

AN ALTERNATIVE TO PLEMELJ-SMITHIES FORMULAS ON INFINITE DETERMINANTS

Domingos H. U. Marchetti

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario L8S 4K1, Canada

ABSTRACT: An alternative to Plemelj - Smithies formulas for the p -regularized quantities $d^{(p)}(K)$ and $D^{(p)}(K)$ is presented which generalizes previous expressions with $p = 1$ due to Grothendieck and Fredholm. It is also presented global upper bounds for these quantities. In particular we prove that

$$|d^{(p)}(K)| \leq e^{\kappa \|K\|_p^p}$$

holds with $\kappa = \kappa(p) \leq \kappa(\infty) = \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{4(1+e^{2\pi})}\right\}$ for $p \geq 3$ which improves previous estimate yielding $\kappa(p) = e(2 + \ln(p - 1))$.

to appear in J. Funct. Analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

The Fredholm Theory^[1], as addressed in this paper, is concerned with the problem of solving the equation

$$(1 + \mu K)f = f_0 \quad (1.1)$$

in a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with K belonging to the trace - class of operators on \mathcal{H} or, more generally^[2,3,4,5], K is considered to be a compact operator of the class $\mathcal{C}_p = \{A : \|A\|_p^p \equiv \text{Tr}(|A|^p) < \infty\}$. Fredholm theory has been mainly applied in Scattering Theory but (1.1) also appears in a variety of problems in Many Body Theory and Quantum Field Theory (see Simon^[6,7] for a review and applications).

The basic result of the Fredholm Theory is to write the resolvent $R(K; \mu) \equiv (1 + \mu K)^{-1}$ of the operator K as a quotient

$$R(K; \mu) = \frac{D^{(p)}(K; \mu)}{d^{(p)}(K; \mu)}, \quad p = 1, 2, \dots \quad (1.2)$$

of entire functions of μ . Therefore, (1.1) has a unique solution for any operator of the class \mathcal{C}_p , given by

$$f = R(K; \mu) f_0 \quad (1.3)$$

provided $-1/\mu$ is not an eigenvalue of K .

$d^{(p)}$ and $D^{(p)}$ can be explicitly written in terms of their power series

$$d^{(p)}(K; \mu) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{\mu^n}{n!} d_n^{(p)}(K) \quad (1.4)$$

$$D^{(p)}(K; \mu) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{\mu^n}{n!} D_n^{(p)}(K) \quad (1.5)$$

where $d_n^{(p)}$ are complex valued and $D_n^{(p)}$ are operator valued coefficients given by the Plemelj^[3] - Smithies^[4] formulas

$$d_n^{(p)}(K) = \begin{vmatrix} \sigma_1 & n-1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \sigma_2 & \sigma_1 & n-2 & \dots & 0 \\ \sigma_3 & \sigma_2 & \sigma_1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sigma_n & \sigma_{n-1} & \sigma_{n-2} & \dots & \sigma_1 \end{vmatrix} \quad (1.6)$$

and

$$D_n^{(p)}(K) = \begin{vmatrix} K^0 & n & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ K^1 & \sigma_1 & n-1 & \dots & 0 \\ K^2 & \sigma_2 & \sigma_1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ K^n & \sigma_n & \sigma_{n-1} & \dots & \sigma_1 \end{vmatrix} \quad (1.7)$$

with $K^0 \equiv I$ and

$$\sigma_j = \sigma_j(p) = \begin{cases} \text{Tr}(K^j) & \text{if } j \geq p \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

Expression (1.5) is to be interpreted in the sense that $(\phi, D_n^{(p)}(K)\psi)$ is the determinant of the matrix (1.7) with the operator K^i replaced by $(\varphi, K^i \psi)$, for $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}$.

The function $d^{(p)}$ is called the p -regularized determinant and we write here Poincaré's definition^[2]

$$d^{(p)}(K; \mu) = \det_p(1 + \mu K) \equiv \exp \left\{ \sum_{j=p}^{\infty} (-1)^{j+1} \frac{\mu^j}{j} \text{Tr}(K^j) \right\} \quad (1.9)$$

Although definition (1.9) seems to require $\mu \|K\|_p < 1$ (see Simon^[6] for other definition), it can be used to derive (1.6) for μ sufficiently small and by Hadamard's inequality^[4], or by a limite procedure^[5], one can prove analyticity of (1.4) for all $\mu \in \mathbf{C}$.

In this note (1.9) is used to derive an alternative formula for $d^{(p)}$ and $D^{(p)}$, with $p = 1, 2, \dots$, which generalize the algebraic formula for the determinant $d^{(1)}$ due to Grothendieck^[9]. We then discuss the analytic properties of these series.

Grothendieck's formula is given by the power series (1.4) where the n -th coefficient

$$d_n^{(1)} = n! \text{Tr}(\wedge^n K) \equiv \mathcal{T}_n(\wedge^n K) \quad (1.10)$$

is a trace of a n -fold antisymmetric tensor product of operators on \mathcal{H} and, as recognized by Simon^[6], it has the following advantage: once one uses the simple bound

$$|\mathcal{T}_n(\wedge^n A)| \leq \|A\|_1^n \quad (1.11)$$

the analytic properties of $d^{(1)}$ are established avoiding to use Hadamard's inequality. It is also worth of mention that (1.10) reduces to the definition of Fredholm^[1] if K is an integral operator with continuous kernel.

