

Uniform spectral asymptotics for semiclassical wells on phase space loops

DELEPORTE Alix* VŨ NGỌC SAN†

January 31, 2022

Abstract

We consider semiclassical self-adjoint operators whose symbol, defined on a two-dimensional symplectic manifold, reaches a non-degenerate minimum b_0 on a closed curve. We derive a classical and quantum normal form which allows us, in addition to the complete integrability of the system, to obtain eigenvalue asymptotics in a window $(-\infty, b_0 + \epsilon)$ for $\epsilon > 0$ independent on the semiclassical parameter. These asymptotics are obtained in two complementary settings: either a symmetry of the system under translation along the curve, or a Morse hypothesis reminiscent of Helffer-Sjöstrand's "miniwell" situation.

1 Wells on closed loops

Let (M, ω) be a symplectic surface without boundary. When introducing quantization, we will assume for simplicity that $M = T^*\mathbb{R}$ or $M = T^*S^1$. Let $\gamma \subset M$ be a smooth embedded closed loop. We say that a smooth function $p \in C^\infty(M)$ admits a non-degenerate well on the loop γ if there exists a neighborhood Ω of γ in M such that

1. $p|_\Omega$ is minimal on γ :

$$p^{-1}(b_0) \cap \Omega = \gamma, \quad \text{where } \inf_\Omega p = \min_\Omega p = b_0; \quad (1)$$

2. and this minimum is Morse-Bott non-degenerate: at each point $m \in \gamma$, the restriction of the Hessian $p''(m)$ to the transversal direction to γ does not vanish.

*Institute for Mathematics, University of Zürich, Winterthurerstr. 190, CH-8057 Zürich

†Univ Rennes, CNRS, IRMAR - UMR 6625, F-35000 Rennes, France

Thus by the Morse-Bott lemma, there exists a neighborhood $\tilde{\Omega} \subset \Omega$ of γ , and coordinates $(x, t) : \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \gamma \times [-\delta, \delta]$ such that $\gamma = \{t = 0\}$ and $p = b_0 + t^2 q(x)$, for some smooth, non-vanishing function q on γ .

An example of such a p can be obtained in the following way. Let $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be smooth and proper, and let $c \in \mathbb{R}$ be a regular value of f . Let γ be a connected component of $f^{-1}(c)$. Then define $p = (f - c)^2$. We see that γ is a non-degenerate well for p .

As we will see below, this is actually the universal form of a non-degenerate well. However, this normal form is not sufficient to describe the semiclassical quantization of our setting, because assumption (1) is *not* stable under perturbation. In fact, generic perturbations of p create isolated local extrema along γ . Local minima are called *mini-wells* and local maxima *mini-saddles*. The quantization of the classical universal form will introduce such perturbations.

Theorem 1.1. *Let I_0 be the first Bohr-Sommerfeld invariant of γ (see Subsection 2.2). There exists a neighborhood Ω of γ , $\epsilon > 0$, and a Fourier integral operator $U : L^2(X) \rightarrow L^2(S^1)$ such that*

1. *U is microlocally unitary from Ω to $\{(\theta, I) \in T^*S^1, |I - I_0| < \epsilon\}$.*
2. *$Q = UPU^* = b_0 + (g_h(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}))^2 + \hbar V_h(\theta) + R$, where V_h is an \hbar -dependent potential on S^1 with an asymptotic expansion*

$$V_h(\theta) = V_0(\theta) + \hbar V_1(\theta) + \cdots ,$$

$g_h \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is supported on an \hbar -independent set, with

$$g_h(I) = g_0(I) + \hbar g_1(I) + \cdots ,$$

*and g_0 is a local diffeomorphism from a neighborhood of $I = I_0$ to a neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Here, R is such that, for every u_h with $WF_h(u_h) \subset \{(\theta, I) \in T^*S^1, |I - I_0| < \epsilon\}$, one has $\|Ru_h\| = \mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty)\|u_h\|$.*

The first systematic treatment of quantum mini-wells was proposed in [11], where $P_h = -\hbar^2 \Delta + V$ is a Schrödinger operator in several dimensions, and the potential V is Morse-Bott and minimal on a compact submanifold. Then, under a non-degeneracy assumption on the mini-wells, one has a complete expansion, as well as sharp decay estimates, for the lowest energy eigenfunction of P_h . This result generalizes to any Morse-Bott principal symbol which reaches its minimum on a compact isotropic submanifold, see [4] for a treatment in the Berezin-Toeplitz setting.

Other settings in which the principal symbol vanishes in a Morse-Bott way include magnetic Laplacians, where the minimal set is the zero set of the kinetic energy of the classical charged particle. In the two-dimensional case, under the assumption that the magnetic field does not vanish, the minimal set is symplectic, and one obtains an effective 1D quantum Hamiltonian by viewing the minimal set as the reduced phase space. This gives rises to spectral asymptotic to all orders, see [14]. In the three-dimensional case, under the assumption of a maximal rank magnetic 2-form, and a non-degenerate minimum for the magnetic intensity, one obtains a more intricate reduction, which contains half-integer powers of the semiclassical parameter \hbar , see [10].

In this paper, we focus on the 1D case. Despite the critical points, we are able to formulate Bohr-Sommerfeld conditions (in a folded covering) for the eigenvalues in a macroscopic window $[\min Sp(P_\hbar), \min Sp(P_\hbar) + c]$ for c small, see Propositions 5.7 and 5.10. The invariant I_0 appears in the low-lying eigenvalues under a symmetry hypothesis.

Proposition 1.2. *Let $k \geq 0$. Suppose that, in Theorem 1.1, the $k + 1$ first terms V_0, V_1, \dots, V_k of the potential do not depend on θ . Suppose also that $P_\hbar - b_0$ is elliptic at infinity. Then the following is true.*

1. *There exists $f : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ non-constant such that the first eigenvalue e_0^\hbar of P_\hbar satisfies:*

$$e_0^\hbar = b_0 + \hbar V_0(0) + \hbar^2 f\left(\frac{I_0}{\hbar} \bmod \mathbb{Z}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^{\max(k+2,3)}).$$

2. *Let e_1^\hbar similarly denote the second eigenvalue of P_\hbar (with multiplicity). There exists a sequence $(\hbar_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow 0$ such that*

$$e_1^{\hbar_j} - e_0^{\hbar_j} = \mathcal{O}(\hbar_j^{k+2}).$$

This oscillatory behaviour of the first eigenvalue was remarked in recent work on the magnetic Laplacian [9]. It is related to the topological nature of the problem: low-energy eigenfunctions are microsupported on a non-contractible set (here, γ). In previous works by one of the authors [16, 15], quantum maps between open sets of non-trivial topology were already discussed.

In the generic case where V_0 is a Morse function, this oscillatory behaviour disappears at the bottom of the spectrum: because of these sub-principal effects, eigenfunctions with energies smaller than $b_0 + \hbar \max(V_0)$

will microlocalise on a contractible set, and one can build a quantum normal form independent of I_0 .

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 contains a classical normal form for functions admitting a non-degenerate well on a closed loop and a reminder on the invariant I_0 . In preparation for the quantum normal form, Section 3 contains a treatment of formal perturbations of the normal form above. Then, in Section 4 we derive a corresponding quantum normal form, microlocally near the non-degenerate well. In Section 5 we apply this quantum normal form to obtain asymptotics of the low-lying eigenvalues.

