



HAL
open science

A POINCARÉ-STEKLOV MAP FOR THE MIT BAG MODEL

Badreddine Benhellal, Vincent Bruneau, Mahdi Zreik

► **To cite this version:**

Badreddine Benhellal, Vincent Bruneau, Mahdi Zreik. A POINCARÉ-STEKLOV MAP FOR THE MIT BAG MODEL. 2022. hal-03706471v2

HAL Id: hal-03706471

<https://hal.science/hal-03706471v2>

Preprint submitted on 18 Sep 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

A POINCARÉ-STEKLOV MAP FOR THE MIT BAG MODEL

BADREDDINE BENEHELLAL¹, VINCENT BRUNEAU², AND MAHDI ZREIK³

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this paper is to introduce and study Poincaré-Steklov (PS) operators associated to the Dirac operator D_m with the so-called MIT bag boundary condition. In a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, for a complex number z and for U_z a solution of $(D_m - z)U_z = 0$, the associated PS operator maps the value of $\Gamma_- U_z$, the MIT bag boundary value of U_z , to $\Gamma_+ U_z$, where Γ_\pm are projections along the boundary $\partial\Omega$ and $(\Gamma_- + \Gamma_+) = t_{\partial\Omega}$ is the trace operator on $\partial\Omega$.

In the first part of this paper, we show that the PS operator is a zero-order pseudodifferential operator and give its principal symbol. In the second part, we study the PS operator when the mass m is large, and we prove that it fits into the framework of $1/m$ -pseudodifferential operators, and we derive some important properties, especially its semiclassical principal symbol. Subsequently, we apply these results to establish a Krein-type resolvent formula for the Dirac operator $H_M = D_m + M\beta 1_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{\Omega}}$ for large masses $M > 0$, in terms of the resolvent of the MIT bag operator on Ω . With its help, the large coupling convergence with a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$ is shown.

1. INTRODUCTION

Motivation. Boundary integral operators have played a key role in the study of many boundary value problems for partial differential equations arising in various areas of mathematical physics, such as electromagnetism, elasticity, and potential theory. In particular, they are used as a tool for proving the existence of solutions as well as for their construction by means of integral equation methods, see, e.g., [20, 28, 29, 43].

The study of boundary integral operators has also been the motivation for the development of various tools and branches of mathematics, e.g., Fredholm theory, Singular integral and Pseudodifferential operators. Moreover, it turned out that functional analytic and spectral properties of some of these operators are strongly related to the regularity and geometric properties of surfaces, see for example [26, 25]. A typical and well-known example which occurs in many applications is the Dirichlet-to-Neumann (DtN) operator. In the classical setting of a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with a smooth boundary, the DtN operator, \mathcal{N} , is defined by

$$\mathcal{N} : H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega) \longrightarrow H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega), \quad g \longmapsto \mathcal{N}g = \Gamma_N U(g),$$

where $U(g)$ is the harmonic extension of g (i.e., $\Delta U(g) = 0$ in Ω and $\Gamma_D U = g$ on $\partial\Omega$). Here Γ_D and Γ_N denote the Dirichlet and the Neumann traces, respectively. In this setting, it is well known that the DtN operator fits into the framework of pseudodifferential operators, see e.g., [39]. Moreover, from the viewpoint of the spectral theory, several geometric properties of the eigenvalue problem for the DtN operator (such as isoperimetric inequalities, spectral asymptotics and geometric invariants) are closely related to the theory of minimal surfaces [21], as well as the problem of determining a complete Riemannian manifold with boundary from the Cauchy data of harmonic functions, see [31] (see also the survey [23] for further details).

The main goal of this paper is to introduce a Poincaré-Steklov map for the Dirac operator (i.e., an analogue of the DtN map for the Laplace operator) and to study its (semiclassical) pseudodifferential properties. Our main motivation for considering this operator is that it arises naturally in the study of the well-known Dirac operator with the MIT bag boundary condition, $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$, which will be rigorously defined below.

Description of main results. To give a rigorous definition of the operator we are dealing with in this paper and go more into details, we need to introduce some notations. Given $m > 0$, the free Dirac operator D_m on \mathbb{R}^3 is defined by $D_m := -i\alpha \cdot \nabla + m\beta$, where

$$\alpha_k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma_j \\ \sigma_j & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, 3, \quad \beta = \begin{pmatrix} I_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -I_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad I_2 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\text{and } \sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

are the family of Dirac and Pauli matrices. As usual, we use the notation $\alpha \cdot x = \sum_{j=1}^3 \alpha_j x_j$ for $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. We recall that D_m is self-adjoint in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ with $\text{dom}(D_m) = H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ (see, e.g., [42, subsection 1.4]),

Date: September 12, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 35Q40; Secondary 35P05, 81Q10, 81Q20.

Key words and phrases. Poincaré-Steklov operators, the MIT bag Model, h -Pseudodifferential operators, Large coupling limits.

and for the spectrum and the continuous spectrum, we have:

$$\mathrm{Sp}(D_m) = \mathrm{Sp}_{\mathrm{cont}}(D_m) = (-\infty, -m] \cup [m, +\infty).$$

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a domain with a compact smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, let n be the outward unit normal to Ω , and let Γ_{\pm} and P_{\pm} be the trace mappings and the orthogonal projections, respectively, defined by

$$\Gamma_{\pm} = P_{\pm}\Gamma_D : H^1(\Omega)^4 \longrightarrow P_{\pm}H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4 \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\pm} := \frac{1}{2}(I_4 \mp i\beta(\alpha \cdot n(x))), \quad x \in \partial\Omega.$$

In the present paper, we investigate the specific case of the Poincaré-Steklov (PS for short) operator, \mathcal{A}_m , defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_m : P_-H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4 \longrightarrow P_+H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4, \quad g \longmapsto \mathcal{A}_m(g) = \Gamma_+U_z,$$

where z belongs to the resolvent set of the MIT bag operator on Ω (i.e., $z \in \rho(H_{\mathrm{MIT}}(m))$), $U_z \in H^1(\Omega)^4$ is the unique solution to the following elliptic boundary problem:

$$\begin{cases} (D_m - z)U_z = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \Gamma_-U_z = g, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

We point out that in the R-matrix theory and the embedding method for the Dirac equation, similar operators linking on $\partial\Omega$ values of the upper and lower components of the spinor wavefunctions have been studied in [38, 1, 2, 17]. It corresponds to a different boundary condition (the trace of the upper/lower components) which is not necessarily elliptic. As far as we know, such operators for the MIT bag boundary condition have not been studied yet.

Let us now briefly describe the contents of the present paper. Our results are mainly concerned with the pseudodifferential properties of \mathcal{A}_m and their applications. Thus, our first goal is to show that \mathcal{A}_m fits into the framework of pseudodifferential operators. In Section 4, we show that when the mass m is fixed and $z \in \rho(D_m)$, then the Poincaré-Steklov operator \mathcal{A}_m is a classical homogeneous pseudodifferential operators of order 0, and that

$$\mathcal{A}_m = S \cdot \left(\frac{\nabla_{\partial\Omega} \wedge n}{\sqrt{-\Delta_{\partial\Omega}}} \right) P_- \quad \text{mod } OpS^{-1}(\partial\Omega),$$

where $S = i(\alpha \wedge \alpha)/2$ is the spin angular momentum, $\nabla_{\partial\Omega}$ and $\Delta_{\partial\Omega}$ are, respectively, the surface gradient and the Laplace-Beltrami operator on $\partial\Omega$ (equipped with the Riemann metric induced by the euclidian one in \mathbb{R}^3) and OpS^{-1} is the classical class of pseudodifferential operators of order -1 (see Theorem 4.1 for details). For $D_{\partial\Omega}$, the extrinsically defined Dirac operator introduced in Section 2.4, we also have:

$$\mathcal{A}_m = D_{\partial\Omega} (-\Delta_{\partial\Omega})^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_- \quad \text{mod } OpS^{-1}(\partial\Omega).$$

The proof of the above result is based on the fact that we have an explicit solution of the system (1.1) for any $z \in \rho(D_m)$, and in this case the PS operator takes the following layer potential form:

$$\mathcal{A}_m = -P_+\beta(\beta/2 + \mathcal{C}_{z,m})^{-1}P_-, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$ is the Cauchy operator associated with $(D_m - z)$ defined on $\partial\Omega$ in the principal value sense (see Subsection 2.2 for the precise definition). So the starting point of the proof is to analyze the pseudodifferential properties of the Cauchy operator. In this sense, we show that $2\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$ is equal, modulo $OpS^{-1}(\partial\Omega)$, to $\alpha \cdot (\nabla_{\partial\Omega}(-\Delta_{\partial\Omega})^{-1/2})$. Using this, the explicit layer potential description of \mathcal{A}_m , and the symbol calculus, we then prove that \mathcal{A}_m is a pseudodifferential operator and catch its principal symbol (see Theorem 4.1).

While the above strategy allows us to capture the pseudodifferential character of \mathcal{A}_m , but unfortunately it does not allow us to trace the dependence on the parameter m , and it also imposes a restriction on the spectral parameter z (i.e., $z \in \rho(D_m)$), whereas \mathcal{A}_m is well-defined for any $z \in \rho(H_{\mathrm{MIT}}(m))$. In Section 5, we address the m -dependence of the pseudodifferential properties of \mathcal{A}_m for any $z \in \rho(H_{\mathrm{MIT}}(m))$. Since we are mainly concerned with large masses m in our application, we treat this problem from the semiclassical point of view, where $h = 1/m \in (0, 1]$ is the semiclassical parameter. In fact, we show in Theorem 5.1 that $\mathcal{A}_{1/h}$ admits a semiclassical approximation, and that

$$\mathcal{A}_{1/h} = \frac{hD_{\partial\Omega}}{\sqrt{-h^2\Delta_{\partial\Omega} + I} + I} P_- \quad \text{mod } hOp^hS^{-1}(\partial\Omega).$$

The main idea of the proof is to use the system (1.1) instead of the explicit formula (1.2), and it is based on the following two steps. The first step is to construct a local approximate solution for the pushforward of the system (1.1) of the form

$$U^h(\tilde{x}, x_3) = Op^h(A^h(\cdot, \cdot, x_3))g = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} A^h(\tilde{x}, h\xi, x_3) e^{iy \cdot \xi} \hat{g}(\xi) d\xi, \quad (\tilde{x}, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, \infty),$$

where A^h belongs to a specific symbol class and has the following asymptotic expansion

$$A^h(\tilde{x}, \xi, x_3) \sim \sum_{j \geq 0} h^j A_j(\tilde{x}, \xi, x_3).$$

The second step is to show that when applying the trace mapping Γ_+ to the pull-back of $U^h(\cdot, 0)$ it coincides locally with $\mathcal{A}_{1/h}$ modulo a regularizing and negligible operator. At this point, the properties of the MIT bag operator become crucial, in particular, the regularization property of its resolvent which allows us to achieve this second step, as we will see in Section 5. The MIT bag operator on Ω is the Dirac operator on $L^2(\Omega)^4$ defined by

$$H_{\text{MIT}}(m)\psi = D_m\psi, \quad \forall \psi \in \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) := \{\psi \in H^1(\Omega)^4 : \Gamma_- \psi = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}.$$

It is well-known that $(H_{\text{MIT}}(m), \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)))$ is self-adjoint when Ω is smooth, see, e.g., [36]. In Section 3, we briefly discuss the basic spectral properties of $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$ when Ω is a domain with compact Lipschitz boundary (see Theorem 3.1). Moreover, in Theorem 3.2 we establish regularity results concerning the regularization property of the resolvent and the Sobolev regularity of the eigenfunctions of H_{MIT} . In particular, we prove that $(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1}$ is bounded from $H^n(\Omega)^4$ into $H^{n+1}(\Omega)^4 \cap \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, for all $n \geq 1$.

Motivated by the natural way in which the PS operator is related to the MIT bag operator, and to illustrate its usefulness, we consider in Section 6 the large mass problem for the self-adjoint Dirac operator $H_M = D_m + M\beta_{1\mathcal{U}}$, where $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. Indeed, it is known that, in the limit $M \rightarrow \infty$, every eigenvalue of $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$ is a limit of eigenvalues of H_M , cf. [4, 35] (see also [9, 14, 37] for the two-dimensional setting). Moreover, it is shown in [9, 14] that the two-dimensional analogue of H_M convergences to the two-dimensional analogue of $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$ in the norm resolvent sense with a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1/2})$.

The main goal of Section 6 is to address the following question: Let $M_0 > 0$ be large enough and fix $M \geq M_0$ and $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \cap \rho(H_M)$. Given $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ such that $f = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{\Omega}$, and $U \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$, what is the boundary value problem on Ω whose solutions closely approximate those of $(D_m + M\beta_{1\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{\Omega}} - z)U = f$?

It is worth noting that the answer to this question becomes trivial if one establishes an explicit formula for the resolvent of H_M . Having in mind the connection between the Dirac operators H_M and $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$, this leads us to address the following question: *for M sufficiently large, is it possible to relate the resolvents of H_M and H_{MIT} via a Krein-type resolvent formula?* In Theorem 6.1, which is the main result of Section 6, we establish a Krein-type resolvent formula for H_M in terms of the resolvent of $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$. The key point to establish this result is to treat the elliptic problem $(H_M - z)U = f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ as a transmission problem (where $\Gamma_{\pm}U|_{\Omega} = \Gamma_{\pm}U|_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega}$ are the transmission conditions) and to use the semiclassical properties of the Poincaré-Steklov operators in order to invert the auxiliary operator $\Psi_M(z)$ acting on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ (see Theorem 6.1 for the precise definition). In addition, we prove an adapted Birman-Schwinger principle relating the eigenvalues of H_M in the gap $(-(m+M), m+M)$ with a spectral property of $\Psi_M(z)$. With their help, we show in Corollary 6.1 that the restriction of U on Ω satisfies the elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} (D_m - z)U|_{\Omega} = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \Gamma_- U|_{\Omega} = \mathcal{B}_M \Gamma_+ R_{\text{MIT}}(z)f & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \Gamma_+ U|_{\Omega} = \Gamma_+ R_{\text{MIT}}(z)f + \mathcal{A}_m \Gamma_- v & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where \mathcal{B}_M is a semiclassical pseudodifferential operators of order 0. Here, the semiclassical parameter is $1/M$. Moreover, we show that the convergence of H_M to H_{MIT} in the norm-resolvent sense indeed holds with a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$, which improves previous works, see Proposition 6.2. The most important ingredient in proving these results is the use of the Krein formula relating the resolvents of H_M and $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$, as well as regularity estimates for the PS operators (see Theorem 6.1) and layer potential operators (see Lemma 6.1 for details).

Organization of the paper. The paper is organized as follows. Sections 2 and 3 are devoted to preliminaries for the sake of completeness and self-containedness of the paper. In Section 2 we set up some notations and we recall some basic properties of boundary integral operator associated with $(D_m - z)$. Section 3 is devoted to the study of the MIT bag operator, where we gather its basic properties in Theorem 3.1 and we establish the regularization property of its resolvent in Theorem 3.2. In Section 4 we establish Theorem 4.1, proving that the PS operator is a classical pseudodifferential operator. Then, in Section 5 we study the PS operator from viewpoint of semiclassical pseudodifferential operators, the main result being Theorem 5.1. Finally, Section 6 is devoted to the study of the large mass problem for the operator H_M . There, we prove Theorem 6.1 regarding the Krein-type resolvent formula and we solve the large mass problem, and Proposition 6.2 on the resolvent convergence.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we gather some well-known results about boundary integral operators. We also recall some properties of symbol classes and their associated pseudodifferential operators. Before proceeding further, however, we need to introduce some notations that we will use in what follows.

2.1. Notations. Throughout this paper we will write $a \lesssim b$ if there is $C > 0$ so that $a \leq Cb$ and $a \lesssim_h b$ if the constant C depends on the parameter h . As usual, the letter C stands for some constant which may change its value at different occurrences.

For a bounded or unbounded Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, we write $\partial\Omega$ for its boundary and we denote by n and σ the outward pointing normal to Ω and the surface measure on $\partial\Omega$, respectively. By $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4 := L^2(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{C}^4)$ (resp. $L^2(\Omega)^4 := L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{C}^4)$) we denote the usual L^2 -space over \mathbb{R}^3 (resp. Ω), and we let $r_\Omega : L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4 \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)^4$ be the restriction operator on Ω and $e_\Omega : L^2(\Omega)^4 \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ its adjoint operator, i.e., the extension by 0 outside of Ω .

For $s \in [0, 1]$, we define the usual Sobolev space $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)^4$ as

$$H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)^4 := \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)^4 : \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |\xi|^2)^s |\mathcal{F}[u](\xi)|^2 d\xi < \infty\},$$

where $\mathcal{F} : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the unitary Fourier-Plancherel operator, and we let $H^s(\Omega)^4$ to be standard L^2 -based Sobolev space of order s . By $L^2(\partial\Omega)^4 := L^2(\partial\Omega, d\sigma)^4$ we denote the usual L^2 -space over $\partial\Omega$. If Ω is a C^2 -smooth domain with a compact boundary $\partial\Omega$, then the Sobolev space of order $s \in (0, 1]$ along the boundary, $H^s(\partial\Omega)^4$, is defined using local coordinates representation on the surface $\partial\Omega$. As usual, we use the symbol $H^{-s}(\partial\Omega)^4$ to denote the dual space of $H^s(\partial\Omega)^4$. We denote by $t_{\partial\Omega} : H^1(\Omega)^4 \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$ the classical trace operator, and by $\mathcal{E}_\Omega : H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4 \rightarrow H^1(\Omega)^4$ the extension operator, that is

$$t_{\partial\Omega}\mathcal{E}_\Omega[f] = f, \quad \forall f \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4.$$

Throughout the current paper, we denote by P_\pm the orthogonal projections defined by

$$P_\pm := \frac{1}{2}(I_4 \mp i\beta(\alpha \cdot n(x))), \quad x \in \partial\Omega. \quad (2.1)$$

We use the symbol $H(\alpha, \Omega)$ for the Dirac-Sobolev space on a smooth domain Ω defined as

$$H(\alpha, \Omega) = \{\varphi \in L^2(\Omega)^4 : (\alpha \cdot \nabla)\varphi \in L^2(\Omega)^4\}, \quad (2.2)$$

which is a Hilbert space (see [36, Section 2.3]) endowed with the following scalar product

$$\langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_{H(\alpha, \Omega)} = \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_{L^2(\Omega)^4} + \langle (\alpha \cdot \nabla)\varphi, (\alpha \cdot \nabla)\psi \rangle_{L^2(\Omega)^4}, \quad \varphi, \psi \in H(\alpha, \Omega).$$

We also recall that the trace operator $t_{\partial\Omega}$ extends into a continuous map $t_{\partial\Omega} : H(\alpha, \Omega) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$. Moreover, if $v \in H(\alpha, \Omega)$ and $t_{\partial\Omega}v \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$, then $v \in H^1(\Omega)^4$, cf. [36, Proposition 2.1 & Proposition 2.16].

2.2. Boundary integral operators. The aim of this part is to introduce boundary integral operators associated with the fundamental solution of the free Dirac operator D_m and to summarize some of their well-known properties.

For $z \in \rho(D_m)$, with the convention that $\text{Im}\sqrt{z^2 - m^2} > 0$, the fundamental solution of $(D_m - z)$ is given by

$$\phi_m^z(x) = \frac{e^{i\sqrt{z^2 - m^2}|x|}}{4\pi|x|} \left(z + m\beta + (1 - i\sqrt{z^2 - m^2}|x|)i\alpha \cdot \frac{x}{|x|^2} \right), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}. \quad (2.3)$$

We define the potential operator $\Phi_{z,m}^\Omega : L^2(\partial\Omega)^4 \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)^4$ by

$$\Phi_{z,m}^\Omega[g](x) = \int_{\partial\Omega} \phi_m^z(x-y)g(y)d\sigma(y), \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, \quad (2.4)$$

and the Cauchy operators $\mathcal{C}_{z,m} : L^2(\partial\Omega)^4 \rightarrow L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$ as the singular integral operator acting as

$$\mathcal{C}_{z,m}[f](x) = \lim_{\rho \searrow 0} \int_{|x-y|>\rho} \phi_m^z(x-y)f(y)d\sigma(y), \quad \text{for } \sigma\text{-a.e. } x \in \partial\Omega, f \in L^2(\partial\Omega)^4. \quad (2.5)$$

It is well known that $\Phi_{z,m}^\Omega$ and $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$ are bounded and everywhere defined (see, for instance, [7, Section. 2]), and that

$$((\alpha \cdot n)\mathcal{C}_{z,m})^2 = (\mathcal{C}_{z,m}(\alpha \cdot n))^2 = -4I_4, \quad \forall z \in \rho(D_m), \quad (2.6)$$

holds in $L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$, cf. [8, Lemma 2.2]. In particular, the inverse $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}^{-1} = -4(\alpha \cdot n)\mathcal{C}_{z,m}(\alpha \cdot n)$ exists and is bounded and everywhere defined. Since we have $\phi_m^z(y-x)^* = \phi_m^{\bar{z}}(x-y)$ for all $z \in \rho(D_m)$, it follows that $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}^* = \mathcal{C}_{\bar{z},m}$ as operators in $L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$. In particular, $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$ is self-adjoint in $L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$ for all $z \in (-m, m)$.

Next, recall that the trace of the single layer operator, S_z , associated with the Helmholtz operator $(-\Delta + m^2 - z^2)I_4$ is defined, for every $f \in L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$ and $z \in \rho(D_m)$, by

$$S_z[f](x) := \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{e^{i\sqrt{z^2 - m^2}|x-y|}}{4\pi|x-y|} I_4 f(y) d\sigma(y), \quad \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega.$$

It is well-known that S_z is bounded from $L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$ into $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$, and it is a positive operator in $L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$ for all $z \in (-m, m)$, cf. [8, Lemma 4.2]. Now we define the operator Λ_m^z by

$$\Lambda_m^z = \frac{1}{2}\beta + \mathcal{C}_{z,m}, \quad \text{for all } z \in \rho(D_m),$$

which is clearly a bounded operator from $L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$ into itself.

