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1 Introduction

In this note we give a simple proof of Fefferman-Phong inequality by means of Wick calculus, instead of FBI operator discussed by Tataru[T]. Recently, the Wick calculus has been used by the first author in [L2, L3], treating irregular symbols which appear in the local solvability problem for pseudo-differential operators of principal type. As a generalization of the product formula given there, Ando and the second author [AM] have given a full expansion formula as follows (similar to that of Weyl pseudo-differential operators):

\[ a^{\text{Wick}} b^{\text{Wick}} = (ab)^{\text{Wick}} - \frac{1}{2} \left( a' \cdot b' - \frac{1}{i} \{ a, b \} \right)^{\text{Wick}} + \cdots \]

\[ + \frac{(-1)^k}{2^k k!} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{2n} \partial_{X_j} \partial_{Z_j} + \frac{H_{X_J}}{i} \partial_{Z_j} \right)^k \left( a(X)b(Z_{J}') \right)_{Z=X}^{Wick} + \cdots , \]

where, for \( a(x, \xi) = a(X), (X \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n_\xi) \), we define \( a^{\text{Wick}} = a^{\text{Wick}}(x, D) \) on \( L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \) by

\[ a^{\text{Wick}}(x, D)u(x) = (W^* a^\mu W u)(x) \quad for \quad u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) . \]

Here \( (W u)(Y) = (W u)(y, \eta) \) is a windowed Fourier transform of \( u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \) defined by

\[ (W u)(Y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g^Y(x) u(x) dx , g^Y(x) = e^{i\pi^2 g(x - y)} , \]

with a Gauss function \( g = (4\pi^2)^{-n/4} \exp(-|x|^2/2) \),

\( a^\mu \) is the multiplication operator by \( a(Y) \) on \( L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}) \) and \( W^* \) is the adjoint operator of \( W \). The formal expansion formula (1.1) seems to be known for polynomial symbols since the Wick calculus is classical and has a long history(cf., [S]). In fact, it is not difficult to obtain (1.1) in formal arguments because the Wick operators can be converted to the Weyl pseudo-differential operators and one may apply the product formula (in p.155 of [H]) of Weyl calculus *. However our interest here is to estimate the remainder term in the frame of Wick operators, yielding a variant of Bony's proof [B] of the Fefferman-Phong inequality.

Though our methods can be applied to the expansion formula of any order, for the brevity we confine ourselves to the one of first order in what follows:

*see the last paragraph of Section 2.
Proposition 1.1. If \( a(X), b(X) \) and those derivatives belong to \( L^\infty \) then we have
\[
a^{\text{Wick}} b^{\text{Wick}} = \left( ab - \frac{1}{2} a' \cdot b' + \frac{1}{2i} \{a, b\} \right)^{\text{Wick}} + R_2,
\]
where the remainder term \( R_2 \) is an operator from \( L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \) to \( L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \) satisfying two different estimates:

\[
||R_2||_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C||a||_{L^\infty} \left( \sum_{|\beta|=2} ||b^{(\beta)}||_{L^\infty} \right)
\]

or

\[
||R_2||_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \left( \sum_{|\alpha|=|\beta|=2} ||a^{(\alpha)}||_{L^\infty} ||b^{(\beta)}||_{L^\infty} \right. \\
+ \left. \sum_{|\beta|=2, |\alpha|=|\gamma|=1} ||(a^{(\alpha)}b^{(\beta)})^{(\gamma)}||_{L^\infty} + \sum_{|\alpha|=2, |\gamma|=2} ||(ab^{(\alpha)})^{(\gamma)}||_{L^\infty} \right),
\]

provided that all terms on the right hand side of (1.3) or (1.4) are well-defined. Here \( a^{(\alpha)}(X) = \partial_X^{\alpha} a(X) \). Furthermore, we have
\[
b^{\text{Wick}} a^{\text{Wick}} = \left( ab - \frac{1}{2} a' \cdot b' - \frac{1}{2i} \{a, b\} \right)^{\text{Wick}} + \tilde{R}_2,
\]
where the remainder term \( \tilde{R}_2 \) has the same estimates as (1.3) or (1.4).

It should be noted that estimates (1.3) and (1.4) are not symmetric with respect to \( a \) and \( b \).

