# Mathematics 222B Lecture 17 Notes

#### Daniel Raban

March 29, 2022

## 1 Local Well-Posedness of the Initial Value Problem for Variable-Coefficient Wave Equations

#### 1.1 Recap: setting and statement of the estimate

We have been looking at linear hyperbolic PDEs  $P\phi = f$ , where

$$P\phi = \partial_{\mu}(g^{\mu,\nu}\partial_{\nu}\phi) + b^{\mu}\partial_{\mu}\phi + c\phi.$$

We want to solve the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} P\phi = f\\ (\phi, \partial_t \phi)|_{t=0} = (g, h). \end{cases}$$

To discuss existence and uniqueness, we made further assumptions on the coefficients:

- $g^{\mu,\nu}$  is a symmetric  $(1+d) \times (1+d)$  matrix with signature  $(-,+,+,\ldots,+)$ .
- $g^{0,j}(t,x) = 0$  and  $g^{0,0}(t,x) = -1$ .
- For  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $g^{j,k}\xi_j\xi_k \ge \lambda |\xi|^2$  (bottom right  $d \times d$  minor is positive definite).
- $g^{\mu,\nu}$ , b, c are uniformly bounded, with uniformly bounded derivatives.

**Example 1.1.** Set b = c = 0, and let g = diag(-1, 1, 1, ..., 1). Then  $P = \Box$ .

We take the convention that  $x^0 = t$ . We also use Greek indices  $\mu, \nu \in \{0, 1, ..., d\}$  and indices  $j, k \in \{1, ..., d\}$ . Last time, we were proving the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1** (Local well-posedness of the initial value problem). Let  $s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Given  $(g,h) \in H^{s+1} \times H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $f \in L^1_t([0,t]; H^s(\mathbb{R}^d))$ , there exists a unique solution  $\phi$  to the initial value problem with  $\phi \in C_t([0,T], H^{s+1})$  and  $\partial \phi \in C_t((0,T); H^s)$ . Moreover, the unique solution  $\phi$  satisfies the estimate

$$\|\phi\|_{C_t([0,T];H^{s+1})} + \|\partial_t\phi\|_{C_t([0,T];H^s)} \lesssim_{g^{\mu,\nu},b^{\mu},c,T,s} \|(g,h)\|_{H^{s+1}\times H^s} + \|f\|_{L^1_t([0,T];H^s)}.$$

**Remark 1.1.** Local well-posedness entails continuous dependence of  $\phi$  on (f, g, h). Because of linearity, this a priori estimate implies continuous dependence (and in fact Lipschitz dependence).

### 1.2 Proof of the a priori estimate

Let's finish the proof. Recall that the idea of the proof is to use the a priori estimate, along with a functional analytic lemma.

**Proposition 1.1.** Let  $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $\phi \in C_t([0,T]; H^{s+1})$  and  $\partial_t \phi \in C_t([0,T]; H^s)$ . Then

$$\|\phi\|_{C_t([0,T];H^{s+1})} + \|\partial_t\phi\|_{C_t((0,t):H^s)} \lesssim \|(\phi,\partial_t\phi)|_{t=0}\|_{H^{s+1}\times H^s} + \|P\phi\|_{L^1_t([0,T];H^s)}.$$

*Proof.*  $(s \ge 0)$ : We want to use the energy method. The natural strategy would be to commute  $P\phi$  with  $D^{\alpha}$  for  $|\alpha| \le s$  and apply the energy estimate (multiply by  $\partial_t \phi$  and integrate by parts). Instead, we vary the multiplier:

$$\langle P\phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_t \phi \rangle := \int P\phi (1-\Delta)^s \partial_t \phi \, dx$$

• On one hand, we know by duality that

$$\int_0^T \langle P\phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_t \phi \rangle \, dt \lesssim \|P\phi\|_{L^1_t([0,T];H^s)} \|\partial_t \phi\|_{C_t([0,T];H^s)}$$

This is basically integrating by parts s times and using Cauchy-Schwarz. We can also think of this as the general bound

$$|\langle f,g\rangle| \lesssim \|f\|_{H^s} \|g\|_{H^{-s}}$$

In general, if Q is an order r differential operator with that have uniformly bounded derivatives to all order, then (with some Fourier analysis), we can say that

$$\|Qg\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|g\|_{H^{r+s}} \qquad (s \in \mathbb{R}).$$

For negative s, we get the inequality by duality:

$$\begin{aligned} \|Qf\|_{H^{s}} &= \sup_{\|g\|_{H^{s}}=1} ||\langle Qf, g\rangle| \\ &= \sup_{\|g\|_{H^{s}}=1} ||\langle f, Q^{*}g\rangle| \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{H^{s+r}} \|Q^{*}g\|_{H^{s-r}} \end{aligned}$$

