

Volume growth, big jump, and essential spectrum for regular Dirichlet forms*

Yuichi Shiozawa[†]

April 1, 2025

Abstract

We establish an upper bound of the bottom of the essential spectrum for the generator associated with a regular Dirichlet form in terms of the rates of the volume growth/decay and big jump. Using this bound, we discuss how the bottom of the essential spectrum is affected by the volume growth and coefficient growth.

1 Introduction

We are concerned with the spectral properties of the L^2 -generator associated with a regular Dirichlet form. We first establish an upper bound of the bottom of the essential spectrum in terms of the volume growth/decay rate of the underlying space and the big jump rate for the Dirichlet form (Theorems 3.2 and 3.6). We then apply this result to a class of non-local Dirichlet forms. These applications suggest the validity of our upper bound in terms of the positivity of the bottom of the essential spectrum.

It is well known that an L^2 -Markovian semigroup is noncompact if and only if the essential spectrum of the associated generator is nonempty. Hence a noncompact Markovian semigroup is in fact an infinite dimensional object, and the domain of the corresponding Dirichlet form is large in this sense. In particular, we can regard the bottom of the essential spectrum as a characteristic quantity of noncompactness.

On the other hand, the volume growth of the underlying measure is one of the benchmarks for the global properties of Markovian semigroups such as conservativeness and recurrence. In fact, there are several criteria in terms of the volume growth rate for the validity of these properties (see, e.g., [7, 10, 11, 15, 19, 25, 29]).

In connection with noncompactness of Markovian semigroups, it is natural to relate the bottom of the essential spectrum to the volume growth rate. For the Laplace-Beltrami operator on a noncompact and complete Riemannian manifold, Brooks [2, 3] established a precise upper bound of the bottom of the spectrum in terms of the volume growth/decay rate (see also [13, 17] for refinements). This result was generalized to strongly local regular Dirichlet forms via the notion of intrinsic metrics ([21]), and to weighted manifolds ([23]). Folz [6] further extended the result of Brooks [2] to Dirichlet forms on weighted graphs via the notion of adapted metrics. By using the notion of intrinsic metrics in the sense of Frank-Lenz-Wingert [8], Haeseler-Keller-Wojciechowski [12] also extended the result of Brooks [2] to regular Dirichlet forms without the

*This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP22K18675, JP23K25773.

[†]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Doshisha University, Kyotanabe, Kyoto, 610-0394, Japan; yshiozaw@mail.doshisha.ac.jp

killing term, with applications to weighted graphs. See [16, Section 13.2 and Note (p. 524)] for the exposition and related references on these results.

The previous works mentioned above concern regular Dirichlet forms with strong locality or graph structure. Even though the formulation of Haeseler-Keller-Wojciechowski [12] covers general regular Dirichlet forms with infinite volume, the use of intrinsic metrics may force the small and big jump parts to have finite moments of the common order (see [8, Sections 14.3 and 14.4]). On the other hand, for a non-local Dirichlet form, we know necessary and sufficient conditions for compactness and transience of the Markovian semigroup in terms of the growth rates of the coefficients for the small and big jump parts ([27, 28]). Therefore, it is natural to separate the small and big jumps for getting the upper bound of the bottom of the spectrum. Our objective in this paper is to pursue this approach so that we extend the previous works to regular Dirichlet forms having non-locality and no graph structure.

We accomplish our objective by following the approach of [25, 26]. More precisely, we divide the non-local part of a Dirichlet form into the relatively small and big jump parts by introducing the adapted length and jump height function (see Assumption 2.2). We can then apply the argument in the previous works ([2, 3, 6, 12, 21, 23]) to the relatively small jump part. We also extract the big jump rate from the relatively big jump part. Our results (Theorems 3.2 and 3.6) and their proofs are presented in Section 3.

In Section 4, we focus on the relation between the volume growth and the essential spectrum. As will be mentioned in Remark 4.2, our results provide a nontrivial upper bound of the bottom of the essential spectrum for a non-local Dirichlet form under the exponential volume growth condition with respect to the original distance.

In Section 5, we apply our results to two kinds of non-local Dirichlet forms with unbounded coefficients. We here take into consideration the coefficient growth rate into the adapted length and jump height function. When the state space is Euclidean space, we know necessary and sufficient conditions for noncompactness of associated Markovian semigroups in terms of the coefficient growth rate ([4, 14, 20, 28, 31, 32]). Under the setting as [20, 28, 31], we further get a lower bound of the bottom of the essential spectrum by making use of Persson's formula ([18]) and the Lyapunov method ([27, 28]). Combining this bound with Theorem 3.2, we have a quantitative characterization of noncompactness in terms of the positivity of the bottom of the essential spectrum.

In Section 6, motivated by [30], we study the bottom of the spectrum for a non-local operator related to the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type. We will see that, even if the volume is finite, the big jump rate may contribute to the positivity of the bottom of the essential spectrum. See Remark 6.2 for details.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we set up notation and terminology on the Dirichlet form theory by following [9]. We also introduce assumptions which will be needed throughout this paper.

Let E be a locally compact separable metric space, and m a positive Radon measure on E with full support. Let $C(E)$ be the totality of continuous functions on E , and $C_0(E)$ the totality of functions in $C(E)$ with compact support. Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ be a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(E; m)$. By definition, $\mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$ is dense in $C_0(E)$ with respect to the uniform norm, and also dense in \mathcal{F} with respect to the norm $\|u\|_{\mathcal{E}} = (\mathcal{E}(u, u) + \|u\|_{L^2(E; m)}^2)^{1/2}$ ($u \in \mathcal{F}$).

Let $\mathcal{B}(E)$ denote the totality of Borel measurable subsets of E . We impose the next assumption on the Beurling-Deny expression of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ ([9, Theorem 3.2.1]).

Assumption 2.1. For any $u \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$,

$$\mathcal{E}(u, u) = \mathcal{E}^{(c)}(u, u) + \iint_{E \times E \setminus \text{diag}} (u(x) - u(y))^2 J(x, dy) m(dx),$$

where

- diag is the diagonal set in $E \times E$, that is, $\text{diag} = \{(x, y) \in E \times E \mid x = y\}$.
- $(\mathcal{E}^{(c)}, \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E))$ is a symmetric form with the strongly local property (see [9, p.120] for definition).
- $J(x, dy)$ is a positive measurable kernel on $(E, \mathcal{B}(E))$ such that the measure $J(dx, dy) = J(x, dy)m(dx)$ is symmetric, that is,

$$J(A \times B) = J(B \times A), \quad A, B \in \mathcal{B}(E).$$

The symmetric form $\mathcal{E}^{(c)}$ can be extended to \mathcal{F} ([9, p. 125]). Moreover, for any $u \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists a unique finite measure $\mu_{\langle u \rangle}^{(c)}$ on E such that

$$\mathcal{E}^{(c)}(u, u) = \frac{1}{2} \mu_{\langle u \rangle}^{(c)}(E)$$

([9, Lemma 3.2.3]). We call $\mu_{\langle u \rangle}^{(c)}$ the local part of the energy measure of $u \in \mathcal{F}$.

We say that a function u on E is locally in \mathcal{F} ($u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$ in notation) if for any relatively compact open set G in E , there exists a function $u_G \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $u = u_G$, m -a.e. on G . For any $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$, we can well define the measure which is consistent with the local part of the energy measure ([9, p. 130]). We use the notation $\mu_{\langle u \rangle}^{(c)}$ also for this measure. When $\mu_{\langle u \rangle}^{(c)}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the measure m , we write $\Gamma^{(c)}(u)$ for the Radon-Nikodym derivative, that is, $\mu_{\langle u \rangle}^{(c)}(dx) = \Gamma^{(c)}(u)(x) m(dx)$.

We further make the following assumption on the existence of a family of length functions adapted to $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$.

Assumption 2.2. There exist families $\{\rho_r\}_{r>0} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}} \cap C(E)$ and $\{F_r\}_{r>0} \subset C(E \times E)$ such that F_r is positive and pointwisely increasing in $r > 0$, and the following conditions are satisfied:

- For each $r > 0$, the measure $\mu_{\langle \rho_r \rangle}^{(c)}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to m and $\text{ess sup}_{x \in E} \{\Gamma^{(c)}(\rho_r)(x)\} < \infty$.
- For any $r > 0$,

$$\text{ess sup}_{x \in E} \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq F_r(x, y)} (\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y))^2 J(x, dy) < \infty$$

and

$$\text{ess sup}_{x \in E} \int_{d(x, y) > F_r(x, y)} J(x, dy) < \infty.$$

Here ess sup is the essential supremum with respect to m .

Let $\{\rho_r\}_{r>0} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}} \cap C(E)$ and $\{F_r\}_{r>0} \subset C(E \times E)$ satisfy Assumption 2.2. For $r > 0$, we define

$$M_1(r) = \text{ess sup}_{x \in E} \{\Gamma^{(c)}(\rho_r)(x)\} + \text{ess sup}_{x \in E} \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq F_r(x, y)} (\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y))^2 J(x, dy)$$

and

$$M_2(r) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in E} \int_{d(x,y) > F_r(x,y)} J(x, dy).$$

For $r > 0$ and $R > 0$, we also define

$$K_{\rho_r}(R) = \{x \in E \mid \rho_r(x) \leq R\}.$$

We further impose the topological assumption on $K_{\rho_r}(R)$, which implies that for any $r > 0$, $K_{\rho_r}(R) \nearrow E$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$.

Assumption 2.3. For any $r > 0$ and $R > 0$, $K_{\rho_r}(R)$ is compact. Moreover, for any $r > 0$ and for any compact set $K \subset E$, there exists $R > 0$ such that $K \subset K_{\rho_r}(R)$.

3 Upper bound of the bottom of the essential spectrum

Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ be a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(E; m)$. Then there exists a unique nonpositive self-adjoint operator $(L, \mathcal{D}(L))$ on $L^2(E; m)$ such that $\mathcal{D}(L) \subset \mathcal{F}$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(u, v) = (-Lu, v), \quad u \in \mathcal{D}(L), v \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (3.1)$$

Let $\sigma_{\operatorname{ess}}(-L)$ be the essential spectrum of $-L$, and let $\lambda_e = \inf \sigma_{\operatorname{ess}}(-L)$. To show the upper bound of λ_e , we rely on the following Persson theorem:

Proposition 3.1. (see [12, Proposition 2.1] or [16, Theorem E.2]) *If there exists a sequence $\{f_n\} \subset \mathcal{F}$ with $\|f_n\|_{L^2(E; m)} = 1$ converging weakly to 0 in $L^2(E; m)$, then*

$$\lambda_e \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(f_n, f_n).$$

Throughout this section, we impose Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 on $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. We will establish upper bounds of λ_e for the infinite volume and finite volume cases, respectively, by using Proposition 3.1.

3.1 Infinite volume

In this subsection, we assume that $m(E) = \infty$. For $r > 0$, let

$$\mu_r = \liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{R} \log m(K_{\rho_r}(R)).$$

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that $\mu_r < \infty$ for some $r > 0$. Then*

$$\lambda_e \leq \inf_{r > 0} \left(\frac{\mu_r^2}{4} M_1(r) + 2M_2(r) \right).$$

By comparison with the previous works [2, 6, 12, 21, 23], Theorem 3.2 includes not only the volume growth rate, but also the big jump rate expressed as $M_2(r)$. A key point in our argument is to take into consideration the degree of farness of points in E by introducing the function $F_r(x, y)$. We can then adapt the approach of the previous works [2, 6, 12, 21, 23] to the relatively small jump part.

In what follows, we assume that $\mu_r < \infty$ for some $r > 0$. Then there exists a positive sequence $\{R_n\}$ such that $R_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\mu_r = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{R_n} \log m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n)).$$

We fix such a sequence $\{R_n\}$.

