

UNCLASSIFIED

AD 268 212

*Reproduced
by the*

**ARMED SERVICES TECHNICAL INFORMATION AGENCY
ARLINGTON HALL STATION
ARLINGTON 12, VIRGINIA**



UNCLASSIFIED

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

REGULARITY OF FUNDAMENTAL SOLUTIONS OF HYPERBOLIC EQUATIONS

by

Avner Friedman

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 101

November 3, 1961

PREPARED UNDER CONTRACT Nonr-225(11)

(NR-041-086)

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH



Reproduction in Whole or in Part is Permitted for
any Purpose of the United States Government

APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS LABORATORIES

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

REGULARITY OF FUNDAMENTAL SOLUTIONS OF HYPERBOLIC EQUATIONS

by

Avner Friedman

Introduction.

Fundamental solutions play a decisive role in the method of Hadamard [11] for solving the Cauchy problem for hyperbolic equations with variable coefficients, of the second order. In the case of analytic coefficients, he constructed the fundamental solution as a series of functions, each term being determined by the previous ones by solving fairly simple differential systems. Convergence of the series is proved by employing the method of majorants of Cauchy.

For higher order hyperbolic equations with constant coefficients, which are homogeneous in the highest derivatives, the fundamental solution was given by Herglotz [12] in a closed form for m even, $m \geq n$ (m is the order of the equation and n is the number of space-dimensions). A closed form was later given by Petrowski [17] for $m \geq n$, and by F. John [13] and Gelfand-Shapiro [9] (see also [10; Chapter 1]) for all m, n . More recently that form was derived by Borovikov [2] as a consequence of a general formula for fundamental solutions of partial differential equations with constant coefficients.

Partially supported by Contract Nonr 710 (16) (NR 044 004) between the Office of Naval Research and the University of Minnesota.

Recently, Babitch^(u) [1], extending the scheme of Gelfand-Shapiro, has constructed fundamental solutions for hyperbolic equations with analytic coefficients of any order, by representing them as series $G = \sum u_k f_k d\sigma$ (integration on a parameter σ). The method depends on the construction of some special solutions ("quasi" plane-waves) which are employed in the successive construction of the sequences u_k, f_k . Convergence is proved by generalizing the proof of Hadamard [11]. Using this construction, Babitch proved that the fundamental solution G with pole at a point $(0, x^0)$ is analytic at all points (t, x) ($0 < t < \xi$, ξ sufficiently small) which do not lie on the bicharacteristics through $(0, x^0)$ (i.e., on the characteristic conoid with vertex $(0, x^0)$). This result may also be formulated in the following way: (The strict) Huygen's principle is valid for the property of analyticity of solutions.

Babitch also proved that for sufficiently smooth coefficients (and not necessarily analytic), the fundamental solution is differentiable up to any given order at the points (t, x) as above. Finally, he extended all the above results to hyperbolic systems of any order.

The result about the differentiability of the fundamental solution was previously proved by Courant-Lax [3] and by Lax [14], by different methods, for first order hyperbolic systems.

The purpose of the present paper is to extend the results of Babitch in the following way: We consider classes $C\{M_q\}$ consisting of all the C^∞ functions (in some set) whose q -th derivatives are bounded by $H^q M_q$ for all $q \geq 1$ (H is a constant depending on f), where M_q is a given sequence of ^{positive} numbers satisfying

$$\binom{k}{h} M_h M_{k-h} \leq A M_k \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq h \leq k < \infty \quad (A \text{ constant}).$$

(*)

After the manuscript was completed, it came to our attention that most of the results of Babitch [1] were also obtained, independently, by D. Ludwig, "Exact and asymptotic solution of the Cauchy problem", Comm. Pure Appl. Math., vol. 13 (1960), pp. 473-508.

We then prove that if the coefficients of the hyperbolic equation belong to $C(M_q)$, then the fundamental solution belongs to $C(\hat{M}_q)$ in any set lying in $0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon$, which excludes the bicharacteristics through $(0, x^0)$, where (with $\tilde{M}_q$ defined by (3.28))

$$\hat{M}_q \leq \frac{M_{3q}}{q!} + \frac{M_{2q} \tilde{M}_q}{q!}, \text{ and if } M_q = q! \text{ then } \hat{M}_q = q!.$$

For $M_q = q!$ we thus get a new proof for the analytic case considered by Babitch.

Our procedure starts (as that of Hadamard and Babitch) by constructing "quasi" plane-waves and then sequences u_k, f_k . However, we stop at a certain $k = p$ and proceed to evaluate derivatives D^r or $\tilde{u} = \sum_{k=0}^p u_k f_k$ (or $\int \tilde{u} d\sigma$) and of $\hat{u} = G_\sigma - \tilde{u}$ (where $G = \int G d\sigma$) separately. The derivation of the estimates for the u_k is technically the most lengthy step in our proof. It employs techniques which we used in earlier works [4] - [7]. As for $\hat{u}$, it satisfies a certain hyperbolic equation and, to evaluate $\hat{u}$ we employ well known energy inequalities. In estimating $D^r G$, we take p to be dependent on r (in fact, $p = r + d_0$; d_0 depending on m, n).

We briefly describe the structure of the paper:

In §1 we prove auxiliary lemmas to the effect that various nonlinear operations are closed in classes $C(M_q)$. In §2 we solve the Cauchy problem for general first order nonlinear equations within the class $C(M_q)$, i.e., we prove (Theorem 1) that if all the data and the equation belong to classes $C(M_q)$, then the same is true of the solution.

In § 3 we write down the formal procedure of constructing a fundamental solution in the analytic case and then state the main theorem (Theorem 2) of the paper. A theorem (Theorem 3) on interior estimates for hyperbolic equations (analogous to the main theorems in [4][5] for elliptic and parabolic equations) is proved in § 4. The proof of Theorem 2 is given in § 5. It uses the results of § § 1, 4. In § 6 we prove (Theorem 4) Huygen's principle for the property of smoothness in the $C(M_q)$ - sense, and also mention briefly the case of hyperbolic systems of any order.

1. Auxiliary Lemmas

Let D be an open set, or the closure of an open set, in the n -dimensional euclidean space with coordinates $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Let $\{M_q\}$ be a monotone increasing sequence of (positive) numbers with $M_1 \geq 1$, which satisfy for some constant A and all $0 \leq p \leq q < \infty$,

$$(1.1) \quad \binom{q}{p} M_p M_{q-p} \leq A M_q.$$

Taking, in particular, $p = 0$ and $p = 1$ we conclude:

$$(1.2) \quad M_q \geq A_1^q M_{q-1}, \quad M_q \geq (A_1)^q q! \quad (A_1 \text{ constant}).$$

By $C(M_q; D)$ we mean the class of C^∞ (infinitely differentiable) functions $f(x)$ on D which satisfy for some constants H_0, H (depending on f)

$$(1.3) \quad |D_x^q f(x)| \leq H_0 H^q M_q \quad (0 \leq q < \infty).$$

Here D_x^q denotes any partial derivative $\partial^q / \partial x_1^{q_1} \dots \partial x_n^{q_n}$. The class $C(q; D)$ consists of all the functions which are analytic in $\bar{D}$, the closure of D .

If f depends on a parameter λ , we say that $f(x, \lambda)$ belongs to $C(M_q; D)$ uniformly with respect to λ , if (1.3) holds with H_0, H independent of λ .

If (1.2) is replaced by

$$|D_x^q f(x)| \leq H_0 \quad (0 \leq q < a)$$

(1.4)

$$|D_x^q f(x)| \leq H_0 H^{q-a} M_{q-a} \quad (a \leq q < \infty)$$

for some integer $a > 0$, then the class is denoted by $C(M_{q-a}; D)$. For

$a \leq 0$, the class $C(M_{q-a}; D)$ is defined by (1.3) with M_q replaced by M_{q-a} .

For conveniency we set $M_q = 1$ if $q < 0$. We then can express (1.4) in the equivalent form:

$$|D_x^q f(x)| \leq H_1 H_2^q M_{q-a} \quad (0 \leq q < \infty).$$

Lemma 1. Let $u_1, \dots, u_h$ be functions of $x \in D$ which satisfy the inequalities $(1 \leq i \leq h)$

$$\begin{aligned} (1.5) \quad & \left| D_x^r u_i(x) \right| \leq H_0 \quad (0 \leq r \leq a) \\ & \left| D_x^r u_i(x) \right| \leq H_0 H^{r-a} M_{r-a} \quad (a < r \leq p) \end{aligned}$$

where $a \geq 2$, and let V be an h -dimensional open set which contains the set $\{u(x) = (u_1(x), \dots, u_h(x)) ; x \in D\}$. Finally, let $F(u_1, \dots, u_h)$ be a function defined in V and satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} (1.6) \quad & \left| D_u^r F(u) \right| \leq K_0 \quad (0 \leq r \leq a) \\ & \left| D_u^r F(u) \right| \leq K_0 K^{r-a} M_{r-a} \quad (a < r \leq p) . \end{aligned}$$

Then, if H is sufficiently large depending on K_0, K, H_0 , the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} (1.7) \quad & \left| D_x^r F(u(x)) \right| \leq B H_0 \quad (0 \leq r \leq a) \\ & \left| D_x^r F(u(x)) \right| \leq B H_0 H^{r-a} M_{r-a} \quad (a < r \leq p) , \end{aligned}$$

where B is a constant depending only on K_0, K, H_0 .

Remark. The lemma is not true if $a = 0$ or $a = 1$.

Proof. For $a = 2$ the proof, in a slightly different form, is given in [6; pp. 47-50]. The proof for $a > 2$ is obtained by some obvious modifications of the proof for $a = 2$.

Corollary 1. If the u_i belong to $C(M_{q-a}; D)$, $a \geq 2$, and if $F(u)$ belongs to $C(M_{q-a}; V)$, then $F(u(x))$ belongs to $C(M_{q-a}; D)$.

In particular (with $M_q = q!$), an analytic function of an analytic function is analytic.

We shall also need a more detailed result in the special case $h = 1$, $F(u) = u^1$:

Lemma 2. Let $F(u) = u^1$, $u = u(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and assume that

$$|D_x^q u(x)| \leq H_0 \quad (0 \leq q \leq a)$$

$$|D_x^q u(x)| \leq H_0 H^{q-a} M_{q-a} \quad (a < q \leq 1),$$

where $a \geq 2$. Then

$$|D_x^q F(u(x))| \leq K_0 \quad (0 \leq q \leq a)$$

$$|D_x^q F(u(x))| \leq \frac{H_0^1 K_0^{1-1}}{H^{1-1}} H^{q-a} q(q-1)\dots(q-1+2) M_{q-1-a+1} \quad (a < q \leq 1)$$

where K_0 depends only on H_0 .

Proof. The proof for $a = 2$ follows from (16), (18) of [6]. The proof for $a \geq 2$ is very similar to the case $a = 2$.

Later on we shall deal with polynomials of the form

$$(1.8) \quad \sum_{i=0}^m b_i(x) \lambda^i \quad (x \in \bar{D}, \quad D \text{ open bounded set})$$

having the property: for all $x \in \bar{D}$ the roots $\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_m(x)$ of (1.8) are real and distinct. We shall then need:

Lemma 3. If a polynomial (1.8) has the above property and if the coefficients $b_i(x)$ belong to $C(M_{q-a}; D)$ for some $a \geq 2$, then the $\lambda_j(x)$ also belongs to $C(M_{q-a}; D)$.

Proof. Consider the polynomials $\sum_{i=0}^m b_i \lambda^i$ where the b_i vary in a complex neighborhood N_ϵ of the $b_i(x)$, that is, $\sum |b_i - b_i(x)| < \epsilon$. Since the roots $\lambda_k = \lambda_k(b)$ are continuous functions of $b = (b_0, \dots, b_m)$, all the $\lambda_k(b)$ are distinct if ϵ is sufficiently small. Hence, by a well known theorem, the $\lambda_k(b)$ are analytic functions of $b \in N_\epsilon$. Therefore, by (1.2), they belong to $C(M_{q-a}; N_\epsilon)$, for any a . Since the $b_i(x)$ belong to $C(M_{q-a}; D)$, the assertion of the lemma follows by Corollary 1.

We next need an extension of the Implicit Function Theorem. We consider a system

$$(1.9) \quad F_i(x_1, \dots, x_n; y_1, \dots, y_h) = 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq h)$$

and assume that at some point (x^0, y^0)

$$(1.10) \quad F_i(x_1^0, \dots, x_n^0; y_1^0, \dots, y_h^0) = 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq h)$$

$$(1.11) \quad \frac{\partial(F_1, \dots, F_h)}{\partial(y_1, \dots, y_h)} \Big|_{(x^0, y^0)} \neq 0$$

If the F_i are functions of differentiability class $C^p (p \geq 1)$, then in some neighborhood N of (x^0, y^0) the only solution of (1.9) is given by some functions

$$y_i = f_i(x) \quad (1 \leq i \leq h)$$

defined in a certain neighborhood D of x^0 and f_i are of class C^p .

We shall prove:

Lemma 4. Let the F_i satisfy, in addition to the foregoing assumptions, the inequalities $(1 \leq i \leq h)$

$$(1.12) \quad |D^r F_1(x, y)| \leq K_0 \quad (0 \leq r \leq a+1)$$

$$|D^r F_1(x, y)| \leq K_0 K^{r-a-1} M_{r-a-1} \quad (a+1 < r \leq p),$$

where D^r is any r -th partial derivative with respect to (x, y) , and $a \geq 2$.

Then the solution $y_i = f_i(x)$ of (1.9) satisfies

$$(1.13) \quad |D_x^r f_1(x)| \leq H_0 \quad (0 \leq r \leq a)$$

$$|D_x^r f_1(x)| \leq H_0 H^{r-a} M_{r-a} \quad (a < r \leq p)$$

where H_0 is determined so that (1.13) holds for $0 \leq r \leq a$ and H then

depends only on K_0, K, H_0 and on a lower bound on the absolute value of

$\partial(F_1, \dots, F_h) / \partial(y_1, \dots, y_h)$.

Corollary 2. If the F_1 belong to $C(M_{q-a-1}; N)$ then the f_1 belong to $C(M_{q-a}; D)$.

The analytic case ($M_q = q!$) is of course well known, but the standard proofs are different from the present one.

Proof. The proof is by induction on r . The assertion (1.13) for $r < s + 1$ is valid by the choice of H_0 . We now assume that (1.13) holds for all $0 \leq r < q$ ($q \leq p$) and proceed to prove it for q . Differentiating (1.9) with respect to x_j we get

$$(1.14) \quad \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial x_j} + \sum_{k=1}^h \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial y_k} \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_j} = 0 \quad (1 \leq j \leq h).$$

We next apply D_x^{q-1} (where D_x now means total x -differentiation) to both sides of (1.14) and obtain

$$(1.15) \quad \sum_{k=1}^h \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial y_k} D_x^q f_k = \frac{\partial^q}{\partial x^q} F_1 + \sum_{k=1}^h \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \binom{q-1}{j} \left[D_x^j \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial y_k} \right] D_x^{q-j} f_k.$$

Here we used Leibnitz' rule

$$D^q(fg) = \sum_{i=0}^q \binom{q}{i} D^i f D^{q-i} g$$

where $\binom{q}{i} D^i f D^{q-i} g$ means that there are $\binom{q}{i}$ terms of the form $D^i f D^{q-i} g$,

D being any partial derivative.

The functions $y_k = f_k(x)$ satisfy (1.13) for all $r \leq q - 1$. Hence, applying Lemma 1 we get

$$\left| D_x^j \left(\frac{\partial F_1(x, y)}{\partial y_k} \right) \right| \leq B H_0 H^{j-a} M_{j-a} \quad (a \leq j \leq q - 1),$$

provided H is sufficiently large (depending on K_0, K, H_0).

