ON THE STABILITY OF THE AREA LAW FOR THE ENTANGLEMENT ENTROPY OF THE LANDAU HAMILTONIAN

PAUL PFEIFFER

ABSTRACT. We consider the two-dimensional ideal Fermi gas subject to a magnetic field which is perpendicular to the Euclidean plane $\mathbb{R}^2$ and whose strength $B(x)$ at $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ converges to some $B_0 > 0$ as $\|x\| \to \infty$. Furthermore, we allow for an electric potential $V_\varepsilon$ which vanishes at infinity. They define the single-particle Landau Hamiltonian of our Fermi gas (up to gauge fixing). Starting from the ground state of this Fermi gas with chemical potential $\mu \geq B_0$ we study the asymptotic growth of its bipartite entanglement entropy associated to $L\Lambda$ as $L \to \infty$ for some fixed bounded region $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. We show that its leading order in $L$ does not depend on the perturbations $B_\varepsilon := B_0 - B$ and $V_\varepsilon$ if they satisfy some mild decay assumptions. Our result holds for all $\alpha$-Rényi entropies $\alpha > 1/3$; for $\alpha \leq 1/3$, we have to assume in addition some differentiability of the perturbations $B_\varepsilon$ and $V_\varepsilon$. The case of a constant magnetic field $B_\varepsilon = 0$ and with $V_\varepsilon = 0$ was treated recently for general $\mu$ by Leschke, Sobolev and Spitzer. Our result thus proves the stability of that area law under the same regularity assumptions on the boundary $\partial \Lambda$.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Bipartite entanglement entropy is an important quantity that measures correlations of particles inside a given region with the particles outside that region. These non-trivial correlations are solely due to the Fermi–Dirac statistics of the particles involved. In recent years there has considerable interest and progress in quantifying these correlations. Mathematicians and physicists alike realized fascinating connections between the large scale asymptotics of entanglement entropy and certain semi-classical asymptotic formulas of traces of certain operators, mostly Toeplitz operators in the discrete case and Wiener–Hopf operators in the continuous case.

In the discrete setting, Jin and Korepin related the Fisher–Hartwig conjecture of Toeplitz matrices to the scaling of the entanglement entropy in the XY-chain in a transverse magnetic field in [7]. More relevant to our continuous setting here is the discovery of Gioev and Klich [5] that a conjecture by Harold Widom (proved by Alexander V. Sobolev [20]) gives the precise leading asymptotic growth of the bipartite entanglement entropy in ground states of the free Fermi gas. It displays a logarithmically enhanced area law of the order $L^{d-1} \ln(L)$, where $L$ is a scaling parameter, see below. In [8], this
was finally proved by Leschke, Sobolev and Spitzer. In [14], Müller and Schulte proved that this law is stable under a perturbation by a compactly supported potential (in dimension \( d \geq 2 \)). The line of proof in their paper is also important for our model here.

A ground state of a non-interacting fermions on \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) with single-particle Hamiltonian \( H \) as in our model is given by the (Fermi) spectral projection \( 1 \leq \mu(H) \), where \( \mu \in \mathbb{R} \). The function \( 1 \leq \mu \) is the indicator function of the set \( (-\infty, \mu] \subset \mathbb{R} \) and the number \( \mu \) is called the Fermi energy. Let \( h_1 \) be the von Neumann entropy function, see (3.3). For a given bounded region \( \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \) we denote by \( 1_\Lambda \) the (multiplication operator associated to the) indicator function on \( \Lambda \). Then we define the local entropy (or entanglement entropy) \( S_1(\Lambda) \) to be the (usual Hilbert space) trace of \( h_1 \) applied to the spatially to \( \Lambda \) reduced Fermi projection, that is,

\[
S_1(\Lambda) := \text{tr} \, h_1(1_\Lambda 1 \leq \mu(H) 1_\Lambda) .
\]

At positive temperature a definition of entanglement entropy or mutual information needs to be amended, see [9].

For a fixed region \( \Lambda \), it is generally hard or impossible to calculate the entropy. However, if we introduce a scaling parameter \( L > 0 \) and consider the leading order asymptotic expansion of (1.1) with \( \Lambda \) replaced by \( L \Lambda \) for \( L \to \infty \), there are interesting results. They all assume some kind of regularity of the boundary \( \partial \Lambda \) and assume the Hamiltonian \( H \) to be of a certain form. For \( H = -\nabla^2 + V \), with some assumptions on \( V \), there are results presented in [4, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17].

In this paper, we consider the Hamiltonian \( H = (-i \nabla - A)^2 + V_\varepsilon \), which is a slight perturbation of the Landau Hamiltonian \( H_0 \) for a constant magnetic field and no electric field, see (3.2) and (3.11). Entanglement entropy of the ground state of the latter Landau Hamiltonian (for the ground state with chemical potential \( \mu = B_0 \)) has been studied in [11, 18, 19] with some additional assumptions on the region \( \Lambda \). The case of \( \mu = B_0 \) has been solved by Charles and Estienne in [3] and then for arbitrary \( \mu \) by Leschke, Sobolev and Spitzer in [10], both under some regularity assumptions on the boundary \( \partial \Lambda \). Our main result is Corollary 3.6. It shows that the leading order asymptotic growth of the entanglement entropy does not change, if we add such a slight perturbation in both the magnetic field and the electric potential. Hence, we will not need to recalculate the value of the leading term, as we only estimate that this perturbation leads to an error term of smaller order in the scaling parameter \( L \).

Our proof is based on a statement by Aleksandrov and Peller in [1], which is Proposition 3.4 in this paper. With the help of this and approximations of the Rényi entropy functions \( h_\alpha \) (see (3.3)), we can reduce our result to some \( p \)-Schatten norm estimates, as we prove in Section 3.

Proving these \( p \)-Schatten norm estimates relies on a result by Birman and Solomyak in [2], which is our Proposition 4.6 and allows us to estimate the \( p \)-Schatten norms of operators with sufficiently differentiable kernels. To get a representation of the kernel of the spectral projection of the perturbed Hamiltonian, we use the contour integral representation and the resolvent expansion. This has recently been done for perturbations of the free case \( (H = -\nabla^2 + V) \) by Müller and Schulte in [14], which inspired me to try this approach. In our case \( (B_0 > 0) \), we use an expanded resolvent expansion. The discrete spectrum allows us to explicitly resolve the contour integral for most terms. The general idea is explained in Section 4, while the required kernel estimates are proven in the remaining sections.

The magnetic case (with an asymptotically constant magnetic field) appears simpler and more stable than the free case with the (negative) Laplacian as its single-particle Hamiltonian. From a technical point of view this is due to the gaps in the purely essential spectrum and the exponential decay of eigenfunctions of the Landau Hamiltonian. This is also the reason for an area law growth (without any logarithmic enhancement as in the free case), see also [15].
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2. Notations and preliminaries

Let \( \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots \} \) be the natural numbers and \( \mathbb{Z}^+ \) be the positive integers.

Let \( n \) be a positive integer and \( k \) be a natural number. For \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) or \( x \in \mathbb{C}^n \), let \( \|x\| \) be its 2-norm. The space of \( p \)-integrable, complex valued functions on \( \mathbb{R}^n \) is called \( L^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \). The Sobolev space \( W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \) is the space of complex valued \( p \)-integrable functions on \( \mathbb{R}^n \), such that their first \( k \) distributional derivatives are \( p \)-integrable functions. We define \( C^k_b(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{C}^k) \) as the subspace of \( C^k(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}^k) \), such that all derivatives of order \( 0 \leq j \leq n \) are bounded.

For any non-empty set \( \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) and any point \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), we define the distance as
\[
\operatorname{dist}(x, \Lambda) := \inf_{y \in \Lambda} \|x - y\|,
\]
and for any \( r > 0 \) we define the \( r \)-neighbourhood of \( \Lambda \) as
\[
D_r(\Lambda) := \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n | \operatorname{dist}(y, \Lambda) < r \}.
\]
Furthermore, \( 1_\Lambda : \mathbb{R}^n \to \{0, 1\} \subset \mathbb{R} \) is the indicator function of \( \Lambda \), \( \Lambda^c := \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Lambda \) is the complement of \( \Lambda \), and if \( \Lambda \) is measurable, let \( |\Lambda| \) be its \( n \)-dimensional Lebesgue measure, and if it has Lipschitz boundary \( \partial \Lambda \), let \( |\partial \Lambda| \) be the \((n-1)\)-dimensional Hausdorff measure of \( \partial \Lambda \).

For any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), we set \( D_r(x) = D_r(\{x\}) \). For any \( x \in \mathbb{C}^n, j \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \), we inductively define \( x^{(j)} \in (\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes j} \cong \mathbb{C}^{n^j} \) by setting \( x^{(1)} := x \in (\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes 1} \cong \mathbb{C}^n \) and \( x^{(j+1)} = x^{(j)} \otimes x \in (\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes j} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n \cong (\mathbb{C}^n)^{\otimes (j+1)} \cong \mathbb{C}^{n^{j+1}} \). Every appearance of \( . \otimes . \) refers to this tensor product.

By \( J \) we denote the matrix
\[
J := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

For a complex number \( \zeta \), let \( \Re \zeta \) be its real part.

For a multiplication operator with a function \( G : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{C}^n \), we use a slight abuse of notation and call it \( G \) as well. We will regard \( G \) as a function, if and only if it is written as \( G(\cdot) \), where \( \cdot \) is either left as a place holder or is a point in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). This is relevant to decide, whether we are applying an operator to the underlying function or taking the composition of a multiplication operator and any other operator.

\( C \) will always refer to a generic constant, that may depend on some, but never on all variables. \( F \) will be used similarly, but the dependency on one complex variable will be important, which is why we write \( F \) as a function of that variable. Both may change from line to line.

For any compact operator \( S \) and any \( p \in \mathbb{R}^+ \), we define the \( p \)-Schatten von Neumann (quasi-)norm by the expression
\[
\|S\|_p = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+} s_n(S)^p,
\]
where \( (s_n(S))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \) is the decreasing sequence of singular values of \( S \) counted with multiplicity. The operator norm of \( S \) is written as \( \|S\|_\infty \).

We recall some properties of the \( p \)-Schatten von Neumann (quasi-) norms. In the following, we will refer to them as \( p \)-Schatten norms.

**Proposition 2.1.** Let \( 0 < p \leq q \leq \infty \) and let \( S, T \) be operators on a Hilbert space. The \( p \)-Schatten norm satisfies the properties

**Monotonicity I:** \( \|S\|_p \geq \|S\|_q \).
**Monotonicity II:** If \( S \geq T \geq 0 \), then \( \|S\|_p \geq \|T\|_p \).
**Triangle inequality:** If \( p \geq 1 \), then \( \|S + T\|_p \leq \|S\|_p + \|T\|_p \).
**p-triangle inequality:** If \( p \leq 1 \), then \( \|S + T\|_p \leq \|S\|_p + \|T\|_p^p \).
**Powers:** If \( S \geq 0 \), then \( \|S^p\|_q = \|S^p\|_p \).
**Square:** \( \|S\|_2 = \|S^*S\|_{p/2} \) where \( S^* \) denotes the adjoint of \( S \).
**Adjoint:** \( \|S^*\|_p = \|S\|_{p'} \).
**Hölder I:** Let \( \frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} \) with \( r > 0 \). Then \( \|ST\|_r \leq \|S\|_p \|T\|_q \).
Hölder II: Let $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1-\alpha}{q}$ with $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $r > 0$. Then $\|S\|_r \leq \|S\|_p^{\alpha} \|S\|_q^{1-\alpha}$.

Hilbert Schmidt kernel: If $T: L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ has an integral kernel $t$, which is square integrable, then $\|T\|_2 = \|t\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{a_1+a_2})}$.

Orthogonality: If $ST^* = 0$ or $S^*T = 0$, then $\|S\|_p \leq \|S + T\|_p$.

Most of these have for example been proven by McCarthy in [12]. We will now briefly prove the remaining ones.

Proof. “Monotonicity II” follows, as the inequality holds for the ordered sequence of singular values. “Hölder II” is an application of “Hölder I” with the operators $|S|^\alpha$ and $|S|^{1-\alpha}$ and the properties “Square” and “Powers”. “Hilbert–Schmidt kernel” can be seen as a corollary of Lemma 2.2 in [12]. “Orthogonality” is based on the observation, that if $S^*T = 0$, we have $(S+T)^*(S+T) = S^*S + T^*T$,”Monotonicity II”, and “Adjoint” to replace the condition $S^*T = 0$ by the non-equivalent condition $ST^* = 0$. □

Definition 2.2. We say a densely defined operator $T$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ has the integral kernel $t: \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, if for any $f \in C^0_c(\mathbb{R}^2)$, the identity

$$(Tf)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} t(x,y)f(y)dy$$

holds. We say, that $t$ is nice, or respectively, that $T$ is a nice integral operator, if for any fixed $x$, the functions $t(x, \cdot)$ and $t(\cdot, x)$ are in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with a norm bounded independently of $x$. In this case, we define

$$\text{iker}(T)(x,y) := t(x,y).$$

Lemma 2.3. Let $S,T$ be nice integral operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with integral kernels $s,t$. Let $x,z \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then we have the identities

$$\text{iker}(S+T)(x,z) = (s+t)(x,z),$$
$$\text{iker}(ST)(x,z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} s(x,y)t(y,z)dy.$$ 

In particular, $S + T$ and $ST$ are nice integral operators.

The first statement is trivial and the second follows by Fubini to interchange the integral over $y$ with the one over $z$, for any test function $f \in C^0_c(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

3. SETTING AND MAIN RESULT

We introduce the Landau Hamilton operator $H_0$ with a constant magnetic field $B_0 > 0$, defined on (a suitable subspace of) $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, with magnetic gauge $A_0$ given for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$A_0(x) := \frac{B_0}{2} Jx,$$
$$H_0 := (-i\nabla - A_0)^2.$$ 

The spectrum of $H_0$, $\sigma(H_0)$, equals $B_0(2N + 1)$. Let $P_l$ be the projection onto the eigenspace with eigenvalue $B_0(2l + 1)$ for $l \in \mathbb{N}$.

Furthermore, for any $\alpha > 0$, we introduce the $\alpha$-Rényi entropy functions $h_\alpha: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,\ln(2)]$,

$$h_\alpha(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \ln(x^\alpha + (1-x)^\alpha) & \text{for } \alpha \neq 1, \\ -x \ln x - (1-x) \ln(1-x) & \text{for } \alpha = 1, \end{cases}$$

for $x \in (0,1)$ and $h_\alpha(0) = h_\alpha(1) = 0$. Throughout this paper, let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded open set with Lipschitz boundary.

Let $\mu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus B_0(2N + 1)$. We define $1_{\leq \mu}(H_0)$ as the spectral projection associated to $H_0$ and $\mu$. We are interested in how the leading order asymptotic expansion of the local entropy,

$$S_\alpha(\Lambda) := \text{tr} h_\alpha(1_{\Lambda} 1_{\leq \mu}(H_0) 1_{\Lambda}),$$

(3.4)
as \( L \to \infty \) changes under slight perturbations of \( H_0 \). The trace is defined as the usual Hilbert space trace of trace class operators on \( L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \). This quantity is the local entropy or entanglement entropy of the ground state restricted to \( \Lambda \). Under the assumption that \( \Lambda \) has \( C^2 \) boundary, the leading term of order \( L \) for the operator \( H = H_0 \) has been calculated by Leschke, Sobolev and Spitzer in [10]. This allows us to focus on bounding the error term that arises, as we introduce a perturbation to \( H_0 \). Our main result is Corollary 3.6 and relies on the exact calculations of the leading term for \( H = H_0 \), see [10], and the estimates we will prove in this paper.