For any $\alpha > \mu_r/2$, let w_n ($n \geq 1$) be a continuous function on $[0, \infty)$ such that

$$w_n(t) = \begin{cases} \alpha R_n/2, & 0 \leq t \leq R_n/2, \\ \alpha(R_n - t), & R_n/2 < t \leq R_n, \\ 0, & t > R_n. \end{cases}$$

Define $h_n^{(r)}(x) = w_n(\rho_r(x))$ and $f_n^{(r)}(x) = e^{h_n^{(r)}(x)} - 1$. We first prove that we can take the sequence $\{f_n^{(r)}/\|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)}\}$ as $\{f_n\}$ in Proposition 3.1.

Lemma 3.3. (i) For any $n \geq 1$, $h_n^{(r)}$ and $f_n^{(r)}$ belong to $\mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$.

(ii) The sequence $\{f_n^{(r)}/\|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)}\}$ is weakly convergent to 0 in $L^2(E; m)$. In particular,

$$\lambda_e \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}(f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)})}{\|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)}^2}. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. We first prove (i). Since $h_n^{(r)}$ and $f_n^{(r)}$ belong to $C_0(E)$ by definition and Assumption 2.3, it is sufficient to show that $h_n^{(r)}$ and $f_n^{(r)}$ belong to \mathcal{F} .

Since $\rho_r \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$, we can follow the proof of [25, Lemma 3.1] to see that $h_n^{(r)} \in \mathcal{F}$. We also know that $|e^t - e^s| \leq e^{s \vee t}|t - s|$ for any $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |f_n^{(r)}(x) - f_n^{(r)}(y)| &= |e^{h_n^{(r)}(x)} - e^{h_n^{(r)}(y)}| \leq e^{h_n^{(r)}(x) \vee h_n^{(r)}(y)} |h_n^{(r)}(x) - h_n^{(r)}(y)| \\ &\leq e^{\alpha R_n/2} |h_n^{(r)}(x) - h_n^{(r)}(y)| \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|f_n^{(r)}(x)| = |e^{h_n^{(r)}(x)} - 1| \leq e^{h_n^{(r)}(x)} |h_n^{(r)}(x)| \leq e^{\alpha R_n/2} |h_n^{(r)}(x)|.$$

Since $h_n^{(r)} \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$, we have $f_n^{(r)} \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$ by [9, p. 5].

We next prove (ii). Take any $u \in L^2(E; m)$ with $u \neq 0$. Then for any $R > 0$,

$$\int_E u f_n^{(r)} dm = \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R)} dm + \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R)^c} dm.$$

By the Schwarz inequality,

$$\left| \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R)} dm \right| \leq \left(\int_E u^2 dm \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R)} dm \right)^{1/2}$$

and

$$\left| \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R)^c} dm \right| \leq \left(\int_E u^2 \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R)^c} dm \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm \right)^{1/2}.$$

By the definition of $f_n^{(r)}$,

$$\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm \geq \int_{\rho_r(x) \leq R_n/2} (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm = (e^{\alpha R_n/2} - 1)^2 m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n/2)) \rightarrow \infty, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.3)$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then by Assumption 2.3, there exists $R_* > 0$ such that

$$\left(\int_E u^2 \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)^c} dm \right)^{1/2} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Note that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $R_n/2 \geq R_*$,

$$\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)} dm \leq (e^{\alpha R_n}/2 - 1)^2 m(K_{\rho_r}(R_*)).$$

Then, as (3.3) holds and $m(E) = \infty$ by assumption, there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \geq N_0$,

$$\left(\frac{\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)} dm}{\|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)}^2} \right)^{1/2} = \left(\frac{\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)} dm}{\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm} \right)^{1/2} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2\|u\|_{L^2(E;m)}}.$$

Therefore, for any $n \geq N_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_E u f_n^{(r)} dm \right| &= \left| \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)} dm + \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)^c} dm \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)} dm \right| + \left| \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)^c} dm \right| \\ &\leq \|u\|_{L^2(E;m)} \left(\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)} dm \right)^{1/2} + \left(\int_E u^2 \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)^c} dm \right)^{1/2} \|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)} \\ &< \varepsilon \|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the first assertion of (ii). Proposition 3.1 further yields (3.2). \square

We next discuss the upper bound of $\mathcal{E}(f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)})$. Let $g_n^{(r)} = (f_n^{(r)} + 2)\mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_n)}$ and

$$\varphi(t) = \frac{(1 - e^{\alpha t})^2}{1 + e^{2\alpha t}}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.4)$$

Then φ is even and nonnegative, and strictly increasing for $t \geq 0$ such that

$$\varphi(t) = 1 - \frac{2e^{\alpha t}}{1 + e^{2\alpha t}} \leq \frac{\alpha^2 t^2}{2}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Lemma 3.4. (i) For any $n \geq 1$,

$$(f_n^{(r)}(x) - f_n^{(r)}(y))^2 \leq \varphi(|\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y)|)(g_n^{(r)}(x)^2 + g_n^{(r)}(y)^2), \quad x, y \in E. \quad (3.5)$$

In particular,

$$(f_n^{(r)}(x) - f_n^{(r)}(y))^2 \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{2} (\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y))^2 (g_n^{(r)}(x)^2 + g_n^{(r)}(y)^2), \quad x, y \in E.$$

(ii) For any $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{E}(f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)}) \leq \alpha^2 M_1(r) \int_E (g_n^{(r)})^2 dm + 2M_2(r) \int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm.$$

Proof. We omit the proof of (i) because it is the same with that of [12, Lemma 2.5]. Let us prove (ii). For $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}} \cap C(E)$, we define

$$\mathcal{E}^{(r),1}(u, u) = \iint_{0 < d(x,y) \leq F_r(x,y)} (u(x) - u(y))^2 J(x, dy) m(dx)$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}^{(r),2}(u, u) = \iint_{d(x,y) > F_r(x,y)} (u(x) - u(y))^2 J(x, dy) m(dx)$$

so that

$$\mathcal{E}(u, u) = \mathcal{E}^{(c)}(u, u) + \mathcal{E}^{(r),1}(u, u) + \mathcal{E}^{(r),2}(u, u). \quad (3.6)$$

Since $w_n(t) = 0 \vee \{\alpha(R_n - t)\} \wedge (\alpha R_n/2)$ and $R_n/2 - \rho_r \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$, we have by the chain rule and the contraction property of $\Gamma^{(c)}$ ([29, p. 190]),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{(c)}(f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)}) &= \int_E \Gamma^{(c)}(f_n^{(r)}) dm = \int_E e^{2w_n(\rho_r)} \Gamma^{(c)}(w_n(\rho_r)) dm \\ &\leq \alpha^2 \int_E (g_n^{(r)})^2 \Gamma^{(c)}(\rho_r) dm \leq \alpha^2 \sup_{z \in E} \{\Gamma^{(c)}(\rho_r(z))\} \int_E (g_n^{(r)})^2 dm. \end{aligned}$$

By (i), $F_r(x, y) = F_r(y, x)$ and $J(x, dy)m(dx) = J(y, dx)m(dy)$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{(r),1}(f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)}) &= \iint_{0 < d(x,y) \leq F_r(x,y)} (f_n^{(r)}(x) - f_n^{(r)}(y))^2 J(x, dy) m(dx) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \iint_{0 < d(x,y) \leq F_r(x,y)} (\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y))^2 (g_n^{(r)}(x)^2 + g_n^{(r)}(y)^2) J(x, dy) m(dx) \\ &= \alpha^2 \int_E g_n^{(r)}(x)^2 \left(\int_{0 < d(x,y) \leq F_r(x,y)} (\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y))^2 J(x, dy) \right) m(dx) \\ &\leq \alpha^2 \sup_{z \in E} \left(\int_{0 < d(z,y) \leq F_r(z,y)} (\rho_r(z) - \rho_r(y))^2 J(z, dy) \right) \int_E (g_n^{(r)})^2 dm. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{E}^{(c)}(f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)}) + \mathcal{E}^{(r),1}(f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)}) \leq \alpha^2 M_1(r) \int_E (g_n^{(r)})^2 dm. \quad (3.7)$$

Since $f_n^{(r)}$ is nonnegative, $F_r(x, y) = F_r(y, x)$ and $J(x, dy)m(dx) = J(y, dx)m(dy)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{(r),2}(f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)}) &= \iint_{d(x,y) > F_r(x,y)} (f_n^{(r)}(x) - f_n^{(r)}(y))^2 J(x, dy) m(dx) \\ &\leq \iint_{d(x,y) > F_r(x,y)} (f_n^{(r)}(x)^2 + f_n^{(r)}(y)^2) J(x, dy) m(dx) \\ &= 2 \int_E f_n^{(r)}(x)^2 \left(\int_{d(x,y) > F_r(x,y)} J(x, dy) \right) m(dx) \\ &\leq 2M_2(r) \int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

By (3.6) with $u = f_n^{(r)}$, (3.7) and (3.8), we arrive at the desired assertion. \square

We finally prove the asymptotic equivalence of the norms of $f_n^{(r)}$ and $g_n^{(r)}$.

Lemma 3.5. *The sequences $\{f_n^{(r)}\}$ and $\{g_n^{(r)}\}$ satisfy $\|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)} / \|g_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)} \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. By the definitions of $\{f_n^{(r)}\}$ and $\{g_n^{(r)}\}$,

$$\int_E (g_n^{(r)})^2 dm = \int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm + 4 \int_E f_n^{(r)} dm + 4m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n)). \quad (3.9)$$

Then

$$\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm \geq \int_{\rho_r(x) \leq R_n/2} (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm = (e^{\alpha R_n/2} - 1)^2 m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n/2)).$$

By the definition of μ_r , we see that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $R_* > 0$ such that

$$m(K_{\rho_r}(R)) \geq e^{(\mu_r - \varepsilon)R}, \quad R \geq R_*.$$

By the definition of $\{R_n\}$, we can also take $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $R_N \geq R_*$ such that

$$m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n)) \leq e^{(\mu_r + \varepsilon/2)R_n}, \quad n \geq N.$$

Hence if we take $\varepsilon \in (0, \alpha - \mu_r/2)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n))}{\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm} &\leq \frac{m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n))}{(e^{\alpha R_n/2} - 1)^2 m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n/2))} \leq \frac{e^{(\mu_r + \varepsilon/2)R_n}}{(e^{\alpha R_n/2} - 1)^2 e^{(\mu_r - \varepsilon)R_n/2}} \\ &= \frac{e^{\alpha R_n}}{(e^{\alpha R_n/2} - 1)^2} e^{-(\alpha - \mu_r/2 - \varepsilon)R_n} \rightarrow 0 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Since the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\int_E f_n^{(r)} dm = \int_E f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_n)} dm \leq \left(\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm \right)^{1/2} m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n))^{1/2},$$

we get by (3.10),

$$\frac{\int_E f_n^{(r)} dm}{\left(\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm \right)^{1/2}} \leq \frac{m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n))^{1/2}}{\left(\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm \right)^{1/2}} \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Combining this with (3.9), we complete the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2. By Lemma 3.3 (ii), Lemma 3.4 (ii) and Lemma 3.5,

$$\lambda_e \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}(f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)})}{\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm} \leq \alpha^2 M_1(r) \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_E (g_n^{(r)})^2 dm}{\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm} \right) + 2M_2(r) = \alpha^2 M_1(r) + 2M_2(r).$$

Since $r > 0$ and $\alpha > \mu_r/2$ are arbitrary, we arrive at the desired assertion. \square

3.2 Finite volume

In this subsection, we assume that $m(E) < \infty$. For $r > 0$, let

$$\nu_r = \liminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-1}{R} \log m(K_{\rho_r}(R)^c).$$

Theorem 3.6. *Assume that $\nu_r < \infty$ for some $r > 0$. If $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is recurrent, then*

$$\lambda_e \leq \inf_{r > 0} \left(\frac{\nu_r^2}{4} M_1(r) + 2M_2(r) \right).$$

We note that if $m(E) < \infty$ and $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is recurrent, then any constant function belongs to \mathcal{F} by [9, Theorem 1.6.3 and Theorem 1.5.2 (iii)].

