

Title	On the uniqueness of Markovian selfadjoint extension of diffusion operators on infinite-dimensional spaces
Author(s)	Takeda, Masayoshi
Citation	Osaka Journal of Mathematics. 22(4) p733-p.742
Issue Date	1985
oaire:version	VoR
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.18910/11583">https://doi.org/10.18910/11583</a>
DOI	
rights	
Note	

*Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA*

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

## ON THE UNIQUENESS OF MARKOVIAN SELF-ADJOINT EXTENSION OF DIFFUSION OPERATORS ON INFINITE DIMENSIONAL SPACES

MASAYOSHI TAKEDA

(Received November 19, 1984)

### 1. Introduction

Let  $(\mathcal{S}(R^d), L^2(R^d), \mathcal{S}'(R^d))$  be a rigged Hilbert space, where  $\mathcal{S}(R^d)$  is the Schwartz space of test functions and  $\mathcal{S}'(R^d)$  is its dual space. Letting  $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{S}(R^d)$  be a complete orthonormal basis of  $L_2(R^d)$ , we put  $FC_0^\infty = \{f; f \text{ is a function on } \mathcal{S}'(R^d) \text{ of the form } f(\xi) = \tilde{f}(\langle \xi, e_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle \xi, e_{i_n} \rangle) \text{ for some } n \text{ and a real } C_0^\infty(R^n)\text{-function } \tilde{f}\}$ , where  $\langle, \rangle$  is the dualization between  $\mathcal{S}'(R^d)$  and  $\mathcal{S}(R^d)$ . Let  $\nu$  be a quasi-invariant measure on  $\mathcal{S}'(R^d)$  with respect to  $\mathcal{S}(R^d)$ . We call the measure  $\nu$  *admissible* if the symmetric bilinear form  $\varepsilon_\nu(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} (Du, Dv)_{L^2(R^d) \otimes L^2(\nu)}$ ,  $u, v \in FC_0^\infty$ , is closable. Its closed extension  $(\mathcal{E}_\nu, \mathcal{F}_\nu)$  is said to be the *energy form* associated with the quasi-invariant admissible measure  $\nu$ . Here,  $Du = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} e_i \otimes D_i u \in L^2(R^d) \otimes L^2(\nu)$  and  $D_i$  is a derivative in the direction of  $e_i$ . Furthermore, a self-adjoint operator  $H_\nu$  representing the energy form  $(\mathcal{E}_\nu, \mathcal{F}_\nu)$  is said to be a *diffusion operator*. For example, the probability measure  $\mu_0$  on  $\mathcal{S}'(R^d)$  defined by the following formula is quasi-invariant and admissible:

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}'(R^d)} e^{i\langle \xi, \phi \rangle} d\mu_0(\xi) = e^{-1/4(\phi, (\Delta + m^2)^{-1/2} \phi)}, \quad \phi \in \mathcal{S}(R^d),$$

where  $(, )$  is the scalar product in  $L^2(R^d)$ .

Let  $\mu_0^*$  be the Euclidian random field  $\langle \xi^*, \psi \rangle$  over  $R^{d+1}$ , defined by

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}'(R^{d+1})} e^{i\langle \xi^*, \psi \rangle} d\mu_0^*(\xi^*) = e^{-1/2(\psi, (\Delta + m^2)^{-1} \psi)}, \quad \psi \in \mathcal{S}(R^{d+1}).$$

The random field  $\langle \xi^*, \psi \rangle$  can be regard as the restriction to  $\mathcal{S}(R^{d+1})$  of the generalized random field indexed by the Sobolev space  $H_{-1}$  the completion of  $\mathcal{S}(R^{d+1})$  with respect to the norm  $\|(-\Delta + m^2)^{-1/2} \psi\|$ . We denote by  $\Sigma_0$  the  $\sigma$ -field generated by random variable  $\{\langle \xi^*, \delta_0 \otimes \phi \rangle; \phi \in \mathcal{S}(R^d)\}$ , and regard the restriction of  $\mu_0^*$  to  $\Sigma_0$  as the measure on  $\mathcal{S}'(R^d)$  by the natural identifica-

tion of  $\langle \xi, \phi \rangle$  with  $\langle \xi^*, \delta_0 \otimes \phi \rangle$ . Then, it coincides with  $\mu_0$  and the diffusion operator  $H_{\mu_0}$  corresponding to  $\mu_0$  is nothing but the energy operator  $H$  of free Euclidean field model  $\mu_0^*$ . To see this, it is enough to show that  $H_{\mu_0}$  and  $H$  are the same operators on  $FC_0^\infty$  and that the symmetric operator  $S = H_{\mu_0} \uparrow FC_0^\infty$  has a unique Markovian self-adjoint extension, where the notation  $H_{\mu_0} \uparrow FC_0^\infty$  indicates the restriction of  $H_{\mu_0}$  to  $FC_0^\infty$ . In fact, the operator  $S$  is known to be an essentially self-adjoint operator.

