

SPECIAL POTENTIALS FOR RELATIVISTIC LAPLACIANS I FRACTIONAL ROLLNIK-CLASS

GIACOMO ASCIONE, ATSUHIDE ISHIDA AND JÓZSEF LŐRINCZI

ABSTRACT. We propose a counterpart of the classical Rollnik-class of potentials for fractional and massive relativistic Laplacians, and describe this space in terms of appropriate Riesz potentials. These definitions rely on precise resolvent estimates. We show that Coulomb-type potentials are elements of fractional Rollnik-class up to but not including the critical singularity of the Hardy potential. For the operators with fractional exponent $\alpha = 1$ there exists no fractional Rollnik potential, however, in low dimensions we make sense of these classes as limiting cases by using Γ -convergence. In a second part of the paper we derive detailed results on the self-adjointness and spectral properties of relativistic Schrödinger operators obtained under perturbations by fractional Rollnik potentials. We also define an extended fractional Rollnik-class which is the maximal space for the Hilbert-Schmidt property of the related Birman-Schwinger operators.

Key-words: fractional and relativistic Laplacians, Riesz potential, resolvent estimates, Γ -convergence, Coulomb potentials, subcriticality

2010 *MS Classification:* Primary 46N50, 81Q10; Secondary 42B20

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	4
2.1. Massive and massless relativistic Laplacians	4
2.2. Lizorkin space and Riesz potential	5
2.3. Resolvent estimates	8
3. Fractional Rollnik class	9
3.1. Definitions and basic properties	9
3.2. Comparison properties	15
3.3. Specific cases	17
3.4. Extended fractional Rollnik-class	24
4. Perturbations by fractional Rollnik class potentials	25
4.1. Self-adjointness	25
4.2. Spectral properties	28
5. The case $\alpha = 1$	33
6. Appendix: Proofs of resolvent estimates	36
6.1. Massless case	37
6.2. Massive case	39
Acknowledgments	49
References	49

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to define and explore a relativistic counterpart of the classical Rollnik-class of potentials, which plays a fundamental role in mathematical quantum theory. We call this fractional Rollnik-class, and also set ourselves the task to describe the properties of relativistic Schrödinger operators obtained as perturbations of the (free) relativistic operators by this class of potentials. Since both the massive and massless cases involve singular integral operators, in our approach the Riesz potential will play a role to a far-reaching extent. In particular, we will make use of it to a detailed description of Coulomb-type potentials belonging to fractional Rollnik-class and investigate their boundaries on the verge of the critical Hardy potential.

In the paper [26] Rollnik identified the class of potentials

$$\mathcal{R} = \left\{ V : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}}^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^2} dx dy < \infty \right\}, \quad (1.1)$$

which later turned out to play a special role in the classical theory of Schrödinger operators on the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. He noticed that for an eigenvalue $\lambda < 0$ generated by a negative potential V , the eigenvalue equation $H\varphi := (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta + V)\varphi = \lambda\varphi$ can equivalently be written as $K_\lambda\psi := \sqrt{-V}(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta - \lambda)^{-1}\sqrt{-V}\psi = \psi$, with $\psi = \sqrt{-V}\varphi$, so the original Schrödinger operator H has a eigenvalue λ exactly when the related operator K_λ has eigenvalue 1. Thereby he appears to have anticipated by a five years (if we count by the publication dates) what is now known as the Birman-Schwinger principle. In fact, Rollnik studied mostly the case $\lambda = 0$ and required his operator K_0 (in his notation $W(0)$) to be compact, that he satisfied by turning its kernel square-integrable, which results in (1.1).

The integral condition (1.1) has appeared in subsequent work by Schwinger [30], Scadron, Weinberg and Wright [29], Coester [9], and in the series of papers by Grossmann and Wu [18]. A later development is Simon's mathematical work in the paper [31] and the monograph [32], in which he made a comprehensive analysis of Rollnik potentials in the non-relativistic case.

Our goal here is to construct and analyse a counterpart of Rollnik-class for the massive and massless relativistic Laplacians

$$L_{m,\alpha} = (-\Delta + m^{2/\alpha})^{\alpha/2} - m, \quad 0 < \alpha < 2, \quad m \geq 0,$$

on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $d \geq 1$, and study relativistic Schrödinger operators obtained as perturbations of $L_{m,\alpha}$ by these potentials. For the massless case $m = 0$ the operator $L_{m,\alpha}$ reduces to the fractional Laplacian with exponent $\frac{\alpha}{2}$, and for $\alpha = 1$ and $m > 0$ it is the physical relativistic operator widely used in mathematical physics. For the purposes of understanding fractional Rollnik-class it will be useful to keep the full range $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ in order to appreciate how our results (qualitatively) depend on the details of the operators of different fractional exponent. Our guiding principle is to keep to the original idea that the Birman-Schwinger operators associated with the non-local Schrödinger operators we consider should have the Hilbert-Schmidt property, however, for the rest we will have to tread a new path due to qualitative differences between the Laplacian and the fractional operators requiring very different techniques.

In the following we summarise our approach and the main results of this paper.

(1) Our first task is to find an appropriate concept of a fractional Rollnik-class holding to this principle and investigate its structure. The construction will depend on precise estimates of the resolvent kernels of the operators $L_{m,\alpha}$. Making use of estimate (2.14) and assuming

$$\alpha < d < 2\alpha, \quad (1.2)$$

we introduce the fractional Rollnik-class

$$\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha} = \left\{ V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2(d-\alpha)}} dx dy < \infty \right\}$$

in the massless case and

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha^m = \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha} \cap \mathcal{R}$$

in the massive case (see Definition 3.1). This definition is consistent with the classical case as it reproduces \mathcal{R} for $d = 3$ and $\alpha = 2$ (see also Corollary 3.14 below). Observing that the Fourier transform of the Riesz potential \mathcal{I}_β of functions on Lizorkin space can be computed (Theorem 2.2), we show that the fractional Rollnik norm of V can be expressed in the form

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} = c(d,\alpha) \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} |V| \right\|_2 \quad (1.3)$$

where $c(d,\alpha)$ is a constant, we show that the left-hand side above is indeed a norm (Theorem 3.4), turning $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ into a Banach space (Theorem 3.6). Furthermore, as it will be seen, fractional Rollnik-class contains a variety of L^p subspaces (Propositions 3.11-3.13).

To get a closer idea of fractional Rollnik potentials, we consider several specific cases (Section 3.4). In particular, we consider potentials having Coulomb-type singularities and by using (1.3) and formula (3.15) allowing to compute Riesz potentials of radial functions, we show that $V(x) = |x|^{-\beta_1} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x|<1\}} + |x|^{-\beta_2} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x|\geq 1\}}$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ if and only if $\beta_1 < \alpha$ and $\beta_2 \in (\alpha, d)$ (see Propositions 3.19-3.22 and Corollary 3.24). Since for the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$ the critical potential is the Hardy potential $V(x) = |x|^{-\alpha}$, we see that the Coulomb-type fractional Rollnik-class potentials are subcritical with possible singularities arbitrarily approaching but not attaining the critical exponent. Also, we show (Theorem 3.18) that the Hardy exponent marks the boundary to Coulomb-potentials in fractional Rollnik class. We also show that $V(x) = |x|^{-\alpha} (-\log|x|)^{-\gamma} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x|<1/2\}}$, with $\alpha < d$, belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ exactly when $\gamma > \frac{1}{2}$ (see Proposition 3.20). Apart from Coulomb singularities, we also discuss potentials with compact support and show that their fractional Rollnik norm increases under symmetric rearrangement and it can be bounded by the fractional perimeter of the supporting set (Section 3.4.1), and asymmetric potentials whose non-radial symmetry deficit we can bound by the L^1 -norm of the difference between the potential and a family of rotationally symmetric potentials (Section 3.4.2).

Using another crucial resolvent estimate (see (2.16)-(2.17) and (2.18)-(2.20) below) we also introduce extended fractional Rollnik-classes $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m$ (Definition 3.25), containing $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ as a proper subset (Proposition 3.26 and Remark 3.29 below). We will discuss the role of the extended fractional Rollnik-class further below.

The restriction (1.2) has the implication that according to our definition above, in case $d \geq 2\alpha$ no non-trivial continuous potential exists in $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ (Theorem 3.9). Also, there exists no fractional Rollnik-class potential for the physical case $\alpha = 1$ in any dimension. However, in low dimensions we can make sense of them by further developing Definition 3.1. For $d = 1$ it is covered by

the extended fractional Rollnik-class, and for $d = 2$ we obtain it as a limiting case. Proposition 3.10 shows, however, that the required limit is not straightforward. Since, as it turns out, with a sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ accumulating at $\alpha = 1$ the corresponding Schrödinger operators with \mathcal{R}_{d,α_n} -potentials have a limit in Γ -convergence sense (see Theorem 5.3), we arrive to define it by $\mathcal{R}_{d,1}^p := L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \liminf_{\alpha \downarrow 1} \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ with $p > 1$.

(2) Having defined fractional Rollnik-class, our interest next is to study the properties of relativistic Schrödinger operators of the form $H_{m,\alpha} = L_{m,\alpha} + V$ with V in $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}^m$ or $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m$, for $m \geq 0$. First we consider the self-adjointness of $H_{m,\alpha}$. To obtain this it suffices to have the operator norm of $K_\lambda^m = |V|^{1/2}(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1}|V|^{1/2}$ vanish as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ (Lemma 4.1). To ensure this, we show that K_λ^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator at least for a large enough λ . In particular, we show that for potentials in $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ the operator $H_{m,\alpha}$ is self-adjoint (Theorem 4.3). Also, we show that if a potential is in the extended fractional Rollnik-class $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}$, then the related K_λ^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator, and conversely, if K_λ^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for a potential, then the potential is in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}$ (Theorem 4.4), thus the extended fractional Rollnik-class is the maximal space for the Hilbert-Schmidt property to hold for the operators we consider.

Next we study the spectrum of $H_{m,\alpha}$. Since fractional Rollnik potentials are small in an aggregate sense (without being subject to any specific fall-off rate), a perturbation by such potentials does not change the essential spectrum of $L_{m,\alpha}$ (see Theorem 4.7). However, contrary to the classical case, we can not make use of Fourier methods and develop an other argument to show this. In case $H_{m,\alpha}$ has a non-empty discrete spectrum, we can estimate the number of negative eigenvalues (Theorem 4.8); since this number is controlled above by the fractional Rollnik norm, the discrete spectrum is finite in both the massless and massive cases. We obtain similar results for $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}$ -class potentials (Theorems 4.9-4.10), where now the control is made by the quantity $[V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}}$, which defines the extended class. By using the extended Birman-Schwinger principle, we can further derive conditions under which no bound states exist and zero (the spectral edge) is not an embedded eigenvalue. This occurs when then fractional Rollnik norm is too small (Theorem 4.13).

(3) The main estimates on the resolvent $R_\lambda^m = (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1}$, $\lambda > 0$, (uniform in λ , pointwise upper and lower for large λ and for $\lambda = 0$ both for the massive and massless cases) on which our constructions are built are stated in the expressions (2.14)-(2.15), (2.16)-(2.17) and (2.19)-(2.20). Detailed proofs will be presented in the Appendix. We note that these results have an independent interest, in areas such as analytic and probabilistic potential theory.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Massive and massless relativistic Laplacians

Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $m \geq 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and consider the family of functions $\Psi_{m,\alpha}(u) = (u + m^{2/\alpha})^{\alpha/2} - m$ for every $u \geq 0$. Using these functions, we define the operators

$$\begin{aligned} L_{m,\alpha} &= \Psi_{m,\alpha}(-\Delta) = (-\Delta + m^{2/\alpha})^{\alpha/2} - m && \text{if } m > 0 \\ L_{0,\alpha} &= \Psi_{0,\alpha}(-\Delta) = (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} && \text{if } m = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and generically combine the notation into just $L_{m,\alpha}$, $m \geq 0$, whenever suitable. These operators can be defined in several different ways. We define them through the Fourier multipliers

$$(\widehat{L_{m,\alpha}f})(y) = \Psi_{m,\alpha}(|y|^2)\widehat{f}(y), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad f \in \text{Dom}(L_{m,\alpha}),$$

with domain

$$\text{Dom}(L_{m,\alpha}) = \left\{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) : \Psi_{m,\alpha}(|\cdot|^2)\widehat{f} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \right\}, \quad m \geq 0.$$

In the $m = 0$ case we have more specifically $\text{Dom}(L_{0,\alpha}) = H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$, i.e., the fractional Sobolev space of order $0 < \alpha < 2$.

For $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we have the expression

$$L_{m,\alpha}f(x) = -\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{|y-x|>\varepsilon} (f(y) - f(x)) \nu_{m,\alpha}(dy)$$

with the Lévy jump measures as follows. For $m > 0$ we have

$$\nu_{m,\alpha}(dx) = j_{m,\alpha}(|x|)dx = \frac{2^{\frac{\alpha-d}{2}} m^{\frac{d+\alpha}{2\alpha}} \alpha}{\pi^{d/2} \Gamma(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})} \frac{K_{(d+\alpha)/2}(m^{1/\alpha}|x|)}{|x|^{(d+\alpha)/2}} dx, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}, \quad (2.1)$$

and for $m = 0$ we have

$$\nu_{0,\alpha}(dx) = j_{0,\alpha}(|x|)dx = \frac{2^\alpha \Gamma(\frac{d+\alpha}{2})}{\pi^{d/2} |\Gamma(-\frac{\alpha}{2})|} \frac{dx}{|x|^{d+\alpha}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Here

$$K_\rho(z) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{z}{2}\right)^\rho \int_0^\infty t^{-\rho-1} e^{-t - \frac{z^2}{4t}} dt, \quad z > 0, \quad \rho > -\frac{1}{2},$$

is the standard modified Bessel function of the second (sometimes also called third) kind. Below we will make use of the asymptotic formulae

$$K_\rho(z) \sim \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2|z|}} e^{-|z|} \quad \text{as } |z| \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{and} \quad K_\rho(z) \sim \frac{\Gamma(\rho)}{2} \left(\frac{2}{z}\right)^\rho \quad \text{as } |z| \downarrow 0. \quad (2.3)$$

A consequence of the second expression is that $j_{m,\alpha} \rightarrow j_{0,\alpha}$ as $m \downarrow 0$, thus the operator $L_{0,\alpha}$ is the massless limit of $L_{m,\alpha}$.

The operators $L_{m,\alpha}$, $m \geq 0$, are positive with spectrum $\text{Spec } L_{m,\alpha} = \text{Spec}_{\text{ess}} L_{m,\alpha} = [0, \infty)$, and self-adjoint with core $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, for every $0 < \alpha < 2$ and $m \geq 0$. In case $m > 0$, the operator $L_{m,\alpha}$ is called *relativistic fractional Laplacian with exponent $\frac{\alpha}{2}$ and rest mass m* , while for $m = 0$ it is the *fractional Laplacian with exponent $\frac{\alpha}{2}$* , but for simplicity we will refer to them as the massive and massless relativistic Laplacians, respectively.

Below we will use the following generic notations. $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ norms will be denoted by $\|\cdot\|_p$ and $L^p(E)$, $E \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^d$, norms by $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(E)}$. A ball centred in $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with radius $r > 0$ will be denoted by $B_r(x)$, and simply B_r when $x = 0$. We write ω_d for the Lebesgue measure of B_1 and σ_d for the surface measure of ∂B_1 , so that $\sigma_d = d\omega_d$. When convenient, we will also use the notations $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$ and $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$.

2.2. Lizorkin space and Riesz potential

Consider the negative Laplacian $-\Delta$ and for $\beta \in (0, d)$ let

$$\gamma_d(\beta) = \frac{2^\beta \pi^{d/2} \Gamma(\frac{\beta}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{d-\beta}{2})}.$$

The Riesz potential of order $0 < \beta < d$ of a measurable function f is defined as

$$\mathcal{I}_\beta f(x) = (-\Delta)^{\beta/2} f(x) = \frac{1}{\gamma_d(\beta)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{d-\beta}} dy = (k_\beta * f)(x).$$

The requirement $\beta > 0$ is necessary in order to guarantee that the Riesz kernel k_β is at least $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. It is clear that the integral defining $\mathcal{I}_\beta f$ is absolutely convergent almost everywhere if and only if f is taken from

$$\mathfrak{X}_\beta^d := \left\{ f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C} : f \text{ is measurable and } \int_{|x|<1} |f(x)| dx + \int_{|x|\geq 1} \frac{|f(x)|}{|x|^{d-\beta}} dx < \infty \right\}. \quad (2.4)$$

If f belongs to the Schwartz space $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of rapidly decreasing functions, its Riesz potential $\mathcal{I}_\beta f$ is well-defined since $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathfrak{X}_\beta^d$. However, it is not guaranteed that $\mathcal{I}_\beta f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) + L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. To ensure this, we need to consider f in a suitable subspace of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let \mathbb{N}_0^d , where $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$, be the set of all multi-indices and for all $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ denote by $D^{\mathbf{j}}h$ the partial derivative of h taken j_i -times with respect to the x_i variable, for all $i = 1, \dots, d$. Following the lines of [28, Ch. 2.2], we introduce the spaces

$$\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^d) := \left\{ h \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d) : D^{\mathbf{j}}h(0) = 0, \forall \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d) := \left\{ h \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d) : h = \mathcal{F}[g], g \in \mathcal{S}_0 \right\},$$

where \mathcal{F} denotes Fourier transform. The set $\mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is called Lizorkin space. Since \mathcal{F} maps $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ into itself, it is clear that $\mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In particular, it is not difficult to check that $\mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is formed by all (complex-valued) functions in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ that are orthogonal to all polynomials. We will make use of the following denseness result, which was shown in [28, Th. 2.7].

Theorem 2.1. *The Lizorkin space $\mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $p \in (1, \infty)$.*

For our purposes below the following connection between Lizorkin space and the Riesz potential will be important, for details we refer to [28, Lem. 2.15, Th. 2.16].

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\beta \in (0, d)$. If $h \in \mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then $\mathcal{I}_\beta h \in \mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and*

$$\mathcal{F}[\mathcal{I}_\beta h](z) = |z|^{-\beta} \mathcal{F}[h](z).$$

In the special case of radially symmetric functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ written in the form $f(x) = g(|x|)$ with some $g : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, it has been shown in [34, Th. 1] that the Riesz potential $\mathcal{I}_\beta f$ is radially symmetric and for $d \geq 2$ the expression

$$\mathcal{I}_\beta f(x) = \frac{1}{\gamma_d(\beta)} \int_0^\infty r^{\beta-1} F_\beta \left(\frac{|x|}{r} \right) g(r) dr \quad (2.5)$$

holds, where

$$F_\beta(r) = \sigma_{d-1} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{(1-t^2)^{\frac{d-3}{2}}}{(1+r^2-2rt)^{\frac{d-\beta}{2}}} dt, \quad r > 0. \quad (2.6)$$

The asymptotic behaviour of the function F_β is known. First, it is continuous for $r \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$, and for $\beta > 1$ it is continuous also in $r = 1$ with value

$$F_\beta(1) = \sigma_{d-1} 2^{\beta-1} B \left(\frac{d-1}{2}, \frac{\beta-1}{2} \right),$$

where B is the Beta-function. Also, if $\beta = 1$, then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \frac{F_\beta(r)}{-\sigma_{d-1} \log(|r-1|)} = 1$$

while if $\beta \in (0, 1)$, then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \frac{2F_\beta(r)}{\sigma_{d-1} B\left(\frac{d-1}{2}, \frac{1-\beta}{2}\right) |r-1|^{\beta-1}} = 1.$$

For its behaviour at zero we have

$$F_\beta(r) = \sigma_d + O(r), \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.7)$$

while at infinity

$$F_\beta(r) = \sigma_d r^{\beta-d} + O(r^{\beta-d-1}), \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.8)$$

We note that in [28, Eq. (2.10)] the same formula has been obtained in terms of hypergeometric functions. However, the above representation is preferable for our purposes since usually the analytic extension of the hypergeometric function is considered on the cut complex plane $\mathbb{C} \setminus (1, \infty)$. This is due to the fact that $z = 1$ and $z = \infty$ are branch points of this function.