The following condition is needed to state our main results and a lot of results along the way. Throughout this paper, we fix \( 0 < \varepsilon < 1 \).

**Definition 3.1.** Let \( \lambda, C \in (0, \infty) \). We say a function \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{C} \) has \((\lambda, C)\) decay, if it is measurable and for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), we have

\[
\| f(x) \| \leq \frac{C}{(1 + \|x\|)^\lambda}.
\]

Let \( \gamma \geq 1 \) be a natural number. We call a magnetic field \( B_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R} \) and a potential \( V_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R} \) \((\gamma, C_\varepsilon)\) tame, if all directional derivatives of order \( 0 \leq m \leq \gamma - 1 \) of \( B_\varepsilon \) have \((1 + \varepsilon, C_\varepsilon)\) decay and the same differentials of \( V_\varepsilon \) have \((\varepsilon, C_\varepsilon)\) decay. We say that they are \((0, C_\varepsilon)\) tame, if they are \((1, C_\varepsilon)\) tame.

**Remark.** All the following estimates will depend on \( B_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon \) only through \( \varepsilon, \gamma, C_\varepsilon \). Maybe somewhat counterintuitively, small values of \( \varepsilon \) correspond to slowly decaying \( B_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon \).

To define the perturbed Hamiltonian \( H \), we need to choose a gauge \( A_\varepsilon \) of the magnetic field \( B_\varepsilon \). We choose the convolution, which is given by

\[
A_\varepsilon(x) := (B_\varepsilon \ast \frac{J \cdot \varepsilon}{2\pi \| \cdot \|}) (x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} B_\varepsilon(x - y) \frac{Jy}{2\pi \| y \|^2} dy
\]

for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \). Its relevant properties are summed up in the following Lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** For any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^2, m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( m_1 + m_2 \leq \gamma - 1 \), the gauge \( A_\varepsilon \) satisfies

\[
\begin{align*}
\nabla_x \times A_\varepsilon(x) &= B_\varepsilon(x), \\
\nabla_x \cdot A_\varepsilon(x) &= 0,
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\| \partial_{x_1}^{m_1} \partial_{x_2}^{m_2} A_\varepsilon(x) \| \leq \frac{C}{(1 + \|x\|)^\varepsilon}.
\]

**Remark.** A gauge satisfying (3.8) is commonly referred to as a Coulomb gauge. The restriction to \( \varepsilon < 1 \) is necessary to get the described decay. A value of \( \varepsilon > 1 \) will only achieve a \((1 + \|x\|)^{-1}\) decay in \( A_\varepsilon \).

The proof can be found in Appendix B.

Now we define the perturbed gauge \( A \) and the perturbed Hamiltonian \( H \) by

\[
A := A_0 - A_\varepsilon,
\]

\[
H := (-i\nabla - A)^2 + V_\varepsilon.
\]

As we can see, this gauge corresponds to the magnetic field \( B_0 - B_\varepsilon \), that is, \( \nabla_x \times A(x) = B_0 - B_\varepsilon(x) \). The operator \( H \) is self-adjoint and its domain agrees with the domain of \( H_0 \), which we will see in Corollary 4.2.

We need the following \( p \)-Schatten quasi norm estimate, which will be proven in the next section.

**Theorem 3.3.** Let \( l \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \). Let \( B_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon \) be \((\gamma, C_\varepsilon)\) tame and let \( 1 \geq p > \frac{2}{\gamma + 2} \). Let \( a, b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus B_0(2\mathbb{N} + 1) \) with \( a < b \). Then we have the estimates

\[
\begin{align*}
\left\| 1_{L^2} A_{[a,b]}(H) 1_{L^2} \right\|_p &\leq CL, \\
\left\| 1_{L^2} (1_{[a,b]}(H) - 1_{[a,b]}(H_0)) 1_{L^2} \right\|_p &\leq CL^{1-p\varepsilon}.
\end{align*}
\]

The constants \( C \) depend on \( \gamma, C_\varepsilon, a, b, \Lambda, p, \varepsilon \).
Finally, we need the following statement due to Aleksandrov and Peller, which is a Corollary of Theorem 5.11 in [1] and the inclusion $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \subset B^{1}_{\infty,1}(\mathbb{R})$, where the latter refers to the Besov space as used by Aleksandrov and Peller.

**Proposition 3.4** (based on Theorem 5.11 in [1]). Let $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Then there is a constant $C < \infty$, such that for any self-adjoint bounded operators $A, B$, such that $A - B$ is trace class, we have the estimate

$$
\|f(A) - f(B)\|_1 \leq C \|A - B\|_1.
$$

(3.14)

Now we can prove the main results of this paper.

**Theorem 3.5.** Let $\alpha > 0$ and choose $\beta = \min(0.5, \alpha)$. Define $\gamma$ as the smallest positive integer, such that $\gamma > \frac{1}{\beta} - 2$. Let $B_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon$ be $(\gamma, C_d)$ tame. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus B_0(2N + 1), a < b$ and $I := [a, b]$. Then we have

$$
\text{tr}(h_\alpha(1_{LA}1_I(H)1_{LA}) - h_\alpha(1_{LA}1_I(H_0)1_{LA})) = o(L) ,
$$

(3.15)
as $L \to \infty$.

**Remark.** The choice of $\beta = 0.5$ for $\alpha \geq 0.5$ delivers the optimal value for $\gamma$, namely 1. For $\alpha > \frac{1}{3}$, we can get away with a non-differentiable $B_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon$.

The assumption that $a, b \notin B_0(2N + 1)$ cannot be dropped, as the following counter example illustrates. Let $B_\varepsilon = 0, a = 0$ and $b = B_0$. By Corollary 4.2 the spectrum of $H$ has an accumulation point at $B_0$. If we assume $V_\varepsilon > 0$ pointwise, then all eigenvalues of $H$ are strictly larger than $B_0$ and hence $1_I(H) = 0$. But Theorem 8 in [10], which we will elaborate on shortly, states, that the leading order asymptotic expansion of $\text{tr} h_\alpha(1_{LA}1_I(H_0)1_{LA})$ for large $L$ is of order $O(L)$ and does not vanish. On the other hand, if we assume that $V_\varepsilon < 0$ pointwise, there is a spectral gap of the form $(B_0, B_0 + \delta]$ in the spectrum of $H$. Hence, we can move $b$ to $B_0 + \delta$ without changing the operators. Now we can apply our Theorem 3.5. Hence under our general assumptions, it is possible to get both one-sided limits, when $b = B_0$. We expect similar results, whenever $a$ or $b$ is in the spectrum of $H_0$. It is, however, a little more complicated to see, whether the leading order expansion for $H_0$ changes, when we add or remove a single Landau level from the interval $I$.

The following corollary is our main result. It combines Theorem 8 in [10], which can be stated as the corollary for the case $B_\varepsilon = V_\varepsilon = 0$, with our Theorem 3.5.

**Corollary 3.6.** Let $\alpha > 0$ and choose $\beta = \min(\alpha, 0.5)$. Define $\gamma$ as the smallest positive integer, such that $\gamma > \frac{1}{\beta} - 2$. Let $B_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon$ be $(\gamma, C_d)$ tame. Let $\mu \notin \sigma(H_0)$ and define $\nu$ as the largest integer, such that $B_0(2\nu + 1) < \mu$. Assume that the boundary $\partial \Lambda$ is $C^3$-smooth. Then

$$
S_\alpha(L\Lambda) = \text{tr}(h_\alpha(1_{LA}1_{\mu}(H)1_{LA})) = L \sqrt{B_0(\partial \Lambda)} |M_{\leq \nu}(h_\alpha)| + o(L),
$$

(3.16)
as $L \to \infty$ with $0 < M_{\leq \nu}(h_\alpha) < \infty$ as described in [10].

In the case $\mu < B_0$, the projection is finite dimensional and the entropy has an order at most $O(1)$ in $L$ as $L \to \infty$.

**Proof of Theorem 3.5.** We define the function $g_\alpha : [0, 1] \to [0, \ln(2)]$ by the identity

$$
g_\alpha(4x(1 - x)) = h_\alpha(x).
$$

(3.17)
The symmetry of $h_\alpha$ guarantees the existence of $g_\alpha$. We have

$$
g_\alpha(t) = h_\alpha \left( \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - t}}{2} \right).
$$

(3.18)

Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. We choose a smooth cut-off function $\varphi : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$ with $\varphi(x) = 1$, if $x \leq \varepsilon_0$, and $\varphi(x) = 0$, if $x \geq 2\varepsilon_0$. Now we write

$$
g_\alpha(t) = (1 - \varphi(t))g_\alpha(t) + \varphi(t)g_\alpha(t).
$$

(3.19)
The advantage of this decomposition is that the first summand is smooth, and the second summand is small. The second summand can be bounded using the fact, that $h_\alpha$ is $\beta$-Hölder continuous on $[0,1]$ and smooth on $(0,1)$. As $h_\alpha$ is symmetric around $t = \frac{1}{2}$ and analytic on $(0,1)$, its Taylor expansion at that point contains only even powers of $(t - \frac{1}{2})$. Thus, we see that $g_\alpha$ is analytic at $t = 1$. Hence, $g_\alpha \in C^\infty((0,1])$ and it is $\beta$-Hölder continuous on $[0,1]$, as $\beta = \min(\alpha,0.5)$.

We choose $\beta' < \beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, such that $\gamma > \frac{1}{\beta'} - 2$. Hence, we have

$$\varphi(t)g_\alpha(t) \leq C\varepsilon_0^{\beta-\beta'} t^{\beta'}.$$  

We define $P,P'$ as the spectral projections,

$$P := 1_f(H_0),$$  

$$P' := 1_f(H).$$

We observe

$$h_\alpha(1_{LA}P^{(')}1_{LA}) = g_\alpha(4|1_{LA}\varepsilon P^{(')}1_{LA}|^2).$$  

We can now apply Proposition 3.4. Thus,

$$\left\| ((1 - \varphi)g_\alpha) (4|1_{LA}\varepsilon P^{(')}1_{LA}|^2) - ((1 - \varphi)g_\alpha) (4|1_{LA}\varepsilon P1_{LA}|^2) \right\|_1 \leq C \|1_{LA}\varepsilon P^{(')}1_{LA}|^2 - |1_{LA}\varepsilon P1_{LA}|^2\|_1 \leq C \|1_{LA}\varepsilon (P' - P)1_{LA}\|_1 \leq CL^{1-\varepsilon}. \leq$$

Note that the last constant $C$ depends on $\varepsilon_0$, but not on $L$. In the second step we used the identity $|A|^2 - |B|^2 = A^*(A - B) + (A^* - B^*)B$. In the last step, we used Theorem 3.3 with $p = 1$.

We can also apply Theorem 3.3 for the remaining term, after using (3.20), $1 \geq 2\beta' > \frac{2}{\gamma+2}$ and that $H = H_0$ is admissible for Theorem 3.3

$$\left\| ((\varphi g_\alpha) (4|1_{LA}\varepsilon P^{(')}1_{LA}|^2) \right\|_1 \leq C\varepsilon_0^{\beta-\beta'} \left\|1_{LA}\varepsilon P^{(')}1_{LA}\right\|_{2^{\beta'}} \leq C\varepsilon_0^{\beta-\beta'} L.$$  

Hence,

$$|\text{tr} h_\alpha(1_{LA}P1_{LA}) - \text{tr} h_\alpha(1_{LA}P1_{LA})| \leq C(\varepsilon_0)L^{1-\varepsilon} + C\varepsilon_0^{\beta-\beta'} L.$$  

Note that the first constant $C(\varepsilon_0)$ depends on $\varepsilon_0$ while the second one does not. This term is in $o(L)$, as for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we can choose $L$ large enough to let the first term be less than $\varepsilon_0 L$. This proves that the leading term expansion of the $\alpha$-Rényi entropy for the perturbed Landau Hamiltonian $H$ agrees with the main term in the same expansion for the Landau Hamiltonian $H_0$. This finishes the proof.

\begin{remark}
We can actually pick $\varepsilon_0$ dependent on $L$, which does lead to a smaller error term, if we bound the constant $C(\varepsilon_0)$ more precisely. This does however not lead to an improved error term in Corollary 3.6 as the known error term for the constant magnetic field is too large. Hence, I did not include the details here.
\end{remark}

4. The Ansatz for the proof of Theorem 3.3

The goal of this section is to explain how to prove Theorem 3.3 and, to reduce it to two more technical statements. The general approach has been inspired by [14].

We define

$$H_\varepsilon := H - H_0,$$

where $H$ and $H_0$ were defined in (3.11) and (3.2).

We expand $H_\varepsilon$ as

$$H_\varepsilon = H - H_0$$
Remark. The statement is also true if $B$ is smooth and converges to $B_0$ as $\|x\| \to \infty$ (at any rate), see [6]. They state smoothness of $B$ as a condition, but I think it is not required. However, their algebraic proof does not imply that the eigenspaces of $H$ are at all related.

As $p$-Schatten class operators are compact, we now know that $H_\varepsilon$ is $H_0$ compact. This implies the corollary

**Corollary 4.2.** The essential spectrum of $H$ agrees with the essential spectrum of $H_0$ which is $B_0(2N + 1)$.

**Remark.** The statement is also true if $V = 0$ and $B$ is smooth and converges to $B_0$ as $\|x\| \to \infty$ (at any rate), see [6]. They state smoothness of $B$ as a condition, but I think it is not required. However, their algebraic proof does not imply that the eigenspaces of $H_0$ and $H$ are at all related.

As $\sigma(H_0)$ is discrete, this implies, that $\sigma(H) = \sigma_p(H)$ and that the continuous part of the spectrum of $H$ vanishes. We continue with the Riesz integral representation.

**Fact 4.3.** For any path $\Gamma$ in $\mathbb{C}$ that intersects $\mathbb{R}$ in exactly two points $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$, does not intersect $\sigma(H) \subset \mathbb{R}$ and has winding number $+1$ around $(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2$, we have the identity

$$-\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{d\zeta}{H - \zeta} = \lambda_{1, < \varepsilon < \lambda_2}(H).$$

With the resolvent identity, we can write

$$\frac{1}{H - \zeta} = \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} - \frac{1}{H - \zeta} H_\varepsilon \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta}$$

$$= \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} - \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} H_\varepsilon \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} + \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} H_\varepsilon \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta}.$$

By induction, this leads to

$$= (-i\nabla - A)^2 - (i\nabla - A_0)^2 + V_\varepsilon$$

$$= (A_0 - A) \cdot (i\nabla - A + A_0 - A_0) + (i\nabla - A_0) \cdot (A_0 - A) + V_\varepsilon$$

$$= 2A_\varepsilon \cdot (i\nabla - A_0) + A_\varepsilon^2 + V_\varepsilon.$$
Corollary 4.4. For any \( n \in \mathbb{Z}^+, \zeta \not\in \sigma(H) \cup \sigma(H_0) \), we have

\[
\frac{1}{H - \zeta} = \sum_{k=0}^{2n-1} \frac{(-1)^k}{H_0 - \zeta} \left( \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} \right)^k \left( \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} \right)^n = \frac{1}{H - \zeta} \left( \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} \right)^n,
\]

(4.14)

where \( H_\varepsilon = H - H_0 \), as in (4.1).

