## DENJOY-CARLEMAN DIFFERENTIABLE PERTURBATION OF POLYNOMIALS AND UNBOUNDED OPERATORS

ANDREAS KRIEGL, PETER W. MICHOR, AND ARMIN RAINER

ABSTRACT. Let  $t\mapsto A(t)$  for  $t\in T$  be a  $C^M$ -mapping with values unbounded operators with compact resolvents and common domain of definition which are self-adjoint or normal. Here  $C^M$  stands for  $C^\omega$  (real analytic), a quasianalytic or non-quasianalytic Denjoy-Carleman class,  $C^\infty$ , or a Hölder continuity class  $C^{0,\alpha}$ . The parameter domain T is either  $\mathbb R$  or  $\mathbb R^n$  or an infinite dimensional convenient vector space. We prove and review results on  $C^M$ -dependence on t of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of A(t).

**Theorem.** Let  $t \mapsto A(t)$  for  $t \in T$  be a parameterized family of unbounded operators in a Hilbert space H with common domain of definition and with compact resolvent. If  $t \in T = \mathbb{R}$  and all A(t) are self-adjoint then the following holds:

- (A) If A(t) is real analytic in  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of A(t) can be parameterized real analytically in t.
- (B) If A(t) is quasianalytic of class  $C^Q$  in  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of A(t) can be parameterized  $C^Q$  in t.
- (C) If A(t) is non-quasianalytic of class  $C^L$  in  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and if no two different continuously parameterized eigenvalues (e.g., ordered by size) meet of infinite order at any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of A(t) can be parameterized  $C^L$  in t.
- (D) If A(t) is  $C^{\infty}$  in  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and if no two different continuously parameterized eigenvalues meet of infinite order at any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of A(t) can be parameterized  $C^{\infty}$  in t.
- (E) If A(t) is  $C^{\infty}$  in  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then the eigenvalues of A(t) can be parameterized twice differentiably in t.
- (F) If A(t) is  $C^{1,\alpha}$  in  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  for some  $\alpha > 0$ , then the eigenvalues of A(t) can be parameterized  $C^1$  in t.

If  $t \in T = \mathbb{R}$  and all A(t) are normal then the following holds:

- (G) If A(t) is real analytic in  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then for each  $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and for each eigenvalue  $z_0$  of  $A(t_0)$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  such that the eigenvalues near  $z_0$  of  $A(t_0 \pm s^N)$  and their eigenvectors can be parameterized real analytically in s near s = 0.
- (H) If A(t) is quasianalytic of class  $C^Q$  in  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then for each  $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and for each eigenvalue  $z_0$  of  $A(t_0)$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  such that the eigenvalues near  $z_0$  of  $A(t_0 \pm s^N)$  and their eigenvectors can be parameterized  $C^Q$  in s near s = 0.
- (I) If A(t) is non-quasianalytic of class  $C^L$  in  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then for each  $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and for each eigenvalue  $z_0$  of  $A(t_0)$  at which no two of the different continuously

Date: April 24, 2012.

<sup>2000</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification. 26C10, 26E10, 47A55.

Key words and phrases. Perturbation theory, differentiable choice of eigenvalues and eigenvectors, Denjoy–Carleman ultradifferentiable functions.

AK was supported by FWF-Project P 23028-N13, PM by FWF-Project P 21030-N13, AR by FWF-Projects J 2771-N13 and P 22218-N13.

- parameterized eigenvalues (which is always possible by [12, II 5.2]) meet of infinite order, there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  such that the eigenvalues near  $z_0$  of  $A(t_0 \pm s^N)$  and their eigenvectors can be parameterized  $C^L$  in s near s = 0.
- (J) If A(t) is  $C^{\infty}$  in  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then for each  $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and for each eigenvalue  $z_0$  of  $A(t_0)$  at which no two of the different continuously parameterized eigenvalues meet of infinite order, there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  such that the eigenvalues near  $z_0$  of  $A(t_0 \pm s^N)$  and their eigenvectors can be parameterized  $C^{\infty}$  in s near s = 0.
- (K) If A(t) is  $C^{\infty}$  in  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then for each  $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and for each eigenvalue  $z_0$  of  $A(t_0)$  at which no two of the different continuously parameterized eigenvalues meet of infinite order, the eigenvalues near  $z_0$  of A(t) and their eigenvectors can be parameterized by absolutely continuous functions in t near  $t = t_0$ .