The $d = 1$ case is not covered by (2.6), however, we can derive a similar type of representation. Let $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be even. First observe that

$$\mathcal{I}_\beta f(-x) = \frac{1}{\gamma_1(\beta)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{f(y)}{|x+y|^{1-\beta}} dy = \frac{1}{\gamma_1(\beta)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{1-\beta}} dy = \mathcal{I}_\beta f(x),$$

thus $\mathcal{I}_\beta f$ is also even. Next, notice that for $x > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_\beta f(x) &= \frac{1}{\gamma_1(\beta)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{1-\beta}} dy = \frac{1}{\gamma_1(\beta)} \left(\int_0^\infty \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{1-\beta}} dy + \int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{1-\beta}} dy \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma_1(\beta)} \left(\int_0^\infty \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{1-\beta}} dy + \int_0^\infty \frac{f(y)}{|x+y|^{1-\beta}} dy \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma_1(\beta)} \int_0^\infty y^{\beta-1} f(y) \left(\frac{1}{\left|\frac{x}{y}-1\right|^{1-\beta}} + \frac{1}{\left|\frac{x}{y}+1\right|^{1-\beta}} \right) dy. \end{aligned}$$

This means that (2.5) holds for $d = 1$ with

$$F_\beta(r) = \frac{1}{|r-1|^{1-\beta}} + \frac{1}{|r+1|^{1-\beta}}.$$

For its the asymptotic behaviour, we still have (2.7)-(2.8), while

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \frac{F(r)}{|r-1|^{\beta-1}} = 1.$$

Below we will also make use of the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality, which gives conditions under which \mathcal{I}_β is a bounded operator between specific L^p spaces. Let $\beta \in (0, d)$, $p_\beta := \frac{dp}{dp-\beta}$ be the Sobolev exponent, and $p > 1$. Then

$$\|\mathcal{I}_\beta f\|_{p_\beta} \leq C_{p,\beta} \|f\|_p \quad (2.9)$$

holds. A direct consequence is the inequality

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|f(x)||g(x)|}{|x-y|^\delta} dx dy \leq C_{p,\delta,d} \|f\|_p \|g\|_q, \quad (2.10)$$

where $\delta \in (0, d)$, $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $g \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 2 - \frac{\delta}{d}$.

2.3. Resolvent estimates

For every operator $L_{m,\alpha}$, $m \geq 0$, introduced in Section 2.1 above, the one-parameter operator semigroup $\{e^{-tL_{m,\alpha}} : t \geq 0\}$ can be defined by functional calculus, each of whose elements is an integral operator for $t > 0$. The integral kernel $p(t, x, y) = e^{-tL_{m,\alpha}}(x, y)$, $t > 0$, which we call heat kernel as in the literature, satisfies the property $p(t, x, y) = p(t, |x - y|, 0)$, and we use the simpler conventional notation $p_t(x)$. It is well-known that for $m = 0$ the semigroup is transient whenever $\alpha < d$, and for $m > 0$ whenever $d \geq 3$, while in the complementary cases the semigroups are recurrent. In our considerations below we will occasionally have to make a distinction between transient and recurrent cases. Results relying on the 0-resolvent operator will apply only in the transient case, since otherwise 0-resolvents are not well-defined. On the other hand, results relying on λ -resolvents with $\lambda > 0$ can be stated also in the recurrent case.

The following heat kernel estimates are known, for a proof see [3], [7, Th. 1.2], [8, Th. 4.1].

Proposition 2.3.

(1) Let $p_t(x)$ be the integral kernel of the operator $e^{-tL_{0,\alpha}}$. Then

$$p_t(x) \asymp t|x|^{-d-\alpha} \wedge t^{-d/\alpha} \quad (2.11)$$

holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t > 0$.

(2) Let $p_t^m(x)$ be the integral kernel of the operator $e^{-tL_{m,\alpha}}$, $m > 0$. Then

$$p_t^m(x) \asymp \begin{cases} t^{-d/\alpha} \wedge t|x|^{-(d+\alpha)/2} \kappa_m(|x|) & \text{if } 0 < t \leq \frac{1}{m} \\ m^{d/\alpha-d/2} t^{-d/2} e^{-c(m^{1/\alpha}|x| \wedge m^{2/\alpha-1}|x|^2/t)} & \text{if } t > \frac{1}{m} \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

hold with $c > 0$ and

$$\kappa_m(r) = m^{(d+\alpha)/(2\alpha)} K_{(d+\alpha)/2}(m^{1/\alpha}r). \quad (2.13)$$

For every $\lambda > 0$, let $R_\lambda^m = (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1}$, $m \geq 0$, be the resolvent of the relativistic operator, with integral kernel $R_\lambda^m(x - y)$. We have then

$$R_\lambda^m(x - y) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} p_t^m(x - y) dt, \quad m \geq 0,$$

and similarly to the heat kernel write just $R_\lambda^m(x)$. For the massless case we drop the superscripts for all these objects.

Our results below will largely depend on detailed resolvent estimates for the fractional and relativistic Laplace operators. We will need uniform (in λ), and pointwise upper and lower estimates on the resolvent kernel R_λ^m separately for large λ and for $\lambda = 0$, both for the fractional ($m = 0$) and the relativistic ($m > 0$) Laplacians. These results stand also on their own, and can be applied in independent directions such as potential theory.

We have the following uniform resolvent kernel estimates in the transient massless ($d > \alpha$) and transient massive ($d > 2$) cases. For every $\lambda \geq 0$

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \leq \begin{cases} C_{d,\alpha}|x|^{\alpha-d} & \text{if } m = 0 \\ C_{d,\alpha}(|x|^{\alpha-d} + m^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}|x|^{2-d}) & \text{if } m > 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

holds with appropriate constant $C_{d,\alpha} > 0$. In fact, for $\lambda = 0$ the expression

$$R_0(x) = C_{d,\alpha}|x|^{\alpha-d},$$

holds [21, Prop. 4.293], while for the massive case we have

$$R_0^m(x) \asymp C_{d,\alpha,m} \left(|x|^{\alpha-d} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| \leq 1\}} + |x|^{2-d} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| > 1\}} \right). \quad (2.15)$$

Throughout the paper we will also make use of the non-uniform estimate

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \leq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} H_{d,\alpha}^0(|x|), \quad (2.16)$$

which holds for every $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 1$, $m \geq 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ with

$$H_{d,\alpha}^0(r) := \begin{cases} r^{-(d-\alpha)} \mathbf{1}_{\{r \leq 1\}} + 2^{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}-1} \Gamma\left(\frac{d+\alpha}{2}\right) r^{-(d+\alpha)} \mathbf{1}_{\{r > 1\}} & \text{if } \alpha < d \\ \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{r}\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{r \leq 1\}} + 2^{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}-1} \Gamma\left(\frac{d+\alpha}{2}\right) r^{-2} \mathbf{1}_{\{r > 1\}} & \text{if } \alpha = d = 1 \\ \mathbf{1}_{\{r \leq 1\}} + 2^{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}-1} \Gamma\left(\frac{d+\alpha}{2}\right) r^{-(1+\alpha)} \mathbf{1}_{\{r > 1\}} & \text{if } \alpha > d = 1. \end{cases} \quad (2.17)$$

Again, for $m = 0$ we actually have

$$R_\lambda(x) \asymp C_{d,\alpha,\lambda} H_{d,\alpha}^0(|x|). \quad (2.18)$$

In the massive case we do not have this equivalence. However, for $m > 0$ and $\lambda > m$, we prove that

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \asymp C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} H_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|), \quad (2.19)$$

where

$$H_{d,\alpha}^m(r) := \begin{cases} r^{-(d-\alpha)} \mathbf{1}_{\{r \leq 1\}} + r^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(r) \mathbf{1}_{\{r > 0\}} & \text{if } \alpha < d \\ \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{r}\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{r \leq 1\}} + r^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(r) \mathbf{1}_{\{r > 0\}} & \text{if } \alpha = d = 1 \\ \mathbf{1}_{\{r \leq 1\}} + r^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(r) \mathbf{1}_{\{r > 0\}} & \text{if } \alpha > d = 1. \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

We note that

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \geq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} H_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) \quad (2.21)$$

holds in fact for all $m, \lambda > 0$. The proof of these resolvent estimates is given in the Appendix.

3. Fractional Rollnik class

3.1. Definitions and basic properties

3.1.1. Fractional Rollnik norm

Making use of (2.14) we introduce the following class of potentials for the operators $L_{m,\alpha}$, $m \geq 0$.

Definition 3.1. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \alpha < 2$ and assume that

$$0 < \alpha < d < 2\alpha. \quad (3.1)$$

(1) Let $m = 0$. We call

$$\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha} = \left\{ V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2(d-\alpha)}} dx dy < \infty \right\}$$

fractional Rollnik-class of order α for the massless Laplacian $L_{0,\alpha}$.

(2) Let $d = 3$ and $m > 0$. We define the *fractional Rollnik-class of order α for the massive Laplacian $L_{m,\alpha}$* by $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^m = \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha} \cap \mathcal{R}$, where \mathcal{R} is the classical Rollnik class.

It is seen that the study of the massive case reduces to the study of the massless case. First therefore we focus on the class $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ and as we progress we will consider extensions and which will also accommodate cases of recurrent semigroups.

We begin by showing that the expression $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$ used in the definition of $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ is indeed a norm and that $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ is a Banach space with respect to this norm. Before that, we note the following two properties which will be used below.

Lemma 3.2. *We have that $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ and*

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 \geq \frac{1}{(2r(K))^{2d-2\alpha}} \|V\|_{L^1(K)}^2,$$

where $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is any compact set and $r(K) = \inf\{r \geq 0 : K \subset B_r\}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, it will be sufficient to show this for every ball $B_r \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then we have

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 \geq \int_{B_r} \int_{B_r} |V(x)||V(y)||x-y|^{2\alpha-2d} dx dy \geq (2r)^{2\alpha-2d} \|V\|_{L^1(B_r)}^2. \quad \square$$

A straightforward but useful consequence of the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality is the following inclusion property.

Proposition 3.3. *$L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is continuously embedded in $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, i.e.,*

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} \leq C_{d,\alpha} \|V\|_{d/\alpha}.$$

Proof. It is immediate by (2.10) with $\sigma = 2(d - \alpha)$ and $p = q = \frac{d}{\alpha}$. □

Apart from $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$, we can also define the quantity

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x)\overline{V(y)}|x-y|^{2\alpha-2d} dx dy$$

on $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, where we allow V to be possibly complex-valued. Next we prove that both $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$ and $\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$ are norms on $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$; we take inspiration from a strategy proposed in [22, Sect. 4] for $d = 1$ only, with substantial modifications. Recall the factor γ_d from (2.2).

Theorem 3.4. *The functionals $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$ and $\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$ are norms on $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. Furthermore, for all $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ we have*

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 = \gamma_d(2\alpha - d) \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha - \frac{d}{2}} V \right\|_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 = \gamma_d(2\alpha - d) \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha - \frac{d}{2}} |V| \right\|_2^2. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. The proof will proceed through several steps.

Step 1: First we show (3.2), starting with assuming that $V \in \mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Clearly, by the definition of Lizorkin space, we know that $V \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and then $V \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which in turn implies $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. Furthermore, also $\mathcal{I}_{2\alpha-d}V \in \mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by Theorem 2.2. Hence, by an application of Fubini's theorem and Plancherel's identity we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 &= \gamma_d(2\alpha - d) (V, \mathcal{I}_{2\alpha-d}V)_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &= \gamma_d(2\alpha - d) \left(\mathcal{F}[V], |\cdot|^{d-2\alpha} \mathcal{F}[V] \right)_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &= \gamma_d(2\alpha - d) \left(|\cdot|^{\frac{d}{2}-\alpha} \mathcal{F}[V], |\cdot|^{\frac{d}{2}-\alpha} \mathcal{F}[V] \right)_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \gamma_d(2\alpha - d) \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} V \right\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2: Next assume that $V \in L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Since $\mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by Theorem 2.1, we may choose a sequence $(V_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $V_n \rightarrow V \in L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Since $V_n - V \in L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, by Proposition 3.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V_n(x)V_n(y)|x-y|^{2\alpha-2d} dx dy - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x)V(y)|x-y|^{2\alpha-2d} dx dy \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |V_n(x) - V(x)| |V_n(y)| |x-y|^{2\alpha-2d} dx dy \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |V(x)| |V_n(y) - V(y)| |x-y|^{2\alpha-2d} dx dy \\ &\leq C_{d,\alpha} \|V_n - V\|_{d/\alpha} \left(\|V_n\|_{d/\alpha} + \|V\|_{d/\alpha} \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by the triangle inequality and (2.9),

$$\left| \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} V_n \right\|_2 - \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} V \right\|_2 \right| \leq \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} (V_n - V) \right\|_2 \leq C_{d,\alpha} \|V_n - V\|_{d/\alpha} \rightarrow 0.$$

This proves the first equality in (3.2) for $V \in L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The second equality follows by applying the first on $|V| \in L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Step 3: To complete this part of the proof, consider now any $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and η_M be a $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ function such that $\eta_M(x) = 1$ for every $x \in B_M$, $\eta_M(x) \in [0, 1]$ and $\text{supp}(\eta_M) \subset B_{M+1}$. Then $V_M := \min\{|V|, M\}\eta_M \in L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and (3.2) holds for this function. Next, since $V_M \leq V_{M+1}$ for all $M \in \mathbb{N}$, by the monotone convergence theorem we have

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|V_M\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 = \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} V_M \right\|_2^2 = \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} |V| \right\|_2^2.$$

This proves the second equality in (3.2). To prove the first, notice that we have in fact shown that if $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, then $\left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} |V| \right\|_2 < \infty$. Hence by setting $V_M = \max\{\min\{V, M\}, -M\}\eta_M$, we can use the dominated convergence theorem to obtain

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|V_M\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 = \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} V_M \right\|_2^2 = \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} V \right\|_2^2.$$

Step 4: Finally we show the norm property. Identity (3.2) guarantees that for all $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, both $\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$ and $\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$ are non-negative. Furthermore, note that directly by the definition of the

Riesz potential, the facts $V_1, V_2 \geq 0$ and $V_1 \leq V_2$, imply $\left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} V_1 \right\|_2 \leq \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} V_2 \right\|_2$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|V_1 + V_2\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} &= \sqrt{\gamma(2\alpha - d)} \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} |V_1 + V_2| \right\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\gamma(2\alpha - d)} \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} |V_1| + \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} |V_2| \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{\gamma(2\alpha - d)} \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} |V_1| \right\|_2 + \sqrt{\gamma(2\alpha - d)} \left\| \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} |V_2| \right\|_2 \\ &= \|V_1\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} + \|V_2\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

The fact that $\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} = 0$ implies $V = 0$ a.e. follows by injectivity of the Riesz potential $\mathcal{I}_{2\alpha-d}$. The same argument can be repeated for $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$, which proves that both are norms. \square

Remark 3.5. Notice that $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$ is induced by the scalar product

$$(V_1, V_2)_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V_1(x) \overline{V_2(y)} |x - y|^{2\alpha-2d} dx dy.$$

We can prove the following completeness result with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$.

Theorem 3.6. *The fractional Rollnik class $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$ is a Banach space.*

Proof. Let $(V_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. By Lemma 3.2 it is a Cauchy sequence also in $L^1(B_m)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. By a simple diagonal argument we know that there exists a subsequence $(V_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a function V such that $V_{n_k}(x) \rightarrow V(x)$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. By Fatou's lemma we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |V(x) - V_{n_k}(x)| |V(y) - V_{n_k}(y)| |x - y|^{2\alpha-2d} dx dy \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|V_{n_j} - V_{n_k}\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2.$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $(V_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, there exists a label $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|V_{n_j} - V_{n_k}\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} < \varepsilon$ holds for all $j, k \geq k_0$. Taking the limit inferior, this means that for all $k \geq k_0$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |V(x) - V_{n_k}(x)| |V(y) - V_{n_k}(y)| |x - y|^{2\alpha-2d} dx dy \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|V_{n_j} - V_{n_k}\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 < \varepsilon^2.$$

This proves that $V - V_{n_k} \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, for all $k \geq k_0$, and thus also $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. Furthermore, for all $k \geq k_0$ we have $\|V - V_{n_k}\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} < \varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we get $V_{n_k} \rightarrow V$ in $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. This is sufficient to conclude that $V_n \rightarrow V$ in $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

It is natural to ask whether $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ is a Hilbert space when equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$. Adapting an argument in [22] originally only for $d = 1$, we see that this is not the case.

Theorem 3.7. *The fractional Rollnik class $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ is not complete with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$.*

Proof. Assume, to the contrary, that $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ is complete with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$. Consider any function $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\phi \notin \text{Dom}((-\Delta)^{(2\alpha-d)/4})$. Since $\mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exists a sequence $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\phi_n \rightarrow \phi$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Define the sequence of functions

$$f_n = \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\|\cdot\|^{\frac{d}{2}-\alpha} \mathcal{F}[\phi_n]] \in \mathcal{FS}_0(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}.$$

Since $\phi_n \rightarrow \phi$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, also $\mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} f_n \rightarrow \phi$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, hence $(\mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. By the first equality in (3.2), this implies that $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}})$. Since by assumption this space is complete, there exists a function f such that $f_n \rightarrow f$ in $(\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}})$. Again by (3.2), we know that $\mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} f_n \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} f$. However, this is impossible since then we would have $\phi = \mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}} f \in \text{Dom}((-\Delta)^{(2\alpha-d)/4})$. \square

Remark 3.8. We note that if V_1, V_2 are two potentials such that $|V_1(x)| \leq |V_2(x)|$ a.e. and $V_2 \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, then clearly also $V_1 \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. Furthermore, by Lemma 3.2, it is clear that if $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, then for all $R > 0$

$$\|V\|_{L^1(B_R)} \leq 2^{d-\alpha} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} R^{d-\alpha}. \quad (3.3)$$

This means that fractional Rollnik-class potentials tend to concentrate their mass at infinity.

3.1.2. Restrictions on the fractional exponent

Next we turn to discussing the role of condition (3.1). A straightforward calculation shows that $|x|^{-2(d-\alpha)} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ only when $\alpha < 2d$. This implies that if $d \geq 2\alpha$ there exist no continuous potentials $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ apart from $V \equiv 0$. In fact, we can prove the following more general property.

Theorem 3.9. *Let $k : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a function such that for all $\delta > 0$*

$$\int_0^\delta r^{d-1} k(r) = \infty. \quad (3.4)$$

Suppose that $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |V(x)||V(y)|k(|x-y|)dx dy < \infty. \quad (3.5)$$

Then for any choice of $\varepsilon, r > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there is no ball $B_r(x)$ such that $|V(y)| > \varepsilon$ for a.e. $y \in B_r(x)$. In particular, if V is continuous, then $V \equiv 0$.

Proof. Let $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be satisfying (3.5) and assume, to the contrary, that there exist $\varepsilon^*, r^* > 0$ and $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $|V(y)| > \varepsilon^*$ for all $y \in B_{r^*}(x^*)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |V(x)||V(y)|k(|x-y|) dx dy &\geq \int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} \int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} |V(x)||V(y)|k(|x-y|) dx dy \\ &\geq \varepsilon^{2d} \int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} \int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} k(|x-y|) dx dy, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} \int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} k(|x-y|) dx dy < \infty$. However, by (3.4) we also have

$$\int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} \int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} k(|x-y|) dx dy \geq \int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} \int_{B_{r^*-|x-x^*|(x)}} k(|x-y|) dx dy = \infty,$$

which is impossible. □

In fact, a fractional Rollnik-class cannot be obtained even in the limit $\alpha \uparrow \frac{d}{2}$.