Substituting this into (1.15) we find that the right side is bounded by

$$(1.16) \quad K_0 K^{q-a-1} M_{q-a-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \binom{q-1}{j} B H_0^{\hat{H}^{j-a}} M_{j-a} H_0^{\hat{H}^{q-j-a}} M_{q-j-a},$$

where we use the convention:

$$\hat{H}^i = H^i \quad \text{if } i \geq 0, \quad \hat{H}^i = 1 \quad \text{if } i < 0.$$

Now,

$$(1.17) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \binom{q-1}{j} M_{j-a} M_{q-j-a} \leq B_1 M_{q-a}$$

as follows from calculations similar to [6; p. 49]; B_1 are used to denote constants depending only on K_0, K, H_0 and on a lower bound on

$$|\partial(F_1, \dots, F_h)/\partial(y_1, \dots, y_h)|.$$

Substituting (1.17) into (1.16) we find that the right side of (1.15) is bounded by

$$B_2 H_0 H^{q-a-1} M_{q-a},$$

provided H is also $> K$. We finally solve the linear system (1.15) for

$D_x^q f_k$ and get

$$|D_x^q f_k(x)| \leq B_3 H_0 H^{q-a-1} M_{q-a}.$$

Taking $H \geq B_3$ the proof of (1.13) for $r = q$ is completed.

Remark. If some of the F_1 are linear functions in the y_k , then the assertion of Lemma 4 remains true assuming that these F_1 satisfy (1.12) with $a+1$ replaced by a . Corollary 2 also remains true assuming that these F_1 belong to $C(M_{q-a}; N)$.

a Manifold S is said to belong to class $C(M_{q-a})$ if it can be covered by a finite number of patches, each having a local representation in terms of a function, say, $f(y)$ of class $C(M_{q-a})$. A family of manifolds $S(x)$ is said to belong to class $C(M_{q-a})$ if the f 's are of class $C(M_{q-a})$ in the variables (y, x) . A family $S(x)$ is said to belong strongly to class $C(M_{q-a})$ if (i) there exists one-to-one correspondence $y(x) \rightarrow y(x')$ between the points of $S(x)$ and $S(x')$ whenever $|x - x'| < \delta$ (for some $\delta > 0$), and (ii) in the local representation of $S(x)$, say $y_i = g(y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_k, x)$, where $y = y(x)$, g is of class $C(M_{q-a})$ in all the variables. The local representation of any $S(x)$ is assumed to be valid also for all $S(x')$ with $|x - x'| < \delta$.

Lemma 5. Let $S(x)$ be a family of n -dimensional manifolds with boundaries $\Sigma(x)$ which are $(n-1)$ -dimensional manifolds with no boundary. Assume that $S(x)$ and $\Sigma(x)$ belong strongly to $C(M_{q-a})$ for $x \in D$ (D open bounded set), where $a \geq 2$. Let $u(x, y)$ belong to $C(M_{q-a})$ for (x, y) in an open set V which contains the closure of $\{(x, y) ; y \in S(x), x \in D\}$. Then the integral

$$I(x) = \int_{S(x)} u(x, y) dS_y(x)$$

belongs to $C(M_{q-a}; D)$.

Proof. Differentiating I twice we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D_x I(x) &= \int_{S(x)} [Du(x, y) + u(x, y)\Delta(x, y)] dS_y(x) \\ (1.18) \quad &+ \int_{\Sigma(x)} u(x, y) \Gamma(x, y) d\Sigma_y(x), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$D_x^2 I(x) = \int_{S(x)} \{D[Du + u\Delta] + [Du + u\Delta] \Delta\} dS_y(x)$$

$$(1.19) \quad + \int_{\Sigma(x)} ([Du + u\Delta]\Gamma + D(u\Gamma)W) d\Sigma_y(x)$$

where $Du = D_x u + D_y u D_x y$ and where $\Delta = \Delta_1$, $\Gamma = \Gamma_1$, $W = W_1$ if $D = D_1$. Δ and Γ , W can be represented in terms of the functions of the local representations of $S(x)$ and $\Sigma(x)$ respectively and of their first derivatives. We then find that

$$(1.20) \quad |D^r L| \leq A_0 A^r M_{r-a+1} \quad (0 \leq r < \infty) \text{ for } L = \Delta, \Gamma, W,$$

where D^r now means any r -th partial derivatives with respect to (x, y) .

In deriving (1.19) we made use of the fact that $\Sigma(x)$ has no boundary.

We can now proceed to differentiate $I(x)$ any number of times. Introducing the notation

$$f_{r+1} = Df_r \cdot W, \quad f_0 = f$$

we have:

$$(1.21) \quad \begin{aligned} D_x^q I(x) &= \int_{S(x)} (Du + u\Delta)^q dS_y(x) \\ &+ \int_{\Sigma(x)} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} D \left\{ [(Du + u\Delta)^{q-1} \Gamma]_{i-1} \right\} + (u\Gamma)_{q-1} \right\} d\Sigma_y(x). \end{aligned}$$

We shall prove that for any $q \geq 0$

$$(1.22) \quad |D_x^q I(x)| \leq H_0 H^q M_{q-a}.$$

In proving it, we shall use the inequalities

$$(1.23) \quad |D^r u(x, y)| \leq K_0 K^r M_{r-a}$$

which follow from the assumptions of the lemma.

Using Lemma 2 and (1.20), (1.23) we find that

$$(1.24) \quad |D^r [(Du + u\Delta)^{q-1}]| \leq \frac{K_1}{2^{q-1}} K_2^r M_{r-a+1}$$

for all $r \geq 0$, where K_1 are appropriate constants.

Next, it can be proved by induction on s that if a function g satisfies, for all $r \geq 0$,

$$(1.25) \quad |D^r g| \leq N_0 N^r M_{r-b}$$

where $b \geq 0$, then

$$(1.26) \quad |D^r g_s| \leq N_0 N^{r+s} M_{r+s-b}$$

provided N is sufficiently large (depending only on A_0, A of (1.20)).

Applying this fact to $g = (Du + u\Delta)^{q-1} \Gamma$ (which satisfies (1.25) ^{with $b=\alpha-1$,} by (1.20), (1.24) combined) and to $g = u\Gamma$, we obtain from (1.21) the inequality (1.22) with appropriate constants H_0, H (independent of q).

From the proof of Lemma 5 one can easily establish:

Lemma 5'. Let $S(x, \gamma)$, $\Sigma(x, \gamma)$ satisfy, for each γ ($\alpha \leq \gamma \leq \beta$), the assumptions of Lemma 5 and let $S(x, \gamma)$, $\Sigma(x, \gamma)$ belong strongly to $C(M_{q-a})$ ($a \geq 2$). Finally, let $u(x, y, \gamma)$ belong to $C(M_{q-a})$ in an open set V containing the closure of $\{(x, y, \gamma) ; x \in D, \alpha \leq \gamma \leq \beta, y \in S(x, \gamma)\}$. Then the integral

$$I(x) = \int_a^b \int_{S(x, \gamma)} u(x, y, \gamma) dS_y(x, \gamma) d\gamma$$

belongs to $C(M_{q-a}; D)$.

2. Cauchy Problem for Nonlinear First Order Equations

Consider the differential equation

$$(2.1) \quad F(x_1, \dots, x_n, z, p_1, \dots, p_n) = 0$$

where F is a C^∞ function in all its arguments and $p_j = \partial z / \partial x_j$. The Cauchy problem consists in finding a unique solution $z = z(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of (2.1) (which is an n -dimensional manifold) passing through a given $(n-1)$ -dimensional manifold

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} x_i^0 &= \psi_i(t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}) & (1 \leq i \leq n) \\ z^0 &= \psi_{n+1}(t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}) \end{aligned}$$

In order to solve the problem, values p_i^0 of p_i corresponding to (x_i^0, z^0) must first be found or be given. These values must necessarily satisfy the equations

$$(2.3) \quad F(x_1^0, \dots, x_n^0, z^0, p_1, \dots, p_n) = 0$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i \frac{\partial \psi_i}{\partial t_h} = \frac{\partial \psi_{n+1}}{\partial t_h} \quad (1 \leq h \leq n-1).$$

One is thus led to assume that for the initial manifold (2.2) the following conditions hold: (i) There exists a solution $p_i = p_i^0$ of (2.3), and (ii) The $n \times n$ matrix

$$\left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial p_i}, \frac{\partial(x_1^0, \dots, x_n^0)}{\partial(t_1, \dots, t_{n-1})} \right)$$

is non-singular on the initial manifold, when $p_i = p_i^0$.

We remark that if (ii) is violated, there may exist more than one solution or no solution at all to the Cauchy problem.

The solution of (2.1), (2.2) (with $p_i = p_i^0$ for $x_i = x_i^0$, $z = z^0$) is constructed with the aid of an auxiliary system of ordinary differential equations (the characteristic equations)

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{dx_1}{ds} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_1}, \quad \frac{dz}{ds} = \sum_{h=1}^n p_h \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_h},$$

$$\frac{dp_i}{ds} = - \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_i} + p_i \frac{\partial F}{\partial z} \right) \quad (1 \leq i \leq n).$$

We solve this system with the initial values x_1^0, z^0, p_1^0 .

The solution

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} x_1 &= x_1(s, t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}) \\ z &= z(s, t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}) \\ p_1 &= p_1(s, t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}) \end{aligned}$$

is C^∞ in $(s, t_1, \dots, t_{n-1})$. Using the assumption (ii) one finds that if s is sufficiently small, then

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{\partial(x_1, \dots, x_n)}{\partial(s, t_1, \dots, t_{n-1})} \neq 0.$$

Hence, we can solve $s, t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}$ in terms of $x_1, \dots, x_n$.

Substituting this into z in (2.5), we obtain a C^∞ function $z = g(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ which can be proved to be a solution of the Cauchy problem (the p_i are proved to be $\partial z / \partial x_i$).

We shall now prove:

Theorem 1. If F belongs to $C(M_{q-b})$ (in all its variables) for some
 $b \geq 3$, and if the ψ_i belong to $C(M_{q-b})$, then the solution $z = z(x_1, \dots, x_n)$
belongs to $C(M_{q-b})$.

For simplicity the domains where the classes $C(M_{q-b})$ are defined has not been mentioned. The domain where $z(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is of class $C(M_{q-b})$ is some neighborhood of $(x_1^0, \dots, x_n^0)$.

Proof. Set $a = b - 1$; then $a \geq 2$. We can write the system (2.4) and the initial conditions ($s = 0$) in the form

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{dv_i(s, t)}{ds} = \phi_i(v_1, \dots, v_N)$$

$$(2.8) \quad v_i(0, t) = v_i^0(t) \quad (1 \leq i \leq N)$$

where $t = (t_1, \dots, t_{n-1})$, $N = 2n + 1$, $v_i = x_i$ if $1 \leq i \leq n$, $v_{n+1} = z$, $v_{n+1+i} = p_i$ if $1 \leq i \leq n$. ϕ_i are functions of class $C(M_{q-a})$ in $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ and v_i^0 are functions of class $C(M_{q-a})$ in t . Indeed, in view of our assumptions, all that remains to show is that the p_i^0 belong to $C(M_{q-a})$ and that follows by Corollary 2 of §1 and the remark following the proof of Lemma 4.

We next perform the transformation

$$w_i(s, t) = v_i(s, t) - v_i(0, t)$$

and obtain

$$(2.9) \quad \frac{dw_i(s, t)}{ds} = \psi_i(s, t, w_1, \dots, w_N)$$

$$(2.10) \quad w_i(0, t) = 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq N)$$

where, by Lemma 1 (or its corollary), the ψ_i are of class $C(M_{q-a})$ in all the variables.

We shall need the following lemma:

Lemma 6. If the ψ_1 belong to $C(M_{q-a})$ for some $a \geq 2$, then the solution w_j of (2.9), (2.10) also belongs to $C(M_{q-a})$.

From the lemma it follows that x_1, z, p are of class $C(M_{q-a})$ in $(s, t_1, \dots, t_{n-1})$. Applying the remark following the proof of Lemma 4 (concerning Corollary 2) we conclude that z and p_1 are of class $C(M_{q-a})$ in $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ (Indeed, we take F_1 to be $x_1 - x_1(s, t_1, \dots, t_{n-1})$, i.e., linear in the x_j). Since $p_1 = \partial z / \partial x_1$, z is then of class $C(M_{q-a+1}) = C(M_{q-b})$, and the proof of Theorem 1 is completed.

It remains to prove Lemma 6.

Proof of Lemma 6. We first prove that it is enough to establish the inequalities

$$(2.11) \quad |D_t^r w_1(s, t)| \leq H_0 \quad (0 \leq r \leq a)$$

$$(2.12) \quad |D_t^r w_1(s, t)| \leq H_0 H^{r-a} M_{r-a} \quad (a < r < \infty)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Indeed we shall prove that if (2.11), (2.12) hold, then

$$(2.13) \quad |D_s^p D_t^r w_1(s, t)| \leq \bar{H}_0 \quad (0 \leq p + r \leq a)$$

$$(2.14) \quad |D_s^p D_t^r w_1(s, t)| \leq \bar{H}_0 \bar{H}^{p+r-a} M_{p+r-a} \quad (a < p + r < \infty)$$

for some $\bar{H}$ depending on $H_0, H, \bar{H}_0$; $\bar{H}_0$ is chosen so that (2.13) is satisfied.

We proceed to establish (2.14) by induction on p ; assuming it to hold for all $p \leq q$ we shall prove it for $p = q + 1$. The case $p = 0$ follows by (2.11), (2.12).

Applying $D_s^p D_t^r$ to both sides of (2.9) we obtain

$$(2.15) \quad D_s^{p+1} D_t^r w_1 = D_s^p D_t^r \psi_1(s, t, w_1, \dots, w_N) .$$

Using Lemma 1, the assertion readily follows if $\bar{H}$ is appropriately large (independently of p, r) .

We remark, in passing, that the ψ_1 are of class $C(M'_q)$ in s where $M'_q = 1$, and we can therefore establish (using (2.11), (2.12)) the inequalities

$$(2.16) \quad |D_s^p D_t^r w_1| \leq \bar{H}_0 \bar{H}^{p+r-a} M_{r-a} \quad (a \leq p + r < \infty) .$$

These stronger inequalities, however, are not needed in proving Theorem 1.

It remains to prove (2.11), (2.12). We first choose H_0 so that (2.11) hold and then proceed to prove (2.12) by induction on r : assuming it to hold for all $r \leq q-1$ we shall prove it for $r = q$.

Applying D_t^q to both sides of (2.9) and integrating with respect to s we get, using (2.10),

$$(2.17) \quad D_t^q w_1(s, t) = \int_0^s D_t^q \psi_1(\alpha, t, w_1, \dots, w_N) d\alpha .$$

Expanding $D_t^q \psi_1$ by the formula of total differentiation, we see that all the derivatives $D_t^j w_k$ appearing in the expansion are of order less than q with the exception of the terms

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial w_k} \psi_1 \right) D_t^q w_k .$$

Hence, applying Lemma 1, we obtain

$$|D_t^q \psi_1| \leq A_1 \sum_{k=1}^N |D_t^q w_k| + A_2 H_0 H^{q-a-1} M_{q-a} ,$$

where A_1 are used to denote constants depending only on the ψ_j and on H_0 . Substituting this inequality into (2.17), taking absolute values on both sides of the resulting inequality and finally summing over $i = 1, \dots, N$ we obtain

$$(2.18) \quad \varphi(s) \leq A_3 \int_0^s \varphi(\sigma) d\sigma + A_3 s H_0 H^{q-a-1} M_{q-a}$$

where

$$(2.19) \quad \varphi(s) = \sum_{k=1}^N |D_t^q w_k(s, t)|.$$

Integrating both sides of (2.18) with respect to s and taking s sufficiently small ($2sA_3 \leq 1$) we obtain an estimate for $\int \varphi(\sigma) d\sigma$. Substituting back into (2.18), we conclude that

$$\varphi(s) \leq A_4 s H_0 H^{q-a-1} M_{q-a}.$$

Hence, if $A_4 s \leq H$ then (2.12) follows for $r = q$.