We shall state our results.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $K \in \mathcal{C}_p$. Then the power series (1.4) and (1.5) converge for all $\mu \in \mathbf{C}$ and their coefficients can be written as*

$$d_n^{(p)} = \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_n} \left[\prod_{i=1}^s C_{|P_i|}^{(p)} \right] \mathcal{T}_s(K^{|P_1|} \wedge \dots \wedge K^{|P_s|}) \quad (1.12)$$

$$D_n^{(p)} = \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1}} (-1)^{|P_1|-1} |P_1|! \left[\prod_{i=2}^s C_{|P_i|}^{(p)} \right] K^{|P_1|-1} \mathcal{T}_{s-1}(K^{|P_2|} \wedge \dots \wedge K^{|P_s|}) \quad (1.13)$$

where \mathcal{P}_n is the collection of partitions $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_s)$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and

$$C_k^{(p)} = \left[\left(\frac{d}{d\lambda} + \xi_p \right)^k (1 + \lambda) \right]_{\lambda=0} \quad (1.14)$$

with $\xi_p = \xi_p(\lambda)$ such that $\xi_1 = 0$ and for $p \geq 2$

$$\xi_p = \sum_{j=0}^{p-2} (-1)^{j+1} \lambda^j \quad (1.15)$$

Remark 1.2. One can check from (1.14) that

$$C_k^{(p)} = 0 \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, p-1. \quad (1.16)$$

Therefore (1.12) and (1.13) are well defined expressions since

$$|\mathcal{T}_s(K^{n_1} \wedge \dots \wedge K^{n_s})| \leq \prod_i \|K\|_{n_i}^{n_i} \quad (1.17)$$

is finite provided $n_1, \dots, n_s \geq p$. So, the effect of (1.16) in (1.12) is analogous to that of (1.8) in the Plemelj - Smithies formula of $d_n^{(p)}$ (recall that $|\sigma_q(p)|^{1/q} \leq \|K\|_q \leq \|K\|_p$ for any $q \geq p$).

Remark 1.3. Analyticity of (1.4) and (1.5) can be established by estimating (1.12) and (1.13). If the following crude bound for (1.14)

$$|C_k^{(p)}| \leq 2 p^{k-1} \left(\frac{p-2}{p-1} k \right)! \quad (1.18)$$

is used one can show convergence of these series for all $\mu \in \mathbf{C}$. In (1.18) $2p^{k-1}$ accounts for the number of terms after expanding (1.14) and we then take the worse of these. It is not difficult to provide an upper bound on $C_k^{(p)}$ which replaces $2p^{k-1}$ in (1.18) by a p independent constant c .

A different expression for (1.9) is needed in order to obtain further analytic properties. By Lidskii's theorem^[13,6] (1.9) can be written as

$$d^{(p)}(K; \mu) = \prod_{i \in I} E(-\mu \gamma_i; p-1) \quad (1.19)$$

where $E(z; q)$ is the Weierstrass primary factor defined by

$$E(z; 0) = 1 - z \quad (1.20)$$

and

$$E(z; q) = (1 - z) \exp\left\{\sum_{j=1}^q \frac{z^j}{j}\right\} \quad (1.21)$$

for $q > 0$. Here $\{\gamma_i\}_{i \in I}$ is the collection of all eigenvalues of K , counted up to algebraic multiplicity.

By an improved estimate on the Weierstrass factor E (Lemma 3.1.) which sharpens previous bound on its type^[12], we are led to the following result:

Theorem 1.4. *Given $p \geq 1$, let $K \in \mathcal{C}_p$. The following inequalities hold*

$$|d^{(p)}(K; 1)| \leq e^{\kappa \|K\|_p^p} \quad (1.22)$$

and

$$\|D^{(p)}(K; 1)\|_\infty \leq 2 e^{\kappa(1+\|K\|_p)^p} \quad (1.23)$$

with $\kappa = \kappa(p)$ such that $\kappa(1) = 1$, $\kappa(2) = \frac{1}{2}$ and for $p \geq 3$

$$\kappa = \frac{p-1}{p} \exp\left\{-\frac{p-2}{4p} \left[1 + \left(1 + 2\left(1 + \operatorname{cosec} \frac{\pi}{p}\right)^{-1}\right)^{p-1}\right]^{-1}\right\}. \quad (1.24)$$

Remark 1.5. *The proof of Theorem 1.4 is straightforward for $p = 1$; Smithies^[4] established the result for $p = 2$ and for $p = 4$ Brascamp^[5] obtained $\kappa = \frac{3}{4}$. Our proof of theorem 1.4 extends for arbitrary p the proof of ref. [5]. Notice that $\kappa(p) \leq \kappa(\infty) = e^{\frac{-1}{4(1+e^{2\pi})}}$ is in contrast with the previous estimate^[12,6] resulting in $\kappa(p) = e(2 + \ln(p-1))$.*

Theorem 1.1 and theorem 1.4 will be proved in section 3. Theorem 1.1 is based on an explicit algebraic computation of the n -th derivative of $d^{(p)}$ (Lemma 2.3 of section 2). The expression derived in lemma 2.3 is important for organizing terms in the cluster expansion of fermionic Quantum Field Theories^[10]. Applications on this field will appear elsewhere^[11]. In section 4 it is presented a simple derivation of Fredholm's formula and its generalization.