With the use of Lemma 4.1 we will be able to bound the final term. For the summands in Corollary 4.4 except the last summand, we can resolve the path integral over some paths.

Lemma 4.5. Let \( l, k \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \Gamma \) be the path along the circle \( \partial D_{B_0}(B_0(2l+1)) \) that rotates in positive direction. Then we have

\[
- \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} \left( \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} \right)^k \, d\zeta = \sum_{m=0}^{k} (T_i H_\varepsilon)^m P_l (H_\varepsilon T_i) \frac{k - m}{1 - \varepsilon},
\]

(4.15)

where \( H_\varepsilon = H - H_0 \), as in (4.1).

Proof. Let \( N > 2l \) and either \( I = \mathbb{N} \) and \( \zeta \in \Gamma \) or \( I = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\} \) and \( \zeta = B_0(2l+1) \). We introduce \( P_{\leq N} := \sum_{n \leq N} P_n \) and \( P_{> N} := 1 - P_{\leq N} \). We continue with the identity

\[
P_{\leq N} M_{I, \zeta} = \sum_{j \in I, \zeta \leq N} \frac{P_j}{B_0(2j + 1) - \zeta}.
\]

(4.16)

There is a constant \( C \), independent of \( N \) and \( \zeta \), such that the estimate \( \|P_{> N} M_{I, \zeta}\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{C}{N} \) holds. Furthermore, by Lemma 4.1 and as the 4n_0-Schatten norm is an upper bound for the operator norm, we have the estimate \( \|H_\varepsilon M_{I, \zeta}\|_{\infty} < C \) with a constant \( C \) independent of \( N \) and \( \zeta \). We use the telescope sum \( b(ab)^k - c(ac)^k = \sum_{k'=0}^{k} (ba)^{k'} (b - c)(ac)^{k' - k'} \), which holds in any ring, and the triangle inequality to get

\[
\left\| M_{I, \zeta} (H_\varepsilon M_{I, \zeta})^k - \left( H_\varepsilon P_{\leq N} M_{I, \zeta} \right)^k \right\|_{\infty} \leq \sum_{k'=0}^{k} \left\| (M_{I, \zeta} H_\varepsilon)^{k'} P_{> N} M_{I, \zeta} (H_\varepsilon P_{\leq N} M_{I, \zeta})^{k' - k} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{C}{N},
\]

(4.18)

where \( C \) is independent of \( N \) and \( \zeta \). The second step relies on the submultiplicativity of the norm, and the identity \( M_{I, \zeta} P_{\leq N} = P_{\leq N} M_{I, \zeta} \). Thus, we have

\[
- \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} \left( \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} \right)^k \, d\zeta
\]

(4.19)

\[
= \lim_{N \to \infty} \left\| \sum_{\sigma \in \{0, \ldots, N\}^{k+1}} P_{\sigma_0} \prod_{j=1}^{k} H_\varepsilon P_{\sigma_j} \right\|_{\infty}
\]

(4.20)

\[
= \lim_{N \to \infty} \left\| \sum_{\sigma \in \{0, \ldots, N\}^{k+1}} P_{\sigma_0} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{k} H_\varepsilon P_{\sigma_j} \right) \right\|_{\infty}
\]

(4.21)

\[
= \left\| \sum_{m=0}^{k} (P_{\leq N} T_i H_\varepsilon)^m P_l (H_\varepsilon P_{\leq N} T_i)^{k-m} \right\|_{\infty}
\]

(4.22)

\[
= \sum_{m=0}^{k} (T_i H_\varepsilon)^m P_l (H_\varepsilon T_i)^{k-m}.
\]

(4.23)
In the first step, we used that \(4.18\) holds uniformly in \(\zeta \in \Gamma\) for \(I = \mathbb{N}\). In the second step, we inserted \(4.16\) \(k+1\) times and multiplied out all terms in order to get a finite sum. We then exchanged this finite sum with the complex path integral and resolvent this complex-valued integral. The fourth step uses \(4.16\) in reverse. The final step follows by \(4.18\) for \(I = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{l\}\) and \(\zeta = B_0(2l+1)\). This finishes the proof.

We intend to use an estimate on the singular values due to Birman and Solomyak. It is based on Proposition 2.1 in [2]. We will use the case \(p = 2, a = \gamma + \nu > 1, X = [0,1]^2, Y = D^p_R(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^2\) and we will use the Lebesgue measures on both sides. Now we can write the statement as

**Proposition 4.6.** Let \(T: L^2([0,1]^2) \to L^2(D^p_R(0))\) be an operator with integral kernel \(t\). Let \(\gamma \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma \geq 1\) and \(0 < \nu < 1\). We define

\[
N(\gamma, \nu, T)^2 := \int_{D^p_R(0)} dy \int_{[0,1]^2} dx' \int_{[0,1]^2} dx'' \frac{\|\nabla_x^{\gamma} t(x',y) - \nabla_x^{\gamma} t(x'',y)\|^2}{\|x' - x''\|^{2+2\nu}}
\]

\[
+ \int_{D^p_R(0)} dy \int_{[0,1]^2} |t(x,y)|^2 dx.
\]

Then there is a constant \(C\), depending only on \(\gamma\) and \(\nu\), such that the singular values of \(T, s_n(T)\), \(n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\) satisfy the upper bounds

\[
s_n(T) \leq C n^{-\frac{1 + \nu}{2}} N(\gamma, \nu, T).
\]

Remark. For any \(p > 2/(1 + \gamma + \nu)\), we have

\[
\|T\|_p \leq CN(\gamma, \nu, T),
\]

where \(C\) depends on \(p, \gamma, \nu, \) but not on \(T\) or \(R\).

With this proposition and the integral kernel estimates we still have to establish, we will prove the following theorem in Section 6

**Theorem 4.7.** Let \(k,l \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}^+\) with \(k \geq m\). Let \(B_{\varepsilon}, V_{\varepsilon}\) be \((\gamma, C_d)\) tame and let \(1 \geq p > \frac{2}{\gamma + 2}\).

Then there is a constant \(C > 0\) and a \(\lambda > 0\), such that for any \(R \geq 0\), we have the upper bound for any \(x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2\)

\[
\left\|1_{[0,1]^2+x_0}(T;H_{\varepsilon})^m P_l(H_{\varepsilon}T_l)^{k-m}1_{D^p_R(x_0)}\right\|_p \leq C \exp \left(\frac{-\lambda R^2}{1 + \|x_0\|}\right).
\]

The constant \(C\) depends on \(B_0, l, k, m, \gamma, p, \varepsilon, C_d\), but is independent of \(R\) and \(x_0\).

Remark. For \(k = 0\), this is Lemma 12 in [10].

We will now follow Theorem 13 in [10]. But we go a slightly different direction with the proof.\(^1\)

**Theorem 4.8.** Let \(k,l \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}^+\) with \(k \geq m\), let \(B_{\varepsilon}, V_{\varepsilon}\) be \((\gamma, C_d)\) tame and let \(1 \geq p > \frac{2}{\gamma + 2}\).

Then for any \(L > 1\) we have

\[
\left\|1_{LA}(T;H_{\varepsilon})^m P_l(H_{\varepsilon}T_l)^{k-m}1_{LA}\right\|_p \leq CL^{1-p\varepsilon}.
\]

The constant \(C\) depends on \(\Lambda, B_0, l, k, m, \gamma, p, \varepsilon, C_d\).

Proof. We define

\[
T := (T;H_{\varepsilon})^m P_l(H_{\varepsilon}T_l)^{k-m}.
\]

We choose \(h_0 \in [0,1]^2\). We will now use the \(p\)-Schatten norm property we called orthogonality in the first and forth step, and the \(p\)-triangle inequality in the second step. Hence,

\[
\left\|1_{LA} T 1_{LA}\right\|_p^p \leq (1 + \|x_0\|).\]

\(^1\)We replace a sum by an integral.
by Theorem 4.7. The constant $C$ does not depend on $z, h_0$. Now we can integrate this upper bound over $h_0 \in [0,1]^2$. This integral can be resolved by Lemma A.2. Hence, we have

$$\|1_L T_{1,\Lambda^L}\|_p^p \leq \int_{[0,1]^2} dh_0 \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^2, z+sh_0 \in D_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}} C \exp \left( -p\lambda \operatorname{dist}(z+h_0, \Lambda^L) \right) \left( 1 + \|z+h_0\|^{pk_\varepsilon} \right)^p \ .$$

(4.38)

$$= \int_{D_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}} \frac{\exp \left( -p\lambda \operatorname{dist}(x, \Lambda^L) \right)}{(1 + \|x\|^{pk_\varepsilon})} dx \ .$$

(4.39)

$$= L^2 \int_{D_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}} \frac{\exp \left( -p\lambda L^2 \operatorname{dist}(x', \Lambda^L) \right)}{(1 + \|x'\|^{pk_\varepsilon})} dx' .$$

(4.40)

$$\leq C L^2 \left( \int_{\Lambda} \frac{\exp \left( -p\lambda L^2 \operatorname{dist}(x', \Lambda^L) \right)}{(1 + L\|x'\|^{pk_\varepsilon})} dx' + L^{-pk_\varepsilon} \left| D_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)} \setminus \Lambda \right| \right) .$$

(4.41)

The constant $C$ does not depend on $L$. We are left to show, that the term behind $C L^2$ is bounded by $C L^{-1-pk_\varepsilon}$.

As $L \geq 1$, by (A.27), we have

$$\left| D_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)} \setminus \Lambda \right| \leq \frac{C}{L} .$$

(4.42)

because we can ignore the $\frac{1}{L^2}$ part. The constant depends on $\Lambda$ and this is the desired estimate.

In order to estimate the remaining integral, we apply Lemma A.3 and then once more Lemma A.4 to estimate the following integral. Thus,

$$\int_{\Lambda} \exp \left( -p\lambda L^2 \operatorname{dist}(x', \Lambda^L) \right) dx'$$

(4.43)

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} p\lambda L^2 h \exp \left( -p\lambda L^2 h^2 \right) \left| \{x' \in \Lambda \mid \operatorname{dist}(x', \Lambda^L) \leq h\} \right| dh$$

(4.44)

$$\leq \int_{0}^{\infty} p\lambda L^2 h \exp \left( -p\lambda L^2 h^2 \right) Chdh$$

(4.45)

$$= \int_{0}^{\infty} C \exp \left( -(h')^2 \right) (h')^2 dh'$$

(4.46)

$$= \frac{C}{L}.$$
In the second to last step, we used the substitution \((h')^2 = p\lambda L^2 h^2\). The constant \(C\) depends on \(p, \lambda\)
and in turn on \(p, l, k, m, \gamma, B_0\) and the decay of \(B_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon\).

To deal with the denominator in (4.41), we use \(0 \in \Lambda\). Hence there is an \(r > 0\), such that
\(B_{2r}(0) \subset \Lambda\). For the integral over \(\Lambda \cap D_\varepsilon(0)^c\), we can estimate the denominator by \(CL^{-p\varepsilon}\) and use the integral estimate above for the enumerator. For the integral over \(D_\varepsilon(0)\) we estimate the enumerator by \(Ce^{-L}\) and the denominator by 1. This finishes the proof.

\[\square\]

We can now conclude the proof of Theorem 3.3.

**Proof of Theorem 3.3.** We begin with a fixed Landau level, meaning we assume \(B_0(2l - 1) < a < B_0(2l + 1) < b < B_0(2l + 3)\) for some \(l \in \mathbb{N}\). We choose \(\Gamma\) as a path along the circle through \(a, b\) with centre \(\frac{a+b}{2}\). We choose \(n \in \mathbb{N}\), such that \(p > \frac{2n}{n} a\). Now we use Corollary 4.4. Hence, for any \(\zeta \in \text{im} \Gamma\), we have

\[
\frac{1}{H - \zeta} = \sum_{k=0}^{2n-1} (-1)^k \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} \left( H_\varepsilon - \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} \right)^k + \left( \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} H_\varepsilon \right)^n \frac{1}{H - \zeta} \left( \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta} \right)^n. \tag{4.48}
\]

The path integral over every summand for \(0 \leq k \leq 2n - 1\) can be resolved by Lemma 4.5 and then bounded by Theorem 4.8,

For the last term, we recall the estimate \(\left\| H_\varepsilon \frac{1}{H_0 - \zeta}\right\|_{4n_0} \leq F(\zeta)\) by Lemma 4.1 and note \(\frac{1}{H - \zeta}\) is integrable over the path \(\Gamma\).

For any \(l \in \mathbb{N}\), such that \(a < B_0(2l + 1) < b\), we choose a circle path, such that the last one hits \(\mathbb{R}\) at \(b\), each two neighbouring paths hit \(\mathbb{R}\) at one common point not in \(\sigma(H)\), the first path hits \(\mathbb{R}\) at \(a\) and every circle has a real-valued centre. Then we apply the estimate for a single Landau level and the \(p\)-triangle inequality. If there is no Landau eigenvalue between \(a\) and \(b\), the associated projections are finite dimensional and will lead to an \(O(1)\) term with respect to \(L\).

\[\square\]

5. **On the Landau Hamiltonian**

In this section we establish several properties of the Landau Hamilton operator \(H_0\) and the operators \(P_l, M_l, \zeta\) and in particular, their integral kernels. At the end of this section, we will also include an important integral bound.

We introduce the Laguerre polynomials and their generating function. For any \(l \in \mathbb{N}\), the Laguerre polynomials \(L_l\) is given by

\[
L_l: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad t \mapsto \sum_{k=0}^{l} \binom{l}{k} (-1)^k \frac{t^k}{k!}.
\tag{5.1}
\]

For any \(s \in [0, \infty)\), \(-1 < t < 1\), their generating function is given by

\[
\sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}} t^l L_l(s) = \frac{1}{1 - t} \exp \left( \frac{-ts}{1-t} \right). \tag{5.2}
\]
Let \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \). For \( l \in \mathbb{N} \), we define \( p_l \) as the integral kernel of \( P_l \),

\[
p_l(x, y) := \frac{B_0}{2\pi} \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{4} \|x - y\|^2 + i \frac{B_0}{2} \langle x \mid Jy \rangle \right) L_l \left( \frac{B_0}{2} \|x - y\|^2 / 2 \right). \tag{5.3}
\]

Furthermore, for \( 0 < t < 1 \), we define the operator \( Q_t := \sum_l t^l P_l \). Its integral kernel is given by

\[
q_l(x, y) := \sum_l t^l p_l(x, y) \tag{5.4}
\]

\[
= \frac{B_0}{2\pi(1-t)} \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{4} \|x - y\|^2 + i \frac{B_0}{2} \langle x \mid Jy \rangle - \frac{B_0 t}{2 - 2t} \|x - y\|^2 \right) \tag{5.5}
\]

\[
= \frac{B_0}{2\pi(1-t)} \exp \left( -\frac{B_0(1+t)}{4(1-t)} \|x - y\|^2 + i \frac{B_0}{2} \langle x \mid Jy \rangle \right). \tag{5.6}
\]

We easily calculate

\[
\left( -i \nabla_x - \frac{B_0}{2} Jx \right) q_l(x, y) = \left( \frac{iB_0(1+t)}{2(1-t)} (x - y) - \frac{B_0}{2} J(x - y) \right) q_l(x, y), \tag{5.7}
\]

and

\[
\left( -i \nabla_x - \frac{B_0}{2} Jx \right)^2 q_l(x, y) \tag{5.8}
\]

\[
= \left( \frac{iB_0(1+t)}{2(1-t)} (x - y) - \frac{B_0}{2} J(x - y) \right)^2 + \left( \frac{B_0(1+t)}{2(1-t)} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} - \frac{B_0}{2} J \right) q_l(x, y). \tag{5.9}
\]

**Lemma 5.1.** For any \( j \in \mathbb{N} \), there are \( C, a > 0 \), independent of \( l, B_0 \), such that for any \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \)

\[
\| ( -i \nabla_x - A_0(x) )^{\otimes j} p_l(x, y) \| \leq B_0^{1 + 0.5j} C a^j \exp \left( -\frac{B_0 \|x - y\|^2}{8} \right). \tag{5.10}
\]

The norm on the left-hand side is the 2-norm on \( \mathbb{C}^{2^j} \).