Remark. Lemma 6 is valid without any restriction on the smallness of s . To prove it one modifies the last argument in the proof and uses Lemma 8 of §4.

From the proof of Theorem 1 we get:

Corollary. If the initial values ψ_1 depend on a parameter λ and are of class $C(M_{q-b})$ ($b \geq 3$) in (t, λ) , then the solution $z = z(x, \lambda)$ is of class $C(M_{q-b+1})$ in (x, λ) (in fact, in class $C(M_{q-b})$ in x and $C(M_{q-b+1})$ in λ).

Indeed, the initial values of p_1^0 are then of class $C(M_{q-b+1})$ in (t, λ) (by using Corollary 2 and the remark following the proof of Lemma 4) and we then can proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1, slightly modifying Lemma 6.

3. Formulas for Fundamental Solutions

The formulas of 3.2, 3.3 are taken from Babitch [1].

3.1. Definitions

Consider the differential operator

$$Pu = P(t, x, \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x})u = \frac{\partial^m u}{\partial t^m} + \sum_{k_0+k_1+\dots+k_n=m} a_{k_0 k_1 \dots k_n}(t, x) \frac{\partial^{k_0+k_1+\dots+k_n} u}{\partial t^{k_0} \partial x_1^{k_1} \dots \partial x_n^{k_n}}$$

and denote its principal part by $P_0(t, x, \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x})$. P is said to be hyperbolic (with respect to the t -direction) if for every real vector $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \neq 0$ the algebraic equation $P_0(t, x, \lambda, \xi) = 0$ has m real and distinct roots λ_1 , for any value of (t, x) .

We shall consider in this paper only uniformly hyperbolic operators, in the following sense:

- (i) If we denote by $\lambda_1(\xi, t, x)$ the roots of $P_0 = 0$, then

$$\inf_{(\xi, t, x)} |\lambda_1(\xi, t, x) - \lambda_j(\xi, t, x)| > 0$$

for all $i, j = 1, \dots, m$, where $i \neq j$, ξ varies on $|\xi| = 1$, $0 \leq t \leq \xi_0$ for some $\xi_0 > 0$, and x varies in the euclidean space R^n .

- (ii) The coefficients $a_\alpha(t, x)$ of P and the first derivatives of a_α , $|\alpha| = m$, are uniformly bounded in the strip: $|t| \leq \xi_0$, $x \in R^n$.

Under these assumptions and the assumptions that the a_α are sufficiently smooth, the following Cauchy problem has been solved by Petrowski [16], Leray [15] and Gårding [8]:

$$(3.1) \quad Pu = f(t, x)$$

$$(3.2) \quad \left. \frac{\partial^h u}{\partial t^h} \right|_{t=0} = \varphi_h(x) \quad (0 \leq h \leq m-1).$$

The degree of smoothness of the solution depends on the degree of smoothness of the a_α , f and the φ_h . Petrowski's work contains a gap; Leray's work is complete, whereas Gårding's work is a slight improvement of Leray's results and mostly a simplification of the methods. He considers also non-smooth data, assuming that P satisfies only (i), (ii).

A fundamental solution G_j ($0 \leq j \leq m-1$) of the Cauchy problem with pole (t^0, x^0) is a distribution G_j in x , with t as a parameter, which satisfies the equation $PG_j = 0$ and the initial conditions

$$(3.3') \quad \left. \frac{\partial^h G_j}{\partial t^h} \right|_{t=t^0} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } h \neq j \\ \delta(x-x^0) & \text{if } h = j \end{cases} \quad (0 \leq h \leq m-1)$$

where $\delta(x)$ is the Dirac measure with support at the origin.

Babitch [1] considered only the case $j = m-1$. We consider first this case but in §6 we discuss the general case. We set $G = G_{m-1}$ so that

$$(3.3) \quad \left. \frac{\partial^h G}{\partial t^h} \right|_{t=t^0} = 0 \quad \text{if } 0 \leq h \leq m-2, \quad \left. \frac{\partial^{m-1} G}{\partial t^{m-1}} \right|_{t=t^0} = \delta(x-x^0).$$

3.2. "Quasi" Plane-Waves

If the coefficients of P_0 are constants, then for any real vector $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$ and for any function f there are m solutions $f(\gamma)$ of $P_0 u = 0$, where $\gamma = vt + x \cdot \sigma$ ($x \cdot \sigma = \sum x_i \sigma_i$) and v is any one of the m real and distinct roots of $P_0(v, \sigma) = 0$. The solutions $f(\gamma)$ may be considered as plane-waves.

To construct an analogue of γ in the general case (γ may then be viewed as a "quasi" plane-wave) we solve the problem

$$(3.4) \quad P_0(t, x, \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial x}) = 0$$

$$(3.5) \quad \gamma|_{t=0} = \sigma \cdot x.$$

Equation (3.4) is of the form (2.1) and the initial conditions analogous to (2.2) can be given by setting $s = t$ and

$$(3.6) \quad x_i|_{s=0} = y_i \quad (1 \leq i \leq n), \quad x_0|_{s=0} = t|_{s=0} = 0$$

$$(3.7) \quad \gamma|_{s=0} = \sigma \cdot y,$$

where we (sometimes) set $x_0 = t$.

Conditions on the p_i at $s = 0$ (which satisfy the analogue of (2.3)) are given by

$$(3.8) \quad p_i|_{s=0} = \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial x_i}|_{s=0} = \sigma_i \quad (1 \leq i \leq n), \quad p_0 = v.$$

If $x_1 = y_1$ on $s = 0$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) and if $t = 0$ on $s = 0$ then (3.5) implies (3.7), (3.8). Conversely, (3.7) and (3.8) imply (3.5). The values

$p_0 = v$ are calculated from

$$(3.9) \quad P_0(0, y, v, \sigma) = 0$$

and there are m distinct solutions $v = v_1(y, \sigma)$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$), thus giving rise to m distinct solutions $\gamma = \gamma^{(i)}(x, t)$.

For later purposes we write down the characteristic system corresponding to the Cauchy problem (3.4), (3.6)-(3.8):

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{dx_1}{ds} &= \frac{\partial P_0(t, x, p_0, p)}{\partial p_1}, \quad \frac{dy}{ds} = \sum_{j=1}^n p_j \frac{\partial P_0(t, x, p_0, p)}{\partial p_j}, \\ \frac{dp_1}{ds} &= - \frac{\partial P_0(t, x, p_0, p)}{\partial x_1} \quad (0 \leq i \leq n; p = (p_1, \dots, p_n)). \end{aligned}$$

Solutions of (3.10) are called bicharacteristics.

3.3. Formal Construction of Fundamental Solutions

For simplicity we take $(t^0, x^0) = (0, 0)$.

We shall use the formula of Gelfand-Shapiro [9] (see also [10; Chapter 1]):

$$(3.11) \quad \delta(x) = \int_{|\sigma|=1} \varphi_n(x \cdot \sigma) d\sigma, \quad \varphi_n(r) = \begin{cases} c_n \delta^{(n-1)}(r) & (n \text{ odd}) \\ c_n r^{-n} & (n \text{ even}) \end{cases}$$

where c_n is a constant. It should be stressed that by r^{-2k} we understand the distribution defined by (see [10; p.73])

$$(r^{-2k}, \varphi) = \int_0^{\infty} r^{-2k} (\varphi(r) + \varphi(-r)) \\ -2[\varphi(0) + \frac{r^2}{2!} \varphi''(0) + \dots + \frac{r^{2k-2}}{(2k-2)!} \varphi^{(2k-2)}(0)] dr$$

and by r^{-2k-1} we understand the distribution defined by

$$(r^{-2k-1}, \varphi) = \int_0^{\infty} r^{-2k-1} (\varphi(r) - \varphi(-r)) \\ -2[r\varphi'(0) + \frac{r^3}{3!} \varphi^{(3)}(0) + \dots + \frac{r^{2k-1}}{(2k-1)!} \varphi^{(2k-1)}(0)] dr.$$

We have: $\frac{d}{dr} r^{-h} = -hr^{-h-1}$, and the distribution r^h for $h > 0$ is the ordinary function r^h .

We intend to find a solution G_{σ} of $PG_{\sigma} = 0$, satisfying

$$(3.12) \quad \left. \frac{\partial^h G_{\sigma}}{\partial t^h} \right|_{t=0} = 0 \quad (0 \leq h \leq m-2), \quad \left. \frac{\partial^{m-1} G_{\sigma}}{\partial t^{m-1}} \right|_{t=0} = \varphi_n(x \cdot \sigma).$$

Then, the fundamental solution G would be

$$(3.13) \quad G = \int_{|\sigma|=1} G_{\sigma} d\sigma.$$

We shall find G_{σ} in the form

$$(3.14) \quad G_{\sigma} = \sum_{j=1}^m G_{j\sigma}, \quad G_{j\sigma}(t, x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u_{kj\sigma}(t, x) f_k^{(j)}(\gamma_{\sigma})$$

and, for simplicity, we write

$$(3.15) \quad G_j \text{ for } G_{j\sigma}, u_{kj} \text{ for } u_{kj\sigma}, \gamma^{(j)} \text{ for } \gamma_{\sigma}^{(j)}.$$

The series $G_j = \sum_k u_{kj} f_k(\gamma^{(j)})$ has to satisfy $PG_j = 0$ and ΣG_j has to satisfy (3.12), formally. We do not consider here the question of convergence.

We introduce the operators P_s by the identity

$$(3.16) \quad P(uf(\gamma)) = \sum_{s=0}^m P_s(u) \frac{d^{m-s} f}{d\gamma^{m-s}}.$$

P_s are linear differential operators of order s and their coefficients are linear combinations of products of derivatives $D^j \gamma$ ($j \leq s+1$) with coefficients which are coefficients a_α of P . In particular,

$$(3.17) \quad P_0(u) = P_0(t, x, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma}, \frac{\gamma}{\gamma})u \equiv \sum_{k_0+\dots+k_n=m} a_{k_0\dots k_n}(t, x) \gamma_0^{k_0} \dots \gamma_n^{k_n} u \equiv Au$$

$$(3.17) \quad P_1(u) = \sum \frac{\partial A}{\partial \gamma_1} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1} + \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial^2 A}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \gamma_{ij} + B \right) u,$$

$$B = \sum_{k_0+\dots+k_n=m-1} a_{k_0\dots k_n}(t, x) \gamma_0^{k_0} \dots \gamma_n^{k_n}$$

where $\gamma_i = \partial \gamma / \partial x_i$, $\gamma_{ij} = \partial^2 \gamma / \partial x_i \partial x_j$ ($0 \leq i, j \leq n$).

Taking f_k such that $f_{k+1}(r) = \int f_k(r) dr$ we conclude that $u = \sum_k u_k(t, x) f_k(\gamma)$ is a solution of $Pu = 0$ if

$$(3.18) \quad P_0(u_0) = 0, \quad P_1(u_0) + P_0(u_1) = 0, \dots, \quad P_m(u_k) + P_{m-1}(u_{k+1}) + \dots + P_0(u_{k+m}) = 0, \dots$$

We now make a special choice of γ , namely, we take γ to be one of the m "quasi" plane-waves of 3.2. Then $A = 0$ and the first equation $P_0(u_0) = 0$ in (3.18) is satisfied, in view of (3.17). Also, $P_0(u_k) = 0$ for any k .

If we use (3.10), then the second equation becomes

$$\frac{du_0}{ds} + \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum \frac{\partial^2 A}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \gamma_{ij} + B \right) u_0 = 0 \quad (s = t),$$

and the general equation of (3.18) becomes

$$(3.19) \quad \frac{du_k}{dt} + \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum \frac{\partial^2 A}{\partial \gamma_i \partial \gamma_j} \gamma_{ij} + B \right) u_k = - \sum_{i=2}^m P_i (u_{k-i+1})$$

provided we agree to set $u_{-1} = u_{-2} = \dots = u_{-m+1} = 0$.

Since we have to deal with m distinct $\gamma = \gamma^{(h)}$, we get the equations

$$(3.20) \quad \frac{du_{kh}}{dt} + \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum \frac{\partial^2 A_h}{\partial \gamma_i^{(h)} \partial \gamma_j^{(h)}} \gamma_{ij}^{(h)} + B_h \right) u_{kh} = - \sum_{i=2}^m P_{ih} (u_{k-i+1, h})$$

where A_h, B_h, P_{ih} are obtained from A, B, P_i by taking $\gamma = \gamma^{(h)}$.

In order to satisfy (3.12), formally, we first apply $\partial^h / \partial t^h$ to

$u = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u_k f_k(\gamma)$ and obtain:

$$(3.21) \quad \frac{\partial^h u}{\partial t^h} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left[u_k (\gamma_0)^h + q_{h1}(u_{k-1}) + \dots + q_{h1}(u_{k-1}) + \dots + q_{hh}(u_{k-h}) \right] f_{k-h}(\gamma)$$

where $u_{-j} = 0$ if $j \geq 1$. Here

$$q_{hi} = q_{hi} \frac{\partial^i}{\partial t^i}$$

and q_{hi} is a polynomial in γ and its derivatives up to order h .

If we take

$$(3.22) \quad f_{-m+1}(r) = \begin{cases} c_n \delta^{(n-1)}(r) & (n \text{ odd}) \\ c_n r^{-n} & (n \text{ even}), \end{cases}$$

then it follows that the initial conditions (3.12) are equivalent to

$$(3.23) \quad \left[\sum_{j=1}^m u_{kj} (\gamma_0^{(j)})^h + \dots + Q_{h1j}(u_{k-1,j}) + \dots + Q_{hhj}(u_{k-h,j}) \right]_{t=0} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } h = m-1 \text{ and } k = 0 \\ \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where Q_{h1j} is Q_{h1} with $\gamma = \gamma^{(j)}$.

Since $\gamma_0^{(j)}$ are all distinct, (3.23) defines the u_{kj} uniquely in terms of the preceding u_{sj} , $s < k$ (recall our convention: $u_{sj} = 0$ if $s < 0$).

We finally write down the sequence f_k (as follows by (3.22) and the rule $f_{k+1} = \int f_k$).

For n odd,

$$(3.24) \quad f_k(r) = \begin{cases} c_n \delta^{(n-m-k)}(r) & \text{if } n-m-k \geq 0 \\ c_n \frac{r^{k+m-n-1} \xi(r)}{(k+m-n-1)!} & \text{if } n-m-k < 0 \end{cases}$$

where $\xi(r) = 0$ if $r < 0$, $\xi(r) = 1$ if $r \geq 0$.

For n even

$$(3.25) \quad f_k(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{c_n}{(k+m-1-n) \dots (1-n) r^{n+1-k-m}} & \text{if } n+1-k-m > 0 \\ \frac{(-1)^n c_n}{(n-1)!} \log \frac{1}{|r|} & \text{if } n+1-k-m = 0 \\ \frac{(-1)^n c_n r^{k+m-n-1}}{(n-1)! (k+m-n-1)!} \left(\log \frac{1}{|r|} + 1 + \dots + \frac{1}{k+m-n-1} \right) & \text{if } n+1-k-m < 0 \end{cases}$$

3.4. Statement of the Main Result

The characteristic conoid of P with the origin as vertex is the set of all points (t, x) satisfying the system of equations:

$$(3.26) \quad \gamma_{\sigma}^{(j)}(t, x) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial v_i} \gamma_{\sigma}^{(j)}(t, x) = 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq n-1)$$

for some (σ, j) , where $|\sigma| = 1$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. Here v_i are local coordinates on the unit sphere.