Let us prove Theorem 3.6 by following the arguments of [3, 12] and Theorem 3.2. In what follows, we assume that $\nu_r < \infty$ for some $r > 0$. Then there exists a sequence $\{R_n\}$ such that $R_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\nu_r = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-1}{R_n} \log m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n)^c).$$

We fix such a sequence $\{R_n\}$.

For any $\alpha > \nu_r/2$, let w_n ($n \geq 1$) be a continuous function on $[0, \infty)$ such that

$$w_n(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \leq t \leq R_n/2, \\ \alpha(t - R_n/2), & R_n/2 < t \leq R_n, \\ \alpha R_n/2, & t > R_n. \end{cases}$$

Define $h_n^{(r)}(x) = w_n(\rho_r(x))$ and $f_n^{(r)}(x) = e^{h_n^{(r)}(x)} - 1$. We first prove that we can take the sequence $\{f_n^{(r)}/\|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)}\}$ as $\{f_n\}$ in Proposition 3.1.

Lemma 3.7. *Assume that $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is recurrent.*

(i) *For any $n \geq 1$, $h_n^{(r)}$ and $f_n^{(r)}$ belong to \mathcal{F} .*

(ii) *The sequence $\{f_n^{(r)}/\|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)}\}$ is weakly convergent to 0 in $L^2(E; m)$. In particular,*

$$\lambda_e \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}(f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)})}{\|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)}^2}. \quad (3.11)$$

Proof. We first prove (i). Since $\rho_r \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$, we can follow the proof of [25, Lemma 3.1] to show that $\alpha R_n/2 - h_n^{(r)} \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$. As any constant function belongs to \mathcal{F} by assumption, we have $h_n^{(r)} \in \mathcal{F}$. Following the proof of Lemma 3.3, we further obtain $f_n^{(r)} \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$.

We next prove (ii). Take any $u \in L^2(E; m)$ with $u \neq 0$. Then for any $R > 0$, we have by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \, dm \right| &= \left| \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R)} \, dm + \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R)^c} \, dm \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R)} \, dm \right| + \left| \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R)^c} \, dm \right| \\ &\leq \|u\|_{L^2(E;m)} \left(\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R)} \, dm \right)^{1/2} + \|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)} \left(\int_E u^2 \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R)^c} \, dm \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

On the other hand, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $R_* > 0$ such that

$$\left(\int_E u^2 \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)^c} \, dm \right)^{1/2} < \varepsilon.$$

In particular, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $R_n \geq 2R_*$, we have $f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)} = 0$ and so

$$\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)} \, dm = 0.$$

Hence if we take $R = R_*$ in (3.12), then

$$\left| \int_E u f_n^{(r)} \, dm \right| \leq \|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)} \left(\int_E u^2 \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_*)^c} \, dm \right)^{1/2} < \varepsilon \|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)}.$$

Namely, $\{f_n^{(r)}/\|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)}\}$ is weakly convergent to 0 in $L^2(E; m)$. Combining this with Proposition 3.1, we further get (3.11). \square

We next discuss the upper bound of $\mathcal{E}(f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)})$. Let $g_n^{(r)} = (f_n^{(r)} + 2) \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_n/2)^c}$, and let φ be as in (3.4). Following the proof of [12, Lemma 2.5], we obtain

Lemma 3.8. (i) For any $n \geq 1$,

$$(f_n^{(r)}(x) - f_n^{(r)}(y))^2 \leq \varphi(|\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y)|)(g_n^{(r)}(x)^2 + g_n^{(r)}(y)^2), \quad x, y \in E. \quad (3.13)$$

In particular,

$$(f_n^{(r)}(x) - f_n^{(r)}(y))^2 \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{2}(\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y))^2(g_n^{(r)}(x)^2 + g_n^{(r)}(y)^2), \quad x, y \in E.$$

(ii) For any $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{E}(f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)}) \leq \alpha^2 M_1(r) \int_E (g_n^{(r)})^2 dm + 2M_2(r) \int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm.$$

Proof. We first prove (i). By symmetry, we may and do assume that $\rho_r(x) \leq \rho_r(y)$.

(a) Assume that $\rho_r(x) \leq \rho_r(y) \leq R_n/2$ or $R_n \leq \rho_r(x) \leq \rho_r(y)$. Then by definition, we have $f_n^{(r)}(x) = f_n^{(r)}(y)$ and so (3.13) follows.

(b) Assume that $\rho_r(x) \leq R_n/2 \leq \rho_r(y) \leq R_n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (f_n^{(r)}(x) - f_n^{(r)}(y))^2 &= (e^{\alpha(\rho_r(y)-R_n/2)} - 1)^2 \\ &= \frac{(e^{\alpha(\rho_r(y)-R_n/2)} - 1)^2}{1 + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(y)-R_n/2)}} (1 + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(y)-R_n/2)}). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\frac{(e^{\alpha(\rho_r(y)-R_n/2)} - 1)^2}{1 + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(y)-R_n/2)}} = \varphi(\rho_r(y) - R_n/2) \leq \varphi(\rho_r(y) - \rho_r(x))$$

and

$$1 + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(y)-R_n/2)} \leq g_n^{(r)}(x)^2 + g_n^{(r)}(y)^2,$$

we obtain (3.13).

(c) Assume that $R_n/2 \leq \rho_r(x) \leq \rho_r(y) \leq R_n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (f_n^{(r)}(x) - f_n^{(r)}(y))^2 &= (e^{\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n/2)} - e^{\alpha(\rho_r(y)-R_n/2)})^2 \\ &= \frac{(e^{\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n/2)} - e^{\alpha(\rho_r(y)-R_n/2)})^2}{e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n/2)} + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(y)-R_n/2)}} (e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n/2)} + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(y)-R_n/2)}) \\ &= \frac{(1 - e^{\alpha(\rho_r(y)-\rho_r(x))})^2}{1 + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(y)-\rho_r(x))}} (e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n/2)} + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(y)-R_n/2)}) \\ &\leq \varphi(\rho_r(y) - \rho_r(x))(g_n^{(r)}(x)^2 + g_n^{(r)}(y)^2). \end{aligned}$$

(d) Assume that $\rho_r(x) \leq R_n/2 \leq R_n \leq \rho_r(y)$. Then

$$(f_n^{(r)}(x) - f_n^{(r)}(y))^2 = (e^{\alpha R_n/2} - 1)^2 = \frac{(e^{\alpha R_n/2} - 1)^2}{e^{\alpha R_n} + 1} (e^{\alpha R_n} + 1) = \varphi(R_n/2)(e^{\alpha R_n} + 1).$$

Since $R_n/2 \leq \rho_r(y) - \rho_r(x)$ and $e^{\alpha R_n} + 1 \leq g_n^{(r)}(x)^2 + g_n^{(r)}(y)^2$, we have (3.13).

(e) Assume that $R_n/2 \leq \rho_r(x) \leq R_n \leq \rho_r(y)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (f_n^{(r)}(x) - f_n^{(r)}(y))^2 &= (e^{\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n/2)} - e^{\alpha R_n/2})^2 \\ &= \frac{(e^{\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n/2)} - e^{\alpha R_n/2})^2}{e^{\alpha R_n} + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n/2)}} (e^{\alpha R_n} + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n/2)}) \\ &= \frac{(e^{\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n)} - 1)^2}{1 + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n)}} (e^{\alpha R_n} + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n/2)}). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\frac{(e^{\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n)} - 1)^2}{1 + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n)}} = \varphi(\rho_r(x) - R_n) = \varphi(R_n - \rho_r(x)) \leq \varphi(\rho_r(y) - \rho_r(x))$$

and

$$e^{\alpha R_n} + e^{2\alpha(\rho_r(x)-R_n/2)} \leq g_n^{(r)}(x)^2 + g_n^{(r)}(y)^2,$$

we get (3.13).

By the argument above, the proof of (i) is complete.

We omit the proof of (ii) because it is the same with that of Lemma 3.4 (ii). \square

We finally prove the asymptotic equivalence of the norms of $f_n^{(r)}$ and $g_n^{(r)}$.

Lemma 3.9. *The sequences $\{f_n^{(r)}\}$ and $\{g_n^{(r)}\}$ satisfy $\|f_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)}/\|g_n^{(r)}\|_{L^2(E;m)} \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. By the definitions of $\{f_n^{(r)}\}$ and $\{g_n^{(r)}\}$,

$$\int_E (g_n^{(r)})^2 dm = \int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm + 4 \int_E f_n^{(r)} dm + 4m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n/2)^c). \quad (3.14)$$

Then

$$\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm \geq \int_{\rho_r(x) > R_n} (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm = (e^{\alpha R_n/2} - 1)^2 m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n)^c).$$

By the definition of ν_r , we see that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $R_* > 0$ such that

$$m(K_{\rho_r}(R)^c) \leq e^{-(\nu_r - \varepsilon)R}, \quad R \geq R_*.$$

By the definition of $\{R_n\}$, we can also take $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $R_N \geq R_*$ such that

$$m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n)^c) \geq e^{-(\nu_r + \varepsilon/2)R_n}, \quad n \geq N.$$

Hence if we take $\varepsilon \in (0, \alpha - \nu_r/2)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n/2)^c)}{\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm} &\leq \frac{m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n/2)^c)}{(e^{\alpha R_n/2} - 1)^2 m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n)^c)} \leq \frac{e^{-(\nu_r - \varepsilon)R_n/2}}{(e^{\alpha R_n/2} - 1)^2 e^{-(\nu_r + \varepsilon/2)R_n}} \\ &= \frac{e^{\alpha R_n}}{(e^{\alpha R_n/2} - 1)^2} e^{-(\alpha - \nu_r/2 - \varepsilon)R_n} \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Since the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\int_E f_n^{(r)} dm = \int_E f_n^{(r)} \mathbf{1}_{K_{\rho_r}(R_n/2)^c} dm \leq \left(\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm \right)^{1/2} m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n/2)^c)^{1/2},$$

we get by (3.15),

$$\frac{\int_E f_n^{(r)} dm}{\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm} \leq \frac{m(K_{\rho_r}(R_n/2)^c)^{1/2}}{\left(\int_E (f_n^{(r)})^2 dm \right)^{1/2}} \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Combining this with (3.14) and (3.15), we complete the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.6. We can follow the proof of Theorem 3.2 by using Lemma 3.7 (ii), Lemma 3.8 (ii) and Lemma 3.9. \square

4 Volume growth

In this section, we are concerned with the relation between the volume growth and the upper bound of the bottom of the essential spectrum. Let $K_x(r) = \{y \in E \mid d(x, y) \leq r\}$ be a closed ball with center $x \in E$ and radius $r \geq 0$. Throughout this section, we impose the following assumption on the regular Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$.

Assumption 4.1. $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(E; m)$ satisfying Assumption 2.1 and the next conditions:

- (i) There exists a positive symmetric measurable function $J(x, y)$ on $E \times E$ such that $J(x, dy) = J(x, y) m(dy)$.
- (ii) For some $o \in E$, the function $d_0(x) = d(o, x)$ ($x \in E$) belongs to \mathcal{F}_{loc} .
- (iii) For any $x \in E$ and $r > 0$, the closed ball $K_x(r)$ is compact in E .