It is now well-known (ex., [L1]) that the sharp Gårding inequality follows directly from the Wick calculus because the Wick operator approximates the pseudodifferential operators (see Proposition 2.1 in Section 2). Here, by means of Proposition 1.1 we can prove:

Theorem 1.2. ([FP], Theorem 18.6.8 of [H], [B]). Let \( 0 < \delta < \rho < 1 \). Assume that \( a(x, \xi) \geq 0 \) and

\[
|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_x^\beta a(x, \xi)| \leq C < \xi >^{(\rho-\delta)(|\beta|-|\alpha|)/2} \quad \text{for } 4 \leq |\alpha| + |\beta| \tag{1.5}
\]

\[
|\partial_\xi^\beta \partial_x^\alpha a(x, \xi)| \leq C < \xi >^{2(\rho-\delta)+|\beta|-\rho|\alpha|} \quad \text{for } |\alpha| + |\beta| < 4 \tag{1.6}
\]

Then there exists a constant \( C' > 0 \) such that

\[
\text{Re} (a(x, D)u, u) \geq -C' ||u||^2 \quad \text{for } u \in \mathcal{S}.
\]

We remark that the condition (1.5) is satisfied if \( a(x, \xi) \) belongs to \( S^{2(\rho-\delta)} \) because

\[
2(\rho-\delta) + |\beta|-\rho|\alpha| = \frac{\rho-\delta}{2} (4 - |\alpha + \beta|) + \frac{\rho+\delta}{2} |\beta|-|\alpha|.
\]

This generalization of Fefferman-Phong inequality and further investigation was given by [B]. It should be noted that (1.5) is required only up to finite order of \( \alpha, \beta \) (see (3.3) and (3.9) in Section 3). For the proof of Theorem 1.1, addition to Proposition 1.1 we need the usual Littlewood-Paley decomposition and the following lemma:
Lemma 1.3. ([T], cf. [G], Lemma 18.6.9 of [H]). Let \( a(X) \) be a non-negative \( C^{3,1} \) function defined in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) such that \( \sup_{|\alpha|=4} ||a^{(\alpha)}||_{L^\infty} \leq 1 \). Then there exist an \( M \in \mathbb{N} \) and a \( C > 0 \) depending only on the dimension \( d \) such that

\[
a(X) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} b_j(X)^2
\]

where \( b_j(X) \) are \( C^{1,1} \) functions satisfying

\[
\sum_{|\alpha|=2} ||b_j^{(\alpha)}||_{L^\infty} + \sum_{|\alpha|=2, |\beta|=|\gamma|=1} ||(b_j^{(\alpha)}b_j^{(\beta)})^{(\gamma)}||_{L^\infty} \leq C \cdot
\]

Note that \( b_j^{(\beta)} \) with \( |\beta|=1 \) is a Lipschitz function and the lemma is claiming that the first derivative in the distribution sense of \( b_j^{(\alpha)}b_j^{(\beta)} \) with \( |\alpha|=2, |\beta|=1 \) is in fact \( L^\infty \).

We remark that the fact \( b_j \in C^{1,1} \) is optimal in the case \( d \geq 4 \) ([BBCP]) though it looks like a function belonging to \( C^{3,1} \) in the proof in [T] under rescaling arguments.

2 Proof of Proposition 1.1

The formula in the proposition with the remainder term \( R_2 \) satisfying (1.3) is nothing but (2.4) of [AM] in the case of \( N=2 \) (cf., Proposition 2.3 of [L2]). So we shall prove the second estimate (1.4) for \( R_2 \). If we define the operator \( \Sigma_Y \) as

\[
(\Sigma_Y u)(x) = (Wu)(Y)g^Y(x) \quad \text{for} \quad u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n).
\]

Then it follows from (1.2) that for \( a \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \) we have

\[
a^{\text{Wick}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} a(Y)\Sigma_Y dY.
\]

Since \( \Sigma_Y \) is a Weyl pseudo-differential operator with a symbol \( p_Y(X) = \pi^{-n}e^{-|X-Y|^2} \) for each fixed \( Y \) (see Lemma 2.9 of [AM], cf., (2.2) of [L2]) it follows from (2.2) that \( a^{\text{Wick}}(x, D) = b^{\text{Wick}}(x, D) \), with its Weyl symbol

\[
b(x, \xi) = b(X) = \pi^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} a(X + Y)e^{-|Y|^2} dY.
\]

Furthermore we have (see Lemma 2.10 of [AM])

\[
\Sigma_Y \Sigma_Y = (2\pi)^{-n} \Sigma_Y \quad \text{on} \quad L^2(\mathbb{R}^n),
\]

\[
||\Sigma_Y \Sigma_Z||_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq (2\pi)^{-2n} e^{-\frac{1}{4}|Y-Z|^2}.
\]

