

OBSERVABLE SETS, POTENTIALS AND SCHRÖDINGER EQUATIONS

SHANLIN HUANG GENGSHEG WANG MING WANG

ABSTRACT. We characterize observable sets for 1-dim Schrödinger equations in \mathbb{R} : $i\partial_t u = (-\partial_x^2 + x^{2m})u$ (with $m \in \mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, \dots\}$). More precisely, we obtain what follows: First, when $m = 0$, $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an observable set at some time if and only if it is thick, namely, there is $\gamma > 0$ and $L > 0$ so that

$$\left| E \cap [x, x+L] \right| \geq \gamma L \text{ for each } x \in \mathbb{R};$$

Second, when $m = 1$ ($m \geq 2$ resp.), E is an observable set at some time (at any time resp.) if and only if it is weakly thick, namely

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|E \cap [-x, x]|}{x} > 0.$$

From these, we see how potentials x^{2m} affect the observability (including the geometric structures of observable sets and the minimal observable time).

Besides, we obtain several supplemental theorems for the above results, in particular, we find that a half line is an observable set at time $T > 0$ for the above equation with $m = 1$ if and only if $T > \frac{\pi}{2}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider two 1-dim Schrödinger equations in \mathbb{R} . The first one is as:

$$i\partial_t u(t, x) = (-\partial_x^2 + c)u(t, x), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^+ := (0, \infty), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}; \quad u(0, \cdot) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}), \quad (1.1)$$

where c is a real number, while the second one reads as:

$$i\partial_t u(t, x) = Hu(t, x), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^+, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}; \quad u(0, \cdot) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}), \quad (1.2)$$

where

$$H := -\partial_x^2 + x^{2m}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}^+ := \{1, 2, \dots\}. \quad (1.3)$$

(Here and in what follows, $L^2(\mathbb{R}) := L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C})$. The same is said about $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.) Several notes on these two equations are given in order.

- When $c = 0$, (1.1) is referred to as the free Schrödinger equation, while when $c = 1$, it is the equation (1.2) with $m = 0$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 93B07, 35J10.

Key words and phrases. Observable sets, observability, Schrödinger equations, potentials.

Corresponding author: G. Wang, e-mail: wanggs62@yeah.net.

- The equation (1.2), with $m = 1$, is known as the Hermite Schrödinger equation. It is the Schrödinger equation for the harmonic oscillator, which is a basic model in quantum mechanics, as it approximates any trapping Schrödinger equation with a real potential at its point of equilibrium (see e.g. in [19, 21]).
- Both (1.1) and (1.2) are well-posed in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, the L^2 -norm of any solution u to (1.1) (or (1.2)) is conserved, i.e.,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u(t, x)|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u(0, x)|^2 dx \quad \text{for any } t \in \mathbb{R}^+. \quad (1.4)$$

1.1. Several definitions. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable set. Several definitions on E are given as follows:

- (D₁) The set E is called *an observable set at any time* for (1.1) (or (1.2)), if for any $T > 0$, there is a constant $C_{obs} = C_{obs}(T, E) > 0$ so that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |u(0, x)|^2 dx \leq C_{obs} \int_0^T \int_E |u(t, x)|^2 dx dt, \quad \text{when } u \text{ solves (1.1) (or (1.2)).} \quad (1.5)$$

(Here and in what follows, $C(\dots)$ stands for a positive constant depending on what are enclosed in the brackets.)

- (D₂) The set E is called *an observable set at some time* for (1.1) (or (1.2)), if there is $T > 0$ and $C_{obs} = C_{obs}(T, E) > 0$ so that (1.5) holds. Similarly, the set E is called *an observable set at time $T > 0$* for (1.1) (or (1.2)), if there is $C_{obs} = C_{obs}(T, E) > 0$ so that (1.5) holds.
- (D₃) The set E is said to be *thick*, if there is $\gamma > 0$ and $L > 0$ so that

$$\left| E \cap [x, x + L] \right| \geq \gamma L \quad \text{for each } x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.6)$$

(Here and in what follows, when E is a measurable set in \mathbb{R} (or in \mathbb{R}^n), $|E|$ stands for the Lebesgue measure of E in \mathbb{R} (or in \mathbb{R}^n .)

- (D₄) The set E is said to be *weakly thick*, if

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|E \cap [-x, x]|}{x} > 0. \quad (1.7)$$

Several notes on these definitions are given in order.

- The above definitions can be extended to the n -dim case similarly.
- The inequality (1.5) is the standard observability inequality for (1.1) (or (1.2)). Thus, $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is *an observable set at some time* for (1.1) (or (1.2)) if and only if (1.1) (or (1.2)), with controls restricted in E , is exactly controllable over $(0, T)$ for some $T > 0$, while $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is *an observable set at any time* for (1.1) (or (1.2)) if and only if (1.1) (or (1.2)), with controls restricted in E , is exactly controllable over $(0, T)$ for any $T > 0$.
- To our best knowledge, the concept of *thick sets* arose from studies of the uncertainty principle (see, for instance, [5, p. 5], or [22, p. 113]), while the concept of *weakly thick sets* seems to be insufficiently explored. We notice that in the recent work [3], the authors have used concepts (1.6) and (1.7) (in \mathbb{R}^n) to study spectral

inequalities for Hermite functions. We also mention that if $\underline{\lim}$ is replaced by $\overline{\lim}$ in the above (1.7), then some interesting geometric properties of such sets (in \mathbb{R}^n) can be found in [6]. The relationship between *thick sets* and *weakly thick sets* is established in Proposition 4.9 and Proposition 4.10 of this paper, which tells us that if E is *thick*, then it is *weakly thick*, but a weakly thick set may not be a thick set. We can explain the difference between *thick sets* and *weakly thick sets* in the manner: A *thick set* is “thick” in any interval with a fixed length, while a *weakly thick set* is “thick” in the interval $[-x, x]$ with x sufficiently large.

1.2. Aim and motivation. The aim of this paper is to present characterizations of *observable sets* (at some time or at any time) for equations (1.1) and (1.2). From these, we can see how potentials affect the observability (including the geometric structures of observable sets and the minimal observable time). Our studies were partially motivated by the existing fact: different potentials may cause different geometric structures of observable sets for heat equations in \mathbb{R}^n , with $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. More precisely, consider the following heat equations in \mathbb{R}^n :

$$\partial_t u(t, x) - \Delta u(t, x) = 0, \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n, \quad u(0, x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \quad (1.8)$$

and

$$\partial_t u(t, x) - \Delta u(t, x) + |x|^{2m} u(t, x) = 0, \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n, \quad u(0, x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad (1.9)$$

where $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$. First, it was shown independently in [16, 46] that E is an *observable set at any time* for the heat equation (1.8) if and only if E is thick in \mathbb{R}^n , i.e., for some $\gamma > 0$ and $L > 0$,

$$\left| E \cap Q_L(x) \right| \geq \gamma L^n \quad \text{for each } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (1.10)$$

(Here $Q_L(x)$ is the closed cube in \mathbb{R}^n , centered at x and of the length L .) Second, it was obtained in [14, 35] that when $m \geq 2$, the cone $E = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \geq r_0, x/|x| \in \Theta_0\}$ (where $r_0 > 0$ and Θ_0 is a nonempty and open subset of \mathbb{S}^{n-1}) is an observable set for (1.9), while when $m = 1$, the above cone is no longer an observable set for (1.9). Third, it was proved in [3] that if E is thick, then E is an observable set for (1.9) with $m = 1$.

1.3. Main results. The first main result of this paper is as follows:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable set. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *The set E is thick.*
- (ii) *The set E is an observable set at some time for the equation (1.1) with $c \in \mathbb{R}$.*
- (iii) *The set E is an observable set at some time for the equation (1.1) with $c = 0$.*

Some remarks are given in order.

- (a₁) Theorem 1.1 characterizes the *observable set at some time* for the Schrödinger equation (1.1). This characterization seems new for us, though some sufficient conditions on *observable sets* for Schrödinger equations in \mathbb{R}^n were built up in [39, 47]. We would like to mention some sufficient conditions mentioned above: According to Remark (a6) in [47], E is an *observable set at any time* for the free Schrödinger equation, if E contains $B^c(0, r)$ for some $r > 0$. (Here and in what follows, $B(x_0, r)$ denotes the closed ball in \mathbb{R}^n , centered at $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and of radius $r > 0$, while $B^c(x_0, r)$ denotes its complementary set.) The same conclusion was derived in [39] for the Schrödinger equation with Schwartz class potentials.
- (a₂) For the Schrödinger equation on compact Riemannian manifolds, the observability has been extensively studied: It was shown in [32] (see also [37]) that any open set with geometric control condition (GCC) is an *observable set at any time*. It was further proved in [33] that the GCC is also necessary in the manifolds with periodic geodesic flows (or in Zoll manifolds). It was obtained that on the flat torus $\mathbb{T}^n := (\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})^n$, every non-empty open set $E \subset \mathbb{T}^n$ is an *observable set at any time* (see, for instance, [23, 25, 30] for the free Schrödinger equation and [1, 7, 10] for the Schrödinger equations with potentials). It was verified in [11] that on \mathbb{T}^2 , each measurable set E , with a positive measure, is an *observable set at any time*. For the observability of Schrödinger equations on negatively curved manifolds, we refer the readers to [2, 15, 27] and the references therein.

The second main result of this paper is as follows:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable set. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *The set E is weakly thick.*
- (ii) *The set E is an observable set at some time for the equation (1.2) with $m = 1$.*
- (iii) *The set E is an observable set at any time for the equation (1.2) with $m \geq 2$.*

Several notes are given in order.

- (b₁) Theorem 1.2 characterizes *observable sets* for the equation (1.2). In this direction, we would like to mention [14] which shows that a half line: $(-\infty, x_0)$ (or (x_0, ∞)), with $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, is an *observable set at some time* for the equation (1.2) with $m = 1$ (see [14, Proposition 3]). Compared to this, our Theorem 1.2 shows that the much smaller set:

$$E = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} [kx_0, (k + 1/2)x_0] \quad \text{with } x_0 > 0$$

is also an *observable set at some time* for the equation (1.2) with $m = 1$. With regard to *observable sets* for the equation (1.2), where $m \geq 2$, we do not find any result in the existing literatures.

- (b₂) Since a *weakly thick set* may not be a *thick set* (see Subsection 1.1), it follows from Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 that the characterizations of *observable sets* for the free Schrödinger equation and the equation (1.2) are quite different. The reason is as follows: Differing from the operator $(-\partial_x^2 + c)$ (which has the continuous spectrum), the operator $H = -\partial_x^2 + x^{2m}$ has purely discrete spectrum consisting of all simple and real eigenvalues $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, with a gap condition (see (3.8)). This gap condition ensures that E is an *observable set at some time* if and only if $\|\varphi_k\|_{L^2(E)}$ has a uniform positive lower bound for all $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, where φ_k is the L^2 normalized eigenfunction corresponding to λ_k (see Proposition 3.3). Furthermore, we observed that each eigenfunction φ_k is either even or odd (see **Key Observation** in Subsection 4.2). This fact suggests that *the observable set* can be chosen only on a half line, which is not a thick set clearly.
- (b₃) Theorem 1.2 shows the difference between the equation (1.2) with $m = 1$ and $m \geq 2$ respectively, from the perspective of the observability. It is natural to ask if one can replace *at some time* by *at any time* in the statement (ii) of Theorem 1.2. The answer is negative. In fact, on one hand, the half line (a, ∞) (with $a \in \mathbb{R}$) is clearly a *weakly thick set* (see Example 4.11), while on the other hand, (a, ∞) is an *observable set at time T* if and only if $T > \frac{\pi}{2}$ (see Theorem 1.4). Hence, the above difference is essential. The reason behind this phenomenon is closely related to the different asymptotic behaviours of the associated spectral distributions: in the case that $m \geq 2$, we have (see (4.1) in Section 4)

$$\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

while in the case when $m = 1$, we have (see (5.1) in Section 5)

$$\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k \equiv 2 \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}^+.$$

- (b₄) Our strategy to prove Theorem 1.2 is as follows: First, we treat a class of more general potentials which are real-valued, have the C^3 -regularity and grow at infinity like $|x|^{2c}$, with $c \geq 1$ a real number (see the **Condition (H)** in Section 3 for details). For such a potential, we prove in Theorem 3.1 that E is an *observable set at some time*, if

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|E \cap [0, x]|}{x} > 0. \quad (1.11)$$

Second, we observe that when $V(x) = x^{2m}$ (with $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$), each eigenfunction φ_k of H is either even or odd. With the aid of this observation, we prove that a *weakly thick set* is an *observable set* for (1.2). Third, with the help of the asymptotic formulas for eigenvalues (see (4.1)) and the asymptotic expressions of eigenfunctions (see Lemma 4.6), we prove that an *observable set* for (1.2) is *weakly thick*.

1.4. Supplemental results. This subsection gives three theorems on the observability for the Hermite Schrödinger equation in \mathbb{R}^n (with $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$):

$$i\partial_t u(t, x) = Hu(t, x), \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n; \quad u(0, \cdot) = u_0(\cdot) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad (1.12)$$

where H is the Hermite operator:

$$H = -\Delta + |x|^2. \quad (1.13)$$

(Here and in what follows, $|x|$ stands for the Euclidean norm of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We write e^{-itH} for the unitary group generated by $-iH$.) These theorems can be viewed as supplemental results of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.3. *Given $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$, the exterior domain $B^c(x_0, r)$ is an observable set at any time for (1.12). Furthermore, for any $T > 0$, there is $C = C(n) > 0$ so that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_0(x)|^2 dx \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{T}\right) e^{Cr^2(1+\frac{1}{T})} \int_0^T \int_{B^c(x_0, r)} |e^{-itH} u_0|^2 dx dt, \quad \forall u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (1.14)$$

Theorem 1.4. *Let $E = B^c(0, r) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : a \cdot x \geq 0\}$ with $r > 0$ and $a \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) *The set E is an observable set at time $T > 0$ for (1.12), i.e., there is $C = C(T, n) > 0$ so that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_0(x)|^2 dx \leq C \int_0^T \int_E |e^{-itH} u_0|^2 dx dt, \quad \forall u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (1.15)$$

(ii) *It holds that $T > \frac{\pi}{2}$.*

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose that $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an observable set at time $T > 0$ for the equation (1.12), i.e., there is $C = C(T, E) > 0$ so that when u solves (1.12),*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(0, x)|^2 dx \leq C \int_0^T \int_E |u(t, x)|^2 dx dt. \quad (1.16)$$

Then there is $L > 0$ and $c > 0$ so that

$$\left| E \cap B(y, L\rho(y)) \right| \geq ce^{-|y|^2} \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (1.17)$$

where $\rho(y) := \max(1, |y|)$.

Several notes on Theorem 1.3-Theorem 1.5 are as follows:

- (c₁) From Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4, we see that for the Hermite Schrödinger equation in \mathbb{R}^n , different kinds of E lead to different types of observability: when E is the complement of any closed ball, it is *an observable set at any time* for (1.12), while when E is half of the complement of any closed ball, it is *an observable set at time $T > 0$* for (1.12) if and only if $T > \frac{\pi}{2}$. (These can be viewed as supplements of Theorem 1.2.) In this direction, we mention that Theorem 1.4 where $n = 1$ has been stated in [14, Prop. 5.1] without proof. It also deserves mentioning the recent paper [8] dealing with the time optimal observability for the two-dim Grushin Schrödinger equation on the finite cylinder: $\Omega = (-1, 1) \times \mathbb{T}_y$.

- (c₂) The method to prove Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 differs from that to show Theorem 1.2: the proof of Theorem 1.2 is based on an abstract approach provided by Proposition 2.1, while the proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 rely on an observability inequality for (1.12) at two points in time, given by Theorem 5.1 which is based on Nazarov's uncertainty principle (see [26]) and is independently interesting. With regard to the observability inequality at two points in time for Schrödinger equations, we mention papers [47] and [24].
- (c₃) Theorem 1.5 gives a necessary condition on *observable sets at some time* for the n -dim Hermite Schrödinger equation, while Theorem 1.2 presents a necessary and sufficient condition on *observable sets at some time* for the 1-dim Hermite Schrödinger equation.
- (c₄) The condition (1.17) is another kind of thick condition. In the 1-dim case, it is strictly weaker than the weakly thick condition (1.7) (see Remark 5.2).

1.5. Plan of the paper. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 proves Theorem 1.1; Section 3 shows a sufficient condition (see Theorem 3.1) on *the observable sets at some time* for Schrödinger equations with more general potentials; Section 4 gives the proof of Theorem 1.2, as well as the comparison of thicknesses for two kinds of observable sets; Section 5 presents the proofs of Theorem 1.3-Theorem 1.5; Appendix A is the last section where we give the proof of Lemma 4.6, which is the key to show the necessity of *observable sets* in Theorem 1.2.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We start with introducing a resolvent condition on the observability for some evolution equation, i.e., the next Proposition 2.1, which is another version of [34, Theorem 5.1] (see also [9], [31] and [38]). It will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1, as well as in the proof of Theorem 1.2. To state it, we consider the equation:

$$i\partial_t u(t, x) = \mathcal{A}u(t, x), \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}; \quad u(0, x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}), \quad (2.1)$$

where \mathcal{A} is a self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. *Observable sets at some time* for (2.1) can be defined in the same manner as that in the definition (**D**₁) in Subsection 1.1.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable set. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *The set E is an observable set at some time for (2.1).*

(ii) *There is $M > 0$ and $m > 0$ so that*

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \leq M \|(\mathcal{A} - \lambda)u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + m \|u\|_{L^2(E)}^2 \quad \text{for all } u \in D(\mathcal{A}) \text{ and } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.2)$$

We now on the position to show Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Arbitrarily fix a measurable subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}$. We organize the proof by several steps.