Proposition 3.10. *Let $d = 1, 2$ and suppose $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function such that $\liminf_{\alpha \downarrow \frac{d}{2}} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} < \infty$. Then for any choice of $\varepsilon, r > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there is no ball $B_r(x)$ such that $|V(y)| > \varepsilon$ for a.e. $y \in B_r(x)$. In particular, if V is continuous, then $V \equiv 0$.*

Proof. Let $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\liminf_{\alpha \downarrow \frac{d}{2}} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} < \infty$ and assume, to the contrary, that there exists ε^*, r^* and $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $|V(y)| > \varepsilon^*$ for almost every $y \in B_{r^*}(x^*)$. Let also α_k be such

that $\alpha_k \downarrow \frac{d}{2}$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha_k}} = \liminf_{\alpha \downarrow \frac{d}{2}} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha_k}} < \infty$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\infty > \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |V(x)||V(y)||x-y|^{2\alpha_k-2d} dx dy \geq \varepsilon^2 \int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} \int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} |x-y|^{2\alpha_k-2d} dx dy. \quad (3.6)$$

On the other hand,

$$\int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} \int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} |x-y|^{2\alpha_k-2d} dx dy \geq \int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} \int_{B_{r^*-|x-x^*|(x)}} |x-y|^{2\alpha_k-2d} dy dx.$$

We can evaluate the inner integral for $x \in B_{r^*}(x^*)$ as

$$\int_{B_{r^*-|x-x^*|(x)}} |x-y|^{2\alpha_k-2d} dy = \sigma_d \int_0^{r^*-|x-x^*|} \rho^{2\alpha_k-d-1} d\rho = \frac{\sigma_d}{2\alpha_k-d} (r^*-|x-x^*|)^{2\alpha_k-d}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} \int_{B_{r^*-|x-x^*|(x)}} |x-y|^{2\alpha_k-2d} dy dx &= \frac{\sigma_d^2}{2\alpha_k-d} \int_0^{r^*} (r^*-\rho)^{2\alpha_k-d} \rho^{d-1} d\rho \\ &= \frac{\sigma_d^2}{2\alpha_k-d} (r^*)^{2\alpha_k} B(2\alpha_k-d+1; d), \end{aligned}$$

where $B(x, y)$ is the Beta function. Taking the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ we get

$$\int_{B_{r^*}(x^*)} \int_{B_{r^*-|x-x^*|(x)}} |x-y|^{2\alpha_k-2d} dy dx = \infty,$$

which is in contradiction with (3.6). □

Clearly, by (3.1) we have the possible ranges D_α of α as follows:

$$D_\alpha = \begin{cases} (\frac{1}{2}, 1) & \text{if } d = 1 \\ (1, 2) & \text{if } d = 2 \\ (\frac{3}{2}, 2) & \text{if } d = 3 \\ \emptyset & \text{if } d \geq 4. \end{cases}$$

This just excludes the case $\alpha = 1$, which will be dealt with below. In Section 3.4 we introduce an extended fractional Rollnik-class which is subject only to the constraint $d < 2\alpha$, in particular, the case $\alpha = 1$ is covered by it in the $d = 1$ case. In $d = 2$ we will obtain it in Section 5 below we as a limiting case. As Proposition 3.10 suggests, this limit is not straightforward and we arrive at

$$\mathcal{R}_{d,1}^p := L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \liminf_{\alpha \downarrow 1} \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}, \quad p \geq 1.$$

For later use below, we define more generally for $\alpha = \frac{d}{2}$, $d = 1, 2, 3$, the class

$$\mathcal{R}_{d,\frac{d}{2}}^p := L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \liminf_{\alpha \downarrow \frac{d}{2}} \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}, \quad p \geq 1, \quad (3.7)$$

where the limit inferior means $\liminf_{\alpha \downarrow \frac{d}{2}} \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha} = \bigcup_{\beta \in (\frac{d}{2}, d)} \bigcap_{\alpha \in (\frac{d}{2}, \beta)} \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. The intersection with the L^p spaces in the definition will be justified by Theorem 5.3 below.

3.2. Comparison properties

We have already seen in Proposition 3.3 that $L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. A corollary to this result is the following.

Proposition 3.11. *If $p \leq \frac{d}{\alpha} \leq q$, then $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$.*

Proof. By interpolation it is immediate that $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. \square

Proposition 3.12. *If $\alpha > \frac{d}{2}$, then $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ and the estimate*

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} \leq \left(\frac{\sigma_d}{2(d-\alpha)} \right)^{(d-\alpha)/d} \sqrt{\frac{d}{2\alpha-d}} \|V\|_1^{(2\alpha-d)/d} \|V\|_2^{2(d-\alpha)/d} \quad (3.8)$$

holds, where σ_d is the surface area of the d -dimensional unit sphere.

Proof. Let $V \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\delta > 0$. We compute

$$\iint_{|x-y| \geq \delta} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2(d-\alpha)}} dx dy \leq \frac{1}{\delta^{2(d-\alpha)}} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |V(x)||V(y)| dx dy = \frac{\|V\|_1^2}{\delta^{2(d-\alpha)}}.$$

By the Schwarz inequality, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{|x-y| < \delta} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2(d-\alpha)}} dx dy &\leq \iint_{|x-y| < \delta} \frac{|V(x)|^2}{|x-y|^{2(d-\alpha)}} dx dy \\ &\leq \|V\|_2^2 \int_{|x| < \delta} \frac{dx}{|x|^{2(d-\alpha)}} = \frac{\sigma_d \delta^{2\alpha-d}}{2\alpha-d} \|V\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

and thus

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 \leq \frac{\|V\|_1^2}{\delta^{2(d-\alpha)}} + \frac{\sigma_d \delta^{2\alpha-d}}{2\alpha-d} \|V\|_2^2.$$

Optimizing over δ by the choice

$$\delta = \left(\frac{(2(d-\alpha)\|V\|_1^2)}{\sigma_d \|V\|_2^2} \right)^{1/d}$$

leads to (3.8). \square

Proposition 3.13. *The following inclusions hold:*

- (1) *Let $\alpha \leq \alpha_1 \leq d$. Then $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha} \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha_1}$.*
- (2) *Let $\alpha_2 \leq \alpha$ and $\frac{d}{\alpha_2} < \min\{p, q\}$ for $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Then $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha} \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha_2}$. In particular, $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha} \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha_2}$.*
- (3) *Let $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha \leq \alpha_2$. Then $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha_1} \cap \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha_2} \subset \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$.*

Proof. (1) Let $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha} \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. As in Proposition 3.12, we compute

$$\iint_{|x-y| \geq 1} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2d-2\alpha_1}} dx dy \leq \|V\|_1^2.$$

We clearly have

$$\iint_{|x-y| < 1} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2d-2\alpha_1}} dx dy \leq \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2d-2\alpha}} dx dy = \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2$$

using that $2d - 2\alpha_1 \leq 2d - 2\alpha$.

(2) Let $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha} \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We have

$$\iint_{|x-y| \geq 1} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2d-2\alpha_2}} dx dy \leq \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2d-2\alpha}} dx dy = \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2$$

since $2d - 2\alpha_2 \geq 2d - 2\alpha$. On the other hand, as in (3.9), we compute

$$\iint_{|x-y| < 1} \frac{|V(x)|^p}{|x-y|^{pd-p\alpha_2}} dx dy \leq \frac{\sigma_d}{p\alpha_2 - pd + d} \|V\|_p^p$$

noting that $p\alpha_2 - pd + d > 0$ is equivalent to $d/\alpha_2 < q$. Therefore, by the Hölder inequality we obtain

$$\iint_{|x-y| < 1} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2d-2\alpha_2}} dx dy \leq \left(\frac{\sigma_d}{p\alpha_2 - pd + d} \right)^{1/p} \left(\frac{\sigma_d}{q\alpha_2 - qd + d} \right)^{1/q} \|V\|_p \|V\|_q.$$

(3) We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 &= \iint_{|x-y| < 1} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2d-2\alpha}} dx dy + \iint_{|x-y| \geq 1} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2d-2\alpha}} dx dy \\ &\leq \iint_{|x-y| < 1} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2d-2\alpha_1}} dx dy + \iint_{|x-y| \geq 1} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2d-2\alpha_2}} dx dy \leq \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha_1}}^2 + \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha_2}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

By extension of the definition of $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ to $\alpha = 2$ we consider the space $\mathcal{R}_{3,2}$ which coincides with the classical Rollnik-class given by (1.1). A consequence of part (3) in Proposition 3.13 and the dominated convergence theorem is the following result.

Corollary 3.14. *Let $d = 3$ and $V \in \mathcal{R}_{3,\alpha_0} \cap \mathcal{R}_{3,2}$ for some $\alpha_0 \in (\frac{3}{2}, 2)$. Then the function $\alpha \in [\alpha_0, 2] \mapsto \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$ is continuous.*

Remark 3.15. We see that for $\mathcal{R}_{d,2}$ the only possibility permitted by (3.1) is $d = 3$ and $\mathcal{R}_{3,2} = \mathcal{R}$. Corollary 3.14 shows, moreover, continuity as $\alpha \uparrow 2$. Also, for $d = 3$ and $\alpha = 2$, estimate (3.8) gives

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}} \leq \sqrt{3}(2\pi)^{1/3} \|V\|_1^{1/3} \|V\|_2^{2/3},$$

which coincides with the standard norm estimate for the classical Rollnik-class.

Next we compare the fractional Rollnik-class with the domain of the Riesz potential. Recall the definition in (2.4).

Proposition 3.16. *The following properties hold.*

- (1) $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha} \subset \mathfrak{X}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}}^d$.
- (2) If $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ satisfies $|\{V(x) = 0\}| = 0$, then $V \in \mathfrak{X}_{2\alpha-d}^d$.

Proof. To prove (1), just observe that by (3.2) it follows that if $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, then $\mathcal{I}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}}|V| \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, in particular it is a.e. finite. Hence $|V| \in \mathfrak{X}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}}^d$ and then also $V \in \mathfrak{X}_{\alpha-\frac{d}{2}}^d$. Next consider (2) and define the measure $\mu_V(dx) = |V(x)|dx$. Since $|\{V(x) = 0\}| = 0$, the measure μ_V is equivalent to Lebesgue measure. Since $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{I}_{2\alpha-d}|V|(x) \mu_V(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |V(x)| \mathcal{I}_{2\alpha-d}|V|(x) dx < \infty,$$

hence $\mathcal{I}_{2\alpha-d}|V|$ is μ_V -a.e. finite. Since μ_V and Lebesgue measure are equivalent, $\mathcal{I}_{2\alpha-d}|V|$ is a.e. finite and then $|V| \in \mathfrak{X}_{2\alpha-d}^d$, which in turn implies $V \in \mathfrak{X}_{2\alpha-d}^d$. \square

3.3. Specific cases

3.3.1. Potentials with compact support

Let $V_K = -\mathbf{1}_K$ for a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then clearly $V_K \in L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. We compare the Rollnik norm of V_K with the norm of V_{B^K} , where B^K is a ball centred in the origin having the same volume as K . Recall the fractional perimeter of index $s \in (0, 1)$ of a Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ defined by

$$\text{Per}_s(E) = \frac{s2^{s-1}\Gamma\left(\frac{d+s}{2}\right)}{\pi^{d/2}\Gamma\left(1-\frac{s}{2}\right)} \int_E \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus E} \frac{dxdy}{|x-y|^{d+s}}.$$

A sufficient condition for a set E to have a finite fractional perimeter of order s is that its indicator function $\mathbf{1}_E$ belongs to the fractional Sobolev space $W^{\frac{s}{p},p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In particular, E has finite fractional perimeter if it has finite classical perimeter $\text{Per}(E)$. The inequality

$$\text{Per}_s(E) \geq \text{Per}_s(B^E), \quad s \in (0, 1] \quad (3.10)$$

is well-known. Indeed, the case $s = 1$ is the classical isoperimetric inequality, while for $s \in (0, 1)$ it can be obtained as a consequence of [14, Th. 4.1]. For quantitative versions of (3.10) we refer to [15, 16].

A straightforward consequence of the Riesz rearrangement inequality [25, 5] gives

$$\|V_K\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} \leq \|V_{B^K}\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}, \quad 0 < \alpha < d < 2\alpha. \quad (3.11)$$

Combining the two inequalities above, we get for any compact set K with finite s -perimeter

$$\|V_K\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 \leq \|V_{B^K}\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 = \frac{\|V_{B^K}\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2}{\text{Per}_s(B^K)} \text{Per}_s(B^K) \leq \frac{\|V_{B^K}\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2}{\text{Per}_s(B^K)} \text{Per}_s(K),$$

where the constant $\|V_{B^K}\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} / \text{Per}_s(B^K)$ is sharp in the sense that all the inequalities become equalities if $K = B^K$. The constant can be exactly evaluated. Indeed, by [12, Prop. 2.3] we have

$$\text{Per}_s(B^K) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{|K|}{\omega_d}\right)^{\frac{d-s}{d}} \frac{(\Gamma(\frac{d+s}{2}))^2}{2\pi\Gamma(1-\frac{s}{2})\Gamma(\frac{d-s}{2}+1)} \sigma_d & s \in (0, 1) \\ \left(\frac{|K|}{\omega_d}\right)^{\frac{d-1}{d}} \sigma_d & s = 1. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, by using [12, Prop. 7.5] we obtain

$$\|V_{B^K}\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 = \left(\frac{|K|}{\omega_d}\right)^{\frac{d+\alpha}{d}} \frac{\sigma_d}{\alpha(d+\alpha)} \mu_{2\alpha-d},$$

where

$$\mu_{2\alpha-d} = \begin{cases} 2^{1+2\alpha-d} \pi^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{1+2\alpha-d}{2})}{\Gamma(\alpha)} & \alpha \neq \frac{d+1}{2} \\ \frac{16\pi^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d+1}{2})} & \alpha = \frac{d+1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

3.3.2. Asymmetric fractional Rollnik potentials

By (3.11) symmetric rearrangement increases the fractional Rollnik norm, and since the kernel in the Rollnik integral is spherically symmetric, the inequality reduces to equality only for spherically symmetric potentials. We can use the fractional Rollnik norm to estimate the symmetry deficit of a non-radial $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ potential from a rotationally symmetric potential. We discuss this by comparing with a spherical potential well.

Let $V \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $V \leq 0$ a.e. Clearly, $V \in L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. Denote by B^V the ball centered in the origin with volume $\|V\|_1 / \|V\|_\infty$, and consider the family of potential wells $V_{B,a} := -\|V\|_\infty \mathbf{1}_{B^V+a}$, for $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$. As a direct consequence of [13, Th. 4] we get

$$\|V_{B,0}\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 - \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 \geq \frac{C_{d,\alpha}}{2} \left(\frac{\|V\|_\infty}{\|V\|_1} \right)^{\frac{2(d-\alpha)}{d}} \inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|V - V_{B,a}\|_1^2,$$

i.e., the difference of the fractional Rollnik norms of V and the spherical potential well V_B controls from above an L^1 distance of V from the family of spherical potential wells with the same L^∞ and L^1 norms.

3.3.3. Rotationally symmetric potentials

Consider a generic potential V and denote by V^* the symmetric decreasing rearrangement of $|V|$. Then the following property holds.

Proposition 3.17. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ such that $\alpha < d < 2\alpha$. If $V^* \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, then $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ and*

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} \leq \|V^*\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}. \quad (3.12)$$

Equality holds if and only if there exists a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with $|\det(A)| = 1$ and a vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$|V(x)| = V^*(Ax + a). \quad (3.13)$$

Furthermore, if V is continuous, then equality holds if and only if there exists a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with $|\det(A)| = 1$ and a vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\text{either } V(x) = V^*(Ax + a), \quad \text{or } V(x) = -V^*(Ax + a). \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. The inequality (3.12) follows by a direct application of Riesz rearrangement inequality [25]. If equality holds in (3.12), then we are under the assumptions of [20, Lem. 3] and (3.13) holds. If, moreover, V is continuous, then $V^*(x) = 0$ for some x with $|x| = R$ implies $V^*(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|x| \geq R$. Thus either $V^*(Ax + a) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, or there exists a bounded open set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $V^*(Ax + a) = 0$ exactly when $x \notin K^c$. By (3.13) this means that V cannot change sign and so (3.14) holds. \square

We focus now on the case when V is a non-negative radially symmetric potential, with a non-increasing profile (or, equivalently, on V^* for any potential V). Let this profile be $v : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that $v(t) = V(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|x| = t$. Making use of (3.3) we show a bound on v near the origin.

Theorem 3.18. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ with $\alpha < d < 2\alpha$. Suppose that $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ is non-negative, radially symmetric, with non-increasing profile v . Then there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that*

$$v(t) < \frac{2^{d-\alpha} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} t^{-\alpha}}{\omega_d}, \quad t \in (0, t_0).$$

Proof. Consider the function

$$U(r) = \int_0^r t^{d-1} v(t) dt \leq \frac{2^{d-\alpha} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} r^{d-\alpha}}{\sigma_d},$$

where the bound follows by (3.3). Assume, to the contrary, that there exists a sequence $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $t_n \downarrow 0$ and $v(t_n) \geq \frac{2^{d-\alpha} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} t_n^{-\alpha}}{\omega_d}$. Then we have

$$U(t_0) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{t_{n+1}}^{t_n} t^{d-1} v(t) dt \geq \frac{2^{d-\alpha} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}}{\sigma_d} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} t_n^{-\alpha} (t_n^d - t_{n+1}^d) = \frac{2^{d-\alpha} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}}{\sigma_d} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (t_n^{d-\alpha} - t_{n+1}^{-\alpha} t_{n+1}^d).$$

Since $t_n > t_{n+1}$ and thus $t_n^{-\alpha} < t_{n+1}^{-\alpha}$, in the end we have

$$U(t_0) > \frac{2^{d-\alpha} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}}{\sigma_d} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (t_n^{d-\alpha} - t_{n+1}^{d-\alpha}) = \frac{2^{d-\alpha} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}}{\sigma_d} t_0^{d-\alpha},$$

which is impossible. \square

3.3.4. Coulomb-type potentials

We give an alternative expression of the fractional Rollnik norm for radial potentials, which will be useful below. Let $V(x) = v(|x|)$ with a function $v : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Then, by making use of (2.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 &= \gamma_d (2\alpha - d) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x) \mathcal{I}_{2\alpha-d} V(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v(|x|) \int_0^\infty r^{2\alpha-d-1} F_{2\alpha-d} \left(\frac{|x|}{r} \right) v(r) dr dx \\ &= \sigma_d \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty s^{d-1} r^{2\alpha-d-1} v(s) F_{2\alpha-d} \left(\frac{s}{r} \right) v(r) dr ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Proposition 3.19. *The potential $V(x) = |x|^{-\beta} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| < 1\}}$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ if and only if $\beta < \alpha$.*

Proof. By (3.15) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 &= \sigma_d \int_0^1 \int_0^1 s^{d-1-\beta} r^{2\alpha-d-1-\beta} F_{2\alpha-d} \left(\frac{s}{r} \right) ds dr \\ &= \sigma_d \int_0^1 \int_0^{1/r} z^{d-\beta-1} r^{2(\alpha-\beta)-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz dr \\ &= \sigma_d \int_0^1 \int_0^1 z^{d-\beta-1} r^{2(\alpha-\beta)-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz dr + \sigma_d \int_0^1 \int_1^{1/r^2} z^{d-\beta-1} r^{2(\alpha-\beta)-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz dr \\ &= \sigma_d \int_0^1 \int_0^1 z^{d-\beta-1} r^{2(\alpha-\beta)-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dr dz + \sigma_d \int_1^\infty \int_0^{1/z} z^{d-\beta-1} r^{2(\alpha-\beta)-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dr dz \\ &= \frac{\sigma_d}{2(\alpha-\beta)} \int_0^1 z^{d-\beta-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz + \frac{\sigma_d}{2(\alpha-\beta)} \int_1^\infty z^{d-2\alpha+\beta-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz, \end{aligned}$$

where integration with respect to r was possible since $\beta < \alpha$, while otherwise the integral is divergent. The first integral is finite since $z^{d-\beta-1}F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \sim \sigma_d z^{d-\beta-1}$ as $z \rightarrow 0$, which is integrable near zero, while $F_{2\alpha-d}$ is always integrable near 1. For the second integral observe that $z^{d-2\alpha+\beta-1}F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \sim \sigma_d z^{\beta-1-d}$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$, which is integrable at infinity since $\beta < d$. \square

In case $\beta = \alpha$, we can make a finer analysis including logarithmic corrections.

