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1. Introduction and main theorems. In Chapter II of [1] Fefferman and Phong estimated the eigenvalues of Schrödinger operators $-\Delta+V(x)$ on $R^{n}$ by using the uncertainty principle. Inspirated by their idea, in the present note we give two $L^{2}$-estimates for degenerate Schrödinger operators of higher order, which are a version and an extension of Theorem 4 in Chapter II of [1]. As an application, we consider the hypoellipticity for an example of infinitely degenerate elliptic operators.

Consider a symbol of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
a(x, \xi)=\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{k}(x)\left|\xi_{k}\right|^{2 \mu_{k}}+V(x), \quad x \in R^{n}, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mu_{k}$ are positive rational numbers, $V(x)$ is a non-negative measurable function and

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
a_{1}(x)=1,  \tag{2}\\
a_{k}(x)=\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\left|x_{j}\right|^{2 \kappa(k, j)} \quad \text { for } k \geq 2 .
\end{array}\right.
$$

Here $\kappa(k, j)$ are non-negative rational numbers. If $\left(x_{0}, \xi_{0}\right) \in R^{2 n}$ and if $\delta=$ $\left(\delta_{1}, \cdots, \delta_{n}\right)$ for $\delta_{j}>0$, we denote by $B_{\delta}\left(x_{0}, \xi_{0}\right)$ a box

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{(x, \xi) ;\left|x_{j}-x_{0 j}\right| \leq \delta_{j} / 2,\left|\xi_{j}-\xi_{0 j}\right| \leq \delta_{j}^{-1} / 2\right\} . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Clearly the volume of $B_{\dot{\delta}}\left(x_{0}, \xi_{0}\right)$ is equal to 1 . Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote a set of boxes $B_{\delta}\left(x_{0}, \xi_{0}\right)$ for all $\left(x_{0}, \xi_{0}\right)$ and all $\delta$. We denote by $\mathrm{m}_{l}(\cdot)$ the Lebesgue measure in $R^{l}$. We set $m_{k}=\mu_{k}-1$ if $\mu_{k}$ is integer and $m_{k}=\left[\mu_{k}\right]$ otherwise. Set $m_{0}=$ $\sum_{k=1}^{n} m_{k}$.

Theorem 1. Let $a(x, \xi)$ be the above symbol and let $W(x)$ be a continuous function in $R^{n}$. Assume that there exists a constant $1-2^{-m_{0}}<c \leq 1$ such that for any $B=B_{\delta}\left(x_{0}, \xi_{0}\right) \in \mathcal{C}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{m}_{2 n}\left(\left\{(x, \xi) \in B ; a(x, \xi) \geq \max _{\pi\left(B^{* * *}\right)} W(x)\right\}\right) \geq c, \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\pi$ is a natural projection from $R_{x, s}^{2 n}$ to $R_{x}^{n}$ and $B^{* *}$ denotes a suitable dilation of $B$ whose modulus depends only on $\mu_{k}$ and $\kappa(k, j)$. Then for any compact set $K$ of $R_{x}^{n}$ there exists a constant $c_{K}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
(a(x, D) u, u) \geq c_{K}(W(x) u, u) \quad \text { for any } u \in C_{0}^{\infty}(K) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where (, ) denotes the $L^{2}$ inner product (cf. Theorem B in [5]).
Remark 1. The lower bound of $c$ in (4) is 0 when all $\mu_{k} \leq 1$. If all $a_{k}(x) \equiv 1$ then the constant $c_{K}$ in (5) can be taken independent of $K$. The
theorem holds even if each variable $x_{j}$ is replaced by the vector $\boldsymbol{x}_{j}=\left(x_{1}^{j}\right.$, $\left.\cdots, x_{l_{j}^{j}}^{j}\right)$. The rationality assumption of $\mu_{k}$ and $\kappa(k, j)$ can be removed.

In the polynomial potential case the theorem becomes fairly simple. In order to explain this fact, for a $0<h \leq 1$ we redefine a set $\mathcal{C}_{h}$ of boxes ( 6 )

$$
\vec{B}_{\delta, h}\left(x_{0}, \xi_{0}\right) \equiv\left\{(x, \xi) ;\left|x_{j}-x_{0 j}\right| \leq \delta_{j} / 2,\left|\xi_{j}-\xi_{0 j}\right| \leq h \delta_{j}^{-1} / 2\right\}
$$

