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)}),$$

it follows from (3.6) that

$$|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^k \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(j)} + h\boldsymbol{\xi})| \lesssim \frac{1}{d(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \tilde{\Xi}_h^{(j)})^k}.$$

Therefore,

$$|\nabla_{\xi}^k \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_h^{(j)}(\xi)| \lesssim \frac{\chi_{2h}(\xi)}{d(\xi, \tilde{\Xi}_h^{(j)})^k},$$

where χ_{2h} is the indicator of the ball $\{\xi : |\xi| < 2h\}$, so $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_h^{(j)}$ satisfies (3.6) with an arbitrary $\rho > 0$ and the singular set $\tilde{\Xi}_h^{(j)}$. Now we can use Lemma 4.4 and the relation (5.15) to conclude that

$$\|[\text{Op}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{B}_h^{(j)}), P]\|_{\sigma}^{\sigma} = \|[\text{Op}_{\alpha h}(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_h^{(j)}), \chi_{\Lambda}]\|_{\sigma}^{\sigma} \lesssim (\alpha h)^{d-1}.$$

Therefore, for each $\sigma \in (0, 1]$ we have

$$\|[(\mathbb{1} - J_{2h}) \text{Op}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_h), P]\|_{\sigma}^{\sigma} \lesssim (\alpha h)^{d-1},$$

as required. Estimating $\|[(\mathbb{1} - J_{2h}) \text{Op}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}), P]\|_{\sigma}$ and $\|J_{2h}, P\|_{\sigma} = \|[\mathbb{1} - J_{2h}, P]\|_{\sigma}$, $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, is done in the same way. Substituting the obtained bounds into (5.3), we get the required estimate (5.14). \square

6. PROOF OF WIDOM'S FORMULA FOR SMOOTH SYMBOLS AND NON-SMOOTH TEST FUNCTIONS

We now prove Theorem 3.4 for smooth symbols \mathcal{A} , and functions f satisfying Condition 3.3.

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose that $d \geq 2$. Let the function f satisfy Condition 3.3 with some $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, and let Λ be a bounded C^1 -region. Let $\mathcal{A} \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{C}^{n \times n})$ be a Hermitian matrix-valued symbol such that (3.3) holds with some ρ such that $\rho\gamma > d$. Then the formula (3.7) holds.*

Proof. The proof is conducted in two steps following the idea of [21]. In Step 1 we prove the theorem for $f \in C^2$, and in Step 2 we extend the result to the functions f satisfying Condition 3.3.

Step 1. First suppose that $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$. Since the operator $\text{Op}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{A})$ is bounded, we may assume that $f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R})$. Thinking of f as a function satisfying Condition 5.1 with a t_0 outside its support, and with $\gamma = 1$, we conclude that $\|f\|_2 \lesssim \|f\|_{C^2}$, where $\|f\|_2$ is defined in (5.2). Let I be a closed interval containing the support of f . Let $f_{\delta}, \delta \in (0, 1]$, be a family of polynomials such that $\|f - f_{\delta}\|_{C^2(I)} \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} |\alpha^{1-d} \text{tr } D_{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}; f) - \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f)| &\leq \sup_{\alpha \geq 1} \alpha^{1-d} \|D_{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}; f) - D_{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}; f_{\delta})\|_1 \\ &\quad + \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} |\alpha^{1-d} \text{tr } D_{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}; f_{\delta}) - \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f_{\delta})| \\ &\quad + |\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f_{\delta}) - \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f)|. \end{aligned}$$

Since f_{δ} is a polynomial, we can apply Proposition 3.1 which implies that the second term equals zero for each $\delta > 0$. Estimate the first and the third term using Lemmata 5.4 and 5.5:

$$\sup_{\alpha \geq 1} \alpha^{1-d} \|D_{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}; f) - D_{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}; f_{\delta})\|_1 = \sup_{\alpha \geq 1} \alpha^{1-d} \|D_{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}; f - f_{\delta})\|_1 \lesssim \|f - f_{\delta}\|_{C^2(I)} \rightarrow 0,$$

$$|\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f) - \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f_{\delta})| = |\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f - f_{\delta})| \lesssim \|f - f_{\delta}\|_{C^2(I)} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Therefore the theorem holds for $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Step 2. To complete the proof of the theorem we assume without loss of generality that f satisfies Condition 5.1 with $t_0 = 0$. Let $\zeta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be such that $\zeta(t) = 1$ if $|t| \geq 2$, $\zeta(t) = 0$ if $|t| \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$. Denote $\zeta_r(t) = \zeta(tr^{-1})$, $r \in (0, 1]$. Split f in the sum

$$\begin{aligned} f(t) &= g_r^{(1)}(t) + g_r^{(2)}(t), \\ g_r^{(1)}(t) &= f(t)\zeta_r(t), \quad g_r^{(2)}(t) = f(t)(1 - \zeta_r(t)), \end{aligned}$$

so that $g_r^{(2)}$ is supported on the interval $[-2r, 2r]$. Estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} |\alpha^{1-d} \operatorname{tr} D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; f) - \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f)| &\leq \sup_{\alpha \geq 1} \alpha^{1-d} \|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; f) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; g_r^{(1)})\|_1 \\ &\quad + \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} |\alpha^{1-d} \operatorname{tr} D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; g_r^{(1)}) - \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; g_r^{(1)})| \\ &\quad + |\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; g_r^{(1)}) - \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f)|. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