Albeverio and Høegh-Krohn have raised a question in [3] whether the diffusion operator associated with  $\mu^* \uparrow \Sigma_0$  is identical with energy operator of the Euclidean field model  $\mu^*$  with trigonometric (or exponential) interaction and have shown that these operators are the same on  $FC_0^\infty$  when  $d=1$ . Thus, we now cope with the question: what kind of quasi-invariant admissible measure  $\nu$  induces the symmetric operator  $S_\nu = H_\nu \uparrow FC_0^\infty$  with a unique Markovian self-adjoint extension?

In this paper, we consider this problem in a simpler case that  $\nu$  is an absolutely continuous measure with respect to the Wiener measure on the abstract Wiener space  $(H, B, \mu)$ . We conclude the uniqueness of Markovian self-adjoint extension of  $S_\nu$  under the condition that the Radon-Nikodym derivative  $\rho^2$  is strictly positive and belongs to the space  $D_\infty (= \bigcap_{p \geq 1, r \in \mathbb{R}^1} D_p^r)$ , where  $D_p^r$  is the Sobolev space of order  $r$  and degree  $p$  on the Wiener space. In the proof, we use the Malliavin's calculus and in particular the hypoellipticity of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck generator. We note at the end of this paper that, if  $\rho$  happens to be a tame function, then Wielens' method [8] applies and  $S_\nu$  becomes essentially self-adjoint.

**2. Notations and the closability of a symmetric form**

Let  $(H, B, \mu)$  be an abstract Wiener space and  $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset B^*$  (dual space of  $B$ ) be a complete orthonormal basis of  $H$ . We set  $FC_0^\infty = \{f; f \text{ is a function on } B \text{ of the form } f(x) = \tilde{f}(\langle e_{i_1}, x \rangle, \dots, \langle e_{i_n}, x \rangle) \text{ for some } n \text{ and } \tilde{f} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)\}$  and  $FC_0^\infty(H) = \{F; F \text{ is a } H\text{-valued function on } B \text{ which is of form } F(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i \otimes f_i(x) \text{ for some } n, f_i \in FC_0^\infty\}$ . We denote by  $D_p^r$  the completion of  $FC_0^\infty$  with respect to the norm  $\|f\|_p^r = \|f\|_p + \|D^r f\|_p$ , where  $D^r f, f \in FC_0^\infty$ , is the  $r$ -times iteration of the Fréchet derivative which is an element in  $L_p(B \rightarrow \overbrace{H \otimes \dots \otimes H}^r)$ . Note that

$$\|D^r f\|_p = \|\{ \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in \mathbb{N}^r} (D_{n_1}(D_{n_2} \dots (D_{n_r} f)))^2 \}^{1/2}\|_p$$

where  $D_i$  is the derivative in the direction of  $e_i$ . It is convenient to use two different expressions of  $D_p^1$  ( $1 < p < \infty$ ) according to Sugita [7] and Kusuoka [6]:

$$(2.1) \quad D_p^1 = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{There exists some } g \in L_p(B \rightarrow H) \\ u \in L_p(\mu); \text{ such that } (u, D^*v) = (g, v), \text{ for} \\ \text{any } v \in FC_0^\infty(H) \end{array} \right\}$$

and

$$(2.2) \quad D_p^1 = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} u \text{ is stochastic } H \text{ Gateaux differentiable} \\ \text{(SGD) with respect to } \mu, \text{ ray absolutely} \\ u \in L_p(\mu); \text{ continuous (RAC) and the stochastic} \\ \text{Gateaux derivative } Du \text{ of } u \text{ satisfies that} \\ \|Du(x)\|_H \in L_p(\mu) \end{array} \right\}$$

Here, a function  $u$  is called *SGD*, if there exists a measurable map  $Du; B \rightarrow H$  such that for any  $k \in B^*$ , the convergence  $\frac{1}{t}[u(x+tk) - u(x) - t(Du(x), k)_H] \rightarrow 0$ ,  $t \rightarrow 0$ , take place in probability with respect to  $\mu$ , and  $u$  is called *RAC*, if for any  $k \in B^*$ , there exists a measurable function  $u_k$  such that

- 1)  $\tilde{u}_k(x) = u(x)$  for  $\mu$ -a.e.
  - 2)  $\tilde{u}_k(x+tk)$  is absolutely continuous in  $t$  for each  $x \in B$  (See [6; Definition 1,1 and Definition 1,2]).
- Then, we have for  $u \in D_p^1$ ,  $\|Du(x)\|_H = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^\infty (Du(x), e_i)^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^\infty (D_i u(x))^2}$ , where  $D_i u(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} (\tilde{u}_{e_i}(x+te_i) - \tilde{u}_{e_i}(x))$ .

