

On the Mizohata Operator

Ik-Chan Kim · Seong-Kowan Hong

Mizohata 연산자에 대하여

金益贊 · 洪性官

Summary

In this paper we prove:

- 1) $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + it \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = f(x,t)$ has a unique C^∞ solution when f is analytic
- 2) Let $f(x,t) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ have the following properties:
 $f(x,t) = f(x,-t)$ for all $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$; the $\text{supp } f \cap \{x\text{-axis}\} = \{(0,0)\}$; $\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x,t) dxdt \neq 0$.
 Then $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + it \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = f$ does not have C' solution.

I. Introduction

Throughout this paper Ω will denote an open subset of \mathbb{R}^2 , $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ the space of C^∞ complex-valued functions in Ω having compact supports. We will denote a point in \mathbb{R}^2 by (x, t) .

Let L be a smooth complex vector field in Ω defined by

$$L = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + ib(x,t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$$

where $b(x,t)$ is a real-valued C^∞ function in Ω .

When f and b are analytic, we know by the Cauchy-Kovalevski Theorem that

$$(1.1) \quad Lu = f$$

has always a solution locally in the neighborhood

of any point $p \in \Omega$. For the details, see II.

But, in 1957, H. Lewy showed that, under some restrictions of $f(x,t)$, the equation (1.1) does not have a C' solution for the generic C^∞ function f in any neighborhood of P . The simplest case of (1.1) without local solution is the Mizohata operator:

$$M = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$$

That is, the equation

$$(1.2) \quad Mu = \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + i \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = f$$

is not locally solvable for some function f .

A partial result on this questions was obtained by F. Trèves; namely,

Theorem. Let $f(x,t) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ have the following properties:

$$f(x,t) = f(x,-t) \text{ for all } (x,t);$$

the supp f does not intersect the axis $t = 0$;

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x,t) dx dt \neq 0.$$

Then the equation in \mathbb{R}^2 $Mu=f$ does not have any local solution.

The proof will be found in [9, §3]. In this paper, we shall remove the condition 'The supp f does not intersect the axis $t=0$ ' in the above theorem. Instead of the theorem, we will prove;

Theorem. Let $f(x,t) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ have the following properties:

$f(x,t) = f(x,-t)$ for all (x,t) ; the supp $f \cap \{x\text{-axis}\}$ is a nonempty finite set $\{(0,0)\}$;

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x,t) dx dt \neq 0.$$

Then the equation in \mathbb{R}^2 $Mu = f$ does not have any solution.

This theorem is a generalization of Treves' result.

II. The Solvability of The Mizohata's Partial Differential Equations.

In this section, we will give the solution existence theorem when f is analytic on Ω .

Theorem. Let $Mu = f, u|_{t=0} = u_0$ be the Mizohata's partial differential equation with initial value $u_0, f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then there is a unique solution $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ where u_0 is considered to be C^∞ on \mathbb{R} .

Proof. Set

$$u(t,x) = u_0(x) + \int_0^t f(x,s) ds + \int_0^t -is \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} ds.$$

This is a required solution. For the uniqueness, it is sufficient to prove that if $-it \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}, u(x,0) \equiv 0$, then $u \equiv 0$. Note that $u(x,t) = \int_{t_0}^t -is \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(x,s) ds$. We may assume u is analytic on $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{C}$. Since $Z(u) = \{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : u(x,t) = 0\}$ has limit points in $\mathbb{R}^2, Z(u) = \mathbb{R}^2$. Therefore $u \equiv 0$ on \mathbb{R}^2 .

III. The Unsolvability of the Mizohata's Partial Differential Equations.

We need some preliminary results.

Theorem 3.1 Let f be holomorphic on the open subset Ω^+ of the upper half plane; assume that a segment (a, b) of the real axis forms part of the boundary of Ω^+ , and that f is continuous on $\Omega^+ \cup (a,b)$ and real-valued on (a, b) . Let Ω^- be the reflection of Ω^+ .

$$\Omega^- = \{z : \bar{z} \in \Omega^+\}.$$

Define

$$h(z) = \begin{cases} f(z) & \text{for } z \in \Omega^+ \cup (a,b) \\ \overline{f(\bar{z})} & \text{for } z \in \Omega^- \end{cases}$$

Then $h(z)$ is holomorphic on $\Omega = \Omega^+ \cup (a,b) \cup \Omega^-$.