4.1 Polynomial volume growth

In this subsection, we discuss the upper bound of λ_e under the next conditions:

- The measure m satisfies $m(E) = \infty$, and for some positive constants C_1 and η ,

$$m(K_x(r)) \leq C_1 r^\eta, \quad x \in E, \quad r > 0.$$

- There exist positive constants C_2, C_3, η, β_1 ($0 < \beta_1 < 2$) and β_2 such that for any $x, y \in E$,

$$J(x, y) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C_2}{d(x, y)^{\eta+\beta_1}}, & d(x, y) \leq 1, \\ \frac{C_3}{d(x, y)^{\eta+\beta_2}}, & d(x, y) > 1. \end{cases}$$

Take $\rho_r(x) = d_0(x)$ and $F_r(x, y) = r$, and so $\mu_r = 0$. We first calculate the upper bound of $M_1(r)$. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} M_1(r) &= \text{ess sup}_{x \in E} \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq r} (d_0(x) - d_0(y))^2 J(x, y) m(dy) \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in E} \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq r} d(x, y)^2 J(x, y) m(dy). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

For $r \in (0, 1]$,

$$\int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq r} d(x, y)^2 J(x, y) m(dy) \leq C_2 \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq r} d(x, y)^{2-(\eta+\beta_1)} m(dy).$$

Let $V_x(r) = m(K_x(r))$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq r} d(x, y)^{2-(\eta+\beta_1)} m(dy) &= \int_{(0, r]} s^{2-(\eta+\beta_1)} dV_x(s) \\ &= [s^{2-(\eta+\beta_1)} V_x(s)]_{s=0}^{s=r} - (2 - (\eta + \beta_1)) \int_0^r s^{1-(\eta+\beta_1)} V_x(s) ds \leq c_1 r^{2-\beta_1}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

we obtain $M_1(r) \leq c_1 r^{2-\beta_1}$ for $r \in (0, 1]$. In the same way, we have $M_1(r) \leq c_2 r^{2-\beta_2}$ for $r > 1$.

We next calculate the upper bound of $M_2(r)$. For $r > 1$, we have as in (4.2),

$$\int_{d(x,y)>r} J(x,y)m(dy) \leq C_2 \int_{d(x,y)>r} d(x,y)^{-(\eta+\beta_2)}m(dy) \leq c_3r^{-\beta_2}, \quad (4.3)$$

which implies that $M_2(r) \leq c_3r^{-\beta_2}$. For $r \in (0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{d(x,y)>r} J(x,y)m(dy) &\leq C_1 \int_{r<d(x,y)\leq 1} d(x,y)^{-(\eta+\beta_1)}m(dy) + C_2 \int_{d(x,y)>1} d(x,y)^{-(\eta+\beta_2)}m(dy) \\ &\leq c_4r^{-\beta_1}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $M_2(r) \leq c_4r^{-\beta_1}$.

By the argument above, we obtain

$$\inf_{r>0} \left(\frac{\mu_r^2}{4} M_1(r) + M_2(r) \right) = 0$$

and so $\lambda_e = 0$ by Theorem 3.2.

4.2 Exponential volume growth

In this subsection, we discuss the upper bound of λ_e under the next conditions:

- The measure m satisfies $m(E) = \infty$, and there exist positive constants C_1, C_2, η and κ such that for any $x \in E$,

$$m(K_x(r)) \leq \begin{cases} C_1r^\eta, & 0 < r \leq 1, \\ C_2e^{\kappa r}, & r > 1. \end{cases}$$

- There exist positive constants C_3, C_4, β_1 ($0 < \beta_1 < 2$), β_2 and $\lambda \geq \kappa$ such that

$$J(x,y) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C_3}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta_1}}, & 0 < d(x,y) \leq 1, \\ \frac{C_4e^{-\lambda d(x,y)}}{d(x,y)^{\beta_2}}, & d(x,y) > 1. \end{cases}$$

This formulation is the same as [11, Example 5.7], which is motivated by the fractional Laplacian on the hyperbolic space. We will explain details about this matter in Remark 4.2 below.

Take $\rho_r(x) = d_0(x)$ and $F_r(x,y) = r$. We first calculate the upper bound of $M_1(r)$. As in (4.1),

$$M_1(r) \leq \sup_{x \in E} \int_{0 < d(x,y) \leq r} d(x,y)^2 J(x,y)m(dy).$$

Then by following the calculation just after (4.1), we have $M_1(r) \leq c_1r^{2-\beta_1}$ for $r \in (0, 1]$. Assume that $r > 1$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{0 < d(x,y) \leq r} d(x,y)^2 J(x,y)m(dy) \\ &= \int_{0 < d(x,y) \leq 1} d(x,y)^2 J(x,y)m(dy) + \int_{1 < d(x,y) \leq r} d(x,y)^2 J(x,y)m(dy) \\ &= \text{(I)} + \text{(II)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the same argument as for $r \in (0, 1]$, we have $(I) \leq c_1$. Let $V_x(r) = m(K_x(r))$. Then

$$(II) \leq C_4 \int_{1 < d(x,y) \leq r} e^{-\lambda d(x,y)} d(x,y)^{2-\beta_2} m(dy) = C_4 \int_{(1,r]} e^{-\lambda s} s^{2-\beta_2} dV_x(s).$$

By the integration by parts formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{(1,r]} e^{-\lambda s} s^{2-\beta_2} dV_x(s) &\leq c_2 \int_1^r e^{-\lambda s} s^{2-\beta_2} V_x(s) ds \\ &\lesssim \begin{cases} r^{3-\beta_2} & \text{if } \lambda = \kappa \text{ and } 0 < \beta_2 < 3, \\ \log r & \text{if } \lambda = \kappa \text{ and } \beta_2 = 3, \\ 1 & \text{if } \lambda > \kappa \text{ or } \beta_2 > 3. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Hence for $r > 1$,

$$M_1(r) \lesssim \begin{cases} r^{3-\beta_2} & \text{if } \lambda = \kappa \text{ and } 0 < \beta_2 < 3, \\ \log r & \text{if } \lambda = \kappa \text{ and } \beta_2 = 3, \\ 1 & \text{if } \lambda > \kappa \text{ or } \beta_2 > 3. \end{cases}$$

We turn to the upper bound of $M_2(r)$. If $r > 1$, then by the similar calculation as for (4.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{d(x,y) > r} J(x,y) m(dy) &\leq C_4 \int_{d(x,y) > r} \frac{e^{-\lambda d(x,y)}}{d(x,y)^{\beta_2}} m(dy) = C_4 \int_{(r,\infty)} e^{-\lambda s} s^{-\beta_2} dV_x(s) \\ &\lesssim \begin{cases} e^{-(\lambda-\kappa)r} r^{-\beta_2} & \text{if } \lambda > \kappa, \\ r^{-(\beta_2-1)} & \text{if } \lambda = \kappa \text{ and } \beta_2 > 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $0 < r \leq 1$. Then

$$\int_{d(x,y) > r} J(x,y) m(dy) = \int_{r < d(x,y) \leq 1} J(x,y) m(dy) + \int_{d(x,y) > 1} J(x,y) m(dy).$$

By the calculation as for $r > 1$, the second term above is finite if $\lambda > \kappa$, or if $\lambda = \kappa$ and $\beta_2 > 1$. We also have

$$\int_{r < d(x,y) \leq 1} J(x,y) m(dy) \leq C_3 \int_{r < d(x,y) \leq 1} \frac{1}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta_1}} m(dy) = C_3 \int_r^1 \frac{1}{s^{\eta+\beta_1}} dV_x(s).$$

Then by the integration by parts formula,

$$\int_r^1 \frac{1}{s^{\eta+\beta_1}} dV_x(s) \leq V_x(1) + C_1(\eta + \beta_1) \int_r^1 \frac{s^\eta}{s^{\eta+\beta_1+1}} ds \asymp r^{-\beta_1}.$$

Hence the argument above implies that if $\lambda > \kappa$, or if $\lambda = \kappa$ and $\beta_2 > 1$, then

- For any $r \in (0, 1]$,

$$M_2(r) \lesssim r^{-\beta_1}.$$

- For any $r > 1$,

$$M_2(r) \lesssim \begin{cases} e^{-(\lambda-\kappa)r} r^{-\beta_2} & \text{if } \lambda > \kappa, \\ r^{-(\beta_2-1)} & \text{if } \lambda = \kappa \text{ and } \beta_2 > 1. \end{cases}$$

We now focus on the condition that $\lambda = \kappa$, $\beta_1 = \alpha$ and $\beta_2 = 1 + \alpha/2$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 2)$. Then for some $C > 0$,

$$M_1(r) \leq C \times \begin{cases} r^{2-\alpha}, & 0 < r \leq 1, \\ r^{2-\alpha/2}, & r > 1 \end{cases}$$

and

$$M_2(r) \leq C \times \begin{cases} r^{-\alpha}, & 0 < r \leq 1, \\ r^{-\alpha/2}, & r > 1. \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_e &\leq \inf_{r>0} \left(\frac{\kappa^2}{4} M_1(r) + 2M_2(r) \right) \\ &\leq C \times \begin{cases} \left(\frac{2}{2-\alpha} \right)^{1-\alpha/4} \left(\frac{\kappa}{2} \right)^\alpha & \text{if } 0 < \kappa \leq 2\sqrt{\alpha/(2-\alpha)}, \\ \left(\frac{2}{2-\alpha} \right)^{1-\alpha/2} \left(\frac{\kappa}{2} \right)^\alpha & \text{if } \kappa > 2\sqrt{\alpha/(2-\alpha)}. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Remark 4.2. For $n \geq 2$, let \mathbb{H}^n be the n -dimensional hyperbolic space, and let Δ be the Laplace-Beltrami operator on \mathbb{H}^n . We define the distance ball $K(r) = \{x \in \mathbb{H}^n \mid \rho(o, x) \leq r\}$ for some $o \in \mathbb{H}^n$ and $r > 0$. Let m be the Riemannian volume measure on \mathbb{H}^n . It is known that

$$m(K(R)) = \omega_n \int_0^R (\sinh t)^{n-1} dt \sim c_n e^{(n-1)R}, \quad R \rightarrow \infty \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$\inf \sigma_{\text{ess}} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \right) = \frac{(n-1)^2}{8} \quad (4.7)$$

(see, e.g., [5, Section 5.7]). Note that the constant $n-1$ in (4.7) coincides with the exponential volume growth rate of \mathbb{H}^n in (4.6).

For $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, let $(\mathcal{E}^\alpha, \mathcal{F}^\alpha)$ be a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mathbb{H}^n; m)$ subordinate to $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ with respect to the $\alpha/2$ -subordinator. Then $(\mathcal{E}^\alpha, \mathcal{F}^\alpha)$ is non-local, and its generator is formally written as $-(-\Delta/2)^{\alpha/2}$.

(i) By (4.7), we have for any $\alpha \in (0, 2)$,

$$\inf \sigma_{\text{ess}} \left(\left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \right)^{\alpha/2} \right) = \left\{ \frac{(n-1)^2}{8} \right\}^{\alpha/2} = \frac{(n-1)^\alpha}{2^{3\alpha/2}}. \quad (4.8)$$

On the other hand, we see by [24, Lemma 3.1] that

$$J(x, y) \asymp \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d(x, y)^{n+\alpha}}, & d(x, y) < 1, \\ \frac{e^{-(n-1)d(x, y)}}{d(x, y)^\alpha (1 + d(x, y)^{1-\alpha/2})}, & d(x, y) \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

Therefore, Theorem 3.2 is applicable to the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^\alpha, \mathcal{F}^\alpha)$ with the following parameters:

$$\kappa = \lambda = n-1, \quad \gamma = n, \quad \beta_1 = \alpha, \quad \beta_2 = 1 + \frac{\alpha}{2}.$$

In particular, we have (4.5) with $\kappa = n-1$, which might seem compatible with (4.8). However, we do not know how the constant C in (4.5) depends on the parameter κ . Since the constant C may affect the upper bound of λ_e in (4.5), it is unclear whether (4.5) is sharp or not in terms of the exponential volume growth rate.