If  $t \in T = \mathbb{R}^n$  and all A(t) are normal then the following holds:

- (L) If A(t) is real analytic or quasianalytic of class  $C^Q$  in  $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , then for each  $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and for each eigenvalue  $z_0$  of  $A(t_0)$ , there exist a neighborhood D of  $z_0$  in  $\mathbb{C}$ , a neighborhood W of  $t_0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and a finite covering  $\{\pi_k : U_k \to W\}$  of W, where each  $\pi_k$  is a composite of finitely many mappings each of which is either a local blow-up along a real analytic or  $C^Q$  submanifold or a local power substitution, such that the eigenvalues of  $A(\pi_k(s))$ ,  $s \in U_k$ , in D and the corresponding eigenvectors can be parameterized real analytically or  $C^Q$  in s. If A is self-adjoint, then we do not need power substitutions.
- (M) If A(t) is real analytic or quasianalytic of class  $C^Q$  in  $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , then for each  $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and for each eigenvalue  $z_0$  of  $A(t_0)$ , there exist a neighborhood D of  $z_0$  in  $\mathbb{C}$  and a neighborhood W of  $t_0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that the eigenvalues of A(t),  $t \in W$ , in D and the corresponding eigenvectors can be parameterized by functions which are special functions of bounded variation (SBV), see [9] or [3], in t.

If  $t \in T \subseteq E$ , a  $c^{\infty}$ -open subset in a finite or infinite dimensional convenient vector space then the following holds:

- (N) For  $0 < \alpha \le 1$ , if A(t) is  $C^{0,\alpha}$  (Hölder continuous of exponent  $\alpha$ ) in  $t \in T$  and all A(t) are self-adjoint, then the eigenvalues of A(t) can be parameterized  $C^{0,\alpha}$  in t.
- (O) For  $0 < \alpha \le 1$ , if A(t) is  $C^{0,\alpha}$  in  $t \in T$  and all A(t) are normal, then we have: For each  $t_0 \in T$  and each eigenvalue  $z_0$  of  $A(t_0)$  consider a simple closed  $C^1$ -curve  $\gamma$  in the resolvent set of  $A(t_0)$  enclosing only  $z_0$  among all eigenvalues of  $A(t_0)$ . Then for t near  $t_0$  in the  $c^{\infty}$ -topology on T, no eigenvalue of A(t) lies on  $\gamma$ . Let  $\lambda(t) = (\lambda_1(t), \ldots, \lambda_N(t))$  be the N-tuple of all eigenvalues (repeated according to their multiplicity) of A(t) inside of  $\gamma$ . Then  $t \mapsto \lambda(t)$  is  $C^{0,\alpha}$  for t near  $t_0$  with respect to the non-separating metric

$$d(\lambda, \mu) = \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \max_{1 \le i \le N} |\lambda_i - \mu_{\sigma(i)}|$$

 $on\ the\ space\ of\ N\mbox{-}tuples.$ 

Part (A) is due to Rellich [22] in 1942, see also [4] and [12, VII 3.9]. Part (D) has been proved in [2, 7.8], see also [13, 50.16], in 1997, which contains also a different proof of (A). (E) and (F) have been proved in [14] in 2003. (G) was proved in [19, 7.1]; it can be proved as (H) with some obvious changes, but it is not a special case since  $C^{\omega}$  does not correspond to a sequence which is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersection (see 'definitions and remarks' below and [16]). (J) and (K) were proved in [19, 7.1]. (N) was proved in [17].

The purpose of this paper is to prove the remaining parts (B), (C), (H), (I), (L), (M), and (O).