Proposition 3.20. *The potential $V(x) = |x|^{-\alpha}(-\log|x|)^{-\gamma}\mathbf{1}_{\{|x|<1/2\}}$, $\alpha < d$, belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ if and only if $\gamma > \frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof. By (3.15) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 &= \sigma_d \int_0^{1/2} \int_0^{1/2} s^{d-1-\alpha} r^{\alpha-d-1} (-\log s)^{-\gamma} (-\log r)^{-\gamma} F_{2\alpha-d}\left(\frac{s}{r}\right) ds dr \\ &= \sigma_d \int_0^{1/2} \int_0^{1/2r} z^{d-\alpha-1} (-\log z - \log r)^{-\gamma} r^{-1} (-\log r)^{-\gamma} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz dr \\ &= \sigma_d \int_0^{1/2} \int_0^1 z^{d-\alpha-1} (-\log z - \log r)^{-\gamma} r^{-1} (-\log r)^{-\gamma} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz dr \\ &\quad + \sigma_d \int_0^{1/2} \int_1^{1/2r} z^{d-\alpha-1} (-\log z - \log r)^{-\gamma} r^{-1} (-\log r)^{-\gamma} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz dr \\ &= \sigma_d \int_0^1 \int_0^{1/2} z^{d-\alpha-1} (-\log z - \log r)^{-\gamma} r^{-1} (-\log r)^{-\gamma} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dr dz \\ &\quad + \sigma_d \int_1^\infty \int_0^{1/2z} z^{d-\alpha-1} (-\log z - \log r)^{-\gamma} r^{-1} (-\log r)^{-\gamma} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dr dz \\ &= \sigma_d(I_1 + I_2). \end{aligned}$$

If $\gamma > \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_0^1 z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \int_{\log 2}^\infty x^{-\gamma} (x - \log z)^{-\gamma} dx dz \\ &= \int_0^1 z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \int_{\log 2 - \log z}^\infty (x + \log z)^{-\gamma} x^{-\gamma} dx dz \\ &= \int_0^1 z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) (-\log z)^{-2\gamma} \int_{\log 2 - \log z}^\infty \left(1 - \frac{-\log z}{x}\right)^{-\gamma} \left(\frac{x}{-\log z}\right)^{-2\gamma} dx dz \\ &= \int_0^1 z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) (-\log z)^{1-2\gamma} \int_0^{\frac{-\log z}{\log 2 - \log z}} (1-x)^{-\gamma} x^{-2\gamma-2} dx dz \\ &= \int_0^1 z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) (-\log z)^{1-2\gamma} \int_0^{\frac{-\log z}{\log 2 - \log z}} B\left(\frac{-\log z}{\log 2 - \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right) dz, \end{aligned}$$

with the incomplete Beta-function $B(\cdot; \cdot, \cdot)$. In the limit $z \downarrow 0$ we have

$$B\left(\frac{-\log z}{\log 2 - \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right) \rightarrow B(2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma),$$

hence

$$z^{d-\alpha-1} \log^{1-2\gamma}(z) F_{2\alpha-d}(z) B\left(\frac{-\log z}{\log 2 - \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right) \sim B(1 - \gamma, 2\gamma - 1) \sigma_d z^{d-\alpha-1} \log^{1-2\gamma}(z),$$

where the right hand side is integrable in a neighbourhood of zero. As to the behaviour at 1, recall that the incomplete Beta-function satisfies

$$B(z; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma) \sim \frac{z^{2\gamma-1}}{2\gamma - 1} \quad \text{as } z \downarrow 0.$$

Indeed, by [17, eq. (8.391)], we have

$$B(z; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma) = \frac{z^{2\gamma-1}}{2\gamma - 1} {}_2F_1(2\gamma - 1, \gamma; 2\gamma; z),$$

where ${}_2F_1(a, b; c, z)$ is Gauss' hypergeometric function, so it is clear that

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{(2\gamma - 1)B(z; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma)}{z^{2\gamma-1}} = {}_2F_1(2\gamma - 1, \gamma; 2\gamma; 0) = 1.$$

Hence we get, in general,

$$z^{d-\alpha-1} \log^{1-2\gamma}(z) F_{2\alpha-d}(z) B\left(\frac{-\log z}{\log 2 - \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right) \sim \frac{F_{2\alpha-d}(z)}{2\gamma - 1} \quad \text{as } z \downarrow 1,$$

where the right-hand side is integrable near 1. This proves that $I_1 < \infty$. Next we estimate I_2 and write

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \int_1^\infty z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \int_{\log(2z)}^\infty x^{-\gamma} (x - \log z)^{-\gamma} dx dz \\ &= \int_1^\infty z^{d-\alpha-1} \log^{1-2\gamma}(z) F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \int_0^{\log z / (\log 2 + \log z)} x^{2\gamma-2} (1-x)^{-\gamma} dx dz \\ &= \int_1^\infty z^{d-\alpha-1} \log^{1-2\gamma}(z) F_{2\alpha-d}(z) B\left(\frac{\log z}{\log 2 + \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right), \end{aligned}$$

with the incomplete Beta-function $B(\cdot; \cdot, \cdot)$. We have

$$B\left(\frac{\log z}{\log 2 + \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right) \rightarrow B(1 - \gamma, 2\gamma - 1)$$

as $z \rightarrow \infty$, hence

$$z^{d-\alpha-1} \log^{1-2\gamma}(z) F_{2\alpha-d}(z) B\left(\frac{\log z}{\log 2 + \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right) \sim B(1 - \gamma, 2\gamma - 1) \sigma_d z^{\alpha-d-1} \log^{1-2\gamma}(z),$$

which is integrable near infinity since $\alpha < d$. Again, to handle the behaviour at 1, note that

$$z^{d-\alpha-1} \log^{1-2\gamma}(z) F_{2\alpha-d}(z) B\left(\frac{\log z}{\log 2 + \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right) \sim \frac{F_{2\alpha-d}(z)}{2\gamma - 1} \quad \text{as } z \downarrow 1,$$

where the right-hand side is integrable near 1.

Finally, consider the case $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Then

$$I_1 \geq \sigma_d \int_0^1 z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{(-\log z + x)^{2\gamma}} dx dz = \infty$$

due to $2\gamma \leq 1$. □

Remark 3.21. Notice that for V as in Proposition 3.20 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |V(x)|^{d/\alpha} dx &= \int_{B_{1/2}} |x|^{-d} (-\log(|x|))^{-\frac{\gamma d}{\alpha}} dx \\ &= \sigma_d \int_0^{1/2} r^{-1} (-\log r)^{-\frac{\gamma d}{\alpha}} dr = \sigma_d \int_{\log 2}^\infty x^{-\frac{\gamma d}{\alpha}} dx, \end{aligned}$$

which is finite if and only if $\gamma > \frac{\alpha}{d}$. If $d = 3$ and $\alpha > \frac{3}{2}$ or if $d = 2$ and $\alpha > 1$, then $\frac{\alpha}{d} > \frac{1}{2}$. Hence, under these conditions, whenever $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\alpha}{d})$, we have $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ but $V \notin L^{d/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Next we study the possible decay at infinity of fractional Rollnik potentials.

Proposition 3.22. *The potential $V(x) = |x|^{-\beta} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| \geq 1\}}$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ if and only if $\beta \in (\alpha, d)$.*

Proof. By (3.15) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 &= \sigma_d \int_1^\infty \int_1^\infty s^{d-1-\beta} r^{2\alpha-d-1-\beta} F_{2\alpha-d} \left(\frac{s}{r} \right) ds dr \\ &= \sigma_d \int_1^\infty \int_{1/r}^\infty z^{d-\beta-1} r^{2(\alpha-\beta)-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz dr \\ &= \sigma_d \int_1^\infty \int_{1/r}^1 z^{d-\beta-1} r^{2(\alpha-\beta)-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz dr + \sigma_d \int_1^\infty \int_1^\infty z^{d-\beta-1} r^{2(\alpha-\beta)-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz dr \\ &= \sigma_d \int_1^\infty \int_{1/z}^\infty z^{d-\beta-1} r^{2(\alpha-\beta)-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dr dz + \sigma_d \int_1^\infty \int_1^\infty z^{d-\beta-1} r^{2(\alpha-\beta)-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dr dz \\ &= \frac{\sigma_d}{2(\beta-\alpha)} \int_1^\infty z^{d-2\alpha+\beta-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz dz + \frac{\sigma_d}{2(\beta-\alpha)} \int_1^\infty z^{d-\beta-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz, \end{aligned}$$

where again integration on r makes since since $\beta > \alpha$ and else diverge. For the former integral notice that $F_{2\alpha-d}$ is integrable near 1, and

$$z^{d-2\alpha+\beta-1} F_{2\alpha-d} \sim \sigma_d z^{\beta-1-d} \text{ as } z \rightarrow \infty,$$

which is integrable if and only if $\beta < d$. For the latter integral, observe again that $F_{2\alpha-d}$ is integrable near 1, while

$$z^{d-\beta-1} F_{2\alpha-d} \sim \sigma_d z^{2\alpha-d-\beta-1} \text{ as } z \rightarrow \infty,$$

which is integrable since $2\alpha - d < \alpha < \beta$. □

Proposition 3.23. *The potential $V(x) = |x|^{-\alpha} \log^{-\gamma}(x) \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| \geq 2\}}$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ if and only if $\gamma > \frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof. By (3.15) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 &= \sigma_d \int_2^\infty \int_2^\infty s^{d-1-\alpha} r^{\alpha-d-1} \log^{-\gamma}(s) \log^{-\gamma}(r) F_{2\alpha-d} \left(\frac{s}{r} \right) ds dr \\ &= \sigma_d \int_2^\infty \int_{2/r}^\infty z^{d-\alpha-1} r^{-1} (\log(r) + \log z)^{-\gamma} \log^{-\gamma}(r) F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz dr \\ &= \sigma_d \int_2^\infty \int_{2/r}^1 z^{d-\alpha-1} r^{-1} (\log(r) + \log z)^{-\gamma} \log^{-\gamma}(r) F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dr \\ &\quad + \sigma_d \int_2^\infty \int_1^\infty z^{d-\alpha-1} r^{-1} (\log(r) + \log z)^{-\gamma} \log^{-\gamma}(r) F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dz dr \\ &= \sigma_d \int_0^1 \int_{2/z}^\infty z^{d-\alpha-1} r^{-1} (\log(r) + \log z)^{-\gamma} \log^{-\gamma}(r) F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dr dz \\ &\quad + \sigma_d \int_1^\infty \int_2^\infty z^{d-\alpha-1} r^{-1} (\log(r) + \log z)^{-\gamma} \log^{-\gamma}(r) F_{2\alpha-d}(z) dr dz \\ &= \sigma_d (I_1 + I_2). \end{aligned}$$

First consider I_1 with $\gamma > \frac{1}{2}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_0^1 z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \int_{\log(2/z)}^{\infty} (x + \log z)^{-\gamma} x^{-\gamma} dx dz \\ &= \int_0^1 z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) (-\log z)^{1-2\gamma} \int_0^{\frac{-\log z}{\log 2 - \log z}} (1-x)^{-\gamma} x^{2\gamma-2} dx dz \\ &= \int_0^1 z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) (-\log z)^{1-2\gamma} B\left(\frac{-\log z}{\log 2 - \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right) dz. \end{aligned}$$

As in Proposition 3.20, we have

$$z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) (-\log z)^{1-2\gamma} B\left(\frac{-\log z}{\log 2 - \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right) \sim \frac{F_{2\alpha-d}(z)}{2\gamma - 1} \text{ as } z \uparrow 1,$$

where the right-hand side is integrable near 1. Concerning the behaviour at 0, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) (-\log z)^{1-2\gamma} B\left(\frac{-\log z}{\log 2 - \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right) \\ \sim \sigma_d z^{d-\alpha-1} (-\log z)^{1-2\gamma} B(2\gamma - 1, \gamma - 1) \text{ as } z \downarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is integrable near 0 since $\alpha < d$. Hence $I_1 < \infty$. Next consider I_2 . We can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \int_1^{\infty} z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \int_{\log 2}^{\infty} (x + \log z)^{-\gamma} x^{-\gamma} dx dz \\ &= \int_1^{\infty} z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \int_{\log 2 + \log z}^{\infty} x^{-\gamma} (x - \log z)^{-\gamma} dx dz \\ &= \int_1^{\infty} z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \log^{-2\gamma}(z) \int_{\log 2 + \log z}^{\infty} \left(\frac{x}{\log z}\right)^{-2\gamma} \left(1 - \frac{\log z}{x}\right)^{-\gamma} dx dz \\ &= \int_1^{\infty} z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \log^{1-2\gamma}(z) \int_0^{\frac{\log z}{\log 2 + \log z}} x^{2\gamma-2} (1-x)^{-\gamma} dx dz \\ &= \int_1^{\infty} z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \log^{1-2\gamma}(z) B\left(\frac{\log z}{\log 2 + \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right) dz. \end{aligned}$$

Like before, we thus have

$$z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \log^{1-2\gamma}(z) B\left(\frac{\log z}{\log 2 + \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right) \sim \frac{F_{2\alpha-d}(z)}{2\gamma - 1} \text{ as } z \downarrow 1,$$

where the right-hand side is integrable near 1. Concerning the behaviour at ∞ , observe that

$$z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \log^{1-2\gamma}(z) B\left(\frac{-\log z}{\log 2 - \log z}; 2\gamma - 1, 1 - \gamma\right) \sim \sigma_d z^{\alpha-d-1} \log^{1-2\gamma}(z) B(2\gamma-1, \gamma-1) \text{ as } z \uparrow \infty,$$

which is integrable near ∞ since $\alpha < d$. This proves that $I_2 < \infty$.

For the case $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$, note that

$$I_2 \geq \int_1^{\infty} z^{d-\alpha-1} F_{2\alpha-d}(z) \int_1^{\infty} (x + \log z)^{-2\gamma} dx dz = \infty.$$

□

Corollary 3.24. *The potential $V(x) = |x|^{-\beta_1} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x|<1\}} + |x|^{-\beta_2} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x|\geq 1\}}$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ if and only if $\beta_1 < \alpha$ and $\beta_2 \in (\alpha, d)$.*

Proof. By Propositions 3.19 and 3.22 it follows that if $\beta_1 < \alpha$ and $\beta_2 \in (\alpha, d)$, then $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. Conversely, if $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, then it follows by Remark 3.8 that both $V_1(x) = |x|^{-\beta_1} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x|<1\}}$ and $V_2(x) = |x|^{-\beta_2} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x|\geq 1\}}$ belong to $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, which implies $\beta_1 < \alpha$ and $\beta_2 \in (\alpha, d)$ again by Propositions 3.19 and 3.22. \square

3.4. Extended fractional Rollnik-class

Next we introduce another class of potentials related to the fractional Rollnik-class, constructed on the resolvent estimates (2.17) and (2.20). This class will be justified by the behaviours we will discuss in Section 4 below.

Definition 3.25. Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \geq 0$, and assume that $d < 2\alpha$. We call

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m := \left\{ V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : [V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}}^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H_{d,\alpha}^m(|x-y|)^2 |V(x)| |V(y)| dx dy < \infty \right\}$$

extended fractional Rollnik-class. If $m = 0$, we omit the superscript.

First we settle the relationship between the fractional Rollnik-classes and their extensions.

Proposition 3.26. Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that $d < 2\alpha$.

(1) If $d > \alpha$, we have $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha} \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}$. In particular, there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha} > 0$ such that

$$[V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}} \leq C_{d,\alpha} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}$$

for every $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$.

(2) For every $m > 0$ we have $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha} \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m$. In particular, there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha} > 0$ such that

$$[V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m} \leq C_{d,\alpha} [V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}}$$

for every $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$.

Proof. (1) easily follows since $r \geq 1$ trivially implies $r^{-2(d+\alpha)} \leq r^{-2(d-\alpha)}$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} [V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}}^2 &= \iint_{|x-y|\leq 1} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2(d-\alpha)}} dx dy + 2^{d+\alpha-2} \Gamma^2\left(\frac{d+\alpha}{2}\right) \iint_{|x-y|\geq 1} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2(d+\alpha)}} dx dy \\ &\leq \iint_{|x-y|\leq 1} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2(d-\alpha)}} dx dy + 2^{d+\alpha-2} \Gamma^2\left(\frac{d+\alpha}{2}\right) \iint_{|x-y|\geq 1} \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2(d-\alpha)}} dx dy \\ &\leq C_{d,\alpha} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

To obtain (2) note that by (6.6) there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha} > 0$ such that $H_{d,\alpha}^m(r) \leq C_{d,\alpha} H_{d,\alpha}(r)$, for all $r > 0$. \square

The above definitions yield a consistent behaviour in the massless limit.

Proposition 3.27. Let $V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}$. Then $\lim_{m \downarrow 0} [V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m} = [V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}}$.

Proof. By Remark 6.16 in the Appendix we have $\lim_{m \downarrow 0} H_{d,\alpha}^m(r) = H_{d,\alpha}(r)$, and then the claim follows by the dominated convergence theorem. \square

Concerning the relationship between L^p -spaces and $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m$, we can prove the following continuous embedding property.

Proposition 3.28. *Let $m \geq 0$. Then $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m$. In particular,*

$$[V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m} \leq \|H_{d,\alpha}^m\|_2 \|V\|_2. \quad (3.16)$$

Proof. Note that if $d < 2\alpha$ then $H_{d,\alpha}^m \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $m \geq 0$ and thus (3.16) follows by a direct application of Young's convolution inequality. \square

Remark 3.29. Proposition 3.28 guarantees that for $\beta > \frac{d}{2}$ the potential $V(x) = |x|^{-\beta} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| \geq 1\}}$ belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m$ for all $m \geq 0$. However, since $d < 2\alpha$, we can take $\beta \in (\frac{d}{2}, \alpha)$ such that $V \notin \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$ due to Proposition 3.22, and thus $V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$.

Similarly to (3.7) we define $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\frac{d}{2}}^{m,p}$ for some $p > 1$ through of a limiting argument by

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\frac{d}{2}}^{m,p} := L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \liminf_{\alpha \downarrow \frac{d}{2}} \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m.$$

By Proposition 3.28, for $p = 2$ we have $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\frac{d}{2}}^{m,2} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Furthermore, Proposition 3.26 implies that for every $p > 1$

$$\mathcal{R}_{d,\frac{d}{2}}^p \subset \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\frac{d}{2}}^{m,p}.$$

4. Perturbations by fractional Rollnik class potentials

4.1. Self-adjointness

In what follows our main interest is to study the properties of fractional Schrödinger operators for $m \geq 0$

$$H = L_{m,\alpha} + V$$

with fractional Rollnik-class potentials V . First we show that H can be defined as a self-adjoint linear operator for $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$.

Define

$$K_\lambda^m = |V|^{1/2} (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1} |V|^{1/2},$$

which is an integral operator with kernel

$$K_\lambda^m(x-y) = \sqrt{|V(x)|} R_\lambda^m(x-y) \sqrt{|V(y)|}.$$

First we give a criterion for self-adjointness of the operator H .