We fix a function  $\rho$  on  $B$  satisfying

$$(2.3) \quad \text{i) } \rho > 0 \quad \text{ii) } \rho \in D_\infty$$

where  $D_\infty = \bigcap_{\substack{p \geq 1 \\ r \in \mathbb{R}^1}} D_p^r$ . We define the symmetric bilinear form  $(\mathcal{E}_\rho, FC_0^\infty)$  by

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{E}_\rho(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} \int_B (Du(x), Dv(x))_H \rho^2(x) d\mu, \quad u, v \in FC_0^\infty.$$

**Lemma 1.**  $(\mathcal{E}_\rho, FC_0^\infty)$  is closable on  $L_2(\rho^2\mu)$ .

*Proof.* We follows the argument of [1; Theorem 2.3]. Since  $D_i^* \rho^2 = -2\rho D_i \rho + \langle e_i, x \rangle \rho^2(x)$ , we have for  $g \in FC_0^\infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (Dg, e_i \otimes 1)_{H \otimes L^2(\rho^2\mu)} &= (D_i g, \rho^2)_{L^2(\mu)} \\ &= (g, -2\rho D_i \rho + \langle e_i, x \rangle \rho^2)_{L^2(\mu)} \\ &= (g, -2 \frac{D_i \rho}{\rho} + \langle e_i, x \rangle)_{L^2(\rho^2\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

By noting that  $\int (\frac{D_i \rho}{\rho})^2 \rho^2 d\mu \leq \|\rho\|_{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$ , we see that  $-2 \frac{D_i \rho}{\rho} + \langle e_i, x \rangle \in L_2(\rho^2\mu)$

and  $e_i \otimes 1 \in [D_\rho^*]$ , where  $D_\rho^*$  denote the adjoint operator of  $D$  which is an operator from  $L_2(\rho^2\mu)$  to  $H \otimes L_2(\rho^2\mu)$ . Put  $\beta(e_i) = D_\rho^*(e_i \otimes 1)$ . Then, we see that for  $g, f \in FC_0^\infty$

$$\begin{aligned} (Dg, e_i \otimes f)_{H \otimes L^2(\rho^2\mu)} &= (D_i g \cdot f, 1)_{\rho^2\mu} \\ &= (D_i (g \cdot f) - g D_i f, 1)_{\rho^2\mu} \\ &= (g, \beta(e_i) f - D_i f)_{\rho^2\mu}. \end{aligned}$$

Because the function  $\beta(e_i) f - D_i f$  belongs to  $L_2(\rho^2\mu)$ , it holds that  $e_i \otimes f \in \mathcal{D}[D_\rho^*]$  and consequently  $FC_0^\infty(H)$  is contained in  $\mathcal{D}[D_\rho^*]$ . Since  $FC_0^\infty(H)$  is dense in  $H \otimes L_2(\rho^2\mu)$ , the closure  $\bar{D} = (D_\rho^*)^*$  is well defined and hence  $(\mathcal{E}_\rho, FC_0^\infty)$  is closable. q.e.d.

We denote by  $(\mathcal{E}_\rho, \mathcal{F})$  the closed extension of  $(\mathcal{E}_\rho, FC_0^\infty)$ .

### 3. The uniqueness of Markovian self-adjoint extension

Let  $H_\rho$  be a self-adjoint operator associated with the closed form  $(\mathcal{E}_\rho, \mathcal{F})$  and  $S$  be a symmetric operator defined by  $S = H_\rho \upharpoonright FC_0^\infty$ .  $S$  can be represented as

$$(3.1) \quad Su = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}u + \frac{1}{\rho} \langle D\rho, Du \rangle_H, \quad u \in FC_0^\infty,$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  is a Ornstein-Uhlenbeck generator. We denote by  $\mathcal{A}_M(S)$  the totality of Markovian self-adjoint extensions:  $A \in \mathcal{A}_M(S)$  means that  $A$  is a self-adjoint extension of  $S$  which generates a strongly continuous contraction Markovian semi-group on  $L_2(\rho^2\mu)$ .  $H_\rho$  is called the Friedrichs extension of  $S$  and is an element of  $\mathcal{A}_M(S)$ . Then, the following theorem holds.