**Definitions and remarks.** Let  $M = (M_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}}$  be an increasing sequence  $(M_{k+1} \geq M_k)$  of positive real numbers with  $M_0 = 1$ . Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be open. We denote by  $C^M(U)$  the set of all  $f \in C^{\infty}(U)$  such that, for each compact  $K \subseteq U$ , there exist positive constants C and  $\rho$  such that

$$|\partial^{\alpha} f(x)| \leq C \, \rho^{|\alpha|} \, |\alpha|! \, M_{|\alpha|} \quad \text{ for all } \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n \text{ and } x \in K.$$

The set  $C^M(U)$  is a *Denjoy-Carleman class* of functions on U. If  $M_k = 1$ , for all k, then  $C^M(U)$  coincides with the ring  $C^\omega(U)$  of real analytic functions on U. In general,  $C^\omega(U) \subseteq C^M(U) \subseteq C^\infty(U)$ .

Throughout this paper  $Q = (Q_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence as above which is log-convex (i.e.,  $Q_k^2 \leq Q_{k-1}Q_{k+1}$  for all k), derivation closed (i.e.,  $\sup_k (Q_{k+1}/Q_k)^{1/k} < \infty$ ), quasianalytic (i.e.,  $\sum_k (k! \, Q_k)^{-1/k} = \infty$ ), and which is also an  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersection. We say that Q is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersection if  $C^Q = \bigcap \{C^N : N \text{ non-quasianalytic, log-convex}, N \geq Q\}$ . Moreover,  $L = (L_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence as above which is log-convex, derivation closed, and non-quasianalytic. Then  $C^Q$  and  $C^L$  are closed under composition and allow for the implicit function theorem. See [16] or [15] and references therein.

That A(t) is a real analytic,  $C^M$  (where M is either Q or L),  $C^{\infty}$ , or  $C^{k,\alpha}$  family of unbounded operators means the following: There is a dense subspace V of the Hilbert space H such that V is the domain of definition of each A(t), and such that  $A(t)^* = A(t)$  in the self-adjoint case, or A(t) has closed graph and  $A(t)A(t)^* = A(t)^*A(t)$  wherever defined in the normal case. Moreover, we require that  $t \mapsto \langle A(t)u, v \rangle$  is of the respective differentiability class for each  $u \in V$  and  $v \in H$ . From now on we treat only  $C^M = C^{\omega}$ ,  $C^M$  for M = Q, M = L, and  $C^M = C^{0,\alpha}$ .

This implies that  $t \mapsto A(t)u$  is of the same class  $C^M(T, H)$  (where T is either  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ) or is in  $C^{0,\alpha}(T,H)$  (if T is a convenient vector space) for each  $u \in V$  by [13, 2.14.4, 10.3] for  $C^{\omega}$ , by [15, 3.1, 3.3, 3.5] for M = L, by [16, 1.10, 2.1, 2.3] for M = Q, and by [13, 2.3], [11, 2.6.2] or [10, 4.14.4] for  $C^{0,\alpha}$  because  $C^{0,\alpha}$  can be described by boundedness conditions only and for these the uniform boundedness principle is valid.

A sequence of functions  $\lambda_i$  is said to parameterize the eigenvalues, if for each  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  the cardinality  $|\{i : \lambda_i(t) = z\}|$  equals the multiplicity of z as eigenvalue of A(t).

Let X be a  $C^{\omega}$  or  $C^{Q}$  manifold. A local blow-up  $\Phi$  over an open subset U of X means the composition  $\Phi = \iota \circ \varphi$  of a blow-up  $\varphi : U' \to U$  with center a  $C^{\omega}$  or  $C^{Q}$  submanifold and of the inclusion  $\iota : U \to X$ . A local power substitution is a mapping  $\Psi : V \to X$  of the form  $\Psi = \iota \circ \psi$ , where  $\iota : W \to X$  is the inclusion of a coordinate chart W of X and  $\psi : V \to W$  is given by

$$(y_1,\ldots,y_q)=((-1)^{\epsilon_1}x_1^{\gamma_1},\ldots,(-1)^{\epsilon_q}x_q^{\gamma_q}),$$

for some  $\gamma=(\gamma_1,\ldots,\gamma_q)\in (\mathbb{N}_{>0})^q$  and all  $\epsilon=(\epsilon_1,\ldots,\epsilon_q)\in \{0,1\}^q$ , where  $y_1,\ldots,y_q$  denote the coordinates of W (and  $q=\dim X$ ).