In the next lemma we collect the main properties of the operators $\Phi_{z,m}^\Omega$, $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$ and Λ_m^z .

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that Ω is C^2 -smooth. Given $z \in \rho(D_m)$ and let $\Phi_{z,m}^\Omega$, $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$ and Λ_m^z be as above. Then the following hold true:*

- (i) *The operator $\Phi_{z,m}^\Omega$ is bounded from $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$ to $H^1(\Omega)^4$, and extends into a bounded operator from $H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$ to $H(\alpha, \Omega)$. Moreover, it holds that*

$$t_{\partial\Omega} \Phi_{z,m}^\Omega[f] = \left(-\frac{i}{2}(\alpha \cdot n) + \mathcal{C}_{z,m} \right) [f], \quad \forall f \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4. \quad (2.7)$$

- (ii) *The operator $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$ gives rise to a bounded operator $\mathcal{C}_{z,m} : H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4 \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$.*

- (iii) *The operator $\Lambda_m^z : H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4 \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$ is bounded invertible for all $z \in \rho(D_m)$.*

Proof. (i) The proof of the boundedness of $\Phi_{z,m}^\Omega$ from $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$ into $H^1(\Omega)^4$ is contained in [11, Proposition 4.2], and the jump formula (2.7) is proved in [7, Lemma 3.3] in terms of non-tangential limit which coincides (almost everywhere in $\partial\Omega$) with the trace operator for functions in $H^1(\Omega)^4$. The boundedness of $\Phi_{z,m}^\Omega$ from $H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$ to $H(\alpha, \Omega)$ is established in [36, Theorem 2.2].

Since n is smooth, it is clear from (i) that $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$ is bounded from $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$ into itself, which proves (ii). As consequence we also obtain that Λ_m^z is bounded from $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$ into itself. Now, the invertibility of Λ_m^z in $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$ for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ is shown in [10, Lemma 3.3 (iii)], see also [12, Lemma 3.12]. To complete the proof of (iii), note that if $f \in L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$ is such that $\Lambda_m^z[f] \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$, then a simple computation shows that

$$H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4 \ni (\Lambda_m^z)^2[f] = (1/4 + (\mathcal{C}_{z,m})^2 + (mI_4 + z\beta)S_z)[f],$$

which means that $f \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$. From the above computation we see that Λ_m^z is invertible from $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$ into itself for all $z \in (-m, m)$, since $((\mathcal{C}_{z,m})^2 + (mI_4 + z\beta)S_z)$ is a positive operator. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Remark 2.1. *Note that if Ω is a Lipschitz domain with a compact boundary, then for all $z \in \rho(D_m)$ the operators $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$ and Λ_m^z are bounded from $L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$ into itself (see, e.g. [7, Lemma 3.3]), and since Λ_m^z is an injective Fredholm operator (see the proof of [16, Theorem 4.5]) it follows that it is also invertible in $L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$. Note also that, thanks to [13, Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2], we know that the mapping $\Phi_{z,m}^\Omega$ defined by (2.4) is bounded from $L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$ to $H^{1/2}(\Omega)^4$, $t_{\Sigma} \Phi_{z,m}^\Omega[g] \in L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$ and the formula (2.7) still holds true for all $g \in L^2(\partial\Omega)^4$.*

2.3. Symbol classes and Pseudodifferential operators. We recall here the basic facts concerning the classes of pseudodifferential operators that will serve in the rest of the paper.

Let $\mathcal{M}_4(\mathbb{C})$ be the set of 4×4 matrices over \mathbb{C} . For $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$ we let $\mathcal{S}^m(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ be the standard symbol class of order $m \in \mathbb{R}$ whose elements are matrix-valued functions a in the space $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{M}_4(\mathbb{C}))$ such that

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta a(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{m - |\beta|}, \quad \forall (x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d, \quad \forall \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d.$$

Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the Schwartz class of functions. Then, for each $a \in \mathcal{S}^m(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and any $h \in (0, 1]$, we associate a semiclassical pseudodifferential operator $Op^h(a) : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)^4 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)^4$ via the standard formula

$$Op^h(a)u(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi \cdot x} a(x, h\xi) \mathcal{F}[u](\xi) d\xi, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)^4.$$

If $a \in \mathcal{S}^0(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, then Calderón-Vaillancourt theorem's (see, e.g., [19]) yields that $Op^h(a)$ extends to a bounded operator from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)^4$ into itself, and there exists $C, N_C > 0$ such that

$$\|Op^h(a)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C \max_{|\alpha+\beta| \leq N_C} \left\| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta a \right\|_{L^\infty}. \quad (2.8)$$

Given a C^∞ -smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with a compact boundary $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$. Then Σ is a 2-dimensional parameterized surface, which in the sense of differential geometry, can also be viewed as a smooth 2-dimensional manifold immersed into \mathbb{R}^3 . Thus, Σ can be covered by an atlas $\mathbb{A} = \{(U_j, V_j, \varphi_j) | j \in \{1, \dots, N\}\}$ (i.e., a collection of smooth charts) where $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$. That is

$$\Sigma = \bigcup_{j=1}^N U_j,$$

and for each $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, U_j is an open set of Σ , $V_j \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is an open set of the parametric space \mathbb{R}^2 , and $\varphi_j : U_j \rightarrow V_j$ is a C^∞ -diffeomorphism. Moreover, by definition of a smooth manifold, if $U_j \cap U_k \neq \emptyset$ then

$$\varphi_k \circ (\varphi_j)^{-1} \in C^\infty\left(\varphi_j(U_j \cap U_k); \varphi_k(U_j \cap U_k)\right).$$

As usual, the pull-back $(\varphi_j^{-1})^*$ and the pushforward φ_j^* are defined by

$$(\varphi_j^{-1})^* u = u \circ \varphi_j^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_j^* v = v \circ \varphi_j,$$

for u and v functions on U_j and V_j , respectively. We also recall that a function u on Σ is said to be in the class $C^k(\Sigma)$ if for every chart the pushforward has the property $(\varphi_j^{-1})^* u \in C^k(V_j)$.

Following Zworski [44, Part 4.], we define pseudodifferential operators on the boundary Σ as follows:

Definition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{A} : C^\infty(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow C^\infty(\Sigma)^4$ be a continuous linear operator. Then \mathcal{A} is said to be a h -pseudodifferential operator of order $m \in \mathbb{R}$ on Σ , and we write $\mathcal{A} \in Op^h \mathcal{S}^m(\Sigma)$, if*

- (1) *for every chart (U_j, V_j, φ_j) there exists a symbol $a \in \mathcal{S}^m$ such that*

$$\psi_1 \mathcal{A}(\psi_2 u) = \psi_1 \varphi_j^* Op^h(a)(\varphi_j^{-1})^*(\psi_2 u),$$

for any $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C_0^\infty(U_j)$ and $u \in C^\infty(\Sigma)^4$.

- (2) *for all $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$ such that $\text{supp}(\psi_1) \cap \text{supp}(\psi_2) = \emptyset$ and for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\|\psi_1 \mathcal{A} \psi_2\|_{H^{-N}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow H^N(\Sigma)^4} = \mathcal{O}(h^\infty).$$

For h fixed (for example $h = 1$), \mathcal{A} is called a pseudodifferential operator.

Since the study of a given pseudodifferential operator on Σ reduces to local study on local charts, in what follows, we will recall below the specific local coordinates and surface geometry notations we will use in the rest of the paper.

We always fix an open set $U \subset \Sigma$, and we let $\chi : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be a C^∞ -function (where $V \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is open) such that its graph coincides with U . Set $\varphi(\tilde{x}) = (\tilde{x}, \chi(\tilde{x}))$, then for $x \in U$ we write $x = \varphi(\tilde{x})$ with $\tilde{x} \in V$. Here and also in what follows, $\partial_1 \chi$ and $\partial_2 \chi$ stand for the partial derivatives $\partial_{\tilde{x}_1} \chi$ and $\partial_{\tilde{x}_2} \chi$, respectively. Recall that the first fundamental form, I , and the metric tensor $G(\tilde{x}) = (g_{jk}(\tilde{x}))$, have the following forms:

$$I = g_{11} d\tilde{x}_1^2 + 2g_{12} d\tilde{x}_1 d\tilde{x}_2 + g_{22} d\tilde{x}_2^2,$$

$$G(\tilde{x}) = (g_{jk}(\tilde{x})) = \begin{pmatrix} g_{11} & g_{12} \\ g_{21} & g_{22} \end{pmatrix}(\tilde{x}) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 + |\partial_1 \chi|^2 & \partial_1 \chi \partial_2 \chi \\ \partial_1 \chi \partial_2 \chi & 1 + |\partial_2 \chi|^2 \end{pmatrix}(\tilde{x}).$$

As $G(\tilde{x})$ is symmetric, it follows that it is diagonalizable by an orthogonal matrix. Indeed, let

$$Q(\tilde{x}) := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{|\partial_2 \chi|}{|\nabla \chi|} & \frac{\partial_1 \chi \partial_2 \chi}{|\partial_2 \chi| |\nabla \chi|} \\ -\frac{\partial_1 \chi \partial_2 \chi}{|\partial_2 \chi| |\nabla \chi|} & \frac{|\partial_2 \chi|}{|\nabla \chi|} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & g^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix}(\tilde{x}). \quad (2.9)$$

where g stands for the determinant of G . Then, it is straightforward to check that

$$Q^t G Q(\tilde{x}) = I_2, \quad Q Q^t(\tilde{x}) = G(\tilde{x})^{-1} =: (g^{jk}(\tilde{x})), \quad \det(Q) = \det(Q^t) = g^{-1/2}. \quad (2.10)$$

2.4. Operators on the boundary $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$. As above, we consider $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$ the boundary of a smooth bounded domain Ω . On Σ equipped with the Riemann metric induced by the euclidian one in \mathbb{R}^3 , we consider the Laplace-Beltrami operator $-\Delta_\Sigma$ and the surface gradient $\nabla_\Sigma = \nabla - n(n \cdot \nabla)$ where n is the unit normal to the surface pointing outside Ω . With the notation of the previous section, in local coordinates, these operators are pseudodifferential operators with respective principal symbols

$$p_{\Delta_\Sigma}(\tilde{x}, \xi) = \langle G(\tilde{x})^{-1} \xi, \xi \rangle, \quad p_{\nabla_\Sigma}(\tilde{x}, \xi) = \xi_G := \left(\begin{matrix} G(\tilde{x})^{-1} \xi \\ \langle \nabla \chi(\tilde{x}), G(\tilde{x})^{-1} \xi \rangle \end{matrix} \right). \quad (2.11)$$

Let us now introduce D_Σ , the extrinsically defined Dirac operator. To any $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ we associate the matrix $\alpha(x) = \alpha \cdot x$, where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$. For H_1 the mean curvature of Σ , D_Σ is given by (for more details see Appendix B of [35]):

$$D_\Sigma = -\alpha(n) \alpha(\nabla_\Sigma) + \frac{H_1}{2}.$$

It is a pseudodifferential operator with principal symbol:

$$p_{D_\Sigma}(\tilde{x}, \xi) = -i\alpha(n^\varphi(\tilde{x})) \alpha(\xi_G),$$

where $n^\varphi = \varphi^* n$. Using the anticommutation relations of the Dirac's matrices (see also (4.2)) and that $n \cdot \xi_G = 0$ we have:

$$p_{D_\Sigma}(\tilde{x}, \xi) = -i\alpha \cdot n^\varphi(\tilde{x}) \alpha \cdot \xi_G = S \cdot (\xi_G \wedge n^\varphi(\tilde{x})).$$

Moreover for $\bar{\xi} := \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, we have: $\bar{\xi} = \xi_G + (\bar{\xi} \cdot n^\varphi) n^\varphi$. Thus, in local coordinates, the principal symbol of D_Σ is also:

$$p_{D_\Sigma}(\tilde{x}, \xi) = S \cdot (\bar{\xi} \wedge n^\varphi(\tilde{x})). \quad (2.12)$$

Let us also point out the relationship between the principal symbols of Δ_Σ and D_Σ :

$$|\bar{\xi} \wedge n^\varphi(\tilde{x})|^2 = \langle G(\tilde{x})^{-1} \xi, \xi \rangle. \quad (2.13)$$

3. BASIC PROPERTIES OF THE MIT BAG MODEL

In this section, we give a brief review of the basic spectral properties of the Dirac operator with the MIT bag boundary condition on Lipschitz domains. Then, we establish some results concerning the regularization properties of the resolvent and the Sobolev regularity of the eigenfunctions in the case of smooth domains.

Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a Lipschitz domain with a compact boundary $\partial\mathcal{U}$. Then, for $m > 0$, the Dirac operator with the MIT bag boundary condition on \mathcal{U} , $(H_{\text{MIT}}(m), \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)))$, or simply the MIT bag operator, is defined on the domain

$$\text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) := \left\{ \psi \in H^{1/2}(\mathcal{U})^4 : (\alpha \cdot \nabla)\psi \in L^2(\mathcal{U})^4 \text{ and } P_- t_{\partial\mathcal{U}} \psi = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{U} \right\},$$

by $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)\psi = D_m\psi$, for all $\psi \in \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, and where the boundary condition holds in $L^2(\partial\mathcal{U})^4$. Here P_\pm are the orthogonal projections defined by (2.1).

The following theorem gathers the basic properties of the MIT bag operator. We mention that some of these properties are well-known in the case of smooth domains, see, e.g., [4, 5, 6, 12, 36].

Theorem 3.1. *The operator $(H_{\text{MIT}}(m), \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)))$ is self-adjoint and we have*

$$(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1} = r_{\mathcal{U}}(D_m - z)^{-1} e_{\mathcal{U}} - \Phi_{z,m}^{\mathcal{U}}(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1} t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}(D_m - z)^{-1} e_{\mathcal{U}}, \quad \forall z \in \rho(D_m). \quad (3.1)$$

Moreover, the following statements hold true:

- (i) *If \mathcal{U} is bounded, then $\text{Sp}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) = \text{Sp}_{\text{disc}}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus [-m, m]$.*
- (ii) *If \mathcal{U} is unbounded, then $\text{Sp}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) = \text{Sp}_{\text{ess}}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) = (-\infty, -m] \cup [m, +\infty)$. Moreover, if \mathcal{U} is connected then $\text{Sp}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ is purely continuous.*
- (iii) *Let $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ be such that $2|z| < m$, then for all $f \in L^2(\mathcal{U})^4$ it holds that*

$$\|(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1} f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} \lesssim \frac{1}{m} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4}.$$

Proof. Let $\varphi, \psi \in \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, then by density arguments we get the Green's formula

$$\langle (-i\alpha \cdot \nabla)\varphi, \psi \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} - \langle \varphi, (-i\alpha \cdot \nabla)\psi \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} = \langle (-i\alpha \cdot n) t_{\partial\mathcal{U}} \varphi, t_{\partial\mathcal{U}} \psi \rangle_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{U})^4}. \quad (3.2)$$

Since $P_- t_{\partial\mathcal{U}} \varphi = P_- t_{\partial\mathcal{U}} \psi = 0$ and $P_\pm(\alpha \cdot n) = (\alpha \cdot n) P_\mp$, it follows that

$$\langle (-i\alpha \cdot \nabla)\varphi, \psi \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} - \langle \varphi, (-i\alpha \cdot \nabla)\psi \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} = \langle P_+(-i\alpha \cdot n) P_+ t_{\partial\mathcal{U}} \varphi, P_+ t_{\partial\mathcal{U}} \psi \rangle_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{U})^4} = 0.$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H_{\text{MIT}}(m)\varphi, \psi \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} - \langle \varphi, H_{\text{MIT}}(m)\psi \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} &= \langle D_m \varphi, \psi \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} - \langle \varphi, D_m \psi \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} \\ &= \langle (-i\alpha \cdot \nabla)\varphi, \psi \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} - \langle \varphi, (-i\alpha \cdot \nabla)\psi \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(H_{\text{MIT}}(m), \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)))$ is symmetric. Now, thanks to [16, Proposition 4.3] we know that the MIT bag operator defined on the domain

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{ \psi = u + \Phi_m^{\mathcal{U}}[g], u \in H^1(\mathcal{U})^4, g \in L^2(\partial\mathcal{U})^4 : P_- t_{\partial\mathcal{U}} \psi = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{U} \right\}, \quad (3.3)$$

by $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)(u + \Phi_m^{\mathcal{U}}[g]) = D_m u$, for all $(u + \Phi_m^{\mathcal{U}}[g]) \in \mathcal{D}$, is a self-adjoint operator. As $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$ is symmetric on $\text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ we deduce that $\text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \subset \mathcal{D}$. Now, by Remark 2.1 we also get that $\mathcal{D} \subset \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$

which proves the equality $\mathcal{D} = \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, and thus $(H_{\text{MIT}}(m), \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)))$ is self-adjoint. Next, we check the resolvent formula (3.1). So let $f \in L^2(\mathcal{U})^4$, $z \in \rho(D_m)$ and set

$$\psi = r_{\mathcal{U}}(D_m - z)^{-1}e_{\mathcal{U}}f - \Phi_{z,m}^{\mathcal{U}}(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}(D_m - z)^{-1}e_{\mathcal{U}}f.$$

Since $(D_m - z)^{-1}e_{\mathcal{U}}$ is bounded from $L^2(\mathcal{U})^4$ into $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ and $(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}$ is well-defined by Remark 2.1, it follows that

$$u := r_{\mathcal{U}}(D_m - z)^{-1}e_{\mathcal{U}}f \in H^1(\mathcal{U})^4 \quad \text{and} \quad g := -(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}(D_m - z)^{-1}e_{\mathcal{U}}f \in L^2(\partial\mathcal{U})^4,$$

which entails that $\psi \in H^{1/2}(\mathcal{U})^4$ and that $(\alpha \cdot \nabla)\psi \in L^2(\mathcal{U})^4$. Next, using Lemma 2.1-(i) and Remark 2.1 we easily get

$$t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}\psi = P_+\beta(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}(D_m - z)^{-1}e_{\mathcal{U}}f,$$

thus $P_-t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}\psi = 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{U}$, which means that $\psi \in \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$. Since $(D_m - z)\Phi_{z,m}^{\mathcal{U}}[g] = 0$ holds in \mathcal{U} , it follows that $(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)\psi = f$ and the formula (3.1) is proved.

Now, we are going to prove assertions (i) and (ii). First, note that for $\psi \in \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ a straightforward application of the Green formula (3.2) yields that

$$\|H_{\text{MIT}}(m)\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4}^2 = \|(\alpha \cdot \nabla)\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4}^2 + m^2\|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4}^2 + m\|P_+t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}\psi\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{U})^4}^2. \quad (3.4)$$

Thus $\|H_{\text{MIT}}(m)\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4}^2 \geq m^2\|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4}^2$ which yields that $\text{Sp}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \subset (-\infty, -m] \cup [m, +\infty)$. Note that this fact can be seen immediately from the formula (3.1). Next, we show that $\{-m, m\} \notin \text{Sp}_{\text{disc}}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$. Assume that there is $0 \neq \psi \in \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ such that $(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - m)\psi = 0$ in \mathcal{U} . Then, from (3.4) we have that

$$\|(-i\alpha \cdot \nabla)\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4}^2 + m\|P_+t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}\psi\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{U})^4}^2 = 0.$$

Since $m > 0$ it follows that $P_+t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}\psi = 0$, and thus $t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}\psi = 0$. Using this and the above equation, an integration by parts (using density arguments) gives

$$\|\nabla\psi\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{U})^4} = \|(-i\alpha \cdot \nabla)\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} = 0.$$

From this we conclude that ψ vanishes identically, which contradicts the fact that $\psi \neq 0$, and thus $m \notin \text{Sp}_{\text{disc}}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$. Following the same lines as above we also get that $-m \notin \text{Sp}_{\text{disc}}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$. Thus, if \mathcal{U} is bounded, then the above considerations and the fact that $\text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \subset H^{1/2}(\mathcal{U})^4$ is compactly embedded in $L^2(\mathcal{U})^4$ yield that $\text{Sp}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) = \text{Sp}_{\text{disc}}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus [-m, m]$, which shows the assertion (i).

Lest us now complete the proof of (ii), so suppose that \mathcal{U} is unbounded. We first show that $(-\infty, -m] \cup [m, +\infty) \subset \text{Sp}_{\text{ess}}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ by constructing Weyl sequences as in the case of half-space, see [15, Theorem 4.1]. As \mathcal{U} is unbounded it follows that there is $R_1 > 0$ such that the half-space $\{x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_3 > R_1\}$ is strictly contained in \mathcal{U} and $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \bar{\mathcal{U}} \subset B(0, R_1)$. Fix $\lambda \in (-\infty, -m) \cup (m, +\infty)$ and let $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2)$ be such that $|\xi|^2 = \lambda^2 - m^2$. We define the function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^4$ by

$$\varphi(\bar{x}, x_3) = \left(\frac{\xi_1 - i\xi_2}{\lambda - m}, 0, 0, 1 \right)^t e^{i\xi \cdot \bar{x}}, \quad \text{with } \bar{x} = (x_1, x_2).$$

Clearly we have $(D_m - \lambda)\varphi = 0$. Now, fix $R_2 > R_1$ and let $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$ and $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ be such that $\text{supp}(\chi) \subset [R_1, R_2]$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we define the sequences of functions

$$\varphi_n(\bar{x}, x_3) = n^{-\frac{3}{2}}\varphi(\bar{x}, x_3)\eta(\bar{x}/n)\chi(x_3/n), \quad \text{for } (\bar{x}, x_3) \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Then, it is easy to check that $\varphi_n \in H_0^1(\mathcal{U}) \subset \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ converges weakly to zero, and that

$$\|\varphi_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4}^2 = \frac{2\lambda}{\lambda - m}\|\eta\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2\|\chi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 > 0, \quad \frac{\|(D_m - \lambda)\varphi_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4}}{\|\varphi_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

for more details see the proof of [15, Theorem 4.1]. Therefore, Weyl's criterion yields that

$$(-\infty, -m) \cup (m, +\infty) \subset \text{Sp}_{\text{ess}}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)).$$

Since the spectrum of a self-adjoint operator is closed, we then get the first statement of (ii). Now, if we assume in addition that \mathcal{U} is connected, then using the same arguments as in the proof of [8, Theorem 3.7] (i.e., using Rellich's lemma and the unique continuation property) one can verify that $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$ has no eigenvalues in $\mathbb{R} \setminus [-m, m]$. As $\{-m, m\} \notin \text{Sp}_{\text{disc}}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ it follows that $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$ has a purely continuous spectrum.

