

LONG TIME BEHAVIOR OF THE HALF-WAVE TRACE AND WEYL REMAINDERS

ETHAN SUSSMAN

ABSTRACT. Given a compact Riemannian manifold (M, g) , Chazarain, Hörmander, Duistermaat, and Guillemin study the half-wave trace $\text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau) \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_\tau)$. From the regularity of the half-wave trace near $\tau = 0$, Hörmander deduces the standard remainder $O(\sigma^{d-1}) = O(\lambda^{d/2-1/2})$ in Weyl’s law, where $d = \dim M$. From the assumption of global qualitative regularity, Duistermaat and Guillemin improve this to $o(\sigma^{d-1})$. We show – using a modification of Newman’s proof of Ingham’s Tauberian theorem – that even fairly bad Sobolev bounds on $\text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau)$ yield further improved error terms. In particular, if the $(d-1)$ -fold regularized half-wave trace

$$\langle D_\tau \rangle^{1-d} \text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau)$$

is in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$ (in particular ruling out the case of Zoll manifolds) (per Duistermaat-Guillemin, this holds “generically” for $d \geq 3$) and if $\|\langle D_\tau \rangle^{1-d} \text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau)\|_{L^{1,1}[-T,+T] \setminus (-1,+1)}$ grows at most as fast as a polynomial (of whatever degree) as $T \rightarrow \infty$, then Weyl’s law (possibly with subleading polynomial corrections to the leading order polynomial asymptotics) holds with an $O(\sigma^{d-1-\epsilon})$ remainder, for some specifiable $\epsilon > 0$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Primer on the Fourier-Laplace Transform	7
3. Newman’s Tauberian Argument	9
3.1. Estimates of the Errors	13
3.2. Contribution from the Origin	17
3.3. Conclusion	18
4. Estimating the Integrand	19
5. Application To Weyl’s Law	24
Acknowledgements	27
References	27

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we apply a modification of an argument originally used by Newman [New80] (to prove the prime number theorem) to the proof of Weyl-type laws, e.g. Weyl’s law [Wey11][Lev52][Ava56]

$$N(\lambda) = (2\pi)^{-d} \text{Vol}_g(M) \text{Vol}(\mathbb{B}^d) \lambda^{d/2} + O(\lambda^{d/2-1/2}), \quad (1)$$

Date: September 20th, 2021.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 11M45, 35P20, 42axx.

where the function $N : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, $N(\lambda) = \#\{n : \lambda_n \leq \lambda\}$ is the counting function of the eigenvalues $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots$ of the Laplace-Beltrami operator on a compact Riemannian manifold (M, g) . One goal of research following [Wey11] is to estimate, under appropriate geometric or analytic assumptions, the remainder $N(\lambda) - (2\pi)^{-d} \text{Vol}_g(M) \text{Vol}(\mathbb{B}^d) \lambda^{d/2}$. (For recent work in this vein, along with a more extensive bibliography, see [CG19][CG20].) The standard estimate, $O(\lambda^{d/2-1/2})$, as written in eq. (1), is sharp when (M, g) is a Zoll manifold (e.g. the d -sphere, \mathbb{S}^d), so any improvement will have to be specific to some particular class of manifolds under consideration. One method for estimating the remainder involves using a Tauberian theorem – e.g. the Ingham-Karamata theorem – for the Laplace transform in λ (which is related to the heat (kernel) trace); the most general version of this theorem yields only an $o(\lambda^{d/2})$ remainder in eq. (1), or perhaps a logarithmic improvement on top of that. This argument can be sharpened by an appeal to the analyticity of the Fourier-Laplace transform of the eigenvalue counting function in the right half of the complex plane. This yields remainders of the form $O(\lambda^{d/2-1/2+\epsilon})$ in eq. (1), for any $\epsilon > 0$ — still short of the now standard $O(\lambda^{d/2-1/2})$. Newman, in his elegant proof [New80][Kor82][Zag97][Kor04] of Ingham’s Tauberian theorem, assumed what translates into the case at hand as the continuity of the Fourier-Laplace transform of the function under consideration all the way up to and including the imaginary axis (sans the origin). (See the expositions by Zagier [Zag97] and Korevaar [Kor82][Kor04] for this perspective, which differs slightly from Newman’s.) Continuity is one form of regularity, and so one takeaway from the argument is that a Tauberian argument for the Fourier-Laplace transform can be strengthened by an appeal to the regularity of the Fourier transform of the function under consideration, assuming the Fourier transform is indeed regular. The analogous assumption, applied to a suitable regularization of the half-wave (kernel) trace $\text{HWT}_{(M,g)}(\tau) \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_\tau)$ rather than the heat (kernel) trace, yields an $o(\lambda^{d/2-1/2})$ remainder in eq. (1), and therefore cannot hold for an arbitrary manifold, in particular not for Zoll manifolds.

In a series of papers, Hörmander [Hör68] (inspired by [Lev52][Ava56]), Chazarain [Cha74], and Duistermaat & Guillemin [DG75] established the precise regularity of the half-wave trace (the geometric assumptions are all spelled out there) along the whole axis. In particular, Duistermaat & Guillemin show that, under an appropriate genericity assumption (to rule out spheres, or Zoll manifolds more generally), the half-wave trace has singularities of a particular order, what ends up being enough *local* regularity to carry through the version of Newman’s argument outlined above. This yields a generic improvement of eq. (1) where the remainder is smaller than that in eq. (1) by an $o(1)$ amount, as originally shown using a different argument in [DG75]. When supplemented with the plausible assumption that the regularized half-wave trace grows at most polynomially as measured in an appropriate Sobolev space (a Sobolev space in which the half-wave trace of a Zoll manifold cannot locally lie), this argument – modified in a few key places – yields a remainder term in Weyl’s law which is better than the standard remainder by a polynomial amount:

$$\begin{aligned} N(\lambda) &= (2\pi)^{-d} \text{Vol}_g(M) \text{Vol}(\mathbb{B}^d) \lambda^{d/2} + O(\lambda^{d/2-1/2-\epsilon/2}) & (2) \\ &= (2\pi)^{-d} \text{Vol}_g(M) \text{Vol}(\mathbb{B}^d) \sigma^d + O(\sigma^{d-1-\epsilon}) & (3) \end{aligned}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$ which can be specified in terms of the regularity level and growth rate of the half-wave trace. (Going forward, we will work with $\sigma = \lambda^{1/2}$, following the notational conventions of [DG75].) The quantitative control of the Sobolev regularity of the half-wave trace – which goes beyond the mostly qualitative control established by Duistermaat and Guillemin – is necessary to get the polynomial improvement in eq. (3). We will focus on polynomial improvements to eq. (1), but analogous arguments show that exponential control of the half-wave trace leads to logarithmic improvements. The goal of this paper is to carry through the argument leading to eq. (3), leaving

aside the question of what geometric hypotheses guarantee that our analytic hypotheses are satisfied and leaving aside the further question of the genericity of whatever geometric assumptions those might be. Individual examples of Riemannian manifolds satisfying our assumptions certainly exist: when (M, g) is a flat torus, the half-wave trace will grow at most polynomially (and this has been checked in low dimensions), so the argument is guaranteed to yield a polynomial improvement to eq. (1) and therefore a nontrivial improvement to the trivial estimate of the remainder in the Gauss d -sphere problem. We leave this and other potential applications to another paper; it suffices for now to note that the hypotheses of our main theorem are actually satisfiable, and (Theorem 1.2) that the Tauberian argument below yields a nontrivial polynomial improvement on the standard remainder in Weyl's law for each such case.

Now, despite the fact that most of our work will be in proving an appropriate Tauberian theorem into which to input assumptions regarding the half-wave trace, we would like to emphasize how our main results fit in with the results of [DG75]. If [Hör68] demonstrated how to conclude the standard remainder in Weyl's law from the behavior of the half-wave trace in a neighborhood of the origin, [DG75] demonstrated how to deduce an $o(1)$ improvement from the qualitative behavior of the half-wave trace for positive time. We demonstrate here how, via one particular argument, quantitative control of the half-wave trace for positive time yields further improvements, and even polynomial improvements under some plausible hypotheses. We now outline the main argument, with the details presented in full in a later section.

Applied to the Laplace transform, the idea is as follows: given a nondecreasing (typically piecewise-constant) function $N(\sigma) \in \langle \sigma \rangle^J L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\neq 0})$, for some $J \in \mathbb{R}$, and given an ansatz $Z(\sigma) \in \langle \sigma \rangle^J L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\neq 0})$ (typically a polynomial) for N , attempt to determine the asymptotics of the improper integral

$$A_\Sigma = \int_0^\Sigma \frac{1}{\langle \sigma \rangle^K} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma)) d\sigma \quad (4)$$

as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$, for appropriate $K \in \mathbb{R}$. (Here $\langle \sigma \rangle = (1 + \sigma^2)^{1/2}$ is the ‘‘Japanese bracket.’’) If $Z(\sigma)$ is a good polynomial ansatz (and the Fourier transform of the integrand is sufficiently regular around zero), then the integrand should be oscillating, and the integral of an oscillating function is typically smaller than we would expect via computing an L^1 -norm. Consequently, in order to understand the $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$ asymptotics of A_Σ , we should expect to have to understand the amplitude of these oscillations, e.g. via the Fourier transform. (For convenience, we can if we want take $Z(\sigma)$ to be equal to $N(\sigma)$ in some neighborhood of the origin $\sigma = 0$, and then we can replace the weight $\langle \sigma \rangle^{-K}$ in eq. (4) by σ^{-K} . Since changing Z on a compact set changes the large Σ asymptotics of A_Σ in a trivial way, this alteration is immaterial below.) In the applications at hand, $J \in \mathbb{N}$, with the general case introducing only notational complications, and we take $Z(\sigma) \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma]$ to be a polynomial of degree J outside possibly of some large neighborhood around the origin. When estimating the remainder in Weyl's law, $Z(\sigma)$ can be taken to be smooth for positive σ , so

$$Z(\sigma) = \Theta(\sigma)Z_0(\sigma) + E(\sigma) \quad (5)$$

for $Z_0 \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma]$, $E \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Here $\Theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is the Heaviside step function, $\Theta(\sigma) = (1 + \text{sign } \sigma)/2$. In this case, for all $K \geq J$ sufficiently large, A_Σ will converge as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$, at some polynomial rate which can be estimated. (And E can be chosen so as to make $\lim_{\Sigma \rightarrow \infty} A_\Sigma = 0$, if so desired.) Since this simplest case suffices to illustrate the idea of our argument, suppose that K is in fact sufficiently large, leaving aside for the moment the question of what precisely this means (which will, of course, depend on the specifics). Since N is nondecreasing, if for some $\sigma_0 > 0$ the quantity $N(\sigma_0)$ differs too much from its leading order asymptotic, as captured by the ansatz $Z(\sigma_0)$,

then the integrand above will be comparably large over an interval of polynomial length; this will result in a relatively large contribution to the tail of the improper integral (4). If this event were to occur for infinitely many, arbitrarily large σ_0 , then this sets a bound for the rate of convergence of A_Σ as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$. If this bound contradicts the known rate of convergence, then we can conclude that the difference between $N(\sigma)$ and $Z(\sigma)$ is smaller than supposed, at least for sufficiently large σ .

The crux of the argument, then, is estimating A_Σ , to a sufficiently high degree of accuracy, where the meaning of the previous phrase will be determined by the results in §4. (If we were only to use the $\langle \sigma \rangle^J L^\infty$ -bounds of $N(\sigma), Z(\sigma)$ without any additional input, we could – of course – not reach a nontrivial conclusion going through the reasoning above. As we will see, we will need both a stronger *a priori* hypothesis – what is typically referred to as a “Tauberian hypothesis” – and control over the Fourier transform.) In Newman’s Tauberian approach, this is done by comparing A_Σ with

$$A_\Sigma(t) = \int_0^\Sigma \frac{e^{-\sigma t}}{\langle \sigma \rangle^K} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma)) d\sigma, \quad A(t) = \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-\sigma t}}{\langle \sigma \rangle^K} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma)) d\sigma, \quad (6)$$

defined initially for $t > 0$. As $t \rightarrow 0^+$ for fixed $\Sigma > 0$, $A_\Sigma(t) \rightarrow A_\Sigma$ (indeed, $A_\Sigma(t)$ is entire in t), and as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$ for fixed $t > 0$, $A_\Sigma(t) \rightarrow A(t)$. So, by taking $t \rightarrow 0^+$ and $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$ together at some appropriate relative rate, and by estimating the closeness of $A_\Sigma(t), A(t), A_\Sigma$, we can estimate A_Σ . If Z is chosen correctly, then $A(t)$ (in the applications at hand) will actually be continuous all the way down to $t = 0$, so it makes sense to first take $t \rightarrow 0^+$ and then take $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$. Estimating the closeness of $A_\Sigma(0)$ and $A(0)$ is accomplished by means of a complex analytic argument whose input is the regularity of the Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}\alpha$ of

$$\alpha(\sigma) = \begin{cases} \langle \sigma \rangle^{-K} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma)) & (\sigma > 0) \\ 0 & (\sigma \leq 0) \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

in the interval $[-T, +T]$, for each $T > 0$. We will mainly take $K = d - 1$, but modifications of the arguments below can deal with other K . Indeed, $A(t)$ is the Laplace transform of $\langle \sigma \rangle^{-K} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma))$, evaluated at t . (It is also sometimes convenient to add to α a Schwartz function supported in \mathbb{R}^+ , and the discussion below carries over.) Hence, $A(t)$ analytically continues to $t \in \mathbb{H}_R$, $\mathbb{H}_R \subset \mathbb{C}$ the right half of the complex plane. This is the Fourier-Laplace transform, and the Fourier transform is its distributional boundary value at the imaginary axis $i\mathbb{R}_\tau \subset \mathbb{C}_t$. Trivially, L^1 -based Sobolev regularity of $\mathcal{F}\alpha$ implies L^∞ -based decay of α – indeed, it implies even better decay by the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma – but Newman’s argument is stronger, precisely because it works even if $\mathcal{F}\alpha$ fails to decay. That is, it works even if $\mathcal{F}\alpha$ only has local L^1 -based Sobolev regularity, assuming that $\langle \tau \rangle^{-k} \mathcal{F}\alpha(\tau)$ has global Sobolev regularity for some (possibly very large) $k \geq 0$. If a tempered distribution fails to decay, this might signal the irregularity of the distribution’s Fourier transform, but even if the half-wave trace has poor decay we already know that α is a function. This *a priori* input to the argument supplements the *a posteriori* control on the regularity of $\mathcal{F}\alpha$ in order to make up for the lack of control on the decay. Precisely, the argument works even when $\mathcal{F}\alpha$ fails to decay because it essentially estimates (when $A \in \tau L^1[-\epsilon, +\epsilon]_\tau$ for some $\epsilon > 0$) the closeness of the full Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}_{\tau \rightarrow \Sigma}^{-1}(\tau^{-1} A(i\tau))(\Sigma)$ and the partial Fourier transform