**Proof.** Using the explicit formula for the Laguerre polynomials, for any \( t \geq 0, j' \in \mathbb{N}, 0 < \delta < 1 \), we bound the \( j' \)th differential as follows:

\[
\| L_l^{(j')} (t) \| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{l-j'} (\frac{2}{\delta})^l \frac{(\delta t)^k}{k!} \tag{5.11}
\]

\[
= \sum_{k=0}^{l-j'} \left( \frac{2}{\delta} \right)^l \frac{(\delta t)^k}{k!} \tag{5.12}
\]

\[
\leq \left( \frac{2}{\delta} \right)^l \exp(\delta t). \tag{5.13}
\]

Each of the \( j \) differential operators have to be resolved with the product rule, where we apply the \(-i \nabla_x\) to the polynomial, which is resolved by chain rule, and \(-i \nabla_x - A_0(x)\) to the exponential. This will always be the exponential times a polynomial expression in \( x - y \), taking values in \( \mathbb{C}^{2^j} \). This leads to the first bound, with a constant \( C \) depending only on \( j \), as the dependency on \( l \) is encoded entirely in the polynomial \( L_l \) and its differentials. Thus, we have

\[
\| ( -i \nabla_x - A_0(x) )^{\otimes j} p_l(x, y) \| \leq C \sum_{j'=0}^{j} \left\| L_l^{(j')} \left( \frac{B_0}{2} \|x - y\|^2 \right) \right\| \left( 1 + \sqrt{B_0 \|x - y\|^2} \right)^j B_0^{1 + 0.5j} \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{4} \|x - y\|^2 \right). \tag{5.14}
\]

By setting \( t = B_0 \|x - y\|^2 / 2 \) and \( \delta = \frac{1}{8} \) in (5.13), we can finally estimate

\[
\| ( -i \nabla_x - A_0(x) )^{\otimes j} p_l(x, y) \| \leq \left( \frac{2}{\delta} \right)^l \exp(\delta t). \tag{5.15}
\]
Lemma 5.2. Let $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ be cofinite, $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}, \zeta \notin B_0(2I + 1)$ and $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $l_0 \geq \max((I^2 \cup \{\Re(z) + B_0\}))$. Then we have the identity

$$B_0 M_{I, \zeta} = \int_0^1 t^{-\zeta/B_0} \left( Q_{I^2} - \sum_{l \leq l_0} t^{2l} P_l \right) dt + \sum_{l \in I, l \leq l_0} \frac{P_l}{(2l + 1 - \zeta/B_0)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.21)

Proof. The idea of this proof is the formal identity

$$\int_0^1 \sum_{l \leq l_0} t^{2l - \zeta/B_0} P_l dt = \sum_{l \in I} \frac{1}{1 + 2l - \zeta/B_0} P_l. \hspace{1cm} (5.22)$$

Now we need to establish the precise meaning of this identity. First, we note that $t^{-\zeta/B_0} = \exp(-\zeta/B_0 \ln(t))$ is well defined, as $t > 0$. If $\Re(\zeta)/B_0 \geq 2l + 1$, then the integral of the summands for $l$ will not exist, which is the reason we introduced $l_0$. We bounded the real part of $\zeta$ a little stronger then necessary to make the proof easier. Hence, we have

$$\int_0^1 \sum_{l > l_0} t^{2l - \zeta/B_0} P_l dt = \sum_{l > l_0} \frac{1}{1 + 2l - \zeta/B_0} P_l. \hspace{1cm} (5.23)$$

For any single $l \geq l_0$, the integrals exists as a Bochner integral with respect to the operator norm. As these operators are scalar multiples of a set of orthogonal projections corresponding to pairwise orthogonal subspaces, we can exchange the integral and the sum by dominated convergence, as we can replace the triangle inequality by a maximum. \hspace{1cm} (5.24)

We will deal with a few integral kernels that have a singularity at the diagonal. To describe such a singularity, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we introduce

$$b_s: \mathbb{R}^2 \to [0, \infty), \hspace{0.5cm} (x, y) \mapsto \begin{cases} -1_D \frac{\ln(\sqrt{B_0} ||x - y||)}{\sqrt{B_0}} & s = 0, \\ 1_D \frac{1}{\sqrt{B_0} ||x - y||^s} & s \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 5.3. Let $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ be cofinite. Then there is a function $F \in L^\infty_{I^2}(\mathbb{C} \setminus (2I + 1))$, such that the following pointwise upper bounds hold for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2, x \neq y$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_0(2I + 1)$:

$$|\ker M_{I, \zeta}(x, y)| \leq F \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) \left( b_0(x, y) + \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} ||x - y||^2 \right) \right), \hspace{1cm} (5.25)$$

$$||\ker(-i \nabla - A_0) M_{I, \zeta}(x, y)|| \leq F \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) \left( b_1(x, y) + \sqrt{B_0} \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} ||x - y||^2 \right) \right), \hspace{1cm} (5.26)$$

$$||(-i \nabla_x - A_0(x)) \otimes^2 \ker M_{I, \zeta}(x, y)|| \leq F \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) \left( b_2(x, y) + B_0 \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} ||x - y||^2 \right) \right). \hspace{1cm} (5.27)$$
Remark. The last inequality is structurally different, because the implied operator \((-i\nabla - A_0)^{\otimes 2} M_{l,\zeta}\) does not have a nice integral kernel (see Definition 2.2). The differential of the integral kernel can still be considered but is not \(L^1\) with respect to \(y\) for any fixed \(x\) and hence not a nice integral kernel. It is a singular integral kernel. While there is a lot of theory developed on such a kernel, we can avoid dealing with such a kernel in this paper.

Proof. The set \(I \subset \mathbb{N}\) is fixed throughout the proof. For any \(t \in [0,1], l \in \mathbb{N}, j \in \{0,1,2\}\), we define
\[
q_{l,j}(x,y) := (-i\nabla_x - A_0(x))^{\otimes j} q_l(x,y),
\]
\[
p_{l,j}(x,y) := (-i\nabla_x - A_0(x))^{\otimes j} p_l(x,y).
\]
As \(q_{l,j}, p_{l,j}\) are nice integral kernels, we can apply dominated convergence and see that
\[
q_{l,j}(x,y) = iker \left( (-i\nabla - A_0)^{\otimes j} Q_l \right)(x,y),
\]
\[
p_{l,j}(x,y) = iker \left( (-i\nabla - A_0)^{\otimes j} P_l \right)(x,y).
\]
We choose \(l_0 \in \mathbb{N}\) minimal, such that \((2l_0 - 1)B_0 > \Re \zeta\) and \(l_0 \geq \max(l^5)\). Now we use the representation established in Lemma 5.2. To prove, that for \(j \in \{0,1\}\), the operators have integral kernels, we want to use Lemma A.6. Hence, we only need to show, that the following inequality holds, in order to finish the proof for \(j = 0,1\):
\[
\int_0^1 \left| t^{-\zeta/B_0} \left( q_{l,j}(x,y) - \sum_{l \leq l_0} t^{2l} p_{l,j}(x,y) \right) \right| dt + \sum_{l \leq l_0} \frac{\| p_{l,j}(x,y) \|}{(2l + 1 - \zeta/B_0)} \leq B_0 \mathcal{F} \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) \left( b_2(x,y) + B_0 \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} \| x - y \|^2 \right) \right).
\]
For \(j = 2\), however, we need to consider, that as the integrand is smooth on \((0,1)\) and the summands at the end are smooth, we can try to exchange the integral with the differential operator \((-i\nabla - A_0)\). This will work, if the absolute value of the differential is integrable, by dominated convergence. Hence the above integral bound also covers the case \(j = 2\) and we will now proceed to bound all terms at the same time by choosing \(j \in \{0,1,2\}\). We want to use Lemma 5.1 to bound the first integral on the interval \((0,t_0)\) and the sums. Hence,
\[
\int_0^{t_0} \left| t^{-\zeta/B_0} \left( q_{l,j}(x,y) - \sum_{l \leq l_0} t^{2l} p_{l,j}(x,y) \right) \right| dt \leq \int_0^{t_0} \sum_{l > l_0} t^{2l - \Re \zeta/B_0} \| p_{l,j}(x,y) \| dt \leq \int_0^{t_0} \sum_{l > l_0} t^{2l - \Re \zeta/B_0} C B_0^{1 + 0.5j} t_0^4 \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} \| x - y \|^2 \right) dt \leq C B_0^{1 + 0.5j} \sum_{l > l_0} (t_0^2 t_0^4 (2l + 1 - \Re \zeta/B_0) t_0^{3\Re \zeta/B_0} \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} \| x - y \|^2 \right) \leq F_0(\zeta/B_0) B_0^{1 + 0.5j} \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} \| x - y \|^2 \right).
\]
The last step holds, if \(t_0^2 a < 1\), so we fix such a \(t_0\) now\(^2\). The function \(F_0\) is in \(L_{\infty,loc}(\mathbb{C} \setminus B_0(2I + 1))\), as \(l_0\) is chosen locally bounded in \(\zeta/B_0\). For fixed \(l_0\) the function \(F_0\) is continuous. The next step is

\(^2\)Actually \(a = 16\), so we could choose for example \(t_0 = 0.1\), but the value is not relevant.
bounded the remaining finite sum terms. Here, we will use, that \( l \leq l_0 \) and hence \( a^l \leq C \). Thus,

\[
\int_{t_0}^{1} \left\| \sum_{l \leq l_0} t^{2l - \frac{\zeta}{B_0}} p_{i,j}(x,y) \right\| dt + \sum_{l \in I, l \leq l_0} \frac{\|p_{i,j}(x,y)\|}{(2l + 1 - \frac{\zeta}{B_0})}
\]

\[
\leq C B_0^{1+0.5j} \left( \sum_{l \leq l_0} \left( \int_{t_0}^{1} t^{2l - \Re(\zeta)/B_0} dt \right) + \sum_{l \in I, l \leq l_0} \left( \frac{1}{2l + 1 - \Re(\zeta)/B_0} \right) \right) \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} \|x - y\|^2 \right)
\]

\[
\leq F_1(\zeta/B_0) B_0^{1+0.5j} \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} \|x - y\|^2 \right).
\]  

The function \( F_1 \) is \( L^\infty_{loc}(\mathbb{C} \setminus B_0(2I + 1)) \) by the same argumentation as \( F_0 \). We will now turn our attention to the last remaining term. It is given by

\[
\int_{t_0}^{1} \left\| q_{i,j}(x,y) t^{-\zeta/B_0} \right\| dt.
\]

The integrand is given by (5.7) for \( j = 1 \) and by (5.9) for \( j = 2 \). Only in the following lines, we denote by \( j \mapsto \delta(j,2) \) the function, that is 1, if \( j = 2 \) and 0 otherwise. We introduce the parameter \( h := \sqrt{B_0} \|x - y\| \) and estimate

\[
\int_{t_0}^{1} \left\| t^{-\zeta/B_0} q_{i,j}(x,y) \right\| dt \leq \left( t_0^{-\Re(\zeta)/B_0} + 1 \right) \int_{t_0}^{1} \frac{C B_0}{1 - t^2} \left( \frac{\sqrt{B_0} h}{2(1 - t^2)} \right)^j + \delta(j,2) \frac{B_0}{2(1 - t^2)} \exp \left( -\frac{1 + t^2}{4(1 - t^2)} h^2 \right) dt
\]

\[
\leq \int_{t_0}^{1} F_2(\zeta/B_0) B_0^{1 - \frac{\zeta}{B_0}} \left( \frac{\sqrt{B_0} h}{2(1 - t)} \right)^j + \delta(j,2) \frac{B_0}{2(1 - t)} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{5(1 - t)} h^2 \right) dt.
\]

In the last step, we used the fact, that \( \frac{1 + t^2}{4(1 - t^2)} \geq 2\sqrt{2} - 2 > \frac{4}{5} \) to bound the factor in the exponential. The function \( F_2 \) is just continuous on \( \mathbb{C} \).

We change variables to \( s := \frac{h^2}{5(1 - t)} \). The interval is changed to \((h^2/5, \infty)\) and the determinant is \( h^2/(5s^2) \). In total we have

\[
\int_{t_0}^{1} \left\| t^{-\zeta/B_0} q_{i,j}(x,y) \right\| dt \leq F_2 \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) B_0^{1 + 0.5j} \int_{s_0}^{\infty} s \frac{h^2}{5s^2} \left( \frac{s}{h} \right)^j + \delta(j,2) \frac{s}{h^2} \exp \left( -s \right) \frac{h^2}{8s} ds
\]

\[
\leq F_2 \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) B_0^{1 + 0.5j} \int_{s_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{s} \left( \frac{s}{h} \right)^j + \delta(j,2) \frac{h^2}{s} \exp \left( -s \right) ds =: \Theta.
\]

If \( h > 1 \), we can bound the integrand by \( C \exp(-\frac{5}{8}s) \). The reduction in the exponent takes care of the factor \( s \), that appears in the case \( j = 2 \). Negative powers of \( h \) can be bounded by one. The integral can then be resolved and we have

\[
\Theta \leq CF_2 \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) B_0^{1 + 0.5j} \exp \left( -\frac{5}{8} \frac{h^2}{5} \right)
\]

\[
= CF_2 \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) B_0^{1 + 0.5j} \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} \|x - y\|^2 \right).
\]

This is the desired upper bound.

If \( h \leq 1, j > 0 \), we can set the lower interval limit to 0 and get an integrable function in \( s \) multiplied by \( h^{-j} \). This gives us

\[
\Theta \leq CF_2 \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) B_0^{1 + 0.5j} h^{-j} \leq CF_2 \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) B_0 b_j(x,y),
\]
which is the desired upper bound.

Finally, if \( h \leq 1, j = 0 \), we get a constant from the integral starting at \( \frac{1}{h} \). For the integral up to \( \frac{1}{3} \), we can bound the integrand by \( \frac{1}{h} \). Hence, the remaining integral is bounded by \( C(1 - \ln(h^2)) = C(1 + b_0(x, y)) \). Once again, this is the desired result. \( \square \)

We need one very important bound, which will have multiple uses later.