By means of (2.2) we have

\[
a^{\text{Wick}}b^{\text{Wick}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} a(Y)b(Z)\Sigma_Y \Sigma_Z dYdZ.
\]

1In particular the product \( b'b'' \) is not meaningful but requiring \( (b'b'')' - b'b'' \in L^\infty \) makes sense for \( b = b_j \in C^{1,1} \).
Using the Taylor formula \( b(Z) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \frac{b^{(\alpha)}(Y)(Z - Y)^\alpha}{\alpha!} + b_2(Y, Z) \) with
\[
b_2(Y, Z) = 2 \sum_{|\alpha|=2} \int_0^1 (1 - \theta)b^{(\alpha)}(Y + \theta(Z - Y))d\theta \frac{(Z - Y)^\alpha}{\alpha!}
\]
we have
\[
a^{\text{Wick}}b^{\text{Wick}} = \sum_{\ell=0}^1 \sum_{|\alpha|=\ell} \Omega_\alpha + R_2^0,
\]
where
\[
\Omega_\alpha = \frac{1}{\alpha!} \int \int_{R^n_p \times R^n_p} a(Y) b^{(\alpha)}(Y)(Z - Y)^\alpha \Sigma_Y \Sigma_Z dY dZ,
\]
\[
R_2^0 = \int \int_{R^n_p \times R^n_p} a(Y) b_2(Y, Z) \Sigma_Y \Sigma_Z dY dZ.
\]
If \( \sigma(\Omega_\alpha) \) denotes the Weyl symbol of \( \Omega_\alpha \), we have the formula
\[
(2.6) \quad \sigma(\Omega_\alpha) = \frac{\pi^{-n}}{2^{2|\alpha|} \alpha!} \int_{R^n_p} a(X + Y)b^{(\alpha)}(X + Y) \left( \sum_{q=0}^\infty \frac{(2\Delta_Z)^q}{q!} Z^\alpha \right|_{Z = \partial_Y + H_Y / i} e^{-|Y|^2} dY,
\]
as in the same way in p.134 in [AM]. If \(|\alpha| = 1\) then we have the only term with \( q = 0 \), that is,
\[
\sigma(\Omega_\alpha) = \frac{\pi^{-n}}{2} \int_{R^n_p} a(X + Y)b^{(\alpha)}(X + Y)(\partial_Y + H_Y / i)^\alpha e^{-|Y|^2} dY
\]
\[
= \frac{\pi^{-n}}{2} \int_{R^n_p} \left\{ (-\partial_Y + H_Y / i)^\alpha \left( a(X + Y)b^{(\alpha)}(X + Y) \right) \right\} e^{-|Y|^2} dY,
\]
where we have used the integration by parts in the last equality. In view of (2.3) we have
\[
(2.7) \quad \sum_{|\alpha|=1} \Omega_\alpha = \left( -\frac{1}{2} a' \cdot b' + \frac{1}{2i} \{ a, b \} - \frac{1}{2} a \Delta_X b \right)^\text{Wick}
\]
because \( \sum_{|\alpha|=1} H_Z^\alpha \partial^\alpha b = 0 \). We shall calculate \( R_2^0 \), whose principal part cancels the third term of the right hand side of (2.7). Using the Taylor formula for \( a(Y) \) at \( Y + \theta(Z - Y) \), we have
\[
R_2^0 = \sum_{|\alpha|=2} \left[ \int \int_{R^n_p \times R^n_p} \int_0^1 (1 - \theta) \{ a(Y + \theta(Z - Y)) \right. \\
- \sum_{|\beta|=1} a^{(\beta)}(Y + \theta(Z - Y)) \theta(Z - Y)^\beta \\
+ 2 \sum_{|\beta|=2} \int_0^1 (1 - \theta) a^{(\beta)}(Y + (1 - \tilde{\theta})\theta(Z - Y)) \frac{\theta^2(Z - Y)^\beta}{\beta!} d\tilde{\theta} \\
\left. \times b^{(\alpha)}(Y + \theta(Z - Y)) d\theta \frac{(Z - Y)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \Sigma_Y \Sigma_Z dY dZ \right] \\
:= J_1 + J_2 + J_3.
\]
Since we have

\[ J_3 = \sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta|=2} \frac{4}{\alpha!\beta!} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 d\theta d\tilde{\theta} (1-\theta)(1-\tilde{\theta}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_2} a^{(\beta)}(Y + (1-\tilde{\theta})(Z - Y)) b^{(\alpha)}(Y + \theta(Z - Y))(Z - Y)^{\alpha+\beta} \Sigma_Y \Sigma_Z dY dZ \]

by means of (2.5) and Cotlar's lemma we get as in (2.19) of [L2]

\[ \|J_3\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \sum_{|\alpha|,|\beta|=2} \|a^{(\beta)}\|_{L^\infty} \|b^{(\alpha)}\|_{L^\infty}. \]