This paper became possible only after some of the results of [15] and [16] were proved, in particular the uniform boundedness principles. The wish to prove the results of this paper was the main motivation for us to work on [15] and [16].

**Applications.** For brevity we confine ourselves to  $C^Q$ ; the same applies to  $C^{\omega}$ . Let X be a compact  $C^Q$  manifold and let  $t \mapsto g_t$  be a  $C^Q$ -curve of  $C^Q$  Riemannian metrics on X. Then we get the corresponding  $C^Q$  curve  $t \mapsto \Delta(g_t)$  of Laplace-Beltrami operators on  $L^2(X)$ . By theorem (B) the eigenvalues and eigenvectors

can be arranged  $C^Q$  in t. By [1], the eigenfunctions are also  $C^Q$  as functions on X (at least for those  $C^Q$  which can be described by a weight function, see [7]). Question: Are the eigenvectors viewed as eigenfunctions then also in  $C^Q(X \times \mathbb{R})$ ?

Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded region in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $C^Q$  boundary, and let  $H(t) = -\Delta + V(t)$  be a  $C^Q$ -curve of Schrödinger operators with varying  $C^Q$  potential and Dirichlet boundary conditions. Then the eigenvalues and eigenvectors can be arranged  $C^Q$  in t. Question: Are the eigenvectors viewed as eigenfunctions then also in  $C^Q(\Omega \times \mathbb{R})$ ?

**Example.** This is an elaboration of [2, 7.4] and [14, Example]. Let S(2) be the vector space of all symmetric real  $(2 \times 2)$ -matrices. We use the  $C^L$ -curve lemma [15, 3.6] or [16, 2.5]: For each L, there exist sequences  $\mu_n \to \infty$ ,  $t_n \to t_\infty$ ,  $s_n > 0$  in  $\mathbb R$  with the following property: For  $\mu_n$ -converging sequences  $A_n, B_n \in S(2)$ , i.e.,  $\mu_n A_n$  and  $\mu_n B_n$  are bounded in S(2), there exists a curve  $A \in C^L(\mathbb R, S(2))$  such that  $A(t_n + t) = A_n + tB_n$  for  $|t| \leq s_n$ .

Choose a sequence  $\nu_n$  of reals satisfying  $\mu_n\nu_n\to 0$  and  $(\nu_n)^n\le s_n$  for all n and use the  $C^L$ -curve lemma for

$$A_n := (\nu_n)^{n+1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_n := \nu_n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The eigenvalues of  $A_n + tB_n$  and their derivatives are

$$\lambda_n(t) = \pm \nu_n \sqrt{(\nu_n)^{2n} + t^2}, \quad \lambda'_n(t) = \pm \frac{\nu_n t}{\sqrt{(\nu_n)^{2n} + t^2}}.$$

Then

$$\frac{\lambda'(t_n + (\nu_n)^n) - \lambda'(t_n)}{((\nu_n)^n)^{\alpha}} = \frac{\lambda'_n((\nu_n)^n) - \lambda'_n(0)}{(\nu_n)^{n\alpha}} = \pm \frac{\nu_n}{(\nu_n)^{n\alpha}\sqrt{2}}$$
$$= \pm \frac{(\nu_n)^{1-n\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}} \to \infty \text{ for } \alpha > 0.$$

So the condition (in (C), (D), (I), (J), and (K)) that no two different continuously parameterized eigenvalues meet of infinite order cannot be dropped. By [2, 2.1], we may always find a twice differentiable square root of a non-negative smooth function, so that the eigenvalues  $\lambda$  are functions which are twice differentiable but not  $C^{1,\alpha}$  for any  $\alpha > 0$ .

Note that the normed eigenvectors cannot be chosen continuously in this example (see also example [21,  $\S 2$ ]). Namely, we have

$$A(t_n) = (\nu_n)^{n+1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A(t_n + (\nu_n)^n) = (\nu_n)^{n+1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Resolvent Lemma.** Let  $C^M$  be any of  $C^{\omega}$ ,  $C^Q$ ,  $C^L$ ,  $C^{\infty}$ , or  $C^{0,\alpha}$ , and let A(t) be normal. If A is  $C^M$  then the resolvent  $(t,z) \mapsto (A(t)-z)^{-1} \in L(H,H)$  is  $C^M$  on its natural domain, the global resolvent set

$$\{(t,z)\in T\times\mathbb{C}:(A(t)-z):V\to H\ is\ invertible\}$$

which is open (and even connected).

