

NONCOMMUTATIVE RESIDUE FOR HEISENBERG MANIFOLDS AND APPLICATIONS IN CR AND CONTACT GEOMETRY

RAPHAËL PONGE

ABSTRACT. This paper has four main parts. In the first part we construct a noncommutative residue for hypoelliptic calculus on Heisenberg manifolds, that is, for the class of Ψ_H DO operators introduced by Beals-Greiner and Taylor. This noncommutative residue appears as the residual trace induced on Ψ_H DOs of integer orders by the analytic extension of the usual trace to Ψ_H DOs of non-integer orders and it agrees with the integral of the density defined by the logarithmic singularity of the Schwartz kernel of the corresponding operator. In addition, we show that this noncommutative residue provides us with the unique trace up to constant multiple on the algebra of integer order Ψ_H DOs. In the second part, we give some analytic applications of this construction concerning zeta functions of hypoelliptic operators and logarithmic metric estimates for Green kernels of hypoelliptic operators, and we show that this noncommutative residue allows us to extend the Dixmier trace to the whole algebra of integer order Ψ_H DOs. In the third part, we present examples of computations of noncommutative residues for suitable powers of the horizontal sublaplacian and of Rumin's contact Laplacian. In the fourth part, we present several applications in CR geometry. First, we give some examples of geometric computations of noncommutative residues of suitable powers of the horizontal sublaplacian and of the Kohn Laplacian. We then show that the logarithmic singularities of the Green kernels of the Gover-Graham are local CR invariants in the sense of Fefferman. Finally, we make use of framework of noncommutative geometry and of our noncommutative residue to define lower dimensional volumes in CR, e.g., we can give sense to the area of any 3-dimensional CR manifold. On the way we obtain a spectral interpretation of the Einstein-Hilbert action in CR geometry.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to construct and of a noncommutative residue trace for the Heisenberg calculus and to present several of its applications, in particular in CR and contact geometry. The Heisenberg calculus was built independently by Beals-Greiner [BG] and Taylor [Tay] as the relevant pseudodifferential tool to study the main geometric operators on contact and CR manifolds which fail to be elliptic, but may be hypoelliptic (see also [BdM], [EM], [FSt], [Po5]). This calculus holds in the general setting of a Heisenberg manifold, that is, a manifold M together with a distinguished hyperplane bundle $H \subset TM$, and we construct a noncommutative residue trace in this general context.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 58J42; Secondary 58J40, 35H10.

Key words and phrases. Noncommutative residue, Heisenberg calculus, noncommutative geometry, hypoelliptic operators.

The noncommutative residue trace of Wodzicki ([Wo1], [Wo3]) and Guillemin [Gu1] was originally constructed for classical Ψ DOs and it appears as the residual trace on integer order Ψ DOs induced by analytic extension of the operator trace to Ψ DOs of non-integer order. It has numerous applications and generalizations (see, e.g., [Co1], [Co3], [CM], [FGLS], [Gu3], [Ka], [Les], [MMS], [MN], [PR], [Po3], [Sc], [Vas]). In particular, the existence of a residual trace is an essential ingredient in the framework for the local index formula in noncommutative geometry of Connes-Moscovici [CM].

Accordingly, the noncommutative residue for the Heisenberg calculus has various applications and several of them are presented in this paper. Additional geometric applications can be found in [Po6], where new invariants for CR and contact manifolds are constructed as noncommutative residue traces of projections in the Heisenberg calculus.

1.1. Noncommutative residue for Heisenberg manifolds. Our construction of a noncommutative residue trace for Ψ_H DOs, i.e., for the pseudodifferential operators in the Heisenberg calculus, follows the approach of [CM] and [Po7]. It has two main ingredients:

(i) The observation that the coefficient of the logarithmic singularity of the Schwartz kernel of a Ψ_H DO operator P can be defined globally as a density $c_P(x)$ functorial with respect to the action of Heisenberg diffeomorphisms, i.e., diffeomorphisms preserving the Heisenberg structure (see Proposition 3.11).

(ii) The analytic extension of the operator trace to Ψ_H DOs of complex non-integer order (Proposition 3.16).

The analytic extension of the trace from (ii) is obtained by working directly at the level of densities and induces on Ψ_H DOs of integer order a residual trace given by (minus) the integral of the density from (i) (Proposition 3.14). This residual trace is our noncommutative residue for the Heisenberg calculus.

In particular, as an immediate byproduct of this construction the noncommutative residue is invariant under the action of Heisenberg diffeomorphisms. Moreover, in the foliated case our noncommutative residue agrees with that of [CM], and on the algebra of Toeplitz pseudodifferential operators on a contact manifold of Boutet de Monvel-Guillemin [BGu] we recover the noncommutative residue of Guillemin [Gu3].

As a first application of this construction we show that when the Heisenberg manifold is connected the noncommutative residue is the unique trace up to constant multiple on the algebra of integer order Ψ_H DOs (Theorem 3.24). As a consequence we get a characterization sums of Ψ_H DO commutators and we obtain that any smoothing operator can be written as a sum of Ψ_H DO commutators.

These results are the analogues for Ψ_H DOs of well known results of Wodzicki ([Wo2]; see also [Gu3], [Po7]) for classical Ψ DOs. Our arguments are somewhat elementary and partly rely on the characterization of the Schwartz kernels of Ψ_H DOs that was used in the analysis of their logarithmic singularities near the diagonal.

1.2. Analytic applications on general Heisenberg manifolds. The analytic extension of the trace allows us to directly define the zeta function $\zeta_\theta(P; s)$ of a hypoelliptic Ψ_H DO operator P as a meromorphic functions on \mathbb{C} . The definition depends on the choice of a ray $L_\theta = \{\arg \lambda = \theta\}$, $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$, which is a ray of

principal of values for the principal symbol of P in the sense of [Po8] and is not through an eigenvalue of P , so that L_θ is a ray of minimal growth for P . Moreover, the residues at the potential singularity points of $\zeta_\theta(P; s)$ can be expressed as noncommutative residues.

When the set of principal values of the principal symbol of P contains the left half-plane $\Re \lambda \leq 0$ we further can relate the residues and regular values of $\zeta_\theta(P; s)$ to the coefficients in the heat kernel asymptotics for P (see Proposition 4.4 for the precise statement). We then use this to derive a local formula for the index of a hypoelliptic Ψ_H DO and to rephrase in terms of noncommutative residues the Weyl asymptotics for hypoelliptic Ψ DOs from [Po5] and [Po8].

An interesting application concerns logarithmic metric estimates for Green kernels of hypoelliptic Ψ_H DOs. It is not true that a positive hypoelliptic Ψ_H DO has a Green kernel positive near the diagonal. Nevertheless, by making use of the spectral interpretation of the noncommutative residue as a residual trace, we show that the positivity still pertains when the order is equal to the critical dimension $\dim M + 1$ (Proposition 4.7).

When the bracket condition $H + [H, H] = TM$ holds, i.e., H is a Carnot-Carathéodory distribution, this allows us to get metric estimates in terms of the Carnot-Carathéodory metric associated to any given subriemannian metric on H (Theorem 4.9). This result connects nicely with the work of Fefferman, Stein and their collaborators on metric estimates for Green kernels of subelliptic sublaplacians on general Carnot-Carathéodory manifolds (see, e.g., [FS], [Ma], [NSW], [Sa]).

Finally, we show that on a Heisenberg manifold (M, H) the Dixmier trace is defined for Ψ_H DOs of order less than or equal to the critical order $-(\dim M + 1)$ and on such operators agrees with the noncommutative residue (Theorem 4.12). Therefore, the noncommutative residue allows us to extend the Dixmier trace to the whole algebra of Ψ_H DOs of integer order. In noncommutative geometry the Dixmier trace plays the role of the integral on infinitesimal operator of order ≤ 1 . Therefore, our result allows us to integrate any Ψ_H DO even though it is not an infinitesimal operator of order ≤ 1 . This is the analogue of a well known result of Connes [Co1] for classical Ψ DOs.

1.3. Noncommutative residue and contact geometry. Let (M^{2n+1}, H) be a compact orientable contact manifold, so that the hyperplane bundle $H \subset TM$ can be realized as the kernel of a contact form θ on M . The additional datum of a *calibrated* almost complex structure on H defined a Riemannian metric on M whose volume $\text{Vol}_\theta M$ depends only on θ .

Let $\Delta_{b;k}$ be the horizontal sublaplacian associated to the above Riemannian metric acting on horizontal forms of degree k , $k \neq n$. This operator is hypoelliptic for $k \neq n$ and by making use of the results of [Po5] we can explicitly express the noncommutative residue of $\Delta_{b;k}^{-(n+1)}$ as a constant mutiple of $\text{Vol}_\theta M$ (see Proposition 5.2).

Next, the contact complex of Rumin [Ru] is a complex of horizontal forms on a contact manifold whose Laplacians are hypoelliptic in every bidegree. Let $\Delta_{R;k}$ denote the contact Laplacian acting on forms degree k , $k = 0, \dots, n$. Unlike the horizontal sublaplacian Δ_R does not act on all horizontal forms, but on the sections of a subbundle of horizontal forms. Moreover, it is not a sublaplacian and it even has order 4 on forms of degree n . Nevertheless, by making use of the results of [Po5]

we can show that the noncommutative residues of $\Delta_{R;k}^{-(n+1)}$ for $k \neq n$ and of $\Delta_{R;n}^{-\frac{n+1}{2}}$ are universal constant multiples of the contact volume $\text{Vol}_\theta M$ (see Proposition 5.3).

1.4. Applications in CR geometry. Let (M^{2n+1}, H) be a compact orientable κ -strictly pseudoconvex CR manifold equipped with a pseudohermitian contact form θ , i.e., the hyperplane bundle $H \subset TM$ has an (integrable) complex structure and the Levi form associated to θ has at every point $n - \kappa$ positive eigenvalues and κ negative eigenvalues. If h is a Levi metric on M then the volume with respect to this metric depends only on θ and is denoted $\text{Vol}_\theta M$.

As in the general contact case we can explicitly relate the pseudohermitian volume $\text{Vol}_\theta M$ to the noncommutative residues of the following operators:

- $\square_{b;pq}^{-(n+1)}$, where $\square_{b;pq}$ denotes the Kohn Laplacian acting on (p, q) -forms with $q \neq \kappa$ and $q \neq n - \kappa$ (Proposition 6.3);

- $\Delta_{b;pq}^{-(n+1)}$, where $\Delta_{b;pq}$ denotes the horizontal sublaplacian acting on (p, q) -forms with $(p, q) \neq (n - \kappa, \kappa)$ and $(p, q) \neq (\kappa, n - \kappa)$ (Proposition 6.7).

From now on we assume M strictly pseudoconvex (i.e. we have $\kappa = 0$) and consider the following operators:

- $\square_{b;pq}^{-n}$, with $q \neq 0$ and $q \neq n$;
- $\Delta_{b;pq}^{-n}$, with $(p, q) \neq (n, 0)$ and $(p, q) \neq (0, n)$.

Then we can make use of the results of [BGS] to express the noncommutative residues of these operators as universal constant multiple of the integral $\int_M R_n d\theta^n \wedge \theta$, where R_n denotes the scalar curvature of the connection of Tanaka [Ta] and Webster [We] (see Propositions 6.5 and 6.9). These last results provide us with a spectral interpretation of the Einstein-Hilbert action in CR geometry, analogous to that of Connes ([Co3], [KW], [Kas]) in the Riemannian case. Recall that the Einstein-Hilbert action is the integral of the scalar curvature and it yields the contribution of gravity forces to the action functional of the standard model. Therefore, it is of great interest in mathematical physics to give a spectral interpretation of this action, as an insight to cast gravity into the framework of quantum mechanics.

Next, following an idea of Connes [Co3] we can make use of the noncommutative residue for classical Ψ DOs to define the k -th dimensional volumes Riemannian manifold of dimension m for $k = 1, \dots, m - 1$, e.g. we can give sense to the area in any dimension (see [Po7]). Similarly, we can make use of the noncommutative residue for the Heisenberg calculus to define the k -dimensional pseudohermitian volume $\text{Vol}_\theta^{(k)} M$ for any $k = 1, \dots, 2n + 2$. The argument involves noncommutative geometry, but we can give a purely differential geometric expression of these lower dimensional volumes (see Proposition 6.11). Furthermore, in dimension 3 the area (i.e. the 2-dimensional volume) is a constant multiple of the integral of the Tanaka-Webster scalar curvature (Theorem 6.12). In particular, we find that the area of the sphere $S^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ endowed with its standard pseudohermitian structure has area $\frac{\pi^2}{8\sqrt{2}}$.

Finally, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n + 1$ let $\square_\theta^{(k)}$ be the Gover-Graham [GG] of order k associated to θ . The Gover-Graham operators are the CR analogues of the GJMS operators of conformal geometry (see [GJMS]). In particular, they transform conformally under a conformal change of contact form, for we have:

$$(1.1) \quad \square_{e^{2f}\theta} = e^{-(n+2)f} \square_\theta e^{nf} \quad \forall f \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}).$$

For $k = 1$ we recover the CR invariant sublaplacian used by Jerison-Lee [JL] in their solution of the Yamabe problem in CR geometry. In general, $\square_\theta^{(k)}$ is selfadjoint and it agrees up to lower order terms with the product of k sublaplacians that are all hypoelliptic unless $k = n + 1$. Thus, for $k \neq n + 1$ the principal symbol of $\square_\theta^{(k)}$ (in the Heisenberg calculus' sense) is invertible and its partial inverse (denoted $\square_\theta^{(-k)}$) is a Ψ_H DO of order $-2k$. The Schwartz kernel of $\square_\theta^{(-k)}$ is the Green kernel of $\square_\theta^{(k)}$ and we show that its logarithmic singularity, i.e. the density $c_{\square_\theta^{(-k)}}(x)$, satisfies

$$(1.2) \quad c_{\square_\theta^{(-k)}}(x) = e^{2kf(x)} c_{\square_\theta^{(-k)}}(x) \quad \forall f \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}).$$

In fact, if we write $c_{\square_\theta^{(-k)}}(x) = c_{n,k}(x) d\theta^n \wedge \theta$, then the results of [BGS] extends to show that $c_{n,k}(x)$ is a local pseudohermitian invariant (i.e. it is linear combination of complete contraction of covariant derivatives of the curvature and torsion tensors of the Tanaka-Webster connection). Together with (1.2) this shows that $c_{n,k}(x)$ is a local CR invariant of weight $n + 1 - k$ in the sense of Fefferman [Fe2]. The local CR invariants naturally appear in the analysis of the singularity of the Bergman kernel of a strictly pseudoconvex domain in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} . Motivated by this Fefferman [Fe2] launched a difficult program of determining all the local invariants of a strictly pseudoconvex CR structure (see also [BEG], [Hi]). Because the weight of $c_{n,k}(x)$ is $\leq n + 1$ we may apply the results of [BEG] to deduce that $c_{\square_\theta^{(-k)}}(x)$ takes the form:

$$(1.3) \quad c_{\square_\theta^{(-k)}}(x) = c_{n,k}(x) d\theta^n \wedge \theta,$$

where $c_{n,k}(x)$ is a universal linear combination of complete contractions of weight $n + 1 - k$ of the covariant derivatives of the curvature of the ambient Kähler-Lorentz metric of Fefferman [Fe2] (Theorem 6.18).

1.5. Potential geometric applications. The boundaries of a strictly pseudoconvex domain of \mathbb{C}^{n+1} naturally carry strictly pseudoconvex CR structures, so one can expect the above results to be useful for studying from the point of view of noncommutative geometry strictly pseudoconvex boundaries, and more generally Stein manifolds with boundaries and the asymptotically complex hyperbolic manifolds of [EMM]. Similarly, the boundary of a symplectic manifold naturally inherits a contact structure, so we could also use the results of this papers to give a noncommutative geometric study of symplectic manifolds with boundary.

Another interesting potential application concerns a special class of Lorentzian manifolds, the Fefferman's spaces ([Fe1], [Le]). Arguably, it would be important to understand Lorentzian manifolds from the point of view of noncommutative geometry, as an insight to cast gravity within the framework of quantum mechanics. A Fefferman's Lorentzian space \mathcal{F} can be realized as the total space of a circle bundle over a strictly pseudoconvex CR manifold M and it carries a Lorentzian metric naturally associated to any pseudohermitian contact form on M . For instance, the curvature tensor of \mathcal{F} can be explicitly expressed in terms of the curvature and torsion tensors of the Tanaka-Webster connection of M and the Dalemberertian of \mathcal{F} pushes down to the horizontal sublaplacian on M . This strongly suggests that one could deduce a noncommutative geometric study of Fefferman spaces from a noncommutative geometric study of strictly pseudoconvex CR manifolds. An item of special interest would be to get a spectral interpretation of the Einstein-Hilbert

action in this setting, since the latter yields the contribution of gravity forces to the standard model.

Finally, it would be interesting to extend the results of this paper to other subriemannian geometries such as the quaternionic contact manifolds of Biquard [Bi].

1.6. Organization of the paper. The rest of the paper is organized as follows.

In Section 2, we recall the main facts about Heisenberg manifold and the Heisenberg calculus.

In Section 3, we study the logarithmic singularity of the kernel of a Ψ_H DO and show that it gives rise to a well defined density. We then construct the noncommutative residue for the Heisenberg calculus as the residual trace induced on integer order Ψ_H DOs by the analytic extension of the usual trace to Ψ_H DOs of non-integer orders, and we show that the noncommutative residue of an integer order Ψ_H DO agrees with the integral of the density defined by the logarithmic singularity of its kernel. We end the section by showing that when the Heisenberg manifold is connected, the noncommutative residue is the only trace up to constant multiple.

In Section 4, we give some analytic applications of the construction of the noncommutative residue. First, we deal with zeta functions of hypoelliptic Ψ_H DOs and relate their singularities to the heat kernel asymptotics of the corresponding operators. Second, we give we prove logarithmic metric estimates for Green kernels of hypoelliptic Ψ_H DOs. Finally, we show that the noncommutative residue allows us to extend the Dixmier to *all* Ψ_H DO of integer orders.

In Section 5, we present examples of computations of noncommutative residues for suitable powers of the horizontal sublaplacian and of the contact Laplacian of Rumin.

In Section 6, we present several applications in CR geometry. First, we give some examples of geometric computations of noncommutative residues of suitable powers of the horizontal sublaplacian and of the Kohn Laplacian. Next, we make use of the framework of noncommutative geometry and of the noncommutative residue for the Heisenberg calculus to define lower dimensional volumes in CR geometry. As a last application we show that the logarithmic singularities of the Green kernels of the Gover-Graham operators are local CR invariants and can be expressed as linear combinations of complete contractions covariant derivatives of the curvature tensors of Fefferman's ambient Kähler-Lorentz metric.

Finally, in Appendix for reader's convenience we present a detailed proof of Lemma 3.1 about the extension of a homogeneous symbol into a homogeneous distribution. This is crucial result in the analysis of the study of the logarithmic density of the kernel of a Ψ_H DO in Section 3.

Acknowledgements. Part of the results of this paper were announced in [Po1] and [Po2] and presented as part of my PhD dissertation at the University of Paris-Sud (Orsay, France) on December 4th, 2000. I am grateful to my advisor Alain Connes for having brought this subject to my attention. I also thank him, as well as Charlie Epstein, Kengo Hirachi, Henri Moscovici and Michel Rumin, for interesting discussions related to the subject matter of this paper.

2. HEISENBERG CALCULUS

The Heisenberg calculus is the relevant pseudodifferential calculus to study hypoelliptic operators on Heisenberg manifolds. It was independently introduced by

Beals-Greiner [BG] and Taylor [Tay] (see also [BdM], [Dy1], [Dy2], [EM], [FSt], [Po5], [RS]). In this section we recall the main facts about the Heisenberg calculus following the point of view of [BG] and [Po5].

2.1. Heisenberg manifolds. In this subsection we gather the main definitions and examples concerning Heisenberg manifolds and their tangent Lie group bundles.

Definition 2.1. 1) A Heisenberg manifold is a pair (M, H) consisting of a manifold M together with a distinguished hyperplane bundle $H \subset TM$.

2) Given Heisenberg manifolds (M, H) and (M', H') a diffeomorphism $\phi : M \rightarrow M'$ is said to be a Heisenberg diffeomorphism when $\phi_*H = H'$.

Following are the main examples of Heisenberg manifolds:

- *Heisenberg group.* The $(2n + 1)$ -dimensional Heisenberg group \mathbb{H}^{2n+1} consists of $\mathbb{R}^{2n+1} = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ together with the group law $x.y = (x_0 + y_0 + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} (x_{n+j}y_j - x_jy_{n+j}), x_1 + y_1, \dots, x_{2n} + y_{2n})$. A left-invariant basis for its Lie algebra \mathfrak{h}^{2n+1} is then provided by the vector-fields $X_0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_0}$, $X_j = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} + x_{n+j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_0}$ and $X_{n+j} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{n+j}} - x_j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_0}$, $1 \leq j \leq n$. For $j, k = 1, \dots, n$ and $k \neq j$ we have the Heisenberg relations $[X_j, X_{n+k}] = -2\delta_{jk}X_0$ and $[X_0, X_j] = [X_j, X_k] = [X_{n+j}, X_{n+k}] = 0$. In particular, the subbundle spanned by the vector field X_1, \dots, X_{2n} yields a left-invariant Heisenberg structure on \mathbb{H}^{2n+1} .

- *Foliations.* A (smooth) foliation is a manifold M together with a subbundle $\mathcal{F} \subset TM$ integrable in Frobenius' sense, i.e., the space of sections of H is closed under the Lie bracket of vector fields. Therefore, any codimension 1 foliation is a Heisenberg manifold.

- *Contact manifolds.* Opposite to foliations are contact manifolds. A contact manifold is a Heisenberg manifold (M^{2n+1}, H) such that H can be locally realized as the kernel of a contact form, that is, a 1-form θ such that $d\theta|_H$ is nondegenerate. When M is orientable it is equivalent to require H to be globally the kernel of a contact form. Furthermore, by Darboux's theorem any contact manifold is locally Heisenberg-diffeomorphic to the Heisenberg group \mathbb{H}^{2n+1} equipped with the standard contact form $\theta^0 = dx_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n (x_j dx_{n+j} - x_{n+j} dx_j)$.

- *Confoliations.* According to Elyashberg-Thurston [ET] a *confoliation structure* on an oriented manifold M^{2n+1} is given by a global non-vanishing 1-form θ on M such that $(d\theta)^n \wedge \theta \geq 0$. In particular, if we let $H = \ker \theta$ then (M, H) is a Heisenberg manifold which is a foliation when $d\theta \wedge \theta = 0$ and a contact manifold when $(d\theta)^n \wedge \theta > 0$.

- *CR manifolds.* A CR structure on an orientable manifold M^{2n+1} is given by a rank n complex subbundle $T_{1,0} \subset T_{\mathbb{C}}M$ such that $T_{1,0}$ is integrable in Frobenius' sense and we have $T_{1,0} \cap T_{0,1} = \{0\}$, where we have set $T_{0,1} = \overline{T_{1,0}}$. Equivalently, the subbundle $H = \Re(T_{1,0} \otimes T_{0,1})$ has the structure of a complex bundle of (real) dimension $2n$. In particular, (M, H) is a Heisenberg manifold. The main example of a CR manifold is that of the (smooth) boundary $M = \partial D$ of a bounded complex domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. In particular, when D is strongly pseudoconvex with defining function ρ the 1-form $\theta = i(\partial - \bar{\partial})\rho$ is a contact form on M .

Next, the terminology Heisenberg manifold stems from the fact that the relevant tangent structure in this setting is that of a bundle GM of graded nilpotent Lie

groups (see [BG], [Be], [EMM], [FSt], [Gro], [Po4], [Ro2], [Va]). This tangent Lie group bundle can be described as follows.

First, there is an intrinsic Levi form $\mathcal{L} : H \times H \rightarrow TM/H$ such that, for any point $a \in M$ and any sections X and Y of H near a , we have

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{L}_a(X(a), Y(a)) = [X, Y](a) \mod H_a.$$

In other words the class of $[X, Y](a)$ modulo H_a depends only on the values $X(a)$ and $Y(a)$, not on the germs of X and Y near a (see [Po4]). This allows us to define the tangent Lie algebra bundle $\mathfrak{g}M$ as the vector bundle $(TM/H) \oplus H$ together with the grading and field of Lie brackets such that, for sections X_0, Y_0 of TM/H and X', Y' of H , we have

$$(2.2) \quad t.(X_0 + X') = t^2 X_0 + tX', \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$(2.3) \quad [X_0 + X', Y_0 + Y']_{\mathfrak{g}M} = \mathcal{L}(X', Y').$$

Since each fiber $\mathfrak{g}_a M$ is 2-step nilpotent, $\mathfrak{g}M$ is the Lie algebra bundle of a Lie group bundle GM which can be realized as $(TM/H) \oplus H$ together with the field of group law such that, for sections X_0, Y_0 of TM/H and X', Y' of H , we have

$$(2.4) \quad (X_0 + X').(Y_0 + Y') = X_0 + Y_0 + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}(X', Y') + X' + Y'.$$

We call GM the *tangent Lie group bundle* of M .

Let ϕ be a Heisenberg diffeomorphism from (M, H) onto a Heisenberg manifold (M', H') . Since we have $\phi_* H = H'$ the linear differential ϕ' induces linear vector bundle isomorphisms $\phi' : H \rightarrow H'$ and $\overline{\phi'} : TM/H \rightarrow TM'/H'$, so that we get a linear vector bundle isomorphism $\phi'_H : (TM/H) \oplus H \rightarrow (TM'/H') \oplus H'$ by letting

$$(2.5) \quad \phi'_H(a).(X_0 + X') = \overline{\phi'}(a)X_0 + \phi'(a)X',$$

for any $a \in M$ and any X_0 in $(T_a M/H_a)$ and X' in H_a . This isomorphism commutes with the dilations in (2.2) and it can be further shown that it gives rise to a Lie group isomorphism from GM onto GM' (see [Po4]).

The above description of GM can be related to the extrinsic approach of [BG] as follows. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a local chart together with H -frame X_0, \dots, X_d , that is, a frame such that X_1, \dots, X_d span H . Such a chart is called a *Heisenberg chart*. For $a \in U$ we let $\psi_a : \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ denote the unique affine change of variable such that $\psi_a(a) = 0$ and $(\psi_a)_* X_j(0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ for $j = 0, \dots, d$. In the sequel we will call the local coordinates provided by ψ_a *privileged coordinates centered at a* . In addition, on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} we consider the dilations,

$$(2.6) \quad t.x = (t^2 x_0, tx_1, \dots, tx_d), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In privileged coordinates centered at a we can write $X_j = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} + \sum_{k=0}^d a_{jk}(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}$ with $a_{jk}(0) = 0$. Let $X_0^{(a)} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_0}$ and for $j = 1, \dots, d$ let $X_j^{(a)} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} + \sum_{k=1}^d b_{jk} x_k \frac{\partial}{\partial x_0}$, where $b_{jk} = \partial_{x_k} a_{j0}(0)$. With respect to the dilations (2.6) the vector field $X_j^{(a)}$ is homogeneous of degree $w_0 = -2$ for $j = 0$ and of degree $w_j = -1$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$. In fact, using Taylor expansions at $x = 0$ we get a formal expansion $X_j \sim X_j^{(a)} + X_{j,w_j-1} + \dots$, with $X_{j,l}$ homogeneous vector field of degree l .

The subbundle spanned by the vector fields $X_j^{(a)}$ forms a 2-step nilpotent Lie algebra of vectors fields with associated Lie group $G^{(a)}$, which can be realized as \mathbb{R}^{d+1} together with the group law $x.y = (x_0 + \sum_{j,k=1}^d b_{kj} x_j x_k, x_1, \dots, x_d)$.

On the other hand, the vectors $X_0(a), \dots, X_d(a)$ provide us with a linear basis of the space $(T_a M / H_a) \oplus H_a$ which allows us to realize $G_a M$ as \mathbb{R}^{d+1} together with the group law $x.y = (x_0 + y_0 + \frac{1}{2}L_{jk}(a)x_j y_k, x_1 + y_1, \dots, x_d + y_d)$, where L_{jk} are the coefficients of the Levi form (2.1) with respect to the H -frame X_0, \dots, X_d , i.e., we have $\mathcal{L}(X_j, X_k) = [X_j, X_k] = L_{jk}X_0 \bmod H$.

The Lie group $G^{(a)}$ is isomorphic to $G_a M$ since $L_{jk} = b_{jk} - b_{kj}$ and an explicit isomorphism is $\phi_a(x_0, \dots, x_d) = (x_0 - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k=1}^d (b_{jk} + b_{kj})x_j x_k, x_1, \dots, x_d)$. In the sequel the local coordinates provided by the map $\varepsilon_a := \phi_a \circ \psi_a$ are called *Heisenberg coordinates centered at a* .

The Heisenberg coordinates refines the privileged coordinates in such way that the above realizations of $G^{(a)}$ and $G_a M$ agree. In particular, the vector fields $X_j^{(a)}$ and X_j^a , which in turn allows us to see X_j^a as a first order approximation of $X_j^{(a)}$. For this reason X_j^a is called the *model vector field of X_j at a* .

2.2. Left-invariant pseudodifferential operators. Let (M^{d+1}, H) be a Heisenberg manifold and let G be the tangent group $G_a M$ of M at a given point $a \in M$. We briefly recall the calculus for homogeneous left-invariant Ψ DOs on the nilpotent group G .