As to the term \( J_2 \) we use the Taylor formula for \( (a^{(\beta)}b^{(\alpha)})(Y + \theta(Z - Y)) \) with \(|\alpha| = 2\) and \(|\beta| = 1\) at \( Y \). Then

\[ J_2 = - \sum_{|\alpha|=2,|\beta|=1} \frac{2}{\alpha!\beta!} \int_0^1 \theta(1-\theta) d\theta \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_2} \left( a^{(\beta)}b^{(\alpha)}(Y) \right) (Z - Y)^{\beta+\alpha} \Sigma_Y \Sigma_Z dY dZ \right\} \]

By the same way as in (2.6) we have

\[ \sigma(J_2^{(1)}) = \sum_{|\alpha|=2,|\beta|=1} -\frac{\pi^{-n}}{32^3 \alpha!\beta!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_2} a^{(\beta)}b^{(\alpha)}(X + Y) \left( \frac{1}{3^q} \frac{(2\Delta_{Z})^q}{q!} Z^\beta + \frac{1}{\alpha!} \frac{(2\Delta_{Z})^\gamma}{\gamma!} \right) e^{-|Y|^2} dY. \]

Note that the term between the last parentheses is the sum of differential operators with order 1 or 3. Use one derivative for the integration by parts. Then, by the same method as in (3.19) of [L2] we have

\[ \|J_2^{(1)}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \sum_{|\gamma|=1,|\alpha|=2,|\beta|=1} \|a^{(\beta)}b^{(\alpha)}\|_{L^\infty}. \]

For \( J_2^{(2)} \) we have the same estimate by the same way as in (2.19) of [L2]. Now we estimate \( J_1 \) by using the Taylor formula for \( a b^{(\alpha)}(Y + \theta(Z - Y)) \) at \( Y \) again. We have

\[ J_1 = \sum_{|\alpha|=2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_2} a(Y)b^{(\alpha)}(Y) \frac{(Z - Y)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \Sigma_Y \Sigma_Z dY dZ \]

\[ + \sum_{|\alpha|=2,|\gamma|=1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_2} (ab^{(\alpha)})^{(\gamma)}(Y) \frac{(Z - Y)^{\alpha+\gamma}}{3\alpha!} \Sigma_Y \Sigma_Z dY dZ \]

\[ + 2 \sum_{|\alpha|=2,|\gamma|=2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (1-\theta) \theta^2 (1-t) d\theta dt \]

\[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n_2} (ab^{(\alpha)})^{(\gamma)}(Y + t\theta(Z - Y)) \frac{(Z - Y)^{\alpha+\gamma}}{\alpha!\gamma!} \Sigma_Y \Sigma_Z dY dZ \]
The operator norm of both last two terms on the right hand side are estimated by

\[(2.10) \sum_{|\alpha|=2, |\gamma|=2} \parallel (ab^{(\alpha)})^{(\gamma)} \parallel_{L^\infty}\]

with a constant factor. Writing the first term \(\sum \Omega_\alpha\), we use the formula (2.6) with \(|\alpha|=2\). Then we have

\[(2.11) \sum_{|\alpha|=2} \Omega_\alpha = \frac{1}{2^2} \sum_{|\alpha|=2} (\partial X + H_{X} a^{(\alpha)})^{Wick} + \frac{1}{2} (a \Delta b)^{Wick},\]

where the right hand side is ordered according to \(q=0,1\) in (2.6). In view of (2.7) we can see that \(R_2\) satisfies the desired estimate (1.4). \(\square\)

In the rest of this section we shall precise the comments for (1.1) stated in Introduction. We recall that the formula (2.3) and Taylor's formula

\[a(X+Y) = \sum_{|\alpha|\leq \ell-1} a^{(\alpha)}(X)Y^{\alpha}/\alpha! + a_\ell(X,Y)\]

with

\[a_\ell(X,Y) = \ell \sum_{|\alpha|=\ell} \int_0^1 (1-\theta)^{\ell-1} a^{(\alpha)}(X + \theta Y)\partial Y^{\alpha}/\alpha!,\]

yield the following (see the proof of Corollary 2.4 of [AM]);

**Proposition 2.1.** (cf. [S]) Let \(\ell>0\) be an even integer and let \(a(X)\) satisfy \(a^{(\alpha)}(X) \in L^\infty\) for \(|\alpha| \leq \ell+2N\). Then we have

\[a^{Wick} = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\ell/2-1} \frac{1}{k!} \left( \frac{\Delta X}{4} \right)^k a \right)^w + r_\ell^w,\]

where \(\parallel r_\ell^w \parallel_{L^\infty(C(\mathbb{R}))} \leq C_\ell \sum_{\ell \leq |\alpha| \leq \ell+2N} \parallel a^{(\alpha)} \parallel_{L^\infty} \) for a constant \(C_\ell > 0\) depending only on \(\ell\).

