On mixed boundary conditions, function spaces, and Kato's square root property

Sebastian Bechtel



Darmstadt, 24 June 2021



Interpolation theory real & complex



Extension operators $W_D^{s,p}(O) \& W_D^{k,p}(O)$

Kato square root problem



Beyond CZ p > 2 & p < 2













- ► $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ open
- $W_0^{1,2}(O) \subseteq \mathcal{V} \subseteq W^{1,2}(O)$ closed subspace

O ⊆ ℝ^d open W₀^{1,2}(O) ⊆ V ⊆ W^{1,2}(O) closed subspace a_{ij}, b_i, c_j, d : O → ℂ^{m×m} bounded and measurable define sesquilinear form on V × V

$$a(u,v) = \int_O \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij} \partial_j u \cdot \overline{\partial_i v} + \sum_{i=1}^d b_i u \cdot \overline{\partial_i v} + \sum_{j=1}^d c_j \partial_j u \cdot \overline{v} + du \cdot \overline{v} \, dx$$

form a coercive in Gårding's sense

$$Re\,a(u,u) \ge \lambda(\|u\|_{L^{2}(O)}^{2} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^{2}(O)}^{2})$$

O ⊆ ℝ^d open W₀^{1,2}(O) ⊆ V ⊆ W^{1,2}(O) closed subspace a_{ij}, b_i, c_j, d : O → ℂ^{m×m} bounded and measurable define sesquilinear form on V × V

$$a(u,v) = \int_O \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij} \partial_j u \cdot \overline{\partial_i v} + \sum_{i=1}^d b_i u \cdot \overline{\partial_i v} + \sum_{j=1}^d c_j \partial_j u \cdot \overline{v} + du \cdot \overline{v} \, dx$$

form a coercive in Gårding's sense

$$Re\,a(u,u) \ge \lambda(\|u\|_{L^{2}(O)}^{2} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^{2}(O)}^{2})$$

• L operator in $L^2(O)$ associated with a

O ⊆ ℝ^d open W₀^{1,2}(O) ⊆ V ⊆ W^{1,2}(O) closed subspace a_{ij}, b_i, c_j, d : O → ℂ^{m×m} bounded and measurable define sesquilinear form on V × V

$$a(u,v) = \int_O \sum_{i,j=1}^a a_{ij} \partial_j u \cdot \overline{\partial_i v} + \sum_{i=1}^a b_i u \cdot \overline{\partial_i v} + \sum_{j=1}^a c_j \partial_j u \cdot \overline{v} + du \cdot \overline{v} \, dx$$

▶ form *a* coercive in Gårding's sense

$$Re\,a(u,u) \ge \lambda(\|u\|_{L^{2}(O)}^{2} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^{2}(O)}^{2})$$

• L operator in $L^2(O)$ associated with a

Problem

For which spaces \mathcal{V} do we have $D(L^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \mathcal{V}$ with equivalent norms?

Theorem (AKM '06, EHT '16)

Suppose:

- O bounded domain
- ► O is d-regular
- ► ∂O is (d-1)-regular
- ▶ $D \subseteq \partial O$ is (d-1)-regular
- *O* is bi-Lipschitz near $\partial O \setminus D$

Then Kato's square root property holds for $\mathcal{V} = W_D^{1,2}(O)$.

Theorem (AKM '06, EHT '16)

Suppose:

- O bounded domain
- ► O is d-regular
- ► ∂O is (d-1)-regular
- ▶ $D \subseteq \partial O$ is (d-1)-regular
- *O* is bi-Lipschitz near $\partial O \setminus D$

Then Kato's square root property holds for $\mathcal{V} = W_D^{1,2}(O)$.

"domain"

boundary

Theorem (AKM '06, EHT '16)

Suppose:

- O bounded domain
- ► O is d-regular
- ► ∂O is (d-1)-regular
- ▶ $D \subseteq \partial O$ is (d-1)-regular
- *O* is bi-Lipschitz near $\partial O \setminus D$

Then Kato's square root property holds for $\mathcal{V} = W_D^{1,2}(O)$.

Aim: only demand for boundary regularity!

