EIGENVALUE DECAY OF POSITIVE INTEGRAL OPERATORS 
ON COMPACT TWO-POINT HOMOGENEOUS SPACES

MARIO HENRIQUE DE CASTRO

Abstract. We generalize and extend results on decay rates of singular values 
or eigenvalues of positive integral operators from unit spheres to two-point ho-
moogeneous spaces. The rates we present depend upon the order of the Laplace-
Beltrami operator used to define the smoothness conditions on generating ker-
nels, the Schatten class containing the integral operator generated by the de-
ervative of the generating kernel and the dimension of the space.

1. Introduction

Let \( m \geq 1 \) be an integer and \( \mathbb{M} \) be a compact two-point homogeneous space 
of dimension \( m \). Such space is both a Riemannian \( m \)-manifold and a compact 
symmetric space of rank 1. According to Wang \[19\], they are the unit spheres 
\( S^m, m = 1, 2, \ldots \); the real projective spaces \( \mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{R}), m = 2, 3, \ldots \); the 
complex projective spaces \( \mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{C}), m = 4, 6, \ldots \); the quaternion projective spaces \( \mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{H}), m = 8, 12, 16, \ldots \); and Cayley’s elliptic plane \( \mathbb{P}^{16} \) of dimension 16. More interest-
ing information about these spaces can be found in \[6, 8, 11, 12\].

In this paper, we will always consider \( m \geq 2 \). Let \( dx \) be the Riemannian measure 
on \( \mathbb{M} \) and \( L^2(\mathbb{M}) \) the Hilbert space of all square-integrable complex functions on 
\( \mathbb{M} \) endowed with the inner product

\[
\langle f, g \rangle_2 := \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{M}} f(x) \overline{g(x)} \, dx, \quad f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{M}),
\]

and the derived norm \( \| \cdot \|_2 \), the normalization constant being defined by \( \sigma := \int_{\mathbb{M}} dx \).

We will deal with integral operators defined by

\[
K(f) = \int_{\mathbb{M}} K(\cdot, y) f(y) \, dy,
\]

in which the generating kernel \( K : \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{M} \to \mathbb{C} \) is an element of \( L^2(\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{M}) \). In 
this case, (1.1) defines a compact operator on \( L^2(\mathbb{M}) \). If \( K \) is positive definite in 
the sense that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{M}} \int_{\mathbb{M}} K(x, y) f(x) \overline{f(y)} \, dx \, dy \geq 0, \quad f \in L^2(\mathbb{M}),
\]
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then $\mathcal{K}$ becomes a self-adjoint operator and the standard spectral theorem for compact and self-adjoint operators is applicable and we can write
\[
\mathcal{K}(f) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n(\mathcal{K}) \langle f, f_n \rangle_2 f_n, \quad f \in L^2(\mathbb{M}),
\]
in which $\{\lambda_n(\mathcal{K})\}$ is a sequence of nonnegative reals (possibly finite) decreasing to 0 and $\{f_n\}$ is an $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_2$-orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{M})$. The numbers $\lambda_n(\mathcal{K})$ are the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{K}$ and the sequence $\{\lambda_n(\mathcal{K})\}$ takes into account possible repetitions implied by the algebraic multiplicity of each eigenvalue. The positive definiteness of $\mathcal{K}$ means nothing but the positivity of the integral operator $\mathcal{K}$. Since it relates to the inner product above, it is a common sense to call it $L^2$-positive definiteness.