2 Reduction of Morse-Bott functions

2.1 Local symplectic normal form

The Morse-Bott condition on p near γ amounts to the following: there exist a neighbourhood Ω_1 of γ and (non necessarily symplectic) smooth coordinates $(t, x) : \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{S}^1$, such that

$$p = b_0 + t^2.$$

In particular, $\gamma = \{t = 0\}$ is a regular level set of the function t .

By the action-angle theorem, there exists a possibly smaller open neighborhood of γ , Ω_2 , equipped with symplectic coordinates $(\theta, I) \in T^*\mathbb{S}^1$, such that $t = g(I)$ for some smooth function g , with

1. $\gamma = \{I = 0\}$;
2. $g'(0) \neq 0$.

Thus we obtain

Proposition 2.1. *If p admits a non-degenerate well along a closed curve γ , then there exists “folded action-angle” coordinates (θ, I) near γ that are adapted to p , in the sense that*

$$p = b_0 + (g(I))^2,$$

for some smooth function $g : (\mathbb{R}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, 0)$ with non-vanishing derivative.

Remark 2.2. It follows that the set of leaves defined by p , i.e. the space of connected components of levels sets of p , is a smooth one-dimensional manifold \mathcal{C} (parameterized by I or $\tilde{I} := g(I)$), and the induced map $\bar{p} - b_0 : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a simple fold: $\tilde{I} \mapsto \tilde{I}^2$.

For any $\delta \in \mathcal{C}$, and $h \in C^\infty(\hat{\Omega})$, we define

$$\langle h \rangle_\delta := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} h(\theta, I(\delta)) d\theta.$$

Let us denote by φ_H^t the hamiltonian flow of the function H at time t . We notice that, for all $m \in \delta$,

$$\langle h \rangle_\delta = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} (\varphi_I^t)^* h(m) dt = \frac{1}{T_\delta} \int_0^{T_\delta} (\varphi_f^t)^* h(m) dt,$$

where $T_\delta = \frac{2\pi}{g'(I(\delta))}$ is the period of the Hamiltonian flow of f on δ . This defines a map $m \mapsto \langle h \rangle_\delta \in C^\infty(\hat{\Omega})$, that we denote by $\langle h \rangle$.

2.2 The first Bohr-Sommerfeld invariant

Let us recall, in this context, the appearance of an invariant associated to γ when quantizing the symplectic change of variables of Proposition 2.1.

Definition 2.3. Suppose that either $M = \mathbb{R}^2$ or $M = T^*S^1$. We define $I_0(\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

1. If γ is contractible, it is the boundary of a close, compact surface $\Sigma \subset M$. Let $I_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_\Sigma \omega$.
2. If γ is not contractible, then $M = T^*S^1$ and γ is a curve with winding number 1 with respect to θ . For $K \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, $\gamma \cup \{\xi = -K\}$ is the boundary of a close, compact surface $\Sigma \subset M$. Let $I_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi} (-K + \int_\Sigma \omega)$.

The following proposition is well known.

Proposition 2.4. I_0 is a Hamiltonian invariant of γ .

Proof. In case 1, I_0 is clearly a symplectic invariant.

In case 2, (and in fact the same reasoning applies to case 1 as well) let $\alpha = Id\theta$ be the canonical Liouville 1-form of T^*S^1 ; then we have $I_0(\gamma) = \int_\gamma \alpha$ (because both sides of this equality vanish when γ is $\{I = 0\}$.) If X is a Hamiltonian vector field, then by Cartan's formula, $\mathcal{L}_X \alpha$ is an exact 1-form and hence acts on the cohomology class of α restricted to γ (known as the Liouville class of γ). Therefore, a Hamiltonian flow preserves the Liouville class. On T^*S^1 this means that it preserves the integral $\int_\gamma \alpha$. □

Remark 2.5. In the case 2 above, I_0 is *not* a *symplectic* invariant of γ ; indeed any curve of the type $\{\xi = C\}$, for $C \in \mathbb{R}$ can be sent to $\{\xi = 0\}$ by the symplectic change of variables $(\theta, I) \mapsto (\theta, I - C)$. However, for this curve, $I_0 = C$.

Remark 2.6. Note that the Liouville class I_0 is the first Bohr-Sommerfeld invariant, *i.e.* the principal term in the Bohr-Sommerfeld cocycle defined in [15] (the subprincipal terms involve Maslov indices and the 1-form induced by the subprincipal symbol of P_h). In the case of Berezin-Toeplitz quantization, I_0 can be defined using parallel transport along γ on the prequantum bundle [1]. In this case, I_0 is defined up to a sign and modulo \mathbb{Z} , but the choice does not impact the oscillations in Proposition 1.2 since, for Toeplitz quantization, \hbar^{-1} takes integer values.

In the rest of this section, we use Proposition 2.1 to build normal forms given by Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms.

Proposition 2.7. *Let $p : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ admitting a non-degenerate well along a curve γ .*

There exists $\epsilon > 0$ and a symplectic change of variables $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, equal to the identity outside of a compact set, such that, for all $(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$|x|^2 + |\xi|^2 \in (2I_0 - \epsilon, 2I_0 + \epsilon) \Rightarrow p \circ \sigma(x, \xi) = b_0 + (g(|x|^2 + |\xi|^2 - 2I_0))^2.$$

Proof. Let $r_0 = \sqrt{2I_0}$.

By Proposition 2.1, there exists a symplectic change of variables σ_0 from a neighbourhood Ω_0 of γ to a neighbourhood of $\{|x|^2 + |\xi|^2 = 2I_0\}$ such that $p \circ \sigma_0(x, \xi) = (g(|x|^2 + |\xi|^2 - 2I_0))^2$.

Let Ω_i be a neighbourhood of the compact component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_0$, such that Ω_i is delimited by a connected component of a level set of p . The open set Ω_i is contractible; let $\phi_i : \Omega_i \rightarrow B(0, r_i)$ be a diffeomorphism smooth up to the boundary, where r_i is fixed by a scaling and such that $\text{vol}(\Omega_i) = \pi r_i^2$.

The map $\phi_i \circ \sigma_0^{-1}$ is a smooth diffeomorphism from the boundary $\{x^2 + \xi^2 = r_i^2\}$ to itself, and is the boundary value of an orientation-preserving, smooth map. Hence it has winding number 1 and is smoothly isotopic to the identity. This allows us to correct ϕ_i into $\tilde{\phi}_i$, which satisfies the same conditions, and such that $\tilde{\phi}_i \circ \sigma_0^{-1}$ is the identity near $\{x^2 + \xi^2 = r_i^2\}$.

We apply the same strategy to a neighbourhood Ω_e of the infinite component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_0$, and obtain a smooth diffeomorphism $\tilde{\phi}_e$, equal to identity outside a very large ball.

Now the three smooth functions $\tilde{\phi}_i$, $\tilde{\phi}_e$, and σ_0 , coincide on the intersections of their domains of definition, so that gluing them yields a smooth diffeomorphism ϕ satisfying the following conditions.

