

31. A Note on Regularity of Null Solutions

By Kenzo SHINKAI

Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Osaka Prefecture

(Comm. by Kinjirô KUNUGI, M.J.A., Feb. 13, 1967)

The object of this note is to show that every null solution of partial differential operators of a certain class belongs to the Gevrey class $G_x(0)$ with respect to the space variable. This gives a partial answer for Kumano-go's problem: "Is it possible to construct a null solution such that its derivative of some order has the discontinuity with respect to space-variables at some point (t_0, x_0) ?" H. Kumano-go [1].

Our results are stated in the following

Theorem. Let $L(\lambda, \zeta)$ be a polynomial in λ and ζ with constant coefficients and have the form

$$(1) \quad L(\lambda, \zeta) = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq j_0 \\ 0 \leq k \leq k_0}} a_{j,k} \lambda^j \zeta^k, \quad j_0 > 0, k_0 > 0, \text{ and } a_{j_0, k_0} = 1.$$

Let u be a distribution solution of the equation

$$(2) \quad L\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)u = 0$$

in R^2 . If u vanish when $t \leq 0$ and if there exist an open neighbourhood of the t -axis where $(\partial^k/\partial x^k)u$ for $0 \leq k \leq k_0 - 1$ be functions which are continuously differentiable with respect to t for j_0 times.

Then u is a continuous function of t and x which is entire with respect to x , and satisfies the following inequality

$$(3) \quad \left| \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} u(t, x) \right| \leq C_0^{k+1} e^{C_1 |x|}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \quad t \leq T,$$

where C_0 and C_1 are constants which are independent of k and x .

Remark 1. The telegraph equation

$$u_{tt} = u_{xx} - r^2 u \quad (r = \text{constant})$$

can easily be transformed into an operator of the form (1) by introducing new independent variables

$$\xi = t + x, \quad \eta = t - x.$$

Remark 2. Let $P(\lambda, \zeta)$ be a polynomial in λ and ζ , and its degree with respect to ζ be equal to $K > 0$. We can then write

$$(4) \quad P(\lambda, \zeta) = Q_0(\lambda) \prod_{k=1}^K (\zeta - \zeta_k(\lambda)),$$

where every ζ_k for some positive integer p_k is an analytic function of λ^{-1/p_k} when $|\lambda| > C$, with no essential singularity at infinity, that is,

$$(5) \quad \zeta_k(\lambda) = \sum_{n=N_k}^{\infty} a_n (\lambda^{-1/p_k})^n.$$

We assume that

$$(6) \quad N_1/p_1 \leq N_2/p_2 \leq \dots \leq N_K/p_K.$$

Then the following properties (i)~(iii) are equivalent:

(i) $N_K \leq 0.$

(ii) $|\zeta_k(\lambda)|$ is bounded for every k when $|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty.$

(iii) P has the same form as that of L defined in the Theorem. that (Proof of Remark 2.) It is obvious that (i) and (ii) are equivalent. In (6) we may assume that there is an integer h such that $1 \leq h \leq K$ and

$$(7) \quad N_1/p_1 \leq \dots \leq N_{h-1}/p_{h-1} < N_h/p_h = N_{h+1}/p_{h+1} = \dots = N_K/p_K.$$

If we write

$$P(\lambda, \zeta) = Q_0(\lambda)\zeta^k + Q_1(\lambda)\zeta^{k-1} + \dots + Q_K(\zeta)$$

and set $\deg Q_k(\lambda) =$ degree of $Q_k(\lambda)$, then we have

$$(8) \quad \deg Q_{K-h+1}(\lambda) = \deg Q_0(\lambda) + (K-h+1)N_K/p_K.$$

Now if P satisfies (iii), we have

$$\deg Q_0(\lambda) \geq \deg Q_{K-h+1}(\lambda),$$

and with (8) we have $N_K \leq 0.$

Conversely, if P does not satisfy (iii), that is,

$$\deg Q_0(\lambda) < \deg Q_k(\lambda) \quad \text{for some } k,$$

then (7) gives

$$0 < \deg Q_k(\lambda) - \deg Q_0(\lambda) \leq N_{K-k+1}/p_{K-k+1} + \dots + N_K/p_K \leq k(N_K/p_K).$$

Hence we have $N_K > 0.$

Remark 3. We use the same notation as in Remark 2. In the note [2] H. Kumano-go and the author proved that when $N_1/p_1 \leq 0$, the null solution of the equation $Pu=0$ are not able to belong to $G_x(N_1/p_1 - \epsilon)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, and there exists a null solution which belongs to $G_x(N_1/p_1).$

The above theorem and Remark 2. mean that every null solution belongs to $G_x(0)$ when $N_K/p_K \leq 0.$ But the converse is not true. It is a problem still pending to decide the operators whose null solutions are all in $G_x(0).$

Lemma 1. Let L and u satisfy the condition in the theorem and let

$$(9) \quad \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} u(t, 0) = 0, \quad 0 \leq k \leq k_0 - 1.$$

Then u vanishes identically.