2. THE BASIC LEMMA

We begin with a brief review on the antisymmetric tensor product. We use the notation and some results of ref. [10].

Let $\otimes^n \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}$ be the n -fold tensor product of a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and let $\wedge^n \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathcal{H}$ denote its antisymmetric subspace. A "simple" vector $\Phi \in \wedge^n \mathcal{H}$ is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &= \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi} (-1)^{|\pi|} \varphi_{\pi(1)} \otimes \varphi_{\pi(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \varphi_{\pi(n)} \\ &\equiv \Pi(\varphi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \varphi_n) \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

for some $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \mathcal{H}$. Here we sum over all permutations $\pi = (\pi(1), \dots, \pi(n))$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $|\pi|$ counts the number of permutations required to return to the original order. Π stands for the projection of $\otimes^n \mathcal{H}$ into $\wedge^n \mathcal{H}$. We write $\Phi = \varphi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_n$.

If $\{\varphi_i\}$ is an orthonormal basis for \mathcal{H} then $\{\varphi_{i_1} \wedge \varphi_{i_2} \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_{i_r}\}$ with $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_r$ is an orthonormal basis for $\wedge^r \mathcal{H}$, $r = 1, 2, \dots$. From this (1.11) and its generalization (1.17) can be proved.

If $\Phi, \Psi \in \wedge^n \mathcal{H}$ are "simple" vectors, their scalar product is given by the determinant of a $n \times n$ matrix

$$(\Phi, \Psi) = \frac{1}{n!} \det\{(\phi_i, \psi_j)\} \quad (2.2)$$

whose elements are scalar products in \mathcal{H} .

Given K_1, \dots, K_n bounded operators on \mathcal{H} and $\Phi \in \wedge^n \mathcal{H}$ we define

$$(K_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge K_n)\Phi = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi} K_{\pi(1)} \varphi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge K_{\pi(n)} \varphi_n \quad (2.3)$$

i.e. $K_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge K_n = \Pi(K_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes K_n)\Pi$. We write $\wedge^n K = K \wedge \cdots \wedge K$.

If K and L are operators on $\wedge^n \mathcal{H}$ and $\wedge^m \mathcal{H}$, respectively, then $K \wedge L = \Pi(K \otimes L)\Pi$ is an operator in $\wedge^{n+m} \mathcal{H}$. Moreover the product \wedge is commutative, associative and distributive with respect to addition.

Given a bounded operator K on \mathcal{H} , we define its derivation $d(\wedge^n K)$ on $\wedge^n \mathcal{H}$ by

$$d(\wedge^n K) = n(K \wedge I \wedge \cdots \wedge I) \quad (2.4)$$

Lemma 2.1. *Let K_1, \dots, K_n and L be bounded operators on \mathcal{H} . Then*

$$\wedge^n L \cdot K_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge K_n = LK_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge LK_n \quad (2.5)$$

$$d \wedge^n L \cdot K_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge K_n = \sum_{i=1}^n K_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge LK_i \wedge \cdots \wedge K_n \quad (2.6)$$

proof: Appendix of [10].

Lemma 2.2^[10]. *Let A_1, \dots, A_{k+1} be trace class operators on \mathcal{H} . Then*

$$\mathcal{T}_{k+1}(A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_{k+1}) = \mathcal{T}_1(A_{k+1})\mathcal{T}_k(A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_k) - \mathcal{T}_k(d \wedge^k A_{k+1} \cdot A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_k) \quad (2.7)$$

proof: We notice that (1.10) implies

$$\left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k+1} \frac{d}{d\lambda_i} \right) \det(1 + A(\lambda)) \right]_{\lambda=0} = \mathcal{T}_{k+1}(A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_{k+1}) \quad (2.8)$$

where $A(\lambda) = \lambda_1 A_1 + \dots + \lambda_{k+1} A_{k+1}$. We write

$$\det(1 + A(\lambda)) = \det(1 + \lambda_{k+1} A_{k+1}) \det(1 + R_{k+1} A(\tilde{\lambda})) \quad (2.9)$$

where $R_{k+1} = R(A_{k+1}; \lambda_{k+1})$ and $\tilde{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)$.

From (2.5), (2.8) and (2.9) we have

$$\left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^k \frac{d}{d\lambda_i} \right) \det(1 + A(\lambda)) \right]_{\tilde{\lambda}=0} = \det(1 + \lambda_{k+1} A_{k+1}) \mathcal{T}_k(\wedge^k R_{k+1} \cdot A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_k) \quad (2.10)$$

We deduce (2.7) by differentiating (2.10) with respect to λ_{k+1} and setting $\lambda_{k+1} = 0$.

We are now ready to state our basic lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $A \in \mathcal{C}_p$ be a multivariable function and let D_1, \dots, D_n be derivatives. Then we have*

$$\left(\prod_{j=1}^n D_j \right) d^{(p)}(A; 1) = \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_n} \mathcal{T}_s(\wedge^s R \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \dots \wedge A_{P_s}) d^{(p)}(A; 1) \quad (2.11)$$

where $R = R(A; 1) = (1 + A)^{-1}$ and for any subset Q of $\{1, \dots, n\}$

$$A_Q = \left(\prod_{j \in Q} (D_j + \xi_p D_j A) \right) (1 + A) \quad (2.12)$$

with $\xi_p = \xi_p(A)$ as in (1.15) with λ replaced by A .