- There exists a neighbourhood Ω_1 of γ on which ϕ is a symplectomorphism and

$$p = [(x, \xi) \mapsto (g(x^2 + \xi^2 - 2I_0))^2] \circ \phi.$$

- The volume of the compact component K_i of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_1$ is equal to the volume of its image by ϕ .
- ϕ is identity outside a large ball $B(0, R)$
- The volume of K_e , the infinite component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_1$ intersected with $B(0, R)$, is equal to the volume of its image by ϕ .

It only remains to modify ϕ into a volume-preserving transformation. To this end, we will apply the Moser trick.

On $\phi(K_i)$, consider the standard volume form ω_{st} , and the pushed-forward volume form $\phi^*\omega_{st}$. These two forms coincide on a neighbourhood of the boundary and have same integral. The interpolation

$$[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto \omega_t = t\omega_{st} + (1 - t)\phi^*\omega_{st}$$

yields a family of exact symplectic forms: every (closed) 2-form with zero integral is exact. By Moser's argument, there exists a diffeomorphism $\psi_i : \phi(K_i) \rightarrow \phi(K_i)$, sending $\phi^*\omega_{st}$ to ω_{st} , and equal to identity near the boundary. In particular, one can correct ϕ into a symplectic change of variables on K_i , without modifying ϕ near the boundary of K_i .

To conclude, we play the same game on $\phi(K_e)$. □

Remark 2.8. In the previous Proposition, if a ball $B(0, c)$ lies inside the compact component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \gamma$, one can impose that σ is equal to identity on $B(0, c - \epsilon)$. Indeed, in this case, one can prescribe that ϕ_i is the identity on $B(0, c - \epsilon/2)$, and the corrections in the rest of the proof preserve the fact that ϕ_i is the identity on $B(0, c - \epsilon)$.

Proposition 2.9. *Let $p : T^*S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ admitting a non-degenerate well along a curve γ . Suppose that γ is non-contractible.*

*Then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ and a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism $\sigma : T^*S^1 \rightarrow T^*S^1$, equal to the identity outside of a compact set, such that, for all $(x, \xi) \in T^*S^1$,*

$$\xi \in (I_0 - \epsilon, I_0 + \epsilon) \Rightarrow p \circ \sigma(x, \xi) = b_0 + (g(\xi - I_0))^2.$$

Proof. Let $R > 0$; consider the following symplectomorphism from $S^1 \times [-2R, 2R]$ to $\{(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^2, R \leq x^2 + \xi^2 \leq 9R\}$:

$$(\theta, I) \mapsto \{(\sqrt{2(I + 5R/2)} \cos(\theta), \sqrt{2(I + 5R/2)} \sin(\theta))\}.$$

Through this symplectomorphism, we are reduced to Proposition 2.7: because of the volume considerations, one can extend the symplectic normal form given by Proposition 2.1 to a hamiltonian change of variables, equal to identity outside of $\{(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^2, R \leq x^2 + \xi^2 \leq 9R\}$. \square

The symplectic change of variables at the beginning of the last proof can be quantized; this will allow us in Section to quantize the normal form 2.1 into a unitary operator, up to $\mathcal{O}(\hbar)$ error, but where I is replaced with $I - I_0$. Improving this $\mathcal{O}(\hbar)$ error is the topic of the next section.

3 Formal perturbations

Suppose that p admits a non-degenerate well along γ , with $p(\gamma) = b_0$, and let

$$p_\epsilon := p + \epsilon p_1,$$

where p_1 is smooth. We consider infinitesimal Hamiltonian deformations of p , *i.e.* functions of the form $\exp(\epsilon \text{ad}_a)p = p_\epsilon + \epsilon\{a, p_\epsilon\} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$, where the generator of the deformation is the smooth function a (and $\text{ad}_a(h) := \{a, h\} = -\text{ad}_p(a)$). We have

$$\exp(\epsilon \text{ad}_a)p_\epsilon = p + \epsilon(p_1 + \{a, p\}) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2).$$

This leads to the study of the cohomological equation $\{a, p\} = r$ where r is given and a is unknown. As in the previous section, we let f be the smooth branch of $\sqrt{p - b_0}$.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a neighborhood $\hat{\Omega}$ of γ on which, for any $h \in C^\infty(\hat{\Omega})$, the following holds.*

1. $h \in \ker \text{ad}_p$ if and only if $h = q \circ f$ for some smooth function q .
2. $h \in \text{ad}_p(C^\infty(\hat{\Omega}))$ if and only if
 - (a) for all $\delta \in \mathcal{C}$, $\langle h \rangle_\delta = 0$ and
 - (b) $h|_\gamma = 0$.

Proof.

1. In the action-angle variables of Proposition 2.1 one has

$$p : (\theta, I) \mapsto b_0 + (g(I))^2,$$

where $g : (\mathbb{R}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, 0)$ is a smooth diffeomorphism.

On Ω_2 , one has

$$\{p, h\} = 2g'(I)g(I)\partial_\theta h(\theta, I).$$

In particular, $\{p, h\} = 0$ if and only if h depends only on I , that is, $h = q \circ f$ for some $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$.

2. Let us decompose $h \in C^\infty(\Omega_2, \mathbb{R})$ in Fourier series in θ :

$$h : (\theta, I) \mapsto \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} h_k(I) e^{ik\theta}.$$

We search for $a \in C^\infty(\Omega_2, \mathbb{R})$, of the form

$$a : (\theta, I) \mapsto \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k(I) e^{ik\theta}.$$

such that

$$\{a, p\} = h.$$

One can compute

$$\{a_k(I) e^{ik\theta}, p\} = ik g'(I) g(I) a_k(I) e^{ik\theta}.$$

The action of ad_p is diagonal with respect to the Fourier series decomposition; h belongs to its image if and only if $h_0 = 0$ and for every $k \neq 0$, h_k belongs to the ideal generated by g , that is, $h_k(0) = 0$. This concludes the proof.

□

Let $\pi_\theta : \hat{\Omega} \rightarrow \gamma$ be given by $(\theta, I) \mapsto \theta$. The space of functions that depend only on θ is then denoted $\pi_\theta^* C^\infty(\gamma)$.

Inside $\ker \text{ad}_p$, let $(\ker \text{ad}_p)_0$ denote the subspace of functions vanishing on γ .

Corollary 3.2. *There is a direct sum decomposition*

$$C^\infty(\hat{\Omega}) = (\ker \text{ad}_p)_0 \oplus \text{ad}_p(C^\infty(\hat{\Omega})) \oplus \pi_\theta^* C^\infty(\gamma).$$

Proof. Let us write again h as a Fourier series in θ :

$$h : (\theta, I) \mapsto \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} h_k(I) e^{ik\theta}.$$

We decompose $h = h_1 + h_2 + h_3$, where

$$\begin{aligned} (\ker \text{ad}_p)_0 &\ni h_1 : (\theta, I) \mapsto h_0(I) - h_0(0) \\ \text{ad}_p(C^\infty(\Omega_2)) &\ni h_2 : (\theta, I) \mapsto \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^*} (h_k(I) - h_k(0)) e^{ik\theta} \\ \pi_\theta^* C^\infty(\gamma) &\ni h_3 : (\theta, I) \mapsto \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} h_k(0) e^{ik\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

In particular, we obtain the following:

Proposition 3.3. *Given any $r \in C^\infty(\hat{\Omega})$, there exists $a \in C^\infty(\hat{\Omega})$, $q \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, b_0)$ with $q(0) = 0$, and $V \in \pi_\theta^* C^\infty(\gamma)$, such that*

$$\{p, a\} = r - q \circ f - V.$$

By induction, this leads to the following Birkhoff normal form.