"domain"

boundary



Put
$$\Gamma := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \nabla_D & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
, $B := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & d & c \\ 0 & b & A \end{bmatrix}$, $\Pi_B := \Gamma + \Gamma^* B$.

Put
$$\Gamma := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \nabla_D & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
, $B := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & d & c \\ 0 & b & A \end{bmatrix}$, $\Pi_B := \Gamma + \Gamma^* B$.
 $\Rightarrow \quad \Pi_B \text{ is bisectorial} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_B^2 = \begin{bmatrix} L & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & * \\ 0 & * & * \end{bmatrix}$.

Put
$$\Gamma := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \nabla_D & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
, $B := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & d & c \\ 0 & b & A \end{bmatrix}$, $\Pi_B := \Gamma + \Gamma^* B$.
 $\Rightarrow \quad \Pi_B \text{ is bisectorial} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_B^2 = \begin{bmatrix} L & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & * \\ 0 & * & * \end{bmatrix}$.

Assume Π_B has bounded H^{∞} -calculus: Set $|z| \coloneqq \sqrt{z^2}$ on bisector, then $\frac{|z|}{z}, \frac{z}{|z|} \in H^{\infty}$.

Put
$$\Gamma := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \nabla_D & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
, $B := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & d & c \\ 0 & b & A \end{bmatrix}$, $\Pi_B := \Gamma + \Gamma^* B$.
 $\Rightarrow \quad \Pi_B \text{ is bisectorial} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_B^2 = \begin{bmatrix} L & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & * \\ 0 & * & * \end{bmatrix}$.

Assume Π_B has bounded H^{∞} -calculus: Set $|z| \coloneqq \sqrt{z^2}$ on bisector, then $\frac{|z|}{z}, \frac{z}{|z|} \in H^{\infty}$. Hence

$$\|\Pi_B U\| \approx \|\sqrt{\Pi_B^2 U}\|.$$

Put
$$\Gamma := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \nabla_D & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
, $B := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & d & c \\ 0 & b & A \end{bmatrix}$, $\Pi_B := \Gamma + \Gamma^* B$.
 $\Rightarrow \quad \Pi_B \text{ is bisectorial} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_B^2 = \begin{bmatrix} L & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & * \\ 0 & * & * \end{bmatrix}$.

Assume Π_B has bounded H^{∞} -calculus: Set $|z| := \sqrt{z^2}$ on bisector, then $\frac{|z|}{z}, \frac{z}{|z|} \in H^{\infty}$. Hence

$$\|\Pi_B U\| \approx \|\sqrt{\Pi_B^2 U}\|.$$

For $U = \begin{bmatrix} v & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^{T}$: $\|v\|_{W^{1,2}} \approx \|\Gamma U\| = \|\Pi_B U\| \approx \|\sqrt{\Pi_B^2} U\| = \|\sqrt{L}v\|.$

The Axelsson–Keith–McIntosh framework

Provide: Sufficient conditions for square function estimate

$$\int_0^\infty \|t\Pi_B(1+t^2\Pi_B^2)^{-1}U\|^2 \frac{dt}{t} \approx \|U\|^2 \qquad U \in R(\Pi_B).$$

The Axelsson–Keith–McIntosh framework

Provide: Sufficient conditions for square function estimate

$$\int_0^\infty \|t\Pi_B(1+t^2\Pi_B^2)^{-1}U\|^2 \frac{dt}{t} \approx \|U\|^2 \qquad U \in R(\Pi_B).$$

McIntosh's theorem:

square function estimate \iff bounded H^{∞} -calculus.

The Axelsson–Keith–McIntosh framework

Provide: Sufficient conditions for square function estimate

$$\int_0^\infty \|t\Pi_B(1+t^2\Pi_B^2)^{-1}U\|^2 \frac{dt}{t} \approx \|U\|^2 \qquad U \in R(\Pi_B).$$

McIntosh's theorem:

square function estimate \iff bounded H^{∞} -calculus.

Refinement by Egert–Haller-Dintelmann–Tolksdorf: square function estimate in mixed BC context









Let *O* open, $D \subseteq \partial O$ closed. Put $N = \partial O \setminus D$.