Now we prove (iii). Let $\psi \in \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, then (3.4) yields that $\|H_{\text{MIT}}(m)\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)^4}^2 \geq m^2\|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)^4}^2$, and thus

$$m\|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} \leq \|H_{\text{MIT}}(m)\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} \leq \|(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} + |z|\|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4}$$

Therefore, for $2|z| < m$ with $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, we get that $\|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4} \leq 2m^{-1} \|(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U})^4}$. Thus, (iii) follows by taking $\psi = (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1}f$. \square

Remark 3.1. We mention that the above statement on the self-adjointness can also be deduced from [13, Theorem 5.4]. We also mention that the MIT bag operator defined on the domain \mathcal{D} given by (3.3) is still self-adjoint for less regular domains, cf. [16] for more details.

Remark 3.2. Note that if \mathcal{U} is in the class of Hölder's domains $C^{1,\omega}$, with $\omega \in (1/2, 1)$, then $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$ is self-adjoint and $\text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) := \{\psi \in H^1(\mathcal{U})^4 : P_- t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}\psi = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{U}\}$, see [16, Theorem 4.3] for example.

Now we establish regularity results which concerns the regularization property of the resolvent and the Sobolev regularity of the eigenfunctions of $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$. The first statement of the following theorem will be crucial in Section 5 when studying the semiclassical pseudodifferential properties of the Poincaré-Steklov operator.

Theorem 3.2. Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer and assume that \mathcal{U} is C^{2+k} -smooth. Then the following statements hold true:

- (i) The mapping $(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1} : H^k(\mathcal{U})^4 \rightarrow H^{k+1}(\mathcal{U})^4 \cap \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ is well-defined and bounded for all $m > 0$ and all $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$. In particular, for $m_0 > 0$ and all $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m_0)) \cap \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ we have

$$\|(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1}\|_{H^k(\mathcal{U})^4 \rightarrow H^{k+1}(\mathcal{U})^4} \lesssim 1,$$

uniformly on $m \geq m_0$.

- (ii) If ϕ is an eigenfunction associated with an eigenvalue $z \in \text{Sp}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, i.e., $(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)\phi = 0$, then $\phi \in H^{1+k}(\mathcal{U})^4$. In particular, if \mathcal{U} is C^∞ -smooth, then $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathcal{U})^4$.

To prove this theorem we need the following classical regularity result.

Proposition 3.1. Let k be a nonnegative integer. Assume that \mathcal{U} is C^{3+k} -smooth and $u \in H^1(\mathcal{U})$. If u solves the Neumann problem

$$-\Delta u = f \in H^k(\mathcal{U}) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_n u = g \in H^{1/2+k}(\partial\mathcal{U}),$$

then $u \in H^{2+k}(\mathcal{U})$.

Proof. First, assume that $k = 0$. As \mathcal{U} is C^3 -smooth we know that the Neumann trace $\partial_n : H^2(\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\partial\mathcal{U})$ is surjective. Thus, there is $G \in H^2(\mathcal{U})$ such that $\partial_n G = g$ in $\partial\mathcal{U}$. Note that the function $\tilde{u} = u - G$ satisfies the homogeneous Neumann problem

$$-\Delta \tilde{u} = f + \Delta G \text{ in } \mathcal{U} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_n \tilde{u} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{U}.$$

Therefore, $\tilde{u} \in H^2(\mathcal{U})$ by [32, Theorem 5, p. 217], which implies that $u \in H^2(\mathcal{U})$ and this proves the result for $k = 0$. If $k \geq 1$, then the result follows by [24, Theorem 2.5.1.1]. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2. The theorem will be proved by induction on k . First, we show (i), so fix $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ and assume that $k = 1$. Let $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)^\top \in \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ be such that $(D_m - z)\phi = f$ in \mathcal{U} , with $f = (f_1, f_2)^\top \in H^1(\mathcal{U})^4$. By assumption we have $(\Delta + m^2 - z^2)\phi = (D_m - z)f$ in $\mathcal{D}'(\mathcal{U})^4$, and then in $L^2(\mathcal{U})^4$. We next prove that $\partial_n \phi \in H^{1/2}(\partial\mathcal{U})^4$. To this end, consider $\mathcal{U}_\epsilon := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \text{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{U}) < \epsilon\}$ for $\epsilon > 0$. Then, for $\delta > 0$ small enough and $0 < \epsilon \leq \delta$ the mapping $\Psi : \Sigma \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$, defined by

$$\Psi(x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}, t) = x_{\partial\mathcal{U}} + tn(x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}), \quad x_{\partial\mathcal{U}} \in \partial\mathcal{U}, t \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \quad (3.5)$$

is a C^2 -diffeomorphism and $\mathcal{U}_\epsilon := \{x + tn(x) : x \in \partial\mathcal{U}, t \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)\}$.

Let $\widetilde{P}_- : L^2(\mathcal{U}_\epsilon \cap \mathcal{U})^4 \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{U}_\epsilon \cap \mathcal{U})^4$ be the bounded operator defined by

$$\widetilde{P}_- \varphi(\Psi(x, t)) = \frac{1}{2}(I_4 + i\beta(\alpha \cdot n(x)))\varphi(\Psi(x, t)), \quad \Psi(x, t) \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon \cap \mathcal{U}.$$

Let $x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}^0$ be an arbitrary point on the boundary Σ , fix $0 < r < \epsilon/2$, and let $\zeta : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a C^∞ -smooth and compactly supported function such that $\zeta = 1$ on $B(x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}^0, r)$ and $\zeta = 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B(x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}^0, 2r)$. We claim that $\widetilde{P}_- \zeta \phi$ satisfies the elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta(\widetilde{P}_- \zeta \phi) = g & \text{in } \mathcal{U}, \\ t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}(\widetilde{P}_- \zeta \phi) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{U}, \end{cases}$$

with $g \in L^2(\mathcal{U})^4$. Indeed, set $\mathcal{B}(x) = i\beta(\alpha \cdot n(x))$ for $x \in \partial\mathcal{U}$, and observe that

$$(D_m - z)(\widetilde{P}_- \zeta \phi) = \left(\widetilde{P}_- \zeta f + \frac{1}{2}[D_m, \zeta] \phi \right) + \frac{1}{2}[D_m, \zeta \mathcal{B}] \phi =: I(\phi, f) + \frac{1}{2}[D_m, \zeta \mathcal{B}] \phi.$$

Since n is C^2 -smooth, ζ is infinitely differentiable and $\psi, f \in H^1(\mathcal{U})^4$, it is clear that $I(\phi, f) \in H^1(\mathcal{U})^4$ and $[D_m, \zeta\mathcal{B}]\phi \in L^2(\mathcal{U})^4$. Now, applying $(D_m + z)$ to the above equation yields that $-\Delta(\widetilde{P}_-\zeta\phi) = g$ with

$$g := (z^2 - m^2)\widetilde{P}_-\zeta\phi + (D_m + z)I(\phi, f) + \frac{z}{2}[D_m, \zeta\mathcal{B}]\phi + \frac{1}{2}D_m[D_m, \zeta\mathcal{B}]\phi.$$

As before, it is clear that the first three terms are square integrable. Next, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} D_0[D_0, \zeta\mathcal{B}]\phi &= \{D_0, [D_0, \zeta\mathcal{B}]\}\phi - [D_0, \zeta\mathcal{B}](f - (m\beta - z)\phi) \\ &= [-\Delta, \zeta\mathcal{B}]\phi - [D_0, \zeta\mathcal{B}](f - (m\beta - z)\phi). \end{aligned}$$

Using this together with the smoothness assumption on n and the fact $(D_m - z)\phi = f \in H^1(\mathcal{U})^4$, we easily see that $D_0[D_0, \zeta\mathcal{B}]\phi \in L^2(\mathcal{U})^4$. Hence, $D_m[D_m, \zeta\mathcal{B}]\phi$ is square integrable, which means that $g \in L^2(\mathcal{U})^4$. As $P_-t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}\phi = 0$ and $t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}(\widetilde{P}_-\zeta\phi) = t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}\zeta P_-t_{\partial\mathcal{U}}\phi = 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{U}$, by [22, Theorem 8.12] it follows that $\widetilde{P}_-\zeta\phi \in H^2(\mathcal{U}_\epsilon \cap \mathcal{U})^4$, which implies that

$$\zeta(\phi_1 + i(\sigma \cdot n)\phi_2) \in H^2(B(x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}^0, 2r) \cap \mathcal{U})^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta(-i(\sigma \cdot n)\phi_1 + \phi_2) \in H^2(B(x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}^0, 2r) \cap \mathcal{U})^2.$$

Consequently, we get

$$\phi_1 + i(\sigma \cdot n)\phi_2 \in H^2(B(x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}^0, r) \cap \mathcal{U})^2 \quad \text{and} \quad -i(\sigma \cdot n)\phi_1 + \phi_2 \in H^2(B(x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}^0, r) \cap \mathcal{U})^2. \quad (3.6)$$

Since $-i(\sigma \cdot \nabla)\phi_2 = (z - m)\phi_1 + f_1$ and $-i(\sigma \cdot \nabla)\phi_1 = (z + m)\phi_2 + f_2$ hold in $H^1(\mathcal{U})^2$, it follows from (3.6) that

$$(\sigma \cdot \nabla)\phi_j \in H^1(B(x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}^0, r))^2 \quad \text{and} \quad (\sigma \cdot \nabla)(\sigma \cdot n)\phi_j \in H^1(B(x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}^0, r))^2, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Using this and the fact that n is C^2 -smooth, we easily get that

$$(\sigma \cdot n)(\sigma \cdot \nabla)\phi_j + (\sigma \cdot \nabla)(\sigma \cdot n)\phi_j \in \langle n, \nabla \rangle I_2\phi_j + F_j \in H^1(B(x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}^0, r))^2,$$

with $F_j \in H^1(B(x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}^0, r) \cap \mathcal{U})^2$. As a consequence, we get that $\langle n, \nabla \rangle I_2\phi_j \in H^1(B(x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}^0, r) \cap \mathcal{U})^2$. Since this holds true for all $x_{\partial\mathcal{U}}^0 \in \partial\mathcal{U}$, using the compactness of $\partial\mathcal{U}$ it follows that $\partial_n\phi \in H^{1/2}(\partial\mathcal{U})^4$. Therefore, Propositions 3.1 yields that $\phi \in H^2(\mathcal{U})^4$.

Next, assume $k \geq 2$, \mathcal{U} is C^{2+k} -smooth and $\phi, f \in H^k(\mathcal{U})^4$. Since n is C^{1+k} -smooth and Ψ defined by (3.5) is a C^{1+k} -diffeomorphism, following the same arguments as above we then conclude that $\partial_n\phi \in H^{k-1/2}(\Sigma)^4$. Note also that $-\Delta\phi = (z^2 - m^2)\phi + (D_m - z)f \in H^{k-1}(\mathcal{U})^4$. Therefore, thanks to Propositions 3.1, we conclude that $\phi \in H^{k+1}(\mathcal{U})^4$, which proves the first statement of (i).

Now, the second statement of (i) is a direct consequence of the first one, and this completes the proof of (i).

Finally, the proof of the first statement of (ii) follows the same lines as the one of (i). In particular, if \mathcal{U} is C^∞ -smooth, we then get $\phi \in H^{k+1}(\mathcal{U})^4$ for any $k \geq 0$, which implies that ϕ is infinitely differentiable in \mathcal{U} , and the theorem is proved. \square

4. POINCARÉ-STEKLOV OPERATORS AS PSEUDODIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS

The main purpose of this section is to define the Poincaré-Steklov operator \mathcal{A}_m associated with the Dirac operator and to prove that it fits into the framework of pseudodifferential operators.

Throughout this section, let Ω be a smooth domain with a compact boundary Σ , let P_\pm be as in (2.1) and set

$$\gamma_5 := -i\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_2 \\ I_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad S \cdot X = -\gamma_5(\alpha \cdot X), \quad \forall X \in \mathbb{R}^3. \quad (4.1)$$

Using the anticommutation relations of the Dirac's matrices we easily get the following identities

$$\begin{aligned} i(\alpha \cdot X)(\alpha \cdot Y) &= iX \cdot Y + S \cdot (X \wedge Y), \\ \{S \cdot X, \alpha \cdot Y\} &= -(X \cdot Y)\gamma_5, \quad [S \cdot X, \beta] = 0, \quad \forall X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^3. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Next, we give the rigorous definition of the Poincaré-Steklov operator \mathcal{A}_m , which is the main subject of this paper.

Definition 4.1. (PS operator) Let $z \in \rho(H_{MIT}(m))$ and $g \in P_-H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$. We denote by $E_m^\Omega(z) : P_-H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow H^1(\Omega)^4$ the lifting operator associated with the elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} (D_m - z)U_z = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ P_-t_\Sigma U_z = g & \text{on } \Sigma. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

That is, $E_m^\Omega(z)g$ is the unique function in $H^1(\Omega)^4$ satisfying $(D_m - z)E_m^\Omega(z)g = 0$ in Ω , and $P_- t_\Sigma E_m^\Omega(z)g = g$ on Σ . Then the Poincaré-Steklov (PS) operator $\mathcal{A}_m : P_- H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4 \rightarrow P_+ H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$ associated with the system (4.3) is defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_m(g) = P_+ t_\Sigma E_m^\Omega(z)g,$$

Recall the definitions of $\Phi_{z,m}^\Omega$ and Λ_m^z from Subsection 2.2. Then, the following proposition justifies the existence and the unicity of the solution to the elliptic problem (4.3), and gives in particular the explicit formula of the PS operator in terms the operator $(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}$ when $z \in \rho(D_m)$. The third assertion of the proposition will be particularly important in Section 5 when studying the PS operator from the semiclassical point of view. In the last statement, we use the notations $\mathcal{A}_m(z)$ to highlight the dependence on the parameter $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$.

Proposition 4.1. *For any $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ and $g \in P_- H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$, the elliptic problem (4.3) has a unique solution $E_m^\Omega(z)[g] \in H^1(\Omega)^4$. Moreover, the following hold true:*

- (i) $(E_m^\Omega(z))^* = -\beta P_+ t_\Sigma (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \bar{z})^{-1}$.
- (ii) *For any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{C}$, there is $m_0 > 0$ such that for all $m \geq m_0$ it holds that $K \subset \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, and for all $z \in K$ we have*

$$\|E_m^\Omega(z)g\|_{L^2(\Omega)^4} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \|g\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}, \quad \forall g \in P_- H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4.$$

- (iii) *If $z \in \rho(D_m)$, then $E_m^\Omega(z)$ and \mathcal{A}_m are explicitly given by*

$$E_m^\Omega(z) = \Phi_z^\Omega (\Lambda_m^z)^{-1} P_- \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_m = -P_+ \beta (\Lambda_m^z)^{-1} P_-. \quad (4.4)$$

- (iv) *Let $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ and let $E_m^\Omega(z)$ be as above. Then, for any $\xi \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, the operator $E_m^\Omega(\xi)$ has the following representation*

$$E_m^\Omega(\xi) = (I_4 + (\xi - z)(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \xi)^{-1}) E_m^\Omega(z). \quad (4.5)$$

In particular, we have

$$\mathcal{A}_m(\xi) - \mathcal{A}_m(z) = (z - \xi) \beta (E_m^\Omega(\bar{\xi}))^* E_m^\Omega(z). \quad (4.6)$$

- (v) *For any $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ the operator $E_m^\Omega(z)$ extends into a bounded operator from $P_- H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4$ to $H(\alpha, \Omega)$.*

Proof. We first show that the boundary value problem (4.3) has a unique solution. For this, assume that u_1 and u_2 are both solutions of (4.3), then $(D_m - z)(u_1 - u_2) = 0$ in Ω , and $P_- t_\Sigma(u_1 - u_2) = 0$ on Σ . Thus, $(u_1 - u_2) \in \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ holds by Remark 3.2, and since $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$ is self-adjoint by Theorem 3.1 it follows that $u_1 = u_2$, which proves the uniqueness. Next, observe that the function

$$v_g = \mathcal{E}_\Omega(P_- g) - (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1} (D_m - z) \mathcal{E}_\Omega(P_- g)$$

is a solution to (4.3). Indeed, we have $\mathcal{E}_\Omega(P_- g) \in H^1(\Omega)^4$ and thus $v_g \in H^1(\Omega)^4$, moreover, we clearly have that $P_- t_\Sigma v_g = g$ and $(D_m - z)v_g = 0$. Since we already know that the solution to (4.3) is unique, it follows that v_g is independent of the extension operator \mathcal{E}_Ω , and hence there is a unique solution in $H^1(\Omega)^4$ to the elliptic problem (4.3).

Let us show the assertion (i). Let $\psi \in P_- H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$ and $f \in L^2(\Omega)^4$, then using the Green's formula and the fact that $P_+(-i\alpha \cdot n) = (-i\alpha \cdot n)P_- = -\beta P_-$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle E_m^\Omega(z)\psi, f \rangle_{L^2(\Omega)^4} &= \langle E_m^\Omega(z)\psi, (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \bar{z})(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \bar{z})^{-1} f \rangle_{L^2(\Omega)^4} \\ &= \langle E_m^\Omega(z)\psi, (D_m - \bar{z})(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \bar{z})^{-1} f \rangle_{L^2(\Omega)^4} \\ &= \langle (D_m - z)E_m^\Omega(z)\psi, (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \bar{z})^{-1} f \rangle_{L^2(\Omega)^4} \\ &\quad + \langle (-i\alpha \cdot n) t_\Sigma E_m^\Omega(z)\psi, t_\Sigma (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \bar{z})^{-1} f \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma)^4} \\ &= \langle (-i\alpha \cdot n) P_- t_\Sigma E_m^\Omega(z)\psi, P_+ t_\Sigma (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \bar{z})^{-1} f \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma)^4} \\ &= \langle \psi, -\beta P_+ t_\Sigma (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \bar{z})^{-1} f \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma)^4} \end{aligned}$$

which entails that $-\beta P_+ t_\Sigma (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \bar{z})^{-1}$ is the adjoint of $E_m^\Omega(z)$ and proves (i).

Now we are going to show the assertion (ii). So, let K be a compact set of \mathbb{C} , and note that for all $m > \sup\{|\text{Re}(z)| : z \in K\}$ it holds that $K \subset \rho(D_m) \subset \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$. Hence, $v := E_m^\Omega(z)g$ is well defined for any $z \in K$ and $g \in P_- H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$. Then a straightforward application of the Green's formula yields that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \|(D_m - z)v\|_{L^2(\Omega)^4}^2 = \|(i\alpha \cdot \nabla - z)v\|_{L^2(\Omega)^4}^2 + m^2 \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)^4}^2 \\ &\quad + m \left(\langle -i(\alpha \cdot n) t_\Sigma v, \beta t_\Sigma v \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma)^4} - 2\text{Re}(z) \langle v, \beta v \rangle_{L^2(\Omega)^4} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Observe that

$$\langle -i(\alpha \cdot n)t_{\Sigma}v, \beta t_{\Sigma}v \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma)^4} = \langle (P_+ - P_-)t_{\Sigma}v, t_{\Sigma}v \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma)^4} = \|P_+t_{\Sigma}v\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}^2 - \|P_-t_{\Sigma}v\|_{H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4}^2.$$

Since $P_-t_{\Sigma}v = g$ and $P_+t_{\Sigma}v = \mathcal{A}_m(g)$ hold by definition, and that

$$-\operatorname{Re}(z)\langle v, \beta v \rangle_{L^2(\Omega)^4} \geq -|\operatorname{Re}(z)|\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)^4}^2$$

holds by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it follows from (4.7) that

$$\|g\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}^2 \geq m\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)^4}^2 - 2|\operatorname{Re}(z)|\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)^4}^2 + \|\mathcal{A}_m(g)\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}^2.$$

Thus, if we take $m_0 \geq 4 \sup\{|\operatorname{Re}(z)| : z \in K\}$, then

$$\|\mathcal{A}_m(g)\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}^2 + \frac{m}{2}\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)^4}^2 \leq \|g\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}^2$$

holds for any $m \geq m_0$, which prove the desired estimate for $E_m^{\Omega}(z)$.

Let us now show the assertion (iii), so let $z \in \rho(D_m)$ and recall that $\Phi_{z,m}^{\Omega}(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1} : H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow H^1(\Omega)^4$ is well defined and bounded by Lemma 2.1. Since ϕ_m^z is a fundamental solution of $(D_m - z)$, it holds that

$$(D_m - z)\Phi_{z,m}^{\Omega}(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}[g] = 0 \text{ in } L^2(\Omega)^4, \quad \forall g \in H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4.$$

Now, observe that if $g \in P_-H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$, then a direct application of the identity (2.7) yields that

$$t_{\Sigma}\Phi_{z,m}^{\Omega}(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}[g] = \left(-\frac{i}{2}(\alpha \cdot n) + \mathcal{C}_{z,m}\right)(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}[g] = g - P_+\beta(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}[g].$$

Consequently, we get

$$P_-t_{\Sigma}\Phi_{z,m}^{\Omega}(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}[g] = g \text{ and } P_+t_{\Sigma}\Phi_{z,m}^{\Omega}(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}[g] = -P_+\beta(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}[g],$$

which means that $E_m^{\Omega}(z)[g] = \Phi_{z,m}^{\Omega}(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}[g]$ is the unique solution to the boundary value problem (4.3), and proves the identity $\mathcal{A}_m = -P_+\beta(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}P_-$.