If E is a finite dimensional vector space the Schwartz class $\mathcal{S}(E)$ is a Fréchet space and the Fourier transform of a function $f \in \mathcal{S}(E)$ is the element $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{S}(E^*)$ such that $\hat{f}(\xi) = \int_E e^{i\langle \xi, x \rangle} f(x) dx$ for any $\xi \in E^*$, where dx denotes the Lebesgue measure of E . When $E = (T_a M / H_a) \oplus H_a$ its Lebesgue measure agrees with the Haar measure of G and so $\mathcal{S}(E)$ and $\mathcal{S}(G)$ agree. Furthermore, as $E^* = (T_a M / H_a)^* \otimes H_a^*$ is just the linear dual \mathfrak{g}^* of the Lie algebra of G , we also see that $\mathcal{S}(E^*)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ agree.

Let $\mathcal{S}_0(G)$ denote the closed subspace of $\mathcal{S}(G)$ consisting of $f \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ such that for any differential operator P on \mathfrak{g}^* we have $(P\hat{f})(0) = 0$. Notice that the image $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0(G)$ of $\mathcal{S}(G)$ under the Fourier transform consists of functions $v \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ such that, given any norm $|\cdot|$ on G , near $\xi = 0$ we have $|g(\xi)| = O(|\xi|^N)$ for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

We endow \mathfrak{g}^* with the dilations $\lambda.\xi = (\lambda^2 \xi_0, \lambda \xi')$ coming from (2.2). For $m \in \mathbb{C}$ we let $S_m(\mathfrak{g}^* M)$ denote the closed subspace of $C^\infty(\mathfrak{g}^* \setminus 0)$ consisting in functions $p(\xi) \in C^\infty(\mathfrak{g}^* \setminus 0)$ such that $p(\lambda.\xi) = \lambda^m p(\xi)$ for any $\lambda > 0$.

If $p(\xi) \in S_m(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ then it defines an element of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0(\mathfrak{g}^*)'$ by letting

$$(2.7) \quad \langle p, g \rangle = \int_{\mathfrak{g}^*} p(\xi) g(\xi) d\xi, \quad g \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_0(\mathfrak{g}^*).$$

This allows us to define the inverse Fourier transform of p as the element $\check{p} \in \mathcal{S}_0(G)'$ such that $\langle \check{p}, f \rangle = \langle p, \hat{f} \rangle$ for any $f \in \mathcal{S}_0(G)$. It then can be shown (see, e.g., [BG], [CGGP]) that the left-convolution with p defines a continuous endomorphism of $\mathcal{S}_0(G)$ via the formula,

$$(2.8) \quad \text{Op}(p)f(x) = \check{p} * f(x) = \langle \check{p}(y), f(xy) \rangle, \quad f \in \mathcal{S}_0(G).$$

Furthermore, we get a bilinear product,

$$(2.9) \quad * : S_{m_1}(\mathfrak{g}^*) \times S_{m_2}(\mathfrak{g}^*) \rightarrow S_{m_1+m_2}(\mathfrak{g}^*),$$

$$(2.10) \quad \text{Op}(p_1) \circ \text{Op}(p_2) = \text{Op}(p_1 * p_2) \quad \forall p_j \in S_{m_j}(\mathfrak{g}^*).$$

In addition, if $p \in S_m(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ then $\text{Op}(p)$ really is a pseudodifferential operator. Indeed, let $X_0(a), \dots, X_d(a)$ be a (linear) basis of \mathfrak{g} so that $X_0(a)$ is in $T_a M / H_a$ and $X_1(a), \dots, X_d(a)$ span H_a . For $j = 0, \dots, d$ let X_j^a be the left-invariant vector

field on G such that $X_j^a|_{x=0} = X_j(a)$. The basis $X_0(a), \dots, X_d(a)$ yields a linear isomorphism $\mathfrak{g} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, hence a global chart of G . In this chart $p(\xi)$ is a homogeneous symbol on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus 0$ with respect to the dilations (2.6).

Similarly, each vector field $\frac{1}{i}X_j^a$, $j = 0, \dots, d$, corresponds to a vector field on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} with symbol $\sigma_j^a(x, \xi)$. Then, setting $\sigma^a(x, \xi) = (\sigma_0^a(x, \xi), \dots, \sigma_d^a(x, \xi))$, it can be shown that in the above chart we have

$$(2.11) \quad \text{Op}(p)f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} e^{ix \cdot \xi} p(\sigma^a(x, \xi)) \hat{f}(\xi), \quad f \in \mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}).$$

In other words $\text{Op}(p)$ is the pseudodifferential operator $p(-iX^a) := p(\sigma^a(x, D))$ acting on $\mathcal{S}_0(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

2.3. The Ψ_H DO operators. The initial idea in the Heisenberg calculus, which goes back to Elias Stein, is to construct a class of operators on a Heisenberg manifold (M^{d+1}, H) , called Ψ_H DOs, which at any point $a \in M$ are modeled in a suitable sense on left-invariant pseudodifferential operators on the tangent group $G_a M$.

Locally the Ψ_H DOs can be described as follows. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a Heisenberg chart with H -frame X_0, \dots, X_d .

Definition 2.2. 1) $S_m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $m \in \mathbb{C}$, consists of functions $p(x, \xi)$ in $C^\infty(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus 0)$ which are homogeneous of degree m in the ξ -variable with respect to the dilations (2.6), i.e., we have $p(x, t\xi) = t^m p(x, \xi)$ for any $t > 0$.

2) $S^m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $m \in \mathbb{C}$, consists of functions $p(x, \xi)$ in $C^\infty(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ with an asymptotic expansion $p \sim \sum_{j \geq 0} p_{m-j}$, $p_k \in S_k(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, in the sense that, for any integer N and for any compact $K \subset U$, we have

$$(2.12) \quad |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (p - \sum_{j < N} p_{m-j})(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta NK} \|\xi\|^{\Re m - \langle \beta \rangle - N}, \quad x \in K, \quad \|\xi\| \geq 1,$$

where we have let $\langle \beta \rangle = 2\beta_0 + \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_d$ and $\|\xi\| = (\xi_0^2 + \xi_1^4 + \dots + \xi_d^4)^{1/4}$.

Next, for $j = 0, \dots, d$ let $\sigma_j(x, \xi)$ denote the symbol (in the classical sense) of the vector field $\frac{1}{i}X_j$ and set $\sigma = (\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_d)$. Then for $p \in S^m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ we let $p(x, -iX)$ be the continuous linear operator from $C_c^\infty(U)$ to $C^\infty(U)$ such that

$$(2.13) \quad p(x, -iX)f(x) = (2\pi)^{-(d+1)} \int e^{ix \cdot \xi} p(x, \sigma(x, \xi)) \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi, \quad f \in C_c^\infty(U).$$

In the sequel we let $\Psi^{-\infty}(U)$ denote the space of smoothing operators on U , that is, the space of operators $P : \mathcal{E}'(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'(U)$ with a smooth Schwartz kernel.

Definition 2.3. $\Psi_H^m(U)$, $m \in \mathbb{C}$, consists of operators $P : C_c^\infty(U) \rightarrow C^\infty(U)$ which are of the form $P = p(x, -iX) + R$ with p in $S^m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, called the symbol of P , and with $R \in \Psi^{-\infty}(U)$.

The class of Ψ_H DOs is invariant under changes of Heisenberg charts (see [BG, Sect. 16], [Po5, Appendix A]), so we may extend the definition of Ψ_H DOs to an arbitrary Heisenberg manifold (M, H) and let them act on sections of a vector bundle \mathcal{E} over M . We let $\Psi_H^m(M, \mathcal{E})$ denote the class of Ψ_H DOs of order m on M acting on sections of \mathcal{E} .

Assume for simplicity that M is compact and that M and \mathcal{E} are endowed with a Riemannian and a Hermitian metric. Then we have:

Proposition 2.4 ([BG]). 1) For any $P_1 \in \Psi_H^{m_1}(M, \mathcal{E})$ and $P_2 \in \Psi_H^{m_2}(M, \mathcal{E})$ the operator $P_1 P_2$ is in $\Psi_H^{m_1+m_2}(M, \mathcal{E})$.

2) For any $P \in \Psi_H^m(M, \mathcal{E})$ the transpose operator P^t is in $\Psi_H^m(M, \mathcal{E})$ and the adjoint P^* is in $\Psi_H^{\bar{m}}(M, \mathcal{E})$.

Let $\mathfrak{g}^*M = (TM/H)^* \oplus H^*$ denote the (linear) dual of the Lie algebra bundle $\mathfrak{g}M$ of GM with canonical projection $\text{pr} : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*M$. If $P \in \Psi_H^m(M, \mathcal{E})$ then the principal symbol of P can be invariantly defined as an element $\sigma_m(P)$ of the space $S_m(\mathfrak{g}^*M, \mathcal{E})$ of sections $p \in C^\infty(\mathfrak{g}^*M \setminus 0, \text{End pr}^*\mathcal{E})$ such that $p(x, t\xi) = t^m p(x, \xi)$ for any $t > 0$. More precisely $\sigma_m(P)(x, \xi)$ is the unique symbol in $S_m(\mathfrak{g}^*M, \mathcal{E})$ such that, for any $a \in M$, in trivializing Heisenberg coordinates centered at a we have $\sigma_m(P)(a, \xi) = p_m(0, \xi)$, where $p_m(x, \xi)$ is the principal symbol of P in the local coordinates in the sense of (2.12) (see [Po5]).

Given a point a the principal symbol $\sigma_m(P)$ allows us to define the model operator of P at a as the left-invariant Ψ DO on $\mathcal{S}_0(\mathfrak{g}^*M, \mathcal{E}_a)$ with symbol $p_m^a(\xi) := \sigma_m(P)(a, \xi)$ so that, in the notation of (2.8), the operator P^a is just $\text{Op}(p_m^a)$.

Let $S_m(\mathfrak{g}_a^*M, \mathcal{E}_a)$ be the space of functions $p \in C^\infty(\mathfrak{g}_a^*M \setminus 0, \mathcal{E}_a)$ which are homogeneous of degree m . Then the product (2.9) on G_aM defines a bilinear product $*^a : S_{m_1}(\mathfrak{g}_a^*M, \mathcal{E}_a) \times S_{m_2}(\mathfrak{g}_a^*M, \mathcal{E}_a) \rightarrow S_{m_1+m_2}(\mathfrak{g}_a^*M, \mathcal{E}_a)$. This product depends smoothly on a as much so to gives rise to the product,

$$(2.14) \quad * : S_{m_1}(\mathfrak{g}^*M, \mathcal{E}) \times S_{m_2}(\mathfrak{g}^*M, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow S_{m_1+m_2}(\mathfrak{g}^*M, \mathcal{E}),$$

$$(2.15) \quad p_{m_1} * p_{m_2}(a, \xi) = (p_{m_1}(a, \cdot) *^a p_{m_2}(a, \cdot))(\xi), \quad p_{m_j} \in S_{m_j}(\mathfrak{g}^*M).$$

Proposition 2.5 ([Po5]). 1) For any $P_1 \in \Psi_H^{m_1}(M, \mathcal{E})$ and $P_2 \in \Psi_H^{m_2}(M, \mathcal{E})$ we have $\sigma_{m_1+m_2}(P_1 P_2) = \sigma_{m_1}(P_1) * \sigma_{m_2}(P_2)$ and $(P_1 P_2)^a = P_1^a P_2^a \forall a \in M$.

2) Let $P \in \Psi_H^m(M, \mathcal{E})$. Then $\sigma_m(P^t)(x, \xi) = \sigma_m(P)(x, -\xi)^t$ and $\sigma_{\bar{m}}(P^*)(x, \xi) = \sigma_m(P)(x, \xi)^*$ and we have $(P^t)^a = (P^a)^t$ and $(P^*)^a = (P^a)^*$ for any $a \in M$.

In addition, there is a complete symbolic calculus for Ψ_H DOs which allows us to carry out the classical parametrix construction for an operator $P \in \Psi_H^m(M, \mathcal{E})$ whenever its principal symbol $\sigma_m(P)$ with respect to the product $*$. In this case the operator P is hypoelliptic with a gain/loss of derivatives depending only on its order (see [BG]).

In general, it may be difficult to determine whether $\sigma_m(P)$ is invertible with respect to the product $*$. Nevertheless, given a point $a \in M$ we have an invertibility criterion for P^a in terms of the representation theory of G_aM ; this is the so-called Rockland condition (see, e.g., [Ro1], [CGGP]). We then can completely determine the invertibility of the principal symbol of P in terms of the Rockland conditions for its model operators and those of its transpose (see [Po5, Thm. 3.3.19]).

2.4. Holomorphic families of Ψ_H DOs. Let Ω denote an open subset of \mathbb{C} and let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a Heisenberg chart with H -frame X_0, \dots, X_d .

Definition 2.6. A family $(p_z)_{z \in \Omega} \subset S^*(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is holomorphic when:

- (i) The order $m(z)$ of p_z depends analytically on z ;
- (ii) For any $(x, \xi) \in U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ the function $z \rightarrow p_z(x, \xi)$ is holomorphic on Ω ;
- (iii) The bounds of the asymptotic expansion (2.12) for p_z are locally uniform with respect to z , i.e., we have $p_z \sim \sum_{j \geq 0} p_{z, m(z)-j}, p_{z, m(z)-j} \in S_{m(z)-j}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$,

and for any integer N and for any compacts $K \subset U$ and $L \subset \Omega$ we have

$$(2.16) \quad |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (p_z - \sum_{j < N} p_{z, m(z)-j})(x, \xi)| \leq C_{NKL\alpha\beta} \|\xi\|^{\Re m(z) - N - \langle \beta \rangle},$$

for $(x, z) \in K \times L$ and $\|\xi\| \geq 1$.

We let $\text{Hol}(\Omega, S^*(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}))$ denote the set of holomorphic families with values in $S^*(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Notice that the properties (i)–(iii) imply that each homogeneous symbol $p_{z, m(z)-j}(x, \xi)$ depends analytically on z , that is, gives rise to a holomorphic family with values in $C^\infty(U \times (\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus 0))$ (see [Po5, Rem. 4.2.2]).

Since $\Psi^{-\infty}(U) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}'(U), C^\infty(U))$ is a Fréchet space isomorphic to $C^\infty(U \times U)$ by the Schwartz's kernel theorem, we can define holomorphic families of smoothing operators as families of operators given by holomorphic families of smooth kernels.

Definition 2.7. A family $(P_z)_{z \in \Omega} \subset \Psi_H^m(U)$ is holomorphic when it can be put into the form $P_z = p_z(x, -iX) + R_z$, $z \in \Omega$, with $(p_z)_{z \in \Omega} \in \text{Hol}(\Omega, S^*(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}))$ and $(R_z)_{z \in \Omega} \in \text{Hol}(\Omega, \Psi^{-\infty}(U))$.

This notion is invariant under change of Heisenberg chart (see [Po5]), so we can extend to define holomorphic family of Ψ_H DOs on a general Heisenberg manifold and acting sections of vector bundles.

Definition 2.8. A family $(P_z)_{z \in \Omega} \subset \Psi_H^*(M, \mathcal{E})$ is holomorphic when:

- (i) The order $m(z)$ of P_z is a holomorphic function of z ;
- (ii) For φ and ψ in $C_c^\infty(M)$ with disjoint supports $(\varphi P_z \psi)_{z \in \Omega}$ is a holomorphic family of smoothing operators;
- (iii) For any trivialization $\tau : \mathcal{E}|_U \rightarrow U \times \mathbb{C}^r$ over a local Heisenberg chart $\kappa : U \rightarrow V \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ the family $(\kappa_* \tau_*(P_z|_U))_{z \in \Omega}$ belongs to $\text{Hol}(\Omega, \Psi_H^*(V, \mathbb{C}^r)) := \text{Hol}(\Omega, \Psi_H^*(V)) \otimes \text{End } \mathbb{C}^r$.

We let $\text{Hol}(\Omega, \Psi_H^*(M, \mathcal{E}))$ denote the set of holomorphic families of Ψ_H DOs.

Proposition 2.9 ([Po5, Chap. 4]). 1) For $j = 1, 2$ let $P_{j,z} \in \text{Hol}(\Omega, \Psi_H^*(M, \mathcal{E}))$ and assume that $(P_{1,z})_{z \in \Omega}$ or $(P_{2,z})_{z \in \Omega}$ is uniformly properly supported with respect to z . Then $(P_{1,z} P_{2,z})_{z \in \Omega}$ is a holomorphic family of Ψ_H DOs too.

2) Let $\phi : (M, H) \rightarrow (M', H')$ be a Heisenberg diffeomorphism. Then for any $(P_z)_{z \in \Omega} \in \text{Hol}(\Omega, \Psi_H^*(M, \mathcal{E}))$ the family $(\phi_* P_z)_{z \in \Omega}$ belongs to $\text{Hol}(\Omega, \Psi_{H'}^*(M', \phi_* \mathcal{E}))$.

2.5. Complex powers of hypoelliptic Ψ_H DOs. Assume M compact and suppose that M and \mathcal{E} are endowed with a smooth density > 0 and a Hermitian metric.

Let $P : C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E})$ be a differential operator of Heisenberg order m which is positive, i.e., $\langle Pu, u \rangle \geq 0$ for any $u \in C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E})$, and assume that the principal symbol of P is invertible, i.e., P satisfies the Rockland at every point.

By standard functional calculus for any $s \in \mathbb{C}$ we can define the power P^s as an unbounded operator on $L^2(M, \mathcal{E})$ whose domain contains $C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E})$. In particular P^{-1} is the partial inverse of P and we have $P^0 = 1 - \Pi_0(P)$, where $\Pi_0(P)$ denotes the orthogonal projection onto the kernel of P . Furthermore, we have:

Proposition 2.10 ([Po5, Thm. 5.3.4]). Assume that H satisfies the bracket condition $H + [H, H] = TM$. Then the complex powers $(P^s)_{s \in \mathbb{C}}$ form a holomorphic 1-parameter group of Ψ_H DOs such that $\text{ord } P^s = ms \forall s \in \mathbb{C}$.

This construction has been generalized to more general hypoelliptic Ψ_H DOs in [Po8]. Let $P : C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E})$ be a Ψ_H DO of order $m > 0$. In [Po8] there is a notion of principal cut for the principal symbol $\sigma_m(P)$ of P as a ray $L \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus 0$ such that $P - \lambda$ admits a parametrix in a version of the Heisenberg calculus with parameter in a conical neighborhood $\Theta \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus 0$ of L .

Let $\Theta(P)$ be the union set of all principal sets of $\sigma_m(P)$. Then $\Theta(P)$ is an open conical subset of $\mathbb{C} \setminus 0$ and for any conical subset Θ of $\Theta(P)$ such that $\overline{\Theta} \setminus 0 \subset \Theta(P)$ there are at most finitely many eigenvalues of P in Θ (see [Po8]).

Let $L_\theta = \{\arg \lambda = \theta\}$, $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$, be a principal cut for $\sigma_m(P)$ such that no eigenvalue of P lies in L . Then L_θ is ray of minimal growth for P and we have:

Proposition 2.11 ([Po8]). *There exists a unique holomorphic family $(P_\theta^s)_{s \in \mathbb{C}}$ of Ψ_H DOs such that:*

- (i) $\text{ord} P_\theta^s = ms$ for any $s \in \mathbb{C}$;
- (ii) $P_\theta^{s_1+s_2} = P_\theta^{s_1} P_\theta^{s_2}$ and $P_\theta^{s_1+k} = P^k P_\theta^{s_1} \quad \forall s_j \in \mathbb{C} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (iii) For $\Re s < 0$ we have

$$(2.17) \quad P_\theta^s = \frac{-1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_\theta} \lambda_\theta^s (P - \lambda)^{-1} d\lambda,$$

$$(2.18) \quad \Gamma_\theta = \{\rho e^{i\theta}; \infty < \rho \leq r\} \cup \{r e^{it}; \theta \geq t \geq \theta - 2\pi\} \cup \{\rho e^{i(\theta-2\pi)}; r \leq \rho \leq \infty\},$$

where $r > 0$ is such that no nonzero eigenvalue of P lies in the disc $|\lambda| < r$.

Let $E_0(P) = \cup_{j \geq 0} \ker P^j$ be the characteristic subspace of P associated to $\lambda = 0$. This is a finite dimensional subspace of $C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E})$ and so the projection $\Pi_0(P)$ onto $E_0(P)$ and along $E_0(P^*)^\perp$ is a smoothing operator (see [Po8]). Then we have:

$$(2.19) \quad P_\theta^0 = 1 - \Pi_0(P), \quad P_\theta^{-k} = P^{-k}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

where P^{-k} denotes the partial inverse of P^k , i.e., the operator that inverts P^k on $E_0(P^*)^\perp$ and is zero on $E_0(P)$.

Assume further that 0 is not in the spectrum of P . Let $Q \in \Psi_H^*(M, \mathcal{E})$ and for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ let $Q_z = Q P_\theta^{z/m}$. Then $(Q_z)_{z \in \mathbb{C}}$ is a holomorphic family of Ψ_H DOs such that $Q_0 = Q$ and $\text{ord} Q_z = z + \text{ord} Q$. Following the terminology of [Gu2] a holomorphic family of Ψ_H DOs with these properties is called a *gauging* for Q .

3. NONCOMMUTATIVE RESIDUE TRACE FOR THE HEISENBERG CALCULUS

In this section we construct a noncommutative residue trace for the algebra of integer order Ψ_H DOs on a Heisenberg manifold. We start by describing that the logarithmic singularity near the diagonal of the Schwartz kernel of a Ψ_H DO of integer order and we show that it gives rise to a well-defined density. We then construct the noncommutative residue for the Heisenberg calculus as the residual trace induced by the analytic continuation of the usual trace to Ψ_H DOs of non-integer orders and we show that it agrees with the integral of the density defined by the log singularity of the kernel of the corresponding operator. Finally, we prove that when the manifold is connected then every other trace on the algebra of integer order Ψ_H DOs is a constant multiple of our noncommutative residue. This is the analogue of a well-known result of Wodzicki and Guillemin.

3.1. Logarithmic singularity of the kernel of a Ψ_H DO. In this subsection we show that the logarithmic singularity of the Schwartz kernel of any integer order Ψ_H DO gives rise to a density which makes sense intrinsically. This uses the characterization of Ψ_H DOs in terms of their Schwartz kernels, which we shall now recall.

First, we extend the notion of homogeneity of functions to distributions. For K in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ and for $\lambda > 0$ we let K_λ denote the element of $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that

$$(3.1) \quad \langle K_\lambda, f \rangle = \lambda^{-(d+2)} \langle K(x), f(\lambda^{-1} \cdot x) \rangle \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}).$$

It will be convenient to also use the notation $K(\lambda \cdot x)$ for denoting $K_\lambda(x)$. We say that K is homogeneous of degree m , $m \in \mathbb{C}$, when $K_\lambda = \lambda^m K$ for any $\lambda > 0$.

In the sequel we let E be the anisotropic radial vector field $2x_0\partial_{x_0} + \partial_{x_1} + \dots + \partial_{x_d}$, i.e., E is the infinitesimal generator of the flow $\phi_s(\xi) = e^s \cdot \xi$.

Lemma 3.1 ([BG, Prop. 15.24], [CM, Lem. I.4]). *Let $p(\xi) \in S_m(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $m \in \mathbb{C}$.*

1) If m is not an integer $\leq -(d+2)$, then $p(\xi)$ can be uniquely extended into a homogeneous distribution $\tau \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

2) If m is an integer $\leq -(d+2)$, then at best we can extend $p(\xi)$ into a distribution $\tau \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that

$$(3.2) \quad \tau_\lambda = \lambda^m \tau + \lambda^m \log \lambda \sum_{\langle \alpha \rangle = -(m+d+2)} c_\alpha(p) \delta^{(\alpha)} \quad \text{for any } \lambda > 0,$$

where we have let $c_\alpha(p) = \frac{(-1)^{|\alpha|}}{\alpha!} \int_{\|\xi\|=1} \xi^\alpha p(\xi) i_E d\xi$. In particular, $p(\xi)$ admits a homogeneous extension iff all the $c_\alpha(p)$'s vanish.

Remark 3.2. For reader's convenience a detailed proof of this lemma is given in Appendix.

Let $\tau \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ and let $\lambda > 0$. Then for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ we have

$$(3.3) \quad \langle (\tilde{\tau})_\lambda, f \rangle = \lambda^{-(d+2)} \langle \tau, (f_{\lambda^{-1}})^\vee \rangle = \langle \tau, (\tilde{f})_\lambda \rangle = \lambda^{-(d+2)} \langle (\tau_{\lambda^{-1}})^\vee, f \rangle.$$

Hence $(\tilde{\tau})_\lambda = \lambda^{-(d+2)} (\tau_{\lambda^{-1}})^\vee$. It follows from this that:

- τ is homogeneous of degree m iff $\tilde{\tau}$ is homogeneous of degree $\tilde{m} := -(m+d+2)$;
- τ satisfies (3.2) iff, for any $\lambda > 0$, we have

$$(3.4) \quad \tilde{\tau}(\lambda \cdot y) = \lambda^{\tilde{m}} \tilde{\tau}(y) - \lambda^{\tilde{m}} \log \lambda \sum_{\langle \alpha \rangle = \tilde{m}} (2\pi)^{-(d+1)} c_\alpha(p) (-iy)^\alpha.$$

Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a Heisenberg chart with H -frame X_0, \dots, X_d . In the sequel we let $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and we let $\mathcal{S}'_{\text{reg}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ be the space of tempered distributions on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} which are smooth outside the origin. We endow $\mathcal{S}'_{\text{reg}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ with the locally convex topology induced by that of $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ and $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus 0)$. Recall also that if E is a topological vector space contained in $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ then $C^\infty(U) \hat{\otimes} E$ can be identified as the space $C^\infty(U, E)$ seen as a subspace of $\mathcal{D}'(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

The discussion above about the homogeneity of the (inverse) Fourier transform leads us to consider the classes of distributions below.

Definition 3.3. $\mathcal{K}_m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $m \in \mathbb{C}$, consists of distributions $K(x, y)$ in $C^\infty(U) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{S}'_{\text{reg}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that, for any $\lambda > 0$, we have:

$$(3.5) \quad K(x, \lambda y) = \begin{cases} \lambda^m K(x, y) & \text{if } m \notin \mathbb{N}_0, \\ \lambda^m K(x, y) + \lambda^m \log \lambda \sum_{\langle \alpha \rangle = m} c_{K, \alpha}(x) y^\alpha & \text{if } m \in \mathbb{N}_0, \end{cases}$$

where the functions $c_{K,\alpha}(x)$, $\langle \alpha \rangle = m$, are in $C^\infty(U)$ when $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Remark 3.4. For $\Re m > 0$ we have $K_m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \subset C^\infty(U) \hat{\otimes} C^{[\frac{\Re m}{2}]'}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, where $[\frac{\Re m}{2}]'$ denotes the greatest integer $< \Re m$ (see [Po5, Lemma A.1]).

Definition 3.5. $\mathcal{K}^m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $m \in \mathbb{C}$, consists of distributions $K(x, y)$ in $\mathcal{D}'(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ with an asymptotic expansion $K \sim \sum_{j \geq 0} K_{m+j}$, $K_l \in \mathcal{K}_l(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, in the sense that, for any integer N , as soon as J is large enough $K - \sum_{j \leq J} K_{m+j}$ is in $C^N(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

Remark 3.6. The definition implies that any distribution $K \in \mathcal{K}^m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is smooth on $U \times (\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus 0)$. Furthermore, using Remark 3.4 we see that for $\Re m > 0$ we have $\mathcal{K}^m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \subset C^\infty(U) \hat{\otimes} C^{[\frac{\Re m}{2}]'}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

Using Lemma 3.1 we can characterize homogeneous symbols on $U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ as follows.

Lemma 3.7. 1) If $p(x, \xi) \in S_m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ then $p(x, \xi)$ can be extended into a distribution $\tau(x, \xi) \in C^\infty(U) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{S}'_{reg}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that $K(x, y) := \tilde{\tau}_{\xi \rightarrow y}(x, y)$ belongs to $\mathcal{K}_{\hat{m}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $\hat{m} = -(m + d + 2)$. Furthermore, if m is an integer $\leq -(d + 2)$ then, using the notation of (3.5), we have $c_{K,\alpha}(x) = (2\pi)^{-n} \int_{\|\xi\|=1} \frac{(i\xi)^\alpha}{\alpha!} p(x, \xi) \iota_E d\xi$.

2) If $K(x, y) \in \mathcal{K}_{\hat{m}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ then the restriction of $\hat{K}_{y \rightarrow \xi}(x, \xi)$ to $U \times (\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus 0)$ is a symbol in $S_m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

Next, for $x \in U$ we let ψ_x denote the affine change of variable to the privileged coordinates at x as in Section 2. In fact, if we write $\sigma(x, \xi) = A_x \cdot \xi$ with $A_x \in GL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ then we have $\psi_x(y) = (A_x^{-1})^t \cdot (y - x)$. In addition, let $\varepsilon_x = \phi_x \circ \psi_x$ be the change to the Heisenberg coordinates centered at x as in Section 2.

Let $p \in S_m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Then one can check (see, e.g., [Po5, p. 54]) that the distribution kernel of $P = p(x, -iX)$ is equal to

$$(3.6) \quad k_{p(x, -iX)}(x, y) = |\psi'_x| \check{p}_{\xi \rightarrow y}(x, -\psi_x(y)) = |\varepsilon'_x| \check{p}_{\xi \rightarrow y}(x, \phi_x(-\varepsilon_x(y))).$$

Combining this with Lemma 3.7 leads us to the characterization of Ψ_H DOs below.

Proposition 3.8 ([BG, Thms. 15.39, 15.49], [Po5, Prop. 3.1.16]). Consider a continuous operator $P : C_c^\infty(U) \rightarrow C^\infty(U)$ with distribution kernel $k_P(x, y)$. Let $m \in \mathbb{C}$ and set $\hat{m} = -(m + d + 2)$. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) P is a Ψ_H DO of order m .