Since $g_r^{(1)} \in C^2$, the second term on the right-hand side equals zero for each $r > 0$, as proved in Step 1. Calculating the derivatives

$$\begin{aligned} (g_r^{(2)})'(t) &= f'(t)(1 - \zeta_r(t)) - f(t)\zeta'(tr^{-1})r^{-1}, \\ (g_r^{(2)})''(t) &= f''(t)(1 - \zeta_r(t)) - 2f'(t)\zeta'(tr^{-1})r^{-1} - f(t)\zeta''(tr^{-1})r^{-2}, \end{aligned}$$

we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \neq 0} \left| (g_r^{(2)})'(t) \right| |t|^{-\gamma+1} &\leq \sup_{t \neq 0} \left[|f'(t)| |t|^{-\gamma+1} + |f(t)| |t|^{-\gamma} |\zeta'(tr^{-1})| \frac{|t|}{r} \right], \\ \sup_{t \neq 0} \left| (g_r^{(2)})''(t) \right| |t|^{-\gamma+2} &\leq \sup_{t \neq 0} \left[|f''(t)| |t|^{-\gamma+2} + 2|f'(t)| |t|^{-\gamma+1} |\zeta'(tr^{-1})| \frac{|t|}{r} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |f(t)| |t|^{-\gamma} |\zeta''(tr^{-1})| \left(\frac{|t|}{r} \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

On the support of $g_r^{(2)}$ we have $\frac{|t|}{r} \leq 2$, so we conclude that

$$\|g_r^{(2)}\|_2 \lesssim \|f\|_2.$$

Using this we can finally estimate the first and the third term on the right hand side of (6.1) using Lemmata 5.4 and 5.5 with arbitrary $\sigma \in (0, \gamma)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\alpha \geq 1} \alpha^{1-d} \|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; f) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; g_r^{(1)})\|_1 &= \sup_{\alpha \geq 1} \alpha^{1-d} \|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; g_r^{(2)})\|_1 \lesssim \|f\|_2 r^{\gamma-\sigma} \rightarrow 0, \\ |\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f) - \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; g_r^{(1)})| &= |\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; g_r^{(2)})| \lesssim \|f\|_2 r^{\gamma-\sigma} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $r \rightarrow 0$. Therefore the right-hand side of (6.1) equals zero.

This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

7. PROOF OF WIDOM'S FORMULA FOR NON-SMOOTH SYMBOLS AND NON-SMOOTH TEST FUNCTIONS

In this section give the proofs of Theorems 3.4, 3.5 and of Proposition 3.6.

7.1. Continuity of the asymptotic coefficient $B(\mathcal{A}; f)$. Below the symbol \mathcal{A}_h is as defined in (5.12).

Lemma 7.1. *Let $d \geq 2$, and let f and Λ be as in Theorem 3.4. Suppose that \mathcal{A} satisfies (3.6). Then*

$$B(\mathcal{A}_h; f) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{A}; f) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0,$$

uniformly in \mathcal{A} , Ξ and f .

Proof. It suffices to prove the lemma for functions f satisfying Condition 5.1. By definition (5.12), $\mathcal{A}_h(\xi) = \mathcal{A}(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\text{dist}(\xi, \Xi) > 2h$, and hence $\mathcal{A}_h(\hat{\xi}; t) = \mathcal{A}(\hat{\xi}; t)$ for all $\hat{\xi} \in \mathbf{T}_e$ such that $\text{dist}(\hat{\xi}, \widehat{\Xi}) > 2h$. Consequently,

$$\mathcal{M}(\hat{\xi}; e; \mathcal{A}_h; f) = \mathcal{M}(\hat{\xi}; e; \mathcal{A}; f), \quad \text{dist}(\hat{\xi}, \widehat{\Xi}) > 2h.$$

Since \mathcal{A}_h satisfy the bounds (3.6) uniformly in $h > 0$, using (5.4) with some $\sigma \in (d\rho^{-1}, \gamma)$, for the corresponding integrals (3.1) we obtain the convergence

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathfrak{M}(e; \mathcal{A}_h; f) - \mathfrak{M}(e; \mathcal{A}; f)| \\ & \lesssim \|f\|_2 \int_{\hat{\xi} \in \mathbf{T}_e, \text{dist}(\hat{\xi}, \widehat{\Xi}) < 2h} \langle \hat{\xi} \rangle^{-\rho\sigma+1} \log(\text{dist}(\hat{\xi}, \widehat{\Xi})^{-1} + 2) d\hat{\xi} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $h \rightarrow 0$, uniformly in \mathcal{A} , $e \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and functions f satisfying Condition 5.1. This, in turn, implies the uniform convergence $B(\mathcal{A}_h; f) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{A}; f)$, as claimed. \square

Lemma 7.2. *Let $d \geq 2$, and let f and Λ be as in Theorem 3.4. Suppose that the family $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}$ satisfies Condition 3.2. Then*

$$B(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}; f) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{A}; f), \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \searrow 0.$$