**Lemma 5.4.** Let \( u_1, u_2, u_3 : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) be functions, such that \( \ln \circ u_j \) is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant \( C_{lip} > 0 \). Let \( 0 \leq s_1, s_2 < 2 \) and \( \lambda > 0 \) be real numbers. Then there is a constant \( C > 0 \), depending only on \( B_0, s_1, s_2, \lambda \) and \( C_{lip} \), such that for all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2, x \neq y \) we have the estimate

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{(b_{s_1}(x, y) + \exp(-B_0 \lambda \|x - y\|^2)) (b_{s_2}(y, z) + \exp(-B_0 \lambda \|y - z\|^2))}{u_1(x)u_2(y)u_3(z)} dy \leq C b_{s_1+s_2-2}(x, z) + C \exp\left(-\frac{B_0 \lambda \|x - z\|^2}{3}\right). \tag{5.52}
\]

If \( 1/(u_1 u_2 u_3) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \) and \( s_1 + s_2 < 3 \), then the integral kernel is Hilbert–Schmidt.

This is to be used together with Lemma 5.3 with \( \lambda = \frac{1}{\pi} \). The general \( \lambda \) is included to be able to chain more resolvents inductively. As all summands in the integral are positive, we may assume that they have the same constants in front.

**Proof.** We first need two minor results. Let \( a, b \in \mathbb{R}^2, j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \). Then for any \( \delta > 0 \), we have

\[
\frac{u_j(a)}{u_j(b)} = \exp(\ln \circ u_j(a) - \ln \circ u_j(b)) \leq \exp(C_{lip}\|a - b\|) \leq \exp\left(\delta\|a - b\|^2 + \frac{C_{lip}^2}{4\delta}\right) = C(C_{lip}, \delta) \exp(\delta\|a - b\|^2). \tag{5.56}
\]

We used the Young inequality. Furthermore (for any \( x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^2 \)) we have the identity

\[
\|x - y\|^2 + \|y - z\|^2 = \frac{1}{2}\|x - z\|^2 + 2\|y - \frac{x + z}{2}\|^2. \tag{5.58}
\]

We write \( R := \frac{1}{\sqrt{B_0}} \). Let us begin with the left-hand side of (5.53) and just write out most of the Hölder estimates. Hence,

\[
LHS \leq \frac{C}{u_1(x)u_3(z)} \tag{5.59}
\]

\[
\left(\int_{D_R(x)} b_{s_1}(x, y)b_{s_2}(y, z)dy\right)\|\frac{1}{u_2(\cdot)}\|_{L^\infty(D_R(x))} \tag{5.60}
\]

\[
+ \exp\left(-\frac{B_0 \lambda}{2}\|x - z\|^2\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{\exp\left(-2B_0\|y - \frac{x + z}{2}\|^2\right)}{u_2(y)} dy \tag{5.61}
\]

\[
+ \|b_{s_1}(x, \cdot)\|_{L^1(D_R(x))} \|\exp\left(-B_0 \lambda \cdot - z\|^2\right)\|_{L^\infty(D_R(x))} \|\frac{1}{u_2(\cdot)}\|_{L^\infty(D_R(x))} \tag{5.62}
\]

\[
+ \|b_{s_2}(\cdot, z)\|_{L^1(D_R(z))} \|\exp\left(-B_0 \lambda \|x - \cdot\|^2\right)\|_{L^\infty(D_R(z))} \|\frac{1}{u_2(\cdot)}\|_{L^\infty(D_R(z))}. \tag{5.63}
\]

The \( L^\infty \) norms of the non-exponential terms can be bounded by a constant times the function evaluated at the centre, where the constant is given by (5.55), using \( a \) as the centre of the ball and \( b \) as any point in the ball. For the \( L^\infty \) norms of the exponential terms, we use Lemma A.5 with
We have just bound the integral by a constant depending on \( R \) times the Gaussian. We are left to consider the case \( x, z \) can bound this by a constant (independent of vector and \( R \)). This finishes the proof of the upper bound.

If we apply (5.57) again, we can get the desired bound for the last three summands. So, we only need to get the same bound for the first summand. If \( \| x - z \| > 2R \), the first summand vanishes. Otherwise, the term \( 1/u_3(z) \) can be bounded by \( C/u_3(x) \) by (5.57). In the case \( 2R \geq \| x - z \| \geq R/2 \), we just bound the integral by a constant depending on \( R \), which can then be bounded by a constant times the Gaussian. We are left to consider the case \( \| x - z \| < R/2 \). So, we are left to bound the integral

\[
\int_{D_R(x)} b_s(x, y)b_s(y, z)dy.
\]

We have \( b_s(x, \cdot) \in L^p \) for any \( 1 \leq p < 2/s \) and \( b_s \) is symmetric in \( x, y \). Hence, if \( s_1 + s_2 < 2 \), we can bound this by a constant (independent of \( x, z \)) using Hölder. This can then be bounded by the Gaussian, as \( \| x - z \| \leq 2R \). We are left with the case \( s_1 + s_2 \geq 2 \), where we want to bound the integral by \( b_{s_1+s_2-2}(x, z) + C \). As \( s_1, s_2 < 2 \), we have \( s_1, s_2 > 0 \). Let \( e_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) be the standard unit vector and let \( D_{r_1, r_2}(0) \) be the annulus between the two radii \( r_1 \leq r_2 \). Then we have

\[
\int_{D_R(x)} b_s(x, y)b_s(y, z)dy \leq \int_{D_R(0)} \frac{1}{\| x - y \|^{s_1} \| y - z \|^{s_2}}dy
\]

\[
= \int_{D_R(0)} \frac{1}{\| y \|^{s_1} \| y - (z - x) \|^{s_2}}dy
\]

\[
= \int_{D_{R\|x-z\|^{-1}}(0)} \frac{\| x - z \|^{2-s_1-s_2}}{\| y \|^{s_1} \| y - e_1 \|^{s_2}}dy
\]

\[
\leq \frac{C}{\| x - z \|^{s_1+s_2-2}} \int_{D_{2, R\|x-z\|^{-1}}(0)} \frac{\| x - z \|^{2-s_1-s_2}}{\| y \|^{s_1} \| y - e_1 \|^{s_2}}dy
\]

\[
\leq C b_{s_1+s_2-2}(x, z).
\]

In the final step, we have to consider the case \( s_1 + s_2 = 2 \) separately. In this case, the integral at the end yields the term \( b_0(x, z) \) up to a constant. In the case \( s_1 + s_2 > 2 \), the integral over \( \| y \|^{-s_1-s_2} \) can be bounded by a constant, independent of \( x, z \) and we are left with the correct singularity at the diagonal. This finishes the proof of the upper bound.

If \( 1/(u_1 u_2 u_3) \in L^2 \) and \( s_1 + s_2 < 3 \), we get

\[
C \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dz \left( \frac{b_{s_1+s_2-2}(x, z) + \exp \left( -\frac{B_0 \lambda}{3} \| x - z \|^2 \right)}{u_1(x) u_2(x) u_3(x)} \right)^2
\]
In the last step we used

\[ C \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d(x-z) \left( \frac{b_{s_1} + s_2 - 2(x,z) + \exp \left( -\frac{B_0 \lambda}{3} \|x-z\|^2 \right)}{u_1(x)u_2(x)u_3(x)} \right)^2 \]

(5.76)

\[ \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx \left( \frac{C}{(u_1(x)u_2(x)u_3(x))^2} \right) \leq C. \]

(5.77)

Hence the integral kernel is Hilbert–Schmidt. \hfill \Box

**Corollary 5.5.** Let \( n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \) and for any \( 0 \leq i \leq n \), let there be an operator \( K_i \) with integral kernel \( k_i \) on \( L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \), log-Lipschitz functions \( u_i, v_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \), \( \lambda_i > 0 \), and \( 0 \leq s_i < 2 \). Assume the integral kernels \( k_i \) satisfy the upper bound

\[ u_i(x)|k_i(x,y)|v_i(y) \leq Cb_{s_i}(x,y) + C \exp \left( -B_0 \lambda_i \|x-y\|^2 \right), \]

for any \( x \neq y \). Define \( K := \prod_{i=0}^{n} K_i \) and let

\[ s = -2n + \sum_{i=0}^{n} s_i. \]

(5.79)

Then \( K \) has an integral kernel \( k \) and there are \( \lambda > 0, C > 0 \), such that for any \( x \neq y \), we have the inequality

\[ |k(x,y)| \leq Cb_k(x,y) + C \exp \left( -B_0 \lambda \|x-y\|^2 \right). \]

(5.80)

For \( s < 0 \), we can replace \( b_s \) by 0 in \( (5.50) \), as \( b_s \) is bounded and can be absorbed in the Gaussian.

The proof follows by induction on \( n \), as nice integral operators (see 2.2) are closed under composition and \( K_i \) is by assumption always a nice integral operator.

Now we have established everything necessary to prove Lemma 4.1.

**Proof of Lemma 4.1** We recall that \( I \subset \mathbb{N} \) is cofinite and \( \zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_0(2I + 1) \). By the triangle inequality, we have

\[ \|H_{x}M_{I,\zeta}\|_{4n_0} \leq \|2A_{x} \cdot (-i\nabla - A_0)M_{I,\zeta}\|_{4n_0} + \|W_{x}M_{I,\zeta}\|_{4n_0}. \]

(5.81)

We can estimate pointwise for \( x \neq y \), using first the assumption that \( B_{x}, V_{x} \) are \((1, C_d)\) tame and Lemma 3.2 and then Lemma 5.3. Thus, we have

\[ \|\text{iker} A_{x}(-i\nabla - A_0)M_{I,\zeta}(x,y)\| \]

(5.82)

\[ \leq \frac{C}{(1 + \|x\|)^{\varepsilon}} \|\text{iker}(-i\nabla - A_0)M_{I,\zeta}(x,y)\| \]

(5.83)

\[ \leq F \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) \frac{b_1(x,y) + \sqrt{B_0} \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{3} \|x-y\|^2 \right)}{(1 + \|x\|)^{\varepsilon}}. \]

(5.84)

And now for the other part, we get

\[ \|\text{iker} W_{x}M_{I,\zeta}(x,y)\| \]

(5.85)

\[ \leq \frac{C}{(1 + \|x\|)^{\varepsilon}} \|\text{iker} M_{I,\zeta}(x,y)\| \]

(5.86)

\[ \leq F \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) \frac{b_0(x,y) + \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{3} \|x-y\|^2 \right)}{(1 + \|x\|)^{\varepsilon}} \]

(5.87)

\[ \leq F \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) \frac{b_1(x,y) + \sqrt{B_0} \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{3} \|x-y\|^2 \right)}{(1 + \|x\|)^{\varepsilon}}. \]

(5.88)

In the last step we used \( b_0 \leq Cb_1 \) and \( 1 = C\sqrt{B_0} \).

We use properties we denoted as powers and Hilbert–Schmidt kernel of the \( p \)-Schatten norms from \ref{22}. Hence the \( 4n_0 \)-Schatten norm of \( T \) can be calculated as the \( 4n_0 \)th root of the square integral.
of the integral kernel of \((TT^*)^n\). We note, that \(u(x) := (1 + \|x\|)^\varepsilon\) is log Lipschitz. We want to use \textbf{Corollary 5.5}. Hence, we define for \(0 \leq i \leq 2n_0 - 1\)

\[
K_i := \begin{cases} H_x M_{t, \zeta} & \text{i even,} \\ (H_x M_{t, \zeta})^* & \text{i odd.} \end{cases}
\]

(5.89)

For even \(i\), we choose \(u_i(x) = u(x), v_i(x) = 1\) and for odd \(i\), we choose \(v_i(x) = u(x), u_i(x) = 1\). We always have \(s_i = 1\). Now we can apply \textbf{Corollary 5.5} and get for any \(x \neq y\) that

\[
|\text{iker} (H_x M_{t, \zeta}) (H_x M_{t, \zeta})^n (x, y)| \leq F \left( \frac{\zeta}{B_0} \right) b_0 (x, y) + \exp \left( -\lambda B_0 \|x - y\|^2 \right) \left(1 + \|x\|\right)^{2n_0 + \varepsilon}.
\]

(5.90)

(5.91)

The function \(F\) is in \(L^\infty_{t,x} (\mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(H_0))\). This integral kernel is in \(L^2\), as \(2n_0 \varepsilon > 1\). The \(b_0\) term only appears for \(n_0 = 1\), as for \(n_0 > 1\), we get \(s < 0\), which corresponds to a bounded \(b_s\).

\textbf{6. Proof of Theorem 4.7}

In order to apply \textbf{Proposition 4.6} we need to apply some differential operators to the integral kernel of \((T_1 H_x)^m P_1 (H_x T_1)^{k-m}\). We denote by \(t_i\) the integral kernel of \(T_i\). By \textbf{Lemma 5.5} we can only apply one full differential in \(x\) or \(y\) to \(t_i\), before we get a function, that is not a nice integral kernel (as defined in \textbf{Definition 2.2}) anymore. However, the operator \(P_1\) has a smooth integral kernel, which is why we would like to move differentials over to it. For this purpose, we have to study some \((\text{-anti})\)-commutators.

\textbf{Lemma 6.1.} For any \(l \in \mathbb{N}, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2\) with \(x \neq y\), we have the identity

\[
\nabla_x t_i(x, y) = \left( -i \frac{B_0}{2} J(x - y) - \nabla_y \right) t_i(x, y).
\]

(6.1)

\textbf{Proof.} We use the fact, that the adjoint of an operator with integral kernel \((x, y) \mapsto k(x, y)\) has the integral kernel \((x, y) \mapsto \overline{k}(y, x)\) and that \(Q_{t_i}\) is self-adjoint. We recall \textbf{5.7}. Hence,

\[
\nabla_x q_i(x, y) = \left( -\frac{B_0 (1 + t)}{2 (1 - t)} (x - y) + \frac{B_0}{2} J y \right) q_i(x, y),
\]

(6.2)

\[
\nabla_y q_i(x, y) = \nabla_y q_i(x, y),
\]

(6.3)

\[
= \left( -\frac{B_0 (1 + t)}{2 (1 - t)} (y - x) - \frac{B_0}{2} J x \right) q_i(x, y).
\]

(6.4)

If we add these up, we get

\[
\nabla_x q_i(x, y) + \nabla_y q_i(x, y) = -i \frac{B_0}{2} J(x - y) q_i(x, y).
\]

(6.5)

As this identity is independent of \(t\), the same identity is satisfied, if we replace \(q_i\) by \(p_i\) by a simple coefficient comparison, in view of \textbf{(5.4)} and as \(q_t\) is real analytic for \(|t| < 1\). We define the function \(k_t : (0, 1) \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2\) by

\[
k_t(x, y) := t^{-(2l+1)} \left( q_{2l} x, y \right) - \sum_{k=0}^{l} t^{2k} p_k(x, y) + \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \frac{p_k(x, y)}{2(k - l)}.
\]

(6.6)

Hence, we have for any \(t \in (0, 1)\), we have the identity

\[
\nabla_x k_t(x, y) + \nabla_y k_t(x, y) = -i \frac{B_0}{2} J(x - y) k_t(x, y).
\]

(6.7)

By \textbf{Lemma 5.2} \textbf{Lemma 5.3} and \textbf{Lemma A.6} for any \(l \in \mathbb{N}_0, j = 0, 1\), we have the representation

\[
B_0 (-i \nabla_x - A_0(x))^{\otimes j} t_i(x, y) = \int_0^1 (-i \nabla_x - A_0(x))^{\otimes j} k_t(x, y) dt.
\]