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-T}^{+T} e^{i\tau\Sigma} A(i\tau) \frac{d\tau}{\tau} \quad (8)$$

(“partial” referring to the cutting off of the integral to $[-T, +T]$) in terms of L^∞ -bounds on α . The integral (8) corresponds to one component of Newman’s contour integral, and the other components are bounded in terms of assumed L^∞ -bounds on α , while (8) is bounded in terms of the regularity of the half-wave trace. This is not completely correct, because a few factors of $(1 - \tau^2/T^2)$ are necessary in the integrand to smooth out the sharp cutoff $1_{[-T, +T]}(\tau)$, which otherwise would introduce terms which decay slowly in Σ . (Newman’s argument requires only a single factor of $(1 - \tau^2/T^2)$, whereas we typically need more.)

In the application to Weyl’s law, $a(\tau) = \mathcal{F}\alpha(\tau)$ is the half-wave trace, regularized depending on K , and weighted by $1/\tau$. By Chazarain [Cha74, §0], the singular support of a is the set $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{R}$ of lengths of all geodesic loops in (M, g) , including loops which consist of multiple laps around a basic loop. Generically, \mathcal{T} is a discrete set, and the half-wave trace $\text{HWT}_{(M, g)}(\tau)$ will be given by a Laurent series

$$\text{HWT}_{(M, g)}(\tau) = \sum_{s \in S} \frac{a_s}{(\tau - T - i0)^s} \text{ mod } C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\tau) \text{ near } T, \quad (9)$$

for $S(T) \subset \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup (1/2)\mathbb{Z}^+$ finite and T -dependent $\{a_s\}_{s \in S} \subset \mathbb{C}$, in some neighborhood of each $T \in \mathcal{T}$. The regularity of the half-wave trace therefore refers to

- (I) the size of the elements of S and $\{a_s\}_{s \in S}$ in eq. (9),
- (II) the “density” of \mathcal{T} (roughly speaking), and
- (III) the growth rate of the smooth remainder (and derivatives) in eq. (9) .

The size of the smooth remainder can be measured in the weighted L^1 -based Sobolev spaces $\langle \tau \rangle^\ell L^{1, N}(\mathbb{R}_\tau)$. For the sake of simplicity, we take $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

The fractional and negative order $L^{1+\varepsilon}$ -based Sobolev spaces also suffice for the analysis of the singular terms in eq. (9), as long as we do not mind losing an arbitrarily small (but polynomial) amount of sharpness. But, in actual applications it is likely easier to handle this contribution to the large Σ asymptotics of A_Σ directly. The case $T = 0$ is rather different from the case $T \neq 0$; the poles of a in the former case yield contributions to A_Σ that are one power of Σ larger than the poles in the latter case, for the same s . (So, the poles at $T = 0$ of the half-wave trace yield contributions to A_Σ that are two powers of Σ larger than the poles in the latter case.) This is because of the extra factor of $1/\tau$ in eq. (8). All of the off-origin poles together, however, might yield a total contribution which grows more rapidly than any individual’s contribution, and in this case the half-wave trace will have poor decay.

It is worth noting that we do not take into account any cancellations between the various contributions to $N(\Sigma)$ coming from the poles (9) for different $T \neq 0$. We simply control (or assume control of) the contribution from each individual pole and then apply the triangle inequality. So if such cancellations do occur, we do not take them into account. Such cancellations can be assumed in order to strengthen the conclusion of the Tauberian argument (assuming that the Tauberian hypothesis is sufficiently strong), but we do not do so here, even though we state the main theorems in §3, §4 in sufficient generality for this. When (M, g) is a flat torus, such cancellations do in fact seem to occur if we attempt to apply the argument to a (slightly smoothed out) version of $N(\Sigma)$ in place of A_Σ (the slight smoothing is necessary to apply the argument in §3), which is why the method here cannot match the best known results — see [IKN04] for these. In fact, we conjecture that the best one can do with this argument is rederive van der Corput’s result [Cor36] for ellipsoids. It is not known how typical such cancellations are, but it is almost certainly the case that the extent of cancellations in the rational toroidal case is an arithmetic anomaly. On the subject of fine control of exponential sums, we refer the reader to Huxley’s monograph [Hux96], which includes an extensive bibliography.

We record here special cases of the main theorems of this paper, differing from the main theorems presented in §3, §4 only in some secondary technical details which are not important for the most basic applications (like the result stated in the abstract). The first is a version of Ingham’s Tauberian theorem with remainder, which we state in the case when the function α under investigation is bounded and when the Fourier transform $a = \mathcal{F}\alpha$ is in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$. Item 1 is the Tauberian hypothesis of the theorem, and analogously Item 2 should be called the “Abelian conclusion.” The second theorem below is a refinement of Weyl’s law, contingent on the polynomial growth of the half-wave trace – which in this version of the theorem has been regularized a few times, simply because it allows us to avoid a discussion of negative order $L^{1+\epsilon}$ -based Sobolev spaces. Applications of this result typically lose an (arbitrarily) small amount of sharpness in the exponent, because we are measuring the poles $(\tau - T - i0)^{-j}$, $T \neq 0$, of the half-wave trace in L^1 -based Sobolev spaces, whereas they are most precisely measured in $\mathcal{F}\langle\sigma\rangle^{j-1}L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$. The arithmetic in Theorem 1.2 is simplest when $J = d - 1$, and so we state this case in Corollary 1.3 (and the abstract), although in applications of this result we will usually lose a half order of Sobolev regularity (because of our consideration only of integral order Sobolev regularity). This is an issue for manifolds which – while not Zoll – have nontrivial geodesic loops of the second-highest degeneracy possible.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $N : \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a piecewise continuous, nondecreasing function and that $Z(\sigma) \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma]$ is a polynomial in σ of degree L , and fix a $J \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\alpha(\sigma) = \langle\sigma\rangle^{-J}(N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma) + E(\sigma))$ for some $E \in C_c^\infty((0, \infty))$, and suppose that the singular support of $\mathcal{F}N$ and hence $a = \mathcal{F}\alpha$ is discrete. Suppose further that*

- (1) $\alpha \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$,
- (2) $a(\tau)$ is in $\tau\langle\tau\rangle^k L^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R}_\tau)$ for some integer $\ell \geq 0$ and real $k \geq 0$.

Then, $N(\sigma) = Z(\sigma) + O(\sigma^{J-\delta-\epsilon})$ as $\sigma \rightarrow \infty$, where $\epsilon = \ell/(2k + 2)$ and δ is defined by $\delta = (1/2)(J - L + 1)$. ■

(So, $\delta \geq 0$ if and only if $J \geq L - 1$. If $\delta \leq 0$, in order for this conclusion to be stronger than Item 2 we need ϵ to be sufficiently large.)

Theorem 1.2. *Fix $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Suppose that (M, g) is a compact Riemannian manifold such that $\langle D_\tau \rangle^{-J} \text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau)$ is in $L^{1,\ell}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$ for $J \geq d - 1$ and such that there exists some (M, g) -dependent $C > 0$ and some real number $k \geq 2$ such that*

$$\|\langle D_\tau \rangle^{-J} \text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau)\|_{L^{1,\ell}_{[+1,+T]}} \|\langle D_\tau \rangle^{-J} \text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau)\|_{L^{1,\ell}_{[-T,-1]}} \leq CT^k \quad (10)$$

for all $T \geq 1$. Then, for some polynomial $Z_0(\sigma)$ of degree at most $d - 2$,

$$N(\lambda) = (2\pi)^{-d} \text{Vol}_g(M) \text{Vol}(\mathbb{B}^d) \sigma^d + Z_0(\sigma) + O(\sigma^{\frac{J+d-1}{2}-\epsilon}) \quad (11)$$

for $\epsilon = \ell/(2k - 2)$. ■

Corollary 1.3. *Fix $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Suppose that (M, g) is a compact Riemannian manifold such that $\langle D_\tau \rangle^{1-d} \text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau)$ is in $L^{1,\ell}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$ and such that there exists some (M, g) -dependent $C > 0$ and some real number $k \geq 2$ such that*

$$\|\langle D_\tau \rangle^{1-d} \text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau)\|_{L^{1,\ell}_{[+1,+T]}} \|\langle D_\tau \rangle^{1-d} \text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau)\|_{L^{1,\ell}_{[-T,-1]}} \leq CT^k \quad (12)$$

for all $T \geq 1$. Then, for some polynomial $Z_0(\sigma)$ of degree at most $d - 2$,

$$N(\lambda) = (2\pi)^{-d} \text{Vol}_g(M) \text{Vol}(\mathbb{B}^d) \sigma^d + Z_0(\sigma) + O(\sigma^{d-1-\epsilon}) \quad (13)$$

for $\epsilon = \ell/(2k - 2)$. ■□

Of course, Z_0 can be computed in terms of the Laurent series of $\text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau)$ at $\tau = 0$, although we will not do so explicitly below.

In [DG75] are geometric conditions that guarantee that the $(d-1)$ -times regularized half-wave trace is in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$ for large ℓ , so that one of the two hypotheses of Corollary 1.3 is implied via geometric conditions. See Proposition 5.1, where this is spelled out. We can take $\ell = \lceil d - \delta/2 - 3/2 \rceil$, where $\delta \in \{0, \dots, 2d-1\}$ is the maximum degeneracy of nontrivial geodesic loops in (M, g) , assuming that the hypotheses of [DG75, Theorem 4.5] hold. This corollary is slightly lossy, due to our decision to work with integral L^1 -based Sobolev regularity (as opposed to fractional \mathcal{FL}^∞ -based Sobolev regularity), but this allows a somewhat streamlined presentation. Loosely speaking, $\delta = 1$ is generic, so Corollary 1.3 yields a polynomial improvement in Weyl's law, for generic manifolds for which the half-wave trace grows polynomially in the sense of eq. (12). (And it remains to be seen how generic such polynomial growth is, outside of the completely integrable case, but the results of this paper jibe well with the conjectures in [CG20].)

The subsequent sections of this paper are organized as follows:

- §2 is a primer on the Fourier-Laplace transform,
- §3 contains the bulk of the Tauberian argument for estimating the asymptotics of A_Σ , including a flexible and somewhat refined version (Theorem 3.7) of Ingham's theorem, with a polynomial estimate on the remainder,
- §4 contains the second step of the Tauberian argument, the extraction of weak asymptotics of $N(\Sigma)$ from the asymptotics of A_Σ via monotonicity, which together with the conclusion of the previous section finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1, and
- §5 contains the application to Weyl's law, including the proof of Theorem 1.2.

2. PRIMER ON THE FOURIER-LAPLACE TRANSFORM

Let $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}) \subset \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ denote the set of tempered distributions supported on the nonnegative real axis. That is, $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ is in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0})$ if and only if $u(\chi) = 0$ whenever $\text{supp } \chi \subset (-\infty, 0)$. In this section, we review the *Fourier-Laplace transform*, defined as a map $\mathcal{FL} : \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}) \rightarrow A(\mathbb{H}_\mathbb{R})$, where $A(\mathbb{H}_\mathbb{R})$ is the set of analytic functions on $\mathbb{H}_\mathbb{R} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Re z > 0\}$. (The Fourier-Laplace transform actually makes sense on distributions supported on translates of $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, as is clear from the discussion below, but we have no use for this level of generality, although this may be useful in other applications of Newman's argument.) Detailed presentations of the Laplace transform on tempered distributions can be found in a number of textbooks, e.g. [Dij13], so we will be brief, presenting only the results crucial to the rest of the paper.