Let *O* open, $D \subseteq \partial O$ closed. Put $N = \partial O \setminus D$. Assume:

► $x, y \in O$ with $|x - y| < \delta$ connectable by ε -cigar w.r.t. $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{N}$,

Let *O* open, $D \subseteq \partial O$ closed. Put $N = \partial O \setminus D$. Assume:

- ► $x, y \in O$ with $|x y| < \delta$ connectable by ε -cigar w.r.t. $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{N}$,
- \triangleright ε -cigars satisfy "quasi-hyperbolic distance condition",

Extension operator

Theorem (B.–Brown–Haller-Dintelmann–Tolksdorf '21)

Let *O* open, $D \subseteq \partial O$ closed. Put $N = \partial O \setminus D$. Assume:

- ► $x, y \in O$ with $|x y| < \delta$ connectable by ε -cigar w.r.t. $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{N}$,
- \triangleright ε -cigars satisfy "quasi-hyperbolic distance condition",
- connected components near N have minimum size.

Let *O* open, $D \subseteq \partial O$ closed. Put $N = \partial O \setminus D$. Assume:

- ► $x, y \in O$ with $|x y| < \delta$ connectable by ε -cigar w.r.t. $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{N}$,
- \triangleright ε -cigars satisfy "quasi-hyperbolic distance condition",
- connected components near N have minimum size.

Then there exists extension operator which is semiuniversal for $W_D^{k,p}(O)$, $1 \le p < \infty$.

Strategy: non-trivial extension of Jones' result (Acta '81) using "escaping chains" of cubes.

Let *O* open, $D \subseteq \partial O$ closed. Put $N = \partial O \setminus D$. Assume:

- ► $x, y \in O$ with $|x y| < \delta$ connectable by ε -cigar w.r.t. $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{N}$,
- \triangleright ε -cigars satisfy "quasi-hyperbolic distance condition",
- connected components near N have minimum size.

Then there exists extension operator which is semiuniversal for $W_D^{k,p}(O)$, $1 \le p < \infty$.

Strategy: non-trivial extension of Jones' result (Acta '81) using "escaping chains" of cubes.

Kato: locally uniform near N

Let *O* open, $D \subseteq \partial O$ closed. Put $N = \partial O \setminus D$. Assume:

- ► $x, y \in O$ with $|x y| < \delta$ connectable by ε -cigar w.r.t. $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{N}$,
- \triangleright ε -cigars satisfy "quasi-hyperbolic distance condition",
- connected components near N have minimum size.

Then there exists extension operator which is semiuniversal for $W_D^{k,p}(O)$, $1 \le p < \infty$.

Strategy: non-trivial extension of Jones' result (Acta '81) using "escaping chains" of cubes.

Kato: locally uniform near $N \implies$ assumptions above.

A wild geometry that is admissible

Neumann boundary part N (black) is fractal



A wild geometry that is admissible

- Neumann boundary part N (black) is fractal
- Iocal quantitative connectivity (cyan ɛ-cigar) holds near N (in gray neighborhood around N)


A wild geometry that is admissible

- Neumann boundary part N (black) is fractal
- ► local quantitative connectivity (cyan ε-cigar) holds near N (in gray neighborhood around N)
- Dirichlet boundary part (orange) contains a slice (so worse than Lipschitz)



A wild geometry that is admissible

- Neumann boundary part N (black) is fractal
- Iocal quantitative connectivity (cyan ε-cigar) holds near N (in gray neighborhood around N)
- Dirichlet boundary part (orange) contains a slice (so worse than Lipschitz)
- O contains outward cusp (not d-regular)



A wild geometry that is admissible

- Neumann boundary part N (black) is fractal
- local quantitative connectivity (cyan ε-cigar) holds near N (in gray neighborhood around N)
- Dirichlet boundary part (orange) contains a slice (so worse than Lipschitz)
- O contains outward cusp (not d-regular)
- diameter of connected components away from N degenerates







Put $\Pi = \Gamma + \Gamma^*$. Whole space: Π accretive on its range:

```
\|\Pi U\|_2 \gtrsim \|U\|_{W^{1,2}}
```

Put $\Pi = \Gamma + \Gamma^*$. Whole space: Π accretive on its range. Modify to:

 $\|(\Pi^2)^{1/2}U\|_2 \approx \|\Pi U\|_2 \gtrsim \|U\|_{[L^2, W^{1,2}]_1}$

Put $\Pi = \Gamma + \Gamma^*$. Whole space: Π accretive on its range. Modify to:

 $\| (\Pi^2)^{\gamma/2} U \|_2 \gtrsim \| U \|_{[L^2, W^{1,2}]_{\gamma}}$

Put $\Pi = \Gamma + \Gamma^*$. Whole space: Π accretive on its range. Modify to:

 $\|(\Pi^2)^{\gamma/2}U\|_2\gtrsim \|U\|_{[L^2,W^{1,2}]_{\gamma}} \qquad U\in R(\Gamma)\cap D(\Pi^2).$

Put $\Pi = \Gamma + \Gamma^*$. Whole space: Π accretive on its range. Modify to: $\|(\Pi^2)^{\gamma/2}U\|_2 \gtrsim \|U\|_{[L^2, W^{1,2}]_{\gamma}}$ $U \in R(\Gamma) \cap D(\Pi^2)$. To check: Let

 $U \in R(\Gamma) \implies U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ v \\ \nabla_D v \end{bmatrix} = \Pi V \text{ for } V = \begin{bmatrix} v \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$

Put $\Pi = \Gamma + \Gamma^*$. Whole space: Π accretive on its range. Modify to: $\|(\Pi^2)^{\gamma/2}U\|_2 \gtrsim \|U\|_{[L^2, W^{1,2}]_{\gamma}}$ $U \in R(\Gamma) \cap D(\Pi^2).$

To check: Let

$$U \in R(\Gamma) \implies U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ v \\ \nabla_D v \end{bmatrix} = \Pi V \text{ for } V = \begin{bmatrix} v \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Calculate:

 $\|U\|_{[L^2, W_D^{1,2}(O)]_{\gamma}}$

Put $\Pi = \Gamma + \Gamma^*$. Whole space: Π accretive on its range. Modify to: $\|(\Pi^2)^{\gamma/2}U\|_2 \gtrsim \|U\|_{[L^2, W^{1,2}]_{\gamma}}$ $U \in R(\Gamma) \cap D(\Pi^2).$

To check: Let

$$U \in R(\Gamma) \implies U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ v \\ \nabla_D v \end{bmatrix} = \Pi V \text{ for } V = \begin{bmatrix} v \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Calculate:

$$\|U\|_{[L^2,W_D^{1,2}(O)]_{\gamma}} \stackrel{!}{\approx} \|U\|_{W^{\gamma,2}(O)} \lesssim \|v\|_{W_D^{1+\gamma,2}(O)}$$

Put $\Pi = \Gamma + \Gamma^*$. Whole space: Π accretive on its range. Modify to: $\|(\Pi^2)^{\gamma/2}U\|_2 \gtrsim \|U\|_{[L^2, W^{1,2}]_{\gamma}}$ $U \in R(\Gamma) \cap D(\Pi^2).$

To check: Let

$$U \in R(\Gamma) \implies U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ v \\ \nabla_D v \end{bmatrix} = \Pi V \text{ for } V = \begin{bmatrix} v \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Calculate:

$$\|U\|_{[L^2, W_D^{1,2}(O)]_{\gamma}} \stackrel{!}{\approx} \|U\|_{W^{\gamma,2}(O)} \lesssim \|v\|_{W_D^{1+\gamma,2}(O)} \stackrel{!}{\approx} \|(-\Delta_D + 1)^{1/2 + \gamma/2} v\|$$

Put $\Pi = \Gamma + \Gamma^*$. Whole space: Π accretive on its range. Modify to: $\|(\Pi^2)^{\gamma/2}U\|_2 \gtrsim \|U\|_{[L^2, W^{1,2}]_{\gamma}}$ $U \in R(\Gamma) \cap D(\Pi^2).$