Remark 2.4. *The cancelation leading to (1.16) occurs for (2.12): terms in the expansion of $R A_Q$ are of the form*

$$A^q D_{Q_1} A \dots D_{Q_n} A$$

for a $q \in \mathbf{N}$ and a partition (Q_1, \dots, Q_n) of Q such that $q + n \geq p$. Here $D_{Q_i} = \prod_{k \in Q_i} D_k$. So, each monomial in A and/or derivatives of A has at least order p . We are assuming that all these terms are in \mathcal{C}_1 .

proof: We prove Lemma 2.3 by induction. We write $d^{(p)} = d^{(p)}(A; 1)$.

First step: Differentiating once (1.9) gives

$$D_1 d^{(p)} = \sum_{j=p}^{\infty} (-1)^{j-1} \mathcal{T}_1(A^{j-1} D_1 A) d^{(p)} \quad (2.13)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=p}^{\infty} (-1)^{j-1} A^{j-1} D_1 A &= (R + \xi_p) D_1 A \\ &= R[D_1 + \xi_p D_1 A](1 + A) \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

we have from (2.12)

$$D_1 d^{(p)} = \mathcal{T}_1(R A_{\{1\}}) d^{(p)} \quad (2.15)$$

which establishes (2.11) for $n = 1$.

Induction step: We now assume (2.11) valid for $n = k$. By differentiating (2.11) with respect to $(k+1)$ -th variable and using (2.15) with $\{1\}$ replaced by $\{k+1\}$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\prod_{j=1}^{k+1} D_j \right) d^{(p)} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k} \{ D_{k+1} \mathcal{T}_s(\wedge^s R \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \dots \wedge A_{P_s}) + \mathcal{T}_s(\wedge^s R \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \dots \wedge A_{P_s}) \mathcal{T}_1(R A_{\{k+1\}}) \} d^{(p)} \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{k+1} \mathcal{T}_s(\wedge^s R \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \dots \wedge A_{P_s}) &= \sum_{i=1}^s \mathcal{T}_s(\wedge^s R \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \dots \wedge D_{k+1} A_{P_i} \wedge \dots \wedge A_{P_s}) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{T}_s(\wedge^s R \cdot d \wedge^s (R D_{k+1} A) \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \dots \wedge A_{P_s}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

The second term in the right hand side of (2.17) can be written as

$$\mathcal{T}_s(\wedge^s R \cdot d \wedge^s (\xi_p D_{k+1} A) \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \dots \wedge A_{P_s}) - \mathcal{T}_s(\wedge^s R \cdot d \wedge (R A_{\{k+1\}}) \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \dots \wedge A_{P_s}) \quad (2.18)$$

Now, it follows from (2.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_i A_{P_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge D_{k+1} A_{P_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{P_s} + d \wedge^s (\xi_p D_{k+1} A) \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{P_s} \\
&= \sum_i A_{P_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge (D_{k+1} + \xi_p D_{k+1} A) A_{P_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{P_s} \\
&= \sum_i A_{P_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{P_i \cup \{k+1\}} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{P_s} \tag{2.19}
\end{aligned}$$

From (2.16) - (2.19) we have

$$\left(\prod_{j=1}^{k+1} D_j \right) d^{(p)} = \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_k} (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{P}} + \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{P}}) d^{(p)} \tag{2.20}$$

where

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{P}} = \mathcal{T}_s(\wedge^s R \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{P_s}) \mathcal{T}_1(RA_{\{k+1\}}) - \mathcal{T}_s(\wedge^s R \cdot d \wedge^s (RA_{\{k+1\}})) \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{P_s}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{P}} = \sum_{i=1}^s \mathcal{T}_s(\wedge^s R \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{P_i \cup \{k+1\}} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{P_s}) \tag{2.21}$$

We now set in Lemma 2.2 $A_j = RA_{P_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $A_{k+1} = RA_{\{k+1\}}$. It follows from Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2 and Remark 2.4 that

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{P}} = \mathcal{T}_{s+1}(\wedge^{s+1} R \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{P_s} \wedge A_{\{k+1\}}) \tag{2.22}$$

From (2.21) and (2.22) we can write (2.20) as

$$\sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{k+1}} \mathcal{T}_s(\wedge^s R \cdot A_{P_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{P_s}) d^{(p)} \tag{2.23}$$

which proves that (2.11) is also valid for $n = k + 1$, completes our induction argument and proves Lemma 2.3.

3. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.1 AND 1.4

Let $D_1 = \dots = D_n = \frac{d}{d\lambda}$ and $A = \lambda K$ in Lemma 2.4. Since we have for any $Q \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$

$$\begin{aligned} [K_Q]_{\lambda=0} &= \left[\left(\frac{d}{d\lambda} + \xi_p(\lambda K) K \right)^{|Q|} (1 + \lambda K) \right]_{\lambda=0} \\ &= \left[\left(\frac{d}{d\lambda} + \xi_p(\lambda) \right)^{|Q|} (1 + \lambda) \right]_{\lambda=0} K^{|Q|} \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

(1.12) follows from (2.11).