Step 1. We show that (i) of Theorem 1.1 implies (2.2) with $\mathcal{A} = -\partial_x^2$.

Suppose that E is thick. Arbitrarily fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$. In the case that $\lambda \geq 0$, we get from [20, Proposition 1] that for some $m = m(E) > 0$ and $C = C(E) > 0$,

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \leq C \left(\|(-\partial_x^2 - \lambda)u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + m\|u\|_{L^2(E)}^2 \right), \quad (2.3)$$

which yields (2.2) (with $\mathcal{A} = -\partial_x^2$) for the case when $\lambda \geq 0$.

In the case that $\lambda < 0$, we have $\|-\partial_x^2 u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \leq \|(-\partial_x^2 - \lambda)u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2$, which, along with (2.2) where $\lambda = 0$, leads to (2.2) (with $\mathcal{A} = -\partial_x^2$) for the case when $\lambda < 0$.

Step 2. We show that (2.2) (with $\mathcal{A} = -\partial_x^2$) implies (ii) of Theorem 1.1.

Arbitrarily fix $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that E satisfies (2.2) (with $\mathcal{A} = -\partial_x^2$). Then we have that for some $M > 0$ and $m > 0$,

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \leq M \|(-\partial_x^2 - \lambda)u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + m\|u\|_{L^2(E)}^2 \quad \text{for all } u \in D(\partial_x^2 + c) \text{ and } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.4)$$

since $D(-\partial_x^2 + c) = D(\partial_x^2) = H^2(\mathbb{R})$. By (2.4) and Proposition 2.1 (with $\mathcal{A} = -\partial_x^2 + c$), we find that E is an observable set at some time for (1.1). Hence, (ii) of Theorem 1.1 is true.

Step 3. It is clear that (ii) of Theorem 1.1 implies (iii) of Theorem 1.1.

Step 4. We show that (iii) of Theorem 1.1 implies (i) of Theorem 1.1.

We borrow some ideas from [46] in this step. Recall that the kernel of the Schrödinger equation (1.1) with $c = 0$ is

$$K(t, x) = (4\pi it)^{-1/2} e^{-|x|^2/4it}, \quad t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Thus, given $u_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ (the Schwartz class), the function defined by

$$(t, x) \longrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}} K(t, x - y) u_0(y) dy, \quad (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.5)$$

is a solution to the equation (1.1) (where $c = 0$), with the initial condition $u(0, x) = u_0(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Arbitrarily fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. By taking

$$u_0(x) = (4\pi)^{-1/2} e^{-|x-x_0|^2/4}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

in (2.5), we get the following solution to the equation (1.1) (where $c = 0$):

$$v(t, x) = (4\pi(it + 1))^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4(it+1)}}, \quad t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.6)$$

We now suppose that E satisfies (iii) of Theorem 1.1. Then there is $T > 0$ and $C = C_{obs}(T, E) > 0$ so that any solution u to (1.1) (where $c = 0$) satisfies (1.5), from which, it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |v(0, x)|^2 dx \leq C \int_0^T \int_E |v(t, x)|^2 dx dt. \quad (2.7)$$

Besides, we have the following two observations: First, a direct computation gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |v(0, x)|^2 dx = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}. \quad (2.8)$$

Second, for arbitrarily fixed $L > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_E |v(t, x)|^2 dx dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_E \frac{1}{4\pi(1+t^2)} e^{-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{2(1+t^2)}} dx dt \leq \int_0^T \int_E \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{2(1+T^2)}} dx dt \\ &= \frac{T}{2\pi} \left(\int_{E \cap [x_0-L/2, x_0+L/2]} e^{-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{2(1+T^2)}} dx + \int_{E \cap [x_0-L/2, x_0+L/2]^c} e^{-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{2(1+T^2)}} dx \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Since

$$\int_{E \cap [x_0-L/2, x_0+L/2]} e^{-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{2(1+T^2)}} dx \leq |E \cap [x_0-L/2, x_0+L/2]|$$

and

$$\int_{E \cap [x_0-L/2, x_0+L/2]^c} e^{-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{2(1+T^2)}} dx \leq e^{-\frac{(L/2)^2}{4(1+T^2)}} \int_{E \cap [x_0-L/2, x_0+L/2]^c} e^{-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{4(1+T^2)}} dx \leq \sqrt{4\pi(1+T^2)} e^{-\frac{L^2}{16(1+T^2)}},$$

we deduce from (2.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_E |v(t, x)|^2 dx dt \\ & \leq \frac{T}{2\pi} \left(|E \cap [x_0-L/2, x_0+L/2]| + \sqrt{4\pi(1+T^2)} e^{-\frac{L^2}{16(1+T^2)}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Now, it follows from (2.7), (2.8) and (2.10) that

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \leq \frac{CT}{2\pi} \left(|E \cap [x_0-L/2, x_0+L/2]| + \sqrt{4\pi(1+T^2)} e^{-\frac{L^2}{16(1+T^2)}} \right).$$

In the above, by taking $L = L_0 > 0$ so that

$$\frac{CT}{2\pi} \sqrt{4\pi(1+T^2)} e^{-\frac{L_0^2}{16(1+T^2)}} \leq \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2\pi}},$$

we find that

$$\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2\pi}} \leq \frac{CT}{2\pi} |E \cap [x_0-L_0/2, x_0+L_0/2]|,$$

from which, it follows that

$$|E \cap [x_0-L_0/2, x_0+L_0/2]| \geq \gamma L_0 \text{ with } \gamma = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{4CTL_0}.$$

Since x_0 was arbitrarily taken from \mathbb{R} , we obtain from the above that

$$|E \cap [x-L_0/2, x+L_0/2]| \geq \gamma L_0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

This implies that

$$|E \cap [x, x + L_0]| \geq \gamma L_0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R},$$

i.e., E is a thick set.

Thus, we end the proof of Theorem 1.1. \square

3. OBSERVABLE SETS FOR MORE GENERAL POTENTIALS

In this section, we will give a sufficient condition on *observable sets at some time* for the Schrödinger equation:

$$i\partial_t u(t, x) = (-\partial_x^2 + V(x))u(t, x), \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}; \quad u(0, x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}), \quad (3.1)$$

where the potential V satisfies the following condition:

Condition (H). The real-valued function V belongs to the space $C^3(\mathbb{R})$ and there is $c \geq 1$ so that

(i) for some compact interval $K \Subset \mathbb{R}$, $V''(x) > 0$ and $xV'(x) \geq 2cV(x) > 0$, when $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus K$;

(ii) when $j = 1, 2, 3$, $V^{(j)}(x) = O(x^{-j}|x|^{2c})$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

Here and in what follows, given two functions f and g , by $f(x) = O(g(x))$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, we mean that there is $C > 0$ and $M > 0$ so that $|f(x)| \leq C|g(x)|$, when $|x| \geq M$.

Several notes on **Condition (H)** are given in order.

(d₁) **Condition (H)** is a variant of the condition given in [48], where the smoothness of the fundamental solution of Schrödinger equations with similar perturbations was studied. Typical examples of potentials satisfying this condition are as:

$$V_1(x) = C(1 + |x|^2)^c, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{with } C > 0, \quad c \geq 1;$$

and

$$V_2(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{2m} a_j x^j, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{with } a_{2m} > 0, \quad a_j \in \mathbb{R}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}^+.$$

(d₂) By **Condition (H)**, we have that for some $x_0 > 0$,

$$V'(x) > 0, \quad \text{when } x \geq x_0; \quad (3.2)$$

we also have two constants $D > D' > 0$ so that

$$D'x^{2c} \leq V(x) \leq Dx^{2c}, \quad \text{when } |x| \geq x_0. \quad (3.3)$$

The later shows that $V(x) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $|x|$ goes to $+\infty$. Hence, **Condition (H)** implies the following weaker condition:

$$V \text{ is real-valued, locally bounded and } V(x) \rightarrow +\infty, \quad \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.4)$$

(d₃) Suppose that V satisfies (3.4). Then, according to [4, Theorem 1.1, p.50], the operator $H = -\partial_x^2 + V$ has the properties: it is essentially self-adjoint (i.e., its closure is self-adjoint); its resolvent is compact. Thus, we have $\sigma(H) = \{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, with

$$\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \cdots < \lambda_k \rightarrow +\infty, \quad (3.5)$$

where $\lambda_k, k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, are all eigenvalues of H . We further have that each λ_k is simple. (See Proposition 3.2.)

(d₄) Throughout this section, we write $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, with (3.5), for the family of all eigenvalues of H , and $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ for the family of corresponding normalized eigenfunctions.

The main theorem of this section is as:

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that **Condition (H)** holds. If $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable set satisfying*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|E \cap [0, x]|}{x} > 0, \quad (3.6)$$

then E is an observable set at some time for the equation (3.1).

3.1. Properties of the operator H with the weak condition (3.4). In this subsection, we will study some properties of eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of H under the assumption (3.4). The conclusions (i) and (ii) of the following Proposition 3.2 are given by [4, Corollary, p.64] and [4, Proposition 3.3, p.65], respectively.

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that (3.4) holds. Then the following statements are true:*

- (i) *Every eigenfunction φ_k of H has at most finite zero points.*
- (ii) *Every eigenvalue λ_k of H is simple, i.e., each eigenspace has dimension one.*

Notice that under (3.4), H is essentially self-adjoint. Thus we have the following facts: First, we can put the equation:

$$i\partial_t u(t, x) = (-\partial_x^2 + V(x))u(t, x), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^+, x \in \mathbb{R}; \quad u(0, x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \quad (3.7)$$

into the framework of (2.1). Second, *the observable sets at some time* for (3.7) can be defined in the same manner as that in the definition (D₁) in Subsection 1.1. Third, $-iH$ generates a unitary group e^{-itH} in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Thus, the solution to equation (3.7) is as: $u(t, \cdot) = e^{-itH}u(0, \cdot)$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

The next proposition gives connections among *observable sets*, eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of H .

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose that (3.4) is true. Further assume that eigenvalues of H satisfy that for some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ (independent of k),*

$$\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k \geq \varepsilon_0 > 0 \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1. \quad (3.8)$$

Then for any measurable set $E \subset \mathbb{R}$, the following statements are equivalent:

(i) The set E is an observable set at some time for (3.7).

(ii) The L^2 -normalized eigenfunctions of H satisfy that for some $C > 0$ (independent of k),

$$\int_E |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq C > 0 \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1. \quad (3.9)$$

In addition, if (ii) holds and H satisfies the following stronger spectral gap condition:

$$\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.10)$$

then E is an observable set at any time for (3.7).

Proof. First, from the proof of [4, Theorem 3.1, p.57], we see that H has a compact resolvent. Then according to [38, Theorem 1.3, p.195], we have the fact: E is an observable set at some time for (3.7) if and only if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_E |\varphi(x)|^2 dx \geq C \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\varphi(x)|^2 dx \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \text{span}\{\varphi_m : m \in J_\varepsilon(\lambda)\}, \quad (3.11)$$

where

$$J_\varepsilon(\lambda) := \{m \in \mathbb{N}^+ : |\lambda_m - \lambda| < \varepsilon\}. \quad (3.12)$$

From this, we in particular have what follows:

$$\text{The conclusion (i) of Proposition 3.3} \iff (3.11) \quad \text{with } \varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}. \quad (3.13)$$

(Here, ε_0 is given by (3.8)).

Next, by (3.8), (3.12) (where $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0/2$) and (ii) of Proposition 3.2, one can directly check that

$$\bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \text{span}\{\varphi_m : m \in J_\varepsilon(\lambda)\} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}^+} \{a\varphi_k : a \in \mathbb{C}\}, \quad \text{with } \varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}.$$

This yields that

$$(3.11) \quad \text{with } \varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \iff \int_E |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq C \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}^+. \quad (3.14)$$

Now, since $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx = 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, it follows from (3.13) and (3.14) that (i) \iff (ii).

Finally, if (3.10) holds, then we can apply [45, Corolory 6.9.6] to see directly that E is an observable set at any time for (3.7). This ends the proof of Proposition 3.2. \square

Lemma 3.4 (Lower bound for low frequency). *Suppose that (3.4) is true. Then for each subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ of positive measure and each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^+$, there exists $C = C(E, \ell) > 0$ so that*

$$\int_E |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq C, \quad \text{when } 1 \leq k \leq \ell. \quad (3.15)$$

Proof. Arbitrarily fix a subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ of positive measure and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^+$. First, by (i) of Proposition 3.2, we can easily see that for each $1 \leq k \leq \ell$, there is $C_k = C(k, E) > 0$ so that

$$\int_E |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq C_k. \quad (3.16)$$

Next, by setting $C := \min_{1 \leq k \leq \ell} C_k > 0$, we get (3.15) from (3.16) at once. This ends the proof of Lemma 3.4. \square

3.2. Properties of the operator H with Condition (H). In this subsection, we will study some properties of eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of H under **Condition (H)**. In particular, we shall give a uniform lower bound of high frequency eigenfunctions φ_k for all $k > \ell$. The ideas in [18, 44] (where the WKB method was applied to study the asymptotic behaviors of eigenfunctions of H) will be used.

We start with several facts. Fact One: Each φ_k satisfies

$$-\varphi_k''(x) + V(x)\varphi_k(x) = \lambda_k \varphi_k(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.17)$$

Fact Two: By **Condition (H)** and by (3.5), there is $\bar{k}_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ so that $\lambda_k \geq 1$, when $k \geq \bar{k}_0$ and so that

$$0 \in \Omega_k, \quad \text{when } k \geq \bar{k}_0, \quad (3.18)$$

where

$$\Omega_k := \{x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad V(x) \leq \lambda_k/2\}, \quad k \geq \bar{k}_0. \quad (3.19)$$

Moreover, we find from (3.3) that Ω_k is a bounded set and that for some $C > 0$ (independent of k),

$$|\Omega_k| \leq C \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2c}} \quad \text{for all } k \geq \bar{k}_0. \quad (3.20)$$

Fact Three: Recall the following Liouville transform (see e.g. [44, p. 119]):

$$\begin{cases} y = S(x) = \int_0^x \sqrt{\lambda_k - V(s)} ds, & x \in \Omega_k \\ w = w(y) = (\lambda_k - V(S^{-1}(y)))^{\frac{1}{4}} \varphi_k(S^{-1}(y)), & y \in S(\Omega_k). \end{cases} \quad (3.21)$$

By (3.21), we see that

$$S'(x) > 0 \text{ over } \Omega_k; \quad S^{-1}(\cdot) \text{ exists over } S(\Omega_k). \quad (3.22)$$

By (3.21) and (3.18), we obtain

$$0 \in S(\Omega_k), \quad \text{as } k \geq \bar{k}_0. \quad (3.23)$$

For each $k \geq \bar{k}_0$, by making the above Liouville transform to (3.17), which is restricted over Ω_k , we obtain

$$\frac{d^2 w(y)}{dy^2} + w(y) + q(y)w(y) = 0, \quad y \in S(\Omega_k), \quad (3.24)$$

where

$$q(y) = \frac{V''(x)}{4(\lambda_k - V(x))^2} + \frac{5(V'(x))^2}{16(\lambda_k - V(x))^3}, \quad \text{with } x = S^{-1}(y) \in \Omega_k.$$

Fact Four: The function w (given by (3.21)) depends on k . By (3.21) and (3.23), we see that when $k \geq \bar{k}_0$, 0 is in the domain of w . Hence, $w(0)$ and $w'(0)$ make sense.

Fact Five: The next Lemma 3.5 is quoted from [48] (see [48, Lemma 3.1&3.2]) and will play an important role in our studies. In the proof of Lemma 3.5, (3.24) was used.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that **Condition (H)** holds for some $c \geq 1$. Let Ω_k be given by (3.19). Let S and w be given by (3.21). Then there exists $C > 0$ and $\bar{k}_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ (with $\tilde{k}_0 \geq \bar{k}_0$ which is given by (3.18)) so that when $k \geq \tilde{k}_0$,*

$$\varphi_k(x) = (\lambda_k - V(x))^{-\frac{1}{4}} \cdot \Re(C_{\lambda_k} e^{iS(x)}) + R_k(x) \quad \text{for each } x \in \Omega_k, \quad (3.25)$$

where R_k is a function with the estimate:

$$|R_k(x)| \leq C(\lambda_k - V(x))^{-\frac{1}{4}} \cdot |C_{\lambda_k}| \cdot \lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{for each } x \in \Omega_k, \quad (3.26)$$

with

$$C_{\lambda_k} = w(0) - iw'(0). \quad (3.27)$$

Moreover, there is $C' > 0$ so that

$$|C_{\lambda_k}| \geq C' \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4c}} \quad \text{for all } k \geq \tilde{k}_0. \quad (3.28)$$

Next, we will give an upper bound for the family $\{|C_{\lambda_k}|\}$. That upper bound shows that the lower bound in (3.28) is sharp, as a byproduct.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that **Condition (H)** (with $c \geq 1$) holds. Let C_{λ_k} be given by (3.27) in Lemma 3.5. Then there is $\hat{k}_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $C > 0$ so that*

$$|C_{\lambda_k}| \leq C \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4c}} \quad \text{for all } k \geq \hat{k}_0. \quad (3.29)$$

Proof. By **Condition (H)**, we have the notes (\mathbf{d}_2) (see (3.2) and (3.3)) and (\mathbf{d}_3) (see (3.5)). Let c and x_0 be given by **Condition (H)** and the note (\mathbf{d}_2) respectively. According to (3.5), there is $\hat{k}_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$, with $\hat{k}_0 \geq \tilde{k}_0$ (where \tilde{k}_0 is given by Lemma 3.5) so that when $k \geq \hat{k}_0$,

$$\lambda_k \geq \max \left\{ 1, 2D(2(x_0 + 1))^{2c}, (6\sqrt{2}\pi)^{2c/(c+1)} (2D)^{1/(c+1)}, \left(\frac{4C}{\sqrt{3}} \right)^2 \right\}, \quad (3.30)$$

where C and D are given by (3.26) and (3.3) respectively. Arbitrarily fix $k \geq \hat{k}_0$. We divide the rest of the proof into several steps.