The map is defined as follows. For any $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0})$ and $t \geq 0$, the product $\alpha_t(\sigma) = \exp(-t\sigma)\alpha(\sigma) \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0})$ is well-defined, and in fact if $t > 0$ we have $\alpha_t \in \cup_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \cap_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle \sigma \rangle^k \langle D \rangle^\ell L^2(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$, so the Fourier transform

$$\mathcal{F}\alpha_t(\tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-i\tau\sigma - t\sigma} \alpha(\sigma) \, d\sigma \in \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle \tau \rangle^\ell \langle D \rangle^k L^2(\mathbb{R}_\tau) \quad (14)$$

is well-defined, the integral above being formal if α is not a subexponential function (but typically a Lebesgue integral in the cases of interest). By the Sobolev embedding theorem, we deduce that $\mathcal{F}\alpha_t(\tau)$ is actually a smooth function of τ . Consequently, we can define a function $\mathcal{FL}\alpha : \mathbb{H}_\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by $\mathcal{FL}\alpha(t + i\tau) = \mathcal{F}\alpha_t(\tau)$, $t > 0$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proposition 2.1. *Given $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0})$, $\mathcal{FL}\alpha$ is analytic.* ■

For the following proof, we recall the following facts about tempered distributions $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$ of the form $u(x, y) = u_1(x)u_2(y)$ for $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$:

- $\partial_x u(x, y) = (\partial_x u_1(x))u_2(y)$,
- $\partial_y u(x, y) = u_1(x)(\partial_y u_2(y))$,

the partial Fourier transform in either of x, y is well-defined and has the expected mapping properties, and the distributional derivatives of any smooth distribution agree with the classical derivatives (and likewise for a.e. derivatives, etc.).

Proof. For each $t_0 > 0$, let $\alpha^{(t_0)}(t, \sigma) = 1_{t \geq t_0} e^{-t\sigma} \alpha(\sigma)$, which is a well-defined element of $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_t \times \mathbb{R}_\sigma)$. Let

$$1_{t \geq t_0} \mathcal{FL}\alpha(t + i\tau) = \begin{cases} 0 & (t < t_0) \\ \mathcal{FL}\alpha(t + i\tau) & (t \geq t_0), \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

which we can interpret as an element of $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_t \times \mathbb{R}_\tau)$. Clearly, this is the partial Fourier transform of $\alpha^{(t_0)}(t, \sigma)$ along \mathbb{R}_σ . Fix $\chi \in C_c(\mathbb{C})$ supported in $2t_0 + \mathbb{H}_\mathbb{R}$. We see that

$$\chi(z) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} 1_{t \geq t_0} \mathcal{FL}\alpha(t + i\tau) = +\chi(z) 1_{t \geq t_0} \mathcal{FL}(\sigma^2 \alpha(\sigma))(t + i\tau), \quad (16)$$

$$\chi(z) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau^2} 1_{t \geq t_0} \mathcal{FL}\alpha(t + i\tau) = -\chi(z) 1_{t \geq t_0} \mathcal{FL}(\sigma^2 \alpha(\sigma))(t + i\tau), \quad (17)$$

which means that $\mathcal{FL}\alpha(t + i\tau)$ is harmonic – and therefore smooth by elliptic regularity – in the interior of the support of χ . By the arbitrariness of χ and t_0 , we deduce that $\mathcal{FL}\alpha$ is actually smooth in $\mathbb{H}_\mathbb{R}$.

Clearly, $\mathcal{FL}\alpha$ satisfies the Cauchy-Riemann equations in the distributional sense (by analogous reasoning), from which it follows that it satisfies the Cauchy-Riemann equations in the usual classical sense. We conclude that \mathcal{FL} is analytic, as claimed. \square

So, $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{FL}\alpha$ defines a map $\mathcal{FL} : \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}) \rightarrow A(\mathbb{H}_\mathbb{R})$, and this is the Fourier-Laplace transform.

Note that not all elements of $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0})$ that are locally integrable admit a Laplace transform in the sense of a Lebesgue integral:

$$\begin{cases} e^\sigma \cos(e^\sigma) & (\sigma \geq 0) \\ 0 & (\sigma < 0) \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

defines an element of $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_\sigma^{\geq 0}) \cap L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$, but the Laplace transform of (18) does not make sense as a Lebesgue integral. Nevertheless, we have:

Proposition 2.2. *Suppose that $\alpha \in \cup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \sigma \rangle^k L^1(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$, so that $e^{-t\sigma} \alpha(\sigma) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$ for each $t > 0$. Then,*

$$\mathcal{FL}\alpha(t + i\tau) = \int_0^\infty e^{-i\tau\sigma - t\sigma} \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma, \quad (19)$$

where the right-hand side is now a well-defined Lebesgue integral. \blacksquare

This is just a special case of the statement that Schwartz's and Lebesgue's Fourier transforms agree on $L^1(\mathbb{R})$.

We now discuss distributional boundary values.

Proposition 2.3. *For any $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0})$, the indexed set $\{\mathcal{FL}\alpha(t + i\tau)\}_{t > 0} \subset \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_\tau)$ satisfies $\mathcal{FL}\alpha(t + i\tau) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}\alpha(\tau)$ in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_\tau)$, i.e. $\mathcal{F}\alpha$ is the “distributional boundary value” of $\mathcal{FL}\alpha$ on the imaginary axis. \blacksquare*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{F}\mathcal{L}\alpha(t + i\tau) = \mathcal{F}\alpha_t(\tau)$, it suffices (since $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ is continuous) to show that $\alpha_t(\sigma) \rightarrow \alpha(\sigma)$ in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_\tau)$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$. This latter claim follows from the proposition that if $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ vanishes identically for sufficiently negative input, then $e^{-t\sigma}\varphi(\sigma)$ converges to $\varphi(\sigma)$ in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$. This is the statement that, for all φ as above, $\sigma^\ell \partial_\sigma^k (e^{-t\sigma}\varphi(\sigma) - \varphi(\sigma)) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$ for each $\ell, k \in \mathbb{N}$. By Leibniz's rule, this follows from the statement that

$$t^k e^{-t\sigma} \varphi(\sigma) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (e^{-t\sigma} \varphi(\sigma) - \varphi(\sigma)) \rightarrow 0 \quad (20)$$

in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$ for all $k \geq 1$ and all $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ vanishing identically for sufficiently negative input. The first is clear, since $\|t^k e^{-t\sigma} \varphi(\sigma)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)} \leq t^k \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty} \sup_{\sigma \in \text{supp } \varphi} e^{-t\sigma}$.

The second statement in eq. (20) holds because $\varphi(\sigma) \in \langle \sigma \rangle^{-1} L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$. \square

The following proposition (while likely not strictly necessary and stated without proof in [DG75]) can be convenient in simplifying the technical details of Newman's argument. (This simplification is removed in e.g. [Kor04, Chapter III, §14][DV19], and we expect that the modified argument carries over, *mutatis mutandis*.) This result is a special case of a result in the theory of boundary problems for elliptic differential operators.

Proposition 2.4. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}\alpha \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ is smooth in some neighborhood of $T \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists some relatively open neighborhood $U \subset \mathbb{H}_\mathbb{R}$ of iT in which $\mathcal{F}\mathcal{L}\alpha$ extends smoothly to the boundary. \blacksquare*

3. NEWMAN'S TAUBERIAN ARGUMENT

The cornerstone of Newman's Tauberian argument is the following complex-analytic computation, expressing the integral

$$A : [0, \infty)_\Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad A : \Sigma \mapsto A_\Sigma, \quad A_\Sigma = \int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma \quad (21)$$

of a tempered, locally integrable (possibly complex-valued) function supported on the nonnegative real axis – denoted $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}) \cap L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0})$ throughout this section – in terms of

- a contribution from the principal part of the Laurent series of $a(\tau) = \mathcal{F}\alpha(\tau)$ at $\tau = 0$ (whose well-definedness will be one of our hypotheses),
- a separately treated contribution from the constant term of the Laurent series,
- a contribution from the L^1_{loc} -singularities $T \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{0\}$ of $a(\tau)$ in $[-T, +T]$ away from $\tau = 0$,
- a typically small contribution from the remainder of $a(\tau)$ on $[-T, +T]$, and
- a controllable contribution from $a(\tau)$ outside of $[-T, +T]$,

where $T \geq 1$ is a parameter of the argument. We will not be explicit about the contribution to A_Σ from the off-origin poles of a , which can be treated as an error to be controlled (and in applications should typically be the same size of the error from $a(\tau)$ outside of $[-T, +T]$). We handle the off-origin singularities of $a(\tau)$ separately from the smooth background because while it is most convenient to measure the latter in an L^1 -based Sobolev space, in order to be sharp it is necessary to measure the former as a pseudomeasure, i.e. in $\mathcal{F}\langle \sigma \rangle^K L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$ for some $K \geq 0$.

Based on our treatment of each contribution, we decompose

$$a(\tau) = a_{00} \mathcal{F}\chi_0 + a_0(\tau) + b(\tau) + c(\tau), \quad (22)$$

where $a_{00} \in \mathbb{C}$, $\chi_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$ satisfies $\int_0^\infty \chi_0(\sigma) d\sigma = 1$, and

- $a_0(\tau) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} a_0^{(j)} (\tau - i0)^{-j}$ for some finite subset $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ of positive real numbers and some indexed collection $\{a_0^{(j)}\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \subset \mathbb{C}$,

- $c(\tau) \in \tau L_{\text{loc}}^1(-\epsilon, +\epsilon) \cap \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_\tau)$ is a tempered distribution (with discrete singular support) of the form $c = \mathcal{F}\gamma$ for

$$\gamma(\sigma) \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}) \cap \cup_{K \geq 0} \langle \sigma \rangle^K L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma^{\geq 0}), \quad (23)$$

and

- $b = a - a_0 - c$ is the remainder, which we will not analyze (but will in applications typically be zero).

We will further split $c(\tau) = p(\tau) + g(\tau)$, where $g(\tau)$ is regular (so p absorbs all of the off-origin poles). The function g is the portion of c that will be measured in an L^1 -based Sobolev space, while p will be analyzed in $\mathcal{F}\langle \sigma \rangle^K L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$. Given the setup above, b can be the entirety of a . So no matter what α is, we can find a_{00}, a_0, b, c as above such that (22) holds, but consequently the results below are only interesting when the contribution from b can be analyzed somewhat explicitly — e.g. if $b = 0$ (which, as mentioned above, will be the case in typical applications).

The main result of this section, presented in Theorem 3.7, is a result of the following form: given $\alpha, a, a_{00}, a_0, b, c, g, p$ as above, and given appropriate control on g, p ,

$$\int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \frac{e^{\pi i j / 2}}{j!} a_0^{(j)} \Sigma^j + \int_0^\Sigma \beta(\sigma) d\sigma + a_{00} + \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)} \quad (24)$$

for sufficiently large Σ , where $\beta = \mathcal{F}^{-1}b$ is the inverse Fourier transform of b and $\mathcal{R}(\Sigma) > 0$ is to-be-specified. This result is to be thought of as an estimation of the left-hand side by the right-hand side sans the $1/\mathcal{R}(\sigma)$ term. The $1/\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ term is to be thought of as the estimate's error, bounded in terms of the global Sobolev regularity of g , the size of $\mathcal{F}p$, and the assumed growth rate of γ (that is, the K witnessing eq. (23)). Hence, if e.g. $b, \beta = 0$ and the function $1/\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ is sufficiently slowly growing (or, better yet, decaying), then we understand the $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$ asymptotics of A_Σ , at least to what is generically leading order. Our estimate is closely related to – but not obviously equivalent to – a result of Debruyne [Deb18, §6], but our the argument is different (following Newman).

The key computation is:

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}) \cap L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0})$. Let $a = \mathcal{F}\alpha$. Suppose we are given some distributions $b, c \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$ of the form*

- (1) $b = \mathcal{F}\beta$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}) \cap L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0})$ and
- (2) $c = \mathcal{F}\gamma$ for $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}) \cap L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0})$

such that $a = b + c$ and c is continuous in some neighborhood of the origin. Then, if $T > 0$ is such that c is smooth in some neighborhood of the two points $-T, +T \in \mathbb{R}$, we can write, for each $\Sigma > 0$

$$\int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma = \int_0^\Sigma \beta(\sigma) d\sigma + c(0) + I_1(T, \Sigma, M) + I_2(T, \Sigma, M) + I_3(T, \Sigma, M), \quad (25)$$

for arbitrary $M \in \mathbb{N}^+$, where I_1 is a well-defined Riemann integral given by eq. (43),

$$I_1(T, \Sigma, M) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_+(T, 0)} (C_\Sigma(t) - C(t)) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{dt}{t},$$

and I_2, I_3 are well-defined distributional pairings given by (44, 45),

$$\begin{aligned} I_2(T, \Sigma, M) &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-T}^{+T} C_\Sigma(i\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + i0}, \\ I_3(T, \Sigma, M) &= +\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-T}^{+T} c(\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + i0}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_+(T, 0)$ is the positively oriented contour whose path is the semicircle arc of radius T . \blacksquare

Proof. For each $T > 0$ and $\delta \in [0, T)$, let $\Gamma = \Gamma(T, \delta)$ denote the boundary of the region $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq T, \Re z \geq \delta\}$. We consider Γ as a contour, oriented counterclockwise. Set $\Gamma_0(T, \delta) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq T, \Re z = \delta\}$ and $\Gamma_+(T, \delta) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = T, \Re z > \delta\}$, so that

$$\Gamma(T, \delta) = \Gamma_+(T, \delta) \cup \Gamma_0(T, \delta). \quad (26)$$

We consider Γ_0 and Γ_+ as contours, with orientations consistent with that of Γ . (That is, Γ_0 is oriented top-to-bottom, and Γ_+ is oriented counterclockwise.)