**Theorem 1.** *Under the condition (2.3),  $\mathcal{A}_M(S)$  has only one element  $H_\rho$ , namely,  $S$  has a unique Markovian self-adjoint extension.*

For any  $A \in \mathcal{A}_M(S)$ , the form domain  $\mathcal{D}[\sqrt{-A}]$  is orthogonally decomposed with respect to  $\mathcal{E}_{A,\omega} (= (\sqrt{-A} \cdot, \sqrt{-A} \cdot)_{\rho^2\mu} + \alpha(\cdot, \cdot)_{\rho^2\mu})$  as

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{D}[\sqrt{-A}] = \mathcal{F} \oplus (\mathcal{N}_\omega \cap \mathcal{D}[\sqrt{-A}]),$$

where  $\mathcal{N}_\omega = \{u \in L_2(\rho^2\mu); (\alpha I - S^*)u = 0\}$  ([4; Theorem 2.3.2]). Hence, for the proof of Theorem 1 we must show that

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{N}_\omega \cap \mathcal{D}[\sqrt{-A}] \subset \mathcal{F}.$$

In order to prove (3.3) we introduce the intermediate space  $\mathcal{H}$  by (3.4) and prove that  $\mathcal{N}_\omega \cap \mathcal{D}[\sqrt{-A}] \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{F}$  (Lemma 2 and Lemma 4).

Let  $\{a_i(t)\}_{i=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of  $C_0^\infty(R^1)$ -functions satisfying that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{i) } 0 \leq a_l(t) \leq 1 \quad \text{ii) } a_l(t) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on } \frac{1}{2^l} < t < 2^l \\ 0 & \text{on } t \leq \frac{1}{2^{l+1}}, t \geq 2^{l+1} \end{cases} \\
 \text{iii) } |a'_l(t)| \leq &\begin{cases} c 2^{l+1} & \text{on } t \leq \frac{1}{2^l} \\ c' & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for some constants } c \text{ and } c'.
 \end{aligned}$$

We put  $\phi_l(x) = a_l \circ \rho(x)$ . If a function  $u$  satisfies  $\phi_l \cdot u \in \bigcup_{1 < \rho < 2^l} D_\rho^1$ , for any  $l$ , then we have  $D(\phi_{l+1} \cdot u) = D(\phi_l \cdot u)$   $\mu$ -a.e. on  $\mathcal{M}_l = \left\{ \frac{1}{2^l} < \rho < 2^l \right\}$ , because  $D(\phi_l \cdot u) = D(\phi_l \cdot \phi_{l+1} u) = \phi_l \cdot D(\phi_{l+1} \cdot u) + \phi_{l+1} u \cdot D\phi_l$ . Therefore, we can well define  $Du$  by

$$Du = D(\phi_l \cdot u) \text{ on } \mathcal{M}_l.$$

Let us consider the function space

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{H} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \phi_l \cdot u \in \bigcup_{1 < \rho < 2^l} D_\rho^1 \text{ for any } l \text{ and} \\ u \in L_2(\rho^2 \mu); \int \langle Du, Du \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \rho^2 d\mu < \infty \end{array} \right\}$$

Then, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** *It holds that*

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{F}.$$

*Proof.* For any  $u \in \mathcal{H}$ , we see that  $u_{(N)} = (-N \vee u) \wedge N \in \mathcal{H}$  since  $\phi_l \cdot u_{(N)} = ((-N \phi_l) \vee \phi_l u) \wedge N \phi_l \in D_\rho^1$  by (2.2),  $u_{(N)}$  converges to  $u$  in  $\mathcal{E}_{\rho,1}$ . Furthermore  $u_{(N)}$  can be approximated by  $\phi_l \cdot u_{(N)} \in \mathcal{H}$ . In fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.6) \quad &\int \|Du_{(N)} - D(\phi_l \cdot u_{(N)})\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \rho^2 d\mu \\
 &\leq 2 \left[ \int |1 - \phi_l|^2 \|Du_{(N)}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \rho^2 d\mu + \int u_{(N)}^2 \|D\phi_l\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \rho^2 d\mu \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

The second term of the right hand side is equal to  $\int u_{(N)}^2 (a'_l(\rho))^2 \|D\rho\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \rho^2 d\mu$  and is not greater than  $\int_{\{\rho \leq 1/2^l\}} u_{(N)}^2 \cdot (c2^{l+1})^2 \|D\rho\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \rho^2 d\mu + \int_{\{\rho \geq 2^l\}} u_{(N)}^2 c'^2 \|D\rho\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \rho^2 d\mu \leq 4c^2 N^2 \int_{\{\rho \leq 1/2^l\}} \|D\rho\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 d\mu + c'^2 N^2 \int_{\{\rho \geq 2^l\}} \|D\rho\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \rho^2 d\mu$ , which tends to zero as  $l \rightarrow \infty$  by the assumption (2.3). Hence the left hand side of (3.6) tends to zero as  $l \rightarrow \infty$ .