Let us assume that $R(K; \lambda) d^{(p)}(K; \lambda)$ is an analytic (entire) operator valued function of λ . We have from (1.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} D_n^{(p)}(K) &= \left[\left(\frac{d}{d\lambda} \right)^n \left(R(K; \lambda) d^{(p)}(K; \lambda) \right) \right]_{\lambda=0} \\ &= \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{m=1}^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{m} (-1)^{m-1} m! K^{m-1} \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{n+1-m}} \left(\prod_i C_{|P_i|}^{(p)} \right) \mathcal{T}_s(K^{|P_1|} \wedge \dots \wedge K^{|P_s|}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

from which we get (1.13).

We shall now establish the analytic properties of $d^{(p)}$ and $D^{(p)}$. We begin with the determinant.

Let \mathcal{P}_n be the collection of partitions $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_s)$ of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. We define

$$T_n^{(p)} = \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_n} t_{|P_1|}^{(p)} \dots t_{|P_s|}^{(p)} \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$t_r^{(p)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } r < p \\ c^r \left(\frac{p-2}{p-1} r \right)! \|K\|_r^r & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

It follows from (1.16) - (1.18) that

$$|d_n^{(p)}(K)| \leq T_n^{(p)} \quad (3.5)$$

Let $k_j = \#\{P_i : |P_i| = j, i = 1, \dots, s\}$. Then (3.3) can be written as

$$T_n^{(p)} = n! \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_n} \frac{1}{k_1! \dots k_n!} \left(\frac{t_1^{(p)}}{1!} \right)^{k_1} \dots \left(\frac{t_n^{(p)}}{n!} \right)^{k_n} \quad (3.6)$$

where the summation is over all non negative integers k_1, \dots, k_n , such that $k_1 + 2k_2 + \dots + nk_n = n$.

Notice that

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{1}{n!} T_n^{(p)} = \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{1}{j!} t_j^{(p)} \right\} \quad (3.7)$$

can be used with (1.4) and (3.5) to obtain that

$$|d^{(p)}(K; \lambda)| \leq e^\eta \quad (3.8)$$

with

$$\eta = \sum_{j \geq p} \frac{c^j}{j!} \left(\frac{p-2}{p-1} j \right)! \|\lambda K\|_j^j \quad (3.9)$$

which establishes Theorem 1.1 for $d^{(p)}$.

The proof of (1.22) requires the following Lemma:

Lemma 3.1. *Given $p > 2$, the Weierstrass primary factor satisfies the upper bound*

$$|E(z; p-1)| \leq e^{\kappa|z|^p} \quad (3.10)$$

with

$$\kappa = \frac{p-1}{p} \exp \left\{ -\frac{p-2}{4p} \left[1 + \left(1 + 2 \left(1 + \operatorname{cosec} \frac{\pi}{p} \right)^{-1} \right)^{p-1} \right]^{-1} \right\}. \quad (3.11)$$

Defferring the proof of Lemma 3.1 to the end of this section, it follows from (1.21) and (3.10) that

$$|d^{(p)}(K; 1)| \leq \exp \left\{ \kappa \sum_{i \in I} |\gamma_i|^p \right\}$$

which establishes (1.22) since by Weyl's inequality^[14]

$$\sum_{i \in I} |\gamma_i|^p \leq \|K\|_p^p.$$

To prove convergence of $D^{(p)}$'s series we base on Simon's ideas^[6].

Let $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}$ be such that $\|\phi\|_2 = \|\psi\|_2 = 1$ and let $B = (\phi, \cdot)\psi$. We set $A = \mu B + \lambda K$ in Lemma 2.3. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\frac{d}{d\mu} d^{(p)}(A; 1) \right]_{\mu=0} &= \left[\mathcal{T}_1(RK_{\{1\}}) d^{(p)}(A; 1) \right]_{\mu=0} \\ &= [\mathcal{T}_1(R(K; \lambda) B) + \mathcal{T}_1(\xi_p(\lambda K) B)] d^{(p)}(K; \lambda) \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Since $\mathcal{T}_1(R(K; \lambda)B) = (\phi, R(K; \lambda)\psi)$, (1.2) and (3.12) imply that

$$(\phi, D^{(p)}(K; \lambda)\psi) = \left[\frac{d}{d\mu} d^{(p)}(A; 1) \right]_{\mu=0} - \mathcal{T}_1(\xi_p(\lambda K)B) d^{(p)}(K; \lambda) \quad (3.13)$$

The first term in the right hand side of (3.13) can be estimated as in [6]

$$\left| \frac{d}{d\mu} d^{(p)}(A; 1) \right|_{\mu=0} \leq \sup_{|\mu|=1} |d^{(p)}(A; 1)| \leq e^{\kappa \|B + \lambda K\|_p^p} \quad (3.14)$$

If we use $\mathcal{T}_1(|B|^k) \leq \|\phi\|_2^k \|\psi\|_2^k = 1$ we obtain

$$\|B + \lambda K\|_p^p \leq \sum_{n=0}^p \binom{p}{n} |\lambda|^n \mathcal{T}_1(|K|^n |B|^{p-n}) \leq (1 + |\lambda| \|K\|_p)^p \quad (3.15)$$

The second term of (3.13) can be estimated by using

$$|(\phi, \xi_p(\lambda K)\psi)| \leq \|\xi_p(\lambda K)\|_\infty \leq \exp \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{p-2} |\lambda|^j \|K\|_p^j \right\} \quad (3.16)$$

and the estimate (1.22).