Step 1. Define the following interval:

$$I_k := [x_k/2, x_k], \quad \text{with } x_k := \alpha \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2c}}, \quad \alpha := \left(\frac{1}{2D} \right)^{\frac{1}{2c}}. \quad (3.31)$$

We claim that

$$I_k \subset \Omega_k \cap [x_0 + 1, \infty). \quad (3.32)$$

We first show that $I_k \subset [x_0 + 1, \infty)$. Indeed, by (3.30), we have $\lambda_k \geq 2D(2(x_0 + 1))^{2c}$, which, along with (3.31), yields $x_k \geq 2(x_0 + 1)$. This, together with (3.31), leads to $I_k \subset [x_0 + 1, \infty)$.

We next show that $I_k \subset \Omega_k$. In fact, since $I_k \subset [x_0, \infty)$, it follows from (3.2) that

$$V'(x) > 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in I_k. \quad (3.33)$$

Meanwhile, by the definitions of x_k and α (see (3.31)), and by (3.3), we find

$$V(x_k) = V(\alpha \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2c}}) \leq \lambda_k/2. \quad (3.34)$$

Combining (3.33) and (3.34) gives that

$$V(x) \leq \lambda_k/2 \quad \text{for all } x \in I_k.$$

This, along with (3.19), leads to $I_k \subset \Omega_k$. Hence, (3.32) has been proved.

Step 2. Define the following set:

$$J := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : S(x_k/2) + \pi \leq j\pi + \theta_0 \leq S(x_k) - \pi\}, \quad (3.35)$$

where $S(\cdot)$ is given by (3.21) and θ_0 is defined as:

$$\theta_0 := \arctan w'(0)/w(0), \quad \text{when } w(0) \neq 0; \quad \theta_0 := \pi/2, \quad \text{when } w(0) = 0, \quad (3.36)$$

where $w(\cdot)$ is given by (3.21). We claim

$$\#J \geq \frac{\alpha}{6\pi\sqrt{2}} \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2c}} \geq 1. \quad (3.37)$$

Here and below, $\#J$ denotes the cardinality of J .

Two facts deserve to be mentioned: First, (3.37) holds for all $\theta_0 \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ and that we choose it satisfying (3.36) for later use. Second, when (3.37) is proved, we have that $J \neq \emptyset$.

To prove (3.37), we see from (3.32), (3.3) and (3.19) that

$$0 \leq V(x) \leq \lambda_k/2, \quad x \in I_k. \quad (3.38)$$

Then, by the definition of $S(x)$ (see (3.21)) and by (3.38), we have

$$S(x_k) - S(x_k/2) = \int_{x_k/2}^{x_k} \sqrt{\lambda_k - V(x)} \, dx \geq \frac{x_k \sqrt{\lambda_k}}{2\sqrt{2}}.$$

Since $\lambda_k \geq (6\sqrt{2}\pi)^{2c/(c+1)} (2D)^{1/(c+1)}$ (see (3.30)) and because $\theta_0 \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ (see (3.36)), the above, along with (3.35) and the definitions of x_k and α (see (3.31)), shows

$$\#J \geq \frac{S(x_k) - S(x_k/2) - 2\pi}{\pi} \geq \frac{x_k \sqrt{\lambda_k}}{2\pi\sqrt{2}} - 2 = \frac{\alpha \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2c}}}{2\pi\sqrt{2}} - 2 \geq \frac{\alpha}{6\pi\sqrt{2}} \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2c}} \geq 1,$$

which leads to (3.37).

Step 3. Define, for each $j \in J$, the following set:

$$E_{k,j} := [x_{k,j} - \mu x_{k,j}^{-c}, x_{k,j}], \quad \text{with } \mu := \frac{\pi}{6 \cdot 2^c \sqrt{D}}, \quad (3.39)$$

where $x_{k,j}$ is the unique solution to the equation:

$$S(x) = j\pi + \theta_0, \quad x \in I_k. \quad (3.40)$$

We claim

$$E_{k,j} \subset I_k, \quad j \in J; \quad (3.41)$$

$$E_{k,j} \cap E_{k,j'} = \emptyset \quad \text{for all } j, j' \in J \text{ with } j \neq j'; \quad (3.42)$$

$$|\cos(S(x) - \theta_0)| \geq \sqrt{3}/2 \quad \text{for all } x \in E_{k,j} \text{ and } j \in J. \quad (3.43)$$

First of all, by (3.22) and (3.32), we infer that the function $S(\cdot)$ is strictly increasing over I_k . This fact and the definition (3.35) imply that the equation (3.40) has a unique solution $x_{k,j}$, which satisfies that $x_k/2 \leq x_{k,j} \leq x_k$ for all $j \in J$.

We claim that for each $j \in J$,

$$0 \leq V(x) \leq \lambda_k/2, \quad \text{when } x \in E_{k,j}. \quad (3.44)$$

To this end, we arbitrarily fix $j \in J$. Since $x_k/2 \leq x_{k,j}$; $x_k/2 \geq x_0 + 1$ (see (3.32)); $\mu(x_k/2)^{-c} \leq 1$ (see (3.30) and (3.39)), we have

$$x_{k,j} - \mu x_{k,j}^{-c} \geq (x_k/2) - \mu(x_k/2)^{-c} \geq x_0. \quad (3.45)$$

Since $x_{k,j} \leq x_k$, it follows by (3.45) that

$$E_{k,j} \subset [x_0, x_k]. \quad (3.46)$$

Notice that $V'(x) > 0$ and $V(x) > 0$ over $[x_0, +\infty)$ (see (3.2) and (3.3)). From these, (3.46) and (3.34), we are led to (3.44).

We now show (3.43). Since $x_{k,j}$ satisfies (3.40), we have that when $x \in E_{k,j}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |S(x) - \theta_0 - j\pi| &= |S(x) - S(x_{k,j})| \leq |x - x_{k,j}| \cdot \sup_{x \in E_{k,j}} |V'(x)| \\ &= |x - x_{k,j}| \cdot \sup_{x \in E_{k,j}} \sqrt{\lambda_k - V(x)} \\ &\leq \mu x_{k,j}^{-c} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_k}{2}} \leq \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{2}} 2^c \sqrt{2D} = \frac{\pi}{6}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

(On the last line of (3.47), we used (3.44) and the fact $x_{k,j} \geq x_k/2 = 2^{-1}(2D)^{-1/(2c)} \lambda_k^{1/(2c)}$, as well as the definition of μ in (3.39).) From (3.47), we are led to (3.43) at once.

We next show (3.41). Indeed, by the monotonicity of S^{-1} on I_k (see (3.22) and (3.32)) and by (3.35), we see

$$x_k/2 \leq S^{-1}(j\pi + \theta_0 - \frac{\pi}{6}) \leq S^{-1}(j\pi + \theta_0 + \frac{\pi}{6}) \leq x_k \text{ for all } j \in J. \quad (3.48)$$

Meanwhile, by (3.47), we have

$$E_{k,j} \subset S^{-1}([j\pi + \theta_0 - \frac{\pi}{6}, j\pi + \theta_0 + \frac{\pi}{6}]) \text{ for all } j \in J. \quad (3.49)$$

From (3.49) and (3.48), we obtain $E_{k,j} \subset [x_k/2, x_k]$, i.e., (3.41) holds.

We finally show (3.42). Indeed, it follows from (3.49) that for all $j, j' \in J$ with $j \neq j'$,

$$E_{k,j} \cap E_{k,j'} \subset S^{-1}(K_{k,j}) \cap S^{-1}(K_{k,j'}), \quad (3.50)$$

where

$$K_{k,j} := \left[j\pi + \theta_0 - \frac{\pi}{6}, j\pi + \theta_0 + \frac{\pi}{6} \right];$$

$$K_{k,j'} := \left[j'\pi + \theta_0 - \frac{\pi}{6}, j'\pi + \theta_0 + \frac{\pi}{6} \right].$$

Since S^{-1} is strictly monotonic on I_k (see (3.22) and (3.32)), the set on the right hand side of (3.50) is empty. This leads to (3.42).

Step 4. Define the following subset:

$$G_k := \left\{ x \in I_k : |\cos(S(x) - \theta_0)| \geq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right\}. \quad (3.51)$$

We claim

$$|\varphi_k(x)| \geq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4} \left(\frac{\lambda_k}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} |C_{\lambda_k}|, \quad x \in G_k, \quad (3.52)$$

and

$$G_k \supset \bigcup_{j \in J} E_{k,j}. \quad (3.53)$$

We start with proving (3.52). Because $k \geq \hat{k}_0 \geq \tilde{k}_0$, the results in Lemma 3.5 are valid for k . Thus, we can use (3.25), (3.26), (3.27) and (3.36) to get

$$\Re(C_{\lambda_k} e^{iS(x)}) = w(0) \cos S(x) + w'(0) \sin S(x) = |C_{\lambda_k}| \cos(S(x) - \theta_0), \quad x \in \Omega_k. \quad (3.54)$$

From (3.25), (3.26), (3.54), (3.51) and (3.38), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_k(x)| &\geq (\lambda_k - V(x))^{-\frac{1}{4}} (|\Re(C_{\lambda_k} e^{iS(x)})| - C|C_{\lambda_k}| \lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{\lambda_k}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} |C_{\lambda_k}| \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} - C \lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \geq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4} \left(\frac{\lambda_k}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} |C_{\lambda_k}|, \text{ when } x \in G_k. \end{aligned}$$

(On the last step above, we used the fact that $\lambda_k \geq (\frac{4C}{\sqrt{3}})^2$ which follows from (3.30).) This leads to (3.52).

Now (3.53) follows from (3.41), (3.43) and (3.51) directly.

Step 5. We complete the proof.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &\geq \int_{G_k} |\varphi_k|^2 dx \\
&\stackrel{\text{(by(3.52))}}{\geq} \int_{G_k} \frac{3}{16} \left(\frac{\lambda_k}{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |C_{\lambda_k}|^2 dx \\
&\stackrel{\text{(by (3.53) and (3.42))}}{\geq} \sum_{j \in J} \int_{E_{k,j}} \frac{3}{16} \left(\frac{\lambda_k}{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |C_{\lambda_k}|^2 dx \\
&= \frac{3}{16} \left(\frac{\lambda_k}{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |C_{\lambda_k}|^2 \cdot \#J \cdot |E_{k,j}| \\
&\stackrel{\text{(by (3.37) and (3.39))}}{\geq} \frac{3\alpha\mu}{96\pi} |C_{\lambda_k}|^2 \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2c}} x_{k,j}^{-c} \\
&\geq \frac{3\mu}{96\pi} \alpha^{1-c} \lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2c}} |C_{\lambda_k}|^2. \tag{3.55}
\end{aligned}$$

(On the last inequality in (3.55), we used the fact that $x_{k,j} \leq x_k$ and the definition of x_k in (3.31).) By (3.55), we see

$$|C_{\lambda_k}| \leq C(D, C, c) \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4c}}.$$

Since the above holds for any $k \geq \hat{k}_0$, we obtain (3.29). This ends the proof of Lemma 3.6. \square

The inequality (3.52) gives a point-wise lower bound for each eigenfunction with the high frequency. Some ideas used in its proof can be borrowed to build up the following uniform lower bound for eigenfunctions (with the high frequency) over some kind of thick set:

Lemma 3.7 (Lower bound for high frequency). *Suppose that **Condition (H)** holds. If $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable set satisfying*

$$\underline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|E \cap [0, x]|}{x} > 0, \tag{3.56}$$

then there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $C > 0$ so that

$$\int_E |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq C \quad \text{for all } k \geq k_0. \tag{3.57}$$

Proof. Suppose that E satisfies (3.56). Then there is $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ and $L > 0$ so that

$$\frac{|E \cap [0, x]|}{x} \geq \gamma \quad \text{for all } x \geq L. \tag{3.58}$$

Let $\delta := \gamma/2 \in (0, 1/2]$. It follows from (3.58) that

$$\frac{|E \cap [\delta x, x]|}{x} \geq \gamma/2 \quad \text{for all } x \geq L. \quad (3.59)$$

We will use (3.59) later. Now we let $k_1 := \max\{\tilde{k}_0, \hat{k}_0\}$, where \tilde{k}_0 and \hat{k}_0 are given by Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6 respectively. Set

$$I_k^\delta := [\delta x_k, x_k], \quad k \geq k_1, \quad (3.60)$$

where x_k is given by (3.31). Similar to (3.32), we can find $k_2 > k_1$ so that when $k \geq k_2$,

$$I_k^\delta \subset (\Omega_k \cap [x_0 + 1, \infty) \cap [L, \infty)), \quad (3.61)$$

where Ω_k and x_0 are given by (3.19) and (3.2), respectively. The rest of the proof is organized by several steps.

Step 1. Given $k \geq k_2$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we define

$$F_{k,\varepsilon} := \left\{ x \in I_k^\delta : \cos^2(S(x) - \theta_0) \leq \varepsilon \right\}, \quad (3.62)$$

where $S(\cdot)$ and θ_0 are given by (3.21) and (3.36) respectively. We claim that there is a constant $C_1 > 0$, independent of ε and k , so that

$$|F_{k,\varepsilon}| \leq C_1 \sqrt{\varepsilon} \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2c}} \quad \text{for all } k \geq k_2 \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1). \quad (3.63)$$

For this purpose, we arbitrarily fix $k \geq k_2$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Define the following set:

$$J' := \left\{ j \in \mathbb{N} : S(\delta x_k) - \pi \leq j\pi + \frac{\pi}{2} + \theta_0 \leq S(x_k) + \pi \right\}. \quad (3.64)$$

Several observations are given in order. First, by a very similar way to that used in the proof of (3.37), we can obtain

$$\#J' \leq \frac{S(x_k) - S(\delta x_k)}{\pi} + 2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \alpha \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2c}} + 2. \quad (3.65)$$

Second, by (3.62) and (3.64), we have

$$F_{k,\varepsilon} \subset \bigcup_{j \in J'} \left\{ x \in I_k^\delta : j\pi + \frac{\pi}{2} - \arcsin \sqrt{\varepsilon} \leq S(x) - \theta_0 \leq j\pi + \frac{\pi}{2} + \arcsin \sqrt{\varepsilon} \right\}. \quad (3.66)$$

Third, there is $C_2 > 0$ (independent of k and ε) so that when $j \in J'$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left\{ x \in I_k^\delta : j\pi + \frac{\pi}{2} - \arcsin \sqrt{\varepsilon} \leq S(x) - \theta_0 \leq j\pi + \frac{\pi}{2} + \arcsin \sqrt{\varepsilon} \right\} \right| \\ &= S^{-1}\left(j\pi + \frac{\pi}{2} + \theta_0 + \arcsin \sqrt{\varepsilon}\right) - S^{-1}\left(j\pi + \frac{\pi}{2} + \theta_0 - \arcsin \sqrt{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &\leq 2(\arcsin \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \cdot \sup_{x \in I_k^\delta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_k - V(x)}} \\ &\leq C_2 \sqrt{\varepsilon} \lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.67)$$

In (3.67), for the first equality, Line 2, we used the fact that $S(\cdot)$ is continuous and strictly increasing on I_k (which follows from (3.61) and (3.2)); for the first inequality, Line 3, we used the rule of the derivative of inverse function and the fact that $S'(x) = \sqrt{\lambda_k - V(x)}$

(which follows from (3.21)); for the last inequality, Line 4, we used the fact $V(x) \leq \lambda_k/2$ for $x \in I_k^\delta$ (which follows from (3.61) and (3.19)) and $\arcsin \sqrt{\varepsilon} \sim \sqrt{\varepsilon}$.

According to (3.65)-(3.67), there is $C_1 > 0$ (independent of k and ε) so that

$$|F_{k,\varepsilon}| \leq \#J' C_2 \sqrt{\varepsilon} \lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_1 \sqrt{\varepsilon} \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2c}} \text{ for all } k \geq k_2 \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, 1),$$

which leads to (3.63).

Step 2. We prove (3.57).

Several observations are given in order. First, by (3.59) (where $x = x_k$), (3.60) and (3.61), we find

$$|E \cap I_k^\delta| \geq \frac{\gamma}{2} \alpha \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2c}}, \text{ when } k \geq k_2. \quad (3.68)$$

Write

$$\varepsilon_0 := \left(\frac{1}{1 + 4C_1/(\gamma\alpha)} \right)^2 \in (0, 1).$$

Then it follows from (3.63) that

$$|F_{k,\varepsilon_0}| \leq C_1 \sqrt{\varepsilon_0} \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2c}} \leq \frac{\gamma\alpha}{4} \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2c}} \text{ for all } k \geq k_2. \quad (3.69)$$

Combining (3.68) and (3.69), we get

$$\left| (E \cap I_k^\delta) \setminus F_{k,\varepsilon_0} \right| \geq \frac{\gamma\alpha}{4} \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2c}}, \text{ when } k \geq k_2. \quad (3.70)$$

Second, by (3.62) (where $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0$), we have that when $k \geq k_2$,

$$\cos^2(S(x) - \theta_0) \geq \varepsilon_0 \text{ for all } x \in (E \cap I_k^\delta) \setminus F_{k,\varepsilon_0}. \quad (3.71)$$

Third, noting that when $k \geq k_2$, we have $I_k^\delta \subset \Omega_k$ (see (3.61)), then using (3.25), (3.26) and (3.54), we obtain that when $k \geq k_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_E |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq \int_{E \cap I_k^\delta} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{E \cap I_k^\delta} (\lambda_k - V)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |C_{\lambda_k}|^2 \cos^2(S(x) - \theta_0) dx - 3C \int_{E \cap I_k^\delta} (\lambda_k - V)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot |C_{\lambda_k}|^2 \cdot \lambda_k^{-1} dx, \end{aligned} \quad (3.72)$$

where C is given by (3.26).