- (ii) Let $C_0^{\text{lip}}(\mathbb{H}^n)$ be the totality of Lipschitz continuous functions on \mathbb{H}^n with compact support. Then by [22, Theorem 2.1], $\mathcal{F}^\alpha \subset \mathcal{F}^\beta$ holds for any $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 2]$ with $\alpha \leq \beta$, and $C_0^{\text{lip}}(\mathbb{H}^n)$ is a core of \mathcal{F}^α for any $\alpha \in (0, 2]$. Hence by [8, Theorem 7.3] and the calculation similar to [8, Subsection 14.4], we see that for any $p \in (0, \alpha/4)$, there exists $c > 0$ such that the metric $\rho(x, y) := c(d(x, y) \wedge d(x, y)^p)$ is an intrinsic metric for $(\mathcal{E}^\alpha, \mathcal{F}^\alpha)$ in the sense of [8]. However, if we define the ρ -distance ball $K_\rho(r) = \{x \in \mathbb{H}^d \mid \rho(o, x) \leq r\}$ for $o \in \mathbb{H}^d$ and $r > 0$, then (4.6) implies that for all large $R \geq 1$,

$$m(K_\rho(R)) \asymp \exp(c^{-1/p}(n-1)R^{1/p}).$$

Since $0 < p < 1$, we have

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{R} \log m(K_\rho(R)) = \infty. \quad (4.10)$$

By taking into consideration the calculation in [8, Subsection 14.4], we can regard the distance ρ above as a natural intrinsic metric for $(\mathcal{E}^\alpha, \mathcal{F}^\alpha)$. However, since (4.10) holds, it would not follow from [12, Theorem 1.1] that for $(\mathcal{E}^\alpha, \mathcal{F}^\alpha)$, the essential spectrum is non-empty.

5 Coefficient growth

In this section, we focus on the relation between the coefficient growth and the bottom of the essential spectrum. We here include the coefficient in the jump kernel, or in the underlying measure of non-local Dirichlet forms. The latter formulation is nothing but the time change of Dirichlet forms. Throughout this section, we keep Assumption 4.1.

5.1 Coefficient in the jump kernel

In this subsection, we examine how the coefficient in the jump kernel affects the upper bound of the bottom of the essential spectrum. Let $p \in [0, 2]$ and $q \in [0, 2)$, and let

$$c(x, y) = \{(1 + d_0(x))^p + (1 + d_0(y))^p\} \mathbf{1}_{d(x, y) \leq 1} \\ + \{(1 + d_0(x))^q + (1 + d_0(y))^q\} \mathbf{1}_{d(x, y) > 1}, \quad x, y \in E.$$

We impose the next conditions on the volume growth and jump kernel.

- There exist positive constants C_1 and η such that

$$m(K_x(r)) \leq C_1 r^\eta, \quad x \in E, \quad r > 0.$$

- There exist positive constants C_2 and $\beta \in (q, 2)$ such that

$$J(x, y) \leq C_2 \frac{c(x, y)}{d(x, y)^{\eta + \beta}}, \quad (x, y) \in E \times E \setminus \text{diag}.$$

- (i) We first prove that if $p < 2$, then $\lambda_e = 0$. Assume that $p < 2$. Let $\delta > 0$ satisfy $p < 2(1 - \delta)$ and $q < \beta(1 - \delta)$. For fixed constants $r > 0$ and $c_* \in (0, 1)$, we define

$$\rho_r(x) = (1 + r + d_0(x))^\delta, \quad x \in E$$

and

$$F_r(x, y) = c_* \{r + (d_0(x) \vee d_0(y))\}^{1 - \delta}, \quad x, y \in E.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} |(1+r+t)^\delta - (1+r+s)^\delta| &= \delta \int_{s \wedge t}^{s \vee t} \frac{1}{(1+r+u)^{1-\delta}} du \\ &\leq \frac{\delta|t-s|}{(1+r+(s \wedge t))^{1-\delta}}, \quad s, t > 0, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y)| &\leq \frac{\delta|d_0(x) - d_0(y)|}{(1+r+(d_0(x) \wedge d_0(y)))^{1-\delta}} \\ &\leq \frac{\delta d(x, y)}{(1+r+(d_0(x) \wedge d_0(y)))^{1-\delta}}, \quad x, y \in E. \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

Let us give upper bounds of $M_1(r)$ and $M_2(r)$ in this order. Suppose that $d(x, y) \leq F_r(x, y)$.

(a) Assume that $d_0(x) \leq d_0(y)$. Then

$$d_0(y) \leq d_0(x) + d(x, y) \leq d_0(x) + c_*(r + d_0(y))^{1-\delta} \leq d_0(x) + c_*\{(r + d_0(y)) \vee 1\}$$

and so

$$d_0(y) \leq \frac{1}{1-c_*}(d_0(x) + c_*(r \vee 1)).$$

This yields

$$F_r(x, y) \lesssim (1+r+d_0(x))^{1-\delta}, \quad x, y \in E$$

and

$$c(x, y) \lesssim (1+r+d_0(x))^p \mathbf{1}_{d(x,y) \leq 1} + (1+r+d_0(x))^q \mathbf{1}_{d(x,y) > 1}, \quad x, y \in E.$$

We also have by (5.1),

$$|\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y)| \leq \frac{\delta d(x, y)}{(1+r+d_0(x))^{1-\delta}}, \quad x, y \in E.$$

(b) Assume that $d_0(y) \leq d_0(x)$. Then

$$d_0(x) \leq \frac{1}{1-c_*}(d_0(y) + c_*(r \vee 1))$$

and so

$$1+r+d_0(y) \geq 1+r+(1-c_*)d_0(x) - c_*(r \vee 1) \geq (1-c_*)(1+r+d_0(x)).$$

Hence by (5.1),

$$|\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y)| \lesssim \frac{d(x, y)}{(1+r+d_0(x))^{1-\delta}}, \quad x, y \in E.$$

We also have

$$F_r(x, y) = c_*(r + d_0(x))^{1-\delta}, \quad x, y \in E$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} c(x, y) &\leq 2(1+d_0(x))^p \mathbf{1}_{d(x,y) \leq 1} + 2(1+d_0(x))^q \mathbf{1}_{d(x,y) > 1} \\ &\lesssim (1+r+d_0(x))^p \mathbf{1}_{d(x,y) \leq 1} + (1+r+d_0(x))^q \mathbf{1}_{d(x,y) > 1}, \quad x, y \in E. \end{aligned}$$

By (a) and (b) above, we get for some $c_{**} > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{0 < d(x,y) \leq F_r(x,y)} (\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y))^2 J(x,y) m(dy) \\
& \lesssim \int_{0 < d(x,y) \leq c_{**}(1+r+d_0(x))^{1-\delta}} \frac{d(x,y)^2}{(1+r+d_0(x))^{2(1-\delta)}} \frac{(1+r+d_0(x))^p}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta}} \mathbf{1}_{d(x,y) \leq 1} m(dy) \\
& + \int_{0 < d(x,y) \leq c_{**}(1+r+d_0(x))^{1-\delta}} \frac{d(x,y)^2}{(1+r+d_0(x))^{2(1-\delta)}} \frac{(1+r+d_0(x))^q}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta}} \mathbf{1}_{d(x,y) > 1} m(dy) \\
& \lesssim (1+r+d_0(x))^{p-2(1-\delta)} + (1+r+d_0(x))^{q-2(1-\delta)} (1+r+d_0(x))^{(1-\delta)(2-\beta)} \\
& = (1+r+d_0(x))^{p-2(1-\delta)} + (1+r+d_0(x))^{q-\beta(1-\delta)},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$M_1(r) \lesssim r^{p-2(1-\delta)} + r^{q-\beta(1-\delta)}, \quad r \geq 1.$$

Since

$$(1+r+d_0(y))^p \leq (1+r+d_0(x)+d(x,y))^p \leq 2^p \{(1+r+d_0(x))^p + d(x,y)^p\},$$

we also obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
M_2(r) & \lesssim \int_{d(x,y) > c_*(r+d_0(x))^{1-\delta}} \frac{(1+r+d_0(x))^p + d(x,y)^p}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta}} \mathbf{1}_{d(x,y) \leq 1} m(dy) \\
& + \int_{d(x,y) > c_*(r+d_0(x))^{1-\delta}} \frac{(1+r+d_0(x))^q + d(x,y)^q}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta}} \mathbf{1}_{d(x,y) > 1} m(dy) \quad (5.2) \\
& \lesssim \mathbf{1}_{c_* r^{1-\delta} < 1} \left\{ (1+r+d_0(x))^{p-\beta(1-\delta)} + (1+r+d_0(x))^{(p-\beta)(1-\delta)} \right\} \\
& + (1+r+d_0(x))^{q-\beta(1-\delta)} + (1+r+d_0(x))^{(q-\beta)(1-\delta)}.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $r \geq c_*^{-1/(1-\delta)}$, then

$$M_2(r) \lesssim r^{q-\beta(1-\delta)} + r^{(q-\beta)(1-\delta)} \asymp r^{q-\beta(1-\delta)}. \quad (5.3)$$

By the definition of ρ_r , we have $m(K_{\rho_r}(R)) \lesssim R^{\eta/\delta}$ for $R \geq 1$ and so $\mu_r = 0$. Hence Theorem 3.2 and (5.3) yield $\lambda_e \lesssim r^{q-\beta(1-\delta)}$ for any $r \geq c_*^{-1/(1-\delta)}$. Since $q - \beta(1 - \delta) < 0$, we have $\lambda_e = 0$.

- (ii) We next prove that if $p = 2$, then $\lambda_e < \infty$. Assume that $p = 2$. For fixed constants $r > 0$ and $c_* \in (0, 1)$, let

$$\rho_r(x) = \log(r + d_0(x)), \quad x \in E$$

and

$$F_r(x, y) = c_* \{r + (d_0(x) \vee d_0(y))\}, \quad x, y \in E.$$

Then as in (5.1), we have

$$|\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y)| \leq \frac{d(x,y)}{r + (d_0(x) \wedge d_0(y))}, \quad x, y \in E. \quad (5.4)$$

Let us give upper bounds of $M_1(r)$ and $M_2(r)$ in this order. Suppose that $d(x, y) \leq F_r(x, y)$.