Let V be an open bounded set of points (t, x) , or a closure of such a set, which does not intersect the characteristic conoid, and let V^{ϵ} be the set $V \cap \{0 \leq t \leq \epsilon\}$, for any $\epsilon > 0$. Let W_{ρ}^{ϵ} be the set

$$\{(t, x) ; 0 \leq t \leq \epsilon, |x| \leq \rho\}$$

for any $0 < \rho \leq \infty$. Finally let R, R_0 be any positive numbers such that $R < R_0$ and $V^{\epsilon} \subset W_R^{\epsilon}$ for sufficiently small ϵ , say (for simplicity) for $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ where ϵ_0 appears in 3.1.

As is well known [15] [16] there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that for any $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$ the following holds: For every f and φ_h , the solution u of

$$Pu = f(t, x)$$

$$(3.27) \quad \left. \frac{\partial^h u}{\partial t^h} \right|_{t=0} = \varphi_h(x) \quad (0 \leq h \leq m-1)$$

in W_R^{ϵ} depends on f, φ_h and the coefficients of P only in $W_{R_0}^{\epsilon}$, that is to say: if one changes f, φ_h outside $W_{R_0}^{\epsilon}$ in any manner and if one changes the coefficients of P outside $W_{R_0}^{\epsilon}$ in such a way that (i), (ii) and the bounds concerned are preserved (ϵ_1 depends on these bounds) then the solution $\tilde{u}$ of the

modified problem (3.27) coincides with the solution u of (3.27) in W_R^ε . In other words, $W_{R_0}^\varepsilon$ contains the domain of dependence of W_R^ε .

In the sequel we shall assume (see Theorem 2) that the coefficients a_α of P are C^∞ in $W_{R_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$, and we shall consider the behavior of the fundamental solution

G in $V^\varepsilon \subset W_R^\varepsilon$. Hence, if $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$, we may modify the a_α outside $W_{R_0}^\varepsilon$ without affecting G in V^ε . We can use mollifiers for this purpose and thus achieve C^∞ coefficients for P also outside $W_{R_0}^\varepsilon$. Hence, in proving Theorem 2 we may assume that the coefficients of P are C^∞ in W_∞^ε for all $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$.

Let $\{\tilde{M}_q\}$ be a sequence of numbers which satisfy the same properties that $\{M_q\}$ was assumed to satisfy, and in addition,

$$(3.28) \quad M_{p+q} \leq (A')^{p+q+1} \tilde{M}_p M_q, \quad M_p \leq \tilde{M}_p \quad \text{for all } p, q \geq 0$$

where A' is a constant. For instance, if $M_p = (\delta p)!$ ($\delta \geq 1$), then we can take $\tilde{M}_p = M_p$.

We can now state the main result of the paper.

Theorem 2. If the coefficients of P belong to $C(M_{q-a}; W_{R_0}^{\varepsilon_0})$ for some $a \geq \varphi(m, n)$, then the fundamental solution $G(t, x)$ belongs to $C(\hat{M}_{q-a+d}; V^\varepsilon)$ for some ε sufficiently small, where φ and $d = d(m, n)$ depend only on m, n ; $\varphi(m, n) \geq d(m, n)$, and where

$$(3.29) \quad \hat{M}_{p-b} \leq \frac{M_{3p-b}}{p!} + \frac{M_{2p-b} \tilde{M}_p}{p!} \quad \text{for } b \geq 0$$

and $\hat{M}_p = M_p$ if $M_p = p!$.

Corollary 1. $M_q = q!$ is the analytic case and our result for this case coincides with that of Babitch [1].

Corollary 2. If the coefficients of P belong to $C[(\delta q)!; W_{R_0}^{\epsilon_0}]$ then G belongs to $C[(3\delta - 1)q!; V^{\epsilon}]$, for any $\delta > 1$.

The proof of Theorem 2 is given in §5. An auxiliary result on interior estimates for hyperbolic equations, which is of intrinsic interest, is proved in §4.

4. A Theorem on Interior Estimates

In this section we prove that for the Cauchy problem

$$(4.1) \quad Pu = f$$

$$(4.2) \quad \left. \frac{\partial^h u}{\partial t^h} \right|_{t=0} = 0 \quad (0 \leq h \leq m-1)$$

the following is true: If the coefficients of P belong to $C(M_{q-b}; W_{R_0}^{\alpha})$ for some $\alpha > 0$, $R_0 > 0$, then the successive derivatives of u in W_R^{α} can be estimated in terms of the successive derivatives of f in $W_{R_0}^{\alpha}$, provided the latter are bounded by $A^q M_{q-b}$. Here R_0 is sufficiently large, depending on R, α and P . The result is formulated in Theorem 3 below, and this theorem will be needed in §5, for the proof of Theorem 2.

Theorem 3 is analogous to results derived by the author in [4] [5] for elliptic and parabolic equations. It would be strictly analogous if R were to be $R_0 - \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, but such an assertion cannot be expected to hold for hyperbolic equations. The proof of Theorem 3 is based on different tools than those used in [4] [5], although a part of the technique is similar to [4] [5].

To formulate the theorem we introduce the norm

$$||v(t, \cdot)||_p = \left(\int_{|x| < \rho} |v(t, x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We assume that P is a uniformly hyperbolic operator with C^∞ coefficients in W_∞^α and that the coefficients belong to $C(M_{q-b}; W_{R_0}^\alpha)$, where $b \geq 0$. We further assume that R_1, R_2 can be found such that $R < R_1 < R_2 < R_0$ and (a) the domain of dependence of W_R^α is contained in $W_{R_1}^\alpha$, and (b) the domain of dependence of $W_\infty^\alpha - W_{R_0}^\alpha$ is contained in $W_\infty^\alpha - W_{R_2}^\alpha$.

We can now state:

Theorem 3. Let the foregoing assumptions be satisfied and let u be a solution of (4.1), (4.2) in W_R^α . If f satisfies, for $0 \leq t \leq \alpha$,

$$(4.3) \quad \|D^q f(t, \cdot)\|_{R_0} \leq E_0 E^q M_{q-b} \quad (0 \leq q \leq p)$$

then u satisfies, for $0 \leq t \leq \alpha$,

$$(4.4) \quad \|D^{q+m-1} u(t, \cdot)\|_R \leq K_0 K^q M_{q-b} \quad (0 \leq q \leq p)$$

where K_0, K depend only on E_0, E and on P, R, R_0, R_1, R_2 .

Proof. Note, first, that all the derivatives of u in (4.4) exist by [8] [15] [16]. We shall prove (4.3) for any given q , $0 \leq q \leq p$ (without using induction on q).

We modify f into a function $\tilde{f}$ defined as follows:

$$(4.5) \quad \tilde{f}(t, x) = \begin{cases} f(t, x) & \text{in } W_{R_1}^\alpha \\ \varphi(x) f(t, x) & \text{in } W_{R_2}^\alpha - W_{R_1}^\alpha \\ 0 & \text{in } W_\infty^\alpha - W_{R_2}^\alpha, \end{cases}$$

where $\varphi(x) = \varphi(|x|)$, and

$$(4.6) \quad \varphi((R_2 - R_1)r + R_1) = \zeta(r^2).$$

The function $\zeta(r)$ is required to satisfy the conditions:

$$\zeta(0) = 1, \quad \zeta^{(k)}(0) = 0 \quad (1 \leq k \leq q), \quad \zeta^{(j)}(1) = 0 \quad (0 \leq j \leq q).$$

Then, the same conditions are satisfied by $\zeta(r^2)$, and by (4.5) (4.6) it follows that $\tilde{f}$ is of differentiability class C^q in W_∞^α .

We want to find $\zeta(r)$ as a polynomial of degree $2q + 2$.

Then,

$$\zeta'(r) = r^q(1-r)^q(\beta r + \gamma)$$

for some β, γ . Integrating and using the conditions $\zeta(0) = 1$, $\zeta(1) = 0$, we get

$$\zeta(r) = \beta \int_0^r s^{q+1}(1-s)^q ds + \gamma \int_0^r s^q(1-s)^q ds + 1$$

where β, γ satisfy

$$\beta B(q+2, q+1) + \gamma B(q+1, q+1) + 1 = 0.$$

Here

$$B(x, k) = \frac{k!}{x(x+1) \dots (x+k-1)!} \quad (k \text{ integer } > 0)$$

is the Beta function.

If we take $\beta = 1$ then

$$\gamma = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{B(q+1, q+1)} \rightarrow -\frac{1}{2} \quad \text{as } q \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let $\eta(r)$ be the polynomial

$$\eta(r) = \int_0^r s^q (1+s)^{q+1} ds + 1.$$

Then it is clear that

$$|D_r^k \zeta(r^2)| \leq D_r^k \eta(r^2).$$

By expanding $D_x^k \zeta(r^2)$ and comparing each term in the expansion with that of $D_r^k \zeta(r^2)$ we find that

$$(4.7) \quad |D_x^k \zeta(r^2)| \leq D_r^k \eta(r^2).$$

The right side of (4.7) is easily seen to be bounded by $B_1^{k+1} q^k$, where B_1 are used in this section to denote appropriate constants depending only on P, R, R_0, R_1, R_2 .

Using (4.6) we get

$$(4.8) \quad |D_x^k \varphi(x)| \leq B_2^{k+1} q^k \quad (0 \leq k \leq q).$$

Hence,

$$(4.9) \quad \|D^k f(t, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \leq E_0 E^k M_{k-b} + \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} |D^j \varphi| \|D^{k-j} f(t, \cdot)\|_{R_0}.$$

At this point we introduce a new sequence $(\bar{M}_{k-b})$ defined by

$$(4.10) \quad \bar{M}_{k-b} = M_{k-b} \frac{q^k}{k!} \quad (0 \leq k \leq q)$$

and notice that $\bar{M}_k \geq M_k$. Also, by (1.2) and (1.1),

$$\binom{k}{j} q^j M_{k-j-b} \leq B_3^j \frac{q^j}{j!} \binom{k}{j} M_{j-b} M_{k-j-b} \leq B_3^j M_{k-b} \frac{q^k}{k!}$$

that is

$$(4.11) \quad \binom{k}{j} q^j M_{k-j-b} \leq B_3^j \bar{M}_{k-b} \quad (0 \leq j \leq k \leq q) .$$

Using (4.11), we obtain from (4.9)

$$\|D^k f(t, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \leq E_0 E^k M_{k-b} + B_4 E_0 \bar{E}^k \bar{M}_{k-b}$$

where $\bar{E} = \max\{E, 2B_2 B_3\}$. Hence,

$$(4.12) \quad \|D^k f(t, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \leq \bar{E}_0 \bar{E}^k \bar{M}_{k-b} \quad (0 \leq k \leq q)$$

where $\bar{E}_0 = E_0(1 + B_4)$.

Let u be the solution in W_∞^α of

$$(4.13) \quad P\tilde{u} = \tilde{f}$$

$$(4.14) \quad \left. \frac{\partial^j \tilde{u}}{\partial t^j} \right|_{t=0} = 0 \quad (0 \leq j \leq m-1).$$

By the choice of R_1, R_2 we conclude:

$$(4.15) \quad \tilde{u} = 0 \text{ in } W_\infty^\alpha - W_{R_0}^\alpha, \quad \tilde{u} = u \text{ in } W_R^\alpha.$$

Hence, if we prove by induction on h that

$$(4.16) \quad \|D^{h+m-1} \tilde{u}(t, \cdot)\| \leq K_1 K_2^h \bar{M}_{h-b} \quad (0 \leq h \leq q)$$

then, taking $h = q$ we obtain (4.4) with any $K > eK_2$. K_1 and K_2 will be proved to depend on $\bar{M}_0, \bar{E}$ and on P, R, R_0, R_1, R_2 .

Before starting with the proof of (4.16), we need the following fact which we state as a lemma.

Lemma 7.

$$\underline{\text{If}} \quad |D^k g| \leq B_5^{k+1} M_{k-b},$$

$$\|D^k h\| \leq N_0 N^k \bar{M}_{k-b}$$

for $0 \leq k \leq q$, then

$$\|D^k(fg)\| \leq B_6 N_0 N^k \bar{M}_{k-b} \quad (0 \leq k \leq q)$$

provided $N > 2B_5$. B_6 is independent of N_0, N .

Proof. We first observe that if $0 \leq j \leq k \leq q$,

$$\binom{k}{j} M_{k-j-b} \bar{M}_{j-b} \leq A M_{k-b} \frac{q^j}{j!} \leq A M_{k-b} \frac{q^k}{q!},$$

that is,

$$(4.17) \quad \binom{k}{j} M_{k-j-b} \bar{M}_{j-b} \leq A \bar{M}_{k-b},$$

where we made use of (1.1).

Using (4.17) we get

$$\|D^k(g_h)\| \leq \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} |D^{k-j}h| \|D^j g\| \leq B_6 N_0 N^k \bar{M}_{k-b},$$

where we made use of the fact that $N > 2B_5$.

In proving (4.16) we shall make use of the energy inequality [8 ; Theorem 7.1]:

$$(4.18) \quad \sum_{|\alpha|=m-1} \|D^\alpha v(t, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq B_7 \sum_{|\alpha|=m-1} \|D^\alpha v(0, \cdot)\|_\infty + \\ + B_7 \int_0^t \|Pv(\tau, \cdot)\|_\infty d\tau,$$

where B_7 depends only on P . We shall apply it to $v = D^h u$. Hence, we first have to estimate the left side of (4.16) for $t = 0$.

We shall prove, by induction on h , that

$$(4.19) \quad \|D_t^{h+m} D_x^r u(0, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq K_3 K_4^{2h+r} \bar{M}_{h-b} \quad (0 \leq h+r \leq q).$$

Here K_3, K_4 depend on the same quantities as K_1, K_2 .

For $h = -1$ the left side of (4.19) is zero. We now assume that (4.19) holds for all $h < k$ and proceed to prove it for $h = k$.

Applying $D_t^k D_x^r$ ($k+r \leq q$) to both sides of (4.13) and taking $t = 0$ we get

$$(4.20) \quad D_t^{k+m} D_x^r \tilde{u} = - D_t^k D_x^r \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} a_\alpha D^\alpha \tilde{u} \right) + D_t^k D_x^r \tilde{f} \equiv I_1 + I_2,$$

where $D^\alpha = D_t^{\alpha_0} \dots D_{x_n}^{\alpha_n}$ and $\alpha_0 < m$.

$\|I_1\|$ can be estimated by using the inductive assumption, making use of the assumption that $a_\alpha \in C(M_{q-b}; W_{R_0}^\alpha)$ (and recalling that $u = 0$ in $W_\infty^\alpha - W_{R_0}^\alpha$, by (4.15)), and employing Lemma 7. $\|I_2\|$ was already estimated in (4.12). Combining these estimates we get

$$\|D_t^{k+m} D_x^r \tilde{u}(0, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq B_8 K_3 K_4^{2k+r-1} \bar{M}_{k-b},$$

provided K_4 is sufficiently large, depending only on $\bar{E}_0, \bar{E}, P, R, R_0, R_1, R_2$. Taking $K_4 \geq B_8$ the proof of (4.19), by induction, is completed.

We can now proceed to establish (4.16).

Proof of (4.16). We assume (4.16) to hold for all $h < k$ and shall prove it for $h = k$. The case $h = 0$ follows from the energy inequality (4.18) applied to $v = \tilde{u}$.

Applying D^k to both sides of (4.13) we get

$$(4.21) \quad P(D^k \tilde{u}) = D^k \tilde{f} - \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{s} (D^{\alpha+s} \tilde{u}) D^{k-s} a_\alpha \equiv J_1 + J_2.$$

J_2 consists of two sums. The first sum, J_{21} , contains all the terms involving derivatives of $\tilde{u}$ of order $k + m - 1$ and its norm is bounded by

$$B_9 \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \|D^{\alpha+k-1} u(t, \cdot)\|_{\infty}.$$

The other sum, $J_2 - J_{21}$, can be estimated using the inductive assumption and Lemma 7. We obtain

$$\|J_2 - J_{21}\| \leq B_{10} K_1 K_2^{k-1} \bar{M}_{k-b}.$$

Finally, $\|J_1\|$ is estimated by (4.12).