To check: Let

$$U \in R(\Gamma) \implies U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ v \\ \nabla_D v \end{bmatrix} = \Pi V \text{ for } V = \begin{bmatrix} v \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Calculate:

$$\begin{split} \|U\|_{[L^2,W_D^{1,2}(O)]_{\gamma}} &\stackrel{!}{\approx} \|U\|_{W^{\gamma,2}(O)} \lesssim \|v\|_{W_D^{1+\gamma,2}(O)} \stackrel{!}{\approx} \|(-\Delta_D + 1)^{1/2 + \gamma/2} v\| \\ &\approx \|(-\Delta_D + 1)^{\gamma/2} \Pi V\| = \|(\Pi^2)^{\gamma/2} U\|. \end{split}$$

Real interpolation of Sobolev spaces

Theorem (B.–Egert JFAA '19)

- O open & d-regular with porous boundary,
- ► $D \subseteq \partial O$ uniformly (d 1)-regular,
- ▶ $p \in (1,\infty)$ and $s \in (0,1) \setminus \{1/p\}$.

Then one has

$$(L^{p}(O), W_{D}^{1,p}(O))_{s,p} = \begin{cases} W_{D}^{s,p}(O) & (\text{if } s > 1/p) \\ W^{s,p}(O) & (\text{if } s < 1/p) \end{cases}$$

Real interpolation of Sobolev spaces

Theorem (B.–Egert JFAA '19)

- O open & d-regular with porous boundary,
- ► $D \subseteq \partial O$ uniformly (d 1)-regular,
- ▶ $p \in (1,\infty)$ and $s \in (0,1) \setminus \{1/p\}$.

Then one has

$$(L^{p}(O), W_{D}^{1,p}(O))_{s,p} = \begin{cases} W_{D}^{s,p}(O) & (\text{if } s > 1/p) \\ W^{s,p}(O) & (\text{if } s < 1/p) \end{cases}$$

Strategy:

Based on Grisvard's trace method.

Real interpolation of Sobolev spaces

Theorem (B.–Egert JFAA '19)

- O open & d-regular with porous boundary,
- ► $D \subseteq \partial O$ uniformly (d 1)-regular,
- ▶ $p \in (1,\infty)$ and $s \in (0,1) \setminus \{1/p\}$.

Then one has

$$(L^{p}(O), W_{D}^{1,p}(O))_{s,p} = \begin{cases} W_{D}^{s,p}(O) & (\text{if } s > 1/p) \\ W^{s,p}(O) & (\text{if } s < 1/p) \end{cases}$$

Strategy:

- Based on Grisvard's trace method.
- ► Use fractional Hardy's inequality (Dyda–Vähäkangas) on auxiliary sets ~> uniformly (d 1)-regular.

Impressions from Orsay 2018

Impressions from Orsay 2018



week 1

Impressions from Orsay 2018



week 1

week 2



Want to show: $D((1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 + \gamma/2}) = W_D^{1 + \gamma, 2}(O)$.

Want to show:
$$D((1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 + \gamma/2}) = W_D^{1+\gamma,2}(O)$$
. Decompose:
 $(1 - \Delta_D)^{-1/2 - \gamma/2} = (1 - \Delta_D)^{-1}(1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 - \gamma/2}.$



Want to show:
$$D((1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 + \gamma/2}) = W_D^{1+\gamma,2}(O)$$
. Decompose:
 $(1 - \Delta_D)^{-1/2 - \gamma/2} = (1 - \Delta_D)^{-1}(1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 - \gamma/2}.$

∂O porous + Netrusov's theorem: boundedness



Want to show:
$$D((1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 + \gamma/2}) = W_D^{1+\gamma,2}(O)$$
. Decompose:
 $(1 - \Delta_D)^{-1/2 - \gamma/2} = (1 - \Delta_D)^{-1}(1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 - \gamma/2}.$

∂O porous + Netrusov's theorem: boundedness

Lax-Milgram lemma



Want to show:
$$D((1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 + \gamma/2}) = W_D^{1+\gamma,2}(O)$$
. Decompose:
 $(1 - \Delta_D)^{-1/2 - \gamma/2} = (1 - \Delta_D)^{-1}(1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 - \gamma/2}.$

- ∂O porous + Netrusov's theorem: boundedness
- Lax-Milgram lemma
- Šneĭberg + interpolation: isomorphisms