(a) Assume that $d_0(x) \leq d_0(y)$. Then

$$d_0(y) \leq d_0(x) + d(x, y) \leq d_0(x) + c_*(r + d_0(y))$$

and so

$$d_0(y) \leq \frac{1}{1 - c_*}(d_0(x) + c_*r).$$

Hence

$$c(x, y) \lesssim (1 + r + d_0(x))^2 \mathbf{1}_{d(x, y) \leq 1} + (1 + r + d_0(x))^q \mathbf{1}_{d(x, y) > 1}, \quad x, y \in E$$

and

$$F_r(x, y) \lesssim r + d_0(x), \quad x, y \in E.$$

By (5.4), we also have

$$|\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y)| \leq \frac{d(x, y)}{r + d_0(x)}, \quad x, y \in E.$$

(b) Assume that $d_0(y) \leq d_0(x)$. Then

$$c(x, y) \leq 2(1 + d_0(x))^2 \mathbf{1}_{d(x, y) \leq 1} + 2(1 + d_0(x))^q \mathbf{1}_{d(x, y) > 1}$$

and $F_r(x, y) = c_*(r + d_0(x))$. The latter yields

$$d_0(y) \geq d_0(x) - d(x, y) \geq d_0(x) - c_*(r + d_0(x)) = (1 - c_*)d_0(x) - c_*r$$

and so

$$r + d_0(y) \geq (1 - c_*)(r + d_0(x)).$$

Hence by (5.4),

$$|\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y)| \leq \frac{d(x, y)}{r + d_0(y)} \leq \frac{1}{1 - c_*} \cdot \frac{d(x, y)}{r + d_0(x)}, \quad x, y \in E.$$

By (a) and (b) above, we get for some $c_{**} > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq F_r(x, y)} (\rho_r(x) - \rho_r(y))^2 J(x, y) m(dy) \\ & \lesssim \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq c_{**}(r + d_0(x))} \frac{d(x, y)^2}{(r + d_0(x))^2} \frac{(1 + r + d_0(x))^2}{d(x, y)^{\eta + \beta}} \mathbf{1}_{d(x, y) \leq 1} m(dy) \\ & + \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq c_{**}(r + d_0(x))} \frac{d(x, y)^2}{(r + d_0(x))^2} \frac{(1 + r + d_0(x))^q}{d(x, y)^{\eta + \beta}} \mathbf{1}_{d(x, y) > 1} m(dy) \\ & \lesssim \left(1 + \frac{1}{r + d_0(x)}\right)^2 + \frac{(1 + r + d_0(x))^q}{(r + d_0(x))^\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last relation follows by the same calculation as in (4.2). Therefore, $M_1(r) \lesssim 1$ for $r \geq 1$. By following the calculation in (5.2) and (5.3), we also see that if $r \geq 1/c_*$, then

$$M_2(r) \lesssim r^{q - \beta}.$$

On the other hand, we see by the definition of ρ_r that $m(K_{\rho_r}(R)) \lesssim e^{\eta R}$ for $R \geq 1$ and so $\mu_r \leq \eta$. Then Theorem 3.2 implies that for any $r \geq 1/c_*$,

$$\lambda_e \lesssim \frac{\eta^2}{2} + r^{q - \beta}.$$

Since $q < \beta$, we obtain $\lambda_e \lesssim \eta^2/2$.

Remark 5.1. We here note the sharpness of Theorem 3.2. Let dx be the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d . For $p \geq 0$ and $q \geq 0$, define

$$c(x, y) = \{(1 + |x|)^p + (1 + |y|)^p\} \mathbf{1}_{|x-y| \leq 1} + \{(1 + |x|)^q + (1 + |y|)^q\} \mathbf{1}_{|x-y| > 1}, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

For $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, let $J(x, y)$ be a positive measurable function on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \text{diag}$ such that

$$J(x, y) \asymp \frac{c(x, y)}{|x - y|^{d+\alpha}}, \quad (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \text{diag}.$$

Assume that $q \in [0, \alpha)$. If we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E}) &= \left\{ u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; dx) \mid \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \text{diag}} (u(x) - u(y))^2 J(x, y) dx dy < \infty \right\}, \\ \mathcal{E}(u, u) &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \text{diag}} (u(x) - u(y))^2 J(x, y) dx dy, \quad u \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E}), \end{aligned}$$

then $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E})$ with respect to the norm $\|u\|_{\mathcal{E}} = (\mathcal{E}(u, u) + \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; dx)}^2)^{1/2}$. Hence, if we let \mathcal{F} be the closure of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}}$, then $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; dx)$.

We know from [28, Theorem 1.1] that $\lambda_e < \infty$ if and only if $p \leq 2$, independently of the value of $q \in [0, \alpha)$. We further see by (i) above that $\lambda_e = 0$ if $0 \leq p < 2$. Let us assume that $p = 2$. According to the calculations in [28, Proposition 2.6 and Lemma 2.8], there exist positive constants R_0 and C_0 such that for any $u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $u = 0$ on $K_0 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |x| \leq R_0\}$,

$$\mathcal{E}(u, u) \geq C_0 \int_{|x| > R_0} u(x)^2 dx. \quad (5.5)$$

On the other hand, by [18, Theorem 3.2, Remark 3.3 (c) and Corollary 4.3], Persson's formula is applicable to $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$:

$$\lambda_e = \sup_{K \subset \mathbb{R}^d: \text{compact}} \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u, u) \mid u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K), \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; dx)} = 1 \right\}.$$

Combining this with (5.5), we have

$$\lambda_e \geq \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u, u) \mid u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K_0), \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; dx)} = 1 \right\} \geq C_0 > 0.$$

Namely, Theorem 3.2 is sharp in regard to the positivity of λ_e .

5.2 Time change

In this subsection, we discuss how the coefficient in the underlying measure affects the upper bound of λ_e . We impose the next conditions on the volume growth and jump kernel.

- There exist positive constants η , C_1 and C_2 such that

$$C_1 r^\eta \leq m(K_x(r)) \leq C_2 r^\eta, \quad x \in E, r > 0.$$

- There exist positive constants C_3 and $\beta \in (0, 2)$ such that

$$J(x, y) \leq \frac{C_3}{d(x, y)^{\eta+\beta}}, \quad x, y \in E \times E \setminus \text{diag}.$$

Let $w(x)$ be a positive Borel measurable function on \mathbb{R}^d such that for some $p > 0$,

$$w(x) \asymp (1 + d_0(x))^p, \quad x \in E.$$

We define a measure μ on E by $\mu(dx) = w(x)^{-1} m(dx)$. Let $(\mathcal{F}_e, \mathcal{E})$ be the extended Dirichlet space of $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E})$ (see [9, p. 41] for definition). Let $(\check{\mathcal{E}}, \check{\mathcal{F}})$ be the time changed Dirichlet form of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on E with respect to the measure μ (see [9, (6.2.4)] for definition). Since μ is of full support, we know that

$$\check{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F}_e \cap L^2(E; \mu), \quad \check{\mathcal{E}}(u, u) = \mathcal{E}(u, u), \quad u \in \check{\mathcal{F}} \quad (5.6)$$

(see [9, (6.2.22)]). In particular, $(\check{\mathcal{E}}, \check{\mathcal{F}})$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(E; \mu)$ with core $\mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$ ([9, Theorem 6.2.1 (iii)]). If we define

$$\check{J}(x, dy) = w(x)J(x, y) m(dy),$$

then

$$J(x, y) m(dy)m(dx) = \check{J}(x, dy)\mu(dx).$$

Moreover, we see by (5.6) that for any $u \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_0(E)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathcal{E}}(u, u) = \mathcal{E}(u, u) &= \iint_{E \times E \setminus \text{diag}} (u(x) - u(y))^2 J(x, y) m(dy)m(dx) \\ &= \iint_{E \times E \setminus \text{diag}} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \check{J}(x, dy)\mu(dx). \end{aligned}$$

(i) Assume first that $p < \beta$. Let $\rho_r(x) = (r + d_0(x))^\delta$ and

$$F_r(x, y) = c\{r + (d_0(x) \vee d_0(y))\}^{1-\delta}, \quad x, y \in E$$

for some $c \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ with $p < \beta(1 - \delta)$. Then as in Subsection 5.1 (i), we have

$$M_1(r) \lesssim r^{p-\beta(1-\delta)}, \quad M_2(r) \lesssim r^{p-\beta(1-\delta)}, \quad r \geq 1.$$

(a) Assume that $p \leq \eta$. Then for all sufficiently large $R > 1$,

$$\mu(K_{\rho_r}(R)) \lesssim \begin{cases} R^{(\eta-p)/\delta} & (p < \eta), \\ \log R & (p = \eta). \end{cases}$$

This yields $\mu_r = 0$ and so $\lambda_e = 0$ by Theorem 3.2.

(b) Assume that $p > \eta$ and so $\mu(E) < \infty$. Since $\eta < \beta$ by assumption, we can show that $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is recurrent by [27, Theorem A.3] (see also references therein for previous results) and by following the calculation in [27, Example A.5]. Hence by [9, Theorem 1.6.3], it follows that $1 \in \mathcal{F}_e$ and $\mathcal{E}(1, 1) = 0$. Since this and (5.6) yield $1 \in \check{\mathcal{F}}$, Theorem 3.6 is applicable to $(\check{\mathcal{E}}, \check{\mathcal{F}})$.

Assume in addition that $C_2 < C_1 p(p - \eta)^{-1}$. Then for all sufficiently large $R > 1$,

$$\mu(K_{\rho_r}(R)^c) \gtrsim R^{-(p-\eta)/\delta}.$$

This implies that $\nu_r = 0$ and thus $\lambda_e = 0$ by Theorem 3.6.

(ii) Assume next that $p = \beta$. Let $\rho_r(x) = \log(r + d_0(x))$ and

$$F_r(x, y) = c\{r + (d_0(x) \vee d_0(y))\}, \quad x, y \in E$$

for some $c \in (0, 1)$. Then as in Subsection 5.1 (ii),

$$M_1(r) \lesssim 1/r^\beta, \quad M_2(r) \lesssim 1, \quad r \geq 1.$$

(a) Assume that $p \leq \eta$. Then for all sufficiently large $R > 1$,

$$\mu(K_{\rho_r}(R)) \lesssim \begin{cases} e^{(\eta-p)R}, & p < \eta, \\ R, & p = \eta. \end{cases}$$

Hence Theorem 3.2 yields $\lambda_e < \infty$ for $p < \eta$, and $\lambda_e = 0$ for $p = \eta$.

(b) Assume that $p > \eta$ and so $\mu(E) < \infty$. By the same argument as in (i)(b), we can apply Theorem 3.6 to $(\check{\mathcal{E}}, \check{\mathcal{F}})$.

Assume in addition that $C_2 < C_1 p(p - \eta)^{-1}$. Then for all sufficiently large $R \geq 1$,

$$\mu(K_{\rho_r}(R)^c) \gtrsim e^{-(p-\eta)R}.$$

Therefore, Theorem 3.6 yields $\lambda_e < \infty$.

We now examine the sharpness of the upper bound of λ_e for time changed Dirichlet forms. In what follows, we assume that $E = \mathbb{R}^d$. Let dx be the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure. We also assume that $m(dx) = dx$ and

$$J(x, y) \asymp |x - y|^{-(d+\alpha)}, \quad (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \text{diag}$$

for some $\alpha \in (0, 2)$. Then $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; dx)$ with $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as a core.

Let $w(x)$ be a positive measurable function on \mathbb{R}^d such that $w(x) \asymp (1 + |x|)^p$ ($x \in \mathbb{R}^d$) for some $p > 0$. We then define the measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d by $\mu(dx) = w(x)^{-1}dx$. Let $(\check{\mathcal{E}}, \check{\mathcal{F}})$ be a time changed Dirichlet form of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ with respect to μ . By [4, 14, 20, 31, 32], we already know necessary and sufficient condition for noncompactness of the Markovian semigroups associated with $(\check{\mathcal{E}}, \check{\mathcal{F}})$. In particular, these conditions are consistent with those in (i) and (ii) of this section. In what follows, we discuss the positivity of λ_e for $d > \alpha$.

For $\delta > 0$, let $\phi_\delta(x) = (1 + |x|^2)^{-\delta}$ and

$$\mathcal{A}\phi_\delta(x) = \int_{|z|>1} (\phi_\delta(x+z) - \phi_\delta(x))|z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz.$$

For $R > 0$, define $K_0(R) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |x| \leq R\}$. The next proposition states that Theorem 3.2 is sharp in regard to the positivity of λ_e .