Lemma 4.1. *Fix $m \geq 0$ and assume that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} = 0$. Then H is self-adjoint on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Proof. By the assumption we have directly that

$$\|\sqrt{|V|} (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2}\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2)} \rightarrow 0$$

as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. Define the function

$$\tilde{V}^{1/2}(x) = \begin{cases} V(x)/\sqrt{|V(x)|} & \text{if } V(x) \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } V(x) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then $|\tilde{V}^{1/2}| = \sqrt{|\tilde{V}|}$ and $\tilde{V}^{1/2}\sqrt{|\tilde{V}|} = V$ hold. For $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2}V(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2}\phi\|_2^2 \\ &= (\tilde{V}^{1/2}(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1}V(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2}\phi, \sqrt{|\tilde{V}|}(\lambda + (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2})^{-1/2}\phi)_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2)}\|\sqrt{|\tilde{V}|}(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2}\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2)}^2\|\phi\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$\|(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2}V(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2}\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2)} \rightarrow 0 \quad (4.1)$$

as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. It follows then for $\phi \in \text{Dom}(L_{m,\alpha})$ that

$$|(V\phi, \phi)_{L^2}| \leq \varepsilon_\lambda |((\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})\phi, \phi)_{L^2}|$$

with $\varepsilon_\lambda \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. An application of the KLMN theorem [23, Th. X.17] completes the proof. \square

Using Lemma 4.1 it remains to show that under specific assumptions on V it follows that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} = 0$. This can be guaranteed if for a sufficiently large $\lambda_0 > 0$ the operator $K_{\lambda_0}^m$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that $K_{\lambda_0}^m$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator. Then K_λ^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all $\lambda > \lambda_0$ and*

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\text{HS}} = 0,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\text{HS}}$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm.

Proof. Assume that $K_{\lambda_0}^m$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator and let $\lambda > \lambda_0$. Then we have

$$R_\lambda^m(x) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} p_t^m(x) dt \leq \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda_0 t} p_t^m(x) dt = R_{\lambda_0}^m(x).$$

Furthermore, by the dominated convergence theorem, it is clear that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} R_\lambda(x) = 0$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\text{HS}}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |V(x)| R_\lambda^m(|x-y|)^2 |V(y)| dx dy \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |V(x)| R_{\lambda_0}^m(|x-y|)^2 |V(y)| dx dy \\ &= \|K_{\lambda_0}^m\|_{\text{HS}}^2 < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Again by dominated convergence, it follows that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\text{HS}} = 0$. \square

Once this established, our goal is determine conditions under which K_λ^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for some $\lambda > 0$. First consider the case of the fractional Rollnik-class.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 1$, $m \geq 0$ and assume that $\alpha < d < 2\alpha$. If $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, then K_λ^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for every $\lambda > 0$. Furthermore, there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha} > 0$ such that*

$$\|K_\lambda^m\|_{\text{HS}} \leq \sqrt{C_{d,\alpha}} \left(1 + \frac{me^{-\lambda/m}}{\lambda}\right) \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}.$$

(The bracket equals 1 if $m = 0$.) In particular, if $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$, then H is a self-adjoint operator.

Proof. By Lemmas 6.1 and 6.10, it is straightforward that

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} K_\lambda^m(x-y)^2 dx dy = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} R_\lambda^m(x-y)^2 |V(x)||V(y)| dx dy \leq C_{d,\alpha}^2 \left(1 + \frac{me^{-\lambda/m}}{\lambda}\right)^2 \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 \quad (4.2)$$

for every $\lambda > 0$ and $m \geq 0$. Lemma 4.1 then implies that H is self-adjoint on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. \square

We can, however, provide a finer argument to characterize the class of potentials V such that K_λ^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator, at least for $\lambda > m$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 1$, $m \geq 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ and assume that $d < 2\alpha$. Then the following properties hold:*

- (1) *If $V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}$, then K_λ^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator and there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m}$, independent of V , such that*

$$\|K_\lambda^m\|_{\text{HS}} \leq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} [V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}}.$$

- (2) *If K_λ^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator, then $V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m$ and there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m}$, independent of V , such that*

$$[V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m} \leq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\text{HS}}.$$

- (3) *If $\lambda > m$, then K_λ^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator if and only if $V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m$, and there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} > 1$ independent of V such that*

$$\frac{1}{C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m}} [V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m} \leq \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\text{HS}} \leq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} [V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m}.$$

Proof. To obtain (1), let $V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}$. Then by Corollary 6.13 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\text{HS}}^2 &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |V(x)| R_\lambda^m(|x-y|)^2 |V(y)| dx dy \\ &\leq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |V(x)| H_{d,\alpha}^0(|x-y|)^2 |V(y)| dx dy = C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} [V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Next we show (2). Assume that K_λ^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator. By Lemma 6.17 we then have

$$\begin{aligned} [V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m}^2 &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |V(x)| H_{d,\alpha}^m(|x-y|)^2 |V(y)| dx dy \\ &\leq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |V(x)| R_\lambda^m(|x-y|)^2 |V(y)| dx dy = C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\text{HS}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, to show (3) note that one implication has already been shown in (2). If we assume further that $\lambda > m$ and $V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m$, then by Corollary 6.15 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\text{HS}}^2 &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |V(x)| R_\lambda^m(|x-y|)^2 |V(y)| dx dy \\ &\leq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |V(x)| H_{d,\alpha}^m(|x-y|)^2 |V(y)| dx dy = C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} [V]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m}^2. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Remark 4.5. We note that by the Kato-Rellich theorem the relativistic Schrödinger operators with Coulomb potentials $|x|^{-\gamma}$, $\gamma > 0$, are self-adjoint if $\gamma < \frac{d}{2}$ for $d \leq 3$ by [19, Prop. 1.5]. On the other hand, a combination of Theorem 4.4 and Corollary 3.24 improve this to $\gamma < \alpha$.

Finally we note that if $d \geq 2\alpha$, then K_λ^m cannot be a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for continuous potentials V .

Proposition 4.6. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 1$, $\lambda > 0$, $m \geq 0$ and assume $d \geq 2\alpha$. If there exist $\varepsilon^*, r^* > 0$ and $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $|V(y)| > \varepsilon^*$ for all $y \in B_{r^*}(x^*)$, then K_λ^m is not a Hilbert-Schmidt operator. In particular, if V is continuous, then K_λ^m is not a Hilbert-Schmidt operator, unless $V \equiv 0$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.17 we see that the function $r \in [0, \infty) \mapsto R_\lambda^m(re_1)^2 \in [0, \infty)$ satisfies (3.4), since clearly $H_{d,\alpha}^m$ does not belong to $L^2(B_\delta)$ for any ball B_δ centred in 0. The statement follows then by Theorem 3.9. \square

4.2. Spectral properties

4.2.1. Essential spectrum

In this section we discuss the spectrum of non-local Schrödinger operators with fractional Rollnik-class potentials. In the classical case, for $V \in \mathcal{R}$ Fourier transform gives that $\text{Spec}_{\text{ess}}(-\Delta + V) = \text{Spec}_{\text{ess}}(-\Delta)$ without any further requirements [32]. However, if $(d, \alpha) \neq (3, 2)$, it appears to be difficult to construct a Fourier theory of $\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. Therefore we need other ways to prove the stability of the essential spectrum.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 1$, $m \geq 0$, and assume that $d < 2\alpha$. If the potential $V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m \cap (L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) + L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$, then*

$$\text{Spec}_{\text{ess}} H = \text{Spec}_{\text{ess}} L_{m,\alpha} = [0, \infty)$$

holds for $m \geq 0$.

Proof. Due to (4.1) we may choose $\lambda > m$ sufficiently large such that

$$\|(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2} V (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2}\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2)} < 1. \quad (4.3)$$

Write

$$G_{m,\lambda} = (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2} V (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2}.$$

By the Neumann expansion we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda + H)^{-1} &= (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2} (1 + G_{m,\lambda})^{-1} (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2} \\ &= (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^j G_{m,\lambda}^j (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

and λ that satisfies (4.3) belongs to the resolvent set of H . We thus obtain

$$(\lambda + H)^{-1} - (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1} = -A_{m,\lambda} + B_{m,\lambda},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{m,\lambda} &= (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1} V (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1}, \\ B_{m,\lambda} &= (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2} \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} (-1)^j G_{m,\lambda}^j (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 4.4 K_λ^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator and thus compact. Therefore $B_{m,\lambda}$ is also compact since the operator-norm limit of a sequence of compact operators is compact. We now

prove compactness of $A_{m,\lambda}$. To do this, we split $V = V_1 + V_2$, where $V_1 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $V_2 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. It is clear that

$$A_{m,\lambda} = (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1}V_1(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1} + (\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1}V_2(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1} =: A_{m,\lambda}^1 + A_{m,\lambda}^2.$$

Since $V_1 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we have by Corollary 6.15,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} R_\lambda^m(x-y)|V_1(y)|dx dy \leq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m}\|V_1\|_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)dx < \infty. \quad (4.4)$$

This bound implies that $(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2}|V_1|^{1/2}$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator. Hence $A_{m,\lambda}^1$ is compact. On the other hand, we prove that $(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1/2}V_2$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator by replacing $|V_1(y)|$ and $\|V_1\|_1$ in (4.4) with $|V_2(y)|^2$ and $\|V_2\|_2^2$. Therefore $A_{m,\lambda}^2$ is compact. Hence $A_{m,\lambda}$ is compact since it is a sum of compact operators. The Weyl theorem then completes the proof. \square

4.2.2. Discrete spectrum

Next we consider the discrete spectrum. First we provide a bound on the number of negative eigenvalues, which in order to keep explicit, we only consider the case $\alpha < d$ and $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$.

Theorem 4.8. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 1$, $m \geq 0$ and assume that $\alpha < d < 2\alpha$. Let the potential $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha} \cap (L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) + L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Denote by V_- its negative part and by $N(V)$ the number of the negative eigenvalues of H . Then there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that*

$$N(V) \leq C_{d,\alpha}^2 \left(1 + \frac{me^{-\lambda_0/m}}{\lambda_0} \right)^2 \|V_-\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2 \quad (4.5)$$

holds (the quantity in the brackets is set to 1 and is independent of λ_0 if $m = 0$), where $C_{d,\alpha} > 0$ is same constant as in Lemma 6.10. In particular, the discrete spectrum of H is finite for both the massless and massive cases.

Proof. The argument is based on the Birman-Schwinger principle, for details see [21, Sect. 4.9.7] and [24, Th. XIII.10]. We may assume that $V \leq 0$, otherwise apply the proof to the negative part of V . Let $H(\gamma) = L_{m,\alpha} + \gamma V$ with $\gamma > 0$. By Theorem 4.7 we have $\text{Spec}_{\text{ess}}(H(\gamma)) = [0, \infty)$. If $-\lambda \in \text{Spec}_p(H(\gamma))$, that is, $H(\gamma)\phi = -\lambda\phi$ for $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ holds, then we have

$$(\lambda + L_{m,\alpha})^{-1}(-V)\phi = \frac{1}{\gamma}\phi.$$

This implies that $1/\gamma \in \text{Spec}_p(K_\lambda^m)$ and $\sqrt{-V}\phi$ is the corresponding eigenfunction. Denote by $\mu_n(\gamma)$ the n th negative eigenvalue of $H(\gamma)$, counting multiplicity. Since the negative eigenvalues of H make a discrete set, we can choose $\lambda_0 > 0$ sufficiently small so that $\mu_1(1) < -\lambda_0 < 0$ holds. Denote

$$N(V) = \#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \mu_n(1) < -\lambda_0\}.$$

In a similar way as for classical Schrödinger operators, see [24, Lem. XIII.3.C], it can be shown that $\mu_n(\gamma)$ is monotone decreasing and continuous in γ . For every $1 \leq n \leq N(V)$ the relations $\mu_n(0) = 0$ and $\mu_n(1) < -\lambda_0$ imply that there exists a $0 < \gamma_n < 1$ such that $\mu_n(\gamma_n) = -\lambda_0$. We thus compute

$$N(V) = \#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \mu_n(\gamma_n) = -\lambda_0\} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{N(V)} \frac{1}{\gamma_n^2} \leq \sum_{\nu \in \text{Spec}_p(K_{\lambda_0})} \nu^2 = \|K_{\lambda_0}^m\|_{\text{HS}}^2. \quad (4.6)$$

By (4.2) and (4.6) we obtain (4.5). \square

By the same proof we can show the following result for extended fractional Rollnik class.

Theorem 4.9. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 1$, $m \geq 0$ and assume that $d < 2\alpha$. Let the potential $V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^0 \cap (L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) + L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Denote by V_- its negative part and by $N(V)$ the number of the negative eigenvalues of H for $m \geq 0$. Then there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that*

$$N(V) \leq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda_0,m}^2 [V_-]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^0}^2$$

holds, where $C_{d,\alpha,\lambda_0,m} > 0$ is the same constant as in Corollary 6.13. In particular, the discrete spectrum of H is finite for both the massless and massive operators.

In case $m > 0$ and $V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m$, we cannot directly provide a bound on the number of negative eigenvalues, however, we can prove that they are only finitely many.

Theorem 4.10. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 1$, $m > 0$ and assume that $d < 2\alpha$. Let $V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^0 \cap (L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) + L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Denote by V_- its negative part and by $N_m(V)$ the number of eigenvalues of H , counting multiplicity, that are less than $-m$. Then there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that*

$$N_m(V) \leq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda_0,m}^2 [V_-]_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m}^2$$

holds, where $C_{d,\alpha,\lambda_0,m} > 0$ is the same constant as in Corollary 6.15. In particular, the discrete spectrum of H is finite.

Proof. By a similar argument to the proof of Theorem 4.8, we may assume that $V \leq 0$ and define $H(\gamma) = L_{m,\alpha} + \gamma V$ with $\gamma > 0$, so that if $-\lambda \in \text{Spec}_p(H(\gamma))$ then $1/\gamma \in \text{Spec}_p(K_\lambda)$. Since $\gamma V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha}^m$, by Theorem 4.7 we have $\text{Spec}_{\text{ess}}(H(\gamma)) = [0, \infty)$. Let $N(V)$ be the number of negative eigenvalues of H (counting multiplicity). For fixed $\gamma > 0$, the sequence $(\mu_n(\gamma))_{0 \leq n \leq N(V)}$ of negative eigenvalues of $H(\gamma)$, counting multiplicity, where $\mu_n(\gamma) = -\infty$ if $n > N(V)$, is monotone, decreasing and continuous in γ . Furthermore, $\text{Spec}_p(H)$ is continuous, hence there is a finite number of eigenvalues $\mu_n(1)$ lying in the interval $[-m, 0]$. Thus in case $N_m(V) = 0$, the statement follows. In the contrary case $N_m(V) > 0$ let

$$n_\star := \min\{n \geq 1 : \mu_n(1) < -m\}.$$

Hence for all $n \geq n_\star$ we have $\mu_n(1) < -m$. Choose $\lambda_0 > m$ such that for all $n \geq n_\star$ we have $\mu_n(1) \leq \mu_{n_\star}(1) < -\lambda_0$. On the other hand, $\mu_n(0) = 0$ thus due to the fact that $\mu_n(\gamma)$ is continuous in γ , there exists a sequence $(\gamma_n)_{n_\star \leq n \leq n_\star + N_m(V)}$ such that $\mu_n(\gamma_n) = -\lambda_0$ and $\gamma_n \in (0, 1)$. In particular, $1/\gamma_n \in \text{Spec}_p(K_{\lambda_0}^m)$ for all $n_\star \leq n \leq n_\star + N_m(V)$ and

$$N_m(V) = \#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \mu_{n+n_\star}(\gamma_{n+n_\star}) = -\lambda_0\} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{N_m(V)} \frac{1}{\gamma_{n+n_\star}^2} \leq \sum_{\nu \in \text{Spec}_p(K_{\lambda_0}^m)} \nu^2 = \|K_{\lambda_0}^m\|_{\text{HS}}^2$$

holds. Since $\lambda_0 > m$, by part (3) of Theorem 4.4 it follows that $K_{\lambda_0}^m$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator, and the same result then completes the proof. \square

4.2.3. Non-existence of negative and zero eigenvalues

It is known, see [33], [21, Th. 4.308], that whenever the semigroup $\{e^{-tL_{m,\alpha}} : t \geq 0\}$ is recurrent, the operator $H = L_{m,\alpha} + V$ has at least one bound state whenever V is a non-positive potential. However, when $\{e^{-tL_{m,\alpha}} : t \geq 0\}$ is transient, a bound state exists only when the potential is strong enough in a specific sense. By making use of the extended Birman-Schwinger principle, we can show that for too small Rollnik-norm there exist no bound states and as a bonus we can also rule out embedded eigenvalues at zero. We will use the following result, for a proof see [21, Cor. 4.150, Cor. 4.151, Prop. 4.309].

Theorem 4.11. *Let $\alpha < d$. Suppose that $V \leq 0$ is form-compact with respect to $L_{m,\alpha}$ and the operator norm $\|K_0^m\| < 1$. Then H has no non-positive eigenvalues, in particular, it has no bound states at negative eigenvalues and zero is not an embedded eigenvalue.*

In what follows, we derive suitable upper estimates on the norm of K_0^m which will permit to use this observation. We will separately consider the cases $m = 0$ and $m > 0$, which will require different treatment.

First we note that the map $\lambda \in [0, \infty) \mapsto \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))}$ is monotone and continuous.

Lemma 4.12. *Let $m \geq 0$ and suppose that $K_{\lambda_0}^m \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ for some $\lambda_0 > 0$. Then $K_\lambda^m \in \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ and $\|K_\lambda^m\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq \|K_{\lambda_0}^m\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))}$. Furthermore, if $\|K_{\lambda_0}^m\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} < \infty$, then $\lim_{\lambda \downarrow \lambda_0} \|K_\lambda^m\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} = \|K_{\lambda_0}^m\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))}$.*

Proof. Since K_λ is positivity preserving, we have

$$\|K_\lambda\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} = \sup_{\substack{f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ f \geq 0, f \neq 0}} \frac{\|K_\lambda f\|_2}{\|f\|_2}. \quad (4.7)$$

Indeed, choosing C to be the right-hand side of (4.7), for all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with positive and negative parts f^+, f^- respectively, we get

$$\|K_\lambda f\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\|K_\lambda f^+\|_2^2 + \|K_\lambda f^-\|_2^2} \leq C \sqrt{\|f^+\|_2^2 + \|f^-\|_2^2} = C \|f\|_2.$$

Once this is established, the statement clearly follows by the fact that $0 \leq R_\lambda(x) \leq R_{\lambda_0}(x)$. By the monotone convergence theorem, the same relation guarantees that $\|K_\lambda f\|_2 \rightarrow \|K_{\lambda_0} f\|_2$ for any $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $f \geq 0$, and so $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0} \|K_\lambda\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq \|K_{\lambda_0}\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))}$. To prove that in fact equality holds, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ consider $f_\varepsilon \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $f_\varepsilon \geq 0$ such that

$$\left| \frac{\|K_{\lambda_0} f_\varepsilon\|_2}{\|f_\varepsilon\|_2} - \|K_{\lambda_0}\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} \right| < \varepsilon.$$

There also exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $0 < \lambda - \lambda_0 < \delta$ then

$$\left| \frac{\|K_\lambda f_\varepsilon\|_2}{\|f_\varepsilon\|_2} - \frac{\|K_{\lambda_0} f_\varepsilon\|_2}{\|f_\varepsilon\|_2} \right| < \varepsilon.$$

Then for all $\lambda_0 < \lambda < \lambda_0 + \delta$ it follows that

$$\left| \frac{\|K_\lambda f_\varepsilon\|_2}{\|f_\varepsilon\|_2} - \|K_{\lambda_0}\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} \right| < 2\varepsilon,$$

which in turn implies

$$\|K_\lambda\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} \geq \frac{\|K_\lambda f_\varepsilon\|_2}{\|f_\varepsilon\|_2} \geq \|K_{\lambda_0}\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} - 2\varepsilon.$$

Taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the claim follows. \square

Now we focus on estimating $\|K_0^m\|_{\mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))}$. In fact, we will provide a necessary and sufficient condition for K_0^m to be a Hilbert-Schmidt operator.