Making \(\ell\) tend to \(\infty\) we get \(a^{Wick} = (e^{\frac{\Delta X}{4} a})^w\) and moreover \(a^w = (e^{-\frac{\Delta X}{4}} a)^{Wick}\) formally, though both are true for polynomial \(a(X)\) (cf., [S]). Admitting those formula we obtain

\[a^{Wick} b^{Wick} = (e^{\frac{\Delta X}{4} a})^w (e^{\frac{\Delta X}{4} b})^w = (e^{-\frac{\Delta X}{4} H_{X} \partial Z} (e^{\frac{\Delta X}{4} a(X) e^{\frac{\Delta X}{4} b(Z)}})_{Z=x})^w = (e^{-\frac{\Delta X}{4} (e^{-\frac{1}{4} H_{X} \partial Z} (e^{\frac{\Delta X}{4} a(X) e^{\frac{\Delta X}{4} b(Z)}})_{Z=x}))^{Wick},\]

where the second equality follows from the product formula of Weyl calculus in p.155 of [H]. Noting that

\[-\Delta(f(X)g(X)) = -(\Delta X + 2\partial X \cdot \partial Z + \Delta Z) f(X)g(Z)_{Z=x}\]

we formally get (1.1) because

\[e^{-\frac{1}{4}(\Delta X + 2\partial X \cdot \partial Z + \Delta Z) - \frac{1}{2} H_{X} \partial Z + \frac{\Delta X}{4} + \frac{\Delta Z}{4}} = e^{-\frac{1}{4}(\partial X \cdot \partial Z + \frac{H_{X} \partial Z}{4})}.\]
3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Take the Littlewood-Paley decomposition

\[(3.1) \quad \chi(\xi)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \varphi_j^2(\xi) = 1, \quad \varphi_j(\xi) = \varphi(2^{-j}|\xi|), \]

where \(\chi(\xi) \in C_0^\infty\) and \(\varphi \in C_0^\infty([1, 2]).\) Choose \(\phi(x), \psi(x) \in C_0^\infty([1/3, 3])\) such that \(\phi \subset \subset \psi \subset \subset \psi,\)

where \(\phi \subset \subset \psi\) means that \(\psi = 1\) on \(\text{supp} \, \phi.\) Define \(\phi_j\) and \(\psi_j\) by the \(j\)th same as \(\varphi_j.\) Set \(a_j(x, \xi) = a(x, \xi)\phi_j(\xi)\) and set \(\tilde{a}_j(x, \xi) = a_j(T_j^{-1}x, T_j\xi)\) with \(T_j = 2^{j(\rho+\delta)/2}.\) Then for the proof of Theorem 1.2 it suffices to show

\[(3.2) \quad (\tilde{a}_j^\varphi(x, D)u, u) \geq -C||u||^2 \quad \text{for} \quad u \in S, \]

where \(\tilde{a}_j^\varphi(x, D)\) denotes the pseudodifferential operator of Weyl calculus defined by

\[
\tilde{a}_j^\varphi(x, D)u = (2\pi)^{-n} \int \tilde{a}_j(x + y/2, \xi) e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi} u(y) dy d\xi
\]

In fact, it follows from (3.1) (with \(\varphi_0 = \chi\)) that

\[
\text{Re} (a(x, D)u, u) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \text{Re} (a(x, D)u, \varphi_j(D)^2 u)
\]

\[
= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \{\text{Re} (\varphi_j a_j(x, D)\psi_j u, \varphi_j u) + \text{Re} (\varphi_j a(x, D)(1-\psi_j) u, \varphi_j u)\}
\]