Next we show that there exists a sequence  $\{f_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset FC_0^\infty$  such that

$$(3.7) \quad \phi_{l+1} f_m \rightarrow \phi_l u_{(N)} \text{ (} m \rightarrow \infty \text{) in } \mathcal{E}_{\rho,1}.$$

Since we see  $\phi_l u_{(N)} \in D_{2,b}^1$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \int \|D(\phi_l \cdot u_{(N)})\|_H^2 d\mu &\leq 2 \left[ \int \phi_l^2 \|Du_{(N)}\|_H^2 d\mu + \int u_{(N)}^2 \|D\phi_l\|_H^2 d\mu \right] \\ &\leq 2 \left[ \int_{(1/2)^{l+1} < \rho < 2^{l+1}} \phi_l^2 \|Du_{(N)}\|_H^2 d\mu + N^2 \int \|D\phi_l\|_H^2 d\mu \right] \\ &\leq 2^{2l+3} \int \|Du_{(N)}\|_H^2 \rho^2 d\mu + 2N^2 \int \|D\phi_l\|_H^2 d\mu \\ &< \infty, \end{aligned}$$

there exists a sequence  $\{f_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset FC_0^\infty$  such that 1)  $|f_m| \leq N$ , 2)  $f_m \rightarrow \phi_l u_{(N)}$ ,  $\mu$ -a.e., 3)  $f_m \rightarrow \phi_l u_{(N)}$  in  $D_{2,b}^1$ . Then, (3.7) follows because

$$\begin{aligned} \int \|D(\phi_{l+1} f_m) - D(\phi_l u_{(N)})\|_H^2 \rho^2 d\mu &= \int \|D(\phi_{l+1}(f_m - \phi_l u_{(N)}))\|_H^2 \rho^2 d\mu \\ &\leq 2 \left[ \int \phi_{l+1}^2 \|Df_m - D(\phi_l u_{(N)})\|_H^2 \rho^2 d\mu + \int (f_m - \phi_l u_{(N)})^2 \|D\phi_{l+1}\|_H^2 \rho^2 d\mu \right] \\ &\leq 2^{2l+5} \int \|Df_m - D(\phi_l u_{(N)})\|_H^2 d\mu + 2 \int (f_m - \phi_l u_{(N)})^2 \|D\phi_{l+1}\|_H^2 \rho^2 d\mu \\ &\rightarrow 0 \quad (m \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned}$$

Finally we take a sequence  $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset FC_0^\infty$  satisfying that  $g_n \rightarrow \phi_{l+1} f_m$  in  $D_{p,1}^1$ . Then, we see that

$$(3.8) \quad g_n \rightarrow \phi_{l+1} f_m \quad \text{in } \mathcal{E}_{p,1},$$

since  $\int \|D(\phi_{l+1} f_m) - Dg_n\|_H^2 \rho^2 d\mu \leq \left( \int \|D(\phi_{l+1} f_m) - Dg_n\|_H^4 d\mu \right)^{1/2} \cdot \left( \int \rho^4 d\mu \right)^{1/2}$ . q.e.d.

Denote by  $\bar{S}^{(p)}$ ,  $1 < p$ , the closure of  $S$  in  $L_p(\rho^2 \mu)$ . We need the following lemma in the proof of Lemma 4.

**Lemma 3.** *If  $w \in D_p^2$ ,  $p > 1$ , then for any  $l$ ,  $\phi_l w \in \bigcap_{\substack{1 < p' < p \\ p' \leq 2}} \mathcal{D} [\bar{S}^{(p')}]$  and*

$$(3.9) \quad \bar{S}^{(p')}(\phi_l w) = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}(\phi_l w) + \frac{1}{\rho} \langle D\rho, D(\phi_l w) \rangle_H.$$

Proof. First of all we show that  $\phi_l \psi \in \mathcal{D} [\bar{S}^{(2)}]$ , for  $\psi \in FC_0^\infty$ . Take a sequence  $\{g_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset FC_0^\infty$  such that  $g_k$  converges to  $\phi_l$  with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_H^2$ . Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (3.10) \quad S(g_k \psi) &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L} g_k \psi + \frac{1}{2} g_k \mathcal{L} \psi + \frac{1}{2} \langle Dg_k, D\psi \rangle_H + \frac{g_k}{\rho} \langle D\rho, D\psi \rangle_H \\ &\quad + \frac{\psi}{\rho} \langle D\rho, Dg_k \rangle_H \\ &\xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L} \phi_l \psi + \frac{1}{2} \phi_l \mathcal{L} \psi + \frac{1}{2} \langle D\phi_l, D\psi \rangle_H + \frac{\phi_l}{\rho} \langle D\rho, D\psi \rangle_H \\ &\quad + \frac{\psi}{\rho} \langle D\rho, D\phi_l \rangle_H \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}(\phi_l \psi) + \frac{1}{\rho} \langle D\rho, D(\phi_l \psi) \rangle_H,$$

the convergence being in  $L_2(\rho^2 \mu)$ . In fact, by Schwartz inequality we have

$$\int |\mathcal{L}g_k \psi - \mathcal{L}\phi_l \psi|^2 \rho^2 d\mu \leq \left( \int |\mathcal{L}g_k - \mathcal{L}\phi_l|^4 d\mu \right)^{1/2} \left( \int (\psi \rho)^4 d\mu \right)^{1/2} \rightarrow 0 \quad (k \rightarrow \infty),$$

and in the same way we can show the convergence of other terms of (3.10).