We are going to prove assertion (iv), so fix $z, \xi \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ and let $g \in P_-H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$. Then, by definition of $E_m^{\Omega}(z)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (D_m - \xi)E_m^{\Omega}(\xi)g &= (D_m - \xi)(I_4 + (\xi - z)(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \xi)^{-1})E_m^{\Omega}(z)g, \\ &= (D_m - z)E_m^{\Omega}(z)g - (\xi - z)E_m^{\Omega}(z)g + (\xi - z)(D_m - \xi)(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \xi)^{-1}E_m^{\Omega}(z)g, \\ &= (\xi - z)E_m^{\Omega}(z)g - (\xi - z)E_m^{\Omega}(z)g = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \xi)^{-1}E_m^{\Omega}(z)g \in \operatorname{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, and hence $P_-t_{\Sigma}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - \xi)^{-1}E_m^{\Omega}(z)g = 0$, it follows that $P_-t_{\Sigma}E_m^{\Omega}(\xi)g = P_-t_{\Sigma}E_m^{\Omega}(z)g = g$, which prove the identity (4.5). Now, (4.6) follows by applying P_+t_{Σ} to the representation (4.5) and using assertion (i).

It remains to prove item (v). We first consider the case $z \in \rho(D_m)$, then the claim for $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \setminus \rho(D_m)$ follows by the representation formula (4.5). Fix $z \in \rho(D_m)$ and recall that the operators $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$ and Λ_m^z are bounded invertible in $H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$ by Lemma 2.1(ii)-(iii) and (2.6). Since $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}^* = \mathcal{C}_{\bar{z},m}$, by duality it follows that Λ_m^z admits a bounded and everywhere defined inverse in $H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4$. This together with Lemma 2.1(i) and item (iii) of this proposition show that $E_m^{\Omega}(z)$ admits a continuous extension from $P_-H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4$ to $H(\alpha, \Omega)$. This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

Remark 4.1. *The proof above gives more, namely that for all $m_0 > 0$, $K \subset \rho(D_{m_0})$ a compact set and $z \in K$, there is $m_1 \gg 1$ such that*

$$\sup_{m \geq m_1} \|\mathcal{A}_m\|_{P_-H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow P_+L^2(\Sigma)^4} \lesssim 1.$$

Remark 4.2. *Thanks to Theorem 3.1 and Remark 2.1, if Ω is a Lipschitz domain, then $E_m^{\Omega}(z)$ is the unique solution in $H^{1/2}(\Omega)^4$ to the system (4.3) for datum in $L^2(\Sigma)^4$. Moreover, the PS operator $\mathcal{A}_m = -P_+\beta(\Lambda_m^z)^{-1}P_-$ is well-defined and bounded as an operator from $P_-L^2(\Sigma)^4$ to $P_+L^2(\Sigma)^4$.*

In the rest of this section, we will only address the case $z \in \rho(D_m)$ and we show that the Poincaré-Steklov operator \mathcal{A}_m from Definition 4.1 is a homogeneous pseudodifferential operators of order 0 and capture its principal symbol in local coordinates. To this end, we first study the pseudodifferential properties of the Cauchy operator $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$. Once this is done, we use the explicit formula of \mathcal{A}_m given by (4.4) and the symbol calculus to obtain the principal symbol of \mathcal{A}_m .

Recall the definition of ϕ_m^z from (2.3), and observe that

$$\phi_m^z(x - y) = k^z(x - y) + w(x - y),$$

where

$$k^z(x-y) = \frac{e^{i\sqrt{z^2-m^2}|x-y|}}{4\pi|x-y|} \left(z + m\beta + \sqrt{z^2-m^2} \alpha \cdot \frac{x-y}{|x-y|} \right) + i \frac{e^{i\sqrt{z^2-m^2}|x-y|} - 1}{4\pi|x-y|^3} \alpha \cdot (x-y),$$

$$w(x-y) = \frac{i}{4\pi|x-y|^3} \alpha \cdot (x-y).$$

Using this, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{z,m}[f](x) &= \lim_{\rho \searrow 0} \int_{|x-y|>\rho} w(x-y)f(y)d\sigma(y) + \int_{\Sigma} k^z(x-y)f(y)d\sigma(y) \\ &= W[f](x) + K[f](x). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

As $|k^z(x-y)| = \mathcal{O}(|x-y|^{-1})$ when $|x-y| \rightarrow 0$, using the standard layer potential techniques (see, e.g. [40, Chap. 3, Sec. 4] and [39, Chap. 7, Sec. 11]) it is not hard to prove that the integral operator K gives rise to a pseudodifferential operator of order -1 , i.e. $K \in Op\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\Sigma)$. Thus, we can (formally) write

$$\mathcal{C}_{z,m} = W \quad \text{mod } Op\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\Sigma), \quad (4.9)$$

which means that the operator W encodes the main contribution in the pseudodifferential character of $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$. So we only need to focus on the study of the pseudodifferential properties of W . The following theorem makes this heuristic more rigorous. Its proof follows similar arguments as in [3, 33, 34].

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$ be as (2.5), W as in (4.8) and \mathcal{A}_m as in Definition 4.1. Then $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$, W and \mathcal{A}_m are homogeneous pseudodifferential operators of order 0, and we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{z,m} &= \frac{1}{2} \alpha \cdot \frac{\nabla_{\Sigma}}{\sqrt{-\Delta_{\Sigma}}} \quad \text{mod } Op\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\Sigma), \\ \mathcal{A}_m &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\Delta_{\Sigma}}} S \cdot (\nabla_{\Sigma} \wedge n) P_{-} \quad \text{mod } Op\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\Sigma) = \frac{D_{\Sigma}}{\sqrt{-\Delta_{\Sigma}}} P_{-} \quad \text{mod } Op\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\Sigma). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We first deal with the operator W . So, let $\psi_k : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $k = 1, 2$, be a C^{∞} -smooth function. Clearly, if $\text{supp}(\psi_2) \cap \text{supp}(\psi_1) = \emptyset$, then $\psi_2 W \psi_1$ gives rise to a bounded operator from $H^{-j}(\Sigma)^4$ into $H^j(\Sigma)^4$, for all $j \geq 0$.

Now, fix a local chart (U, V, φ) as in Subsection 2.3 and recall the definition of first fundamental form I and the metric tensor $G(\tilde{x})$. That is, for all $x \in U$ we have $x = \varphi(\tilde{x}) = (\tilde{x}, \chi(\tilde{x}))$ with $\tilde{x} \in V$, and where the graph of $\chi : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ coincides with U . Notice that if we assume that ψ_k is compactly supported with $\text{supp}(\psi_k) \subset U$, then, in this setting, the operator $\psi_2 W \psi_1$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_2 W[\psi_1 f](x) &= \psi_2(x) \text{p.v.} \int_V i\alpha \cdot \frac{\varphi(\tilde{x}) - \varphi(\tilde{y})}{4\pi|\varphi(\tilde{x}) - \varphi(\tilde{y})|^3} \psi_1(\varphi(\tilde{y})) f(\varphi(\tilde{y})) \sqrt{g(\tilde{y})} d\tilde{y} \\ &= \psi_2(x) \sqrt{g(\tilde{x})} \text{p.v.} \int_V i\alpha \cdot \frac{\varphi(\tilde{x}) - \varphi(\tilde{y})}{4\pi|\varphi(\tilde{x}) - \varphi(\tilde{y})|^3} \psi_1(\varphi(\tilde{y})) f(\varphi(\tilde{y})) d\tilde{y} \\ &\quad + \psi_2(x) \int_V i\alpha \cdot \frac{\varphi(\tilde{x}) - \varphi(\tilde{y})}{4\pi|\varphi(\tilde{x}) - \varphi(\tilde{y})|^3} f(\varphi(\tilde{y})) \left(\sqrt{g(\tilde{y})} - \sqrt{g(\tilde{x})} \right) d\tilde{y}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where g is the determinant of the metric tensor G . Since $g(\cdot)$ is smooth, it follows that

$$|\sqrt{g(\tilde{y})} - \sqrt{g(\tilde{x})}| \lesssim |\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|.$$

Therefore, the last integral operator on the right-hand side of (4.10) has a non singular kernel and does not require to write it as an integral operator in the principal value sense. Thus, a simple computation using Taylor's formula shows that

$$|x-y|^2 = |\varphi(\tilde{x}) - \varphi(\tilde{y})|^2 = \langle \tilde{x} - \tilde{y}, G(\tilde{x})(\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}) \rangle (1 + \mathcal{O}|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|),$$

where the definition of I was used in the last equality. It follows from the above computations that

$$|x-y|^{-3} = \frac{1}{\langle \tilde{x} - \tilde{y}, G(\tilde{x})(\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}) \rangle^{3/2}} + k_1(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}),$$

where the kernel k_1 satisfies $|k_1(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})| = \mathcal{O}(|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|^{-2})$, when $|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}| \rightarrow 0$. Consequently, we get that

$$\frac{x_j - y_j}{|x-y|^3} = \begin{cases} \frac{\tilde{x}_j - \tilde{y}_j}{\langle \tilde{x} - \tilde{y}, G(\tilde{x})(\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}) \rangle^{3/2}} + (\tilde{x}_j - \tilde{y}_j) k_1(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}), & \text{for } j = 1, 2, \\ \frac{\langle \nabla \chi, \tilde{x} - \tilde{y} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{x} - \tilde{y}, G(\tilde{x})(\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}) \rangle^{3/2}} + k_2(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}), & \text{for } j = 3, \end{cases}$$

with $|k_2(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})| = \mathcal{O}(|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|^{-1})$, when $|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}| \rightarrow 0$. Note that this implies

$$\alpha \cdot \left(\frac{x-y}{|x-y|^3} \right) = \alpha \cdot \frac{(\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}, \langle \nabla \chi, \tilde{x} - \tilde{y} \rangle)}{\langle \tilde{x} - \tilde{y}, G(\tilde{x})(\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}) \rangle^{3/2}} + \mathcal{O}(|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|^{-1})I_4.$$

Combining the above computations and (4.10), we deduce that

$$\psi_2 W[\psi_1 f](x) = \psi_2(x) \sqrt{g(\tilde{x})} \text{p.v.} \int_V i\alpha \frac{(\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}, \langle \nabla \chi, \tilde{x} - \tilde{y} \rangle)}{\langle \tilde{x} - \tilde{y}, G(\tilde{x})(\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}) \rangle^{3/2}} f(\varphi(\tilde{y})) d\tilde{y} + \psi_2(x) L[\psi_1 f](x), \quad (4.11)$$

where L is an integral operator with a kernel $l(x, y)$ satisfying

$$|l(x, y)| = \mathcal{O}(|x - y|^{-1}) \quad \text{when } |x - y| \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus, similar arguments as the ones in [39, Chap. 7, Sec. 11] yield that L is a pseudodifferential operator of order -1 . Now, for $h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $k = 1, 2$, observe that if we set

$$R_k[h](\tilde{x}) = \frac{i\sqrt{g(\tilde{x})}}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} r_k(\tilde{x}, \tilde{x} - \tilde{y}) h(\tilde{y}) d\tilde{y},$$

where

$$r_k(\tilde{x}, \tilde{x} - \tilde{y}) = \frac{\tilde{x}_k - \tilde{y}_k}{\langle \tilde{x} - \tilde{y}, G(\tilde{x})(\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}) \rangle^{3/2}}, \quad \tilde{x} \neq \tilde{y}.$$

Then the standard formula connecting a pseudodifferential operator and its symbol yields

$$R_k[h](\tilde{x}) = \frac{i\sqrt{g(\tilde{x})}}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i\langle \tilde{x} - \tilde{y}, \xi \rangle} q_k(\tilde{x}, \xi) h(\tilde{y}) d\xi d\tilde{y},$$

where

$$q_k(\tilde{x}, \xi) = \frac{i\sqrt{g(\tilde{x})}}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-i\langle \omega, \xi \rangle} r_k(\tilde{x}, \omega) d\omega.$$

Recall the definition of Q from (2.9) and set $\omega = Q(\tilde{x})\tau$. Also recall that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-i\langle \omega, \xi \rangle} \frac{\omega_k}{|\omega|^3} d\omega = -i \frac{\xi_k}{|\xi|}, \quad k = 1, 2. \quad (4.12)$$

Thus, the above change of variables together with the properties (2.10) and (4.12) yield that

$$q_k(\tilde{x}, \xi) = \frac{i}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-i\langle \tau, Q^t(\tilde{x})\xi \rangle} \frac{(Q^t(\tilde{x})\tau)_k}{|\tau|^3} d\tau = \frac{(G^{-1}(\tilde{x})\xi)_k}{2\langle G^{-1}(\tilde{x})\xi, \xi \rangle^{1/2}} = \frac{g_{k1}\xi_1 + g_{k2}\xi_2}{2\langle G^{-1}(\tilde{x})\xi, \xi \rangle^{1/2}},$$

which means that $q_k(\tilde{x}, \xi)$ is homogeneous of degree 0 in ξ . Therefore, R_k is a homogeneous pseudodifferential operators of degree 0. From the above observation and (4.11) it follows that

$$\psi_2 W \psi_1 = \psi_2 \alpha \cdot (R_1, R_2, \partial_1 \chi(\tilde{x})R_1 + \partial_2 \chi(\tilde{x})R_2) \psi_1 + \psi_2 L \psi_1.$$

Since L is a pseudodifferential operator of order -1 , we deduce that W is a homogeneous pseudodifferential operators of order 0, and exploiting (2.11), we obtain that

$$W = \frac{1}{2} \alpha \cdot \frac{\nabla_\Sigma}{\sqrt{-\Delta_\Sigma}} \quad \text{mod } OpS^{-1}(\Sigma). \quad (4.13)$$

Thanks to (4.9) and (4.13), we deduce that the Cauchy operator $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$ has the same principal symbol as the operator W .

Now we are going to deal with the operator \mathcal{A}_m . Note that we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\beta + \alpha \cdot \frac{\nabla_\Sigma}{\sqrt{-\Delta_\Sigma}} \right)^2 = I_4, \quad (4.14)$$

and as \mathcal{A}_m is given by the formula

$$\mathcal{A}_m = -P_+ \beta \left(\frac{1}{2} \beta + \mathcal{C}_{z,m} \right)^{-1} P_-,$$

using (4.14) and the standard mollification arguments, it follows from the product formula for calculus of pseudodifferential operators that, in local coordinates, the symbol of \mathcal{A}_m denoted by $q_{\mathcal{A}_m}$ has the form

$$q_{\mathcal{A}_m}(\tilde{x}, \xi) = -P_+ \beta \left(\beta + \alpha \cdot \left(\frac{\xi_G}{\langle G^{-1}\xi, \xi \rangle^{1/2}} \right) \right) P_- + p(\tilde{x}, \xi),$$

where $p \in S^{-1}(\Sigma)$ and ξ_G defined in (2.11) is the principal symbol of ∇_Σ . Therefore, we get

$$q_{\mathcal{A}_m}(\tilde{x}, \xi) = -P_+ \beta \alpha \cdot \xi_G \langle G^{-1}\xi, \xi \rangle^{-1/2} P_- + p(\tilde{x}, \xi).$$

Hence, using the fact that P_{\pm} are projectors, a simple computation shows

$$q_{\mathcal{A}_m}(\tilde{x}, \xi) = -i\alpha \cdot n^\varphi(\tilde{x}) \alpha \cdot \xi_G \langle G^{-1}\xi, \xi \rangle^{-1/2} P_- + p(\tilde{x}, \xi).$$

Finally, from results of Section 2.4 we deduce

$$q_{\mathcal{A}_m}(\tilde{x}, \xi) = -\alpha \cdot n^\varphi(\tilde{x}) \alpha \cdot \xi_G \langle G^{-1}\xi, \xi \rangle^{-1/2} P_- + p(\tilde{x}, \xi) = S \cdot \left(\frac{\xi_G \wedge n^\varphi(\tilde{x})}{\langle G^{-1}\xi, \xi \rangle} \right) P_- + p(\tilde{x}, \xi),$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_m = \frac{D_\Sigma}{\sqrt{-\Delta_\Sigma}} P_- \quad \text{mod } Op\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\Sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\Delta_\Sigma}} S \cdot (\nabla_\Sigma \wedge n) P_- \quad \text{mod } Op\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\Sigma).$$

It justifies that \mathcal{A}_m is a homogeneous pseudodifferential operators of order 0 and completes the proof of the theorem. \square

5. APPROXIMATION OF THE POINCARÉ-STEKLOV OPERATORS FOR LARGE MASSES

Although the technique used in the last section allows us to treat the layer potential operator \mathcal{A}_m as pseudodifferential operator and to derive its principal symbol. However, it does not allow us to capture the dependence on m . The main goal of this section is to study the Poincaré-Steklov operator, \mathcal{A}_m , as a m -dependent pseudodifferential operator when m is large enough. For this purpose, we consider $h = 1/m$ as a semiclassical parameter (for $m \gg 1$) and use the system (4.3) instead of the layer potential formula of \mathcal{A}_m . Roughly speaking, we will look for a local approximate formula for the solution of (4.3). Once this is done, we use the regularization property of the resolvent of the MIT bag operator to catch the semiclassical principal symbol of \mathcal{A}_m .

Throughout this section, we assume that $m > 1$, $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ and that Ω is smooth with a compact boundary $\Sigma := \partial\Omega$. Next, we introduce the semiclassical parameter $h = m^{-1} \in (0, 1]$, and we set $\mathcal{A}^h := \mathcal{A}_m$. Then, the following theorem is the main result of this section, it ensures that \mathcal{A}^h is a h -pseudodifferential operator of order 0 and gives its semiclassical principal symbol.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $h \in (0, 1]$ and $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, and let \mathcal{A}^h be as above. Then for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a h -pseudodifferential operator of order 0, $\mathcal{A}_N^h \in Op^h \mathcal{S}^0(\Sigma)$ such that for h sufficiently small, and any $0 \leq l \leq N + \frac{1}{2}$*

$$\|\mathcal{A}^h - \mathcal{A}_N^h\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma) \rightarrow H^{N+\frac{3}{2}-l}(\Sigma)} = O(h^{N+\frac{1}{2}+l}),$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_N^h = \frac{hD_\Sigma}{\sqrt{-h^2\Delta_\Sigma + I} + I} P_- \quad \text{mod } hOp^h \mathcal{S}^{-1}(\Sigma).$$

Let us consider $\mathbb{A} = \{(U_{\varphi_j}, V_{\varphi_j}, \varphi_j) : j \in \{1, \dots, N\}\}$ an atlas of Σ and $(U_\varphi, V_\varphi, \varphi) \in \mathbb{A}$. As in Section 3 we consider the case where U_φ is the graph of a smooth function χ , and we assume that Ω corresponds locally to the side $x_3 > \chi(x_1, x_2)$. Then, for

$$U_\varphi = \{(x_1, x_2, \chi(x_1, x_2)); (x_1, x_2) \in V_\varphi\}; \quad \varphi((x_1, x_2, \chi(x_1, x_2))) = (x_1, x_2)$$

$$\mathcal{V}_{\varphi, \varepsilon} := \{(y_1, y_2, y_3 + \chi(y_1, y_2)); (y_1, y_2, y_3) \in V_\varphi \times (0, \varepsilon)\} \subset \Omega,$$

with ε sufficiently small, we have the following homeomorphism:

$$\phi : \mathcal{V}_{\varphi, \varepsilon} \longrightarrow V_\varphi \times (0, \varepsilon)$$

$$(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mapsto (x_1, x_2, x_3 - \chi(x_1, x_2)).$$

Then the pull-back

$$\phi^* : C^\infty(V_\varphi \times (0, \varepsilon)) \longrightarrow C^\infty(\mathcal{V}_{\varphi, \varepsilon})$$

$$v \mapsto \phi^* v := v \circ \phi$$

transforms the differential operator D_m restricted on $\mathcal{V}_{\varphi, \varepsilon}$ into the following operator on $V_\varphi \times (0, \varepsilon)$:

$$\tilde{D}_m^\varphi := (\phi^{-1})^* D_m (\phi)^* = -i(\alpha_1 \partial_{y_1} + \alpha_2 \partial_{y_2} - (\alpha_1 \partial_{x_1} \chi + \alpha_2 \partial_{x_2} \chi - \alpha_3) \partial_{y_3}) + m\beta$$

$$= -i(\alpha_1 \partial_{y_1} + \alpha_2 \partial_{y_2}) + \sqrt{1 + |\nabla \chi|^2} (i\alpha \cdot n^\varphi)(\tilde{y}) \partial_{y_3} + m\beta,$$

where $\tilde{y} = (y_1, y_2)$ and $n^\varphi = (\varphi^{-1})^* n$ is the pull-back of the outward pointing normal to Ω restricted on V_φ :

$$n^\varphi(\tilde{y}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla \chi|^2}} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_1} \chi \\ \partial_{x_2} \chi \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} (y_1, y_2).$$

For the projectors P_{\pm} , we have:




FIGURE 1. Change of coordinates

$$P_{\pm}^{\varphi} := (\varphi^{-1})^* P_{\pm}(\varphi)^* = \frac{1}{2} \left(I_4 \mp i\beta \alpha \cdot n^{\varphi}(\tilde{y}) \right).$$

Thus, in the variable $y \in V_{\varphi} \times (0, \varepsilon)$, the equation (4.3) becomes:

$$\begin{cases} (\tilde{D}_m^{\varphi} - z)u = 0, & \text{in } V_{\varphi} \times (0, \varepsilon), \\ \Gamma_{-}^{\varphi} u = g^{\varphi} = g \circ \varphi^{-1}, & \text{on } V_{\varphi} \times \{0\}, \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

where $\Gamma_{\pm}^{\varphi} = P_{\pm}^{\varphi} t_{\{y_3=0\}}$.