Let $A, B, C : \mathbb{H}_\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ denote the (well-defined) Fourier-Laplace transforms

$$A(t) = \int_0^\infty \alpha(\sigma) e^{-\sigma t} d\sigma, \quad B(t) = \int_0^\infty \beta(\sigma) e^{-\sigma t} d\sigma, \quad C(t) = \int_0^\infty \gamma(\sigma) e^{-\sigma t} d\sigma. \quad (27)$$

(These integrals may have to be interpreted formally if α, β, γ are not in $\cup_{K \geq 0} \langle \sigma \rangle^K L^1(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$, but $A = \mathcal{FL}\alpha, B = \mathcal{FL}\beta, C = \mathcal{FL}\gamma$ are always well-defined functions, as shown in the previous section.) For each $\Sigma \geq 0$, let $A_\Sigma, B_\Sigma, C_\Sigma : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the *entire* functions defined by the Lebesgue integrals

$$A_\Sigma(t) = \int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) e^{-\sigma t} d\sigma, \quad B_\Sigma(t) = \int_0^\Sigma \beta(\sigma) e^{-\sigma t} d\sigma, \quad C_\Sigma(t) = \int_0^\Sigma \gamma(\sigma) e^{-\sigma t} d\sigma. \quad (28)$$

(We are assuming that α, β, γ are locally integrable. Entirety is proven as in Proposition 2.1.) Note that, by Proposition 2.3, a, b, c , are the distributional boundary values of A, B, C (respectively) at the imaginary axis.

By the Cauchy integral theorem: for each $t_0 \in (\delta, T)$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$(C_\Sigma(t_0) - C(t_0)) e^{t_0 \Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t_0^2}{T^2}\right)^M = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma (C_\Sigma(t) - C(t)) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{dt}{t - t_0}. \quad (29)$$

We split up the integral in (29) into three pieces:

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma (C_\Sigma(t) - C(t)) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{dt}{t - t_0} = I_1 + I_2 + I_3, \quad (30)$$

where $I_1 = I_1(\delta, t_0, T, \Sigma, M)$, $I_2 = I_2(\delta, t_0, T, \Sigma, M)$, and $I_3 = I_3(\delta, t_0, T, \Sigma, M)$ are functions of $\delta, t_0, T, \Sigma, M$ given by

$$I_1 = +\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_+(T, \delta)} (C_\Sigma(t) - C(t)) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{dt}{t - t_0}, \quad (31)$$

$$I_2 = +\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_0(T, \delta)} C_\Sigma(t) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{dt}{t - t_0}, \quad (32)$$

$$I_3 = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_0(T, \delta)} C(t) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{dt}{t - t_0}. \quad (33)$$

We now consider the limit $\delta \downarrow 0$, for fixed t_0, T, σ, M . Clearly, $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} I_2(\delta, t_0, T, \Sigma, M)$ exists and is equal to

$$I_2(t_0, T, \Sigma, M) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_0(T, 0)} C_\Sigma(t) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{dt}{t - t_0} \quad (34)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-T}^{+T} C_\Sigma(i\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + it_0}. \quad (35)$$

Similarly, since $\pm T \notin \text{singsupp } C$ – and therefore C is continuous in some neighborhood of $\pm iT$ in $\overline{\mathbb{H}}_{\mathbb{R}}$, by Proposition 2.4 – $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} I_1(\delta, t_0, T, \Sigma, M)$ exists and is equal to

$$I_1(t_0, T, \Sigma, M) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_+(T, 0)} (C_\Sigma(t) - C(t)) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{dt}{t - t_0}, \quad (36)$$

which is well-defined as a Riemann integral. The $\delta \downarrow 0$ limit of I_3 requires a bit of care. Since $\pm T \notin \text{singsupp } c$ (and singular supports are closed sets, by definition), we can find some $T_0 \in (0, T)$ such that $[-T, +T] \cap \text{singsupp } c \subseteq [-T_0, +T_0]$. Choose some $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ which is supported in the interior of $[-T, +T]$ and such that χ is identically equal to one on the slightly smaller interval $[-T + (T - T_0)/2, +T - (T - T_0)/2]$. Then we can write

$$I_3(\delta, t_0, T, \Sigma, M) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_0(T, \delta)} \chi(\Im t) C(t) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{dt}{t - t_0} \quad (37)$$

$$- \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_0(T, \delta)} (1 - \chi(\Im t)) C(t) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{dt}{t - t_0}. \quad (38)$$

As $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$, the first term on the right-hand side converges to

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-T}^{+T} \chi(\tau) c(\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + it_0} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left\langle c(\tau), \chi(\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{1}{\tau + it_0} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}_\tau)} \quad (39)$$

by the definition of distributional convergence, and the second term, (38), converges to the well-defined Riemann integral

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-T}^{+T} (1 - \chi(\tau)) c(\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + it_0} \quad (40)$$

since $C(t)$ is continuous on some neighborhood in $\overline{\mathbb{H}}_{\mathbb{R}}$ of the compact set $[-T, -T + (T - T_0)/2] \cup [+T - (T - T_0)/2, +T]$. Combining (39) and (40): $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} I_3(\delta, t_0, T, \Sigma, M)$ exists (although this we could deduce from the limits already considered) and is equal to the well-defined distributional pairing

$$I_3(t_0, T, \Sigma, M) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-T}^{+T} c(\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + it_0}. \quad (41)$$

Combining what we have shown so far,

$$(C_\Sigma(t_0) - C(t_0)) e^{t_0\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t_0^2}{T^2}\right)^M = I_1(t_0, T, \Sigma, M) + I_2(t_0, T, \Sigma, M) + I_3(t_0, T, \Sigma, M), \quad (42)$$

where I_1, I_2, I_3 are given by eq. (36), eq. (35), eq. (38), respectively.

We now consider the limit $t_0 \rightarrow 0^+$, for fixed T, Σ, M . The limit $\lim_{t_0 \rightarrow 0^+} I_1(t_0, T, \Sigma, M)$ clearly exists and is equal to

$$I_1(T, \Sigma, M) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_+(T, 0)} (C_\Sigma(t) - C(t)) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{dt}{t}. \quad (43)$$

Since $C_\Sigma|_{i\mathbb{R}}$ (by entirety) and c (by assumption) are both continuous in some neighborhood of the origin, $\lim_{t_0 \rightarrow 0^+} I_2(t_0, T, \Sigma, M)$ and $\lim_{t_0 \rightarrow 0^+} I_3(t_0, T, \Sigma, M)$ exist and are equal to the well-defined distributional pairings

$$I_2(T, \Sigma, M) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-T}^{+T} C_\Sigma(i\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + i0}, \quad (44)$$

$$I_3(T, \Sigma, M) = +\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-T}^{+T} c(\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + i0}. \quad (45)$$

It follows from (42) and the computations of the limits above that

$$\begin{aligned} C_\Sigma(0) &= \lim_{t_0 \rightarrow 0^+} C_\Sigma(t_0) e^{t_0\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t_0^2}{T^2}\right)^M = \lim_{t_0 \rightarrow 0^+} \left[C(t_0) e^{t_0\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t_0^2}{T^2}\right)^M + \sum_{j=1}^3 I_j(t_0, T, \Sigma, M) \right] \\ &= c(0) + I_1(T, \Sigma, M) + I_2(T, \Sigma, M) + I_3(T, \Sigma, M). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Since $C_\Sigma(0) = A_\Sigma(0) - B_\Sigma(0)$, we have $A_\Sigma(0) = B_\Sigma(0) + c(0) + I_1(T, \Sigma, M) + I_3(T, \Sigma, M) + I_2(T, \Sigma, M)$, which is precisely the desired result, eq. (25). \square

3.1. Estimates of the Errors. We now bound the contribution to the integral A_Σ coming from $I_1(T, \Sigma, M)$, $I_2(T, \Sigma, M)$, given an *a priori* polynomial bound

$$\gamma \in \cup_{K \geq 0} \langle \sigma \rangle^K L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma), \quad (48)$$

so that $\gamma \in \langle \sigma \rangle^K L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$ for some real number $K \geq 0$. This weak bound (involving no detailed asymptotics of γ , only an upper bound of the absolute value) functions as the ‘‘Tauberian hypothesis’’ of the initial part of Newman’s Tauberian argument (the part discussed in the present section). In the application to Weyl’s law, this hypothesis is verified by Weyl’s law with the standard remainder. (So the standard form of Weyl’s law will be used with some assumptions on the half-wave trace to deduce a strengthened form of Weyl’s law. Note that this is not circular.) Allowing $K > 0$ is typically not necessary (since we could always work with more heavily weighted α), but it is convenient. The most important case is $K = 0$. In this subsection only ‘‘momentum-space’’ – i.e. \mathbb{R}_σ -side – assumptions come into play.

The $M = 1, K = 0$ case of this proposition can be found at the end of [Zag97].

Proposition 3.2. *Consider the setup of Proposition 3.1, and suppose that (48) holds, with $\gamma \in \langle \sigma \rangle^K L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$, $K \geq 0$. Then, if $M \geq K + 1$, $I_1(T, \Sigma, M)$ and $I_2(T, \Sigma, M)$ obey the bounds*

$$|I_1(T, \Sigma, M)|, |I_2(T, \Sigma, M)| \leq R_{K,M} \Sigma^K F / T \quad (49)$$

for $T \geq 1$ and sufficiently large $\Sigma > \Sigma_K > 0$, where $F = \|\gamma\|_{\langle \sigma \rangle^K L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)}$ and $R_{K,M} > 0$ is some constant depending only on K and M . \blacksquare

Proof. We handle I_1, I_2 in that order. In the following, R (with or without subscripts) will denote an arbitrary constant (which will change line to line). One computation that appears in both bounds in Equation (49) is that, on the circle $T\mathbb{S}^1 = \{t \in \mathbb{C} : |t| = T\}$ of radius $T > 0$, $|1 + t^2/T^2| = |2\Re t/T|$.

(1) On $\Gamma_+(T) \setminus \{\pm iT\} = \Gamma_+(T, 0) \setminus \{\pm iT\}$,

$$|C_\Sigma(t) - C(t)| = \left| \int_\Sigma^\infty \gamma(\sigma) e^{-\sigma t} d\sigma \right| \leq F \int_\Sigma^\infty \langle \sigma \rangle^K e^{-\sigma \Re t} d\sigma. \quad (50)$$

For sufficiently large $\Sigma_K > 0$, for all $\Sigma > \Sigma_K$ we can bound $\langle \sigma \rangle^K$ for $\sigma \geq \Sigma$ above by $2\sigma^K$, so

$$|C_\Sigma(t) - C(t)| \leq 2F \int_\Sigma^\infty \sigma^K e^{-\sigma \Re t} d\sigma = 2F \frac{1}{(\Re t)^{K+1}} \int_{\Sigma \Re t}^\infty \sigma^K e^{-\sigma} d\sigma \quad (51)$$

for such Σ . If K is a nonnegative integer, we have the explicit computation

$$\int_{\Sigma \Re t}^\infty \sigma^K e^{-\sigma} d\sigma = \sum_{k=0}^K k! \binom{K}{k} (\Sigma \Re t)^{K-k} e^{-\Sigma \Re t} \leq R_K e^{-\Sigma \Re t} \langle \Sigma \Re t \rangle^K. \quad (52)$$

If K is not an integer, then, observing that $\sup_{\sigma \geq \Sigma \Re t} (1 + \sigma^{\lceil K \rceil})^{-1} \sigma^K = O(\langle \Sigma \Re t \rangle^{K - \lceil K \rceil})$, we have

$$\int_{\Sigma \Re t}^\infty \sigma^K e^{-\sigma} d\sigma = \int_{\Sigma \Re t}^\infty \left(\frac{\sigma^K}{1 + \sigma^{\lceil K \rceil}} \right) (1 + \sigma^{\lceil K \rceil}) e^{-\sigma} d\sigma \quad (53)$$

$$\leq \sup_{\sigma \geq \Sigma \Re t} \{ (1 + \sigma^{\lceil K \rceil})^{-1} \sigma^K \} \int_{\Sigma \Re t}^\infty (1 + \sigma^{\lceil K \rceil}) e^{-\sigma} d\sigma \quad (54)$$

$$\leq R_K e^{-\Sigma \Re t} \langle \Sigma \Re t \rangle^K. \quad (55)$$

So, regardless of whether or not K is an integer, $\int_{\Sigma \Re t}^\infty \sigma^K e^{-\sigma} d\sigma \leq R_K e^{-\Sigma \Re t} \langle \Sigma \Re t \rangle^K$.

Plugging this into eq. (51), $|C_\Sigma(t) - C(t)| \leq 2F R_K (\Re t)^{-K-1} e^{-\Sigma \Re t} \langle \Sigma \Re t \rangle^K$.

Now,

$$\left| e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2} \right)^M \frac{1}{t} \right| = e^{\Sigma \Re t} \cdot \left(\frac{2\Re t}{T} \right)^M \cdot \frac{1}{T} \quad (56)$$

on $\Gamma_+(T)$. So, we have the following bound on the integrand of $I_1(T, \Sigma, M)$:

$$\left| (C_\Sigma(t) - C(\sigma)) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2} \right)^M \frac{1}{t} \right| \leq 2^{M+1} F R_K (\Re t)^{M-1-K} \langle \Sigma \Re t \rangle^K \frac{1}{T^{M+1}}. \quad (57)$$

Under the assumption that $M \geq 1 + K$, $(\Re t)^{M-1-K} \leq \langle \Re t \rangle^{M-1-K}$ on $\Gamma_+(T)$, so the right-hand side above is bounded above by $R_{K,M} F \langle \Sigma \rangle^K \langle \Re t \rangle^{M-1} / T^{M+1}$. Redefining $R_{K,M}$, this is bounded above by $R_{K,M} F \langle \Sigma \rangle^K / T^2$. For Σ sufficiently large, this is bounded above by $R_{K,M} F \Sigma^K / T^2$, for some new $R_{K,M}$.

It follows that $I_1(T, \Sigma, M)$ is bounded above in absolute value by $R_{K,M} \Sigma^K F / T$, as claimed, for some new $R_{K,M}$.