Write \(\varphi_j(D)a(x, D)(1-\psi_j) = 2^{-j(1-\delta)}\Phi_j(D)a(x, D)(1-\psi_j(D))\) and note \(\Phi_j(\xi) \in S_{1,0}^{1-\delta}.\) The symbol of pseudodifferential operator \(r_j(x, D) := \Phi_j(D)a(x, D)(1-\psi_j(D))\) is given by

\[
3 \sum_{|\alpha|=0}^{1} \int_{0}^{1} \frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\alpha!} \left( \mathcal{O}_S - \int e^{-i\eta \cdot \Phi_j} (\partial_\xi^\alpha \Phi_j)(\xi + \theta \eta)(D_x^\alpha a)(x + y, \xi)(1-\psi_j(\xi)) \frac{dy d\eta}{(2\pi)^n} \right)\ d\theta.
\]

Here \(\mathcal{O}_S\) denotes the oscillatory integral (see [K]). In view of (1.5) and (1.6) we see that \(D_x^\varphi a(x, D) \in S_{(\rho+\delta)/2,(\rho+\delta)/2}^{\varphi} \) and \((\partial_\xi^\alpha \Phi_j)(\xi) \in S_{1,0}^{2-\delta}.\) It follows from the integration by parts (see Theorem 3.1 of [K]) that \(r_j(x, \xi)\) belongs to a bounded set of \(S_{(\rho+\delta)/2,(\rho+\delta)/2}^{\varphi} \) uniformly with respect to \(j.\) By Calderón-Vaillancourt theorem we have

\[
\left| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \text{Re} (\varphi_j a(x, D)(1-\psi_j) u, \varphi_j u) \right| \leq C' ||u|| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-j(1-\delta)}||\varphi_j u|| \leq C' ||u||^2.
\]

If \(N\) is the smallest integer satisfying \(N > n/2\) then the \(L^2\) boundedness of \(r_j(x, D)\) follows from the boundedness of derivatives of \(r_j(x, \xi)\) up to \(N\)th order. To this end, we need only (1.5) for \(\alpha, \beta\) with

\[(3.3) \quad |\alpha|, |\beta| \leq \frac{(N+4)(1+(\rho+\delta)/2)}{2(1-(\rho+\delta)/2)},
\]

(see the proof of Theorem 3.1 of [K]). If we write \(\tilde{a}_j(X) = \tilde{a}_j(x, \xi) = a_j(T_j^{-1}x, T_j\xi)\) with \(T_j = 2^{j(\rho+\delta)/2}\) then it follows from (1.5) and (1.6) that

\[(3.4) \quad |\partial_\xi^\alpha \tilde{a}_j(X)| \leq C_\alpha \quad \text{for} \quad 4 \leq |\alpha|.
\]
\[ (\ref{eq:3.5}) \quad |\partial^2_{x} \tilde{a}_j(X)| \leq C_{\alpha} T_j^{(|\alpha|+2)/(\rho+\delta)} \quad \text{for} \quad |\alpha| \leq 3 \]

If \( \tilde{\varphi}_j(\xi) = \tilde{\varphi}_j(T_j \xi) \) then we have
\[ (\ref{eq:3.6}) \quad |\partial^2_{x} \tilde{\varphi}_j(\xi)| \leq C_{\alpha} T_j^{-3(|\alpha|+2)/(\rho+\delta)}. \]

If we set \((Tu)(x) = u(Tx)\) for \( u \in \mathcal{S} \), then we have
\[ (\ref{eq:3.7}) \quad a_j(x, D)u = T_j \tilde{a}_j(x, D)T_j^{-1}u. \]

Noting this formula we shall consider
\[
\text{Re} (\tilde{\varphi}_j \tilde{a}_j(x, D) \tilde{\psi}_j u, \tilde{\varphi}_j u)
\]
instead of those removed tilders. If one write \( \tilde{a}_j(x, D) = \tilde{b}_j(x, D) \) then it follows from Theorem 18.5.10 of [H]
\[
\tilde{b}_j(x, \xi)
= \tilde{a}_j(x, \xi) + \frac{i}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \partial_{x_j} \partial_{\xi_j} \tilde{a}_j(x, \xi)
+ \pi^{-n} \sum_{|\alpha|=2}^{1} \frac{(1 - \theta)}{2^2 \alpha!} \left( O_8 - \int \int e^{-i\psi \eta} D_{2}^{2} \partial_{\xi}^2 \tilde{a}_j(x + \theta y, \xi + \eta) dyd\eta \right) d\theta
:= \tilde{a}_j(x, \xi) + i \tilde{c}_j(x, \xi) + \tilde{r}_j(x, \xi).
\]