for all $\left(x_{0}, \xi_{0}\right)$ and all $\delta$.
Theorem 2. Let $a(x, \xi)$ be the symbol of the form (1) with $V(x)$ replaced by a polynomial $U(x)$ in $R^{n}$ of order $d$, which is not always nonnegative. Then for any compact set $K$ of $R^{n}$ there exists a positive $h=$ $h_{K} \leq 1$ satisfying the following property: If the estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max _{B_{h}} a(x, \xi) \geq 0 \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds for any $B_{h}=B_{\delta, h}\left(x_{0}, \xi_{0}\right) \in \mathcal{C}_{h}$ then we have
(8)

$$
(a(x, D) u, u) \geq 0 \quad \text { for any } u \in C_{0}^{\infty}(K)
$$

Here the positive $h$ depends only on $d, n, \mu_{k}$ and $\kappa(k, j)$ except $K$.
Remark 2. When all $a_{k}(x) \equiv 1$ then we can take $h>0$ independent of K. Furthermore, if all $\mu_{k}=1$ then Theorem 2 is nothing but one part of Theorem 4 in Chapter II of [1].

Remark 3. When $V(x)$ and $W(x)$ in Theorem 1 are polynomials, Theorem 1 follows from Theorem 2 by putting $U(x)=V(x)-h^{2 \mu_{0}} W(x)$, where $\mu_{0}=\max _{1 \leq k \leq n} \mu_{k}$. In fact, this is obvious if we note that for $0<h \leq 1$

$$
\max _{B_{h}}\left\{a(x, \xi)-h^{2 \mu_{0}} W(x)\right\} \geq h^{2 \mu_{0}}\left\{\max _{B_{1}} a(x, \xi)-\max _{\pi\left(B_{1}\right)} W(x)\right\} .
$$

2. Infinitely degenerate hypoelliptic operators. As an application of Theorem 1 we consider a second order elliptic operator with infinite degeneracy as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
L=D_{1}^{2}+x_{1}^{2 l} D_{2}^{2}+x_{1}^{2 k} x_{2}^{2 m} D_{3}^{2}+f(x) D_{4}^{2} \quad \text { in } R^{4}, \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $l, k$ and $m$ are positive integers and $f(x)=\exp \left(-1 /\left|x_{1}\right|^{k}-1 /\left|x_{2}\right|^{k}\right)+$ $\exp \left(-1 /\left|x_{1}\right|^{\delta}-1 /\left|x_{2}\right|^{\sigma}\right)$. Here $\tau=k+1+m(l+1), 0<\kappa<1, \delta>0$ and $\sigma>0$.

Theorem 3. (i) Suppose that $l \geq k$. If $0<\delta<k+1$ and $0<\sigma<m+$ $(k+1) /(l+1)$ then $L$ is hypoelliptic in $R^{4}$ and moreover we have

WF $L u=\mathrm{WF} u \quad$ for any $u \in \mathscr{D}^{\prime}$.
(ii) Suppose that $k>l$. If $0<\delta<l+1$ and $0<\sigma<m+1$ then we have (10).

Remark 4. In the case of (i), the assumption of Theorem 3 is optimal. That is, if either $\delta \geq k+1$ or $\sigma \geq m+(k+1) /(l+1)$ then $L$ is not hypoelliptic in any neighborhood of the origin, (regardless of $l \geq k$ ). Furthermore, if $\sigma \geq m+1$ then we also get the non-hypoellipticity of $L$ in any neighborhood of $\left\{x_{2}=0\right\}$. Those non-hypoellipticity results follow from the analogous method as in Theorem 1 of [2].

For the proof of the hypoellipticity of $L$ we use the $L^{2}$ apriori estimate method as in [3] and [4]. The key point in the proof is to derive the following two estimates: For any $\varepsilon>0$ and any compact set $K$ of $R^{4}$ there exists a constant $C_{\varepsilon, K}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(x_{1}^{2 k} x_{2}^{2 m}(\log \Lambda)^{2} u, u\right) \leq \varepsilon(L u, u)+C_{\varepsilon, K}\|u\|^{2} \quad \text { for } u \in C_{0}^{\infty}(K), \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and furthermore

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(x_{1}^{2 l}(\log \Lambda)^{2} u, u\right) \leq \varepsilon(L u, u)+C_{\varepsilon, K}\|u\|^{2}  \tag{12}\\
& \quad \text { for } u \in C_{0}^{\infty}(K) \text { with supp } u \cap\left\{x_{2}=0\right\}=\varnothing .
\end{align*}
$$