(ii) We can put $k_P(x, y)$ in the form,

$$(3.7) \quad k_P(x, y) = |\psi'_x| K(x, -\psi_x(y)) + R(x, y),$$

for some $K \in \mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $K \sim \sum K_{\hat{m}+j}$, and some $R \in C^\infty(U \times U)$.

(iii) We can put $k_P(x, y)$ in the form,

$$(3.8) \quad k_P(x, y) = |\varepsilon'_x| K_P(x, -\varepsilon_x(y)) + R_P(x, y),$$

for some $K_P \in \mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $K_P \sim \sum K_{P, \hat{m}+j}$, and some $R_P \in C^\infty(U \times U)$.

Furthermore, if (i)–(iii) hold then we have $K_{P,l}(x, y) = K_l(x, \phi_x(y))$ and P has symbol $p \sim \sum_{j \geq 0} p_{m-j}$, where $p_{m-j}(x, \xi)$ is the restriction to $U \times (\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus 0)$ of $(K_{m+j})_{y \rightarrow \xi}^\wedge(x, \xi)$.

Now, let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a Heisenberg chart with H -frame X_0, X_1, \dots, X_d . Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and let $K \in \mathcal{K}^m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $K \sim \sum_{j \geq m} K_j$. Then:

- For $j \leq -1$ the distribution $K_j(x, y)$ is homogeneous of degree j with respect to y and is smooth for $y \neq 0$;

- For $j = 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ we have $K_0(x, \lambda.y) = K_0(x, y) - c_{K_0,0}(x) \log \lambda$, which by setting $\lambda = \|y\|^{-1}$ with $y \neq 0$ gives

$$(3.9) \quad K_0(x, y) = K_0(x, \|y\|^{-1}.y) - c_{K_0,0} \log \|y\|.$$

- The remainder term $K - \sum_{j \geq 1} K_j$ is in $C^0(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ (cf. Remarks 3.4 and 3.6).

It follows that $K(x, y)$ has a behavior near $y = 0$ of the form,

$$(3.10) \quad K(x, y) = \sum_{m \leq j \leq -1} K_j(x, y) - c_K(x) \log \|y\| + O(1), \quad c_K(x) = c_{K_0,0}(x).$$

Next, let $P \in \Psi_H^m(U)$ have Schwartz kernel $k_P(x, y)$ and set $\hat{m} = -(m + d + 2)$.

Lemma 3.9. 1) Near the diagonal $k_P(x, y)$ has a behavior of the form,

$$(3.11) \quad k_P(x, y) = \sum_{\hat{m} \leq j \leq -1} a_j(x, -\psi_x(y)) - c_P(x) \log \|\psi_x(y)\| + O(1),$$

with $a_j(x, y) \in C^\infty(U \times (\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus 0))$ homogeneous of degree j in y and $c_P(x) \in C^\infty(U)$.

2) If we write $k_P(x, y)$ in the forms (3.7) and (3.8) with $K(x, y)$ and $K_P(x, y)$ in $\mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, then we have

$$(3.12) \quad c_P(x) = |\psi'_x| c_K(x) = |\varepsilon'_x| c_{K_P}(x) = \frac{|\psi'_x|}{(2\pi)^{d+1}} \int_{\|\xi\|=1} p_{-(d+2)}(x, \xi) \iota_E d\xi,$$

where $p_{-(d+2)}$ denotes the symbol of degree $-(d+2)$ of P .

Proof. If we put $k_P(x, y)$ in the form (3.7) with $K \in \mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $K \sim \sum K_{\hat{m}+j}$, then it follows from (3.10) that $k_P(x, y)$ has a behavior near the diagonal of the form (3.11) with $c_P(x) = |\psi'_x| c_K(x) = |\psi'_x| c_{K_0,0}(x)$. Furthermore, by Proposition 3.8 the symbol $p_{-(d+2)}(x, \xi)$ of degree $-(d+2)$ of P is the restriction to $U \times (\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus 0)$ of $(K_0)_{y \rightarrow \xi}^\wedge(x, \xi)$, so by Lemma 3.7 we have $c_K(x) = c_{K_0,0}(x) = (2\pi)^{-(d+1)} \int_{\|\xi\|=1} p_{-(d+2)}(x, \xi) \iota_E d\xi$.

Next, if we put $k_P(x, y)$ in the form (3.8) with $K_P \in \mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $K_P \sim \sum K_{P, \hat{m}+j}$ then by Proposition 3.8 we have $K_{P,0}(x, y) = K_0(x, \phi_x(y))$. Let $\lambda > 0$. Since $\phi_x(\lambda.y) = \lambda.\phi_x(y)$, using (3.5) we get

$$(3.13) \quad K_{P,0}(x, \lambda.y) - K_{P,0}(x, y) = K_0(x, \lambda.\phi_x(y)) - K_0(x, \phi_x(y)) = c_{K_0}(x) \log \lambda.$$

Hence $c_{K_{P,0}}(x) = c_{K_0,0}(x)$. As $|\varepsilon'_x| = |\phi'_x| \cdot |\psi'_x| = |\psi'_x|$ we see that $|\psi'_x| c_K(x) = |\varepsilon'_x| c_{K_P}(x)$. The proof is thus achieved. \square

Let $\phi : U \rightarrow \tilde{U}$ be a Heisenberg diffeomorphism onto a Heisenberg chart \tilde{U} .

Lemma 3.10. For any $\tilde{P} \in \Psi_H^m(\tilde{U})$ we have $c_{\phi^* \tilde{P}}(x) = |\phi'(x)| c_{\tilde{P}}(\phi(x))$

Proof. Let $P = \phi^* \tilde{P}$. Then P is a Ψ_H DO of order m on U (see [BG]). Moreover, by [Po5, Prop. 3.1.18] if we write the distribution kernel $k_{\tilde{P}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ in the form (3.8)

with $K_{\tilde{P}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ in $\mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}}(\tilde{U} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, then the distribution kernel $k_P(x, y)$ of P can be put in the form (3.8) with $K_P(x, y)$ in $\mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that

$$(3.14) \quad K_P(x, y) \sim \sum_{\langle \beta \rangle \geq \frac{3}{2}\langle \alpha \rangle} \frac{1}{\alpha! \beta!} a_{\alpha\beta}(x) y^\beta (\partial_y^\alpha K_{\tilde{P}})(\phi(x), \phi'_H(x)y),$$

where we have let $a_{\alpha\beta}(x) = \partial_y^\beta [\partial_y(\varepsilon_{\phi(x)} \circ \phi \circ \tilde{\varepsilon}_x^{-1})(y) |(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\phi(x)} \circ \phi \circ \varepsilon_x^{-1}(y) - \phi'_H(x)y)^\alpha|_{y=0}]$, the map $\phi'_H(x)$ is the tangent map (2.5) and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_x$ denotes the change to the Heisenberg coordinates at $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{U}$. In particular, we have

$$(3.15) \quad K_P(x, y) = a_{00}(x) K_{\tilde{P}}(\phi(x), \phi'_H(x)y) \mod y_j \mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}+1}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}),$$

where $a_{00}(x) = |\varepsilon'_{\phi(x)}| |\phi'(x)| |\varepsilon'_x|^{-1}$.

Notice that $\tilde{K}(x, y) := K_{\tilde{P}}(\phi(x), \phi'_H(x)y)$ is an element of $\mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, since $\phi'_H(x)y$ satisfies $\phi'_H(x)(\lambda \cdot y) = \lambda \phi'_H(x)y$ for any $\lambda > 0$. Moreover, as the distributions in $y_j \mathcal{K}^*(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $j = 0, \dots, d$, cannot have a logarithmic singularity near $y = 0$, the logarithmic singularities in (3.10) of $K_P(x, y)$ and $a_{00}(x)\tilde{K}(x, y)$ must agree, i.e., we have $c_{K_P}(x) = c_{a_{00}\tilde{K}}(x) = a_{00}(x)c_{\tilde{K}}(x) = |\varepsilon'_{\phi(x)}| |\phi'(x)| |\varepsilon'_x|^{-1} c_{\tilde{K}}(x)$. In fact, the only contribution to the logarithmic singularity of $\tilde{K}(x, y)$ comes from

$$(3.16) \quad c_{K_{\tilde{P}}}(\phi(x)) \log \|\phi'_H(x)y\| = c_{K_{\tilde{P}}}(\phi(x)) \log [\|y\| \|\phi'_H(x)\| \|y\|^{-1} \|y\|] \\ = c_{K_{\tilde{P}}}(\phi(x)) \log \|y\| + O(1).$$

Hence $c_{\tilde{K}}(x) = c_{K_{\tilde{P}}}(\phi(x))$. Therefore, we get $c_{K_P}(x) = |\varepsilon'_{\phi(x)}| |\phi'(x)| |\varepsilon'_x|^{-1} c_{K_{\tilde{P}}}(\phi(x))$, which by combining with (3.12) shows that $c_P(x) = |\phi'(x)| c_{\tilde{P}}(\phi(x))$ as desired. \square

Let $P \in \Psi_H^m(M, \mathcal{E})$ and let $\kappa : U \rightarrow V$ be a Heisenberg over which there is a trivialization $\tau : \mathcal{E}|_U \rightarrow U \times \mathbb{C}^r$. Then the Schwartz kernel of $P_{\kappa, \tau} := \kappa_* \tau_*(P|_U)$ has a singularity near the diagonal of the form (3.11). Moreover, if $\tilde{\kappa} : \tilde{U} \rightarrow \tilde{V}$ be a Heisenberg over which there is a trivialization $\tau : \mathcal{E}|_{\tilde{U}} \rightarrow \tilde{U} \times \mathbb{C}^r$ and if we let ϕ denote the Heisenberg diffeomorphism $\tilde{\kappa} \circ \kappa^{-1} : \kappa(U \cap \tilde{U}) \rightarrow \tilde{\kappa}(U \cap \tilde{U})$, then by Lemma 3.10 we have $c_{P_{\kappa, \tau}}(x) = |\phi'(x)| c_{P_{\tilde{\kappa}, \tilde{\tau}}}(\phi(x))$ for any $x \in U$. Therefore, on $U \cap \tilde{U}$ we have the equality of densities,

$$(3.17) \quad \tau^* \kappa^*(c_{P_{\kappa, \tau}}(x) dx) = \tilde{\tau}^* \tilde{\kappa}^*(c_{P_{\tilde{\kappa}, \tilde{\tau}}}(\phi(x)) dx).$$

Now, the space $C^\infty(M, |\Lambda|(M) \otimes \text{End } \mathcal{E})$ of $\text{END } \mathcal{E}$ -valued densities is a sheaf, so there exists a unique density $c_P(x) \in C^\infty(M, |\Lambda|(M) \otimes \text{End } \mathcal{E})$ such that, for any local Heisenberg chart $\kappa : U \rightarrow V$ and any trivialization $\tau : \mathcal{E}|_U \rightarrow U \times \mathbb{C}^r$, we have

$$(3.18) \quad c_P(x)|_U = \tau^* \kappa^*(c_{\kappa_* \tau_*(P|_U)}(x) dx).$$

Moreover, this density is functorial with respect to Heisenberg diffeomorphisms, i.e., for any Heisenberg diffeomorphism $\phi : M \rightarrow \tilde{M}$ we have

$$(3.19) \quad c_{\phi_* P}(x) = \phi_*(c_P(x)).$$

Therefore, we have proved:

Proposition 3.11. *Let $P \in \Psi_H^m(M, \mathcal{E})$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then:*

1) *On any local trivializing Heisenberg chart the Schwartz kernel $k_P(x, y)$ of P has a behavior near the diagonal of the form*

$$(3.20) \quad k_P(x, y) = \sum_{-(m+d+2) \leq j \leq 1} a_j(x, -\psi_x(y)) - c_P(x) \log \|\psi_x(y)\| + O(1),$$

where the function $a_j(x, y)$ is smooth for $y \neq 0$ and is homogeneous of degree j with respect to y and $c_P(x)$ is a smooth function given by (3.12).

2) The coefficient $c_P(x)$ makes sense globally on M as a smooth $\text{END } \mathcal{E}$ -valued density which is functorial with respect to Heisenberg diffeomorphisms as in (3.19).

Finally, the following holds.

Proposition 3.12. *Let $P : C_c^\infty(M, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E})$ be a Ψ_H DO of order m .*

1) *Let $P^t \in \Psi_H^m(M, \mathcal{E}^*)$ be the transpose of P . Then we have $c_{P^t}(x) = c_P(x)^t$.*

2) *Assume that M is endowed with a smooth density $\rho > 0$ and \mathcal{E} a smooth Hermitian metric and let $P^* \in \Psi_H^m(M, \mathcal{E})$ be the corresponding adjoint of P . Then we have $c_{P^*}(x) = c_P(x)^*$.*

Proof. Let us first assume that \mathcal{E} is the trivial line bundle. Then it is enough to prove the result in a local Heisenberg chart $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, so that the distribution kernel $k_P(x, y)$ can be put in the form (3.8) with $K_P(x, y)$ in $\mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

We know that P^t is a Ψ_H DO of order m (see [BG, Thm. 17.4]). Moreover, by [Po5, Prop. 3.1.21] we can put its distribution kernel $k_{P^t}(x, y)$ in the form (3.8) with $K_{P^t}(x, y)$ in $\mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that

$$(3.21) \quad K_{P^t}(x, y) \sim \sum_{\frac{3}{2}|\alpha| \leq |\beta|} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq |\delta| \leq 2|\gamma|} a_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}(x) y^{\beta+\delta} (\partial_x^\gamma \partial_y^\alpha K_P)(x, -y),$$

where $a_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}(x) = \frac{|\varepsilon_x^{-1}|}{\alpha! \beta! \gamma! \delta!} [\partial_y^\beta (|\varepsilon_x^{-1}(-y)| (y - \varepsilon_x^{-1}(y)(x))^\alpha) \partial_y^\delta (\varepsilon_x^{-1}(-y) - x)^\gamma](x, 0)$. In particular, we have $K_{P^t}(x, y) = K_P(x, -y) \bmod y_j \mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}+1}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Therefore, in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 3.10, we see that the logarithmic singularity near $y = 0$ of $K_P(x, y)$ agrees with that of $K_{P^t}(x, -y)$, hence with that of $K_{P^t}(x, y)$. Therefore, we have $c_{K_{P^t}}(x) = c_{K_P}(x)$. Combining this with (3.12) then shows that $c_{P^t}(x) = c_P(x)$.

Next, suppose that U is endowed with a smooth density $\rho(x) > 0$. Then the corresponding adjoint P^* is a Ψ_H DO of order m on U with distribution kernel $k_{P^*}(x, y) = \rho(x)^{-1} \overline{k_P(x, y)} \rho(y)$. Thus $k_{P^*}(x, y)$ can be put in the form (3.8) with $K_{P^*}(x, y)$ in $\mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that

$$(3.22) \quad K_{P^*}(x, y) = [\rho(x)^{-1} \rho(\varepsilon_x^{-1}(-y))] \overline{K_{P^t}(x, y)} \\ = \overline{K_{P^t}(x, y)} \bmod y_j \mathcal{K}^{\hat{m}+1}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}).$$

Therefore, $K_{P^*}(x, y)$ and $\overline{K_{P^t}(x, y)}$ same logarithmic singularity near $y = 0$, so that we have $c_{K_{P^*}}(x) = c_{K_{P^t}}(x) = c_{K_P}(x)$. Hence $c_{P^*}(x) = c_P(x)$.

Finally, when \mathcal{E} is a general vector bundle over M , we can argue as above to show that we still have $c_{P^t}(x) = c_P(x)^t$ and that, if P^* denotes the adjoint of P with respect to some smooth density $\rho > 0$ on M and some smooth Hermitian metric on \mathcal{E} , then we again have $c_{P^*}(x) = c_P(x)^*$. \square

3.2. Noncommutative residue. Let (M^{d+1}, H) be a Heisenberg manifold and let \mathcal{E} be a vector bundle over M . We shall now construct a noncommutative residue trace on the algebra $\Psi_H^\mathbb{Z}(M, \mathcal{E})$ as the residual trace induced by the analytic extension of the operator trace to Ψ_H DOs of non-integer order.

If P is an operator in $\Psi_H^{\text{int}}(M, \mathcal{E}) := \cup_{\Re m < -(d+2)} \Psi_H^m(M, \mathcal{E})$ then it follows from Remark 3.6 that the restriction to the diagonal of $M \times M$ of its distribution kernel

defines a smooth density $k_P(x, x)$ with values in $\text{End } \mathcal{E}$. Therefore, P is a trace-class operator on $L^2(M, \mathcal{E})$ and we have

$$(3.23) \quad \text{Trace}(P) = \int_M \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} k_P(x, x).$$

We shall now construct an analytic extension of the operator trace to the class $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ of Ψ_H DOs of non-integer order. As in [KV] (see also [CM], [Gu2], [Po7]) the approach consists in working directly at the level of densities by constructing an analytic extension of the map $P \rightarrow k_P(x, x)$ to $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$. Here analyticity is meant with respect to holomorphic families of Ψ_H DOs, e.g., the map $P \rightarrow k_P(x, x)$ is analytic since for any holomorphic family $(P_z)_{z \in \Omega}$ with values in $\Psi_H^{\text{int}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ the output densities $k_{P_z}(x, x)$ depend analytically on z in the Fréchet space $C^\infty(M, |\Lambda|(M) \otimes \text{End } \mathcal{E})$.

Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a local trivializing Heisenberg chart with H -frame X_0, \dots, X_d and for $x \in U$ let ψ_x denote the affine map to the privileged coordinates at x . Any $P \in \Psi_H^m(U)$ can be written as $P = p(x, -iX) + R$ with $p \in S^m(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ and $R \in \Psi^{-\infty}(U)$. Therefore, if $\Re m < -(d+2)$ then using (3.6) we get

$$(3.24) \quad k_P(x, x) = |\psi'_x|(2\pi)^{-(d+2)} \int p(x, \xi) d\xi + k_R(x, x).$$

This leads us to consider the functional,

$$(3.25) \quad L(p) = (2\pi)^{-(d+2)} \int p(\xi) d\xi, \quad f \in S^{\text{int}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}).$$

In the sequel, as in Section 2 for Ψ_H DOs, we say that a holomorphic family of symbols $(p_z)_{z \in \mathbb{C}} \subset S^*(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is a gauging for a given symbol $p \in S^*(\mathbb{R}^d)$ when $p_0 = p$ and $\text{ord } p_z = z + \text{ord } p$.

Lemma 3.13 ([CM, Prop. I.4]). *1) The functional L has a unique analytic continuation \tilde{L} to $S^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. The value of \tilde{L} on a symbol $p \sim \sum_{j \geq 0} p_{m-j}$ of order $m \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ is given by*

$$(3.26) \quad \tilde{L}(p) = (p - \sum_{j \leq N} \tau_{m-j})^\vee(0), \quad N \geq \Re m + d + 2,$$

where the value of the integer N is irrelevant and $\tau_{m-j} \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ denotes the unique homogeneous extension of p_{m-j} given by Lemma 3.1.

2) Let $p \in S^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $p \sim \sum p_{m-j}$, and let $(p_z)_{z \in \mathbb{C}}$ be a holomorphic family for p which is a gauging for p . Then $\tilde{L}(p_z)$ has at worst a simple pole singularity at $z = 0$ such that

$$(3.27) \quad \text{Res}_{z=0} \tilde{L}(p_z) = \int_{\|\xi\|=1} p_{-(d+2)}(\xi) \iota_E d\xi,$$

where $p_{-(d+2)}$ denotes the symbol of degree $-(d+2)$ of $p(\xi)$ and E is the anisotropic radial vector field $2\xi_0 \partial_{x_0} + \xi_1 \partial_{\xi_1} + \dots + \xi_d \partial_{\xi_d}$.

Proof. First, the extension is necessarily unique since the functional L is holomorphic on $S^{\text{int}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ and each symbol $p \in S^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ can be connected to $S^{\text{int}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ by means of a holomorphic family with values in $S^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

Let $p \in S^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $p \sim \sum_{j \geq 0} p_{m-j}$, and for $j = 0, 1, \dots$ let $\tau_{m-j} \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ denote the unique homogeneous extension of p_{m-j} provided by Lemma 3.1. For

$N \geq \Re m + d + 2$ the distribution $p - \sum_{j \leq N} \tau_{m-j}$ agrees with an integrable function near ∞ , so its Fourier transform is continuous and we may define

$$(3.28) \quad \tilde{L}(f) = (f - \sum_{j \leq N} \tau_{m-j})^\wedge(0).$$

Notice that if $j > \Re m + d + 2$ then τ_{m-j} is also integrable near ∞ , so $\hat{\tau}_{m-j}(0)$ makes well sense, but its value must be 0 for homogeneity reasons. Therefore, the value of the integer N in (3.26) is irrelevant and so (3.28) really defines a linear functional on $S^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ which agrees with L on $S^{\text{int}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \cap S^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

Let $(p_z)_{z \in \Omega}$ be a holomorphic family of symbols such that $m_z = \text{ord} p_z$ is never an integer and let us study the analyticity of $\tilde{L}(p_z)$. As the functional L is holomorphic on $S^{\text{int}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ we may assume that we have $|\Re m_z - m| < 1$ for some integer $m \geq -(d+2)$. In this case in (3.28) we can set $N = m + d + 2$ and for $j = 0, \dots, m + d + 1$ we can represent $\tau_{z, m_z - j}$ by $p_{z, m_z - j}$. Then, picking $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that $\varphi = 1$ near the origin, we see that $\tilde{L}(p_z)$ is equal to

$$(3.29) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int [p_z(\xi) - (1 - \varphi(\xi)) \sum_{j \leq m+d+2} p_{z, m_z - j}(\xi)] d\xi - \sum_{j \leq m+d+2} \langle \tau_{z, m_z - j}, \varphi \rangle \\ & = L(\tilde{p}_z) - \langle \tau_z, \varphi \rangle - \sum_{j \leq m+d+1} \int p_{z, m_z - j}(\xi) \varphi(\xi) d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

where we have let $\tau_z = \tau_{z, m_z - m - (d+2)}$ and $\tilde{p}_z = p_z - (1 - \varphi) \sum_{j \leq m+d+2} p_{z, m_z - j}$.

In the r.h.s. of (3.29) the only term that may fail to be analytic is $-\langle \tau_z, \varphi \rangle$. Furthermore, the formulas (A.1) and (A.5) in Appendix for τ_z give

$$(3.30) \quad \langle \tau_z, \varphi \rangle = \int p_{z, m_z - m - (d+2)}(\varphi(\xi) - \psi_z(\xi)) d\xi,$$

where $\psi_z \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is of the form $\psi_z(\xi) = \int_{\log \|\xi\|}^\infty [(\frac{1}{m_z - m} \frac{d}{ds} + 1)g](t) dt$ with $g \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\int g(t) dt = 1$. Without any loss of generality we may suppose that $\varphi(\xi) = \int_{\log \|\xi\|}^\infty g(t) dt$. Then $\psi_z(\xi) = -\frac{1}{m_z - m} g(\log \|\xi\|) + \varphi(\xi)$, which gives

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \tau_z, \varphi \rangle &= \frac{1}{m_z - m} \int p_{z, m_z - m - (d+2)}(\xi) g(\log \|\xi\|) d\xi \\ &= \frac{1}{m_z - m} \int \mu^{m_z - m} g(\log \mu) \frac{d\mu}{\mu} \int_{\|\xi\|=1} p_{z, m_z - m - (d+2)}(\xi) \iota_E d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Together with (3.29) this shows that $\tilde{L}(p_z)$ is an analytic function, so the the first part of the lemma is proved.

Finally, let $p \sim \sum p_{m-j}$ be in $S^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ and let $(p_z)_{|\Re z - m| < 1}$ be a holomorphic family which is a gauging for p . Since p_z has order $m_z = m + z$ it follows from (3.29) and (3.31) that $\tilde{L}(p_z)$ has at worst a simple pole singularity at $z = 0$ such that

$$(3.32) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Res}_{z=0} \tilde{L}(p_z) &= \text{Res}_{z=0} \frac{-1}{z} \int \mu^z g(\log \mu) \frac{d\mu}{\mu} \int_{\|\xi\|=1} p_{z, z - (d+2)}(\xi) \iota_E d\xi \\ &= - \int_{\|\xi\|=1} p_{-(d+2)}(\xi) \iota_E d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the second part of the lemma. \square

Now, for $P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(U)$ we let

$$(3.33) \quad t_P(x) = (2\pi)^{-(d+2)} |\psi'_x| \tilde{L}(p(x, \cdot)) + k_R(x, x),$$

where the pair $(p, R) \in S^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \times \Psi^\infty(U)$ is such that $P = p(x, -iX) + R$. This definition does not depend on the choice of (p, R) . Indeed, if (p', R') is another such pair then $p - p'$ is in $S^{-\infty}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, so $k_{R'}(x, x) - k_R(x, x)$ is equal to

$$(3.34) \quad (2\pi)^{-(d+2)} |\psi'_x| L((f - f')(x, \cdot)) = (2\pi)^{-(d+2)} |\psi'_x| (\tilde{L}(p(x, \cdot)) - \tilde{L}(f'(x, \cdot))),$$

which shows that the r.h.s. of (3.33) is the same for both pairs.

On the other hand, observe that (3.29) and (3.31) show that $\tilde{L}(p(x, \cdot))$ depends smoothly on x and that for any holomorphic family $(p_z)_z \in \Omega \subset S^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ the map $z \rightarrow \tilde{L}(p(x, \cdot))$ is holomorphic from Ω to $C^\infty(U)$. Therefore, the map $P \rightarrow t_P(x)$ is an analytic extension to $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(U)$ of the map $P \rightarrow k_P(x, x)$.

Let $P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(U)$ and let $(P_z)_{z \in \Omega} \subset \Psi_H^*(U)$ be a holomorphic family which is a gauging for P . Then it follows from (3.29) and (3.31) that with respect to the topology of $C^\infty(M, |\Lambda|(M) \otimes \text{End } \mathcal{E})$ the map $z \rightarrow t_{P_z}(x)$ has at worst a simple pole singularity at $z = 0$ with residue

$$(3.35) \quad \text{Res}_{z=0} t_{P_z}(x) = -(2\pi)^{-(d+2)} \int_{\|\xi\|=1} p_{-(d+2)}(\xi) \iota_E d\xi = -c_P(x),$$

where $p_{-(d+2)}(\xi)$ denotes the symbol of degree $-(d+2)$ of P .

Next, let $\phi : \tilde{U} \rightarrow U$ be a Heisenberg diffeomorphism from another local trivializing Heisenberg chart \tilde{U} onto U . Let $P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(U)$ and let $(P_z)_{z \in \mathbb{C}}$ be a holomorphic family which is a gauging for P . As shown in [Po8] the Ψ_H DO family $(\phi^* P_z)_{z \in \mathbb{C}}$ is holomorphic and is a gauging for $\phi^* P$. Moreover, as for $\Re z$ negatively large enough we have $k_{\phi^* P_z} = |\phi'(x)| k_{P_z}(\phi(x), \phi(x))$, an analytic continuation gives

$$(3.36) \quad t_{\phi^* P}(x) = |\phi'(x)| t_P(\phi(x)).$$

Now, in the same way as in the construction of the density $c_P(x)$ in the proof of Proposition 3.11, it follows from all this that if $P \in \Psi_H^m(M, \mathcal{E})$ then there exists a unique $\text{End } \mathcal{E}$ -valued density $t_P(x)$ such that, for any local Heisenberg chart $\kappa : U \rightarrow V$ and any trivialization $\tau : \mathcal{E}|_U \rightarrow U \times \mathbb{C}^r$, we have

$$(3.37) \quad t_P(x)|_U = \tau^* \kappa^* (t_{\kappa_* \tau_* (P|_U)}(x) dx).$$

On every trivializing Heisenberg chart the map $P \rightarrow t_P(x)$ is analytic and satisfies (3.35). Therefore, we obtain:

Proposition 3.14. 1) The map $P \rightarrow t_P(x)$ is the unique analytic continuation of the map $P \rightarrow k_P(x, x)$ to $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$.

2) Let $P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ and let $(P_z)_{z \in \Omega} \subset \Psi_H^*(M, \mathcal{E})$ be a holomorphic family which is a gauging for P . Then, in $C^\infty(M, |\Lambda|(M) \otimes \text{End } \mathcal{E})$, the map $z \rightarrow t_{P_z}(x)$ has at worst a simple pole singularity at $z = 0$ with residue given by

$$(3.38) \quad \text{Res}_{z=0} t_{P_z}(x) = -c_P(x),$$

where $c_P(x)$ denotes the $\text{End } \mathcal{E}$ -valued density on M given by Theorem 3.11.

3) The map $P \rightarrow t_P(x)$ is functorial with respect to Heisenberg diffeomorphisms as in (3.19).

Remark 3.15. Taking residues at $z = 0$ in (3.36) allows us to recover (3.19).

Suppose now that M is compact. Then for any $P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ we can let

$$(3.39) \quad \text{TR } P = \int_M \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} t_P(x).$$

Proposition 3.16. 1) *The functional TR is the unique analytic continuation to $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ of the operator trace.*

2) *We have $\text{TR } P_1 P_2 = \text{TR } P_2 P_1$ whenever $\text{ord } P_1 + \text{ord } P_2 \notin \mathbb{Z}$.*

3) *TR is invariant by Heisenberg diffeomorphisms, i.e., for any Heisenberg diffeomorphism ϕ from a Heisenberg manifold (M, H') onto (M, H) we have*

$$(3.40) \quad \text{TR } \phi^* P = \text{TR } P \quad \forall P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E}).$$

Proof. The first and third statements are immediate consequences of Theorem 3.14, so we only have to prove the second one.