Taking $K_2 > \bar{E}$, $K_1 > \bar{E}_0$ we get:

$$(4.22) \quad \|P(D^k \tilde{u})(t, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \leq B_9 \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \|D^{\alpha+k-1} \tilde{u}(t, \cdot)\|_{\infty} + B_{11} K_1 K_2^{k-1} \bar{M}_{k-b}.$$

We now apply (4.18) with $v = D^k \tilde{u}$. Using (4.19), (4.22) we obtain, if $K_2 > K_4$ and $K_1 > K_3$,

$$(4.23) \quad \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \|D^{\alpha} D^{k-1} \tilde{u}(t, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \leq B_{12} K_1 K_2^{k-1} \bar{M}_{k-b} + B_{12} \int_0^t \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \|D^{\alpha} D^{k-1} \tilde{u}(\tau, \cdot)\|_{\infty} d\tau.$$

In this inequality $D^{k-1} \tilde{u}$ is one specific $(k-1)$ -th derivative. (Strictly speaking, we only obtain (4.23) with

$$\sum_{|\alpha|=m-1} \|D^{\alpha} D^k \tilde{u}\|$$

on the left, but then (4.23) follows very easily.)

We now need:

Lemma 8. Let $y(\tau)$, $Q(\tau)$ be continuous non-negative functions for $\tau \geq 0$ and suppose that

$$y(\tau) \leq H \int_0^{\tau} y(\xi) d\xi + Q(\tau), \quad \tau \geq 0.$$

Then

$$\int_0^{\tau} y(\xi) d\xi \leq e^{H\tau} \int_0^{\tau} e^{-H\xi} Q(\xi) d\xi.$$

Applying the lemma to (4.23) and taking K_2 sufficiently large (depending on B_{12} and α ($t \leq \alpha$)), the proof is completed.

Corollary 1. Using Sobolev's lemma we conclude from (4.4) that for all (t, x) in W_R^α ,

$$(4.29) \quad |D^{q+m-1-\nu} u(t, x)| \leq \bar{K}_0 K^q M_{q-b} \quad (0 \leq q \leq p)$$

where $\bar{K}_0 = K_0 B_{13}$ and $\nu = [\frac{n+2}{2}]$.

Corollary 2. From (4.24) it follows that if f belongs to $C(M_{q-b}; W_{R_0}^\alpha)$ then u belongs to $C(M_{q-b+m-1-\nu}; W_R^\alpha)$.

Corollary 3. If $f = f(t, x, \lambda)$ depends on a parameter λ and it satisfies

$$\|D_0^q f(t, \cdot, \lambda)\|_R \leq K_0 K^q M_{q-b} \quad (0 \leq q \leq p).$$

where D_0^q means any q -th partial derivatives with respect to (t, x, λ) , and $0 \leq t \leq \alpha$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$, then

$$\|D_0^{q+m-1} u(t, \cdot, \lambda)\|_R \leq K_0 K^q M_{q-b} \quad (0 \leq q \leq p).$$

The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3. Indeed, $\tilde{f}$ is defined in the same way as before. In (4.19) we replace D_x^r by $D_{x\lambda}^r$ which means: any r -th partial derivative with respect to (x, λ) , and then proceed to prove it by induction on h .

Finally, in proving (4.16) we apply D_0^k to both sides of (4.13).

Remark. Given any $R < R_0$ we can find R_1, R_2 as in the assumptions of Theorem 3, provided α is sufficiently small. This fact will be used in § 5.

4. Proof of the Theorem 2.

The proof is divided into seven steps. In 4.1 - 4.4 we only use the restriction $\phi(m,n) \geq m + 4$.

4.1. Estimates for $\gamma^{(j)}$

Consider the Cauchy problem (3.4), (3.6)-(3.8) (with $v = v_j$) for $\gamma = \gamma^{(j)}$. By Lemma 3 and (1.2), the initial values $p_0 = v_j$ which are determined as solutions of the polynomial equation (3.9), whose coefficients are of class $C\{M_{q-a}\}$ in (y, σ) , are of class $C\{M_{q-a}\}$ in (y, σ) .

We can now apply Theorem 1 and its corollary (as $a \geq 3$) and conclude that $\gamma^{(j)} = \gamma_{\sigma}^{(j)}(t, x)$ is of class $C\{M_{q-a+1}\}$ in (t, x, σ) . Thus,

$$(5.1) \quad |D_*^r \gamma_{\sigma}^{(j)}(t, x)| \leq A_0 A^r M_{r-a+1} \quad (0 \leq r < \infty),$$

where D_* is used in this section to denote any partial derivative with respect to (t, x, σ) .

4.2. Estimates for u_{kh}

We set $b = a - 3$.

The coefficient

$$(5.2) \quad c_h(t, x) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial^2 A_h}{\partial x_i^{(h)} \partial y_j^{(h)}} \gamma_{ij}^{(h)} + B_h$$

in (3.20) is of class $C\{M_{q-b}\}$ (as follows by (5.1), using Lemma 1). Hence,

$$(5.3) \quad |D_*^r c_h(t, x)| \leq A_1 A_2^r M_{r-b} \quad (0 \leq r < \infty),$$

where A_1, A_2 are constants.

We next derive estimates for the coefficients of the operators P_{ij} , Q_{hij} appearing in (3.20) and (3.23), respectively.

By the paragraph containing (3.16) and the fact that $\gamma^{(j)}$ belongs to $C(M_{q-a+1})$ (and hence $D^{s+1} \gamma^{(j)}$ belongs to $C(M_{q-a+s+2})$) it follows, using Lemma 1, that the coefficients of P_{sj} belong to $C(M_{q-a+s+2})$ provided $a-(s+2) \geq 2$. A closer look at P_{sj} shows that if

$$P_{sj}(v) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} P_{s\alpha j}(t, x) D^\alpha v$$

where $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$, $|\alpha| = \sum \alpha_i$, $D^\alpha = D_t^{\alpha_0} D_{x_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots D_{x_n}^{\alpha_n}$, then

$$(5.4) \quad P_{s\alpha j} \text{ belongs to } C(M_{q-a+s-|\alpha|+2}),$$

provided $a-(s-|\alpha|+2) \geq 2$. Here it is where our assumption $a \geq m+4$ enters, as $1 \leq s \leq m$.

We turn to Q_{hij} . By the sentence following (3.21) it follows, upon using Lemma 1, that

$$Q_{hij} = q_{hij}(t, x) \frac{\partial^1}{\partial t^1}$$

and

$$(5.5) \quad q_{hij} \text{ belongs to } C(M_{q-a+m}).$$

We set

$$c = \min(a-3, a-m)$$

so that $b \geq c \geq 2$, and express (5.4), (5.5) in more detail, namely,

$$(5.6) \quad |D_*^r P_{s\alpha j}| \leq A_3 A_4^r M_{r-a+s-|\alpha|+2} \quad (0 \leq r < \infty)$$

$$(5.7) \quad |D_*^r q_{hij}| \leq A_3 A_4^r M_{r-c} \quad (0 \leq r < \infty)$$

where A_3, A_4 are constants.

We shall now establish the desired inequalities for $u_{kh}(t, x)$ (recall (3.15)) in five steps. Throughout the rest of this section, we denote by D_0^r any r -th partial derivative with respect to the variables (x, σ) . D^r has the same meaning with respect to the variables (t, x) .

The first step consists in proving that

$$(5.8) \quad |D_t^q D_0^r u_{oh}(0, x)| \leq H_1 H_2^{q+r-b} M_{q+r-b}$$

for all $1 \leq h \leq m$, and all q, r such that $q + r > b$. Here H_1 is chosen in such a way that

$$|D_t^q D_0^r u_{oh}(0, x)| \leq H_1 \quad \text{if } q + r \leq b.$$

The proof of (5.8) is by induction on q . To prove it for $q = 0$ we use equations (2.23) for $k = 0$, namely,

$$\sum_{j=1}^m u_{oj} (\gamma_o^{(j)})^h = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq h \leq m-2 \\ 1 & \text{if } h = m-1. \end{cases}$$

The u_{oj} can be uniquely solved by using Cramer's rule, as the coefficients matrix is non-singular. Since by Lemma 1, the product of functions in $C(M_{q-b})$ is again in $C(M_{q-b})$ and since $1/f$ belongs to $C(M_{q-b})$ if $f \neq 0$ and f belongs to $C(M_{q-b})$, we conclude that the u_{oj} belong to $C(M_{q-b})$ (as $\gamma_o^{(j)} = \partial \gamma^{(j)} / \partial t$ belongs to $C(M_{q-b})$, by (5.1)). This establishes (5.8) for $q = 0$.

We next assume that (5.8) holds for all $q < p$ and proceed to establish it for $q = p$. We shall make use of the differential equation (3.20) for $k = 0$, namely,

$$(5.9) \quad \frac{du_{oh}}{dt} + C_h u_{oh} = 0.$$

Applying $D_t^{p-1} D_o^r$ to both sides of (5.9) and then taking $t = 0$ we obtain (at points $(0, x, \sigma)$)

$$D_t^p D_o^r u_{oh} = - \sum_{l=0}^r \sum_{s=0}^{p-1} \binom{p-1}{s} \binom{r}{l} D_t^s D_o^l u_{oh} D_t^{p-1-s} D_o^{r-l} C_h.$$

The right side is bounded by

$$A_5 H_1 \sum_{l=0}^r \sum_{s=0}^{p-1} \binom{p-1}{s} \binom{r}{l} \hat{H}_2^{s+l-b} A_2^{p-1+r-s-l} M_{s+l-b} M_{p-1+r-s-l-b}$$

where A_1 are constants independent of r, p and where we use the notation:

$$\hat{H}_j^e = \begin{cases} H_j^e & \text{if } e \geq 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } e < 0. \end{cases}$$

Taking $H_2 > 2A_2$ and using (1.1) we get

$$|D_t^p D_o^r u_{oh}(0, x)| \leq A_6 H_1 H_2^{p-1+r-b} M_{p-1+r-b}.$$

Taking $H_2 > A_6$, the proof of (5.8) for $q = p$ follows. (In fact, we have proved (5.8) with M_{q+r-b} replaced by $M_{q+r-b-1}$, but this will not be used in the sequel, as it does not yield any improvement for the estimates of the $u_{kh}(t, x)$.)

The second step consists in proving that

$$(5.10) \quad |D_t^q D_o^r u_{kh}(0, x)| \leq H_3 H_4^{2k+q+r-b} M_{k+q+r-c},$$

for all $1 \leq h \leq m$, and all q, r, k such that $2k + q + r > b$. H_3 is chosen in such a way that

$$|D_t^q D_o^r u_{kh}(0, x)| \leq H_3 \quad \text{if } 2k + q + r \leq b.$$

From the proof given below it follows that $M_{k+q+r-c}$ can be replaced in (5.10) by

$M_{k+q+r-c-1}$, but this will not be used in the sequel.

Since $c \leq b$, (5.10) for $k = 0$ follows from (5.8) if we take $H_3 \geq H_1$, $H_4 \geq H_2$. We now proceed by induction on k : We assume that (5.10) holds for all u_{ph} with $p \leq k$ and proceed to prove it for $p = k$. H_3 is fixed and H_4 is still to be determined (independently of k, q, r).

We employ another induction on q . We then first have to establish (5.10) for $q = 0$. We make use of (3.23) and we write these equations in the form

$$(5.11) \quad \sum_{j=1}^m u_{kj} (\gamma_o^{(j)})^h = - \tilde{Q}_{kh}.$$

We first need to estimate $D_o^r \tilde{Q}_{kh}$ at points $(0, x, \sigma)$. This expression consists of a finite sum (the number of terms is bounded independently of k, r), the general term of which is

$$D_o^r (q_{hij} D_t^1 u_{k-1,j}) = \sum_{s=0}^r \binom{r}{s} D_o^{r-s} q_{hij} D_o^s D_t^1 u_{k-1,s} \quad (1 \leq i \leq h, k).$$

Using (5.7) and the inductive assumptions we get the bound

$$A_7 \sum_{s=0}^r \binom{r}{s} A_4^{r-s} H_3 \hat{H}_4^{2(k-1)+1+s-b} M_{r-s-c} M_{k+s-c}.$$

Taking $H_4 > 2A_4$ we thus obtain

$$(5.12) \quad |D_o^r \tilde{Q}_{kh}| \leq A_8 H_3 H_4^{k+r-b-1} M_{k+r-c}.$$

We are now ready to establish (5.10) for $q = 0$ by induction on r . For $r = 0$ we simply solve (5.11) and use (5.12) with $r = 0$, taking $H_4 > A_8$. Assuming the validity of (5.10) for $D_o^s u_{kr}$ with $s < r$, we shall prove it for $s = r$. We apply D_o^r to both sides of (5.11) and obtain

$$(5.13) \quad \sum_{j=1}^m (D_o^r u_{kj})(\gamma_o^{(j)})^h = - \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} \binom{r}{s} D_o^s u_{kj} D_o^{r-s} (\gamma_o^{(j)})^h - D_o^r \tilde{q}_{kh}.$$

Using the inductive assumption and the inequalities (5.1) which hold not only for the $\gamma^{(j)}$ but also for any power $(\gamma^{(j)})^h$ (by Lemma 1) with different A_0, A , we find that the first sum on the right side of (5.13) is bounded by

$$A_9 H_3 H_4^{2k+r-1} M_{k+r-c}.$$

The second term is estimated by (5.12). Hence, taking $H_4 > A_8 + A_9$, the proof of (5.10) for $q = 0$ is completed.

We now proceed by induction on q . Assuming (5.10) to hold for all $q < p$, we shall establish it for $q = p$. We shall make use of the differential equations (3.20) which we write in the abbreviated form

$$(5.14) \quad \frac{du_{kh}}{dt} + C_h u_{kh} = - \tilde{P}_{kh}.$$

We first estimate $D_t^{p-1} D_o^r \tilde{P}_{kh}$ at points $(0, x, \sigma)$. It suffices to estimate the general term

$$J \equiv D_t^{p-1} D_o^r (P_{i\alpha h} D^\alpha u_{k-i+1, h}) \quad (2 \leq i \leq m, |\alpha| \leq 1, k \geq 1).$$

Using the inductive assumptions and (5.6) we get

$$\begin{aligned} |J| &\leq \sum_{s=0}^{p-1+r} \binom{p-1+r}{s} |D_*^{p-1+r-s} P_{i\alpha h}| |D^\alpha D_*^s u_{k-i+1, h}| \\ &\leq A_{10} H_3 H_4^{2k+p-1+r-b} \max_s \binom{p-1+r}{s} M_{p-1+r-s-a+1-|\alpha|+2} M_{k-i+1+|\alpha|+s-c} \\ &\leq A_{11} H_3 H_4^{2k+p-1+r-b} M_{k+p+r-c}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$(5.15) \quad |D_t^{p-1} D_o^r \tilde{P}_{kh}| \leq A_{12} H_3 H_4^{2k+p-1+r-b} M_{k+p+r-c}.$$

We now proceed to estimate $D_t^p D_o^r u_{kh}(0, x)$. Applying $D_t^{p-1} D_o^r$ to both sides of (5.14) and taking $t = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D_t^p D_o^r u_{kh} = & - \sum_{l=0}^{p-1} \sum_{s=0}^r \binom{p-1}{l} \binom{r}{s} (D_t^{p-1-l} D_o^{r-s} c_h) (D_t^l D_o^s u_{kh}) \\ & - D_t^{p-1} D_o^r \tilde{P}_{kh}. \end{aligned}$$

The first sum is estimated by using (5.3) and the inductive assumptions, and we obtain the bound

$$A_{13} H_3 H_4^{2k+p-1+r-b} M_{k+p-1+r-c}.$$

Combining this with the inequality (5.15) and taking $H_4 > A_{12} + A_{13}$, the proof of (5.10) is completed.