Next, if  $\{h_m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset FC_0^\infty$  converges to  $w$  with respect to  $\| \cdot \|_p^2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3.11) \quad \bar{S}^{(2)}(\phi_l h_m) &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}\phi_l h_m + \frac{1}{2} \phi_l \mathcal{L}h_m + \frac{1}{2} \langle D\phi_l, Dh_m \rangle_H + \frac{1}{2} \phi_l \mathcal{L}h_m \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \langle D\phi_l, Dh_m \rangle_H \\ &\xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}\phi_l w + \frac{1}{2} \phi_l \mathcal{L}w + \frac{1}{2} \langle D\phi_l, Dw \rangle_H + \frac{w}{\rho} \langle D\rho, D\phi_l \rangle_H \\ &\quad + \frac{\phi_l}{\rho} \langle D\rho, Dw \rangle_H \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}(\phi_l w) + \frac{1}{\rho} \langle D\rho, D(\phi_l w) \rangle_H, \end{aligned}$$

the convergence being in  $L_{p'}(\rho^2 \mu)$ . In fact, by Hölder inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int |\mathcal{L}\phi_l w - \mathcal{L}\phi_l h_m|^{p'} \rho^2 d\mu &\leq \left( \int |w - h_m|^p d\mu \right)^{p'/p} \left( \int |\mathcal{L}\phi_l|^{p' \rho^2} d\mu \right)^{p-p'/p} \\ &\rightarrow 0 \quad (m \rightarrow \infty), \end{aligned}$$

and the second and the third terms of (3.11) also converge to the corresponding terms in  $L_{p'}(\rho^2 \mu)$ . Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int \left| \frac{w}{\rho} \langle D\rho, D\phi_l \rangle_H - \frac{h_m}{\rho} \langle D\rho, D\phi_l \rangle_H \right|^{p'} \rho^2 d\mu &= \int |w - h_m|^{p'} |\langle D\rho, D\phi_l \rangle_H|^{p'} \rho^{2-p'} d\mu \\ &\leq \left( \int |w - h_m|^p d\mu \right)^{p'/p} \left( \int |\langle D\rho, D\phi_l \rangle_H|^{p' \rho^{2-p'}} d\mu \right)^{p-p'/p} \\ &\rightarrow 0 \quad (m \rightarrow \infty), \end{aligned}$$

and the last term in (3.11) also tends to  $\frac{\phi_l}{\rho} \langle D\rho, Dw \rangle_H$ . q.e.d.

Take any element  $A \in \mathcal{A}_M(S)$  and let  $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  be a semi-group on  $L_2(\rho^2 \mu)$  corresponding to  $A$ . Then, by the contractivity and symmetry, we can extend  $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  to a strongly continuous semi-group  $\{T_t^{(\rho)}\}_{t \geq 0}$  on  $L_p(\rho^2 \mu)$ . We denote by  $\{G_\alpha^{(\rho)}\}_{\alpha > 0}$  the corresponding resolvent.

**Lemma 4.** *It hold that*

$$(3.12) \quad \mathcal{N}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{D}[\sqrt{-A}] \subset \mathcal{H} \quad \text{for } A \in \mathcal{A}_M(S).$$

*Proof.* Take any element  $v \in \mathcal{N}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{D}[\sqrt{-A}]$ . We first show that  $\phi_l v \in$



$\bigcap_{1 < p < 2} D_p^1$  for any  $l$ . Let  $w = \frac{\phi_l}{\rho^2} \in D_\infty$ . Then, by Lemma 3, we see  $w\psi$   
 $\left( = \phi_{l+1} \frac{\phi_l \psi}{\rho^2} \right) \in \mathcal{D} [\bar{S}^{(2)}]$ , for any  $\psi \in FC_0^\infty$ . Then, by the definition

$$(v\rho^2, \alpha\phi - \bar{S}^{(2)}\phi)_\mu = 0, \quad \text{for } \phi \in \mathcal{D} [\bar{S}^{(2)}].$$

Hence, we obtain for  $\psi \in FC_0^\infty$

$$(3.13) \quad (v\rho^2, \mathcal{L}(w\psi))_\mu = 2\alpha(v\rho^2, w\psi)_\mu - 2(v\rho, \langle D\rho, D(w\psi) \rangle_H)_\mu.$$