Theorem 3.4. *Let p_ϵ be a formal deformation of p :*

$$p_\epsilon \sim p + \epsilon p_1 + \epsilon^2 p_2 + \dots$$

There exists a symplectic diffeomorphism φ_ϵ in a neighborhood of γ , depending smoothly on ϵ , such that

$$\varphi_\epsilon^* p_\epsilon = b_0 + (g_\epsilon \circ f)^2 + \epsilon V_\epsilon + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^\infty),$$

where $g_\epsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, 0)$, $V_\epsilon = \pi_\theta^ \tilde{V}_\epsilon$ for some $\tilde{V}_\epsilon \in C^\infty(\gamma)$; moreover both g_ϵ and \tilde{V}_ϵ (and hence V_ϵ) admit an asymptotic expansion in integer powers of ϵ (for the C^∞ topology), and moreover $g_\epsilon = g + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ and $g_\epsilon(0) = g(0)$.*

*In other words, there exists canonical coordinates $(\theta, I) \in T^*S^1$ in which*

$$p_\epsilon(\theta, I) = b_0 + (g_\epsilon(I))^2 + \epsilon V_\epsilon(\theta) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^\infty).$$

Proof. By the classical normal form we may assume that $p = b_0 + (g \circ f)^2$. Suppose by induction that

$$\varphi_\epsilon^* p_\epsilon = b_0 + (g_\epsilon \circ f)^2 + \epsilon V_\epsilon + \epsilon^N r,$$

for some $N \geq 1$ (if $N = 1$ we choose $g_\epsilon = g$ and $V_\epsilon = 0$).

Let (a, q, V) be as in Proposition 3.3. We have

$$\exp(\epsilon^N \text{ad}_a) \varphi_\epsilon^* p_\epsilon = \varphi_\epsilon^* p_\epsilon + \epsilon^N \{a, \varphi_\epsilon^* p_\epsilon\} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{2N}).$$

Hence

$$\exp(\epsilon^N \text{ad}_a) \varphi_\epsilon^* p_\epsilon = b_0 + (g_\epsilon \circ f)^2 + \epsilon V_\epsilon + \epsilon^N (r + \{a, p\}) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{N+1}),$$

with

$$r + \{a, p\} = q \circ f + V$$

where $q(0) = 0$.

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(\epsilon^N \text{ad}_a) \varphi_\epsilon^* p_\epsilon &= b_0 + (g_\epsilon \circ f)^2 + \epsilon^N q \circ f + \epsilon(V_\epsilon + \epsilon^{N-1} V) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{N+1}) \quad (2) \\ &= b_0 + \left[\left(g_\epsilon + \epsilon^N \frac{1}{2} q \right) \circ f \right]^2 + \epsilon(V_\epsilon + \epsilon^{N-1} V) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{N+1}) \end{aligned}$$

Finally if we assumed that φ_ϵ was the time-one flow of a Hamiltonian a_ϵ , we see that the left-hand side of (2) is the flow of the Hamiltonian $a_\epsilon + \epsilon^N a$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{N+1})$. This proves the induction step. \square

4 Semiclassical normal form

4.1 Quantum maps

In order to quantize the results of Section 2, we need a proper notion of quantum map corresponding to a symplectic change of variables.

In the whole of this section, to simplify notation, we will use the subscript \hbar to denote that an object depends on a parameter \hbar belonging to a punctured neighbourhood of zero within a closed subset of \mathbb{R}^+ .

Definition 4.1. Let $(M^1, \sigma^1, H_h^1, Op_h^1)$ and $(M^2, \sigma^2, H_h^2, Op_h^2)$ be two quantization procedures: for $i = 1, 2$, (M^i, σ^i) are symplectic manifolds, H_h^i are (\hbar -dependent) Hilbert spaces and $Op_h^i : C_c^\infty(M, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow B(H_h^i)$ realise formal deformations of the Poisson algebras $C_c^\infty(M^i, \mathbb{C})$. The functors Op_h^i yield natural notions of \hbar -wave front set for families of elements of H_h^i .

A **quantum map** consists of data $(U_h, \Omega_1, \Omega_2, \sigma)$, where Ω_1, Ω_2 are respectively open subsets of M_1 and M_2 , $\sigma : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ is a smooth and proper symplectomorphism, and $U_h : H_h^1 \rightarrow H_h^2$ satisfies the following properties:

1. For every $K \subset\subset \Omega_1$, for every $u_h \in H^1$ with $\|u_h\|_{H^1} = 1$ and $WF_h(u_h) \subset K$, one has

$$\|U_h u_h\|_{H^2} = 1 + \mathcal{O}_K(\hbar^\infty).$$

2. For every $K \subset\subset \Omega_2$, for every $v_h \in H^2$ with $\|v_h\|_{H^2} = 1$ and $WF_h(v_h) \subset K$, one has

$$\|U_h^* v_h\|_{H^1} = 1 + \mathcal{O}_K(\hbar^\infty).$$

3. For every $a \in C_c^\infty(M_2, \mathbb{R})$, there exists a sequence $(b_k)_{k \geq 0} \in [C_c^\infty(M_1, \mathbb{R})]^{\mathbb{N}_0}$, such that $b_0 = a \circ \sigma$ and for all $K \subset\subset \Omega_2$, for every $v_h \in H^2$ with $\|v_h\|_{H^2} = 1$ and $WF_h(v_h) \subset K$, one has

$$U_h Op_h^2(a) U_h^* v = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hbar^{-k} Op_h^1(b_k) v + O(\hbar^\infty).$$

A linear operator U_h satisfying conditions 1 and 2 above will be called a microlocal unitary transform.

A broad class of examples of quantum maps is given by the Egorov Theorem (see [18]). Indeed, if $(M^1, \omega^1) = (M^2, \omega^2) = T^*X$ where X is a smooth, compact manifold, if Op is the Weyl quantization, and if σ is a global Hamiltonian transformation (corresponding to a time-dependent Hamiltonian $H(t)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$), then one can construct U_h as follows: for $u_0 \in L^2(X)$, $U_h u_0$ is the solution at time $t = 1$ of the differential equation $i\hbar \partial_t u(t) = Op_h^W(H(t))u(t)$ with initial value $u(0) = u_0$. This procedure also works in more general quantization contexts.

In this section, we will use two particular quantum maps from T^*S^1 to \mathbb{R}^2 , which we define now.