We also have the fact that

$$\|(1-\Delta^s)g\|_{L^2} \simeq \|g\|_{H^{2s}}, \langle (1-\Delta)^s g, g \rangle \simeq \|g\|_{H^s}^2,$$

which we get by using the Fourier transform:

$$\langle (1-\Delta)^s g, g \rangle = \langle (1+|\xi|^2)^s, \widehat{g}, \widehat{g} \rangle = \| (1+\xi|^2)^{s/2} \widehat{g} \|_{L^2}^2$$

• On the other hand, we have

$$P\phi = \underbrace{\partial_{\mu}(g^{\mu,\nu}\partial_{\nu}\phi)}_{-\partial_{t}^{2}\phi+\partial_{i}(g^{j,k}\partial_{k}\phi)} + b^{\mu}\partial_{\mu}\phi + c\phi.$$

Now we can observe that

$$\langle -\partial_t^2 \phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_t \phi \rangle = -\partial_t \langle \partial_t \phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_t \phi \rangle + \langle \partial_t \phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_t^2 \phi \rangle$$
  
Since  $\langle \partial_t \phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_t^2 \phi \rangle = \langle (1-\Delta)^s \partial_t \phi, \partial_t^2 \phi \rangle$ , we get  
$$= -\frac{1}{2} \partial_t \langle \partial_t \phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_t \phi \rangle$$

For the other term, we have

$$\begin{split} \langle \partial_j (g^{j,k} \partial_k \phi), (1-\Delta)^s \partial_t \phi \rangle &= -\langle g^{j,k} \partial_k \phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_t \partial_j \phi \rangle \\ &= -\partial_t \langle g^{j,k} \partial_k \phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_j, \phi \rangle \\ &+ \langle \partial_t g^{j,k} \partial_k \phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_j, \phi \rangle \\ &+ \langle g^{j,k} \partial_k \partial_t \phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_j \phi \rangle. \end{split}$$

Write the last term as

$$-\langle_t\phi,\partial_k(g^{j,k}(1-\Delta)^s\partial_j\phi)\rangle = -\langle\partial_t\phi\partial_k([g^{j,k},(1-\Delta)^s]\partial_j\phi)\rangle \underbrace{-\langle\partial_t\phi,\partial_k(1-\Delta)^s(g^{j,k}\partial_j\phi)\rangle}_{=-\langle(1-\Delta)^s\partial_t\phi,\partial_k(g^{j,k}\partial_j\phi)\rangle}$$

Overall, this equals

$$-\frac{1}{2}\partial_t \langle g^{j,k} \partial_k \phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_j \phi \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \partial_t g^{j,k} \partial_k \phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_j \phi \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \partial_t \phi, \partial_k ([g^{j,k}, (1-\Delta)^s] \partial_j \phi) \rangle.$$

The point is of this messy calculation is as follows: for the terms with the highest number of derivatives, we want to put things in to this total derivative form. The other terms will have at least 1 derivative that is not falling on  $\phi$ . This is the purpose of using the commutator. What we get is that

$$\langle P\phi, (1-\Delta)^{s}\partial_{t}\phi \rangle$$

$$= \underbrace{-\frac{1}{2}\partial_{t}(\langle\partial_{t}\phi, (1-\Delta)^{s}\partial_{t}\phi \rangle + \langle g^{j,k}\partial_{k}\phi, (1-\Delta)^{s}\partial_{j}\phi \rangle)}_{E_{s}[\phi](t)}$$

$$+ \underbrace{O(\langle q_{1}\partial\phi, \partial^{2s}\partial\phi \rangle) + O(\langle q_{2}\partial\phi, \partial^{2s-1}\partial\phi \rangle) + \dots + O(\langle q_{2s+1}\partial\phi, \partial\phi \rangle)}_{R_{s}},$$

where  $q_1 = \partial g, b, q_2 = \partial^2 g \partial bc$ , etc.