For $j = 1, 2$ let $P_j \in \Psi_H^*(M, \mathcal{E})$ and let $(P_{j,z})_{z \in \mathbb{C}} \subset \Psi_H^*(M, \mathcal{E})$ be a holomorphic family which is a gauging for P_j . We also assume that $\text{ord } P_1 + \text{ord } P_2 \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Then $P_{1,z} P_{2,z}$ and $P_{2,z} P_{1,z}$ have non-integer order for z in $\Sigma := -(\text{ord } P_1 + \text{ord } P_2) + \mathbb{Z}$. For $\Re z$ negatively large enough we have $\text{Trace } P_{1,z} P_{2,z} = \text{Trace } P_{2,z} P_{1,z}$, so by analytic continuation we get $\text{TR } P_{1,z} P_{2,z} = \text{TR } P_{2,z} P_{1,z}$ for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Sigma$. Setting $z = 0$ then gives $\text{TR } P_1 P_2 = \text{TR } P_2 P_1$ as desired. \square

Definition 3.17. *The noncommutative residue of an operator $P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ is*

$$(3.41) \quad \text{Res } P = \int_M \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} c_P(x).$$

The functional Res provides us with the analogue for Ψ_H DOs of the noncommutative residue trace of Wodzicki ([Wo1], [Wo3]) and Guillemin [Gu1], for we have:

Proposition 3.18. *The functional Res has the following properties:*

1) *Let $P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ and let $(P_z)_{z \in \Omega} \subset \Psi_H^*(M, \mathcal{E})$ be a holomorphic family which is a gauging for P . Then $\text{TR } P_z$ has at $z = 0$ a simple pole such that*

$$(3.42) \quad \text{Res}_{z=0} \text{TR } P_z = -\text{Res } P.$$

2) *This is a trace, i.e., we have $\text{Res } P_1 P_2 = \text{Res } P_2 P_1 \quad \forall P_j \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$.*

3) *It is invariant by Heisenberg diffeomorphisms, i.e., it satisfies (3.40).*

4) *We have $\text{Res } P^t = \text{Res } P$ and $\text{Res } P^* = \overline{\text{Res } P}$ for any $P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$.*

Proof. The first property follows from Proposition 3.14 and the third and fourth properties are immediate consequences of Propositions 3.11 and 3.12.

It remains to prove that Res is a trace. To this end for $j = 1, 2$ let $P_j \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ and let $(P_{j,z})_{z \in \mathbb{C}} \subset \Psi_H^*(M, \mathcal{E})$ be a holomorphic family which is a gauging for P_j . Since by Proposition 3.16 we have $\text{TR } P_{1,z} P_{2,z} = \text{TR } P_{2,z} P_{1,z}$ for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$, taking residues at $z = 0$ and using (3.42) gives $\text{Res } P_1 P_2 = \text{Res } P_2 P_1$. Hence Res is a trace. \square

3.3. Traces and sum of commutators. We shall now prove that when M is connected the noncommutative residue Res spans the space of traces on the algebra $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$. As a consequence this will allow us to characterize the sums of commutators in $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$.

Let $H \subset T\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a hyperplane bundle such that there exists a global H -frame X_0, X_1, \dots, X_d of $T\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. We shall now give a series of criteria for an operator $P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ to be a sum of commutators of the form,

$$(3.43) \quad P = [x_0, P_0] + \dots + [x_d, P_d], \quad P_j \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}).$$

In the sequel for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ we let ψ_x denote the affine change to the privileged coordinates at x .

Lemma 3.19. *Let $P \in \Psi_H^{-(d+2)}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ have a kernel of the form*

$$(3.44) \quad k_P(x, y) = |\psi'_x| K_0(x, -\psi_x(y)),$$

where $K_0(x, y) \in \mathcal{K}_0(\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is homogeneous of degree 0 with respect to y . Then P is a sum of commutators of the form (3.43).

Proof. Set $\psi_x(y) = A(x) \cdot (y - x)$ with $A \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, GL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}))$ and for $j, k = 0, \dots, d$ define

$$(3.45) \quad K_{jk}(x, y) = A_{jk}(x) y_j^{\beta_j} \|y\|^{-4} K_0(x, y), \quad (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus 0,$$

where $\beta_0 = 1$ and $\beta_1 = \dots = \beta_d = 3$. As $K_{jk}(x, y)$ is smooth for $y \neq 0$ and is homogeneous with respect to y of degree -2 if $j = 0$ and of degree -1 otherwise, we see that it belongs to $\mathcal{K}_*(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$. Therefore, the operator Q_{jk} with kernel $k_{Q_{jk}} = |\psi'_x| K_{jl}(x, -\psi_x(y))$ is a Ψ_H DO.

Next, set $A^{-1}(x) = (A^{jk}(x))_{1 \leq j, k \leq d}$. Since $x_k - y_k = -\sum_{l=0}^d A^{kl}(x) \psi_x(y)_l$ we deduce that the kernel of $\sum_{j,k=0}^d [x_k, Q_{jk}]$ is $|\psi'_x| K(x, -\psi_x(y))$, where

$$(3.46) \quad \begin{aligned} K(x, y) &= \sum_{0 \leq j, k, l \leq d} A^{kl}(x) y_l A_{jk}(x) y_j^{\beta_j} \|y\|^{-4} K_0(x, y) \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq j \leq d} y_j^{\beta_j+1} \|y\|^{-4} K_0(x, y) = K_0(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $P = \sum_{j,k=0}^d [x_k, Q_{jk}]$. The lemma is thus proved. \square

Lemma 3.20. *Any $R \in \Psi^{-\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ can be written as a sum of commutators of the form (3.43).*

Proof. Let $k_R(x, y)$ denote kernel of R . Since $k_R(x, y)$ is smooth we can write

$$(3.47) \quad k_R(x, y) = k_R(x, x) + (x_0 - y_0)k_{R_0}(x, y) + \dots + (x_d - y_d)k_{R_d}(x, y),$$

for some smooth functions $k_{R_0}(x, y), \dots, k_{R_d}(x, y)$. For $j = 0, \dots, d$ let R_j be the smoothing operator with kernel $k_{R_j}(x, y)$ and let Q be the operator with kernel $k_Q(x, y) = k_R(x, x)$. Then by (3.47) we have $R = Q + \sum_{j=0}^d [x_j, R_j]$. Notice that the kernel of Q is of the form (3.44) with $K_0(x, y) = |\psi'_x|^{-1} k_R(x, x)$. Here $K_0(x, y)$ belongs to $\mathcal{K}_0(\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ and is homogeneous of degree 0 with respect to y , so it follows from Lemma 3.19 that Q and R are of the form (3.43). \square

Lemma 3.21. *Any $P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that $c_P(x) = 0$ is a sum of commutators of the form (3.43).*

Proof. For $j = 1, \dots, d$ we let $\sigma_j(x, \xi)$ denote the classical symbol of $-iX_j$ and we set $\sigma = (\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_d)$, so that $\sigma(x, \xi) = \sigma(x) \cdot \xi$ with $\sigma(x) = (\sigma_{jk}(x))_{1 \leq j, k \leq d} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, GL_{d+1}(\mathbb{C}))$.

(i) Let us first assume that $P = (\partial_{\xi_j} q)(x, -iX)$ for some $q \in S^{\mathbb{Z}}(U \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ and let $q_{\sigma}(x, \xi) = q(x, \sigma(x, \xi))$. Then $[q(x, -iX), x_k]$ is equal to

$$(3.48) \quad [q_{\sigma}(x, D), x_k] = (\partial_{\xi_k} q_{\sigma})(x, D) = \sum_l \sigma_{lk}(x) (\partial_{\xi_l} q)(x, -iX).$$

Therefore, if we let $(\sigma^{kl}(x))$ denote the inverse matrix of $\sigma(x)$ then we see that $\sum_k [\sigma^{jk}(x) q(x, -iX), x_k] = \sum_{kl} \sigma^{jk}(x) \sigma_{lk}(x) (\partial_{\xi_l} q)(x, -iX) = (\partial_{\xi_j} q)(x, -iX) = P$. Hence P is a sum of commutators of the form (3.43).

(ii) Suppose now that P has symbol $p \sim \sum_{j \leq m} p_j$ with $p_{-(d+2)} = 0$. As $p_l(x, \xi)$ is homogeneous of degree l the Euler identity $2\xi_0 \partial_{\xi_0} p_l + \xi_1 \partial_{\xi_1} p_l + \dots + \xi_d \partial_{\xi_d} p_l = l p_l$ implies that we have

$$(3.49) \quad 2\partial_{\xi_0}(\xi_0 p_l) + \partial_{\xi_1}(\xi_1 p_l) + \dots + \partial_{\xi_d}(\xi_d p_l) = (l + d + 2)p_l.$$

For $j = 0, \dots, d$ let $q^{(j)}$ be a symbol so that $q^{(j)} \sim \sum_{l \neq -(d+2)} (l + d + 2)^{-1} \xi_j p_l$. Then for $l \neq -(d+2)$ the symbol of degree l of $2\partial_{\xi_0} q^{(0)} + \partial_{\xi_1} q^{(1)} + \dots + \partial_{\xi_d} q^{(d)}$ is equal to $(l + d + 2)^{-1} (2\partial_{\xi_0}(\xi_0 p_l) + \partial_{\xi_1}(\xi_1 p_l) + \dots + \partial_{\xi_d}(\xi_d p_l)) = p_l$. Since $p_{-(d+2)} = 0$ this shows that $p - 2\partial_{\xi_0} q^{(0)} + \partial_{\xi_1} q^{(1)} + \dots + \partial_{\xi_d} q^{(d)}$ is in $S^{-\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Thus, there exists R in $\Psi^{-\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that

$$(3.50) \quad P = 2(\partial_{\xi_0} q^{(0)})(x, -iX) + (\partial_{\xi_1} q^{(1)})(x, -iX) + \dots + (\partial_{\xi_d} q^{(d)})(x, -iX) + R,$$

Thanks to the part (i) and to Lemma 3.20 the operators $(\partial_{\xi_j} q^{(j)})(x, -iX)$ and R are of the form (3.43), so P is of that form as well.

(iii) The general case can be obtained as follows. Let us write the kernel of P in the form $k_P(x, y) = |\psi'_x| K(x, -\psi_x(y)) + R(x, y)$, with $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\hat{m}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, $\hat{m} = -(m + d + 2)$, and $R \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Let us write $K \sim \sum_{j \geq \hat{m}} K_j$ with $K_j \in \mathcal{K}_j(\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ and let $Q \in \Psi_H^*(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ have kernel $|\psi'_x| K_0(x, -\psi_x(y))$.

Since by (3.12) we have $c_{K_0,0}(x) = c_K(x) = |\psi'_x|^{-1} c_P(x) = 0$ we see that $K_0(x, y)$ is homogeneous of degree 0 with respect to y . Therefore, using Lemma 3.19 we see that Q is of the form (3.43).

On the other hand, as by Proposition 3.8 we have $(K_0)_{y \rightarrow \xi}^{\wedge}(x, \xi) = p_{-(d+2)}(x, \xi)$ on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times (\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus \{0\})$, we see that Q has symbol $q \sim p_{-(d+2)}$. In particular $P - Q$ has no symbol of degree $-(d+2)$, which by the part (ii) implies that $P - Q$ is of the form (3.43). Since Q is of this form too, it follows that so is P . The proof is now achieved. \square

In the sequel we let $\Psi_{H,c}^*(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ and $\Psi_c^{-\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ respectively denote the classes of Ψ_H DOs and smoothing operators on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} with compactly supported kernels.

Lemma 3.22. *There exists $\Gamma \in \Psi_{H,c}^{-(d+2)}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that, for any $P \in \Psi_{H,c}^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, we have*

$$(3.51) \quad P = (\text{Res } P)\Gamma \mod [\Psi_{H,c}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}), \Psi_{H,c}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})].$$

Proof. Let $P \in \Psi_{H,K}^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. We will put P into the form (3.51) in 3 steps.

(i) Assume first that $c_P(x) = 0$. Then by Lemma 3.21 we can write P in the form,

$$(3.52) \quad P = [x_0, P_0] + \dots + [x_d, P_d], \quad P_j \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}).$$

Let χ and ψ in $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ be such that $\psi(x)\psi(y) = 1$ near the support of the kernel of P and $\chi = 1$ near $\text{supp } \psi$. Since $\psi P \psi = P$ we obtain

$$(3.53) \quad P = \sum_{j=0}^d \psi[x_d, P_d] \psi = \sum_{j=0}^d [x_d, \psi P_d \psi] = \sum_{j=0}^d [\chi x_d, \psi P_d \psi].$$

In particular P is a sum of commutators in $\Psi_{H,c}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

(ii) Let $\Gamma_0 \in \Psi_H^{-(d+2)}$ have kernel $k_{\Gamma_0}(x, y) = -\log \|\phi_x(y)\|$ and suppose that $P = c\Gamma_0\psi$ where $c \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is such that $\int c(x)dx = 0$ and $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is such that $\psi = 1$ near $\text{supp } c$. Since we have $\int c(x)dx = 0$ we can write c as a sum of derivatives $c = \sum_{j=0}^d \partial_j c_j$ with $c_j \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

On the other hand, observe that the distribution kernel of $[\partial_{x_j}, \Gamma_0]$ is equal to

$$(3.54) \quad (\partial_{x_j} - \partial_{y_j})[-\log \|\psi_x(y)\|] \\ = \sum_{k,l} (\partial_{x_j} - \partial_{y_j})[\varepsilon_{kl}(x)(x_l - y_l)][\partial_{z_k} \log \|z\|]_{z=-\psi_x(y)} \\ = \sum_{k,l} (x_k - y_k)(\partial_{x_j} \varepsilon_{kl})(x) \gamma_k(-\psi_x(y)) \|\psi_x(y)\|^{-4},$$

where we have let $\gamma_0(y) = \frac{1}{2}y_0$ and $\gamma_k(y) = y_k^3$, $k = 1, \dots, d$. In particular $k_{[\partial_{x_j}, \Gamma_0]}(x, y)$ has no logarithmic singularity near the diagonal, that is, we have $c_{[\partial_{x_j}, \Gamma_0]}(x) = 0$.

Next, let $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ be such that $\psi = 1$ near $\text{supp } c \cup \text{supp } c_1 \cdots \text{supp } c_d$ and let $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ be such that $\chi = 1$ near $\text{supp } \psi$. Then we have

$$(3.55) \quad [\chi \partial_{x_j}, c_j \Gamma_0 \psi] = [\partial_{x_j}, c_j \Gamma_0 \psi] = [\partial_{x_j}, c_j] \Gamma_0 \psi + c_j [\partial_{x_j}, \Gamma_0] \psi + c_j \Gamma_0 [\partial_{x_j}, \psi] \\ = \partial_{x_j} c_j \Gamma_0 \psi + c_j [\partial_{x_j}, \Gamma_0] \psi + c_j \Gamma_0 \partial_{x_j} \psi.$$

Since $c_j \Gamma_0 \partial_{x_j} \psi$ is smoothing and $c_{c_j [\partial_{x_j}, \Gamma_0] \psi}(x) = c_j c_{[\partial_{x_j}, \Gamma_0]}(x) = 0$ we deduce from this that P is of the form $P = \sum_{j=0}^d [\chi \partial_{x_j}, c_j \Gamma_0 \psi] + Q$ with $Q \in \Psi_{H,c}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that $c_Q(x) = 0$. It then follows from the part (i) that P belongs to the commutator space of $\Psi_{H,c}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

(iii) Let $\rho \in C_K^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ be such that $\int \rho(x)dx = 1$ and set $\Gamma = \rho \Gamma_0 \psi$. Then any $P \in \Psi_{H,L}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ can be written as $P = (\text{Res } P)\Gamma + (c_P - (\text{Res } P)\rho)\Gamma_0 \psi + Q$, with $Q \in \Psi_{H,c}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that $c_Q(x) = 0$. Since Q is as in (i) and $(c_P - (\text{Res } P)\rho)\Gamma_0 \psi$ is as in (ii) we see that $P = (\text{Res } P)\Gamma \text{ mod } [\Psi_{H,c}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}), \Psi_{H,c}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})]$. The lemma is thus proved. \square

Next, we quote the well known lemma below.

Lemma 3.23 ([Gu3, Appendix]). *Any $R \in \Psi^{-\infty}(M, \mathcal{E})$ such that $\text{Tr } R = 0$ is the sum of two commutators in $\Psi^{-\infty}(M, \mathcal{E})$.*

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.24. *If M is connected then any trace on $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ is proportional to the noncommutative residue Res .*

Proof. By Lemma 3.22 there exists $\Gamma \in \Psi_{H,c}^{-(d+2)}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that any $P = (P_{ij})$ in $\Psi_{H,c}^{-(d+2)}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mathbb{C}^r)$ is of the form,

$$(3.56) \quad P = \Gamma \otimes R \text{ mod } [\Psi_{H,c}^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}), \Psi_{H,c}^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})] \otimes M_r(\mathbb{C}),$$

where we have let $R = (\text{Res } P_{ij}) \in M_r(\mathbb{C})$. Notice that $\text{Tr } R = \sum \text{Res } P_{ii} = \text{Res } P$. Therefore, if $A \in M_r(\mathbb{C})$ is such that $\text{Tr } A = 1$ then $R - (\text{Res } P)A$ has a zero trace, hence belongs to the commutator space of $M_r(\mathbb{C})$ (in fact is the sum of two commutators in $M_r(\mathbb{C})$). Thus,

$$(3.57) \quad P = (\text{Res } P)\Gamma \otimes A \mod [\Psi_{H,c}^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mathbb{C}^r), \Psi_{H,c}^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mathbb{C}^r)].$$

It follows from all this that for any open domain $U \subset M$ of a trivializing Heisenberg chart which is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^{d+1} there exists $\Gamma_U \in \Psi_{H,c}^{-(d+2)}(U, \mathcal{E}|_U)$ such that any $P \in \Psi_{H,c}^{\mathbb{Z}}(U, \mathcal{E}|_U)$ is of the form,

$$(3.58) \quad P = (\text{Res } P)\Gamma_U \mod [\Psi_{H,c}^{\mathbb{Z}}(U, \mathcal{E}|_U), \Psi_{H,c}^{\mathbb{Z}}(U, \mathcal{E}|_U)].$$

Therefore, if τ is a trace on $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ then for any $P \in \Psi_{H,c}^{\mathbb{Z}}(U, \mathcal{E}|_U)$ we have

$$(3.59) \quad \tau(P) = \Lambda_U \text{Res } P, \quad \Lambda_U = \tau(\Gamma_U).$$

Notice that near every point of M there is a trivializing Heisenberg chart mapping onto \mathbb{R}^{d+1} and that if V_1 and V_2 are the domains of two such charts then we have $\Lambda_{V_1} = \Lambda_{V_2}$, for we can always find a Ψ_H DO operator P supported in $V_1 \cap V_2$ such that $\text{Res } P \neq 0$. Therefore, the set of points of M near which there exists a trivializing Heisenberg chart V diffeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^{d+1} and such that $\Lambda_V = \Lambda_U$ is a nonempty subset of M which is both open and closed. Since M is connected we deduce that this subset actually agrees with M . Thus, there exists $\Lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that, for any domain U of a trivializing Heisenberg chart mapping onto \mathbb{R}^{d+1} , we have

$$(3.60) \quad \tau(P) = \Lambda \text{Res } P \quad \forall P \in \Psi_{H,c}^{\mathbb{Z}}(U, \mathcal{E}|_U).$$

Now, let (φ_i) be a finite partition of the unity subordinated to an open covering (U_i) of trivializing Heisenberg charts diffeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^{d+1} and for each index i let $\psi_i \in C_c^\infty(U_i)$ be such that $\psi_i = 1$ near $\text{supp } \varphi_i$. Then any $P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ can be written as $P = \sum \varphi_i P \psi_i + R$, where R is a smoothing operator whose kernel vanishes near the diagonal of $M \times M$. In particular $\text{Tr } R = 0$ and so by Lemma 3.23 the commutator space of $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ contains R . Since each operator $\varphi_i P \psi_i$ can be seen as an element of $\Psi_{H,c}^{\mathbb{Z}}(U_i, \mathcal{E}|_{U_i})$, using (3.60) we get

$$(3.61) \quad \tau(P) = \sum \tau(\varphi_i P \psi_i) = \sum \Lambda \text{Res } \varphi_i P \psi_i = \Lambda \text{Res } P.$$

Hence we have $\tau = \Lambda \text{Res}$. This shows that any trace on $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ is proportional to the noncommutative residue. \square

Since the dual of $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})/[\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E}), \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})]$ is isomorphic to the space of traces on $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$, as an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.24 we get:

Corollary 3.25. *Assume that M is connected. Then for any $P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ the following are equivalent:*

- (i) P is a sum of commutators in $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$;
- (ii) We have $\text{Res } P = 0$.

Remark 3.26. In [EM] Epstein and Melrose computed the Hochschild homology of the algebra of symbols $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})/\Psi^{-\infty}(M, \mathcal{E})$. In fact, as the algebra $\Psi^{-\infty}(M, \mathcal{E})$ is H -unital and its Hochschild homology is known, the long exact sequence of [Wo4] holds and allows us to relate the Hochschild homology of $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ to that of

$\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})/\Psi^{-\infty}(M, \mathcal{E})$. In particular, we can recover from this that the space of traces on $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ has dimension 1 when the manifold is connected.

4. ANALYTIC APPLICATIONS ON GENERAL HEISENBERG MANIFOLDS

In this section we derive several analytic applications of the construction of the noncommutative residue trace for the Heisenberg calculus. First, we deal with zeta functions of hypoelliptic Ψ_H DOs and relate their singularities to the heat kernel asymptotics of the corresponding operators. Second, we give logarithmic metric estimates for Green kernels of hypoelliptic Ψ_H DOs whose order is equal to the Hausdorff dimension $\dim M + 1$. This connects nicely with previous results of Fefferman, Stein and their students and collaborators. Finally, we show that the noncommutative residue for the Heisenberg calculus allows us to extend the Dixmier trace to the whole algebra of integer order Ψ_H DOs. This is the analogue for the Heisenberg calculus of a celebrated result of Alain Connes.

4.1. Zeta functions of hypoelliptic Ψ_H DOs. Let (M^{d+1}, H) be a compact Heisenberg manifold equipped with a smooth density > 0 , let \mathcal{E} be a Hermitian vector bundle over M of rank r , and let $P : C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E})$ be a Ψ_H DO of integer order $m \geq 1$ with an invertible principal symbol. In addition, assume that there is a ray $L_\theta = \{\arg \lambda = \theta\}$ which is not through an eigenvalue of P and is a principal cut for the principal symbol $\sigma_m(P)$ as in Section 2.

Let $(P_\theta^s)_{s \in \mathbb{C}}$ be the associated family of complex powers associated to θ as in Proposition 2.11. Since $(P_\theta^s)_{s \in \mathbb{C}}$ is a holomorphic family of Ψ_H DOs, Proposition 3.16 allows us to directly define the zeta function $\zeta_\theta(P; s)$ as the meromorphic function:

$$(4.1) \quad \zeta_\theta(P; s) = \text{TR } P_\theta^{-s}, \quad s \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\Sigma = \{\frac{d+2}{m}, \frac{d+1}{m}, \dots, \frac{-1}{m}, \frac{1}{m}, \frac{2}{m}, \dots\}$. Then $\zeta_\theta(P; s)$ is analytic outside Σ , and on Σ has at worst simple pole singularities such that*

$$(4.2) \quad \text{Res}_{s=\sigma} \zeta_\theta(P; s) = m \text{Res } P_\theta^{-\sigma}, \quad \sigma \in \Sigma.$$

In particular, the function $\zeta_\theta(P; s)$ is always regular at $s = 0$.

Proof. It is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.18 that $\zeta_\theta(P; s)$ is analytic outside $\Sigma' := \Sigma \cup \{0\}$ and on Σ' has at worst simple pole singularities satisfying (4.2). For $s = 0$ we have $P_\theta^0 = 1 - \Pi_0(P)$ so, as $\Pi_0(P)$ is smoothing, we get $\text{Res } P_\theta^0 = \text{Res}[1 - \Pi_0(P)] = -\text{Res } \Pi_0(P) = 0$. Hence $\zeta_\theta(P; s)$ is regular at $s = 0$. \square

Assume now that P is selfadjoint and has a positive principal symbol, so that P is bounded from below (see [Po5, Thm. 5.4.10]). In particular, the spectrum of P is real and has only finitely many negative eigenvalues. We will use the subscripts \uparrow (resp. \downarrow) to refer to spectral cuttings in the upper halfplane $\Im \lambda > 0$ (resp. lower halfplane $\Im \lambda < 0$).

On the other hand, since P is bounded from below it defines a heat semi-group e^{-tP} , $t \geq 0$, and, as the principal symbol of P is invertible, for $t > 0$ the operator e^{-tP} is smoothing, hence is given by a smooth kernel $k_t(x, y)$ in $C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E}) \hat{\otimes} C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E}^* \otimes |\Lambda|(M))$. Moreover, as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ we have the heat kernel asymptotics,

$$(4.3) \quad k_t(x, x) \sim t^{-\frac{d+2}{m}} \sum_{j \geq 0} t^{\frac{j}{m}} a_j(P)(x) + \log t \sum_{k \geq 0} t^k b_k(P)(x),$$

where the asymptotics takes place in $C^\infty(M, \text{End } \mathcal{E} \otimes |\Lambda|(M))$ and when P is a differential operator we have $a_{2j-1}(P)(x) = b_j(P)(x) = 0$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ (see [BGS], [Po5] for the differential case and [Po8] for the general case).

Proposition 4.2. 1) For $j = 0, 1, \dots$ let $\sigma_j = \frac{d+2-j}{m}$. When $\sigma_j \notin \mathbb{Z}_-$ we have:

$$(4.4) \quad \text{Res}_{s=\sigma_j} t_{P_{\uparrow\downarrow}}^{-s}(x) = mc_{P^{-\sigma_j}}(x) = \Gamma(\sigma_j)^{-1} a_j(P)(x).$$

2) For $k = 1, 2, \dots$ we have

$$(4.5) \quad \text{Res}_{s=-k} t_{P_{\uparrow\downarrow}}^{-s}(x) = mc_{P^k}(x) = (-1)^{k+1} k! b_k(P)(x),$$

$$(4.6) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow -k} [t_{P_{\uparrow\downarrow}}^{-s}(x) - m(s+k)^{-1} c_{P^k}(x)] = (-1)^k k! a_{d+2+m_k}(P)(x).$$

3) For $k = 0$ we have

$$(4.7) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} t_{P_{\uparrow\downarrow}}^{-s}(x) = a_{d+2}(P)(x) - t_{\Pi_0}(x).$$

Remark 4.3. When P is positive and invertible the result is a standard consequence of the Mellin formula (see, e.g., [Gi]). Here it is slightly more complicated because we don't assume that P is positive or invertible. This way when M is strictly pseudoconvex the above result is valid for the conformal sublaplacian of [JL] and the operators of Gover-Graham [GG] (this fact will be important in Part II).

Proof. For $\Re s > 0$ let $Q_s = \Gamma(s)^{-1} \int_0^1 t^{s-1} e^{-tP} dt$. Then we have:

Claim. The family $(Q_s)_{\Re s > 0}$ can be uniquely extended to a holomorphic family of Ψ_H DOs over \mathbb{C} such that:

(i) The families $(Q_s)_{s \in \mathbb{C}}$ and $(P_{\uparrow\downarrow})_{s \in \mathbb{C}}$ agree up to holomorphic families of smoothing operators;

(ii) We have $Q_0 = 1$ and $Q_{-k} = P^k$ for any integer $k \geq 1$.

Proof of the claim. First, let $\Pi_+(P)$ and $\Pi_-(P)$ denote the orthogonal projections onto the positive and negative eigenspaces of P . Notice that $\Pi_-(P)$ is a smoothing operator because P has at most only finitely many negative eigenvalues. For $\Re s > 0$ the Mellin formula allows us to write

$$(4.8) \quad P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{-s} = \Pi_-(P) P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{-s} + \Gamma(s)^{-1} \int_0^\infty t^s \Pi_+(P) e^{-tP} \frac{dt}{t} = Q_s + R_{\uparrow\downarrow, s},$$

where $R_{\uparrow\downarrow, s}$ is equal to

$$(4.9) \quad \Pi_-(P) P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{-s} - s^{-1} \Gamma(s)^{-1} \Pi_0(P) - \Pi_-(P) \int_0^1 t^s e^{-tP} \frac{dt}{t} + \int_1^\infty t^s \Pi_+(P) e^{-tP} \frac{dt}{t}.$$

Notice that $(\Pi_-(P) P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{-s})_{s \in \mathbb{C}}$ and $(s^{-1} \Gamma(s)^{-1} \Pi_0(P))_{s \in \mathbb{C}}$ are holomorphic families of smoothing operators because $\Pi_-(P)$ and $\Pi_0(P)$ are smoothing operators. Moreover, upon writing

$$(4.10) \quad \Pi_-(P) \int_0^1 t^s e^{-tP} \frac{dt}{t} = \Pi_-(P) \left(\int_0^1 t^s e^{-tP} \frac{dt}{t} \right) \Pi_-(P),$$

$$(4.11) \quad \int_1^\infty t^s \Pi_+(P) e^{-tP} \frac{dt}{t} = e^{-\frac{1}{4}P} \left(\int_{1/2}^\infty t^s \Pi_+(P) e^{-tP} \frac{dt}{t} \right) e^{-\frac{1}{4}P},$$

we see that $(\Pi_-(P) \int_0^1 t^s e^{-tP} \frac{dt}{t})_{\Re s > 0}$ and $(\int_1^\infty t^s \Pi_+(P) e^{-tP} \frac{dt}{t})_{\Re s > 0}$ are holomorphic families of smoothing operators. Therefore $(R_{\uparrow\downarrow, s})_{\Re s > 0}$ is a holomorphic family

of smoothing operators and using (4.8) we see that $(Q_s)_{s \in \mathbb{C}}$ is a holomorphic family of Ψ_H DOs.