We observe that the addition of continuity to $\mathcal{K}$ implies that $\mathcal{K}$ is also trace-class (nuclear) ([7, 9, 10]), that is,
\[
\sum_{f \in B} \langle \mathcal{K}^* \mathcal{K}(f), f \rangle_2^{1/2} < \infty,
\]
whenever $B$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{M})$. In particular, it follows from Mercer’s Theorem ([4]) that
\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n(\mathcal{K}) = \int_{\mathbb{M}} K(x, x) \, dx < \infty,
\]
and we can extract the most elementary result on decay rates for the eigenvalues of such operators, namely,
\[
\lambda_n(\mathcal{K}) = o(n^{-1}).
\]

If the integral operator $\mathcal{K}$ is compact but not self-adjoint then decay rates for the singular values of the operator becomes the focus. If $T$ is a compact operator on $L^2(\mathbb{M})$, its eigenvalues can be ordered as $|\lambda_1(T)| \geq |\lambda_2(T)| \geq \cdots \geq 0$, counting multiplicities ([13]). The singular values of $T$ are, by definition, the eigenvalues of the compact, positive and self-adjoint operator $|T| := (T^*T)^{1/2}$. The sequence $\{s_n(T)\}$ of singular values of $T$ can also be ordered in a decreasing manner, with repetitions being included according to their multiplicities as eigenvalues of $|T|$. That being the case, the classical Weyl’s inequality ([10, p.52])
\[
\Pi_{j=1}^{n} |\lambda_j(T)| \leq \Pi_{j=1}^{n} s_j(T), \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots,
\]
provides the convenient bridge between eigenvalues and singular values. We remark that the inequality characterizing the traceability of a compact non self-adjoint operator $T$ on $L^2(\mathbb{M})$ reduces itself to
\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} s_n(T) < \infty
\]
and the elementary decay presented before becomes $s_n(\mathcal{K}) = o(n^{-1})$. Classical references on eigenvalues and singular values distribution of compact operators on Banach spaces are [13, 17].
The idea of nuclearity can be extended as follows. For \( p > 0 \) we say that a compact operator \( T \) belongs to the Schatten \( p \)-class \( \mathcal{S}_p \) if
\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (s_n(T))^p < \infty.
\]
For \( p \geq 1 \), \( \mathcal{S}_p \) is a Banach space endowed with the norm
\[
\|T\|_p := \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (s_n(T))^p \right)^{1/p}.
\]
In particular, \( \mathcal{S}_1 \) and \( \mathcal{S}_2 \) coincide respectively to the spaces of trace-class operators and of Hilbert-Schmidt operators. Of course, if \( T \in \mathcal{S}_p \) then its singular values satisfy \( s_n(K) = o(n^{-1/p}) \).

The problem of analyse the asymptotic behavior of \( \{\lambda_n(K)\} \) or \( \{s_n(K)\} \) under additional smoothness assumptions on the kernel \( K \) is the subject of this paper. Results of this very same nature can be found in [3] (and references therein), where authors used Laplace-Beltrami differentiability as a condition of smoothness to the kernel \( K \) and obtained some sharp results about how eigenvalues and singular values of \( K \) behave. The intention here is to invest in the very same issue by extending the setting from the sphere to two-point homogeneous spaces. However, in this more general setting we do not have a notion of devititative as the spherical Laplace-Beltrami derivative. Instead we use the Laplace-Beltrami operator to define the smoothness condition we need. The connection between these two concepts on the sphere is relatively known and can be found in [5].

The presentation of the paper is as follows. Section 2 contains basic material about harmonic analysis in two-point homogeneous spaces and the statement of the main result of the paper. In Section 3, we state and prove some technical results related to Fourier expansions to be used in Section 4, where we present the proof for the main result along with other pertinent information.

2. Statement of the main results

Two-point homogeneous spaces can be considered as the orbit of some compact subgroup \( \mathfrak{H} \) of the orthogonal group \( \mathfrak{G} \), i.e., \( \mathcal{M} = \mathfrak{G}/\mathfrak{H} \). Let \( e \) be the identity of \( \mathfrak{G} \) and \( \pi: \mathfrak{G} \to \mathfrak{G}/\mathfrak{H} \) the natural mapping. The pole of \( \mathcal{M} \), \( o = \pi(e) \), is invariant under all motions of \( \mathfrak{H} \). Each one of these manifolds \( \mathcal{M} \) has an invariant Riemannian metric \( d(\cdot,\cdot) \) and a measure \( dx \) induced by the normalized left Haar measure on \( \mathfrak{G} \) which is invariant under the action of \( \mathfrak{G} \). Also, these spaces admit essentially one invariant second order differential operator called the Laplace-Beltrami operator which we denote by \( \Delta \). We suggest [2, 15] and references therein for more information about this subject.