(6.8)
Hence, the equality holds for $t_t$. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 6.2.** For any $k_1, k_2, m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, there are polynomial functions $s_{k_1 k_2 m_1 m_2} : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ of degree at most $m_1 + m_2$, such that for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\Psi \in W^{m_1 + m_2, 3}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, the identity

$$ \partial_{x_1}^{m_1} \partial_{x_2}^{m_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} t_l(x, y) \Psi(y)dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{k_1 \leq m_1, k_2 \leq m_2} s_{k_1 k_2 m_1 m_2}(x - y) t_l(x, y) \partial_{y_1}^{k_1} \partial_{y_2}^{k_2} \Psi(y)dy $$

holds for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

**Proof.** We use induction on $(m_1, m_2)$. The case $(0, 0)$ is tautological. By Lemma 5.3 $\nabla_x t_l(x, \cdot) \in L^1.5(\mathbb{R}^2)$. The cases $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$ follow from Lemma 6.1 dominated convergence to exchange integral and differentiation, and integration by parts. We need the steps $(m_1, m_2) \to (m_1 + 1, m_2)$ and $(m_1, m_2) \to (m_1, m_2 + 1)$. As they work analogously, we will only consider the first case. Thus,

$$ \partial_{x_1}^{m_1 + 1} \partial_{x_2}^{m_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} t_l(x, y) \Psi(y)dy $$

$$ = \partial_{x_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{k_1 \leq m_1, k_2 \leq m_2} s_{k_1 k_2 m_1 m_2}(x - y) t_l(x, y) \partial_{y_1}^{k_1} \partial_{y_2}^{k_2} \Psi(y)dy $$

$$ = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{k_1 \leq m_1, k_2 \leq m_2} (\partial_{x_1} s_{k_1 k_2 m_1 m_2}) (x - y) t_l(x, y) \partial_{y_1}^{k_1} \partial_{y_2}^{k_2} \Psi(y)dy $$

$$ - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{k_1 \leq m_1, k_2 \leq m_2} s_{k_1 k_2 m_1 m_2}(x - y) \left( \frac{B_0}{2} J(x - y) \right) t_l(x, y) \partial_{y_1}^{k_1} \partial_{y_2}^{k_2} \Psi(y)dy $$

$$ + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{k_1 \leq m_1, k_2 \leq m_2} s_{k_1 k_2 m_1 m_2}(x - y) t_l(x, y) \partial_{y_1}^{k_1 + 1} \partial_{y_2}^{k_2} \Psi(y)dy. $$

We used the product rule, the case $(1, 0)$, dominated convergence to exchange integral and differentiation, and partial integration. We can read off a recursive definition for the polynomials $s_{k_1 k_2 m_1 m_2}$, but we are only interested in their degree and independence of $l$. The recursive formula lets us conclude, that the degree of $s_{k_1 k_2 m_1 m_2}$ is at most $m_1 + m_2 - k_1 - k_2$. This finishes the proof. \hfill \Box

The next step is to move the differentials past $H_\varepsilon$. For this, we easily see the identity

$$ \nabla_j H_\varepsilon = \left[ \nabla_j, W_\varepsilon \right] + 2A_\varepsilon \cdot (-i\nabla - A_0) $$

$$ = 2(\partial_{x_j} A_\varepsilon) \cdot (-i\nabla - A_0) - 2A_\varepsilon \cdot \frac{B}{2} J e_j + (\partial_{x_j} W_\varepsilon). $$

Here, $\partial_{x_j} A_\varepsilon$ and $\partial_{x_j} W_\varepsilon$ refer to the multiplication operators of the partial derivatives of the functions $A_\varepsilon(\cdot), W_\varepsilon(\cdot)$.

For any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we introduce

$$ B_{\varepsilon, x_0}(x) := B_\varepsilon(x + x_0), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2 $$

The operators $A_{\varepsilon, x_0}, V_{\varepsilon, x_0}, W_{\varepsilon, x_0}, H_{\varepsilon, x_0}$ are defined accordingly. For any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we define

$$ A_{\varepsilon, x_0}(x) := B_\varepsilon(\cdot + x_0) * \frac{J}{2\pi ||x||^2}(x) $$

$$ V_{\varepsilon, x_0}(x) := V_\varepsilon(x + x_0) $$

$$ H_{\varepsilon, x_0} := (-i\nabla - A_0 + A_{\varepsilon, x_0})^2 + V_{\varepsilon, x_0} - H_0 $$

$$ W_{\varepsilon, x_0}(x) := W_\varepsilon(x + x_0). $$

We have not defined $A_{x_0}$ and $H_{x_0}$, as this may lead to confusion with $A_0$ and $H_0$, if we set $x_0 = 0$. The idea behind this is, that by conjugating with the unitary operator $U_{x_0} : L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, as defined in Lemma A.1 we observe the identity

$$ \left\| 1_{[0,1]^2 + x_0} (T_t H_{x_0})^m P_l (H_{x_0})^{k-m} 1_{D_R(0)} \right\|_p = \left\| 1_{[0,1]^2} (T_t H_{x_0})^m P_l (H_{x_0} T_t)^{k-m} 1_{D_R(0)} \right\|_p, $$

where $P_l$ denotes the projection operator.
as the $p$-Schatten norm is unitarily invariant.

Now, we can prove our next major step.

**Theorem 6.3.** Let $k, l, m, m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \geq m$. If $m > 0$, let $B_{\varepsilon}, V_{\varepsilon}$ be $(m_1 + m_2, C_d)$ tame. If $m = 0$ let $B_{\varepsilon}, V_{\varepsilon}$ be $(1, C_d)$ tame. Then there are $C, \lambda > 0, \alpha_1 \geq 0, \alpha_2 \geq k \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, such that for any $x_0, x, z \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have the upper bound

$$\| \partial_{x_1}^{m_1} \partial_{x_2}^{m_2} \text{ker}(T_{1 \varepsilon}, x_0) \|_{m} \leq C \left( \frac{1 + \| x \|}{1 + \| x + x_0 \|} \right)^{\alpha_1} \exp (-\lambda \| x - z \|^2).$$

The idea of the proof is to move the differentials forward, until they get applied to $T_1$, which has a smooth integral kernel. Then we can use **Lemma 5.4** or **Corollary 5.5** and are done.

**Remark.** For $0 < m < k$, it may be possible to get an even stronger decay under slightly stronger assumptions on the decay of the first differentials of $B_{\varepsilon}, V_{\varepsilon}$, by estimating the kernel of $P_1^\varepsilon x_0 T_l = [P_1^\varepsilon, H_{\varepsilon, x_0}] T_l$. In the case, where $B_{\varepsilon} = 0$ and $\nabla V_{\varepsilon}$ has $(1 + \varepsilon, C_d)$ decay, we can show $\alpha_2 \geq 1 + k \varepsilon$ using this approach. For $B_{\varepsilon} \neq 0$, there is the problem of moving the stronger decay of the differential of $B_{\varepsilon}$ over to the differential of $A_{\varepsilon}$ and the problem, that $-i \nabla - A_0$ does not commute with $H_0$.

**Proof.** First, we note that $H_{\varepsilon, x_0} T_l$ and $P_1^\varepsilon$ are **nice** integral operators, as defined in **Definition 2.2**. This allows us to write compositions of these operators as the related integrals over the kernels.

We do an induction on $m$ and $k$ over the following statement:

The theorem holds for any $m_1', m_2' \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $m_1' + m_2' \leq m_1 + m_2$. The values of $\alpha_2, \lambda$ may depend on $m_1', m_2'$. The value of $\alpha_1$ is given by $m_1 + m_2 + 2m^3$.

We observe

$$\| \partial_x^{m_1'} \partial_y^{m_2'} P_1(x, y) \| \leq C (1 + \| y \|)^{m_1' + m_2'} \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} \| x - y \|^2 \right).$$

In the last step, we used (5.57) and the fact, that polynomials can be bounded by exponentials. We consider the case $m = 0$. For $k = 0$, we are done by (6.25). For $k > 0$ we consider

$$\theta_3(y, z) := \text{ker} (H_{\varepsilon, x_0} T_l)^k (y, z)$$

and note

$$\text{ker} P_1 (H_{\varepsilon, x_0} T_l)^k (x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} p_l(x, y, \theta_3(y, z)) dy.$$ 

For $k = 1$, $\theta_3(y, z)$ is equal to

$$\left( W_{\varepsilon}(y + x_0) + 2 A_{\varepsilon}(y + x_0) \cdot (-i \nabla y - \frac{B_0}{2} J y) \right) t_1(y, z).$$

Now we can use the $C_d$ decay of $A_{\varepsilon}$ and $V_{\varepsilon}$, **Lemma 5.3** and $b_0 \leq C b_1$ to arrive at

$$|\theta_3(y, z)| \leq C \left( \frac{1 + \| y + x_0 \|}{1 + \| y + x_0 \|} \right)^{\alpha_1} \left( b_1(y, z) + \sqrt{B_0} \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} \| y - z \|^2 \right) \right).$$

for $k = 1$. For general $k \geq 1$, we apply **Corollary 5.3** to $\theta_3$ and have

$$|\theta_3(y, z)| \leq C \left( \frac{1 + \| y + x_0 \|}{1 + \| y + x_0 \|} \right)^{\alpha_1} \left( b_2 - k(y, z) + \exp \left( -\lambda B_0 \| y - z \|^2 \right) \right) \leq C \left( \frac{1 + \| y + x_0 \|}{1 + \| y + x_0 \|} \right)^{\alpha_1} \left( b_1(y, z) + \exp \left( -\lambda B_0 \| y - z \|^2 \right) \right).$$

for some $C, \lambda > 0$. In the last step, we used $b_2 - k \leq C b_1$, which holds as $k \geq 1$.

---

3It may be possible to remove the $2m$ in here, but it is not relevant for this paper.
Now we use \( \text{(6.25)}, \text{Lemma 5.4} \) and interchange integration and differentiation by dominated convergence. Hence,

\[
\left| \partial_{x_1}^{m_1'} \partial_{x_2}^{m_2'} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} pt(x, y) \theta_3(y, z) dy \right| \leq \frac{C(1 + \|x\|)^{m_1' + m_2'}}{(1 + \|x + x_0\|)^{k\varepsilon}} \exp\left(-\lambda\|x - z\|^2\right). \tag{6.32}
\]

The precise value of \( \lambda \) is irrelevant and we can choose \( \alpha_1 = m_1' + m_2' \) and \( \alpha_2 = k\varepsilon \).

Now we do the step \((m, k) \to (m + 1, k + 1)\). For any \( y, z \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), we define

\[
\varphi(y, z) := \text{ker}(T_l H_{x,0})^m P_l (H_{x,0} T_l)^{k-m}(y, z). \tag{6.33}
\]

We know that for any \( m_1' + m_2' \leq m_1 + m_2 \),

\[
\left| \partial_{x_1}^{m_1'} \partial_{x_2}^{m_2'} \varphi(y, z) \right| \leq C \frac{(1 + \|y\|)^{\alpha_1}}{(1 + \|y + x_0\|)^{\alpha_2}} \exp\left(-\lambda\|y - z\|^2\right). \tag{6.34}
\]

By \( \text{(5.57)} \), we can get a similar bound with \( y \) in front instead of \( x \), if we slightly decrease \( \lambda \) and increase \( C \). Hence \( \varphi(\cdot, y) \in W^{m_1+m_2,3}(\mathbb{R}^2) \).

We need to bound the integral kernel

\[
\psi(x, z) := \partial_{x_1}^{m_1'} \partial_{x_2}^{m_2'} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} t_l(x, y) (H_{x,0} \varphi(\cdot, z))(y) dy \tag{6.35}
\]

in a similar manner.

We will first consider the case \( m_1' = m_2' = 0 \). Here, we just use \( \text{(6.31)} \) to bound the integral kernel of \( (T_l H_{x,0})^m \) and then \text{Lemma 5.3} \) and the induction hypothesis to prove the statement for \( m + 1 \).

In the remaining case, we assume w.l.o.g. that \( m_1' > 0 \). As \( A_x, W_x \in C^m_{m_1 + m_2 - 1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \) and \( \varphi(\cdot, z) \in W^{m_1+m_2,3}(\mathbb{R}^2) \) for any \( z \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), we know that \( H_{x,0} \varphi(\cdot, z) \in W^{m_1+m_2 - 1,3}(\mathbb{R}^2) \) for any \( z \in \mathbb{R}^2 \). Hence, we can apply \text{Lemma 6.2} \) with the pair \((m_1' - 1, m_2')\) and get

\[
\psi(x, z) = \partial_{x_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy \sum_{k_1 \leq m_1' - 1, k_2 \leq (m_1' - 1)m_2'} (s_{k_1, k_2}(m_1' - 1) m_2'(x - y) t_l(x, y))
\]

\[
\times \partial_{y_1}^{k_1} \partial_{y_2}^{k_2} \left( W_x(y + x_0) + \sum_{j=1}^2 A_x(y + x_0)_j \left( -i\partial_{y_j} - \frac{B_0}{2} (Jy)_j \right) \right) \varphi(y, z). \tag{6.37}
\]

As the second factor is in \( L^3(\mathbb{R}^2) \) and the first differential of the first factor is in \( L^1,3(\mathbb{R}^2) \), we can exchange integration and differentiation by dominated convergence. We now resolve every differential by the product rule. In the next equation, each differential is only applied to the immediately following function. We have

\[
\psi(x, z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{k_1 \leq m_1' - 1, k_2 \leq m_2'} \sum_{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = k_1, \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 = k_2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \left( \partial_{x_1} s_{k_1, k_2}(m_1' - 1) m_2'(x - y) t_l(x, y) \right)
\]

\[
\times \left( M_1 \left( \partial_{y_1}^{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2} \partial_{y_2}^{\beta_1 + \beta_2} W_x(y + x_0) \right) \left( \partial_{y_1}^{\alpha_3} \partial_{y_2}^{\beta_3} \varphi(y, z) \right) \right)
\]

\[
- iM_2 \left( \partial_{y_1}^{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2} \partial_{y_2}^{\beta_1 + \beta_2} A_x(y + x_0)_j \right) \left( \partial_{y_j}^{\alpha_3} \partial_{y_2}^{\beta_3} \varphi(y, z) \right)
\]

\[
- M_3 \left( \partial_{y_1}^{\alpha_1} \partial_{y_2}^{\beta_1} A_x(y + x_0)_j \right) \left( \partial_{y_1}^{\alpha_3} \partial_{y_2}^{\beta_3} \varphi(y, z) \right) \right) dy. \tag{6.42}
\]

The rational numbers \( M_1, M_2, M_3 \) are combinatorial expressions in the summation indices. Their precise values are irrelevant. Now we can bound every single term and combine this to bound the integral.

There are at most \( m_1 + m_2 \) differentials applied to \( \varphi \), hence we can use the induction hypothesis to bound this. Here, we will get an \( \alpha_2 \geq k\varepsilon \) and \( \alpha_1 = m_1 + m_2 + 2m \). The values of \( \lambda \) and \( C \) are not relevant.
At most $m_1 + m_2 - 1$ differentials are applied to $A_\varepsilon, W_\varepsilon$. Any of these terms will be bounded by the decay assumptions on $B_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon$. Specifically, it will have at least $(C, \varepsilon)$ decay, for some constant $C$.

The function $(Jy)_j$ is linear. Its differentials are all bounded by $1 + \|y\|$. Most of them even vanish.