Proof. As before, assume that f satisfies Condition 5.1. For an arbitrary $h > 0$ estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} |B(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}; f) - B(\mathcal{A}; f)| & \leq \sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} |B(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}; f) - B(\mathcal{A}_h^{(\varepsilon)}; f)| \\ & \quad + \limsup_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} |B(\mathcal{A}_h^{(\varepsilon)}; f) - B(\mathcal{A}_h; f)| + |B(\mathcal{A}_h; f) - B(\mathcal{A}; f)|. \end{aligned} \quad (7.1)$$

The symbols $\mathcal{A}_h^{(\varepsilon)}$ and \mathcal{A}_h are both smooth, and hence by Theorem 6.1, for each of them the formula (3.7) holds. Furthermore, these symbols satisfy (5.9) as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$. Therefore, by Lemma 5.7,

$$|B(\mathcal{A}_h^{(\varepsilon)}; f) - B(\mathcal{A}_h; f)| \leq \sup_{\alpha \geq 1} \alpha^{1-d} \|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}_h^{(\varepsilon)}) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}_h)\|_1 \rightarrow 0,$$

as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$. Thus the second term on the right-hand side of (7.1) equals zero. By Lemma 7.1, the first and the third terms tend to zero as $h \rightarrow 0$ uniformly in ε , and hence $B(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}; f) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{A}; f)$, as claimed. \square

7.2. Proof of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5. Since Theorem 3.4 is a special case of Theorem 3.5, we concentrate on the proof of Theorem 3.5. Thus assume that the family $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}$ satisfies Condition 3.2. For an arbitrary $h \in (0, 1]$ we can write, as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varepsilon \searrow 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup \left| \alpha^{1-d} \operatorname{tr} D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}; f) - \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f) \right| \\ & \leq \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\varepsilon \in [0, 1]} \alpha^{1-d} \|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}; f) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}_h^{(\varepsilon)}; f)\|_1 \\ & \quad + \limsup_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \sup_{\alpha \geq 1} \alpha^{1-d} \|D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}_h^{(\varepsilon)}; f) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}_h; f)\|_1 \\ & \quad + \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left| \alpha^{1-d} \operatorname{tr} D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}_h; f) - \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}_h; f) \right| \\ & \quad + |\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}_h; f) - \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f)|. \end{aligned}$$

By definition (5.12) and by (3.6), \mathcal{A}_h and $\mathcal{A}_h^{(\varepsilon)}$ satisfy (3.3) uniformly in $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ (but not in h !) and in view of Condition 3.2, we have

$$\sup_{\xi} |\mathcal{A}_h^{(\varepsilon)}(\xi) - \mathcal{A}_h(\xi)| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \searrow 0.$$

Thus the second term in the bound above equals zero by virtue of Lemma 5.7. The third term equals zero due to Theorem 6.1. By Lemma 5.8, the first term is bounded by h^{d-1} uniformly in ε , so that

$$\limsup \left| \alpha^{1-d} \operatorname{tr} D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}; f) - \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f) \right| \lesssim h^{d-1} + |\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}_h; f) - \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f)|, \quad \alpha \rightarrow \infty, \varepsilon \searrow 0.$$

Since $h \in (0, 1]$ is arbitrary, taking $h \rightarrow 0$ and using Lemma 7.1 we obtain (3.8) thereby completing the proof of Theorem 3.5, and hence that of Theorem 3.4. \square

7.3. Proof of Proposition 3.6. The coefficient $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f)$ is finite by (5.5). Let $\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ be two arbitrary unit vectors. Let $\mathbf{R} \in \operatorname{SO}(d)$ be a matrix such that $\mathbf{R}\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{b}$, and let $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{R}} \in \operatorname{SU}(n)$ be such that (3.9) holds. Thus

$$\mathcal{A}(\hat{\xi}; t) = \mathcal{A}(\hat{\xi} + t\mathbf{e}) = \mathbf{Q} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{R}\hat{\xi} + t\mathbf{b}) \mathbf{Q}^{-1},$$

and hence, by cyclicity of trace, $\mathcal{M}(\hat{\xi}; \mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f) = \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}\hat{\xi}; \mathbf{b}; \mathcal{A}; f)$. Integrating in $\hat{\xi}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{e}}} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{R}\hat{\xi}; \mathbf{b}; \mathcal{A}; f) d\hat{\xi} \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{b}}} \mathcal{M}(\hat{\xi}; \mathbf{b}; \mathcal{A}; f) d\hat{\xi} = \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{b}; \mathcal{A}; f). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f)$ is indeed \mathbf{e} -independent. Now it is clear that the formula (3.2) rewrites as (3.10), as claimed. \square

8. POSITIVITY OF THE COEFFICIENT $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f)$

The goal of this section is to investigate under which conditions on the function f and on the matrix-valued symbol \mathcal{A} the asymptotic coefficient $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f)$ defined in (3.2) is strictly positive.

8.1. An abstract result. Our starting point is the following well-known abstract fact from [3]. Below \mathcal{H} is a complex separable Hilbert space, P an orthogonal projection on \mathcal{H} and A a self-adjoint operator on \mathcal{H} . The operator $\mathcal{D}(A, P; f)$ is defined in (5.1).