Here $\Lambda$ denotes $\left(1+|D|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$. For a $M>0$ set

$$
a(x, \xi)=\xi_{1}^{2}+x_{1}^{2 l} \xi_{2}^{2}+\exp \left(-1 /\left|x_{1}\right|^{\delta}-1 /\left|x_{2}\right|^{\sigma}\right) M^{2}, \quad W(x)=\varepsilon^{-1} x_{1}^{2 k} x_{2}^{2 m}(\log M)^{2} .
$$

Then, by means of the microlocal analysis concentrated at $(0,(0,0,0, \pm 1)) \in$ $T^{*} R^{4}$, for the proof of the estimate (11) it suffices to show that the estimate (5) of Theorem 1 holds if $M>M_{\varepsilon}$ for a large $M_{\varepsilon}$. We shall check the assumption of (4) in the case of $l \geq k$. If $K$ is a compact set of $R^{2}$ and if $\alpha=$ $\{k+1+m(l+1)\}^{-1}$ and $\beta=(l+1) \alpha$ we set $\Omega_{1}=\left\{x \in K ;\left|x_{1}\right| \leq \rho_{1}(\log M)^{-\alpha},\left|x_{2}\right| \leq\right.$ $\left.\rho_{2}(\log M)^{-\beta}\right\}$. Here $\rho_{j}$ are small positives and in what follows we require that
(13)

$$
\rho_{2} \ll \rho_{1} \ll \varepsilon, \quad \rho_{1} \ll 1 / r^{*},
$$

where $r^{*}$ denotes the modulus of the dilation of (.)**. Suppose that $B \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfies $\pi(B) \subset \Omega_{1}$. Then it follows from (13) that $\max _{\pi\left(B^{* * *}\right)} W(x) \leq \varepsilon^{-1}(\log M)^{2 \alpha}$. Noting that $\xi_{1}^{2} \geq\left(4 \rho_{1}\right)^{-2}(\log M)^{2 \alpha}$ on a half of $B$, we get (4) in view of (13). If $\pi(B)$ is contained in $\left\{\left|x_{1}\right| \leq \rho_{1}(\log M)^{-1 /(k+1)}\right\} \cap K$ then we obtain (4) because we see that

$$
\max _{\pi^{(B+*)}} W(x) \leq \varepsilon^{-1} C_{K}(\log M)^{2 /(k+1)} \quad \text { and } \quad \xi_{1}^{2} \geq\left(4 \rho_{1}\right)^{-2}(\log M)^{2 /(k+1)}
$$

on a half of $B$. If $B$ satisfies

$$
\begin{gather*}
\pi(B) \subset\left\{\left|x_{2}\right| \leq \rho_{2}(\log M)^{-\beta}\right\} \cap K,  \tag{14}\\
b \equiv \max _{\pi(B)}\left|x_{1}\right| \geq \rho_{1}(\log M)^{-\alpha}, \tag{15}
\end{gather*}
$$

then we see that

$$
\max _{\pi\left(B^{* *}\right)} W(x) \leq \varepsilon^{-1}\left(b r^{*}\right)^{2 k}(\log M)^{2-2 \beta m} \quad \text { and } \quad x_{1}^{2 l} \xi_{2}^{2} \geq 2^{-6} b^{2 l} \rho_{2}^{-2}(\log M)^{2 \beta}
$$

on a quater of $B$. In view of $l \geq k$ and (15) we obtain (4) for this $B$. The assumption (4) for other $B \in \mathcal{C}$ is also obvious because we see that $\exp \left(-1 /\left|x_{1}\right|^{\sigma}-1 /\left|x_{2}\right|^{\sigma}\right) M^{2} \geq M$ on
(16) $\quad\left\{\left|x_{1}\right| \geq\left(\rho_{1} / 2\right)(\log M)^{-1 /(k+1)},\left|x_{2}\right| \geq\left(\rho_{2} / 2\right)(\log M)^{-\beta}\right\}$
if $M$ is large enough that $\left(2 / \rho_{1}\right)^{\delta}(\log M)^{z /(k+1)}$ and $\left(2 / \rho_{2}\right)^{\sigma}(\log M)^{\beta \sigma}$ are less than $\log M^{1 / 2}$. In the case of $k>l$, the assumption (4) is checked by the same way as above if we replace $\beta$ only in (14) and (16) by $(m+1)^{-1}$. The estimate (12) is also reduced to (5), by setting

$$
a(x, \xi)=\xi_{1}^{2}+\exp \left(-1 /\left|x_{1}\right|^{\rho}\right) M^{2}, \quad W(x)=\varepsilon^{-1} x_{1}^{2 l}(\log M)^{2} .
$$

The way how estimates (11) and (12) lead us to the hypoellipticity of $L$ will be shown elsewhere. The proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 will be also given elsewhere.
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