From (3.13) - (3.16)

$$|(\phi, D^{(p)}(K; \lambda)\psi)| \leq 2 e^{\kappa(1 + \lambda \|K\|_p)^p} \quad (3.17)$$

which implies that $D^{(p)}$ is an entire bounded operator valued function on λ , proves (1.23) and concludes the proof of theorems 1.1 and 1.4.

Proof of Lemma 3.1: Given $p \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ we define a family of real valued functions on \mathbf{C} indexed by $\kappa > 0$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} f_\kappa(\rho, \varphi) &\equiv |E(z = (\rho, \varphi); p - 1)|^2 e^{-2\kappa\rho^p} \\ &= (1 + \rho^2 - 2\rho \cos \varphi) \exp \left\{ 2 \left[\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{\rho^j}{j} \cos j\varphi - \kappa\rho^p \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Lemma 3.1 is implied if there exists $\kappa = \kappa(p)$ such that

$$|f_\kappa(\rho, \varphi)| \leq 1 \quad (3.19)$$

for any $(\rho, \varphi) \in [0, \infty] \times (-\pi, \pi]$. We let \mathcal{K} be the set of κ 's satisfying (3.19). In the sequel we will construct a non empty set $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{K}$ from which (3.11) follows by taking $\bar{\kappa} = \inf_\kappa \mathcal{M}$.

One can easily check the following properties of f_κ :

- (i) $f_\kappa(0, 0) = 1$
- (ii) $f_\kappa(\rho, \varphi) \geq 0$
- (iii) $f_\kappa(\rho, \varphi) \longrightarrow 0$ as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$

From these we conclude that (3.19) is violated only if a non-trivial maximum is developed.

We first fix φ and minimize f_κ with respect to ρ . We have

$$\frac{d}{d\rho} f_\kappa(\rho, \varphi) = 2 \left[\frac{(\rho - \cos \varphi)}{(1 + \rho^2 - 2\rho \cos \varphi)} + \left(\sum_{j=0}^{p-2} \rho^j \cos(j+1)\varphi - p\kappa\rho^{p-1} \right) \right] f(\rho, \varphi) \quad (3.20)$$

which can be written, using $2 \cos(j+1)\varphi \cos \varphi = \cos(j+2)\varphi + \cos j\varphi$, as

$$\frac{-2p\kappa\rho^{p-1}}{1 + \rho^2 - 2\rho \cos \varphi} \left[\rho^2 - \left(2 \cos \varphi + \frac{1}{p\kappa} \cos(p-1)\varphi \right) \rho + 1 + \frac{1}{p\kappa} \cos p\varphi \right] f(\rho, \varphi) \quad (3.21)$$

Thus, non-trivial solutions of $\frac{d}{d\rho} f_\kappa(\rho, \varphi) = 0$,

$$\rho_\pm(\varphi) = \cos \varphi + \frac{1}{2p\kappa} \cos(p-1)\varphi \pm \Delta, \quad (3.22)$$

exist provided

$$\Delta^2 = \left(\cos \varphi - \frac{1}{2p\kappa} \cos(p-1)\varphi \right)^2 + \frac{1}{p\kappa} \cos(p-2)\varphi - 1 \geq 0 \quad (3.23)$$

We notice that, since

$$\frac{d^2}{d\rho^2} f_\kappa(\rho_\pm, \varphi) = \mp \frac{4p\kappa\rho_\pm^{p-1} \Delta^2}{1 + \rho_\pm^2 - 2\rho_\pm \cos \varphi} f(\rho_\pm, \varphi) \quad (3.24)$$

ρ_+ (ρ_-) is a maximum (minimum) of f_κ for each direction φ . Moreover, if $\frac{\pi}{p} < |\varphi| < (p-1)\frac{\pi}{p}$ and $\kappa > \frac{1}{2p}(1 + \operatorname{cosec} \frac{\pi}{p}) \equiv \kappa_1$, we have $\Delta^2 < 0$ and if $|\varphi| \geq (p-1)\frac{\pi}{p}$ and $\kappa > \kappa_1$, we have $\rho_\pm < 0$.

We now fix ρ and use the trigonometric relation $2 \sin j\varphi \cos \varphi = \sin(j+1)\varphi + \sin(j-1)\varphi$ to get

$$\frac{d}{d\varphi} f_\kappa(\rho, \varphi) = \frac{2\rho^p}{1 + \rho^2 - 2\rho \cos \varphi} [\sin p\varphi - \rho \sin(p-1)\varphi] f(\rho, \varphi) \quad (3.25)$$

We find that any solution $\bar{\varphi} = \bar{\varphi}(\rho)$ of $\frac{d}{d\varphi} f_\kappa(\rho, \varphi) = 0$ satisfies

$$\sin p\bar{\varphi} = \rho \sin(p-1)\bar{\varphi} \quad (3.26)$$

Notice that $\bar{\varphi} = 0$ satisfies (3.26) and $\frac{d^2}{d\varphi^2} f(\rho, \bar{\varphi})$ is negative if and only if

$$\rho > \frac{p \cos p\bar{\varphi}}{(p-1) \cos(p-1)\bar{\varphi}} \quad (3.27)$$

which implies that $(\rho_+(0), 0) = (1 + \frac{1}{p\kappa}, 0)$ is a local maximum of f_κ if $\kappa < 1 - \frac{1}{p} \equiv \kappa_2$.