Theorem 4.13. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ with $0 < \alpha < d < 2\alpha$ and $m \geq 0$.*

- (1) *If $m = 0$, then K_0 is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator if and only if $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. Furthermore, there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha} > 0$ such that*

$$\|K_0\|_{\text{HS}} = C_{d,\alpha} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} \quad (4.8)$$

for all $V \in \mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}$. In particular, whenever $V \leq 0$ such that

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}} < \frac{1}{C_{d,\alpha}}, \quad (4.9)$$

the operator $H = L_{0,\alpha} + V$ has no bound states at negative eigenvalues and zero is not an embedded eigenvalue.

- (2) *If $m > 0$, let $d = 3$. Then K_0^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator if and only if $V \in \mathcal{R}_{3,\alpha} \cap \mathcal{R}$ and there exist two constants $C_\alpha^1, C_{\alpha,m}^2 > 0$ such that*

$$C_{\alpha,m}^2 \sqrt{\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{3,\alpha}}^2 + \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}}^2} \leq \|K_0^m\|_{\text{HS}} \leq C_\alpha^1 \sqrt{\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{3,\alpha}}^2 + m^{\frac{4}{\alpha}-2} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}}^2} \quad (4.10)$$

for all $V \in \mathcal{R}_{3,\alpha} \cap \mathcal{R}$. In particular, whenever $V \leq 0$ is such that

$$\sqrt{\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{3,\alpha}}^2 + m^{\frac{4}{\alpha}-2} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}}^2} < \frac{1}{C_\alpha},$$

the operator $H = L_{m,\alpha} + V$ has no bound states at negative eigenvalues and zero is not an embedded eigenvalue.

Proof. To prove (1) observe that by (2.3)

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} K_0(x-y)^2 dx dy = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} R_0(x-y)^2 |V(x)||V(y)| dx dy = C_{d,\alpha}^2 \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{d,\alpha}}^2.$$

Note that (4.8) and (4.9) directly imply that V is form-compact with respect to $L_{0,\alpha}$ with relative bound strictly less than one, thus by Theorem 4.11 the operator $H = L_{0,\alpha} + V$ has no bound states at negative eigenvalues and zero is not an embedded eigenvalue. To get (2) first we show that if $V \in \mathcal{R}_{3,\alpha} \cap \mathcal{R}$, then K_0^m is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator and that the second inequality in (4.10) holds. By Lemma 6.7

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^6} K_0^m(x-y)^2 dx dy &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^6} R_0^m(x-y)^2 |V(x)||V(y)| dx dy \\ &\leq C_\alpha \left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^6} |x-y|^{-(6-2\alpha)} |V(x)||V(y)| dx dy + m^{\frac{4}{\alpha}-2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^6} |x-y|^{-2} |V(x)||V(y)| dx dy \right) \\ &= C_\alpha (\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{3,\alpha}}^2 + m^{\frac{4}{\alpha}-2} \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}}^2). \end{aligned}$$

If $V \in \mathcal{R}_{3,\alpha} \cap \mathcal{R}$, we restate Lemma 6.8 for any $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $m > 0$ and $d \geq 3$ as follows

$$R_0^m(x) \geq C_{d,\alpha,m} \max\{|x|^{-(d-\alpha)}, |x|^{-(d-2)}\} \geq \frac{C_{d,\alpha,m}}{2} (|x|^{-(d-\alpha)} + |x|^{-(d-2)}).$$

Hence, for $d = 3$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^6} |K_0^m(x-y)|^2 dx dy &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^6} R_0^m(x-y)^2 |V(x)||V(y)| dx dy \\ &\geq C_{\alpha,m} \left(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^6} |x-y|^{-(6-2\alpha)} |V(x)||V(y)| dx dy + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^6} |x-y|^{-2} |V(x)||V(y)| dx dy \right) \\ &= C_{\alpha,m} (\|V\|_{\mathcal{R}_{3,\alpha}}^2 + \|V\|_{\mathcal{R}}^2). \end{aligned}$$

The remaining part of the claim follows in the same way as in part (1). \square

5. The case $\alpha = 1$

In this section we study the $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ limit and, more generally, consider $\alpha \rightarrow \frac{d}{2}$ for $d = 1, 2, 3$, using the spaces defined in (3.7). As seen in Proposition 3.10, this limit taken directly does not lead to a sensible set of potentials. Here we show, however, that the limit of Schrödinger operators with Rollnik-class potentials in Γ -convergence sense behaves much better, and as a bonus we even obtain self-adjointness of the limit operator.

Recall the Lévy jump measures (2.1)-(2.2) and let

$$[u]_{m,\alpha}^2 := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(x+h) - u(x)|^2 j_{m,\alpha}(|h|) dx dh$$

be a Gagliardo-type seminorm on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and rewrite fractional Sobolev space

$$H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{R}^d) := \left\{ u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) : [u]_{0,\alpha} < \infty \right\}$$

equivalently in its terms. For a given potential V , we define the quadratic form associated to the operator formally written as $H = L_{m,\alpha} + V$ by

$$\mathcal{A}_{m,\alpha}^V[u] := [u]_{m,\alpha} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x)u^2(x) dx, \quad u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

We denote $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_{m,\alpha}^V) = H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^2(|V|)$ and set $\mathcal{A}_{m,\alpha}^V[u] = \infty$ if $u \notin \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_{m,\alpha}^V)$. We will show self-adjointness of the limit Schrödinger operator obtained on varying α by means of the Γ -convergence of the associated quadratic forms.

First we recall the concept of Γ -convergence.

Definition 5.1. *Let \mathcal{M} be a metric space, $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ a sequence of functionals $F_n : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, and $F : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be another functional. We say that the sequence is Γ -convergent to F as $n \rightarrow \infty$, denoted $F = \Gamma - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n$, if*

- (1) *for all sequences $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{M}$ convergent to $x \in \mathcal{M}$ the property $F(x) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n(x_n)$ holds*
- (2) *for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ there exists a sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow x$ in \mathcal{M} such that $F(x) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n(x_n)$.*

Furthermore, if $\mathcal{M} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we say that $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Mosco-convergent to F as $n \rightarrow \infty$, denoted $F = M - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n$, if property (2) above holds and

- (1_w) *for all sequences $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ weakly convergent to $x \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ it follows that $F(x) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n(x_n)$.*

It is clear that if $F = \text{M} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n$, then also $F = \Gamma - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n$ in the strong topology of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

We will make use of the following decomposition, obtained in [27, Lem. 2], see also [2, Prop. 2.7]. For every $m > 0$, $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $d \geq 1$ there exists a function $\Sigma_{m,\alpha} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ with the property that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Sigma_{m,\alpha}(|x|) dx = m, \quad (5.1)$$

such that

$$j_{0,\alpha}(r) = j_{m,\alpha}(r) + \Sigma_{m,\alpha}(r). \quad (5.2)$$

This leads to the following domination property.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $d \geq 1$, $m > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 2)$. Then*

$$[u]_{m,\alpha}^2 \leq [u]_{0,\alpha}^2 \leq [u]_{m,\alpha}^2 + 2m \|u\|_2^2 \quad (5.3)$$

for every $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In particular, if $u \in H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then $[u]_{m,\alpha} < \infty$ for all $m > 0$. Conversely, if $[u]_{m,\alpha} < \infty$ for some $m > 0$, then $u \in H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proof. The first bound in (5.3) is a straightforward consequence of (5.2) and the fact that $\sigma_{m,\alpha}$ is positive. For the second we have

$$\begin{aligned} [u]_{0,\alpha}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(x+h) - u(x)|^2 j_{0,\alpha}(|h|) dx dh \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(x+h) - u(x)|^2 j_{m,\alpha}(|h|) dx dh + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(x+h) - u(x)|^2 \Sigma_{m,\alpha}(|h|) dx dh \\ &=: [u]_{m,\alpha}^2 + I. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|u(y)|^2 + |u(x)|^2) \Sigma_{m,\alpha}(|x-y|) dx dy \\ &= 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(y)|^2 \Sigma_{m,\alpha}(|x-y|) dx dy = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(y)|^2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma_{m,\alpha}(|x-y|) dx \right) dy = 2m \|u\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (5.1). □

Now we can prove our result on Γ -convergence yielding self-adjointness.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $d = 1, 2, 3$, $m \geq 0$, and consider a potential $V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\frac{d}{2}}^{m,p}$ for some $p \geq 4$ such that $V_- \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then the Schrödinger operator $H = L_{m,\frac{d}{2}} + V$ is self-adjoint.*

Proof. By the definition of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\frac{d}{2}}^{m,p}$ there exists a sequence $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset (\frac{d}{2}, 2)$ such that $\alpha_k \downarrow \frac{d}{2}$ and $V \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{d,\alpha_k}^m$. Consider the sequence of Schrödinger operators $H_k := L_{\alpha_k,m} + V$. By Section 4.1 H_k is self-adjoint for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence we can consider the lower-semicontinuous (in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$) quadratic forms $\mathcal{A}_{m,\alpha_k}^V$. Define

$$\mathcal{A}_{m,\frac{d}{2}}^V[u] := [u]_{m,\alpha} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x) u^2(x) dx, \quad u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

We show that $\mathcal{A}_{m,\frac{d}{2}}^V = \Gamma - \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{m,\alpha_k}^V$. First note that $[\cdot]_{m,\frac{d}{2}} = \text{M} - \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [\cdot]_{m,\alpha_k}$ by [6, Lem. 3.2]. We proceed in two steps.

Step 1. We show that condition (1) in Definition 5.1 holds. Let $u_k \rightarrow u$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In case that $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{m, \alpha_k}^V[u_k] = \infty$, the statement is trivial, thus we assume that $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{m, \alpha_k}^V[u_k] < \infty$. With no loss of generality we assume that the sequence u_k satisfies

- (1) $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{m, \alpha_k}^V[u_k] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{m, \alpha_k}^V[u_k]$,
- (2) $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} [u_k]_{m, \alpha_k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [u_k]_{m, \alpha_k}$,
- (3) $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (V(x) + C_V) u_k^2(x) dx = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (V(x) + C_V) u_k^2(x) dx$,
- (4) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_k(x) \rightarrow u(x)$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

where $C_V := \|V_-\|_{L^\infty}$. Note also that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} C_V \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_k^2(x) dx = C_V \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2(x) dx.$$

Then we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{m, \alpha_k}^V[u_k] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [u_k]_{m, \alpha_k} + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (V(x) + C_V) u_k^2(x) dx - C_V \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2(x) dx. \quad (5.4)$$

By Mosco-convergence of $[\cdot]_{m, \alpha_k}$ to $[\cdot]_{m, \frac{d}{2}}$ it follows that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [u_k]_{m, \alpha_k} \geq [u]_{m, \frac{d}{2}}.$$

Furthermore, since $(V(x) + C_V) u_k^2(x) \geq 0$, Fatou's Lemma gives

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (V(x) + C_V) u_k^2(x) dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (V(x) + C_V) u^2(x) dx.$$

Hence, by (5.4) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{m, \alpha_k}^V[u_k] &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [u_k]_{m, \alpha_k} + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (V(x) + C_V) u_k^2(x) dx - C_V \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2(x) dx \\ &\geq [u]_{m, \alpha_k} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (V(x) + C_V) u^2(x) dx - C_V \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2(x) dx = \mathcal{A}_{m, \frac{d}{2}}^V[u]. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. Next we show that condition (2) in Definition 5.1 also holds. Let $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. If $u \notin \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_{m, \frac{d}{2}}^V)$, then the statement is trivial with the sequence $u_k = u$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $u \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_{m, \frac{d}{2}}^V)$, then consider the sequence $(u_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $u_k \rightarrow u$ strongly in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $[u]_{m, \frac{d}{2}} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [u_k]_{m, \alpha_k}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $u_k(x) \rightarrow u(x)$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and that there exists a constant M_1 (possibly dependent on m, d and u) such that $\|u_k\|_2 + [u_k]_{m, \alpha_k} \leq M_1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By (5.3) we have $[u_k]_{0, \alpha_k}^2 \leq M_2$ for some constant M_2 . Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} [u_k]_{0, \frac{d}{2}}^2 &= \frac{d2^{\frac{d}{2}-3}}{\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_k(x+h) - u_k(x)|^2 |h|^{-\frac{3d}{2}} dh dx \\ &= \frac{d2^{\frac{d}{2}-1}}{\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{B_1} |u_k(x+h) - u_k(x)|^2 |h|^{-\frac{3d}{2}} dh dx \\ &\quad + \frac{d2^{\frac{d}{2}-1}}{\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{B_1^c} |u_k(x+h) - u_k(x)|^2 |h|^{-\frac{3d}{2}} dh dx = I_1^k + I_2^k. \end{aligned}$$

For the first integral we have

$$I_1^k \leq \frac{d2^{\frac{d}{2}-1}}{\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{B_1} |u_k(x+h) - u_k(x)|^2 |h|^{-d-\alpha_k} dh dx \leq C_0 [u_k]_{0,\alpha_k}^2,$$

where

$$C_0 := \max_{\alpha \in [\frac{d}{2}, \alpha_1]} \frac{d2^{\frac{d}{2}-\alpha+1} \Gamma(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})}{\alpha_k \Gamma(\frac{d+\alpha}{2})}.$$

For the second,

$$I_2^k \leq \frac{\sigma_d 2^{\frac{d}{2}+1}}{\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}} \|u_k\|_2^2.$$

Hence there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$, independent of k , such that

$$[u_k]_{0,\frac{d}{2}} \leq C_1 ([u_k]_{0,\alpha_k} + \|u_k\|_2) \leq M_3,$$

where $M_3 > 0$ is a suitable constant. By the Sobolev inequality (see [11, Th. 6.5]) we have

$$\|u_k\|_q \leq M_4(q)$$

for every $q \in [2, \frac{8}{3}]$, where $M_4(q) > 0$ is a suitable constant. Note that $\frac{8}{3}$ is the critical Sobolev exponent in $H^{\frac{d}{4}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. This further implies that

$$\|u_k^2\|_q \leq M_5(q)$$

for a suitable constant $M_5(q)$, for all $q \in [1, \frac{4}{3}]$. Hence $\|u_k^2\|_{p'} \leq M_5(p')$ due to $p \geq 4$. Without loss of generality, we can then assume that $u_k^2 \rightharpoonup u^2$ weakly in $L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x) u_k^2(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x) u^2(x) dx$$

and so

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{m,\alpha_k}^V[u_k] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [u_k]_{m,\alpha_k} + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x) u_k^2(x) dx = [u]_{m,\frac{d}{2}} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x) u^2(x) dx = \mathcal{A}_{m,\frac{d}{2}}^V[u].$$

Hence $\mathcal{A}_{m,\frac{d}{2}}^V = \Gamma\text{-}\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{m,\alpha_k}^V$. By [4, Prop. 1.28] this implies that $\mathcal{A}_{m,\frac{d}{2}}^V$ is lower semi-continuous. However, $\mathcal{A}_{m,\frac{d}{2}}$ is the quadratic form associated with the operator H , hence by [10, Th. 12.13] the operator H is self-adjoint. \square

6. Appendix: Proofs of resolvent estimates

In this section we prove the resolvent estimates stated in Section 2.3. We treat the massless ($m = 0$) and massive ($m > 0$) cases separately.

6.1. Massless case

6.1.1. Proof of estimate (2.14) in the $m = 0$ case

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $d \geq 1$. There exists $C_{d,\alpha} > 0$ such that for all $\lambda > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$*

$$R_\lambda(x) \leq C_{d,\alpha} \begin{cases} |x|^{\alpha-d}, & \alpha < d, \\ \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda|x|}\right) + 1, & \alpha = d = 1, \\ |x|^{\alpha-1} + \lambda^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}, & \alpha > d = 1. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, if $\alpha < d$, then the statement holds also for $\lambda = 0$.

Proof. From (2.11) it follows that there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$p_t(x) \leq c_1 t |x|^{-d-\alpha} \text{ if } t < |x|^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad p_t(x) \leq c_1 t^{-d/\alpha} \text{ if } t > |x|^\alpha. \quad (6.1)$$

We write

$$R_\lambda(x) = \left(\int_0^{|x|^\alpha} + \int_{|x|^\alpha}^\infty \right) e^{-\lambda t} p_t(x) dt = I_1 + I_2.$$

We first estimate I_1 as

$$I_1 \leq c_1 |x|^{-d-\alpha} \int_0^{|x|^\alpha} t e^{-\lambda t} dt \leq c_1 |x|^{-d-\alpha} \int_0^{|x|^\alpha} t dt = \frac{c_1}{2} |x|^{-d+\alpha}$$

In estimating I_2 we have three cases to consider. If $\alpha < d$, we have

$$I_2 \leq c_1 \int_{|x|^\alpha}^\infty t^{-d/\alpha} e^{-\lambda t} dt \leq c_1 \int_{|x|^\alpha}^\infty t^{-d/\alpha} dt = \frac{c_1}{\frac{d}{\alpha} - 1} |x|^{-d+\alpha}.$$

Note that the same estimate holds for $\lambda = 0$ in this case. If $d = 1$ and $\alpha > d$, we get

$$I_2 \leq c_1 \int_{|x|^\alpha}^\infty t^{-1/\alpha} e^{-\lambda t} dt \leq c_1 \lambda^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \int_0^\infty t^{-1/\alpha} e^{-t} dt = c_1 \lambda^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \Gamma\left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}\right).$$

In case $\alpha = d = 1$ we use the exponential integral function

$$E_1(x) = \int_x^\infty t^{-1} e^{-t} dt, \quad x > 0$$

and recall the following bracketing property (see [1, Ch. V, eq. 5.1.20])

$$\frac{e^{-x}}{2} \log\left(1 + \frac{2}{x}\right) \leq E_1(x) \leq e^{-x} \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{x}\right). \quad (6.2)$$

Hence we obtain

$$I_2 \leq c_1 \int_{|x|}^\infty t^{-1} e^{-\lambda t} dt \leq c_1 \int_{\lambda|x|}^\infty t^{-1} e^{-t} dt = c_1 E_1(\lambda|x|) \leq c_1 \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda|x|}\right).$$

□

6.1.2. Proof of estimate (2.18)

Below we will make use of the inequality

$$s^p e^{-s} \leq p^p e^{-p}, \quad (6.3)$$

for $0 \leq s \leq p$. Beside Proposition 6.1, we can also prove a further estimate that is sharper for large values of $|x|$.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $d \geq 1$. Then there exists a positive constant $C_{d,\alpha}$ such that for all $\lambda > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$,*

$$R_\lambda(x) \leq \frac{C_{d,\alpha}}{\lambda^2 |x|^{d+\alpha}}.$$

Proof. We give another estimate of I_1 and I_2 in the proof of Lemma 6.1. Concerning I_1 , we have

$$I_1 \leq c_1 |x|^{-d-\alpha} \int_0^{|x|^\alpha} t e^{-\lambda t} dt = c_1 |x|^{-d-\alpha} \left(-|x|^\alpha \frac{e^{-\lambda|x|^\alpha}}{\lambda} - \frac{e^{-\lambda|x|^\alpha}}{\lambda^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \right) \leq \frac{c_1}{\lambda^2 |x|^{d+\alpha}}$$

Next, observe that

$$I_2 \leq c_1 \int_{|x|^\alpha}^\infty t^{-d/\alpha} e^{-\lambda t} dt = c_2 \lambda^{\frac{d}{\alpha}-1} \int_{\lambda|x|^\alpha}^\infty s^{-d/\alpha} e^{-s} ds.$$

By (6.3), we clearly have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq \frac{2c_1}{e} \lambda^{\frac{d}{\alpha}-1} \int_{\lambda|x|^\alpha}^\infty s^{-d/\alpha-1} e^{-\frac{s}{2}} ds \leq \frac{2c_1}{e} e^{-\frac{\lambda|x|^\alpha}{2}} \lambda^{\frac{d}{\alpha}-1} \int_{\lambda|x|^\alpha}^\infty s^{-d/\alpha-1} ds \\ &= \frac{2\alpha c_1}{de} e^{-\frac{\lambda|x|^\alpha}{2}} \lambda^{-1} |x|^{-d} \leq \frac{4\alpha c_1}{d\lambda^2 e^2 |x|^{d+\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Combining Proposition 6.1 and Lemma 6.2 we get the following non-uniform upper bound.