These spaces have a similar geometry. For instance, all geodesics in one of them are closed and have the same length \( 2L \), in which \( L = \max\{d(x,y) : x, y \in \mathcal{M}\} \) is the diameter of \( \mathfrak{G}/\mathfrak{H} \). A function on \( \mathfrak{G}/\mathfrak{H} \) is invariant under the left action of \( \mathfrak{H} \) on \( \mathfrak{G}/\mathfrak{H} \) if and only if it depends only on the distance of its argument from the pole of \( \mathcal{M} \). Let \( \theta \) be the distance of a point from the pole. One can choose
a geodesic polar coordinate system $(\theta, u)$, where $u$ is an angular parameter, in which the radial part of $\Delta$ can be written, up to a multiplicative constant, as

$$\Delta_\theta = \frac{1}{(\sin \lambda \theta)^\sigma (\sin 2\lambda \theta)^\rho} \frac{d}{d\theta} (\sin \lambda \theta)^\sigma (\sin 2\lambda \theta)^\rho \frac{d}{d\theta},$$

in which

| $\mathbb{S}^m$ | $\sigma = 0$ | $\rho = m - 1$ | $\lambda = \pi/2L$ | $m = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$ |
| $\mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{R})$ | $\sigma = 0$ | $\rho = m - 1$ | $\lambda = \pi/4L$ | $m = 2, 3, 4, \ldots$ |
| $\mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{C})$ | $\sigma = m - 2$ | $\rho = 1$ | $\lambda = \pi/2L$ | $m = 4, 6, 8, \ldots$ |
| $\mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{H})$ | $\sigma = m - 4$ | $\rho = 3$ | $\lambda = \pi/2L$ | $m = 8, 12, \ldots$ |
| $\mathbb{P}^{16}(\text{Cay})$ | $\sigma = 8$ | $\rho = 7$ | $\lambda = \pi/2L$ | $m = 16$ |

Furthermore, the change of variables $x = \cos 2\lambda \theta$ gives us

$$\Delta_x = (1 - x)^{-\alpha}(1 + x)^{-\beta} \frac{d}{dx} (1 - x)^{1+\alpha}(1 + x)^{1+\beta} \frac{d}{dx},$$

with $\alpha = (\sigma + \rho - 1)/2 = (m - 2)/2$ and $\beta = (\rho - 1)/2$.

We will write $\mathcal{B} = -\Delta_x$ and also call it Laplace-Beltrami operator on $\mathbb{M}$. Let denote $\mathcal{B}^r$ the $r$-th power of $\mathcal{B}$, $r = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. The Sobolev space of order $r$ constructed from $\mathcal{B}$ is defined as in [16, p.37] and [18] by

$$W^r_2(\mathbb{M}) := \{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{M}) : \mathcal{B}^j f \in L^2(\mathbb{M}), j = 1, 2, \ldots, r \},$$

and the Laplace-Beltrami operator and its powers satisfy

$$\langle \mathcal{B}^r f, g \rangle_2 = \langle f, \mathcal{B}^r g \rangle_2, \quad f, g \in W^r_2(\mathbb{M}).$$

(2.1)

The action of the Laplace-Beltrami operator on kernels is done separately: we keep one variable fixed and differentiate with respect to the other. We denote $K_{0,r}(x, y)$ to indicate the $r$-th order of $\mathcal{B}$ acting on the kernel $K$ with respect to the second variable $y$ (we do not differentiate with respect to the first variable $x$). The integral operator associated with $K_{0,r}$ will be written as $K_{0,r}$.