Next, an integration by parts gives

$$(4.12) \quad \Gamma(s+1)PQ_{s+1} = \int_0^1 t^s \frac{d}{dt}(e^{-tP}) = e^{-P} + s \int_0^1 t^{s-1} e^{-tP} dt.$$

Since $\Gamma(s+1) = s\Gamma(s)$ we get

$$(4.13) \quad Q_s = PQ_s - \Gamma(s+1)^{-1}e^{-P}, \quad \Re s > 0.$$

An easy induction then shows that for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ we have

$$(4.14) \quad Q_s = P^k Q_{s+k} - \Gamma(s+k)^{-1}P^{k-1}e^{-P} + \dots + (-1)^k \Gamma(s+1)^{-1}e^{-P}.$$

It follows that the family $(Q_s)_{\Re s > 0}$ has a unique analytic continuation to each half-space $\Re s > -k$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots$, so it admits a unique analytic continuation to \mathbb{C} . Furthermore, as for $\Re s > -k$ we have $P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{-s} = P^k P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{-(s+k)}$ we get

$$(4.15) \quad Q_s - P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{-s} = P^k R_{\uparrow\downarrow, s+k} - \Gamma(s+k)^{-1}P^{k-1}e^{-P} + \dots + (-1)^k \Gamma(s+1)^{-1}e^{-P},$$

from which we deduce that $(Q_s - P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{-s})_{\Re s > -k}$ is a holomorphic family of smoothing operators. Hence the families $(Q_s)_{s \in \mathbb{C}}$ and $(P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{-s})_{s \in \mathbb{C}}$ agree up to a holomorphic family of smoothing operators.

Finally, we have

$$(4.16) \quad Q_1 = \Pi_0(P) + \int_0^1 (1 - \Pi_0(P))e^{-tP} dt = \Pi_0(P) - P^{-1}(e^{-P} - 1).$$

Thus letting $s = 1$ in (4.13) gives

$$(4.17) \quad Q_0 = P[\Pi_0(P) - P^{-1}(e^{-P} - 1)] + e^{-P} = -(1 - \Pi_0(P))(e^{-P} - 1) + e^{-P} \\ = 1 - \Pi_0(P) + \Pi_0 e^{-P} = 1.$$

Furthermore, as $\Gamma(s)^{-1}$ vanishes at every non-positive integer, from (4.14) and (4.17) we see that we have $Q_{-k} = P^k Q_0 = P^k$ for any integer $k \geq 1$. The proof of the claim is thus achieved. \square

Now, as $(R_{\uparrow\downarrow, s})_{s \in \mathbb{C}} := (P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{-s} - Q_s)_{s \in \mathbb{C}}$ is a holomorphic family of smoothing operators the map $s \rightarrow t_{R_{\uparrow\downarrow, s}}(x)$ is holomorphic from \mathbb{C} to $C^\infty(M, |\Lambda|(M) \otimes \text{End } \mathcal{E})$. Therefore, for $j = 0, 1, \dots$ we get

$$(4.18) \quad \text{Res}_{s=\sigma_j} t_{P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{-s}}(x) = m c_{P^{-\sigma_j}}(x) = \text{Res}_{s=\sigma_j} t_{Q_s}(x),$$

where we have set $\sigma_j = \frac{d+2-j}{m}$. Moreover, for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ we have $R_{\uparrow\downarrow, -k} = 0$, so $\lim_{s \rightarrow -k} [t_{P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{-s}}(x) - m(s+k)^{-1} c_{P^k}(x)]$ is equal to

$$(4.19) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow -k} [t_{Q_s}(x) - (s+k)^{-1} \text{Res}_{s=-k} t_{Q_s}(x)].$$

Similarly, as $P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^0 = 1 - \Pi_0(P) = Q_0 - \Pi_0(P)$ we also get

$$(4.20) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} t_{P_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{-s}}(x) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} t_{Q_s}(x) - t_{\Pi_0}(x).$$

Next, let $k_{Q_s}(x, y)$ denote the kernel of Q_s . As Q_s has order $-ms$, for $\Re s > -\frac{d+2}{m}$ this is a trace-class operator and thanks to (4.3) we have

$$(4.21) \quad \Gamma(s) k_{Q_s}(x, x) = \int_0^1 t^{s-1} k_t(x, x) dt.$$

Moreover (4.3) implies that, for any integer $N \geq 0$, in $C^\infty(M, \text{End } \mathcal{E} \otimes |\Lambda|(M))$ we have

$$(4.22) \quad k_t(x, x) = \sum_{-\sigma_j < N} t^{-\sigma_j} a_j(P)(x) + \sum_{k < N} (t^k \log t) b_k(P)(x) + O(t^N).$$

Therefore, for $\Re s > \frac{d+2}{m}$ the density $\Gamma(s) k_{Q_s}(x, x)$ is of the form

$$(4.23) \quad \sum_{\sigma_j < N} \left(\int_0^1 t^{s-\sigma_j} \frac{dt}{t} \right) a_j(P)(x) + \sum_{k < N} \left(\int_0^1 t^{k+s} \log t \frac{dt}{t} \right) b_k(P)(x) + \Gamma(s) h_{N,s}(x),$$

with $h_{N,s}(x) \in \text{Hol}(\Re s > -N, C^\infty(M, \text{End } \mathcal{E} \otimes |\Lambda|(M)))$. Since for $\alpha > 0$ we have

$$(4.24) \quad \int_0^1 t^\alpha \log t \frac{dt}{t} = -\frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^1 t^{\alpha-1} dt = -\frac{1}{\alpha},$$

we see that $k_{Q_s}(x, x)$ is equal to

$$(4.25) \quad \Gamma(s)^{-1} \sum_{\sigma_j < N} \frac{1}{s + \sigma_j} a_j(P)(x) - \Gamma(s)^{-1} \sum_{k < N} \frac{1}{(s + k)^2} b_k(P)(x) + h_{N,s}(x).$$

Since $\Gamma(s)$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\})$ and for $k = 0, 1, \dots$ near $s = -k$ we have $\Gamma(s)^{-1} \sim (-1)^k k! (s + k)^{-1}$, we deduce that:

- When $\sigma_j \notin \mathbb{N}$ we have $\text{Res}_{s=\sigma_j} t_{Q_s}(x) = \Gamma(\sigma_j)^{-1} a_j(P)(x)$.
- For $k = 1, 2, \dots$ we have

$$(4.26) \quad \text{Res}_{s=-k} t_{Q_s}(x) = (-1)^{k+1} k! b_k(P)(x),$$

$$(4.27) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow -k} [t_{Q_s}(x) - (s + k)^{-1} \text{Res}_{s=-k} t_{Q_s}(x)] = (-1)^k k! a_{d+2+mk}(P)(x).$$

- For $k = 0$ we have $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} t_{Q_s}(x) = a_{d+2}(P)(x)$.

Combining this with (4.18)–(4.20) then gives the equalities (4.4)–(4.7). □

From Proposition 4.2 we immediately get:

Proposition 4.4. 1) For $j = 0, 1, \dots$ let $\sigma_j = \frac{d+2-j}{m}$. When $\sigma_j \notin \mathbb{Z}_-$ we have:

$$(4.28) \quad \text{Res}_{s=\sigma_j} \zeta_{\uparrow\downarrow}(P; s) = m \text{Res } P^{-\sigma_j} = \Gamma(\sigma_j)^{-1} \int_M \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} a_j(P)(x).$$

2) For $k = 1, 2, \dots$ we have

$$(4.29) \quad \text{Res}_{s=-k} \zeta_{\uparrow\downarrow}(P; s) = m \text{Res } P^k = (-1)^{k+1} k! \int_M \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} b_k(P)(x),$$

$$(4.30) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow -k} [\zeta_{\uparrow\downarrow}(P; s) - m(s + k)^{-1} \text{Res } P^k] = (-1)^k k! \int_M \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} a_{d+2+mk}(P)(x).$$

3) For $k = 0$ we have

$$(4.31) \quad \zeta_{\uparrow\downarrow}(P; 0) = \int_M \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} a_{d+2}(P)(x) - \dim \ker P.$$

Next, for $k = 0, 1, \dots$ let $\lambda_k(P)$ denote the $(k+1)$ 'th eigenvalue of P counted with multiplicity. Then by [Po5] and [Po8] as $k \rightarrow \infty$ we have the Weyl asymptotics,

$$(4.32) \quad \lambda_k(P) \sim \left(\frac{k}{\nu_0(P)} \right)^{\frac{m}{d+2}}, \quad \nu_0(P) = \Gamma(1 + \frac{d+2}{m})^{-1} \int_M \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} a_0(P)(x).$$

Now, by Proposition 4.4 we have

$$(4.33) \quad \int_M \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} a_0(P)(x) = m \Gamma\left(\frac{d+2}{m}\right) \operatorname{Res} P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}} = \frac{1}{d+2} \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{d+2}{m}\right) \operatorname{Res} P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}},$$

Therefore, we obtain:

Proposition 4.5. *As $k \rightarrow \infty$ we have*

$$(4.34) \quad \lambda_k(P) \sim \left(\frac{k}{\nu_0(P)} \right)^{\frac{m}{d+2}}, \quad \nu_0(P) = (d+2)^{-1} \operatorname{Res} P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}.$$

Finally, we can make use of Proposition 4.4 to prove a local index formula for hypoelliptic Ψ_H DOs in the following setting. Assume that \mathcal{E} admits a \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^+ \oplus \mathcal{E}^-$ and let $D : C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E})$ be a selfadjoint Ψ_H DO of integer order $m \geq 1$ with an invertible principal symbol and anticommuting with the \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading of \mathcal{E} , that is,

$$(4.35) \quad D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D_- \\ D_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_\pm : C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E}_\pm) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E}_\mp).$$

Notice that the selfadjointness of D means that $D_+^* = D_-$.

Since D has an invertible principal symbol and M is compact we see that D is invertible modulo finite rank operators, hence is Fredholm. Then we let

$$(4.36) \quad \operatorname{ind} D := \operatorname{ind} D_+ = \dim \ker D_+ - \dim \ker D_-.$$

Proposition 4.6. *Under the above assumptions we have*

$$(4.37) \quad \operatorname{ind} D = \int_M \operatorname{str}_{\mathcal{E}} a_{d+2}(D^2)(x),$$

where $\operatorname{str}_{\mathcal{E}} = \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{E}^+} - \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{E}^-}$ denotes the supertrace on the fibers of \mathcal{E} .

Proof. We have $D^2 = \begin{pmatrix} D_- D_+ & 0 \\ 0 & D_+ D_- \end{pmatrix}$ and $D_\mp D_\pm = D_\pm^* D_\pm$. In particular, $D_\mp D_\pm$ is a positive operators with an invertible principal symbol. Moreover, for $\Re s > \frac{d+2}{2m}$ the difference $\zeta(D_- D_+; s) - \zeta(D_+ D_-; s)$ is equal to

$$(4.38) \quad \sum_{\lambda > 0} \lambda^s (\dim \ker(D_- D_+ - \lambda) - \dim \ker(D_+ D_- - \lambda)) = 0,$$

for D induces for any $\lambda > 0$ a bijection between $\ker(D_- D_+ - \lambda)$ and $\ker(D_+ D_- - \lambda)$ (see, e.g., [BGV]). By analytic continuation this yields $\zeta(D_- D_+; 0) - \zeta(D_+ D_-; 0) = 0$.

On the other hand, by Proposition 4.4 we have

$$(4.39) \quad \zeta(D_\mp D_\pm; 0) = \int_M \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{E}_\pm} a_{d+2}(D_\mp D_\pm)(x) - \dim \ker D_\mp D_\pm.$$

Since $\dim \ker D_\mp D_\pm = \dim \ker D_\pm$ we deduce that $\operatorname{ind} D$ is equal to

$$(4.40) \quad \int_M \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{E}_+} a_{d+2}(D_+ D_-)(x) - \int_M \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{E}_-} a_{d+2}(D_- D_+)(x) = \int_M \operatorname{str}_{\mathcal{E}} a_{d+2}(D^2)(x).$$

The proof is thus achieved. \square

4.2. Metric estimates for Green kernels of hypoelliptic Ψ_H DOs. Consider a compact Heisenberg manifold (M^{d+1}, H) endowed with a positive density and let \mathcal{E} be a Hermitian vector bundle over M . In this subsection we prove that the positivity of a hypoelliptic Ψ_H DO still pertains in its logarithmic singularity, when it has order $-(\dim M + 1)$. As a consequence this will allow us to derive metric estimates for Green kernels of hypoelliptic Ψ DOs.

Let $P : C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E})$ be a Ψ_H DO of order $m > 0$ whose principal symbol is invertible and is positive in the sense of [Po5], i.e., we can write $\sigma_m(P) = q * q^*$ with $q \in S_{\frac{m}{2}}(\mathfrak{g}^*M, \mathcal{E})$. The main technical result of this section is the following.

Proposition 4.7. *The density $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} c_{P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}}(x)$ is > 0 .*

We will prove Proposition 4.7 later on in the section. As a first consequence, by combining with Proposition 4.2 we get:

Proposition 4.8. *Let $a_0(P)(x)$ be the leading coefficient in the small time heat kernel asymptotics (4.3) for P . Then the density $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} a_0(P)(x)$ is > 0 .*

Assume now that the bracket condition $H + [H, H] = TM$ holds, i.e., H is a Carnot-Carathéodory distribution in the sense of [Gro]. Let g be a Riemannian metric on H and let $d_H(x, y)$ be the associated Carnot-Carathéodory metric on M . Recall for two points x and y of M the value of $d_H(x, y)$ is the infimum of the lengths of all closed paths joining x to y that are tangent to H at each point (such a path always exists by Chow's Lemma). Moreover, the Hausdorff dimension of M with respect to d_H is equal to $\dim M + 1$.

In the setting of general Carathéodory distributions there has been lot of interest by Fefferman, Stein and their collaborators for giving metric estimates for the singularities of the Green kernels of hypoelliptic sublaplacians (see, e.g., [FS], [Ma], [NSW], [Sa]). This allows us relate the hypoelliptic analysis of sublaplacians to the metric geometry of the underlying manifold.

An important fact is that by the maximum principle of Bony [Bo] the Green of kernel of a selfadjoint hypoelliptic sublaplacian is positive near the diagonal. In general the positivity of the principal symbol does not pertain in the Green kernel. Nevertheless, thanks to Proposition 4.7 we will prove:

Theorem 4.9. *Assume that $H + [H, H] = TM$ and let $k_{P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}}(x, y)$ denote the Schwartz kernel of $P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}$. Then near the diagonal we have*

$$(4.41) \quad k_{P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}}(x, y) \sim -c_{P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}}(x) \log d_H(x, y).$$

In particular $k_{P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}}(x, y)$ is > 0 near the diagonal.

Proof. It is enough to proceed in a Heisenberg chart $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. For $x \in U$ let ψ_x be the affine change to the corresponding privileged coordinates at x . Since by Proposition 4.7 we have $c_{P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}}(x) > 0$, using Proposition 3.11 we see that near the diagonal we have

$$(4.42) \quad k_{P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}}(x, y) \sim -c_{P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}}(x) \log \|\psi_x(y)\|.$$

Incidentally $k_{P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}}(x, y)$ is positive near the diagonal.

On the other hand, since H has codimension one our definition of the privileged coordinates agrees with that of [Be]. Therefore, it follows from [Be, Thm. 7.34] that the ratio $\frac{d_H(x, y)}{\|\psi_x(y)\|}$ remains bounded in $(0, \infty)$ when (x, y) gets closer and closer to

the diagonal, so that we have $\log d_H(x, y) \sim \log \|\psi_x(y)\|$. Together with (4.42) this shows that we have $k_{P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}}(x, y) \sim -c_{P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}}(x) \log d_H(x, y)$ near the diagonal. \square

It remains now to prove Proposition 4.7. To this end recall that for an operator $Q \in \Psi_H^*(M, \mathcal{E})$ the model operator Q^a at a given point $a \in M$ is defined as the left-invariant Ψ_H DO on $\mathcal{S}_0(G_a M, \mathcal{E})$ with symbol $q^a(\xi) = \sigma_*(Q)(a, \xi)$. Bearing this in mind we have:

Lemma 4.10. *Let $Q \in \Psi_H^{-(d+2)}$ and let Q^a be its model operator at a point $a \in M$.*

1) *We have $c_{Q^a}(x) = c_{Q^a} dx$, where c_{Q^a} is a constant and dx denotes the Haar measure of $G_a M$.*

2) *In Heisenberg coordinates centered at a we have $c_Q(0) = c_{Q^a}$.*

Proof. Let X_0, X_1, \dots, X_d be a H frame near a and let us work in Heisenberg coordinates centered at a . In these coordinates let $q^a(\xi) = \sigma_{-(d+2)}(P)(a, \xi)$. By definition Q^a is the left-convolution operator with the inverse Fourier transform of $q^a(\xi)$, where the latter is seen as an element of $\mathcal{S}'_0(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Thus, if we let $\tau \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ be an extension of $q^a(\xi)$ as in Lemma 3.1 then Q^a has kernel $k_{Q^a}(x, y) = \tilde{\tau}(x.y^{-1})$. Thanks to (3.4) this shows that for $y \neq x$ we have

$$(4.43) \quad k_{Q^a}(x, y) = \tilde{\tau}(\|x.y^{-1}\|^{-1} \cdot (x.y^{-1})) - c_{Q^a} \log \|x.y^{-1}\|,$$

with $c_{Q^a} = (2\pi)^{-(d+1)} \int_{\|\xi\|=1} q^a(\xi) \iota_E d\xi$.

On the other hand, the left-invariance of the frame X_0^a, \dots, X_d^a implies that, for any x in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} , the change of coordinates to the privileged coordinates at x is $\psi_x^a(y) = y.x^{-1}$. As with respect to the group law (2.4) of $G_a M$ we have $z^{-1} = -z$, we see that for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ we have $\psi_x^a(y) = -(x.y^{-1})$. Therefore, using (4.43) we deduce that $c_{Q^a}(x) = c_{Q^a}$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Since on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} the Haar measure with respect to the product of $G_a M$ is equal to the Lebesgue measure, this proves that as a density $c_{Q^a}(x)$ is equal to c_{Q^a} times the Haar measure of $G_a M$.

Next, by its very definition in Heisenberg coordinates centered at a the principal symbol $\sigma_{-(d+2)}(Q)(x, \xi)$ agrees at $x = 0$ with the principal symbol $q_{-(d+2)}(x, \xi)$ of Q in the sense of (2.12), i.e., we have $p^a(\xi) = p(0, \xi)$. Furthermore, as we already are in Heisenberg coordinates, hence in privileged coordinates, the change map to the privileged coordinates centered at the origin with respect to the frame X_0, \dots, X_d is just the identity. Therefore, in view of the definition (3.12) of $c_P(x)$ we get

$$(4.44) \quad c_P(0) = (2\pi)^{-(d+1)} \int_{\|\xi\|=1} q(0, \xi) \iota_E d\xi = (2\pi)^{-(d+1)} \int_{\|\xi\|=1} q^a(\xi) \iota_E d\xi = c_{Q^a}.$$

The lemma is thus proved. \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition 4.7.

Proof of Proposition 4.7. For sake of simplicity we assume that \mathcal{E} is the trivial line bundle over M , that is, P is a scalar operator, since in the general case the proof follows along similar lines. Moreover, as by Lemma 4.10 in Heisenberg coordinates centered at a point $a \in M$ we have $c_{P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}}(x)|_{x=0} = c_{(P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}})_a}(x)|_{x=0}$, it is enough to prove that $c_{(P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}})_a}$ is > 0 for any $a \in M$.

Let $a \in M$, let X_0, \dots, X_d be a H -frame near a and let $H^a \subset T\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be the hyperplane bundle spanned by the model vector fields X_1^a, \dots, X_d^a under the trivialization $G_a M \simeq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ defined by the frame $X_0(a), \dots, X_d(a)$. In addition, for $z \in \mathbb{C}$

we let $p(z)(x, \xi)$ be the principal symbol of $P_{\frac{z}{m}}$, so that $(p(z))_{z \in \mathbb{C}}$ is a holomorphic family with values in $C^\infty(\mathfrak{g}^*M \setminus 0)$ (see [Po5, Prop. 4.5.4]).

Let $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ be such that $\chi(\xi) = 1$ near $\xi = 0$. For $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we set $\tilde{p}(z)(\xi) = (1 - \chi(\xi))p(z)(0, \xi)$ and for φ and ψ in $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ we let $P_{\varphi, \psi}(z) = \varphi \tilde{p}(z)(-iX^a)\psi$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Then $(P_{\varphi, \psi}(z))_{z \in \mathbb{C}}$ is a holomorphic family with values in $\Psi_{H^a}^*(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that $\text{ord} P_{\varphi, \psi}(z) = z$ and the kernel of $P_{\varphi, \psi}(z)$ is supported in the compact set $\text{supp } \varphi \times \text{supp } \psi$. In particular $(P_{\varphi, \psi}(z))_{\Re z \leq 0}$ is a holomorphic family with values in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}))$.

Next, as $(P_{\varphi, \psi}(\bar{z})^*)_{z \in \mathbb{C}}$ is in $\text{Hol}(\mathbb{C}, \Psi_{H^a}^*(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}))$ (see [Po5, Prop. 4.6.2]), we see that the family $(P_{\varphi, \psi}(z)P_{\varphi, \psi}(\bar{z})^*)_{\Re z < -\frac{d+2}{2}}$ belongs to $\text{Hol}(\mathbb{C}, \Psi_{H^a}^{\text{int}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}))$. Since for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ the support of the kernel $P_{\varphi, \psi}(\bar{z})^*P_{\varphi, \psi}(z)$ is contained in the fixed compact set $\text{supp } \varphi \times \text{supp } \varphi$, it follows that $(P_{\varphi, \psi}(z)P_{\varphi, \psi}(\bar{z})^*)_{\Re z < -\frac{d+2}{2}}$ is a holomorphic family with values in $\mathcal{L}^1(L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}))$.

Assume now that φ and ψ are such that $\varphi \neq 0$ and $\psi = 1$ near $\text{supp } \varphi$. For $t \in \mathbb{R}$ the operator $P_{\frac{t}{m}}$ is selfadjoint, so by Proposition 2.5 its principal symbol is selfadjoint, i.e., is real-valued. Therefore, using Proposition 2.5 we see that the principal symbol of $(P_{\varphi, \psi}(t)P_{\varphi, \psi}(t)^*)$ is equal to

$$(4.45) \quad [\varphi(x)p(t)(a, \xi)\psi(x)] *^a [\overline{\psi(x)p(t)(a, \xi)\varphi(x)}] = |\varphi(x)|^2 p(2t)(a, \xi).$$

In particular, the principal symbol of $P_{\varphi, \psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})P_{\varphi, \psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})^*$ agrees with that of $P_{|\varphi|^2, \psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})$, so that we have

$$(4.46) \quad c_{P_{\varphi, \psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})P_{\varphi, \psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})^*}(x) = c_{P_{|\varphi|^2, \psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})}(x) = |\varphi(x)|^2 c_{(P^{-\frac{(d+2)}{m}})_a}.$$

Therefore, we obtain:

$$(4.47) \quad \begin{aligned} c_{(P^{-\frac{(d+2)}{m}})_a}(x) &= \int |\varphi(x)|^2 dx = \int c_{P_{\varphi, \psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})P_{\varphi, \psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})^*}(x) dx \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \frac{d+2}{2}^+} \frac{1}{t - \frac{d+2}{2}} \int t P_{\varphi, \psi}(-t)P_{\varphi, \psi}(-t)^*(x) dx \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \frac{d+2}{2}^+} \frac{1}{t - \frac{d+2}{2}} \text{Trace}[P_{\varphi, \psi}(-t)P_{\varphi, \psi}(-t)^*] \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $c_{(P^{-\frac{(d+2)}{m}})_a} \geq 0$.

Assume now that $c_{(P^{-\frac{(d+2)}{m}})_a} = 0$. Then we have $c_{P_{\varphi, \psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})P_{\varphi, \psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})^*}(x) = 0$, which implies that $\text{Tr}[P_{\varphi, \psi}(z)P_{\varphi, \psi}(\bar{z})^*]$ is analytic near $z = -\frac{d+2}{2}$. Let $(\xi_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. For any $t > \frac{d+2}{2}$ and any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(4.48) \quad \sum_{0 \leq k \leq N} \langle P_{\varphi, \psi}(t)P_{\varphi, \psi}(t)^*\xi_k, \xi_k \rangle \leq \text{Trace}[P_{\varphi, \psi}(t)P_{\varphi, \psi}(t)^*].$$

Letting $t \rightarrow -\frac{d+2}{2}^+$ then gives

$$(4.49) \quad \sum_{0 \leq k \leq N} \langle P_{\varphi, \psi}(t_0)P_{\varphi, \psi}(t_0)^*\xi_k, \xi_k \rangle \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \frac{d+2}{2}^+} \text{Trace}[P_{\varphi, \psi}(t)P_{\varphi, \psi}(t)^*] < \infty.$$

Hence $P_{\varphi, \psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})P_{\varphi, \psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})^*$ is a trace-class operator, that is, $P_{\varphi, \psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator.

Next, let $Q \in \Psi_{H^a}^{-\frac{d+2}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Since the principal symbol of $\varphi Q\psi$ agrees with that of $\psi Q\psi^2 \tilde{p}(\frac{d+2}{2})(X^a)\psi P_{\varphi,\psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})$ we can write

$$(4.50) \quad \varphi Q\psi = \psi Q\psi^2 \tilde{p}(\frac{d+2}{2})(X^a)\psi P_{\varphi,\psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2}) + R,$$

for some $R \in \Psi_{H^a}^{-\frac{d+2}{2}-1}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ with a compactly supported kernel. Notice that:

- $Q\psi^2 \tilde{p}(\frac{d+2}{2})(X^a)\psi$ is a zero'th order Ψ_H DO with a compactly supported kernel, hence is a bounded operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$;
- $P_{\varphi,\psi}(-\frac{d+2}{2})$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator;
- R is also Hilbert-Schmidt operator, since this is a Ψ_H DO of order $-\frac{d+2}{2} - 1$ with a compactly supported kernel.

Since the class $\mathcal{L}^2(L^2(M))$ of Hilbert-Schmidt operators is a two-sided ideal it follows that $\varphi Q\psi$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator. In particular, by [GK, p. 109] the kernel of $\varphi Q\psi$ lies in $L_c^2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.

We now get a contradiction as follows. Let $Q \in \Psi_{H^a}^{-\frac{d+2}{2}}$ have distribution kernel,

$$(4.51) \quad k_Q(x, y) = |\psi_x^{(a)}|' \|\psi_x^{(a)}(y)\|^{-\frac{d+2}{2}},$$

where $\psi_x^{(a)}$ is the change to the privileged coordinates at a with respect to the H^a -frame X_0^a, \dots, X_d^a (this makes sense since $\|y\|^{-\frac{d+2}{2}}$ is in $\mathcal{K}_{-\frac{d+2}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$).

Then the kernel of $\varphi Q\psi$ is equal to $\varphi(x) = |\psi_x^{(a)}|' \|\psi_x^{(a)}(y)\|^{-\frac{d+2}{2}} \psi(x)$ and it is not L^2 -integrable, for we have

$$(4.52) \quad \begin{aligned} \iint |\varphi(x)|^2 |\psi_x^{(a)}|'^2 \|\psi_x^{(a)}(y)\|^{-(d+2)} |\psi(y)|^2 dx dy \\ = \int |\varphi(x)|^2 \int |\psi_x^{(a)}|' \left(\int \|y\|^2 |\psi(\psi_x^{-1}(y))|^2 dy \right) dx = \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we cannot have $c_{(P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}})_a} = 0$. Since we know that $c_{(P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}})_a} \geq 0$ it follows that $c_{(P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}})_a} > 0$. The proof of Proposition 4.7 is now complete. \square

4.3. The Dixmier trace of Ψ_H DOs. The quantized calculus of Connes [Co2] allows us to translate into the language of quantum mechanics the main tools of the classical infinitesimal calculus. In particular, an important device is the Dixmier trace ([Di], [CM, Appendix A]), which is the noncommutative analogue of the standard integral. We shall now show that, as in the case of classical Ψ DOs (see [Co1]), the noncommutative residue allows us to extend the Dixmier trace to the whole algebra of integer order Ψ_H DOs.

Let us first recall the main facts about Connes' quantized calculus and the Dixmier trace. The general setting is that of bounded operators on a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Extending the well known correspondence in quantum mechanics between variables and operators, we get the following dictionary between classical notions of infinitesimal calculus and their operator theoretic analogues.

Classical	Quantum
Real variable	Selfadjoint operator on \mathcal{H}
Complex variable	Operator on \mathcal{H}
Infinitesimal variable	Compact operator on \mathcal{H}
Infinitesimal of order $\alpha > 0$	Compact operator T such that $\mu_n(T) = O(n^{-\alpha})$

The third line can be explained as follows. We cannot say that an operator T is an infinitesimal by requiring that $\|T\| \leq \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, for this would give $T = 0$. Nevertheless, we can relax this condition by requiring that for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have $\|T\| < \epsilon$ outside a finite dimensional space. This means that T is in the closure of finite rank operators, i.e., T belongs to the ideal \mathcal{K} of compact operators on \mathcal{H} .