Proposition 8.1. *Suppose that the spectrum of A is contained in the interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, and $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a concave function. Assume that $\mathcal{D}(A, P; f)$ is trace class and that PAP compact. Then $\text{tr } \mathcal{D}(A, P; f) \geq 0$.*

Using this proposition we can prove the following bound in the spirit of [19, Theorem A.1]. In the theorem below the space $W_{\text{loc}}^{2,\infty}(I)$ and the notion of essential supremum (ess-sup) are understood in the sense of Lebesgue measure.

Theorem 8.2. *Suppose that the spectrum of A is contained in the interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and that $AP \in \mathbf{S}_2$ and $\mathcal{D}(A, P; f) \in \mathbf{S}_1$. Assume also that $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a $W_{\text{loc}}^{2,\infty}(I)$ -function such that*

$$\text{ess-sup}_{t \in I} f''(t) = -k_0, \quad \text{for some } k_0 > 0.$$

Then, with the notation $f_0(t) = -\frac{1}{2}t^2$, we have

$$\text{tr } \mathcal{D}(A, P; f) \geq k_0 \text{tr } \mathcal{D}(A, P; f_0) = \frac{k_0}{2} \|(\mathbb{1} - P)AP\|_2^2. \quad (8.1)$$

Proof. We essentially follow the proof of [19, Theorem A.1]. Denote $\mathcal{D}(f) = \mathcal{D}(A, P; f)$ and

$$g(t) = f(t) - k_0 f_0(t),$$

so that $\text{ess-sup}_I g''(t) = 0$. Thus g is concave on I , and by Proposition 8.1,

$$\text{tr } \mathcal{D}(f) - k_0 \text{tr } \mathcal{D}(f_0) = \text{tr } \mathcal{D}(g) \geq 0.$$

The first trace on the left-hand side is finite by assumption, and the second one equals

$$2 \text{tr } \mathcal{D}(f_0) = \text{tr } (PA^2P - PAPAP) = \text{tr } PA(\mathbb{1} - P)AP = \|(\mathbb{1} - P)AP\|_2^2,$$

and hence it is also finite. This leads to the required bound (8.1). \square

8.2. Application to pseudo-differential operators. Now we can apply the above results to the operator $D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; f)$. We do not intend to consider the most general functions f satisfying Condition 3.3 with some $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, but assume that f is real-valued, the set \mathbf{T} consists of two points, i.e. $\mathbf{T} = \{t_1, t_2\}$ with $t_1 < t_2$, and that

$$\text{ess-sup}_{t \in (t_1, t_2)} f''(t) = -k_0, \quad \text{where } k_0 > 0.$$

Theorem 8.3. *Let $d \geq 2$, and let f be as described above. Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded region with a C^1 -boundary. Suppose that \mathcal{A} is a non-zero Hermitian matrix-valued symbol that satisfies (3.6) with some $\rho > 0$ such that $\rho\gamma > d$. Assume also that for all $\xi \notin \Xi$ the spectrum of $\mathcal{A}(\xi)$ belongs to the interval $[t_1, t_2]$. Then $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f) > 0$.*

We precede the proof with two lemmata.

Lemma 8.4. *Let $\mathcal{A} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^{n \times n})$, be a Hermitian matrix-valued symbol satisfying*

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{d\xi^k} \mathcal{A}(\xi) \right| \lesssim \langle \xi \rangle^{-\rho}, \quad (8.2)$$

for some $\rho > 1$ and $k = 0, 1, 2$. Then the operator $\chi_{\mathbb{R}_-} \text{Op}_1(\mathcal{A}) \chi_{\mathbb{R}_+}$ is Hilbert-Schmidt.

If $\mathcal{A}(\xi)$ is a non-zero operator function, i.e. if \mathcal{A} is not identically zero matrix, then the Hilbert-Schmidt norm $\|\chi_{\mathbb{R}_-} \text{Op}_1(\mathcal{A}) \chi_{\mathbb{R}_+}\|_2$ is strictly positive.

Proof. Denote the kernel of the operator $\text{Op}_1(\mathcal{A})$ by

$$\check{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int e^{ix\xi} \mathcal{A}(\xi) d\xi .$$

Because of (8.2),

$$|\check{\mathcal{A}}(x)| \lesssim \langle x \rangle^{-2} ,$$

so that the (squared) Hilbert-Schmidt norm

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_{\mathbb{R}_-} \text{Op}_1(\mathcal{A}) \chi_{\mathbb{R}_+}\|_2^2 &= \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{\infty} |\check{\mathcal{A}}(x-y)|^2 dy dx \\ &= \sum_{k,l} \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{\infty} |\check{\mathcal{A}}_{k,l}(x-y)|^2 dy dx \end{aligned}$$

is finite. Assume now that there is an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\xi) \neq 0$ for all $\xi \in I$. Without loss of generality we may assume that the matrix entry $\mathcal{A}_{k,l}(\xi)$ with some k, l , is not zero for all $\xi \in I$. Since \mathcal{A} is Hermitian, we also have

$$\mathcal{A}_{l,k}(\xi) = \overline{\mathcal{A}_{k,l}(\xi)} \neq 0, \quad \xi \in I .$$

As a consequence, $\check{\mathcal{A}}_{k,l}(-x) = \overline{\check{\mathcal{A}}_{l,k}(x)}$, so that the function

$$F(x) := \frac{1}{2} (|\check{\mathcal{A}}_{k,l}(x)|^2 + |\check{\mathcal{A}}_{l,k}(x)|^2)$$

is even and not identically zero. Therefore there is an interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}_-$ such that $F(x) > 0$ for all $x \in J$. Estimating

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_{\mathbb{R}_-} \text{Op}_1(\mathcal{A}) \chi_{\mathbb{R}_+}\|_2^2 &\geq \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{\infty} F(x-y) dy dx \\ &\geq \int_J \int_{-\infty}^x F(t) dt dx , \end{aligned}$$

we conclude that the Hilbert Schmidt norm on the left-hand side is strictly positive, as required. \square

Using the above lemma we can now show the positivity of the asymptotic coefficient $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f_0)$ for the function $f_0(t) = -t^2/2$.