Proposition 5.2. (1) *Let $\delta > 0$ and $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then*

$$\iint_{|z|>1} |\phi_\delta(x+z) - \phi_\delta(x)||g(x+z) - g(x)||z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz dx < \infty$$

and

$$\iint_{|z|>1} (\phi_\delta(x+z) - \phi_\delta(x))(g(x+z) - g(x))|z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz dx = -2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{A}\phi_\delta(x)g(x) dx.$$

(2) Suppose that $d > \alpha$ and $p = \alpha$. Then there exist positive constants C and R_0 such that for any $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K_0(R_0))$,

$$\iint_{|z|>1} (g(x+z) - g(x))^2 |z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz dx \geq C \int_{|x|>R_0} g(x)^2 \mu(dx).$$

(3) Suppose that $d > \alpha$ and $p = \alpha$. Let λ_e be the bottom of the essential spectrum of the nonpositive self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mu)$ associated with $(\check{\mathcal{E}}, \check{\mathcal{F}})$ as in (3.1). Then $0 < \lambda_e < \infty$.

Proof. We first prove (1). Let $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and let ω_d be a surface area of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{|z|>1} |\phi_\delta(x+z) - \phi_\delta(x)| |g(x)| |z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz dx \\ & \leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g(x)| dx \int_{|z|>1} |z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz = \frac{d\omega_d}{\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g(x)| dx < \infty \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{|z|>1} |\phi_\delta(x+z) - \phi_\delta(x)| |g(x+z)| |z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz dx \\ & \leq 2 \int_{|z|>1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g(x+z)| dx \right) |z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g(x)| dx \int_{|z|>1} |z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

We thus arrive at the first assertion.

By the first assertion, we have

$$- \iint_{|z|>1} (\phi_\delta(x+z) - \phi_\delta(x)) g(x) |z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{A}\phi_\delta(x) g(x) dx.$$

By the translation invariance of the Lebesgue measure and the symmetry of the function $|z|^{-(d+\alpha)}$, we also obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{|z|>1} (\phi_\delta(x+z) - \phi_\delta(x)) g(x+z) |z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz dx \\ & = \iint_{|z|>1} (\phi_\delta(x) - \phi_\delta(x-z)) g(x) |z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz dx \\ & = \iint_{|z|>1} (\phi_\delta(x) - \phi_\delta(x+z)) g(x) |z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{A}\phi_\delta(x) g(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we get the second assertion.

We next prove (2). It follows by [27, Proposition 3.11] that if $d > \alpha$, then there exist positive constants δ_0 , C_0 and R_0 such that

$$\frac{-\mathcal{A}\phi_{\delta_0}}{\phi_{\delta_0}}(x) \geq \frac{C_0}{(1+|x|)^\alpha}, \quad |x| > R_0.$$

Then by (1) and the proof of [28, Lemma 2.8], we have for any $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K_0(R_0))$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{|z|>1} (g(x+z) - g(x))^2 |z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz dx \geq 2 \int_{|x|>R_0} \frac{-\mathcal{A}\phi_{\delta_0}}{\phi_{\delta_0}}(x) g(x)^2 dx \\ & \geq 2C_0 \int_{|x|>R_0} g(x)^2 \frac{1}{(1+|x|)^\alpha} dx \geq c_1 \int_{|x|>R_0} g(x)^2 \mu(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the proof of (2) is complete.

We finally prove (3). Let $\{\check{p}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be the Markovian semigroup on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mu)$ associated with $(\check{\mathcal{E}}, \check{\mathcal{F}})$. Since $\{\check{p}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is ultracontractive by [20, Lemma 4.9], we obtain by [18, Remark 2.2 (c), Theorem 3.2 and Remark 3.3 (c)] together with (5.6),

$$\lambda_e = \sup_{K \subset \mathbb{R}^d: \text{compact}} \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u, u) \mid u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K), \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mu)} = 1 \right\}. \quad (5.7)$$

On the other hand, we see by (2) that there exist positive constants c_2, c_3 and R_0 such that for any $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K_0(R_0))$,

$$\mathcal{E}(g, g) \geq c_2 \iint_{|z| > 1} (g(x+z) - g(x))^2 |z|^{-(d+\alpha)} dz dx \geq c_3 \int_{|x| > R_0} g(x)^2 \mu(dx).$$

Combining this with (5.7), we have

$$\lambda_e \geq \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}(u, u) \mid u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K_0(R_0)), \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mu)} = 1 \right\} \geq c_3 > 0.$$

Since $\lambda_e < \infty$ by (ii) (a) in this section, we complete the proof of (3). \square

Remark 5.3. When $\alpha > d = 1$ and $p = \alpha$, it is unclear if Persson's formula ([1, Theorem 5.5], [18, Theorem 3.2]) is applicable to $(\check{\mathcal{E}}, \check{\mathcal{F}})$ at this moment. In particular, we do not know the positivity of λ_e .

6 Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type operators

In this section, we discuss the bottom of the spectrum of a non-local operator which is related to the fractional Laplacian with the drift of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type (see, e.g., the introduction of [30] and references therein for details on this operator).

Let E be a locally compact separable metric space, and let m be a positive Radon measure on E with full support. Recall that $K_x(r) = \{y \in E \mid d(x, y) \leq r\}$ for $x \in E$ and $r > 0$. We assume that $K_x(r)$ is compact for any $x \in E$ and $r > 0$. We also assume that for some positive constants C_1, C_2 and η ,

$$C_1 r^\eta \leq m(K_x(r)) \leq C_2 r^\eta, \quad x \in E, r > 0. \quad (6.1)$$

Let $J(x, y)$ be a positive measurable function on $E \times E$ such that for some positive constants C_3 and $\beta \in (0, 2)$,

$$J(x, y) \leq \frac{C_3}{d(x, y)^{\eta+\beta}}, \quad (x, y) \in E \times E \setminus \text{diag}. \quad (6.2)$$

Let $V(r)$ be a positive increasing function on $[0, \infty)$, and let $\mu_V(dx) = e^{-V(d_0(x))} m(dx)$. We define the quadratic form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E}))$ on $L^2(E; \mu_V)$ by

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E}) = \left\{ u \in L^2(E; \mu_V) \mid \iint_{E \times E \setminus \text{diag}} (u(x) - u(y))^2 J(x, y) m(dy) \mu_V(dx) < \infty \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{E}(u, u) = \iint_{E \times E \setminus \text{diag}} (u(x) - u(y))^2 J(x, y) m(dy) \mu_V(dx), \quad u \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E}).$$

For $u \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E})$, let

$$\mathcal{E}_1(u, u) = \mathcal{E}(u, u) + \|u\|_{L^2(E; m)}^2, \quad \|u\|_{\mathcal{E}} = \sqrt{\mathcal{E}_1(u, u)}.$$

Then $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E})$ is a Banach space with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}}$. We also note that, if $C_0^{\text{lip}}(E)$ denotes the totality of Lipschitz continuous functions on E with compact support, then $C_0^{\text{lip}}(E) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E})$. Hence if \mathcal{F} is the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}}$ -closure of $C_0^{\text{lip}}(E)$, then $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(E; m)$.

For some $o \in E$, let $d_0(x) = d(o, x)$ ($x \in E$). Let $C_b^{\text{lip}}(E)$ be the totality of bounded Lipschitz continuous functions on E . To apply Theorem 3.6 for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, we prove

Lemma 6.1. (i) *The function d_0 belongs to \mathcal{F}_{loc} .*

(ii) *Suppose that $\mu_V(E) < \infty$. Then $C_b^{\text{lip}}(E) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E})$, and \mathcal{F} coincides with the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}}$ -closure of $C_b^{\text{lip}}(E)$. In particular, $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is recurrent.*

Proof. We first prove (i). For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$w_n(t) = \begin{cases} t, & t \leq n, \\ n+1-t, & n < t \leq n+1, \\ 0, & t > n+1. \end{cases}$$

Then there exists a positive constant L such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|w_n(t) - w_n(s)| \leq L|t - s|, \quad s, t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Let $\varphi_n(x) = w_n(d_0(x))$ ($x \in E$). Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x, y \in E$,

$$|\varphi_n(x) - \varphi_n(y)| = |w_n(d_0(x)) - w_n(d_0(y))| \leq L|d_0(x) - d_0(y)| \leq Ld(x, y), \quad (6.3)$$

which yields $\varphi_n \in C_0^{\text{lip}}(E)$. Since $d_0(x) = \varphi_n(x)$ for any $x \in E$ with $d_0(x) \leq n$, we have (i).

We next prove the first assertion of (ii). Assume that $\mu_V(E) < \infty$. Then for $u \in C_b^{\text{lip}}(E)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{E \times E \setminus \text{diag}} (u(x) - u(y))^2 J(x, y) m(dy) \mu_V(dx) \\ &= \iint_{0 < d(x, y) \leq 1} (u(x) - u(y))^2 J(x, y) m(dy) \mu_V(dx) \\ &+ \iint_{d(x, y) > 1} (u(x) - u(y))^2 J(x, y) m(dy) \mu_V(dx) \\ &\leq c_1 \left(\iint_{0 < d(x, y) \leq 1} d(x, y)^2 J(x, y) m(dy) \mu_V(dx) + \iint_{d(x, y) > 1} J(x, y) m(dy) \mu_V(dx) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (6.2) and the same calculation as (4.2) and (4.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{0 < d(x, y) \leq 1} d(x, y)^2 J(x, y) m(dy) \mu_V(dx) &\leq C_3 \int_E \left(\int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq 1} \frac{d(x, y)^2}{d(x, y)^{\eta+\beta}} m(dy) \right) \mu_V(dx) \\ &\leq c_2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\iint_{d(x, y) > 1} J(x, y) m(dy) \mu_V(dx) \leq C_3 \int_E \left(\int_{d(x, y) > 1} \frac{1}{d(x, y)^{\eta+\beta}} m(dy) \right) \mu_V(dx) \leq c_3.$$

We thus have $u \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E})$ and so $C_b^{\text{lip}}(E) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E})$.