Proposition 6.3. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $d \geq 1$. Then for all $\lambda > 0$ there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha,\lambda} > 0$ such that*

$$R_\lambda(x) \leq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda} H_{d,\alpha}^0(|x|),$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, where $H_{d,\alpha}^0$ is defined in (2.18).

Proposition 6.3 corresponds to the upper bound in (2.18). We only have to prove the lower bound.

Proposition 6.4. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $d \geq 1$. Then for all $\lambda > 0$ there exists $C_{d,\alpha,\lambda} > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$*

$$R_\lambda(x) \geq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda} H_{d,\alpha}^0(x),$$

where $H_{d,\alpha}^0$ is defined in (2.17).

Proof. First we give an estimate for $|x| > 1$. By (2.11) there exists a constant c_2 such that

$$p_t(x) \geq c_2 t |x|^{-d-\alpha} \quad \text{if } t < |x|^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad p_t(x) \geq c_2 t^{-d/\alpha} \quad \text{if } t > |x|^\alpha. \quad (6.4)$$

Using (6.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R_\lambda(x) &\geq \int_0^{|x|^\alpha} e^{-\lambda t} p_t(x) dt \geq c_2 |x|^{-d-\alpha} \int_0^{|x|^\alpha} t e^{-\lambda t} dt \\ &\geq c_2 |x|^{-d-\alpha} \int_0^{|x|^\alpha} t e^{-\lambda t} dt \geq \frac{c_2}{e^\lambda \lambda^2} |x|^{-d-\alpha} (e^\lambda - 1 - \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Now let $|x| \leq 1$ and assume $\alpha < d$. Then we have, again by (6.1),

$$R_\lambda(x) \geq c_2 |x|^{-d-\alpha} \int_0^{|x|^\alpha} t e^{-\lambda t} dt \geq c_2 |x|^{-d-\alpha} e^{-\lambda} \int_0^{|x|^\alpha} t dt = \frac{c_2}{2} e^{-\lambda} |x|^{-(d-\alpha)}.$$

If $\alpha = d = 1$ we get instead

$$R_\lambda(x) \geq c_2 \int_{|x|}^\infty t^{-1} e^{-\lambda t} dt = c_2 E_1(\lambda |x|) \geq \frac{c_2}{2} e^{-\lambda} \log \left(1 + \frac{2}{\lambda |x|} \right) \geq C_{1,1,\lambda} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{|x|} \right),$$

where we also used (6.2). Finally, for $\alpha > d = 1$, notice that

$$R_\lambda(x) \geq c_2 \int_{|x|^\alpha}^\infty t^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{-\lambda t} dt \geq c_2 \int_1^\infty t^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{-\lambda t} dt.$$

□

6.2. Massive case

6.2.1. The function κ_m

Next we turn to the massive case. First we state some basic properties of the function κ_m defined in (2.13).

Lemma 6.5. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $d \geq 1$.*

(1) *We have*

$$\lim_{m \downarrow 0} \kappa_m(r) = 2^{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}-1} \Gamma\left(\frac{d+\alpha}{2}\right) r^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}}. \quad (6.5)$$

(2) *There exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha}$ such that*

$$\kappa_m(r) \leq C_{d,\alpha} r^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \quad (6.6)$$

Proof. Part (1) directly follows by (2.3). Consider part (2). If $r \leq 1$ the expression

$$c_{1,d,\alpha} := \sup_{r \leq 1} r^{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} K_{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}}(r),$$

is finite by the second asymptotic relation in (2.3). Hence $\kappa_m(r) \leq c_{1,d,\alpha} r^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}}$. Similarly, if $r > 1$

$$c_{2,d,\alpha} := \sup_{r \geq 1} r^{1/2} e^r K_{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}}(r),$$

is finite by the first relation in (2.3). Thus we have

$$\kappa_m(r) \leq c_{2,d,\alpha} m^{\frac{d+\alpha+1}{2\alpha}} r^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{m^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} r} = c_{2,d,\alpha} r^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \left(m^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} r\right)^{\frac{d+\alpha+1}{2}} e^{m^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} r} \leq c_{2,d,\alpha} \left(\frac{d+\alpha+1}{2}\right)^{\frac{d+\alpha+1}{2}} r^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}}.$$

□

Since the function

$$\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(r) = \frac{r^{\alpha/2}}{\kappa_m(r)^{\alpha/(d+\alpha)}}, \quad r > 0$$

will play a prominent role in what follows, we show some of its elementary properties.

Lemma 6.6. *The following hold:*

(1) *For $r \downarrow 0$ we have*

$$\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(r) \sim \frac{2^{\frac{\alpha}{d+\alpha} - \frac{\alpha}{2}}}{\Gamma^{\frac{\alpha}{d+\alpha}}\left(\frac{d+\alpha}{2}\right)} r^\alpha.$$

As a consequence, for all $R > 0$ there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha,m,R}$ such that for all $r \in (0, R]$

$$\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(r) \leq C_{d,\alpha,m,R} r^\alpha. \quad (6.7)$$

(2) *As $r \uparrow \infty$ we have*

$$\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(r) \sim \frac{2^{\frac{\alpha}{2(d+\alpha)}}}{m^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2(d+\alpha)}} \pi^{\frac{\alpha}{2(d+\alpha)}}} r^{\frac{\alpha}{2} + \frac{\alpha}{2(d+\alpha)}} e^{\frac{\alpha}{d+\alpha} m^{1/\alpha} r}.$$

(3) *The function $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(r)$ is strictly increasing.*

(4) *For every fixed $r > 0$ we have*

$$\lim_{m \downarrow 0} \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(r) = \frac{2^{1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{d+\alpha}{2}\right)^{d/(d+\alpha)}} r^\alpha.$$

(5) *There exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha}$ such that for all $r > 0$*

$$\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(r) \geq C_{d,\alpha} r^\alpha. \quad (6.8)$$

Proof. Using (2.3), properties (1)-(2) are straightforward. (3) is also immediate since $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(r)$ is the product of the two strictly increasing positive functions $r \in (0, \infty) \mapsto m^{-1/2} r^{\alpha/2}$ and $r \in (0, \infty) \mapsto (K_{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}}(m^{1/\alpha} r))^{-\alpha/(d+\alpha)}$. Finally, (4) and (5) are consequences of (6.5) and (6.6), respectively. \square

6.2.2. Proof of estimate (2.14) in the $m > 0$ case

Proposition 6.7. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 3$. There exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha} > 0$ such that for all $m > 0$, $\lambda \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$,*

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \leq C_{d,\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{|x|^{d-\alpha}} + \frac{m^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1}}{|x|^{d-2}} \right).$$

Proof. While in the massless case we split $R_\lambda(x)$ into two integrals, here we have to deal with four different integrals depending on the range of $|x|$. Indeed, by (2.12) it follows for $m > 0$ that there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$p_t^m(x) \leq \begin{cases} c_1 t |x|^{-d-\alpha} & \text{if } t < \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) \wedge \frac{1}{m} \\ c_1 t^{-d/\alpha} & \text{if } \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) < t \leq \frac{1}{m} \\ c_1 m^{d/\alpha-d/2} t^{-d/2} e^{-c(m^{1/\alpha}|x|)} & \text{if } \frac{1}{m} < t < m^{(1-\alpha)/2}|x| \\ c_1 m^{d/\alpha-d/2} t^{-d/2} e^{-c(m^{2/\alpha-1}|x|^2/t)} & \text{if } m^{(1-\alpha)/2}|x| \vee \frac{1}{m} \leq t. \end{cases} \quad (6.9)$$

According to this split, we define

$$I_1^m := \int_0^{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) \wedge \frac{1}{m}} e^{-\lambda t} p_t^m(x) dt, \quad I_2^m := \begin{cases} \int_{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)}^{1/m} e^{-\lambda t} p_t^m(x) dt & \text{if } \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) < \frac{1}{m} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$I_3^m := \begin{cases} \int_{1/m}^{m^{(1-\alpha)/\alpha}|x|} e^{-\lambda t} p_t^m(x) dt & \text{if } |x|^\alpha > \frac{1}{m} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad I_4^m := \int_{m^{(1-\alpha)/\alpha}|x| \vee \frac{1}{m}}^\infty e^{-\lambda t} p_t^m(x) dt,$$

so that

$$R_\lambda(x) = I_1^m + I_2^m + I_3^m + I_4^m.$$

We will use (6.9) to estimate each integral for above. To estimate I_1^m we need to distinguish two cases. If $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) \geq \frac{1}{m}$, we have

$$I_1^m \leq c_1 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) \int_0^{\frac{1}{m}} t e^{-\lambda t} dt \leq \frac{c_1}{2m^2} |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|).$$

However, since $\frac{1}{m^2} \leq \left(\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)\right)^2$, we get

$$I_1^m \leq \frac{c_1}{2} |x|^{-\frac{d-\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m^{\frac{d-\alpha}{d+\alpha}}(|x|) \leq C_{d,\alpha} \frac{c_1}{2} |x|^{-(d-\alpha)},$$

where we also used (6.6). In case $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) < \frac{1}{m}$, we get

$$I_1^m \leq c_1 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) \int_0^{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)} t e^{-\lambda t} dt \leq \frac{c_1}{2} |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) (\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|))^2 \leq C_{d,\alpha} \frac{c_1}{2} |x|^{-(d-\alpha)}.$$

We only need to estimate I_2^m in case $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) < \frac{1}{m}$. Since $d \geq 3 > \alpha$, we have

$$I_2^m \leq c_1 \int_{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)}^{\frac{1}{m}} t^{-\frac{d}{\alpha}} e^{-\lambda t} dt \leq c_1 \int_{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)}^\infty t^{-\frac{d}{\alpha}} dt = \frac{\alpha c_1}{d-\alpha} (\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|))^{-\frac{d-\alpha}{\alpha}} \leq C_{d,\alpha} \frac{\alpha c_1}{d-\alpha} |x|^{-(d-\alpha)}.$$

Next we estimate I_3^m . We only need to consider the case $|x|^\alpha \geq \frac{1}{m}$ giving

$$I_3^m \leq c_1 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha} - \frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}|x|} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{m^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}|x|} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} dt \leq c_1 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha} - \frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}|x|} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^\infty t^{-\frac{d}{2}} dt = \frac{2c_1}{d-2} m^{\frac{d}{\alpha} - 1} e^{-cm^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}|x|}$$

$$= \frac{2c_1}{(d-2)c^{d-\alpha}|x|^{d-\alpha}} \left(cm^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}|x|\right)^{d-\alpha} e^{-cm^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}|x|} \leq \frac{2c_1(d-\alpha)^{d-\alpha}}{(d-2)e^{d-\alpha}c^{d-\alpha}|x|^{d-\alpha}}.$$

Finally, consider I_4^m . With $|x|^\alpha \leq \frac{1}{m}$ we obtain

$$I_4^m \leq c_1 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha} - \frac{d}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^\infty e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}|x|^2/t} dt \leq c_1 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha} - \frac{d}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^\infty t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}|x|^2/t} dt.$$

The change of variable $s = cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}|x|^2/t$ gives

$$I_4^m \leq \frac{c_1 m^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}}{c^{\frac{d-2}{2}}|x|^{d-2}} \int_{cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}|x|^2}^\infty s^{\frac{d}{2}-2} e^{-s} ds \leq \frac{c_1 m^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}}{c^{\frac{d-2}{2}}|x|^{d-2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2} - 1\right).$$

□

6.2.3. Proof of estimate (2.15)

Since

$$|x|^{\alpha-d} + m^{2/\alpha-1}|x|^{2-d} \leq 2(1 \vee m^{2/\alpha-1})(|x|^{\alpha-d}\mathbf{1}_{\{|x|\leq 1\}} + |x|^{2-d}\mathbf{1}_{\{|x|>1\}}),$$

the above also shows the upper bound in (2.15). The lower bound is shown in the next statement.

Lemma 6.8. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $d \geq 3$. Then, for all $m > 0$ there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha,m} > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$*

$$R_0^m(x) \geq C_{d,\alpha,m}(|x|^{-(d-\alpha)}\mathbf{1}_{\{|x|\leq 1\}} + |x|^{-(d-2)}\mathbf{1}_{\{|x|>1\}}).$$

Proof. Now we use the lower bounds in (2.12). Thus there exists a constant $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$p_t^m(x) \geq \begin{cases} c_2 t |x|^{-d-\alpha} & \text{if } t < \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) \wedge \frac{1}{m} \\ c_2 t^{-d/\alpha} & \text{if } \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) < t \leq \frac{1}{m} \\ c_2 m^{d/\alpha-d/2} t^{-d/2} e^{-c(m^{1/\alpha}|x|)} & \text{if } \frac{1}{m} < t < m^{(1-\alpha)/2}|x| \\ c_2 m^{d/\alpha-d/2} t^{-d/2} e^{-c(m^{2/\alpha-1}|x|^2/t)} & \text{if } m^{(1-\alpha)/2}|x| \vee \frac{1}{m} \leq t. \end{cases} \quad (6.10)$$

Consider the case $|x| > 1$ and let first $|x|^\alpha > \frac{1}{m}$. We obtain

$$I_3^m \geq c_2 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha}-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}|x|} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{m^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}|x|} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} dt \geq c_2 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha}-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{m^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}|x|} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}|x|^2/t} dt,$$

since for $t \leq m^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}|x|$ we clearly have $e^{-cm^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}|x|} \geq e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}|x|^2/t}$. Hence for all $|x| > 1$ we get

$$R_0^m(x) \geq I_3^m + I_4^m \geq c_2 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha}-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}|x|^2/t} dt.$$

The substitution $s = \frac{cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}|x|^2}{t}$ then gives

$$R_0^m(x) \geq c_2 m^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1} c^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} |x|^{-(d-2)} \int_0^{cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}|x|^2} s^{\frac{d}{2}-2} e^{-s} ds \geq c_2 m^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1} c^{-\frac{d-2}{2}} |x|^{-(d-2)} \int_0^{cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}} s^{\frac{d}{2}-2} e^{-s} ds$$

where the integral at the right-hand side is finite since $d \geq 3$. Next consider $|x| \leq 1$. If $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) \leq \frac{1}{m}$, then

$$R_0^m(x) \geq I_1^m \geq c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) \int_0^{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)} t dt = \frac{c_2}{2} |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) (\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|))^2 \geq C_{d,\alpha} |x|^{-(d-\alpha)},$$

where we used (6.8) and the fact that $\kappa_m(|x|) \geq C_{d,\alpha} |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}}$ since $|x| \leq 1$. If $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) > \frac{1}{m}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_0^m(x) &\geq I_1^m \geq c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) \int_0^{\frac{1}{m}} t dt = \frac{c_2}{2m^2} |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) \\ &\geq \frac{c_2}{2m^2 (\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(1))^2} |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) (\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|))^2 \geq c_{d,\alpha,m} |x|^{-(d-\alpha)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 6.9. Notice that, up to a multiplicative constant, the term $|x|^{-(d-2)}$ represents the 0-resolvent kernel of the Laplacian. Indeed, we could say that the 0-potential R_0^m interpolates between the massless case $R_0(x) = C_{d,\alpha}|x|^{-(d-\alpha)}$ and the classical Newtonian case (i.e. $\alpha = 2$) that we denote here by $R_0^N(x) = C_d|x|^{-(d-2)}$. To observe this, we introduce a constant c_ℓ and write $c_\ell^2 m$ in place of m ; this constant is physically motivated and it stands for the speed of light (which was set to 1 in units used in mathematical physics). Taking $m \downarrow 0$ and using [6, Lem. 3.2] it follows that $[\cdot]_{0,\alpha} = \text{M-lim}_{m \rightarrow 0} [\cdot]_{c_\ell^2 m, \alpha}$, which implies by an application of [6, Prop. 2.1] the strong resolvent convergence of the operators $-L_{c_\ell^2 m, \alpha}$ to $-L_{0,\alpha}$ as $m \downarrow 0$. On the other hand, if we consider the classical limit $c_\ell \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain again by [6, Lem. 3.2] that $[\cdot]_{0,2} = \text{M-lim}_{c_\ell \rightarrow \infty} [\cdot]_{c_\ell^2 m, \alpha}$, where $[u]_{0,2} = \|\nabla u\|_2$ for all $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Hence $L_{c_\ell^2 m, \alpha}$ converges to $-\Delta$ in strong resolvent sense.

6.2.4. Proof of estimate (2.16)

We start by the following preliminary estimate.

Lemma 6.10. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 1$ and $m > 0$. There exists $C_{d,\alpha} > 0$ such that*

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \leq C_{d,\alpha} \begin{cases} \left(1 + \frac{me^{-\lambda/m}}{\lambda}\right) \frac{1}{|x|^{d-\alpha}} & \alpha < d \\ \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda|x|}\right) + 1 + \frac{m^{1/\alpha}}{\lambda} e^{-\lambda/m} & \alpha = d = 1 \\ |x|^{\alpha-1} + \lambda^{-\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} + \frac{m^{1/\alpha}}{\lambda} e^{-\lambda/m} & \alpha > d = 1 \end{cases}$$

holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\lambda > 0$.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 6.7, we have

$$I_1^m \leq C_{d,\alpha}|x|^{-(d-\alpha)}.$$

If $d > \alpha$, we obtain

$$I_2^m \leq C_{d,\alpha}|x|^{-(d-\alpha)}.$$

If $d = \alpha = 1$, by making use of (6.2) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2^m &\leq c_1 \int_{\Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|)}^{\frac{1}{m}} t^{-1} e^{-\lambda t} dt \leq c_1 \int_{\Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|)}^{\infty} t^{-1} e^{-\lambda t} dt = c_1 \int_{\lambda \Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|)}^{\infty} t^{-1} e^{-t} dt \\ &= c_1 E_1(\lambda \Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|)) \leq c_1 \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{C_{d,\alpha} \lambda |x|}\right) \leq C_{d,\alpha} \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda |x|}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $\alpha > d = 1$, then

$$I_2^m \leq c_1 \int_{\Phi_{1,\alpha}^m(|x|)}^{\frac{1}{m}} t^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{-\lambda t} dt \leq c_1 \int_0^{\infty} t^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{-\lambda t} dt = c_1 \lambda^{-\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\right).$$

Next we estimate I_3^m . It is necessary to do this only if $|x|^\alpha > \frac{1}{m}$. In this case by (6.9) we get

$$I_3^m \leq c_1 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha} - \frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm \frac{1}{\alpha} |x|} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{m^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} |x|} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} dt \leq \frac{c_1 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha}}}{\lambda} e^{-cm \frac{1}{\alpha} |x| - \frac{\lambda}{m}}. \quad (6.11)$$

It is clear that if $\alpha \geq d = 1$

$$I_3^m \leq C_{1,\alpha} \frac{m^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{\lambda} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}}.$$

For $\alpha < d$, by (6.3) we have

$$I_3^m \leq \frac{c_1 m}{\lambda e^{d-\alpha} |x|^{d-\alpha}} \left(cm^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} |x| \right)^{d-\alpha} e^{-cm^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} |x|} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}} \leq \frac{c_1 m (d-\alpha)^{d-\alpha}}{\lambda e^{d-\alpha} e^{d-\alpha} |x|^{d-\alpha}} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}}.$$

Finally, for I_4^m we have two cases. If $|x|^\alpha \leq \frac{1}{m}$, then for $d > \alpha$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_4^m &\leq c_1 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha} - \frac{d}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1} |x|^2/t} dt \\ &\leq \frac{c_1 m^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{c^{\frac{d-\alpha}{2}} |x|^{d-\alpha}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \left(cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1} |x|^2/t \right)^{\frac{d-\alpha}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1} |x|^2/t} dt \\ &\leq \frac{c_1 m^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{e^{\frac{d-\alpha}{2}} c^{\frac{d-\alpha}{2}} |x|^{d-\alpha}} \left(\frac{d-\alpha}{2} \right)^{\frac{d-\alpha}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} dt \leq \frac{c_2 m e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}}}{e^{\frac{d-\alpha}{2}} c^{\frac{d-\alpha}{2}} \lambda |x|^{d-\alpha}} \left(\frac{d-\alpha}{2} \right)^{\frac{d-\alpha}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\alpha \geq d = 1$ we estimate like

$$I_4^m \leq c_1 m^{\frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1} |x|^2/t} dt \leq c_1 \frac{m^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{\lambda} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}}.$$

In case $|x|^\alpha > \frac{1}{m}$, we obtain

$$I_4^m \leq c_1 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha} - \frac{d}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} |x|}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1} |x|^2/t} dt \leq c_1 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha} - \frac{d}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1} |x|^2/t} dt$$

and then we proceed as in the previous case. \square

The following estimate is sharper for large values of $|x|$.