**Definition 2.1.** A kernel $K \in L^2(\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{M})$ belongs to $W^r_2$ if $K(x, \cdot) \in W^r_2$, $x \in \mathbb{M}$ a.e..

We are able to state the main result we intend to prove here.

**Theorem 2.2.** Let $K \in L^2(\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{M})$ be a $L^2$-positive definite kernel satisfying $K(x, \cdot) \in W^r_2(\mathbb{M})$, $x \in \mathbb{M}$ a.e.. If $K_{0,r} \in \mathcal{S}_p$ then

$$\lambda_n(K) = o(n^{-(1/p) - (2r/m)}).$$

**Remark 2.3.** This result unifies and generalizes Theorems 2.4 and 2.5 in [3]. Moreover, Theorem 2.3 of [3] can also be generalized to homogeneous spaces but since the proofs are very similar then we do not state e prove it here.
3. Fourier analysis for functions on $\mathbb{M}$

The Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{M})$ can be decomposed as $L^2(\mathbb{M}) = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_n^m$, where $\mathcal{H}_n^m$ is the eigenspace of $\mathcal{B}$ with respect to the eigenvalue $\lambda_n(\mathcal{B}) := n(n + \alpha + \beta + 1)$ ($\lambda_0(\mathcal{B}) = 1$). The elements of $\mathcal{H}_n^m$ are the well-known Jacobi polynomials $P_n^{(\alpha,\beta)}$. Each $\mathcal{H}_n^m$ has a finite dimension given by the formula

$$d_n^m = d_n^m(\mathbb{M}) = \frac{\Gamma(\beta + 1)(n + \alpha + \beta + 1)\Gamma(n + \alpha + \beta + 1)}{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)\Gamma(\alpha + \beta + 2)\Gamma(n + 1)\Gamma(n + \beta + 1)},$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\mathbb{M} \in \{S^m, \mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{H}), \mathbb{P}^{16}(\text{Cay})\}$ and for $n$ even if $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{R})$. Otherwise, for $n$ odd, $d_n^m(\mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{R})) = 0$. Let denote $\mathcal{T}_n^m = \oplus_{k=0}^{n} \mathcal{H}_n^m$ and $r_n^m = \text{dim} \mathcal{T}_n^m$. Precisely, for $S^m, \mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{H})$, and $\mathbb{P}^{16}(\text{Cay})$ we have the explicit expression

$$r_n^m = \frac{\Gamma(\beta + 1)\Gamma(n + \alpha + \beta + 2)\Gamma(n + \alpha + 2)}{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta + 2)\Gamma(\alpha + 2)\Gamma(n + \beta + 1)\Gamma(n + 1)},$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that

$$d_n^m = O(n^{m-1}), \quad \text{as } n \to \infty. \quad (3.2)$$

$$r_n^m = O(n^m), \quad \text{as } n \to \infty. \quad (3.3)$$

Let $\{Y_{n,k} : k = 1, \ldots, d_m^m\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_n^m$. Each $f \in L^2(\mathbb{M})$ has a Fourier expansion

$$f = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{d_m^m} c_{n,k}(f) Y_{n,k},$$

in which $c_{n,k}(f) = \langle f, Y_{n,k} \rangle_2$.

If $r > 0$, a function $g \in L^2(S^m)$ is called the fractional derivative of order $r$ of $f$ whenever the Fourier series of $g$ has the form

$$g = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{d_m^m} n^r(n + \alpha + \beta - 1)^r c_{n,k}(f) Y_{n,k}.$$

Thus, the fractional derivative of order $r$ of a function $f \in W_2^r(\mathbb{M})$ corresponds to $\mathcal{B}^r f$ whenever $r$ is a positive integer.

The $r$-th fractional integral ($r > 0$) of $f \in L^2(\mathbb{M})$ is the $L^2(\mathbb{M})$ element

$$J^r f = c_{0,1}(f) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{d_m^m} n^{-r}(n + \alpha + \beta - 1)^{-r} c_{n,k}(f) Y_{n,k}. \quad (3.4)$$

**Proposition 3.1.** Let $r > 0$. The $r$-th fractional integral operator $J^r : L^2(\mathbb{M}) \to L^2(\mathbb{M})$ defined by (3.4) is a compact operator.