By isolating the derivative with respect to y_3 , and using that $(i\alpha \cdot n^{\varphi})^{-1} = -i\alpha \cdot n^{\varphi}$, the system (5.1) becomes:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{y_3} u = \frac{i\alpha \cdot n^{\varphi}(\tilde{y})}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla\chi(\tilde{y})|^2}} \left(-i\alpha_1 \partial_{y_1} - i\alpha_2 \partial_{y_2} + m\beta - z \right) u, & \text{in } V_{\varphi} \times (0, \varepsilon), \\ \Gamma_{-}^{\varphi} u = g^{\varphi}, & \text{on } V_{\varphi} \times \{0\}. \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

Let us now introduce the matrices-valued symbols

$$L_0(\tilde{y}, \xi) := \frac{i\alpha \cdot n^{\varphi}(\tilde{y})}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla\chi(\tilde{y})|^2}} (\alpha \cdot \xi + \beta); \quad L_1(\tilde{y}) := \frac{-iz\alpha \cdot n^{\varphi}(\tilde{y})}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla\chi(\tilde{y})|^2}}, \quad (5.3)$$

with $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2)$ identified with $(\xi_1, \xi_2, 0)$. Then (5.2) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} h\partial_{y_3} u = L_0(\tilde{y}, hD_{\tilde{y}})u + hL_1(\tilde{y})u, & \text{in } V_{\varphi} \times (0, \varepsilon), \\ \Gamma_{-}^{\varphi} u = g^{\varphi}, & \text{on } V_{\varphi} \times \{0\}. \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

Before constructing an approximate solution of the system (5.4), let us give some properties of L_0 .

5.1. Algebraic properties of L_0 . The following lemma will be used in the sequel, it gathers some useful properties which allow us to simplify the expression of $L_0(\tilde{y}, \xi)$. We omit the proof since it is an easy consequence of the anticommutation relations of the Dirac's matrices and the formulas (4.2).

Lemma 5.1. *Let n^{φ} and ξ be as above, and let S be as in (4.1). Then, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\tau \perp n^{\varphi}$, the following identities hold:*

$$(S \cdot \tau - im\beta(\alpha \cdot n^{\varphi}(\tilde{y})))^2 = (|\tau|^2 + m^2) I_4.$$

$$P_{\pm}^{\varphi}(S \cdot \tau) = (S \cdot \tau)P_{\mp}^{\varphi} \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\pm}^{\varphi}(i\alpha \cdot n^{\varphi}) = (i\alpha \cdot n^{\varphi})P_{\mp}^{\varphi}.$$

The next proposition gathers the main properties of the operator L_0 .

Proposition 5.1. *Let $L_0(\tilde{y}, \xi)$ be as in (5.3), then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} L_0(\tilde{y}, \xi) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla\chi(\tilde{y})|^2}} \left(i\xi \cdot n^{\varphi}(\tilde{y}) + S \cdot (n^{\varphi}(\tilde{y}) \wedge \xi) - i\beta(\alpha \cdot n^{\varphi}(\tilde{y})) \right), \\ &= i\xi \cdot \tilde{n}^{\varphi}(\tilde{y}) + \frac{\lambda(\tilde{y}, \xi)}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla\chi(\tilde{y})|^2}} \Pi_{+}(\tilde{y}, \xi) - \frac{\lambda(\tilde{y}, \xi)}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla\chi(\tilde{y})|^2}} \Pi_{-}(\tilde{y}, \xi) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(\tilde{y}, \xi) &:= \sqrt{|n^\varphi(\tilde{y}) \wedge \xi|^2 + 1} = \sqrt{\langle G(\tilde{y})^{-1}\xi, \xi \rangle + 1}, \\ \tilde{n}^\varphi(\tilde{y}) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla\chi|^2}} n^\varphi(\tilde{y}), \\ \Pi_\pm(\tilde{y}, \xi) &:= \frac{1}{2} \left(I_4 \pm \frac{S \cdot (n^\varphi(\tilde{y}) \wedge \xi) - i\beta(\alpha \cdot n^\varphi(\tilde{y}))}{\lambda(\tilde{y}, \xi)} \right),\end{aligned}\tag{5.5}$$

with G the induced metric defined in Section 2.3.

In particular, the symbol $L_0(\tilde{y}, \xi)$ is elliptic in \mathcal{S}^1 and it admits two eigenvalues $\rho_\pm(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathcal{S}^1$ of multiplicity 2 which are given by

$$\rho_\pm(\tilde{y}, \xi) = \frac{in^\varphi(\tilde{y}) \cdot \xi \pm \lambda(\tilde{y}, \xi)}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla\chi|^2}},\tag{5.6}$$

and for which there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\pm \Re \rho_\pm(\tilde{y}, \xi) > c(\xi),\tag{5.7}$$

uniformly with respect to \tilde{y} . Moreover, $\Pi_\pm(\tilde{y}, \xi)$ are the projections onto $\text{Kr}(L_0(\tilde{y}, \xi) - \rho_\pm(\tilde{y}, \xi)I_4)$, belong to the symbol class \mathcal{S}^0 and satisfy:

$$P_\pm^\varphi \Pi_\pm(\tilde{y}, \xi) P_\pm^\varphi = k_\pm^\varphi(\tilde{y}, \xi) P_\pm^\varphi \quad \text{and} \quad P_\pm^\varphi \Pi_\mp(\tilde{y}, \xi) P_\mp^\varphi = \mp \Theta^\varphi(\tilde{y}, \xi) P_\mp^\varphi,\tag{5.8}$$

with

$$k_\pm^\varphi(\tilde{y}, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 \pm \frac{1}{\lambda(\tilde{y}, \xi)} \right), \quad \Theta^\varphi(\tilde{y}, \xi) = \frac{1}{2\lambda(\tilde{y}, \xi)} (S \cdot (n^\varphi(\tilde{y}) \wedge \xi)).\tag{5.9}$$

That is, k_\pm^φ is a positive function of \mathcal{S}^0 , $(k_\pm^\varphi)^{-1} \in \mathcal{S}^0$ and $\Theta^\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^0$.

Remark 5.1. Thanks to the property (5.8) a 4×4 -matrix A is uniquely determined by $P_-^\varphi A$ and $\Pi_+ A$ and we have:

$$A = P_-^\varphi A + P_+^\varphi A = P_-^\varphi A + \frac{1}{k_+^\varphi} P_+^\varphi \Pi_+ P_+^\varphi A = \left(I - \frac{P_+^\varphi \Pi_+}{k_+^\varphi} \right) P_-^\varphi A + \frac{P_+^\varphi}{k_+^\varphi} \Pi_+ A.$$

Proof of Proposition 5.1. By definition it is clear that $L_0(\tilde{y}, \xi)$ belongs to the symbol class \mathcal{S}^1 , $\Pi_\pm(\tilde{y}, \xi)$, $\Theta^\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^0$, k_\pm^φ a positive function of \mathcal{S}^0 and $(k_\pm^\varphi)^{-1} \in \mathcal{S}^0$. Now, by (4.2) we obtain that

$$L_0(\tilde{y}, \xi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla\chi(\tilde{y})|^2}} \left(i\xi \cdot n^\varphi(\tilde{y}) + S \cdot (n^\varphi(\tilde{y}) \wedge \xi) - i\beta(\alpha \cdot n^\varphi(\tilde{y})) \right),$$

and since $(n^\varphi \wedge \xi) \perp n^\varphi$, Lemma 5.1 yields that

$$(S \cdot (n^\varphi(\tilde{y}) \wedge \xi) - i\beta(\alpha \cdot n^\varphi(\tilde{y})))^2 = |n^\varphi \wedge \xi|^2 + 1 = (\lambda(\tilde{y}, \xi))^2,$$

with λ as in (5.5). From this we deduce that $L_0(\tilde{y}, \xi)$ has two eigenvalues ρ_\pm which are given by (5.6) and $\Pi_\pm(\tilde{y}, \xi)$ are the corresponding projectors onto $\text{Kr}(L_0(\tilde{y}, \xi) - \rho_\pm(\tilde{y}, \xi)I_4)$. Next, using (2.13) we get for some $c > 0$ independent of \tilde{y} that

$$\pm \Re \rho_\pm(\tilde{y}, \xi) = \frac{\sqrt{|n^\varphi \wedge \xi|^2 + 1}}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla\chi|^2}} = \frac{\sqrt{\langle G(\tilde{y})^{-1}\xi, \xi \rangle + 1}}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla\chi|^2}} \geq c(1 + |\xi|),$$

which gives (5.7) and shows that ρ_\pm are elliptic in \mathcal{S}^1 . Consequently, we also get that $L_0(\tilde{y}, \xi)$ is elliptic in \mathcal{S}^1 . Now, using Lemma 5.1 and the properties (4.1), a simple computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}P_+^\varphi \Pi_\pm &= k_\pm^\varphi P_+^\varphi \pm \frac{1}{2\lambda} (S \cdot (n^\varphi(\tilde{y}) \wedge \xi)) P_-^\varphi, \\ P_-^\varphi \Pi_\pm &= k_\mp^\varphi P_-^\varphi \pm \frac{1}{2\lambda} (S \cdot (n^\varphi(\tilde{y}) \wedge \xi)) P_+^\varphi,\end{aligned}$$

with k_\pm^φ as in (5.9). Hence, (5.8) directly follows from the above formulas. \square

5.2. Semiclassical parametrix for the boundary problem. In this section, we construct the approximate solution of the system (1.1) mentioned in the introduction. For simplicity of notation, in the sequel we will use y and P_{\pm} instead of \tilde{y} and P_{\pm}^{φ} , respectively.

We are going to construct a local approximate solution of the following first order system:

$$\begin{cases} h\partial_{\tau}u^h = L_0(y, hD_y)u^h + hL_1(y)u^h, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, +\infty), \\ P_-u^h = f, & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

To be precise, we will look for a solution u^h in the following form:

$$u^h(y, \tau) = Op^h(A^h(\cdot, \cdot, \tau))f = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} A^h(y, h\xi, \tau)e^{iy \cdot \xi} \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi, \quad (5.10)$$

with $A^h(\cdot, \cdot, \tau) \in \mathcal{S}^0$ for any $\tau > 0$ constructed inductively in the form:

$$A^h(y, \xi, \tau) \sim \sum_{j \geq 0} h^j A_j(y, \xi, \tau).$$

The action of $h\partial_{\tau} - L_0(y, hD_y) - hL_1(y)$ on $A^h(y, hD_y, \tau)f$ is given by $T^h(y, hD_y, \tau)f$, with

$$T^h(y, \xi, \tau) = h(\partial_{\tau}A)(y, \xi, \tau) - L_0(y, \xi)A(y, \xi, \tau) + h\left(L_1(y)A(y, \xi, \tau) - \partial_{\xi}L_0(y, \xi) \cdot \partial_y A(y, \xi, \tau)\right).$$

Then we look for A_0 satisfying:

$$\begin{cases} h\partial_{\tau}A_0(y, \xi, \tau) = L_0(y, \xi)A_0(y, \xi, \tau), \\ P_-(y)A_0(y, \xi, \tau) = P_-(y), \end{cases} \quad (5.11)$$

and for $j \geq 1$,

$$\begin{cases} h\partial_{\tau}A_j(y, \xi, \tau) = L_0(y, \xi)A_j(y, \xi, \tau) + L_1(y)A_{j-1}(y, \xi, \tau) - \partial_{\xi}L_0(y, \xi) \cdot \partial_y A_{j-1}(y, \xi, \tau), \\ P_-(y)A_j(y, \xi, \tau) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (5.12)$$

Let us introduce a class of parametrized symbols, in which we will construct the family A_j :

$$\mathcal{P}_h^m := \{b(\cdot, \cdot, \tau) \in \mathcal{S}^m; \forall (k, l) \in \mathbb{N}^2, \tau^k \partial_{\tau}^l b(\cdot, \cdot, \tau) \in h^{k-l} \mathcal{S}^{m-k+l}\}; \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proposition 5.2. *There exists $A_0 \in \mathcal{P}_h^0$ solution of (5.11) given by:*

$$A_0(y, \xi, \tau) = \frac{\Pi_-(y, \xi)P_-(y)}{k_+^{\varphi}(y, \xi)} e^{h^{-1}\tau\rho_-(y, \xi)}.$$

Proof. The solutions of the differential system $h\partial_{\tau}A_0 = L_0A_0$ are $A_0(y, \xi, \tau) = e^{h^{-1}\tau L_0(y, \xi)}A_0(y, \xi, 0)$. By definition of ρ_{\pm} and Π_{\pm} , we have:

$$e^{h^{-1}\tau L_0(y, \xi)} = e^{h^{-1}\tau\rho_-(y, \xi)}\Pi_-(y, \xi) + e^{h^{-1}\tau\rho_+(y, \xi)}\Pi_+(y, \xi). \quad (5.13)$$

It follows from (5.7) that A_0 belongs to \mathcal{S}^0 for any $\tau > 0$ if and only if $\Pi_+(y, \xi)A_0(y, \xi, 0) = 0$. Moreover, the boundary condition $P_-A_0 = P_-$ implies $P_-(y)A_0(y, \xi, 0) = P_-(y)$. Thus, thanks to Remark 5.1, we deduce that

$$A_0(y, \xi, 0) = P_-(y) - \frac{P_+\Pi_+P_-}{k_+^{\varphi}}(y, \xi) = P_-(y) + \frac{P_+\Pi_-P_-}{k_+^{\varphi}}(y, \xi) = \frac{\Pi_-P_-}{k_+^{\varphi}}(y, \xi).$$

The properties of ρ_- , Π_- , P_- and k_+ given in Proposition 5.1, imply that $(k_+^{\varphi})^{-1}\Pi_-P_- \in \mathcal{S}^0$ and that $e^{h^{-1}\tau\rho_-(y, \xi)} \in \mathcal{P}_h^0$. This concludes the proof of Proposition 5.2. \square

For the other terms A_j , $j \geq 1$, we have:

Proposition 5.3. *Let A_0 be defined by Proposition 5.2. Then for any $j \geq 1$, there exists $A_j \in h^j \mathcal{P}_h^{-j}$ solution of (5.12) which has the form:*

$$A_j(y, \xi, \tau) = e^{h^{-1}\tau\rho_-(y, \xi)} \sum_{k=0}^{2j} (h^{-1}\tau\langle \xi \rangle)^k B_{j,k}(y, \xi), \quad (5.14)$$

with $B_{j,k} \in h^j \mathcal{S}^{-j}$.

Proof. Since A_0 has already the claimed form by Proposition 5.2, so for A_j with $j \geq 1$, it is sufficient to prove the induction step. Thus, assume that there exists $A_j \in h^j \mathcal{P}_h^{-j}$ solution of (5.12) satisfying the above property and let us prove that the same holds for A_{j+1} . In order to be a solution of the differential system $h\partial_\tau A_{j+1} = L_0 A_{j+1} + L_1 A_j - \partial_\xi L_0 \cdot \partial_y A_j$, for A_{j+1} we have:

$$A_{j+1} = e^{h^{-1}\tau L_0} A_{j+1}|_{\tau=0} + e^{h^{-1}\tau L_0} \int_0^\tau e^{-h^{-1}s L_0} (L_1 A_j - \partial_\xi L_0 \cdot \partial_y A_j) ds, \quad (5.15)$$

where $L_1 A_j$ has still the form (5.14), and we have

$$\partial_y A_j = e^{h^{-1}\tau \rho_-} \left(h^{-1}\tau \partial_y \rho_- + \partial_y \right) \sum_{k=0}^{2j} (h^{-1}\tau \langle \xi \rangle)^k B_{j,k}.$$

Thus, thanks to the properties ρ_- and $B_{j,k}$, the quantity $(L_1 A_j - \partial_\xi L_0 \cdot \partial_y A_j)(y, \xi, s)$ has the form:

$$e^{h^{-1}s \rho_-(y, \xi)} \sum_{k=0}^{2j+1} (h^{-1}\tau \langle \xi \rangle)^k \tilde{B}_{j,k}(y, \xi) \quad (5.16)$$

with $\tilde{B}_{j,k} \in h^j \mathcal{S}^{-j}$. So, by using the decomposition (5.13), for the second term of the r.h.s. of (5.15) we have:

$$e^{h^{-1}\tau L_0} \int_0^\tau e^{-h^{-1}s L_0} (L_1 A_j - \partial_\xi L_0 \cdot \partial_y A_j) ds = e^{h^{-1}\tau \rho_-} \Pi_- I_-^j(\tau) + e^{h^{-1}\tau \rho_+} \Pi_+ I_+^j(\tau) \quad (5.17)$$

with

$$I_\pm^j(\tau) = \int_0^\tau e^{h^{-1}s(\rho_- - \rho_\pm)} \sum_{k=0}^{2j+1} (h^{-1}s \langle \xi \rangle)^k \tilde{B}_{j,k} ds,$$

For I_-^j , the exponential term is equal to 1 and by integration of s^k , we obtain:

$$I_-^j(\tau) = \sum_{k=0}^{2j+1} (h^{-1}\tau \langle \xi \rangle)^{k+1} \frac{h \langle \xi \rangle^{-1}}{k+1} \tilde{B}_{j,k}. \quad (5.18)$$

For I_+^j , let us introduce P_k the polynomial of degree k such that

$$\int_0^\tau e^{\lambda s} s^k ds = \frac{1}{\lambda^{k+1}} (e^{\tau \lambda} P_k(\tau \lambda) - P_k(0)),$$

for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$. With this notation in hand, we easily see that the term $e^{\tau^h \rho_+} \Pi_+ I_+^j(\tau)$ has the following form:

$$e^{\tau^h \rho_+} \Pi_+ I_+^j(\tau) = \Pi_+ \sum_{k=0}^{2j+1} \frac{h \langle \xi \rangle^k}{(\rho_- - \rho_+)^{k+1}} \tilde{B}_{j,k} \left(e^{\tau^h \rho_-} P_k(\tau^h (\rho_- - \rho_+)) - e^{\tau^h \rho_+} P_k(0) \right), \quad (5.19)$$

where $\tau^h := h^{-1}\tau$. Thus, combining (5.18) and (5.19) with (5.15), (5.17) and (5.13), yields that

$$A_{j+1} = e^{h^{-1}\tau \rho_+} \left(\Pi_+ A_{j+1}|_{\tau=0} - \widetilde{B_{j+1}^+} \right) + e^{h^{-1}\tau \rho_-} \left(\Pi_- A_{j+1}|_{\tau=0} + \sum_{k=0}^{2(j+1)} (h^{-1}\tau \langle \xi \rangle)^k \widetilde{B_{j+1,k}^-} \right),$$

where

$$\widetilde{B_{j+1}^+} = \Pi_+ \sum_{k=0}^{2j+1} \frac{h \langle \xi \rangle^k}{(\rho_- - \rho_+)^{k+1}} P_k(0) \tilde{B}_{j,k} \in h^{j+1} \mathcal{S}^{-j-1},$$

and $\widetilde{B_{j+1,k}^-} \in h^{j+1} \mathcal{S}^{-j-1}$ as a linear combination of products of $\Pi_- \in \mathcal{S}^0$, $h \langle \xi \rangle^{-1}$ (or $h \langle \xi \rangle^k (\rho_- - \rho_+)^{-k-1}$) belonging to $h \mathcal{S}^{-1}$, and of $\tilde{B}_{j,k} \in h^j \mathcal{S}^{-j}$.

Now, in order to have $A_{j+1} \in \mathcal{S}^0$, we let the contribution of the exponentially growing term vanish by choosing

$$\Pi_+ A_{j+1}(y, \xi, 0) = \widetilde{B_{j+1}^+}(y, \xi).$$

Then, thanks to Remark 5.1, the boundary condition $P_-(y) A_{j+1}(y, \xi, 0) = 0$ gives

$$A_{j+1}(y, \xi, 0) = \frac{P_+ \Pi_+}{k_+^\varphi} \widetilde{B_{j+1}^+}(y, \xi).$$

Finally, we have

$$A_{j+1}(y, \xi, \tau) = e^{h^{-1}\tau \rho_-(y, \xi)} \left(\frac{\Pi_- P_+ \Pi_+}{k_+^\varphi} \widetilde{B_{j+1}^+}(y, \xi) + \sum_{k=0}^{2(j+1)} (h^{-1}\tau \langle \xi \rangle)^k \widetilde{B_{j+1,k}^-}(y, \xi) \right),$$

and Proposition 5.3 is proven with

$$B_{j+1,0} = \frac{\Pi_- P_+ \Pi_+}{k_+^\varphi} \widetilde{B_{j+1}^+} + \widetilde{B_{j+1,0}^-},$$

and for $k \geq 1$, $B_{j+1,k} = \widetilde{B_{j+1,k}^-}$. \square

Remark 5.2. *The computation of each term $B_{j,0}$ can be done recursively, but this leads to complicated calculations. For example $B_{1,0}$ has the following form*

$$B_{1,0}(y, \xi) = -h\Pi_+ a_0 \left(\frac{(z + i\alpha \cdot \partial_y)}{2\lambda} - \frac{i\alpha \cdot \partial_y \rho_-}{4\lambda^2} \right) \Pi_- A_0(y, \xi),$$

with $a_0(\tilde{y}) = i\alpha \cdot \tilde{n}^\varphi(\tilde{y})$.

Thanks to the relation (5.10), to any $A^h \in \mathcal{P}_h^0$ we associate a bounded operator from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ into $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, +\infty))$. The boundedness in the variable $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is a consequence of the Calderon-Vaillancourt theorem (see (2.8)), and in the variable $\tau \in (0, +\infty)$ it is essentially the multiplication by an L^∞ -function. Moreover, for A_j of the form (5.14), we have the following mapping property which captures the Sobolev space regularity.