In the last line $\mu_n(T)$ denotes the $(n+1)$ 'th characteristic value of T , i.e., the $(n+1)$ 'th eigenvalue of $|T| = (T^*T)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. In particular, by the min-max principle we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_n(T) &= \inf\{\|T_{E^\perp}\|; \dim E = n\}, \\
(4.53) \quad &= \text{dist}(T, \mathcal{R}_n), \quad \mathcal{R}_n = \{\text{operators of rank} \leq n\},
\end{aligned}$$

so the decay of $\mu_n(T)$ controls the accuracy of the approximation of T by finite rank operators. Moreover, using (4.53) we also get

$$(4.54) \quad \mu_n(T + S) \leq \mu_n(T) + \mu_n(S) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_n(ATB) \leq \|A\|\mu_n(T)\|B\|,$$

for S, T in \mathcal{K} and A, B in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. This implies that the set of infinitesimal operators of order α is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$.

Next, in this setting the analogue of the integral is provided by the Dixmier trace ([Di], [CM, Appendix A]), which arises in the study of the logarithmic divergency of the partial traces,

$$(4.55) \quad \text{Trace}_N(T) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mu_n(T), \quad T \in \mathcal{K}, \quad T \geq 0.$$

The domain of the Dixmier trace is the Schatten ideal,

$$(4.56) \quad \mathcal{L}^{(1,\infty)} = \{T \in \mathcal{K}; \|T\|_{1,\infty} := \sup \frac{\sigma_N(T)}{\log N} < \infty\}.$$

We extend the definition of $\text{Trace}_N(T)$ to non-integer values of N using the interpolation formula,

$$(4.57) \quad \sigma_\lambda(T) = \inf\{\|x\|_1 + \Lambda\|y\|; x + y = T\}, \quad \lambda > 0.$$

The Cesàro mean of $\sigma_\lambda(T)$ with respect to the Haar measure of \mathbb{R}_+^* is

$$(4.58) \quad \tau_\Lambda(T) = \frac{1}{\log \Lambda} \int_e^\Lambda \frac{\sigma_\lambda(T)}{\log \lambda} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}, \quad \Lambda \geq e.$$

Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})_+ = \{T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}); T \geq 0\}$. Then as shown in [CM, Appendix A] for $T_j \in \mathcal{L}^{(1,\infty)} \cap \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})_+$ we have

$$(4.59) \quad |\tau_\lambda(T_1 + T_2) - \tau_\lambda(T_1) - \tau_\lambda(T_2)| \leq 3(\|T_1\|_{(1,\infty)} + \|T_2\|_{(1,\infty)}) \frac{\log \log \lambda}{\log \lambda}.$$

Hence the functionals τ_Λ , $\Lambda \geq e$ give rise to an additive homogeneous map,

$$(4.60) \quad \tau : \mathcal{L}^{(1,\infty)} \cap \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})_+ \longrightarrow C_b[e, \infty)/C_0[e, \infty).$$

It follows from this that for any state ω on the C^* -algebra $C_b[e, \infty)/C_0[e, \infty)$, i.e., a positive linear form such that $\omega(1) = 1$, there is a unique trace $\text{Tr}_\omega : \mathcal{L}^{(1, \infty)} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$(4.61) \quad \text{Tr}_\omega T = \omega(\tau(T)) \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{L}^{(1, \infty)} \cap \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})_+.$$

This trace is called the Dixmier trace associated to ω .

Proposition 4.11 ([Di], [CM]). *For any state ω on $C_b[e, \infty)/C_0[e, \infty)$ the Dixmier trace Tr_ω has the following properties:*

- 1) Locality. *If T is trace-class then $\text{Tr}_\omega T = 0$.*
- 2) Positivity. *We have $\text{Tr}_\omega(T^*T) \geq 0$ for any $T \in \mathcal{L}^{(1, \infty)} \cap \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})_+$.*
- 3) Invariance. *If $S : \mathcal{H}' \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a topological isomorphism, then $\text{Tr}_{\omega, \mathcal{H}'}(T) = \text{Tr}_{\omega, \mathcal{H}}(STS^{-1})$ for any $T \in \mathcal{L}^{(1, \infty)}(\mathcal{H}')$. In particular, Tr_ω does not depend on the inner product of \mathcal{H} .*

Next, we say that an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}^{(1, \infty)}$ is *measurable* when the value of $\text{Tr}_\omega T$ is independent of the choice of the state ω . We then call the Dixmier trace of T the common value

$$(4.62) \quad \oint T := \text{Tr}_\omega T.$$

In addition, we let \mathcal{M} denote the space of measurable operators. For instance, if $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a positive compact operator then we have:

$$(4.63) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\log N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mu_n(T) = L \implies T \in \mathcal{M} \text{ and } \oint T = L.$$

An important example of measurable operator is due to Connes [Co1]. Let \mathcal{H} be the Hilbert space $L^2(M, \mathcal{E})$ of L^2 -sections of a Hermitian vector bundle over a compact manifold M equipped with a smooth positive density and let $P : L^2(M, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow L^2(M, \mathcal{E})$ be a classical Ψ DO of order $-\dim M$. Then P is measurable for the Dixmier trace and we have

$$(4.64) \quad \oint P = \frac{1}{\dim M} \text{Res } P,$$

where $\text{Res } P$ denotes the noncommutative residue trace for classical Ψ DOs of Wodzicki ([Wo1], [Wo3]) and Guillemin [Gu1]. This allows us to extend the Dixmier trace to all Ψ DOs of integer order, hence to integrate any such Ψ DO even though it is not an infinitesimal of order ≤ 1 .

From now on we let (M^{d+1}, H) be a compact Heisenberg manifold equipped with a smooth positive density and let \mathcal{E} be a Hermitian vector bundle over M .

Let $P : C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \mathcal{E})$ be a positive Ψ_H DO with an invertible principal symbol of order $m > 0$ and for $k = 0, 1, \dots$ let $\lambda_k(P)$ denote the $(k+1)$ 'th eigenvalue of P counted with multiplicity. By Proposition 4.5 when $k \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$(4.65) \quad \lambda_k(P) \sim \left(\frac{k}{\nu_0(P)} \right)^{\frac{m}{d+2}}, \quad \nu_0(P) = \frac{1}{d+2} \text{Res } P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}.$$

It follows that for any $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Re \sigma > 0$ the operator $P^{-\sigma}$ is an infinitesimal operator of order $\frac{m \Re \sigma}{d+2}$. Furthermore, for $\sigma = \frac{d+2}{m}$ using (4.54) we see that $P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}$ is measurable and we have

$$(4.66) \quad \oint P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}} = \nu_0(P) = \frac{1}{d+2} \text{Res } P^{-\frac{d+2}{m}}.$$

These results are actually true for general Ψ_H DOs, for we have:

Theorem 4.12. *Let $P : L^2(M, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow L^2(M, \mathcal{E})$ be a Ψ_H DO order m with $\Re m < 0$.*

1) *P is an infinitesimal operator of order $(\dim M + 1)^{-1}|\Re m|$.*

2) *If $\text{ord} P = -(\dim M + 1)$ then P is measurable and we have*

$$(4.67) \quad \oint P = \frac{1}{\dim M + 1} \text{Res } P.$$

Proof. First, let $P_0 \in \Psi_H^1(M, \mathcal{E})$ be an invertible positive Ψ_H DO with an invertible principal symbol. Then PP_0^m is a zero'th order Ψ_H DO, hence is bounded. Moreover, as alluded to above, P_0^{-m} is an infinitesimal of order $\alpha = (\dim M + 1)^{-1}|\Re m|$. Since $P = PP_0^m.P_0^{-m}$ we see that P is product of a bounded operator and of an infinitesimal operator of order α . Since (4.54) shows that the space of infinitesimal operators of order α is a two-sided ideal, it follows that P is an infinitesimal of order α . In particular, if $\text{ord} P = -(d + 2)$ then P is an infinitesimal of order 1, hence belongs to $\mathcal{L}^{(1, \infty)}$.

Now, let Tr_ω be the Dixmier trace associated to a state ω on $C_b[e, \infty)/C_0[e, \infty)$ and let us prove that for any $P \in \Psi_H^{-(d+2)}(M, \mathcal{E})$ we have $\text{Tr}_\omega P = \frac{1}{d+2} \text{Res } P$. Let $U \subset M$ be the domain of a Heisenberg chart in such way that U is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . We shall identify U with \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . Then the hyperplane bundle $H|_U \subset TU$ is identified with a hyperplane bundle of $T\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, still denoted H , and the H -frame on U is identified with a H -frame on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . This allows us to identify the class $\Psi_{H,c}^*(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ of compactly supported Ψ DOs on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} with the class $\Psi_{H,c}^*(U) \subset \Psi_H^*(M)$ of Ψ_H DOs on M with a compact support on U .

Since P_0 is a positive Ψ_H DO with an invertible principal symbol, Proposition 4.7 tells us that the density $c_{P_0^{-(d+2)}}(x)$ is > 0 . Thus for $c \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ and $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that $\psi = 1$ near $\text{supp } c$ we may define

$$(4.68) \quad P_{c,\psi} = \frac{c}{c_{P_0^{-(d+2)}}} P_0^{-(d+2)} \psi.$$

Notice that $c_{P_c}(x) = c(x)$. Moreover P_c depends on ψ only modulo operators in $\Psi_c^{-\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, hence only modulo trace-class operators. Therefore $\text{Tr}_\omega P_{c,\psi}$ does not depend on ψ and we define a linear functional $\tau : C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by letting

$$(4.69) \quad \tau(c) = \text{Tr}_\omega P_{c,\psi}, \quad c \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}).$$

where $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is such that $\psi = 1$ near $\text{supp } c$. Moreover, any $P \in \Psi_{H,c}^{-(d+2)}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ can be written as $P = P_{c_P,\psi} + Q$ with $Q \in \Psi_{H,c}^{-(d+2)}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that $c_Q(x) = 0$. Then Q can be put into the form (3.53), hence belongs to $[\Psi_{H,c}^0(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}), \Psi_{H,c}^{-(d+2)}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})]$. Since the latter is contained in $[\mathcal{L}(L^2(M)), \mathcal{L}^{(1, \infty)}(M)] \subset \ker \text{Tr}_\omega$, it follows that $\text{Tr}_\omega Q = 0$. Thus,

$$(4.70) \quad \text{Tr}_\omega P = \text{Tr}_\omega P_{c_P,\psi} = \tau(c_P).$$

Let $c \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, let $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that $\psi \geq 0$ and $\psi = 1$ near $\text{supp } c$, and set $c_1 = \frac{c}{(c_{P_0^{-(d+2)}})^{\frac{1}{2}}}$. Then modulo $\Psi_{H,c}^{-\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ we have

$$(4.71) \quad (c_1 P_0^{-\frac{d+2}{2}} \psi)(c_1 P_0^{-\frac{d+2}{2}} \psi)^* = c_1 P_0^{-\frac{d+2}{2}} \psi^2 P_0^{-\frac{d+2}{2}} \overline{c_1} = c_1 P_0^{-(d+2)} \psi \overline{c_1}.$$

Therefore $\text{Tr}_\omega[(c_1 P_0^{-\frac{d+2}{2}} \psi)(c_1 P_0^{-\frac{d+2}{2}} \psi)^*]$ is equal to

$$(4.72) \quad \text{Tr}_\omega[c_1 P_0^{-(d+2)} \psi \overline{c_1}] = \text{Tr}_\omega[\overline{c_1} c_1 P_0^{-(d+2)} \psi] = \text{Tr}_\omega P_{\overline{c}c, \psi} = \tau(\overline{c}c).$$

Since Tr_ω is a positive trace we see that we have $\tau(\overline{c}c) \geq 0$ for any $c \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. This shows that τ is a positive linear functional on $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$, hence is a Radon measure on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} .

Next, for $a \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ let $\phi(x) = x + a$ be the translation on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} by a . Since $\phi'(x) = 1$ we see that ϕ is a Heisenberg diffeomorphism, so for any $P \in \Psi_{H,c}^*(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ the operator $\phi_* P$ is in $\Psi_{H,c}^*(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ too. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be compact and set $K_a = K + a$. Then ϕ gives rise to an isomorphism $\phi_{a*} : L_K^2(M) \rightarrow L_{K_a}^2(M)$, which can be extended to an isomorphism S of $L^2(M)$ onto itself by means of the choice of an isomorphism $L_K^2(M)^\perp \simeq L_{K_a}^2(M)^\perp$. Combining this with the invariance property of Proposition 4.11 we see that, for any $P \in \Psi_{H,c}^{-(d+2)}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ supported in L with $L \subset\subset K$, we have

$$(4.73) \quad \text{Tr}_\omega \phi_* P = \text{Tr}_\omega S P S^{-1} = \text{Tr}_\omega P.$$

Let $c \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Since $\phi_* P_{c,\psi} = P_{c \circ \phi, \psi \circ \phi}$, using (4.73) we get

$$(4.74) \quad \tau(c \circ \phi) = \text{Tr}_\omega P_{c \circ \phi, \psi \circ \phi} = \text{Tr}_\omega \phi_* P_{c,\psi} = \text{Tr}_\omega P_{c,\psi} = \tau(c).$$

This shows that τ is a translation-invariant Radon measure on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} , hence is proportional to the Lebesgue measure. Thus there exists $\Lambda_U \geq 0$ such that

$$(4.75) \quad \tau(c) = \Lambda_U \int c(x) dx, \quad c \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}).$$

Combining this with (4.70) we deduce that for any $P \in \Psi_{H,c}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ we have

$$(4.76) \quad \text{Tr}_\omega P = \tau(c_P) = \Lambda_U \int c_P(x) dx = \Lambda_U \text{Res } P.$$

Next, let M_1, \dots, M_N be the connected components of M . Then by arguing as in the proof of Theorem 3.24 we can deduce from (4.76) that on each connected component M_j , $j = 1, \dots, N$, there exists $\Lambda_j \geq 0$ such that

$$(4.77) \quad \text{Tr}_\omega P = \Lambda_j \text{Res } P \quad \forall P \in \Psi_H^{-(d+2)}(M_j, \mathcal{E}).$$

In fact, if we take $P = P_{0|M_j}^{-(d+2)}$ then from (4.66) we get $\Lambda_j = (d+2)^{-1}$. Thus,

$$(4.78) \quad \text{Tr}_\omega P = \frac{1}{d+2} \text{Res } P \quad \forall P \in \Psi_H^{-(d+2)}(M, \mathcal{E}).$$

This proves that any $P \in \Psi_H^{-(d+2)}(M, \mathcal{E})$ is measurable with Dixmier trace equal to $(d+2)^{-1} \text{Res } P$. The proof is therefore complete. \square

As a consequence of Theorem 4.12 we can extend the Dixmier trace to the whole algebra $\Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E})$ by letting

$$(4.79) \quad \oint P = \frac{1}{d+2} \text{Res } P, \quad P \in \Psi_H^{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathcal{E}).$$

In the language of the quantized calculus this shows that we can integrate any Ψ_H DO of integer order, even though it is not an infinitesimal operator of order or even a bounded operator on $L^2(M, \mathcal{E})$. This property will be used in Section 6 to define lower dimensional volumes in CR geometry.

5. NONCOMMUTATIVE RESIDUE AND CONTACT GEOMETRY

In this section we make use of the results of [Po5] to give examples of computations of the noncommutative residues of geometric operators on contact manifolds.

Throughout this section we let (M^{2n+1}, H) denote a compact orientable contact manifold, i.e., (M^{2n+1}, H) is a Heisenberg manifold and there exists a real 1-form θ on M such that $H = \ker \theta$ and $d\theta|_H$ is nondegenerate. Such a form is called a contact form. Since M is orientable the hyperplane H admits an almost complex structure $J \in C^\infty(M, \text{End } H)$, $J^2 = -1$, which is calibrated with respect to θ , i.e., we have $d\theta(X, JX) > 0$ for any $X \in C^\infty(M, H \setminus 0)$. We then can endow M with the Riemannian metric

$$(5.1) \quad g_{\theta, J} = \theta^2 + d\theta(\cdot, J\cdot).$$

The volume of M with respect to $g_{\theta, J}$ depends only on θ and is equal to

$$(5.2) \quad \text{Vol}_\theta M := \frac{1}{n!} \int_M d\theta^n \wedge \theta.$$

In addition, we let X_0 be the Reeb vector field associated to θ , so that $\iota_{X_0}\theta = 1$ and $\iota_{X_0}d\theta = 0$.

5.1. Noncommutative residue and the horizontal sublaplacian (contact case). We identify H^* with the subbundle of T^*M annihilating the orthogonal supplement H^\perp . Then we get the orthogonal splitting,

$$(5.3) \quad \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}} T^*M = \left(\bigoplus_{0 \leq k \leq 2n} \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^k H^* \right) \oplus (\theta \wedge \Lambda^* T_{\mathbb{C}}^* M).$$

The horizontal differential $d_{b; k} : C^\infty(M, \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^k H^*) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+1} H^*)$ is

$$(5.4) \quad d_b = \pi_{b; k+1} \circ d,$$

where $\pi_{b; k} \in C^\infty(M, \text{End } \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}} T^*M)$ denotes the orthogonal projection onto $\Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^k H^*$. This is not the differential of a chain complex, for we have

$$(5.5) \quad d_b^2 = -\mathcal{L}_{X_0} \varepsilon(d\theta) = -\varepsilon(d\theta) \mathcal{L}_{X_0},$$

where $\varepsilon(d\theta)$ denotes the exterior multiplication by $d\theta$.

The horizontal sublaplacian $\Delta_{b; k} : C^\infty(M, \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^k H^*) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+1} H^*)$ is

$$(5.6) \quad \Delta_{b; k} = d_{b; k}^* d_{b; k} + d_{b; k-1} d_{b; k-1}^*.$$

Notice that the definition of Δ_b makes sense on any Heisenberg manifold equipped with a Riemannian metric. This operator was first introduced by Tanaka [Ta], but versions of this operator acting on functions were independently defined by Greenleaf [Gr] and Lee [Le]. Since the fact that (M, H) is a contact manifold implies that the Levi form (2.1) is nondegenerate, from [Po5, Prop. 3.5.4] we get:

Proposition 5.1. *The principal symbol of $\Delta_{b; k}$ is invertible iff we have $k \neq n$.*

Next, for $\mu \in (-n, n)$ we let

$$(5.7) \quad \rho(\mu) = \frac{\pi^{-(n+1)}}{2^n n!} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\mu \xi_0} \left(\frac{\xi_0}{\sinh \xi_0} \right)^n d\xi_0.$$

Notice that with the notation of [Po5, Eq. (6.2.29)] we have $\rho(\mu) = (2n+2)\nu(\mu)$. For $q \neq n$ let $\nu_0(\Delta_{b; k})$ be the coefficient $\nu_0(P)$ in the Weyl asymptotics (4.32) for

$\Delta_{b;k}$, i.e., we have $\text{Res } \Delta_{b;k}^{-(n+1)} = (2n+2)\nu_0(\Delta_{b;k})$. By [Po5, Prop. 6.3.3] we have $\nu_0(\Delta_{b;k}) = \tilde{\gamma}_{nk} \text{Vol}_\theta M$, where

$$(5.8) \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{nk} = \sum_{p+q=k} 2^n \binom{n}{p} \binom{n}{q} \nu(p-q).$$

Therefore, we obtain:

Proposition 5.2. *For $k \neq n$ we have*

$$(5.9) \quad \text{Res } \Delta_{b;k}^{-(n+1)} = \gamma_{nk} \text{Vol}_\theta M, \quad \gamma_{nk} = \sum_{p+q=k} 2^n \binom{n}{p} \binom{n}{q} \rho(p-q).$$

5.2. Noncommutative residue and the contact Laplacian. The contact complex of Rumin [Ru] can be seen as an attempt to get a complex of horizontal forms by forcing the equalities $d_b^2 = 0$ and $(d_b^*)^2 = 0$. Because of (5.5) there are two natural ways to modify d_b to get a chain complex. The first one is to force the equality $d_b^2 = 0$ by restricting d_b to the subbundle $\Lambda_2^* := \ker \varepsilon(d\theta) \cap \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^* H^*$, since the latter is closed under d_b and is annihilated by d_b^2 . Similarly, we get the equality $(d_b^*)^2 = 0$ by restricting d_b^* to the subbundle $\Lambda_1^* := \ker \iota(d\theta) \cap \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^* H^* = (\text{im } \varepsilon(d\theta))^\perp \cap \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^* H^*$, where $\iota(d\theta)$ denotes the interior product with $d\theta$. This amounts to replace d_b by $\pi_1 \circ d_b$, where π_1 is the orthogonal projection onto Λ_1^* .

In fact, since $d\theta$ is nondegenerate on H the operator $\varepsilon(d\theta) : \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^k H^* \rightarrow \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^{k+2} H^*$ is injective for $k \leq n-1$ and surjective for $k \geq n+1$. This implies that $\Lambda_2^k = 0$ for $k \leq n$ and $\Lambda_1^k = 0$ for $k \geq n+1$. Therefore, we only have two halves of complexes. As observed by Rumin [Ru] we get a full complex by connecting the two halves by means of the operator $B_R : C^\infty(M, \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^n H^*) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^n H^*)$ such that

$$(5.10) \quad B_R = \mathcal{L}_{X_0} + d_{b,n-1} \varepsilon(d\theta)^{-1} d_{b,n},$$

where $\varepsilon(d\theta)^{-1}$ is the inverse of $\varepsilon(d\theta) : \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^{n-1} H^* \rightarrow \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^{n+1} H^*$. Notice that $D_{R;n}$ is second order differential operator. Thus, if we let $\Lambda^k = \Lambda_1^k$ for $k = 0, \dots, n-1$ and $\Lambda^k = \Lambda_1^k$ for $k = n+1, \dots, 2n$ then we get the contact complex,

$$(5.11) \quad C^\infty(M) \xrightarrow{d_{R;0}} C^\infty(M, \Lambda^1) \xrightarrow{d_{R;1}} \dots C^\infty(M, \Lambda^{n-1}) \xrightarrow{d_{R;n-1}} C^\infty(M, \Lambda_1^n) \xrightarrow{B_R} C^\infty(M, \Lambda_2^n) \xrightarrow{d_{R;n}} C^\infty(M, \Lambda^{n+1}) \dots \xrightarrow{d_{R;2n-1}} C^\infty(M, \Lambda^{2n}),$$

where $d_{R;k} = \pi_1 \circ d_{b;k}$ for $k = 0, \dots, n-1$ (so that $d_{R;k+1}^* = d_{b;k+1}^*$) and $d_{R;k} = d_{b;k}$ for $k = n, \dots, 2n-1$.

The contact Laplacian is defined as follows. In degree $k \neq n$ this is the differential operator $\Delta_{R;k} : C^\infty(M, \Lambda^k) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \Lambda^k)$ such that

$$(5.12) \quad \Delta_{R;k} = \begin{cases} (n-k)d_{R;k-1}d_{R;k}^* + (n-k+1)d_{R;k+1}^*d_{R;k} & k = 0, \dots, n-1, \\ (k-n-1)d_{R;k-1}d_{R;k}^* + (k-n)d_{R;k+1}^*d_{R;k} & k = n+1, \dots, 2n. \end{cases}$$

For $k = n$ we have the differential operators $\Delta_{R;nj} : C^\infty(M, \Lambda_j^n) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \Lambda_j^n)$, $j = 1, 2$, given by the formulas,

$$(5.13) \quad \Delta_{R;n1} = (d_{R;n-1}d_{R;n}^*)^2 + B_R^*B_R, \quad \Delta_{R;n2} = B_RB_R^* + (d_{R;n+1}^*d_{R;n}).$$

Observe that $\Delta_{R;k}$, $k \neq n$, is a differential operator of order 2, whereas $\Delta_{R;n1}$ and $\Delta_{R;n2}$ are differential operators of order 4. Moreover, Rumin [Ru] proved that in every degree the contact Laplacian is maximal hypoelliptic in the sense of [HN].

In fact, in every degree the contact Laplacian has an invertible principal symbol, hence admits a parametrix in the Heisenberg calculus (see [JK], [Po5, Sect. 3.5]).

For $k \neq n$ and $j = 1, 2$ let $\nu_0(\Delta_{R;k})$ and $\nu_0(\Delta_{R;nj})$ be the coefficients $\nu_0(P)$ in the Weyl asymptotics (4.32) for $\Delta_{R;k}$ and $\Delta_{R;nj}$. Then we have $\text{Res } \Delta_{R;k}^{-(n+1)} = (2n + 2)\nu_0(\Delta_{R;k})$ and $\text{Res } \Delta_{R;nj}^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} = (2n + 2)\nu_0(\Delta_{R;nj})$. Moreover, by [Po5, Thm. 6.3.4] there exist universal positive constants ν_{nk} and $\nu_{n,j}$ depending only on n, k and j such that $\nu_0(\Delta_{R;k}) = \nu_{nk} \text{Vol}_\theta M$ and $\nu_0(\Delta_{R;nj}) = \nu_{n,j} \text{Vol}_\theta M$. Therefore, we obtain:

Proposition 5.3. 1) For $k \neq n$ there exists a universal constant $\rho_{nk} > 0$ depending only on n and k such that we have

$$(5.14) \quad \text{Res } \Delta_{R;k}^{-(n+1)} = \rho_{nk} \text{Vol}_\theta M.$$

2) For $j = 1, 2$ there exists a universal constant $\rho_{n,j} > 0$ depending only on n and j such that we have

$$(5.15) \quad \text{Res } \Delta_{R;nj}^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} = \rho_{n,j} \text{Vol}_\theta M.$$

Remark 5.4. We have $\rho_{nk} = (2n + 2)\nu_{nk}$ and $\rho_{n,j} = (2n + 2)\nu_{n,j}$, so it follows from the proof of [Po5, Thm. 6.3.4] that we can explicitly relate the universal constants ρ_{nk} and $\rho_{n,j}$ to the fundamental solutions of the heat operators $\Delta_{R;k} + \partial_t$ and $\Delta_{R;nj} + \partial_t$ associated to the contact Laplacian on the Heisenberg group \mathbb{H}^{2n+1} (cf. [Po5, Eq. (6.3.18)]). For instance, if $K_{0;k}(x, t)$ denotes the fundamental solution of $\Delta_{R;0} + \partial_t$ on \mathbb{H}^{2n+1} then we have $\rho_{n,0} = \frac{2^n}{n!} K_0(0, 1)$.

6. APPLICATIONS IN CR GEOMETRY

In this section we present several applications in CR geometry of the noncommutative residue for Heisenberg manifolds. After recalling the geometric set-up we give some examples of geometric computations of noncommutative residues of suitable powers of the horizontal sublaplacian and of the Kohn Laplacian. We then show that the logarithmic singularities of the Green kernels of the Gover-Graham are geometric local CR invariants. Finally, we make use of framework of noncommutative geometry and of our noncommutative residue to define lower dimensional volumes in CR, e.g., we can give sense to the area of any 3-dimensional CR manifold endowed with a pseudohermitian structure as the integral of the Tanaka-Webster scalar curvature. Incidentally, we obtain a spectral interpretation of the Einstein-Hilbert action in CR geometry.

6.1. The geometric set-up. Let (M^{2n+1}, H) be a compact orientable CR manifold. Thus (M^{2n+1}, H) is a Heisenberg manifold such that H admits a complex structure $J \in C^\infty(M, H)$, $J^2 = -1$, so that $T_{1,0} := \ker(J + i) \subset T_{\mathbb{C}}M$ is a complex rank n subbundle which is integrable in Fröbenius' sense, i.e., $C^\infty(M, T_{1,0})$ is closed under the Lie bracket of vector fields. In addition, we let $T_{0,1} = \overline{T_{1,0}} = \ker(J - i)$.

Since M is orientable and H is orientable by means of its complex structure, there exists a global non-vanishing real 1-form θ such that $H = \ker \theta$. Associated to θ is its Levi form, i.e., the Hermitian form on $T_{1,0}$ such that

$$(6.1) \quad L_\theta(Z, W) = -id\theta(Z, \overline{W}) \quad \forall Z, W \in C^\infty(M, T_{1,0}).$$

Definition 6.1. We say that M is strictly pseudoconvex (resp. κ -strictly pseudoconvex) when we can choose θ so that L_θ is positive definite (resp. has signature $(n - \kappa, \kappa, 0)$) at every point.

In particular, if (M, H) is κ -strictly pseudoconvex then θ is a contact form and so (M, H) is a contact manifold. Then in the terminology of [We] the datum of the contact form θ annihilating H defines a pseudohermitian structure on M .

From now we assume that M is κ -strictly pseudoconvex and that θ is such that L_θ has everywhere signature $(n - \kappa, \kappa, 0)$. In particular, since θ is a contact form, there exists a unique vector field X_0 , called the Reeb vector field, such that $\iota_{X_0}\theta = 1$ and $\iota_{X_0}d\theta = 0$. We let $\mathcal{N} \subset T_{\mathbb{C}}M$ be the complex line bundle spanned by X_0 . We then endow M with a Levi metric as follows. We always can construct a splitting $T_{1,0} = T_{1,0}^+ \oplus T_{1,0}^-$ with subbundles $T_{1,0}^+$ and $T_{1,0}^-$ which are orthogonal with respect to L_θ and such that L_θ is positive definite on $T_{1,0}^+$ and negative definite on $T_{1,0}^-$ (see, e.g., [FSt], [Po5]). Let $T_{0,1}^\pm = \overline{T_{1,0}^\pm}$. Then we have the splittings,

$$(6.2) \quad T_{\mathbb{C}}M = \mathcal{N} \oplus T_{1,0} \oplus T_{0,1} = \mathcal{N} \oplus T_{1,0}^+ \oplus T_{1,0}^- \oplus T_{0,1}^+ \oplus T_{0,1}^-.$$

Associated to these splittings is the unique Hermitian metric h on $T_{\mathbb{C}}M$ such that:

- The splittings (6.2) are orthogonal with respect to θ ;
- h commutes with complex conjugation;
- We have $h(X_0, X_0) = 1$ and h agrees with $\pm L_\theta$ on $T_{1,0}^\pm$.