Proof. If $D(z_0, r) \subset \Omega^-$, then $D(\bar{z}_0, r) \subset \Omega^+$, so for every $z \in D(z_0, r)$ we have

$$f(\bar{z}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n (\bar{z} - \bar{z}_0)^n$$

$$\text{Hence } h(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bar{c}_n (z - z_0)^n \quad (z \in D(z_0, r)).$$

Since $h(z)$ is representable by power series in Ω^- , $h(z)$ is holomorphic on $\Omega^+ \cup \Omega^-$. Let $z \in (a,b)$. If $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that if $w \in \Omega^+$ and $|w - z| < \delta$, then $|f(w) - f(z)| < \epsilon$. If $w \in \Omega^-$ and $|w - z| < \delta$, then $|\bar{w} - z| = |\bar{w} - \bar{z}| = |w - z| < \delta$, hence $|f(\bar{w}) - f(z)| < \epsilon$. Since f is real-valued on (a,b) ,

$$|h(w) - h(z)| = |\overline{f(\bar{w})} - f(z)| = |f(\bar{w}) - f(z)| < \epsilon$$

Thus $h(z)$ is continuous on Ω .

Now assume $z \in (a,b)$, and let $D(z,r) \subset \Omega$. If ∇ is a triangle in $D(z,r)$, then $\int_{\nabla} h = 0$ by the Cauchy's Theorem for a triangle. Hence by the

Morera's Theorem, $h(z)$ is holomorphic on $D(z,r)$.

Theorem 3.2. Let f be holomorphic on the open connected set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$. Suppose that f has a limit point of zeros in Ω , that is, there is a point $z_0 \in \Omega$ and a sequence of points $z_n \in \Omega$, $z_n \neq z_0$, such that $z_n \rightarrow z_0$ and $f(z_n) = 0$ for all $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Then f is identically 0 on Ω .

Proof. Expand f in a Taylor series about z_0 , say

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n (z - z_0)^n, \quad |z - z_0| < r.$$

We will show that all $a_n = 0$. If not, let m be the smallest integer such that $a_m \neq 0$. Then $f(z) = (z - z_0)^m g(z)$, where $g(z)$ is holomorphic at z_0 and $g(z_0) \neq 0$. By continuity, g is nonzero in a neighborhood of z_0 , contradicting the fact that z_0 is a limit point of zeros.

Let $A = \{z \in \Omega : \text{there is a sequence of points } z_n \in \Omega, z_n \neq z_0, z_n \rightarrow z \text{ with } f(z_n) = 0 \text{ for all } n\}$. Since $z_0 \in A$ by hypothesis, A is not empty. If $z \in A$, then by the above argument f is zero on a disc $D(z,r)$ for some $r > 0$ and it follows that $D(z,r) \subset A$. Thus A is open. If we can show that A is also closed in Ω , the connectedness of Ω gives $A = \Omega$, and the result will follow.

Let $z_n \rightarrow z \in \Omega$, $z_n \in A$. If $z_n = z$, there is nothing to prove; thus assume $z_n \neq z$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$. But since $z_n \neq z$ we have $f(z_n) = 0$, and hence $z \in A$ by the definition of A . Thus A is closed in Ω .

Theorem 3.3 (Stokes' Theorem) If ω is a $(k-1)$ -form on an open set ACR^n and c is a k -chain in A , then

$$\int_c d\omega = \int_{\partial c} \omega.$$

In particular, if $\omega = f dx + g dy$ is a 1-form on \mathbb{R}^2 , and $\phi: T \rightarrow SCR^2$ is a continuously differentiable mapping of a closed rectangle T , then

$$\iint_s \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right) dy \wedge dx = \int_{\partial s} f dx + g dy$$

Proof will be given in [6] p.102.

Now let's prove the following generalization of F. Trèves' Theorem.

Theorem 3.4 Let $f(x,t) \in C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ have the following properties:

- (3.1) $f(x,t) = f(x,-t)$ for all (x,t) ;
- (3.2) the support $f \cap [x \text{--axis}]$ is a finite set $\{(0,0)\}$;
- (3.3) $\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x,t) dx dt \neq 0$.

Then the equation in \mathbb{R}^2 $Mu = f$ does not have any c' solution.