Lemma 8.5. *Let $\mathcal{A} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Xi; \mathbb{C}^{m \times n})$, $d \geq 2$, be a Hermitian operator-valued symbol satisfying (3.6) with $\rho > d$ that is not identically equal to the zero matrix. Then for the function $f_0(t) = -t^2/2$ we have $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f_0) > 0$.*

Recall that the coefficient \mathbf{B} is finite due to Lemma 5.5.

Proof. By definition (3.2) it suffices to show that $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f) > 0$ for each $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. Fix a vector \mathbf{e} and rewrite the integrand in (3.1) using the notation $A = \text{Op}_1(\mathcal{A}(\hat{\xi}; \cdot))$, $P = \chi_{\mathbb{R}_+}$. As in the proof of Theorem 8.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathcal{M}(\hat{\xi}; \mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f_0) &= \text{tr} (PA^2P - PAPAP) \\ \text{tr} PA(\mathbb{1} - P)AP &= \|(\mathbb{1} - P)AP\|_2^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{A} is a non-zero symbol, there is a ball $\hat{B} \subset \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{e}} \setminus \hat{\Xi}$ such that for all $\hat{\xi} \in \hat{B}$ the symbol $\mathcal{A}(\hat{\xi}; \cdot)$ is $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^{n \times n})$, it is non-zero and satisfies

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{d\xi^k} \mathcal{A}(\hat{\xi}; \xi) \right| \lesssim \langle \xi \rangle^{-\rho}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R},$$

with a constant uniform in $\hat{\xi} \in \hat{B}$. Thus by Lemma 8.4, $\mathcal{M}(\hat{\xi}; \mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; f_0) > 0$ for all $\hat{\xi} \in \hat{B}$. This leads to the positivity of $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f_0)$. \square

8.3. Proof of Theorem 8.3. In order to use Theorem 8.2 we check that $\text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A})\chi_\Lambda$ is Hilbert-Schmidt, i.e.

$$\| \text{Op}_\alpha(\mathcal{A})\chi_\Lambda \|_2^2 = \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi} \right)^d \int |\mathcal{A}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \int_\Lambda dx < \infty,$$

where we have used that $|\mathcal{A}(\xi)| \lesssim \langle \xi \rangle^{-\rho}$ with $\rho \geq \rho\gamma > d$. Now, by Theorem 8.2,

$$\text{tr} D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; f) \geq k_0 \text{tr} D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}; f_0), \quad f_0(t) = -\frac{1}{2}t^2.$$

Using the asymptotics (3.7) established in Theorem 3.4, we obtain $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f) \geq k_0 \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; f_0)$. The latter is positive by Lemma 8.5. This completes the proof. \square

8.4. Corollaries for the functions η_\varkappa . Let the functions η_\varkappa be as defined in (1.4). Each function η_\varkappa satisfies Condition 3.3 with $\mathbf{T} = \{0, 1\}$, with $\gamma = \min\{\varkappa, 1\}$, if $\varkappa \neq 1$, and with arbitrary $\gamma < 1$ if $\varkappa = 1$.

Corollary 8.6. *Let \mathcal{A} be as in Theorem 8.3 and such that $0 \leq \mathcal{A}(\xi) \leq \mathbb{1}$ for all $\xi \notin \Xi$. If $\varkappa \in (0, 2)$, then $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; \eta_\varkappa) > 0$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that for $\varkappa \in (0, 2)$ the derivative $\text{ess-sup}_{t \in (0,1)} \eta_\varkappa''(t) < 0$. If $\varkappa = 1$, then one easily finds that $\eta_1''(t) = -t^{-1}(1-t)^{-1} \leq -4$. For $\varkappa \neq 1$ we use a slightly modified version of the proof of [22, Lemma 3.1]. One checks directly that

$$\eta_\varkappa''(t)[t^\varkappa + (1-t)^\varkappa]^2 = -\varkappa[t(1-t)]^{\varkappa-2} - \frac{\varkappa}{1-\varkappa}[t^{\varkappa-1} - (1-t)^{\varkappa-1}]^2. \quad (8.3)$$

For $\varkappa < 1$ the right-hand side is clearly negative for $t \in (0, 1)$ and $\text{ess-sup} \eta_\varkappa''(t) < 0$, as required.