- (2) Since C_Σ (along with the rest of the integrand of $I_2(\delta, t_0, T, \Sigma, M)$, for $\delta > 0$) is analytic to the left of t_0 , we can deform the contour $\Gamma_0(T, \delta)$ to the (slightly extended) semicircle $\Gamma_-(\delta) = \{t \in \mathbb{C} : |t| = T, \Re t \leq \delta\}$ oriented counterclockwise:

$$I_2(\delta, t_0, T, \Sigma, M) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_-(T, \delta)} C_\Sigma(t) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2} \right)^M \frac{dt}{t - t_0}. \quad (58)$$

Obviously, we can take $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$, so $I_2(t_0, T, \Sigma, M) = (2\pi i)^{-1} \int_{\Gamma_-(T)} C_\Sigma(t) e^{t\Sigma} (1 + t^2/T^2)^M (t - t_0)^{-1} dt$, where $\Gamma_-(T) = \Gamma_-(T, 0) = \{t \in \mathbb{C} : |t| = T, \Re t \leq 0\}$, oriented as before. Since $\Gamma_-(T)$ is bounded away from the origin of the complex plane, the limit of the integral as $t_0 \rightarrow 0^+$ is well-defined (as a Riemann integral, not just as a distributional pairing) and equal to the contour integral

$$I_2(T, \Sigma, M) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma_-(T)} C_\Sigma(t) e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2} \right)^M \frac{dt}{t}. \quad (59)$$

On $\Gamma_-(T)$, $t \notin i\mathbb{R}$, we can bound

$$|C_\Sigma(t)| = \left| \int_0^\Sigma \gamma(\sigma) e^{-\sigma t} d\sigma \right| \leq F \int_0^\Sigma \langle \sigma \rangle^K e^{+\sigma |\Re t|} d\sigma. \quad (60)$$

For sufficiently large Σ_K (and for some $R_K > 0$), for all $\Sigma > \Sigma_K$ we can bound the right-hand side by $|\Re t|^{-1} \cdot F R_K e^{\Sigma |\Re t|} \Sigma^K$. And:

$$\left| e^{t\Sigma} \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{1}{t} \right| = e^{-\Sigma |\Re t|} \cdot \left(\frac{2|\Re t|}{T}\right)^M \cdot \frac{1}{T} \leq e^{-\Sigma |\Re t|} \cdot \frac{2^M |\Re t|}{T^2} \quad (61)$$

on $\Gamma_-(T)$. So, (59), which is an integral of a continuous function along a contour of length πT , is bounded above in absolute value by $R_{K,M} \Sigma^K F/T$, as claimed. \square

We now turn to

$$I_3(T, \Sigma, M) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-T}^{+T} c(\tau) e^{i\tau \Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + i0}. \quad (62)$$

which is evidently where the regularity of c becomes relevant. We give three different bounds for $I_3(T, \Sigma, M)$, increasing in strength. The first estimate, related to Hörmander's derivation of Weyl's law, uses only the regularity of the background near $\tau = 0$. The second estimate, related to Duistermaat & Guillemin's $o(1)$ improvements, uses the local regularity of the background along the whole τ -axis, but it does not require any quantitative control. The strongest estimate requires quantitative control on the background as $\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Since the first two estimates are only interesting when $p = 0$, we effectively work with this assumption; that is, we assume that c has sufficient regularity to take the entirety of c as the background.

Proposition 3.3. *Consider the setup of Proposition 3.1, and suppose that the hypothesis of Proposition 3.2 holds for some $K \geq 0$. Suppose further that for some T with $T, -T \notin \text{singsupp } c$, $c(\tau) \in \tau L^1[-T, +T]_\tau$. Then*

$$\int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma = O(\Sigma^K) + \int_0^\Sigma \beta(\sigma) d\sigma \quad (63)$$

as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$. \blacksquare

Note that, despite the appearance of K in both the hypothesis and conclusion, the conclusion is not weaker than the hypothesis: the hypothesis states that $\gamma(\sigma) = \alpha(\sigma) - \beta(\sigma)$ is $O(\langle \sigma \rangle^K)$, and integrating this yields

$$\int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma = \int_0^\Sigma (\gamma(\sigma) + \beta(\sigma)) d\sigma = O(\langle \Sigma \rangle^{K+1}) + \int_0^\Sigma \beta(\sigma) d\sigma, \quad (64)$$

a whole power of $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ worse than eq. (63).

Proof. Fix $M \geq K + 1$. Via Proposition 3.2, $|I_1(T, \Sigma, M)|, |I_2(T, \Sigma, M)|$ can be bounded above by $O(\Sigma^K/T) = O(\Sigma^K)$, where the constant in the second big-O depends on T . Moreover, letting $d \in L^1[-T, +T]$ be such that $c(\tau) = \tau d(\tau)$ in $[-T, +T]$,

$$\lim_{\Sigma \rightarrow \infty} I_3(T, \Sigma, M) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \lim_{\Sigma \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-T}^{+T} d(\tau) e^{i\tau \Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M d\tau = 0, \quad (65)$$

by the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma. Combining these three estimates with the conclusion of Proposition 3.1, eq. (63) follows. \square

This next weak estimate is analogous to the conclusion of Newman's argument in [New80].

Proposition 3.4. *Consider the setup of Proposition 3.1, and suppose that the hypothesis of Proposition 3.2 holds, for some $K \geq 0$. Suppose further that $c(\tau) - c(0)\mathcal{F}\chi_0 \in \tau L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}_\tau)$, for some $\chi_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Then $|I_3(T, \Sigma, M)| \rightarrow 0$ as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$ for each nonzero T with $T, -T \notin \text{singsupp } c$. Consequently, if $K = 0$ and c is smooth in a neighborhood of a sequence $\{T_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_k = \infty$, then*

$$\int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma = c(0) + o(1) + \int_0^\Sigma \beta(\sigma) d\sigma \quad (66)$$

as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$. ■

Proof. We can assume without loss of generality that $T_0 \geq 1$. In order to show that $I_3(T, \Sigma, M) = o(1)$ as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$, we decompose

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-T}^{+T} c(\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + i0} &= \int_{-T}^{+T} c(0)\mathcal{F}\chi_0(\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + i0} \\ &\quad + \int_{-T}^{+T} (c(\tau) - c(0)\mathcal{F}\chi_0(\tau)) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

By the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma applied to the second integral above, it suffices to show that

$$\int_{-T}^{+T} c(0)\mathcal{F}\chi_0 e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + i0} = o(1) + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} c(0)\mathcal{F}\chi_0 e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + i0} \quad (68)$$

converges to zero as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, the integral on the right-hand side of eq. (68) is rapidly decaying as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$, which follows from the one-sidedness of the wavefront set of $(\tau + i0)^{-1}$ (and the particular direction in which the wavefront set is absent).

Suppose now that $K = 0$. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, pick $T' \in \mathbb{R}$ sufficiently large such that $|I_1(T, \Sigma, 1)|, |I_2(T, \Sigma, 1)|$ are each less than $\varepsilon/3$ for all $T > T'$ and all $\Sigma > \Sigma_K$. Such a T' exists by Proposition 3.1. Then we can pick some positive integer k sufficiently large such that $T_k > T'$ and then pick some $\Sigma_{K,k} > \Sigma_K$ sufficiently large such that $|I_3(T_k, \Sigma, 1)| < \varepsilon/3$ for all $\Sigma > \Sigma_{K,k}$. Then, for such Σ ,

$$\left| \int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma - c(0) - \int_0^\Sigma \beta(\sigma) d\sigma \right| \leq |I_1(T_k, \Sigma, 1)| + |I_2(T_k, \Sigma, 1)| + |I_3(T_k, \Sigma, 1)| < \varepsilon. \quad (69)$$

Since ε was arbitrary, eq. (66) follows. □

We split the integral $2\pi i I_3(T, \Sigma, M)$ as

$$\int_{-T}^{+T} g(\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + i0} + \int_{-T}^{+T} p(\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M \frac{d\tau}{\tau + i0}. \quad (70)$$

As explained earlier, we first handle the first integral assuming a positive amount of integral order L^1 -based Sobolev regularity of c . It is not obvious that working only with the non-fractional L^1 -based Sobolev spaces will yield optimal results (for appropriate choices of the other parameters), but the argument for fractional order spaces should be analogous. So, I expect our restriction to be without serious loss of applicability. The previous two subsections make the effect of nonzero $c(0)$ clear. We can always add to β a scalar multiple of a bump function (e.g. $c(0)\chi_0$) supported on \mathbb{R}^+ so as to arrange $c(0) = 0$.

Proposition 3.5. *Consider the setup of Proposition 3.1, $T, -T \notin \text{singsupp } c$. Suppose that $c(\tau) \in \tau L^1[-\epsilon, +\epsilon]$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Then, if $Q(t) = t^{-1}c(t)$ is in $L^{1,N}[-T, +T]$ for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M \geq N$, $I_3(T, \Sigma, M)$ obeys the bound*

$$|I_3(T, \Sigma, M)| \leq R_{N,M} \Sigma^{-N} \|Q\|_{L^{1,N}[-T, +T]}, \quad (71)$$

where $R_{N,M} > 0$ is a constant depending only on N and M . \blacksquare

Proof. In terms of Q , $I_3(T, \Sigma, M)$ is given by

$$I_3(T, \Sigma, M) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-T}^{+T} Q(\tau) e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M d\tau. \quad (72)$$

One of our hypotheses is that c is smooth in some neighborhoods of $\pm T$, so we can integrate by parts. Fixing $M \geq N$,

$$I_3(T, \Sigma, M) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \frac{1}{(i\Sigma)^N} \int_{-T}^{+T} Q(\tau) (\partial_\tau^N e^{i\tau\Sigma}) \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M d\tau = \sum_{n=0}^N J_n, \quad (73)$$

where, for $n = 0, \dots, N$, $J_n = J_n(T, \Sigma, M)$ is given by

$$J_n = (-1)^N \frac{1}{2\pi i} \binom{N}{n} \frac{1}{(i\Sigma)^N} \int_{-T}^{+T} e^{i\tau\Sigma} (\partial_\tau^{N-n} Q(\tau)) \partial_\tau^n \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M d\tau. \quad (74)$$

Note the absence of boundary terms when performing the integration by parts — this follows from our assumption that $M \geq N$. By our other assumption, $\partial_\tau^{N-n} Q(\tau) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_\tau)$ for each $n = 0, \dots, N$. Note that $\sup_{\tau \in [-T, +T]} \partial_\tau^n (1 - \tau^2/T^2)^M \leq R_{N,M,n} T^{-n}$, for some constant $R_{N,M,n} > 0$ depending only on N, M, n , and in particular not on T . Consequently, $|J_n| \leq R'_{N,M,n} \Sigma^{-N} T^{-n} \|Q^{(N-n)}\|_{L^1[-T, +T]}$ for some new constant $R'_{N,M,n} > 0$. Adding up the contributions from each $n = 0, \dots, N$, we conclude eq. (71). \square

3.2. Contribution from the Origin. If a has a pole at the origin but no constant term, that is if

$$a(\tau) = \sum_{j=1}^J a_j \frac{1}{(\tau - i0)^j} \text{ mod } \tau C^\infty(-\epsilon, +\epsilon), \quad (75)$$

in some neighborhood $(-\epsilon, +\epsilon)$ of $\tau = 0$, then we can find a polynomial $Z(\sigma) \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma]$ whose Fourier transform is $a_J(\tau - i0)^{-J} + \dots + a_1(\tau - i0)^{-1}$. For this, we note that

$$\mathcal{F} : \{\Theta(\sigma)Z(\sigma) \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma] : \deg Z \leq J-1\} \rightarrow \{a_J(\tau - i0)^{-J} + \dots + a_1(\tau - i0)^{-1} : a_J, \dots, a_1 \in \mathbb{C}\} \quad (76)$$

is bijective. Since we would like to be explicit in stating asymptotics, we record the exact correspondence:

Proposition 3.6. *Given $J \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $a_J, \dots, a_1 \in \mathbb{C}$, the unique $Z(\sigma) \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma]$ such that*

$$\mathcal{F}(\Theta Z)(\tau) = \sum_{j=1}^J a_j \frac{1}{(\tau - i0)^j} \quad (77)$$

is given by $Z(\sigma) = \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} i^{j+1} a_{j+1} \sigma^j / j!$. \blacksquare

Proof. We see that $\mathcal{F}(\Theta Z) = Z(D)\mathcal{F}\Theta$, where $D = i\partial$. (So $Z(D)$ is a differential operator.) We recall that $\mathcal{F}\Theta = -i(\tau - i0)^{-1}$. It follows that Z has degree $J - 1$, so $Z(\sigma) = b_{J-1}\sigma^{J-1} + \dots + b_0$ for some $b_0, \dots, b_{J-1} \in \mathbb{C}$.

$$Z(D)\mathcal{F}\Theta = \sum_{j=1}^J i^j (-1)^j (j-1)! \cdot b_{j-1} \frac{1}{(\tau - i0)^j}. \quad (78)$$

We conclude that $b_j = i^{j+1}a_{j+1}/j!$ for each $j = 0, \dots, J - 1$. \square

The analogous formula holds for nonintegral j , in which case we interpret i^j as $e^{\pi i j/2}$ and $j!$ as $\Gamma(j+1)$ — cf. [GS64, Vol. 1, pg. 359]. (Note that in [GS64] Gelfand and Shilov use the reverse of our conventions for $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}^{-1}$.) For the application to Weyl's law, the case when j is a half-integer is particularly useful.

3.3. Conclusion. Putting together the estimates and computations above, we can conclude the main result of this section, a variant of Ingham's Tauberian theorem with an estimate on the remainder.