We finally prove the second assertion of (ii). In order to do so, it is sufficient to show that $C_b^{\text{lip}}(E) \subset \mathcal{F}$. Let $u \in C_b^{\text{lip}}(E)$. Then $u\varphi_n \in C_0^{\text{lip}}(E)$. In particular, if we let $\psi_n(x) = 1 - \varphi_n(x)$ ($x \in E$), then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1(u - u\varphi_n, u - u\varphi_n) &= \mathcal{E}_1(u\psi_n, u\psi_n) \\ &= \iint_{E \times E \setminus \text{diag}} (u(x)\psi_n(x) - u(y)\psi_n(y))^2 J(x, y) m(dy) \mu_V(dx) + \int_E u(x)^2 \psi_n(x)^2 \mu_V(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Since (6.3) holds and u is bounded and Lipschitz continuous, there exists $M > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x, y \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned} (u(x)\psi_n(x) - u(y)\psi_n(y))^2 &= \{u(x)(\psi_n(x) - \psi_n(y)) + \psi_n(y)(u(x) - u(y))\}^2 \\ &\leq M(1 \wedge d(x, y)^2). \end{aligned}$$

By noting that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_n(x) = 0$ for any $x \in E$ and

$$\iint_{E \times E \setminus \text{diag}} (1 \wedge d(x, y)^2) J(x, y) m(dy) \mu_V(dx) < \infty,$$

the dominated convergent theorem yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_1(u - u\varphi_n, u - u\varphi_n) = 0$$

and so $u \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence the proof is complete. \square

Let us discuss the upper bound of λ_e for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ under the condition that $\mu_V(E) < \infty$. Note that $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is recurrent by Lemma 6.1, and so Theorem 3.6 is applicable to $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Define

$$J(x, dy) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + e^{V(d_0(x)) - V(d_0(y))})J(x, y) m(dy), \quad J(dx, dy) = J(x, dy)\mu_V(dx).$$

Then $J(A \times B) = J(B \times A)$ for any $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(E)$, and for any $u \in C_b^{\text{lip}}(E)$,

$$\mathcal{E}(u, u) = \frac{1}{2} \iint_{E \times E} (u(x) - u(y))^2 (1 + e^{V(d_0(x)) - V(d_0(y))}) J(x, y) m(dy) \mu_V(dx).$$

In what follows, we assume that for some positive constants δ and C_2 ,

$$\frac{e^{V(r)}}{e^{V(s)}} \leq C_2 \left(\frac{r}{s}\right)^\delta, \quad 0 < s < r < \infty. \quad (6.4)$$

We take $\rho_r(x) = d_0(x)$ and $F_r(x, y) = r$ for $r > 0$. We first give an upper bound of $M_1(r)$. By assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq r} d(x, y)^2 J(x, dy) &\lesssim \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq r} d(x, y)^{2 - (\eta + \beta)} (1 + e^{V(d_0(x)) - V(d_0(y))}) m(dy) \\ &\asymp r^{2 - \beta} + \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq r} d(x, y)^{2 - (\eta + \beta)} e^{V(d_0(x)) - V(d_0(y))} m(dy). \end{aligned}$$

Since the function $V(r)$ is increasing, we have by (6.4),

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq r, d_0(y) > d_0(x)/2} d(x, y)^{2 - (\eta + \beta)} e^{V(d_0(x)) - V(d_0(y))} m(dy) \\ &\leq e^{V(d_0(x)) - V(d_0(x)/2)} \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq r, d_0(y) > d_0(x)/2} d(x, y)^{2 - (\eta + \beta)} m(dy) \\ &\lesssim \int_{0 < d(x, y) \leq r} d(x, y)^{2 - (\eta + \beta)} m(dy) \asymp r^{2 - \beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

On the other hand, if $0 < d(x, y) \leq r$ and $d_0(y) \leq d_0(x)/2$, then

$$r \geq d(x, y) \geq d_0(x) - d_0(y) \geq \frac{d_0(x)}{2}$$

and so $d_0(x) \leq 2r$. Therefore, by (6.4),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{0 < d(x,y) \leq r, d_0(y) \leq d_0(x)/2} d(x,y)^{2-(\eta+\beta)} e^{V(d_0(x))-V(d_0(y))} m(dy) \\ & \leq e^{V(2r)} \int_{0 < d(x,y) \leq r} d(x,y)^{2-(\eta+\beta)} m(dy) \asymp r^{2-\beta} e^{V(r)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (6.5), we get

$$M_1(r) \lesssim r^{2-\beta} e^{V(r)}. \quad (6.6)$$

We next give an upper bound of $M_2(r)$. By assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{d(x,y) > r} J(x, dy) & \lesssim \int_{d(x,y) > r} \frac{1}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta}} (1 + e^{V(d_0(x))-V(d_0(y))}) m(dy) \\ & \asymp r^{-\beta} + \int_{d(x,y) > r} \frac{1}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta}} e^{V(d_0(x))-V(d_0(y))} m(dy). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\int_{d(x,y) > r} \frac{1}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta}} e^{-V(d_0(y))} m(dy) \lesssim r^{-(\eta+\beta)}, \quad (6.7)$$

there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that for any $x \in E$ with $d_0(x) \leq r$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{d(x,y) > r, d_0(y) \leq d_0(x)/2} \frac{1}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta}} e^{V(d_0(x))-V(d_0(y))} m(dy) & \leq e^{V(r)} \int_{d(x,y) > r} \frac{1}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta}} e^{-V(d_0(y))} m(dy) \\ & \leq c_1 r^{-(\eta+\beta)} e^{V(r)}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that, if $d_0(y) \leq d_0(x)/2$, then $d(x,y) \geq d_0(x)/2$ by the triangle inequality. Hence by (6.7), there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that for any $x \in E$ with $d_0(x) > r$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{d(x,y) > r, d_0(y) \leq d_0(x)/2} \frac{1}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta}} e^{V(d_0(x))-V(d_0(y))} m(dy) \\ & \leq e^{V(d_0(x))} \int_{d(x,y) \geq d_0(x)/2} \frac{1}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta}} e^{-V(d_0(y))} m(dy) \leq c_2 d_0(x)^{-(\eta+\beta)} e^{V(d_0(x))}. \end{aligned}$$

By (6.4), we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{d(x,y) > r, d_0(y) > d_0(x)/2} \frac{1}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta}} e^{V(d_0(x))-V(d_0(y))} m(dy) & \leq \frac{e^{V(d_0(x))}}{e^{V(d_0(x)/2)}} \int_{d(x,y) > r} \frac{1}{d(x,y)^{\eta+\beta}} m(dy) \\ & \lesssim r^{-\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the argument above yields for $r \geq 1$,

$$M_2(r) \lesssim r^{-\beta} + \sup_{s \geq r} (s^{-(\eta+\beta)} e^{V(s)}). \quad (6.8)$$

By Theorem 3.6 together with (6.6) and (6.8), we have

$$\lambda_e \lesssim \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} (\nu_r r^{2-\beta} e^{V(r)} + r^{-(\eta+\beta)} e^{V(r)}).$$

We assume in addition that $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{-(\eta+\beta)} e^{V(r)} < \infty$ and $C_2 < C_1(\eta + \beta)\beta^{-1}$. Then for all sufficiently large $R > 1$,

$$\mu_V(K_o(R)^c) = \int_{K_o(R)^c} e^{-V(d_0(x))} m(dx) \gtrsim \int_{K_o(R)^c} d_0(x)^{-(\eta+\beta)} m(dx) \asymp R^{-\beta}.$$

This yields $\nu_r = 0$ and so

$$\lambda_e \lesssim \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} (r^{-(\eta+\beta)} e^{V(r)}). \quad (6.9)$$

In particular, if $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{-(\eta+\beta)} e^{V(r)} = 0$, then $\lambda_e = 0$.

Remark 6.2. Assume that $E = \mathbb{R}^d$. If m is the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure, and if $J(x, y) \asymp |x - y|^{-(d+\alpha)}$ ($(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \text{diag}$) for some $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, then (6.1) and (6.2) are satisfied with $\eta = d$ and $\beta = \alpha$. Under this setting, we see by [30, Corollaries 1.2 and 1.3] that if $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{-(d+\beta)} e^{V(r)} = \infty$, then $\lambda_e = \infty$. Hence (6.9) provides an effective upper bound for the bottom of the essential spectrum for $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Professor Masayoshi Takeda and Professor Toshihiro Uemura for their valuable discussion on the topic in this paper. He is grateful to Professor Tao Wang for sending him the reference [14].

References

- [1] A. BenAmor, B. Güneysu and P. Stollmann, Essential spectrum and Feller type properties, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* **95** (2023), Paper No. 12, 20 pp.
- [2] R. Brooks, A relation between growth and the spectrum of the Laplacian, *Math. Z.* **178** (1981), 501–508.
- [3] R. Brooks, On the spectrum of noncompact manifolds with finite volume, *Math. Z.* **187** (1984), 425–432.
- [4] Z.-Q. Chen and J. Wang, Ergodicity for time-changed symmetric stable processes, *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **124** (2014), 2799–2823.
- [5] E. B. Davies, *Heat Kernels and Spectral Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- [6] M. Folz, Volume growth and spectrum for general graph Laplacians, *Math. Z.* **276** (2014), 115–131.
- [7] M. Folz, Volume growth and stochastic completeness of graphs, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **366** (2014), 2089–2119.
- [8] R. L. Frank, D. Lenz and D. Wingert, Intrinsic metrics for non-local symmetric Dirichlet forms and applications to spectral theory, *J. Funct. Anal.* **266** (2014), 4765–4808.
- [9] M. Fukushima, Y. Oshima and M. Takeda, *Dirichlet Forms and Symmetric Markov Processes*, Second revised and extended edition, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2011.
- [10] A. Grigor’yan, Analytic and geometric background of recurrence and non-explosion of the Brownian motion on Riemannian manifolds, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **36** (1999), 135–249.
- [11] A. Grigor’yan, X. Huang and J. Masamune, On stochastic completeness of jump processes, *Math. Z.* **271** (2012), 1211–1239.
- [12] S. Haeseler, M. Keller and R. K. Wojciechowski, Volume growth and bounds for the essential spectrum for Dirichlet forms, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **88** (2013), 883–898.
- [13] Y. Higuchi, A remark on exponential growth and the spectrum of the Laplacian, *Kodai Math. J.* **24** (2001), 42–47.

- [14] L.-J. Huang and T. Wang, Symmetry and functional inequalities for stable Lévy-type operators, *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **183** (2025), Paper No. 104600.
- [15] X. Huang, M. Keller and M. Schmidt, On the uniqueness class, stochastic completeness and volume growth for graphs, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **373** (2020), 8861–8884.
- [16] M. Keller, D. Lenz and R. K. Wojciechowski, *Graphs and Discrete Dirichlet Spaces*, Cham, Springer, 2021.
- [17] H. Kumura, Infimum of the exponential volume growth and the bottom of the essential spectrum of the Laplacian, preprint, arXiv:0707.0185v3.
- [18] D. Lenz and P. Stollmann, On the decomposition principle and a Persson type theorem for general regular Dirichlet forms, *J. Spectr. Theory* **9** (2019), 1089–1113.
- [19] J. Masamune, T. Uemura, and J. Wang, On the conservativeness and the recurrence of symmetric jump-diffusions, *J. Funct. Anal.* **263** (2012), 3984–4008.
- [20] K. Matsuura, Compactness of semigroups of explosive symmetric Markov processes, *Kyoto J. Math.* **61** (2021), 97–113.
- [21] L. Notarantonio, Growth and spectrum of diffusions, preprint, arXiv:math/9806002.
- [22] H. Ôkura, Recurrence and transience criteria for subordinated symmetric Markov processes, *Forum Math.* **14** (2002), 121–146.
- [23] A. Rocha, Essential spectrum of the weighted Laplacian on noncompact manifolds and applications, *Geom. Dedicata* **186** (2017), 197–219.
- [24] M. Ryznar and T. Żak, Exit time of a hyperbolic α -stable process from a halfspace or a ball, *Potential Anal.* **45** (2016), 83–107.
- [25] Y. Shiozawa, Conservation property of symmetric jump-diffusion processes, *Forum Math.* **27** (2015), 519–548.
- [26] Y. Shiozawa, Escape rate of symmetric jump-diffusion processes, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **368** (2016), 7645–7680.
- [27] Y. Shiozawa, Transience of symmetric nonlocal Dirichlet forms, *Math. Nachr.* **296** (2023), 2121–2149.
- [28] Y. Shiozawa and J. Wang, Compactness of semigroups generated by symmetric non-local Dirichlet forms with unbounded coefficients, *Potential Anal.* **58** (2023), 373–392.
- [29] K. T. Sturm, Analysis on local Dirichlet spaces I. Recurrence, conservativeness and L^p -Liouville properties, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **456** (1994), 173–196.
- [30] F.-Y. Wang and J. Wang, Functional inequalities for stable-like Dirichlet forms, *J. Theoret. Probab.* **28** (2015), 423–448.
- [31] J. Wang, Compactness and density estimates for weighted fractional heat semigroups, *J. Theoret. Probab.* **32** (2019), 2066–2087.
- [32] J. Wang and L. Zhang, Functional inequalities for time-changed symmetric α -stable processes, *Front. Math. China* **16** (2021), 595–622.