It remains to consider the case $\varkappa \in (1, 2)$. We rewrite (8.3) as

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_\varkappa''(t)[t^\varkappa + (1-t)^\varkappa]^2 &= -\frac{\varkappa}{\varkappa-1}g_{\varkappa-1}(t), \\ g_p(t) &:= p[t(1-t)]^{p-1} - [t^p - (1-t)^p]^2, \end{aligned}$$

for $p := \varkappa - 1 \in (0, 1)$. Since $[t^\varkappa + (1-t)^\varkappa]^2$ is strictly positive and bounded for $t \in [0, 1]$, it suffices to show that $g_p(t) \geq c$ with some positive c . This claim is equivalent to

$$[t(1-t)]^{1-p}[t^{2p} + (1-t)^{2p} + c] \leq 2t(1-t) + p. \quad (8.4)$$

Using the notation

$$M_p := 2^{p-1} \max_{t \in [0,1]} [t^{2p} + (1-t)^{2p}] = \begin{cases} 2^{-p} & \text{if } 0 < p < 1/2 \\ 2^{p-1} & \text{if } 1/2 \leq p < 1 \end{cases},$$

the (elementary example of the) Young inequality

$$ab \leq \frac{a^u}{u} + \frac{b^v}{v}, \quad a, b \geq 0, \quad u, v > 1, \quad \frac{1}{u} + \frac{1}{v} = 1$$

for $a = [2t(1-t)]^{1-p}$, $u = (1-p)^{-1}$ and $b = 1$, $v = p^{-1}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} [(t(1-t))^{1-p}[t^{2p} + (1-t)^{2p} + c] &\leq (M_p + 2^{p-1}c)[2t(1-t)]^{1-p} \\ &\leq (M_p + 2^{p-1}c)[(1-p)(2t(1-t)) + p]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $M_p < 1$ for $p \in (0, 1)$, the number

$$c = (1 - M_p)2^{1-p}$$

is positive. With this choice of c the right-hand side of the above inequality coincides with

$$(1-p)(2t(1-t)) + p \leq 2t(1-t) + p,$$

so (8.4) holds. This completes the proof of the inequality $\text{ess-sup}_{t \in (0,1)} \eta''_\varkappa(t) < 0$ and hence entails that $B(\mathcal{A}; \eta_\varkappa) > 0$. \square

9. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

We are now in a position to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. In order to use Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 we begin with the relation derived already in the introduction:

$$S_\varkappa(\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}, L\Lambda) = \text{tr } D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}, \Lambda; \eta_\varkappa), \quad \alpha = L\varepsilon^{-1},$$

where the symbol $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \mathcal{P}^{(\varepsilon)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}\varepsilon^{-1}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \frac{\sum_{\beta=1}^3 \xi_\beta \gamma^\beta - \varepsilon m}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\xi}^2 + \varepsilon^2 m^2}} \gamma^0 \right) \phi(\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\xi}^2 + (\varepsilon m)^2}).$$

The symbol $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}$ is Hermitian 4×4 -matrix-valued and it satisfies Condition 3.2 with the limiting symbol

$$\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{C}^4} + \sum_{\beta=1}^3 \frac{\xi_\beta}{|\boldsymbol{\xi}|} \gamma^\beta \gamma^0 \right) \phi(|\boldsymbol{\xi}|)$$

with the finite set $\Xi = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and for arbitrary $\rho > 0$. Moreover, as we have already observed earlier, each function η_\varkappa satisfies Condition 3.3 with $\Gamma = \{0, 1\}$, with $\gamma = \min\{\varkappa, 1\}$, if $\varkappa \neq 1$, and with arbitrary $\gamma < 1$ if $\varkappa = 1$. Thus, according to Theorem 3.4, as $L \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is fixed, we have

$$\lim (L\varepsilon^{-1})^{-2} S_\varkappa(\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}, L\Lambda) = \lim \alpha^{-2} \text{tr } D_\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}, \Lambda; \eta_\varkappa) = B(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}; \eta_\varkappa).$$

Similarly, if $\varepsilon \searrow 0$ and $\alpha = L\varepsilon^{-1} \rightarrow \infty$, then Theorem 3.5 leads to the formula

$$\lim L^{-2}\varepsilon^2 S_{\varkappa}(\Pi^{(\varepsilon)}, L\Lambda) = \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; \eta_{\varkappa}).$$

To complete the proof of (1.7) and (1.8) we will check that the symbols $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}, \mathcal{A}$ satisfy the conditions of Proposition 3.6. The following lemma is the first step in this direction.

Lemma 9.1. *Let $\mathbf{R} \in \text{SO}(3)$ be arbitrary. Then there exists a matrix $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{R}} \in \text{SU}(4)$ such that for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^3$:*

$$\mathbf{Q} \sum_{\beta=1}^3 (\mathbf{R}\mathbf{v})_{\beta} \gamma^{\beta} \mathbf{Q}^{-1} = \sum_{\beta=1}^3 v_{\beta} \gamma^{\beta}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Q} \gamma^0 \mathbf{Q}^{-1} = \gamma^0.$$

Proof. This lemma is a specialization of the Lorentz invariance of the Dirac equation to spatial rotations. General proofs can be found for example in [26, Section 3-4] or [11, Lemma 1.3.1]. To make the connection clear, we recall that for any orthochronous proper Lorentz transformation $\Lambda \in \text{SO}(1,3)$ there is matrix $U \in \text{SU}(2,2)$ which is unitary with respect to the spin inner product (2.2) such that $U\Lambda_j^i \gamma^j U^{-1} = \gamma^i$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}$. Specializing this result to the case $\Lambda = \mathbf{R}$ of rotations, the resulting matrix $U =: \mathbf{Q}$ commutes with γ^0 , implying that it is also in $\text{SU}(4)$, concluding the proof.