Theorem 3.7. *Suppose that $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}) \cap L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0})$, and let $a = \mathcal{F}\alpha$, $\chi_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$ with $\int_0^\infty \chi_0(\sigma) d\sigma = 1$. Suppose we are given some distributions $a_0, b, c, g, p \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ of the form*

- (1) $a_0(\tau) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} a_0^{(j)}(\tau - i0)^{-j}$ for some finite subset $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ of positive real numbers and some indexed collection $\{a_0^{(j)}\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \subset \mathbb{C}$,
- (2) $b = \mathcal{F}\beta$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}) \cap L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0})$,
- (3) $c = \mathcal{F}\gamma$ for $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}) \cap L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0})$, such that c is continuous in some neighborhood of the origin,
- (4) $g \in \tau L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_\tau)$ with discrete singular support,
- (5) $p \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ with discrete singular support not containing the origin, vanishing at the origin,

such that $a(\tau) = a_{00}\mathcal{F}\chi_0 + a_0(\tau) + b(\tau) + c(\tau)$ for some $a_{00} \in \mathbb{C}$, where $c = g + p$ and

- $\gamma + \mathcal{F}^{-1}p \in \langle \sigma \rangle^K L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$ for some $K \geq 0$ (Tauberian hypothesis),
- $g \in \langle \tau \rangle^{k+1} L^{1,N}(\mathbb{R}_\tau)$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \geq 0$,
- and p such that

$$\sup_{\Sigma > 1, T > 1} \frac{\Sigma^N}{T^k} \left| \int_{-T}^{+T} \frac{p(\tau)}{\tau} e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M d\tau \right| < \infty \quad (79)$$

for some $M \geq \max\{K + 1, N\}$.

Then,

$$\int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma = a_{00} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}, j \neq 0} \frac{e^{i\pi j/2}}{j!} a_0^{(j)} \Sigma^j + \int_0^\Sigma \beta(\sigma) d\sigma + O(\Sigma^{K-(N+K)/(k+1)}) \quad (80)$$

as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$. \blacksquare

Proof. We apply Proposition 3.1 with $a_{00}\mathcal{F}\chi_0 + a_0(\tau) + b(\tau)$ in place of $b(\tau)$. Then, for any $T \notin \text{singsupp } c$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma &= \int_0^\Sigma \left(a_{00}\chi_0(\sigma) + \mathcal{F}^{-1}a_0(\sigma) + \beta(\sigma) \right) d\sigma \\ &\quad + I_1(T, \Sigma, M) + I_2(T, \Sigma, M) + I_3(T, \Sigma, M) \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

where $I_1 = I_1(T, \Sigma, M)$, $I_2 = I_2(T, \Sigma, M)$, $I_3 = I_3(T, \Sigma, M)$ are as in Proposition 3.1. Since $\int_0^\infty \chi_0(\sigma) d\sigma = 1$, the first term above contributes an a_{00} to the sum for sufficiently large Σ . By Proposition 3.6,

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}a_0(\sigma) = \Theta(\sigma) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} i^j \frac{a_0^{(j)}}{(j-1)!} \sigma^{j-1}. \quad (82)$$

So, $\int_0^\Sigma \mathcal{F}^{-1}a_0(\sigma) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} i^j a_0^{(j)} \Sigma^j / j!$. So, for sufficiently large Σ and $T \geq 1$,

$$\int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma = a_{00} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}, j \neq 0} \frac{i^j}{j!} a_0^{(j)} \Sigma^j + \int_0^\Sigma \beta(\sigma) d\sigma + I_1 + I_2 + I_3 \quad (83)$$

$$= a_{00} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}, j \neq 0} \frac{i^j}{j!} a_0^{(j)} \Sigma^j + \int_0^\Sigma \beta(\sigma) d\sigma + O(\Sigma^K T^{-1}) + I_3 \quad (84)$$

$$= a_{00} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}, j \neq 0} \frac{i^j}{j!} a_0^{(j)} \Sigma^j + \int_0^\Sigma \beta(\sigma) d\sigma + O(\Sigma^K T^{-1}) + O(\Sigma^{-N} \langle T \rangle^k) \quad (85)$$

using Proposition 3.2, Proposition 3.5. The constants in the big-Os do not depend on Σ, T . Here we decomposed

$$I_3(T, \Sigma, M) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-T}^{+T} \frac{g(\tau)}{\tau} e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M d\tau + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-T}^{+T} \frac{p(\tau)}{\tau} e^{i\tau\Sigma} \left(1 - \frac{\tau^2}{T^2}\right)^M d\tau, \quad (86)$$

bounded the first using Proposition 3.5, and bounded the second using the assumption eq. (79). Since the singular support of c is discrete, for any $\nu > 0$ we can plug in $T(\Sigma) \geq 1$ to be a function of Σ such that $T(\Sigma) \notin \text{singsupp } c$ for all $\Sigma > 0$ and such that $T = (1 + o(1))\Sigma^\nu$. The two error terms in eq. (85) are then $O(\Sigma^{K-\nu})$ and $O(\Sigma^{-N+k\nu})$ as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$. The former decreases as ν increases, while the latter increases as ν increases. So, in order to minimize the size of the error, we should choose ν so that these two terms are equal. This means $\nu = (K + N)/(k + 1)$. In this case, eq. (85) reads

$$\int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma = a_{00} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}, j \neq 0} \frac{i^j}{j!} a_0^{(j)} \Sigma^j + \int_0^\Sigma \beta(\sigma) d\sigma + O(\Sigma^{K-\nu}), \quad (87)$$

which is eq. (80). \square

4. ESTIMATING THE INTEGRAND

We now move on to the second step of the argument, which involves attempting to extract information about $\alpha \in \cup_{K \in \mathbb{R}} \langle \sigma \rangle^K L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma^+)$ from the asymptotics of

$$A_\Sigma = \int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma \quad (88)$$

as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$. In order to extract any asymptotics whatsoever, we need to know that $\alpha(\sigma)$ does not fluctuate too rapidly with σ . Rather than axiomatize this condition (which can be and has been done [Kor04]), we specialize to the sort of functions considered in eigenvalue counting problems: we assume that $\alpha(\sigma)$ is of the form

$$\alpha(\sigma) = \frac{1}{\langle \sigma \rangle^J} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma)) \quad (89)$$

for some nondecreasing piecewise continuous $N : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and some polynomial $Z(\sigma) \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma]$ of degree (at most) L (which will in Weyl's law be d). (We can also add to α an element of $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$ without changing any of the arguments below.) Here $J \geq 0$ is a to-be-decided parameter, but given the admissible range of K_0 in Proposition 3.5 we will want to take $J \leq K_0$, where K_0 is such that $N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma) \in \langle \sigma \rangle^{K_0} L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$. (Increasing J above K_0 yields weaker results.) Note that Z is not *a priori* the same as in the previous section; the singularities of $\mathcal{F}N$, which must be dealt with in order to apply Newman's Tauberian argument, can either be dealt with by absorbing them into the function $b = \mathcal{F}\beta$ of Proposition 3.1, as we did in the previous subsection, in which case we need to evaluate their contribution explicitly, or by simply choosing J to be sufficiently large for their contribution to be treated as part of the background. (In the application to Weyl's law, we take $J = K_0 = d - 1$.) It remains to be seen which tradeoff is optimal (if any).

In this section, we will mainly take J to be sufficiently large such that the Tauberian argument in the previous section will imply that $\lim_{\Sigma \rightarrow \infty} A_\Sigma = \lim_{\Sigma \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) d\sigma$ exists. Similar results (e.g. Proposition 4.2) will hold as long as A_Σ does not diverge or fluctuate too rapidly as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$. And as the proof indicates, we only need quantitative Cauchy-like estimates (which might fall short of implying that $\{A_\Sigma\}_{\Sigma > 0}$ is actually Cauchy and hence convergent), e.g. that $A_\Sigma = O(\Sigma^\ell)$ for some $\ell > 0$, which can occur if J is too small. This generality is useful when directly applying the argument to the integral $\int_0^\Sigma N(\sigma) d\sigma$ instead of (88). In other words, the weighting of the right-hand side of eq. (89) by the factor of $\langle \sigma \rangle^{-J}$ is unnecessary but convenient. We restrict attention to the case when $\lim_{\Sigma \rightarrow \infty} A_\Sigma$ exists (that is, when J is sufficiently large) for the sake of this convenience, but the extension of the proposition below to greater generality is straightforward and left to the interested reader.

Proposition 4.1. *Given the setup above, suppose that $\lim_{\Sigma \rightarrow \infty} A_\Sigma$ exists and satisfies*

$$A_\Sigma = o\left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)}\right) + \lim_{\Sigma \rightarrow \infty} A_\Sigma \quad (90)$$

or

$$A_\Sigma = O\left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)}\right) + \lim_{\Sigma \rightarrow \infty} A_\Sigma \quad (91)$$

for some nondecreasing $\mathcal{R} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ with $\lim_{\Sigma \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}(\Sigma) = \infty$. Set $\kappa = L - \Delta$, where $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$ is defined by $J = L - 2\Delta + 1$. Then, for sufficiently large $\sigma \geq 0$, $N(\sigma) = Z(\sigma) + o(\sigma^\kappa \mathcal{R}(\sigma)^{-1/2})$ if (90) and $N(\sigma) = Z(\sigma) + O(\sigma^\kappa \mathcal{R}(\sigma)^{-1/2})$ if (91). ■

Remark 1. As long as $\lim_{\Sigma \rightarrow \infty} A_\Sigma$ exists, we can find some $\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ such that e.g. eq. (90) holds. Perhaps typically, $\mathcal{R}(\sigma)^{-1/2}$ will be very slowly decaying, so, in this case, the conclusion of Proposition 4.1 might as well be

$$N(\sigma) = Z(\sigma) + O(\sigma^\kappa). \quad (92)$$

The quantity $\Delta = L - \kappa$ is therefore the difference between the exponent of the estimate of the remainder term in eq. (92) and the exponent, L , of the ansatz. The difference between the former and the exponent of the estimate of the remainder term plugged into the argument as a Tauberian hypothesis is

$$K + J - \kappa = K + J - L + \Delta = K + J - L + \frac{L - J + 1}{2} = K + \frac{J}{2} - \frac{L}{2} + \frac{1}{2}, \quad (93)$$

where K is as in the previous section, i.e. $K = K_0 - J$. So (contingent on the existence of $\lim_{\Sigma \rightarrow \infty} A_\Sigma$) the (big-O) Tauberian argument automatically has a nontrivial conclusion if and only

if $\Delta > L - J - K$ (or if $\Delta = L - J - K$ and eq. (90) holds, in which case the output of the Tauberian argument is an $o(1)$ better than the input, as occurs in Duistermaat-Guillemin). (In other words, if $K \geq (L - J - 1)/2 = \Delta - 1$. If $K = 0$, this means $\Delta \leq 1$, so we cannot get any better estimate of the remainder term in eq. (92) than $O(\sigma^{L-1})$. This corresponds to the standard remainder term in Weyl's law (since then we take $L = d$). Consequently, in order to use this Tauberian argument to get any improvement on the standard remainder – for some appropriate class of manifolds – we must take into account \mathcal{R} . Equation (92) is not sufficient.)

Larger Δ , equivalently (for fixed L) smaller J (the “weighting”), corresponds to a better remainder term: the less we damp the function α , the more sensitive the integral A_Σ will be to large fluctuations of $N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma)$.

Proof. For any $L \in \mathbb{N}, J \in \mathbb{R}$, we define Δ, κ as above.

- Suppose that (90) holds and suppose, to the contrary of the desired conclusion, that there exists some $c > 0$ and $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^\infty, \sigma_n > 0, \sigma_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$|N(\sigma_n) - Z(\sigma_n)| \geq c\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta} \quad (94)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, either $N(\sigma_n) - Z(\sigma_n) \geq c\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta}$ for infinitely many n or $N(\sigma_n) - Z(\sigma_n) \leq -c\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta}$ for infinitely many n . By passing to a subsequence of $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, we may assume without loss of generality that the same possibility holds for all n . We break the argument into two analogous cases, depending on which possibility holds.

We begin with the positive case: $N(\sigma_n) - Z(\sigma_n) \geq c\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, since N is nondecreasing,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\sigma_n}^{\Sigma_n} \frac{1}{\langle \sigma \rangle^{L-2\Delta+1}} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma)) d\sigma \\ \geq \int_{\sigma_n}^{\Sigma_n} \frac{1}{\langle \sigma \rangle^{L-2\Delta+1}} (c\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta} + Z(\sigma_n) - Z(\sigma)) d\sigma \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

for any $\Sigma_n \geq \sigma_n$. For later convenience, we take $\Sigma_n \leq 2\sigma_n$. Consider the numerator of the integrand,

$$c\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta} + \sum_{m=0}^L Z_m(\sigma_n^{L-m} - \sigma^{L-m}), \quad (96)$$

where we've written $Z(\sigma) = \sum_{m=0}^L Z_m\sigma^{L-m}$. Since Z has degree L , we can find some $\Sigma_n \in (\sigma_n, 2\sigma_n)$ of the form

$$\Sigma_n = \sigma_n + \Omega(\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{1-\Delta}), \quad (97)$$

meaning that $\Sigma_n - \sigma_n \geq \varepsilon\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{1-\Delta}$ for sufficiently large n and sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, such that

$$\left| \sum_{m=0}^L Z_m(\sigma_n^{L-m} - \sigma^{L-m}) \right| \leq \frac{c}{2}\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta} \quad (98)$$

for all $\sigma \in [\sigma_n, \Sigma_n]$. Then we can bound the integral on the right-hand side of (95) below by

$$\frac{c}{2}\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta} \int_{\sigma_n}^{\Sigma_n} \frac{1}{\langle \sigma \rangle^{L-2\Delta+1}} d\sigma \geq \frac{c}{4}\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{\Delta-1}(\Sigma_n - \sigma_n) \geq \frac{\varepsilon c}{4} \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}(\sigma)}, \quad (99)$$

where we used the lower bound (97) on Σ_n . To summarize the argument so far, we have shown that (contingent on the existence of σ_n as above)

$$\int_{\sigma_n}^{\Sigma_n} \frac{1}{\langle \sigma \rangle^{L-2\Delta+1}} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma)) d\sigma \geq \frac{\varepsilon c}{4} \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}(\sigma)}, \quad (100)$$

for some $\Sigma_n \geq \sigma_n$. This is inconsistent with the asymptotic (90), and so no such $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ can exist.