Want to show:
$$D((1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 + \gamma/2}) = W_D^{1+\gamma,2}(O)$$
. Decompose:
 $(1 - \Delta_D)^{-1/2 - \gamma/2} = (1 - \Delta_D)^{-1}(1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 - \gamma/2}.$

- ∂O porous + Netrusov's theorem: boundedness
- Lax-Milgram lemma
- Šneĭberg + interpolation: isomorphisms



Want to show:
$$D((1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 + \gamma/2}) = W_D^{1+\gamma,2}(O)$$
. Decompose:
 $(1 - \Delta_D)^{-1/2 - \gamma/2} = (1 - \Delta_D)^{-1}(1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 - \gamma/2}.$

- ∂O porous + Netrusov's theorem: boundedness
- Lax-Milgram lemma
- Šneĭberg + interpolation: isomorphisms
- Kato (self-adjoint)



Want to show:
$$D((1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 + \gamma/2}) = W_D^{1+\gamma,2}(O)$$
. Decompose:
 $(1 - \Delta_D)^{-1/2 - \gamma/2} = (1 - \Delta_D)^{-1}(1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 - \gamma/2}.$

- ∂O porous + Netrusov's theorem: boundedness
- Lax-Milgram lemma
- Šneĭberg + interpolation: isomorphisms
- Kato (self-adjoint)
- fractional power domains



Want to show:
$$D((1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 + \gamma/2}) = W_D^{1+\gamma,2}(O)$$
. Decompose:
 $(1 - \Delta_D)^{-1/2 - \gamma/2} = (1 - \Delta_D)^{-1}(1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 - \gamma/2}.$

- ∂O porous + Netrusov's theorem: boundedness
- Lax-Milgram lemma
- Šneĭberg + interpolation: isomorphisms
- Kato (self-adjoint)
- fractional power domains
- duality + self-adjoint



Want to show:
$$D((1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 + \gamma/2}) = W_D^{1+\gamma,2}(O)$$
. Decompose:
 $(1 - \Delta_D)^{-1/2 - \gamma/2} = (1 - \Delta_D)^{-1}(1 - \Delta_D)^{1/2 - \gamma/2}.$

- ∂O porous + Netrusov's theorem: boundedness
- Lax-Milgram lemma
- Šneĭberg + interpolation: isomorphisms
- Kato (self-adjoint)
- fractional power domains
- duality + self-adjoint









Decomposition of elliptic system

Write
$$\boldsymbol{O} = \bigcup_i O_i$$
.

Decomposition of elliptic system

Write $\boldsymbol{O} = \bigcup_i O_i$. Assume that

$$L^2(\boldsymbol{O}) \cong \bigotimes_i L^2(O_i) \text{ and } W^{1,2}_{\boldsymbol{D}}(\boldsymbol{O}) \cong \bigotimes_i W^{1,2}_{\boldsymbol{D} \cap \partial O_i}(O_i).$$
Decomposition of elliptic system

Write $\boldsymbol{O} = \bigcup_i O_i$. Assume that

$$L^2(\boldsymbol{O}) \cong \bigotimes_i L^2(O_i) \text{ and } W^{1,2}_{\boldsymbol{D}}(\boldsymbol{O}) \cong \bigotimes_i W^{1,2}_{\boldsymbol{D} \cap \partial O_i}(O_i).$$

Transference principle:

$$D(\sqrt{L}) = W^{1,2}_{D}(O) \iff D(\sqrt{L_i}) = W^{1,2}_{D \cap \partial O_i}(O_i)$$
 uniformly in *i*.

Write $\boldsymbol{O} = \bigcup_i O_i$. Assume that

$$L^2(\mathbf{O}) \cong \bigotimes_i L^2(O_i) \text{ and } W^{1,2}_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{O}) \cong \bigotimes_i W^{1,2}_{\mathbf{D} \cap \partial O_i}(O_i).$$

Transference principle:

$$D(\sqrt{L}) = W^{1,2}_{D}(O) \iff D(\sqrt{L_i}) = W^{1,2}_{D \cap \partial O_i}(O_i)$$
 uniformly in *i*.

Upshot: Kato on interior thick O gives Kato on (possibly thin) O_i .