Next, we will estimate two terms on the right hand side of (3.72), with the aid of Lemma 3.5, Lemma 3.6 and the first two facts above-mentioned. First, since $V \geq 0$ over I_k^δ (see(3.3) and (3.61)), it follows from (3.71), (3.70) and the lower bound (3.28) that when $k \geq k_2$,

$$\int_{E \cap I_k^\delta} (\lambda_k - V(x))^{-\frac{1}{2}} |C_{\lambda_k}|^2 \cos^2(S(x) - \theta_0) dx$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \varepsilon_0 \int_{(E \cap I_k^\delta) \setminus F_{\varepsilon_0}} (\lambda_k - V(x))^{-\frac{1}{2}} |C_{\lambda_k}|^2 dx \\
&\geq \varepsilon_0 \lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} |C_{\lambda_k}|^2 \left| (E \cap I_k^\delta) \setminus F_{k, \varepsilon_0} \right| \\
&\geq C_3 \varepsilon_0 \gamma \alpha
\end{aligned} \tag{3.73}$$

for some $C_3 > 0$ (independent of k). Second, because $V \leq \lambda_k/2$ over I_k^δ (see (3.61) and (3.19)), it follows from (3.20) and the upper bound (3.29) that when $k \geq k_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{E \cap I_k^\delta} (\lambda_k - V(x))^{-\frac{1}{2}} |C_{\lambda_k}|^2 \lambda_k^{-1} dx &\leq |I_k^\delta| (\lambda_k/2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |C_{\lambda_k}|^2 \lambda_k^{-1} \\
&\leq C_4 \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2c}} \lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2c}} \lambda_k^{-1} = C_4 \lambda_k^{-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.74}$$

for some $C_4 > 0$ (independent of k).

Finally, inserting (3.73) and (3.74) into (3.72), we find that when $k \geq k_2$,

$$\int_E |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq \frac{1}{2} C_3 \varepsilon_0 \gamma \alpha - 3C_4 \lambda_k^{-1}. \tag{3.75}$$

Since $\lambda_k^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, we can find $k_0 \geq k_2$ so that when $k \geq k_0$,

$$\frac{1}{2} C_3 \varepsilon_0 \gamma \alpha - 3C_4 \lambda_k^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{4} C_3 \varepsilon_0 \gamma \alpha,$$

which, together with (3.75), leads to (3.57).

Hence, we end the proof of Lemma 3.7. \square

3.3. Proof of Theorem 3.1. Arbitrarily fix a subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (3.6). Then we have $|E| > 0$.

We first claim that there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ so that

$$\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k \geq \varepsilon_0 \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}^+. \tag{3.76}$$

In fact, because of **Condition (H)**, we can apply [48, Lemma 3.3] to find $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $C > 0$, which are independent of k , so that

$$\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k \geq C \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2c}} \quad \text{for all } k \geq k_0,$$

which, along with the conclusion (ii) in Proposition 3.2, leads to (3.76).

Next, we claim that there exists $C > 0$, independent of k , so that

$$\int_E |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq C \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}^+. \tag{3.77}$$

Indeed, by (3.6), we can apply Lemma 3.7 to find $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $C > 0$, independent of k , so that (3.77) holds for all $k \geq k_0$. This, together with Lemma 3.4, leads to (3.77).

Finally, by (3.76) and (3.77), we can use Proposition 3.3 to see that E is an *observable set at some time* for the equation (3.1). This ends the proof of Theorem 3.1. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In this section, we mainly prove Theorem 1.2, besides, we give the difference between *thick sets* and *weakly thick sets*. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is based on the following two theorems:

Theorem 4.1. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ be weakly thick. Then the following conclusions are true:*

- (i) *The set E is an observable set at some time for the equation (1.2) with $m = 1$.*
- (ii) *The set E is an observable set at any time for the equation (1.2) with $m \geq 2$.*

Theorem 4.2. *If E is an observable set at some time for the equation (1.2) with $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$, then it is weakly thick.*

Proof of Theorem 1.2. The equivalence of (i) and (ii) in Theorem 1.2 follows from (i) of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2. The equivalence of (i) and (iii) in Theorem 1.2 follows from (ii) of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2. This ends the proof of Theorem 1.2. \square

The rest of this section is organized as follows: Subsection 4.1 provides some preliminaries; Subsections 4.2 and 4.3 prove Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2, respectively; Subsection 4.4 presents the difference between *thick sets* and *weakly thick sets*.

4.1. Preliminaries. Arbitrarily fix $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Let H be given by (1.3). Recall that $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ are the eigenvalues and the corresponding L^2 -normalized eigenfunctions of the above H . We also recall the property (3.5) for $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$.

To show that the weakly thick condition (1.7) is sufficient for *observable sets at some time* for the equation (1.2), we first use Theorem 3.1 (where $V(x) = x^{2m}$) to get the sufficient condition (3.6) on *observable sets at some time* for the equation (1.2). (Notice that the potential $V(x) = x^{2m}$ satisfies **Condition (H)**.) Next, we will find connections between (3.6) and the weakly thick condition (1.7), through using the property: each eigenfunction is either even or odd.

To prove that the weakly thick condition (1.7) is necessary for *observable sets at some time* for the equation (1.2), we shall use the following explicit asymptotic expression of eigenvalues: (See e.g. [17, 40].)

$$\lambda_k = \left(\frac{\pi}{B(3/2, 1/(2m))} \cdot k \right)^{\frac{2m}{m+1}} (1 + r_k), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}^+; \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} r_k = 0, \quad (4.1)$$

where $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Beta function. From (4.1), we can directly verify the next Lemma 4.3:

Lemma 4.3. *The eigenvalues $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ satisfy (3.8).*

(It deserves mentioning that since **Condition (H)** holds for $V(x) = x^{2m}$, Lemma 4.3 has been proved in the proof of Theorem 3.1 (see (3.76)).

The next two lemmas will be used in the proof that the weakly thick condition (1.7) is necessary for *observable sets at some time* for the equation (1.2) in Subsection 4.3.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable subset. Then for each $a > 0$,*

$$\liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}, a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}]|}{a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}} = \liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}, abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}]|}{abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}}, \quad (4.2)$$

where

$$b = \left(\frac{\pi}{B(3/2, 1/2m)} \right)^{\frac{1}{m+1}}. \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. First of all, by (4.1), we have

$$bk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}(1 - |r_k|)^{\frac{1}{2m}} \leq \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}} \leq bk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}(1 + |r_k|)^{\frac{1}{2m}} \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}^+, \quad (4.4)$$

where b is given by (4.3). Arbitrarily fix $a > 0$. Then by (4.4), we find that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\left(E \cap [-a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}, a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}] \right) \subset \left(E \cap [-abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}(1 + |r_k|)^{\frac{1}{2m}}, abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}(1 + |r_k|)^{\frac{1}{2m}}] \right). \quad (4.5)$$

From (4.5), we see

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}, a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}]|}{a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}} &\leq \liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}(1 + |r_k|)^{\frac{1}{2m}}, abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}(1 + |r_k|)^{\frac{1}{2m}}]|}{abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}(1 + |r_k|)^{\frac{1}{2m}}} \\ &\leq \liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}, abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}]|}{abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}(1 - |r_k|)^{\frac{1}{2m}}} + \liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2((1 + |r_k|)^{\frac{1}{2m}} - 1)}{(1 - |r_k|)^{\frac{1}{2m}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Since $\lim_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} r_k = 0$ (see (4.1)), the second term on the right hand side of (4.6) vanishes. So we obtain from (4.6) that

$$\liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}, a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}]|}{a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}} \leq \liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}, abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}]|}{abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}}. \quad (4.7)$$

On the other hand, it follows from (4.4) that when k is large enough so that $|r_k| < 1$,

$$\left(E \cap [-a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}, a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}] \right) \supset \left(E \cap [-abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}(1 - |r_k|)^{\frac{1}{2m}}, abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}(1 - |r_k|)^{\frac{1}{2m}}] \right). \quad (4.8)$$

Similar to (4.7), one can deduce from (4.8) that

$$\liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}, a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}]|}{a\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}}} \geq \liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}, abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}]|}{abk^{\frac{1}{m+1}}}. \quad (4.9)$$

Finally, (4.2) follows from (4.7) and (4.9) at once. This ends the proof of Lemma 4.4. \square

The next Proposition 4.5 gives different equivalent versions of the characterization of *weakly thick sets*, in particular, it shows the connection between (4.2) and (1.7).

Proposition 4.5. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable set. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *The set E is weakly thick, i.e., $\liminf_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|E \cap [-x, x]|}{x} > 0$.*
- (ii) *The set E satisfies that $\liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-k, k]|}{k} > 0$.*
- (iii) *For all $a > 0$ and $l > 0$, $\liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-ak^l, ak^l]|}{ak^l} > 0$.*
- (iv) *There is $a > 0$ and $l > 0$ so that $\liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-ak^l, ak^l]|}{ak^l} > 0$.*

Proof. It is clear that (i) \implies (ii) and (iii) \implies (iv). The rest of the proof is organized by two steps.

Step 1. We show that (ii) \implies (iii).

By (ii), there is $\gamma > 0$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ so that

$$\frac{|E \cap [-k, k]|}{k} \geq \gamma \quad \text{for all } k \geq k_0. \quad (4.10)$$

Let $a > 0$ and $l > 0$. Arbitrarily fix $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ so that

$$k \geq c_1 := \left(\frac{k_0 + 1}{a} \right)^{1/l}. \quad (4.11)$$

Then there exists a unique $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$n \leq ak^l < n + 1. \quad (4.12)$$

From (4.11), we have $n > k_0$. Meanwhile, from (4.12), we obtain

$$E \cap [-ak^l, ak^l] \supset E \cap [-n, n].$$

Thus, by (4.10), we find that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^+ \cap [c_1, +\infty)$,

$$|E \cap [-ak^l, ak^l]| \geq |E \cap [-n, n]| \geq \gamma n.$$

This, along with (4.12), yields that

$$\liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-ak^l, ak^l]|}{ak^l} \geq \liminf_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma(ak^l - 1)}{ak^l} = \gamma > 0,$$

which leads to (iii).

Step 2. We show that (iv) \implies (i).

By (iv), there is $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\gamma > 0$ so that

$$\frac{|E \cap [-ak^l, ak^l]|}{ak^l} \geq \gamma \quad \text{for all } k \geq k_0. \quad (4.13)$$

Arbitrarily fix $x \in \mathbb{R}$ so that

$$x \geq c_2 := a(k_0 + 1)^l. \quad (4.14)$$

Then, there exists a unique $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$an^l \leq x < a(n+1)^l. \quad (4.15)$$

The fact (4.14), together with (4.15), implies that $n > k_0$. Meanwhile, from (4.15), we also have

$$E \cap [-x, x] \supset E \cap [-an^l, an^l],$$

which, along with (4.13), leads to

$$|E \cap [-x, x]| \geq |E \cap [-an^l, an^l]| \geq \gamma an^l. \quad (4.16)$$

Now, from (4.16) and (4.15), we find that for all $x \in [c_2, +\infty)$,

$$|E \cap [-x, x]| \geq \gamma \left(\frac{n}{n+1}\right)^l x \geq \gamma 2^{-l} x. \quad (4.17)$$

It follows from (4.17) that

$$\underline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|E \cap [-x, x]|}{x} \geq \gamma 2^{-l} > 0,$$

which leads to (i).

Hence, we complete the proof of Proposition 4.5. \square

4.2. Proof of Theorem 4.1. Arbitrarily fix a weakly thick set $E \subset \mathbb{R}$. Then we have

$$\underline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|E \cap [-x, x]|}{x} > 0. \quad (4.18)$$

Arbitrarily fix $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$. First of all, we claim that the eigenfunctions $\{\varphi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ (to the operator $H = -\partial_x^2 + x^{2m}$) satisfy

$$\int_E |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq C \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}^+, \quad (4.19)$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of k . To this end, we introduce the following sets:

$$E_+ := E \cap [0, \infty); \quad E_- := E \cap (-\infty, 0); \quad E_-^* := \{-x, x \in E_-\}. \quad (4.20)$$

It is clear that $E = E_+ \cup E_-$ and $E_+ \cap E_- = \emptyset$ and that

$$E \cap [-x, x] = (E_+ \cap [0, x]) \cup (E_- \cap [-x, 0]) \text{ for each } x > 0,$$

which, together with (4.20), implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |E \cap [-x, x]| &= |E_+ \cap [0, x]| + |E_- \cap [-x, 0]| = |E_+ \cap [0, x]| + |E_-^* \cap [0, x]| \\ &\leq 2 \left| (E_+ \cup E_-^*) \cap [0, x] \right| = 2 |\tilde{E} \cap [0, x]|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

where

$$\tilde{E} := E_+ \cup E_-^* \subset [0, \infty). \quad (4.22)$$

Now it follows from (4.18) and (4.21) that

$$\underline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|\tilde{E} \cap [0, x]|}{x} > 0. \quad (4.23)$$

Because of (4.23), we can apply Theorem 3.1 to conclude that \tilde{E} is *an observable set at some time* for (1.2). Further, according to Proposition 3.3, there is $C > 0$ (independent of k) so that

$$\int_{\tilde{E}} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq C \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}^+. \quad (4.24)$$

To proceed, we need the following **Key Observation**: *Each eigenfunction of H is either even or odd.* Indeed, we have

$$\left(-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + x^{2m}\right)\varphi_k(x) = \lambda_k \varphi_k(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.25)$$

Let $\tilde{\varphi}_k(x) := \varphi_k(-x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$. One can easily check that $\tilde{\varphi}_k$ also satisfies (4.25) and that $\|\tilde{\varphi}_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = \|\varphi_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$. These, along with the conclusion (ii) Proposition 3.2, give immediately that either $\varphi_k = \tilde{\varphi}_k$ or $\varphi_k = -\tilde{\varphi}_k$, which leads to **Key Observation**.

By **Key Observation** and (4.20), we infer that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\int_{E_-} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx = \int_{E_+} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx. \quad (4.26)$$

It follows from (4.20), (4.26) and (4.22) that

$$\int_E |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx = \int_{E_+} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx + \int_{E_-} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq \int_{\tilde{E}} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx. \quad (4.27)$$

Combining (4.24) and (4.27), we find that

$$\int_E |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq C \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}^+,$$

which leads to (4.19).

Now we prove (i) of Theorem 4.1. Indeed, by (4.19) and Lemma 4.3, we can use Proposition 3.3 to conclude that E is *an observable set at some time* for (1.2) with $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$, which leads to (i) clearly.

Next we prove (ii) of Theorem 4.1. Arbitrarily fix $m \geq 2$. By (4.1), after some direct calculation, we can find $C > 0$ (independent of k) so that

$$\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_k \geq Ck^{\frac{m-1}{m+1}} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then because of (4.19) and Lemma 4.3, we apply the last statement in Proposition 3.3 to conclude that E is *an observable set at any time* for (1.2). This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1. \square

4.3. Proof of Theorem 4.2. Let E be *an observable set at some time* $T_0 > 0$ for (1.2), with an arbitrarily fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Then there is $C_0 = C_0(T_0, E) > 0$ so that

$$\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_0 \int_0^{T_0} \int_E |e^{-itH} u_0|^2 dx dt \text{ for all } u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}). \quad (4.28)$$

By taking $u_0 = \varphi_k$ in (4.28) and noting that φ_k is the L^2 normalized eigenfunction of H , we find

$$\int_E |\varphi_k|^2 dx \geq C_1 \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}^+, \quad (4.29)$$

where $C_1 = 1/(T_0 C_0)$. (Notice that (4.29) can also be obtained by Proposition 3.3.)

In order to show that E is *weakly thick* from the uniform inequality (4.29), the asymptotic expression (3.25) for general potentials with **Condition (H)** doesn't seem to be enough. We need a finer asymptotic expression of φ_k for the case (1.3). This will be given by the next Lemma 4.6. To state it, we write

$$\mu_k := \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2m}} \quad \text{for each } k \gg 1 \text{ (so that } \lambda_k > 0\text{)}. \quad (4.30)$$

For each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and each $k \gg 1$, we define

$$S_k^-(x) := \int_0^x \sqrt{|\mu_k^{2m} - t^{2m}|} dt \quad \text{and} \quad S_k^+(x) := \int_{\mu_k}^{|x|} \sqrt{|t^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m}|} dt. \quad (4.31)$$

We also notice that φ_k satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\varphi_k''(x) + x^{2m}\varphi_k(x) = \mu_k^{2m}\varphi_k(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}; \\ \|\varphi_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 1. \end{cases} \quad (4.32)$$

The next Lemma 4.6 is the key in our proof.