We now consider the remaining case: $N(\sigma_n) - Z(\sigma_n) \leq -c\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, since N is nondecreasing,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_n}^{\sigma_n} \frac{1}{\langle \sigma \rangle^{L-2\Delta+1}} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma)) d\sigma \\ \leq \int_{\Sigma_n}^{\sigma_n} \frac{1}{\langle \sigma \rangle^{L-2\Delta+1}} (-c\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta} + Z(\sigma_n) - Z(\sigma)) d\sigma \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

for any $\Sigma_n \in (0, \sigma_n)$. For later convenience, we take $\Sigma_n \geq \sigma_n/2$. Consider the numerator of the integrand,

$$-c\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta} + \sum_{m=0}^L Z_m(\sigma_n^{L-m} - \sigma^{L-m}). \quad (102)$$

Clearly, since Z has degree L , we can find some $\Sigma_n \in (\sigma_n/2, \sigma_n)$ of the form

$$\Sigma_n = \sigma_n - \Omega(\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{1-\Delta}), \quad (103)$$

meaning that $\sigma_n - \Sigma_n \geq \varepsilon\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{1-\Delta}$ for sufficiently large n and sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, such that

$$\left| \sum_{m=0}^L Z_m(\sigma_n^{L-m} - \sigma^{L-m}) \right| \leq \frac{c}{2} \mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2} \sigma_n^{L-\Delta} \quad (104)$$

for all $\sigma \in [\Sigma_n, \sigma_n]$. Then we can bound the integral on the right-hand side of (101) above by

$$-\frac{c}{2} \mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2} \sigma_n^{L-\Delta} \int_{\Sigma_n}^{\sigma_n} \frac{1}{\langle \sigma \rangle^{L-2\Delta+1}} d\sigma \leq -\frac{c}{2} \mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2} \sigma_n^{\Delta-1} (\sigma_n - \Sigma_n) \quad (105)$$

$$\leq -\frac{\varepsilon c}{2} \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}(\sigma)}, \quad (106)$$

where we used the upper bound (103) on Σ_n . To summarize the argument so far, we have shown that (contingent on the existence of σ_n as above)

$$\int_{\Sigma_n}^{\sigma_n} \frac{1}{\langle \sigma \rangle^{L-2\Delta+1}} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma)) d\sigma \leq -\frac{\varepsilon c}{4} \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}(\sigma)}, \quad (107)$$

for some $\Sigma_n \geq \sigma_n/2$. This is inconsistent with the asymptotic (90), and so no such $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ can exist.

- Suppose that (91) holds. The proof is analogous to the one above. Suppose, to the contrary of the desired conclusion, that for every $c > 0$ there exists some $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, $\sigma_n > 0$, $\sigma_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$|N(\sigma_n) - Z(\sigma_n)| \geq c\mathcal{R}(\sigma_n)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta} \quad (108)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, either $N(\sigma_n) - Z(\sigma_n) \geq c\mathcal{R}(\sigma)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta}$ for infinitely many n or $N(\sigma_n) - Z(\sigma_n) \leq -c\mathcal{R}(\sigma)^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{L-\Delta}$ for infinitely many n . By passing to a subsequence of $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, we may assume without loss of generality that the same possibility holds for all n . And then one of the two possibilities has to hold for arbitrarily large c . We break the argument into two analogous cases. Beginning with the positive case, we can conclude as before that there exists some $\varepsilon > 0$ (independent of c) such that

$$\int_{\sigma_n}^{\Sigma_n} \frac{1}{\langle \sigma \rangle^{L-2\Delta+1}} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma)) \, d\sigma \geq \frac{\varepsilon c}{4} \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}(\sigma)}, \quad (109)$$

for some $\Sigma_n \geq \sigma_n$. Moreover, this holds for arbitrarily large c , with $\{\sigma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \{\Sigma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ depending on c . This is inconsistent with the asymptotic (91), and so no such $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ can exist. The remaining case is analogous. \square

An analogous argument yields the following:

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose that $A_\Sigma = \int_0^\Sigma \langle \sigma \rangle^{-J} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma)) \, d\sigma = O(\mathcal{R}(\sigma))$, where $\mathcal{R} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is nondecreasing. Then*

$$N(\sigma) = Z(\sigma) + O(\sigma^\kappa \mathcal{R}(\sigma^{+1/2})), \quad (110)$$

where κ is as in Proposition 4.1. \blacksquare

We now prove Theorem 1.1, which we rewrite here as a proposition (in slightly more generality):

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that $N : \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a piecewise continuous, nondecreasing function and that $Z(\sigma) \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma]$ is a polynomial in σ of degree L , and fix a $J \geq 0$. Let $\alpha(\sigma) = \langle \sigma \rangle^{-J} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma) + E(\sigma))$ for some $E \in C_c^\infty((0, \infty))$, and suppose that the singular support of $\mathcal{F}N$ and hence $a = \mathcal{F}\alpha$ is discrete. Suppose further that*

- (1) $\alpha \in \langle \sigma \rangle^K L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_\sigma)$, $K \geq 0$,
- (2) $a(\tau) \in \tau \langle \tau \rangle^k L^{1,M}(\mathbb{R}_\tau)$ for some $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \geq 0$.

Then, $N(\Sigma) = Z(\Sigma) + O(\Sigma^{J-\delta-\epsilon})$ as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$, where $\epsilon = (M+K)/(2k+2) - (K/2)$ and δ is defined by $\delta = (1/2)(J-L+1)$. \blacksquare

Proof. We apply Theorem 3.7 with $a_{00}, a_0, b, p = 0$, i.e. with $a = c = g$. Then, per the conclusion of the theorem,

$$\int_0^\Sigma \frac{1}{\langle \sigma \rangle^J} (N(\sigma) - Z(\sigma)) \, d\sigma = \int_0^\Sigma \alpha(\sigma) \, d\sigma - \int_0^\Sigma \frac{E(\sigma)}{\langle \sigma \rangle^J} \, d\sigma \quad (111)$$

$$= - \int_0^\infty \frac{E(\sigma)}{\langle \sigma \rangle^J} \, d\sigma + O(\sigma^{K-(M+K)/(k+1)}). \quad (112)$$

Applying Proposition 4.1 if $K < (M+K)/(k+1)$ or Proposition 4.2 otherwise, this implies that

$$N(\Sigma) = Z(\Sigma) + O(\Sigma^{\kappa + \frac{K}{2} - (M+K)/(2k+2)}) \quad (113)$$

for $\kappa = L - \Delta$ and Δ defined by $J = L - 2\Delta + 1$. We see that $\kappa = J - \delta$, and so the claim holds. \square

Proposition 4.3 can be used iteratively in order to yield better bounds on $N(\Sigma)$. Indeed, say we are working under the restriction $K = 0$ — then the J for which the hypotheses of Proposition 4.3 apply will in part be determined by how close $N(\Sigma)$ is to $Z(\Sigma)$, and the conclusion of the proposition

may be plugged back into the argument in order to allow us to use a lower J . Since the exponent in the $O(\sigma^\kappa)$ part of the error is $\kappa = (1/2)(J + L) - 1/2$, lowering J without lowering M yields a better remainder. Lowering J is equivalent to regularizing $\mathcal{F}\alpha$ less, so lowering J typically forces us to lower M . In fact, if we allow fractional M , then the trade-off is tit-for-tat if $k = 0$. But if $k > 0$, as is always the case in applications of interest, then lowering J and decreasing M by the corresponding amount improves the remainder term. If k can be taken arbitrarily close to zero, then this gains us nothing, but if k is bounded below by a positive number, then this is a fruitful thing to do. This suggests that, by allowing M in Proposition 4.3 to be fractional, we can repeat the argument, changing J to sharpen the conclusion so that the bound depends on k less strongly. Given Proposition 4.3, we may also start with J low, K high, apply the argument, use the conclusion to lower K , and repeat. Since $K \geq 0$, we must choose J to be sufficiently low to iterate an optimal or near optimal number of times. Since this procedure does not change the functions under consideration, M, k, J may all remain unchanged through multiple iterations of the basic argument. Carrying through this procedure, we expect that, for every $o > 0$,

$$N(\Sigma) = Z(\Sigma) + O(\Sigma^{\frac{k+1}{k+2}(L-1) + \frac{J-M}{k+2} + o}) \quad (114)$$

as $\Sigma \rightarrow \infty$. For $L = d, J = d - 1$, this says $N(\Sigma) = Z(\Sigma) + O(\Sigma^{d-1-M/(k+2)+o})$.

5. APPLICATION TO WEYL'S LAW

Let (M, g) denote a compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $d \geq 1$, and let $0 = \lambda_0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots$ denote the eigenvalues of the positive semidefinite Laplace-Beltrami operator (counted with multiplicity), and for convenience we assume $\text{Vol}_g M = 1$. Consider the following well-defined regular Borel measure on the line \mathbb{R}_σ :

$$\mu_{1/2}(\sigma) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \delta(\sigma - \lambda_n^{1/2}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \delta(\sigma - \sigma_n), \quad (115)$$

where $\sigma_n = \lambda_n^{1/2}$. Note that $\mu_{1/2}$, considered as a map $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}) \ni \varphi \mapsto \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \varphi(\sigma) d\mu_{1/2}(\sigma)$, is in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ (e.g. as a consequence of the weakest form of Weyl's law). This measure is related to the eigenvalue counting function $N(\lambda) = \#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_n \leq \lambda\}$ by the distributional identity $\partial_\sigma N_{1/2}(\sigma) = \mu_{1/2}(\sigma)$, where

$$N_{1/2}(\sigma) = \#\{n : \lambda_n^{1/2} = \sigma_n \leq \sigma\} = N(\sigma^2). \quad (116)$$

Now suppose that the nontrivial geodesic loops in M are at most δ -fold degenerate. ('Geodesic loop' means smooth geodesic loop, so a periodic trajectory of the Hamiltonian flow in phase space.) Here

$$\delta \in \{0, \dots, 2d - 1\} \quad (117)$$

is roughly the Hausdorff dimension of the set of points in the sphere bundle $\mathbb{S}M$ lying along a (nontrivial) geodesic loop. (This dimension will always be positive, unless M just so happens to have no nontrivial geodesic loops.) Suppose that (M, g) is a nonpathological (see the precise hypotheses of [DG75, Theorem 4.5]), smooth, compact Riemannian manifold without boundary of dimension $d \geq 1$, whose nontrivial geodesic loops are at most δ -fold degenerate. Then, as shown in [Cha74][Hör68][DG75], letting $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be the set of lengths of geodesic loops (including loops consisting of multiple lap around a single loop):

- (1) \mathcal{T} is discrete and has no accumulation points.
- (2) The singular support of the half-wave trace $\text{HWT}_{M,g} = \mathcal{F}\mu_{1/2}$ is \mathcal{T} .

(3) $0 \in \mathcal{T}$, and given an open neighborhood $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ of 0 whose closure is disjoint from $\mathcal{T} \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\mathcal{F}\mu_{1/2}|_U(\tau) = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \frac{Z_j}{(\tau - i0)^{d-j}} + E(\tau)$$

for some $Z_0, \dots, Z_{d-1} \in \mathbb{C}$, $Z_0 \neq 0$, and $E \in C^\infty(U)$. Moreover, $Z_1, Z_3, Z_5, \dots = 0$ [DG75, Proposition 2.1].

(4) Given any $T \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{0\}$ and an open neighborhood $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of T whose closure is disjoint from $\mathcal{T} \setminus \{T\}$,

$$\mathcal{F}\mu_{1/2}|_V(\tau) = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor 2^{-1}(\delta-1) \rfloor} \frac{C_j}{(\tau - T - i0)^{-j+(\delta+1)/2}} + E(\tau)$$

for some T -dependent $C_0 = C_0(T), \dots, C_{\lfloor 2^{-1}(\delta-1) \rfloor} = C_{\lfloor 2^{-1}(\delta-1) \rfloor}(T) \in \mathbb{C}$, and function $E \in C^\infty(V)$.

Referring to the statement of [DG75, Theorem 4.5], $\delta = \max\{d_j(T) : j = 1, \dots, r, T \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{0\}\}$. In fact, Hörmander and Duistermaat & Guillemin provide explicit formulas for the first couple of these coefficients. The very precise information on the singularities of $\mathcal{F}\mu_{1/2}$ given by the Duistermaat-Guillemin result can serve as the local input to Newman's Tauberian argument. For each $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and open $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, let $\langle D \rangle^{-s} L_{\text{loc}}^1(U) \subseteq \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$ denote the subspace of tempered distributions u such that whenever $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is supported in U , $\langle D \rangle^s \chi u \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$. (This notation is slightly abusive, since according to standard usage a statement like " $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$ " is not supposed to state any temperedness of u , but since $\langle D \rangle^s$ is only defined on tempered distributions (except for $s \in 2\mathbb{N}$), this should not cause any confusion below.)