Definition 4.2. Let $\Omega_1 = S^1 \times \mathbb{R}_*^+$ and $\Omega_2 = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ be respectively open sets of T^*S^1 and \mathbb{R}^2 . Let $\sigma : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ be defined as

$$(\theta, I) \mapsto (\sqrt{2I} \cos(\theta), \sqrt{2I} \sin(\theta)).$$

For $\hbar > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $\phi_{k,\hbar} \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ denote the k -th Hermite eigenfunction of the \hbar -harmonic oscillator, defined by the following induction relation:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{0,\hbar} : x &\mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\hbar}} \\ \phi_{k+1,\hbar} &= \frac{1}{\hbar\sqrt{2(k+1)}} (-\hbar\partial + x)\phi_{k,\hbar} \quad \text{for } k \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The toric quantum map $(\mathcal{T}_\hbar, \Omega_1, \Omega_2, \sigma)$ is defined by its action on the Fourier basis as

$$\mathcal{T}_\hbar(\theta \mapsto e^{ik\theta}) = \begin{cases} \phi_{k,\hbar} & \text{if } k \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } k < 0. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 4.3. *The toric quantum map is indeed a quantum map.*

Proof. By definition, one has, for $k \geq 0$,

$$\mathcal{T}_h^*(-\hbar\partial + x)\mathcal{T}_h(\theta \mapsto e^{ik\theta}) = (\theta \mapsto \sqrt{2\hbar}\sqrt{k+1}e^{i(k+1)\theta}).$$

In other terms, if Op_h^1 denotes left quantization [18],

$$\mathcal{T}_h^*(-\hbar\partial + x)\mathcal{T}_h = Op_h^1(\sqrt{2I}\mathbf{1}_{I \geq 0}e^{i\theta}).$$

Weyl quantization and left quantization are equivalent for smooth symbols. Hence, there exists $(b_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \in [C^\infty(S^1 \times \mathbb{R}_+^*, \mathbb{R})]^{\mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ such that, for all $K \subset\subset S^1 \times \mathbb{R}_+^*$, for all $u_h \in L^2(S^1)$ normalised with $WF_h(u_h) \subset K$, one has

$$\mathcal{T}_h^*(-\hbar\partial + x)\mathcal{T}_h u = Op_h^W \left(\sqrt{2I}\mathbf{1}_{I \geq 0}e^{i\theta} + \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \hbar^{-k} b_k(\theta, I) \right) u + \mathcal{O}_K(\hbar^\infty).$$

Taking the symmetric and antisymmetric part yields, with the same hypotheses,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_h^* Op_h^W(x)\mathcal{T}_h u &= Op_h^W \left(\sqrt{2I} \cos(\theta) + \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \hbar^{-k} \operatorname{Re}(b_k)(\theta, I) \right) u \\ \mathcal{T}_h^* Op_h^W(\xi)\mathcal{T}_h u &= Op_h^W \left(\sqrt{2I} \sin(\theta) + \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \hbar^{-k} \operatorname{Im}(b_k)(\theta, I) \right) u. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the Weyl calculus, one can determine $\mathcal{T}_h^* Op_h(P(x, \xi))\mathcal{T}_h$ for any polynomial P , and eventually of any smooth function. \square

Definition 4.4. Let $(x_0, \xi_0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and let $r < \pi$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &= \{(\theta, I) \in S^1 \times \mathbb{R}, \operatorname{dist}(\theta + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}, x_0)^2 + (I - \xi_0)^2 < r\} \\ \Omega_2 &= \{(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^2, (x - x_0)^2 + (\xi - \xi_0)^2 < r\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\sigma_{x_0, \xi_0, r} : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ be defined by $(\theta, I) \mapsto (x_\theta, I)$ where $x_\theta \in \theta + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ and $\operatorname{dist}(x_\theta, x_0) = \operatorname{dist}(\theta + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}, x_0)$. Let $\chi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto [0, 1]$ be a smooth function equal to 1 on a neighbourhood of $[-r, r]$ and to 0 on a neighbourhood of $\mathbb{R} \setminus [-\pi, \pi]$.

We then define $W_{x_0, \xi_0, r} : L^2(S^1) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$ as follows: for $u \in L^2(S^1)$,

$$W_{x_0, \xi_0, r} u : x \mapsto \chi(x - x_0) Op_h^W(\mathbf{1}_{(\theta, I) \in \Omega_1}) u(x \bmod 2\pi\mathbb{Z}),$$

and we define the unrolling quantum map as $(W_{x_0, \xi_0, r}, \Omega_1, \Omega_2, \sigma)$.

The unrolling quantum map is a quantum map by definition of Op^W on T^*S^1 .

4.2 Quantization of the normal form

From now on, $M = T^*X$, with $X = \mathbb{R}$ or $X = S^1$; our semiclassical analysis will be concerned with Weyl quantization. The results can be transported to other geometrical settings (manifolds with asymptotically conic or hyperbolic ends, Berezin-Toeplitz quantization of compact manifolds, ...) as long as one has a good notion of ellipticity at infinity and a microlocal equivalence with Weyl quantization, and provided that one can make sense of the invariant I_0 above. One should note, however, that the Morse condition of Section 5.3 is not invariant under a change of quantization.

Let P be a semiclassical pseudo-differential operator on X with a classical symbol in a standard class,

$$p_h(x, \xi) = p_0(x, \xi) + \hbar p_1(x, \xi) + \cdots$$

We assume that the principal symbol p_0 admits a non-degenerate well on a loop γ .

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.1

Proof. One proceeds as in Theorem 3.4. The starting point is a quantization U_0 of the symplectic normal form given by Proposition 2.1.

In our setting, there are three possible topological situations for γ , and we give the three corresponding constructions of U_0 .

1. If $M = \mathbb{R}^2$, then γ is contractible and one can apply Proposition 2.7. Let H be a (time-dependent) Hamiltonian satisfying the conditions of Proposition 2.7 (in particular, H is constant near infinity, so it belongs to the symbol class S_0). We let $\exp(-i\hbar^{-1}\hat{H})$ be the corresponding quantum evolution. We now let, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$U_0 = \mathcal{T}_h^* \exp(i\hbar^{-1}\hat{H}).$$

2. If $M = T^*S^1$ and γ is contractible, we let Σ be the compact connected component of $M \setminus \gamma$, and we let $(B((\theta_i, \xi_i), r_i))_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be a finite covering of a contractible neighbourhood of Σ by disks of radius $< \pi$, and $(\chi_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be an associated partition of unity. We then let $(x_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be a family of real numbers such that $[x_i] = \theta_i$ and $(B((x_i, \xi_i), r_i))_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is a covering of a connected preimage $\hat{\Sigma}$ of Σ by the rolling map. Then, we define

$$W = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} W_{x_i, \theta_i, r_i} Op_W^{\hbar}(\chi_i).$$

Near $\hat{\Sigma}$, one can apply Proposition 2.7 as in the previous case, and we let

$$U_0 = \mathcal{T}_h^* \exp(-i\hbar^{-1}\hat{H})W.$$

3. If $M = T^*S^1$ and γ is not contractible, then we apply Proposition 2.9; if H is a (time-dependent) Hamiltonian satisfying Proposition 2.9, then we let

$$U_0 = \exp(-i\hbar^{-1}\hat{H}).$$

In all cases, by the Egorov theorem, there exists a sequence $(q_k)_{k \geq 1}$ of symbols such that, for all u microlocalised in a neighbourhood of $\{\xi = I_0\}$, one has

$$Q_0 u := U_0 P U_0^* u = b_0 u + \left(g_0 \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right) \right)^2 u + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \hbar^{-k} O p_h^W(q_k) u + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty).$$

It remains to correct U_0 by induction, in order to get an $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty)$ remainder. To this end, we proceed exactly as in Theorem 3.4, replacing $\exp(\hbar^N \text{ad}_a)$ with $\exp(i\hbar^{N-1} O p_W^h(a))$ which acts the same way up to a next-order error. \square

5 Low-energy spectrum under global ellipticity

If γ is a global minimum for p , then from Theorem 1.1 one can hope to describe the spectrum of P_h at low energies. This section is devoted to the spectral study of Q_h under two different assumptions.