Lemma 4.6. *With notations in (4.30) and (4.31), when $k \rightarrow +\infty$, either*

$$\varphi_k(x) = \begin{cases} a_{2k}^- (\mu_k^{2m} - |x|^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{4}} (\cos S_k^-(x) + R_k(x)), & |x| < \mu_k - \delta \cdot \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}, \\ O(\mu_k^{\frac{m-2}{6}}), & \mu_k - \delta \cdot \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}} \leq |x| \leq \mu_k + \delta \cdot \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}, \\ a_{2k}^+ (|x|^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{4}} e^{-S_k^+(x)} (1 + R_k(x)), & |x| > \mu_k + \delta \cdot \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}, \end{cases} \quad (4.33)$$

or

$$\varphi_k(x) = \begin{cases} a_{2k+1}^- (\mu_k^{2m} - |x|^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{4}} (\sin S_k^-(x) + R_k(x)), & |x| < \mu_k - \delta \cdot \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}, \\ O(\mu_k^{\frac{m-2}{6}}), & \mu_k - \delta \cdot \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}} \leq |x| \leq \mu_k + \delta \cdot \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}, \\ a_{2k+1}^+ (|x|^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{4}} e^{-S_k^+(x)} (1 + R_k(x)), & |x| > \mu_k + \delta \cdot \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}, \end{cases} \quad (4.34)$$

where $\delta > 0$ is independent of k and x and

$$|a_k^\pm| \sim \mu_k^{\frac{m-1}{2}}, \quad R_k(x) = O\left(|x^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m}|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \||x| - \mu_k|^{-1}\right). \quad (4.35)$$

Here and in what follows, given sequences of numbers $\{\alpha_k\}$ and $\{\gamma_k\}$, by $\alpha_k \sim \gamma_k$, we mean that there is $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ so that $C_1|\gamma_k| \leq |\alpha_k| \leq C_2|\gamma_k|$ for all k , while by $\alpha_k = O(\gamma_k)$, we mean that there is $C_3 > 0$ so that $|\alpha_k| \leq C_3|\gamma_k|$ for all k .

Remark 4.7. *One can use the standard WKB method (see e.g. in [4, 18, 44]) to obtain asymptotic expressions of the form $\varphi_k = f(x)e^{iS(x)}$ for certain amplitude f and phase function S . The corresponding result for the case $m = 1$ was stated in [29, Lemma 5.1]*

without proof. Since Lemma 4.6 will play an important role in our proof, we will give its detailed proof in the Appendix A for the sake of completeness of the paper.

We now back to the proof of Theorem 4.2. In order to apply Lemma 4.6, we make the following decomposition:

$$\int_E |\varphi_k|^2 dx = I_1 + I_2 + I_3, \quad (4.36)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \int_{E \cap \left\{x: |x| < \mu_k - \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}\right\}} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx, \\ I_2 &:= \int_{E \cap \left\{x: \mu_k - \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}} \leq |x| \leq \mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}\right\}} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx, \\ I_3 &:= \int_{E \cap \left\{x: |x| > \mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}\right\}} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

To deal with the term I_1 , we observe that by (4.35), there is $C > 0$ (independent of k and x) so that

$$|R_k(x)| \leq C \left(\mu_k^{2m-1} \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu_k^{\frac{2m-1}{3}} \leq C, \quad (4.37)$$

when x satisfies

$$\text{either } |x| < \mu_k - \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}} \text{ or } |x| > \mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}.$$

Now, we write

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_{E \cap \{x: |x| < \rho \mu_k\}} |\varphi_k|^2 dx + \int_{E \cap \{x: \rho \mu_k < |x| < \mu_k - \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}\}} |\varphi_k|^2 dx \\ &:= I_{1,1} + I_{1,2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

where $\rho \in (0, 1)$ is some constant to be chosen later. Notice that for any given $\rho \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\rho \mu_k < \mu_k - \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}, \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus we can use (4.37), as well as Lemma 4.6, to find $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ so that when $k \geq k_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,1} &\leq C_2 \int_{E \cap \{x: |x| < \rho \mu_k\}} \mu_k^{m-1} (\mu_k^{2m} - x^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{2}} dx \\ &\leq C_2 (1 - \rho^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{|E \cap \{x: |x| < \rho \mu_k\}|}{\mu_k} \end{aligned} \quad (4.39)$$

and

$$I_{1,2} \leq C_3 \int_{\{x: \rho \mu_k < |x| < \mu_k - \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}\}} \mu_k^{m-1} (\mu_k^{2m} - x^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{2}} dx$$

$$\leq C_3 \int_{\rho}^1 (1 - x^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{2}} dx, \quad (4.40)$$

where $C_2, C_3 > 0$ are two absolute constants. Since $\int_{\rho}^1 (1 - x^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{2}} dx \rightarrow 0$ as $\rho \rightarrow 1^-$, we can choose $\rho = \rho_0 \in (0, 1)$ so that

$$\int_{\rho_0}^1 (1 - x^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{2}} dx < \frac{C_1}{100C_3}. \quad (4.41)$$

Then it follows from (4.38)-(4.41) that

$$I_1 \leq C_2 (1 - \rho_0^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{|E \cap \{x : |x| < \rho_0 \mu_k\}|}{\mu_k} + \frac{C_1}{100}. \quad (4.42)$$

For the term I_2 , we can use Lemma 4.6 again to find $k_2 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $C_4 > 0$ so that

$$I_2 \leq C_4 \mu_k^{\frac{m-2}{3}} \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}} = C_4 \mu_k^{-\frac{m+1}{3}} \leq \frac{C_1}{100} \text{ for all } k \geq k_2. \quad (4.43)$$

We next deal with the term I_3 . First we claim that for large k ,

$$S_k^+(x) > \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{3} \mu_k^{\frac{2m-1}{3}} (|x| - \mu_k), \text{ when } |x| > \mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}. \quad (4.44)$$

(Here, $S_k^+(x)$ is given by (4.31).) Indeed, by (4.31), one can directly check that

$$S_k^+\left(\mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}\right) \geq \frac{2}{3} \delta^{\frac{3}{2}} \text{ for all } k \gg 1. \quad (4.45)$$

We define the function:

$$F(x) = S_k^+(x) - \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{3} \mu_k^{\frac{2m-1}{3}} (|x| - \mu_k), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.46)$$

From (4.46) and (4.45), we have that

$$F\left(\mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}\right) > 0 \text{ for all } k \gg 1 \quad (4.47)$$

and that when $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned} F'(x) &= \sqrt{|x^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m}|} - \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{3} \mu_k^{\frac{2m-1}{3}} \\ &\geq \left(\left(\mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}} \right)^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{3} \mu_k^{\frac{2m-1}{3}} \\ &\geq \left(\sqrt{2m} - \frac{1}{3} \right) \sqrt{\delta} \mu_k^{\frac{2m-1}{3}} > 0, \text{ when } |x| \geq \mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.48)$$

From (4.48), (4.47) and (4.46), we obtain (4.44). Now by Lemma 4.6, (4.37) and (4.44), there is some constant $C_5 > 0$ (independent of k) so that

$$I_3 \leq C_5 \mu_k^{m-1} \int_{\{x: |x| > \mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}\}} (x^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{3} \mu_k^{\frac{2m-1}{3}} (|x| - \mu_k)\right\} dx$$

$$\leq C_5 \mu_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mu_k + \delta \mu_k}^{\infty} (x - \mu_k)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{3} \mu_k^{\frac{2m-1}{3}} (x - \mu_k) \right\} dx.$$

By changing variable $\mu_k^{\frac{2m-1}{3}} (x - \mu_k) = y$ in the second integral above, we can find $k_3 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $C_6 > 0$ so that

$$I_3 \leq C_6 \mu_k^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2m-1}{6}} \leq \frac{C_1}{100} \text{ for all } k \geq k_3. \quad (4.49)$$

Finally, it follows from (4.29), (4.36), (4.42), (4.43) and (4.49) that there is $C > 0$, independent of k , so that

$$\frac{|E \cap \{x : |x| < \rho_0 \mu_k\}|}{\mu_k} \geq C, \text{ when } k \geq k_4 := \max\{k_1, k_2, k_3\}. \quad (4.50)$$

By (4.50) and Lemma 4.4, we deduce that

$$\lim_{\mathbb{N} \ni k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [-\rho_0 b k^{\frac{1}{m+1}}, \rho_0 b k^{\frac{1}{m+1}}]|}{\rho_0 b k^{\frac{1}{m+1}}} > 0, \quad (4.51)$$

where b is given by (4.3). By (4.51) and Proposition 4.5, we conclude that E is *weakly thick*.

In summary, we have completed the proof of Theorem 4.2. \square

Remark 4.8. (i) It follows immediately from Theorem 4.2 that any bounded set in \mathbb{R} is not an observable set at any time for (1.2) (with $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$). Indeed, if $E \subset [-R, R]$ for some $R > 0$, then

$$\frac{|E \cap [-x, x]|}{|x|} \leq \frac{2R}{|x|} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } x \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (4.52)$$

Thus E is not weakly thick, consequently, it is not an observable set for (1.2).

As a comparison, it is natural to ask if a bounded measurable subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an observable set for the heat equation: $\partial_t u + Hu = 0$ where $H = -\Delta + |x|^{2m}$ with $m > 1$. This seems to be open (see [35]).

(ii) One can also construct unbounded sets which are not observable sets at any time for (1.2) (with $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$). For example, let

$$E := \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} E_j, \text{ with } E_j := [j, j + (j+1)^{-\varepsilon}], \varepsilon > 0. \quad (4.53)$$

It is clear that $E \subset [0, \infty)$; E is unbounded; $|E| = \infty$ if $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. Let $x > 2$ and let j_0 be the unique positive integer so that $j_0 \leq x < j_0 + 1$. Then by (4.53) we have

$$\frac{|E \cap [-x, x]|}{|x|} \leq \frac{1}{j_0} \sum_{j=1}^{j_0} (j+1)^{-\varepsilon} \leq C x^{-\varepsilon}. \quad (4.54)$$

Since the right hand side of (4.54) tends to 0 as $x \rightarrow +\infty$, E is not weakly thick, therefore it is not an observable set for (1.2) for all $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$.

4.4. Comparison of thicknesses for two kinds of observable sets. In this subsection, we shall show that the class of *thick* sets is strictly included in the class of *weakly thick* sets.

Proposition 4.9. *Every thick set is weakly thick.*

Proof. Let E be a *thick* set. According to the definition (\mathbf{D}_3), there is $L > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ so that

$$\frac{|E \cap [x, x + L]|}{L} \geq \gamma \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.55)$$

Given $x \geq L$, there is $n_x \in \mathbb{N}^+$ so that

$$n_x L \leq x < (n_x + 1)L. \quad (4.56)$$

By (4.56), we find

$$[-x, x] \supset [-n_x L, n_x L] = \bigcup_{-n_x \leq j \leq n_x - 1} [jL, (j + 1)L].$$

This, along with (4.55) and (4.56), yields

$$\begin{aligned} |E \cap [-x, x]| &\geq \sum_{-n_x \leq j \leq n_x - 1} |E \cap [jL, (j + 1)L]| \geq \sum_{-n_x \leq j \leq n_x - 1} \gamma L \\ &= 2\gamma n_x L \geq \gamma(n_x + 1)L > \gamma x. \end{aligned}$$

Since $x \geq L$ is arbitrarily given, the above leads to

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|E \cap [-x, x]|}{x} \geq \gamma > 0.$$

Hence, E is *weakly thick*. This ends the proof of Proposition 4.9. \square

Proposition 4.10. *A weakly thick set may not be thick.*

This can be seen from the next two examples.

Example 4.11. *Let $E = [a, \infty)$ with $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then E is weakly thick but not thick.*

Here is the proof: Arbitrarily fix $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $E = [a, \infty)$. Then, when $x > |a|$, we have $|E \cap [-x, x]| = x - a$. Hence,

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|E \cap [-x, x]|}{x} = 1.$$

So E is *weakly thick*.

On the other hand, we arbitrarily fix $L > 0$. Then we have that for each $x < a - L$, $E \cap [x, x + L] = \emptyset$. So we have

$$|E \cap [x, x + L]| = 0 \quad \text{for all } x < a - L.$$

This shows that E is not *thick*.

Example 4.12. *Let*

$$E = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} ([2^j, 2^{j+1} - j] \cup [-2^{j+1} + j, -2^j]). \quad (4.57)$$

Then E is weakly thick but not thick.

Here is the proof: We first show that E is *weakly thick*. To this end, we first claim that

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|E \cap [0, x]|}{x} > 0. \quad (4.58)$$

For this purpose, we arbitrarily fix $x \geq 32$. Then there is a unique integer $n \geq 5$ so that

$$2^n \leq x < 2^{n+1}. \quad (4.59)$$

From (4.59), we find that $[0, x] \supset [0, 2^n] \supset [2^{n-1}, 2^n - n + 1]$. This, along with (4.57), yields that

$$E \cap [0, x] \supset [2^{n-1}, 2^n - n + 1].$$

The above, together with (4.59), implies that

$$|E \cap [0, x]| \geq 2^{n-1} - n + 1 > x/8,$$

which leads to (4.58). By (4.58), we find that E is *weakly thick*.

We next show that E is not *thick*. To this end, we arbitrarily fix $L > 0$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ so that $k > 3L$. Using (4.57), we deduce that

$$E \cap [2^k - 3L, 2^k - L] = \emptyset. \quad (4.60)$$

But clearly one has

$$[x, x + L] \subset [2^k - 3L, 2^k - L], \quad \text{when } x \in [2^k - 3L, 2^k - 2L]. \quad (4.61)$$

Combining (4.60) and (4.61), we find that

$$E \cap [x, x + L] = \emptyset, \quad \text{when } x \in [2^k - 3L, 2^k - 2L].$$

This shows that E is not *thick*.

Remark 4.13. *Given a sequence $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$, with $0 < a_j < 2^{j-1}$, let*

$$\tilde{E} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} ([2^j, 2^{j+1} - a_j] \cup [-2^{j+1} + a_j, -2^j]). \quad (4.62)$$

Then \tilde{E} is thick if and only if $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded, i.e., there is $L_0 > 0$ (independent of j) so that

$$a_j \leq L_0 \quad \text{for all } j \geq 1. \quad (4.63)$$

Indeed, if \tilde{E} is thick, then by (1.6) (where $E = \tilde{E}$ and $x = 2^{j+1} - a_j$), we see that for all j large enough,

$$|[2^{j+1}, 2^{j+1} - a_j + L]| = |\tilde{E} \cap [x, x + L]| \geq L\gamma > 0.$$

Since $a_j < 2^{j-1}$, the above leads to (4.63). Conversely, we suppose that (4.63) is true. Set $g(x) := |\tilde{E} \cap [x, x + 2L_0]|/(2L_0)$. By (4.62) and (4.63), we can find $M > 0$ so that $g(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, when $|x| > M$. Since $g(\cdot)$ is continuous and positive over $[-M, M]$, we can choose $\gamma_0 > 0$ so that $g(x) \geq \gamma_0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. So \tilde{E} is thick.

Intuitively speaking, the sequence $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ describes the gaps of the set \tilde{E} . From (4.63), we see that a thick set must have uniformly bounded gaps, while from (4.57) ($a_j = j$), we find that a weakly thick set can contain increasing gaps of arbitrarily large size.

5. FURTHER RESULTS FOR HERMITE SCHRÖDINGER EQUATIONS IN \mathbb{R}^n

We start with recalling several known facts related to the spectral theory of the Hermite operator $H = -\Delta + |x|^2$ (in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$), which can be found in [43, 44]. The first one is about eigenvalues:

$$\sigma(H) = \{n + 2k, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}. \quad (5.1)$$

The second one is about eigenfunctions of H : For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\varphi_k(x) = (2^k k! \sqrt{\pi})^{-\frac{1}{2}} H_k(x) e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (5.2)$$

where H_k is the Hermite polynomial given by

$$H_k(x) = (-1)^k e^{x^2} \frac{d^k}{dx^k} (e^{-x^2}), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (5.3)$$

Notice that $\|\varphi_k(x)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Now for each multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$ ($\alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}$), we define the following n -dimensional Hermite function by tensor product:

$$\Phi_\alpha(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \varphi_{\alpha_i}(x_i), \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5.4)$$

Then for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, Φ_α (with $|\alpha| = k$) is an eigenfunction of H corresponding to the eigenvalue $n + 2k$, and $\{\Phi_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\}$ forms a complete orthonormal basis in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The third one is about the solution u of the Hermite-Schrödinger equation (1.12) with the initial condition $u(0, \cdot) = f(\cdot) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$:

$$u(t, x) = e^{-itH} f = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} e^{-it(n+2|\alpha|)} a_\alpha \Phi_\alpha(x), \quad t \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (5.5)$$

where $a_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \Phi_\alpha(x) dx$ is the Fourier-Hermite coefficient. Let $K(t, x, y)$ be the kernel associated to the operator e^{-itH} . Then by Mehler's formula (see e.g. in [42, 43]), we have

$$e^{-itH} f = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K(t, x, y) f(y) dy, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \frac{\pi}{2}\mathbb{N}, \quad (5.6)$$

where

$$K(t, x, y) = \frac{e^{-i\pi n/4}}{(2\pi \sin 2t)^{n/2}} \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}(|x|^2 + |y|^2) \cot 2t - \frac{i}{\sin 2t} x \cdot y\right), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5.7)$$

Meanwhile, it follows by (5.5) that

$$\|e^{-itH} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0 \quad (5.8)$$

and that

$$e^{-i(t+\pi)H} f = e^{-i\pi n} e^{-itH} f \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (5.9)$$

5.1. Proof of Theorem 1.3. As already mentioned in Remark (c₂) in the introduction, we first build up the observability inequality at two points in time for the equation (1.12), then by using it, obtain the observability inequality (1.14) for any $T > 0$. Since we are in the general case where $n \geq 1$, the spectral approach used to prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 seem not work. (At least, we do not know how to use it.) Fortunately, the kernel, associated with e^{-itH} , has an explicit expression given by (5.7). This expression can help us to look at the problem from a new perspective. In particular, we realize some connections between uncertainty principles in harmonic analysis and observability inequalities. It deserves mentioning what follows: (i) The aforementioned observability inequality at two time points was obtained in [47] for the free Schrödinger equation; (ii) In [24], the authors considered a class of decaying potentials V and established observability inequality at two points in time for $H = -\Delta + V$. To our best knowledge, no such kind of results have been proved for potentials that are increasing to infinity when $|x| \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 5.1. *The following conclusions are true:*

(i) *If T and S , with $T > S \geq 0$, satisfy that $T - S \neq \frac{k\pi}{2}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, then there is $C := C(n)$ so that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(0, x)|^2 dx \leq C e^{\frac{Cr_1 r_2}{\sin 2(T-S)}} \left(\int_{B^c(x_1, r_1)} |u(S, x)|^2 dx + \int_{B^c(x_2, r_2)} |u(T, x)|^2 dx \right) \quad (5.10)$$

holds for any closed balls $B(x_1, r_1)$ and $B(x_2, r_2)$ in \mathbb{R}^n and any solution u to (1.12).