Note that \( \tilde{r}_j(x, \xi) \) belongs to a bounded set of \( \mathcal{S}_{0}^{0,0} \) uniformly with respect to \( j \), and moreover \( \tilde{\varphi}_j(D)\tilde{\psi}_j(x, D) \) is equal to a selfadjoint operator \( \tilde{\varphi}_j \tilde{\psi}_j(x, D) \) modulo \( L^2 \) bounded operator whose norm is independent of \( j \)\(^\dagger\). Hence there exists a constant \( C > 0 \) independent of \( j \) such that
\[
\text{Re} (\tilde{\varphi}_j \tilde{a}_j(x, D) \tilde{\psi}_j u, \tilde{\varphi}_j u) - \text{Re} (\tilde{\varphi}_j \tilde{a}_j(x, D) \tilde{\psi}_j u, \tilde{\varphi}_j u) \leq C(||\tilde{\psi}_j u|| ||\tilde{\varphi}_j u|| + ||\tilde{\psi}_j u||^2).
\]

Since the sum of the right hand side with respect to \( j \) is estimated above by \( ||u||^2 \) with a constant factor, we consider
\[
\text{Re} (\tilde{\varphi}_j \tilde{a}_j(x, D) \tilde{\psi}_j u, \tilde{\varphi}_j u) = (\tilde{a}_j(x, D) \tilde{\varphi}_j u, \tilde{\varphi}_j u) + \text{Re} (\tilde{\varphi}_j \tilde{a}_j(x, D) \tilde{\psi}_j u, \tilde{\varphi}_j u).
\]

It follows from Theorem 18.5.4 of [H] that the symbol of \( [\tilde{\varphi}_j, \tilde{a}_j(x, D)] \) is equal to
\[
\frac{1}{\iota} \{ \tilde{\varphi}_j, \tilde{a}_j \} + \frac{3}{2^3} \sum_{|\alpha|=3}^{1} \frac{(1 - \theta)}{\alpha!} \left( O_8 - \int \int \int e^{-i\psi \xi + \theta \eta} \right) d\theta
\]
\[ \times (\partial^2_{\xi} \tilde{\varphi}_j)(\xi + \theta \eta)(D^2 \tilde{a}_j)(x + z, \xi + \eta) + \left( \partial^2_{\xi} \tilde{\varphi}_j\right)(\xi + \eta)(D^2 \tilde{a}_j)(x + \theta y, \xi + \eta) \frac{dydxd\zeta}{(\pi)^{3n}} d\theta.\]

It follows from \((\ref{eq:3.4})-(\ref{eq:3.6})\) that the second term belongs to a bounded set of \( \mathcal{S}_{0,0}^{0,0} \) uniformly with respect to \( j \). Since \( (\{\tilde{\varphi}_j, \tilde{a}_j\})^w(x, D) \) is selfadjoint, there exists a constant \( C \) independent of \( j \) such that
\[ (\ref{eq:3.8}) \quad \left| \text{Re} (\{\tilde{\varphi}_j, \tilde{a}_j(x, D)\} \tilde{\psi}_j u, \tilde{\varphi}_j u) \right| \leq C(||\tilde{\psi}_j u|| ||\tilde{\varphi}_j u|| + ||\tilde{\psi}_j u||^2).\]

Since the sum of the right hand side is estimated by \( ||u||^2 \) with a constant factor, in view of \((\ref{eq:3.7})\) we see that \((\ref{eq:3.2})\) is enough for the proof of Theorem 1.2.

\(^\dagger\)Both facts and \((\ref{eq:3.8})\) follow only from estimates \((\ref{eq:1.5})\) with \( \alpha, \beta \) satisfying \((\ref{eq:3.3})\) at most.
For the proof of (3.2) we shall write simply $a(X)$ instead of $\tilde{a}(X)$. In what follows we need only the fact that $a(X) \geq 0$ and it satisfies

\begin{equation}
|\partial_{X}^{\alpha} a(X)| \leq 1 \text{ for } 4 \leq |\alpha| \leq 4 + 2N \quad (\text{cf., (3.3)}),
\end{equation}

because of a suitable normalization by a constant factor. It follows from Proposition 3.1 (see also Corollary 2.4 of [AM]) that we have for a constant $C > 0$

\begin{equation}
\| (a - \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} a)^{\text{Wick}} - a_{w} \|_{L^{2}(\mathbb{R}^{n})} \leq C.
\end{equation}

because of the Calderón-Vaillancourt theorem and (3.9). Therefore it suffices to show

\begin{equation}
\left( a - \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} a \right)^{\text{Wick}} \geq -C' \| u \|^{2}.
\end{equation}