In particular, the matrix of L_θ with respect to h is $\text{diag}(1, \dots, 1, -1, \dots, -1)$, where 1 has multiplicity $n - \kappa$ and -1 multiplicity κ . Such a metric is called a *Levi metric*.

Notice that when M is strictly pseudoconvex h is uniquely determined by θ , since in this case $T_{1,0}^+ = T_{1,0}$ and one can check that we have $h = \theta^2 + d\theta(\cdot, J\cdot)$, that is, h agrees on TM with the Riemannian metric $g_{\theta, J}$ from (5.1). In general, we can check that the volume form of M with respect to h depends only on θ and is equal to

$$(6.3) \quad \text{vol}_\theta(x) := \frac{(-1)^\kappa}{n!} d\theta^n \wedge \theta.$$

In particular, the volume of M agrees with

$$(6.4) \quad \text{Vol}_\theta M := \frac{(-1)^\kappa}{n!} \int_M d\theta^n \wedge \theta.$$

Finally, as proved by Tanaka [Ta] and Webster [We] the datum of the pseudohermitian contact form θ defines a natural connection, the Tanaka-Webster connection, which preserves the pseudohermitian structure of M , i.e., preserves both θ and J . It can be defined as follows.

Let $\{Z_j\}$ be a frame of $T_{1,0}$. Then $\{X_0, Z_j, \bar{Z}_j\}$ forms a frame of $T_{\mathbb{C}}M$ with dual coframe $\{\theta, \theta^j, \bar{\theta}^j\}$ with respect to which we can write $d\theta = i h_{j\bar{k}} \theta^j \wedge \bar{\theta}^k$. Using the matrix $(h_{j\bar{k}})$ and its inverse $(h^{j\bar{k}})$ to raise and lower indices, the connection 1-form $\omega = (\omega_j^k)$ and the torsion form $\tau_k = A_{jk} \theta^j$ of the Tanaka-Webster connection are uniquely determined by the relations,

$$(6.5) \quad d\theta^k = \theta^j \wedge \omega_j^k + \theta \wedge \tau^k, \quad \omega_{j\bar{k}} + \omega_{\bar{k}j} = dh_{j\bar{k}}, \quad A_{jk} = A_{kj}.$$

The components of the curvature tensor $\Pi_j^k = d\omega_j^k - \omega_j^l \wedge \omega_l^k$ satisfy the structure equations,

$$(6.6) \quad \Pi_j^k = R_{j\bar{l}\bar{m}}^k \theta^l \wedge \theta^{\bar{m}} + W_{jl}^k \theta^l \wedge \theta - W_{j\bar{l}}^k \theta^{\bar{l}} \wedge \theta + i\theta_j \wedge \tau^k - i\tau^j \wedge \theta^k$$

The Ricci and scalar curvatures of the Tanaka-Webster connection then are:

$$(6.7) \quad R_{j\bar{k}} = R_{l\bar{j}\bar{k}}^l \quad \text{and} \quad R_n = R_j^j = h^{j\bar{k}} R_{j\bar{k}}.$$

6.2. Noncommutative residue and the Kohn Laplacian. The $\bar{\partial}_b$ -complex of Kohn-Rossi ([KR], [Ko]) is defined as follows. For $p, q = 0, \dots, n$ let $\Lambda^{p,q} = (\Lambda^{1,0})^p \wedge (\Lambda^{0,1})^q$ be the bundle of (p, q) -covectors, where $\Lambda^{1,0}$ and $\Lambda^{0,1}$ are the annihilators in $T_{\mathbb{C}}^*M$ of $T_{0,1} \oplus \mathcal{N}$ and $T_{1,0} \oplus \mathcal{N}$ respectively. Then we get the orthogonal decomposition,

$$(6.8) \quad \Lambda^* T_{\mathbb{C}}^* M = \left(\bigoplus_{p,q=0}^n \Lambda^{p,q} \right) \oplus (\theta \wedge \Lambda^* T_{\mathbb{C}}^* M).$$

Thanks to the integrability of $T_{1,0}$ for any $\eta \in C^\infty(M, \Lambda^{p,q})$ we can uniquely decompose $d\eta$ as

$$(6.9) \quad d\eta = \bar{\partial}_{b;p,q}\eta + \partial_{b;p,q}\eta + \theta \wedge \mathcal{L}_{X_0}\eta,$$

where $\bar{\partial}_{b;p,q}\eta$ and $\partial_{b;p,q}\eta$ are sections of $\Lambda^{p,q+1}$ and $\Lambda^{p+1,q}$ respectively.

The integrability of $T_{1,0}$ further implies that $\bar{\partial}_b^2 = 0$ on $(0, q)$ -forms, so that we get the cochain complex $\bar{\partial}_{b;0,*} : C^\infty(M, \Lambda^{0,*}) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \Lambda^{0,*+1})$. More generally, the operator $\bar{\partial}_b^2$ is a tensor on (p, q) -forms with $p \geq 1$ and, as the hyperplane H is invariant under the Reeb flow, this tensor vanishes when the complex structure J too is invariant under the Reeb flow, i.e., when we have $[X_0, JX] = J[X_0, X]$ for any $X \in C^\infty(M, H)$.

Let $\bar{\partial}_{b;p,q}^*$ be the formal adjoint of $\bar{\partial}_{b;p,q}$ with respect to the Levi metric of M . Then the Kohn Laplacian $\square_{b;p,q} : C^\infty(M, \Lambda^{p,q}) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \Lambda^{p,q})$ is:

$$(6.10) \quad \square_{b;p,q} = \bar{\partial}_{b;p,q}^* \bar{\partial}_{b;p,q} + \bar{\partial}_{b;p,q-1} \bar{\partial}_{b;p,q-1}^*.$$

Proposition 6.2 ([BG]). *The principal symbol of $\square_{b;p,q}$ is invertible if, and only if, we have $q \neq \kappa$ and $q \neq n - \kappa$.*

Next, for $q \notin \{\kappa, n - \kappa\}$ let $\nu_0(\square_{b;p,q})$ be the coefficient $\nu_0(P)$ in the Weyl asymptotics (4.32) for $P = \square_{b;p,q}$. Then it follows from [BGS] and [Po5, Thm. 6.2.4] that we have $\nu_0(\square_{b;p,q}) = \tilde{\alpha}_{n\kappa pq} \text{Vol}_\theta M$, where $\tilde{\alpha}_{n\kappa pq}$ is equal to

$$(6.11) \quad \sum_{\max(0, q-\kappa) \leq k \leq \min(q, n-\kappa)} \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{p} \binom{n-\kappa}{k} \binom{\kappa}{q-k} \nu(n-2(\kappa-q+2k)).$$

Therefore, by arguing as in the proof of Proposition 5.2 we get:

Proposition 6.3. *For $q \neq \kappa$ and $q \neq n - \kappa$ we have*

$$(6.12) \quad \text{Res } \square_{b;p,q}^{-(n+1)} = \alpha_{n\kappa pq} \text{Vol}_\theta M,$$

where $\alpha_{n\kappa pq}$ is equal to

$$(6.13) \quad \sum_{\max(0, q-\kappa) \leq k \leq \min(q, n-\kappa)} \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{p} \binom{n-\kappa}{k} \binom{\kappa}{q-k} \rho(n-2(\kappa-q+2k)).$$

In particular $\alpha_{n\kappa pq}$ is a universal constant depending only on n, κ, p and q .

Remark 6.4. Let $a_0(\square_{b;p,q})(x)$ be the leading coefficient in the heat kernel asymptotics (4.3) for $\square_{b;p,q}$. By (4.4) we have $\nu_0(\square_{b;p,q}) = \frac{1}{(n+1)!} \int_M \text{tr}_{\Lambda^{p,q}} a_0(\square_{b;p,q})(x)$. Moreover, a careful look at the proof of [Po5, Thm. 6.2.4] shows that what is really carried out there is the computation of the density $\text{tr}_{\Lambda^{p,q}} a_0(\square_{b;p,q})(x)$, which gives

$$(6.14) \quad \text{tr}_{\Lambda^{p,q}} a_0(\square_{b;p,q})(x) = (n+1)! \tilde{\alpha}_{n\kappa pq} \text{vol}_\theta(x).$$

Since by (4.4) we have $2c_{\square_{b;p,q}^{-(n+1)}}(x) = (n!)^{-1} a_0(\square_{b;p,q})(x)$, it follows that the equality (6.12) ultimately holds at the level of densities, that is, we have

$$(6.15) \quad c_{\square_{b;p,q}^{-(n+1)}}(x) = \alpha_{n\kappa pq} \text{vol}_\theta(x).$$

Now, suppose that M is strictly pseudoconvex, i.e., we have $\kappa = 0$, and for $q = 1, \dots, n-1$ let $a_2(\square_{b;p,q})(x)$ be the coefficient of t^{-n} in the heat kernel asymptotics (4.3) for $\square_{b;p,q}$. By (4.4) we have $2c_{\square_{b;p,q}^{-n}}(x) = \Gamma(n)^{-1} a_2(\square_{b;p,q})(x)$ and by [BGS, Thm. 8.31] there exists a universal constant α'_{npq} depending only on n, p and q such that $a_2(\square_{b;p,q})(x) = \alpha'_{npq} R_n d\theta^n \wedge \theta$, where R_n is the Tanaka-Webster scalar curvature as in (6.7). Thus, we get:

Proposition 6.5. *Assume M strictly pseudoconvex. Then for $q = 1, \dots, n-1$ there exists a universal constant α'_{npq} depending only on n, p and q such that*

$$(6.16) \quad \text{Res } \square_{b;p,q}^{-n} = \alpha'_{npq} \int_M R_n d\theta^n \wedge \theta,$$

where R_n denotes the Tanaka-Webster scalar curvature of M .

6.3. Noncommutative residue and the horizontal sublaplacian (CR case).

Let us identify H^* with the subbundle of T^*M annihilating the orthogonal supplement H^\perp and let $\Delta_b : C^\infty(M, \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^* H^*) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^* H^*)$ be the horizontal sublaplacian on M as in (5.6). With the notation of (6.9) we have $d_b = \bar{\partial}_b + \partial_b$ and we can check that $\bar{\partial}_b \partial_b^* + \partial_b^* \bar{\partial}_b = \bar{\partial}_b^* \partial_b + \partial_b \bar{\partial}_b^* = 0$. Therefore, we get

$$(6.17) \quad \Delta_b = \square_b + \bar{\square}_b, \quad \bar{\square}_b = \partial_b^* \partial_b + \partial_b \bar{\partial}_b^*.$$

In particular, we see that Δ_b preserves the bidegree. We let $\Delta_{b;p,q} : C^\infty(M, \Lambda^{p,q}) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, \Lambda^{p,q})$ denote the horizontal sublaplacian acting on (p, q) -forms. Then:

Proposition 6.6 ([Po5, Prop. 3.5.6]). *The principal symbol of $\Delta_{b;p,q}$ is invertible if, and only if, we have $(p, q) \neq (\kappa, n - \kappa)$ and $(p, q) \neq (n - \kappa, \kappa)$.*

Bearing this in mind we have:

Proposition 6.7. *For $(p, q) \neq (\kappa, n - \kappa)$ and $(p, q) \neq (n - \kappa, \kappa)$ we have*

$$(6.18) \quad \text{Res } \Delta_{b;p,q}^{-(n+1)} = \beta_{n\kappa pq} \text{Vol}_\theta M,$$

where $\beta_{n\kappa pq}$ is equal to

$$(6.19) \quad \sum_{\substack{\max(0, q-\kappa) \leq k \leq \min(q, n-\kappa) \\ \max(0, p-\kappa) \leq l \leq \min(p, n-\kappa)}} 2^n \binom{n-\kappa}{l} \binom{\kappa}{p-l} \binom{n-\kappa}{k} \binom{\kappa}{q-k} \rho(2(q-p) + 4(l-k)).$$

In particular $\beta_{n\kappa pq}$ is a universal constant depending only on n, κ, p and q .

Proof. Let $\nu_0(\Delta_{b;p,q})$ be the coefficient $\nu_0(P)$ in the Weyl asymptotics (4.32) for $P = \Delta_{b;p,q}$. It follows from [Po5, Thm. 6.2.5] we have $\nu_0(\Delta_{b;p,q}) = \frac{1}{2n+2} \beta_{n\kappa pq} \text{Vol}_\theta M$, where $\beta_{n\kappa pq}$ is given by (6.19). Therefore, by arguing as in the proof of Proposition 5.2 we get $\text{Res } \Delta_{b;p,q}^{-(n+1)} = \beta_{n\kappa pq} \text{Vol}_\theta M$. \square

Remark 6.8. In the same way as in Remark 6.4 we can see that the equality (6.18) holds at the level of densities, i.e., we have $c_{\Delta_{b;p,q}^{-(n+1)}}(x) = \beta_{n\kappa pq} \text{vol}_\theta(x)$.

Proposition 6.9. *Assume that M is strictly pseudoconvex. Then for $(p, q) \neq (0, n)$ and $(p, q) \neq (n, 0)$ there exists a universal constant β'_{npq} depending only n, p and q such that*

$$(6.20) \quad \text{Res } \Delta_{b;p,q}^{-n} = \beta'_{npq} \int_M R_n d\theta^n \wedge \theta.$$

Proof. The same analysis as that of [BGS, Sect. 8] for the coefficients in the heat kernel asymptotics (4.3) for the Kohn Laplacian can be carried out for the coefficients in the heat kernel asymptotics of $\Delta_{b;p,q}$. In particular, if we let $a_2(\Delta_{b;p,q})(x)$ denote the coefficient of t^{-n} in the heat kernel asymptotics for $\Delta_{b;p,q}$ then there exists a universal constant $\tilde{\beta}_{npq}$ depending only on n, p and q such that $a_2(\Delta_{b;p,q})(x) = \tilde{\beta}_{npq} R_n d\theta^n \wedge \theta$. Combining this with the fact that $2c_{\Delta_{b;p,q}^{-n}}(x) = \Gamma(n)^{-1} a_2(\Delta_{b;p,q})(x)$ completes the proof of the proposition. \square

6.4. Lower dimensional volumes in CR geometry. Following an idea of Connes we can make use of the noncommutative residue for classical Ψ DOs to define lower dimensional dimensional volumes in Riemannian geometry, e.g., we can give sense to the area and the length of a Riemannian manifold even when the dimension is not 1 or 2 (see [Co3], [Po7]). We shall make use of the noncommutative residue for the Heisenberg calculus to define lower dimensional volumes in CR as follows.

In this subsection we assume that M is strictly pseudoconvex. In particular, the Levi metric h is uniquely determined by θ . In addition, we let $\Delta_{b;0}$ be the horizontal sublaplacian acting on functions. Then, as explained in Remark 6.8, we have $c_{\Delta_{b;0}^{-(n+1)}}(x) = \beta_n \text{vol}_\theta(x)$, where $\beta_n = \beta_{n000} = 2^n \rho(0)$. In particular, for any $f \in C^\infty(M)$ we get $c_{f\Delta_{b;0}^{-(n+1)}}(x) = \beta_n f(x) \text{vol}_\theta(x)$. Combining this with Theorem 4.12 then gives

$$(6.21) \quad \oint f \Delta_{b;0}^{-(n+1)} = \frac{1}{2n+2} \int_M c_{f\Delta_{b;0}^{-(n+1)}}(x) = \frac{\beta_n}{2n+2} \int_M f(x) \text{vol}_\theta(x).$$

Thus the operator $\frac{2n+2}{\beta_n} \Delta_{b;0}^{-(n+1)}$ allows us to recapture the volume form $\text{vol}_\theta(x)$.

Since $-(2n+2)$ is the critical order for a Ψ_H DO to be trace-class and M has Hausdorff dimension $2n+2$ with respect to the Carnot-Carathéodory metric defined by the Levi metric on H , it stands for reason to define the *length element* of (M, θ) as the positive selfadjoint operator ds such that $(ds)^{2n+2} = \frac{2n+2}{\beta_n} \Delta_{b;0}^{-(n+1)}$, that is,

$$(6.22) \quad ds := c_n \Delta_{b;0}^{-1/2}, \quad c_n = \left(\frac{2n+2}{\beta_n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2n+2}}.$$

Definition 6.10. *For $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2n+2$ the k -dimensional volume of (M, θ) is*

$$(6.23) \quad \text{Vol}_\theta^{(k)} M := \oint ds^k.$$

In particular, for $k = 2$ the area of (M, θ) is $\text{Area}_\theta M := \oint ds^2$.

We have $f ds^k = \frac{(c_n)^k}{2n+2} \int_M c_{\Delta_{b;0}^{-\frac{k}{2}}}(x)$ and thanks to (4.4) we know that $2c_{\Delta_{b;0}^{-\frac{k}{2}}}(x)$ agrees with $\Gamma(\frac{k}{2})^{-1} a_{2n+2-k}(\Delta_{b;0})(x)$, where $a_j(\Delta_{b;0})(x)$ denotes the coefficient of $t^{\frac{2n+2-j}{2}}$ in the heat kernel asymptotics (4.3) for $\Delta_{b;0}$. Thus,

$$(6.24) \quad \text{Vol}_\theta^{(k)} M = \frac{(c_n)^k}{4(n+1)} \Gamma(\frac{k}{2})^{-1} \int_M a_{2n+2-k}(\Delta_b)(x).$$

Since $\Delta_{b;0}$ is a differential operator we have $a_{2j-1}(\Delta_{b;0})(x) = 0$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, so $\text{Vol}_\theta^{(k)} M$ vanishes when k is odd. Furthermore, as alluded to in the proof of Proposition 6.9 the analysis in [BGS, Sect. 8] of the coefficients of the heat kernel asymptotics for the Kohn Laplacian applies *verbatim* to the heat kernel asymptotics for the horizontal sublaplacian. Thus, we can write

$$(6.25) \quad a_{2j}(\Delta_{b;0})(x) = \gamma_{nj}(x) d\theta^n \wedge \theta(x),$$

where $\gamma_{nj}(x)$ is a local scalar pseudohermitian invariant of weight j depending only on n and j , i.e., $\gamma_{nj}(x)$ is a linear combination depending only on n and j of complete contractions of weight j in the covariant derivatives of the curvature and torsion tensors of the Tanaka-Webster connection. In particular, we have $\gamma_{n0}(x) = \gamma_{n0}$ and $\gamma_{n1} = \gamma'_{n1} R_n(x)$, where γ_{n0} and γ_{n1} are universal constants and $R_n(x)$ is the Tanaka-Webster scalar curvature (in fact the constants γ_{n0} and γ'_{n1} can be explicitly related to the constants β_{n000} and β'_{n00}). Therefore, we obtain:

Proposition 6.11. 1) $\text{Vol}_\theta^{(k)} M$ vanishes when k is odd.

2) When k is even we have

$$(6.26) \quad \text{Vol}_\theta^{(k)} M = \frac{(c_n)^k}{4(n+1)} \Gamma(\frac{k}{2})^{-1} \int_M \tilde{\gamma}_{nk}(x) d\theta^n \wedge \theta(x).$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}_{nk}(x) := \gamma_{nn+1-\frac{k}{2}}(x)$ is a universal linear combination, depending only on n and k , of complete contractions of weight $n+1-\frac{k}{2}$ of covariant derivatives of the curvature and torsion tensors of the Tanaka-Webster connection.

In particular, thanks to (6.26) we have a purely differential-geometric formulation of the k -dimensional volume $\text{Vol}_\theta^{(k)} M$. Moreover, for $k = 2n+2$ we get:

$$(6.27) \quad \text{Vol}_\theta^{(2n+2)} M = \frac{(c_n)^{2n+2}}{4(n+1)} \frac{\gamma_{n0}}{n!} \int_M d\theta^n \wedge \theta.$$

Since $\text{Vol}_\theta^{(2n+2)} M = \text{Vol}_\theta M = \frac{1}{n!} \int_M d\theta^n \wedge \theta$ we see that $(c_n)^{2n+2} = \frac{4(n+1)}{\gamma_{n0}}$, where γ_{n0} is above.

On the other hand, when $n = 1$ (i.e. $\dim M = 3$) and $k = 2$ we get

$$(6.28) \quad \text{Area}_\theta M = \gamma_1'' \int_M R_1 d\theta \wedge \theta, \quad \gamma_1'' := \frac{(c_1)^2}{8} \gamma_{11}' = \frac{\gamma_{11}'}{\sqrt{8}\gamma_{10}},$$

where γ_{11}' is above. To compute γ_1'' it is enough to compute γ_{10} and γ_{11}' in the special case of the unit sphere $S^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ equipped with its standard pseudohermitian structure, i.e., with the CR structure induced by the complex structure of \mathbb{C}^2 together with the contact form $\theta = \frac{i}{2}(z_1 d\bar{z}_1 + z_2 d\bar{z}_2)$.

First, the volume $\text{Vol}_\theta S^3$ is equal to

$$(6.29) \quad \int_{S^3} d\theta \wedge \theta = \frac{-1}{4} \int_{S^3} (z_2 dz_1 \wedge d\bar{z}_1 \wedge d\bar{z}_2 + z_1 dz_1 \wedge dz_2 \wedge d\bar{z}_2) = \pi^2.$$

Moreover, as by [We] we have $R_1 = 4$, we get

$$(6.30) \quad \int_{S^3} R_1 d\theta \wedge \theta = 4 \operatorname{Vol}_\theta S^3 = 4\pi^2.$$

Next, for $j = 0, 1$ set $A_{2j}(\Delta_{b;0}) = \int_{S^3} a_{2j}(\Delta_{b;0})(x)$. In view of the definition of the constants γ_{10} and γ'_{11} we have

$$(6.31) \quad A_0(\Delta_{b;0}) = \gamma_{10} \int_{S^3} d\theta \wedge \theta = \pi^2 \gamma_{10}, \quad A_2(\Delta_{b;0}) = \gamma'_{11} \int_{S^3} R_1 d\theta \wedge \theta = 4\pi^2 \gamma'_{11}.$$

Notice that $A_0(\Delta_{b;0})$ and $A_2(\Delta_{b;0})$ are the coefficients of t^{-2} and t^{-1} in the asymptotics of $\operatorname{Tr} e^{-t\Delta_{b;0}}$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$. In the notation of (6.34) we have $\Delta_{b;0} = \square_\theta - \frac{1}{4}R_1 = \square_\theta - 1$ and by [St, Thm. 4.34] we have $\operatorname{Tr} e^{-t\square_\theta} = \frac{\pi^2}{16t^2} + O(t^\infty)$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$. Therefore, as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ we have

$$(6.32) \quad \operatorname{Tr} e^{-t\Delta_{b;0}} = e^t \operatorname{Tr} e^{-t\square_\theta} \sim \frac{\pi^2}{16t^2} (1 + t + \frac{t^2}{2} + \dots).$$

Hence $A_0(\Delta_{b;0}) = A_2(\Delta_{b;0}) = \frac{\pi^2}{16}$. Combining this with (6.31) then shows that $\gamma_{10} = \frac{1}{16}$ and $\gamma'_{11} = \frac{1}{64}$, from which we get $\gamma''_1 = \frac{1/64}{\sqrt{8 \cdot \frac{1}{16}}} = \frac{1}{32\sqrt{2}}$. Therefore, we get:

Theorem 6.12. *If $\dim M = 3$, then we have*

$$(6.33) \quad \operatorname{Area}_\theta M = \frac{1}{32\sqrt{2}} \int_M R_1 d\theta \wedge \theta.$$

For instance, for S^3 equipped with its standard pseudohermitian structure we obtain $\operatorname{Area}_\theta S^3 = \frac{\pi^2}{8\sqrt{2}}$.

6.5. Local CR invariants of hypoelliptic operators. In [Po7] it has been shown that the coefficients of the logrightmic singularities of the Green kernels of the conformal powers of Laplacian, i.e., the operators of [GJMS], are local conformal invariants in the sense of [FG] and can actually be written as linear combinations of complete contractions of the covariant derivatives of the curvature tensor of the ambient metric of Fefferman-Graham. We shall now prove the analogous result in CR geometry, namely, for the logarithmic singularities of the Green kernels of the operators of Gover-Graham [GG], which are the CR analogues of the GJMS operators.

Throughout this subsection we assume M strictly pseudoconvex. In order to study the analogue in CR geometry of the Yamabe problem, Jerison-Lee [JL] introduced a CR invariant version of the horizontal sublaplacian $\Delta_{b;0}$ as the operator $\square_\theta : C^\infty(M) \rightarrow C^\infty(M)$ given by

$$(6.34) \quad \square_\theta = \Delta_{b;0} + \frac{n}{n+2} R_n,$$

so that under a conformal change $\theta \rightarrow e^{2f}\theta$ with $f \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R})$ we have

$$(6.35) \quad \square_{e^{2f}\theta} = e^{-(n+2)f} \square_\theta e^{nf}.$$

The construction of Jerison-Lee has been generalized by Gover-Graham [GG], who produced CR analogues of the GJMS operators of conformal geometry. For $k = 1, \dots, n+1$ and for $k = n+2, n+4, \dots$ their constructions yield a selfadjoint differential operator, $\square_\theta^{(k)} : C^\infty(M) \rightarrow C^\infty(M)$ such that

$$(6.36) \quad \square_{e^{2f}\theta}^{(k)} = e^{-(n+1+k)f} \square_\theta^{(k)} e^{(n+1-k)f} \quad \forall f \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}).$$

We make the convention that for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n+1$ the operator $\square_\theta^{(k)}$ corresponds to the operator $P_{w,w}$ of [GG] with $w = \frac{k-1-n}{2}$ under the canonical trivializations of the density bundles $\mathcal{E}(w, w) = |\Lambda^{n,n}|^w$ coming from the trivialization of $\Lambda^{n,n}$ provided by $\frac{1}{n!}d\theta^n$. For $k = n+2, n+4, \dots$ the operator $\square_\theta^{(k)}$ similarly corresponds to the operator $\mathcal{P}_{w,w}$ of [GG] with $w = \frac{k-1-n}{2}$. The operator $P_{w,w}$ is obtained by pushing down to M the GJMS operator of order k on the associated Fefferman bundle, while $\mathcal{P}_{w,w}$ is constructed by making use of the CR tractor calculus. In particular, for $k = 1$ the operator $\square_\theta^{(1)}$ agrees with the conformal sublaplacian of Jerison-Lee. In any case $\square_\theta^{(k)}$ has same principal part (in the Heisenberg sense) as

$$(6.37) \quad (\Delta_{b;0} + i(k-1)X_0)(\Delta_{b;0} + i(k-3)X_0) \cdots (\Delta_{b;0} - i(k-1)X_0).$$

In particular, unless for the value $k = n+1$ the operator $\square_\theta^{(k)}$ has an invertible principal symbol (see [Po5, Prop. 3.5.7]).

We let $\square_\theta^{(-k)}$ denote the partial inverse of $\square_\theta^{(k)}$. For $k \neq n+1$ this a Ψ_H DO of order $-2k$ and we have:

Proposition 6.13. *For $k = 1, \dots, n$ we have*

$$(6.38) \quad c_{\square_{e^{2f}\theta}^{(-k)}}(x) = e^{2kf(x)} c_{\square_\theta^{(-k)}}(x) \quad \forall f \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}).$$

Proof. Set $Q_\theta = \square_\theta^{(-k)}$ and let Π_θ be the orthogonal projection onto $\ker \square_\theta^{(k)}$. Then Π_θ is a smoothing operator such that $Q_\theta \square_\theta^{(k)} = \square_\theta^{(k)} Q_\theta = 1 - \Pi_\theta$.

Let $f \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R})$ and set $\tilde{Q} := e^{-(n+1-k)f} Q_\theta e^{(n+1+k)f}$. From (6.36) we get

$$(6.39) \quad \tilde{Q} \square_{e^{2f}\theta}^{(k)} = e^{-(n+1-k)f} Q_\theta \square_\theta^{(k)} e^{(n+1+k)f} = 1 - e^{-(n+1-k)f} \Pi_\theta e^{(n+1+k)f}.$$

Since $e^{-(n+1-k)f} \Pi_\theta e^{(n+1+k)f}$ is a smoothing operator, this shows that \tilde{Q} is a parametrix for $\square_{e^{2f}\theta}^{(k)}$. Thus $Q_{e^{2f}\theta}$ and \tilde{Q} agree up to a smoothing operator and we have $c_{Q_{e^{2f}\theta}}(x) = c_{\tilde{Q}}(x)$.

Next, let $k_{Q_\theta}(x, y)$ and $k_{\tilde{Q}}(x, y)$ denote the respective Schwartz kernels of Q_θ and \tilde{Q} . Then we have

$$(6.40) \quad \begin{aligned} k_{\tilde{Q}}(x, y) &= e^{-(n+1-k)f(x)} k_{Q_\theta}(x, y) e^{(n+1+k)f(y)} \\ &= e^{2kf(x)} k_{Q_\theta}(x, y) + e^{2kf(x)} r(x, y) k_{Q_\theta}(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

where we have let $r(x, y) = \exp[(n+1+k)(f(y) - f(x))] - 1$.

Let us work in a local Heisenberg chart $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Then, using the notation of Proposition 3.11, near the diagonal we have

$$(6.41) \quad k_{Q_\theta}(x, y) = \sum_{-2n \leq j \leq -1} a_j(x, \psi_x(y)) - c_{Q_\theta}(x) \log \|\psi_x(y)\| + O(1),$$

where $a_j \in C^\infty(U \times (\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus 0))$ is homogeneous of degree j with respect to y . Furthermore, since $r(x, x) = 0$ we also can write

$$(6.42) \quad r(x, y) = \sum_{1 \leq \langle \alpha \rangle < 2n} b_\alpha(x) \psi_x(y)^\alpha + \sum_{\langle \alpha \rangle = 2n} c_\alpha(x, y) \psi_x(y)^\alpha.$$

for some functions $b_\alpha(x)$ in $C^\infty(U)$ and $c_\alpha(x, y)$ in $C^\infty(U \times U)$.