(ii) *If T and S , with $T > S \geq 0$, satisfy that $T - S = \frac{k\pi}{2}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, then for any closed balls $B(x_1, r_1)$ and $B(x_2, r_2)$ in \mathbb{R}^n , there is no $C > 0$ so that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(0, x)|^2 dx \leq C \left(\int_{B^c(x_1, r_1)} |u(S, x)|^2 dx + \int_{B^c(x_2, r_2)} |u(T, x)|^2 dx \right) \quad (5.11)$$

holds for all solutions u to (1.12).

Proof. Let $K(t, x, y)$ be the kernel associated to e^{-itH} . The following two facts are needed. First, when $t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \frac{\pi}{2}\mathbb{N}$, $K(t, x, y)$ is given by (5.7). (Notice that the structure of the above

kernel breaks down and becomes singular at resonant times $t = \frac{\pi}{2} \cdot k$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$)
 Second, one has (see e.g. in [28])

$$K\left(\frac{k\pi}{2}, x, y\right) = e^{-\frac{ik\pi n}{2}} \delta\left(x - (-1)^k y\right), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5.12)$$

where δ is the Dirac function.

We will use (5.7) to show the conclusion (i). Arbitrarily fix a solution u to (1.12) and two balls $B(x_1, r_1)$ and $B(x_2, r_2)$. By (5.8) and (5.9), we can assume, without loss of generality, that $S = 0$ and $0 < T \leq \pi$. In this case, we have $0 < T < \pi$ and $T \neq \frac{\pi}{2}$, which implies that $\sin 2T \neq 0$. The key observation is as:

$$\begin{aligned} u(T, x) &= \frac{e^{-i\pi n/4}}{(2\pi \sin 2T)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}(|x|^2 + |y|^2) \cot 2T - \frac{i}{\sin 2T} x \cdot y\right) u(0, y) dy \\ &= \frac{e^{-i\pi n/4}}{(2\pi \sin 2T)^{n/2}} e^{\frac{ix|^2}{2} \cdot \cot 2T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-i \frac{x}{\sin 2T} \cdot y} u(0, y) e^{i \frac{|y|^2}{2} \cdot \cot 2T} dy \\ &= \frac{e^{-i\pi n/4}}{(2\pi \sin 2T)^{n/2}} e^{\frac{ix|^2}{2} \cdot \cot 2T} \mathcal{F}\left(e^{i \frac{|y|^2}{2} \cdot \cot 2T} u(0, \cdot)\right)\left(\frac{x}{\sin 2T}\right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

where \mathcal{F} stands for the Fourier transform. Recall that the uncertainty principle built up in [26] says: *for any $S, \Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|S| < \infty$ and $|\Sigma| < \infty$, there is a positive constant*

$$C(n, S, \Sigma) := C e^{C \min\{|S||\Sigma|, |S|^{1/n} \omega(\Sigma), |\Sigma|^{1/n} \omega(S)\}}, \quad (5.14)$$

with $C = C(n)$, so that for any $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |g|^2 dx \leq C(n, S, \Sigma) \left(\int_{S^c} |g|^2 dx + \int_{\Sigma^c} |\hat{g}|^2 dx \right). \quad (5.15)$$

(Here $\omega(S)$ denotes the mean width of S , we refer the readers to [26] for its detailed definition. In particular, when S is a ball in \mathbb{R}^n , $\omega(S)$ is the diameter of the ball.)

By (5.15), where $g(x) = e^{i \frac{|x|^2}{2} \cdot \cot 2T} u(0, x)$ and (S^c, Σ^c) is replaced by $(B^c(x_1, r_1), \frac{B^c(x_2, r_2)}{\sin 2T})$ (here we have used the notation $kE := \{kx, x \in E\}$) and then by (5.13), we find

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(0, x)|^2 dx \leq C \left(\int_{B^c(x_1, r_1)} |u(0, x)|^2 dx + \int_{B^c(x_2, r_2)} |u(T, x)|^2 dx \right), \quad (5.16)$$

where $C := C\left(n, B(x_1, r_1), \frac{B(x_2, r_2)}{\sin 2T}\right)$ is given by (5.14). In view of (5.14), we find that

$$C\left(n, B(x_1, r_1), \frac{B(x_2, r_2)}{\sin 2T}\right) \leq C e^{\frac{Cr_1 r_2}{\sin 2T}}, \quad (5.17)$$

which, along with (5.16), leads to (5.10).

Next, we will use (5.12) to prove the conclusion (ii). Without loss of generality, we can assume that $(S, T) = (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ or $(S, T) = (0, \pi)$. In the case when $(S, T) = (0, \pi)$, we see from (5.12) that $K(\pi, x, y) = e^{-i\pi n} \delta(x - y)$, which implies that for any solution u to (1.12),

$$|u(0, x)| = |u(\pi, x)|, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5.18)$$

To simplify matters, we set $x_1 = x_2 = 0$. Let f be a nonzero function in $C_0^\infty(B(0, r))$, with $r = \min\{r_1, r_2\}$. Let v be the solution to (1.12) with the initial condition: $v(\cdot, 0) = f(\cdot)$. Then, for this solution v , the left hand side of the inequality (5.11) is strictly positive, but the right hand side of (5.11) is zero since both integrals vanish. (Here we used (5.18).) This shows that for this solution v , (5.11) is not true in the case that $(S, T) = (0, \pi)$.

We now consider the case that $(S, T) = (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$. To simplify matters, we again set $x_1 = x_2 = 0$. Let $u_0(\cdot) \in C_0^\infty((-r/\sqrt{n}, r/\sqrt{n}))$ (with $r = \min\{r_1, r_2\}$) be a nonzero real-valued even function (i.e., $u_0(x) = u_0(-x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$). Then define a function by

$$g(x) := \prod_{i=1}^n u_0(x_i), \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5.19)$$

Let w be the solution to (1.12) with the initial condition: $w(0, \cdot) = g(\cdot)$, where g is given by (5.19). It is clear that $\text{supp } w(0, x) \subset B(0, r)$. We claim

$$|w(0, x)| = |w(\pi/2, x)|, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5.20)$$

Indeed, since $\{\Phi_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\}$ forms a complete orthonormal basis in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have

$$w(0, x) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \langle w(0, \cdot), \Phi_\alpha(\cdot) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \Phi_\alpha(x). \quad (5.21)$$

Meanwhile, by (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4), we see that when α_i is odd/even, φ_{α_i} is odd/even. Thus, when $|\alpha|$ is odd, there exists some j , $1 \leq j \leq n$, such that α_j is odd, consequently, φ_{α_j} is an odd function, which implies that $\langle u_0(x_j), \varphi_{\alpha_j}(x_j) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 0$. This, along with (5.19), yields

$$\langle w(0, \cdot), \Phi_\alpha(\cdot) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \prod_{i=1}^n \langle u_0(\cdot), \varphi_{\alpha_i}(\cdot) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 0, \quad \text{if } |\alpha| \text{ is odd.} \quad (5.22)$$

From (5.21) and (5.22), we see

$$w(0, \cdot) = \sum_{|\alpha| \text{ is even}} \langle w(0, \cdot), \Phi_\alpha(\cdot) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \Phi_\alpha(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5.23)$$

On the other hand, we obtain from (5.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} w(\pi/2, x) &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}(n+2|\alpha|)} \langle w(0, \cdot), \Phi_\alpha(\cdot) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \Phi_\alpha(x) \\ &= e^{-\frac{i\pi n}{2}} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} (-1)^{|\alpha|} \langle w(0, \cdot), \Phi_\alpha(\cdot) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \Phi_\alpha(x) \\ &= e^{-\frac{i\pi n}{2}} \sum_{|\alpha| \text{ is even}} \langle w(0, \cdot), \Phi_\alpha(\cdot) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \Phi_\alpha(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned}$$

which, together with (5.23), leads to (5.20).

Hence, for the above solution w , the left hand side of the inequality (5.11) is strictly positive, but the right hand side of (5.11) is zero. (Here we used (5.20).) This ends the proof of Theorem 5.1. \square

Based on Theorem 5.1, we are on the position to show Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Arbitrarily fix a ball $B(x_0, r)$ and a solution u to (1.12). We first consider the case when $0 < T \leq \pi/4$. According to (i) of Theorem 5.1 (with $r_1 = r_2 = r$ and $x_1 = x_2 = x_0$), there exists $C = C(n)$ so that when $0 \leq s < t < T$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(0, x)|^2 dx \leq C e^{\frac{Cr^2}{\sin 2(t-s)}} \left(\int_{B^c(x_0, r)} |u(s, x)|^2 dx + \int_{B^c(x_0, r)} |u(t, x)|^2 dx \right). \quad (5.24)$$

Since $0 \leq s < t < T$ and $T < \pi/4$, we have $0 < 2(t-s) < \pi/2$. Thus $\sin 2(t-s) \geq 4(t-s)/\pi$. Moreover, if $(s, t) \in [0, T/3] \times [2T/3, T]$, we have $2(t-s) \geq 2T/3$. These show that

$$\sin 2(t-s) \geq 4T/(3\pi), \quad (s, t) \in [0, T/3] \times [2T/3, T]. \quad (5.25)$$

Integrating (5.24) with s over $s \in [0, T/3]$ and t over $t \in [2T/3, T]$, using (5.25), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{T}{3}\right)^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(0, x)|^2 dx &\leq C \int_0^{\frac{T}{3}} \int_{\frac{2T}{3}}^T e^{\frac{Cr^2}{4T/(3\pi)}} \left(\int_{B^c(x_0, r)} |u(s, x)|^2 dx + \int_{B^c(x_0, r)} |u(t, x)|^2 dx \right) dt ds \\ &\leq \frac{CT}{3} e^{\frac{3\pi Cr^2}{4T}} \left(\int_0^{\frac{T}{3}} \int_{B^c(x_0, r)} |u(s, x)|^2 dx ds + \int_{\frac{2T}{3}}^T \int_{B^c(x_0, r)} |u(t, x)|^2 dx dt \right) \\ &\leq \frac{CT}{3} e^{\frac{3\pi Cr^2}{4T}} \int_0^T \int_{B^c(x_0, r)} |u(t, x)|^2 dx dt. \end{aligned}$$

From the above, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(0, x)|^2 dx \leq \frac{3C}{T} e^{\frac{3\pi Cr^2}{4T}} \int_0^T \int_{B^c(x_0, r)} |u(t, x)|^2 dx dt, \quad (5.26)$$

which leads to (1.14) for the case that $0 < T \leq \pi/4$.

We next consider the case when $T > \pi/4$. By (5.26) with $T = \pi/4$, we find

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(0, x)|^2 dx \leq \frac{12C}{\pi} e^{3Cr^2} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{4}} \int_{B^c(x_0, r)} |u(t, x)|^2 dx dt,$$

from which, it follows that when $T > \pi/4$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(0, x)|^2 dx \leq \frac{12C}{\pi} e^{\frac{6Cr^2}{\pi}} \int_0^T \int_{B^c(x_0, r)} |u(t, x)|^2 dx dt.$$

The above leads to (1.14) for the case where $T > \pi/4$. This ends the proof of Theorem 1.3. \square

5.2. Proof of Theorem 1.4. Since the equation (1.12) is rotation invariant, we can assume, without loss of generality, that $a = (1, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In what follows, $E := B^c(0, r) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 \geq 0\}$.

Step 1. We prove that (i) \Rightarrow (ii).

Given $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, write $\vec{k} := (k, \dots, k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$; let

$$u_{0,k}(x) := \pi^{-\frac{n}{4}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2} - i\vec{k} \cdot x}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n; \quad (5.27)$$

and write $u_k(t, x)$ for the solution of (1.12), with the initial condition: $u_k(0, x) = u_{0,k}(x)$. We claim that

$$\|u_{0,k}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 1 \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}^+ \quad (5.28)$$

and that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \int_E |u_k(t, x)|^2 dx dt = 0 \quad \text{for each } T \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2}]. \quad (5.29)$$

When this is done, “(i) \Rightarrow (ii)” follows from (5.28) and (5.29) at once.

The equality (5.28) follows from (5.27) and the direct calculation:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_{0,k}|^2 dx = \pi^{-\frac{n}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-|x|^2} dx = 1 \quad \text{for each } k \in \mathbb{N}^+.$$

We next show (5.29). By (5.6) and (5.27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_k(t, x) &= \frac{e^{-in\pi/4}}{(2\pi \sin 2t)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}(|x|^2 + |y|^2) \cot 2t - \frac{i}{\sin 2t} x \cdot y\right) u_{0,k}(y) dy \\ &= \frac{e^{-in\pi/4}}{(2\pi \sin 2t)^{n/2}} e^{\frac{i|x|^2}{2} \cot 2t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-i\frac{x}{\sin 2t} \cdot y} u_{0,k}(y) e^{\frac{i|y|^2}{2} \cot 2t} dy, \quad t \in (0, \pi/2), x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned}$$

By changing variables in the above, we find

$$u_k(t, x) = \frac{e^{-in\pi/4}}{(2\pi \sin 2t \cdot A_t)^{n/2}} \exp\left\{\frac{i|x|^2}{2} \cdot \cot 2t - \frac{|\frac{x}{\sin 2t} + \vec{k}|^2}{2A_t}\right\}, \quad t \in (0, \pi/2), x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $A_t := 1 - i \cot 2t$. This implies that when $0 < t < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$|u_k(t, x)| \leq C \exp\left\{-\frac{|\frac{x}{\sin 2t} + \vec{k}|^2}{2(1 + \cot^2 2t)}\right\} = C \exp\left\{-\frac{|x + \vec{k} \sin 2t|^2}{2}\right\}. \quad (5.30)$$

Now we arbitrarily fix $0 < \epsilon < \frac{\pi}{4}$. Several facts are given in order. Fact One:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_E |u_k(t, x)|^2 dx dt &\leq \int_0^{\frac{\epsilon}{3}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_k(t, x)|^2 dx dt + \int_{\frac{\epsilon}{3}}^{\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{\epsilon}{3}} \int_E |u_k(t, x)|^2 dx dt \\ &\quad + \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{\epsilon}{3}}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_k(t, x)|^2 dx dt. \end{aligned} \quad (5.31)$$

Fact Two: It follows directly from (5.28) that

$$\int_0^{\frac{\epsilon}{3}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_k(t, x)|^2 dx dt + \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{\epsilon}{3}}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_k(t, x)|^2 dx dt = \frac{2\epsilon}{3}. \quad (5.32)$$

Fact Three: Since $\sin 2t \geq \sin(2\epsilon/3) > 0$, when $\frac{\epsilon}{3} \leq t \leq \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{3}$, we deduce from (5.30) and the definition of E that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E |u_k(t, x)|^2 dx &\leq C \int_E e^{-|x+\vec{k} \sin 2t|^2} dx \\ &\leq C \int_{k \sin(2\epsilon/3)}^\infty e^{-x_1^2} dx_1 \prod_{j=2}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-x_j^2} dx_j \longrightarrow 0, \text{ as } k \rightarrow +\infty, \end{aligned}$$

from which, we can find $K > 0$ so that

$$\int_{\frac{\pi}{3}}^{\frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{3}} \int_E |u_k(t, x)|^2 dx dt \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3} \text{ for all } k > K. \quad (5.33)$$

Because $\epsilon > 0$ can be arbitrarily small, (5.29) follows from (5.31), (5.32) and (5.33) immediately.

Hence, we have proved “(i) \Rightarrow (ii)”.

Step 2. We prove that “(ii) \Rightarrow (i)”.