Proposition 5.4. *Let A_j , $j \geq 0$, be of the form (5.14). Then, for any $s \geq -j - \frac{1}{2}$, the operator A_j defined by*

$$\mathcal{A}_j : f \longmapsto (\mathcal{A}_j f)(y, y_3) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} A_j(y, h\xi, y_3) e^{iy \cdot \xi} \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi$$

gives rise to a bounded operator from $H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$ into $H^{s+j+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, +\infty))$. Moreover, for any $l \in [0, j + \frac{1}{2}]$ we have:

$$\|\mathcal{A}_j\|_{H^s \rightarrow H^{s+j+\frac{1}{2}-l}} = O(h^{l-s}). \quad (5.20)$$

Proof. First, let us prove the result for $s = k - j - \frac{1}{2}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, between the semiclassical Sobolev spaces

$$H_{\text{scl}}^s(\mathbb{R}^2) := \langle hD_y \rangle^{-s} L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$$

$$H_{\text{scl}}^k(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, +\infty)) := \{u \in L^2; \langle hD_y \rangle^{k_1} (h\partial_{y_3})^{k_2} u \in L^2 \text{ for } (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2, k_1 + k_2 = k\},$$

where $\langle hD_y \rangle = \sqrt{-h^2 \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} + I}$. Then, for $f \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)^4$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{A}_j f\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^k(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, +\infty))}^2 &= \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} \|\langle hD_y \rangle^{k_1} (h\partial_{y_3})^{k_2} \mathcal{A}_j f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, +\infty))}^2 \\ &= \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} \int_0^{+\infty} \|\langle hD_y \rangle^{k_1} (h\partial_{y_3})^{k_2} (\mathcal{A}_j f)(\cdot, y_3)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 dy_3. \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

Thanks to the ellipticity property (5.7), for A_j given by Proposition 5.3 we have:

$$(h\partial_{y_3})^{k_2} A_j(y, \xi, y_3) = h^j b_j(y, \xi; y_3) e^{-h^{-1} y_3 \frac{c}{2} \langle \xi \rangle} \langle \xi \rangle^{k_2-j},$$

with b_j satisfying, for any $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \times \mathbb{N}^2$ there exists $C_{\alpha, \beta} > 0$ such that:

$$|\partial_y^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta b_j(y, \xi; y_3)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta}, \quad \forall (y, \xi; y_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, +\infty).$$

Consequently, thanks to the Calderón-Vaillancourt theorem (see (2.8)), we can write:

$$\langle hD_y \rangle^{k_1} (h\partial_{y_3})^{k_2} \mathcal{A}_j = h^j \mathcal{B}_j(y_3) \langle hD_y \rangle^{k_1+k_2-j} e^{-h^{-1} y_3 \frac{c}{2} \langle hD_y \rangle},$$

with $(\mathcal{B}_j(y_3))_{y_3>0}$ a family of bounded operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and uniformly bounded with respect to $y_3 > 0$. Then, for $f \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)^4$, we have:

$$\|\langle hD_y \rangle^{k_1} (h\partial_{y_3})^{k_2} (\mathcal{A}_j f)(\cdot, y_3)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \lesssim h^j \|\langle hD_y \rangle^{k_1+k_2-j} e^{-h^{-1} y_3 \frac{c}{2} \langle hD_y \rangle} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2,$$

and from (5.21) we deduce that

$$\|\mathcal{A}_j f\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^k(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, +\infty))}^2 \lesssim h^{2j+1} \|\langle hD_y \rangle^{k-j-\frac{1}{2}} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 = h^{2j+1} \|f\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^{k-j-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2,$$

where we used that for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $f \in H_{\text{scl}}^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle hD_y \rangle^l e^{-h^{-1} y_3 \frac{c}{2} \langle hD_y \rangle} f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 &= \langle e^{-h^{-1} y_3 c \langle hD_y \rangle} \langle hD_y \rangle^l f, \langle hD_y \rangle^l f \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= -\frac{h}{c} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_3} \langle e^{-h^{-1} y_3 c \langle hD_y \rangle} \langle hD_y \rangle^{l-1} f, \langle hD_y \rangle^l f \rangle_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By interpolation arguments we thus deduce that for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $s \geq -j - \frac{1}{2}$, it holds that

$$\|\mathcal{A}_j\|_{H_{\text{scl}}^s \rightarrow H_{\text{scl}}^{s+j+\frac{1}{2}}} = O(h^{j+\frac{1}{2}}),$$

proving the estimate (5.20) and completing the proof of the proposition. \square

Proposition 5.5. *Let $f \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and A_j , $j \geq 0$, be as in Propositions 5.2 and 5.3. Then for any $N \geq -s - \frac{1}{2}$, the function $u_N^h = \sum_{j=0}^N h^j \mathcal{A}_j f$ satisfies:*

$$\begin{cases} h\partial_\tau u_N^h - L_0(y, hD_y)u_N^h - hL_1(y)u_N^h = h^{N+1}\mathcal{R}_N^h f, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, +\infty), \\ P_- u_N^h = f, & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0\}, \end{cases} \quad (5.22)$$

with

$$\mathcal{R}_N^h : f \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(L_1 A_N - \partial_\xi L_0 \cdot \partial_y A_N \right) (y, h\xi, \tau) e^{iy \cdot \xi} \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi,$$

a bounded operator from $H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$ into $H^{s+N+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, +\infty))$ satisfying for any $l \in [0, N + \frac{1}{2}]$:

$$\|\mathcal{R}_N^h\|_{H^s \rightarrow H^{s+N+\frac{1}{2}-l}} = O(h^{l-s}). \quad (5.23)$$

Proof. By construction of the sequence $(A_j)_{j \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}}$ we have the system (5.22) with $\mathcal{R}_N^h = Op^h(r_N^h(\cdot, \cdot, \tau))$,

$$r_N^h(y, \xi, \tau) = \left(L_1 A_N - \partial_\xi L_0 \cdot \partial_y A_N \right) (y, \xi, \tau),$$

(see the beginning of Section 5.2). As in the proof of Proposition 5.3, r_N^h has the form (5.16) (with $j = N$). Then, as in the proof of Proposition 5.4 we obtain the estimate (5.23). \square

5.3. Proof of Theorem 5.1. In this section, we apply the above construction in order to prove Theorem 5.1.

Let $g \in P_- H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$, $(U_\varphi, V_\varphi, \varphi)$ a chart of the atlas \mathbb{A} and $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C_0^\infty(U_\varphi)$. Then $f := (\varphi^{-1})^*(\psi_2 g)$ is a function of $H^{1/2}(V_\varphi)^4$ which can be extended by 0 to a function of $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^2)^4$. Then for $h = 1/m$ and any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the previous construction provides a function $u_N^h \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, +\infty))^4$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} (\tilde{D}_m^\varphi - z)u_N^h = h^{N+1}\mathcal{R}_N^h f, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \varepsilon), \\ \Gamma_- u_N^h = f, & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0\}, \end{cases}$$

with $u_N^h = \sum_{j=0}^N h^j \mathcal{A}_j f$ (see Proposition 5.4) and $\mathcal{R}_N^h f \in H^{N+1}(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \varepsilon))$ with norm in H^{N+1-l} , $l \in [0, N + \frac{1}{2}]$, bounded by $O(h^{l-\frac{1}{2}})$. Consequently, $v_N^h := \phi^* u_N^h$, defined on $\mathcal{V}_{\varphi, \varepsilon}$, satisfies:

$$\begin{cases} (D_m - z)v_N^h = h^{N+1}\phi^*(\mathcal{R}_N^h f), & \text{in } \mathcal{V}_{\varphi, \varepsilon}, \\ \Gamma_- v_N^h = \psi_2 g, & \text{on } U_\varphi. \end{cases}$$

Now, let $E_m^\Omega(z)[\psi_2 g] \in H^1(\Omega)^4$ be as in Definition 4.1. Since $\Gamma_- v_N^h = \Gamma_- E_m^\Omega(z)[\psi_2 g] = \psi_2 g$, then the following equality holds in $\mathcal{V}_{\varphi, \varepsilon}$:

$$v_N^h - E_m^\Omega(z)[\psi_2 g] = h^{N+1}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1}\phi^*\left(\mathcal{R}_N^h(\varphi^{-1})^*(\psi_2 g)\right).$$

From this, we deduce that

$$\psi_1 \mathcal{A}_m \psi_2(g) := \psi_1 \Gamma_+ E_m^\Omega(z)[\psi_2 g] = \psi_1 \Gamma_+ v_N^h - h^{N+1}\psi_1 \Gamma_+ (H_{\text{MIT}} - z)^{-1}\phi^*\left(\mathcal{R}_N^h(\varphi^{-1})^*(\psi_2 g)\right).$$

Since $\phi \lfloor_{U_\varphi} = \varphi$, for any $u \in H^1(V_\varphi \times (0, \varepsilon))^4$, we have that

$$\Gamma_+ \phi^*(u) = \varphi^*(P_+ u \lfloor_{V_\varphi \times \{0\}}), \quad \psi_1 \Gamma_+ v_N^h = \psi_1 \varphi^* Op^h(a_N^h)(\varphi^{-1})^* \psi_2 g,$$

with

$$a_N^h(\tilde{y}, \xi) = \sum_{j=0}^N h^j P_+ A_j(y, \xi, 0) = \sum_{j=0}^N h^j P_+ B_{j,0}(y, \xi),$$

where $B_{j,0} \in h^j S^{-j}$ are introduced in Proposition 5.3. Thus, from Proposition 5.2, in local coordinates, the principal semiclassical symbol of \mathcal{A}_m is given by

$$P_+ B_{0,0}(y, \xi) = P_+ A_0(y, \xi, 0) = \frac{P_+ \Pi_- P_-}{k_+^\varphi}(y, \xi).$$

Thanks to the property (5.8) it is equal to

$$-\Theta^\varphi P_-(y, \xi) = \frac{S \cdot (\xi \wedge n^\varphi(y))}{\sqrt{\langle G(y)^{-1} \xi, \xi \rangle + 1 + 1}} P_-(y, \xi).$$

We conclude the proof of Theorem 5.1 from results of Section 2.4 and by proving the following Lemma which is a consequence of the above considerations, the regularity estimates from Theorem 3.1-(iii), Theorem 3.2-(i) and Proposition 4.1.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$ such that $\text{supp}(\psi_1) \cap \text{supp}(\psi_2) = \emptyset$. Then, for $m_0 > 0$ sufficiently large, $m \geq m_0$, and for any $(k, N) \in \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}^*$ it holds that*

$$\|\psi_1 \mathcal{A}_m \psi_2\|_{P_- H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow P_+ H^k(\Sigma)^4} = \mathcal{O}(m^{-N}).$$

Proof. Let $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$ with disjoint supports. Thanks to Theorem 3.1-(iii) and Theorem 3.2-(i), to prove the lemma it suffices to show that for any $(N_1, N_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, there exists C_{N_1, N_2} such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\psi_1 \mathcal{A}_m \psi_2)g\|_{P_+ H^{N_2 + \frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)^4} &\leq \frac{C_{N_1, N_2}}{\sqrt{m}} \left(\prod_{k=0}^{N_2-1} \|(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1}\|_{H^k(\Omega)^4 \rightarrow H^{k+1}(\Omega)^4} \right) \\ &\quad \times \|(H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^4 \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)^4}^{N_1} \|g\|_{P_- H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

For this, let us introduce $\Phi_1 \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\Phi_1 = 1$ near $\text{supp}(\psi_1)$ and $\Phi_1 = 0$ near $\text{supp}(\psi_2)$. Thus for $g \in P_- H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)^4$ and $E_m^\Omega(z)[\psi_2 g] \in H^1(\Omega)$ as in Definition 4.1, the function $u_{1,2} := \Phi_1 E_m^\Omega(z)[\psi_2 g]$ satisfies:

$$\begin{cases} (D_m - z)u_{1,2} = [D_0, \Phi_1]E_m^\Omega(z)[\psi_2 g], & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \Gamma_- u_{1,2} = \Phi_1 \lfloor_\Sigma \psi_2 g = 0, & \text{on } \Sigma. \end{cases}$$

Then, $u_{1,2} = (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1}[D_0, \Phi_1]E_m^\Omega(z)[\psi_2 g]$, and for any $\widetilde{\Phi}_1 \in C_0^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ equals to 1 near $\text{supp}(\psi_1)$ we have:

$$\psi_1 \mathcal{A}_m \psi_2(g) = \psi_1 \Gamma_+ \widetilde{\Phi}_1 (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1}[D_0, \Phi_1]E_m^\Omega(z)[\psi_2 g].$$

Moreover, by choosing $\widetilde{\Phi}_1$ such that $\widetilde{\Phi}_1 \prec \Phi_1$, that is $\Phi_1 = 1$ on $\text{supp}(\widetilde{\Phi}_1)$, both functions $\widetilde{\Phi}_1$ and $[D_0, \Phi_1]$ have disjoint supports, and we can then apply the following telescopic formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\Phi}_1 (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1}(1 - \chi_1) &= \widetilde{\Phi}_1 (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1}[D_0, \chi_N] \cdots (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1}[D_0, \chi_2] \\ &\quad (H_{\text{MIT}}(m) - z)^{-1}(1 - \chi_1), \end{aligned}$$

for $(\chi_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ a family of compactly supported smooth functions such that $\widetilde{\Phi}_1 \prec \chi_N \prec \chi_{N-1} \prec \cdots \prec \chi_1 \prec \Phi_1$. Since $[D_0, \Phi_1] = (1 - \chi_1)[D_0, \Phi_1]$, the above telescopic formula allows us to write $\psi_1 \mathcal{A}_m \psi_2(g)$ as a product of N cutoff resolvents of $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$. Now, by Proposition 4.1 we have

$$\|E_m^\Omega(z)[\psi_2 g]\|_{L^2(\Omega)^4} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \|g\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}.$$

Thus, using the continuity of Γ_+ from $H^{N_2+1}(\Omega)$ to $H^{N_2+\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma)$, we then get the estimation (5.24) for $N = N_1 + N_2$, finishing the proof of the lemma. \square

Remark 5.3. *Note that for any $m > 0$ and $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, the parametrix we have constructed for \mathcal{A}_m is valid from the classical pseudodifferential point of view. Actually, Lemma 5.2 is the only result where the assumption that m is big enough has been assumed, and it is exclusively required to ensure that away from the diagonal the operator \mathcal{A}_m is negligible in $1/m$. In the same vein, if m is fixed then the proof of Lemma 5.2 still ensures that away from the diagonal \mathcal{A}_m is regularizing. Consequently, we deduce that for any $m > 0$ and $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, the operator \mathcal{A}_m is a homogeneous pseudodifferential operator of order 0, and that*

$$\mathcal{A}_m = \frac{D_\Sigma}{\sqrt{-\Delta_\Sigma}} P_- \quad \text{mod } Op\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\Sigma),$$

which is in accordance with Theorem 4.1.

Remark 5.4. *If Ω is the upper half-plane $\{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3; x_3 > 0\}$, we easily obtain that \mathcal{A}_m is a Fourier multiplier with symbol*

$$a_m(\xi) = -\frac{i\alpha_3(\alpha \cdot \xi - z)}{\sqrt{|\xi|^2 + m^2 + m}} P_-.$$

6. RESOLVENT CONVERGENCE TO THE MIT BAG MODEL

In the whole section, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ denotes a bounded smooth domain, we set

$$\Omega_i = \Omega, \quad \Omega_e = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \bar{\Omega} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma = \partial\Omega,$$

and we let n be the outward (with respect to Ω_i) unit normal vector field on Σ .

Fix $m > 0$ and let $M > 0$. Consider the perturbed Dirac operator

$$H_M \varphi = (D_m + M\beta 1_{\Omega_e})\varphi, \quad \forall \varphi \in \text{dom}(H_M) := H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^4,$$

where 1_{Ω_e} is the characteristic function of Ω_e . Using Kato-Rellich theorem and Weyl's theorem, it is easy to see that $(H_M, \text{dom}(H_M))$ is self-adjoint and that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sp}_{\text{ess}}(H_M) &= (-\infty, -(m+M)] \cup [m+M, +\infty), \\ \text{Sp}(H_M) \cap (-(m+M), m+M) &\text{ is purely discrete.} \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$ be the MIT bag operator acting on $L^2(\Omega_i)^4$, that is

$$H_{\text{MIT}}(m)v = D_m v \quad \forall v \in \text{dom}(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) := \{v \in H^1(\Omega_i)^4 : P_- t_\Sigma v = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma\},$$

where t_Σ and P_\pm are the trace operator and the orthogonal projection from Subsection 2.1.

The aim of this section is to use the properties of the Poincaré-Steklov operators carried out in the previous sections to study the resolvent of H_M when M is large enough. Namely, we give a Krein-type resolvent formula in terms of the resolvent of $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$, and we show that the convergence of H_M toward $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$ holds in the norm resolvent sense with a convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/M)$, which improves the result of [9].

Before stating the main results of this section, we need to introduce some notations and definitions. First, we introduce the following Dirac auxiliary operator

$$\tilde{H}_M u = D_{m+M} u, \quad \forall u \in \text{dom}(\tilde{H}_M) := \{u \in H^1(\Omega_e)^4 : P_+ t_\Sigma u = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma\}.$$

Notice that \tilde{H}_M is the MIT bag operator on Ω_e (the boundary condition is with P_+ because the normal n is incoming for Ω_e). Since Ω_e is unbounded, Theorem 3.1 together with Remark 3.1 imply that $(\tilde{H}_M, \text{dom}(\tilde{H}_M))$ is self-adjoint and that

$$\text{Sp}(\tilde{H}_M) = \text{Sp}_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{H}_M) = (-\infty, -(m+M)] \cup [m+M, +\infty).$$

In particular, $\rho(H_M) \subset \rho(\tilde{H}_M)$. Let $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \cap \rho(\tilde{H}_M)$, $g \in P_- H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$ and $h \in P_+ H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$. We denote by $E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) : P_- H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_i)^4$ the unique solution of the boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} (D_m - z)v = 0, & \text{in } \Omega_i, \\ P_- t_\Sigma v = g, & \text{in } \Sigma. \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

Similarly, we denote by $E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z) : P_+ H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_e)^4$ the unique solution of the boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} (D_{m+M} - z)u = 0, & \text{in } \Omega_e, \\ P_+ t_\Sigma u = h, & \text{in } \Sigma. \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

Define the Poincaré-Steklov operators associated to the above problems by

$$\mathcal{A}_m^i = P_+ t_\Sigma E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) P_- \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e = P_- t_\Sigma E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z) P_+.$$

Notation 6.1. In the sequel we shall denote by $R_M(z)$, $\tilde{R}_M(z)$ and $R_{\text{MIT}}(z)$ the resolvent of H_M , \tilde{H}_M and $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$, respectively. We also use the notations:

- $\Gamma_\pm = P_\pm t_\Sigma$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma_+ r_{\Omega_i} + \Gamma_- r_{\Omega_e}$.
- $E_M(z) = e_{\Omega_i} E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) P_- + e_{\Omega_e} E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z) P_+$.
- $\tilde{R}_{\text{MIT}}(z) = e_{\Omega_i} R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i} + e_{\Omega_e} \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e}$.

With these notations in hand, we can state the main results of this section. The following theorem is the main tool to show the large coupling convergence with a rate of convergence of $\mathcal{O}(1/M)$.

Theorem 6.1. *There is $M_0 > 0$ such that for all $M > M_0$ and all $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \cap \rho(H_M)$, the operator $\Psi_M(z) := (I - \mathcal{A}_m^i - \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e)$ is bounded invertible in $H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$, and the inverse is given by*

$$\Psi_M^{-1}(z) = (I_4 - \mathcal{A}_m^i \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e - \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \mathcal{A}_m^i)^{-1} (I + \mathcal{A}_m^i + \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e),$$

and the following resolvent formula holds:

$$R_M(z) = \tilde{R}_{\text{MIT}}(z) + E_M(z) \Psi_M^{-1}(z) \Gamma \tilde{R}_{\text{MIT}}(z). \quad (6.3)$$

Remark 6.1. By Proposition 4.1 (ii) we have that

$$(E_m^{\Omega_i}(z))^* = -\beta\Gamma_+ R_{\text{MIT}}(\bar{z}) \quad \text{and} \quad (E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z))^* = -\beta\Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(\bar{z}),$$

for any $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \cap \rho(H_M)$. Thus, the resolvent formula (6.3) can be written in the form

$$R_M(z) = \tilde{R}_{\text{MIT}}(z) - (\beta\Gamma \tilde{R}_{\text{MIT}}(\bar{z}))^* \Psi_M^{-1}(z) \Gamma \tilde{R}_{\text{MIT}}(z).$$

Before going through the proof of Theorem 6.1 we first establish a regularity result that will play a crucial role in the rest of this section. It concerns the dependence on the parameter M of the norm of an auxiliary operator which involves the composition of the operators \mathcal{A}_m^i and \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e . In the proof we use the symbols \hat{u} and $\mathcal{F}[u]$ to denote the Fourier transform of u .

Proposition 6.1. Let \mathcal{A}_m^i and \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e be as above. Then, there is $M_0 > 0$ such that for every $M > M_0$ and all $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \cap \rho(H_M)$ the following hold true:

(i) For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ the operator $\Xi_M(z) : H^s(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow H^s(\Sigma)^4$ defined by

$$\Xi_M(z) = (I_4 - \mathcal{A}_m^i \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e - \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \mathcal{A}_m^i)^{-1}, \quad (6.4)$$

is everywhere defined and uniformly bounded with respect to M .