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that (M, g) is a nonpathological d -dimensional compact Riemannian manifold whose nontrivial geodesic loops are at most δ -fold degenerate, $\delta \in \{0, \dots, 2d-1\}$. Given any polynomial $Z \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma]$ and any $E \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$, set*

$$\alpha(\sigma) = \begin{cases} 0 & (\sigma \leq 0) \\ \langle \sigma \rangle^{1-d} (N_{1/2}(\sigma) - Z(\sigma) + E(\sigma)) & (\sigma \geq 0). \end{cases}$$

Then, the Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}\alpha$ of α lies in $\langle D \rangle^{-(d-\delta/2-1/2-\epsilon)} L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$ for every $\epsilon > 0$. \blacksquare

Proof. Clearly, it suffices to consider $Z = 0 = E$, since the Fourier transform of $\langle \sigma \rangle^\ell \Theta(\sigma) Z(\sigma)$ has singular support at the origin, for any $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ and $Z \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma]$, and, for any $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$, the Fourier transform of $\langle \sigma \rangle^\ell E$ is Schwartz and therefore in $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$. Since \mathcal{T} is discrete, we may choose a partition of unity $\{\chi_n\}_{n=0}^\infty \subset C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}; [0, 1])$ of \mathbb{R} such that each χ_n contains at most one point of \mathcal{T} in its support and (if it contains such a point) is identically equal to one in some neighborhood of it. We index our partition of unity such that χ_0 is the only element of this partition of unity whose support contains the origin. We can write, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\chi_n \mathcal{F}\alpha = \chi_n \langle D \rangle^{1-d} \mathcal{F}N_{1/2} = \chi_n \langle D \rangle^{1-d} \chi_n \mathcal{F}N_{1/2} + \chi_n \langle D \rangle^{1-d} (1 - \chi_n) \mathcal{F}N_{1/2}. \quad (118)$$

Since $\mathcal{F}\mu_{1/2}(\tau) = -i\tau \mathcal{F}N_{1/2}$, by the pseudolocality of $\langle D \rangle^{1-d}$ the second term in (118), $\chi_n \langle D \rangle^{1-d} (1 - \chi_n) \mathcal{F}N_{1/2}$, is smooth. (If $\text{supp } \chi_n \cap \mathcal{T} = \emptyset$, then from $\text{singsupp } \langle D \rangle^{1-d} (1 - \chi_n) \mathcal{F}N_{1/2} \subset \mathcal{T}$ we conclude $\text{singsupp } \chi_n \langle D \rangle^{1-d} (1 - \chi_n) \mathcal{F}N_{1/2} = \emptyset$. If $\text{supp } \chi_n \cap \mathcal{T} = \{T\}$, then $\text{singsupp } (1 - \chi_n) \mathcal{F}N_{1/2} \subset \mathcal{T} \setminus \{T\}$, so a similar conclusion holds. Alternatively, via the symbol calculus, the essential support of the operator $\chi_n \langle D \rangle^{1-d} (1 - \chi_n)$ is disjoint from \mathcal{T} .) It remains therefore to show that

$$\chi_n \langle D \rangle^{1-d} \chi_n \mathcal{F}N_{1/2} \in \langle D \rangle^{-(d-\delta/2-1/2-\epsilon)} L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) \quad (119)$$

for each $n \neq 0$. This will hold if $\langle D \rangle^{1-d} \chi_n \mathcal{F} N_{1/2} \in \langle D \rangle^{-(d-\delta/2-1/2-\epsilon)} L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$ holds.

If χ_n contains no points of \mathcal{T} in its support, then by Chazarain's theorem, $\chi_n \mathcal{F} \alpha \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, so by the pseudolocality of $\langle D \rangle^{1-d}$, (119) holds. Otherwise – letting T denote the sole point in $\mathcal{T} \cap \text{supp } \chi_n$ – by the Duistermaat-Guillemin result, we can write

$$\chi_n(\tau) \mathcal{F} \mu_{1/2}(\tau) = \chi_n(\tau) \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor 2^{-1}(\delta-1) \rfloor} \frac{C_j}{(\tau - T - i0)^{-j+(\delta+1)/2}} + E(\tau) \quad (120)$$

for some $E \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, depending on n . Since χ_n is identically equal to one in some neighborhood of T , eq. (120) actually implies that

$$\chi_n(\tau) \mathcal{F} \mu_{1/2}(\tau) = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor 2^{-1}(\delta-1) \rfloor} \frac{C_j}{(\tau - T - i0)^{-j+(\delta+1)/2}} + F(\tau) \quad (121)$$

for some $F \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Applying the pseudodifferential operator $\langle D \rangle^{1-d}$ to both sides eq. (121),

$$\langle D \rangle^{1-d} \chi_n \mathcal{F} \mu_{1/2}(\tau) = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor 2^{-1}(\delta-1) \rfloor} C_j \langle D \rangle^{1-d} (\tau - T - i0)^{j-(\delta+1)/2} + \langle D \rangle^{1-d} F(\tau). \quad (122)$$

By the mapping properties of Ψ DOs (or equivalently pseudolocality), $\langle D \rangle^{1-d} F(\tau) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. It therefore suffices to observe that

$$\langle D \rangle^{1-d} (\tau - T - i0)^{j-(\delta+1)/2} \in \langle D \rangle^{-(d-\delta/2-1/2-\epsilon)} L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}) \quad (123)$$

holds, for each $j = 0, \dots, \lfloor 2^{-1}(\delta-1) \rfloor$, which is equivalent to the inclusion $(\tau - T - i0)^{j-(\delta+1)/2} \in \langle D \rangle^{\delta/2-1/2+\epsilon} L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$ holding for each j . By the translation invariance of $\langle D \rangle$ and its fractional powers, it suffices to show that $\langle D \rangle^{1-d} (\tau - i0)^{j-(\delta+1)/2} \in \langle D \rangle^{-(d-\delta/2-1/2-\epsilon)} L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$ holds, for each $j = 0, \dots, \lfloor 2^{-1}(\delta-1) \rfloor$. For this, it suffices (and is in fact necessary, by Sobolev embedding) to show that, for each $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\langle D \rangle^{-(\delta/2-1/2+\epsilon(\epsilon))} (\tau - i0)^{j-(\delta+1)/2} \in L_{\text{loc}}^{1+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}), \quad (124)$$

where $\epsilon(-) : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is some function such that $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \epsilon(\epsilon) = 0$. Via the Taylor series expansion of $\langle \sigma \rangle^{-\ell}$ around $\sigma = \infty$, we see that $\langle D \rangle^{-(\delta/2-1/2+\epsilon(\epsilon))} (\tau - i0)^{j-(\delta+1)/2} = (\tau - i0)^{-1+\epsilon(\epsilon)/2+j} G(\tau)$ for some continuous $G(\tau)$. This is in $L_{\text{loc}}^{1+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R})$ for each $j = 0, \dots, \lfloor 2^{-1}(\delta-1) \rfloor$ if and only if it is for $j = 0$. This holds if $(1 - \epsilon/2)(1 + \epsilon) < 1$, so we can find $\epsilon(\epsilon)$ with the desired properties. \square

Analogously, if we replace $\langle \sigma \rangle^{1-d}$ in the definition of α above with $\langle \sigma \rangle^{-J}$, then

$$\mathcal{F} \alpha \in \langle D \rangle^{-J+\delta/2-1/2+\epsilon} L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}). \quad (125)$$

The singularity of $\mathcal{F} \alpha$ at the origin is easy to treat via an analogous argument, and the result is that $\mathcal{F} \alpha \in \langle D \rangle^{-J+d+\epsilon} L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R})$ in the $E = 0$ case, with the singularity at the origin expressible via a Laurent series with leading term $1/(\tau - i0)^{d+1-J}$.

Proposition 5.2 (Theorem 1.2). *Fix $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Suppose that (M, g) is a compact Riemannian manifold such that $\langle D_\tau \rangle^{-J} \text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau)$ is in $L_{\text{loc}}^{1,\ell}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$ for $J \geq d-1$ and such that*

$$\|\langle D_\tau \rangle^{-J} \text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau)\|_{L^{1,\ell}[+1,+T]}, \|\langle D_\tau \rangle^{-J} \text{HWT}_{M,g}(\tau)\|_{L^{1,\ell}[-T,-1]} \leq CT^k \quad (126)$$

for some (M, g) -dependent $C > 0$ and some real number $k \geq 2$. Then, for some polynomial Z_0 of degree $d - 2$,

$$N(\lambda) = (2\pi)^{-d} \text{Vol}_g(M) \text{Vol}(\mathbb{B}^d) \sigma^d + Z_0(\sigma) + O(\sigma^{\frac{J+d-1}{2}-\epsilon}) \quad (127)$$

for $\epsilon = \ell/(2k - 2)$. ■

Proof. We can choose a $Z \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma]$, $E \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$ such that, setting

$$\alpha(\sigma) = \begin{cases} 0 & (\sigma < 0) \\ \langle \sigma \rangle^{-J} (N_{1/2}(\sigma) - Z(\sigma) + E(\sigma)) & (\sigma \geq 0), \end{cases} \quad (128)$$

$\mathcal{F}\alpha$ is smooth in some neighborhood of the origin and vanishing to first order. Moreover, the leading term of Z is $(2\pi)^{-d} \text{Vol}_g(M) \text{Vol}(\mathbb{B}^d) \sigma^d$ (by the same computation as in the proof of Weyl's law). From the absence of half of the terms in Item 3 (note the different usage of 'Z') – see also [DG75, Equation 2.4] – we see that the subleading part Z_0 of Z has degree at most $d - 2$. The conclusion now follows from Proposition 4.3, which we can apply with $K = 0$ (since $J \geq d - 1$), $L = d$, and $k - 2$ in place of k . □

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is supported by a Hertz fellowship, and thanks Gregory Debruyne, Elliott Fairchild, Peter Hintz, and Richard Melrose for helpful comments and/or conversations.

REFERENCES

- [Ava56] Vojislav G. Avakumovic. “Über die Eigenfunktionen auf geschlossenen Riemannschen Mannigfaltigkeiten.” In: *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 65 (1956), pp. 327–344.
- [CG19] Yaiza Canzani and Jeffrey Galkowski. “Eigenfunction concentration via geodesic beams”. In: *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)* 2021 (2019), pp. 197–257.
- [CG20] Yaiza Canzani and Jeffrey Galkowski. “Weyl remainders: an application of geodesic beams”. In: *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2010.03969 (Oct. 2020), arXiv:2010.03969. arXiv: [2010.03969](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.03969) [math.AP].
- [Cha74] Jacques Chazarain. “Formule de Poisson pour les variétés riemanniennes.” In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 24 (1974), pp. 65–82. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/142270>.
- [Cor36] Johannes van der Corput. “Verallgemeinerung einer Mordellschen Beweismethode in der Geometrie der Zahlen, Zweite Mitteilung”. ger. In: *Acta Arithmetica* 2.1 (1936), pp. 145–146. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/205437>.
- [Deb18] Gregory Debruyne. “Complex Tauberian theorems and applications to Beurling generalized primes”. PhD thesis. Ghent, Belgium: Ghent University, 2018.
- [DG75] J.J. (Hans) Duistermaat and Victor W. Guillemin. “The Spectrum of Positive Elliptic Operators and Periodic Bicharacteristics.” In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 29 (1975), pp. 39–80. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/142329>.
- [Dij13] Gerrit Dijk. *Distribution Theory*. De Gruyter, 2013. ISBN: 978-3-11-029851-2.
- [DV19] Gregory Debruyne and Jasson Vindas. “Complex Tauberian theorems for Laplace transforms with local pseudofunction boundary behavior”. In: *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique* 138.2 (2019), pp. 799–833.
- [GS64] Israel M. Gelfand and Georgiy E. Shilov. *Generalized Functions*. Vol. 1. 1964. ISBN: 978-1-4704-2658-3.
- [Hör68] Lars Hörmander. “The spectral function of an elliptic operator”. In: *Acta Mathematica* 121 (1968), pp. 193–218. DOI: [10.1007/BF02391913](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02391913).

- [Hux96] Martin Neil Huxley. *Area, Lattice Points, and Exponential Sums*. Vol. 13. Clarendon Press, 1996.
- [IKN04] E. Ivić A. and Krätzel, M. Kühleitner, and W.G. Nowak. “Lattice points in large regions and related arithmetic functions: Recent developments in a very classic topic”. In: *arXiv preprint math/0410522* (2004).
- [Kor04] Jacob Korevaar. *Tauberian Theory: a Century of Developments*. Vol. 329. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2004, pp. XV, 483. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-662-10225-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-10225-1).
- [Kor82] Jacob Korevaar. “On Newman’s quick way to the prime number theorem”. In: *The Mathematical Intelligencer* 4.3 (1982), pp. 108–115.
- [Lev52] Boris M. Levitan. “On the asymptotic behavior of the spectral function of a self-adjoint differential equation of the second order”. Russian. In: *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Mat.* 16 (1952), pp. 325–352. ISSN: 0373-2436.
- [New80] Donald J. Newman. “Simple Analytic Proof of the Prime Number Theorem”. In: *The American Mathematical Monthly* 87.9 (1980), pp. 693–696.
- [Wey11] Hermann Weyl. “Ueber die asymptotische Verteilung der Eigenwerte”. In: *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse* 1911 (1911), pp. 110–117. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/58792>.
- [Zag97] Don Zagier. “Newman’s short proof of the prime number theorem”. In: *The American Mathematical Monthly* 104.8 (1997), pp. 705–708.

Email address: ethanws@mit.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, MASSACHUSETTS 02139-4307, USA