In fact, from the above analysis we conclude that $(1 + \frac{1}{p\kappa}, 0)$ is the unique non-trivial maximum of f_κ provided

$$\rho_+(\varphi) > \frac{p \sin p\varphi}{(p-1) \sin(p-1)\varphi} \quad (3.28)$$

holds for $|\varphi| \leq \frac{\pi}{p}$ with $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa \leq \kappa_2$.

Assuming (3.28) valid, we can replace (3.19) by the condition

$$f_\kappa(\rho_+(0), 0) \leq 1 \quad (3.29)$$

which is implied by

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{1}{j} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p\kappa}\right)^j \leq \kappa \left(1 + \frac{1}{p\kappa}\right)^p + \ln p\kappa \quad (3.30)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{1}{j} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p\kappa}\right)^j &\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{p\kappa}\right) + \int_{\frac{1}{p}}^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \frac{1}{x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p\kappa}\right)^{px} dx \\ &\leq \ln(p-1) + \left(1 + \frac{1}{p\kappa}\right)^{p-1} - \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

(3.30) is implied by

$$\left(1 - \kappa - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{p\kappa}\right)^{p-1} \leq \ln \frac{p}{p-1} \kappa + \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p}\right). \quad (3.32)$$

It has been used in (3.31) that $\int \frac{e^{ax}}{x} dx = C + \ln ax + \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{(ax)^k}{k \cdot k!}$ and $\kappa < 1 - \frac{1}{p}$.

Now, for any $\kappa \geq \frac{1}{2p}(1 + \operatorname{cosec} \frac{\pi}{p})$ we have

$$\left(1 - \kappa - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{p\kappa}\right)^{p-1} \leq \left(-\ln \frac{p}{p-1} \kappa\right) \left[1 + \left(1 + 2 \operatorname{cosec} \frac{\pi}{p}\right)^{-1}\right]^{p-1} \quad (3.33)$$

and (3.32) is implied by

$$\kappa \geq \frac{p-1}{p} \exp \left\{ -\frac{p-2}{4p} \left[1 + \left(1 + 2 \left(1 + \operatorname{cosec} \frac{\pi}{p}\right)^{-1}\right)^{p-1}\right]^{-1} \right\} \equiv \kappa_3 \quad (3.34)$$

Notice that $\kappa_1 < \kappa_3 < \kappa_2$, which implies that $\mathcal{M} = \{\kappa : \kappa_3 \leq \kappa < \kappa_2\} \subset \mathcal{K}$ is a non-empty set and (3.11) follows.

We conclude the proof of Lemma 3.1 by showing (3.28). (3.23) and (3.34) imply that $\Delta^2 \leq (\cos \varphi - 1/2p\kappa \cos(p-1)\varphi)^2$ which can be used with (3.22) and $2 \sin(p-1)\varphi \cos(p-2)\varphi = \sin \varphi + \sin(p-2)\varphi$ to replace (3.28) by

$$(p-1) \sin(p-2)\varphi \geq \sin \varphi \quad (3.35)$$

This concludes our proof since (3.35) is true for $|\varphi| \leq \frac{\pi}{p}$ provided $p > 2$.

4. FREDHOLM FORMULA

We are here concerned with integral equations of the form (1.1). Our Hilbert space is $\mathcal{H} = L_2(\Lambda)$ and K has an integral kernel on $\Lambda \times \Lambda$, with $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbf{R}^d$ so that, if $K \in \mathcal{C}_p$ with p even, then

$$\int \prod_i d^d x_i |K(x_1, x_2)K^*(x_2, x_3) \dots K(x_{p-1}, x_p)K^*(x_p, x_1)| < \infty \quad (4.1)$$

We notice that

$$\mathcal{T}_n(\wedge^n K) = n! \int \prod_i d^d x_i \sum_{\pi} (-1)^{|\pi|} K(x_1, x_{\pi(1)}) \dots K(x_n, x_{\pi(n)}) \quad (4.2)$$

which implies that Fredholm's formula for determinant $d^{(1)}(K)$ is just Grothendieck's formula.

A simple derivation of the Fredholm's formula for $D^{(1)}(K)$ can be obtained from (3.13). By using

$$d^{(1)}(\mu B + \lambda K; 1) = d^{(1)}(B; \mu) d^{(1)}(R(B; \mu)K; \lambda) \quad (4.3)$$

and (2.7), (3.13) (with $p = 1$) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi, D^{(1)}(K; \lambda)\psi) &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} \left[\frac{d}{d\mu} \left(\mathcal{T}_n(\wedge^n R(B; \mu) \cdot \wedge^n K) d^{(1)}(B; \mu) \right) \right]_{\mu=0} \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} (\mathcal{T}_1(B) \mathcal{T}_n(\wedge^n K) - \mathcal{T}_n(d \wedge^n B \cdot \wedge^n K)) \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} \mathcal{T}_{n+1}(\wedge^n K \wedge B) \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

which can be immediately recognized as Fredholm's formula after we rewrite its coefficients $(\phi, D_n^{(1)}\psi) = \mathcal{T}_{n+1}(\wedge^n K \wedge B)$ as

$$(n+1)! \int \prod_i dx_i \sum_{\pi} (-1)^{|\pi|} K(x_1, x_{\pi(1)}) \dots K(x_n, x_{\pi(n)}) \phi(x_{n+1}) \psi(x_{\pi(n+1)}) \quad (4.5)$$

In our last application we generalize Fredholm's expression of $D^{(p)}$ for $p > 1$. It is based on an explicitly calculation of $\frac{d}{d\lambda} d^{(p)}(A; 1)$ with $A = \mu B + \lambda K$ as in (3.12).