Lemma 6.11. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 1$ and $m > 0$. Then there exists $C_{d,\alpha} > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ and $\lambda > 0$ we have*

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \leq C_{d,\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2} + \frac{e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}}}{m\lambda} + \frac{m^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1}}{\lambda^{\frac{\alpha}{2}+1}} \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + 1; \frac{\lambda}{m}\right) \right) \frac{1}{|x|^{d+\alpha}}.$$

Proof. We estimate I_j^m , $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$, in the proof of Lemma 6.10 in different ways. First consider I_1^m . By (6.6) we get

$$I_1^m \leq c_1 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) \int_0^{\min\{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|), \frac{1}{m}\}} t e^{-\lambda t} dt \leq c_1 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) \int_0^{\infty} t e^{-\lambda t} dt \leq \frac{C_{d,\alpha}}{\lambda^2 |x|^{d+\alpha}}.$$

Next consider I_2^m . We need to obtain an estimate only for the case $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) < \frac{1}{m}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2^m &\leq c_1 \int_{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)}^{\frac{1}{m}} t^{-\frac{d}{\alpha}} e^{-\lambda t} dt \leq \frac{2c_1}{\lambda e} \int_{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)}^{\infty} t^{-\frac{d}{\alpha}-1} e^{-\frac{\lambda t}{2}} dt \leq \frac{2\alpha c_1}{d\lambda e} e^{-\frac{\lambda \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)}{2}} (\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|))^{-\frac{d}{\alpha}} \\ &= \frac{4\alpha c_1}{d\lambda^2 e} \left(\frac{\lambda \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)}{2} \right) e^{-\frac{\lambda \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)}{2}} (\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|))^{-\frac{d}{\alpha}-1} \leq \frac{4\alpha c_1}{d\lambda^2 e^2} (\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|))^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{\alpha}} \leq \frac{C_{d,\alpha}}{\lambda^2 |x|^{d+\alpha}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we also used (6.8). Next we need to control I_3^m . We only need to consider the case $|x|^\alpha > \frac{1}{m}$. Starting from (6.11) and using (6.3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_3^m &\leq \frac{c_1 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha}}}{\lambda} e^{-cm^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}|x|-\frac{\lambda}{m}} = \frac{c_1}{\lambda c^{d+\alpha} m |x|^{d+\alpha}} \left(cm^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} |x| \right)^{d+\alpha} e^{-cm^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}|x|-\frac{\lambda}{m}} \\ &\leq \frac{(d+\alpha)^{d+\alpha} c_1}{\lambda e^{d+\alpha} c^{d+\alpha} m |x|^{d+\alpha}} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we consider I_4^m . If $|x|^\alpha \leq \frac{1}{m}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_4^m &\leq c_1 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha}-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}|x|^2/t} dt \\ &\leq \frac{c_1 m^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1}}{c^{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} |x|^{d+\alpha}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \left(cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}|x|^2/t \right)^{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}|x|^2/t} dt \\ &\leq \frac{c_1 m^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1}}{e^{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} c^{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} |x|^{d+\alpha}} \left(\frac{d+\alpha}{2} \right)^{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} dt \\ &\leq \frac{c_1 m^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1}}{e^{\frac{d-\alpha}{2}} c^{\frac{d-\alpha}{2}} \lambda^{\frac{\alpha}{2}+1} |x|^{d+\alpha}} \left(\frac{d+\alpha}{2} \right)^{\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \Gamma \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + 1; \frac{\lambda}{m} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Gamma(a; z) = \int_z^{\infty} t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}, z \geq 0,$$

is the upper incomplete Gamma function. If $|x|^\alpha > \frac{1}{m}$, we have instead

$$I_4^m \leq c_1 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha}-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{m^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}|x|}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}|x|^2/t} dt \leq c_1 m^{\frac{d}{\alpha}-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-cm^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}|x|^2/t} dt$$

and we proceed as in the previous case. \square

Remark 6.12. Since

$$\Gamma(a, z) \sim z^{a-1} e^{-z}, \quad z \rightarrow \infty,$$

on taking $m \rightarrow 0$ with $\lambda > 0$ fixed it follows that

$$\frac{m^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1}}{\lambda^{\frac{\alpha}{2}+1}} \Gamma \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} + 1; \frac{\lambda}{m} \right) \sim \frac{e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}}}{m\lambda}.$$

The same holds for $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ if m is fixed.

Combining Lemmas 6.10 and 6.11' we get the following result.

Proposition 6.13. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 1$. Then for all $\lambda > 0$ and $m > 0$ there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m}$ such that*

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \leq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} H_{d,\alpha}^0(|x|),$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, where $H_{d,\alpha}^0$ is defined in (2.17).

This shows (2.16) for $m > 0$.

6.2.5. Proof of estimate (2.19)

To provide the upper bound we improve the bound given in Lemma 6.11 for large values of λ .

Lemma 6.14. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 1$ and $m > 0$. Then there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha} > 0$ such that for all $\lambda > m$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$*

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \leq C_{d,\alpha} \frac{|x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|)}{(\lambda - m)^2}.$$

Proof. By [8, eq. (2.16)] there exists a constant c_1 dependent on α and d such that for all $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$

$$p_t(x) \leq c_1 t e^{mt} |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|)$$

If $\lambda > m$, we have

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \leq c_1 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) \int_0^\infty t e^{-(\lambda-m)t} dt \leq c_1 \frac{|x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|)}{(\lambda - m)^2}.$$

□

Combining the previous estimate with Lemma 6.10 gives the following result.

Corollary 6.15. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $d \geq 1$. Then for all $m > 0$ and $\lambda > m$, there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$*

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \leq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} H_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)$$

where $H_{d,\alpha}^m$ is defined in (2.20)

Remark 6.16. We note that (6.5) gives $\lim_{m \downarrow 0} H_{d,\alpha}^m(r) = H_{d,\alpha}^0(r)$.

This proves the upper bound in (2.19). Finally, we prove the lower bound in (2.19), together with (2.21).

Lemma 6.17. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $d \geq 1$. Then for all $\lambda > 0$ and $m > 0$ there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} > 0$ such that*

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \geq C_{d,\alpha,\lambda,m} H_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|),$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, where $H_{d,\alpha}^m$ is defined in (2.20).

Proof. Throughout this proof we will use the lower bounds provided in (6.10). First we give an estimate for $|x| > 1$. We need to distinguish among two cases. If $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) \geq \frac{1}{m}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_\lambda^m(x) &\geq \int_0^{\frac{1}{m}} e^{-\lambda t} p_t^m(x) dt \geq c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) \int_0^{\frac{1}{m}} t e^{-\lambda t} dt \\ &= \frac{c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|)}{\lambda^2} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}} - \frac{\lambda}{m} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}} \right) \geq \frac{c_2}{2} m^{-2} |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) e^{-\lambda/m}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) \leq \frac{1}{m}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_\lambda^m(x) &\geq \int_0^{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)} e^{-\lambda t} p_t^m(x) dt \geq c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) \int_0^{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)} t e^{-\lambda t} dt \\ &\geq c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) \int_0^{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(1)} t e^{-\lambda t} dt \\ &\geq \frac{c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|)}{\lambda^2} \left(1 - e^{-\lambda \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(1)} - \lambda \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(1) e^{-\lambda \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(1)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m$ is strictly increasing. Next let $|x| \leq 1$ and consider the following cases. If $d > \alpha$ and $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) \leq \frac{1}{m}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} R_\lambda^m(x) &\geq \int_0^{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)} e^{-\lambda t} p_t^m(x) dt \geq c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) \int_0^{\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)} t e^{-\lambda t} dt \\ &= \frac{c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|)}{\lambda^2} e^{-\lambda \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)} \left(e^{\lambda \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)} - 1 - \lambda \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) \right) \\ &\geq c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) (\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|))^2 e^{-\lambda \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now observe that for $|x| \leq 1$ the second asymptotic relation in (2.3) implies that there exists a constant $C_{d,\alpha}$ such that $\kappa_m(|x|) \geq C_{d,\alpha} |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}}$. Hence, by also using (6.8) and the fact that $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m$ is increasing, we obtain

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \geq C_{d,\alpha} |x|^{-(d-\alpha)} e^{-\lambda \Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(1)}.$$

Next, if $d > \alpha$ and $\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|) > \frac{1}{m}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_\lambda^m(x) &\geq \int_0^{\frac{1}{m}} e^{-\lambda t} p_t^m(x) dt \geq c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) \int_0^{\frac{1}{m}} t e^{-\lambda t} dt \\ &= \frac{c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|)}{\lambda^2} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}} \left(e^{\frac{\lambda}{m}} - 1 - \frac{\lambda}{m} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|)}{m^2} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}} \geq \frac{c_2 |x|^{-\frac{d+\alpha}{2}} \kappa_m(|x|) (\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(|x|))^2}{(\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(1))^2 m^2} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}} \geq C_{d,\alpha} \frac{|x|^{-(d-\alpha)}}{(\Phi_{d,\alpha}^m(1))^2 m^2} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{m}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next assume that $d = \alpha = 1$ and let $\Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|) \leq \frac{1}{m}$. Then we start from

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \geq I_2^m + I_3^m + I_4^m$$

and we first search for some lower bounds of I_3^m and I_4^m . Again, we have to distinguish two cases. If $|x| \leq \frac{1}{m}$, then $I_3^m = 0$ and we have

$$I_4^m \geq c_2 m^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-cm|x|^2/t} dt.$$

Now observe that, for fixed $|x|$, the function $f(r) = r^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-cm|x|^2 r}$ is decreasing, hence, for $t > \frac{1}{m}$ and $|x| \leq 1$, we have

$$t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-cm|x|^2/t} \geq m^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-cm^2|x|^2} t^{-1} \geq m^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-cm^2} t^{-1}. \quad (6.12)$$

Thus

$$I_4^m \geq c_2 e^{-cm^2} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} t^{-1} e^{-\lambda t} dt.$$

If $|x| > \frac{1}{m}$, we have

$$I_3^m \geq c_2 m^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-cm|x|} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{|x|} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\lambda t} dt \geq e^{-cm} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{|x|} t^{-1} e^{-\lambda t} dt.$$

Furthermore

$$I_4^m \geq c_2 m^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{|x|}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-cm\frac{2}{\alpha}-1|x|^2/t} dt \geq c_2 e^{-cm^2} \int_{|x|}^{\infty} t^{-1} e^{-\lambda t} dt,$$

where we used again (6.12), since $t > |x| > \frac{1}{m}$ and $|x| \leq 1$. In general, we have

$$I_3^m + I_4^m \geq C_{1,1,m} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} t^{-1} e^{-\lambda t} dt$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} R_\lambda^m(x) &\geq I_2^m + I_3^m + I_4^m \geq C_{1,1,m} \int_{\Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|)}^{\infty} t^{-1} e^{-\lambda t} dt = C_{1,1,m} E_1(\lambda \Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|)) \\ &\geq \frac{C_{1,1,m} e^{-\lambda \Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|)}}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{2}{\lambda \Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used (6.2). Since $|x| \leq 1$, we can use (6.7) to finally obtain

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \geq C_{1,1,m,\lambda} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{|x|} \right).$$

Now consider the case $d = \alpha = 1$ and $\Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|) > \frac{1}{m}$. Arguing as before, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_\lambda^m(x) &\geq I_3^m + I_4^m \geq C_{1,1,m} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} t^{-1} e^{-\lambda t} dt \geq C_{1,1,m} \int_{\Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|)}^{\infty} t^{-1} e^{-\lambda t} dt \\ &= C_{1,1,m} E_1(\lambda \Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|)) \geq \frac{C_{1,1,m} e^{-\lambda \Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|)}}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{2}{\lambda \Phi_{1,1}^m(|x|)} \right) \geq C_{1,1,m,\lambda} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{|x|} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let $\alpha > d = 1$ and make the split

$$R_\lambda^m(x) \geq I_3^m + I_4^m.$$

If $|x| \leq \frac{1}{m}$, then $I_3^m = 0$ and

$$I_4^m \geq c_2 m^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-cm\frac{2}{\alpha}-1|x|^2/t} dt.$$

Since $f_\alpha(r) = r^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{-cm\frac{2}{\alpha}-1|x|^2r}$ is decreasing, for $t > \frac{1}{m}$ and $|x| \leq 1$ we get

$$t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-cm\frac{2}{\alpha}-1|x|^2/t} dt \geq m^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{-cm\frac{2}{\alpha}} t^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \quad (6.13)$$

and then

$$I_4^m \geq c_2 e^{-cm\frac{2}{\alpha}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} dt.$$

If $|x| > \frac{1}{m}$, we have

$$I_3^m \geq c_2 m^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-cm\frac{1}{\alpha}|x|} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{m^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}|x|} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\lambda t} dt \geq e^{-cm\frac{1}{\alpha}} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{m^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}|x|} t^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{-\lambda t} dt$$

and

$$I_4^m \geq c_2 e^{-cm\frac{2}{\alpha}} \int_{m^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}|x|}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} dt,$$

by (6.13) since $t > m^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}|x| > \frac{1}{m}$. Thus we finally obtain

$$R_{\lambda}^m(x) \geq I_3^m + I_4^m \geq C_{1,\alpha,\lambda,m} \int_{\frac{1}{m}}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} t^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} dt = C_{1,\alpha,\lambda,m} \Gamma\left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}, \frac{\lambda}{m}\right).$$

□

Acknowledgments

G.A. is supported by the PRIN 2022XZSAFN Project “Anomalous Phenomena on Regular and Irregular Domains: Approximating Complexity for the Applied Sciences” CUP_E53D23005970006 and by the GNAMPA-INdAM group. A.I. thanks JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 20K03625, 21K03279 and 21KK0245. J.L. thanks the hospitality of Tokyo University of Science on a research visit during which part of this paper has been written.

References

- [1] M. Abramowitz, I. A. Stegun (eds.): *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*, US Government Printing Office, 1968
- [2] G. Ascione, J. Lőrinczi. Potentials for non-local Schrödinger operators with zero eigenvalues, *J. Diff. Eq.*, **317** (2022), 264-364
- [3] K. Bogdan et al.: *Potential Analysis of Stable Processes and its Extensions*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1980**, Springer, 2009
- [4] A. Braides: *Gamma-convergence for Beginners*, Clarendon Press, 2002.
- [5] A. Burchard: Cases of equality in the Riesz rearrangement inequality, *Ann. Math.* **143** (1996), 499-527
- [6] Z.Q. Chen, R. Song: Continuity of eigenvalues of subordinate processes in domains. *Math. Zeitschrift* **252** (2006), 71-89
- [7] Z.Q. Chen, P. Kim, T. Kumagai: Global heat kernel estimates for symmetric jump processes, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **363** (2011), 5031-5055
- [8] Z.Q. Chen, P. Kim, R. Song: Sharp heat kernel estimates for relativistic stable processes in open sets, *Ann. Probab.* **40** (2012), 213-244
- [9] F. Coester: Systematic approximations for the single-channel scattering amplitude, *Phys. Rev.* **133** (1964), 6B: B1516-B1519
- [10] G. Dal Maso: *An Introduction to Γ -Convergence*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012
- [11] E. Di Nezza, G. Palatucci, E. Valdinoci: Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces, *Bull. Sci. Math.* **136** (2012), 521-573
- [12] A. Figalli et al.: Isoperimetry and stability properties of balls with respect to nonlocal energies, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **336** (2015), 441-507
- [13] R.L. Frank, E.H. Lieb: Proof of spherical flocking based on quantitative rearrangement inequalities, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. di Pisa, Classe di scienze* **22** (2021), 1241-1263
- [14] R.L. Frank, R. Seiringer: Non-linear ground state representations and sharp Hardy inequalities, *J. Funct. Anal.* **255** (2008), 3407-3430.
- [15] N. Fusco, V. Millot, M. Morini: A quantitative isoperimetric inequality for fractional perimeters, *J. Funct. Anal.* **261** (2011), 697-715
- [16] N. Fusco: The quantitative isoperimetric inequality and related topics, *Bull. Math. Sci.* **5** (2015), 517-607
- [17] I.S. Gradshteyn, I. M. Ryzhik: *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*, Academic Press, 2014
- [18] A. Grossmann, T.T. Wu: Schrödinger scattering amplitude, (I) *J. Math. Phys.* **2** (1961), 710-713; (II) *J. Math. Phys.* **2** (1961), 714-718; (III) *J. Math. Phys.* **3** (1962), 684-689
- [19] A. Ishida: Minimal velocity bound for Schrödinger-type operator with fractional powers, arXiv:2007.05388
- [20] E.H. Lieb: Existence and uniqueness of the minimizing solution of Choquard’s nonlinear equation, *Studies Appl. Math.*, **57** (1977), 93-105
- [21] J. Lőrinczi, F. Hiroshima, V. Betz: *Feynman-Kac-Type Theorems and Gibbs Measures on Path Space. With Applications to Rigorous Quantum Field Theory*, de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics **34**, Walter de Gruyter, 2011; 2nd rev. exp. ed., vol. 1, 2020

- [22] V. Pipiras, M.S. Taqqu: Integration questions related to fractional Brownian motion, *Probab. Theory Rel. Fields* **118** (2000), 251-291
- [23] M. Reed, B. Simon: *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics*, vol. 2: *Fourier Analysis, Self-adjointness*, Academic Press, 1975
- [24] M. Reed, B. Simon: *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics*, vol. 4: *Analysis of Operators*, Academic Press, 1980
- [25] F. Riesz: Sur une inégalité intégrale, *J. London Math. Soc.* **1** (1930), 162-168
- [26] H. Rollnik: Streumaxima und gebundene Zustände, *Z. Phys.* **145** (1956), 639-653
- [27] M. Ryznar: Estimates of Green function for relativistic α -stable process, *Potential Anal.* **17** (2002), 1-23
- [28] S. Samko: *Hypersingular Integrals and Their Applications*, CRC Press, 2001
- [29] M. Scadron, S. Weinberg, J. Wright: Functional analysis and scattering theory, *Phys. Rev.* **135**, 1B (1964), B202-B207
- [30] J. Schwinger: On the bound states of a given potential, in: *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, vol. **47**, No. 1 (1961), pp. 122-129
- [31] B. Simon: Hamiltonians defined as quadratic forms, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **21** (1971), 192-210
- [32] B. Simon: *Quantum Mechanics for Hamiltonians Defined as Quadratic Forms*, Princeton University Press, 1971
- [33] B. Simon: *Functional Integration and Quantum Physics*, Academic Press, 1979, 2nd ed. 2005
- [34] J. Thim: Asymptotics and inversion of Riesz potentials through decomposition in radial and spherical parts, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* **195** (2016), 323-341

GIACOMO ASCIONE, SCUOLA SUPERIORE MERIDIONALE, 80138 NAPOLI, ITALY

Email address: `g.ascione@ssmeridionale.it`

ATSUHIDE ISHIDA, KATSUSHIKA DIVISION, INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE, TOKYO, 125-8585, JAPAN, AND, ALFRÉD RÉNYI INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, REÁLTANODA UTCA 13-15, 1053 BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

Email address: `aishida@rs.tus.ac.jp`

JÓZSEF LŐRINCZI, ALFRÉD RÉNYI INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, REÁLTANODA UTCA 13-15, 1053 BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

Email address: `lorinczi@renyi.hu`