**Proof.** It is enough to observe that $J^r$ is linear and can be approximated by some sequence of linear finite rank operators in the space of bounded operators on $L^2(\mathbb{M})$. \qed

**Proposition 3.2.** If $r$ be a positive integer then $J^r(L^2(\mathbb{M})) \subset W_2^r(\mathbb{M})$.

**Proposition 3.3.** If $r$ is a positive integer and $f \in \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_n^m$ then $\mathcal{B}^r J^r f = f$. 


The singular values of the \( J^r \) are given by \( s_0(J^r) = 1 \) and
\[
s_n(J^r) = \lambda_n(\mathcal{B}^r)^{-1} = n^{-r}(n + \alpha + \beta + 1)^{-r}, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots.
\]
They are ordered in accordance with the spectral theorem for compact operators. In other words, we assume they are listed in decreasing order counting the repetitions. As so, if \( M \in \{S^m, P^m(\mathbb{C}), P^m(\mathbb{H}), P^{16}(Cay)\} \) we may think the sequence \( \{s_n(J^r)\} \) is blocked ordered in such a way that the first block contains the singular value \( s_0(J^r) = 1 \) and the \((n+1)\)-th block \((n \geq 1) \) contains \( d_n^m \) entries equal to \( n^{-r}(n + \alpha + \beta + 1)^{-r} \). For future reference, we notice that the first entry in the \((n+1)\)-th block corresponds to the index
\[
d_0^m + d_1^m + \cdots + d_{n-1}^m + 1 = \tau_n^m + 1.
\]
As for the last one, it corresponds to
\[
d_0^m + d_1^m + \cdots + d_{n-1}^m + d_n^m = \tau_n^m.
\]
(3.5)

In the next lemmas we detach technical inequalities to be used ahead. The first one improves (3.3).

**Lemma 3.4.** If \( M \in \{S^m, P^m(\mathbb{C}), P^m(\mathbb{H}), P^{16}(Cay)\} \) then there exists an integer \( \delta(m) \geq 1 \) such that
\[
\tau_n^m \leq 2n^m, \quad n \geq \delta(m).
\]

**Proof.** We keep (3.3) in mind and develop each case using (3.1) in order to obtain a polynomial expression to \( \tau_n^m \). For \( M = S^m \) we know \( \alpha = \beta = (m - 2)/2 \). Consequently there is \( \delta(S^m) > 0 \) such that
\[
\tau_n^m = \frac{2n^m}{m!} \left( 1 + \frac{c_1^{(1)}}{n} + \frac{c_2^{(1)}}{n^2} + \cdots + \frac{c_m^{(1)}}{n^m} \right) \leq 2n^m, \quad n \geq \delta(S^m),
\]
where \( c_1^{(1)}, \ldots, c_m^{(1)} \) do not depend upon \( n \).

For \( M = P^m(\mathbb{C}) \) we know \( \alpha = (m - 2)/2 \) and \( \beta = 0 \). As so, there is \( \delta(P^m(\mathbb{C})) > 0 \) such that
\[
\tau_n^m = \left[ \frac{n^{m/2}}{(m/2)!} \left( 1 + \frac{c_1^{(2)}}{n} + \cdots + \frac{c_m^{(2)}}{n^{m/2}} \right) \right]^2 \leq 2n^m, \quad n \geq \delta(P^m(\mathbb{C})),
\]
in which \( c_1^{(2)}, \ldots, c_m^{(2)} \) do not depend upon \( n \).