Proof. We may choose a $c > 0$ so that $\text{supp } f \subset \{(x,t) : t \geq c|x|\} \cup \{(x,t) : t \leq -c|x|\}$. By (3.1) we may write

$$f(x,t) = F(x,s), \quad s = \frac{1}{2} t^2 > 0.$$

For $s < 0$, we define $F(x,s) = 0$. Suppose that there exists a solution u of $Mu = f$ where u is a c' function. Since we can put

$$u(x,t) = \phi(x,s) + t \Psi(x,s) \quad (s \geq 0)$$

for some even functions ϕ, Ψ ,

$$Mu = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + it \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) (\phi + t\Psi) = t(\phi_s + i\phi_x) + (\Psi + 2s\Psi_s + 2is\Psi_x) = F(x,s) = f(x,t).$$

Since $f(x,t) = f(x,-t)$, $s = \frac{1}{2} t^2$, it is proved that $Mu = f$ is equivalent to

$$(3.5) \quad \phi_s + i\phi_x = 0$$

$$(3.6) \quad \Psi + 2s\Psi_s + 2is\Psi_x = F$$

But equation (3.6) can be rewritten

$$(3.7) \quad (\sqrt{s}\Psi)_s + i(\sqrt{s}\Psi)_x = \frac{F}{2\sqrt{s}} \quad (s > 0)$$

Put $\sqrt{s}\Psi(x,s) = h(z)$ ($s > 0$), where $z = x + is$. As

$\sqrt{s} \Psi$ vanishes when $s=0$, we define $h(x,0)=0$. Due to Theorem 3.1, $h(z)$ can be extended as a holomorphic function, say $h(z)$ again. Obviously

$$h(z) \equiv 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (\text{supp } F) \cap (\text{supp } F)^-,$$

where $(\text{Supp } F)^- = \{(x, -t) : (x,t) \in \text{supp } F\}$. By (3.7) we have then $h \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\})$.

Let C be a circle with center o enclosing $\text{supp } F$ and C_n be a small circle with center 0 , radius approaching 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let D_n be the annulus surrounded by C and C_n . Then using the Green's Theorem,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x,t) \, dx \, dt = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \iint_{D_n} \frac{F(x,s)}{2\sqrt{s}} \, dx \, ds$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \iint_{D_n} [(\sqrt{s} \Psi)_s + i(\sqrt{s} \Psi)_x] \, dx \, ds$$

$$= [-\int_C \sqrt{s} \Psi \, dx + \int_{C_n} i\sqrt{s} \Psi \, ds]$$

$$+ \lim [\int_{C_n} \sqrt{s} \Psi \, dx - \int_{C_n} i\sqrt{s} \Psi \, ds].$$

But

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{C_n} \sqrt{s} \Psi \, dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{C_n} i\sqrt{s} \Psi \, ds = 0.$$

Since $\sqrt{s} \Psi \equiv 0$ on C ,

$$\int_C \sqrt{s} \Psi \, dx = \int_C i\sqrt{s} \Psi \, ds = 0.$$

$$\text{Hence } \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x,t) \, dx \, dt = 0,$$

contrary to the hypothesis (3.3).

This completes our theorem.

Literatures Cited

- [1] Hörmander, L., Differential Equations without solutions, Math. Ann. 140 (1960), 169-173.
- [2] — Linear Partial Differential Operators, Springer-Verlag the 3rd ed., 1969.
- [3] — An introduction to Complex Analysis in Several Variables, North-Holland Publishing Co.
- [4] Lewy, H., An example of a smooth linear partial differential equations without solution, Ann. Math.(2) 66 (1957), 155-158.
- [5] Mizohata, S., The Theory of Partial Differential Equations, Cambridge, 1973.
- [6] Spivak, M., Calculus on Manifolds, The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, 1965.
- [7] Treves, F., Basic linear partial differential Equations, Academic Press.
- [8] — On local Solvability of linear partial Differential Equations, Part I and Part II, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 23(1970).
- [9] — Lectures on P.D.E., Korea -U.S. Workshop '79, Seoul National Univ., 1979.

국 문 초 록

Mizohata 연산자에 대하여

초기조건이 주어진 Mizohata 편미방은 유일한 해를 가짐을 증명하고, 해를 가지지 않을 조건을 Treves의 결과보다 일반화하여 다음을 증명하였다.

$f(x, t) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ 가 다음 성질들을 갖는다고 하자.

i) $f(x, t) = f(x, -t) \quad (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$

ii) f 의 Support $\cap \{x\text{-축}\} = \{(0, 0)\}$

iii) $\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x, t) dx dt \neq 0$

그러면, Mizohata 편미방은 해를 가지지 못한다.