1. Case where V_0 is constant. When \hbar varies, the eigenvalues are located on smooth branches (parabolas) and the smallest eigenvalue regularly “jumps” from one branch to the other (See Figure 1). In the case of Schrödinger operators with a strong magnetic field, this oscillatory effect is known as “Little-Parks”, see Figure 1 in [12] and [8].
2. Generic subprincipal symbol. Then we can reduce to a Schrödinger-like operator with Morse potential V , but after a $\sqrt{\hbar}$ zoom in the variable I . We consider the two following interesting cases.
 - (a) local minima of the potential: we get “mini-wells”;
 - (b) local maxima: we can describe the concentration on hyperbolic trajectories.

Before studying these assumptions, we recall that the microlocal knowledge of P near γ is sufficient to treat low-energy eigenvalues if the symbol is elliptic at infinity.




Figure 1: Small eigenvalues for the operator $Op_W^h((x^2 + y^2 - 1)^2)$ acting on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, as a function of $1/h$. The first eigenvalue jumps branches when $1/h$ is a multiple of $\frac{1}{I_0} = 2$.

5.1 Microlocal confinement

From now on, we make the following assumption:

Assumption 1. *The curve γ is a global minimum for p . Moreover, $p - b_0$ is elliptic at infinity in a scattering symbol class $S^{m,\ell}$ with $m \geq 0$ and $\ell \geq 0$. That is,*

$$\forall (j, k) \in \mathbb{N}^2, \exists C_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}, \forall (x, \xi) \in T^*M, |\partial_x^j \partial_\xi^k p(x, \xi)| < C_{jk} (1 + |x|)^{\ell-j} (1 + |\xi|)^{m-k}.$$

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Then there exists $E_0 > b_0$ and $h_0 > 0$ such that, for any $\hbar < h_0$ and any eigenpair (u, E) of P with $E < E_0$ and $\|u\|_{L^2(X)} = 1$, one has $\|Uu\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)} = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty)$ and*

$$\|QUu - Uu\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)} = \mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty).$$

Proof. Let $E_0 > p(\gamma)$ be such that

$$\{p \leq E_0\} \subset\subset \Omega \quad \phi_0^{-1}(\{p \leq E_0\}) \subset\subset \{|I - I_0| \leq \eta\}.$$

By standard elliptic estimates (see Appendix E in [7], for instance), u is $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty)$ outside $\{p \leq E_0\}$, so that $\|Uu\|_{L^2} = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty)$ by item 1 in Theorem

1.1; moreover the characteristic of U is the graph of ϕ_0^{-1} , so that $WF_h(Uu) \subset \{|I - I_0| \leq \eta\}$. Thus, one can apply item 2 in Theorem 1.1. \square

The $S_{\rho, 1-\rho}$ -calculus for $\rho < \frac{1}{2}$ then leads to the following, more precise localisation estimate.

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Let $\delta > 0$ and $\delta' > 0$. For every $\hbar^{1-\delta} \leq E \leq E_0$, where E_0 is as in Proposition 5.2, for every unit eigenfunction v of Q with eigenvalue E , \hat{v} is $\mathcal{O}_{\delta, \delta'}(\hbar^\infty)$ on $\{|I - I_0| \geq \hbar^{\frac{1-\delta-\delta'}{2}}\}$.*

Here, for $v \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)$, \hat{v} is the semiclassical discrete Fourier transform of v , which we view as an element of $\ell^2(\hbar\mathbb{Z})$.

5.2 Case with a symmetry

In this section we suppose that V_0 is constant, and we prove Proposition 1.2.

We first give a proof in the simpler case when one has also V_1 constant.

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds and that V_h does not depend on θ modulo \hbar^N . Let E_0 be as in Proposition 5.1. The eigenvalues of P in the window $(-\infty, b_0 + E)$ are given up to a uniform $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^{N+1})$ error by*

$$\{b_0 + \hbar V_h(0) + g_h(\hbar k)^2 \cap [0, c), k \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Proof. From Proposition 5.1, the eigenvalues of P in the window above are exactly given by eigenvalues of Q in the same window, up to an $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty)$ error. Reciprocally, since low-energy eigenfunctions of Q are themselves microlocalised in $\{|\xi - I_0| < \epsilon\}$, small eigenvalues of Q are $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty)$ -close to the spectrum of P .

If V_h does not depend on θ up to some error, then Q is a Fourier multiplier (up to this error), whose eigenvalues are the values at $I \in \hbar\mathbb{Z}$. \square

Proposition 5.4. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds and that V_0 does not depend on θ .*

Then the first eigenvalue of P_h is given, up to $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^3)$, by $b_0 + \hbar(g_1(I_0) + V_0) + \hbar^2 f(I_0 \hbar^{-1})$, where f is a non-constant, 1-periodic function.

Proof. For all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$\lambda_k = (k - I_0 \hbar^{-1}) g_1'(I_0) + (k - I_0 \hbar^{-1})^2 g_0'(I_0).$$

Let us also write a Fourier decomposition of V_1 as

$$V_1 : \theta \mapsto \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} v_l e^{il\theta}.$$

Then, by the ellipticity assumption, the first eigenvalue of P_{\hbar} coincides, modulo $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^3)$, with the first eigenvalue of

$$b_0 + \hbar(V_0 + g_1(I_0)) + \hbar^2 A$$

where A is the following operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$:

$$\forall (k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2, A_{k,l} = \begin{cases} \lambda_k + v_0 & \text{if } k = l \\ v_{l-k} & \text{if } k \neq l. \end{cases}$$

The spectrum of the operator A is 1-periodic as a function of $\sigma = I_0 \hbar^{-1}$. Indeed,

$$\lambda_k(\sigma) = \lambda_{k+1}(\sigma + 1).$$

In particular, the first eigenvalue of P_{\hbar} has the requested form, but it remains to prove that f is not constant.

To this end, observe that A has compact resolvent and analytic dependence on σ , so that if its first eigenvalue is constant, the corresponding eigenspace E_0 is also constant.

However, we observe that $\partial_{\sigma}^2 A = g_0'(I_0)^2 \text{Id}$, with $g_0'(I_0) \neq 0$. In particular, since E_0 does not depend on σ , $\partial_{\sigma}^2 A|_{E_0} = g_0'(I_0)^2 \text{Id}$, so that the first eigenvalue cannot be constant. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 5.5. Since g_0^2 reaches a non-degenerate minimum at I_0 , the first eigenvalue of P is, in this case,

$$b_0 + \hbar g_1(I_0) + \hbar(\hbar k_{\hbar} - I_0)g_1'(I_0) + (\hbar k_{\hbar} - I_0)^2 g_0'(I_0)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^3),$$

where

$$k_{\hbar} = \left\lfloor \frac{I_0}{\hbar} - \frac{1}{2}g_1'(I_0) - \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor,$$

for typical values of \hbar (unless $\frac{I_0}{\hbar} - \frac{1}{2}g_1'(I_0) - \frac{1}{2}$ is \hbar -close to an integer, in which case it might be $k_{\hbar} + 1$ or $k_{\hbar} - 1$). In particular, this proves Proposition 1.2.