The third step consists in proving that, for $1 \leq h \leq m$,

$$(5.16) \quad |D_t^q D_o^r u_{oh}(t, x)| \leq H_5 H_6^{q+r-b} M_{q+r-c} \quad (q + r > b)$$

(note that the argument is (t, x) and not $(0, x)$ as in the first two steps).

H_5 is chosen in such a way that

$$|D_t^q D_o^r u_{oh}(t, x)| \leq H_5 \quad \text{if} \quad q + r \leq b.$$

The proof is by induction on q . To prove it for $q = 0$ we employ induction on r . Assuming (5.16) with $q = 0$ to hold for all D_o^l , $l < r$, we proceed to prove it for $l = r$.

Applying D_o^r to both sides of (5.9) we get

$$(5.17) \quad \frac{d}{dt} (D_o^r u_{oh}) + c_h (D_o^r u_{oh}) = F_{oh}$$

and

$$(5.18) \quad |F_{oh}| \leq \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} \binom{r}{s} |D_o^s u_{oh}| |D_o^{r-s} c_h| \leq A_{14} H_5 H_6^{r-1-b} M_{r-c},$$

as follows by using (5.3) and the inductive assumption.

Integrating (5.17) with respect to t and using (5.8) with $q = 0$ and (5.18), we get

$$(5.19) \quad |D_o^r u_{oh}(t, x)| \leq H_1 H_2^{r-b} M_{r-c} + A_{14} H_5 H_6^{r-1-b} M_{r-c} + A_{15} \int_0^t |D_o^r u_{oh}(\tau, x)| d\tau.$$

Integrating both sides of (5.19) with respect to t , we can then eliminate the integral on the right side of (5.19) and thus obtain (5.16) with $q = 0$, provided we take $H_6 > H_2$, $H_6 > A_{16}$, for appropriate A_{16} :

We proceed to prove that if (5.16) holds for all $q < p$ then it holds for $q = p$. Applying $D_t^{p-1} D_o^r$ to both sides of (5.9) and using (5.3) and the inductive assumption (in a similar way to the calculations in step 1), the desired inequality easily follows if $H_6 > A_{17}$, for appropriate A_{17} .

The fourth step consists in proving that, for $1 \leq h \leq m$,

$$(5.20) \quad |D_t^q D_o^r u_{kh}(t, x)| \leq H_7 H_8^{2k+q+r-b} M_{2k+q+r-c} \quad (2k+q+r > b)$$

where H_7 is chosen in such a way that

$$|D_t^q D_o^r u_{kh}(t, x)| \leq H_7 \quad \text{if} \quad 2k+q+r \leq b.$$

The proof is by induction on k . The case $k = 0$ is step 3. In order to establish

the inductive passage from $k-1$ to k , we employ another induction on q . Thus, we first have to prove the case $q = 0$, that is,

$$(5.21) \quad |D_0^r u_{kh}(t, x)| \leq H_7 H_8^{2k+r-b} M_{2k+r-c} \quad (2k + r > b).$$

To prove (5.21) we employ induction on r . The case $r = 0$ will not be described here since it follows by a part of the argument given below for the inductive passage from $r-1$ to r .

In order to perform this passage, we apply D_0^r to both sides of (3.20) and obtain

$$(5.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (D_0^r u_{kh}) + C_h (D_0^r u_{kh}) = & - \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} \binom{r}{s} D_0^s u_{kh} D_0^{r-s} C_h \\ & - \sum_{i=2}^m D_0^r P_{ih}(u_{k-i+1, h}) \equiv F_{rkh}. \end{aligned}$$

The first sum is estimated by

$$(5.23) \quad A_{18} H_7 H_8^{2k+r-1-b} M_{2k+r-c},$$

where use is being made of (5.3) and the inductive assumption.

In the second sum, each term is a sum of terms of the form

$$(5.24) \quad D_0^r (P_{i0h} D_0^\alpha u_{k-i+1, h}).$$

Using (5.6) and the inductive assumption get (by calculation similar to step 2) a bound (5.23) but with a different A_{18} .

Hence,

$$(5.25) \quad |F_{rkh}| \leq A_{19} H_7 H_8^{2k+r-1-b} M_{2k+r-c}.$$

We now integrate (5.22) with respect to t and proceed by an argument of step 3.

The proof of (5.21) is thus established.

Having proved (5.20) for $q = 0$ to proceed to establish the inductive passage from $q-1$ to q . This is done simply by applying $D_t^{q-1} D_0^r$ to both sides of (5.14). Since a similar argument appears in step 2, we omit further details.

Remark. The inequalities

$$(5.26) \quad |D_t^q D_0^r u_{kh}(t, x)| \leq H_7 H_8^{2k+q+r-b} M_{k+q+r-c}$$

may seem more natural than (5.20). If they are true then the next step is superfluous and Theorem 2 can also be improved by having

$$\hat{M}_{p-b} \leq \frac{M_{2p-b}}{p!} + \frac{M_{p-b} \tilde{M}_p}{p!}.$$

However, it seems to us that (5.26) is not true. The difficulty in trying to establish it is that the sum of the orders of differentiation and the subindices of the u 's of (5.24) is $k + r + 1$, if $|\alpha| = 1$, and not $k + r$. Therefore, in order to carry out the inductive passage from $k-1$ to k , more weight should be given to the index k . We are thus led to establishing (5.20) with $M_{\lambda k+q+r-c}$ for some $\lambda \geq 1$. The previous proof works well only if $\lambda \geq 2$.

The fifth step (and the final one) consists in combining the results of the second and fourth steps in order to improve the results of the fourth step.

By Taylor's formula we have:

$$D_t^q D_0^r u_{kh}(t, x) = \sum_{v=0}^{N-1} \frac{t^v}{v!} D_t^{v+q} D_0^r u_{kh}(0, x) + R_{kh}^N$$

where

$$|R_{kh}^N| \leq \frac{t^N}{N!} |D_t^{N+q} D_0^r u_{kh}(t, x)|$$

for some $\tilde{t}$, $0 < \tilde{t} < t$.

Using (5.10), (5.20) we get

$$(5.27) \quad \begin{aligned} |D_t^q D_o^r u_{kh}(t, x)| &\leq \sum_{v=0}^{N-1} \frac{t^v}{v!} H_3 H_4^{2k+q+r+v} M_{k+q+r+v-c} \\ &+ \frac{t^N}{N!} H_7 H_8^{2k+q+r+N} M_{2k+q+r+N-c} \end{aligned}$$

If $M_q = q!$ then the last term on the right side of (5.27) tends to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$, provided $t \leq \xi$ and ξ is sufficiently small (i.e., $3 \xi H_8 < 1$). On the other hand, the sum on the right side of (5.27) is bounded, independently of v , by

$$A_{20} H_3 H_4^{2k+q+r} (k + q + r - c)!,$$

provided ξ is sufficiently small (say $3 \xi H_4 < 1$).

Introducing the notation

$$(5.28) \quad M_{k,s} = \begin{cases} M_s & \text{if } M_q = q! \\ M_{k+s} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

we conclude from (5.27) and from step 4, that

$$(5.29) \quad |D_*^r u_{kh}(t, x)| \leq H_o H^{k+r} M_{k, k+r-c}$$

for some constants H_o, H . This is the final form of our estimates for the u_{kh} . Note that (t, x) varies in $W_{R_o}^\xi$, and σ varies on $|\sigma| = 1$.

4.3. Estimates for $f_k(\gamma^{(j)})$

From (3.24), (3.25) we see that $f_k(x)$, for $k \geq n - m + 2$ is of differentiability class $C^{k-n+m-2}$ and we can write

$$(5.30) \quad f_k(r) \approx \frac{r^{k-n+m-1}}{(k-n+m-1)!}$$

in the following sense: Each derivative D_r^q ($q \leq k-n+m-2$) of any side of (5.30) is bounded by a constant (independent of q, k) times the derivative D_r^q of the other side.

From the proof of Lemma 2 it is seen (using (5.30)) that the lemma remains true if $F(u) = u^1$ is replaced by

$$F(u) = 1! f_{i+n-m+1}(u).$$

Making use of (5.1) we thus get

$$(5.31) \quad |D_*^q f_k(\gamma^{(j)})| \leq K_1 \frac{A_0^{i-1} K_0^{i-1}}{A^{i-1}} A_0 A^{q-a-1} \frac{q(q-1) \dots (q-i+2)}{(k-n+m-1)!} M_{q-i-a+2}$$

where $i = k - n + m - 1$ and $a + 1 < q \leq k - n + m - 2 = i - 1$, and

$$(5.32) \quad |D_*^q f_k(\gamma^{(j)})| \leq K_1 \frac{1}{(k-n+m-1)!} \quad \text{if } 0 \leq q \leq a + 1.$$

K_1 are constant independent of q, k .

Taking $A > A_0 K_0$ we conclude, from (5.31), that

$$(5.33) \quad |D_*^q f_k(\gamma^{(j)})| \leq K_2 \frac{A_0 A^{q-a}}{(k-n+m-1)!} M_{q-a+1} \quad (a+1 < q < k-n+m-2).$$

The inequalities (5.32), (5.33) are true also for all $q \geq 0$ at points (t, x, σ) where $\gamma_\sigma^{(j)}(t, x) \neq 0$. Indeed, for n odd, $f_k(r) = 0$ if $k \leq n-m$, and $r \neq 0$ whereas $f_k(r) = C_{k,n} r^{k+m-n-1}$ if $k > n-m$, where $C_{k,n}$ is constant, positive for $r > 0$ and zero for $r < 0$. Hence we only have to consider the case $k > n-m$, $\gamma^{(j)}(t, x) > 0$ and we then apply Lemma 2 and derive (5.32), (5.33) for all $q \geq 0$.

For n even proof of (5.32), (5.33) for all $q \geq 0$ (at points where $\gamma^{(j)} \neq 0$

is somewhat different. Let $|\gamma^{(j)}(t, x)| > r_0$ for some $r_0 > 0$. We then observe that $(k+m-n-1)! f_k(r)$ belongs to $C(\{q-\alpha\})$, uniformly in k , on any set $\{r; r_0 \leq |r| \leq r_1\}$. Combining this remark with (5.1) and using Lemma 1, the proof of (5.32), (5.33) follows.

4.4. Estimates for $u_{kh}(t, x) f_k(\gamma^{(h)})$

Let $q \leq k - n + m + 1$. Then, using (5.29) and (5.32), (5.33) we get

$$(5.34) \quad |D_*^q [u_{kh}(t, x) f_k(\gamma^{(h)})]| \leq \frac{K_3}{(k-n+m-1)!} \sum_{r=0}^q \binom{q}{r} H_0 \hat{H}^{k+r} A_0 A^{q-r} M_{k, k+r-c}$$

$$M_{q-r-a+1} \leq \frac{K_4 H^{k+q}}{(k-n+m-1)!} M_{k, k+q-c}$$

This inequality remains true for all $q > 0$ at points (t, x, σ) where $\gamma_\sigma^{(h)}(t, x) \neq 0$, and then K_4 depends on r_0 where r_0 is any constant $< |\gamma_\sigma^{(h)}(t, x)|$. Hence, for such points (t, x, σ) ,

$$(5.35) \quad |D_*^q \left[\sum_{k=0}^N u_{kh}(t, x) f_k(\gamma^{(h)}) \right]| \leq \frac{K_5 H^{N+q}}{(N-n+m-2)!} M_{N, N+q-c}$$

4.5. Estimates for the "remainder" $G_h = \sum_{k=0}^N u_{kh}(t, x) f_k(\gamma^{(h)})$

We set

$$(5.36) \quad U_{pj}(t, x) = \sum_{k=0}^p u_{kj}(t, x) f_k(\gamma^{(j)})$$

$$(5.37) \quad R_{ph}(t, x) = G_h(t, x) - U_{ph}(t, x).$$

We continue to use the abbreviations (3.15). R_{ph} may be considered as the "remainder"

of the (generally) divergent series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u_{kh} f_k(\gamma^{(h)})$. We shall estimate in this subsection $D_*^q R_{ph}$ for $q \leq p - n + m - 1 - v$ where $v = [\frac{n+2}{2}]$. Setting $P = P(t, x, \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x})$ it is easily seen that R_{ph} satisfies formally, the equation

$$(5.38) \quad P R_{ph} = - L_{ph},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{where} \quad L_{ph} = & P_{mh}(u_{p,h}) f_p(\gamma^{(h)}) + [P_{mh}(u_{p-1,h}) + P_{m-1,h}(u_{p,h})] f_{p-1}(\gamma^{(h)}) \\ & + \dots + [P_{mh}(u_{p-m+2}) + P_{m-1,h}(u_{p-m+3,h}) + \dots + P_{2h}(u_{ph})] f_{p-m+2}(\gamma^{(h)}), \end{aligned}$$

and the initial conditions

$$(5.39) \quad \frac{\partial^j}{\partial t^j} R_{ph} \Big|_{t=0} = 0 \quad (0 \leq j \leq m-1).$$

(5.38) is an hyperbolic equation and the nonhomogeneous part is of differentiability class C^{p-n} in $W_{R_0}^{\mathcal{E}}$ (if $m=1$, $L_{ph} \equiv 0$). By Gårding [8] and the fact that the domain of dependence of W_R is contained in W_{R_0} , it follows R_{ph} exists in $W_R^{\mathcal{E}}$ and is of class C^{p+m-n} . Using the definitions (5.36), (5.37) and (3.15), it follows that G is the fundamental solution. Since p can be made arbitrarily large, G is differentiable up to any order s at points (t, x) where

$$(5.40) \quad U_{ph}(t, x) = \int_{|\sigma|=1} \left[\sum_{h=1}^m U_{ph\sigma}(t, x) \right] d\sigma$$

is differentiable up to the order s , for some $p \geq s + n - m$.

We proceed to estimate $D_*^q R_{ph}$ in two steps.

The first step consists in deriving estimates for L_{ph} .

In order to find a bound on $D_*^q L_{ph}$, it suffices to find a bound on

$$(5.41) \quad D_*^q \{P_{m-j,h}(u_{p-1+j,h}) f_{p-1}(\gamma^{(h)})\} \quad (0 \leq 1, j \leq m-2)$$

We first estimate

$$(5.42) \quad D_*^r \{P_{m-j,h}(u_{p-1+j,h})\}.$$

It suffices to treat the general term of (5.42):

$$I = D_*^r \{P_{m-j,\alpha,h} D^\alpha u_{p-1+j,h}\} \quad (|\alpha| \leq m-j).$$

Using (5.6), (5.29) we get, after some (by now) standard calculation,

$$(5.43) \quad |I| \leq B_1 B_2^{p+r} M_{p,p+r-e}$$

where B_1 are used to denote appropriate constants, and where the symbol e will be used in what follows to denote various constants, all of which are of the form

$$e = a - e_1, \quad e_1 \text{ depending only on } m, n.$$

The $\varphi(m, n)$ appearing in the statement of Theorem 2 is taken to be larger than the maximum of the various $e_1(m, n)$, so that $e \geq 0$.

An inequality similar to (5.43) holds also for (5.42). Using this and (5.32), (5.33) we find that each term of (5.41) is bounded by

$$B_3 B_4^{p+q} \frac{M_{p,p+q-e}}{p!}$$

provided $q \leq p - 1 - n + m - 2$. Since $1 \leq m - 2$ we conclude that

$$(5.44) \quad |D_*^q L_{ph}(t, x)| \leq B_5 B_6^{p+q} \frac{M_{p, p+q-e}}{p!} \quad \text{for } (t, x) \text{ in } W_{R_0}^\varepsilon,$$

for all $0 \leq q \leq p - n$.