Now, we have for  $\psi \in FC_0^\infty$

$$(\phi_l v, \mathcal{L}\psi)_\mu = (g, \psi)_\mu$$

where  $g = 2\alpha v\rho^2 w - 2D^*(v w \rho D\rho) - 2\rho \langle D\rho, Dw \rangle_H - v\rho^2 \mathcal{L}w - D^*(v\rho^2 Dw)$ . Now, we use the hypoellipticity of  $\mathcal{L}$  ([5]) as follows: since  $v w \rho D\rho$  and  $v\rho^2 Dw$  belong to  $\bigcap_{1 < p < 2} L_p(B \rightarrow H)$ , we have  $g \in \bigcap_{1 < p < 2} D_p^{-1}$ . By [5],  $\phi_l v$  belongs to the domain of extended  $\mathcal{L}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(\phi_l v) \in \bigcap_{1 < p < 2} D_p^{-1}$  and  $\phi_l v = R(\mathcal{L}(\phi_l v)) \in \bigcap_{1 < p < 2} D_p^1$ , where  $R$  is the resolvent of  $\mathcal{L}$ . Using this property of  $\phi_l v$  and repeating the same procedure as above, we get  $g \in \bigcap_{1 < p < 2} D_p^0$  and consequently  $\phi_l v \in \bigcap_{1 < p < 2} D_p^2$  as was to be proved.

We next prove that  $\int \langle Dv, Dv \rangle_H \rho^2 d\mu$  is finite. To this end, let  $\{b_{(n)}(t)\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^1)$  be a sequence satisfying that

i)  $b_{(n)}(t) = t$  on  $-n \leq t \leq n$  ii)  $b_{(n)}(t) - b_{(n)}(s) \leq t - s, t > s$  iii)  $|b_{(n)}(t)| \leq n + 1$ . Then,  $v_{(n)} = b_{(n)}(v) \in \mathcal{D} [\sqrt{-A}]$  by virtue of the Markovian property of Dirichlet space  $\mathcal{D} [\sqrt{-A}]$ . According to [4; (2.3.24)], we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_A(v_{(n)}, v_{(n)}) &= (\sqrt{-A}v_{(n)}, \sqrt{-A}v_{(n)}) \rho^2 \mu \\ &= \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_A^{(\beta)}(v_{(n)}, v_{(n)}) \\ &= \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} (f_\beta, 1) \rho^2 \mu, \end{aligned}$$

where  $f_\beta = -\beta(v_{(n)}^2 - \beta G_\beta^{(2)} v_{(n)}^2) + 2\beta v_{(n)}(v_{(n)} - \beta G_\beta^{(2)} v_{(n)}) + v_{(n)}^2(1 - \beta G_\beta^{(2)} 1)$ . First, we see that

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} -\beta(v_{(n)}^2 - \beta G_\beta^{(2)} v_{(n)}^2, \phi_l) \rho^2 \mu &= \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} -\beta(v_{(n)}^2, \phi_l - \beta G_\beta^{(2)} \phi_l) \rho^2 \mu \\ &= \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} -\beta(v_{(n)}^2, \beta G_\beta^{(2)} \bar{S}^{(2)} \phi_l) \rho^2 \mu \\ &= (v_{(n)}^2, \bar{S}^{(2)} \phi_l) \rho^2 \mu. \end{aligned}$$

But, since  $\phi_l v_{(n)}$  belongs to  $D_p^2$  for any  $l$ , we see that the right hand side of (3.14) is equal to  $(v_{(n)}(\mathcal{L}v_{(n)} + \frac{2}{\rho} \langle D\rho, Dv_{(n)} \rangle_H) + \langle Dv_{(n)}, Dv_{(n)} \rangle_H, \phi_l) \rho^2 \mu$ . On the other hand,  $\phi_l v_{(n)} \in \mathcal{D} [\bar{S}^{(p)}], 1 < p < 2$ , by Lemma 3. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \beta(v_{(n)} - \beta G_{\beta}^{(2)} v_{(n)}, \phi_l v_{(n)}) \rho^2 \mu &= \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \beta(v_{(n)}, \phi_l v_{(n)} - \beta G_{\beta}^{(\beta)}(\phi_l v_{(n)})) \rho^2 \mu \\ &= \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \beta(v_{(n)}, \phi_l v_{(n)} - \beta G_{\beta}^{(\beta)}(\phi_l v_{(n)})) \rho^2 \mu \\ &= (v_{(n)}, -\bar{S}^{(\beta)}(\phi_l v_{(n)})) \rho^2 \mu \\ &= (-\frac{\mathcal{L}}{2} v_{(n)} - \frac{1}{\rho} \langle D\rho, Dv_{(n)} \rangle_H, \phi_l v_{(n)}) \rho^2 \mu . \end{aligned}$$