We shift our focus to the first term. We start by bounding the polynomial $s_-$. Its degree is at most $m_1 + m_2 - 1$. We want to use Lemma 5.3. On the first summand, we can immediately do so. On the second summand, we need a zero addition. Thus,

$$\exists \left(1 + \|x - y\| \right)^{m_1 + m_2 - 1} \left| t_1(x, y) \right| \leq \left(1 + \|x - y\| \right)^{m_1 + m_2 - 1} \left(1 + \|x - y\| \right)^{m_1 + m_2 - 1} \left| \partial_x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{B_0}{2} (Jy)_1 \right| t_1(x, y)$$

The expression $(Jy)_j$ refers to a potential $(1 + \|y\|)$ factors (one from $(Jy)_1$ and one from the last estimate). The value of $\alpha_2$ increases by $\varepsilon$, as every summand contains some $A_\varepsilon$ or $W_\varepsilon$ term. The value of $\lambda$ could be bounded more precisely, but we just divide it by three again. This finishes the proof. 

To estimate the fractional derivative in Proposition 4.6, we need the following geometric fact.

**Fact 6.4.** Let $x', x'' \in \mathbb{R}^2$ be pairwise distinct and $\|x' - y\| \leq \|x'' - y\|$. Then there is a $C^1$ path $\Gamma$ from $x'$ to $x''$ of length at most $\frac{\pi}{2} \|x' - x''\|$, such that for any point $x$ on the path, $\|x - y\| \geq \|x' - y\|$.

This allows us to show the following estimate.

**Lemma 6.5.** For each $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, let $\varphi_y \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$. Let there be a constant $C_0 > 0$, independent of $x, y$, such that for all $x, y$, we have $\|\varphi_y(x)\| \leq C_0 \exp(\|x - y\|)$ and $\|\nabla \varphi_y(x)\| \leq C_0 \exp(\|x - y\|)$.

Let $0 \leq \nu < 1, h \in \{0, 1\}$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there is a constant $C$, depending only on $C_0, \nu, B_0, l$, such that for any pairwise distinct $x', x'', y \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\frac{\|\varphi_y(x') \nabla^h b t_1(x', y) - \varphi_y(x'') \nabla^h b t_1(x'', y)\|}{\|x' - x''\|^{1 + \nu}} \leq C \left(1 + \|x'\| + \|x''\|\right)^{\frac{\nu}{2}} \max_{x \in \{x', x''\}} \left( b \nabla^h b (x, y) \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{9} \|x - y\|^2 \right) \right).$$

The expression $\nabla^h_x$ refers to $\nabla_x$, if $h = 1$ and the identity otherwise.

**Proof.** We can bound the left-hand side either with the triangle inequality or with the gradient theorem. We will need both and begin with the second one.

We can write the difference as a path integral of the gradient along a path $\Gamma$ as described in Fact 6.3. Hence, we begin with estimating the gradient. We use Lemma 5.3 for $j = 0, 1, 2$ and the upper bounds for $\varphi_y$. The $A_0$ in Lemma 5.3 is moved to the other side. The dependency on $h$ is bounded against the worst case after the first upper bound. Hence,

$$\frac{\|\nabla \varphi_y(x) \nabla^h_b t_1(x, y)\|}{\|x' - x''\|^{1 + \nu}} \leq \sum_{j \in \{0, 1, 2\}} C_0 \left(1 + \|x\|^j \right) \exp(\|x - y\|) C \left( b (x, y) \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} \|x - y\|^2 \right) \right)$$
\[ C(1 + ||x||^2) \exp \left( \frac{B_0}{8} ||x - y||^2 \right) \]

W.l.o.g. we assume that \( ||x' - y|| \leq ||x'' - y|| \). Along the path \( \Gamma \), the second half of the upper bound for the gradient maximizes at \((x', y)\). For any \( x \) on the path \( \Gamma \), \( ||x|| \leq C(||x'|| + ||x''||) \). Bounding the path integral by the supremum times the path length, we get

\[ \frac{\|\varphi_y(x')\nabla^b_h t_l(x', y) - \varphi_y(x'')\nabla^b_h t_l(x'', y)\|}{(1 + ||x'|| + ||x''||)^2} \]

\[ \leq C \left( b_3(x', y) + \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{9} ||x' - y||^2 \right) \right) \frac{\pi}{2} ||x' - x''|| \]

\[ \leq C ||x' - x''|| \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\|x' - y\|^{-1} & \text{if } ||x' - y|| \leq 1/\sqrt{B_0}, \\
\exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{9} ||x' - y||^2 \right) & \text{if } ||x' - y|| > 1/\sqrt{B_0}.
\end{array} \right. \]

The constant \( C \) depends on \( C_0, B_0, t, l \).

Now we use the triangle inequality to bound the difference. Then we use Lemma 5.3 the upper bound for \( \varphi \) and, that \( ||x' - y|| \leq ||x'' - y|| \). We also use, that \( b_0 \leq Cb_1 \). The denominator on the left-hand side appears, if we have \( h = 1 \), as we move \( A_0 \) to the other side in Lemma 5.3. We square it for convenience. Hence, we get

\[ \frac{\|\varphi_y(x')\nabla^b_h t_l(x', y) - \varphi_y(x'')\nabla^b_h t_l(x'', y)\|}{(1 + ||x'|| + ||x''||)^2} \leq \sum_{x \in \{x', x''\}} C_0 \exp \left( ||x - y|| \right) C \left( b_1(x, y) + \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{8} ||x - y||^2 \right) \right) \]

\[ \leq C \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\|x' - y\|^{-1} & \text{if } ||x' - y|| \leq 1/\sqrt{B_0}, \\
\exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{9} ||x' - y||^2 \right) & \text{if } ||x' - y|| > 1/\sqrt{B_0}.
\end{array} \right. \]

Once again, the constant \( C \) depends on \( C_0, B_0, t, l \).

As we have these two upper bounds (6.57) and (6.60), we can use the fact \( \min(a, b) \leq a^{\frac{1}{1+\nu}} b^{\frac{\nu}{1+\nu}} \) for any \( a, b > 0 \). Hence, we know

\[ \frac{\|\varphi_y(x')\nabla^b_h t_l(x', y) - \varphi_y(x'')\nabla^b_h t_l(x'', y)\|}{(1 + ||x'|| + ||x''||)^2} \leq C ||x' - x''||^{1+\nu} \]

\[ \leq C ||x' - x''||^{1+\nu} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\|x' - y\|^{-\frac{\nu}{1+\nu}} & \text{if } ||x' - y|| \leq 1/\sqrt{B_0}, \\
\exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{9} ||x' - y||^2 \right) & \text{if } ||x' - y|| > 1/\sqrt{B_0}.
\end{array} \right. \]

\[ \leq C ||x' - x''||^{1+\nu} \left( b_{2+\nu}(x', y) + \exp \left( -\frac{B_0}{9} ||x' - y||^2 \right) \right). \]

The constant \( C \) depends only on \( C_0, B_0, t, l, \nu \). If we divide both sides by \( ||x' - x''||^{1+\nu} \), multiply by \( (1 + ||x'|| + ||x''||)^2 \) and write the maximum over \( x', x'' \) on the right-hand side, we get the desired result. It is a maximum over \( x', x'' \), as we assumed that \( ||x' - y|| \leq ||x'' - y|| \).

We can now finally present the proof of Theorem 4.7.

Proof of Theorem 4.7. We begin by conjugating with the unitary operator \( U_{x_0} : L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \), as defined in Lemma A.1. Hence, we have\(^4\)

\[ \left\| 1_{[0,1]^2+x_0}(T_l H_{\epsilon})^m P_l(H_{\epsilon} T_l)k^{-m}1_{D^b_{x_0}(0)} \right\|_p = \left\| 1_{[0,1]^2}(T_l H_{\epsilon,x_0})^m P_l(H_{\epsilon,x_0} T_l)k^{-m}1_{D^b_{x_0}(0)} \right\|_p. \]
For $x \in [0,1]^2$, $z \in D^2(0)$ we define
\[
\theta_0(x, z) := \text{ker}(T_l (H_\varepsilon x_0))^{m-1} P_l (H_{\varepsilon x_0} T_l)^{k-m}(x, z).
\] (6.65)

We choose $0 < \nu < 1$, such that $p > \frac{2}{\gamma + \nu + 1}$. We want to use Proposition 4.6 and the remark below it. Hence, we have
\[
N(\gamma, \nu, (T_l H_\varepsilon x_0))^{m} P_l (H_{\varepsilon x_0} T_l)^{k-m}(x, z)\]
\[
= \int_{D^2(0)} dz \int_{[0,1]^2} dx' \int_{[0,1]^2} dx'' \frac{\|\nabla_x^\nu \theta_0(x', z) - \nabla_x^\nu \theta_0(x'', z)\|^2}{\|x' - x''\|^{2+2\nu}}
\] (6.66)
\[
+ \int_{D^2(0)} dz \int_{[0,1]^2} dx \|\theta_0(x, z)\|^2.
\] (6.67)

The second summand can be bounded easily. We use Theorem 6.3 noting $\alpha_1 = 2m, \alpha_2 \geq k \varepsilon$, to bound $\theta_0$. Hence,
\[
\int_{D^2(0)} dz \int_{[0,1]^2} dx \|\theta_0(x, z)\|^2 \leq C \int_{D^2(0)} dz \int_{[0,1]^2} dx \frac{\exp(-2\lambda \|x - z\|^2)}{1 + \|x + x_0\|^k \varepsilon^2} \leq C \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda R^2}{1 + \|x_0\|^k \varepsilon^2}\right).
\] (6.69)

In the last step we used Lemma A.5. The constant $C$ depends on $B_0, l, k$ and $m$.

We will now assume $m > 0$. The case $m = 0$ is the easier special case. We define
\[
\theta_2(y, z) := \text{ker} [(T_l H_\varepsilon x_0)^{m-1} P_l (H_{\varepsilon x_0} T_l)^{k-m}](y, z).
\] (6.71)

We can now write
\[
\nabla_x^\nu \theta_0(x, z) = \nabla_x^\nu \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} t_1(x, y) (W_\varepsilon(y + x_0) + 2A_\varepsilon(y + x_0) \cdot (-i\nabla_y - A_0(y))) \theta_2(y, z) dy.
\] (6.72)

The differential is resolved by the product rule. We will now deal with a single component of this element of $\mathbb{C}^2$. We assume without loss of generality, that we differentiate at least once in the direction corresponding to $\partial_1$. Let $m_1 + m_2 = \gamma - 1$ be natural numbers. Any component corresponding to $m_1 + 1$ times $\nabla_1$ and $m_2$ times $\nabla_2$ has the form
\[
\partial_1^{m_1+1} \partial_2^{m_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} t_1(x, y) H_\varepsilon(y + x_0) \theta_2(y, z) dy.
\] (6.73)

We know, that $A_\varepsilon, W_\varepsilon \in C_C^{-1}$ by the assumptions on $B_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon$ and $\theta_2(\cdot, z) \in W^{\gamma, 3}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by Theorem 6.3. Hence, we can apply Lemma 6.3 with the pair $(m_1, m_2)$. Hence, we have
\[
\text{Lemma 6.3 } \partial_1^{m_1+1} \partial_2^{m_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} t_1(x, y) H_\varepsilon(y + x_0) \theta_2(y, z) dy.\] (6.74)

As the second factor is in $L^3(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and the differential of the first term is in $L^{1,3}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we can exchange integration and differentiation by dominated convergence. Hence, we finally have
\[
\text{Lemma 6.3 } \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{k_1 \leq m_1, k_2 \leq m_2} \partial_{x_1} (s_{k_1 k_2 m_1 m_2} (x - y) t_1(x, y) \partial_{y_1}^{k_1} \partial_{y_2}^{k_2} (H_{\varepsilon x_0} \theta_2(\cdot, z))(y) dy.\] (6.75)

We define $\varphi_{y k_1} k_2$ as the unique polynomials in $x - y$, such that
\[
\partial_{x_1} (s_{k_1 k_2 m_1 m_2} (x - y) t_1(x, y)) = \varphi_{y k_1} k_2(x) t_1(x, y) + \varphi_{y k_1} k_2(x) \partial_{x_1} t_1(x, y).
\] (6.76)

As they are polynomials, they are exponentially bounded and admissible for Lemma 6.5. In the last few steps, we have established the identity
\[
\partial_{x_1}^{m_1+1} \partial_{x_2}^{m_2} \theta_0(x, z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{k_1 \leq m_1, k_2 \leq m_2} \sum_{h=0}^{1} \varphi_{y k_1 k_2} (x) \partial_{x_1}^{k_1} t_1(x, y) \partial_{y_1}^{k_1} \partial_{y_2}^{k_2} (H_{\varepsilon x_0} \theta_2(\cdot, z))(y) dy.\] (6.77)
Now we bound the difference of this term at \( x = x' \) and \( x = x'' \),
\[
\left| \frac{\partial^{m+1}_x \partial^{m}_z \theta_0(x', z)}{\partial^{m}_x \theta_0(x'' , z)} \right| \leq \sum_{k_1 \leq m, k_2 \leq m_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{h=0}^1 \varphi_{y h k_1 k_2} (x') \frac{\partial^{h}_x t_1 (x', y)}{\partial^{h}_x t_1 (x'' , y)}
\]
\[
\times \frac{\partial^{k_1}_y \partial^{k_2}_z ((W_\varepsilon(y + x_0) + 2 A_\varepsilon(y + x_0) \cdot (-i \nabla_y - A_0(y))) \theta_2 (y, z)) dy}{\partial^{k_1}_y \partial^{k_2}_z (W_\varepsilon(y + x_0) + 2 A_\varepsilon(y + x_0) \cdot (-i \nabla_y - A_0(y))) \theta_2 (y, z)) dy}
\]
\[
\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d y \left\{ \frac{\max_{x \in \{x', x''\}} (b_{\frac{k_1}{k_2}} (x, y) + \exp (-\frac{B_\varepsilon}{2} \|x - y\|^2)) (1 + \|y\|^\alpha \exp (-\frac{\lambda}{2} \|y - z\|^2)}{\|x' - x''\|^{1+\nu}} \right\}
\]
\[
\leq C \max_{x \in \{x', x''\}} (1 + \|x\|)^\alpha \exp (-\lambda \|x - z\|^2)
\]
\[
\leq C \exp (-\frac{\lambda}{2} \|y - z\|^2)
\]
(6.83)

In the second step we pulled the absolute value inside, used \( \text{Lemma 6.5} \) on the first term, used that \( A_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon \) are \((\gamma, C_\varepsilon)\) tame to bound the first \( \gamma \) differentials of \( A_\varepsilon \) and \( W_\varepsilon \) and used \( \text{Theorem 6.3} \) to bound the first \( \gamma \) differentials of the integral kernel \( \theta_2 \). As the resulting upper bound is independent of \( h, k_1, k_2 \), the sums can be absorbed in the constant \( C \).

Then we used \( \text{Lemma 6.4} \) in the third step. We also used, that \( x', x'' \in [0, 1]^2 \) to get the second factor in the denominator independent of \( x', x'' \). The constant \( C \) depends on \( B_0, l, m, k, \gamma, \nu, C_\varepsilon, \varepsilon \) but not on \( x_0, x', x'', z \). In the last step, we used \( x', x'' \in [0, 1]^2 \) and \( \text{Lemma A.5} \).