Using (3.28) we get

$$(5.45) \quad |D_*^q L_{ph}(t, x)| \leq B_7 B_8^{p+q} \frac{M_{p, p-e}}{p!} \tilde{M}_q \quad \text{for } (t, x) \text{ in } W_{R_0}^\varepsilon.$$

The second step consists of applying Corollaries 1,3 of Theorem 3 to the solution

$$R_{ph} / (B_8^p \frac{M_{p, p-e}}{p!})$$

of the system (5.38), (5.39) with L_{ph} replaced by

$$L_{ph} / (B_8^p \frac{M_{p, p-e}}{p!}).$$

Recalling the remark at the end of §4 we conclude that if ε is sufficiently small, depending only on R, R_0 and P , then

$$(5.46) \quad |D_*^{q+m-1-v} R_{ph}(t, x)| \leq B_9 B_{10}^{p+q} \frac{M_{p, p-e} \tilde{M}_q}{p!} \quad \text{in } W_R^\varepsilon,$$

for $0 \leq q \leq p - n$.

4.6. Division into Cases: The First Case

We are now going to divide the points (σ, h) into two classes, and complete the proof of the theorem by treating each class separately and then combining the two results.

For every point (t^0, x^0) in V , the system of equations (3.26) is not satisfied. Hence, for any given σ and h ($|\sigma| = 1$ and $1 \leq h \leq m$), either

$$\gamma_{\sigma}^h(t^0, x^0) \neq 0, \quad \text{or}$$

$$\gamma_{\sigma}^h(t^0, x^0) = 0 \quad \text{but} \quad \text{grad}_{\psi} \gamma_{\sigma}^h(t^0, x^0) \neq 0 \quad (\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{n-1})).$$

It is clear that, for any h , we can divide the unit sphere $|\sigma| = 1$ into a finite number of smooth regions $\Sigma_{\mu h}$ such that for all σ in any $\Sigma_{\mu h}$ either

$$(i) \quad \gamma_{\sigma}^{(h)}(t^0, x^0) \neq 0$$

or, for all σ in that $\Sigma_{\mu h}$

$$(ii) \quad \text{grad}_{\psi} \gamma_{\sigma}^h(t^0, x^0) \neq 0.$$

Both cases may occur simultaneously.

It is clearly enough to derive the estimates on G for (t, x) in a small neighborhood V_0 of (t^0, x^0) , $V_0 \in V^{\varepsilon}$, since then we can apply the Heine-Borel principle and complete the proof of the theorem.

We can take V_0 and the $\Sigma_{\mu h}$ in such a way that if (ii) holds, but (i) does not hold, then

$$(5.47) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{for some } \eta > 0, \quad \gamma^h(t, x) = \gamma \quad (|\gamma| < \eta, \sigma \in \Sigma_{\mu h}, (t, x) \in V_0) \\ &\text{can be uniquely solved in terms of one of the } \psi_i, \text{ and} \\ &\text{grad}_{\psi} \gamma_{\sigma}^{(h)}(t, x) \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

We shall now estimate derivatives of $G_{h\sigma} = R_{ph\sigma} + U_{ph\sigma}$ for $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mu h}$, in case (i)

By (5.35), (5.46) we get, for $q = p - 2n - 2$,

$$(5.48) \quad |D_{*}^q G_{h\sigma}(t, x)| \leq B_{11}(B_{12})^q \left[\frac{M_{q, 2q-a+\alpha}}{q!} + \frac{M_{q, q-a+\alpha} \tilde{M}_q}{q!} \right]$$

for some $\alpha = \alpha(m, n)$.

4.7. The Second Case; Completion of the Proof

We next consider the case (ii) and estimate derivatives of

$$(5.49) \quad G_{h,\mu}(t,x) = \int_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mu h}} G_{h\sigma}(t,x) dS_{\psi}.$$

Since $G_{h\sigma} = R_{ph\sigma} + U_{ph\sigma}$ and the derivatives of $R_{ph\sigma}$ have already been estimated in 4.5 (see (5.46)), it remains to estimate derivatives of

$$(5.50) \quad U_{ph,\mu}(t,x) = \int_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mu h}} U_{ph\sigma}(t,x) dS_{\psi}.$$

We may clearly assume that (i) is not satisfied; hence (5.47) holds. Let σ^0 be the unique $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mu h}$ for which $\gamma_{\sigma}^{(h)}(t^0, x^0) = 0$. Because of (5.47), there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that

$$(5.51) \quad \text{if } |\sigma - \sigma^0| \geq \eta_0, \sigma \in \Sigma_{\mu h}, (t,x) \in \bar{V}_0, \text{ then } \gamma_{\sigma}^h(t,x) \neq 0,$$

provided the diameter of V_0 is sufficiently small, which we may assume.

We now split the integral (5.50) into two integrals:

$$(5.52) \quad U_{ph,\mu} = \int_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mu h}} = \int_{\sigma \in \Sigma'} + \int_{\sigma \in \Sigma''} = J_p' + J_p''.$$

To define Σ' consider the family of surfaces

$$(5.53) \quad \gamma_{\sigma}^h(t,x) = \gamma$$

for $-\eta < \gamma < \eta$. Because of (5.47) this is a family of $(n-2)$ -dimensional surfaces in the local parameters $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{n-1}$, the parameters of the family are (t,x,γ) . Denote this family by $T(t,x,\gamma)$. For each γ', γ'' in the interval

$-\frac{\eta}{N} < \gamma < \frac{\eta}{N}$ there is a one-to-one correspondence ξ between the points

$\psi = \psi(t', x', \gamma')$ on $T(t', x', \gamma')$ and $\psi = \psi(t'', x'', \gamma'')$ on $T(t'', x'', \gamma'')$ provided (t', x') and (t'', x'') belong to V_0 , and N is sufficiently large. We determine on $T(t, x, \gamma)$ a set $\pi(t, x, \gamma)$ in the following way:

$\pi(t^0, x^0, 0)$ is the intersection of $T(t^0, x^0, 0)$ with an $(n-1)$ -dimensional sphere in the ψ -space. If the radius of the sphere is taken to be sufficiently small, then $\pi(t^0, x^0, 0)$ is a manifold. $\pi(t, x, \gamma)$ is defined to be the set corresponding to $\pi(t^0, x^0, 0)$ by the mapping ξ . Let $T_0(t, x, \gamma)$ be the interior of

$\pi(t, x, \gamma)$ in $T(t, x, \gamma)$. Then it is clear that if the diameter of V_0 is sufficiently small and if N is sufficiently large, then $\pi(t, x, \gamma)$ and $T_0(t, x, \gamma)$ belong strongly to $C(M_{q-a-1})$ (see §1). Also, $\pi(t, x, \gamma)$ has no boundary.

Note now that if we decrease V_0 , η and N remain unchanged but η_0 in (5.51) can be decreased. Hence, without loss of generality we may assume that the family $\{T_0(t, x, \gamma); -\frac{\eta}{N} < \gamma < \frac{\eta}{N}\}$ contains the $(n-1)$ -dimensional set in the ψ -space which corresponds to the set $|\sigma - \sigma^0| < \eta_0$.

We define

$$\Sigma' = \Sigma'(t, x) = \{T_0(t, x, \gamma); -\frac{\eta}{N} < \gamma < \frac{\eta}{N}\}.$$

Then, by (5.51), $|\gamma_\sigma^h(t, x)| \geq r_0 > 0$ in $\Sigma_{\mu h} - \Sigma'$.

Hence, in Σ'' (5.35) is valid, and using (3.28) we obtain

$$|D_*^q U_{ph\sigma}(t, x)| \leq B_{13} (B_{14})^{p+q} \frac{M_{p, p-e}}{p!} \tilde{M}_{q-2}.$$

Applying Lemma 5' , we obtain, for the particular choice $q = p - n$,

$$(5.54) \quad |D^q J_p''(t, x)| \leq B_{15} (B_{16})^{p+q} \frac{M_{p, p-e}}{p!} M_p .$$

We turn to J_p' and introduce on Σ_{kh} the form (see [10; pp. 272-3])

$$d\sigma = d\gamma d\theta \quad \text{where} \quad d\theta = dS_\gamma / \left| \frac{\partial \gamma_\sigma(h)}{\partial v} \right| ;$$

dS_γ is the element of area on the manifold $T_0(t, x, \gamma)$ and $\partial/\partial v$ is the normal derivative to $T_0(t, x, \gamma)$. We obtain

$$(5.55) \quad J_p'(t, x) = \int_{-\frac{\eta}{N}}^{\frac{\eta}{N}} \sum_{k=0}^p f_k(\gamma) \left\{ \int_{T_0(t, x, \gamma)} u_{kh\sigma}(t, x) \frac{dS_\gamma}{\left| \frac{\partial \gamma_\sigma(h)}{\partial v} \right|} \right\} d\gamma .$$

Denoting the inner integral by $\phi_{kh}(t, x, \gamma)$, we claim that for any $q \geq 0$,

$$(5.56) \quad |D_+^q \phi_{kh}(t, x, \gamma)| \leq B_{17} (B_{18})^{k+q} M_{k, k-e} \tilde{M}_q$$

where D_+^q is any q -th partial derivative with respect to (t, x, γ) .

Indeed, this follows by employing Lemma 5 while making use of the estimates (5.29), (5.1).

It is now easy to complete the derivation of the estimates for J_p' . In fact,

$$D_+^q J_p'(t, x) = \sum_{k=0}^p \int_{-\frac{\eta}{N}}^{\frac{\eta}{N}} f_k(\gamma) D_+^q \phi_k(t, x, \gamma) d\gamma \equiv \sum_{k=0}^p J_k .$$

Consider first the case where n is odd. If $k \leq n - m$ then, by (3.24),

$$(5.57) \quad J_k(t, x) = c_n D_\gamma^{n-m-k} D_+^q \phi_k(t, x, \gamma) \Big|_{\gamma=0} ,$$

and if $k > n - m$ then

$$(5.58) \quad |J_k(t, x)| \leq \frac{B_{19}}{(k + m - n - 1)!} \sup_{\gamma} |D^q \phi_k(t, x, \gamma)|.$$

Combining both cases for k , and using (5.56), we get

$$(5.59) \quad |D^q J'_p(t, x)| \leq B_{20}(B_{21})^{p+q} \frac{M_{p, p-e}}{p!} \tilde{M}_q.$$

For n even, if $n + 1 - k - m < 0$ then (see (3.25)) we obtain an estimate similar to (5.58). If $n + 1 - k - m \geq 0$ then we obtain a result similar to (5.57); this follows by using the definition of the distribution r^{-h} ($h > 0$) and Taylor's formula.

Combining the estimates (5.59), (5.54) and using (5.52) we get, for $q = p - 2n - 2$,

$$(5.60) \quad |D^q U_{ph, \mu}(t, x)| \leq B_{22}(B_{23})^p \frac{M_{p, p-e}}{p!} \tilde{M}_p.$$

Combining this inequality with (5.46) we obtain for $G_{h, \mu}$ the inequality (5.48) with different B 's and α .

Since in the first case we have, by (5.48) (see the definition (5.49),

$$(5.61) \quad |D^q G_{h, \mu}(t, x)| \leq B_{24}(B_{12})^q \left[\frac{M_{q, 2q-a+\alpha}}{q!} + \frac{M_{q, q-a+\alpha} \tilde{M}_q}{q!} \right],$$

we find that (5.61) holds in each of the cases.

Summing over h, μ we obtain the same inequality (with different B_{24}) for $G(t, x)$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

6. Concluding Remarks

6.1. Other Fundamental Solutions

Theorem 2 remains true also for the other fundamental solutions $G_j(t, x)$ defined by the initial conditions (3.3'), with $t^0 = 0$, $x^0 = 0$. The only

difference is in the definition of the f_k . f_{k+1} is defined as $\int f_k$, but instead of (3.22) we now take

$$(6.1) \quad f_{-j}(r) = \begin{cases} c_n \delta^{(n-1)}(r) & (n \text{ odd}) \\ c_n r^{-n} & (n \text{ even}). \end{cases}$$

Formulas (3.24), (3.25) have to be modified accordingly.

Obviously, all the results remain true for the fundamental solutions $G_j(t, x; t^0, x^0)$ with pole at (t^0, x^0) .

6.2. Smoothness of Solutions: Huygen's Principle

Let u be a solution of the Cauchy problem

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} Pu &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial^j u}{\partial t^j} \Big|_{t=0} &= \varphi_j(x) \quad (0 \leq j \leq m-1). \end{aligned}$$

For any point (t^*, x^*) where $0 < t^* < \epsilon$ (the same ϵ which appears in the statement of Theorem 2), denote by $C(t^*, x^*)$ the intersection of $t = 0$ with the characteristic conoid with center (t^*, x^*) . Let C^* be an open neighborhood of $C(t^*, x^*)$, and assume that

$$(6.3) \quad \varphi_j(x) = \varphi_{1j}(x) + \varphi_{2j}(x) \quad (0 \leq j \leq m-1)$$

where φ_{1j} is of the class $C(M_{q-a})$ in some ball $|x| \leq R'$ and where φ_{2j} is any function (say, bounded and measurable) which vanishes on C^* .

Let u_1 and u_2 be the solutions of the Cauchy problem (6.2) with the initial conditions φ_{1j} and φ_{2j} respectively.

If $R' \geq R_0$ where R_0 depends only on ϵ and P , then, by Theorem 3, u_1 is of class $C(M_{q-a})$ in some neighborhood N of (t^*, x^*) .

As for u_2 , we can represent it in terms of the fundamental solutions, namely,

$$(6.4) \quad u_2(t, x) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} G_j(t, x; 0, x^0) * \varphi_j(x^0).$$

Since $\varphi_j(x^0) = 0$ if $x^0 \in C^*$, we can apply Theorem 2 and conclude that u_2 belongs to $C(\hat{M}_{q-a+d}; N_0)$ if N_0 is sufficiently small neighborhood of (t^*, x^*) . Hence:

Theorem 4. Under the assumptions of Theorem 2 and the forgoing assumptions concerning the φ_j , the solution u of the Cauchy problem (6.2) belongs to $C(\hat{M}_{q-a+d})$ in some sufficiently small neighborhood of (t^*, x^*) .

This theorem may be viewed as an Huygen's principle for the smoothness of solutions, namely, if the initial values belong to $C(\hat{M}_{q-a})$ in some neighborhood of $C(t^*, x^*)$ and are arbitrary elsewhere, and if the decomposition (6.3) holds in some ball $|x| \leq R'$, then the solution u is in a corresponding class $C(\hat{M}_{q-a+d})$ in some neighborhood of (t^*, x^*) .

6.3. Hyperbolic Systems of equations

The most general hyperbolic systems for whom the Cauchy problem has been solved by Petrowski [16] and Leray [15] are

$$(6.5) \quad \frac{\partial^{n_p} u_p}{\partial t^{n_p}} = \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\substack{k_0+k_1+\dots+k_n \leq n_j \\ k_0 < n_j}} A_{k_0 k_1 \dots k_n, j} \frac{\partial^{k_0+k_1+\dots+k_n} u_j}{\partial t^{k_0} \partial x_1^{k_1} \dots \partial x_n^{k_n}}$$

$$(1 \leq p \leq N),$$

where the A 's are matrices of order $N \times N$ with coefficients depending on (t, x) . The condition of hyperbolicity is the following:

For any real vector $\sigma \neq 0$, the matrix

$$(e_{j\rho}) = \left(\sum_{\sum k_1 = n_j} A_{k_0 k_1 \dots k_n} \sigma_1^{k_0} \sigma_2^{k_1} \dots \sigma_n^{k_n} - v^j \delta_{j\rho} \right)$$

can be transformed into a matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} N_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & N_2 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & N_k \end{pmatrix}$$

where the roots of each polynomial $\det(N_h)$ are real and distinct.

Consider now the special case $k = 1$. If all the $n_j = 1$ then the system is the one considered by Courant-Lax [3] and Lax [14].