**Proof.** By definition the function  $t \mapsto \langle A(t)v, u \rangle$  is of class  $C^M$  for each  $v \in V$  and  $u \in H$ . We may conclude that the mapping  $t \mapsto A(t)v$  is of class  $C^M$  into H as follows: For  $C^M = C^\infty$  we use [13, 2.14.4]. For  $C^M = C^\omega$  we use in addition [13, 10.3]. For  $C^M = C^Q$  or  $C^M = C^L$  we use [16, 2.1] and/or [15, 3.3] where we replace  $\mathbb{R}$  by  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For  $C^M = C^{0,\alpha}$  we use [13, 2.3], [11, 2.6.2], or [10, 4.1.14] because  $C^{0,\alpha}$  can be described by boundedness conditions only and for these the uniform boundedness principle is valid.

For each t consider the norm  $||u||_t^2 := ||u||^2 + ||A(t)u||^2$  on V. Since A(t) is closed,  $(V, || ||_t)$  is again a Hilbert space with inner product  $\langle u, v \rangle_t := \langle u, v \rangle + \langle A(t)u, A(t)v \rangle$ .

(1) Claim (see [2, in the proof of 7.8], [13, in the proof of 50.16], or [14, Claim 1]). All these norms  $\| \ \|_t$  on V are equivalent, locally uniformly in t. We then equip V with one of the equivalent Hilbert norms, say  $\| \ \|_0$ .

We reduce this to  $C^{0,\alpha}$ . Namely, note first that  $A(t):(V,\|\ \|_s)\to H$  is bounded since the graph of A(t) is closed in  $H\times H$ , contained in  $V\times H$  and thus also closed in  $(V,\|\ \|_s)\times H$ . For fixed  $u,v\in V$ , the function  $t\mapsto \langle u,v\rangle_t=\langle u,v\rangle+\langle A(t)u,A(t)v\rangle$  is  $C^{0,\alpha}$  since so is  $t\mapsto A(t)u$ . By the multilinear uniform boundedness principle ([13, 5.18] or [11, 3.7.4]) the mapping  $t\mapsto \langle\ ,\ \rangle_t$  is  $C^{0,\alpha}$  into the space of bounded sesquilinear forms on  $(V,\|\ \|_s)$  for each fixed s. Thus the inverse image of  $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_s+\frac{1}{2}$  (unit ball) in  $L(\overline{(V,\|\ \|_s)}\oplus (V,\|\ \|_s);\mathbb{C})$  is a  $c^\infty$ -open neighborhood U of s in T. Thus  $\sqrt{1/2}\|u\|_s\leq \|u\|_t\leq \sqrt{3/2}\|u\|_s$  for all  $t\in U$ , i.e., all Hilbert norms  $\|\ \|_t$  are locally uniformly equivalent, and claim (1) follows.

By the linear uniform boundedness theorem we see that  $t\mapsto A(t)$  is in  $C^M(T,L(V,H))$  as follows (here it suffices to use a set of linear functionals which together recognize bounded sets instead of the whole dual): For  $C^M=C^\infty$  we use [13, 1.7, 2.14.3]. For  $C^M=C^\omega$  we use in addition [13, 9.4]. For  $C^M=C^Q$  or  $C^M=C^L$  we use [16, 2.2, 2.3] and/or [15, 3.5] where we replace  $\mathbb R$  by  $\mathbb R^n$ . For  $C^M=C^{0,\alpha}$  see above.

If for some  $(t,z) \in T \times \mathbb{C}$  the bounded operator  $A(t) - z : V \to H$  is invertible, then this is true locally with respect to the  $c^{\infty}$ -topology on the product which is the product topology by [13, 4.16], and  $(t,z) \mapsto (A(t)-z)^{-1} : H \to V$  is  $C^M$ , by the chain rule, since inversion is real analytic on the Banach space L(V,H).