For the reader who is not so familiar with Dirac spinors, we now give an alternative, more computational proof. Using the method of Euler angles, it suffices to prove this lemma for rotations around the three coordinate axes, because any other rotation may be written as a product of those three rotations. Let us consider for example the case where \mathbf{R} is a rotation around the z -axis (for rotations around the x - and y -axes, the computation is similar). Then \mathbf{R} is given by

$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta & 0 \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ is the rotation angle. We claim that

$$\mathbf{Q} := \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\theta/2} & & & \\ & e^{i\theta/2} & & \\ & & e^{-i\theta/2} & \\ & & & e^{i\theta/2} \end{pmatrix}$$

is the sought matrix. Indeed, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q} \gamma^0 \mathbf{Q}^{-1} &= \gamma^0, & \mathbf{Q} \gamma^3 \mathbf{Q}^{-1} &= \gamma^3, \\ \mathbf{Q} \gamma^1 \mathbf{Q}^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} & & & e^{i\theta} \\ & & e^{-i\theta} & \\ -e^{-i\theta} & -e^{i\theta} & & \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{Q} \gamma^2 \mathbf{Q}^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} & & & -ie^{i\theta} \\ & & ie^{-i\theta} & \\ -ie^{-i\theta} & ie^{i\theta} & & \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by a straightforward computation we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{Q} \sum_{\beta=1}^3 (\mathbf{Rv})_{\beta} \gamma^{\beta} \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \\ &= v_1 \left(\cos \theta \mathbf{Q} \gamma^1 \mathbf{Q}^{-1} + \sin \theta \mathbf{Q} \gamma^2 \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \right) + v_2 \left(-\sin \theta \mathbf{Q} \gamma^1 \mathbf{Q}^{-1} + \cos \theta \mathbf{Q} \gamma^2 \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \right) + v_3 \gamma^3 \\ &= \sum_{\beta=1}^3 v_{\beta} \gamma^{\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 9.1 ensures that the symbols \mathcal{A} and $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}$ satisfy the conditions of Proposition 3.6. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}; \eta_{\varkappa}) = \mathfrak{M}_{\varkappa}^{(\varepsilon)} \text{vol}_2(\partial\Lambda), \quad \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; \eta_{\varkappa}) = \mathfrak{M}_{\varkappa} \text{vol}_2(\partial\Lambda),$$

where

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\varkappa}^{(\varepsilon)} := \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}; \eta_{\varkappa}), \quad \mathfrak{M}_{\varkappa} := \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{e}; \mathcal{A}; \eta_{\varkappa}),$$

with an arbitrary unit vector \mathbf{e} , and the coefficients \mathfrak{M} are defined in (3.1). By continuity of the asymptotic coefficient established in Lemma 7.2, we have $\mathfrak{M}_{\varkappa}^{(\varepsilon)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{\varkappa}$ as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$.

Finally, since the matrix symbols \mathcal{A} and $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}$ satisfy the bounds $0 \leq \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \leq \mathbf{1}$ and $0 \leq \mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \leq \mathbf{1}$ for all $\boldsymbol{\xi} \neq \mathbf{0}$, it follows from Corollary 8.6 that $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}; \eta_{\varkappa}) > 0$ and $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)}; \eta_{\varkappa}) > 0$ for $\varkappa \in (0, 2)$. This immediately implies that $\mathfrak{M}_{\varkappa}^{(\varepsilon)} > 0$ and $\mathfrak{M}_{\varkappa} > 0$ for $\varkappa \in (0, 2)$, as claimed. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is now complete.

Acknowledgments: M.L. gratefully acknowledges support by the Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes and the Marianne-Plehn-Programm. The authors are grateful to the referees for their instructive remarks.

REFERENCES

- [1] *Link to web platform on causal fermion systems: www.causal-fermion-system.com.*
- [2] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, and V. Vedral, *Entanglement in many-body systems*, arXiv:quant-ph/0703044, Rev. Modern Phys. **80** (2008), no. 2, 517–576.
- [3] F.A. Berezin, *Convex functions of operators.*, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **88(130)** (1972), 268–276. MR 300121
- [4] M.Sh. Birman, G.E. Karadzhov, and M.Z. Solomjak, *Boundedness conditions and spectrum estimates for the operators $b(X)a(D)$ and their analogs*, Estimates and asymptotics for discrete spectra of integral and differential equations (Leningrad, 1989–90), Adv. Soviet Math., vol. 7, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1991, pp. 85–106.
- [5] M.Sh. Birman and M.Z. Solomjak, *Estimates for the singular numbers of integral operators*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk **32** (1977), no. 1(193), 17–84, 271.
- [6] ———, *Spectral theory of selfadjoint operators in Hilbert space*, Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series), D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht, 1987, Translated from the 1980 Russian original by S. Khrushchëv and V. Peller. MR 1192782
- [7] L. Bollmann and P. Müller, *Widom’s formula for discontinuous matrix-valued symbols*, arXiv:2311.06036 [math.SP] (2023).
- [8] H. Casini and M. Huerta, *Analytic results on the geometric entropy for free fields*, arXiv:0707.1300 [hep-th], J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp. (2008), no. 1, P01012, 9.