By using Lemma 1.3 we shall show

\begin{equation}
(a - \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} a )^{\text{Wick}} \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{M} \left( b_{j} - \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \right)^{\text{Wick}} \left( b_{j} - \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \right)^{\text{Wick}}
\end{equation}

modulo $L^{2}$ bounded operator. This formula clearly yields (3.11). Since $b_{j}^{(\alpha)} \in L^{\infty} (|\alpha| = 2)$ it follows that

\begin{equation}
\left( b_{j} - \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \right)^{\text{Wick}} \left( b_{j} - \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \right)^{\text{Wick}} \equiv b_{j}^{\text{Wick}} b_{j}^{\text{Wick}} - \left( \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \right)^{\text{Wick}} b_{j}^{\text{Wick}} - b_{j}^{\text{Wick}} \left( \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \right)^{\text{Wick}}
\end{equation}

We use Proposition 1.1 with (1.3), but a little modified form as follows:

\begin{equation}
a^{\text{Wick}} b^{\text{Wick}} = (ab)^{\text{Wick}} + \sum_{|\alpha| = 1} \frac{1}{2} (-\partial_{Y} + H_{Y}/i)^{\alpha} (ab)^{\text{Wick}} + R_{2},
\end{equation}

which is obvious by (2.7). We have

\begin{equation}
\left( \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \right)^{\text{Wick}} b_{j}^{\text{Wick}} = \left( b_{j} \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \right)^{\text{Wick}} + R_{1},
\end{equation}

where the operator norm $R_{1}$ is estimated by

\begin{equation}
\sum_{|\alpha| = |\beta| = 1} \| \left( \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \right)^{\alpha} b_{j}^{\beta} \|_{L^{\infty}} + \sum_{|\gamma| = 2} \| \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \|_{L^{\infty}} \| b_{j}^{(\gamma)} \|_{L^{\infty}}
\end{equation}

with a constant factor, whose two terms are bounded by means of (1.7). We have the similar formula for $b_{j}^{\text{Wick}} \left( \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \right)^{\text{Wick}}$. Hence

\begin{equation}
- \left( \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \right)^{\text{Wick}} b_{j}^{\text{Wick}} - b_{j}^{\text{Wick}} \left( \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \right)^{\text{Wick}} = -2 \left( b_{j} \frac{\Delta_{X}}{4} b_{j} \right)^{\text{Wick}}.
\end{equation}

Now we consider $b_{j}^{\text{Wick}} b_{j}^{\text{Wick}}$ by using the estimate (1.4) and its proof. It follows that

\begin{equation}
b_{j}^{\text{Wick}} b_{j}^{\text{Wick}} = (b_{j}^{2})^{\text{Wick}} - \frac{1}{2} (b_{j} \cdot b_{j})^{\text{Wick}} + R_{2}.
\end{equation}
The remainder term $R_j^2$ is composed of terms estimated in (2.8)-(2.11), by setting $a = b = b_j$. Those coming from (2.8) and (2.9) are bounded from the condition (1.7). We must estimate remainder terms coming from (2.9) and the first term of the right hand side of (2.11) as the sum of $R_j^2$ with respect to $j$. Note that for $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ with $|\alpha_j| = 1$ we have
\[ a^{(\alpha)} - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{M} b_j^{(\alpha_1)} b_j^{(\alpha_2)} = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{M} b_j b_j^{(\alpha)}. \]
The left hand side is continuous and its second derivatives in the distribution sense belong to $L^\infty$ by means of (1.7). Therefore
\[ \left( \sum_{j=1}^{M} b_j b_j^{(\alpha)} \right)^{(\beta)} \in L^\infty \text{ for } \alpha, \beta \text{ with } |\alpha| = |\beta| = 2. \]
If the integration by parts in the arguments preceding (2.10) and (2.11) is done after summing up $R_j^2$ with respect to $j$, we see that
\[ \sum_{j=1}^{M} b_j^2 \text{Wick} b_j^2 \text{Wick} \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{M} b_j^2 \text{Wick} - 1/2 (b_j' \cdot b_j') \text{Wick}. \]
Finally we have
\[ \sum_{j=1}^{M} \left( b_j - \frac{\Delta X}{4} b_j \right) \text{Wick} \left( b_j - \frac{\Delta X}{4} b_j \right) \text{Wick} = \left( \sum_{j=1}^{M} b_j^2 - \frac{1}{2} b_j' \cdot b_j' - 2 b_j \frac{\Delta X}{4} b_j \right) \text{Wick} \]
\[ = \left( a - \frac{\Delta X}{4} a \right) \text{Wick}. \]
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