Notice that near $y = x$ we have $\psi_x(y)^\alpha \log \|\psi_x(y)\| = O(1)$ for $\langle \alpha \rangle \geq 1$. Moreover, from (6.41) we see that if $\langle \alpha \rangle = 2n$ then $\psi_x(y)^\alpha k_{Q_\theta}(x, y)$ is bounded near $y = x$. Thus,

$$(6.43) \quad r(x, y)k_{Q_\theta}(x, y) = \sum_{-2n \leq j \leq -1} \sum_{1 \leq \langle \alpha \rangle - (j+1)} b_\alpha(x) \psi_x(y)^\alpha a_j(x, \psi_x(y)) + O(1).$$

In particular $r(x, y)k_{Q_\theta}(x, y)$ has no logarithmic singularity near the diagonal. Together with (6.40) this implies that the logarithmic singularity of $k_{\tilde{Q}}(x, y)$ agrees with that of $e^{2kf(x)}k_{Q_\theta}(x, y)$ and so we have $c_{\tilde{Q}} = e^{2kf(x)}c_{Q_\theta}(x)$. Since we know that $c_{Q_{e^{2f}\theta}}(x) = c_{\tilde{Q}}(x)$, we see that $c_{Q_{e^{2f}\theta}}(x) = e^{2kf(x)}c_{Q_\theta}(x)$. The proposition is thus proved. \square

Remark 6.14. The compactness of M in Proposition 6.13 is really not necessary, since we can replace $\square_\theta^{(-k)}$ by any parametrix $Q_\theta^{(-k)}$ of $\square_\theta^{(k)}$. The density $c_{Q_\theta^{(-k)}}(x)$ is independent of the choice of $Q_\theta^{(-k)}$ and agrees with $c_{\square_\theta^{(-k)}}(x)$ when M is compact. Then the arguments of the proof of Proposition 6.13 can be applied *mutatis mutandis* to show that $c_{\square_\theta^{(-k)}}(x)$ satisfies (6.38) even when M is noncompact.

Let $a_{2(n+1-k)}(\square_\theta^{(k)})(x)$ be the coefficient of t^{-1} in the heat kernel asymptotics (4.3) for $\square_\theta^{(k)}$. By (4.4) we have $2kc_{\square_\theta^{(-k)}}(x) = a_{2(n+1-k)}(\square_\theta^{(k)})(x)$, so from Proposition 6.13 we immediately get:

Corollary 6.15. *For $k = 1, \dots, n$ we have*

$$(6.44) \quad a_{2(n+1-k)}(\square_{e^{2f}\theta}^{(k)})(x) = e^{2kf(x)}a_{2(n+1-k)}(\square_\theta^{(k)})(x) \quad \forall f \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}).$$

Remark 6.16. For $k = 1$ this result was first proved by N.K. Stanton [St, Thm. 3.3].

Let Θ be the family of contact forms that are conformal multiples of θ .

Definition 6.17. 1) A family $(\mathcal{I}_{\theta'})_{\theta' \in \Theta} \subset C^\infty(M)$ is a local pseudohermitian invariant of weight w if $\mathcal{I}_{\theta'}(x)$ can be written as a linear combination in complete contractions of the covariant derivatives of the curvature and torsion forms of the Tanaka-Webster connection and if we have

$$(6.45) \quad \mathcal{I}_{\lambda\theta'}(x) = \lambda^{-w}\mathcal{I}_{\theta'}(x) \quad \forall \lambda > 0 \quad \forall \theta' \in \Theta.$$

2) A family $(\mathcal{I}_{\theta'})_{\theta' \in \Theta} \subset C^\infty(M)$ is a local CR invariant of weight w if this is a local pseudohermitian invariant of weight w and we have:

$$(6.46) \quad \mathcal{I}_{e^{2f}\theta}(x) = e^{-2wf(x)}\mathcal{I}_\theta(x) \quad \forall f \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}).$$

When M is a real hypersurface the above definition of a local CR invariant agrees with the definition in [Fe2] in terms of Chern-Moser invariants (with our convention about weight a local CR invariant that has weight w in the sense of (6.46) has weight $2w$ in [Fe2]). Motivated by the analysis of the Bergman kernel on strictly pseudoconvex domains of \mathbb{C}^{n+1} , Fefferman launched in [Fe2] a difficult program of determining all local CR invariants. The original idea of Fefferman is that they should be expressed in terms of linear combinations of CR Weyl invariants obtained from Fefferman's ambient Kähler-Lorentz metric as follows.

Let $\mathcal{K}^* = (\Lambda^{n,0}) \setminus 0$ be the canonical line bundle of M minus the zero section. The Fefferman space of M is the total space of the circle bundle $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{K}^*/\mathbb{R}_+^*$. It carries a natural Lorentzian metric g whose conformal class depends only on the CR

structure of M (see [Fe1], [Le]). More precisely under a conformal change $\theta \rightarrow e^{2f}\theta$, with $f \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R})$, the metric g becomes $e^{2f}g$. Moreover, the curvature tensor of g can be explicitly related to the curvature and torsion tensors of the Tanaka-Webster connection (see [Le]). Therefore, any local conformal invariant of \mathcal{F} of weight w in the sense of [FG] gives rise to a CR invariant on M .

Let \mathcal{G} be the \mathbb{R}_+ -ray bundle defined by the conformal class of the metric g . We identify \mathcal{G} with the hypersurface $\mathcal{G} \times \{0\}$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} := \mathcal{G} \times (-1, 1)$. The space $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is Fefferman's ambient space and Fefferman constructed the ambient metric as the Kähler-Lorentz metric \tilde{g} on $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ that satisfies the Einstein's equation $\text{Ric}(\tilde{g}) = 0$ up to order $2n + 2$ in the direction transverse to \mathcal{G} . Because \mathcal{G} depends only on the conformal structure of \mathcal{F} and \tilde{g} is naturally related to g , any complete contraction of weight w of covariant derivatives of the curvature tensor of \tilde{g} restricts to \mathcal{G} to a local conformal invariant of weight w , which then gives rise to a local CR invariant of weight w . The local CR invariants arising in this way are called *Weyl CR invariants*. Fefferman [Fe2] proved that any local CR invariant of weight $w \leq n - 19$ is a linear combination of Weyl CR invariants and the result was extended by Bailey-Eastwood-Graham [BEG, Thm. 10.1] to local CR invariants of weight $w \leq n + 1$.

Now, set $c_{\square_\theta^{(-k)}}(x) = c_{nk}(x)d\theta^n \wedge \theta$ and $a_{2(n+1-k)}(\square_\theta^{(k)})(x) = a_{nk}(x)\theta \wedge d\theta^n$. Then we have $2kc_{nk}(x) = a_{nk}(x)$. Moreover, the analysis in [BGS] of the coefficients in the heat kernel asymptotics (4.3) for the Kohn Laplacian can be applied *mutatis mutandis* to the coefficients in the heat kernel asymptotics for the Gover-Graham operator $\square_\theta^{(k)}$. In particular, we see that $a_{nk}(x)$ is a local pseudohermitian. Together with Proposition 6.13 this shows that c_{nk} is a local CR invariant of weight $n + 1 - k$. Because the weight is $\leq n + 1$ we may apply the result of Bailey-Eastwood-Graham [BEG, Thm. 10.1] to deduce that c_{nk} is a universal linear combinations of Weyl CR invariants. Therefore, we obtain:

Theorem 6.18. *The density $c_{\square_\theta^{(-k)}}(x)$ defined by the logarithmic singularity near the diagonal of the Green kernel of $\square_\theta^{(k)}$ is of the form*

$$(6.47) \quad c_{\square_\theta^{(-k)}}(x) = c_{nk}(x)d\theta^n \wedge \theta,$$

where $c_{nk}(x)$ is obtained from a universal linear combination, depending only on n and k , of complete contractions of weight $n + 1 - k$ of the covariant derivatives of Fefferman's ambient Kähler-Lorentz metric.

We can get a list of the complete contractions of the covariant derivatives of the ambient curvature tensor of weight ≤ 4 by looking at the list of them in [Gi] and by making use of the fact that the Ricci-flat condition $\text{Ric}(\tilde{g}) = 0$ implies the vanishing of all the contractions involving traces. For instance, the only complete contraction of weight 1 is the scalar curvature which vanishes, so there is no nonzero local CR invariant of weight 1, so that from Theorem 6.18 we get:

Proposition 6.19. *We have $c_{\square_\theta^{(-n)}}(x) = 0$, i.e., the Green kernel of $\square_\theta^{(n)}$ has no logarithmic singularity.*

Combining this with Proposition 4.4 immediately gives:

Corollary 6.20. *The zeta function $\zeta(\square_\theta^{(n)}; s)$ is always regular at $s = 1$.*

Remark 6.21. For $n = 1$ the above result also can be obtained from the vanishing in dimension 3 of $a_2(\square_\theta)(x)$ established by N.K. Stanton [St, Thm. 5.1].

APPENDIX. PROOF OF LEMMA 3.1

In this appendix, for reader's convenience we give a detailed proof of Lemma 3.1 about the extension of a homogeneous symbol on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus 0$ into a homogeneous distribution on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} .

Let $p \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus 0)$ be homogeneous of degree m , $m \in \mathbb{C}$, so that $p(\lambda\xi) = \lambda^m p(\xi)$ for any $\lambda > 0$. If $\Re m > -(d+2)$, then p is integrable near the origin, so it defines a tempered distribution which is its unique homogeneous extension.

If $\Re m \leq -(d+2)$ then we can extend p into $\tau \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ given by

$$(A.1) \quad \langle \tau, u \rangle = \int [u(\xi) - \psi(\|\xi\|) \sum_{\langle \alpha \rangle \leq k} \frac{\xi^\alpha}{\alpha!} u^{(\alpha)}(0)] p(\xi) d\xi, \quad u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}),$$

with $k \geq -(\Re m + d + 2)$ and $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ such that $\psi = 1$ near 0. For any $\lambda > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tau_\lambda, u \rangle - \lambda^m \langle \tau, u \rangle &= \lambda^{-(d+2)} \int [u(\lambda^{-1} \cdot \xi) - \psi(\|\xi\|) \sum_{\langle \alpha \rangle \leq k} \frac{\xi^\alpha \lambda^{-\langle \alpha \rangle}}{\alpha!} u^{(\alpha)}(0)] p(\xi) d\xi \\ &\quad - \lambda^m \int [u(\xi) - \psi(\|\xi\|) \sum_{\langle \alpha \rangle \leq k} \frac{\xi^\alpha}{\alpha!} u^{(\alpha)}(0)] p(\xi) d\xi, \\ &= \lambda^m \sum_{\langle \alpha \rangle \leq k} \frac{u^{(\alpha)}(0)}{\alpha!} \int [\psi(\|\xi\|) - \psi(\lambda\|\xi\|)] \xi^\alpha p(\xi) d\xi, \\ &= \lambda^m \sum_{\langle \alpha \rangle \leq k} \rho_\alpha(\lambda) c_\alpha(p) \langle \delta^{(\alpha)}, u \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_\alpha(p) = \frac{(-1)^{|\alpha|}}{\alpha!} \int_{\|\xi\|=1} \xi^\alpha p(\xi) i_E d\xi$ and $\rho_\alpha(\lambda) = \int_0^\infty \mu^{\langle \alpha \rangle + m + d + 2} (\psi(\mu) - \psi(\lambda\mu)) \frac{d\mu}{\mu}$ (as in the statement E is the vector field $2\xi_0 \partial_{\xi_0} + \xi_1 \partial_{\xi_1} + \dots + \xi_d \partial_{\xi_d}$).

Set $\lambda = e^s$ and assume that ψ is of the form $\psi(\mu) = h(\log \mu)$ with $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $h = 1$ near $-\infty$ and $h = 0$ near $+\infty$. Then, setting $a_\alpha = \langle \alpha \rangle + m + d + 2$, we get

$$(A.2) \quad \frac{d}{ds} \rho_\alpha(e^s) = \frac{d}{ds} \int_{-\infty}^\infty (h(t) - h(s+t)) e^{a_\alpha t} dt = -e^{-as} \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{a_\alpha t} h'(t) dt.$$

As $\rho_\alpha(1) = 0$ it follows that τ is homogeneous of degree m provided that

$$(A.3) \quad \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{at} h'(t) dt = 0 \quad \text{for } a = m + d + 2, \dots, m + d + 2 + k.$$

Next, if $g \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is such that $\int g(t) dt = 1$ then for any $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus 0$ we have

$$(A.4) \quad \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{at} \left(\frac{1}{a} g'(t) + g(t) \right) dt = 0.$$

Therefore, if $m \notin \mathbb{Z}$ then the equations (A.3) are satisfied by

$$(A.5) \quad h'(t) = \left[\prod_{a=m+d+2}^{m+d+2+k} \left(\frac{1}{a} \frac{d}{ds} + 1 \right) \right] g(t).$$

Since $\int_{-\infty}^\infty h'(t) dt = 1$ we see that the distribution τ defined by (A.1) with $\psi(\mu) = \int_{\log \mu}^\infty h'(t) dt$ is a homogeneous extension of p .

On the other hand, if $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is another homogeneous extension of $p(\xi)$ then $\tau - \tau_1$ is supported at the origin, so we have $\tau = \tilde{\tau} + \sum b_\alpha \delta^{(\alpha)}$ for some constants $b_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. As both τ and $\tilde{\tau}$ are homogeneous of degree m it follows that $\sum (\lambda^{-(d+2-\langle\alpha\rangle)} - \lambda^m) b_\alpha \delta^{(\alpha)} = 0$. Thus $b_\alpha = 0$ for all α and so $\tilde{\tau} = \tau$. Hence τ is the unique homogeneous extension of $p(\xi)$ on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} .

Now, assume that m is an integer $\leq -(d+2)$. Then in the formula (A.1) for τ we can set $k = -(m+d+2)$ and we can let ψ be of the form

$$(A.6) \quad \psi(\mu) = \int_{\log \mu}^{\infty} h'(t) dt, \quad h'(t) = \prod_{a=m+d+2}^{m+d+2+k} \left(\frac{1}{a} \frac{d}{dt} + 1 \right) g(t),$$

with $g \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that $\int g(t) dt = 1$. Then thanks to (A.2) and (A.4) we have $\rho_\alpha(\lambda) = 0$ for $\langle\alpha\rangle < -(m+d+2)$, while for $\langle\alpha\rangle = -(m+d+2)$ we get

$$(A.7) \quad \frac{d}{ds} \rho_\alpha(e^s) = \int h'(t) dt = \int g(t) dt = 1,$$

which gives $\rho_\alpha(e^s) = s$, that is, $\rho_\alpha(\lambda) = \log \lambda$. Thus,

$$(A.8) \quad \tau_\lambda = \lambda^m \tau + \lambda^m \log \lambda \sum_{\langle\alpha\rangle = -(m+d+2)} c_\alpha(p) \delta^{(\alpha)}, \quad \lambda > 0.$$

In particular, if all the coefficients $c_\alpha(p)$ with $\langle\alpha\rangle = -(m+d+2)$ vanish then τ is homogeneous of degree m .

Conversely, suppose that p admits a homogeneous extension $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. As $\tau - \tilde{\tau}$ is supported at 0, we can write $\tau = \tilde{\tau} + \sum b_\alpha \delta^{(\alpha)}$ with $b_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. Then for any $\lambda > 0$ the distribution $\tau_\lambda - \lambda^m \tilde{\tau}$ is equal to

$$(A.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\tau}_\lambda - \lambda^m \tilde{\tau} + \sum b_\alpha (\lambda^{-(\langle\alpha\rangle+d+2)} - \lambda^m) \delta^{(\alpha)} \\ = \sum_{\langle\alpha\rangle \neq -(m+d+2)} b_\alpha (\lambda^{-(\langle\alpha\rangle+d+2)} - \lambda^m) \delta^{(\alpha)}. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing this with (A.8) shows that $c_\alpha(p) = 0$ for $\langle\alpha\rangle = -(m+d+2)$. Therefore p admits a homogeneous extension if, and only if, all the coefficients $c_\alpha(p)$ with $\langle\alpha\rangle = -(m+d+2)$ vanish. The proof of Lemma 3.1 is thus achieved.

REFERENCES

- [BEG] Bailey, T.N.; Eastwood, M.G.; Graham, C.R.: *Invariant theory for conformal and CR geometries*. Ann. Math. **139** (1994) 491–552.
- [BG] Beals, R.; Greiner, P.C.: *Calculus on Heisenberg manifolds*. Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 119. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1988.
- [BGS] Beals, R.; Greiner, P.C. Stanton, N.K.: *The heat equation on a CR manifold*. J. Differential Geom. **20** (1984), no. 2, 343–387.
- [Be] Bellaïche, A.: *The tangent space in sub-Riemannian geometry*. Sub-Riemannian geometry, 1–78, Progr. Math., 144, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1996.
- [BGV] Berline, N.; Getzler, E.; Vergne, M.: *Heat kernels and Dirac operators*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 298. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- [Bi] Biquard, O.: *Métriques d'Einstein asymptotiquement symétriques*. Astérisque No. 265 (2000).
- [Bo] Bony, J.M: *Principe du maximum, inégalité de Harnack et unicité du problème de Cauchy pour les opérateurs elliptiques dégénérés*. Ann. Inst. Fourier **19** (1969) 277–304.
- [BdM] Boutet de Monvel, L.: *Hypoelliptic operators with double characteristics and related pseudo-differential operators*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **27** (1974), 585–639.

- [BGu] Boutet de Monvel, L.; Guillemin, V. *The spectral theory of Toeplitz operators*. Annals of Mathematics Studies, 99. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1981.
- [BGe] Brylinski, J.L.; Getzler, E.: *The homology of algebras of pseudodifferential symbols and the noncommutative residue*. *K-Theory* **1** (1987), no. 4, 385–403.
- [CGGP] Christ, M.; Geller, D.; Glowacki, P.; Polin, L.: *Pseudodifferential operators on groups with dilations*. *Duke Math. J.* **68** (1992) 31–65.
- [Co1] Connes, A.: *The action functional in noncommutative geometry*. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **117** (1988), no. 4, 673–683.
- [Co2] Connes, A.: *Noncommutative geometry*. Academic Press, Inc., San Diego, CA, 1994.
- [Co3] Connes, A.: *Gravity coupled with matter and the foundation of non-commutative geometry*. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **182** (1996), no. 1, 155–176.
- [CM] Connes, A.; Moscovici, H.: *The local index formula in noncommutative geometry*. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **5** (1995), no. 2, 174–243.
- [Di] Dixmier, J.: *Existence de traces non normales*. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B* **262** (1966) A1107–A1108.
- [Dy1] Dynin, A.: *Pseudodifferential operators on the Heisenberg group*. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **225** (1975) 1245–1248.
- [Dy2] Dynin, A.: *An algebra of pseudodifferential operators on the Heisenberg groups*. *Symbolic calculus*. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **227** (1976), 792–795.
- [ET] Eliashberg, Y.; Thurston, W.: *Confoliations*. University Lecture Series, 13, AMS, Providence, RI, 1998.
- [EM] Epstein, C.L.; Melrose, R.B.: *The Heisenberg algebra, index theory and homology*. Preprint, 1998. Available at <http://www-math.mit.edu/rbm>.
- [EMM] Epstein, C.L.; Melrose, R.B.; Mendoza, G.: *Resolvent of the Laplacian on strictly pseudoconvex domains*. *Acta Math.* **167** (1991), no. 1-2, 1–106.
- [FGLS] Fedosov, B.V.; Golse, F.; Leichtnam, E.; Schrohe, E.: *The noncommutative residue for manifolds with boundary*. *J. Funct. Anal.* **142** (1996), no. 1, 1–31.
- [Fe1] Fefferman, C.: *Monge-Ampère equations, the Bergman kernel, and geometry of pseudoconvex domains*. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **103** (1976), no. 2, 395–416.
- [Fe2] Fefferman, C.: *Parabolic invariant theory in complex analysis*. *Adv. in Math.* **31** (1979), no. 2, 131–262.
- [FG] Fefferman, C.; Graham, C.R.: *Conformal invariants*. *Élie Cartan et les Mathématiques d’Aujourd’hui*, Astérisque, hors série, (1985), 95–116.
- [FS] Fefferman, C.L.; Sánchez-Calle, A.: *Fundamental solutions for second order subelliptic operators*. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **124** (1986), no. 2, 247–272.
- [FSt] Folland, G.; Stein, E.M.: *Estimates for the $\bar{\partial}_b$ complex and analysis on the Heisenberg group*. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **27** (1974) 429–522.
- [Gi] Gilkey, P.B.: *Invariance theory, the heat equation, and the Atiyah-Singer index theorem*. Mathematics Lecture Series, 11. Publish or Perish, Inc., Wilmington, Del., 1984.
- [GK] Gohberg, I.C.; Kreĭn, M.G.: *Introduction to the theory of linear nonselfadjoint operators*. *Trans. of Math. Monographs* 18, AMS, Providence, 1969.
- [GG] Gover, A.R.; Graham, C.R.: *CR invariant powers of the sub-Laplacian*. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **583** (2005), 1–27.
- [GJMS] Graham, C.R.; Jenne, R.; Mason, L.J.; Sparling, G.A.: *Conformally invariant powers of the Laplacian. I. Existence*. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* **46** (1992), no. 3, 557–565.
- [Gr] Greenleaf, A.: *The first eigenvalue of a sub-Laplacian on a pseudo-Hermitian manifold*. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **10** (1985), no. 2, 191–217.
- [Gro] Gromov, M.: *Carnot-Carathéodory spaces seen from within*. *Sub-Riemannian geometry*, 79–323, *Progr. Math.*, 144, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1996.
- [Gu1] Guillemin, V.: *A new proof of Weyl’s formula on the asymptotic distribution of eigenvalues*. *Adv. in Math.* **55** (1985), no. 2, 131–160.
- [Gu2] Guillemin, V.W.: *Gauged Lagrangian distributions*. *Adv. Math.* **102** (1993), no. 2, 184–201.
- [Gu3] Guillemin, V.: *Residue traces for certain algebras of Fourier integral operators*. *J. Funct. Anal.* **115** (1993), no. 2, 391–417.
- [HN] Helffer, B.; Nourrigat, J.: *Hypoellipticité maximale pour des opérateurs polynômes de champs de vecteurs*. *Prog. Math.*, No. 58, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1986.

- [HS] Hilsaum, M.; Skandalis, G.: *Morphismes K -orientés d'espaces de feuilles et fonctorialité en théorie de Kasparov (d'après une conjecture d'A. Connes)*. Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **20** (1987), no. 3, 325–390.
- [Hi] Hirachi, K.: *Construction of boundary invariants and the logarithmic singularity of the Bergman kernel*. Ann. of Math. **151** (2000) 151–191.
- [Hö] Hörmander, L.: *Hypoelliptic second order differential equations*. Acta Math. **119** (1967), 147–171.
- [JL] Jerison, D.; Lee, J.M.: *The Yamabe problem on CR manifolds*. J. Differential Geom. **25** (1987), no. 2, 167–197.
- [JK] Julg, P.; Kasparov, G.: *Operator K -theory for the group $SU(n, 1)$* . J. Reine Angew. Math. **463** (1995), 99–152.
- [KW] Kalau, W.; Walze, M.: *Gravity, non-commutative geometry and the Wodzicki residue*. J. Geom. Phys. **16** (1995), no. 4, 327–344.
- [Ka] Kassel, C.: *Le résidu non commutatif (d'après M. Wodzicki)*. Séminaire Bourbaki, Vol. 1988/89. Astérisque No. 177-178, (1989), Exp. No. 708, 199–229.
- [Kas] Kastler, D.: *The Dirac operator and gravitation*. Comm. Math. Phys. **166** (1995), no. 3, 633–643.
- [Ko] Kohn, J.J.: *Boundaries of complex manifolds*. 1965 Proc. Conf. Complex Analysis (Minneapolis, 1964) pp. 81–94 Springer, Berlin
- [KR] Kohn, J.J.; Rossi, H.: *On the extension of holomorphic functions from the boundary of a complex manifold*. Ann. of Math. **81** (1965) 451–472.
- [KV] Kontsevich, M.; Vishik, S.: *Geometry of determinants of elliptic operators. Functional analysis on the eve of the 21st century*, Vol. 1 (New Brunswick, NJ, 1993), 173–197, Progr. Math., 131, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1995.
- [Le] Lee, J.M.: *The Fefferman metric and pseudo-Hermitian invariants*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **296** (1986), no. 1, 411–429.
- [Les] Lesch, M.: *On the noncommutative residue for pseudodifferential operators with log-polyhomogeneous symbols*. Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **17** (1999), no. 2, 151–187.
- [Ma] Machedon, M.: *Estimates for the parametrix of the Kohn Laplacian on certain domains*. Invent. Math. **91** (1988), no. 2, 339–364.
- [MMS] Mathai, V.; Melrose, R.; Singer, I.: *Fractional index theory*. E-print, arXiv, Feb. 04. To appear in J. Differential Geom..
- [MN] Melrose, R.; Nistor, V.: *Homology of pseudodifferential operators I. Manifolds with boundary*. Preprint, arXiv, June '96.
- [NSW] Nagel, A.; Stein, E.M.; Wainger, S.: *Balls and metrics defined by vector fields. I. Basic properties*. Acta Math. **155** (1985), no. 1-2, 103–147.
- [PR] Paycha, S.; Rosenberg, S.: *Curvature on determinant bundles and first Chern forms*. J. Geom. Phys. **45** (2003), no. 3-4, 393–429.
- [Po1] Ponge, R.: *Calcul fonctionnel sous-elliptique et résidu non commutatif sur les variétés de Heisenberg*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série I, **332** (2001) 611–614.
- [Po2] Ponge, R.: *Géométrie spectrale et formules d'indices locales pour les variétés CR et contact*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série I, **332** (2001) 735–738.
- [Po3] Ponge, R.: *Spectral asymmetry, zeta functions and the noncommutative residue*. Int. J. Math. **17** (2006), 1065–1090.
- [Po4] Ponge, R.: *The tangent groupoid of a Heisenberg manifold*. Pacific Math. J. **227** (2006) 151–175.
- [Po5] Ponge, R.: *Heisenberg calculus and spectral theory of hypoelliptic operators on Heisenberg manifolds*. E-print, arXiv, Sep. 05, 136 pages. To appear in Mem. Amer. Math. Soc..
- [Po6] Ponge, R.: *Noncommutative residue invariants for CR and contact manifolds*. E-print, arXiv, Oct. 05, 30 pages. To appear in J. Reine Angew. Math..
- [Po7] Ponge, R.: *Noncommutative residue, conformal invariants and lower dimensional volumes in Riemannian geometry*. E-print, arXiv, Apr. 06, 28 pages.
- [Po8] Ponge, R.: *Hypoelliptic functional calculus on Heisenberg manifolds. A resolvent approach*. In preparation.
- [Ro1] Rockland, C.: *Hypoellipticity on the Heisenberg group-representation-theoretic criteria*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **240** (1978) 1–52.
- [Ro2] Rockland, C.: *Intrinsic nilpotent approximation*. Acta Appl. Math. **8** (1987), no. 3, 213–270.

- [RS] Rothschild, L.; Stein, E.: *Hypoelliptic differential operators and nilpotent groups*. Acta Math. **137** (1976) 247–320.
- [Ru] Rumin, M.: *Formes différentielles sur les variétés de contact*. J. Differential Geom. **39** (1994), no.2, 281–330.
- [Sa] Sánchez-Calle, A.: *Fundamental solutions and geometry of the sum of squares of vector fields*. Invent. Math. **78** (1984), no. 1, 143–160.
- [Sc] Schrohe, E.: *Noncommutative residues and manifolds with conical singularities*. J. Funct. Anal. **150** (1997), no. 1, 146–174.
- [St] Stanton, N.K.: *Spectral invariants of CR manifolds*. Michigan Math. J. **36** (1989), no. 2, 267–288.
- [Ste] Stein, E.M.: *Some geometrical concepts arising in harmonic analysis*. GAFA 2000 (Tel Aviv, 1999). Geom. Funct. Anal. 2000, Special Volume, Part I, 434–453.
- [Ta] Tanaka, N.: *A differential geometric study on strongly pseudo-convex manifolds*. Lectures in Mathematics, Department of Mathematics, Kyoto University, No. 9. Kinokuniya Book-Store Co., Ltd., Tokyo, 1975.
- [Tay] Taylor, M.E.: *Noncommutative microlocal analysis. I*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 52 (1984), no. 313,
- [We] Webster, S.: *Pseudo-Hermitian structures on a real hypersurface*. J. Differential Geom. **13** (1978), no. 1, 25–41.
- [Va] Van Erp, E.: PhD thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 2005.
- [Vas] Vassout, S.: *Feuilletages et résidu non commutatif longitudinal*. PhD thesis, University of Paris 7, 2001.
- [Wo1] Wodzicki, M.: *Local invariants of spectral asymmetry*. Invent. Math. **75** (1984), no. 1, 143–177.
- [Wo2] Wodzicki, M.: *Spectral asymmetry and noncommutative residue* (in Russian), Habilitation Thesis, Steklov Institute, (former) Soviet Academy of Sciences, Moscow, 1984.
- [Wo3] Wodzicki, M.: *Noncommutative residue. I. Fundamentals. K-theory, arithmetic and geometry* (Moscow, 1984–1986), 320–399, Lecture Notes in Math., 1289, Springer, Berlin-New York, 1987.
- [Wo4] Wodzicki, M.: *The long exact sequence in cyclic homology associated with extensions of algebras*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **306** (1988), no. 9, 399–403.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, CANADA.

E-mail address: `ponge@math.toronto.edu`