By noting  $1 \in \mathcal{D}[\sqrt{-A}]$ , we see that  $\beta G_{\beta}^{(2)} 1 = 1$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_A(v, v) &\geq \mathcal{E}_A(v_{(n)}, v_{(n)}) \\ &\geq \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} (f_{\beta}, \phi_l) \rho^2 \mu \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \langle Dv_{(n)}, Dv_{(n)} \rangle_H \phi_l \rho^2 d\mu \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int (b'_{(n)}(v))^2 \langle Dv, Dv \rangle_H \phi_l \rho^2 d\mu . \end{aligned}$$

therefore, we can conclude that the function  $v$  belongs to  $\mathcal{H}$  by letting  $l, n \rightarrow \infty$ .  
 q.e.d.

REMARK. If  $\rho$  is a tame function represented as  $\rho(x) = \tilde{\rho}(\langle e_1, x \rangle, \dots, \langle e_n, x \rangle)$ ,  $\tilde{\rho} > 0$   $C^2(R^n)$ , and  $\int \rho^2 d\mu < \infty$ , we can show that  $S$  is an essentially self-adjoint operator by using Wielens' idea. In fact, let  $\psi_l(t)$  be a  $C^\infty$ -function satisfying that i)  $0 \leq \psi_l(t) \leq 1$  ii)  $\psi_l = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on } t \leq l \\ 0 & \text{on } t \geq l+1 \end{cases}$  iii)  $|\psi'_l(t)|, |\psi''_l(t)| < M$ , and  $\tilde{\psi}_l(r) = \psi_l(|r|)$ ,  $r \in R^n$ . Put  $\phi_l(x) = \tilde{\psi}_l(\langle e_1, x \rangle, \dots, \langle e_n, x \rangle)$  and  $\mathcal{M}_l = \{x \in B; \langle e_1, x \rangle, \dots, \langle e_n, x \rangle \in B_l (= \{r \in R^n; |r| < l\})\}$ . Then, it holds that  $\phi_l^2 v \in \mathcal{D}[\bar{S}]$ ,  $v \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha$ , and that

$$\begin{aligned} (v, (\alpha - \bar{S})(\phi_l^2 v)) \rho^2 \mu &= \alpha(\phi_l v, \phi_l v) \rho^2 \mu + \int \phi_l v \langle D\phi_l, Dv \rangle_H \rho^2 d\mu \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int \phi_l^2 \langle Dv, Dv \rangle_H \rho^2 d\mu = 0 . \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi_l v, (\alpha - \bar{S}) \phi_l v) \rho^2 \mu &= \alpha(\phi_l v, \phi_l v) \rho^2 \mu + \int \phi_l v \langle D\phi_l, Dv \rangle_H \rho^2 d\mu \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int v^2 \langle D\phi_l, D\phi_l \rangle_H \rho^2 d\mu + \frac{1}{2} \int \phi_l^2 \langle Dv, Dv \rangle_H \rho^2 d\mu \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int v^2 \langle D\phi_l, D\phi_l \rangle_H \rho^2 d\mu , \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \int v^2 \langle D\phi_l, D\phi_l \rangle_H \rho^2 d\mu \geq \alpha \int \phi_l^2 v^2 \rho^2 d\mu .$$

therefore,  $\frac{1}{2} M^2 \cdot n \int_{\mathcal{M}_i} \rho^2 d\mu \geq \alpha \int_{\mathcal{M}_{i+1}} v^2 \rho^2 d\mu$  and by letting  $l \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain  $v=0$ .

---

### References

- [1] S. Albeverio and R. Høegh-Krohn: *Hunt processes and analytic potential theory on rigged Hilbert spaces*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré B **13** (1977), 269–291.
- [2] S. Albeverio and R. Høegh-Krohn: *Dirichlet forms and diffusion processes on rigged Hilbert space*, Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete **40** (1977), 1–55.
- [3] S. Albeverio and R. Høegh-Krohn: *Diffusion, quantum fields and groups of mappings*, Springer, Lect. Note 923, pp. 133–145, 1981.
- [4] M. Fukushima: *Dirichlet forms and Markov processes*, North-Holland, Kodansha, 1980.
- [5] N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe: *An introduction to Malliavin's calculus*, Proc. Taniguchi Symposium on Stochastic Analysis, Katata, 1982.
- [6] S. Kusuoka: *Dirichlet forms and diffusion processes on Banach space*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **29** (1982), 79–95.
- [7] H. Sugita: *Sobolev space of Wiener functionals and Malliavin's calculus*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **25** (1985), 31–48.
- [8] N. Wielens: *On the essential self-adjointness of generalized Schrödinger operators*, ZIF preprint, 1984.

Department of Mathematics  
Osaka University, Toyonaka,  
Osaka 560, Japan