So our energy argument says

$$\int_0^t \langle P\phi, (1-\Delta)^s \partial_t \phi \rangle \, dt' \ge E_s[\phi](0) - E_s[\phi](t) - C \int_0^t \|\phi\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 + \|\partial_t \phi\|_{H^s}^2 \, dt',$$

where we are just using the estimate for the remainder:

$$|R_s(t') \lesssim (\|\phi\|_{H^{s+1}} + \|\partial_t \phi\|_{H^s})^2.$$

Now we have

$$E_s[\phi](t) \le E_s[\phi](0) + \|P\phi\|_{L^1_t([0,T];H^s)} \|\partial_t \phi\|_{C_t((0,T);H^s)} + \int_0^t \|\phi\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 + \|\partial_t \phi\|_{H^s}^2 dt'.$$

Note that  $E_s[\phi](t) \simeq \|\phi\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 + \|\partial_t \phi\|_{H^s}^2$ , so our propries of  $H^s$  and the elliptic estimate for  $\partial_j g^{j,k} \partial_k$  gives:

$$E_s[\phi(t) \le E_s[\phi](0) + \|P\phi\|_{L^1_t([0,T];H^s)} \|\partial_t \phi\|_{C_t((0,T);H^s)} + \int_0^t E_s[\phi(t') \, dt']$$

So Grönwall's inequality tells us that

$$E_s[\Phi](t) \lesssim E_s[\phi](0) + \|P\phi\|_{L^1_t([0,T];H^s)} \sup_{t \in [0,T]} E_s[\phi](t).$$

Now we can take the sup over  $t \in [0, T]$  on the left hand side and use the AM-GM inequality with an epsilon to absorb the  $\sup_{t \in [0,T]} E_s[\phi](t)$  on the right into the left hand side.

(s < 0): Let  $\Phi = (1 - \Delta)^{-|s|} \phi$ . We have the equivalence

$$\|\Phi\|_{H^{|s|+1}} \simeq \|\phi\|_{H^{-|s|+1}} = \|\phi\|_{H^{s+1}}.$$

Similarly,

$$\|\partial_t \Phi\|_{H^{|s|}} \simeq |\partial_t\|_{H^s}.$$

Now, we do the same argument with s replaced by |s| and  $\phi$  replaced by  $\Phi$ . The only thing that is different is part 1 above. So we need to estimate

$$\begin{split} |\langle P\Phi, (1-\Delta)^{|s|}\partial_t\Phi\rangle| &= |\langle (1-\Delta)^{|s|}P\Phi, \partial_t\Phi\rangle| \\ &= |\langle P\underbrace{(1-\Delta)^{|s|}\Phi}_{\phi}, \partial_t\Phi\rangle| + |\langle [(1-\Delta)^{|s|}, P]\Phi, \partial_t\Phi\rangle| \end{split}$$

The right term has order 2|s| + 2 - 1. Using duality,

$$\lesssim \|P\phi\|_{H^{s}} \|\partial_{t}\Phi\|_{H^{|s|}} \|\Phi\|_{H^{|s|+1}} \|\partial_{t}\Phi\|_{H^{|s|}}.$$

This completes the proof.

#### **1.3** Proof of well-posedness from the a priori estimate

Now we can quickly conclude the proof existence and uniqueness theorem.

*Proof.* Note that uniqueness and the a priori estimate follow from the proposition. It remains to prove existence.

Step 1: First, view this as trying to find the inverse of the operator  $P: L_t^{\infty}([0,T], \mathcal{H}^{s+1}) \to L_t^1([0,T]; H^s)$ . We want to reduce to the case when the initial data g, h = 0; we may achieve this using extension and modifying f.

Step 2: By duality,  $\phi \in L^{\infty}_t([0,T]; H^{s+1}) = (L^1_t([0,T]; H^{-s-1}))^*$ . We want

$$\int_0^T \langle f, \psi \rangle \, dt = \int_0^T \langle P\phi, \psi \rangle \, dt$$
$$= \int_0^T \langle \phi, P^*\psi \rangle \, dt.$$

Define  $\ell : P^*(L^1_t([0,T]; H^{-s})) \to \mathbb{R}$  by  $\ell(P^*\psi) = \int_0^T \langle f, \psi \rangle dt$ . This is well-defined by our a-priori estimate:

$$\|\ell\| \le \|f\|_{L^1(H^s)} \|\psi\|_{L^{\infty}(H^{-s})} \le \|f\|_{L^1(H^s)} \|P^*\psi\|_{L^1(H^{-s-1})}.$$

By Hahn-Banach, there exists an extension  $\ell^* \in (L^1_t(H^{-s-1}))^*$  which is an extension with the bound  $\|\ell^*\| \leq \|f\|_{L^1(H^s)}$ . Here,  $\phi = \ell^* \in L^\infty_t(H^{s+1})$ .

Step 3: Upgrade  $\phi \in L_t^{\infty}(H^{s+1})$  to  $\phi \in C_t(H^{s+1})$  with  $\partial_t \phi \in C_t(H^s)$ . The way to do this is to approximate by smooth objects and try to take the limit. The a priori estimate will stay intact through the limit.