Note that  $(A(t)-z)^{-1}: H \to H$  is a compact operator for some (equivalently any) (t,z) if and only if the inclusion  $i: V \to H$  is compact, since  $i = (A(t)-z)^{-1} \circ (A(t)-z): V \to H \to H$ .

Polynomial proposition. Let P be a curve of polynomials

$$P(t)(x) = x^n - a_1(t)x^{n-1} + \dots + (-1)^n a_n(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

- (a) If P is hyperbolic (i.e., all roots of P(t) are real for each fixed t) and if the coefficient functions  $a_i$  are all  $C^Q$  then there exist  $C^Q$  functions  $\lambda_i$  which parameterize all roots.
- (b) If P is hyperbolic, the coefficient functions  $a_i$  are  $C^L$ , and no two of the different continuously arranged roots (e.g., ordered by size) meet of infinite order, then there exist  $C^L$  functions  $\lambda_i$  which parameterize all roots.
- (c) If the coefficient functions  $a_i$  are  $C^Q$ , then for each  $t_0$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  such that the roots of  $s \mapsto P(t_0 \pm s^N)$  can be parameterized  $C^Q$  in s for s near 0
- (d) If the coefficient functions  $a_i$  are  $C^L$  and no two of the different continuously arranged roots (by [12, II 5.2]) meet of infinite order, then for each  $t_0$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  such that the roots of  $s \mapsto P(t_0 \pm s^N)$  can be parameterized  $C^L$  in s for s near  $\theta$ .

All  $C^Q$  or  $C^L$  solutions differ by permutations.

The proof of parts (a) and (b) is exactly as in [2] where the corresponding results were proven for  $C^{\infty}$  instead of  $C^{L}$ , and for  $C^{\omega}$  instead of  $C^{Q}$ . For this we need only the following properties of  $C^{Q}$  and  $C^{L}$ :

- They allow for the implicit function theorem (for [2, 3.3]).
- They contain  $C^{\omega}$  and are closed under composition (for [2, 3.4]).
- They are derivation closed (for [2, 3.7]).

Part (a) is also in [8, 7.6] which follows [2]. It also follows from the multidimensional version [20, 6.10] since blow-ups in dimension 1 are trivial. The proofs of parts (c) and (d) are exactly as in [19, 3.2] where the corresponding result was proven for  $C^{\omega}$  instead of  $C^{Q}$ , and for  $C^{\infty}$  instead of  $C^{L}$ , if none of the different roots meet of infinite order. For these we need the properties of  $C^{Q}$  and  $C^{L}$  listed above.

**Matrix proposition.** Let A(t) for  $t \in T$  be a family of  $(N \times N)$ -matrices.

- (e) If  $T = \mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto A(t)$  is a  $C^Q$ -curve of Hermitian matrices, then the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors can be chosen  $C^Q$ .
- (f) If  $T = \mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto A(t)$  is a  $C^L$ -curve of Hermitian matrices such that no two different continuously arranged eigenvalues meet of infinite order, then the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors can be chosen  $C^L$ .
- (g) If  $T = \mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto A(t)$  is a  $C^L$ -curve of normal matrices such that no two different continuously arranged eigenvalues meet of infinite order, then for each  $t_0$  there exists  $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  such that the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of  $s \mapsto A(t_0 \pm s^{N_1})$  can be parameterized  $C^L$  in s for s near 0.
- (h) Let  $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be open and let  $T \ni t \mapsto A(t)$  be a  $C^\omega$  or  $C^Q$ -mapping of normal matrices. Let  $K \subseteq T$  be compact. Then there exist a neighborhood W of K, and a finite covering  $\{\pi_k : U_k \to W\}$  of W, where each  $\pi_k$  is a composite of finitely many mappings each of which is either a local blow-up along a  $C^\omega$  or  $C^Q$  submanifold or a local power substitution, such that the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of  $A(\pi_k(s))$  can be chosen  $C^\omega$  or  $C^Q$  in s. Consequently, the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of A(t) are locally special functions of bounded variation (SBV). If A is a family of Hermitian matrices, then we do not need power substitutions.