Using Lemma 2.3 we have

$$d^{(p)}(A; 1) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} \tilde{d}_n^{(p)}(\mu) \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$\tilde{d}_n^{(p)}(\mu) = \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_n} \mathcal{T}_s(\wedge^s R(B; \mu) \cdot \tilde{K}_{P_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \tilde{K}_{P_s}) d^{(p)}(B; \mu) \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{K}_Q &= \left[\left(\frac{d}{d\lambda} + \xi_p(\mu B + \lambda) \right)^{|Q|} (1 + \mu B + \lambda) \right]_{\lambda=0} K^{|Q|} \\ &\equiv \tilde{C}_{|Q|}^{(p)}(\mu) K^{|Q|} \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Notice that $\tilde{C}_k^{(p)}(0) = C_k^{(p)}$ as defined by (1.14).

Since $\frac{d}{d\mu} d^{(p)}(B; \mu)|_{\mu=0} = 0$ for any $p > 1$, we have

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\mu} \tilde{d}_n^{(p)}(\mu) \right]_{\mu=0} = \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_n} (\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathbf{P}} - \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_{\mathbf{P}}) \quad (4.9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathbf{P}} &= \frac{d}{d\mu} \left[\mathcal{T}_s(\tilde{K}_{P_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \tilde{K}_{P_s}) \right]_{\mu=0} \\ &= \sum_j \left[\frac{1}{B} \frac{d}{d\mu} \tilde{C}_{|P_j|}^{(p)} \right]_{\mu=0} \left(\prod_{i \neq j} C_{|P_i|}^{(p)} \right) \mathcal{T}_s(K^{|P_1|} \wedge \dots \wedge BK^{|P_j|} \wedge \dots \wedge K^{|P_s|}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_{\mathbf{P}} = \left(\prod_i C_{|P_i|}^{(p)} \right) \mathcal{T}_s(d \wedge^s B \cdot K^{|P_1|} \wedge \dots \wedge K^{|P_s|}) \quad (4.11)$$

We now notice that

$$\left[\frac{1}{B} \frac{d}{d\mu} \tilde{C}_k^{(p)} \right]_{\mu=0} - C_k^{(p)} = C_{k+1}^{(p)} \quad (4.12)$$

From (4.6) - (4.12) and Lemma 2.1 we conclude that

$$\frac{d}{d\mu} d^{(p)}(A; 1) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} \Delta_n^{(p)} \quad (4.13)$$

where

$$\Delta_n^{(p)} = \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_n} C_{|P_1|+1}^{(p)} \left(\prod_{j=2}^s C_{|P_j|}^{(p)} \right) \mathcal{T}_s(d \wedge^s B \cdot K^{|P_1|} \wedge \dots \wedge K^{|P_s|}) \quad (4.14)$$

This expression can be expanded as in (4.5) to exhibit its determinant form.

Our final expression is obtained by combining (3.13), (4.13) and (4.14).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank T. Hurd and G. Slade for the hospitality at McMaster University. I also thank T. Hurd and P. Faria da Veiga for many helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. Fredholm, “Sur une classe d’équation fonctionnelle”, Acta Math. **27**, 365 - 390 (1903).
- [2] H. Poincaré, “Remarques diverses sur l’équation de Fredholm”, Acta Math. **33**, 57 - 86 (1910).
- [3] J. Plemelj, “Zur theorie Fredholmshen funktionalgleichung”, Monat. Math. Phys. **15** 93 - 128 (1907).
- [4] F. Smithies, “The Fredholm theory of integral equations”, Duke Math. J. **8**, 107 - 130 (1941).
- [5] H. J. Brascamp, “The Fredholm theory of integral equations for special types of compact operators on separable Hilbert space”, Comp. Math. **21**, 59 - 80 (1969).
- [6] B. Simon, “Notes on infinite determinants of Hilbert space operators”, Adv. Math. **24**, 244 - 273, (1977).
- [7] B. Simon, “Trace ideals and their applications”, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note **35** (1979).

- [8] see e.g. R. Courrant and D. Hilbert, "Methods of Mathematical Physics", John Wiley (1989).
- [9] A. Grothendieck, "La théorie de Fredholm", Bull. Soc. Math. (France) **84**, 319 - 384 (1956).
- [10] A. Cooper and L. Rosen, "The weakly coupled Yukawa₂ field theory: cluster expansion and Wightman axioms", Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **234** 1 - 88 (1977).
- [11] T.R. Hurd, D.H.U. Marchetti and P.A.F. da Veiga, "On the mass generation in the Gross- Neveu₂ quantum field theory", work in preparation.
- [12] R. Nevanlinna, "Analytic Function", Springer - Verlag (1970).
- [13] V. B. Lidskii, "Non - selfadjoint operators with a trace", Dokl. Akad. SSSR **125**, 485 - 587 (1959).
- [14] H. Weyl, " Inequalities between two kinds of eigenvalues of a linear transformation", Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **35**, 408 - 411 (1949).