If \( M = P^m(\mathbb{H}) \) then \( \alpha = (m - 2)/2 \) and \( \beta = 1 \). Thus, there is \( \delta(P^m(\mathbb{H})) > 0 \) such that
\[
\tau_n^m = \frac{(n + 1 + m/2)}{(n + 1)(1 + m/2)} \left[ \frac{(n + m/2)!}{n!(m/2)!} \right]^2 \leq 2n^m, \quad n \geq \delta(P^m(\mathbb{H})).
\]

If \( M = P^{16}(Cay) \) then \( \alpha = (m - 2)/2, \beta = 3 \), and there is \( \delta(P^{16}(Cay)) > 0 \) such that
\[
\tau_n^{16} = \frac{(n + 12)(n + 11)(n + 10)(n + 9)}{1980(n + 4)(n + 3)(n + 2)(n + 1)} \left[ \frac{(n + 8)!}{(n)!8!} \right]^2 \leq 2n^{16},
\]
since \( n \geq \delta(P^{16}(Cay)) \).
To conclude we define \( \delta(m) = \max\{\delta(S^m), \delta(\mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{C})), \delta(\mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{H})), \delta(\mathbb{P}^{16}(\text{Cay}))\} \).

**Lemma 3.5.** If \( m \) is an integer at least 2 then
\[
(n + 1)^m - (n^m + 1) + 1 \leq m2^{m-1}n^{m-1}, \quad n \geq 1.
\]

**Proof.** It suffices to apply the mean value theorem to the function \( x^m \) on the interval \([n, n+1]\) and estimate the resulting formula conveniently. \( \square \)

## 4. Proof of the Main Result

This section contains a proof for Theorem 2.2. It depends upon some general properties of compact operators and their singular values which we now describe in a form adapted to our needs. They can be found in standard references on operator theory such as [9, 10, 13, 17] and depend on the ordering of eigenvalues and singular values as previously mentioned.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let \( T \) be a compact operator on \( L^2(M) \). The following assertions hold:

(i) If \( T \) is self-adjoint then
\[
s_n(T) = |\lambda_n(T)|, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots;
\]

(ii) If \( A \) is a bounded operator on \( L^2(M) \) then both, \( AT \) and \( TA \), are compact. In addition,
\[
\max\{s_n(AT), s_n(TA)\} \leq \|A\| s_n(T), \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots;
\]

(iii) If \( A \) is a linear operator on \( L^2(M) \) of rank at most \( l \), then
\[
s_{n+l}(T) \leq s_n(T + A), \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots;
\]

(iv) If \( A \) is a compact operator on \( L^2(M) \) then
\[
s_{n+k-1}(AT) \leq s_n(A)s_k(T), \quad n, k = 1, 2, \ldots.
\]

The following additional lemma regarding the singular values of an integral operator generated by a square-integrable kernel is proved in [13, p.40].

**Lemma 4.2.** If \( K \in L^2(M \times M) \) then
\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} s_n^2(K) = \|K\|_2^2.
\]

The key idea behind the proof of the main result previously stated resides in the following estimation for the singular values of \( K \), which holds when \( K \) is smooth enough.

**Lemma 4.3.** Let \( K \) be an element of \( W_2^r(M) \). If \( K_{0,r} \) is bounded then
\[
s_{n+1}(K) \leq s_n(K_{0,r}J^r), \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots.
\]

**Proof.** Consider the orthogonal projection \( Q \) of \( L^2(M) \) onto \( \bigoplus_{\ell=1}^{\infty} H_\ell^{m+1} \). Since \( I - Q \) is a projection onto the orthogonal complement of \( \bigoplus_{\ell=1}^{\infty} H_\ell^{m+1} \) then \( K - KQ \).
is an operator on $L^2(\mathbb{M})$ of rank at most 1. Using Lemma 4.1-\((iii)\), we may deduce that

$$s_{n+1}(\mathcal{K}) \leq s_n(\mathcal{K} - \mathcal{K}(I - Q)) = s_n(\mathcal{K}Q), \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.1)