Proof. The equation (2) gives

$$(10) \quad Q_0 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \frac{\partial^{k_0}}{\partial x^{k_0}} u(t, 0) = 0,$$

where $Q_0(\lambda)$ is the polynomial defined by

$$L(\lambda, \zeta) = Q_0(\lambda)\zeta^{k_0} + Q_1(\lambda)\zeta^{k_0-1} + \dots + Q_{k_0}(\lambda).$$

Since (10) is an ordinary differential equation with respect to $(\partial^k/\partial x^{k_0})u(t, 0)$ which vanishes when $t \leq 0$, we have

$$\frac{\partial^{k_0}}{\partial x^{k_0}} u(t, 0) = 0.$$

By differentiation with respect to x of the equation (2), we have

$$\frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} u(t, 0) = 0 \quad \text{for all } k \geq 0.$$

If we set

$$\tilde{u} = \begin{cases} u & \text{when } t > 0, x > 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then \tilde{u} is a solution of the equation (2) in R^2 . Now we can apply the uniqueness theorem of Holmgren and we get

$$\tilde{u} = 0.$$

This proves the lemma.

Let H be the integral operator defined by the following identity:

$$(11) \quad H[u(t, x)] = L \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) \int_0^t d\tau \int_0^x \frac{(t-\tau)^{j_0-1} (x-y)^{k_0-1}}{(j_0-1)! (k_0-1)!} u(\tau, y) dy - u(t, x).$$

Then we have the following

Lemma 2. *Let $f(t, x)$ be a polynomial in x whose coefficients are continuous functions of t . Then the series*

$$(12) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} H^n[f(t, x)]$$

converges absolutely to a continuous function $w(t, x)$ which is entire with respect to x and satisfies the inequality same to (3).

Proof. In order to simplify the statements we assume that $f(t, x) = f(t)x^p$, $f(t)$ is a continuous function. As $H^l[f(t, x)]$ is a polynomial in x , setting $g_{k,i}(t)$ as the coefficient of x^k in $H^l[f(t, x)]$, we have

$$(14) \quad |g_{k,i}(t)| \leq (j_0 k_0)^i a^i T^{j' p_0 p} / (j'! k!), \quad \text{when } 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} p_0 &= \max \{ |f(t)|; 0 \leq t \leq T \}, \\ a &= \max \{ |a_{j,k}|; a_{j,k} \text{ are coefficients of } L \}, \\ j' &= \max \{ 0, l - k + p \}. \end{aligned}$$

We can choose a constant $C \geq 1$ which satisfies the following inequality:

$$(j_0 k_0)^i a^i T^{j' p_0 p} \leq T^{-k} C^{l+1}.$$

Then we have

$$|g_{k,i}(t)| \leq \frac{T^{-k} C^{l+1}}{k! j'!}.$$

If $k \geq p$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} g_{k,i}(t) \right| &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |g_{k,i}(t)| \\ &\leq \frac{T^{-k}}{k!} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{C^{l+1}}{j'!} \\ &= \frac{T^{-k}}{k!} \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{k-p-1} C^{l+1} + C^{k-p} \sum_{i=k-p}^{\infty} \frac{C^{l-k+1}}{(l-k+1)!} \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{T^{-k}}{k!} \{ (k-p) + e^{\sigma} \} C^{k-p}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have a constant C_0 such that

$$(15) \quad \left| \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} g_{k,i}(t) \right| \leq C_0^{k+1}/k! \quad \text{for every } k \geq 0.$$

This means that the series (12) is an absolutely convergent power series of x and the absolute value of the coefficient of x^k is dominated by $C_0^{k+1}/k!$, which proves the lemma.

Proof of the theorem. If we take the function

$$(16) \quad f_0(t, x) = \sum_{k=0}^{k_0-1} \frac{x^k}{k!} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} u(t, 0),$$

and set

$$(17) \quad w_0(t, x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} H^n \left[-L \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) f_0(t, x) \right],$$

then $w_0(t, x)$ satisfies the following equation

$$(18) \quad w_0(t, x) - H[w_0(t, x)] = -L \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) f_0(t, x),$$

and by lemma 2, $w_0(t, x)$ satisfies the inequality (3).

If we set

$$(19) \quad u_0(t, x) = \int_0^t d\tau \int_0^x \frac{(t-\tau)^{j_0-1} (x-y)^{k_0-1}}{(j_0-1)! (k_0-1)!} w_0(\tau, y) dy + f_0(t, x),$$

then by (11) and (18) we have

$$L \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) u_0(t, x) = 0.$$

It is easy to see that $u_0(t, x)$ satisfies the other conditions of the theorem. Since (19) gives

$$\frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} (u - u_0(t, x))_{x=0} = 0, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq k_0 - 1,$$

it follows from lemma 1 that

$$u = u_0(t, x).$$

This completes the proof.

References

- [1] Kumano-go, H.: On propagation of regularity in space-variables for the solutions of differential equations with constant coefficients. Proc. Japan Acad., **42**, 204-209 (1966).
- [2] Kumano-go, H., and Shinkai, K.: The characterization of differential operators with respect to the characteristic Cauchy problem. Osaka J. of Math., **3**, 155-162 (1966).