- [9] F. Finster, *The Continuum Limit of Causal Fermion Systems*, arXiv:1605.04742 [math-ph], *Fundamental Theories of Physics*, vol. 186, Springer, 2016.
- [10] F. Finster, R. Jonsson, M. Lottner, A. Much, and S. Murro, *Notions of fermionic entropies for causal fermion systems*, in preparation.
- [11] F. Finster, S. Kindermann, and J.-H. Treude, *An Introductory Course on Causal Fermion Systems*, in preparation, www.causal-fermion-system.com/intro-public.pdf (2024).
- [12] S. Galanda, A. Much, and R. Verch, *Relative entropy of fermion excitation states on the CAR algebra*, arXiv:2305.02788 [math-ph], *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.* **26** (2023), 21.
- [13] R. Helling, H. Leschke, and W. Spitzer, *A special case of a conjecture by Widom with implications to fermionic entanglement entropy*, arXiv:0906.4946 [math-ph], *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* (2011), no. 7, 1451–1482.
- [14] S. Hollands, O. Islam, and K. Sanders, *Relative entanglement entropy for widely separated regions in curved spacetime*, arXiv:1711.02039 [math-ph], *J. Math. Phys.* **59** (2018), no. 6, 062301, 13.
- [15] S. Hollands and K. Sanders, *Entanglement Measures and their Properties in Quantum Field Theory*, arXiv:1702.04924 [quant-ph], *Springer Briefs in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 34, Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [16] L. Hörmander, *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators. I*, second ed., *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*, vol. 256, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990.
- [17] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, *Quantum entanglement*, arXiv:quant-ph/0702225, *Rev. Modern Phys.* **81** (2009), no. 2, 865–942.
- [18] I. Klich, *Lower entropy bounds and particle number fluctuations in a Fermi sea*, arXiv:quant-ph/0406068, *J. Phys. A* **39** (2006), no. 4, L85–L91.
- [19] A. Laptev and Y. Safarov, *Szegő type limit theorems*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **138** (1996), no. 2, 544–559. MR 1395969
- [20] H. Leschke, A.V. Sobolev, and W. Spitzer, *Large-scale behaviour of local and entanglement entropy of the free Fermi gas at any temperature*, arXiv:1501.03412 [quant-ph], *J. Phys. A* **49** (2016), no. 30, 30LT04, 9.
- [21] ———, *Trace formulas for Wiener-Hopf operators with applications to entropies of free fermionic equilibrium states*, arXiv:1605.04429 [math.SP], *J. Funct. Anal.* **273** (2017), no. 3, 1049–1094.
- [22] ———, *Rényi entropies of the free Fermi gas in multi-dimensional space at high temperature*, *Toeplitz operators and random matrices—in memory of Harold Widom*, arXiv:2201.11087 [math-ph], *Oper. Theory Adv. Appl.*, vol. 289, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2022, pp. 477–508.
- [23] R. Longo and F. Xu, *Relative entropy in CFT*, arXiv:1712.07283 [math], *Adv. Math.* **337** (2018), 139–170.
- [24] M. Ohya and D. Petz, *Quantum Entropy and its Use*, *Texts and Monographs in Physics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.
- [25] M.J. Radzikowski, *Micro-local approach to the Hadamard condition in quantum field theory on curved spacetime*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **179** (1996), no. 3, 529–553.
- [26] J.J. Sakurai and J. Napolitano, *Advanced Quantum Mechanics*, second ed., Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1994.
- [27] B. Simon, *Trace ideals and their applications*, second ed., *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, vol. 120, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005.
- [28] A.V. Sobolev, *On the Schatten-von Neumann properties of some pseudo-differential operators*, arXiv:1310.2083 [math.SP], *J. Funct. Anal.* **266** (2014), no. 9, 5886–5911.
- [29] ———, *Functions of self-adjoint operators in ideals of compact operators*, arXiv:1504.07261 [math.SP], *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* **95** (2017), no. 1, 157–176.
- [30] B. Thaller, *The Dirac Equation*, *Texts and Monographs in Physics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- [31] H. Widom, *Szegő's limit theorem: the higher-dimensional matrix case*, *J. Functional Analysis* **39** (1980), no. 2, 182–198.
- [32] ———, *A trace formula for Wiener-Hopf operators*, *J. Operator Theory* **8** (1982), no. 2, 279–298.
- [33] ———, *Asymptotic Expansions for Pseudodifferential Operators on Bounded Domains*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 1152, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [34] E. Witten, *On entanglement properties of quantum field theory*, arXiv:1803.04993 [hep-th], *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90** (2018), 045003.

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK UNIVERSITÄT REGENSBURG D-93040 REGENSBURG, GERMANY
Email address: `finster@ur.de`

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK UNIVERSITÄT REGENSBURG D-93040 REGENSBURG, GERMANY
Email address: `magdalena.lottner@ur.de`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON, GOWER STREET, LONDON WC1E 6BT,
UNITED KINGDOM
Email address: `a.sobolev@ucl.ac.uk`