(ii) The Poincaré-Steklov operator, \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e , satisfies the estimate

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e\|_{P_+ H^{s+1}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow P_- H^s(\Sigma)^4} \lesssim h, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof. (i) Set $\tau := (m+M)$, then the result essentially follows from the fact that $\Xi_M(z)$ is a $1/\tau$ -pseudodifferential operator of order 0. Indeed, fix $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \cap \rho(H_M)$ and set $h = \tau^{-1}$. Then, from Theorem 4.1 and Remark 5.3 we know that \mathcal{A}_m^i is a homogeneous pseudodifferential operator of order 0. Thus \mathcal{A}_m^i can also be viewed as a h -pseudodifferential operators of order 0. That is, $\mathcal{A}_m^i \in Op^h \mathcal{S}^0(\Sigma)$, and in local coordinates, its semiclassical principal symbol is given by

$$p_{h, \mathcal{A}_m^i}(x, \xi) = \frac{S \cdot (\xi \wedge n(x)) P_-}{|\xi \wedge n(x)|},$$

where we identify $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\bar{\xi} = (\xi_1, \xi_2, 0)^t \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and for $x = \varphi(\tilde{x}) \in \Sigma$, $n(x)$ stands for $n^\varphi(\tilde{x})$. Similarly, thanks to Theorem 5.1, we also know that for h_0 sufficiently small (and hence M_0 big enough) and all $h < h_0$, \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e is a h -pseudodifferential operator and that

$$\mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \in Op^h \mathcal{S}^0(\Sigma), \quad p_{h, \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e}(x, \xi) = -\frac{S \cdot (\xi \wedge n(x)) P_+}{\sqrt{|\xi \wedge n(x)|^2 + 1} + 1}.$$

Therefore, the symbol calculus yields for all $h < h_0$ that $(I_4 - \mathcal{A}_m^i \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e - \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \mathcal{A}_m^i)$ is a $1/\tau$ -pseudodifferential operator of order 0. Now, a simple computation using Lemma 5.1 yields that

$$\frac{S \cdot (\xi \wedge n(x)) P_\pm S \cdot (\xi \wedge n(x)) P_\mp}{|\xi \wedge n(x)| (\sqrt{|\xi \wedge n(x)|^2 + 1} + 1)} = \frac{|\xi \wedge n(x)| P_\mp}{\sqrt{|\xi \wedge n(x)|^2 + 1} + 1}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 - p_{h, \mathcal{A}_m^i}(x, \xi) p_{h, \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e}(x, \xi) - p_{h, \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e}(x, \xi) p_{h, \mathcal{A}_m^i}(x, \xi) &= I_4 + \frac{|\xi \wedge n(x)|}{\sqrt{|\xi \wedge n(x)|^2 + 1} + 1} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{|\xi \wedge n(x)|^2 + 1} + 1 + |\xi \wedge n(x)|}{\sqrt{|\xi \wedge n(x)|^2 + 1} + 1} \gtrsim 1. \end{aligned}$$

From this, we deduce that $(I_4 - \mathcal{A}_m^i \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e - \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \mathcal{A}_m^i)$ is elliptic in $Op^h \mathcal{S}^0(\Sigma)$. Thus, $\Xi_M(z) \in Op^h \mathcal{S}^0(\Sigma)$, and in local coordinates, its semiclassical principal symbol is given by

$$p_{h, \Xi_M(z)}(x, \xi) = \frac{\sqrt{|\xi \wedge n(x)|^2 + 1} + 1}{\sqrt{|\xi \wedge n(x)|^2 + 1} + 1 + |\xi \wedge n(x)|}.$$

As $\Xi_M(z)$ is a h -pseudodifferential operators of order 0, it follows that $\Xi_M(z) : H^s(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow H^s(\Sigma)^4$ is well-defined and uniformly bounded with respect to M , for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, proving the statement (i) of the theorem.

The proof of the statement (ii) follows the standard arguments of the proof of the boundedness of classical pseudodifferential operators. Indeed, for $\tau = m + M$, as a classical pseudodifferential operator, \mathcal{A}_τ^e is given by:

$$\mathcal{A}_\tau^e = \frac{1}{\tau} Op(a_{0, \tau}) + \frac{1}{\tau} Op(a_{1, \tau}),$$

with $a_{1,\tau}$ uniformly bounded with respect to $\tau \gg 1$ in \mathcal{S}^0 and

$$a_{0,\tau}(x, \xi) = -\frac{S \cdot (\xi \wedge n(x)) P_+}{\sqrt{\tau^{-2} |\xi \wedge n(x)|^2 + 1} + 1}$$

which is uniformly bounded in \mathcal{S}^1 . Then (ii) is a consequence of the Calderón-Vaillancourt theorem (see (2.8)). \square

We can now give the proof of Theorem 6.1.

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Let M_0 be as in Proposition 6.1 and $M > M_0$, fix $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \cap \rho(H_M)$ and let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$. We set

$$v = r_{\Omega_i} R_M(z) f \quad \text{and} \quad u = r_{\Omega_e} R_M(z) f.$$

Then u and v satisfy the following system

$$\begin{cases} (D_m - z)v = f & \text{in } \Omega_i, \\ (D_{m+M} - z)u = f & \text{in } \Omega_e, \\ P_- t_\Sigma v = P_- t_\Sigma u & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ P_+ t_\Sigma v = P_+ t_\Sigma u & \text{on } \Sigma. \end{cases}$$

Since $E_m^{\Omega_i}(z)$ (resp. $E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z)$) gives the unique solution to the boundary value problem (6.1) (resp. (6.2)), and

$$\Gamma_- R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i} f = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_+ \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} f = 0,$$

if we let

$$\varphi = \Gamma_- u \quad \text{and} \quad \psi = \Gamma_+ v,$$

then it is easy to check that

$$\begin{cases} v = R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i} f + E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) \varphi, \\ u = \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} f + E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z) \psi. \end{cases} \quad (6.5)$$

Hence, to get an explicit formula for $R_M(z)$ it remains to find the unknowns φ and ψ . For this, note that from (6.5) we have

$$\begin{cases} \psi = \Gamma_+ r_{\Omega_i} R_M(z) f = \Gamma_+ R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i} f + \Gamma_+ E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) [\varphi], \\ \varphi = \Gamma_- r_{\Omega_e} R_M(z) f = \Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} f + \Gamma_- E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z) [\psi]. \end{cases} \quad (6.6)$$

Substituting the values of ψ and φ (from (6.6)) into the system (6.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R_M(z) &= e_{\Omega_i} R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i} + e_{\Omega_e} \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} \\ &\quad + \left(e_{\Omega_i} E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) \Gamma_- r_{\Omega_e} + e_{\Omega_e} E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z) \Gamma_+ r_{\Omega_i} \right) R_M(z) \\ &= \tilde{R}_{\text{MIT}}(z) + E_M(z) \Gamma R_M(z). \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

Note that, by definition of the Poincaré-Steklov operators, (6.6) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \psi = \Gamma_+ R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i} f + \mathcal{A}_m^i(\varphi), \\ \varphi = \Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} f + \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e(\psi). \end{cases} \quad (6.8)$$

Thus, applying Γ to the identity (6.7) yields that

$$\Gamma \tilde{R}_{\text{MIT}}(z) = (I - \mathcal{A}_m^i - \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e) \Gamma R_M(z) = \Psi_M(z) \Gamma R_M(z).$$

Now, we apply $(I + \mathcal{A}_m^i + \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e)$ to the last identity and we get

$$(I + \mathcal{A}_m^i + \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e) \Gamma \tilde{R}_{\text{MIT}}(z) = (I - \mathcal{A}_m^i \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e - \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \mathcal{A}_m^i) \Gamma R_M(z) =: (\Xi_M(z))^{-1} \Gamma R_M(z),$$

where $\Xi_M(z)$ is given by (6.4). Then, thanks to Proposition 6.1 we know that for $M > M_0$ the operator $(\Xi_M(z))^{-1}$ is bounded invertible from $H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$ into itself, which actually means that Ψ_M is bounded invertible from $H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$ into itself, and that

$$\Psi_M^{-1} = \Xi_M(z) (I + \mathcal{A}_m^i + \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e).$$

From which it follows that

$$\Gamma R_M(z) = \Psi_M^{-1}(z) \Gamma \tilde{R}_{\text{MIT}}(z).$$

Substituting this into formula (6.7) yields that

$$R_M(z) = \tilde{R}_{\text{MIT}}(z) + E_M(z) \Psi_M^{-1}(z) \Gamma \tilde{R}_{\text{MIT}}(z),$$

which achieves the proof of the theorem. \square

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 6.1 and Proposition 6.1 we have:

Corollary 6.1. *There is $M_0 > 0$ such that for every $M > M_0$ and all $z \in \rho(H_{MIT}(m)) \cap \rho(H_M)$, the operators $\Xi_M^\pm(z) : P_\pm H^s(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow P_\pm H^s(\Sigma)^4$ defined by*

$$\Xi_M^+(z) = (I - \mathcal{A}_m^i \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \Xi_M^-(z) = (I - \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \mathcal{A}_m^i)^{-1},$$

are everywhere defined and bounded for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, and it holds that

$$\|\Xi_M^\pm(z)\|_{P_\pm H^{s+r}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow P_\pm H^s(\Sigma)^4} \lesssim M^{-r}, \quad \forall r > 0.$$

Moreover, if $v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ solves $(D_m + M\beta_{1\Omega_e} - z)v = e_{\Omega_i} f$, for some $f \in L^2(\Omega_i)^4$. Then, $r_{\Omega_i} v$ satisfies the following boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} (D_m - z)r_{\Omega_i} v = f & \text{in } \Omega_i, \\ \Gamma_- v = \Xi_M^-(z) \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \Gamma_+ R_{MIT}(z) f & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \Gamma_+ v = \Gamma_+ R_{MIT}(z) f + \mathcal{A}_m^i \Gamma_- v & \text{on } \Sigma. \end{cases} \quad (6.9)$$

Proof. We first note that $\Xi_M^\pm(z) = P_\pm \Xi_M(z) P_\pm$. Thus, the first statement follows immediately from Proposition 6.1. Now, let $f \in L^2(\Omega_i)^4$, and suppose that $v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ solves $(D_m + M\beta_{1\Omega_e} - z)v = e_{\Omega_i} f$. Thus $(D_m - z)r_{\Omega_i} v = f$ in Ω_i , and if we set

$$\varphi = P_- t_\Sigma v \quad \text{and} \quad \psi = P_+ t_\Sigma v,$$

then, from (6.8) we easily get

$$\varphi = \Xi_M^-(z) \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \Gamma_+ R_{MIT}(z) f \quad \text{and} \quad \psi = \Gamma_+ R_{MIT}(z) f + \mathcal{A}_m^i \varphi,$$

which means that $r_{\Omega_i} v$ satisfies (6.9), and this completes the proof of the corollary. \square

Remark 6.2. *Notice that from (6.8) we have that*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_+ r_{\Omega_i} R_M(z) f \\ \Gamma_- r_{\Omega_e} R_M(z) f \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Xi_M^+(z) \\ \Xi_M^-(z) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_4 & \mathcal{A}_m^i \\ \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e & I_4 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_+ R_{MIT}(z) r_{\Omega_i} f \\ \Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} f \end{pmatrix}.$$

With this observation, we remark that the resolvent formula (6.3) can also be written in the following matrix form

$$\begin{pmatrix} r_{\Omega_i} R_M(z) \\ r_{\Omega_e} R_M(z) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} R_{MIT}(z) r_{\Omega_i} \\ \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) \Xi_M^-(z) \\ E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z) \Xi_M^+(z) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e & I_4 \\ I_4 & \mathcal{A}_m^i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_+ R_{MIT}(z) r_{\Omega_i} \\ \Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} \end{pmatrix}.$$

An inspection of the proof of Theorem 6.1 shows that, for any $M > 0$, $z \in \rho(H_{MIT}(m)) \cap \rho(H_M)$ and $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$, one has

$$\Gamma \tilde{R}_{MIT}(z) f = \Psi_M(z) \Gamma R_M(z) f. \quad (6.10)$$

When f runs through the whole space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$, then the values of $\Gamma \tilde{R}_{MIT}(z) f$ and $\Gamma R_M(z) f$ cover the whole space $H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$, which means that $\text{Rn}(\Psi_M(z)) = H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$. Hence, if one proves that $\text{Kr}(\Psi_M(z)) = \{0\}$, then $\Psi_M(z)$ would be boundedly invertible in $H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$, and thus (6.3) holds without restriction on $M > 0$. The following theorem provides a Birman-Schwinger-type principle relating $\text{Kr}(H_M - z)$ with $\text{Kr}(\Psi_M(z))$ and allows us to recover the resolvent formula (6.3) for any $M > 0$.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $M > 0$ and let Ψ_M be as in Theorem 6.1. Then, the following hold:*

- (i) *For any $a \in (-(m+M), m+M) \cap \rho(H_{MIT}(m))$ we have $a \in \text{Sp}_p(H_M) \Leftrightarrow 0 \in \text{Sp}_p(\Psi_M(a))$, and it holds that*

$$\text{Kr}(H_M - a) = \{E_M(a)g : g \in \text{Kr}(\Psi_M(a))\}.$$

In particular, $\dim \text{Kr}(H_M - a) = \dim \text{Kr}(\Psi_M(a))$ holds for all $a \in (-(m+M), m+M) \cap \rho(H_{MIT}(m))$.

- (ii) *The operator $\Psi_M(z)$ is boundedly invertible in $H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$ for all $z \in \rho(H_{MIT}(m)) \cap \rho(H_M)$, and the following resolvent formula holds:*

$$R_M(z) = \tilde{R}_{MIT}(z) + E_M(z) \Psi_M^{-1}(z) \Gamma \tilde{R}_{MIT}(z). \quad (6.11)$$

Proof. (i) Let us first prove the implication (\implies). Let $a \in (-(m+M), m+M) \cap \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ be such that $(H_M - a)\varphi = 0$ for some $0 \neq \varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$. Set $\varphi_+ = \varphi|_{\Omega_i}$ and $\varphi_- = \varphi|_{\Omega_e}$. Then, it is clear that φ_+ solves the system (6.1) with $g = \Gamma_- \varphi$, and φ_- solves the system (6.2) with $h = \Gamma_+ \varphi$. Thus, $\varphi_+ = E_m^{\Omega_i}(a)\Gamma_- \varphi$ and $\varphi_- = E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(a)\Gamma_+ \varphi$. Hence, $\varphi = E_M(a)t_\Sigma \varphi$ and $\Gamma_\pm \varphi \neq 0$, as otherwise φ would be zero. Using this and the definition of the Poincaré-Steklov operators, we obtain that

$$(I_4 + \mathcal{A}_m^i)\Gamma_- \varphi =: t_\Sigma \varphi_+ = \tilde{t}_\Sigma \varphi = t_\Sigma \varphi_- := (I_4 + \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e)\Gamma_+ \varphi,$$

and since $t_\Sigma \varphi \neq 0$ it follows that

$$\Psi_M(a)t_\Sigma \varphi = (I_4 - \mathcal{A}_m^i - \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e)t_\Sigma \varphi = 0,$$

which means that $0 \in \text{Sp}_\mathbb{P}(\Psi_M(a))$ and proves the inclusion $\text{Kr}(H_M - a) \subset \{E_M(a)g : g \in \text{Kr}(\Psi_M(a))\}$.

Now we turn to the proof of the implication (\impliedby). Let $a \in (-(m+M), m+M) \cap \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ and assume that 0 is an eigenvalue of $\Psi_M(a)$. Then, there is $g \in H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\Psi_M(a)g = 0$ on Σ . Note that this is equivalent to

$$(P_- + \mathcal{A}_m^i)g = (P_+ + \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e)g. \quad (6.12)$$

Since $a \in (-(m+M), m+M) \cap \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, the operators $E_m^{\Omega_i}(a) : P_- H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_i)^4$ and $E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(a) : P_+ H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_e)^4$ are well-defined and bounded. Thus, if we let $\varphi = E_M(a)g = (E_m^{\Omega_i}(a)P_- g, E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(a)P_+ g)$, then $\varphi \neq 0$ and we have that $(D_m - a)\varphi = 0$ in Ω_i , and that $(D_{m+M} - a)\varphi = 0$ in Ω_e . Hence, it remains to show that $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$. For this, observe that by (6.12) we have

$$t_\Sigma E_m^{\Omega_i}(a)P_- g = (P_- + \mathcal{A}_m^i)g = (P_+ + \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e)g = t_\Sigma E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(a)P_+ g.$$

Thanks to the boundedness properties of $E_m^{\Omega_i}(a)$ and $E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(a)$, it follows from the above computations that $\varphi = E_M(a)g \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^4 \setminus \{0\}$ and satisfies the equation $(H_M - a)\varphi = 0$. Therefore, $a \in \text{Sp}_\mathbb{P}(H_M)$ and the inclusion $\{E_M(a)g : g \in \text{Kr}(\Psi_M(a))\} \subset \text{Kr}(H_M - a)$ holds, which completes the proof of (i).

(ii) Let $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \cap \rho(H_M)$ and note that the self-adjointness of H_M together with assertion (i) imply that $\text{Kr}(\Psi_M(z)) = \{0\}$, as otherwise $\text{Kr}(H_M - z) \neq \{0\}$. Since $\text{Rn}(\Psi_M(z)) = H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$ holds for all $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \cap \rho(H_M)$, it follows that $\Psi_M(z)$ admits a bounded and everywhere defined inverse in $H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$. Therefore, (6.10) yields that $\Gamma R_M(z) = \Psi_M^{-1}(z)\Gamma \tilde{R}_{\text{MIT}}(z)$, and the resolvent formula (6.11) follows from this and (6.7). \square

Remark 6.3. Note the different nature of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2, since the second one ensures the invertibility of Ψ_M and yields the resolvent formula (6.11) without assumption, while the first one is based on a largeness assumption that allows us (thanks to the semiclassical properties of the PS operators) to obtain the explicit formula of the operator $(\Psi_M)^{-1}$. Besides, note that in Theorem 6.2 we do not know a priori whether $(\Psi_M)^{-1}$ is uniformly bounded when M is large, and hence (6.11) is not suitable for studying the large coupling convergence.

In the next proposition we prove the norm convergence of $R_M(z)$ toward $R_{\text{MIT}}(z)$ and estimate the rate of convergence.

Proposition 6.2. For any compact set $K \subset \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$ there is $M_0 > 0$ such that for all $M > M_0$: $K \subset \rho(H_M)$, and for all $z \in K$ the resolvent R_M admits an asymptotic expansion in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4)$ of the form:

$$R_M(z) = e_{\Omega_i} R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i} + \frac{1}{M} (K_M(z) + L_M(z)), \quad (6.13)$$

where $K_M(z), L_M(z) : L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4 \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ are uniformly bounded with respect to M and satisfy

$$r_{\Omega_i} K_M(z) e_{\Omega_i} = 0 = r_{\Omega_e} K_M(z) e_{\Omega_e}.$$

In particular, it holds that

$$\|R_M(z) - e_{\Omega_i} R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4 \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{M}\right). \quad (6.14)$$

Before giving the proof, we need the following estimates.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a compact set. Then, there is $M_0 > 0$ such that for all $M > M_0$: $K \subset \rho(\tilde{H}_M)$ and for every $z \in K$ the following estimates hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{R}_M(z)f \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \left\| \Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(z)f \right\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4} &\lesssim \frac{1}{M} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}, \quad \forall f \in L^2(\Omega_e)^4, \\ \left\| \Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(z)f \right\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4} &\lesssim \frac{1}{M} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}, \quad \forall f \in L^2(\Omega_e)^4, \\ \left\| E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z)\psi \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \|\psi\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}, \quad \forall \psi \in P_+L^2(\Sigma)^4, \\ \left\| E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z)\psi \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} &\lesssim \frac{1}{M} \|\psi\|_{H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4}, \quad \forall \psi \in P_+H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Fix a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{C}$, and note that for $M_1 > \sup_{z \in K} \{|\operatorname{Re}(z)| - m\}$ it holds that $K \subset \rho(D_{m+M_1})$, and hence $K \subset \rho(\tilde{H}_M)$ for all $M > M_1$. We next show the claimed estimates for $\tilde{R}_M(z)$ and $\Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(z)$. For this, let $z \in K$ and assume that $M > M_1$. Let $\varphi \in \operatorname{dom}(\tilde{H}_M)$, then a straightforward application of the Green's formula yields that

$$\|\tilde{H}_M \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 = \|(\alpha \cdot \nabla)\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 + (m+M)^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 + (m+M) \|P_- t_\Sigma \varphi\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}^2.$$

Using this and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\tilde{H}_M - z)\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 &= \|\tilde{H}_M \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 + |z|^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 - 2\operatorname{Re}(z) \langle \tilde{H}_M \varphi, \varphi \rangle_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} \\ &\geq \|\tilde{H}_M \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 + |z|^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{H}_M \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 - 2|\operatorname{Re}(z)|^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 \\ &\geq \left(\frac{(m+M)^2}{2} + |\operatorname{Im}(z)|^2 - |\operatorname{Re}(z)|^2 \right) \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 + \frac{M}{2} \|P_- t_\Sigma \varphi\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, taking $\tilde{R}_M(z)f = \varphi$ and $M \geq M_2 \geq \sup_{z \in K} \{\sqrt{|\operatorname{Re}(z)|^2 - |\operatorname{Im}(z)|^2} - m\}$ we obtain the inequality

$$\left\| \tilde{R}_M(z)f \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \left\| \Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(z)f \right\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4} \lesssim \frac{1}{M} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}.$$

Since Γ_- is bounded from $L^2(\Omega_e)^4$ into $H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4$, it follows from the above inequality that

$$\left\| \Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(z)f \right\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4} \lesssim \|\Gamma_- \|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4 \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4} \left\| \tilde{R}_M(z)f \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} \lesssim \frac{1}{M} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4},$$

for any $f \in L^2(\Omega_e)^4$, which gives the second inequality.