Arbitrarily fix $T > \frac{\pi}{2}$. By contradiction, we suppose that (i) is not true for the aforementioned T . Then there exists a sequence of functions $\{v_{0,k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ so that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\|v_{0,k}\|_2 = 1 \text{ and } \int_0^T \int_E |e^{-itH} v_{0,k}|^2 dx dt \leq \frac{\|v_{0,k}\|_{L^2}^2}{k} = \frac{1}{k}. \quad (5.34)$$

Several observations are given in order. First, from (5.6), we see that when $t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \frac{\pi}{2}\mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} &(e^{-i(t+\pi/2)H} v_{0,k})(x) \\ &= \frac{e^{-i\pi n/4}}{(2\pi \sin 2(t+\pi/2))^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}(|x|^2 + |y|^2) \cot 2(t+\frac{\pi}{2}) - \frac{i}{\sin 2(t+\pi/2)} x \cdot y\right) v_{0,k}(y) dy \\ &= \frac{e^{-i3\pi n/4}}{(2\pi \sin 2t)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}(|x|^2 + |y|^2) \cot 2t - \frac{i}{\sin 2t} (-x) \cdot y\right) v_{0,k}(y) dy \\ &= e^{-i\pi n/2} (e^{-itH} v_{0,k})(-x). \end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

Second, since $T > \frac{\pi}{2}$, we have

$$\int_0^T \int_E |e^{-itH} v_{0,k}|^2 dx dt = \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_E |e^{-itH} v_{0,k}|^2 dx dt + \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}}^T \int_E |e^{-itH} v_{0,k}|^2 dx dt. \quad (5.36)$$

Third, by the change of variable $t \rightarrow t + \frac{\pi}{2}$ and the fact (5.35), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}}^T \int_E |e^{-itH} v_{0,k}(x)|^2 dx dt &= \int_0^{T-\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_E |e^{-i(t+\frac{\pi}{2})H} v_{0,k}(x)|^2 dx dt \\ &= \int_0^{T-\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{-E} |e^{-itH} v_{0,k}(x)|^2 dx dt, \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

where $-E := B^c(0, r) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 \leq 0\}$. Last, it is clear that

$$E \bigcup (-E) = B^c(0, r). \quad (5.38)$$

Set $T_0 = \min\{T - \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\}$. Then by the second inequality in (5.34) and by (5.36), (5.37) and (5.38), we have

$$\int_0^{T_0} \int_{B^c(0, r)} |e^{-itH} v_{0,k}|^2 dx dt \leq \frac{1}{k}. \quad (5.39)$$

Now by Theorem 1.3 (with $x_0 = 0$), the first equality in (5.34) and (5.39), we find

$$1 \leq C(T_0) \int_0^{T_0} \int_{B^c(0, r)} |e^{-itH} v_{0,k}|^2 dx dt \leq \frac{C(T_0)}{k} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.40)$$

which leads to a contradiction. So (i) is true.

Thus we end the proof of Theorem 1.4. \square

5.3. Proof of Theorem 1.5. In its proof, we borrow some ideas from [14] and [46].

Suppose that E holds (1.16) for some $T > 0$ and $C > 0$. Notice that the semigroup $\{e^{-tH}\}_{t \geq 0}$, generated by the Hermite operator $-H$, can be extended over $\mathbb{C}^+ := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Re z > 0\}$. Furthermore, the kernel associated with e^{-zH} (over \mathbb{C}^+) can be written in the form:

$$K_z(x, y) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} e^{-(n+2|\alpha|)z} \Phi_\alpha(x) \Phi_\alpha(y), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (5.41)$$

where $\Phi_\alpha(x)$ is given by (5.4). Thanks to the Mehler's formula (see e.g. in [43, p. 85]), the series in (5.41) can be summed explicitly. More precisely, we have that when $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$K_z(x, y) = (2\pi \sinh 2z)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\coth 2z}{2}(|x|^2 + |y|^2) + \frac{2}{\sinh 2z} x \cdot y\right), \quad (5.42)$$

where \coth and \sinh are hyperbolic trigonometric functions. From (5.42), we see that for each fixed $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, the kernel is an analytic function of z over \mathbb{C}^+ .

We claim

$$|K_{s+it}(x, y)| \leq C s^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{s \cdot |x - y|^2}{4(s^2 + t^2)}\right) \text{ for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, s > 0, t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.43)$$

To prove (5.43), we first recall the following result on analytic function: (It can be found in [13, Lemma 9].) *Let F be an analytic function on \mathbb{C}^+ . Suppose that there is $a_1 > 0$, $a_2 > 0$, $\beta \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ so that*

$$|F(re^{i\theta})| \leq a_1(r \cos \theta)^{-\beta}, \quad |F(r)| \leq a_1 r^{-\beta} \exp(-a_2 r^{-\alpha}) \text{ for all } r > 0 \text{ and } |\theta| < \pi/2.$$

Then

$$|F(re^{i\theta})| \leq a_1 2^\beta (r \cos \theta)^{-\beta} \exp\left(-\frac{a_2 \alpha}{2} r^{-\alpha} \cos \theta\right) \text{ for all } r > 0 \text{ and } |\theta| < \pi/2. \quad (5.44)$$

Now we are in a position to prove (5.43). On one hand, when $z = s > 0$, one can use the inequalities: $e^{2s} + e^{-2s} \geq 2$ and $\sinh 2s \geq 2s$, to find some $C > 0$ so that

$$K_s(x, y) \leq C s^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{2s}\right) \text{ for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } s > 0. \quad (5.45)$$

(One can also use the fact: $-\Delta + |x|^2 \geq -\Delta$, to get (5.45), see e.g. in [41].) On the other hand, by (5.42), it follows that there is some $C > 0$ so that

$$|K_{s+it}(x, y)| \leq C s^{-\frac{n}{2}} \text{ for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, s > 0 \text{ and } t \geq 0. \quad (5.46)$$

In view of (5.45) and (5.46), the desired estimate (5.43) follows by applying (5.44) with $a_2 = |x-y|^2/2$, $\alpha = 1$, $\beta = n/2$ and $\cos \theta = s/\sqrt{s^2+t^2}$.

Next, we arbitrarily fix $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let

$$u_0(x) := K_1(x, y_0), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

(It is clear that $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.) By the group property, the solution $v(t, x) := e^{-itH} u_0(x)$ ($(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$) is as:

$$v(t, x) = \int K_{it}(x, y) K_1(y, y_0) dy = K_{1+it}(x, y_0), \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5.47)$$

Since the Hermite function $\Phi_0(x) = \pi^{-n/4} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}}$ ($x \in \mathbb{R}^n$), given by (5.4), is the normalized eigenfunction of $H = -\Delta + |x|^2$ corresponding to the smallest eigenvalue $\lambda_0 = n$, it follows from the eigenfunction expansion of $u_0(x)$ that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_0(x)|^2 dx = \int \left| \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} e^{-(n+2|\alpha|)} \Phi_\alpha(x) \Phi_\alpha(y_0) \right|^2 dx \geq e^{-2n} |\Phi_0(y_0)|^2 = C e^{-|y_0|^2}. \quad (5.48)$$

Meanwhile, by (5.47) and (5.43), we see that for any $L > 0$,

$$|v(t, x)| \leq C e^{-\frac{\gamma|x-y_0|^2}{8}} e^{-\frac{\gamma L^2 \rho(y_0)^2}{8}}, \quad \text{when } |x-y_0| \geq L\rho(y_0) \text{ and } t \in [0, T], \quad (5.49)$$

where $\gamma := \frac{1}{1+T^2}$ and $\rho(y_0)$ is given by (1.17).

Finally, by (5.48), (1.16) (where u is replaced by the above v) and (5.49), we see that for any $L > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-|y_0|^2} &\leq C \int_0^T \int_{E \cap B(y_0, L\rho(y_0))} |v(t, x)|^2 dx dt + C e^{-\frac{\gamma L^2 \rho(y_0)^2}{4}} \int_0^T \int_{B^c(y_0, L\rho(y_0))} e^{-\frac{\gamma|x-y_0|^2}{4}} dx dt \\ &\leq C \int_0^T \int_{E \cap B(y_0, L\rho(y_0))} |v(t, x)|^2 dx dt + CT e^{-\frac{\gamma L^2 \rho(y_0)^2}{4}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.50)$$

In the above, by choosing $L > 0$ so that $CT e^{-\frac{\gamma L^2 \rho(y_0)^2}{4}} < \frac{e^{-|y_0|^2}}{2}$, we obtain, with the help of (5.43), that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{e^{-|y_0|^2}}{2} &\leq C \int_0^T \int_{E \cap B(y_0, L\rho(y_0))} e^{-\frac{\gamma|x-y_0|^2}{2}} dx dt \\ &\leq CT |E \cap B(y_0, L\rho(y_0))|, \end{aligned} \quad (5.51)$$

which leads to (1.17) with $c = \frac{1}{2CT}$. This ends the proof of Theorem 1.5. \square

Remark 5.2. *In the 1-dim case, the necessary condition (1.17) is strictly weaker than the weakly thick property (1.7). This can be seen by three facts as follows: First, if $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ satisfies (1.7), then E must satisfy (1.17). Second, the set E , defined by (4.53), holds (1.17). Third, the set E , defined by (4.53), does not satisfy (1.7). The first fact follows from Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.5. The second fact can be proved in the following way: Since*

$$[y - 3\rho(y), y + 3\rho(y)] \supseteq [0, 2\rho(y)] \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathbb{R},$$

here $\rho(y)$ is given by (1.17). It follows from (4.53) that for some $c > 0$,

$$\left| E \cap [y - 3\rho(y), y + 3\rho(y)] \right| \geq \rho(y)^{-\varepsilon} \geq ce^{-|y|^2} \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathbb{R},$$

which shows that E satisfies (1.17). The third fact follows from (4.54) in Remark 4.8.

APPENDIX A. WKB APPROXIMATE SOLUTIONS-PROOF OF LEMMA 4.6

According to **Key Observation** in the proof of Theorem 4.1, each φ_k is either even or odd. We claim: in the case that φ_k is even, (4.33), as well as (4.35), holds, while in the case that φ_k is odd, (4.34), as well as (4.35), holds. We only give the proof for the case that φ_k is even, while the proof for the second case is very similar. Thus, we will assume, in what follows, that φ_k is even.

Notice that the equation (4.32) has two turning points $x = \pm\mu_k$ (with $\mu_k = \lambda_k^{1/2m}$). Since φ_k is even, we need only focus our studies on $[0, \infty)$ and the turning point $x = \mu_k$. Since φ_k has different behaviors for the cases that x is small (compared to μ_k); x is close to μ_k ; and x is large, it has three different expressions in (4.35).

Case 1. Asymptotic behavior of φ_k when $0 \leq x < \mu_k - \delta\mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}$ (Here, $\delta > 0$ is arbitrarily fixed. Notice that for large k , we have $\mu_k - \delta\mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}} > 0$.)

This case is corresponding to the classical allowed region. Consider the following standard Liouville transform (see e.g. [44, p. 119]):

$$\begin{cases} y = S^-(x) = \int_0^x \sqrt{\mu_k^{2m} - s^{2m}} ds, & x \in \hat{\Omega}_k := \{x : |x| \leq \mu_k - \delta\mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}\} \\ w = w(y) = (\mu_k^{2m} - x^{2m})^{\frac{1}{4}} \varphi_k(x), & \text{with } y = S^-(x) \in S^-(\hat{\Omega}_k). \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Applying the above transform to the equation (4.32) (restricted over $\hat{\Omega}_k$), we find

$$\frac{d^2 w(y)}{dy^2} + w(y) + q_1(\mu_k, y)w(y) = 0, \quad y \in S^-(\hat{\Omega}_k), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where

$$q_1(\mu_k, y) = \frac{m(2m-1)x^{2m-2}}{2(\mu_k^{2m} - x^{2m})^2} + \frac{5m^2 x^{2(2m-1)}}{4(\mu_k^{2m} - x^{2m})^3}, \quad \text{with } y = S^-(x) \in S^-(\hat{\Omega}_k). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Using Duhamel's formula to (A.2), we have

$$w(y) = w(0) \cos y - \int_0^y \sin(y-z) q_1(\mu_k, z) w(z) dz, \quad y \in S^-(\hat{\Omega}_k). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

By (A.3), after some computations, we see that when $0 \leq x < \mu_k - \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^y q_1(\mu_k, z) dz &= \int_0^x \left(\frac{m(2m-1)t^{2m-2}}{2(\mu_k^{2m} - t^{2m})^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{5m^2 t^{2(2m-1)}}{4(\mu_k^{2m} - t^{2m})^{\frac{5}{2}}} \right) dt \quad (\text{by changing variable: } z = S^-(t)) \\ &\leq C \left(\int_0^{\mu_k - \delta \mu_k^{-(2m-1)/3}} \frac{t^{2m-2}}{(\mu_k^{2m} - t^{2m})^{\frac{3}{2}}} dt + \int_0^{\mu_k - \delta \mu_k^{-(2m-1)/3}} \frac{t^{2(2m-1)}}{(\mu_k^{2m} - t^{2m})^{\frac{5}{2}}} dt \right) \\ &\leq C \mu_k^{-\frac{2}{3}(m+1)} + C \leq C. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Here and in what follows, C stands for a positive constant (independent of k) which may vary in different contexts. Moreover, when $0 \leq x < \mu_k$, we have

$$\int_0^x \frac{t^{2m-2}}{(\mu_k^{2m} - t^{2m})^{\frac{3}{2}}} dt + \int_0^x \frac{t^{2(2m-1)}}{(\mu_k^{2m} - t^{2m})^{\frac{5}{2}}} dt \leq C(\mu_k^{2m} - x^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mu_k - x)^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

By (A.5), we can apply Gronwall's inequality in (A.4) to see

$$|w(y)| \leq C \cdot |w(0)|, \quad \text{when } y \in S^-(\hat{\Omega}_k). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Inserting (A.7) into (A.4), using (A.6) and (A.1), we obtain

$$\varphi_k(x) = w(0)(\mu_k^{2m} - |x|^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{4}}(\cos S^-(x) + R_k(x)), \quad |x| < \mu_k - \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where the error term $R_k(x)$ satisfies

$$|R_k(x)| \leq C(\mu_k^{2m} - x^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mu_k - x)^{-1}, \quad 0 \leq x < \mu_k. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Comparing (A.8) (as well as (A.9)) with (4.33) (as well as (4.35)), we see that the remainder in *Case 1* is to show that

$$w(0) \sim \mu_k^{\frac{m-1}{2}}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

First, we notice that Lemma 3.5 (where Ω_k is replaced by $\hat{\Omega}_k$) can be applied, except for a slight modification on (3.26). Thus, Lemma 3.6 holds for $C_{\lambda_k} := w(0) - iw'(0)$ where w is given by (A.1) (see (3.27)). Since w is even, we have $C_{\lambda_k} := w(0)$. This, along with (3.29), yields

$$|w(0)| \lesssim \lambda_k^{\frac{m-1}{4m}} = \mu_k^{\frac{m-1}{2}}.$$

Next, we will use the argument in [48, Lemma 3.2] to prove that

$$|w(0)| \gtrsim \mu_k^{\frac{m-1}{2}}.$$

Indeed, from the following viral identity [12, p. 66]:

$$\mu_k^{2m} = \left\langle (-\partial_x^2 + x^{2m})\varphi_k, \varphi_k \right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = (m+1) \langle x^{2m}\varphi_k, \varphi_k \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R})},$$

we have

$$\mu_k^{2m} = (m+1) \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^{2m} \cdot |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq \frac{\mu_k^{2m}(m+1)}{\sqrt{2}} \int_{|x| \geq \mu_k/(2^{\frac{1}{4m}})} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx.$$

From this and the fact $\int_0^\infty |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx = 1/2$, we have

$$\int_0^{\mu_k/(2^{\frac{1}{4m}})} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx = \frac{1}{2} - \int_{x \geq \mu_k/(2^{\frac{1}{4m}})} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx \geq \frac{m+1-\sqrt{2}}{2(m+1)} > 0. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

On the other hand, for $0 \leq x \leq \mu_k/(2^{\frac{1}{4m}})$, it follows from (A.8) and (A.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\mu_k/(2^{\frac{1}{4m}})} |\varphi_k(x)|^2 dx &= \int_0^{\mu_k/(2^{\frac{1}{4m}})} \frac{|w(0)(\cos S^-(x) + R_k(x))|^2}{\sqrt{\mu_k^{2m} - x^{2m}}} dx \\ &\leq C|w(0)|^2 \cdot \mu_k^{1-m}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

which, together with (A.11), yields that $|w(0)| \gtrsim \mu_k^{\frac{m-1}{2}}$. Hence, we end the proof of (A.10).

Case 2. Asymptotic behavior of φ_k when $\mu_k - \delta\mu_k^{\frac{2m-1}{3}} \leq x \leq \mu_k + \delta\mu_k^{\frac{2m-1}{3}}$ (Here, $\delta > 0$ will be given later.)

Notice that near the turning point μ_k , the approximation in *Case 1* breaks down since the factor $|x^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m}|^{-1/4}$ in (A.8) goes to infinity when $|x - \mu_k| \rightarrow 0$. The way to pass this barrier is to linearize the potential x^{2m} near the turning point. Indeed, plugging the Taylor's expansion:

$$x^{2m} = \mu_k^{2m} + 2m\mu_k^{2m-1}(x - \mu_k) + \mu_k^{2m-2}(x - \mu_k)^2 \cdot T(x - \mu_k),$$

(where $T(t) = c_0 + c_1 t + \dots + c_{2m-2} t^{2m-2}$ is some polynomial of degree $2m-2$) into (4.32) yields

$$-\varphi_k''(x) + 2m\mu_k^{2m-1}(x - \mu_k)\varphi_k(x) + \mu_k^{2m-2}(x - \mu_k)^2 T(x - \mu_k) \cdot \varphi_k(x) = 0. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Using the transform:

$$y = (2m\mu_k^{2m-1})^{\frac{1}{3}}(x - \mu_k), \quad (\text{A.14})$$

and choosing δ so that

$$0 < \delta < \frac{(2m)^{-1/3}}{10},$$

we change the equation (A.13) into

$$\varphi_k''(y) - y \cdot \varphi_k(y) - q_2(\mu_k, y)\varphi_k(y) = 0, \quad -1/10 < y < 1/10, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

where

$$q_2(\mu_k, y) = \mu_k^{-\frac{2(m+1)}{3}} \cdot y^2 \cdot T((2m\mu_k^{2m-1})^{-\frac{1}{3}}y). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

The idea to deal with (A.15) is as: the term $q_2(\mu_k, y)$ is small as k is large; when it is ignored, the above equation becomes the standard Airy equation. Thus, it can be solved explicitly in terms of $Ai(\cdot)$ and $Bi(\cdot)$ (which are two linear independent solutions of the Airy equation: $\psi''(y) - y\psi(y) = 0$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$) by the method of variation of parameters (see [36]).