The function V_0 is the pseudodifferential equivalent of the “Melin value” μ introduced and studied in [4]. In particular, if the subprincipal symbol p_1 of the original operator is identically zero, then so is V_0 . However, the term V_1 is, in general, non-zero.

Example 5.6. Let $S \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Consider the normalized spin operator

$$S_z^2 = \frac{1}{4(S+1)^2} \begin{pmatrix} (-S)^2 & & & & \\ & (-S+1)^2 & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & (S-1)^2 & \\ & & & & S^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This operator is the Berezin-Toeplitz quantization of the symbol $(x, y, z) \mapsto z^2 - \hbar$ on \mathbb{S}^2 , where the semiclassical parameter is $\hbar = \frac{1}{2S}$. This symbol vanishes on the equator in a Morse-Bott way; here $I_0 = \frac{1}{2}$. In this rotational invariant case, one has $V = 0$.

Even though \hbar is a discrete parameter, the oscillation phenomenon of Figure 1 is also found here: for integer values of S , the lowest eigenvalue of S_z^2 is 0; whereas for half-integer values of S it is $\frac{1}{8(S+1)^2}$.

Spin operators are models for magnetism in solids. In some contexts, the behaviour of a spin system is expected to strongly depend on whether the spin is integer or half-integer (Haldane conjecture). These effects may be related to the model case above.

5.3 Morse case

In this section we make Assumption 2. We give Bohr-Sommerfeld quantization rules in two overlapping regimes: the first one consists of energies smaller than $b_0 + C\hbar$ for any fixed $C > 0$. The second consists of energies in the window $[b_0 + C\hbar, b_0 + c]$ for $C > 0$ large enough and $c > 0$ small enough. Propositions 5.7 and 5.10 yield together the spectrum of P_0 up to energies $b_0 + c$.

5.3.1 Small energies

Proposition 5.7. *Let the following operators act on $L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)$:*

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= g'_0(I_0)^2 \left(\frac{\sqrt{\hbar}}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 + V_0(\theta) \\ H_1 &= 2g'_0(I_0) \left[g_1(I_0) + g'_0(I_0) \left(\frac{I_0}{\hbar} - \left\lfloor \frac{I_0}{\hbar} \right\rfloor \right) \right] \frac{\sqrt{\hbar}}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $C > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that the spectrum of P_\hbar , in the interval $[b_0, b_0 + C\hbar]$, is the spectrum of $H_0 + \sqrt{\hbar}H_1$ in the interval $[0, 2C]$, composed by the affine function $\lambda \mapsto b_0 + \hbar\lambda$, and up to an error uniformly bounded by $C_1\hbar^{2-\epsilon}$.

Remark 5.8. The operator $H_0 + \sqrt{\hbar}H_1$ is the quantization of a symbol on $L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)$, with semiclassical parameter $\sqrt{\hbar}$; H_0 corresponds to the principal part and H_1 to the subprincipal part. The spectrum of this operator, on fixed intervals, can be described by Bohr-Sommerfeld rules if V is Morse: we

refer to [5] for the regular case, [2] for the elliptic case (a), and [3] for the hyperbolic case (b).

In particular, away from the critical values of V_0 , for instance on $[\max V_0 + c, C]$, the principal symbol of H_0 is regular and consists of two connected components. On each of these components, the Bohr-Sommerfeld rule yield $\mathcal{O}(\hbar)$ -quasimodes for $H_0 + \sqrt{\hbar}H_1$, whose associated eigenvalues are separated by $\epsilon\sqrt{\hbar}$ for ϵ small enough depending on c . Eigenmodes corresponding to different components are microlocalized on disjoint regions of phase space (respectively $\{\xi > c\}$ and $\{\xi < -c\}$ so that they do not interact up to $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty)$. In conclusion, for \hbar small enough, by a perturbative argument, one can construct $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty)$ -quasimodes for Q in this spectral region, yielding $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty)$ -quasimodes for P in the region $[b_0 + \hbar(\max V_0 + c), b_0 + \hbar C]$.

Proof. First, by Proposition 5.1 we are reduced to the study of the spectrum Q in the same interval $[b_0, b_0 + C\hbar]$.

By Proposition 5.2, any eigenfunction v of Q in this interval is localised in frequency in $\{|\xi - I_0| \leq C\hbar^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}\}$ for all $\epsilon > 0$. In particular, if the Taylor expansion of g_0 and g_1 around I_0 are

$$\begin{aligned} g_0(I) &= g'_0(I_0)(I - I_0) + \frac{g''_0(I_0)}{2}(I - I_0)^2 + \mathcal{O}((I - I_0)^3) \\ g_1(I) &= g_1(I_0) + \mathcal{O}(I - I_0), \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[g_0 \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right) + \hbar g_1 \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right) \right]^2 v \\ &= \left[g'_0(I_0) \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} - I_0 \right) + \frac{g''_0(I_0)}{2} \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} - I_0 \right)^2 + \hbar g_1(I_0) + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^{\frac{3}{2}-3\epsilon}) \right]^2 v \\ &= \hbar \left[g'_0(I_0)^2 D_h^2 + \sqrt{\hbar} g'_0(I_0) (2g_1(I_0) + g''_0(I_0) D_h^2) D_h + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^{1-3\epsilon}) \right] v \end{aligned}$$

where we introduce

$$D_h = \frac{\sqrt{\hbar}}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} - \frac{I_0}{\sqrt{\hbar}}.$$

Notice that, the unitary conjugation on $L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)$ given by multiplication by

$$x \mapsto \exp \left(i \left\lfloor \frac{I_0}{\hbar} \right\rfloor \right)$$

amounts to replacing D_h with

$$\widetilde{D}_h = \frac{\sqrt{h}}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} - \sqrt{h} \{I_0\}_h$$

where

$$\{I_0\}_h = \frac{I_0}{h} - \left\lfloor \frac{I_0}{h} \right\rfloor = O_{h \rightarrow 0}(1).$$

In conclusion, the eigenvalues of Q in the interval $[b_0, b_0 + C\hbar]$ are given, up to $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^{2-3\epsilon})$, by the eigenvalues of

$$\left[g'_0(I_0)^2 \widetilde{D}_h^2 + V_0(\theta) \right] + \hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} g'_0(I_0) \left[2g_1(I_0) + g''_0(I_0) \widetilde{D}_h^2 \right] \widetilde{D}_h$$

in the window $[0, C]$, pushed by the map $\lambda \mapsto b_0 + \hbar\lambda$. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 5.9. If V_0 is Morse, the smallest eigenvalue of P admits an expansion in powers of \sqrt{h} [4]. The oscillations in Figure 1, of order $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^2)$, are destroyed by the perturbation induced by V_0 , which at this scale is of order $\hbar^{3/2}$.