Let us now turn to the proof of the claimed estimates for $E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z)$. Let $\psi \in P_+L^2(\Sigma)^4$, then from the proof of Proposition 4.1 we have

$$\|\psi\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}^2 \geq (m+M) \left\| E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z)\psi \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 - 2|\operatorname{Re}(z)| \left\| E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z)\psi \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2.$$

Thus, for any $M \geq M_3 \geq \sup_{z \in K} \{4|\operatorname{Re}(z)| - m\}$, we get that

$$M \left\| E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z)\psi \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 \leq 2 \|\psi\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}^2,$$

and this proves the first estimate for $E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z)$. Finally, the last inequality is a consequence of the first one and Proposition 4.1. Indeed, from Proposition 4.1 (ii) we know that $\beta \Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(\bar{z})$ is the adjoint of the operator $E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z) : P_+H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow L^2(\Omega_e)^4$. Using this and the estimate fulfilled by $\Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(\bar{z})$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle f, E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z)\psi \rangle_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} \right| &= \left| \langle \Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(\bar{z})f, \beta\psi \rangle_{H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4, H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4} \right| \\ &\leq \left\| \Gamma_- \tilde{R}_M(\bar{z})f \right\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4} \|\psi\|_{H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{M} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} \|\psi\|_{H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4}. \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for all $f \in L^2(\Omega_e)^4$, by duality arguments it follows that

$$\left\| E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z)\psi \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} \lesssim \frac{1}{M} \|\psi\|_{H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4}, \quad \forall \psi \in P_+H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4,$$

which proves the last inequality. Hence, the lemma follows by taking $M_0 = \max\{M_1, M_2, M_3\}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 6.2. We first show (6.14) for some $M'_0 > 0$ and any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. So, let us fix such a z and let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$. Then, it is clear that $z \in \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m)) \cap \rho(H_M)$, and from Theorem 6.1 and Remark 6.2 we know that there is $M'_0 > 0$ such that for all $M > M'_0$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(R_M(z) - e_{\Omega_i} R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i}) f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4} &\leq \|E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) \Xi_M^-(z) \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \Gamma + R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i} f\|_{L^2(\Omega_i)^4} \\ &\quad + \|E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) \Xi_M^-(z) \Gamma - \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} f\|_{L^2(\Omega_i)^4} \\ &\quad + \|E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z) \Xi_M^+(z) \Gamma + R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i} f\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} \\ &\quad + \|E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z) \Xi_M^+(z) \mathcal{A}_m^i \Gamma - \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} f\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} f\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} =: J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4 + J_5. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 6.1 we immediately get that $J_5 \lesssim M^{-1} \|f\|$. Next, notice that $\Gamma + R_{\text{MIT}}(z) : L^2(\Omega_i)^4 \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$, $\mathcal{A}_m^i : H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4$ and $E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) : H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow H(\alpha, \Omega_i) \subset L^2(\Omega_i)^4$ (where $H(\alpha, \Omega_i)$ is defined by (2.2)) are bounded operators and do not depend on M . Moreover, thanks to Corollary 6.1 we know that for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ there is $C > 0$ independent of M such that

$$\|\Xi_M^\pm(z)\|_{P_\pm H^s(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow P_\pm H^s(\Sigma)^4} \leq C.$$

Using this and the above observation, for $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we can estimate J_k as follows

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &\lesssim \|E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) \Xi_M^-(z)\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow L^2(\Omega_i)^4} \|\Gamma - \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4}, \\ J_2 &\lesssim \|E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z)\|_{H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow L^2(\Omega_e)^4} \|\Xi_M^+(z) \Gamma + R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i} f\|_{H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4}, \\ J_3 &\lesssim \|E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) \Xi_M^-(z)\|_{P_- H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow L^2(\Omega_i)^4} \|\mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e\|_{H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\Sigma)^4} \|\Gamma + R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i} f\|_{H^{1/2}(\Sigma)^4}, \\ J_4 &\lesssim \|E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z)\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow L^2(\Omega_e)^4} \|\Xi_M^+(z) \mathcal{A}_m^i\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4 \rightarrow L^2(\Sigma)^4} \|\Gamma - \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} f\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Theorem 6.1-(ii) together with Lemma 6.1 yield that

$$J_k \lesssim \frac{1}{M} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4}, \quad \text{for any } j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}.$$

Thus, we obtain the estimate

$$\|(R_M(z) - e_{\Omega_i} R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i}) f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4} \leq \frac{C}{M} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4}. \quad (6.15)$$

Moreover, the asymptotic expansion (6.13) holds with

$$\begin{aligned} L_M(z) &= M(e_{\Omega_e} \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} + e_{\Omega_i} E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) \Xi_M^-(z) \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \Gamma + R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i} \\ &\quad + e_{\Omega_e} E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z) \Xi_M^+(z) \mathcal{A}_m^i \Gamma - \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$K_M(z) = M \left(e_{\Omega_i} E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) \Xi_M^-(z) \Gamma - \tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} + e_{\Omega_e} E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z) \Xi_M^+(z) \Gamma + R_{\text{MIT}}(z) r_{\Omega_i} \right),$$

and we clearly see that $r_{\Omega_i} K_M(z) e_{\Omega_i} = 0 = r_{\Omega_e} K_M(z) e_{\Omega_e}$.

Finally, since (6.15) holds true for every $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, for any fixed compact subset $K \subset \rho(H_{\text{MIT}}(m))$, one can show by arguments similar to those in the proof of [9, Lemma A.1] that there is $M_0 > M'_0$ such that $K \subset \rho(H_M)$. Therefore, the proposition follows with the same arguments as before. \square

6.1. Comments and further remarks. In this part we discuss possible generalizations of our results and comment on the usefulness of the pseudodifferential properties of the Poincaré-Steklov operators.

- (1) First note that all the results in this article which are proved without the use of the (semi) classical properties of the Poincaré-Steklov operator are valid when Σ is just $C^{1,\omega}$ -smooth with $\omega \in (1/2, 1)$, and can also be generalized without difficulty to the case of local deformation of the plane $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0\}$ (see [15] where the self-adjointness of $H_{\text{MIT}}(m)$ and the regularity properties of $\Phi_{z,m}^\Omega$, $\mathcal{C}_{z,m}$ and Λ_m^z were shown for this case). We mention, however, that in the latter case the spectrum of the MIT bag operator is equal to that of the free Dirac operator, cf. [15, Theorem 4.1].

- (2) It should also be noted that there are several boundary conditions that lead to self-adjoint realizations of the Dirac operator on domains (see, e.g., [6, 12, 16]) and for which the associated PS operators can be analyzed in a similar way as for the MIT bag model. In particular, one can consider the PS operator $\mathcal{B}_m(z)$ associated with the self-adjoint Dirac operator

$$\tilde{H}_{MIT}(m)v = D_m v \quad \forall v \in \text{dom}(\tilde{H}_{MIT}(m)) := \{v \in H^1(\Omega_i)^4 : P_+ t_\Sigma v = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma\}.$$

According to the previous considerations, this operator can be viewed as an analogue of the Neumann-to-Dirichlet map for the Dirac operator. Moreover, the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 4.1 show that

$$\mathcal{B}(z)_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\Delta_\Sigma}} S \cdot (\nabla_\Sigma \wedge n) P_+ \quad \text{mod } Op\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\Sigma) = \frac{D_\Sigma}{\sqrt{-\Delta_\Sigma}} P_+ \quad \text{mod } Op\mathcal{S}^{-1}(\Sigma),$$

for all $z \in \rho(D_m) \cap \rho(\tilde{H}_{MIT}(m))$.

- (3) As already mentioned in the introduction, in [9] it was shown that (in the two-dimensional massless case) the norm resolvent convergence of H_M to $H_{MIT}(m)$ holds with a convergence rate of $M^{-1/2}$. Their proof is based on two main ingredients: The first is a resolvent identity (see [9, Lemma 2.2] for the exact formula), and the second is the following inequality

$$\|\Gamma_- R_M(z)f\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4}, \quad (6.16)$$

which is a consequence of the lower bound

$$\|\nabla\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 + M^2 \|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4}^2 \geq (M - C) \|t_\Sigma\psi\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}^2,$$

which holds for all $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ and M large enough (see [37, Lemma 4] for the proof in the 2D-case and [4, Proposition 2.1 (i)] for the 3D-case). Note that the resolvent formula (6.7) together with (6.16) yield the same result. Indeed, from (6.6) and (6.16) we easily get the inequality

$$\|\Gamma_+ R_M(z)f\|_{L^2(\Sigma)^4} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4}.$$

This together with (6.7) and Lemma 6.1 yield

$$\begin{aligned} \|(R_M(z) - e_{\Omega_i} R_{MIT}(z) r_{\Omega_i})f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4} &\leq \|E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) \Gamma_- r_{\Omega_e} R_M(z)f\|_{L^2(\Omega_i)^4} + \|\tilde{R}_M(z) r_{\Omega_e} f\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} \\ &\quad + \|E_{m+M}^{\Omega_e}(z) \Gamma_+ r_{\Omega_i} R_M(z)f\|_{L^2(\Omega_e)^4} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4}. \end{aligned}$$

- (4) Finally, let us point out that a first order asymptotic expansion of the eigenvalues of H_M in terms of the eigenvalues of $H_{MIT}(m)$ was established in [4] when $M \rightarrow \infty$. In their proof the authors used the min-max characterization and optimization techniques. Note that it is also possible to obtain such a result using the properties of the PS operator, the Krein formula from Theorem 6.1 and the finite-dimensional perturbation theory (cf. Kato [30] for example), see, e.g., [14, 18] for similar arguments. Note also that the asymptotic expansion of the eigenvalues of H_M depends only on the term $E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) \Xi_M^-(z) \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \Gamma_+ R_{MIT}(z) r_{\Omega_i}$. Indeed, let λ_{MIT} be an eigenvalue of $H_{MIT}(m)$ with multiplicity l , and let (f_1, \dots, f_l) be an $L^2(\Omega_i)^4$ -orthonormal basis of $\text{Ker}(H_{MIT}(m) - \lambda_{MIT} I_4)$. Then, using the explicit resolvent formula from Remark 6.2 we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle R_M(z) e_{\Omega_i} f_k, e_{\Omega_i} f_j \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^4} &= \langle E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) \Xi_M^-(z) \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \Gamma_+ R_{MIT}(z) f_k, f_j \rangle_{L^2(\Omega_i)^4} \\ &= \langle \Xi_M^-(z) \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \Gamma_+ R_{MIT}(z) f_k, -\beta \Gamma_+ R_{MIT}(\bar{z}) f_j \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma)^4} \\ &= \frac{1}{(z - \lambda_{MIT})^2} \langle \Xi_M^-(z) \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \Gamma_+ f_k, -\beta \Gamma_+ f_j \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}, \end{aligned}$$

which means that $E_m^{\Omega_i}(z) \Xi_M^-(z) \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e \Gamma_+ R_{MIT}(z) r_{\Omega_i}$ is the only term that intervenes in the asymptotic expansion of the eigenvalues of H_M . Besides, recall that the principal symbol of $\Xi_M^-(z) \mathcal{A}_{m+M}^e$ is given by

$$q_M(x, \xi) = - \frac{S \cdot (\xi \wedge n(x)) P_+}{\sqrt{|\xi \wedge n(x)|^2 + (m + M)^2 + |\xi \wedge n(x)| + (m + M)}},$$

and for $M > 0$ large enough one has

$$q_M(x, \xi) = - \frac{1}{2M} S \cdot (\xi \wedge n(x)) P_+ \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{M^{l+1}} p_l(x, \xi) P_+, \quad p_l \in \mathcal{S}^{-l}.$$

Using this, we formally deduce that for sufficiently large M , H_M has exactly l eigenvalues $(\lambda_k^M)_{1 \leq k \leq l}$ counted according to their multiplicities (in $B(\lambda_{MIT}, \eta)$ with $B(\lambda_{MIT}, \eta) \cap \text{Sp}(H_{MIT}(m)) = \{\lambda_{MIT}\}$) and these eigenvalues admit an asymptotic expansion of the form

$$\lambda_k^M = \lambda_{MIT} + \frac{1}{M}\mu_k + \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{1}{M^j}\mu_k^j + O\left(M^{-(N+1)}\right). \quad (6.17)$$

where $(\mu_k)_{1 \leq k \leq l}$ are the eigenvalues of the matrix \mathcal{M} with coefficients:

$$m_{kj} = \frac{1}{2} \langle \beta \text{Op}(S \cdot (\xi \wedge n(x))) \Gamma_+ f_k, \Gamma_+ f_j \rangle_{L^2(\Sigma)^4}.$$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

B. Benhellal was supported by the ERC-2014-ADG Project HADE Id. 669689 (European Research Council) and by the Spanish State Research Agency through BCAM Severo Ochoa excellence accreditation SEV- 2017-0718. The authors are grateful to Luis Vega for stimulating discussions on this work and thank Grigori Rozenblum for pointing out the references on the R-matrix theory.

REFERENCES

- [1] M.S. Agranovich, *Spectral problems for the Dirac system with a spectral parameter in the local boundary conditions*. (Russian) Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. 35 (2001), no. 3, 1-18, 95; translation in Funct. Anal. Appl. 35 (2001), no. 3, 161-175
- [2] M.S. Agranovich and G.V. Rozenblum, *Spectral boundary value problems for a Dirac system with singular potential*. (Russian) Algebra i Analiz 16 (2004), no. 1, 33-69; translation in St. Petersburg Math. J. 16 (2005), no. 1, 25-57
- [3] K. Ando, H. Kang and Y. Miyanishi, *Elastic Neumann-Poincaré operators on three dimensional smooth domains: Polynomial compactness and spectral structure*. Int. Math. Res. Notices, rnx258, (2017).
- [4] N. Arrizabalaga, L. Le Treust, A. Mas and N. Raymond, *The MIT Bag Model as an infinite mass limit*, J. Éc. polytech. Math., 6 (2019), 329-365.
- [5] N. Arrizabalaga, L. Le Treust, A. Mas and N. Raymond, *On the MIT bag model in the non-relativistic limit*, Comm. Math. Phys., 354 (2017), pp. 641-669.
- [6] N. Arrizabalaga, A. Mas, T. Sanz-Perela and L. Vega, *Eigenvalue curves for generalized MIT bag models*, arXiv preprint (2021), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.08348>.
- [7] N. Arrizabalaga, A. Mas, and L. Vega, *Shell interactions for Dirac operators*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 102(4):617-639, 2014.
- [8] N. Arrizabalaga, A. Mas, and L. Vega, *Shell interactions for Dirac operators: on the point spectrum and the confinement*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 47(2):1044-1069, 2015.
- [9] J.-M. Barbaroux, H. Cornean, L. Le Treust and E. Stockmeyer, *Resolvent convergence to Dirac operators on planar domains*, Ann. Henri Poincaré 20, 1877-1891 (2019).
- [10] J. Behrndt, P. Exner, M. Holzmann, and V. Lotoreichik, *On Dirac operators in \mathbb{R}^3 with electrostatic and Lorentz scalar δ -shell interactions*, Quantum Stud. Math. Found. 6: 295-314, 2019.
- [11] J. Behrndt and M. Holzmann, *On Dirac operators with electrostatic δ -shell interactions of critical strength*, J. Spectr. Theory, 10, 147 (2020).
- [12] J. Behrndt, M. Holzmann and A. Mas, *Self-Adjoint Dirac Operators on Domains in \mathbb{R}^3* , Ann. Henri Poincaré 21 (2020), 2681-2735.
- [13] J. Behrndt, M. Holzmann, C. Stelzer, and G. Stenzel, *A class of singular perturbations of the Dirac operator: boundary triplets and Weyl functions*, Acta Wasaensia 462 (2021), Festschrift in honor of Seppo Hassi, 15-36.
- [14] B. Benhellal, *Spectral asymptotic for the infinite mass Dirac operator in bounded domain*. arXiv preprint (2019), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.03769>.
- [15] B. Benhellal, *Spectral properties of the Dirac operator coupled with δ -shell interactions*. Lett Math Phys 112, 52 (2022).
- [16] B. Benhellal, *Spectral Analysis of Dirac operators with singular interactions supported on the boundaries of rough domains*, J. Math. Phys. 63, 011507 (2022).
- [17] S. Bielski and R. Szymkowski, *Dirichlet-to-Neumann and Neumann-to-Dirichlet embedding methods for bound states of the Dirac equation*. J. Phys. A 39 (2006), no. 23, 7359-7381.
- [18] V. Bruneau, G. Carbou, *Spectral asymptotic in the large coupling limit*, Asymp. Anal, 29 (2) (2002) 91-113.
- [19] A. P. Calderón and R. Vaillancourt, *A class of bounded pseudodifferential operators*. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 69:1185-1187, 1972.
- [20] E. B. Fabes, M. Jodeit Jr., and N. M. Rivièrè, *Potential techniques for boundary value problems on C^1 -domains*. Acta Math. 141, 1 (1978), pp. 165-186.
- [21] A. Fraser and R. Schoen, *Sharp eigenvalue bounds and minimal surfaces in the ball*, Invent. Math. 203, 823-890 (2016). (2016), no. 3, 823-890.
- [22] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Reprint of the 1998 edition. Classics in Mathematics. Springer, Berlin (2001).
- [23] A. Girouard and L. Polterovich, *Spectral geometry of the Steklov problem (Survey article)*, J. Spectr. Theory 7 (2017), no. 2, pp. 321-359.
- [24] P. Grisvard, *Elliptic Problems in Nonsmooth Domains*, Monographs and Studies in Mathematics, vol. 24, Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, MA, 1985. MR 775683.
- [25] S. Hofmann, E. Marmolejo-Olea, M. Mitrea, S. Pérez-Esteva and M. Taylor: *Hardy spaces, singular integrals and the geometry of Euclidean domains of locally finite perimeter*. Geom. Funct. Anal. 19 (2009), no. 3, 842-882.
- [26] S. Hofmann, M. Mitrea and M. Taylor, *Singular integrals and elliptic boundary problems on regular Semmes-Kenig-Toro domains*. International Mathematics Research Notices, Volume 2010, Issue 14, 2010, Pages 2567-2865.
- [27] S. Hofmann, M. Mitrea and M. Taylor, *Symbol calculus for operators of layer potential type on Lipschitz surfaces with VMO normals, and related pseudodifferential operator calculus*, Anal. PDE 8 (2015), no. 1, 115-181.

- [28] D. Jerison and C. Kenig, *The Dirichlet problem on nonsmooth domains*, Ann. of Math., (2) 113 (1981), no. 2, 367-382.
- [29] D. Jerison and C. Kenig, *The Neumann problem on Lipschitz domains*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 4 (1981), 203-207.
- [30] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, Springer Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg/New York, 1966.
- [31] M. Lassas, M. Taylor and G. Uhlmann, *The Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for complete Riemannian manifolds with boundary*, Comm. Anal. Geom. 11 (2003), no. 2, 207-221.
- [32] V. P. Mikhaïlov, *Partial differential equations*, "Mir", Moscow; distributed by Imported Publications, Inc., Chicago, Ill., 1978. Translated from the Russian by P. C. Sinha. MR601389.
- [33] Y. Miyanishi, *Weyl's law for the eigenvalues of the Neumann-Poincaré operators in three dimensions: Willmore energy and surface geometry*, arXiv:1806.03657, (2018).
- [34] Y. Miyanishi and G. Rozenblum, *Eigenvalues of the Neumann-Poincaré operators in dimension 3: Weyl's Law and geometry*, St. Petersburg Math. J., 31 (2020), 371-386.
- [35] A. Moroianu, T. Ourmières-Bonafos and K. Pankrashkin, *Dirac Operators on Hypersurfaces as Large Mass Limits*, Commun. Math. Phys. 374, 1963-2013 (2020).
- [36] T. Ourmières-Bonafos and L. Vega, *A strategy for self-adjointness of Dirac operators: applications to the MIT bag model and δ -shell interactions*. Publicacions matemàtiques, vol. 62 (2018), pp. 397-437.
- [37] E. Stockmeyer and S. Vugalter, *Infinite mass boundary conditions for Dirac operators*, J. Spectr. Theory, 9 (2019), pp 569-600.
- [38] R. Szmtykowski, *Operator formulation of Wigner's R-matrix theories for the Schrödinger and Dirac equations* J. Math. Phys. 39 (1998) 5231.
- [39] M. Taylor, *Partial differential equations. II. Qualitative studies of linear equations*. Applied Mathematical Sciences, 116. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.
- [40] M. Taylor, *Tools for PDE. Pseudo Differential Operators, Paradifferential Operators, and Layer Potentials*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 81, AMS, Providence, 2000.
- [41] G. Teschl, *Mathematical methods in quantum mechanics. With applications to Schrödinger operators*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2014.
- [42] B. Thaller, *The Dirac equation*, Text and Monographs in Physics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- [43] G. Verchota, *Layer potentials and regularity for the Dirichlet problem for Laplace's equation*. J. of Funct. Anal. 59 (1984), 572-611.
- [44] M. Zworski, *Semiclassical Analysis*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics 138, AMS, 2012.

¹BASQUE CENTER FOR APPLIED MATHEMATICS, ALAMEDA MAZARREDO 14, 48009, AND DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DEL PAÍS VASCO, BARRIO SARRIENA S/N 48940 LEIOA, SPAIN, AND INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE BORDEAUX, UMR 5251, UNIVERSITÉ DE BORDEAUX 33405 TALENCE CEDEX, FRANCE.

Email address: ¹benhellal.badreddine@ehu.eus and badreddine.benhellal@u-bordeaux.fr

²INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE BORDEAUX, UMR 5251, UNIVERSITÉ DE BORDEAUX, 33405 TALENCE CEDEX, FRANCE.

Email address: ²vbruneau@math.u-bordeaux.fr

³INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE BORDEAUX, UMR 5251, UNIVERSITÉ DE BORDEAUX 33405 TALENCE CEDEX, FRANCE, AND DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DEL PAÍS VASCO, BARRIO SARRIENA S/N 48940 LEIOA, SPAIN.

Email address: ³mahdi.zreik@ehu.eus and mahdi.zreik@math.u-bordeaux.fr