The formalism of §3 was extended to hyperbolic systems (with $k = 1$) by Babitch [1]. An energy inequality analogous to (4.18) is valid also for hyperbolic systems (Leray [15]). Using these tools, Theorems 2-4 can be extended without difficulty to hyperbolic systems. Since the proofs are quite analogous and the methods are the same, we omit all the details. We only mention here the definition of a fundamental matrix:

Fundamental matrix with pole at the origin is a matrix $G = (G_{jk}^h)$ of order $N \times N$ having the following properties:

- (a) Each column is a distribution in x , with t as a parameter, which satisfies (6.5).
- (b) For $0 \leq i \leq n_j - 1$

$$\frac{\partial^i}{\partial t^i} G_{jk}^h \Big|_{t=0} = 0 \text{ if } i \neq h; \quad \frac{\partial^h}{\partial t^h} G_{jk}^h \Big|_{t=0} = \delta_{jk} \delta(x).$$

REFERENCES

- [1] V.M. Babitch, "Fundamental solutions of hyperbolic equations with variable coefficients," Math. Sbornik (N.S.), vol. 52 (94) (1960), pp. 709-738.
- [2] V.A. Borovikov, "Fundamental solutions of linear partial differential equations with constant coefficients," Trudy Moscow Mat. Obšč., vol. 8 (1959), pp. 199-257.
- [3] R. Courant and P.D. Lax, "The propagation of discontinuities in wave motion," Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., vol. 42 (1956), pp. 872-876.
- [4] A. Friedman, "On classes of solutions of elliptic linear partial differential equations," Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 8 (1957), pp. 418-427.
- [5] A. Friedman, "Classes of solutions of linear systems of partial differential equations of parabolic type, Duke Math. J., vol. 24 (1957), pp. 433-442.
- [6] A. Friedman, "On the regularity of the solutions of nonlinear elliptic and parabolic systems of partial differential equations," J. Math. and Mech., vol. 7 (1958), pp. 43-59.
- [7] A. Friedman, "A new proof and generalizations of the Cauchy-Kowalewski theorem," Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 98 (1961), pp. 1-20.
- [8] L. Gårding, Cauchy's Problem for Hyperbolic Equations, University of Chicago, 1957.

- [9] I.M. Gelfand and Z.Y. Shapiro, "Homogeneous generalized functions and their application," Uspehi Math. Nauk SSSR, vol. 10, no. 3 (1955), pp. 3-70.
- [10] I.M. Gelfand and G.E. Šilov, Generalized Functions and Operations on Them, Moscow, 1958.
- [11] J. Hadamard, Lectures on Cauchy's Problem in Linear Differential Equations, Dover Publication, Copyright 1952.
- [12] G. Herglotz, "Über die integration linear partieller Differentialgleichungen mit konstanten Koeffizienten," Berichte der Sächsischen Akad. Wiss. Leipzig, vol. 78 (1926), pp. 93-126, 287-318; vol. 80 (1928), pp. 69-114.
- [13] F. John, Plane Waves and Spherical Means, Interscience Publishers, New York, 1955.
- [14] P.D. Lax, "Asymptotic solutions of oscillatory initial value problems," Duke Math. J., vol. 24 (1957), pp. 627-646.
- [15] J. Leray, Lectures on Hyperbolic Equations with Variable Coefficients, Princeton, Inst. for Advanced Study, 1952.
- [16] I.G. Petrowski, "Über das Cauchysche Problem für Systeme von partiellen Differentialgleichungen," Rec. Math. (Math. Sbornik, N.S.), vol. 2 (1937), pp. 814-868.
- [17] I.G. Petrowski, "On the diffusion of waves and lacunas for hyperbolic equations," Math. Sbornik (N.S.), vol. 17 (59) (1945), pp. 289-370.

University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
and
Stanford University
Stanford, California

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST
CONTRACT Nonr-225(11)
(NR 041-086)

Armed Services Technical Information Agency Arlington Hall Station Arlington 12, Virginia	10	Commanding Officer Branch Office Office of Naval Research Navy No. 100 Fleet Post Office New York, New York	2	Harvard University Technical Report Collection Pierce Hall, Room 303A Cambridge 38, Massachusetts	1
Asst. Chief of Staff, G-4 for Research and Development U. S. Army Washington 25, D. C.	1	Commanding Officer Ballistic Research Laboratory U. S. Proving Ground Aberdeen, Maryland Attn: Mr. R. H. Kent	1	John Crerar Library Chicago 1, Illinois	1
Ames Research Center Moffett Field, California Attn: Technical Library	1	Commanding Officer Naval Ordnance Laboratory White Oak Silver Spring 19, Maryland Attn: Technical Library	1	Library B-230 Massachusetts Institute of Technology Lincoln Laboratory Lexington 73, Massachusetts	1
California Institute of Technology Attn: Library 1201 E. California Street Pasadena 4, California	1	Computation Division Directorate of Management Analysis Comptroller of the Air Force Headquarters USAF Washington 25, D. C.	1	Library Princeton University Princeton, New Jersey Attn: Verna E. Bayles	1
Chief of Naval Operations Operations Evaluation Group OP 342 E Washington 25, D. C.	1	Director, David Taylor Model Basin Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Hydromechanics Laboratory Technical Library	1	Scripps Institute of Oceanography La Jolla, California	1
Chief, Bureau of Ordnance Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Re3d Re6a	1	Director, National Bureau of Standards Department of Commerce Washington 25, D. C. Attn: National Hydraulics Lab.	1	Louisiana State University Attn: Library University Station Baton Rouge 3, Louisiana	1
Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.	1	Director, Pennsylvania State School of Engineering Ordnance Research Laboratory State College, Pennsylvania	1	Los Angeles Engineering Field Office Air Res. and Development Command 5504 Hollywood Blvd. Los Angeles 28, California Attn: Capt. N. E. Nelson	1
Chief, Bureau of Ships Asst. Chief for Research and Development Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.	1	Department of Mathematics Library University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois	1	Massachusetts Institute of Technology Attn: Library Cambridge 39, Massachusetts	1
Chairman Research and Development Board The Pentagon Washington 25, D. C.	1	Department of Statistics University of California Berkeley 4, California	1	Mathematical Reviews 190 Hope Street Providence 6, Rhode Island	1
Commander, U.S.N.O.T.S. Pasadena Annex 3202 E. Foothill Boulevard Pasadena 8, California Attn: Technical Library	1	Diamond Ordnance Fuse Laboratory Department of Defense Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Dr. W. K. Saunders	1	Mathematics Department University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado	1
Commander, U.S.N.O.T.S. Inyokern China Lake, California Attn: Technical Library	1	Engineering Library University of California Los Angeles 24, California	1	Mathematics Department University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania	1
Commanding General U. S. Proving Ground Aberdeen, Maryland	1	Engineering Societies Library 29 W. 39th Street New York, New York	1	Mathematics Library Rec. Bldg. Purdue University W. Lafayette, Indiana	1
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1000 Geary Street San Francisco 9, California	1	Fisk University Attn: Library Nashville, Tennessee	1	Mathematics Library Syracuse University Syracuse 10, New York	1
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 346 Broadway New York 13, New York	1	Headquarters USAF Director of Research and Development Washington 25, D. C.	1	N.A.C.A. 1724 F. Street, N.W. Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Chief, Office of Aeronautical Intelligence	1
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1030 E. Green Street Pasadena 1, California	1	Hydrodynamics Laboratory California Institute of Technology 1201 E. California Street Pasadena 4, California Attn: Executive Committee	1	National Bureau of Standards Library Room 301, Northwest Building Washington 25, D. C.	1
				New York Public Library Acquisition Branch Fifth Avenue and 42nd Street New York 18, New York	1

Contract Nonr-225(11)
May 1961

Office of Naval Research Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Code 438	2	Mrs. J. Henley Crosland Director of Libraries Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, Georgia	1	Professor Ignace I. Kolodner Department of Mathematics University of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico	1
Office of Naval Research Attn: Dr. Robert Osserman, Code 432 Washington 25, D. C.	2	Professor Avron Douglis Mathematics Department University of Maryland College Park, Maryland	1	Dr. W. A. Kozumplik Technical Information Center Lockheed Aircraft Corporation Missile and Space Division 3251 Hanover Street Palo Alto, California	1
Office of Ordnance Research Duke University 2127 Myrtle Drive Durham, North Carolina	1	Dr. William Drummond General Atomic P. O. Box 608 San Diego, California	1	Professor P. A. Lagerstrom Aeronautics Department California Institute of Technology Pasadena 4, California	1
Office of Technical Services Department of Commerce Washington 25, D. C.	1	Professor R. J. Duffin Mathematics Department Carnegie Institute of Technology Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania	1	Professor L. Landweber Hydraulics Laboratory State University of Iowa Iowa City, Iowa	1
Technical Information Officer Naval Research Laboratory Washington 25, D. C.	6	Dr. Carl Eckart Scripps Institute of Oceanography La Jolla, California	1	Director R. E. Langer Mathematics Research Center University of Wisconsin Madison 6, Wisconsin	1
University of Southern California University Library 3518 University Avenue Los Angeles 7, California	1	Professor Bernard Epstein University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania	1	Dr. John Laurmann Aerodynamics Research Spec. Technology Laboratory P. O. Box 95001 Los Angeles 45, California	1
Professor L. V. Ahlfors Mathematics Department Harvard University Cambridge 38, Massachusetts	1	Professor A. Endely Mathematics Department California Institute of Technology Pasadena 4, California	1	Professor B. Lepson Mathematics Department Catholic University of America Washington 17, D. C.	1
Dr. Richard Bellman The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California	1	Professor F. A. Ficken New York University (Heights) New York 53, New York	1	Mr. H. G. Lew General Electric Company, MSVD 3750 "D" Street Philadelphia 24, Pennsylvania	1
Professor P. G. Bergman Physics Department Syracuse University Syracuse 10, New York	1	Professor K. O. Friedrichs Institute of Mathematical Sciences New York University New York 3, New York	1	Professor H. Lewy Institute of Mathematical Sciences New York University New York 3, New York	1
Professor G. Birkhoff Mathematics Department Harvard University Cambridge 38, Massachusetts	1	Professor Paul Garabedian Institute of Mathematical Sciences 25 Waverly Place New York 3, New York	1	Professor C. C. Lin Department of Mathematics Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge 39, Massachusetts	1
Dr. John P. Breslin Davidson Laboratory Stevens Institute of Technology 711 Hudson Street Hoboken, New Jersey	1	Professor E. Garjony 6430 Campina Place La Jolla, California	1	Professor W. T. Martin Department of Mathematics Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge 39, Massachusetts	1
Professor H. Busemann Mathematics Department University of Southern California Los Angeles 7, California	1	Professor Philip Hartman Department of Mathematics The Johns Hopkins University Baltimore 18, Maryland	1	Dr. Irving Michelson, Head Department of Aeronautical Engineering The Pennsylvania State University University Park, Pennsylvania	1
Dr. Milton Clauser Space Technology Laboratories Los Angeles, California	1	Professor Albert E. Heins Department of Mathematics University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	1	Professor P. E. Mohn, Dean School of Engineering The University of Buffalo Buffalo 14, New York	1
Dr. R. H. Clauser Aeronautical Engineering Department The Johns Hopkins University Baltimore 18, Maryland	1	Professor A. T. Ippen Hydrodynamics Laboratory Dept. of Civil and Sanitary Engineering Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge 39, Massachusetts	1	Professor C. B. Morrey Department of Mathematics University of California Berkeley 4, California	1
Dr. Eugene P. Cooper Associate Scientific Director U. S. Naval Radiological Defense Lab. San Francisco 24, California	1	Mr. R. T. Jones Ames Aeronautical Laboratory Moffett Field, California	1	Professor C. Nahari Department of Mathematics Carnegie Institute of Technology Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania	1
Professor R. Courant AEC Computing Center New York University New York 3, New York	1	Professor Morris Kline, Proj. Dir. Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Div. Electromagnetic Res. New York 3, New York	1		

Professor L. Nirenberg Institute of Mathematical Sciences 25 Waverly Place New York 3, New York	1	Professor C. A. Truesdell 801 N. College Avenue Bloomington, Indiana	1	Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 495 Summer Street Boston 10, Massachusetts	1
Professor J. Nitsche Department of Mathematics Institute of Technology University of Minnesota Minneapolis 14, Minnesota	1	Professor J. L. Ullman Mathematics Department University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	1	Institute of Mathematical Sciences New York University New York 3, New York	1
Professor C. D. Olds P. O. Box 462 Los Altos, California	1	Professor S. E. Warschawski University of Minnesota Institute of Technology Department of Mathematics Minneapolis 14, Minnesota	1	Department of Mathematics Harvard University Cambridge, Massachusetts	1
Professor Charles H. Papas Department of Electrical Engineering California Institute of Technology Pasadena, California	1	Professor A. Weinstein Institute for Fluid Dynamics and Applied Mathematics University of Maryland College Park, Maryland	1	Department of Mathematics Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts	1
Mr. J. D. Pierson The Martin Company Baltimore 3, Maryland	1	Dr. J. D. Wilkes Director, Naval Analysis Group Office of Naval Research Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.	1	Professor B. Zumino Department of Physics New York University New York 13, New York	1
Professor M. S. Plesset Division of Engineering California Institute of Technology Pasadena 4, California	1	Dr. T. T. Wu Gordon McKay Laboratory of Applied Science Harvard University Cambridge 38, Massachusetts	1	Professor S. Sherman Department of Mathematics Wayne State University Detroit 2, Michigan	1
Professor W. Prager Division of Applied Mathematics Brown University Providence 12, Rhode Island	1	Professor A. Zygmund Mathematics Department University of Chicago Chicago 37, Illinois	1	Professor L. Greenberg Department of Mathematics Brown University Providence, Rhode Island	1
Dr. Milton Rose Applied Mathematics Division Brookhaven National Laboratory Upton, Long Island	1	Mr. R. Vasudevan Research Assistant Physics Department School of Science and Engineering University of California La Jolla, California	1	Professor N. Levinson Mathematics Department Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts	1
Professor P. C. Rosenbloom Department of Mathematics University of Minnesota Minneapolis 14, Minnesota	1	<u>Distribution via ONR London</u>			
Professor A. E. Ross Department of Mathematics University of Notre Dame Notre Dame, Indiana	1	Commanding Officer Branch Office Navy No. 100 Fleet Post Office New York, New York		U. S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory White Oak Silver Spring, Maryland Attn: Mathematics Department	1
Dr. H. Rouse Iowa Institute of Hydraulic Research University of Iowa Iowa City, Iowa	1	Mathematisch Centrum 2e Boerhaavestraat 49 Amsterdam-O-HOLLAND	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Electronics Laboratory San Diego 52, California Attn: Dr. R. F. Arenz	1
Dr. C. Saltzer Department of Mathematics Case Institute of Technology Cleveland 6, Ohio	1	Professor Bundgaard Mathematical Institute Aarhus University Aarhus, DENMARK	1	U. S. Naval Weapons Laboratory Dahlgren, Virginia	1
Professor W. Sears Graduate School of Aeronautical Engineering Grumman Hall, Cornell University Ithaca, New York	1	Professor Lars Garding Mathematical Institute Sölvegatan 14 Lund, SWEDEN	1	Department of Mathematics University of California Berkeley, California	1
Professor Laurie Snell Department of Mathematics Dartmouth College Hanover, New Hampshire	1	Mrs. R. B. Opdahl The Library, Physics Department Norwegian Institute of Technology Trondheim, NORWAY	1	Professor H. C. Kranzer Department of Mathematics Adelphi College Garden City, New York	1
Professor D. C. Spencer Fine Hall Box 708 Princeton, New Jersey	1	<u>Other Foreign Address</u>			
Professor J. J. Stoker Institute of Mathematical Sciences New York University New York 3, New York	1	Hydrodynamics Laboratory National Research Laboratory Ottawa, CANADA	1	Dr. Joseph Hirsch Institute Battelle 7, Route De Drize Geneva, SWITZERLAND	1
				Professor J. B. Albani Technical University Eindhoven, NETHERLANDS	1
				Additional copies for project leader and assistants and reserve for future requirements	
				Contract Non-225(11) May 1961 (204)	90