This fact stresses out again the topological nature of the invariant I_0 . If V_0 is Morse, the lowest-energy eigenfunctions of P will microlocalise near the minimal points of V_0 , so that a quantum normal form only needs to be built in a neighbourhood of these points, instead of in a whole neighbourhood of γ .

5.3.2 Large energies

It remains to study the spectrum of Q in the window $[b_0 + C\hbar, b_0 + c_1]$ for C large enough.

To this end, let $E \in [2C\hbar, c_1]$; we will determine the eigenvalues of Q in the window $[b_0 + \frac{E}{2}, b_0 + 2E]$ up to an error $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^2)$ uniform in E .

Since $g_0(I_0) = 0$ and $g_0 \in C^\infty([I_0 - c, I_0 + c], \mathbb{R})$, there exists $\widetilde{g}_0 \in C^\infty([-c, c], \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$g_0(I) = (I - I_0) \widetilde{g}_0(I).$$

In particular, the following function belongs to $C^\infty([-c, c] \times [-c, c], \mathbb{R})$:

$$f : (x, y) \mapsto \frac{1}{x} g_0(xy + I_0) = y \widetilde{g}_0(xy + I_0).$$

In particular, $f(0, y) = (g'_0(I_0)y)$.

The function

$$h_0^{E,t} : (\theta, \eta) \mapsto f^2(\sqrt{E}, \eta) + tV_0(\theta),$$

is then a continuous deformation of $h_0^{0,0} = f^2(0, \eta)$, whose Hamiltonian trajectories are circles.

We also let

$$h_1^E : (\theta, \eta) \mapsto 2f(\sqrt{E}, \eta)g_1(\eta\sqrt{E} + I_0).$$

We let $c_1 > 0, c_2 > 0$ be such that, for $0 \leq E \leq c_1$ and $0 \leq t \leq c_2$, the hamiltonian trajectories of $h_0^{E,t}$ of energies in the window $[\frac{1}{3}, 3]$ are nondegenerate circles.

Now

$$\frac{1}{E}(Q_h - b_0) = \frac{1}{E}g_0 \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 + 2\frac{\hbar}{E}g_0 \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right) g_1 \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right) + \frac{\hbar}{E}V_0(\theta) + O\left(\frac{\hbar^2}{E}\right)$$

where

$$\frac{1}{E}g_0 \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 + \frac{\hbar}{E}V_0(\theta) = Op_W^{\frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{E}}} \left(h_0^{E, \frac{\hbar}{E}} \left(\theta, \eta - \frac{I_0}{\sqrt{E}} \right) \right)$$

and

$$2\frac{\hbar}{E}g_0 \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right) g_1 \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right) = \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{E}} Op_W^{\frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{E}}} \left(h_1^E \left(\theta, \eta - \frac{I_0}{\sqrt{E}} \right) \right).$$

As previously, after unitary conjugation with $x \mapsto \exp(-ix \lfloor \frac{I_0}{\hbar} \rfloor)$, one can replace $\frac{I_0}{\sqrt{E}}$ with $\frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{E}}\{I_0\}_h$.

Proposition 5.10. *Let $E \in [\frac{1}{c_2}\hbar, c_1]$. The eigenvalues of P_h in the window $[b_0 + \frac{E}{2}, b_0 + 2E]$ are given by the eigenvalues of*

$$Op_W^{\frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{E}}} \left(h_0^{E, \frac{\hbar}{E}} \right) + \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{E}} Op_W^{\frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{E}}} (h_1^E)$$

in the window $[\frac{1}{2}, 2]$, by the transformation

$$\lambda \mapsto b_0 + \frac{\lambda}{E},$$

up to an error $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^2)$, uniform in E .

By definition of c_2 , the Hamiltonian trajectories of $h_0^{E, \frac{\hbar}{E}}$ are non-degenerate circles, so that the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the model operator are given by the Bohr-Sommerfeld rules.

Again, the error $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^2)$ is very small compared to the spectral gap of the model operator in each branch, which is $\hbar\sqrt{E}$, as long as \hbar is small enough. Hence, in practical cases one can determine $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^\infty)$ -quasimodes for P .

6 Acknowledgements

This work emerged from a discussion at a CNRS GDR “DYNQUA” in Lille, and we gratefully acknowledge the importance of such GDR meetings.

Part of the paper is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1440140 while A. Deleporte was in residence at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in Berkeley, California, during the Fall 2019 semester.

References

- [1] L. Charles. Symbolic calculus for Toeplitz operators with half-form. *Journal of Symplectic Geometry*, 4(2):171–198, 2006.
- [2] Y. Colin De Verdière. Spectre conjoint d’opérateurs pseudo-différentiels qui commutent. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 171(1):51–73, 1980.
- [3] Y. Colin De Verdière and B. Parisse. Conditions de Bohr-Sommerfeld singulières. *Preprint Institut Fourier*, 432, 1998.
- [4] A. Deleporte. Low-energy spectrum of Toeplitz operators with a miniwell. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, (to appear), 2019.
- [5] J. J. Duistermaat. Oscillatory integrals, Lagrange immersions and unfolding of singularities. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 27(2):207–281, 1974.
- [6] J. J. Duistermaat, L. Hörmander, et al. Fourier integral operators. ii. *Acta mathematica*, 128:183–269, 1972.
- [7] S. Dyatlov and M. Zworski. *Mathematical Theory of Scattering Resonances*, volume 200. American Mathematical Soc., 2019.

- [8] S. Fournais and M. P. Sundqvist. Lack of diamagnetism and the Little–Parks effect. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 337(1):191–224, 2015.
- [9] B. Helffer and A. Kachmar. Thin domain limit and counterexamples to strong diamagnetism. *arXiv:1905.06152 [math-ph]*, May 2019.
- [10] B. Helffer, Y. Kordyukov, N. Raymond, and S. Vũ Ngọc. Magnetic Wells in Dimension Three. *Analysis & PDE*, 9(7):1575–1608, Nov. 2016.
- [11] B. Helffer and J. Sjöstrand. Puits multiples en limite semi-classique V : Étude des minipuits. *Current topics in partial differential equations*, pages 133–186, 1986.
- [12] A. Kachmar and M. P. Sundqvist. Counterexample to strong diamagnetism for the magnetic Robin Laplacian. *arXiv:1910.12499 [math-ph]*, Nov. 2019.
- [13] Y. Le Floch. Singular Bohr-Sommerfeld conditions for 1D Toeplitz operators: elliptic case. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 39(2):213–243, 2014.
- [14] N. Raymond and S. Vũ Ngọc. Geometry and spectrum in 2D magnetic wells. *Annales de l’Institut Fourier*, 65:137–169, 2015.
- [15] S. Vũ Ngọc. Bohr-Sommerfeld conditions for integrable systems with critical manifolds of focus-focus type. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 53(2):143–217, 2000.
- [16] S. Vũ Ngọc. Formes normales semi-classiques des systèmes complètement intégrables au voisinage d’un point critique de l’application moment. *Asymptotic Analysis*, 24(3,4):319–342, 2000.
- [17] S. Vũ Ngọc. Systèmes intégrales semi-classiques: Du local au global. *Panoramas et synthèses-Société mathématique de France*, (22):1–151, 2006.
- [18] M. Zworski. *Semiclassical Analysis*, volume 138. American Mathematical Soc., 2012.