The proof of the matrix proposition in case (e) and (f) is exactly as in [2, 7.6], using the polynomial proposition and properties of  $C^Q$  and  $C^L$ . Item (g) is exactly as in [19, 6.2], using the polynomial proposition and properties of  $C^L$ . Item (h) is proved in [20, 9.1, 9.6], see also [18].

**Proof of the theorem.** We have to prove parts (B), (C), (H), (I), (L), (M), and (O). So let  $C^M$  be any of  $C^\omega$ ,  $C^Q$ ,  $C^L$ , or  $C^{0,\alpha}$ , and let A(t) be normal. Let z be an eigenvalue of  $A(t_0)$  of multiplicity N. We choose a simple closed  $C^1$  curve  $\gamma$  in the resolvent set of  $A(t_0)$  for fixed  $t_0$  enclosing only z among all eigenvalues of  $A(t_0)$ . Since the global resolvent set is open, see the resolvent lemma, no eigenvalue of A(t) lies on  $\gamma$ , for t near  $t_0$ . By the resolvent lemma,  $A: T \to L((V, \| \cdot \|_0), H)$  is  $C^M$ , thus also

$$t\mapsto -\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\gamma}(A(t)-z)^{-1}\;dz=:P(t,\gamma)=P(t)$$

is a  $C^M$  mapping. Each P(t) is a projection, namely onto the direct sum of all eigenspaces corresponding to eigenvalues of A(t) in the interior of  $\gamma$ , with finite rank. Thus the rank must be constant: It is easy to see that the (finite) rank cannot fall locally, and it cannot increase, since the distance in L(H,H) of P(t) to the subset of operators of rank  $\leq N = \operatorname{rank}(P(t_0))$  is continuous in t and is either 0 or 1.

So for t in a neighborhood U of  $t_0$  there are equally many eigenvalues in the interior of  $\gamma$ , and we may call them  $\lambda_i(t)$  for  $1 \le i \le N$  (repeated with multiplicity).

Now we consider the family of N-dimensional complex vector spaces  $t \mapsto P(t)H \subseteq H$ , for  $t \in U$ . They form a  $C^M$  Hermitian vector subbundle over U of  $U \times H \to U$ : For given t, choose  $v_1, \ldots, v_N \in H$  such that the  $P(t)v_i$  are linearly independent and thus span P(t)H. This remains true locally in t. Now we use the Gram Schmidt orthonormalization procedure (which is  $C^{\omega}$ ) for the  $P(t)v_i$  to obtain a local orthonormal  $C^M$  frame of the bundle.

Now A(t) maps P(t)H to itself; in a  $C^M$  local frame it is given by a normal  $(N \times N)$ -matrix parameterized  $C^M$  by  $t \in U$ .

Now all local assertions of the theorem follow:

- (B) Use the matrix proposition, part (e).
- (C) Use the matrix proposition, part (f).
- (H) Use the matrix proposition, part (h), and note that in dimension 1 blowups are trivial.
- (I) Use the matrix proposition, part (g).
- (L,M) Use the matrix proposition, part (h), for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .
  - (O) We use the following

**Result** ([6], [5, VII.4.1]) Let A, B be normal  $(N \times N)$ -matrices and let  $\lambda_i(A)$  and  $\lambda_i(B)$  for i = 1, ..., N denote the respective eigenvalues. Then

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \max_j |\lambda_j(A) - \lambda_{\sigma(j)}(B)| \le C ||A - B||$$

for a universal constant C with 1 < C < 3. Here  $\| \|$  is the operator norm.

Finally, it remains to extend the local choices to global ones for the cases (B) and (C) only. There  $t \mapsto A(t)$  is  $C^Q$  or  $C^L$ , respectively, which imply both  $C^\infty$ , and no two different eigenvalues meet of infinite order. So we may apply [2, 7.8] (in fact we need only the end of the proof) to conclude that the eigenvalues can be chosen  $C^\infty$  on  $T = \mathbb{R}$ , uniquely up to a global permutation. By the local result above they are then  $C^Q$  or  $C^L$ . The same proof then gives us, for each eigenvalue  $\lambda_i: T \to \mathbb{R}$  with generic multiplicity N, a unique N-dimensional smooth vector subbundle of  $\mathbb{R} \times H$  whose fiber over t consists of eigenvectors for the eigenvalue  $\lambda_i(t)$ . In fact this vector bundle is  $C^Q$  or  $C^L$  by the local result above, namely the matrix proposition, part (e) or (f), respectively.