- Start with *O*.
- ► Fix grid of cubes (size adapted to Neumann tube).

- Start with *O*.
- Fix grid of cubes (size adapted to Neumann tube).
- ► Add cubes away from *N* and hitting *O*.

Construction of **O**:

- Start with *O*.
- Fix grid of cubes (size adapted to Neumann tube).
- Add cubes away from N and hitting O.

Then: **O** of same geometric quality as **O**

Construction of **O**:

- Start with *O*.
- Fix grid of cubes (size adapted to Neumann tube).
- Add cubes away from N and hitting O.

Then: **O** of same geometric quality as O + d-regular \checkmark

Construction of **O**:

- Start with *O*.
- Fix grid of cubes (size adapted to Neumann tube).
- Add cubes away from N and hitting O.

Then: **O** of same geometric quality as O + d-regular \checkmark

Construction of **O**:

- Start with *O*.
- Fix grid of cubes (size adapted to Neumann tube).
- Add cubes away from N and hitting O.

Then: **O** of same geometric quality as O + d-regular \checkmark

Construction of *L*:

Put *L* on *O* and $1 - \Delta$ otherwise \checkmark

What is known for mixed boundary conditions?



Aim: only demand for boundary regularity!

What is known for mixed boundary conditions?



Aim: only demand for boundary regularity!

What is known for mixed boundary conditions?



Suppose:

- O bounded domain
- ► O is d-regular
- ► ∂O is (d = 1) regular porous
- ► $D \subseteq \partial O$ is uniformly (d 1)-regular
- O is bi-Lipschitz locally uniform near $\partial O \setminus D$

Then Kato's square root property holds for $\mathcal{V} = W_D^{1,2}(O)$.

Aim: only demand for boundary regularity!

"domain"

boundary

Theorem (AKM '06, EHT '16, B.-Egert-Haller-Dintelmann Adv. Math. '20)

"domain"

boundary

Suppose:

- O bounded domain
- ► O is d-regular
- ► ∂O is (d = 1) regular porous
- ► $D \subseteq \partial O$ is uniformly (d 1)-regular
- O is bi-Lipschitz locally uniform near $\partial O \setminus D$

Then Kato's square root property holds for $\mathcal{V} = W_D^{1,2}(O)$.

Aim: only demand for boundary regularity!

• $q^+(L) > 2$ critical number for $\sqrt{t} \nabla e^{-tL}$

▶ $q^+(L) > 2$ critical number for $\sqrt{t} \nabla e^{-tL}$, then $p \in (2, q^+(L))$

- ▶ $q^+(L) > 2$ critical number for $\sqrt{t}\nabla e^{-tL}$, then $p \in (2, q^+(L))$
- extrapolation based on good- λ argument

- ▶ $q^+(L) > 2$ critical number for $\sqrt{t}\nabla e^{-tL}$, then $p \in (2, q^+(L))$
- extrapolation based on good- λ argument
- uses conservation property

- ▶ $q^+(L) > 2$ critical number for $\sqrt{t}\nabla e^{-tL}$, then $p \in (2, q^+(L))$
- extrapolation based on good- λ argument
- uses conservation property ~> only pure Neumann BC

- ▶ $q^+(L) > 2$ critical number for $\sqrt{t}\nabla e^{-tL}$, then $p \in (2, q^+(L))$
- extrapolation based on good- λ argument
- uses conservation property ~> only pure Neumann BC
- uses local Poincaré inequalities on all scales

- ▶ $q^+(L) > 2$ critical number for $\sqrt{t}\nabla e^{-tL}$, then $p \in (2, q^+(L))$
- extrapolation based on good- λ argument
- uses conservation property ~> only pure Neumann BC
- uses local Poincaré inequalities on all scales ~> desire: local & homogeneous estimates for extension operator

- ▶ $q^+(L) > 2$ critical number for $\sqrt{t} \nabla e^{-tL}$, then $p \in (2, q^+(L))$
- extrapolation based on good- λ argument
- uses conservation property ~> only pure Neumann BC
- ► uses local Poincaré inequalities on all scales → desire: local & homogeneous estimates for extension operator → work on (ε, ∞)-domains, in particular unbounded

Thank you for your attention!