To proceed, we need a convenient decomposition for $\mathcal{K}Q$. Looking at the action of $\mathcal{K}Q$ on a generic element $f$ from $L^2(\mathbb{M})$ and using Proposition 3.3 we see that

$$\mathcal{K}Q(f) = \int_M K(\cdot, y)Qf(y)\,d\sigma_m(y) = \int_M K(\cdot, y)B^rJ^rQf(y)\,d\sigma_m(y).$$

Since $K \in W_2^r(\mathbb{M})$, we employ (2.1) to obtain

$$\mathcal{K}Q(f) = \int_M K_{0,r}(\cdot, y)J^r(Qf)(y)\,d\sigma_m(y) = \mathcal{K}_{0,r}J^rQ(f),$$

that is, $\mathcal{K}Q = \mathcal{K}_{0,r}J^rQ$. Now, assuming $\mathcal{K}_{0,r}$ is bounded, we can apply (4.1) and Lemma 4.1-\((ii)\) to see that

$$s_{n+1}(\mathcal{K}) \leq s_n(\mathcal{K}Q) \leq \|Q\|s_n(\mathcal{K}_{0,r}J^r) \leq s_n(\mathcal{K}_{0,r}J^r), \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots.$$

The proof is complete. \hfill $\square$

The following technical result is borrowed from [14]. An elementary proof of such result can be found in [1].

**Lemma 4.4.** Let $\{a_n\}$ be a decreasing sequence of positive real numbers. If the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^\alpha a_n^\beta$ is convergent for some positive constants $\alpha$ and $\beta$ then $a_n = o(n^{-(\alpha+1)/\beta})$.

We now proceed to the proof of the main result in the paper.

**Proof of Theorem 2.2.** We perform the demonstration in three steps. First, we assume $\mathcal{K}_{0,r}$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_p$ and show

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2rp+m-1} (\lambda_{n,m}(\mathcal{K}))^p < \infty.$$

Second, we prove

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2rp/m} (\lambda_n(\mathcal{K}))^p < \infty.$$

Finally, we apply Lemma 4.4 to conclude that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} n^{\frac{1}{p} + \frac{2r}{m}} \lambda_n(\mathcal{K}) = 0.$$

Combining Lemma 4.3 with Lemma 4.1-\((iv)\) we can deduce the inequalities

$$s_{n+k}(\mathcal{K}) \leq s_{n+k-1}(\mathcal{K}_{0,r}J^r) \leq s_k(\mathcal{K}_{0,r}) s_n(J^r), \quad n, k = 1, 2, \ldots,$$

Since the sequence of eigenvalues of $\mathcal{K}$ is non increasing, it follows from Lemma 4.1-\((i)\) that

$$\lambda_{\tau_{n+k}}(\mathcal{K}) \leq s_k(\mathcal{K}_{0,r}) s_{\tau_n}(J^r) = s_k(\mathcal{K}_{0,r}) n^{-r}(n + \alpha + \beta + 1)^{-r}, \quad n, k = 1, 2, \ldots,$$