## REFERENCES

- A. A. Albanese, D. Jornet, and A. Oliaro, Quasianalytic wave front sets for solutions of linear partial differential operators, Integral Equations Operator Theory 66 (2010), no. 2, 153-181.
- [2] D. Alekseevsky, A. Kriegl, M. Losik, and P. W. Michor, Choosing roots of polynomials smoothly, Israel J. Math. 105 (1998), 203–233.
- [3] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, and D. Pallara, Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.
- [4] H. Baumgärtel, Endlichdimensionale analytische Störungstheorie, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1972, Mathematische Lehrbücher und Monographien, II. Abteilung. Mathematische Monographien, Band 28.
- [5] R. Bhatia, Matrix analysis, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 169, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.
- [6] R. Bhatia, C. Davis, and A. McIntosh, Perturbation of spectral subspaces and solution of linear operator equations, Linear Algebra Appl. 52/53 (1983), 45–67.
- [7] J. Bonet, R. Meise, and S. N. Melikhov, A comparison of two different ways to define classes of ultradifferentiable functions, Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin 14 (2007), 424–444.
- [8] J. Chaumat and A.-M. Chollet, Division par un polynôme hyperbolique, Canad. J. Math. 56 (2004), no. 6, 1121–1144.
- [9] E. De Giorgi and L. Ambrosio, New functionals in the calculus of variations, Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. (8) 82 (1988), no. 2, 199–210 (1989).
- [10] C.-A. Faure, Théorie de la différentiation dans les espaces convenables, Ph.D. thesis, Université de Genéve, 1991.
- [11] A. Frölicher and A. Kriegl, Linear spaces and differentiation theory, Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York), John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, 1988, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [12] T. Kato, Perturbation theory for linear operators, second ed., Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 132, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976.

- [13] A. Kriegl and P. W. Michor, The convenient setting of global analysis, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 53, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997, http://www.ams.org/online\_bks/surv53/.
- [14] \_\_\_\_\_, Differentiable perturbation of unbounded operators, Math. Ann. **327** (2003), no. 1, 191–201.
- [15] A. Kriegl, P. W. Michor, and A. Rainer, The convenient setting for non-quasianalytic Denjoy-Carleman differentiable mappings, J. Funct. Anal. 256 (2009), 3510–3544.
- [16] \_\_\_\_\_, The convenient setting for quasianalytic Denjoy-Carleman differentiable mappings, Preprint, arXiv:0909.5632v1, 2009.
- [17] \_\_\_\_\_\_, Many parameter Hölder perturbation of unbounded operators, Preprint, arXiv:math.FA/0611506, 2009.
- [18] K. Kurdyka and L. Paunescu, Hyperbolic polynomials and multiparameter real-analytic perturbation theory, Duke Math. J. 141 (2008), no. 1, 123–149.
- [19] A. Rainer, Perturbation of complex polynomials and normal operators, Math. Nach. 282 (2009), no. 12, 1623–1636.
- [20] \_\_\_\_\_\_, Quasianalytic multiparameter perturbation of polynomials and normal matrices, to appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., arXiv:0905.0837, 2009.
- [21] F. Rellich, Störungstheorie der Spektralzerlegung, Math. Ann. 113 (1937), no. 1, 600-619.
- [22] \_\_\_\_\_, Störungstheorie der Spektralzerlegung. V, Math. Ann. 118 (1942), 462–484.

Andreas Kriegl: Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Wien, Nordbergstrasse 15, A-1090 Wien, Austria

 $E ext{-}mail\ address: andreas.kriegl@univie.ac.at}$ 

PETER W. MICHOR: FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT WIEN, NORDBERGSTRASSE 15, A-1090 WIEN, AUSTRIA

E-mail address: peter.michor@univie.ac.at

ARMIN RAINER: FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT WIEN, NORDBERGSTRASSE 15, A-1090 WIEN, AUSTRIA

E-mail address: armin.rainer@univie.ac.at