With the above idea, we write the solution of (A.15) as:

$$\varphi_k(y) = c_{\mu_k} \cdot (Ai(y) + r(y)), \quad -1/10 < y < 1/10. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Since $Ai''(y) - y \cdot Ai(y) = 0$, the error term $r(\cdot)$ satisfies

$$r''(y) - y \cdot r(y) - q_2(\mu_k, y)(Ai(y) + r(y)) = 0, \quad -1/10 < y < 1/10. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

By the variation of parameters and by using of the identity:

$$W(Ai(y), Bi(y)) := Ai(y)Bi'(y) - Bi(y)Ai'(y) = 1/\pi, \quad y \in \mathbb{R},$$

we can get from (A.18) that (see e.g. [36, p.400])

$$r(y) = \pi \int_{-1/10}^y (Bi(y)Ai(v) - Ai(y)Bi(v))q_2(\mu_k, v)(Ai(v) + r(v)) dv, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

when $-1/10 < y < 1/10$. Since the functions $Ai(\cdot)$ and $Bi(\cdot)$ don't vanish over $[-1/10, 1/10]$ ([36, p.395]), we can find some absolute constant $C > 0$ so that

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq |Ai(y)|, |Bi(y)| \leq C \quad \text{for all } -1/10 < y < 1/10. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

This, along with (A.16), yields

$$\int_{-1/10}^y |(Bi(y)Ai(v) - Ai(y)Bi(v))q_2(\mu_k, v)| dv \leq C\mu_k^{-\frac{2(m+1)}{3}}, \quad -1/10 < y < 1/10. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

By (A.21), we can apply Gronwall's inequality to (A.19) to see

$$|r(y)| \leq C\mu_k^{-\frac{2(m+1)}{3}}, \quad -1/10 < y < 1/10. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

Now, it follows from (A.17) and (A.14) that

$$\varphi_k(x) = c_{\mu_k} \cdot \left(Ai((2m\mu_k^{2m-1})^{\frac{1}{3}}(x - \mu_k)) + r((2m\mu_k^{2m-1})^{\frac{1}{3}}(x - \mu_k)) \right), \quad (\text{A.23})$$

where r satisfies the estimate (A.22). The remainder is to estimate c_{μ_k} in (A.23). By (A.20), one has $Ai(x) \sim 1$, when $|x| \leq 1/10$. Therefore we have

$$\varphi_k(x) \sim c_{\mu_k}, \quad \text{when } \mu_k - \delta\mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}} \leq x \leq \mu_k + \delta\mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}. \quad (\text{A.24})$$

Meanwhile, if w is given by (A.1), then by results in *Case 1* and by the fact $|w(0)| \sim \mu_k^{\frac{m-1}{2}}$, we see that $x \nearrow \mu_k - \delta\mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}$,

$$\varphi_k(x) \rightarrow w(0) \left(\mu_k^{2m} - (\mu_k - \delta\mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}})^{2m} \right)^{-1/4} \sim \mu_k^{\frac{m-2}{6}}.$$

This, together with the continuity of the function φ_k , yields that

$$c_{\mu_k} \sim \mu_k^{\frac{m-2}{6}}. \quad (\text{A.25})$$

From (A.24) and (A.25), we get (4.33) for *Case 2*.

Case 3. Asymptotic behavior of φ_k when $x > \mu_k + \delta\mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}$.

This case is corresponding to the classically forbidden region since the potential energy $V = x^{2m}$ is greater than total energy $\lambda_k = \mu_k^{2m}$. So we use the following transform (instead of (A.1)):

$$\begin{cases} y = S^+(x) = \int_{\mu_k}^x \sqrt{s^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m}} ds, \\ w = w(y) = (x^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m})^{\frac{1}{4}} \varphi_k(x), \text{ with } y = S^+(x). \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.26})$$

Under this transform, the equation (4.32) is as:

$$\frac{d^2 w(y)}{dy^2} - w(y) + q_3(\mu_k, y)w(y) = 0, \quad (\text{A.27})$$

where

$$q_3(\mu_k, y) = \frac{m(2m-1)x^{2m-2}}{2(x^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m})^2} + \frac{5m^2 x^{2(2m-1)}}{4(x^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m})^3}, \quad y = S^+(x). \quad (\text{A.28})$$

Then by (A.28) and a direct computation, one has

$$\int_{S^+(\mu_k + \delta\mu_k^{-(2m-1)/3})}^{\infty} q_3(\mu_k, y) dy \leq C \int_{\mu_k + \delta\mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}}^{\infty} \left(\frac{x^{2m-2}}{(x^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m})^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{x^{2(2m-1)}}{(x^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m})^{\frac{5}{2}}} \right) dx \leq C.$$

This shows that the unbounded potential x^{2m} is reduced to an integrable one after the transform (A.26). Then, according to some fundamental results in ODE (see e.g. [4, Theorem 4.1]), the solution satisfies

$$w(y) = C_{\mu_k} e^{-y} (1 + o(1)), \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow +\infty, \quad (\text{A.29})$$

and it is uniquely defined by

$$w(y) = C_{\mu_k} e^{-y} - \int_y^{\infty} \sinh(t-y) q_3(\mu_k, t) w(t) dt. \quad (\text{A.30})$$

To proceed, observe that by (A.29), one has

$$|\sinh(t-y) \cdot w(t)| \leq C_{\mu_k} (e^{t-y} - e^{-(t-y)}) e^{-t} \leq C_{\mu_k} e^{-y}, \quad \text{when } t > y.$$

Plugging this into the integral in (A.30) and making change of variable $t = S^+(s)$ (notice that $y = S^+(x)$), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_y^\infty \sinh(t-y) q_3(\mu_k, t) w(t) dt \right| &\leq C_{\mu_k} e^{-y} \cdot \int_y^\infty q_3(\mu_k, t) dt \\ &\leq C_{\mu_k} e^{-y} \cdot \int_x^\infty \left(\frac{s^{2m-2}}{(s^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m})^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{s^{2(2m-1)}}{(s^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m})^{\frac{5}{2}}} \right) ds \\ &\leq C_{\mu_k} e^{-y} \cdot (x^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (x - \mu_k)^{-1}, \quad x > \mu_k. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.31})$$

Therefore we obtain from (A.30), (A.31) and (A.26) that

$$\varphi_k(x) = C_{\mu_k} (x^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{4}} e^{-S^+(x)} (1 + R_k(x)), \quad \text{when } x > \mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}, \quad (\text{A.32})$$

and the reminder term $R_k(x)$ satisfies

$$|R_k(x)| \leq C (x^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (x - \mu_k)^{-1}, \quad \text{when } x > \mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}. \quad (\text{A.33})$$

We next claim that

$$C_{\mu_k} \sim \mu_k^{\frac{m-1}{2}} \quad (\text{A.34})$$

Indeed, according to (A.26) and (A.33), there is an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that

$$0 < S^+(\mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}) \leq \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}} \cdot \sqrt{(\mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}})^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m}} \leq C,$$

and

$$R_k(\mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}) \leq C.$$

By these, we can use (A.32) and the continuity of φ_k near the point $\mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}$ to find that when $x \searrow \mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}}$,

$$\varphi_k(x) \rightarrow C_{\mu_k} \left((\mu_k + \delta \mu_k^{-\frac{2m-1}{3}})^{2m} - \mu_k^{2m} \right)^{-1/4} \sim \mu_k^{\frac{m-2}{6}},$$

which leads to (A.34).

Finally, by (A.32), (A.33) and (A.34), we get (4.33) and (4.35) for *Case 3*. This ends the proof of Lemma 4.6. \square

Remark A.1. *The proof of Lemma 3.5, provided in [48], is in the same spirit of the above Case 1. This is because the region $\Omega_{\mu_k} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}, V(x) \leq \frac{\mu_k}{2}\}$ in the consideration belongs to the classically allowed region in Case 1. Since the potential in Lemma 3.5 satisfies the **Condition (H)**, [48] uses transform (3.21) instead of (A.1). Moreover, the **Condition (H)** is sufficient to obtain the sharp bounds of the constant $w(0)$.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Dr. Yubiao Zhang for very useful discussions and for constructive comments on the time optimal observability of Hermite Schrödinger equations.

S. Huang was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grants 11801188 and 11971188.

G. Wang was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grants 11971022 and 11926337.

M. Wang was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant No. 11701535

REFERENCES

- [1] Anantharaman, N., Macià, F.: Semiclassical measures for the Schrödinger equation on the torus. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **16**, 1253–1288 (2014) 4
- [2] Anantharaman, N., Riviere, G.: Dispersion and controllability for the Schrödinger equation on negatively curved manifolds. *Anal. PDE.* **5**, 313–338 (2012) 4
- [3] Beauchard, K., Jaming, P., Pravda-Starov, K.: Spectral inequality for finite combinations of Hermite functions and null-controllability of hypoelliptic quadratic equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.04895*, (2018) 2, 3
- [4] Berezin, F. A., Shubin, M. A.: *The Schrödinger equation, Mathematics and its Applications.* Kluwer Academic Publishers 66 (1991) 10, 11, 12, 27, 46
- [5] Bonami, A., Demange, B.: A survey on uncertainty principles related to quadratic forms. *Collect. Math.*, 1–36 (2006) 2
- [6] Bourgain, J.: A szemerédi type theorem for sets of positive density in \mathbb{R}^k . *Israel J. Math.* **54**, 307–316 (1986) 3
- [7] Bourgain, J., Burq, N., Zworski, M.: Control for Schrödinger operators on 2-tori: rough potentials. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **15**, 1597–1628 (2013) 4
- [8] Burq, N., Sun, C.: Time optimal observability for Grushin Schrödinger equation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03691*, (2019) 6
- [9] Burq, N., Zworski, M.: Geometric control in the presence of a black box. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **17**, 443–471 (2004) 7
- [10] Burq, N., Zworski, M.: Control for Schrödinger equations on tori. *Math. Res. Lett.* **19**, 309–324 (2012) 4
- [11] Burq, N., Zworski, M.: Rough controls for Schrödinger operators on 2-tori. *Annales H. Lebesgue* **2**, 331–347 (2019) 4
- [12] Cycon, H. L., Froese, R. G., Kirsch, W., Simon, B.: *Schrödinger operators with applications to quantum mechanics and global geometry.* Texts and Monographs in Physics, Springer-Verlag (1987) 43
- [13] Davies, E. B.: Uniformly elliptic operators with measurable coefficients. *J. Funct. Anal.* **132**, 141–169 (1995) 40
- [14] Duyckaerts, T., Miller, L.: Resolvent conditions for the control of parabolic equations. *J. Funct. Anal.* **263**, 3641–3673 (2012) 3, 4, 6, 40
- [15] Dyatlov, S., Jin, L., Nonnenmacher, S.: Control of eigenfunctions on surfaces of variable curvature. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.08923*, (2019) 4
- [16] Egidi, M., Veselić, I.: Sharp geometric condition for null-controllability of the heat equation on \mathbb{R}^d and consistent estimates on the control cost. *Arch. Math.* **111**, 85–99 (2018) 3

- [17] Eremenko, A., Gabrielov, A., Shapiro, B.: High energy eigenfunctions of one-dimensional Schrödinger operators with polynomial potentials. *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory* **8**, 513–529 (2008) 22
- [18] Fedoryuk, M. V.: *Asymptotic analysis*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1993) 13, 27
- [19] Feynman, R., Hibbs, A.: *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals*. McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, Maiden-head, Berkshire (1965) 2
- [20] Green, W.: On the energy decay rate of the fractional wave equation on \mathbb{R} with relatively dense damping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.10946*, (2019) 8
- [21] Griffiths, D.: *Introduction to Quantum Mechanics*. Pearson Education, London (2005) 2
- [22] Havin, V., Jörnicke, B.: *The Uncertainty Principle in Harmonic Analysis*. Springer Science and Business Media, (2012) 2
- [23] Haraux, A.: Séries lacunaires et contrôle semi-interne des vibrations d’une plaque rectangulaire. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **68**, 457–465 (1989) 4
- [24] Huang, S., Soffer, A.: Uncertainty principle, minimal escape velocities and observability inequalities for schrödinger equations. *Amer. J. Math.* to appear, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.09485v2*, (2017) 7, 34
- [25] Jaffard, S.: Contrôle interne exact des vibrations d’une plaque rectangulaire. *Portugal. Math.* **47**, 423–429 (1990) 4
- [26] Jaming, P.: Nazarov’s uncertainty principles in higher dimension. *J. Approx. Theory* **149**, 30–41 (2007) 7, 35
- [27] Jin L.: Control for Schrödinger equation on hyperbolic surfaces. *Math. Res. Lett.* **25**, 1865–1877 (2018) 4
- [28] Kapitanski, L., Rodnianski, I., Yajima, K.: On the fundamental solution of a perturbed harmonic oscillator. *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.* **9**, 77–106 (1997) 34
- [29] Koch, H., Tataru, D.: L^p eigenfunction bounds for the Hermite operator. *Duke Math. J.* **128**, 369–392 (2005) 27
- [30] Komornik, V.: On the exact internal controllability of a Petrowsky system. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **71**, 331–342 (1992) 4
- [31] Laurent, C.: Internal control of the Schrödinger equation. *Math. Control Related Fields* **4**, 161–186 (2014) 7
- [32] Lebeau, G.: Contrôle de l’équation de Schrödinger. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **71**, 267–291 (1992) 4
- [33] Macià, F.: The Schrödinger flow on a compact manifold: High-frequency dynamics and dispersion. *Modern Aspects of the Theory of Partial Differential Equations*, *Oper. Theory Adv. Appl.* **216**, Springer, Basel (2011) 4
- [34] Miller, L.: Controllability cost of conservative systems: resolvent condition and transmutation. *J. Funct. Anal.* **218**, 425–444 (2005) 7
- [35] Miller, L.: Unique continuation estimates for sums of semiclassical eigenfunctions and null-controllability from cones. *Preprint*, (2009) 3, 30
- [36] Olver, F. W. J.: *Asymptotics and special functions*. Academic Press, New York (1997). 44, 45
- [37] Phung, K. D.: Observability and control of Schrödinger equations. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **40**, 211–230 (2001) 4
- [38] Ramdani, K., Takahashi, T., Tenenbaum, G., Tucsnak, M.: A spectral approach for the exact observability of infinite-dimensional systems with skew-adjoint generator. *J. Funct. Anal.* **226**, 193–229 (2005) 7, 12
- [39] Rosier, L., Zhang, B. Y.: Exact boundary controllability of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *J. Differential Equations* **246**, 4129–4153 (2009) 4
- [40] Sibuya, Y.: *Global theory of a second order linear ordinary differential equation with a polynomial coefficient*. North Holland Math. Studies No. 18, North Holland, Amsterdam (1975) 22
- [41] Simon, B.: Schrödinger semigroups. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* **7**, 447–526 (1982) 40
- [42] Sjögren, P., Torrea, J. L.: On the boundary convergence of solutions to the Hermite-Schrödinger equation. *Colloq. Math.* **118**, 161–174 (2010) 33

- [43] Thangavelu, S.: Lecture on Hermite and Laguerre expansions (with a preface by Robert S. Strichartz). Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ (1993) 33, 40
- [44] Titchmarsh, B. C.: Eigenfunction expansions associated with second order differential operators Part I. Second edition, Oxford Univ. Press (1969) 13, 27, 33, 42
- [45] Tucsnak, M., Weiss, G.: Observation and control for operator semigroups. Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basel Textbooks, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel (2009) 12
- [46] Wang, G., Wang, M., Zhang, C., Zhang, Y.: Observable set, observability, interpolation inequality and spectral inequality for the heat equation in \mathbb{R}^n . J. Math. Pures Appl. **126**, 144–194 (2019) 3, 8, 40
- [47] Wang, G., Wang, M., Zhang, Y.: Observability and unique continuation inequalities for the Schrödinger equation. J. Eur. Math. Soc. **21**, 3513–3572 (2019) 4, 7, 34
- [48] Yajima, K.: Smoothness and non-smoothness of the fundamental solution of time dependent Schrödinger equations. Comm. Math. Phys. **181**, 605–629 (1996) 10, 13, 21, 43, 47

SHANLIN HUANG, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, HUBEI KEY LABORATORY OF ENGINEERING MODELING AND SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING, HUAZHONG UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, WUHAN, 430074, P.R. CHINA

E-mail address: shanlin_huang@hust.edu.cn

GENGSHENG WANG, CENTER FOR APPLIED MATHEMATICS, TIANJIN UNIVERSITY, TIANJIN 300072, P.R. CHINA

E-mail address: wanggs62@yeah.net

MING WANG, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, CHINA UNIVERSITY OF GEOSCIENCES, WUHAN 430074, P.R. CHINA

E-mail address: mwang@cug.edu.cn