We will now switch to the case \( m = 0 \).

We want to bound the integrand in (6.67). The first step is to write the difference as the path integral of the gradient, where the path is chosen as in \( \text{Fact 6.4} \). Then we bound this by the supremum times the path length. Hence, we get
\[
\left\| \nabla_x^{(\gamma)} \theta_0 (x', z) - \nabla_x^{(\gamma)} \theta_0 (x'', z) \right\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \max_{x \in \text{im}(\Gamma)} \left\| \nabla_x^{(\gamma+1)} \theta_0 (x, z) \right\|.
\]
(6.84)

We apply \( \text{Theorem 6.3} \) to all components of the right-hand side. As \( m = 0 \), we can apply this without requiring differentiability of \( A_\varepsilon, V_\varepsilon \). We get \( \alpha_1 = \gamma + 1 \) and \( \alpha_2 = k \varepsilon \). Thus, we have
\[
\left\| \nabla_x^{\gamma_1} \theta_0 (x', z) - \nabla_x^{\gamma_1} \theta_0 (x'', z) \right\| \leq \frac{C \max_{x \in \text{im}(\Gamma)} \left\| \nabla_x^{(\gamma+1)} \theta_0 (x, z) \right\|}{\|x' - x''\|^{1+\nu}}
\]
(6.85)

\[
\leq \frac{C \max_{x \in \text{im}(\Gamma)} \left\{ (1 + \|x\|)^\gamma \exp (-\lambda \|x - z\|^2) \right\}}{\|x' - x''\|^{1+\nu}}
\]
(6.86)

\[
\leq \frac{C \exp (-\frac{\lambda}{2} \|y - z\|^2)}{\|x' - x''\|^{1+\nu}}
\]
(6.87)

\[
\leq \left( \frac{1}{x' - x''} \right)^{1+\nu} (1 + \|x_0\|)^{k \varepsilon}
\]
(6.88)

for some \( C, \lambda > 0 \). In the last step, we used \( x', x'' \in [0, 1]^2 \) and hence \( \text{im}(\Gamma) \subset [-2, 3]^2 \), \( \text{Lemma A.5} \) and \( \nu \leq \frac{1}{k \varepsilon} \). This is essentially the same upper bound, as we have for the case \( m > 0 \) in (6.83).

Now we can finally estimate the main term in \( \mathcal{N} \) for general \( m \).

We can resolve the integral over \( x'' \) in (6.67), as \( 2 \times \frac{1+\nu}{1+\nu} < 2 \). The integral over \( x' \) is then an integral over a bounded function. The final step is \( \text{Lemma A.5} \). Hence, we get
\[
\int_{\mathcal{D}_n^{(0)}} d z \int_{[0, 1]^2} d x' \int_{[0, 1]^2} d x'' \left\| \nabla_x^{\gamma_1} \left( \theta_0 (x', z) - \nabla_x^{\gamma_1} \theta_0 (x'' , z) \right) \right\|^2
\]
(6.89)
Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then there is a unitary operator $U_{x_0} : L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, such that the following identities hold for any $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$:

\[ U_{x_0} f(\mathbf{X}) U_{x_0}^{-1} = f(\mathbf{X} + x_0), \]

\[ U_{x_0} ( -i \nabla - A_0 ) U_{x_0}^{-1} = ( -i \nabla - A_0 ), \]

\[ U_{x_0} H_x U_{x_0}^{-1} = H_x, \]

\[ U_{x_0} T_i U_{x_0}^{-1} = T_i. \]

Here, $\mathbf{X}$ refers to the multiplication operator with the identity on $\mathbb{R}^2$ and $f(\mathbf{X})$ is defined by functional calculus and hence the multiplication operator with the function $f$.

**Proof.** In this proof $\psi$ will always refer to a $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ function, that we regard as the test function for our densely defined operators. For any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we define the three unitary operators $U_{x_01}, U_{x_02}, U_{x_0}$ by

\[ U_{x_01}(x) := \psi(x + x_0), \]

\[ U_{x_02}(x) := \psi(x) \exp \left( -\frac{i B_0}{2} \langle x | J x_0 \rangle \right), \]

\[ U_{x_0} := U_{x_01} U_{x_02}. \]

We conjugate our operator with the unitary operator $U_{x_0}$. This does not change the Schatten norm. We have

\[ U_{x_01} U_{x_02} f(\mathbf{x}) U_{x_02}^{-1} U_{x_01}^{-1} = U_{x_01} f(\mathbf{x}) U_{x_01}^{-1} = f(\mathbf{x} + x_0). \]

Now, we need to check how $(-i \nabla - B_0/2 J \mathbf{X})$ behaves under conjugation with $U_{x_0}$. Hence, we get

\[ U_{x_02} \left( -i \nabla - \frac{B_0}{2} J \mathbf{X} \right) U_{x_02}^{-1} U_{x_01} \psi(\mathbf{x}) \]

\[ = \exp \left( -\frac{i B_0}{2} \langle x | J x_0 \rangle \right) \left( -i \nabla \cdot \frac{B_0}{2} J \mathbf{X} \right) \exp \left( \frac{i B_0}{2} \langle x | J x_0 \rangle \right) \psi(x - x_0) \]

\[ = \left( -i \nabla \cdot \frac{B_0}{2} J \mathbf{X} \right) \psi(x - x_0) + \psi(x - x_0) \left( -i \nabla \cdot \frac{B_0}{2} J \mathbf{X} \right) \]

\[ = \left( U_{x_0}^{-1} \left( -i \nabla - \frac{B_0}{2} J \mathbf{X} \right) \psi \right)(\mathbf{x}). \]
In conclusion, we have
\[ U_{x_0} (-i \nabla - A_0) U_{x_0}^{-1} = (-i \nabla - A_0). \] (A.15)

This implies
\[ U_{x_0} T_1 U_{x_0}^{-1} = T_1. \] (A.16)

Together with (A.9), this implies the identity
\[ U_{x_0} H \varepsilon U_{x_0}^{-1} = H_{\varepsilon, x_0}. \] (A.17)

This finishes the proof. \( \square \)

**Lemma A.2.** Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be measurable and let \( f : \Omega \to \mathbb{C} \) be integrable. Then we have the identity
\[ \int_{[0,1)^n} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^n, z+h_0 \in \Omega} f(z+h_0) dh_0 = \int_{\Omega} f(x) dx. \] (A.18)

**Proof.** We observe
\[ \int_{[0,1)^n} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^n, z+h_0 \in \Omega} f(z+h_0) dh_0 = \int_{[0,1)^n} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^n} 1_{\Omega}(z+h_0) f(z+h_0) dh_0 \]
\[ = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} 1_{\Omega}(x) f(x) dx \]
\[ = \int_{\Omega} f(x) dx. \] (A.19)

In the second step we used Fubini with \([0,1)^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n = \mathbb{R}^n\). \( \square \)

**Lemma A.3.** Let \( f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}) \) with \( f' \leq 0 \) and \( \lim_{t \to \infty} f(t) = 0 \), \( h \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}) \) and \( \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \) be measurable. Then we have
\[ \int_{\Lambda} f(h(x)) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} -f'(t) \{ x \in \Lambda \mid h(x) \leq t \} dt. \] (A.20)

As both integrands are positive, we do not need to require the existence of the integral, both sides being \( \infty \) is an option.

**Proof.** We use the fundamental theorem of calculus and Fubini. As everything is positive, we can apply both theorems. Thus,
\[ \int_{\Lambda} f(h(x)) dx = \int_{\Lambda} dx \int_{h(x)}^\infty (-f'(t)) dt \]
\[ = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt 1_{\Lambda}(x) 1_{(h(x), \infty)}(t)(-f'(t)) \]
\[ = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx 1_{\Lambda}(x) 1_{(h(x), \infty)}(t)(-f'(t)) \]
\[ = \int_{\mathbb{R}} -f'(t) \{ x \in \Lambda \mid h(x) \leq t \} dt. \] (A.21)

**Lemma A.4.** Let \( \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \) be a bounded Lipschitz region. Then there is a constant \( C > 0 \), such that for any \( r > 0 \)
\[ \{ x \in \Lambda \mid \text{dist}(x, \Lambda^c) \leq r \} \leq Cr, \] (A.22)
\[ \{ x \in \Lambda^c \mid \text{dist}(x, \Lambda) \leq r \} \leq C(r + r^2). \] (A.23)

In both cases, for small \( r \) we have an approximately linear dependency. In the first case, it is bounded by \( |\Lambda| < \infty \) and in the second case it is contained in a ball of radius \( r + r_0 \), which explains the \( r^2 \) term.
Lemma A.5. Let $R, \lambda > 0$ be real numbers and $x_0, x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|x - x_0\| \leq R$. Then we have
\[
\exp(-\lambda \|x\|^2) \leq e^{\lambda R^2} \exp(-\frac{\lambda}{2} \|x_0\|^2), \tag{A.28}
\]
\[
\int_{D_R^2(0)} \exp(-\lambda \|x'\|^2)dx' = \frac{\pi}{\lambda} \exp(-\lambda R^2). \tag{A.29}
\]
For $\|x_0\| \leq R$, the estimate is trivial. Otherwise, the proof follows by taking the ln, dividing by $\lambda$ and then completing the square.

Lemma A.6. For every $t \in (0, 1)$, let $K_t : L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \to L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be an operator with a nice integral kernel $k_t : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$, as defined in Definition 2.2. Assume, that for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the function $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{C} : (t, y) \mapsto k_t(x, y)$ is integrable, its integral is bounded independently of $x$, and the same holds for $x$ and $y$ reversed. Then we have
\[
\text{iker} \left( \int_0^1 K_t dt \right) (x, y) = \int_0^1 k_t(x, y)dt. \tag{A.30}
\]
Proof. The integral $\int_0^1 K_t dt$ exists as a Bochner integral with respect to the operator norm from $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by the integrability assumptions on the kernel. Let $f \in C_0^0(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have
\[
\left( \left( \int_0^1 K_t dt \right) f \right) (x) = \left( \int_0^1 K_t f dt \right) (x) = \int_0^1 \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} k_t(x, y)f(y)dy \right) dt \tag{A.31}
\]
\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left( \int_0^1 k_t(x, y)dt \right) f(y)dy. \tag{A.32}
\]
The first step holds, as the Bochner integral commutes with the (linear, bounded) evaluation operator. The second step is the definition of $k_t$ and the last step is Fubini, as $f$ is bounded and we assumed $k_t(x, \cdot)$ to be integrable for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. The same holds, if $x$ and $y$ are reversed, hence this is a nice integral kernel again. □

Appendix B.

Proof of Lemma 3.3. We define
\[
A_\epsilon(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{Jy}{2\pi \|y\|^2} B_\epsilon(x - y)dy. \tag{B.1}
\]
The last property will be seen by bounding this integral. $C_\epsilon$ will be a constant depending only on $\epsilon$, that may change from line to line. To begin with we have the bound
\[
\|A_\epsilon(x)\| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{\|y\| \left( 1 + \|y - x\| \right)^{1+\epsilon}}dy \tag{B.2}
\]
\[
\leq \int_{D_2 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{\|y\| \left( 1 + \|y - x\| \right)^{1+\epsilon}}dy \tag{B.3}
\]
\[
+ \int_{D_2^\epsilon \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{\|y\| \left( 1 + \|y - x\| \right)^{1+\epsilon}}dy \tag{B.4}
\]
\[
\leq \int_{D_2(0)} \frac{C_\epsilon}{\|y\| \left( \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} + \|y - x\| \right)^{1+\epsilon}}|x|^{2-1-1-\epsilon}dy \tag{B.5}
\]
\[
+ \int_{D_2^\epsilon(0)} \frac{C_\epsilon}{\|y\| \left( 1 + \|y/2\| \right)^{1+\epsilon}}dy \tag{B.6}
\]
\[
\leq \min \{C_\epsilon C_d \|x\|^{-\epsilon}, C_\epsilon C_d \|x\|^\epsilon \} \tag{B.7}
\]
\( + C_c d \max \{ \| x \|, 1 \}^{-\epsilon} + C_c d 1_{D_1(0)}(x) \) \quad (B.8)

\[
\leq \frac{C_c d}{(1 + \| x \|)^\epsilon}.
\]  

(B.9)

In the second to last step, we got the first minimum by ignoring either of the summands in the denominator of the bounded domain integral and for the second part we just did a different bound on the annulus from \( \| x \| \) to 1, if \( \| x \| < 1 \).

For the first two properties, we use the Fourier transform,

\[
\mathcal{F}(f)(\xi) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x) \exp(-ix \cdot \xi) dx, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2
\]

for any \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( f \in L^1 \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^n) \). It can be expanded to tempered distributions and has the following properties for any \( \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 \):

\[
\mathcal{F}(\cdot f(\cdot))(\xi) = i\nabla \mathcal{F}(f)(\xi),
\]  

(B.11)

\[
\mathcal{F}(\nabla f(\cdot))(\xi) = -i\xi \mathcal{F}(f)(\xi),
\]  

(B.12)

\[
\mathcal{F}(1)(\xi) = 2\pi \delta_0(\xi),
\]  

(B.13)

\[
\mathcal{F}(f * g)(\xi) = 2\pi \mathcal{F}(f)(\xi) \mathcal{F}(g)(\xi).
\]  

(B.14)

Here \( \delta_0 \) refers to the \( \delta \)-distribution at 0. Furthermore, the Fourier transform is linear and invertible.

As \( A_\epsilon \) and \( B_\epsilon \) are bounded, they are both tempered distributions. Now we can apply the Fourier transform to our first two claimed equations and are left to show

\[
-2\pi i J \xi \cdot \mathcal{F} \left( \frac{J}{2\pi \| \cdot \|^2} \right) (\xi) \mathcal{F}(B_\epsilon)(\xi) = \mathcal{F}(B_\epsilon)(\xi),
\]  

(B.15)

\[
-2\pi i \xi \cdot \mathcal{F} \left( \frac{J}{2\pi \| \cdot \|^2} \right) (\xi) \mathcal{F}(B_\epsilon)(\xi) = 0.
\]  

(B.16)

Basically, this equation does not depend on \( B_\epsilon \). Now we have to compute the Fourier transform of \( \frac{J}{2\pi \| \cdot \|^2} \),

\[
\mathcal{F} \left( \frac{J}{2\pi \| \cdot \|^2} \right) (\xi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( Ji\nabla (-\Delta)^{-1} \mathcal{F}(1) \right)(\xi)
\]

\[
= iJ \nabla (-\Delta)^{-1} \delta_0(\xi)
\]

\[
= iJ \nabla \frac{1}{2\pi} \ln(\| \xi \|)
\]

\[
= iJ \frac{\xi}{2\pi \| \xi \|^2}.
\]  

(B.20)

Hence, we have

\[
-2\pi i J \xi \cdot \mathcal{F} \left( \frac{J}{2\pi \| \cdot \|^2} \right) (\xi) = -2\pi i J \xi \cdot iJ \frac{\xi}{2\pi \| \xi \|^2} = 1,
\]  

(B.21)

\[
-2\pi i \xi \cdot \mathcal{F} \left( \frac{J}{2\pi \| \cdot \|^2} \right) (\xi) = -2\pi i \xi \cdot iJ \frac{\xi}{2\pi \| \xi \|^2} = 0.
\]  

(B.22)

This finishes the proof.  

\[ \square \]
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