where the last equality is a consequence of (3.5). Thus

$$n^{2r} \lambda_{\tau_{n+k}}(\mathcal{K}) \leq n^r(n + \alpha + \beta + 1)^r \lambda_{\tau_{n+k}}(\mathcal{K}) \leq s_k(\mathcal{K}_{0,r}), \quad n, k = 1, 2, \ldots.$$
which implies
\[ n^{2rp}(\lambda_{\tau_n+k}(K))^p \leq (s_k(K_{0,r}))^p, \quad n, k = 1, 2, \ldots. \]
Since \( K_{0,r} \in S_p \), by adding on \( k \) and \( n \) leads to
\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2rp} \sum_{k=\tau_{n-1}+1}^{\tau_n} (\lambda_{\tau_n+k}(K))^p \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=\tau_{n-1}+1}^{\tau_n} (s_k(K_{0,r}))^p \\
\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (s_n(K_{0,r}))^p < \infty.
\]
To proceed, we apply Lemma 3.4 to select a constant \( \delta = \delta(m) \geq 1 \) such that
\[ 2^{\tau_n} m \leq 2^m n \leq (2n)^m, \quad n \geq \delta. \]
As long as (3.2) gives us a constant \( c > 0 \) such that
\[ n^{m-1} \leq c d_n^m, \quad n \geq \beta = \beta(m), \]
and \( \{\lambda_n(K)\} \) does not increases, choosing \( \gamma = \max\{\delta(m), \beta(m)\} \), we now see that
\[
\sum_{n \geq \gamma} (2n)^2r_{n+m-1}(\lambda_{(2n)^m}(K))^p \leq c \sum_{n \geq \gamma} (2n)^{2rp} d_n^m (\lambda_{(2n)^m}(K))^p \\
\leq 2^{2rp} c \sum_{n \geq \gamma} n^{2rp} \sum_{k=\tau_{n-1}+1}^{\tau_n} (\lambda_{(2n)^m}(K))^p \\
\leq c_1 \sum_{n \geq \gamma} n^{2rp} \sum_{k=\tau_{n-1}+1}^{\tau_n} (\lambda_{2\tau_n}(K))^p \\
\leq c_1 \sum_{n \geq \gamma} n^{2rp} \sum_{k=\tau_{n-1}+1}^{\tau_n} (\lambda_{\tau_n+k}(K))^p < \infty.
\]
Moreover, we show in the same way there is \( c_2 = c_2(r, p, m) > 0 \) such that
\[
\sum_{n \geq \gamma} (2n+1)^{2r_{n+m-1}}(\lambda_{(2n+1)^m}(K))^p \leq c_2 \sum_{n \geq \gamma} n^{2rp} \sum_{k=\tau_{n-1}+1}^{\tau_n} (\lambda_{\tau_n+k}(K))^p < \infty.
\]
Hence, we conclude the first step showing that
\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2rp+m-1}(\lambda_{n^m}(K))^p < \infty.
\]
The second step starts with the notice that
\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2rp}(\lambda_n(K))^p = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{(n+1)^m-n^m+1} (n^m+k)^{2rp} (\lambda_{n^m+k}(K))^p \\
\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{(n+1)^m-n^m+1} (n^m+(n+1)^m-n^m-1)^{2rp} (\lambda_{n^m+k}(K))^p.
\]
With an application of Lemma 3.5 we obtain
\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2rp} \left( \lambda_n(K) \right)^p \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{(n+1)m-(n^m+1)} [(2n)^m]^{2rp} \left( \lambda_{n^m+k}(K) \right)^p \right) \leq 2^{2rp} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2rp} \left( \lambda_{n^m}(K) \right)^p \sum_{k=0}^{(n+1)m-(n^m+1)} 1 \]
\[
= 2^{2rp} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2rp} \left( \lambda_{n^m}(K) \right)^p [n^{m+1} - n^m],
\]
from which we can find a constant \( c_3 = c_3(r, p, m) > 0 \) so that

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2rp} \left( \lambda_n(K) \right)^p \leq c_3 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2rp} \left( \lambda_{n^m}(K) \right)^p n^{m-1} \leq c_3 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2rp+m-1} \left( \lambda_{n^m}(K) \right)^p < \infty.
\]

Finally, Lemma 4.4 is applied to give
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} n^{\frac{1}{p} + \frac{2r}{m}} \lambda_n(K) = 0
\]
and complete the proof. \(\square\)

**Remark 4.5.** The proof we performed here does not include the case \( \mathcal{M} = \mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{R}) \). However, Theorem 2.2 works also in this case. Indeed, functions on \( \mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{R}) \) can be seen as even functions on \( \mathbb{S}^m \), so \( L^2(\mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{R})) \) can be identified to \( \bigoplus_n \mathcal{H}^m_{2n}(\mathbb{S}^m) \) and the case \( \mathcal{M} = \mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{R}) \) follows directly from the case \( \mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}^m \).

**Remark 4.6.** The decay rate obtained was proved to be optimal in [3] for the case \( \mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}^m \), with \( p = 1 \).
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